

PRESENTATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS  
TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, CONSUMER PROTECTION,  
AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING  
SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET REQUEST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

TWENTY-FOURTH STATE LEGISLATURE  
REGULAR SESSION

JANUARY 18, 2008

TO THE HONORABLE RUSSELL S. KOKUBUN, CHAIR  
AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Program Structure Number: 10 01 03 02

Program ID: CCA-103

Program Title: Consumer Advocate for Communication, Utilities and Transportation Services

Page References in the Multi-Year Program and Financial Plan:

**1. Introduction:**

**a. Summary of program objectives.**

Through advocacy, education, and long range planning, to ensure sustainable, reliable, safe, and quality communications, utility and transportation services at fair cost for Hawaii's consumers for the short and long term.

Statutory reference: Section 269-51, HRS.

**b. Description of program objectives.**

**Present your summary of objectives and activities as discussed in the Multi-Year Program and Financial Plan.**

The Division of Consumer Advocacy, Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs (Consumer Advocate) represents the interests of utility, communication, and transportation service consumers before regulatory bodies such as the Public Utilities Commission (PUC), Federal Communications Commission (FCC), and other federal, state and local agencies. The program reviews requests for rate increases, capital improvement projects, energy integrated resource plans, issues regarding competition in the telecommunications and electric power industries, certificates for authority to operate, and other applications filed with regulatory bodies by utility and transportation companies. The Consumer Advocate also educates people about utility matters affecting them, how they can be wiser consumers, and how they can more fully participate in the regulatory process.

**c. Explain how your program intends to meet its objectives in the upcoming supplemental.**

The program will actively participate in general rate applications, review general tariff filings and non-rate applications filed by utility, communication and transportation companies to determine the reasonableness and need for such requests, monitor service quality standards and participate in investigations regarding service quality and operational integrity, participate in restructuring dockets and participate in rulemaking proceedings initiated by the regulatory agencies. The program will educate the consumers of utility and transportation services through its web site, newsletters, sponsored events, and attendance at trade-shows, fairs, and business and community meetings. The program will also monitor, and to the extent possible participate in, the anticipated debate and probable revision of our federal telecommunications law in Congress. There are unresolved issues regarding how to deal with emerging technologies (such as Voice over Internet Protocol) and their relationships to new and existing technologies, state/federal jurisdictional issues, and "public benefits" supported by traditional telecommunications rates such as universal service and emergency 911 services.

**2. Program Performance Results:**

**a. Discuss the performance results achieved by the program in FY07.**

During FY 2007, the Consumer Advocate's office reviewed twelve general rate increase applications, 183 motor carrier tariff change requests, and ninety-six non-rate applications. As a result of the review conducted by the Consumer Advocate's office and decisions subsequently issued by the PUC, consumers saved over \$52.1 million in FY 2007.

**b. Explain how these results relate to the program's objectives and department's mission.**

The mission of the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs is "to uphold fairness and public confidence in the marketplace, promote sound consumer practices, and increase knowledge, opportunity, and justice in our community." The analysis performed by the Consumer Advocate's analysts in matters before the regulatory bodies (e.g., PUC) furthers the mission of the Department by ensuring:

- Fairness in the rates charged to all consumers of a utility service;
- The maintenance of acceptable service standards;
- The provision of safe and reliable utility service to improve the quality of life for Hawaii's utility customers; and
- Promotion of the State's energy policy without compromising service quality.

These goals are also consistent with the Consumer Advocate's program objectives that are set forth in Item 1.a. above.

The Consumer Advocate's analysis of rate applications and tariff transmittals ensured that the rates charged for utility services were non-discriminatory and reflected reasonable costs of providing the services to all consumers.

The analysis of integrated resource planning, demand-side management and capital improvement applications ensured that utilities had the infrastructure and facilities needed to provide safe and reliable service to its customers, thereby fostering a high quality of life and the promotion of the State's economy. For example, electric service is essential to customers and their everyday existence, whether it be an individual resident or a large business. Consumers' heavy reliance on computer technology to perform many of our daily functions creates a greater need for reliable electric service. In addition, the Consumer Advocate's analysis in these matters helped to achieve the State's energy policy of reducing the State's dependence on fossil fuel without compromising service quality by supporting the use of renewable energy, where appropriate.

The analysis of certification applications ensured that affordable, safe and reliable utility service was provided to all consumers in a designated service area. This analysis is crucial to quality of life since utility services, by their nature, are essential services that may not be available to the consumer in a particular service area, but for the service offered by the applicant seeking certification from the PUC.

**c. Explain how the effectiveness of the program is measured (i.e., outcomes, measures of effectiveness, benchmarks, etc.) and discuss the performance results achieved during the past two years.**

The Consumer Advocate's office uses the planning, programming, and budgeting (PPB) Measures of Effectiveness to quantify money saved for consumers by actions taken by the office. For FYs 2006 and 2007, the total amount of consumer savings for those years was in excess of \$86.2 million.

However, the Consumer Advocate's office is also very active in many cases where the case outcomes have significant impacts on utility, communications and transportation consumers but cannot be directly measured or quantified through evaluation of rate increases or reductions. For these significant cases and rulemaking proceedings, the office examines whether the results as stated by the authority (usually the PUC) is consistent with the positions advocated by the Consumer Advocate. The measures are conducted on a case-by-case basis and are by their nature somewhat subjective when contrasted to the PPB Measures. Yet, each of these cases is important to the Consumer Advocate's office's understanding of its effectiveness.

The following is a summary of some of the larger proceedings and committees in which the Consumer Advocate has participated during FY 2006 and 2007:

**i. *Rate Cases***

**a. *Hawaii Electric Light Company's (HELCO) 2006 Test Year Rate Case***

On May 5, 2006, HELCO filed an application for approval of rate increases and revised rate schedules and rules. In particular, HELCO sought a general rate increase of approximately 9.24 per cent over revenues at present rates. In fiscal year 2006-2007, the Consumer

Advocate, among other things, developed written testimonies, participated in technical meetings, conducted employee interviews, and worked to resolve the issues outstanding in this docket. On April 4, 2007, the PUC issued an interim decision and order, approving a rate increase of approximately 7.58 per cent, an amount consistent with the recommendation of HELCO and the Consumer Advocate. The parties are awaiting a final disposition of this proceeding.

b. *Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc.'s (HECO) 2007 Test Year Rate Case*

On December 22, 2006, HECO filed an application for approval to increase its rates (net rate increase for consumers of 7.1 per cent) and to amend its rate schedules and rules. In fiscal year 2006-2007, the Consumer Advocate, among other things, participated in a public hearing, developed written testimonies, participated in technical meetings, conducted employee interviews, and worked to resolve the issues outstanding in this docket. On October 22, 2007, the PUC issued an interim decision and order, approving a rate increase of approximately 4.9 per cent, which was consistent with the recommendation of the parties. The parties are awaiting the final disposition of this proceeding.

c. *Young Brothers, Limited's (YB) 2007 Test Year Rate Case*

On December 15, 2006, YB filed an application requesting PUC approval of an average overall rate increase of 10.7 per cent for certain types of cargo (for its intrastate water carrier operations) and its revised rate schedules and rules. In fiscal year 2006-2007, the Consumer Advocate, among other things, participated in public hearings held Statewide, developed written testimonies, participated in technical meetings, conducted employee interviews, and worked to resolve the issues outstanding in this docket. On October 12, 2007, the PUC issued a decision and order approving a rate increase of approximately 7.5 per cent, an amount consistent with that recommended by the parties to the proceeding.

d. *Waikoloa Resort Utilities, Inc., dba West Hawaii Utility Company (WHUC)*

On December 29, 2007, WHUC filed an application seeking approval of general rate increases of \$1,594,313, or 52 per cent, over revenues at present rates for water service and \$1,107,089, or 132 per cent over revenues at present rates for sewer services. During fiscal year 2006-2007, the Consumer Advocate, among other things, participated in a public hearing, developed written testimonies, and worked to resolve the issues outstanding in this docket. This proceeding has not been completed. If the parties are able to resolve their differences and submit a settlement letter to the PUC for its consideration, the PUC will consider such filing and issue an interim decision and order. Thereafter, the parties will await final disposition of the proceeding.

e. *Maui Electric Company, Limited (MECO) 2007 Test Year Rate Case*

On February 23, 2007, MECO filed an application requesting approval of rate increases and revised rate schedules and rules. Specifically, MECO requested approval of a general rate increase of approximately 5.3 per cent over revenues at present rates. In fiscal year 2006-2007, the Consumer Advocate, among other things, participated in public hearings, developed written testimonies, participated in technical meetings, conducted employee interviews, and worked to resolve the issues outstanding in this docket. The procedural steps for this proceeding have not been completed. If the parties are able to resolve their differences and submit a settlement letter to the PUC for its consideration, the PUC will consider such filing and issue an interim decision and order. Thereafter, the parties will await final disposition of the proceeding.

f. *Five water and wastewater utilities received streamlined rate review processes*

On June 28, 2006, Manele Water Resources, LLC applied for a certificate of public convenience and necessity (CPCN) to provide sewer service in the area of Manele-Hulopoe on the island of Lanai, and for approval of its rules, regulations, and rates. The PUC treated this application for CPCN as a *de facto* rate increase application.

From the end of October 2006 through the end of December 2006 four water and wastewater companies filed applications for general rate increase with the PUC: (1) Puhī Sewer and Water Company, Inc.; (2) Miller and Lieb Water Company, Inc., nka Hawaiian Beaches Water Company, Inc.; (3) Laie Water Company, Inc.; and (4) Launiupoko Water Company, LLC. During fiscal year 2006-2007, the Consumer Advocate participated in public hearings, developed written testimonies, and worked to resolve the issues in this docket.

ii. ***Major Capitol Improvement Projects***

a. *HECO's Campbell Industrial Park Generating Unit*

In June 2005, HECO requested commission approval to commit approximately \$137,430,260 to build a 110 megawatt generating unit, the Campbell Industrial Park Generating Station. During fiscal year 2005-2006, the Consumer Advocate engaged in discovery and submitted testimonies to the PUC, stating that the Consumer Advocate does not oppose the commitment of funds for the new combustion turbine and construction of the associated generating facilities to meet the Company's service obligations, provided that HECO power the unit with ethanol or some other bio-fuel. During the week of December 11, 2006, the Consumer Advocate participated in an evidentiary hearing on the issues disputed by the parties to the proceeding. Immediately following the hearing, the Consumer Advocate prepared post hearing opening and reply briefs for the PUC. The PUC issued a decision and order on May 23,

2007, approving HECO's request to commit the funds to purchase and install the generating unit, among other things.

iii. ***Generic and Other Proceedings***

- a. *PUC's investigation seeking to increase the maximum capacity of eligible customer-generators to more than 50 kW and the total rated generating capacity produced by eligible customer-generators to an amount above 0.5 per cent of peak demand*

Hawaii law provides the PUC with the authority to increase, but not decrease these two net energy metering thresholds. The Consumer Advocate participated in technical and other meetings convened by the parties to discuss the issues, prepared a statement of position, and conducted research on the issues. The parties (but not the sole participant) to this proceeding filed a settlement letter with the PUC recommending that the thresholds for the customer-generator be increased to 100 kW for HECO, HELCO, and MECO, and that the generating capacity be limited to 1 per cent of a utility's peak demand for all electric utilities. Moreover, to ensure that the thresholds received regular review by stakeholders, the parties agreed that these two net energy metering thresholds be examined in the electric utilities' integrated resource plans. The PUC has not yet rendered a decision on this settlement proposal.

- b. *PUC's investigation of Hawaii's Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS) Law, Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS) §§ 269-91 – 269-95, as amended by Act 162, Session Laws of Hawaii (SLH) 2006*

The PUC is required by HRS § 269-95, to implement a ratemaking structure by December 31, 2007 to provide the electric utilities with the incentive to meet the RPS. The PUC opened this docket to examine the ratemaking structure to be implemented. Many of the parties recommended to the PUC that the existing ratemaking structure used by the PUC for regulatory oversight can and should be used to provide the electric utilities with incentives and disincentives to meet the RPS. In addition, many of the parties stated that a renewable energy infrastructure surcharge should be considered as a means to promote renewable energy use by the electric utilities, and that additional tools, like renewable energy credits should be considered by the PUC in future proceedings. The parties are awaiting final disposition of this proceeding.

- c. *Hawaiian Telcom, Inc.'s Service Quality Docket*

In March 2006, the PUC conditionally approved the merger transaction transferring control over Hawaiian Telcom (then Verizon Hawaii, Inc.) and related assets from certain subsidiaries of Verizon Communications, Inc. to Hawaiian Telcom Communications, Inc. When it approved the merger transaction, the PUC stated that it recognized that such a transaction may negatively impact the quality of service being provided to the general public. Accordingly, the PUC planned to initiate an investigation

regarding service quality levels and standards approximately six months after cutover from Verizon's systems. This service quality docket, opened on October 16, 2006, is that which the PUC anticipated it would open in its decision and order approving the merger transaction.

During the fiscal year, the Consumer Advocate participated in numerous technical and other meetings convened by the parties, conducted extensive discovery, participated in evidentiary hearings, and prepared written statements of position. The procedural steps are nearly complete; thereafter, the parties will await a final decision and order from the PUC.

- d. *PUC's investigative docket examining the major power outages that occurred on October 15 and 16, 2006 on the islands of Oahu, Maui, and Hawaii.*

On Sunday, October 15, 2006, the State experienced a 6.7 magnitude earthquake west of the island of Hawaii, which initiated a series of events that resulted in island-wide power outages on Oahu and Maui and significant outages on the island of Hawaii. On October 23, 2006, the Consumer Advocate requested the PUC open an investigative docket to examine whether HECO, HELCO, and MECO (the "HECO Companies") acted reasonably and in the public interest prior to and during the outages.

During the fiscal year, the Consumer Advocate conducted extensive discovery, employee interviews, and field inspections, prepared a statement of position, and participated in numerous technical meetings and discussions convened by the parties. After completing this extensive review, the Consumer Advocate concluded that: (1) there are at least three main underlying causes that contributed or may have contributed to the Power Outages occurring and potentially lengthening the recovery duration; (2) the HECO Companies' activities and performance prior to and during the power outages were reasonable and in the public interest; (3) the island-wide power outages could not have been avoided on Maui and were understandable on Oahu; and (4) the HECO Companies should not be assessed penalties for these uncommon island-wide outages. Moreover, the Consumer Advocate recommended that the HECO Companies implement the following recommendations: (a) formalize their training programs for plant and system operators to include more formalized training, practiced simulation, certification, requalification and record keeping; (b) evaluate and pursue providing additional black start capability on HECO's system; and (c) develop and commence a long-term program to implement Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) control on HECO's existing distribution breakers, and the HECO Companies to implement a standard requiring SCADA control for all new distribution breakers that are installed on all three islands.

- e. *PUC's investigative dockets examining the proposed tariffs filed by HECO, HELCO, MECO, and KIUC governing distributed generation and other related matters*

From 2003 through 2006, the PUC conducted a generic proceeding for the purpose of establishing a framework and policy “to promote the development of a market structure that assures: (a) [Distributed Generation (“DG”)] is available at the lowest feasible cost; (b) DG that is economical and reliable has an opportunity to come to fruition; and (c) DG that is not cost-effective does not enter the system.” Decision and Order No. 22248, filed on January 27, 2006, in Docket No. 03-0371 at 12. The electric utilities were required to file tariffs governing distributed generation within six months of the filing of Decision and Order No. 22248 for its consideration. Instead of examining the interconnection and standby tariffs filed by the utilities in the generic DG docket, the PUC opened two new dockets to address these issues, citing the public concern expressed over the amount of the standby rates to be charged by the electric utilities and the methodologies by which such rates were derived.

iv. ***Advocacy through Participation on Committees and Boards***

a. ***Enhanced Wireless 911 Services***

The Consumer Advocate has been an active participant in the State’s implementation of an order issued by the FCC mandating that enhanced 911 (E-911) services be provided by wireless telecommunication carriers. The passage of Act 159 in 2004 provided the framework to implement the State’s wireless E-911 system to route emergency calls to emergency responders along with the wireless callers identification and location. Act 159 also established a Wireless Enhanced 911 Board that oversees the collection and distribution of money collected by the E-911 special fund. As a member of the board, the Executive Director of the Consumer Advocate has continued to be an active participant in the implementation of this system which is critical to the public safety of both Hawaii residents and visitors.

b. ***Federal Communications Commission’s Consumer Advisory Committee***

The Consumer Advocate’s Executive Director was appointed to the FCC’s Consumer Advisory Committee in May 2005 for a term to last through December 2006. This committee was formed to make recommendations to the FCC regarding consumer issues under its jurisdiction, including implementation of FCC rules and consumer participation in the rulemaking process, consumer protection and education, access to services by people with disabilities and by those in underserved areas and populations, and the impact of new and emerging technologies. As an active participant of the committee and three of its working groups, the Consumer Advocate is ensuring that the interests of Hawaii consumers are well represented before the FCC at this critical time when similar communications services are beginning to be offered by industries through different technologies and under various levels of regulatory oversight.



c. *One Call Center Advisory Committee*

The Executive Director of the DCA is also a member of the One Call Center Advisory Committee, which makes recommendations to the PUC regarding the implementation of Chapter 269E, HRS (Act 141, SLH 2004). This advisory committee was integral in developing the request for proposals for a vendor to operate this “call-before-you-dig” system. The system, which was operational on January 1, 2006, is intended to reduce the risk of critical services being disrupted because utility systems were inadvertently damaged due to excavation work conducted in areas where the systems are placed in underground facilities. The Consumer Advocate is hopeful that this law will ensure greater public health and safety, and ultimately save excavators time and money.

d. *Hawaii Energy Policy Forum*

The University of Hawaii convened the Hawaii Energy Policy Forum in 2002 to help develop and promote a vision for Hawaii’s energy future. It is a collaborative effort that brings together interested stakeholders including representatives of electric utilities; oil and synthetic natural gas suppliers; environmental groups; the renewable energy industry; State legislature; federal, state, and county government agencies; the business community; and other major energy consumers. The Forum’s efforts focus on many different energy related issues, including social and cultural issues, energy conservation and efficiency, and regulatory reform. The Consumer Advocate believes that as an active participant in the forum it has and will continue to effectively represent consumers' views as major policy issues are discussed and as proposals are developed and implemented.

**d. Discuss actions taken by the program to improve its performance results.**

The following represent some of the significant steps taken to improve the performance of the program.

- i. The office is continuing to explore different means by which to fill its position vacancies with qualified individuals despite perceived difficulties in competing with the compensation offered by utility companies. The office is considering hiring individuals who, with greater efforts to implement training programs for existing employees and new recruits, will be able to meet the varied ,complex and numerous demands of Consumer Advocate employees. In addition, pursuant to direction in Act 143, SLH 2006 and Act 183, SLH 2007, the office is reorganizing the Consumer Advocate to increase the possibility of attracting viable, interested candidates. The office’s reorganization plan, which appropriately matches the job functions with the job classifications in order to attract and retain qualified candidates, was recently approved by the Department of Budget and Finance and the Department of Human Resources Development.
- ii. The Consumer Advocate is continuing the enhancement of its plan for consumer

education and outreach. The Consumer Advocate has revamped its website, making it user-friendly and more valuable for consumers. Also, the website provides copies of the PUC's order as well as tips and templates to help consumers participate in utility public hearings. The Consumer Advocate publishes a quarterly newsletter to help educate consumers and update them on utility issues and trends. Our education specialist performs outreach activities at appropriate public trade and senior fairs and events as well as in other community venues. The education specialist will also be conducting public education and awareness seminars on pertinent utility issues, serving members of the public and business community with regards to specific utility issues and to ensure that the Consumer Advocate is aware of and able to effectively protect utility consumer interests.

- iii. The office continues to upgrade its computer and office equipment and utilize its network facilities to streamline work flow processes in order to enhance efficiencies and work productivity. The computer equipment also permits the evaluation of large quantities of data that is regularly supplied by the various utility, telecommunications and transportation companies. This permits the office's analysts to effectively challenge the assumptions and conclusions of the regulated companies on a timely basis. It also reduces duplication of effort and streamlines the processing of work within the office, thereby enhancing operational efficiency and productivity. These changes have resulted in a better utilization of existing resources within the Consumer Advocate's office.
- iv. The office continued the training from national experts of both new employees and veterans in the areas of telecommunications and electric regulation because of the potentially vast changes occurring in technology and regulation. The office also conducts an in-house training program designed to provide on-the job training that is directly related to a docketed matter before the PUC.
- v. The Consumer Advocate is collaborating with the PUC in the acquisition/development of a document management system that shares common information and processes but keeps separate information secure. The system's first phase is scheduled to be operational by mid-2007. The system will allow for better coordination between the Consumer Advocate and the PUC, make managing Consumer Advocate workflow much more efficient, and greatly improve public access to records filed with the Consumer Advocate and PUC.

**e. Identify all modifications to your program's performance measures and discuss the rationale for these modifications.**

None.

**3. Problems and Issues:**

**a. Discussion of problems and issues encountered, if any.**

The regulated utility, communication and transportation industries and the regulatory climate have undergone major shifts since the mid-1980's. First, there was a pervasive trend at the federal level to reduce economic regulation and overt consumer protection in the telecommunications, electric power, and transportation industries.

Second, the regulated industries themselves, especially in telecommunications, are rapidly changing due to even more rapid advances in technology. Furthermore, changes in the industries' structure have occurred as federal agencies that regulate utilities continue to depart from traditional rate regulation of those industries. As a result, a greater burden of regulation has been placed upon the PUC and the Consumer Advocate's office to ensure that Hawaii's utilities, telecommunications and transportation companies provide reliable service at a reasonable cost.

Third, due to increased awareness regarding the significance of the energy industry on such issues as environmental and economic impacts, there has been increased interest in making modifications to the manner in which energy utility companies meet customer demand. Examples of such interest has taken form in the renewable portfolio standards and net energy metering. One of the main objectives of both the renewable portfolio standards and net energy metering is to increase the relative contribution of renewable resources to the production of energy meeting Hawaii's needs. The Consumer Advocate's office has been working to ensure that the utility companies strive to achieve the established renewable portfolio standards in a manner that will not result in undue increases in existing utility rates. The Consumer Advocate will also ensure through its active participation in the integrated resource planning process that the energy utility companies will continue to migrate towards greater reliance on renewable resources, which should reduce Hawaii's reliance on imported fossil fuels.

Finally, and most important, the number and complexity of the major filings (e.g., applications requesting rate adjustments and utility planning dockets) of the Hawaii utility, communications and transportation companies have increased dramatically since 1989. Because of the need for the utility and telecommunication companies to improve their infrastructure and add capacity to meet customer demands, these trends will continue in the immediate future.

**b. Program change recommendations to remedy problems.**

The office will continue to prioritize its caseload to focus on projects with the greatest consumer impact. To that end, the office will carefully select and prioritize the issues to be addressed in each of the cases in which it participates in fiscal year 2008.

In addition, the office will continue to utilize teams made up of staff members, expert consultants and outside legal counsel to target the consumer issues that have the greatest impact on the ratepayers of utility, communication and transportation services in Hawaii. This will allow the continuity and consistency in positions taken by the Consumer Advocate in all related cases litigated before the regulatory agencies.

**c. Identify any program issues or problems that have affected or will affect the**

**implementation of the program, and the corrective measures or remedies established or planned.**

The federal telecommunications law may undergo some significant revisions in Congress in an attempt to deal with emerging technologies (such as Voice over Internet Protocol) and their relationships to new and existing technologies, state/federal jurisdictional issues, and "public benefits" supported by traditional telecommunications rates such as universal service and emergency 911 services. Not only will the Consumer Advocate be monitoring and trying to influence any changes to the law to best benefit Hawaii ratepayers, the ultimate outcome of any revisions could change the levels of resources the Consumer Advocate must commit to continue its effective work in the telecommunications arena (at the federal and/or state levels). Additionally, the PUC, under Act 95, SLH 2004, is reviewing alternative rate making structures to promote the development/implementation of renewable energy resources. A change in the rate making structure could alter the way the Consumer Advocate approaches its work regarding electric, and perhaps other, utilities.

These pending issues may eventually result in the need for additional consultant services. Finally, although no specific corrective measures or remedies have been established or planned, the program will adapt as necessary to continue protecting consumers' interests if any of the aforementioned changes do occur.

**4. Expenditures for FY08:**

**Provide the appropriation data, transfers, restrictions, available resources, and the estimated expenditures for FY0. For new Program I.D.'s, please present the data as best as can be determined.**

	FY 08 Apprn (Act 213/07)	Collective Bargaining	Transfers	Restrictions	Ceiling Increase	Estimated Total Expenditure
(Position Count)	(23.00)	-		-	-	(23.00)
Personal Services	1,757,179	21,755		-	-	1,778,934
Other Current	928,614	-		-	-	928,614
Equipment	20,000	-		-	-	20,000
Leases	-	-		-	-	-
Motor Vehicles	-	-		-	-	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,705,793</b>	<b>21,755</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,727,548</b>
(Position Count)	-	-		-	-	-
General Funds	-	-		-	-	-
(Position Count)	(23.00)	-		-	-	(23.00)
Special Funds	2,705,793	21,755		-	-	2,727,548
(Position Count)	-	-		-	-	-
Trust Funds	-	-		-	-	-
(Position Count)	-	-		-	-	-
Other Funds	-	-		-	-	-

- a. **Explain all transfers within the program I.D. and the impact on the program.**

None.

- b. **Explain all transfers between program I.D.s and the impact on the program.**

None.

- c. **Explain all restrictions and the impact on the program.**

**As applicable, provide a description of the impact of the transfers that have occurred within the program I.D. between the various cost elements, transfers occurring between different program I.D.s, and restrictions imposed.**

None.

**5. Supplemental Budget Requests for FY09:**

**Provide the total position counts and funds requested.**

	MOF	FY09 Apprn (Act 213/07)	Supplemental Request	Total FY09 Exec Supp Budget
(Position Count)	B	(23.00)	-	(23.00)
				-
Personal Services	B	1,757,179		1,757,179
Other Current	B	928,614	-	928,614
Equipment	B	20,000	-	20,000
Leases	B	-	-	-
Motor Vehicles	B	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>2,705,793</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,705,793</b>

- a. **Workload or program request:**  
**For each program package or item requested within the Program I.D., provide the following (if no request if being made, indicate "none"):**

None.

- b. **For all position count reductions, please specify whether the positions were filled or vacant.**

None.

- 6. Program restrictions:**  
Identify restrictions carried over from FY08 as well as additional reductions due to the Department of Budget & Finance budget ceilings for FY09. If no reduction is being proposed, please indicate “none”.

None.

- 7. Capital Improvement Program (CIP) requests for FY09:**  
CIP data for all projects within the agency being heard shall be combined into a single appendix in the department’s testimony (if no request is being made, please indicate “none”).

None.

- 8. Proposed lapses of CIP projects:**  
Any CIP project identified for lapse shall include the following (if no lapses are being proposed, please indicate “none”):

None.