FILE

DEO EXHIBIT 1



In the Matter of the Application of The East Ohio Gas Company d/b/a Dominion East Ohio to Adjust its Automated Meter Reading Cost Recovery Charge and Related Matters IMISSION OF OHIO

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF VICKI H. FRISCIC ON BEHALF OF DOMINION EAST OHIO

This is to certify that the images appearing are an accurate and complete reoreduction of a case file document delivered in the regular course of business: Technician A. Date Processed 4/15/19

TABLE OF CONTENTS

. .

.

.

Page

I.	INTRODUCTION
II.	BACKGROUND
III.	DEO'S OBJECTION TO STAFF RECOMMENDATION NO. 1
IV.	DEO'S OBJECTION TO OCC'S PROPOSAL

1		Direct Testimony of
2		Vicki H. Friscic
3	I.	INTRODUCTION
4	Q1.	Please state your name, occupation and business address.
5	A1.	My name is Vicki H. Friscic. I am employed by The East Ohio Gas Company, d/b/a
6		Dominion East Ohio ("DEO"), as Director Regulatory & Pricing. My business address is
7		1201 East 55th Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44103-1028.
8	Q2.	Please describe your educational background and work experience.
9	A2.	I graduated from Ohio University in 1980 with a Bachelor of Business Administration
10		degree. In 1980, I joined the accounting firm Price Waterhouse as an auditor, became a
11		licensed CPA in 1982, and was promoted to Audit Manager in 1986. From 1987 to 1989,
12		I worked for Progressive Insurance and held managerial accounting positions with
13		responsibility for accounts payable, billing, cash processing, and internal reporting for
14		Progressive's Financial Services Group. In 1989, I was employed by Pepsi-Cola as
15		Manager, Financial Services for its Northeast Ohio franchise with responsibility for
16		accounts receivable and credit, route sales auditing, and computer operations. From 1993
17		to 1997, I worked as a CPA for a local firm providing accounting, business consulting,
18		and tax services to small businesses. I was hired by The East Ohio Gas Company (now
19		DEO) in December 1997 as Manager, Tax and Accounting Services. In 2001, I joined
20		DEO's Pricing and Regulatory Affairs department. I am currently a member of the Ohio
21		Society of CPAs.

x)

1	Q3.	What are your job responsibilities as Director Regulatory & Pricing?
2	A3.	My present duties include oversight of DEO's regulatory affairs. In overseeing DEO's
3		regulatory affairs, I am responsible for all of its regulatory filings before the Public
4		Utilities Commission of Ohio ("Commission"). I also act as DEO's principle liaison with
5		the Commission and with other regulatory process stakeholders. In order to represent
6		DEO effectively in that role, I interact with all levels of management across a variety of
7		functional areas to understand the commercial, operational and administrative issues
8		facing the Company.
9	Q4.	Have you previously testified before the Commission?
10	A4.	Yes. I testified on behalf of DEO in Case No. 07-829-GA-AIR, et al., regarding various
11		schedules supporting the Company's application, including those related to working
12		capital calculation, unaccounted-for gas, test year operating income, tax expense, and test
13		year depreciation and amortization expense. I also testified on behalf of the Company in
14		Case No. 05-474-GA-ATA regarding cost recovery through the Transportation Migration
15		Rider – Part B and Energy Choice program costs under DEO's Phase 1 transition plan.
16 17	Q5.	In your capacity as Director Regulatory & Pricing, are you generally familiar with the Company's books and records?
18	A5.	Yes. I am responsible to prepare and make a variety of financial filings with the
19		regulatory agencies with which I interact. Those filings include financial information
20		derived from DEO's financial records, including the general ledger, annual reports,
21		income statements and balance sheets.

:

1 2	Q6.	Are you familiar with DEO's Application to adjust its Automated Meter Reading Cost Recovery Charge ("AMR Charge")?
3	A6.	Yes. I supervised and coordinated the collection of the data and assembly of the
4		schedules supporting the AMR Charge, which were filed as part of DEO's pre-filing
5		notice and Application.
6	Q7.	What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?
7	A7.	The purpose of my testimony is to explain why DEO disagrees with Staff
8		Recommendation No. 1 set forth on page 9 of Staff's comments. This recommendation
9		eliminates the regulatory asset agreed to by the parties and necessary for DEO to recover
10		costs associated with the implementation of AMR equipment. It also is in conflict with
11		the Stipulation and Recommendation ("Stipulation") signed by Staff and approved by the
12		Commission.
13		I also explain why DEO disagrees with the proposal by the Ohio Consumers' Counsel
14		("OCC") to exclude adjustments made by DEO to meter reading costs in determination of
15		the baseline level of expense from which meter reading operations and maintenance
16		expense savings were measured.
17	Q8.	Does DEO disagree with any other comments made by Staff or OCC?
18	A8.	No. DEO agrees with Staff's remaining proposals. OCC makes no other proposals in its
19		comments.
20	II.	BACKGROUND
21	Q9.	What is AMR?
22	A9.	AMR refers to equipment associated with a gas meter that allows the meter to be read
23		remotely through electronic means. DEO is currently installing encoder-receive-
24		transmitter ("ERT") devices, a type of AMR device, on all its customers' meters. These

devices are read by DEO employees using specialized receivers, while on a meter reading
 route, or simply while driving past the customer's premises.

3

Q10. Does AMR benefit customers?

4 Yes. DEO's customers will realize several benefits from AMR technology, including: A10. 5 (i) cost-effective meter reading as required under the minimum gas service standards; (ii) fewer estimated bills, which in turn will provide a better match between the amount 6 7 billed and actual gas consumption; (iii) more frequent actual meter reads, which improves 8 accuracy in transferring service and eliminates call volume associated with estimated meter reads; and (iv) less need for DEO to schedule appointments to read meters inside 9 10 customers' premises, further enhancing convenience for customers. Commission Staff 11 recognized many of these benefits in its report in Case No. 07-829-GA-AIR, et al., which 12 was subsequently signed by the parties and approved by the Commission. In re DEO Rate Case, Case No. 07-829-GA-AIR et al., (Staff Report at 42) (May 23, 2008). 13

14

Q11. Why did DEO propose an AMR Charge?

A11. DEO proposed an AMR Charge to secure the capital funds necessary to complete AMR installation on a five-year timetable. Absent this charge, DEO would have to fund the program through its normal capital budgeting process, which, in turn, would have meant that a system wide deployment would take fifteen to twenty years. With the AMR Charge, and the ability to deploy AMR technology throughout the Company's system in five years, DEO will achieve the "critical mass" of AMR installations that will yield AMR-related benefits and savings more quickly.

22 Q12. What Commission approvals are necessary for DEO to implement an AMR Charge.

- 23 A12. The process envisioned two steps. First, DEO applied for Commission approval of an
- 24 automatic adjustment mechanism to recover AMR-related costs, in part through deferral

1		of costs to a regulatory asset comprised of depreciation expense, incremental property tax
2		expense, and post-in-service carrying charges ("PISCC") associated with the AMR
3		assets. The Commission approved this mechanism in its Opinion and Order, dated
4		October 15, 2008. Second, all parties, including DEO, were to negotiate a baseline from
5		which call center and meter reading savings could be calculated to offset the regulatory
6		asset to determine the AMR Charge in Case No. 09-38-GA-UNC. Having been
7		unsuccessful in negotiating a baseline, DEO has applied for approval of a \$0.46 AMR
8		Charge under the approved automatic adjustment mechanism. DEO calculated the \$0.46
9		AMR Charge in accordance with the Stipulation, and with appropriate adjustments to
10		meter-reading expenses. There were no call center savings during the applicable time
11		period.
12 13	Q13.	Is there a dispute regarding the arithmetic accuracy of DEO's calculation of the \$0.46 AMR Charge?
14	A13.	No. Both Staff and OCC recommended adjustments from DEO's calculation of a \$0.46
15		AMR Charge but did not dispute \$0.46 as a starting point for their amendments.
16	III.	DEO'S OBJECTION TO STAFF RECOMMENDATION NO. 1
17	Q14.	Please describe Staff's Recommendation No. 1.
18	A14.	Staff allowed DEO's deferral of depreciation and property tax expense through
19		December 31, 2008, but proposes eliminating any further deferrals of depreciation
20		expense and property tax expense. Staff suggests that the deferred expenses be
21		amortized over the useful life of the AMR equipment. Staff also recommends that the
22		unamortized balances of deferred depreciation expense and property taxes be included in
23		rate base.

•

1 Q15. Why does DEO object to Staff's proposal? 2 A15. DEO objects to Staff's proposal because it is contrary to DEO's application in Case No. 3 06-1453-GA-UNC ultimately consolidated with Case No. 07-829-GA-AIR et al., 4 contrary to the Staff Report issued in Case No. 07-829-GA-AIR et al., and contrary to the 5 Stipulation signed by Staff and approved by the Commission in Case No. 07-829-GA-AIR et al. It seeks to revisit issues that have been agreed to by the parties, and have been 6 7 resolved and approved by the Commission. Further, it violates key regulatory principles 8 and will ultimately adversely affect not only the Company, but also its customers. 9 016. Why is the Staff's recommendation contrary to the Staff Report, the Stipulation and 10 the Commission order relating to the AMR Charge? 11 The application, Staff Report, Stipulation signed by Staff, and Commission order A16. 12 approving the Stipulation resolved all issues regarding the method to be used to calculate 13 the AMR Charge. Given that the automatic adjustment mechanism and use of deferrals 14 to accumulate costs to be recovered through the AMR Charge have already been agreed 15 to and approved, the only issues properly for consideration in this proceeding are: (1) the 16 accuracy of calculations included in DEO's application in this case based on the cost 17 recovery mechanism agreed to as part of the Stipulation; and (2) the development of "an 18 appropriate baseline from which meter reading and call center savings will be 19 determined...." In re DEO Rate Case, Case No. 07-829-GA-AIR et al., (Stipulation at 20 10) (August 22, 2008). Staff's proposal is improper because it has nothing to do with 21 either of the issues remaining for consideration in this proceeding. Staff incorrectly seeks 22 to relitigate the agreed to and approved calculation methodology. For this reason alone, 23 Staff's recommendation should be rejected.

Q17. What was the AMR Charge calculation methodology that DEO set forth in its application in Case No. 06-1453-GA-UNC?

3	A17.	DEO's application sought to establish an automatic adjustment mechanism that included:
4		(1) a regulatory asset including depreciation expense, incremental property tax expense,
5		and PISCC earned on AMR capital expenditures; (2) a comparison of the annual meter
6		reading operating and maintenance ("O&M") expense to a 2006 baseline (to determine
7		any savings achieved through the AMR deployment that would be used to reduce the
8		regulatory asset for the benefit of customers); and (3) recovery of the regulatory asset net
9		of the O&M savings through the AMR Charge. In re DEO AMR, Case No. 006-1453-
10		GA-UNC, (Application at 6-7) (December 13, 2006). To provide appropriate due
11		process, in February of each year, DEO proposed to file an application to establish the
12		new AMR Charge based upon the costs accumulated through December 31 of the prior
13		year, adjusted for the associated excise tax obligation, and bills rendered over the prior
14		year.

Q18. What recommendations to DEO's application did Staff make in the Staff Report in Case No. 07-829-GA-AIR et al?

17 A18. The Staff Report made four recommendations regarding the AMR Charge calculation 18 methodology. Staff recommended that DEO should: (1) exclude from the AMR Charge 19 the cost of replacing 82,000 obsolete tin case meters; (2) exclude from the AMR Charge 20 the cost of routine maintenance and replacement activities that occur concurrently with 21 AMR replacement; (3) eliminate a charge for non-access to a customer's premises (that 22 would reduce the regulatory asset as proposed in DEO's application); and (4) change the 23 baseline year to measure O&M expense savings from 2006 to 2007. In re DEO Rate 24 Case, Case No. 07-829-GA-AIR et al., (Staff Report at 43) (May 23, 2008).

1 Q19. Did Staff make any proposals to modify DEO's proposed automatic adjustment 2 mechanism, regulatory asset, or determination of the AMR Charge? 3 A19. No. In fact, the Staff Report unequivocally recognizes that DEO would record the 4 regulatory asset in the manner that Staff now opposes. On page 41 of the Staff Report, it 5 states: 6 According to the AMR Application, DEO would install AMR devices on 7 all of its customer meters over a 5-year period, and would record as a 8 regulatory asset the depreciation, incremental property taxes, and 9 post in-service carrying charges associated with AMR program costs. 10 DEO would accumulate these costs during each year of the 11 deployment period and file an application in February the following 12 year with schedules supporting a fixed AMR Cost Recovery Charge. 13 In each succeeding year, this charge would increase by the 14 accumulated AMR costs until DEO files another rate case and new 15 base rates are approved and go into effect. [Emphasis added.] 16 Q20. Did the Stipulation amend the AMR Charge calculation methodology proposed by 17 DEO, as amended by the Staff Report? 18 A20. No. DEO agreed to all four of the Staff Report recommendations. As to all issues 19 resolved by the Stipulation, it expressly adopted all rates, terms, and conditions set forth 20 in the Staff Report and, if the Staff report did not address any such item, it expressly 21 adopted the application. In re DEO Rate Case, Case No. 07-829-GA-AIR et al., 22 (Stipulation at 3-4) (August 22, 2008). Regarding the AMR Charge, the Stipulation 23 expressly adopted the recommendations set forth in the Staff Report and agreed that 24 "DEO shall work with Staff and OCC to develop an appropriate baseline from which 25 meter reading and call center savings will be determined and such quantifiable savings shall be credited to amounts that would otherwise be recovered through the AMR Cost 26 27 Recovery Charge." In re DEO Rate Case, Case No. 07-829-GA-AIR et al., (Opinion and

- 28 Order at 13) (October 15, 2008). Staff did not recommend elimination of DEO's
- 29 proposed regulatory asset or suggest a change in the amortization period. Staff signed the

Stipulation and thus, agreed to DEO's AMR Charge calculation methodology. The
 Commission approved the Stipulation.

3 Q21. How does the approval of the Stipulation affect this proceeding?

4 A21. It means that all parties - including Staff - have agreed upon DEO's AMR Charge 5 calculation methodology set forth in DEO's application, as amended by the Staff Report. 6 Therefore, as previously stated, the remaining issues for consideration in this proceeding 7 are: (1) the accuracy of DEO's mechanical application of the calculation methodology 8 agreed to as part of the Stipulation; and (2) the development of "an appropriate baseline from which meter reading and call center savings will be determined...." In re DEO Rate 9 10 Case, Case No. 07-829-GA-AIR et al., (Stipulation at 10) (August 22, 2008). 11 The Staff's proposal does not suggest that DEO deviated from the Stipulated calculation 12 methodology for the AMR Charge. It also does not address the establishment of a 13 baseline. Instead, Staff improperly attempts to reshape the calculation methodology 14 already agreed upon and approved by the Commission. DEO believes the Commission 15 should affirm its order approving the AMR cost recovery mechanism and reject Staff's 16 proposal.

17 Q22. Does DEO have any other objection to Staff's proposal?

A22. Yes. Staff's proposal results in an annual rate case with additional risk to customers and
 DEO by effectively eliminating the automatic adjustment mechanism and making it
 possible that DEO could over or under collect the costs associated with AMR.

- 21 Q23. Why do you say that?
- A23. Staff's proposal requires DEO to establish annually a new AMR rate base at a date
 certain and AMR expenses over a test year, much like a traditional rate case. This
 eliminates several of the prime advantages of an automatic adjustment mechanism. It

1		also creates a more complex process that is likely to result in additional time for all
2		parties, and additional costs for DEO to prosecute the case, to the detriment of all
3		customers.
4 5	Q24.	Is the AMR Charge calculated in a manner consistent with other DEO cost recovery mechanisms?
6	A24.	Yes. DEO's deferral of AMR costs and calculation of the AMR Charge are consistent
7		with how DEO handles other cost recovery deferrals and rider calculations. The
8		following cost recovery mechanisms are designed to provide a full recovery of all costs
9		incurred in connection with the affiliated programs in the same manner that DEO
10		anticipates fully recovering all costs associated with the AMR program:
11		• The calculation of the Uncollectible Expense Rider is an example of another
12		automatic adjustment mechanism, which for any given year includes deferred
13		costs that have not yet been recovered from the preceding period(s) plus an
14		estimate of net bad debt expense for the prospective 12 months.
15		• The calculation of DEO's Transportation Migration Rider - Part B includes
16		previously deferred but unrecovered operational balancing gas costs plus an
17		estimate of contract storage capacity costs for the prospective 12 months.
18		• The PIPP Rider calculation also includes previously deferred but unrecovered
19		PIPP program costs plus an estimate of PIPP program deferrals for the
20		prospective period during which the new rider will be in effect.
21	Q25.	Does Staff's proposal violate any important regulatory principle?
22	A25.	Yes. Regulatory and accounting principles require that DEO incur expenses and collect
23		revenues during the same time period to the extent possible. Staff's proposal violates the
24		matching principle by causing a time lag between DEO's incurrence of an expense and its

1		receipt of revenues. Further, Staff's proposal applies the matching principle in an
2		inconsistent manner. Specifically, Staff's proposal retains DEO's methodology of
3		crediting operating and maintenance savings to customers over a single year while
4		requiring DEO to amortize deferred depreciation and property tax expense over the life of
5		the AMR assets. Simply put, Staff wants customers to realize within a year any savings
6		achieved but doesn't want customers to pay in the same timeframe for the expenses
7		incurred to achieve those savings. Staff's proposal results in a lopsided mechanism in
8		which all of the savings go to the benefit of the customer but only a portion of the cost is
9		recognized.
10 11 12	Q26.	Does the AMR Charge calculation methodology agreed to by the parties to the Stipulation and approved by the Commission resolve the issues raised by Staff's proposal?
1 3	A26.	Yes. The automatic adjustment mechanism permits DEO to recover actual costs
14		associated with AMR implementation so that there is no over or under collection
15		associated with the AMR Charge. Avoiding over or under collections is a benefit to
16		customers and DEO. The annual deferrals will be offset by O&M savings, including any
17		reductions in call-center and or meter-reading expenses. The deferral of costs associated
18		with AMR capital investments permits DEO to properly match expenses and revenues
19		during the life of the AMR Charge.
20	Q27.	Does the Staff's proposal raise concerns apart from this case?
21	A27.	Yes. Staff agreed to the automatic adjustment mechanism and deferral process. Staff did
22		not propose any alternative in its Staff Report. Staff signed the Stipulation and did not
23		propose any alternative to be included in the Stipulation. At no time did Staff suggest
24		elimination of the regulatory asset set forth in DEO's application. At the same time,
25		DEO accepted every adjustment proposed by Staff and ultimately, came to an agreement

.

.

٠

1		on an AMR Charge calculation methodology with all parties. It is important to the
2		regulatory process that Staff remain consistent in its position so that DEO and customers
3		may depend upon agreements with the Staff.
4	Q28.	What effect does rejection of Staff's proposal have on the AMR Charge?
5	A28.	Rejection of Staff's proposal and acceptance of Staff's remaining three recommendations
6		changes DEO's proposed AMR Charge from \$0.46 to \$ 0.39 as shown on Attachment
7		VHF 1.
8 9	Q29.	What effect would Commission acceptance of Staff's proposal have on AMR implementation?
10	A29.	Staff has calculated the AMR Charge at \$0.34 if its proposals are adopted. At that rate it
11		is doubtful that DEO can fully recover the actual costs associated with the AMR
12		implementation.
13	IV.	DEO'S OBJECTION TO OCC'S PROPOSAL
14	O 30.	Please describe OCC's proposal.
	4 000	
15	A30.	OCC proposes to exclude adjustments made by DEO to meter reading costs in
15 16	A30.	OCC proposes to exclude adjustments made by DEO to meter reading costs in determination of the baseline level of expense from which meter reading O&M expense
15 16 17	A30.	OCC proposes to exclude adjustments made by DEO to meter reading costs in determination of the baseline level of expense from which meter reading O&M expense savings were measured.
15 16 17 18 19	A30. Q31.	OCC proposes to exclude adjustments made by DEO to meter reading costs in determination of the baseline level of expense from which meter reading O&M expense savings were measured.
15 16 17 18 19 20	A30. Q31. A31.	OCC proposes to exclude adjustments made by DEO to meter reading costs in determination of the baseline level of expense from which meter reading O&M expense savings were measured. What are DEO's obligations to the Department of Transportation ("DOT") to conduct inspections of inside meters? The DOT requires a safety inspection to perform leak detection for all inside meters
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A30. Q31. A31.	OCC proposes to exclude adjustments made by DEO to meter reading costs in determination of the baseline level of expense from which meter reading O&M expense savings were measured. What are DEO's obligations to the Department of Transportation ("DOT") to conduct inspections of inside meters? The DOT requires a safety inspection to perform leak detection for all inside meters every three years. This requirement does not change based upon installation of an ERT
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 21 22	A30. Q31. A31.	OCC proposes to exclude adjustments made by DEO to meter reading costs in determination of the baseline level of expense from which meter reading O&M expense savings were measured. What are DEO's obligations to the Department of Transportation ("DOT") to conduct inspections of inside meters? The DOT requires a safety inspection to perform leak detection for all inside meters every three years. This requirement does not change based upon installation of an ERT device. DEO incurs expense to conduct the inspection and uses a third party contractor
 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	A30. Q31. A31.	OCC proposes to exclude adjustments made by DEO to meter reading costs in determination of the baseline level of expense from which meter reading O&M expense savings were measured. What are DEO's obligations to the Department of Transportation ("DOT") to conduct inspections of inside meters? The DOT requires a safety inspection to perform leak detection for all inside meters every three years. This requirement does not change based upon installation of an ERT device. DEO incurs expense to conduct the inspection and uses a third party contractor and its employees to conduct the inspections. OCC proposes to include the Department

Q32. Why does DEO object to OCC's proposal?

A32. DEO has four objections to OCC's proposal. First, OCC's proposal seeks to assign
 expenses to the AMR Charge that have nothing to do with AMR implementation. The
 costs associated with the required DOT inspections of inside meters do not vary with or
 have any relation to the AMR implementation.

6 Second, OCC, and all other parties, agreed in the Stipulation to include savings 7 associated with DOT inspections of inside meters that may no longer be necessary if 8 meters are relocated outside as part of the determination of the Pipeline Infrastructure 9 Rider ("PIR") Cost Recovery Charge. In re DEO Rate Case, Case No. 07-829-GA-AIR 10 et al., (Stipulation at 10) (August 22, 2008). It is inappropriate to try to amend the 11 Stipulation subsequent to agreement by the parties and after Commission approval by 12 including the DOT cost savings in the AMR Charge. Any such savings will be 13 appropriately considered in connection with the PIR Cost Recovery Charge. 14 Third, OCC seeks to eliminate adjustments made by DEO to meter reading O&M 15 expenses for 2007 and 2008 related to labor costs for six meter reading clerks. Effective 16 November 2007, an organizational change was made to move six meter reading clerks 17 into a pool of Operations clerical workers. That change had the effect of moving the 18 labor costs associated with the six meter reading clerks out of meter reading cost centers 19 into a cost center where the costs of the other Operations clerical workers are recorded. 20 Accordingly, 2007 meter reading expense, which included 10 months of the meter 21 reading clerks' labor costs, was not comparable to 2008 meter reading expense. The 22 labor cost adjustments made by DEO put a full year of labor costs for these clerks in both 23 2007 and 2008 to make them comparable. DEO has implemented a change to ensure that

the labor costs associated with the meter reading clerks are properly classified as meter
 reading expense for 2009 and going forward.

3 Fourth, the OCC claims that the adjustments made by DEO "unjustifiably inflated the year-end regulatory asset and the resulting AMR Cost Recovery Charge," that 2007 is the 4 5 proper base for calculating meter reading savings, and that "no adjustments were allowed 6 or contemplated." DEO disagrees. The Stipulation directs the parties to determine "an 7 appropriate baseline." It does not specify a year that should be used, nor does it state that 8 adjustments to a given year being considered cannot be made. It also does not state that 9 meter reading and call center expense savings should be determined separately rather 10 than in the aggregate. In the spirit of compromise, DEO considers 2007 meter reading 11 O&M expenses, as adjusted, to be an appropriate baseline for meter reading expense 12 savings and believes the meter reading savings included in its application were properly 13 determined by comparing the 2007 baseline with 2008 meter reading expenses similarly 14 adjusted.

15 Q33. Does this conclude your testimony?

16 A33. Yes.

Attachment VHF.1

.

THE EAST OHIO GAS COMPANY *d/b/a* DOMINION EAST OHIO AUTOMATED METER READING ESTIMATED COST RECOVERY CHARGE - FILING SCHEDULES REVENUE REQUIREMENT CASE NO. 09-38-GA-UNC

Schedule 1

		Revised for Staff Adjustments 2 - 4	Filed 02/27/09	
Llne		Cumulative through	Cumulative through	Variance from
No.		12/31/08	12/31/08	Schedules Filed 2/27/09
- ~	Return on Investment Plant in Service			
4 ጦ	Additions	\$32,891,588,51	\$38,009,432,70	-\$5,117,844,19
4	Retirements	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Ŋ	Total Plant In Service	\$32,891,588.51	\$38,009,432.70	-\$5,117,844,19
9	Less: Accumulated Provision for Depreciation			
~	Depreciation Expense	\$882,775.40	\$918,016.77	-\$35,241.37
8	Cost of Removal	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
a (Original Cost Retired	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
9	Total Accumulated Provision for Depreciation	\$882,775.40	\$918,016.77	-\$35,241.37
11	Net Regulatory Asset - Post-In-Service Carrying Cost	\$1,607,909.09	\$1,671,739.43	-\$63,830.34
12	Net Deferred Tax Balance - PISCC	-\$562,768.18	-\$585,108.80	\$22,340.62
13	Deferred Taxes on Liberalized Depreciation	-\$1,057,425.87	-\$1,134,653.67	\$77,227.80
14	Net Rate Base	\$31,996,528.15	\$37,043,392.89	-\$5,046,864.74
15	Approved Pre -Tax Rate of Return (ROR)	11.36%	11.36%	0.00%
16	Annualized Return on Rate Base	\$3,634,805.60	\$4,208,129.43	-\$573,323.83
17	Operating Expense			
i 93	Incremental Depreciation Expense through 12/31/08	\$882,775.40	\$918,016.77	-\$35,241.37
19	Annualized Depreciation for Additions through 12/31/08	\$1,093,795.75	\$1,231,977.54	-\$138,181.79
21	Annualized Amortization of PISOC	\$54,762.00	\$58,825.74	-\$4,063.74
5	Indremental Property 1aX Expense Unougn 12/31/08	20.1/5/5	986,/U9.30 * 407 952 95	-\$13,158.28 #102 720 00
3 2	Annualized Property Lax Expense for Additions unrough 12/31/08 Dedication in Call Cantor Evences	\$314,022.98 #0.00	08.508,1844	99.052,251.4-
J X	Reduction in Meter Reading Expense	-\$275,928.62	-\$275,928.62	\$0.00
ĸ	Annualized Revenue Requirement	\$5,780,404.13	\$6,727,584.02	-\$947,179.89
8	Number of Bills	14,769,345	14,769,345	ı
27	AMR Cost Recovery Charge - Revised	\$0.39	\$0.46	-\$0.07

~1414069.xls

THE EAST OHIO GAS COMPANY d/b/a DOMINION EAST OHIO AUTOMATED METER READING ESTIMATED COST RECOVERY CHARGE Plant Additions by Month

Schedule 2

•

.

-	ERC#	Balance at 3/31/07 (1)	04/30/07	05/31/07	06/30/07	07/31/07	08/31/07	10/02/60	10/31/07	11/30/07	12/31/07	2007 Total Year
	3820	0.00	49,586.29 188 270 13	603,398.16 1 889 439 17	894,103,66 3 242 157 30	1,083,084.77	1,367,601.22 3.193.789.81	1,519,505.99 4,233,451.32	2,105,930.60 4.598.289.42	2,289,783.66 4.564.425.91	2,756,263.11 4.523.047.88	
	3912	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	115,257.55	115,257.55	115,256.70	115,256.70	115,289.43	115,959.17	
	3990	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	3030	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	119,545.96	122,715.84	123,287.08	172,851.91	226,195.37	
hased	3030	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	90,887.50	91,310.58	91,735.63	278,945.51	
	1	0.00	237,856.42	2,492,837.28	4,136,260.96	4,399,121.59	4,796,194.54	6,081,817.35	7,034,074.38	7,234,086.54	7,900,411.04	
		0.00	49.586.29	553,811,87	290,705.50	188,981.11	284,516.45	151,904.77	586,424.61	183,853.06	466,479.45	2,756,263.11
		00.0	188.270.13	1,701,168.99	1,352,718.18	(41,378.03)	(6,989.46)	1,039,661.51	364,838.10	(33,863.51)	(41,378.03)	4,523,047.88
		00.0	0.00	800	0.00	115,257.55	00.0	(0.85)	0.0	32.73	669.74	115,959.17
		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0
Company 17		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	119,545.96	3,169.88	571.24	49,564.83	53,343.46	226,195.37
rchased		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	90,887.50	423.08	425.05	187,209.88	278,945.51
	I	000	237,856.42	2,254,980,86	1.643.423.68	262,860.63	397.072.95	1,285,622.81	952,257.03	200,012.16	666,324.50	7,900,411.04

15 (1) Included in Rate Case No. 07-0829-GA-AIR

Schedule 2A

•

2008 Total Year		8,592,168.14 14,771,574.63 392,355.47 966,250.44 197,774.09 71,054.70 24,991,177.47
12/31/2008	11, 348, 421. 25 19, 294, 622. 51 508, 314. 64 966, 220, 946 320,000.21 32, 891, 588.51	718,079.28 (110,938,62) 16,966.30 99,703.58 51,146.51 714,957.05
11/30/08	10,630,351.97 19,405,561.13 491,348,34 866,546,86 423,999,46 298,853.70 32,116,631,46	495,789.51 (15,899,10) 14,310,14 81,459,74 2,040,03 1,438,00 1,438,00 579,138,32
10/31/08	10,134,562.46 19,421,460.23 785,087.12 785,087.12 421,929,43 297,415.70 31,537,493.14	793,327.16 (22,334.10) 68,895.82 2,030.21 1,431.09 843,350.18
80/01/60	9,341,235,30 19,443,794,33 477,038,20 716,191,30 419,899,22 295,984,61 30,694,142.96	655,345.15 (402,188.77) 136.97 96,384.37 9,357.59 1,606.32 360,641.63
08/31/08	8,665,890.15 19,845,963.10 476,901.23 619,806,93 410,541.63 294,378,29 30,333,501.33	854,291.26 3,118,796.22 113,749.67 2,228.03 4,273.86 4,093,339.04
02/31/08	7,631,598,89 16,727,186,88 476,901,23 506,0137,26 408,313,60 290,104,43 26,240,162,29	671,108.07 1,614,986.78 3,502.05 125,726.98 4,190.87 1,574.41 2,421,089.16
06/30/08	7,160,490.82 15,112,200.10 473,390.18 380,330.28 404,122.73 288,530.02 288,530.02 23,819,073.13	947,996.94 1,500,523.61 87,080.98 55,350.26 1,555.40 2,552,507.19
05/31/08	6,212,493,88 13,611,676,49 473,399,18 293,2493,243 348,772,47 286,974,62 21,226,565.94	650,325.92 1,562,251.21 94,817.73 10,832.10 1,974.06 2,310,201.02
04/30/08	5,562,167,96 12,049,425,28 473,399,18 208,491,37 337,940,37 285,000.56 18,916,364,92	885,288.09 1,527,575.04 72,276.47 17,980.93 1,536.38 1,536.38
03/31/08	4.676,879.87 10,521,850.24 120,828.23 136,155.10 319,955.41 282, <u>464.18</u> 283, <u>464.18</u> 16,059,137.06	1,055,287.90 1,395,469.00 4,869.06 52,958.98 12,421.15 2,449,426.52 2,449,426.52
02/29/08	3,624,591,97 9,126,381,24 115,959,17 83,186,23 307,538,29 312,043,75 13,569,710,54	774,395.97 4,685,081.64 48,798.74 40,646.84 1,478.29 1,478.29 5,550,401.48
01/31/08	2,850,136,00 4,441,299,60 115,959,17 34,393,28 34,393,38 266,891,35 310,565,46 8,019,309,06	93,932,89 (81,748,28) 34,397,38 40,695,08 31,619,95 118,896,02
FERC	3820 3810 3810 3810 3820 3820 3820 3820 3820 3820 3820 382	
Line No.	Cumulative I EKT installation I EKT Purchases 3 Computer Hardware 4 In House Labor - CCS IT 5 In House Labor - TT 5 In House Labor - TT 6 Computer Software - Purchased 7 Total	Incrementai 8 E.R.T. Installation 9 E.R.T. Purchases 10 Computer Hardware 11 In House Labor - Service Company IT 12 In House Labor - Service Company IT 13 Computer Software - Purchased 14 Total

THE EAST OHIO GAS COMPANY d'bia DOMINION EAST OHIO AUTOMATED METER READING ESTIMATED COST RECOVERY CHARGE Provision for Depreciation

Schedule 3

늰	υ	Balance at	20/06/90	0138707	20/05/90	20/12/20	20/16/80	20/30/07	10/31/07	11/30/07	20136121	Balance at 12/31/2007
Ĭ	_			10/20/00	10 100 100							
-	ERT Installation		38 .35	1,196.74	1,773.31	2,148.12	2,712.41	3,013.69	4,176.76	4,541.40	5,466.59	25,127.37
	ERT Purchases	I	356.14	3,574.19	6,133.08	6,054.81	6,041.59	8,008.28	8,698.43	8,634.37	8,556.10	56,056.99
ŝ	Computer Hardware	,				1,920.96	1,920.96	1,920.95	1,920.95	1,921.49	1,932.65	11,537.96
4	In House Labor - CCS JT					,		ŀ			'	
- UN	In House Labor - IT		•	•	•	F	1,992.43	2,045.26	2,054.78	2,680,87	3,769.92	12,743.26
, ve	Computer Software - Punchased	-		•	-		•	1,514.79	1,521.84	1,528.93	4,649.09	9,214.65
~	Total		454.49	4,770.93	7,906.39	10,123.89	12,667.39	16,502.97	18,372.76	19,507.06	24,374.35	114,680.23
80	Cumulative Provision for Depreciation		454.49	5,225.42	13,131.81	23,255.70	35,923.09	52,426.06	70,798.82	90,305.88	114,680.23	
ch.	(1) Included in Rate Case No. 07-0829-GA-AIR											

Depr Rate	2.38%	2.27%	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	6.67%
	ERT Installation	ERT Purchases	Computer Hardware	Computer Software - Purchases	Computer Software Project	Computer Software Project - CCS

• .

!

Schedule 3A

.

ς Β	پو	20/1E/2T	01/31/08	30/22/20	03/31/08	04/30/08	05/31/08	80/30/08	B0/TE/20	80/16/80	80/05/60	BO/LE/OL	11/30/08	12/31/2008	Balance at 12/31/2008
	EOT Installation		5 653 84	7.188.77	9.275.81	11.031.63	12,321.45	14,201.64	15,532.67	17, 227, 02	18,526.78	20,100.22	19,666.15	20,994.60	171,719.63
1 10	ERT Purchages		8.401.46	17.264.07	19,903.83	22,793.50	25,748,75	28,587.25	31,642.26	37,541,98	35,781.18	36,738.93	43,662,51	43,412.90	352,478.62
. "	Competer Harriware		1 932.65	1.932.65	2,013.80	7,889.99	7,889.99	7,889.99	7,948.35	7,948.35	7,950.64	7,950,64	8,189.14	8,471.91	78,008.10
•			191.19	462.43	756.80	1,158.53	1,629.98	2,114.00	2,812.83	3,445,09	3,980.63	4,363.78	4,816.56	5,370.74	31,102.76
	To House abor - TT		4.448.19	5.125.64	5.332.66	5,632.34	5,812.87	8E'5EZ'9	6,805.23	6,842,36	6,998.32	7,032.16	7,066.16	7,066.16	74,897.47
9	Computer Software - Purchased		5,176.09	5,200.73	4,724.40	4,750.01	4,782.91	4,808.83	4,835.07	4,906.30	4,933.08	4,956.93	4,980.50	5,833.34	59,888.59
~	Total		25,802,47	37,174,29	42,007.30	53,256.00	58,185.95	64,337.09	69,576.41	77,911.10	E8'0 <u>/1</u> '6/	81,142.66	88,381.42	31,149.65	768,095.17
-	Cumulative Provision for Depreciation	114,680.23	140,482.70	177,656,99	219,664.29	272.920.29	331,106.24	395,443.33	465,019.74	542,930.84	622,101.67	703,244.33	791,625.75	882,775.40	
	EDT Tootslation	Depr Rate	Effective 11/1/08 2 22%												

 ERT Installation
 2.39%
 2.22%

 ERT Prictasses
 2.27%
 2.70%

 Computer Handware
 2.00%
 2.00%

 Computer Software Project
 20.00%
 2.00%

 Computer Software Project
 20.00%
 2.00%

 Computer Software Project
 20.00%
 2.00%

Line No.		70/ 02/40	02/31/07	06/30/07	07/31/07	08/31/07	0/30/02	10/31/07	11/30/07	12/31/07	Balance at 12/31/2007
	Accumulated CapX		1002 000	201 100 66	TE 100 COV 1	CC 103 236 1	1 610 505 00	7 10E 030 ED	37 COL VOL C	3 TEC 162 11	
~		47.050,24	003,398.10	00.5UL #40	1/100/CON/1	77'TN0'/0C'T	1,012,410,410 k	00'056'E01'7	2,203/,00,001		
~	ERT Purchases	188,270.13	1,889,459.12	UC. /CL,242,2	3,200,179.21	2, 193, 789, 81	26.104,462,4	24,202,090,42	TR'C74'+0C'+	00'/+0'c7c'+	
4	Computer Hardware	0.00	0.00	0.00	115,257.55	115,257,55	115,256.70	115,256.70	115,289.43	115,959.17	
ŝ	In House Labor - CCS IT	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.00	
9	In House Labor - IT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	119,545.96	122,715.84	123,287.08	172,851.91	226,195.37	
7	Computer Software - Purchased	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	90,887.50	91,310.58	91,735.63	278,945.51	
80	Accumulated CapX	237,856.42	2,492,837.28	4,136,260.96	4,399,121.59	4,796,194.54	6,081,817.35	7,034,074.38	7,234,086.54	7,900,411.04	
đ	Requiatory Asset - Deferrals										
9	ERT Installation	0.0	268.59	3,268.41	4,843.06	5,866.71	7,407.84	8,230.66	11,407.12	12,402.99	53,695.39
Π	ERT Purchases	0.00	1,019.80	10,234.46	17,561.69	17,337.55	17,299.69	22,931.19	24,907.40	24,723.97	136,015.76
1	Computer Hardware	0.00	0.00	0,00	0.00	624.31	624.31	624.31	624.31	624.48	3,121.72
13	In House Labor - CCS IT	0.00	0.00	00'0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	In House Labor - IT	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	647.54	664.71	667.81	936.28	2,916.34
51	Computer Software - Purchased	0.00	00:0	0,00	0.00	0.00	0.00	492.31	494.60	496.90	1,483.81
91	Total Deferrals	0.00	1,288.39	13,502.87	22,404.75	23,828.58	25,979.39	32,943.18	38,101.24	39,184.64	197,233.02
ŗ	these defense Accede - Accededition										
2 9	regulating Asset - zeros uzarout CDT Trattalistion	000	000	000	0.00	0.00	0.00	000	000	0.00	0.00
99	CDT Diarchaeae			000	000	000	0.0	0.00	000	00.0	0.00
2 5	Criticaco Computer Hambiero		800	000	000		000	0.0	000	0.00	0.00
3 5	To House Labor - CCS IT	00.0	000	000	000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	00'0	0.00
3 2	In House Labor - Coo II			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0,00	0.00	0.00
12	Computer Software - Purchased	00'0	0.00	0.00	00.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	00'0
2	Total Amortization	0.00	00:0	000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
25	Renulatory Asset - Net										
ž	FRT Installation	0.00	268.59	3,268,41	4,843.06	5,866.71	7,407.84	8,230.66	11,407.12	12,402.99	53,695.39
5	ERT Purchases	0.00	1,019.80	10,234.46	17,561.69	17,337.55	17,299.69	22,931.19	24,907.40	24,723.97	136,015.76
i 22	Computer Handware	0.00	00.0	0.00	0.00	624.31	624.31	624.31	624.31	624.48	3,121.72
R	In House Labor - CCS IT	0.00	0.0	0.00	00.0	0.00	0.0	00.0	0.00	0.00	0.00
8	In House Labor - IT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	647.54	664.71	667.81	936.28	2,916.34
31	Computer Software - Purchased	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.00	0,00	0.00	492.31	494.60	496.90	1,483.81
32	Net	0.00	1,288.39	13,502.87	22,404.75	23,828,58	25,979.39	32,943.18	38,101.24	39,184.64	197,233.02
EE	Cumulative	0.0	1,288.39	14,791.26	37,196.00	61,024.58	87,003.97	119,947.14	158,048.38	197,233.02	

e S

5000

Schedule 4A

430,444.75 889,578,46 23,227.38 25,076.19 25,076.19 23,270.38 19,078.91 19,078.91 430,444.75 839,578.46 23,2778.46 25,076.19 25,076.19 23,270.38 23,270.38 23,270.38 Balance at 12/31/2008 484,140.14 1,025,594.22 26,349.10 25,076,19 26,186.72 26,186.72 26,272 26,272 111,348,431.25 19,294,622.51 508,314,64 966,250,44 423,969,46 <u>350,000.21</u> 32,891,588.51 57,581.07 105,113.46 2,661.47 4,693.80 7,296.50 1,618.79 171,965.09 57,581.07 105,113.46 2,661.47 4,693.80 2,296.50 1,618.79 1,518.79 1,73,965.09 88888888 12/31/2008 54,895.55 105,199.58 2,583,96 4,252.56 2,285,45 1,611.00 1,0428,10 10,630,351.97 19,405,561.13 491.348.34 866,546.86 423,969.46 298,853.70 298,853.70 32,116,631.46 426,559,07 920,480,76 23,687,63 20,382,39 23,994,00 433,944,00 54,895.55 105,199.58 2,583.96 4,252.56 2,285.45 1,611.00 170,828.10 88888888 11/30/08 10,134,562.46 19,421,460.23 477,038.20 785,067.12 421,929.43 297,415.70 31,537,493.14 50,598.36 105,320.55 2,583.96 3,879.37 2,774.45 1,603.25 166,259.94 50,598.36 105,320.55 2,583.96 3,879.37 2,274.45 2,274.45 1,603.25 1,603.25 371,663.52 81.15281.18 21,103.67 73,101.604.73 21,604.73 21,504.23 263,115.90 10/31/08 47,048.57 107,499.08 2,583.21 3,357,29 2,223.77 1,594.55 164,306.47 321,065.16 709,960.63 18,519.71 12,250.46 19,330.32 15,729.68 096,855.96 9,341,235,30 19,443,794,33 477,038,20 716,191,30 419,899,22 295,984,61 30,694,142,96 47,048.57 107,499.08 2,583.21 3,357.29 2,223.77 2,223.77 1594.55 164,306.47 88888888 09/30/08 42,421.16 90,605.60 2,583.21 2,741.14 2,741.14 2,211.70 1,271.40 8,685,890.15 19,845,983.10 476,901.23 619,806.93 410,541.63 294,378.29 30,333,501.33 42,421.16 90,605.60 2,583.23 2,741.14 2,711.10 1,571.40 142,134.23 274,016.59 602,461.55 15,936.50 8,893.17 17,106.55 14,135.13 932,549,49 08/31/08 7,831,598.89 16,727,186.88 476,901.23 506,057.26 408,313.60 290,104.43 26,240,162.29 38,785,99 81,857,75 2,564,25 2,160,02 2,189,00 2,189,00 2,189,00 2,189,00 2,00,95 2,00,95 33,785.99 81,857.75 2,564.25 2,189.00 2,189.00 1,562.87 1,562.87 231,595,43 511,855,95 13,353,29 16,152,07 14,894,85 11,563,73 11,563,73 8888888 07/31/08 33,651.01 73,729.91 2,566.25 1,586.43 1,586.45 1,597.45 114,977.23 33,651.01 73,729.91 2,564.25 1,588.43 1,889.18 1,889.18 1,554.45 1,554.45 7,160,490.82 15,112,200.10 473,399.18 380,330.28 404,122.73 288,530.02 23,819,073.13 192,809,44 429,958,20 10,789,04 4,091,91 12,705,85 11,000,86 661,395,30 88888888 06/30/08 6,212,493,88 13,611,676,49 473,399,18 293,249,30 348,772,47 286,974,62 21,226,565,94 30,128.41 65,267.72 2,554.25 1,129.00 1,129.00 1,830.51 1,543.55 102,463.64 30,128,41 65,267.72 2,564.25 1,129,00 1,129,00 1,543.75 102,463.64 159,158,43 356,268,29 8,224,79 8,224,79 10,816,67 9,446,41 9,446,41 05/31/08 129,030.02 291,000.57 5,660.57 1,374.48 8,986.16 7,902.66 443,954.43 25,333.10 56,993.36 654.49 737.51 1,733.11 1,535.43 86,987.00 5,562,167,96 12,049,425,28 473,399,18 208,431,57 337,940,37 285,000,56 18,916,364,92 25,333.10 56,993.36 654.49 737.51 1,733.11 1,733.11 1,733.11 1,535.43 86,887.00 888888888 04/30/08 103,696.92 234,007.21 5,006.05 636.97 7,253.05 6,367.23 356,967.43 4,676,879,87 10,521,850,24 120,828,23 136,155,10 319,959,44 283,464,18 16,059,137,06 19,633.21 49,434,57 628.11 450,65 1,665.83 1,690.24 73,502.61 19,633.21 49,434.57 6,28.11 450.65 1,666.83 1,690.24 73,502.61 88888888 03/31/08 3,624,591.97 9,126,381.24 115,959.17 83,196.12 307,538.29 312,043.75 3,569,710.54 15,438,56 24,057,04 628,11 186,32 1,445,66 1,445,66 1,682,23 43,437,92 15,438.56 24,057.04 628.11 186.32 1,445.66 1,682.23 43,437.92 88888888 84,063.71 184,572.64 4,377.94 186.32 5,587.22 6,587.22 183,464.82 02/29/08 2,850,196.00 4,441,299.60 115,959.17 34,397,38 266,891,45 310,565.46 8,019,309.06 14,929.76 24,495.84 628.11 0.00 1,225.22 1,510.95 1,510.95 68,625.15 160,515.60 3,749.83 0.00 4,141.56 2,994.76 2,994.76 14,929.76 24,499.84 628.11 0.00 1,225.22 1,510.95 42,793.89 01/31/08 2,756,263.11 4,523,047.88 115,959.17 0.00 226,195.37 278,945.51 7,900,411.04 53,69539 136,015.76 3,121.72 2,916.34 1,483.81 197,233.02 12/31/2007 3 Currulative ERT Fraculation ERT Purchases Computer Hardware In House Labor - CCS IT In House Labor - 17 Compute Software - Purchased Total Zecumulated CapK ERT pristilistion ERT Purchases Computer Handware In House Labor - CCS IT In House Labor - CCS IT Computer Schware - Purchased Accumutated CapK Regulatory Asset - Deferrals Etti Installation Etti Purchases Computer Hardware In House Labor - CCS IT In House Labor - CC Computer Software - Purchased Total Deferrals Regulatory Asset - Amortization ERT Purchases ERT Purchases Computer Hahor - ICS IT In House Labor - IC Computer Schmare - Purchased Total Amortisation Regulatory Asset - Net ERT Installation ERT Installation Computer Haavas Computer Haavas Computer Haavas In House Labor - TC Theore - Purchased

•93325593 589855888 5886888 848868889

	Schedule 5	Balance at 12/31/07	55,316.93 13,714.62	69,031.56	35.00%
		11/30/07	41,981.50 13,335.43	55,316.93	35.00%
		10/31/07	30,451.39 11,530.11	41,981.50	35.00%
<u>HIO</u> CHARGE		0/02/60	21,358.60 9,092.79	30,451.39	35.00%
IINION EAST O ST RECOVERY (ISCC		08/31/07	13,018.60 8,340.00	21,358.60	35.00%
<u>ANY d/b/a DOM</u> STIMATED CO: Fax Balance - P		07/31/07	5,176.94 7,841.66	13,018.60	35.00%
HIO GAS COMPAN TER READING EST Net Deferred Tax		06/30/07	450.94 4 ,7 26.00	5,176.94	35.00%
<u>THE EAST OF</u> ITOMATED MET		05/31/07	- 450.94	450.94	35.00%
AL		04/30/07			35.00%
			Net Deferred Tax Balance - PISCC Beginning Balance Monthly Activity	Ending Balance	Tax Rate
		Line No.	10 €	4	

.

ł

.

THE EAST OHLO GAS COMPANY d/b/a DOMINION EAST OHLO AUTOMATED METER READING ESTIMATED COST RECOVERY CHARGE Net Deferred Tax Balance - PISCC

Schedule 5A

.

.

Line No.	12/31/2007	07/31/08	02/29/08	03/31/08	04/30/08	02/31/08	06/30/08	07/31/08	08/31/08	80/08/60	10/31/08	11/30.08	Balance at 12/31/08
 Net Deferred Tax Balance - PISCC Beginning Balance Monthly Activity 		69,031.56 14,977.86	84,009.41 15,203.27	99,212.69 25,725.91	124,938.60 30,445.45	155,384.05 35,862.27	191,246.32 40,242.03	231,488.35 45,156.99	276,645.35 49,746.97	326,392.32 57,507.26	383,899.58 58,190.98	442,090.56 59,789.84	501,880.40 60,887.78
4 Ending Balance	69,031.56	84,009.41	99,212.69	124,938.60	155,384.05	191,246.32	231,488.35	276,645.35	326,392.32	383,899.58	442,090.56	501,880.40	562,768.18
Tax Rate	35.00%	35.00%	35,00%	35.00%	35.00%	35.00%	35.00%	35.00%	35.00%	35.00%	32:00%	35.00%	35.00%

THE EAST OHIO GAS COMPANY d/b/a DOMINION EAST OHIO AUTOMATED METER READING ESTIMATED COST RECOVERY CHARGE Deferred Taxes on Liberalized Depreciation

Schedule 6

•

•

				Tax Year 2007	Tax Yea	r 2008	
			 	Vintage 2007	Vintage 2007	Vintage 2008	
j P		FERC Acrount	lax Ife	10(3)	10031 Vintage 2007	Vintage 2008	10081 Vta 2007 - 08
0	Plant In-Service	ALCOULT	i i	1003/10/21			
-	ERT Installation	3820	15/20	2,756,263.11	2,756,263.11	8,592,168.14	11,348,431.25
~	ERT Purchases	3810	15/20	4,523,047.88	4,523,047.88	14,771,574.63	19,294,622.51
m	Computer Hardware	3912	ŝ	115,959.17	115,959.17	392,355.47	508,314.64
ব	Computer Software - CCS IT	3990	1	0.00	0.00	966,250.44	966,250.44
ŝ	Computer Software · IT	3030		226,195.37	226,195.37	197,774.09	423,969.46
ç	Computer Software - Purchased	3030	ا م	278,945.51	278,945.51	71,054.70	350,000.21
~	Total Plant In-Service			7,900,411.04	7,900,411.04	24,991,177.47	32,891,588.51 Schedule 2A
	Book to Tax Basis Adjustments:						
82	MACRS - 5 Year Property			0:00	0.00	0.00	0.00
cr.	MACRS - 15 Year Property			0.00	00.0	0.00	0.00
9	MACRS - 20 Year Property			0.00	0.00	0:00	0.00
11	MACR5 - 3 Year Property			0.00	000	8.6	0.00
21	MACKS - 1 Year Property		1	0.00	M 10	M	0.00
13	Total Book to Tax Basis Adjustments			D.00	0000	0.00	0.00
	Tav Baco Ta-Convine subject two						
P.	ad base in Service subject to: MAPRS - 5 Year Dimonth			115.959.17	115,959,17	392,355,47	508.314.64
1	MACR5 - 15 Year Property			7,279,310.99	7,279,310.99	23,363,742,77	30,643,053.76
16	MACRS - 20 Year Property			00.00	0.00	0000	0.00
1	MACRS - 3 Year Property			278,945.51	278,945.51	71,054.70	350,000.21
13	MACRS - 1 Year Property		I	226,195.37	226,195.37	1,164,024.53	1,390,219.90
61	Total Tax Depreciation Base			7,900,411.04	7,900,411.04	24,991,177.47	32,891,588.51
20	18X Nares MACKS - 5 Year Property			20.0001%	32.0000%	20.0009%	
21	MACRS - 15 Year Property			5.0000%	6.5000%	5.000%	
ង	MACRS - 20 Year Property			3.7500%	7.2190%	3./500%	
3 X	MALKS - 3 Tear Property MALKS - 1 Year Property			100.000%	0.0000%	100.000%	
ų r	lax Depreciation MARDC - E Very Bronnety			23 101 83	37,106,93	78.471.09	115.528.02
3 8	MACRS - 15 Year Pronenty			363.965.55	691,534.54	1,168,187.14	1,859,721.68
36	MACKS - 20 Year Property			00.0	00.00	0.00	0.00
28	MACR5 - 3 Year Property			46,490.92	92,981.84	11,842.45	104,824.29
53	MACRS - 1 Year Property		I	226,195.37	00'0	1,164,024.53	L,104,024.53
Œ	Total Tax Depreciation			659,843.67	821,623.31	2,422,525.21	3,244,148.52
	Book Depreciation						
E	ERT - Installations			25,127.37			171,719.63
22	ERT - Purchases cor - Other			79,000,000			20:01/4/200
1	Lonai Book Depreciation		ı	114,680.23			768,095.17 Schedule 3A
5	Less: Book Depr on ARUDC Equity			0.00			0.00
86	Plus: Originating Dif, Exclusive of AFUDC Equity Net Book Depreciation	~		0.00 114,680.23			0.00
8	Tay Derivertative in Evenes of Reck Derivaciation	ç		545.163.44			2.476.053.35
2		1	1				
65	Federal Deferred Taxes @ 35.00%		u	190,807.20			866,618.67
4	Accumulated Deferred Income Tax (ADIT)		"	190,807.20			1,057,425.87
4	Federal Deferral Rate			35.00%			35,00%
ļ							

THE EAST OHIO GAS COMPANY d/b/a DOMINION EAST OHIO AUTOMATED METER READING ESTIMATED COST RECOVERY CHARGE Annualized Depreciation Associated With Additions

								Schedule 2A									
Total Activity Through 12/31/2008		11,348,431.25	19,294,622.51	508,314.64	966,250.44	423,969.46	350,000.21	32,891,588.51			251,935.17	520,954.81	101,662.93	64,448.90	84,793.89	70,000.04	1,093,795.75
Depr Rate									Effective	11/1/08	2.22%	2.70%	20.00%	6.67%	20.00%	20.00%	: 1
	Basis	ERT Installation	ERT Purchases	Computer Hardware	In House Labor - CCS IT	In House Labor - IT	Computer Software - Purchased	Total		alized	ERT Installation	ERT Purchases	Computer Hardware	In House Labor - CCS IT	In House Labor - IT	Computer Software - Purchased	Total
Line No.	Plant	1	Ν	m	4	un,	Q	7		Annu	8	ማ	10	11	12	E	4

THE EAST OHIO GAS COMPANY d/b/a DOMINION EAST OHIO AUTOMATED METER READING ESTIMATED COST RECOVERY CHARGE Annualized Amortization of PISCC

Accumulated Balance at 12/31/08	484,140.14 1,025,594.22	26,379.10 25,076.19 26,186.72 20,562.72 1,607,909.09 Schedule 4A	Accumulated Balance at 12/31/08	2.220% 10,747.91 2.703% 27,721.81	20.00% 5,269.82 6.67% 1,672.58	20.00% 5,237.34 20.00% 4,112.54 54,762.00
ine 4o. Description	1 Regulatory AssetDeferrals 2 ERT Installation 3 ERT Purchases	5 In House Labor - CCS IT 6 In House Labor - TT 7 Computer Software - Purchased 8 Cumulative TotalPISCC	Description Annualized Amortization of PISCC	10 ERT Installation 11 ERT Purchases	12 Computer Hardware 13 In House Labor - CCS IT	 In House Labor - IT Computer Software - Purchased TotalAnnualized Amortization PISCC

THE EAST OHIO GAS COMPANY d/b/a DOMINION EAST OHIO AUTOMATED METER READING ESTIMATED COST RECOVERY CHARGE Property Tax Expense Calculation

No.	Property Tax Expense (Amounts Exclude Post In-Service Carrying Costs)	Actual Thru 3/31/07 (1)	Actual Thru 12/31/07	Activity Thru 12/31/08	
<u>и</u> 10 4 10	Current Year Investment Less: AFUDC In-Service Drawing Costs In-Service Net Cost of Taxable Property	0.0 0.00 0.00 0.00	7,900,411.04 0.00 7,900,411.04	32,891,588.51 0.00 32,891,588.51	Sch 2A
9	Total Taxable Value	0.00	7,900,411.04	32,891,588.51	
r 8	2008 Effective Rate (Full Cost) 2009 Effective Rate (Full Cost) Estimated		0.957%	0.957%	
9	Ohio Property Tax	0.00	75,571.02	314,622.98	

THE EAST OHIO GAS COMPANY d/b/a DOMINION EAST OHIO AUTOMATED METER READING ESTIMATED COST RECOVERY CHARGE Appproved Rate of Return on Rate Base

		48.66%	51.34%		6.50%	10.38%	8.49%	11.36%
	Capital Structure	Debt	Equity	Cost of Capital	Debt	Equity	Return on Rate Base (WACC)	Return on Rate Base using Pre-Tax Equity
Line No.		2	m	4	ŝ	9	~	8

THE EAST OHIO GAS COMPANY d/b/a DOMINION EAST OHIO AUTOMATED METER READING ESTIMATED COST RECOVERY CHARGE Actual Bills Issued from December 31, 2007 - December 31, 2008

IctoT	IOIGI	13,720,961	1,025,591	22,793	14,769,345
CRC	cnc	2,220	27,208	16,921	46,349
SUJ		13,718,741	998,383	5,872	14,722,996
Customor Class	CUSUITE CLASS	Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Total
Line	100.	-	2	m	Ś

THE EAST OHIO GAS COMPANY <u>d/b/a dominion east ohio</u> Automated meter reading estimated cost recovery charge Call center and meter reading expenses

Schedule 12

.

Call Center	2007	2008	Variance
	Actual	Actual	08 vs 07
	19 031 482.22	20.628.459.53	1.596.977.31
Meter Reading with Adjustments	8,684,136.64	8,408,208.02	(275,928.62)
	27,715,618.86	29,036,667.55	1,321,048.69

Schedule 12A

<u>.</u>	Decription	2007 Actual	Adjuctments	2007 Adjusted	2008 Actual	Adjustments	2008 Adjusted	Variance 08 Adi vs. 07 Adi	Notes
	Cost Provide State								
-	l abor Expense	5.664.962.08	30,806.00	5,695,768.08	5,151,318.22	406,181.02	5,557,499.24	(138,268.84)	4
5	Pavroll Taxes and Benefits	1,962,772.91	12,788.19	1,975,561.10	1,545,401.74	135,985.05	1,681,386.79	(294,174.31)	മ
ı m	Labor Allocations	76,088.61		76,088.61	153,821.86		153,821.86	77,733.25	
4	Net Labor	7,703,823.60	43,594.19	7,747,417.79	6,850,541.82	542,166.07	7,392,707.89	(354,709.90)	
S	Material & Supplies	100,300.50		100,300.50	79,746.25		79,746.25	(20,554.25)	
5	Outside Services - Southern Cross	1,000,227.02	(1,000,227.02)	0.00	764,739.82	(764,739.82)	0.00	0.00	υ
~	Outside Services	199,852.88		199,852.88	172,933.91		172,933.91	(26,918.97)	
. cc	Utilities - Wireless	69,198.35		69,198.35	80,612.64		80,612.64	11,414.29	
σ	Vehicle Expenses	482,690.58		482,690.58	560,813.14		560,813.14	78,122.56	
Ę	Other Miscellaneous	84,676,54		84,676.54	121,394.19		121,394.19	36,717.65	
Ħ	Subtotal Other	1,936,945.87	(1,000,227.02)	936,718.85	1,780,239.95	(764,739.82)	1,015,500.13	78,781.28	
12	Total Meter Reading Expenses	9,640,769.47	(956,632.83)	8,684,136.64	8,630,781.77	(222,573.75)	8,408,208.02	(275,928.62)	
ł									

Notes:

DEO will include the meter reading costs of those clerks in a meter-reading WBS account going forward. As a result, adjustments were made to properly reflect the costs of the meter reading clerks in both 2007 and 2008, i.e., the December salary was added to the 2007 expense, and a full year of 2008 salary was added to Six Meter Reading Clerks were transferred to a derical cost center effective 11/2007. Those derks, however, will continue to perform meter reading related work. 2008. Those adjustments ensure that the resulting amounts for the 2007 baseline and 2008 expense are consistent and comparable.

Adjustments were made to properly reflect benefit costs based on labor expense for the six Meter Reading Clerks transferred to the clerical cost center.

C Outside contractor expenses related to DOT inspections were removed from both years.

മ

meter readers to enter the customer's premise to complete this survey with their leak detection equipment. As a result, responsibility for those inspections will shift to a Customer Service field call. The DOT inspection costs will not be eliminated, but will simply be moved to another part of the operation. In order to provide for a consistent treatment of those costs, the Outside Service - Southern Cross expense was removed from Meter Reading expense since the work is not being eliminated as a result of the AMR Project. completing interior service leak surveys on residential inside meter services. As DEO completes more AMR installations on inside meters, the company will no longer utilize DOT interior service inspections are to be performed on all inside meter services once every 36 months. DEO utilizes an outside contractor, Southern Cross, to assist in

Although DOT inspection costs may vary somewhat from one year to the next, those costs will continue to be incurred through use of an outside contractor, use of DEO personnel, or a combination of the two. In any case, the fluctuation in those costs has no relation to the deployment of AMR equipment and should not be considered in determining the appropriate baseline expense.

THE EAST OHIO GAS COMPANY d/b/a DOMINION EAST OHIO AUTOMATED METER READING ESTIMATED COST RECOVERY CHARGE

METER READING EXPENSES

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Direct Testimony of Vicki H. Friscic on

Behalf of Dominion East Ohio was sent to the following via regular U.S. Mail and electronic

mail this 15th day of April, 2009:

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel Joseph Serio, Esq. 10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800 Columbus, OH 43215-3485 serio@occ.state.oh.us

Stephen Reilly Anne Hammerstein Office of the Ohio Attorney General Public Utilities Section 180 East Broad Street, 9th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215 stephen.reilly@puc.state.oh.us anne.hammerstein@puc.state.oh.us

111. Unt

Paul A. Colbert