# PUCO EXHIBIT FILING

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

Date of Hearing: 43/10	2818 MAY -4	PM 1: 33
Case No. 10-388-EL-556	PUC	00
PUCO Case Caption: Thio Edison, CE	<u> </u>	
and Toledo Edison		
Volume IV		
	·	
	·	ie an Je . Hiness
List of exhibits being filed:		ing the state of t
Company Ex. 9, 10 and 11		appeari of a ca course o
OCC Ex. 2A		images ductión egular (
		hat the e repro
		certify t d complet
		~ 급히 그
		This is to accurate a focument d
Reporter's Signature: Maria MiParlo Jones Date Submitted: 4/38/18	er_	

Company Esh. 9

# Transmission Enhancement Charges (PJM OATT Schedule 12) settlement worksheet

Required Transmission Enhancements owned by: Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company (TrAILCo)

	East Coast	Power		0.24%	\$ 1,817.83			0.24%	115.13		_	0.24%	\$ 8.261.75	_		_	-	_		_	0.24%	15.80	Γ	_	0.24%	221.41	\$ 6,431,71
		Reckland		0.27%	\$ 2,045,06 \$			0.27%	129.52			0.27%									%12.0	17.55 \$			0.27%	249.08 \$	9.483.67
		PSEG Re		7.12%	53,928.88 \$ 2			7.12%	3,415,45 \$			7 12%	185,785,18 \$ 7								7.12% 0	462.79			7.12%	6,568.44	250,140,74 \$ 9
					v								*									. 99				u	*
		PPL		3,00%	1 \$ 42,415.97			5,60%	9 \$ 2,686.31			5.60%	2								5.50%	4 \$ 363.99		00	5.80%	8 \$ 5,166.19	4 \$196,739.91
		PEPCO		4.65%	\$ 35,220,41			4.65%	\$ 1,012.16 \$ 2,230.59			4.65%	\$121,321.38						3.95%	\$ 3,304.46	4.65%	\$ 302.24	17,64%	6 10,592.49	165%	\$ 4,288.78	\$177,261.3
		Penelec		2.1%	\$ 15,961,73			2.11%	\$ 1,012.16			2.11%	\$ 55,051,20								2.11%	\$ 137.15			2.11%	\$ 1,948.55	\$ 74,128.79 \$177,261.3
		PECO		5,83%	\$ 44,538,77	39.41%	1 76,451.33	5.88%	2,820.62			5.89%	\$153,412.82								. 5.98%	382.19			5.88%	\$ 5,424.50 \$ 1,946.55	\$283,028.23
/ charges		Nepture		8.50%				0.50%	239.85			200.0	동								2,50%	32.50			7,050	461.27	\$ 17,568.06
res of monthi		MetEd		2.08% 2.08%	\$15,630.25 \$ 3,787,14			2.09%	\$ 1,002.57 \$			2.08%	\$ 65,625,159						0.67%	580.30	2.00%	135.85 \$	1.43%	858.68	2.09%	\$ 1,928.10 \$	\$74,845.34 \$
Responsible Customers'/Zones' allocation afteres of monthly charges		텇		ដ	¢	15.56%	30,164,79		2,024,32			4.22%	ş							-	4.22%	274.29			4.22%	3,803.09	178,442,37
ners'/Zones'		Dominian		19.34%	101,040,971 \$	13.81%	26,789.97 \$	13.34%	6,399.17 \$			13.34%	348,046,81						11.75%	9,829.72	13.34%	\$ 80.798	14.50%	8,706.98	3.34%	12,306.60 \$	\$13,989.24 \$
sible Custor					4		4		u				*							*		95		*		**	*
Respons		Delmarva		2.83%	\$ 21.435.22	19.39%	\$ 37,614.60	2.83%	1,357,54			2,83%	\$ 73,806.44						0.86%	\$ 719,45	2.83%	\$ 183.85	2.03%	\$ 1,218.98	2.03%	\$ 2,610.77	\$138,976.85
		Duqueena			\$15,224.30			2.01%	8.196			2.01%	\$52,442.14						,		2,01%	\$ 130.65			2.01%	\$ 1,854.29	\$70,615.57
		Dayton		2.46%	\$18,632,73			2.46%	3 1,180.DB			2.46%	77								2.46%	\$ 159.80			2.46%	\$ 2,269.43	\$86,425,03
		Commed		15.61%	\$118,234.53 \$18,632.73		Į.	15.61%	2,326,53 \$ 7,488,05 \$ 1,180,06			15.01%	\$407,274,50								15.61%	5 1,014.63			15,61%	\$ 14,400.75	\$548,412.49
		RGR		4.85%	\$ 36,735.28			4.85%	2,326,53			4.85%	\$128,539.48 \$407,274.50						3.61%	3,020.03	4,85%	315.24	13,42%	\$ 8,058,46	4.85%	4,474.29	1181,469,30
		Sav		6.27%	15,072.62 \$136,034,09 \$ 47,490,74 \$ 36,735.28			6.27%	\$ 9,007.70	100.00%	68,596.74	6.27%	\$163,588.16				1600:001	18,999,47	79.16%	66,223.05 \$ 3,020.03	827%	407.54	50.98%	\$ 30,812,54	8.27%	5,784.29 \$ 4,474.29 \$ 14,400.75	404,710.23
		AEP		7.86%	136,034,09			17.96%	\$ 8,615.37		•	17.96%	\$468,587.45							•	17.95%	1,167.37			17.95%	18,568.71	30,972.98
		Æ		1884	15,072.62 \$	11.83%	22,848.98	1,98%	854.80		ě	1.98%	51,820.32								1.86%	129.35			1.89%	1,835,84 \$ 18,568,71	92,861.81 \$630,972.98 \$404,710.23 \$181,469.30 \$548,412.49
-	_	E	10)	01.8		89.68	•	19,78	-	17.6		H.53	84			_	1270		12.1		8,499.85	44	8.14			**	
Monthly	Revenue	Requirement	릙	757,428.10		193,989.68		47,969.78		68,598,74		5,009,081.53					18,000.47		83,657.21				1 80,048.1		92,253.37		TOTAL \$ 47,282,046.18 \$ 3,938,593.85 \$
	<b>#</b> 2	T T T		9,089,137.18 \$		2,327,878.21 \$		\$75,537.10 \$		823,150,84 \$		31,308,736,38 \$	_				227,993.61 \$		886.47   \$	-	77,988.22 \$		720,577.68 3		1,107,040.49 \$	-	046.18
AUMUN	Revenue	Requirement		9,089						EC8 .		\$ 31,308,					227,		\$ 1,003,886.47 \$						\$ 1,107,		47,282,
PJM	Upgrade	٩		<b>\$</b> 91209		b0218 \$		b0321.1 \$		b03212 \$	b0321.3	b0329.2	b0347	b0347.2	50347.3	50347.4	\$ 52500		b0230		\$ 69504		B0228		60495 \$		TOTAL \$

		East Coast	Power	0.24%	\$ 2.496.03	0.24%	\$ 2,114.57	\$ 4,610.60
			Rockland	0.27%	\$ 2,808,03	0.27%	\$ 2,378,89	\$ 5,186,82
			PSEG	7.12%	74,048.62	7 12%	62,732.23	\$ 136,781.04 \$ 5,186.82 \$ 4
			£	5.50%	58,240.64 \$	5.60%	49,339.95 \$	107,580.60
			PEPCO	4.65%	\$ 48,350.53	4.65%	\$ 40,989.78	\$ 40,534.83 \$ 89,330.32 \$107,580.60
			Penelec	2.11%	\$ 21,044.24	2.11%	\$ 18,590.59	\$ 40,534.83
,			PECO	5.88%	\$ 61,152.86	5.88%	\$ 51,806.95	\$ 9,605.41 \$112,959.63 \$
	1h charges		Neptune	0.50%	\$ 5,200.08	0.50%	\$ 4,405.35	\$ 9,605.41
	heres of mont		MetEd	2.09%	21,736.24	2.09%	18,414,38	40,150,62
	s allecation s		JCPL	4.22%	43,888.49	425%	\$ 37,181,18	\$ 81,069.06
	ustomers/Zone		Deminion	13,34%	138,737,53	13.34%	117,534.82	5 256,272,35
	Responsible (		Deimarva	2.83%	\$ 29,432,33	2,83%	\$ 24,934,30	\$ 54,366,82
			Duqueend	2.01%	\$20,904.2	201%	\$17,709.5	\$38,613.7
.C. (PATH)			Dayton	2.46%	\$25,584,28	2.46%	321,874.34	38,229.53 \$345,028.34 \$120,451.85 \$ 93,172.48 \$299,880.91 \$47,258.82
lighline, L.L			Comed	15.61%	\$162,345.80	15.61%	\$137,535.12	16,036,6922
namission H			BGE	4.85%	\$ 50,440,56	4,85%	\$ 42,731,92	\$ 93,172,48
iachian Tra			AP3	8.27%	\$ 85,208.72	6.27%	\$ 55,243.13	\$120,451.85
tomac-Appa			AEP	17.98%	\$186,789.07	17,96%	\$158,240.28	\$345,028.34
med by: Po			¥	1.86%	\$ 20,696.33	1.00%	\$ 17,533.30	\$ 38,229.53
lequired Transmission Enhancements owned by: Potomac-Appaiachtan Transmission Highline, L.L.C, (PATF	Monthly	Revenue	Requirement (Jan-Dec2010)	1,040,011.50		881,070,58	,	TOTAL \$ 23,052,985,00 \$ 1,921,082,08 \$
Sion En	H	٠,		38.00				\$ 00.21
1 Transmis.	Annual	Revente	Requirement	\$ 12,480,138.0		\$ 10,572,847,00 \$		\$ 23,052,94
Required	Hr'd	Upgrade	Q	\$ 061-09	D0491	26109	P0560	TOTAL

Required Transmission Enhancements owned by: Beltimore Gas and Electric Company's Network Customers

	East Coast d Power	i		
	Rockland			
	PSEG			
	1dd			
	PEPCO	7.86% \$ 47.855.79	13,81%	72.178
	Panelec			
	PECO			
uhly charges	Neptune			
shares of mor	MetEd	4.73%	0.83% \$ 1.463.18	#30 20A RO
nes' allocation	JCPL			
kesponsible Customers'/Cones' ellocation shares of mon	Dominion	11.54% \$ 70.083.22		\$ 70 GAR 22
Responsible.	Delmarva			
	Duquesne			
	Dayton			
	ComEd			
	908	75.85%	85.56% \$162,892.87	1,9813,536 (1)
	APS			
	AEP			
	¥			
Monthly	Requirement (Jan-May2010)	\$ 607,308.92	178,696.67	# 786 n/3 59
	Revenue Requirement	7,287,883.00	b0244 \$ 2,144,360.00	9 432 043 00
	Upgrade ED	\$ 86209	b0244 \$	S LATOT

Required Transmission Enhancements owned by: Dominion Virginia Power's Network Customers

¥	Annual	Monthly								Responsible C	Responsible Customers/Zones' allocation shares of monthly charges	altocation sha	res of month	y charges							
Upgrade	Revenue	Revenue																			East Coast
9	Requirement	Requirement (Jan-Dec2010)		Ą	APS	80 80 80	CornEd	Dayton	Duquesne Delmarva	Delmarva	Dominlon	JCPL	Mated	Neptune	PECO	Penelec	PEPCO	ጟ	PSEG	Rockland	Power
b0217 \$	\$ 332,012.00	-	1,99%	17.96%	17.96% 6.27%	4,85%	15.01%	2.48%	2.01%	2.01% 2.83%	13.34%	4.22%	4.22% 2.09%	0.50%	5,88%	2.11%	4.65%	5.60%	7.12%	0.27%	0.24%
	١		8000	4,909.1	20,000	5 1,341,64 * 4,318.82 \$ 680.62	4.318.HZ	\$ 680.62	\$ 556.12	63.00		1,15/.56	3/8/25	138.34	1,62d.86 \$	583.79 5	1.209.55	1,549,39	1.969.94	3 74.70	\$ 65.40
22 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2	\$ 275,968.00 \$	\$ 22,987.17	1,99%	17,98% s 4 130 29	6% 17,98% 6,27% 467 64 S 4 130 26 S 1441 92 S	4.85%	4.85% 15.81% 1.115.36 \$ 3.589.88	246%	2.01%	2.83%	13,34%	22% 820%	2.09%	0.50%	0.50% 5,88% 2.11% 4,65%	211%	211% 4.65% 5.60% A 4.62% 1.069	5.60%	7.12%	0.27%	0.24%
90250	\$328-164-99 \$27,346-17	£27,346.17									400.08%		- Areas		A 444444	1	12000	10000	2000	60.20	
90228	00'000'091	05.502.50								•	160,00%										
90226	50226 \$ 1,313,104.00 \$	\$ 109,425,33			3.69%	3,54%				"	85.73%					"	7.04%				
#834t	6	\$ +++23B:08)								"	100.00%										
p0403	1,102,579.00	\$ 91,881,58			3,36%	4,22%	!			1.010.78 \$	89,04% \$ 77,125.40					. **	7.39%			ļ ,	
P0232	b0202 \$367,370.00 \$36,814,17	\$ 30,644.17			-						100.00%										
866.0 <del>4</del>	66,559,58	92:01:29					   				408.00%										
90209	\$	6,749.83								-	190.00%										
P6933	4,865.00	\$ 0.00							 	7	100.00% \$ 988.76										
6650 <b>9</b>	270,321.00	\$ 23,276,75					)     		-	"	409-00% \$ 23,276.76										
PO 328	2 00 866 750 5	S 262 323 17									400.00%				1						

NS 7.12% D.27% 0.24% 50.56 \$ 76.350.00 \$ 2.895.29 \$ 2.573.60		560% 7.12% 0.27% 0.24% 3.191.78 155.88 \$ 1.36.78	0.54% 1.697.92		97.85 7.12% 0.27% 0.24% 87.85 \$ 620.38 \$ 23.53 \$ 20.91		64.72 \$ 84,834.94 \$ 3,268.47 \$ 2,852.86  East Coast  Rectaind Power		<b>"</b> 56
5.88% 2.11% 4.65% 5.60%. 3.63.053.09 3.22,626.19 3.48,885.41 \$.80,050.		8,350,62 & 1,202,35 \$ 2,649,72 \$ 3,11	14.05% \$ 2832.81 \$ 2.832.81 7,326.20 \$ 38,391.75 \$ 1.61	7.57% \$ 2576.64 \$ 180% \$ 854.22	5894 2.11% 4.65% 5.60% 5.20%	4 USK 5 2.292.94	77,221,34 \$ 26,081,42 \$116,715,44 \$ 68,264,72 FECO Panelec PEDCO PPIL		954 2.17% 4.15% 6.80% 8.00% 183.75 \$ 11.807.77 \$ 25.34.25 \$ 31.603
422% 2.08% 0.50% 5.8 45,252.39 \$22,411,73 \$ 5,381.69 \$ 53.0		2.404.70 \$ 1,190.95 \$ 284.92 \$ 3.	0.29% \$ 2.798.42 \$ 7.5	#500 #500	4.22% 2.09% 0.50% 5.8 392.70 \$ 182.11 \$ 43.57 \$ 5		*	0.28%	28.62% \$ 10.45.53 \$ 13.94.54.42.42.42.42.42.42.42.42.42.42.42.42.42
\$-253.334.47 2.83% \$13.45 30.346.88 \$143.048.01 100.00% \$22.751.17 100.00%	\$ 100,782,33 100,007 \$ 52,283,17 \$400,004 \$	2.83% 1.512.63.8 7.601.58 3 400.06% 400.06% 400.06%	5 -163,877,002 40.05% 5 -10.05% 5 -10.05% 5 -10.09% 614.056 614.056 614.056 614.056 614.056 614.056 614.056 614.056 614.056 614.056	\$69.4% \$69.4% \$69.4% \$69.4% \$69.4% \$ 0.4% \$		\$ 4660-75 75.18% \$ -40.30% \$ -40.30% \$ -30.80% \$ -80.80% \$ -80.60% \$ -80.60%	\$ 40,483.64 \$ 888,704.63 \$  Responsible Quajomers/Cones* a		2 15,071,09 \$ 73,204,22 \$
4.85% 15.61% 2.46% 2.01% 52.008.07 5107,380.83 \$26,378.35 \$71,553.86		2,765,60 \$ 8,895,10 \$ 1,401,70 \$ 1,146,3	12.18% == 2.185.80 10.87% 34.367.00	7.01% 2.35441 3.01% 666.11	485% 15.61% 2.46% 2.0 422.60 \$ 1.360.15 \$ 214.35 \$ 11		\$106,246.88 \$185,554.96 \$23.241.85 \$23,892.73 813 BGE Comfed Dayton Duquestre		485% 15.61% 2.46% 2.01% 27,270.95 \$ 55,004.86 \$15,883.00 \$11,343.42
1,09% 17,86% 6,27% 1,09% 1,00%		1,135 g7 & 10,234.21 \$ 3,572.85 \$	33.69% 1 0.71% 5 0.702.21 \$ 2.222.45 \$ 10.533.57 \$ 3	32.70% 6.10.982.76 \$ 6.10.82.76 \$	173.40 \$ 1,564% 6,27%	\$ 11.259.87	\$213,488.25 \$121,283.68 ES.G's Network Custom	1,554,88 1,654,88 17,01%	17.86% 8.27% \$101.357.17 \$ 35,384.71 \$
1,072,831.42 \$ 202,751.17 100,782,33		\$6,983,33 \$ \$77,447,82 \$48,373,82	20,160.92 314,429.00 \$ 14,666,67	1    1 1    1	67.048.23 24.077.00 44.081.60 8,713.33 5 198.607.50	28 16 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	2.193.019.59 \$ 25.937.44 2.115.209.92 would nearthes 77.74.967 incentives Montaly Revenue Resentant	340,800.00 141,142,33 1,447,802,92 374,118,33	564,348.50 \$ 453,560.08 366,458,75 122,056,42
b0326.1 \$ 12.867,077.00 \$ b0786 \$ 2,432,014.00 \$ b0337 \$ 1.299,386.00 \$	M1236 8319.172-00 8-10.236 6-1038 8-10.236 8	60231 \$ 663,600,00 \$ 60234.2 \$2,426,467.00 \$ 6 6 7.00 \$	\$ 241,831.00 \$ 3,773,148.00 \$ 139,888.00 \$ 235,886,69	\$ 403,484,400 \$ 403,637,000 \$ \$ 205,560,000 \$ \$ 205,560,000	8 00-085		## 100   100	D0130 \$ 4.085,000.00 \$  D0134 \$ 1.893,706.00 \$  D0145 \$ 17,373,635,00 \$  D0411 \$ 4,489,420.00 \$	boyee \$ 6,772,194.00 \$ botes \$ 4,637,215.00 \$ botes \$ 4,637,255.00 \$ botes \$ 1,464,761,00 \$

b0512 \$ b0268 \$ FOTAL \$ 1	Upgrade ID Re	Required Tra	1 1	MIS17 E	큺	•	60210,A \$	b0276 \$	1 1	Upgrade Re	1	1	P0218	Upgrade Ro	Required Tra	TOTAL S	b0487.1 S	b0284.2 <b>\$</b>	60171.2 \$	1	Upgrade ID R	3	TOTAL \$ 6	ьов13 \$	- 1	60489 \$ 1	ь0274 \$	
9,698,240.00 7,293,854.00 17,192,094.00	Requirement	nemission E	2,170,869.00	Requirement	memission t	13,842,367.00	5,680,025.00 4,060,067.00	2,477,413.00	854,014,00	Requirement	Insmission E	3,146,714.00	894,7146.00 2.251.918.00	Revenus Requirement	nsmission &	3,582,910.00	91,338.00	15,719,00	12,387.00	3,446,167.00	Revenue Requirement	nsmission b	69,595,079.00	450,848.00	7,560,00	16,153,399.00	4,768,896.00	
\$ 824,853.33 \$ 807,821.17 \$ 1,432,874.50	Revenue Requirement (Jan-May 2010)	Required Transmission Enhancements owned by: PEPCO's Network Customers	\$ 180,905.75	Requirement (Jan-May 2018)	Enhancements owned by:	\$ 1,153,530.58	\$ 473,335.42 \$ 337,505.58	\$ 206,451,08		Revenue Requirement	툹	- 1	\$ 74,566.33 \$ 187,659.63	Requirement Requirement (Jan-Jun2010)	Required Transmission Enhancements owned by: 'AEP East Operating Companies  PJM Annual Montky	\$ 296,575.83	\$ 7,011.50	\$ 1,309.92	\$ 1,440.75	2	Requirement Requirement (Jan-May 2016)	Enhancements owned by:	\$ 5,799,589,92	\$ 37,570.67	\$ 630,00	\$ 1,348,116,58	\$ 397,408,17	
1,99% \$ 16,414.58 \$ 16,414.58	₩.	o 2331.89	\$ 2,351,98			\$ 487,832,34	\$ 9.419.37 \$ 9.419.37	\$1.28% \$ 74,009.83 \$5,23%	89.87% \$ 48,880.20	ř		\$ 1,463.67	1.99% \$ 1,483.67	ΑE	owned by: 'AEF	\$ 5,790.19	\$ 26.07	1.99%	-	\$ 5,714.88	Æ	owned by: PPL	\$ 234,770,85	\$ 12.54	_	1.99% \$ 26,787.72		i    -
17.96% \$148,143.66 \$148,143.66	À	CO's Netwo	1 1	AEP	narva's Net	\$ 85,011,04	17.98% \$ 85,011,04			ğ	ntic Electric	\$185,783.23 \$198,175.34	17.96% 5.13.382.11 99.00%	ΑΞΡ	East Opera	\$ 52,257,19	\$ 235.2H	\$ 185.54 17,96%			ğ	Electric Uti	\$343,232,86	\$ 113.15	-	17.98% \$241,762.54		
6.27% 5.51,718,30 \$ 51,718.30	APS	sk Custome	1 1 .	AP9	Delmarva's Network Customers	\$ 29,878.13	8.27% \$ 29,878,13			AP8	Atlantic Electric's Network Customers	\$ 4,675.31	8.27% \$ 4,675,31	APS	ting Compa	\$ 18,243,46	5 62.13	8.27%	\$ 90.34 6.27%	6.27% \$ 18,006.22	<b>1</b> 60	illides Corp.	\$119,825.72	944	5.27%	8.27% \$ 84,401.51		
4.85% 5.40.005.39 19.33% \$117.491.63 \$157.497.22	BGE	92.261,6	5,732.20	BGE	Dera	\$ 22,958.77	4.85% \$ 22,956.77			<del>D</del> GE	Customers	\$ 3,516.47	4.85% \$ 3.616.47	BCE		\$ 14,311.27	\$ 63.53	\$ 50.10 4.85%	4.85% 4.85%	4.85% \$ 13,928.28	BGE	Electric Utilities Corp. dba PPL Utilities	\$ 93,157.79	1.25%	4.85%	4.85% \$ 65,288.65		
15.61% 5129.759.60 5129.759.60 5129.759.60		<b>∌</b> 500 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	\$ 18 449 42	ComEd		\$ 73,887.66	15,61% \$ 73,587.66			ComEd		\$ 11,639.80	15.61% \$ 11.639.80	ComEd		\$ 45,419.53	7 204.48	\$ 161.20 15.61%	3 224.80 15.61%	15,61% \$ 44,828.89	ComEd	litles	\$296,666,06	98.34		15.61% \$210,128.60		
2.46% 520.291.39 1 \$20.291.39 1		Z,307.47	2,907.47	1 _		\$11,844.05	2.46% \$11,644.05			Dayton		\$ 1,834.33	2.48% \$ 1.834.33 :	Dayton		\$ 7,157.72	\$ 32.22 4	2.46%	2.46% 2.46%	2.46% \$ 7,084.84	Dayton		\$47,089.24	3 15.50	\$ 58.27 2.40%	2.48% \$33,114,47		
\$16,579.55 <b>\$</b> \$16,579.55 <b>\$</b> \$16,579.55 <b>\$</b>	₩.	2,373.01	2375.61			\$ 9,514.04 \$	2.01% \$ 8,514.04 \$			Duqueene		\$ 1,498.78 \$	2.01% \$ 1.498.78 \$	Duquesna		\$ 5,848.38 \$	28.33	2.01%	28.95 \$	2.01% \$ 5,772,33 \$	Duquesne		\$38,413,03 \$	\$ 99721.		2.01% \$27,056.94 \$		
2.83% § 23,343.35 § 23,343.35 § 23,343.35	De/avarya		\$ 3,344,77 \$ 84,50% \$152,865,36	Delmarve.	lesponsible C	\$ 19,365,39 \$	283% 13,395.39 \$			Delimarya	espansible C	2,110.23 \$	2.83% 2,110.23 \$	Delmarva	tespansible C	8,234.29 \$	31.97 3	29.24 \$	2.83%	2.60% 8.127.21 \$	Defamirva	lesponsible C	\$ 57,422.84 \$	17.83 \$	2.83%	2.83% \$ 38,095.10 \$		
13.34% 110,035.43 \$ (7.00% 103,329.80 213,365.63 \$	Delmarya Dominion	10,760.01	1 1	Dominion 13, saw	Responsible Customers'/Zones' all	63,142,95 \$	13.34% 83,142.95 \$			Dominion	Responsible Gustomers/IZones! allocation shares of growthly charges	9,947.15 \$	13.34% 8,947.15 \$	Domision	Responsible Gustamers'/Zones' all	38,814.64 \$	174.74 5		13.34% 182.20 1	13,34%, 38,309,89	Dominian	Responsible Customers/Zones, allocation shares of positify charges	254,940.22	84.04	ŀ	13.34% 179,571.95 \$		
4.22% 34,606.81 34,608.61	_ =		4,987.61	JCPL	e' allocation si	<u>.</u>	53.408.89 4.22% 19.974.75 25.87%	25,67%	9,48% 5,168,71	JCPL	s' allocation st	3,146,70	4.22% 3.146.78	JCPL	allocation sh	12,278.69	55,26		4,22% 4,22%	4,22% 12,119.02	JCPL	s' allocation sh	\$1,822,785.07	26.59 8.92%		4 22% 56,800 12		
2.09% \$17,239.43 \$17,239.43	CPL MetEd Notices	\$ 2,470.11	1 1	MetEd	estion shares of monthly charges	\$ 9,892.71	2.09% \$ 9.862.71			MetEd	ares of month	\$ 1,550.44	2.09% \$ 1,558,44 \$	MetEd	ocation shares of monthly charges	\$ 8,081.15	\$ 27.38 \$		2.09% \$ 30,11 \$ 2.09%	2.09% \$ 6,002.07	MeiEd	ares of mouth	\$39,941.9	13.1	2.09%	2.09% \$28,133,8		
0.50% \$ 4,124.27 \$ \$ 4,124.27 \$	Nepluse	Į ·	580.95		r charges		0.50% 0.50% \$ 2,988.68 3		0.65% 354.28	Neptune	y charges	\$ 372.83	0.50% 372.83 \$	Neptune	y charges	\$ 1,454.82		0.50%	0.50%	0.60% \$ 1,435.90	Veptune	y charges	65,676.07	6.87%	\$ 11.517.17 \$ 19,113.81 \$ 0.50% 5.88%	0.50%		:
5.88% 46,501.38	PECO .	34,909,30	\$ 6,949.56 1 16,50% \$ 26,040.39	PECO		\$ 27,832.12 \$	5.8 <b>0%</b> \$ 27,832.12 \$			PECO		\$ 4,384.50	5.88% 4.384.50 \$	PECO		\$ 17,108,70	77.02	5.88%	l	5.88% \$ 18,896.22 \$	PECO		218,880.30 \$	37,04 \$	19,113.81 3 5,88%	5.88%		
2.11% 17,404.41 17,404.41		2,483.80	2,493.80	Peneluc		9,987.38	2.11% B,987.38 \$			Penelec		\$ 1,573.35 \$	2.11%	Penelac		\$ 7,425.69 \$	16,90%	21.80 \$	2,77% 30,40 2,11%	2.11% 6,059.51	Penelec		41,374.54	13,29	1,950.42 211%	2.11% 28,403.00		
4.65% \$ 39,355,68 \$ 63,67% \$306,998,74 \$425,395,42 \$	PEPCO	5,485.02	5,495,82	PEPCO		\$ 22,010.10 \$	4.65% 5.60% 22,010.10 \$ 26,506,78			PEPCO			4,65% 3,467.33 \$	PEPGO		\$ 13,528.84	16.09	4,85%	4,65%	4,65% 3 13,353.80 \$	03594		\$ 89,283.00 \$	1.11%		4.65% \$ 62,594.42 \$		
5.60% 45,191.79 \$ 45,181.79 \$	PPL	0,018.03	6,618.63	PP		\$ 26,506,78 \$	5.60% 28.508.78 \$		 			4,175.71 \$	5.80% 4,175.71 \$	PPL		\$ 22,199.77 \$	77.50%	5.60%	5.60% 80.68 \$	5.80% \$ 14,082.11 \$			\$107,021.38 \$	35.2 <b>0</b>	5.50%	5.80% \$ 75,362.53 \$	<b>\$</b>	
7.12% 58,729.56 58,729.55	PSEG	8,415,11	<b>i</b> I.	PSEG		· i	13,109.04 7.12% 33,701.48 8.35%	- 1		PSEG		5,309.12	7.12% 5,309.12	PSEG		21,107,13		- 1		1 1	PSEG		\$1,995,213.50	83.73%	76,248,90 7,12%	7.12% 95,843.50	96.77% 384.571.89	
9 2,227.10 4 \$ 2,227.10 4 \$ 2,227.10 1	Rockland	318.11	319.11	,		\$ 1,466.00	0.27% \$ 1,278.01	0.23% \$ 188.90		Rockband		\$ 201.33	0.27% \$ 201.33	Rockland		\$ 800.07	0.19%	0.27%	0.27% \$ 3.89 0.27%	0.27% \$ 775.38	Rockland		\$84,250,34	3.12%	\$ 2,851.13 0.27%	0.27% \$ 3,634.51		
0.24% \$ 1,979.65 \$ 1,979.65	Easi Coast Power	283.66		Power		\$ 1,299.48	0.24% \$ 1,136.01	0.20% \$ 163.47		East Coast Power		\$ 178.96	0.24% \$ 176,96	East Coast Power		\$ 712.78	3 3.14 0.18%	\$ <u>2.48</u>	0.24% \$ 3.48 0.24%	0.24% \$ 689.23	Easl Coast Power		\$27,455.20	57 55	D -	0.24%	3.23% \$12.836.28	

# Virginia State Corporation Commission eFiling CASE Document Cover Sheet

Case Number (if already assigned)

PUE-2009-00043

Case Name (if known)

Application of PATH Allegheny Virginia Transmission Corporation for Certificates of Public Convenience and . Necessity to Construct Facilities: 765 kV Transmission Line through Loudoun, Frederick and Clarke Counties

**Document Type** 

**EXMO** 

**Document Description Summary** 

Cover letter, PATH Allegheny Virginia Transmission Corporation's Motion to Withdraw Application and

Terminate Proceeding

Total Number of Pages

18

Submission ID

1846

eFiling Date Stamp

12/21/2009 9:22:33AM



HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP RIVERFBONT PLAZA, EAST TOWER 951 EAST BYRD STREET RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219-4074

TEL FAX 864 • 788 • 8200 864 • 788 • 8218

RICHARD D. GARY DIRECT DIAL: 804-788-8330 EMAIL: rgary@hunton.com

FILE NO: 27364.71

December 21, 2009

### Via Electronic Filing

Hon. Joel H. Peck Clerk State Corporation Commission Document Control Center Tyler Building, 1st Floor 1300 East Main Street Richmond, Virginia 23219

Application of
PATH Allegheny Virginia Transmission Corporation for
Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity to Construct Facilities:
765 kV Transmission Line through Loudoun, Frederick, and Clarke Counties
Case No. PUE-2009-00043

Dear Mr. Peck:

Enclosed is PATH Allegheny Virginia Transmission Corporation's Motion to Withdraw Application and Terminate Proceeding in Case No. PUE-2009-00043.

Sincerely-yours,

Richard D. Gary

RDG/tms Enclosure

---

Hon. Alexander F. Skirpan, Jr. William H. Chambliss, Esq.

Service List

Noelle J. Coates, Esq.

### BEFORE THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

APPLICATION OF	)	
PATH ALLEGHENY VIRGINIA	)	
TRANSMISSION CORPORATION	) Case No. PUE-2009	-00043
For certificates of public convenience	Ś	
and necessity to construct facilities:	) ·	
765 kV Transmission Line through	j	
Loudoun, Frederick, and Clarke Counties	ì	

### MOTION TO WITHDRAW APPLICATION AND TERMINATE PROCEEDING

PATH Allegheny Virginia Transmission Corporation ("PATH-VA") moves the State

Corporation Commission (the "Commission") to allow the withdrawal of the Application it filed

on May 19, 2009 that requested the Commission's approval and certification of electric

transmission facilities (the "Potomac Appalachian Transmission Highline," or "PATH Project").

PATH-VA's current intention is to file a new application in early 2010 based on the most current
information then available with regard to the PATH Project and to propose a procedural schedule
for the Commission's consideration that will be coordinated with the procedural schedules for
the West Virginia and Maryland Public Service Commissions' consideration of the portions of
the PATH Project that will be constructed in those states. In support of this Motion, PATH-VA
states the following.<sup>1</sup>

In May 2009, applications for certification of the PATH Project were filed in Virginia,
West Virginia and Maryland with the expectation that the procedural schedules in those three
states would be reasonably well aligned. Due to intervening events, these schedules are now out

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> PATH-VA filed a Motion to Suspend Procedural Schedule concurrently with this Motion.

of alignment. The West Virginia Public Service Commission issued a procedural order on November 24, 2009 that, among other things, delayed the hearing on the West Virginia portion of the PATH Project until October 18, 2010.<sup>2</sup> In addition, the West Virginia procedural schedule provides for the supplementation of testimony on June 29, 2010. In Maryland, an application for approval and certification of the PATH Project is being filed concurrently with the filing of this motion and consideration of the Maryland portion of the PATH Project is also expected to proceed to evidentiary hearings in the second half of 2010. Thus, under the current schedule in Virginia the evidentiary hearings will conclude several months before the consideration of the other segments of the PATH Project begin.

The withdrawal of this pending Application in Virginia and a subsequent filing of a new application will allow the Commission and PATH-VA to coordinate the procedural schedule in Virginia with those of the other jurisdictions.<sup>3</sup> In addition, withdrawal of the application and the filing of a new application will permit this Commission to consider the electrical need for the PATH Project based on the same facts considered by its counterparts in West Virginia and Maryland.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, withdrawal of the Application now will allow the parties to avoid the significant preparation that will be required for the filing of PATH-VA's rebuttal testimony on

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> PATH West Virginia Transmission Company, LLC, PATH Allegheny Transmission, LLC, et al., Order, Case No. 09-0770-E-CN (Nov. 24, 2009). Attached as Exhibit 1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The withdrawal of the Application will eliminate any legal right of the PATH-VA to seek a federal construction permit regarding the current Application pursuant to Section 216(b)(1)(c)(i) of the Federal Power Act ("FPA"). The filing of the new application would initiate the one-year time period for the Commission's consideration of the application under that section of the FPA.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> PATH-VA and The Potomac Edison Company, the PATH Project applicant in Maryland, expect to file supplemental testimony supporting their new applications in Virginia and Maryland, respectively, contemporaneously with the filing of supplemental testimony in the West Virginia proceeding.

December 31, 2009, for discovery by the parties as to that rebuttal testimony and, of course, for the lengthy hearing scheduled to begin on January 19, 2010.<sup>5</sup>

The Hearing Examiner, through the Commission's delegation of authority in the Order for Notice and Hearing, dated June 12, 2009, and Rule 5 VAC 5-20-120.A, Procedure Before Hearing Examiners, has authority to "rule on motions, matters of law and procedural questions," and thereby has the authority to grant this Motion. Due to the straightforward nature of this Motion, PATH-VA requests that the Hearing Examiner grant the Motion or recommend promptly to the Commission that the Motion be granted and establish an expedited schedule for comments to the Commission pursuant to Rule 5 VAC 5-20-120.

PATH-VA does not take lightly the decision to delay any aspect of this proceeding. The PATH Project is an important baseline transmission project with a long lead-time for construction. Yet in view of the current procedural status of this multi-state project, the most reasonable course of action is to coordinate the schedules in Virginia, West Virginia and Maryland.

WHEREFORE, PATH-VA requests that the Commission expeditiously grant this Motion, allow it to withdraw its Application, and terminate the proceeding.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> To the extent appropriate and applicable, PATH-VA is amenable to the moving of the testimony that has been pre-filed in this current proceeding into the next proceeding.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Hearing Examiners have granted Motions to Withdraw Applications on several occasions. See, e.g. Application of Robert A. Winney d/b/a The Waterworks Company of Franklin County, Case No. PUE-2000-00665, Report of Hearing Examiner (March 16, 2001) (finding that a motion to withdraw is "analogous to that of a nonsuit....); Commission v. Smith Mountain Water Co., Case No. PUE-1992-00082, Ruling of Hearing Examiner (July 16, 1993); and Commission v. Tidewater Water Co., Case. No. PUE-1991-00078, Ruling of Hearing Examiner (March 16, 1992).

Respectfully submitted,

PATH ALLEGHENY VIRGINIA TRANSMISSION CORPORATION

Counsel

Dated: December 21, 2009

Richard D. Gary
W. Jeffery Edwards
Noelle J. Coates
Hunton & Williams LLP
Riverfront Plaza, East Tower
951 East Byrd Street
Richmond, VA 23219-4074
(804) 788-8328; fax (804) 788-8218
rgary@hunton.com
jedwards@hunton.com
ncoates@hunton.com

Randall B. Palmer
Jeffrey P. Trout
Allegheny Energy
800 Cabin Hill Drive
Greensburg, PA 15601-1689
724-838-6894
rpalmer@alleghenyenergy.com
jtrout2@alleghenypower.com

090770cg112409.wpd

# PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF WEST VIRGINIA CHARLESTON

At a session of the PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF WEST VIRGINIA in the City of Charleston on the 24th day of November 2009.

CASE NO. 09-0770-E-CN

PATH WEST VIRGINIA TRANSMISSION COMPANY, LLC; PATH ALLEGHENY TRANSMISSION COMPANY, LLC; PATH-WV LAND ACQUISITION COMPANY; AND PATH-ALLEGHENY LAND ACQUISITION COMPANY

Joint application for Certificate of Convenience and Necessity for the construction and operation of the West Virginia segments of a 765kV electric transmission line and related facilities in Putnam, Kanawha, Roane, Calhoun, Braxton, Lewis, Upshur, Barbour, Tucker, Preston, Grant, Hardy, Hampshire, and Jefferson Counties, including modifications to the Amos Substation in Putnam County and a new substation in Hardy County, and for related relief.

### COMMISSION ORDER

This order (i) denies the motions to dismiss, (ii) tolls the statutory due date, and (iii) establishes a procedural schedule.

### BACKGROUND

On May 15, 2009, the PATH West Virginia Transmission Company, LLC ("PATH-WV"), PATH Allegheny Transmission Company, LLC ("PATH-Allegheny"), the PATH-WV Land Acquisition Company, and the PATH-Allegheny Land Acquisition Company (all four, collectively, "Applicants") filed a joint application for certificates of public convenience and necessity and for related relief ("Joint Application") pursuant to W.Va. Code §§24-2-11 and 24-2-11a. The PATH Project is approximately 225 miles of 765 kV electric transmission line and related facilities in the fourteen counties of Putnam, Kanawha, Roane, Calhoun, Braxton, Lewis, Upshur, Barbour, Tucker, Preston, Grant, Hardy, Hampshire, and Jefferson. The Applicants also seek a certificate of public convenience and necessity (i) to jointly construct, own, operate, and maintain the new Welton Spring Substation, as another part of the PATH Project in West Virginia to be constructed two miles north of Old Fields in Hardy County, and (ii) to construct, own, operate, and maintain certain modifications to the Amos Substation owned by Appalachian Power Company and Ohio Power Company.

On November 10, 2009, the Commission issued an Order (i) staying the current procedural schedule, (ii) granting the parties additional time to file recommendations regarding the Commission Staff motion to dismiss, and (iii) granting the request of two parties to withdraw from the case.

Additional procedural information will be addressed as necessary in the Discussion section of this Order.

### DISCUSSION

Motions To Dismiss

On October 28, 2009, Staff filed a Motion to Dismiss the Filing as Insufficient or in the Alternative, Require Path to Request a Tolling and Implement Further Case Processing Procedures. Staff argued that (i) the failure to re-file the dismissed Maryland proceeding renders this project incomplete, (ii) the application should be supported by current economic and PJM load forecast information to determine the need for the PATH Project and that the updated information in the 2010 Regional Transmission Expansion Plan ("RTEP") was not included in updates to the 2009 RTEP but is potentially crucial in determining the need for the PATH Project, and (iii) Staff and Intervenors will be prejudiced by expending limited resources to review an incomplete project and stale need-related information, and then analyze updated information as it becomes available.

Staff asked that the Commission (i) dismiss this case without prejudice, (ii) permit the Applicants to re-file concurrent with the filing of a proper certificate application before the Maryland Public Service Commission ("Maryland PSC"), and (iii) require the Applicants to support the re-filed West Virginia application with the updated PJM annual load forecast and February 2010 RTEP. In the alternative Staff recommended proceeding with the pending application if the Applicants request to toll the statutory due date subject to certain other conditions.

On November 4, 2009, the Applicants filed a response to the Staff motion to dismiss. In opposition to the Staff motion the Applicants stated that (i) the Staff bases to dismiss or toll this case are not warranted; (ii) the absence of a pending application for certification of the PATH Project in Maryland does not support any delay in the West Virginia portion of the proceeding; and (iii) feasibility of further study cannot be asserted as a justification for postponing the evidentiary hearing because there is always more up-to-date analysis that can be performed. In support of an alternate tolling of the statutory deadline Applicants conceded that delayed consideration and certification of the Maryland segments of the project provide an opportunity for this Commission and its sister commission in Virginia to base their decisions on updated evidence of electrical need. The Applicants proposed tolling the statutory decision due date in West Virginia if a satisfactory extension of the current procedural schedule were put into place.

On November 10, 2009, Staff filed a reply to the Applicants' response. Staff stated that (i) the Applicants' offer to toll the statutory deadline contingent on a specific procedural schedule was not acceptable, (ii) the Commission should not hold two hearings to address need and non-need testimony, and (iii) the parties should be given more time to file testimony on non-need issues.

Numerous parties filed in support of the Staff motion to dismiss. Several of those supportive filings made further recommendations that the Commission extend or stay the procedural deadline pending a decision on the Applicants offer to toll.

On November 10, 2009, the Commission issued an order (i) suspending the procedural schedule in this case and (ii) granting the parties until November 17, 2009 to file a final response to the Staff motion to dismiss and offer to toll tendered by the Applicants.

Several intervenors filed responses as permitted by the November 10, 2009 order. In addition to those described below, the majority of the comments opposed splitting the testimony and hearing between need and non-need issues as proposed by the Applicants.

On November 16, 2009, Intervenors Eric Burleyson and Kirsten Weiblen filed a Motion to Dismiss the Filing as Insufficient arguing that the Commission should (i) dismiss the case without prejudice; (ii) allow re-filing concurrently with the filing of a proper certificate application before the Maryland PSC and before the Virginia State Corporation Commission; and (iii) require any re-filed application to be supported with the forthcoming PJM annual load forecast and the updated RTEP. The Intervenors also described a scenario under which the Applicants might file for approval of the proposed line before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") under the "backstop" provision of Section 216 of the Federal Power Act ("FPA").

On November 17, 2009, (i) the Sierra Club, Inc., and the West Virginia Highlands Conservancy, (ii) the Jefferson County Intervenor Group and the Tucker County Landowners, and (iii) the Consumer Advocate Division, each filed separate responses to the Staff motion to dismiss. While recommending the Commission grant the motion to dismiss, each also provided the Commission with a proposed procedural schedule for use in this case in the event the Commission decided not to dismiss. All of the parties were opposed to splitting the testimony and hearing between the need and non-need issues.

On November 17, 2009, the Applicants filed a Revised Proposal to Toll Statutory Decision Due Date and Extend Procedural Schedule. The Applicants (i) stated that the Potomac Edison Company plans to re-file an application seeking certification of those portions of the PATH Project in Maryland, including a terminus at the Kemptown Substation, (ii) proposed tolling the statutory due date until February 24, 2011, and (iii) submitted a revised procedural schedule that did not require multiple hearings and testimony filings to address need and non-need issues.

### Commission Decision Regarding the Motions to Dismiss

The motions to dismiss and filings in support thereof cited the (i) need for updated information on the question of need, and (ii) dismissal of the Maryland application, as sufficient reason to dismiss this case.

The benefit of updated information is not unique to this case. In addressing the need for updated information, we will begin by stating the obvious: If no one used electricity, there would be no need to build transmission lines. It follows that the amount of electricity required and the need for this particular line is a critical question underlying this proceeding. The task of defining and measuring that need creates the illusion that better and more accurate information is just beyond the horizon and that the Commission cannot issue a fair decision unless it first considers that future information. This belief manifests more frequently during a turbulent economy but is present in almost all cases that rely on projections of future demand. Nevertheless, the adjudicatory process requires that the Commission select a deadline for the submission of new information, and then make a decision based on the evidence.

The Maryland PSC dismissal of the PATH proceeding potentially exacerbates the problem described in the above paragraph. For instance, if the Commission moved forward in this case, but PATH does not re-file the application to build the transmission line in Maryland, the parties in this State would have expended time and resources for naught. Even a significant delay in a Maryland refiling could create the need to reopen the proceedings in this State based on unanticipated routing or other changes dictated by the Maryland PSC. All things considered, it is beneficial to have the proceedings before the utility commissions of Virginia and Maryland moving forward at a pace at least roughly parallel to our own.

The proposed grounds to dismiss suggest that the Commission make a determination that either of the above reasons is sufficient as a matter of law to dismiss this case; i.e., the Commission should dismiss because the Applicants would be unable to support the need for a certificate unless (i) they were able to present updated information or (ii) the application had been re-filed in Maryland. Subsequent filings, however, have diluted the persuasiveness of the reasons to dismiss. First, the revised proposal to toll will assure the availability of updated information. Specifically, tolling the running of the statutory deadline will assure that the PJM February 2010 RTEP will be filed in this case and the parties, as well as the Commission, will have sufficient time to evaluate the issues presented by that updated study. Second, the assurance that the PATH Project will be re-filed in Maryland avoids proceeding in West Virginia without parallel filings in other affected jurisdictions.

The Commission will deny the motions to dismiss.

### Procedural Schedule

Several parties submitted procedural schedules. The schedules were substantially similar. The Commission will adopt the schedule submitted by the Applicants and endorsed by Staff. There are several advantages afforded by the Applicants schedule: (i) the extended discovery period following issuance of the February 2010 RTEP and (ii) a submission date for the Applicants testimony to allow inclusion of the May 2010 RPM capacity auction. The Commission will adopt the following schedule for use in this case.

Event	Date
Discovery reopens on issues of electrical need.	Monday, February 1, 2010
Applicants file supplemental testimony on issue of electrical need and any other issues requiring supplementation.	Noon, Tuesday, June 29, 2010
Deadline for propounding discovery on supplemental testimony due June 29, 2010.	Noon, Tuesday, July 13, 2010
Staff's and Intervenors' prepared direct testimony and rebuttal to the direct testimony of Applicants.	Noon, Tuesday, August 31, 2010
Deadline for propounding discovery in, response to testimony due August 31, 2010.	Noon, Tuesday, September 7, 2010
Applicants' rebuttal testimony to the direct testimony for Staff and Intervenors, and Staff and Intervenor rebuttal testimony to the direct testimony of one another.	Noon, Tuesday, September 28, 2010
Deadline for propounding discovery in response to the rebuttal testimony due September 28, 2010.	Noon, Tuesday, October 5, 2010
Written opening statements.	Noon, Thursday, October 14, 2010
Evidentiary hearing begins.	Monday, October 18, 2010
Evidentiary hearing ends.	Tuesday, November 2, 2010
Initial briefs and proposed orders.	Noon, Tuesday, November 30, 2010
Reply briefs.	Noon, Thursday, December 16, 2010
Deadline for Commission decision.	Thursday, February 24, 2011

The parties should note that the discovery period beginning February 1, 2010 and ending July 13, 2010 is limited to (i) the issue of need, and (ii) any issues supplemented by the June 29, 2010 testimony filed by the Applicants. Additionally, the "party responsibilities" outlined in the Commission August 4, 2009 order, and the specific rules regarding service and filings of documents and discovery described in the August 21, 2009 order remain in effect.

The "Backstop" Provision

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 added Section 216(b) to the FPA giving the FERC "backstop" transmission siting authority under certain conditions. The language in Section 216(b)(1)(C)(i) allows FERC to permit the siting and construction of new transmission lines when the state authority has withheld approval for more than one year after the filing of an application seeking approval. The Commission does not have authority to modify the one year triggering period in the FPA. The Commission interprets the Applicants proposal to toll this proceeding as an indication that the Applicants will not avail themselves of the backstop provision pending resolution of the current proceeding. The Applicants should immediately notify the Commission if this interpretation is not correct.

### FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. The motions to dismiss primarily focus on updating information on the question of need and the current state of the PATH Project filing before the Maryland PSC.
- 2. The Applicants submitted a revised proposal to toll, a revised procedural schedule endorsed by Staff, and an assertion that the PATH Project will be re-filed in Maryland by the end of this year.
- 3. The procedural schedule submitted by the Applicants and endorsed by Staff will provide (i) an extended discovery period on the question of need and (ii) revised testimony on need including the February 2010 RTEP and the May 2010 RPM capacity auction.

### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. The revised proposal to toll supported by the Applicant and assertion regarding re-filing of the PATH Project in Maryland renders it unnecessary for the Commission to deliberate further on the motions to dismiss.
  - 2. It is reasonable to deny the motions to dismiss.
- 3. It is reasonable to grant the Applicants revised proposal to toll the running of the statutory deadline in this proceeding for 247 days, which shall establish a new deadline of February 24, 2011 for a Commission decision.

- 4. The procedural schedule proposed by the Applicants and endorsed by Staff is reasonable and will be adopted by the Commission in this case. The "party responsibilities" outlined in the Commission August 4, 2009 order, and the specific rules regarding service and filings of documents and discovery described in the August 21, 2009 order remain in effect.
- 5. It is reasonable to interpret the Applicants proposal to toll the running of the statutory deadline in this proceeding as an indication that the Applicants will not avail themselves of the right to seek a permit from the Federal Energy Regulations Commission pursuant to §216(b) of the Federal Power Act a provision pending resolution of the current proceeding.

### **ORDER**

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Staff and the Burleyson/Weiblen motions to dismiss this proceeding are denied.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Applicants revised proposal to toll is hereby granted. The statutory due date in this matter is tolled until Thursday, February 24, 2011.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the procedural schedule established herein, including the hearing beginning October 18, 2010, is adopted for use in this proceeding.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Applicants must notify the Commission within five days of the date of this Order if they disagree that their proposal to delay a decision in this case by tolling the West Virginia statutory suspension period is also an agreement by the Applicants that they will not avail themselves of the Federal permitting process pursuant to \$216(b) of the Federal Power Act of 2005.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Commission Executive Secretary serve a copy of this Order on all parties of record via electronic mail or United States First Class Mail as appropriate, and on Commission Staff by hand delivery.

A Cres Cope? Terms

Gala Green

JJW/slc 090770cg.wpd

> onic service Commission of West Virginia Charleston

8

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 21st day of December 2009, a true copy of the foregoing Motion was delivered by hand or mailed, first-class, postage prepaid, to the attached service list, which was copied from the Commission's electronic service list in Case No. PUE-2009-00043 on December 21, 2009 and to the following:

C. Meade Browder, Jr., Esq. Office of Attorney General 900 E. Main Street 2nd Floor Richmond, VA 23219

Wayne N. Smith, Esq.
Frederick Ochsenhirt, Esq.
State Corporation Commission
1300 East Main Street
Tyler Building, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor
Richmond, VA 23219

### SERVICE LIST CASE NO. PUE-2009-00043 AS OF DECEMBER 21 2009

BAIGMAPAGEC	3 - 16 Van inter antique
Benson, W. T.	Esquire Piedmont Environmental Council
· ·	PO Box 460
Browers and an area of the second	Warrenton VA 20188
	Office and the African Canada
The state of the s	
Burger, John D.	39605 Wenner Rd
	Lovettsville VA 20180
Cadden, Kevin F.	1602 Aerie Lane
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	McLean VA 22101
Paradorio de de la companya del companya de la companya del companya de la compan	RATE OF THE STATE
Cardamon, Don C.	12226 Harpers Ferry Rd
	Purceliville VA 20132
Stierwek Lini (Factor	
Crowley, James K.	PO Box 344
	40267 Quarter Branch Rd
BEEN BEITTE BETTE	Lovettsville VA 20180
Dellano, Josephine B.	2567 E 21st St Brooklyn NY 11235-2918
PROFILE STATE OF THE PROFILE S	THE REPORT OF THE PARTY OF THE
Dunagin, James	13226 Crest Lane
Duragai, saises	Purceliville VA 20132
Duning in Valence 200	COSC MINE TO THE TAXABLE PARTY OF THE PARTY
Dunlap, Daniel C.	39593 Sugar Maple Lane
	Lovettsville VA 20180
cinade Evadeiro a propieta	SON OF CAMPARATERS AND
Fisher-Guarino, Taina G.	11771 Folly Lane
A. Annual Market	Lovettsville VA 20180
Flancing (P. Chr. 2)	
Eggpapa Kapacih M	10015 Chadulana
Fognano, Kenneth M.	12915 Shady Lane Purceliville VA 20132
Cary Fight Big.	
	STERM STELLING TO SELECTION TO

Ghiorzi Baus, Angela	313 Ross St Morgantown WV 26501
Ghiorzi, Irene A.	39558 Wenner Rd Lovettsville VA 20180
Ghiorzi, Theresa	39558 Wenner Rd Lovettsville VA 20180
Golgies artibanes d'autre de la company de l	
Griffin, J. D.	29 N Braddock St PO Box 444
	Winchester VA 22604
Hall, Patricia A.	39540 Quarter Branch Rd
Ance	Lovettsville VA 20180
Hodgson, Gordon M.	11820 Berlin Turnpike
rioppietit zamien (2000)	Lovettsville VA 20180
Hoffman, James S.	39883 Catoclin View Lane
	Lovettsville VA 20180
Hyatt, Franklin J.	39687 Wenner Rd
	Lovettsville VA 20180
Johnson, Lauren	190 Hannah Court Winchester VA 22603
lgerisen kommer i transmissione i transmissione i transmissione i transmissione i transmissione i transmissione	Witchester VA 22503
Kershner, Robert J.	11688 Purcel) Rd
Course Course	Economie VA 20100
Lawson, Keith	11750 Berlin Tpk Lovettsville VA 20180
n di Madaret Gadria Supera Se	
MacHorton, J. G.	12910 Crest Lane Purcelville VA 20132
HARCHER TO THE RESERVE TO THE RESERV	
Marmet, Robert G.	Esquire Piedmont Environmental Council
	45 Horner St PO Box 460
VERBER 2008 Communication of the Communication of t	Warrenton VA 20188
Matarazzo, William	39825 Sugar Maple Lane
	Lovettsville VA 20180

Meiser, Hala A.	8700 Lothbury Court Fairfax VA 22031
Melser Holase N	11479 Potomac Heights Lane Lovettsville VA 20180
Murphy, Timothy	12031 Morningstar Place Lovettsville VA 20180
Nizola Baran Palmer, Randall B.	Esquire Aliegheny Energy 800 Cabin Hill Drive Greensburg PA 15601-1689
Randles, Kenneth	39998 Catoctin View Lane Lovettsville VA 20180
Rancolor Recoral B. Rittner, Dawn	Glidan A 2018 12001 Morningstar Pl Lovettsville VA 20180
Roberts, John R.	County Attorney County of Loudoun 1 Harrison St., SE/5th Ft. Leesburg VA 20175-8102
Rosenthal, Dawn L.	39763 Rivers Edge Lane Lovettsville VA 20180
Resent is Sidne & Silverman, Deanna	12011 Morningstar Place Lovettsville VA 20180
Signate John Jav. Trout, Jeffrey P.	Esquire Allegheny Power 800 Cabin Hill Dr Greensburg PA 15601
Ulmer, Tylee M.	Brighter (so temps to the control of
Vanderhye, Robert A.	Lovettsville VA 20180  Books Agent Value 100
Wallsquariance Paragraphic	McLean VA 22101-1625

Wallington, Mary L.

11583 Scott Morgan Lane Lovettsville VA 20180-1868







Zwicker, David

12220 Harpers Ferry Rd Purcellville VA 20132



# N.J. utilities board unanimously approves \$750M power line project

## By Lawrence Ragonese/The Star-Ledger February 11, 2010, 6:29PM



Jerry McCrea/The Star-Ledger

A view of PSE&G's Susquehanna-Roseland transmission line in Montville. A proposal by PSE&G would more than triple the line's current size and capacity. The state Board of Public Utilities heard testimony on the project today and is expected to make a decision next week.

The state Board of Public Utilities has unanimously approved the \$750 million Susquehanna-Roseland power line project that will cut through North Jersey with a goal of providing a reliable power supply to the region.

The board voted 5-0 at a hearing in Newark in favor of the Public Service Electric & Gas Co. plan to run new 500-kilovolt towers along an existing 45-mile power line route through Warren, Sussex and Morris and Essex counties.

Board members said the company had proven it is "reasonably necessary" to construct the new power lines to ensure a future power supply to serve the needs of the state's residents.

"We have to ensure a safe, reliable power services for the people of the state of New Jersey," said Commissioner Joseph Fiordaliso, who served as hearing officer for the case.

"I'm convinced of the need, convinced there is no real alternative," added Commissioner Frederick Butler.

Opponents of the project were disappointed, saying PSE&G did not prove its case. They contend the power project will harm the environment, contribute to illnesses, hurt local property values and damage the

aesthetics of one of the state's most natural areas.

"The BPU\_ the Board of Promoting Utilities \_ just sold out clean energy and the people of New Jersey," said Jeff Tittel, director of the New Jersey Sierra Club.

Opponents hoped Gov. Chris Christie might intercede on their behalf, but he has declined, allowing the BPU to serve as his experts on the issue, said a spokesman for the governor.

### Previous coverage:

- N.J. utilities board delays decision on \$750M power line project due to snow
- N.J. board hears testimony on \$750M power line, plans to issue ruling next week
- Opponents of \$750M power-line project urge residents, Gov. Christie to fight PSE&G plan
- © 2010 NJ.com. All rights reserved.

### OCC EXHIBIT 2-A

CORRECTIONS
To the April 15, 2010 PREPARED TESTIMONY of

### WILSON GONZALEZ ON BEHALF OF THE OFFICE OF THE OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

Page	Line	Change	
23	18	Change "\$193 to \$332" to "\$183 to \$322"	
39	13	Change "5" to ".5"	
39	13	Change "\$109" to "\$95"	
39	footnote 59	Change "5" to ".5"	
42	23	Change "\$193 to \$332" to "\$183 to \$322"	-

Name   Comparison   Compariso	Case One: DCR, Modified Distribution Rate Case and Revenue Decoupling	g Scenario					Corrected Schedule WG-1	nedule WG-1	_
June 11 - May 12   June 12 - May   June 13 - May   June 14 - May   June 15 - May   June 15 - May   June 15 - May   June 16 - May   June 17 - May   June 17 - May   June 18 - May   June 18 - May   June 19 -	FE Assumptions							· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
June 11 - May 12   June 12 - May   June 13 - May   June 14 - May   June 15 - May   S June 16 - May   T	(1) CBP Price (\$/MWH) 61.50					Andread or continuous to the state of the st			
June 11 - May 12   June 12 - May   June 13 - May   June 14 - May   June 15 - May   17	(2) RS Retail Generation Rate (Non-Seasonal) (\$/MWH) 63.23				The same of the sa				
June 11 - May 12   June 12 - May   June 13 - May   June 14 - May   June 15 - May   17	9.44)							•	
Millions   Smillions   Smill	(5) Net Present Value Discount Rate 8.48%								-
MANUAL)   (MANUAL)	THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY O	June 11 - May 12	June 12 - May	June 13 - May	June 14 - May	June 15 - May	16 June 16 - M	ay 17	
1193.396   1,202,877   1,200,378   1,194,670   1,186,591     Revenue   Rev		(MWH)	(MWH)	(MWH)	(MWH)	(MWH)	and a second		
Severne   Revenue   Reve	(6) RS PIPP	1,193,396		1,200,378			591		
Revenue         Revenue <t< td=""><td>(7) Total</td><td>52,521,450</td><td></td><td>54,175,960</td><td></td><td>54,685,</td><td>040</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	(7) Total	52,521,450		54,175,960		54,685,	040		
\$ millions \$ millions \$ millions \$ millions   \$ millions		Revenue	Revenue	Revenue	Revenue	Revenue	Revenue		
124 6	THE PROPERTY CASES IN CO. SECURITY CASES IN CO. SECURITY	\$ millions	\$ millions	\$ millions	\$ millions	\$ millions	\$ millions	de la companya de desarrollar de la companya del companya del companya de la comp	
70.9   71.5   71.3   71.5   71.3   71.5	(8) Delivery Capital Recovery (DCR) Rider \$2.34/MWH	51.3							
10	(9) PIPP RS Generation Revenue \$ 59.44/MWH	70.9			- 100				
Columbia	(10) Economic Development Funds	-1.0	er of a special section of the secti			1 44			
Columbia	1	-0.5	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			Ar and an artist of the second			
Columbia	(12) MISO Exit Cost Estimate	0.0	al qui albite y mandays in al phagainness and all			the second of the second	0.0		
136.0   10.0   0	(13) PJM Integration Cost Estimate (\$5.0)	0.0	THE RESERVE A MANAGEMENT	The same of the same of		:	0.0		
136	(14) Right Estimated Andrew CSD (Angresses Brook and all put after)	0.0		:			2 6	22.2	
Revenue   Reve	Smart Grid Cost (1)	0.0	!		:		2	? ??	
136.0   223.9   233.3   136.0   223.9   233.3   136.0   233.3   136.0   233.3   136.0   233.3   136.0   283.3   136.0   283.5   233.	TO THE PARTY OF TH							•	
Revenue         Revision         Remilions         <	(15) Total Revenues Per Year	136.0					23	23.3	\$662.6
ted by 40%)         \$ millions         \$ mill		Revenue	Revenue	Revenue	Revenue	Revenue		MRO (	Savin
tred by 40%) 28.3 68.6 70.0  70.6 71.2 71.0  71.0 3.5 3.5  7.6 13.3 11.6 \$3.5 \$3.5  \$186.3 \$156.1 \$3.5 \$3.5  \$186.3 \$156.1 \$3.5 \$3.5  \$24.5 \$18.5 \$156.1 \$1.8 \$1.8 \$1.8 \$1.8 \$1.8 \$1.8 \$1.8 \$1			\$ millions	\$ millions	. 1	\$ millions	& millions	S milli	lions
1.6   71.2   71.0   3.5   3.	(16) Distribution Rate Case (Based on Rider DCR Discounted by 40%)	28.3					* 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		136.0
ted Under MRO (2)         18         3.6         3.5	(17) PIPP RS Generation Revenue Discounted .5 Percent	70.6				4			1.0
% by Operational Savings         7.6         13.3         11.6         \$3.5         \$3	Estimated Lost Revenue Collected Under MRO (2)	1.8	1		The state of the s		3.5		ගී
STORE   STORE   STORE   STORE   STORE   STORE   STORE     STORE   STORE   STORE   STORE     STORE   STORE   STORE     STORE   STORE   STORE     STORE   STORE   STORE     STORE   STORE   STORE     STORE   STORE   STORE     STORE   STORE   STORE     STORE   STORE   STORE     STORE   STORE   STORE     STORE   STORE     STORE   STORE   STORE     STORE	Smart Grid Cost Discounted 10% by Operational Savings	7.6							3.6
	(18) Iotal Revenues Per Year	\$108.3		5			3.5	63.5	7
Present Value Summary  (19) NPV: ESP  (20) NPV: ESP  (20) NPV: SIRC  (21) Banefits to Customers (MRO - ESP)  (22) Assumptions Customers (MRO - ESP)  (23) Assumptions  (24) Rate Case Reduction Percentage  (25) Assumptions  (26) Rate Case Reduction from Competitive Bid  (27) Decoupling Adjustment Factor  (28) Occidentage Reduction from Competitive Bid  (28) Occidentage Reduction from Competitive Bid  (29) Occidentage Reduction from Competitive Bid  (20) Occidentage Reduction from	MRO Savings per Year	27.8					9.8	19.8	\$23
(19) NPV: ESP (20) NPV: MRO (20) NPV: MRO (21) Benefits to Customers (MRO - ESP) (21) Benefits to Customers (MRO - ESP) (21) Sale \$362 (21) Benefits to Customers (MRO - ESP) (2) Assumption Smart Grid Cost from Case No. 09-1820-EL-ATA and with federal match (Distributed according to Response to OCC Set 1 DR 25) (2) Assumptions (2) Assumptions (2) Assumptions (2) Rate Case Reduction Percentage (3) PIPP Percentage Reduction from Competitive Bid (4) 6005	Present Value Summary							:	
(21) Benefits to Customers (MRO - ESP)       (\$183)         (21) Benefits to Customers (MRO - ESP)       (\$183)             (2) Assumptions       Smart Grid Cost from Case No. 09-1820-EL-ATA and with federal match (Distributed according to Response to OCC Set 1 DR 25)         (2) Assumptions       OCC Assumptions         Rate Case Reduction Percentage       0.6         PIPP Percentage Reduction from Competitive Bid       0.06         Decoupling Adjustment Factor       0.005	(19) NPV: ESP	\$545	a desperate the second second second second second		the first many of any other little from the first of the	and an annual an annual and an annual an			
(21) Banefits to Customers (MRO - ESP)  (1) \$72.2 Million Smart Grid Cost from Case No. 09-1820-EL-ATA and with federal match (Distributed according to Response to OCC Set 1 DR 25)  (2) Assumptions  OCC Assumptions Rate Case Reduction Percentage Rate Case Reduction from Competitive Bid Decoupling Adjustment Factor  0.005	(20) NPV: MRO	\$362							
(1) \$72.2 Million Smart Grid Cost from Case No. 09-1820-EL-ATA and with federal match (Distributed according to Response to OCC Set 1 DR 25)  (2) Assumes Lost Revenue Recovery occurs through distribution rate case and decoupling with .5 percent annual adjustment  OCC Assumptions  Rate Case Reduction Percentage PIPP Percentage Reduction from Competitive Bid  Decoupling Adjustment Factor  0.005	(21) Benefits to Customers (MRO - ESP)	(\$183)							
(2) Assumes Lost Revenue Recovery occurs through distribution rate case and decoupling with .5 percent annual adjustment  OCC Assumptions Rate Case Reduction Percentage PIPP Percentage Reduction from Competitive Bid Decoupling Adjustment Factor	(1) \$72.2 Million Smart Grid Cost from Case No. 09-1820-EL-ATA and with fer	deral match (Distrib	uted according t	o Response to	OCC Set 1 DR	25)		:	
	(2) Assumes Lost Revenue Recovery occurs through distribution rate case an	d decoupling with.	5 percent annua	adjustment		1			,
	- THE COLUMN THE REAL PROPERTY AND ADDRESS OF THE PROPERTY OF	man / ar and an ar an ar and a general contract of the art and are an area.				-	e mellen		
	OCC Assumptions				,				
	Rate Case Reduction Percentage	9.0							: .
	PIPP Percentage Reduction from Competitive Bid	0.935							,
	Decoupling Adjustment Factor	0.005			-				

JOTAL OHIO					A		
FE Assumptions							:
(1) CBP Price (\$/MWH) 61.50					The state of the s		
(2) RS Retail Generation Rate (Non-Seasonal) (\$/MWH) 63.23			Committee and the committee of the commi			A COMMENT OF THE PARTY OF THE P	
(3) PIPP KS Generation Discount 6% (4) BIPP PS Patril Generation Boto (Non-Economy) (#MAN) 50 44)	the state of the s			The state of the s		3	:
(5) Net Present Value Discount Rate 8.48%							
Sales Forecast	June 11 - May 12	June 12 - May	June 13 - May		June 14 - May June 15 - May 16	16 June 16 - May	17
	(ммн)		٤	Ξ,	¥ ∑	the plane of a mapping of the total same has been present and	
(U) NO FIFF	1,193,396		1	1,194,670	1,188,591		
(17) 10tg	52,521,450	53,274,861	54,175,960			041	
ESP Provisions	Revenue	Revenue	Revenue	Revenue	Revenue	Revenue	
	\$ millions	\$ millions	\$ millions	\$ millions	\$ millions	\$ millions	
(8) Delivery Capital Recovery (DCR) Rider at \$390 Millon Cap	66.1	160.4	163.6			1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
(9) PIPP RS Generation Revenue \$ 59.44/MWH	6.07	71.5					
(10) Economic Development Funds	-1.0	-					,
(11) Fuel Fund (\$0.5) (\$0.5)	-0.5				5		
(12) MISO EXIT COST Estimate	0.0					0.0	
(13) FJW Integration Cost Estimate (\$5.0)	0.0		[	17:14:15	es many a serie de mineral management de management de la constitució de la constitu	0.0	
	0.0				And to the contract the second	- comme de formation de la section de la comme	-!(
Lost Revenue Collected Under ESP (Assumes 6 year provision of last stb.)	6.8			23.3		23.3	23.3
Smart Grad Cost (1)	8.5	14.7	12.9				
(15) Total Revenues Per Year	150.8	259.7	269.5	23.3		23.3	23.3 \$749.8
							-
MRO Provisions	Revenue	Revenue	Revenue	Revenue	Revenue		MRO Savings
	\$ millions	\$ millions	\$ millions	\$ millions	\$ millions	\$ millions	\$ millions
(16) Distribution Rate Case (Based on Rider DCR Discounted 40%)	28.3						223.2
(17) PIPP RS Generation Revenue	70.6		_		1	The second secon	;
Estimated Lost Revenue Collected Under MRO (2)	1.8			3.5		3.5	3.5 95.2
Smart Grid Cost (minus 10 percent operational savings)	7.6	!					,
(18) Total Revenues Per Year	\$108.3		\$156.1			:	:
MRO Savings per Year	42.6	103.2	113.4	19.8	1	19.8	19.8 \$318.5
Prozent Valus Summery				The same of the sa			: -
May NDV. Eeb	-						
(19) NTV. EST (20) NDV. 4DO	/105						The state of the s
(24) MrV. mrV (21) Benefits to Customers (MRO , ESD)	\$362						
	(CC7#)						The same of the sa
(1) \$72.2 Million Smart Grid Cost from Case No. 09-1820-EL-ATA and with federal match (Distributed according to Response to OCC Set 1 DR 25)	deral match (Distrib	uted according 1	to Response to	OCC Set 1 DR	25)		
(2) Assumes Lost Revenue Recovery occurs through distribution rate case and d	nd decoupling with .5 percent annual adjustment	percent annua	l adjustment			Control of the contro	
OCC Assumptions					The same of many of many or ma		
Rate Case Reduction Percentage	9.0					A service and the service of the ser	
PIPP Percentage Reduction from Competitive Bid	0.935						
Lost Revenue Adjustment Factor	0.005						

Midth 01 std   Midt	Case Infee: D.C.K. Zero Distribution Rate Case Recovery and Revenue Decoupling Scenario	ecoupling Scenari			e de la composition della comp		Corrected Schedule WG	aure we - 18	'n
Minth (ii) Light	TOTAL OHIO			100			× 1		
Part	FE Assumptions								
Control Records (SAVIVI) 55.22   Control Records (SAVIVI) 55.22   Control Records (SAVIVI) 55.22   Control Records (SAVIVI) 55.24	(1) CBP Price (\$MWH) 61.50								
Second Color   Seco	2) RS Retail Generation Rate (Non-Seasonal) (\$/MWH) 63.23				and operations of the special former to the second	and the second s	The American contract of the C		
The Proposite Rate & APPs,   The Proposite Rate & APPs,   The Proposition Rate & APPs,   Th	3) FIFT RS Serietation Discount 976 4) PIPP RS Refail Generation Rafa (Non-Seasons) (\$6000H 50.44)								
Name   1 - New   12 - New   13 - New   14 - New   15 - New   16 - New   17 - New   16 - New   17 - New   18	(5) Net Present Value Discount Rate 8.48%					, and a second			: ;
Comparison	Sales Forecast	June 11 - May 12	June 12 - May		v June 14 - May	June 15 - Ma	/ 16 June 16 - N	fav 17	
150		(MWH)	(MWH)		(MWH)	(MWH)			:
Second   S	6) RS PIPP	1,193,396				,	591		
Second	7) Total	52,521,450		2	'n		040		
Stationary (DCR) Pider \$2.34/AWH	SP Provisions	Revenue	Revenue	Revenue	Revenue	Revenue	Revenue		
Page   Recentle   Page   Pag		\$ millions	\$ millions	\$ millions	\$ millions	\$ millions	\$ millions		
10   11   12   13   14.44W/H   10   11   11   11   11   11   11   1	8) Delivery Capital Recovery (DCR) Rider \$2.34/MWH	513							
State   Case	9) PIPP RS Generation Revenue \$ 59.44/MWH	70.9			3;				
University   Uni	10) Economic Development Funds	-1.0			0			- 1	
State Case (Zero collars approved)	11) Fuel Fund (\$0.5) (\$0.5) (\$0.5)	0.5							
On October Estimate (45.0)         0.0 </td <td>2) MISO Exit Cost Estimate</td> <td>0.0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.0</td> <td></td> <td></td>	2) MISO Exit Cost Estimate	0.0					0.0		
Second Control of Second Con	13) PJM Integration Cost Estimate (\$5.0)	0.0					0.0		
146   23.3   2	44) KIET ESIMATO	0.0					0.0	The state of the s	
Units         136.0         223.9         23.3         23.3         23.3         23.3         4.8         1.29         23.3         <	USE REVENUE COILECTED UNDER ESP (ASSUMES & YEAR DIOVISION OF LAST STD.)	0					23.3	23.3	
uss Per Vear         136.0         223.9         23.3         23.5         3.5	וואו פות סמו ( ז )	Ö,Ö						;	ŗ
NROS	5) Total Revenues Per Year	136.0					23.3	23.3	\$662.6
Sque Case (Zero dollars approved)         \$ millions         \$ millions </td <td>IRO Provisions</td> <td>Revenue</td> <td>Revenue</td> <td>Revenue</td> <td>Revenue</td> <td>Revenue</td> <td></td> <td>MRO</td> <td>Savings</td>	IRO Provisions	Revenue	Revenue	Revenue	Revenue	Revenue		MRO	Savings
Second Continued approved to the continued to the cont	(2) Distribution Date Cons. (72m dell.	_	\$ millions	S millions	- 1	\$ millions	\$ millions	≣ 8-	lions
Particular   Par	7) PIDD DS Generation Descripted is Descripted in Description	70.0						٠	302.0
Discounted 10% by Operational Savings	stimated Lost Revenue Collected Under MRO (2)	201			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		4	in m	5. 7. 5. 7. 7. 8.
uses Per Year         \$88.0         \$88.0         \$88.0         \$3.5         \$3.5         \$3.5           ummany         \$6.1         135.9         146.8         19.8         19.8         19.8           ummany         \$54.5         \$22.3         \$22.5         \$3.2 </td <td>mart Grid Cost Discounted 10% by Operational Savings</td> <td>7.6</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>, } ;</td> <td>3.6</td>	mart Grid Cost Discounted 10% by Operational Savings	7.6						, } ;	3.6
wr Year         135.9         146.8         19.8	(8) Total Revenues Per Year	\$80.0					\$3.5	\$3.5	\$264.5
19) NPV: ESP 20) NPV: ESP 20) NPV: ESP 21) NPV: ESP 21) NPV: ESP 2223 2223 21) NPV: MRO 21) Benefits to Customers (MRO - ESP) 2222	IRO Savings per Year	56.1					19.8	19.8	\$398.1
9) NPV: ESP 20) NPV: ESP 20) NPV: MRO 5223  21) Benefits to Customers (MRO - ESP)  (\$322)  (\$323)  (\$322)  (\$323)  (\$322)  (\$323)  (\$3	resent Value Summary			,			, a		:
90) NPV: MRO  1) Benefits to Customers (MRO - ESP)  1) \$72.2 Million Smart Grid Cost from Case No. 09-1820-EL-ATA and with federal match (Distributed according to Response to OCC Set 1 DR 25)  2) Assumes Lost Revenue Recovery occurs through distribution rate case and decoupling with .5 percent annual adjustment  CC Assumptions  CC Assumptions  are Case Reduction Forcentage  IPP Percentage Reduction from Competitive Bid  ost Revenue Adjustment Factor  0.005	9) NPV: ESP	\$545							
1) Benefits to Customers (MRO - ESP)  1) \$72.2 Million Smart Grid Cost from Case No. 09-1820-EL-ATA and with federal match (Distributed according to Response to OCC Set 1 DR 25)  2) Assumes Lost Revenue Recovery occurs through distribution rate case and decoupling with .5 percent annual adjustment  CC Assumptions  CC Assumptions  ide Case Reduction Percentage  IPP Percentage Reduction from Competitive Bid  ost Revenue Adjustment Factor  0.005	20) NPV: MRO	\$223			-				:
1) \$72.2 Million Smart Grid Cost from Case No. 09-1820-EL-ATA and with federal match (Distributed according to Response to OCC Set 1 DR 25)  2) Assumes Lost Revenue Recovery occurs through distribution rate case and decoupling with .5 percent annual adjustment  CC Assumptions  Rate Case Reduction Percentage 1 PP Percentage Reduction from Competitive Bid  O. 935  Ost Revenue Adjustment Factor  O. 0005	21) Benefits to Customers (MRO - ESP)	(\$322							
OCC Assumptions  Acte Case Reduction from Competitive Bid  OST Revenue Adjustment Factor  OC. Assumptions  OC. Assumptions  OC. Assumptions  OC. OST Revenue Adjustment Factor  OC. OST Revenue Adjustment Factor	1) \$72.2 Million Smart Grid Cost from Case No. 09-1820-EL-ATA and with fe	deral match (District	outed according	to Response to	OCC Set 1 DR	25)	The second secon	!	
Competitive Bid	בן דייסי מוווסם בספר ויסי טוומס דעיסיסיסן ליסיסיס אין אויסטאים אין מיסיאים וויסים מו	The Buildhoon N			and the section of th			e •	
Competitive Bid	OCC Assumptions			1 10 and		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	3		
Competitive Bid	tate Case Reduction Percentage								
	IPP Percentage Reduction from Competitive Bid	0.93							
	ost Revenue Adjustment Factor	00:00	ć					: : : !	

--

				į		
	'n hartet	Res rev dist operating com; residential	operating comp	residential		
Revenue Requirement from 07-551-EL-AIR with Residential Distribution	\$ 465,140,883	0.4755 cei	<b>.</b>	\$221,174,490		
	\$ 195,451,002	0.5793 te	9	\$113,224,765		
	\$ 577,011,492	0.6245 09	90	\$360,343,677		
	\$ 1,237,603,377			\$694,742,932		
	0\$	1			,	
Residential Decoupling	1st Period	2nd Period	3rd Period	4th Period 5	5th Period	6th Period
Revenue Requirement from Last Rate Case	\$694,742,932	\$694,742,932 \$694,742,932 \$694,742,932 \$694,742,932	\$694.742.932	\$694,742,932	\$694,742,932	\$694 742 932
Revenue from DCR discounted 40 % at 39.21 % of Residential Share	\$ 6,648,448	6,648,448 \$ 16,134,131 \$ 16,458,790	\$ 16,458,790	63		49
New Revenue Requirement	\$701,391,380	\$701,391,380 \$710,877,063 \$711,201,722 \$694,742,932	\$711,201,722	\$694,742,932	\$694,742,932	\$694,742,932
Decoupling Amount Collected	S 1 753 478	2 2 554 295	E 2 556 000	\$ 2 A72 74E	2 472 745	يوا