STATE OF NEW JERSEY OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW BEFORE HONORABLE WALTER J. BRASWELL

I/M/O THE PETITION OF)	
PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND)	
GAS COMPANY FOR APPROVAL OF)	
AN INCREASE IN ELECTRIC AND)	
GAS RATES AND FOR CHANGES IN)	
THE TARIFFS FOR ELECTRIC AND)	
GAS SERVICE,)	BPU DOCKET No. GR09050422
B.P.U. N.J. NO. 14 ELECTRIC AND)	OAL DOCKET No. PUC-7559-09
B.P.U. N.J. NO. 14 GAS PURSUANT TO)	
N.J.S.A. 48: 2-21 AND N.J.S.A. 48: 2-21.1)	
AND FOR APPROVAL OF GAS)	
WEATHER NORMALIZATION;)	
A PENSION EXPENSE TRACKER AND)	
FOR OTHER APPROPRIATE RELIEF		
)	

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL J. MAJOROS, JR. ON BEHALF OF THE NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF THE PUBLIC ADVOCATE DIVISION OF RATE COUNSEL

RONALD K. CHEN PUBLIC ADVOCATE OF NEW JERSEY

STEFANIE A. BRAND, ESQ. DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF RATE COUNSEL

> DIVISION OF RATE COUNSEL 31 Clinton Street, 11th Floor P. O. Box 46005 Newark, New Jersey 07101 Phone: 973-648-2690 Email: njratepayer@rpa.state.nj.us

FILED: NOVEMBER 19, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS	1
III	PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY	3
IV.	HISTORY OF PSE&G CURRENT DEPRECIATION RATES	3
V	EXISTING ELECTRIC AND COMMON PLANT DEPRECIATION RATES	4
VI.	EXISTING GAS, GAS GENERAL AND GAS COMMON PLANT	
	DEPRECIATION RATES	6
	BPU <u>Docket No. GR01050297.</u> BPU Docket No. GR05100845.	7
VIII.	PSE&G'S CURRENT DEPRECIATION PROPOSAL	9
EXHI	BIT MJM-1	

APPENDIX A- Michael J. Majoros resume

APPENDIX B- List of Prior Testimonies

|--|

2 **Q.** State your name.

- 3 A. Michael J. Majoros, Jr.
- 4 Q. Who is your employer, and what is your position?
- A. I am Vice President of Snavely King Majoros O'Connor & Bedell, Inc. ("Snavely
 King"), located at 1111 14th Street, N.W., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20005.

7 II. <u>BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS</u>

8 Q. Describe Snavely King.

9 A. Snavely King is a small, diverse and veteran-owned Economic and Management
10 Consulting firm founded in 1970 in Washington D.C. Snavely King conducts economic,
11 accounting and technical analyses and research into the costs, rates, revenues, and
12 economic performance of companies in the power, transportation, water and wastewater,
13 public utility and telecommunications industries.

14 For almost four decades, Snavely King has analyzed and translated the effects of 15 alternative regulatory ratemaking policies and free market practices into their practical 16 cost and pricing consequences. The firm's clients include federal and state government agencies, businesses and individuals. Over the course of its 39-year history, members of 17 18 the firm have participated in more than 1,000 proceedings before almost all of the state 19 commissions and all Federal commissions that regulate prices in the utilities and 20 transportation industries. Snavely King believes in accountability, fair competition and 21 effective regulation.

1		Snavely King has also assisted a multitude of non-ratemaking organizations
2		including the U.S. Department of Justice, U.S. Department of Defense, the General
3		Services Agency, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the Maryland Senate and
4		House of Delegates, the Sierra Club and the National Parks Conservation Association.
5		Snavely King's subject matter experts include professional economists, MBAs,
6		CPAs, attorneys, scientists, engineers, IT professionals, cost analysts and experts in
7		utility finance and operations. Snavely King currently has a Washington D.C.
8		complement of thirteen experts.
9	Q.	Have you prepared a summary of your qualifications and experience?
10	A.	Yes, Appendix A is a summary of my qualifications and experience. Appendix B is a
11		tabulation of my appearances as an expert witness before state and Federal regulatory
12		agencies.
13	Q.	At whose request are you appearing in this proceeding?
14	A.	I am appearing on behalf of the New Jersey Department of the Public Advocate, Division
15		of Rate Counsel ("Rate Counsel").
16	Q.	What is the subject of your testimony?
17	A.	My testimony addresses depreciation.
18	Q.	Do you have any specific experience in the field of public utility depreciation?
19	A.	Yes. Among other things, Snavely King specializes in the field of public utility
20		depreciation. We have appeared as expert witnesses on this subject before the regulatory
21		commissions of almost every state in the country as well as several Federal commissions.
22		I have testified in over 100 proceedings on the subject of public utility depreciation,

1		including several appearances before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities ("BPU" or
2		"Board").
3	Q.	How many times have you addressed public utility depreciation in New Jersey
4		proceedings?
5	A.	I have appeared in more than twenty New Jersey proceedings on the subject of public
6		utility depreciation. These proceedings have addressed electric, gas, water, telephone and
7		waste removal utilities.
8	III	PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY
9	Q.	Explain the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding.
10	A.	Rate Counsel asked me to review Public Service Electric and Gas Company's ("PSE&G"
11		or "the Company") depreciation-related testimony and exhibits. I am to express an
12		opinion regarding the reasonableness of the Company's depreciation proposal and, if
13		warranted, make alternative recommendations.
14	IV.	HISTORY OF PSE&G CURRENT DEPRECIATION RATES
15	Q.	Have you studied PSE&G's current depreciation rates?
16	A.	Yes, I have studied PSE&G's electric and gas depreciation rates on several occasions.
17	Q.	What is the recent history of PSE&G's current depreciation rates?
18	A.	PSE&G's current depreciation rates come from a mix of several prior proceedings. The
19		existing gas general and common plant depreciation rates resulted from a stipulation and
20		settlement, and BPU Order, Docket No. GR01050297, dated January 9, 2002. The
21		present electric and common plant depreciation rates resulted from a settlement and
22		Summary Order, Docket No. ER02050303, dated April 22, 2004. The present gas

1		depreciation rates were approved as a result of a stipulation and a BPU Order in the
2		Company's last Gas Base Rate proceeding, Docket No. GR05100845, dated November 9,
3		2006. ¹ Consequently, PSE&G has at least three sets of depreciation rates: electric, gas,
4		and common. Each of these depreciation rates were established at a different point in
5		time, reflecting the considerations reflected in three different settlements.
6	Q.	Were you a witness in any of those proceedings?
6 7	Q. A.	Were you a witness in any of those proceedings? Yes, I was a witness in all of those proceedings. In fact, I was a witness in even earlier
	-	
7	-	Yes, I was a witness in all of those proceedings. In fact, I was a witness in even earlier

depreciation rates. Exhibit MJM-1 is a copy of Attachment 4 to the ALJ's December 9,

1992 Order adopting the stipulation in BRC Docket No. EE91081428. Exhibit MJM-1

shows the depreciation rates to which the parties agreed in that case. They went into

effect January 1, 1993.² The parties agreed to composite depreciation rates at the

16 V.. EXISTING ELECTRIC AND COMMON PLANT DEPRECIATION RATES

functional rather than plant account level in that proceeding.

17 Q. Please summarize the history of PSE&G's electric and common plant depreciation 18 rates.

A. The parties stipulated to a 3.52 percent composite electric distribution function rate in the
 1992/1993 case. This stipulation reflected retention of a composite depreciation rate
 actually adopted sometime prior to that 1992 proceeding. In its 1997 Electric

11

12

13

14

15

¹ Response to RCR-DEP-43.

² ALJ Initial Decision, p. 15, BRC Docket No. EE91081428.

1		Restructuring filing, PSE&G asserted that the 3.52 percent distribution plant rate
2		reflected a 28.4-year composite average service life (1/.0352=28.4) and then proposed to
3		extend the 28.4-year average life to 45 years. The Company used the 45-year life to
4		calculate a remaining life depreciation rate assuming zero ("0") net salvage. This
5		resulted in a 2.49 percent depreciation rate. Since the new rate was much lower than the
6		old rate, the Company's change resulted in a significant depreciation reserve excess.
7		PSE&G proposed the 2.49 percent depreciation rate, and in addition, PSE&G
8		proposed amortizing the resulting reserve excess over 84 months (7 years.) The Board
9		agreed with both the 2.49 percent depreciation rate and the amortization, but adopted a
10		43-month amortization period.
11	Q.	Did PSE&G properly implement the Board's decision in the restructuring case?
12	A.	I conclude that PSE&G properly implemented the amortization, but did not properly
12 13	A.	I conclude that PSE&G properly implemented the amortization, but did not properly implement the 2.49 percent electric distribution plant depreciation rate. Apparently,
	A.	
13	A.	implement the 2.49 percent electric distribution plant depreciation rate. Apparently,
13 14	A.	implement the 2.49 percent electric distribution plant depreciation rate. Apparently, PSE&G only used the 2.49 percent electric distribution plant depreciation rate for the
13 14 15	A.	implement the 2.49 percent electric distribution plant depreciation rate. Apparently, PSE&G only used the 2.49 percent electric distribution plant depreciation rate for the restructuring case, and then in August 1999 reverted to the 3.52 percent established in the
13 14 15 16	A.	implement the 2.49 percent electric distribution plant depreciation rate. Apparently, PSE&G only used the 2.49 percent electric distribution plant depreciation rate for the restructuring case, and then in August 1999 reverted to the 3.52 percent established in the prior docket.
13 14 15 16 17	A.	implement the 2.49 percent electric distribution plant depreciation rate. Apparently, PSE&G only used the 2.49 percent electric distribution plant depreciation rate for the restructuring case, and then in August 1999 reverted to the 3.52 percent established in the prior docket. In 2002, in BPU Docket No. ER02050303, PSE&G filed for an increase in its
 13 14 15 16 17 18 	A.	 implement the 2.49 percent electric distribution plant depreciation rate. Apparently, PSE&G only used the 2.49 percent electric distribution plant depreciation rate for the restructuring case, and then in August 1999 reverted to the 3.52 percent established in the prior docket. In 2002, in BPU Docket No. ER02050303, PSE&G filed for an increase in its electric service rates and for a change to its electric depreciation rates. The Company did
 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 	A.	 implement the 2.49 percent electric distribution plant depreciation rate. Apparently, PSE&G only used the 2.49 percent electric distribution plant depreciation rate for the restructuring case, and then in August 1999 reverted to the 3.52 percent established in the prior docket. In 2002, in BPU Docket No. ER02050303, PSE&G filed for an increase in its electric service rates and for a change to its electric depreciation rates. The Company did not submit a depreciation study. Instead, it proposed to retain the 3.52 percent

1		Rate Counsel agreed to the Company's proposal regarding its general and
2		common plant requests, even though it did not agree with many of the rates. Rate
3		Counsel also raised an issue concerning PSE&G's failure to use the proper distribution
4		depreciation rate for its electric plant and that PSE&G should have been using the 2.49
5		percent rate approved in the restructuring docket. This failure resulted in a \$115 million
6		additional reserve excess. The Board agreed that PSE&G should have been using the
7		2.49 percent distribution plant depreciation rate since August 1999, and consequently
8		approved a 29-month amortization of the additional reserve excess.
9 10	VI.	EXISTING GAS, GAS GENERAL AND GAS COMMON PLANT DEPRECIATION RATES
11	Q.	Please provide a summary of the history of PSE&G's existing gas depreciation
12		rates.
13	A.	PSE&G's existing gas depreciation rates resulted from two prior BPU proceedings:
13 14	A.	
	A.	PSE&G's existing gas depreciation rates resulted from two prior BPU proceedings:
14	A.	PSE&G's existing gas depreciation rates resulted from two prior BPU proceedings: GR01050297 and GR05100845.
14 15	A.	PSE&G's existing gas depreciation rates resulted from two prior BPU proceedings:GR01050297 and GR05100845.BPU Docket No. GR01050297.
14 15 16	A.	PSE&G's existing gas depreciation rates resulted from two prior BPU proceedings: GR01050297 and GR05100845. BPU <u>Docket No. GR01050297.</u> On May 4, 2001 PSE&G filed a petition for approval to change its gas
14 15 16 17	A.	PSE&G's existing gas depreciation rates resulted from two prior BPU proceedings: GR01050297 and GR05100845. BPU Docket No. GR01050297. On May 4, 2001 PSE&G filed a petition for approval to change its gas depreciation rates and associated revenue requirement. ³ The proposed change would

³ Order p 1. ⁴ ALJ Initial Decision p 1.

storage plant investment, and finally several of the amortization periods for its general
 plant accounts.⁵

However, the parties stipulated to a much lower depreciation expense. PSE&G retained its old depreciation rates except that it reduced the service life from 60-years to 40-years for transmission mains. The stipulation did not identify either the individual depreciation rates or the composite functional plant depreciation rates.

The parties also agreed to new rates for its gas general plant which composited to
12.79 percent. The relevant gas general plant depreciation rates were also applied to gas
common plant. Hence, BPU Docket No. GR01050297 established rates for PSE&G's
gas general and gas common plant.

11

BPU Docket No. GR05100845.

12 In New Jersey BPU Docket No. GR05100845 the Company proposed a \$42.6 13 million increase in annual gas depreciation expense relative to current depreciation rates 14 based on December 31, 2003 plant balances. PSE&G did not include general plant in the 15 depreciation study. Over half of PSE&G's depreciation request related to estimated 16 future costs of removal for non-legal Asset Retirement Obligations ("AROs") (\$72.1 17 million out of a total accrual of \$134.5 million). The Company also identified \$134.4 18 million relating to excess collections for cost of removal in its 2003 depreciation reserve. 19 This is part of the regulatory liability for non-legal AROs identified by Statement of 20 Financial Accounting Standards ("SFAS") No. 143.

⁵ Majoros Direct pp. 2 – 3, BPU Docket No. GR01050297.

1	Rate Counsel recommended that future net salvage be eliminated from the
2	depreciation rates and replaced with a normalized net salvage allowance based on
3	PSE&G's actual experience from 1999-2003, and also recommended that the \$134.4
4	million cost of removal reserve be amortized back to ratepayers over a three-year period.
5	Finally, Rate Counsel recommended changes to two lives. Overall, the recommendations
6	resulted in a \$74.5 million decrease based on December 31, 2003 plant balances.
7	The parties settled the case and agreed to Rate Counsel's depreciation rate
8	proposals, a \$6.375 million annual allowance for cost of removal, and a five-year
9	amortization of the \$148.495 million cost of removal regulatory liability that existed as of
10	December 31, 2005. Specifically:
11	
12	The parties agree that the Company's composite gas-only plant
13	depreciation rate shall be 1.644% based upon actual plant balances
14	as of the end of the test year, September 30, 2005. The
15	depreciation rates, as delineated in Attachment B to the Stipulation
16	of Settlement, attached hereto and incorporated herein by
17	reference, shall be applied to the corresponding functional
18	accounts. The existing rates for common plant and General Gas
19	Plant shall continue, as these rates were not at issue in this case.
20	
21	As of December 31, 2005, the Company's depreciation reserve
22 23	included \$148.495 million previously collected for Cost of Removal (COR) but not expended for that surpase. The parties
23 24	Removal (COR) but not expended for that purpose. The parties agree that the Company will amortize accumulated depreciation
24 25	reserve associated with COR at an annual rate of \$13.2 million.
23 26	This \$13.2 million annual rate amortization will continue for a
20 27	period of sixty (60) months, beginning with the implementation of
28	the new base rates resulting from this proceeding. The Company
29	shall not be entitled to recover any amounts claimed to be overpaid
30	to ratepayers in the event the rates resulting from this proceeding
31	remain in effect beyond the five-year amortization period.
32	
33	The expense for COR recoverable through rates shall be \$6.375
34	million on an annual basis reflecting the average actual annual

expenditure on COR for the five year period 1999 through 2003. 1 2 The annual recovery as determined above will be charged to 3 depreciation expense and credited to the depreciation reserve. Actual cost of removal incurred will continue to be debited to the 4 5 depreciation reserve. Therefore, any over or under recovery of 6 actual expense will be reflected in the depreciation reserve. The 7 parties acknowledge that under this Settlement, the Board will 8 continue the above policy to allow full recovery of and make the 9 Company whole on its actual and prudently incurred cost of 10 removal. All amounts associated with Cost of Removal, which remain in the depreciation reserve, will continue to be an offset to 11 12 the Company's rate base. The parties reserve their rights to argue 13 their respective positions as to the calculation of future remaining 14 life depreciation rates in subsequent rate cases.⁶ 15 16 VIII. **PSE&G'S CURRENT DEPRECIATION PROPOSAL** 17 **Q**. Has PSE&G proposed a change in the depreciation expense component of its 18 revenue requirement? 19 A. No. PSE&G did not propose any changes to its depreciation rates in its Petition. 20 Have you reached a conclusion regarding PSE&G's depreciation proposal? **O**. 21 A. Yes. In my opinion, PSE&G's depreciation proposal is unsupported. This proceeding 22 involves all of PSE&G's depreciation rates. Stipulations in separate proceedings at

23 several different points in time provide little authoritative support for the propriety of

24 those rates. The fact that the current rates are based on settlements does not mean they

- are correct, it means they were adopted as part of an overall settlement process.
- 26 Q. Why is it important to establish the correct depreciation rates?

27 A. First of all, PSE&G bases its customer charges on its "Cost of Service." PSE&G is

28 proposing \$166.7 million of electric depreciation and \$95.2 million for gas depreciation

⁶ I/M/O Public Service Electric and Gas Company, BPU Docket No. GR05100845, Decision and Order Adopting Initial Decision and Stipulation of Settlement, dated November 11, 2006, p. 4.

1		plus an additional \$10.4 million for cost of removal. ⁷ PSE&G's applies depreciation
2		rates to it plant balances to calculate its depreciation expense. Since depreciation expense
3		is a cost, the higher the depreciation rate, the higher PSE&G's charges to its customers.
4		In total, PSE&G is requesting \$272.3 million of unrestricted cash flow, without
5		any current support for the underlying depreciation rates. From an accounting and
6		technical standpoint, it is important to establish correct depreciation rates to properly
7		match depreciation expense to the appropriate period and to avoid a build-up of a
8		depreciation reserve imbalance resulting from overcharging or undercharging
9		depreciation to the proper periods. From a ratemaking standpoint, it is important to
10		establish the correct depreciation to avoid overcharging or undercharging ratepayers for
11		depreciation expense.
12	Q.	Is depreciation expense the same as other operating expenses?
12 13	Q. A.	Is depreciation expense the same as other operating expenses? No. Depreciation expense is different than PSE&G's other expenses. For example,
13		No. Depreciation expense is different than PSE&G's other expenses. For example,
13 14		No. Depreciation expense is different than PSE&G's other expenses. For example, PSE&G makes actual cash payments when it records its payroll expense. Consequently,
13 14 15		No. Depreciation expense is different than PSE&G's other expenses. For example, PSE&G makes actual cash payments when it records its payroll expense. Consequently, auditors can verify PSE&G's payroll expense merely by checking its cash payment
13 14 15 16		No. Depreciation expense is different than PSE&G's other expenses. For example, PSE&G makes actual cash payments when it records its payroll expense. Consequently, auditors can verify PSE&G's payroll expense merely by checking its cash payment records. On the other hand, PSE&G does not make any cash outlays for depreciation
13 14 15 16 17		No. Depreciation expense is different than PSE&G's other expenses. For example, PSE&G makes actual cash payments when it records its payroll expense. Consequently, auditors can verify PSE&G's payroll expense merely by checking its cash payment records. On the other hand, PSE&G does not make any cash outlays for depreciation expense. Instead, PSE&G records an estimated non-cash amount to its expenses and
 13 14 15 16 17 18 		No. Depreciation expense is different than PSE&G's other expenses. For example, PSE&G makes actual cash payments when it records its payroll expense. Consequently, auditors can verify PSE&G's payroll expense merely by checking its cash payment records. On the other hand, PSE&G does not make any cash outlays for depreciation expense. Instead, PSE&G records an estimated non-cash amount to its expenses and then, in turn, charges the estimated non-cash amount to its customers. The same auditors

Does PSE&G derive any current benefits from depreciation expense? **Q**.

⁷ PSE&G Exhibit P-7, Schedules MGK-45(6+6) and Kahrer, page 41.

1	A.	Yes. Since depreciation is a price-driver with no corresponding cash outlay, it provides
2		significant cash flow to PSE&G. Consequently, it is in PSE&G's best interest to charge
3		as much depreciation expense as it can to its cost of service.
4	Q.	Are depreciation rates normally based on studies?
5	A.	Yes. Given the magnitude of the numbers involved and the facts that these are non-cash
6		expenses being passed on to customers, depreciation rates are normally based on detailed
7		studies of parameters such as average lives, retirement patterns and estimated net
8		salvage. These studies ultimately reflect judgment, but at least they provide some basis
9		for the depreciation rates a utility applies. These parameters and resulting calculations
10		are normally available for Board scrutiny in base rate cases.
11	Q.	Did you ask PSE&G to support its current depreciation rates?
11 12	Q. A.	
		Did you ask PSE&G to support its current depreciation rates?
12		Did you ask PSE&G to support its current depreciation rates? Yes. Even though it requests a huge amount of depreciation expense, PSE&G does not
12 13		Did you ask PSE&G to support its current depreciation rates?Yes. Even though it requests a huge amount of depreciation expense, PSE&G does not provide any support for that amount. PSE&G states in responses to RCR data requests:
12 13 14		Did you ask PSE&G to support its current depreciation rates?Yes. Even though it requests a huge amount of depreciation expense, PSE&G does not provide any support for that amount. PSE&G states in responses to RCR data requests:"PSE&G objects, pursuant to NJSA 48:2-18 and 14:1-5.7, the petition does not include a
12 13 14 15		Did you ask PSE&G to support its current depreciation rates? Yes. Even though it requests a huge amount of depreciation expense, PSE&G does not provide any support for that amount. PSE&G states in responses to RCR data requests: "PSE&G objects, pursuant to NJSA 48:2-18 and 14:1-5.7, the petition does not include a request to a change in depreciation rates ⁸ . PSE&G admits, however, that it is unable to
12 13 14 15 16		Did you ask PSE&G to support its current depreciation rates? Yes. Even though it requests a huge amount of depreciation expense, PSE&G does not provide any support for that amount. PSE&G states in responses to RCR data requests: "PSE&G objects, pursuant to NJSA 48:2-18 and 14:1-5.7, the petition does not include a request to a change in depreciation rates ⁸ . PSE&G admits, however, that it is unable to provide any quantitative support for its proposed depreciation expense. PSE&G is not
12 13 14 15 16 17		Did you ask PSE&G to support its current depreciation rates? Yes. Even though it requests a huge amount of depreciation expense, PSE&G does not provide any support for that amount. PSE&G states in responses to RCR data requests: "PSE&G objects, pursuant to NJSA 48:2-18 and 14:1-5.7, the petition does not include a request to a change in depreciation rates ⁸ . PSE&G admits, however, that it is unable to provide any quantitative support for its proposed depreciation expense. PSE&G is not able to support its current depreciation rates because they "were approved as a result of

⁸ RCR-DEP-3, 4 and 16. ⁹ RCR-DEP-43.

¹⁰ RCR-DEP-44.

to provide a depreciation study and the basic data required to conduct a depreciation
 study.¹¹

3 Q. Is PSE&G cognizant of any major events that could have an impact on its 4 depreciation rates?

- 5 Yes. PSE&G recognized in its recent Capital Infrastructure Investment Program ("CIIP") A. 6 proceeding that such a major new program involving significant incremental expenditures on plant could have an impact upon its depreciation expense.¹² In that proceeding, Rate 7 8 Counsel sought to conduct a depreciation study to reflect the effects of the program on 9 PSE&G's depreciation rates. PSE&G provided the following response to eleven separate 10 Rate Counsel data requests designed to obtain the information and data necessary to 11 conduct a depreciation study: "No such [depreciation] study will be done prior to the 12 next base rate case filing, at such time changes in depreciation lives, and or rates and salvage will be considered."¹³ Rate Counsel relied on PSE&G's representations in the 13 14 CIIP case, and thus agreed to incorporate PSE&G current depreciation rates into the 15 calculation of its Capital Adjustment Charge "CAC" Rider.
- 16 **Q.** What do you recommend?

17 A. I understand that PSE&G will submit a depreciation study in early January 2010, and I

- 18 reserve my right to conduct additional discovery and file supplemental testimony
- 19 addressing PSE&G's depreciation study when it's filed.

¹² See I/M/O the Petition of Public Service Electric and Gas Company For Approval of A Capital Economic Stimulus Infrastructure Investment Program and An Associated Cost Recovery Mechanism Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 48:2-21 and 48:2-21.1, BPU Docket No. EO09010050, Order dated April 28, 2009.

¹¹ RCR-DEP-3 and 16.

¹³ RC-PS-IN-A-11, 12,15,19,20,21,23,24,25,26, and 27, BPU Dkt. No. EO09010050.

1 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

2 A. Yes, it does.

EXHIBIT MJM-1

Public Service Electri alculation of Depreciation: C

1

-

•

STIPULATED RATES Depreciation Pate Acorual	3.49% \$56,945,294 Various 182,585,910 2.43 507,796 4.11 14,442,347 2.40 22,670,280 3.52 86,869,0280 3.55 261 3.05 2,755,261	3.25 366.776.709	6.58 15,448,712 10.21 9,347,469 7.35 973,105 5.41 874,327	7.41 26.643.614	7.08 4,749,948 4.09 382,794 2.64 1,411,030 2.65 47,769,311 2.57 669,395 2.57 669,395 3.30 448,432,801
Accrual Adjustment	\$15,000,000	15,000,000			(25,000,000) (25,000,000) (10,000,000)
A C T U A L CURPENT Depreciation Parte Aconuel	2.57% \$41,945,284 Various 182,565,910 2.43 507,788 4.11 14,442,347 2.40 22,670,280 3.52 88,856,822 3.55 281	3.12 351,778,709	8 58 15,448,712 10.21 8,347,489 7.35 973,105 5.41 874,327	7.41 26.643.614	7.08 4,749,948 4.09 362,794 2.64 1,411,030 4.03 72,768,311 2.57 669,365 4.08 80,012,478 3.37 458,432,801
<u>6 - 30 - 82</u> Depredable Balarce	\$1,632,112,580 5,771,686,178 20,886,839 351,385,288 844,585,005 2,467,608,588 80,336,430	11.278.631.028	234,782,884 91,552,100 13,238,523 4,008,221 16,155,339	359,736,047	67,089,686 9,359,261 53,448,110 1,805,690,094 27,213,795 1,962,600,827 \$13,601,168,002
Description	Electric Total Steam Production Plant Total Nuclear Production Plant Total Avaulio Production Plant Total Other Production Plant Total Distribution Plant Total Distribution Plant	Total Electric Plant	Common Plant Subtotal Common Plant 392. I Automobiles & Ught Trucks 392. 3 Heixoy Trucks & Work Equipment 392. 3 Heixopter 398 Power Operated Equipment	Total Common Plant	Ges Total Production Plant Total Storage Plant Total Distribution Plant Total General Plant Total Gas Plant Grand Total

(A) Nuclear Decommissioning Costs are excluded.

For the Steam Production Plant the current rate of 2.57% is made up of a Life Portion of 2.3256% with a Net Salvage Portion of .2444%. The Stipulated Plate of 3.49% reflects the same Life Portion of 2.32569% with a New Net Salvage Portion of 1.1634%.

For the Gas Distribution Plant the current rate of 4.03% is made up of a Life Portion of 2.3256% with a Net Salvage Portion of 1.7044%. The Stipulated Pate of 2.65% reflects the same life portion of 2.3256% and a new Net Salvage Portion of .3244%.

APPENDIX A

Experience

Snavely King Majoros O'Connor & Bedell, Inc.

Vice President and Treasurer (1988 to Present) Senior Consultant (1981-1987)

Mr. Majoros provides consultation specializing in accounting, financial, and management issues. He has testified as an expert witness or negotiated on behalf` of clients in more than one hundred thirty regulatory federal and state regulatory proceedings involving telephone, electric, gas, water, and sewerage companies. His testimony has encompassed a wide array of complex issues including taxation, divestiture accounting, revenue requirements, rate base, nuclear decommissioning, plant lives, and capital recovery. Mr. Majoros has also provided consultation to the U.S. Department of Justice and appeared before the U.S. EPA and the Maryland State Legislature on matters regarding the accounting and plant life effects of electric plant modifications and the financial capacity of public utilities to finance environmental controls. He has estimated economic damages suffered by black farmers in discrimination suits.

Van Scoyoc & Wiskup, Inc., Consultant (1978-1981)

Mr. Majoros conducted and assisted in various management and regulatory consulting projects in the public utility field, including preparation of electric system load projections for a group of municipally and cooperatively owned electric systems; preparation of a system of accounts and reporting of gas and oil pipelines to be used by a state regulatory commission; accounting system analysis and design for rate proceedings involving electric, gas, and telephone utilities. Mr. Majoros provided onsite management accounting and controllership assistance to a municipal electric and water utility. Mr. Majoros also assisted in an antitrust proceeding involving a major electric utility. He submitted expert testimony in FERC Docket No. RP79-12 (El Paso Natural Gas Company), and he co-authored a study entitled Analysis of Staff Study on Comprehensive Tax Normalization that was submitted to FERC in Docket No. RM 80-42.

Handling Equipment Sales Company, Inc. *Controller/Treasurer (1976-1978)*

Mr. Majoros' responsibilities included financial management, general accounting and reporting, and income taxes.

Ernst & Ernst, Auditor (1973-1976)

Mr. Majoros was a member of the audit staff where his responsibilities included auditing, supervision, business systems analysis, report preparation, and corporate income taxes.

University of Baltimore - (1971-1973)

Mr. Majoros was a full-time student in the School of Business.

During this period Mr. Majoros worked consistently on a parttime basis in the following positions: Assistant Legislative Auditor – State of Maryland, Staff Accountant – Robert M. Carney & Co., CPA's, Staff Accountant – Naron & Wegad, CPA's, Credit Clerk – Montgomery Wards.

Central Savings Bank, (1969-1971)

Mr. Majoros was an Assistant Branch Manager at the time he left the bank to attend college as a full-time student. During his tenure at the bank, Mr. Majoros gained experience in each department of the bank. In addition, he attended night school at the University of Baltimore.

Education

University of Baltimore, School of Business, B.S. – Concentration in Accounting

Professional Affiliations

American Institute of Certified Public Accountants Maryland Association of C.P.A.s Society of Depreciation Professionals

Publications, Papers, and Panels

"Analysis of Staff Study on Comprehensive Tax Normalization," FERC Docket No. RM 80-42, 1980.

"Telephone Company Deferred Taxes and Investment Tax Credits – A Capital Loss for Ratepayers," Public Utility Fortnightly, September 27, 1984.

"The Use of Customer Discount Rates in Revenue Requirement Comparisons," Proceedings of the 25th Annual Iowa State Regulatory Conference, 1986

"The Regulatory Dilemma Created By Emerging Revenue Streams of Independent Telephone Companies," Proceedings of NARUC 101st Annual Convention and Regulatory Symposium, 1989.

"BOC Depreciation Issues in the States," National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, 1990 Mid-Year Meeting, 1990.

"Current Issues in Capital Recovery" 30th Annual Iowa State Regulatory Conference, 1991.

"Impaired Assets Under SFAS No. 121," National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, 1996 Mid-Year Meeting, 1996.

"What's 'Sunk' Ain't Stranded: Why Excessive Utility Depreciation is Avoidable," with James Campbell, Public Utilities Fortnightly, April 1, 1999.

"Local Exchange Carrier Depreciation Reserve Percents," with Richard B. Lee, Journal of the Society of Depreciation Professionals, Volume 10, Number 1, 2000-2001

"Rolling Over Ratepayers," Public Utilities Fortnightly, Volume 143, Number 11, November, 2005.

"Asset Management – What is it?," American Water Works Association, Pre-Conference Workshop, March 25, 2008.

APPENDIX B

<u>Date</u>	Jurisdiction /	Docket	Utility
	<u>Agency</u>		
		Federal Courts	
2005	US District Court, Northern District of AL, Northwestern Division 55/56/57/	CV 01-B-403-NW	Tennessee Valley Authority

State Legislatures

2006	Maryland General Assembly <u>61</u> /	SB154	Maryland Healthy Air Act
2006	Maryland House of Delegates <u>62</u> /	HB189	Maryland Healthy Air Act

Federal Regulatory Agencies

1979	FERC-US <u>19</u> /	RP79-12	El Paso Natural Gas Co.
1980	FERC-US <u>19</u> /	RM80-42	Generic Tax Normalization
1996	CRTC-Canada <u>30</u> /	97-9	All Canadian Telecoms
1997	CRTC-Canada <u>31</u> /	97-11	All Canadian Telecoms
1999	FCC <u>32</u> /	98-137 (Ex Parte)	All LECs
1999	FCC <u>32</u> /	98-91 (Ex Parte)	All LECs
1999	FCC <u>32</u> /	98-177 (Ex Parte)	All LECs
1999	FCC <u>32</u> /	98-45 (Ex Parte)	All LECs
2000	EPA <u>35</u> /	CAA-00-6	Tennessee Valley Authority
2003	FERC <u>48</u> /	RM02-7	All Utilities
2003	FCC <u>52</u> /	03-173	All LECs
2003	FERC <u>53</u> /	ER03-409-000, ER03-666-000	Pacific Gas and Electric Co.

State Regulatory Agencies

1982	Massachusetts 17/	DPU 557/558	Western Mass Elec. Co.
1982	Illinois <u>16</u> /	ICC81-8115	Illinois Bell Telephone Co.
1983	Maryland <u>8</u> /	7574-Direct	Baltimore Gas & Electric Co.
1983	Maryland <u>8</u> /	7574-Surrebuttal	Baltimore Gas & Electric Co.
1983	Connecticut <u>15</u> /	810911	Woodlake Water Co.
1983	New Jersey <u>1</u> /	815-458	New Jersey Bell Tel. Co.
1983	New Jersey <u>14</u> /	8011-827	Atlantic City Sewerage Co.
1984	Dist. Of Columbia 7/	785	Potomac Electric Power Co.
1984	Maryland <u>8</u> /	7689	Washington Gas Light Co.
1984	Dist. Of Columbia 7/	798	C&P Tel. Co.
1984	Pennsylvania <u>13</u> /	R-832316	Bell Telephone Co. of PA
1984	New Mexico <u>12</u> /	1032	Mt. States Tel. & Telegraph
1984	Idaho <u>18</u> /	U-1000-70	Mt. States Tel. & Telegraph

1984	Colorado 11/	1655	Mt. States Tel. & Telegraph	
1984	Dist. Of Columbia 7/	813	Potomac Electric Power Co.	
1984	Pennsylvania <u>3</u> /	R842621-R842625	Western Pa. Water Co.	
1985	Maryland <u>8</u> /	7743	Potomac Edison Co.	
1985	New Jersey <u>1</u> /	848-856	New Jersey Bell Tel. Co.	
1985	Maryland <u>8</u> /	7851	C&P Tel. Co.	
1985	California 10/	1-85-03-78	Pacific Bell Telephone Co.	
1985	Pennsylvania <u>3</u> /	R-850174	Phila. Suburban Water Co.	
1985	Pennsylvania <u>3</u> /	R850178	Pennsylvania Gas & Water Co.	
1985	Pennsylvania <u>3</u> /	R-850299	General Tel. Co. of PA	
1986	· — —	7899	Delmarva Power & Light Co.	
1986	Maryland <u>8</u> / Maryland <u>8</u> /	7754		
			Chesapeake Utilities Corp. York Water Co.	
1986 1986	Pennsylvania <u>3</u> /	R-850268		
	Maryland 8/	7953	Southern Md. Electric Corp.	
1986	Idaho <u>9</u> /	U-1002-59	General Tel. Of the Northwest	
1986	Maryland <u>8</u> /	7973	Baltimore Gas & Electric Co.	
1987	Pennsylvania <u>3</u> /	R-860350	Dauphin Cons. Water Supply	
1987	Pennsylvania <u>3</u> /	C-860923	Bell Telephone Co. of PA	
1987	lowa <u>6</u> /	DPU-86-2	Northwestern Bell Tel. Co.	
1987	Dist. Of Columbia 7/	842	Washington Gas Light Co.	
1988	Florida <u>4</u> /	880069-TL	Southern Bell Telephone	
1988	lowa <u>6</u> /	RPU-87-3	Iowa Public Service Company	
1988	lowa <u>6</u> /	RPU-87-6	Northwestern Bell Tel. Co.	
1988	Dist. Of Columbia 7/	869	Potomac Electric Power Co.	
1989	lowa <u>6</u> /	RPU-88-6	Northwestern Bell Tel. Co.	
1990	New Jersey <u>1</u> /	1487-88	Morris City Transfer Station	
1990	New Jersey <u>5</u> /	WR 88-80967	Toms River Water Company	
1990	Florida <u>4</u> /	890256-TL	Southern Bell Company	
1990	New Jersey <u>1</u> /	ER89110912J	Jersey Central Power & Light	
1990	New Jersey <u>1</u> /	WR90050497J	Elizabethtown Water Co.	
1991	Pennsylvania <u>3</u> /	P900465	United Tel. Co. of Pa.	
1991	West Virginia 2/	90-564-T-D	C&P Telephone Co.	
1991	New Jersey <u>1</u> /	90080792J	Hackensack Water Co.	
1991	New Jersey <u>1</u> /	WR90080884J	Middlesex Water Co.	
1991	Pennsylvania <u>3</u> /	R-911892	Phil. Suburban Water Co.	
1991	Kansas <u>20</u> /	176, 716-U	Kansas Power & Light Co.	
1991	Indiana <u>29</u> /	39017	Indiana Bell Telephone	
1991	Nevada <u>21</u> /	91-5054	Central Tele. Co. – Nevada	
1992	New Jersey <u>1</u> /	EE91081428	Public Service Electric & Gas	
1992	Maryland <u>8/</u>	8462	C&P Telephone Co.	
1992	West Virginia <u>2</u> /	91-1037-E-D	Appalachian Power Co.	
1993	Maryland <u>8</u> /	8464	Potomac Electric Power Co.	
1993	South Carolina 22/	92-227-C	Southern Bell Telephone	
1993	Maryland <u>8</u> /	8485	Baltimore Gas & Electric Co.	
1993	Georgia <u>23</u> /	4451-U	Atlanta Gas Light Co.	

1993	New Jersey 1/	GR93040114	New Jersey Natural Gas. Co.	
1994	lowa <u>6</u> /	RPU-93-9	U.S. West – Iowa	
1994	lowa <u>6</u> /	RPU-94-3	Midwest Gas	
1995	Delaware <u>24</u> /	94-149	Wilm. Suburban Water Corp.	
1995	Connecticut 25/	94-10-03	So. New England Telephone	
1995	Connecticut <u>25</u> /	95-03-01	So. New England Telephone	
1995	Pennsylvania <u>3</u> /	R-00953300	Citizens Utilities Company	
1995	Georgia <u>23</u> /	5503-0	Southern Bell	
		8715	Bell Atlantic	
1996	Maryland <u>8</u> /	E-1032-95-417		
1996	Arizona <u>26</u> /		Citizens Utilities Company	
1996	New Hampshire <u>27</u> /	DE 96-252	New England Telephone	
1997	lowa <u>6</u> /	DPU-96-1	U S West – Iowa	
1997	Ohio <u>28</u> /	96-922-TP-UNC	Ameritech – Ohio	
1997	Michigan <u>28</u> /	U-11280	Ameritech – Michigan	
1997	Michigan <u>28</u> /	U-112 81	GTE North	
1997	Wyoming <u>27</u> /	7000-ztr-96-323	US West – Wyoming	
1997	lowa <u>6</u> /	RPU-96-9	US West – Iowa	
1997	Illinois <u>28</u> /	96-0486-0569	Ameritech – Illinois	
1997	Indiana <u>28</u> /	40611	Ameritech – Indiana	
1997	Indiana <u>27</u> /	40734	GTE North	
1997	Utah <u>27</u> /	97-049-08	US West – Utah	
1997	Georgia <u>28</u> /	7061-U	BellSouth – Georgia	
1997	Connecticut 25/	96-04-07	So. New England Telephone	
1998	Florida <u>28</u> /	960833-TP et. al.	BellSouth – Florida	
1998	Illinois <u>27</u> /	97-0355	GTE North/South	
1998	Michigan <u>33</u> /	U-11726	Detroit Edison	
1999	Maryland <u>8</u> /	8794	Baltimore Gas & Electric Co.	
1999	Maryland 8/	8795	Delmarva Power & Light Co.	
1999	Maryland <u>8</u> /	8797	Potomac Edison Company	
1999	West Virginia <u>2</u> /	98-0452-E-GI	Electric Restructuring	
1999	Delaware 24/	98-98	United Water Company	
1999	Pennsylvania <u>3</u> /	R-00994638	Pennsylvania American Water	
1999	West Virginia 2/	98-0985-W-D	West Virginia American Water	
1999	Michigan 33/	U-11495	Detroit Edison	
2000	Delaware 24/	99-466	Tidewater Utilities	
2000	New Mexico 34/	3008	US WEST Communications, Inc.	
2000	Florida <u>28</u> /	990649-TP	BellSouth -Florida	
2000	New Jersey <u>1</u> /	WR30174	Consumer New Jersey Water	
2000	Pennsylvania 3/	R-00994868	Philadelphia Suburban Water	
2000	Pennsylvania <u>3</u> /	R-0005212	Pennsylvania American Sewerage	
2000	Connecticut 25/	00-07-17	Southern New England Telephone	
2000	Kentucky 36/	2000-373	Jackson Energy Cooperative	
2001	Kansas <u>38/39/40</u> /	01-WSRE-436-RTS	Western Resources	
2001	South Carolina 22/	2001-93-E	Carolina Power & Light Co.	
2001	North Dakota <u>37</u> /	PU-400-00-521	Northern States Power/Xcel Energy	
2001	1101111 Danola <u>51</u> /	1 0-400-00-321	Inorthern Otales I Ower/Acer Lifelyy	

2001	Indiana <u>29/41</u> /	41746	Northern Indiana Power Company	
2001	New Jersey <u>1</u> /	GR01050328	Public Service Electric and Gas	
2001	Pennsylvania <u>3</u> /	R-00016236	York Water Company	
2001	Pennsylvania <u>3</u> /	R-00016339	Pennsylvania America Water	
2001	Pennsylvania 3/	R-00016356	Wellsboro Electric Coop.	
2001	Florida <u>4</u> /	010949-EL	Gulf Power Company	
2001	Hawaii 42/	00-309	The Gas Company	
2002	Pennsylvania <u>3/</u>	R-00016750	Philadelphia Suburban	
2002	Nevada 43/	01-10001 &10002	Nevada Power Company	
2002	Kentucky 36/	2001-244	Fleming Mason Electric Coop.	
2002	Nevada 43/	01-11031	Sierra Pacific Power Company	
2002	Georgia 27/	14361-U	BellSouth-Georgia	
2002	Alaska 44/	U-01-34,82-87,66	Alaska Communications Systems	
2002	Wisconsin 45/	2055-TR-102	CenturyTel	
2002	Wisconsin 45/	5846-TR-102	TelUSA	
2002	Vermont 46/	6596	Citizen's Energy Services	
2002	North Dakota 37/	PU-399-02-183	Montana Dakota Utilities	
2002	Kansas 40/	02-MDWG-922-RTS	Midwest Energy	
2002	Kentucky 36/	2002-00145	Columbia Gas	
2002	Oklahoma 47/	2002-00145		
2002	New Jersey 1/	GR02040245	Reliant Energy ARKLA	
2002	New Jersey 1/	ER02050303	Elizabethtown Gas Company Public Service Electric and Gas Co.	
2003	Hawaii 42/	01-0255	Young Brothers Tug & Barge	
2003	New Jersey 1/	ER02080506	Jersey Central Power & Light	
2003	New Jersey 1/	ER02100724	Rockland Electric Co.	
2003	Pennsylvania 3/	R-00027975	The York Water Co.	
2003	Pennsylvania /3	R-00038304	Pennsylvania-American Water Co.	
2003	Kansas 20/ 40/	03-KGSG-602-RTS	Kansas Gas Service	
2003	Nova Scotia, CN 49/	EMO NSPI	Nova Scotia Power, Inc.	
2003	Kentucky 36/	2003-00252	Union Light Heat & Power	
2003	Alaska 44/	U-96-89	ACS Communications, Inc.	
2003	Indiana 29/	42359	PSI Energy, Inc.	
2003	Kansas 20/ 40/	03-ATMG-1036-RTS	Atmos Energy	
2003	Florida 50/	030001-E1	Tampa Electric Company	
2003	Maryland 51/	8960	Washington Gas Light	
2003	Hawaii 42/	02-0391	Hawaiian Electric Company	
2003	Illinois 28/	02-0864	SBC Illinois	
2003	Indiana 28/	42393	SBC Indiana	
2004	New Jersey 1/	ER03020110	Atlantic City Electric Co.	
2004	Arizona 26/	E-01345A-03-0437	Arizona Public Service Company	
2004	Michigan 27/	U-13531	SBC Michigan	
2004	New Jersey 1/	GR03080683	South Jersey Gas Company	
2004	Kentucky 36/	2003-00434,00433	Kentucky Utilities, Louisville Gas & Electric	
2004	Florida 50/ 54/	031033-EI	Tampa Electric Company	

			Corporation	
2004	Delaware 24/	04-288	Delaware Electric Cooperative	
2004	Missouri 58/	ER-2004-0570	Empire District Electric Company	
2005	Florida 50/	041272-EI	Progress Energy Florida, Inc.	
2005	Florida 50/	041291-EI	Florida Power & Light Company	
2005	California 59/	A.04-12-014	Southern California Edison Co.	
2005	Kentucky 36/	2005-00042	Union Light Heat & Power	
2005	Florida 50/	050045 & 050188-EI	Florida Power & Light Co.	
2005	Kansas 38/ 40/	05-WSEE-981-RTS	Westar Energy, Inc.	
2006	Delaware 24/	05-304	Delmarva Power & Light Company	
2006	California 59/	A.05-12-002	Pacific Gas & Electric Co.	
2006	New Jersey 1/	GR05100845	Public Service Electric and Gas Co.	
2006	Colorado 60/	06S-234EG	Public Service Co. of Colorado	
2006	Kentucky 36/	2006-00172	Union Light, Heat & Power	
2006	Kansas 40/	06-KGSG-1209-RTS	Kansas Gas Service	
2006	West Virginia 2/	06-0960-E-42T,	Allegheny Power	
0000	Maat Virginia 0/	06-1426-E-D	Llana Caa, Inc. and Equitable	
2006	West Virginia 2/	05-1120-G-30C,	Hope Gas, Inc. and Equitable	
2007	Delaware 24/	06-0441-G-PC, et al. 06-284	Resources, Inc.	
2007	Kentucky 36/	2006-00464	Delmarva Power & Light Company Atmos Energy Corporation	
2007	Colorado 60/	06S-656G	Public Service Co. of Colorado	
2007	California 59/	A.06-12-009,	San Diego Gas & Electric Co., and	
2007		A.06-12-010	Southern California Gas Co.	
2007	Kentucky 36/	2007-00143	Kentucky-American Water Co.	
2007	Kentucky 36/	2007-00089	Delta Natural Gas Co.	
2008	Kansas 40/	08-ATMG-280-RTS	Atmos Energy Corporation	
2008	New Jersey 1/	GR07110889	New Jersey Natural Gas Co.	
2008	North Dakota 37/	PU-07-776	Northern States Power/Xcel Energy	
2008	Pennsylvania 3/	A-2008-2034045 et	UGI Utilities, Inc. / PPL Gas Utilities	
		al	Corp.	
2008	Washington 63/	UE-072300,	Puget Sound Energy	
	_	UG-072301		
2008	Pennsylvania 3/	R-2008-2032689	Pennsylvania-American Water Co Coatesville	
2008	New Jersey 1/	WR08010020	NJ American Water Co.	
2008	Washington 63/ 64/	UE-080416,	Avista Corporation	
		UG-080417		
2008	Texas 65/	473-08-3681, 35717	Oncor Electric Delivery Co.	
2008	Tennessee 66/	08-00039	Tennessee-American Water Co.	
2008	Kansas	08-WSEE-1041-RTS	Westar Energy, Inc.	

2009	Indiana 29/	43501	Duke Energy Indiana
2009	Indiana 29/	43526	Northern Indiana Public Service Co.
2009	Michigan 33/	U-15611	Consumers Energy Company
2009	Kentucky 36/	2009-00141	Columbia Gas of Kentucky
2009	New Jersey 1/	GR00903015	Elizabethtown Gas Company

PARTICIPATION AS NEGOTIATOR IN FCC TELEPHONE DEPRECIATION RATE REPRESCRIPTION CONFERENCES

Diamond State Telephone Co. 24/1985 + 1988Delaware Public Service CommBell Telephone of Pennsylvania 3/1986 + 1989PA Consumer AdvocateChesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co Md. 8/1986Maryland People's CounselSouthwestern Bell Telephone – Kansas 20/1986Kansas Corp. CommissionSouthern Bell – Florida 4/1986Florida Consumer AdvocateChesapeake & Potomac Telephone CoW.Va. 2/1987 + 1990West VA Consumer AdvocateNew Jersey Bell Telephone Co. 1/1985 + 1988New Jersey Rate CounselSouthern Bell - South Carolina 22/1986 + 1989 + 1992S. Carolina Consumer AdvocateGTE-North – Pennsylvania 3/1989PA Consumer Advocate	COMPANY	<u>YEARS</u>	<u>CLIENT</u>
The month is the sylvania of t	Bell Telephone of Pennsylvania <u>3</u> /	1986 + 1989	PA Consumer Advocate
	Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co Md. <u>8</u> /	1986	Maryland People's Counsel
	Southwestern Bell Telephone – Kansas <u>20</u> /	1986	Kansas Corp. Commission
	Southern Bell – Florida <u>4</u> /	1986	Florida Consumer Advocate
	Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone CoW.Va. <u>2</u> /	1987 + 1990	West VA Consumer Advocate
	New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. <u>1</u> /	1985 + 1988	New Jersey Rate Counsel

PARTICIPATION IN PROCEEDINGS WHICH WERE SETTLED BEFORE TESTIMONY WAS SUBMITTED

S	T/	١	Έ

DOCKET NO.

7878

88-728

WR90090950J

WR900050497J

WR91091483

91-1037-E

R-00932873

93-1165-E-D

94-0013-E-D

WR94030059

WR95080346

WR95050219

1999-077-E

1999-072-E

2001-104 & 141

92-7002

Maryland 8/ Nevada 21/ New Jersey 1/ New Jersey 1/ New Jersey 1/ West Virginia 2/ Nevada 21/ Pennsylvania 3/ West Virginia2/ West Virginia2/ New Jersey 1/ New Jersey 1/ New Jersey 1/ Maryland 8/ South Carolina 22/ South Carolina 22/ Kentucky 36/

Kentucky 36/

2002-485

8796

<u>UTILITY</u>

Potomac Edison Southwest Gas New Jersey American Water Elizabethtown Water Garden State Water Appalachian Power Co. Central Telephone - Nevada Blue Mountain Water Potomac Edison Monongahela Power New Jersey American Water Elizabethtown Water Toms River Water Co. Potomac Electric Power Co. Carolina Power & Light Co. Carolina Power & Light Co. Kentucky Utilities, Louisville Gas and Electric Jackson Purchase Energy Corporation

<u>Clients</u>

<u>1</u> /	New Jersey Rate Counsel/Advocate		New Mexico Attorney General
<u>2</u> /	West Virginia Consumer Advocate	<u>35</u> /	Environmental Protection Agency Enforcement Staff
<u>3</u> /	Pennsylvania OCA	<u>36</u> /	Kentucky Attorney General
<u>4</u> /	Florida Office of Public Advocate	<u>37</u> /	North Dakota Public Service Commission
<u>5</u> /	Toms River Fire Commissioner's	<u>38</u> /	Kansas Industrial Group
<u>6</u> /	Iowa Office of Consumer Advocate	<u>39</u> /	City of Witchita
<u>7</u> /	D.C. People's Counsel	<u>40</u> /	Kansas Citizens' Utility Rate Board
<u>8</u> /	Maryland's People's Counsel	<u>41</u> /	NIPSCO Industrial Group
<u>9/</u>	Idaho Public Service Commission	<u>42</u> /	Hawaii Division of Consumer Advocacy
<u>10</u> /	Western Burglar and Fire Alarm	<u>43</u> /	Nevada Bureau of Consumer Protection
<u>11</u> /	U.S. Dept. of Defense	<u>44</u> /	GCI
<u>12</u> /	N.M. State Corporation Comm.	<u>45</u> /	Wisc. Citizens' Utility Rate Board
<u>13</u> /	City of Philadelphia	<u>46</u> /	Vermont Department of Public Service
<u>14</u> /	Resorts International	<u>47</u> /	Oklahoma Corporation Commission
<u>15</u> /	Woodlake Condominium Association		National Assn. of State Utility Consumer Advocates
	Illinois Attorney General	<u>49</u> /	Nova Scotia Utility and Review Board
<u>17</u> /	Mass Coalition of Municipalities	<u>50</u> /	Florida Office of Public Counsel
<u>18</u> /	U.S. Department of Energy	<u>51</u> /	Maryland Public Service Commission
<u>19</u> /	Arizona Electric Power Corp.	<u>52</u> /	MCI
<u>20</u> /	Kansas Corporation Commission	<u>53</u> /	Transmission Agency of Northern California
<u>21</u> /	Public Service Comm. – Nevada	<u>54</u> /	Florida Industrial Power Users Group
<u>22</u> /	SC Dept. of Consumer Affairs		Sierra Club
<u>23</u> /	Georgia Public Service Comm.	<u>56/</u>	Our Children's Earth Foundation
<u>24</u> /	Delaware Public Service Comm.	57/	National Parks Conservation Association, Inc.
<u>25</u> /	Conn. Ofc. Of Consumer Counsel	<u>58/</u>	Missouri Office of the Public Counsel
<u>26</u> /	Arizona Corp. Commission	<u>59</u> /	The Utility Reform Network
<u>27</u> /	AT&T	<u>60</u> /	Colorado Office of Consumer Counsel
<u>28</u> /	AT&T/MCI	<u>61</u> /	MD State Senator Paul G. Pinsky
<u>29</u> /	IN Office of Utility Consumer	<u>62</u> /	MD Speaker of the House Michael Busch
Counselor			
	Unitel (AT&T – Canada)		Washington Office of Public Counsel
	Public Interest Advocacy Centre		Industrial Customers of Northwestern Utilities
	U.S. General Services Administration		Steering Committee of Cities
<u>33</u> /	Michigan Attorney General	<u>66</u> /	City of Chattanooga