



Deloitte & Touche LLP
Suite 500
Eighth & Main Building
707 East Main Street
Richmond, VA 23219
USA
Tel: +1 804 697 1500
Fax: +1 804 697 1825
www.deloitte.com

FILE

INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

The Board of Directors
East Ohio Gas Company
Cleveland, OH

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by the East Ohio Gas Company (the "Company") and provided to the Public Utility Commission of Ohio (the "PUCO") and the Ohio Consumers' Counsel (the "OCC"), with respect to the Company's evaluation of the recovery of uncollectible expense through a bad debt recovery mechanism in conjunction with the PUCO Case No. 03-1127-GA-UNC. The Company's management is responsible for the bad debt recovery mechanism. This agreed-upon procedures engagement was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of those parties specified in the report. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV
2005 MAY 19 PM 3:48
PUCO

The procedures that we performed and our findings are as follows:

UNCOLLECTIBLE EXPENSE RECOVERY MECHANISM

- a) We obtained from Company management, and proved the mathematical accuracy of, the accounting schedules summarizing bad debt tracker activity by month and supporting schedules for the following items from January 1, 2005 to December 31, 2005:
 1. Bad debt charge offs for the period of January 1, 2005 thru December 31, 2005 of \$52,763,987.
 2. Recovery of bad debts
 - i. Through the updated rider implemented in July 2004 and effective through June 2005 of \$22,625,063.
 - ii. Through the updated rider implemented in July 2005 through December 31, 2005 of \$14,492,309.
 3. Broker recoveries for the period of January 1, 2005 through December 31, 2005 of \$7,722,828.
 4. Customer recoveries for the period of January 1, 2005 through December 31, 2005 of \$13,487,507.
 5. Carrying charges for the period of January 1, 2005 through December 31, 2005 of \$544,451.

This is to certify that the images appearing are an accurate and complete reproduction of a case file document delivered in the regular course of business
Technician _____ Date Processed 5.19.05

- b) We compared bad debt charge offs from the schedule obtained in a)1. above to Customer Care System (CCS) and Special Billing System (SBS) reports. We report all amounts to be in agreement and report that eligible charge-offs used in the calculations relate only to accounts that pay the PIPP rider per the CCS charge-off and SBS charge-off reports.
- c) We randomly selected 3 months of data included in the schedules obtained in a)2. above and performed the following procedures:
 - 1. We compared sales and energy choice transportation volumes to volumetric CCS and SBS reports and found them to be in agreement. We report that such eligible volumes relate only to accounts that pay the PIPP rider per the CCS charge-off and SBS charge-off reports.
 - 2. We compared the bad debt recovery rates for East Ohio and for West Ohio Division with those permitted by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, as outlined in Case No. 05-672-GA-UEx and Case No. 04-570-GA-UEx, and found them to be in agreement. We report that the respective rates, net of the portion attributable to gross receipts tax, have been applied to the eligible volumes by reference to the SBS and CCS billing summaries obtained from management.
- d) We compared the amounts of the accounts receivable discounts withheld from the Energy Choice brokers per the schedule obtained in a) above to CCS billing system and SBS broker worksheets, and found them to be in agreement for the months selected in c).
- e) We compared customer recovery volumes for the months selected in c) above to the respective CCS and SBS reports and found them to be in agreement.
- f) We obtained the Company's money pool interest rate for the months selected in c) above and found them to be in agreement with the interest rate utilized by the Company to calculate the monthly carrying charges.
- g) We applied the rate obtained in f) and recalculated the carrying cost calculations for the months selected in c) above, and found them to be in agreement.
- h) We recalculated the gross receipts tax component of the rider billings for the months selected in c) above, and found them to be in agreement.

A/R REGULATORY ASSET BALANCE

- i) We obtained the A/R Regulatory Asset balance from general ledger account 1242200 at December 31, 2005 and report that the balance recorded on the general ledger is \$336,332 greater than the balance reflected on the rollforward obtained in j) below. We were informed by the Company that the difference relates to timing differences in the general ledger and an interest true up based on the final summary of 2005 bad debt tracker activity.

- j) We obtained the rollforward of SAP accounts 1242199 and 1242200 and report that the charge-offs reported on the general ledger are \$3,456 greater than the charge-offs obtained in a)1 above. We also report that the recovery of bad debts reported on the general ledger is \$41,858 less than the recovery of bad debts obtained in a)2 above. We also report that broker recoveries reported on the general ledger are \$23,373 greater than the broker recoveries obtained in a)3 above. We report that these differences are included within the total difference between the general ledger and summary schedule of \$336,332 reported in i) above.

- k) We compared the amortization rate of the regulatory assets per the schedule obtained in j) above to the PUCO order in Case No. 05-672-GA-UEx and found them to be in agreement.

We were not engaged to, and did not, conduct an examination, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on compliance. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the specified parties listed above and is not intended to be and should not be used by any other party.

Deloitte & Touche LLP

May 18, 2006