

IN THE MATTER OF the *Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998*, S.O. 1998, c.15, (Schedule B) to the *Energy Competition Act, 1998*, S.O. 1998, c.15;

AND IN THE MATTER OF an Application by Toronto Hydro-Electric System Limited for an Order or Orders approving or fixing just and reasonable distribution rates and other charges, effective May 1, 2010.

**ARGUMENT-IN-CHIEF
OF TORONTO HYDRO-ELECTRIC SYSTEM LIMITED**

February 12, 2010

BORDEN LADNER GERVAIS LLP

Barristers and Solicitors
Scotia Plaza, 40 King Street West
Toronto, Ontario M5H 3Y4

J. Mark Rodger

Tel: (416) 367-6190
Fax: (416) 361-7088
mrodger@blgcanada.com

John A.D. Vellone

Tel: (416) 367-6730
Fax: (416) 361-2758
jvellone@blgcanada.com

Counsel to the Applicant
Toronto Hydro-Electric System Limited

EB-2009-0139

IN THE MATTER OF the *Ontario Energy Board Act*, 1998, S.O. 1998, c.15, (Schedule B) to the *Energy Competition Act*, 1998, S.O. 1998, c.15;

AND IN THE MATTER OF an Application by Toronto Hydro-Electric System Limited for an Order or Orders approving or fixing just and reasonable distribution rates and other charges, effective May 1, 2010.

**ARGUMENT-IN-CHIEF
OF TORONTO HYDRO-ELECTRIC SYSTEM LIMITED**

DELIVERED FEBRUARY 12, 2010

A. INTRODUCTION

1. On August 28, 2009 Toronto Hydro-Electric System Limited (“THESL”) submitted an application to the Ontario Energy Board (the “Board”) pursuant to Section 78 of the *Ontario Energy Board Act*, 1998, as amended, (the “Act”) for approval of its proposed electricity distribution rates and other charges for the rate year commencing May 1, 2010 (the “Application”).
2. On October 19, 2009 the Board issued Procedural Order No. 1. This procedural order allowed for submissions on the draft issues list, which list was finalized and approved by the Board in its November 10, 2009 Procedural Order No. 2 (the “Issues List”). The procedural order also provided for the delivery of and responses to written interrogatories from Board staff and intervenors. Through this process THESL received over 400 interrogatories and responded with more than 2,100 pages of additional evidence in support of the Application. Finally, the procedural order provided for a settlement conference commencing December 8, 2009.

3. THESL and eight intervenors participated in the settlement conference which concluded with the filing of a settlement proposal with the Board on January 22, 2010 (updated on January 25, 2010 to include the relevant rate impact tables) (the “Settlement Agreement”). A copy of the Settlement Agreement has been attached hereto as Schedule “A”. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement the parties reached complete settlement of 20 issues from the Issues List and partial settlement of another 7 issues from the Issues List – significantly reducing the scope of issues that the Board would have to address in the oral hearing. During the first day of the oral hearing in this proceeding, on February 4, 2010, the Board accepted the Settlement Agreement noting:

“Now, just getting on for a moment, if I may, with the settlement proposal, the Panel appreciates the consensus that was achieved by the parties on so many issues in this matter, and the Panel has had an opportunity to review and consider the settlement proposal and the Board accepts that proposal.”

EB-2009-0139 Transcript Volume 1 dated February 4, 2010 at Page 5, Lines 8-13.

4. THESL submits that the Board should adopt the Settlement Agreement as its findings on the settled and partially settled issues contained therein.
5. The parties to the Settlement Agreement were able to settle the vast majority of issues however a few issues remained contested for the oral phase of the hearing. In general, the unsettled issues related to the following three topics (including a reference to the relevant issues from the Issues List):
 - (a) Cost of Capital (relating to issues 3.7, 5.1 and 5.2);
 - (b) Distributed Generation (relating to issues 1.1, 4.1, 4.2 and 4.4); and
 - (c) Individual Suite Metering (relating to issues 7.1 and 7.2).

6. Finally, on January 22, 2010 the Board issued its Decision on a motion brought by THESL on November 27, 2009 to review and vary its gain on sale order in EB-2007-0680. While the Board did not grant the relief requested in the motion, it did recognize that the implementation of the “gain on sale” order requires further direction and the Board subsequently indicated during the oral hearing that this issue should be addressed by the parties as part of their written submissions in this proceeding.
7. THESL files these submissions as its argument-in-chief in this matter.

B. COST OF CAPITAL

8. In Exhibit E1 of its Application, THESL proposed a return on rate base of 6.39%, which was prepared using a deemed capital structure of 56% long term debt, 4% short term debt, and 40% equity in compliance with the Report of the Board on Cost of Capital and 2nd Generation Incentive Regulation for Ontario Electricity Distributors dated December 20, 2006 (the “December 2006 Report”). On November 30, 2009, THESL updated its evidence in respect of cost of capital, reducing its proposed return on rate base to 6.26% as a result of updates to its long-term debt cost estimates reflecting debt issued in November 2009 and updated forecasts for its planned debt issue in 2010.
9. During the oral phase of this proceeding, THESL further updated its evidence noting that based on the reduced level of capital spending that was agreed to with the intervenors as part of the Settlement Agreement, THESL has reduced its forecasted unissued long-term debt to \$200 million. In addition, THESL updated the forecast rate for the debt issue to 5.79% based on the most recently available Conference Board of Canada’s December 2009 Report forecasting Government bond yields, and its forecast for corporate spread over the government bond yields.

Exhibit K2 and EB-2009-0139 Transcript Volume 1 dated February 4, 2010 at Page 10, Lines 9-24.

10. For the purposes of the pre-filed evidence, THESL used a forecast Return on Equity (“ROE”) of 8.01% and a forecast short-term debt rate of 1.33%, both based on 2009 approved Cost of Capital parameters. However, THESL’s evidence clearly indicates that, in respect of ROE, “should the OEB’s determination of ROE change pursuant to the Board’s consultation process (“EB-2009-0084”), then THESL will set its ROE and final revenue requirement for 2010 rates based on the ROE per that process.” In addition, for the short-term debt component, THESL indicated that “this will be updated to the Cost of Capital guidelines prior to May 1, 2010 rate implementation date.”

Exhibit E1, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Page 2 of 4, Lines 6-9 and Page 4 of 4 Lines 10-11.

11. On December 11, 2009, during the course of this proceeding, the Board issued its revised guideline Cost of Capital methodology in the Report of the Board on the Cost of Capital for Ontario’s Regulated Utilities under EB-2009-0084 (the “December 2009 Report”). While the December 2009 Report was issued subsequent to this Application, the report states that the revised guidelines apply to applications for rates effective in 2010 or later and determined by way of cost of service application. Thus, the December 2009 Report supplements the guidelines documented in the December 2006 Report and both reports apply to this Application.

December 2009 Report, Section 5.1, Page 61.

12. Pursuant to the December 2009 Report, the Board confirmed that it will continue to use a formula-based equity risk premium (“ERP”) approach but that its current formula-based ROE approach needed to be reset and refined. The Board set its refined ROE formula in Appendix B of the December 2009 Report, which based on September 2009 data sets a base ROE of 9.75% and which will be updated

based on data for the month that is three months prior to the effective date for the new rates (i.e. for rates effective May 1, 2010 January data will be used to calculate the updated ROE). The Board also set out its refined short-term debt calculations in Appendix D of the December 2009 Report.

The Board's December 2009 Report, Appendix B, Pages V-VII and Appendix D.

13. The amount and appropriateness of the cost of capital adjustments arising from the Board's December 2009 Report were not agreed to by the parties to the Settlement Agreement. THESL submits that the application of the December 2009 Report for determining THESL's cost of capital for 2010 should be approved by the Board. THESL notes that no other party to this proceeding has produced any evidence that suggests that the Board should deviate from its policy in respect of cost of capital. THESL further notes that its own evidence in this proceeding entirely supports its requested relief. Appendix B to the Settlement Agreement includes the revenue requirement impacts resulting from an estimate of the December 2009 Report adjustments to the cost of capital parameters. THESL submits that it is both just and reasonable for the Board to allow for a fair return to the shareholder in a manner that is consistent with the Board's policy as articulated in its December 2009 Report.

C. DISTRIBUTED GENERATION

14. Issues relating to distributed generation, and particularly relating to natural gas fired combined heat and power distributed generation, were not settled as part of the Settlement Agreement. Instead, pursuant to the Settlement Agreement the parties agreed that that the scope of the unsettled component of this issue can be narrowed to: *"Has Toronto Hydro responded appropriately to all of the Board's relevant directions with respect to distributed generation from previous proceedings?"* The parties to the Settlement Agreement noted

that the resolution of the DG issue may impact rate base, revenue requirement and other monetary issues.

15. The relevant Board direction related to distributed generation can be found in Section 5.3 of the Board's May 15, 2008 Decision in EB-2007-0680 (the "Decision"), which is excerpted below in its entirety (emphasis added):

"Leaving aside the question of the need for the third transmission line, which the Board acknowledges is best addressed through other proceedings, including the IPSP application currently before the Board, the Board considers that the Applicant should facilitate connections for DG and self-generation, where they can be implemented practically and economically, both from the perspective of the generator and of the Applicant and its load customers.

With regard to conservation and demand management, it would be premature for the Board to comment on the specific suggestions made by Pollution Probe, as the IPSP proceeding has not yet been completed.

The Board observes that the Applicant's study of distributed generation has not been rigorous. **Therefore, the Board directs the Applicant to conduct a study into the capability, costs and benefits of incorporating into the Applicant system, a significant (up to 300MW) component of bi-directional distributed generation in Toronto.** In this study, the Applicant should also incorporate the outcomes, as they pertain to distributed generation, of two items which are currently being considered by the Board: 1) enabler lines and their connection costs; and 2) the IPSP. The study should also be responsive to any new policy or regulatory developments in these areas. This study shall be filed as part of the Company's next application dealing with rates beyond the test period dealt with in this proceeding."

Board Decision in EB-2007-0680 dated May 15, 2008 at page 62.

16. In response to this direction, Toronto Hydro, together with the Ontario Power Authority ("OPA"), retained Navigant Consulting, Inc. ("Navigant") to evaluate the potential for distributed generation to address the need for additional area supply capacity, infrastructure renewal, and supply diversity to

mitigate against low probability but high impact events in Central and Downtown Toronto (the “Study”). The Study was commissioned to respond directly to the Board’s direction in the Decision. Toronto Hydro filed the Navigant Study at Exhibit Q1, Tab 4 of its Application.

17. Throughout this proceeding, THESL has responded to numerous interrogatories in respect of the Study and during the oral proceeding a THESL panel of witnesses answered numerous additional questions in relation to the Study.
18. THESL submits that it procured the services of Navigant, a reputable and professional independent consultant, to complete the Study in accordance with the Board’s directive, that the Study was diligently completed and filed as part of the Application, and that the Study satisfies the requirements of the Board’s directive.
19. THESL notes that it does not “propose” any part of the Study as part of its distribution system. There are no revenue requirement or rate impacts that flow directly from the Study. Put more directly, the Study is not being used as evidence to support any increase in Toronto Hydro’s revenue requirement or rates as part of this cost of service rate hearing. THESL’s evidence is that it is entirely agnostic regarding the ultimate solution to the serious supply mix problem facing the City of Toronto, and it will continue to act in accordance with the Board’s policies in respect of the costs associated with new connections, expansions, and upgrades.
20. Finally, THESL notes that the Board confirmed in Procedural Order No. 2 (at pages 3-4) that generic policy issues raised by Pollution Probe related to (i) the appropriate supply mix and the possible need for a third transmission line (i.e. reducing distribution system constraints to facilitate the installation of distributed generation) and (ii) the recovery of the costs of adding CHP generation to a distribution grid, were both outside of the scope of this

proceeding except to the extent that they were subsumed within issue 1.1. THESL submits that this is the correct approach as these broader questions of policy are best addressed in alternative proceedings, such as the OPA's IPSP proceeding, which includes representation from all of the relevant stakeholders and not just a single special interest group.

D. SUITE METERING

21. Pursuant to Ontario Regulation 442/07, THESL as a licensed distributor is legally permitted to install smart meters in new condominium developments and existing condominiums when the board of directors of the condominium corporation approves the installation of smart meters.
22. In addition, Section 5.1.9 of the Board's Distribution System Code, which THESL must comply with as a condition of its distribution license, provides that (emphasis added):

When requested by either:

- (a) the board of directors of a condominium corporation; or
- (b) the developer of a building, in any stage of construction, on land for which a declaration and description is proposed or intended to be registered pursuant to section 2 of the *Condominium Act, 1998*,

a distributor shall install smart metering that meets the functional specification of Ontario Regulation 425/06—Criteria and Requirements for Meters and Metering Equipment, Systems and Technology (made under the Electricity Act).

Distribution System Code, Section 5.1.9.

23. In accordance with the terms of its license and pursuant to the express authority to conduct this activity within a licensed distribution utility, THESL applied in its Application to recover its prudently incurred individual smart suite metering costs in rates. Numerous interrogatories were received on this issue, principally from

the Smart Sub-Metering Working Group (SSMWG), and THESL provided a complete written response to the each of these interrogatories.

24. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, THESL and SSMWG agreed that that the scope of the relevant issues related to suite metering could be narrowed to: "Is Toronto Hydro's cost allocation in respect of residential customers residing in individually metered multiple unit residential units ("suite metered customers") appropriate?" The parties also agreed that the answer to this question has implications in respect of THESL's proposed revenue to cost ratios as well.
25. After failing to reach settlement on this issue, SSMWG filed its own evidence on December 15, 2009 which evidence was further updated in advance of the oral hearing on this matter on February 6, 2010. The SSMWG evidence consists of an analysis of THESL's evidence in this proceeding by Philip Hanser.
26. During cross-examination on the SSMWG evidence, Mr. Hanser admits that he did not conduct a fully allocated cost of service study and that such a study would be necessary to demonstrate whether or not a subsidy actually exists. This is illustrated in the following exchange between Mr. Buonaguro and Mr. Hanser:

MR. BUONAGURO: And I notice -- this is your conclusion, which is -- I guess I will read it for the record:

"Whether viewed from an incremental standpoint for 2010 or viewed cumulatively, it appears THESL is not recovering sufficient revenues from its suite meters to offset the increased capital and OM&A expenditures associated with the installation and operation of the suite meters. Thus it appears that THESL is cross-subsidizing its suite meter program from revenues from other customers."

I notice in both assertions that you are making in this paragraph you use the word "appears", which suggests to me that what you are saying is that there may be a cross-subsidization as opposed to definitively giving an opinion that there is a cross-subsidization. Am I correct?

MR. HANSER: Well, what I am trying to say is that relatively the limitations of the information I have been provided by Toronto Hydro, that's the way it appears.

I haven't done a fully allocated cost-of-service study to determine, and neither has Toronto Hydro, but given the data that I have been presented in response to looking at their rate filing and relative to the interrogatories, I have no reason to believe there isn't cross-subsidization.

But the definitive opinion would require, I think, a fully allocated cost-of-service study.

[...]

EB-2009-0139 Transcript Volume 3 (February 6, 2010), Pages 112-113.

27. THESL agrees that to demonstrate whether any purported cross-subsidization exists a fully allocated cost-of-service study would be required. THESL submits that the SSMWG has failed to produce any meaningful evidence to support its proposition that THESL is cross-subsidizing its suite metered customers. The evidence is not meaningful because it is not comprehensive and balanced and does not present a complete picture of the costs of serving the named sub-group of customers: instead it looks at a narrow cross-section of selected costs. The SSMWG evidence is premised on assumptions that THESL asserts are incorrect and THESL submits that its cost structure is not within the expertise of SSMWG's independent consultant to opine upon.
28. THESL notes that in general the Board is of the opinion that the proper treatment of cost allocation for smart sub-metering is a generic issue that requires consideration of a more generic proceeding. Notably, the Board commented on this issue in its May 15, 2009 Decision in respect of THESL's last cost-of-service rate application (at page 20):

At this time, for the purposes of this Decision, the Board will not consider differentiation in metering costs to be a pivotal consideration in

entertaining the separation of the existing residential class or to direct the institution of contributions, capital or otherwise

This is an issue that requires consideration in a more generic proceeding with appropriate notice to effected parties, directed towards rate design and cost allocation.

29. This approach was affirmed by the Majority Panel of the Board in its July 27, 2009 Decision in respect of Powerstream's 2009 cost-of-service rates (at page 7) (emphasis added):

"The SSMWG intends to raise its issue in other rates proceedings. The Board's view is that consideration of the issue on a utility-specific basis going forward is not the best approach for two reasons. First, there are substantial differences in the rates and operating costs from one utility to the next. The conclusions drawn in one case will be of little if any value in the resolution of this matter. Second, this is clearly a matter of Board policy. The shaping of Board policy will of course need to consider this issue in the context of a number of other policy issues before the Board. In that regard, the Board will now have two decisions from rate proceedings as it considers this matter. In the Majority Panel's view, it would be advisable for the Board to take a generic approach in addressing this matter."

30. THESL notes that the SSMWG's actions in this proceeding appear to evidence an apparent disregard for the Majority Panel's decision in the Powerstream decision. THESL entirely agrees with the Board that the issues raised by the SSMWG are properly considered a generic policy issue which should be addressed by the Board in a generic proceeding with appropriate notice to affected parties.
31. Indeed, the issue posed by the SSMWG is such an important public policy issue that the Ontario legislature is currently debating Bill 235, its proposed *Energy Consumer Protection Act, 2009*, to directly address specific concerns related to the regulation of suite metering activities. The Ministry of Energy and Infrastructure framed the problems and the proposed solution in respect of suite metering as follows in its December 8, 2009 release:

Suite Metering		
Problem		Proposed Solution
No framework to install suite metering in rental apartment buildings	→	Enable mandatory installation in new residential buildings Voluntary installation in existing buildings
No rules for individual billing in rental apartment buildings	→	Consent required from sitting tenants Establish a framework for rent reduction if a tenant agrees to suite metering Prospective new tenants given prescribed information on suite energy use
Suite-metering companies not subject to the same rules as local distribution companies (LDCs)	→	Suite-metering providers subject to rules paralleling LDCs concerning fee regulation, licensing, security deposits and disconnections
Tenants can't control major energy efficiency factors in their suites, things like windows or appliances	→	Landlords required to meet certain energy efficiency standards for appliances and suites

Exhibit K7 and EB-2009-0139 Transcript Volume 3 (February 6, 2010), Pages 108-112.

32. THESL submits that particularly in the context of the policy uncertainty created by Bill 235, the Board should maintain its existing position that the issues raised by SSMWG are best addressed in a generic proceeding involving the appropriate stakeholders once the relevant framework is established by the Ministry.

E. GAIN ON SALES

33. On May 15, 2008, the Board issued its Decision with Reasons in respect of THESL's application for just and reasonable rates to be effective May 1, 2008 and 2009 in proceeding number EB-2007-0680 (the "Decision"). In the Decision, the Board made the following finding and order regarding certain properties owned by Toronto Hydro (the "gain on sales order"):

"[...] the Board finds that 100% of the net after-tax gains from the sale of 228 Wilson Avenue, 175 Goddard Street, and 28 Underwriters Road, the properties that are planned to be sold in 2008, should go to the ratepayer. The Company's revenue requirement for the 2008 test year shall be adjusted downward by \$10.3 Million to reflect this finding.

[...]

The Board further directs the Company to employ a variance account to record any differences in the gains reflected in rates and the actual gains achieved from the sale of these properties either in 2008 or beyond.

[...]

The Board directs the Company to also record in the above variance account 100% of the net capital gains associated with the sale of these four pieces of land [Bathurst, Birmingham, Sterling, and Rustic]; at the next rate hearing the Company will have an opportunity to make submissions regarding the appropriate allocation of these gains between the shareholder and ratepayers.”

EB-2007-0680 Decision, Section 3.4, Pages 26-28.

34. Starting on June 4, 2008 and continuing until the Board’s recent January 22, 2010 Decision on Motion, THESL has exercised its statutory and procedural rights under the Act to appeal and review the sale proceeds order in a reasonable, professional and practical manner. While the ultimate appeal was unsuccessful, THESL submits that it would be inappropriate for the Board to penalize THESL for pursuing its statutory and procedural rights under the Act.
35. On June 27, 2008, during this appeals process, the Board ordered Toronto Hydro to record the forecasted sale proceeds of \$10.3 million in Deferral Account 1508, Other Regulatory Assets, to ensure that it could be credited to ratepayers in the event that Toronto Hydro was unsuccessful with its appeal.
36. In view of the delay caused by the appeals process, and in light of the Board’s intention in the gain on sales order to true-up any amounts to reflect the actual net after-tax gain on sales for the named properties through the use of a variance account, THESL submits that the Board should, given the new evidence before it in this proceeding, put aside the old and outdated forecast of a \$10.3 million revenue offset and instead use the updated evidence presented to the Board in this proceeding for the purposes of calculating and disposing of the appropriate gain on sales.

37. During the oral phase of this proceeding, THESL filed an update to its evidence in respect of the net after-tax gain on sale amounts related to the properties named in the gain on sales order. THESL's evidence in this regard is summarized in the table below.

PROPERTY	STATUS	Net After-Tax Gain on Sale Amount \$000s
3706 Bathurst Street	Sold	\$354.1
124 Birmingham Avenue	Sold	\$323.6
522 Rustic Road	Sold	\$185.8
228 Wilson Avenue	Sold	\$786.3
Sub Total - Actual		\$1,649.8
175 Goddard Street	Forecast to be sold in 2010	\$2,400.0
Total Actual + Forecast		\$4,049.8
211 Sterling Road	Not forecast to be sold in 2010	-
28 Underwriters Road	Not for sale	-

Exhibit I1, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Page 6 (February 4 2010). Filed as part of Exhibit K2.

38. In light of this updated evidence, THESL has four submissions in respect of the proper treatment of the after-tax gain on sale of the above named properties.
39. First, THESL notes that through the evolution of its facilities strategy and plans it no longer intends to sell its 28 Underwriters Road facility. The evidence before the Board is that the facility is now being used as a staging area for THESL's emergency response teams, and that it is THESL's expectation that it will continue to utilize this space in the foreseeable future. Therefore the evidence before the Board is that there is no after-tax gain on sale associated with this property and therefore THESL submits that no amount should be paid ratepayers in respect of this property.

40. Second, THESL notes that it has sold its 228 Wilson Avenue and that it intends to sell its 175 Goddard Street facilities reflecting a total after-tax gain on sale of \$3,186,300. THESL submits that, in a manner consistent with the gain on sales order, this amount should be disposed of in favour of THESL's ratepayers. THESL further submits that it will employ a variance account to record any differences in the gains reflected in rates and the actual gains achieved from the sale of 175 Goddard Street.
41. Third, THESL notes that it has not sold its 211 Sterling Road facility and THESL does not expect to sell this property in its 2010 test year, primarily because of the presence of extensive environmental damage caused by a neighbouring facility. As a result, THESL submits that, in accordance with the gain on sales order, it will record in its variance account 100% of the net capital gains associated with any future sale of this piece of land. THESL understands that at the next applicable rate hearing THESL will be given a further opportunity to make submissions regarding the appropriate allocation of these gains between the shareholder and ratepayers.
42. Fourth, THESL notes that it has sold three remaining properties (3706 Bathurst Street, 124 Birmingham Avenue, 522 Rustic Road) since the original gain on sales order. THESL's evidence in the EB-2007-0680 proceeding was that these properties were surplus. THESL will allocate the net after-tax gain on sales amount associated with these three properties to ratepayers should the Board find it is in the public interest to direct THESL to do so.
43. In the result, THESL requests approval to credit ratepayers in 2010 rates with all of the net after tax gains on sale amounts related to named properties that either have been sold or, in the case of Goddard Street, are forecast to be sold, within the test period. This amounts to a \$4.05 million reduction in revenue requirement and rates from what they otherwise would have been.

44. Furthermore, in accordance with the concept of the EB-2007-0680 Decision, THESL would record any difference between the forecast and actual net after tax gain on sale amounts for Goddard Street in a variance account for future disposition, and would apply the same treatment to Sterling Road at the time of its sale and to Underwriters Road in the event that plans for it change and it is sold at some future date.

45. THESL submits that the proposal outlined above is consistent with the concept of the EB-2007-0680 Decision and fairly disposes of the amounts involved in a timely and orderly manner, based on the best currently available information. As such the Board should approve the THESL proposal.

F. CONCLUSIONS

46. For all of the foregoing reasons, THESL requests that the OEB approve its proposed 2010 Electricity Distribution Rates and other charges.

All of which is respectfully submitted this 12th day of February, 2010.

Original Signed by J. Mark Rodger

J. Mark Rodger

Original Signed by John A.D. Vellone

John A.D. Vellone

Counsel to Toronto Hydro-Electric System Limited

SCHEDULE "A"

THESL'S 2010 EDR SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

See attached.

EB-2009-0139

TORONTO HYDRO-ELECTRIC SYSTEM LIMITED

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

January 22, 2010

Toronto Hydro-Electric System Limited

EB-2009-0139

Settlement Agreement

Filed with OEB: January 22, 2009

This settlement proposal is filed with the Ontario Energy Board (“the Board”) in connection with an application by Toronto Hydro-Electric System Limited (“THESL”) for an Order or Orders fixing just and reasonable distribution rates and other charges, effective May 1, 2010 (Board Docket Number EB-2009-0139) (the “Application”).

Further to the Board’s Procedural Order No. 1 dated October 19, 2009, a settlement conference was held commencing on December 8, 2009 in accordance with the Board’s *Rules of Practice and Procedure* (the “Rules”) and the Board’s *Settlement Conference Guidelines* (the “Guidelines”). Mr. Ken Rosenberg acted as facilitator for the settlement conference, which continued until December 18, 2009.

THESL and the following intervenors (the “intervenors”, and collectively including THESL, the “parties”) participated in the settlement conference:

- Association of Major Power Consumers in Ontario (“AMPCO”)
- Building Owners and Managers Association of the Greater Toronto Area (“BOMA”)
- Consumers Council of Canada (“CCC”)
- Energy Probe Research Foundation (“EP”)
- Pollution Probe Foundation (“PP”)
- School Energy Coalition (“SEC”)
- Smart Sub-metering Working Group (“SSMWG”)
- Vulnerable Energy Consumers Coalition (“VECC”)

Ontario Energy Board staff also participated in the settlement conference but are not a party to this settlement proposal. The Canadian Union of Public Employees (Local One) and the Ontario Power Authority did not participate in the settlement conference and are not parties to this settlement proposal.

These settlement proceedings are subject to the rules relating to confidentiality and privilege contained in the *Guidelines*. The parties understand this to mean that the documents and other information provided, the discussion of each issue, the offers and counter-offers, and the negotiations leading to the settlement – or not – of each issue during the Settlement Conference are strictly confidential and without prejudice. None of the foregoing is admissible as evidence in this proceeding, or otherwise, with one exception: the need to resolve a subsequent dispute over the interpretation of any provision of this settlement proposal.

Outlined below are the final positions of the parties following the settlement conference. For ease of reference, the settlement proposal follows the format of the Approved Final Issues List provided in the Board’s Procedural Order No. 2 dated November 10, 2009 (which is hereto

attached as Appendix “A”). The following table describes how the issues have been characterized for the purposes of this settlement proposal and provides a summary of the status of the issues at the outcome of the settlement conference:

Complete Settlement: An issue for which complete settlement was reached by all parties. If this settlement proposal is accepted by the Board, the parties will not adduce any evidence or argument during the oral hearing in respect of these issues.	# issues settled: 20
Partial Settlement: An issue for which there is partial settlement, as THESL and the intervenors who take any position on the issue were able to agree on some, but not all, aspects of the particular issue. If this settlement proposal is accepted by the Board, the parties who take any position on the issue will only adduce evidence and argument during the hearing on those portions of the issues not addressed in this settlement proposal.	# issues partially settled: 7
No Settlement: An issue for which no settlement was reached. THESL and the intervenors who take a position on the issue will adduce evidence and/or argument at the hearing on the issue.	# issues not settled: 2

A party who is noted as taking no position on an issue may or may not have participated in the discussion on that particular issue and takes no position on the settlement or partial settlement reached or on the sufficiency of the evidence filed to date.

This settlement proposal provides a brief description of each of the settled and partially settled issues, together with references to the evidence filed to-date. The supporting parties for each settled or partially settled issue agree that the evidence filed to-date in respect of that settled or partially settled issue, as supplemented in some instances by additional information recorded in this settlement proposal, is sufficient in the context of the overall settlement to support the proposed settlement or partial settlement. There are Appendices to this settlement proposal which provide further support for the proposed settlement.

According to the *Guidelines* (p. 3), the parties must consider whether a settlement proposal should include an appropriate adjustment mechanism for any settled issue that may be affected by external factors. THESL and the other parties consider that no settled issue requires a specific adjustment mechanism. The settlement on each of the issues may, however, be subject to adjustment for the impacts of the Board’s determination on the unsettled issues such as individual suite metering or cost of capital, as further described below.

The parties have settled the issues as a package and none of the parts of this settlement proposal is severable. If the Board does not accept this settlement proposal, in its entirety, then there is no settlement (unless the parties agree in writing that any part(s) of this settlement proposal that the Board does accept may continue as a valid settlement without inclusion of any part(s) that the Board does not accept).

Unless stated otherwise, the settlement of any particular issue in this proceeding and the positions of the parties in this settlement proposal are without prejudice to the rights of parties to raise the same issue and/or to take any position thereon in any other proceeding, whether or not THESL is a party to such proceeding.

Summary of the Settlement

The central feature of this settlement proposal is an agreed-to decrease in THESL's proposed 2010 Revenue Requirement from \$528M, as proposed in the Application, to \$507M in this settlement proposal, subject to adjustments arising out of the Board's determination of the unsettled issues.

This reduced Revenue Requirement corresponds to the following changes in capital and operational expenditures, which changes are more fully explained in the applicable section of this settlement agreement:

(\$ million)	Application	Settlement proposal	See also issue #
2010 Revenue Requirement	\$528	\$507	1.4
2010 Capital Expenditures	\$423.6	\$350 ¹	4.2
2010 OM&A	\$212.1 ²	\$195.4 ³	3.1

In addition, THESL agrees as part of this settlement proposal to:

- 1) Maintain, relative to 2009 rates, its fixed – variable splits for rates charged to ratepayers constant for all classes with the exception of GS-50-999 kW, which would see an increase in its fixed charge component to no more than \$40.00 per month.
- 2) Beginning July 1, 2010 and until THESL's next cost-of-service rebasing application, track in a deferral account the incremental Input Tax Credit it receives on non-pass-through items that were previously subject to Provincial Sales Tax and become subject to Harmonized Sales Tax. The intention of this account is to track the incremental change due to the shift from Provincial Sales Tax to the Harmonized Sales Tax and the amounts THESL receives through the incremental Input Tax Credit. Tracking of these amounts will continue in the deferral account until THESL's next cost of service application is determined by the Board or until the Board provides guidance on this matter, whichever occurs first. For example, Cost of Power and all other upstream charges applied to

¹ Plus a deferral account for an additional \$27.8M in capital spending for Transit City.

² Plus Property Taxes of approximately \$6.7M for 2010 and Ontario Capital Tax of approximately \$2M for 2010 for a total OM&A of \$220.8M.

³ Plus Property Taxes of approximately \$6.7M for 2010 and Ontario Capital Tax of approximately \$2M for 2010 for total OM&A of \$204.1M.

THESL by the IESO and/or Hydro One are excluded from this calculation, and to qualify for this treatment the cost of the subject items must be determinative of distribution revenue requirement (including capital and distribution expenses). THESL will apply to clear the balance in the variance account as a credit to customers at the next opportunity for a rate change after the account balance information becomes available.

- 3) Clear all deferral and variance accounts as proposed by THESL in Exhibit J1, Tab 1, Schedule 2, Table 2, over two rate years (2010 and 2011), instead of three as originally proposed, in order to mitigate some of the expected increase in rates arising out of the Application.
- 4) File an updated Asset Condition Assessment Report for the next cost of service rate filing, anticipated to be made in connection with rates effective May 1, 2011.

Attached hereto as Appendix B are schedules comparing Revenue Requirement and bill impacts as reflected in the original Application filed in August, as the result of the proposed settlement based on a \$507M revenue requirement, and reflecting the settlement agreement adjusted for estimates of cost of capital based on the Board's recently released Cost of Capital policy.

Unsettled Issues

The parties were able to settle all of the issues except for the following contested issues. These issues are either not resolved or only partially resolved as part of this settlement proposal. Each contested issue described below are considered subsets of the Board Approved Final Issues List attached as Appendix A, as described by the parties that are opposing settlement on the specific issues:

- (i) cost of capital and related PILs impact (issues 3.7, 5.1 and 5.2);
- (ii) has Toronto Hydro responded appropriately to all of the Board's relevant directions with respect to distributed generation from previous proceedings (issue 1.1);
- (iii) are Toronto Hydro's proposed capital expenditures to facilitate distributed generation appropriate (issues 4.1 and 4.2);
- (iv) does Toronto Hydro's Asset Condition Assessment information and Investment Planning Process adequately address the condition of the distribution system assets and support the OM&A and Capital Expenditures for 2010 (issue 4.4); and
- (v) the proper rate design for multiple unit residential "suite metered" customers (issues 7.1 and 7.2).

The parties agree that failure to achieve settlement on the above-noted issues should not otherwise displace the settlement described in this settlement proposal. The parties agree that all unsettled issues will be dealt with during the oral phase of this proceeding.

Individual Suite Metering (Issues 7.1 and 7.2)

Included in many of the general issues in this proceeding are impacts of THESL's individual suite metering activities. SSMWG has taken the position that the revenue requirement impacts

of those activities should not be included in rates in the Test Year. THESL believes that they should. Other parties have not, as yet, taken any position on this issue.

The parties agree that the evidence on this matter, and resulting submissions, should be put to the Board for a determination. In such hearing, it is agreed that all parties may participate, and the settlement by the parties of the issues as set forth in this settlement proposal shall have no effect on their ability to participate in that hearing, or on the positions they take on the suite metering issue or any part of it.

The costs associated with suite metering activities are included in rate base, OM&A, and potentially other consequential aspects of the calculation of revenue requirement, and the figures set forth in this settlement proposal include those amounts as filed by THESL. In the event that, after a hearing on this issue, the Board determines that all or any portion of those costs should not be included in the revenue requirement, the amounts for each component of revenue requirement that may be affected will be adjusted to reflect the Board's decision, and the lower adjusted figures shall be deemed to be the figures agreed to by the parties. Correspondingly, any consequential revenue reductions and lower revenues will be deemed to be the figures agreed to by the parties.

The settlement of all issues in this proceeding is therefore subject to any adjustments that arise from the Board's decision on suite metering. Where, throughout this document, issues relating to revenue requirement and its components are listed as settled, the phrase "subject to the Board's determination of the revenue requirement impacts of suite metering" shall be read in.

Cost of Capital (Issues 3.7, 5.1 and 5.2)

The agreed-upon revenue requirement of \$507 million for the Test Year is based on the as-filed cost of capital parameters which were in place at the time the Application was filed. THESL reiterates its proposal to adjust those parameters on the basis of the Board's recent policy report on Cost of Capital dated December 11, 2009 in a manner consistent with its pre-filed evidence, which would if accepted have an impact on the figures set forth in this settlement proposal. The amount and appropriateness of these adjustments are not agreed to by the parties. Appendix B to this settlement proposal sets out the revenue requirement impact of these adjustments.

The settlement of all issues in this proceeding is therefore subject to any adjustments that arise from the Board's decision on cost of capital. Where, throughout this document, issues relating to revenue requirement and its components are listed as settled, the phrase "subject to the Board's determination of the revenue requirement impacts of cost of capital" shall be read in.

Distributed Generation (Issues 1.1, 4.1, 4.2 and 4.4)

Issues relating to combined heat and power and distributed generation have not been settled, but the scope of the issues has been focused as set forth under those headings below. The resolution of the DG issue may impact rate base, revenue requirement and other monetary issues.

The parties agree that the evidence on this matter, and resulting submissions, should be put to the Board for a determination. The settlement of all issues in this proceeding is therefore subject to

any adjustments that arise from the Board's decision on issues 1.1, 4.1, 4.2 and 4.4. Where, throughout this document, issues relating to revenue requirement and its components are listed as settled, the phrase "subject to the Board's determination of issues 1.1, 4.1, 4.2 and 4.4" shall be read in.

1. GENERAL

1.1 Has Toronto Hydro responded appropriately to all relevant Board directions from previous proceedings?

Partial Settlement: For the purposes of settlement of the issues in this proceeding, the intervenors, with the exception of PP, accept THESL's evidence that it has responded appropriately to all relevant Board directions from previous proceedings.

As part of this settlement proposal, THESL agrees to complete and file an updated Asset Condition Assessment as part of its application to be filed by August 2010 for new rates to be implemented by May 1, 2011.

Evidence: Exhibit A1, Tab 5; Exhibit Q1, Tab 1-5; ; Exhibit R1, Tab 1, Schedule 1-3; Exhibit R1, Tab 4, Schedule 8, 37; Exhibit R1, Tab 8, Schedule 1-9; Exhibit R1, Tab 11, Schedule 2

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Party taking no position: SSMWG.

Opposing party: PP.

Opposing party notes: PP does not agree with a settlement on this issue.

THESL and PP agree that that the scope of the unsettled component of this issue can be narrowed to:

"Has Toronto Hydro responded appropriately to all of the Board's relevant directions with respect to distributed generation from previous proceedings?"

1.2 Are Toronto Hydro's economic and business planning assumptions for 2010 appropriate?

Complete Settlement: For the purposes of settlement of the issues in this proceeding, the intervenors accept THESL's economic and business planning assumptions for 2010 as an appropriate and reasonable foundation for the settlement herein.

Evidence: Exhibit C1, Tab 4; Exhibit R1, Tab 1, Schedule 4; Exhibit R1, Tab 3, Schedule 2; Exhibit R1, Tab 4, Schedule 6

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Parties taking no position: PP and SSMWG.

1.3 Is service quality, based on the OEB specified performance indicators, acceptable?

Complete Settlement: For the purpose of obtaining settlement of the issues contained herein, the intervenors accept THESL's service quality targets for the Test Year.

Evidence: Exhibit B1, Tab 13-14; Exhibit R1, Tab 1, Schedule 5; Exhibit R1, Tab 6, Schedule 22

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Parties taking no position: PP and SSMWG.

1.4 Is the overall increase in the 2010 revenue requirement reasonable given the impact on consumers?

Complete Settlement: As part of this settlement agreement, THESL has agreed to reduce its revenue requirement to \$507M, from \$528.7M originally requested in its pre-filed evidence, subject to resolution of the unsettled issues. In addition, THESL agrees to dispose of the combined credit balance in deferral and variance accounts over a 2-year period, rather than the 3-year period originally proposed in its pre-filed evidence (see Issue 6.1). All parties agree that together, these changes are sufficient to alleviate the revenue requirement impact on consumers in the Test Year. The parties do not agree on whether the \$23.2 million increase in revenue requirement that would result if the Cost of Capital issues are accepted by the Board as proposed by THESL produces a reasonable result given the impact on consumers.

Evidence: Exhibit J1, Tab 1-2; Exhibit O1, Tab 1; Exhibit R1, Tab 3, Schedule 4; Exhibit R1, Tab 9, Schedule 36-37; Exhibit R1, Tab 11, Schedule 42

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Parties taking no position: PP and SSMWG.

2. LOAD AND REVENUE FORECAST

2.1 Is the load forecast and methodology appropriate and have the impacts of Conservation and Demand Management initiatives been suitably reflected?

Complete Settlement: For the purpose of settlement the intervenors accept the load forecast and methodology and the reflection therein of the impact of CDM initiatives.

Evidence: Exhibit K1, Tab 1-3, Exhibit R1, Tab 1, Schedule 7; Exhibit R1, Tab 1, Schedule 7-11; Exhibit R1, Tab 3, Schedule 6-15; Exhibit R1, Tab 11, Schedule 43-48

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Parties taking no position: PP and SSMWG.

2.2 Is the proposed amount for 2010 other revenues appropriate?

Complete Settlement: For the purpose of settlement the intervenors accept THESL's forecast of 2010 other revenues.

Evidence: Exhibit I1, Tab 1; Exhibit R1, Tab 1, Schedule 13; Exhibit R1, Tab 3, Schedule 16-17; Exhibit R1, Tab 9, Schedule 34

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Parties taking no position: PP and SSMWG.

3. OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COSTS

3.1 Are the overall levels of the 2010 Operation, Maintenance and Administration budgets appropriate?

Complete Settlement: As part of the settlement agreement, THESL has agreed to reduce its Revenue Requirement to \$507M with the OM&A component reduced to \$195.4M⁴. For the purpose of settlement the intervenors accept this reduced OM&A budget.

To accommodate the OM&A reduction which is reflected in the proposed settlement, THESL plans to modify the pace of some activities. THESL believes it can make these OM&A changes in the Test Year without materially impacting customer service and in a manner that allows THESL to continue the safe operation of its distribution system.

Evidence: Exhibit F1, Tab 1–7; Exhibit F2, Tab 1-11; Exhibit R1, Tab 1, Schedule 14; Exhibit R1, Tab 4, Schedule 18; Exhibit R1, Tab 9 Schedule 25; Exhibit R1, Tab 11, Schedule 17-18

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Parties taking no position: PP and SSMWG.

3.2 Is the proposed level of 2010 Shared Services and Other O&M spending appropriate?

Complete Settlement: For the purpose of settlement, the intervenors accept the revised level of Shared Services and Other O&M spending (see Issue 3.1 above).

Evidence: Exhibit C1, Tab 2–3; Exhibit R1, Tab 11, Schedule 3, 5

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Parties taking no position: PP and SSMWG.

⁴ Plus Property Taxes of approximately \$6.7M for 2010 and Ontario Capital Tax of approximately \$2M for 2010 for total OM&A of \$204.1M.

3.3 Are the methodologies used to allocate Shared Services and Other O&M costs to the distribution business for 2010 appropriate?

Complete Settlement: Because the level of Shared Services and Other OM&A spending was settled, the issue of the methodology no longer arises in this proceeding.

Evidence: Exhibit C1, Tab 1-3; Exhibit R1, Tab 11, Schedule 2

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Parties taking no position: PP and SSMWG.

3.4 Are the 2010 Human Resources related costs (wages, salaries, benefits, incentive payments, and pension costs) including employee levels, appropriate? Has Toronto Hydro demonstrated improvements in efficiency, including labour productivity, and value for dollar associated with its compensation costs?

Complete Settlement: For the purpose of settlement, the intervenors accept the revised levels of Human Resources related costs.

Evidence: Exhibit C2, Tab 1; Exhibit R1, Tab 1, Schedule 36-42; Exhibit R1, Tab 3, Schedule 28; Exhibit R1, Tab 4, Schedule 13; Exhibit R1, Tab 11, Schedule 10-14

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Parties taking no position: PP and SSMWG.

3.5 Is Toronto Hydro's depreciation expense appropriate?

Complete Settlement: For the purposes of settlement, the intervenors accept THESL's depreciation expenses, as adjusted to reflect the reduced 2010 Capital Expenditures discussed under item 4.2 below in this Settlement Proposal.

Evidence: Exhibit D1, Tab 12-13; Exhibit R1, Tab 3, Schedule 29; Exhibit R1, Tab 9, Schedule 15

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Parties taking no position: PP and SSMWG.

3.6 Are the amounts proposed for capital and property taxes appropriate?

Complete Settlement: For the purposes of settlement, the intervenors accept the proposed amounts for capital and property taxes, but with the Ontario Capital Tax adjusted to reflect the reduced 2010 Capital Expenditures discussed under item 4.2 below in this Settlement Proposal.

Evidence: Exhibit H1, Tab 1; Exhibit R1, Tab 1, Schedule 48; Exhibit R1, Tab 3, Schedule 30

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Parties taking no position: PP and SSMWG.

3.7 Is the amount proposed for PILs, including the methodology, appropriate?

Partial Settlement: For the purposes of settlement, the intervenors accept THESL's evidence that it has followed the Board's methodology to determine PILs, however the amount of PILs is dependent on the net income, and therefore the PILs amount to be included in revenue requirement is dependent on the determination of Issues 5.1 and 5.2.

Evidence: Exhibit H1, Tab 1; Exhibit R1, Tab 1, Schedule 49

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Parties taking no position: PP and SSMWG.

4. CAPITAL EXPENDITURES AND RATE BASE

4.1 Are the amounts proposed for Rate Base appropriate?

Partial Settlement: For the purposes of settlement the intervenors, with the exception of PP, accept the proposed amounts for Rate Base, based on the revised capital budget discussed under 4.2 below.

Evidence: Exhibit D1, Tab 1-15; Exhibit R1, Tab 3, Schedule 39

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Party taking no position: SSMWG.

Opposing party: PP.

4.2 Are the amounts proposed for 2010 Capital Expenditures appropriate including the specific Operational and Emerging Requirements categories?

Partial Settlement: As part of this settlement proposal, THESL agrees to reduce its 2010 capital budget from \$423.6M originally requested in the Application to \$350M, excluding any capital expenditures on its proposed Transit City program. THESL agrees to record in a deferral account for future disposal, subject to the Board's standard prudence review, any revenue requirement impact in 2010 of up to \$27.8M of capital expense actually incurred related to its proposed Transit City program. All of the parties, with the exception of PP, agree that the revised

capital expenditure levels are appropriate, including the treatment of any capital expenditures in connection with the Transit City initiative.

THESL will accommodate the reduction in its capital budget by slowing down the pace of non-critical renewal and new emerging capital programs. THESL will review its prioritization schedule to ensure that it yields the maximum benefits for its customers. THESL believes that the level of capital expenditures agreed to as part of this settlement will still allow for the majority of the required capital projects to proceed, avoiding material effects to customers or the system in the Test Year.

It is THESL's intention to file another COS application in 2010 for implementation for May 1, 2011. This will provide the Board and parties with an opportunity to review the status of THESL's capital program again next year.

Evidence: Exhibit D1, Tab 7-9; Exhibit R1, Tab 1, Schedule 56, 58-63, 67, 72, 73, 75, 76, 78; Exhibit R1, Tab 4, Schedule 32, 33, 36, 38, 39; Exhibit R1, Tab 6, Schedule 4-32; Exhibit R1, Tab 9, Schedule 8-14; Exhibit R1, Tab 11, Schedule 19-20

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Party taking no position: SSMWG.

Opposing party: PP.

4.3 Are the inputs used to determine the Working Capital component of the Rate Base appropriate and is the methodology used consistent with the methodologies approved by the Board in previous Toronto Hydro rate applications?

Complete Settlement: For the purpose of settlement the intervenors accept the proposed working capital calculation.

Evidence: Exhibit D1, Tab 14; Exhibit R1, Tab 1, Schedule 80; Exhibit R1, Tab 11, Schedule 49

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Parties taking no position: PP and SSMWG.

4.4 Does Toronto Hydro's Asset Condition Assessment information and Investment Planning Process adequately address the condition of the distribution system assets and support the O&MA and Capital expenditures for 2010?

Partial Settlement: For the purpose of settlement the intervenors, except for PP, accept that THESL's Asset Condition Assessment and Investment Planning Process adequately support the revised levels of spending.

Evidence: Exhibit Q1, Tab 3; Exhibit C1, Tab 6, Schedule 1-2; Exhibit R1, Tab 4, Schedule 37; Exhibit R1, Tab 11, Schedule 57

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Party taking no position: SSMWG.

Opposing party: PP.

5. CAPITAL STRUCTURE AND COST OF CAPITAL

5.1 Is the proposed Capital Structure, Rate of Return on Equity, and Short-Term Debt Rate appropriate?

No Settlement: The parties were unable to reach agreement on this issue.

5.2 Is the proposed Long-Term Debt Rate appropriate?

No Settlement: The parties were unable to reach agreement on this issue.

6. DEFERRAL AND VARIANCE ACCOUNTS

6.1 Is the proposal for the amounts, disposition and continuance of Toronto Hydro's existing Deferral and Variance Accounts appropriate?

Complete Settlement: As part of this settlement proposal, THESL agrees to clear the total credit balance of the deferral and variance accounts proposed by THESL to customers over a period of 2 years, instead of 3 as proposed in the prefiled evidence. The details of these accounts are provided in Exhibit J1, Tab 1, Schedule 2, Table 2, and result in a credit to customers forecast to be \$68.5M which amount will be subject to adjustments for Board approved carrying costs.

Included in the group of accounts subject to disposition is account 1592, PILs and Tax Variances for 2006 and Subsequent Years. Parties are aware that there is currently a separate proceeding in progress that will establish corrected values for account balances in account 1562, Deferred Payments in Lieu of Taxes (for the period October 1, 2001 to April 30, 2006)⁵ ("PILs Proceeding").

The notice for the PILs proceeding indicated that the results of that proceeding "may also have an impact on balances in other accounts, such as 1563 Contra - Deferred PILS, or 1592 PILS for 2006 and Subsequent Years". Parties have included the disposition of account 1592 as part of this settlement agreement primarily because account 1592 represents a large credit balance of \$11.7M as of December 31, 2008 which THESL and the intervenors wish to dispose at this time ("the current balance").

⁵ EB-2008-0381 (previously EB-2007-0820).

Parties propose that this current balance in account 1592 be cleared in this proceeding. The impact, if any, of the PILs proceeding on account 1592 shall be incorporated in account 1592 by THESL and brought forward by THESL to the Board for review at a future proceeding.

In addition, as a result of the pending changes to Provincial Sales Tax regulations, and the introduction of the Harmonized Sales Tax (HST) as of July 1, 2010, THESL agrees to record in a deferral account the difference between any PST on forecast capital expenditures and expenses to be incurred, and any HST (8% Ontario share) on similar capital and expense actual amounts for which it will be eligible for an HST Input Tax Credit ("ITC").

Beginning July 1, 2010 and until THESL's next cost-of-service rebasing application, THESL will track in a deferral account the incremental Input Tax Credit it receives on non-pass-through items (the "subject items") that were previously subject to PST and become subject to HST. The intention of this account is to track the incremental change due to the shift from Provincial Sales Tax to the Harmonized Sales Tax and the amounts THESL receives through the incremental Input Tax Credit. Tracking of these amounts will continue in the deferral account until THESL's next cost of service application is determined by the Board or until the Board provides guidance on this matter, whichever occurs first. For example, Cost of Power and all other upstream charges applied to THESL by the IESO and/or Hydro One are excluded from this calculation.

To qualify for this treatment the cost of the subject items must be in the category of distribution revenue requirement. THESL will apply to clear the balance in the variance account as a credit to customers at the next opportunity for a rate change after the account balance information becomes available and is supported by audited financial statements.

In practice, this treatment effects a refund to the ratepayer of the incremental ITC. THESL will file to dispose of the balance in this account at a future date.

The parties understand that as of the date of the filing of this settlement agreement, the Board has not established a deferral account to address the introduction of the HST for any rate regulated distributor. Parties recognize that if the Board establishes an HST account on a generic basis, the Board will likely provide specific directions on the accounting guidelines to be followed with regard to the HST account ("HST guidelines"). If the Board does so, the parties understand that the Board's HST guidelines will supersede the methodology noted above.

THESL agrees to record in a deferral account for future disposal, subject to the Board's standard prudence review, any revenue requirement impact in 2010 of up to \$27.8M of capital expense actually incurred related to its proposed Transit City program.

Subject to these three changes, for the purposes of settlement the intervenors accept THESL's proposal for the amounts, disposition, use and continuance of deferral and variance accounts.

Evidence: Exhibit J1, Tab 1, Schedule 2; Exhibit J2, Tab 2, Schedule 8-10; Exhibit R1, Tab 1, Schedule 84-89; Exhibit R1, Tab 11, Schedule 38-40

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Parties taking no position: PP and SSMWG.

6.2 Is Toronto Hydro's proposal to record variances between the approved levels of capital contributions to Hydro One and the actual contribution levels in USOA 1508 appropriate?

Complete Settlement: For the purposes of settlement the intervenors accept THESL's proposal.

Evidence: Exhibit D2, Tab 1; Exhibit J1, Tab 1, Schedule 2; Exhibit R1, Tab 1, Schedule 92

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Parties taking no position: PP and SSMWG.

7. COST ALLOCATION AND RATE DESIGN

7.1 Is Toronto Hydro's cost allocation appropriate?

Partial Settlement: For the purposes of settlement, the intervenors, with the exception of the SSMWG, accept THESL's cost allocation for 2010 rates.

Evidence: Exhibit L1, Tab 1-2; Exhibit R1, Tab 1, Schedule 93; Exhibit R1, Tab 10, Schedule 4; Exhibit R1, Tab 3, Schedule 41, 50-51

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Party taking no position: PP.

Opposing party: SSMWG.

Opposing party notes: The SSMWG views THESL's treatment of residential customers residing in individually metered multiple unit residential units (i.e. "suite metered customers") as inappropriate.

THESL and SSMWG agree that the scope of this issue can be narrowed to:

“Is Toronto Hydro’s cost allocation in respect of residential customers residing in individually metered multiple unit residential units (“suite metered customers”) appropriate?”

7.2 Are the proposed revenue to cost ratios for each class appropriate?

Partial Settlement: For the purposes of settlement, the intervenors, with the exception of the SSMWG, accept THESL’s proposed revenue to cost ratios for each class as the basis for 2010 rates.

Evidence: Exhibit L1, Tab 1-2, Exhibit M1, Tab 1, Schedule 1; Exhibit R1, Tab 1, Schedule 96; Exhibit R1, Tab 3, Schedule 50; Exhibit R1, Tab 11, Schedule 52

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Party taking no position: PP.

Opposing party: SSMWG.

Opposing party notes: The SSMWG views THESL’s treatment of residential customers residing in individually metered multiple unit residential units (i.e. “suite metered customers”) as inappropriate.

7.3 Are the fixed-variable splits for each class appropriate?

Complete Settlement: As part of this settlement proposal, THESL agrees to maintain the existing fixed-variable split for all rate classes (with the exception of the GS50-999 class) as included in its 2009 rate design. The company's original proposal for fixed portion of rates was informed by the outputs of the Cost Allocation model for fixed rates. All parties agree that maintaining the split is acceptable.

Regarding the GS50-999 class, THESL agrees that the fixed charge will be increased from the current \$32.69 per 30 days to no more than \$40.00 per 30 days. While this increase is not as large as would be suggested by the outputs of the cost allocation model, it moves the fixed rate in the correct direction, and is an acceptable increase. Therefore, all parties agree that THESL’s revised fixed variable splits for each class are appropriate.

The proposed rates, subject to adjustment of the revenue requirement with respect to the unsettled issues, are set forth in Appendix B.

Evidence: Exhibit M1, Tab 1-2; Exhibit R1, Tab 11, Schedule 53

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Parties taking no position: PP and SSMWG.

7.4 Are the proposed Retail Transmission Service rates appropriate?

Complete Settlement: For the purposes of settlement, the intervenors accept the proposed Retail Transmission Service rates.

Evidence: Exhibit N1, Tab 2, Schedule 2; Exhibit R1, Tab 3, Schedule 52-53; Exhibit R1, Tab 11, Schedule 56

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Parties taking no position: PP and SSMWG.

7.5 Are the proposed Distribution Loss Factors appropriate?

Complete Settlement: For the purposes of settlement, the intervenors accept the proposed Distribution Loss Factors.

Evidence: Exhibit M1, Tab 1-2 and 5; Exhibit R1, Tab 3, Schedule 51

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Parties taking no position: PP and SSMWG.

8. SMART GRID PLAN

8.1 Does Toronto Hydro's Smart Grid Plan meet the Board's filing guidelines and the objectives set out in the *Green Energy and Green Economy Act, 2009*?

Complete Settlement: For the purposes of settlement, the intervenors accept THESL's evidence that its Smart Grid Plan meets the Board's filing guidelines and the objectives set out in the *Green Energy and Green Economy Act, 2009*.

Evidence: Exhibit G1, Tab 1; Exhibit R1, Tab 1, Schedule 74, 101-121; Exhibit R1, Tab 2, Schedule 11-20; Exhibit R1, Tab 4, Schedule 50-52; Exhibit R1, Tab 11, Schedule 34-36

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Parties taking no position: PP and SSMWG.

8.2 Has Toronto Hydro appropriately addressed the Smart Grid Plan expenditures in the context of its overall Capital and O&M budgets?

Complete Settlement: For the purposes of settlement the intervenors accept THESL's evidence with respect to its Smart Grid expenditures .

Evidence: Exhibit G1, Tab 1; Exhibit D1, Tab 7, Schedule 7-8; Exhibit R1, Tab 1, Schedule 74, 101-121; Exhibit R1, Tab 2, Schedule 11-20; Exhibit R1, Tab 4, Schedule 50-52; Exhibit R1, Tab 11, Schedule 34-36

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Parties taking no position: PP and SSMWG.

8.3 Is Toronto Hydro's approach to allocating Smart Grid Plan O&M and Capital costs to its distribution customers appropriate?

Complete Settlement: For the purposes of settlement, the intervenors accept THESL's allocation of its Smart Grid costs.

Evidence: Exhibit G1, Tab 1; Exhibit R1, Tab 1, Schedule 104-105

Supporting parties: THESL, AMPCO, BOMA, CCC, EP, SEC and VECC.

Parties taking no position: PP and SSMWG.

APPENDIX “A”

Approved Final Issues List

1. GENERAL

- 1.1 Has Toronto Hydro responded appropriately to all relevant Board directions from previous proceedings?
- 1.2 Are Toronto Hydro's economic and business planning assumptions for 2010 appropriate?
- 1.3 Is service quality, based on the OEB specified performance indicators, acceptable?
- 1.4 Is the overall increase in the 2010 revenue requirement reasonable given the impact on consumers?

2. LOAD and REVENUE FORECAST

- 2.1 Is the load forecast and methodology appropriate and have the impacts of Conservation and Demand Management initiatives been suitably reflected?
- 2.2 Is the proposed amount for 2010 other revenues appropriate?

3. OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE and ADMINISTRATION COSTS

- 3.1 Are the overall levels of the 2010 Operation, Maintenance and Administration budgets appropriate?
- 3.2 Is the proposed level of 2010 Shared Services and Other O&M spending appropriate?
- 3.3 Are the methodologies used to allocate Shared Services and Other O&M costs to the distribution business for 2010 appropriate?
- 3.4 Are the 2010 Human Resources related costs (wages, salaries, benefits, incentive payments, and pension costs) including employee levels, appropriate? Has Toronto Hydro demonstrated improvements in efficiency, including labour productivity, and value for dollar associated with its compensation costs?
- 3.5 Is Toronto Hydro's depreciation expense appropriate?
- 3.6 Are the amounts proposed for capital and property taxes appropriate?
- 3.7 Is the amount proposed for PILs, including the methodology, appropriate? Ontario Energy Board

4. CAPITAL EXPENDITURES and RATE BASE

- 4.1 Are the amounts proposed for Rate Base appropriate?
- 4.2 Are the amounts proposed for 2010 Capital Expenditures appropriate including the specific Operational and Emerging Requirements categories?

4.3 Are the inputs used to determine the Working Capital component of the Rate Base appropriate and is the methodology used consistent with the methodologies approved by the Board in previous Toronto Hydro rate applications?

4.4 Does Toronto Hydro's Asset Condition Assessment information and Investment Planning Process adequately address the condition of the distribution system assets and support the O&MA and Capital expenditures for 2010?

5. CAPITAL STRUCTURE AND COST OF CAPITAL

5.1 Is the proposed Capital Structure, Rate of Return on Equity, and Short-Term Debt Rate appropriate?

5.2 Is the proposed Long-Term Debt Rate appropriate?

6. DEFERRAL and VARIANCE ACCOUNTS

6.1 Is the proposal for the amounts, disposition and continuance of Toronto Hydro's existing Deferral and Variance Accounts appropriate?

6.2 Is Toronto Hydro's proposal to record variances between the approved levels of capital contributions to Hydro One and the actual contribution levels in USOA 1508 appropriate?

7. COST ALLOCATION and RATE DESIGN

7.1 Is Toronto Hydro's cost allocation appropriate?

7.2 Are the proposed revenue to cost ratios for each class appropriate?

7.3 Are the fixed-variable splits for each class appropriate?

7.4 Are the proposed Retail Transmission Service rates appropriate?

7.5 Are the proposed Distribution Loss Factors appropriate?

8. SMART GRID PLAN

8.1 Does Toronto Hydro's Smart Grid Plan meet the Board's filing guidelines and the objectives set out in the Green Energy and Green Economy Act, 2009? Ontario Energy Board

8.2 Has Toronto Hydro appropriately addressed the Smart Grid Plan expenditures in the context of its overall Capital and O&M budgets?

8.3 Is Toronto Hydro's approach to allocating Smart Grid Plan O&M and Capital costs to its distribution customers appropriate?

APPENDIX "B"

Revenue Requirements and Bill Impacts

Revenue Requirement

	Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4
			As Per Settlement Agreement (before CoC impact)	As Per Settlement Agreement (including CoC estimate Impact)
1		As Filed (Aug 2009)		
2	Net Fixed assets (\$M)	1,885.4	1,867.1	1867.1
3	Working capital (\$M)	276.9	273.0	273.7
4	Rate Base (\$M)	2,162.3	2,140.2	2,140.9
5	Deemed Long-Term Debt Component %	56.0%	56.0%	56.0%
6	Deemed Short-Term Debt Component %	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%
7	Deemed Equity Component %	40.0%	40.0%	40.0%
8	Long-Term Debt Rate	5.60%	5.37%	5.37%
9	Short-Term Debt Rate	1.33%	1.33%	2.30%
10	Return on Equity	8.01%	8.01%	9.75%
11	Weighted Average Cost of Capital	6.39%	6.26%	7.00%
12	Cost of Capital (Return on Rate Base)	138.2	134.1	149.8
13	OM&A	212.1	195.4	195.4
14	Municipal and Property Taxes	6.7	6.7	6.7
15	Depreciation and Amortization (\$M)	167.0	166.4	166.4
16	PILS (\$M)	23.4	23.2	30.6
17	Service Revenue Requirement (\$M)	547.5	525.7	548.9
18	Revenue Offsets (\$M)	18.7	18.7	18.7
19	Base Revenue Requirement (\$M)	528.7	507.0	530.2

::ODMA\PCDOCS\TOR01\4253611\6

Summary Table - Monthly Bill Impacts - Percentage Change from 2009 Rates

	Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8	Col. 9	Col. 10	Col. 11	Col. 12	Col. 13
					Prefiled Evidence			ADR			ADR plus Cost of Capital Estimate		
					Distribution	Distribution + Rate Riders	Total Bill	Distribution	Distribution + Rate Riders	Total Bill	Distribution	Distribution + Rate Riders	Total Bill
1	kWh	kW	kVA										
2	Residential												
3	(RPP)	800			11.7%	10.4%	3.3%	6.7%	3.7%	1.4%	11.6%	8.6%	2.8%
4	GS<50 kW												
5	(RPP)	2,000			16.2%	13.7%	4.2%	11.5%	7.0%	2.5%	16.3%	11.8%	3.8%
6	GS 50-999 kW												
7	(RPP)	200,000	500	556	9.0%	2.0%	-0.4%	5.6%	-5.4%	-1.4%	10.5%	-0.4%	-0.8%
8	(Non RPP)				9.0%	4.4%	-0.1%	5.6%	-1.7%	-0.9%	10.5%	3.3%	-0.3%
9	GS 1000-4999 kW												
10	(RPP)	1,000,000	2,000	2,222	-5.3%	-13.5%	-1.4%	-8.9%	-22.2%	-2.3%	-5.1%	-18.4%	-1.9%
11	(Non RPP)				-5.3%	-9.9%	-1.1%	-8.9%	-16.8%	-1.8%	-5.1%	-13.0%	-1.4%
12	Large Use												
13	(RPP)	2,500,000	5,000	5,556	9.0%	-0.1%	0.2%	6.4%	-8.6%	-0.6%	10.6%	-4.3%	-0.2%
14	(Non RPP)				9.0%	3.6%	0.6%	6.4%	-3.1%	-0.1%	10.6%	1.2%	0.4%
15	Street Lighting	Connections	Mthly kVA										
16	(RPP)	365	1	1	56.1%	54.2%	20.4%	54.2%	51.0%	19.2%	62.3%	59.2%	22.4%
17	(Non RPP)				56.1%	54.8%	20.7%	54.2%	52.0%	19.5%	62.3%	60.1%	22.8%
18	Unmetered Scattered Loads												
19	(RPP)	365	1	1	42.3%	44.5%	17.4%	37.4%	38.1%	15.0%	44.3%	45.2%	17.7%

NOTE: The Global Adjustment Rate Riders are included for the Non RPP customers in each rate class.

2010 Distribution Bill Impact (Prefiled Evidence)

	Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8	Col. 9	Col. 10	Col. 11	Col. 12	Col. 13
				2009 Rates				2010 Rates				2010 Change	
	kWh	kW	kVA	Customer (\$/cust)	Volumetric (\$/kWh or KVa)	Connection (\$/conn)	Dist Bill (\$)	Customer (\$/cust)	Volumetric (\$/kWh or KVa)	Connection (\$/conn)	Dist Bill (\$)	\$	%
1													
2	Residential												
3	100			16.85	0.01432		18.28	18.14	0.01684		19.82	1.54	8.4%
4	250			16.85	0.01432		20.43	18.14	0.01684		22.35	1.92	9.4%
5	500			16.85	0.01432		24.01	18.14	0.01684		26.56	2.55	10.6%
6	800			16.85	0.01432		28.31	18.14	0.01684		31.61	3.31	11.7%
7	1,000			16.85	0.01432		31.17	18.14	0.01684		34.98	3.81	12.2%
8	1,500			16.85	0.01432		38.33	18.14	0.01684		43.40	5.07	13.2%
9	2,000			16.85	0.01432		45.49	18.14	0.01684		51.82	6.33	13.9%
10	GS<50 kW												
11	2,000			21.44	0.01975		60.94	22.84	0.02399		70.82	9.88	16.2%
12	5,000			21.44	0.01975		120.19	22.84	0.02399		142.79	22.60	18.8%
13	10,000			21.44	0.01975		218.94	22.84	0.02399		262.74	43.80	20.0%
14	20,000			21.44	0.01975		416.44	22.84	0.02399		502.64	86.20	20.7%
23	GS 50-999 kW												
24	30,000	100	100	32.69	5.15090		547.78	50.50	5.5866		609.16	61.38	11.2%
25	40,000	100	100	32.69	5.15090		547.78	50.50	5.5866		609.16	61.38	11.2%
26	150,000	500	556	32.69	5.15090		2,894.30	50.50	5.5866		3,154.17	259.87	9.0%
27	200,000	500	556	32.69	5.15090		2,894.30	50.50	5.5866		3,154.17	259.87	9.0%
28	270,000	900	1,000	32.69	5.15090		5,183.59	50.50	5.5866		5,637.10	453.51	8.7%
29	360,000	900	1,000	32.69	5.15090		5,183.59	50.50	5.5866		5,637.10	453.51	8.7%
30	450,000	900	1,000	32.69	5.15090		5,183.59	50.50	5.5866		5,637.10	453.51	8.7%
31	GS 1000-4999 kW												
32	300,000	1,000	1,111	705.35	4.32300		5,508.68	691.11	4.0844		5,229.33	-279.35	-5.1%
33	400,000	1,000	1,111	705.35	4.32300		5,508.68	691.11	4.0844		5,229.33	-279.35	-5.1%
34	500,000	1,000	1,111	705.35	4.32300		5,508.68	691.11	4.0844		5,229.33	-279.35	-5.1%
35	600,000	2,000	2,222	705.35	4.32300		10,312.02	691.11	4.0844		9,767.55	-544.46	-5.3%
36	800,000	2,000	2,222	705.35	4.32300		10,312.02	691.11	4.0844		9,767.55	-544.46	-5.3%
37	1,000,000	2,000	2,222	705.35	4.32300		10,312.02	691.11	4.0844		9,767.55	-544.46	-5.3%
38	Large Use												
39	1,500,000	5,000	5,556	2639.04	3.93480		24,499.04	2277.32	4.3984		26,712.88	2,213.84	9.0%
40	2,000,000	5,000	5,556	2639.04	3.93480		24,499.04	2277.32	4.3984		26,712.88	2,213.84	9.0%
41	2,500,000	5,000	5,556	2639.04	3.93480		24,499.04	2277.32	4.3984		26,712.88	2,213.84	9.0%
42	3,000,000	10,000	11,111	2639.04	3.93480		46,359.04	2277.32	4.3984		51,148.43	4,789.39	10.3%
43	4,000,000	10,000	11,111	2639.04	3.93480		46,359.04	2277.32	4.3984		51,148.43	4,789.39	10.3%
44	5,000,000	10,000	11,111	2639.04	3.93480		46,359.04	2277.32	4.3984		51,148.43	4,789.39	10.3%
45	Street Lighting Connections Mthly kVA												
46	9,108,245	162,353	26,765	0.89	19.75810		673,324.73	1.12	31.1169		1,014,686.96	341,362.24	50.7%
47	365	1	1	0.89	19.75810		20.65	1.12	31.1169		32.24	11.59	56.1%
48	Unmetered												
49	Scattered Loads Customers Connections												
49	4,367,777	1,124	21,782	3.42	0.0417	0.35	193,779.08	3.74	0.06283	0.37	286,690.84	92,911.76	47.9%
50	365	1	1	3.42	0.0417	0.35	19.01	3.74	0.06283	0.37	27.04	8.04	42.3%

2010 Distribution + Rate Rider Bill Impact (Prefiled Evidence) - RPP Customers

Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 8	Col. 9	Col. 10	Col. 12	Col. 13	Col. 14
			2009			2010			2010 Change		
	kWh	kW	kVA	Distribution (\$)	Rate Rider (\$)	Total (\$)	Distribution (\$)	Rate Rider (\$)	Total (\$)	\$	%
Residential											
100				18.28	0.57	18.85	19.82	0.55	20.37	1.52	8.1%
250				20.43	0.45	20.88	22.35	0.36	22.71	1.83	8.8%
500				24.01	0.25	24.26	26.56	0.05	26.61	2.35	9.7%
800				28.31	0.01	28.32	31.61	-0.34	31.27	2.96	10.4%
1,000				31.17	-0.15	31.02	34.98	-0.59	34.39	3.37	10.9%
1,500				38.33	-0.55	37.78	43.40	-1.23	42.17	4.39	11.6%
2,000				45.49	-0.95	44.54	51.82	-1.86	49.96	5.42	12.2%
GS<50 kW											
2,000				60.94	-0.16	60.78	70.82	-1.72	69.10	8.32	13.7%
5,000				120.19	-1.36	118.83	142.79	-5.32	137.47	18.64	15.7%
10,000				218.94	-3.36	215.58	262.74	-11.32	251.42	35.84	16.6%
20,000				416.44	-7.36	409.08	502.64	-23.32	479.32	70.24	17.2%
GS 50-999 kW											
30,000	100	100		547.78	-4.02	543.76	609.16	-40.32	568.84	25.08	4.6%
40,000	100	100		547.78	-4.02	543.76	609.16	-40.32	568.84	25.08	4.6%
150,000	500	556		2,894.30	-24.52	2,869.78	3,154.17	-227.10	2,927.07	57.29	2.0%
200,000	500	556		2,894.30	-24.52	2,869.78	3,154.17	-227.10	2,927.07	57.29	2.0%
270,000	900	1,000		5,183.59	-44.52	5,139.07	5,637.10	-409.32	5,227.78	88.71	1.7%
360,000	900	1,000		5,183.59	-44.52	5,139.07	5,637.10	-409.32	5,227.78	88.71	1.7%
450,000	900	1,000		5,183.59	-44.52	5,139.07	5,637.10	-409.32	5,227.78	88.71	1.7%
GS 1000-4999 kW											
300,000	1,000	1,111		5,508.68	-106.88	5,401.81	5,229.33	-514.65	4,714.68	-687.13	-12.7%
400,000	1,000	1,111		5,508.68	-106.88	5,401.81	5,229.33	-514.65	4,714.68	-687.13	-12.7%
500,000	1,000	1,111		5,508.68	-106.88	5,401.81	5,229.33	-514.65	4,714.68	-687.13	-12.7%
600,000	2,000	2,222		10,312.02	-214.43	10,097.59	9,767.55	-1,029.99	8,737.56	-1,360.02	-13.5%
800,000	2,000	2,222		10,312.02	-214.43	10,097.59	9,767.55	-1,029.99	8,737.56	-1,360.02	-13.5%
1,000,000	2,000	2,222		10,312.02	-214.43	10,097.59	9,767.55	-1,029.99	8,737.56	-1,360.02	-13.5%
Large Use											
1,500,000	5,000	5,556		24,499.04	-548.76	23,950.28	26,712.88	-2,782.65	23,930.23	-20.05	-0.1%
2,000,000	5,000	5,556		24,499.04	-548.76	23,950.28	26,712.88	-2,782.65	23,930.23	-20.05	-0.1%
2,500,000	5,000	5,556		24,499.04	-548.76	23,950.28	26,712.88	-2,782.65	23,930.23	-20.05	-0.1%
3,000,000	10,000	11,111		46,359.04	-1,098.21	45,260.83	51,148.43	-5,565.99	45,582.44	321.61	0.7%
4,000,000	10,000	11,111		46,359.04	-1,098.21	45,260.83	51,148.43	-5,565.99	45,582.44	321.61	0.7%
5,000,000	10,000	11,111		46,359.04	-1,098.21	45,260.83	51,148.43	-5,565.99	45,582.44	321.61	0.7%
Street Lighting	Connections	Mthly kVA									
9,108,245	162,353	26,765		673,324.73	-1,769.18	671,555.55	1,014,686.96	-13,288.46	1,001,398.50	329,842.96	49.1%
365	1	1		20.65	-0.07	20.58	32.24	-0.50	31.74	11.15	54.2%
Unmetered											
Scattered Loads	Customers	Connections									
4,367,777	1,124	21,782		193,779.08	-7,381.54	186,397.54	286,690.84	-6,374.60	280,316.24	93,918.70	50.4%
365	1	1		19.01	-0.62	18.39	27.04	-0.48	26.56	8.17	44.5%

2010 Distribution + Rate Rider Bill Impact (Prefiled Evidence) - Non RPP Customers

	Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 8	Col. 9	Col. 10	Col. 12	Col. 13	Col. 14
				2009			2010 Rate Rider			2010 Change		
	kWh	kW	kVA	Distribution (\$)	Rate Rider (\$)	Total (\$)	Distribution (\$)	(\$)	Total (\$)	\$	%	
1	Residential											
2	100			18.28	0.57	18.85	19.82	0.59	20.41	1.56	8.3%	
3	250			20.43	0.45	20.88	22.35	0.46	22.81	1.93	9.2%	
4	500			24.01	0.25	24.26	26.56	0.23	26.79	2.53	10.4%	
5	800			28.31	0.01	28.32	31.61	-0.04	31.57	3.26	11.5%	
6	1,000			31.17	-0.15	31.02	34.98	-0.22	34.76	3.74	12.1%	
7	1,500			38.33	-0.55	37.78	43.40	-0.67	42.73	4.95	13.1%	
8	2,000			45.49	-0.95	44.54	51.82	-1.12	50.70	6.16	13.8%	
9	GS<50 kW											
10	2,000			60.94	-0.16	60.78	70.82	-0.98	69.84	9.06	14.9%	
11	5,000			120.19	-1.36	118.83	142.79	-3.47	139.32	20.49	17.2%	
12	10,000			218.94	-3.36	215.58	262.74	-7.62	255.12	39.54	18.3%	
13	20,000			416.44	-7.36	409.08	502.64	-15.92	486.72	77.64	19.0%	
14	GS 50-999 kW											
23	30,000	100	100	547.78	-4.02	543.76	609.16	-29.82	579.34	35.58	6.5%	
24	40,000	100	100	547.78	-4.02	543.76	609.16	-26.32	582.84	39.08	7.2%	
25	150,000	500	556	2,894.30	-24.52	2,869.78	3,154.17	-174.60	2,979.57	109.79	3.8%	
26	200,000	500	556	2,894.30	-24.52	2,869.78	3,154.17	-157.10	2,997.07	127.29	4.4%	
27	270,000	900	1,000	5,183.59	-44.52	5,139.07	5,637.10	-314.82	5,322.28	183.21	3.6%	
28	360,000	900	1,000	5,183.59	-44.52	5,139.07	5,637.10	-283.32	5,353.78	214.71	4.2%	
29	450,000	900	1,000	5,183.59	-44.52	5,139.07	5,637.10	-251.82	5,385.28	246.21	4.8%	
30	GS 1000-4999 kW											
31	300,000	1,000	1,111	5,508.68	-106.88	5,401.81	5,229.33	-406.65	4,822.68	-579.13	-10.7%	
32	400,000	1,000	1,111	5,508.68	-106.88	5,401.81	5,229.33	-370.65	4,858.68	-543.13	-10.1%	
33	500,000	1,000	1,111	5,508.68	-106.88	5,401.81	5,229.33	-334.65	4,894.68	-507.13	-9.4%	
34	600,000	2,000	2,222	10,312.02	-214.43	10,097.59	9,767.55	-813.99	8,953.56	-1,144.02	-11.3%	
35	800,000	2,000	2,222	10,312.02	-214.43	10,097.59	9,767.55	-741.99	9,025.56	-1,072.02	-10.6%	
36	1,000,000	2,000	2,222	10,312.02	-214.43	10,097.59	9,767.55	-669.99	9,097.56	-1,000.02	-9.9%	
37	Large Use											
38	1,500,000	5,000	5,556	24,499.04	-548.76	23,950.28	26,712.88	-2,257.65	24,455.23	504.95	2.1%	
39	2,000,000	5,000	5,556	24,499.04	-548.76	23,950.28	26,712.88	-2,082.65	24,630.23	679.95	2.8%	
40	2,500,000	5,000	5,556	24,499.04	-548.76	23,950.28	26,712.88	-1,907.65	24,805.23	854.95	3.6%	
41	3,000,000	10,000	11,111	46,359.04	-1,098.21	45,260.83	51,148.43	-4,515.99	46,632.44	1,371.61	3.0%	
42	4,000,000	10,000	11,111	46,359.04	-1,098.21	45,260.83	51,148.43	-4,165.99	46,982.44	1,721.61	3.8%	
43	5,000,000	10,000	11,111	46,359.04	-1,098.21	45,260.83	51,148.43	-3,815.99	47,332.44	2,071.61	4.6%	
44	Street Lighting			Connections	Mthly kVA							
45	9,108,245	162,353	26,765	673,324.73	-1,769.18	671,555.55	1,014,686.96	-9,982.94	1,004,704.02	333,148.48	49.6%	
46	365	1	1	20.65	-0.07	20.58	32.24	-0.37	31.87	11.28	54.8%	
47	Unmetered											
48	Scattered Loads			Customers	Connections							
49	4,367,777	1,124	21,782	193,779.08	-7,381.54	186,397.54	286,690.84	-6,374.60	280,316.24	93,918.70	50.4%	
50	365	1	1	19.01	-0.62	18.39	27.04	-0.48	26.56	8.17	44.5%	

2010 Total Bill Impact (Prefiled Evidence) - RPP Customers

	Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8	Col. 9	Col. 10	Col. 11	Col. 12	Col. 13	Col. 14
					2009				2010				2010 Change	
	kWh	kW	kVA		Distribution (\$)	Rate Rider (\$)	Non-Distribution (\$)	Total (\$)	Distribution (\$)	Rate Rider (\$)	Non-Distribution (\$)	Total (\$)	\$	%
Residential														
100					18.28	0.57	8.63	27.48	19.82	0.55	8.66	29.03	1.55	5.6%
250					20.43	0.45	21.20	42.08	22.35	0.36	21.27	43.98	1.91	4.5%
500					24.01	0.25	42.14	66.40	26.56	0.05	42.29	68.90	2.50	3.8%
800					28.31	0.01	67.55	95.86	31.61	-0.34	67.79	99.06	3.20	3.3%
1,000					31.17	-0.15	86.17	117.19	34.98	-0.59	86.47	120.86	3.67	3.1%
1,500					38.33	-0.55	132.73	170.51	43.40	-1.23	133.18	175.35	4.84	2.8%
2,000					45.49	-0.95	179.29	223.83	51.82	-1.86	179.89	229.85	6.02	2.7%
GS<50 kW														
2,000					60.94	-0.16	178.70	239.48	70.82	-1.72	180.55	249.65	10.17	4.2%
5,000					120.19	-1.36	456.51	575.34	142.79	-5.32	461.13	598.60	23.26	4.0%
10,000					218.94	-3.36	919.52	1,135.10	262.74	-11.32	928.75	1,180.17	45.07	4.0%
20,000					416.44	-7.36	1,845.54	2,254.62	502.64	-23.32	1,864.01	2,343.33	88.71	3.9%
GS 50-999 kW														
30,000	100	100			547.78	-4.02	2,815.28	3,359.04	609.16	-40.32	2,785.83	3,354.67	-4.37	-0.1%
40,000	100	100			547.78	-4.02	3,637.54	4,181.30	609.16	-40.32	3,608.09	4,176.93	-4.37	-0.1%
150,000	500	556			2,894.30	-24.52	14,102.40	16,972.18	3,154.17	-227.10	13,955.15	16,882.22	-89.96	-0.5%
200,000	500	556			2,894.30	-24.52	18,213.70	21,083.48	3,154.17	-227.10	18,066.45	20,993.52	-89.96	-0.4%
270,000	900	1,000			5,183.59	-44.52	25,389.52	30,528.59	5,637.10	-409.32	25,124.47	30,352.25	-176.34	-0.6%
360,000	900	1,000			5,183.59	-44.52	32,789.86	37,928.93	5,637.10	-409.32	32,524.81	37,752.59	-176.34	-0.5%
450,000	900	1,000			5,183.59	-44.52	40,190.20	45,329.27	5,637.10	-409.32	39,925.15	45,152.93	-176.34	-0.4%
GS 1000-4999 kW														
300,000	1,000	1,111			5,508.68	-106.88	28,581.30	33,983.11	5,229.33	-514.65	28,536.60	33,251.28	-731.83	-2.2%
400,000	1,000	1,111			5,508.68	-106.88	36,803.90	42,205.71	5,229.33	-514.65	36,759.20	41,473.88	-731.83	-1.7%
500,000	1,000	1,111			5,508.68	-106.88	45,026.50	50,428.31	5,229.33	-514.65	44,981.80	49,696.48	-731.83	-1.5%
600,000	2,000	2,222			10,312.02	-214.43	57,169.10	67,266.69	9,767.55	-1,029.99	57,079.70	65,817.26	-1,449.42	-2.2%
800,000	2,000	2,222			10,312.02	-214.43	73,614.30	83,711.89	9,767.55	-1,029.99	73,524.90	82,262.46	-1,449.42	-1.7%
1,000,000	2,000	2,222			10,312.02	-214.43	90,059.50	100,157.09	9,767.55	-1,029.99	89,970.10	98,707.66	-1,449.42	-1.4%
Large Use														
1,500,000	5,000	5,556			24,499.04	-548.76	141,277.13	165,227.40	26,712.88	-2,782.65	141,881.63	165,811.85	584.45	0.4%
2,000,000	5,000	5,556			24,499.04	-548.76	181,705.00	205,655.28	26,712.88	-2,782.65	182,309.50	206,239.73	584.45	0.3%
2,500,000	5,000	5,556			24,499.04	-548.76	222,132.88	246,083.15	26,712.88	-2,782.65	222,737.38	246,667.60	584.45	0.2%
3,000,000	10,000	11,111			46,359.04	-1,098.21	282,560.75	327,821.58	51,148.43	-5,565.99	283,769.75	329,352.19	1,530.61	0.5%
4,000,000	10,000	11,111			46,359.04	-1,098.21	363,416.50	408,677.33	51,148.43	-5,565.99	364,625.50	410,207.94	1,530.61	0.4%
5,000,000	10,000	11,111			46,359.04	-1,098.21	444,272.25	489,533.08	51,148.43	-5,565.99	445,481.25	491,063.69	1,530.61	0.3%
Street Lighting	Connections	Mthly kVA												
9,108,245	162,353	26,765			673,324.73	-1,769.18	872,048.16	1,543,603.71	1,014,686.96	-13,288.46	857,975.00	1,859,373.51	315,769.80	20.5%
365	1	1			20.65	-0.07	31.45	52.04	32.24	-0.50	30.93	62.67	10.63	20.4%
Unmetered Scattered Loads	Customers	Connections												
4,367,777	1,124	21,782			193,779.08	-7,381.54	390,409.14	576,806.68	286,690.84	-6,374.60	392,357.90	672,674.14	95,867.46	16.6%
365	1	1			19.01	-0.62	29.47	47.86	27.04	-0.48	29.63	56.19	8.34	17.4%

2010 Total Bill Impact (Prefiled Evidence) - Non RPP Customers

	Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8	Col. 9	Col. 10	Col. 11	Col. 12	Col. 13	Col. 14
				2009				2010				2010 Change		
	kWh	kW	kVA	Distribution (\$)	Rate Rider (\$)	Non-Distribution (\$)	Total (\$)	Distribution (\$)	Rate Rider (\$)	Non-Distribution (\$)	Total (\$)	\$	%	
1	Residential													
2	100			18.28	0.57	8.63	27.48	19.82	0.59	8.66	29.07	1.59	5.8%	
3	250			20.43	0.45	21.20	42.08	22.35	0.46	21.27	44.08	2.01	4.8%	
4	500			24.01	0.25	42.14	66.40	26.56	0.23	42.29	69.08	2.68	4.0%	
5	800			28.31	0.01	67.55	95.86	31.61	-0.04	67.79	99.36	3.50	3.6%	
6	1,000			31.17	-0.15	86.17	117.19	34.98	-0.22	86.47	121.23	4.04	3.4%	
7	1,500			38.33	-0.55	132.73	170.51	43.40	-0.67	133.18	175.91	5.40	3.2%	
8	2,000			45.49	-0.95	179.29	223.83	51.82	-1.12	179.89	230.59	6.76	3.0%	
9	GS<50 kW													
10	2,000			60.94	-0.16	178.70	239.48	70.82	-0.98	180.55	250.39	10.91	4.6%	
11	5,000			120.19	-1.36	456.51	575.34	142.79	-3.47	461.13	600.45	25.11	4.4%	
12	10,000			218.94	-3.36	919.52	1,135.10	262.74	-7.62	928.75	1,183.87	48.77	4.3%	
13	20,000			416.44	-7.36	1,845.54	2,254.62	502.64	-15.92	1,864.01	2,350.73	96.11	4.3%	
14	GS 50-999 kW													
15	30,000	100	100	547.78	-4.02	2,815.28	3,359.04	609.16	-29.82	2,785.83	3,365.17	6.13	0.2%	
16	40,000	100	100	547.78	-4.02	3,637.54	4,181.30	609.16	-26.32	3,608.09	4,190.93	9.63	0.2%	
17	150,000	500	556	2,894.30	-24.52	14,102.40	16,972.18	3,154.17	-174.60	13,955.15	16,934.72	-37.46	-0.2%	
18	200,000	500	556	2,894.30	-24.52	18,213.70	21,083.48	3,154.17	-157.10	18,066.45	21,063.52	-19.96	-0.1%	
19	270,000	900	1,000	5,183.59	-44.52	25,389.52	30,528.59	5,637.10	-314.82	25,124.47	30,446.75	-81.84	-0.3%	
20	360,000	900	1,000	5,183.59	-44.52	32,789.86	37,928.93	5,637.10	-283.32	32,524.81	37,878.59	-50.34	-0.1%	
21	450,000	900	1,000	5,183.59	-44.52	40,190.20	45,329.27	5,637.10	-251.82	39,925.15	45,310.43	-18.84	0.0%	
22	GS 1000-4999 kW													
23	300,000	1,000	1,111	5,508.68	-106.88	28,581.30	33,983.11	5,229.33	-406.65	28,536.60	33,359.28	-623.83	-1.8%	
24	400,000	1,000	1,111	5,508.68	-106.88	36,803.90	42,205.71	5,229.33	-370.65	36,759.20	41,617.88	-587.83	-1.4%	
25	500,000	1,000	1,111	5,508.68	-106.88	45,026.50	50,428.31	5,229.33	-334.65	44,981.80	49,876.48	-551.83	-1.1%	
26	600,000	2,000	2,222	10,312.02	-214.43	57,169.10	67,266.69	9,767.55	-813.99	57,079.70	66,033.26	-1,233.42	-1.8%	
27	800,000	2,000	2,222	10,312.02	-214.43	73,614.30	83,711.89	9,767.55	-741.99	73,524.90	82,550.46	-1,161.42	-1.4%	
28	1,000,000	2,000	2,222	10,312.02	-214.43	90,059.50	100,157.09	9,767.55	-669.99	89,970.10	99,067.66	-1,089.42	-1.1%	
29	Large Use													
30	1,500,000	5,000	5,556	24,499.04	-548.76	141,277.13	165,227.40	26,712.88	-2,257.65	141,881.63	166,336.85	1,109.45	0.7%	
31	2,000,000	5,000	5,556	24,499.04	-548.76	181,705.00	205,655.28	26,712.88	-2,082.65	182,309.50	206,939.73	1,284.45	0.6%	
32	2,500,000	5,000	5,556	24,499.04	-548.76	222,132.88	246,083.15	26,712.88	-1,907.65	222,737.38	247,542.60	1,459.45	0.6%	
33	3,000,000	10,000	11,111	46,359.04	-1,098.21	282,560.75	327,821.58	51,148.43	-4,515.99	283,769.75	330,402.19	2,580.61	0.8%	
34	4,000,000	10,000	11,111	46,359.04	-1,098.21	363,416.50	408,677.33	51,148.43	-4,165.99	364,625.50	411,607.94	2,930.61	0.7%	
35	5,000,000	10,000	11,111	46,359.04	-1,098.21	444,272.25	489,533.08	51,148.43	-3,815.99	445,481.25	492,813.69	3,280.61	0.7%	
36	Street Lighting													
37	Connections	Mthly kVA												
38	9,108,245	162,353	26,765	673,324.73	-1,769.18	872,048.16	1,543,603.71	1,014,686.96	-9,982.94	857,975.00	1,862,679.03	319,075.32	20.7%	
39	365	1	1	20.65	-0.07	31.45	52.04	32.24	-0.37	30.93	62.80	10.76	20.7%	
40	Unmetered													
41	Scattered Loads													
42	Customers	Connections												
43	4,367,777	1,124	21,782	193,779.08	-7,381.54	390,409.14	576,806.68	286,690.84	-6,374.60	392,357.90	672,674.14	95,867.46	16.6%	
44	365	1	1	19.01	-0.62	29.47	47.86	27.04	-0.48	29.63	56.19	8.34	17.4%	

2010 Distribution Bill Impact (As Per ADR)

	Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8	Col. 9	Col. 10	Col. 11	Col. 12	Col. 13
				2009 Rates				2010 Rates				2010 Change	
	kWh	kW	kVA	Customer (\$/cust)	Volumetric (\$/kWh or KVa)	Connection (\$/conn)	Dist Bill (\$)	Customer (\$/cust)	Volumetric (\$/kWh or KVa)	Connection (\$/conn)	Dist Bill (\$)	\$	%
1													
2	Residential												
3	100			16.85	0.01432		18.28	17.83	0.01548		19.38	1.10	6.0%
4	250			16.85	0.01432		20.43	17.83	0.01548		21.70	1.27	6.2%
5	500			16.85	0.01432		24.01	17.83	0.01548		25.57	1.56	6.5%
6	800			16.85	0.01432		28.31	17.83	0.01548		30.22	1.91	6.7%
7	1,000			16.85	0.01432		31.17	17.83	0.01548		33.31	2.14	6.9%
8	1,500			16.85	0.01432		38.33	17.83	0.01548		41.05	2.72	7.1%
9	2,000			16.85	0.01432		45.49	17.83	0.01548		48.79	3.30	7.3%
10	GS<50 kW												
11	2,000			21.44	0.01975		60.94	22.69	0.02262		67.93	6.99	11.5%
12	5,000			21.44	0.01975		120.19	22.69	0.02262		135.79	15.60	13.0%
13	10,000			21.44	0.01975		218.94	22.69	0.02262		248.89	29.95	13.7%
14	20,000			21.44	0.01975		416.44	22.69	0.02262		475.09	58.65	14.1%
23	GS 50-999 kW												
24	30,000	100	100	32.69	5.15090		547.78	34.60	5.4405		578.65	30.87	5.6%
25	40,000	100	100	32.69	5.15090		547.78	34.60	5.4405		578.65	30.87	5.6%
26	150,000	500	556	32.69	5.15090		2,894.30	34.60	5.4405		3,057.10	162.79	5.6%
27	200,000	500	556	32.69	5.15090		2,894.30	34.60	5.4405		3,057.10	162.79	5.6%
28	270,000	900	1,000	32.69	5.15090		5,183.59	34.60	5.4405		5,475.10	291.51	5.6%
29	360,000	900	1,000	32.69	5.15090		5,183.59	34.60	5.4405		5,475.10	291.51	5.6%
30	450,000	900	1,000	32.69	5.15090		5,183.59	34.60	5.4405		5,475.10	291.51	5.6%
31	GS 1000-4999 kW												
32	300,000	1,000	1,111	705.35	4.32300		5,508.68	746.46	3.8937		5,072.80	-435.89	-7.9%
33	400,000	1,000	1,111	705.35	4.32300		5,508.68	746.46	3.8937		5,072.80	-435.89	-7.9%
34	500,000	1,000	1,111	705.35	4.32300		5,508.68	746.46	3.8937		5,072.80	-435.89	-7.9%
35	600,000	2,000	2,222	705.35	4.32300		10,312.02	746.46	3.8937		9,399.13	-912.89	-8.9%
36	800,000	2,000	2,222	705.35	4.32300		10,312.02	746.46	3.8937		9,399.13	-912.89	-8.9%
37	1,000,000	2,000	2,222	705.35	4.32300		10,312.02	746.46	3.8937		9,399.13	-912.89	-8.9%
38	Large Use												
39	1,500,000	5,000	5,556	2639.04	3.93480		24,499.04	2792.86	4.1894		26,067.31	1,568.27	6.4%
40	2,000,000	5,000	5,556	2639.04	3.93480		24,499.04	2792.86	4.1894		26,067.31	1,568.27	6.4%
41	2,500,000	5,000	5,556	2639.04	3.93480		24,499.04	2792.86	4.1894		26,067.31	1,568.27	6.4%
42	3,000,000	10,000	11,111	2639.04	3.93480		46,359.04	2792.86	4.1894		49,341.75	2,982.71	6.4%
43	4,000,000	10,000	11,111	2639.04	3.93480		46,359.04	2792.86	4.1894		49,341.75	2,982.71	6.4%
44	5,000,000	10,000	11,111	2639.04	3.93480		46,359.04	2792.86	4.1894		49,341.75	2,982.71	6.4%
45	Street Lighting Connections Mthly kVA												
46	9,182,014	159,861	26,461	0.89	19.75810		665,085.50	0.94	30.8913		967,968.49	302,882.99	45.5%
47	365	1	1	0.89	19.75810		20.65	0.94	30.8913		31.83	11.19	54.2%
48	Unmetered Scattered Loads Customers Connections												
49	4,829,242	1,466	17,721	3.42	0.0417	0.35	212,788.64	3.62	0.06062	0.37	304,618.49	91,829.85	43.2%
50	365	1	1	3.42	0.0417	0.35	19.01	3.62	0.06062	0.37	26.12	7.11	37.4%

2010 Distribution + Rate Rider Bill Impact (as per ADR) - RPP Customers

	Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 8	Col. 9	Col. 10	Col. 12	Col. 13	Col. 14
				2009			2010			2010 Change		
	kWh	kW	kVA	Distribution (\$)	Rate Rider (\$)	Total (\$)	Distribution (\$)	Rate Rider (\$)	Total (\$)	\$	%	
1	Residential											
2	100			18.28	0.57	18.85	19.38	0.49	19.87	1.02	5.4%	
3	250			20.43	0.45	20.88	21.70	0.21	21.91	1.03	4.9%	
4	500			24.01	0.25	24.26	25.57	-0.27	25.30	1.04	4.3%	
5	800			28.31	0.01	28.32	30.22	-0.84	29.38	1.06	3.7%	
6	1,000			31.17	-0.15	31.02	33.31	-1.22	32.09	1.07	3.5%	
7	1,500			38.33	-0.55	37.78	41.05	-2.17	38.88	1.10	2.9%	
8	2,000			45.49	-0.95	44.54	48.79	-3.12	45.67	1.13	2.5%	
9	GS<50 kW											
10	2,000			60.94	-0.16	60.78	67.93	-2.92	65.01	4.23	7.0%	
11	5,000			120.19	-1.36	118.83	135.79	-8.32	127.47	8.64	7.3%	
12	10,000			218.94	-3.36	215.58	248.89	-17.32	231.57	15.99	7.4%	
13	20,000			416.44	-7.36	409.08	475.09	-35.32	439.77	30.69	7.5%	
14	GS 50-999 kW											
23	30,000	100	100	547.78	-4.02	543.76	578.65	-60.82	517.83	-25.93	-4.8%	
24	40,000	100	100	547.78	-4.02	543.76	578.65	-60.82	517.83	-25.93	-4.8%	
25	150,000	500	556	2,894.30	-24.52	2,869.78	3,057.10	-340.99	2,716.11	-153.67	-5.4%	
26	200,000	500	556	2,894.30	-24.52	2,869.78	3,057.10	-340.99	2,716.11	-153.67	-5.4%	
27	270,000	900	1,000	5,183.59	-44.52	5,139.07	5,475.10	-614.32	4,860.78	-278.29	-5.4%	
28	360,000	900	1,000	5,183.59	-44.52	5,139.07	5,475.10	-614.32	4,860.78	-278.29	-5.4%	
29	450,000	900	1,000	5,183.59	-44.52	5,139.07	5,475.10	-614.32	4,860.78	-278.29	-5.4%	
30	GS 1000-4999 kW											
31	300,000	1,000	1,111	5,508.68	-106.88	5,401.81	5,072.80	-772.32	4,300.48	-1,101.33	-20.4%	
32	400,000	1,000	1,111	5,508.68	-106.88	5,401.81	5,072.80	-772.32	4,300.48	-1,101.33	-20.4%	
33	500,000	1,000	1,111	5,508.68	-106.88	5,401.81	5,072.80	-772.32	4,300.48	-1,101.33	-20.4%	
34	600,000	2,000	2,222	10,312.02	-214.43	10,097.59	9,399.13	-1,545.32	7,853.81	-2,243.78	-22.2%	
35	800,000	2,000	2,222	10,312.02	-214.43	10,097.59	9,399.13	-1,545.32	7,853.81	-2,243.78	-22.2%	
36	1,000,000	2,000	2,222	10,312.02	-214.43	10,097.59	9,399.13	-1,545.32	7,853.81	-2,243.78	-22.2%	
37	Large Use											
38	1,500,000	5,000	5,556	24,499.04	-548.76	23,950.28	26,067.31	-4,174.88	21,892.43	-2,057.84	-8.6%	
39	2,000,000	5,000	5,556	24,499.04	-548.76	23,950.28	26,067.31	-4,174.88	21,892.43	-2,057.84	-8.6%	
40	2,500,000	5,000	5,556	24,499.04	-548.76	23,950.28	26,067.31	-4,174.88	21,892.43	-2,057.84	-8.6%	
41	3,000,000	10,000	11,111	46,359.04	-1,098.21	45,260.83	49,341.75	-8,350.43	40,991.32	-4,269.51	-9.4%	
42	4,000,000	10,000	11,111	46,359.04	-1,098.21	45,260.83	49,341.75	-8,350.43	40,991.32	-4,269.51	-9.4%	
43	5,000,000	10,000	11,111	46,359.04	-1,098.21	45,260.83	49,341.75	-8,350.43	40,991.32	-4,269.51	-9.4%	
44	Street Lighting	Connections	Mthly kVA									
45	9,182,014	159,861	26,461	665,085.50	-1,749.04	663,336.46	967,968.49	-19,932.69	948,035.79	284,699.34	42.9%	
46	365	1	1	20.65	-0.07	20.58	31.83	-0.75	31.08	10.50	51.0%	
47	Unmetered											
48	Scattered Loads	Customers	Connections									
49	4,829,242	1,466	17,721	212,788.64	-8,161.42	204,627.22	304,618.49	-9,561.90	295,056.59	90,429.37	44.2%	
50	365	1	1	19.01	-0.62	18.39	26.12	-0.72	25.39	7.01	38.1%	

2010 Distribution + Rate Rider Bill Impact (as per ADR) - Non RPP Customers

	Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 8	Col. 9	Col. 10	Col. 12	Col. 13	Col. 14
				2009			2010			2010 Change		
	kWh	kW	kVA	Distribution (\$)	Rate Rider (\$)	Total (\$)	Distribution (\$)	Rate Rider (\$)	Total (\$)	\$	%	
1	Residential											
2	100			18.28	0.57	18.85	19.38	0.55	19.93	1.07	5.7%	
3	250			20.43	0.45	20.88	21.70	0.34	22.04	1.16	5.6%	
4	500			24.01	0.25	24.26	25.57	0.01	25.58	1.32	5.4%	
5	800			28.31	0.01	28.32	30.22	-0.40	29.82	1.50	5.3%	
6	1,000			31.17	-0.15	31.02	33.31	-0.67	32.64	1.62	5.2%	
7	1,500			38.33	-0.55	37.78	41.05	-1.35	39.71	1.93	5.1%	
8	2,000			45.49	-0.95	44.54	48.79	-2.02	46.77	2.23	5.0%	
9	GS<50 kW											
10	2,000			60.94	-0.16	60.78	67.93	-1.82	66.11	5.33	8.8%	
11	5,000			120.19	-1.36	118.83	135.79	-5.57	130.22	11.39	9.6%	
12	10,000			218.94	-3.36	215.58	248.89	-11.82	237.07	21.49	10.0%	
13	20,000			416.44	-7.36	409.08	475.09	-24.32	450.77	41.69	10.2%	
14	GS 50-999 kW											
23	30,000	100	100	547.78	-4.02	543.76	578.65	-44.92	533.73	-10.03	-1.8%	
24	40,000	100	100	547.78	-4.02	543.76	578.65	-39.62	539.03	-4.73	-0.9%	
25	150,000	500	556	2,894.30	-24.52	2,869.78	3,057.10	-261.49	2,795.61	-74.17	-2.6%	
26	200,000	500	556	2,894.30	-24.52	2,869.78	3,057.10	-234.99	2,822.11	-47.67	-1.7%	
27	270,000	900	1,000	5,183.59	-44.52	5,139.07	5,475.10	-471.22	5,003.88	-135.19	-2.6%	
28	360,000	900	1,000	5,183.59	-44.52	5,139.07	5,475.10	-423.52	5,051.58	-87.49	-1.7%	
29	450,000	900	1,000	5,183.59	-44.52	5,139.07	5,475.10	-375.82	5,099.28	-39.79	-0.8%	
30	GS 1000-4999 kW											
31	300,000	1,000	1,111	5,508.68	-106.88	5,401.81	5,072.80	-607.32	4,465.48	-936.33	-17.3%	
32	400,000	1,000	1,111	5,508.68	-106.88	5,401.81	5,072.80	-552.32	4,520.48	-881.33	-16.3%	
33	500,000	1,000	1,111	5,508.68	-106.88	5,401.81	5,072.80	-497.32	4,575.48	-826.33	-15.3%	
34	600,000	2,000	2,222	10,312.02	-214.43	10,097.59	9,399.13	-1,215.32	8,183.81	-1,913.78	-19.0%	
35	800,000	2,000	2,222	10,312.02	-214.43	10,097.59	9,399.13	-1,105.32	8,293.81	-1,803.78	-17.9%	
36	1,000,000	2,000	2,222	10,312.02	-214.43	10,097.59	9,399.13	-995.32	8,403.81	-1,693.78	-16.8%	
37	Large Use											
38	1,500,000	5,000	5,556	24,499.04	-548.76	23,950.28	26,067.31	-3,379.88	22,687.43	-1,262.84	-5.3%	
39	2,000,000	5,000	5,556	24,499.04	-548.76	23,950.28	26,067.31	-3,114.88	22,952.43	-997.84	-4.2%	
40	2,500,000	5,000	5,556	24,499.04	-548.76	23,950.28	26,067.31	-2,849.88	23,217.43	-732.84	-3.1%	
41	3,000,000	10,000	11,111	46,359.04	-1,098.21	45,260.83	49,341.75	-6,760.43	42,581.32	-2,679.51	-5.9%	
42	4,000,000	10,000	11,111	46,359.04	-1,098.21	45,260.83	49,341.75	-6,230.43	43,111.32	-2,149.51	-4.7%	
43	5,000,000	10,000	11,111	46,359.04	-1,098.21	45,260.83	49,341.75	-5,700.43	43,641.32	-1,619.51	-3.6%	
44	Street Lighting			Connections	Mthly kVA							
45	9,182,014	159,861	26,461	665,085.50	-1,749.04	663,336.46	967,968.49	-14,974.41	952,994.08	289,657.63	43.7%	
46	365	1	1	20.65	-0.07	20.58	31.83	-0.56	31.28	10.69	52.0%	
47	Unmetered											
48	Scattered Loads			Customers	Connections							
49	4,829,242	1,466	17,721	212,788.64	-8,161.42	204,627.22	304,618.49	-9,561.90	295,056.59	90,429.37	44.2%	
50	365	1	1	19.01	-0.62	18.39	26.12	-0.72	25.39	7.01	38.1%	

2010 Total Bill Impact (as per ADR) - RPP Customers

Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8	Col. 9	Col. 10	Col. 11	Col. 12	Col. 13	Col. 14
				2009				2010				2010 Change	
	kWh	kW	kVA	Distribution (\$)	Rate Rider (\$)	Non-Distribution (\$)	Total (\$)	Distribution (\$)	Rate Rider (\$)	Non-Distribution (\$)	Total (\$)	\$	%
Residential													
100				18.28	0.57	8.63	27.48	19.38	0.49	8.66	28.53	1.05	3.8%
250				20.43	0.45	21.20	42.08	21.70	0.21	21.27	43.18	1.10	2.6%
500				24.01	0.25	42.14	66.40	25.57	-0.27	42.29	67.59	1.19	1.8%
800				28.31	0.01	67.55	95.86	30.22	-0.84	67.79	97.16	1.30	1.4%
1,000				31.17	-0.15	86.17	117.19	33.31	-1.22	86.47	118.56	1.37	1.2%
1,500				38.33	-0.55	132.73	170.51	41.05	-2.17	133.18	172.06	1.55	0.9%
2,000				45.49	-0.95	179.29	223.83	48.79	-3.12	179.89	225.57	1.73	0.8%
GS<50 kW													
2,000				60.94	-0.16	178.70	239.48	67.93	-2.92	180.55	245.56	6.08	2.5%
5,000				120.19	-1.36	456.51	575.34	135.79	-8.32	461.13	588.60	13.26	2.3%
10,000				218.94	-3.36	919.52	1,135.10	248.89	-17.32	928.75	1,160.32	25.22	2.2%
20,000				416.44	-7.36	1,845.54	2,254.62	475.09	-35.32	1,864.01	2,303.78	49.16	2.2%
GS 50-999 kW													
30,000	100	100		547.78	-4.02	2,815.28	3,359.04	578.65	-60.82	2,785.83	3,303.66	-55.38	-1.6%
40,000	100	100		547.78	-4.02	3,637.54	4,181.30	578.65	-60.82	3,608.09	4,125.92	-55.38	-1.3%
150,000	500	556		2,894.30	-24.52	14,102.40	16,972.18	3,057.10	-340.99	13,955.15	16,671.26	-300.92	-1.8%
200,000	500	556		2,894.30	-24.52	18,213.70	21,083.48	3,057.10	-340.99	18,066.45	20,782.56	-300.92	-1.4%
270,000	900	1,000		5,183.59	-44.52	25,389.52	30,528.59	5,475.10	-614.32	25,124.47	29,985.25	-543.34	-1.8%
360,000	900	1,000		5,183.59	-44.52	32,789.86	37,928.93	5,475.10	-614.32	32,524.81	37,385.59	-543.34	-1.4%
450,000	900	1,000		5,183.59	-44.52	40,190.20	45,329.27	5,475.10	-614.32	39,925.15	44,785.93	-543.34	-1.2%
GS 1000-4999 kW													
300,000	1,000	1,111		5,508.68	-106.88	28,581.30	33,983.11	5,072.80	-772.32	28,536.60	32,837.08	-1,146.03	-3.4%
400,000	1,000	1,111		5,508.68	-106.88	36,803.90	42,205.71	5,072.80	-772.32	36,759.20	41,059.68	-1,146.03	-2.7%
500,000	1,000	1,111		5,508.68	-106.88	45,026.50	50,428.31	5,072.80	-772.32	44,981.80	49,282.28	-1,146.03	-2.3%
600,000	2,000	2,222		10,312.02	-214.43	57,169.10	67,266.69	9,399.13	-1,545.32	57,079.70	64,933.51	-2,333.18	-3.5%
800,000	2,000	2,222		10,312.02	-214.43	73,614.30	83,711.89	9,399.13	-1,545.32	73,524.90	81,378.71	-2,333.18	-2.8%
1,000,000	2,000	2,222		10,312.02	-214.43	90,059.50	100,157.09	9,399.13	-1,545.32	89,970.10	97,823.91	-2,333.18	-2.3%
Large Use													
1,500,000	5,000	5,556		24,499.04	-548.76	141,277.13	165,227.40	26,067.31	-4,174.88	141,881.63	163,774.06	-1,453.34	-0.9%
2,000,000	5,000	5,556		24,499.04	-548.76	181,705.00	205,655.28	26,067.31	-4,174.88	182,309.50	204,201.93	-1,453.34	-0.7%
2,500,000	5,000	5,556		24,499.04	-548.76	222,132.88	246,083.15	26,067.31	-4,174.88	222,737.38	244,629.81	-1,453.34	-0.6%
3,000,000	10,000	11,111		46,359.04	-1,098.21	282,560.75	327,821.58	49,341.75	-8,350.43	283,769.75	324,761.07	-3,060.51	-0.9%
4,000,000	10,000	11,111		46,359.04	-1,098.21	363,416.50	408,677.33	49,341.75	-8,350.43	364,625.50	405,616.82	-3,060.51	-0.7%
5,000,000	10,000	11,111		46,359.04	-1,098.21	444,272.25	489,533.08	49,341.75	-8,350.43	445,481.25	486,472.57	-3,060.51	-0.6%
Street Lighting	Connections	Mthly kVA											
9,182,014	159,861	26,461		665,085.50	-1,749.04	876,712.06	1,540,048.52	967,968.49	-19,932.69	862,799.13	1,810,834.93	270,786.41	17.6%
365	1	1		20.65	-0.07	31.45	52.04	31.83	-0.75	30.93	62.01	9.97	19.2%
Unmetered													
Scattered Loads	Customers	Connections											
4,829,242	1,466	17,721		212,788.64	-8,161.42	431,657.44	636,284.67	304,618.49	-9,561.90	433,812.10	728,868.69	92,584.03	14.6%
365	1	1		19.01	-0.62	29.47	47.86	26.12	-0.72	29.63	55.02	7.17	15.0%

2010 Total Bill Impact (as per ADR) - Non RPP Customers

Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8	Col. 9	Col. 10	Col. 11	Col. 12	Col. 13	Col. 14
				2009				2010				2010 Change	
	kWh	kW	kVA	Distribution (\$)	Rate Rider (\$)	Non-Distribution (\$)	Total (\$)	Distribution (\$)	Rate Rider (\$)	Non-Distribution (\$)	Total (\$)	\$	%
Residential													
100				18.28	0.57	8.63	27.48	19.38	0.55	8.66	28.58	1.10	4.0%
250				20.43	0.45	21.20	42.08	21.70	0.34	21.27	43.32	1.24	2.9%
500				24.01	0.25	42.14	66.40	25.57	0.01	42.29	67.87	1.47	2.2%
800				28.31	0.01	67.55	95.86	30.22	-0.40	67.79	97.60	1.74	1.8%
1,000				31.17	-0.15	86.17	117.19	33.31	-0.67	86.47	119.11	1.92	1.6%
1,500				38.33	-0.55	132.73	170.51	41.05	-1.35	133.18	172.89	2.38	1.4%
2,000				45.49	-0.95	179.29	223.83	48.79	-2.02	179.89	226.67	2.83	1.3%
GS<50 kW													
2,000				60.94	-0.16	178.70	239.48	67.93	-1.82	180.55	246.66	7.18	3.0%
5,000				120.19	-1.36	456.51	575.34	135.79	-5.57	461.13	591.35	16.01	2.8%
10,000				218.94	-3.36	919.52	1,135.10	248.89	-11.82	928.75	1,165.82	30.72	2.7%
20,000				416.44	-7.36	1,845.54	2,254.62	475.09	-24.32	1,864.01	2,314.78	60.16	2.7%
GS 50-999 kW													
30,000	100	100		547.78	-4.02	2,815.28	3,359.04	578.65	-44.92	2,785.83	3,319.56	-39.48	-1.2%
40,000	100	100		547.78	-4.02	3,637.54	4,181.30	578.65	-39.62	3,608.09	4,147.12	-34.18	-0.8%
150,000	500	556		2,894.30	-24.52	14,102.40	16,972.18	3,057.10	-261.49	13,955.15	16,750.76	-221.42	-1.3%
200,000	500	556		2,894.30	-24.52	18,213.70	21,083.48	3,057.10	-234.99	18,066.45	20,888.56	-194.92	-0.9%
270,000	900	1,000		5,183.59	-44.52	25,389.52	30,528.59	5,475.10	-471.22	25,124.47	30,128.35	-400.24	-1.3%
360,000	900	1,000		5,183.59	-44.52	32,789.86	37,928.93	5,475.10	-423.52	32,524.81	37,576.39	-352.54	-0.9%
450,000	900	1,000		5,183.59	-44.52	40,190.20	45,329.27	5,475.10	-375.82	39,925.15	45,024.43	-304.84	-0.7%
GS 1000-4999 kW													
300,000	1,000	1,111		5,508.68	-106.88	28,581.30	33,983.11	5,072.80	-607.32	28,536.60	33,002.08	-981.03	-2.9%
400,000	1,000	1,111		5,508.68	-106.88	36,803.90	42,205.71	5,072.80	-552.32	36,759.20	41,279.68	-926.03	-2.2%
500,000	1,000	1,111		5,508.68	-106.88	45,026.50	50,428.31	5,072.80	-497.32	44,981.80	49,557.28	-871.03	-1.7%
600,000	2,000	2,222		10,312.02	-214.43	57,169.10	67,266.69	9,399.13	-1,215.32	57,079.70	65,263.51	-2,003.18	-3.0%
800,000	2,000	2,222		10,312.02	-214.43	73,614.30	83,711.89	9,399.13	-1,105.32	73,524.90	81,818.71	-1,893.18	-2.3%
1,000,000	2,000	2,222		10,312.02	-214.43	90,059.50	100,157.09	9,399.13	-995.32	89,970.10	98,373.91	-1,783.18	-1.8%
Large Use													
1,500,000	5,000	5,556		24,499.04	-548.76	141,277.13	165,227.40	26,067.31	-3,379.88	141,881.63	164,569.06	-658.34	-0.4%
2,000,000	5,000	5,556		24,499.04	-548.76	181,705.00	205,655.28	26,067.31	-3,114.88	182,309.50	205,261.93	-393.34	-0.2%
2,500,000	5,000	5,556		24,499.04	-548.76	222,132.88	246,083.15	26,067.31	-2,849.88	222,737.38	245,954.81	-128.34	-0.1%
3,000,000	10,000	11,111		46,359.04	-1,098.21	282,560.75	327,821.58	49,341.75	-6,760.43	283,769.75	326,351.07	-1,470.51	-0.4%
4,000,000	10,000	11,111		46,359.04	-1,098.21	363,416.50	408,677.33	49,341.75	-6,230.43	364,625.50	407,736.82	-940.51	-0.2%
5,000,000	10,000	11,111		46,359.04	-1,098.21	444,272.25	489,533.08	49,341.75	-5,700.43	445,481.25	489,122.57	-410.51	-0.1%
Street Lighting	Connections	Mthly kVA											
9,182,014	159,861	26,461		665,085.50	-1,749.04	876,712.06	1,540,048.52	967,968.49	-14,974.41	862,799.13	1,815,793.21	275,744.70	17.9%
365	1	1		20.65	-0.07	31.45	52.04	31.83	-0.56	30.93	62.21	10.17	19.5%
Unmetered Scattered Loads	Customers	Connections											
4,829,242	1,466	17,721		212,788.64	-8,161.42	431,657.44	636,284.67	304,618.49	-9,561.90	433,812.10	728,868.69	92,584.03	14.6%
365	1	1		19.01	-0.62	29.47	47.86	26.12	-0.72	29.63	55.02	7.17	15.0%

2010 Distribution Bill Impact (ADR plus Cost of Capital Estimate)

	Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8	Col. 9	Col. 10	Col. 11	Col. 12	Col. 13
	2009 Rates				2010 Rates				2010 Change				
	kWh	kW	kVA	Customer (\$/cust)	Volumetric (\$/kWh or KVa)	Connection (\$/conn)	Dist Bill (\$)	Customer (\$/cust)	Volumetric (\$/kWh or KVa)	Connection (\$/conn)	Dist Bill (\$)	\$	%
Residential													
100				16.85	0.01432		18.28	18.63	0.01619		20.25	1.97	10.8%
250				16.85	0.01432		20.43	18.63	0.01619		22.68	2.25	11.0%
500				16.85	0.01432		24.01	18.63	0.01619		26.72	2.71	11.3%
800				16.85	0.01432		28.31	18.63	0.01619		31.58	3.28	11.6%
1,000				16.85	0.01432		31.17	18.63	0.01619		34.82	3.65	11.7%
1,500				16.85	0.01432		38.33	18.63	0.01619		42.91	4.58	12.0%
2,000				16.85	0.01432		45.49	18.63	0.01619		51.01	5.52	12.1%
GS<50 kW													
2,000				21.44	0.01975		60.94	23.70	0.02357		70.84	9.90	16.3%
5,000				21.44	0.01975		120.19	23.70	0.02357		141.55	21.36	17.8%
10,000				21.44	0.01975		218.94	23.70	0.02357		259.40	40.46	18.5%
20,000				21.44	0.01975		416.44	23.70	0.02357		495.10	78.66	18.9%
GS 50-999 kW													
30,000	100	100		32.69	5.15090		547.78	36.14	5.6930		605.44	57.66	10.5%
40,000	100	100		32.69	5.15090		547.78	36.14	5.6930		605.44	57.66	10.5%
150,000	500	556		32.69	5.15090		2,894.30	36.14	5.6930		3,198.92	304.62	10.5%
200,000	500	556		32.69	5.15090		2,894.30	36.14	5.6930		3,198.92	304.62	10.5%
270,000	900	1,000		32.69	5.15090		5,183.59	36.14	5.6930		5,729.14	545.55	10.5%
360,000	900	1,000		32.69	5.15090		5,183.59	36.14	5.6930		5,729.14	545.55	10.5%
450,000	900	1,000		32.69	5.15090		5,183.59	36.14	5.6930		5,729.14	545.55	10.5%
GS 1000-4999 kW													
300,000	1,000	1,111		705.35	4.32300		5,508.68	779.85	4.0519		5,281.96	-226.73	-4.1%
400,000	1,000	1,111		705.35	4.32300		5,508.68	779.85	4.0519		5,281.96	-226.73	-4.1%
500,000	1,000	1,111		705.35	4.32300		5,508.68	779.85	4.0519		5,281.96	-226.73	-4.1%
600,000	2,000	2,222		705.35	4.32300		10,312.02	779.85	4.0519		9,784.07	-527.95	-5.1%
800,000	2,000	2,222		705.35	4.32300		10,312.02	779.85	4.0519		9,784.07	-527.95	-5.1%
1,000,000	2,000	2,222		705.35	4.32300		10,312.02	779.85	4.0519		9,784.07	-527.95	-5.1%
Large Use													
1,500,000	5,000	5,556		2639.04	3.93480		24,499.04	2917.76	4.3512		27,091.10	2,592.06	10.6%
2,000,000	5,000	5,556		2639.04	3.93480		24,499.04	2917.76	4.3512		27,091.10	2,592.06	10.6%
2,500,000	5,000	5,556		2639.04	3.93480		24,499.04	2917.76	4.3512		27,091.10	2,592.06	10.6%
3,000,000	10,000	11,111		2639.04	3.93480		46,359.04	2917.76	4.3512		51,264.43	4,905.39	10.6%
4,000,000	10,000	11,111		2639.04	3.93480		46,359.04	2917.76	4.3512		51,264.43	4,905.39	10.6%
5,000,000	10,000	11,111		2639.04	3.93480		46,359.04	2917.76	4.3512		51,264.43	4,905.39	10.6%
Street Lighting	Connections	Mthly kVA											
9,182,014	159,861	26,461		0.89	19.75810		665,085.50	0.98	32.5338		1,018,163.52	353,078.03	53.1%
365	1	1		0.89	19.75810		20.65	0.98	32.5338		33.52	12.87	62.3%
Unmetered Scattered Loads	Customers	Connections											
4,829,242	1,466	17,721		3.42	0.0417	0.35	212,788.64	3.78	0.06373	0.39	320,168.27	107,379.63	50.5%
365	1	1		3.42	0.0417	0.35	19.01	3.78	0.06373	0.39	27.43	8.42	44.3%

2010 Distribution + Rate Rider Bill Impact (ADR plus Cost of Capital Estimate) - RPP Customers

	Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 8	Col. 9	Col. 10	Col. 12	Col. 13	Col. 14
				2009			2010 Rate Rider			2010 Change		
	kWh	kW	kVA	Distribution (\$)	Rate Rider (\$)	Total (\$)	Distribution (\$)	(\$)	Total (\$)	\$	%	
1	Residential											
2	100			18.28	0.57	18.85	20.25	0.49	20.74	1.89	10.0%	
3	250			20.43	0.45	20.88	22.68	0.21	22.88	2.00	9.6%	
4	500			24.01	0.25	24.26	26.72	-0.27	26.45	2.19	9.0%	
5	800			28.31	0.01	28.32	31.58	-0.84	30.74	2.43	8.6%	
6	1,000			31.17	-0.15	31.02	34.82	-1.22	33.60	2.58	8.3%	
7	1,500			38.33	-0.55	37.78	42.91	-2.17	40.74	2.96	7.8%	
8	2,000			45.49	-0.95	44.54	51.01	-3.12	47.89	3.35	7.5%	
9	GS<50 kW											
10	2,000			60.94	-0.16	60.78	70.84	-2.92	67.92	7.14	11.8%	
11	5,000			120.19	-1.36	118.83	141.55	-8.32	133.23	14.40	12.1%	
12	10,000			218.94	-3.36	215.58	259.40	-17.32	242.08	26.50	12.3%	
13	20,000			416.44	-7.36	409.08	495.10	-35.32	459.78	50.70	12.4%	
14	GS 50-999 kW											
23	30,000	100	100	547.78	-4.02	543.76	605.44	-60.82	544.62	0.86	0.2%	
24	40,000	100	100	547.78	-4.02	543.76	605.44	-60.82	544.62	0.86	0.2%	
25	150,000	500	556	2,894.30	-24.52	2,869.78	3,198.92	-340.99	2,857.93	-11.85	-0.4%	
26	200,000	500	556	2,894.30	-24.52	2,869.78	3,198.92	-340.99	2,857.93	-11.85	-0.4%	
27	270,000	900	1,000	5,183.59	-44.52	5,139.07	5,729.14	-614.32	5,114.82	-24.25	-0.5%	
28	360,000	900	1,000	5,183.59	-44.52	5,139.07	5,729.14	-614.32	5,114.82	-24.25	-0.5%	
29	450,000	900	1,000	5,183.59	-44.52	5,139.07	5,729.14	-614.32	5,114.82	-24.25	-0.5%	
30	GS 1000-4999 kW											
31	300,000	1,000	1,111	5,508.68	-106.88	5,401.81	5,281.96	-772.32	4,509.64	-892.17	-16.5%	
32	400,000	1,000	1,111	5,508.68	-106.88	5,401.81	5,281.96	-772.32	4,509.64	-892.17	-16.5%	
33	500,000	1,000	1,111	5,508.68	-106.88	5,401.81	5,281.96	-772.32	4,509.64	-892.17	-16.5%	
34	600,000	2,000	2,222	10,312.02	-214.43	10,097.59	9,784.07	-1,545.32	8,238.75	-1,858.84	-18.4%	
35	800,000	2,000	2,222	10,312.02	-214.43	10,097.59	9,784.07	-1,545.32	8,238.75	-1,858.84	-18.4%	
36	1,000,000	2,000	2,222	10,312.02	-214.43	10,097.59	9,784.07	-1,545.32	8,238.75	-1,858.84	-18.4%	
37	Large Use											
38	1,500,000	5,000	5,556	24,499.04	-548.76	23,950.28	27,091.10	-4,174.88	22,916.22	-1,034.05	-4.3%	
39	2,000,000	5,000	5,556	24,499.04	-548.76	23,950.28	27,091.10	-4,174.88	22,916.22	-1,034.05	-4.3%	
40	2,500,000	5,000	5,556	24,499.04	-548.76	23,950.28	27,091.10	-4,174.88	22,916.22	-1,034.05	-4.3%	
41	3,000,000	10,000	11,111	46,359.04	-1,098.21	45,260.83	51,264.43	-8,350.43	42,914.00	-2,346.83	-5.2%	
42	4,000,000	10,000	11,111	46,359.04	-1,098.21	45,260.83	51,264.43	-8,350.43	42,914.00	-2,346.83	-5.2%	
43	5,000,000	10,000	11,111	46,359.04	-1,098.21	45,260.83	51,264.43	-8,350.43	42,914.00	-2,346.83	-5.2%	
44	Street Lighting			Connections	Mthly kVA							
45	9,182,014	159,861	26,461	665,085.50	-1,749.04	663,336.46	1,018,163.52	-19,932.69	998,230.83	334,894.37	50.5%	
46	365	1	1	20.65	-0.07	20.58	33.52	-0.75	32.76	12.18	59.2%	
47	Unmetered											
48	Scattered Loads			Customers	Connections							
49	4,829,242	1,466	17,721	212,788.64	-8,161.42	204,627.22	320,168.27	-9,561.90	310,606.37	105,979.15	51.8%	
50	365	1	1	19.01	-0.62	18.39	27.43	-0.72	26.71	8.32	45.2%	

2010 Distribution + Rate Rider Bill Impact (ADR plus Cost of Capital Estimate) - Non RPP Customers

Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 8	Col. 9	Col. 10	Col. 12	Col. 13	Col. 14
			2009			2010			2010 Change		
	kWh	kW	kVA	Distribution (\$)	Rate Rider (\$)	Total (\$)	Distribution (\$)	Rate Rider (\$)	Total (\$)	\$	%
Residential											
100				18.28	0.57	18.85	20.25	0.55	20.79	1.94	10.3%
250				20.43	0.45	20.88	22.68	0.34	23.02	2.14	10.2%
500				24.01	0.25	24.26	26.72	0.01	26.73	2.47	10.2%
800				28.31	0.01	28.32	31.58	-0.40	31.18	2.87	10.1%
1,000				31.17	-0.15	31.02	34.82	-0.67	34.15	3.13	10.1%
1,500				38.33	-0.55	37.78	42.91	-1.35	41.57	3.79	10.0%
2,000				45.49	-0.95	44.54	51.01	-2.02	48.99	4.45	10.0%
GS<50 kW											
2,000				60.94	-0.16	60.78	70.84	-1.82	69.02	8.24	13.6%
5,000				120.19	-1.36	118.83	141.55	-5.57	135.98	17.15	14.4%
10,000				218.94	-3.36	215.58	259.40	-11.82	247.58	32.00	14.8%
20,000				416.44	-7.36	409.08	495.10	-24.32	470.78	61.70	15.1%
GS 50-999 kW											
30,000	100	100		547.78	-4.02	543.76	605.44	-44.92	560.52	16.76	3.1%
40,000	100	100		547.78	-4.02	543.76	605.44	-39.62	565.82	22.06	4.1%
150,000	500	556		2,894.30	-24.52	2,869.78	3,198.92	-261.49	2,937.43	67.65	2.4%
200,000	500	556		2,894.30	-24.52	2,869.78	3,198.92	-234.99	2,963.93	94.15	3.3%
270,000	900	1,000		5,183.59	-44.52	5,139.07	5,729.14	-471.22	5,257.92	118.85	2.3%
360,000	900	1,000		5,183.59	-44.52	5,139.07	5,729.14	-423.52	5,305.62	166.55	3.2%
450,000	900	1,000		5,183.59	-44.52	5,139.07	5,729.14	-375.82	5,353.32	214.25	4.2%
GS 1000-4999 kW											
300,000	1,000	1,111		5,508.68	-106.88	5,401.81	5,281.96	-607.32	4,674.64	-727.17	-13.5%
400,000	1,000	1,111		5,508.68	-106.88	5,401.81	5,281.96	-552.32	4,729.64	-672.17	-12.4%
500,000	1,000	1,111		5,508.68	-106.88	5,401.81	5,281.96	-497.32	4,784.64	-617.17	-11.4%
600,000	2,000	2,222		10,312.02	-214.43	10,097.59	9,784.07	-1,215.32	8,568.75	-1,528.84	-15.1%
800,000	2,000	2,222		10,312.02	-214.43	10,097.59	9,784.07	-1,105.32	8,678.75	-1,418.84	-14.1%
1,000,000	2,000	2,222		10,312.02	-214.43	10,097.59	9,784.07	-995.32	8,788.75	-1,308.84	-13.0%
Large Use											
1,500,000	5,000	5,556		24,499.04	-548.76	23,950.28	27,091.10	-3,379.88	23,711.22	-239.05	-1.0%
2,000,000	5,000	5,556		24,499.04	-548.76	23,950.28	27,091.10	-3,114.88	23,976.22	25.95	0.1%
2,500,000	5,000	5,556		24,499.04	-548.76	23,950.28	27,091.10	-2,849.88	24,241.22	290.95	1.2%
3,000,000	10,000	11,111		46,359.04	-1,098.21	45,260.83	51,264.43	-6,760.43	44,504.00	-756.83	-1.7%
4,000,000	10,000	11,111		46,359.04	-1,098.21	45,260.83	51,264.43	-6,230.43	45,034.00	-226.83	-0.5%
5,000,000	10,000	11,111		46,359.04	-1,098.21	45,260.83	51,264.43	-5,700.43	45,564.00	303.17	0.7%
Street Lighting	Connections	Mthly kVA									
9,182,014	159,861	26,461		665,085.50	-1,749.04	663,336.46	1,018,163.52	-14,974.41	1,003,189.12	339,852.66	51.2%
365	1	1		20.65	-0.07	20.58	33.52	-0.56	32.96	12.38	60.1%
Unmetered											
Scattered Loads	Customers	Connections									
4,829,242	1,466	17,721		212,788.64	-8,161.42	204,627.22	320,168.27	-9,561.90	310,606.37	105,979.15	51.8%
365	1	1		19.01	-0.62	18.39	27.43	-0.72	26.71	8.32	45.2%

2010 Total Bill Impact (ADR plus Cost of Capital Estimate) - RPP Customers

	Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8	Col. 9	Col. 10	Col. 11	Col. 12	Col. 13	Col. 14
				2009				2010				2010 Change		
					Rate Rider	Non-Distribution			Rate Rider	Non-Distribution				
	kWh	kW	kVA	Distribution (\$)	(\$)	(\$)	Total (\$)	Distribution (\$)	(\$)	(\$)	Total (\$)		\$	%
1														
2	Residential													
3	100			18.28	0.57	8.63	27.48	20.25	0.49	8.66	29.40		1.92	7.0%
4	250			20.43	0.45	21.20	42.08	22.68	0.21	21.27	44.15		2.08	4.9%
5	500			24.01	0.25	42.14	66.40	26.72	-0.27	42.29	68.75		2.35	3.5%
6	800			28.31	0.01	67.55	95.86	31.58	-0.84	67.79	98.53		2.67	2.8%
7	1,000			31.17	-0.15	86.17	117.19	34.82	-1.22	86.47	120.07		2.88	2.5%
8	1,500			38.33	-0.55	132.73	170.51	42.91	-2.17	133.18	173.93		3.42	2.0%
9	2,000			45.49	-0.95	179.29	223.83	51.01	-3.12	179.89	227.78		3.95	1.8%
10	GS<50 kW													
11	2,000			60.94	-0.16	178.70	239.48	70.84	-2.92	180.55	248.48		8.99	3.8%
12	5,000			120.19	-1.36	456.51	575.34	141.55	-8.32	461.13	594.36		19.02	3.3%
13	10,000			218.94	-3.36	919.52	1,135.10	259.40	-17.32	928.75	1,170.84		35.74	3.1%
14	20,000			416.44	-7.36	1,845.54	2,254.62	495.10	-35.32	1,864.01	2,323.79		69.17	3.1%
23	GS 50-999 kW													
24	30,000	100	100	547.78	-4.02	2,815.28	3,359.04	605.44	-60.82	2,785.83	3,330.45		-28.59	-0.9%
25	40,000	100	100	547.78	-4.02	3,637.54	4,181.30	605.44	-60.82	3,608.09	4,152.71		-28.59	-0.7%
26	150,000	500	556	2,894.30	-24.52	14,102.40	16,972.18	3,198.92	-340.99	13,955.15	16,813.08		-159.10	-0.9%
27	200,000	500	556	2,894.30	-24.52	18,213.70	21,083.48	3,198.92	-340.99	18,066.45	20,924.38		-159.10	-0.8%
28	270,000	900	1,000	5,183.59	-44.52	25,389.52	30,528.59	5,729.14	-614.32	25,124.47	30,239.29		-289.30	-0.9%
29	360,000	900	1,000	5,183.59	-44.52	32,789.86	37,928.93	5,729.14	-614.32	32,524.81	37,639.63		-289.30	-0.8%
30	450,000	900	1,000	5,183.59	-44.52	40,190.20	45,329.27	5,729.14	-614.32	39,925.15	45,039.97		-289.30	-0.6%
31	GS 1000-4999 kW													
32	300,000	1,000	1,111	5,508.68	-106.88	28,581.30	33,983.11	5,281.96	-772.32	28,536.60	33,046.24		-936.87	-2.8%
33	400,000	1,000	1,111	5,508.68	-106.88	36,803.90	42,205.71	5,281.96	-772.32	36,759.20	41,268.84		-936.87	-2.2%
34	500,000	1,000	1,111	5,508.68	-106.88	45,026.50	50,428.31	5,281.96	-772.32	44,981.80	49,491.44		-936.87	-1.9%
35	600,000	2,000	2,222	10,312.02	-214.43	57,169.10	67,266.69	9,784.07	-1,545.32	57,079.70	65,318.45		-1,948.24	-2.9%
36	800,000	2,000	2,222	10,312.02	-214.43	73,614.30	83,711.89	9,784.07	-1,545.32	73,524.90	81,763.65		-1,948.24	-2.3%
37	1,000,000	2,000	2,222	10,312.02	-214.43	90,059.50	100,157.09	9,784.07	-1,545.32	89,970.10	98,208.85		-1,948.24	-1.9%
38	Large Use													
39	1,500,000	5,000	5,556	24,499.04	-548.76	141,277.13	165,227.40	27,091.10	-4,174.88	141,881.63	164,797.85		-429.55	-0.3%
40	2,000,000	5,000	5,556	24,499.04	-548.76	181,705.00	205,655.28	27,091.10	-4,174.88	182,309.50	205,225.72		-429.55	-0.2%
41	2,500,000	5,000	5,556	24,499.04	-548.76	222,132.88	246,083.15	27,091.10	-4,174.88	222,737.38	245,653.60		-429.55	-0.2%
42	3,000,000	10,000	11,111	46,359.04	-1,098.21	282,560.75	327,821.58	51,264.43	-8,350.43	283,769.75	326,683.75		-1,137.83	-0.3%
43	4,000,000	10,000	11,111	46,359.04	-1,098.21	363,416.50	408,677.33	51,264.43	-8,350.43	364,625.50	407,539.50		-1,137.83	-0.3%
44	5,000,000	10,000	11,111	46,359.04	-1,098.21	444,272.25	489,533.08	51,264.43	-8,350.43	445,481.25	488,395.25		-1,137.83	-0.2%
45	Street Lighting			Connections	Mthly kVA									
46	9,182,014	159,861	26,461	665,085.50	-1,749.04	876,712.06	1,540,048.52	1,018,163.52	-19,932.69	862,799.13	1,861,029.96		320,981.44	20.8%
47	365	1	1	20.65	-0.07	31.45	52.04	33.52	-0.75	30.93	63.69		11.66	22.4%
48	Unmetered													
49	Scattered Loads			Customers	Connections									
	4,829,242	1,466	17,721	212,788.64	-8,161.42	431,657.44	636,284.67	320,168.27	-9,561.90	433,812.10	744,418.47		108,133.80	17.0%
50	365	1	1	19.01	-0.62	29.47	47.86	27.43	-0.72	29.63	56.34		8.48	17.7%

2010 Total Bill Impact (ADR plus Cost of Capital Estimate) - Non RPP Customers

Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8	Col. 9	Col. 10	Col. 11	Col. 12	Col. 13	Col. 14
				2009				2010				2010 Change	
	kWh	kW	kVA	Distribution (\$)	Rate Rider (\$)	Non-Distribution (\$)	Total (\$)	Distribution (\$)	Rate Rider (\$)	Non-Distribution (\$)	Total (\$)	\$	%
Residential													
100				18.28	0.57	8.63	27.48	20.25	0.55	8.66	29.45	1.97	7.2%
250				20.43	0.45	21.20	42.08	22.68	0.34	21.27	44.29	2.21	5.3%
500				24.01	0.25	42.14	66.40	26.72	0.01	42.29	69.02	2.62	3.9%
800				28.31	0.01	67.55	95.86	31.58	-0.40	67.79	98.97	3.11	3.2%
1,000				31.17	-0.15	86.17	117.19	34.82	-0.67	86.47	120.62	3.43	2.9%
1,500				38.33	-0.55	132.73	170.51	42.91	-1.35	133.18	174.75	4.24	2.5%
2,000				45.49	-0.95	179.29	223.83	51.01	-2.02	179.89	228.88	5.05	2.3%
GS<50 kW													
2,000				60.94	-0.16	178.70	239.48	70.84	-1.82	180.55	249.58	10.09	4.2%
5,000				120.19	-1.36	456.51	575.34	141.55	-5.57	461.13	597.11	21.77	3.8%
10,000				218.94	-3.36	919.52	1,135.10	259.40	-11.82	928.75	1,176.34	41.24	3.6%
20,000				416.44	-7.36	1,845.54	2,254.62	495.10	-24.32	1,864.01	2,334.79	80.17	3.6%
GS 50-999 kW													
30,000	100	100		547.78	-4.02	2,815.28	3,359.04	605.44	-44.92	2,785.83	3,346.35	-12.69	-0.4%
40,000	100	100		547.78	-4.02	3,637.54	4,181.30	605.44	-39.62	3,608.09	4,173.91	-7.39	-0.2%
150,000	500	556		2,894.30	-24.52	14,102.40	16,972.18	3,198.92	-261.49	13,955.15	16,892.58	-79.60	-0.5%
200,000	500	556		2,894.30	-24.52	18,213.70	21,083.48	3,198.92	-234.99	18,066.45	21,030.38	-53.10	-0.3%
270,000	900	1,000		5,183.59	-44.52	25,389.52	30,528.59	5,729.14	-471.22	25,124.47	30,382.39	-146.20	-0.5%
360,000	900	1,000		5,183.59	-44.52	32,789.86	37,928.93	5,729.14	-423.52	32,524.81	37,830.43	-98.50	-0.3%
450,000	900	1,000		5,183.59	-44.52	40,190.20	45,329.27	5,729.14	-375.82	39,925.15	45,278.47	-50.80	-0.1%
GS 1000-4999 kW													
300,000	1,000	1,111		5,508.68	-106.88	28,581.30	33,983.11	5,281.96	-607.32	28,536.60	33,211.24	-771.87	-2.3%
400,000	1,000	1,111		5,508.68	-106.88	36,803.90	42,205.71	5,281.96	-552.32	36,759.20	41,488.84	-716.87	-1.7%
500,000	1,000	1,111		5,508.68	-106.88	45,026.50	50,428.31	5,281.96	-497.32	44,981.80	49,766.44	-661.87	-1.3%
600,000	2,000	2,222		10,312.02	-214.43	57,169.10	67,266.69	9,784.07	-1,215.32	57,079.70	65,648.45	-1,618.24	-2.4%
800,000	2,000	2,222		10,312.02	-214.43	73,614.30	83,711.89	9,784.07	-1,105.32	73,524.90	82,203.65	-1,508.24	-1.8%
1,000,000	2,000	2,222		10,312.02	-214.43	90,059.50	100,157.09	9,784.07	-995.32	89,970.10	98,758.85	-1,398.24	-1.4%
Large Use													
1,500,000	5,000	5,556		24,499.04	-548.76	141,277.13	165,227.40	27,091.10	-3,379.88	141,881.63	165,592.85	365.45	0.2%
2,000,000	5,000	5,556		24,499.04	-548.76	181,705.00	205,655.28	27,091.10	-3,114.88	182,309.50	206,285.72	630.45	0.3%
2,500,000	5,000	5,556		24,499.04	-548.76	222,132.88	246,083.15	27,091.10	-2,849.88	222,737.38	246,978.60	895.45	0.4%
3,000,000	10,000	11,111		46,359.04	-1,098.21	282,560.75	327,821.58	51,264.43	-6,760.43	283,769.75	328,273.75	452.17	0.1%
4,000,000	10,000	11,111		46,359.04	-1,098.21	363,416.50	408,677.33	51,264.43	-6,230.43	364,625.50	409,659.50	982.17	0.2%
5,000,000	10,000	11,111		46,359.04	-1,098.21	444,272.25	489,533.08	51,264.43	-5,700.43	445,481.25	491,045.25	1,512.17	0.3%
Street Lighting	Connections	Mthly kVA											
9,182,014	159,861	26,461		665,085.50	-1,749.04	876,712.06	1,540,048.52	1,018,163.52	-14,974.41	862,799.13	1,865,988.25	325,939.73	21.2%
365	1	1		20.65	-0.07	31.45	52.04	33.52	-0.56	30.93	63.89	11.85	22.8%
Unmetered													
Scattered Loads	Customers	Connections											
4,829,242	1,466	17,721		212,788.64	-8,161.42	431,657.44	636,284.67	320,168.27	-9,561.90	433,812.10	744,418.47	108,133.80	17.0%
365	1	1		19.01	-0.62	29.47	47.86	27.43	-0.72	29.63	56.34	8.48	17.7%