

Exhibit No:
Issue: Worn or Deteriorated Condition of Replaced Facilities
Witness: Timothy H. Goodson
Type of Exhibit: Direct Testimony
Sponsoring Party: Spire Missouri Inc.
Case Nos.: GO-2018-0309, GO-2018-0310

Date Prepared: May 13, 2020

SPIRE MISSOURI INC.

File Nos. GO-2018-0309; 2018-0310

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

TIMOTHY H. GOODSON

May 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----------|
| I. | PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY & ISRS BACKGROUND | 2 |
| II. | CAST IRON AND BARE STEEL GENERALLY | 3 |
| III. | FIELD CONDITIONS OF SPIRE’S CAST IRON AND BARE STEEL PIPE..... | 5 |
| IV. | CONDITION OF PHYSICAL EVIDENCE IN THIS CASE | 10 |
| V. | MO EAST SAMPLES THG-D1 | |
| VI. | MO WEST SAMPLES THG-D2 | |

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF TIM GOODSON

1 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.**

2 A. My name is Timothy Goodson, and my business address is 700 Market Street, St. Louis,
3 Missouri, 63101.

4 **Q. WHAT IS YOUR PRESENT POSITION?**

5 A. I am presently employed by Spire Missouri (“Spire Missouri” or “Company”) as Vice
6 President – Field Operations.

7 **Q. PLEASE STATE HOW LONG YOU HAVE HELD YOUR POSITION AND**
8 **BRIEFLY DESCRIBE YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES.**

9 A. I was appointed to my current position in 2015. In this capacity, I oversee all field
10 operations of the company, including physical pipeline installation and replacement.

11 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EXPERIENCE WITH SPIRE MISSOURI PRIOR TO**
12 **ASSUMING YOUR CURRENT POSITION.**

13 A. From 2013-2014, I was the Company’s Managing Director of Environmental, Health,
14 Safety and Emergency Management.

15 **Q. WHAT OTHER EXPERIENCE DO YOU HAVE WITH REGARDS TO PIPELINE**
16 **OPERATIONS AND SAFETY?**

17 A. Prior to joining the Company, I held various positions at AGL Resources, Inc. (now part
18 of Southern Company). Most recently, I served as the Vice President of Operations of
19 Nicor Gas, a natural gas LDC serving approximately two million customers in the Chicago
20 area, with over 32,000 miles of pipeline. I previously held the positions of Vice President
21 of Midstream Operations and Projects, and Managing Director of Environmental, Health,

1 Safety and Emergency Management, both for AGL Resources, Inc. In total, I have 42
2 years of experience in the energy, chemicals, and environmental engineering industries.

3 **Q. WHAT IS YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND?**

4 A. I received a Bachelor of Science degree from Clemson University in 1976, and a Masters
5 of Science degree from University of South Carolina in 1981.

6 **Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE THIS COMMISSION?**

7 A. No.

8 **I. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY**

9 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS**
10 **PROCEEDING?**

11 A. The purpose of my direct testimony is to provide general background on the condition of
12 cast iron and bare steel pipes in the Spire distribution system, based upon my personal
13 observation of these facilities in the field, my experience with Spire's engineering
14 department findings, my observation of specimens removed for testing and inspection, and
15 the experience of the field teams I oversee.

16 **ISRS STATUTE**

17 **Q. WILL YOU PLEASE DESCRIBE, IN GENERAL TERMS, THE ISRS**
18 **MECHANISM.**

19 A. In 2003, the Missouri legislature enacted the ISRS statute to allow for certain infrastructure
20 replacement costs to be recovered by utilities more quickly and outside of a general rate
21 case. Among other things, the ISRS legislation addressed a safety issue previously
22 identified by the Commission related to aged cast iron and bare steel pipes. It also reduces

1 the regulatory cost of frequent rate cases and ensures that utility companies are able to
2 attract investor capital to fund these multimillion-dollar efforts.

3 **Q. HOW HAS THE ISRS STATUTE IMPACTED SPIRE AND MISSOURI?**

4 A. At Spire, safety is our top priority. The ISRS mechanism has played a valuable role in
5 supporting our efforts to accelerate the replacement of aged cast iron and bare steel
6 infrastructure. In the past 10 years, pipeline replacement in Missouri has accelerated
7 considerably. During this period, Spire has replaced more than 2,400 miles of aging
8 pipeline across the state through the ISRS, and has reduced the anticipated time to complete
9 its cast iron replacement program from 80-plus years to approximately 25 years. Without
10 mechanisms such as the ISRS, which ease the financial burden of deploying large amounts
11 of capital between rate cases, this magnitude of investment would not be possible. At the
12 same time, the systematic replacement approach has substantially reduced the long-term
13 cost of eliminating these problematic facilities while lower commodity costs and lower
14 interest rates have further helped to reduce the burden on our customers.

15 **Q. EXPLAIN HOW THE COMPANY'S ISRS FILINGS AND THE REPLACEMENT**
16 **OF CAST IRON AND BARE STEEL INFRASTRUCTURE ARE RELATED?**

17 A. Spire's systematic cast iron and bare steel main replacement programs are major
18 components of its ISRS filings. These programs are designed to comply with the
19 Commission's rules mandating the replacement of aged cast iron and bare steel
20 infrastructure, found at 20 CSR 4240-40.030(15). These safety rules were promulgated by
21 the Commission in 1989 after several gas explosions involving bare steel service and yard
22 lines; however, as acknowledged by the Commission in Case Nos. GO-2019-0115 and GO-
23 2019-0116, Spire has been actively engaged in replacing cast iron and steel pipes since the

1 1950's. Spire employs a systematic, neighborhood approach to conducting these programs
2 which has resulted in improved system integrity and reliability, efficient operations and
3 customer savings related to not only the replacements themselves, but also by reducing the
4 ongoing maintenance needs and operating costs of the Company's distribution system.

6 **CAST IRON AND BARE STEEL**

7 **Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE PROBLEMATIC CHARACTERISTICS OF CAST IRON**
8 **AND BARE STEEL PIPE.**

9 A. There is no question that there are clear safety-related concerns regarding aging cast iron
10 and bare steel infrastructure. The cast iron and bare steel pipes being retired or replaced as
11 part of Spire's ISRS projects are 50-100+ years old. While there has certainly been an
12 increased focus in more recent years on eliminating cast iron and bare steel pipe given
13 some of the very serious incidents that have occurred involving such facilities, it is
14 important to recognize that the problematic characteristics of these facilities has been
15 known for some time. Cast iron facilities experience graphitic corrosion that weakens their
16 integrity without impacting wall thickness, whereas uncoated "bare" steel facilities
17 experience oxidative and reductive corrosion, even where cathodic protection has been
18 later applied.

19 **Q. ARE THE CONCERNS REGARDING CAST IRON AND BARE STEEL PIPE**
20 **SHARED BY FEDERAL REGULATORY ORGANIZATIONS AND THE**
21 **NATURAL GAS INDUSTRY?**

22 A. Yes. It is widely accepted by leading industry experts and organizations, as well as the
23 scientific community, that there are significant risks associated with cast iron and bare steel

1 infrastructure and that there is an acute need to implement aggressive programs to remove
2 this pipe from service. Following tragic incidents in 2010 and 2011, the Secretary of the
3 Department of Transportation, Ray LaHood, sent letters to Governors of each state inviting
4 them and others to a DOT Pipeline Safety Forum at DOT's Washington headquarters to
5 address these issues. Spire representatives attended and participated in this forum.
6 Similarly, a letter was sent to utility commissioners urging them to review their State's
7 replacement plans (for cast iron and bare steel specifically) and "consider what would be
8 necessary to accelerate these plans." (March 31, 2011 letter from Cynthia Quarterman,
9 DOT Administrator). The stated goal of the DOT's April 2011 Pipeline Safety Forum was
10 "accelerating the rehabilitation, repair, and replacement of critical pipeline infrastructure
11 with known integrity risks."

12 **Q. PLEASE CONTINUE.**

13 A. Also in 2011, the federal Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration
14 ("PHMSA") issued a White Paper reviewing the programs available in various states "to
15 support efforts to accelerate the repair, rehabilitation and replacement of high-risk
16 infrastructure in pipeline systems..." PHMSA looked favorably upon Missouri's ISRS
17 Statute as one of the programs available to protect the public "by ensuring the prompt
18 rehabilitation, repair, or replacement of high-risk gas distribution infrastructure." PHMSA
19 further urged State commissions to "accelerate the repair, rehabilitation, and replacement
20 of high-risk pipeline infrastructure." (PHMSA White Paper, p. 17). In March 2012,
21 PHMSA issued an Advisory Bulletin to gas operators and state pipeline safety
22 representatives on Cast Iron Pipe. The Bulletin urged pipeline operators, like Spire, to
23 conduct a comprehensive review of their cast iron distribution pipelines and replacement

1 programs, and accelerate the pipeline repair, rehabilitation, and replacement of high-risk
2 pipelines. The Bulletin also requested that agencies consider enhancements to cast iron
3 replacement plans and programs.

4 **Q. HOW HAVE STATES AND THE NATURAL GAS INDUSTRY RESPONDED TO**
5 **THESE CALLS TO ACTION?**

6 A. According to the American Gas Association, over 40 state jurisdictions have mechanisms
7 in place similar to Missouri’s ISRS and the heightened awareness of this issue combined
8 with effective cost recovery mechanisms has facilitated billions of dollars in utility
9 investment in replacing aging, high risk cast iron and bare steel pipe. In fact, gas utilities
10 throughout the country have been replacing their cast iron and bare steel facilities on the
11 same accelerated pace as Spire – another factor that broadly confirms the deteriorated
12 condition of such facilities.

13 **FIELD CONDITIONS OF SPIRE’S CAST IRON AND BARE STEEL**

14 **Q. WHAT OPPORTUNITIES HAVE YOU HAD TO VIEW SPIRE’S CAST IRON**
15 **AND BARE STEEL FACILITIES IN PERSON.**

16 A. During my tenure as Vice President of Field Operations for Spire, I have visited hundreds
17 of job sites at which crews under my direction are engaged in strategic replacement of
18 Spire’s cast iron and bare steel facilities. I have observed the condition of these facilities
19 on site, as they are exposed for abandonment. I have also observed numerous specimens
20 of these facilities that have been removed from service for testing and analysis.

21 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE TYPICAL CONDITION OF CAST IRON MAINS IN**
22 **SPIRE’S DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM.**

1 A. Spire’s distribution systems still utilizes cast iron mains, in both the Missouri East and
2 Missouri West operating units. These facilities are typically between 60 and 110 years old,
3 with most exceeding their estimated service life. The facilities tend to be located in older,
4 and often more economically disadvantaged areas of our service territories. Because they
5 utilize lower operating pressures, these pipes are larger in diameter than equivalent modern
6 facilities. They have been subjected to many years of freeze-thaw cycles and associated
7 frost heave. When originally installed, the joints were sealed using a rope-like material
8 called oakum that has now worn out and in many cases is no longer functional. Essentially
9 all of Spire’s cast iron facilities exhibit evidence of graphitic corrosion, in which the
10 structural iron leaches out of the pipe. This leaves the cast iron pipes very brittle and likely
11 to crack easily. Their large diameter, rigidity, and exposure to Midwestern freeze-thaw
12 cycles all exacerbate this problem, and lead to much higher leak rates than any other
13 material in the Spire distribution system.

14 **Q. DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION REGARDING WHETHER CAST IRON PIPES IN**
15 **SPIRE’S SYSTEM ARE “WORN OUT OR IN A DETERIORATED CONDITION”?**

16 A. Yes. Many of the cast iron mains in Spire’s distribution systems are completely worn out
17 and at the end of their useful life. All cast iron mains in Spire’s distribution system are in
18 a deteriorated condition.

19 **Q. WHY DO YOU THINK ALL OF SPIRE’S CAST IRON FACILITIES ARE IN A**
20 **DETERIORATED CONDITION?**

21 A. It’s a combination of age and the action of the elements on these materials over time. I
22 haven’t seen a single piece of cast iron pipe in Spire’s system that did not exhibit signs of
23 graphitic corrosion and oakum deterioration. These materials were simply never intended

1 to last, or remain in service, indefinitely. Our field crews have experienced numerous
2 situations in which the dirt surrounding the cast iron main was the only thing holding the
3 pipe together. As soon as the crew excavated dirt below the pipe, it just collapsed into
4 pieces.

5 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE TYPICAL CONDITION OF UNCOATED “BARE”**
6 **STEEL FACILITIES IN SPIRE’S DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM?**

7 A. The bare steel pipes in Spire’s system were typically installed between 1920 and 1960.
8 They were not installed with any protective coating, meaning that the steel pipes’ walls are
9 in direct and constant contact with the soil matrix. Steel corrodes when it comes in contact
10 with water, through both oxidative and reductive processes. In the Midwest, soils are
11 typically wet at least part of the year, and exhibit wet-dry cycling. This results in significant
12 corrosion of the uncoated “bare” steel pipe in the Spire distribution system. These
13 corrosive processes weaken the structure of the steel pipe, and compromise its integrity
14 over time. In the worst cases, holes develop in the pipe wall itself where the material has
15 completely corroded through. Over time, this makes uncoated “bare” steel pipe susceptible
16 to leaks and other failures. We experience that frequently in the field. Uncoated “bare”
17 steel pipes have a much higher leak rate than modern pipe materials, and exhibit the second
18 highest leak rate (behind only cast iron) of all materials in the Spire distribution system.

19 **Q. DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION REGARDING WHETHER BARE STEEL PIPES IN**
20 **SPIRE’S SYSTEM ARE “WORN OUT OR IN A DETERIORATED CONDITION”?**

21 A. Yes. Some portion of the uncoated “bare” steel in Spire’s system is worn out. Those would
22 be sections with active leaks resulting from wall failure due to corrosion. But certainly all
23 uncoated “bare” steel pipe in Spire’s distribution system is in a deteriorated condition.

1 These pipes began to deteriorate almost immediately after they were installed, because they
2 were not installed with any type of protective coating that would have slowed or prevented
3 interaction with soil moisture. The oxidative and reductive processes would have begun
4 to work on these facilities immediately, and progressed unabated for many years.

5 **Q. BUT DOESN'T THE ADDITION OF CATHODIC PROTECTION SOLVE THE**
6 **SAFETY PROBLEMS WITH THESE PIPES?**

7 A. No. In general, cathodic protection can help protect steel pipe from the effects of corrosion.
8 It does so by inducing an electrical current in the pipe itself, which directs the corrosion
9 away from the pipe and towards some consumable non-pipe metal receptor. These can be
10 anodes, rectifiers, ground beds, or other electrically driven systems. However, the
11 effectiveness of such systems in preventing corrosion deterioration largely depends on
12 whether they were installed in conjunction with a proper pipe coating. The coating is the
13 first line of defense against corrosion. The cathodic protection works primarily by
14 directing current to sites where there is a small gap in the coating. These small sites are
15 known as coating "holidays" in the industry. By limiting the number of sites along the
16 pipeline where the cathodic protection system must "defend" the pipe against corrosion,
17 the coating allows the cathodic protection system to maintain an effective level of
18 protection against corrosion deterioration.

19 **Q. SO THE CATHODIC PROTECTION APPLIED TO SPIRE'S UNCOATED "BARE"**
20 **STEEL PIPES ISN'T EFFECTIVE TO PREVENT DETERIORATION?**

21 A. Not long term. The uncoated "bare" steel pipes in Spire's distribution system were all
22 installed originally without any cathodic protection. Those cathodic protection systems
23 were added later, in many cases 30 years or more after the pipe was originally installed.

1 At that point, the uncoated pipe would have already been deteriorated due to corrosion, in
2 some cases badly. However, the distribution systems at that time included large amounts
3 of uncoated “bare” steel. It would have been impractical, if not impossible, to replace it all
4 on a timely basis, especially since the Company was simultaneously replacing tens of
5 thousands of bare steel service lines under Commission safety directives/programs.
6 Instead, cathodic protection was added in an attempt to slow down the pace of the corrosion
7 deterioration. It was like a band-aid on the problem. The addition of cathodic protection
8 to these steel pipes would have slowed the corrosive processes some, allowing Spire’s
9 measured replacement efforts to reach more of this pipe before it had completely failed due
10 to corrosion deterioration. But adding cathodic protection to uncoated “bare” steel pipes
11 that had already been deteriorating in the ground for years or decades did nothing to reverse
12 the damage done by those corrosive processes. At best, it helped to slow down additional
13 corrosion until replacement could be accomplished.

14 **CONDITION OF PHYSICAL EVIDENCE IN THIS CASE**

15 **Q. HAVE YOU REVIEWED THE PHYSICAL EVIDENCE SUBMITTED IN THESE**
16 **CASES?**

17 A. Yes. The physical evidence presented in these cases were pulled from the field under my
18 direction by field crews in both Spire East and Spire West. After it was removed from the
19 field, the physical samples were assembled at our Shrewsbury Service Center, where I
20 inspected them the week of May 4, 2020.

21 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PHYSICAL EVIDENCE YOU REVIEWED.**

22 A. The physical evidence consists of two pallets of samples of pipe from Spire East and one
23 pallet of samples of pipe from Spire West. The pallets include numerous samples of both

1 cast iron and bare steel pipes. These samples are all connected to ISRS projects from the
2 Company's 2018 ISRS filings.

3 **Q. HOW DID THE COMPANY DETERMINE WHAT SAMPLES TO SUBMIT AS**
4 **EVIDENCE IN THESE CASES?**

5 A. We tried to obtain samples from a variety of areas in our service territory as well as samples
6 that represented some of the Company's larger replacement projects. Please see Schedules
7 THG-D1 and THG-D2 for detailed information pertaining to the pipe samples, including
8 work order numbers, footage of pipe replaced, and location where pipe was removed from.

9 **Q. WHEN WERE THE 2018 PIPE SAMPLES OBTAINED BY SPIRE?**

10 A. The pipe samples were retrieved in April and May 2020.

11 **Q. ARE THE 2018 PIPE SAMPLES IN THE SAME OR SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR**
12 **CONDITION TODAY AS THEY WERE IN 2018?**

13 A. Yes. Given the advanced age of these pipes, the amount of wear and deterioration between
14 2018 and now would not have materially changed their condition.

15 **Q. HAVE YOU REVIEWED THE PHOTOGRAPHS OF THESE SAMPLES,**
16 **SUBMITTED WITH YOUR TESTIMONY AND LABELED AS FIGURE 1**
17 **THROUGH FIGURE 54?**

18 A. Yes.

19 **Q. DO THESE FIGURES CONTAIN A TRUE AND ACCURATE DEPICTION OF**
20 **THE SAMPLES YOU'RE REFERRING TO?**

21 A. Yes.

1 **Q. DO YOU BELIEVE THIS EVIDENCE IS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE FIELD**
2 **CONDITION OF CAST IRON AND BARE STEEL PIPE IN SPIRE’S**
3 **DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM GENERALLY?**

4 A. Yes, absolutely. There is nothing unique about the pipe samples taken for this case. They
5 are very representative of the condition of the facilities replaced in the course of our
6 systematics replacement programs. They aren’t the “best of the best” or the “worst of the
7 worst;” they are a representative sample of what we typically see in the field.

8 **Q. DO YOU BELIEVE THIS EVIDENCE DEMONSTRATES THAT THE**
9 **REPLACED FACILITIES AT ISSUE IN THIS CASE WERE WORN OUT OR IN**
10 **A DETERIORATED CONDITION AT THE TIME THEY WERE REPLACED?**

11 A. Yes. You don’t have to be a scientist or an engineer to see that these pipes have deteriorated
12 significantly from their original condition. Some of them have holes in them. Others show
13 significant, irregular wall thickness degradation. Others have propagating cracks. They
14 aren’t all worn out, but they are certainly all significantly deteriorated from their original
15 condition. Metallurgical analysis and our experience with cast iron pipe repairs clearly
16 shows embrittlement of these pipes is also prevalent.

17 **Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY CONCLUDING REMARKS?**

18 A. Yes. At Spire, the safety of our customers is paramount and our primary value. The
19 Company has followed the Missouri legislature and this Commission’s lead on addressing
20 the critical safety issue of cast iron and bare steel replacement. Since the inception of the
21 ISRS, Spire has replaced more than 2,500 miles of aging pipeline across the state through
22 the ISRS and has reduced the anticipated time to complete its cast iron replacement
23 program from 80-plus years to approximately 25 years. The Company has continued to

1 employ best practices and pursue these replacements in a strategic, efficient manner that
2 provides customers with not only safety benefits now, but savings and benefits that will
3 continue long into the future. The Commission's continued support of cast iron and bare
4 steel replacement cost recovery through the ISRS is crucial to ensuring that Spire can
5 continue its programs at its current pace and deliver these benefits to its customers.

6 **Q. DOES THIS COMPLETE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?**

7 **A. Yes.**

THG-D1 MO East Samples

| Project | Work Order | Region | Work Type | Sub Work Type | Description | Sample Location | Vintage Year * | Main Footage Abandon Actuals |
|---------|------------|--------|-----------|----------------|--|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|
| 901467 | 15107462 | South | MREPL | STRATEGIC | Dogtown Cast Iron Main Replacement Grid Phase 2B | 6667 Berthold | 1925 | 3785 |
| 901130 | 13653637 | South | MREPL | STRATEGIC | Compton Heights Grid Phase H | 2403 Indiana | 1911 | 2750 |
| 901677 | 15513923 | South | MREPL | STRATEGIC GRID | Southwest Area 2 (Reg #102) Grid Phase 1B | 6974 Arthur | 1905 | 2534 |
| 901548 | 15307244 | South | MREPL | STRATEGIC GRID | Marconi & Shaw Grid Phase 1D | 5630 Botanical | 1924 | 1917 |
| 901596 | 15429600 | South | MREPL | STRATEGIC GRID | Earthquake Zone Grid Phase 3A | 7300 Minnesota | 1942 | 2912 |
| 901094 | 13608294 | South | MREPL | STRATEGIC | U-City Grid Phase 1H | 7223 Cambridge | 1926 | 8228 |
| 901050 | 13413362 | South | MREPL | STRATEGIC | Soulard Grid Phase 2F | 2000 South Broadway | 1922 | 4564 |
| 900613 | 12817718 | South | MREPL | STRATEGIC | Maplewood Grid Phase 2F | 6814 Wyatt Pl. | 1941 | 4961 |
| 901802 | 15797182 | North | MREPL | PLANNED | Bellefontaine Bare Steel Replacement Phase 1 | 10464 Seton Dr. | 1954 | 0 |
| 901979 | 16446744 | North | MREPL | STRATEGIC GRID | Bircher & Newstead (Reg #568) Phase 1B | 4840 Carter Ave. | 1905 | 2799 |
| 901281 | 14465103 | North | MREPL | STRATEGIC | Broadway - 9th & Palm Phase B | 9th & Clinton | 1914 | 8035 |
| 901798 | 15753224 | North | MREPL | STRATEGIC GRID | Central West End Grid Phase 3E | Taylor Ave & W.Belle Pl. | 1892 | 1171 |
| 901409 | 14771209 | North | MREPL | STRATEGIC | Kingsbury Phase N | 5258 Maple Ave | 1893 | 3732 |
| 901237 | 13787240 | North | MREPL | STRATEGIC | Pagedale Grid Phase 2A | 6634 Etzel Ave | 1912 | 4065 |
| 901275 | 14450752 | North | MREPL | STRATEGIC | West End - W22 & 26 Grid Phase 1B | 1338 Temple Pl. | 1898 | 4583 |

* Year Installed per information found in GIS records based on sample location

THG-D2 MO West Samples

MO West Pipe Sections for FY 2018 ISRS Filing

| Project | Work Order | | | City | Vintage Year | Pipe Section Location | Date Removed | Material |
|---------|------------|---|--|--------------|--------------|---------------------------------|--------------|------------|
| 801220 | 15804900 | Sheley & E 33rd Terr -MGE | Main Footage Abandon actuals - 13,644' | Independence | 1957 | 10721 E. 33rd Ter S. | 4" | Steel |
| 801874 | 17612824 | Replacement due to Leak at 111 N Turk | Main Footage Abandon actuals - 478' | Joplin | 1945 | 111 N Turk | 2" | Steel |
| 800286 | 14592466 | Carrollton Grid Main Replacement Phase I - Miller | Main Footage Abandon actuals - 15,012' | Carrollton | 1960 | 501 N LOCUST ST | 2" | Steel |
| 800940 | 15503496 | Claremont and 25th -Main Replacement | Main Footage Abandon actuals - 2,241' | Independence | 1951 | 11222 E 25TH ST | 2" | Steel |
| 801295 | 15952060 | Willis and Hayward - IUI | Main Footage Abandon actuals - 286' | Independence | 1930 | 709 S WILLIS AVE | 4" | Steel |
| 801323 | 16106897 | Walnut- Noland to Crane- IUI | Main Footage Abandon actuals - 3,129' | Independence | 1955 | S Leslie St & E Walnut St | 4" | Steel |
| 800435 | 14916409 | TC Lea & Kiger- IUI | Main Footage Abandon actuals - 12,465' | Independence | 1968 | Frandsen Rd & Trailer Park St A | 2" | Steel |
| 801815 | 17219240 | Cherry and Noland Rd - IUI | Main Footage Abandon actuals - 2,654' | Independence | 1975 | 1844 N NOLAND | 2" | Steel |
| 801873 | 17611805 | Replacement due to CP at Canterbury in Joplin - SPIRE - Smith | Main Footage Abandon actuals - 2,293' | Joplin | 1955 | 87 CANTERBURY LN | 2" | Steel |
| 801875 | 17610593 | Harris Ave and Truman Rd Repl - Spire | Main Footage Abandon actuals - 2,430' | Independence | 1948 | 1208 S HARRIS AVE | 4" | Steel |
| 802002 | 18548035 | Maywood Ave replacement-IUI | Main Footage Abandon actuals - 1,230' | Independence | 1927 | 1943 S MAYWOOD AVE | 4" | Steel |
| 801835 | 17280758 | Budd Park Header- 6" Plastic- Benton Blvd to St IUI POWELL | The installation of this header main allows us to abandon cast iron mains in subsequent grid phases. | KANSAS CITY | NA | 3404 St John | 4" | Cast Iron |
| 801909 | 17964766 | Pittman &38th St - Replace 4in Bare Steel - SPIRE, LOVE-GPS | Main Footage Abandon actuals - 3,901' | KANSAS CITY | 1960 | 4000 Pittman rd. | 4" | Bare Steel |
| 802032 | 18588610 | 33rd and Highland - 4in CI Replacement - SPIRE-- Stenvall | Main Footage Abandon actuals - 354' | KANSAS CITY | 1904 | 1615 E 33 rd st | 4" | Cast Iron |
| 801834 | 17279501 | AOR - 29th and Cleveland - 6in CI - Miller | Main Footage Abandon actuals - 852' | KANSAS CITY | 1922 | 2907 Cleveland | 6" | Cast Iron |
| 801844 | 17353150 | 63rd and Baltimore - 4in CI - Water in Main - murphy | Main Footage Abandon actuals - 547' | KANSAS CITY | 1923 | 101 W 63 rd | 4" | Cast Iron |
| 801868 | 17607273 | CI Breaks - 28th Ter and Oakley - IUI | Main Footage Abandon actuals - 971' | KANSAS CITY | 1958 | 5432 E 28 th ter | 4" | Cast Iron |
| 800342 | 14665837 | St. Joe's South Grid Phase 2F - MGE | Main Footage Abandon actuals - 6411' | St. Joseph | 1962 | 6622 Wilton Dr | 2" | Steel |
| 800344 | 14665811 | St. Joe's South Grid Phase 2D - MGE | Main Footage Abandon actuals - 8002' | St. Joseph | 1949 | 6199 EUREKA ST | 6" | Steel |
| 800137 | 14475077 | St. Joe's South Phase 1C - MGE | Main Footage Abandon actuals - 7159' | St. Joseph | 1945 | 6306 MORRIS ST | 2" | Steel |
| 800138 | 14475084 | St. Joe's South Phase 1D - MGE | Main Footage Abandon actuals - 3625' | St. Joseph | 1926 | 5702 S 3RD ST | 2" | Steel |