

**BEFORE  
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Annual Application )  
of Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc. for an Ad- ) Case No. 15-1918-GA-RDR  
justment to Rider IRP and Rider DSM )  
Rates )

---

---

**PREPARED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF  
ERIC T. BELLE  
ON BEHALF OF COLUMBIA GAS OF OHIO, INC.**

---

---

**COLUMBIA GAS OF OHIO, INC.**

Stephen B. Seiple, Asst. General Counsel  
Counsel of Record (0003809)  
Joseph M. Clark, Sr. Counsel (0080711)  
290 W. Nationwide Blvd.  
P.O. Box 117  
Columbus, Ohio 43216-0117  
Telephone: (614) 460-4648  
(614) 460-6988  
Email: sseiple@nisource.com  
josephclark@nisource.com

**February 26, 2016**

Attorneys for  
**COLUMBIA GAS OF OHIO, INC.**

1                                   **PREPARED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF ERIC BELLE**

2  
3   **Q.     Please state your name and business address.**

4   A.     My name is Eric T. Belle and my business address is 290 W. Nationwide  
5           Blvd., Columbus, Ohio 43215.

6  
7   **Q.     By whom are you employed?**

8   A.     I am employed by Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc. ("Columbia"). My current  
9           title is Manager, Field Engineering.

10  
11   **Q.    Please summarize your educational background and experience.**

12   A.     I have a Bachelor of Science degree in Chemical Engineering from Syracuse  
13           University, Syracuse, New York and a Master's degree in Business Admin-  
14           istration from Tiffin University, Tiffin, Ohio. In 1995, I began my career in  
15           Toledo, Ohio with Columbia as an Operations Engineering Trainee where  
16           I gained a broad understanding of the natural gas distribution industry. In  
17           1997, I accepted a position as an Operations Engineer in Findlay, Ohio. As  
18           an Operations Engineer, I was responsible for evaluating, planning and de-  
19           signing natural gas distribution facilities. I also provided technical assis-  
20           tance and support to the construction and field operations staff involved in  
21           the construction, operation, and maintenance of gas distribution facilities.  
22           In 2006, I was promoted to Field Engineering Leader where I was responsi-  
23           ble for providing technical and budgetary guidance, support, and direction  
24           to Columbia's Field Engineering department in northwest Ohio. Addition-  
25           ally, I ensured all projects in northwest Ohio were designed according to all  
26           applicable codes and regulations. In 2009, I was promoted to my current  
27           position of Manager, Field Engineering for Columbia.

28  
29   **Q.    What are your responsibilities as Manager, Field Engineering?**

30   A.     As Manager, Field Engineering, my principal responsibilities include over-  
31           seeing the identification, design, and estimating of generally all capital  
32           work for Columbia's gas distribution system. I am also responsible for the  
33           development, monitoring, and execution of Columbia's capital budget. I  
34           provide leadership and strategic direction to the Field Engineering staff in  
35           line with Columbia's goals. I also provide technical guidance and support  
36           to Columbia's engineering staff in support of their professional develop-  
37           ment and the accomplishment of department objectives. I facilitate and en-  
38           courage the improvement of existing engineering processes, policies and

1 procedures. I monitor and evaluate the performance of Columbia's infra-  
2 structure replacement program and collaborate with peers to ensure effec-  
3 tive execution of the program.  
4

5 **Q. Have you previously testified before this Commission?**

6 A. Yes. I previously testified in Case No. 10-2353-GA-RDR, Case No. 11-5803-  
7 GA-RDR, Case No. 11-5515-GA-ALT, Case No. 12-2923-GA-RDR, Case No.  
8 13-2146-GA-RDR, and Case No. 14-2078-GA-RDR.  
9

10 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

11 A. The purpose of my testimony is to explain the management, engineering, and  
12 construction practices of Columbia as they relate to the various components  
13 of Rider IRP, included in this filing, for the 2015 calendar year. I will also dis-  
14 cuss Columbia's performance with respect to its accelerated main replace-  
15 ment program and hazardous service line replacement program.  
16

17 **Q. Please summarize Rider IRP and its components included in this filing.**

18 A. Rider IRP is an infrastructure tracker which captures cumulative plant invest-  
19 ment over a specified period of time and provides for a return on and the  
20 return of all program costs. The program components that make up Colum-  
21 bia's IRP are: (1) the Accelerated Main Replacement Program ("AMRP"); and  
22 (2) the replacement of hazardous service lines; and (3) the Automated Meter  
23 Reading Device ("AMRD") program.  
24

25 **Q. Please describe the AMRP and replacement of hazardous service line pro-  
26 grams.**

27 A. Columbia's AMRP targets certain types of main for replacement over the  
28 course of approximately 25 years. The types of gas main included in the  
29 AMRP are unprotected bare steel, unprotected coated steel, wrought iron,  
30 and cast iron. These types of main ("Priority Pipe" or "Priority Main") typi-  
31 cally have a greater probability to leak due to their material type, protection,  
32 age, and other characteristics. Also included in the AMRP is the replacement  
33 of all metallic service lines and associated appurtenances.  
34

35 Columbia also has responsibility of all maintenance, repair, and replacement  
36 of customer-owned service lines that have been determined by Columbia to  
37 present an existing or probable hazard to persons or property.  
38

1 **Q. Please summarize the AMRP and hazardous service line performance por-**  
2 **tions of Rider IRP for 2015.**

3 A. For the 2015 AMRP filing, Columbia has included costs for projects associated  
4 with the retirement of Priority Pipe totaling approximately \$182.8 million. The  
5 total footage abandoned or retired from service for each type of main is as  
6 follows:

8	Bare Steel:	995,341 feet
9	Iron/Other:	38,510 feet
10	Pre-1955 Unprotected Coated Steel:	160,428 feet
11	Post-1954 Coated Steel:	67,450 feet
12	Plastic:	147,210 feet

13  
14 Also, in 2015, Columbia replaced 6,030 hazardous customer service lines for  
15 a total cost of approximately \$20.6 million.

16  
17 **Q. Has Columbia included the costs to replace segments of plastic and coated**  
18 **steel mains in this filing?**

19 A. Columbia has included the costs of retiring these portions of non-priority pipe  
20 main in conjunction with its infrastructure replacement projects in this  
21 tracker. As part of the Joint Stipulation and Recommendation in Case No. 11-  
22 5515-GA-ALT approved by the Commission in its Opinion and Order dated  
23 November 26, 2012, Columbia clarified the scope of the AMRP to include in-  
24 terspersed non-priority main, first generation plastic main, and ineffectively  
25 coated steel main.

26  
27 The Opinion and Order issued in 11-5515-GA-ALT provided for recovery of  
28 investment related to interspersed sections of nonpriority pipe contained  
29 within the bounds of priority pipe replacement projects where it is more eco-  
30 nomical to replace such pipe based on the pipe diameter and length of main.  
31 These replacement metrics are set forth in the Commission's Order dated No-  
32 vember 26, 2012.

33  
34 The Opinion and Order further allowed for the inclusion and recovery of in-  
35 vestment related to the replacement of first generation plastic pipe or Aldyl-  
36 A plastic pipe when such pipe is associated with priority pipe in replacement  
37 projects not to exceed 5% of the total pipe replaced. For 2015, Columbia's re-  
38 tirement of first generation plastic pipe installed prior to 1982 associated with  
39 an AMRP totaled 22,425 feet of pipe which was 1.59% of the total retirement  
40 footage.

1  
2 Columbia's AMRP was also clarified to expressly include ineffectively coated  
3 steel pipe installed before 1955 which was considered ineffectively coated  
4 without further testing. Columbia also tested segments of post-1954 coated  
5 steel pipe that were retired with replacement projects. Segments of post-1954  
6 coated steel pipe that were determined to be ineffectively coated were in-  
7 cluded in the IRP. Columbia retired a total of 31,566 feet of post-1954 coated  
8 steel pipe that was found to be ineffectively coated.  
9

10 **Q. The Joint Stipulation and Recommendation in Case No. 11-5515-GA-ALT**  
11 **also included restrictions on certain types of projects related to system bet-**  
12 **terment and municipal improvement. What has Columbia done to ensure**  
13 **compliance with those requirements?**

14 **A.** Columbia has put processes in place to ensure that the cost of projects such as  
15 system betterment designed for future growth and municipal improvement  
16 projects where Columbia was required to move its facilities were not included  
17 in the AMRP filing if they did not meet the requirements contained within the  
18 Joint Stipulation and Recommendation approved by the Commission in Case  
19 No. 11-5515-GA-ALT. One such process is the monthly review of all active job  
20 orders through a Pre-Closeout Report. With this report, a list of all active job  
21 orders are provided monthly to Columbia's field engineering leaders to re-  
22 view with their respective engineering team members. Key information that  
23 is provided includes the estimated footage of priority pipe that is expected to  
24 be retired, the project accounting code (indicates whether the job order is an  
25 AMRP project), and whether the project accounting code was entered cor-  
26 rectly. This monthly review helps to ensure that AMRP related job orders are  
27 properly entered into our Work Management System. Additionally, Colum-  
28 bia has a comprehensive training module in its learning management system  
29 for new and existing engineering employees that provides clear instructions  
30 on what is included in the AMRP, and how to properly code projects for in-  
31 clusion in its annual filing. In 2015, Columbia's entire field engineering team  
32 had this training module added to their individual learning plans along with  
33 the requirement to complete the training annually, but not later than Septem-  
34 ber 1 of each year. Columbia's entire engineering team successfully com-  
35 pleted this training prior to the established due date. These efforts help to re-  
36 inforce the importance Columbia places on this program and helps to ensure  
37 compliance to the Joint Stipulation.  
38

1 **Q. How did Columbia determine which mains were to be replaced as part of**  
2 **its AMRP in 2015?**

3 A. In 2015, Columbia utilized Optimain DS™ to help evaluate and rank pipe seg-  
4 ments system-wide against a range of environmental conditions (e.g. popula-  
5 tion density, building class, surface cover type, etc.), risk factors (pipe seg-  
6 ment leak history, pipe condition, pitting depth, depth of cover, etc.) and eco-  
7 nomic factors. Generally, we identified, ranked and selected projects based on  
8 the level of relative risk score that would be removed from the system per  
9 every thousand feet of pipe that would be abandoned with the project. We  
10 also considered the level of relative risk score that would be removed from  
11 the system per every \$100,000 dollars of capital spent. This evaluation and  
12 risk ranking of pipe segments was then reviewed by the engineering and op-  
13 erations departments to assess whether that data was consistent with what  
14 has been observed in the field. Additionally, Columbia worked collabora-  
15 tively with local and state governments in areas where public improvement  
16 work was to occur. Columbia reviewed plans and identified areas of Priority  
17 Pipe within the scope of pending public improvement work. Columbia used  
18 both sets of information listed above to help determine which sections of main  
19 were the best candidates to select for replacement.  
20

21 **Q. Please describe Columbia's process for determining the resources to be**  
22 **used in conjunction with the AMRP projects.**

23 A. The majority of all Columbia's capital work is performed by contractors un-  
24 der "blanket" contracts. Columbia extended and expanded the scope of our  
25 previously bid "blanket" construction contracts through December 31, 2015.  
26 This approach allows Columbia to maintain highly skilled contract resources  
27 and encourages these contractors to expand their businesses in Ohio. Local  
28 Columbia employees may perform work on some smaller projects when they  
29 are available. Columbia evaluates each project on a variety of criteria to de-  
30 termine who will perform the work.  
31

32 **Q. What percentage of contractors working on AMRP projects in 2015 con-**  
33 **sisted of Ohio labor?**

34 A. As part of the Stipulation in Case No. 08-72-GA-AIR, et al., approved by the  
35 Commission on December 3, 2008, Columbia agreed to encourage its AMRP  
36 contractors to use their best efforts to retain Ohio labor to perform AMRP re-  
37 lated services. In the Joint Stipulation and Recommendation in Case No. 09-  
38 0006-GA-UNC, filed on June 2, 2009, and approved by the Commission on  
39 June 24, 2009, Columbia agreed to continue to encourage its AMRP contrac-  
40 tors to use Ohio labor, and to report on Ohio labor participation in the AMRP

1 program. Columbia has added language to its bid packages stating a prefer-  
2 ence that Ohio labor be used whenever possible as long as the price and qual-  
3 ity of work is not negatively impacted. For 2015, 75% of contractor labor work-  
4 force on AMRP projects was from Ohio.  
5

6 **Q. Do contractors typically replace Columbia's hazardous customer service**  
7 **lines?**

8 A. Contractors do replace some hazardous service lines in a few locations, but  
9 the majority of hazardous service lines are replaced by local Columbia em-  
10 ployees.  
11

12 **Q. Did the various components included in this filing produce any other sig-**  
13 **nificant benefits for customers in 2015?**

14 A. Yes. Customer safety has been improved significantly due to the replacement  
15 of more than 6,030 hazardous service lines. With the retirement of 1,033,851  
16 feet of Priority Pipe, Columbia was able to eliminate the chance of water en-  
17 tering these lines and freezing meters off in the winter. Incidents of water en-  
18 tering the lines reduced 36% between the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 gas sea-  
19 sons. Additionally, Columbia was able to retire distribution mains where it  
20 has habitually had to go in and dig up to repair the mains. Overall, Columbia  
21 has continued to see a decrease in the number of new leaks found on distri-  
22 bution mains and services based on its three year leakage survey frequency.  
23 Columbia found 16,553 new leaks in 2015 or approximately 10.3% fewer leaks  
24 compared to 2012 when the same geographic areas were surveyed and 18,457  
25 leaks were found.  
26

27 **Q. What are Columbia's construction plans for 2016?**

28 A. Columbia expects to spend approximately \$188.0 million on the various com-  
29 ponents of Rider IRP in 2016. Columbia currently estimates it will spend ap-  
30 proximately \$25 million on hazardous service lines, and \$163.0 million on re-  
31 placing infrastructure. Priority Pipe projects will be constructed throughout  
32 the year. Many of these projects have either not yet been identified or involve  
33 third party coordination the schedules for which cannot be confirmed at this  
34 time. These projects will address existing hazards and/or eliminate risky pipe  
35 in conjunction with public works projects. A current listing of Columbia's  
36 largest planned infrastructure projects are shown below.  
37

<b>Project Name</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Estimated Cost</b>
Valentine AMRP	Toledo	\$6,255,750
Near South: Markison & 6th AMRP	Columbus	\$4,445,000
<b>Project Name</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Estimated Cost</b>
Estell Ave. & Oxford Blvd. AMRP	Steubenville	\$3,570,720
Hoag AMRP	Toledo	\$3,321,960
Rosslyn & Milton AMRP	Columbus	\$3,287,500
Vermilion West AMRP	Vermilion	\$3,273,550
Near East : E. Fulton & Seymour AMRP	Columbus	\$3,108,250
Walnut St. AMRP	Logan	\$3,068,500
Liberty St, Amsterdam AMRP	Amsterdam	\$3,033,500
Grandview: King & Kenny AMRP	Columbus	\$2,948,550
Near South: Ann & Stanley AMRP	Columbus	\$2,928,000
Lake Breeze Road AMRP	Sheffield Lake	\$2,892,750
Daleford 2 AMRP	Toledo	\$2,859,900
OSU : Worthington & 9th AMRP	Columbus	\$2,717,000
Elmwood Rd AMRP	Medina	\$2,711,093
Prospect Street Berea AMRP	Berea	\$2,681,700
Berdan & Garrison AMRP	Toledo	\$2,553,600
Mound & Wood AMRP	Marion	\$2,455,200
Hilltop: Clarendon & Palmetto AMRP	Columbus	\$2,370,000
Limestone & McCreight AMRP	Springfield	\$2,367,600
Forest Boulevard AMRP	Avon Lake	\$2,365,050
Leonard AMRP	Fostoria	\$2,234,750
Short North : Hubbard and Henry	Columbus	\$2,227,400
Indiana & Summit AMRP	Marion	\$2,215,800
Liberty St AMRP	Springfield	\$2,179,100
North 7th St.	Steubenville	\$2,148,325
Lucerne Ave AMRP	Parma	\$2,105,200
Grace St. North AMRP	Mansfield	\$2,083,500
Worthington Ave AMRP	Chillicothe	\$1,993,875
Ward & Locust AMRP	Urbana	\$1,940,000
John St AMRP	East Liverpool	\$1,908,260

Franklinton: Cable & Chicago	Columbus	\$1,888,500
Harvest AMRP	Toledo	\$1,887,650
Prospect St AMRP	Elyria	\$1,831,500
<b>Project Name</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Estimated Cost</b>
E. Water & Maple AMRP	Oak Harbor	\$1,817,950
Homewood Ave AMRP	Salem	\$1,668,845
Westgate AMRP	Mansfield	\$1,580,730
Wade Ave AMRP	Alliance	\$1,531,010
Race & Cedar AMRP	Springfield	\$1,454,100
Locust St AMRP	Newark	\$1,337,850
Sterkel Park AMRP	Mansfield	\$1,336,050
West Lafayette AMRP	West Lafayette	\$1,318,788
Franklinton: Derrer & Wicklow AMRP	Columbus	\$1,252,500
Leroy & Prospect	Bowling Green	\$1,215,500
Oak Knoll & Fairway AMRP	Springfield	\$1,162,600
Main St, Sugargrove AMRP	Sugar Grove	\$1,040,010
Eden Park - Hinkley Hollow AMRP	Portsmouth	\$1,018,220
Whitehall: Poth & Hamilton AMRP	Whitehall	\$976,000
Birchard AMRP	Fremont	\$951,500
Wooster Ave AMRP	Mount Vernon	\$912,100
McAllister & Byron AMRP	Columbus	\$879,000
Walbridge & E Broadway	Walbridge	\$861,750
Baird St. AMRP	Logan	\$808,750
Adams AMRP	Toledo	\$799,650
Maple Ave AMRP	New Concord	\$760,041
Tremont City PH 1 AMRP	Tremont City	\$721,400
McConnel AMRP	McConnelsville	\$689,500
Enterprise AMRP	Logan	\$576,750
Downtown: Mound & Front AMRP	Columbus	\$531,750

1

2 **Q. Does this complete your Prepared Direct Testimony?**

3 **A. Yes, it does.**

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio's e-filing system will electronically serve notice of the filing of this document on the parties referenced on the service list of the docket card who have electronically subscribed to the case. In addition, the undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing document is also being served via electronic mail, on the 26<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2016 upon the parties listed below.

/s/ Stephen B. Seiple

Stephen B. Seiple

Attorney for

**COLUMBIA GAS OF OHIO, INC.**

## SERVICE LIST

William Wright, Esq.  
Assistant Attorney General  
Public Utilities Section  
180 East Broad Street  
Columbus, OH 43215  
Email: William.wright@puc.state.oh.us

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

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

**2/26/2016 12:15:54 PM**

**in**

**Case No(s). 15-1918-GA-RDR**

Summary: Testimony of Eric Belle electronically filed by Cheryl A MacDonald on behalf of Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc.