

Mr. George A. Carter, Director of Public Works (continued)

of reconstruction, relocation, or other necessary changes, even though this will probably result in a request for higher rates by the Company.

The Gas Company rejected the position taken by the City and although the Company continued to make street light relocations requested of it, the Company would advise the City in each case that the work was done without prejudice of the Company's claim that the City was obligated to pay for it.

The Company based its position that the City was responsible for the payment of the costs on the street lighting tariffs (paragraph 9 of Rider 18) submitted to and approved by the Public Service Commission of Maryland, which paragraph reads as follows:

"The Customer shall pay the Company the cost of relocating lamps or other street lighting equipment at the Customer's request, except in connection with a change of service from overhead to underground."

In a rate case before the Public Service Commission in 1944-45, an entirely separate branch of the case was devoted to the charges for street lighting. The net result was a reduction in the street lighting charges and the acceptance by the Commission of the Company's street lighting tariffs under which such service has since been supplied.

In the latter part of July of this year, a meeting was arranged in your office at the request of Mr. Ramsey for the purpose of attempting to arrive at a final solution and determination of the question of costs. At this meeting, the whole matter of the costs and expenses was again gone into very thoroughly. A question was raised by the City as to whether the City was being charged for any of the costs of removing Company-owned equipment for the supplying of service to others. Mr. Ramsey felt that the City was not, but he agreed to make a thorough check to verify that this was correct. It was agreed that final determination of the