Hopping Green & Sams

Attorneys and Counselors

Writer's Direct Dial No. (850) 425-2359

November 26, 2003

BY HAND DELIVERY

Blanca Bayó Director, Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399

Re: City Gas -- Docket No. 030569-GU

Dear Ms. Bayó:

Enclosed for filing on behalf of City Gas Company of Florida are the original and fifteen copies of its Response to the Staff's Rate Case Audit Report in the above-referenced docket.

If you have any questions regarding this filing, please call.

Very truly yours,

Out Volume

Gary V. Perko

GVP/mee Enclosures

cc: Certificate of Service

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished by regular U.S. mail and/or hand-delivery (*) to the following in Docket No. 030569-GU this 26th day of November, 2003.

Ralph Jaeger *
Staff Attorney
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

City Gas Company of Florida Gloria L. Lopez 955 East 25th Street Hialeah, FL 33013-3498

Office of Public Counsel Charles Beck 111 W. Madison Street 812 Claude Pepper Building Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400

Attorney Attorney

NUI CITY GAS COMPANY RATE CASE YEAR ENDED ACTUAL SEPTEMBER, 2002 PROJECTED YEAR ENDED SEPTEMBER 2004

AUDIT EXCEPTIONS:

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 1

The Company disagrees. The \$125,000 for new computers projected in 2004 is for the Field Force Automation Project. The Computers for this project have already been purchased and the \$125,000 projected for FY 2004 is additional cost for the programming and setup of the system, which includes installation of the equipment in the trucks. The cost should not be disallowed.

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 2

The Company agrees. Please see Attachment AE-2 for the reduction in Corporate allocations and the associated expense and accumulated depreciation.

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 3

The sample selected for testing was not the lowest level of detail. Therefore, instead of requesting 74 items as originally thought, the sample selection resulted in over two hundred vouchers and journal entries. When this was explained to the audit staff, it was decided that all vouchers already pulled, as well as a smaller selection later identified by Staff would be sufficient.

The Company disagrees with the recommended adjustment because of the \$3,986,575.50, \$985,728.45 represents telephone equipment purchased from NUI Telecom and \$177,353.70 represents consultant cost for the automation of margin accounting for the utilities.

The adjustment should be \$570,345.66 ((3,986,575.50-985,728.45-177,353.70) x 20.2%). The associated accumulated depreciation is \$65,149 (\$322,518 x 20.2%) and the depreciation expense is \$15,930 (\$78,859 x 20.2%).

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 4

The Company agrees.

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 5

The Company agrees.

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 6

The Company agrees.

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 7

The Company agrees. However, if utility bills are allocated out to non-regulated operations, City Gas should get an allocation in for the same type charges from Elizabethtown Gas.

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 8

The Company disagrees. Over the past three years, the average annual amount for canceled projects has been over \$100,000, which means these costs should not be considered extra-ordinary and non-recurring.

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 9

The Company agrees with facts as stated. However, if these charges are allocated out to non-regulated operations, City Gas should get an allocation in for the same type charges from Elizabethtown Gas.

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 10

The Company disagrees. Over the past three years, the average annual amount for canceled projects has been over \$100,000, which means these costs should not be considered extra-ordinary and non-recurring.

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 11

The Company agrees.

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 12

The Company disagrees with recommended adjustments because these specific charges reside in RC 237 (one of the Customer Care departments) in account 903 and are allocated out to non-regulated operations on monthly basis based on the number of calls as part of the RC 237 customer care allocations. Therefore, the allocation adjustment was already reflected in the filing.

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 13

The Company disagrees. If the UBS margin is in line with market rates, there should be no disallowance. Having these services done by UBS is no different than if the services were being performed by another third party provider.

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 14

The Company agrees.

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 15

The Company agrees.

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 16

The Company agrees.

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 17

The Company agrees. However, if these charges are allocated out to non-regulated operations, City Gas should get an allocation in for the same type charges from Elizabethtown Gas.

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 18

The Company agrees. However, if these charges are allocated out to non-regulated operations, City Gas should get an allocation in for the same type charges from Elizabethtown Gas.

EXCEPTION NO. 19

The Company agrees.

EXCEPTION NO. 20

The Company disagrees. The \$112,399 for 2000 and 2001 re-audits was not removed from RC 556 because there will be other additional expenses incurred that were not included in the forecast (i.e. Sarbanes Oxley, internal control review, increased audit fees, and other compliance requirements). If the costs to re-audit FY 2000 and FY 2001 are removed, then the estimated costs for Sarbanes Oxley implementation and increased audit fees should be included.

EXCEPTION NO. 21

The Company agrees. In light of the changes that have taken place in the Executive Department (RC 401-see Audit Disclosure #9) the adjustment for RC 401 should be \$562,483 (\$2,717,308 x 20.7%); this results in a total increase of O&M expense of \$1,094,467.

EXCEPTION NO. 22

RC 470 - Company agrees

RC 471 – Company agrees

RC 472 - Company agrees

RC 473 – Company agrees

RC 474 – Company agrees

EXCEPTION NO. 23

The Company agrees.

EXCEPTION NO. 24

The Company disagrees. Below is FY 2003 actual and FY 2004 budget MIS salary expense. Please note that the Budget FY'04 salary expense is lower than actual FY'03, but the Budget FY'04 consultants costs are higher than actual FY'03. This results in a net increase to MIS FY'04 expense from FY'03. Therefore, no disallowance is appropriate.

Below are names of employees that were terminated and their replacements:

John Pignotti – Mike Vargas
Jose Sousa - Dina Raza
Pearl Kobran - Brian Thornton
Marlin Scheerberg – Consultant (1)
Anthony Brasil - Ben Seward
Doreen Berry – Consultant (1)
Duncan Ellsworth - Pat Donnelly
Sharon Miller – Consultant (1)
Ralph Carracedo - Ralph Carracedo (he has returned)
Brette Dille - Manju Ghante
John Chiang – Consultant (1)

(1) - Mark Nagrocki and Yan Teper

MIS Departments:

	Empioyees	Consultants	Combined
FY2003 Actual	1,922,496	655,996	2,578,492
FY2004 Budget	1,885,895	738,979	2,624,873
Change FY2003 to FY2004	(36,602)	82,983	46,381

EXCEPTION NO. 25

The Company disagrees. The Green Lane Property, although owned by Elizabethtown Gas, houses departments that support City Gas operations, such as Dispatching, Distribution Compliance and Customer Relations.

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 26

The Company agrees.

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 27

The Company agrees.

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 28

The Company agrees that \$50,960 should be removed from the forecast for the reasons stated above.

The Company does not agree with a reduction of \$483,480 to the FY 2004 benefit costs projected. The calculation supporting Audit Exception No. 28 shows a 12.33% of actual benefits to total wages in 2003. Based on actual FY 2003, total benefit costs were \$1,598,234; this is 20.96% of total O&M Payroll expense. It appears that the 12.33% the auditor calculated was based on FY 2002 benefits expense and FY 2003 actual payroll; and as a result, the percentage calculated by auditors was understated.

Based on actual FY 2003 benefit cost per employee, annual calculation of benefit costs resulted in \$1,629,336, see Attachment AE-28.

The FY 2004 employee benefit costs of \$1,393,370 is consistent with actual FY 2003 results and should not be reduced. It should be increased to \$1,598,234 based on actual FY 2003 net benefits expense or to \$1,667,136 based on actual FY 2003 benefit cost of \$678.89 per employee.

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 29

The Company disagrees. The rent for the 74th Street Warehouse is removed through the NOI adjustments for non-utility operations.

AUDIT EXCEPTION NO. 30

The Company agrees.

AUDIT DISCLOSURES:

AUDIT DISCLOSURE NO. 1

Christine Romig reviewed the FY'04 projected bad debt expense and recommended an adjustment to reduce bad debt expense by \$271,985 for FY'04. The company agrees with this adjustment.

AUDIT DISCLOSURE NO. 2

The Company agrees with the removal of the former Marketing Director salary of \$50,208. However there should be no marketing disallowance for the Channel positions. There are open personnel requisitions and Company is actively looking for Channel Reps.

AUDIT DISCLOSURE NO. 3

The Company regularly provides training to its sales people. Some years we bring someone in-house while in other years we send employees out to training. Therefore, these costs should be considered recurring, and should be allowed.

AUDIT DISCLOSURE NO. 4

The Company agrees with facts as stated. The Company is waiting for a decision on the rate case prior to incurring these costs and risk disallowance.

AUDIT DISCLOSURE NO. 5

The Company agrees with facts as stated. The Company is waiting for a decision on the rate case prior to incurring these costs and risk disallowance.

AUDIT DISCLOSURE NO. 6

Company agrees with facts as stated.

AUDIT DISCLOSURE NO. 7

The legal (regulatory) expenses are recurring in nature. Although the Company will not do another flat rate billing filing, in 2004 the Company plans to file a new curtailment plan, revise the Alternate Fuel Discount provision in the tariff, and may enter into new special contracts. All these activities will require legal services that were not specifically included in FY'04 legal expenses included in the rate case filing. Since they are recurring in nature, they should not be disallowed.

AUDIT DISCLOSURE NO. 8

The Company disagrees. Although the space occupied for corporate operations in Elizabethtown has decreased since 2002, the space occupied in Bedminster for corporate operations has increased. Also, the third party sub-lease space should not be removed from regulated operations because the rental income associated with the third party sub-leases were used to offset these costs.

DISCLOSURE NO. 9

Although John Kean Jr. resigned, Mark Abramovic, former CFO, was appointed to the position of CEO. The CFO position and his staff have been replaced by FTI Consultants. The company has appointed Dan Scouler Chief Financial Officer. Scouler is a Senior Managing Director with FTI Consulting. Also, James T. Egler was added to RC 401's Executive roster. The preliminary budget number (which was inadvertently excluded from the case, see Audit Exception #21 related to RC 401) was \$1,922,122. This budget was created when John Kean Jr. was still CEO. The new budget for RC 401 is \$2,717,308. This takes into account the recent executive changes. As a result of the increases to the budget, no disallowance is appropriate.

Although John Kean Sr. will be retiring in March 2004, the Board will be appointing a new Chairman, therefore this cost will continue.

AUDIT DISCLOSURE NO. 10

The Company disagrees with facts a stated. The Company revised the rate case expense amortization schedule. See Attachment AD-10-1.

Revised FY'04 Rate Case Projection: \$ 131,389 FY'04 Expense in Rate Case: \$ 165,090 Adjustment: \$ (33,701)

The Company has incurred \$242,375 in rate case expenses through October 2003. An additional \$200,613 is projected. Attachment AD-10-2 shows a comparison of projected rate case expenses to actual rate case expenses incurred thru October 2003.

AUDIT DISCLOSURE NO. 11

The Company agrees. Please see Attachment AD-11 for the revised depreciation expense recalculated using the revised depreciation rates.

NUI HEADQUARTERS CORPORATE ASSETS

Attachment 2

		PLANT B	l	
FERC C	ode	Per MFRs	Revised Budget	Difference
39010	STRUCTURES & IMPS.	3,106,410.11	3,106,025.50	(384.62)
39020	STRUCTURES & IMPS.	1,439,027.97	1,439,027.97	0.00
39110	OFFICE FURNITURE	986,418.08	986,418.08	0.00
39120	OFFICE EQUIPMENT	185,439.40	185,439.40	0.00
39130	COMPUTERS	23,527,613.38	21,186,305.69	(2,341,307.69)
39250	TRANSPORTATION	275,161.94	275,161.94	0.00
39260	TRANSPORTATION	75,290.30	75,290.30	0.00
39700	COMMUNICATION EQT.	3,201,668.53	3,193,976.22	(7,692.31)
39800	MISCELLANEOUS EQT.	918,039.89	918,039.89	0.00
Total Co	orporate Plant	33,715,069.60	31,365,684.99	(2,349,384.62)
	territa i ceassa			
39130	Work Order Mgmt System	25,384.62	25,384.62	0.00
39130	Billing System	4,615,384.62	0.00	(4,615,384.62)
	English Color of the State of t			

DEPRECIATION EXPENSE										
Per MFRs	Revised Budo	Difference								
77,649.68	77,618.44	(31.24)								
35,970.00	35,970.00	0.00								
56,225.88	56,225.88	0.00								
15,205.29	15,205.29	0.00								
3,944,091.38	3,544,242.07	(399,849.31)								
22,860.13	22,860.13	0.00								
6,249.36	6,249.36	0.00								
265,505.18	265,159.33	(345.85)								
59,676.24	59,676.24	0.00								
4,483,433.14	4,083,206.74	(400,226.40)								
3,827.18	3,827.18	0.00								
700,000,00		(700 000 00)								
793,269.00	0.00	(793,269.00)								

ACCUM DEPRECIATION										
Per MFRs	Revised Budget	Difference								
250,470.27	250,422.61									
75,689.63	75,689.63									
384,213.13	384,213.13	0.00								
112,877.84	112,877.84	0.00								
16,595,710.34	16,449,273.00	(146,437.34)								
150,473.24	150,473.24	0.00								
12,576.09	12,576.09	0.00								
727,443.98	727,417.38	(26.60)								
128,322.75	128,322.75	0.00								
18,437,777.28	18,291,265.67	(146,511.61)								
6,888.93	6,888.93	0.00								
		All San								
321,161.54	0.00	(321,161.54)								

City Gas Company of Florida Employee Benefits Analysis Response to Audit Exception #28

		Actual FY 2003	calculation attached to audit exception #28	FY 2004Per Rate Case	FY 2004 Per Budget
Total O& M Payroll Expense:	(a)	5,617,044	5,617,044	6,305,484	6,107,226
Amount credited to Payroll for Customer Care allocation to Elizabethtown Gas (Account 618253):	(b)	2,006,859	2,006,859	1,073,947	2,451,214
Total O&M Payroll before allocation to Elizabethtown Gas:	c= (a+b)	7,623,903	7,623,903	7,379,431	8,558,440
Employee Benefits (Account 689261) Less Capitalized Benefits (Account 619925) Net Employee Benefits:	(d) (e) f= (d+e)	1,654,756 (56,522) 1,598,234	939,223 (a) 0 939,223	1,491,992 (98,622) 1,393,370	1,880,064 · 0 1,880,064
Percent of Net benefits to Total O&M Payroll:	(f/c)	20.96%	12.32% (b)	18.88%	21.97%

Per Auditor's

Annual benefits costs based on # of Employees @ Actual cost per Employee:

		Actual FY 2003	Projected FY 2004	
City Gas # of Employees	(g)	200	200	
Actual FY 2003 Benefit Cost per Employee:	(h)	678.89	694.64	(678.89 x 1.0232) - Trended
Monthly benefit cost: Annual benefit cost:	(g*h) i = (g*h)*12	135,778 1,629,336	138,928 1,667,136	
Percent of Annual benefit cost to Total O&M Payroll:	(i/c)	21.37%	21.87%	

⁽a) - Actual FY 2002 Employee benefits expense in Account 689261.

⁽b) - It appears that the Auditor's calculation included the FY 2002 Benefits Expense amount in Account 689261 and actual FY 2003 payroll expense.

Rate Ca1

Unit	Journal	Date	Acct	Amount	Long Descr	FER
	MTH2001017		617990		To record amortization expense for Rate Case.	
	MTH2001017		617990		To record Rate Case Amortization Expense.	9280 9280
	MTH2001021		617990		To record Rate Case Amortization Expense.	9280
	REC2001050		617990		Rate case amortization expense	9280
	REC2001050		617990		Rate case amortization expense	9280
	REC2001050		617990		Rate case amortization expense	9280
	REC2001050		617990		Rate case amortization expense	9280
GI CO	11202001000	Expense 2001:	017330	49,822.00	Trate case amortization expense	9200
		Expense zeen.		TO,022.00		
GECO	REC2002050	2001-10-31	617990	7 117 00	Rate case amortization expense	9280
	REC2002050		617990		RATE CASE AMORTIZATION EXPENSE	9280
	REC2002050	— 	617990		RATE CASE AMORTIZATION EXPENSE	9280
	REC2002050	——————————————————————————————————————	617990		RATE CASE AMORTIZATION EXPENSE	9280
	REC2002050		617990		RATE CASE AMORTIZATION EXPENSE	9280
	REC2002050		617990		RATE CASE AMORTIZATION EXPENSE	9280
	REC2002050		617990		RATE CASE AMORTIZATION EXPENSE	9280
	REC2002050		617990		RATE CASE AMORTIZATION EXPENSE	9280
	REC2002050	2002-06-30	617990		RATE CASE AMORTIZATION EXPENSE	9280
	REC2002050	2002-07-31	617990		RATE CASE AMORTIZATION EXPENSE	9280
	REC2002050	2002-07-31	617990		RATE CASE AMORTIZATION EXPENSE	9280
	REC2002050	2002-09-30	617990		RATE CASE AMORTIZATION EXPENSE	9280
201 00	INEC2002030	Expense 2002:		85,404.00		9200
		LAPSIISS 2002.		05,404.00		
CECO	REC2003050	2002-10-31	617990	7 117 00	To record rate case Amort exp	9280
	REC2003050	2002-10-31	617990		To record rate case Amort exp	9280
	REC2003050	2002-11-30	617990		To record rate case Amort exp	9280
	REC2003050	2002-12-31	617990		To record rate case Amort exp	
	REC2003050	2003-01-31	617990		To record rate case Amort exp	9280
	REC2003050	2003-02-28	617990		To record rate case Amort exp	9280
	REC2003050	2003-04-30	617990		To record rate case Amort exp	9280
	REC2003050	2003-04-30	617990		To record rate case Amort exp	9280
	REC2003050	2003-06-30				9280
	REC2003050	2003-06-30	617990 617990		To record rate case Amort exp	9280
	REC2003050	2003-07-31	617990		To record rate case Amort exp	9280
	REC2003050	2003-08-31	617990		To record rate case Amort exp	9280
CGFCC	REC2003000	Expense 2003			To record rate case Amort exp	9280
		Expense 2003	: T	85,404.00		
2000 B	ate Case Expense:		 	 		
ZUUU K	ate Case Expense.	342,537.00	MEDIC	12		
1 000	2004 evenes:	(49,822.00)		13		
	2001 expense: 2002 expense:	(85,404.00)	+			
	zouz expense: ortized balance	(65,404.00)		-		-
		207 244 00	MEDIC	42		
	0/30/02:	207,311.00		13		
	FY'03 expense:	(85,404.00)				
	Oct-Dec'03 expense:	(21,351.00)		 		
	ortized balance	400 550 00	+	-		
	12/31/03:	100,556.00	+			
2003 R	ate Case Expense	425,000.00	+			
Marrie	4-14	EOF 220 00	04			
new to	otal to amortize:	525,556.00	Starting	January 200	4 over a period of 3 years	
		464 000 00	 	F (505 556)	20101	
		131,389.00		[(525,556/3		
		Annual rate ca	se amorti	zation expen	se for FY'2004	
				1		
				1-4- C A-	portization Expanse projected EEDC 000 in MED	1
		165,090.00	FY U4 F	tate Case An	nortization Expense projected FERC 928 in MFR	

A DIVISION OF NUI UTILITIES, INC.

DOCKET NO 030569-GU

PROJECTED TEST YEAR 9/30/04

COMPARISON OF PROJECTED RATE CASE EXPENSES WITH ACTUAL THRU OCTOBER 2003

Line No.	C	Projected for Current Case Description 2003 *				octual for Frent Case 203 Thru Oct'03 *	Additional costs expected		
1	OUTSIDE CONSULTANTS MORI	N (COST OF CAPITAL)	s	40,000	\$	20,000	\$	20,000	
2	OUTSIDE CONSULTANTS HOUS	SEHOLDER (COST OF SERVICE)	\$	38,500	\$	19,516	\$	18,984	
3	OUTSIDE CONSULTANTS CHER	RY ROAD (DEPRECIATION STUDY)	\$	11,500	\$	11,242	\$	258	
4	OUTSIDE CONSULTANTS TEMPO	ORARY SERVICES	\$	40,000	\$	13,930	\$	26,070	
5	LEGAL SERVICES		\$	145,000	\$	37,143	\$	107,857	
6	TRAVEL EXPENSE		\$	50,000	\$	36,432	\$	13,568	
7	PAYROLL & OVERHEADS		\$	50,000	\$	48,674	\$	1,326	
8	OTHER EXPENSE		\$	50,000	\$	55,438	\$	12,550	
9	TOTAL		\$	425,000	\$	242,375	\$	200,613	

^{*} THESE EXPENSES WOULD ALL BE HIGHER IN THE EVENT A HEARING IS REQUIRED.

CALCULATION OF THE PRIOJECTED TEST YEAR - DEPRECIATION & AMORTIZATION	Attachment 11

EXPLANATION PROVIDE THE CALCULATION FOR DEPRECIATION AND AMORTIZATION FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION EXPENSE FOR THE PROJECTED TEST YEAR PROJECTED TEST YEAR, 09/30/04

COMPANY CITY GAS COMPANY OF FLORIDA ADIVISION OF NUI UTILITIES INC

DOCKE	TNO	O 000999-GU ESTIMATED DEPRECIATION AND AMORTIZATION EXPENSE FOR THE YEAR ENDING 9/30004													
LINE	AC				-	ESTR	MIED DEPRECA	ATION AND AM	ORTIZATION E	CPENSE FOR TH	E YEAR ENDING	9/30/04			TOTAL
NO	NO	DESCRIPTION	OCT-03	NOV-03	DEC-03	JAN-04	FEB-04	MAR-04	APR-0	MAY-04	JUN-04	JUL-0	AUG-04	SEP-04	EXPENSE
1	301	ONGANIZATION	•	-		•	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0
2	302	FRANCHISES AND CONSENTS	481	481	481	481	481	481	481	481	481	481	481	481	\$5,772
3	303	MISCELLANEOUS INTANGIBLE PLANT	87	67	67	87	67	87	87	87	87	87	87	87	\$1,044
4	367	TRANSMISSION MAIN	-			-	-	•	-	-	-			•	\$0
5	369	MEASURING/REGULATING EQUIPMENT						-	-	9	-				\$0
6	371	OTHER EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-				\$ 0
7	375	STRUCTURES & IMPROVEMENTS	1 020	1,020	1 020	1,020	1,020	1,020	1,020	1 020	1,020	1 020	1 020	1 020	\$12,235
8	376	WANG	284 081	206 443	287,427	289 130	290,286	291,278	292,481	294,023	295,645	297,092	298,230	299,090	\$3,504,205
9	379	MIJER STATION EQUIPMENT - CITY GATE	12,946	12,984	13,089	13,222	13,363	13,514	13,619	13,963	13,802	14,034	14,172	14,205	\$162,612
10	300	BERVICES	159,421	180,222	161,185	162,180	163,154	184,122	165,069	186,025	186 976	167,928	168,881	169,822	\$1,974,985
11	361	METERN	31,174	31,360	31,589	31,673	31,916	32,158	32,236	32,321	32,561	32,800	32,882	33,120	\$385 789
12	382	METER INSTALLATIONS	8 115	8,117	8,128	8,135	8,144	8,153	8,162	8,171	8,180	8,189	8,197	8,206	\$97,894
13	363	HOUSE REGULATORS	7,444	7,486	7 543	7,558	7 620	7,681	7,896	7,711	7,772	7,833	7 848	7,909	\$92,102
14	384	HOUSE REGUÇILATORS-INSTALLATIONS	3,751	3,741	3,736	3,728	3,722	3 715	3,708	3,702	3,696	3,688	3 68 2	3 675	\$44,543
15	385	INDUSTRIAL MER STATION EQUIPMENT	7,298	7,302	7,308	7,306	7,308	7,306	7,306	7,306	7 339	7,406	7 439	7 439	\$88,056
16	367	OTHER EQUIPMENT	377	377	377	377	377	377	377	377	377	374	377	377	\$4,517
17	390	STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS	5,021	5,032	5,075	5,130	5,189	5,261	5,324	5,392	5,452	5,486	5 508	5,519	\$63,368
18	391	OFFICE FUNNITURE & EQUIPMENT	26,377	26,453	28,608	26 778	28 946	27,098	27,263	27 429	27,577	27,728	27,867	28 041	\$326,186
19	392	TRANSPORTATION EQUIPMENT	700	700	696	603	689	696	682	679	675	671	666	664	\$8,203
20	393	STORES EQUIPMENT	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	\$518
21	394	TOOLS, SHOP, GARAGE EQUIPMENT	4,072	4 098	4,145	4,188	4,235	4,289	4,376	4,455	4,492	4,532	4,574	4,607	\$52,063
22	396	LABORATORY EQUIPMENT	π	77	π	77	77	π	77	77	π	77	π	77	\$921
23	397	COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	7 614	7 615	7,846	7 677	7,708	7,748	7 788	7,817	7 834	7 851	7 851	7,851	93 001
24	398	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	968	958	966	975	983	1,131	1,416	1,673	1,787	1,790	1 739	1,790	18,216
25		SUSTOTAL	561,056	563,593	567,219	570 436	573,345	576 220	579,212	582,451	585,872	589 109	591 893	594,024	\$6 934,225
26		OTHER DEPRECIATION	26,986	27,734	26,607	26,607	26,607	26,315	26,315	23,495	23,495	23,495	23,495	20,566	\$303 709
27		OTHER AMORTIZATION EXPENSE	10,444	10,444	10,444	10 444	10 444	10 444	10,444	10,444	10 444	10,444	10,444	10,444	125,328
28	то	TAL AMORTIZATION & DEPRECIATION EXP	600,487	601,772	604,269	607,467	610,396	612,979	615,970	616,389	619,811	823,049	625 631	625,024	7,383,281

RECAP SCHEDULES G-2 p5 SUPPORTING SCHEDULES G-2 p27