

FILED

JUL 1 5 2004

STATE OF INDIANA BEFORE THE INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY **COMMISSION**INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY **COMMISSION**

VERIFIED JOINT PETITION OF INDIANA GAS)	
COMPANY, INC., SOUTHERN INDIANA GAS)	
AND ELECTRIC COMPANY AND THE BOARD)	
OF DIRECTORS FOR UTILITIES OF THE)	
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES OF THE)	
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS, AS SUCCESSOR)	CAUSE NO. 42590
TRUSTEE OF A PUBLIC CHARITABLE TRUST,)	
d/b/a CITIZENS GAS & COKE UTILITY,)	
PURSUANT TO IND. CODE § 8-1-2.5 et. seq.)	
FOR APPROVAL OF AN ALTERNATIVE)	
REGULATORY PLAN WHICH WOULD)	
ESTABLISH A UNIVERSAL SERVICE PROGRAM)	

SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS

Of

GREGORY A. SAWYERS And L. DOUGLAS PETITT

On Behalf Of Petitioners

Citizens Gas.& Coke Utility, Indiana Gas Company, Inc., and Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Company

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GAS-S	Supplemental Testimony of Gregory A. Sawyers
GAS-S1	Stipulation and Settlement Agreement Among All Parties
GAS-S2	Calculation of Percentages and Tier Structure for Citizens
LDP-S	Supplemental Testimony of L. Douglas Petitt
LDP-S1	Calculation of Percentages and Tier Structure for Vectren
	Certificate of Service

STATE OF INDIANA BEFORE THE INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

VERIFIED JOINT PETITION OF INDIANA GAS)	
COMPANY, INC., SOUTHERN INDIANA GAS)	
AND ELECTRIC COMPANY AND THE BOARD)	
OF DIRECTORS FOR UTILITIES OF THE)	
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES OF THE)	
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS, AS SUCCESSOR)	CAUSE NO. 42590
TRUSTEE OF A PUBLIC CHARITABLE TRUST,)	0110021101.2090
d/b/a CITIZENS GAS & COKE UTILITY,)	
PURSUANT TO IND. CODE § 8-1-2.5 et. seq.)	
FOR APPROVAL OF AN ALTERNATIVE)	
REGULATORY PLAN WHICH WOULD)	
ESTABLISH A UNIVERSAL SERVICE PROGRAM)	

SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS

Of

GREGORY A. SAWYERS

On Behalf of Petitioners

Citizens Gas & Coke Utility, Indiana Gas Company, Inc., and Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Company

Petitioners' Exhibit GAS-S

- 1 Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
- 2 A. My name is Gregory A. Sawyers. My business address is 2020 N. Meridian
- 3 Street, Indianapolis, Indiana 46202.
- 4 **Q.** BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?
- 5 A. I am employed by Citizens Gas & Coke Utility ("Citizens"). My title is Director
- 6 of Customer Services.
- 7 Q. ARE YOU THE SAME GREGORY A. SAWYERS THAT PREVIOUSLY
- 8 TESTIFIED IN THIS PROCEEDING?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY IN
- 11 THIS PROCEEDING?
- 12 A. The purpose of my Supplemental Testimony is to provide support for the
- Stipulation and Settlement Agreement Among All Parties (the "Settlement
- Agreement") that was filed with the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
- (Commission'') on July 15,2004 and to recommend that the Commission approve
- the Settlement Agreement as consistent with the public interest. A copy of the
- 17 Settlement Agreement is attached hereto as Exhibit GAS-S1. My Supplemental
- Testimony focuses on those areas of the Settlement Agreement that differ from
- the prior Stipulations filed in this Cause.
- 20 **Q.** PLEASE DESCRIBE THE HISTORY LEADING UP TO THE
- 21 EXECUTION OF THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.
- 22 A. On March 4,2004, Citizens, along with Indiana Gas Company, Inc. d/b/a Vectren

Energy Delivery of Indiana, Inc. ("IGC") and Southern Indiana Gas & Electric 1 Company, d/b/a Vectren Energy Delivery of Indiana, Inc. ("SIGECO") 2 (collectively, the "Joint Petitioners"), filed a Verified Joint Petition seeking 3 approval of an alternative regulatory plan ("ARP") for each Joint Petitioner. 4 Under the terms of the proposed ARPs, each Joint Petitioner would implement a 5 pilot "Universal Service Program" (the "Program"). 6 7 Prior to filing the Verified Joint Petition, Joint Petitioners met with the Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor ("OUCC") on a number of 8 occasions to discuss how best to create and implement the proposed pilot 9 Program. On March 5,2004, IGC and SIGECO (collectively "Vectren") entered 10 into a Stipulation and Settlement Agreement with the OUCC, and filed it with the 11 Commission. Citizens also entered into a Stipulation and Settlement Agreement 12 with the OUCC on the same day and filed it with the Commission. 13 On March 12,2004, Citizens Action Coalition of Indiana, Inc. ("CAC") 14 filed a Petition to Intervene and to be made a party in the proceeding, which was 15 granted by Docket Entry dated March 18,2004. An ad hoc group of Joint 16 Petitioners' customers known as the Manufacturing and Health Providing 17 Customers ("MHPC") filed a Petition to Intervene on April 5,2004, which the 18 Commission also granted by Docket Entry on April 7,2004. 19 On April 30,2004, Joint Petitioners and the OUCC entered into and filed 20 with the Commission Amended Stipulation and Settlement Agreements (the 21 22 "Amended Stipulations"). The primary difference between the original

Stipulations and the Amended Stipulations was that under the Amended Stipulations, customers eligible to participate in the Program would receive one of three tiered percentage reductions in their bills based on certain criteria. Under the original Stipulations, customers were to receive a flat percentage reduction. After the original Stipulations were filed, Joint Petitioners and the OUCC were advised by the Family and Social Service Administration ("FSSA"), which oversees the administration of the State's Energy Assistance Program ("EAP"), that a tiered percentage reduction in eligible low-income customers' bills would be needed to fulfill the guidelines of the federal Low-Income Heating Energy Assistance Program ("LIHEAP") Block Grant. On April 30,2004, Joint Petitioners and the OUCC filed their Direct Testimony and Exhibits in support of the Amended Stipulations. On May 28, 2004, CAC filed the Direct Testimony and Exhibits of Roger D. Colton. Also on May 28,2004, MHPC filed the Direct Testimony of Nicholas Phillips, Jr. Joint Petitioners filed Rebuttal Testimony on June 7,2004. Also on June 7,2004, CAC's witness Colton and MHPC's witness Phillips filed crossanswering testimony. Prior to the June 17,2004 evidentiary hearing in this Cause, the parties continued their ongoing settlement discussions. As a result of those discussions, the Parties reached a settlement of all issues in this proceeding prior to the commencement of the evidentiary hearing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	Q.	WHAT IS THE PROPOSED TERM OF THE PILOT PROGRAM UNDER
2		THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT?
3	A.	Under the Settlement Agreement, the Program will begin on January 1,2005 and
4		end on December 31,2006. I believe the 2-year term of the Pilot Program will
5		give Joint Petitioners, the Commission, the OUCC and the other interested
6		parties' useful information about the actual impact of the Program in assisting
7		low-income customers. At the expiration of the Pilot Period, Joint Petitioners
8		may seek to implement the same or a different universal service program by filing
9		a new petition with the Commission.
10	Q.	WHY WAS THE START DATE OF THE PROGRAM MOVED BACK TO
11		JANUARY 1, 2005?
12	A.	The FSSA and Community Action Agencies ("CAAs") responsible for enrolling
13		customers in the Program expressed a concern that an earlier start date would not
14		allow adequate time for the CAAs to enroll customers. The revised start date is
15		an attempt to accommodate those concerns.
16	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE THE ASSISTANCE THAT CITIZENS WILL
17		PROVIDE TO LOW-INCOME CUSTOMERS UNDER THE
18		SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.
19	A.	The net bill for Citizens' low-income customers eligible to participate in the
20		Program's first year will be either 9%, 18% or 24% lower than their residential
21		gas service bill. The State's Benefit Matrix used in the EAP application process
22		will determine which percentage reduction an eligible customer will receive.

1		The pre-determined tier structures were established jointly by the FSSA
2		and Joint Petitioners using prior heating season data regarding low-income
3		customers. Spreadsheets showing how the percentages and tier structures for
4		Citizens were established are attached hereto as Exhibit GAS-S2.
5		Prior to the start of the second year of the Program, the FSSA and Joint
6		Petitioners will use the Program's first year heating season data to determine if
7		any adjustments are needed to the percentages or the tier structure.
8	Q.	IS USE OF THE STATE'S BENEFIT MATRIX CONSISTENT WITH MR.
9		COLTON'S TESTIMONY THAT DISCOUNTS SHOULD NOT BE TIED
10		SOLELY TO POVERTY LEVEL?
11	A.	Yes. Poverty level is but one of number of factors considered under the Benefit
12		Matrix. Other factors, to name a few, include: (i) size of household; (ii) whether
13		there are at risk persons in the home (i.e., elderly or disabled individuals and
14		children under the age of 5); and (iii) the heating source used in the home (<u>i.e.</u> ,
15		gas, electric, oil, etc.).
16	Q.	HOW WILL THE EAP GRANTS OF ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS BE
17		TREATED UNDER THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT?
18	A.	CAC's witness Roger D. Colton testified that he was concerned that some
19		customers might not receive their full LIHEAP benefit under the terms of the
20		Program as set forth in the original and Amended Stipulations, which called for
21		EAP grants to be accumulated in the Joint Petitioners' respective Universal
22		Service Funds and applied to the customer discounts. Mr. Colton also indicated

that he was concerned that under the prior Stipulations, LIHEAP benefits received in a specified year would be used to pay energy costs in a later year. Mr. Colton 2 3 pointed out that the utilities may be required by federal law to ensure that all customers receive their entire LIHEAP benefit each year. 4 5 Under the Settlement Agreement, instead of FSSA directing each 6 participating customer's EAP grant into the respective utility's "Universal Service Fund," the EAP grant would continue to be applied directly to customer bills. 7 8 Citizens then would discount the bills of its participating customers by 9%, 18% 9 or 24%. WHAT WOULD THE ULTIMATE IMPACT BE ON CUSTOMER BILLS. 10 Q. CONSIDERING BOTH THE CUSTOMER'S EAP GRANT AND THE 11 12 DISCOUNT PROVIDED UNDER THE PROGRAM? 13 A. The EAP grant itself generally accounts for an approximately 20% decrease in the customer's annual gas bill, but fluctuates based on customer need (the bills of 14 15 customers with less need based on the State's Benefit Matrix are reduced by something less than 20%, while the bills of those with a greater need are reduced 16 by a little more than 20%). During the first year of the Program, the net bills of 17 Citizens' participating customers on an annual basis ultimately would be 18 approximately 27%, 40% or 50% lower than their normal residential gas service 19 20 bill.

1

1	Q.	ARE THE TOTAL BILL REDUCTIONS TO BE REALIZED BY
2		PARTICIPATING CUSTOMERS CONSISTENT WITH MR. COLTON'S
3		PROPOSED PERCENTAGE DISCOUNT TIERS?
4	A.	Yes. In his direct testimony, Mr. Colton proposed that the net bill for Citizens'
5		participating low-income customers be 25%, 40% or 50% lower than their normal
6		residential gas service bill (instead of 35%, 40% and 45% as called for under
7		Citizens' Amended Stipulation).
8	Q.	DOES THE MODIFICATION TO THE PROGRAM TO ALLOW THE
9		EAP GRANT TO CONTINUE TO BE APPLIED DIRECTLY TO
10		CUSTOMER BILLS ALSO ALLEVIATE MR. COLTON'S CONCERN
11		THAT LIHEAP BENEFITS RECEIVED IN THE SPECIFIED PROGRAM
12		YEAR WOULD BE USED TO PAY ENERGY COSTS IN A LATER
13		YEAR?
14	A.	Yes, it does. LIHEAP funds would be separated from funds provided by the
15		utilities and their customers and, thereby, ensure that customers get the full
16		amount of their LIHEAP benefit each year.
17	Q.	WILL FUNDS FOR THE WEATHERIZATION OF LOW-INCOME
18		HOMES BE PROVIDED UNDER THE PROGRAM?
19	A.	Yes. The parties believe weatherization of homes is an integral part of the
20		success of any universal service program. Under the Settlement Agreement,
21		Citizens will increase its annual weatherization program funding to a minimum of
22		\$500,000 annually during the two years of the Program. These funds will be used

so that customers with the highest usage will be referred to a State or a Citizenssponsored weatherization program.

Q. HOW WILL CITIZENS FUND THE PROGRAM?

A.

Both weatherization funds and the difference between the amount that otherwise would be payable for residential gas heating service under Citizens' approved and authorized rates and the lower bill to be paid by eligible Program participants will be recovered first from contributions Citizens will make. Citizens will contribute \$950,000 annually from its various support programs currently in place for low-income customers (Warm Heart Warm Home Foundation ("WHWH), Weatherization Funds, GCA50 Funds). Citizens also will contribute \$912,000 annually in new funds from its unregulated businesses.

Citizens will recover any remaining deficiency through new per unit charges to residential, commercial, and industrial customers (including low-income customers participating in the Program), which will be incorporated into Rider C (the "Customer Benefit Distribution/Universal Service Program Funding Tracker"). The charges to be added to Rider C will be imposed commensurate with Program implementation. Initially, the per dekatherm charge assessed Large Volume (Gas Rate No. D5) and Interruptible (Gas Rate No. D8) customers will be one-half cent (\$0.005). The per dekatherm charge for Citizens' remaining customers will be fully offset by the per unit credit that is equivalent to the amount of Citizens' recovery through the Customer Benefit Distribution ("CBD) of FAS106 and FAS71 costs (i.e., \$1,288,000) annually during the term of the

1		Pilot Program. Rider C will be trued up annually, but in no event will the per
2		dekatherm charges exceed one cent (\$0.01) for Gas Rate Nos. D5 and D8.
3		In the event a funding deficit exists at the end of the pilot Program,
4		Citizens may create a regulatory asset and continue to utilize the above described
5		funding mechanism, or for good cause shown, propose an alternate method to
6		recover such deficit, without carrying charges. In the event surplus funding exists
7	•	at the end of the pilot Program, then such surplus shall be included in Citizens'
8		subsequent CBD or used to fund a subsequent program as authorized by the
9		Commission.
10	Q.	DOES THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT SET FORTH THE
11		PROCEDURES FOR "TRUING UP" THE PER DEKATHERM CHARGES
12		DESCRIBED ABOVE?
13	A.	Yes. By June 30,2005, Joint Petitioners will review their respective pilot
14		Programs to determine whether the initial charges need to be revised. Joint
15		Petitioners will file any revisions to their respective Riders pursuant to the
16		Commission's thirty (30) day filing procedures and serve the other parties with
17		copies of the filing. Upon Commission approval, the revised Riders would take
18		effect on January 1,2006.
19	Q.	DOES THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT INCLUDE A MECHANISM
20		BY WHICH THE COMMISSION AND THE PARTIES CAN ASSESS
21		WHETHER THE PROGRAM EFFECTIVELY ADDRESSES THE NEEDS
22		OF LOW-INCOME CUSTOMERS?

1	A.	Yes. On or before June 30 th of each year of the pilot Program, Joint Petitioners
2		will submit reports to the Commission and provide copies to the OUCC, MHPC
3		and CAC, showing all necessary and pertinent information from the previous
4		heating season, which will permit the Commission and the parties to evaluate the
5		performance and effectiveness of the Program in achieving its goals and purposes.
6		In the Settlement Agreement, Joint Petitioners agreed to employ Mr. Colton to
7		assist in determining the pertinent data to be collected.
8	Q.	WHAT DOES THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT PROVIDE WITH
9		RESPECT TO ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS?
10	A.	The Joint Petitioners will absorb all costs associated with administering the Pilot
11		Program. However, Joint Petitioners will continue to track (i.e. monitor and
12		report) the administrative costs of the Program for review and consideration in
13		future filings relating to the continuation of the Program after December 31,2006.
14		Any recovery by Joint Petitioners of administrative costs will be limited to 5% of
15		the cost of their respective Programs. The cost of the Program is defined in the
16		Settlement Agreement to include the cost of weatherization and discounting
17		customer bills.
18	Q.	UNDER THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT, WILL JOINT
19		PETITIONERS SHARE IN ANY NET SAVINGS RESULTING FROM
20		REDUCED WRITE-OFFS OF BAD DEBT?
21	A.	Yes. The Settlement Agreement provides that Joint Petitioners will retain 50% of
22		any net savings resulting from reduced write-offs of bad debt. The remaining

1		50% of such net savings will be re-deposited into their respective Universal
2		Service Funds.
3	Q.	DO YOU BELIEVE THE PROGRAM AS SET FORTH IN THE
4		SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT WILL BENEFIT JOINT PETITIONERS'
5		CUSTOMERS?
6	A.	Yes. The parties to the Settlement Agreement expect the Program to eventually
7		result in a significant increase in the number of weatherized homes in Indiana and
8		reduce the number of service terminations attributable to low-income customers'
9		inability to pay for gas service. Joint Petitioners believe the remainder of their
10		customers will benefit from the anticipated decrease in number of defaults, and
11		untimely payments, which otherwise ultimately would have resulted in higher
12		costs being imposed on them.
13	Q.	DO YOU BELIEVE THE PROGRAM IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST
14		AND THAT THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT SETTING FORTH THE
15		TERMS OF THE ARP SHOULD BE APPROVED BY THE
16		COMMISSION?
17	A.	Yes. As I have previously testified, recent increases in natural gas prices and
18		colder than normal weather have been particularly difficult on Joint Petitioners'
19		low-income customers. The Program will provide significant benefits to Joint
20		Petitioners' low-income customers by reducing their costs and making winter
21	ı	heating bills more manageable.

Supplemental Testimony and Exhibits Of Gregory A. Sawyers IURC Cause No. 42590 Page No. 12

- 1 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY IN
- 2 THIS PROCEEDING?
- 3 A. Yes, at this time.

STATE OF INDIANA BEFORE THE INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

VERIFIED JOINT PETITION OF INDIANA GAS)	
COMPANY, INC., SOUTHERN INDIANA GAS)	
AND ELECTRIC COMPANY AND THE BOARD)	
OF DIRECTORS FOR UTILITIES OF THE)	
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES OF THE)	
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS, AS SUCCESSOR)	CAUSE NO. 42590
TRUSTEE OF A PUBLIC CHARITABLE TRUST,)	
d/b/a CITIZENS GAS & COKE UTILITY,)	
PURSUANT TO IND. CODE § 8-1-2.5 et. seq.)	
FOR APPROVAL OF AN ALTERNATIVE)	
REGULATORY PLAN WHICH WOULD)	
ESTABLISH A PILOT UNIVERSAL SERVICE)	
PROGRAM)	

STIPULATION AND SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AMONG ALL PARTIES

Joint Petitioners, the Board of Directors for Utilities of the Department of Public Utilities of the City of Indianapolis, as Successor Trustee of a Public Charitable Trust, d/b/a Citizens Gas & Coke Utility ("Citizens"), Indiana Gas Company, Inc. d/b/a Vectren Energy Delivery of Indiana, Inc. ("IGC") and Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Company, d/b/a Vectren Energy Delivery of Indiana, Inc. ("SIGECO), the Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor ("OUCC"), and Intervenors, Manufacturing and Health Providing Customers ("MHPC") and Citizens Action Coalition of Indiana, Inc. ("CAC") (collectively, the "Parties") having been duly advised by their respective staff, experts and counsel, stipulate and agree that the following terms represent an alternative regulatory plan, and a fair, reasonable and just resolution of the issues involved in this proceeding, subject to their incorporation into a non-appealable final order of the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission (the "Commission") without modification or further condition that may be unacceptable to any Party hereto ("Final Order"). If the Commission does

not approve this Stipulation and Settlement Agreement Among All Parties (the "Agreement") in its entirety, the Agreement shall be deemed null and void and withdrawn, unless otherwise agreed to in writing by the Parties.

I. BACKGROUND

On March 4,2004, Joint Petitioners filed their Verified Joint Petition seeking approval of an alternative regulatory plan for each Joint Petitioner, which would allow each Petitioner to implement a pilot "Universal Service Program." On March 5,2004, IGC and SIGECO (collectively "Vectren") entered into a Stipulation and Settlement Agreement with the OUCC, and filed it with the Commission. Also, on March 5,2004, Citizens entered into a Stipulation and Settlement Agreement with the OUCC and filed it with the Commission.

On March 12,2004, CAC filed a Petition to Intervene and to be made a party in the proceeding. The Commission granted CAC's Petition to Intervene by Docket Entry dated March 18,2004. MHPC filed a Petition to Intervene on April 5,2004, which the Commission granted by Docket Entry dated April 7,2004.

On April 30,2004, Joint Petitioners and the OUCC entered into and filed with the Commission their Amended Stipulation and Settlement Agreements. Also on April 30,2004, Joint Petitioners filed the Direct Testimony and Exhibits of Gregory A. Sawyers, Citizens' Director of Customer Services, and L. Douglas Petitt, Vectren's Vice President of Government Affairs, in support of the Amended Stipulations. The OUCC filed the Direct Testimony and Exhibits of Mathew G. Parsell in support of the Amended Stipulations on April 30,2004.

On May 28,2004, CAC filed the Direct Testimony and Exhibits of Roger D. Colton and MHPC filed the Direct Testimony of Nicholas Phillips, Jr. Joint Petitioners filed the Rebuttal

Testimony of Gregory A. Sawyers and L. Douglas **Petitt** on June 7,2004. Also on June 7,2004, **CAC's** witness **Colton** and **MHPC's** witness Phillips filed cross-answering testimony.

Prior to the June 17,2004 evidentiary hearing, the Parties engaged in settlement discussions. As a result of those discussions, the Parties reached a settlement of all issues in this proceeding, under the terms of which they agree the Commission should enter an Order approving an alternative regulatory plan for each Joint Petitioner as outlined below.

II. TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF AGREEMENT

Joint Petitioners will implement a **two-year** pilot Universal Service Program (the "Program") to begin on January 1,2005 and end on December 31,2006. Under the Program, Joint Petitioners' low-income customers eligible for the Program will pay a reduced rate for natural gas service, as set forth in paragraph A below. The weatherization costs and the amounts resulting from the bill reduction provided will be accumulated for recovery in a "Universal Service Fund" described in paragraph C below.

The Joint Petitioners may seek to implement the same or a different universal service type program ("Subsequent Program") to begin any time after the Program terminates on December 31,2006. Any Subsequent Program shall be initiated by a new petition filed with the Commission, and the petitioner shall bear the burden of proof that such Subsequent Program should be approved by the Commission.

A. Discounts to Eligible Customers

1. Citizens.

The net bill for Citizens' low-income customers eligible to participate in the first year of the Program will be either **9%**, 18% or 24% lower **than** the residential gas service bill. The State's Benefit Matrix, used in the Energy Assistance Program ("EAP") application process, will

determine which percentage reduction an eligible customer will receive. The pre-determined tier structure was established jointly by the Family and Social Services Administration ("FSSA") and Citizens, using prior heating season low-income data. Prior to the start of the second year of the Program, FSSA and Citizens will use the Program's first year heating season data to determine if any adjustments are needed to the percentages or the tier structure.

During the first year of the Program, the combined benefit of the discount tiers and the standard EAP benefits will represent an approximate 27%, 40% or 50% reduction in the overall heating costs to Citizens' eligible low-income customers.

2. Vectren.

The net bill for Vectren's low-income customers eligible to participate in the **first** year of the Program will be either **15%**, **26%**, or 32% lower than the residential gas service bill. The State's EAP Benefit Matrix, used in the EAP application process, will determine which percentage reduction an eligible customer will receive. The pre-determined tier structure was established jointly by the FSSA and Vectren, using prior heating season low-income data. Prior to the start of the second year of the Program, FSSA and Vectren will use the Program's first year heating season data to determine if any adjustments are needed to the percentages or the tier structure.

During the first year of the Program, the combined benefit of the discount tiers and the standard EAP benefits will represent approximate 35%, 50% or 60% reduction in the overall heating costs to Vectren's eligible low-income customers.

B. Program Eligibility Requirements and Enrollment

1. *Eligibility*. In order for low-income customers to be eligible for assistance from the Program, the following criteria must be satisfied:

- a. The customer's gross household income must be at or below levels established for assistance from the State's EAP;
- b. The customer must enroll in and qualify for assistance from the State's EAP;
- The customer's account must be designated as residential gas service;
- d. The customer must reside at the service address; and
- e. There must be only one (1) account in the customer's name.
- Enrollment. Eligible low-income customers will be enrolled in the
 Program by existing Community Action Agencies through the EAP application enrollment process.

C. Program Funding

1. Citizens

Both weatherization funds and the difference between the bill that otherwise would be payable by Program eligible customers for residential gas service under Citizens' approved and authorized rates after reduction for the standard EAP benefits and the net bill to be paid by Program participants will be recovered first from contributions Citizens will make from existing support programs and new contributions described in paragraph J, below. Citizens' funding of the Program will work as follows:

- (a) all weatherization costs and customer bill reductions will be placed into Citizens' Universal Service Fund as a balance to be recouped;
- (b) the funds from Citizens' existing support programs and new contributions will be applied against the balance; and

- (c) in accordance with the Stipulation and Settlement Agreement approved in Cause No. 41605 on December 11, 2002, Citizens will pass through to its customers via the Customer Benefit Distribution ("CBD) a per unit credit that is at least equal to the amount of Citizens' recovery through the CBD of FAS106 and FAS71 costs ("Matching Funds"). The Matching Funds amount to \$1,288,000 annually during the term of the pilot Program.
- (d) Citizens will expand and incorporate into Rider C (the "Customer Benefit Distribution/Universal Service Program Funding Tracker") per unit charges to recover any unfunded balance in the Universal Service Fund for residential, commercial, and industrial customers (including low-income customers participating in the Program). The charges to be added to Rider *C* will be imposed commensurate with Program implementation. Initially, the per dekatherm charge assessed Large Volume (Gas Rate No. D5) and Interruptible (Gas Rate No. D8) customers will be one-half cent (\$0.005) and the per dekatherm charge for Citizens' remaining customers will be equivalent to the per dekatherm Matching Funds described in subparagraph (c) above. Rider C will be trued up once, to be effective January 1,2006, the start of the last year of the pilot Program, as described in paragraph D below, but in no event will the per dekatherm charges during the last year of the Program exceed one cent (\$0.01) for Gas Rate Nos. D5 and D8 and the per dekatherm Matching Funds for Citizens' remaining customers.

In the event additional funds are required, Citizens will utilize a portion of its weatherization funds to the extent permitted under paragraph F to make up the difference. In the event a funding deficit exists at the end of the pilot Program, Citizens may create a regulatory asset and continue to utilize the funding mechanism described in this paragraph C, or for good cause shown, propose an alternate method to recover such deficit, without **carrying** charges. In the event surplus funding exists at the end of the pilot Program, then such surplus shall be

included in Citizens' subsequent CBD, unless Citizens obtains Commission approval to utilize such surplus to assist in funding a Subsequent Program.

2. Vectren

The difference between the bill that otherwise would be payable by Program eligible customers for residential gas service under Vectren's approved and authorized rates after reduction for the standard EAP benefits and the net bill to be paid by Program participants will be recovered first from contributions Vectren will make from existing support programs described in paragraph J, below. Vectren's funding of the Program will work as follows:

- (a) all customer bill reductions will be placed into IGC and SIGECO's respective Universal Service Funds as a balance to be recouped;
- (b) the funds from Vectren's existing support programs will be applied against the balance; and
- (c) any unfunded balance in the "Universal Service Fund" will be recovered from per unit charges ("the USF Rider"), incorporated as part of residential, commercial, and industrial distribution charges (including low-income customers participating in the Program). The Rider will be implemented commensurate with Program implementation based on estimates of eligible customer needs. Initially, the per dekatherm charge assessed will be five cents (\$0.05) for residential customers (Rate 10: Indiana Gas; Rate 110: SIGECO), three cents (\$0.03) for commercial customers (Rates 20 and 40: Indiana Gas; Rate 120 Sales: SIGECO) and one-half cent (\$0.005) for transportation customers (Rates 45, 60 and 70: Indiana Gas; Rates 120, transportation, 160 and 170: SIGECO). The USF Rider will be trued up once, to be effective January 1,2006, the start of the last year of the pilot Program, as described in paragraph D below, but in no event will the per dekatherm charges during the last year of the Program exceed

seven cents (\$0.07) for residential customers, five cents (\$0.05) for commercial customers and one cent (\$0.01) for industrial customers. Any increase or decrease to the USF Rider will be applied proportionately across customer classes. In the event that there is any remaining deficiency at the end of the Program term, IGC and SIGECO may create a regulatory asset and recover (without carrying charges) such deficiency from their respective customers in the form of per dekatherm charges that do not exceed the foregoing maximum limits. In the event surplus funding exists at the end of the pilot Program, then such surplus shall be returned to customers, unless IGC and SIGECO obtain Commission approval to utilize such surplus to assist in funding a Subsequent Program.

D. Annual True-Up

On June 30,2005, Joint Petitioners will review the pilot Program to determine whether the initial charges set forth in subparagraphs C.1.d and C.2.c. above need to be revised. Joint Petitioners shall file any revisions to their respective Riders pursuant to the Commission's thirty (30) day filing procedures. Joint Petitioners shall serve the other Parties with copies of any filing for a revision to their respective Riders. Upon Commission approval under the 30-day filing process, or otherwise, the revised Riders would take effect on January 1,2006.

E. Notice

Each Joint Petitioner will provide notice describing the benefits and purposes of the Program and the respective funding mechanisms twice each year, which notice will be included in residential, commercial and industrial customers' bills. The notice will reflect that the Program is a result of **an** agreement, which has been approved by the Commission as a pilot Program.

F. Weatherization of Low Income Homes

1. Citizens

Citizens will increase its annual weatherization program funding to a minimum of \$500,000 annually during the two years of the Program. These funds will be used so that customers enrolled in the Program with the highest annual usage can be referred to the State weatherization program, or Citizens' weatherization program. These funds will be reflected in the "Universal Service Fund" and dealt with for recovery in the same manner described in paragraph C.1.

2. Vectren

IGC will designate \$200,000 annually for use in weatherization projects. These funds will be used so that customers enrolled in the Program with the highest annual usage can be referred to the State weatherization program, or one of IGC's weatherization programs. These funds will be reflected in the "Universal Service Fund" and dealt with for recovery in the same manner described in paragraph C.2.

SIGECO has a pending "DSM proposal, which is not included in this part of the pilot Program; thus SIGECO will not provide incremental weatherization.

G. Service Terminations

Joint Petitioners will continue to protect all eligible Program customers from service termination from December 1 through March 15, as provided in **Ind.** Code § 8-1-2-121.

H. Pilot Program: Number of Participants

Under the pilot Program, Joint Petitioners are projecting a combined annual enrollment of 21,000 low-income customers for IGC and SIGECO and 16,000 for Citizens.

These estimates are based on prior enrollment in the State's EAP program. The only limit placed

on enrollment in the Program is the requirement that an eligible customer must enroll in and receive funding **from** the State's EAP program. Once funding for the State's program is exhausted or the end of the EAP enrollment period is reached (<u>i.e.</u>, May 31st), enrollment in the Program will end.

I. Reporting Requirements

On or before June 30th of each year of the pilot Program, Joint Petitioners will submit reports to the Commission and provide copies to the OUCC, MHPC and CAC, showing all necessary and pertinent information from the previous heating season, which will permit the Commission and the Parties to evaluate the performance and effectiveness of the Program in achieving its goals and purposes. All parties may participate in determining what data should be collected during the Program and Joint Petitioners will engage Roger D. Colton to assist in that process. The combined maximum amount to be paid by Joint Petitioners to Mr. Colton shall be \$10,000, which amount shall not be included as an administrative expense under paragraph K.

J. Contributions by Joint Petitioners to Support the Program

Joint Petitioners will contribute to the Program to offset a portion of their respective Universal Service Fund balance as follows:

1. Citizens

Citizens will contribute to its Universal Service Fund \$950,000 per year from its various support programs currently in place for low-income customers (Warm Heart Warm Home Foundation ("WHWH), Weatherization Funds, GCA 50 Funds) and \$912,000 in new unregulated funds.

2. Vectren

All of IGC's and SIGECO's "Share the Warmth" annual funding totaling \$500,000,

plus funds collected **from** donors and matched by IGC and SIGECO in accordance with the terms of the "Share the Warmth" Program, will be contributed annually to **Vectren's** Universal Service Fund. In addition, Vectren will contribute to the Universal Service Fund \$25,000 annually from its "below-the-line" income.

K. Administrative Costs

Joint Petitioners will absorb all costs associated with administering the pilot Program. However, Joint Petitioners will continue to track (i.e., monitor and report) the administrative costs of the pilot Program for review and consideration in **future** filings relating to any Subsequent Program. Any recovery by Joint Petitioners of administrative costs will be limited to 5% of the cost of their respective Programs. The cost of the Program is defined as weatherization costs and customer bill reductions. Any administrative costs recovered shall not include any amounts previously recovered under the procedures set forth below.

Joint Petitioners will retain 50% of any net savings resulting from reduced write-offs of bad debt. The remaining 50% of such net savings will be re-deposited into the respective Joint Petitioners' Universal Service Funds.

For the purposes of estimating the Program write-off savings, Joint Petitioners will report, as their benchmarks for the most recent fiscal year, EAP customer write-offs and write-offs as a percent of total revenue. At the end of each subsequent fiscal year, each of the Joint Petitioners will provide its EAP customer write-offs and total revenue data. This will enable an estimate of write-off savings attributable to the Program by multiplying the benchmark write-off percent by the current year's total revenues and comparing the product to the actual write-offs experienced. Other reasonable evidence and estimates also may be considered. The Parties will work together to reach agreement on the EAP write-off savings attributable to the Program. In

the event an agreement can not be reached, the Parties would take the issue to the Commission for resolution.

The estimated write-off savings, if any, will be adjusted by the amount of associated Program administrative costs. Program administrative costs will be subject to audit and may include costs associated with necessary system changes; increased customer inquiry volumes; training costs for both Joint Petitioners' and Community Action Agencies' support staff; and communication and education expenses to support the changes to the State's EAP Program. In addition, Program administrative costs will include an amortization of the start up costs associated with the Program, including legal fees and consulting fees. These administrative costs will be amortized over the life of the Program and are also subject to audit. The EAP write-off savings net of the Program administrative costs will be multiplied by 50% to determine the amount to be re-deposited to the Joint Petitioners' Universal Service Funds.

If, at the conclusion of the Program, a share of the net savings remains due to customers, Joint Petitioners agree that such savings shall be provided to customers through the GCA or other appropriate means for transportation customers.

L. Effect on Future Rate Cases

In the event that during the term of the pilot Program any of the Joint Petitioners has pending before the Commission a base rate case, such case shall not override the terms of this Agreement. In any such base rate case, the respective Joint Petitioner's test year and proforma expenses for the twelve months following the end of the test year shall neither include administrative costs related to the Program, nor any reduction to bad debt expense resulting from the Program. Rather, the administrative cost of the Program, and its likely favorable reduction of

bad debt expense, will be considered through the net savings calculation provided for in paragraph K above.

M. Presentation of this Agreement to the Commission

The Parties shall support this Agreement before the Commission and request that the Commission accept and approve this Agreement without any changes or conditions(s) unacceptable to any party. The Parties agree that this Agreement shall be submitted to the Commission for approval on the condition that if the Commission fails to approve this Agreement in its entirety without any changes or condition(s) unacceptable to any of the Parties, this Agreement and the supporting evidence shall be withdrawn, and the Commission shall conduct a second prehearing conference, set another procedural schedule and continue with the litigation of this Cause at the point where it was suspended or dismiss the proceeding, at the option of the Parties.

N. Public Announcements and Marketing Materials

The OUCC will have an opportunity to review and concur with Joint Petitioners' public announcements and marketing materials. Following Commission approval of the Program, Joint Petitioners will include information about **the Program** on their **websites** and include a brief description of the OUCC, its role, contact information as well as provide a link to the OUCC's own web page. All marketing materials used by Joint Petitioners regarding the Program should provide brief information about the OUCC, its role, as well as the relevant contact information.

O. Effect and Use of Agreement

1. There are no other agreements in existence between the Parties relating to the matters covered by this Agreement which in any way affect this Agreement.

- 2. This Agreement shall not constitute nor be cited as precedent by any person or deemed an admission by any Party in any other proceeding except as necessary to enforce its terms before the Commission, or any tribunal of competent jurisdiction on these particular issues. This Agreement is solely the result of compromise in the settlement process and, except as provided herein, is without prejudice to and shall not constitute a waiver of any position that any of the Parties may take with respect to any or all of the issues resolved herein in any future regulatory or other proceeding.
- 3. The undersigned have represented and agreed that they are fully authorized to execute this Agreement on behalf of their designated clients, and their successors and assigns, who will be bound thereby.
- 4. In the event that the Commission enters a Final Order changing or modifying the terms of this Agreement, the Parties shall indicate on the record within twenty (20) days after entry of the Order whether such changes or modifications are acceptable.
- 5. The provisions of this Agreement shall be enforceable by any Party, in any tribunal of competent jurisdiction, including but not limited to the Commission.
- 6. The communications and discussions during the negotiations and conferences attended by the Parties, their attorneys, and their consultants have been conducted on the explicit understanding that said communications and discussions are or relate to offers of settlement and therefore are privileged. All prior drafts of this Agreement also are or relate to offers of settlement and are therefore privileged.
- 7. The Parties shall not appeal or seek rehearing, reconsideration or a stay of any Final Order entered by the Commission approving the Agreement in its entirety without changes or **condition(s)** unacceptable to any Party (or related orders to the extent such orders are specifically implementing the provisions of this Agreement) and shall support this Agreement in the event of any appeal or a request for rehearing, reconsideration or a stay by any person not a party hereto.

Accepted and Agreed on this 15 day of July, 2004.

INDIANA GAS COMPANY, INC., and SOUTHERN INDIANA GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY, INC., d/b/a VECTREN ENERGY DELIVERY OF INDIANA, INC.

By: Robert E. Heidorn (Atty. #14264-49)

Vice President and General Counsel

Vectren Corporation

20 N. Fourth St., P.O. Box 209 Evansville, IN 47702-0209

THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR UTILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES OF THE CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS, AS SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE OF A PUBLIC CHARITABLE TRUST D/B/A CITIZENS GAS & COKE UTILITY

By: Michael B. Cracraff (Atty. #3416-49) Steven W. Krohne (Atty. #20969-49) Hackman Hulett & Cracraft, LLP One Indiana Square, Suite 2400 Indianapolis, IN 46204-2030 INDIANA OFFICE OF UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR

By. Anne E. Becker Randall C. Helmen

Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor Indiana Government Center North 100 N. Senate Avenue, Room N501 Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2208

CITIZENS ACTION COALITION OF INDIANA, INC.

By: Jerome E. Polk (Atty. # 23712-49) Michael A. Mullett (Atty. #10124-03) Mullett, Polk & Associates, LLC 309 W. Washington Street, Ste. 233 Indianapolis, IN 46204

MANUFACTURING AND HEALTH

PROYIDING CUSTOMERS

By: John F. Wickes, Jr. (Atty. #1230-49) Timothy L. Steyvart (Atty. #2189-49)

Lewis & Kappes, P.C.

1700 One American Square

Box 82053

Indianapolis, IN 46282-0003

G:\Citizens Gas & Coke Utility\CG-Vectren Energy Delivery\Pleadings\USF Stip-Clean.doc

Template for USP Tier Calculations

Average Residential Gas Bill

\$937.50

Original Tier Concept Percentage (including EAP funds)

Tier #1	27%
Tier #2	40%
Tier #3	50%

Average EAP Benefit and households per Tier

	Benefit	Households
Tier #1	171	3,682
Tier #2	210	9,555
Tier #3	245	2,765

Calculation of Benefits

	Original USP	Less: EAP Benefit		Average USP	Average Total
	Tiers	%	Adjusted USP %	Benefit	Benefit
Tier #1	27%	18%	9%	\$84.38	\$255.38
Tier #2	40%	22%	18%	\$168.75	\$378.75
Tier #3	50%	26%	24%	\$225.00	\$470.00

Total Discount Program Costs

Tier #1	9%	\$310,687
Tier #2	18%	\$1,612,406
Tier #3	24%	\$622,125
		\$2,545,218

CAGI Matrix Data (CGCU)

		(,	Weighted					
		Total CAGI	Customers		Total Dollars	Total		
		Customers by	by Matrix	Matrix Dollar	Distributed by	Customers Per	Total Dollars	Average
Matrix Points	S	Matrix Point	Point	Value	Matrix Points	Tier	Per Tier	Dollars Per Tier
	1	0	0	\$15	\$0			
	2	0	0	\$30	\$0			
	3	0	0	\$45	\$0			
	4	0	0	\$60	\$0			
	5	0	0	\$75	\$0			
	6	4	5	\$90	\$450			
	7	2	2	\$105	\$210			
	8	2	2	\$120	\$240			
	9	39	45	\$135	\$6,075			
	10	342	396	\$150	\$59,400			
	11	1,098	1,272	\$1 65	\$209,880			
	12	1,692	1,960	\$180	\$352,800	3,682	\$629,055	\$171
	13	2,553	2,957	\$195	\$576,615			
a deducer of the second	14	3,150	3,648	\$210	\$766,080			
	15	2,547	2,950	\$225	\$663,750	9,555	\$2,006,445	\$210
	16	1,629	1,887	\$240	\$452,880			
	17	732	848	\$255	\$21 6,240			
	18	26	30	\$270	\$8,100			
to Atlanta	19	0	0	\$285	\$0			
	20_	0	0	\$300_	\$0	2,765	\$677,220	and the second of the contract
	=	13,816	16,002	=	\$3,312,720	16,002	\$3,312,720	_

Template for Low Income Program Calculations

Please input the following information:

(enter all numbers as positive numbers)

Annual Typical Residiential Customer Bill	\$930
Program Discount %	17.00%
Est. # of Res. Customers on the Low Income program	16,000
Est. # of Total Customers	266,000
Typical Res Customer annual usage	1,032
LIHEAP funds per customer	\$0
Weatherization Funding	\$600,000
Contributions (as shown below)	\$3,130,000

\$1,068,000 Surcharge of the FAS match

\$912,000 Community Investment Increase for **USP/Weatherization** (Formerly CBD Increase)

\$250,000 WHWM

\$150,000 Weatherization

\$550,000 Portion of GCA 50 Funds

\$200,000 Estimated sharing of Low-income write-off savings

Template For Customer Bill

		Debit	Credit
Annual Typical Customer Bill before discount		\$930.00	
Program Discount %	17.00%		\$158.10
Average LIHEAP Benefit			\$210.00
Annual Customer Responsibility (Bill)		\$561.90	

Universal	Service Fund	
	Debit	Credit
Program Discount LIHEAP funds	\$2,529,600	\$0
Weatherization funding	\$600,000	
Utility Contributions		\$3,130,000
Fund Balance	(\$400)	

STATE OF INDIANA BEFORE THE INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

VERIFIED JOINT PETITION OF INDIANA GAS)	
COMPANY, INC., SOUTHERN INDIANA GAS)	
AND ELECTRIC COMPANY AND THE BOARD)	
OF DIRECTORS FOR UTILITIES OF THE)	
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES OF THE)	
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS, AS SUCCESSOR)	CAUSE NO. 42590
TRUSTEE OF A PUBLIC CHARITABLE TRUST,)	
d/b/a CITIZENS GAS & COKE UTILITY,)	
PURSUANT TO IND. CODE § 8-1-2.5 et. seq.)	
FOR APPROVAL OF AN ALTERNATIVE)	
REGULATORY PLAN WHICH WOULD)	
ESTABLISH A UNIVERSAL SERVICE PROGRAM)	

SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY AND EXHIBIT

Of

L. DOUGLAS PETITT

On Behalf of Petitioners

Citizens Gas & Coke Utility, Indiana Gas Company, Inc., and Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Company

Petitioners' Exhibit LDP-S

Supplemental Testimony of L. Douglas Petitt Vectren Energy Delivery of Indiana, Inc. IURC Cause No. 42590 Page No. 1

2	A.	My name is L. Douglas Petitt. My business address is 20 N.W. Fourth Street,
3		Evansville, Indiana 47702.
4	Q.	ARE YOU THE SAME L. DOUGLAS PETITT THAT PREVIOUSLY
5		TESTIFIED IN THIS PROCEEDING?
6	A.	Yes.
7	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY IN
8		THIS PROCEEDING?
9	A.	The purpose of my Supplemental Testimony is to provide support for the
10		Stipulation and Settlement Agreement Among All Parties (the "Settlement
11		Agreement") that was filed with the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
12		(Commission") on July 15,2004 and to recommend that the Commission approve
13		the Settlement Agreement as consistent with the public interest. My
14		Supplemental Testimony focuses on those areas of the Settlement Agreement
15		relating to Vectren that differ from the prior Stipulations filed in this Cause.
16	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE THE ASSISTANCE THAT VECTREN WILL
17		PROVIDE TO LOW-INCOME CUSTOMERS UNDER THE
18		SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT?
19	A.	The net bill for Vectren's low-income customers eligible to participate in the
20		Program will be either 15%, 26%, or 32% lower than their residential gas service
21		bill. The State's Benefit Matrix used in the EAP application process will
22		determine which percentage reduction an eligible customer will receive.

PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

1

Q.

1		Spreadsheets showing how the percentages and tier structures for Vectren were
2		established are attached hereto as Exhibits LDP-S1.
3	Q.	WHAT WILL THE ULTIMATE IMPACT BE ON CUSTOMER BILLS,
4		CONSIDERING BOTH THE CUSTOMER'S EAP GRANT AND THE
5		DISCOUNT PROVIDED UNDER THE PROGRAM?
6	A.	The EAP grant itself generally accounts for an approximately 20% decrease in the
7		customer's annual gas bill, but fluctuates based on customer need (the bills of
8		customers with less need based on the State's Benefit Matrix are reduced by
9		something less than 20%, while the bills of those with a greater need are reduced
10		by a little more than 20%). The net bills of SIGECO and IGC's participating
11		customers when combined with LIHEAP funds ultimately would be
12		approximately 35%, 50% or 60% lower than their normal residential gas service
13		bill on an annual basis.
14	Q.	ARE THE TOTAL BILL REDUCTIONS TO BE REALIZED BY
15		PARTICIPATING CUSTOMERS CONSISTENT WITH MR. COLTON'S
16		PROPOSED PERCENTAGE DISCOUNT TIERS?
17	A.	Yes. In his direct testimony, Mr. Colton proposed that the net bill for SIGECO
18		and IGC's participating low-income customers be 35%, 50% or 60% lower than
19		their normal residential gas service bill (instead of 45%, 50% and 55% as called
20		for under the Vectren Amended Stipulation).
21	Q.	WILL FUNDS FOR THE WEATHERIZATION OF LOW-INCOME
22		HOMES BE PROVIDED UNDER THE PROGRAM?

1 Yes. IGC will designate a minimum of \$200,000 annually for use in A. 2 weatherization projects. Given **SIGECO's** pending DSM proposal in Cause No. 3 42418, SIGECO will not provide incremental weatherization through the 4 Program. 5 Q. HOW WILL VECTREN FUND THE PROGRAM? 6 A. The difference between the bill that otherwise would be payable by Program 7 eligible customers for residential gas service under Vectren's approved and 8 authorized rates and the net bill to be paid by Program participants will be 9 recovered first from contributions Vectren will make from existing support 10 programs. Vectren will contribute \$500,000 annually from its "Share the 11 Warmth" program. Vectren also will contribute \$25,000 annually in new funds 12 from its "below-the-line" revenues. The remaining balance will be recovered via 13 a charge to all customers. This per unit charge ("the USF Rider"), incorporated as 14 part of IGC's and SIGECO's residential, commercial, and industrial distribution 15 charges (including low-income customers participating in the Program) will be 16 implemented commensurate with Program implementation, based on estimates of 17 low-income customer needs. 18 Initially, the per dekatherm charge assessed will be five cents (\$0.05) for 19 residential customers, three cents (\$0.03) for commercial customers and one-half 20 cent (\$0.005) for industrial customers. The USF Rider will be trued up annually, 21 but in no event will the per dekatherm charges exceed seven cents (\$0.07) for

residential customers, five cents (\$0.05) for commercial customers and one cent

22

(\$0.01) for industrial customers. Any increase or decrease to the USF Rider will 2 be applied proportionately across customer classes. 3 In the event there is any remaining deficiency, IGC and SIGECO may 4 create a regulatory asset and recover such deficiency from customers in the form 5 of per dekatherm charges that do not exceed the foregoing minimum and 6 maximum limits. In the event surplus funding exists at the end of the pilot 7 Program, then such surplus shall be returned to customers or used to fund a 8 subsequent program, as authorized by the Commission. 9 DO YOU BELIEVE THE PROGRAM IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST Q. 10 AND THAT THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT SETTING FORTH THE TERMS OF THE ARP SHOULD BE APPROVED BY THE 11 12 **COMMISSION?** 13 A. Yes. I believe the proposed alternative regulatory plan is in the public interest in 14 that it will provide significant benefits to the Joint Petitioners' low-income gas 15 customers by reducing their total gas bills and making winter heating bills more 16 manageable. The Program also is expected to benefit the remainder of Joint 17 Petitioners' customers by decreasing the number of defaults and untimely 18 payments which ultimately result in higher uncollectible costs being imposed on 19 the remainder of Joint Petitioners' customers. 20 The Program also will result in rates and charges applicable to Joint 21 Petitioners' low-income customers, which will promote efficiency. Because 22 participating customers will continue to be responsible for the payment of a

1

Supplemental Testimony of L. Douglas Petitt Vectren Energy Delivery of Indiana, Inc. IURC Cause No. 42590 Page No. 5

- 1 manageable portion of their gas bills, customers will have an incentive to monitor
- and reduce usage, if possible, and to better manage their monthly gas bills.
- 3 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY IN
- 4 THIS PROCEEDING?
- 5 A. Yes, at this time.

Template for USF Tier Calculations

Average Vectren Residential Gas Bill

\$ 876

Original Tier Concept Percentage (including EAP funds)

Tier #1	35%	(1-12 points)
Tier #2	50%	(13-15 points)
Tier #3	60%	(16-20 points)

Average EAP Benefit and households per Tier

	Benefit	Households	
Tier #1	\$	171 5,080 \$ 86 8 ,7	41
Tier #2	\$	209 13,741 \$ 2,871,8	115
Tier #3	\$	246 3,034 <u>\$ 746,6</u>	41
		\$ 4,486,8	196

Calculation of Benefits

	Less: EAP Benefit			Average USF		/	Average Total
	Original USF Tiers	%	Adjusted USF %		Benefit		Benefit
Tier#1	35%	20%	15%	\$	131	\$	302
Tier #2	50%	24%	26%	\$	228	\$	437
Tier#3	60%	28%	32%	\$	280	\$	526

Total Discount Program Costs

Tier #1	15% \$ 667,559
Tier #2	26% \$ 3,129,591
Tier #3	32% <u>\$ 850,464</u>
	\$ 4,647,614

Vectren Matrix Data

=				:	<u> </u>			,	=
	21,690	21,855	SONTANIANI	97.9655166527555666666666666666	\$	4,482,361	21,855	\$ 4,482,361	
20	0	0	\$	300	S	-	3,034	\$ 747,332	\$ 246
19	0	0	\$	285	\$	-			
18	169	170	\$	270	\$	45,977			
17	932		\$	255	\$	239,468			
16	1,910	1,925	\$	240	\$	461,887	en meister – er einen ermitigen im der eine einen eine der eine erhalbtig eingen, einer eine eine eine eine ein	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	an term a termina atem atem per
15	3,556	3,583		225	\$	XXX-987,000 XXX 950 XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX X	13,741	\$ 2,867,267	\$ 209
14	5,315	5,355		210	\$	1,124,641			•
13	4,766	4,802	SOURCES INCO	195	\$	936,440		A CONTRACTOR OF THE STATE OF TH	NEW TOTAL STREET OF THE CONTRACT OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER
12	2,762	2,783	O CAMPACA (CAMPACA	180	\$	MAGCYGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGGG	5,080	\$ 867,761	\$ 171
11	1,643	1,655	~	165	\$	273,157			
10	464		\$	150	\$	70,129			
9	173	174	\$	135	\$	23,533			
8	0	0	\$	120	\$	-			
7	0	0	\$	105	\$	<u>-</u>			
6	0	0	\$	90	\$	_			
5	0	0	\$	75	\$				/
4	0	0	\$	60	\$				
3	0	ŏ	\$	45	\$	•			
2	0	0	\$	30	\$	-			
1	0	0	\$	15	\$				20
Matrix Points	Matrix Point	Matrix Point	IVIC	Value		Matrix Points	Tier	Per Tier	Dollars Per Tier
	Customers by	Customers by	Ma	atrix Dollar		Distributed by	Customers Per	Total Dollars	Average
VOOLI OII MIGHTIX BU	Total Vectren	Weighted				Total Dollars	Total		
V CCU CI I IVIALI IX DA	la								

165

CERTIFIC I OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 15th day of July, 2004 a copy of the foregoing "Supplemental

Testimony and Exhibits of Gregory A. Sawyers and L. Douglas Petitt' has been served by U. S.

Mail or personal delivery to:

Anne E. Becker Randall C. Helmen, Office of Utility Consumer Counselor Government Center North 100 N. State Street, Room N501 Indianapolis, IN 46204

John F. Wickes, Jr. Timothy L. Stewart Lewis & Kappes, P.C. 1700 One American Square Indianapolis, IN 46282

Jerome E. Polk Michael A. Mullett Mullett, Polk & Associates, LLC 309 W. Washington Street, Suite 233 Indianapolis, IN 46204

Dave Menzer Citizens Action Coalition of Indiana 5420 N. College Suite 101 Indianapolis, IN 46220

An Attorney for Petitioners

Michael B. Cracraft (#3416-49) Steven W. Krohne (#20969-49) Hackman Hulett & Cracraft, LLP One Indiana Square, Suite 2400 Indianapolis, IN 46204-2030 Telephone: (317) 636-5401 Facsimile: (317) 686-3288

Attorneys for Petitioners