

21 East State Street • Columbus, OH 43215-4228 Tel: 614.469.8000 • Fax: 614.469.4653

July 17, 2012

Barcy McNeal Secretary, Docketing Division Public Utilities Commission of Ohio 180 East Broad Street Columbus, Ohio 43215

RE: Case No. 12-1423-GA-RDR

Dear Secretary McNeal:

In the process of responding to Staff Data Requests in the above case, Vectren Energy Delivery of Ohio, Inc. ("VEDO") discovered that an out-of-period work order was inadvertently included in Attachment A of the Application, the Testimony of James M. Francis and Exhibits 1 and 2 attached thereto. Accordingly, VEDO hereby submits the Amended Attachment A (Testimony and Exhibits of James M. Francis) to its Application in this case.

Thank you for your kind attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Gretchen J. Hummel
Gretchen J. Hummel

Attorney for Vectren Energy Delivery of Ohio, Inc.

cc: Parties of Record

Enclosures

GJH:dr

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

for Authority to Adjust its Distribution Replacement Rider Charges.)	
AMENDED TO A	ATTAC	

Gretchen J. Hummel (Trial Attorney)
Frank P. Darr
McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC
Fifth Third Center
21 East State Street, 17th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
Telephone: 614-469-8000
Telecopier: 614-469-4653
ghummel@mwncmh.com
fdarr@mwncmh.com

Attorneys for Vectren Energy Delivery of Ohio, I

BEFORE

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

JAMES M. FRANCIS

DIRECTOR OF ENGINEERING AND ASSET MANAGEMENT

ON BEHALF OF

VECTREN ENERGY DELIVERY OF OHIO, INC.

CASE NO. 12-1423-GA-RDR

April 30, 2012

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF JAMES M. FRANCIS

INTRODUCTION

- 1 Q. Please state your name, business address and occupation.
- 2 A. My name is James M. Francis. My address is One Vectren Square,
- 3 Evansville, Indiana, and I am Director of Engineering & Asset
- 4 Management for Vectren Utility Holdings, Inc. ("VUHI"), the immediate
- 5 parent company of Vectren Energy Delivery of Ohio, Inc. ("VEDO" or "the
- 6 Company").

7 Q. What are your duties in your present position?

- 8 A. I have responsibility for engineering and technical support for VEDO utility
- 9 operations. My specific responsibilities include System Design and
- 10 Planning, Corrosion Control, Project Engineering, Compliance, Standards,
- 11 Asset Management, Pipeline Integrity Management, and Capital Planning
- and Management. Additionally, I am responsible for identifying and
- implementing many of VEDO's asset management programs.

14 Q. Please describe your work experience.

- 15 A. I have been employed by VEDO since April 8, 2004 as the Director of
- Technical Services. My title has subsequently been changed to Director
- of Engineering & Asset Management. Prior to my current position, I have
- been employed with VEDO since the purchase of the gas assets of the
- 19 Dayton Power & Light Company by Vectren Corporation in 2000.
- Immediately prior to my current position, I was the Regional Manager of

- the Troy Operating Region with responsibility for field operations. I also
- 2 held other positions at VEDO including Planning Manager and
- 3 Measurement Supervisor. Prior to my employment with VEDO, in 1991, I
- 4 became an employee of Dayton Power & Light serving as a Project
- 5 Engineer, System Planner and Measurement Supervisor.

6 Q. What is your educational background?

- 7 A. I received a Bachelor of Science in mechanical engineering from the
- 8 University of Dayton in 1993. I received a Masters in Business
- 9 Administration from The Ohio State University in 2000.

10 Q. Are you involved in any gas industry association activities?

- 11 A. Yes. I am active in the American Gas Association's ("AGA") Operating
- Section. I am currently a member of the AGA's Distribution and
- 13 Transmission Engineering Committee.

14 Q. Have you previously testified before this Commission?

- 15 A. Yes. I testified in VEDO's most recent general rate case, Case No. 07-
- 16 1080-GA-AIR ("Rate Case"), in support of the need for recovery of certain
- 17 costs under the Distribution Replacement Rider ("DRR") proposed in that
- proceeding. I also testified in VEDO's 2010 DRR proceeding, Case No.
- 19 10-0595-GA-RDR and 2011 DRR proceeding, Case No. 11-2776-GA-
- 20 RDR.

21 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?

- 1 Α. First, I will provide details on the progress of VEDO's accelerated bare 2 steel and cast iron replacement program ("Replacement Program"). I will discuss the status of pipe replacement, the costs incurred and the benefits 3 4 identified in 2011. I will discuss certain other issues, such as meter 5 relocations and plastic pipe retirements, and how these are addressed within the Replacement Program. I will discuss the processes used to 6 7 assess and award the construction work associated with the Replacement Program, and will provide the 2012 replacement plan. 8
 - The second portion of my testimony will discuss VEDO's riser replacement program ("Riser Program"). I will detail the status of replacements and costs associated with the Riser Program in 2011. I will also discuss how the Riser Program work was awarded in 2011.
 - The third portion of my testimony will discuss VEDO's experience with the change in service line ownership and responsibilities which took effect in 2009.
 - The final portion of my testimony will discuss identified savings resulting from the Replacement Program as well as the additional costs incurred by VEDO due to its assumption of service line responsibility in 2009.

19 Q. What Exhibits are you sponsoring in this proceeding?

- 20 A. I am sponsoring the following exhibits:
 - Exhibit No. JMF-1 2011 VEDO BS/CI Replacement Program Progress
- Exhibit No. JMF-2- Plastic Main Retirement Causes

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Exhibit No. JMF-3- VEDO BS/CI 2012 Replacement Plan
- Exhibit No. JMF-4- VEDO Riser Replacement Program 2011 Costs
- Exhibit No. JMF-5- VEDO 2011 BS/CI Maintenance Expense
- Exhibit No. JMF-6-VEDO Incremental Service Line Responsibility
- 5 Capital Costs

6 Q. How is your testimony organized?

- 7 A. My testimony is organized in four sections:
- 8 I. Bare Steel and Cast Iron Replacement Program
- 9 II. Riser Replacement Program
- 10 III. Service Line Responsibility
- 11 IV. O&M Savings and Incremental Costs

12 I. <u>Bare Steel and Cast Iron Replacement Program</u>

- 13 Q. Please provide a brief description of VEDO's Replacement Program.
- 14 A. As of the end of 2010, VEDO had a total of 492 miles of bare steel and
- 15 161 miles of cast iron main remaining in its system. In the Rate Case,
- VEDO proposed to replace its remaining bare steel and cast iron
- infrastructure over a twenty year period at a rate of approximately 35 miles
- per year. The Replacement Program, as approved by the Commission in
- the Rate Case, includes the replacement of both mains and service lines.
- 20 Existing bare steel and cast iron mains and service lines are being retired
- 21 as part of the Replacement Program.

- Q. How much bare steel and cast iron infrastructure did VEDO retire in2 2011 as part of the Replacement Program?
- A. In 2011, VEDO retired 29.4 miles of bare steel and 5.3 miles of cast iron mains under the Replacement Program. Additionally, VEDO retired 3,633 bare steel service lines, with 3,318 of those being replaced.

6 Q. How much did VEDO invest in the Replacement Program in 2011?

7 A. As identified by VEDO witness Janice M. Barrett, VEDO's Replacement Program investment for projects placed in service in 2011 was 8 9 \$17,436,948. Exhibit No. JMF-1 provides a detailed list of the projects 10 placed in service under the Replacement Program in 2011, the costs of 11 each project as of December 31, 2011, and the amount of pipe (main 12 footage and number of service lines) retired and replaced. For some projects placed in service in 2011, additional trailing charges (such as 13 14 restoration costs) will be incurred in 2012. These costs will be included in 15 a future DRR filing.

16 Q. Did VEDO retire any plastic main as part of the Replacement 17 Program in 2011?

A. Yes. VEDO retired a total of 7,402 feet of plastic main within the replacement projects completed in 2011. There were a number of reasons why plastic main segments were retired, which were discussed in my testimony in the Rate Case. Some short segments of plastic main existed within the bare steel or cast iron systems. It would have been more costly to try and salvage that main rather than replace it. Also, there

18

19

20

21

22

existed sections of plastic main at the ends of some distribution systems being retired wherein those segments no longer served any customers; therefore, there was no reason to continue to maintain those segments at this time. Exhibit No. JMF-2 "Plastic Main Retirement Causes" provides a brief description of the cause of the plastic retirement for each applicable project.

Q. Did the Rate Case Stipulation contemplate the inclusion of plastic pipe replacement costs for recovery through the DRR?

Yes. The Rate Case Stipulation, Paragraph 10(a) requires that the annual Replacement Program construction plans are to be provided to the Rate Case parties on February 1 of each year and shall include, among other things, the "...investment in infrastructure replacement under the program (including service line replacement costs and the other cost components included in the Company's application)...." The Rate Case Application, Alt. Reg. Exhibit A, Page 4, discusses in detail the replacement of plastic pipe as a part of the Replacement Program. Additionally, the Rate Case Stipulation, Paragraph 10(c), requires that the annual application to establish the DRR rate "...will include the information described in Paragraph 10(a) above for the costs incurred during the previous calendar year," which, as already indicated, includes the cost components, including plastic pipe replacement, which were included in the Rate Case Application.

A.

- 1 Q. Is there any other evidence that the replacement of plastic pipe was
- 2 contemplated to be a part of the Replacement Program as proposed
- 3 in the Rate Case Application?
- 4 A. Yes. The Direct Testimony of Scott E. Albertson in the Rate Case, Page
- 5 4, in discussing the content of Rate Case Application, Alt. Reg. Exhibit A
- and the cost components thereof, reiterates that the replacement of plastic
- 7 pipe was a part of the Replacement Program from its inception.
- 8 Q. Did VEDO move any meters outside as part of the Replacement
- 9 **Program?**
- 10 A. Yes. VEDO moved 2,552 meters outside in 2011. Because the newly
- installed mains operate at a higher pressure (requiring the installation of a
- service regulator), the cost associated with moving the meters outside was
- less than if the meter remained inside and the necessary service regulator
- was installed outside. In addition to better utilization of VEDO's capital,
- moving the meters outside should improve operational efficiency
- 16 associated with future meter order work and will eliminate the need for
- inside atmospheric corrosion inspections. VEDO has employed this meter
- 18 move-out approach since the Replacement Program was first
- implemented.
- 20 Q. Does VEDO believe that the Replacement Program is achieving or
- 21 will achieve the expected benefits?
- 22 A. Yes. VEDO expects to experience improved service reliability and safety
- 23 through the reduction of leakage and the replacement of the mains and

service lines that contribute most to system leaks. Proactive replacement of this pipe, moving meters outside, and retiring the older assets will drive workforce efficiencies. The Company was able, in 2011, to achieve improved capital utilization by retiring more existing main infrastructure than it was necessary to replace. Customers and property owners will experience a reduction in the number and frequency of disturbances and inconveniences (such as leak repair, service interruptions, etc.) as the older sections of main are retired. VEDO has historically repaired approximately 1 leak per mile per year on the mains retired. Additionally, as quantified below, there are active leaks and meter orders that will be eliminated as a result of replacing the infrastructure. The elimination of active leaks will result in a relatively lower level of lost and unaccounted for gas, although it is impractical to quantify a specific reduction. Finally, VEDO expects long term benefits in terms of reduced impacts on the communities where public infrastructure improvements may occur after these projects are completed.

Q. What operational benefits did VEDO achieve as a result of the Replacement Program in 2011?

- 19 A. There are a number of operational benefits that VEDO has achieved to date as a result of the Replacement Program.
 - The replacement of these assets has reduced the number of active leaks in VEDO's system, is expected to reduce the occurrence of future leaks and leak repair work, and will reduce interruptions.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

21

22

inconveniences and disturbances to customers. Specifically, the
replacement projects from 2011 have allowed VEDO to eliminate
110 active leaks, of which 44 would have required a more
immediate and less efficient repair.

- Over the past 7 years, the Company has experienced an average
 of 156 asset condition related meter orders on the types of assets
 that were replaced in 2011. VEDO will experience a reduction in
 the number of these meter orders (Outside Gas Leak, Gas
 Emergency, Water in Line, and No Gas orders) through the
 retirement of bare steel and cast iron infrastructure.
- VEDO moved 2,552 inside meters outside. This will eliminate the requirement for a separate atmospheric corrosion check.
- Certain system components that had been used to address issues associated with assets in poor condition have been eliminated, such as the 42 drips used to remove water from low pressure mains.

Ultimately, these types of improvements provide reliability and safety benefits to VEDO's customers or property owners that live in the vicinity of the replacement projects.

Q. Did VEDO derive cost savings from the 2011 replacement projects?

21 A. Yes. VEDO has detailed the reduction of specific work items, assets and 22 the estimated reduction of historically experienced work quantities, all of 23 which allowed VEDO to achieve maintenance cost savings attributable to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

the Replacement Program (and specific to the assets that were retired) in 2011. Quantification of the savings achieved in 2011 compared to the baseline amount of \$1,192,953 established in the Rate Case will be discussed later in my testimony.

- 5 Q. Were the construction projects within the 2011 Replacement
 6 Program competitively bid?
- 7 A. Yes.

Α.

8 Q. How were the bid packages organized, bid and awarded?

Based on the geographical location of the projects, VEDO divided the planned 2011 projects into ten (10) bid packages. Separate bid packages were prepared for the bare steel and cast iron replacement projects and the riser replacement work. All existing contractors could bid on any of the 10 packages but were not required to bid on all packages. If a contractor had not performed a gas distribution replacement project for Vectren with the last 3 years, they were deemed a new contractor and were limited to bid on the two (2) designated entry level packages. Each bid package was independently evaluated.

Twelve (12) different construction contractors were invited to provide bids for the work. A pre-bid meeting was held with all of the contractors to provide direction and to answer questions with regard to the work to be performed and the bids to be submitted. Each contractor was provided

with copies of prints for all of the projects and given time to visit the project

2 sites prior to submitting bids.

A.

Bids were submitted based on unit pricing; that is, a fixed price for a given unit of work to be performed. VEDO used the unit prices and the estimated work units for each project to create comparative cost estimates. These comparative estimates were then summarized for each bid package. Each package was evaluated based on overall cost, and the contractor's capacity. If a contractor submitted bids on several projects, the contractor's capacity was evaluated to ensure the potential award did not exceed their capacity.

Q. What is VEDO's replacement plan for 2012?

VEDO's planned replacement projects for 2012 are identified in Exhibit No.JMF-3. VEDO plans, in 2012, to spend approximately \$18.6 Million under the Replacement Program, replacing approximately 33 miles of bare steel and cast iron main along with the bare steel service lines served from those mains. As was the case in 2011, VEDO reserves the right to modify the plan as necessary to accommodate additional or different, higher priority projects as circumstances may change throughout the year.

20 II. Riser Program

21 Q. Please describe the Riser Program.

A. As ordered by the PUCO, in 2007 VEDO began conducting an inventory of customer owned service risers in its service territory. VEDO completed its inventory of risers in 2008. VEDO began replacing the risers identified as "prone-to-fail" in 2009 and further refined the list of risers to be replaced. As of the end of 2010, VEDO had 14,709 remaining prone-to-fail risers to replace.

7 Q. How many risers did VEDO replace in 2011?

A. VEDO replaced the remaining 14,709 prone-to-fail risers in 2011. The cost to replace these risers was \$5,471,106 or approximately \$372 per riser. Exhibit No. JMF-4 provides a breakdown of the costs incurred under the Riser Program. VEDO has now replaced all identified prone-to-fail risers.

Q. What is the total Riser Program cost after completion at the end of2011?

A. The total Riser Program cost as of the end of 2011 was \$17,262,601, 15 16 which consists of the 2009 Riser Program cost of \$5,451,132, the 2010 17 Riser Program cost of \$6,340,363 and the 2011 Riser Program cost of 18 This total estimated cost is less than the \$33 million \$5,471,106. 19 projected spend identified during the Rate Case due to a reduction of the 20 number of risers to be replaced and the Company's use of alternative replacement methods, as described below. 21

Q. What methods did VEDO use to replace risers in 2011?

- 1 A. Where possible, VEDO used the Perfection Servi-Sert service head
 2 adaptor to replace the service riser head. Where the Servi-Sert was not
 3 able to be used, the entire riser was replaced.
- 4 Q. Why was the average per unit cost of a riser replacement in 2011 \$372 compared to \$337 in 2010?
- 6 A. Many of the more challenging riser replacements were completed in 2011, 7 which included the need to hand dig and squeeze off services as a result of inaccessible curb stops. Additionally, there were fewer Servi-Serts 8 9 installed in 2011 than in 2010 based on varying manufactures as a result 10 of the existing service risers. This required more risers to be replaced 11 using a full riser replacement. Additionally, VEDO incurred an increase in material costs resulting from the replacement of 86% more 1 1/4" risers 12 (which are more costly than a 1" riser) than in 2010. 13
- 14 Q. Was the riser replacement work in 2011 competitively bid?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. How were the bid packages organized, bid and awarded?
- 17 A. The Riser Program bid packages were organized geographically into two (2) packages.
- Twelve (12) different construction contractors were invited to provide bids for the riser work, of which six (6) provided bids. A pre-bid meeting was held with all of the contractors to answer questions with regard to the work

- to be performed and the bid packages to be submitted. Each contractor
- was provided with a count of risers to be replaced by package.
- 3 Bids were submitted based on unit pricing for full replacements, service
- 4 riser head replacements and any associated activities. VEDO used the
- 5 unit prices to create comparative cost estimates for each package. Each
- 6 package was evaluated independently, much like the Replacement
- 7 Program, and awarded accordingly.
- The two (2) bid packages were awarded to the lowest two bidders based
- 9 on the comparative cost estimate. The same two (2) contractors
- performed the Riser Program work in both 2010 and 2011.
- 11 Q. Was some of the riser replacement work completed by VEDO crews?
- 12 A. Yes. In addition to the contracted crews, VEDO used internal crews to
- complete a number of replacements.
- 14 Q. Is VEDO's Riser Replacement Program complete?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 III. Service Line Responsibility
- 17 Q. Are you able to assess how VEDO's transition to service line
- responsibility has progressed?
- 19 A. VEDO continues to view the transfer of service line responsibility to the
- 20 Company as a positive for both the Company and its customers. In
- 21 general, VEDO's assumption of service line responsibility has been a

benefit to its customers. Customers no longer are required to schedule the services of a plumber to repair or replace their service line, minimizing inconvenience and out of pocket costs for customers. VEDO's response times to leak calls and its repair activities reduce the amount of time customers are out of service. The Company's ability to adjust to an ever changing schedule to meet the needs of customers has also been a benefit. Also, confusion over customer responsibility for the service line has been essentially eliminated because there is now a clear delineation of responsibility between the customer and VEDO. Because VEDO (and its customers) have a significant number of aged service line assets, the annual amount of service line replacements is significant. VEDO has responded to numerous leak calls, many on bare steel service lines that have required replacement. VEDO does expect that as the Replacement Program matures and as individual service lines are replaced, over time this leak call activity will be reduced, as was identified in the Replacement Program benefits.

Q. Has VEDO experienced any incremental costs as a result of assuming service line responsibility?

Yes. VEDO has had to repair a number of gas leaks on the portion of the buried service line and the above ground meter setting that was previously maintained by the customer. As a result of this change, VEDO has seen both an increase in capital replacements and operations and maintenance expenses to repair these leaks. Incremental capital replacement costs

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Α.

- related to service line responsibility are included in Witness Barrett's DRR revenue requirement. The incremental O&M expenses will be discussed later in my testimony.
- 4 IV. Maintenance Savings and Incremental Costs
- 5 Q. Did VEDO achieve maintenance savings in 2011 compared to the 6 baseline amount of \$1,192,953?
- 7 A. Yes. VEDO calculated its maintenance expenses incurred in 2011 by the 8 same method it used to calculate the baseline maintenance expense 9 amount of \$1,192,953. The actual comparable maintenance expenses in 10 2011 were \$870,301, resulting in a savings against the baseline of 11 \$322,652. This amount is broken into expense reductions attributable to 12 mains of \$350,190 and expense increases from service lines replaced, 13 and now owned by VEDO, of \$27,538 for a net savings of \$322,652. 14 Additionally, VEDO experienced an increase in maintenance expenses of 15 \$86,335 for those service lines that are not bare steel. Exhibit No. JMF-5 16 provides the actual 2011 maintenance expenses and a comparison 17 against the baseline expense amount. Additionally, this exhibit provides a 18 breakdown of the maintenance expenses between mains and services.
- Q. Are the maintenance savings fully attributable to the ReplacementProgram?
- A. No. While certainly the elimination of the bare steel and cast iron infrastructure would have driven some of the cost reductions, the change

in service line responsibilities also led to some of the savings. The reason for this is that VEDO completed a significant number of service line replacements that would have formerly been at the customer's expense. The resources that previously had been conducting more leak repairs instead completed service line replacements, which are capital expenditures. As such, the maintenance expenses identified in 2011 are not necessarily indicative of the ongoing level of O&M. Rather, they are indicative of the work VEDO actually performed in a single year (2011). As such, the actual maintenance savings as compared to the baseline will change year over year.

Q. Has VEDO experienced any incremental capital investment, beyond the Replacement Program, as a result of assuming service line responsibility?

Yes. VEDO has replaced a number of service lines in order to eliminate gas leaks on the portion of the buried service line and the above ground meter setting that was previously maintained by the customer. As a result of this change, VEDO has seen an increase in capital costs. In 2011, VEDO spent, on average, \$4,812 per service line replaced. The incremental cost of the curb-to-meter portion of the service line is approximately \$1,113 per service line replaced over that experienced during the baseline period of 2007. The incremental investment includes the cost for the incremental length of curb to meter service line and meter setting that was formerly installed and maintained by the customer. In

Α.

Amended 7-13-2012

2011, VEDO replaced 1,354 service lines that were not associated with the formal Replacement Program. This equated to an incremental capital investment of \$1,507,002 for service line replacements as a result of the assumption of this responsibility for service lines. <u>Exhibit No. JMF-6</u> provides the calculation of the incremental investment.

6 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

7 A. Yes.

2011 VEDO BS/CI Replacement Program Progress Actual Install & Retirement

							Mains ²			Servi	ces ²	Meter	Move-Outs 2
A	В	С	D	<u> </u>	F	G	Н		J=G+H+I	K	L	М	N
Work Order Number	Completion Date	Group#	City	Utility Plant Additions ⁽¹⁾	Plastic Installed (Feet)	Total BS Retired (Feet)	Total CI Retired (Feet)	Total PL Retired (Feet)	Total Main Retired (Feet)	Total # Services Installed	Total # Services Retired	Total # Meter Move-Ou	Total # Meter Installations Retired
10046703052210	23-Dec-11	V-444	Washington CH	\$ 511,795	3,165	4,365	0	445		97	104		59 59
10046803052213	9-Jan-12	V-361	Dayton	\$ 806,621	5,400	5,464	0	250	5,714	105	122		85
10046803052212	9-Jan-12	V-358	Dayton	\$ 787,958	5,109	4,782	5,499	442	10,723	159	253	1	134
10046903052212	6-Jan-12	V-352	Miamisburg	\$ 571,433	2,464	5,175	0	535		103	106		90
09046703052525	22-Dec-11	V-103	Washington CH	\$ 659,464	4,895	7,325	0	0	7,325	164	167		12
09046703052523	21-Dec-11	V-102	Washington CH	\$ 381,662	3,119	3,568	40	0	-,	75			34
10046703052212	21-Dec-11	V-450	Washington CH	\$ 490,428	5,030	4,930	0	0	1,000	96			27 27
09046952532	16-Sep-11	V-10-19	W Carrollton	\$ 685,974	4,972	6,529	0	158	6,687	131			101
11046903052210	11-Jul-11	V-816	Kettering	\$ 42,659	700	750	0	0		20			12
09048152529	09-Jun-11	V-09-32	Greenville	\$ 198,573	2,339	2,968	0	0	2,000	33			21 21
09046852534	6-Jan-12	V-10-05	Dayton	\$ 1,532,489	9,397	6,261	2,813	53		193	292	1	180
09046603052523	30-Sep-11	V-101	Yellow Springs	\$ 53,546	2,426	2,282	0	430	2,712	6			0 0
09046952530	14-Sep-11	V-10-13	Oakwood	\$ 945,379	9,766	11,200	0	0		130			21 121
09046852537	22-Dec-11	V-10-18	Dayton	\$ 1,768,959	11,269	4,459	2,998	0	7,457	314	320		9 309
09046852536	06-Jan-12	V-10-20	Dayton	\$ 1,425,502	9,614	4,838	5,890	236		299			55 255
09046852542	22-Dec-11	V-10-35	Dayton	\$ 624,025	6,337	3,955	3,171	94		118			24 124
09046803052523	23-Sep-11	V-104	Dayton	\$ 259,359	1,371	2,690	475	0		32			46
09046952533	14-Sep-11	V-10-41	Dayton	\$ 492,839	5,074	2,851	0	0	2,851	106	107)2 102
09048103052523	28-Oct-11	V-106	Covington	\$ 368,810	8,094	5,381	0	130	5,511	100	105		59 59
09048103052525	28-Oct-11	V-107	Covington	\$ 269,278	3,828	3,543	0	170	3,713	86			19 49
09048203052523	25-Aug-11	V-108	Bellefontaine	\$ 286,769	4,731	2,975	1,755	25		79			18 48
09048203052525	25-Aug-11	V-109	Bellefontaine	\$ 287,961	3,998	3,775	85	1,390	5,250	60			30
09048103052526	14-Jul-11	V-110	Aracanum	\$ 204,974	3,407	3,217	0	165	3,382	55			57 57
09046603052525	10-Aug-11	V-111	Yellow Springs	\$ 224,104	950	4,180	0	0	4,180	41	41		27 27
09046603052526	12-Aug-11	V-112	New Carlisle	\$ 83,565	405	1,353	0	0	1,000	15			9 9
09046603052527	05-Aug-11	V-113	Jamestown	\$ 93,735	1,209	1,575	0	0	1,010	26			3
09046603052528	15-Aug-11	V-114	Fairborn	\$ 461,981	4,170	5,244	0	166	5,410	62	62		59 59
10048103052212	23-Aug-11	V-124	Greenville	\$ 907,077	11,043	9,830	0	610	10,440	178		1	
10046603052210	13-Aug-11	V-137	Xenia	\$ 218,283	2,620	3,915	0	140	4,055	62			32
09046803052525	23-Sep-11	V-211	Dayton	\$ 408,979	4,977	4,845	3,700	215	8,760	50			18 48
10048103052213	28-Oct-11	V-447	Covington	\$ 143,785	2,889	3,821	0	137	3,958	28			16
10048203052210	25-Aug-11	V-449	Bellefontaine	\$ 29,625	2,012	483	1,280	20		5			2 2
10046603052212	05-Aug-11	V-451	Jamestown	\$ 437,758	5,760	7,243	0	831	8,074	113)2 102
10048203052212	25-Aug-11	V-454	Bellefontaine	\$ 516,013	5,444	4,669	270	375		120		1	08 108
10048103052210	30-Jun-11	V-455	Aracanum	\$ 255,586	4,080	4,655	0	385	5,040	57	58		14 44
			TOTAL	\$ 17,436,948	162,064	155,096	27,976	7,402	190,474	3,318	3,633	2,55	2 2,552

Notes

¹ Utility plant additions do not include cost of removal or 2011 trailing charge activity associated with BS/CI groups placed in service prior to January 1, 2011, both of which will be included in the 2012 DRR filing.

² Quantities may reflect estimates as final as-built information has not been received for all work orders; final as-built quantities will be reflected in 2012 DRR filing.

Work Order Number	Completion Date	Group#	City	Total PL Retired (Feet)	Plastic Retirement Causes
10046703052210	23-Dec-11	V-444	Washington CH	445	Installed 310' main in the alley and retired existing plastic main from front disrtibution due to local requirements for meter location Also a segment of plastic main was between steel mains segments to be retired (higher cost to dig both ends and uprate). (directional bore the new main)
10046803052213	9-Jan-12	V-361	Dayton	250	Plastic main crossing was retired (higher cost to dig both ends and uprate). Also a segment of plastic was between steel mains segments to be retired (directional bore the new main).
10046803052212	9-Jan-12	V-358	Dayton	442	2 segments of plastic mains were between steel mains (higher cost to dig both ends and uprate). Also segment of plastic main was retired, not needed, no customer.
10046903052212	6-Jan-12	V-352	Miamisburg	535	Transfered services from existing 3" LPP to the MPS main, do not need the second main.
09046703052525	22-Dec-11	V-103	Washington CH	0	
09046703052523	21-Dec-11	V-102	Washington CH	0	
10046703052212	21-Dec-11	V-450	Washington CH	0	
09046952532	16-Sep-11	V-10-19	W Carrollton	158	Plastic main between steel main segments to be retired (higher cost to dig both ends and uprate). (directional bore the new main).
11046903052210	11-Jul-11	V-816	Kettering	0	
09048152529	09-Jun-11	V-09-32	Greenville	0	
09046852534	6-Jan-12	V-10-05	Dayton	53	Isolated plastic main segment was retired, not needed, no customer.
09046603052523	30-Sep-11	V-101	Yellow Springs		Isolated plastic main segment was retired, not needed, no customer.
09046952530	14-Sep-11	V-10-13	Oakwood	0	
09046852537	22-Dec-11	V-10-18	Dayton	0	
09046852536	06-Jan-12	V-10-20	Dayton	236	3 segments of plastic main were between steel mains (higher cost to dig both ends and uprate). Also segment of plastic main was retired, not needed, no customer.
09046852542	22-Dec-11	V-10-35	Dayton	94	Segment of plastic main was between steel main segments to be retired (higher cost to dig both ends and uprate). (directional bore the new main).
09046803052523	23-Sep-11	V-104	Dayton	0	
09046952533	14-Sep-11	V-10-41	Dayton	0	
09048103052523	28-Oct-11	V-106	Covington	130	Segment of plastic main was between steel main segments to be retired (higher cost to dig both ends and uprate). (directional bore the new main).
09048103052525	28-Oct-11	V-107	Covington	170	Segment of plastic main was between steel main segments to be retired. 1" and 11/4" plastic main segments upgraded to 2" plastic main.
09048203052523	25-Aug-11	V-108	Bellefontaine	25	Segment of plastic main was between steel main segments to be retired (higher cost to dig both ends and uprate). (directional bore the new main).
09048203052525	25-Aug-11	V-109	Bellefontaine	1,390	Retired 1390' of 3" plastic main due to need to upgrade to 6" MPP, no need for 2 mains on the same side of street.
09048103052526	14-Jul-11	V-110	Aracanum	165	
09046603052525	10-Aug-11	V-111	Yellow Springs	0	
09046603052526	12-Aug-11	V-112	New Carlisle	0	
09046603052527	05-Aug-11	V-113	Jamestown	0	
09046603052528	15-Aug-11	V-114	Fairborn	166	Segment of plastic main was between steel main segments to be retired (higher cost to dig both ends and uprate). (directional bore the new main).
10048103052212	23-Aug-11	V-124	Greenville	610	Segment of plastic main was between steel main segments to be retired. 600' of 1" and 11/4" LP plastic main segments upgraded to 2" plastic main.
10046603052210	13-Aug-11	V-137	Xenia	140	Segment of plastic main was between steel main segments to be retired (higher cost to dig both ends and uprate). (directional bore the new main).
09046803052525	23-Sep-11	V-211	Dayton	215	2 Segment of plastic main was between steel main segments to be retired (higher cost to dig both ends and uprate). (directional bore the new main).
10048103052213	28-Oct-11	V-447	Covington	137	Segments of plastic main was between steel main segments to be retired (higher cost to dig both ends and uprate). (directional bore the new main).
10048203052210	25-Aug-11	V-449	Bellefontaine	20	Retired isolated Plastic main, no customer.
10046603052212	05-Aug-11	V-451	Jamestown	831	3 segments of plastic main were between steel main segments to be retired (higher cost to dig both ends and uprate). (directional bore the new main).
10048203052212	25-Aug-11	V-454	Bellefontaine	375	3 segments of plastic main were between steel main segments to be retired (higher cost to dig both ends and uprate). (directional bore the new main).
10048103052210	30-Jun-11	V-455	Aracanum	385	3 segments of plastic main were between steel main segments to be retired (higher cost to dig both ends and uprate). 45' of 11/4" LPP main upgraded to 2" main.



VEDO BS / CI 2012 Replacement Program Calendar Year 2012

				Estimated	I		
Project Group #	Operating Center	City	Street	Install Footage	Retire Footage	Project Services	Estimated Project Cost
V-441	Bellefontaine	BELLEFONTAINE	Green St., Park St.	3,010	4,481	84	\$460,750
V-481	Bellefontaine	BELLEFONTAINE	Lake Ave., Superior St., Erie St.	1,803	2,267	53	\$265,049
V-133	Centerville	DAYTON	Maple St., Clover St., Little St.	4,405	6,445	242	\$995,755
V-147	Centerville	DAYTON	Heaton Ave., Highland Ave.	7,585	7,650	266	\$996,497
V-291	Centerville	DAYTON	Coventry Rd. Cleaveland Ave.	4,645	3,955	151	\$546,812
V-453	Centerville	MIAMISBURG	Cole ave., Park Ave.	4,338	4,931	106	\$500,434
V-513	Centerville	DAYTON	Hessler St., Glenn Rock, Pusell Ave.	940	1,455	45	\$212,557
V-523	Centerville	DAYTON	Guncle Ave., Gebhart St.	2,740	2,854	75	\$401,285
V-524	Centerville	DAYTON	Angle St., George St.	5,165	5,990	165	\$786,744
V-530	Centerville	DAYTON	Wayne Ave., Epworth Ave.	6,810	6,851	239	\$961,211
V-744	Centerville	DAYTON	Brown st., K St.	1,114	2,124	17	\$171,128
V-810	Centerville	DAYTON	Paterson Rd.	3,777	3,955	83	\$578,458
V-10-42	Dayton West	DAYTON	Ray Ave., Troy St., Edmond St.,	5,760	9,420	192	\$965,129
V-115	Dayton West	DAYTON	Fith st., Riverview Ave., E Second St.	3,787	6,295	31	\$462,878
V-116	Dayton West	DAYTON	Hart St.,Leo St., Leonard St.	5,385	4,940	252	\$996,972
V-117	Dayton West	DAYTON	First St., Douglas Ave., Webb St.	5,840	8,055	128	\$719,729
V-118	Dayton West	DAYTON	Findlay st., S. Jersey St., N McGee St.	9,455	10,775	195	\$998,945
V-123	Dayton West	EATON	Maple St., E. Edison St., E Mechanic St.	7,075	7,010	124	\$660,392
V-134	Dayton West	DAYTON	Bolton St., Richard St., Bantz Ct.	6,286	9,214	137	\$753,466
V-511	Dayton West	DAYTON	Pleasant St., Garland St., Harbine St.	4,394	5,560	184	\$845,015
V-528	Dayton West	DAYTON	Ryburn Ave., Bruce Ave.,	2,496	3,531	87	\$367,687
V-567	Dayton West	DAYTON	Orchard St., Mathison St., 1st St.	4,040	6,285	136	\$653,704
V-596	Dayton West	DAYTON	Edison St., Woodward St., Howell St.	2,858	4,686	64	\$365,658
V-440	Fairborn	CEDARVILLE	Elm st., Walnut St., North St.	3,125	4,950	53	\$342,016
V-452	Fairborn	XENIA	Main St., West St., Collier St.	8,990	12,450	125	\$760,743
V-612	Fairborn	JAMESTOWN	Maple St., Washington St., Xenia St.	3,731	4,448	64	\$288,482
V-120	Troy	NEW MADISON	Cherry St., Summit St., Wayne St.	5,649	6,733	115	\$613,051
V-460	Troy	SIDNEY	Mishigan Ave., Cary St., North St.	4,330	4,910	130	\$411,519
V-520	Troy	PIQUA	Summit St., Willard St., Sunset St.	2,108	3,109	77	\$469,132
V-522	Troy	PIQUA	Garfield St., Plum St.	2,892	2,872	74	\$412,008
V-623	Troy	SIDNEY	Miami St., South St., Thompson St.	4,421	4,956	158	\$685,612
			TOTAL	138,954	173,157	3,852	\$18,648,818

Vectren Energy Delivery of Ohio Riser Replacement Program Twelve Months Ended December 31, 2011

Expense Category	Expense
Contract Labor	\$ 2,805,386
Materials	\$ 1,127,312
Overheads	\$ 1,066,605
Labor	\$ 408,776
Other Expenses	\$ 63,027
Total	\$ 5,471,106
# Risers	14,709
Costs per Riser	\$ 372

Notes:

(1) Ties to Exhibit No. JMB-3a, Column P, Line 11.

VEDO 2011 Maintenance Expense - BS/CI & Service Line Ownership

Service O&M Expense Change

	Α		В		С	
	Meter Order Man	agement				
Meter Orders	Baseline		2011		Change from Baseline	
1 Outside Leaks	3467		3411			
2 Investigate Gas Emergency	937		782			
3 No Gas	1831		1651			
4 Water in Service	11		36			
5 Total	6246		5880			
6 % Allocated to BS/CI Facilities	48%		43.6%			
7 Orders applicable to BS/CI	2998	A5 * A6	2564	B5 * B6		
Maintenance Expenses	Baseline		2011			
8 Total Meter Orders	122091		114928			
9 Meter Order Mgmt Actuals	\$ 3,542,248		\$ 4,134,424			
10 Average Cost per Order	29.01	A9/A8	35.97	B9/B8		
11 Average cost per Asset Condition based Order	58.03	2 *A10	71.95	2 * B10		
* Leak Investigation order averages approximately 2x's longer than average meter order						
Maintenance Expenses Reduction Opportunity	Baseline (C1xC2)		2011		Change from Baseline	
12 Orders Applicable to BS/CI x Average Order Cost per Asset Condition based Order	\$ 173,968	A7 * A11	\$ 184,452	B7 * B11	\$ (10,484)	A12 - B12

Leak Repair & Management										
Service Leaks Maintenance Expenses		Baseline			2011		Chang	ge from Baseline		
13 Service Leak Repair Actuals	\$	145,655		\$	249,044		\$	(103,389)	A13-B13	
14 % of Service BS/CI Leak Repairs		56%			39.6%					
15 Incremental Service O&M Expenses attributable to BS/CI	\$	81,567	A13*A14	\$	98,621	B13*B14	\$	(17,054)	A15-B15	
16 Incremental Service O&M Expenses attributable to All Other Asset Types	\$	64,088	A13-A15	\$	150,423	B13-B15	\$	(86,335)	A16-B16	
17 TOTAL BS/CI SERVICE MAINTENANCE EXPENSES	\$	255,535	A12+A15	\$	283,073	B12+B15	\$	(27,538)	A17-B17	

MAIN O&M Expense Change

Leak Repair & Management										
Main Leaks Maintenance Expenses		Baseline			2011		Change from Baseline			
18 Total Main Leak Repair Actuals	\$	1,610,684		\$	1,172,215					
19 Cost Associated with Soft Surface Repairs	\$	644,274		\$	736,151					
20 % of Soft Surface Repairs on BS/CI Main Leaks		39%			42%					
21 Cost Associated with Hard Surface Repairs	\$	966,410		\$	436,064					
22 % of Hard Surface Repairs on BS/CI Main Leaks		71%			64%					
Main O&M Expenses attributable to BS/CI	\$	937,418	(A19*A20)+(A21*A22)	\$	587,228	(B19*B20)+(B21*B22)	\$ 350,190	A23-B23		
24 Total O&M Maintenance Expenses (Main + Services)	\$	1,192,953	A17+A23	\$	870,301	B17+B23	\$ 322,652	A24-B24		

VEDO Incremental Service Line Responsibility Capital Costs

	A		В		С	
	Baseline		2011		Incremental over Baseline	
1 Service Line Replacements Costs	\$ 3,313,867		\$ 6,515,450			
2 Count of Service Lines Replaced	896		1,354			
3 Average Cost per Service Line Replaced	\$ 3,699	A1/A2	\$ 4,812	B1/B2	\$ 1,113	B3-A3

	Cost p	er		Service		Total	I Incremental Capital	
	Servic	e		Replacements			Cost	
7 Total Incremental Capital Investment for Service Line Responsibility	\$ 1, ⁻	113	C3	1,354	B2	\$	1,507,002	A7*B7

Note: The service replacements included in this count were not replaced as part of a bare steel/cast iron replacement project. Replacements were performed as a result of individual leaks, relocations, public improvement projects or other system improvement projects.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing *Amended Attachment A to Application* has been sent electronically, this 17th day of July, 2012 to the following parties of record.

/s/ Gretchen J. Hummel Gretchen J. Hummel

Joseph P. Serio Assistant Consumers' Counsel Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel 10 West Broad Street, 18th Floor Columbus, OH 43215 serio@occ.state.oh.us This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

7/17/2012 10:32:58 AM

in

Case No(s). 12-1423-GA-RDR

Summary: Application -Amended Attachment A to 4/30/12 Application electronically filed by Mrs. Debbie S Ryan on behalf of Vectren Energy Delivery of Ohio, Inc.