

ORIGINAL

Commissioner	Yes	No	Not Participating
Zay	√		
Deig	√		
Swinger		√	
Veleta	√		
Ziegner	√		

STATE OF INDIANA

INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

**VERIFIED PETITION OF INDIANA GAS)
 COMPANY, INC. D/B/A CENTERPOINT)
 ENERGY INDIANA NORTH FOR (1))
 APPROVAL OF AN ADJUSTMENT TO ITS)
 GAS SERVICE RATES THROUGH ITS CSIA)
 RATE SCHEDULE TO EFFECTUATE THE)
 TIMELY RECOVERY OF 80% OF ELIGIBLE)
 AND APPROVED CAPITAL EXPENDITURES)
 AND TDSIC AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM)
 COSTS, INCLUDING FINANCING COSTS)
 INCURRED DURING CONSTRUCTION, (2))
 AUTHORITY TO DEFER 20% OF ELIGIBLE)
 AND APPROVED CAPITAL EXPENDITURES)
 AND TDSIC AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM)
 COSTS FOR RECOVERY IN PETITIONER’S)
 NEXT GENERAL RATE CASE, (3))
 APPROVAL OF PETITIONER’S UPDATED)
 2022-2026 COMPLIANCE PROJECTS AND 5-)
 YEAR TDSIC PLAN, INCLUDING ACTUAL)
 CAPITAL EXPENDITURES AND TDSIC AND)
 COMPLIANCE PROGRAM COSTS, AND (4))
 APPROVAL OF A TARGETED ECONOMIC)
 DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, ALL PURSUANT)
 TO IND. CODE CHS. 8-1-8.4 AND 8-1-39 AND)
 THE COMMISSION’S ORDER IN CAUSE NO.)
 45611)**

CAUSE NO. 45611 TDSIC 7

APPROVED: APR 08 2026

ORDER ON RECONSIDERATION

Presiding Officers:

David E. Ziegner, Commissioner

Kristin E. Kresge, Administrative Law Judge

On January 28, 2026, the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission (“Commission”) issued a Final Order in this Cause (“January Order”). Among the many issues addressed, the Commission found that Indiana Gas Company, Inc. d/b/a Centerpoint Energy Indiana North (“CEI North”) should be authorized to recover soil remediation costs and, the Commission approved CEI North’s updated project estimates.

On February 17, 2026, the Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor (“OUCC”) filed a Motion for Rehearing and Reconsideration (“Motion”). In the Motion, the OUCC requests the Commission reconsider its decision approving the recovery of soil remediation costs and

reconsider the threshold for a best estimate of the costs for the Transmission, Distribution, and Storage System Improvement Charge (“TDSIC”) Plan and the specific justification required to increase an approved best estimate.

CEI North filed a response on February 27, 2026 to the OUCC’s Motion, opposing its requested relief. CEI North asserts that the OUCC does not identify a change in law or fact that compels a different outcome. CEI North states that the Motion merely reargues positions previously asserted by the OUCC.

After reviewing the filings on the OUCC’s request and the evidence that was presented in this Cause, the Commission denies the Motion. In CEI North’s case-in-chief, it requested recovery of soil remediation incurred from relocation of its facilities in the public right of way and approval of increased costs estimates for TDSIC Project Nos. 102514692, 113115593, 102514976, and 102514974. The OUCC requested that recovery of soil remediation be denied and that CEI North be ordered to seek recovery from the party responsible for the contamination. Further, the OUCC requested that the updated costs for the specified TDSIC Projects be denied. CEI North stated that Indiana precedent allows for a utility occupying a public right of way to obtain recovery for costs associated with relocation of its facilities when it complies with public health and safety regulations; CEI North asserts that the soil remediation was part of these costs and that precedent does not require it to seek recovery from a third party. CEI North also asserted that the increased costs for the specified TDSIC Projects are reasonable and warranted.

In the January Order, the Commission acknowledged that a utility occupying a public right of way assumes the obligation to relocate its facilities when necessary for public improvements to the streets or road. For TDSIC Project No. 11317590, CEI North was required to relocate its facilities, and discovered soil contamination, which needed to be remediated prior to completion of the relocation. The Commission found that CEI North could recover the soil remediation costs through the TDSIC proceedings, but must also make a good faith attempt in seeking reimbursement from other parties and report on such efforts in its next TDSIC filing. In its Motion, the OUCC asks the Commission to reconsider its decision based merely on a restatement of its case, which was presented at the hearing and considered in the Commission’s January Order.

In the January Order, the Commission found that CEI North’s updated estimates for TDSIC Project Nos. 102514692, 113115593, 102514976, and 102514974 are reasonable. The Commission based this decision on CEI North’s explanation that the updated estimates are based on detailed designs, which were not available when the preliminary designs were originally approved. In its Motion, the OUCC again asks the Commission to reconsider its decision based on a restatement of its case, which was presented at the hearing, and considered in the Commission’s January Order.

Accordingly, the OUCC’s Motion is denied. The January Order is upheld without modification.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED BY THE INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION that:

1. The OUCC's Motion is denied and the January Order is upheld without modification.

2. This Order shall be effective on or after the date of its approval.

ZAY, DEIG, VELETA, AND ZIEGNER CONCUR; SWINGER DISSENTS WITH SEPARATE OPINION:

APPROVED: APR 08 2026

I hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of the Order as approved.

**Dana Kosco
Secretary of the Commission**

STATE OF INDIANA

INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

VERIFIED PETITION OF INDIANA GAS)
 COMPANY, INC. D/B/A CENTERPOINT)
 ENERGY INDIANA NORTH FOR (1))
 APPROVAL OF AN ADJUSTMENT TO ITS)
 GAS SERVICE RATES THROUGH ITS CSIA)
 RATE SCHEDULE TO EFFECTUATE THE)
 TIMELY RECOVERY OF 80% OF ELIGIBLE)
 AND APPROVED CAPITAL EXPENDITURES)
 AND TDSIC AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM)
 COSTS, INCLUDING FINANCING COSTS)
 INCURRED DURING CONSTRUCTION, (2))
 AUTHORITY TO DEFER 20% OF ELIGIBLE) CAUSE NO. 45611 TDSIC 7
 AND APPROVED CAPITAL EXPENDITURES)
 AND TDSIC AND COMPLIANCE PROGRAM)
 COSTS FOR RECOVERY IN PETITIONER'S) APPROVED: APR 08 2026
 NEXT GENERAL RATE CASE, (3))
 APPROVAL OF PETITIONER'S UPDATED)
 2022-2026 COMPLIANCE PROJECTS AND 5-)
 YEAR TDSIC PLAN, INCLUDING ACTUAL)
 CAPITAL EXPENDITURES AND TDSIC AND)
 COMPLIANCE PROGRAM COSTS, AND (4))
 APPROVAL OF A TARGETED ECONOMIC)
 DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, ALL PURSUANT)
 TO IND. CODE CHS. 8-1-8.4 AND 8-1-39 AND)
 THE COMMISSION'S ORDER IN CAUSE NO.)
 45611)

DISSENTING OPINION OF COMMISSIONER ANTHONY F. SWINGER

I respectfully dissent from the majority and would grant the OUCC's requested relief.

Although the underlying order received unanimous Commission approval, my dissent is based upon my reconsideration of the case's evidence as it pertains to CEI North's efforts to recover soil remediation costs. It is further based upon my review and consideration of the OUCC's February 17, 2026 motion and CEI North's February 27, 2026 response.