

**BEFORE**

**THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

**In the Application of the East Ohio Gas  
Company d/b/a Dominion East Ohio to  
Adjust its Pipeline Infrastructure  
Replacement Program Cost Recovery  
Charge and Related Matters.**

**Case No. 09-458-GA-UNC**

---

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF  
ERIC HALL  
ON BEHALF OF  
DOMINION EAST OHIO**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. ANALYSIS OF CHANGES IN O&amp;M EXPENSES</b>	<b>2</b>

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 **Q1. Please state your name, occupation and business address.**

3 A1. My name is Eric Hall. I am employed by The East Ohio Gas Company, d/b/a Dominion  
4 East Ohio ("DEO"), as Director of Operations. My business address is 1201 East 55th  
5 Street; Cleveland, Ohio 44103.

6 **Q2. Please describe your educational background and work experience.**

7 A2. In 1982, I received a Bachelor of Science degree in mechanical engineering from Case  
8 Western Reserve University. In 1989, I received my Masters in Business Administration  
9 from Case Western. For the past 27 years, I have worked for DEO or its predecessors.  
10 Since April 2006, I have served as Director of Operations. Prior to this position, I served  
11 in a variety of roles in distribution, transmission and storage operations, and marketing,  
12 including positions as Director of Compliance and Director of Transmission Storage  
13 Operations.

14 **Q3. What are your job responsibilities as Director of Operations?**

15 A3. I am responsible for pipeline safety compliance, including distribution pipelines as well  
16 as DEO's transmission pipeline integrity program. Other areas of operations  
17 responsibility includes underground facility damage prevention as well as our leak repair,  
18 leak surveillance, and corrosion control programs.

19 **Q4. Have you previously testified before the Commission?**

20 A4. No.

21 **Q5. Are you familiar with DEO's Application to adjust its Pipeline Infrastructure  
22 Replacement ("PIR") Cost Recovery Charge?**

23 A5. Yes.

1 **Q6. Are you familiar with the leak repair, leak surveillance, corrosion monitoring and**  
2 **corrosion remediation Operation and Maintenance (“O&M”) expenses that are**  
3 **reflected on Schedule 16 of DEO’s Application in this case?**

4 A6. Yes.

5 **Q7. How are you familiar with these expenses?**

6 A7. Managing DEO’s processes for leak repair, leak surveillance, corrosion monitoring and  
7 corrosion remediation activities are a large part of my day-to-day responsibilities. I  
8 supervise the employees who conduct these activities, and I regularly monitor the amount  
9 of time and money DEO spends on these programs. Expenses for these programs  
10 comprise approximately half of my organization’s O&M budget.

11 **Q8. What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?**

12 A8. The purpose of my testimony is to explain the reasons for increases in the leak repair,  
13 leak surveillance and corrosion monitoring O&M expenses between the July 2007—June  
14 2008 and July 2008—June 2009 time periods.

15 **II. ANALYSIS OF CHANGES IN O&M EXPENSES**

16 **Q9. What are the categories of O&M expense included the calculation of the O&M**  
17 **baseline for this case?**

18 A9. There are four categories: leak repair, leak surveillance, corrosion monitoring, and  
19 corrosion remediation.

20 **Q10. How has the PIR program contributed to increases in the leak repair, leak**  
21 **surveillance and corrosion monitoring expense categories?**

22 A10. In implementing the PIR program, DEO has effectively moved from a reactive to a  
23 proactive approach to leak repair and related activities. The company’s proactive

1 approach involves the prioritization of pipeline replacements that have an impact on the  
2 incurrence of leak repair costs. Over a long period of time, leak repair costs will decrease  
3 as more and more of DEO's older-vintage bare-steel pipelines are replaced. However, in  
4 the short-term, the prioritization of replacements may result in certain pipelines being  
5 repaired under an O&M expense category rather than being replaced under a capital  
6 expense.

7 Upon discovering a leak in the past, DEO may have replaced a very short segment of the  
8 affected pipeline, the cost of which would have been treated as a capital expenditure. As  
9 a result of the PIR program, DEO now proactively assesses whether that part of its  
10 pipeline system should be included in a larger section of pipeline that has not been  
11 identified for replacement in the current year's prioritized list. If the section on which the  
12 leak is discovered is part of a larger project scheduled for the following year or some  
13 other later date, the leak will be repaired under an O&M expense to make it safe until the  
14 larger section encompassing that area is included in the prioritized queue of PIR projects.  
15 While there is a short-term increase in such O&M expenses due to the PIR project, the  
16 management of the project on a prioritized basis will ultimately lead to the lowest total  
17 cost to customers and the largest benefit as leak repair costs decline over time. It is  
18 unrealistic to expect that initial PIR replacements will yield such decreases. As indicated  
19 above, the PIR program will have the opposite effect in the very near term due to the  
20 prioritization of projects within a given fiscal year's capital budget. As a result, those  
21 costs should be considered when assessing O&M savings from a baseline expense level.

22 **Q11. Are there other reasons why leak repair expenses increased?**

1 A11. Yes. East Ohio has been experiencing an increasing number of leaks repaired on an  
2 annual basis, and so it makes sense that leak repair expenses would go up when  
3 comparing the Base Line Period to the Recovery Period. (Help me make the table here)  
4 DEO's actual O&M Leak Repairs are shown below;

5	2006	2007	2008	2009 YTD August
6	9150	10,321	11,499	11,117

7 As DEO pointed out in PIR application Testimony, pipes develop leaks at an increasing  
8 rate over time. (See Figure 11, page 23 from Black and Veatch report). While DEO has  
9 begun a pipeline replacement program which will eventually reduce overall leakage, it  
10 must be pointed out that the overwhelming majority of bare steel pipe has NOT YET  
11 been replaced under that program and therefore DEO's leak experience is continuing to  
12 grow, and will probably continue to grow for some time to come.

13 Moreover, the initial focus of the PIR program has been on the larger-diameter bare steel  
14 transmission pipelines. But the overwhelming majority of the leaks we repair are found  
15 on distribution lines. Therefore, it is not surprising that we would not realize leak-repair  
16 savings in the initial stages of the PIR program. Those savings will become more  
17 apparent as DEO replaces more distribution pipe.

18 **Q12. Why did corrosion monitoring expenses increase?**

19 A12. Pursuant to the parties' Stipulation and Recommendation and the Commission's Opinion  
20 and Order in Case Nos. 07-829-GA-AIR, *et al.*, DEO is replacing ineffectively-coated  
21 pipe as part of the PIR program. As ineffectively-coated pipe is taken out of service,  
22 DEO and its customers will begin to realize savings associated with reduced corrosion  
23 monitoring of that pipe. Because DEO initially has focused on replacing bare steel pipe

1        rather than ineffectively-coated pipe, however, those savings have not yet been realized.  
2        In fact, the total number of test points that East Ohio must monitor annually has  
3        INCREASED since the program began. This is because some of the bare steel pipe  
4        replaced on higher pressure systems has been replaced with steel pipe. This new pipe  
5        must be coated and cathodically protected as required by federal pipeline safety code and  
6        so additional test points are installed. Consequently DEO had 125,228 test points to  
7        monitor in 2009, but only 122,404 to monitor in 2008.

8        **Q13. What types of expenses are included in the corrosion remediation category?**

9        A13. This category includes expenses associated with the improvement of cathodic protection  
10       on our pipe, most commonly including the installation of anodes.

11       **Q14. Please describe the change in corrosion remediation O&M expense from the**  
12       **Baseline Period to the Recovery Period.**

13       Q14. As reflected on Schedule 16 to Exhibit A of DEO's Application, O&M expenses for  
14       corrosion remediation were \$4,087,204.47 during the Baseline Period and \$3,532,903.83  
15       during the Recovery Period. Corrosion remediation expenses thus decreased  
16       \$554,300.64, or 13.5%.

17       **Q15. Why did corrosion remediation expenses decrease?**

18       A15. I do not attribute these savings to the PIR program, which is still in its early stages.  
19       Rather, our corrosion remediation savings result from the consolidation of our corrosion  
20       management process over the last few years. During that time, we have placed all of our  
21       corrosion management employees under one manager. We have invested heavily in  
22       training for our corrosion management employees. We also have implemented several  
23       process efficiency improvements in this area in recent years. Because of these measures,

1 which are unrelated to PIR, our corrosion management employees are performing at an  
2 even higher level.

3 Further, the commission is focusing it's O&M savings approach on the totality of DEO's  
4 corrosion monitoring program . DEO wishes to point out that the bulk of corrosion  
5 monitoring and correction activity occurs on pipe that was installed after 1970. The PIR  
6 program focuses on replacing pipe that was installed BEFORE 1970, most of which has  
7 no cathodic protection. It makes no sense to focus on corrosion control savings that may  
8 occur on pipe that is specifically excluded from cost recovery under the PIR program.

9 **Q16. Any final comments on this issue ?**

10 A16. The O&M expenses included in the PIR baseline are influenced by many factors. Some  
11 of the factors influence costs positively, like reductions in leaks that will at some point be  
12 attributed to the pipe replacement program. Improvements in technology and process  
13 management can also drive cost savings exclusive of the pipe replacement program.  
14 Other factors can increase costs from year to year. These include inflation on material  
15 costs, labor rate changes, contractor pricing changes, and weather.  
16 Replacement of bare steel pipe is obviously only one of many factors which influence the  
17 total amount of O&M dollars spent on PIR Baseline activities.  
18 Since these factors all combine to influence the total annual O&M expense for these  
19 items it is not rational to assume that all O&M reductions in any given year are due solely  
20 to bare steel pipe replacement, and that all O&M increases are not.

21 **Q17. Please Summarize DEO's Position.**

22 A17. During the initial year of the PIR program DEO has experienced increases in the  
23 categories identified in the Stipulation to provide cost savings to customers. These



1 increases are related to the PIR program. Ultimately, DEO expects each category to  
2 experience cost reductions. DEO voluntarily identified an additional related category,  
3 corrosion remediation, which contained cost savings unrelated to the PIR program that  
4 DEO was willing to aggregate with the cost increases associated with the categories  
5 identified by the Parties to the Stipulation to provide customers with savings in the first  
6 year of the PIR program. DEO should not be penalized for its voluntary inclusion of  
7 such savings.

8 **Q17. Does this conclude your testimony?**

9 A17. Yes.

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was sent by electronic mail to the following parties on this 9th day of October, 2009.

/s Grant W. Garber  
Grant W. Garber

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

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

**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities**

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**10/9/2009 11:56:01 AM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 09-0458-GA-UNC**

Summary: Testimony of Eric Hall on Behalf of Dominion East Ohio electronically filed by Paul A Colbert on behalf of The East Ohio Gas Company d/b/a Dominion East Ohio