FILED
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
01 FEB 20 AM 11:33
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Missouri Public Service Commission

POST OFFICE BOX 360
JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65102
573-751-3234
573-751-1847 (Fax Number)
http://www.psc.state.mo.us

February 16, 2001

ORIGINAL

Mr. David Boergers, Secretary
Office of the Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, N.E., Room 1-A
Washington, D.C. 20426

RE: Docket No. RP93-109

Dear Mr. Boergers:

Enclosed for filing in the above-captioned case are an original and fifteen (15) conformed copies of the **COMMENTS OF THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION IN SUPPORT OF STIPULATION AND AGREEMENT.**

Please date and time stamp the extra copy which is enclosed and return it to me in the enclosed self-addressed envelope.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Lera L. Shemwell by TFS

Lera L. Shemwell
Associate General Counsel
(573) 751-7431
(573) 751-9285 (Fax)

LLS:sw
Enclosures
cc: Counsel of Record

FERC DOCKETED
FEB 20 2001

010221-0418-2

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Williams Natural Gas Company) Docket No. RP93-109

COMMENTS OF THE
MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
IN SUPPORT OF STIPULATION AND AGREEMENT

Pursuant to Rule 602(f) of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. §385.602(f), the Missouri Public Service Commission ("MoPSC") hereby submits its comments in support of the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement ("Stipulation") filed on January 31, 2001 in the above captioned proceeding.

The MoPSC is a "state commission" within the meaning of Section 1.101a(k) of the Commission's general regulations. The MoPSC has actively participated in this proceeding to protect the interests of Missouri's natural gas consumers who receive service from Williams Gas Pipelines Central, Inc., formerly known as Williams Natural Gas Company (Williams).

This Stipulation is the result of extensive negotiations between the parties in this case. If the Commission approves this Stipulation, it will settle the issue of Williams' recovery of its environmental clean-up costs. The Stipulation establishes an annual environmental cost of service allowance of $1,700,000 for the rates associated with this docket's locked-in period. This means that Williams is due an additional $1,012,150, which will be offset against the $2,808,519 refund Williams owes customers for environmental cost recoveries from third-party insurers during calendar year 2000.

Since Williams refunded the balance of the environmental cost recovery moneys on January 31, 2001, the Stipulation is considered to be consistent with the public interest and to be a fair and reasonable resolution of the remanded environmental cost issue in this docket.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, the MoPSC respectfully requests the January 31 Stipulation and Agreement be certified by Presiding Administrative Law Judge Harfeld and approved by the Commission.

Respectfully submitted,

DANA K. JOYCE
General Counsel

Lera L. Shemwell

Lera L. Shemwell
Associate General Counsel

Missouri Public Service Commission
P. O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(573) 751-7431 (Telephone)
(573) 751-9285 (Fax)
lshemwel@mail.state.mo.us

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Rule 2010 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, I hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of the foregoing document on all persons designated on the official service list compiled by the Secretary in this proceeding,

Dated at Jefferson City, Missouri this 16th day of February, 2001.

Lera L. Shemwell

Lera L. Shemwell

GARY W. BOYLE
Senior Counsel – Gas Pipeline Central
918/573-2359
918/573-4195 office fax
gary.boyle@williams.com

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY ORIGINAL
01 JAN 31 PM 3:29
REGULATORY COMMISSION

Williams.

Gas Pipelines - Central
One Williams Center
P.O. Box 3288
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74101
918/588-2000

January 31, 2001

David P. Boergers
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Williams Natural Gas Co., Docket No. RP93-109 - 000

Dear Mr. Boergers:

Pursuant to Rule 602 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission), 18 C.F.R. § 385.602, Williams Gas Pipelines Central, Inc., formerly named Williams Natural Gas Company (Williams), hereby submits an original and fourteen (14) copies of a Stipulation and Agreement (Agreement) in the captioned proceeding.

In addition, this transmittal letter, including the explanatory statement, constitute compliance with Rule 602(c)(1)(ii). A proposed order of the Commission accepting the Agreement is also attached.

A. EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

On April 30, 1993, Williams filed a general Section 4 rate filing proposing, among other things, to amortize over a three-year period actual past period environmental costs of $4.2 million. On November 22, 1995, the Presiding ALJ issued an Initial Decision approving the three-year amortization of environmental costs with a procedure for refunding amounts that Williams recovered from third parties. On December 19, 1996, the Commission affirmed in part and reversed in part the ALJ's Initial Decision rejecting Williams' proposed amortization in favor of the "test period" method and ruling that $1.4 million was a reasonable representation of the level of environmental costs to be recovered in rates. Williams appealed that decision to the D. C. Circuit Court of Appeals. The D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals remanded the environmental cost issue to the Commission finding that it had not adequately explained why it had approved a $1.4 million annual environmental allowance. The active parties have engaged in discovery, Williams has filed direct testimony and all parties have spent time discussing settlement. This Stipulation and Agreement represents a final, comprehensive resolution of environmental costs in this proceeding. Williams believes this settlement is supported by all active parties.

FERC-DOCKETED
JAN 31 2001

0102020083-2

B. PROCEDURES AND COMMENTS

Williams respectfully requests that the instant Agreement be transmitted forthwith to Presiding Administrative Law Judge Harfeld pursuant to Rule 602(b)(2)(i) of the Commission's Rules. Pursuant to Rule 602(f)(2), initial comments on this Agreement must be filed on or before February 20, 2001, and reply comments must be filed on or before March 2, 2001. Failure to file comments will be deemed a waiver of the right to file comments on the offer of settlement.

C. WAIVERS

Williams respectfully requests waiver of any provisions of the Commission's regulations and any other waivers which may be necessary for approval of the Agreement as proposed herein.

D. SERVICE

The Agreement, together with all attachments thereto, is this day being served pursuant to Rule 602(d)(1) upon all participants listed on the official restricted service list in this proceeding on file with the Secretary of the Commission.

Sincerely,

Gary W. Boyle /TLW

Gary W. Boyle
Senior Counsel

Williams Gas Pipelines Central
RP93-109 Environmental Cost
Settlement Allocation

Appendix A

Shipper	12-Mos. Ending Sep 30, 2000 Revenue 1/	Percentage	Allocated Settlement Amount
Acme Brick	$ 79,109	0.0555%	$ 841
AFG Industries	$ 102,873	0.0722%	$ 1,094
AG Processing	$ 31,823	0.0223%	$ 338
Altamont	$ 40,371	0.0283%	$ 429
Americus Gas	$ 29,774	0.0209%	$ 317
Amoco Energy	$ 527,106	0.3698%	$ 5,604
Aquila Energy Marketing	$ 1,021	0.0007%	$ 11
Aquila Energy Transportaion	$ 3,601	0.0025%	$ 38
Argonia	$ 18,837	0.0132%	$ 200
Auburn	$ 98,286	0.0690%	$ 1,045
Avant	$ 10,402	0.0073%	$ 111
Bayer	$ 42,315	0.0297%	$ 450
Billings	$ 16,363	0.0115%	$ 174
Burlington	$ 6,511	0.0046%	$ 69
Central Mo State Univ	$ 42,701	0.0300%	$ 454
Certainteed Co.	$ 295,315	0.2072%	$ 3,140
City Utilities of Springfield	$ 5,284,997	3.7078%	$ 56,192
Cleveland	$ 108,339	0.0760%	$ 1,152
CMS Field	$ 163,681	0.1148%	$ 1,740
Comm of Land Office	$ 10,561	0.0074%	$ 112
Conagra Energy	$ 36,931	0.0259%	$ 393
Copan	$ 31,927	0.0224%	$ 339
Cotton Valley	$ 15,000	0.0105%	$ 159
Denison	$ 8,911	0.0063%	$ 95
Duke Energy	$ 2,640,836	1.8527%	$ 28,078
Dynegy Mkt & Trade	$ 2,014	0.0014%	$ 21
Eckert Gas	$ 2,324	0.0016%	$ 25
Empire Dist. Electric	$ 2,175,232	1.5261%	$ 23,128
Energy One	$ 154,251	0.1082%	$ 1,640
Enserco Energy	$ 102,200	0.0717%	$ 1,087
Excel Corp.	$ 35,086	0.0246%	$ 373
Fag Bearing	$ 10,630	0.0075%	$ 113
Farmland Industries	$ 1,150,669	0.8073%	$ 12,234
Flint Hills	$ 2,008	0.0014%	$ 21
Ford	$ 11,756	0.0082%	$ 125
Freedom	$ 11,876	0.0083%	$ 126
Gate	$ 4,297	0.0030%	$ 46
General Motors	$ 450,920	0.3164%	$ 4,794
Granby	$ 51,582	0.0362%	$ 549
Greeley Gas Co.	$ 1,545,712	1.0844%	$ 16,435
Greeley Gas Co.	$ 6,301,238	4.4207%	$ 66,997
Grove Municipal	$ 570,320	0.4001%	$ 6,064

Williams Gas Pipelines Central
RP93-109 Environmental Cost
Settlement Allocation

Appendix A

Shipper		12-Mos. Ending Sep 30. 2000 Revenue 1/	Percentage		Allocated Settlement Amount
GS-WRI	$	190,596	0.1337%	$	2,027
Hamilton	$	9,400	0.0066%	$	100
Heartland Cemt	$	25,983	0.0182%	$	276
Howard	$	17,429	0.0122%	$	185
International Paper	$	11,981	0.0084%	$	127
Iola	$	328,796	0.2307%	$	3,496
Jane Phillips Med. Center	$	6,956	0.0049%	$	74
Kansas City Power & Light	$	18,215	0.0128%	$	194
Kansas City Power & Light	$	971,513	0.6816%	$	10,330
Kansas Gas Service	$	42,628,863	29.9070%	$	453,246
KMGA	$	1,143,678	0.8024%	$	12,160
Laclede	$	2,982,346	2.0923%	$	31,710
Lawrence Paper	$	29,284	0.0205%	$	311
Leann Gas	$	174,868	0.1227%	$	1,859
Lebo	$	20,433	0.0143%	$	217
Liberal	$	18,902	0.0133%	$	201
Manchester Pipeline Corp.	$	3,795	0.0027%	$	40
Mannford	$	108,953	0.0764%	$	1,158
Margasco Partnership	$	102,422	0.0719%	$	1,089
Marshall Municpal Utilities	$	5,480	0.0038%	$	58
Mclouth	$	15,326	0.0108%	$	163
Midwest United	$	76,193	0.0535%	$	810
Missouri Gas Energy	$	49,677,467	34.8521%	$	528,190
Mountain Energy	$	603,446	0.4234%	$	6,416
Mulberry	$	18,740	0.0131%	$	199
Nebraska Public Gas Agency	$	451,419	0.3167%	$	4,800
Nelagoney Rural	$	1,650	0.0012%	$	18
Neodesha	$	99,685	0.0699%	$	1,060
Oneok Energy	$	2,018,616	1.4162%	$	21,463
Orlando	$	5,159	0.0036%	$	55
Oronogo	$	4,734	0.0033%	$	50
Ozark Natural	$	263,958	0.1852%	$	2,807
PG&E Energy Services	$	78,408	0.0550%	$	834
Pittsburg Corning	$	98,467	0.0691%	$	1,047
Plattsburg	$	119,481	0.0838%	$	1,270
Public Srv Co	$	16,287	0.0114%	$	173
Questar ETC	$	346,703	0.2432%	$	3,686
Reading	$	4,489	0.0031%	$	48
Reliant	$	4,216	0.0030%	$	45
Reliant	$	98,749	0.0693%	$	1,050
Severy Gas	$	11,622	0.0082%	$	124
Southern Mo. Gas	$	1,052,809	0.7386%	$	11,194

Williams Gas Pipelines Central
RP93-109 Environmental Cost
Settlement Allocation

Appendix A

Shipper	12-Mos. Ending Sep 30. 2000 Revenue 1/	Percentage	Allocated Settlement Amount
Talbot Industries	$ 6,363	0.0045%	$ 68
Tenaska Mkt	$ 182,996	0.1284%	$ 1,946
Terra Nitro LT	$ 540,000	0.3788%	$ 5,741
TXU Energy	$ 6,358	0.0045%	$ 68
Tyson	$ 137,095	0.0962%	$ 1,458
US Gypsum	$ 196,057	0.1375%	$ 2,085
US Gypsum	$ 34,092	0.0239%	$ 362
Utilicorp Energy	$ 7,981	0.0056%	$ 85
Utilicorp United	$ 7,981,648	5.5997%	$ 84,864
Viola	$ 5,188	0.0036%	$ 55
Vulcan Chemical	$ 336,926	0.2364%	$ 3,582
Wakita	$ 17,044	0.0120%	$ 181
Wann Public Works	$ 3,297	0.0023%	$ 35
WBI Production	$ 554,724	0.3892%	$ 5,898
WES	$ 5,109,095	3.5844%	$ 54,322
Western Resources	$ 984,464	0.6907%	$ 10,467
WFS Company	$ 289,619	0.2032%	$ 3,079
Wheaton Natural Gas	$ 47,770	0.0335%	$ 508
Totals	$ 142,537,940	100.0000%	$ 1,515,517

Net Settlement $ 1,515,517

1/ Includes firm transportation and firm storage reservation revenues for the twelve months ended September 30, 2000.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Williams Natural Gas Company) Docket No. RP93-109

STIPULATION AND AGREEMENT
(January 31, 2001)

Pursuant to Rule 602 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission), 18 C.F.R. § 385.602, Williams Gas Pipelines Central, Inc., formerly named Williams Natural Gas Company (Williams), submits this Stipulation and Agreement in settlement of the remaining contested issues in the captioned proceeding.

DESCRIPTION OF PROCEEDING

On April 30, 1993, Williams made a general Section 4 rate filing (Docket No. RP93-109). The Commission suspended the effective date of the proposed rate increase until November 1, 1993, and set the matter for hearing.[1] Evidentiary hearings before an ALJ were conducted in 1994. Initial and reply briefs were filed by various parties. Among the many issues addressed at the hearing was the issue of Williams' recovery of its environmental costs. Williams proposed to amortize over a three-year period actual past period costs of $4.2 million instead of projecting environmental costs under a test period methodology. By amortizing these costs over three years, Williams would have been allowed to recover $1.4 million each year. On November 22, 1995, the Presiding Judge issued an Initial Decision which approved the three-year amortization with a procedure for refunding any amounts Williams recovered from third parties, such as liability insurance carriers or the suppliers of the PCB-laden material.[2] Several parties filed exceptions to the Initial Decision. Williams filed a new Section 4 rate case in 1995,

---

1 Williams Natural Gas Co., 63 FERC ¶ 61,241 (1993).

2 Williams Natural Gas Co., 73 FERC ¶ 63,015 (1995).

with the result that the instant rate case covers a locked-in period of November 1, 1993, through July 31, 1995.

On December 19, 1996, the Commission affirmed in part and reversed in part the ALJ's Initial Decision.[3] The Commission rejected Williams' proposed amortization in favor of the "test period" method.[4] The Commission determined that the $1.4 million annual amount that the participants and the ALJ arrived at using an amortization method was a reasonable equivalent of Williams' actual Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB) clean-up related test period costs for use as a projection of Williams' future annual PCB costs under the test period methodology.[5]

On rehearing, Williams did not contest the Commission's requirement that it recover these costs based on a test period methodology but it did assert that the Commission erred in adopting an annual allowance of $1.4 million for PCB clean-up costs. The Commission ruled that the $1.4 million was a reasonable representation of the level of these costs to be recovered in rates given the record that had been developed.[6] Williams appealed that decision to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals.

The court granted Williams' petition and remanded the PCB issue to the Commission finding that it had not adequately explained why it had approved use of the $1.4 million figure. The court found that an allowance developed under an amortization method is not useful for applying past experience to project future costs as required by the test period method. The court

---

3 Williams Natural Gas Co., 77 FERC ¶ 61,277 (1996).

4 18 C.F.R. § 154.303.

5 Williams Natural Gas Co., 77 FERC ¶ 61,277 at 62,181-183 (1996).

6 Id. at 61,679-80.

also found that the Commission had not explained why Williams' $3.9 million "test period actual" figure was inadequate.

On October 13, 2000, the Commission directed the Chief Administrative Law Judge to appoint an Administrative Law Judge to preside over a hearing in this matter and encouraged the parties to reach a settlement. Williams has filed direct supplemental testimony, the Staff and Intervenors have engaged in discovery, and the parties have spent considerable time discussing settlement. This Stipulation and Agreement is a product of those discussions.

This Settlement is supported by all parties active in these proceedings and resolves all outstanding issues in this docket.

SETTLEMENT PROVISIONS

ARTICLE I

Environmental Cost of Service

Williams will be entitled to recover an annual environmental cost of service of $1,700,000 for the locked-in period applicable in this docket. The Commission originally allowed Williams to recover an annual cost of service of $1,355,813 for the locked-in period applicable in this docket. Applying the settlement environmental allowance to the original amount authorized by the Commission for the locked-in period results in a net additional amount due Williams of $1,012,150 including interest at the Commission's established rates through January 31, 2001.

ARTICLE II

Collection

Williams will collect the net cost of service increase of $1,012,150 by set-off against the pass-through of insurance proceeds due on January 31, 2001. During calendar year 2000, Williams collected $2,808,519 from third-party insurers related to its environmental costs, including interest at the Commission's established rates through January 31, 2001. Under the Commission's prior orders in this proceeding, Williams is required to pass through to its customers 90% of any such third-party collections.[7] Williams has therefore allocated to its customers $2,527,667 of its third-party collections. To effect the set-off provided for herein, Williams will refund a total of $1,515,517 to its customers on January 31, 2001.

ARTICLE III

Allocation and Payment

A. Williams will allocate its net pass-through of third-party proceeds to its firm customers based on firm reservation revenues during the twelve months ended September 30, 2000. The allocation, reflected on Appendix A, sets forth the amount to be refunded to each party under the terms of this Settlement.

B. Williams will make the refunds on Appendix A to each of the customers listed thereon on or before January 31, 2001.

C. If the Commission should issue a final and non-appealable order directing Williams to pass-through the net amount due under this Settlement in a manner inconsistent with Appendix A, Williams will have the right to correct each party's net refund by adjusting the amount of any future pass-through of third-party environmental collections, if any.

D. The parties agree that Williams' future pass-through of third-party environmental proceeds, if any, should be allocated to Williams' customers based on firm reservation revenues for the twelve months ended on the September 30 immediately preceding the date on which the

---

7 Williams Natural Gas Co., 77 FERC ¶ 61,277 at 62,182 (1996); Williams Natural Gas Co., 73 FERC ¶ 63,015 at 65,075 (1995).

pass-through payments are made. Any future payments related to third-party environmental proceeds shall continue to be refunded to customers by the 31st of January following the calendar year in which Williams receives the third-party proceeds. Williams will file a refund plan consistent with the allocation set forth in this paragraph no less than 30 days prior to the date on which refunds are required.

ARTICLE IV

Refund Report

This Stipulation and Agreement will serve as Williams' refund report in this proceeding related to its obligation to pass-through a portion of the third-party proceeds it received during calendar year 2000. The Commission's Order approving this Stipulation and Agreement will constitute approval of Williams' refund report and will resolve all remaining issues in this docket.

ARTICLE V

Effective Date

The Commission's order approving this Stipulation and Agreement shall constitute a waiver of the Commission's Rules and Regulations, including 18 C.F.R. Part 154, Subpart C, to the extent necessary to effectuate all of the provisions of this Stipulation and Agreement. This Stipulation and Agreement shall be effective on January 31, 2001, regardless of the date on which the Commission approves this Stipulation and Agreement.

ARTICLE VI

General Reservations

This Settlement Agreement is submitted for Commission approval pursuant to Rule 602 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. If it does not become effective for any reason it shall be considered privileged and not admissible in evidence or made a part of the record in any proceeding.

ARTICLE VII

Waiver of Regulation

Commission approval of this Settlement Agreement shall constitute the requisite waiver of any and all otherwise applicable Commission regulations to permit the implementation of the provisions hereof and a determination that the settlement is fair, reasonable, and in the public interest and consistent with NGPA § 502.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAMS GAS PIPELINES CENTRAL, INC.

Gary W. Boyle/TLW

Gary W. Boyle
The Williams Companies, Inc.
P. O. Box 2400
Tulsa, OK 74102

January 31, 2001

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20426

01 JAN 31 PM 3:29

In Reply Refer To:
Williams Natural Gas Company
Docket No. RP93-109

Williams Gas Pipelines Central, Inc.
P. O. Box 2400
Tulsa, OK 74102

Attention: Gary W. Boyle, Senior Counsel

Reference: Offer of Settlement (January 31, 2001)

On January 31, 2001, Williams Gas Pipelines Central, Inc., formerly known as Williams Natural Gas Company ("Williams"), submitted for filing with the Commission an offer of settlement including a Stipulation and Agreement ("Agreement") dated January 31, 2001. The offer of settlement is in the public interest and is accepted and approved.

On April 30, 1993, Williams filed a general Section 4 rate filing proposing, among other things, to amortize over a three-year period actual past period costs of $4.2 million. On November 22, 1995, the Presiding ALJ issued an Initial Decision approving the three-year amortization of environmental costs with a procedure for refunding amounts which Williams recovered from third parties. On December 19, 1996, the Commission affirmed in part and reversed in part the ALJ's Initial Decision rejecting Williams' proposed amortization in favor of the "test period" method and ruling that the $1.4 million was a reasonable representation of the level of environmental costs to be recovered in rates. Williams appealed that decision to the D. C. Circuit Court of Appeals. This Agreement arises out of The D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals remanded the environmental cost issue to the Commission finding that it had not adequately explained why it had approved a $1.4 million annual environmental allowance. The active parties engaged in discovery, Williams filed direct testimony and all parties spent time discussing settlement. The Agreement represents a final, comprehensive resolution of environmental costs in this proceeding.

Pursuant to Rule 602(f) (18 C.F.R. § 385.602(f)(2000)) of the Commission's regulations, initial comments were filed on February 20, 2001, and reply comments were filed on March 2, 2001. Presiding Administrative Law Judge David I. Harfeld certified the offer of settlement to the Commission with the filed comments.

The Commission finds that settlement offer reflected in the Agreement is in the public interest and it is accepted and approved. The Commission's approval of this settlement does not constitute approval of, or precedent regarding, any principle or issue in this proceeding.

By direction of the Commission.

David P. Boergers
Secretary

xc: All Parties on restricted service list

MISSOURI GAS ENERGY
A Division of Southern Union Company

MISSOURI GAS ENERGY **DATA INFORMATION REQUEST** **Missouri Rate Case No: GR-2004-0209** Data Request No: 0130

Requested From: Tom Imhoff

Date Requested: 4/23/04

Information Requested:

Has witness Imhoff, or any other individual or individuals on the Commission Staff, undertaken any analysis to ascertain how any changes proposed to Section 3.02 will affect the costs MGE incurs for its collection process? If so, please provide the results of that analysis and any information or material upon which it is based.

Requested By: Michael R. Noack

Information Provided:

No.

Date Response Received:__________

Signed By: Tom Imhoff

Date: 5/12/04

Schedule MRN-5

Missouri Gas Energy
COMPARISON OF ACHIEVED RATE OF RETURN VS. AUTHORIZED RATE OF RETURN

Description	6/30/1996 (000)	6/30/1997 (000)	6/30/1998 (000)	6/30/1999 (000)	6/30/2000 (000)	6/30/2001 (000)	6/30/2002 (000)	6/30/2003 (000)	Cumulative (000)
Net Operating Income	$ 30,821	$ 30,056	$ 32,785	$ 35,566	$ 31,624	$ 33,582	$ 39,984	$ 37,421	
Net plant from most recent rate case	$ 359,290	$ 359,290	$ 431,152	$ 431,152	$ 431,152	$ 431,152	$ 503,192	$ 503,192	
Net Plant Balance at 6/30/XX	360,288	384,986	440,251	460,145	478,794	491,271	505,412	525,495	
Increase in plant since most recent rate case (includes average current year plant additions	$ 499	$ 13,347	$ 4,550	$ 19,046	$ 38,318	$ 53,881	$ 1,110	$ 12,262	
Estimated increase in deferred taxes	$ (614)	$ (7,367)	$ (2,728)	$ (8,183)	$ (13,638)	$ (18,632)	$ (6,800)	$ (11,333)	
Total rate base from most recent case updated for annual plant increases	$ 347,927	$ 354,022	$ 420,041	$ 429,082	$ 442,899	$ 453,468	$ 496,740	$ 503,359	
Achieved Rate of Return	8.86%	8.49%	7.81%	8.29%	7.14%	7.41%	8.05%	7.43%	
Authorized Rate of Return	10.54%	9.46%	9.46%	9.40%	9.40%	9.40%	9.03%	9.03%	
Date Rates Went into Effect	1-Feb-94	1-Feb-97		2-Sep-98			6-Aug-01	6-Aug-01	
Return Deficiency	-1.68%	-0.97%	-1.65%	-1.11%	-2.26%	-1.99%	-0.98%	-1.60%	
Earnings Deficiency	$ (5,851)	$ (3,434)	$ (6,951)	$ (4,768)	$ (10,009)	$ (9,044)	$ (4,872)	$ (8,032)	$ (52,960)
Revenue Deficiency	$ (9,531)	$ (5,594)	$ (11,323)	$ (7,766)	$ (16,303)	$ (14,732)	$ (7,936)	$ (13,083)	$ (86,266)

* - High end of Staff recommendation implicit in the settlement