

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Application of Co-)
lumbia Gas of Ohio, Inc. for Approval of) Case No. 17-2202-GA-ALT
an Alternative Form of Regulation.)

**PREPARED SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF
DIANA M. BEIL
ON BEHALF OF COLUMBIA GAS OF OHIO, INC.**

/s/ Eric B. Gallon

Eric B. Gallon (0071465)

(Counsel of Record)

Mark Stemm (0023146)

Emily Lane (0095947)

Porter Wright Morris & Arthur LLP

41 South High Street

Columbus, OH 43215

Telephone: (614) 227-2190

Email: egallon@porterwright.com

mstemm@porterwright.com

elane@porterwright.com

Stephen B. Seiple, Asst. General Counsel
(0003809)

Joseph M. Clark, Sr. Counsel (0080711)

P.O. Box 117

290 W. Nationwide Blvd.

Columbus, Ohio 43216-0117

Telephone: (614) 460-4648

E-mail: sseiple@nisource.com

josephclark@nisource.com

(Willing to accept service by e-mail)

Attorneys for

COLUMBIA GAS OF OHIO, INC.

October 22, 2018

**PREPARED SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY
OF DIANA M. BEIL**

I. INTRODUCTION

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. Diana Beil, 290 W. Nationwide Blvd., Columbus, Ohio 43215.

Q. By whom are you employed?

A. I am employed by Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc. ("Columbia").

Q. Have you previously submitted testimony in this proceeding?

A. Yes, I filed my Direct Testimony on December 1, 2017, and my Amended Direct Testimony on April 2, 2018.

Q. Have there been any changes in your job responsibilities since your Amended Direct Testimony was filed?

A. No.

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

A. This testimony is being filed in support of the following issues raised by Columbia in its Objections to the Staff Report of Investigation ("Staff Report") filed in this case:

Objection 1 – Annual Caps

Objection 2 – Recovery Period of Deferrals

Objection 3 – Rate Base Depreciation Expense Calculation

Objection 4 – Rate Base Depreciation Expense Offset

Objection 5 – Single Rate

Objection 6 – Annual Filing

II. ANNUAL CAPS

Q. Why has Columbia objected to Staff's recommendation to establish annual caps (Columbia Objection 1)?

A. Columbia objects to Staff's recommendation to establish annual caps for two primary reasons. First, it appears Staff misinterpreted the Blue Ridge finding on which it based its recommendations. Second, annual caps are not needed to control costs or protect ratepayers from excessive and unnecessary plan investments.

1 **Q. How did Staff misinterpret the Blue Ridge finding?**

2 A. The Blue Ridge report stated that spending on growth projects with in the
3 CEP had increased 149% from 2012 to 2017. Staff interpreted Blue Ridge's
4 report to mean that overall capital spending had increased 149% from 2012
5 to 2017. Growth-related activities only represent a portion of the total CEP
6 spend, approximately 44%.

7
8 **Q. Did the Blue Ridge audit report make further recommendations with re-**
9 **gards to the necessity or prudence of Columbia's investments?**

10 A. No. In fact, Blue Ridge reported that it found nothing to indicate that Co-
11 lumbia's CEP expenses and assets were unnecessary, unreasonable or im-
12 prudent. The Blue Ridge audit covered over \$2.5 billion in capital invest-
13 ments and only recommended a disallowance of \$205,710. Additionally,
14 Blue Ridge concluded that Columbia is implementing sound cost contain-
15 ment strategies. Blue Ridge further noted that these strategies would miti-
16 gate the impact of increasing costs, but not negate the impact on costs due
17 to constraints in the pipe construction market in Ohio and surrounding
18 states.

19
20 **III. RECOVERY PERIOD OF DEFERRALS**

21
22 **Q. Why has Columbia objected to Staff's proposed recovery period of defer-**
23 **als (Columbia Objection 2)?**

24 A. Staff has proposed using average service lives from Columbia's last rate
25 case, which results in an average composite service life of 50 years or an
26 accrual rate of 2%, to amortize CEP deferrals. Columbia objects to this pro-
27 posal for several reasons. First, the proposed amortization period is signif-
28 icantly longer than the estimated remaining useful life of the underlying
29 assets. Second, Staff's proposed methodology is not consistent with the pe-
30 riods used to amortize Columbia's other plant-based deferrals. And finally,
31 amortizing the deferrals over 50 years versus Columbia's estimated 25
32 years results in customer paying more.

33
34 **Q. How does Columbia's methodology differ from Staff's proposed amorti-**
35 **zation period?**

36 A. Columbia uses a composite depreciation rate based on the underlying as-
37 sets to calculate the deferral amortization period. This composite deprecia-
38 tion rate aligns the estimated remaining useful life of the asset with the
39 amortization of the related deferred expenses. Using Staff's proposed aver-
40 age service life approach, Columbia would be amortizing expense deferrals

1 for approximately 25 years after the underlying assets have a net book value
2 of \$0.

3
4 **Q. Does Columbia use the composite depreciation rate to amortize Colum-**
5 **bia's other plant-based deferrals?**

6 A. Yes. Columbia uses a composite depreciation rate to amortize plant-based
7 deferrals in both the IRP and from the last base rate case.

8
9 **Q. Columbia's Objections to the Staff Report said that "Columbia's compo-**
10 **site current depreciation rates result in an amortization period of 37 years,**
11 **rather than 50 years." Why do you say the proper amortization period is**
12 **25 years?**

13 A. Since filing its Objections, Columbia recalculated the composite deprecia-
14 tion rate based on the specific types of assets in the CEP. For those specific
15 assets, the correct and proper amortization period is 25 years, not 37 years.

16
17 **Q. Why does utilizing a longer amortization period mean customers pay**
18 **more?**

19 A. On an annual basis, customers will pay more due to the extended time pe-
20 riod for recovery. The longer a deferral is amortized, the longer it remains
21 in rate base and is included in the calculation of return on rate base.

22
23 **Q. Has Columbia estimated the overall impact to customers if it used the**
24 **longer amortization period recommended by Staff, rather than the com-**
25 **posite depreciation rate?**

26 A. Yes. Using Columbia's authorized pre-tax rate of return, Columbia esti-
27 mates customers will pay an estimated \$144.8 million more over 50 years
28 compared to an estimated 25 years. Please see the analysis included in At-
29 tachment 1.

30
31 **IV. PROVISION FOR ACCUMULATED DEPRECIATION**

32
33 **Q. Why has Columbia objected to Staff's proposed provision for accumu-**
34 **lated depreciation included in the calculation of the revenue requirement**
35 **(Columbia Objection 3)?**

36 A. Staff proposed calculating the provision for accumulated depreciation
37 based on gross plant additions versus net plant (net of retirements). Colum-
38 bia objects to this calculation being based on gross plant additions, as it does
39 not follow generally accepted accounting principles and does not mirror the
40 accounting on Columbia's books for accumulated depreciation. Columbia's

1 accumulated depreciation, based on accounting principles, is calculated
2 based on gross plant less retirements.
3

4 **V. RATE BASE DEPRECIATION EXPENSE OFFSET**
5

6 **Q. Why has Columbia objected to Staff's recommendation of a rate base de-**
7 **preciation expense offset (Columbia Objection 4)?**

8 A. Columbia's current tariffed rates are not the subject of Columbia's
9 Amended Application, except to the extent the Commissions adjusts those
10 rates to reflect the recently enacted Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. Any over-collec-
11 tions under those rates should be addressed in Columbia's next base rate
12 case, and not in this proceeding.
13

14 **Q. What would be the impact of Staff's recommended adjustment on the**
15 **overall revenue requirement?**

16 A. Staff recommended a single rate to begin recovery of CEP investments and
17 the related deferral through December 31, 2017, with a rate base deprecia-
18 tion expense offset of \$289.9 million. This rate base offset results in a \$27.6
19 million reduction to, and understatement of, the revenue requirement.
20

21 **Q. Would the recommended offset allow Columbia to earn its authorized**
22 **rate of return?**

23 A. No. With the adjustment, Columbia would only earn a rate of return of ap-
24 proximately 5.3% on its CEP investments, compared to its authorized pre-
25 tax rate of return of 9.52%.
26

27 **VI. SINGLE RATE**
28

29 **Q. Does Columbia object to Staff's recommendation for a single CEP Rider**
30 **rate (Columbia Objection 5)?**

31 A. No. Columbia would not object to a single CEP Rider rate for each rate class,
32 to remain in effect until Columbia's next base rate case, as recommended
33 by Staff. However, Columbia does object to the rates Staff proposed. Staff's
34 proposed rate reflects the depreciation accrual rates for amortization of de-
35 ferred expenses, rate base provision for accumulated depreciation calcula-
36 tion, and rate base depreciation expense offset to which Columbia objected
37 above.
38

1 **Q. Has Columbia performed a calculation of a single CEP Rider rate?**

2 A. Yes. Columbia's single CEP Rider rate, considering all objections previously
3 discussed, is projected to be \$4.94 for SGS Class customers, \$41.26 for GS
4 Class customers, and \$798.20 for LGS Class customers. See calculation on
5 Attachment 2.
6

7 **VII. ANNUAL FILING**
8

9 **Q. Why has Columbia objected to Staff's recommendation of an annual fil-**
10 **ing (Columbia Objection 6)?**

11 A. Staff recommended an annual filing to account for over/under collections
12 and modifications in the amortization of deferrals. Columbia objects to this
13 annual filing because it is unnecessary if the CEP Rider rate is a fixed rate
14 to remain in effect until Columbia's next base rate case. If the CEP Rider
15 were an ongoing, annually adjusted rider, however, an annual true-up pro-
16 cess would be appropriate.
17

18 **Q. Would an ongoing Rider, updated annually for additional CEP invest-**
19 **ment, benefit customers?**

20 A. Yes. As Staff stated in its report, a single rate Rider would pick up CEP in-
21 vestments and the associated deferrals through December 31, 2017. This
22 would stop further deferrals on the investments made through December
23 31, 2017. However, Columbia would continue to defer depreciation, prop-
24 erty taxes and post in-service carrying costs ("PISCC") on investments
25 made post-2017. An ongoing Rider would more closely align the invest-
26 ment with recovery, and save customers money by avoiding compounding
27 deferrals, specifically PISCC.
28

29 **Q. Does this conclude your Prepared Supplemental Testimony?**

30 A. Yes.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio's e-filing system will electronically serve notice of this document's filing on the parties referenced on the service list of the docket card who have electronically subscribed to the case. In addition, the undersigned certifies that he is serving a copy of this document via electronic mail on the 22nd day of October, 2018, upon the persons listed below:

Ohio Attorney General's Office	jodi.bair@ohioattorneygeneral.gov robert.eubanks@ohioattorneygeneral.gov
Industrial Energy Users – Ohio	fdarr@mwncmh.com
The Kroger Co.	mpritchard@mwncmh.com paul@carpenterlipps.com dutton@carpenterlipps.com
The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel	bryce.mckenney@occ.ohio.gov
Ohio Energy Group	dboehm@BKLawfirm.com mkurtz@BKLawfirm.com kboehm@BKLawfirm.com jkylercohn@BKLawfirm.com
Ohio Manufacturers' Association Energy Group	bojko@carpenterlipps.com dressel@carpenterlipps.com
Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy	cmooney@ohiopartners.org
Retail Energy Supply Association	mjsettineri@vorys.com glpetrucci@vorys.com
Interstate Gas Supply, Inc.	mnugent@igsenergy.com joliker@igsenergy.com

/s/ Eric B. Gallon

Eric B. Gallon

Attorney for
COLUMBIA GAS OF OHIO, INC.

Staff Recommendation

50 year amortization period, or 2%

Deferred Balance as of December 31, 2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
\$ 156,580,969.39													
Annual Amortization	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39
Ending Balance	\$ 153,449,350.00	\$ 150,317,730.61	\$ 147,186,111.23	\$ 144,054,491.84	\$ 140,922,872.45	\$ 137,791,253.06	\$ 134,659,633.68	\$ 131,528,014.29	\$ 128,396,394.90	\$ 125,264,775.51	\$ 122,133,156.12	\$ 119,001,536.74	\$ 115,869,917.35
Net of Tax Balance	\$ 121,224,986.50	\$ 118,751,007.19	\$ 116,277,027.87	\$ 113,803,048.55	\$ 111,329,069.24	\$ 108,855,089.92	\$ 106,381,110.60	\$ 103,907,131.29	\$ 101,433,151.97	\$ 98,959,172.65	\$ 96,485,193.34	\$ 94,011,214.02	\$ 91,537,234.71
Annualized Return on Rate Base	\$ 11,540,618.71	\$ 11,305,095.88	\$ 11,069,573.05	\$ 10,834,050.22	\$ 10,598,527.39	\$ 10,363,004.56	\$ 10,127,481.73	\$ 9,891,958.90	\$ 9,656,436.07	\$ 9,420,913.24	\$ 9,185,390.41	\$ 8,949,867.57	\$ 8,714,344.74
	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	2038	2039	2040	2041	2042	2043
Annual Amortization	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39
Ending Balance	\$ 112,738,297.96	\$ 109,606,678.57	\$ 106,475,059.19	\$ 103,343,439.80	\$ 100,211,820.41	\$ 97,080,201.02	\$ 93,948,581.63	\$ 90,816,962.25	\$ 87,685,342.86	\$ 84,553,723.47	\$ 81,422,104.08	\$ 78,290,484.70	\$ 75,158,865.31
Net of Tax Balance	\$ 89,063,255.39	\$ 86,589,276.07	\$ 84,115,296.76	\$ 81,641,317.44	\$ 79,167,338.12	\$ 76,693,358.81	\$ 74,219,379.49	\$ 71,745,400.17	\$ 69,271,420.86	\$ 66,797,441.54	\$ 64,323,462.23	\$ 61,849,482.91	\$ 59,375,503.59
Annualized Return on Rate Base	\$ 8,478,821.91	\$ 8,243,299.08	\$ 8,007,776.25	\$ 7,772,253.42	\$ 7,536,730.59	\$ 7,301,207.76	\$ 7,065,684.93	\$ 6,830,162.10	\$ 6,594,639.27	\$ 6,359,116.43	\$ 6,123,593.60	\$ 5,888,070.77	\$ 5,652,547.94
	2044	2045	2046	2047	2048	2049	2050	2051	2052	2053	2054	2055	2056
Annual Amortization	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39
Ending Balance	\$ 72,027,245.92	\$ 68,895,626.53	\$ 65,764,007.14	\$ 62,632,387.76	\$ 59,500,768.37	\$ 56,369,148.98	\$ 53,237,529.59	\$ 50,105,910.20	\$ 46,974,290.82	\$ 43,842,671.43	\$ 40,711,052.04	\$ 37,579,432.65	\$ 34,447,813.27
Net of Tax Balance	\$ 56,901,524.28	\$ 54,427,544.96	\$ 51,953,565.64	\$ 49,479,586.33	\$ 47,005,607.01	\$ 44,531,627.69	\$ 42,057,648.38	\$ 39,583,669.06	\$ 37,109,689.75	\$ 34,635,710.43	\$ 32,161,731.11	\$ 29,687,751.80	\$ 27,213,772.48
Annualized Return on Rate Base	\$ 5,417,025.11	\$ 5,181,502.28	\$ 4,945,979.45	\$ 4,710,456.62	\$ 4,474,933.79	\$ 4,239,410.96	\$ 4,003,888.13	\$ 3,768,365.29	\$ 3,532,842.46	\$ 3,297,319.63	\$ 3,061,796.80	\$ 2,826,273.97	\$ 2,590,751.14
	2057	2058	2059	2060	2061	2062	2063	2064	2065	2066	2067		
Annual Amortization	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 3,131,619.39		
Ending Balance	\$ 31,316,193.88	\$ 28,184,574.49	\$ 25,052,955.10	\$ 21,921,335.71	\$ 18,789,716.33	\$ 15,658,096.94	\$ 12,526,477.55	\$ 9,394,858.16	\$ 6,263,238.78	\$ 3,131,619.39	\$ 0.00		
Net of Tax Balance	\$ 24,739,793.16	\$ 22,265,813.85	\$ 19,791,834.53	\$ 17,317,855.21	\$ 14,843,875.90	\$ 12,369,896.58	\$ 9,895,917.27	\$ 7,421,937.95	\$ 4,947,958.63	\$ 2,473,979.32	\$ 0.00		
Annualized Return on Rate Base	\$ 2,355,228.31	\$ 2,119,705.48	\$ 1,884,182.65	\$ 1,648,659.82	\$ 1,413,136.99	\$ 1,177,614.15	\$ 942,091.32	\$ 706,568.49	\$ 471,045.66	\$ 235,522.83	\$ 0.00		
Total Return on Rate Base	\$ 288,515,467.87												

Columbia's Calculation

~25 year amortization period, or 3.94%

Deferred Balance as of December 31, 2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
\$ 156,580,969.39													
Annual Amortization	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19
Ending Balance	\$ 150,411,679.20	\$ 144,242,389.00	\$ 138,073,098.81	\$ 131,903,808.61	\$ 125,734,518.42	\$ 119,565,228.23	\$ 113,395,938.03	\$ 107,226,647.84	\$ 101,057,357.64	\$ 94,888,067.45	\$ 88,718,777.26	\$ 82,549,487.06	\$ 76,380,196.87
Net of Tax Balance	\$ 118,825,226.56	\$ 113,951,487.31	\$ 109,077,748.06	\$ 104,204,008.81	\$ 99,330,269.55	\$ 94,456,530.30	\$ 89,582,791.05	\$ 84,709,051.79	\$ 79,835,312.54	\$ 74,961,573.29	\$ 70,087,834.03	\$ 65,214,094.78	\$ 60,340,355.53
Annualized Return on Rate Base	\$ 11,312,161.57	\$ 10,848,181.59	\$ 10,384,201.62	\$ 9,920,221.64	\$ 9,456,241.66	\$ 8,992,261.68	\$ 8,528,281.71	\$ 8,064,301.73	\$ 7,600,321.75	\$ 7,136,341.78	\$ 6,672,361.80	\$ 6,208,381.82	\$ 5,744,401.85
	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	2038	2039	2040	2041	2042	2043
Annual Amortization	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 6,169,290.19	\$ 2,348,714.54
Ending Balance	\$ 70,210,906.67	\$ 64,041,616.48	\$ 57,872,326.29	\$ 51,703,036.09	\$ 45,533,745.90	\$ 39,364,455.70	\$ 33,195,165.51	\$ 27,025,875.32	\$ 20,856,585.12	\$ 14,687,294.93	\$ 8,518,004.73	\$ 2,348,714.54	\$ 0.00
Net of Tax Balance	\$ 55,466,616.27	\$ 50,592,877.02	\$ 45,719,137.77	\$ 40,845,398.51	\$ 35,971,659.26	\$ 31,097,920.01	\$ 26,224,180.75	\$ 21,350,441.50	\$ 16,476,702.25	\$ 11,602,962.99	\$ 6,729,223.74	\$ 1,855,484.49	\$ 0.00
Annualized Return on Rate Base	\$ 5,280,421.87	\$ 4,816,441.89	\$ 4,352,461.92	\$ 3,888,481.94	\$ 3,424,501.96	\$ 2,960,521.98	\$ 2,496,542.01	\$ 2,032,562.03	\$ 1,568,582.05	\$ 1,104,602.08	\$ 640,622.10	\$ 176,642.12	\$ 0.00
Total Return on Rate Base	\$ 143,610,046.15												

Estimated Customer impact \$ 144,905,421.72

Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc.
Capital Expenditure Program (CEP) Rider
Case No. 17-2202-GA-ALT
Revenue Requirement Calculation

		Company Proposed Single Rate 12/31/2017
Line No.	Investment Date	
	Description	
	Return on Investment	
1	Plant In-Service	
2	Additions ¹	\$660,093,110.37
3	Retirements	\$111,379,391.10
4	Total Plant In-Service	\$ 548,713,719.27
5	Less: Accumulated Provision for Depreciation	
6	Depreciation Expense	\$ 55,299,434.00
7	Retirements	\$111,379,391.10
8	Total Accumulated Provision for Depreciation	\$ 56,079,957.10
9	Deferred Plant Depreciation	\$55,299,434.00
10	Deferred PISCC	\$71,707,463.81
11	Deferred Property Taxes	\$29,574,071.58
12	Deferred Taxes on PISCC	\$ (15,058,567.40)
13	Deferred Taxes on Property Taxes	\$ (6,210,555.03)
14	Deferred Taxes on Liberalized Depreciation	(\$60,344,626.34)
15	Net Rate Base	\$ 679,760,896.99
16	Approved Pre-tax Rate of Return	9.52%
17	Annualized Return on Rate Base	\$ 64,713,237.39
	Operating Expenses	
18	Annualized Depreciation	\$ 21,619,320.54
19	Annualized Deferred Depreciation Amortization	\$ 1,922,861.00
20	Annualized PISCC Amortization	\$ 2,825,274.07
21	Annualized Property Tax Expense	\$ 12,669,976.42
22	Annualized Deferred Property Tax Amortization	\$ 1,165,218.42
	Revenue Requirement	\$ 104,915,887.84
23	(Over)/Under Recovered Balance Excess Deferred Tax Passback	\$ -
24	Total Amount to be Collected	\$ 104,915,887.84

Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc.
Capital Expenditure Program (CEP) Rider
Case No. 17-2202-GA-ALT
Rate Development

**Company
Proposed
Single Rate**

Line No.	Investment Date	12/31/2017
Description		
1	Revenue Requirement from Case No. 17-2202-GA-ALT	\$ 104,915,888
	<u>Allocated Plant in Service per Case No. 08-0072-GA-AIR⁽¹⁾</u>	
2	SGS Class	\$ 1,406,934.00
3	GS Class	\$ 274,607.00
4	LGS Class	\$ 59,651.00
5	Total	\$ 1,741,192.00
	<u>Percent by Class</u>	
6	SGS Class	80.80%
7	GS Class	15.77%
8	LGS Class	3.43%
9	Total	100.00%
	<u>Revenue Requirement Allocated to Each Class</u>	
10	SGS Class	\$ 84,775,102.20
11	GS Class	\$ 16,546,502.17
12	LGS Class	\$ 3,594,283.47
13	Total	\$ 104,915,887.84
	<u>Number of Projected Bills TME July 31</u>	
14	SGS Class	17,152,600
15	GS Class	401,072
16	LGS Class	4,503
17	Total	
18	Projected Impact Per Month - SGS	\$ 4.94
19	Projected Impact Per Month - GS	\$ 41.26
20	Projected Impact Per Month - LGS	\$ 798.20

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

10/22/2018 4:17:11 PM

in

Case No(s). 17-2202-GA-ALT

Summary: Testimony /Prepared Supplemental Testimony of Diana M. Beil electronically filed by Cheryl A MacDonald on behalf of Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc.