

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from electronic originals
(may include minor formatting differences from printed original)

MAINE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Report on the Assessments of Investor Owned and Consumer-Owned Utilities

**Pursuant to
An Act Regarding Public Utility Assessments, Fees and Penalties
(P.L. 2021, Chapter 318)**



**Presented to the
Joint Standing Committee on
Energy, Utilities and Technology**

January 15, 2022

I. INTRODUCTION

During the First Special Session of the 130th Legislature, the Legislature enacted Public Law 2021, chapter 318 (LD 251, An Act Regarding Public Utility Assessments, Fees and Penalties) (Act). Those portions of the Act that amend the way in which utilities in Maine are assessed take effect August 1, 2022.

Section 22 of the Act directs the Public Utilities Commission (Commission) to submit to the Joint Standing Committee on Energy, Utilities and Technology (Committee) initial calculations related to the amendments in the Act to 35-A M.R.S. § 116(1) by January 15, 2022. The Committee is authorized to report out a bill to the Second Regular Session of the 130th Legislature based on the information submitted by the Commission.

The current methodology under 35-A M.R.S. § 116(1) to calculate the assessment on utilities for Commission costs is amended by section 1 of the Act. Specifically, the Act states: “Within each category of public utility, the assessment must be apportioned and applied separately to investor-owned utilities (IOU) and consumer-owned utilities (COU). The portion of the assessment applicable to investor-owned utilities and consumer-owned utilities within each category must be determined based on an accounting by the commission of the portion of the commission's resources devoted to matters related to investor-owned utilities and the portion devoted to matters related to consumer-owned utilities.” Additionally the Act specifies “the portion of the assessment applicable to investor-owned utilities and consumer-owned utilities within each category of public utility, as determined by the commission under this subsection, must be allocated to each utility based on a three-year rolling average of revenue reported by the utility.”

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Commission revised the methodology and calculations of the actual May 2021 assessment based on the language from the Act using an allocation that reflected staff time tracked between IOUs and COUs for four months (August through November 2021). In addition, contractual costs or other non-labor costs were allocated to the appropriate IOU or COU industry category. For example, if a consulting contract was required for an electric IOU, those costs were allocated to the electric IOUs and not the electric COUs. Finally, the Commission used a three-year average of revenues for all utility industries (Electric, Natural Gas, Water, Communications, and Water Carriers) to calculate the revised assessment based on this methodology.

For electric utilities, under the revised allocation methodology, IOUs realized an increase of about \$90,000 in total or 1.5%, and COUs realized a corresponding decrease of \$90,000 or 35.6%. For water utilities, IOUs realized an increase of about \$50,000 in total or 49.8%, and COUs realized a corresponding decrease of \$50,000 or 7.8%. Several of the IOU water utilities are small, and therefore the large increase in assessment will have financial consequences.

The impact of these changes is detailed below. Because of the timing of the effective date of the Act, the Commission was able to track just four months of actual staff time data for these calculations. Given that the Commission’s case load and corresponding staff time and consulting needs can vary from year to year, perhaps significantly, the assessment allocation that results from this four month snapshot is not necessarily indicative of how assessments would be allocated in the future under this methodology. It would not be surprising for these fluctuations to impact assessments significantly.

In addition, the three-year revenue average applies to all industries. Therefore, all communication utilities are impacted as is the Casco Bay Island Transit District.

III. IMPACT TO ELECTRIC UTILITIES

As noted above, for electric utilities, under the revised allocation methodology, the IOUs realized an increase in assessment of about \$90,000 in total or 1.5% and COUs realized a corresponding decrease in assessment of \$90,000 in total or 35.6%. The following chart details the change in dollars for each utility as well as the percentage change. The “Revised” column uses the methodology from the Act and the “Current” column is the actual assessment from May 2021. For example, Eastern Maine Electric was assessed \$111,966 in May 2021. Using the methodology contained in the Act, this utility would be assessed \$72,400, a 35.3% decrease.

Electric Transmission and Distribution Utility Assessment Overview

	Revised	Current	Difference	% Change
Electric T&D				
IOU				
CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY	\$4,710,867	\$4,765,651	\$ (54,784)	-1.1%
VERSANT POWER F/K/A EMERA MAINE	\$1,530,839	\$1,386,039	\$ 144,800	10.4%
Total IOU	\$ 6,241,706	\$ 6,151,690	\$ 90,016	1.5%
COU				
EASTERN MAINE ELECTRIC CO-OP, INC	\$72,400	\$111,966	(39,566)	-35.3%
FOX ISLANDS ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC	\$15,529	\$23,315	(7,786)	-33.4%
HOULTON WATER COMPANY - ELECTRIC DEPT.	\$31,290	\$51,463	(20,173)	-39.2%
ISLE-AU-HAUT ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY	\$818	\$1,255	(437)	-34.8%
KENNEBUNK LIGHT & POWER DISTRICT	\$23,387	\$34,804	(11,417)	-32.8%
MADISON ELECTRIC WORKS	\$10,655	\$15,494	(4,839)	-31.2%
MATINICUS PLANTATION ELECTRIC COMPANY	\$849	\$1,232	(383)	-31.1%
MONHEGAN PLANTATION POWER DISTRICT	\$2,141	\$2,809	(668)	-23.8%
VAN BUREN LIGHT & POWER DISTRICT	\$5,787	\$10,540	(4,753)	-45.1%
Total COU Electric	\$162,855	\$252,877	-\$90,022	-35.6%
Total Electric T&D	\$ 6,404,561.37	\$ 6,404,567.58	\$ (6.21)	

IV. IMPACT TO WATER UTILITIES

For water utilities, IOUs realized an increase in assessment of about \$50,000 in total or 49.8%, and COUs realized a corresponding decrease in assessment of about \$50,000 in total or 7.8%. The following chart details the change in dollars for each IOU water utility as well as the percentage change. As noted above, several of the water IOUs serve small populations and thus the increased assessment under the Act could result in financial hardship for these utilities. For example, the assessment for Kezar Falls would increase from \$1,866 to \$2,830, a 51.7% increase.

Water Utility Assessment Overview-IOU's

	Revised	Current	Difference	% Change
Water				
IOU				
FRYEBURG WATER COMPANY	4,355	2,933	1,422	48.5%
MACHIAS WATER COMPANY	2,851	1,816	1,035	57.0%
PINE SPRINGS ROADS & WATER, LLC	561	372	189	50.8%
THE MAINE WATER COMPANY FREEPORT	5,676	3,515	2,161	61.5%
THE MAINE WATER COMPANY GREENVILLE	3,244	2,136	1,108	51.9%
THE MAINE WATER COMPANY BIDDEFORD & SACO	56,175	38,363	17,812	46.4%
THE MAINE WATER COMPANY BUCKSPORT	4,192	2,901	1,290	44.5%
THE MAINE WATER COMPANY CAMDEN/ROCKLAND	44,705	29,258	15,448	52.8%
THE MAINE WATER COMPANY HARTLAND	2,259	1,519	740	48.7%
THE MAINE WATER COMPANY KEZAR FALLS	2,830	1,866	964	51.7%
THE MAINE WATER COMPANY MILLINOCKET	8,546	5,589	2,956	52.9%
THE MAINE WATER COMPANY OAKLAND	4,857	3,249	1,608	49.5%
THE MAINE WATER COMPANY SKOWHEGAN	10,714	7,279	3,436	47.2%
Total Water IOU	150,966	100,797	50,169	49.8%

Of the 118 Water COUs, all would experience a decrease except for the following ten water utilities: Anson/Madison, Bath, Berwick, Fort Fairfield, Grand Isle, Kittery, Lubec, Mt. Blue, Northport Village, and Pittsfield. The increases range from 0.2% to 38.6% and are highlighted for convenience in Attachment 1 of this report.

For the 108 utilities experiencing a decrease, the reductions ranged from -0.8% to -21.8% and are also detailed in Attachment 1 of this report.

V. IMPACT TO COMMUNICATIONS UTILITIES AND WATER CARRIERS

The three-year revenue average applies to all utilities as noted above. The impact to the 54 communications utilities varied widely ranging from a decrease of

50.5% to an increase of 492%. The specific changes are detailed in Attachment 2 of this report.

The Casco Bay Island Transit District is the only water carrier utility regulated by the Commission. Their assessment would increase from \$254 to \$255

VI. CONCLUSION

As outlined in this Report, several small water utilities (both IOU and COU) will see a significant increase to their assessment. These small utilities have limited financial capacity and may find it difficult to manage these increases within existing resources.

Ten of the 54 communications utilities experienced an increase in their assessment. This is a result of using the three-year revenue average.

Finally, the Commission reiterates that the results described above reflect an allocation based on only a four month snapshot of staff time data. The Commission's case load in terms of COU and IOU cases and their related costs fluctuate from year to year. These fluctuations could impact assessments significantly, potentially resulting in a lack of certainty and predictability and, in some cases, may result in rate increases for the customers of some of these utilities.

COU Water Utility Assessment Overview

	Revised	Current	Difference	% Change
COU				
ALFRED WATER DISTRICT	2,348	2,464	(117)	-4.7%
ANDOVER WATER DISTRICT	339	342	(3)	-0.8%
ANSON AND MADISON WATER DISTRICT	4,872	4,863	9	0.2%
ASHLAND WATER & SEWER DISTRICT	681	727	(46)	-6.3%
AUBURN WATER DISTRICT	16,898	18,915	(2,017)	-10.7%
BAILEYVILLE UTILITIES DISTRICT	2,258	2,760	(502)	-18.2%
BANGOR WATER DISTRICT	28,481	30,708	(2,227)	-7.3%
BAR HARBOR WATER DEPARTMENT	9,498	9,702	(204)	-2.1%
BATH WATER DISTRICT	11,161	9,019	2,141	23.7%
BELFAST WATER DISTRICT	6,065	6,317	(252)	-4.0%
BERWICK WATER DEPARTMENT	2,887	2,800	87	3.1%
BETHEL WATER DISTRICT	1,979	2,151	(172)	-8.0%
BINGHAM WATER DISTRICT	1,018	1,091	(72)	-6.6%
BOOTHBAY REGION WATER DISTRICT	13,880	15,889	(2,010)	-12.6%
BOWDOINHAM WATER DISTRICT	880	958	(79)	-8.2%
BRIDGTON WATER DISTRICT	2,597	2,747	(150)	-5.5%
BROWNVILLE WATER DEPARTMENT	998	1,096	(98)	-9.0%
BRUNSWICK & TOPSHAM WATER DISTRICT	20,180	23,746	(3,566)	-15.0%
BUCKFIELD VILLAGE CORPORATION	718	761	(42)	-5.6%
CALAIS (CITY OF) WATER DEPARTMENT	2,731	2,880	(149)	-5.2%
CANTON WATER DISTRICT	508	540	(32)	-5.9%
CARIBOU UTILITIES DISTRICT	4,775	5,136	(361)	-7.0%
CASTINE WATER DEPARTMENT	2,641	2,686	(45)	-1.7%
CITY OF BREWER WATER DEPARTMENT	11,105	11,687	(582)	-5.0%
CITY OF LEWISTON - WATER DIVISION	23,081	24,630	(1,549)	-6.3%
CLINTON WATER DISTRICT	929	973	(44)	-4.5%
CORNISH WATER DISTRICT	801	899	(98)	-10.9%
DANFORTH WATER DISTRICT	384	426	(43)	-10.0%
DEXTER UTILITY DISTRICT	2,846	3,120	(274)	-8.8%
DIXFIELD WATER DEPARTMENT	1,720	1,898	(178)	-9.4%
DOVER AND FOXCROFT WATER DISTRICT	3,105	3,288	(183)	-5.6%
EAGLE LAKE WATER & SEWER DISTRICT	976	1,006	(30)	-3.0%
EAST MILLINOCKET WATER WORKS	1,070	1,340	(270)	-20.1%
ELLSWORTH WATER DEPARTMENT	4,880	5,395	(515)	-9.5%
EUSTIS WATER DEPARTMENT	666	673	(7)	-1.1%
FARMINGTON VILLAGE CORPORATION	4,856	5,379	(523)	-9.7%
FORT FAIRFIELD UTILITIES DISTRICT	1,807	1,734	74	4.2%
FORT KENT WATER & WASTEWATER DEPARTMENT	1,338	1,388	(50)	-3.6%
FRANKLIN WATER DEPARTMENT	444	460	(16)	-3.5%
GARDINER WATER DISTRICT	7,369	8,352	(983)	-11.8%
GRAND ISLE WATER DEPARTMENT	326	282	44	15.4%
GRAY WATER DISTRICT	2,241	2,548	(308)	-12.1%
GREAT SALT BAY SANITARY DISTRICT	3,224	3,363	(138)	-4.1%
GREATER AUGUSTA UTILITY DISTRICT	16,149	16,841	(691)	-4.1%
GUILFORD/SANGERVILLE WATER DISTRICT	1,981	2,075	(94)	-4.5%
HALLOWELL WATER DISTRICT	2,323	2,671	(348)	-13.0%
HAMPDEN WATER DISTRICT	7,252	8,068	(816)	-10.1%
HARRISON WATER DISTRICT	918	969	(51)	-5.3%
HEBRON WATER COMPANY	757	949	(192)	-20.2%
HOULTON WATER COMPANY	4,127	4,357	(230)	-5.3%
HOWLAND WATER DEPARTMENT	958	1,007	(49)	-4.9%
ISLAND FALLS WATER DEPARTMENT	782	821	(39)	-4.7%
JACKMAN UTILITY DISTRICT - WATER DIVISION	908	963	(55)	-5.7%
JAY VILLAGE WATER DISTRICT	2,042	2,206	(164)	-7.5%
KENNEBEC WATER DISTRICT	24,442	26,464	(2,022)	-7.6%
KENNEBUNK/KENNEBUNKPORT/WELLS WATER	33,672	37,979	(4,307)	-11.3%
KINGFIELD WATER DISTRICT	916	958	(42)	-4.4%

	Revised	Current	Difference	% Change
KITTERY WATER DISTRICT	15,612	14,992	620	4.1%
LIMERICK WATER DISTRICT	486	621	(135)	-21.8%
LIMESTONE WATER & SEWER DISTRICT	996	1,056	(61)	-5.7%
LINCOLN WATER DISTRICT	4,025	4,493	(468)	-10.4%
LISBON WATER DEPARTMENT	6,018	6,727	(709)	-10.5%
LIVERMORE FALLS WATER DISTRICT	3,132	3,884	(752)	-19.4%
LONG POND WATER DISTRICT	625	642	(18)	-2.8%
LUBEC WATER DISTRICT	1,274	994	280	28.2%
MADAWASKA WATER DISTRICT	4,155	4,437	(282)	-6.3%
MARS HILL UTILITY DISTRICT	1,775	1,916	(141)	-7.4%
MECHANIC FALLS WATER DEPARTMENT	1,784	1,933	(149)	-7.7%
MEXICO WATER DISTRICT	2,629	2,837	(207)	-7.3%
MILBRIDGE WATER DISTRICT	579	609	(29)	-4.8%
MILO WATER DISTRICT	2,133	2,371	(238)	-10.0%
MONSON UTILITIES DISTRICT	237	248	(12)	-4.7%
MOSCOW WATER DISTRICT	359	384	(25)	-6.5%
MOUNT DESERT WATER DISTRICT	4,657	4,924	(267)	-5.4%
MT. BLUE STANDARD WATER DISTRICT	996	989	8	0.8%
NEW SHARON WATER DISTRICT	281	287	(6)	-2.0%
NEWPORT WATER DISTRICT	3,803	3,967	(164)	-4.1%
NORRIDGEWOCK WATER DISTRICT	1,261	1,348	(87)	-6.5%
NORTH BERWICK WATER DISTRICT	2,205	2,332	(127)	-5.5%
NORTH HAVEN WATER DEPARTMENT	1,173	1,261	(88)	-7.0%
NORTH JAY WATER DISTRICT	837	897	(59)	-6.6%
NORTHPORT VILLAGE CORPORATION (WATER DEPARTMENT)	704	508	196	38.6%
NORWAY WATER DISTRICT	1,978	2,165	(187)	-8.6%
OLD TOWN WATER DISTRICT	7,843	8,970	(1,127)	-12.6%
ORONO-VEAZIE WATER DISTRICT	5,919	6,245	(326)	-5.2%
OXFORD WATER DISTRICT	1,011	1,062	(52)	-4.9%
PARIS UTILITY DISTRICT	2,658	2,896	(238)	-8.2%
PASSAMAQUODDY WATER DISTRICT	3,703	3,822	(119)	-3.1%
PATTEN WATER DEPARTMENT	321	380	(59)	-15.6%
PITTSFIELD WATER DEPARTMENT	1,684	1,592	92	5.8%
PORT CLYDE WATER DISTRICT	486	550	(64)	-11.6%
PORTLAND WATER DISTRICT	108,079	119,146	(11,068)	-9.3%
PRESQUE ISLE UTILITIES DISTRICT	7,058	7,795	(737)	-9.5%
QUANTABACOOK WATER DISTRICT	314	334	(20)	-5.9%
RANGELEY WATER DISTRICT	1,910	2,293	(383)	-16.7%
RICHMOND UTILITIES DISTRICT	1,242	1,308	(66)	-5.1%
RUMFORD WATER DISTRICT	5,597	6,658	(1,061)	-15.9%
SABATTUS SANITARY / WATER DISTRICT	1,231	1,408	(177)	-12.6%
SANFORD WATER DISTRICT	13,139	14,111	(972)	-6.9%
SEARSPORT WATER DISTRICT	4,086	4,280	(194)	-4.5%
SOLOM WATER DISTRICT	325	342	(18)	-5.1%
SOUTH BERWICK WATER DISTRICT	4,168	4,582	(414)	-9.0%
SOUTH FREEPORT WATER DISTRICT	766	957	(191)	-20.0%
SOUTHWEST HARBOR WATER & SEWER DISTRICT	2,951	3,249	(298)	-9.2%
STONINGTON WATER COMPANY	1,129	1,199	(71)	-5.9%
STRONG WATER DISTRICT	416	438	(22)	-5.0%
VAN BUREN WATER DISTRICT	2,394	2,502	(108)	-4.3%
VINALHAVEN WATER DISTRICT	1,252	1,276	(24)	-1.9%
WALDOBORO WATER COMPANY (Town of)	1,019	1,109	(90)	-8.1%
WASHBURN WATER & SEWER DISTRICT	827	899	(72)	-8.0%
WATERBORO WATER DISTRICT	784	824	(40)	-4.8%
WEST PARIS WATER DISTRICT	575	645	(70)	-10.8%
WILTON WATER DEPARTMENT	2,046	2,396	(349)	-14.6%
WINTER HARBOR WATER DISTRICT	819	858	(39)	-4.6%
WINTERPORT WATER DISTRICT	1,217	1,283	(66)	-5.2%
WINTHROP UTILITIES DISTRICT	2,680	2,868	(189)	-6.6%
WISCASSET WATER DISTRICT	3,481	3,707	(226)	-6.1%
YARMOUTH WATER DISTRICT	9,274	10,522	(1,248)	-11.9%
YORK WATER DISTRICT	18,276	20,553	(2,277)	-11.1%
Total COU Water	593,181	643,350	(50,169)	-7.8%

Attachment 2

Communications Utility Assessment Overview

	Revised	Current	Difference	% Change
AT AND T CORP	\$ 4,140	\$ 3,461	\$ 679	19.6%
ATLANTIC BROADBAND ENTERPRISE, LLC	\$ 413	\$ 749	\$ (336)	-44.9%
BCN TELECOM, INC. F/K/A NUI TELECOM, INC	\$ 2,697	\$ 3,013	\$ (316)	-10.5%
BEE LINE INC D/B/A BEE LINE CABLE	\$ 1,670	\$ 1,971	\$ (301)	-15.3%
BIDDEFORD INTERNET CORP. D/B/A GWI	\$ 14,202	\$ 15,309	\$ (1,107)	-7.2%
BROADVIEW NETWORKS, INC.	\$ 848	\$ 1,040	\$ (192)	-18.5%
BULLSEYE TELECOM, INC	\$ 1,134	\$ 1,440	\$ (306)	-21.3%
CENTURYLINK COMMUNICATIONS, LLC F/K/A EMBARQ	\$ 1,225	\$ 1,415	\$ (190)	-13.4%
COBBOSSECONTEE TELEPHONE COMPANY (TDS)	\$ 319	\$ 339	\$ (20)	-5.9%
CHARTER COMMUNICATIONS F/K/A TIME WARNER CABLE dba SPECTRUM	\$ 133,957	\$ 132,204	\$ 1,753	1.3%
COMCAST PHONE OF MAINE	\$ 21,109	\$ 26,315	\$ (5,206)	-19.8%
CONSOLIDATED COMMUNICATIONS OF MAINE F/K/A CHINA, COMMUNITY, SIDNEY, STANDISH, NORTHLAND AND MAINE	\$ 22,525	\$ 24,616	\$ (2,091)	-8.5%
CRC COMMUNICATIONS	\$ 11,534	\$ 13,093	\$ (1,559)	-11.9%
DSI-ITI, INC	\$ 774	\$ 925	\$ (151)	-16.3%
EARTHLINK BUSINESS II F/K/A CHOICE ONE COMMUNICATIONS	\$ 2,613	\$ 2,277	\$ 336	14.8%
EARTHLINK BUSINESS IV F/K/A CONVERSENT COMM D/B/A ONE COMMUNICATIONS IV	\$ 684	\$ 826	\$ (142)	-17.2%
EARTHLINK BUSINESS V F/K/A ONE COMMUNICATIONS CORP F/K/A CTC COMM CORP.	\$ 4,253	\$ 3,130	\$ 1,123	35.9%
ENHANCED COMMUNICATION OF NORTHERN NEW ENGLAND, INC. d/b/a FAIRPOINT LONG DISTANCE d/b/a CONSOLIDATED COMMUNICATIONS/NNE	\$ 49,305	\$ 64,998	\$ (15,693)	-24.1%
FIRSTLIGHT FIBER F/K/A TVC ALBANY INC	\$ 66,831	\$ 35,600	\$ 31,231	87.7%
FUSION CLOUD SERVICES LLC F/K/A BIRCH COMMUNICATIONS, LLC	\$ 862	\$ 1,376	\$ (514)	-37.4%
GLOBAL CROSSING TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.	\$ 397	\$ 629	\$ (232)	-36.9%
GRANITE TELECOMMUNICATIONS, LLC	\$ 5,708	\$ 5,961	\$ (253)	-4.2%
HAMPDEN TELEPHONE COMPANY (TDS)	\$ 1,992	\$ 2,315	\$ (323)	-14.0%
HARTLAND & ST. ALBANS TELEPHONE COMPANY (TDS)	\$ 2,385	\$ 2,776	\$ (391)	-14.1%
ISLAND TELEPHONE CO. (TDS)	\$ 657	\$ 788	\$ (131)	-16.6%
LEGACY LONG DISTANCE INTERNATIONAL	\$ 2,495	\$ 2,900	\$ (405)	-14.0%
LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS D/B/A LEVEL 3 FINANC, INC.	\$ 1,442	\$ 2,737	\$ (1,295)	-47.3%
LINCOLNVILLE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.	\$ 4,592	\$ 5,757	\$ (1,165)	-20.2%
LINCOLNVILLE NETWORKS	\$ 2,007	\$ 339	\$ 1,668	492.0%
MCI COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, LLC	\$ 6,469	\$ 11,491	\$ (5,022)	-43.7%
MCIMETRO ACCESS TR A SER D/B/A VERIZON ACCESS	\$ 1,582	\$ 2,882	\$ (1,300)	-45.1%
METROPOLITAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS OF MAINE, INC.	\$ 1,341	\$ 1,421	\$ (80)	-5.6%
MID MAINE TEL PLUS	\$ 14,174	\$ 15,607	\$ (1,433)	-9.2%
MID MAINE TELECOM, LLC	\$ 1,839	\$ 2,516	\$ (677)	-26.9%
NEW HORIZONS COMMUNICATIONS CORP	\$ 924	\$ 1,036	\$ (112)	-10.8%
NORTHERN NEW ENGLAND COMPANY, LLC. D/B/A CONSOLIDATED COMMUNICATIONS-NNE	\$ 218,477	\$ 214,364	\$ 4,113	1.9%
OTELCO TELECOMMUNICATIONS, LLC	\$ 2,058	\$ 2,267	\$ (209)	-9.2%
OXFORD TELEPHONE COMPANY, D/B/A FIRSTLIGHT	\$ 1,938	\$ 2,120	\$ (182)	-8.6%
OXFORD WEST TELEPHONE COMPANY, D/B/A FIRSTLIGHT	\$ 2,459	\$ 2,681	\$ (222)	-8.3%
PAETEC COMMUNICATIONS, LLC.	\$ 4,953	\$ 4,747	\$ 206	4.3%
PINE TREE TELEPHONE, LLC	\$ 1,581	\$ 1,902	\$ (321)	-16.9%
PIONEER WIRELESS, INC, D/B/A PIONEER BROADBAND	\$ 1,072	\$ 1,308	\$ (236)	-18.0%
SACO RIVER TELEPHONE, LLC	\$ 2,019	\$ 2,561	\$ (542)	-21.2%
SECURUS TECH, LLC F/K/A EVERCOM SYSTEMS, INC.	\$ 4,256	\$ 4,952	\$ (696)	-14.1%
SOMERSET TELEPHONE COMPANY (TDS)	\$ 9,045	\$ 11,135	\$ (2,090)	-18.8%
TDS LONG DISTANCE CORPORATION	\$ 3,656	\$ 4,148	\$ (492)	-11.9%
TELRITE CORPORATION	\$ 379	\$ 262	\$ 117	44.7%
TIDEWATER TELECOM, INC.	\$ 8,902	\$ 1,628	\$ 7,274	446.8%
UNICAP, INC D/B/A UNITEL LONG DISTANCE	\$ 812	\$ 947	\$ (135)	-14.3%
UNION RIVER TELEPHONE COMPANY	\$ 1,218	\$ 1,416	\$ (198)	-14.0%
UNITEL, INC.	\$ 3,006	\$ 3,500	\$ (494)	-14.1%
WARREN TELEPHONE COMPANY (TDS)	\$ 832	\$ 927	\$ (95)	-10.2%
WEST PENOBSCOT TELEPHONE COMPANY (TDS)	\$ 1,899	\$ 2,268	\$ (369)	-16.3%
XO COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, INC.	\$ 1,251	\$ 2,527	\$ (1,276)	-50.5%
Total Communications	\$ 658,912	\$ 658,912	\$ -	