

R-113954

8/19/97

MS Jan

RESPONSE OF ENRON POWER MARKETING, INC. TO THE INTERROGATORIES OF PENNSYLVANIA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY, INTERROGATORY NO. 49, DATED JULY 21, 1997 SUBMITTED IN DOCKET NO. R-00973954.

Request:

- 49. Provide any basis in law or contract for the statement that "PP&L's management has a fiduciary responsibility to attempt to set up the future market in a way that advantages PP&L and its investors even if such activities are inconsistent with the development of competitive markets."

Response:

The question appears to ask for a legal conclusion. Since Mr. Dirmeier is not an attorney, he does not offer a legal conclusion. Mr. Dirmeier's position is based on the recognition that the obligation of management is to maximize shareholder return. This does not require either a legal or contractual interpretation.

Answer Prepared by: Michael D. Dirmeier

U (G)

AUG 20 1997

DOCUMENT
FOLDER

RECEIVED
97 AUG 20 PM 1:39
PA.P.U.C.
PROTHONOTARY'S OFFICE

R-973954

8/19/97
1/165

Jan

RESPONSE OF ENRON POWER MARKETING, INC. TO THE INTERROGATORIES OF PENNSYLVANIA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY, INTERROGATORY NO. 39, DATED JULY 21, 1997 SUBMITTED IN DOCKET NO. R-00973954.

Request:

- 39. Is it the view of Mr. Reising or any other witness for Enron that ultimate suppliers are permitted to rebundle distribution? If so, please provide the basis for that view including an explanation of how that view is consistent with section 2804(3) of the Electricity Generation Customer Choice and Competition Act.

Response:

Yes. Suppliers should be able to bill its customer however it chooses, as long as PP&L is properly paid for wires and any other services provided. Section 2804(3) does not apply to suppliers.

Response prepared by Paul D. Reising

DSH:9357.1

U
AUG 20 1997

RECEIVED
97 AUG 20 PM 1:39
PA, P.U.C.
PROTHONOTARY'S OFFICE

DOCUMENT
FOLDER

R-973954

8/19/97
1105
jar

RESPONSE OF ENRON POWER MARKETING, INC. TO THE INTERROGATORIES OF PENNSYLVANIA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY, INTERROGATORY NO.42, DATED JULY 21, 1997 SUBMITTED IN DOCKET NO. R-00973954.

Request:

- 42. Please refer to page 35, line 6. If in fact these customers are not connected to any PP&L distribution facilities, will the Pennsylvania PUC have jurisdiction to impose universal service and competitive transmission charges? If so, please the basis for your answer.

Response:

By my testimony at page 35, beginning at line 6, I was not suggesting that retail customers connected at transmission voltage (as defined by the applicable open access transmission tariff) would escape Pa. PUC approved CTC charges.

Response prepared by Paul D. Reising

DSH:9357.1

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
AUG 20 1997

DOCUMENT
FOLDER

RECEIVED
97 AUG 20 PM 1:39
PA. P.U.C.
PROTHONOTARY'S OFFICE