JPEC

MAR 2 8 2008 PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Response to Attorney General's Supplemental Request for Information

PSC Case No. 2007-00116

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

)

)

)

IN THE MATTER OF:

MAR 2 8 2008

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

JACKSON PURCHASE ENERGY CORPORATION,

CASE NO. 2007-00116

JPEC'S RESPONSE TO ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

COMES Jackson Purchase Energy Corporation (hereinafter "JPEC"), through the undersigned counsel, and in response to the Attorney General's Supplemental Requests for Information, states as follows:

1. Exhibit 4 of the response to AG-1-2 shows that the total revenues for 2007 amount to \$40,365,851 which is \$2,969,478 higher than the total revenues of \$37,396,373 for the 2006 test year. It also shows that the purchased power costs for 2007 amount to \$25,264,492 which is \$1,608,548 higher than the purchased power costs of \$23,655,944 for the 2006 test year. In this regard, please provide the following information:

a. Provide a detailed explanation of all of the various reasons why the actual
2007 revenues are almost \$3 million higher than the actual 2006 revenues.

b. Explain how much of the 2007 purchased power cost increase of approximately \$1.6 million is associated with the 2007 total revenue increase of approximately \$3 million.

RESPONSE: As a matter of clarification, the revenues in 2007 were \$40,365,878, rather than \$40,365,851.

a. 2007 revenues were higher than the test year due to 2007 having abnormally hot dry periods (drought-like conditions) and a more severe winter than normal. The high revenues were not driven by customer count or usage since that number increased a minimal 1.14%.

b. One hundred percent (100%). JPEC did not experience a rate increase from Big Rivers Electric Corporation ("BREC") in either 2006 or 2007. See Volume II, Exhibit H-1, pre-filed testimony of Kelly Nuckols, (document numbered 000489).

Witness: Kelly Nuckols.

2. If not already explained in response to the above request, provide the reasons for the following revenue differences between the 2006 test year and 2007:

a. Difference of \$1,810,979 between the 2006 residential revenues of \$23,404,071 and the 2007 residential revenues of \$25,215,050.

b. Difference of \$460,038 between the 2006 small commercial revenues of \$9,461,559 and the 2007 small commercial revenues of \$9,921,597.

c. Difference of \$1,562,942 between the 2006 large commercial revenues of \$2,102,275 and the 2007 large commercial revenues of \$3,665,217 [Exhibit 7 of the responses to AG-1-12 and AG-1-13 indicate that \$968,715 of the \$1,562,942 difference is due to the August 2006 switching of accounts 442210 and 442220 to the large commercial account 442200. Please explain the remaining difference of \$594,227 (\$1,562,942 - \$968,715)].

RESPONSE:

a. Please see response to 1a, above. JPEC believes the differences are attributable to the same weather phenomenon as described in 1a.

b. Please see response to 1a, above. JPEC believes the differences are attributable to the same weather phenomenon as described in 1a.

c. JPEC believes that the difference in large commercial revenues is likewise weather driven. However, during 2007 JPEC had one large commercial account which was billed on the basis of a temporary agreement which contributed larger than normal revenues. By the end of 2007, that account had normalized. The future of that account remaining in our service district remains uncertain.

Witness: Kelly Nuckols.

3. The End of Year Customer net revenue adjustment of \$236,288 quantified by JEPC in its response to PSC-2-21 is based on a comparison of the average test year number of customers to the December 2005 number of customers. However, this annualization methodology is not consistent with the End of Year Customer annualization adjustment traditionally applied by the PSC and overstates the net revenue adjustment amount. In the same format and detail as per the response to PSC-2-21, provide the End of Year Customer net revenue adjustment based on the comparison of the December 2006 number of customers to the average test year number of customers.

RESPONSE: Please see Exhibit 1 attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

I believe that the methodology desired by the PSC would penalize JPEC for having growth in its number of customers. When a cooperative has growth, comparing the End of Year number of customers to the average number of customers for that same year creates a much

-3-

smaller increase than comparing the Beginning Year number of customers to the average number of customers for that year.

Witness: Gary Stephens.

4. With regard to the test year, regulatory commission expenses of \$21,650 in account 928.000, please provide the following information:

a. Breakout of the components making up this expense amount.

b. Similar component breakout for the actual account 928.000 expenses in 2005 of \$9,826 and in 2007 of \$12,423, including an explanation why the test year expenses are so much higher than in 2005 and 2007.

RESPONSE:

a. Please see Exhibit 2 attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

b. In PSC Case No 2004-00036, styled *In the Matter of: Ballard Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation v. Jackson Purchase Energy Corporation*, the Public Service Commission, for the first time, asserted jurisdiction over pole attachments between joint users. The novel issues presented therein were extensively contested and litigated. The majority of the billing in 2006 was incurred preparing for and attending a hearing held in July of 2006 before the Commission. That case continues to raise issues between the parties in 2008 and may result in further litigation between the parties.

Witness: Kelly Nuckols.

5. Exhibit 12, page 19 in the response to AG-1-16 shows that account 921.00 includes \$7,416.04 for moving expenses of employee Bensley. Please indicate whether this is an

-4-

annual recurring or non-recurring expense and explain why this expense amount should be included for ratemaking purposes in this case.

RESPONSE: Moving expenses are a normal cost of recruitment of professionals for employers. Mr. Bensley is a licensed engineer. These expenses, as they relate to employee Bensley, are non-recurring. However, JPEC expects to pay similar expenses in future years. It is normal business for key employees to leave and be replaced.

Witness: Kelly Nuckols.

6. With regard to Directors fees and expenses shown on Exhibit G, Schedule 14, please provide the following information:

a. Exhibit G, Schedule 14, page 1 shows that JPEC currently has 7 directors which no longer include Ivus Crouch. Yet, as shown on Schedule 14, page 7, JPEC has included director fees and expenses of \$3,555 associated with Ivus Crouch. Why shouldn't this expense amount be excluded for ratemaking purposes?

b. Is JPEC aware that it has been Commission policy not to allow per diem fees for meetings other than regular board meetings? If so, explain why JPEC is requesting rate recovery for \$16,600 worth of meeting fees other than regular board meeting fees.

RESPONSE:

a. Exhibit G, Schedule 14, page 1 inadvertently omitted Ivus Crouch from the listing of directors. He was, in fact, a director for the entire year. A corrected schedule in attached as Exhibit 3. This expense should be included for ratemaking purposes.

-5-

Witness: Chuck Williamson.

b. The fees referenced are for attendance at monthly-held board meetings, referred to as "workshops". The maximum amounts which may be annually paid to Directors are contained in Article IV, Section 7 of the by-laws, as adopted and approved by the members of the cooperative approximately ten years ago. JPEC is unaware of any policy which would prohibit it from paying its Board Members for attending regularly scheduled meetings which are styled "workshops".

As further explanation regarding the workshops, JPEC's Board of Directors has no standing committees. Therefore, it does not hold committee meetings, monthly or otherwise. JPEC utilizes workshops between required board meetings so that planning, financial and operational matters may be discussed in greater detail as necessary. Topics such as capital expenditures, revenue, approval of work plans, budgeting and audit reviews are discussed and workshops include meeting with consultants, auditors, and engineers. The board believes the system is an effective and economic way for it to fulfill their duties as directors.

Witness: Kelly Nuckols

7. Exhibit 27 in the response to AG-1-32 shows total pro forma depreciation expenses of \$3,743,046 based on the application of the current depreciation rates to the actual 12/31/06 depreciable plant balances. This is \$412,854 lower than the pro forma depreciation expenses of \$4,155,900 based on the application of the newly proposed depreciation rates to the actual 12/31/06 depreciable plant balances, the derivation of which is shown on filing Exhibit G, Schedule 4, page 2 of 5. In this regard, provide the following information:

-6-

a. The actual 12/31/06 General Plant balances and the depreciation rates applied to these balances are exactly the same in Exhibit 27 of the response to AG-1-32 as in filing Exhibit G, Schedule 4, page 2. Yet the normalized depreciation expenses for almost each General Plant item are different, resulting in total normalized General Plant depreciation expenses of \$595,904 in Exhibit 27 and \$538,992 in filing Exhibit G, Schedule 4, page 2. Please explain why these General Plant depreciation expenses are different in the two exhibits and indicate which represents the correct normalized General Plant depreciation expense level.

b. Exhibit G, Schedule 4, page 5, lines 10 through 17 shows how the total proposed normalized depreciation expense of \$4,155,900 is allocated to transportation, stores and power equipment, resulting in a net depreciation expense of \$3,830,072. Please provide the exact same type of information for the total normalized depreciation expense amount of \$3,743,046 in Exhibit 27 of the response to AG-1-32 [or the corrected amount to be provided in response to part (a) above].

RESPONSE:

a. These schedules cannot be directly compared. General assets are depreciated on an individual asset basis, not as a group. At the time an individual asset is fully depreciated, depreciation for that item stops. Exhibit G, Schedule 4, page 2, represents the correct normalized General Plant depreciation expense level. The numbers submitted with Exhibit 27 in the response to AG-1-32 are revised in Exhibit 4 to reflect this set of numbers rather than those originally requested.

b. This information is given in Exhibit 5. This Exhibit utilizes information from Exhibit 4, referred to in the response to 7a. The Exhibit lists depreciation allocated to transportation, stores and power equipment resulting in a net depreciation amount of \$3,360,306.

Witness: Chuck Williamson.

8. Please confirm that, based on the response to AG-1-26, the corrected FAS-106 expense adjustment amount on Exhibit G, Schedule 9, page 1 should be \$6,463 (calculation: $$186,100 \times 5.75\% \times 60.40\% = $6,463$) as opposed to the filed expense adjustment amount of \$7,711.

RESPONSE: Please refer to Exhibit 6. This Exhibit indicates a two part revision to the calculation of the post retirement benefit adjustment. First, an adjustment (\$3,020) should reflect the difference between the expense recorded in 2006 compared to the accrual that should have been recorded as indicated in the study. The study was not completed until very late in 2006 which did not allow adequate time to fully adjust payroll accruals to the final figure. Second, the correct accrual amount of \$189,100 should be increased by the discount rate used in the study, 5.75%. The total of these two adjustments are \$13,894. The portion of this total adjustment flowing through to expense is 60.40%, which results in an adjustment to expenses of \$8,392.

Witness: Chuck Williamson.

Respectfully submitted,

DENTON & KEULER P. O. BOX 929 PADUCAH KY 42002-0929 Telephone: (270) 443-8253 Facsimile: (270) 442-6000

By:

W. David Denton Melissa D. Yates ATTORNEYS FOR JPEC

I hereby certify that the foregoing has been served by mailing a true and correct copy to:

STEPHANIE STUMBO EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR KENTUCKY PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 211 SOWER BLVD. FRANKFORT KY 40602

DENNIS G HOWARD OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 1024 CAPITAL CENTER DRIVE SUITE 200 FRANKFORT KY 40601-8204

on this 2day of March, 2008. Melissa D. Yates

.

JPEC

Response to Question No. 3 in the Attorney General Supplemental Request
End of Test Year Customer Adjustment

Line			Small	Small	Lg Com	Comm &	
No.	Month	Residential	Com (1 ph)	Com (3 ph)	(Existing)	Industrial	
1	Dec 2005	25,317	2,004	172	2	690	
2	Jan 2006	25,322	2,027	177	2	739	
3	Feb 2006	25,354	2,023	175	2	739	
4	Mar 2006	25,391	2,030	176	2	739	
5	Apr 2006	25,425	1,987	176	2	739	
6	May 2006	25,427	2,007	177	2	739	
7	Jun 2006	25,467	2,007	177	2	740	
8	Jul 2006	25,501	2,006	177	2	740	
9	Aug 2006	25,538	2,018	182	2	740	
10	Sep 2006	25,501	2,028	180	2	740	
11	Oct 2006	25,540	2,046	181	2	740	
12	Nov 2006	25,513	2,040	182	2	740	
13	Dec 2006 -	25,556	2,034	176	2	740	
14	Average	25,450	2,020	178	2	736	
15	Increase	106	14	(2)	0	4	
				(_/			
16	Total Revenue	\$24,247,477	\$1,688,015	\$309,099	\$1,725,798	\$9,354,175	
17	KWH Usage	379,714,788	25,347,920	4,860,579	40,619,100	178,774,164	
18	Avg per KWH	\$0.06386	\$0.06659	\$0.06359	\$0.04249	\$0.05232	
19	Total Billings	305,532	24,252	2,136	24	8,808	
20	Avg Monthly						
21	KWH Usage	1,243	1,045	2,276	1,692,463	20,297	
21	it in it obugo	1,213	1,015	2,270	1,092,105	20,257	
22	Increase in custom	ers, times averag	ge use, times ave	erage rate, times12	2 months, equals	additional reven	iues
23	Increase in Rev	\$100,801	\$11,886	(\$2,672)	\$0	\$53,917	\$163,933
24 25	Increase in consun equals additional p		ge use, times av	erage cost per KV	VH purchased, ti	imes 12 months,	
26	Inc in Power Cost	\$58,142	\$6,574	(\$1,547)	\$0	\$37,954 _	\$101,124
27	Net Increase					=	\$62,810
28	Total Cost of powe	er, base rates	\$24,454,934				
29	KWH purchased	, 0400 14100	663,944,351				
30	Cost per KWH Pu	rchased	\$0.03683				

Jackson Purchase Energy Corporation Case No. 2007-00116 Regulatory Commission Expenses - Account 928.000 1/1/2005 thru 12/31/2006

1

2

3

4					
5		Ohaali			
6	D . /	Check	Davias	Amount	Description
7	Date	Number	Payee	<u>Amount</u>	Description
8 9	5/13/2005	146631	DENTON & KEULER LLP	345.00	Legal-BRTC
9 10	5/20/2005	146707	DENTON & KEULER LLP	1,552.50	Legal-BRTC
10	7/1/2005	147220	DENTON & KEULER LLP	2,182.54	Legal-BRTC
12	8/19/2005	147941	DENTON & KEULER LLP	1,380.00	Legal-BRTC
12	8/19/2005	147941	DENTON & KEULER LLP	3,450.00	Legal-BRTC
14	9/9/2005	148163	PADUCAH SUN/THE	53.90	Adv - BRTC
15	9/30/2005	148408	DENTON & KEULER LLP	402.50	Legal-BRTC
16	9/30/2005	148408	DENTON & KEULER LLP	28.75	Legal-BRTC
17	10/28/2005	149183	DENTON & KEULER LLP	143.75	Legal-BRTC
18	11/25/2005	149525	DENTON & KEULER LLP	287.50	Legal-BRTC
19			Total for 2005	9,826.44	J. J
20					
21	3/31/2006	150912	DENTON & KEULER LLP	840.00	Legal-BRTC
22	5/26/2006	151588	DENTON & KEULER LLP	672.11	Legal-BRTC
23	5/26/2006	151588	DENTON & KEULER LLP	1,110.00	Legal-BRTC
24	6/30/2006	151990	DENTON & KEULER LLP	1,050.00	Legal-BRTC
25	7/28/2006	152340	DENTON & KEULER LLP	2,430.00	Legal-BRTC
26	8/25/2006	152684	DENTON & KEULER LLP	13,110.00	Legal-BRTC
27	9/29/2006	153079	DENTON & KEULER LLP	1,452.21	Legal-BRTC
28	10/20/2006	153951	DENTON & KEULER LLP	625.26	Legal-BRTC
29	11/24/2006	154619	DENTON & KEULER LLP	330.00	Legal-BRTC
30	12/31/2006	Accrued	DENTON & KEULER LLP	30.00	Legal-Reliability
31			Total for 2006	21,649.58	
32					
33	2/23/2007	155586	DENTON & KEULER LLP	390.00	Legal-Renewable Resource
34	4/20/2007	156159	PADUCAH SUN/THE	313.20	Adv-Renewable Resource
35	4/27/2007	156235	DENTON & KEULER LLP	715.00	Legal-Renewable Resource & Reliability
36	5/4/2007	156362	DENTON & KEULER LLP	520.00	Legal-Reliability
37	5/25/2007	156596	DENTON & KEULER LLP	682.50	Legal-Reliability & BRTC
38	6/29/2007	157571	DENTON & KEULER LLP	2,978.32	Legal-BREC Unwind & Reliability
39	8/31/2007	158274	DENTON & KEULER LLP	1,267.92	Legal-Reliability & BRTC
40	8/31/2007	158274	DENTON & KEULER LLP	984.20	Legal-Reliability & BRTC
41	9/28/2007	158598	DENTON & KEULER LLP	1,080.00	Legal-BRTC & Renewable Resource
42	10/19/2007	159145	DENTON & KEULER LLP	742.50	Legal-BRTC
43	11/30/2007	159711	DENTON & KEULER LLP	825.44	Legal-BRTC
44	12/31/2007	Accrued	DENTON & KEULER LLP	1,923.75	Legal-BRTC, Reliability & Accident Investigation
45			Total for 2007	12,422.83	
46					

1	Jackson	Purchase Energy Corporation		
2	(Case No. 2007-00116		
3	Na	me of Board Members		Exhibit 3 Page 1 of 1
4		December 31, 2006		Witness: Chuck Williamson
5				
6				
7	Name and Address	Board Title	Associated Organizations	
8				
9	Lee Bearden	Vice-Chair	Big Rivers Representative	
10	211 Green Oaks Lane		Board Member	
11	Benton, KY 42025			
12				
13	Dr. Ivus Crouch			
14	1148 US 60 East			
15	Smithland, KY 42081			
16				
17	Wayne Ellliott	Secretary/Treasurer		
18	6725 New Hope Church Rd.			
19	Paducah, KY 42001			
20				
21	Gary L. Joiner	Chair		
22	994 US 60 West			
23	Smithland, KY 42081			
24				
25	Jack S. Marshall			
26	6905 Old Calvert City Rd.			
27	Paducah, KY 42003			
28				
2 9	Bobby W. Ross			
30	9237 Wickliffe Rd.			
31	Wickliffe, KY 42087			
32				
33	Glenn Spear			
34	3709 Metropolis Lake Rd			
35	West Paducah, KY 42086			
36	John H. Wolker		KAEC Depresentative	
37	John H. Walker		KAEC Representative	
38	36 Gray Rd.		Board Member	
39	LaCenter, KY 42056			
40				
41	Directors are compensated \$200 for atten		-	
42	meeting for the board of directors. In add	-	-	
43	on official business such as seminars, co		•	
44	\$200 for attendance on the business ses			e
45	meetings at \$125 per day up to maximun			Pig
46	actual expenses incurred for meetings att Rivers Board are not remunerated for the		-	ыg
47	Rivers Board are not remunerated for the spouses are not paid for by the cooperat		Apenses of directors	
48 49	spouses are not paid for by the cooperat			

.

.

Exhibit 4 Page 1 of 1 Witness: Chuck Williamson

~ 0 с 4 с	J _i Test General	Jackson Purchase Energy Corporation Case No. 2007-00116 Test Year-End Balances Times Current Rates General Assets Using Individual Asset Depreciation					
9 2		December 31, 2006			Ending Balance	Amortization of Conv	Total Based on
დ თ (A/C	φετοιιπ	Balance 12/31/2006	Depr Rate	x Existing Rate	to Specific Assets	EOY Assets
; ⊆	N	DISTRIBUTION PLANT					
; ;	360	Land & Land Rights	\$ 235,871	0.00%	۰ ب	n/a	۰ ج
1 6	361	Structures & Improvements	0	0.00%	ı	n/a	ı
2 4	362	Station Equipment	12,008,367	1.53%	183,728	n/a	183,728
- 1	364	Poles. Towers & Fixtures	28,486,552	4.19%	1,193,587	n/a	1,193,587
<u>5</u> 4	365	Overhead Cond. & Devices	17,054,966	3.47%	591,807	n/a	591,807
2 4	366	Underaround Conduit	4,106,735	1.77%	72,689	n/a	72,689
: 6	367	Underard, Cond. & Devices	9,423,466	3.19%	300,609	n/a	300,609
0 0	368	Line Transformers	15,623,839	2.75%	429,656	n/a	429,656
2 00	369	Services	6,468,811	2.23%	144,254	n/a	144,254
2 2	370	Matars	2,934,243	4.34%	127,346	n/a	127,346
5 6	371	Install on Cons Premises	1,484,794	6.42%	95,324	n/a	95,324
4 6	372	Leased Pron on Cons. Prems.	1,048	10.00%	105	n/a	105
3 5	373	St itn & Sinnal Systems	558,138	1.44%	8,037	n/a	8,037
52 52	5	Total Distribution Plant	\$ 98,386,830		\$ 3,147,142	۰ ج	3,147,142
26					:		
27					Futture Depr		
28					Exp Using		
29		GENERAL PLANT			Depr System		
30	389	Land & Land Rights	\$ 86,866	0.00%	۰ ج	، ھ	ю
31	390	Structures & Improvements	2,047,039	2.50%	51,176	(11,052)	
32	391	Office Furniture & Equip.	614,616	5.00%	42,517	(14,136)	
33	392	Transportation Equipment - Heavy	2,079,856	10.00%	240,784	60,418	301,202
20	392 1	Transportation Equipment - Light	375,930	20.00%	Inc Above	Inc Above	Inc Above
т ц	303	Stores Equipment	79,007	5.00%	2,576	1,028	3,604
2 4	394	Tools. Shop & Garage Equip.	451,976	6.67%	20,879	8,277	29,156
37	395	l aboratory Equipment	169,060	6.67%	6,843	2,052	8,895
n ee	396	Power Operated Equip.	287,695	10.00%	21,026	(4)	
5 6	397	Communication Equip.	589,509	5.00%	29,509	69,646	99,155
04	398	Miscellaneous Equip.	94,242	10.00%	5,899		
41		Total General Plant	\$ 6,875,796		- 1		
42		TOTAL ELECTRIC PLANT IN SERVICE	\$ 105,262,626		\$ 3,568,351	\$ 117,783	\$ 3,686,134

Exhibit 5 Page 1 of 1 Witness: Chuck Williamson

Jackson Purchase Energy Corporation Case No. 2007-00116

2 3 4 5 6	Jackson Purchase Energy Corporation Case No. 2007-00116 Depreciation Expense Detail December 31, 2006				
7 8	Normalized	Test Year	A	djustment	
9 0 Total depreciation accruals 1	3,686,134	3,562,321	\$	123,813	
2 Less amounts charged to clearing:					
3 Transportation	(301,202)	(299,484)		(1,718)	
4 Stores	(3,604)	(4,250)		646	
5 Power Operated Equipment	(21,022)	(23,487)		2,465	
6					
7 Net depreciation	3,360,306	3,235,100	\$	125,206	
8					
9 Transmontation Allocation		Dorcont		Amount	
0 <u>Transportation Allocation</u>		Percent 49%	¢	Amount 836	
1 Construction and retirement WIP 2 Others		49%	φ	50	
		16%		267	
3 Distribution - operations 4 Distribution - maintenance		27%		462	
5 Consumer accounts		21/8		41	
6 Consumer service and information		0%		-	
7 Administration and general		4%		62	
8					
9 Total	-	100%	\$	1,718	
0	=				
1 Stores Allocation		Percent	•	Amount	
2 Construction and retirement WIP		81%	\$	(523)	
3 Others		2%		(13)	
4 Distribution - operations		5%		(32)	
5 Distribution - maintenance		12%		(78)	
36 Consumer accounts		0% 0%		-	
87 Consumer service and information		0%		-	
88 Administration and general		0 70		-	
39 40 Total	-	100%	\$	(646)	
11	-	10070	–		
Power Operated Equipment Allocation		Percent		Amount	
3 Construction and retirement WIP		52%	\$	(1,274)	
4 Others		3%		(76)	
15 Distribution - operations		17%		(409)	
6 Distribution - maintenance		29%		(705)	
7 Consumer accounts		0%		-	
18 Consumer service and information		0%		-	
19 Administration and general		0%		-	
50		1000		10 105	
51 Total	:	100%	\$	(2,465)	
52				Power	
53 54	Transp	Stores		Power Equip	Tota
55 Construction and retirement WIP	\$ 836	\$ (523)	\$		(9
56 Others	φ 090 50	(13)		(1,274) (76)	V.
57 Distribution - operations	267	(32)		(409)	(1
58 Distribution - maintenance	462	(78)		(705)	(3
59 Consumer accounts	41	-		-	,-
50 Consumer service and information	-	-		-	
51 Administration and general	62	-		-	
52	•=				
53 Total	\$ 1,718	\$ (646)	\$	(2,465) \$	(1,
54					