Layout Cost Center

HOPE RATE hope information 700102... CHAIRMAN OF BOARD...

Report currency

USD

US Dollar

Cost Elem	Cost element name Postg Date	Per	Val.in RC Cost Ct	r Vendor Name	CD object name	Aux.acct assgment_1	Document Header Text	Doc
5308090	Other DossiHembershp[05/31/2004	i	116.00 (703233	1	LEGAL SERVICES EXEC	1		AB
5308090	Other Ducs&Hembershp 05/31/2004	1 5	268,75 703274	1	EXEC - DELIVERY	1	I	AB
5308090	Other DusséHembershp[05/31/2004	1 5	374.44 704004	1	PIN EXEC DELIVERY	1	l	AB
	i (1 5	53,598.19	I	1	1	ſ	1
5308090	Other DuesaHembershp[06/15/2004	1 6	200.00 [700102	TWENTY FIVE YEAR CLUB OF THE	CHAIRMAN OF BOARD	1	2004 membership dues	100
5308090	Other Dossemembershp 06/28/2004	1 6	200.00-700102	1	CHAIRHAN OF BOARD	1	to charge a billing proje	SA
5308090	Other DueseHembershp[06/28/2004	1 6	200.00 700102	1.	CHAIRHAN OF BOARD	INBS EXEC.ALLOCI	to charge a billing proje	SA S
5308090	Other DuesaHembershp 06/30/200	1 6	327.00 [700142	1	FIN ANAL & PLAN-EXEC	í	l	AB
5308090	Other DuestHembershp 06/30/2004		50.00 [700205	i	GAS DISTR EXEC	1	i	AB
5308090	Other DuesiHembershp 06/30/2004		289.00 700228	i	DRS RETAIL EXEC	1	I	lλB
5308090	Other DuesiMembershpj06/29/2004		59.95 700577	i	EXTERNAL APPAIR EXEC	i	I	PD
5308090	Other DuestHambershp 05/29/2004		23.45 700577	i	EXTERNAL APPAIR EXEC	i	i I	120
5308090	Other DueséHembershp 06/30/2006	-	232.00 700832	i	,	NBS EXEC.ALLOCI	i I	AB
	Other DussiMembershp 05/30/2004	1 1	2.58 [70323]	1	LEGAL SERVICES EXEC	•	, I	l AB
5308090	Other Dues&Nembershp 06/30/2006		324.76 703274		EXEC - DELIVERY	1	•	İÆB
	Other DuessMembershp 06/30/2004	-	279.25 704004	1	PIN EXEC DELIVERY	1	•	IAB
270030	1 I I I I I			1	I THE PURE DEPTACKA	i ;	; 1	i I
	Indian Burning to the last on	6	-	1			1	ÌλB
	Other DueseNewbershp 07/31/2006		66.00 700142	1	(FIN ANAL & PLAN-EXEC		1	lan
	Other DuesaHembershp 07/31/2004		50.00 700205	1	GAS DISTR EXEC	!		
	Other DuestKembershp 07/31/2004		289.00 700228	I.	DRS RETAIL EXEC	1	•	AB
	Other DueskHembershp[07/15/2004		40,901.00 700577	GREATER RICHMOND	EXTERNAL APPAIR EXEC	•	•	KA
	Other Duesalembershp[07/26/2004	1 71	40,901.00- 700577	1			to correct billing projec	
	Other DuestHembershp 07/26/2004	1 7	40,901.00 700577	t	EXTERNAL AFFAIR EXEC		to correct billing projec	•
	Other DuestHembershp 07/21/2004			CONFERENCE BOARD INC	HR EXECUTIVE	•		IN
308090	Other DuesEMembershp 07/28/2004	1 7	4,000.00- 700806	1	(HR EXECUTIVE	1	to charge a billing proje	ļaλ
308090	Other DuestHembershp 07/25/2006	1 7	4,000.00 700806	1	HR EXECUTIVE	WBS HR.ALLOC1	to charge a billing proje	AB
5308090	Other DuessHembershp 07/31/2004	ij 7]	116.00 700832	1	TREASURY EXECUTIVE			YB
5308090	Other DuesEHembershp 07/29/2004	1 7	50.00 702044	1	SHOWED SERVICES EXEC	1	1	PD
5308090	Other Dessidembershp 07/31/2004	1 7	116.00 703233	1	LEGAL SERVICES EXEC	MBS EXEC.ALLOCI	1	ΑĐ
5308090	Other DuessMembershp 07/31/2004	1 71	342.26 703274	1	EXEC - DELIVERY)	I	ΑB
5308090	Other Dues&Membershp 07/13/2004	1 7	250.00 704002	VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH OF	Regulation Exec	1	Bar dues	RN
5308090	Other Dues&Hembershp 07/31/2004	7	187.22 [704004	I	PIN EXEC DELIVERY	}	1	AB
	1	7	46,367.48	1	i	į į	!	1
5308090	Other Dues&Hembershp 08/31/2004	1 8	192.20 700142	ŧ	PIN ANAL & PLAN-EXEC		PP0000003303	AB
5308090	Other DuestNumbershp 08/31/2004	1 8	64.19 700205	1	GAS DISTR EXEC	•	PP0000003303	AB
5308090	Other DuesEHembershp 08/31/2004	11 81	289.00 [700228	i	DRS RETAIL EXEC		PP0000003303	AB
	Other Dues&Membershp 08/31/2004		370.00 700460	1	AUDIT SVCS EXEC		PP0000003303	AB
	Other DuestHembershp 08/09/2004		1,074.00 700577	ELSEVIER SCIENCE INC	EXTERNAL AFFAIR EXEC	•	•	RN
	Other DueseHembershp 08/11/2004		325.00 700577	CAPITOL HILL CLUB THE	EXTERNAL AFFAIR EXEC		•	KN
308090	Other DuesEHembershp 08/24/2004		597.00 700577	IO ENERGY LLC	EXTERNAL APPAIR EXEC	-		RON
	Other Duesäliemberahp 08/30/2004		119.97 700577	(EXTERNAL APPAIR EXEC	•	•	PO
308090	Other Residentershp 08/30/2004			1				
			59.95 700577	1 1	EXTERNAL AFFAIR EXEC	•		120
	Other Dues (Membershp) 08/31/2004		252.00 [700806		HR EXECUTIVE			AB
1308030	Other DueseMembershp 08/31/2004		342.25 703274	1	EXEC - DELIVERY	1	PP0000003303	[AB
200000	Inches Proceedings of Security	8	3,685.56	1	[i .		
	Other DucasHemberohp[09/30/2004		228.98 (700102		CHAIRMAN OF BOARD		•	AB
	Other Duesettembershp 09/30/2004		66.00 700142	1	FIN ANAL & PLAN-EXEC			AB
	Other DuestHembershp 09/14/2004		650.00 700228	1	DRS RETAIL EXEC	!	,	PD
	Other Deschembershp 09/30/2004		289.00 700228	1	DRE RETAIL EXEC]	PPG000003495	[AB
	Other DueseMembershp 09/22/2004		455.00 700575	I	TAX EXECUTIVE			PD
	Other DuesEHembershp 09/30/2004	9	116.00 [700832	į.	TREASURY EXECUTIVE	WBS EXEC.ALLOC1	PF0000003495	ļΑΒ
308090	Other DueseMembershp 09/30/2004	1 91	116.00 [703233	1	LEGAL SERVICES EXEC	WES EXEC.ALLOCI	PP0000003495	λB
306090	Other DuestMembershp 09/28/2004	9	45,000.00 [703233	GENERAL COUNSEL ROUNDTABLE	LEGAL SERVICES EXEC	WBS EXEC.ALLOCI	Numbership Fee	KN
	Other DueseMembersbp 09/30/2004		342.25 703274	1	EKBC - DELIVERY			AB
308090	Other Dues&Membershp 09/30/2004	9	469.57 704004	1	FIN EXEC DELIVERY			IAB
	-,		,	•				

Leyout HOPE RATE hope information
Cost Center 700102... CHAIRMAN OF BOARD...

Report currency USD US Dollar

Cost I	lem. Cost :	element name	Postg Date	Per	var.in KC	Cost Ctr	Vendor Name	CO object name	NUX.800C 488GDMHL_1	Document Keader Text	(Doc
530809	0 (Other	DuesiHembershp	09/20/2004[200.00	(704662 	r 	Gas & Blec Del Exec			JPD I
530809	0 lOther	DuesiMembershp	10/15/2004	•	116.00	700102	COMMONWEALTH CLUB THE	CHAIRMAN OF BOARD		MONTHLY DUES	100
530809		DuesiHembershp				700142	i	FIN ANAL & PLAN-EXEC		PP0000003631	AB
530809	•	DueskHembershp			289.00	•	,	DRS RETAIL EXEC	•	PP0000003631	AB
530809	-	Dues&Hembershp		-		•	CAPITOL HILL CLUB THE	EXTERNAL APPAIR EXEC		eervice	IKN
530005	•	Duesthenoeraho			14,175.00	•	CORPORATE EXECUTIVE BOARD	EXTERNAL APPAIR EXEC		MEMBERSHIP SERVICES	IKN
530809	• • • • =	DueskHembereim			495.00		1	EXTERNAL APPAIR EXEC	•		PD
530809		Dugs&Membersho			232.00	•		TREASURY EXECUTIVE		PP0000003631	IλB
530809	•	Dues & Mambersho			116.00	•	CONSUMEALITH CLAIR THE	LEGAL SERVICES EXEC		HOWTHLY DUES	1127
530809	-	DuesEMembershp		•	484.04	•	1	EXEC - DELIVERY		PP0000003631	IAB.
530809	•	DuesiMembershy		-	116.00		COMPONIEALTH CLUB THE	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFR	•	HONTHLY DUES	į RM
	-			-		,	COMPOSMENDIA COOR THE	•	•		AB
530809	o joener	DueséMembershp			251.80	,	1	FIN EXEC DELIVERY		PP0000003631	120
					16,390.84	-	!	1			!
530809	•	DuosaMembershp			350.00	•	KINLOCH GOLF CLUB	CHAIRMAN OF BOARD	•	MONTHLYSTATEMENT	KN
530809	•	DuosEMenbershp			331.00	•	ROLLING ROCK CLUB	CHAIRMAN OF BOARD		QUARTERLY DUES	[KN
530809	•	DuesaMembershp			116.00	•	CONMUNICALITH CLUB THE	CHAIRMAN OF BOARD		HONTHLYDUES	KN
530805		Dues&Membershp				700205	i	OAS DISTR EXEC		PP0000003730	[AB
530809	0 Other	DucaéMonbershp	11/30/2004	11	289.00	700228	l .	DRE RETAIL EXEC	1	PP0000003730	YD
530805	0 Other	Dues Membershp	11/30/2004	11	49.00	700460	I	AUDIT SVCS EXEC		PP0000003730	NB.
530805	0 (Other	DuenMembershp	11/29/2004	11	100.00	700460	i .	AUDIT SVCS EXEC		I) Ph
530805	0 Other	DuesMembersho	11/01/2004	11	2,100.00	700577	KING FUBLISHING GROUP	EXTERNAL AFFAIR EXEC	'	SERVICE	KN
530809	0 Other	DuestMembershp	11/30/2004[11	84.00	700806	l	HR EXECUTIVE		PP0000003730	AB
530809	D Other	DuesSHembershp	11/30/2004	11	116.00	700832	ſ	TREASURY EXECUTIVE		PP0000003730	AB
530809	0 Other	Dues&Hambershp)	11/16/2004	11	54.77-	703233	1	LEGAL SERVICES EXEC		JANES L. SANDERLIN	SA
530809	0 Other	DuesiHembershp	11/19/2004	11	170.77	703233	COMPONNEALTH CLUB THE	LEGAL SERVICES EXEC		HONTHLYDUES	EM
530809	0 Other	DucasHembershp	11/30/2004	11	276.25	703274	1	EXEC - DELIVERY		PP0000003730	[AB
530809	0 [Other	Dues&Membershp	11/19/2004	111	331.00	703274	ROLLING ROCK CLUB	EXEC - DELIVERY		HOHTHLYDUES	KN
530805	-	Dues&Mumbershp		-	115.00	703274	COMMONWEALTH CLUB THE	EXEC - DELIVERY		MONTHLYDUES	KN
530809	•	Dues&Membershp		-	21.70-	-	Ì	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFR		THOMAS F. PARRELL	SA
530805	•	Dues&Nambershp			137.70	-	COMMONWEALTH CLUB THE	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFR		KONTHLYDUES	IQ
530809		DuesaNembersho			116.00		,	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFR		KONTHLYDUES	FRV
530809		DueséKembershpi		-	100.00		•	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFR		PEES	LKIN
530809	•	Duesakembershpi		•	187.32	•	•	FIN EXEC DELIVERY		PP0000003730	IAB
530809		DuosaMembershp		•	385.25		•	Gas & Elec Del Exec		MONTHLYDUES	IKN
230403	o joener	Measucanetaubi	•	,		704004	leuckret crop	1 1000 et Erac her meet		MON BUILDES	1 104
	I			22[5,310.72	l 	l	1			i
530809		Dueskienbershp	-	-	116.00	-	,	CHAIRMAN OF BOARD		HONTHLYDUES	INN
530809	•	Duest Membershp		•			•	CHATRHAN OF BOARD		HONTHLYDUES	1XN
530809	•	DuesiMembersho			285.00	•		CHAIRMAN OF BOARD		•	KN
530809	•	DuestMembershp	•		164.00		•	FIN ANAL & PLAN-EXEC		PP0000003894	(AB
530809		DuessHembershp		,	624.00		•	DRS RETAIL EXEC		PP0000003894	AB
530809	•	DuesiHembershp			76.50		•	EXTERNAL APPAIR EXEC			PD
530809		DuesiHembershp			116.00		•	TREASURY EXECUTIVE		PP0000003894	AB
530809		Dues&Kembershp			5,000.00	•	l	CHIEF INFO OFFICER	1	!	PD
530809	•	DuesSMembershp			5,000.00-		1	CHIEF INFO OFFICER	!	to charge a billing proje	SA
530809	•	Dues&Membershp		-	5,000.00		l	CHIES INSO OFFICES	WB5 EXEC.ALLOC1	to charge a billing proje	a sa
530809	Other	DuestHembershp	12/16/2004	12	156.00	703233	COMMONWEALTH CLUB THE	LEGAL SERVICES EXEC	ļ	HOMINITADAES	(KN
530809	Other	Duss&Nembershp	12/31/2004	12	342.25	703274	1	EXEC - DELIVERY	1	PP0000003894	ĮAB
530809	Other	DussäNembershp	12/16/2004	12	156.00	703274	COMMONWEALTH CLUB THE	EXEC - DELIVERY	1	MONTHLYDUBS	KN
530809	Other	DuasiNembershp	12/16/2004]	12	116.00	703498	CONHONNEALTH CLUB THE	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFR	ĺ	KONTHLYDUES	[KN
570809	Other	Dues (Hembershp)	12/16/2004	12	116.00	703498		CHIEF PINANCIAL OFFR		, and the second se	KN
530809	Other	Dues & Membershp	12/17/2004	12	1,040.00	703498	UMHARRIE POINT COMMUNITY ASSN INC		,		IN
530809		Dues Hambershp			232.00			Regulation Exec		PP0000003894	AB
530809	,	Dues Membershp	-		354.94		•	FIN EXEC DELIVERY		PP0000003894	AB
	,	Duesidenbershp				704062	•	1	i,		į-us

	000	-	
	Aux.dock assgrant_1 Document Reader Text		
	CO object name		
	oat Elen. Cost element name Posty Date Port Vol. in RC Cost Ctr Vendor Name	1 12 9,339.94	
	Postg Date Pur	125	
************************	ost Elem. Cost element name		

PRDOCE CENTERION AND AS INCIDENTAL OF BOARD...

PROMOTE HOPE PATE AND STREAM OF BOARD...

,					1			1	,		,		
1		l)				84.586,051		ł 	1			••
•		*	+			,				1			
1] }	ļ				TE.659,72		•	 			•
1		Justorq mixedni ne bbe od	'	PINANCIAL OFFR	···•				•	* .	immentajasjugi	9302020	
!		coetorg miretni na bbs oc		RTSO LAIDNANIS TI					,		Encertainment	0202025	
1	¥S	•	•						•		Encertainment	9302028	
1	NX	•			OLD MORTH STATE CLUB THE CHIE				•	-	Entertainment	2305050	
- 1	NX			RYNO JAIOWANIY YE	SIND SHT SULD STATS HTRON GLO			•			Encertainment	0202025	
- (NX	2004-2005 Pues Balance	1 1	SE PINANCIAL OFFR	OIFTIONAIFTE STYMEMION CHIE					leanque d	inemniatretics	OZOZOES	
ı		I			, i		30,955,63	-		!	1		٠
I	NX				STREET BLUE STATE HIROR GLO					•	immuniaties in	0202065	
1	NX) SEA	MBS EXEC.ALLOCL	ER PINAMEIAL OFFR	OLD MORTH STATS CLUB THE CHIE	960507	33,182,90	111	11/24/2004	astrona a	(Bntertainment	OZOCOES	
ł	G/g	l	i I	ERGAL APPAIR EXEC	suxa !	TT209T	00.027,5	ITT	DOOR/6T/TT	bangs a	(Antertalumen	2303020	
1	Aa	co charge a billing proje	NES EXEC.ALLOCT	INVON OF BOARD	chvi	100705	00.000,2	111	11/29/2004	eningsa a	mennikas resina	2302050	
1	Aa	co charge a billing proje	i I	INSTAN OF BOARD	i jenvi	100705	-00.800,2	ITT	11/29/2004	asudica a	Entertainment	2302020	
ı	KM	Occoper 14, 2004 Byent	1	сиком ор воляр	HYAES * VEROCIVEER ITC CHVI	200006	00,000,2	ITT	POGE/8G/TT	esnora a	mensiadiedna)	9302020	
1	1	1	i 1		1		1,308.00	le.	î .	1	ì		
1	Œ	1	1	INGRAN OF BOARD	[civi]	100705	1,308.00	9	0017975004	esudxa z	Entertainmen	2302020	
1		i	1		;		04.68£	Įù.	ſ	l	!		
1	Œ	1	i 1	EMNYF VALVIE EKEC	erxe i	1300233	06.30	İs	14002/22/50	eanqx2 3	Enterteainmen	OZOZOES	
1	Œ	1	1	ERNAL APPAIR EXEC	arxa)	LL500L	05-E01	Ìs	02/51/50041	ಕಾಗಧನ ೨	Entertainmen	2302020	
i		l	1		i	ı	30'888'TE	ĺ.	1	1	i		
i	ws.	ekerge a billlid segmens of	ING. CHAR BENT	EL LINVACIVE OLLE	l cura	869604	30,000,05	١v	04/27/2004	jesudeg a	Encortainoon	2302020	
í	VS.	to charge a billing proje	1	EL RINVICIVE OFFR	loan	REDEUT	-00-000'01	lb	12002/12/20	leaudica a	Entertainmen	02020ES	
·		Dass for 2005-5005 mead	•	EL PERMANCIAL OFFR			30,000,00	•	•	•	Encertament	0202025	
ŧ	Cd			EMANAL APPAIR EXEC	•			•	,		Entertainen	2305050	
		; 		COM CANADA TANGA		1200022	v + 338	., 	+	1			
let	DOGLÂ	эмт тервен знашлоод	T"aumenanavamv l	east speigo	lanuros urum	Zan penni	OH HTTEN	Izaz	leann Bakes	l numer	Cost element	COURT PTGE	i
						,	-, :-	,c	,			_ 12 4445	
7*			·					,	, 	,			

200H

hope information CHAIRPAN OF BOARD...

HOPE RAFE 700162... USD

Cost Elem	Cost Elem. Cost element name Postg Date Par Val.in RC Cost Ctr Vondor Name	Postg Date	Par	Val.in R	c coor cer	Vondor Name	(co object name	AuxAcctAsmat_1	AuxAcctAsunt_ Document Beader Text	Dootlyp	<u> </u>
6202029	6202020 Civic/Politic Antvty 01/15/2004 1 1,642.94 700577	101/15/2004	1 =	1,642.94	[70057]	6202020 Civic/Politic Actory 01,15,2004 1 1,642.54 100577	EXTERNAL AFFAIR EXEC	1		2	
		_	1	1 1,642.94	_		-				
6202020	(Civic/Politic Actyty	103/24/2004	<u>~</u>	1,000.00	703274	Civic/Politic Actoby 03/24/2004 3 1,000.00 703274 VINGINIA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE EXEC - DELIVERY	EXEC - DELIVERY		WA Chamber Golf Classic NH	ž	_
6202020	Cavic/Politic Actvey 03/31/2004 3 1.000.00-[703274	103/31/2004	<u>m</u>	1,000.00	-[703274		EXEC - DELIVERY		to charge a billing proje(5A	€ BA	
6202029	Civic/Politic Activty 03/31/2004 3 1,000.00 703274	103/31/2004	3	1,000.00	103274		EXEC - DELIVERY	WES EXEC.ALLOCE	WHS EXEC.ALLOCALLO charge a Ediling proje(SA	e SA	
	_		3	3 1,000.00	_					_	_
6202029	Civio/Politic Actvty 07/29/2004 7 33.73 700806	107/29/2004	7	33.73	100806		IN EXECUTIVE		_	2	
	_		-	33.72	_		_			_	
6202029		12713/2004	22	25,000.00	72002	ctvic/Politic Actvry 12/13/2004 12 25,000.00 700577 TROARS INFERSON INFITUTE FOR EXTERNAL AFPAIR EXEC WBS EXEC.ALLOCI contribution	HEXTERNAL AFFAIR EXEC	WBS EXEC. ALLOCI	contribution	2	_
	_		17	12 25,000.00	_			_		_	4
, ,			1 =	27,676.67	-						
		***********	t		*********		******************				

HOPE RATE hope information

700102... CHAIRNAN OF BOARD...

us Dollar

+		+	 +		+	+	. 4	+	++	+
Cost Eles	L Cost element name	Postg Date	Per	Val.in RC	Cost Ctz	Vendor Name	CO object name	Aux.acct assgrant_1	Dog. Header Text	מעומסמ
+	-+	+	++		+	+	+	+	+	·
6202050	Civic/Politic Lobby	01/01/2004	1 1	2,500.00	700577	MATIONAL CONSULTING GROUP IN	EKTERNAL AFFAIR EXEX	:	CONSULTING	KE
1*	1	1 1	1 1	2,500.00	l	1	1	1	1	1 1
6202050	Civic/Politic Lobby	[02/06/2004]	2	2,000.00	700577	E L CRUMP JR	EXTERNAL AFFAIR EXEX	wee extappre.alloce	Consulting	KM
5202050	Civic/Politic Lobby	02/25/2004	2	2,000.00	700577	E L CRUMP JR	EXTERNAL APPAIR EXE	WBS EXTAPPRE.ALLOCE	Consulting Fee	KE
1*	1	1	2	4,000.00	l	1	I	1	1	1 1
6202050	Civic/Politic Lobby	03/25/2004	3	2,000.00	700577	E L CRUMP JR	EXTERNAL APPAIR EXE	HBS EXTAFFRS.ALLOCS	Consulting Fee	KE
{*	1	1 1	9	2,000.00	1	I	1	1	1	1 1
1 6202050	Civic/Politic Lobby	04/25/2004	4	3,000.00	700577	IE L CRUMP OR	EXTERNAL AFFAIR EXEC	MBS EXTAFFRS.ALLOCG	Consulting Fee	RE
1*	1	1	4	3,000.00	I	1	1	i	· ·	1 1
6202050	Civic/Politic Labby	[05/18/2004]	ļ 5ļ	2,500.00	700577	WATIONAL CONSULTING GROUP INC	EXTERNAL APPAIR EXEC	:	Commulting Services	I MA
6202050	[Civic/Politic Labby	05/25/2004	[5]	2,000.00	700577	E L CRUMP JR	EXTERNAL AFFAIR EXEC	WBS EXTAFFRE ALLOCS	Consulting Fee	KE
[*	t		=	4,500.00	1	ł	1	1	I	1 1
6202050	Civic/Politic Lobby	06/25/2004	6	2,000.00	700577	E L CHURP JR	EXTERNAL AFFAIR EXEC	WBS EXTAFFRS.ALLOCG	Consulting Fee	RE
i*	1	1 1	6	2,000.00	1	1	1	1	1	1 1
6202050	[Civic/Politic Lobby	12/30/2004	12	17,500.00	700577	NATIONAL CONSULTING GROUP INC	EXTERNAL AFFAIR EXEC	Wes exec. Alloca	CONSULTING SERVICES	IXN I
14	i	i 1	12	17,500.00	ì	1	I	Į.	1	1
+	-+	*	+		+	+	+	+		+
[**	1	1 1	:	34,500.00	1	I	i	1	I .	I I
*	-+	+	+			+		+	+====	·+

NOTE. Cost Element not used in 2005

í
om
•

Billing WBS

A/C Days Hours Authorizer

Date

Note: Using new methodology and new rates effective 01/2	004	<u> Daily</u>	1	<u>Hourly</u>		<u>Total</u>
Aircraft Codes	CCTR/ACTTYPE	Rate		Rate	S	Charges
G = Gulfstream (N600DR)	702050 - AVGS	Assessed & allocated	\$	2,384	\$	2,384
HP = Hawker 2 (N601DR)	702052 - AVHP	Assessed & alocated	\$	1,647	\$	1,647
HR = Hawker 1 (N800DR)	702051 - AVHR	Assessed & alocated	\$	1,468	\$	1,468
HR = Hawker 2 (N802DR)	702056 - AVHN	Assessed & allocated	\$	1,468	\$	1,468
Note: July 04 - used N800DR as model for N802DR						

Destination

		702050 FAVGS	A SECURIOR NECODA SECURIOR NECES	3						
7/25 G	1.00	2.3 HARDY	ALLOC 1	DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION	BOSTON MA BEDFORD					
7/27 G	0.50	2.4 CAPPS	ALLOC 1	DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION	MA/RICHMOND VA					
7/29 G	0.33	0.6 CAPPS	ALLOC 1	MAKE PREPARATIONS FOR CONGRESSMAN RICHARD BURR FUNDRAISER ON AUGUST 12	WILMINGTON NO					
//25 G	1,83	5.3	ALLOC 1	TONDRINGER ON AGGIST 12	***************************************	N/A	\$	12,635.20	\$	12,635.20
	,							•		
7/27 G	0.50	2.1 JOHNSON	ALLOC 3D	WEEKLY DELIVERY TRAVEL	CLEVELAND OH/RICHMOND VA					
1121 6	0,50	2.1 JUNI43UN	ALLOC 3D	MEEUTI DEFINEU! LUMAET	CLEVELAND					
7/29 G	0.33	2.0 JOHNSON	ALLOC 3D	WEEKLY DELIVERY TRAVEL	OH/RICHMOND VA	tronumia u memoratiko kontre ta	ed mercey	neretranscensor	anga gyara	TILVAGE STARTERFEST
7/1 G	£1,00 ±	0.8 CAPPS	ALLOC 3D	BUSINESS TRIP WITH JAY JOHNSON	WASHINGTON	NA WA		11,681.60	\$	11,681.60
	1.83	4.9	ALLOC 3D			IWA	Ψ	11,001.00	4	11,001.00
					WASHINGTOWRICHMO					
7/28 G	0.50	NOSVHOL 8.0	AVIATION.CAVALIER	BUSINESS MEETING	ND VA		_	4 007 00	_	4 007 00
	0.50	0.8	AVIATION.CAVALIER			N/A	\$	1,907.20	\$	1,907.20
					HOUSTON					
7/16 G	1.00	4.8 DOSWELL	CNGP	E&P INTERN EVENT	TX/RICHMOND VA					
7/20 G	0.50	1.3 FARRELL	CNGP	DOMINION GOLF INVITATIONAL & STAFF MEETING	CLARKSBURG WVA RICHMOND/NO/HOUSTO	,				
7/20 G	0.50	3.2 RADTKE	CNGP	DOMINION GOLF INVITATIONAL & STAFF MEETING	NTX	,				
7/21 G	1,00	2.3 RADTKE	CNGP	DOMINION GOLF INVITATIONAL & STAFF MEETING	RICHMOND VA					
	3.00	11.6	CNGP			N/A	\$	27,654.40	\$	27,654.40
7/5 G	1.00	7.4 KOONCE	DCOVE	STATOIL	STAVANGER NO					
7/6 G	2.00	0.6 KOONCE	DCOVE	STATOIL	OSLO NO					
7/8 G	1.00	1.8 KOONCE	DCOVE	STATOIL	TROMSO NO					
7/9 G	1.00	1.6 KOONCE	DCOVE	STATOIL	OSLO NO					
7/10 G	1.00 6.00	7.9 KOONCE 19.1	DCOVE DCOVE	STATOIL	RICHMOND VA	N/A	\$	45,534,40	\$	45,534,40
	סימים	19.1	DCCVE			IVA	φ	-0,004,40	Ψ	10,003.10
					PROVIDENCE					
7/12 G	1.00	1.4 MCGETTRICK	DEIBD	US GEN DUE DILIGENCE	RI/BOSTON MA					
7/13 G	1.00	1.3 MCGETTRICK	DEIBD	US GEN DUE DILIGENCE	RICHMOND VA	NIZA	s	6,436,80	\$	6,436,80
	2.00	2.7	DEIBD			N/A	ð	0,450.00	4	0,430.00
					GREEN BAY					
7/26 G	0.50	3.4 MCGETTRICK	DEK	KEWAUNEE INTEGRATION TEAM	WURICHMOND VA		_	0.400.05		0.40#.00
	0.50	3.4	DEK			N/A	\$	8,105.60	\$	8,105.60

Note

- 7. 8100031
 - a. Detail of DRS billing true-up for 2004 and Jan May 2005.
 - i. See attachment 7(2004) and 7(2005).
- 8. What are 62_ cost elements?
 - a. 62_cost elements are 'Other Income / Expense accounts used to facilitate GAAP reporting.
- 9. What are 83_ cost elements?
 - a. 83_ cost elements are used to settle costs accumulated in a project to the appropriate cost object. Virginia Power uses interim projects that settle to WIRES.CUSTSVC.HOPE.
- 10. What are 84_ cost elements?
 - a. 84_cost elements are used for affiliated company surcharges that represent fixed/overhead charges. Virginia Power is required to be compensated at full cost and therefore applies a surcharge to projects to bill appropriately.
- 11. DRS Deliver Segment why substantial difference is % of cost allocated to Hope for exec/admin?

6/04 4.60% 9/04 6.60% 2/05 4.97%

The Gas Distribution Executive, Tom Wester, retired in September 2004. There was an increase in expenses for the month billed on EXEC.ALLOC3B on the true-up cost element. EXEC.ALLOC3B is the executive gas delivery allocator that billed East Ohio Gas 68.9%, Peoples Natural Gas 21.51% and Hope Gas 9.59% in September.

- 12. Copy of J-19 spreadsheet?
 - a. Overnight to J. Gregorini 7/11/05
- 13. Meaning of "DNC"?
 - a. Dominion Nuclear Connecticut

Layout HOPE RATE hope information
Cost Center 700102... CHAIRMAN OF BOARD...

Report currency USD US Dollar

 -		Cost element name	,	Peri	Val.in RC Cost Ct:	Vend Name	CO object name	AuxAcctAs1 Document Header Text	: +
		DRS Billing True-U		7	31,758.02-[704001	1	ELEC DISTRIB EXEC	A01D9720010101DRS Exec Tru	up]
	8100031	DRS Billing True-T	7p 07/31/2004	7	43,157.41- 704002	i	Regulation Exec	[A01D9720010101DRS Exac Tru	o Up
	B100031	DRS Billing True-T	7p 07/31/2004	7	47,387.80-[704003	;	PLEC TRANSITION EXEC	[A01DS720010101DRS Exec Tru	o Up
	8100031	DRS Billing True-V	[p 07/31/2004	7	97,435.91- 704004	1	FIN EXEC DELIVERY	A01D6720010101DRS Exec Tru	o Vol
	8100031	DRS Billing True-U	p 07/31/2004	7	194,406.39- 704062	1	Gas & Elec Del Exec	A01DS720010101DRS Exec Tru	e Up
	B100031	DRS Billing True-U	p 07/31/2004	7	67,221.90- 704085	1	Business Plang Exec	A01DS720010101DRS Exac Tru	e Up
•		1	1 1	7	2,397,527.20-	1	I	1	1
	8100031	DRS Billing True-L	p[08/31/2004]	8	118,070.43-[700102	1	CHAIRMAN OF BOARD	A01DS720010101DRS Exce Tru-	s Vpļ
	8100031	DRS Billing True-L	p[08/31/2004]	В	31,325.62- 700142	ł	PIN ANAL & PLAN-EXEC	A01DS720010101DRS Exec True	פט פ
	8100031	DRS Billing True-L	p[0B/31/2004]	8	64,561.05-[700205	ł	GAS DISTR EXEC	A0108720010101DRS Exec Tru	s Up
	8100031	DRS Billing True-L	p 08/31/2004	8 [21,653.81- 700228	1	DRS RETAIL EXEC	A01DS72001010IDRS Exec Tru-	up)
	8100031	DRS Billing True-L	p 08/31/2004	8	7,217.94- 700228	i	ORS RETAIL EXEC	A01DS720010101DRS Exec True	פט פ
	8100031	DRS Billing True-L	p[08/31/2004]	8	25,744.06-[700460	F	AUDIT SVCS EXEC	A01DS720010101DRS Exec True	upi
	8100033	DRS Billing True-T	p 08/31/2004	8 [28,967.31- 700575	1	TAX EXECUTIVE	A01DS72001010DRS Exec True	qu e
	8100031	DRS Billing True-t	p 08/31/2004	8 [44,210.60- 700577	1	EXTERNAL AFFAIR EXEC	A01DE7200101DES Exec True	o Upį
	8100033	DRS Billing True-L	p[08/31/2004]	8	24.549.89 700806	1	HR EXECUTIVE	A01DS720010101DRS Exec True	e Up
	8100031	DRS Billing True-L	p[08/31/2004]	8 !	5,716.36- 700832	1	TREASURY EXECUTIVE	A01D37200101DRS Exec True	ן עטיני
	8100031	DRS Billing True-L	p[08/31/2004]	в	50,190.59- 700888	1	CHIEF ACTO OFFICER	AULDS720010101DRS Exec True	a Up
	8100031	DRS Billing True-L	p 08/31/2004	8	54,715.27-[700890	I	Chief Admin Officer	* · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	8100031	DRS Billing True-U	p[08/31/2004]	8	60,024.91- 701720	1	CHIEF INTO OFFICER	A01DS720010101DRS Exec True	a Upj
	8200031	DRS Billing True-U	p[08/31/2004]	8 (19,592.33- 702044	!	SHARED SERVICES EXEC	[A01DS720010101DRS Exec True	a Up
	6100031	DRS Billing True-t	mp[08/31/2004]	8	4,781.25- 703189	į	Professional Develop	A01DS720010101DRS Exec Tru	ı Vəj
	8100031	DRS Billing True-t	p 08/31/2004	8	59,052.80- 703233	I	LEGAL SERVICES EXEC	A01D8720010101DRS Exec Tru	e Upj
	8100031	DRS Billing True-U	p 08/31/2004	8	208,024.12- 703274	1	EXEC - DELIVERY	A01D8720010101DRS Exec True	• Vpj
	8100031	DRS Billing True-V	p[08/31/2004]	В	34,149.78- 703281	1	CORP SECRETARY EXEC	A01DS720010101DRS Exec True	• Up!
	8100031	DRS Billing True-U	08/31/2004 08/31/2004	8	177,183.44- 703498	1	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFR	A01DS720010101DRS Exec True	. Up
	8100031	DRS Billing True-U	p[08/31/2004]	В	79,023.50- 704000	1	DRS Finl Hot Exec	•	
	8100031	DRS Billing True-U	p[08/31/2004]	В	13,335.50- 704001	1	BLEC DISTRIB EXEC	A01D8720010101DRS Exec True	o Vpj
	8100031	DRS Billing True-L	D[08/31/2004]	8	320,249.90- 704002	1	Regulation Exec	A01DS720010101DRS Exec True	
	8100031	DRS Billing True-U	p 08/31/2004[8 (22,621.62- 704093	1	ELEC TRANSITION EXEC		
	8100031	DRS Billing True-U	D 08/31/2004	8	60,874.73- 704004	1	PIN EXEC DELIVERY	A01DS720010101DRS Exec True	e Up
	8100031	DRS Billing True-L	D 08/31/2004[8 [93,990.37- 704062	1	Oas & Elec Del Exec	A01D5720010101DRS Exce Tru	· Up
	8100031	DRS Hilling True-L	D 08/31/2004	8	71,313.22- 704085	1	Business Plang Exec	A01DS720010101DRS Exec True	e Up
		1	1 1	8	1,652,040.62-	1	1	1	1
	8100031	DRS Billing True-U	p 09/30/2004	9	172,026.72- 700102	1	CHAIFHAN OF BOARD	A01D9720010101DRS Exec True	
		DRS Billing True-V		9	21,736.05- 700142	1	PIN ANAL & PLAN-EXEC	•	
		DRS Billing True-V		91	449,737.41-1700205	1		A01DS720010101DRS Exec True	
		DRS Billing True-U		9	20,058.21- 700228	1	•	A01DS720010101DRS Exac True	-,
		DRS Billing True-t		91		1	•	A01DS720010101DRS Exec Tru	
		DRS Billing True-U		9		I	•	A01DS720010101DRS Exec True	- •
		DRS Billing True-U		9		1	TAX EXECUTIVE	A01DS720010101DRS Exec True	- •
		DRS Rilling True-U	- • • • •	9	99,813.04- 700577	l	(EXTERNAL APPAIR EXEC		- •
		DRS Billing True-U		9		I	HR EXECUTIVE	A01D8720010101DRS Exec True	
		DRS Billing True-U		9	32,722.73- 700832	I	TREASURY EXECUTIVE	A01DS720010101DRS Exec True	-,
		DRS Billing True-U		9	33,093.79- 700686	1	CHIEF ACTO OFFICER	A01DS7Z0010101DRS Exec True	- (
		DRS Billing True-U		9	35,477.96- 700890	i	Chief Admin Officer	•	
		DRS Billing True-U		9 [i	CHIEF INFO OFFICER	A01D5720010101DRS Exce True	- •
		DRS Billing True-U		9		1	SHARED SERVICES EXEC	•	- •
		DRS Billing True-U		9	1,317.92-703189	1	Professional Develop	•	- •
		DRS Billing True-U		9	60,395.05- 703233	i	LEGAL SERVICES EXEC	•	- •
		DRS Billing True-U		9 [82,840.99-[703274	1	•	[A01D9720010101DRS Exec True	
		DRS Billing True-U		9	•	į	CORP SECRETARY EXEC	•	
		DRS Billing True-U		9	165,074.64- 703498	1	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFR	A01DS720010101DRS Exec True	lqV e
		DRS Billing True-U		9	72,254.80- 704000	1	DRS Finl Hgt Exec	A01D\$720010101DRS Exec True	
	8100031	DRS Billing True-U	p[09/30/2004]	9	15,235.74- 704001	1	ELEC DISTRIB EXEC	A01DS720010101DRS Exec True	up

ţ.

Layout HOPE RATE hope information
Cost Canter 700102... CHAIRHAN OF BOARD...

Report currency USD US Dollar

		•		t name		+-				CO object name		Document Header Text		 +
8:	100031	DRS	Billing	True-Up	09/30/2004	9	27,214.29- 70	24003		ELEC TRANSITION EXEC	!	A01D9720010101DR9 Exe	ic True	Up
8:	100031	DRS	Billing	Trus-Up	09/30/2004	9	70,263.71-170	34004		FIN EXEC DELIVERY		A01D9720010101DR9 Exe	ic Trus	Up
8	100031	DRS	Billing	True-Up	09/30/2004	9	118,779.15- 70	04062		Gas & Elec Del Exec		A01027200101010RS Exe	ic Trus	VΡ
8	100031	DRS	Billing	True-Up	09/30/2004	9	71,929.41- 70	34085		Business Plang Exec		A01087200101010RS Exe	c True	υp
,		1			i I	9	1,785,768.51-			!		i		- 1
8	100031	DR8	Billing	True-Up	10/31/2004	10	49,382.28 70	00102	i	CHAIRMAN OF BOARD		A01DS720010101DRS Exe	ic True	υp
81	100031	DRS	Billing	True-Up	10/31/2004	10	34,914.88- 70	00142		FIN ANAL & PLAN-EXEC		A01DS720010101DRS Exc	c True	υp
B:	100031	DRS	Billing	True-Up	10/31/2004	10	62,289.42- 70	10205		GAS DISTR EXEC		A01DS720010101DRS Exe	e True	$\mathfrak{v}_{P}[$
8	100031	DRS	Billing	True-Up	10/31/2004	10	24,592.62-170	00228		DRS RETAIL EXEC		A01D3720010101DRS Exe	IO TINO	up!
8:	100031	DRS	Billing	True-Up	10/31/2004	10	8,197.54- 70	00228		DRS RETAIL EXEC		A010S720010101DRS Exc	O True	Vp[
8:	100031	DRG	ailling	True-Up	10/31/2004	10	23,428.02-170	00460		AUDIT SVCS EXEC		A01DS720010101DRS Exe	c True	Upl
8	100031	DRS	Billing	True-Up	10/31/2004	10	25,701.13-170	00575		TAX EXECUTIVE		A01D5720010101DRS Exe	e True	Upi
8:	100031	DRS	Billing	True-Up	10/31/2004	10	106,624.95-170	00577		EXTERNAL AFFAIR EXEC		A01D5720010101DRS Exa	o True	Upi
8:					10/31/2004		21,315.67-170	00806		HR EXECUTIVE		A01DS720010101DRS Exc	e True	Uρ
8:	100031	DRS	Billing	True-Up	10/31/2004	101	12,217.90- 70	30832		TREASURY EXECUTIVE		A01DS720010101DRS Exe	C True	Up
					10/31/2004		88,542.38-[70			CHIEF ACTO OFFICER		A01D8720010101DR8 Exc	c True	Upl
81					10/31/2004	-	31,891.21- 70			Chief Admin Officer		A01D5720010101DR5 Exc		- 1
					10/31/2004		29,687.90- 70			CHIEF INFO OFFICER		A01DS720010101DRS Exc		
					10/31/2004		16,220.77- 70			SHARED SERVICES EXEC		A01DS720010101DRS Exe		
					10/31/2004		12,670.43-170			Professional Develop		A01DS720010101DRS Exe	c True	Up
					10/31/2004		46,918.95- 70			LEGAL SERVICES EXEC		A01DS720010101DRS Exc	c True	Upl
83					10/31/2004		62.540.13-[70			EXEC - DELIVERY		A01DS720010101DRS Exc	c True	Upl
					10/31/2004		20,699.33- 70			CORP SECRETARY EXEC		A01D8720010101DR8 Exe		
					10/31/2004		198,965.90- 70			CHIEF PINANCIAL OFFR		A01D3720010101DRS Exc	e Trus	vol
-					10/31/2004		80,719.76-170			DRS Finl Mgt Exec		A01D3720010101DRS Exe		- •
					10/31/2004		17,804.26- 70			ELEC DISTRIB EXEC		A01D5720010101DRS Exe		٠.
-					10/31/2004		44,469.79-170			Reculation Exec		A01DS720010101DRS Exe		
	-				10/31/2004		27,958.74- 70		'	ELEC TRANSITION EXEC		A01D8720010101DRS Exe		- •
					10/31/2004		48.608.89-170	-		PIN EXEC DELIVERY.		A01087200101010RS Exe		
					10/31/2004	-	118.123.81-(70			Gas & Elec Del Exec		A01DS720010101DRS Ex		
					10/31/2004	-	68,165.84- 70			Business Flang Exec		A01D5720010101DRS Exe		
	100031		DILLING	TT-GC-ODI		10	1,183,867.94~	1		postness right meet		, AUTHOR 200 TO TATE WATER		1
	100031	npa:	01111	Owner-The	 11/30/2004		69,276.38-[70	,		CHAIRNAN OF BOARD		: A01DS720010101DRS Еже	er Trite	uni
					11/30/2004		16,256.99- 70			FIN ANAL & PLAN-EXEC		A0105720010101DRS Exe		- ,
	,				11/30/2004		20,302.11- 70			GAS DISTR EXEC		A01DS720010101DRS Exc		
	-				11/30/2004		20,393.88-170			DRS RETAIL EXEC		A01DS720010101DRS Exc		
	,				11/30/2004		6,797.96- 70			DRS RETAIL EXEC		A01D5720010101DRS Exc		
-												A01DS720010101DRS Exe		
					11/30/2004 11/30/2004	-	27,709.73-170 33,095.88-170			AUDIT SVCS EXEC		A01DS720010101DRS Exe		- 1
					11/30/2004 11/30/2004		205.028.65-[70		,	EXTERNAL AFFAIR EXEC		AOIDS720010101DRS Exe		-
-					11/30/2004 11/30/2004	-	43,075.14-[70			HR EXECUTIVE		A01DS720010101DRS EXE A01DS720010101DRS EX		- •
	,				11/30/2004		21,956,85-[70			TREASURY EXECUTIVE		A01DS720010101DRS Exc		- •
	•				11/30/2004		72,330.74-[70		'	CHIEF ACTS OFFICER		A01DS720010101DRS Exc		
	,				11/30/2004	•	46,654.10- 70		'	Chief Admin Officer		A01DS720010101DRS Exe		
	•				11/30/2004		61,281.22- 70		'	CHIEF INPO OPPICER		A01D5720010101DRB Exc		
					11/30/2004		27,062.41-170			SHARED SERVICES EXEC		A01D5720010101DRS Exe		
					•		-	,				A01D5720010101DRS Exe		
	,				11/30/2004		3,725.79-[70	•	1	Professional Develop		A01057200101010RS Exe A0105720010101DRS Exe		
	,				11/30/2004		66,540.19-[70			LEGAL SERVICES EXEC				- ,
					11/30/2004		111,656.30- 70			EXEC - DELIVERY		A01DS720010101DRS Exc		
					11/30/2004[•	23,037.63-[70	,		CORP SECRETARY EXEC		A01D9720010101DRS Exc		٠,
				,	11/30/2004	•	120,556.27-[70			CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFR		A01DS720010101DRS Exe		
	-			- •	11/30/2004	•	84,475.48-170	•		DRS Finl Mgt Exec		A0105720010101DRS Exe		
					11/30/2004	•	49,321,77-[70	-		ELEC DISTRIB EXEC		A01D6728810101DR6 Exe		
81	100031 {	DRS I	31111ng	True-Up	11/30/2004	11	44,061.47- 70	4002		Regulation Exec	1	A01D5720010101DRS Exe	o True	υp
	100031				11/30/2004		49,011.07-70			ELEC TRANSITION EXEC				

Hope Gas, Inc., d/b/a Dominion Hope Case No. 05-0304-G-42T

DRS Services Rendered to Dominion Hope Gas, Inc., Calendar Year 2004 (information copied from CAD J-5)

Associated	Company	Charges
-------------------	---------	---------

Customer Service	2,382,243	
Gas Supply	11,399	
Facilities	3,937	
Information Technology	104,632	
Subtotal	2,502,211	

DRS Direct Charges

Accounting Services	337,272
Aviation Costs	1,320
Corp Communications	34,264
Corporate Planning	101,713
Corporate Secretary	23,527
Customer Service	71,842
Emp Benefits/Pension	6,494
Environmental	33,151
Ext Affairs & Policy	6,891
Facilities	41,447
General Services	465,606
HR/Employee Relations	170,092
Information Technology	383,139
Legal	317,872
Procurement	32,054
Risk Management	34,179
Security	1,967
Тах	87,238
Treasury	133,697
Subtotal	2,283,765

DRS Delivery Segment Charges

122,538
16,467
22,382
77,205
421,903
31,140
9,538
900,622
186,736
<u> 15,971</u>
1,804,502

DRS Corporate Allocated Charges

Accounting Services	95,628
Accounts Payable	30,897
Auditing	45,841
Aviation Costs	80,820
Business Planning	27,037
Corp Communications	81,540
Corporate Planning	4,125
Customer Service	155,004
Emp Benefits/Pension	36,710
Energy Marketing	39,085
Environmental	10,381
Executive/Admin	220,021
Ext Affairs & Policy	41,928
Facilities	22,261
Fleet Mgt	45,820
General Services	43,149
HR/Employee Relations	226,701
Information Technology	1,364,936
Legal	32,608
Medical	6,950
Other Expense	(107,441
Payroll	43,130
Procurement	19,676
Risk Management	6,034
Security	69,584
Software Pooling	22,912
Tax	50,754
Travel Services	15,050
Treasury	19,991
Subtotal	2,751,132

Intercompany Interest Expense

Interest	21,885
Subtotal	21,885
TOTAL BILL	9,363,495

Exhibit B

Gas Line Repair/Replacement Program Service Agreement

This Agreement is made as of this <u>11th</u>day of March 1999, by and between CNG Products and Services, Inc. (doing business as "Hope Energy"), a Delaware Corporation, with its principal offices at One Chatham Center, Pittsburgh, PA 15219 (hereinafter referred to as "CNGPS") and Hope Gas, Inc., a West Virginia Corporation, with its principal offices at P.O. Box 2868, Clarksburg, WV 26301 (hereinafter referred to as "Hope").

CNGPS requests and Hope agrees to provide services, upon the terms and conditions hereinafter provided, which CNGPS will require in order to conduct CNGPS' Gas Line Repair/Replacement Program (hereinafter referred to as "GLRP") on the Hope system.

Accordingly, in consideration of the mutual promises herein contained, CNGPS and Hope agree as follows:

ARTICLE I Hope Services Provided to CNGPS

- A. Repair/Replacement Services: Hope agrees to provide underground gas line repair and replacement services for CNGPS customers covered under the GLRP in order to restore such covered customer-owned gas lines to full and safe operating condition. Hope shall provide basic site cleanup services to the affected area. Cleanup shall include back filling ditches, removal of material/debris, and reseeding of grass where necessary. Hope agrees to commence repair/replacement services within twenty-four (24) hours of verification of the gas line leak condition and to complete such services as soon as practicable. Hope may provide gas line repair or replacement services with its own qualified personnel or it may, after prior consultation with CNGPS, secure the services of such qualified third party contractors as Hope, in its judgment, may deem necessary or appropriate.
- B. <u>Billing/Payment Services</u>: Hope agrees to provide customer billing, payment processing, and related administrative/customer services using Hope's CAMP information system for CNGPS customers covered under the GLRP. Hope will provide CNGPS direct, realtime, on-line access to Hope's CAMP system in connection with the GLRP.

ARTICLE II Reimbursement For Services Provided

A. Services Provided at Cost: Hope shall render monthly invoice statements to CNGPS for GLRP repair/replacement services and billing/payment processing services provided by Hope in the manner set forth in Article I. Each monthly invoice statement will be provided by Hope to CNGPS no later than thirty (30) days from the end of a given billing month. The monthly invoice statements for gas line repair/replacement services will include customer account data and actual job cost data.

CNGPS shall make payment hereunder upon receipt of Hope monthly invoice statements. All services rendered hereunder shall be provided at cost. The cost of rendering such services shall include:

- (1) a portion of the salaries and wages of Hope employees determined according to the time devoted by such employees to the performance of services hereunder for CNGPS;
- (2) the cost of Hope employees' benefits, payroll taxes and compensated absences attributable to salaries and wages directly billed under (1) above;
- (3) all other out-of-pocket operating costs, including expenses for transportation tolls, and other expenses incurred by Hope or its employees in connection with the performance of services under this Agreement.
- (4) the actual costs of materials and supplies furnished by Hope in connection with the performance of services under this Agreement.
- (5) administrative and general costs attributable to services performed under this Agreement (including reasonable amounts for general office maintenance and depreciation, amortization, return and related taxes on Hope's general plant investment), determined in accordance with Hope's policies and procedures; and
- (6) the actual cost incurred by Hope in procuring third-party contractors to provide replacement and replacement services in accordance with Article I.
- B. Payment for Repair/Replacement and Billing/Payment Processing Services: CNGPS agrees to pay Hope the sum of \$500. See as reimbursement for the successful completion of each GLRP job. The payment amount can be adjusted by mutual agreement during the first six months to reflect actual incurred costs. Thereafter, the payment amount shall be adjusted annually at year end for application during the forthcoming calendar year. The payment amount for each forthcoming year will be equal to Hope's actual average job cost experience for the prior year and will be made in conjunction with the annual reconciliation process set forth in Article III.

CNGPS will not reimburse Hope for any work not listed in the GLRP coverage guidelines.

CNGPS shall also pay Hope Eight Cents (\$0.08) per bill as reimbursement for billing/payment processing services.

ARTICLE III Annual Reconciliation

Actual GLRP payment and cost experience shall be subject to an annual, year-end reconciliation to be performed by CNGPS. In the event of CNGPS underpayment, CNGPS will remit additional funds to Hope to the extent Hope's actual annual GLRP job costs exceed CNGPS' actual annual payments to Hope. In the event of CNGPS overpayment, Hope will remit funds to CNGPS to the extent CNGPS' actual annual payments to Hope exceed Hope's actual annual GLRP job costs.

ARTICLE IV GLRP Customer Information

Hope agrees that CNGPS will have access to any customer account information in accordance with GLRP customers' prior authorization regarding the release of account information.

Hope agrees to notify CNGPS as soon as possible of any preexisting customer line leak conditions for new sign-ups during the waiting period. Hope also agrees to document, maintain and provide to CNGPS, upon request, and in accordance with GLRP customers' prior authorizations regarding the release of account information, customer gas line inspection records in order to facilitate CNGPS' identification and verification of preexisting gas line conditions.

ARTICLE V Term of Agreement

This Agreement shall have an initial term of ore (1) years, after which period it shall renew automatically for successive additional terms of ONE (1) years unless either party shall provide 60 days' written notice to the other of its intention not to continue the Agreement; provided, however, that this Agreement shall be subject to termination or modification at any time to the extent that its performance may conflict with the provisions of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, as amended, or any rule, regulation or order of the Securities and Exchange Commission adopted or promulgated prior or subsequent to the making of this Agreement; and provided, further, that this Agreement shall be subject to the approval of any state or federal regulatory body or agency, the approval of which is, by the laws of said state or of the United States, a legal prerequisite to the execution, acceptance or performance of this Agreement

ARTICLE VI **Assignment**

Either party may, without relieving itself of its obligations under this Agreement, assign any of its rights hereunder to a person with which it is affiliated, but otherwise no assignment of this Agreement or any of the rights or obligations hereunder shall be made unless there first shall have been obtained in writing the consent thereto of the other party.

ARTICLE VII **Entire Agreement**

This Agreement represents the entire Agreement of the parties hereto and supersedes all prior negotiations, representations or agreements, either oral or written.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Agreement as of the day and year first written above.

Vice President

CNG PRODUCTS AND SERVICES, INC.

Vice President

HOPE GAS, INC.

Secretary

FOCUSED MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS AUDIT

OF

THE PEOPLES NATURAL GAS COMPANY

d/b/a

DOMINION PEOPLES

PREPARED BY THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
BUREAU OF AUDITS
MANAGEMENT AUDIT DIVISION
ISSUED JANUARY 2003

Findings and Conclusions

Our examination of Affiliated Relationships and Transactions focused on a review of the cost allocation methodology; compliance with existing cost allocation policies, practices, and procedures; verification of direct costs; inter-company billings; and the roles and responsibilities of employees. Based on our review, the Company should initiate or devote additional efforts to improving the efficiency and/or effectiveness of its affiliated relationships and transactions by addressing the following:

1. Dominion Peoples does not consistently adhere to the billing and payment terms established in its affiliated interest agreements.

Dominion Peoples is not consistently adhering to the terms in three of its affiliated interest agreements which require that it bill each affiliate on a monthly basis for expenses incurred, and accordingly, payment would be due upon receipt. We identified three specific examples of delayed billing and payments. First, Dominion Peoples billed Dominion Retail a rental adjustment of \$16,888 in June 2002, for additional space that it occupied but was not billed for during the months of December 2000 to May 2002. This billing adjustment was not issued until after Dominion Retail left the premises. Payment terms were "net due last day of month" (or June 30, 2002), and no interest charges for the billing delay were recorded on the invoice. Also in June 2002, Dominion Peoples billed Dominion Telecom \$474,327 for rent owed for the space it occupied from October 2000 to June 2002. Although the rent invoice to Dominion Telecom included a charge of \$19,537 for interest, Dominion Peoples granted payment terms of net 60 days (or August 27, 2002) even though the invoice was already issued late.

Another similar delay in billing occurred in April 2002, when Dominion Peoples issued Dominion Products and Services an invoice for \$82,642 to recover billing and collection fees it earned for the following periods:

- December 2000.
- June 2001 through December 2001.
- January 2002 through March 2002.

The fees were earned because Dominion Peoples is allowed to charge \$0.15 per bill for including a monthly surcharge for the Gas Line Replacement Program on Dominion Peoples' customer's bills. The invoice issued in April 2002, included payment terms of "net due at the end of the month" (or April 30, 2002) and again no interest charges for the delayed billing were charged on the invoice.

Dominion Peoples attributed the delayed billings to the effects of corporate downsizing and centralization of both the Property Management and Accounting

functions. Each incident of a delay in billing by Dominion Peoples and/or a receipt of a late payment from an affiliate adversely affect Dominion Peoples' cash flow.

In order to eliminate the appearance of cross-subsidization of a non-regulated affiliate, Dominion Peoples should consider charging interest when it does not bill affiliates on time or receives a late payment. Any assessment made by Dominion Peoples on amounts owned by an affiliate should be sufficient to fully cover its increased cost of borrowing, or cost of capital encounter. Although a policy to assess interest on delayed billings and/or late payments is not included in Dominion Peoples affiliated interest agreements; in the future, Dominion Peoples (as the regulated entity) should consider applying interest to delayed billings to affiliates, even when it is at fault, as a method to make itself whole.

2. There has been a significant increase in the funds borrowed by Dominion Peoples from the Corporate Money Pool.

Funds borrowed by Dominion Peoples from the Corporate Money Pool have increased from approximately \$15 million as of March 31, 1999 to approximately \$112 million as of June 30, 2002. A cash flow analysis for this period shows that part of the reason for this increase is the fact that Dominion Peoples financed approximately \$90 million in capital projects and retired approximately \$13 million in long-term debt with Corporate Money Pool funds. The funds generated by ongoing operations were not sufficient to meet these requirements, support normal obligations and pay approximately \$125 million in dividends to the parent corporation during this period.

A Corporate Money Pool is primarily established so that a subsidiary can invest excess funds or meet short-term obligations without using a bank. It is not intended to finance capital projects for long periods of time or to be used to retire a significant amount of long-term debt. However, as the interest rate charged by the Corporate Money Pool has been reasonable over the last several years, Dominion Peoples did not refinance capital projects and bond retirements into either long-term debt or increase its equity during the last three years. The interest rate charged by the Corporate Money Pool in June 2002, was approximately two percent.

The low interest rates existing during the second half of 2002 presented an excellent opportunity for Dominion Peoples to reduce its debt owed to the Corporate Money Pool both by increasing cash flow and establishing long-term financing. Allowing the debt owed to the Corporate Money Pool to increase from the present level will inevitably result in higher interest expense or dividend payments in the future.

Management indicated that Dominion Peoples does face some challenges in trying to increase cash flow but we noted some opportunities. For example, it seems that a

- 1. Agreement for Customer Support and Call Center Services. The Agreement dated May 9, 2000 between AWR and Pennsylvania-American is incorporated herein by reference.
- 2. Amendment. (a) In addition to Section 4 Paragraph 4.1 of the Agreement, Paragraph 4.1.1 is incorporated herein as follows:

4.1.1 <u>Billing and Collection Fee</u>. The Fee for billing and collection services rendered by Pennsylvania-American as set forth in Paragraph 5.1.3 shall be based on a structured sliding scale fee as follows:

Number of Customers	Rate
1 - 2,500	\$0.55 per customer bill
2,501 - 5,000	\$0.45 per customer bill
5,001 - 10,000	\$0.30 per customer bill
10,001 - 15,000	\$0.20 per customer bill
15,001 +	\$0.10 per customer bill

The per customer sliding scale fee shall be adjusted, by mutual agreement of the parties, in direct proportion to changes in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor (the "Consumer Price Index") from one calendar year to the next for each successive year of the Agreement.

(b) Section 5 Paragraph 5.1.3 of the Agreement, is hereby deleted, in its entirety, and the following substituted therefore:

- 5.1.3 <u>Billing and Collection Services Included</u>. PennsylvaniaAmerican shall be responsible for the preparation, distribution and collection of any bills and invoices for services rendered to customer who have enrolled in the Water Line Protection

 Program and have requested that those charges be included on their regular monthly or bimonthly water bill. AWR shall be responsible for the collection and distribution of invoices and bills paid by the customer by all other means except as provided by the above.
- (d) Section 7 Paragraph 7.4 of the Agreement, is hereby deleted, in its entirety, and the following substituted therefore:
- 7.4 Administration. AWR shall be responsible for coordinating all administrative activities for the Program and its customers including, but not limited to, enrollments, billings s provided for in Section 5 Paragraph 5.1.3, accounting, marketing, financial analysis and reporting. AWR shall promptly notify Pennsylvania-American of customer enrollments in the Program, including any changes in enrollment status.
- 3. Balance of Agreement. All other terms and conditions of the Agreement shall be and remain in effect, and the Agreement shall only be amended as set forth in this Amendment.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Amendment to the Agreement for Customer Support and Call Center Services between American Water Resources, Inc. and Pennsylvania-American Water Company to be executed on the day and year first above written.

3.3.3 Transition Services Following Termination Without Cause - Upon termination of the Agreement without cause, Pennsylvania-American shall continue to provide services to AWR on a day-to-day basis, at AWR's request, for a period of not less than sixty (60) days during AWR's transition to another service provider. Such transition services shall be provided under and subject to the same terms and provisions of its Agreement, including compensation.

SECTION 4. Compensation.

4.1 Fee. The Fee paid to Pennsylvania-American by AWR for Services rendered pursuant to this Agreement shall be equal to one hundred and fifteen (115%) percent of the total expenses incurred by Pennsylvania-American in providing the Services, inclusive of labor, materials and overheads:

Fee = Total Expenses x 115%

The Fee for Call Center services rendered during the first three (3) months of the initial term of this Agreement shall be Five Dollars and Sixty-One Cents (\$5.61) per call received or made by Pennsylvania-American in connection with the Program, which Fee is based on Total Expenses per call of Four Dollars and Eighty-Eight Cents (\$4.88). At the end of the first three (3) months of this Agreement, the per-call Fee for future Call Center services shall be adjusted by mutual consent of the parties to reflect the actual costs experienced during the three (3) month period. At the end of the first year of the Agreement, and at one year intervals thereafter, the per-call Fee for future Call Center services shall be adjusted by mutual agreement of the parties to reflect the actual costs experienced during the prior one year period and also adjusted in direct proportion to changes in the Consumer

Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States

Department of Labor (the "Consumer Price Index") from one calendar year to the next for each successive year of the Agreement, using 2000 as the base year.

4.2 Reporting and Payments.

- 4.2.1 Pennsylvania-American shall maintain detailed records of (i) the number of telephone calls received by and made to the Call Center for the Program pursuant to this Agreement, and (ii) all other expenses incurred, inclusive of labor, materials and overhead expenses, in providing services to AWR. Pennsylvania-American will make such detailed records available for AWR's periodic review upon request by AWR.
- 4.2.2 Pennsylvania-American shall invoice AWR monthly or quarterly, at Pennsylvania-American's discretion, for the Fee for services on or about the tenth business day of each billing period during the term of this Agreement. The invoice shall detail the services provided and the expenses incurred, including labor, materials and overhead. AWR shall pay such Fee to Pennsylvania-American within thirty (30) days of receiving the invoice.

SECTION 5. Scope of Services.

- 5.1 Pennsylvania-American agrees that it shall provide the following customer support and Call Center services for the Program in accordance with the terms and provisions of this Agreement:
- 5.1.1 <u>Distribution of Promotional Materials</u>. Pennsylvania-American shall manage and direct the distribution of informational and promotional materials regarding the Program to its customers. Such materials shall be developed by AWR and provided to Pennsylvania-American in

Hope Gas, Inc., d/b/a Dominion Hope Case No. 05-0304-G-42T

Calculation of Revenue Increase from GLRP Billing

Line		
1	Number of Hope customers billed for GLRP	8,147
2	Annual number of bills	97,764
3	Current Hope charge per bill	\$ 80.0
4	Current Hope revenue for GLRP	\$ 7,821
5	Recommended charge per bill	\$ 0.32
6	Recommended revenue from GLRP	\$ 31,284
7	Addition to going level revenue	\$ 23,463

Notes: Line 1 from CAD J-51

Line 2: line 1 x 12

Line 3: Sch. SJR-18

Line 4: line 2 x line 3

Line 5: see testimony

Line 6: line 2 x line 5

Line 7: line 6 - line 4

BEFORE THE MAINE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Re: Consumers Maine Water Company Request for Approval of Contracts with Consumers Water Company and with Ohio Water Service Company

Docket No. 94-352

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF SCOTT J. RUBIN ON BEHALF OF THE MAINE PUBLIC ADVOCATE

December 1994

L INTRODUCTION

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 2 Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, OCCUPATION, AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
- 3 A. My name is Scott Rubin. I am an independent public utility consultant and attorney. My business
- 4 address is 3 Lost Creek Drive, Selinsgrove, PA 17870.
- 5 Q. PLEASE DISCUSS YOUR BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS.
 - I was employed by the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate ("OCA") from 1983 through A. January 1994 in increasingly responsible positions. Since January 1994, I have been an independent public utility consultant and attorney. I have developed substantial expertise in matters relating to the economic regulation of public utilities, particularly water and electric utilities. I have published articles and written speeches and other presentations, on both the national and state level, relating to regulatory issues. From 1990 until I left the OCA, I was one of two senior attorneys in that Office. Among my other responsibilities in this position, I had a major role in setting the OCA's policy positions on water and electric matters. In addition, I was responsible for supervising the technical staff of that Office. I have testified as an expert witness on several occasions in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, and New Jersey. This case will mark my first appearance in Maine. I also would note that I am currently representing a municipally owned electric utility in Pennsylvania, where I am part of a team that is negotiating power purchase and service contracts. Thus, I have first-hand experience not only with the regulatory issues associated with affiliated service contracts, but also with the practical side of negotiating arms' length agreements to provide support services to a utility. Appendix A to this testimony is my curriculum vitae.
- Q. WHAT DOCUMENTS HAVE YOUR REVIEWED IN PREPARATION FOR TESTIFYING
 IN THIS CASE?
- A. In addition to the agreement between Consumers Maine Water Company ("Consumers Maine")
 and Consumers Water Company ("Consumers"), and the affiliated interest portions of the

· A promise

1		Commission's order in Consumers Maine's recent rate case, I reviewed similar agreements
2		between Consumers and several of its other subsidiaries, including:
3		 Camden and Rockland Water Company (now part of Consumers Maine)
4		Garden State Water Company (New Jersey)
5		Inter-state Water Company (Illinois)
6		Maine Water Company (now part of Consumers Maine)
7		Ohio Water Service Company
8		Roaring Creek Water Company (Pennsylvania)
9		Over the years, I have reviewed many other agreements among other companies that are
10		engaged in providing services to public utilities, both affiliated and non-affiliated.
11		I also reviewed documentation of the expenses which Consumers charges to Consumers
12		Maine (and its predecessor companies) under the terms of its agreement, the original draft of the
13		agreement between Consumers Maine and Consumers, and the other information provided by
14		Consumers Maine during the discovery process in this case.
15	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE?
16	A.	My testimony will address whether the provisions of the contract between Consumers Maine and
17		its parent company, Consumers, are in the public interest.
18	Q.	WHAT DO YOU CONCLUDE ABOUT THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN CONSUMERS
19		MAINE AND CONSUMERS?
20	A.	I conclude that the agreement in its current form is one-sided and greatly favors Consumers over
21		the interests of Consumers Maine and the latter's customers. In my opinion, such an agreement
22		could not be the product of arms' length bargaining and would be likely to result in a loss of
23		control of portions of the utility's daily operations to its parent company. In addition, if the
24		agreement is used to allocate costs for ratemaking purposes, the customers of Consumers Maine
25		would be responsible for costs that are unrelated to the provision of water service in the State of

Q.

A.

1	Maine and are otherwise inappropriate for inclusion in the jurisdictional cost of service. In short,
2	it is my opinion that the unconditional approval of this agreement is not in the public interest.

BEFORE DISCUSSING THE REASONS FOR YOUR CONCLUSIONS, CAN YOU GIVE

US SOME BACKGROUND ON THE REASONS WHY IT IS SO IMPORTANT TO CLOSELY SCRUTINIZE CONTRACTS AND TRANSACTIONS AMONG AFFILIATES? Yes, the regulation of agreements and transactions among affiliates of public utilities is absolutely essential to keep the traditional ratemaking process honest. Under traditional rate base / rate of return regulation, the cost of service is based on the utility's actual expenditures. When those expenditures are made in arms' length transactions that are subject to market forces, the public has some assurance that it is paying rates based on the actual cost of doing business, plus a reasonable profit margin. However, when the utility's expenditures are made in affiliated transactions, this assurance is lost. Affiliates can be used, intentionally or unintentionally, to inflate the cost of goods or services above those which the utility could provide by its own personnel (or obtain in the open market), pass on expenses that are otherwise improper, or obtain unreasonably high profits. Thus, the careful scrutiny of affiliated relationships is required to ensure the very integrity of the regulatory process.

This public policy has been implemented in Maine through Me. Rev. Stat., tit. 35-A, § 707. This statutory provision requires Commission approval of all "contracts or arrangements" between a public utility and an affiliated interest. The Commission's approval can be given only if it finds that "the contract or arrangement is not adverse to the public interest" (§ 707(3)). Moreover, the Commission has the authority to make its approval "subject to such terms, conditions and requirements as it determines necessary to safeguard the public interest" (§ 707(3)(B)).

Q. NOW PLEASE DISCUSS THE FACTORS THAT LED YOU TO CONCLUDE THAT THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN CONSUMERS MAINE AND CONSUMERS IS NOT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST.

1	A.	The major factor that has led me to this conclusion is Consumers Maine's lack of control over the
2		services for which it is obligated to pay.
3	Q.	CAN YOU GIVE US SOME EXAMPLES OF CONSUMERS MAINE'S LACK OF
4		CONTROL UNDER THIS AGREEMENT?
5	A.	Yes, I can. The major element of control that I would expect to find is a requirement that
6		Consumers Maine request a service before Consumers provides it. That is, rather than giving the
7		parent company carte blanche to provide whatever service it feels like providing, services must
8		be requested by the subsidiary. This element is missing in several keys instances from the
9		contract between Consumers Maine and Consumers.
10	Q.	WHY IS IT IMPORTANT THAT CONSUMERS MAINE REQUEST THE SERVICE FROM
11		CONSUMERS?
12	A.	When dealing with affiliated transactions, it is essential that the utility be held responsible for the
13		purchasing decision. In this way, the utility can be required to compare the services offered by its
14		affiliate to those that are available in the open market. If the utility then decides to purchase the
15		service from an affiliate, it can be held accountable for that decision (for example, by being
16		required to prove in a subsequent rate case that the services were lower in cost, higher in quality,
17		more timely, or in some other way more valuable than those available in the open market).
18		Simply, it places the decision-making authority squarely with the utility. This is essential because
19		it is the utility that is the regulated entity; it is the utility that holds the certificate of public
20		convenience and necessity; and it is the utility that has the legal obligation to provide adequate,
21		reliable, and cost-effective service. These obligations are not transferrable to another entity and
22		should not be ceded to an unregulated, affiliated company.
23		For example, Professor Phillips, in his comprehensive text on public utility regulation,
24		notes the following general principles regarding payments among affiliates:
25 26		In general, service fees will not be approved unless the company can show some specific services rendered by the management firm. This

A.

requirement follows the principle expressed by the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) in a 1943 case:

Each service company should confine itself to functions which the operating subsidiaries cannot perform as efficiently and economically themselves. These services should be limited to services of an "operating nature" as distinguished from managerial, executive, or policy-forming functions.

At the federal level, the service contracts of electric and gas holding companies are closely controlled by the SEC. In the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, the commission was authorized to approve service companies if it finds that services will be performed efficiently and economically "at a cost fairly and equitably allocated among" operating subsidiaries and "at a reasonable saving over the cost of comparable services ... sold by independent persons."

(Charles F. Phillips, Jr., *The Regulation of Public Utilities* (3rd Ed. 1993), page 267 (emphasis added; citations omitted).

This standard — that the operating subsidiary cannot perform or obtain the service for a comparable cost — provides the basis for determining whether an affiliated arrangement is in the public interest. In order to meet this standard, the utility must have control over the procurement of services or there must be some other objective measure of the market value of the services being provided.

- Q. DOES THE CONTRACT BETWEEN CONSUMERS MAINE AND CONSUMERS

 VIOLATE THE REQUIREMENT OF UTILITY CONTROL OVER THE RELATIONSHIP?
 - Yes, it does. In nearly every instance, Consumers has the ability to charge Consumers Maine for services, without Consumers Maine having made a request for such services. Only in the relatively minor areas of executive recruitment (Section 1), hiring a certified public accountant (Section 5), and purchasing supplies (Section 10) does the agreement state that Consumers Maine must request the service from Consumers. In all other instances, Consumers simply has the right to "assist" or "advise" Consumers Maine, without first having been asked. That is, Consumers will have the ability, on its own, to charge Consumers Maine for work that the utility never requested and may not even need. I find such a contractual relationship to be abusive and not in the public interest.

1	Q.	IN WHAT SPECIFIC AREAS WOULD CONSUMERS HAVE THE UNILATERAL RIGHT
2		TO PROVIDE SERVICES UNDER THE CONTRACT WITH CONSUMERS MAINE?
3	A.	Under the contract between Consumers Maine and Consumers, Consumers has the unilateral
4		right to provide assistance and advice in the following areas:
5		● Long-range planning (Section 2)
6 7 8		 Accounting, budgeting, regulatory relations and compliance, construction, tax matters, business planning, pensions, personnel, and "all other matters incident to the operations and business of Consumers Maine" (Section 3)
9		• Federal, state, and local taxation (Section 4)
10 11		 Accounting requirements and corporate records, with the exception of employing a certified public accountant (Section 5)
12		• Short- and long-term financing (Section 6)
13		Data processing (Section 7)
14		• Employee benefits (Section 8)
15		• Engineering, construction, legal, and "other specialized services" (Section 9)
16		• Insurance and risk management (Section 11)
17		• Comparative analysis of operations (Section 12)
18		In other words, in almost every area of water utility operations, Consumers has the right
19		to provide Consumers Maine with services without the utility having first requested those
20		services.
21		In addition, as I will explain below, these provisions of the contract also fail to incorporate
22		any objective measure of the market value of the services provided. Thus, the agreement fails
23		both methods of achieving the standard summarized above.
24	Q.	DO ANY OF THESE AREAS RAISE A SPECIAL CONCERN?
25	A.	Yes. I am particularly troubled by the lack of control that Consumers Maine has in the area of
26		"general assistance" (Section 3 of the contract). This is an extremely broad provision that permits
27		Consumers to provide virtually any type of service without first having been requested to do so by
28		Consumers Maine. In particular, this provision states:

33

area.

Consumers will provide advice and assistance to Consumers Maine as to 1 Consumers Maine's business, its trends, accounting matters, budgetary control, 2 3 relations with regulatory agencies, construction requirements, purchase 4 requirements, financing and financial requirements, state and federal water 5 quality requirements, tax matters, business planning, rates, and without limitation 6 by specific enumeration, all other matters incident to the operations and business 7 of Consumers Maine, and will assist or advise Consumers Maine on such matters 8 as personnel, surveys, pensions, labor contracts, the selection of key personnel 9 and any other of Consumers Maine's activities. Frankly, it is difficult for me to imagine a broader provision. This gives Consumers virtually 10 unlimited power to provide whatever service it desires to Consumers Maine, without regard to the 11 utility's need for, or request for, the service. Indeed, this provision even encompasses the types of 12 managerial, executive, and policy-making functions that the SEC found should not be delegated to 13 an affiliate. (See Phillips, supra, page 267, citing In re Columbia Engineering Corp. (SEC), 14 15 Holding Co. Act Release No. 4166 (March 1943).) HOW IS THIS PROVISION REFLECTED IN CONSUMERS'S CONTRACTS WITH ITS Q. 16 OTHER SUBSIDIARIES? 17 Without exception the contracts with Consumers's other subsidiaries require the utility to request 18 A. these types of services from Consumers. For example, the contract with Maine Water Company, 19 20 that this Commission approved in 1977, stated: 21 Consumers' organization will, at Maine's request, be available to advise and assist Maine as to Maine's business, its trends, accounting matters, budgetary 22 control, relations with regulatory agencies, construction requirements, purchase 23 requirements, financing and financial requirements, tax matters, new business 24 plans, rates and will, at Maine's request, assist or advise Maine on such matters 25 26 as personnel, surveys, pensions, labor contracts, the selection of key personnel and, without limitation by specific enumeration, all other matters incident to the 27 28 operations and business of Maine. (Emphasis added.) 29 Similar provisions, requiring the utility to request the service from Consumers, appear in 30 the contracts between Consumers and all of the other subsidiaries for which I have reviewed 31

copies of the agreements. Only Consumers Maine has given Consumers carte blanche in this

1	Q.	ARE THERE ANY OTHER INDICATIONS IN THE CONTRACT THAT CONSUMERS
2		MAINE HAS CEDED TOO MUCH AUTHORITY TO CONSUMERS?
3	A.	Yes, there are. Section 4 of the Consumers Maine Covenants (Third Party Payments) requires
4		Consumers Maine to pay bills from third parties when such third parties "have been authorized by
5		Consumers to provide services to Consumers Maine in furtherance of the terms of this
6		agreement." This provision would permit Consumers to make a contract with a third party to
7		provide a service to Consumers Maine, apparently without Consumers Maine being either a party
8		to that contract or having any say in the award of such a contract. Once again, I find such a
9		provision to be unacceptable, both as a matter of public policy and as a matter of providing
10		adequate legal protection to Consumers Maine.
11	Q.	DO CONSUMERS'S OTHER SUBSIDIARIES HAVE SIMILAR PROVISIONS IN THEIR
12		AGREEMENTS?
13	A.	All of the other agreements that I examined have provisions that govern the payment of third
14		parties, but none of them contain the language that is in the Consumers Maine contract. All of
15		the other agreements contain language on this point that is identical (except for the name of the
16		subsidiary) to that found in the Maine Water Company agreement that this Commission approved
17		in 1977, which follows:
18 19		Maine agrees to pay all bills rendered to Maine by any third parties which third parties have been approved by Maine to be engaged solely for Maine's account.
20		This language is very different from that which is contained in the Consumers Maine agreement.
21		Consumers's other subsidiaries retain control over their relationships with third party contractors
22		(they must specifically approve the use of third parties and the third parties will bill the utility
23		directly). In contrast, Consumers Maine apparently has ceded control over this aspect of its
24		operations to Consumers, but it is unclear whether it did so voluntarily. Indeed, the original draft
25		of this agreement, that was prepared by Consumers Maine's President, contained the following
26		provision:

1 2 3		Consumers Maine agrees to pay all bills rendered to Consumers Maine by any third parties which third parties have been approved by Consumers Maine to be engaged solely for Consumers Maine's account, with no amount added for profit.
4		(Staff DR 1-29).
5		Consumers Maine was unable to identify why this provision was changed, or the person
6		who recommended the change (Staff DR 1-29). However, it is apparent that the change in this
7		provision works to the detriment of Consumers Maine and its customers and is not consistent with
8		the public interest. Simply, I cannot think of a valid reason for permitting the current version of
9		this provision to remain in the contract.
		and the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second of the second o
10	Q.	YOU HAVE EXPLAINED WHY YOU BELIEVE THAT CONSUMERS MAINE HAS
l 1		GIVEN TOO MUCH AUTHORITY TO CONSUMERS. DO YOU ALSO HAVE A
12		CONCERN WITH THE TYPES OF CHARGES THAT CONSUMERS WILL BE ABLE TO
13		PASS ON TO CONSUMERS MAINE?
14	A.	Yes, I do. While I recognize that this proceeding is limited to approving the contract itself, and
15		not any specific charges that might flow to Consumers Maine under the contract, I do have
16		several concerns in this area. I will focus my testimony on the contract itself, referring to specific
17		charges only as examples of the way in which the contract has been implemented by the parties.
18		I am troubled by Consumers's ability to pass on all of its overhead expenses to its
19		subsidiaries, including Consumers Maine. The key provision of the contract is found on page 4,
20		Section 1, which requires Consumers Maine to reimburse Consumers for the "cost of service" for
21		all time that Consumers employees spend working for Consumers Maine. "Cost of service" is
22		defined as follows:
23 24 25 26 27 28 29		an equitable proportion, based on time spent in the performance of services for Consumers Maine, of the total reasonable and necessary annual compensation paid by Consumers to the personnel of Consumers performing the services, plus an equitable proportion of the reasonable and necessary annual overhead expenses of Consumers, all audited in accordance with general accepted auditing standards by independent certified public accountants. No amount will be added for profit.

1		My concern with this definition is that it permits Consumers to bill a proportion of all of its
2		"overhead expenses" to Consumers Maine. Importantly, the contract does not define "overhead
3		expenses" or limit the types of costs that can be included in this charge.
4	Q.	DO YOU HAVE ANY INDICATION OF THE TYPES OF CHARGES THAT
5		CONSUMERS APPARENTLY CONSIDERS TO BE OVERHEAD EXPENSES?
6	A.	Yes, I do. In response to Staff Data Request 1-21, Consumers Maine provided a copy of the
7		monthly billings that it (or its predecessors) received from Consumers for the months of October
8		1993 through September 1994. Included in Consumers's overhead are charges that are
9		completely unrelated to the provision of water service in the State of Maine. For example, the
10		following types of charges are classified as "overhead expenses" by Consumers and are being
11		partially charged to Consumers Maine:
12 13 14 15 16 17		Costs for attending conferences that are completely unrelated to Consumers's operations in the State of Maine (for example, the Great Lakes Conference of Public Utilities Commissioners, the Southeast Area Regulatory Utility Commissioners Conference, and the Mid-America Regulatory Commissioners Conference), for William Holmes, who was not then (and is not now) an employee, officer, or director of Consumers.
18 19		 Costs for attending board meetings of the National Association of Water Companies for Mr. Holmes.
20		Costs for Mr. Holmes to attend a NARUC conference in California.
21		• Entertainment expenses.
22		Charitable contributions.
23		Marketing expenses.
24		Simply, I believe that the undefined category of "overhead expenses" is much too broad
25		and essentially permits Consumers to charge Consumers Maine for costs which are unrelated to
26		the provision of utility service in Maine. If Consumers Maine incurred these expenses directly, I
27		believe that they would be considered to be "below-the-line" expenses. The contract should not
28		permit Consumers Maine to convert such expenses into "above-the-line" expenses simply by

passing them through an affiliate.

29

25

26

27

1	Q.	CAN'T THIS PROBLEM WITH THE CONTRACT BE HANDLED BY DISALLOWING
2		SOME OF THESE EXPENSES IN A CONSUMERS MAINE RATE CASE?
3	A.	Obviously, if such charges appear on the books of Consumers Maine, I would recommend that
4		they be disallowed in a rate case. However, I do not believe that this is the best way to handle
5		these charges. These are expenses of the parent company that are unrelated to providing service
6		in Maine. There is no good reason for them to be charged at all to an operating utility in this
7		State. Again, I would reiterate that the central issue is the degree of control and responsibility
8		that Consumers Maine has in its relationship with its affiliate. Allowing these costs to be passed
9		through to Consumers Maine means that the utility has less control over its own costs. In
10		addition, of course, having to deal with such issues in rate cases can be expensive and time-
11		consuming for the Commission, intervenors, utility and, ultimately, for the ratepayers in the State
12		of Maine. In my opinion, there is no good reason why these costs should be passed on to
13		Consumers Maine at all.
14	Q.	YOU HAVE BEEN FAIRLY CRITICAL OF THE CONTRACT BETWEEN CONSUMERS
15		MAINE AND CONSUMERS. ARE YOU SUGGESTING THAT THE UTILITY SHOULD
16		NOT PURCHASE ANY SERVICES FROM CONSUMERS?
17	A.	No, I am not. I know some of the people at Consumers and I believe that they are
18		knowledgeable and have something of value to offer to their subsidiaries. What I am suggesting
19		is that Consumers Maine be given greater responsibility for procuring such services, including
20		being given the option of obtaining them from an unaffiliated company. In addition, Consumers
21		Maine should not be charged for broad categories of expenses that are unrelated to the provision
22		of water service in Maine.
23		In particular, I recommend that Consumers Maine should be required to competitively bid

services that are readily available from other companies. These types of services would include those in the following areas: engineering; rate case support; tax and accounting; financing; employment (hiring and placement); legal; and insurance and risk management. In fact, in its supplemental response to Staff DR 1-2, 10, and 12-20, Consumers Maine identified (with an "R")

A.

the services that it typically requests from Consumers. In so doing, it said: "These items are services that are available from other vendors, but the relationship between the company and Consumers is such that there is an ongoing dialogue and sharing of information." I interpret this to mean that these services could be competitively bid. Any successful bidder would soon develop the same type of "ongoing dialogue and sharing of information" that Consumers Maine enjoys with Consumers. In my opinion, by refusing to competitively bid for these services, Consumers Maine is failing to act in the best interests of its customers. The Commission and Consumers Maine's customers cannot be fully assured that Consumers Maine is being charged a reasonable amount by Consumers for providing these services.

Q. WOULD YOU PROHIBIT CONSUMERS FROM BIDDING FOR THE PROVISION OF THESE SERVICES?

- No, I certainly would not. I would encourage Consumers to submit a competitive bid for providing these services to Consumers Maine. As I mentioned earlier, Consumers has qualified personnel who can provide knowledgeable assistance to Consumers Maine; but that assistance must be provided at a reasonable price. Thus, I would caution that such a bid should contain the types of terms and conditions that one would expect in the commercial services market (stated hourly rates for employees, the basis for determining charges for expenses, limits on the amount to be spent for a particular project, etc.).
- Q. WHAT DO YOU RECOMMEND THAT THE COMMISSION DO TO REMEDY THE PROBLEMS THAT YOU HAVE ADDRESSED?
- A. I would recommend that the relationship between Consumers Maine and Consumers be changed.

 This could be accomplished by either (1) amending the agreement between Consumers Maine
 and Consumers, or (2) by the Commission conditioning its approval of this agreement. Whichever
 method is chosen, I recommend that the following changes be instituted:
 - Consumers Maine should be required to procure the following types of services through written, competitive bids: engineering; rate case support; tax and

1 2		accounting; financing; employment (hiring and placement); legal; and insurance and risk management.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9		Any requests from Consumers Maine to Consumers for services in other areas (such as pensions and benefits, business planning, consolidated taxation issues, and data processing) should be made in writing and be subject to the same approval limitations that Consumers Maine uses for procuring outside services. (The necessary approvals for procuring services were provided in response to Staff DR 2-5. For example, amounts between \$1,000 and \$5,000 must be approved by a Vice President; amounts between \$5,000 and \$25,000 must be approved by the President; etc.)
11 12 13		 The types of "overhead services" that are allowable should be specifically defined. Any charges for such services should be limited to those which would be eligible for inclusion in rates above-the-line.
14 15 16	æ?	 Section 4 of the Consumers Maine Covenants should be revised to require that Consumers Maine request the services of a third party before being required to pay for such services.
17	Q.	HOW WOULD THE COMPETITIVE BIDDING PROCESS WORK?
18	A.	I would leave the specific details of this process up to the management of Consumers Maine. I
19		would urge the Commission to impose the following conditions:
20 21		 Certain, discrete projects (for example, engineering services for a significant construction project) should be bid separately.
22 23		• Other types of services (for example, general accounting services) should be bid periodically (for a term of no more than one year).
24		I do wish to make it clear, however, that I do not envision a process where Consumers Maine
25		would have to obtain a bid before its Treasurer could call an accountant to ask a question. Such
26		services would be handled through a periodic solicitation for professional services.
27	Q.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?
28	A.	Yes, it does.

BEFORE THE MAINE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Re: Consumers Maine Water Company

Docket No. 94-352

Re: Consumers Maine water Company and With

Ohio Water Service Company

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF SCOTT J. RUBIN ON BEHALF OF THE MAINE PUBLIC ADVOCATE

1	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
2	A.	My name is Scott Rubin. My business address is 3 Lost Creek Drive, Selinsgrove, PA 17870.
3		
4	Q.	DID YOU PREVIOUSLY OFFER PREPARED DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE?
5	A.	Yes, I did. That testimony was submitted in December 1994.
6		
7	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?
8	A.	I will briefly address several of the statements made by the President of Consumers Maine Water
9		Company ("Consumers Maine"), Judith W. Hayes, in her testimony.
10		
11	Q.	WHAT IS YOUR MAJOR CONCERN WITH MS. HAYES'S TESTIMONY?
12	A.	My primary concern is that she failed to address or fully understand many of the points that I
13		raised in my direct testimony. To briefly review, my testimony concluded that the contract
14		between Consumers Maine and its parent, Consumers Water Company ("Consumers") was not in
15		the public interest, largely because of the lack of control that Consumers Maine has over the
16		services that it would receive from Consumers. In addition, I pointed out several areas where the
17		services that were subject to an exclusive contract with Consumers should be competitively bid.
18		
19	Q.	HAS MS. HAYES RESPONDED TO YOUR CONCERN WITH CONSUMERS MAINE'S
20		LACK OF CONTROL UNDER ITS CONTRACT WITH CONSUMERS?
21	A.	She does not dispute the fact that the contract, as submitted to the Commission, gives Consumers
22		nearly total control over the operations of Consumers Maine. In fact, Ms. Hayes states that there
23		is a "new culture" developing at Consumers that would give the subsidiaries more authority and
24		control. Specifically, she states: "The parent central services are developed and priced to meet

the needs and wants of the working subsidiaries, instead of the existing structure where less input was allowed." (pages 12-13; emphasis added) She also testifies that, under this new structure, she has "a lot more input into the decisions, and the costs associated with them, than a subsidiary ever had before." (page 13)

This was precisely my point. The existing structure of Consumers, as evidenced by the contract between Consumers and Consumers Maine, places most of the control in the hands of the parent company. This is inappropriate and not in the public interest. From Ms. Hayes's testimony, it appears that this general corporate policy is changing at Consumers. If that is the case, then the contract also must be changed. It makes no sense to put in place an agreement that gives very little authority to the subsidiary when the new "corporate culture" is designed to give more control to the subsidiary. My original recommendations -- to require Consumers Maine to make an affirmative request for services and to competitively bid certain types of services -appear to be consistent with the new management style at Consumers.

14

15

16

17

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

- Q. ONE OF THE AREAS WHERE YOU HIGHLIGHTED THE LACK OF CONTROL IN THE CONTRACT WAS IN THE PROCUREMENT OF SERVICES FROM THIRD PARTIES.
- DOES MS. HAYES RESPOND TO THIS POINT?
- A. No, she does not. My concern here was that the contract would give Consumers the right to 18 procure services from third parties on behalf of Consumers Maine, without Consumers Maine 19 ever having requested the service. In my opinion, this was the most egregious area where 20 Consumers Maine had ceded control over its operations to Consumers. Ms. Hayes does not even 21 mention this issue in her testimony. Needless to say, this provision of the contract appears to be in 22 direct conflict with the new "corporate culture" at Consumers. 23

1	Q.	ON THE ISSUE OF CONTROL, YOU ALSO HIGHLIGHTED THE NEED FOR WRITTEN
2		REQUESTS FOR CERTAIN TYPES OF SERVICES. HOW DOES MS. HAYES
3		RESPOND?
4	A.	She states that she has no objection to this recommendation (page 17). She does not specifically
5		mention my related recommendation that appropriate approvals be obtained within Consumers
6		Maine (for example, that the President must approve any requisition involving between \$5,000 and
7		\$25,000). I believe that this must be an integral part of any controls that are put in place.
8		Requests for services from Consumers should be treated in the same fashion as requests for
9		services from an independent company.
10		
11	Q.	COULD YOU REVIEW FOR US THE TYPES OF SERVICES THAT YOU THOUGHT
12		SHOULD BE COMPETITIVELY BID BY CONSUMERS MAINE?
13	A.	I recommended that the following types of services should be competitively bid:
14 15 16 17 18 19 20		 Engineering Rate case support Tax and accounting Financing Employment Legal Insurance and risk management
21		
22	Q.	HOW DOES MS. HAYES RESPOND TO YOUR RECOMMENDATION?
23	A.	She did not address the areas of rate case support, employment, and legal. She briefly discusses
24		engineering and tax/accounting services. She spends a good deal of her testimony discussing
25		financing, insurance, and issues that I did not even dispute (such as data processing and employee
26		benefits).
27		

22

23

1	Q.	DOES MS. HAYES'S TESTIMONY ON ENGINEERING AND TAX/ACCOUNTING
2		SERVICES AFFECT YOUR ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATION?
3	A.	No, it does not. Her testimony on those points is essentially that the current service provider
4		(Consumers) knows Consumers Maine and, therefore, does a good job. While I have no doubt
5		that Consumers knows Consumers Maine, this does not mean that independent engineering and
6		accounting firms could not provide comparable services. What we don't know because
7		Consumers Maine has never asked is what it would cost to have an independent firm provide
8		these services. Again, it bears repeating that this is precisely the point of my initial
9		recommendation: These are services that are available in the open market. There is no reason
10		that Consumers should automatically provide these services, unless it can do so in the most cost-
11		effective manner.
12		
13	Q.	DOES MS. HAYES DISAGREE WITH YOU?
14	A.	I'm not sure if she completely disagrees. On page 12, she says that the new corporate structure
15		of Consumers "demands cost-efficient services that are regularly benchmarked against the
16		marketplace." I can think of no better way to benchmark Consumers's services against the
17		market than to require Consumers to compete with independent companies to provide these
18		services. If Consumers cannot capture enough of the economies of scale to compete with
19		independent companies, then it should either stop providing that service or it should streamline its
20		operations to become more competitive.
21		
22	Q.	DOES MS. HAYES'S TESTIMONY ON FINANCING AND INSURANCE CHANGE

YOUR ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATIONS?

No, it does not. She explains how Consumers is currently able to provide these services at a lower cost. However, none of her examples reflect actual, competitive quotations from other service providers for providing these services to Consumers Maine. I have never suggested that Consumers could not be the low bidder or that it was unable to provide some services in a cost-effective manner. My point was, and remains, that there is no reason to give Consumers an exclusive contract to provide these services. They are available from dozens of independent companies that might be able to provide them at a lower price. We simply have no way of knowing if Consumers is providing a cost-effective service unless it is subjected to the test of competition.

A.

Q. DO YOU HAVE OTHER, SPECIFIC CONCERNS WITH MS. HAYES'S TESTIMONY?

A. Yes, I do. There are several instances where she makes statements that I believe are unsupported or inaccurate.

First, on page 7, lines 7-9, Ms. Hayes states that "[m]ost stand-alone water systems can not afford to hire the expertise, or if they do, they are also paying for a profit component." I find no basis for concluding that a water system the size of Consumers Maine (more than 10,000 customers) would be unable to contract for the necessary expertise in the open market. In 1994, Consumers Maine paid Consumers more than \$340,000 for services. In addition, Consumers Maine paid more than \$135,000 for corporate overhead and sundry items. These figures are calculated on my Schedule 1. In my opinion, the \$475,000 that Consumers Maine paid to Consumers last year would be more than adequate to procure such services in the competitive market. Moreover, Ms. Hayes's point about paying a "profit component" to independent firms is misleading. That "profit component" is used to cover such items as overhead, officers' salaries, shareholder services, financing costs, and so on -- all of which are being billed directly to

Consumers Maine by Consumers. The amounts included for these items and profit are subject to competitive market forces. Of course, these companies want to make a profit, but their ability to do so depends on how efficiently they can provide services for their clients. What we don't know (because Consumers Maine has not asked) is whether the combination of overhead and profit for independent companies is less than the overhead and sundry charges of Consumers.

A.

Q. ON PAGE 10 OF HER TESTIMONY, MS. HAYES STATES THAT IT IS NOT

NECESSARY TO BE CONCERNED WITH THE COSTS OF SERVICES FROM

CONSUMERS IN THIS CASE, BECAUSE THE COMMISSION REVIEWS THEM IN A

RATE CASE. DO YOU AGREE?

No, I do not. While I agree that we should not be reviewing the precise costs that Consumers Maine paid to Consumers in this case, I think that it is necessary to look at the elements of cost that are being passed down to Consumers Maine. One of the very bases for requiring Commission review of affiliated interest agreements is to ensure that the resources of the operating utility are not diverted to the parent company. Even if the Commission were able to eliminate all improper expenses from the cost of service, if Consumers Maine is required (by contract) to pay that money to Consumers, then it could have an adverse effect on Consumers Maine's balance sheet and cash flow and, ultimately, its ability to provide adequate service. In addition, as I have mentioned previously, it removes the incentive for Consumers to become a more efficient provider of services.

Simply, unlike Ms. Hayes, I believe that there is a good reason why the Commission is required to approve affiliated interest contracts. The review of these agreements protects ratepayers, encourages competition, and fosters efficiency in the utility and its affiliates. As I stated in my direct testimony, it is my opinion that the contract itself is harmful to ratepayers,

24

1		discourages competitive providers, and does nothing to force Consumers and Consumers Maine to
2		become more efficient. Therefore, I concluded then, and I still conclude now, that the contract is
3		not in the public interest and should not be approved.
4		
5	Q.	ON PAGES 13 AND 14, MS. HAYES COMPLAINS THAT THERE IS INCONSISTENT
6		TREATMENT OF TRANSACTIONS WITH AFFILIATES AND INDEPENDENT
7		COMPANIES. DO YOU AGREE?
8	A.	No, I do not. As I discussed in my direct testimony, there are very good reasons why enhanced
9		review is required of transactions with affiliates. I will not try to review all of those reasons here.
10		However, one of the major reasons for a different level of review is that affiliated transactions are
11		not at arms' length and are not subjected to market forces. Competitive forces will control how
12		much overhead, profit, and inefficiency can be passed on to the end user. When a transaction
13		occurs outside of the marketplace, these external controls are not present. Consequently, it
14		becomes the role of the regulator to ensure that the terms and conditions, as well as the price
15		being paid, are appropriate and otherwise in the public interest.
16		
17	Q.	ON PAGE 16, MS. HAYES PROVIDES A NUMBER OF REASONS WHY BIDDING
18		WOULD NOT BE APPROPRIATE FOR VARIOUS TYPES OF SERVICES. DO YOU
19		HAVE A RESPONSE TO HER TESTIMONY?
20	A.	Most of her arguments are either irrelevant to the issues that I have raised or do not provide a
21		valid reason why it would be inappropriate to competitively bid these services. Initially, in the first
22		paragraph on page 16, she states that audit costs, health insurance costs, and insurance costs are
23		regularly bid by Consumers. First, it must be noted that I have not proposed any change in the

procurement of health insurance. As with other employee benefits, I believe that this is one area

where there are clear benefits to the purchasing power of Consumers as a whole. Moreover, the mere fact that audit and insurance costs are occasionally put out for bids does not mean that an individual subsidiary's needs could not be met more cost effectively in the market. There is a big difference between trying to meet the needs of the entire Consumers organization and trying to meet the needs of an individual operating utility like Consumers Maine.

Her next argument (the second paragraph on the page) concerns pension, health insurance, and the 401(k) plan. Each of these are employee benefit programs which I have not contested.

Paragraph 3 on page 16 states that Consumers's employees have in-depth knowledge of the accounting and data processing systems. I agree and, again, I have not challenged the provision of data processing services by Consumers to Consumers Maine.

In her final argument on page 16, Ms. Hayes states that there might be harm to Consumers as a whole if individual companies can go in and out of the system. First, this argument has little relevance to the issues that I raised. Further, if it is possible for a number of subsidiaries to reach a better deal outside of the Consumers organization, then Consumers is failing to provide any of the "economies of scale" that Ms. Hayes is afraid will be lost.

A.

Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY FINAL COMMENTS?

Yes. I would like to summarize my testimony simply and directly. The contract that Consumers and Consumers Maine have signed gives Consumers an enormous amount of discretion in providing services for Consumers Maine. The result of this contractual relationship is that Consumers Maine would lose control over several critically important aspects of its operations and could be required to pay for services that it did not request and that do not provide a benefit to it.

Ms. Haves appears to have recognized some of these concerns with the relationship between

Consumers and its subsidiaries, and she indicates that the relationship is changing. While this is good news for ratepayers, the contract between Consumers and Consumers Maine must reflect these changes, as well as other procedures that ensure that Consumers Maine is neither paying for services that it does not need nor paying more than market rates for services. The changes that I have proposed -- competitive bidding for certain services, increased cost controls and procedures, and placing the control in the hands of Consumers Maine -- would resolve these problems. As it presently stands, the contract between Consumers and Consumers Maine is not in the public interest. In my opinion, the modifications that I propose would make their relationship one that is reasonable and in the best interests of ratepayers, Consumers Maine, and the Consumers organization as a whole.

- Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?
- 13 A. Yes, it does.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Regulation of the Electric Fuel Component Contained Within the Rate Schedules of Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company and Related Matters

Case No. 97-103-EL-EFC

Direct Testimony of **Scott J. Rubin**

on Behalf of The Ohio Consumers' Counsel

- 1 Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
- 2 A. My name is Scott J. Rubin. My business address is 3 Lost Creek Drive, Selinsgrove, PA.
- 3 Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?
- 4 A. I am an independent attorney and consultant, with a practice limited to matters affecting the
- 5 public utility industry.
- 6 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE?
- 7 A. I have been asked by the Ohio Consumers' Counsel ("OCC") to examine the manner in which
- 8 Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company ("CG&E") has been conducting fuel-related transactions
- 9 and the effect of those transactions on its EFC for CG&E's retail customers.
- 10 Q. WHAT ARE YOUR QUALIFICATIONS TO PROVIDE THIS TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE?
- I was employed by the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate ("OCA") from 1983
 through January 1994 in increasingly responsible positions. Since January 1994, I have been an
 independent public utility consultant and attorney. I have developed substantial expertise in
 matters relating to the economic regulation of public utilities. I have published articles and
- written speeches and other presentations, on both the national and state level, relating to
- regulatory issues. From 1990 until I left the OCA, I was one of two senior attorneys in that
- Office. Among my other responsibilities in this position, I had a major role in setting the OCA's
- policy positions on water and electric matters. In addition, I was responsible for supervising the
- technical staff of that Office. During 1991, I served as a member of the U.S. Environmental
- 20 Protection Agency's Acid Rain Advisory Committee, Subcommittee on Nitrogen Oxides. I