## VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Andrew S. Johnston, Executive Secretary
Maryland Public Service Commission
William Donald Schaefer Tower, 16th Floor
6 St. Paul Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

## Re: Application of The Potomac Edison Company for Adjustments to its Retail Rates for the Distribution of Electric Energy

## Dear Executive Secretary Johnston:

The Potomac Edison Company ("PE" or the "Company") hereby files electronically this date its Application for Adjustments to its Retail Rates for the Distribution of Electric Energy.

As required by the provisions of the Code of Maryland Regulations ("COMAR") 20.07.04.07, the Company concurrently files herewith sixteen pieces of Direct Testimony and Exhibits of its witnesses: Raymond E. Valdes, Stephanie L. Fall, Donald J. McGettigan, Weizhong (Bill) Wang, Gregory J. Gawlik, Susan M. Colflesh, Bobbi S. Miller, Jill A. Soltis, Heather E. Ward, Tracy M. Ashton, Walter S. Larnerd, Dylan W. D'Ascendis, Timothy S. Lyons, ${ }^{1}$ John J. Spanos, and Mark Warner.

As described further in the Application and Direct Testimony, PE's request for adjustment to retail rates includes a request for the approval of two new innovative low-income assistance initiatives in accordance with the Maryland Code's Public Utilities Article ("PUA") § 4-309. Pursuant to PUA § 4-309(d)(1)(ii), and as set forth in PE's Application, PE is seeking prior approval from the Commission to consider these low-income assistance initiatives as part of this rate case filing.

In addition, the Company files with this Application the Supplemental Information required by the Commission's April 18, 1983 Secretarial Letter Order. Certain portions of the Supplemental Information are Confidential and will be filed separately.

Although the Commission's March 16, 2020 Operational Notice has waived the requirement to provide paper copies of this filing, PE will provide a limited number of paper copies
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of this filing as a courtesy to the Commission. The Maillog number assigned to this filing will be indicated above for your reference.

If you need additional information or have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

J. Joseph Curran, III

Enclosures<br>Cc: Jeffrey Trout, The Potomac Edison Company<br>Jessica Raba, The Potomac Edison Company<br>Lloyd Spivak, Staff Counsel<br>David Lapp, People's Counsel

## BEFORE THE <br> PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND

In the Matter of the Application * Of the Potomac Edison Company * For Adjustments to its Retail * Rates for the Distribution of * Electric Energy *

Case No. $\qquad$

## APPLICATION OF THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

## FOR ADJUSTMENTS TO ITS RETAIL RATES FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF

 ELECTRIC ENERGYThe Potomac Edison Company ("PE" or "the Company"), a public service company under the Public Utilities Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland ("PUA"), herein applies for authority to adjust its retail rates for the distribution of electric energy in its Maryland service territory pursuant to PUA §§ 4-203 and 4-204. All correspondence and communications concerning this matter should be sent to the following persons at the addresses stated below:

Jeffrey P. Trout, Senior Corporate Counsel<br>Jessica M. Raba, Corporate Counsel<br>The Potomac Edison Company<br>10802 Bower Avenue<br>Williamsport, MD 21795<br>(301) 790-6116<br>jtrout2@firstenergycorp.com<br>jraba@firstenergycorp.com<br>and<br>J. Joseph Curran, III<br>Christopher S. Gunderson<br>Susan R. Schipper<br>Venable LLP<br>750 E. Pratt Street, Suite 900<br>Baltimore, MD 21202<br>(410) 244-5468<br>jcurran@venable.com

## csgunderson@venable.com

 srschipper@venable.comThrough this Application, PE seeks an increase of distribution rates to recover the costs of the Company's ongoing efforts to provide safe and reliability service to its customers in a costeffective manner. PE's request also includes the costs of important service and state-policy initiatives, including but not limited to: moving the costs of past Electric Distribution Investment Surcharge ("EDIS") projects into rate base, as directed by the Commission in the Company's last rate case order, as well as proposing a Phase II of EDIS to continue proactive investments in system reliability and resiliency; recovery of costs for the Electric Vehicle charging pilot program (Case No. 9478); recovery of costs for the Commission's and the Company's responses to protect customers, PE employees, and the integrity of the distribution system during the COVID pandemic; and two new initiatives, undertaken in response to recent Maryland legislation, to provide further assistance to the Company's low-income customers.

PE files herewith certain adjustments to its electric base rates and other revisions to its Electric Service Tariffs to become effective on April 22, 2023. In support of its application, PE states as follows:

## Description of PE

1. PE is a public service company subject to regulation by the Maryland Public Service Commission ("Commission") pursuant to § 2-112 of the PUA.
2. Currently, PE provides electric service to approximately 285,000 customers in Maryland, across a service territory of 2,547 miles. PE's service territory covers approximately 26\% of Maryland's land mass and includes all or parts of Allegany, Carroll, Frederick, Garrett,

Howard, Montgomery, and Washington counties and 41 municipalities. PE's unique service territory is a combination of suburban, rural, and mountainous terrain and demographics.

## Requested Increase in Rates

3. Under the provisions of PUA § 5-303, PE has the affirmative duty to furnish utilities, services, and facilities which are safe, adequate, just, reasonable, economical and efficient.
4. In order to continue to meet its obligation to provide safe and adequate service, PE must continuously replace and enhance its distribution system infrastructure and must also continue to make substantial investments in infrastructure and have a reasonable opportunity to recover its costs. The costs in this case cover investments since PE's last base rate case, as well as planned spending on reliability in 2023 and beyond.
5. Since its last request for a rate increase filed in 2018, PE has made substantial investments in its infrastructure. These capital investments in PE's distribution system are producing positive results for the Company and for its customers; PE's metrics in System Average Interruption Frequency Index ("SAIFI") and System Average Interruption Duration Index ("SAIDI") performance have seen continuous improvement, particularly since 2019 with the implementation of PE's EDIS program. For example, as reported in the most recent customer perception survey required and supervised by the Commission under COMAR 20.50.12.14.C, 86\% of PE's residential customers and $80 \%$ of its commercial customers expressed overall satisfaction with the Company's performance. Moreover, as the annual service reliability reports filed by PE pursuant to COMAR 20.50.12.11 indicate, the Company has continuously met or exceeded most or all of the goals for various measures of service quality set by the Commission in each of the years since PE's last base rate case. However, PE must continue to invest in its distribution system
in order to maintain and improve on its reliability performance. Thus, PE has proposed three specific incremental infrastructure improvements to its electric distribution system which, if approved, would form the EDIS Part II, i.e., a continuation of the modest reliability surcharge (EDIS) that the Commission approved as a part of PE's most recent base rate case (Case No. 9490). The testimony and exhibits supporting this Application provide support for EDIS Part II's implementation.
6. PE is also proposing for the Commission's consideration two new initiatives to further assist PE's low-income customers. First, PE is proposing the creation of an "Energy Assistance Outreach Team" to increase awareness, education, and participation in energy assistance programs that are available to low-income customers. This team, which will consist of full-time staff, will assist low-income residential customers with learning about and applying for assistance programs that will help with their utility costs. The team will also partner with targeted organizations and strengthen relationships within the community. Second, PE proposes to implement a " $50 \%$ Discount Program," which would authorize the Company to provide a $50 \%$ monthly discount to distribution charges at the primary residence of income-eligible residential customers during the five-month winter heating period (November-March). These programs comply and are consistent with the Maryland General Assembly's recently-enacted legislation in 2022 to promote the adoption of well-constructed limited-income mechanisms to benefit Maryland's eligible limited-income customers. See PUA § 4-309.
7. Pursuant to PUA § 4-309(d)(1)(ii), by way of this Application, PE requests the Commission's prior approval for the Commission to consider as part of this base rate case application these two new low-income programs described in the preceding paragraph and more fully in the testimony and exhibits supporting this Application.
8. In addition to the reliability and low-income customer programs discussed above, PE is proposing a rate adjustment to enable the Company to earn its authorized rate of return. Under the provisions of PUA §4-101, PE is entitled to an operating income yielding, after a deduction for necessary and proper expenses, a reasonable return upon the fair value of its property, which must be adequate to assure confidence in the financial soundness of the utility, to maintain and support its credit, and to enable it to raise the capital necessary for the proper discharge of its duties as a public service company. Bluefield Water Works v. Public Service Commission, 262 U.S. 679 (1923).
9. The requested increases are needed for the Company to continue to provide safe and reliable service to its customers and to maintain the financial health of the Company. As described above, PE continues to make significant investments in its infrastructure while experiencing rising operating costs in order to provide the level of service and reliability that customers expect.
10. In the testimony and exhibits supporting this Application, PE provides evidentiary support for an increase in its electric distribution revenue requirement of $\$ 48.5$ million, which is $\$ 47.5$ million plus the approximately $\$ 1$ million for new low-income assistance programs discussed above. ${ }^{1}$ This increase is based on a test year for the 12-month period from January 1, 2022 through December 31, 2022, and an overall rate of return on investment of $7.54 \%$, and an overall return on equity ("ROE") of $10.60 \%$. The Company's proposed rate increase results in an increase of $\$ 9.50$ per month for an average residential customer using $1,000 \mathrm{kWh}$ per month, representing a $9.7 \%$ increase in the customer's total bill. For an aggregate of all customer classes, the proposed rate increase results in a $6.4 \%$ increase in the customer's total bill.

[^1]11. Importantly, even with all of the Company's critical infrastructure investments leading to the requested rate increase, the Company's proposed rates will remain the lowest investor-owned electric utility rates in the State of Maryland. Even after the proposed rate increase, an average residential customer in the PE service territory will pay a distribution rate that is $31 \%$ less than the BGE and Pepco's current rates, and $40 \%$ less than Delmarva Power \& Light Company's current rates. PE's customers will still benefit from having the lowest distribution rates of all investor-owned utilities in Maryland. This will be true even if the Commission approves the Company's requested rate request and reliability surcharge (the EDIS Part II) in full.
12. This Application is supported by the prepared direct testimony and exhibits of:

- Raymond E. Valdes, Director, Rates and Regulatory Affairs at FirstEnergy Service Company;
- Stephanie L. Fall, Manager, Rates and Regulatory Affairs at FirstEnergy Service Company;
- Donald J. McGettigan, Director, Operations at The Potomac Edison Company;
- Weizhong (Bill) Wang, Assistant Treasurer, Treasury at FirstEnergy Service Company;
- Gregory J. Gawlik, Assistant Controller, Tax at FirstEnergy Service Company;
- Susan M. Colflesh, State Regulatory Analyst, Rates and Regulatory Affairs Department - West Virginia/Maryland at FirstEnergy Service Company;
- Bobbi S. Miller, Analyst IV, Rates and Regulatory Affairs at First Energy Service Company;
- Jill A. Soltis, Analyst V, Rates and Regulatory Affairs at FirstEnergy Service Company;
- Heather E. Ward, Analyst, Rates and Regulatory Affairs at FirstEnergy Service Company;
- Tracy M. Ashton, Assistant Controller Corporate at FirstEnergy Corp.;
- Walter S. Larnerd, Manager, Revenue Operations Strategy at FirstEnergy Service Company;
- Dylan W. D'Ascendis, Partner at ScottMadden, Inc.;
- Timothy S. Lyons, Partner at ScottMadden, Inc.;2
- John J. Spanos, President at Gannett Fleming Valuation and Rate Consultants, LLC; and
- Mark Warner, Vice President at Gabel Associates, Inc.

[^2]13. This Application will also be supported by voluminous data submissions required by the Commission's April 18, 1983 Secretarial Letter Order, which provides that the supplemental filing requirement is "a possible means to expedite Commission proceedings by providing as much relevant data as possible at the beginning of the proceeding thereby obviating or diminishing the need for subsequent time consuming and costly data requests." This will be provided in a supplemental submission labeled "Supplemental Information" that will be filed with the Commission.
14. PE is also filing with the Commission today: (1) its Cost Allocation Manual ("CAM") for 2021, in accordance with the Code of Maryland Regulations 20.40.02.07B; and (2) the independent audit opinion of Pricewaterhouse Coopers LLP, which was prepared following an examination of the 2021 CAM pursuant to the provisions of PUA § 4-208.
15. In addition to the above information, PE wishes to note that it has performed and includes with this Application all of the required studies in compliance with the Commission's Order No. 89072 issued in PE's last rate case, to wit:

- Updates to its Jurisdictional Cost of Service Study ("JCOSS") and Cost of Service Study ("COSS"), such that all updated studies are current to within one year of the test year in the present application (January 1, 2022 - December 31, 2022)
- A COSS with and without a zero intercept study;
- A COSS that includes a labor allocator to better reflect the functionalization of general and intangible plant;
- Testimony supporting or rejecting the use of the Average Coincident Peak ("ACP") methodology to allocate costs related to subtransmission and FERC Accounts 362 and 368 capacitors based on current system conditions and cost causation; and
- Three years of demand at transmission, subtransmission, primary, and secondary levels, as well as their resulting allocators that are used in the COSS.

16. Finally, as more fully discussed in the Company's testimony, PE hereby advises the Commission that effective January 1, 2022, FirstEnergy and, likewise, PE, adjusted its capitalization rate for Administrative and General ("A\&G") overhead costs as a result of a representative labor time study conducted by an independent, third-party entity in response to an
audit report from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("FERC") Division of Audits and Accounting. The effect of the adjustment to A\&G capitalization was to reduce amounts of costs that were capitalized and increase amounts that were charged to operations and maintenance ("O\&M"). Also, in response to the FERC audit, FirstEnergy and, likewise, PE reclassified the change in A\&G plant and reserve for the amounts capitalized between years 2015 and 2021 to an A\&G capitalization regulatory asset. As a result, the Company is proposing to include the A\&G capitalization regulatory asset in rate base and to recover this regulatory asset by amortizing the balance removed from each plant account and included in this regulatory asset by applying the Commission-approved depreciation rates applicable to the plant account from which each balance was removed. This will ensure that customer rates are not impacted by this reclassification.
17. In accordance with PUA § 4-203, PE's revised rate schedules are submitted with a proposed effective date of April 22, 2023. The testimony and exhibits filed herewith in support of this Application demonstrate that the proposed rate increases are essential, cost justified, and required to assure continued adequate service and to achieve the minimum rate of return needed to attract capital at reasonable costs.

WHEREFORE, The Potomac Edison Company urges the Commission to find the accompanying revised rate schedules for retail electric distribution service in Maryland to be just and reasonable, and authorize the rates and charges specified therein to become effective.
[signature page follows]

Respectfully submitted, THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

By:<br><br>defrey P . Trout (pro hac vice forthcoming)<br>Jessica Raba<br>The Potomac Edison Company<br>10802 Bower Avenue<br>Williamsport, MD 21795<br>(724) 838-6621<br>jtrout2@firstenergycorp.com<br>jraba@firstenergycorp.com<br>J. Joseph Curran, III<br>Christopher S. Gunderson<br>Susan R. Schipper<br>Venable LLP<br>750 E. Pratt Street, Suite 900<br>Baltimore, MD 21202<br>(410) 244-5468<br>jcurran@venable.com<br>csgunderson@venable.com<br>srschipper@venable.com

Attorneys for The Potomac Edison Company
March 22, 2023
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# DIRECT TESTIMONY OF 

RAYMOND E. VALDES

Concerning: Overview of Application

## I. INTRODUCTION

## Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is Raymond E. Valdes, and my business address is 800 Cabin Hill Drive, Greensburg, Pennsylvania 15601.

## Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?

A. I am employed by FirstEnergy Service Company and my title is Director, Rates and Regulatory Affairs. My time is devoted to tasks performed for The Potomac Edison Company ("PE" or "Company") and Monongahela Power Company ("Mon Power").
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.
A. I am a graduate of the University of Pittsburgh where I earned a Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering. I have over 32 years of experience with FirstEnergy Service Company or its predecessor companies, and have held positions of Engineer, Power Services; Engineer, Rates; Regulatory Specialist; Senior Consultant; Rates Advisor; General Manager, Retail Pricing Services; and my current position of Director, Rates and Regulatory Affairs. My current duties and responsibilities include directing the rates and regulatory activities for PE's Maryland and West Virginia operations and Mon Power's West Virginia operations.
Q. HAVE YOU TESTIFIED IN RATE PROCEEDINGS BEFORE REGULATORY COMMISSIONS?
A. Yes, I have testified in proceedings before the Maryland Public Service Commission ("Commission"), the Public Service Commission of West Virginia, the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio, the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, and the Virginia State Corporation Commission.

## Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to:

1) Provide an overview of the Company and comparison of the Company's rates regionally and nationally;
2) Summarize the Company's distribution base rate increase;
3) Provide information on the Company's new low-income residential assistance programs to help with the affordability of electric service for the Company's low-income customers;
4) Introduce the other witnesses for the Company in this proceeding who will detail individual aspects of the Company's rate filing for increased revenues sufficient to cover its cost of service and provide an adequate return for its investors; and
5) Address additional items, such as the request for a storm deferral and a proposal for customer refunds.

## Q. HAVE YOU PREPARED OR HAD PREPARED UNDER YOUR SUPERVISION EXHIBITS TO ACCOMPANY YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. Yes, I have. Exhibits RV-1 through RV-3 provide calculations regarding costs that should not have been included in customer rates from the Company's prior distribution base rate case, Exhibit RV-4 presents the summation of such costs (with interest) that has accumulated between the prior distribution rate case and eventual customer refund, and

Exhibit RV-5 presents a calculation of the credits to refund to customers for the abovementioned amounts. These exhibits are described in detail in my testimony.

## Q. PLEASE PROVIDE AN OVERVIEW OF THE COMPANY.

A. PE is a Maryland electric distribution utility that is a part of the FirstEnergy Corporation ("FirstEnergy") family of electric utilities. PE is headquartered in Williamsport, Maryland and provides retail electric service to approximately 285,000 customers in Maryland, ${ }^{1}$ representing approximately $11 \%$ of the electric customers in Maryland. PE's residential customers make up about $88 \%$ of the Company's Maryland customer count and account for about $49 \%$ of the 6.8 million kilowatt-hours (" $k W h ")$ delivered by PE in 2022. Commercial customers are about 11\% of PE's Maryland customer base and are about 29\% of the kWh delivered, while industrial customers account for about $1 \%$ of the customer base and about $22 \%$ of the kWh delivered in $2022 .{ }^{2}$

PE's Maryland service territory includes all or parts of Allegany, Carroll, Frederick, Garrett, Howard, Montgomery, and Washington counties and is a combination of suburban, rural, and mountainous terrain and demographics. PE's service territory in Maryland is depicted in yellow below.

[^3]

PE's Maryland service territory and reliability is more fully described in the testimony of Company witness McGettigan.

## Q. Please describe the efforts of firstenergy and pe with REGARD TO DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION.

A. FirstEnergy has received numerous awards, which include the 2022 Leading Disability Employer Seal by the National Organization on Disability, Forbes' Best Employers for Diversity in 2020, DiversityInc's Top Utilities list in 2019, 2020 and 2021, recognition by the Bloomberg Gender-Equality Index for women's equality in the workplace in 2019, 2020 and 2021, recognition by G.I. Jobs magazine as a Military Friendly employer every year since 2016, and in 2023 was designated as a Top 50 Diversity Employer by Minority Engineer magazine.

Also, FirstEnergy and the Company are committed to providing opportunities to small, women-owned, minority-owned, Historically Underutilized Business Zones ("HUBZone"), veteran-owned, and service-disabled veteran-owned businesses through its supplier diversity program. In 2020, FirstEnergy spent $\$ 482$ million with diverse suppliers and earned the 2021 Regional Council Member Done Deals award from the Women's Business Enterprise Center-East ("WBEC-East") for the $\$ 54.8$ million spent with womenowned businesses certified by WBEC-East. Additionally, PE participates in the FirstEnergy's Preferred Supplier Program, which seeks to support minority businesses within the FirstEnergy footprint using a three-pronged approach:

1. Enrollment - Companies identified by FirstEnergy will be given the opportunity to grow their existing relationship and possibly be used as a supplier.
2. Support - Assistance to suppliers enrolled in the program through mentorship and training.
3. Investment - FirstEnergy will invest in minority-owned funds that are willing and able to invest in diverse businesses across our service territory.

PE exceeded its long-term supplier diversity goal of $25 \%$ in every year since the last time the Company filed a rate case in 2018, including in 2022 by achieving a supplier diversity spend of $27.87 \%$. PE continues to invest in its supplier diversity programs by, for example, using vendor data reports to identify categories where diverse supplier utilization has been low, and strengthening its supplier diversity recruitment initiatives in those categories.

Moreover, PE is proudly involved in the communities that it serves and the Company's employees take pride in supporting their local communities. The FirstEnergy Foundation and PE have donated nearly $\$ 890,000$ over the last decade to Maryland and West Virginia United Way agencies and raised almost \$174,000 for Maryland and West Virginia-based food banks through Harvest for Hunger, an annual awareness campaign aimed at fighting hunger.

## Q. TURNING TO PE'S ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES, DOES THE COMPANY ENGAGE IN PRACTICES TO ADDRESS CLIMATE CHANGE AND ITS IMPACTS, AND TO FURTHER MARYLAND'S GOALS FOR REDUCING STATEWIDE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS?

A. Yes. PE supports initiatives and programs that encourage and incent customers to use energy more efficiently and to adopt electric vehicles ("EVs"), and that foster the state's transition to clean energy. PE has been an active participant in EmPOWER Maryland since the program's inception, and the Company continues to offer energy efficiency and conservation programs, which currently are designed to assist customers in reducing their energy consumption. PE is currently nearing the end of its 2021-2023 EmPOWER Maryland program cycle. It is my understanding that as the Company plans for the 20242026 cycle, it is looking to propose plans and programs to target reducing greenhouse gas emissions in addition to improving energy efficiency.

To support the state's transition to clean energy, PE also received Commission approval for two energy storage pilot projects. The first project went into service in late 2022 and will be used to study the interaction between EV public charging and battery
storage. The second project is projected to be completed by February 2024. Also, to help further expand the adoption of EVs across its service territory, PE is advancing several programs including the offering of residential and multi-family rebates for EV chargers and the installation of public EV chargers. PE also recently filed a proposal for a residential EV-only time-of-use rate plan. The Company is committed to supporting its customers and the State of Maryland in reaching their clean energy goals and to helping power a cleaner, healthier, sustainable future.

## Q. DOES PE COMPLY WITH FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS AND LAWS?

A. Yes. It is my understanding that in addition to advancing programs that support energy efficiency in Maryland and investing in programs to develop and promote EVs, PE is in compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local environmental regulations and laws.

## Q. HOW DO PE'S RATES CURRENTLY COMPARE TO MARYLAND AND

 NATIONAL ELECTRIC RATES?A. Very favorably. PE's residential electric rates are currently the lowest amongst the investor-owned electric utilities in Maryland and are among the lowest nationally. Chart 1 below depicts a residential electric bill in Maryland as of March 2023 based upon an average usage of $1,000 \mathrm{kWh}$ per month. As shown on the chart, an average PE residential bill for distribution ${ }^{3}$ service is less than half of other Maryland investor-owned electric

[^4]utilities and, after adding in surcharges ${ }^{4}$ and standard offer generation service, is over $35 \%$ below the state average.


The Company's electric rates also compare favorably to national electric rates. The Company's total electric rate for an aggregate of all customers in 2022 was approximately 9.9 cents per kWh , which when compared to the most recent data available from the United States Energy Information Administration ("U.S. EIA"), ${ }^{5}$ is the lowest from all states east of the Mississippi River and $13^{\text {th }}$ lowest in the nation. With regard to residential customers,

[^5]the previously-mentioned average bill for PE residential customers is currently $\$ 98$ per month, which translates to 9.8 cents per kWh and was the second lowest in the nation for the U.S. EIA most recent reporting period. ${ }^{6}$

In sum, PE provides safe, reliable, and cost-effective electric service to approximately 285,000 customers throughout its varied and diverse Maryland service territory, which includes large parts of Maryland's rural and mountainous terrain. PE employs hundreds of Marylanders, who contribute their skills to support the Company in its goal to provide its customers and communities with consistent, safe, and reliable electric service. The Company's concerted efforts to increase supplier diversity have allowed PE consistently to exceed its diverse supplier spend goal, and PE and its employees contribute to the Maryland economy through corporate philanthropy initiatives.

## III. COMPANY'S BASE RATE INCREASE

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE BACKGROUND FOR THE COMPANY'S DISTRIBUTION BASE RATE FILING.

A. PE's prior distribution base rate case was filed on August 24, 2018 in Case No. 9490 and ended with Commission Order No. 89072 (the "Order") issued on March 22, 2019 that authorized an increase in distribution rates effective March 23, 2019. That Order also issued interlocking directives with respect to the duration of the Electric Distribution Investment Surcharge ("EDIS") program and its relationship with the Company's next base

[^6]rate case filing. Specifically, the Commission directed the Company to submit a base rate case application that aligns with the end of the initial four-year period of EDIS (end of 2022 or early 2023). ${ }^{7}$ In accordance with the Order, the Company is submitting its distribution base rate filing application in early 2023 (i.e., four years after the issuance of the Order) to: (1) roll into rate base the EDIS capital costs for 2019-2022 so that those costs will no longer be recovered through a surcharge upon conclusion of this proceeding; and (2) request current rate relief to address a new revenue deficiency. As a result, this distribution base rate proceeding provides the Commission an opportunity to address the roll-in of EDIS costs into distribution rates, provide revenues sufficient to cover the Company's cost of service, and determine a reasonable rate of return that will allow the Company to attract the necessary capital resources to continue to provide our customers with safe and reliable distribution service.

## Q. WHAT IS THE TEST PERIOD UTILIZED IN THE COMPANY'S REQUEST FOR RATE RELIEF? <br> A. The Company's filing is a traditional base rate filing utilizing a historical test year (meaning the Company's filing is not a multi-year rate filing). The test year is 12 months ended December 2022, with rate base calculated on a 13-month average from December 2021 through December 2022. <br> Q. DOES THE HISTORICAL TEST YEAR INCLUDE ANY FORECASTED AMOUNTS?

[^7]A. No. Although past practice has permitted the filing by utilities of a partially forecasted test year, in cases filed that way the forecasted test year amounts must ultimately be replaced in the record with actual amounts to ensure Commission determination is based upon a historical test year utilizing actual cost data. The practical effect of having to submit testimony regarding, and to take and provide discovery on, two sets of numbers is that all the parties, including the applicant, Staff, and Office of People's Counsel ("OPC"), have to do a large amount of duplicative work in such cases. Here, however, in an effort to help ease the administrative burden associated with evaluation of two different sets of Company filing data (i.e., an initial set with a partially forecasted historical test year followed a couple months later with a second set with a historical test year based upon actual cost data), the Company has endeavored to submit its initial distribution base rate application based solely on actual cost data from a historical test year of 2022. This should significantly ease the review and evaluation process for all parties with respect to the Company's distribution base rate application. The Company has, though, included some post-test year adjustments as described by Company witness Soltis.

## Q. DOES THE COMPANY ANTICIPATE ANY UPDATES TO ITS FILING?

A. Yes. Due to the desire of the Company to initially file its distribution base rate application based upon actual cost data from a historical test year and due to the limited time between the end of 2022 through the date of this filing, the depreciation study sponsored by Company witness Spanos is based upon plant and reserve balance data as of June 30, 2022. However, the Company has recently provided Mr. Spanos with updated plant and reserve balance data as of December 31, 2022, to eventually synchronize the depreciation study
with the end of the historical test year. Upon completion of the depreciation study with data as of December 31, 2022, the Company will file an update to its distribution base rate case to reflect the depreciation rate results of the updated depreciation study as well as any other changes or corrections that may have occurred subsequent to this initial filing.

## Q. WHAT IS THE COMPANY'S REQUESTED CAPITAL STRUCTURE AND RETURN IN ITS REQUEST FOR RATE RELIEF?

A. As more fully described and supported by Company witness Wang, PE's requested capital structure is the Company's actual capital structure on December 31, 2022, with ratios of $53.53 \%$ for common equity and $46.47 \%$ for long-term debt. The Company's embedded long-term debt cost rate is $4.018 \%$ and, as described and supported by Company witness D'Ascendis, the requested return on equity is $10.60 \%$. The resultant rate of return is $7.54 \%$.
Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE COMPANY'S OVERALL REQUEST IN THIS CASE.
A. The Company's request is detailed in the testimony of other witnesses but, generally, the Company is requesting a $\$ 47.5$ million increase ${ }^{8}$ in base distribution revenues based on an overall rate of return of $7.54 \%$. As the Company is experiencing a revenue deficiency, it is necessary that it makes this request for rate relief in conjunction with the request to roll into rate base (and subsequently decrease from surcharge recovery) EDIS capital costs incurred during 2019-2022.

[^8]
## Q. IS THE COMPANY PROPOSING ANY NEW INITIATIVES TO HELP LOW INCOME CUSTOMERS WITH THE AFFORDABILITY OF THEIR ELECTRIC BILL?

A. Yes. To assist low-income customers with paying their electric bill and to help increase participation in available low-income assistance programs, PE is proposing a new "Energy Assistance Outreach Team" and a " $50 \%$ Discount Program." The "Energy Assistance Outreach Team" is designed to increase awareness, education and participation in energy assistance programs that are available to low-income residential customers; whereas the " $50 \%$ Discount Program" will provide a $50 \%$ monthly discount to distribution charges to income-eligible residential customers during the winter heating period. ${ }^{9}$ These two programs are discussed in greater detail in the direct testimony of Company witness Larnerd.

## Q. WHAT IS THE COST OF THE TWO PROGRAMS TO ASSIST LOW-INCOME CUSTOMERS AND HOW WILL THE COST BE COLLECTED?

A. The total estimated annual cost for the two new low-income assistance programs is $\$ 1,042,433$. Since the programs are solely available to residential customers, cost collection is proposed to be collected through the residential distribution kWh rate of Schedule R. Dividing the $\$ 1,042,433$ by the 2022 residential weather-normalized distribution kWh and grossing up the result for Maryland gross receipts tax and the Commission assessment factor equates to a rate increment of $\$ 0.00032$ per kWh . Put

[^9]another way, the proposed rate increment to assist low-income residential customers is only 32 cents per month for an average residential customer using $1,000 \mathrm{kWh}$ per month. This small impact on residential customer bills will help the affordability of electric service for the Company's low-income customers.

## Q. WHAT IS THE TOTAL OF THE COMPANY'S REQUESTED RATE RELIEF THAT INCLUDES THE NEW LOW INCOME ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS?

A. The Company's total base rate request is an increase of $\$ 48.5$ million, which is the $\$ 47.5$ million previously discussed plus the approximately $\$ 1$ million for new low-income assistance programs. The Company's requested increase, however, reflects the movement of about $\$ 4.8$ million of EDIS revenues from the surcharge to distribution rates. In other words, the $\$ 48.5$ million increase in distribution revenues will be accompanied by an approximate $\$ 4.8$ million decrease in the EDIS, resulting in a net change in revenues of $\$ 43.8$ million.

## Q. WHAT ARE SOME OF THE CONTRIBUTING FACTORS FOR THE NEED FOR THE REQUESTED RATE RELIEF?

A. In general, the Company is seeking an increase in rates because its revenues are not sufficient to cover the cost of service, including a reasonable return to investors. There are several items that contribute to the requested rate increase. First - and as further described below - it represents an increase in rate base supported by incremental capital expenditures to provide benefit to our customers. Also, increases in operation and maintenance ("O\&M") expenses are primarily attributable to costs associated with vegetation management and changes in FirstEnergy's capitalization policy. In the Company's prior
distribution rate case, PE requested recovery through the EDIS for the costs to transition its vegetation management program from a five-year vegetation management clearing cycle to a four-year clearing cycle, which is also consistent with the clearing cycle for other Maryland electric utilities. Although incremental cost recovery was not approved by the Commission through the EDIS, the Company remained concerned of the impact of treecaused outages to electric service reliability and subsequent impact to customers. Therefore, the Company proceeded with its transition from a five-year vegetation management clearing cycle to a four-year clearing cycle to help improve reliability performance for its customers. Also, the cost increase in this filing that is associated with vegetation management is inherent in the regulatory lag process where costs are initially incurred and then subsequently recovered through future base rate cases.

Additionally, as more fully discussed by Company witness Ashton, effective January 1, 2022, FirstEnergy and, likewise, PE adjusted its capitalization rate for Administrative and General ("A\&G") overhead costs as a result of a representative labor time study conducted by an independent, third-party entity in response to an audit report from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("FERC") Division of Audits and Accounting. The effect of the adjustment to A\&G capitalization was to reduce amounts that were capitalized and increase amounts that were charged to O\&M. For example, if approximately $57 \%$ of A\&G costs were previously capitalized, then the remaining $43 \%$ of A\&G costs were charged to $O \& M$. A reduction of the capitalization percentage to $28 \%$ would then translate to $72 \%$ of A\&G costs being charged to O\&M. Also, in response to the FERC audit, FirstEnergy and, likewise, PE reclassified the effect of the change in A\&G
overhead percentages on plant and reserve for the amounts capitalized between years 2015 and 2021 to an A\&G capitalization regulatory asset. The Company is proposing to include the A\&G capitalization regulatory asset in rate base and to recover this regulatory asset by amortizing the balance removed from each plant account and included in this regulatory asset by applying the Commission-approved depreciation rates applicable to the plant account from which each balance was removed. This ensures that customer rates are not impacted by this reclassification. Because the reclassification has no impact on rate base or recovery, items impacted continue to be shown in the appropriately charged plant accounts within this filing.

Furthermore, during 2021, an additional change to vegetation management capitalization occurred whereby the capitalization percentage for vegetation management was lowered with a corresponding increase in the percentage charged to O\&M. Since O\&M has a greater effect on customer rates than capital, the effect of the reduction in capitalization percentages and subsequent increases in O\&M percentages tends to increase customer rates.

## Q. DID CHANGES IN CAPITAL PLACED IN SERVICE BETWEEN RATE CASES ALSO HAVE AN EFFECT ON THE COMPANY'S REQUEST FOR RATE RELIEF?

A. Yes. A portion of the increase in capital placed in service, which subsequently increases rate base, is due to the rolling into rate base of EDIS capital costs for 2019-2022. There are also other capital projects that contribute to the increase in capital placed in service,
such as those that are used to bolster and/or improve reliability to the benefit of customers, as more fully described by Company witness McGettigan.

## Q. BASED ON THE COMPANY'S REQUEST FOR RATE RELIEF, WHAT WILL BE THE IMPACT TO CUSTOMERS?

A. Table 1 below shows a summary of the impact per rate schedule of the Company's request for rate relief, which includes the proposed low-income assistance programs and reduction in the current EDIS rate.

Table 1

| Rate <br> Schedule | Distribution Revenue ${ }^{1}$ |  | Low-Income Programs ${ }^{2}$ | EDIS <br> Reduction | Change | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total Bill } \\ \text { \% Change }{ }^{3} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Current | Proposed |  |  |  |  |
| (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | $\begin{gathered} \hline(f)=(c)+(d)+ \\ (e)-(b) \end{gathered}$ | (g) |
| R (residential) | \$ 83,434,046 | \$116,805,235 | \$ 1,066,726 | \$ $(2,885,189)$ | \$31,552,725 | 9.5\% |
| G, C | 24,649,053 | 31,710,614 | - | $(789,248)$ | 6,272,313 | 5.7\% |
| Hag/Fred | 22,208 | 29,012 |  | $(1,239)$ | 5,565 | 6.4\% |
| C-A, CSH | 435,542 | 569,506 | - | $(28,456)$ | 105,508 | 3.7\% |
| PH, AGS | 19,362,724 | 25,006,595 | - | $(1,043,863)$ | 4,600,008 | 2.7\% |
| PP | 1,374,959 | 1,776,695 | - | $(14,192)$ | 387,545 | 0.6\% |
| Street Lighting | 4,969,621 | 5,843,144 | - | $(25,029)$ | 848,494 | 13.6\% |
| Total | \$ 134,248,154 | \$ 181,740,802 | \$ 1,066,726 | \$(4,787,214) | \$43,772,160 | 6.4\% |

[^10]The proposed rate increase results in an increase of $\$ 9.50$ per month for a residential customer using $1,000 \mathrm{kWh}$ per month, representing a $9.7 \%$ increase in the customer's total
bill. ${ }^{10}$ For an aggregate of all customer classes, the proposed rate increase results in a $6.4 \%$ increase in the customer's total bill.

## Q. ARE THERE ANY ADDITIONAL ASPECTS OF THE COMPANY'S DISTRIBUTION RATE APPLICATION?

A. Yes. In addition to the Company's request for rate relief, PE is also seeking the continuation of the EDIS program in a Phase II. The proposed EDIS Phase II will fund three incremental reliability programs for underground cable replacement, substation reclosers, and resiliency, as explained in further detail in the direct testimony of Company witness McGettigan. Notwithstanding the Company's positive reliability and service performance and the significant investments the Company has made in those areas, PE understands that our customers and this Commission expect our continuous improvement. These programs will provide real and meaningful benefits to our customers and help increase our reliability performance to ensure that the Company continues to meet and exceed this Commission's standards and expectations, and are not related to the base rate increase request. The surcharge rate change associated with EDIS Phase II will not occur until January 1, 2024, to coincide with commencement of the EDIS Phase II, and is addressed in further detail by Company witness Fall.

## Q. IF THE COMPANY'S REQUEST IS APPROVED, HOW WILL PE'S RATES COMPARE TO THE RATES OF MARYLAND'S OTHER ELECTRIC UTILITIES?

[^11]A. The Company's proposed rates will still compare favorably to those of Maryland's other investor-owned electric utilities in that they will continue to remain the lowest in the State of Maryland. Chart 2 is a replication of my previous Chart 1 that depicts a residential electric bill based upon an average usage of $1,000 \mathrm{kWh}$ per month. However, in Chart 2, I have added the effect of the Company's proposed rate increase which, even after the increase, results in a monthly bill that is less than the other Maryland investor-owned electric utilities on a distribution-only basis and a total bill basis. In sum, the Company's rates will still be the lowest of any of the investor-owned electric utilities in the state and the new low-income assistance programs will further assist those with limited incomes.

## Chart 2



Additionally, even after the proposed rate increase, the Company's electric rates will continue to compare favorably to national electric rates. The new total electric rate of
approximately 10.6 cents per kWh for an aggregate of all customers will still be one of the lowest of all states in the nation and lower than all states east of the Mississippi River (with the exception of West Virginia and North Carolina) when compared to the most recent data available from the United States Energy Information Administration ("U.S. EIA"). ${ }^{11}$ The new average PE residential customer rate of 10.8 cents per kWh will be 7 th lowest in the nation and lower than all states east of the Mississippi River. ${ }^{12}$

## Q. HOW WILL THE PROPOSED RATE INCREASE BRING VALUE TO PE'S

## CUSTOMERS?

A. PE must attract capital at cost-effective rates to remain a financially strong company that can continue to invest in its distribution system. The Company is under-earning its authorized rate of return, as well as earning less than the Commission-approved returns for the state's other electric distribution utilities. By authorizing the Company to earn a fair rate of return, the Commission will allow the Company to maintain the stability and profitability needed to attract investors and capital at cost-effective rates. As a result, the Company will then be well-positioned to continue its capital expenditures program, which will allow us to continue to meet our customers' and this Commission's expectations of the safe and reliable service for which we are known.

## IV. OVERVIEW OF THE APPLICATION

## Q. PLEASE PROVIDE AN OVERVIEW OF THE APPLICATION.

[^12]A. PE's request for rate relief in this proceeding consists of the Company's Application for rate relief, and the direct testimonies and supporting documentation and exhibits of witnesses testifying on behalf of the Company.

## Q. PLEASE PROVIDE AN OVERVIEW OF THE WITNESSES TESTIFYING ON BEHALF OF THE COMPANY AND THE SUBJECT MATTERS THEY WILL DISCUSS.

A. The following witnesses are employed by the Company or affiliates of the Company and have submitted direct testimony and supporting exhibits in this proceeding:

1) Jill A. Soltis, Analyst in the Rates and Regulatory Affairs Department, provides the Company's income statement and rate base, and describes certain ratemaking adjustments.
2) Susan M. Colflesh, Analyst in the Rates and Regulatory Affairs Department, provides the jurisdictional separation study and describes certain ratemaking adjustments.
3) Heather E. Ward, Analyst in the Rates and Regulatory Affairs Department, describes certain ratemaking adjustments.
4) Tracy M. Ashton, Assistant Controller in Corporate Finance, proposes a new pension and other post-employment benefits ("OPEB") expense normalization mechanism ("PON Mechanism"), addresses accounting items and allocations to PE, describes proposed customer refunds, and describes certain ratemaking adjustments.
5) Gregory J. Gawlik, Assistant Controller in the Tax Department, supports state
and federal income tax information used by PE and discusses significant tax law changes.
6) Weizhong (Bill) Wang, Assistant Treasurer in the Treasury Department, describes and supports PE's capital structure, embedded cost of long-term debt, and overall weighted average cost of capital.
7) Stephanie L. Fall, Manager in the Rates and Regulatory Affairs Department, supports the Company's tariff revisions and the rate-related aspects of EDIS Phase II.
8) Bobbi S. Miller, Analyst in the Rates and Regulatory Affairs Department, describes and supports updated studies used by the class cost of service study.
9) Donald J. McGettigan, Director of Operations at PE, provides supporting information regarding electric distribution operations, the Company's reliability performance, and describe the proposed incremental infrastructure improvements in EDIS Phase II.
10) Walter S. Larnerd, Manager, Revenue Operations Strategy in the Revenue Operations Department, addresses two proposed new low-income assistance initiatives for residential customers.

In addition, the following expert consultants are testifying on behalf of the Company and provide supporting documentation and exhibits:

1) Timothy S. Lyons, Partner at ScottMadden, Inc., sponsors and supports the lead lag study, the class cost of service study, and the distribution rate design.
2) Dylan W. D'Ascendis, Partner at ScottMadden, Inc., sponsors and supports the
proposed rate of return on common equity for the Company's Maryland jurisdictional rate base, and calculates the credit-adjusted risk-free rate for PE.
3) John J. Spanos, President at Gannett Fleming Valuation and Rate Consultants, LLC, sponsors and supports the depreciation study and proposed updates to the depreciation accrual rates.
4) Mark Warner, Vice President at Gabel Associates, Inc., presents the results of the benefit-cost analysis performed regarding the suite of electric vehicle charging program offerings developed and implemented by PE.

## Q.

 ARE THERE ANY ADDITIONAL ITEMS TO ADDRESS REGARDING THIS FILING?A. Yes, there are two additional items. One is a request for a storm deferral mechanism and the second deals with a customer refund proposal.

## Storm Deferral Mechanism

## Q. PLEASE ADDRESS THE STORM DEFERRAL MECHANISM.

A. Storm expense can be a volatile category of $O \& M$ expense that is unpredictable and outside the control of a utility. No amount of good utility management can eliminate the potential for significant storms that occur in a utility's service territory that can cause considerable damage to utility facilities and infrastructure. As such, the Company proposes to institute deferral accounting for storm expense to periodically compare actual storm $O \& M$ expense
to the amount currently collected in rates (referred to hereafter as "Storm Deferral Mechanism"). Deferral accounting will be calculated on a monthly basis, with any overcollection recorded as a regulatory liability and any under-collection recorded as a regulatory asset. This will ensure that customers will ultimately pay only the actual incurred level of storm expense - no more and no less. To be clear, this is not a request for a surcharge. The Company acknowledges that the Commission would retain full authority to determine the prudency of any future storm expenses. This is simply a request for authorization to establish an accounting mechanism to record over-collected amounts as a regulatory liability and under-collected amounts as a regulatory asset. Distribution rates would not be adjusted until the Company's subsequent base rate case, at which time the cumulative regulatory liability or regulatory asset would be presented to the Commission for determination of disposition in customer rates.

## Q. HOW WOULD THE STORM DEFERRAL MECHANISM BE ESTABLISHED AND OPERATE?

A. The first step is to establish a baseline by which actual storm O\&M expenses will be compared. Adjustment No. 5 sponsored by Company witness Ward sets forth a level of storm O\&M expense that is equivalent to a five-year annual average, which effectively normalizes within distribution rates a level of annual storm collection expense. Effective with the establishment of new distribution rates in this proceeding, on a monthly basis the actual level of storm O\&M expense will be compared against the baseline level with an accounting entry made to record amounts that are in excess or less than the baseline. The
cumulative amount, represented as a regulatory liability if it is an over-collection or a regulatory asset if it is an under-collection, will be presented by the Company in the subsequent distribution base rate proceeding as a request for a rate adjustment to return to customers (in the case of a cumulative over-collection) or collect from customers (in the case of a cumulative under-collection). In that proceeding, all intervening parties will be afforded the opportunity to closely examine and evaluate the request and storm-related expenses.

## Q. PLEASE PROVIDE AN EXAMPLE OF THE STORM DEFERRAL MECHANISM.

A. Shown below in Table 2 is an example of how the Storm Deferral Mechanism would have worked if it had been approved in the Company's last distribution base rate proceeding

Table 2

| Baseline | $\$ 3,387,162$ | Proposed storm O\&M from last base <br> rate case |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Under/(Over)-Collection |  |
|  |  | $\$ 2,256,688$ | 2019 minus Baseline |
| 2019 Storm O\&M | $\$ 5,643,850$ | 2020 minus Baseline |  |
| 2020 Storm O\&M | $\$ 1,072,305$ | $(\$ 2,314,857)$ | 202, |
| 2021 Storm O\&M | $\$ 1,431,460$ | $(\$ 1,955,702)$ | 2021 minus Baseline |
| 2022 Storm O\&M | $\$ 2,616,818$ | $(\$ 770,344)$ | 2022 minus Baseline |
| Total (Over)-Collection $=$ |  |  |  |
| $(\$ 2,784,215)$ |  |  |  |

In the above example, a cumulative over-collected amount (i.e., a regulatory liability) of $\$ 2,784,215$ would have been presented to the Commission in this proceeding as a reduction to customer rates.

## Q. DID THE COMMISSION APPROVE THE COMPANY'S REQUEST FOR A STORM DEFERRAL MECHANISM IN THE PRIOR BASE RATE CASE?

A. No. Although Commission Staff did not object to the Storm Deferral Mechanism based on certain conditions, the Commission agreed with the argument of OPC that the Company's proposal was not necessary or appropriate since the use of a five-year average to normalize storm damage expense allegedly provides an opportunity to recover storm damage expense. ${ }^{13}$ However, in that proceeding, the Commission did not approve either the five-year average or the Storm Deferral Mechanism. Further, the use of a five-year average is not a means to recover prior storm damage expense. It is used solely as a means to normalize and levelize storm damage expense to a baseline value.

Further, criteria typically used to establish deferral accounting are that the expense is: (1) outside the control of a utility; (2) unpredictable and volatile; and (3) substantial and recurring. Storm-related expenses are certainly outside the control of a utility since the Company has no control over the intensity and duration of potentially significant storms that may affect its service territory. The above Table 2 demonstrates that the storm expenses are indeed unpredictable and volatile since actual storm expenses over the last four years have varied from $23 \%$ to as much as $68 \%$ from the baseline. In the past ten years, actual storm expenses have varied as much as $227 \%$. Finally, storm damage expense is recurring each year, and the incurrence of millions of dollars in storm damage expense

[^13]is substantial for a utility the size of PE and can potentially be crippling depending upon the size and intensity of future storms.

## Q. WHAT WERE THE CONDITIONS FOR A STORM DEFERRAL MECHANISM PUT FORTH BY COMMISSION STAFF IN CASE NO. 9490? <br> A. Staff believed a Storm Deferral Mechanism would be reasonable with the following conditions: (1) the regulatory asset and regulatory liability balance earn a return based on the Company's most recent authorized rate of return; and (2) the Company file an annual reconciliation with the Commission for the storm-related regulatory asset or liability. ${ }^{14}$ The Company is agreeable to both conditions for the establishment of a Storm Deferral Mechanism.

## Customer Refunds

## Q. PLEASE ADDRESS THE CUSTOMER REFUNDS PROPOSED IN THIS

 PROCEEDING.A. FirstEnergy took swift and deliberate action following the investigation of Ohio HB6 activities to report certain costs that may have been improperly classified, misallocated, or lacked proper supporting documentation. ${ }^{15}$ To that end, my department received information coordinated through the Controllers Department that identified the costs that were improperly classified, misallocated, or lacked proper supporting documentation, at

[^14]which time my department performed calculations to determine amounts that were reflected in PE Maryland distribution rates. Those calculations first determined the time period by which such costs were reflected in the test year ${ }^{16}$ from the last distribution base rate case and then applied allocations from the last base rate case to achieve a PE Maryland distribution jurisdictional amount. Upon calculation of the associated revenue requirement, PE then took proactive action to create a regulatory liability (i.e., future refund to customers) to ensure customers would be refunded such amounts with interest. The workpapers for this calculation are attached to my testimony as Exhibit RV-1 and show that $\$ 37,588$ was reflected in distribution rates for amounts that were improperly classified, misallocated, or lacked proper supporting documentation.

## Q. WERE ANY ADDITIONAL HISTORICAL REVIEWS DONE UNRELATED TO THE REVIEW DISCUSSED IN CASE NO. 9667?

A. Yes. As also described by Company witness Ashton, FirstEnergy performed additional reviews of certain non-operating or non-recoverable costs, including costs associated with advertising, sponsorships, competitive services, and lobbying, and identified certain costs that were recorded to utility operating accounts that were also included in customer rates. The Controllers Department identified the costs allocated to PE, and my department performed a PE Maryland-specific analysis to determine the time period by which such costs were reflected in the test year from the last distribution base rate case and then applied

[^15]allocations from the last base rate case to achieve a PE Maryland distribution jurisdictional amount. The workpapers for this calculation are attached to my testimony as Exhibits RV2 and RV-3 and are separated into the categories of Sponsorship/Advertising and Miscellaneous, ${ }^{17}$ respectively. The Sponsorship/Advertising category has identified \$195,939 included in distribution rates, whereas the Miscellaneous category has identified $\$ 68,421$. A summary of the amounts included in PE Maryland distribution rates is shown below in Table 3.

Table 3

| Case No. 9667 | $\$ 37,588$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Sponsorship/Advertising | $\$ 195,939$ |
| Miscellaneous | $\$ 68,421$ |
|  | Total $=$ |

## Q. BASED UPON THE NUMBERS PROVIDED IN TABLE 3, HOW WAS THE CUSTOMER REFUND DETERMINED?

A. Since the amounts above in Table 3 were reflected in the test year from the last distribution base rate case, as each year passes by, the amounts are incremented annually until new distribution rates are established in this new rate case. There is a timespan of approximately 4 years and 7 months (i.e., approximately 4.6 years) from the date current distribution rates were established on March 23, 2019, through the October 19, 2023 date by which new distribution rates are presumed to be effective from this proceeding. As a result, the

[^16]$\$ 301,948$ total in Table 3 needs to be multiplied by approximately 4.6 years to determine the total amount in the regulatory liability that will accumulate during that timespan.

## Q. IS INTEREST APPLIED FOR THE PERIOD BETWEEN BASE RATE CASES?

A. Yes. The Company applied compounded interest to the regulatory liability at the Company's currently authorized rate of return, which is $7.15 \%$. Further, compounded interest will continue to apply upon conclusion of this base rate case until the amount in the regulatory liability is refunded to customers.

## Q. WHAT IS THE TOTAL AMOUNT TO BE REFUNDED TO CUSTOMERS?

A. Once the timespan since the test year and interest is applied, the total refunds to customers equal $\$ 1,668,447$ - of which $\$ 207,363(12 \%)$ represents the amount discussed in Case No. 9667, $\$ 1,083,418(65 \%)$ represents sponsorships and advertisement, and $\$ 377,666(23 \%)$ represents miscellaneous (as described earlier in my testimony). Detailed calculations supporting the $\$ 1,668,447$ are contained in Exhibit RV-4 to my testimony.

## Q. HOW DOES THE COMPANY PROPOSE TO REFUND THIS AMOUNT TO

## CUSTOMERS?

A. Like the one-time refunds the Company provided to customers as a result of the Tax Cut and Jobs Act of 2017, the Company proposes to issue a one-time fixed bill credit to customers to discharge the regulatory liability. Specifically, within 30 days of a final order in this proceeding, the Company will file with the Commission the credits that are to be rendered to each customer class. The $\$ 1,668,447$ regulatory liability will be allocated to rate schedules on the basis of distribution revenue from the Company's last base rate case. The format of the filing and calculation of the credits will be substantially similar to the
example provided in Exhibit RV-5. Since such a filing would be made in November 2023, the Company will be requesting Commission approval prior to the end of the year so that refunds can be provided to customers during the month of January 2024. Additionally, following the distribution of the one-time refunds, the Company will submit an informational filing to the Commission that reports the actual refunds distributed to customers not more than 30 days after completion of the distribution of refunds.

The Company wanted to provide the refunds to customers as soon as practical upon conclusion of the base rate case, which is January 2024, and did not want to extend the distribution of customer refunds over an extended period, which is why the refunds are provided over a one-month period instead of an annual or multi-year period. Also, to ensure the full amount of refunds are provided to customers, the refund was designed as a fixed credit per rate schedule ${ }^{18}$ since the use of a kWh credit can unfortunately result in a high degree of variability due in large part to unpredictable changes in weather temperature during the winter; whereas the number of customers can be forecasted with a much greater degree of accuracy.

## VI. CONCLUSION

## Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE COMPANY'S DISTRIBUTION BASE RATE

 FILING.[^17]A. The Company's total rate request is an increase of $\$ 48.5$ million in distribution revenues accompanied by an approximate $\$ 4.8$ million decrease in the EDIS, resulting in a net change in revenues of $\$ 43.8$ million. PE seeks an increase in distribution rates to recover the costs of the Company's ongoing efforts to provide safe and reliable service to its customers. PE's request also includes the rolling into rate base of EDIS capital incurred through 2022; proposing a Phase II of EDIS to continue proactive investments in system reliability and resiliency; recovery of costs for existing deferrals; a proposal for deferrals association with storm and pension/OPEB recovery; approval to include the A\&G capitalization regulatory asset in rate base; and two new initiatives to provide further assistance to the Company's low-income residential customers. Even with the proposed rate increase, the Company's rates will still be the lowest of any of the investor-owned electric utilities in the State of Maryland. The Company requests the Commission to approve its base rate application and to find that the revised rates for retail electric service in Maryland result in just and reasonable rates.

## Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY AT THIS TIME?

A. Yes, it does.

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY - MARYLAND
Summary Case No. 9667

|  |  | Prior to Nov 1, 2021 |  | Effective ${ }^{1}$ <br> Nov 1, 2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | MD |  | MD |
| Vendor 1 |  |  |  |  |
| O\&M Annual Rev Req | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Capital Annual Rev Req | \$ | 1,238 | \$ | 1,162 |
|  | \$ | 1,238 | \$ | 1,162 |
| Vendor 2 |  |  |  |  |
| O\&M Annual Rev Req | \$ | 27,048 | \$ | 27,048 |
| Capital Annual Rev Req | \$ | 796 | \$ | 749 |
|  | \$ | 27,844 | \$ | 27,797 |
| Vendor 3 |  |  |  |  |
| O\&M Annual Rev Req | \$ | 6,442 | \$ | 6,442 |
| Capital Annual Rev Req | \$ | 2,063 | \$ | 1,945 |
|  | \$ | 8,506 | \$ | 8,387 |
|  |  | MD |  | MD |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| O\&M Annual Rev Req | \$ | 33,490 | \$ | 33,490 |
| Capital Annual Rev Req | \$ | 4,098 | \$ | 3,856 |
|  | \$ | 37,588 | \$ | 37,346 |

${ }^{1}$ New depreciation rates were effective November 1, 2021 in accordance with Commission Order No. 89971 dated October 26, 2021 in Case No. 9490 Phase II, which subsequently lowered the capital revenue

## Exhibit RV-1
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THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY - MARYLAND
Case No. 9667
O\&M Recorded to Account 923


| Maryland |  | Vendor 1 |  | Vendor 2 |  | Vendor 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MD rate case test year O\&M = | \$ | - | \$ | 54,902.04 | \$ | 13,076.60 |
| PE-MD Allocator ${ }^{1}=$ |  | 58.116\% |  | 58.116\% |  | 58.116\% |
| PE-MD rate case test year O \& $\mathrm{M}=$ | \$ | - | \$ | 31,906.87 | \$ | 7,599.60 |
| PE-MD Distribution Allocator ${ }^{2}=$ |  | 82.065\% |  | 82.065\% |  | 82.065\% |
| PE-MD Distribution rate case test year O\&M = | \$ | - | \$ | 26,184.37 | \$ | 6,236.61 |
| Gross-Up with GRT \& PSC Assessment Fee = | \$ | - | \$ | 26,771.66 | \$ | 6,376.49 |
| Gross-Up with GRT, PSC Fee \& Uncollectibles = | \$ | - | \$ | 27,048.09 | \$ | 6,442.33 |

[^18]${ }^{2}$ PE-MD MDGP01 A\&G O\&M allocator per Exhibit LMO-1 Actuals, Distribution Base Rate Filing dated October 22, 2018 in Case No. 9490

| Year | Month | PE Capital | MD Jurisdictional Allocator ${ }^{1}$ | Distribution Allocator ${ }^{2}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PE-MD } \\ \text { Distribution } \\ \text { Plant-In-Service } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PE-MD } \\ \text { Dist. Plant-In- } \\ \text { Service Month } \\ \text { Ending } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Regulatory Book | Regulatory Depreciation Reserve | Net Plant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

$\square$ $\underset{\text { Taxes }}{\substack{\text { Deferred Income }}}$ nome
\$ - $\$$.

| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (0.50) | \$ | (0.50) | \$ | 221.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (1.10) | \$ | (1.60) | \$ | 441.32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (2.10) | \$ | (3.69) | \$ | 659.85 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (2.02) | \$ | (5.71) | S | 656.14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (0.76) | \$ | (6.48) | 5 | 898.18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (0.91) | \$ | (7.39) | \$ | 1,291.76 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (1.32) |  | (8.71) | \$ | 2,080.75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (1.36) | \$ | (10.06) | \$ | 2,470.87 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (1.59) | \$ | (11.65) | \$ | 2,859.75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (5.57) | \$ | (17.23) | \$ | 6,502.70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (5.39) | \$ | (22.62) | \$ | 7,274.31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (5.79) | \$ | (28.41) | \$ | 7,646.70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (6.54) | \$ | (34.95) | \$ | 8,017.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (7.63) | \$ | (42.58) | \$ | 8,385.87 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (7.49) | \$ | (50.07) | \$ | 8,356.73 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (11.45) | \$ | (61.53) | S | 8,720.43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.91) | \$ | (70.43) | \$ | 9,511.49 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.86) | \$ | (79.30) | \$ | 9,889.20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.72) | \$ | (88.01) | \$ | 9,854.70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.72) | \$ | (96.73) | \$ | 9,820.19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.72) | \$ | (105.45) | \$ | 9,785.69 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.72) | \$ | (114.17) | \$ | 9,751.19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.72) | \$ | (122.89) | \$ | 9,716.69 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.72) | \$ | (131.61) | \$ | 9,682.19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.72) | \$ | (140.33) | \$ | 9,647.68 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.72) | \$ | (149.05) | \$ | 9,613.18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.72) | \$ | (157.77) | \$ | 9,578.68 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.72) | \$ | (166.49) | S | 9,544.18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.57) | \$ | (175.05) | s | 9,509.83 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.57) | \$ | (183.62) | \$ | 9,475.48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.57) | \$ | (192.19) | \$ | 9,441.14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.57) | \$ | (200.75) | \$ | 9,406.79 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.57) | \$ | (209.32) | \$ | 9,372.44 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.57) | \$ | (217.88) | \$ | 9,338.09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.57) | \$ | (226.45) | \$ | 9,303.75 | \$ | 96.23 | \$ | 8.31 | \$ | 104.54 |
| \$ | (8.57) | \$ | (235.01) | \$ | 9,269.40 | \$ | 95.97 | \$ | 8.31 | \$ | 104.28 |
| \$ | (8.57) | \$ | (243.58) | \$ | 9,235.05 | \$ | 95.71 | \$ | 8.31 | \$ | 104.02 |
| 5 | (8.57) | \$ | (252.14) | \$ | 9,200.70 | \$ | 95.45 | \$ | 8.31 | \$ | 103.76 |
| \$ | (8.57) | \$ | (260.71) | \$ | 9,166.36 | \$ | 95.19 | \$ | 8.31 | \$ | 103.50 |
| \$ | (8.57) | 5 | (269.27) | \$ | 9,132.01 | \$ | 94.93 | \$ | 8.31 | \$ | 103.24 |
| \$ | (7.39) | \$ | (276.66) | \$ | 9,098.83 | \$ | 94.68 | \$ | 8.31 | \$ | 102.99 |
| \$ | (7.39) | \$ | (284.05) | \$ | 9,065.66 | \$ | 94.43 | \$ | 8.31 | \$ | 102.74 |
| \$ | (7.39) | \$ | (291.45) | \$ | 9,032.49 | \$ | 94.17 | \$ | 8.31 | \$ | 102.49 |
| \$ | (7.39) | 5 | (298.84) | \$ | 8,999.31 | \$ | 93.92 | \$ | 8.31 | \$ | 102.23 |
| \$ | (7.39) | \$ | (306.23) | \$ | 8,966.14 | \$ | 93.67 | \$ | 8.31 | \$ | 101.98 |
| s | (7.39) | \$ | (313.62) | \$ | 8,932.96 | \$ | 93.42 | \$ | 8.31 | \$ | 101.73 |

nnua Reven $\begin{array}{rrr}\text { New Depreciation Rate effective March 23, 2019 }= & 2.66 \% \\ \text { Annual Revenue Requirement after new Depreciation Rates }=\$ & 1,198.83 \\ \text { Gross-Up with GRT \& PSC Assessment Fee }=\$ & 1,225.72\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{ccc}\text { Gross-Up with GRT \& PSC Assessment Fee }=\$ & 1,225.72 \\ \text { Gross-Up with Uncollectibles }=\$ & 1,238.37\end{array}$

New Depreciation Rate effective November $1,2021=\quad 1.93 \%$ Annual Revenue Requirement after new Depreciation Rates $=\mathbf{\$} \quad 1,124.54$ $\begin{array}{rll}\text { Gross-Up with GRT \& PSC Assessment Fee }=\$ & 1,149.76 \\ \text { Gross-Up with Uncollectibles }=\$ & 1,161.63\end{array}$

| Year | Month | PE Capital | $\underset{\substack{\text { MD } \\ \text { Jurisdictional } \\ \text { Allocator }}}{\text { 2 }}$ | Distribution Allocator ${ }^{2}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { PE-MD } \\ \text { Distribution } \\ \text { Plant-In-Service } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\qquad$ <br> Dist. Plant-InService Month Ending | Regulatory Book Depreciation | Regulatory Depreciation Reserve | Net Plant |  | $\underset{\text { Taxes }}{\substack{\text { Deferred Income } \\ \text { T. }}}$ |  | ADIT |  | Rate Base |  | Monthly Capital Revenue Requirement | тоIT: Property Tax | Total Revenue Requirement |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2014 | Jan-14 | \$ - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ | \$ - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |
|  | Feb-14 | 5 - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ - | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | s | - |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mar-14 | 5- | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | s | \$ | \$ - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |
|  | Apr-14 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ | \$ - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |
|  | May-14 | 5 - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | S | 5 | 5 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |
|  | Jun-14 | 5- | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Jul-14 | 754.11 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | 404.35 | 404.35 | 0.51 | 0.51 | \$ | 403.84 | \$ | (0.55) | \$ | (0.55) | \$ | 403.29 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Aug-14 | \$ - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 404.35 | 1.02 | 1.54 | \$ | 402.82 | \$ | (0.41) | \$ | (0.97) | \$ | 401.85 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sep-14 | 5 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 404.35 | 1.02 | 2.56 | \$ | 401.79 | \$ | (0.41) | \$ | (1.38) | \$ | 400.41 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Oct-14 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | \$ 404.35 | 1.02 | 3.59 | \$ | 400.77 | \$ | (0.41) | \$ | (1.80) | \$ | 398.97 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Nov-14 | 5- | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 404.35 | 1.02 | 4.61 | \$ | 399.75 | \$ | (0.41) | \$ | (2.21) | \$ | 397.54 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Dec-14 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | \$ 404.35 | \$ 1.02 | \$ $\quad 5.63$ | \$ | 398.72 | \$ | (0.41) | \$ | (2.62) | \$ | 396.10 |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | Jan-15 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | \$ 404.35 | 1.02 | 6.66 | \$ | 397.70 | \$ | (0.39) | \$ | (3.01) | \$ | 394.69 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Feb-15 | 5 - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | \$ 404.35 | 1.02 | 7.68 | \$ | 396.67 | \$ | (0.39) | \$ | (3.40) | \$ | 393.27 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mar-15 | 5- | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 404.35 | 1.02 | \$ 8.71 | \$ | 395.65 | \$ | (0.39) | \$ | (3.78) | \$ | 391.86 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Apr-15 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 404.35 | 1.02 | 9.73 | \$ | 394.62 | \$ | (0.39) | \$ | (4.17) | \$ | 390.45 |  |  |  |  |
|  | May-15 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 404.35 | 1.02 | 10.76 | \$ | 393.60 | \$ | (0.39) | \$ | (4.56) | \$ | 389.04 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Jun-15 | - | 0.59138 | 0.96670 | \$ - | \$ 404.35 | 1.02 | 11.78 | S | 392.57 | \$ | (0.39) | \$ | (4.95) | \$ | 387.63 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Jul-15 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 404.35 | \$ 1.02 | 12.80 | \$ | 391.55 | \$ | (0.39) | \$ | (5.33) | \$ | 386.22 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Aug-15 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 404.35 | 1.02 | 13.83 | 5 | 390.53 | \$ | (0.39) | \$ | (5.72) | \$ | 384.80 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sep-15 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | \$ 404.35 | 1.02 | 14.85 | \$ | 389.50 | \$ | (0.39) | \$ | (6.11) | \$ | 383.39 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Oct-15 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 404.35 | 1.02 | 15.88 | \$ | 388.48 | \$ | (0.39) | \$ | (6.50) | \$ | 381.98 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Nov-15 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 404.35 | 1.02 | \$ 16.90 | \$ | 387.45 | \$ | (0.39) | \$ | (6.88) | \$ | 380.57 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Dec-15 | - | 0.59138 | 0.96670 | \$ | \$ 404.35 | \$ 1.02 | \$ 17.93 | \$ | 386.43 | \$ | (0.39) | \$ | (7.27) | \$ | 379.16 |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 | Jan-16 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | \$ 404.35 | 1.02 | 18.95 | \$ | 385.40 | \$ | (0.34) | \$ | (7.61) | \$ | 377.79 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Feb-16 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 404.35 | 1.02 | 19.98 | \$ | 384.38 | \$ | (0.34) | \$ | (7.95) | \$ | 376.43 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mar-16 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 404.35 | 1.02 | \$ 21.00 | s | 383.36 | \$ | (0.34) | \$ | (8.28) | \$ | 375.07 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Apr-16 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 404.35 | 1.02 | 22.02 | \$ | 382.33 | \$ | (0.34) | \$ | (8.62) | \$ | 373.71 |  |  |  |  |
|  | May-16 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 404.35 | 1.02 | 23.05 | \$ | 381.31 | \$ | (0.34) | \$ | (8.96) | \$ | 372.35 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Jun-16 | 5- | 0.59138 | 0.96670 | \$ - | \$ 404.35 | 1.02 | \$ 24.07 | S | 380.28 | \$ | (0.34) | \$ | (9.30) | \$ | 370.99 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Jul-16 | 212.29 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | 113.83 | 518.18 | 1.17 | 25.24 | \$ | 492.94 | \$ | (0.49) | \$ | (9.79) | \$ | 483.15 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Aug-16 | 212.28 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | 113.83 | \$ 632.01 | 1.46 | 26.70 | \$ | 605.31 | \$ | (0.65) | \$ | (10.44) | \$ | 594.88 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sep-16 | 212.28 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | 113.83 | 745.84 | 1.75 | 28.44 | \$ | 717.40 | \$ | (0.86) | \$ | (11.30) | \$ | 706.09 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Oct-16 | 212.28 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | 113.83 | 859.67 | \$ $\quad 2.03$ | 30.48 | \$ | 829.19 | \$ | (1.18) | \$ | (12.48) | \$ | 816.71 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Nov-16 | 212.28 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | 113.83 | \$ 973.49 | 2.32 | \$ 32.80 | \$ | 940.70 | \$ | (1.68) | \$ | (14.16) | \$ | 926.54 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Dec-16 | 212.28 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | 113.83 | \$ 1,087.32 | 2.61 | \$ 35.41 | \$ | 1,051.91 | \$ | (2.78) | \$ | (16.94) | \$ | 1,034.98 |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | Jan-17 | 7,498.69 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | 4,020.83 | 5,108.15 | \$ 7.85 | 43.26 | \$ | 5,064.89 | \$ | (3.00) | \$ | (19.94) | \$ | 5,044.95 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Feb-17 | 425.25 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | 228.02 | \$ 5,336.17 | 13.23 | \$ 56.49 | s | 5,279.69 | \$ | (1.73) | \$ | (21.67) | s | 5,258.01 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mar-17 | 425.25 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ 228.02 | \$ 5,564.19 | 13.81 | 70.29 | s | 5,493.90 | \$ | (1.81) | \$ | (23.48) | \$ | 5,470.41 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Apr-17 | 425.25 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | 228.02 | \$ 5,792.21 | 14.38 | 84.68 | \$ | 5,707.54 | \$ | (1.91) | \$ | (25.40) | \$ | 5,682.14 |  |  |  |  |
|  | May-17 | 425.25 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | 228.02 | \$ 6,020.23 | 14.96 | \$ 99.64 | s | 5,920.59 | \$ | (2.05) | \$ | (27.45) | \$ | 5,893.15 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Jun-17 | 425.25 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | 228.02 | \$ 6,248.26 | 15.54 | 115.18 | S | 6,133.07 | \$ | (2.23) | \$ | (29.67) | \$ | 6,103.40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Jul-17 | 5- | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 6,248.26 | 15.83 | 131.01 | \$ | 6,117.25 | \$ | (2.15) | \$ | (31.82) | \$ | 6,085.43 | 61.91 | \$ 5.10 | \$ | 67.01 |
|  | Aug-17 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 6,248.26 | \$ 15.83 | \$ 146.84 | \$ | 6,101.42 | \$ | (2.15) | \$ | (33.96) | \$ | 6,067.45 | \$ 61.77 | 5.10 | \$ | 66.87 |
|  | Sep-17 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | \$ 6,248.26 | 15.83 | 162.67 | \$ | 6,085.59 | \$ | (2.15) | \$ | (36.11) | \$ | 6,049.48 | 61.63 | 5.10 | \$ | 66.74 |
|  | Oct-17 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 6,248.26 | 15.83 | 178.50 | 5 | 6,069.76 | \$ | (2.15) | \$ | (38.26) | \$ | 6,031.50 | 61.50 | \$ 5.10 | \$ | 66.60 |
|  | Nov-17 | \$ - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 6,248.26 | \$ 15.83 | \$ 194.33 | s | 6,053.93 | \$ | (2.15) | \$ | (40.40) | \$ | 6,013.53 | 61.36 | 5.10 | \$ | 66.46 |
|  | Dec-17 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 6,248.26 | \$ 15.83 | 210.15 | \$ | 6,038.10 | \$ | (2.15) | \$ | (42.55) | \$ | 5,995.55 | 61.23 | \$ 5.10 | \$ | 66.33 |
| 2018 | Jan-18 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | \$ 6,248.26 | 15.83 | 225.98 | \$ | 6,022.27 | \$ | (5.76) | \$ | (48.31) | \$ | 5,973.96 | 61.06 | \$ 5.10 | \$ | 66.17 |
|  | Feb-18 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 6,248.26 | \$ 15.83 | 241.81 | S | 6,006.44 | \$ | (5.76) | \$ | (54.08) | \$ | 5,952.37 | 60.90 | 5.10 | \$ | 66.00 |
|  | Mar-18 | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 6,248.26 | \$ 15.83 | 257.64 | \$ | 5,990.61 | \$ | (5.76) | \$ | (59.84) | \$ | 5,930.78 | 60.74 | 5.10 | \$ | 65.84 |
|  | Apr-18 | 5 - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | \$ 6,248.26 | \$ 15.83 | \$ 273.47 | \$ | 5,974.79 | \$ | (5.76) | \$ | (65.60) | \$ | 5,909.18 | \$ 60.57 | \$ 5.10 | \$ | 65.67 |
|  | May-18 | 5 - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 6,248.26 | 15.83 | \$ 289.30 | s | 5,958.96 | \$ | (5.76) | \$ | (71.36) | \$ | 5,887.59 | 60.41 | 5.10 | \$ | 65.51 |
|  | Jun-18 | S - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ - | \$ 6,248.26 | \$ 15.83 | 305.13 | \$ | 5,943.13 | \$ | (5.76) | \$ | (77.13) | \$ | 5,866.00 | \$ 60.25 | 5.10 | \$ | 65.35 |
|  |  | 11,652.75 |  |  | 6,248.26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Annual | evenue | quiremen | nt prior to new Dep | reciation Rates $=$ | \$ | 794.55 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Depreciat | tion Rate effective | March 23, $2019=$ |  | 2.66\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Annua | Reve | Requirem | ment after new Dep | reciation Rates $=$ |  | 770.81 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Gross-Up | p with GRT \& PSC A | Assessment Fee $=$ | \$ | 788.10 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Gross-Up with | Uncollectibles $=$ |  | 796.24 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.93\% |
| ${ }^{1}$ PE-MD CWIP allocator per Exhibit LMO-1 Actuals (page 11), Distribution Base Rate Filing dated October 22, 2018 in Case No. 9490 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Annual Revenue Requirement after new Depreciation Rates $=\$ \quad 725.20$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {PPE-MD Distribution CWIP allocator per Exhibit LMO-1 Actuals (page 11), Distribution Base Rate Filing dated October 22, } 2018 \text { in Case No. } 9490}{ }^{3}$ New depreciation rates were effective November 1, 2021 in accordance with Commission Order No. 89971 dated October 26,2021 in Case No. 9490 Phase II |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Gross-Up with GRT \& PSC Assessment Fee = |  |  |  |  |  | 741.46 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Gross-Up with Uncollectibles = |  |  | 749.12 |


| Year | Month | PE Capital | $\begin{array}{c\|} \text { MD } \\ \text { Jurisdictional } \\ \text { Allocator }^{1} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Distribution Allocator ${ }^{2}$ | PE-MD <br> Distribution Plant-In-Service | PE-MD Dist. Plant-InService Month Ending | Regulatory Book Depreciation | Regulatory Depreciation Reserve | Net Plant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Deferred Income <br> Taxes | ADIT |
| :--- | :--- |

$\square$ Monthly Capital
Revenue
тоाт:
Total Revenue

| 2014 Jan-14 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feb-14 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Mar-14 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Apr-14 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | S | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| May-14 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Jun-14 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Jul-14 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Aug-14 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Sep-14 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Oct-14 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Nov-14 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Dec-14 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  |
| 2015 Jan-15 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Feb-15 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Mar-15 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Apr-15 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| May-15 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Jun-15 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Jul-15 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Aug-15 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Sep-15 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Oct-15 | s | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Nov-15 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Dec-15 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | s | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 2016 Jan-16 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Feb-16 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Mar-16 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Apr-16 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| May-16 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Jun-16 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Jul-16 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Aug-16 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Sep-16 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Oct-16 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Nov-16 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Dec-16 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 2017 Jan-17 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  |
| Feb-17 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Mar-17 | \$ | 8,561.70 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 4,590.82 | \$ | 4,590.82 | \$ | 5.82 | \$ | 5.82 | 5 | 4,585.01 |
| Apr-17 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | 4,590.82 | \$ | 11.63 | \$ | 17.45 | \$ | 4,573.38 |
| May-17 | \$ | 8,561.70 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 4,590.82 | \$ | 9,181.64 | \$ | 17.45 | \$ | 34.89 | \$ | 9,146.75 |
| Jun-17 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | 9,181.64 | \$ | 23.26 | \$ | 58.15 | \$ | 9,123.49 |
| Jul-17 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | 9,181.64 | \$ | 23.26 | \$ | 81.41 | \$ | 9,100.23 |
| Aug-17 | \$ | 8,561.70 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 4,590.82 | \$ | 13,772.46 | \$ | 29.08 | \$ | 110.49 | S | 13,661.98 |
| Sep-17 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | 13,772.46 | \$ | 34.89 | \$ | 145.38 | \$ | 13,627.09 |
| Oct-17 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | s | - | \$ | 13,772.46 | \$ | 34.89 | \$ | 180.27 | s | 13,592.20 |
| Nov-17 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | 13,772.46 | 5 | 34.89 | \$ | 215.16 | \$ | 13,557.31 |
| Dec-17 | \$ | 8,561.70 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 4,590.82 | \$ | 18,363.28 | \$ | 40.71 | \$ | 255.86 | \$ | 18,107.42 |
| 2018 Jan-18 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | 18,363.28 | \$ | 46.52 | \$ | 302.38 | \$ | 18,060.90 |
| Feb-18 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | s | - | \$ | 18,363.28 | \$ | 46.52 | \$ | 348.90 | \$ | 18,014.38 |
| Mar-18 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | 18,363.28 | \$ | 46.52 | \$ | 395.42 | S | 17,967.86 |
| Apr-18 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | 18,363.28 | \$ | 46.52 | \$ | 441.94 | \$ | 17,921.34 |
| May-18 |  | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | 18,363.28 |  | 46.52 | \$ | 488.46 |  | 17,874.82 |
| Jun-18 | s | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | s | - | \$ | 18,363.28 | \$ | 46.52 | \$ | 534.98 | \$ | 17,828.30 |


| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| s | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ |  | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 5 | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | s | - |
| \$ | (3.14) | \$ | (3.14) |
| \$ | (1.54) | \$ | (4.67) |
| \$ | (5.86) | \$ | (10.53) |
| \$ | (4.26) | \$ | (14.79) |
| \$ | (4.26) | \$ | (19.05) |
| \$ | (12.13) | \$ | (31.18) |
| \$ | (10.53) | \$ | (41.71) |
| \$ | (10.53) | \$ | (52.25) |
| \$ | (10.53) | \$ | (62.78) |
| \$ | (56.31) | \$ | (119.09) |
| \$ | (17.60) | \$ | (136.68) |
| \$ | (17.60) | \$ | (154.28) |
| \$ | (17.60) | \$ | (171.88) |
| \$ | (17.60) | \$ | (189.48) |
| \$ | (17.60) | \$ | (207.07) |
| \$ | (17.60) | \$ | (224.67) |

$\$$
$\$$

| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | 4,581.87 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | 4,568.70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | 9,136.22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | 9,108.70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | 9,081.18 | \$ | 92.02 | \$ | 7.50 | \$ | 99.52 |
| \$ | 13,630.79 | \$ | 132.29 | \$ | 11.25 | \$ | 143.53 |
| \$ | 13,585.37 | \$ | 137.76 | \$ | 11.25 | \$ | 149.00 |
| \$ | 13,539.95 | \$ | 137.41 | \$ | 11.25 | \$ | 148.66 |
| \$ | 13,494.53 | \$ | 137.07 | \$ | 11.25 | \$ | 148.32 |
| \$ | 17,988.34 | \$ | 176.91 | \$ | 15.00 | \$ | 191.91 |
| \$ | 17,924.22 | \$ | 182.24 | \$ | 15.00 | \$ | 197.24 |
| \$ | 17,860.10 | \$ | 181.75 | \$ | 15.00 | \$ | 196.75 |
| \$ | 17,795.98 | \$ | 181.27 | \$ | 15.00 | \$ | 196.26 |
| \$ | 17,731.86 | \$ | 180.78 | \$ | 15.00 | \$ | 195.78 |
| \$ | 17,667.75 | \$ | 180.30 | \$ | 15.00 | \$ | 195.29 |
| \$ | 17,603.63 | \$ | 179.81 | S | 15.00 | \$ | 194.81 |

## Exhibit RV-2

Page 1 of 3
THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY - MARYLAND
Summary Sponsorship/Advertising

|  | Prior to <br>  <br> Nov 1, 2021 | Effective ${ }^{1}$ <br> Nov 1, 2021 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | MD | MD |  |
| Sponsorship/Advertising |  |  |  |
| O\&M Annual Rev Req | $\$$ | 194,146 | $\$$ |
| Capital Annual Rev Req | $\$$ | 1,792 | $\$$ |

${ }^{1}$ New depreciation rates were effective November 1, 2021 in accordance with Commission Order No. 89971 dated October 26, 2021 in Case No. 9490 Phase II, which subsequently lowered the capital revenue

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY - MARYLAND
Sponsorship/Advertising
O\&M Recorded to Account 923


| Maryland | Sponsorship/ <br> Advertising |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| MD rate case test year O\&M $=$ | $\$$ | $394,077.04$ |
| PE-MD Allocator ${ }^{1}=$ |  | $58.116 \%$ |
| PE-MD rate case test year O\&M $=$ | $\$$ | $229,021.81$ |
| PE-MD Distribution Allocator ${ }^{2}=$ | $82.065 \%$ |  |
| PE-MD Distribution rate case test year O\&M $=$ | $\$$ | $187,946.75$ |
| Gross-Up with GRT \& PSC Assessment Fee $=$ | $\$$ | $192,162.21$ |
| Gross-Up with GRT, PSC Fee \& Uncollectibles $=$ | $\$$ | $194,146.39$ |

## ${ }^{1}$ PE-MD GP01 A\&G O\&M allocator per Exhibit LMO-1 Actuals,

 Distribution Base Rate Filing dated October 22, 2018 in Case No. 9490${ }^{2}$ PE-MD MDGP01 A\&G O\&M allocator per Exhibit LMO-1 Actuals, Distribution Base Rate Filing dated October 22, 2018 in Case No. 9490

| Year | Month | PE Capital | MD <br> Jurisdictional <br> Allocator |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Y |  |  |  |


| Deferred Income <br> Taxes | ADIT |
| :--- | :--- |


| Rate Base | Monthly Capital <br> Revenue <br> Requirement | ToIT: <br> Property Tax | Total Revenue <br> Requirement |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |


816

| Sep-15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,663.00 | \$ | 6.75 | \$ | 37.27 | \$ | 2,625.73 |
|  | Oct-15 | \$ | 12.01 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 6.44 | \$ | 2,669.43 | \$ | 6.75 | \$ | 44.02 | \$ | 2,625.41 |
|  | Nov-15 | \$ | 177.16 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 94.99 | \$ | 2,764.43 | \$ | 6.88 | \$ | 50.91 | \$ | 2,713.52 |
|  | Dec-15 | \$ |  | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ |  | \$ | 2,764.43 | \$ | 7.00 | \$ | 57.91 | \$ | 2,706.52 |
| 2016 | Jan-16 | \$ | 2,178.98 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 1,168.38 | \$ | 3,932.81 | \$ | 8.48 | \$ | 66.39 | \$ | 3,866.41 |
|  | Feb-16 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | 3,932.81 | \$ | 9.96 | \$ | 76.36 | \$ | 3,856.45 |
|  | Mar-16 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | 3,932.81 | \$ | 9.96 | \$ | 86.32 | \$ | 3,846.49 |
|  | Apr-16 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | 3,932.81 | \$ | 9.96 | \$ | 96.28 | \$ | 3,836.52 |
|  | May-16 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | 3,932.81 | \$ | 9.96 | \$ | 106.25 | \$ | 3,826.56 |
|  | Jun-16 | \$ | 2,006.73 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 1,076.02 | \$ | 5,008.82 | \$ | 11.33 | \$ | 117.57 | \$ | 4,891.25 |
|  | Jul-16 | \$ | 1,906.76 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 1,022.41 | \$ | 6,031.24 | \$ | 13.98 | \$ | 131.56 | \$ | 5,899.68 |
|  | Aug-16 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | 6,031.24 | \$ | 15.28 | \$ | 146.84 | \$ | 5,884.40 |
|  | Sep-16 | \$ | 4,139.28 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 2,219.50 | \$ | 8,250.73 | \$ | 18.09 | \$ | 164.93 | \$ | 8,085.81 |
|  | Oct-16 | \$ | 521.36 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 279.55 | \$ | 8,530.29 | \$ | 21.26 | \$ | 186.18 | \$ | 8,344.11 |
|  | Nov-16 | \$ | 1,160.31 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 62.17 | \$ | 9,152.45 | \$ | 22.40 | \$ | 208.58 | \$ | 8,943.87 |
|  | Dec-16 | \$ | 173.79 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | s | 93.18 | \$ | 9,245.64 | 5 | 23.30 | \$ | 231.8 | \$ | 9,013.75 |
| 2017 | Jan-17 | \$ | 2,220.94 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 1,190.88 | \$ | 10,436.51 | \$ | 24.93 | \$ | 256.81 | \$ | 10,179.70 |
|  | Feb-17 | \$ | 342.47 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 183.63 | \$ | 10,620.15 | \$ | 26.67 | \$ | 283.49 | \$ | 10,336.66 |
|  | Mar-17 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | 10,620.15 | \$ | 26.90 | \$ | 310.39 | s | 10,309.76 |
|  | Apr-17 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | 10,620.15 | \$ | 26.90 | \$ | 337.30 | S | 10,282.85 |
|  | May-17 | \$ |  | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | 10,620.15 | \$ | 26.90 | \$ | 364.20 | \$ | 10,255.95 |
|  | Jun-17 | \$ | 68.49 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 36.73 | s | 10,656.87 | \$ | 26.95 | \$ | 391.15 | \$ | 10,265.72 |
|  | Jul-17 | \$ | 1,784.50 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 956.85 | \$ | 11,613.73 | \$ | 28.21 | \$ | 419.36 | \$ | 11,194.37 |
|  | Aug-17 | \$ | 446.42 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 239.37 | \$ | 11,853.10 | \$ | 29.72 | \$ | 449.08 | \$ | 11,404.02 |
|  | Sep-17 | \$ | 72.77 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 39.02 | \$ | 11,892.12 | \$ | 30.08 | \$ | 479.16 | \$ | 11,412.96 |
|  | Oct-17 | \$ | 4,175.00 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 2,238.66 | \$ | 14,130.78 | \$ | 32.96 | \$ | 512.12 | \$ | 13,618.65 |
|  | Nov-17 | \$ | 1.93 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 1.03 | \$ | 14,131.81 | \$ | 35.80 | \$ | 547.92 | \$ | 13,583.89 |
|  | Dec-17 | \$ | 8.06 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 4.32 | \$ | 14,136.13 | \$ | 35.81 | \$ | 583.73 | \$ | 13,552.40 |
| 2018 | Jan-18 | \$ |  | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ |  | \$ | 14,136.13 | \$ | 35.81 | \$ | 619.54 | \$ | 13,516.59 |
|  | Feb-18 | \$ | 2,548.24 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 1,366.38 | \$ | 15,502.51 | \$ | 37.54 | \$ | 657.08 | S | 14,845.43 |
|  | Mar-18 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | 5 | 15,502.51 | \$ | 39.27 | \$ | 696.36 | \$ | 14,806.15 |
|  | Apr-18 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | 15,502.51 | \$ | 39.27 | \$ | 735.63 | \$ | 14,766.88 |
|  | May-18 | \$ | - | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | - | \$ | 15,502.51 | \$ | 39.27 | \$ | 774.90 | \$ | 14,727.61 |
|  | Jun-18 | s | 2,427.50 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | s | 1,301.63 | \$ | 16,804.14 | \$ | 40.92 | \$ | 815.82 | S | 15,988.32 |
|  |  | \$ | 31,339.07 |  |  | \$ | 16,804.14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\mathrm{No}}{\mathrm{De}} \\
& 2016 \mathrm{De}_{\mathrm{Jar}}^{\mathrm{Fe}}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
017
$$

| \$ | (0.15) | \$ | (0.15) | \$ | 297.64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | (0.07) | \$ | (0.22) | \$ | 333.55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (0.91) | \$ | (1.13) | \$ | 1,577.34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (0.47) | \$ | (1.61) | \$ | 1,572.85 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (0.49) | \$ | (2.09) | \$ | 1,580.30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (1.69) | \$ | (3.78) | S | 2,642.19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (1.31) | \$ | (5.09) | \$ | 2,634.13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (1.31) | \$ | (6.40) | \$ | 2,626.07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (1.31) | \$ | (7.72) | \$ | 2,618.01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (1.33) | \$ | (9.05) | \$ | 2,616.36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (1.79) | \$ | (10.84) | \$ | 2,702.68 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| s | (1.75) | \$ | (12.59) | S | 2,693.92 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (3.25) | \$ | (15.84) |  | 3,850.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (2.84) | \$ | (18.68) | \$ | 3,837.77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (2.84) | \$ | (21.52) | \$ | 3,824.97 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (2.84) | \$ | (24.36) | \$ | 3,812.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (2.84) | \$ | (27.19) | s | 3,799.37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (4.05) | \$ | (31.25) | \$ | 4,860.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (5.08) | \$ | (36.32) | \$ | 5,863.36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (4.72) | \$ | (41.04) | \$ | 5,843.36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (9.67) | \$ | (50.72) | \$ | 8,035.09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (9.76) | \$ | (60.48) | \$ | 8,283.62 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (12.66) | \$ | (73.14) | \$ | 8,870.73 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| s | (13.37) | \$ | (86.51) | S | 8,927.24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (9.13) | \$ | (95.64) | \$ | 10,084.06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.82) | \$ | (104.46) | \$ | 10,232.20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.75) | \$ | (113.21) | \$ | 10,196.54 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.75) | \$ | (121.97) | \$ | 10,160.89 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.75) | \$ | (130.72) | \$ | 10,125.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.80) | \$ | (139.52) | \$ | 10,126.21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (10.10) | \$ | (149.61) | \$ | 11,044.76 | \$ | 111.84 | \$ | 9.48 | \$ | 121.32 |
| \$ | (10.17) | \$ | (159.78) | \$ | 11,244.23 | \$ | 114.86 | \$ | 9.68 | \$ | 124.54 |
| \$ | (10.18) | \$ | (169.96) | \$ | 11,243.00 | \$ | 115.21 | \$ | 9.71 | \$ | 124.92 |
| \$ | (17.08) | \$ | (187.04) | \$ | 13,431.61 | \$ | 134.66 | s | 11.54 | \$ | 146.20 |
| \$ | (16.31) | \$ | (203.35) | \$ | 13,380.54 | \$ | 137.11 | S | 11.54 | \$ | 148.66 |
| \$ | (16.35) | \$ | (219.70) | S | 13,332.70 | \$ | 136.76 |  | 11.54 | \$ | 148.30 |
| \$ | (12.08) | \$ | (231.78) | \$ | 13,284.81 | \$ | 136.40 | \$ | 11.54 | \$ | 147.95 |
| \$ | (12.89) | \$ | (244.67) | \$ | 14,600.76 | \$ | 148.10 | \$ | 12.66 | \$ | 160.76 |
| \$ | (12.41) | \$ | (257.08) | \$ | 14,549.08 | \$ | 149.44 | \$ | 12.66 | \$ | 162.10 |
| \$ | (12.41) | \$ | (269.49) | \$ | 14,497.40 | \$ | 149.04 | S | 12.66 | \$ | 161.71 |
| \$ | (12.41) | \$ | (281.90) | \$ | 14,445.71 | \$ | 148.65 | \$ | 12.66 | \$ | 161.31 |
| \$ | (13.87) | \$ | (295.77) | \$ | 15,692.55 | s | 159.74 | \$ | 13.72 | \$ | 173.47 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY - MARYLAND
Summary Miscellaneous*

|  | Prior to Nov 1, 2021 |  | Effective ${ }^{1}$ <br> Nov 1, 2021 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MD |  | MD |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| O\&M Annual Rev Req | \$ | 62,676 | \$ | 62,676 |
| Capital Annual Rev Req | \$ | 5,745 | \$ | 5,402 |
|  | \$ | 68,421 | \$ | 68,078 |

*Includes amounts related to FE Foundation, Lobbying, FE Products, IT for FE Products, Vendors, and Trade Association Dues
${ }^{1}$ New depreciation rates were effective November 1, 2021 in accordance with Commission Order No. 89971 dated October 26, 2021 in Case No.
9490 Phase II, which subsequently lowered the capital revenue

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY - MARYLAND
Miscellaneous
O\&M Recorded to Accounts 923, 926 and 403

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { ERC } 923 \\ \text { PE10 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { FERC } 926 \\ \text { PE10 } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { FERC } 403 \\ \text { PE10 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Total } \\ & \text { PE10 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2017 Jul | \$ | 6,989.37 | \$ | 1,045.44 | \$ | 17.71 | \$ | 8,052.52 |
| 2017 Aug | \$ | 6,989.37 | \$ | 1,045.44 | \$ | 17.71 | \$ | 8,052.52 |
| 2017 Sep | \$ | 6,989.37 | \$ | 1,045.44 | \$ | 17.71 | \$ | 8,052.52 |
| 2017 Oct | \$ | 7,503.63 | \$ | 1,045.44 | \$ | 17.71 | \$ | 8,566.77 |
| 2017 Nov | \$ | 6,989.37 | \$ | 1,045.44 | \$ | 17.71 | \$ | 8,052.52 |
| 2017 Dec | \$ | 8,772.06 | \$ | 1,045.44 | \$ | 17.71 | \$ | 9,835.21 |
| 2018 Jan | \$ | 8,843.27 | \$ | 1,161.87 | \$ | 17.20 | \$ | 10,022.34 |
| 2018 Feb | \$ | 8,846.21 | \$ | 1,161.87 | \$ | 17.20 | \$ | 10,025.28 |
| 2018 Mar | \$ | 10,158.81 | \$ | 1,161.87 | \$ | 17.20 | \$ | 11,337.88 |
| 2018 Apr | \$ | 8,860.09 | \$ | 1,161.87 | \$ | 17.20 | \$ | 10,039.16 |
| 2018 May | \$ | 8,849.78 | \$ | 1,161.87 | \$ | 17.20 | \$ | 10,028.85 |
| 2018 Jun | \$ | 22,209.64 | \$ | 1,161.87 | \$ | 17.20 | \$ | 23,388.71 |
| Total PE = | \$ | 112,000.98 | \$ | 13,243.88 | \$ | 209.41 | \$ | 125,454.28 |


| Maryland |  | FERC 923 |  | FERC 926 |  | FERC 403 |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MD rate case test year O \& $\mathrm{M}=$ | \$ | 112,000.98 | \$ | 13,243.88 | \$ | 209.41 | \$ | 125,454.28 |
| PE-MD Allocator ${ }^{1}=$ |  | 58.116\% |  | 58.670\% |  | 60.794\% |  |  |
| PE-MD rate case test year O\&M = | \$ | 65,090.49 | \$ | 7,770.19 | \$ | 127.31 | \$ | 72,987.99 |
| PE-MD Distribution Allocator ${ }^{2}=$ |  | 82.065\% |  | 91.902\% |  | 91.902\% |  |  |
| PE-MD Distribution rate case test year O\&M = | \$ | 53,416.51 | \$ | 7,140.96 | \$ | 117.00 | \$ | 60,674.47 |
| Gross-Up with GRT \& PSC Assessment Fee = | \$ | 54,614.59 | \$ | 7,301.12 | \$ | 119.62 | \$ | 62,035.34 |
| Gross-Up with GRT, PSC Fee \& Uncollectibles = | \$ | 55,178.52 | \$ | 7,376.51 | \$ | 120.86 | \$ | 62,675.89 |

${ }^{1}$ PE-MD allocators per Exhibit LMO-1 Actuals, Distribution Base Rate Filing dated October 22, 2018 in Case No. 9490 ${ }^{2}$ PE-MD allocators per Exhibit LMO-1 Actuals, Distribution Base Rate Filing dated October 22, 2018 in Case No. 9490

| Year | Month | PE Capital | MD Jurisdictional Allocator ${ }^{1}$ | Distribution Allocator ${ }^{2}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PE-MD } \\ \text { Distribution } \\ \text { Plant-In-Service } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PE-MD } \\ \text { Dist. Plant-In- } \\ \text { Service Month } \\ \text { Ending } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Regulatory Book | Regulatory Depreciation Reserve | Net Plant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Deferred Income <br> Taxes | ADIT |
| :--- | :--- |


| Rate Base | Monthly Capital <br> Revenue <br> Requirement | ToIT: <br> Property Tax | Total Revenue <br> Requirement |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |


2015

2017

| Se | 5 | 2,429.80 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | 5 | 1,302.87 | \$ | 39,612.48 | 5 | 98.70 | 5 | 1,467.36 | 5 | 38,1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Oct-17 | \$ | 3,103.20 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 1,663.95 | \$ | 41,276.43 | \$ | 102.46 | \$ | 1,569.82 | \$ | 39,706.60 |
| Nov-17 | \$ | 2,429.80 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 1,302.87 | \$ | 42,579.30 | \$ | 106.22 | \$ | 1,676.04 | \$ | 40,903.26 |
| Dec-17 | \$ | 2,686.66 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 1,440.60 | \$ | 44,019.89 | \$ | 109.69 | \$ | 1,785.73 | \$ | 42,234.16 |
| Jan-18 | \$ | 2,349.28 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 1,259.69 | \$ | 45,279.59 | \$ | 113.11 | \$ | 1,898.84 | \$ | 43,380.74 |
| Feb-18 | \$ | 2,349.28 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 1,259.6 | \$ | 46,539.2 | \$ | 116.30 | \$ | 2,015.15 | \$ | 44,524.13 |
| Mar-18 | \$ | 4,066.25 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 2,180.3 | \$ | 48,719.6 | s | 120.66 | s | 2,135.81 | \$ | 46,583.81 |
| Apr-18 | \$ | 2,349.28 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 1,259.69 | \$ | 49,979.31 | \$ | 125.02 | \$ | 2,260.83 | \$ | 47,718.49 |
| May-18 | \$ | 2,349.28 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 1,259.69 | \$ | 51,239.01 | \$ | 128.21 | \$ | 2,389.04 | \$ | 48,849.97 |
| Jun-18 | s | 19,831.21 | 0.59138 | 0.90670 | \$ | 10,633.58 | \$ | 61,872.59 | \$ | 143.27 | \$ | 2,532.31 | \$ | 59,340.27 |



| \$ | (0.42) | \$ | (0.42) | \$ | 816.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | (0.62) | \$ | (1.03) | \$ | 1,630.06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (0.89) | \$ | (1.92) | \$ | 2,441.62 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (1.26) | \$ | (3.18) | \$ | 3,250.73 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (1.74) | \$ | (4.92) | \$ | 4,057.29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (2.38) | \$ | (7.30) | \$ | 4,861.14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (3.21) | \$ | (10.51) | \$ | 5,662.09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (4.33) | \$ | (14.84) | \$ | 6,459.84 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (6.90) | \$ | (21.73) | \$ | 7,712.22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (8.98) | \$ | (30.71) | \$ | 8,500.02 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (15.28) | \$ | (45.99) | \$ | 9,830.56 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (22.96) | \$ | (68.95) | \$ | 10,598.84 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (10.96) | \$ | (79.90) | \$ | 11,699.77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (11.23) | \$ | (91.14) | \$ | 12,803.12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (11.61) | \$ | (102.75) | \$ | 13,897.60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (12.13) | \$ | (114.87) | S | 14,988.67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (13.08) | \$ | (127.96) | \$ | 16,371.31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (13.86) | \$ | (141.82) | \$ | 17,454.12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (15.03) | \$ | (156.85) | s | 18,532.87 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (16.59) | \$ | (173.44) | \$ | 19,607.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (21.65) | \$ | (195.09) | \$ | 21,976.45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (25.68) | \$ | (220.77) | \$ | 23,471.98 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (31.52) | \$ | (252.29) | \$ | 24,704.40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (42.44) | \$ | (294.73) | S | 25,737.76 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (24.95) | \$ | (319.68) | \$ | 26,951.78 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (25.27) | \$ | (344.95) | \$ | 28,156.66 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (25.70) | \$ | (370.65) | \$ | 29,357.81 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (26.29) | \$ | (396.94) | S | 30,555.07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (27.23) | \$ | (424.17) | \$ | 31,931.49 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (29.25) | \$ | (453.42) | \$ | 34,069.28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$ | (30.25) | \$ | (483.68) | S | 35,249.79 | \$ | 359.01 | \$ | 30.22 | \$ | 389.23 |
| \$ | (32.03) | \$ | (515.71) | s | 36,425.23 | \$ | 371.21 | \$ | 31.29 | \$ | 402.49 |
| \$ | (34.49) | \$ | (550.20) | \$ | 37,594.91 | \$ | 383.36 | \$ | 32.35 | \$ | 415.71 |
| \$ | (39.18) | \$ | (589.37) | \$ | 39,117.23 | \$ | 398.65 | \$ | 33.71 | \$ | 432.36 |
| \$ | (44.86) | \$ | (634.24) | S | 40,269.02 | s | 411.13 | \$ | 34.77 | \$ | 445.90 |
| \$ | (58.77) | \$ | (693.01) | S | 41,541.15 | 5 | 424.23 | \$ | 35.95 | \$ | 460.18 |
| \$ | (38.26) | \$ | (731.28) | \$ | 42,649.47 | \$ | 436.05 | \$ | 36.98 | \$ | 473.02 |
| \$ | (38.57) | \$ | (769.84) | \$ | 43,754.29 | \$ | 447.60 | \$ | 38.01 | \$ | 485.61 |
| \$ | (39.62) | \$ | (809.46) | \$ | 45,774.35 | \$ | 467.26 | \$ | 39.79 | \$ | 507.04 |
| \$ | (39.86) | \$ | (849.32) | \$ | 46,869.16 | \$ | 479.90 | \$ | 40.82 | \$ | 520.72 |
| \$ | (40.61) | \$ | (889.93) | \$ | 47,960.04 | 5 | 491.35 | \$ | 41.85 | \$ | 533.20 |
| \$ | (52.14) | \$ | (942.07) | \$ | 58,398.20 | \$ | 585.46 | \$ | 50.53 | \$ | 635.98 |

Annual Revenue Requirent rio to Denreciation Rates $=\$ 5,701$, New Depreciation Rate effective March $23,2019=$
$5,701.46$
2.66\%
5.561 .57
ew Depreciation Rate effective March 23, $2019=$

| Gross-Up with GRT \& PSC Assessment Fee $=\$$ | $\begin{array}{l}5,686.31 \\ \text { Gross-Up with Uncollectibles }=\$\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| , 745.02 |  |

New Depreciation Rate' effective November $1,2021=\quad 1.93 \%$
${ }^{1}$ PE-MD CWIP allocator per Exhibit LMO-1 Actuals (page 11), Distribution Base Rate Filing dated October 22, 2018 in Case No. 9490
${ }^{2}$ PE-MD Distribution CWIP allocator per Exhibit LMO-1 Actuals (page 11), Distribution Base Rate Filing dated October 22, 2018 in Case No. 9490
${ }^{3}$ New depreciation rates were effective November 1,2021 in accordance with Commission Order No. 89971 dated October 26,2021 in Case No. 9490 Phase II
$\begin{array}{rll}\text { Anual Revenue Requirement after new Depreciation Rates }=\$ & 5,229.15 \\ \text { Gross-Up with GRT \& PSC Assessment Fee }=\$ & 5,346.44\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{rll}\text { Gross-Up with Uncollectibles }=\$ & 5,401.64\end{array}$

Case No. 9667

|  | Case No. 9667 |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Effective March 23, 2019 |  |  |
| O\&M Revenue Req | $\$$ | $33,490.42$ |
| Capital Revenue Req |  | $4,097.97$ |
|  | $\$$ | $37,588.39$ |
| Effective November 1, 2021 |  |  |
| O\&M Revenue Req | $\$$ | $33,490.42$ |
| Capital Revenue Req |  | $3,855.83$ |
|  | $\$$ | $37,346.25$ |


| PSC Ordered ROR | 7.15\% thru Oct 18, 2023 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Proposed ROR | $7.54 \%$ after Oct 18, 2023 |



Sponsorship/Advertising

|  | Sponsorship / <br> Advertising |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Effective March 23, 2019 |  |  |
| O\&M Revenue Req | $\$$ | $194,146.39$ |
| Capital Revenue Req | $1,792.19$ |  |
|  | $\$$ | $195,938.58$ |
| Effective November 1, 2021 |  |  |
| O\&M Revenue Req | $\$$ | $194,146.39$ |
| Capital Revenue Req |  | $1,684.92$ |
|  | $\$$ | $195,831.31$ |

PSC Ordered ROR 7.15\% thru Oct 18, 2023
Proposed ROR
7.54\% after Oct 18, 2023

|  | Total Before Carrying Charge |  | ROR Daily Carrying Charge \% | Days in <br> Month | Compounded Carrying Charge |  | Total with Carrying Charge |  | Cumulative Principal |  | Cumulative Carrying Charge |  | Cumulative Principal + Carrying Charge |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mar 23-31, 2019 | \$ | 4,831.36 | 0.02\% | 9 | \$ | 8.52 | \$ | 4,839.88 | \$ | 4,831.36 | \$ | 8.52 | \$ | 4,839.88 |
| Apr 2019 | \$ | 16,104.54 | 0.02\% | 30 | \$ | 123.08 | \$ | 16,227.62 | \$ | 20,935.90 | \$ | 131.60 | \$ | 21,067.50 |
| May 2019 | \$ | 16,641.36 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 228.99 | \$ | 16,870.35 | \$ | 37,577.26 | \$ | 360.59 | \$ | 37,937.85 |
| Jun 2019 | \$ | 16,104.54 | 0.02\% | 30 | \$ | 317.59 | \$ | 16,422.13 | \$ | 53,681.80 | \$ | 678.18 | \$ | 54,359.98 |
| Jul 2019 | \$ | 16,641.36 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 431.16 | \$ | 17,072.52 | \$ | 70,323.16 | \$ | 1,109.34 | \$ | 71,432.50 |
| Aug 2019 | \$ | 16,641.36 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 534.84 | \$ | 17,176.20 | \$ | 86,964.52 | \$ | 1,644.18 | \$ | 88,608.70 |
| Sep 2019 | \$ | 16,104.54 | 0.02\% | 30 | \$ | 615.37 | \$ | 16,719.91 | \$ | 103,069.06 | \$ | 2,259.55 | \$ | 105,328.61 |
| Oct 2019 | \$ | 16,641.36 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 740.68 | \$ | 17,382.04 | \$ | 119,710.42 | \$ | 3,000.23 | \$ | 122,710.65 |
| Nov 2019 | \$ | 16,104.54 | 0.02\% | 30 | \$ | 815.78 | \$ | 16,920.32 | \$ | 135,814.96 | \$ | 3,816.01 | \$ | 139,630.97 |
| Dec 2019 | \$ | 16,641.36 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 948.98 | \$ | 17,590.34 | \$ | 152,456.32 | \$ | 4,764.99 | \$ | 157,221.31 |
| Jan 2020 | \$ | 16,641.36 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 1,055.80 | \$ | 17,697.16 | \$ | 169,097.68 | \$ | 5,820.79 | \$ | 174,918.47 |
| Feb 2020 | \$ | 15,567.72 | 0.02\% | 29 | \$ | 1,082.12 | \$ | 16,649.84 | \$ | 184,665.40 | \$ | 6,902.91 | \$ | 191,568.31 |
| Mar 2020 | \$ | 16,641.36 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 1,264.37 | \$ | 17,905.73 | \$ | 201,306.76 | \$ | 8,167.28 | \$ | 209,474.04 |
| Apr 2020 | \$ | 16,104.54 | 0.02\% | 30 | \$ | 1,325.66 | \$ | 17,430.20 | \$ | 217,411.30 | \$ | 9,492.94 | \$ | 226,904.24 |
| May 2020 | \$ | 16,641.36 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 1,478.96 | \$ | 18,120.32 | \$ | 234,052.66 | \$ | 10,971.90 | \$ | 245,024.56 |
| Jun 2020 | \$ | 16,104.54 | 0.02\% | 30 | \$ | 1,534.58 | \$ | 17,639.12 | \$ | 250,157.20 | \$ | 12,506.48 | \$ | 262,663.68 |
| Jul 2020 | \$ | 16,641.36 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 1,696.11 | \$ | 18,337.47 | \$ | 266,798.56 | \$ | 14,202.59 | \$ | 281,001.15 |
| Aug 2020 | \$ | 16,641.36 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 1,807.46 | \$ | 18,448.82 | \$ | 283,439.92 | \$ | 16,010.05 | \$ | 299,449.97 |
| Sep 2020 | \$ | 16,104.54 | 0.02\% | 30 | \$ | 1,854.42 | \$ | 17,958.96 | \$ | 299,544.46 | \$ | 17,864.47 | \$ | 317,408.93 |
| Oct 2020 | \$ | 16,641.36 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 2,028.55 | \$ | 18,669.91 | \$ | 316,185.82 | \$ | 19,893.02 | \$ | 336,078.84 |
| Nov 2020 | \$ | 16,104.54 | 0.02\% | 30 | \$ | 2,069.68 | \$ | 18,174.22 | \$ | 332,290.36 | \$ | 21,962.70 | \$ | 354,253.06 |
| Dec 2020 | \$ | 16,641.36 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 2,252.29 | \$ | 18,893.65 | \$ | 348,931.72 | \$ | 24,214.99 | \$ | 373,146.71 |
| Jan 2021 | \$ | 16,641.36 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 2,367.03 | \$ | 19,008.39 | \$ | 365,573.08 | \$ | 26,582.02 | \$ | 392,155.10 |
| Feb 2021 | \$ | 15,030.90 | 0.02\% | 28 | \$ | 2,233.39 | \$ | 17,264.29 | \$ | 380,603.98 | \$ | 28,815.41 | \$ | 409,419.39 |
| Mar 2021 | \$ | 16,641.36 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 2,587.30 | \$ | 19,228.66 | \$ | 397,245.34 | \$ | 31,402.71 | \$ | 428,648.05 |
| Apr 2021 | \$ | 16,104.54 | 0.02\% | 30 | \$ | 2,613.68 | \$ | 18,718.22 | \$ | 413,349.88 | \$ | 34,016.39 | \$ | 447,366.27 |
| May 2021 | \$ | 16,641.36 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 2,817.73 | \$ | 19,459.09 | \$ | 429,991.24 | \$ | 36,834.12 | \$ | 466,825.36 |
| Jun 2021 | \$ | 16,104.54 | 0.02\% | 30 | \$ | 2,838.04 | \$ | 18,942.58 | \$ | 446,095.78 | \$ | 39,672.16 | \$ | 485,767.94 |
| Jul 2021 | \$ | 16,641.36 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 3,050.93 | \$ | 19,692.29 | \$ | 462,737.14 | \$ | 42,723.09 | \$ | 505,460.23 |
| Aug 2021 | \$ | 16,641.36 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 3,170.52 | \$ | 19,811.88 | \$ | 479,378.50 | \$ | 45,893.61 | \$ | 525,272.11 |
| Sep 2021 | \$ | 16,104.54 | 0.02\% | 30 | \$ | 3,181.51 | \$ | 19,286.05 | \$ | 495,483.04 | \$ | 49,075.12 | \$ | 544,558.16 |
| Oct 2021 | \$ | 16,641.36 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 3,407.94 | \$ | 20,049.30 | \$ | 512,124.40 | \$ | 52,483.06 | \$ | 564,607.46 |
| Nov 2021 | \$ | 16,095.72 | 0.02\% | 30 | \$ | 3,412.63 | \$ | 19,508.35 | \$ | 528,220.12 | \$ | 55,895.69 | \$ | 584,115.81 |
| Dec 2021 | \$ | 16,632.25 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 3,648.10 | \$ | 20,280.35 | \$ | 544,852.37 | \$ | 59,543.79 | \$ | 604,396.16 |
| Jan 2022 | \$ | 16,632.25 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 3,771.26 | \$ | 20,403.51 | \$ | 561,484.62 | \$ | 63,315.05 | \$ | 624,799.67 |
| Feb 2022 | \$ | 15,022.68 | 0.02\% | 28 | \$ | 3,509.38 | \$ | 18,532.06 | \$ | 576,507.30 | \$ | 66,824.43 | \$ | 643,331.73 |
| Mar 2022 | \$ | 16,632.25 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 4,007.70 | \$ | 20,639.95 | \$ | 593,139.55 | \$ | 70,832.13 | \$ | 663,971.68 |
| Apr 2022 | \$ | 16,095.72 | 0.02\% | 30 | \$ | 3,996.56 | \$ | 20,092.28 | \$ | 609,235.27 | \$ | 74,828.69 | \$ | 684,063.96 |
| May 2022 | \$ | 16,632.25 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 4,255.05 | \$ | 20,887.30 | \$ | 625,867.52 | \$ | 79,083.74 | \$ | 704,951.26 |
| Jun 2022 | \$ | 16,095.72 | 0.02\% | 30 | \$ | 4,237.39 | \$ | 20,333.11 | \$ | 641,963.24 | \$ | 83,321.13 | \$ | 725,284.37 |
| Jul 2022 | \$ | 16,632.25 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 4,505.36 | \$ | 21,137.61 | \$ | 658,595.49 | \$ | 87,826.49 | \$ | 746,421.98 |
| Aug 2022 | \$ | 16,632.25 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 4,633.73 | \$ | 21,265.98 | \$ | 675,227.74 | \$ | 92,460.22 | \$ | 767,687.96 |
| Sep 2022 | \$ | 16,095.72 | 0.02\% | 30 | \$ | 4,606.07 | \$ | 20,701.79 | \$ | 691,323.46 | \$ | 97,066.29 | \$ | 788,389.75 |
| Oct 2022 | \$ | 16,632.25 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 4,888.58 | \$ | 21,520.83 | \$ | 707,955.71 | \$ | 101,954.87 | \$ | 809,910.58 |
| Nov 2022 | \$ | 16,095.72 | 0.02\% | 30 | \$ | 4,854.20 | \$ | 20,949.92 | \$ | 724,051.43 | \$ | 106,809.07 | \$ | 830,860.50 |
| Dec 2022 | \$ | 16,632.25 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 5,146.49 | \$ | 21,778.74 | \$ | 740,683.68 | \$ | 111,955.56 | \$ | 852,639.24 |
| Jan 2023 | \$ | 16,632.25 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 5,278.74 | \$ | 21,910.99 | \$ | 757,315.93 | \$ | 117,234.30 | \$ | 874,550.23 |
| Feb 2023 | \$ | 15,022.68 | 0.02\% | 28 | \$ | 4,879.25 | \$ | 19,901.93 | \$ | 772,338.61 | \$ | 122,113.55 | \$ | 894,452.16 |
| Mar 2023 | \$ | 16,632.25 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 5,532.65 | \$ | 22,164.90 | \$ | 788,970.86 | \$ | 127,646.20 | \$ | 916,617.06 |
| Apr 2023 | \$ | 16,095.72 | 0.02\% | 30 | \$ | 5,481.28 | \$ | 21,577.00 | \$ | 805,066.58 | \$ | 133,127.48 | \$ | 938,194.06 |
| May 2023 | \$ | 16,632.25 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 5,798.28 | \$ | 22,430.53 | \$ | 821,698.83 | \$ | 138,925.76 | \$ | 960,624.59 |
| Jun 2023 | \$ | 16,095.72 | 0.02\% | 30 | \$ | 5,739.90 | \$ | 21,835.62 | \$ | 837,794.55 | \$ | 144,665.66 | \$ | 982,460.21 |
| Jul 2023 | \$ | 16,632.25 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 6,067.09 | \$ | 22,699.34 | \$ | 854,426.80 | \$ | 150,732.75 | \$ | 1,005,159.55 |
| Aug 2023 | \$ | 16,632.25 | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 6,204.94 | \$ | 22,837.19 | \$ | 871,059.05 | \$ | 156,937.69 | \$ | 1,027,996.74 |
| Sep 2023 | \$ | 16,095.72 | 0.02\% | 30 | \$ | 6,135.83 | \$ | 22,231.55 | \$ | 887,154.77 | \$ | 163,073.52 | \$ | 1,050,228.29 |
| Oct 1-18, 2023 | \$ | 9,657.43 | 0.02\% | 18 | \$ | 3,737.19 | \$ | 13,394.62 | \$ | 896,812.20 | \$ | 166,810.71 | \$ | 1,063,622.91 |
| Oct 19-31, 2023 | \$ | - | 0.02\% | 13 | \$ | 2,856.34 | \$ | 2,856.34 | \$ | 896,812.20 | \$ | 169,667.05 | \$ | 1,066,479.25 |
| Nov 2023 | \$ | - | 0.02\% | 30 | \$ | 6,609.25 | \$ | 6,609.25 | \$ | 896,812.20 | \$ | 176,276.30 | \$ | 1,073,088.50 |
| Dec 2023 | \$ | - | 0.02\% | 31 | \$ | 6,871.88 | \$ | 6,871.88 | \$ | 896,812.20 | \$ | 183,148.18 | \$ | 1,079,960.38 |
| Jan 2024 | \$ | - | 0.02\% | 15.5 | \$ | 3,457.94 | \$ | 3,457.94 | \$ | 896,812.20 | \$ | 186,606.12 | \$ | 1,083,418.32 |
| Total | \$ | 896,812.20 |  |  | \$ | 186,606.12 | \$ | 1,083,418.32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Miscellaneous

|  | Miscellaneous |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Effective March 23, 2019 |  |  |
| O\&M Revenue Req | $\$$ | $62,675.89$ |
| Capital Revenue Req |  | $5,745.02$ |
|  | $\$$ | $68,420.91$ |
| Effective November 1, 2021 |  |  |
| O\&M Revenue Req | $\$$ | $62,675.89$ |
| Capital Revenue Req |  | $5,401.64$ |
|  | $\$$ | $68,077.53$ |


| PSC Ordered ROR | 7.15\% thru Oct 18, 2023 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Proposed ROR | $7.54 \%$ after Oct 18, 2023 |
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Illustrative Customer Refund Calculation

| Schedule | Regulatory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2019 Distribution ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Liability with Interest |  | January 2024 Forecast ${ }^{2}$ |  | Estimated January 2024 ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Revenue |  | \%-to-Total |  |  | Customers | kWh | Credit/Cust |  | Credit/kWh |  |
| R | \$ | 73,832,904 | 62.4\% | \$ | $(1,041,572)$ | 256,466 |  | \$ | (4.06) |  |  |
| G | \$ | 19,374,083 | 16.4\% | \$ | $(273,313)$ | 27,759 |  | \$ | (9.85) |  |  |
| C | \$ | 2,940,608 | 2.5\% | \$ | $(41,484)$ | 3,924 |  | \$ | (10.57) |  |  |
| C-A \& CSH | \$ | 471,049 | 0.4\% | \$ | $(6,645)$ | 324 |  | \$ | (20.51) |  |  |
| PH | \$ | 15,586,131 | 13.2\% | \$ | $(219,876)$ | 1,747 |  | \$ | (125.86) |  |  |
| AGS | \$ | 7,283 | 0.0\% | \$ | (103) | 1 |  | \$ | (102.74) |  |  |
| PP | \$ | 1,178,518 | 1.0\% | \$ | $(16,626)$ |  | see below |  | see below |  |  |
| Hag \& Fred | \$ | 21,747 | 0.0\% | \$ | (307) |  | 107,950 |  |  | \$ | (0.00284) |
| Street Lighting | \$ | 4,857,261 | 4.1\% | \$ | $(68,522)$ |  | 2,174,073 |  |  | \$ | (0.03152) |
| Total | \$ | 118,269,584 | 100.0\% | \$ | $(1,668,447)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Schedule PP Customer | Estimated Jan '24 Credit/Customer ${ }^{3}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$ | $(1,245.62)$ |
| 2 | \$ | (711.85) |
| 3 | \$ | (1,790.14) |
| 4 | \$ | (626.39) |
| 5 | \$ | (516.25) |
| 6 | \$ | $(3,507.14)$ |
| 7 | \$ | $(6,766.71)$ |
| 8 | \$ | (308.55) |
| 9 | \$ | (958.95) |
| 10 | \$ | (193.95) |
| Total | \$ | $(16,625.54)$ |

${ }^{1}$ Per Potomac Edison Tariff Compliance filing dated March 25, 2019 in Case No. 9490 (Maillog \#224435)
${ }^{2}$ Forecast to be updated for November 2023 filing for credits effective during January 2024
${ }^{3}$ Schedule PP credits allocated from billed kWh for 12 months ended September 2023; currently based upon forecasted kWh which will be updated with actual kWh during November 2023 filing for credits effective during January 2024
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## I. INTRODUCTION

## Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is Stephanie L. Fall, and my business address is 76 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio, 44308.

## Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?

A. I am employed by FirstEnergy Service Company as a Manager in the Rates and Regulatory Affairs Department - West Virginia/Maryland. I report to the Director, Rates and Regulatory Affairs, and my responsibilities include overseeing the development, coordination, preparation and presentation of retail tariffs, and the development of retail electric rates, rules, and regulations in the retail tariff. My time is devoted to tasks performed for The Potomac Edison Company ("PE or "Company") and Monongahela Power Company ("Mon Power").
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.
A. I am a graduate of Ohio University where I earned a Bachelor of Business Administration in Accounting, Finance and Business Pre-Law. I have over 17 years of experience with FirstEnergy Service Company or its predecessor companies, and have held positions of Business Analyst, FES Finance; Fuel Specialist, Fuel Procurement; Analyst, Renewables; Analyst, Rates Support; Analyst, Investor Relations; Analyst, Strategy and my current position of Manager, Rates and Regulatory Affairs.

## Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE?

The Potomac Edison Company
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A. My testimony will address the following:

1. Proposed retail tariff revisions; and
2. The cost impacts of the proposed Electric Distribution Investment Surcharge ("EDIS") Phase II.

## Q. HAVE YOU PREPARED OR HAD PREPARED UNDER YOUR SUPERVISION

 EXHIBITS TO ACCOMPANY YOUR TESTIMONY?A. Yes. I am sponsoring the following exhibits, which will be discussed further in my testimony:

Exhibit SLF-1: Clean version of the retail tariff
Exhibit SLF-2: Redlined version of the retail tariff
Exhibit SLF-3: 2024 EDIS calculation

## II. RETAIL TARIFF REVISIONS

## Q. HAVE YOU PREPARED REVISIONS TO THE RETAIL TARIFF TO REFLECT THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED NEW DISTRIBUTION RATES?

A. Yes, Exhibit SLF-1 contains the new distribution rates for each affected rate schedule based upon the proposed distribution rates contained in the exhibits of Company witness Lyons plus the rate increment for the new low-income assistance programs discussed by Company witnesses Valdes and Larnerd.
Q. ARE THERE ANY ADDITIONAL TARIFF UPDATES PROPOSED IN THIS PROCEEDING?
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A. Yes. In addition to the proposed rate changes previously discussed, the Company proposes minor updates and clarifications to certain provisions and rules in the retail tariff. Given that only four years have passed since PE's last distribution base rate case, with all outdated legacy items being removed from the retail tariff upon conclusion of that prior rate case, there are not a large amount of additional updates proposed in this proceeding. The proposed tariff changes affect Schedules PH, PP, CO-G, SP and LED, and are generally informative in nature or add additional clarity that is not present in the current version of those rate schedules.

## Q. HAS A REDLINED VERSION OF THE TARIFF CHANGES BEEN PREPARED?

A. Yes. Exhibit SLF-2 contains a redlined version of the Company's retail tariff so that all proposed changes can easily be identified. Only affected tariff pages are included, meaning that tariff pages that have no proposed changes are not included in Exhibits SLF-1 or SLF-
2.

## Q. PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF SCHEDULES PH AND PP AND AN EXPLANATION OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES.

A. Schedule PH is a commercial and industrial rate schedule for mid-size customers and is available to customers with demands of 50 kilowatts (" kW ") or greater. Schedule PP is a commercial and industrial rate schedule for large-size customers and is available to customers with demands of $5,000 \mathrm{~kW}$ or greater that are also served from high-voltage ${ }^{1}$ service facilities. Both rate schedules currently list the kW eligibility levels of 50 kW and
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$5,000 \mathrm{~kW}$ for Schedules PH and PP, respectively, but do not clarify the frequency by which such kW levels are to be achieved. The Availability section of both rate schedules is updated to include language that clarifies customer load must equal or exceed 50 kW and $5,000 \mathrm{~kW}$ for Schedules PH and PP , respectively, at least once during a rolling 12-month period to maintain eligibility for the respective rate schedules.

## Q. PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF SCHEDULE CO-G AND AN

 EXPLANATION OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES.A. Schedule CO-G is a rate schedule available for the purchase of electricity by the Company from co-generators and small power producers. On October 13, 2021, FirstEnergy Service Company, as agent for the FirstEnergy utility companies including PE, submitted an application pursuant to section 210(m) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 ("PURPA") and the applicable Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") regulations to terminate the requirement to enter into new contracts or obligations to purchase electric energy and capacity from any qualifying facility ("QF") within PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. ("PJM") with a net capacity greater than 20 megawatts ("MW"), and any small power production QF with a net capacity greater than 5 MW on a service territory-wide basis. The FERC issued an Order ${ }^{2}$ approving the application on December 17, 2021 making the request effective October 13, 2021.

The kW change on Schedule CO-G is made to make eligibility consistent with the FERC Order on PURPA obligation requirements. Additional changes on energy and

[^20]capacity payments within Schedule CO-G are to address project applications that PE may receive for qualifying PURPA interconnection at the distribution level and outside of the PJM market. The changes under Sales to Qualifying Facilities and Interconnection Costs are for clarification purposes.
Q. PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF SCHEDULE SP AND AN EXPLANATION OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES.
A. Schedule SP is a rate schedule that covers rare situations where a generation station within PJM and the Company's service territory is not generating for an entire PJM billing period. The changes on this schedule clarify the applicable charges customers will be billed based upon whether they are a net producer or consumer of generation.

## Q. PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF SCHEDULE LED AND AN

 EXPLANATION OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES.A. Schedule LED is a rate schedule for the provision of street lighting service from light emitting diode ("LED") street lights. PE wanted to remove potential barriers for customers to switch to Schedule LED, therefore it has removed the eligibility restriction for group installation of 12 or more LED street lights.

PE is also inserting language to provide customers with an option to negotiate a contract for service on an individual basis. These contracts may include additional terms and conditions regarding advanced functionality of the LED street lights. Inserting this language expands the options for customers who wish to move to connected LED street lighting.
$\qquad$

## Q. IS THE COMPANY PROPOSING TO EXPAND ITS LED STREET LIGHTING SERVICE SCHEDULE?

A. Not in this proceeding, other than to make the two changes above which expand options for customers. However, PE is currently assessing ways to provide customers additional opportunities to transition to LED street lighting. At this time, the Company is evaluating available LED street light offerings and is determining the path to potentially expand Schedule LED in a future filing.
Q. DO YOU PLAN TO CLOSE ANY STREET LIGHTING SCHEDULES IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE POTENTIAL EXPANSION OF THE LED STREET LIGHTING SERVICE SCHEDULE?
A. Yes, concurrent with the possible future filing I mention above. Due to limited availability of non-LED street lighting fixtures, the Company plans to review the current street lighting rate schedules that are not restricted to new customers and/or installations and will propose to close those schedules (or specific street lights) to new customers and installations when equivalent LED street lighting options are available in conjunction with an expanded Schedule LED. This will ensure customers have comparable options on Schedule LED to replace their existing street lighting. Customers that do not switch to Schedule LED may remain on their current street lighting rate schedule until they voluntarily choose to discontinue street lighting service or if switching to LED street lights must occur due to non-availability of non-LED replacements.
$\qquad$

## III. EDIS PHASE II

## Q. IS THE COMPANY PROPOSING CONTINUATION OF INCREMENTAL

 ELECTRIC DISTRIBUTION INVESTMENTS?A. Yes. Company witness McGettigan discusses the historical reliability performance of the Company that includes the effects of the current EDIS programs, and then he describes proposed incremental investments and program enhancements as part of EDIS Phase II to help improve reliability to customers. These proposed investments and enhancements are as follows:

1. Underground Cable Replacement program;
2. Substation Recloser Replacement program; and
3. Resiliency program, which includes the previously-approved distribution automation program.
Q. ARE ANY EDIS COSTS BEING ROLLED INTO DISTRIBUTION RATES AS PART OF THIS PROCEEDING?
A. Yes. In Order No. 89072 issued March 22, 2019 in Case No. 9490, the Maryland Public Service Commission ("Commission") authorized the Company to implement the underground cable replacement, substation recloser replacement, and distribution automation EDIS programs and to recover their costs through a surcharge mechanism through the end of December 2022. On April 28, 2022, the Company proposed and subsequently received Commission approval for a one-year extension of the EDIS through
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2023. ${ }^{3}$ As indicated in the Company's April 28, 2022 filing and per the Commission's order in the Company's prior distribution rate case, as part of this proceeding the Company is rolling into distribution rates all EDIS costs incurred through December 2022. Therefore, upon conclusion of this proceeding, the EDIS will be reduced to eliminate any costs incurred through December 2022. The EDIS will, instead, only reflect collection of costs incurred as of January 2023 as well as the proposed EDIS Phase II costs.

## Q. DO THESE EDIS PHASE II INVESTMENTS AND ENHANCEMENTS RESULT IN ADDITIONAL COSTS?

A. Yes. The investments and enhancements involve incremental capital above and beyond costs that were incurred prior to original implementation of the EDIS and are all non-revenue-producing costs. As such, the incremental capital as of January 2023 is not in the rate case test year and is not reflected in the proposed distribution rates discussed in the testimony of Company witness Lyons. Since these are new and future costs that have yet to be incurred and are subject to Commission approval of the investments, the Company is proposing to continue surcharge recovery for these incremental costs. Continuation of the surcharge accomplishes three important objectives:

1. Allows for transparent and on-going Commission review of the surcharge and annual adjustments, so that customers pay no more than the actual costs for the actual projects completed;
2. Allows the surcharge to ultimately be based upon incremental actual costs
[^21]The Potomac Edison Company
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instead of incremental estimated costs, thereby adhering to a known and measurable standard; and
3. Mitigates the regulatory lag associated with traditional cost recovery through distribution rates, which would require the Company to install the investments in advance with uncertain approval by the Commission and the loss of cost recovery between the period of time the investments were made and distribution rates were reset.

Timely cost recovery of these incremental investments is part and parcel of the Company's proposal for the incremental EDIS Phase II investments.

## Q. WHAT ARE THE FORECASTED CAPITAL COSTS FOR EDIS PHASE II?

A. Shown below in Table 1 is a forecast of the annual capital costs for each of the EDIS Phase II programs that were developed by the Company's Engineering Services department. As discussed later in my testimony, these estimates will be updated annually in a filing at the Commission for consideration and approval.

Table 1
Forecasted EDIS Phase II Capital Costs

|  | Underground Cable <br> Replacement | Substation Recloser <br> Replacement | Resiliency |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2024 | $\$ 18,838,900$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 2,800,000$ |
| 2025 | $\$ 20,335,550$ | $\$ 1,128,400$ | $\$ 2,800,000$ |
| 2026 | $\$ 21,832,200$ | $\$ 1,128,400$ | $\$ 2,800,000$ |
| 2027 | $\$ 23,439,000$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 2,800,000$ |

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE SURCHARGE.

A. The surcharge would continue to be identified as the EDIS and would recover the
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incremental investments associated with the previously-discussed EDIS Phase II categories of underground cable replacement, substation recloser replacement, and resiliency programs. All the cost categories reflect incremental capital costs and exclude operation and maintenance costs. The incremental costs represent an investment in the Company's infrastructure to the direct benefit of customers with a projected increase in reliability, as discussed by Company witness McGettigan. Cost recovery through the EDIS will consist of a revenue requirement for recovery of a return on and of incremental capital placed inservice. Upon conclusion of this rate proceeding, the return of capital will be calculated from Commission-approved depreciation rates, and the return on capital will be calculated in accordance with the Commission-approved capital structure, debt cost, and return on equity. ${ }^{4}$

## Q. HOW IS THE EDIS REVENUE REQUIREMENT ALLOCATED TO COMPANY RATE SCHEDULES AND HOW ARE RATES CALCULATED?

A. Consistent with the Commission-approved allocation methodology of the current EDIS, the EDIS revenue requirement will be allocated to the various rate schedules based upon the non-coincident peak of each rate schedule, at both the primary and secondary levels based upon the split between primary and secondary distribution plant in the class cost of service study. To calculate the rate for each rate schedule, the allocated revenue requirement per rate schedule will be divided by its respective forecasted annual distribution kWh sales. Similar to the calculations contained in the class cost of service
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study, Schedules G and C will have identical EDIS rates, and Schedule C-A and the CSH subset will have identical EDIS rates.

The 2024 EDIS calculation is provided in Exhibit SLF-3. The 2024 EDIS rate would not be effective until the Company submits its annual reconciliation filing as described later in my testimony.

## Q. WHAT IS THE EFFECT OF THE EDIS ON A TYPICAL RESIDENTIAL

 CUSTOMER BILL?A. As shown on Exhibit SLF-3, the forecasted EDIS for residential customers in 2024 is an energy charge of $\$ 0.00047$ per kWh . For an average residential customer that uses 1,000 kWh per month, this translates into $\$ 0.47$ per month.

## Q. HOW OFTEN WILL EDIS RATES BE UPDATED?

A. The update to EDIS rates will follow the same frequency as the current EDIS. EDIS rates will be filed for Commission approval by December 1 of each year for rates effective the forthcoming calendar year beginning January 1. EDIS rates will be based on forecasted costs for the forthcoming calendar year, as well as a reconciliation of prior costs and revenues. The reconciliation will be based upon the deferral balance recorded on the Company's books as of October 31, and a forecast of any anticipated incremental change to the deferral balance for the period of November 1 through December 31. The deferral balance is based upon the reconciliation of costs and revenues recorded monthly and may be represented as an over-collection or an under-collection. As such, the Company requests authorization to continue deferral accounting as part of the EDIS.

## Q. WOULD THE EDIS ALWAYS REMAIN AS A SURCHARGE?

A. No. As previously discussed, the Company is proposing in this rate proceeding to roll into distribution rates the capital associated with investments placed into service through December 31, 2022, with a corresponding reduction in the surcharge upon conclusion of this rate proceeding. Similarly, capital associated with investments placed in service from January 2023 through December of the test year of a future base rate case will be proposed to be rolled into distribution rates and removed from surcharge recovery upon conclusion of that future rate proceeding. In other words, the EDIS will continually reset based upon the costs the Commission approves to be rolled into base distribution rates.

## IV. CONCLUSION

## Q. DOES THIS COMPLETE YOUR TESTIMONY AT THE TIME?

A. Yes, it does.

## RESIDENTIAL SERVICE SCHEDULE "R"

## AVAILABILITY

Available for single-phase Residential Service through one meter. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.

MONTHLY RATE

DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

FIXED DISTRIBUTION CHARGE
$\$ 8.00$ per month.

VARIABLE DISTRIBUTION CHARGE

Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours................................................................................. \$0.02556 per kilowatt-hour
TRANSMISSION CHARGE

Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours
. $\$ 0.00396$ per kilowatt-hour

The Transmission Charge is based on PJM's Open Access Transmission Tariff which will change from time to time and is subject to FERC approval.

ELECTRIC SUPPLY CHARGE

| Summer | Non-Summer <br> $06-01-2022$ thru <br> $09-30-2022$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $10-01-2022$ thru |  |
| $05-31-2023$ |  |

Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours $\qquad$ \$0.05973 per kilowatt-hour $\qquad$ \$0.06318 per kilowatt-hour

The Transmission and Electric Supply Charges apply only to Customers receiving Residential SOS from the Company. These charges do not apply to Customers obtaining Competitive Power Supply.

## GENERAL SERVICE SCHEDULE "G"

## AVAILABILITY

Available for single-phase and three-phase Service at standard Company voltage throughout the entire territory served by the Company. The standard voltage depends upon the location, character and size of the Customer's load. This information can be furnished at any of the Company's offices. Service shall not be available for Standby or Maintenance Service such as that required for Alternative Generation Facilities. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.

## MONTHLY RATE

## DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

FIXED DISTRIBUTION CHARGE
$\$ 8.00$ per month.

## VARIABLE DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

Capacity Charge
Minimum kilowatts .......................................................................................... $\$ 1.80$ per kilowatt
All kilowatts in excess of 7.5 measured as set forth under
"Determination of Capacity" ........................................................................ $\$ 2.25$ per kilowatt

Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours............................................................................. $\$ 0.02371$ per kilowatt-hour

Voltage Discount
Company will furnish Service at one voltage and at one point from the Company's existing distribution system voltage. A voltage discount of $25 \phi$ per kilowatt will apply when the Customer takes Service at a voltage between 2,000 and 15,000 volts and provides all facilities beyond the Point of Service. A voltage discount of $50 \phi$ per kilowatt will apply when the Customer takes Service at a voltage greater than 15,000 volts and provides all facilities beyond the Point of Service.

## Reactive Kilovolt-Ampere Charge

Reactive kilovolt-ampere charge is applied to the Customer's reactive kilovolt-ampere capacity requirement in excess of $25 \%$ of the Customer's kilowatt capacity.

Billing reactive kilovolt-amperes
$\$ 0.40$ per reactive kilovolt-ampere

## GENERAL AND COMMERCIAL SERVICE SCHEDULE "C"

## AVAILABILITY

Available only at locations served as of November 26, 1991 for single-phase and three-phase Service at standard Company voltage below 15,000 volts. The standard voltage available depends upon the location, character and size of Customer's load. This information can be furnished at any of the Company's offices. Service shall not be available for Standby or Maintenance Service such as that required for Alternative Generation Facilities. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.

## MONTHLY RATE

## DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

FIXED DISTRIBUTION CHARGE
$\$ 8.00$ per month.

## VARIABLE DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

Minimum kilowatts ................................................................................................ $\$ 1.80$ per kilowatt
Energy Charge
First block (0-350 kilowatt-hours)....................................................... $\$ 0.02371$ per kilowatt-hour
Second block (next 350 kilowatt-hours)............................................. $\$ 0.04489$ per kilowatt-hour
Third block (over 700 kilowatt-hours)................................................. $\$ 0.02371$ per kilowatt-hour

Voltage Discount
Company will furnish Service at one voltage and at one point from the Company's existing distribution system voltage. Where Customer takes Service at a voltage between 2,000 and 15,000 volts and provides all facilities beyond the Service point, a voltage discount of $25 \phi$ per kilowatt will apply.

Reactive Kilovolt-Ampere Charge

Reactive kilovolt-ampere charge is applied to the Customer's reactive kilovolt-ampere capacity requirement in excess of $25 \%$ of the Customer's kilowatt capacity.

Billing reactive kilovolt-amperes. $\qquad$ \$0.40 per reactive kilovolt-ampere

## GENERAL SERVICE - ALL ELECTRIC SCHEDULE "C-A"

## AVAILABILITY

Available only at locations served or for which contracts have been signed as of April 9, 1973. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.

## APPLICATION

This schedule applies to Customers contracting for electric Service to heat their entire establishment by the use of electricity and when all other electrical uses in the establishment are billed under this schedule. Not applicable to establishments whose primary operations are conducted outside the heated area.

## MONTHLY RATE

DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

FIXED DISTRIBUTION CHARGE
$\$ 8.00$ per month.
VARIABLE DISTRIBUTION CHARGES
Minimum kilowatts $\qquad$ . $\$ 1.44$ per kilowatt
Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours $\qquad$ . 0.02317 per kilowatt-hour

Voltage Discount

Company will furnish Service at one voltage and at one point from the Company's existing distribution system voltage. Where Customer takes Service at a voltage between 2,000 and 15,000 volts and provides all facilities beyond the Point of Service, a voltage discount of $25 \phi$ per kilowatt will apply.

TRANSMISSION CHARGES

| Minimum Charge | \$1.30 per month |
| :---: | :---: |
| Minimum kilowatts | \$0.14 per kilowatt |
| Energy Charge |  |
| First block (0-350 kilowatt-hours).. | \$0.00725 per kilowatt-hour |
| Second block (next 350 kilowatt-hours). | \$0.00632 per kilowatt-hour |
| Third block (over 700 kilowatt-hours). | \$0.00337 per kilowatt-hour |

The Transmission Charges are based on PJM's Open Access Transmission Tariff which will change from time to time and is subject to FERC approval.

## GENERAL SERVICE - ALL ELECTRIC <br> SCHEDULE "C-A" (Continued)

## SERVICE SUPPLIED TO SCHOOLS AND CHURCHES WITH SPACE HEATING

When a school or church uses electric Service as the only means of space heating in a building, buildings, or in a separate area of a building then the kilowatt-hours used in the building, buildings, or separate area of a building will be billed at the above prices. When all energy uses, except as provided hereafter, for space heating, lighting, cooking, water heating, cooling (if any) and power are provided by electrical energy, all kilowatt-hours will be billed at the prices below. Any form of energy may be used for instruction, training and demonstration purposes and will be excluded from the above requirement.

A building, buildings, or separate area of a building not meeting the conditions of this provision shall be separately metered and billed under the applicable rate. The word school as used herein refers to a school operated through the use of public funds or by a non-profit organization.

A school building refers to a building containing any of the following facilities: classrooms, laboratories, manual arts shops, domestic science kitchens, gymnasium, dining areas, dormitories and other facilities used for educational purpose. Service for athletic field flood lighting shall be excluded from Service supplied under this provision and shall be billed for Service separately.

A church building refers to a building used principally for religious worship and Services.

## MONTHLY RATE

## DISTRIBUTION CHARGE

FIXED DISTRIBUTION CHARGE
$\$ 8.00$ per month.

## VARIABLE DISTRIBUTION CHARGE

Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours
\$0.01789 per kilowatt-hour

TRANSMISSION CHARGE

Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours \$0.00381 per kilowatt-hour

The Transmission Charge is based on PJM's Open Access Transmission Tariff which will change from time to time and is subject to FERC approval.

## POWER SERVICE SCHEDULE "PH"

## AVAILABILITY

Available for loads of 50 kilowatts or greater at standard single-phase and three-phase voltages. To maintain eligibility, Customer load must equal or exceed 50 kilowatts at least once during a rolling 12-month period. The standard voltages available depend upon location, character and size of Customer's load. This information can be furnished at any of the Company's offices. Service shall not be available for Standby or Maintenance Service such as that required for Alternative Generation Facilities. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.

## MONTHLY RATE

## DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

FIXED DISTRIBUTION CHARGE
$\$ 17.00$

Capacity Charge
Minimum kilowatts ............................................................................................. $\$ 1.54$ per kilowatt
All kilowatts....................................................................................................... $\$ 2.41$ per kilowatt

Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours................................................................................ \$0.00523 per kilowatt-hour

Voltage Discount
Company will furnish Service at one voltage and at one point from the Company's existing distribution system voltage. A voltage discount of $25 \phi$ per kilowatt will apply when the Customer takes Service at a voltage between 2,000 and 15,000 volts and provides all facilities beyond the Point of Service. A voltage discount of $50 \phi$ per kilowatt will apply when the Customer takes Service at a voltage greater than 15,000 volts and provides all facilities beyond the Point of Service.

Reactive Kilovolt-Ampere Charge
Reactive kilovolt-ampere charge is applied to the Customer's reactive kilovolt-ampere capacity requirement in excess of $25 \%$ of the Customer's kilowatt capacity.

Billing reactive kilovolt-amperes
\$0.40 per reactive kilovolt-ampere

## LARGE POWER SERVICE SCHEDULE "PP"

## AVAILABILITY

Available to Customers with a kilowatt capacity of 5,000 kilowatts or more that can be served from a $138,000 / 34,500$ volt Load Center Substation located within 5 miles of the point of delivery to the Customer. To maintain eligibility, Customer load must equal or exceed 5,000 kilowatts at least once during a rolling 12-month period. Also available to Customers with a kilowatt capacity of 10,000 kilowatts and over, located adjacent to 138,000 volt transmission lines. Also available at 12,470 volts where the Company elects, at its sole option, to supply Service directly from an adjacent 138,000 volt transmission line by a single transformation. Service shall not be available for Standby or Maintenance Service such as that required for Alternative Generation Facilities. Service will be delivered and metered at 34,500 volts or over. An Electric Service Agreement must be executed. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.

## MONTHLY RATE

DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

## FIXED DISTRIBUTION CHARGE

$$
\$ 453.00
$$

Capacity Charge
All kilowatts as set forth below under "Billing Capacity" . $\$ 0.402$ per kilowatt

Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours \$0.00083 per kilowatt-hour

Reactive Kilovolt-Ampere Charge

Reactive kilovolt-ampere charge is applied to the Customer's reactive kilovolt-ampere capacity requirement in excess of $25 \%$ of the Customer's Billing Capacity.

Billing reactive kilovolt-amperes $\qquad$ \$0.40 per reactive kilovolt-ampere

TRANSMISSION CHARGES

Capacity Charge
All kilowatts as set forth below under "Billing Capacity" . $\$ 0.574$ per kilowatt

Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours \$0.00118 per kilowatt-hour

The Transmission Charges are based on PJM's Open Access Transmission Tariff which will change from time to time and is subject to FERC approval.

# OUTDOOR LIGHTING <br> EQUIPMENT, MAINTENANCE, AND UNMETERED SERVICE SCHEDULE EMU 

## AVAILABILITY

Available for roadway and other outdoor lighting supplied from overhead or underground secondary distribution system of the Company and contracted for by a Customer for lighting accessible areas. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.

## MONTHLY RATE

## DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

OVERHEAD SERVICE

High Pressure Sodium - Vertical Open Lens Luminaire ("OL")

| Installation <br> Requires a Pole ${ }^{1}$ | Installation <br> on Existing Pole |
| :---: | :---: |
| 9,500 Lumen-100 Watt .......... $51 \mathrm{kWh} \ldots . . . . . \$ 20.56$ per lamp.......................... $\$ 10.40$ per lamp |  |

Mercury Vapor - Horizontal Luminaire (Cobra Head)
8,150 Lumen - 175 watt ............ 74 kWh
.\$ 9.42 per lamp

High Pressure Sodium - Horizontal Luminaire (Cobra Head)

9,500 Lumen - 100 watt ........... 51 kWh .................................................................. $\$ 10.78$ per lamp
22,000 Lumen - 200 watt ............ 86 kWh .................................................................. $\$ 16.44$ per lamp
50,000 Lumen - 400 watt .......... 167 kWh ................................................................... $\$ 23.11$ per lamp
Metal Halide - Horizontal Luminaire (Cobra Head)

90,000 Lumen - 1000 watt .......... 379 kWh .................................................................. $\$ 25.48$ per lamp

# OUTDOOR LIGHTING <br> EQUIPMENT, MAINTENANCE, AND UNMETERED SERVICE SCHEDULE EMU (Continued) 

OVERHEAD SERVICE (Continued)
High Pressure Sodium Floodlight



Metal Halide Floodlight

36,000 Lumen - 400 watt .......... 157 kWh ................................................................ $\$ 29.25$ per lamp
90,000 Lumen - 1000 watt ......... 379 kWh ................................................................. $\$ 28.27$ per lamp
${ }^{1}$ Mounted on a 30 ' direct burial pole
UNDERGROUND SERVICE
High Pressure Sodium - Colonial Post Top Luminaire 14' Mounting Height
9,500 Lumen - 100 watt ............ 51 kWh ......................................................................... 19.22 per lamp
Metal Halide - Colonial Post Top Luminaire 14' Mounting Height
11,600 Lumen - 175 watt ............ 74 kWh ................................................................ $\$ 26.86$ per lamp

# OUTDOOR LIGHTING <br> EQUIPMENT, MAINTENANCE, AND UNMETERED SERVICE <br> SCHEDULE EMU (Continued) 

UNDERGROUND SERVICE (Continued)
High Pressure Sodium - Horizontal Luminaire (Cobra Head) 30' Mounting Height

|  | Single Luminaire Per Pole | Each Additional Luminaire Per Pole |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9,500 Lumen - 100 watt - | . 28.74 per lamp. | \$10.78 per lamp |
| 22,000 Lumen - 200 watt - | . 32.04 per lamp. | \$16.44 per lamp |
| 50,000 Lumen - 400 watt - | . $\$ 38.72$ per lamp. | . $\mathbf{2 3 . 1 1}$ per lamp |


|  | Single Luminaire Per Pole | Each Additional <br> Luminaire Per Pole |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 36,000 Lumen - 400 watt - 157 kWh . | \$40.49 per lamp | \$25.13 per lamp |
| 90,000 lumen - 1,000 watt -379 kWh | \$50.19 per lamp | \$25.48 per lamp |

High Pressure Sodium - Rectangular Luminaire (Shoe Box) 30' Mounting Height

| Single Luminaire |
| :---: |
| Per Pole |

With base $^{1}$ No base | Each Additional |
| :---: |
| Luminaire Per Pole |

# OUTDOOR LIGHTING <br> EQUIPMENT, MAINTENANCE, AND UNMETERED SERVICE <br> SCHEDULE EMU (Continued) 

Metal Halide - Rectangular Luminaire (Shoe Box) 30' Mounting Height
With base ${ }^{1} \quad$ No base Luminaire Per Pole

36,000 Lumen - 400 watt...... 157 kWh........ $\$ 49.21$ per lamp............ $\$ 44.60$................ $\$ 25.43$ per lamp
Metal Halide - Rectangular Area Luminaire (Shoe Box) 40' Mounting Height

90,000 Lumen - 1000 watt...... 379 kWh............................................. $\$ 55.55$................ $\$ 33.06$ per lamp
${ }^{1}$ With base includes the installation of a non-concrete power installed foundation where soil conditions warrant its application.

Note: The rating of lamps in lumens is for identification purposes only and shall approximate the manufacturer's standard rating. All luminaires are lighted from dusk to dawn aggregating approximately 4,200 hours per year.

TRANSMISSION CHARGE

Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours................................................................................ $\$ 0.00079$ per kilowatt-hour

The Transmission Charge is based on PJM's Open Access Transmission Tariff which will change from time to time and is subject to FERC approval.

# OUTDOOR LIGHTING <br> MAINTENANCE AND UNMETERED SERVICE SCHEDULE MU 

## AVAILABILITY

Available for high-pressure sodium, mercury vapor, metal halide and incandescent lighting. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.

## MONTHLY RATE

DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

| High Pressure Sodium Vapor | Installed On | Installed On Company's |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Customer-Owned | Distribution |
|  | Pole | System |
| 9,500 Lumen ...... 100 Watt. | . \$ 3.20 per lamp. | 4.82 per lamp |
| 22,000 Lumen ...... 200 Watt. | \$ 3.25 per lamp.. | 4.86 per lamp |
| 50,000 Lumen ...... 400 Watt. | \$ 7.99 per lamp. | 9.56 per lamp |

Mercury Vapor

| 8,150 Lumen ...... 175 Watt | $74 \mathrm{kWh} . . . . . . .$. \$ | \$ 3.05 per lamp......................\$ 4.68 per lamp |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11,500 Lumen ...... 250 Watt | 103 kWh .........\$ | \$ 5.96 per lamp......................\$ 7.58 per lamp |
| 21,500 Lumen ...... 400 Watt | . 162 kWh .........\$ | \$ 6.46 per lamp..................... \$ 8.04 per lamp |
| 60,000 Lumen .... 1000 Watt | .386 kWh | \$ 8.99 per lamp..................... \$10.57 per lamp |

Metal Halide


## OUTDOOR LIGHTING MAINTENANCE AND UNMETERED SERVICE SCHEDULE MU (Continued)

Incandescent


Note: The rating of the lamps in lumens is for identification and shall approximate the manufacturer's standard rating.

TRANSMISSION CHARGE

Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours
\$0.00079 per kilowatt-hour
The Transmission Charge is based on PJM's Open Access Transmission Tariff which will change from time to time and is subject to FERC approval.

ELECTRIC SUPPLY CHARGE

| $\frac{\text { Summer }}{}$ | $\frac{\text { Non-Summer }}{0-01-2022 \text { thru }}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $06-01-2022$ thru |  |
| $09-30-2022$ | $05-31-2023$ |

Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours
\$0.05417 per kilowatt-hour $\qquad$ .\$0.05512 per kilowatt-hour

The Transmission and Electric Supply Charges apply only to Customers receiving Type I SOS from the Company. These charges do not apply to Customers obtaining Competitive Power Supply.

# OUTDOOR LIGHTING <br> EQUIPMENT AND MAINTENANCE SERVICE SCHEDULE EM 

## AVAILABILITY

Available for roadway and other outdoor lighting where energy is supplied by Customer's metered Service and contracted for by a Customer for lighting accessible areas. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.

MONTHLY RATE

## DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { OVERHEAD SERVICE } \\ \text { Mercury Vapor-Horizontal Luminaire (Cobra Head) } \\ \text { 8,150 Lumen ....... } 175 \text { watt................................................................... } \$ 10.34 \text { per lamp } \\ \text { Installation } \\ \text { on Existing Pole }\end{array}\right]$

# OUTDOOR LIGHTING EQUIPMENT AND MAINTENANCE SERVICE SCHEDULE EM (Continued) 

UNDERGROUND SERVICE
Metal Halide - Colonial Post Top Luminaire 14' Mounting Height
11,600 Lumen ....... 175 watt............................................................................... $\$ 26.80$ per lamp

# OUTDOOR LIGHTING <br> EQUIPMENT AND MAINTENANCE SERVICE <br> SCHEDULE EM (Continued) 

## UNDERGROUND SERVICE (Continued)

Metal Halide - Rectangular Luminaire (Shoe Box) 30' Mounting Height


Metal Halide - Rectangular Area Luminaire (Shoe Box) 40' Mounting Height

90,000 Lumen ..... 1000 watt....................... $\$ 55.92$ per lamp...................................... $\$ 32.59$ per lamp

Note: The rating of lamps in lumens is for identification purposes only and shall approximate the manufacturer's standard rating.
${ }^{1}$ With base includes the installation of a non-concrete power installed foundation where soil conditions warrant its application.

TRANSMISSION CHARGE

Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours................................................................................ \$0.00000 per kilowatt-hour

The Transmission Charge is based on PJM's Open Access Transmission Tariff which will change from time to time and is subject to FERC approval.

## LED STREET LIGHTING SERVICE SCHEDULE "LED"

## COMPANY-OWNED AND MAINTAINED EQUIPMENT (COMPANY SUPPLIES UNMETERED ENERGY)

## AVAILABILITY

Available for the illumination of streets, highways and other outdoor areas by Company owned and maintained Light Emitting Diode (LED) street lights where energy supplied from the Company's overhead or underground secondary distribution system is unmetered and lighting Service is contracted for by the Customer. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.

## MONTHLY RATE

DISTRIBUTION CHARGE


LED Colonial Post Top Luminaire

| 2,500 Lumen - | 50 watt................... 18 kV | \$12.91 per lamp |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5,000 Lumen - | 90 watt.................. 32 kWh | . $\mathbf{1 4 . 2 2}$ per lamp |

Note: The rating of lamps in lumens is for identification purposes only and shall approximate the manufacturer's standard rating. All luminaires are lighted from dusk to dawn aggregating approximately 4,200 hours per year.

## LED STREET LIGHTING SERVICE

## SCHEDULE "LED" (Continued)

Underground Service will be installed where Service is supplied from an existing underground distribution system. Customer shall provide, at their expense, any excavating, backfilling, reconstructing, resurfacing and conduit necessary for the installation of the Company's underground cable. Customer shall provide and install conduit of size specified by the Company.

All Service and necessary maintenance will be performed only during regular working hours of the Company. If Service and necessary maintenance cannot be performed during regular working hours of the Company, for reasons beyond the Company's control, the incremental costs of performing such work shall be borne by the Customer.

## REPLACEMENT OR REMOVAL

Costs associated with the replacement, relocation, alteration, or removal of existing street lighting equipment are not included as part of normal maintenance and will be the responsibility of the Customer. Examples of such activities include, but are not limited to, the replacement of an existing fixture, removal or relocation of a luminaire, bracket, and/or pole, or installation of a luminaire shield.

In the event of early termination for any reason prior to expiration of the initial term of the agreement, Customer shall pay either the balance of the agreement responsibility, less applicable energy charge, or the cost of installation and removal of equipment, whichever is less. Any remaining balance due for extra facilities, rearranging of facilities or other additional installed costs which were separately billed over the term of the agreement shall also become immediately due and payable.

## GENERAL

All costs described in this schedule are actual costs or, where applicable, estimates based on standard engineering practice.

All Customer charges are subject to any applicable local, state and federal taxes.

Company shall not be liable for damages to the Customer for any failure in any lighting system which results from any cause beyond the Company's control.

Customers may negotiate a contract for Service on an individual basis, upon mutual agreement with the Company. Such contracts shall incorporate all terms and conditions of this tariff and may include additional terms and conditions regarding advanced functionality of the LED lights and associated equipment including, but not limited to, controllers, dimming capabilities, sensors, or other network enabled functions. All costs of the advanced functionalities shall be borne by the Customer. Rates, terms and conditions may be subject to final approval of the Commission.

All energy savings associated with Customer participation under this schedule shall count toward the Company's energy efficiency and peak demand reduction requirements arising as a result of Section 7-211, Annotated Code of Maryland.

## LED STREET LIGHTING SERVICE

## SCHEDULE "LED" (Continued)

## Company Responsibilities

Company will, at its own cost, install, operate and maintain its standard outdoor lighting equipment with unmetered Service.

Company shall furnish luminaires at additional locations in accordance with Company practices upon the written order of Customer; Company shall increase size of any luminaire in the same Rate Schedule upon written order of Customer.

## Customer Responsibilities

Customer shall provide to Company free of cost and with free access, a satisfactory right-of-way and location for Company's facilities necessary to supply Service on premises controlled by Customer. Facilities provided at Company's expense shall remain Company property.

Customer shall be responsible for selecting the lamp size and location of the luminaire which shall be in conformance with applicable safety standards and governmental regulations. Customer shall obtain appropriate approval for luminaires to be located on public thoroughfares.

Customer shall be responsible for reporting non-operating lighting systems to the Company.

## CONTRACT

Company standard form of Outdoor Lighting Agreement shall be executed, when appropriate, along with applicable map showing location and size of all luminaires.

## CUSTOMER-OWNED AND MAINTAINED EQUIPMENT (COMPANY SUPPLIES UNMETERED ENERGY)

## AVAILABILITY

Available for the illumination of streets, highways and other outdoor areas by Customer owned and maintained LED street lights where energy supplied from the Company's overhead or underground secondary distribution system is unmetered and lighting Service is contracted for by the Customer. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.

This schedule is also applicable within private property such as private walkways, streets, roads, and when supply from the Company's distribution system is directly available and when lighting Service is contracted for by the owner thereof.

Available only for LED street lights that are served from a low voltage (120 volt) electric circuit.

## LED STREET LIGHTING SERVICE SCHEDULE "LED" (Continued)

This rate is not available to serve Customer-owned lighting systems in an area where there will be a mix of Company-owned and Customer-owned systems.

## MONTHLY RATE

DISTRIBUTION CHARGE

Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours
\$0.03581 per kilowatt-hour

TRANSMISSION CHARGE

Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours. \$0.00079 per kilowatt-hour

The Transmission Charge is based on PJM's Open Access Transmission Tariff which will change from time to time and is subject to FERC approval.

ELECTRIC SUPPLY CHARGE

| Summer <br> $06-01-2022$ thru <br> $09-30-2022$ | $\frac{\text { Non-Summer }}{10-01-2022 \text { thru }}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $05-31-2023$ |  |

Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours
\$0.05417 per kilowatt-hour $\qquad$ . $\$ 0.05512$ per kilowatt-hour

The Transmission and Electric Supply Charges apply only to Customers receiving Type I SOS from the Company. These charges do not apply to Customers obtaining Competitive Power Supply.

Service rendered herein is unmetered with the monthly kWh billed for each light calculated based on the manufacturer's luminaire wattage rating and the average monthly burn hours ( 4,200 annual burn hours / 12 months per year).

## LATE PAYMENT CHARGE

Applies to this schedule as set forth in Company Rule No. 12 of this tariff.

## TERM OF CONTRACT

Service is sold under this schedule for a minimum period of thirty days.

## OUTDOOR LIGHTING SERVICE SCHEDULE "OL"

## AVAILABILITY

Available for lighting Service sold prior to November 18, 1998 for outdoor lighting supplied from the existing overhead secondary distribution system of the Company and contracted for by a private Customer. The rating of lamps in lumens is for identification and shall approximate the manufacturer's standard rating. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.

## MONTHLY RATE

## DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

A. For each 9,500 lumen (100 watt) high-pressure sodium lamp (51 kWh) \$10.40 per lamp.
Company will provide lamp, photo-electric relay control equipment, fixture and upsweep arm not over 4 feet in length, and will mount same on an existing pole carrying secondary circuits.
B. Restricted to installations as of February 25, 1993

For each 8150 lumen (175 Watt) mercury vapor lamp ( 74 kWh ) $\qquad$ \$ 9.88 per lamp. Company will provide lamp, photo-electric relay control equipment, fixture and upsweep arm not over 4 feet in length, and will mount same on an existing pole carrying secondary circuits.
C. Restricted to installations as of February 25, 1993

For each 21,500 lumen (400 Watt) mercury vapor lamp (162 kWh) $\qquad$ . 17.21 per lamp. Company will provide lamp, photo-electric relay control equipment, fixture and upsweep arm not over 6 feet in length, and will mount same on an existing pole carrying secondary circuits.
D. For each 22,000 lumen ( 200 watt) high pressure sodium lamp ( 86 kWh ) $\qquad$ . $\$ 18.81$ per lamp Company will provide lamp, photo-electric relay control equipment, fixture and upsweep arm not over 6 feet in length, and will mount same on an existing pole carrying secondary circuits.
E. When facilities, in addition to those specified in paragraphs A., B., or C. are required to provide outdoor lighting Service, the Customer will pay in advance the cost of installing all additional facilities. For those facilities installed prior to September 9, 1985, where the Company provided facilities at a monthly rental, such monthly charges will continue at a rate of $\$ 4.25$ for each standard distribution wood pole required, $\$ 0.026$ per foot for each foot of span length of wires required and $\$ 4.25$ for each KVA of transformer capacity installed.
F. The Customer may elect to own and maintain poles and secondary circuits on their property to accommodate the installation of the outdoor lighting fixture. Such poles and circuits shall meet Company specifications.

## PRIVATE OUTDOOR AREA LIGHTING SERVICE SCHEDULE "AL"

## AVAILABILITY

Available only for installations served prior to September 9, 1985, for lighting Service sold for pole-mounted outdoor area lighting supplied from the existing secondary distribution system of the Company and contracted for by a private Customer. The rating of lamps in lumens is for identification and shall approximate the manufacturer's standard rating. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.

MONTHLY RATE

DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

LIGHTING FIXTURE

|  |  |  | Floodlighting <br> Nominal <br> Watts |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

MERCURY VAPOR

| 175 | 8,150 | 74 | $\$ 16.57$ | $\$ 20.93$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 400 | 21,500 | 162 |  | 26.48 |
| 1,000 | 60,000 | 386 |  |  |

HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM
$400 \quad 50,000 \quad 167$
27.86

QUARTZ IODINE
$500176 \quad 21.97$

| $\underline{\text { POLES }}$ | $\underline{\text { Wood }}$ |  | Metal |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\underline{\text { Length }}$ | $\underline{\text { Standard }}$ | $\underline{\text { Other }}$ |  |
| 14 foot |  | $\$ 8.76$ | $\$ 6.09$ |
| 30 foot | $\$ 4.33$ |  | 18.18 |
| 35 foot | 6.06 | 9.22 |  |
| 40 foot | 6.49 |  |  |

# PRIVATE OUTDOOR AREA LIGHTING SERVICE <br> SCHEDULE "AL" (Continued) 

## OVERHEAD CIRCUIT

\$0.027 per foot for each foot of span length.
TRANSMISSION CHARGE

Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours
\$0.00079 per kilowatt-hour

The Transmission Charge is based on PJM's Open Access Transmission Tariff which will change from time to time and is subject to FERC approval.

ELECTRIC SUPPLY CHARGE

| $\frac{\text { Summer }}{0-01-2022}$ thru <br> $09-30-2022$ | $\frac{\text { Non-Summer }}{10-01-2022 \text { thru }}$ <br> $05-31-2023$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Energy Charge |  |
| $\quad$ All kilowatt-hours....................................... $\$ 0.05417$ per kilowatt-hour......... $\$ 0.05512$ per kilowatt-hour |  |

The Transmission and Electric Supply Charges apply only to Customers receiving Type I SOS from the Company. These charges do not apply to Customers obtaining Competitive Power Supply.

## LATE PAYMENT

Applies to this schedule as set forth in Company Rule No. 12 of this tariff.

## PRIVATE OUTDOOR AREA LIGHTING SERVICE <br> SCHEDULE "AL" (Continued)

GENERAL (Concluded)
When lighting is served from an underground circuit the Customer shall own, install and maintain all necessary concrete bases for poles to be installed in accordance with the Company specifications. The Customer shall also own, install and maintain all facilities including circuits, conduit and pedestals necessary to supply Service to the base of the pole.

## CUSTOMER OWNED EQUIPMENT - COMPANY OPERATES AND MAINTAINS

Whenever the Customer furnishes, installs and owns the entire lighting system using equipment approved by and installed in a manner acceptable to the Company, the Company may, at its discretion, operate and maintain the system at the following rates.

DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

| LAMP SIZE IN |  |  | TYPE OF FIXTURE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NOMINAL WATTS | KWH | TYPE OF LAMP | BRACKET | POST TOP |
| 250 | 103 | Mercury Vapor | \$ 5.96 |  |
| 400 | 162 | " " | 6.46 |  |
| 1,000 | 386 | " " | 8.99 |  |
| 400 | 167 | High Pressure Sodium | 7.99 | \$7.99 |

The Company's responsibility under the aforementioned charges for maintaining the Customer owned lighting system is limited to photo control, relamping, cleaning fixtures and painting poles requiring paint. When the Customer's equipment is intermediate in size to those listed above the Customer shall pay the monthly charges applicable to the next larger size.

## STREET AND HIGHWAY LIGHTING SERVICE SCHEDULE "MSL"

## 1. COMPANY OWNED AND MAINTAINED EQUIPMENT

## AVAILABILITY

Available for lighting Service sold prior to November 18, 1998 for the lighting of public streets, public highways and other public outdoor areas in municipalities, governmental units and unincorporated communities where such Service can be supplied from the existing general distribution system. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.

This schedule is also applicable within private property which is open to the general public such as private walkways, streets, roads, when the property and buildings are under common ownership and when supply from the Company's distribution system is directly available and when lighting Service is contracted for by the owner thereof. The rating of lamps in lumens is for identification and shall approximate the manufacturer's standard rating.

MONTHLY RATE

DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

| Lamp Size |  |  | Overhead Supply |  | Underground Supply Standard Pole |  | Multiple Units For Each |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nominal <br> Watts | Nominal Lumens | kWh | Wood Pole | Metal <br> Pole | Low <br> Mounting | High Mounting | Additional Fixture Per Pole |
| High Pressure Sodium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 | 5,800 | 37 | \$10.21 |  | \$18.64 | \$28.18 | \$10.21 |
| 100 | 9,500 | 51 | 10.11 |  | 18.47 | 28.07 | 10.11 |
| 200 | 22,000 | 86 | 15.76 |  |  | 31.37 | 15.76 |
| 400 | 50,000 | 167 | 22.43 | \$38.04 |  | 38.04 | 22.43 |
| High Pressure Sodium - Rectangular Enclosed Fixture |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100 | 9,500 | 51 |  |  |  | 43.70 | 23.80 |
| 200 | 22,000 | 86 |  |  |  | 44.63 | 24.78 |
| 400 | 50,000 | 167 |  |  |  | 42.73 | 22.87 |

# STREET AND HIGHWAY LIGHTING SERVICE SCHEDULE "MSL" (Continued) 

MONTHLY RATE (Continued)

DISTRIBUTION CHARGES (Continued)

| Lamp Size |  |  | Overhead Supply |  | Underground Supply Standard Pole |  | Multiple Units For Each |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nominal | Nominal |  | Wood | Metal | Low | High | Additional |
| Watts | Lumens | Kwh | Pole | Pole | Mounting | Mounting | Fixture Per Pole |

Mercury Vapor - Restricted to installations as of February 25, 1993:

| 175 | 8,150 | 74 | $\$ 8.74$ | $\$ 16.49$ | $\$ 8.18$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Mercury Vapor - Restricted to installations as of June 14, 1982:

| 100 | 4,000 | 45 | 9.99 | 14.40 |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 250 | 11,500 | 103 | 12.76 |  | 29.20 |

Mercury Vapor - Restricted to installations as of October 17, 1988:

All lamps are lighted from dusk to dawn every night, or for approximately 4,200 hours per annum. However, at the request of the Customer individual lamps may be operated continuously 24 hours per day. The monthly rate for each light continuously operated shall be the applicable rate above plus $60 \%$ of the base overhead supply wood pole monthly rate.

When the circuit length exceeds 150 feet per light there will be an additional monthly charge of $\$ 0.026$ per foot for each foot of span length and $\$ 0.034$ per foot for each underground trench foot. (This provision is restricted to locations as of September 9, 1985.)

## STREET AND HIGHWAY LIGHTING SERVICE <br> SCHEDULE "MSL" (Continued)

MONTHLY RATE

## DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

The Company's supply of unmetered energy to the Customer's high pressure sodium street lighting system will be at the following rates:

| Lamp Size |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Nominal <br> Watts | Nominal <br> Lumens |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 | 5,800 | 37 | Monthly Rate |  |
| 100 | 9,500 | 51 | $\$ 3.62$ |  |
| 200 | 22,000 | 86 | 3.48 |  |
| 400 | 50,000 | 167 | 4.25 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

When the Customer's equipment is intermediate in size to those listed above, the Customer shall pay the monthly rate applicable to the next larger size.

TRANSMISSION CHARGE

Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours................................................................................ $\$ 0.00079$ per kilowatt-hour

The Transmission Charge is based on PJM's Open Access Transmission Tariff which will change from time to time and is subject to FERC approval.

## CO-GENERATION <br> SCHEDULE "CO-G"

## AVAILABILITY

This schedule is applicable for purchases of electricity by the Company from such qualifying facilities (QF) as cogenerators or small power producers as defined in Part 292, Subpart B, of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 regulations. The Company may require proof that the QF meets the requirements for a qualifying facility under those regulations.

This schedule is available for power to be supplied by the QF to the Company at a single point of delivery in amounts or not more than $5,000 \mathrm{~kW}$ for qualifying small power producers and $20,000 \mathrm{~kW}$ for qualifying cogenerators.

This schedule may be used in conjunction with any of the Company's filed Rate Schedules presently in effect and applicable to the supply of electric Service to a Customer.

## MONTHLY PAYMENTS

Energy Payments:

If applicable, the Company may sell the QF's energy in the PJM hourly real-time energy market provided the QF complies with all PJM requirements to qualify as a PJM generation resource. The Company will pay the QF the PJM real-time locational marginal price (LMP) at the APS Zone, or its successor, for each hour energy is produced and delivered to the Company, less any PJM ancillary charges, other related costs, and Company administrative costs.

Capacity Payments:

If applicable, the Company may offer the QF's capacity in the PJM capacity market provided the QF complies with all PJM requirements to qualify as a PJM capacity resource. The Company will pay the QF the capacity revenues received from PJM, less Company administrative costs, any PJM penalties incurred by the Company as a result of the QF's failure to perform, and other related costs.

## CONNECTION CHARGE:

The QF will pay the installed cost of the metering equipment and a monthly charge for the recurring expense of the QF metering connection pursuant to Rule 10 of the Company's Rules and Regulations Covering the Supply of Electric Service.

## SIMULTANEOUS PURCHASE AND SALE OPTION

Each QF served under this schedule shall have the option of either a simultaneous purchase and sale or the sale of only its excess power. The selection of such option shall be expressed in an Electric Service Agreement and shall be for a period of not less than one year.

# CO-GENERATION <br> SCHEDULE "CO-G" (Continued) 

## TERM

One year or longer.

## SALES TO QUALIFYING FACILITIES

Supplementary, backup, interruptible, maintenance, and station power will be supplied by the Company to the QF under the applicable standard Rate Schedules.

## INTERCONNECTION COSTS

All interconnection costs including interconnection costs incurred by the Company which are necessary to purchase energy or energy and capacity from the QF or to supply power are the responsibility of the QF. The Company will provide a nonbinding estimate of all interconnection costs to be incurred by the Company.

The QF is responsible for providing, installing, owning, and maintaining at its expense all equipment on the QF's side of the interconnection point. The QF must submit its interconnection plans and specifications to the Company, and the Company shall accept or reject those plans. The Company will inspect and approve the installation prior to making the interconnection. The inspection will be conducted by the Company, and the results of the inspection will be provided to the QF. The costs of any additional Company inspection required shall be borne by the QF. The QF is also responsible for obtaining Company approval for equipment and material specifications prior to making any modifications.
(a) The review and/or acceptance by the Company of the application for interconnection or plans and specification for such interconnection submitted by a QF does not and shall not be construed (1) as confirming or endorsing the design of the QF's facilities or (2) as any warranty of safety, durability, or reliability of the facilities.
(b) The Company shall not, by reason of any review or acceptance of the plans and specifications or application for interconnection submitted by QF, be responsible for strength, details of design, adequacy, or capability of the QF's facilities; nor shall the Company's acceptance and/or review of said plans and specifications or application for interconnection be deemed an endorsement or warranty of those facilities.

The Company installs, owns, and maintains at the QF's expense all metering equipment needed to measure separately the electricity delivered to the Company. Access shall be granted by the QF to the Company's authorized representative during any reasonable hours to install, inspect, and maintain the Company's metering equipment.

## ALTERNATIVE GENERATION SCHEDULE <br> SCHEDULE "AGS" (Continued)

## Penalty

The maximum by which the Customer's kilowatt demands exceed the sum of the Customer's firm capacities (i.e., the sum of the Customer's Supplementary, Maintenance, and Standby Firm capacities as applicable) during each interruption period shall be subject to a penalty charge. Only one such penalty shall be assessed per interruption period. The first time that the Customer is notified by the Company to interrupt Service and the Customer fails to reduce load to not more than the sum of its firm capacities, a penalty of $\$ 10$ per kilowatt shall be applied to those kilowatts in excess of firm capacities. Upon the second occurrence of such a failure to interrupt, a penalty of $\$ 10$ per kilowatt calculated as set forth above shall be applied and interruptible Service shall not be available to the Customer for the next two years. Upon the third occurrence of such a failure to interrupt, a $\$ 10$ per kilowatt penalty shall be applied and interruptible Service shall no longer be available to the Customer.

## MONTHLY RATE

DISTRIBUTION CHARGE

FIXED DISTRIBUTION CHARGE
$\$ 17.00$

Demand Charges

Firm Standby Power
All kilowatts........................................................................................... $\$ 1.216$ per kilowatt

Interruptible Standby Power
All kilowatts.............................................................................................. $\$ 1.151$ per kilowatt

Firm or Interruptible Maintenance Power
All kilowatts............................................................................................... $\$ 1.134$ per kilowatt

## Reactive Kilovolt-Ampere Charge

Reactive kilovolt-ampere charge is applied to the Customer's reactive kilovolt-ampere capacity requirement in excess of $25 \%$ of the Customer's kilowatt capacity.

Billing reactive kilovolt-amperes \$0.40 per reactive kilovolt-ampere

Energy Charge

All kilowatt-hours \$0.00203 per kilowatt-hour

## GENERATION STATION POWER SCHEDULE "SP"

## AVAILABILITY

Available to electric generation stations which are owned and/or operated by a qualified member of PJM who are unable to supply station power from other generation stations within PJM. Electric service must be supplied at one point of delivery and the Customer will be responsible for all transforming, controlling, regulating and protective equipment and its operation and maintenance.

## MONTHLY BILLING

During any PJM billing period in which the Customer's net generation output is negative, the Customer shall pay the Company a charge based upon all Company Charges for Schedule " $G$ " inclusive of Default Electricity Supply Service. During any PJM billing period in which the Customer's net generation output is positive:

1. Customers receiveing metered Service over 100 kilovolts shall pay the Company the Fixed Distribution Charge in accordance with Schedule " $G$ ".
2. Customers receiving metered Service under 100 kilovolts shall pay the Company the Fixed Distribution Charge in accordance with Schedule "G" along with the Distribution Charge portion of Schedule "G" kilowatt demand ratchets during the periods that such ratches are applicable.

Net generation output is positive when the Customer generates and delivers more power to the Company's electric system than it consumes from the electric system, as measured by the revenue meters.

Net generation output is negative when the Customer consumes more power from the Company's electric system than it generates and delivers to the electric system, as measured by the revenue meters.

## ELECTRIC SERVICE AGREEMENT

Electric service hereunder shall be furnished in accordance with an Electric Service Agreement in accordance with the provisions of Schedule "G".

## LATE PAYMENT CHARGE

Applies to this schedule as set forth in Company Rule No. 12 of this tariff.
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## RESIDENTIAL SERVICE

## SCHEDULE "R"

AVAILABILITY
Available for single-phase Residential Service through one meter. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.
MONTHLY RATE
DISTRIBUTION CHARGES
FIXED DISTRIBUTION CHARGE
\$58. 70 00 per month.
VARIABLE DISTRIBUTION CHARGE
Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours $\qquad$ \$0.01750-02556 per kilowatt-hour
TRANSMISSION CHARGE
Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours $\qquad$ $\$ 0.00396$ per kilowatt-hour
The Transmission Charge is based on PJM's Open Access Transmission Tariff which will change from time to time and is subject to FERC approval.

## ELECTRIC SUPPLY CHARGE

|  | Summer | Non-Summer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 06-01-2022 thru | 10-01-2022 thru |
|  | 09-30-2022 | 05-31-2023 |
| Energy Charge |  |  |
| All kilowatt-hours.. | 973 per kilowat | 6318 per kilowatt- |

The Transmission and Electric Supply Charges apply only to Customers receiving Residential SOS from the Company. These charges do not apply to Customers obtaining Competitive Power Supply.

ISSUED BY SAMUEL L. BELCHER, PRESIDENT
Issued January 20, 2022
Effective June 1, 2022
Approved at Public Service Commission Administrative Meeting of February 23, 2022
in Case Nos. 8908, 9056, and 9064
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## MONTHLY RATE

## DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

FIXED DISTRIBUTION CHARGE
$\$ 48.00$ per month.

## VARIABLE DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

## Capacity Charge

Minimum kilowatts ....................................................................................... $\$ 1.4280$ per kilowatt
All kilowatts in excess of 7.5 measured as set forth under
"Determination of Capacity" ................................................................. $\$ 12.7725$ per kilowatt
Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours.................................................................... \$0.01869-02371 per kilowatt-hour
Voltage Discount
Company will furnish Service at one voltage and at one point from the Company's existing distribution system voltage. A voltage discount of $25 \phi$ per kilowatt will apply when the Customer takes Service at a voltage between 2,000 and 15,000 volts and provides all facilities beyond the Point of Service. A voltage discount of $50 \phi$ per kilowatt will apply when the Customer takes Service at a voltage greater than 15,000 volts and provides all facilities beyond the Point of Service.

Reactive Kilovolt-Ampere Charge
Reactive kilovolt-ampere charge is applied to the Customer's reactive kilovolt-ampere capacity requirement in excess of $25 \%$ of the Customer's kilowatt capacity.

Billing reactive kilovolt-amperes ............................................. $\$ 0.40$ per reactive kilovolt-ampere
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## GENERAL AND COMMERCIAL SERVICE SCHEDULE "C"

## AVAILABILITY

Available only at locations served as of November 26, 1991 for single-phase and three-phase Service at standard Company voltage below 15,000 volts. The standard voltage available depends upon the location, character and size of Customer's load. This information can be furnished at any of the Company's offices. Service shall not be available for Standby or Maintenance Service such as that required for Alternative Generation Facilities. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.

## MONTHLY RATE

DISTRIBUTION CHARGES
FIXED DISTRIBUTION CHARGE
$\$ 48.00$ per month.
VARIABLE DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

Minimum kilowatts .............................................................................................. $\$ 1.4280$ per kilowatt
Energy Charge
First block ( $0-350$ kilowatt-hours)................................................ $\$ 0.01869-02371$ per kilowatt-hour
Second block (next 350 kilowatt-hours)....................... $\$ 0.03540-04489$ per kilowatt-hour

Third block (over 700 kilowatt-hours)...................................... \$0.01869-02371 per kilowatt-hour
Voltage Discount
Company will furnish Service at one voltage and at one point from the Company's existing distribution system voltage. Where Customer takes Service at a voltage between 2,000 and 15,000 volts and provides all facilities beyond the Service point, a voltage discount of $25 \phi$ per kilowatt will apply.

Reactive Kilovolt-Ampere Charge
Reactive kilovolt-ampere charge is applied to the Customer's reactive kilovolt-ampere capacity requirement in excess of $25 \%$ of the Customer's kilowatt capacity.

Billing reactive kilovolt-amperes.................................................... \$0.40 per reactive kilovolt-ampere
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## GENERAL SERVICE - ALL ELECTRIC

## SCHEDULE "C-A"

AVAILABILITY
Available only at locations served or for which contracts have been signed as of April 9, 1973. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.

## APPLICATION

This schedule applies to Customers contracting for electric Service to heat their entire establishment by the use of electricity and when all other electrical uses in the establishment are billed under this schedule. Not applicable to establishments whose primary operations are conducted outside the heated area.

## MONTHLY RATE

DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

FIXED DISTRIBUTION CHARGE
$\$ 48.00$ per month.
VARIABLE DISTRIBUTION CHARGES
Minimum kilowatts .................................................................................................. \$1.09 44 per kilowatt
Energy Charge
$\quad$ All kilowatt-hours........................................................................ $\$ 0.01757$ 02317 per kilowatt-hour

Voltage Discount
Company will furnish Service at one voltage and at one point from the Company's existing distribution system voltage. Where Customer takes Service at a voltage between 2,000 and 15,000 volts and provides all facilities beyond the Point of Service, a voltage discount of $25 \phi$ per kilowatt will apply.

TRANSMISSION CHARGES

| Min | onth |
| :---: | :---: |
| Minimum kilowatts | \$0.14 per kilowatt |
| Energy Charge |  |
| First block (0-350 kilowatt-hours).. | \$0.00725 per kilowatt-hour |
| Second block (next 350 kilowatt-hours) | \$0.00632 per kilowatt-hour |
| Third block (over 700 kilowatt-hours) | \$0.00337 per kilowatt-hour |

The Transmission Charges are based on PJM's Open Access Transmission Tariff which will change from time to time and is subject to FERC approval.

## ISSUED BY SAMUEL L. BELCHER, PRESIDENT
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## GENERAL SERVICE - ALL ELECTRIC SCHEDULE "C-A" (Continued)

## SERVICE SUPPLIED TO SCHOOLS AND CHURCHES WITH SPACE HEATING

When a school or church uses electric Service as the only means of space heating in a building, buildings, or in a separate area of a building then the kilowatt-hours used in the building, buildings, or separate area of a building will be billed at the above prices. When all energy uses, except as provided hereafter, for space heating, lighting, cooking, water heating, cooling (if any) and power are provided by electrical energy, all kilowatt-hours will be billed at the prices below. Any form of energy may be used for instruction, training and demonstration purposes and will be excluded from the above requirement.

A building, buildings, or separate area of a building not meeting the conditions of this provision shall be separately metered and billed under the applicable rate. The word school as used herein refers to a school operated through the use of public funds or by a non-profit organization.

A school building refers to a building containing any of the following facilities: classrooms, laboratories, manual arts shops, domestic science kitchens, gymnasium, dining areas, dormitories and other facilities used for educational purpose. Service for athletic field flood lighting shall be excluded from Service supplied under this provision and shall be billed for Service separately.

A church building refers to a building used principally for religious worship and Services.
MONTHLY RATE
DISTRIBUTION CHARGE
FIXED DISTRIBUTION CHARGE
$\$ 48.00$ per month.
VARIABLE DISTRIBUTION CHARGE
Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours. \$0.01357-01789 per kilowatt-hour

TRANSMISSION CHARGE
Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours.
\$0.00381 per kilowatt-hour
The Transmission Charge is based on PJM's Open Access Transmission Tariff which will change from time to time and is subject to FERC approval.

ISSUED BY SAMUEL L. BELCHER, PRESIDENT
Issued October 28, 2021 Effective November 1, 2021
Issued under Order No. 89971 dated October 26, 2021 in Case No. 9490.
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## POWER SERVICE <br> SCHEDULE "PH"

## AVAILABILITY

Available for loads of 50 kilowatts or greater at standard single-phase and three-phase voltages. To maintain eligibility, Customer load must equal or exceed 50 kilowatts at least once during a rolling 12-month period. The standard voltages available depend upon location, character and size of Customer's load. This information can be furnished at any of the Company's offices. Service shall not be available for Standby or Maintenance Service such as that required for Alternative Generation Facilities. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.

## MONTHLY RATE

DISTRIBUTION CHARGES
$\qquad$
$\square$
$\$ 17.00$
Capacity Charge
Minimum kilowatts ...................................................................................... \$1.14 54 per kilowatt
All kilowatts ............................................................................................... $\$ 12.78$ 41 per kilowatt
Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours $\qquad$ \$0.00386-00523 per kilowatt-hour

Voltage Discount
Company will furnish Service at one voltage and at one point from the Company's existing distribution system voltage. A voltage discount of $25 \phi$ per kilowatt will apply when the Customer takes Service at a voltage between 2,000 and 15,000 volts and provides all facilities beyond the Point of Service. A voltage discount of $50 \phi$ per kilowatt will apply when the Customer takes Service at a voltage greater than 15,000 volts and provides all facilities beyond the Point of Service.

## Reactive Kilovolt-Ampere Charge

Reactive kilovolt-ampere charge is applied to the Customer's reactive kilovolt-ampere capacity requirement in excess of $25 \%$ of the Customer's kilowatt capacity.

Billing reactive kilovolt-amperes ............................................ $\$ 0.40$ per reactive kilovolt-ampere

ISSUED BY SAMUEL L. BELCHER, PRESIDENT

Issued October 28, 2021
Effective November 1, 2021
Issued under Order No. 89971 dated October 26, 2021 in Case No. 9490.
THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY
Electric P.S.C. Md. No. 54

## LARGE POWER SERVICE

 SCHEDULE "PP"
## AVAILABILITY

Available to Customers with a kilowatt capacity of 5,000 kilowatts or more that can be served from a $138,000 / 34,500$ volt Load Center Substation located within 5 miles of the point of delivery to the Customer. To maintain eligibility, Customer load must equal or exceed 5,000 kilowatts at least once during a rolling 12-month period. Also available to Customers with a kilowatt capacity of 10,000 kilowatts and over, located adjacent to 138,000 volt transmission lines. Also available at 12,470 volts where the Company elects, at its sole option, to supply Service directly from an adjacent 138,000 volt transmission line by a single transformation. Service shall not be available for Standby or Maintenance Service such as that required for Alternative Generation Facilities. Service will be delivered and metered at 34,500 volts or over. An Electric Service Agreement must be executed. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.

## MONTHLY RATE

## DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

## FIXED DISTRIBUTION CHARGE

$\$ 453.00$

$\quad$| Capacity Charge |
| :--- |
| $\quad$ All kilowatts as set forth below under "Billing Capacity".......................... $\$ 0.286-402$ per kilowatt |


| Energy Charge |
| :--- |
| $\quad$ All kilowatt-hours.................................................................. $\$ 0.00059-00083$ per kilowatt-hour |
| Reactive Kilovolt-Ampere Charge |

Reactive kilovolt-ampere charge is applied to the Customer's reactive kilovolt-ampere capacity requirement in excess of $25 \%$ of the Customer's Billing Capacity.

Billing reactive kilovolt-amperes ............................................ $\$ 0.40$ per reactive kilovolt-ampere
TRANSMISSION CHARGES
Capacity Charge
All kilowatts as set forth below under "Billing Capacity"................................. $\$ 0.574$ per kilowatt
Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours. $\qquad$ \$0.00118 per kilowatt-hour

The Transmission Charges are based on PJM's Open Access Transmission Tariff which will change from time to time and is subject to FERC approval.

ISSUED BY SAMUEL L. BELCHER, PRESIDENT

Issued October 28, 2021 Effective November 1, 2021

Issued under Order No. 89971 dated October 26, 2021 in Case No. 9490.
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{l}\text { THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY } \\
\begin{array}{l}\text { Electric P.S.C. Md. No. } 54 \\
\text { First Second Revision of } \\
\text { Original Page No. } 11 \\
\text { Canceling }\end{array}
$$ <br>

First Revision of\end{array}\right\}\)| Original Page No. 11 |
| :--- |




ISSUED BY SAMUEL L. BELCHER, PRESIDENT

| THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY | Electric P.S.C. Md. No. 54 |
| :--- | :--- |
| First-Second Revision of |  |
| Original Page No. 11-3 |  |
| Canceling |  |
|  | First Revision of |
|  | Original Page No. 11-3 |

## OUTDOOR LIGHTING

## EQUIPMENT, MAINTENANCE, AND UNMETERED SERVICE SCHEDULE EMU (Continued)

Metal Halide - Rectangular Luminaire (Shoe Box) 30' Mounting Height
With base ${ }^{1} \quad$ No base Luminaire Per Pole
36,000 Lumen - 400 watt...... $157 \mathrm{kWh} \$ 414 \underline{49} .68$ 21 per lamp... $\$ 37 \underline{44} .77 \underline{60}$....... $\$ 21 \underline{25} .54 \underline{43}$ per lamp
Metal Halide - Rectangular Area Luminaire (Shoe Box) 40' Mounting Height

${ }^{1}$ With base includes the installation of a non-concrete power installed foundation where soil conditions warrant its application.
Note: The rating of lamps in lumens is for identification purposes only and shall approximate the manufacturer's standard rating. All luminaires are lighted from dusk to dawn aggregating approximately 4,200 hours per year
TRANSMISSION CHARGE
Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours............................................................................... $\$ 0.00079$ per kilowatt-hour
The Transmission Charge is based on PJM's Open Access Transmission Tariff which will change from time to time and is subject to FERC approval.

## ISSUED BY SAMUEL L. BELCHER, PRESIDENT

| THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY |  | Electric P.S.C. Md. No. 54 <br> First-Second Revision of Original Page No. 12 <br> Canceling <br> First Revision of <br> Original Page No. 12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OUTDOOR LIGHTING ENANCE AND UNMETERED SERVICE SCHEDULE MU |  |  |
| AVAILABILITY |  |  |
| Available for high-pressure sodium, mercury vapor, metal halide and incandescent lighting. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply. |  |  |
| MONTHLY RATE |  |  |
| DISTRIBUTION CHARGES |  |  |
|  | Installed On | Installed On Company's |
| High Pressure Sodium Vapor | Customer-Owned $\qquad$ Pole | Distribution $\qquad$ |
| 9,500 Lumen ...... 100 Watt........ $51 \mathrm{kWh} . . . \$ 23.71$ 20 per lamp................. \$ 4.08-82 per lamp |  |  |
| 22,000 Lumen ...... 200 Watt........ $86 \mathrm{kWh} . . . \$ 2$ z3. $75-25$ per lamp................. \$ 4.12 86 per lamp |  |  |
| 50,000 Lumen ...... 400 Watt...... $167 \mathrm{kWh} . . . \$ 67.77$ g9 per lamp................\$ 89. 10 - 56 per lamp |  |  |
| Mercury Vapor |  |  |
| 8,150 Lumen ...... 175 Watt........ 74 kWh ...\$ 23.58-05 per lamp................\$ 34.96-68 per lamp |  |  |
| 11,500 Lumen ...... 250 Watt...... $103 \mathrm{kWh} . . .$. \$ 5.0596 per lamp................ \$ 67.4258 per lamp |  |  |
| 21,500 Lumen ...... 400 Watt...... $162 \mathrm{kWh} . . . \$ 5 \underline{6} .47$ 46 per lamp................\$ 68.81-04 per lamp |  |  |
| 60,000 Lumen .... 1000 Watt...... $386 \mathrm{kWh} . . . \$ 78.61$ 99 per lamp............... $\$ 810.95 \underline{57}$ per lamp |  |  |
| Metal Halide |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
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## MAINTENANCE AND UNMETERED SERVICE <br> SCHEDULE MU (Continued)

Incandescent


Note: The rating of the lamps in lumens is for identification and shall approximate the manufacturer's standard rating.

TRANSMISSION CHARGE

Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours.
$\$ 0.00079$ per kilowatt-hour
The Transmission Charge is based on PJM's Open Access Transmission Tariff which will change from time to time and is subject to FERC approval.

ELECTRIC SUPPLY CHARGE

| $\underline{\text { Summer }}$ <br> $06-01-2022$ thru <br> $09-30-2022$ |
| :---: | | $\frac{\text { Non-Summer }}{10-01-2022 \text { thru }}$ |
| :---: |
| Energy Charge |
| All kilowatt-hours..................................... $\$ 0.05417$ per kilowatt-hour......... $\$ 0.05512$ per kilowatt-hour |

ISSUED BY SAMUEL L. BELCHER, PRESIDENT
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## OUTDOOR LIGHTING

EQUIPMENT AND MAINTENANCE SERVICE
SCHEDULE EM

## AVAILABILITY

Available for roadway and other outdoor lighting where energy is supplied by Customer's metered Service and contracted for by a Customer for lighting accessible areas. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.


## ISSUED BY SAMUEL L. BELCHER, PRESIDENT
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## LED STREET LIGHTING SERVICE SCHEDULE "LED"

## COMPANY-OWNED AND MAINTAINED EQUIPMENT (COMPANY SUPPLIES UNMETERED ENERGY)

## AVAILABILITY

Available for the illumination of streets, highways and other outdoor areas by Company owned and maintained Light Emitting Diode (LED) street lights where energy supplied from the Company's overhead or underground secondary distribution system is unmetered and lighting Service is contracted for by the Customer. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.

Available only for group installations of 12 or more LED streetlights per Customer.


Note: The rating of lamps in lumens is for identification purposes only and shall approximate the manufacturer's standard rating. All luminaires are lighted from dusk to dawn aggregating approximately 4,200 hours per year.

## ISSUED BY SAMUEL L. BELCHER, PRESIDENT
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## LED STREET LIGHTING SERVICE <br> SCHEDULE "LED" (Continued)

Underground Service will be installed where Service is supplied from an existing underground distribution system. Customer shall provide, at their expense, any excavating, backfilling, reconstructing, resurfacing and conduit necessary for the installation of the Company's underground cable. Customer shall provide and install conduit of size specified by the Company.

All Service and necessary maintenance will be performed only during regular working hours of the Company. If Service and necessary maintenance cannot be performed during regular working hours of the Company, for reasons beyond the Company's control, the incremental costs of performing such work shall be borne by the Customer.

## REPLACEMENT OR REMOVAL

Costs associated with the replacement, relocation, alteration, or removal of existing street lighting equipment are not included as part of normal maintenance and will be the responsibility of the Customer. Examples of such activities include, but are not limited to, the replacement of an existing fixture, removal or relocation of a luminaire, bracket, and/or pole, or installation of a luminaire shield.

In the event of early termination for any reason prior to expiration of the initial term of the agreement, Customer shall pay either the balance of the agreement responsibility, less applicable energy charge, or the cost of installation and removal of equipment, whichever is less. Any remaining balance due for extra facilities, rearranging of facilities or other additional installed costs which were separately billed over the term of the agreement shall also become immediately due and payable.

## GENERAL

All costs described in this schedule are actual costs or, where applicable, estimates based on standard engineering practice.

All Customer charges are subject to any applicable local, state and federal taxes.
Company shall not be liable for damages to the Customer for any failure in any lighting system which results from any cause beyond the Company's control.

Customers may negotiate a contract for Service on an individual basis, upon mutual agreement with the Company. Such contracts shall incorporate all terms and conditions of this tariff and may include additional terms and conditions regarding advanced functionality of the LED lights and associated equipment including, but not limited to, controllers, dimming capabilities, sensors, or other network enabled functions. All costs of the advanced functionalities shall be borne by the Customer. Rates, terms and conditions may be subject to final approval of the Commission.

All energy savings associated with Customer participation under this schedule shall count toward the Company's energy efficiency and peak demand reduction requirements arising as a result of Section 7-211, Annotated Code of Maryland.

Company Responsibilities

Company will, at its own cost, install, oporate and maintain its standard outdoor lighting equipment with unmetered Service.
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## LED STREET LIGHTING SERVICE SCHEDULE "LED" (Continued)

Company Responsibilities
Company will, at its own cost, install, operate and maintain its standard outdoor lighting equipment with unmetered Service.

Company shall furnish luminaires at additional locations in accordance with Company practices upon the written order of Customer; Company shall increase size of any luminaire in the same Rate Schedule upon written order of Customer.

Customer Responsibilities
Customer shall provide to Company free of cost and with free access, a satisfactory right-of-way and location for Company's facilities necessary to supply Service on premises controlled by Customer. Facilities provided at Company's expense shall remain Company property.

Customer shall be responsible for selecting the lamp size and location of the luminaire which shall be in conformance with applicable safety standards and governmental regulations. Customer shall obtain appropriate approval for luminaires to be located on public thoroughfares.

Customer shall be responsible for reporting non-operating lighting systems to the Company.

## CONTRACT

Company standard form of Outdoor Lighting Agreement shall be executed, when appropriate, along with applicable map showing location and size of all luminaires.

## CUSTOMER-OWNED AND MAINTAINED EQUIPMENT (COMPANY SUPPLIES UNMETERED ENERGY)

## AVAILABILITY

Available for the illumination of streets, highways and other outdoor areas by Customer owned and maintained LED street lights where energy supplied from the Company's overhead or underground secondary distribution system is unmetered and lighting Service is contracted for by the Customer. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.

This schedule is also applicable within private property such as private walkways, streets, roads, and when supply from the Company's distribution system is directly available and when lighting Service is contracted for by the owner thereof.

Available only for LED street lights that are served from a low voltage (120 volt) electric circuit.

## ISSUED BY SAMUEL L. BELCHER, PRESIDENT
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## LED STREET LIGHTING SERVICE <br> SCHEDULE "LED" (Continued)

This rate is not available to serve Customer-owned lighting systems in an area where there will be a mix of Company-owned and Customer-owned systems.

## MONTHLY RATE

DISTRIBUTION CHARGE

## Energy Charge

All kilowatt-hours. \$0.03033-03581 per kilowatt-hour

TRANSMISSION CHARGE
Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours............................................................................... $\$ 0.00079$ per kilowatt-hour
The Transmission Charge is based on PJM's Open Access Transmission Tariff which will change from time to time and is subject to FERC approval.

ELECTRIC SUPPLY CHARGE

| Summer <br> $06-01-2022$ thru <br> $09-30-2022$ | $\frac{\text { Non-Summer }}{10-01-2022 \text { thru }}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $05-31-2023$ |  |

Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours $\qquad$ \$0.05417 per kilowatt-hour. $\qquad$ \$0.05512 per kilowatt-hour

The Transmission and Electric Supply Charges apply only to Customers receiving Type I SOS from the Company. These charges do not apply to Customers obtaining Competitive Power Supply.

Service rendered herein is unmetered with the monthly kWh billed for each light calculated based on the manufacturer's luminaire wattage rating and the average monthly burn hours (4,200 annual burn hours / 12 months per year).

## LATE PAYMENT CHARGE

Applies to this schedule as set forth in Company Rule No. 12 of this tariff.
TERM OF CONTRACT

Service is sold under this schedule for a minimum period of thirty days.
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## OUTDOOR LIGHTING SERVICE

## SCHEDULE "OL"

## AVAILABILITY

Available for lighting Service sold prior to November 18, 1998 for outdoor lighting supplied from the existing overhead secondary distribution system of the Company and contracted for by a private Customer. The rating of lamps in lumens is for identification and shall approximate the manufacturer's standard rating. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.

## MONTHLY RATE

## DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

A. For each 9,500 lumen (100 watt) high-pressure sodium lamp ( 51 kWh ). . $\$ 810.8140$ per lamp. Company will provide lamp, photo-electric relay control equipment, fixture and upsweep arm not over 4 feet in length, and will mount same on an existing pole carrying secondary circuits.
B. Restricted to installations as of February 25, 1993

For each 8150 lumen (175 Watt) mercury vapor lamp ( 74 kWh ).................................... \$89. 37.88 per lamp. Company will provide lamp, photo-electric relay control equipment, fixture and upsweep arm not over 4 feet in length, and will mount same on an existing pole carrying secondary circuits.
C. Restricted to installations as of February 25, 1993

For each 21,500 lumen (400 Watt) mercury vapor lamp ( 162 kWh )........................... $\$ 1417.58-21$ per lamp. Company will provide lamp, photo-electric relay control equipment, fixture and upsweep arm not over 6 feet in length, and will mount same on an existing pole carrying secondary circuits.
D. For each 22,000 lumen ( 200 watt) high pressure sodium lamp ( 86 kWh ). $\qquad$ .. \$1518.93-81 per lamp Company will provide lamp, photo-electric relay control equipment, fixture and upsweep arm not over 6 feet in length, and will mount same on an existing pole carrying secondary circuits.
E. When facilities, in addition to those specified in paragraphs A., B., or C. are required to provide outdoor lighting Service, the Customer will pay in advance the cost of installing all additional facilities. For those facilities installed prior to September 9, 1985, where the Company provided facilities at a monthly rental, such monthly charges will continue at a rate of $\$ 34.60-\underline{25}$ for each standard distribution wood pole required, $\$ 0.022 \underline{026}$ per foot for each foot of span length of wires required and \$34.60-25 for each KVA of transformer capacity installed.
F. The Customer may elect to own and maintain poles and secondary circuits on their property to accommodate the installation of the outdoor lighting fixture. Such poles and circuits shall meet Company specifications.
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## PRIVATE OUTDOOR AREA LIGHTING SERVICE

SCHEDULE "AL"
AVAILABILITY
Available only for installations served prior to September 9, 1985, for lighting Service sold for pole-mounted outdoor area lighting supplied from the existing secondary distribution system of the Company and contracted for by a private Customer. The rating of lamps in lumens is for identification and shall approximate the manufacturer's standard rating. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.
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## PRIVATE OUTDOOR AREA LIGHTING SERVICE SCHEDULE "AL" (Continued)

OVERHEAD CIRCUIT
\$0.023-027 per foot for each foot of span length.
TRANSMISSION CHARGE
Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours............................................................................... $\$ 0.00079$ per kilowatt-hour
The Transmission Charge is based on PJM's Open Access Transmission Tariff which will change from time to time and is subject to FERC approval.

ELECTRIC SUPPLY CHARGE

Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours......................................... $\$ 0.05417$ per kilowatt-hour......... $\$ 0.05512$ per kilowatt-hour
The Transmission and Electric Supply Charges apply only to Customers receiving Type I SOS from the Company. These charges do not apply to Customers obtaining Competitive Power Supply.

LATE PAYMENT

Applies to this schedule as set forth in Company Rule No. 12 of this tariff.
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## PRIVATE OUTDOOR AREA LIGHTING SERVICE SCHEDULE "AL" (Continued)

GENERAL (Concluded)

When lighting is served from an underground circuit the Customer shall own, install and maintain all necessary concrete bases for poles to be installed in accordance with the Company specifications. The Customer shall also own, install and maintain all facilities including circuits, conduit and pedestals necessary to supply Service to the base of the pole.

## CUSTOMER OWNED EQUIPMENT - COMPANY OPERATES AND MAINTAINS

Whenever the Customer furnishes, installs and owns the entire lighting system using equipment approved by and installed in a manner acceptable to the Company, the Company may, at its discretion, operate and maintain the system at the following rates.

DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

| LAMP SIZE IN |  |  | TYPE OF FIXTURE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NOMINAL WATTS | KWH | TYPE OF LAMP | BRACKET | POST TOP |
| 250 | 103 | Mercury Vapor | \$ 5.0596 |  |
| 400 | 162 | " " | $5 \underline{6} .47 \underline{46}$ |  |
| 1,000 | 386 | " " | 78.6199 |  |
| 400 | 167 | High Pressure Sodium | 67.7799 | \$67.7799 |

The Company's responsibility under the aforementioned charges for maintaining the Customer owned lighting system is limited to photo control, relamping, cleaning fixtures and painting poles requiring paint. When the Customer's equipment is intermediate in size to those listed above the Customer shall pay the monthly charges applicable to the next larger size.

## ISSUED BY SAMUEL L. BELCHER, PRESIDENT

Issued October 28, 2021 Effective November 1, 2021

| THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY | Electric P.S.C. Md. No. 54 |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | First-Second Revision of |
| Original Page No. 17 |  |
|  | Canceling |
|  | First Revision of |
|  | Original Page No. 17 |

## STREET AND HIGHWAY LIGHTING SERVICE SCHEDULE "MSL"

## 1. COMPANY OWNED AND MAINTAINED EQUIPMENT

## AVAILABILITY

Available for lighting Service sold prior to November 18, 1998 for the lighting of public streets, public highways and other public outdoor areas in municipalities, governmental units and unincorporated communities where such Service can be supplied from the existing general distribution system. All applicable surcharges, credits and taxes shall apply.

This schedule is also applicable within private property which is open to the general public such as private walkways, streets, roads, when the property and buildings are under common ownership and when supply from the Company's distribution system is directly available and when lighting Service is contracted for by the owner thereof. The rating of lamps in lumens is for identification and shall approximate the manufacturer's standard rating.

## MONTHLY RATE

DISTRIBUTION CHARGES

| Lamp Size |  |  | Overhead Supply |  | Underground Supply Standard Pole |  | Multiple Units For Each |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nominal <br> Watts | Nominal Lumens | kWh | Wood Pole | Metal <br> Pole | Low <br> Mounting | High <br> Mounting | Additional Fixture Per Pole |
| High Pressure Sodium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 | 5,800 | 37 | \$810.6521 |  | \$1518.7964 | \$2328.8718 | \$810.6521 |
| 100 | 9,500 | 51 | 810.5611 |  | $15 \underline{18.6447}$ | $2328.77 \underline{07}$ | 810.5611 |
| 200 | 22,000 | 86 | 1315.3576 |  |  | $2631.57 \underline{37}$ | 1315.3576 |
| 400 | 50,000 | 167 | 1922.0043 | 8.2204 |  | 3238.2204 | 1922.0043 |

High Pressure Sodium - Rectangular Enclosed Fixture

| 100 | 9,500 | 51 | $37 \underline{43.0470}$ | $20 \underline{23} .1680$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 200 | 22,000 | 86 | 3744.8063 | $20 \underline{24} .99 \underline{78}$ |
| 400 | 50,000 | 167 | $36 \underline{42} .19 \underline{73}$ | $19 \underline{22.3787}$ |
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## STREET AND HIGHWAY LIGHTING SERVICE <br> SCHEDULE "MSL" (Continued)

## MONTHLY RATE (Continued)

DISTRIBUTION CHARGES (Continued)

| Lamp Size |  |  | Overhead Supply |  | Underground Supply Standard Pole |  | Multiple Units For Each |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nominal | Nominal |  | Wood | Metal | Low | High | Additional |
| Watts | Lumens | Kwh | Pole | Pole | Mounting | Mounting | Fixture Per Pole |

Mercury Vapor - Restricted to installations as of February 25, 1993:
$175 \quad 8,150 \quad 74 \quad \$ 7 \underline{8} .40 \underline{74} \quad \$ 13 \underline{16} .97 \underline{49} \quad \$ 6 \underline{8} .93 \underline{18}$

Mercury Vapor - Restricted to installations as of June 14, 1982:

| 100 | 4,000 | 45 | $8 \underline{9} .46 \underline{99}$ | $12 \underline{14.2040}$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 250 | 11,500 | 103 | $10 \underline{12.81 \underline{6}}$ |  | $24 \underline{29.7320}$ |

Mercury Vapor - Restricted to installations as of October 17, 1988:

| 400 | 21,500 | 162 | 1012.9087 | $24 \underline{28.5494}$ | $24 \underline{98.5494}$ | $10 \underline{12.2308}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

All lamps are lighted from dusk to dawn every night, or for approximately 4,200 hours per annum. However, at the request of the Customer individual lamps may be operated continuously 24 hours per day. The monthly rate for each light continuously operated shall be the applicable rate above plus $60 \%$ of the base overhead supply wood pole monthly rate.

When the circuit length exceeds 150 feet per light there will be an additional monthly charge of $\$ 0.022 \underline{026}$ per foot for each foot of span length and $\$ 0.029-034$ per foot for each underground trench foot. (This provision is restricted to locations as of September 9, 1985.)
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## STREET AND HIGHWAY LIGHTING SERVICE

SCHEDULE "MSL" (Continued)

## MONTHLY RATE

DISTRIBUTION CHARGES
The Company's supply of unmetered energy to the Customer's high pressure sodium street lighting system will be at the following rates:

| Lamp Size |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nominal | Nominal |  |  |
| Watts | Lumens | kWh | Monthly Rate |
| 70 | 5,800 | 37 | \$ 3.0762 |
| 100 | 9,500 | 51 | 23.9548 |
| 200 | 22,000 | 86 | $34.60 \underline{5}$ |
| 400 | 50,000 | 167 | 67.0818 |

When the Customer's equipment is intermediate in size to those listed above, the Customer shall pay the monthly rate applicable to the next larger size.

TRANSMISSION CHARGE

Energy Charge
All kilowatt-hours. $\$ 0.00079$ per kilowatt-hour

The Transmission Charge is based on PJM's Open Access Transmission Tariff which will change from time to time and is subject to FERC approval.
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## CO-GENERATION <br> SCHEDULE "CO-G"

## AVAILABILITY

This schedule is applicable for purchases of electricity by the Company from such qualifying facilities (QF) as cogenerators or small power producers as defined in Part 292, Subpart B, of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 regulations. The Company may require proof that the QF meets the requirements for a qualifying facility under those regulations.

This schedule is available for power to be supplied by the QF to the Company at a single point of delivery in amounts or not more than $25,000 \mathrm{~kW}$ for qualifying small power producers and $20,000 \mathrm{~kW}$ for qualifying cogenerators.

This schedule may be used in conjunction with any of the Company's filed Rate Schedules presently in effect and applicable to the supply of electric Service to a Customer.

## MONTHLY PAYMENTS

## Energy Payments:

If applicable, Tthe Company maywill sell the QF's energy in the PJM hourly real-time energy market provided the QF complies with all PJM requirements to qualify as a PJM generation resource. The Company will pay the QF the PJM real-time locational marginal price (LMP) at the APS Zone, or its successor, for each hour energy is produced and delivered to the Company, less any PJM ancillary charges, other related costs, and Company administrative costs.

Capacity Payments:
If applicable, Ithe Company maywill offer the QF's capacity in the PJM capacity market provided the QF complies with all PJM requirements to qualify as a PJM capacity resource. The Company will pay the QF the capacity revenues received from PJM, less Company administrative costs, any PJM penalties incurred by the Company as a result of the QF's failure to perform, and other related costs.

## CONNECTION CHARGE:

The QF will pay the installed cost of the metering equipment and a monthly charge for the recurring expense of the QF metering connection pursuant to Rule 10 of the Company's Rules and Regulations Covering the Supply of Electric Service.

## SIMULTANEOUS PURCHASE AND SALE OPTION

Each QF served under this schedule shall have the option of either a simultaneous purchase and sale or the sale of only its excess power. The selection of such option shall be expressed in an Electric Service Agreement and shall be for a period of not less than one year.

ISSUED BY SAMUEL L. BELCHER, PRESIDENT
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## CO-GENERATION

## SCHEDULE "CO-G" (Continued)

## TERM

One year or longer.

## SALES TO QUALIFYING FACILITIES

Supplementary, backup, interruptible, and maintenance, and station power will be supplied by the Company to the QF under the applicable standard Rate Schedules.

## INTERCONNECTION COSTS


#### Abstract

All interconnection costs including interconnection costs incurred by the Company which are necessary to purchase energy or energy and capacity from the QF or to supply backup power are the responsibility of the QF. The Company will provide a nonbinding estimate of all interconnection costs to be incurred by the Company.


The QF is responsible for providing, installing, owning, and maintaining at its expense all equipment on the QF's side of the interconnection point. The QF must submit its interconnection plans and specifications to the Company, and the Company shall accept or reject those plans. The Company will inspect and approve the installation prior to making the interconnection. The inspection will be conducted by the Company, and the results of the inspection will be provided to the QF. The costs of any additional Company inspection required shall be borne by the QF. The QF is also responsible for obtaining Company approval for equipment and material specifications prior to making any modifications.
(a) The review and/or acceptance by the Company of the application for interconnection or plans and specification for such interconnection submitted by a QF does not and shall not be construed (1) as confirming or endorsing the design of the QF's facilities or (2) as any warranty of safety, durability, or reliability of the facilities.
(b) The Company shall not, by reason of any review or acceptance of the plans and specifications or application for interconnection submitted by QF, be responsible for strength, details of design, adequacy, or capability of the QF's facilities; nor shall the Company's acceptance and/or review of said plans and specifications or application for interconnection be deemed an endorsement or warranty of those facilities.

The Company installs, owns, and maintains at the QF's expense all metering equipment needed to measure separately the electricity delivered to the Company. Access shall be granted by the QF to the Company's authorized representative during any reasonable hours to install, inspect, and maintain the Company's metering equipment.
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## MONTHLY RATE

## DISTRIBUTION CHARGE
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## GENERATION STATION POWER <br> SCHEDULE "SP"

## AVAILABILITY

Available to electric generation stations which are owned and/or operated by a qualified member of PJM who are unable to supply station power from other generation stations within PJM. Electric service must be supplied at one point of delivery and the Customer will be responsible for all transforming, controlling, regulating and protective equipment and its operation and maintenance.

## MONTHLY BILLING

During any PJM billing period in which the Customer's net generation output is positive, the Customer shall pay the Company the Fixed Distribution-Charge in accordance with Schodule " $G$ ". During any PJM billing poriod in which the Customer's net generation output is negative, the Customer shall pay the Company a charge based upon all non-Electric Supply Charges for Schedule "G" and any associated Schedule "G" surcharge, and a charge equivalent to the PJM charges incurred by the Company as a result of the Customer's electricity consumption grossed-up for Maryland Gross Rocoipts Tax and the-Commission assessment foe.

During any PJM billing period in which the Customer's net generation output is negative, the Customer shall pay the Company a charge based upon all Company Charges for Schedule "G" inclusive of Default Electricity Supply Service. During any PJM billing period in which the Customer's net generation output is positive:

1. Customers receiveing metered Service over 100 kilovolts shall pay the Company the Fixed Distribution Charge in accordance with Schedule " G ".
2. Customers receiving metered Service under 100 kilovolts shall pay the Company the Fixed

Distribution Charge in accordance with Schedule " $G$ " along with the Distribution Charge portion of Schedule "G" kilowatt demand ratchets during the periods that such ratches are applicable.

Net generation output is positive when the Customer generates and delivers more power to the Company's electric system than it consumes from the electric system, as measured by the revenue meters.

Net generation output is negative when the Customer consumes more power from the Company's electric system than it generates and delivers to the electric system, as measured by the revenue meters.

## ELECTRIC SERVICE AGREEMENT

Electric service hereunder shall be furnished in accordance with an Electric Service Agreement in accordance with the provisions of Schedule " $G$ ".

## LATE PAYMENT CHARGE

Applies to this schedule as set forth in Company Rule No. 12 of this tariff.

## ISSUED BY SAMUEL L. BELCHER, PRESIDENT
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THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY - MARYLAND
EDIS Phase II
Summary
EDIS In-Service Capital

| EDIS Program | 2023 |  | 2024 |  | 2025 |  | 2026 |  | 2027 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Underground Cable | \$ | 14,001,859 | \$ | 18,838,900 | \$ | 20,335,550 | \$ | 21,832,200 | \$ | 23,439,000 |
| Recloser | \$ | 1,701,700 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,128,400 | \$ | 1,128,400 | \$ | - |
| Resiliency | \$ | 2,800,000 | \$ | 2,800,000 | \$ | 2,800,000 | \$ | 2,800,000 | \$ | 2,800,000 |
| Forecasted Annual In-Service Capital | \$ | 18,503,559 | \$ | 21,638,900 | \$ | 24,263,950 | \$ | 25,760,600 | \$ | 26,239,000 |

2024 EDIS Rates ${ }^{1}$

| Rate Schedule | Underground Cable | Recloser | Resiliency |  |  | GRT \& Assess. Fee | w/GRT \& Assess. <br> Fee |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R | 0.00035 | 0.00003 | 0.00008 | \$ | - | 0.00046 | 0.00047 |
| G, C | 0.00029 | 0.00002 | 0.00007 | \$ | - | 0.00038 | 0.00039 |
| C-A, CSH | 0.00042 | 0.00003 | 0.00010 | \$ |  | 0.00055 | 0.00056 |
| PH | 0.00023 | 0.00002 | 0.00005 | \$ | - | 0.00029 | 0.00030 |
| PP | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | 0.00000 | \$ | - | 0.00000 | 0.00000 |
| St Lighting | 0.00045 | 0.00003 | 0.00010 | \$ | - | 0.00058 | 0.00059 |
| Gross Receipts Tax $=$ PSC Assessment Fee = |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 2.0 \% \\ 0.2773 \% \end{array}$ |

${ }^{1} 2024$ rates are estimates and will be updated in a November 2023 filing for rates effective January 2024
${ }^{2}$ Assumed to be zero but will be updated in a November 2023 filing for rates effective January 2024

# Exhibit SLF-3 

| EDIS Program $\quad$ Test Year ${ }^{1}$ |  | January |  | February |  | March |  | April |  | May |  | une |  | uly |  | August |  | September |  | October |  | November |  | December |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Underground Cable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Test Year \$/month (cumulative) | \$ | 426,844.50 | \$ | 853,689.00 | \$ | 1,280,533.50 | \$ | 1,707,378.00 | \$ | 2,134,222.50 | \$ | 2,561,067.00 | \$ | 2,987,911.50 | \$ | 3,414,756.00 | \$ | 3,841,600.50 | \$ | 4,268,445.00 | \$ | 4,695,289.50 | \$ | 5,122,134.00 |
| 2023 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-Service Capital FERC $36 \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{G}$ Conduit | \$ | 31,456.2 | \$ | 47,184.3 | \$ | 55,048.46 | \$ | 62,912.52 | \$ | 62,912.5 | \$ | 78,640.66 | \$ | 78,640.6 | \$ | 94,368.79 | \$ | 94,368.79 | \$ | 78,640.66 | \$ | 62,912.52 | \$ | 39,320.33 |
| In-Service Capital FERC 36 U/G Conduct, Dvc | \$ | 470,921.87 | \$ | 706,382.81 | \$ | 824,113.28 | \$ | 941,843.74 | \$ | 941,843.74 | \$ | 1,177,304.67 | \$ | 1,177,304.67 | \$ | 1,412,765.62 | \$ | 1,412,765.62 | \$ | 1,177,304.67 | \$ | 941,843.74 | \$ | 588,652.34 |
| In-Service Capital FERC 36 Line Transformers | \$ | 57,696.2 | \$ | 86,544.34 | \$ | 100,968.40 | \$ | 115,392.45 | \$ | 115,392.45 | \$ | 144,240.57 | \$ | 144,240.57 | \$ | 173,088.68 | \$ | 173,088.68 | \$ | 144,240.57 | \$ | 115,392.45 | \$ | 72,120.28 |
| In-Service Capital FERC Total (cumulative) | \$ | 560,074.36 | \$ | 1,400,185.90 | \$ | 2,380,316.04 | \$ | 3,500,464.75 | \$ | 4,620,613.46 | \$ | 6,020,799.36 | \$ | 7,420,985.26 | \$ | 9,101,208.35 | \$ | 10,781,431.44 | \$ | 12,181,617.34 | \$ | 13,301,766.05 | \$ | 14,001,859.00 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 366 | \$ | 7,482.78 | \$ | 23,210.91 | \$ | 31,074.98 | \$ | 38,939.04 | \$ | 38,939.04 | \$ | 54,667.17 | \$ | 54,667.17 | \$ | 70,395.31 | \$ | 70,395.31 | \$ | 54,667.17 | \$ | 38,939.04 | \$ | 15,346.85 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 367 | \$ | 112,022.37 | \$ | 347,483.30 | \$ | 465,213.78 | \$ | 582,944.23 | \$ | 582,944.23 | \$ | 818,405.17 | \$ | 818,405.17 | \$ | 1,053,866.12 | \$ | 1,053,866.12 | \$ | 818,405.17 | \$ | 582,944.23 | \$ | 229,752.83 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 368 | \$ | 13,724.71 | \$ | 42,572.83 | \$ | 56,996.88 | \$ | 71,420.94 | \$ | 71,420.94 | \$ | 100,269.06 | \$ | 100,269.06 | \$ | 129,117.16 | \$ | 129,117.16 | \$ | 100,269.06 | \$ | 71,420.94 | \$ | 28,148.77 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC Total |  | ,229.8 | \$ | 3,267.04 | \$ | 553,285.64 | \$ | 3,304.21 | \$ | 693,304.21 | \$ | 973,341.40 | \$ | 973,341.40 | \$ | 1,253,378.59 | \$ | 253,378.59 | \$ | 973,341.40 | \$ | 693,304.21 | \$ | 273,248.45 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital (cumulative) | \$ | ,22 | \$ | 96.9 | \$ | 99,782.54 | \$ | 3,086.75 | \$ | 66,390.96 | \$ | 959,732.36 | \$ | ,433,073.76 | \$ | 5,686,452.35 | \$ | 6,939,830.94 | \$ | 7,913,172.34 | \$ | 8,606,476.55 | \$ | 8,879,725.00 |
| 2024 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-Service Capital FERC $36 \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{G}$ Conduit |  | 42,323.05 | \$ | 63,484.57 | \$ | 74,065.34 | \$ | 84,646.09 | \$ | 84,646.09 | \$ | 105,807.63 | \$ | 105,807.63 | \$ | 126,969.15 | \$ | 126,969.15 | \$ | 105,807.63 | \$ | 84,646.09 | \$ | 52,903.82 |
| In-Service Capital FERC $36 \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{G}$ Conduct, Dvcs | \$ | 633,605.15 | \$ | 950,407.74 | \$ | 1,108,809.03 | \$ | 1,267,210.31 | \$ | 1,267,210.31 | \$ | 1,584,012.88 | \$ | 1,584,012.88 | \$ | 1,900,815.47 | \$ | 1,900,815.47 | \$ | 1,584,012.88 | \$ | 1,267,210.31 | \$ | 792,006.44 |
| In-Service Capital FERC 36 Line Transformers | \$ | 77,627.80 | \$ | 116,441.69 | \$ | 135,848.65 | \$ | 155,255.59 | \$ | 155,255.59 | \$ | 194,069.49 | \$ | 194,069.49 | \$ | 232,883.39 | \$ | 232,883.39 | \$ | 194,069.49 | \$ | 155,255.59 | \$ | 97,034.74 |
| In-Service Capital FERC Total (cumulative) | \$ | 753,556.00 | \$ | 1,883,890.00 | \$ | 3,202,613.01 | \$ | 4,709,725.00 | \$ | 6,216,836.99 | \$ | 8,100,726.99 | \$ | 9,984,616.99 | \$ | 12,245,285.00 | \$ | 14,505,953.01 | \$ | 16,389,843.01 | \$ | 17,896,955.00 | \$ | 18,838,900.00 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 366 | \$ | 18,349.57 | \$ | 39,511.09 | \$ | 50,091.85 | \$ | 60,672.61 | \$ | 60,672.61 | \$ | 81,834.14 | \$ | 81,834.14 | \$ | 102,995.67 | \$ | 102,995.67 | \$ | 81,834.14 | \$ | 60,672.62 | \$ | 28,930.33 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 367 | \$ | 274,705.65 | \$ | 591,508.23 | \$ | 749,909.53 | \$ | 908,310.79 | \$ | 908,310.80 | \$ | 1,225,113.38 | \$ | 1,225,113.38 | \$ | 1,541,915.97 | \$ | 1,541,915.97 | \$ | 1,225,113.38 | \$ | 908,310.79 | \$ | 433,106.94 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 368 | \$ | 33,656.28 | \$ | 72,470.18 | \$ | 91,877.13 | \$ | 1,284.09 | \$ | 111,284.08 | \$ | 150,097.98 | \$ | 150,097.98 | \$ | 188,911.87 | \$ | 188,911.87 | \$ | 150,097.98 | \$ | 111,284.08 | \$ | 53,063.23 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC Total |  | 326,711.50 | \$ | 703,489.50 | \$ | 891,878.51 | \$ | 0,267.49 | \$ | 1,080,267.49 | \$ | 1,457,045.50 | \$ | 1,457,045.50 | \$ | 1,833,823.51 | \$ | 1,833,823.51 | \$ | 1,457,045.50 | \$ | 1,080,267.49 | \$ | 515,100.50 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital (cumulative) |  | 326 | \$ | 1,030,201.00 | \$ | 1,922,079.51 | \$ | 2,347.00 | \$ | 2,614.49 | \$ | 5,539,659.99 | \$ | 6,996,705.49 | \$ | 8,830,529.00 | \$ | 10,664,352.51 | \$ | 12,121,398.01 | \$ | 13,201,665.50 | \$ | 13,716,766.00 |
| 2025 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-Service Capital FERC $36 \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{G}$ Conduit | \$ | 45,685.39 | \$ | 68,528.08 | \$ | 79,949.43 | \$ | 91,370.77 | \$ | 91,370.77 | \$ | 14,213.48 | \$ | 114,213.48 | \$ | 137,056 | \$ | 137,056.18 | \$ | 114,213.48 | \$ | 91,370.77 | \$ | 74 |
| In-Service Capital FERC $36 \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{G}$ Conduct, Dvcs | \$ | 683,941.70 | \$ | 1,025,912.56 | \$ | 1,196,897.98 | \$ | 1,367,883.40 | \$ | 1,367,883.40 | \$ | 1,709,854.24 | \$ | 1,709,854.24 | \$ | 2,051,825.11 | \$ | 2,051,825.11 | \$ | 1,709,854.24 | \$ | 1,367,883.40 | \$ | 854,927.13 |
| In-Service Capital FERC 36 Line Transformers | \$ | 83,794.91 | \$ | 125,692.36 | \$ | 146,641.10 | \$ | 167,589.81 | \$ | 167,589.81 | S | 209,487.28 | \$ | 209,487.28 | \$ | 251,384.73 | \$ | 251,384.73 | \$ | 209,487.28 | \$ | 167,589.81 | \$ | 104,743.63 |
| In-Service Capital FERC Total (cumulative) | \$ | 813,422.00 | \$ | 2,033,555.00 | \$ | 3,457,043.51 | \$ | 5,083,887.50 | \$ | 6,710,731.49 | \$ | 8,744,286.49 | \$ | 10,777,841.49 | \$ | 13,218,107.50 | \$ | 15,658,373.51 | \$ | 17,691,928.51 | \$ | 19,318,772.50 |  | 20,335,550.00 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 366 | \$ | 21,711.91 | \$ | 44,554.60 | \$ | 55,975.95 | \$ | 67,397.29 | \$ | 67,397.29 | \$ | 90,239.99 | \$ | 90,239.99 | \$ | 113,082.69 | \$ | 113,082.69 | \$ | 90,239.99 | \$ | 67,397.30 | \$ | 33,133.26 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 367 | \$ | 325,042.19 | \$ | 667,013.05 | \$ | 837,998.48 | \$ | 1,008,983.89 | \$ | 1,008,983.89 | \$ | 1,350,954.75 | \$ | 1,350,954.75 | \$ | 1,692,925.61 | \$ | 1,692,925.61 | \$ | 1,350,954.74 | \$ | 1,008,983.88 | \$ | 496,027.62 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 368 | \$ | 39,823.40 | \$ | 81,720.85 | \$ | 102,669.58 | \$ | 123,618.31 | \$ | 123,618.31 | \$ | 165,515.76 | \$ | 165,515.76 | \$ | 207,413.21 | \$ | 207,413.21 | + | 165,515.77 | \$ | 123,618.31 | \$ | 60,772.12 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC Total |  | 386,577.50 | \$ | 793,288.50 | \$ | 996,644.01 | \$ | 1,199,999.49 | \$ | 1,199,999.49 | \$ | 1,606,710.50 | \$ | 1,606,710.50 | \$ | 2,013,421.51 | \$ | 2,013,421.51 | \$ | 1,606,710.50 | \$ | 1,199,999.49 | \$ | 589,933.00 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital (cumulative) | \$ | 386,577.50 | \$ | 1,179,866.00 | \$ | 2,176,510.01 | \$ | 3,376,509.50 | \$ | 4,576,508.99 | \$ | 6,183,219.49 | \$ | 7,789,929.99 | \$ | 9,803,351.50 | \$ | 11,816,773.01 | \$ | 13,423,483.51 | \$ | 14,623,483.00 | \$ | 15,213,416.00 |
| $\underline{2026}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-Service Capital FERC $36 \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{G}$ Conduit | \$ | 49,047.73 | \$ | 73,571.59 | \$ | 85,833.53 | \$ | 98,095.45 | \$ | 98,095.45 | \$ | 122,619.33 | \$ | 122,619.33 | \$ | 147,143.20 | \$ | 147,143.20 | \$ | 122,619.33 | \$ | 98,095.45 | \$ | 61,309.67 |
| In-Service Capital FERC $36 \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{G}$ Conduct, Dvcs |  | 734,278.24 | \$ | 1,101,417.37 | \$ | 1,284,986.94 | \$ | 1,468,556.49 | \$ | 1,468,556.49 | \$ | 1,835,695.60 | \$ | 1,835,695.60 | \$ | 2,202,834.75 | \$ | 2,202,834.75 | \$ | 1,835,695.60 | \$ | 1,468,556.49 | \$ | 917,847.81 |
| In-Service Capital FERC 36 Line Transformers |  | 89,962.03 | \$ | 134,943.03 | \$ | 157,433.55 | \$ | 179,924.04 | \$ | 179,924.04 | \$ | 224,905.06 | \$ | 224,905.06 | \$ | 269,886.07 | \$ | 269,886.07 | 5 | 224,905.06 | \$ | 179,924.04 | \$ | 112,452.52 |
| In-Service Capital FERC Total (cumulative) | \$ | 873,288.00 | \$ | 2,183,220.00 | \$ | 3,711,474.02 | \$ | 5,458,050.00 | \$ | 7,204,625.98 | \$ | 9,387,845.98 | \$ | 11,571,065.98 | \$ | 14,190,930.00 | \$ | 16,810,794.02 | \$ | 18,994,014.02 | \$ | 20,740,590.00 | \$ | 21,832,200.00 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 366 | \$ | 25,074.25 | \$ | 49,598.11 | \$ | 61,860.05 | \$ | 74,121.98 | \$ | 74,121.97 | \$ | 98,645.84 | \$ | 98,645.84 | \$ | 123,169.71 | \$ | 123,169.71 | \$ | 98,645.85 | \$ | 74,121.98 | \$ | 37,336.18 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 367 | \$ | 375,378.74 | \$ | 742,517.87 | \$ | 926,087.44 | S | 1,109,656.98 | \$ | 1,109,656.98 | S | 1,476,796.11 | \$ | 1,476,796.11 | S | 1,843,935.25 | \$ | 1,843,935.25 | \$ | 1,476,796.11 | \$ | 1,109,656.97 | \$ | 558,948.30 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 368 | \$ | 45,990.51 | \$ | 90,971.52 | \$ | 113,462.03 | \$ | 135,952.52 | \$ | 135,952.53 | \$ | 180,933.55 | \$ | 180,933.55 | \$ | 225,914.56 | \$ | 225,914.56 | \$ | 180,933.54 | \$ | 135,952.53 | \$ | 68,481.02 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC Total |  | 446,443.50 | \$ | 883,087.50 | \$ | 1,101,409.52 | \$ | 1,319,731.48 | \$ | 1,319,731.48 | \$ | 1,756,375.50 | \$ | 1,756,375.50 | \$ | 2,193,019.52 | \$ | 2,193,019.52 | \$ | 1,756,375.50 | \$ | 1,319,731.48 | \$ | 664,765.50 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital (cumulative) |  | 446,443.50 | \$ | 1,329,531.00 | \$ | 2,430,940.52 | \$ | 3,750,672.00 | \$ | 5,070,403.48 | \$ | 6,826,778.98 | \$ | 8,583,154.48 | \$ | 10,776,174.00 | \$ | 12,969,193.52 | \$ | 14,725,569.02 | \$ | 16,045,300.50 | \$ | 16,710,066.00 |
| $\underline{2027}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-Service Capital FERC $36 \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{G}$ Conduit | \$ | 52,657.53 | \$ | 78,986.29 | \$ | 92,150.68 | \$ | 105,315.06 | \$ | 105,315.06 | \$ | 131,643.84 | \$ | 131,643.84 | \$ | 157,972.60 | \$ | 157,972.60 | \$ | 131,643.84 | \$ | 105,315.06 | \$ | 65,821.92 |
| In-Service Capital FERC $36 \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{G}$ Conduct, Dvcs | \$ | 788,319.44 | \$ | 1,182,479.18 | \$ | 1,379,559.04 | \$ | 1,576,638.89 | \$ | 1,576,638.89 | \$ | 1,970,798.60 | \$ | 1,970,798.60 | \$ | 2,364,958.35 | \$ | 2,364,958.35 | \$ | 1,970,798.60 | \$ | 1,576,638.89 | \$ | 985,399.31 |
| In-Service Capital FERC 36 Line Transformers | \$ | 96,583.03 | \$ | 144,874.53 | \$ | 169,020.29 | \$ | 193,166.04 | \$ | 193,166.04 | \$ | 241,457.56 | \$ | 241,457.56 | \$ | 289,749.07 | \$ | 289,749.07 | \$ | 241,457.56 | \$ | 193,166.04 | \$ | 120,728.77 |
| In-Service Capital FERC Total (cumulative) | \$ | 937,560.00 | \$ | 2,343,900.00 | \$ | 3,984,630.02 | \$ | 5,859,750.00 | \$ | 7,734,869.98 | \$ | 10,078,769.98 | \$ | 12,422,669.98 | \$ | 15,235,350.00 | \$ | 18,048,030.02 | \$ | 20,391,930.02 | \$ | 22,267,050.00 | \$ | 23,439,000.00 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 366 | \$ | 28,684.05 | \$ | 55,012.81 | \$ | 68,177.20 | \$ | 81,341.58 | \$ | 81,341.58 | S | 107,670.34 | \$ | 107,670.35 | \$ | 133,999.11 | \$ | 133,999.11 | \$ | 107,670.35 | \$ | 81,341.58 | \$ | 41,848.43 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 367 | \$ | 429,419.94 | \$ | 823,579.67 | \$ | 1,020,659.54 | \$ | 1,217,739.38 | \$ | 1,217,739.38 | \$ | 1,611,899.11 | \$ | 1,611,899.11 | \$ | 2,006,058.85 | \$ | 2,006,058.85 | \$ | 1,611,899.11 | \$ | 1,217,739.37 | \$ | 626,499.80 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 368 | \$ | 52,611.51 | \$ | 100,903.02 | \$ | 125,048.78 | \$ | 149,194.52 | \$ | 149,194.52 | S | 197,486.05 | \$ | 197,486.04 | \$ | 245,777.56 | \$ | 245,777.56 | \$ | 197,486.04 | \$ | 149,194.53 | \$ | 76,757.27 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC Total | \$ | 510,715.50 | \$ | 979,495.50 | \$ | 1,213,885.52 | \$ | 1,448,275.48 | \$ | 1,448,275.48 | \$ | 1,917,055.50 | \$ | 1,917,055.50 | \$ | 2,385,835.52 | \$ | 2,385,835.52 | \$ | 1,917,055.50 | \$ | 1,448,275.48 | \$ | 745,105.50 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital (cumulative) |  | 510,715.50 | \$ | 1,490,211.00 | \$ | 2,704,096.52 | \$ | 4,152,372.00 | \$ | 5,600,647.48 | \$ | 7,517,702.98 | \$ | 9,434,758.48 | \$ | 11,820,594.00 | \$ | 14,206,429.52 | \$ | 16,123,485.02 | \$ | 17,571,760.50 | \$ | 18,316,866.00 |

## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY - MARYLAND

EDIS In-Service Capital
Forecasted 2023-2027


# Exhibit SLF-3 

## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY - MARYLAND

EDIS In-Service Capital
Forecasted 2023-2027

| EDIS Program $\quad$ Test Year ${ }^{1}$ |  | January |  | February |  | March |  | April |  |  | May |  |  | June |  | July |  | August |  | September |  | October |  | November |  | December |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Resiliency formerly Distribution Automation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Test Year \$/month (cumulative) | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 2023 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-Service Capital FERC 36 Station Equipment | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | 555.69 | \$ | 370.46 | \$ | 370.46 | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | - |
| In-Service Capital FERC 36 Pole, Tower, Fixture | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 116,988.83 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | - |
| In-Service Capital FERC $360 / \mathrm{H}$ Conduct, Dvcs | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | 662,961.28 | \$ | 441,974.19 | \$ | 441,974.19 | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | - |
| In-Service Capital FERC $36 \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{G}$ Conduit | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | 333.27 | \$ | 222.18 | \$ | 222.18 | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | - |
| In-Service Capital FERC $36 \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{G}$ Conduct, Dvcs | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | 1,740.78 | \$ | 1,160.52 | \$ | 1,160.52 | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | - |
| In-Service Capital FERC 36 Line Transformers | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | 56,658.81 | \$ | 37,772.54 | \$ | 37,772.54 | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | - |
| In-Service Capital FERC 36 Services | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 761.34 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | - |
| In-Service Capital Ferc 39 Comm Equipment | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| In-Service Capital (cumulative) | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 280,000.00 | \$ | 560,000.00 | \$ | 1,400,000.00 | \$ | 1,960,000.00 | \$ | 2,520,000.00 | \$ | 2,800,000.00 | \$ | 2,800,000.00 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 362 | \$ | - | \$ | , | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | 555.69 | \$ | 370.46 | \$ | 370.46 | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | $-$ |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 364 | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 116,988.83 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ |  |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 365 | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | 662,961.28 | \$ | 441,974.19 | \$ | 441,974.19 | \$ | 220,987.09 | S | - |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 366 | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | 333.27 | \$ | 222.18 | \$ | 222.18 | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | - |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 367 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | 1,740.78 | \$ | 1,160.52 | \$ | 1,160.52 | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | - |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 368 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | 56,658.81 | \$ | 37,772.54 | \$ | 37,772.54 | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | - |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 369 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 761.34 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | - |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 397 | \$ | - | \$ | . | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC Total | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 280,000.00 | \$ | 280,000.00 | \$ | 840,000.00 | 5 | 560,000.00 | \$ | 560,000.00 | \$ | 280,000.00 | \$ | - |
| Incremental In-Service Capital (cumulative) | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 280,000.00 | \$ | 560,000.00 | \$ | 1,400,000.00 | \$ | 1,960,000.00 | \$ | 2,520,000.00 | \$ | 2,800,000.00 | \$ | 2,800,000.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-Service Capital FERC 36 Station Equipment | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | 555.69 | \$ | 370.46 | \$ | 370.46 | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | - |
| In-Service Capital FERC 36 Pole, Tower, Fixture | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 116,988.83 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | - |
| In-Service Capital FERC $36 \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{H}$ Conduct, Dvcs | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | 662,961.28 | \$ | 441,974.19 | \$ | 441,974.19 | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | - |
| In-Service Capital FERC $36 \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{G}$ Conduit | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | 333.27 | \$ | 222.18 | \$ | 222.18 | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | - |
| In-Service Capital FERC $36 \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{G}$ Conduct, Dvcs | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | 1,740.78 | \$ | 1,160.52 | \$ | 1,160.52 | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | - |
| In-Service Capital FERC 36 Line Transformers | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | 56,658.81 | \$ | 37,772.54 | \$ | 37,772.54 | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | - |
| In-Service Capital FERC 36 Services | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 761.34 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | - |
| In-Service Capital Ferc 39 Comm Equipment | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| In-Service Capital (cumulative) | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | . | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 280,000.00 | \$ | 560,000.00 | 5 | 1,400,000.00 | \$ | 1,960,000.00 | \$ | 2,520,000.00 | \$ | 2,800,000.00 | \$ | 2,800,000.00 |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 362 | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | 555.69 | \$ | 370.46 | \$ | 370.46 | \$ | 185.23 | \$ |  |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 364 | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 116,988.83 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | - |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 365 | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | 662,961.28 | \$ | 441,974.19 | \$ | 441,974.19 | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | - |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 366 | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | 333.27 | \$ | 222.18 | \$ | 222.18 | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | - |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 367 | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | S |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | 1,740.78 | \$ | 1,160.52 | \$ | 1,160.52 | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | - |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 368 | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | 56,658.81 | \$ | 37,772.54 | \$ | 37,772.54 | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | - |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 369 | \$ | - | \$ |  | 5 |  | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 761.34 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 507.56 | 5 | 253.78 | \$ | - |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 397 | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Incremental In-Service Capital FERC Total | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 280,000.00 | \$ | 280,000.00 | \$ | 840,000.00 | \$ | 560,000.00 | \$ | 560,000.00 | \$ | 280,000.00 | \$ | - |
| Incremental In-Service Capital (cumulative) | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | - | \$ |  | - | \$ | 280,000.00 | \$ | 560,000.00 | \$ | 1,400,000.00 | \$ | 1,960,000.00 | \$ | 2,520,000.00 | \$ | 2,800,000.00 | \$ | 2,800,000.00 |

# Exhibit SLF-3 

## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY - MARYLAND

EDIS In-Service Capital
Forecasted 2023-2027
$\frac{2025}{\mathrm{In}-\mathrm{S}}$
In-Service Capital FERC 36 Station Equipment In-Service Capital FERC $3 \in$ Pole, Tower, Fixture In-Service Capital FERC $360 / \mathrm{H}$ Conduct, Dvcs In-Service Capital FERC $36 \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{G}$ Conduit In-Service Capital FERC 36 U/G Conduct, Dvcs In-Service Capital FERC 36 Services
Invice Capital FERC 39 Comm Equipment in-service Capital (cumulative) Incer In Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 365 Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 366 Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 367 Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 368 Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 369 Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 397 Incremental In-Service Capital FERC Total Incremental In-Service Capital (cumulative) 2026

In-Service Capital FERC 36 Station Equipment In-Service Capital FERC 36 Pole, Tower, Fixture In-Service Capital FERC $360 / \mathrm{H}$ Conduct, Dv In-Service Capital FERC $3 \in \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{G}$ Conduit In-Service Capital FERC $36 \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{G}$ Conduct, Dvcs In-Service Capital FERC 36 Line Transformers In-Service Capital FERC 36 Services In-Service Capital FERC 39 Comm Equipment In-Service Capital (cumulative)
Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 362 Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 364 Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 365 Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 366 Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 367 Incremental In-Service Capital FERC 368 incremental in-Service Capital ERC 369 crement inserve Capital ERC 3 ) Incremental In-Service Capital ( cumulativ)

In-Service Capital FERC 36 Station Equipment

| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | 555.69 | \$ | 370.46 | \$ | 370.46 | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 116,988.83 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | 662,961.28 | \$ | 441,974.19 | \$ | 441,974.19 | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | 333.27 | \$ | 222.18 | \$ | 222.18 | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | 1,740.78 | \$ | 1,160.52 | \$ | 1,160.52 | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | 56,658.81 | \$ | 37,772.54 | \$ | 37,772.54 | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 761.34 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 280,000.00 | \$ | 560,000.00 | \$ | 1,400,000.00 | \$ | 1,960,000.00 | \$ | 2,520,000.00 | \$ | 2,800,000.00 | \$ | 2,800,000.00 |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | 555.69 | \$ | 370.46 | \$ | 370.46 | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 116,988.83 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | 662,961.28 | \$ | 441,974.19 | \$ | 441,974.19 | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | 333.27 | \$ | 222.18 | \$ | 222.18 | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | 1,740.78 | \$ | 1,160.52 | \$ | 1,160.52 | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | 56,658.81 | \$ | 37,772.54 | \$ | 37,772.54 | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 761.34 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 280,000.00 | \$ | 280,000.00 | \$ | 840,000.00 | \$ | 560,000.00 | \$ | 560,000.00 | \$ | 280,000.00 | \$ |  |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 280,000.00 | \$ | 560,000.00 | \$ | 1,400,000.00 | \$ | 1,960,000.00 | \$ | 2,520,000.00 | \$ | 2,800,000.00 | \$ | 2,800,000.00 |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | 555.69 | \$ | 370.46 | \$ | 370.46 | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 116,988.83 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | 662,961.28 | \$ | 441,974.19 | \$ | 441,974.19 | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | 333.27 | \$ | 222.18 | \$ | 222.18 | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | 1,740.78 | \$ | 1,160.52 | \$ | 1,160.52 | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | 56,658.81 | \$ | 37,772.54 | \$ | 37,772.54 | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 761.34 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 280,000.00 | \$ | 560,000.00 | \$ | 1,400,000.00 | \$ | 1,960,000.00 | \$ | 2,520,000.00 | \$ | 2,800,000.00 | \$ | 2,800,000.00 |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | 555.69 | \$ | 370.46 | \$ | 370.46 | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 116,988.83 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | 662,961.28 | \$ | 441,974.19 | \$ | 441,974.19 | \$ | 220,987.09 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | 333.27 | \$ | 222.18 | \$ | 222.18 | \$ | 111.09 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | 1,740.78 | \$ | 1,160.52 | \$ | 1,160.52 | \$ | 580.26 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | 56,658.81 | \$ | 37,772.54 | \$ | 37,772.54 | \$ | 18,886.27 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 761.34 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 280,000.00 | \$ | 280,000.00 | \$ | 840,000.00 | \$ | 560,000.00 | \$ | 560,000.00 | \$ | 280,000.00 | \$ |  |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 280,000.00 | \$ | 560,000.00 | \$ | 1,400,000.00 | \$ | 1,960,000.00 | \$ | 2,520,000.00 | \$ | 2,800,000.00 | \$ | 2,800,000.00 |
| \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | 555.69 | \$ | 370.46 | \$ | 370.46 | \$ | 185.23 | \$ | - |

Exhibit SLF-3

Reg Depreciation $\quad 1.43 \% \quad$ FERC Account 366 (Annual Rate) ${ }^{1}$ effective November 1,2021
$\begin{array}{lrll}\text { Reg Depreciation } & \text { 1.43\% } & \text { FERC Account } 366 \text { (Annual Rate) effective November 1, 2021 } \\ \text { Reg Dopreciation } & 1.62 \% & \begin{array}{l}\text { FERC Account } 366 \text { (Annual Rate) proposed to be effective November 1, 2023 } \\ \text { Tax Life }\end{array} & 20\end{array}$
Tax Life ${ }_{20}$ Years


| $\begin{array}{c}\text { In-Service } \\ \text { Capital Month } \\ \text { Ending }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Regulatory Book } \\ \text { Depreciation }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Regulatory } \\ \text { Depreciation } \\ \text { Reserve }\end{array}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $[$ Net Plant |  |  |  |  |$]$



|  |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | 4.46 | \$ | 4.46 | \$ | 7,478.32 | \$ | 21) | s | 7,473.11 | \$ | 4.46 |  | 5.59 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Feb-23 | \$ | 23,210.91 | \$ | 30,693.69 | \$ | 22.75 | \$ | 27.21 | \$ | 30,666.48 | s | (27.16) | \$ | 30,639.32 | \$ | 22.75 | \$ | 232.00 | \$ | 254.75 |
|  | Mar-23 | \$ | 31,074.98 | \$ | 61,768.67 | \$ | 55.09 | \$ | 82.30 | \$ | 61,686.37 | \$ | (72.27) | \$ | 61,614.10 | \$ | 55.09 | \$ | 466.53 | \$ | 521.62 |
|  | Apr-23 | \$ | 38,939.04 | s | 100,707.71 | \$ | 96.81 | \$ | 179.11 | \$ | 100,528.60 | \$ | (150.55) | \$ | 100,378.05 | \$ | 96.81 | \$ | 760.04 | \$ | 856.85 |
|  | May-23 | \$ | 38,939.04 | \$ | 139,646.75 | \$ | 143.21 | \$ | 322.32 | \$ | 139,324.43 | \$ | (266.29) | \$ | 139,058.14 | \$ | 143.21 | \$ | 1,052.92 | \$ | 1,196.13 |
|  | Jun-23 | \$ | 54,667.17 | \$ | 194,313.92 | \$ | 198.98 | \$ | 521.30 | \$ | 193,792.62 | \$ | (447.27) | \$ | 193,345.35 | \$ | 198.98 | \$ | 1,463.98 | \$ | 1,662.96 |
|  | Jul-23 | \$ | 54,667.17 | \$ | 248,981.09 | \$ | 264.13 | \$ | 785.43 | \$ | 248,195.66 | \$ | (704.34) | \$ | 247,491.32 | \$ | 264.13 | \$ | 1,873.96 | \$ | 2,138.09 |
|  | Aug-23 | \$ | 70,395.31 | \$ | 319,376.40 | \$ | 338.65 | \$ | 1,124.08 | \$ | 318,252.32 | \$ | $(1,086.19)$ | \$ | 317,166.13 | \$ | 338.65 | \$ | 2,401.52 | \$ | 2,740.17 |
|  | Sep-23 | \$ | 70,395.31 | \$ | 389,771.71 | \$ | 422.53 | \$ | 1,546.61 | \$ | 388,225.10 | \$ | $(1,626.56)$ | \$ | 386,598.54 | \$ | 422.53 |  | 2,927.25 | s | 3,349.78 |
|  | Oct-23 | \$ | 54,667.17 | \$ | 444,438.88 | \$ | 497.05 | \$ | 2,043.66 | \$ | 442,395.22 | \$ | $(2,334.46)$ | \$ | 440,060.76 | \$ | 497.05 | \$ | 3,332.06 | \$ | 3,829.11 |
|  | Nov-23 | \$ | 38,939.04 | \$ | 483,377.92 | \$ | 626.28 | \$ | 2,669.94 | \$ | 480,707.98 | \$ | $(3,207.71)$ | \$ | 477,500.27 | \$ | 626.28 | \$ | 3,858.12 | \$ | 4,484.40 |
|  | Dec-23 | \$ | 15,346.85 | 5 | 498,724.77 | \$ | 662.92 | \$ | 3,332.86 | \$ | 495,391.91 | \$ | $(4,229.24)$ | \$ | 491,162.67 | \$ | 662.92 | \$ | 3,968.51 | \$ | 4,631.43 |
| 2024 | Jan-24 | \$ | 18,349.57 | 5 | 517,074.34 | \$ | 685.66 | \$ | 4,018.52 | \$ | 513,055.82 | \$ | $(4,881.94)$ | \$ | 508,173.88 | \$ | 685.66 | \$ | 4,105.96 | \$ | 4,791.62 |
|  | Feb-24 | \$ | 39,511.09 | \$ | 556,585.43 | \$ | 724.72 | \$ | 4,743.24 | \$ | 551,842.19 | \$ | (5,560.95) | \$ | 546,281.24 | \$ | 724.72 | \$ | 4,413.86 | \$ | 5,138.58 |
|  | Mar-24 | \$ | 50,091.85 | \$ | 606,677.28 | \$ | 785.20 | \$ | 5,528.44 | \$ | 601,148.84 | \$ | $(6,275.01)$ | \$ | 594,873.83 | \$ | 785.20 |  | 4,806.48 | \$ | 5,591.68 |
|  | Apr-24 | \$ | 60,672.61 | \$ | 667,349.89 | \$ | 859.97 | \$ | 6,388.41 | \$ | 660,961.48 | \$ | (7,038.06) | \$ | 653,923.42 | \$ | 859.97 |  | 5,283.59 | \$ | 6,143.56 |
|  | May-24 | \$ | 60,672.61 | \$ | 728,022.50 | \$ | 941.88 | \$ | 7,330.29 | \$ | 720,692.21 | \$ | (7,856.83) | \$ | 712,835.38 | \$ | 941.88 | S | 5,759.58 | \$ | 6,701.46 |
|  | Jun-24 | \$ | 81,834.14 | \$ | 809,856.64 | \$ | 1,038.07 | \$ | 8,368.36 | \$ | 801,488.28 | \$ | (8,769.77) | \$ | 792,718.51 | \$ | 1,038.07 | \$ | 6,405.03 | \$ | 7,443.10 |
|  | Jul-24 | \$ | 81,834.14 | s | 891,690.78 | \$ | 1,148.54 | \$ | 9,516.90 | \$ | 882,173.88 | \$ | (9,793.05) | \$ | 872,380.83 | \$ | 1,148.54 | \$ | 7,048.68 | s | 8,197.22 |
|  | Aug-24 | \$ | 102,995.67 | \$ | 994,686.45 | \$ | 1,273.30 | \$ | 10,790.20 | \$ | 983,896.25 | \$ | (10,994.56) | \$ | 972,901.69 | \$ | 1,273.30 | \$ | 7,860.88 | \$ | 9,134.18 |
|  | Sep-24 | \$ | 102,995.67 | 5 | 1,097,682.12 | \$ | 1,412.35 | \$ | 12,202.55 | \$ | 1,085,479.57 | \$ | (12,423.51) | \$ | 1,073,056.06 | \$ | 1,412.35 | \$ | 8,670.10 | \$ | 10,082.45 |
|  | Oct-24 | \$ | 81,834.14 | \$ | 1,179,516.26 | \$ | 1,537.11 | \$ | 13,739.66 | \$ | 1,165,776.60 | \$ | $(14,099.62)$ | \$ | 1,151,676.98 | \$ | 1,537.11 | \$ | 9,305.3 | \$ | 10,842.46 |
|  | Nov-24 | \$ | 60,672.62 |  | 1,240,188.88 | \$ | 1,633.30 | \$ | 15,372.96 | \$ | 1,224,815.92 | \$ | $(16,062.30)$ | \$ | 1,208,753.6 | \$ | 1,633.30 | \$ | 9,766.5 | \$ | 11,399.82 |
|  | Dec-24 | \$ | 28,930.33 | 5 | 1,269,119.21 | 5 | 1,693.78 | \$ | 17,066.74 | s | 1,252,052.47 | 5 | $(18,306.87)$ | 5 | 1,233,745.60 | \$ | 1,693.78 | \$ | 9,968.45 | 5 | 11,662.23 |
| 25 | Jan-25 | \$ | 21,711.91 | 5 | 1,290,831.12 | \$ | 1,727.97 | \$ | 18,794.71 | \$ | 1,272,036.41 | \$ | (19,888.97) | \$ | 1,252,147.4 | \$ | 1,727.97 | \$ | 10,117.13 | \$ | 11,845.10 |
|  | Feb-25 | \$ | 44,554.60 | \$ | 1,335,385.72 | \$ | 1,772.70 | \$ | 20,567.41 | \$ | 1,314,818.31 | \$ | (21,500.56) | \$ | 1,293,317.7 | \$ | 1,772.70 | \$ | 10,499.7 | \$ | 12,222.48 |
|  | Mar-25 | \$ | 55,975.95 | \$ | 1,391,361.67 | \$ | 1,840.55 | \$ | 22,407.96 | \$ | 1,368,993.71 | \$ | (23,151.24) | \$ | 1,345,802.47 | \$ | 1,840.55 | \$ | 10,873.85 | \$ | 12,714.40 |
|  | Apr-25 | \$ | 67,397.29 | \$ | 1,458,758.96 | \$ | 1,923.83 | \$ | 24,331.79 | \$ | 1,434,427.17 | \$ | $(24,856.28)$ | \$ | 1,409,570.89 | \$ | 1,923.83 | \$ | 11,389.09 | \$ | 13,312.92 |
|  | May-25 | \$ | 67,397.29 | 5 | 1,526,156.25 | \$ | 2,014.82 | \$ | 26,346.61 | \$ | 1,499,809.64 | \$ | (26,623.21) | \$ | 1,473,186.43 | \$ | 2,014.82 | \$ | 11,903.09 | \$ | 13,917.91 |
|  | Jun-25 | \$ | 90,239.99 | s | 1,616,396.24 | \$ | 2,121.22 | \$ | 28,467.83 | \$ | 1,587,928.41 | \$ | $(28,493.89)$ | \$ | 1,559,434.52 | \$ | 2,121.22 | \$ | 12,599.96 | \$ | 14,721.18 |
|  | Jul-25 | \$ | 90,239.99 | s | 1,706,636.23 | \$ | 2,243.05 | \$ | 30,710.88 | \$ | 1,675,925.35 | \$ | $(30,486.25)$ | \$ | 1,645,439.10 | \$ | 2,243.05 | \$ | 13,294.86 | \$ | 15,537.91 |
|  | Aug-25 | \$ | 113,082.69 | \$ | 1,819,718.92 | \$ | 2,380.29 | \$ | 33,091.17 | \$ | 1,786,627.75 | \$ | (32,674.22) | \$ | 1,753,953.53 | \$ | 2,380.29 | \$ | 14,171.64 | \$ | 16,551.93 |
|  | Sep-25 | \$ | 113,082.69 | \$ | 1,932,801.61 | \$ | 2,532.95 | \$ | 35,624.12 | \$ | 1,897,177.49 | \$ | (35,111.91) | \$ | 1,862,065.58 | \$ | 2,532.95 | \$ | 15,045.16 |  | 17,578.11 |
|  | Oct-25 | \$ | 90,239.99 | \$ | 2,023,041.60 | \$ | 2,670.19 | \$ | 38,294.31 | \$ | 1,984,747.29 | \$ | (37,822.23) | \$ | 1,946,925.06 | \$ | 2,670.19 | \$ | 15,730.81 | \$ | 18,401.00 |
|  | Nov-25 | \$ | 67,397.30 | \$ | 2,090,438.90 | \$ | 2,776.60 | \$ | 41,070.91 | \$ | 2,049,367.99 | \$ | $(40,851.01)$ | \$ | 2,008,516.98 | \$ | 2,776.60 | \$ | 16,228.46 | \$ | 19,005.06 |
|  | Dec-25 | \$ | 33,133.26 | \$ | 2,123,572.16 | \$ | 2,844.46 | \$ | 43,915.37 | \$ | 2,079,656.79 | S | (44,203.02) | S | 2,035,453.77 | \$ | 2,844.46 | \$ | 16,446.11 | 5 | 19,290.57 |
| 26 | Jan-26 | \$ | 25,074.25 | \$ | 2,148,46.41 | \$ | 2,883.75 | \$ | 46,799.12 | \$ | 2,101,847.29 | \$ | (46,731.51) | \$ | 2,055,115.78 | \$ | 2,883.75 | \$ | 16,604.98 | \$ | 19,488.73 |
|  | Feb-26 | \$ | 49,598.11 | 5 | 2,198,244.52 | \$ | 2,934.15 | \$ | 49,733.27 | \$ | 2,148,511.25 | \$ | (49,292.65) | \$ | 2,099,218.60 | \$ | 2,934.15 | \$ | 16,961.32 |  | 19,895.47 |
|  | Mar-26 | \$ | 61,860.05 | 5 | 2,260,104.57 | \$ | 3,009.39 | \$ | 52,742.66 | \$ | 2,207,361.91 | \$ | (51,896.93) | \$ | 2,155,464.98 | \$ | 3,009.39 | \$ | 17,415.78 | \$ | 20,425.17 |
|  | Apr-26 | \$ | 74,121.98 | 5 | 2,334,226.55 | \$ | 3,101.17 | \$ | 55,843.83 | \$ | 2,278,382.72 | \$ | $(54,560.93)$ | \$ | 2,223,821.79 | \$ | 3,101.17 | \$ | 17,968.09 | \$ | 21,069.26 |
|  | May-26 | \$ | 74,121.97 | \$ | 2,408,348.52 | \$ | 3,201.24 | \$ | 59,045.07 | \$ | 2,349,30,45 | \$ | $(57,293.01)$ | \$ | 2,292,010.44 | \$ | 3,201.24 | \$ | 18,519.04 | \$ | 21,720.28 |
|  | Jun-26 | \$ | 98,645.84 | 5 | 2,506,994.36 | \$ | 3,317.86 | \$ | 62,362.93 | \$ | 2,444,631.43 | \$ | (60,138.42) | \$ | 2,384,493.01 | \$ | 3,317.86 | \$ | 19,266.29 | \$ | 22,584.15 |
|  | Jul-26 | \$ | 98,645.84 | \$ | 2,605,640.20 | \$ | 3,451.03 | \$ | 65,813.96 | \$ | 2,539,826.24 | \$ | $(63,116.84)$ | \$ | 2,476,709.40 | \$ | 3,451.03 | \$ | 20,011.38 | \$ | 23,462.41 |
|  | Aug-26 | \$ | 123,169.71 | \$ | 2,728,809.91 | \$ | 3,600.75 | \$ | 69,414.71 | \$ | 2,659,395.20 | \$ | $(66,308.26)$ | \$ | 2,593,086.94 | \$ | 3,600.75 | \$ | 20,951.69 | \$ | 24,552.44 |
|  | Sep-26 | \$ | 123,169.71 | 5 | 2,851,979.62 | \$ | 3,767.03 | \$ | 73,181.74 | \$ | 2,778,797.88 | \$ | (69,771.67) | \$ | 2,709,026.21 | \$ | 3,767.03 | \$ | 21,888.46 | \$ | 25,655.49 |
|  | Oct-26 | \$ | 98,645.85 | \$ | 2,950,625.47 | \$ | 3,916.76 | \$ | 77,098.50 | \$ | 2,873,526.97 | \$ | $(73,533.19)$ | \$ | 2,799,993.78 | \$ | 3,916.76 | \$ | 22,623.46 | s | 26,540.22 |
|  | Nov-26 | \$ | 74,121.98 |  | 3,024,747.45 | \$ | 4,033.38 | \$ | 81,131.88 | \$ | 2,943,615.57 | \$ | (77,645.05) | \$ | 2,865,970.52 | \$ | 4,033.38 | \$ | 23,156.54 |  | 27,189.92 |
|  | Dec-26 | \$ | 37,336.18 | + | 3,062,083.63 | \$ | 4,108.61 | \$ | 85,240.49 | \$ | 2,976,843.14 | S | (82,121.49) | S | 2,894,721.65 | \$ | 4,108.61 | \$ | 23,388.84 | \$ | 27,497.45 |
| 2027 | Jan-27 | \$ | 28,684.05 | 5 | 3,090,767.68 | \$ | 4,153.17 | \$ | 89,393.66 | \$ | 3,001,374.02 | \$ | (85,609.80) | \$ | 2,915,764.22 | \$ | 4,153.17 | \$ | 23,558.86 | \$ | 27,712.03 |
|  | Feb-27 | \$ | 55,012.81 | \$ | 3,145,780.49 | \$ | 4,209.67 | \$ | 93,603.33 | \$ | 3,052,177.16 | \$ | (89,134.16) | \$ | 2,963,043.00 | \$ | 4,209.67 | \$ | 23,940.87 |  | 28,150.54 |
|  | Mar-27 | \$ | 68,177.20 | \$ | 3,213,957.69 | \$ | 4,292.82 | \$ | 97,896.15 | \$ | 3,116,061.54 | \$ | (92,705.99) | \$ | 3,023,355.55 | \$ | 4,292.82 | \$ | 24,428.18 | \$ | 28,721.00 |
|  | Apr-27 | \$ | 81,341.58 | 5 | 3,295,299.27 | \$ | 4,393.75 | \$ | 102,289.90 | \$ | 3,193,009.37 | \$ | (96,343.31) | \$ | 3,096,666.06 | \$ | 4,393.75 | \$ | 25,020.52 | \$ | 29,414.27 |
|  | May-27 | \$ | 81,341.58 | \$ | 3,376,640.85 | \$ | 4,503.56 | \$ | 106,793.46 | \$ | 3,269,847.39 | \$ | $(100,055.34)$ | \$ | 3,169,792.05 | \$ | 4,503.56 | \$ | 25,611.36 | \$ | 30,114.92 |
|  | Jun-27 | \$ | 107,670.34 | 5 | 3,484,311.19 | \$ | 4,631.14 | \$ | 111,424.60 | \$ | 3,372,886.59 | \$ | $(103,890.99)$ | \$ | 3,268,995.60 | \$ | 4,631.14 | \$ | 26,412.91 | \$ | 31,044.05 |
|  | Jul-27 | \$ | 107,670.35 | \$ | 3,591,981.54 | \$ | 4,776.50 | \$ | 116,201.10 | \$ | 3,475,780.44 | \$ | (107,871.81) | \$ | 3,367,908.63 | \$ | 4,776.50 | \$ | 27,212.11 | \$ | 31,988.61 |
|  | Aug-27 | \$ | 133,999.11 | \$ | 3,725,980.65 | \$ | 4,939.62 | \$ | 121,140.72 | \$ | 3,604,839.93 | \$ | $(112,084.29)$ | \$ | 3,492,755.64 | \$ | 4,939.62 | \$ | 28,220.85 | \$ | 33,160.47 |
|  | Sep-27 | \$ | 133,999.11 | \$ | 3,859,979.76 | \$ | 5,120.52 | \$ | 126,261.24 | \$ | 3,733,718.52 | \$ | $(116,592.68)$ | \$ | 3,617,125.84 | \$ | 5,120.52 | \$ | 29,225.74 | \$ | 34,346.26 |
|  | Oct-27 | \$ | 107,670.35 | \$ | 3,967,650.11 | \$ | 5,283.65 | \$ | 131,544.89 | \$ | 3,836,105.22 | \$ | (121,426.53) | \$ | 3,714,678.69 | \$ | 5,283.65 | \$ | 30,013.95 | \$ | 35,297.60 |
|  | Nov-27 | \$ | 81,341.58 | \$ | 4,048,991.69 | \$ | 5,411.23 | \$ | 136,956.12 | \$ | 3,912,035.57 | \$ | $(126,644.96)$ | \$ | 3,785,390.61 | \$ | 5,411.23 | \$ | 30,585.29 | \$ | 35,996.52 |
|  | Dec-27 |  | 41,848.43 | 5 | 4,090,840.12 |  | 5,494.39 |  | 142,450.51 |  | 3,948,389.61 |  | (132, 272.34) | 5 | 3,816,117.27 |  | 5,494.39 | s | 30,833.5 |  | 36,32 |


${ }^{1}$ per MD PSC Order No. 89971 dated October 26, 2021 in Case No. 9490 reaffirming Public Utility Law Judge Proposed Order dated May 26, 2021

Exhibit SLF-3

| Reg Depreciation | 2.69\% | FERC Account 367 (Annual Rate) ${ }^{\text {e }}$ effective November 1, 2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reg Depreciation | 3.23\% | FERC Account 367 (Annual Rate) proposed to be effective November 1, 2023 |
| Tax Life | 20 | Years |


| Year | Month | Incremental <br> In-Service <br> Capital | $\begin{gathered} \text { In-Service } \\ \text { Capital Month } \\ \text { Ending } \end{gathered}$ | Regulatory Book | Regulatory Depreciation Reserve | Net Plant | Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [a] | ${ }^{\text {[b] }}$ | [c] | [d] | [e] | [f] | $[g]=[d]-(f)$ | [ $n$ ] |



|  | Jan-23 | \$ | 112,022.37 | \$ | 112,022.37 | \$ | 125.56 | \$ | 125.56 | \$ | 111,896.81 | \$ | (61.78) | s | 111,835.03 | \$ | 125.56 | \$ | 846.79 | \$ | 972.35 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Feb-23 | \$ | 347,483.30 | \$ | 459,505. | \$ | 640.59 | \$ | 766.15 | \$ | 458,739.52 | \$ | 307.81) | \$ | 458,431.71 | \$ | 640.59 | \$ | 7. 16 | \$ | 5 |
|  | Mar-23 | \$ | 465,213.78 | \$ | 924,719.45 | \$ | 1,551.49 | \$ | 2,317.64 | \$ | 922,401.81 | \$ | (783.24) | \$ | 921,618.57 | \$ | 1,551.49 | \$ | 6,978.33 | \$ | 8,529.82 |
|  | Apr-23 | \$ | 52,944.23 | \$ | 1,507,63..68 | \$ | 2,726.30 | \$ | 5,043.94 | \$ | 1,502,619.74 | \$ | (1,603.77) | \$ | 1,501,0015.97 | \$ | 2,726.30 | \$ | 11,365.42 | \$ | 14,091.72 |
|  | May-23 | \$ | 582,944.23 | \$ | 2,090,607.91 | \$ | 4,033.06 | \$ | 9,077.00 | \$ | 2,081,530.91 | \$ | $(2,816.64)$ | \$ | 2,078,714.27 | \$ | 4,033.06 | \$ | 15,739.65 | \$ | 19,772.71 |
|  | Jun-23 | \$ | 818,405.17 | \$ | 2,909,013.08 | \$ | 5,603.74 | \$ | 14,680.74 | \$ | 2,894,332.34 | \$ | $(4,803.75)$ | \$ | 2,889,588.59 | \$ | 5,603.74 | \$ | 21,878.98 | \$ | 27,482.72 |
|  | Jul-23 | \$ | 818,405.17 | \$ | 3,727,418.25 |  | 7,438.33 | \$ | 22,119.07 | \$ | 3,705,299.18 | \$ | $(7,693.56)$ | \$ | 3,697,605.62 | \$ | 7,438.33 | \$ | 27,997.60 | \$ | 35,435.93 |
|  | Aug-23 | \$ | 1,053,866.12 | \$ | 4,781,284.37 | \$ | 9,536.84 | \$ | 31,655.91 | \$ | 4,749,628.46 | \$ | $(12,180.89)$ | \$ | 4,737,447.57 | \$ | 9,536.84 |  | 35,871.09 | \$ | 45,407.93 |
|  | Sep-23 | \$ | 1,053,866.12 | \$ | 5,835,150.49 |  | 11,899.25 | \$ | 43,555.16 | \$ | 5,791,595.33 | \$ | (18,736.87) | \$ | 5,772,858.46 | \$ | 11,899.25 | \$ | 43,711.03 | \$ | 55,610.28 |
|  | Oct-23 | \$ | 818,405.17 | \$ | 6,653,555.66 | \$ | 13,997.76 | \$ | 57,552.92 | \$ | 6,596,002.74 | \$ | $(27,530.45)$ | \$ | 6,568,472.29 | \$ | 13,997.76 | \$ | 49,735.27 | \$ | 63,733.03 |
|  | Nov-23 | \$ | 582,944.23 | \$ | 7,236,499.89 |  | 18,693.70 | \$ | 76,246.62 | \$ | 7,160,253.27 | \$ | (38,039.55) | \$ | 7,122,213.72 | \$ | 18,693.70 | \$ | 57,546.24 |  | 76,239.94 |
|  | Dec-23 | 5 | 229,752.83 | S | 7,466,252.72 | \$ | 19,787.45 | \$ | 96,034,07 | S | 7,370,218.65 | 5 | ( $50,618.51$ ) | 5 | 7,319,600.14 | s | 19,787.45 | \$ | 59,141.09 | s | 78,928.54 |
| 2024 | Jan-24 | \$ | 274,705.65 | \$ | 7,740,958.37 | \$ | 20,466.37 | \$ | 116,500.44 | \$ | 7,624,457.93 | \$ | $(57,582.59)$ | \$ | 7,566,875.34 |  | 20,466.37 | \$ | 61,139.03 |  | 81,605.40 |
|  | Feb-24 | \$ | 591,508.23 | \$ | 8,332,466.60 | \$ | 21,632.15 | \$ | 138,132.59 | \$ | 8,194,334.01 | \$ | $(64,780.77)$ | \$ | 8,129,553.24 | \$ | 21,632.15 | \$ | 65,685.36 | \$ | 87,317.51 |
|  | Mar-24 | \$ | 749,909.53 | \$ | 9,082,376.13 | \$ | 23,437.48 | \$ | 161,570.07 | \$ | 8,920,806.06 | \$ | $(72,256.00)$ | \$ | 8,848,550.06 | \$ | 23,437.48 | \$ | 71,494.73 | \$ | 94,932.21 |
|  | Apr-24 | \$ | 908,310.79 | s | 9,990,886.92 | \$ | 25,669.16 | \$ | 187,239.23 | \$ | 9,803,447.69 | \$ | (80,158.57) | \$ | 9,723,289.12 | \$ | 25,669.16 | \$ | 78,562.47 |  | 104,231.63 |
|  | May-24 | \$ | 908,310.80 | \$ | 10,898,997.72 | \$ | 28,114.03 | \$ | 215,353.26 | \$ | 10,683,644.46 | \$ | (88,559.98) | \$ | 10,595,084.48 | \$ | 28,114.03 | \$ | 85,606.42 | \$ | 113,720.45 |
|  | Jun-24 | \$ | 1,225,113.38 | \$ | 12,124,111.10 | \$ | 30,985.27 | \$ | 246,338.53 | \$ | 11,877,772.57 | \$ | (97,977.31) | \$ | 11,779,795.26 | \$ | 30,985.27 | \$ | 95,178.68 |  | 126,163.95 |
|  | Jul-24 | \$ | 1,225,113.38 | \$ | 13,349,224.48 | \$ | 34,282.86 | \$ | 280,621.39 | \$ | 13,068,603.09 | \$ | (108,594.22) | \$ | 12,960,008.87 | \$ | 34,282.86 | \$ | 104,714.60 | \$ | 138,997.4 |
|  | Aug-24 | \$ | 1,541,915.97 | \$ | 14,891,140.45 | \$ | 38,006.82 | \$ | 318,628.21 | \$ | 14,572,512.24 | \$ | (121,368.62) | \$ | 14,451,143.62 | \$ | 38,006.82 | \$ | 116,762.71 | \$ | 154,769.53 |
|  | Sep-24 | \$ | 1,541,915.97 | \$ | 16,433,056.42 | \$ | 42,157.15 | \$ | 360,785.36 | \$ | 16,072,271.06 | \$ | (136,978.73) | \$ | 15,935,292.33 | \$ | 42,157.15 | \$ | 128,754.37 | \$ | 170,911.52 |
|  | Oct-24 | \$ | 1,225,113.38 | \$ | 17,658,169.80 | \$ | 45,881.11 | \$ | 406,666.47 | \$ | 17,251,503.3 | \$ | (155,778.11) | \$ | 17,095,725.22 | \$ | 45,881.11 | \$ | 138,130.46 | \$ | 184,011.57 |
|  | Nov-24 |  | 908,310.79 | \$ | 18,566,480.59 |  | 48,752.34 | \$ | 455,418.81 | \$ | 18,111,061.78 | \$ | $(178,473.86)$ | \$ | 17,932,587.92 | \$ | 48,752.34 | \$ | 144,892.17 | \$ | 193,644.51 |
|  | Dec-24 | \$ | 433,106.94 | 5 | 18,999,587.53 | \$ | 50,557.67 | \$ | 505,976.48 | \$ | 18,493,611.05 | \$ | (205, 142.08) | \$ | 18,288,468.97 | \$ | 50,557.67 | \$ | 147,767.62 | s | 198,325.29 |
| 2025 | Jan-25 | \$ | 325 | \$ | 19,324,629.73 | \$ | 51,578.01 | \$ | 557,554.49 | \$ | 18,767,075.23 | \$ | (221,752.70) |  | 18,545,322.53 | \$ | 51,578.01 | \$ | 149,842.95 |  | 201,420.96 |
|  | Feb-25 | \$ | 667,013.05 | \$ | 19,991,642.77 | \$ | 52,913.15 | \$ | 610,467.64 | \$ | 19,381,175.13 | \$ | (238,621.65) | \$ | 19,142,553.48 | \$ | 52,913.15 | \$ | 154,668.48 | \$ | 207,581.63 |
|  | Mar-25 | \$ | 837,998.48 | \$ | 20,829,641.25 | \$ | 54,938.64 | \$ | 665,406.28 | \$ | 20,164,234.97 | \$ | (255,797.97) | \$ | 19,908,437.00 | \$ | 54,938.64 | \$ | 160,856.68 | \$ | 215,795.32 |
|  | Apr-25 | \$ | 1,008,983.89 | \$ | 21,838,625.14 | \$ | 57,424.38 | \$ | 722,830.66 | \$ | 21,115,794.48 | \$ | (273,447.14) | s | 20,842,347.34 | \$ | 57,424.38 | \$ | 168,402.51 | \$ | 225,826.89 |
|  | May-25 | \$ | 1,008,983.89 | \$ | 22,847,609.03 | \$ | 60,140.22 | \$ | 782,970.88 | \$ | 22,064,638.1 | \$ | $(291,650.45)$ | \$ | 21,772,987.70 | \$ | 60,140.22 | \$ | 175,921.92 | \$ | 236,062.14 |
|  | Jun-25 |  | 1,350,954.75 | \$ | 24,198,5 | \$ | 63,316.31 | \$ | 846,287.19 | \$ | 23,352,276.59 | \$ | (310,971.29) |  | 23,041,305.30 | \$ | 63,316.31 | \$ | 186,169.71 | \$ | 249,486.02 |
|  | Jul-25 | \$ | 1,350,954.75 | \$ | 25,549,518.53 | \$ | 66,952.63 | \$ | 913,239.82 | \$ | 24,636,278.71 | \$ | (331,614.94) | \$ | 24,304,663.77 | \$ | 66,952.63 | \$ | 196,377.42 | \$ | 263,330.05 |
|  | Aug-25 |  | 1,692,925.61 | \$ | 27,242,444. | \$ | 71,049.18 | \$ | 984,289.00 | \$ | 26,258,155.14 | \$ | (354,625.20) | \$ | 25,903,529.94 | \$ | 71,049.18 | \$ | 209,295.98 | \$ | 280,345.16 |
|  | Sep-25 | \$ | 1,692,925.61 | \$ | 28,935,369.75 | \$ | 75,605.97 |  | 1,059,894.97 | \$ | 27,875,474.78 | \$ | (380,748.89) | \$ | 27,494,725.89 | \$ | 75,605.97 | \$ | 222,152.56 | \$ | 297,758.53 |
|  | Oct-25 | \$ | 1,350,954.74 | \$ | 30,286,324.49 | \$ | 79,702.53 |  | 1,139,597.50 | \$ | 29,146,726.99 | \$ | $(410,392.17)$ | \$ | 28,736,334.82 | \$ | 79,702.53 | \$ | 232,184.55 | \$ | 311,887.08 |
|  | Nov-25 | \$ | 1,008,983,88 | \$ | 31,295,308.37 | \$ | 82,878.61 |  | 1,222,476.11 | \$ | 30,072,832.26 | \$ | $(444,367.36)$ |  | 29,628,464.90 | \$ | 82,878.61 | \$ | 239,392.80 | \$ | 322,271.4 |
|  | Dec-25 | 5 | 496,027.62 | 5 | 31,791,335.99 | S | 84,904.11 |  | 1,307,380.22 | \$ | 30,483,955.77 | 5 | (482,903.73) | 5 | 30,001,052.04 | s | 84,904.11 | \$ | 242,403.24 | 5 | 327,307 |
| 2026 | 6 Jan-26 | \$ | 375,378.74 | \$ | 32,166,714.73 | \$ | 86,076.88 |  | 1,393,457.10 | \$ | 30,773,257.63 | \$ | (508,950.46) | \$ | 30,264,307.17 | \$ | 86,076.88 | \$ | 244,530.29 |  | 330,607 |
|  | Feb-26 | \$ | 742,517.87 | \$ | 32,909,232.60 | \$ | 87,581.38 |  | 1,481,038.48 | \$ | 31,428,194.12 | \$ | (535,279.74) | 5 | 30,892,914.38 | \$ | 87,581.38 | \$ | 249,609.33 | \$ | 337,190.71 |
|  | Mar-26 | \$ | 926,087.44 | \$ | 33,835,320.04 | \$ | 89,827.04 |  | 1,570,865.52 | \$ | 32,264,454.52 | \$ | (561,946.71) | \$ | 31,702,507.81 | \$ | 89,827.04 | \$ | 256,150.70 | \$ | 345,977.74 |
|  | Apr-26 | \$ | 1,109,656.98 | \$ | 34,944,977.02 | \$ | 92,566.82 |  | 1,663,432.34 | \$ | 33,281,544.68 | \$ | (589,132.05) | \$ | 32,692,412.63 | \$ | 92,566.82 | \$ | 264,148.96 | \$ | 356,715.78 |
|  | May-26 | \$ | 1,109,656.98 | \$ | 36,054,634.00 | \$ | 95,553.64 |  | 1,758,985.98 | \$ | 34,295,648.02 | \$ | (616,926.82) | \$ | 33,678,721.20 | \$ | 95,553.64 | \$ | 272,118.16 | \$ | 367,61 |
|  | Jun-26 | \$ | 1,476,796.11 | S | 37,531,430.11 | \$ | 99,034.58 |  | 1,858,020.56 | \$ | 35,673,409.55 | \$ | $(645,940.75)$ | \$ | 35,027,468.80 | \$ | 99,034.58 | \$ | 283,015.81 | \$ | 382,050.39 |
|  | Jul-26 | \$ | 1,476,796.11 | \$ | 39,008,226.22 | \$ | 103,009.62 |  | 1,961,030.18 | \$ | 37,047,196.04 | \$ | $(676,400.70)$ | \$ | 36,370,795.34 | \$ | 103,009.62 | \$ | 293,869.65 | \$ | 396,879.27 |
|  | Aug-26 | \$ | 1,843,935.25 | \$ | 40,852,161.47 | \$ | 107,478.77 |  | 2,068,508.95 | \$ | 38,783,652.52 | \$ | (709,436.39) |  | 38,074,216.13 | \$ | 107,478.77 | \$ | 307,632.99 | \$ | 415,111.76 |
|  | Sep-26 | \$ | 1,843,935.25 | \$ | 42,696,096.72 | \$ | 112,442.03 |  | 2,180,950.98 | \$ | 40,515,145.74 | \$ | (745,863.24) | \$ | 39,769,282.50 | \$ | 112,442.03 | \$ | 321,328.83 | \$ | 433,770.86 |
|  | Oct-26 | \$ | 1,476,796.11 | \$ | 44,172,892.83 | s | 116,911.18 |  | 2,297,862.16 | \$ | 41,875,030.67 | \$ | (786,140.00) | \$ | 41,088,890.67 | \$ | 116,911.18 | \$ | 331,991.03 | \$ | 448,902.21 |
|  | Nov-26 | \$ | 1,109,656.97 | \$ | 45,282,549.80 | \$ | 120,392.12 |  | 2,418,254.28 | \$ | 42,864,295.52 | \$ | (831,184.21) | \$ | 42,033,111.31 | \$ | 120,392.12 | \$ | 339,620.17 | \$ | 460,012.29 |
|  | Dec-26 | \$ | 558,948.30 | \$ | 45,841,498.10 | \$ | 122,637.78 |  | 2,540,892.06 | \$ | 43,300,606.04 | + | (881,378.29) | \$ | 42,419,227.75 | \$ | 122,637.78 | \$ | 342,739.92 | \$ | 465,377.70 |
| 2027 | Jan-27 | \$ | 429,419.94 | \$ | 46,270,918.04 | \$ | 123,967.96 |  | 2,664,860.02 | \$ | 43,606,058.02 | \$ | (916,596.91) | \$ | 42,689,461.11 | \$ | 123,967.96 | \$ | 344,923.36 | \$ | 468,891.32 |
|  | Feb-27 | \$ | 823,579.67 | \$ | 47,094,497.71 | \$ | 125,654.29 |  | 2,790,514.31 | \$ | 44,303,983.40 | \$ | (952,124.09) | \$ | 43,351,859.31 | \$ | 125,654.29 | \$ | 350,275.42 | \$ | 475,929.71 |
|  | Mar-27 | \$ | 1,020,659.54 | \$ | 48,115,157.25 | \$ | 128,136.33 |  | 2,918,650.64 | \$ | 45,196,506.61 | \$ | (988,021.50) | \$ | 44,208,485.11 | \$ | 128,136.33 | \$ | 357,196.81 | \$ | 485,333.14 |
|  | Apr-27 | \$ | 1,217,739.38 | \$ | 49,332,896.63 | \$ | 131,148.84 |  | 3,049,799.48 | \$ | 46,283,097.15 |  | (1,024,486.15) | \$ | 45,258,611.00 | \$ | 131,148.84 | \$ | 365,681.64 | \$ | 496,830.48 |
|  | May-27 | \$ | 1,217,739.38 | \$ | 50,550,636.01 | \$ | 134,426.59 |  | 3,184,226.07 | \$ | 47,366,409.94 |  | (1,061,619.59) | \$ | 46,304,790.35 | \$ | 134,426.59 | \$ | 374,134.59 | \$ | 508,561.18 |
|  | Jun-27 | \$ | 1,611,899.11 | \$ | 52,162,535.12 | \$ | 138,234.81 |  | 3,322,460.88 | \$ | 48,840,074.24 |  | (1,100,081.28) | \$ | 47,739,992.96 | \$ | 138,234.81 | \$ | 385,730.77 | \$ | 523,965.58 |
|  | Jul-27 | \$ | 1,611,899.11 | \$ | 53,774,434.23 | \$ | 142,573.50 |  | 3,465,034.38 | \$ | 50,309,399.85 |  | (1,140,121.29) | \$ | 49,169,278.56 | \$ | 142,573.50 | \$ | 397,279.15 | \$ | 539,852.65 |
|  | Aug-27 | \$ | 2,006,058.85 | 5 | 55,780,493.08 | \$ | 147,442.67 |  | 3,612,477.05 | \$ | 52,168,016.03 |  | (1,182,961.55) | \$ | 50,985,054.48 | \$ | 147,442.67 | \$ | 411,950.30 | \$ | 559,392.97 |
|  | Sep-27 | \$ | 2,006,058.85 | \$ | 57,786,551.93 | \$ | 152,842.31 |  | 3,765,319.36 | \$ | 54,021,232.57 |  | (1,229,491.13) | \$ | 52,791,741.44 | \$ | 152,842.31 | \$ | 426,548.01 | \$ | 579,390.32 |
|  | Oct-27 | \$ | 1,611,899.11 | \$ | 59,398,451.04 | \$ | 157,711.48 |  | 3,923,030.84 | \$ | 55,475,420.20 |  | (1,280,225.27) | S | 54,195,194.93 | \$ | 157,711.48 | \$ | 477,887.67 | \$ | 595,599.15 |
|  | Nov-27 | \$ | 1,217,739.37 | \$ | 60,616,190.41 | \$ | 161,519.70 |  | 4,084,550.54 | \$ | 56,531,639.87 |  | (1,336,194.44) | \$ | 55,195,445.43 | \$ | 161,519.7 | \$ | 445,969.5 | \$ | 607,489.22 |
|  | Dec-27 | 5 | 626,499.80 | 5 | 61,242,690.21 |  | 164,001.74 |  | 4,248,552.28 | \$ | 56,994,137.93 |  | (1,397,945.51) | S | 55,596,192.42 | S | 164,001.74 | 5 | 449,207.49 |  | 613,209.23 |


| 2023 Total $=$ | \$ 7,466,252.72 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2024 Total $=$ | \$ 11,533,334.81 |
| 2025 Total $=$ | \$ 12,791,748.46 |
| 2026 Total $=$ | \$ 14,050,162.11 |

Exhibit SLF-3
$\begin{aligned} 1.82 \% & \text { FERC Account } 368 \text { (Annual Rate) effective November 1, } 2021 \\ 1.83 \% & \text { FERC Account } 368 \text { (Annual Rate) proposed to be effective November 1, } 2023 \\ 20 & \text { Years }\end{aligned}$

| Year | Month | Incremental <br> In-Service <br> Capital |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $[a]$ | $[b]$ | $[c]$ |


| In-Service <br> Capital Month <br> Ending | Regulatory Book <br> Depreciation | Regulatory <br> Depreciation <br> Reserve |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left[\begin{array}{lll}{[d]} & {[e]} & \text { Net Plant }\end{array}\right.$ |  |  |  |
| $[g][d]-[f]$ |  |  |  |

$\square$


| 2023 Jan-23 | \$ | 13,724.71 | \$ | 13,724.71 | \$ | 10.41 | \$ | 10.41 | \$ | 13,714.30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feb-23 | \$ | 42,572.83 | \$ | 56,297.54 | \$ | 53.10 | \$ | 63.5 | \$ | 56,234.03 |
| Mar-23 | \$ | 56,996.88 | \$ | 113,294.42 | \$ | 128.61 | \$ | 192.12 | \$ | 113,102.30 |
| Apr-23 | \$ | 71,420.94 | \$ | 184,715.36 | \$ | 225.99 | \$ | 418.11 | \$ | 184,297.25 |
| May-23 | \$ | 71,420.94 | \$ | 256,136.30 | \$ | 334.31 | \$ | 752.42 | \$ | 255,383.88 |
| Jun-23 | \$ | 100,269.06 | \$ | 356,405.36 | \$ | 464.51 | \$ | 1,216.93 | \$ | 355,188.43 |
| Jul-23 | \$ | 100,269.06 | \$ | 456,674.42 | \$ | 616.59 | \$ | 1,833.52 | \$ | 454,840.90 |
| Aug-23 | \$ | 129,117.16 | \$ | 585,791.58 | \$ | 790.54 | \$ | 2,624.06 | \$ | 583,167.52 |
| Sep-23 | \$ | 129,117.16 | \$ | 714,908.74 | \$ | 986.36 | \$ | 3,610.42 | \$ | 711,298.32 |
| Oct-23 | \$ | 100,269.06 | \$ | 815,177.80 | \$ | 1,160.32 |  | 4,770.74 | \$ | 810,407.06 |
| Nov-23 | \$ | 71,420.94 | \$ | 886,598.74 | \$ | 1,297.60 |  | 6,068.34 | \$ | 880,530.40 |
| Dec-23 | 5 | 28,148.77 | 5 | 914,747.51 | \$ | 1,373.53 | \$ | 7,441.87 | s | 907,305.64 |
| Jan-24 | \$ | 33,656.28 | \$ | 948,403.79 | \$ | 1,420.65 | \$ | 8,862.52 | \$ | 939,541.27 |
| Feb-24 | \$ | 72,470.18 | \$ | 1,020,873.97 | \$ | 1,501.57 | \$ | 10,364.09 | \$ | 1,010,509.88 |
| Mar-24 | \$ | 91,877.13 | \$ | 1,112,751.10 | \$ | 1,626.89 | \$ | 11,990.98 | \$ | 1,100,760.12 |
| Apr-24 | \$ | 111,284.09 | \$ | 1,224,035.19 | \$ | 1,781.80 | \$ | 13,772.78 | \$ | 1,210,262.41 |
| May-24 | \$ | 111,284.08 | \$ | 1,335,319.27 | \$ | 1,951.51 | \$ | 15,724.29 | \$ | 1,319,594.98 |
| Jun-24 | \$ | 150,097.98 | \$ | 1,485,417.25 | \$ | 2,150.81 | \$ | 17,875.10 | \$ | 1,467,542.15 |
| Jul-24 | \$ | 150,097.98 | \$ | 1,635,515.23 | \$ | 2,379.71 | \$ | 20,254.81 | \$ | 1,615,260.42 |
| Aug-24 | \$ | 188,911.87 | \$ | 1,824,427.10 | \$ | 2,638.21 | \$ | 22,893.02 | \$ | 1,801,534.08 |
| Sep-24 | \$ | 188,911.87 | \$ | 2,013,338.97 | \$ | 2,926.30 | \$ | 25,819.32 | \$ | 1,987,519.65 |
| Oct-24 | \$ | 150,097.98 | \$ | 2,163,436.95 | \$ | 3,184.79 | \$ | 29,004.11 | \$ | 2,134,432.84 |
| Nov-24 | \$ | 111,284.08 | \$ | 2,274,721.03 | \$ | 3,384.10 | \$ | 32,388.21 | \$ | 2,242,332.82 |
| Dec-24 | \$ | 53,063.23 | \$ | 2,327,784.26 | \$ | 3,509.41 | \$ | 35,897.62 | \$ | 2,291,886.64 |
| 2025 Jan-25 | \$ | ,823.40 | S | 2,367,607.66 | \$ | 3,580.24 | \$ | 39,477.86 | \$ | 2,328,129.80 |
| Feb-25 | \$ | 81,720.85 | \$ | 2,449,328.51 | \$ | 3,672.91 | \$ | 43,150.77 | \$ | 2,406,177.74 |
| Mar-25 | \$ | 102,669.58 | \$ | 2,551,998.09 | \$ | 3,813.51 | \$ | 46,964.28 | \$ | 2,505,033.81 |
| Apr-25 | \$ | 123,618.31 | \$ | 2,675,616.40 | \$ | 3,986.06 | \$ | 50,950.34 | \$ | 2,624,666.06 |
| May-25 | \$ | 123,618.31 | \$ | 2,799,234.71 | \$ | 4,174.57 | \$ | 55,124.91 | \$ | 2,744,109.80 |
| Jun-25 | \$ | 165,515.76 | \$ | 2,964,750.47 | \$ | 4,395.04 | \$ | 59,519.95 | \$ | 2,905,230.52 |
| Jul-25 | \$ | 165,515.76 | \$ | 3,130,266.23 | \$ | 4,647.45 | \$ | 64,167.40 | \$ | 3,066,098.83 |
| Aug-25 | \$ | 207,413.21 | \$ | 3,337,679.44 | \$ | 4,931.81 | \$ | 69,099.21 | \$ | 3,268,580.23 |
| Sep-25 | \$ | 207,413.21 | \$ | 3,545,092.65 | \$ | 5,248.11 | \$ | 74,347.32 | \$ | 3,470,745.33 |
| Oct-25 | \$ | 165,515.77 | \$ | 3,710,608.42 | \$ | 5,532.47 | \$ | 79,879.79 | \$ | 3,630,728.63 |
| Nov-25 | \$ | 123,618.31 | 5 | 3,834,226.73 | \$ | 5,752.94 | \$ | 85,632.73 | \$ | 3,748,594.00 |
| Dec-25 | \$ | 60,772.12 | 5 | 3,894,998.85 | \$ | 5,893.53 | \$ | 91,526.26 | \$ | 3,803,472.59 |
| 2026 Jan-26 | \$ | 45,990.51 | \$ | 3,940,989.36 | \$ | 5,974.94 | \$ | 97,501.20 | \$ | 3,843,488.16 |
| Feb-26 | \$ | 90,971.52 | \$ | 4,031,960.88 | \$ | 6,079.37 | \$ | 103,580.57 | \$ | 3,928,380.31 |
| Mar-26 | \$ | 113,462.03 | \$ | 4,145,422.91 | \$ | 6,235.26 | \$ | 109,815.83 | \$ | 4,035,607.08 |
| Apr-26 | \$ | 135,952.52 | \$ | 4,281,375.43 | \$ | 6,425.43 | \$ | 116,241.26 | \$ | 4,165,134.17 |
| May-26 | \$ | 135,952.53 | \$ | 4,417,327.96 | \$ | 6,632.76 | \$ | 122,874.02 | \$ | 4,294,453.94 |
| Jun-26 | \$ | 180,933.55 | \$ | 4,598,261.51 | \$ | 6,874.39 | \$ | 129,748.41 | \$ | 4,468,513.10 |
| Jul-26 | \$ | 180,933.55 | \$ | 4,779,195.06 | \$ | 7,150.31 | \$ | 136,898.72 | \$ | 4,642,296.34 |
| Aug-26 | \$ | 225,914.56 | s | 5,005,109.62 | \$ | 7,460.53 | \$ | 144,359.25 | \$ | 4,860,750.37 |
| Sep-26 | \$ | 225,914.56 | \$ | 5,231,024.18 | \$ | 7,805.05 | \$ | 152,164.30 | \$ | 5,078,859.88 |
| Oct-26 | \$ | 180,933.54 | \$ | 5,411,957.72 | \$ | 8,115.27 | \$ | 160,279.57 | \$ | 5,251,678.15 |
| Nov-26 | \$ | 135,952.53 | \$ | 5,547,910.25 | \$ | 8,356.90 | \$ | 168,636.47 | \$ | 5,379,273.78 |
| Dec-26 | s | 68,481.02 | 5 | 5,616,391.27 | \$ | 8,512.78 | \$ | 177,149.25 | \$ | 5,439,242.02 |
| Jan-27 | \$ | 52,611.51 | S | 5,669,002.78 | \$ | 8,605.11 | \$ | 1885,754.36 | \$ | 5,483,248.42 |
| Feb-27 | \$ | 100,903.02 | \$ | 5,769,905.80 | \$ | 8,722.17 | \$ | 194,476.53 | \$ | 5,575,429.27 |
| Mar-27 | \$ | 125,048.78 | \$ | 5,894,954.58 | \$ | 8,894.46 | \$ | 203,370.99 | \$ | 5,691,583.59 |
| Apr-27 | \$ | 149,194.52 | \$ | 6,044,149.10 | \$ | 9,103.57 | \$ | 212,474.56 | \$ | 5,831,674.54 |
| May-27 | \$ | 149,194.52 | \$ | 6,193,343.62 | \$ | 9,331.09 | \$ | 221,805.65 | \$ | 5,971,537.97 |
| Jun-27 | \$ | 197,486.05 | \$ | 6,390,829.67 | \$ | 9,595.43 | \$ | 231,401.08 | \$ | 6,159,428.59 |
| Jul-27 | \$ | 197,486.04 | \$ | 6,588,315.71 | \$ | 9,896.60 | \$ | 241,297.68 | \$ | 6,347,018.03 |
| Aug-27 | \$ | 245,777.56 | \$ | 6,834,093.27 | \$ | 10,234.59 | \$ | 251,532.27 | \$ | 6,582,561.00 |
| Sep-27 | \$ | 245,777.56 | \$ | 7,079,870.83 | \$ | 10,609.40 | \$ | 262,141.67 | \$ | 6,817,729.16 |
| Oct-27 | \$ | 197,486.04 | \$ | 7,277,356.87 | \$ | 10,947.39 | \$ | 273,089.06 | \$ | 7,004,267.81 |
| Nov-27 | \$ | 149,194.53 | \$ | 7,426,551.40 | \$ | 11,211.73 | \$ | 284,300.79 | \$ | 7,142,250.61 |
| ec-27 |  | 76,757.27 |  | 03,308 |  | 38 |  | 295,68 |  |  |


| \$ | (8.94) |
| :---: | :---: |
| \$ | (46.07) |
| \$ | (121.23) |
| \$ | (251.49) |
| \$ | (444.07) |
| \$ | (748.63) |
| \$ | $(1,183.79)$ |
| \$ | (1,837.56) |
| \$ | (2,770.53) |
| \$ | $(4,000.53)$ |
| \$ | ( $5,561.25$ ) |
| \$ | (7,391.54) |
| \$ | (8,543.84) |
| \$ | (9,741.85) |
| \$ | (11,000.19) |
| \$ | (12,343.49) |
| \$ | (13,783.63) |
| \$ | (15,390.20) |
| \$ | (17,191.93) |
| \$ | $(19,312.40)$ |
| \$ | (21,840.95) |
| \$ | (24,814.66) |
| \$ | (28,307.70) |
| \$ | (32,313.82) |
| \$ | $(35,102.61)$ |
| \$ | $(37,942.56)$ |
| \$ | (40,849.77) |
| \$ | (43,851.23) |
| \$ | (46,960.27) |
| \$ | (50,252.64) |
| \$ | (53,760.21) |
| \$ | (57,617.60) |
| \$ | (61,923.03) |
| \$ | (66,719.53) |
| \$ | (72,093.17) |
| \$ | (78,055.24) |
| \$ | (82,504.24) |
| \$ | (87,009.85) |
| \$ | (91,589.64) |
| \$ | (96,272.98) |
| \$ | (101,074.63) |
| \$ | $(106,076.52)$ |
| \$ | (111,313.66) |
| \$ | (116,931.68) |
| \$ | $(123,037.70)$ |
| \$ | (129,680.71) |
| \$ | (136,958.68) |
| \$ | (144,900.42) |
| \$ | (151,026.84) |
| \$ | (157,215.70) |
| \$ | $(163,486.19)$ |
| \$ | $(169,870.20)$ |
| \$ | (176,384.05) |
| \$ | (183,116.28) |
| \$ | (190,05.28) |
| \$ | (197,508.51) |
| \$ | (205,442.65) |
| \$ | (213,963.08) |
| \$ | (223,180.54) |
|  | (233,142.66) |


|  | 13,705.3 | \$ | 10.41 | \$ | 103.77 |  | 析 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | 56,187.96 | \$ | 10 | \$ | 425.44 | \$ | 478.54 |
| \$ | 112,981.07 | \$ | 128.61 | \$ | 855.47 | \$ | 84.08 |
| \$ | 184,045.76 | \$ | 225.99 | \$ | 1,393.56 | \$ | 1,619.55 |
| \$ | 254,939.81 | \$ | 334.31 | \$ | 1,930.36 |  | 2,264.67 |
| \$ | 354,439.80 | \$ | 464.51 | \$ | 2,683.75 | \$ | 3,148.26 |
| \$ | 453,657.11 | \$ | 61.59 | \$ | 3,435.01 | \$ | 4,051.60 |
| \$ | 581,329.96 | \$ | 790.54 | \$ | 4,401.72 |  | 5,192.26 |
| \$ | 708,527.79 | \$ | 986.36 | \$ | 5,364.84 | \$ | 6,351.20 |
| \$ | 806,406.53 | \$ | 1,160.32 | \$ | 6,105.96 | \$ | 7,266.28 |
| \$ | 874,969.15 | \$ | 1,297.60 | \$ | 7,069.60 | \$ | 8,367.20 |
| s | 899,914.10 | \$ | 1,373.53 | \$ | 7,271.15 | S | 8,644.68 |
| \$ | 930,997.43 | \$ | 1,420.65 | \$ | 7,522.30 | \$ | 8,942.95 |
| \$ | 1,000,768.03 | \$ | 1,501.57 | \$ | 8,086.03 | \$ | 9,587.60 |
| \$ | 1,089,759.93 | \$ | 1,626.89 | \$ | 8,805.07 | \$ | 10,431.96 |
| \$ | 1,197,918.92 | \$ | 1,781.80 | \$ | 9,678.97 | \$ | 11,460.77 |
| \$ | 1,305,811.35 | \$ | 1,951.51 | \$ | 10,550.73 | \$ | 12,502.24 |
| \$ | 1,452,151.95 | \$ | 2,150.81 | \$ | 11,733.13 | \$ | 13,883.94 |
| 5 | 1,598,068.49 | \$ | 2,379.71 | \$ | 12,912.11 | \$ | 15,291.82 |
| \$ | 1,782,221.68 | \$ | 2,638.21 | \$ | 14,400.04 | \$ | 17,038.25 |
| \$ | 1,965,678.70 | \$ | 2,926.30 | \$ | 15,882.34 | \$ | 18,808.64 |
|  | 2,109,618.18 | \$ | 3,184.79 | \$ | 17,045.34 | \$ | 20,230.13 |
| \$ | 2,214,025.12 | \$ | 3,384.10 | \$ | 17,888.93 | \$ | 21,273.03 |
| \$ | 2,259,572.82 | \$ | 3,509.41 | \$ | 18,256.95 |  | 21,766.36 |
| \$ | 2,293,027.19 | \$ | 3,580.24 | \$ | 18,527.26 | \$ | 22,107.50 |
|  | 2,368,235.18 | \$ | 3,672.91 | \$ | 19,134.92 | \$ | 22,807.83 |
| \$ | 2,464,184.04 | \$ | 3,813.51 | \$ | 19,910.17 | \$ | 23,723.68 |
| \$ | 2,580,814.83 | \$ | 3,986.06 | \$ | 20,852.53 | \$ | 24,838.59 |
|  | 2,697,149.53 | \$ | 4,174.57 | \$ | 21,792.50 | \$ | 25,967.07 |
| 5 | 2,854,977.88 | \$ | 4,395.04 | \$ | 23,067.72 | \$ | 27,462.76 |
|  | 3,012,338.62 | \$ | 4,647.45 | \$ | 24,339.17 | \$ | 28,986.62 |
| \$ | 3,210,962.63 | \$ | 4,931.81 | \$ | 25,944.01 | \$ | 30,875.82 |
|  | 3,408,822.30 | \$ | 5,248.11 | \$ | 27,542.69 | \$ | 32,790.80 |
|  | 3,564,009.10 | \$ | 5,532.47 | \$ | 28,796.57 | \$ | 34,329.04 |
| \$ | 3,676,500.83 | \$ | 5,752.94 | \$ | 29,705.48 | \$ | 35,458.42 |
| \$ | 3,725,417.35 | \$ | 5,893.53 | s | 30,100.72 | S | 35,994.25 |
| \$ | 3,760,983.92 | \$ | 5,974.94 | \$ | 30,388.09 | \$ | 36,363.03 |
|  | 3,841,370.46 | \$ | 6,079.37 | \$ | 31,037.60 | \$ | 37,116.97 |
| \$ | 3,944,017.44 | \$ | 6,235.26 | \$ | 31,866.97 | \$ | 38,102.23 |
|  | 4,068,861.19 | \$ | 6,425.43 | \$ | 32,875.68 | \$ | 39,301.11 |
| \$ | 4,193,379.31 | \$ | 6,632.76 | \$ | 33,881.77 | \$ | 40,514.53 |
| 5 | 4,362,436.58 | \$ | 6,874.39 | \$ | 35,247.72 | \$ | 42,122.11 |
| \$ | 4,530,982.68 | \$ | 7,150.31 | \$ | 36,609.55 | \$ | 43,759.86 |
| \$ | 4,743,818.69 | \$ | 7,460.53 | \$ | 38,329.22 | \$ | 45,789.75 |
|  | 4,955,822.18 | \$ | 7,805.05 | \$ | 40,042.17 | \$ | 47,847.22 |
| \$ | 5,121,997.44 | \$ | 8,115.27 | \$ | 41,384.84 | \$ | 49,500.11 |
|  | 5,242,315.10 | \$ | 8,356.90 | \$ | 42,356.99 | \$ | 50,713.89 |
| \$ | 5,294,341.60 | \$ | 8,512.78 | \$ | 42,777.35 | \$ | 51,290.13 |
| \$ | 5,332,221.58 | \$ | 8,605.11 | \$ | 43,083.42 | 5 | 51,688.53 |
| \$ | 5,418,213.57 | \$ | 8,722.17 | \$ | 43,778.22 | \$ | 52,500.39 |
| \$ | 5,528,097.40 | \$ | 8,894.46 | \$ | 44,666.06 | \$ | 53,560.52 |
| \$ | 5,661,804.34 | \$ | 9,103.57 | \$ | 45,746.39 | \$ | 54,849.96 |
| \$ | 5,795,153.92 | \$ | 9,331.09 | \$ | 46,823.83 | \$ | 56,154.92 |
|  | 5,976,312.31 | \$ | 9,595.43 | \$ | 48,287.56 | \$ | 57,882.99 |
| \$ | 6,156,912.75 | \$ | 9,896.60 | \$ | 49,746.78 | \$ | 59,643.38 |
| \$ | 6,385,052.49 | \$ | 10,234.59 | \$ | 51,590.10 | \$ | 61,824.69 |
| \$ | 6,612,286.51 | \$ | 10,609.40 | \$ | 53,426.12 | \$ | 64,035.52 |
| \$ | 6,790,304.73 | \$ | 10,947.39 | \$ | 54,864.47 | \$ | 65,811.86 |
|  | 6,919,070.07 | \$ | 11,211.73 | \$ | 55,904.87 | \$ | 67,116.60 |
|  | 6,974,481.20 | \$ | 11,384.02 | \$ | 56,352.59 |  | 67,736.61 |


| 2023 Total = | \$ | 914,747.51 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2024 Total $=$ | \$ | 1,413,036.75 |
| 2025 Total $=$ | \$ | 1,567,214.59 |
| 2026 Total $=$ | S | 1,721,392 |

Exhibit SLF-3
 Tax Life 20 Years

${ }^{1}$ per MD PSC Order No. 89971 dated October 26, 2021 in Case No. 9490 reaffirming Public Utility Law Judge Proposed Order dated May 26, 2021

${ }^{1}$ per MD PSC Order No. 89971 dated October 26, 2021 in Case No. 9490 reaffirming Public Utility Law Judge Proposed Order dated May 26, 2021

Exhibit SLF-3

| Reg Depreciation | $1.30 \%$ | FERC Account 364 (Annual Rate) | effective November 1, 2021 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Reg Depreciation | $1.81 \%$ | FERC Account 364 (Annual Rate) proposed to be effective November 1, 2023 |  |
| Tax Life | 20 | Years |  |

Tax Life

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 1.81\% } & \text { FERC Account } 364 \text { (Annual Rate) proposed to be effective November 1, } 2023 \\
20 & \text { Years }
\end{array}
$$



| 2023 Jan-23 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Feb-23 | \$ | . | \$ | . | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Mar-23 | \$ |  | \$ | - | S | . | S | - | \$ |  |
| Apr-23 | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ |  |
| May-23 | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| Jun-23 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 21.12 |  | 21.12 | \$ | 38,975.16 |
| Jul-23 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 77,992.56 | \$ | 63.37 | \$ | 84.49 | \$ | 77,908.07 |
| Aug-23 | \$ | 116,988.83 | \$ | 194,981.39 | \$ | 147.86 | \$ | 232.35 | \$ | 194,749.04 |
| Sep-23 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 272,973.94 | \$ | 253.48 | \$ | 485.83 | \$ | 272,488.11 |
| Oct-23 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 350,966.49 | \$ | 337.97 | \$ | 823.80 | \$ | 350,142.69 |
| Nov-23 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 389,962.77 | \$ | 558.78 | \$ | 1,382.58 | \$ | 388,580.19 |
| Dec-23 | s |  | \$ | 389,962.77 | \$ | 588.19 | \$ | 1,970.77 | \$ | 387,992.00 |
| 2024 Jan-24 | \$ |  | \$ | 389,962.77 | \$ | 588.19 | S | 2,558.96 | \$ | 387,403.81 |
| Feb-24 | \$ | - | \$ | 389,962.77 | \$ | 588.19 | \$ | 3,147.15 | \$ | 386,815.62 |
| Mar-24 | \$ | - | \$ | 389,962.77 | \$ | 588.19 | \$ | 3,735.34 | \$ | 386,227.43 |
| Apr-24 | \$ | - | \$ | 389,962.77 | \$ | 588.19 | \$ | 4,323.53 | \$ | 385,639.24 |
| May-24 | \$ | $\cdot$ | \$ | 389,962.77 | \$ | 588.19 | \$ | 4,911.72 | \$ | 385,051.05 |
| Jun-24 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 428,959.05 | \$ | 617.60 | \$ | 5,529.32 | \$ | 423,429.73 |
| Jul-24 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 467,955.33 | \$ | 676.42 | \$ | 6,205.74 | \$ | 461,749.59 |
| Aug-24 | \$ | 116,988.83 | \$ | 584,944.16 | \$ | 794.06 | \$ | 6,999.80 | \$ | 577,944.36 |
| Sep-24 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 662,936.71 | \$ | 941.11 | \$ | 7,940.91 | \$ | 654,995.80 |
| Oct-24 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 740,929.26 | \$ | 1,058.75 | \$ | 8,999.66 | \$ | 731,929.60 |
| Nov-24 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 779,925.54 | \$ | 1,146.98 | \$ | 10,146.64 | s | 769,778.90 |
| Dec-24 | \$ | - | \$ | 779,925.54 | \$ | 1,176.39 | \$ | 11,323.03 | \$ | 768,602.51 |
| 2025 Jan-25 | \$ |  | \$ | 779,925.54 | \$ | 1,176.39 | \$ | 12,499.42 | \$ | 767,426.12 |
| Feb-25 | \$ | - | \$ | 779,925.54 | \$ | 1,176.39 | \$ | 13,675.81 | \$ | 766,249.73 |
| Mar-25 | s | - | \$ | 779,925.54 | \$ | 1,176.39 | \$ | 14,852.20 | \$ | 765,073.34 |
| Apr-25 | \$ | - | \$ | 779,925.54 | \$ | 1,176.39 | \$ | 16,028.59 | s | 763,896.95 |
| May-25 | \$ |  | \$ | 779,925.54 | \$ | 1,176.39 | \$ | 17,204.98 | \$ | 762,720.56 |
| Jun-25 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 818,921.82 | \$ | 1,205.80 | \$ | 18,410.78 | \$ | 800,511.04 |
| Jul-25 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 857,918.10 | \$ | 1,264.62 | \$ | 19,675.40 | \$ | 838,242.70 |
| Aug-25 | \$ | 116,988.83 | \$ | 974,906.93 | \$ | 1,382.26 | \$ | 21,057.66 | \$ | 953,849.27 |
| Sep-25 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 1,052,899.48 | \$ | 1,529.30 | \$ | 22,586.96 | s | 1,030,312.52 |
| Oct-25 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 1,130,892.03 | \$ | 1,646.94 | \$ | 24,233.90 | \$ | 1,106,658.13 |
| Nov-25 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 1,169,888.31 | \$ | 1,735.17 | \$ | 25,969.07 | \$ | 1,143,919.24 |
| Dec-25 | \$ | - | S | 1,169,888.31 | s | 1,764.58 | \$ | 27,733.65 | s | 1,142,154.66 |
| 2026 Jan-26 | \$ |  | \$ | 1,169,888.31 | \$ | 1,764.58 | \$ | 29,498.23 | \$ | 1,140,390.08 |
| Feb-26 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,169,888.31 | \$ | 1,764.58 | \$ | 31,262.81 | \$ | 1,138,625.50 |
| Mar-26 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,169,888.31 | \$ | 1,764.58 | \$ | 33,027.39 | \$ | 1,136,860.92 |
| Apr-26 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,169,888.31 | \$ | 1,764.58 | \$ | 34,791.97 | \$ | 1,135,096.34 |
| May-26 | \$ |  | \$ | 1,169,888.31 | \$ | 1,764.58 | \$ | 36,556.55 | \$ | 1,133,331.76 |
| Jun-26 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 1,208,884.59 | \$ | 1,793.99 | \$ | 38,350.54 | \$ | 1,170,534.05 |
| Jul-26 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 1,247,880.87 | \$ | 1,852.81 | 5 | 40,203.35 | \$ | 1,207,677.52 |
| Aug-26 | \$ | 116,988.83 | \$ | 1,364,869.70 | \$ | 1,970.45 | \$ | 42,173.80 | \$ | 1,322,695.90 |
| Sep-26 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 1,442,862.25 | \$ | 2,117.50 | \$ | 44,291.30 | \$ | 1,398,570.95 |
| Oct-26 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 1,520,854.80 | \$ | 2,235.14 | \$ | 46,526.44 | \$ | 1,474,328.36 |
| Nov-26 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 1,559,851.08 | \$ | 2,323.37 | \$ | 48,849.81 | \$ | 1,511,001.27 |
| Dec-26 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,559,851.08 | \$ | 2,352.78 | \$ | 51,202.59 | \$ | 1,508,648.49 |
| 2027 Jan-27 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,559,851.08 | \$ | 2,352.78 | \$ | 53,555.37 | \$ | 1,506,295.71 |
| Feb-27 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,559,851.08 | \$ | 2,352.78 | \$ | 55,908.15 | \$ | 1,503,942.93 |
| Mar-27 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,559,851.08 | \$ | 2,352.78 | \$ | 58,260.93 | \$ | 1,501,590.15 |
| Apr-27 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,559,851.08 | \$ | 2,352.78 | \$ | 60,613.71 | \$ | 1,499,237.37 |
| May-27 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,559,851.08 | \$ | 2,352.78 | \$ | 62,966.49 | \$ | 1,496,884.59 |
| Jun-27 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 1,598,847.36 | \$ | 2,382.19 | \$ | 65,348.68 | \$ | 1,533,498.68 |
| Jul-27 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 1,637,843.64 | \$ | 2,441.00 | s | 67,789.68 | \$ | 1,570,053.96 |
| Aug-27 | \$ | 116,988.83 | \$ | 1,754,832.47 | \$ | 2,558.64 | \$ | 70,348.32 | \$ | 1,684,484.15 |
| Sep-27 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 1,832,825.02 | \$ | 2,705.69 | \$ | 73,054.01 | \$ | 1,759,771.01 |
| Oct-27 | \$ | 77,992.55 | \$ | 1,910,817.57 | \$ | 2,823.33 | \$ | 75,877.34 | \$ | 1,834,940.23 |
| Nov-27 | \$ | 38,996.28 | \$ | 1,949,813.85 | \$ | 2,911.56 | ¢ | 78,788.90 | \$ | 1,871,024.95 |
| Dec-27 | s |  | S | 1,949,813.85 | 5 | 2,940.97 | \$ | 81,729.87 | 5 | 1,868,083.98 |




| \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  |
| \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  |
| \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  |
| \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | - | s |  |
| \$ | 38,923.48 | \$ | 21.12 | \$ | 294.72 | \$ | 315.84 |
| \$ | 77,749.27 | \$ | 63.37 | \$ | 588.70 | \$ | 652.07 |
| \$ | 194,264.93 | \$ | 147.86 | \$ | 1,470.94 | \$ | 1,618.80 |
| \$ | 271,506.55 | \$ | 253.48 | \$ | 2,055.80 |  | 2,309.28 |
| \$ | 348,418.66 | \$ | 337.9 | \$ | 2,638.16 | \$ | 2,976.13 |
| \$ | 385,973.25 | \$ | 558.78 | \$ | 3,118.60 |  | ,677.38 |
| s | 384,510.24 | \$ | 88.19 | \$ | 3,106.78 | \$ | 3,694.9 |
| 5 | 383,438.36 | \$ | 588.19 | \$ | 3,098.11 |  | ,686.30 |
| s | 382,366.48 | \$ | 588.1 | \$ | 3,089.45 | \$ | ,677.64 |
| 5 | 381,294.60 | \$ | 588.19 | \$ | 3,080,79 | \$ | ,668.98 |
|  | 380,222.72 | \$ | 588.11 | \$ | 3,072.13 | \$ | 3,660.32 |
| \$ | 379,150.84 | \$ | 588.1 | \$ | 3,063.4 | \$ | 3,651.66 |
| \$ | 416,996.43 | \$ | 617.60 | \$ | 3,369.26 | \$ | 3,986.86 |
| \$ | 454,732.32 | \$ | 676.42 | \$ | 3,674.16 | \$ | 4,350.58 |
| 5 | 570,134.05 | \$ | 794.06 | \$ | 4,606.58 | \$ | 5,400.64 |
| \$ | 646,231.71 | \$ | 941.11 | \$ | 5,221.44 | \$ | 6,162.55 |
| s | 721,975.83 | \$ | 1,058.75 | \$ | 5,833.44 | \$ | ,892.19 |
| \$ | 758,458.53 | \$ | 1,146.98 | \$ | 6,128.21 | \$ | 7,275.19 |
| S | 755,923.63 | \$ | 1,176.39 | \$ | 6,107.73 | S | 7,284.12 |
| \$ | 753,828.33 | \$ | 1,176.39 | \$ | 6,090.80 |  | 7,267.19 |
| 5 | 751,733.03 | \$ | 1,176.39 | \$ | 6,073.87 | \$ | 7,250.26 |
| \$ | 749,637.73 | \$ | 1,176.39 | \$ | 6,056.94 | \$ | 7,233.33 |
| \$ | 747,542.43 | \$ | 1,176.39 | \$ | 6,040.01 | \$ | 7,216.40 |
| \$ | 745,447.13 | \$ | 1,176.39 | \$ | 6,023.08 | \$ | 7,199.47 |
| \$ | 782,269.30 | \$ | 1,205.80 | \$ | 6,320.60 | \$ | 7,526.40 |
| s | 818,981.77 | \$ | 1,264.62 | \$ | 6,617.23 | \$ | 7,881.85 |
| \$ | 933,360.08 | \$ | 1,382.26 | \$ | 7,541.39 | \$ | 8,923.65 |
| s | 1,008,434.33 | \$ | 1,529.30 | \$ | 8,147.97 | \$ | 9,677.27 |
| \$ | 1,083,155.04 | \$ | 1,646.94 | \$ | 8,751.70 | \$ | 10,398.64 |
| \$ | 1,118,614.32 | \$ | 1,735.17 | \$ | 9,038.21 | \$ | 10,773.38 |
| s | 1,115,056.01 | \$ | 1,764.58 | \$ | 9,009.46 | \$ | 10,774.04 |
| \$ | 1,111,982.00 | \$ | 1,764.58 | \$ | 8,984.62 | \$ | 10,749.20 |
| \$ | 1,108,907.99 | \$ | 1,764.58 | \$ | 8,959.78 | \$ | 10,724.36 |
| \$ | 1,105,833.98 | \$ | 1,764.58 | \$ | 8,934.94 | \$ | 10,699.52 |
| 5 | 1,102,759.97 | \$ | 1,764.58 | \$ | 8,910.11 | \$ | 10,674.69 |
| S | 1,099,685.96 | \$ | 1,764.58 | \$ | 8,885.27 | \$ | 10,649.85 |
| \$ | 1,135,529.43 | \$ | 1,793.99 | \$ | 9,174.88 | \$ | 10,968.87 |
| 5 | 1,171,263.20 | \$ | 1,852.81 | \$ | 9,463.60 | \$ | 11,316.41 |
| \$ | 1,284,662.81 | \$ | 1,970.45 | \$ | 10,379.85 | \$ | 12,350.30 |
| S | 1,358,758.35 | \$ | 2,117.50 | \$ | 10,978.53 | \$ | 13,096.03 |
| \$ | 1,432,500.35 | \$ | 2,235.14 | \$ | 11,574.35 | \$ | 13,809.49 |
|  | 1,466,980.92 | \$ | 2,323.37 | \$ | 11,852.95 | \$ | 14,176.32 |
| \$ | 1,462,443.90 | s | 2,352.78 | \$ | 11,816.29 | \$ | 14,169.07 |
|  | 1,458,432.68 | \$ | 2,352.78 | \$ | 11,783.88 | \$ | 14,136.66 |
| S | 1,454,421.46 | \$ | 2,352.78 | \$ | 11,751.47 | \$ | 14,104.25 |
| \$ | 1,450,410.24 | \$ | 2,352.78 | \$ | 11,719.06 | \$ | 14,071.84 |
| \$ | 1,446,399.02 | \$ | 2,352.78 | \$ | 11,686.65 | \$ | 14,039.43 |
| S | 1,442,387.80 | \$ | 2,352.78 | \$ | 11,654.24 | \$ | 14,007.02 |
| \$ | 1,477,294.05 | \$ | 2,382.19 | \$ | 11,936.28 | \$ | 14,318.47 |
| \$ | 1,512,090.61 | \$ | 2,441.00 | \$ | 12,217.43 | \$ | 14,658.43 |
| \$ | 1,624,553.00 | \$ | 2,558.64 | \$ | 13,126.10 | \$ | 15,684.74 |
| \$ | 1,697,711.33 | \$ | 2,705.69 | \$ | 13,717.21 | \$ | 16,422.90 |
| \$ | 1,770,516.12 | \$ | 2,823.33 | \$ | 14,305.46 | \$ | 17,128.79 |
| \$ | 1,804,059.48 | \$ | 2,911.56 | \$ | 14,576.48 | \$ | 17,488.04 |
|  | 1,798,585.25 |  | 2,940.97 |  | 14,532.25 |  |  |


| 2023 Total $=$ | 389,962.77 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2024 Total $=$ | 389,962.77 |
| 2025 Total $=$ | 389,962.77 |
| 2026 Total $=$ | 389,962.77 |

$\begin{array}{lcll}\text { Reg Depreciation } & 1.54 \% & \text { FERC Account } 365 \text { (Annual Rate) } \\ \text { Reffective November 1, 2021 } \\ \text { Reg Depreciation } & 2.02 \% & \text { FERC Account } 365 \text { (Annual Rate) ) proposed to be effective November 1, 2023 } \\ \text { Tax Life } & 20 & \text { Years }\end{array}$


2027 Tax
Depreciation




|  |  | \$ |  | 5 |  | s |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  |
| \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ |  |
| \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ |  |  |  |
| \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ | - |  |  |
| \$ | 220,558.54 | \$ | 141.80 | \$ | 1,670.03 | \$ | 1,811.83 |
| \$ | 440,531.46 | \$ | 425.40 | \$ | 3,335.62 | \$ | 3,761.02 |
| \$ | 1,100,699.22 | \$ | 992.60 | \$ | 8,334.29 | \$ | 9,326.89 |
| \$ | 1,538,225.80 | \$ | 1,701.60 | \$ | 11,647.17 | \$ | 13,348.77 |
| \$ | 1,973,821.00 | \$ | 2,268.80 | \$ | 14,945.41 | \$ | 17,214.21 |
| \$ | 2,186,371.90 | \$ | 3,533.95 | \$ | 17,665.50 | \$ | 21,199.45 |
| S | 2,177,800.89 | \$ | 3,719.95 | \$ | 17,596.25 | s | 21,316.20 |
| \$ | 2,171,446.34 | \$ | 3,719.95 | \$ | 17,544.91 | \$ | 21,264.86 |
| \$ | 2,165,091.79 | \$ | 3,719.95 | \$ | 17,493.56 | \$ | 21,213.51 |
| \$ | 2,158,737.24 | \$ | 3,719.95 | \$ | 17,442.22 | \$ | 21,162.17 |
| \$ | 2,152,382.69 | \$ | 3,719.95 | \$ | 17,390.87 | \$ | 21,110.82 |
| \$ | 2,146,028.14 | \$ | 3,719.95 | \$ | 17,339.53 | \$ | 21,059.48 |
| \$ | 2,360,200.09 | \$ | 3,905.95 | \$ | 19,070.00 | \$ | 22,975.95 |
|  | 2,573,722.35 | \$ | 4,277.94 | \$ | 20,795.23 | S | 25,073.17 |
| \$ | 3,227,311.31 | \$ | 5,021.93 | \$ | 26,076.11 |  | 31,098.04 |
| \$ | 3,658,098.91 | \$ | 5,951.92 | \$ | 29,556.80 | \$ | 35,508.72 |
| \$ | 4,086,827.00 | \$ | 6,695.91 | \$ | 33,020.85 | \$ | 39,716.76 |
| \$ | 4,293,023.35 | \$ | 7,253.90 | \$ | 34,686.88 | \$ | 41,940.78 |
| S | 4,278,097.79 | 5 | 7,439.90 | s | 34,566.28 | 5 | 42,006.18 |
| \$ | 4,265,663.35 | \$ | 7,439.90 | \$ | 34,465.81 | \$ | 41,905.71 |
|  | 4,253,228.91 | \$ | 7,439.90 | \$ | 34,365.34 | \$ | 41,805.24 |
| \$ | 4,240,794.47 | \$ | 7,439.90 | \$ | 34,264. |  | 41,704.78 |
| \$ | 4,228,360.03 | \$ | 7,439.90 | \$ | 34,164.41 | \$ | 41,604.31 |
| \$ | 4,215,925.59 | \$ | 7,439.90 | \$ | 34,063.94 | \$ | 41,503.84 |
|  | 4,424,017.65 | \$ | 7,625.90 | \$ | 35,745.29 | \$ | 43,371.19 |
| \$ | 4,631,460.02 | \$ | 7,997.89 | \$ | 37,421.38 | \$ | 45,419.27 |
| \$ | 5,278,969.09 | \$ | 8,741.88 | \$ | 42,653.14 | \$ | 51,395.02 |
| \$ | 5,703,676.80 | \$ | 9,671.87 | \$ | 46,084.71 | \$ | 55,756.58 |
| \$ | 6,126,325.00 | S | 10,415.86 | \$ | 49,499.63 | \$ | 59,915.49 |
| \$ | 6,326,441.46 | \$ | 10,973.85 | \$ | 51,116.54 | \$ | 62,090.39 |
| \$ | 6,305,436.01 | \$ | 11,159.85 | \$ | 50,946.82 | \$ | 62,106.67 |
| \$ | 6,287,175.06 | \$ | 11,159.85 | \$ | 50,799.27 |  | 61,959.12 |
| \$ | 6,268,914.11 | s | 11,159.85 | \$ | 50,651.73 | \$ | 61,811.58 |
| \$ | 6,250,653.16 | s | 11,159.85 | \$ | 50,504.18 | \$ | 61,664.03 |
| \$ | 6,232,392.21 | \$ | 11,159.85 | \$ | 50,356.64 | \$ | 61,516.49 |
| \$ | 6,214,131.26 | s | 11,159.85 | \$ | 50,209.09 | \$ | 61,368.94 |
| \$ | 6,416,396.81 | \$ | 11,345.85 | \$ | 51,843.36 | \$ | 63,189.21 |
| \$ | 6,618,012.67 | S | 11,717.84 | \$ | 53,472.38 | \$ | 65,190.22 |
| \$ | 7,259,695.23 | \$ | 12,461.83 | s | 58,657.06 | \$ | 71,118.89 |
| \$ | 7,678,576.43 | s | 13,391.82 | \$ | 62,041.55 | \$ | 75,433.37 |
| \$ | 8,095,398.11 | S | 14,135.81 | \$ | 65,409.40 | \$ | 79,545.21 |
| \$ | 8,289,688.06 | 5 | 14,693.80 | \$ | 66,979.23 | \$ | 81,673.03 |
| 5 | 8,262,856.10 | S | 14,879.80 | s | 66,762.43 | s | 81,642.23 |
| \$ | 8,239,003.77 | S | 14,879.80 | \$ | 66,569.71 | \$ | 81,449.51 |
| \$ | 8,215,151.44 | \$ | 14,879.80 | \$ | 66,376.98 | \$ | 81,256.78 |
| \$ | 8,191,299.11 | \$ | 14,879.80 | \$ | 66,184.26 | \$ | 81,064.06 |
| \$ | 8,167,466.78 | \$ | 14,879.80 | \$ | 65,991.54 | \$ | 80,871.34 |
| \$ | 8,143,594.45 | \$ | 14,879.80 | \$ | 65,798.82 | \$ | 80,678.62 |
| \$ | 8,340,268.62 | \$ | 15,065.80 | \$ | 67,387.91 | \$ | 82,453.71 |
| \$ | 8,536,293.10 | s | 15,437.79 | \$ | 68,971.75 | \$ | 84,409.54 |
| \$ | 9,12, 384.28 | \$ | 16,181.78 | \$ | 74,111.26 | \$ | 90,293.04 |
| \$ | 9,585,674.10 | \$ | 17,111.77 | \$ | 77,450.57 | \$ | 94,562.34 |
| 5 | 9,996,904.40 | \$ | 17,855.76 | \$ | 80,773.23 | \$ | 98,628.99 |
|  |  | \$ | 18,413.75 | \$ | 82,297.89 | \$ | 100,711.64 |

$\begin{array}{ll}2023 \text { Annual Revenue Requirement }=\$ & 87,978.37 \\ 2024 \text { Annual Revenue Requirement }=\$ & 344,130.44\end{array}$
 2026 Annual Revenue Requirement $=\$ 8826,112.32$
2027 Annual Revenue Requirement $=\$ 1,057,015.23$

$\begin{array}{lrlll}\text { Reg Depreciation } & 1^{1.62 \%} & \text { FERC Account } 366 \text { (Annual Rate) proposed to be effective November 1, 2023 } \\ \text { Tax Life }\end{array}$

${ }^{1}$ per MD PSC Order No. 89971 dated October 26, 2021 in Case No. 9490 reaffirming Public Utility Law Judge Proposed Order dated May 26, 2021

Exhibit SLF-3

${ }^{1}$ per MD PSC Order No. 89971 dated October 26, 2021 in Case No. 9490 reaffirming Public Utility Law Judge Proposed Order dated May 26, 2021

Exhibit SLF-3

| Reg Depreciation | $1.82 \%$ | FERC Account 368 (Annual Rate) | effective November 1, 2021 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Reg Depreciation | $1.83 \%$ | FERC Account 368 (Annual Rate) proposed to be effective November 1, 2023 |  |
| Tax Life | 20 | Years |  |

Tax Life

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1.83 \% \\
& 20 \\
& \text { FERC Account } 368 \text { (Annual Rate) proposed to be effective November 1, } 2023 \\
& \text { Years }
\end{aligned}
$$


${ }^{1}$ per MD PSC Order No. 89971 dated October 26, 2021 in Case No. 9490 reaffirming Public Utility Law Judge Proposed Order dated May 26, 2021
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { Reg Depreciation } & \text { 1.41\% } & \text { FERC Account } 369 \text { (Annual Rate) })^{1} \text { effective November 1, 2021 } \\ \text { Reg Depreciation } & 1.81 \% & \text { FRRC Account } 369 & \text { (Annual Rate) propesed toveef }\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lrll}\text { Reg Depreciation } & { }^{\text {R }} \\ \text { Tax Life }\end{array}$

| Year | Month |  | In-Service Capital |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { In-Service } \\ \text { Capital Month } \\ \text { Ending } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Regulatory Book | Regulatory Depreciation Reserve |  | Net Plant |  | $\substack{\text { Accumulated } \\ \text { Deferred } \\ \text { Taxes }}$ |  | Rate Base | Return Of: Depreciation | Return On: Rate Base |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Monthly } \\ \text { Revenue } \\ \text { Requirement } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [a] | ${ }^{[b]}$ |  | [c] |  | [d] | [e] | [f] |  | $[g]][d]-[f]$ |  | ${ }^{[n]}$ |  | $[0]=[g]+[n]$ | $\left.{ }^{[p]}\right][e]$ | [a] |  | $[r][p]+[a]$ |
|  | Jan-23 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ | - | \$ | \$ | \$ | - | \$ . | \$ - | \$ | - |
|  | Feb-23 | \$ | - | s | . | \$ - | \$ - | 5 | - | \$ | s | \$ |  | \$ - | \$ - |  | - |
|  | Mar-23 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ | - | \$ | \$ - | \$ | . | \$ - | \$ . | \$ | . |
|  | Apr-23 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ |  | \$ | \$ | \$ | - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ |  |
|  | May-23 | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ - | \$ . | \$ | - | \$ | \$ - | \$ |  | \$ - | \$ . | \$ |  |
|  | Jun-23 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 253.78 | 0.15 | 0.15 | \$ | 253.63 |  | \$ (0.33) | \$ | 253.30 | 0.15 | 1.92 |  | 2.07 |
|  | Jul-23 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 507.56 | 0.45 | 0.60 | \$ | 506.96 | \$ | \$ (1.02) | \$ | 505.94 | 0.45 | 3.83 | \$ | 4.28 |
|  | Aug-23 | \$ | 761.34 | \$ | 1,268.90 | 1.04 | 1.64 | \$ | 1,267.26 | \$ | \$ (3.12) | \$ | 1,264.14 | 1.04 | 9.57 |  | 10.61 |
|  | Sep-23 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 1,776.46 | 1.79 | 3.43 | \$ | 1,773.03 | \$ | (6.32) | \$ | 1,766.71 | 1.79 | 13.38 | \$ | 15.17 |
|  | Oct-23 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 2,284,02 | 2.39 | 5.82 | \$ | 2,278.20 | \$ | \$ (11.10) | \$ | 2,267.10 | 2.39 | 17.17 |  | 19.56 |
|  | Nov-23 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 2,537.80 | 3.64 | 9.46 | \$ | 2,528.34 | \$ | \$ (16.85) | \$ | 2,511.49 | 3.64 | 20.29 | \$ | 23.93 |
|  | Dec-23 | \$ | . | \$ | 2,537.80 | 3.83 | 13.29 | \$ | 2,524.51 | \$ | \$ (22.54) | s | 2,501.97 | 3.83 | 20.22 | \$ | 24.05 |
| 2024 | Jan-24 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,537.80 | 3.83 | 17.12 | \$ | 2,520.68 | \$ | \$ (25.69) | \$ | 2,494.99 | ${ }^{3.83}$ | 20.16 | \$ | 23.99 |
|  | Feb-24 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,537.80 | 3.83 | 20.95 | \$ | 2,516.85 | \$ | \$ (28.84) | \$ | 2,488.01 | 3.83 | 20.10 |  | 23.93 |
|  | Mar-24 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,537.80 | 3.83 | 24.78 | \$ | 2,513.02 | \$ | \$ (31.99) | \$ | 2,481.03 | 3.83 | 20.05 |  | 23.88 |
|  | Apr-24 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,537.80 | 3.83 | 28.61 | \$ | 2,509.19 | \$ | (35.14) | \$ | 2,474.05 | 3.83 | 19.99 |  | 23.82 |
|  | May-24 | \$ | - | \$ | 2,537.80 | 3.83 | 32.44 | \$ | 2,505.36 | \$ | \$ (38.29) | \$ | 2,467.07 | 3.83 | 19.93 |  | 23.76 |
|  | Jun-24 | \$ | 253.78 | s | 2,791.58 | 4.02 | 36.46 | \$ | 2,755.12 | \$ | \$ (41.76) | s | 2,713.36 | 4.02 | 21.92 |  | 25.94 |
|  | Jul-24 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 3,045.36 | 4.40 | 40.86 | \$ | 3,004.50 | s | \$ (45.56) | \$ | 2,958.94 | 4.40 | 23.91 |  | 28.31 |
|  | Aug-24 | \$ | 761.34 | \$ | 3,806.70 | 5.17 | 46.03 | \$ | 3,760.67 | \$ | \$ (50.72) | \$ | 3,709.95 | 5.17 | 29.98 | \$ | 35.15 |
|  | Sep-24 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 4,314.26 | 6.12 | 52.15 | \$ | 4,262.11 | \$ | s (56.93) | \$ | 4,205.18 | 6.12 | 33.98 |  | 40.10 |
|  | Oct-24 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 4,821.82 | 6.89 | 59.04 | \$ | 4,762.78 | \$ | \$ (64.67) | \$ | 4,698.11 | 6.89 | 37.96 | \$ | 44.85 |
|  | Nov-24 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 5,075.60 | 7.46 | 66.50 | \$ | 5,009.10 | \$ | \$ (73.57) | \$ | 4,933.53 | 7.46 | 39.88 |  | 47.34 |
|  | Dec-24 | \$ | . | \$ | 5,075.60 | 7.66 | 74.16 | \$ | 5,001.44 | \$ | \$ (82.41) | s | 4,919.03 | 7.66 | 39.74 | \$ | 47.40 |
| 2025 | Jan-25 | \$ | . | \$ | 5,075.60 | 7.66 | 81.82 | \$ | 4,993.78 | \$ | \$ (88.39) | \$ | 4,905.39 | 7.66 | 39.63 |  | 47.29 |
|  | Feb-25 | \$ |  | \$ | 5,075.60 | 7.66 | 89.48 | \$ | 4,986.12 | \$ | \$ (94.37) | \$ | 4,891.75 | 7.66 | 39.52 | \$ | 47.18 |
|  | Mar-25 | \$ | - | s | 5,075.60 | 7.66 | 97.14 | \$ | 4,978.46 |  | \$ (100.35) | \$ | 4,878.11 | 7.66 | 39.41 |  | 47.07 |
|  | Apr-25 | \$ |  | \$ | 5,075.60 | 7.66 | 104.80 | \$ | 4,970.80 | \$ | \$ (106.33) | \$ | 4,864.47 | 7.66 | 39.30 | \$ | 46.96 |
|  | May-25 | \$ | - | \$ | 5,075.60 | 7.66 | 112.46 | \$ | 4,963.14 | \$ | \$ (112.31) | \$ | 4,850.83 | 7.66 | 39.19 |  | 46.85 |
|  | Jun-25 | \$ | 253.78 | s | 5,329.38 | 7.85 | 120.31 | \$ | 5,209.07 | \$ | \$ (118.61) | \$ | 5,090.46 | 7.85 | 41.13 | s | 48.98 |
|  | Jul-25 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 5,583.16 | 8.23 | 128.54 | \$ | 5,454.62 | \$ | \$ (125.24) | \$ | 5,329.38 | 8.23 | 43.06 |  | 51.29 |
|  | Aug-25 | \$ | 761.34 | \$ | 6,344.50 | 9.00 | 137.54 | \$ | 6,206.96 |  | \$ (133.23) | \$ | 6,073.73 | 9.00 | 49.07 |  | 58.07 |
|  | Sep-25 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 6,852.06 | 9.95 | 147.49 | \$ | 6,704.57 |  | \$ (142.27) | \$ | 6,562.30 | 9.95 | 53.02 |  | 62.97 |
|  | Oct-25 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 7,359.62 | 10.72 | 158.21 | \$ | 7,201.41 |  | \$ (152.84) | \$ | 7,048.57 | 10.72 | 56.95 |  | 67.67 |
|  | Nov-25 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 7,613.40 | 11.29 | 169.50 | \$ | 7,443.90 |  | \$ (164.57) | \$ | 7,279.33 | 11.29 | 58.82 |  | 70.11 |
|  | Dec-25 | \$ | . | \$ | 7,613.40 | 11.48 | 180.98 | \$ | 7,432.42 | s | \$ (176.25) | s | 7,256.17 | 11.48 | 58.63 | \$ | 70.11 |
| 2026 | Jan-26 | \$ | - | \$ | 7,613.40 | 11.48 | 192.46 | \$ | 7,420.94 | \$ | \$ (184.77) | \$ | 7,236.17 | 11.48 | 58.47 |  | 69.95 |
|  | Feb-26 | \$ | - | \$ | 7,613.40 | 11.48 | 203.94 | \$ | 7,409.46 |  | \$ (193.29) | \$ | 7,216.17 | 11.48 | 58.31 |  | 69.79 |
|  | Mar-26 | \$ | - | \$ | 7,613.40 | 11.48 | 215.42 | \$ | 7,397.98 | \$ | \$ (201.81) | \$ | 7,196.17 | 11.48 | 58.14 |  | 69.62 |
|  | Apr-26 | \$ | - | \$ | 7,613.40 | 11.48 | 226.90 | \$ | 7,386.50 |  | \$ (210.33) | s | 7,176.17 | 11.48 | 57.98 |  | 69.46 |
|  | May-26 | \$ | - | \$ | 7,613.40 | 11.48 | 238.38 | \$ | 7,375.02 | \$ | \$ (218.85) | \$ | 7,156.17 | 11.48 | 57.82 |  | 69.30 |
|  | Jun-26 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 7,867.18 | 11.67 | 250.05 | \$ | 7,617.13 |  | \$ (227.69) | s | 7,389.44 | 11.67 | 59.71 |  | 71.38 |
|  | Jul-26 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 8,120.96 | 12.06 | 262.11 | \$ | 7,858.85 | \$ | \$ (236.86) | \$ | 7,621.99 | 12.06 | 61.58 |  | 73.64 |
|  | Aug-26 | \$ | 761.34 | \$ | 8,882.30 | 12.82 | 274.93 | \$ | 8,607.37 |  | \$ (247.40) | \$ | 8,359.97 | 12.82 | 67.55 |  | 80.37 |
|  | Sep-26 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 9,389986 | 13.78 | 288.71 | \$ | 9,101.15 | \$ | \$ (258.98) | \$ | 8,842.17 | 13.78 | 71.44 |  | 85.22 |
|  | Oct-26 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 9,897.42 | 14.55 | 303.26 | \$ | 9,594.16 |  | \$ (272.09) | S | 9,322.07 | 14.55 | 75.32 |  | 89.87 |
|  | Nov-26 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 10,151.20 | 15.12 | \$ 318.38 | s | 9,832.82 | \$ | \$ (286.36) | \$ | 9,546.46 | 15.12 | 77.13 | 5 | 92.25 |
|  | Dec-26 | \$ | - | \$ | 10,151.20 | 15.31 | 333.69 | \$ | 9,817.51 | \$ | ¢ (300.58) | S | 9,516.93 | 15.31 | 76.90 | \$ | 92.21 |
|  | Jan-27 | \$ | - | \$ | 10,151.20 | 15.31 | \$ 349.00 | \$ | 9,802.20 | \$ | \$ (311.37) | \$ | 9,490.83 | 15.31 | 76.68 | s | 91.99 |
|  | Feb-27 | \$ | - | \$ | 10,151.20 | 15.31 | \$ 364.31 | \$ | 9,786.89 | \$ | \$ (322.16) | \$ | 9,464.73 | 15.31 | 76.47 |  | 91.78 |
|  | Mar-27 | \$ | - | \$ | 10,151.20 | 15.31 | \$ 379.62 | \$ | 9,771.58 | \$ | \$ (332.95) | \$ | 9,438.63 | 15.31 | 76.26 | \$ | 91.57 |
|  | Apr-27 | \$ | - | \$ | 10,151.20 | 15.31 | \$ 394.93 | \$ | 9,756.27 |  | \$ (343.74) | \$ | 9,412.53 | 15.31 | 76.05 |  | 91.36 |
|  | May-27 | \$ |  | \$ | 10,151.20 | 15.31 | 410.24 | \$ | 9,740.96 |  | \$ (354.53) | \$ | 9,386.43 | 15.31 | 75.84 | \$ | 91.15 |
|  | Jun-27 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 10,404.98 | 15.50 | 425.74 | \$ | 9,979.24 |  | \$ (365.64) | \$ | 9,613.60 | 15.50 | 77.68 |  | 93.18 |
|  | Jul-27 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 10,658.76 | 15.89 | 441.63 | \$ | 10,217.13 | \$ | \$ (377.08) | \$ | 9,840.05 | 15.89 | 79.51 | \$ | 95.40 |
|  | Aug-27 | \$ | 761.34 | \$ | 11,420.10 | 16.65 | 458.28 | \$ | 10,961.82 |  | \$ (389.89) | \$ | 10,571.93 | 16.65 | 85.42 |  | 102.07 |
|  | Sep-27 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 11,927.66 | 17.61 | 475.89 | \$ | 11,451.77 | \$ | \$ (403.74) | \$ | 11,048.03 | 17.61 | 89.27 | \$ | 106.88 |
|  | Oct-27 | \$ | 507.56 | \$ | 12,435.22 | 18.37 | 494.26 | \$ | 11,940.96 |  | \$ (419.13) | \$ | 11,521.83 | 18.37 | 93.09 |  | 111.46 |
|  | Nov-27 | \$ | 253.78 | \$ | 12,689.00 | 18.95 | 513.21 | \$ | 12,175.79 | \$ | \$ (435.67) | \$ | 11,740.12 | 18.95 | 94.86 | 5 | 113.81 |
|  | Dec-27 | \$ | . | s | 12,689.00 | 19.14 | \$ 532.35 | s | 12,156.65 | s | s (452.16) | s | 11,704.49 | \$ 19.14 | 94.57 | \$ | 113.71 |
| 2023 | otal $=$ | \$ | 2,537.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2023 Annual Revenue | e Requirement $=$ |  | 99.67 |
| 2024 | otal $=$ | \$ | 2,537.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2024 Annual Revenue | e Requirement $=$ | \$ | 388.47 |
| 2025 | otal $=$ | \$ | 2,537.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2025 Annual Revenue | e Requirement $=$ | \$ | 664.55 |
| 2026 | otal $=$ | \$ | 2,537.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2026 Annual Revenue | e Requirement $=$ | \$ | 933.06 |
| 2027 | otal $=$ | \$ | 2,537.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2027 Annual Revenue | Requirement = | \$ | 1,194.36 |

${ }^{1}$ per MD PSC Order No. 89971 dated October 26, 2021 in Case No. 9490 reaffirming Public Utility Law Judge Proposed Order dated May 26, 2021

${ }^{1}$ per MD PSC Order No. 89971 dated October 26, 2021 in Case No. 9490 reaffirming Public Utility Law Judge Proposed Order dated May 26, 2021

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Rate } \\ \text { Schedule } \end{gathered}$ | Primary NCP Allocation Factor ${ }^{1}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Secondary NCP } \\ \text { Allocation } \\ \text { Factor }^{1} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Allocation Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | [a] | ${ }^{\text {b }]}$ | $\begin{gathered} {[c]=[a] \times 50 \%+} \\ {[b] \times 50 \%} \end{gathered}$ |
| R | 0.61366 | 0.64758 | 0.63062 |
| G, C | 0.13428 | 0.13963 | 0.13695 |
| C-A, CSH | 0.00395 | 0.00373 | 0.00384 |
| PH | 0.24003 | 0.20277 | 0.22140 |
| pp | 0.00213 |  | 0.00106 |
| St Lighting | 0.00595 | 0.00628 | 0.00612 |
| Total | 1.00000 | 1.00000 | 1.0000 |



| Forecasted Sales | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Underground } \\ & \text { Cable } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| kWh | \$/kwh |
| [h] | (i) $=$ $([e l+[f]+[g]) /[h]$ |
| 3,463,726,538 | 0.00035 |
| 903,900,034 | 0.00029 |
| 17,551,856 | 0.00042 |
| 1,891,164,520 | \$ 0.00023 |
| 759,845,203 | \$ 0.00000 |
| 26,428,837 | 0.00045 |



| $\begin{gathered} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Forecasted } \\ \text { Sales } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Recloser |
| :---: | :---: |
| kWh | \$/kwh |
| $[1]=[h]$ | $[m]=[k] /[1]$ |
| 3,463,726,538 | 0.00003 |
| 903,900,034 | 0.00002 |
| 17,551,856 | 0.00003 |
| 1,891,164,520 | 0.00002 |
| 759,845,203 | 0.00000 |
| 26,428,837 | 0.00003 |


| Resiliency |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Allocation | 2024 Revenue Requirement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Forecasted Sales | Resiliency |  |
| RateSchedule |  | FERC362 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FERC } \\ & 364 \end{aligned}$ |  | FERC365 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FERCR } \\ & 366 \end{aligned}$ |  | FERC367 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FERC } \\ & 368 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FERC } \\ & 369 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FERC } \\ & 397 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Factor |  |  | kwh | \$/kWh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $[n]=[c]$ |  | ${ }^{\text {[0] }}$ |  |  |  | ${ }^{\text {[p] }}$ |  | [9] |  | ${ }^{[r]}$ |  | [s] |  | [t] |  | [u] |  | [v] | $[$ [ $]=[h]$ |  | ([0] to |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{[w]}$ |
| R | 0.63062 | \$ | 172.00 | \$ | 37,646.27 | \$ | 217,016.29 | \$ | 10.53 | \$ | 62.61 | \$ | 18,255.66 | \$ | 244.98 | \$ |  | 3,463,726,538 | \$ | 0.00008 |
| G, C | 0.13695 | \$ | 37.36 | \$ | 8,175.78 | \$ | 47,130.25 | \$ | 22.92 | \$ | 135.87 | \$ | 3,964.65 | \$ | 53.20 | \$ |  | 903,900,034 | \$ | 0.00007 |
| C-A, CSH | 0.00384 | \$ | 1.05 | \$ | 229.47 | \$ | 1,322.80 | \$ | 0.64 | \$ | 3.81 | \$ | 111.28 | \$ | 1.49 | \$ |  | 17,551,856 | \$ | 0.00010 |
| PH | 0.22140 | \$ | 60.39 | \$ | 13,216.93 | \$ | 76,190.55 | \$ | 37.05 | \$ | 219.64 | \$ | 6,409.23 | \$ | 86.01 | \$ |  | 1,891,164,520 | \$ | 0.00005 |
| Pp | 0.00106 | \$ | 0.29 | \$ | 63.44 | \$ | 365.69 | \$ | 0.18 | \$ | 1.05 | \$ | 30.76 | \$ | 0.41 | \$ |  | 759,845,203 | \$ | 0.00000 |
| St Lighting | 0.00612 | s | 1.67 | s | 365.14 | s | 2,104.86 | s | 1.02 | s | 6.07 | s | 177.06 | s | 2.38 | s |  | 26,428,837 | \$ | 0.00010 |
| Total | 1.00000 | \$ | 272.76 | \$ | 59,697.03 | \$ | 344,130.44 | \$ | 167.34 | \$ | 992.05 | \$ | 28,948.64 | \$ | 388.47 | \$ |  |  |  |  |


| Deferral Reconciliation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Rate } \\ \text { Schedule } \end{gathered}$ | Allocation | 2023 Deferral |
|  |  | (Over)/Under |
|  |  |  |
|  | $[y]=[c]$ | [z] |
| R | 0.63062 | \$ |
| G, C | 0.13695 | \$ |
| C-A, CSH | 0.00384 | \$ |
| PH | 0.22140 | \$ |
| pp | 0.00106 | \$ |
| StLighting | 0.00612 | s |
| Total | 1.00000 | \$ |


| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Forecasted } \\ \text { Sales } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Deferral } \\ \text { Reconciliation } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | EDIS Total W/out GST \& Assess. Fee | EDIST Total $\mathrm{w} / \mathrm{GRT} \&$ Assess. Fee |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| kWh | \$/kWh | \$/kWh | S/kWh |
| $[a a]=[b]$ | $[a b]=[z] /[a a]$ | $\begin{gathered} {[a c]=[i]+[m]+} \\ {[x]+[a b]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} [a d]=[a c] /] \\ 0.977227 \end{gathered}$ |
| 3,463,726,538 | \$ | 0.00046 | 0.00047 |
| 903,900,034 | \$ | 0.00038 | 0.00039 |
| 17,51,856 | \$ | 0.00055 | 0.00056 |
| 1,891,164,520 | \$ | 0.00029 | 0.00030 |
| 759,845,203 | \$ | 0.00000 | 0.00000 |
| 26,42,837 | \$ . | 0.00058 | 0.00059 |

Underground Cable Replacement Revenue Requirement $=\$ \quad 1,926,977$

| Recloser Replacement Revenue Requirement $=$ | $1,196,979$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Resiliency Revenue Requirement $=$ | 434,59 |

Resiliency Revenue Requirement $=$
2023 Reconciliation $=$
$=$

## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY - MARYLAND

Authorized Rate of Return ${ }^{1}$

| Description | Percent | Cost Rate | Weighted <br> Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


|  |  | $47.18 \%$ | $4.335 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Long Term Debt | $52.82 \%$ | $9.650 \%$ | $2.05 \%$ |
| Common Equity |  | $5.10 \%$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total | $100.00 \%$ |  | $7.15 \%$ |
| Pre-Tax Rate of Return |  |  | $9.09 \%$ |


| Federal Income Tax Rate (FIT) | $21.00 \%^{2}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| State Income Tax Rate (SIT) | $8.25 \%^{3}$ |
| Gross Income Tax Rate (GIT) |  |
| $=1-(1-$ SIT $) *(1-F I T)$ | $27.52 \%$ |

${ }^{1}$ per PSC Order No. 89072 issued March 22, 2019 in Case No. 9490
${ }^{2}$ per Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017, Pub. L. No. 115-97, Section 13001
${ }^{3}$ per COMAR 03.04.03.05

## Proposed Rate of Return

| Percent | Cost Rate | Weighted <br> Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |


| $46.47 \%$ | $4.018 \%$ | $1.87 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $53.53 \%$ | $10.600 \%$ | $5.67 \%$ |

## BEFORE THE

## PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

## OF MARYLAND

| In the Matter of the Application | $*$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Of The Potomac Edison Company | $*$ |  |
| For Adjustments to its Retail | $*$ | Case No. |
| Rates for the Distribution of $*$  <br> Electric Energy $*$  |  |  |

# DIRECT TESTIMONY OF 

DONALD J. MCGETTIGAN

Concerning: Electric Distribution Reliability; EDIS Program Phases I and II

## I. INTRODUCTION

## Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is Donald J. McGettigan, and my business address is 12454 Garrett Highway, Oakland, MD 21550.

## Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?

A. I am employed by The Potomac Edison Company ("PE" or "Company") as a Director, Operations. I am one of two such directors for PE. In this capacity, I report to the President, Maryland Operations. My responsibilities include leading the PE Operations regional organization for the western half of PE's service territory. This includes responsibility for lines, substations, meter reading and the fleet organizations. The second PE operation's director is responsible for the eastern half of the service territory.
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.
A. I earned a Bachelor of Science degree in mathematics from Frostburg State College, a Bachelor of Science degree in electrical engineering from the University of Maryland, and a Master of Business Administration degree from West Virginia University. Over the last 36 years, I have held a number of positions in both the Operations and Customer Service organizations of PE which have included Planning Engineer, Supervisor of Customer Service, Supervisor of Engineering, and General Manager of Lines/Operations. Most recently, I was appointed to the Director, Operations position in 2014. In my current role, I oversee western distribution operations of the Company, as noted above. I have also
played a primary role with respect to the design and implementation of PE's current Electric Distribution Investment Surcharge ("EDIS") program.
Q. HAVE YOU TESTIFIED IN RATE PROCEEDINGS BEFORE REGULATORY COMMISSIONS?
A. Yes. Most recently, in 2018 and 2019, I provided testimony in PE's distribution base rate filing (Case No. 9490).

## II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY.

A. The purpose of my testimony is to provide supporting information regarding electric distribution operations, the Company's reliability performance for 2019 through 2022, and the EDIS program, which the Maryland Public Service Commission ("Commission") initially approved through the end of $2022^{1}$ and then extended through $2023^{2}$. I will also describe the proposed incremental infrastructure improvements in the Company's electric distribution system which, if approved in this case, would form EDIS Phase II beginning in 2024, and for which the Company has proposed surcharge recovery (consistent with the current treatment of EDIS) as discussed by Company witness Fall. Finally, I address one area of state policy with respect to which, in the most recent rate cases filed by other utilities, the Commission's Staff has taken the position that the utility needs to provide

[^26]testimony specifically speaking to those policies. My testimony is comprised of the following sections:

- Overview of Electric Distribution Service Territory
- Distribution System Reliability
- Current and Proposed EDIS Programs
- Underground Cable Replacement
- Substation Recloser Replacement
- Current Distribution Automation, Future Resiliency
- PE's labor standards and practices
- Conclusion


## Q. HAVE YOU PREPARED OR HAD PREPARED UNDER YOUR SUPERVISION EXHIBITS TO ACCOMPANY YOUR TESTIMONY? <br> A. Yes. Exhibit DJM-1 shows the number of miles of unjacketed underground cable installed by year. Exhibit DJM-2 shows the underground cable failures from 2019 through 2022. Exhibit DJM-3 shows PE's reliability statistics, including SAIDI ${ }^{\text {MED3 }}$, from 2017 through 2022.

## III. OVERVIEW OF ELECTRIC DISTRIBUTION SERVICE TERRITORY

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE COMPANY'S SERVICE TERRITORY.

[^27]A. The Company provides retail electric service to approximately 285,000 customers in a service territory that covers approximately $26 \%$ of Maryland's land mass and includes all or parts of seven counties and 41 municipalities. Specifically, PE's Maryland service territory encompasses 2,547 square miles, includes all or parts of Allegany, Carroll, Frederick, Garrett, Howard, Montgomery, and Washington counties, and is served by six operating districts. PE's unique service territory is a combination of suburban, rural, and mountainous terrain and demographics, with the Company laying astride and adjacent to the eastern edge of the mountain boundary between Midwestern and Mid-Atlantic weather patterns. This means, among other things, that the Company and its customers can experience more extreme weather challenges than the rest of the state, especially in the winter months.

The Company operates and maintains over 14,200 conductor miles of primary distribution circuits, over 490 circuit miles (more than 1,470 conductor miles) of subtransmission circuits, and in excess of 195,000 PE-owned poles. PE's electric distribution system is a three-phase, multi-grounded wye distribution system which operates at the following voltages: 4 kilovolts (" $k V$ "), $12.47 \mathrm{kV}, 34.5 \mathrm{kV}$, and 69 kV . The system was historically built to meet growth needs while minimizing rate impacts. The distribution system therefore is largely radial, meaning that there are many single-feed circuits with minimal opportunities to feed customers from a secondary source when they experience an outage. Also, many of the circuits traverse off-road areas and are therefore difficult to access.

## Q. HAS PE'S SERVICE TERRITORY EXPERIENCED AN INCREASING NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS?

A. Yes. The number of customers served by PE has increased by approximately $1.4 \%$ per year over the last five years.

## IV. DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM RELIABILITY

Q. PLEASE DISCUSS THE RELIABILITY AND PERFORMANCE OF PE'S DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM.
A. The trends in SAIFI ${ }^{4}$ and SAIDI ${ }^{5}$ have improved since the enactment of the Code of Maryland Regulations ("COMAR") 20.50.12 Rulemaking 43 ("RM43") in 2012. In particular, PE has seen continued improvements since 2019 with the implementation of the EDIS program. Chart 1 below reflects the three-year average reliability data for the Company for the previous four-year period.

[^28]Chart 1: PE 3-Year Average SAIDI and SAIFI Statistics from 2019 through 2022

3-yr Average Reliability Statistics 2019-2022


## Q. HAS PE'S PERFORMANCE COMPLIED WITH THE MARYLAND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION ("COMMISSION") REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS FOR RELIABILITY?

A. Generally, yes. Of the many requirements added to COMAR 20.50.12 in RM43, Staff highlights ten in their annual reliability reports. PE has met those highlighted standards in each of the last five years with only a relative handful of exceptions. ${ }^{6}$ PE has met all RM43 standards for the last two years.

[^29]
## Q. HAS THE COMMISSION RECENTLY REVISED THE RELIABILITY STANDARDS?

A. Yes. As required by COMAR, beginning on March 1, 2014, and every four years thereafter, each electric utility must file proposed annual SAIFI and SAIDI reliability standards for its Maryland service territory. ${ }^{7}$ In accordance with COMAR, on March 1, 2022, PE filed its proposed reliability standards for SAIFI and SAIDI for the period 2024 through 2027. The Commission approved the proposed standards at the July 28, 2022, Administrative Hearing.

PE's SAIFI standard to be met in each of the next four years was lowered (i.e., made more stringent) to 1.05 from 1.06. PE's SAIDI standard remained flat at 142 even though the calculation using the flat reliability scenario showed that it should be 151 . PE will need to continue to improve its SAIDI performance to consistently meet its SAIDI standard, especially when incorporating an appropriate planning margin.
Q. DOES PE HAVE THE DESIRE TO CONTINUE TO IMPROVE ON THESE STATISTICS?
A. Yes, and this is the main reason why the Company is proposing a Phase II to EDIS. While the three current EDIS programs that are described in my testimony were designed to have a positive impact on overall system reliability, and while customers have in fact experienced improved reliability in both blue-sky and storm conditions, the Company does see room for further improvement. The reliability impact of the current EDIS programs is

[^30]detailed in each program description below; so are the expected future benefits of continuing the programs in EDIS Phase II along with concurrent cost recovery.

## Q. IN ADDITION TO THE RELIABILITY INVESTMENTS RELATED TO THE EDIS PROGRAM, HAS THE COMPANY CONTINUED TO INVEST IN THE DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM?

A. Yes, PE has improved system reliability by investing in projects such as circuit tie additions, Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition ("SCADA") additions, and overhead to underground conversions. PE also recently installed West Jefferson Substation, a 230 $\mathrm{kV}-34.5 \mathrm{kV}$ substation to eliminate source outages experienced by approximately 4,300 customers in the PE Maryland territory. Other investment types, including line reconductoring, equipment upgrades, and new substation construction, have been completed to prepare for and better serve the growing capacity needs on PE's distribution system.

## V. CURRENT AND PROPOSED EDIS PROGRAMS

## Q. WHAT PROGRAMS COMPRISE PE'S CURRENT EDIS PROGRAM?

A. PE's EDIS program is currently comprised of three programs:
(1) Underground Cable Replacement - The replacement of aging underground bare concentric neutral electrical cable that is in direct contact with the ground has been shown to improve overall system reliability and individual customer reliability. To proactively address this aging cable, PE is accelerating the replacement of bare
concentric neutral cable with more reliable, jacketed cable before failure rather than afterwards.
(2) Substation Recloser Replacements - Existing substation circuit reclosers are usually three-phase devices that operate all three phases even when a fault occurs only on a single circuit phase. Modern reclosers are designed to only interrupt the faulted circuit phase(s) in the event of a fault that does not impact all three circuit phases. With single-phase operation and electronic controller technology on modern reclosers, fewer customers experience momentary interruptions, and the number of customers experiencing sustained outages, as well as the duration of those outages, is reduced.
(3) Distribution Automation ("DA") - DA equipment and automatic restoration methods have been shown to improve overall system reliability and individual customer reliability by isolating faulted line sections and restoring service to the remainder of the feeder. DA systems employ a tie with an adjacent circuit to provide a second source during faulted conditions, therefore reducing the overall impact of an outage.

## Underground Cable Replacement

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE UNDERGROUND CABLE IN PE'S SERVICE

 TERRITORY.A. PE began installing underground cable as early as 1938. From that time through approximately 1988, the majority of the installed underground cable was "unjacketed" with
a bare concentric neutral ("BCN"). This means that the neutral conductor is in direct contact with the ground, exposing it to deterioration mechanisms, which makes it more prone to failure. This BCN cable is estimated to have an average service life of 25 to 30 years. PE estimates that it has approximately 972 miles of BCN cable. Exhibit DJM-1 shows the comparison of installed BCN cable per year in 2018 compared to 2022. The chart effectively shows the BCN cable reduction by installation year under the EDIS program.

Through the EDIS Underground Cable Replacement program, PE targets the accelerated replacement of 50 miles of direct-buried BCN underground electrical cable per year. Through December 31, 2022, approximately 206 miles of BCN cable have been replaced, leaving approximately 972 miles to be replaced. At a replacement rate of approximately 50 miles per year, the Company needs just under 20 more years to replace the remaining 972 miles of BCN cable with jacketed cable. Accordingly, PE proposes to continue the Underground Cable Replacement program in EDIS Phase II.

## Q. IS PE EXPECTING AN INCREASING NUMBER OF UNDERGROUND CABLE

## FAILURES?

A. Yes, unless the Company continues to proactively replace the cable as it has been doing in the EDIS program. Underground cable failures typically occur on hot, sunny days and are generally lengthy to fix due to the complexity of locating the cable fault and making repairs. Since there was a higher amount of BCN cable installed during the time period of 1982 through 1988, PE expects to experience an increase in underground cable failures as additional BCN cable reaches the end of its estimated life span.

## Q. DESCRIBE THE OVERALL BENEFITS OF THE REPLACEMENT OF BCN CABLE ON RELIABILITY.

A. As the BCN cable continues to age, it's estimated that the failure rate will increase dramatically. As noted above, the outages that result from an underground cable fault tend to be lengthy and inconvenient for the customer. By replacing the cable before it fails, these lengthy outages will be avoided, thereby improving both customer satisfaction and system reliability. Exhibit DJM-2 shows the decline in the number of underground cable failures since the start of the EDIS program. As more BCN cable is replaced, a greater overall benefit will continue to be realized.

## Substation Recloser Replacements

## Q. DESCRIBE PE'S CURRENT RECLOSER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM.

A. Since 2013, PE has been replacing select distribution circuit reclosers in its substations. The new reclosers employ several technological benefits over the existing substation circuit reclosers. First, the new reclosers only interrupt the faulted circuit phase(s) in the event of a fault that doesn't impact all three circuit phases. Existing substation circuit reclosers that have not yet been replaced are usually three-phase devices that operate all three phases even when a fault occurs only on a single circuit phase. Second, during momentary faults, the new reclosers analyze real-time data in order to minimize the number of customers interrupted. Third, the new reclosers have remote operation capabilities. This allows system operators in our Distribution Control Center to operate the reclosers remotely and assist line workers in the field during restoration activities.

## Q. HOW MANY RECLOSERS NEED TO BE REPLACED WITH THE NEW TYPE OF SUBSTATION RECLOSERS?

A. PE's recloser program was approved to replace 68 reclosers by installing approximately 14 reclosers per year for 5 years. While PE's EDIS program was approved to begin in 2019, the recloser installations were not started until 2020 due to the lead time needed for design of the installations. There were 15 installations in 2020, 13 in 2021 and $8^{8}$ in 2022. In 2023, 14 will be installed for a total of 50 installations over the program to date. The Company proposes that the remaining 18 installations would be completed in $2025^{9}$ and 2026 (9 each year) in EDIS Phase II.
Q. WHAT BENEFITS HAS PE REALIZED BY INSTALLING THE NEW RECLOSERS?
A. With single-phase tripping and electronic controller technology, fewer customers experience momentary interruptions on circuits equipped with the new type of circuit recloser. In addition, the single-phase tripping feature reduces both the number of customers experiencing sustained outages as well as the duration of those outages. From 2020 through 2022, PE installed 36 reclosers which have seen an approximate benefit of 4.8 minutes of SAIDI and 0.005 SAIFI per year.

## Q. ON HOW MANY ADDITIONAL CIRCUITS DOES PE PLAN TO INSTALL THE NEW RECLOSERS?

[^31]A. As noted above, PE plans to install the new substation reclosers on an additional 18 Maryland circuits during 2025 and 2026.

## Q. WHAT OVERALL BENEFIT DOES PE ANTICIPATE FROM COMPLETION OF THE RECLOSER INSTALLATION PROGRAM?

A. PE expects to continue to see a reduction in the number of circuit lockouts as well as a reduction in the number of customers impacted when a circuit lockout does occur. This will result in an approximate 0.007 SAIFI reduction and 8.6-minute SAIDI reduction in the year following completion of the final recloser replacement (2027 and beyond).

## Current Distribution Automation, Future Resiliency

## Q. HOW DOES DA IMPROVE RELIABILITY?

A. DA systems employ a tie with an adjacent circuit to provide a second source during faulted conditions. In the diagram below, the star indicates a line fault on Circuit X between Substation A and Switch 1 ("S1"). If Circuit X had no alternate source from which it could be fed, or no way to isolate the fault, this would result in an outage of the entire circuit. However, since the fault can be isolated using S , the rest of Circuit X can be sourced from Substation B, thereby reducing the overall impact of the outage.

Substation A


## Q. DESCRIBE THE OVERALL BENEFITS OF PE'S DISTRIBUTION AUTOMATION PROGRAM.

A. PE has installed 8 DA projects since the start of EDIS in 2019. These DA projects have avoided approximately 9,300 customer interruptions and $1,300,000$ customer minutes interrupted that would have been experienced prior to automation. Two additional DA projects are being completed in 2023 under the current EDIS program.
Q. DOES PE DESIRE TO MAKE CHANGES TO ITS CURRENT DA PROGRAM IN EDIS PHASE II?
A. Yes. PE is proposing making the program more inclusive of other resiliency efforts. As resilience is a measure of the ability of a system to withstand unplanned service disruptions that are triggered by extraordinary events, PE is proposing resiliency enhancements to shorten outage duration during such events. While PE's SAIDI and SAIFI have shown improvement over the past four years, SAIDI ${ }^{\text {MED }}$ has not improved over the same period
(see Exhibit DJM-3). SAIDI ${ }^{\text {MED }}$ represents the total time customers on average did not have service during major event days in a given year.

SAIDI ${ }^{\text {MED }}=$ SAIDI for All Interruptions $-($ SAIDI for All Interruptions Minus IEEE Major Event Day Interruptions).

Therefore, the lower the SAIDI ${ }^{\text {MED }}$, the more resilient the electrical distribution system is to extraordinary events that occurred during a period of time ${ }^{10}$.

## Q. HOW WILL THE RESILIENCY PROGRAM IN EDIS PHASE II IMPROVE PE'S

 ABILITY TO RECOVER FROM OUTAGE EVENTS?A. Enhancements to resiliency will improve the ability of PE's distribution and subtransmission system to return customers to service after outage events. These enhancements will involve circuit ties, circuit splits, line relocation, distribution automation, and upgraded circuit protection as necessary to enhance resiliency.

## Q. HAS PE COMPLETED RESILIENCY PROJECTS IN THE PAST?

A. Yes. PE's DA projects, which are part of the currently approved EDIS Program, have contributed to resiliency by enabling the automatic restoration of service to blocks of customers in the event of a fault.
Q. HOW DOES THE PROPOSED RESILIENCY PROGRAM DIFFER FROM DA?

[^32]A. The DA projects focused on one solution to restoring customers after an outage event. As described above, the resiliency program would allow for the implementation of additional solutions to restoration and resiliency.
Q. WHAT IMPROVEMENTS DOES PE EXPECT FROM A RESILIENCY PROGRAM?
A. PE expects enhancements to resiliency to shorten the duration of customer outages. These enhancements are expected to save approximately 3.4 minutes SAIDI and 0.008 SAIFI per year.
Q. DESCRIBE THE RESILIENCY PROGRAM PROJECTS PLANNED FOR EDIS PHASE II DURING 2024 AND THEIR PROJECTED BENEFITS.
A. PE is planning two resiliency projects for 2024. The first involves the installation of automated switches and remotely controlled switches to remotely sectionalize portions of the sub-transmission lines feeding PE's Wilson Substation in Washington County. This project is expected to save 2.1 minutes of SAIDI and 0.007 SAIFI per year. The second involves the installation of the circuit tie line between the Hoyes - Accident and the Jennings - Grantsville circuits in Garrett County. This tie line will be five miles long. The project also involves installation of a DA system that will allow for automatic restoration to portions of the circuit in the event of a fault. This project is expected to save 1.3 minutes of SAIDI and 0.001 SAIFI per year.
Q. HOW WILL PE PROPOSE AND RECEIVE APPROVAL FOR FUTURE PROJECTS UNDER THE RESILIENCY PROGRAM?
A. Beginning in October 2024, and each October throughout EDIS Phase II, PE will submit for review and approval the following year's resiliency projects. For example, PE will propose 2025 resiliency projects in October 2024.
Q. CAN YOU SUMMARIZE HOW THE PROGRAMS DISCUSSED IN YOUR TESTIMONY ABOVE PROVIDE BENEFITS FOR PE'S CUSTOMERS?
A. Yes. The current EDIS programs discussed above provided additional and incremental investments in the distribution grid to help support a safe, efficient, and reliable electric system and, importantly, a safe, efficient, and reliable experience for our customers. From my operating perspective, the three new or continuing programs in EDIS Phase II build on that foundation and would further improve on the Company's diligent efforts to meet and exceed our customers' expectations for increasingly reliable service at affordable rates.
Q. WHY DOES PE BELIEVE THAT THE THREE PROGRAMS IN EDIS PHASE II WOULD BE APPROPRIATE FOR SURCHARGE TREATMENT?
A. These are additional stretch programs, similar to the types of programs for which PE has received surcharge recovery in its existing EDIS. Also, the annual review and surcharge approach approved by the Commission in PE's last distribution base rate case allows for close and timely scrutiny of the plans for each year. It also allows for costs to be trued up each year, as discussed by Company witness Fall. The forecasted capital costs associated with EDIS Phase II and determination of the associated revenue requirement are provided in the direct testimony of Company witness Fall.

## VI. PE'S LABOR STANDARDS AND PRACTICES

## Q. DOES PE MAINTAIN FAIR AND STABLE LABOR STANDARDS?

A. Yes. PE's labor force is made up of both unionized and non-unionized employees. Most of the Company's Maryland employees are covered under a collective bargaining agreement that historically has been renegotiated every five years. The Company maintains a collaborative relationship with Utility Workers Union of America ("UWUA") Local 102 by communicating regularly with union leadership and working together to promptly address any issues that arise. It is my understanding that PE is in compliance and ensures its compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local labor laws by promulgating a Code of Business Conduct and enforcing Company rules and policies that are compliant with laws and protect employees in the workplace.

## Q. CAN YOU BE MORE SPECIFIC WITH REGARD TO LABOR STANDARDS WITH WHICH PE COMPLIES?

A: Yes. I am aware that PE complies with numerous federal and state rules relating to labor standards. Specifically, I have seen notices that the Company posts which explain that PE complies with the:

- Employee Polygraph Protection Act
- Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970
- Equal Employment Opportunity
- Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act
- Fair Labor Standards Act
- Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993
- National Labor Relations Act
- Pay Transparency Nondiscrimination rules
- Rules relating to workers with disabilities
- Paid Sick Leave rules
- Walsh-Healey Public Contracts/Service Contracts rules
- Federal rules about reporting fraud and misconduct
- Federal Right to Work rules
- Davis Bacon Act


## Q. IN ADDITION TO THESE FEDERAL RULES, ARE YOU AWARE OF ANY STATE LABOR RULES WITH WHICH PE COMPLIES?

A. Yes. I have seen notices indicating that PE complies with Maryland laws and rules relating to:

- Child Labor
- Pregnancy while working
- Earned Sick and Safe Leave
- Health Insurance
- Equal Pay for Equal Work
- Minimum Wage
- Unemployment Insurance
- Fair Employment
- Worker's Compensation
- State Occupational Safety and Health Administration requirements
- No smoking


## VII. CONCLUSION

## Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY AT THIS TIME?

A. Yes, it does.
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WEIZHONG (BILL) WANG

## I. INTRODUCTION

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
A. My name is Weizhong (Bill) Wang. My business address is 76 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio 44308.
Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?
A. I am employed by FirstEnergy Service Company as Assistant Treasurer, Treasury.
Q. WHAT ARE YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES?
A. I previously managed capital structures for FirstEnergy Corp. ("FE") and its subsidiaries, including The Potomac Edison Company ("PE" or "Company"). Currently, I am responsible for managing $\$ 12$ billion in investments related to the FE pension plan, FE Foundation, FE Savings Plans and various other post-retirement plans. I am also responsible for pension-related budgeting, forecasting and financial planning in various states including Maryland.
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.
A. I joined Corning Incorporated as a Senior Financial Analyst in May 2001 after I received a Master of Business Administration from the Business School of the University of Maryland in College Park. At Corning, I was part of the Treasury team and participated in its capital structure management, including various capital market transactions and banking relationship management. In July 2005, I joined Allegheny Energy, which then merged with FE in 2011. I was elected to the Assistant Treasurer role in 2016. Prior to that, I
$\qquad$
served in various Treasury positions, such as Director, Treasury Integration and Director, Investment Management, managing FE's capital structure, $\$ 12$ billion asset investments related to FE's Pension Plan, Savings Plan and other post-retirements plans. I have also served as the Treasurer of Jersey Central Power \& Light Company ("JCP\&L") since 2012.
Q. HAVE YOU TESTIFIED IN RATE PROCEEDINGS BEFORE REGULATORY COMMISSIONS?
A. Yes. I have provided direct testimony in the 2023 distribution base rate case proceeding before the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities on behalf of JCP\&L.

## II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY.
A. I am testifying on behalf of the Company to describe and support: (1) PE's capital structure; (2) PE's embedded cost of long-term debt; and (3) PE's overall weighted average cost of capital.
Q. HAVE YOU PREPARED OR HAD PREPARED UNDER YOUR SUPERVISION EXHIBITS TO ACCOMPANY YOUR TESTIMONY?
A. Yes. I am sponsoring the following exhibits for the Company, which will be discussed further in this testimony:

Exhibit BW-1: Capital Structure
Exhibit BW-2: Embedded Cost of Long-Term Debt
Exhibit BW-3: Overall Weighted Average Cost of Capital
$\qquad$

## III. CAPITAL STRUCTURE

Q. WHAT CAPITAL STRUCTURE RATIOS ARE THE COMPANY PROPOSING TO BE UTILIZED FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING THE COMPANY'S OVERALL WEIGHTED AVERAGE COST OF CAPITAL?
A. The Company is proposing to utilize its actual capital structure. As indicated in Exhibit BW-1, PE's actual capital structure on December 31, 2022 has capital structure ratios of $53.53 \%$ for common equity and $46.47 \%$ for long-term debt.
Q. DOES THE COMPANY HAVE PREFERRED STOCK OR SHORT-TERM DEBT?
A. The Company does not have preferred stock but did have $\$ 15$ million of short-term debt as of December 31, 2022.
Q. IS SHORT-TERM DEBT INCLUDED IN THE CAPITAL STRUCTURE RATIOS?
A. No, short-term debt is not included in the capital structure ratios since such borrowings are typically short-term sources of working capital to bridge operational cash needs, are less than 12 months in length, and do not represent components of long-term capital required to support the rate base of the Company. Since short-term debt does not typically finance long-term assets, it would be improper to include such debt in the Company's capital structure for determination of the rate of return on long-term assets. The Company's capital structure for ratemaking purposes reflects the financing of long-term assets, which explains the absence of short-term debt from BW-1.
Q. WHY IS THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED CAPITAL STRUCTURE APPROPRIATE?
$\qquad$
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A. The $53.53 \%$ equity ratio supports PE's goals of maintaining solid investment-grade ratings and having access to capital on reasonable terms. In addition, the Company's capital structure is consistent with capital structure accepted by the Maryland Public Service Commission in other rate proceedings. ${ }^{1}$

## IV. COST OF CAPITAL

Q. WHAT EMBEDDED COST OF LONG-TERM DEBT IS THE COMPANY PROPOSING TO BE UTILIZED FOR PURPOSES OF DETERMINING THE COMPANY'S OVERALL WEIGHTED AVERAGE COST OF CAPITAL?
A. As indicated in Exhibit BW-2, the Company's embedded long-term debt cost rate is 4.018\%.
Q. HOW DID YOU DETERMINE THE EMBEDDED LONG-TERM DEBT COST RATE?
A. The determination of a utility's embedded long-term debt cost rate is essentially an arithmetic exercise due to the fact that the utility has contracted for the use of the capital in question for a defined period of time at a specified cost rate. The calculations, which take into account debt issuance and reacquisition expenses, are provided in Exhibit BW-2.
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE WHAT IS SHOWN ON EXHIBIT BW-2.
A. Exhibit BW-2 itemizes each series of debt, the date of issuance, maturity, original amount issued and amount outstanding as of December 31, 2022. The Premium/Discount and Issuance Expenses column represents legal, underwriting and other miscellaneous costs

[^33]associated with each issuance. The principal amount issued, adjusted for any premium or discount, less any issuance expenses, equals the Net Proceeds. The effective rate is calculated by incorporating the Net Proceeds at the time of issuance in relation to the interest rate and the years to maturity. After the effective rate is calculated for each individual series, the rates are multiplied by each respective net amount outstanding to determine the annual net cost. Next, the unamortized balance and annual cost of debt reacquisition costs are included. Finally, the embedded cost rate is determined by dividing the total annual net cost by the total net amount outstanding.
Q. WHAT OVERALL WEIGHTED AVERAGE COST OF CAPITAL IS THE COMPANY PROPOSING TO BE UTILIZED?
A. As indicated in Exhibit BW-3, the Company is proposing to utilize an Overall Weighted Cost of Capital of $7.54 \%$.
Q. HOW DID YOU CALCULATE THE OVERALL WEIGHTED COST OF CAPITAL?
A. As set forth in Exhibit BW-3, I quantified, and then combined, the Company's weighted average cost of long-term debt and common equity by multiplying the actual December 31, 2022 capitalization ratios presented in Exhibit BW-1 by: (1) the embedded cost of longterm debt developed on Exhibit BW-2 of 4.018\%; and (2) the Company's requested return on common equity of $10.6 \%$. The proposed cost of equity is supported by Company witness D'Ascendis.
Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY OTHER COMMENTS WITH REGARD TO YOUR TESTIMONY?
A. Yes. I believe that it is vital that the Company maintains access to the capital markets on reasonable terms. Setting a rate of return which is based on a capital structure that warrants solid investment grade ratings is necessary because it allows the Company to access the capital markets on favorable terms, to maintain its financial integrity and financial flexibility, and fund investments in its distribution system that are necessary for safe, proper, and adequate service. Customers, in turn, benefit from the Company incurring lower debt costs as a result.

## V. CONCLUSION

Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY AT THIS TIME?
A. Yes, it does.

## The Potomac Edison Company

## Capital Structure

Actual at December 31, 2022

Actual
December 31, 2022

| Type of Capital | Amount (\$) |  | Ratios |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Long-term Debt | \$ | 675,000,000 |  |
| Unamortized Net Discount |  | - |  |
| Unamortized Debt Issuance Expense |  | $(3,712,122)$ |  |
| Unamortized Debt Reacquisition Costs |  | (542) |  |
| Total Long-term Debt | \$ | 671,287,336 | 46.47\% |
| Common Equity | \$ | 773,299,730 | 53.53\% |
| Total | \$ | ,444,587,066 | 100.00\% |

## The Potomac Edison Company

Embedded Cost of Long-term Debt
Actual at December 31, 2022


| Type of Issue | Coupon <br> Rate | Date <br> Issued | Maturity Date | Original |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Effective <br> Cost <br> Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Principal Amount Issued |  | (Premium)/ <br> Discount |  | Debt Issuance Expense |  | Net Proceeds to Company |  |  |  |
| First Mortgage Bonds | 4.440\% | 11/25/2014 | 11/15/2044 | \$ | 200,000,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,261,677 | \$ | 198,738,323 | \$ 99.37 | 4.478\% |
|  | 4.470\% | 8/17/2015 | 8/15/2045 | \$ | 145,000,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,091,999 | \$ | 143,908,001 | \$ 99.25 | 4.516\% |
|  | 3.890\% | 10/17/2016 | 10/15/2046 | \$ | 155,000,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,113,718 | \$ | 153,886,282 | \$ 99.28 | 3.931\% |
|  | 2.670\% | 6/29/2020 | 6/15/2032 | \$ | 75,000,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 562,840 |  | 74,437,160 | \$ 99.25 | 2.744\% |
|  | 3.430\% | 6/29/2020 | 6/15/2051 | \$ | 100,000,000 | \$ | - | \$ | 680,788 | \$ | 99,319,212 | \$ 99.32 | 3.466\% |
| Total First Mortgage Bonds |  |  |  | \$ | 675,000,000 | \$ | - |  | 4,711,022 | \$ | 670,288,978 |  |  |

## The Potomac Edison Company

Weighted Average Cost of Capital
Actual at December 31, 2022

| Type of Capital | December 31, 2022 <br> Amount (\$) |  | Ratios | Cost <br> Rate | Weighted Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Long-term Debt | \$ | 675,000,000 |  |  |  |
| Unamortized Net Discount |  | - |  |  |  |
| Unamortized Debt Issuance Expense |  | $(3,712,122)$ |  |  |  |
| Unamortized Debt Reacquisition Costs |  | (542) |  |  |  |
| Total Long-term Debt | \$ | 671,287,336 | 46.47\% | 4.018\% | 1.87\% |
| Common Equity | \$ | 773,299,730 | 53.53\% | 10.600\% | 5.67\% |
| Total | \$ | 1,444,587,066 | 100.00\% |  | 7.54\% |

## BEFORE THE

## PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

## OF MARYLAND

| In the Matter of the Application | $*$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Of The Potomac Edison Company | $*$ |  |
| For Adjustments to its Retail | $*$ | Case No. |
| Rates for the Distribution of $*$  <br> Electric Energy $*$  |  |  |

# DIRECT TESTIMONY OF 

GREGORY J. GAWLIK

Concerning: Federal and State Income Tax; Significant Tax Law Changes

## I. INTRODUCTION

## Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is Gregory J. Gawlik, and my business address is 76 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio, 44308.
Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?
A. I am employed by FirstEnergy Service Company and my title is Assistant Controller, Tax, serving as head of the tax department. My responsibilities include federal and state tax compliance and audits, tax planning and business unit support, and financial reporting for taxes.
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.
A. I graduated from Bowling Green State University in 1997 with a Bachelor of Arts degree. I received a Juris Doctorate from Cleveland State University College of Law in 2000. After graduating law school, I practiced law with the firm Thompson Hine LLP in Cleveland, Ohio, focusing on federal and state tax planning and litigation, making partner in November 2008. I left Thompson Hine in January 2011 and became employed with FirstEnergy in February 2011 as Director, Tax Planning. I assumed my current role, Assistant Controller, Tax, in September 2018.

## II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY.

A. My testimony supports the state and federal income tax information used by The Potomac Edison Company ("PE" or "Company") in this rate case, and I also discuss significant tax law changes affecting the Company.

## Q. PLEASE IDENTIFY THE LOCATION OF THE STATE AND FEDERAL INCOME TAX INFORMATION IN THE COMPANY'S FILING.

A. Exhibit No. JAS-1 from Company witness Soltis contains an income statement summary that includes state and federal income tax, as well as deferred income tax, for the test year ended December 31, 2022. With regard to rate base, accumulated deferred income taxes ("ADIT") are identified as the Deferred Federal and State Tax Balance and represents the average balance during 2022. This exhibit starts out with the Company's total taxes per books and then allocates a portion to Maryland jurisdictional operations. To these amounts, the tax effect of going-level adjustments and pro forma adjustments have been applied to reflect the final Maryland jurisdictional amounts. The allocation to Maryland, as well as the associated going-level and pro forma adjustments, are addressed by Company witnesses Soltis and Colflesh.

## III. DEFERRED TAXES

## Q. WHAT ARE DEFERRED INCOME TAXES AND HOW DO THEY OCCUR?

A. Deferred income taxes arise when income tax amounts calculated for book purposes differ from the amount of taxes reported on a tax return and due to be paid in a particular year. The primary cause of the tax differences is that straight-line depreciation rates are traditionally used for ratemaking purposes whereas accelerated depreciation rates are used
for income tax purposes. ${ }^{1}$ In the early years of an asset's life, there is typically higher depreciation expense for tax purposes than for regulatory book purposes, causing the taxes computed for regulatory books to be greater than taxes computed for tax return purposes. This results in a buildup of ADIT during this period, which is a reduction to utility rate base. In the later years of an asset's life, the situation reverses, resulting in taxes computed for regulatory books that are less than the taxes computed for tax return purposes. During this period, the ADIT balance for the asset in question is progressively reduced as the utility makes tax payments that reflect the progressive reversal of the difference between book and tax depreciation over time, with a corresponding progressive reduction in the ADIT balance/rate base offset associated with that asset.

Since revenues and expenses for tax purposes can be recognized earlier or later than when they are accounted for on a regulatory book basis, normalization (or smoothing of the rate effect) is an inter-period tax allocation based on the premise that taxes recorded on the income statement for an accounting period should match the revenues and expenses recorded on a regulatory book basis for the same period.

## Q. DOES THE COMPANY NORMALIZE BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL INCOME TAX?

A. Yes. The Company normalizes state income taxes along with federal income taxes, which helps to mitigate annual fluctuations in rates that could result from a flow-through of state income tax expense in lieu of normalization. The Company's normalization of income

[^34]taxes helps to ensure that the treatment of such taxes is consistent on both a state and federal basis.

## Q. WILL THE COMPANY CONTINUE TO FLOW THROUGH TO CUSTOMERS THE BENEFITS OF THE REDUCTION IN FEDERAL TAXES ENACTED IN THE TAX CUTS AND JOBS ACT OF 2017 ("TCJA")?

A. Yes. The Company will continue to flow through to customers the benefits of the reduction in federal taxes enacted in the TCJA and intends to do so in compliance with the normalization provisions of the Internal Revenue Code (the "Code"). To maintain compliance with the normalization provisions of the Code, the Company refined its accounting process for amortizing property-related excess ADIT. However, as explained further, the change does not impact the timing of refunds of property-related excess ADIT to customers.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE REFINEMENT TO EXCESS ADIT AMORTIZATION.

A. As agreed in the Company's prior distribution rate case, concluded in March 2019, the Company is using the average rate assumption method ("ARAM") ${ }^{2}$ to amortize propertyrelated excess ADIT attributable to both book-tax depreciation timing differences and nondepreciation timing differences over the remaining regulatory life of the assets. In 2021

[^35]and 2022, the Internal Revenue Service ("IRS") issued certain private letter rulings ("PLRs") ${ }^{3}$ to other regulated utilities in which it concluded that including cost-of-removal ("COR") accrual as a component of book depreciation expense for purposes of the ARAM is not consistent with a normalization method of accounting. In general, including the COR accrual in book depreciation can cause book-tax depreciation timing differences to reverse faster and, therefore, the depreciation-related excess ADIT to be refunded faster, than allowed under normalization principles. ${ }^{4}$ The Company's fixed asset software had the COR accrual built into book depreciation but the timing impact on ARAM amortization was mostly offset by the fact that actual COR experience was being allocated to deductible tax retirements. Nevertheless, in response to the PLRs, the Company reconfigured its fixed asset software to separate the COR accrual from book depreciation expense and separate actual COR experience from tax retirements. Separating the COR accrual from book depreciation expense created a COR-specific timing difference (in this case an asset) that builds or reverses independently of book-tax depreciation timing differences. ${ }^{5}$ The system configuration changes did not change the total amount of property-related excess ADIT to be refunded to customers, but only shifted amounts between depreciation and non-depreciation-related categories, all of which will continue to be amortized over the

[^36]remaining regulatory life of the assets using the ARAM as before. ${ }^{6}$ The COR-specific ADIT asset also will build or reverse over the remaining regulatory life of the assets. The Company is informing the Maryland Public Service Commission of the COR configuration changes to maintain compliance with the normalization provisions of the Code. Also, in compliance with the normalization rules, the Company's rate base reflects a reduction in the TCJA-related regulatory liability for the actual amount of excess and deficient ADITs amortized and refunded to customers through December 31, 2022, and the ARAM amortization amount included as a reduction to cost of service will reflect actual ARAM amortization during the period January 1, 2022, to December 31, 2022.

## IV. TAX LAW CHANGES

## Q. HAVE THERE BEEN ANY SIGNIFICANT FEDERAL TAX LAW CHANGES

 SINCE THE LAST BASE RATE CASE?A. Yes. The most significant change to federal tax law since the last distribution base rate case was enactment of the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 ("IRA"), signed by President Biden on August 16, 2022. Most notably, the IRA imposes a new corporate alternative minimum tax ("AMT"), beginning in 2023, based on $15 \%$ of "adjusted financial statement income" ("AFSI"), which is generally accepted accounting principles ("GAAP") net

[^37]income with various adjustments including for federal income taxes, tax depreciation, and pension and other post-employment benefits. Corporations are subject to the AMT if their average AFSI over a three-year period exceeds $\$ 1$ billion. Corporations that are subject to the AMT must pay the greater of $15 \%$ of their AFSI or their regular federal income tax liability. Corporations paying the AMT receive an AMT credit, equal to the amount by which the AMT liability exceeds the regular tax liability, to be carried forward, without limitation, and applied against regular federal income tax in a future year in which no AMT is imposed on the corporation. As disclosed in its recently filed the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2022, FirstEnergy currently believes it is more likely than not based on interim guidance issued by the U.S. Treasury in December 2022 that it will be subject to the AMT beginning in 2023. AMT liability must be allocated among members of FirstEnergy's consolidated tax group, including the Company. Because the 2022 tax year is the test year for this base rate case, the AMT is not yet an issue. However, if the Company is allocated AMT liability in 2023 or future years, the corresponding AMT credits could be subject to rate base inclusion in future proceedings. The U.S. Treasury and the IRS are expected to publish additional guidance with respect to the AMT. To the extent such guidance makes changes to the computation of AFSI or AMT from how those amounts are computed under existing guidance, FirstEnergy could be required to change its current AMT estimates or FirstEnergy, and therefore the Company, could no longer be subject to the AMT. There is no stated timetable for the issuance of such guidance.
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## V. CONCLUSION

## Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY AT THIS TIME?

A. Yes, it does.
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## PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF MARYLAND

| In the Matter of the Application | $*$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Of The Potomac Edison Company | $*$ |  |
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| Rates for the Distribution of | $*$ |  |
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## I. INTRODUCTION

## Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is Susan M. Colflesh, and my business address is 800 Cabin Hill Drive, Greensburg, Pennsylvania 15601.

## Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND WHAT ARE YOUR EDUCATIONAL

 AND PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS?A. I am employed by FirstEnergy Service Company as a State Regulatory Analyst in the Rates and Regulatory Affairs Department - West Virginia/Maryland. My duties include developing and providing detailed and qualitative analysis on behalf of The Potomac Edison Company ("PE" or "Company") and Monongahela Power Company ("Mon Power"), including quarterly reporting of Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") jurisdictional financial data, participating in regulatory proceedings, and developing revenue requirements. I am a graduate of the University of Pittsburgh where I earned a Bachelor of Science in Business Management with an Accounting Emphasis. I have almost 40 years of experience with FirstEnergy Service Company or its predecessor companies. I have worked in various financial positions, including most recently Regulatory Accounting Analyst, before assuming my current role in 2018.
Q. HAVE YOU TESTIFIED OR SUBMITTED TESTIMONY IN OTHER RATE PROCEEDINGS BEFORE REGULATORY COMMISSIONS?
A. Yes, I have testified on behalf of PE and its affiliate Mon Power before the Public Service
Commission of West Virginia in their 2020 Expanded Net Energy Cost Case No. 20-0065-
E-ENEC, and in their 2021 Vegetation Management Surcharge Case No. 21-0659-E-P.
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY.
A. My testimony will discuss the Company's Jurisdictional Separation Study, as well as a
number of going-level adjustments that I am sponsoring.

## II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY

## Q. COULD YOU PLEASE OUTLINE YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. The objective of my testimony is to discuss:

1. The purpose and application of the jurisdictional separation study;
2. The allocation methods used in the jurisdictional separation study;
3. The going-level adjustments which I am sponsoring, listed under Company witness Soltis Exhibit JAS-2, which are related to four primary areas:
(a) Salaries and Wages and other employee-related costs

- Adjustment No. 1 Salaries \& Wages - test year
- Adjustment No. 2 Salaries \& Wages - 2023
- Adjustment No. 3 Employee Savings Plan - test year
- Adjustment No. 4 Employee Savings Plan - 2023
- Adjustment No. 9 Medical Insurance Expenses
- Adjustment No. 10 Group Life Insurance Expenses
- Adjustment No. 26 Payroll Taxes on Salaries \& Wages - test year
- Adjustment No. 27 Payroll Taxes on Salaries \& Wages - 2023
(b) COVID-19 costs, deferrals, and recovery
- Adjustment No. 14 COVID-19 Operation and Maintenance ("O\&M") Expense
- Adjustment No. 22 COVID-19 Regulatory Credits
- Adjustment No. 23 Amortization of COVID-19 Regulatory Asset
- Adjustment No. 40 COVID-19 Regulatory Asset - Rate Base
(c) Allocation of Service Company Common Plant to PE
- Adjustment No. 15 Service Company Carrying Charges
- Adjustment No. 20 Depreciation Expense for Service Company Plant Assets
- Adjustment No. 39a Service Company Common Plant
- Adjustment No. 39b Service Company Depreciation Reserve
- Adjustment No. 39c Service Company Accumulated Deferred Income Tax ("ADIT")
(d) Conservation Voltage Reduction Program
- Adjustment No. 21 Conservation Voltage Reduction Program.
Q. HAVE YOU PREPARED OR HAD PREPARED UNDER YOUR SUPERVISION AN EXHIBIT TO ACCOMPANY YOUR TESTIMONY?
A. Yes. Exhibit SMC-1, Jurisdictional Separation Study, was prepared by me or under my supervision and is described in detail in my testimony.


## Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR TESTIMONY.

A. The revenue, investment (or rate base), and expense records for PE are kept in accordance with FERC's Uniform System of Accounts. Since PE does business as an electric public utility in Maryland and West Virginia, as well as owns and operates transmission facilities in Virginia, it is necessary to perform a jurisdictional separation study to determine the fair share attributable to PE's Maryland distribution customers from the total PE amounts. A going-forward or "going-level" separation study was prepared for PE-Maryland, which is included as Exhibit SMC-1. This study was prepared in accordance with historical practices utilized by the Company and accepted by the Public Service Commission of Maryland ("Commission"). The going-level separation study is based on a test year of twelve months actual data for the period of January 1, 2022 through December 31, 2022 ("test year"), reporting booked revenues and expenses as well as reporting adjustments to those revenues and expenses for known and measurable changes. The separation study shows that the current going-level rate of return ("ROR") for PE in Maryland is $2.90 \%$, well below PE's requested ROR of $7.54 \%$.

## III. JURISDICTIONAL SEPARATION STUDY

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE SEPARATION STUDY, EXHIBIT SMC-1.

A. During the test year, PE operated at the retail level in both Maryland and West Virginia, and also had wholesale customers subject to FERC jurisdiction in those two states plus

Virginia. Generally, PE's books of account for plant investment and expenses are either directly assigned or allocated to applicable jurisdictions, while most revenues are specifically identified by jurisdiction.

The purpose of the separation study is first to identify rate base, revenues, and expenses that should be either allocated or directly assigned to the Maryland jurisdictional portion of PE's operations for the test year. Those amounts were then further allocated or directly assigned in the separation study to arrive at Maryland distribution-related rate base, revenues and expenses, which also incorporated all the going-level adjustments identified in Company witness Soltis' Exhibit JAS-2.

## Q. WAS THE SEPARATION PROCEDURE EMPLOYED IN THIS CASE THE SAME

 AS THAT USED IN THE PREVIOUS CASE FILED BY PE WITH THIS COMMISSION?A. Yes, the separation procedure used in this case is the same basic procedure that was used by PE in the Company's previous distribution base rate case in 2018, as adjusted to conform to the Commission's final order in that case.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE SEPARATION PROCEDURE.

A. The separation procedure consists of a functionalization step and a classification step. In the functionalization step, rate base, expenses, and revenues recorded on the books of PE are separated on a functional basis using the FERC Uniform System of Accounts to identify production, transmission, distribution, customer service, and administrative and general functions. Then the total Company amounts were separated between the jurisdiction being studied (i.e., Maryland) and all others. This separation was performed on the basis of
allocation factors developed to assign direct and common costs of providing service equitably to the jurisdiction being considered. In the classification step, common costs were then classified into four major allocation categories (i.e., demand (or capacity)related, plant-related, labor-related and customer-related) and then allocated appropriately to the Maryland jurisdiction. After arriving at Maryland jurisdictional rate base, revenues, and expenses, the final step applied an additional allocation or direct assignment to determine Maryland distribution-related rate base, revenues and expenses. The two primary allocations used for this last step were derived from the PE FERC Form 1 Distribution of Salaries and Wages and from an internally-developed separation study allocation of Maryland distribution plant to Maryland total plant.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE METHODOLOGY USED TO ALLOCATE DEMANDRELATED COSTS.

A. The Average Coincident Peak ("ACP") method (consisting of the average of the twelve monthly coincident peaks) was used to allocate demand-related costs. Historically, previous base rate cases in Maryland have used this method, and the Commission has accepted the ACP methodology.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE METHODOLOGY USED TO ALLOCATE PLANT-

 RELATED COSTS.A. Directly-assigned plant costs were assigned to Maryland distribution. Common plantrelated costs were allocated from PE to Maryland distribution based upon a ratio of Maryland distribution plant to total PE plant. General and intangible plant-related items utilized Salaries and Wages allocators, except for general plant related to land and
buildings where service centers are located. Plant related to land and buildings where service centers are located was directly assigned to the appropriate jurisdiction when the service center has no operation that crosses state borders, while service centers that house operations that serve multiple states were allocated using a plant allocator, consistent with the Commission's March 22, 2019 Order in the Company's 2018 base distribution rate case, Case No. $9490 .{ }^{1}$
Q. ARE THERE ANY ADDITIONAL ALLOCATION ITEMS REGARDING PLANT? Yes. The Company is proposing to include sub-transmission plant for recovery in this distribution rate case. This plant was previously included in the FERC transmission series of accounts; however, lower voltage sub-transmission plant is operated as part of the distribution system and is not reflected for recovery in transmission rates. In the Jurisdictional Separation Study, this plant is included under the Distribution Plant heading on the line called 'Subtransmission Related -34.5 kV ' and is direct assigned to Maryland based on its physical location.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE METHODOLOGY USED TO ALLOCATE LABORRELATED COSTS.

A. PE Maryland labor-related costs were determined by an allocator developed within the separation study based upon payroll taxes, functionalizing those expenses based on the PE FERC Form 1 Distribution of Salaries and Wages, and then applying appropriate allocations to each of the functionalized components. Common labor-related costs were

[^38]allocated to Maryland distribution based upon a ratio of Maryland distribution labor to total PE labor, also from the PE FERC Form 1 Distribution of Salaries and Wages.
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE METHODOLOGY USED TO ALLOCATE CUSTOMER-RELATED COSTS.
A. Directly assigned customer-related costs were assigned to Maryland distribution. Common customer-related costs are first allocated based on a ratio of the number of PE Maryland customers to total PE customers. Costs not solely distribution-related, such as certain customer accounts and services expenses, were then allocated to Maryland distribution based on a ratio of Maryland distribution plant to total Maryland plant.

## Q. WHAT IS THE RESULT OF THE JURISDICTIONAL SEPARATION STUDY?

A. The result of the separation study is a going-level Maryland Distribution report that is the primary input to the class cost of service study ("CCOS"), which is discussed by Company Witness Lyons.

## IV. RATEMAKING ADJUSTMENTS

## Q. DID YOU INCLUDE ADJUSTMENTS IN YOUR SEPARATION STUDY?

A. Yes, all going-level adjustments were incorporated in the separation study. I will describe a number of going-level adjustments as listed above, with the remaining adjustments described by Company witnesses Ashton, Soltis, and Ward.
Q. CAN YOU EXPLAIN THE FIRST GROUP OF ADJUSTMENTS THAT YOU ARE SPONSORING?
A. Adjustment Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 9 and 10 are related to adjustments to the Company's O\&M expenses and Payroll Taxes for Salaries and Wages and other employee-related expenses.

## Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF ADJUSTMENT NO. 1 (SALARIES AND WAGES)?

A. The purpose of Adjustment No. 1 is to increase PE Maryland distribution O\&M expense to reflect the annualized effect of the expense portion of salary and wage increases incurred during the test year. This adjustment applies to Utility Workers Union of America ("UWUA") Local 0102 employees who are classified under a bargaining arrangement and received a $2.5 \%$ increase effective May 1, 2022. The adjustment also includes an average $3 \%$ increase effective March 1, 2022 for those full-time employees classified as nonbargaining. Because these above-mentioned salary and wage increases were not effective at the beginning of the test year, the salary and wages were annualized for purposes of this adjustment to reflect a full year of the increases. Only straight-time wages (excluding parttime, temporary help and over-time wages) were included in the adjustment.

The O\&M annualized salary and wage expense was functionalized to production, transmission, distribution, customer accounts and services, and administrative and general expenses based on the percentage of test year dollars booked to the FERC accounts by: 1) service company-assessed O\&M straight-time payroll for PE; 2) PE Payroll Straight-Time Bargaining (account 510010); 3) PE Payroll Straight-Time Non-Bargaining (account 510050); and lastly by 4) all other PE straight-time bargaining and non-bargaining labor accounts. These results were then added together to arrive at the appropriate PE Bargaining and Non-Bargaining Straight-Time functionalizations. Allocations to arrive at the

Maryland jurisdictional and Maryland distribution jurisdictional amounts were also utilized.

## Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF ADJUSTMENT NO. 2 (SALARY AND WAGES 2023)?

A. The purpose is to increase PE Maryland distribution O\&M expense to reflect the annualized effect of the expense portion of salary and wage increases incurred in the period following the test year but prior to this filing. This salary and wage adjustment includes an average 4\% increase effective March 1, 2023 for those full-time employees classified as non-bargaining. Because these salary and wage increases are known and measurable, they need to be added to the going-level salary and wages to reflect the true level of wages that the Company will be paying when new distribution rates go into effect. As with the 2022 increases, these incremental 2023 increases were not effective at the beginning of the test year and were likewise annualized for purposes of this adjustment to reflect a full year of the increases. Again, only straight-time wages (excluding part-time, temporary help and over-time wages) were included in the adjustment, and the functionalization and allocations to Maryland and to Maryland distribution were done the same way as in Adjustment No. 1.

## Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF ADJUSTMENT NOS. 3 AND 4 (EMPLOYEE SAVINGS PLAN)?

A. The purpose of Adjustment Nos. 3 and 4 is to increase PE Maryland distribution O\&M expense to reflect the annualized effect of the expense portion of salary and wage increases on savings plan costs incurred during the test year and in the post-test-year period before
this filing. The Company savings plan matches 50 cents per dollar on the first $6 \%$ of employees' 401 K savings plan contributions. Consequently, the annualized salary and wage expense increases in Adjustment Nos. 1 and 2 for PE Maryland distribution for bargaining and non-bargaining straight-time were each multiplied by $3 \%$. This results in the savings plan adjustment on annualized salary and wage increases shown on Adjustment No. 3 for test year increases and Adjustment No. 4 for the 2023 increases.

## Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF ADJUSTMENT NO. 9 (MEDICAL INSURANCE)?

A. The purpose of Adjustment No. 9 is to adjust test year PE Maryland distribution O\&M expense to reflect 2022 going-level medical insurance expenses. The Company is selfinsured for its medical and prescription insurance plans, and plan costs are driven by actual experience. Although the Company proactively manages costs and participates in vendor programs to control costs, medical insurance expenses normally do increase on a calendaryear basis. The calculation of Adjustment No. 9 consists of a comparison of medical insurance expenses in 2022 to forecasted medical insurance expenses in 2023, with allocators applied to the difference to arrive at the Maryland distribution jurisdictional amount.
Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF ADJUSTMENT NO. 10 (GROUP LIFE INSURANCE)?
A. The purpose of Adjustment No. 10 is to adjust test year PE Maryland distribution O\&M expense to reflect 2022 going-level group life insurance expense. The Company completed a Request for Proposal for life insurance to ensure that costs are competitive. The current
contract will expire at the end of 2023. Adjustment No. 10 was calculated in the same fashion as described for Adjustment No. 9.

## Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF ADJUSTMENT NOS. 26 AND 27 (PAYROLL TAXES)?

A. The purpose of Adjustment No. 26 is to increase Federal Insurance Contributions Act ("FICA") expense, which is an increase in PE's expense for employer contributions to FICA payroll taxes related to the salary and wage increases in Adjustment No. 1. The purpose of Adjustment No. 27 is to increase FICA expense for employer contributions to FICA payroll taxes related to the salary and wage increases in Adjustment No. 2. The Company FICA contribution rate of $7.65 \%$ of gross salaries and wages was applied to Adjustment Nos. 1 and 2 for the PE Maryland distribution total for annualized salaries and wages for both bargaining and non-bargaining straight-time to result in the amount of Adjustment Nos. 26 and 27, respectively.

## Q. WHAT AREA OF ADJUSTMENTS DO YOU WISH TO ADDRESS NEXT?

A. Next, I will explain adjustments to test year expenses and rate base that are related to the Company's incremental expenses from the COVID-19 health emergency, including Adjustment Nos. 14, 22, 23, and 40.

On March 16, 2020, Maryland Governor Lawrence Hogan issued an Executive Order prohibiting the termination of residential utility services and the imposition of late fees during the COVID-19 state of emergency. On April 9, 2020, the Commission issued Order No. 89542 authorizing Maryland utilities to create a regulatory asset to record the incremental costs related to COVID-19 incurred by the utilities to ensure that Maryland
residents have essential utility services during this period. The Commission acknowledged the potential for significant financial implications that compliance with COVID-19 emergency orders could have on Maryland utilities and found that the creation of regulatory assets would facilitate recovery of costs prudently incurred by utilities in their efforts to serve customers. In addition, the Commission found that the catastrophic health emergency was outside the control of utilities and a non-recurring event.

Beginning in mid-March 2020 and continuing through October 31, 2022, the Company's Maryland distribution operations have incurred and deferred into a regulatory asset for recovery net incremental costs totaling approximately $\$ 7.3$ million directly related to complying with the various COVID-19 government shut-down orders and precautions. While the Company is still experiencing some impacts from the COVID-19 pandemic, including some restrictions on collections activities beyond October 31, 2022, no additional costs have been or are expected to be deferred beyond that date.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE COSTS RELATED TO COVID-19 THAT THE COMPANY WISHES TO RECOVER.

A. Incremental costs to the Company include costs directly incurred by the Company, along with the Company's allocated share of costs incurred by FirstEnergy Service Corporation ("FESC") on behalf of the Company. These incremental costs include, but are not limited to, costs to implement social distancing requirements (such as rental of additional vehicles, job trailers, etc.), additional technology costs to effectuate remote tele-work, cleaning and disinfecting of facilities, personal protection equipment (including masks, gloves, hand sanitizer, sanitizing wipes, and thermometers), increased medical-related costs, labor costs
in the form of overtime and pandemic recognition awards, and informational communication costs explaining utility safety, COVID-19 response, and customer aid programs. The COVID-19 incremental costs are O\&M expense and do not include any capitalized dollars.

The total also includes the incremental impact on uncollectible expense related to temporary discontinuance of service terminations for non-payment. Effective January 1, 2020, FirstEnergy adopted Financial Accounting Standards Board's Accounting Standards Update ("ASU") No. 2016-13, Financial Instruments - Credit Losses. ASU No. 2016-13 requires companies to change the method of measuring credit losses, including uncollectible accounts receivable, from an incurred loss basis to a current expected credit loss basis. This change had no significant impact during the first quarter of 2020, where the historical levels of uncollectibles were generally consistent with the expected levels. However, with the full onset of the COVID-19 pandemic in the second quarter of 2020, PE and FirstEnergy examined the impact on customer receivable balances outstanding, and the ability of customers to continue payment. PE and FirstEnergy, (including its Controllers and Revenue Operations Departments) reviewed the allowance for uncollectible customer receivables utilizing a quantitative and qualitative assessment, which included consideration of the outbreak of COVID-19, the impact on customer receivable balances outstanding, and the ability of customers to continue payment. The impact of COVID-19 on customers' ability to pay for service, along with the temporary discontinuance of service terminations for non-payment, resulted in an increase in customer receivable write-offs as compared to historically incurred losses. In order to
calculate the additional losses and impacts expected, PE and FirstEnergy analyzed the likelihood of loss based on increases in customer accounts in arrears since the pandemic began in mid-March 2020 as well as what collection methods were suspended that have historically been utilized to ensure payment. Based on this assessment, and in consideration of the factors described above, the Company booked an incremental increase in uncollectible expense. Over the course of the pandemic, this incremental uncollectible expense has been re-evaluated and adjusted as conditions effecting customer arrearages and collections continued to evolve. The incremental impact on uncollectible expense also reflects the decrease from receipt of Recovery for the Economy, Livelihoods, Industries, Entrepreneurs, and Families Act ("RELIEF Act") funds allocated to the Company by Commission Order No. 89856 to reduce or eliminate residential customer utility bill arrearages.

In addition, the moratorium on the imposition of late payment fees in the early days of the pandemic resulted in the Company forgoing receipt of the revenues associated with forfeited discounts, and a reduction in the amount of reconnect fees charged. The cost of these lost revenues was also deferred in the COVID-19 regulatory asset.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE ALLOCATION OF COVID-19 COSTS TO MARYLAND DISTRIBUTION.

A. Many COVID-19-related costs were incurred directly by Maryland distribution operations and were directly assigned; however, some costs that were administrative and general in nature, such as Family and Medical Leave Administration, could be directly assigned to the Maryland jurisdiction, but then needed to be allocated to the distribution segment based
on a Salaries and Wages allocator. Costs incurred by FESC and billed to the Company were first allocated to Maryland based on number of Maryland customers. A second step used a labor allocator to arrive at the distribution portion.
Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF ADJUSTMENT NO. 14 (COVID-19 O\&M EXPENSE)?
A. The purpose of Adjustment No. 14 is to adjust test year PE Maryland distribution O\&M expense to remove COVID-19 expenses from the test year since such expenses have been deferred into a regulatory asset.
Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF ADJUSTMENT NO. 22 (COVID-19 REGULATORY CREDIT)?
A. The purpose of Adjustment No. 22 is to adjust test year PE Maryland distribution Regulatory Credits to remove the deferral of COVID-19 expenses from the test year. This adjustment is a direct effect from Adjustment No. 14, above, with both adjustments effectively removing the test year effect of the COVID-19 expenses.
Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF ADJUSTMENT NO. 23 (COVID-19 AMORTIZATION)?
A. The purpose of Adjustment No. 23 is to increase going-level expenses to recognize the first year amortization of expenses associated with the requested recovery of the regulatory asset for recovery of incremental COVID-19 costs over a five-year period.
Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF ADJUSTMENT NO. 40 (COVID-19 REGULATORY ASSET)?
A. The purpose of Adjustment No. 40 is to increase plant-in-service for the regulatory asset related to COVID-19, and to increase accumulated depreciation for amortization of first year recovery of the regulatory asset, using a mid-year convention, with the result that the unamortized balance of the regulatory asset is included in the Company's rate base.

## Q. WHY IS THE COMPANY PROPOSING TO RECOVER THESE COSTS FROM

 CUSTOMERS?A. The Company's COVID-19 costs are additional, extraordinary costs directly related to complying with the various government shut-down orders and COVID-19 precautions. These costs are known and measurable and are amounts actually incurred and booked. These costs were necessary to continue to provide reliable service to customers in a safe manner under extraordinary pandemic circumstances.

## Q. WHY DID THE COMPANY SELECT FIVE YEARS AS THE RECOVERY PERIOD?

A. The Company chose five years as a recovery period because the costs are substantial, were incurred over a multi-year period, and this period enables the Company to gradually recover its costs without creating an undue burden on customers, some of whom may still be impacted by the pandemic. In addition, this recovery period is consistent with the Commission's rulings in Baltimore Gas \& Electric's Multi-Year Rate Plan Case No. 9645, Potomac Electric Power Company's Multi-Year Rate Plan Case No. 9655, and Delmarva Power's Multi-Year Rate Plan Case No. 9681, where five-year recovery of COVID-19 costs was granted.
Q. ARE THERE OTHER ADJUSTMENTS THAT YOU ARE SPONSORING?
A. Yes, I am sponsoring adjustments related to FirstEnergy Service Company-owned assets that are used by PE, including Adjustment Nos. 39a, 39b, 39c, 15 and 20.

## Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF ADJUSTMENT NO. 39a (FESC COMMON PLANT)?

A. The purpose of Adjustment No. 39a is to increase plant-in-service to reflect general and intangible plant-in-service allocated to PE Maryland distribution held by FESC and recorded on FESC's books rather than PE's books. FESC common plant includes but is not limited to software, office furniture and equipment, computer equipment and communications equipment.

The amount of plant-in-service included in this adjustment was arrived at for the Maryland distribution plant by allocating FESC's plant first to PE based on FirstEnergy's Cost Allocation Manual ("CAM") ${ }^{2}$ multifactor allocation. From the resulting PE-allocated portion, a second step allocated PE amounts to Maryland, based on an allocation of total plant in Maryland to the total Company plant. The final step was to allocate the Maryland plant to distribution, based on a Salaries and Wages allocation. Since much of the FESC plant is general and intangible plant used by employees, the Salary and Wages allocator was the best choice to equitably allocate these assets.

## Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF ADJUSTMENT NO. 39b (FESC DEPRECIATION RESERVE)?

[^39]A. The purpose of Adjustment No. 39b is to increase the accumulated depreciation reserve included in rate base to reflect the depreciation reserve associated with the common plant allocated in Adjustment No. 39a, and follows the same allocation methodology as used in Adjustment Nos. 39a and described above.

## Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF ADJUSTMENT NO. 39c (FESC ADIT)?

A. The purpose of Adjustment No. 39c is to increase the ADIT deduction to rate base to reflect the FESC property-related ADIT's that are associated with the plant-in-service allocated in Adjustment No. 39a. This adjustment again follows the same allocation methodology used in Adjustment Nos. 39a and 39b and detailed above.
Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF ADJUSTMENT NO. 15 (FESC CARRYING CHARGES)?
A. The purpose of Adjustment No. 15 is to adjust the Company's test year O\&M to remove carrying charges charged to the Company by FESC. These charges, which reimburse FESC for the cost of having plant used by PE and its affiliated companies on FESC's books, include ADITs, interest, and a return on the assets. As detailed in Adjustment Nos. 39a and 39 b above, the Company is proposing to include a share of this plant in PE's rate base. This inclusion in PE's rate base eliminates the need for FESC carrying charges.

## Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF ADJUSTMENT NO. 20 (FESC DEPRECIATION AND AMORTIZATION)?

A. The purpose of Adjustment No. 20 is to adjust test year depreciation and amortization expense to include expense for the allocated share of FESC common plant added to PE's rate base as discussed above. Depreciation and amortization expense related to FESC
common plant is calculated based on FESC depreciation rates and billed to the operating affiliates, including PE, in FERC Account 923, Outside Services. This adjustment removes the entire amount of these billings from the test year. New depreciation and amortization expense has been calculated based on the Company's depreciation rates requested in this case and detailed in Company witness Spanos's testimony. While the FESC-calculated depreciation and amortization expense is removed from O\&M expense, the newly calculated depreciation and amortization expense is added to the test year in FERC accounts 403 Depreciation expense and 404 Amortization expense for general and intangible plant, respectively.

## Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY OTHER ADJUSTMENTS?

A. Yes, my final adjustment deals with the Conservation Voltage Reduction ("CVR") program.

## Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF ADJUSTMENT NO. 21 (CVR)?

A. The purpose of Adjustment No. 21 is to remove from the test year amounts that were being recovered for the Conservation Voltage Reduction Program. Recovery of the regulatory asset related to this program was granted over three years beginning March 23, 2019 in the Company's last Maryland distribution base rate case, Case No. 9490. As of March 22, 2022 recovery is complete and no further amortization should be reflected in the test year or beyond.

## Q. SHOULD THE COMMISSION ADOPT THESE ADJUSTMENTS?

A. Yes. First, they are all known and measurable changes to the test year. Second, the test year financials do not reflect going-level expenses to be incurred by the Company unless
these adjustments are adopted in full to reflect the known level of expenses. The full level of expenses is needed to help permit the Company to continue to provide safe and reliable service to its customers. Lastly, the Company will be unable to have the opportunity to earn their allowed rate of return unless these adjustments are made and approved by the Commission in this proceeding.

## V. CONCLUSION

## Q. DOES THIS COMPLETE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?

A. Yes, it does.

Rate Base - 13 Month Average Excluding Prior Period for Maryland
Capacity Allocation Method - Avg. of 12 Monthly Peaks
SUMMARY OF ALLOCATION
Electric Plant in Service
Reserves for Depre
Net Electric Plant
Additions
Construction Work in Progress
Plant Held for Future Use
Prepayments
Total Additions
Deductions
Accumulated Deferred Taxes
Customer Advances for Construction
Customer Deposits
Defrerred Investment Tax Credit
Total Deductions

## Total Rate Base

## Operating Revenues

Operating Expenses
Operation and Maintenance
Depreciation and Amortization Expense
Regulatory Debits
Regulatory Credits
Accretion expe
Taxes - Other
Total Operating Expenses
Operating Income Before Tax
Income Taxes
State
Income Taxes Deferred - Ne
Amortization of Investment Credit
Total Income Taxes

## Operating Income

Allowance for Funds Used During Construction Interest on Customer Deposits

## Return

Rate of Return
Reference ID Allocation Factor Company-Per
$\frac{\text { Reference ID }}{(2)} \frac{\text { Allocation Factor }}{(3)} \frac{\text { Total Company }}{\frac{\text { Books }}{(4)}}$

| \$ | 2,710,742,554 | \$ | 1,650,818,195 | \$ | 918,513,763 | \$ 141,410,596 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1,146,938,030 |  | 746,742,882 |  | 399,008,417 | 1,186,732 |
|  | 1,563,804,524 |  | 904,075,313 |  | 519,505,347 | 140,223,864 |
|  |  |  | - |  | - | - |
|  | 94,967,228 |  | 60,842,623 |  | - | 34,124,605 |
|  | - |  | - |  | - | - |
|  | 17,924,746 |  | - |  | 2,745,671 | 15,179,075 |
|  | 25,579,607 |  | 16,329,597 |  | 8,761,875 | 295,621 |
|  | 138,471,581 |  | 77,172,220 |  | 11,507,546 | 49,599,301 |
|  | 293,096,867 |  | 245,024,430 |  | 99,359,039 | $(51,286,603)$ |
|  | 5,621,654 |  | 5,061,698 |  | 660,646 | $(100,690)$ |
|  | 19,589,516 |  | 14,024,604 |  | 5,564,912 | - |
|  | - |  | - |  | - | - |
|  | - |  | - |  | - | - |
|  | 318,308,037 |  | 264,110,732 |  | 105,584,596 | $(51,387,293)$ |
|  | 1,383,968,068 |  | 717,136,801 |  | 425,428,296 | 241,210,458 |
|  | 948,557,379 |  | 601,150,677 |  | 343,669,321 | 3,737,381 |
|  | 717,381,346 |  | 456,583,358 |  | 249,006,880 | 11,791,108 |
|  | 59,010,352 |  | 32,835,145 |  | 24,627,671 | 1,547,535 |
|  | 10,047,784 |  | 2,005,606 |  | 7,605,978 | 436,200 |
|  | 14,926,305 |  | 16,193,844 |  | $(1,244,383)$ | $(23,156)$ |
|  | 22,788 |  | - |  | - | 22,788 |
|  | 47,813,320 |  | 34,840,619 |  | 12,622,989 | 349,712 |
|  | 849,201,894 |  | 542,458,571 |  | 292,619,136 | 14,124,188 |
|  | 99,355,485 |  | 58,692,106 |  | 51,050,186 | $(10,386,807)$ |
|  | $(235,117)$ |  | $(337,688)$ |  | 92,694 | 9,877 |
|  | 1,065,836 |  | $(1,253,802)$ |  | 772,291 | $(4,427,352)$ |
|  | 19,067,939 |  | 9,201,689 |  | 4,880,728 | 4,985,522 |
|  | - |  | - |  | - | - |
|  | 19,898,658 |  | 7,610,200 |  | 5,745,713 | 568,047 |
|  | 79,456,827 |  | 51,081,907 |  | 45,304,473 | $(10,954,854)$ |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 5,790,352 \\ (22,016) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 3,709,703 \\ (17,180) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $(4,837)$ | 2,080,649 |
| \$ | 85,225,162 | \$ | 54,774,430 | \$ | 45,299,636 | \$ (8,874,205) |
|  | 6.158\% |  | 7.638\% |  | 10.648\% | -3.679\% |


| \$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,400,595,796 \\ 560,424,574 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73,408,934 \\ & 17,503,714 \end{aligned}$ | \$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,474,004,730 \\ 577,928,288 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 840,171,222 |  | 55,905,220 |  | 896,076,441 |
|  | - |  | - |  | - |
|  | 42,795,678 |  | 7,779,093 |  | 50,574,771 |
|  | - |  |  |  | - |
|  | - |  |  |  | - |
|  | 3,403,111 |  | 13,037,676 |  | 16,435,549 |
|  | 46,198,789 |  | 20,816,769 |  | 67,010,320 |
|  | 210,959,941 |  | 5,809,772 |  | 225,475,241 |
|  | 5,061,698 |  |  |  | 5,061,698 |
|  | 14,024,604 |  |  |  | 14,024,604 |
|  | - |  |  |  | - |
|  | - |  |  |  | - |
|  | 230,046,243 |  | 5,809,772 |  | 244,561,543 |
|  | 656,323,768 |  | 70,912,216 |  | 718,525,219 |
|  | 138,842,885 |  | - |  | 138,842,885 |
|  | 59,657,983 |  | $(3,002,598)$ |  | 56,655,385 |
|  | 27,614,934 |  | 6,207,090 |  | 33,822,024 |
|  | 938,317 |  | $(938,317)$ |  | - |
|  | $(3,215,103)$ |  | 4,503,455 |  | 1,288,352 |
|  | - |  | - |  | - |
|  | 30,563,131 |  | 44,187 |  | 30,607,318 |
|  | 115,559,262 |  | 6,813,818 |  | 122,373,079 |
|  | 23,283,624 |  | $(6,813,818)$ |  | 16,469,806 |
|  | $(2,621,445)$ |  | $(412,619)$ |  | $(3,020,652)$ |
|  | $(6,122,265)$ |  | $(963,652)$ |  | $(7,054,596)$ |
|  | 8,298,486 |  |  |  | 8,298,486 |
|  | - |  |  |  | - |
|  | $(445,223)$ |  | (1,376,271) |  | $(1,776,762)$ |
|  | 23,728,847 |  | $(5,437,547)$ |  | 18,246,568 |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 2,609,343 \\ (17,180) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2,609,343 \\ (17,180) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| \$ | 26,321,010 | \$ | $(5,437,547)$ | \$ | 20,838,731 |
|  | 4.010\% |  | -7.668\% |  | 2.900\% |

## Electric Plant in Service

## Production Plant

Transmission Plant Transm
ARC
Total Transmission Plant
Distribution Network
Trans.-Subtransmission Related - 34.5 kV
Reliability Projects in Test Year Adj.
Reliability Projects Post Test Adj.
Total Distribution Plant
General Plant
Structures \& Buildings
Other
Reliability Projects' in Test Year Adj Reliability Projects Post Test Adj. ARC $\quad$ Alocation of FE Service Company Plant Adj.
Total General Plant

## Intangible Plant

Reliability Projects in Test Year Adj.
Reliability Projects Post Test Adj.
Allocation of FE Service Company Plant Adj.

## Subtotal Plant

## Regulatory Assets / Liabilities <br> COVID-19 Regulatory Asset Ad <br> MD Electric Vehicle Program Reg Asset Adj <br> Total Regulatory Assets

## Total Electric Plant in Service

Accumulated Reserves for Depreciation
Production
Transmission
Network
ARC
Total Transmission
Distribution
Network
Trans.-Subtransmission Related-34.5 kV
Reliability Projects in Test Year Adj.
Reliability Projects Post Test Adj.
Total Distribution
General Plant
Structures \& Buildings
Common
Reliability Projects in Test Year Adj.
Reliability Projects Post Test Adj.
Allocation of FE Service Company Plant Adj.
ARC
Total General

Total General

|  | Total Company-Per |  |  |  | MD Distribution |  | Going Level |  | MD Distrib. Going |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reference ID Allocation Factor | Books | Maryland | West Virginia | Other | Alloc.Factor | MD Distribution | Adjustment | Adi. No. | Level |
| (2) (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) |



| RBD10 | 278,554,092 | 182,079,668 | 96,474,424 | - | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Direct-Other | - | - | - | - | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
|  | 278,554,092 | 182,079,668 | 96,474,424 | - |  | - |  |  | - |
| Direct | 678,378,986 | 429,482,117 | 248,835,326 | 61,543 | Direct-MD | 429,482,117 |  |  | 429,482,117 |
| Direct | 115,599,150 | 94,383,818 | 21,211,211 | 4,121 | Direct-MD | 94,383,818 |  |  | 94,383,818 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 438,488 | (33) | 438,488 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 388,483 | (34) | 388,483 |
|  | 793,978,136 | 523,865,935 | 270,046,537 | 65,664 |  | 523,865,935 | 826,971 |  | 524,692,906 |
| Direct | 21,328,543 | 10,519,338 | 10,150,217 | 658,989 | S\&W | 9,426,429 |  |  | 9,426,429 |
| TX60 | 26,308,693 | 15,007,803 | 11,071,852 | 229,038 | S\&W | 13,448,565 |  |  | 13,448,565 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 125,199 | (33) | 125,199 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,531 | (34) | 8,531 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4,497,512 | (39b) | 4,497,512 |
|  |  | - | - | - | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
|  | 47,637,236 | 25,527,141 | 21,222,069 | 888,027 |  | 22,874,994 | 4,631,243 |  | 27,506,237 |

Depreciation Reserve on Regulatory Assets
COVID-19 Regulatory Asset Depreciation Adj
Total Reg Assic Vehicle Program Reg Asset Depr. Adj
CWIP Depr Reserve
Total Depreciation
Accumulated Amortization Intangible Plant

> Reliabiliti Projects' in Test Year Adj.
> Reliability Projects Post Test Adj.
> Non Eligible Amounts
> Allocation of FE Service Company Plant Adj.

## Total Depreciation \& Amortization

## Total Net Electric Plant

## dditions

Construction Work in Progress
Production
Distribution
Terminal treatment of post test year reliability projects
Total Construction Work in Progres
Plant Held for Future Use
Production
Transmission
Distribution
Total Plant Held for Future Use
Working Capital
Plant Materials and Supplies Ad.
Prepayments
Commission Assessments
WV Weatherization Program
Edison Electric Dues (Operating)
Plant Related
Labor Related
Purchased Power
Other (MD Related, Nonoperating)
Total Prepayments
Working Cash Calculation
Total Operating and Maintenance Expense
Taxes Other
Federal Taxes
Interest Expense-Common
nterest Expense-Customer Deposits
Interest Exp-AFUDC
Total Cash Expense
Daily Cash Requiremen
Total Cash Working Capital
Lead / Lag Days
Total Working Capital
Total Additions

| $\frac{\text { Reference ID }}{(2)} \frac{\text { Allocation Factor }}{(3)}$ |  | $\frac{\text { Total Company-Per }}{\frac{\text { Books }}{(4)}}$ | Potomac Edison C dictional Separatio Maryland - Distribu th Ended Decemb In Whole Dollars | pany <br> Study <br> 31, 2022 | $\frac{\text { Other }}{(7)}$ | $\frac{\text { MD Distribution }}{\text { Alloc.Factor }}$ <br> (8) | $\frac{\text { MD Distribution }}{(9)}$ | $\frac{\frac{\text { Going Level }}{\text { Adjustment }}}{(10)}$ | Exhibit SMC-1 <br> Page 3 of 12 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\frac{\text { Maryland }}{(5)}$ | $\frac{\text { West Virginia }}{(6)}$ | $\frac{\text { Adj. No. }}{(11)}$ |  |  |  |  | $\frac{\text { MD Distrib. Going }}{\frac{\text { Level }}{(12)}}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 726,023 \\ 152,629 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (40) \\ & (41) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 726,023 \\ 152,629 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 878,652 |  | 878,652 |
| TX60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 162,583 | (34) | 162,583 |
|  |  | 1,120,169,464 | 731,472,744 | 387,743,030 | 953,690 |  | 546,740,930 | 6,499,449 |  | 553,240,378 |
|  |  | 26,768,566 | 15,270,138 | 11,265,387 | 233,041 |  | 13,683,644 |  |  | $13,683,644$ 32,530 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 32,530 | (33) | 32,530 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 34,930 | (34) | 34,930 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $(12,062)$ | (42) | $(12,062)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10,948,867 | (39b) | 10,948,867 |
|  |  | 1,146,938,030 | 746,742,882 | 399,008,417 | 1,186,732 |  | 560,424,574 | 17,503,714 |  | 577,928,288 |
|  |  | 1,563,804,524 | 904,075,313 | 519,505,347 | 140,223,864 |  | 840,171,222 | 55,905,220 |  | 896,076,441 |
|  | D10 | - | - |  | - |  | - |  |  | - |
|  | RBD10 | 25,379,467 | 16,589,542 |  | 8,789,925 | Direct other | - - |  |  | - |
| Direct |  | 46,631,508 | 30,225,453 |  | 16,406,055 | Direct - MD | 30,225,453 |  |  | 30,225,453 |
| GP60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7,779,093 | (32b) | 7,779,093 |
|  |  | 22,956,253 | 14,027,628 |  | 8,928,625 | S\&W | 12,570,225 |  |  | 12,570,225 |
|  |  | 94,967,228 | 60,842,623 | - | 34,124,605 |  | 42,795,678 | 7,779,093 |  | 50,574,771 |
| D10GP20Direct |  | - | - | - | - | Direct Other Direct MD | - |  |  | 9 |
|  |  | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |  |  |
|  |  | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |  |  |
|  |  | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |  | - |
|  | D10 | - | - | - | - |  | - | 13,191,398 | (35) | 13,191,398 |
|  | Direct | 494,917 | - | 382,082 | 112,835 | Direct-MD | - |  |  | - |
|  | Direct-WV | 35,673 | - | 35,673 | - | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
|  | GP01 | 49,405 | - | 16,741 | 32,665 | MDGP01 | - |  |  | - |
|  | GP01 | 6,820,801 | - | 2,311,175 | 4,509,626 | MDGP01 | - |  |  | - |
|  | TX60 | - | - |  | - | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
|  | Direct-Other | 5,560,365 | - | - | 5,560,365 | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
|  | Direct-Other | 4,963,584 | - | - | 4,963,584 |  | - |  |  | - |
|  |  | 17,924,746 | - | 2,745,671 | 15,179,075 |  | - | - |  | - |
| 11.76 |  | 717,381,346 | 456,583,358 | 249,006,880 | 11,791,108 |  | 59,657,983 | $(3,002,598)$ |  | 56,655,385 |
|  |  | 47,813,320 | 34,840,619 | 12,622,989 | 349,712 |  | 30,563,131 | 44,187 |  | 30,607,318 |
|  |  | $(235,116)$ | $(337,688)$ | 92,694 | 9,877 |  | - |  |  | - |
|  |  | 1,065,836 | $(1,253,802)$ | 772,291 | $(4,427,352)$ |  | - - |  |  | - ${ }^{-}$ |
|  |  | 29,488,167 | 17,958,032 | 9,991,833 | 1,538,301 |  | 16,092,280 | $(1,974,939)$ |  | 14,117,341 |
|  |  | 22,016 | 17,180 | 4,837 |  |  | 17,180 |  |  | 17,180 |
|  |  | $(1,667,739)$ | $(1,015,638)$ | $(565,100)$ | $(87,001)$ |  | $(714,383)$ |  |  | $(714,383)$ |
|  |  | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |  | - |
|  |  | 793,867,830 | 506,792,061 | 271,926,423 | 9,174,646 |  | 105,616,191 | $(4,933,350)$ |  | 100,682,840 |
|  |  | 2,174,980 | 1,388,471 | 745,004 | 25,136 |  | 289,359 | $(13,516)$ |  | 275,843 |
|  |  | 25,579,607 | 16,329,597 | 8,761,875 | 295,621 |  | 3,403,111 | $\begin{array}{r} (158,960) \\ (5,105,826) \end{array}$ | (36) | $\begin{gathered} 3,244,151 \\ (5,105,826) \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | 43,504,353 | 16,329,597 | 11,507,546 | 15,474,696 |  | 3,403,111 | 13,032,438 |  | 16,435,549 |
|  |  | 138,471,581 | 77,172,220 | 11,507,546 | 49,599,301 |  | 46,198,789 | 20,811,531 |  | 67,010,320 |


| $\frac{\text { Reference ID }}{(2)} \frac{\text { Allocation Factor }}{(3)}$ |  | $\frac{\text { Total Company-Per }}{\frac{\text { Books }}{(4)}}$ | Potomac Edison C dictional Separatio Maryland - Distribu th Ended Decemb In Whole Dollars | pany <br> Study <br> 31, 2022 | $\frac{\text { Other }}{(7)}$ | $\frac{\text { MD Distribution }}{\text { Alloc.Factor }}$ <br> (8) | $\frac{\text { MD Distribution }}{(9)}$ | $\frac{\frac{\text { Going Level }}{\text { Adjustment }}}{(10)}$ | Exhibit SMC-1 <br> Page 3 of 12 |  |
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| TX60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 162,583 | (34) | 162,583 |
|  |  | 1,120,169,464 | 731,472,744 | 387,743,030 | 953,690 |  | 546,740,930 | 6,499,449 |  | 553,240,378 |
|  |  | 26,768,566 | 15,270,138 | 11,265,387 | 233,041 |  | 13,683,644 |  |  | $13,683,644$ 32,530 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 32,530 | (33) | 32,530 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 34,930 | (34) | 34,930 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $(12,062)$ | (42) | $(12,062)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10,948,867 | (39b) | 10,948,867 |
|  |  | 1,146,938,030 | 746,742,882 | 399,008,417 | 1,186,732 |  | 560,424,574 | 17,503,714 |  | 577,928,288 |
|  |  | 1,563,804,524 | 904,075,313 | 519,505,347 | 140,223,864 |  | 840,171,222 | 55,905,220 |  | 896,076,441 |
|  | D10 | - | - |  | - |  | - |  |  | - |
|  | RBD10 | 25,379,467 | 16,589,542 |  | 8,789,925 | Direct other | - - |  |  | - |
| Direct |  | 46,631,508 | 30,225,453 |  | 16,406,055 | Direct - MD | 30,225,453 |  |  | 30,225,453 |
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|  | Direct-WV | 35,673 | - | 35,673 | - | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
|  | GP01 | 49,405 | - | 16,741 | 32,665 | MDGP01 | - |  |  | - |
|  | GP01 | 6,820,801 | - | 2,311,175 | 4,509,626 | MDGP01 | - |  |  | - |
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| 11.76 |  | 717,381,346 | 456,583,358 | 249,006,880 | 11,791,108 |  | 59,657,983 | $(3,002,598)$ |  | 56,655,385 |
|  |  | 47,813,320 | 34,840,619 | 12,622,989 | 349,712 |  | 30,563,131 | 44,187 |  | 30,607,318 |
|  |  | $(235,116)$ | $(337,688)$ | 92,694 | 9,877 |  | - |  |  | - |
|  |  | 1,065,836 | $(1,253,802)$ | 772,291 | $(4,427,352)$ |  | - - |  |  | - ${ }^{-}$ |
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|  |  | 25,579,607 | 16,329,597 | 8,761,875 | 295,621 |  | 3,403,111 | $\begin{array}{r} (158,960) \\ (5,105,826) \end{array}$ | (36) | $\begin{gathered} 3,244,151 \\ (5,105,826) \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | 43,504,353 | 16,329,597 | 11,507,546 | 15,474,696 |  | 3,403,111 | 13,032,438 |  | 16,435,549 |
|  |  | 138,471,581 | 77,172,220 | 11,507,546 | 49,599,301 |  | 46,198,789 | 20,811,531 |  | 67,010,320 |
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|  |  | 22,016 | 17,180 | 4,837 |  |  | 17,180 |  |  | 17,180 |
|  |  | $(1,667,739)$ | $(1,015,638)$ | $(565,100)$ | $(87,001)$ |  | $(714,383)$ |  |  | $(714,383)$ |
|  |  | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |  | - |
|  |  | 793,867,830 | 506,792,061 | 271,926,423 | 9,174,646 |  | 105,616,191 | $(4,933,350)$ |  | 100,682,840 |
|  |  | 2,174,980 | 1,388,471 | 745,004 | 25,136 |  | 289,359 | $(13,516)$ |  | 275,843 |
|  |  | 25,579,607 | 16,329,597 | 8,761,875 | 295,621 |  | 3,403,111 | $\begin{array}{r} (158,960) \\ (5,105,826) \end{array}$ | (36) | $\begin{gathered} 3,244,151 \\ (5,105,826) \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | 43,504,353 | 16,329,597 | 11,507,546 | 15,474,696 |  | 3,403,111 | 13,032,438 |  | 16,435,549 |
|  |  | 138,471,581 | 77,172,220 | 11,507,546 | 49,599,301 |  | 46,198,789 | 20,811,531 |  | 67,010,320 |

Exhibit SMC-1
Page 3 of 12

| $\frac{\text { Reference ID }}{(2)}$ | $\frac{\text { Allocation Factor }}{(3)}$ | $\frac{\text { Total Company-Per }}{\frac{\text { Books }}{(4)}}$ | The Potomac Edison Company Jurisdictional Separation Study <br> Maryland - Distribution <br> Months Ended December 31, 2022 In Whole Dollars |  |  | $\frac{\text { MD Distribution }}{\text { Alloc.Factor }}$ (8) | $\frac{\text { MD Distribution }}{(9)}$ | $\frac{\frac{\text { Going Level }}{\text { Adjustment }}}{(10)}$ | Exhibit SMC-1 <br> Page 4 of 12 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\frac{\text { Maryland }}{(5)}$ | $\frac{\text { West Virginia }}{(6)}$ | $\frac{\text { Other }}{(7)}$ |  |  |  | $\frac{\text { Adj. No. }}{(11)}$ | $\frac{\text { MD Distrib. Going }}{\frac{\text { Level }}{(12)}}$ |
|  | GP01 | 326,328,659 | 198,731,262 | 110,169,584 | 17,427,813 | MDGP01 | 178,084,046 |  |  | 178,084,046 |
|  | GP01 | - |  |  |  | MDGP01 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Direct | 27,318,326 | 27,318,326 | - | - | MDGP01 | 24,480,084 |  |  | 24,480,084 |
|  | TX60 | 27,985,101 | 15,964,111 | - | 12,020,990 | S\&W | 14,305,517 |  |  | 14,305,517 |
|  | Direct | 2,068,538 | 2,068,538 | - | - | S\&W | 1,853,627 |  |  | 1,853,627 |
|  | GP01 | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |  | - |
|  | GP30-WV only | (30,670,689) | - | $(10,810,545)$ | $(19,860,144)$ | Direct- Other | - |  |  | - |
|  | Direct | $(3,258,478)$ | - | - | $(3,258,478)$ | Direct- Other | ${ }^{-}$ |  |  | - |
|  | Direct | 942,194 | 942,194 | - | - | Direct-MD | 942,194 |  |  | 942,194 |
|  | Direct- WV | - | - | - | - | Direct- WV | - |  |  | - |
|  | Direct-Other | $(57,616,785)$ | - | - | $(57,616,785)$ | Direct- Other | - |  |  | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1,737,865 \\ & 2,991,255 \\ & 1,080,653 \end{aligned}$ | (37) <br> (38) <br> (39c) | $\begin{aligned} & 1,737,865 \\ & 2,991,255 \\ & 1,080,653 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 293,096,866 | 245,024,430 | 99,359,039 | $(51,286,603)$ |  | 219,665,469 | 5,809,772 |  | 225,475,241 |
|  | Direct | 5,621,654 | 5,061,698 | 660,646 | $(100,690)$ | Direct-MD | 5,061,698 |  |  | 5,061,698 |
|  | Direct | 19,589,516 | 14,024,604 | 5,564,912 | - | Direct-MD | 14,024,604 |  |  | 14,024,604 |
|  |  | - | - | - | - |  | - |  |  | - |
|  |  | 318,308,036 | 264,110,732 | 105,584,596 | $(51,387,293)$ |  | 238,751,771 | 5,809,772 |  | 244,561,543 |
|  |  | 1,383,968,069 | 717,136,801 | 425,428,296 | 241,210,458 |  | 647,618,240 | 70,906,978 |  | 718,525,219 |
| RVSE1 | Direct | 277,743,980 | 277,743,979 | - | 1 | Direct-Other | - |  |  | -- |
| RVSE1a | Direct | 134,248,154 | 134,248,154 | - | (0) | Direct-MD | 134,248,154 |  |  | 134,248,154 |
| RVSE1B | Direct | 14,537,944 | 14,537,944 | - | 0 | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
| RVSE1 | Direct | 334,782,948 | - | 334,782,948 | 0 | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
| RVSE3 | Direct | 28,278,679 | 28,278,679 | - | (0) | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
| RVSE6 | Direct | 1,955,942 | - | 1,955,942 | 0 | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
| RVSE7 | Direct | (22,084,248) | - | (22,084,248) | (0) | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
| RVSE8 | Direct | 978,222 | 978,222 | - | (0) | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
| RVSE9 | Direct | 36,583,369 | 36,583,369 | - | (0) | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
| RVSE13 | Direct | 40,823 | 40,823 | - | 0 | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
| RSVE15 | Direct | 3,822,612 | 3,822,612 | - | - | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
| RVSEARAM | Direct | $(2,173,045)$ | - | (2,173,045) | 0 | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
| RVSE11 | Direct | 28,291,556 | - | 28,291,556 | 0 | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
|  |  | 837,006,936 | 496,233,783 | 340,773,152 | 1 |  | 134,248,154 | - |  | 134,248,154 |
| RVSR1 | Direct-Other | 118,678 | - | - | 118,678 | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
| RVSR1a | Direct | 60,845 | 60,845 | - | 0 | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
| RVSR9 | Direct | - | - | - | - | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
| RVSR12 | Direct | 1,438,912 | 1,438,912 | - | 0 | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
| RVSR13 | Direct | - | - | - | - | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
| RVSR14 | Direct | - | - | - | - | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
| RVSR15 | Direct | 83,824 | 56,411 | 27,413 | (0) | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
| RV5WR | Direct | 87,580,326 | 87,580,326 | - | - | Direct-Other | - |  |  | - |
|  |  | 89,282,585 | 89,136,493 | 27,413 | 118,678 |  | - | - |  | - |
|  |  | 926,289,521 | 585,370,276 | 340,800,566 | 118,680 |  | 134,248,154 | - |  | 134,248,154 |

Deductions
Accumulated Deferred Taxes
Plant Related - Federal \& State
Plant Related - WV
Labor Related - Federal \& State
Labor Related - MD
Customer Relate
CIACS - Federal
CIACS - MD
Direct-MD Distribution Related
Direct - WV
Direct - Other
Reliability Projects in Test Year Adj.
Reliability Projects Post Test Adj.
Service Company allocation of ADIT
Total Accumulated Deferred Taxes
Customer Advances for Construction
Customer Deposits
Contractor Retentions
Total Deductions
Total Rate Base
Operating Revenues
Sales of Electricity
Sales to Ultimate Customers
Generation / SOS (MD)
Distribution (MD)
Bundled (WV) Ancillary
Bundled (WV)
URPA Generation (MD)
LVal Exualize Tax (WV)
MD Environmental Surcharge
EmPower MD Surcharge
MD Electric Vehicle
MD Electric Distribution Infrastructure Surcharge
Tax Reform Reduction to revenues
Tax Reform Reduction to revenues
WV Vegetation Management Surcharge

Total Sales to Ultimate Customers
Sales for Resale
Wholesale
MD Solar
PJM Cap Res Defic \& RPM Auction
Borderlines
Spot Market
PJM Trans-Other
PJM Revenues for Energy Eff. Programs
Warrior Run
Total Sales for Resale

Total Sales of Electricity


Column
(1)
Distribution
Common
Distribution Exp - WV Veg Mgt Surc
Salaries and Wages Adj. - 2022
Salaries and Wageses Adj. -2023
Storm Damage Adj.
Advertising Expense Adj.
COVID-19 Expense Adj.
Total Distribution O\&M
Customer Accounts and Services
Uncollectibles
COVID-19 Expense Adj
Meter Reading \& Billing
Postage Expense Adj.
COVID-19 Expense Adj
Misc. Cust Serv and Info Exp
Customer Assistance
Customer Rebates \& Incentives
Sales Expense
All Other Cust Accts \& Services
Other-Direct to Other
Total Customer Accounts and Services

## Total Customer Accounts and Services

Administrative \& General
Commission Expense Adj.
Rate Case Expense Adj.
Employee Benefits (Acct. 926)
Employee Savings Plan Adj. - Test Year
Employee Savings Plan Adj. - 2023
Medical Insurance Expense Adj.
Group Life Insurance Expense Adj.
Pension/OPEB Expenses Adj.
COVID-19 Expense Adj
Outside Services
Outside Services - MD \& VA Transmission
Service Company Carrying Charges Adj.
COVID-19 Expense Adj
General Advertising Expense
Advertising Expense Adj.
Dues and Memberships
Administrative and General Salaries
All Other O\&M
Total Administrative \& General

## Total Operation and Maintenance

Total Company-Per


## In Whole Dollars

$\frac{\text { Maryland }}{(5)} \quad \frac{\text { West Vira }}{(6)}$
$\frac{\text { Other }}{(7)}$

MD Distribution
$\frac{\text { Alloc.Facto }}{(8)}$

MD Distribution
(9)
$\frac{\text { Going Level }}{\text { Adjustment }}$ $\frac{\text { Adjustmen }}{(10)}$
$\frac{\text { Adi. No. }}{(11)}$

MD Distrib. Going $\frac{\text { Level }}{(12)}$

| $\mathbf{6 0 , 5 2 9}, 063$ | $\mathbf{3 3 , 2 8 7}, \mathbf{3 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 , 2 2 1 , 2 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| ECA1 | Direct | 2,824,842 | 3,235,707 | $(410,864)$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ECA2 | C10 | 10,431,953 | 6,808,962 | 3,622,871 | 120 |
| ECA3 | C10 | 3,655,955 | 2,386,251 | 1,269,662 | 42 |
| ECA4 | C10 | 357,584 | 233,396 | 124,184 | 4 |
| ECA5 | Direct | 4,263,820 | 4,258,262 | 5,558 | - |
| ECA6 | C10 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| ECA7 | Direct | - | - | - | - |
| ECA9 | Direct | 45,245 | 45,245 | - | - |
|  |  | 21,579,401 | 16,967,824 | 4,611,412 | 166 |

Direct - MD

都

| $3,235,707$ |  |  | $3,235,707$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $6,808,962$ | $(2,103,093)$ | $(14)$ | $(2,103,093)$ |
|  | 46,132 | $(7)$ | $6,808,962$ |
|  | $(877)$ | $(14)$ | $(877)$ |
| $2,386,251$ | $(4,438)$ | $(6)$ | $2,381,813$ |
| 233,396 |  |  | 233,396 |
| - |  |  | - |
| 1 |  | 1 |  |
| 45,245 | $(45,245)$ | $(6)$ | - |
|  |  | $\mathbf{1 0 , 6 0 2 , 0 4 1}$ |  |

1,326,184
423,557
$(3,247,059)$
$(3,247,059)$
7,677
7,677
9,415
58.034
58,034
$(543)$
$(543)$
962,253
$(5,050)$ $(55,050)$
$9,710,582$
(2,743, $\overline{-}$
$(83,458)$
57,236 57,236
$(11,930)$
$3,795,263$
$2,060,838$ $\begin{array}{r}\mathbf{2 , 0 6 0 , 8 3 8} \\ \hline \mathbf{1 2 , 2 6 9 , 5 4 0}\end{array}$

56,655,385

## Operating Expenses


Production Depreciation Expense
Transmission Depreciation Expense
Common

Total Transmission

## Distribution

Distribution Network
Subtrans related - 34.5 Kv
Adjust for new depreciation rates
Test year distribution reliability projects adj.
Post-test year distribution reliability projects adj. Total Distribution

## General Plant

## Structures

Common
Adjust for new depreciation rates
Test year distribution reliability projects adj. Post-test year distribution reliability projects adj. Service Company Plant Allocation Adj

## Total General

Intangible Plant
Service Company Plant Allocation Adj
Adjust for new depreciation rates
Test year distribution reliability projects adj.
Post-test year distribution reliability projects adj.
Total Depreciation \& Amortization Expense
Amortization of Deferred Fuel Balance
Total Depreciation \& Amortization Expense

| Regulatory Debits |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Transmission-MD | REGDR1 |
| Vegetation Mgmt - MD \& VA | REGDR5 |
| Offset to Reg Liab for Sponsorships, Lobbying etc. | REGDR6 |
| Adjust for out of period |  |
| Vegetation Mgmt Surcharge - WV | REGDR2 |

EGDR1
REGDR5
REGDR6
REGDR2

The Potomac Edison Company
Jurisdictional Separation Stud
Maryland - Distribution

## In Whole Dollars

Total Company-Per
$\frac{\text { Reference ID }}{(2)} \frac{\text { Allocation Factor }}{(3)} \frac{\text { Books }}{(4)}$
$\frac{\text { Maryland }}{(5)}$

$\frac{\text { Alloc.Facto }}{(8)}$

D10
RBD10


2,050,82 $1,452,344$
$1,452,344$ Direct

| 695,751 | $19,067,875$ | $17,610,253$ | 17,623 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| 153,707 | $4,550,384$ | $1,603,323$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 849,458 | $23,618,259$ | $19,213,576$ | 17,623 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Direct - MD }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{rr}
19,067,875 & \\
4,550,384 & 4,251,230 \\
& 438,488 \\
& 388,483 \\
\hline 23,618,259 & 5,078,200
\end{array}
$$

| Direct | $(148,528)$ | $(148,528)$ | - | 0 | Direct-other |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Direct | $1,652,017$ | $1,215,817$ | - | 436,200 | Direct-other |
| Direct | $1,048,065$ | 938,317 | 109,748 | 0 | Direct - MD |
| Direct | $7,496,230$ | - | $7,496, \mathbf{2 3 0}$ | $(0)$ | Direct-other |


| $\begin{array}{r} 149,910 \\ 1,880,462 \end{array}$ |  |  | 149,910 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 1,880,462 |
|  | $(194,912)$ | (16) | $(194,912)$ |
|  | 125,199 | (17) | 125,199 |
|  | 8,531 | (18) | 8,531 |
|  | 978,101 | (20) | 978,101 |
| 2,030,372 | 916,920 |  | 2,947,291 |
| 1,966,303 |  |  | 1,966,303 |
|  | 1,037,987 | (20) | 1,037,987 |
|  | $(1,056,059)$ | (16) | $(1,056,059)$ |
|  | 32,530 | (17) | 32,530 |
|  | 34,930 | (18) | 34,930 |
|  | 162,583 | (18) | 162,583 |
| 27,614,934 | 6,207,090 |  | 33,822,024 |
| - |  |  |  |
| 27,614,934 | 6,207,090 |  | 33,822,024 |

938,317
(938,317)
$938,317 \quad(938,317)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& (16) \\
& (17) \\
& (18)
\end{aligned}
$$

| $19,067,875$ |
| ---: |
| $4,550,384$ |
| $4,251,230$ |
| 438,488 |
| 388,483 |
| $28,696,459$ |
|  |
| 149,910 |
| $1,880,462$ |
| $(194,912)$ |
| 125,199 |
| 8,531 |
| 978,101 |
| $2,947,291$ |
| $1,966,303$ |
| $11,037,987$ |
| $(1,05,059)$ |
| 32,530 |
| 34,930 |
| 162,503 |
| $33,822,24$ |
| - |
| $33,822,024$ |

(43)

Column
(1)

Regulatory Credit
Storm Deferral WV
MD Empower
Amortization Env. Control Prop - WV
Vegetation Mgmt - MD \& VA
Electric Vehicle Program Going Level Adj.
Electric Vehicle Program Amortization
MD Conservation Voltage Reduction (CVR) CVR Adj
Deferral of Rate Case Expenses
Rate Case Expense Going Level Adj.
Accretion
ARO Accretion
Transmission
COVID-19
COVID-19 Going Level Adj
COVID-19 Amortization
Total Regulatory Credits
Taxes - Other
Payroll Taxes
Production
Transmission
Distribution
$\quad$ Payroll Taxes Salaries and Wages Adj. - Test Year
Payroll Taxes Salaries and Wages Adj. - 2023

Payroll Taxes Salaries and Wages Adj. - Test Year
Payroll Taxes Salaries and Wages Adj. - 2023
Payroll Taxes Salaries and Wages Adj. - 2023 Administrative \& Gen
Total Payroll Taxes

Gross Receipts Taxes
State Gross Receipts Taxes-MD
State Gross Receipts Taxes-WV
WV B\&O Tax
Total Gross Receipts Taxes
Other Taxes
Property Taxes
Property Taxes - MD
Property Taxes-WV
Property Taxes-VA
Federal Excise \& Federal Highway
Public Utility Fuel Energy \& State License
Sales \& Use Tax
Sales \& Use Tax
MD Environmental Surcharge
Total Other Taxes

## Total Taxes - Other

Accretion Expense
Total Operating Expenses
Operating Income Before Tax
$\frac{\text { Going Level }}{\text { Adjustment }}$
$\frac{\text { Adi. No. }}{(11)}$

MD Distrib. Going $\frac{\text { Level }}{(12)}$

| REGCR1 | Direct |
| :--- | :--- |
| REGCR2 | Direct |
| REGCR3 | Direct |
| REGCR6 | Direct |
| REGGC5 | Direct |
| REGCR7 | Direct |
|  |  |
| REGCR14 | Direct |
|  |  |
| REGCR4 | Direct |
| REGCR9 | Direct |
| REGCR11 | Direct |
| REGCR12 | Direct |
|  |  |


| $(3,183,616)$ | - | (3,183,616) | (0) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18,907,756 | 18,907,756 | - | (0) |
| - | - | - |  |
| $(393,539)$ | $(393,539)$ | - |  |
| ( | - | - | - |
| $(527,034)$ | $(527,034)$ | - | 0 |
| 33,050 | 33,050 | - | 0 |
| $(73,049)$ | $(64,261)$ | $(8,789)$ | 0 |
| $(23,156)$ | - | - | $(23,156$ |
| 937,767 | 517,250 | 420,517 | 0 |
| $(751,874)$ | $(2,279,378)$ | 1,527,504 | (0) |

Direct-other
Direct-other

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Direct--ther } \\
& \text { Direct-other }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Direct-other } \\
& \text { Direct - MD }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Direct - MD } \\
& \text { Direct-other }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
(393,539)
$$

Direct - MD

$$
\begin{gathered}
(393,539) \\
- \\
(527,034)
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
(393,539)
$$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
(527,034) \\
527,034
\end{array}
$$

Direct MD

$$
33,050
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 527,034 \\
& 305,258
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& (25) \\
& (24)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 52,054 \\
& 305,258
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
30,258 \\
3,050
\end{array}
$$

Direct MD

$$
(64,261)
$$

$$
(11,152)
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& 3,000  \tag{21}\\
& (3,050) \\
& (64,261)
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& (64,261) \\
& (11,152)
\end{aligned}
$$

| - |  |  | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $(2,263,319)$ |  |  |  |
|  | $2,263,319$ | $(22)$ | $2,263,319)$ |
|  | $1,452,046$ | $(23)$ | $1,452,046$ |
| $\mathbf{3 , 2 1 5 , 1 0 3})$ | $\mathbf{4 , 5 0 3 , 4 5 5}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 , 2 8 8 , 3 5 2}$ |


| OTPAY1 | GP10 | - | - | - | - | Direct- Other | - |  |  | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OTPAY2 | GP20 | 167,048 | 84,639 | 68,790 | 13,619 | Direct- Other | - |  |  | - |
| OTPAY3 | GP30 | 1,049,436 | 577,126 | 471,954 | 355 | Direct-MD | 577,126 |  |  | 577,126 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19,575 | (26) | 19,575 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24,612 | (27) | 24,612 |
| OTPAY4 | C10 | 391,368 | 255,434 | 135,911 | 23 | S\&W | 228,896 |  |  | 228,896 |
| OTPAY5 | O\&M-AG | 24,915 | 14,213 | 10,485 | 217 | S\&W | 12,736 |  |  | 12,736 |
| TX60 |  | 1,632,767 | 931,413 | 687,140 | 14,215 |  | 818,758 | 44,187 |  | 862,945 |
| OTGRTMD | Direct | 8,611,939 | 8,611,939 | - | - | Direct - MD | 6,955,508 |  |  | 6,955,508 |
| OTGRTWV | Direct | 1,957,431 | - | 1,957,431 | - | Direct - Other | - |  |  | - |
| OTB\&O | Direct | 4,822,789 | - | 4,822,789 | - |  | - |  |  | - |
|  |  | 15,392,159 | 8,611,939 | 6,780,220 | - |  | 6,955,508 | - |  | 6,955,508 |
| OTPROP | Direct | 3,182 | - | - | 3,182 |  | - |  |  | - |
| OTPROPMD | Direct | 15,043,173 | 15,043,173 | - | (0) | Direct- MD | 13,480,260 |  |  | 13,480,260 |
| OTPROPWV | Direct | 5,278,481 | - | 5,278,481 | (0) | Direct- Other | - |  |  | - |
| OTPROPVA | Direct | 351,610 | - | - | 351,610 | Direct- Other | - |  |  | - |
| OTFE | GP01 | 143 | 87 | 49 | 7 | MDGP01 | 78 |  |  | 78 |
| OT1 | GP01 | 1,040 | 633 | 352 | 55 | MDGP01 | 568 |  |  | 568 |
| OT2 | Direct | 2,472 | - | 2,472 | 0 | Direct- Other | - |  |  | - |
| От3 | GP01 | $(371,043)$ | $(225,962)$ | $(125,725)$ | $(19,356)$ | MDGP01 | $(202,486)$ |  |  | $(202,486)$ |
| OTMCFE | Direct | 9,510,444 | 9,510,444 | - | 0 | Direct - MD | 9,510,444 |  |  | 9,510,444 |
| OTMDENV | Direct | 968,892 | 968,892 | - | 0 | Direct- Other | - |  |  | - |
|  |  | 30,788,394 | 25,297,267 | 5,155,629 | 335,498 |  | 22,788,864 | - |  | 22,788,864 |
|  |  | 47,813,320 | 34,840,619 | 12,622,989 | 349,712 |  | 30,563,131 | 44,187 |  | 30,607,318 |

$\qquad$ 22,788
Direct- Other $\qquad$
$\qquad$

Column
(1)

## Operating Income Before Tax

## Income Taxes

Income Taxes Deferred
Direct Assignment - MD
Direct Assignment - WV
Plant Related
Labor Related
Allocable Zero
Prior Period
Total Deferred Taxes - Net
Amortization of Investment Tax Credit
Income Tax Calculations
Operating Income Before Taxes interest Charges
Interest Charges - Commo Interest Synchronization Adj. Interest Charges - Customer Deposits Direct ABFUDC
Total Interest Charges
Tax Deductions (Schedule M)
Sch M Deductions-Common
Sch M Deductions - Labor Relat
Sch M Deductions - Labor Related
Sch M Customer Related (Bad Debts) Sch M Deductions-Direct- MD Sch M Deductions-Direct - WV
Total Tax Deductions (Schedule M's
Operating Income Less Tax Modifiers
Adjustment to Income - WV
Adjustment to Income - MD Bonus \& Other adjustments Adjustment to Income - VA Bonus \& Other adjustments

Adjusted State Taxable Income - WV
Adjusted State Taxable Income - VA
PA Income Tax
VA Income Tax
WV Income Tax
MD Income Tax
State Tax NOL Reclass Expense
State Tax NOL Reclass Expense-Prior
Prior Period SIT Adj
State Income Taxes Adjustment
State Income Tax - Net
In Whole Dollars

Total Company-Per $\frac{\text { Books }}{(4)}$


## Federal Taxable Income

Federal Income Tax Current
Federal Income Tax
Federal Income Taxes Prior \& Other
Federal Income Tax Adjustments: First Energy Service Corp Alloc.
Ne Federa - Prior \& Oner Adustme

## Net Utility Operating Income

Allowance For Funds Used During Construction - ABFUDC Interest on Customer Deposits

| $\frac{\text { Books }}{(4)}$ | $\frac{\text { Maryland }}{(5)}$ | West Virginia <br> (6) | $\frac{\text { Other }}{(7)}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4,035,262 | $(5,970,483)$ | 3,677,574 | $(22,122,775)$ |
| 847,405 | $(1,253,802)$ | 772,291 | $(4,645,783)$ |
| 218,431 |  |  | 218,431 |
| - | - |  |  |
| 1,065,836 | (1,253,802) | 772,291 | $(4,427,352)$ |
| 79,456,827 | 51,081,907 | 45,304,473 | $(10,954,854)$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5,790,352 \\ & (22,016) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3,709,703 \\ (17,180) \end{gathered}$ | $(4,837)$ | 2,080,649 |
| 85,225,162 | 54,774,430 | 45,299,636 | (8,874,205) |

MD Distribution $\frac{\text { Alloc.Factor }}{(8)}$

MD Distribution
$\frac{\text { Going Level }}{\text { Adiustment }}$ $\frac{\text { Going Level }}{\text { Adjustment }}$ (9)

| - |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $(29,153,643)$ | $(5,238,086)$ |

$\frac{\text { Adj. No. }}{(11)}$
MD Distrib. Going $\frac{\text { Level }}{(12)}$ (34,391,729) $(6,122,265)$
(932,-331)
$(7,054,596)$
18,246,568
2,609,343
20,838,731
Total Company-Per
$\frac{\text { Reference ID }}{(2)} \frac{\text { Allocation Factor }}{(3)}$

ALLOCATION FACTOR DATA
Allocation Factor Description

Demand at Generation Level - MWH (Retail \& NonAffiliate)
Average Number of Customers

## Allocation

| Factor | Total Company |
| :---: | :---: |
| D10 | 2,715,253 |
| C10 | 436,112 |


| Maryland |
| :--- |
| $1,269,444$ |
| 284,639 |

WV | 721,145 |
| ---: |
| $\mathbf{1 5 1 , 4 4 9}$ |

Other
724,664
151,449

Total MD
Retail and Affiliated \&
Nonaffiliated $\frac{\text { Wholesale }}{1,348,179}$

## Total Co.

Retail \&
Affiliated

## MD Distribution

$\frac{\text { Alloc.Facto }}{(8)}$
$\frac{\text { MD Distribution }}{(9)}$
(9)
$\frac{\text { Going Level }}{\text { Adiustment }}$
$\frac{\text { Adi. No. }}{(11)}$

Exhibit SMC-1

Allocation of MD Retail to MD Retail + Affil. \& NonAffil. Wholesale

Dmd at Gen. Level - kW - VA w/o FERC

Allocation of MD Retail to Total Co. Retail \& Affiliated
Wholesale (Borderline):
Demand at Generation Level - kW w/o FERC

Allocation of MD Retail \& Affil. Wholesale(Borderline) to Total Co. Retail \& Affil Retail \& Affiliated Wholesale (Borderline) and Nonaffiliated Wholesale
Demand at Generation Level - kW w/o FERC Nonaffil. Wholesale RBD10

Internally Calculated within Program
Production Plant

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Transmission Plant } \\
& \text { Distribution Plant }
\end{aligned}
$$

Distribution Plant
Transmission \& Distribution Plan
General Plant
Intangible Plant
Transmission, Distribution \& General Plan
Total Electric Plant In Service
Total Construction Work in Progress
Total Payroll Taxes
Thel, Purch. Power and A\&G less cust rebates
Total Cust. Accts/Cust.Svcs. Less MD customer rebates
Gen \& Intangible

PE Salary \& Wage MD Distrib. Alloc
(From PE 2022 FF1, pg. 354)

## MD General Plant

Total MD Plant to MD Distribution Plan
MD Construction Work in Progress
Total MD Revenue to MD Distribution Revenue

|  | Total Company |
| :--- | ---: |
| GP10 | 0 |
| GP20 | $518,590,690$ |
| GP30 | $2,060,549,901$ |
| GP35 | $2,579,140,591$ |
| GP50 | $91,25,742$ |
| GP60 | $40,347,220$ |
| GP80 | $2,670,395,333$ |
| GP01 | $2,710,742,54$ |
| L00 | $94,96,228$ |
| TX60 | $1,632,767$ |
| E00M | $128,025,083$ |
| E45 | $17,315,581$ |


| Total Co. |
| :--- |
|  |
|  |
| NonAffiliated |
| Wholesale |
| $1,949,286$ |

$\begin{aligned} & \text { Affiliated } \\ & \text { Wholesale }\end{aligned}$
$1,274,181$
${ }^{\text {Other }}{ }_{4,737}$
MD Retail
$\&$ Affiliated
Wholesale
$\frac{\text { (Borderlines) }}{1,274,171}$


| Maryland | $\frac{\text { WV }}{-}$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $242,449,915$ | $137,731,964$ |
| $1,333,557,442$ | $726,285,224$ |
| $1,576,007,358$ | $864,017,187$ |
| $51,794,751$ | $37,516,696$ |
| $23,016,086$ | $16,979,880$ |
| $1,627,802,109$ | $901,533,883$ |
| $1,650,818,195$ | $918,513,763$ |
| $60,842,623$ | - |
| 931,413 | 687,140 |
| $71,422,102$ | $52,491,228$ |
| $12,709,562$ | $4,605,853$ |

## Total PE Distrib.

otal PE S\&W 19,649,463


Total PE Other S\&W 2,041,484

$$
\begin{array}{cr}
\text { MD Distribution } & \\
\hline 46,413,528 & \text { MD Other } \\
\hline 1,333,557,442 & 317,381,260,753 \\
42,795,678 & 18,046,944.9 \\
138,842,885 & 462,307,792.3
\end{array}
$$



| MD Distrib. | MD Other |
| :---: | :---: |
| $89.6105 \%$ | $10.3895 \%$ <br> $80.7816 \%$ <br> $70.3383 \%$ <br> $73.2184 \%$ <br> $23092 \%$ |
| $29.6617 \%$ |  |
|  | $76.9038 \%$ |

## .3895\%

 29.6617\%Other
0.26689 0.00034
0.05394
0.05394
0.02130
0.02130
0.00871
0.00871
0.05282
0.05282
0.05217
0.00871
0.03212
0.03212
0.00001

| MDGP50 | Total MD |
| :--- | ---: |
| M1,794,751 |  |
| MDGP01 | $1,650,818,195$ |
| MDCWIP | $60,842,623$ |
| MDREV | $601,150,677$ |

MDREV

## Other

26.689\%
0.006\%

| Total MD <br> Retail and <br>  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nonaffiliated | MD | MD Affil. |
| Wholesale | \& Nonaffil. |  |
| $100.00 \%$ | $94.160 \%$ | $\underline{\text { Wholesale }}$ |
|  |  |  |

Total Co.
Retail \&

| Affiliated <br> Wholesale | MD <br> Retail | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $100.00 \%$ |  |  |$\quad 99.628 \% \quad 0.37 \%$


| Total Co. <br>  | MD Retail | Other <br> (Including |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Affiliated \& | \& Affiliated | All Non- |
| NonAffiliated | Wholesale | Affiliated |
| Wholesale | (Borderlines) | $\underline{\text { Wholesale) }}$ |
| 1.0000 | 0.65366 |  |


|  | Alloc. Factor Percentages |  |  | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| r | Total Co | MD | WV |  |
| 1 | 1.00 | 0.46752 | 0.27 | 0.26689 |
|  | 1.00 | 0.64719 | 0.35 | 0.00034 |
|  | 1.00 | 0.61106 | 0.34 | 0.05394 |
|  | 1.00 | 0.56758 | 0.41 | 0.02130 |
| 54 | 1.00 | 0.57045 | 0.42 | 0.00871 |
| 42 | 1.00 | 0.60957 | 0.34 | 0.05282 |
| 96 | 1.00 | 0.60899 | 0.34 | 0.05217 |
| 05 | 1.00 | 0.64067 | - | 0.35933 |
| 15 | 1.00 | 0.57045 | 0.42 | 0.00871 |
| 53 | 1.00 | 0.55788 | 0.41 | 0.03212 |
| 66 | 1.00 | 0.73400 | 0.27 | 0.00001 |

76. 

## State Tax Rates

PA Income Tax
MD Income Tax
MD Income Tax
VA Income Tax
WV Income Tax
Federal Income Tax Current

| $\frac{\text { Reference ID }}{(2)}$ | $\frac{\text { Allocation Factor }}{(3)}$ | The Potomac Edison Company Jurisdictional Separation Study Maryland - Distribution 12 Months Ended December 31, 2022 In Whole Dollars |  |  | $\frac{\text { Other }}{(7)}$ | $\frac{\text { MD Distribution }}{\text { Alloc.Factor }}$ <br> (8) | $\frac{\text { MD Distribution }}{(9)}$ | $\frac{\frac{\text { Going Level }}{\text { Adjustment }}}{(10)}$ | $\frac{\text { Adi. No. }}{(11)}$ | xhibit SMC-1 age 12 of 12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\frac{\text { Total Company-Per }}{\frac{\text { Books }}{(4)}}$ <br> (4) | $\frac{\text { Maryland }}{(5)}$ | $\frac{\text { West Virginia }}{(6)}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\frac{\text { MD Distrib. Going }}{\frac{\text { Level }}{(12)}}$ |
| Effective Tax |  | State Apportionment \% from tax rpt 510011 | Statutory State Tax Rates | Apportionment Factor * Statutory Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.00\% | VA Eff. Tax Rate | 1.505\% | 6.000\% | 0.090\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.35\% $0.09 \%$ | WV ETR | 37.824\% | 6.500\% | 2.459\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.46\% | MD ETR | 64.887\% | 8.250\% | 5.353\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21.00\% | PA ETR | 0.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.000\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## BEFORE THE

## PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF MARYLAND

| In the Matter of the Application | $*$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Of The Potomac Edison Company | $*$ |  |
| For Adjustments to its Retail | $*$ | Case No. |
| Rates for the Distribution of | $*$ |  |
| Electric Energy | $*$ |  |

## DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

BOBBI S. MILLER

Concerning: Updated Studies for Jurisdictional and Class Cost of Service Studies

## I. INTRODUCTION

## Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is Bobbi S. Miller, and my business address is 800 Cabin Hill Drive, Greensburg, Pennsylvania 15601.
Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?
A. I am employed by FirstEnergy Service Company and my title is Analyst IV, Rates and Regulatory Affairs. I report to the Manager, Rates and Regulatory Affairs, and my responsibilities include assisting in the development, preparation and coordination of regulatory filings, including the studies addressed in my testimony, and the development of retail electric rates, rules, and regulations. My time is devoted to tasks performed for The Potomac Edison Company ("PE" or "Company") and Monongahela Power Company.
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.
A. I am a graduate of Point Park University where I earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Legal Studies. I have over 16 years of experience with FirstEnergy Service Company or its predecessor companies and have held positions of Paralegal; Legal Specialist; Advanced Legal Specialist, and my current position of Analyst IV, Rates and Regulatory Affairs.
Q. HAVE YOU TESTIFIED IN RATE PROCEEDINGS BEFORE REGULATORY COMMISSIONS?
A. Yes, I have testified before the Public Service Commission of West Virginia.
$\qquad$

## II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY.

A. In Case No. 9490, the Maryland Public Service Commission ("Commission") issued an Order on March 22, 2019 that, among other items, required the Company to file updated studies for the Jurisdictional Cost of Service Study and the Class Cost of Service Study ("CCOS") such that all updated studies are current to within one year of the test year in the Company's next base rate case. ${ }^{1}$ Listed below are the updated studies I will address in my testimony that utilized an updated test period ending 2021 and are within one year of the 2022 test year of the Company's current base rate case:

1. Customer Accounts Weighting Factor Study;
2. Meter Weighting Factor Study;
3. Minimum-Size Study; and
4. Primary/Secondary Study.

## Q. HAVE YOU PREPARED OR HAD PREPARED UNDER YOUR SUPERVISION EXHIBITS TO ACCOMPANY YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. Yes. I am sponsoring the following Exhibits:

1. Exhibit BSM-1 - Customer Accounts Weighting Factor Study;
2. Exhibit BSM-2 - Meter Weighting Factor Study; and
3. Exhibit BSM-3 - Engineering Studies (which includes the results of the Minimum-Size Study and the Primary/Secondary Study).
[^40]
## III. UPDATED STUDIES

## Q. WHAT INFORMATION IS PROVIDED IN THE CUSTOMER ACCOUNTS WEIGHTING FACTOR STUDY AND HOW IS IT USED IN THE CCOS?

A. The Customer Accounts Weighting Factor Study, Exhibit BSM-1, analyzes Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") Accounts 902-905, 908, 910, 450 and 451 as customerrelated costs, which includes, but is not limited to, meter reading expense, customer records collection expense, uncollectible expense, and customer assistance expense, to allocate customer accounts and services expense to the various Company rate schedules in the CCOS. The source of information used and the allocation methodology for each FERC account in the study are outlined in Exhibit BSM-1.

## Q. WHAT INFORMATION IS PROVIDED IN THE METER WEIGHTING FACTOR STUDY AND HOW IS IT USED IN THE CCOS?

A. The Meter Weighting Factor Study, Exhibit BSM-2, analyzes FERC Account 370 and calculates the total cost per customer for each meter, including labor cost, to allocate meter investment to the various Company rate schedules in the CCOS. To calculate the labor costs for residential customers, the study takes the average of all meter technician rates and assumes 15 minutes per installation. To calculate the labor costs for non-residential customers, the study takes the average of the meter technicians' rates for the technicians qualified to do the non-residential customer installations and assumes 60 minutes per installation.

## Q. WHAT INFORMATION IS PROVIDED IN THE ENGINEERING STUDIES?

$\qquad$
A. The Engineering Studies, Exhibit BSM-3, includes the Minimum-Size Study and the Primary/Secondary Study.

## Q. WHAT IS A MINIMUM-SIZE STUDY?

A. According to the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners' Electric Utility Cost Allocation Manual, a Minimum-Size Study assumes that a minimum size distribution system can be built to serve the minimum loading requirements for the customer. The Minimum-Size Study looks at the minimum size of the assets in FERC Accounts $364-370$, which includes, but is not limited to, poles, conductors, transformers, conduit, and service, that will be needed to build the minimum size distribution system. Once that is determined, the minimum size distribution system is classified as customerrelated costs. The difference between customer-related costs and total investment in that specific FERC account is then classified as demand-related costs. The source of information used and the allocation methodology for each FERC account in the study is outlined in Exhibit BSM-3.

## Q. WHY DID THE COMPANY PERFORM A MINIMUM-SIZE STUDY?

A. The Company performed a Minimum-Size Study and Company witness Lyons performed a Zero-Intercept Study. FirstEnergy Corporation has developed internal tools to streamline performance of a Minimum-Size Study based on previous rate case studies in other states in which it has operations. The Minimum-Size Study method was performed to leverage the existing tools that work with the Company's database structure to reduce the time and effort needed to complete the portion of the study that establishes the customer versus demand portion of FERC Accounts 364-370. Company witness Lyons will discuss the

Zero-Intercept Study and how that study is ultimately utilized in the CCOS in his direct testimony.

## Q. WHAT IS A PRIMARY/SECONDARY STUDY?

A. The Primary/Secondary Study analyzes FERC Accounts 364-367, which includes, but is not limited to, poles, conductors, and transformers, to determine the Company's assets used to serve primary voltage customers from the customer-related costs of the Minimum-Size Study. The remaining assets are then allocated to secondary customers. The source of information used and the allocation methodology for each FERC account in the study is outlined in Exhibit BSM-3.
Q. WHAT IS A POLE SAMPLE/STREETLIGHTING STUDY AND WHY DID THE COMPANY NOT INCLUDE THIS AS A SEPARATE STUDY IN ITS FILING?
A. The Pole Sample/Streetlighting Study sub-functionalizes the poles in FERC Accounts 360, 364 , and 365 amongst the various voltage levels, and breaks out street lighting dedicated poles, which determines the ratio of poles dedicated to primary versus secondary versus street lighting service. This study has been incorporated into the Primary/Secondary Study listed above, so there is not a separate study that addresses the sub-functionalization of the poles into primary/secondary/streetlighting customers.
Q. WERE ALL THE PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED STUDIES UPDATED TO WITHIN ONE YEAR OF THE 2022 TEST YEAR OF THE COMPANY'S BASE RATE CASE?
A. Yes.
$\qquad$

## Q. IS THERE ANY ADDITIONAL DATA THE COMMISSION REQUIRED THE COMPANY TO ADDRESS IN THIS RATE CASE?

A. Yes, in its March 22, 2019 Order, the Commission required the Company to file: (1) testimony supporting or rejecting the use of the Average Coincident Peak methodology to allocate costs related to subtransmission and FERC Accounts 362 and 368 capacitors based on current system conditions and cost causation; (2) three years of demand at transmission, subtransmission, primary, and secondary levels, as well as their resulting allocators that are used in the CCOS; and (3) to file a CCOS with and without a Zero-Intercept Study being utilized in the CCOS' allocations.
Q. HAS THE COMPANY ADDRESSED THESE ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS?
A. Yes, these items are addressed in the Direct Testimony of Company witness Lyons.

## IV. CONCLUSION

## Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY AT THIS TIME?

A. Yes, it does.

# The Potomac Edison Company Exhibit BSM-1 

Customer Account Weighting Factor Study

## The Potomac Edison Company

## Year Ending December 2021

## FERC 902 Meter Reading Expenses

## Overview

The allocation methodology required a two-step process. First, a weighting factor was calculated for each rate class based on the number of meters in that rate class and the read time for those meters. Then, these weight factors were used to determine the allocation of the FERC balance across the rate classes.

## Source of Data

FERC 902 account balance for 2021.
Normalized billing units were used for the number of customers at December 2021 (end of period).
Read times for each meter by rate class were obtained from Customer Service Analytics. Streetlights were excluded from the calculations as a majority of those accounts are not metered.

## Allocation Methodology

- The December 2021 (end of period) Number of Customers (a) for each rate category is based on the Normalized billing units.
- The weighted factor (b) is based on the read time for each rate category and represents the minutes per meter to obtain a reading.
- The Weighted Customer Count (c) is the Customer Count (a) X Weighted factor (b).
- Total $\$$ by Rate (d) was calculated by taking the Weighted Customer Count by rate class (c) divided by Total Weighted Customer Count X Total FERC Balance equals FERC balance by rate class.

| Customers By Rate Class | December 2021 <br> Number <br> Customers (a) | Weighted <br> Factor (b) | Weighted Customer Count $(c)=(a) *(b)$ | Total \$ by Rate (d) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |
| R - Residential | 374,991 | 1.09 | 408,740 | \$4,671,181 |
| Total Residential | 374,991 |  | 408,740 | \$4,671,181 |
| Commercial |  |  |  |  |
| G - General Service | 39,235 | 1.46 | 57,283 | \$654,645 |
| C - General | 4,001 | 1.52 | 6,082 | \$69,501 |
| CSH - Church and School | 223 | 2.11 | 471 | \$5,377 |
| C-A - All Electric | 304 | 2.11 | 641 | \$7,331 |
| E - General Service | 3,548 | 1.54 | 5,464 | \$62,443 |
| PH - Light \& Power | 1,422 | 2.61 | 3,711 | \$42,415 |
| Total Commercial | 48,733 |  | 73,652 | \$841,712 |
| Industrial |  |  |  |  |
| G - General Service | 3,159 | 2.04 | 6,444 | \$73,648 |
| E - General Service | 482 | 2.31 | 1,113 | \$12,724 |
| C - General | 451 | 2.08 | 938 | \$10,721 |
| C-A - All Electric | 33 | 3.20 | 106 | \$1,207 |
| PH - Light \& Power | 306 | 3.04 | 930 | \$10,631 |
| Total Industrial | 4,431 |  | 9,532 | \$108,931 |
| Public St \& Highway Lighting |  |  |  |  |
| Public St \& Highway Lighting | 614 |  |  |  |
| Total Public St \& Highway Lighting | 614 |  |  |  |
| Total | 428,769 |  | 491,924 | \$5,621,823 |

## FERC 903 Customer Records Collection Expenses

## Overview

The normalized billing units were used for the number of customers at December 2021 (end of period) to calculate a weighted distribution of the FERC 903 account balance.

## Source of Data

FERC 903 account balance for 2021
Normalized billing units were used for the number of customers at December 2021 (end of period).

## Allocation Methodology

The weighted factor (b) used to distribute the dollars for each rate class was calculated based on the normalized billing units (a) in each rate category compared to the total customers. This factor (b) was then multiplied by the combined FERC 903 balance to determine the distribution of dollars across the rate classes (c).

| Title of Rate Schedule | December 2021 <br> Number <br> Customers (a) | Factor (b) | \$ Total by Rate <br> (c) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential |  |  |  |
| R - Residential | 374,991 | 0.8746 | $\$ 4,188,558$ |
| Total Residential | $\mathbf{3 7 4 , 9 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8 7 4 6}$ | $\$ 4,188,558$ |
| Commercial |  |  |  |
| G - General Service | 39,235 | 0.0915 | $\$ 438,245$ |
| C - General | 4,001 | 0.0093 | $\$ 44,690$ |
| CSH - Church and School | 223 | 0.0005 | $\$ 2,491$ |
| C-A - All Electric | 304 | 0.0007 | $\$ 3,396$ |
| E - General Service | 3,548 | 0.0083 | $\$ 39,630$ |
| PH - Light \& Power | 1,422 | 0.0033 | $\$ 15,883$ |
| Total Commercial | $\mathbf{4 8 , 7 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 1 3 7}$ | $\$ 544,336$ |
| Industrial | 3,159 |  | 0.0074 |
| G - General Service | 482 | 0.0011 | $\$ 35,285$ |
| E - General Service | 451 | 0.0011 | $\$ 5,384$ |
| C - General | 33 | 0.0001 | $\$ 369$ |
| C-A - All Electric | 306 | 0.0007 | $\$ 3,418$ |
| PH - Light \& Power | $\mathbf{4 , 4 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1 0 3}$ | $\$ 49,493$ |
| Total Industrial |  |  |  |
| Public St \& Highway Lighting | 614 | 0.0014 | $\$ 6,858$ |
| Public St \& Highway Lighting | $\mathbf{6 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1 4}$ | $\$ 6,858$ |
| Total Public St \& Highway Lighting | $\mathbf{4 2 8 , 7 6 9}$ |  | $\$ 4,789, \mathbf{2 4 5}$ |
| Total |  |  |  |

## FERC 904 Uncollectible Accounts

## Overview

The normalized billing units were used for the number of customers at December 2021 (end of period) to calculate a weighted distribution of the FERC 904 account balance.

## Source of Data

FERC 904 account balance for 2021
Normalized billing units were used for the number of customers at December 2021 (end of period).

## Allocation Methodology

The weighted factor (b) used to distribute the dollars for each rate classes was calculated based on the normalized billing units (a) in each rate category compared to the total customers. This factor (b) was
then multiplied by the combined FERC 904 balance to determine the distribution of dollars across the rate classes (c).

| Title of Rate Schedule | December 2021 <br> Number <br> Customers (a) | Factor (b) | \$ Total by Rate <br> (c) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential |  |  |  |
| R - Residential | 374,991 | 0.8746 | $\$ 162,616$ |
| Total Residential | $\mathbf{3 7 4 , 9 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8 7 4 6}$ | $\$ 162,616$ |
| Commercial |  |  |  |
| G - General Service | 39,235 | 0.0915 | $\$ 17,014$ |
| C - General | 4,001 | 0.0093 | $\$ 1,735$ |
| CSH - Church and School | 223 | 0.0005 | $\$ 97$ |
| C-A - All Electric | 304 | 0.0007 | $\$ 132$ |
| E - General Service | 3,548 | 0.0083 | $\$ 1,539$ |
| PH - Light \& Power | 1,422 | 0.0033 | $\$ 617$ |
| Total Commercial | $\mathbf{4 8 , 7 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 1 3 7}$ | $\$ \mathbf{2 1 , 1 3 3}$ |
| Industrial | 3,159 | 0.0074 | $\$ 1,370$ |
| G - General Service | 482 | 0.0011 | $\$ 209$ |
| E - General Service | 451 | 0.0011 | $\$ 196$ |
| C - General | 33 | 0.0001 | $\$ 14$ |
| C-A - All Electric | 306 | 0.0007 | $\$ 133$ |
| PH - Light \& Power | $\mathbf{4 , 4 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1 0 3}$ | $\$ 1,922$ |
| Total Industrial |  |  |  |
| Public St \& Highway Lighting | 614 | 0.0014 | $\$ 266$ |
| Public St \& Highway Lighting | $\mathbf{6 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1 4}$ | $\$ \mathbf{2 6 6}$ |
| Total Public St \& Highway Lighting | $\mathbf{4 2 8 , 7 6 9}$ |  | $\$ \mathbf{1 8 5 , 9 3 7}$ |
| Total |  |  |  |

## FERC 905 Miscellaneous Customer Accounts Expenses

## Overview

The normalized billing units were used for the number of customers at December 2021 (end of period) to calculate a weighted distribution of the FERC 905 account balance.

## Source of Data

FERC 905 account balance for 2021
Normalized billing units were used for the number of customers at December 2021 (end of period).

## Allocation Methodology

The weighted factor (b) used to distribute the dollars for each rate classes was calculated based on the normalized billing units (a) in each rate category compared to the total customers. This factor (b) was then multiplied by the combined FERC 905 balance to determine the distribution of dollars across the rate classes (c).

| Title of Rate Schedule | December 2021 <br> Number <br> Customers (a) | Factor (b) | \$ Total by Rate <br> (c) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential |  |  |  |
| R - Residential | 374,991 | 0.8746 | \$458,726 |
| Total Residential | 374,991 | 0.8746 | \$458,726 |
| Commercial |  |  |  |
| G - General Service | 39,235 | 0.0915 | \$47,996 |
| C - General | 4,001 | 0.0093 | \$4,894 |
| CSH - Church and School | 223 | 0.0005 | \$273 |
| C-A - All Electric | 304 | 0.0007 | \$372 |
| E - General Service | 3,548 | 0.0083 | \$4,340 |
| PH - Light \& Power | 1,422 | 0.0033 | \$1,740 |
| Total Commercial | 48,733 | 0.1137 | \$59,615 |
| Industrial |  |  |  |
| G - General Service | 3,159 | 0.0074 | \$3,864 |
| E - General Service | 482 | 0.0011 | \$590 |
| C - General | 451 | 0.0011 | \$552 |
| C-A - All Electric | 33 | 0.0001 | \$40 |
| PH - Light \& Power | 306 | 0.0007 | \$374 |
| Total Industrial | 4,431 | 0.0103 | \$5,420 |
| Public St \& Highway Lighting |  |  |  |
| Public St \& Highway Lighting | 614 | 0.0014 | \$751 |
| Total Public St \& Highway Lighting | 614 | 0.0014 | \$751 |
| Total | 428,769 |  | \$524,512 |

## FERC 450 \& 451 Forfeited Discounts and Miscellaneous Service Revenues

## Overview

The normalized billing units were used for the number of customers at December 2021 (end of period) to calculate a weighted distribution of the FERC 450 and 451 expenses.

## Source of Data

FERC 450 and 451 account balance for 2021
Normalized billing units were used for the number of customers at December 2021 (end of period).

## Allocation Methodology

The weighted factor (b) used to distribute the dollars for each rate classes was calculated based on the normalized billing units (a) in each rate category compared to the total customers. This factor (b) was then multiplied by the combined FERC 450 and 451 balance to determine the distribution of dollars across the rate classes (c).

| Title of Rate Schedule | December 2021 <br> Number <br> Customers (a) | Factor (b) | \$ Total by Rate <br> (c) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential |  |  |  |
| R - Residential | 374,991 | 0.8746 | $-\$ 2,655,425$ |
| Total Residential | $\mathbf{3 7 4 , 9 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8 7 4 6}$ | $-\mathbf{2 , 6 5 5 , 4 2 5}$ |
| Commercial |  |  |  |
| G - General Service | 39,235 | 0.0915 | $-\$ 277,835$ |
| C - General | 4,001 | 0.0093 | $-\$ 28,332$ |
| CSH - Church and School | 223 | 0.0005 | $-\$ 1,579$ |
| C-A - All Electric | 304 | 0.0007 | $-\$ 2,153$ |
| E - General Service | 3,548 | 0.0083 | $-\$ 25,124$ |
| PH - Light \& Power | 1,422 | 0.0033 | $-\$ 10,070$ |
| Total Commercial | $\mathbf{4 8 , 7 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 1 3 7}$ | $-\$ 345,093$ |
| Industrial | 3,159 | 0.0074 | $-\$ 22,370$ |
| G - General Service | 482 | 0.0011 | $-\$ 3,413$ |
| E - General Service | 451 | 0.0011 | $-\$ 3,194$ |
| C - General | 33 | 0.0001 | $-\$ 234$ |
| C-A - All Electric | 306 | 0.0007 | $-\$ 2,167$ |
| PH - Light \& Power | $\mathbf{4 , 4 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{- \$ 3 1 , 3 7 7}$ |
| Total Industrial |  |  |  |
| Public St \& Highway Lighting | 614 | 0.0014 | $-\$ 4,348$ |
| Public St \& Highway Lighting | $\mathbf{6 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1 4}$ | $-\$ 4,348$ |
| Total Public St \& Highway Lighting | $\mathbf{4 2 8 , 7 6 9}$ |  | $\mathbf{- \$ 3 , 0 3 6 , 2 4 3}$ |
| Total |  |  |  |

## FERC 908 Customer Assistance Expenses

## Overview

The FERC 908 account balance for 2021 was assigned to Rate RS because it is the only rate schedule on which the customers receiving service participate in the Company's customer assistance programs.

## Source of Data

FERC 908 account balance for 2021

## Allocation Methodology

The FERC 908 account balance was assigned to RS Rate (a)

| Company | Balance | RS Balance (a) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Potomac Edison | $\$ 107,369$ | $\$ 107,369$ |

## FERC 910 Miscellaneous Customer Service and Information Expenses

## Overview

FERC 910 account balances were distributed based on actual call volume for 2021. Ratios for rate class call volumes were calculated based on call volume and the normalized billing units were used for the number of customers and then applied to the total FERC balance to distribute the dollars across the rate classes.

## Source of Data

FERC 910 account balance for 2021
Normalized billing units were used for the number of customers at December 2021 (end of period).

Call Volumes from the IVR Calls by Call Report for 2021

## Allocation Methodology

Cost Allocations by Call Category were performed by multiplying the FERC Form 910 Costs by the Percentage of Calls in each category (Residential, Commercial \& Industrial, and Streetlight) compared to the total Call Volume. Because commercial and industrial calls cannot be broken out by customer class, a percentage was calculated for the commercial and for the industrial classes based on normalized billing units- the number of customers at December 2021 (end of period). These percentages were then used to allocate costs to each of the categories.

| Calls by Customer Category | Count | Percentage | $\mathbf{\$}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | 444,293 | $92.05 \%$ | $\$ 2,771,090$ |
| Commercial \& Industrial | 35,662 | $7.39 \%$ | $\$ 222,427$ |
| Commercial (Based on Customer Count) $^{\top}$ | 32,690 | $6.77 \%$ | $\$ 203,888$ |
| Industrial (Based on Customer Count) ${ }^{2}$ | 2,972 | $0.62 \%$ | $\$ 18,538$ |
| Public St \& Highway Lighting | 2,724 | $0.56 \%$ | $\$ 16,990$ |
| Total Calls | $\mathbf{4 8 2 , 6 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 3 , 0 1 0 , 5 0 7}$ |

${ }^{1}$ Commercial (Based on Customer Count) $=$ Total Commercial Customers/Total Commercial \& Industrial Customers
${ }^{2}$ Industrial (Based on Customer Count) = Total Industrial Customers / Total Commercial \& Industrial Customers

To calculate the distribution of dollars across the rate classes (c) the percentage of customers in each rate category was calculated (b) based on the normalized billing units (a). This percentage was then multiplied by the dollars allocated to each Call Category (Residential, Commercial, Industrial, and Streetlight), as calculated above, to determine the dollars by rate class.

| Customers By Rate Class | December 2021 Number Customers <br> (a) | Percentage (b) | Total \$ by Rate (c) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential |  |  |  |
| R - Residential | 374,991 | 100.00\% | \$2,771,090 |
| Total Residential | 374,991 | 100.00\% | \$2,771,090 |
| Commercial |  |  |  |
| G - General Service | 39,235 | 80.51\% | \$164,151 |
| C - General | 4,001 | 8.21\% | \$16,739 |
| CSH - Church and School | 223 | 0.46\% | \$933 |
| C-A - All Electric | 304 | 0.62\% | \$1,272 |
| E - General Service | 3,548 | 7.28\% | \$14,844 |
| PH - Light \& Power | 1,422 | 2.92\% | \$5,949 |
| Total Commercial | 48,733 | 100.00\% | \$203,888 |
| Industrial |  |  |  |
| G - General Service | 3,159 | 71.29\% | \$13,217 |
| E - General Service | 482 | 10.88\% | \$2,017 |
| C - General | 451 | 10.18\% | \$1,887 |
| C-A - All Electric | 33 | 0.74\% | \$138 |
| PH - Light \& Power | 306 | 6.91\% | \$1,280 |
| Total Industrial | 4,431 | 100.00\% | \$18,538 |
| Total Commercial \& Industrial | 53,164 |  |  |
| Public St \& Highway Lighting |  |  |  |
| Public St \& Highway Lighting | 614 | 100.00\% | \$16,990 |
| Total Public St \& Highway Lighting | 614 | 100.00\% | \$16,990 |
| Total | 428,769 |  | \$3,010,507 |

## Summary Chart

| Potomac EdisonCustomer AccountingTotal Account Dollars Assigned to Rate Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rate | Meter Reading | Customer <br> Records <br> Collection | Uncollectible <br> Accounts | Miscellaneous Customer Accounts | Forfeited Discounts and Miscellaneous Service Revenues | Cust Asst | MISC |
| Classes | 902 | 903 | 904 | 905 | 450 \& 451 | 908 | 910 |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R - Residential | \$4,671,181 | \$4,188,558 | \$162,616 | \$458,726 | (\$2,655,425) | \$107,369 | \$2,771,090 |
| Total Residential | \$4,671,181 | \$4,188,558 | \$162,616 | \$458,726 | (\$2,655,425) | \$107,369 | \$2,771,090 |
| Commercial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| G - General Service | \$654,645 | \$438,245 | \$17,014 | \$47,996 | (\$277,835) | - | \$164,151 |
| C-General | \$69,501 | \$44,690 | \$1,735 | \$4,894 | $(\$ 28,332)$ | - | \$16,739 |
| CSH - Church and School | \$5,377 | \$2,491 | \$97 | \$273 | $(\$ 1,579)$ | - | \$933 |
| C-A - All Electric | \$7,331 | \$3,396 | \$132 | \$372 | $(\$ 2,153)$ |  | \$1,272 |
| E - General Service | \$62,443 | \$39,630 | \$1,539 | \$4,340 | (\$25,124) | - | \$14,844 |
| PH - Light \& Power | \$42,415 | \$15,883 | \$617 | \$1,740 | (\$10,070) | - | \$5,949 |
| Total Commercial | \$841,712 | \$544,336 | \$21,133 | \$59,615 | (\$345,093) | \$0 | \$203,888 |
| Industrial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| G - General Service | \$73,648 | \$35,285 | \$1,370 | \$3,864 | (\$22,370) |  | \$13,217 |
| E - General Service | \$12,724 | \$5,384 | \$209 | \$590 | $(\$ 3,413)$ |  | \$2,017 |
| C-General | \$10,721 | \$5,038 | \$196 | \$552 | $(\$ 3,194)$ | - | \$1,887 |
| C-A - All Electric | \$1,207 | \$369 | \$14 | \$40 | (\$234) | - | \$138 |
| PH - Light \& Power | \$10,631 | \$3,418 | \$133 | \$374 | $(\$ 2,167)$ | - | \$1,280 |
| Total Industrial | \$108,931 | \$49,493 | \$1,922 | \$5,420 | (\$31,377) | \$0 | \$18,538 |
| Public St \& Highway Lighting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public St \& Highway Lighting | \$0 | \$6,858 | \$266 | \$751 | (\$4,348) | - | \$16,990 |
| Total Public St \& Highway Lighting | \$0 | \$6,858 | \$266 | \$751 | (\$4,348) | \$0 | \$16,990 |
| Total | \$5,621,823 | \$4,789,245 | \$185,937 | \$524,512 | (\$3,036,243) | \$107,369 | \$3,010,507 |

## The Potomac Edison Company <br> Exhibit BSM-2 <br> Meter Weighting Factor Study

Detailed calculation of total cost per customer used to develop the weighting factors and weighted customer allocator:

| COS RATE GROUP | END OF PERIOD HTY CUSTOMER COUNT | METER COUNT | METER COST |  | METER LABOR |  | PT/CT COST \& LABOR |  | TOTAL COST |  | AVERAGE <br> TOTAL COST <br> PER METER |  | AVERAGE TOTAL <br> COST PER <br> CUSTOMER <br> $[1]=[\mathrm{G} / \mathrm{B}]$ |  | WEIGHTING FACTOR (CUSTOMER) | WEIGHTED CUSTOMER ALLOCATOR | weighting FACTOR (METER) | WEIGHTED METER Allocator |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [A] | [B] | [C] |  | [D] |  | [E] |  | [F] |  | $=[\mathrm{D}+\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{F}]$ |  | [ [G/C] |  |  | $[\mathrm{J}]=[1 / \mathrm{min}(1)]$ | [K]=[ ${ }^{*}$ ] $]$ | [L] $]$ [ $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{min}(\mathrm{H})$ ] | [ M$]=[\mathrm{C}$ * L$]$ |
| R | 247,033 | 250,988 | \$ | 6,165,755 | \$ | 3,464,610 | \$ | 83,984 | \$ | 9,714,349 | \$ | 39 | \$ | 39 | 100\% | 247,033 | 100\% | 250,988 |
| G | 26,419 | 27,161 | \$ | 1,328,106 | \$ | 353,197 |  | 2,363,593 | \$ | 4,044,895 | \$ | 149 | \$ | 153 | 389\% | 102,860 | 385\% | 104,507 |
| c | 4,447 | 4,303 | \$ | 184,779 | \$ | 70,038 | \$ | 301,230 | \$ | 556,047 | \$ | 129 | \$ | 125 | 318\% | 14,140 | 334\% | 14,366 |
| CA | 218 | 210 | \$ | 15,689 | \$ | 5,673 | \$ | 38,238 | \$ | 59,600 | \$ | 284 | \$ | 273 | 695\% | 1,516 | 733\% | 1,540 |
| CSH | 118 | 117 | \$ | 10,219 | \$ | 4,042 | \$ | 27,728 | \$ | 41,989 | \$ | 359 | \$ | 356 | 905\% | 1,068 | 927\% | 1,085 |
| PH | 1,673 | 1,727 | \$ | 382,772 | \$ | 32,403 | \$ | 1,228,396 | \$ | 1,643,572 | \$ | 952 | \$ | 982 | 2498\% | 41,796 | 2459\% | 42,465 |
| PPD | 10 | 14 | \$ | 7,288 | \$ | 612 | \$ | 265,929 | \$ | 273,830 | \$ | 19,559 | \$ | 27,383 | 69634\% | 6,963 | 50535\% | 7,075 |
| HAGFRE | 39 | 37 | \$ | 1,048 | \$ | 645 | \$ | 1,833 | \$ | 3,526 | \$ | 95 | \$ | 90 | 230\% | 90 | 246\% | 91 |
| MAN | 1 | 2 | \$ | 5,001 | \$ | 122 | \$ | 12,677 | \$ | 17,800 | \$ | 8,900 | \$ | 17,800 | 45264\% | 453 | 22994\% | 460 |
| WSDV | 19 | 18 | \$ | 2,884 | \$ | 810 | \$ | 39,841 | \$ | 43,534 | \$ | 2,419 | \$ | 2,291 | 5827\% | 1,107 | 6249\% | 1,125 |
| FE- | 27 | 35 | \$ | 6,828 | \$ | 2,846 | \$ | 120,062 | \$ | 129,736 | \$ | 3,707 | \$ | 4,805 | 12219\% | 3,299 | 9577\% | 3,352 |

The Potomac Edison Company
Exhibit BSM-3
Engineering Studies
[Minimum-Size Study and Primary/Secondary Study]

## Customer Component of

FERC Account 364 - POLES, TOWERS, AND FIXTURES
FERC Account 365 - OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS \& DEVICES
FERC Account 367 - UNDERGROUND CONDUCTORS \& DEVICES
FERC Account 368 - LINE TRANSFORMERS
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FERC Account 365 - OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS \& DEVICES
FERC Account 366 - UNDERGROUND CONDUIT
FERC Account 367 - UNDERGROUND CONDUCTORS \& DEVICES

## Streetlight Component of
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FERC Account 369 - SERVICES
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## SCOPE

This report looks at two concepts, the allocation of certain distribution plant accounts to a customer cost (aka "minimum grid") or demand costs, here after referred to as the Customer Cost Study, and the allocation of certain distribution costs to customers served as primary voltage accounts. NARUC describes the basics of Customer Costs Studies in their publication "Electric Utility Cost Allocation Manual ${ }^{1}$, " but the basics of these studies are to serve the purpose of allocating utility costs and/or asset values to different classes of customers.

## Customer Cost Study

The Customer Cost Study is designed to separate the asset values into component costs, as follows:

- Customer Related Costs
- Demand Related Costs
- Energy Related Costs

The costs of the distribution system are primarily impacted by demand and the number of customers, so this study serves the purpose of allocating utility costs and/or asset values to those two cost components ${ }^{2}$. The plant accounts considered in this study are:

- FERC Account 364 - POLES, TOWERS, AND FIXTURES
- FERC Account 365 - OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS \& DEVICES
- FERC Account 367 - UNDERGROUND C ONDUCTORS \& DEVICES
- FERC Account 368 - LINE TRANSFORMERS


## Primary/Secondary Customer Cost Study

The primary/secondary customer cost study is aimed at determining the portion of the distribution assets that are used to serve primary voltage customers; for example, the distribution transformer, secondary conductor, and service conductor types of distribution plant are not used to serve these customers. Similarly, some accounts have limited assets that are used to provide service to these primary service customers; the Primary/Secondary Customer Cost Study is designed to determine the extent of each of those accounts used by the Primary Voltage Customer ${ }^{3}$. The accounts considered in this study are:

- FERC Account 364 - POLES, TOWERS, AND FIXTURES
- FERC Account 365 - OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS \& DEVICES

[^41]- FERC Account 366 - UNDERGROUND CONDUIT
- FERC Account 367 - UNDERGROUND CONDUCTORS \& DEVICES


## DEFINTIONS AND TERMS

Several large data bases house the information used in the preparation of this report. The following definitions and terms describe: those systems and applications, from which data was extracted; the software tools used to extract, analyze, and summarize that information; and finally, references are provided to any external data sources used.

## Company Computer Systems, Data and Processes

The Company has several computer systems that house data used for this study. As utilities have grown, so has the size and complexity of these systems leading to the need to use software tools like SQL queries to analyze data sets that can no-longer be effectively analyzed using common desktop tools like Excel.

## CCS

The Company's CCS or "Customer Care System" is the customer accounting and billing system. With data contained in this system the Company is able to tell the type of customer, the customer's customer rate code. The GIS and CCS customer records are connected though connection object database keys, which enable the Company to determine where, on the geographically represented system, each customer, and customer type, is connected. The CCS is a sub-system of SAP (see SAP below).

## CREWS

CREWS is FirstEnergy's work management system, used by the Operating Companies to perform engineering estimates for construction work.

## GIS

The Company's GIS or "Geographical Information System" is the computer system providing a geographically referenced, asset database of the installed distribution plant information, including information on poles, primary conductors, fuses, transformers, and switches, and how those pieces of the electric distribution system are electrically interconnected from the substation to the customer. The GIS is used primarily for mapping and detailing the distribution system aiding engineering design, planning, and troubleshooting tasks.

## SAP

SAP ${ }^{4}$ offers bundles of applications and services to enable companies to manage their businesses. These applications can include customer care systems (CCS), billing, financial, purchasing, inventory, and human resources functions.

## Software Tools

## SQL

Structured Query Language (SQL) ${ }^{5}$ is a special programming language designed to manage and extract data held in a relational data base management system (RDBS), like Oracle, Sybase, MySQL, or, Microsoft SQL Server. Most of the Company's data bases, used for the preparation of this report, are Oracle RDBSs.

## Toad Data Point

Toad Data Point, by Quest Software Inc ${ }^{6}$, a cross-platform, self-service, data-integration tool that simplifies data access, preparation, and provisioning. FirstEnergy uses Toad Data Point for general SQL execution and Data Cleaning as it pertains to studies on large datasets.

## Microsoft Excel

Excel, by Microsoft ${ }^{7}$, is a general use spreadsheet application. The software has functions allowing calculations, graphing, and aggregating data through use of pivot tables.

## External Data Sources

## Handy-Whitman Index

The Handy-Whitman Index of Public Utility Construction ${ }^{8}$ provides asset price indexes and the capital book value against a benchmark year. Handy-Whitman Index numbers serve as a yardstick to estimate the impact of fluctuations in the value of material and labor costs, allowing assets of a known age to be reflected in other years. Average prices and cost trends are used to develop the Handy-Whitman Index. This Index is commonly used by utilities and regulators in their calculations of rate base for rate cases and in their valuations of property for insurance purposes.

[^42]
## Electric Utility Cost Allocation Manual ${ }^{9}$

The Electric Utility Cost Allocation Manual, by NARUC, was written by a team of utility, public utility commission, and FERC representatives and provides frameworks for costs of service studies. Section II of this Manual contains five chapters that explain the dominant method of cost allocation - the embedded cost study, which is based upon historical or known utility costs. Areas covered are production costs, transmission costs, distribution costs and the classification and allocation of customer-related costs and investments.

[^43]
## Customer Component of

FERC Account 364 - POLES, TOWERS, AND FIXTURES
FERC Account 365 - OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS \& DEVICES
FERC Account 367 - UNDERGROUND CONDUCTORS \& DEVICES
FERC Account 368 - LINE TRANSFORMERS

## FERC Account 364 - POLES, TOWERS, AND FIXTURES

This plant distribution account is predominately made up of the various wood distribution poles used to support primary and secondary distribution conductors.

## Assumptions and Method

- The Company's GIS was used to determine the number of wood distribution poles, by size and install year. In the analysis, these poles were replaced by the minimum size wood distribution poles that have seen common use within the study territory; 35 -foot poles for those supporting primary conductors without joint use underbuild.
- Poles without an install year were omitted
- Poles with install years < 1912 were omitted
- Only poles supporting primary conductor were included (i.e., street-light and secondary only poles were omitted).
- Only poles where POLE_MAT in ( $D, L, M, N, P, R, W, Z$ ) were considered ... the other materials are fiberglass, steel, concrete, aluminum, etc. materials that are unlikely for "distribution" poles.
- Only poles where HEIGHT in (25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, 55, 60, 65, 70, 75, 80, 85, 90, \& 95) were considered, the other pole heights typically indicate either street-light only poles, i.e., HEIGHT in $(12,15,16,17,20,27)$ or may reflect erroneous data.
- The current installed cost for each size pole was obtained from CREWS and trended by size to build a list of costs by pole length for each size wood pole.
- The install years were used to age the current costs for the actual size and minimum size transformers using Handy-Whitman indices and extended by the number of poles in service for each year, then summed to develop the customer component for this plant account.
- The percentage of minimum size cost (Customer Cost), of the Total Plant Value was calculated as the portion represented by the cost of the minimum sized units, 35 -foot poles, as previously defined. The percentage of the demand costs for the account is the remainder, after the customer cost component was removed.
- The methodology, approach, and assumptions for performing the primary rate customer split of this FERC Account (FERC Form 1 Plant Account 364) is described in more detail later in this document. The Minimum Grid aspect of the primary rate customer portion and secondary rate customer portion is summarized below.

| FERC Account 364 POLES, TOWERS, AND FIXTURES SPLIT OF PLANT |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Company | Total Plant Value | Customer Costs |  | Demand Costs |  |
|  |  | Percent | Value | Percent | Value |
| Potomac Edison Maryland | \$128,631,437 ${ }^{10}$ | 80.3\% | \$103,273,689 | 19.7\% | \$25,357,748 |
| Potomac Edison Maryland Primary Customers | \$7,070,016 | 65.7\% | \$4,643,191 | 34.3\% | \$2,426,826 |
| Potomac Edison Maryland Secondary Customers | \$121,561,421 | 81.1\% | \$98,630,499 | 18.9\% | \$22,930,922 |

[^44]
## FERC Account 365 - OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES

This plant distribution account is predominately made up of the various overhead distribution line conductors, operating at either primary or secondary voltage. This study considered primary conductors only, the Company's GIS data is not sufficient to perform a similar analysis on the costs of secondary, service, and/or street-light conductors. The Company's GIS data is not sufficient to perform a Handy-Whitman analysis of the install date for primary conductors.

## Assumptions and Method

- The Company's GIS was used to determine the wire miles of overhead distribution primary distribution line conductors, by size. These conductors were categorized into two sizes, large and small.
- Conductors with a blank or unknown conductor type/size were omitted.
- Conductor segments longer than 700 feet were omitted as likely being in error or nonrepresentative of typical distribution construction.
- The current installed cost for each category of primary line conductor was obtained and used to cost out the currently installed system, if rebuilt using one of those two sizes.
- The minimum grid cost was developed using only the cost of the smaller conductor.
- The percentage of minimum size cost (Customer Cost), of the Total Plant Value was calculated as the portion represented by the cost of the system, built with the minimum sized conductor.
- The methodology, approach, and assumptions for performing the primary rate customer split of this FERC Account (FERC Form 1 Plant Account 365) is described in more detail later in this document. The Minimum Grid aspect of the primary rate customer portion and secondary rate customer portion is summarized below.


## FERC Account 365

OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES SPLIT OF PLANT

| Company | Total Plant <br> Value | Customer Costs |  | Demand Costs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Value | Percent | Value |  |
| Potomac Edison <br> Maryland | $\$ 226,243,5933^{11}$ | $95.8 \%$ | $\$ 216,704,339$ | $4.2 \%$ | $\$ 9,539,254$ |
| Potomac Edison <br> Maryland - <br> Primary <br> Customers | $\$ 12,061,858$ | $87.1 \%$ | $\$ 10,501,142$ | $12.9 \%$ | $\$ 1,560,716$ |
| Potomac Edison <br> Maryland - <br> Scondary <br> Customers | $\$ 214,181,735$ | $96.3 \%$ | $\$ 206,203,196$ | $3.7 \%$ | $\$ 7,978,539$ |

[^45]
## FERC Account 367 - UNDERGROUND CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES

This plant distribution account is predominately made up of the various underground distribution line conductors, operating at either primary or secondary voltage. This study considered primary conductors only, the Company's GIS data is not sufficient to perform a similar analysis on the costs of secondary and/or service conductors.

## Assumptions and Method

- The Company's GIS was used to determine the wire miles of underground distribution primary distribution line conductors, by size. These conductors were categorized into two sizes, large and small.
- Conductors with a blank or unknown conductor type/size were omitted
- Conductor segments greater than 2,500' were considered data errors and omitted
- The current installed cost for each category of primary line conductor was obtained and used to cost out the currently installed system, if rebuilt using one of those two sizes.
- The minimum grid cost was developed using only the cost of the smaller conductor.
- The percentage of minimum size cost (Customer Cost), of the Total Plan Value was calculated as the portion represented by the cost of the system, built with the minimum sized conductor.
- The methodology, approach, and assumptions for performing the primary rate customer split of this FERC Account (FERC Form 1 Plant Account 367) is described in more detail later in this document. The Minimum Grid aspect of the primary rate customer portion and secondary rate customer portion is summarized below.

```
FERC Account 367
UNDERGROUND CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES
SPLIT OF PLANT
```

| Company | Total Plant <br> Value | Customer Costs |  | Demand Costs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percent | Value | Percent | Value |
| Potomac Edison <br> Maryland | $\$ 295,149,931^{12}$ | $84.3 \%$ | $\$ 248,740,541$ | $15.7 \%$ | $\$ 46,409,390$ |
| Potomac Edison <br> Maryland - <br> Primary <br> Customers | $\$ 6,437,659$ | $59.3 \%$ | $\$ 3,814,404$ | $40.7 \%$ | $\$ 2,623,255$ |
| Potomac Edison <br> Maryland - <br> Secondary <br> Customers | $\$ 288,712,272$ | $84.8 \%$ | $\$ 244,926,137$ | $15.2 \%$ | $\$ 43,786,135$ |
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## FERC Account 368 - LINE TRANSFORMERS

This plant distribution account is predominately made up of the various distribution transformers used to step the distribution voltage down to the service-voltage level delivered to the customer. This account includes both overhead and pad-mounted transformers.

## Assumptions and Method

- The Company's GIS system was used to determine the number of overhead and pad-mounted distribution transformers, by size and install year, to be replaced by the minimum size ( 25 KVA Single Phase) overhead line transformer that is in common use within the study territory.
- The current installed cost for each size line transformer was obtained from CREWS and trended by size to build a list of costs by size for each size overhead and pad-mounted distribution transformer.
- The install years were used to age the current costs for the actual size and minimum size transformers using Handy-Whitman indices and extended by the number of transformers in service for each year, then summed to develop the customer component for this plant account.
- Transformers missing install year, construction type, or kVA were omitted.
- The percentage of minimum size cost, of the calculated current cost was calculated as the portion represented by the cost of the minimum sized units.
- The methodology, approach, and assumptions for performing the primary rate customer split of this FERC Account (FERC Form 1 Plant Account 368) is described in more detail later in this document. The Minimum Grid aspect of the primary rate customer portion and secondary rate customer portion is summarized below.
- Overhead ( OH ) minimum grid is $100 \%$ assigned for secondary rate customers due to a large number of existing transformers on the system being at or less than 25 kVA .


## FERC Account 368 <br> LINE TRANSFOMERS <br> SPLIT OF PLANT

| Company | Total Plant <br> Value | Customer Costs |  | Demand Costs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percent | Value | Percent | Value |
| Potomac Edison <br> Maryland | $\$ 201,703,535^{13}$ | $56.0 \%$ | $\$ 112,942,090$ | $44.0 \%$ | $\$ 88,761,445$ |
| Potomac Edison <br> Maryland - <br> Primary <br> Customers | $\$ 336,829$ | $22.0 \%$ | $\$ 74,063$ | $78.0 \%$ | $\$ 262,766$ |
| Potomac Edison <br> Maryland- <br> Secondary <br> Customers | $\$ 201,366,706$ | $56.1 \%$ | $\$ 112,868,026$ | $43.9 \%$ | $\$ 88,498,680$ |
| Potomac Edison <br> Maryland- OH <br> Transformer <br> Secondary <br> Customers | $\$ 83,275,299$ | $100.0 \%$ | $\$ 83,275,299$ | $0.0 \%$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Potomac Edison <br> Maryland - UG <br> Transformer <br> Secondary <br> Customers | $\$ 118,091,407$ | $42.6 \%$ | $\$ 50,347,505$ | $57.4 \%$ | $\$ 67,743,902$ |
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## Primary Customer/Secondary Customer Component of

FERC Account 364 - POLES, TOWERS, AND FIXTURES
FERC Account 365 - OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS \& DEVICES
FERC Account 366 - UNDERGROUND CONDUIT
FERC Account 367 - UNDERGROUND CONDUCTORS \& DEVICES

## FERC Account 364 - POLES, TOWERS, AND FIXTURES

This plant distribution account is predominately made up of the various wood distribution poles used to support primary and secondary distribution conductors.

## Assumptions and Method

Using data from the Company's GIS, the wood pole plant was separated by poles which have both primary and secondary attached facilities, poles with secondary attached facilities, poles with secondary attached facilities and wood poles with street-lighting facilities. To divide up the value of the account, an age-depreciated weighting based upon the cost to install a pole in today's dollars (Year 2022) was used consistent with the minimum grid portion of the analysis.

The Company's pole data allows for the identification of the total wood poles plant, and wood poles with primary facilities attached, but does not allow for the identification of poles with private-outdoor lighting facilities, street-light facilities or secondary facilities. The poles serving primary service customers are allocated to primary rate customers, all other poles will need to be split between all rate classes, except primary service customers.

A list of primary rate accounts was extracted from the CCS and used as the starting point for traces in the GIS system. From these traces in GIS, for each of the primary accounts and their associated Connection Object were reviewed to determine if multiple primary customers shared primary circuit routes to ensure facilities allocated to primary rate customers were only counted once.

- Only poles supporting primary and secondary conductor were included (i.e., street-light only poles were omitted).
- Only poles where POLE_MAT in (D, L, M, N, P, R, W, Z) were considered ... the other materials are fiberglass, steel, concrete, aluminum, etc. materials that are unlikely for "distribution" poles.
- Only poles where HEIGHT in (15, 20, 25, $30,35,40,45,50,55,60,65,70,75,80,85,90$, \& 95) were considered, the other pole heights typically indicate either street-light only poles, i.e., HEIGHT in $(12,15,16,17,20,27)$ or may reflect erroneous data.

| FERC Account 364 POLES, TOWERS, AND FIXTURES SPLIT OF PLANT |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Company | Total Plant Value | Primary Customers |  | Secondary and Street Light Customers |  |
|  |  | Percent | Value | Percent | Value |
| Potomac Edison Maryland | \$128,631,437 ${ }^{14}$ | 5.5\% | \$7,070,016 | 94.5\% | \$121,561,421 |

When a device or structure serves multiple primary customers, it is only counted one time in the results. See Figure 1 for a simplified graphical.
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## FERC Account 365 - OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS \& DEVICES

This plant distribution account is predominately made up of the various overhead distribution line conductors, operating at either primary or secondary voltage. This study considered primary conductors only, the Company's GIS data is not sufficient to perform a similar analysis on the costs of secondary and/or service conductors.

## Assumptions and Method

The primary conductors are allocated to both primary and secondary rates. To simplify the summations the conductors were divided into two sizes: large and small. The unique conductor paths, avoiding the duplicate counting of conductors, were calculated for all the primary customers back to the breaker on each circuit. The primary conductors were separated into small and large size conductors.

Conductor size and length assumptions are the same as the minimum grid portion of the study. Conductor lengths were summed by primary rate customer or non-primary rate customer (i.e., Secondary).
A weighting is then used to account for the differences in cost to install a mile of large vs. small conductor. The weighted conductor length for primary conductors feeding primary rate customers is then compared to the weighted total conductor length of all conductors to obtain the percentage of primary conductor used by the primary rate customers. Sections of Primary conductor were only counted once and assigned to the primary rate customer portion of this account.

FERC Account 365
OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES
SPLIT OF PLANT

| Company | Total Plant <br> Value | Primary Customers |  | Secondary Customers |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percent | Value | Percent | Value |
| Potomac Edison <br> Maryland | $\$ 226,243,593^{15}$ | $5.3 \%$ | $\$ 12,061,858$ | $94.7 \%$ | $\$ 214,181,735$ |

When a device or structure serves multiple primary customers, it is only counted one time in the results. See Figure 1 for a simplified graphical.
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## FERC Account 366 - UNDERGROUND CONDUIT

Conduit systems are used to supply both the primary rate and secondary rate customers. Most of the conduit system is used to protect primary cable (which can be used to serve both primary customers, and secondary customers via transformation), and of that majority, the bulk of the primary conduit system is installed to protect large primary cables. Said another way, where majority of the large-sized primary cables are installed in conduit, and the majority of the smallsized primary cables are direct buried. Most secondary cables are direct buried.

## Assumptions and Method

The circuit length of unique large sized, underground primary conductor feet is obtained by obtaining the span length of each primary line segment and summing to obtain the total primary circuit feet used to serve primary customers. The same process is used for determining the total circuit feet for all large primary conductors in the system.

- Conductors with a blank or unknown conductor type/size were omitted
- Conductor segments greater than $2,500^{\prime}$ were considered data errors and omitted

The circuit length for large primary conductors, serving primary rate customers, is then compared to the total large primary circuit length to obtain the percentage of conduit systems used by the primary rate customers.

## FERC Account 366 <br> UNDERGROUND CONDUIT <br> SPLIT OF PLANT

| Company | Total Plant <br> Value | Primary Customers |  | Secondary Customers |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percent | Value | Percent | Value |
| Potomac Edison <br> Maryland | $\$ 65,979,243^{16}$ | $5.1 \%$ | $\$ 3,344,869$ | $94.9 \%$ | $\$ 62,634,374$ |

When a device or structure serves multiple primary customers, it is only counted one time in the results. See Figure 1 for a simplified graphical.
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## FERC Account 367 - UNDERGROUND CONDUCTORS \& DEVICES

This plant distribution account is predominately made up of the various underground distribution line conductors, operating at either primary or secondary voltage. This study considered primary conductors only, the Company's GIS data is not sufficient to perform a similar analysis on the costs of secondary and/or service conductors.

## Assumptions and Method

The primary conductors are allocated to both primary and secondary rates. To simplify the summations the conductors were divided into two sizes: large and small. The unique conductor paths, avoiding the duplicate counting of conductors, were calculated for all the primary customers back to the breaker on each circuit. The primary conductors were separated into small and large size conductors.

- Conductors with a blank or unknown conductor type/size were omitted
- Conductor segments greater than 2,500' were considered data errors and omitted

The conductor length of unique primary conductor feet is obtained by obtaining the span length of each primary line segment and then, by segment, accounting for the number of conductors (1phase vs 3 -phase) and summing to obtain the total primary conductor mileage used to serve primary customers. The same process is used for determining the total conductor mileage for all primary conductors in the system.

A weighting is then used to account for the differences in cost to install a mile of large vs. small conductor. The weighted conductor length for primary conductors feeding primary rate customers is then compared to the weighted total conductor length of all conductors to obtain the percentage of primary conductor used by the primary rate customers.

| FERC Account 367 <br> UNDERGROUND CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES SPLIT OF PLANT |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Company | Total Plant Value | Primary Customers |  | Secondary Customers |  |
|  |  | Percent | Value | Percent | Value |
| Potomac Edison Maryland | \$295,149,931 ${ }^{17}$ | 2.2\% | \$6,437,659 | 97.8\% | \$288,712,272 |

When a device or structure serves multiple primary customers, it is only counted one time in the results. See Figure 1 for a simplified graphical.
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## Streetlight Component of

FERC Account 364 - POLES, TOWERS, AND FIXTURES

## FERC Account 364 - POLES, TOWERS, AND FIXTURES

This plant distribution account is predominately made up of the various wood distribution poles used to support primary and secondary distribution conductors.

## Assumptions and Method

- The Company's GIS was used to determine the number of streetlights on distribution poles, by size and install year of the pole.
- The count of poles does not identify if the pole is used for anything other than streetlights. (i.e. distribution primary or secondary conductors)
- Streetlights attached to joint use poles were not included.
- Poles taller than 55 feet were excluded from this study.
- The current installed cost for each size pole was obtained from CREWS and trended by size to build a list of costs by pole length for each size wood pole.
- The install years were used to age the current costs for the actual size poles using HandyWhitman indices and extended by the number of poles in service for each year, then summed to develop the streetlight component for this plant account.

| $\|$FERC Account 364 <br> POLES, TOWERS, AND FIXTURES <br> SPLIT OF PLANT |
| :--- |
| Company |
| Total Plant <br> Value |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |
|  |
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## Overhead \& Underground Component of

FERC Account 368 - LINE TRANSFORMERS
FERC Account 369 - SERVICES

## FERC Account 368 - LINE TRANSFORMERS

This plant distribution account is predominately made up of the various distribution transformers used to step the distribution voltage down to the service-voltage level delivered to the customer. This account includes both overhead and pad-mounted transformers.

## Assumptions and Method

- The Company's GIS system was used to determine the number of overhead and pad-mounted distribution transformers, by size and install year, to be replaced by the minimum size ( 25 KVA Single Phase) overhead line transformer that is in common use within the study territory.
- The current installed cost for each size line transformer was obtained from CREWS and trended by size to build a list of costs by size for each size overhead and pad-mounted distribution transformer.
- The install years were used to age the current costs for the actual size and minimum size transformers using Handy-Whitman indices and extended by the number of transformers in service for each year, then summed to develop the customer component for this plant account.
- Transformers missing install year, construction type, or kVA were omitted.
- The percentage of minimum size cost, of the calculated current cost was calculated as the portion represented by the cost of the minimum sized units.
- Utilizing the minimum grid valuation, the population was further subdivided into Overhead $(\mathrm{OH})$ and Underground (UG) where overhead line transformers were assigned into the OH category and Padmount (single and 3 phase) were assigned into the UG category.

FERC Account 368
LINE TRANSFOMERS
SPLIT OF PLANT

| Company | Total Plant <br> Value | Overhead |  | Underground |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percent | Value | Percent | Value |
| Potomac Edison <br> Maryland | $\$ 201,703,5355^{19}$ | $41.4 \%$ | $\$ 83,428,827$ | $58.6 \%$ | $\$ 118,274,708$ |

[^53]
## FERC Account 369 - SERVICES

This plant distribution account is predominately made up of the secondary conductors and hardware used to connect from the last transformation (FERC Account 368) to the customer meter. This plant distribution account is a combination of Overhead (OH) and Underground (UG).

## Assumptions and Method

- The Company's GIS system was used to determine the combined length of the secondary (service) conductor.
- Conductor lengths between 1 and 750 feet were included. Conductor lengths lacking detail or longer than 750 feet per segment were excluded.
- Due to incomplete data associated with installation, a Handy Whitman style value adjustment was not performed, the ratios below are based only on length.
- Inconsistencies with conductor quantities also resulted in the omission of this parameter as part of the analysis (i.e., conductor count was not used as a factor to scale 3 phase vs single phase).
- Establishing the Overhead vs Underground ratios for this plant account was done based on available data within the company's GIS system. The data available for this commodity type is less complete than the other plant accounts presented within this report and is therefore an extrapolation of the service territory based on available data.


## FERC Account 369 <br> SERVICES <br> SPLIT OF PLANT

| Company | Total Plant <br> Value | Overhead |  | Underground |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percent | Value | Percent | Value |
| Potomac Edison <br> Maryland | $\$ 71,194,334^{20}$ | $70.9 \%$ | $\$ 50,483,190$ | $29.1 \%$ | $\$ 20,711,144$ |

[^54]Figure 1 - Primary Customer Connection \& Routing


- $B$ - Substation or Breaker
(P)- Primary Meter Customer


## BEFORE THE

## PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

## OF MARYLAND

| In the Matter of the Application | $*$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Of The Potomac Edison Company | $*$ |  |
| For Adjustments to its Retail | $*$ | Case No. |
| Rates for the Distribution of $*$  <br> Electric Energy $*$  |  |  |

## DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

## JILL A. SOLTIS

Concerning: Revenue Requirements; Ratemaking Adjustments

## I. INTRODUCTION

## Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is Jill A. Soltis, and my business address is 800 Cabin Hill Drive, Greensburg, Pennsylvania 15601.

## Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?

A. I am employed by FirstEnergy Service Company and my title is Analyst V, Rates and Regulatory Affairs. My duties include developing and providing detailed and qualitative analysis on behalf of The Potomac Edison Company ("PE" or "Company") and Monongahela Power Company ("Mon Power"), including quarterly reporting of Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") jurisdictional financial data, participating in regulatory proceedings, and developing revenue requirements.
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.
A. I am a graduate of Seton Hill University where I earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration with an Information Management minor. I have over 32 years of experience with FirstEnergy Service Company or its predecessor companies and have held positions of Customer Service Representative; Customer Service Compliance Specialist; Technician, Load Data Services; Power Scheduler; Analyst IV, Retail Tariff Analysis and Forecasting; Senior Analyst, Human Services; Analyst IV, Rates and Regulatory Affairs, and my current position of Analyst V, Rates and Regulatory Affairs.
Q. HAVE YOU TESTIFIED IN RATE PROCEEDINGS BEFORE REGULATORY COMMISSIONS?
A. Yes, I have testified on behalf of PE and its affiliate Mon Power before the Public Service Commission of West Virginia in their 2021 Vegetation Management Surcharge filing in Case No. 21-0659-E-P and the 2020 Expanded Net Energy Cost filing in Case No. 20-0665-E-ENEC.

## II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY.

A. The purpose of my testimony is to explain and support the Company's:

1) Distribution-related revenue requirement;
2) Going-level adjustments; and
3) Pro forma adjustments.

All the going-level and pro forma adjustments to the test year data are summarized on the exhibits and supporting data I am sponsoring. The following tables list all the adjustments including number, sponsoring witness, and description.

| Going-Level <br> Adjustment | Sponsoring <br> Witness | Description |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Colflesh | Salaries and Wages - Test Year |
| 2 | Colflesh | Salaries and Wages - 2023 |
| 3 | Colflesh | Employee Savings Plan - Test Year |
| 4 | Ward | Storm Damage Expenses |
| 5 | Ward | Advertising Expenses |
| 6 |  |  |

The Potomac Edison Company
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| Going-Level Adjustment | Sponsoring Witness | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | Ward | Postage Expense |
| 8 | Ward | Commission Assessment Expense |
| 9 | Colflesh | Medical Insurance Expense |
| 10 | Colflesh | Group Life Insurance Expense |
| 11 | Ashton | Pension/OPEB Mark-to-Market |
| 12 | Ashton | Pension/OPEB Non-Mark-to-Market |
| 13 | Ward | Rate Case Expense |
| 14 | Colflesh | COVID-19 Expense |
| 15 | Colflesh | Service Company Carrying Charges |
| 16 | Ward | New Depreciation Rates |
| 17 | Soltis | Depreciation Expense on Reliability Projects - Test Year |
| 18 | Soltis | Depreciation Expense on Reliability Projects - Post Test Year |
| 19 | Ward | Rate Case Amortization Expense |
| 20 | Colflesh | Service Company Allocation of Depreciation Expense |
| 21 | Colflesh | Conservation Voltage Reduction |
| 22 | Colflesh | COVID-19 Deferrals |
| 23 | Colflesh | COVID-19 Regulatory Debit |
| 24 | Ward | Electric Vehicle Portfolio Program Regulatory Asset Amortization |
| 25 | Ward | Electric Vehicle Portfolio Program deferral |
| 26 | Colflesh | Payroll Taxes Salaries and Wages - Test Year |
| 27 | Colflesh | Payroll Taxes Salaries and Wages - 2023 |
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| Going-Level <br> Adjustment | Sponsoring <br> Witness | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 28 | Soltis | Interest Synchronization |
| 29 | Soltis | State Income Taxes |
| 30 | Soltis | Federal Income Taxes |
| 31 | Soltis | Reliability Projects - Test Year |
| 32 A | Soltis | Reliability Projects - Post Test Year |
| 32 B | Soltis | Reliability Projects - Construction Work in Progress -- <br> Test Year |
| 33 | Soltis | Accumulated Depreciation Reliability Projects - Test <br> Year |
| 34 | Soltis | Accumulated Depreciation Reliability Projects - Post <br> Test Year |
| 35 | Allocation of Service Company Materials and Supplies |  |
| 36 | Soltis | Cash Working Capital <br> 37 <br> 38Soltis |
| 39 A ADIT Reliability - Test Year |  |  |

# The Potomac Edison Company 
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| Pro Forma <br> Adjustment | Sponsoring <br> Witness | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 44 | Soltis | Pro Forma Revenue Requirement |
| 45 | Soltis | Pro Forma Uncollectible Expense |
| 46 | Soltis | Pro Forma Maryland Regulatory Assessment |
| 47 | Soltis | Pro Forma Maryland Gross Receipt Tax |
| 48 | Soltis | Pro Forma State Income Tax |
| 49 |  | Pro Forma Federal Income Tax |

The going-level adjustments that I am sponsoring are as follows:
(a) Terminal Treatment of Test Year Reliability Plant

- Adjustment No. 3-17 Depreciation Expense on Terminal Treatment Reliability Projects
- Adjustment No. 3-31 Terminal Treatment of Reliability Projects
- Adjustment No. 3-33 Accumulated Depreciation on Terminal Treatment of Reliability Projects
- Adjustment No. 3-37 Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes on Terminal Treatment of Reliability Project
(b) Terminal Treatment of Post-Test Year Reliability Plant
- Adjustment No. 3-18 Depreciation Expense on Terminal Treatment of Reliability Projects - Post Test Year, 6-Months Ended June 2023
- Adjustment No. 3-32a Terminal Treatment of Reliability Projects - Post Test Year, 6-Months Ended June 2023
- Adjustment No. 3-32b Terminal treatment of Construction Work in Progress of Test Year Reliability projects.
- Adjustment No. 3-34 Accumulated Depreciation on Terminal Treatment of Reliability Projects - Post Test Year, 6-Months Ended June 2023
- Adjustment No. 3-38 Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes on Terminal Treatment of Reliability Projects - Post Year, 6-Months Ended June 2023
(c) Adjustment No. 3-28 Interest Synchronization
(d) Adjustment No. 3-29 State Income Taxes on Going-Level Adjustments
(e) Adjustment No. 3-30 Federal Income Tax on Going-Level Adjustments
(f) Adjustment No. 3-35 Materials and Supplies Recorded on Service Company Books
(g) Adjustment No. 3-36 Cash Working Capital on Going-Level Adjustments The pro forma adjustments that I am sponsoring are as follows:
(a) Adjustment No. 3-44 Pro Forma Revenue Requirement
(b) Adjustment No. 3-45 Pro Forma Uncollectible Expense
(c) Adjustment No. 3-46 Pro Forma Regulatory Assessment
(d) Adjustment No. 3-47 Pro Forma Maryland Gross Receipts Tax
(e) Adjustment No. 3-48 Pro Forma State Income Tax
(f) Adjustment No. 3-49 Pro Forma Federal Income Tax


## Q. WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN GOING-LEVEL AND PRO FORMA ADJUSTMENTS?

A. Going-level adjustments are adjustments made to the test year to reflect revenues, expenses, and rate base on a going-level basis. Such adjustments enable the Company to capture the effects of relevant changes which occurred during or after the test year. As such, the inclusion of going-level adjustments into a test year reflects a fully adjusted test year prior to the Company's proposed revenue change or change in expenses related to the proposed revenue change. Pro forma adjustments are adjustments to revenues (and changes in expenses related to the revenue change) necessary to provide the Company an opportunity to earn its requested rate of return.

## Q. WHAT IS THE TEST YEAR USED IN THIS FILING?

A. The test year is the 12-month period from January 1, 2022, through December 31, 2022. The test year includes twelve months of actual data.
Q. HAVE YOU PREPARED OR HAD PREPARED UNDER YOUR SUPERVISION EXHIBITS TO ACCOMPANY YOUR TESTIMONY?
A. Yes, I have. Exhibits JAS-1 through JAS-5 were prepared by me or under my supervision and are described in detail in my testimony.

## III. RATE INCREASE REQUEST

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE INFORMATION YOU WILL BE PROVIDING RELATED TO THE COMPANY'S DISTRIBUTION-RELATED REVENUE REQUIREMENT.
A. Exhibit JAS-1 provides a summary of PE Total Company and Maryland Electric Distribution financial results for the test year. Exhibit JAS-1 shows a per-book rate of
return ("ROR") of $4.06 \%$ and a return on equity ("ROE") of $4.10 \%$ with a fully adjusted going-level ROR of $2.90 \%$ and a fully adjusted ROE of $1.93 \%$. This contrasts with the Company's current authorized ROR of $7.15 \%$ and current authorized ROE of $9.65 \%$ from Order No. 89072 issued March 22, 2019, in Case No. 9490. Exhibit JAS-4 also shows the calculation of the increase in revenues needed to earn the $7.54 \%$ ROR described in the direct testimony of Company witness Wang. Based on the data provided in the exhibits, the Company is requesting a distribution base revenue increase of $\$ 47,492,648$. The request of $\$ 47.5$ million was determined using the Company's Maryland jurisdictional distribution-allocated financial results adjusted with known and measurable adjustments to the test year ending December 31, 2022. The method for determining a Maryland jurisdictional distribution basis is discussed in the direct testimony of Company witness Colflesh.

## IV. RATEMAKING ADJUSTMENTS

## A. Going-Level Adjustments

## Q. WILL YOU BRIEFLY DESCRIBE EACH OF THE ADJUSTMENTS IN THIS CASE USING THE CATEGORIES AND NUMBERS SHOWN IN THE TABLE ABOVE AND IN EXHIBIT JAS-2?

A. Yes.
Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENTS NOS. 1 AND 2 (SALARIES AND WAGES).
A. Adjustment No. 1 is a going-level adjustment that annualizes salary and wage increases that occurred during the test year. Adjustment No. 2 is a going-level adjustment that
annualizes salary and wage increases that occurred during 2023. Company witness Colflesh is sponsoring these adjustments and provides further detail in her testimony.
Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NOS. 3 AND 4 (EMPLOYEE SAVINGS PLAN).
A. Adjustment No. 3 is a going-level adjustment that annualizes employee savings plan expenses related to the increase in salaries and wages during the test year. Adjustment No. 4 is a going-level adjustment that annualizes employee savings plan expenses related to the increase in salaries and wages during 2023. Company witness Colflesh is sponsoring these adjustments and provides further detail in her testimony.
Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NO. 5 (STORM DAMAGE EXPENSES).
A. Adjustment No. 5 is a going-level adjustment that modifies the test year operation and maintenance ("O\&M") expense to a five-year average level of storm damage expense. Company witness Ward is sponsoring this adjustment and provides further detail in her testimony.
Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NO. 6 (REMOVAL OF ADVERTISING EXPENSE).
A. Adjustment No. 6 is a going-level adjustment that removes non-eligible advertising expense from the test year. Company witness Ward is sponsoring this adjustment and provides further detail in her testimony.
Q. WHAT IS ADJUSTMENT NO. 7 (POSTAGE EXPENSE)?
A. Adjustment No. 7 is a going-level adjustment that increases the test year customer account postage costs. Company witness Ward is sponsoring this adjustment and provides further detail in her testimony.
Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NO. 8 (COMMISSION ASSESSMENT EXPENSE).
A. Adjustment No. 8 is a going-level adjustment that increases the test year level of regulatory commission assessment expense. Company witness Ward is sponsoring this adjustment and provides further detail in her testimony.
Q. WHAT ARE ADJUSTMENT NOS. 9 AND 10 (MEDICAL INSURANCE AND GROUP LIFE INSURANCE EXPENSES)?
A. Adjustment No. 9 is a going-level adjustment that annualizes the increase in medical insurance expenses, and Adjustment No. 10 is a going-level adjustment that annualizes the group life insurance increase during the test year. Company witness Colflesh is sponsoring these adjustments and provides further detail in her testimony.

## Q. WHAT IS ADJUSTMENT NO. 11 (PENSION/OPEB MARK-TO-MARKET)?

A. Adjustment No. 11 is a going-level adjustment that, for ratemaking purposes, smooths the effects of the mark-to-market adjustments to pension and other post-employment benefits ("OPEB") expenses. Company witness Ashton is sponsoring this adjustment and provides further detail in her testimony.
Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE PURPOSE OF ADJUSTMENT NO. 12 (PENSION/OPEB NON-MARK-TO-MARKET).
A. Adjustment No. 12 is a going-level adjustment that averages the non-mark-to-market pension OPEB expenses for the five years ending December 31, 2022. Company witness Ashton is sponsoring this adjustment and provides further detail in her testimony.
Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NO. 13 (RATE CASE EXPENSE).
A. Adjustment No. 13 is a going-level adjustment that increases amortization expenses in the test year to recover rate case expenses over a three-year period. Company witness Ward is sponsoring this adjustment and provides further detail in her testimony.
Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NO. 14 (REMOVAL OF COVID-19 EXPENSE).
A. Adjustment No. 14 is a going-level adjustment to O\&M to remove expenses related to COVID-19. Company witness Colflesh is sponsoring this adjustment and provides further detail in her testimony.
Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NO. 15 (REMOVAL OF FESC CARRYING CHARGES).
A. Adjustment No. 15 is an adjustment to O\&M expense to remove FirstEnergy Service Company ("FESC") carrying charges. Company witness Colflesh is sponsoring this adjustment and provides further detail in her testimony.

## Q. WHAT IS ADJUSTMENT NO. 16 (NEW DEPRECIATION RATES)?

A. Adjustment No. 16 is an adjustment to increase depreciation expense to reflect the new proposed depreciation rates. Company witness Ward is sponsoring this adjustment which is based upon Company witness Spanos' depreciation study and provides further detail in her testimony.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NOS. 17 AND 18 (DEPRECIATION EXPENSE).

A. Adjustment No. 17 is to reflect the going-level increase in depreciation expense associated with the terminal treatment of capital expenditures for reliability-related projects placed in service during the test year. Adjustment No. 18 is to reflect the going-level increase in depreciation expense associated with the terminal treatment of capital expenditures for reliability-related projects to be placed in service between the end of the test year (December 31, 2022) and June 30, 2023, prior to the anticipated start of hearings. Terminal treatment is the recognition of expenditures for capital projects as if the expenditures had been included in rate base in full during the entire test year instead of taking a monthly average in service value. The adjustments were made by comparing the terminal (i.e., end of period) value to the test year 13-month average of these non-revenue-producing facilities and then adjusting plant-in-service, accumulated depreciation, ADIT, and depreciation expense to reflect the differences. The Maryland Public Service Commission ("Commission") has previously permitted terminal treatment for the Company for non-revenue-producing capital expenditures. The rate base effect of capital expenditures for test year and post-test year reliability-related projects are discussed in connection with Adjustment Nos. 31 and 32.

## Q. WHAT IS ADJUSTMENT NO. 19 (REMOVAL OF PRIOR RATE CASE EXPENSE AMORTIZATION)?

A. Adjustment No. 19 is to remove the prior rate case expense amortization. Company witness Ward is sponsoring this adjustment and provides further detail in her testimony.

## Q. WHAT IS ADJUSTMENT NO. 20 (FESC ALLOCATION OF DEPRECIATION EXPENSE)?

A. Adjustment No. 20 is to adjust depreciation and amortization expense for FESC allocation of depreciation expense. Company witness Colflesh is sponsoring this adjustment and provides further detail in her testimony.
Q. WHAT IS ADJUSTMENT NO. 21 (CONSERVATION VOLTAGE REDUCTION)?
A. Adjustment No. 21 is a going-level adjustment to the test year regulatory credit to reflect removal of the Company's Conservation Voltage Reduction Program recovery. Company witness Colflesh is sponsoring this adjustment and provides further detail in her testimony.
Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NOS. 22 AND 23 (COVID-19 DEFERRALS AND REGULATORY DEBIT).
A. Adjustment No. 22 is to remove COVID-19 deferrals in the test year. Adjustment No. 23 is to adjust regulatory debits to add recovery of COVID-19 regulatory asset amortization. Company witness Colflesh is sponsoring these adjustments and provides further detail in her testimony.

## Q. WHAT ARE ADJUSTMENT NOS. 24 AND 25 (EV PORTFOLIO PROGRAM REGULATORY ASSET AMORTIZATION AND DEFERRAL)?

A. Adjustment No. 24 is to adjust regulatory debits to add recovery of Electric Vehicle Portfolio Program regulatory asset amortization. Adjustment No. 25 is to adjust regulatory credits to remove the Electric Vehicle Portfolio Program deferrals in the test year. Company witness Ward is sponsoring these adjustments and provides further detail in her testimony.

## Q. WHAT ARE ADJUSTMENT NOS. 26 AND 27 (PAYROLL TAXES SALARIES AND WAGES EXPENSE)?

A. Adjustment No. 26 is a going-level adjustment that annualizes the payroll tax expenses associated with the increase in salaries and wages in the test year. Adjustment No. 27 is a going-level adjustment that annualizes the payroll tax expense associated with the 2023 increase in salaries and wages. Company witness Colflesh is sponsoring this adjustment and provides further detail in her testimony.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NO. 28 (INTEREST SYNCHRONIZATION).

A. Adjustment No. 28 is a going-level adjustment to synchronize the income tax interest expense deduction with interest expense calculated on the debt terms (amount and interest rate) used for the calculation of the overall ROR. This produces a different level of interest expense than the amount that was incurred by the Company during the test year. Since interest expense is a tax deduction, the income tax expense needs to be adjusted to reflect either the greater or lesser amount of income taxes that would be due based upon the use of the ratemaking debt assumptions. This amount was calculated by first multiplying the going-level rate base by the weighted average cost of debt to yield the going-level interest expense used for the ROR calculation. From this amount, the actual interest expense deducted for income tax purposes is subtracted to achieve the required change to interest expense. This amount was then applied to the respective state and federal income tax rate calculations to determine the interest synchronization adjustment.
Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NOS. 29 AND 30 (STATE AND FEDERAL INCOME TAXES).
A. These adjustments are tax related. Adjustment No. 29 is to reflect a decrease in state income tax expense related to the going-level adjustments that are subject to state income tax, whereas Adjustment No. 30 is to reflect a decrease in federal income tax expense related to the going-level adjustments that are subject to federal income tax.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NOS. 31 AND 32 (RELIABILITY PROJECTS).

A. Adjustment No. 31 is a rate base adjustment to increase plant-in-service to reflect terminal treatment of capital expenditures for reliability-related projects placed in service during the test year. Adjustment No. 32 is also a rate base adjustment and increases plant-in-service to reflect terminal treatment of capital expenditures for reliability-related projects to be placed in service between the end of the test year (December 31, 2022) and the end of June 2023, prior to the anticipated hearing in this case. The reliability-related expenditures reflected in Adjustment No. 31 were not placed in service at the beginning of the test year and were adjusted to reflect a full 13-month inclusion in average rate base in the test year. The reliability-related expenditures reflected in Adjustment No. 32a will occur post-test year, and they do not have to be adjusted in order to receive terminal treatment. The reliability-related expenditures reflected in Adjustment No. 32b include the terminal treatment of CWIP for two large projects (West Jefferson Substation and Myersville Energy Storage) to reflect a full 13-month inclusion in average rate base in the test year.

These construction projects are needed to improve reliability by upgrading and modernizing the distribution system. These investments in plant, property, and equipment are non-revenue-producing and instead support the provision of reliable and safe electric
service to customers. Reliability-related projects benefit existing customers, and customers realize these benefits as soon as the facilities are in service, which can be before the facilities are moved to plant-in-service from an accounting standpoint. In these situations, customers see improved system performance during all weather conditions, including storms, and fewer outages overall.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NOS. 33 AND 34 (ACCUMULATED DEPRECIATION RELIABILITY PROJECTS).

A. These adjustments are related to Adjustment Nos. 31 and 32 for the terminal treatment of reliability-related capital projects. Adjustment No. 33 is a rate base adjustment to reflect the increase in accumulated depreciation associated with the terminal treatment of capital expenditures for reliability-related projects during the test year, whereas Adjustment No. 34 is a rate base adjustment to reflect the increase in accumulated depreciation associated with the terminal treatment of capital expenditures for reliability-related projects placed in service between the end of the test year, December 31, 2022, and June 30, 2023.

## Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF ADJUSTMENT NO. 35 (ALLOCATION OF FESC MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES)?

A. The purpose of Adjustment No. 35 is to increase materials and supplies inventory in rate base to reflect distribution inventory allocated to PE Maryland held by FESC and recorded on FESC's books rather than PE's books. Per Commission Order issued January 17, 2012, in Case No. 9233, the Commission granted PE approval (subject to certain conditions which have been met) to participate in the Utility Inventory Management System operated by FESC.

The calculation of the inventory included in this adjustment was first to arrive at the Maryland distribution inventory (excluding centralized meters). This was done by including the FESC distribution inventory located in Maryland, which is for use in PE Maryland. In addition, a portion of the distribution shared inventory not located in Maryland (excluding centralized meters) was included and allocated first to PE based on FirstEnergy's Cost Allocation Manual ("CAM") multifactor allocation. From this PEallocated portion, an additional step was necessary to allocate to Maryland distribution. This allocation was based on the average number of customers served by PE in Maryland and material specific to distribution.

The second inventory calculation step included an allocation of centralized meters at three locations (i.e., Bethel, North Street and Connellsville). To allocate the centralized meter inventory costs to Maryland distribution, an allocation based on both the meters served by meter inventory operating company location and then the number of customers served in Maryland, was performed.

## Q. WHAT IS ADJUSTMENT NO. 36 (CASH WORKING CAPITAL)?

A. Adjustment No. 36 is a rate base adjustment to reflect the going-level amount of cash working capital ("CWC") associated with the adjustments in this case. For ratemaking purposes, CWC is generally defined as the average amount of capital provided by investors, over and above the investment in plant and other specifically identified rate base items, to bridge the gap between the time expenditures are required to be made by the Company to provide service and the time collections are received for that service. CWC is determined
for rate making purposes by a lead/lag study which is described in the testimony of Company witness Lyons.
Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NOS. 37 AND 38 (ADIT RELIABILITY PROJECTS).
A. Adjustment No. 37 is a rate base adjustment for ADIT related to the test year terminal treatment of reliability-related plant whereas adjustment No. 38 is an adjustment for ADIT related to reliability-related projects placed in service between the end of the test year, December 31, 2022, and June 30, 2023. These adjustments are related to Adjustment Nos. 31 and 32.

## Q. WAS THE EFFECT OF CAPITAL REPAIRS TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT WHEN

 ADIT WAS CALCULATED IN ADJUSTMENT NOS. 37 AND 38?A. Yes, Adjustment Nos. 37 and 38 included an adjustment for capital repairs in the calculation of the ADIT. Consistent with the Commission's March 22, 2019 Order in the Company's 2018 base distribution rate case, Case No. 9490, the capital repairs were estimated based on a 3-year average of capital repairs as a percentage of distribution plant additions. ${ }^{1}$
Q. WHAT ARE ADJUSTMENT NOS. 39a, 39b, AND 39c (FESC ALLOCATIONS)?
A. Adjustment No. 39a is a rate base adjustment for the FESC allocation of plant-in-service, Adjustment No. 39b is a rate base adjustment for the FESC allocation of depreciation reserve, and Adjustment No. 39c is a rate base adjustment for the FESC allocation of ADIT.

[^55]Company witness Colflesh is sponsoring these adjustments and provides further detail in her testimony.
Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NO. 40 (COVID-19 REGULATORY ASSET).
A. Adjustment No. 40 is an adjustment to increase rate base for the COVID-19 regulatory asset. Company witness Colflesh is sponsoring this adjustment and provides further detail in her testimony.
Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NO 41 (EV PORTFOLIO PROGRAM REGULATORY ASSET).
A. Adjustment No. 41 is an adjustment to increase rate base for the Electric Vehicle ("EV") Portfolio Program regulatory asset. Company witness Ward is sponsoring this adjustment which is supported by Company witness Warner's EV study and provides further detail in her testimony.

## Q. WHAT IS ADJUSTMENT NO. 42 (NON-ELIGIBLE AMOUNTS)?

A. Adjustment No. 42 is an adjustment to rate base to remove non-eligible amounts. Company witness Ashton is sponsoring this adjustment and provides further detail in her testimony.

## Q. WHAT IS ADJUSTMENT NO. 43 (OUT-OF-PERIOD ADJUSTMENTS)?

A. Adjustment No. 43 is an adjustment to the test year to remove any out-of-period accounting items. Company witness Ashton is sponsoring this adjustment and provides further detail in her testimony.

## B. Pro Forma Adjustments

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NO. 44 (PRO FORMA REVENUE REQUIREMENT).

A. Adjustment No. 44 is a pro forma adjustment to reflect the revenue the Company needs to achieve to earn a requested ROR of $7.54 \%$.
Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NOS. 45 AND 46 (PRO FORMA UNCOLLECTIBLE EXPENSE AND MARYLAND REGULATORY ASSESSMENT).
A. Adjustment No. 45 is a pro forma adjustment of uncollectible debt expense associated with pro forma revenues provided in Adjustment No. 44. The appropriate level of uncollectible expense was determined using the actual net uncollectibles as compared to revenues for the test year and applying this percentage to adjusted revenues. This is the same method accepted by the Commission in the Company's 2018 base distribution rate case where the revenue conversion factor included the uncollectible rate. Adjustment No. 46 is a pro forma adjustment of the Commission regulatory assessment fee associated with pro forma revenues provided in Adjustment No. 44. The appropriate level of regulatory assessment was determined by applying the current Commission assessment rate to the pro forma revenues. As with Adjustment No. 45, this adjustment is the same method accepted by the Commission in the Company's 2018 base distribution rate case.
Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NOS. 47, 48 AND 49 (PRO FORMA MARYLAND GROSS RECEIPT TAX AND PRO FORMA STATE AND FEDERAL INCOME TAXES).
A. These pro forma adjustments are all tax items related to the revenue the Company needs to achieve to earn a requested ROR of $7.54 \%$. Adjustment No. 47 is a pro forma adjustment to reflect Maryland gross receipts tax on the pro forma revenues provided in Adjustment No. 44; Adjustment No. 48 is a pro forma adjustment to reflect the increase in Maryland state income tax on the pro forma revenues provided in Adjustment No. 44; and Adjustment No. 49 is a pro forma adjustment to reflect the increase in federal income tax on the pro forma revenues provided in Adjustment No. 44.

## V. CONCLUSION

## Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY AT THIS TIME?

A. Yes, it does.

$$
\stackrel{\text { Item }}{\text { Column }(1)}
$$

## Operating Revenues

## O \& M Expense

Depreciation and Amortization Expense Regulatory Debits
Regulatory Credits
Accretion Expense
Taxes Other than Income Taxes
State Income Tax
Federal Income Tax
Deferred Income Taxes
Total Operating Expenses
Operating Income
AFUDC
Interest on Customer Deposits
Earnings

Rate Base 13-Month Average
Electric Plant in Service
Less: Depreciation Reserve
Net Plant in Service
CWIP
Working Capital
Plant Materials \& Supplies
Plant Held For Future Use
Prepaid Balances
Deferred Federal and State Tax Balance
Customer Deposits
Customer Advances
Regulatory Asset
Total Rate Base
Rate of Return
Earnings
Interest Expense
Available for Common
Common Equity
Return on Equity
Capital Structure
Total Long-term Debt
Common Equity

Total Company (2)
\$ 948,557,379
\$ 717,381,346 $717,381,346$
$59,010,352$ 10,047,784 14,926,305 22,788
47,813,320 $(235,117)$ 1,065,836

| $19,067,939$ |
| ---: |
| $\$ \quad 869,100,552$ |

$\$ \quad 79,456,827$

|  | 5,790,352 |  | 2,609,343 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $(22,016)$ |  | $(17,180)$ |
| \$ | 85,225,162 | \$ | 26,321,010 |

$\qquad$

The Potomac Edison Company
Maryland Distribution Rate of Return
12 Months Ending December 31, 2022

The Potomac Edison Company
Maryland Distribution Adjustment Summary
12 Months Ending December 31, 2022


The Potomac Edison Company Maryland Distribution Adjustment Summary 12 Months Ending December 31, 2022

|  |  | Description | Maryland Distribution |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Going Level |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Ashton | To adjust non-mark to market pension and OPEB expense to 5 year average. | \$ | 1,172,567 |
| 13 | Ward | To increase rate case expenses in the test year to recover rate case related charges over a three year time period. | \$ | 423,557 |
| 14 | Colflesh | To adjust test year O\&M expense to remove items related to Covid-19. | \$ | $(2,263,319)$ |
| 15 | Colflesh | To adjust O\&M expense to remove service company charges. | \$ | $(2,743,458)$ |
| 16 | Ward | To adjust depreciation expense for new depreciation rates. | \$ | 3,000,258 |
| 17 | Soltis | To increase depreciation expense for test year reliability projects. | \$ | 596,217 |
| 18 | Soltis | To increase depreciation expense for post test year reliability projects. | \$ | 594,527 |
| 19 | Ward | To adjust test year to remove rate case expense amortization. | \$ | $(11,152)$ |
| 20 | Colflesh | To adjust depreciation and amortization expense for service company allocation of rate base. | \$ | 2,016,088 |
| 21 | Colflesh | To adjust the test year regulatory credit for removal of Conservation Voltage Reduction program. | \$ | $(33,050)$ |
| 22 | Colflesh | To adjust regulatory credit to remove Covid-19 deferrals in test year. | \$ | 2,263,319 |

The Potomac Edison Company Maryland Distribution Adjustment Summary 12 Months Ending December 31, 2022

|  |  | Description | Maryland Distribution |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Going Level |  |  |
| 23 | Colflesh | To adjust regulatory debits to add Covid-19 regulatory asset amortization. | \$ | 1,452,046 |
| 24 | Ward | To adjust regulatory debits to add Electric Vehicle Portfolio Program regulatory asset amortization. | \$ | 305,258 |
| 25 | Ward | To adjust regulatory credit to remove Electric Vehicle Portfolio Program deferrals in test year. | \$ | 527,034 |
| 26 | Colflesh | To annualize payroll tax expenses associated with 2022 increases in salaries and wages. | \$ | 19,575 |
| 27 | Colflesh | To annualize payroll tax expenses associated with 2023 increases in salaries and wages. | \$ | 24,612 |
| 28 | Soltis | To reflect the State and Federal income tax effects of interest synchronization | \$ | 543,454 |
| 29 | Soltis | To reflect the State Income Tax effects of all adjustments subject to state income taxes. | \$ | $(399,207.48)$ |
| 30 | Soltis | To provide for the Federal Income Tax effects on all adjustments. | \$ | (932,330.92) |
| 31 | Soltis | To adjust plant in service to reflect terminal treatment of test year reliability projects. | \$ | 20,128,727 |
| 32 a | Soltis | To adjust rate base to reflect terminal treatment of post test year reliability projects. | \$ | 19,214,522 |

The Potomac Edison Company
Maryland Distribution Adjustment Summary
12 Months Ending December 31, 2022


The Potomac Edison Company Maryland Distribution Adjustment Summary

12 Months Ending December 31, 2022
Adjustment
Number Maryland
(Witness) Description Distribution

Going Level

The Potomac Edison Company
Maryland Distribution Adjustment Summary
12 Months Ending December 31, 2022

|  | ustment umber tness) | Description | Maryland Distribution |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Going Level |  |  |  |  |
| 41 | Ward | To increase rate base for the Electric Vehicle Portfolio Program regulatory Asset. | \$ | 1,373,661 |
| 42 | Ashton | To adjust rate base for non-eligible items. | \$ | $(103,159)$ |
| Accounting |  |  |  |  |
| Pro Forma |  |  |  |  |
| 44 | Soltis | To reflect the Pro Forma Revenue Requirement | \$ | 47,492,648 |
| 45 | Soltis | To reflect the Pro Forma Uncollectible Expense | \$ | 400,682 |
| 46 | Soltis | To reflect the Pro Forma Regulatory Assessment. | \$ | 131,697 |
| 47 | Soltis | To reflect the Pro Forma Maryland Gross Receipt Tax. | \$ | 949,853 |
| 48 | Soltis | To reflect the Pro Forma State Income Tax. | \$ | 3,795,859 |
| 49 | Soltis | To reflect the Pro Forma Federal Income Tax. | \$ | 8,865,057 |

The Potomac Edison Company<br>Maryland Distribution<br>Working Papers Supporting Adjustments<br>12 Months Ending December 31, 2022<br>Adjustment No. 1<br>Salaries and Wages Adjustment

| Line No. | Description | Reference Account | MD Distribution Amount |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) |  | (3) |
| 1 | 2022 Salary \& Wages Adjustment: Straight-Time Bargaining |  |  |  |
| 2 | Production | 920 |  |  |
| 3 | Transmission | 920 |  |  |
| 4 | Distribution | 920 | \$ | 57,152 |
| 5 | Cust. Accts \& Sales | 920 |  |  |
| 6 | A\&G | 920 |  |  |
| 7 | Total | 920 | \$ | 57,152 |
| 8 | 2022 Salary \& Wages Adjustment: Straight-Time NonBargaining |  |  |  |
| 9 | Production | 920 |  |  |
| 10 | Transmission | 920 |  |  |
| 11 | Distribution | 920 | \$ | 198,733 |
| 12 | Cust. Accts \& Sales | 920 |  |  |
| 13 | A\&G | 920 |  |  |
| 14 | Total | 920 | \$ | 198,733 |
| 15 | Total |  | \$ | 255,885 |

Discussion:

Increase O\&M expense to annualize salary increases in 2022.

This adjustment is sponsored by Witness S. M. Colflesh.

The Potomac Edison Company
Maryland Distribution
Working Papers Supporting Adjustments
12 months ending December 31, 2022
Adjustment No. 1
Increase Salaries and Wages, Savings Plan \& Payroll Taxes
To annualize Salary Increases in 2022

| Labor Category | Annual Amount <br>  | ST Wages ** |  | Wage Increase |  | Pre-Increase 12/2022 |  | Post-Increase 12/2022 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2022 \text { Labor } \\ \hline \text { PE Adjustment } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Months | $\begin{array}{r\|} \hline \text { Mo. Amount } \\ \hline \$ 1,103,425 \end{array}$ | Months <br> 8 | Mo. Amount Annualized |  |  |  |
| Bargaining ST | \$13,461,789 | Local 0102 | \$ 13,461,789 |  |  |  |  | 2.50\% | 5/1/2022 | 4 | \$1,131,011 | \$13,572,132 | PE Adjustment  <br> $\$$ 110,343 |  |
| Subtotal Bargaining | \$13,461,789 |  | \$ 13,461,789 |  |  |  | \$1,103,425 |  | \$1,131,011 | \$13,572,132 | \$ | 110,343 |
| Non-Bargaining ST | \$15,495,570 |  |  | 3.25\% | 3/1/2022 | 10 | \$1,284,341 | 2 | \$1,326,082 | \$15,912,981 | \$ | 417,411 |
| Total | \$28,957,359 |  |  |  |  |  | \$2,387,766 |  | \$2,457,093 | \$29,485,113 | \$ | 527,753 |

PE Bargaining Straight Time Salary \& Wage Adjustment Functionalized
Functional
Allocators Total PE MD Alloc.

|  | MD <br> Allocation |
| :--- | ---: |
| O\&M-D (Distribution O\&M) | $\frac{\text { Percentages }}{}$ |
| C10 (Avg. Number of Customers) | $55.788 \%$ |
| TX60 (Total Payroll Taxes) | $65.267 \%$ |
| S\&W Distrib PE-MD DX | $57.045 \%$ |


| $-0.063 \%$ | Production | $(69.22)$ | Direct | - |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $9.029 \%$ | Transmission | 9,963 | Direct | - |  |
| $68.769 \%$ | Distribution | 75,882 | O\&M-D | 42,332 | Direct-MD |
| $27.810 \%$ | Cust. Accts \& Sales | 30,686 | C10 | 20,028 | S\&W Distrib. |


| PE Nonbar Functional | ining Straight Time | Salary \& Wag |  | ionalized | MD Distrib. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocators |  | Total PE | MD Alloc. | MD | Alloc. | Total MD Distrib |
| 1.121\% | Production | \$4,678 | Direct | - |  | - |
| 11.694\% | Transmission | 48,812 |  |  |  |  |
| 59.118\% | Distribution | 246,765 | O\&M-D | 137,664 | Direct-MD | 137,664 |
| 3.839\% | Cust. Accts \& Sales | 16,026 | C10 | 10,460 | S\&W Distrib. | 9,373 |
| 24.228\% | A\&G | 101,129 | TX60 | 57,689 | S\&W Distrib. | 51,696 |
| 100.000\% | TOTAL | \$417,411 |  | 205,813 |  | \$198,732.96 |
|  |  |  |  | ADJUSTMEN |  | \$255,884.83 |

The Potomac Edison Company
Maryland Distribution
Working Papers Supporting Adjustments
12 Months Ending December 31, 2022
Adjustment No. 2
Salaries and Wages Adjustment

| Line No. | Description | Reference Account | MD Distribution Amount |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) |  | (3) |
| 1 | 2023 Salary \& Wages Adjustment: Straight-Time Bargaining |  |  |  |
| 2 | Production | 920 |  |  |
| 3 | Transmission | 920 |  |  |
| 4 | Distribution | 920 | \$ | - |
| 5 | Cust. Accts \& Sales | 920 |  |  |
| 6 | A\&G | 920 |  |  |
| 7 | Total | 920 | \$ | - |
| 8 | 2023 Salary \& Wages Adjustment: Straight-Time NonBargaining |  |  |  |
| 9 | Production | 920 |  |  |
| 10 | Transmission | 920 |  |  |
| 11 | Distribution | 920 | \$ | 321,723 |
| 12 | Cust. Accts \& Sales | 920 |  |  |
| 13 | A\&G | 920 |  |  |
| 14 | Total | 920 | \$ | 321,723 |
| 15 | Total |  | \$ | 321,723 |

Discussion:
Increase O\&M expense to annualize salary increases in 2023.
This adjustment is sponsored by Witness S. M. Colflesh.

The Potomac Edison Company
Maryland Distr bution
Working Papers Supporting Adjustments
12 months ending December 31, 2022
Adjustment No. 2, 4 \& 27
Increase Salaries and Wages, Savings Plan \& Payroll Taxes
To annualize Salary Increases in 2023

| Labor Category | Annual <br> Amount - <br> Direct \& ServCo Alloc | $\begin{gathered} \text { Allocated } \\ \text { ST Wages ** } \end{gathered}$ |  | 2022 Wage Increase |  | Pre-Increase 2022 |  | Post-Increase 2022 |  |  | 2023 Wage Increase | Increase 2023 |  | 2023 Labor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Months | Mo. Amount | Months | Mo. Amount | Annualized | Mo. Amount | Annualized |  | Adjustment |
| Bargaining ST | \$13,461,789 | Local 0102 | \$ 13,461,789 |  |  | $250 \%$ | 5/1/2022 | 4 | \$1,103,425 | 8 | \$1,131,011 | \$13,572,132 |  | \$1,131,011 | \$ 13,572,132 | \$ |
| Subtotal Bargaining | \$13,461,789 |  |  |  |  |  | \$1,103,425 |  | \$1,131,011 | \$13,572,132 |  | \$1,131,011 | \$ 13,572,132 | \$ |
| Non-Bargaining ST | \$15,495,570 |  |  | $325 \%$ | 3/1/2022 | 10 | \$1,284,341 | 2 | \$1,326,082 | \$15,912,981 | 400\% | \$1,379,125 | \$ 16,549,500 | \$ 636,519 |
| Total | \$28,957,359 |  |  |  |  |  | \$2,387,766 |  | \$2,457,093 | \$29,485,113 |  | \$2,510,136 | \$ 30,121,632 | \$ 636,519 |


| Allocations: | MD Allocation |
| :--- | ---: |
| O\&M-D (Distribution O\&M) |  |
| C10 (Avg. Number of Customers) | $55.788 \%$ |
| TX60 (Total Payroll Taxes) | $65.267 \%$ |
| S\&W Distrib PE-MD DX | $57.045 \%$ |

PE Nonbargaining Straight Time Salary \& Wage Adjustment Functionalized

|  |  |  |  |  | $\frac{\text { MD Distrib. }}{\text { Alloc. }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total PE | MD Alloc. | MD |  |
| Production | 1.121\% | \$7,134 | Direct |  |  |
| Transmission | 11.694\% | 74,434 | Direct | - |  |
| Distribution | 59.118\% | 376,298 | O\&M-D | 209,928 | Direct-MD |
| Cust. Accts \& Sales | $3839 \%$ | 24,438 | C10 | 15,950 | S\&W Distrib. |
| A\&G | 24.228\% | 154,215 | TX60 | 87,972 | S\&W Distrib. |
| TOTAL | 100.000\% | \$636,519 |  | \$313,849 |  |

The Potomac Edison Company<br>Maryland Distribution<br>Working Papers Supporting Adjustments<br>12 Months Ending December 31, 2022<br>Adjustment No. 3<br>Employee Savings Plan Adjustment



The Company will match 50\% of pre-tax contributions (other than Catch-up Contributions) up to the first 6\% of pre-tax Compensation the Participant contributes to the Plan.

Discussion:
Increase O\&M expense to reflect the annualized effect of the expense portion of savings plan.
This adjustment is sponsored by Witness S. M. Colflesh.


Discussion:

Increase O\&M expense to reflect the annualized effect of the expense portion of savings plan.
This adjustment is sponsored by Witness S. M. Colflesh.

# Exh bit JAS 3-5 <br> Page 1 of 1 <br> The Potomac Edison Company <br> Maryland Distribution <br> Working Papers Supporting Adjustments <br> 12 Months Ending December 31, 2022 <br> Adjustment No. 5 <br> Adjustment to Distr bution Storm O\&M Expenses 

| Line No. | Description | Reference Account | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 1 | Storm Distr bution O\&M Expense for the Twelve Months Ending December 31, 2022 | 593 | \$ 2,616,818 |
| 2 | Average Annual Storm Distribution O\&M Expense for the Five Years Ending December 31, 2022 | 593 | 2,561,664 (A) |
| 3 | Adjustment to Storm Distribution O\&M Expense (Line 2 - Line 1) | 593 | \$ (55,154) |

Discussion:
To adjust Distribution Storm O\&M expenses for the test year to reflect a five year annual average ending December 31, 202乞
This adjustment is sponsored by Witness H. E. Ward.
(A) Support Computations:

| 593 Distribution |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| $\$ \quad 2,043,885$ |  |
|  | $5,643,850$ |
|  | $1,072,305$ |
| $1,431,460$ |  |
| $2,616,818$ |  |
|  |  |
| $\$ 12,808,318$ |  |

This adjustment is sponsored by Witness H. E. Ward.

| The Potomac Edison Company Maryland Distribution <br> Working Papers Supporting Adjustments <br> 12 Months Ending December 31, 2022 <br> Adjustment No. 6 <br> Remove Adver ising Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Line No. | Description | Reference Account | Total Company Amount | MD Alloc. Factor | MD <br> Alloc. <br> Factor \% | Total MD |  | MD <br> Distribution Alloc. Factor | MD Distribution Alloc. Factor \% | Total MD Distrib |  | Total MD Dist Adjustment |  |
|  | Column (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |  | (6) | (7) | (8) |  | (9) |  |  |
| 1 | Distribu ion-Oper Supv \& Enc | ( 958000 | \$ 19 | GP30 | 65\% | \$ | 12 | Direct | 100\% | \$ | 12 | \$ | (12) |
| 2 | Distribu ion-Misc Expense | 958800 | \$ 7,920 | GP30 | 65\% | \$ | 5,126 | Direct | 100\% | \$ | 5,126 | \$ | $(5,126)$ |
| 3 | Cust Svc - Cust Assist Exp | 990800 | \$ 6,800 | C10 | 65\% | \$ | 4,438 | Direct | 100\% | \$ | 4,438 | \$ | $(4,438)$ |
| 4 | Cust Svc - Info \& Inst Exp | 990900 | \$ 45,245 | Direct | 1\% | \$ | 45,245 | Direct | 100\% | \$ | 45,245 | \$ | $(45,245)$ |
| 5 | A\&G - Outside Services | 992300 | \$ 793 | O her | 0\% | \$ | - | Direct | 100\% | \$ |  |  |  |
| 6 | A\&G - General Adv Exp | 993010 | \$ 156,193 | Direct | 1\% | \$ | 57,236 | Direct | 100\% | \$ | 57,236 | \$ | $(11,930)$ |
| 7 | Total |  | \$ 216,969 |  |  |  | 112,057 |  |  | \$ | 112,057 | \$ | $(66,751)$ |

Discussion:
To remove certain advertising expenses so that only informational advertising expenses are in the test year per COMAR 20.07.04.08.
This adjustment is sponsored by Witness H. E. Ward.

The Potomac Edison Company
Maryland Distribution Working Papers Supporting Adjustments
12 Months Ending December 31, 2022
Adjustment No. 7
Postage Increase

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Line } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | Description | Reference Account | Total Company Amount |  | Allocation <br> Factor - C10 | Maryland Amount |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) |  | (3) | (4) |  | 5) |
| 1 | Adjusted Customer Accounts Postage Expense | 903 | \$ | 1,369,046 | 65.267\% | \$ | 893,535 |
| 2 | Customer Accounts Postage Expense Per Books | 903 | \$ | 1,271,757 | 65.267\% | \$ | 830,037 |
| 3 | Postage increase | 903 | \$ | 97,289 | 65.267\% | \$ | 63,498 |
| 4 | Decrease due to increase in eBill Enrollments |  |  |  |  | \$ | $(17,365)$ |
| 5 | Total Adjustment |  |  |  |  | \$ | 46,132 |

Discussion:
Adjust expense for the postage increases effective July 2022 and January 2023, and the impact from eBill Enrollments.

|  | Details | Amount in Test Year |  | Going Level Amount |  | Adjustment Amount |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 6 months ended June 2022 | \$ | 632,551 | \$ | 703,359 | \$ | 70,809 |
| 7 | 6 months ended December 2022 |  | 639,206 |  | 665,747 | \$ | 26,541 |
|  |  | \$ | 1,271,757 | \$ | 1,369,106 | \$ | 97,350 |

8 Price effective January 2022
9 Price effective July 2022

11 Percent increase in price from Jan 2022 to Jul 2022

| 0.029 |
| ---: |

12 Price effective January 2023
13
14 Percent increase in price from Jan 2022 to Jan $2023 \xlongequal{\underline{~ 11.194 \%}}$
Increase in price versus July 2022 rates
0.019

16
Percent increase in price from Jul 2022 to Jan 2023
4.152\%

This adjustment is sponsored by Witness H. E. Ward.

The Potomac Edison Company Maryland Distribution Working Papers Supporting Adjustments 12 Months Ending December 31, 2022

Adjustment No. 8 Increase Commission Assessment

| Line No. | Description | Reference Account | Amount |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) |  | (3) |
| 1 | Potomac Edison Maryland Pubic Service Commission Assessment Fees for Twelve Months Ended December 31, 2022 | 928 | \$ | 1,208,269 |
| 2 | Potomac Edison Maryland Pubic Service Commission Assessment Fees for FY Starting July 1, 2022 | 928 |  | 1,389,911 |
| 3 | Increase in Maryland Public Service Commission Assessment Fees (Line 2 - Line 1) | 928 | \$ | 181,642 |
| 4 | Potomac Edison Maryland Distribution Allocation Factor (MDREV Allocator) |  |  | 23.096\% |
| 5 | Increase in Regulatory Expense Associated with Maryland Public Service Commission Assessment Fee Rate Effective July 1, 2022 (Line 3 X Line 4) | 928 | \$ | 41,952 |

Discussion:
To reflect increase in Regulatory Commission Expense due to increase in Maryland Commission Assessment Fee.

| MD PSC Assessment Fee July 1, 2021 - June 30, 2022 | $\$$ | $1,026,625$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MD PSC Assessment Fee July 1, 2022 - June 30, 2023 | $\$ 1,389,911$ |  |

This adjustment is sponsored by Witness H. E. Ward.

## The Potomac Edison Company

Maryland Distribution
Working Papers Supporting Adjustments
12 Months Ending December 31, 2022

## Adjustment No. 9

Medical Insurance Expense Adjustment

| Line No. | Description | Reference Account |  | Amount | MD <br> Alloc. <br> Factor | MD <br> Alloc. <br> Factor \% |  | Total $\mathrm{MD}$ | MD Distrib. Alloc. Factor | MD <br> Distrib. <br> Alloc. <br> Factor \% |  | Total <br> MD <br> Distr b |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) |  | (3) | (4) | (5) |  | (6) | (7) | (8) |  | (9) |
| 1 | 2023 Medical Expense | 926 | \$ | 5,883,010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 2022 Medical Expense in Test Year | 926 | \$ | 5,769,482 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Adjustment to O\&M Expense (Line 1 Minus Line 2) |  | \$ | 113,528 | TX60 | 57.05\% | \$ | 64,762 | S\&W | 89.610\% | \$ | 58,034 |

Discussion:
Adjust test year O\&M expense to reflect going-level Medical expense.

This adjustment is sponsored by Witness S. M. Colflesh.

The Potomac Edison Company Maryland Distribution
Working Papers Supporting Adjustments 12 Months Ending December 31, 2022

Adjustment No. 10
Group Life Insurance Expense Adjustment

| Line <br> No. | Description | Reference Account | Amount | MD Alloc. Factor | MD <br> Alloc. <br> Factor \% | Total MD | MD Distrib. Alloc. Factor | MD <br> Distrib. <br> Alloc. <br> Factor \% | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { MD } \\ \text { Distrib } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) |
| 1 | 2023 Group Life Insurance Expense | 926 | \$ 63,731 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 2022 Group Life Insurance Expense in Test Year | 926 | 64,794 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Adjustment to O\&M Expense (Line 1 Minus Line 2) |  | \$ (1,063) | TX60 | 57.05\% | \$ (606) | S\&W | 89.61\% | \$ (543) |

Discussion:

Adjust test year O\&M expense to reflect going-level Group Life Insurance expense.
This adjustment is sponsored by Witness S. M. Colflesh.

The Potomac Edison Company
Maryland Distribution
Working Papers Supporting Adjustments
12 Months Ending December 31, 2022
Adjustment No. 11
Pension \& OPEB (Gain)/Loss Adjustment

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Line } \\ & \text { No. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Description | Reference Account |  | Amount | MD <br> Alloc. <br> Factor | MD <br> Alloc. <br> Factor \% |  | Total MD | MD <br> Distrib. <br> Alloc. <br> Factor | MD <br> Distrib. <br> Alloc. <br> Factor \% |  | Total <br> MD <br> Distrib |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) |  | (3) | (4) | (5) |  | (6) | (7) | (8) |  | (9) |
| 1 | 2022 MTM Adjustment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Potomac Edison |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Pension | 926 | \$ | 8,216,945 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | OPEB | 926 |  | $(367,881)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Total MTM |  | \$ | 7,849,064 | TX60 | 57.05\% | \$ | 4,477,501 | S\&W | 89.61\% | \$ | 4,012,311 |
| 6 | 2023 Smoothing Adjustment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Potomac Edison |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Pension | 926 | \$ | 7,155,041 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | OPEB | 926 |  | 282,596 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Total Smoothing |  | \$ | 7,437,638 | TX60 | 57.05\% | \$ | 4,242,803 | S\&W | 89.61\% | \$ | 3,801,996 |
| 11 | Increase in Pension and OPEB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | $(210,314)$ |

Discussion:
Remove mark to market adjustment from going level and replace with smoothing adjustment for pension and OPEB.
This adjustment is sponsored by Witness T. M. Ashton.

The Potomac Edison Company Maryland Distribution
Working Papers Supporting Adjustments
12 Months Ending December 31, 2022

Adjustment No. 12
Pension \& OPEB Non-Market to Market Expense Adjustment

| Line <br> No. | Description | Reference Account |  | Amount | MD Alloc. Factor | MD <br> Alloc. <br> Factor \% |  | Total MD | MD <br> Distrib <br> Alloc. <br> Factor | MD <br> Distrib. <br> Alloc. <br> Factor \% |  | Total <br> MD <br> Distrib |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) |  | (3) | (4) | (5) |  | (6) | (7) | (8) |  | (9) |
| 1 | 2022 Non-MTM Pension \& OPEB Expense |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Potomac Edison |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Pension | 926 |  | $(15,450,325)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | OPEB | 926 |  | $(1,771,465)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Total Non-MTM Exp | Test Year |  | $(17,221,790)$ | TX60 | 57.05\% | \$ | (9,824,176) | S\&W | 89.61\% | \$ | $(8,803,492)$ |
| 6 | 5-Year Average Non-MTM Pension \& OPEB Expense |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Potomac Edison |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Pension | 926 |  | $(12,454,601)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | OPEB | 926 |  | $(2,473,360)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Total Average |  |  | $(14,927,961)$ | TX60 | 57.05\% | \$ | (8,515,660) | S\&W | 89.61\% | \$ | $(7,630,925)(A)$ |
| 11 | Adjustment to Pension and OPEB Non-MTM Expense |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 1,172,567 |

Discussion:
Remove non-mark to market expense from going level and replace with 5 year average.
This adjustment is sponsored by Witness T. M. Ashton.
(A) Support Computations:

Non-MTM O\&M Expense for Twelve Months Ended December 31, 2018 Non-MTM O\&M Expense for Twelve Months Ended December 31, 2019 Non-MTM O\&M Expense for Twelve Months Ended December 31, 2020 Non-MTM O\&M Expense for Twelve Months Ended December 31, 2021 Non-MTM O\&M Expense for Twelve Months Ended December 31, 2022

|  | Pension |  | OPEB |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | $(6,984,989)$ | \$ | $(3,735,402)$ | \$ | $(10,720,391)$ |
| \$ | $(6,774,473)$ | \$ | $(2,872,755)$ | \$ | $(9,647,228)$ |
| \$ | $(14,345,406)$ | \$ | $(1,791,624)$ | \$ | $(16,137,030)$ |
| \$ | $(18,717,812)$ | \$ | $(2,195,553)$ | \$ | $(20,913,365)$ |
| \$ | $(15,450,325)$ | \$ | $(1,771,465)$ | \$ | $(17,221,790)$ |
| \$ | $(62,273,005)$ | \$ | $(12,366,799)$ | \$ | $(74,639,804)$ |
| \$ | $(12,454,601)$ | \$ | $(2,473,360)$ | \$ | (14,927,961) |

The Potomac Edison Company
Maryland Distribution
Working Papers Supporting Adjustments
12 Months Ending December 31, 2022
Adjustment Nos. 13 and 19
Rate Case Expense Adjustment

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Line } \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ | Description | Reference Account | Amount |  | Amortization Period (Years) | Total <br> MD Distribution <br> (5) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) |  | (3) | (4) |  |  |  |
| 1 | Customer Notice/Printing/Postage | 928 | \$ | 14,126 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Employee Expenses | 928 |  | 19,560 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Rate of Return Witness | 928 |  | 27,500 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Depreciation Study Witness | 928 |  | 386,100 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | External Legal Fees | 928 |  | 499,950 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Class Cost of Service Study and Rate Design Witness | 928 |  | 113,316 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Lead Lag Study and Cash Working Capital Witness | 928 |  | 53,618 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Electric Vehicle Benefit and Cost Analysis Witness | 928 |  | 156,500 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Totals Deferred Maryland Rate Case Expenses |  | \$ | 1,270,670 | 3 | \$ | 423,557 | Adj\# 13 |
| 9 | 2023 Maryland Rate Case Expenses in Test Year | 928 |  |  |  | \$ | , |  |
| 10 | Adjustment to Reflect Amortization of Rate Case Expenses (Line 9 - Line 10) | 407.4 |  |  |  | \$ | 423,557 |  |
| 11 | Amortization for Recovery of 2018 Maryland Rate Case in Test Year | 407.4 | \$ | 11,152 |  | \$ | 11,152 |  |
| 12 | Adjustment to Remove 2018 Rate Case Amortization from Test Year | 407.4 | \$ | $(11,152)$ |  | \$ | $(11,152)$ | Adj\# 19 |

## Discussion:

To increase going level expenses to recognize amortization of expenses associated with current distribution rate case.
Also, remove test year amortization from recovery of 2018 rate case expense.
This adjustment is sponsored by Witness H. E. Ward.

```
            The Potomac Edison Company
                        Maryland Distribution
Working Papers Supporting Adjustments
    12 Months Ending December 31, }202
                            Adjustment No. }1
Remove COVID-19 Amounts from Test Year
```

| Line No. | Description | Reference Account | PE - MD Amount | Distribution Allocator | Allocation Percentage | MD <br> Distribution | MD Distribution Adjustment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| 1 | Operating Company Expenses: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Employee Expenses | 588 | 119.15 | Direct | 100\% | 119.15 |  |
| 3 | Materials \& Supplies | 588 | 20,721.84 | Direct | 100\% | 20,721.84 |  |
| 4 | Postage | 903 | 877.25 | Direct | 100\% | 877.25 |  |
| 5 | FMLA Administration | 926 | 61,432.64 | A\&G - DX | 89.61\% | 55,050.09 |  |
| 6 | Subtotal |  | 83,150.88 |  |  | 76,768.33 |  |
| 7 | Service Company Charges: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Communications \& Advertising | 923 | - | A\&G - DX | 89.61\% | - |  |
| 9 | Customer Service Technology | 923 | 2,286.35 | A\&G - DX | 89.61\% | 2,048.81 |  |
| 10 | Customer Accounting \& Billing | 923 | 76,308.37 | A\&G - DX | 89.61\% | 68,380.30 |  |
| 11 | COVID Supply Purchases | 923 | 3,886.65 | A\&G - DX | 89.61\% | 3,482.85 |  |
| 12 | FMLA Administration | 923 | 5,386.43 | A\&G - DX | 89.61\% | 4,826.81 |  |
| 13 | Information Technology | 923 | 69.99 | A\&G - DX | 89.61\% | 62.72 |  |
| 14 | Other | 923 | 5,196.34 | A\&G - DX | 89.61\% | 4,656.47 |  |
| 15 | Subtotal |  | 93,134.13 |  |  | 83,457.95 |  |
| 16 | Incremental Uncollectibles Expense Accrual | 904 | 2,103,093.00 | Direct | 100\% | 2,103,093.00 |  |
| 17 | Total |  | 2,279,378.01 |  |  | 2,263,319.27 |  |
|  | Total O\&M in Test Year |  | 2,279,378.01 |  |  | 2,263,319.27 | \$ (2,263,319.27) |

Discussion:

Adjustment removes Covid-19 amounts from the test year.

This adjustment is sponsored by Witness S. M. Colflesh.

# The Potomac Edison Company Maryland Distribution Working Papers Supporting Adjustments 12 Months Ending December 31, 2022 

Adjustment No. 15
Adjust to Remove Service Company Carrying Charges from Test Year


## Discussion:

Depreciation expense from the Service Company is allocated and billed to Potomac Edison in FERC account 923 Service Company Depreciation expenses are calculated on Service Company Depreciation Rates, which may not the same as Potomac Edistons Depreciation Rates, so the amount billed to Potomac Edison in acocunt 923 relat to Service Company depreciation and amortization is removed.

Depreciation expense on Potomac Edison - MD's allocated share of Service Company Plant Assets will be recalculated based on PE-Maryland Depreciation rates and added back to the test year on Adjustment 21.

This adjustment is sponsored by Witness S. M. Colflesh.

|  | The Potomac Edison Company <br> Maryland Distribution <br> Working Papers Supporting Adjustments 12 Months Ending December 31, 2022 <br> Adjustment No. 16 <br> Adjust Depreciation Expense to Reflect New Depreciation Rates |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Line <br> No. | Description | Reference Account <br> (2) |  | MD Juris Amount (3) |  |  |
| 1 | Depreciation Expense - New Rates | 403 |  | 31,311,414 |  |  |
| 2 | Depreciation Expense - Current Rates | 403 |  | 28,456,194 |  |  |
| 3 | Increase in Depreciation Expense (Line 1 minus Line 2) | 403 | \$ | 2,855,219 |  |  |
| 4 | Breakdown by Function |  |  |  |  | ator |
| 5 | Intangible Plant |  | \$ | $(1,178,500)$ | S\&W | 89.61\% |
| 6 | Distribution |  |  | 4,251,230 | Direct | 100.00\% |
| 7 | General |  |  | $(217,511)$ | S\&W | 89.61\% |
| 8 | Total |  | \$ | 2,855,219 |  |  |

## Discussion:

Adjust depreciation expense to reflect new proposed depreciation rates.
This adjustment is sponsored by Witness H. E. Ward.

# The Potomac Edison Company 

Maryland Distribution
Working Papers Supporting Adjustments
12 Months Ending December 31, 2022
Adjustment No. 17
Depreciation Expense on Terminal Treatment of Reliability Projects

| Line <br> No. | Description | Reference Account | MD Depreciation Rates |  | Amount | MD <br> Alloc. <br> Factor | MD <br> Alloc. <br> Factor \% |  | Total MD | MD <br> Distrib. <br> Alloc. <br> Factor | MD <br> Distrib. <br> Alloc. <br> Factor \% |  | Total MD Distrib |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) | (3) |  | (4) | (5) | (6) |  | (7) | (8) | (9) |  | (10) |
| 1 | Misc. Intangible Plant | 30300 | 7.21\% | \$ | 63,637 | GP60 | 57.045\% | \$ | 36,302 | S\&W | 89.610\% | \$ | 32,530 |
| 2 | Structures, Improvements | 36110 | 1.27\% |  | 1,144 | Direct |  |  | 1,144 | Direct |  |  | 1,144 |
| 3 | Station Equipment | 36200 | 1.35\% |  | 33,677 | Direct |  |  | 33,677 | Direct |  |  | 33,677 |
| 4 | Poles, Towers And Fixtures | 36400 | 1.81\% |  | 17,443 | Direct |  |  | 17,443 | Direct |  |  | 17,443 |
| 5 | Overhead Conductor, Devices | 36500 | 2.02\% |  | 101,656 | Direct |  |  | 101,656 | Direct |  |  | 101,656 |
| 6 | Clearing, Grading of Land | 36510 | 1.25\% |  | 620 | Direct |  |  | 620 | Direct |  |  | 620 |
| 7 | Underground Conduit | 36600 | 1.62\% |  | 6,596 | Direct |  |  | 6,596 | Direct |  |  | 6,596 |
| 8 | Underground Conductor, Devices | 36700 | 3.23\% |  | 232,230 | Direct |  |  | 232,230 | Direct |  |  | 232,230 |
| 9 | Line Transformers | 36800 | 1.83\% |  | 45,122 | Direct |  |  | 45,122 | Direct |  |  | 45,122 |
| 10 | Structures, Improvements | 39010 | 1.36\% |  | 171 | Direct |  |  | 171 | S\&W | 89.610\% |  | 153 |
| 11 | Data Processing Equipment | 39120 | 17.42\% |  | 193,216 | GP35 | 61.106\% |  | 118,067 | S\&W | 89.610\% |  | 105,800 |
| 12 | Communication Equipment | 39700 | 5.26\% |  | 35,148 | GP35 | 61.106\% |  | 21,477 | S\&W | 89.610\% |  | 19,246 |
| 13 | Totals |  |  | \$ 730,660 |  |  |  | \$ 614,504 |  |  | Intangible | \$ 596,217 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 32,530 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Distribution |  | 438,488 |
|  | Discussion: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | General |  | 125,199 |

To reflect depreciation expense on terminal treatment of reliability projects completed during the test year.

## The Potomac Edison Company

Maryland Distribution
Working Papers Supporting Adjustments

Adjustment No. 18
Depreciation Expense on Terminal Treatment of Reliability Projects - Post Test Year, 6-Months Ended June 2023


To reflect depreciation expense on terminal treatment of reliability projects anticipated to be completed prior to start of hearings.

The Potomac Edison Company
Maryland Distribution
Working Papers Supporting Adjustments
12 Months Ending December 31, 2022
Adjustment Nos. 13 and 19
Rate Case Expense Adjustment

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Line } \\ & \text { No. } \end{aligned}$ | Description | Reference Account | Amount |  | Amortization Period (Years) | Total <br> MD Distribution <br> (5) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) |  | (3) | (4) |  |  |  |
| 1 | Customer Notice/Printing/Postage | 928 | \$ | 14,126 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Employee Expenses | 928 |  | 19,560 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Rate of Return Witness | 928 |  | 27,500 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Depreciation Study Witness | 928 |  | 386,100 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | External Legal Fees | 928 |  | 499,950 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Class Cost of Service Study and Rate Design Witness | 928 |  | 113,316 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Lead Lag Study and Cash Working Capital Witness | 928 |  | 53,618 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Electric Vehicle Benefit and Cost Analysis Witness | 928 |  | 156,500 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Totals Deferred Maryland Rate Case Expenses |  | \$ | 1,270,670 | 3 | \$ | 423,557 | Adj\# 13 |
| 9 | 2023 Maryland Rate Case Expenses in Test Year | 928 |  |  |  | \$ | , |  |
| 10 | Adjustment to Reflect Amortization of Rate Case Expenses (Line 9 - Line 10) | 407.4 |  |  |  | \$ | 423,557 |  |
| 11 | Amortization for Recovery of 2018 Maryland Rate Case in Test Year | 407.4 | \$ | 11,152 |  | \$ | 11,152 |  |
| 12 | Adjustment to Remove 2018 Rate Case Amortization from Test Year | 407.4 | \$ | $(11,152)$ |  | \$ | $(11,152)$ | Adj\# 19 |

## Discussion:

To increase going level expenses to recognize amortization of expenses associated with current distribution rate case.
Also, remove test year amortization from recovery of 2018 rate case expense.
This adjustment is sponsored by Witness H. E. Ward.

# The Potomac Edison Company Maryland Distribution <br> Working Papers Supporting Adjustments <br> 12 Months Ending December 31, 2022 

Adjustment No. 20
Adjust to add Service Company Depreciation and Amortization at Maryland Rate to Test Year

|  | DESCRIPTION | 13 Mo Avg <br> Plant In Service <br> Balance as of <br> Dec 31, 2022 | Maryland <br> Depreciation <br> Rate | Depreciation <br> Expense |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Line No. Account |  |  |  |  |


| 1 | 301 | Organization (Fully Amortized) | 49,344 | 0.00\% | \$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 303 | Miscellaneous Intangible Plant (Software) | 542,813,167 | 7.21\% | \$ | 39,136,829 |
| 3 | 389 | Land \& Land Rights (non-depreciable) | 187,282 | 0.00\% | \$ | - |
| 4 | 390 | Structures \& Improvements | 50,241,398 | 1.36\% | \$ | 683,283 |
| 5 | 390 | Leasehold Improvements | 28,919,388 | 1.36\% | \$ | 393,304 |
| 6 | 391.1 | Office Furniture \& Equipment | 15,072,135 | 3.68\% | \$ | 554,655 |
| 7 | 391.2 | Office Equipment - Information Systems | 154,561,518 | 17.42\% | \$ | 26,924,616 |
| 8 | 392 | Transportation Equipment | 6,109,892 | 2.52\% | \$ | 153,969 |
| 9 | 393 | Stores Equipment | 17,057 | 1.15\% | \$ | 196 |
| 10 | 394 | Tools, Shop \& Garage Equipment | 300,960 | 4.60\% | \$ | 13,844 |
| 11 | 395 | Laboratory Equipment | 733,941 | 1.85\% | \$ | 13,578 |
| 12 | 396 | Power Operated Equipment | 438,758 | -0.30\% | \$ | $(1,316)$ |
| 13 | 397 | Communication Equipment | 154,401,555 | 5.26\% | \$ | 8,121,522 |
| 14 | 398 | Miscellaneous Equipment | 3,597,174 | 0.59\% | \$ | 21,223 |
| 15 | 399 | Asset Retirement Costs for General Plant | 40,721 | 0.00\% | \$ | - |
| 16 |  | SUB - TOTAL | 957,484,291 |  |  | 76,015,703 |
| 17 | Multifactor allocation factor from SC00 to PE for Depr Expense |  |  |  |  | 4.86\% |
| 18 | Allocated to PE - Total Company |  |  |  |  | 3,694,363 |
| 19 | Jurisdictional Allocation Factor GP01-M[ |  |  |  |  | 60.90\% |
| 20 | Allocated to PE- Maryland |  |  |  |  | 2,249,834 |
| 21 | Distribution allocator - Salaries \& Wages |  |  |  |  | 89.61\% |
| 22 | 403-404 | Depreciation expense allocated to PE Maryland Distr bution based |  | MD Deprecia | \$ | 2,016,088 |
|  |  |  |  | ngible | \$ | 1,037,987 |
|  |  |  |  | neral | \$ | 978,101 |

Discussion:
Depreciation expense on Potomac Edison - MD's allocated share of Service Company Plant Assets has been recalculated based on PE-MD's Depreciation rates and added back to the test year in account 403 / 404

This adjustment is sponsored by Witness S. M. Colflesh.

# The Potomac Edison Company <br> Maryland Distribution <br> Working Papers Supporting Adjustments <br> 12 Months Ending December 31, 2022 

Adjustment No. 21
Remove Conservation Voltage Reduction Program Amortization

| Line No. | Description | Reference Account | MD Distribution Amount |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) |  | (3) |
| 1 | CVR Amortization in Test Year | 407.4 | \$ | 33,050 |
| 2 | Adjustment to Remove CVR Amortization | 407.4 |  | $(33,050)$ |

Discussion:

Adjustment to remove amortization of Conservation Voltage Reduction ("CVR") recovery in test year.
This adjustment is sponsored by Witness S. M. Colflesh.

The Potomac Edison Company<br>Maryland Distribution<br>Working Papers Supporting Adjustments<br>12 Months Ending December 31, 2022

Adjustment No. 22
COVID-19 Deferral

| Line No. | Description | Reference Account |  | Total Distribution Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) | (3) |  |
| 1 | COVID-19 Deferrals in Test Year | 407.4 | \$ | $(2,263,319)$ |
| 2 | Adjustment to remove COVID-19 Deferrals | 407.4 | \$ | 2,263,319 |

## Discussion:

Adjustment to remove regulatory credits related to deferral of COVID-19 incremental costs in 2022 test year.

This adjustment is sponsored by Witness S. M. Colflesh.

The Potomac Edison Company
Maryland Distribution
Working Papers Supporting Adjustments
12 Months Ending December 31, 2022
Adjustment No. 23
COVID-19 Amortization Adjustment

| Line No. | Description | Reference Account | PE - MD Amount | Distribution Allocator | Allocation Percentage | MD <br> Distribution | Amortization Period (Years) | Total MD Distribution |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| 1 | Operating Company Expenses: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Employee Expenses | 588 | 7,587.12 | Direct | 100\% | 7,587.12 |  |  |
| 3 | Materials \& Supplies | 588 | 78,576.57 | Direct | 100\% | 78,576.57 |  |  |
| 4 | Misc. Leases \& Rentals | 588 | 249,546.38 | Direct | 100\% | 249,546.38 |  |  |
| 5 | Outside Contractors | 923 | 8,356.07 | A\&G - DX | 89.61\% | 7,487.91 |  |  |
| 6 | Postage | 903 | 5,698.53 | Direct | 100\% | 5,698.53 |  |  |
| 7 | FMLA Administration | 926 | 290,329.24 | A\&G - DX | 89.61\% | 260,165.44 |  |  |
| 8 | Informational Advertising | 909 | 2,765.02 | Direct | 100\% | 2,765.02 |  |  |
| 9 | Pandemic Recognition Awards | 588 | 690,452.48 | Direct | 100\% | 690,452.48 |  |  |
| 10 | Over ime Labor | 588 | 795.03 | Direct | 100\% | 795.03 |  |  |
| 11 | Subtotal |  | 1,334,106.44 |  |  | 1,303,074.48 |  |  |
| 12 | Service Company Charges: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Communications \& Advertising | 923 | 124,384.92 | A\&G - DX | 89.61\% | 111,461.93 |  |  |
| 14 | Customer Service Technology | 923 | 112,456.95 | A\&G - DX | 89.61\% | 100,773.22 |  |  |
| 15 | Customer Accounting \& Billing | 923 | 169,187.12 | A\&G - DX | 89.61\% | 151,609.40 |  |  |
| 16 | COVID Supply Purchases | 923 | 89,702.65 | A\&G - DX | 89.61\% | 80,382.98 |  |  |
| 17 | FMLA Administration | 923 | 45,947.24 | A\&G - DX | 89.61\% | 41,173.54 |  |  |
| 18 | Information Technology | 923 | 13,960.28 | A\&G - DX | 89.61\% | 12,509.87 |  |  |
| 19 | Other | 923 | 27,151.93 | A\&G - DX | 89.61\% | 24,330.98 |  |  |
| 20 | Subtotal |  | 582,791.09 |  |  | 522,241.92 |  |  |
| 21 | Late Payment Fees Waived (Distribution Only) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 | Residential | 450 | 470,537.69 | Direct | 100\% | 470,537.69 |  |  |
| 23 | Commercial | 450 | 110,401.48 | Direct | 100\% | 110,401.48 |  |  |
| 24 | Industrial | 450 | 25,749.38 | Direct | 100\% | 25,749.38 |  |  |
| 25 | St Lighting | 450 | 693.84 | Direct | 100\% | 693.84 |  |  |
| 26 | Subtotal |  | 607,382.39 |  |  | 607,382.39 |  |  |
| 27 | Reconnection fees not charged | 451 | 216.00 | Direct | 100\% | 216.00 |  |  |
| 28 | Incremental Uncollec ibles Expense Accrual | 904 | 4,827,313.97 | Direct | 100\% | 4,827,313.97 |  |  |
| 29 | Total |  | 7,351,809.89 |  |  | 7,260,228.76 | 5 | \$1,452,046 |

## Discussion:

To increase going level expenses to recognize amortization of expenses associated with recovery of incremental COVID-19 costs.
This adjustment is sponsored by Witness S. M. Colflesh.

# The Potomac Edison Company <br> Maryland Distribution <br> Working Papers Supporting Adjustments <br> 12 Months Ending December 31, 2022 

Adjustment No. 24
Increase O\&M Expense for Electric Vehicle Portfolio Program Regulatory Asset

| Line No. | Description | Reference Account | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 1 | Electric Vehicle Regulatory Asset at 12/31/22 | 182207 | \$ 1,526,290 |
| 2 | Amortize Over Years |  | 5 |
| 3 | Increase to Expense Per Year (Line 1 / Line 2) |  | \$ 305,258 |
|  | Discussion: |  |  |

Adjustment to increase O\&M expense to reflect recovery of Electric Vehicle regulatory asset. This adjustment is sponsored by Witness H. E. Ward.

The Potomac Edison Company Maryland Distribution<br>Working Papers Supporting Adjustments<br>12 Months Ending December 31, 2022

Adjustment No. 25
Remove Electric Vehicle Portfolio Program Deferral in Test Year

| Line No. | Description | Reference Account |  | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) |  | (3) |
| 1 | Test Year Electric Vehicle Deferral in Regulatory Credit | 407.4 | \$ | $(527,034)$ |
| 2 | Adjustment to remove Regulatory Credit |  | \$ | 527,034 |
|  | Discussion: |  |  |  |

Adjustment to remove regulatory credit in test year related to Electric Vehicle deferral.
This adjustment is sponsored by Witness H. E. Ward.

The Potomac Edison Company<br>Maryland Distribution<br>Working Papers Supporting Adjustments<br>12 Months Ending December 31, 2022

Adjustment No. 26
Payroll Taxes Salaries and Wages Adjustment

| Line No. | Description | Reference Account | MD Distribution Amount |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) | (3) |  |
| 2022 FICA Adjustment: |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Production | 408.1 | \$ | 19,575 |
| 2 | Transmission | 408.1 |  |  |
| 3 | Distribution | 408.1 |  |  |
| 4 | Cust. Accts \& Sales | 408.1 |  |  |
| 5 | A\&G | 408.1 |  |  |
| 6 | Total | 408.1 | \$ | 19,575 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Adjustment on Annualized Salary \& Wage Increase found on Adj. 1: |  | \$ | 255,885 |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Calculation of Employer Portion of FICA tax on above Increase: |  | Total MD Distrib |  |
| 13 | Bargaining | 7.65\% |  | 4,372 |
| 14 | Non-Bargaining | 7.65\% |  | 15,203 |
| 15 | TOTAL |  | \$ | 19,575 |

Discussion:
Increase O\&M expense to reflect the annualized effect of the expense portion of FICA payroll tax increases.

This adjustment is sponsored by Witness S. M. Colflesh.

The Potomac Edison Company<br>Maryland Distribution<br>Working Papers Supporting Adjustments<br>12 Months Ending December 31, 2022

Adjustment No. 27
Payroll Taxes Salaries and Wages Adjustment

| Line No. | Description | Reference Account | MD Distribution Amount |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) | (3) |  |
| 2023 FICA Adjustment: |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Production | 408.1 | \$ | 24,612 |
| 2 | Transmission | 408.1 |  |  |
| 3 | Distribution | 408.1 |  |  |
| 4 | Cust. Accts \& Sales | 408.1 |  |  |
| 5 | A\&G | 408.1 |  |  |
| 6 | Total | 408.1 | \$ | 24,612 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Adjustment on Annualized Salary \& Wage Increase found on Adj. 2: |  | \$ | 321,723 |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Calculation of Employer Portion of FICA tax on above Increase: |  | Total MD Distrib |  |
| 13 | Bargaining | 7.65\% |  | - |
| 14 | Non-Bargaining | 7.65\% |  | 24,612 |
| 15 | TOTAL |  | \$ | 24,612 |

Increase O\&M expense to reflect the annualized effect of the expense portion of FICA payroll tax increases.

This adjustment is sponsored by Witness S. M. Colflesh.

The Potomac Edison Company<br>Maryland Distribution<br>Working Papers Supporting Adjustments<br>12 Months Ending December 31, 2022

Adjustment No. 28
Interest Synchronization

| Line No. | Description | Reference Account | MD Distribution Amount |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) |  | (3) |
| 1 | Per Books Rate Base |  | \$ | 647,618,240 |
| 2 | Rate Base Adjustments ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | 71,065,938 |
| 3 | Adjusted Rate Base |  | \$ | 718,684,179 |
| 4 | Interest Component of Rate of Return |  |  | 1.867\% |
| 5 | Adjusted Interest | 427 | \$ | 13,420,137 |
| 7 | Allocated Interest | 427 |  | 15,395,076 |
| 9 | Interest Adjustment |  | \$ | $(1,974,939)$ |
| 10 | Impact on State Taxable Income |  | \$ | 1,974,939 |
| 11 | State Income Tax Rate |  |  | 8.25\% |
| 12 | State Income Taxes | 409.100 | \$ | 162,932 |
| 13 | Federal Taxable Income |  | \$ | 1,812,007 |
| 14 | Federal Income Tax Rate |  |  | 21\% |
| 15 | Federal Income Taxes | 409.149 | \$ | 380,521 |
| 16 | State and Federal Income Tax Impact on Income |  | \$ | $(543,454)$ |

## Discussion:

To reflect the State and Federal income tax effects of substituting the amount of interest implicit in the capital structure used in the Company's rate of return request for book interest expense.
${ }^{1}$ Excludes cash working capital change in cash requirement from going level adjustments.

> The Potomac Edison Company Maryland Distribution
> Working Papers Supporting Adjustments
> 12 Months Ending December 31, 2022

Adjustment No. 29
State Income Taxes on Going Level Adjustments

| Line No. | Going Level Adjustment No. | Description | MD Distribution Taxable Income |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Column (1) | (2) |  |
| 1 | 1 | Salaries and Wages-Test Year |  | $(255,885)$ |
| 1 | 2 | Salaries and Wages-2023 |  | $(321,723)$ |
| 2 | 3 | Employee Savings Plan-Test Year |  | $(7,677)$ |
| 2 | 4 | Employee Savings Plan-2023 |  | $(9,415)$ |
| 3 | 5 | Storm Damage |  | 55,154 |
| 4 | 6 | Remove Advertising Expense |  | 66,751 |
| 5 | 7 | Increase Postage Expense |  | $(46,132)$ |
| 6 | 8 | Commission Assessment Increase |  | $(41,952)$ |
| 7 | 9 | Medical Insurance Expense |  | $(58,034)$ |
| 8 | 10 | Group Life Insurance Expense |  | 543 |
| 9 | 11 | Pension/OPEB Expense MTM Related |  | 210,314 |
| 10 | 12 | Pension/OPEB Expense Non-MTM Related |  | $(1,172,567)$ |
| 10 | 13 | Rate Case Expense |  | $(423,557)$ |
| 11 | 14 | O\&M Expense Recovered in Covid-19 Deferral |  | 2,263,319 |
| 12 | 15 | Service Company Charges |  | 2,743,458 |
| 13 | 16 | Depreciation Expense New Rates |  | $(3,000,258)$ |
| 14 | 17 | Depreciation Expense on Test Year Reliability Projects |  | $(596,217)$ |
| 15 | 18 | Depreciation Expense on Post Test Year Reliability Projects |  | $(594,527)$ |
| 16 | 19 | Rate Case Expense Amortization |  | 11,152 |
| 17 | 20 | Depr Expense on Service Company Alloc of Rate Base |  | $(2,016,088)$ |
| 16 | 21 | Conservation Voltage Reduction (407.4) |  | 33,050 |
| 17 | 22 | Covid-19 Regulatory Credit Removal (407.4) |  | $(2,263,319)$ |
| 18 | 23 | Covid-19 Regulatory Asset Amortization (407.3) |  | $(1,452,046)$ |
| 19 | 24 | Electric Vehicle Regulatory Asset Amortization (407.3) |  | $(305,258)$ |
| 20 | 25 | Electric Vehicle Regulatory Credit Removal (407.4) |  | $(527,034)$ |
| 21 | 26 | Payroll Taxes Salaries and Wages-Test Year |  | $(19,575)$ |
| 22 | 27 | Payroll Taxes Salaries and Wages-2023 |  | $(24,612)$ |
| 23 | 28 | Interest Synchronization |  | 1,974,939 |
| 24 | 43 | Accounting Adjustments |  | 938,317 |
| 25 |  | Total Maryland State Taxable Income | \$ | $(4,838,879)$ |
| 26 |  | Maryland State Income Tax Rate |  | 8.25\% |
| 27 |  | Maryland State Income Tax on going level adjustments | \$ | $(399,207)$ |

Discussion:

To determine the effect of the going level adjustments on Maryland State Income Tax.

The Potomac Edison Company<br>Maryland Distribution<br>Working Papers Supporting Adjustments<br>12 Months Ending December 31, 2022

Adjustment No. 30
Federal Income Tax on Going Level Adjustments

| Line No. | Description | MD Distribution Taxable Income |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) |  |
| 1 | State Taxable Income from Adjustment No. 29 | \$ | $(4,838,879)$ |
| 2 |  |  |  |
| 3 | Adjustment No. 29 - Maryland State Income Tax on going level |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |
| 5 | Federal Taxable Income | \$ | $(4,439,671)$ |
| 6 |  |  |  |
| 7 | Federal Income Tax Rate | 21.00\% |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |
| 9 | Federal Income Taxes on going level adjustments | \$ | $(932,331)$ |

Discussion:

To calculate effect of the going level adjustments on Federal Income Tax.

The Potomac Edison Company
Maryland Distribution
Working Papers Supporting Adjustments 12 Months Ending December 31, 2022

Adjustment No. 31
Terminal Treatment of Reliability Projects


Discussion:
To reflect terminal treatment of reliability projects completed during the test year.

The Potomac Edison Company
Maryland Distribution
Working Papers Supporting Adjustments

Adjustment No. 32
Terminal Treatment of Reliability Projects - Post Test Year, 6-Months Ended June 2023

| Line No. | Description | Reference Account |  | Terminal Treatment Amount |  | MD <br> Alloc. <br> Factor \% |  | Total MD | MD <br> Distrib. <br> Alloc. <br> Factor | MD <br> Distrib. <br> Alloc. <br> Factor \% |  | Total <br> MD <br> Distrib |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) |  | (3) | (4) | (5) |  | (6) | (7) | (8) |  | (9) |
| 1 | Misc. Intangible Plant | 30300 | \$ | 947,723 | GP60 | 57.045\% | \$ | 540,629 | S\&W | 89.610\% | \$ | 484,460 |
| 2 | Structures, Improvements | 36110 |  | 86,641 | Direct |  |  | 86,641 | Direct |  |  | 86,641 |
| 3 | Station Equipment | 36200 |  | 2,456,647 | Direct |  |  | 2,456,647 | Direct |  |  | 2,456,647 |
| 4 | Poles, Towers And Fixtures | 36400 |  | 1,946,883 | Direct |  |  | 1,946,883 | Direct |  |  | 1,946,883 |
| 5 | Overhead Conductor, Devices | 36500 |  | 1,378,690 | Direct |  |  | 1,378,690 | Direct |  |  | 1,378,690 |
| 6 | Clearing, Grading of Land | 36510 |  | 2,825,427 | Direct |  |  | 2,825,427 | Direct |  |  | 2,825,427 |
| 7 | Underground Conduit | 36600 |  | 1,277,274 | Direct |  |  | 1,277,274 | Direct |  |  | 1,277,274 |
| 8 | Underground Conductor, Devices | 36700 |  | 6,165,682 | Direct |  |  | 6,165,682 | Direct |  |  | 6,165,682 |
| 9 | Line Transformers | 36800 |  | 1,965,502 | Direct |  |  | 1,965,502 | Direct |  |  | 1,965,502 |
| 10 | Terminal CWIP W. Jefferson \& Myersville |  |  | 7,779,093 | Direct |  |  | 7,779,093 | Direct |  |  | 7,779,093 |
| 11 | Structures, Improvements | 39010 |  | 700,047 | Direct |  |  | 700,047 | S\&W | 89.610\% |  | 627,315 |
| 12 | Totals |  | \$ | 27,529,609 |  |  | \$ 27,122,515 |  |  | Without CWIP | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 19,214,522 \\ \hline \hline 7,779,093 \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | CWIP |  |  |  |

Discussion:

To reflect terminal treatment of post test year reliability projects anticipated to be completed prior to start of hearings.

The Potomac Edison Company
Maryland Distribution
Working Papers Supporting Adjustments
12 Months Ending December 31, 2022
Adjustment No. 33
Accumulated Depreciation on Terminal Treatment of Reliability Projects

| Line <br> No. | Description |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Column (1) |
| 1 |  | Misc. Intangible Plant |
| 2 |  | Structures, Improvements |
| 3 |  | Station Equipment |
| 4 |  | Poles, Towers And Fixtures |
| 5 |  | Overhead Conductor, Devices |
| 6 |  | Clearing, Grading of Land |
| 7 |  | Underground Conduit |
| 8 |  | Underground Conductor, Devices |
| 9 |  | Line Transformers |
| 10 |  | Structures, Improvements |
| 11 |  | Data Processing Equipment |
| 12 |  | Communication Equipment |
| 13 |  | Total |


| Reference Account |  | Terminal Treatment Amount | MD <br> Alloc. <br> Factor | MD <br> Alloc. <br> Factor \% |  | Total <br> MD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (2) |  | (3) | (4) | (5) |  | (6) |
| 30300 | \$ | 63,637 | GP60 | 57.045\% | \$ | 36,302 |
| 36110 |  | 1,144 | Direct |  |  | 1,144 |
| 36200 |  | 33,677 | Direct |  |  | 33,677 |
| 36400 |  | 17,443 | Direct |  |  | 17,443 |
| 36500 |  | 101,656 | Direct |  |  | 101,656 |
| 36510 |  | 620 | Direct |  |  | 620 |
| 36600 |  | 6,596 | Direct |  |  | 6,596 |
| 36700 |  | 232,230 | Direct |  |  | 232,230 |
| 36800 |  | 45,122 | Direct |  |  | 45,122 |
| 39010 |  | 171 | Direct |  |  | 171 |
| 39120 |  | 193,216 | GP35 | 61.106\% |  | 118,067 |
| 39700 |  | 35,148 | GP35 | 61.106\% |  | 21,477 |
|  | \$ 730,660 |  |  |  | \$ | 614,504 |


| MD | MD |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Distrib. | Distrib. | Total |  |
| Alloc. | Alloc. |  |  |
| Factor | Factor \% | Distrib |  |
| (7) | (8) | (9) |  |
| S\&W | 89.610\% | \$ | 32,530 |
| Direct |  |  | 1,144 |
| Direct |  |  | 33,677 |
| Direct |  |  | 17,443 |
| Direct |  |  | 101,656 |
| Direct |  |  | 620 |
| Direct |  |  | 6,596 |
| Direct |  |  | 232,230 |
| Direct |  |  | 45,122 |
| S\&W | 89.610\% |  | 153 |
| S\&W | 89.610\% |  | 105,800 |
| S\&W | 89.610\% |  | 19,246 |
|  |  | \$ 596,217 |  |

## Discussion:

To reflect accumulated depreciation on terminal treatment of test year reliability projects.

The Potomac Edison Company
Maryland Distribution
Working Papers Supporting Adjustments

Adjustment No. 34

| Adjustment No. 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | MD <br> Alloc. <br> Factor \% | Total MD |  | MD | MD <br> Distrib. <br> Alloc. <br> Factor \% | Total <br> MD <br> Distrib |  |
| Line <br> No. | Description | Reference Account | Terminal Treatment Amount |  | MD <br> Alloc. <br> Factor |  |  |  | Distrib. <br> Alloc. <br> Factor |  |  |  |
|  | Column (1) | (2) |  | (3) | (4) | (5) |  | (6) | (7) | (8) |  | (9) |
| 1 | Misc. Intangible Plant | 30300 | \$ | 68,331 | GP60 | 57.045\% | \$ | 38,979 | S\&W | 89.610\% | \$ | 34,930 |
| 2 | Structures, Improvements | 36110 |  | 1,100 | Direct |  |  | 1,100 | Direct |  |  | 1,100 |
| 3 | Station Equipment | 36200 |  | 33,165 | Direct |  |  | 33,165 | Direct |  |  | 33,165 |
| 4 | Poles, Towers And Fixtures | 36400 |  | 35,239 | Direct |  |  | 35,239 | Direct |  |  | 35,239 |
| 5 | Overhead Conductor, Devices | 36500 |  | 27,850 | Direct |  |  | 27,850 | Direct |  |  | 27,850 |
| 6 | Clearing, Grading of Land | 36510 |  | 35,318 | Direct |  |  | 35,318 | Direct |  |  | 35,318 |
| 7 | Underground Conduit | 36600 |  | 20,692 | Direct |  |  | 20,692 | Direct |  |  | 20,692 |
| 8 | Underground Conductor, Devices | 36700 |  | 199,152 | Direct |  |  | 199,152 | Direct |  |  | 199,152 |
| 9 | Line Transformers | 36800 |  | 35,969 | Direct |  |  | 35,969 | Direct |  |  | 35,969 |
| 10 | Terminal CWIP W. Jefferson \& My | rsville |  | 162,583 | Direct |  |  | 162,583 | Direct |  |  | 162,583 |
| 11 | Structures, Improvements | 39010 |  | 9,521 | Direct |  |  | 9,521 | S\&W | 89.610\% |  | 8,531 |
| 12 | Totals |  | \$ | 628,918 |  |  | \$ | 599,566 |  |  | \$ | 594,527 |

Discussion:

To reflect accumulated depreciation on terminal treatment of post test year reliability projects anticipated to be completed prior to start of hearings.

|  | The Potomac Edison Company Maryland Distribution <br> Working Papers Supporting Adjustments 12 Months Ending December 31, 2022 <br> Adjustment No. 35 <br> Materials and Supplies Adjustment |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Line No. | Description | Reference Account | MD Distribution Amount |
|  | Column (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 1 | Distribution Inventory located in Maryland (excluding centralized |  |  |
| 2 | Allocation of Bethel Meters | 154 | 252,444 |
| 3 | Allocation of North Street Meters | 154 | 22,286 |
| 4 | Allocation of Connellsville Meters | 154 | 204,873 |
| 5 | Maryland Distribution Ending Inventory Value - 13 Mo. Avg. |  | \$ 13,191,398 |

Discussion:
Reflect 13-month average distribution inventory allocated to PE Maryland held by FE Service Company.

The Potomac Edison Company
Maryland Distribution
Working Papers Supporting Adjustments
12 Months Ending December 31, 2022
Adjustment No. 36
Cash Working Capital on Going-Level Adjustments

| Line <br> No. | Description | Electric Distribution |  |  | Going <br> Level Adjustments | Going Level Electric Distribution |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) |  | (2) |  | (3) |  | (4) |
| 1 | Operating Revenues | \$ | 138,842,885 |  |  | \$ | 138,842,885 |
| 2 | Operating Revenue Adjustments |  |  | \$ | - |  | - |
| 3 | Adjusted Operating Revenues |  |  |  |  | \$ | 138,842,885 |
| 4 | Operating \& Maintenance Expenses |  | 59,657,983 |  | $(3,002,598)$ | \$ | 56,655,385 |
| 5 | Taxes - Other |  | 30,563,131 |  | 44,187 |  | 30,607,318 |
| 6 | Income Taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Interest Expense |  | 15,395,076 |  | $(1,974,939)$ |  | 13,420,137 |
| 8 | Total | \$ | 105,616,191 | \$ | $(4,933,350)$ | \$ | 100,682,840 |
| 9 | Daily Cash Requirement (Line $8 / 365$ ) | \$ | 289,359 | \$ | $(13,516)$ | \$ | 275,843 |
| 10 | Revenue Lag minus Expense Lead (Days) |  | 11.760845 |  | 11.760845 |  | 11.760845 |
| 11 | Cash Requirement | \$ | 3,403,111 | \$ | $(158,960)$ | \$ | 3,244,151 |
| 12 | Change in Cash Requirement from going level adjustments |  |  | \$ | $(158,960)$ |  |  |
| Discussion: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To reflect the change in cash working capital requirement from the previously listed going level adjustments. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The Potomac Edison Company<br>Maryland Distribution<br>Working Papers Supporting Adjustments<br>12 Months Ending December 31, 2022

Adjustment No. 37
Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes on Terminal Treatment of Reliability Projects

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Line } \\ \text { No. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Description | Reference Account |  | Total <br> MD <br> Distrib |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) | (3) |  |
| 1 | Misc. Intangible Plant | 30300 | \$ | $(49,870)$ |
| 2 | Structures, Improvements | 36110 |  | $(7,505)$ |
| 3 | Station Equipment | 36200 |  | $(219,110)$ |
| 4 | Poles, Towers And Fixtures | 36400 |  | $(83,428)$ |
| 5 | Overhead Conductor, Devices | 36500 |  | $(432,748)$ |
| 6 | Clearing, Grading of Land | 36510 |  | $(4,368)$ |
| 7 | Underground Conduit | 36600 |  | $(35,460)$ |
| 8 | Underground Conductor, Devices | 36700 |  | $(594,314)$ |
| 9 | Line Transformers | 36800 |  | $(213,315)$ |
| 10 | Structures, Improvements | 39010 |  | (950) |
| 11 | Data Processing Equipment | 39120 |  | $(60,730)$ |
| 12 | Communication Equipment | 39700 |  | $(36,067)$ |
| 13 | Total |  | \$ | $(1,737,865)$ |

## Discussion:

To reflect accumulated deferred income taxes on terminal treatment of test year reliability projects.

## The Potomac Edison Company <br> Maryland Distribution <br> Working Papers Supporting Adjustments

Adjustment No. 38
Accum Deferred Income Taxes on Terminal Treatment of Reliability Projects - Post Test Year, 6-Months Ended June 2C


Discussion:

To reflect accumulated deferred income taxes on terminal treatment of post test year reliabiltiy projects.

The Potomac Edison Company
Maryland Distr bution
Working Papers Supporting Adjustments
12 Months Ending December 31, 2022

Adjustment No. 39a and 39b
Adjust to allocate share of Plant in Service on Service Company Books to MD Rate Base

| Line No. FERC Account |  | Net Plant in Service on Service Company books | 13 month Avg (Dec 2021 through Dec 2022) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Book Cost | Depr Reserve |  | Net Book Value |  |
| 1 | 30100 |  | Intangible plant - organizational | \$ | 49,344 | \$ | 49,344 | \$ | - |
| 2 | 30300 | Intangible plant - software |  | 542,813,167 |  | 412,772,931 |  | 130,040,236 |
| 3 | 38910 | Land and land rights |  | 187,282 |  | - |  | 187,282 |
| 4 | 39010 | Structures and Improvements (Buildings) |  | 49,124,866 |  | 32,167,777 |  | 16,957,088 |
| 5 | 39020 | Structure \& Improvements (grading, clearing, driveways, concrete, other outside) |  | 1,116,533 |  | 1,116,177 |  | 356 |
| 6 | 39030 | Leasehold Improvements |  | 28,919,388 |  | 12,428,023 |  | 16,491,365 |
| 7 | 39110 | Office Furniture and Fixtures |  | 15,072,135 |  | 10,658,498 |  | 4,413,637 |
| 8 | 39120 | Office Furniture and Fixtures - Information Systems |  | 154,561,518 |  | 45,178,252 |  | 109,383,266 |
| 9 | 39200 | Transportation equipment |  | 6,109,892 |  | 2,163,649 |  | 3,946,243 |
| 10 | 39300 | Stores equipment |  | 17,057 |  | 9,966 |  | 7,091 |
| 11 | 39400 | Tools, shop and garage equipment |  | 300,960 |  | 29,309 |  | 271,651 |
| 12 | 39500 | Laboratory equipment |  | 733,941 |  | 65,358 |  | 668,583 |
| 13 | 39600 | Power operated equipment |  | 438,758 |  | 210,190 |  | 228,568 |
| 14 | 39700 | Communication equipment |  | 154,355,193 |  | 63,707,125 |  | 90,648,068 |
| 15 | 39710 | Communication equipment - F beroptics |  | 46,361 |  | 37,240 |  | 9,121 |
| 16 | 39800 | Miscellanaeous equipment |  | 3,597,174 |  | 1,774,232 |  | 1,822,942 |
| 17 | 39910 | Asset Retirement Costs for General Plant |  | 40,721 |  | 30,941 |  | 9,780 |
| 18 |  | Total Service Company Plant in Service | \$ | 957,484,291 | \$ | 582,399,012 | \$ | 375,085,279 |
| 19 |  | 2022 ServCo Multi Factor-All - \% To Potomac Edison |  | 4.86\% |  | 4.86\% |  | 4.86\% |
| 20 |  | FE ServCo allocated to PE | \$ | 46,533,737 | \$ | \$ 28,304,592 | \$ | 18,229,145 |
| 21 |  | Jurisdictional Allocator GP01-allocate to MD |  | 60.90\% |  | 60.90\% |  | 60.90\% |
| 22 |  | FE ServCo allocated to PE-MD | \$ | 28,338,633 | \$ | \$ 17,237,246 | \$ | 11,101,388 |
| 23 |  | Distributon Allocator S\&W |  | 89.61\% |  | 89.61\% |  | 89.61\% |
| 24 |  | FE ServCo allocation to PE - MD Distribution Rate Base |  | 25,394,387 |  | 15,446,379 |  | 9,948,007 |

Discussion:
Adjustment adds an allocated share of Plant Assets that are booked to the Service Company but used by Potomac Edison to Potomac Edison Rate base.

This adjustment is sponsored by Witness S. M. Colflesh.

The Potomac Edison Company<br>Maryland Distribution<br>Working Papers Supporting Adjustments<br>12 Months Ending December 31, 2022

Adjustment No. 39c
Adjustment to Allocate Share of ADITs on Service Company Books to MD Rate Base


# The Potomac Edison Company Maryland Distribution <br> Working Papers Supporting Adjustments <br> 12 Months Ending December 31, 2022 

Adjustment No. 40
Covid-19 Regulatory Asset Adjustment

Total

| Line No. | Description | Reference Account | MD Distribution Amount |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) |  | (3) |
| 1 | Covid-19 Regulatory Asset at December 31, 2022 | 182.3 | \$ | 7,260,229 |
| 2 | Accumulated Amortization Mid Year Convention | 182.3 | \$ | 726,023 |
| 3 | Unamortized Balance to Rate Base |  | \$ | 6,534,206 |

Discussion:
Adjust rate base to add regulatory asset for Covid-19.
This adjustment is sponsored by Witness S. M. Colflesh.

The Potomac Edison Company<br>Maryland Distribution<br>Working Papers Supporting Adjustments<br>12 Months Ending December 31, 2022

Adjustment No. 41
Maryland Electric Vehicle Portfolio Program Regulatory Asset to Rate Base

| Line No. | Description | Reference Account | MD Distribution Amount |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) |  | (3) |
| 1 | Electric Vehicle Program Regulatory Asset at December 31 | 182.207 | \$ | 1,526,290 |
| 2 | Amortization Period in Years |  |  | 5 |
| 3 | Going Level Recovery in Rates | 407.3 | \$ | 305,258 |
| 4 | Accumulated Amortization Mid Year Convention |  | \$ | 152,629 |
| 5 | Unamortized Balance to Rate Base |  | \$ | 1,373,661 |
|  | Discussion: |  |  |  |
|  | Adjust rate base to add regulatory asset for Electric Vehicle | rogram. |  |  |
|  | This adjustment is sponsored by Witness H. E. Ward. |  |  |  |

The Potomac Edison Company Maryland Distribution
Working Papers Supporting Adjustments
12 Months Ending December 31, 2022

## Adjustment No. 42

Adjust Rate Base and Reserve to Remove Non-Eligible Items

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Line } \\ & \text { No. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Description R | Reference Account | Total Company Amount | MD <br> Alloc. <br> Factor | MD <br> Alloc. <br> Factor \% | Total MD | Distrib. <br> Alloc. <br> Factor |  | Total <br> MD <br> Distrib |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Column (1) | (2) | (3) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Non-Elig ble Amounts in 13 Mo Avg Plant in Service | 101 | \$ 211,135 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Adjustment to Remove Non-Eligible Amounts | 101 | \$ (211, 135) | GP01 | 60.90\% | \$ $(128,580)$ | S\&W | 89.61\% | \$(115,221) |
| 3 | Non-Elig ble Amounts in 13 Mo Avg Reserve | 108 | \$ $(22,102)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Adjustment to Remove Non-Eligible Amounts | 108 | \$ 22,102 | GP01 | 60.90\% | \$ 13,460 | S\&W | 89.61\% | \$ 12,062 |

Discussion:
Adjust rate base and reserve to remove non-eligible items in 13 month average that were removed from the books in September 2022.
This adjustment is sponsored by Company Witness T. M. Ashton.


Discussion:
Remove Regulatory Debits booked in test year for sponsorship refunds. These amounts relate to prior periods.
This adjustment is sponsored by Company Witness T. M. Ashton.

| Line No. | Adjustment Number | Description |  |  |  | Rate Base | Revenue Requirement |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\overline{\text { Column (1) }}$ | (2) | $\frac{\text { Income }}{}$ |  | (4) |  | (5) |  |
| 1 |  | Maryland Distribution Per Book Amounts | \$ | 26,321,010 | \$ | 647,618,240 |  |  |
| 2 |  | per book Revenue increase @ $7.54 \%$ |  |  |  |  | \$ | 32,070,061 |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  | Adjustments: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 1 | Salaries and Wages-Test Year |  | 255,884.83 |  |  |  | 264,128 |
| 6 | 2 | Salaries and Wages-2023 |  | 321,722.96 |  |  |  | 332,087 |
| 7 | 3 | Employee Savings Plan-Test Year |  | 7,676.54 |  |  |  | 7,924 |
| 8 | 4 | Employee Savings Plan-2023 |  | 9,415.48 |  |  |  | 9,719 |
| 9 | 5 | Storm Damage |  | $(55,153.99)$ |  |  |  | $(56,931)$ |
| 10 | 6 | Remove Advertising Expense |  | $(66,751.10)$ |  |  |  | $(68,901)$ |
| 11 | 7 | Increase Postage Expense |  | 46,132.41 |  |  |  | 47,619 |
| 12 | 8 | Commission Assessment Increase |  | 41,952.00 |  |  |  | 43,303 |
| 13 | 9 | Medical Insurance Expense |  | 58,033.79 |  |  |  | 59,903 |
| 14 | 10 | Group Life Insurance Expense |  | (543.38) |  |  |  | (561) |
| 15 | 11 | Pension/OPEB Expense MTM Related |  | (210,314.43) |  |  |  | $(217,090)$ |
| 16 | 12 | Pension/OPEB Expense Non-MTM Related |  | 1,172,567.45 |  |  |  | 1,210,342 |
| 17 | 13 | Rate Case Expense |  | 423,557.00 |  |  |  | 437,202 |
| 18 | 14 | O\&M Expense Recovered in Covid-19 Deferral |  | (2,263,319.27) |  |  |  | $(2,336,232)$ |
| 19 | 15 | Service Company Charges |  | (2,743,458.39) |  |  |  | $(2,831,839)$ |
| 20 | 16 | Depreciation Expense New Rates |  | 3,000,258 |  |  |  | 3,096,912 |
| 21 | 17 | Depreciation Expense on Test Year Reliability Projects |  | 596,217 |  |  |  | 615,424 |
| 22 | 18 | Projects |  | 594,527 |  |  |  | 613,680 |
| 23 | 19 | Rate Case Expense Amortization |  | $(11,152)$ |  |  |  | $(11,511)$ |
| 24 | 20 | Depr Expense on Service Company Alloc of Rate Base |  | 2,016,088 |  |  |  | 2,081,036 |
| 25 | 21 | Conservation Voltage Reduction (407.4) |  | $(33,050)$ |  |  |  | $(34,115)$ |
| 26 | 22 | Covid-19 Regulatory Credit Removal (407.4) |  | 2,263,319 |  |  |  | 2,336,232 |
| 27 | 23 | Covid-19 Regulatory Asset Amortization (407.3) |  | 1,452,046 |  |  |  | 1,498,824 |
| 28 | 24 | Electric Vehicle Regulatory Asset Amortization (407.3) |  | 305,258 |  |  |  | 315,092 |
| 29 | 25 | Electric Vehicle Regulatory Credit Removal (407.4) |  | 527,034 |  |  |  | 544,013 |
| 30 | 26 | Payroll Taxes Salaries and Wages-Test Year |  | 19,575 |  |  |  | 20,206 |
| 31 | 27 | Payroll Taxes Salaries and Wages-2023 |  | 24,612 |  |  |  | 25,405 |
| 32 | 28 | Interest Synchronization |  | $(543,454)$ |  |  |  | 773,927 |
| 33 | 29 | State Income Taxes |  | $(399,207)$ |  |  |  |  |
| 34 | 30 | Federal Income Taxes |  | $(932,331)$ |  |  |  |  |
| 35 | 31 | Reliability Projects in Test Year |  |  |  | 20,128,727 |  | 2,161,804 |
| 36 | 32 a | Reliability Projects Post Test Year |  |  |  | 19,214,522 |  | 2,063,619 |
| 37 | 32 b | Reliability Projects Test Year - CWIP |  |  |  | 7,779,093 |  | 835,466 |
| 38 | 33 | Accum Depreciation Test Year Reliability Projects |  |  |  | $(596,217)$ |  | $(64,033)$ |
| 39 | 34 | Accum Depreciation Post Test Year Reliability Projects |  |  |  | $(594,527)$ |  | $(63,852)$ |
| 40 | 35 | Materials and Supplies |  |  |  | 13,191,398 |  | 1,416,742 |
| 41 | 36 | Cash Working Capital |  |  |  | $(158,960)$ |  | $(17,072)$ |
| 42 | 37 | Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes Test Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Reliability Projects |  |  |  | $(1,737,865)$ |  | $(186,645)$ |
| 43 | 38 | Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes Post Test Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Reliability Projects |  |  |  | $(2,991,255)$ |  | $(321,258)$ |
| 44 | 39 a | Service Company Allocation of Plant in Service |  |  |  | 25,394,387 |  | 2,727,330 |
| 45 | 39 b | Service Company Allocation of Reserve |  |  |  | $(15,446,379)$ |  | (1,658,925) |
| 46 | 39 c | Service Company Allocation of ADIT |  |  |  | $(1,080,653)$ |  | $(116,061)$ |
| 47 | 40 | Covid-19 Regulatory Asset |  |  |  | 6,534,206 |  | 701,767 |
| 48 | 41 | EV Regulatory Asset |  |  |  | 1,373,661 |  | 147,530 |
| 49 | 42 a | Non-eligible amounts removed from Plant in Service |  |  |  | $(115,221)$ |  | $(12,375)$ |
| 50 | 42 b | Non-eligible amounts removed from Reserve |  |  |  | 12,062 |  | 1,295 |
| 51 | 43 | Accounting Adjustments |  | $(938,317)$ |  |  |  | $(968,545)$ |
| 52 |  | Adjustment Totals |  |  | \$ | 70,906,978 | \$ | 15,422,587 |
| 53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54 |  | TOTAL REVENUE DEFICIENCY |  |  |  |  | \$ | 47,492,648 |
| 55 |  | Total Rate Base |  |  | \$ | 718,525,219 |  |  |


| Conversion to Revenue Requirement Factor Development |  | Factor |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Rates | 1.0085 |
| Uncollectibles | $0.8437 \%$ | 1.0293 |
| Maryland Gross Receipt Tax | $2.0000 \%$ | 1.0322 |
| Regulatory Assessment | $0.2773 \%$ | 1.1250 |
| State Income Tax | $8.2500 \%$ | 1.4241 |
| Federal Income Tax | $21.0000 \%$ |  |
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## BEFORE THE

## PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF MARYLAND

| In the Matter of the Application | $*$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Of The Potomac Edison Company | $*$ |  |
| For Adjustments to its Retail | $*$ | Case No. |
| Rates for the Distribution of | $*$ |  |
| Electric Energy | $*$ |  |

## DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

HEATHER E. WARD

Concerning: Specific Ratemaking Adjustments

## I. INTRODUCTION

## Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is Heather E. Ward, and my business address is 5001 NASA Blvd, Fairmont, West Virginia, 26554.

## Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?

A. I am employed by FirstEnergy Service Company as an Analyst for the Rates and Regulatory Affairs Department - West Virginia/Maryland. I report to the Manager, Rates and Regulatory Affairs, and my responsibilities include the development, coordination, preparation and presentation of retail tariffs, and the development of retail electric rates, rules, and regulations. My time is devoted to tasks performed for The Potomac Edison Company ("PE or "Company") and Monongahela Power Company.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.

A. I am a graduate of West Virginia University, where I earned a Bachelor of Science in Political Science, and I am a retired Officer of the United States Air Force, having served 25 years in the Air National Guard in Charleston, West Virginia. I have over 25 years of experience with FirstEnergy Service Company or its predecessor companies, and have held positions of Representative, Customer Service; Supervisor, Customer Service; Analyst, Revenue Operations; Analyst, Customer Service Analytics; and my current position of Analyst, Rates.

## Q. HAVE YOU TESTIFIED IN RATE PROCEEDINGS BEFORE REGULATORY

 COMMISSIONS?A. Yes, I have testified in proceedings before the Public Service Commission of West Virginia.

## II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY

## Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to sponsor several of the adjustments to the 2022 test year data provided in Exhibit JAS-1 from Company witness Soltis. I will discuss the following specific adjustments:

Adjustment No. 5 Adjusts test year expenses for storm damages to a five-year average going level.

Adjustment No. 6 Removes non-eligible advertising expenses from the test year.

Adjustment No. $7 \quad$ Adjusts postage expense to reflect changes in United States Postal Service ("USPS") postage rates.

Adjustment No. 8 Reflects going-level changes to the regulatory commission assessment expense.

Adjustment No. 13 Adjusts rate case expenses in the test year to recover the amounts over a three-year period.

Adjustment No. 16 Adjusts depreciation expense for new depreciation rates.
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Adjustment No. 19 Reflects removal of prior rate case expense amortization.
Adjustment No. 24 Adjusts expense to add amortization of the regulatory asset for Electric Vehicles ("EV").

Adjustment No. 25 Reflects the removal of the EV deferral from the test year.
Adjustment No. 41 Reflects an increase in rate base for the EV regulatory asset.

## III. RATEMAKING ADJUSTMENTS

## Q. HOW HAS THE TEST YEAR DATA BEEN ADJUSTED?

A. The Company has made going-level and pro-forma adjustments to the 2022 test year to properly reflect the level of ongoing revenues and expenses of the Company for use in the establishment of future rates.

Going-level adjustments are ratemaking adjustments made to historical financial data to reflect known and measurable changes to the historical test year data. These adjustments are necessary to provide an ongoing picture of the financial status of the Company to reflect the cost of providing service after the time that new distribution rates are placed into effect. Pro-forma adjustments reflect the effect of the proposed rates on revenues and any related expense changes.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NO. 5.

A. Adjustment No. 5 is a going-level adjustment that modifies the test year operation and maintenance ("O\&M") expense level for storm damage expense. The adjustment compares the five-year annual average of storm-related expenses to the test year, with an
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adjustment made so that the test year expense is equal to the five-year average. The Company used a five-year average since storm expense can be a volatile category of O\&M in which a particular year may not be representative of an average year. This adjustment effectively normalizes the storm expense based upon a five-year average. In conjunction with this adjustment, the Company is also proposing a new storm deferral, as explained by Company witness Valdes.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NO. 6.

A. Adjustment No. 6 is a going-level adjustment that removes advertising expense associated with promotional, community affairs, and institutional advertising from 2022 Maryland electric distribution expenses in accordance with Code of Maryland Regulations ("COMAR") Section 20.07.04.08(F). ${ }^{1}$ The remaining advertising expenses are informational and are eligible for recovery from customers and included in the test year consistent with COMAR Section 20.07.04.08(C). ${ }^{2}$

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NO. 7.

A. Adjustment No. 7 is a going-level adjustment that increases the test year customer accounts postage costs to reflect the USPS postage rate increases effective in July 2022 and January 2023. This adjustment was calculated by first determining the percentage of increase over

[^56]the average cost of postage of the time period from January 2022 through June 2022, and then multiplying the postage increase percentage by the test year expense prior to the postage rate increase. The adjustment also includes the incremental increase in the number of customers enrolled in ebill in the test year. This is calculated by multiplying the incremental cumulative sum of ebill enrollments by the new postage rates. The result of this calculation is a reduction to the adjustment of the postage expense.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NO. 8.

A. Adjustment No. 8 is a going-level adjustment that increases the test year level of regulatory commission assessment expense to annualize the increase in Maryland Public Service Commission ("Commission") assessments that was effective July 1, 2022.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NO. 13 AND NO. 19.

A. Adjustment No. 13 reflects an increment for rate case expenses reflective of one-third of actual and projected costs of the Company's rate case. One-third of the cost is representative of one year of recovery of a requested three-year recovery amortization. These expenses include charges directly related to the rate case for items such as studies for depreciation, overall cost of capital, lead/lag, and class cost of service; legal fees; customer notifications; etc. These expenses are not normally incurred, so it is necessary for the Company to make a going-level adjustment to recover these costs over a reasonable period of time. Additionally, this adjustment includes the recovery of costs for an EV
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benefit cost analysis ${ }^{3}$ and costs incurred from the Company's prior depreciation rate case. ${ }^{4}$ The Commission has in prior rate cases allowed the recovery of these expenses to be collected over a similar time period of three years.

Adjustment No. 19 removes the 2018 rate case amortization from the test year. Recovery of the regulatory asset related to rate case expenses was granted over three years beginning March 23, 2019, in the Company's last Maryland distribution base rate case, Case No. 9490. As of March 23, 2022, recovery is complete, and no further amortization should be reflected in the test year for these expenses.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NO. 16.

A. Adjustment No. 16 increases the depreciation expense related to proposed changes in depreciation rates as filed in this case. The increase in depreciation expense was calculated by applying the current and proposed depreciation rates to the 13-month average balance of Accounts 101 and 106 for the test year. This adjustment also includes the effect of transferring the subtransmission assets from transmission Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") accounts to distribution FERC accounts since such assets are operated as part of the distribution system, as explained by Company witness Colflesh, and are not collected as part of PE's transmission rates. The justification and support for the proposed new depreciation rates is provided in the testimony and exhibits of Company witness Spanos. Due to limitations in the Company's plant accounting system where mid-
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month depreciation rate changes cannot be accommodated, the change in depreciation rates will become effective beginning the first full calendar month following Commission order in this proceeding. ${ }^{5}$

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN ADJUSTMENT NO. 24, ADJUSTMENT NO. 25, and

 ADJUSTMENT NO. 41.A. In Commission Order No. 88997 in Case No. 9478, the Commission rejected the Company's proposal to recover EV Portfolio Program costs through a surcharge and instead directed PE to seek cost recovery through traditional ratemaking in a future rate case proceeding. ${ }^{6}$ Such authorized cost recovery consisted of: (1) EV Portfolio Program O\&M costs (excluding depreciation) to be deferred to a regulatory asset; (2) the regulatory asset would be amortized over a five-year period and earn a return after the balance is incorporated into rate base as part of a base rate case proceeding; and (3) capital assets would be included in rate base and depreciated over their useful lives. ${ }^{7}$ Adjustment No. 24 adds expense to reflect recovery of the first year amortization of the regulatory asset for the Company's EV Portfolio Program costs. Adjustment No. 25 removes the regulatory credits related to the deferral of the EV Portfolio Program expenses in the test year. Adjustment No. 41 increases plant-in-service for the regulatory asset related to the EV Portfolio Program and increases accumulated depreciation for amortization of first year recovery of the regulatory asset, using a mid-year convention, with the result that the
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unamortized balance of the regulatory asset is included in the Company's rate base.

## IV. CONCLUSION

Q. DOES THIS COMPLETE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE?
A. Yes, it does.
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## I. INTRODUCTION

## Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is Tracy M. Ashton, and my business address is 76 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio 44308.

## Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?

A. I am Assistant Controller, Corporate of FirstEnergy Corp. ("FirstEnergy") and a number of its subsidiaries.
Q. PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS.
A. I have been Assistant Controller - Corporate since May 2019. From May 2008 to May 2019, I served in various positions within the finance organization including Manager of Financial Reporting and Technical Accounting and Director of Business Planning and Performance, prior to being promoted into my current role. From 2003 to 2008, I was with Deloitte \& Touche, LLP where I served in various client service positions.

I received a Bachelor of Business Administration degree in Accounting from Kent State University. I am a licensed certified public accountant in Ohio.
Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED TESTIMONY BEFORE ANY REGULATORY COMMISSION?
A. Yes, in addition to this testimony, I have provided expert testimony before the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio and the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities.
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR DUTIES AS ASSISTANT CONTROLLER, CORPORATE.
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A. I am responsible for ensuring the accounting records of FirstEnergy and its subsidiaries are maintained in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles ("GAAP") and regulatory requirements, including the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") Uniform System of Accounts ("USofA"). In addition, I am responsible for disbursements to vendors; external financial reporting; accounting research in connection with proposed business transactions; and cost analysis and accounting classification of construction projects.

## Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. The purpose of my testimony is two-fold. The first section explains and supports the level of pension and other post-employment benefits ("OPEB") expense that The Potomac Edison Company ("PE" or Company") is requesting for recovery in this base rate case filed with the Maryland Public Service Commission ("Commission"), including the impact of certain accounting adjustments and to propose a mechanism to normalize pension and OPEB expense. The second section of my testimony explains the services provided and costs charged to PE in the test year by the FirstEnergy Service Company ("FESC") under the FESC Service Agreement, as well as the refund of other costs previously charged to PE.

## Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR TESTIMONY.

A. The first part of my testimony discusses the following adjustments to pension and OPEB expense: (1) remove the pension and OPEB mark-to-market ("MTM") amount from the 2022 test year recognized by PE under GAAP and FERC USoA; and (2) include, for ratemaking purposes, the recalculated amount of the requested pension and OPEB expense
by amortizing the net accumulated actuarial loss over future periods, consistent with the Delayed Recognition Methodology (also referred to as the "Smoothing Mechanism"), as applied for ratemaking purposes in the 2018 distribution base rate case and approved by the Commission in Order No. 89072 in Case No. 9490. However, as discussed herein, PE is also requesting that test year non-MTM pension and OPEB expense be adjusted to reflect the most recent five-year average to mitigate (or smooth) a portion of the volatility in the expenses for purposes of setting PE's distribution base rates.

To support the proposed level of pension and OPEB expense to be recovered in base rates, my testimony will provide background on the accounting for pension and OPEB costs under GAAP, including the two accounting methods prescribed by GAAP for the accounting of actuarial gains and losses - one of the components of pension and OPEB costs. I also will provide support for the adjustments necessary to determine the appropriate level of test year pension and OPEB expense for PE.

Lastly, with respect to pension and OPEB expense, year-to-year fluctuations in annual earnings, and in some years losses, on the pension and OPEB assets are becoming more material with respect to the Company's income statement and financial performance. These year-to-year market fluctuations also can materially impact test year pension and OPEB expense and customer rates. Therefore, PE is seeking to implement a mechanism to defer the annual difference between the annual pension and OPEB expense calculated using the delayed recognition method for ratemaking purposes, and the approved pension and OPEB expense for rate treatment in future base rate cases.

The second part of my testimony discusses the services provided and costs charged to PE under the FESC Service Agreement. I will discuss the process for charging the FESC costs for those services to PE and its affiliates within the FirstEnergy system. In this regard, I will also review the manner by which FESC fairly and equitably charges the costs for its services directly and/or indirectly to PE, FirstEnergy, and its affiliates that receive such services, including the cost allocation methodologies for charging indirect costs. I will also describe a change in FirstEnergy's method to capitalize costs allocated to its subsidiaries by FESC, including the impact to historical costs. In addition, I explain how certain transactions that were improperly classified, misallocated, or lacked proper supporting documentation regarding certain vendors, were corrected as well as summarize the proactive review performed by FirstEnergy of certain non-operating or non-recoverable costs. I will also describe the controls in place to ensure proper allocation of costs to PE by FESC, including the reinforcement of direct charging policies, training employees on time charging, enhanced procedures on invoice processing, and review of detailed items billed to PE by FESC.

## II. PENSION ACCOUNTING AND RATEMAKING BACKGROUND

## Q. HOW ARE PENSION AND OPEB COSTS DERIVED UNDER GAAP?

A. Pension and OPEB costs or credits generally consist of five components:

1. Service cost - Represents the actuarial present value of benefits attributed by the pension and OPEB plans' benefit formula to services performed by employees during the reporting period.
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2. Interest cost - Annual interest on the present value of the benefit obligations (liability) at the beginning of the year.
3. Estimated return on plan assets - Represents the estimated return on plan investments by applying the expected long-term rate of return to beginning-of-year plan asset balances.
4. Prior service cost amortization - Represents amortization, over the average remaining service period of employees, of changes to the benefit obligations due to plan amendments.
5. Actuarial gains and losses - Represents the net gain or loss resulting from a change in the value of plan assets and benefit obligations due to experience which differs from assumptions used to estimate the value of end-of-year plan asset and benefit obligation balances. Such differences can be related to the return on plan assets, changes in the discount rate used to calculate the present value of benefit obligations, and other actuarial assumptions such as mortality rates. As further described below, companies either recognize actuarial gains and losses immediately in earnings ("mark-to-market accounting") or through delayed recognition whereby actuarial gains and losses are recorded in accumulated other comprehensive income ("AOCI"), a component of equity, and amortized into earnings over a future period.

As noted in the description of cost component 5 above, companies have the option to recognize the earnings effect of actuarial gains and losses immediately or through delayed recognition. For companies that apply immediate recognition (mark-to-market accounting), the full amount of actuarial gains and losses are recognized in earnings
immediately. For companies that apply delayed recognition, actuarial gains and losses are captured in AOCI and amortized over a future period. Therefore, the difference in the two "options" is simply a matter of timing with respect to earnings recognition, with the delayed recognition method producing a less volatile level of gains or losses.

## Q. WHAT ARE ACTUARIAL GAINS AND LOSSES UNDER GAAP?

A. As noted in cost component 5 above, actuarial gains and losses represent the net gain or loss resulting from a change in the value of plan assets and benefit obligations due to experience which differs from assumptions used to estimate the end-of-year plan asset and benefit obligation balances.

In the case of plan assets, the difference between the actual return on plan investments during the year compared to the estimated return on plan investments (cost component 3, above) represents an actuarial gain (if the actual return is higher than the estimated return) or actuarial loss (if the actual return is lower than the estimated return). This component simply adjusts the expected return on plan assets in a given year to the actual return on plan assets in that year.

In the case of benefit obligations, a change in the assumed discount rate that measures the benefit obligation at the beginning of the year to the end of the year will result in an actuarial gain (if the actual discount rate is higher at the end of the year than the assumed discount rate at the beginning of the year) or an actuarial loss (if the actual discount rate at the end of the year is lower than the assumed discount rate at the beginning of the year). The present value of benefit obligations may also be affected by changes in assumed future payouts due to mortality experience that differ from assumed mortality
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rates, changes in assumed wage increases (in the case of pension costs), changes in assumed health care inflation rates (in the case of OPEB benefits) and other actuarial assumptions. If the present value of benefit obligations increases due to changes in actuarial assumptions, an actuarial loss will be incurred; conversely, if the present value of benefit obligations decreases due to actuarial assumption changes, an actuarial gain will be recognized. Actuarial gains or losses on plan assets are netted against actuarial gains or losses on benefit obligations to determine the net actuarial gain or loss for the plans for a given year.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN PE'S BOOK ACCOUNTING FOR PENSION AND OPEB

 EXPENSE.A. PE's test year pension and OPEB expense is calculated in accordance with GAAP. In December of each year, or whenever a plan is determined to qualify for remeasurement, FirstEnergy and its subsidiaries (including PE) record actuarial gains or losses on their pension and OPEB plans to earnings through a MTM adjustment (immediate recognition).

## Q. WHEN ARE PENSION/OPEB COSTS SET FOR THE YEAR?

A. FirstEnergy (including PE) recognizes actuarial gains and losses for its pension and OPEB plans in December of each year, or whenever a plan is determined to qualify for remeasurement. The remaining components of pension and OPEB costs, including service costs, interest cost on obligations, expected return on plan assets, and amortization of prior service costs, are set at the beginning of each calendar year and recorded on a monthly basis. Changes in asset performance and discount rates will not impact these costs during the year, however, future years could be impacted by changes in the market. Pension and

OPEB expense calculated at the beginning of the year is the monthly cost, net of amounts capitalized.

## ADJUSTMENTS TO PENSION AND OPEB EXPENSE

Q. WHAT ADJUSTMENTS HAVE BEEN MADE TO PENSION AND OPEB EXPENSE?
A. Effective December 31, 2011, FirstEnergy and its subsidiaries (including PE) adopted MTM accounting (immediate recognition) for their pension and OPEB plans ("Accounting Change"), which is a preferable method of accounting under GAAP. As a result of the Accounting Change, PE records a MTM adjustment for actuarial gains or losses immediately to earnings in December of each year, or whenever a plan is determined to qualify for a remeasurement.

However, for ratemaking purposes in this distribution base rate filing, PE has removed the effect of this MTM adjustment from GAAP pension and OPEB expense and replaced it with actuarial gains or losses calculated under the delayed recognition (or "smoothed") methodology. This calculation is consistent with the manner in which PE calculated pension/OPEB costs in its last distribution base rate case, which was approved by the Commission in Order No. 89072 in Case No. 9490.
Q. HOW WERE THE ADJUSTMENTS AND TEST YEAR PENSION AND OPEB EXPENSE CALCULATED?
A. There are several steps to the calculation. First, the fiscal year 2022 net actuarial loss recorded by PE is subtracted from the per-books level of expense. Then, under my
direction, the Company's actuary calculated the amount of amortization of the accumulated net actuarial loss that would have been included in pension and OPEB expense under the delayed recognition methodology. An adjustment was then made representing the amount of amortization of the accumulated net actuarial loss calculated under the delayed recognition methodology. This adjustment is listed as Adjustment No. 11 and provided in Exhibit JAS-2 to the direct testimony of Company witness Soltis.

Additionally, the Company has included an adjustment that averages the non-MTM pension and OPEB expenses for the past five years ending December 31, 2022. Similar to the MTM adjustment, this adjustment for non-MTM pension and OPEB expense effectively smooths the costs over a historical period to determine an average level to include for ratemaking purposes. This adjustment is listed as Adjustment No. 12 and provided in Exhibit JAS-2 to the direct testimony of Company witness Soltis.

## NORMALIZATION OF PENSION AND OPEB EXPENSE

## Q. WHY IS PE SEEKING APPROVAL OF A MECHANISM TO NORMALIZE PENSION/OPEB EXPENSE ("PON MECHANISM")

A. FirstEnergy has a qualified pension plan with a total qualified Projected Benefit Obligation for both active employees and retirees of approximately $\$ 8.4$ billion and qualified pension assets totaling $\$ 6.7$ billion, as of year-end 2022. Over the past 10 years, FirstEnergy has contributed $\$ 3.4$ billion to this qualified pension plan, achieving a funded ratio of approximately 79\% for FirstEnergy's qualified pension plan as of December 31, 2022.

PE's portion of the qualified pension plan's Projected Benefit Obligation for both active employees and retirees is approximately $\$ 190$ million and PE's portion of the qualified pension assets is $\$ 218$ million, as of year-end 2022. Over the past 10 years, PE has contributed $\$ 73$ million to the qualified pension plan, achieving a funding ratio of approximately 115\%. PE also maintains an OPEB plan with a Projected Benefit Obligation for both active employees and retirees of approximately \$13 million and assets totaling \$29 million, as of year-end 2022. The funded ratio was $220 \%$ at the end of 2022 .

The Company asserts that these benefit plans are an important part of the total compensation package which attracts and retains a skilled workforce. However, the annual fluctuations in investment performance can become significant in the context of PE's income statement and overall financial performance. Therefore, the Company is seeking to moderate the impacts to its income statement from the impacts of the investment performance of pension/OPEB assets due to market fluctuations, which are outside of the Company's control. The PON Mechanism also may moderate the impacts on customers' rates from market fluctuations as well.

## Q. HOW DOES THE PON MECHANISM WORK?

A. As previously explained, PE will calculate pension and OPEB expense under the Delayed Recognition (or Smoothing) Methodology. The pension/OPEB expense ultimately approved by the Commission in this proceeding sets the expense included in distribution base rates ("Approved Pension/OPEB Expense"). For each calendar year following the conclusion of the base rate case (i.e., on or after the rate effective date), PE will calculate the annual pension/OPEB expense ("Annual Expense") under the Delayed Recognition

Methodology and compare that expense to the Approved Pension/OPEB Expense from its most recent base rate case. To the extent that the Annual Expense is less than the Approved Pension/OPEB Expense, customers will be provided the benefit of the reduction in the Annual Expense and the Company will defer a regulatory liability for $100 \%$ of the difference between Annual Expense and Approved Pension/OPEB Expense. To the extent that the Annual Expense is greater than the Approved Pension/OPEB Expense, the Company will defer a regulatory asset for $90 \%$ of the difference between the Annual Expense and the Approved Pension/OPEB Expense. Therefore, when the Annual Expense is greater than the Approved Pension/OPEB Expense, customers will also benefit from a $10 \%$ reduction in the amount deferred. The net amounts deferred for each calendar year will accumulate until the next base rate case, where the Company will request and the Commission will decide on an appropriate amortization and recovery or refund period for the regulatory asset or liability.

## Q. WILL THE RECOVERY/REFUND OF AMOUNTS RELATED TO THE PON MECHANISM DEFERRAL BE IN ADDITION TO APPROVED PENSION/OPEB EXPENSE?

A. Yes. The Company would recover its pension/OPEB expense and, in addition, seek to refund, or recover, the PON Mechanism deferral balance at its next base rate case. The Company would provide a credit to customers, in the instance where the deferred amount is a regulatory liability, or collect from customers, in the instance where the deferred amount is a regulatory asset, the amortization of the PON Mechanism deferral through future base rates.

## Q. HOW DOES THE PROPOSED PON MECHANISM BENEFIT CUSTOMERS?

A. Fluctuations in pension and OPEB costs are expected to normalize or offset over the longterm. However, in the short-term, market trends or corrections result in pension and OPEB costs that may not be representative of the actual long-term cost of providing these benefits to active employees and retirees. Often after a correction in the markets, for example the events that occurred in 2022, there is some near-term rebound. As this rebound occurs, pension and OPEB expense will decrease as market performance of the pension and OPEB assets improves. Using this scenario as an example, should pension and OPEB expense be set for ratemaking purposes at the time of one of these market correction events, the cost that customers would be paying for pension and OPEB expense would not reflect the nearterm recovery in the markets and, for this period, would be greater than the amount that would need to be recovered to compensate the Company for its pension and OPEB expense. Again, because of the size of the pension and OPEB assets, these amounts year-to-year can be material. The PON Mechanism would accumulate the changes in Annual Expense as compared to the Approved Pension/OPEB Expense and ensure that customers were credited for any reductions in pension and OPEB expense as compared to Approved Pension/OPEB Expense and only paid $90 \%$ of any increases in pension and OPEB expense as compared to Approved Pension/OPEB Expense - the result being that customers pay less than the Company's cost to provide these benefits to its employees.

## Q. HOW DOES THE PROPOSED PON MECHANISM BENEFIT THE COMPANY?

A. Under the PON Mechanism, PE would defer credits or expenses in a regulatory asset on its books, based on the difference between Approved Pension/OPEB Expense and the

Annual Expense in each calendar year following the conclusion of the base rate case and the effective date of base rates implemented as a result of same. In years where the market performance of the pension and OPEB assets was less than expected, the deferral of $90 \%$ of the increase in pension and OPEB expense (as compared to the Approved Pension/OPEB Expense) would reduce the volatility on PE's income statement and financial performance.
Q. DOESN'T THE DELAYED RECOGNITION METHODOLOGY ALREADY PROVIDE FOR SMOOTHING OF IMPACTS RELATED TO PENSION/OPEB ASSET INVESTMENT PERFORMANCE?
A. For customers, yes. Customers benefit from the smoothing aspects of the Delayed Recognition Methodology. However, because pension and OPEB expense is reset only during a base rate case proceeding, it does not capture fluctuations in pension and OPEB expense between base rate cases, which have become more significant with the growth in pension and OPEB assets over time. PE contends that fluctuations in investment performance are significant enough between base rate cases to warrant deferral treatment to mitigate the impacts to PE's income statement and financial performance, and to further mitigate volatility in customers' rates.

## Q. WHY SHOULD THE COMMISSION APPROVE THE PON MECHANISM AT THIS TIME?

A. This is somewhat of an emerging issue for utilities with large pension and OPEB assets and obligations. Because the Projected Benefit Obligation continues to grow as utilities continue to offer these benefits to its active employees and retirees, the corresponding assets must also continue to increase to satisfy these benefit obligations. As a result, the year-to-year fluctuations in annual earnings, and losses in some years, on the pension and OPEB assets as well as the impact of interest costs and volatility in the discount rate utilized to measure benefit plan obligations, are all becoming more material with respect to the Company's income statement and financial performance. Further, the year-to-year market fluctuations also can materially impact test year pension and OPEB expense and, therefore, customer rates. Because of these increasing impacts, PE requests that the Commission consider a deferral mechanism, such as the proposed PON Mechanism, that provides some offset for the utility to downside market performance of the pension and OPEB assets in years when it occurs and also ensures that customers pay no more than the cost of these benefits, which in the case of the proposed PON Mechanism, will result in costs to customers that are less than the cost of these benefits.

## III. FESC RELATIONSHIPS, CHARGES AND ALLOCATIONS

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE FIRSTENERGY AND ITS CONSOLIDATED SUBSIDIARIES.

## BACKGROUND

 SUBSIDIARIES.A. FirstEnergy is a regulated utility that, through its subsidiary companies, primarily owns and operates regulated businesses that are involved in the generation, transmission, and distribution of electricity.

FirstEnergy's regulated business is comprised of ten regulated electric companies that serve customers in Maryland, West Virginia, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York. FirstEnergy's wholly-owned regulated electric companies (The Potomac

Edison Company, Monongahela Power Company, Jersey Central Power \& Light Company, Metropolitan Edison Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Ohio Edison Company, Pennsylvania Power Company, The Toledo Edison Company, and West Penn Power Company) serve approximately six million customers in the Midwest and Mid-Atlantic regions, covering 65,000 square miles across six states. FirstEnergy also has majority ownership in three regulated independent transmission businesses, which have approximately 24,000 miles of high-voltage lines and two regional transmission operation centers within the PJM Interconnection, LLC ("PJM") region. PJM is the regional transmission organization that coordinates the movement of wholesale electricity in all or parts of 13 states and the District of Columbia. ${ }^{1}$

## Q. IN ADDITION TO ITS REGULATED BUSINESS, DOES FIRSTENERGY ALSO HAVE UNREGULATED BUSINESSES?

A. FirstEnergy has limited unregulated business. After completion of the FirstEnergy Solutions and subsidiaries ("FES"), and FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company ("FENOC") bankruptcy (filed March 31, 2018, with emergence February 27, 2020) and the transfer of the competitive Pleasants Power Station in 2020, FirstEnergy completed its exit from non-regulated generation production. Upon the completion of FES's and FENOC's emergence from bankruptcy as a fully separate non-affiliated entity (Energy

[^59]Harbor), the unregulated business now comprises less than 1\% of FirstEnergy's gross plant assets.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE ROLE OF FESC WITHIN FIRSTENERGY.

A. FESC is a centralized service provider formed for the purpose of providing administrative, management, operations support, and other services to FirstEnergy and its affiliated companies. It has been long understood ${ }^{2}$ that providing the broad array of services described herein throughout a holding company system such as the FirstEnergy System, by and through a centralized mutual service company, such as FESC, is more efficient and less costly than providing, managing, and staffing such services at each individual associate company.

The FirstEnergy System is also able to take advantage of its economies of scale to more efficiently utilize its resources by providing such services from centralized groups within FESC. For instance, among other things, FESC has a greater degree of bargaining power with suppliers than would FirstEnergy and each of its associate companies negotiating individually, because FESC negotiates, where appropriate, on behalf of the overall FirstEnergy System.
Q. PLEASE BE MORE SPECIFIC ABOUT THE TYPES OF SERVICES CENTRALLY PROVIDED BY FESC TO FIRSTENERGY AND ITS ASSOCIATE COMPANIES.

[^60]A. FESC provides various corporate, managerial, and administrative support services to FirstEnergy and its associate companies, including PE, in the following areas: executive management, accounting and tax, investor relations, corporate responsibility and communications, treasury, risk, rates and regulatory affairs, strategy, planning and business performance, supply chain, human resources and corporate services, legal, ethics and compliance, internal auditing, corporate affairs and community involvement, compliance and regulated services, external affairs, information technology and corporate security, transmission, utility operations, safety and human performance, operations, utility services, construction and design services, transformation, competitive products and services, customer engagement, customer care and customer policy and solutions. ${ }^{3}$

A full list and description of the services provided by FESC are set forth in Exhibit A to the Service Agreement (as defined below) that is attached hereto as Exhibit TMA-1 to my testimony.

## Q. DOES FESC PERFORM UTILITY OPERATIONS SERVICES FOR PE OR ANY OTHER OF THE FIRSTENERGY UTILITY COMPANIES?

A. Although FESC provides utility operations-related support services, it is important to emphasize that FESC, generally, does not perform the "operations" services, which are, instead, performed by the FirstEnergy utility companies themselves, including PE. One exception to this, however, is in vegetation management, which is centrally managed at FESC for all the entities, such as PE, which engage in such work.

[^61]
## FESC COST ACCOUNTING

## Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH FESC'S BOOKS AND RECORDS AND HOW THEY ARE MAINTAINED?

A. Yes, I am. The books and records of FESC are maintained in accordance with the FERC USofA and GAAP.

## Q. CAN YOU PLEASE PROVIDE AN OVERVIEW OF HOW FESC ACCOUNTS, AND

 CHARGES, FOR THE COSTS OF ITS SERVICES?A. Yes. FESC renders services to FirstEnergy and its associate companies at cost. The full costs of the services provided by FESC are either directly or indirectly charged to FirstEnergy and its associate companies (including PE). Some FESC costs are directly charged to a particular company, such as PE, because those costs are related to services performed solely for PE. An example of such a direct charge is the charge for economic development, where a group of FESC employees based in Maryland provide economic development services exclusively for PE. Each of those employees effectively directly charges his or her time and expenses to PE.

Other FESC costs are indirectly charged when the costs are not directly chargeable to a single associate company because the services benefit multiple associate companies, and the particular costs of the service is not identified to any individual associate company or companies. One example of such indirectly charged costs is an employee's work associated with the execution of the monthly financial close in the FirstEnergy SAP Enterprise Resource Planning system ("SAP"), which is FirstEnergy's comprehensive system-wide management software system. Such an employee's time would be indirectly charged to FirstEnergy and its associate companies using cost allocation methodologies that I discuss herein.

As I will further explain, the processes for accounting for, and charging, FESC costs, including the cost allocation methodologies for charging indirect charges, are integrated into SAP.

## Q. PLEASE FURTHER CLARIFY WHAT YOU MEAN BY "DIRECTLY CHARGED."

A. When I say that a cost is "directly charged," I am using that terminology to convey that the time and expenses associated with the service are charged directly to the identifiable associate company for which the service is being rendered. The costs of services are charged directly to the associate company receiving the services or for a particular transaction.
Q. PLEASE FURTHER CLARIFY WHAT YOU MEAN BY "INDIRECTLY CHARGED."
A. When I say that a cost is "indirectly charged," I am using that terminology to convey that the charges are not specifically directly charged to a single associate company. In such cases, one could also say that such cost is "allocated" or "charged on an allocated basis." While these terms can be used interchangeably, I have attempted to be consistent in using the term "indirectly charged" to simplify the distinction between such charges and those that are directly charged. For instance, it is sometimes said that one cost is "directly charged" while another cost is "indirectly allocated." This combination of terms may create confusion that I am hoping and attempting to avoid.

## Q. ARE THE TERMS "DIRECTLY CHARGED" AND "INDIRECTLY CHARGED" THE SAME AS "DIRECT COSTS" AND "INDIRECT COSTS"?

A. No. The former terms are methods of charging. The latter terms are types of costs. Since I have explained the former terms, I will also explain the latter terms.

Direct costs are costs that can be specifically identified with a particular service performed for an associate company. Costs incidental or related to direct items are also classified as direct costs. Direct costs may be directly charged if reasonably identifiable to a particular recipient associate company. For example, FirstEnergy Corp.'s Board of Director fees are directly charged to FirstEnergy Corp., with no other affiliate bearing the expense.

Indirect costs are costs of a general overhead nature such as support costs that cannot be identified with a particular service. This includes but is not limited to overhead costs (i.e., payroll, stores handling, construction), administrative and general expenses, and various payroll taxes. Costs incidental or related to indirect items are also classified as indirect costs. Indirect costs may be directly charged if reasonably identifiable to a particular recipient associate company; otherwise, indirect costs are indirectly charged using an approved cost allocation methodology.
Q. WHAT ARE THE COMPONENTS OF THE SERVICE COSTS THAT ARE CHARGED BY FESC, WHETHER CHARGED DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY?
A. Service costs are fully loaded, meaning that they include the direct costs incurred to provide a service plus the indirect costs (such as appropriate overheads) incidental or related to a service whether charged directly or indirectly.

## Q. WHEN A SERVICE IS PROVIDED TO A GROUP OF COMPANIES, DOES FESC DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY CHARGE THE COSTS FOR SUCH A SERVICE?

A. It depends. If the costs can be reasonably identified and related to the particular transaction for the particular individual associate companies, then the costs are directly charged to each individual associate company in the group. If they cannot, then the costs must be indirectly charged using an appropriate cost allocation methodology. However, I wish to emphasize that
whenever practicable (to the extent excessive effort or expense is not required), costs that can be identified as related to a particular service provided to a particular associate company are directly charged to that associate company. But, to repeat, where the costs cannot be so identified, they are indirectly charged using an approved cost allocation methodology.

## Q. WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY "COST ALLOCATION METHODOLOGY?"

A. A "cost allocation methodology" is a method or process for distributing costs for services rendered that are not directly charged to a single associate company, such as charges to multiple associate companies, which are indirectly charged.

## Q. WHERE ARE THE FESC COST ALLOCATION METHODOLOGIES FOUND?

A. The cost allocation methodologies used by FESC today are set forth in the FESC (Service Agreement) and are the same ones that were approved by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") in 2003. The cost allocation methodologies are also listed in the FERC Form 60, which FESC uses to report to the FERC annually.

A copy of the FERC Form 60 for 2022 encompassing the test year in this case is being finalized for filing with FERC and will be filed as a supplement to this case as soon as it is filed. As I discuss further below, the FirstEnergy cost allocation methodologies and the procedures for using them are maintained and reviewed annually by the FirstEnergy General Accounting department, which is within the FirstEnergy Controllers Department and reports to me.

## Q. HOW DOES FESC USE COST ALLOCATION METHODOLOGIES?

A. FESC has no earnings, renders services at cost to FirstEnergy and its associate companies and, therefore, all its costs must be fairly and equitably distributed to FirstEnergy and its associated companies. The cost allocation methodologies are used to accurately distribute those costs that
are not directly charged to a particular associate company, and, therefore, are indirectly charged to, and among, the FirstEnergy associate companies in compliance with the standards promulgated by FERC under PUHCA 2005 (including cost allocation methodologies previously approved by the SEC under the ' 35 Act and applicable state requirements). The particular cost allocation methodology used with respect to any particular service varies based on the service provided and the associate company or companies receiving the service.

## Q. HOW MANY COST ALLOCATION METHODOLOGIES DOES FESC USE?

A. As described in the Service Agreement, FESC has eighteen cost allocation methodologies available, of which eleven are currently in use, to appropriately and accurately distribute the costs of services, which are to be indirectly charged to and among FirstEnergy and its associate companies.
Q. DOES THE IDENTITY OF THE RECIPIENT ASSOCIATE COMPANY PLAY A ROLE IN DETERMINING THE USE OF A COST ALLOCATION METHODOLOGY?
A. Yes. For example, if a service is being provided only to an unregulated segment of FirstEnergy's business, then the costs that need to be indirectly charged in a general manner would be indirectly charged using the "Multiple Factor-Non-Utility" cost allocation methodology so that such costs are not borne by any of the FirstEnergy utilities in the regulated segment.
Q. ARE THE COST ALLOCATION METHODOLOGIES GROUPED TOGETHER IN ANY WAY THAT IS HELPFUL TO UNDERSTANDING HOW THEY WORK?
A. Yes. Seven of the cost allocation methodologies pertain to information technology services. Four are used as general cost allocation methodologies with respect to costs that are not readily
identifiable with particular cost drivers (i.e., a measurable event or quantity that can influence the level of costs incurred for or by a particular activity and which can be directly traced to the origin of the costs themselves). The remaining seven cost allocation methodologies are identifiable to particular cost drivers, an example of which would be employee headcount for employee benefit costs.

## Q. HOW ARE THE COST ALLOCATION METHODOLOGIES RELATED TO THE SERVICES PROVIDED BY FESC?

A. The Service Agreement lists the service categories and particular types of services along with a general description of the services and a reference to the cost allocation methodology (or methodologies) that is/are most likely to be used for costs associated with such services that are to be indirectly charged. As discussed later in my testimony, the costs are accumulated and allocated at the cost center level, which is the lowest level of cost collector in SAP. These cost centers and the associated allocation method are reviewed annually.

## Q. ARE THE COST ALLOCATION METHODOLOGIES CHANGED REGULARLY OR PERIODICALLY?

A. No, they have been approved by the SEC and, with respect to PE, accurately reflect the most relevant cost drivers of the organization.
Q. DOES ANY ASPECT OF THE COST ALLOCATION PROCESS CHANGE FROM TIME TO TIME?
A. While the cost allocation methodologies themselves have not changed, the data inputs required to apply the cost allocation methodologies are updated on an annual basis based on actual experience. For example, the general cost allocation methodology "Multiple Factor-Utility"
requires an averaging of three factors related to a FirstEnergy utility's percentage share of all the FirstEnergy utilities' plant, operations, and maintenance ("O\&M") expenses, and revenues. This data will vary from year to year based upon actual results of operations. As a result, while the methodologies would not change, the percentage share for an associate company and the percentage allocation among associate companies within the methodology can change from year to year based on actual results.

## Q. EARLIER YOU REFERRED TO SAP. PLEASE EXPLAIN HOW FIRSTENERGY USES SAP.

A. SAP is the FirstEnergy resource planning software system that links and coordinates business processes to perform core business functions such as, for example, maintaining a general ledger, financial reporting, inventory management and purchasing transactions, in a fully integrated enterprise management system. SAP has been maintained through regular functional enhancements (multiple releases per year) to support business operations, as well as implementing major version updates that introduce new business functionality, the most recent of which was completed in 2015.

SAP is used to manage work, share information, track customer accounts, and meet other business needs. SAP contains the functions and processes for capturing, reporting, and directly charging and indirectly charging FESC costs to and among FirstEnergy and its associate companies. SAP is currently organized to maintain, among other things, (i) separation of costs between FirstEnergy's regulated and non-regulated associate companies, and (ii) an adequate audit trail on the books and records of FirstEnergy and its associate companies.

## Q. PLEASE DISCUSS THE ROLE OF COST COLLECTORS.
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A. Attributing and charging costs accurately to FirstEnergy and its associate companies requires the costs to be captured in SAP. This is the job of cost collectors, which are accounting devices used to plan, track, and account for costs of different categories or types of work. Cost collectors include orders, work breakdown structures ("WBS") and cost centers. Only one of these three types of cost collectors can be entered on a document during data entry. Orders (i.e., sales, production, process, purchase, internal or work order that uniquely identifies a cost source) and WBSs (i.e., a cost collector that organizes in a hierarchy the actions and activities to be carried out in a project) are temporary cost collectors because the costs accumulated using these cost collectors ultimately settle to a cost center or balance sheet account. A cost center is the principal and lowest level of cost collector, where the costs of providing services are accumulated to be either directly charged or indirectly charged.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE USE OF COST CENTERS.

A. Cost centers are the principal type of cost collector in SAP. Within SAP, cost centers are assigned to departments and/or managers responsible for certain areas of the business such as functional areas within, for example, human resources, finance, facilities, information systems, administrative support, and legal. Each employee within the FirstEnergy System, including at FESC, is assigned to a cost center that relates to the area of the business or category of service for which they are responsible (e.g., human resources, legal, treasury). The cost center provides the mechanism for collecting the costs associated with those employees and the services they provide, including overheads, incidental and related costs. All employees are required to ensure that their time in providing services is captured (i.e., by recording the time spent on various tasks on a timesheet). In the case of FESC, this also means identifying the appropriate cost center for
the associate company, or companies, receiving such services. Ultimately, both the service provider cost center and the service recipient cost center track charges and payments for the costs associated with the services rendered.
Q. ARE THE DESCRIPTIONS AND USES OF COST CENTERS REVIEWED PERIODICALLY?
A. Yes. As part of FirstEnergy's annual Sarbanes-Oxley ("SOX") internal control reviews, General Accounting performs an annual review of the allocation methodologies used for indirect charges to determine whether: 1) billing allocators are still valid; 2) new allocation factors are needed; and 3) cost centers are using the correct allocation factors. Additional details about this annual review of cost centers are provided in the "Controls" section of my testimony below.

## Q. IS EMPLOYEE TIME CHARGING SUBJECT TO REVIEW?

A. Yes. Supervisory review of employee time charged out of their home cost center is regularly performed to ensure time charged is appropriate and the cost center (or other cost collector) being used is proper. This includes review of the time document charges in relationship to employees' work schedules. In addition, training is provided to all business units to reinforce appropriate time charging.
Q. BESIDES TIME CHARGES, ARE THERE OTHER SOURCES OF COSTS CAPTURED IN SAP?
A. Other-than-labor costs are accounted for in SAP based on expense reports, vendor invoices, journal entries, and system interfaces (such as depreciation, taxes). The costs associated with these sources would also flow to appropriate cost centers for tracking, billing, and collection.

## Q. HOW ARE COSTS TRANSFERRED IN SAP FROM FESC TO PE?
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A. In responding to this question, it may be helpful to recall my earlier discussion of FESC costs that are directly or indirectly charged. FESC costs are accumulated in the cost centers and other relevant cost collectors and are either (i) "directly charged", for those costs originating within FESC that relate to services identified as benefiting only PE (for instance), or (ii) "indirectly charged" using appropriate general and/or specific cost allocation methodologies associated with the services rendered, where the costs are identified as benefiting PE and one or more of FirstEnergy and its other associated companies.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN HOW THE FESC O\&M INDIRECT COSTS HAVE CHANGED SINCE THE COMPANY'S LAST BASE RATE CASE.

A. Costs indirectly billed by FESC have increased since the Company's last distribution base rate case in part due to expansion in departments to support FirstEnergy's mission and strategy, including but not limited to, creating a new Office of Ethics and Compliance to oversee organization-wide compliance, assurance, training and communications, creation of an Innovation Center and Digital Factory, and build out of our customer support organization to enhance the customer experience, expand communication channels and improve customer satisfaction, as well as creation of a new Organizational Performance Management and Strategy department. As part of an effort to gain efficiencies across the FirstEnergy operating companies, certain services were centralized from the operating companies to FESC increasing the indirect costs. Examples of these services include, among others, vegetation management, engineering, work management and safety services. General wage and benefit costs for FESC employees have also increased since the last rate case consistent with competitive market rates and rise in healthcare costs. Higher spend on public safety programs, software fees associated with critical
systems, and corporate insurance coverage are also contributing to the rise in costs indirectly billed by FESC.

## Q. DID ANY ACCOUNTING METHODS OR POLICY CHANGES IDENTIFIED THROUGH THE FERC AUDIT IMPACT THE FESC AMOUNTS IN THE TEST YEAR?

A. Yes. The FERC Division of Audits and Accounting ("DAA") within the Office of Enforcement of the FERC completed an audit of FirstEnergy for the period January 2015 to September 2021. DAA found that, according to their audit report, FirstEnergy's utilities capitalized Administrative and General ("A\&G") overhead costs to Account 107, Construction Work in Process ("CWIP"), using a capitalization method that was not definitely related to construction activities based on timecard reports or a representative time study. To remedy this finding, DAA recommended that FirstEnergy retain an independent, third-party entity to conduct a representative labor time study for the allocation of A\&G overhead costs incurred to CWIP. As a result of the labor time study, which was completed during 2022, FirstEnergy adjusted its capitalization rate for its A\&G overhead costs. While the change in capitalization rate had no impact on the amount of FESC indirect costs allocated to PE, it did result in higher indirect costs recorded to O\&M than capital in the test year.

## Q. WHEN DID PE MAKE THE CHANGE TO ITS A\&G CAPITALIZATION

## METHODOLOGY?

A. The independent, third-party entity completed the time study for FirstEnergy during 2022, and the revised capitalization methodology for A\&G was applied effective January 1, 2022.

The overall weighted average capitalization rate resulting from the new methodology was approximately $28 \%$ in 2022 as compared to approximately $57 \%$ in the last base rate case.

## Q. <br> DID THE ADJUSTMENT OF THE A\&G CAPITALIZATION RATE HAVE ANY IMPACT ON HISTORICAL COSTS?

A. The FERC audit report recommended that FirstEnergy estimate the costs that would have been allocated to CWIP from the audit period, 2015 through 2021, using the newly calculated rates resulting from the time study, and remove those costs from CWIP for FERC reporting purposes. The results of the time study indicated that over the period, on average, FESC employee activities would support a capitalization rate of approximately $26 \%$ as compared to a historical rate of approximately $57 \%$. FirstEnergy calculated the difference between historical capitalized overhead costs and those calculated as a result of the time study, including adjusting for a corresponding impact to accumulated depreciation and Allowance for Funds Used During Construction, to determine the estimated net book value of the adjustment. As a result of this analysis, PE reclassified approximately $\$ 19$ million of costs from capital accounts to a regulatory asset as of December 31, 2022, for FERC reporting purposes. Of the costs being moved into the regulatory asset, those on PE's books prior to the end of the test year from PE's last rate case (June 30, 2018) would have already been subject to a prudency review by the Commission. Discussions with FERC audit staff remain ongoing, and as such, these estimates are subject to change.

## VI. CONTROLS

Q. ARE THE COMPANY'S BOOKS AND RECORDS AUDITED BY AN INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTING FIRM?
A. Yes. PricewaterhouseCoopers, LLP ("PwC") audited the Company's 2021 financial statements and PE's FERC Form No. 1, as to which PwC concluded that FirstEnergy's and PE's financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position in conformity with GAAP and in accordance with accounting requirements of the FERC's USofA, respectively. PwC also audited FirstEnergy's and PE's financial statements for 2022.

## Q. PLEASE ADDRESS THE CONTROLS THAT ARE IN PLACE WITH RESPECT TO

 CHARGES AND EXPENSES THAT FESC EITHER DIRECTLY CHARGES OR INDIRECTLY CHARGES TO PE.A. The FirstEnergy General Accounting function within the FirstEnergy Controller's department, which reports to me, is responsible for maintaining the cost allocation methodologies, which includes, among other things:

1. Annually reviewing cost allocation methodologies utilized with each service provided to determine if the most appropriate allocation methodology is being utilized and that the appropriate associate companies are being billed for services performed. This includes reviewing the application of the factors within the SAP ERP System. New allocation methods, if any, are identified, but cannot be used until approved, as necessary, by certain regulatory authorities. The results of this annual review are discussed with and reviewed by PwC and FirstEnergy's Internal Audit department as part of annual internal controls testing.
2. Testing and validating that overhead and allocation results are reasonable. During the monthly closing process, the overhead activity is reviewed to determine that the results are appropriate and complete.
3. Monitoring and maintaining existing overheads and allocations to ensure sender (source) amounts are being applied or allocated appropriately.
4. Monitoring and analyzing the application of overheads to direct costs.

In addition, PE utilizes other control mechanisms that monitor the services being provided by FESC. These control mechanisms include billing and review procedures to ensure the accuracy of FESC billings and internal/external audit examinations.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE BILLING PROCESS AS A CONTROL MECHANISM.

A. The FESC charges to PE are generated within SAP on the basis of the recorded activity to cost centers, work orders and time records. The billing process is a monthly automated settlement of these charges within SAP. As mentioned earlier, the time documents are subject to review and approval by the supervisor or manager responsible for the employees completing such time records. In addition, FESC billings to PE are reviewed and compared to budget monthly by the FirstEnergy Utilities ("FEU") Business Services group. If required, detailed FESC information (i.e., time sheets, invoices) is available to the FEU Business Services group for further analyses.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE BILLING RECONCILIATION PROCEDURES AS A

 CONTROL MECHANISM.A. Another control that is performed monthly is the reconciliation of FESC billings to FESC expenses with regard to services rendered to the FEU group of utilities, including PE. Such reconciliation ensures that all expenses have been appropriately allocated and detects any overor under-billings for any cost center.
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE AUDIT PROCESS AS A CONTROL OVER THE FESC CHARGES TO PE.
A. The internal auditing department periodically reviews and audits the FESC charges to assess the design and operating effectiveness of the control environment for FESC charges that are processed through SAP. In general, the main objectives of the internal audit review are to determine whether internal controls over the billing process to the associated companies, including PE, are adequate and effective, as well as to review the cost allocation methodologies in effect and the application of these methodologies. This would include a review to ensure compliance with applicable regulatory requirements, as well as with FESC policies and procedures pertaining to billing. The specific audit procedures to be utilized will typically include interviews, observations, tests, and other procedures deemed necessary to accomplish the audit objectives.

## Q. CAN YOU ELABORATE FURTHER REGARDING THE USE OF THE AUDIT PROCESS AS A CONTROL?

A. Yes. Since 2005, the Internal Auditing department has conducted SOx control tests annually to ensure the appropriate use of cost allocations within SAP and that the SAP system is distributing costs correctly and in accordance with the SOx controls set in place to assure compliance with regulatory requirements.

## Q. CAN YOU DISCUSS THE USE OF THIS CONTROL RELATIVE TO PE?

A. Yes. The Internal Auditing department completed an audit of PE's internal controls related to FirstEnergy's Cost Allocation Manual ("CAM") in 2022. The audit determined the internal controls that support and govern the cost allocation process are adequately designed to provide a reasonable level of assurance regarding reliability and integrity of the allocation of the charges billed to PE, in accordance with the Service Agreement and CAM requirements. PE's external
auditor PwC also examined management's assertion regarding costs allocated to PE during 2021, which was filed with the Commission on July 8, 2022 and is included as Exhibit TMA-2.

Furthermore, the Company underwent an audit by the FERC Division of Audits for the period January 1, 2015 through September 30, 2021, with a subsequent report issued in 2022, which included selective tests of the FESC cost allocation methodologies and charges billed by FESC to the FEU utilities, including PE. The audit did not identify exceptions with respect to the cost allocation methodologies, but provided recommendations related to the capitalization method of FESC costs, as described above, as well as recommended FirstEnergy perform an analysis of certain non-recoverable costs to ensure appropriate accounting classification, as described further below.

Finally, in connection with the issuance of PE's financial statements, audit opinions are issued annually by an independent public accounting firm for the Company's GAAP financial statements and FERC Form 1.

FirstEnergy is currently completing a comprehensive effort under which it has updated the Shared Service Agreement and in the process of updating the CAM to ensure they both properly reflect current business activity.

## Q. HAS THE COMPANY PROVIDED A COPY OF ITS CAM?

A. Yes. Pursuant to Section 4-208(b)(1) of the Public Utility Companies Article, on July 8, 2022 the Company filed: (1) the 2021 CAM; (2) a Certificate of Training Program relating to the CAM; (3) an Affidavit Relating to Cost Allocation and Asset Transfer Pricing Principles; (4) lists of parent, service company, and utility officers for the period covered by the CAM; and (5) the
independent audit opinion with respect to the CAM prepared by PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP. The July 8, 2022 filing is included as Exhibit TMA-2.

## Q. <br> HAS THE COMPANY IDENTIFIED ANY ISSUES OUTSIDE OF THE ALLOCATION PROCESS WITH RESPECT TO CHARGES FROM FESC TO PE?

A. Yes, it has. I will address this in three parts. First, it is my understanding that the Commission is already aware, through Case No. 9667, that following the investigation of Ohio HB 6 activities, FirstEnergy's Board of Directors discovered and reported that certain costs may have lacked proper documentation or may have been improperly classified or misallocated to FirstEnergy's distribution utilities, including to PE. Company witness Valdes discusses in his testimony how PE proposes to fully refund, with interest, all such amounts that have been included in PE's rates. Mr. Valdes' testimony reflects that the amount associated with this first category was just under $\$ 38,000$, which he then adjusts for multiple rates years and then applies carrying costs to.

Second, in addition to, and separate from, those amounts, and as a result of recommendations for improvement identified during the FERC audit, as well as part of a proactive corporate effort, FirstEnergy reviewed certain non-operating or non-recoverable costs and identified costs that were recorded to utility operating accounts that were included in electric service rates. Those costs reviewed included costs associated with advertising, sponsorships, competitive services, and lobbying. The review covered the period of the FERC Audit, 2015-2021, except for review of sport sponsorships, which extended back to 2013. Mr. Valdes' testimony reflects that the amount associated with this category was
approximately $\$ 196,000$, which again he adjusts for multiple rates years and then applies carrying costs to.

Lastly, FirstEnergy also retained Craig Energy \& Financial Services ("CEFS") to review and confirm the results of the company's internal review, described above, as well as to recommend and then review other potential areas of non-recoverable expenses. Through its review, CEFS identified certain additional items, which Mr. Valdes' testimony reflects that the amount associated with this category was approximately $\$ 68,000$, which again he adjusts for multiple rates years and then applies carrying costs to. CEFS issued its final report to FirstEnergy in the first quarter of 2023.
Q. WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE COSTS EXAMINED BY CEFS AND THE COSTS WHICH WERE IMPROPERLY CLASSIFIED, MISALLOCATED, OR LACKED PROPER SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION TO PE AS DISCUSSED IN CASE NO. 9667 ?
A. The charges that were identified as improperly classified, misallocated, or lacked proper supporting documentation discussed in my first point above and in Case No. 9667 are separate and unrelated to the proactive review FirstEnergy performed of certain nonoperating or non-recoverable costs, as described in my second point above, which was also examined by CEFS, as detailed in my third point above. FirstEnergy conducted comprehensive reviews of past charges discussed above and identified additional charges that needed to be refunded to customers. FirstEnergy then worked with the state rate directors, as discussed in the testimony of Company witness Valdes, to determine what portion of the charges were recovered through customer rates, and how customers could be made $100 \%$ whole for
any such rate impacts. Company witness Valdes explains in detail how this correction process worked with respect to Maryland. Company witness Valdes also provides the calculation of the make-whole payment to customers.

## Q. ARE THERE ANY ADJUSTMENTS TO THE TEST YEAR TO REFLECT THE PREVIOUSLY MENTIONED CORRECTIONS?

A. Yes, in addition to the make-whole payment to customers discussed by Company witness Valdes, there are two related adjustments to the Company's 2022 test year in this base rate case. Adjustment No. 42 is an adjustment to remove certain non-operating and non-recoverable costs amounts described above from the Company's rate base. Specifically, in September 2022, an accounting entry was made to adjust plant and accumulated reserve to remove the previously identified charges. This adjustment effectively removes such charges from rate base. Adjustment No. 43 is an adjustment to the 2022 test year to remove the regulatory debit recorded when establishing the regulatory liability that will ultimately flow back to customers as a refund, since this amount related to prior years and would not be included in future customer rates. Adjustment Nos. 42 and 43 are provided in Exhibit JAS-2 to the direct testimony of Company witness Soltis.

## Q. WHAT STEPS HAS FIRSTENERGY TAKEN TO ADDRESS THE ISSUES THAT LED TO THESE CHARGES BEING ASSESSED TO PE?

A. As noted, FirstEnergy hired CEFS to do a separate review to confirm management's analysis of non-recoverable and non-operating expenses. In its review, CEFS stated that it "believes in all material respects, the major, potentially high-risk, assessment coverage areas were identified and evaluated for compliance with the USofA, associated ratemaking impacts, and potential refunds
owed to the regulated transmission and distribution affiliates' customers." All refunds identified have been recognized on the books of PE. The recommendations identified by CEFS are currently being implemented and anticipated to be completed by the end of 2023.

Additionally, FirstEnergy has developed a new monthly report that provides additional details, including vendor names, source of the cost and FERC account charged, for items that are billed to the utility operating companies, including PE, from FESC. This report has aided accounting, business services, rates, and internal auditing in their review of FESC charges billed to the operating companies, including those in these identified categories of non-recoverable or non-operating expenses, to ensure appropriate accounting and ratemaking treatment.

FirstEnergy also implemented various procedures for non-purchase order ("nonPO") transactions, such as energy purchases, legal penalties, and income tax payments that, by their nature, do not have a corresponding purchase order. SAP has been configured to require a user who enters a non-PO invoice for payment to actively affirm the transaction is governed by a valid contract or FirstEnergy has a legal obligation to make payment, the payment amount entered in SAP agrees with the supporting vendor invoice, and the payment is for verified services rendered and/or goods received. SAP requires invoices to be assigned to approvers with the property level of signature of authority as defined within FirstEnergy's Delegation of Authority Practice. This Practice also sets forth the authority level for employes to enter into commitments on behalf of the Company. In addition, Accounts Payable performs a quarterly review of all vendor payments without an associated purchase order to ensure the payment was processed in accordance with accounting policies.

Throughout 2022, FESC employees were provided training around direct charging, time charging, and invoice processing to mitigate the risk of inclusion of non-recoverable or nonoperating charges in customer rates.

## Q. CAN YOU PLEASE DESCRIBE THIS REFERENCED TRAINING IN SOME MORE DETAIL?

A. The training was facilitated by FirstEnergy's Corporate Business Services to over 4,000 FESC employees and reinforced the existing "Time Charging for Service Company Employee Activity" policy. The training covered the importance of charging time to appropriate entities, projects or initiatives as well as included an explanation of new lobbying cost centers created to track and record time spent on lobbying activities. The training also served to remind FESC employees of appropriate invoice processing procedures, including an explanation of types of costs that should be considered non-recoverable and the corresponding accounting to apply.

All employees who entered or approved invoices in SAP were also required to complete a web-based training during 2021. This training included a review of policies for both payments made under existing purchase orders as well as non-purchase order payments and expectations of preparers and reviewers to, among other things, validate the appropriate cost collectors are charged. These additional procedures have been implemented in order for FirstEnergy to ensure proper accounting and ratemaking treatment.

## Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE DEGREE AND EXTENT OF

 THE CONTROLS IN PLACE?A. In my view, as Assistant Controller, Corporate, the company has ample control over the FESC costs. First, PE reviews monthly the amounts FESC bills to it. Second, the cost collector system,
billing review and reconciliation procedures, as well as the periodic audits performed by the internal audit function and external auditors, provide more than adequate opportunities for effective communications, decisions or other actions pertaining to quantity and coordination of service issues between PE and FESC. Third, executive and director level oversight is provided by senior management and the Boards of Directors for disclosure and accountability per the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. Fourth, as set forth above, PE and FirstEnergy have implemented various steps to increase the controls pertaining to the identification of non-recoverable or non-operating expenses and have proposed a reasonable approach to addressing the issues previously identified. All provide a comprehensive framework for assuring the fairness and reasonableness of the charges for the services provided to PE by FESC.

## VII. CONCLUSION

## Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY IN REGARD TO PENSION AND OPEB EXPENSES.

A. PE's proposed adjustments to test year pension and OPEB expense are appropriate to: (1) eliminate the volatility on PE's rates of the MTM accounting for pension and OPEB costs used for financial reporting purposes; and (2) appropriately reflect pension and OPEB costs for ratemaking purposes by amortizing net actuarial losses over future periods. In addition, PE's adjustments related to non-MTM pension and OPEB costs smooth out the changes that have historically happened from year to year. Finally, the proposed PON Mechanism will benefit both customers and the Company by reducing the impact of volatility in future pension and OPEB expenses.
Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY IN REGARD TO FESC RELATIONSHIPS, CHARGES AND ALLOCATIONS.
A. FESC provides necessary services to PE pursuant to approved cost allocation methodologies and direct charges. The level of costs charged to PE in the test year is appropriate and reasonable. FirstEnergy and PE have extensive controls in place by which FESC charges and allocations are reviewed on an ongoing basis.

## Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?

A. Yes, it does.

## SERVICE AGREEMENT

This Service Agreement ("Agreement") is entered into as of the ___ day of $\qquad$ , 20 by and between each of the associate companies listed on the signature page hereto (each a "Client Company" and collectively the "Client Companies"), and FirstEnergy Service Company ("Service Company"), an Ohio corporation.

WHEREAS, Service Company is a direct wholly-owned subsidiary of FirstEnergy Corp. ("FirstEnergy");

WHEREAS, Service Company provides corporate, administrative, management and other services to FirstEnergy and the Client Companies; and

WHEREAS, Client Company desires to purchase such corporate, administrative, management and other services from Service Company as Client Company may request or require in accordance with this Agreement and as required by the laws, rules, regulations, judgement, and orders of any federal or state regulatory body whose approval and regulation is, pursuant to the laws of said jurisdiction, necessary and a legal prerequisite to Client Company's operations to accomplish Client Company's business purpose (collectively, "Law");

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants contained herein and other valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, the parties hereto, intending to be legally bound, hereby agree as follows:

## 1. DESCRIPTION AND PROVISION OF SERVICES.

(a) Service Company shall perform such corporate, administrative, management and other services for Client Company (the "Basic Operating Services"), including but not limited to, executive services, accounting and finance, internal auditing, risk management, human resources, corporate affairs, corporate communications, information technology, policy and compliance, records management, and legal services. Service Company shall provide such Basic Operating Services to Client Company until this Agreement terminates.
(b) In addition to Basic Operating Services, Service Company shall provide to Client Company such services as Client Company deems necessary to achieve Client Company's business purpose or as required by Law (the "Additional Services", and together with Basic Operating Services, the "Services"). Additional Services include but are not limited to, operations management, construction, maintenance, asset oversight, customer service, rates and regulatory affairs, environmental, corporate real estate, strategic planning and operations, flight operations, performance management, business development, and investment management. Service Company
shall provide such Additional Services until such time as Client Company indicates otherwise by written notice.
(c) Exhibit A hereto lists and describes all Services that are available from Service Company, as will be reviewed annually and updated as required by Law or when otherwise deemed appropriate by the parties hereto.

## 2. PERSONNEL.

Service Company will employ such executive officers, accountants, financial advisers, technical advisers, attorneys and other persons with the qualifications to provide the Services, as appropriate and necessary. Service Company may, at its discretion, also arrange for the services of nonaffiliated experts, consultants, and attorneys in connection with the performance of any of the Services provided under this Agreement.

## 3. COMPENSATION AND ALLOCATION.

## (A) COMPENSATION.

As and to the extent permitted by Law,
(i) any Services provided by Service Company pursuant to this Agreement shall be at cost;
(ii) the costs for Services rendered by Service Company shall cover direct and indirect costs, plus any reasonable expenses and fees incurred by Service Company to provide such Services to Client Company (collectively, "Costs"); and
(iii) Client Company shall pay such Costs as appropriate.

## (B) COST ALLOCATION METHODOLOGY.

The Costs of Services provided by Service Company pursuant to this Agreement shall be directly assigned, distributed, or allocated by activity, project, program, work order or other appropriate means, as follows:
(i) a direct charge, whereby Costs are assigned to the Client Company directly benefiting from the Service provided; and/or
(ii) an indirect charge, whereby the appropriate share of the Costs of Services provided by Service Company that are not directly charged to a Client Company will be allocated among Client Companies by utilizing the method that most accurately distributes such Costs. Applicable cost allocation factors, which are included in FirstEnergy's cost allocation manual, will be reviewed annually and updated as required by Law or when otherwise deemed appropriate by the parties hereto.

## 4. BILLING AND PAYMENT.

Billing and payment for Services provided by Service Company shall be by making appropriate accounting entries on the books of Client Company and Service Company. Monthly reports provided to Client Company will include details of Costs associated with Services provided by Service Company. Financial settlement for Services provided by Service Company will be made on a monthly basis, with billing to occur as soon as practicable after the close of the month, and financial settlement or accounting entries completed within thirty (30) days of billing. Any amount remaining unpaid by Client Company after thirty (30) days following billing shall bear interest thereon from the due date of billing until financial settlement at a rate equal to the prime rate on the due date.

## 5. APPLICATION OF LAW.

This Agreement shall be subject to the approval of any state electric utility regulatory commission whose approval is, by the laws of the federal government or said state, a legal prerequisite to the execution and delivery or the performance of this Agreement.

## 6. TERM AND TERMINATION.

## (A) INITIAL TERM.

This Agreement shall commence as of the date first indicated above and shall continue thereafter for a period of five (5) years (the "Initial Term"), unless sooner terminated pursuant to this Section 6.

## (B) RENEWAL TERM.

Upon expiration of the Initial Term, this Agreement shall automatically renew for successive five (5)-year terms unless either party provides written notice of nonrenewal no later than three hundred and sixty-five (365) days prior to the end of the then-current term (each a "Renewal Term" and together with the Initial Term, the "Term"). If the Term is renewed for one or more Renewal Term, the terms and conditions of this Agreement during each Renewal Term shall be the same as the terms and conditions in effect immediately prior to such renewal. If either party provides timely notice of nonrenewal, this Agreement shall terminate on the expiration of the then-current Term, unless sooner terminated in this Section 6.

## (C) VOLUNTARY TERMINATION.

Any party to this Agreement may terminate this Agreement by providing one hundred eighty (180) days written notice of such termination to the other party.

## (D) TERMINATION IN COMPLIANCE WITH LAW.

This Agreement is subject to termination or modification at any time to the extent its performance may conflict with any rule, regulation, requirement, or order of the state or federal electric utility regulatory commission with jurisdiction over the Client Company.

## (E) AUTOMATIC TERMINATION.

This Agreement shall automatically terminate upon Client Company (i) ceasing to be an affiliate of Service Company; (ii) becoming insolvent or admitting its inability to pay its debt obligations as they come due; (iii) becoming subject, voluntarily or involuntarily, to any proceeding under any bankruptcy or insolvency law, which is not stayed within ten (10) business days or is not dismissed or vacated within thirty (30) business days after filing; (iv) being dissolved or liquidated or taking any corporate action for such purpose; (v) making a general assignment for the benefit of creditors; or (vi) having a receiver, trustee, custodian, or similar agent appointed by order of any court of competent jurisdiction to take charge of or sell any material portion of its property or business. In the event of a termination of this Agreement pursuant to this Section 6(E), there shall be a transition period not to exceed ninety (90) days for which the Service Company will continue to provide Services at cost to Client Company.

## 7. GENERAL.

## (A) ENTIRE AGREEMENT.

This Agreement, together with its exhibits, constitutes the entire understanding and agreement of the parties with respect to its subject matter, and effective upon the execution of this Agreement by the respective parties hereof, any and all prior agreements, understandings or representations with respect to this subject matter are hereby terminated and canceled in their entirety and are of no further force and effect, except to the extent transactions thereunder have taken place prior to such effective date, in which case such agreements will govern the terms of such transactions.

## (B) ASSIGNMENT AND BINDING EFFECT.

No assignment of this Agreement or a party's rights, interests or obligations hereunder may be made without the other party's written consent, which shall not be unreasonably withheld, delayed, or conditioned. This Agreement shall inure to the benefit of and shall be binding upon the parties and their respective successors and assigns.

## (C) NOTICE.

Where written notice is required by this Agreement, all notices, consents, certificates, or other communications hereunder shall be in writing and shall be deemed given to the persons and at the addresses identified below (or to such other person and address as a party may give in a notice given in accordance with the provisions hereof) only as follows: (i) if given by personal delivery, upon such personal delivery, (ii) if sent for next day delivery by United States registered, certified or express mail, or overnight delivery service, on the date of delivery as confirmed by written confirmation of delivery, or (iii) if sent by electronic mail, upon electronic confirmation of receipt, except that if such confirmation occurs on a day that is not a business day, then such notice or other communication will not be deemed effective or given until the next succeeding business day. Notices sent in any other manner will not be effective.

To Client Company: c/o President<br>76 South Main St.<br>Akron, OH 44308<br>[President Email]<br>To Service Company: c/o Vice President and Controller<br>76 South Main St.<br>Akron, OH 44308<br>[Controller Email]

## (D) EXTENSION OF TIME; WAIVER.

A party may (i) extend the time for the performance of any of the obligations of the other party under this Agreement, and/or (ii) waive compliance with any of the agreements or conditions for the other party's benefit contained herein. Any such extension or waiver will be valid only if set forth in a writing signed by the acting party. No waiver by a party of any default, misrepresentation, or breach hereunder, whether intentional or not, may be deemed to extend to any prior or subsequent default, misrepresentation, or breach hereunder or affect in any way any rights arising because of any prior or subsequent occurrence. No failure or delay of a party to exercise any right or remedy under this Agreement will operate as a waiver thereof, and no single or partial exercise of any right or remedy will preclude any other or further exercise of the same, or of any other, right or remedy.

## (E) GOVERNING LAW.

This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Ohio, without regard to its conflict of law provisions.

## (F) HEADINGS.

The headings contained in this Agreement are inserted for convenience only and will not affect in any way the meaning or interpretation of this Agreement.

## (G) SEVERABILITY.

The provisions of this Agreement will be deemed severable, and the invalidity or unenforceability of any provision will not affect the validity or enforceability of the other provisions hereof.

## (H) MODIFICATION.

This Agreement may not be amended or modified except by a writing signed by each of Service Company and Client Company.
(I) COUNTERPARTS.

This Agreement may be executed in two or more counterparts, each of which will be deemed an original but all of which together will constitute one and the same instrument. This

Agreement will become effective when one or more counterparts have been signed by each party and delivered to the other party, it being understood that the parties need not sign the same counterpart. The exchange of copies of this Agreement and of executed signature pages by electronic mail in "portable document format" (".pdf") or by a combination of such means, will constitute effective execution and delivery of this Agreement as to the parties and may be used in lieu of an original Agreement for all purposes. Signatures of the parties transmitted by electronic mail or by .pdf shall be deemed to be original signatures for all purposes.

## (J) THIRD PARTY BENEFICIARIES.

Nothing in this Agreement shall be deemed to create any right in any creditor or other person or entity not a party hereto. This Agreement shall not be construed in any respect to be a contract in whole or in part for the benefit of any third party.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have caused this Agreement to be duly executed effective as of date first above written.

## FirstEnergy Service Company

By:
Name:
Title: Vice President and Controller

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have caused this Agreement to be duly executed effective as of date first above written.
[Client Company][, on its own behalf and on behalf of its subsidiaries [•]]

By:
Name:
Title: [Officer]

## EXHIBIT A

## DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES

| Service | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| Executive Management | lrovide strategic, financial, and operational <br> leadership for all aspects of the business. |
| Accounting and Tax Support | Various accounting and tax services, including <br> but not limited to: financial reporting; utility <br> reporting and billing; property, general, <br> regulatory, and tax accounting; accounts <br> payable; accounting research; utility and <br> transmission business services; finance <br> transformation; tax planning; federal, state, <br> and local tax and rates; and return on Service <br> Company assets. |
| Investor Relations, Corporate Responsibility |  |
| and Communications Support | Various services, including but not limited to: <br> investor relations; corporate responsibility and <br> rating agencies; internal, external, and <br> customer communications; and graphic and <br> document production. |
| Treasury Support | Various treasury services, including but not <br> limited to: pension and investment |
| Risk Support | management; business development; and <br> capital markets, cash, and e-commerce. |
| Rates and Regulatory Affairs Support | Various risk-related services, including but not <br> limited to: insurance and credit risk; enterprise |
| risk management and risk control; and |  |
| operational risk management. |  |


| Service | Description |
| :---: | :---: |
| Corporate Services | Various services, including but not limited to: administrative services; real estate; and flight operations. |
| Legal Support | Various services, including but not limited to: legal services; records and information compliance; claims; and corporate secretary. |
| Ethics \& Compliance Support | Perform investigations and risk assessments on compliance matters; provide policy management and compliance training and communication. |
| Internal Auditing Support | Provide risk-based independent assurance and consulting internal audit services; evaluate risk management, control, and governance processes, and administer the program for management's testing of internal controls. |
| Corporate Affairs and Community Involvement Support | Coordinate community partnerships and employee volunteer opportunities; administer contributions for charitable, social and community welfare programs. |
| Compliance \& Regulated Services Support | Various regulatory compliance services, including but not limited to: regulated commodity sourcing; FERC and RTO technical support; NERC compliance; FERC and state compliance reporting; regulated settlements. |
| External Affairs Support | Various external affairs services; including but not limited to: regional external affairs; state and federal government affairs; and legislative and regulatory policy and administration. |
| Information Technology \& Corporate Security | Various IT and security services, including but not limited to: IT innovation and enablement; cyber security and transmission security operations center; compliance field support and physical security; and physical security compliance and technology. |
| Transmission Support | Various transmission-related services, including but not limited to: operations; planning and protection; substation services; and assets and records control. |
| Utility Operations | Various utility-related services, including but not limited to: state executive management; engineering services; distribution engineering and customer accounts support; work management operations; and operational strategy and alignment. |


| Service | Description <br> Safety \& Human Performance <br> Operations Support <br> human performance and governance; safety <br> data analytics, training and work practices, and <br> operations. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Utility Services | Various services, including but not limited to: <br> regional workforce development; metering and <br> support systems; central electric lab and BETA <br> lab support; work management and process <br> improvement; distribution system operations; <br> vegetation management; emergency <br> preparedness; and ADMS/GIS Project. |
| Construction \& Design Services | Various services, including but not limited to: <br> environmental support; generation services; <br> and fuels and generation commercial <br> operations. |
| Transformation Support | Various services, including but not limited to: <br> transmission and substation design; <br> transmission project management; portfolio <br> management; and transmission program <br> support. |
| Competitive Products \& Services | Various services, including but not limited to: <br> emerging technology programs and strategy; <br> and transformation office and program. |
| Customer Engagement | Various services, including but not limited to: <br> FirstEnergy sales; and consumer products and <br> marketing. |
| Customer Policy \& Solutions | Various customer-related services, including <br> but not limited to: national accounts and <br> customer support; economic development; <br> energy efficiency implementation, compliance <br> and reporting; and customer analytics and <br> reporting. |
| Various customer services, including but not <br> limited to: customer contact centers, |  |
| management, and care support; and revenue |  |
| operations. |  |

July 8, 2022

## VIA EFILE

Andrew S. Johnston, Executive Secretary
Maryland Public Service Commission
6 St. Paul Street
Baltimore, MD 21202

## Re: CAM Audit

Dear Secretary Johnston:
Pursuant to Section 4-208(b)(1) of the Public Utility Companies Article and to the Commission's currently-operative filing procedures, enclosed please find the independent audit opinion with respect to The Potomac Edison Company's Cost Allocation Manual prepared by Pricewaterhouse Coopers LLP (Attachment 1). Also enclosed is the "Management's Statement Regarding Costs Allocated to The Potomac Edison Company during 2021" (Attachment 2) and accompanying Schedule of Allocated Costs (Attachment 3) which are referenced in the audit opinion.

As you are aware, under COMAR 20.40.02.07 and .08 as amended, utilities are only required to file their CAM and related documents when they file a rate case. Thus Potomac Edison is not required to file its 2021 CAM. However, in anticipation of Staff requests for further information with respect to the CAM audit, enclosed please also find:
(1) FirstEnergy Service Corporation's Cost Allocation Manual ("CAM") used by Potomac Edison (Attachment 4), which was the subject of the audit;
(2) a Certificate of Training Program relating to that CAM (Attachment 5);
(3) an Affidavit Relating to Cost Allocation and Asset Transfer Pricing Principles regarding that CAM (also in Attachment 5); and
(4) lists of parent, service company, and utility officers for the period covered by that CAM (Attachment 6).

Please also note that Potomac Edison has already filed, in its annual ring-fencing report, an organization chart for the same period - see ML\#240499.

If you have any questions about this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Very truly yours,


## JPT/kbw

cc: David Valcarenghi, PSC Staff
pwc

## Report of Independent Accountants

## To Management and the Board of Directors of <br> The Potomac Edison Company

We have examined management's assertion of The Potomac Edison Company defined within the schedule titled, 'Management's Statement Regarding Costs Allocated to The Potomac Edison Company during 2021' (the "Schedule"), which is as follows: (i) FirstEnergy has complied with the policies and procedures of the FirstEnergy Service Company ("FESC") Cost Allocation Manual ("CAM") in all material respects, (ii) costs have been allocated to The Potomac Edison Company ("Potomac Edison") in accordance with the criteria set forth in FESC"s CAM pursuant to the Code of Maryland Regulations Section 20.40.02.07 (CAM Requirements), and (iii) costs and transactions were appropriately charged to Potomac Edison in accordance with the criteria set forth in the CAM for the twelve-month period ended December 31, 2021. The Potomac Edison Company's management is responsible for its assertion. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on management's assertion based on our examination.

Our examination was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. Those standards require that we plan and perform the examination to obtain reasonable assurance about whether management's assertion is fairly stated, in all material respects. An examination involves performing procedures to obtain evidence about management's assertion. The nature, timing and extent of the procedures selected depend on our judgment, including an assessment of the risks of material misstatement of management's assertion, whether due to fraud or error. We believe that the evidence we obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

We are required to be independent and to meet our other ethical responsibilities in accordance with relevant ethical requirements related to the engagement.

Our procedures did not include the independent verification of the completeness of costs subject to allocation to Potomac Edison; therefore, we express no opinion regarding this attribute.

In our opinion, management's assertion defined within the Schedule, which is as follows: (i) FirstEnergy has complied with the policies and procedures of the FirstEnergy Service Company ("FESC") Cost Allocation Manual ("CAM") in all material respects, (ii) costs have been allocated to The Potomac Edison Company ("Potomac Edison") in accordance with the criteria set forth in FESC's CAM pursuant to the Code of Maryland Regulations Section 20.40.02.07 (CAM Requirements), and (iii) costs and transactions were appropriately charged to Potomac Edison in accordance with the criteria set forth in the CAM for the twelve-month period ended December 31,2021 , is fairly stated, in all material respects.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of Management and the Board of Directors of The Potomac Edison Company, Management and the Board of Directors of FirstEnergy Corp. and the Maryland Public Service Commission, and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than the specified parties.


PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP
June 29, 2022

## Management's Statement Regarding Costs Allocated to The Potomac Edison Company during 2021

## Management Assertion

Management of FirstEnergy Corp. ("FirstEnergy") is responsible for the accompanying schedule, "FirstEnergy Costs Allocated to The Potomac Edison Company in 2021 by Allocation Factor and Expense Category" (the "Schedule") and for complying with the requirements of the Annotated Code of Maryland, Public Utility Companies Article §4-208(b).

Management asserts the following:
(i) FirstEnergy has complied with the policies and procedures of the FirstEnergy Service Company ("FESC") Cost Allocation Manual ("CAM") in all material respects.
(ii) Costs have been allocated to The Potomac Edison Company ("Potomac Edison") in accordance with the criteria set forth in FESC's CAM pursuant to the Code of Maryland Regulations Section 20.40.02.07 (CAM Requirements).
(iii) Costs and transactions were appropriately charged to Potomac Edison in accordance with the criteria set forth in the CAM.

The criteria for allocating and charging costs are reflected in the cost assignment process, as set forth in the CAM, which is summarized as follows:
$>$ Labor-related services performed by FESC on behalf of an affiliate are directly charged at a standard activity rate per unit of labor, which includes direct costs and related overheads.
$>$ Costs accumulated by FESC that are not directly charged are allocated based on specified allocation ratios as set forth in the CAM.
$>$ Costs that are incurred by a legal entity other than FESC on behalf of an affiliate are directly charged or allocated based on specified allocation ratios to the applicable affiliate.
$>$ Direct charges have been excluded from the attached schedule.
There are no adjustments required to the policies and procedures set forth in the CAM based on prior Commission rulings.

As stated in Section V - FirstEnergy Service Company Allocation Codes - Allocation Percentages, the percentages shown in the CAM are the base percentages including all applicable companies in the calculation. FirstEnergy employs a methodology that permits inclusion or exclusion of companies within each methodology, depending upon the cost being allocated, so percentages within each method may vary by company depending on need. The table below shows the various percentages that were used in 2021 as subsets of the base allocation factors for Potomac Edison.

Potomac Edison \%
Multiple Factor Utility
Multiple Factor Utility - Base (see CAM) ..... 5.32\%
Multiple Factor Utility - Excluding MP Gen ..... 5.46\%
Multiple Factor Utility - Excluding MP Gen and TrAIL Co ..... 5.65\%
Multiple Factor Utility - Excluding transmission ..... 6.43\%
Multiple Factor Utility - Excluding transmission and MP Gen ..... 6.63\%
Multiple Factor Utility - Excluding Ohio and All Mon Power ..... 8.38\%
Multiple Factor Utility - Jersey,Transmission, All Mon Power,Potomac Edison\&West Penn ..... 9.78\%
Multiple Factor Utility - Jersey,Transmission,Mon Power,Potomac Edison\&West Penn ..... 10.25\%
Multiple Factor Utility - Jersey, Met Ed, Potomac Edison, West Penn, TrAIL, MAIT ..... 12.25\%
Multiple Factor Utility - PA Utilities, Mon Power \& Potomac Edison ..... 14.79\%
Multiple Factor Utility - GPU \& Potomac Edison ..... 14.81\%
Multiple Factor Utility - Jersey, All Mon Power, Potomac Edison \& TrAIL ..... 16.50\%
Multiple Factor Utility - Penelec, Mon Power, Potomac Edison, West Penn \& MAIT ..... 17.43\%
Multiple Factor Utility - Penelec, Met Ed, Potomac Edison \& West Penn ..... 18.63\%
Multiple Factor Utility - Penelec, Mon Power, Potomac Edison, and West Penn ..... 19.84\%
Multiple Factor Utility - Jersey, Mon Power, Potomac Edison ..... 20.18\%
Multiple Factor Utility - AE only excluding transmission \& MP Gen ..... 28.03\%
Multiple Factor Utility - All Mon Power and Potomac Edison ..... 40.18\%
Multiple Factor Utility - Met Ed and Potomac Edison ..... 42.63\%
Multiple Factor Utility - Mon Power and Potomac Edison ..... 49.53\%
Multiple Factor Utility/Non-Utility
Multiple Factor-Utility/Non-Utility - Base (see CAM) ..... 5.21\%
Multiple Factor-Utility/Non-Utility - Excluding transmission and MP Gen ..... 6.61\%
Number of Customers
Number of Customers - Base (see CAM) ..... 6.87\%
Number of Customers - Excluding GPU ..... 11.01\%
Number of Customers - WV ..... 27.14\%
Transmission
Transmission - Sub Factor excluding MP Gen ..... 2.99\%
Transmission - Sub Factor excluding MP Gen and TrAIL Co ..... 3.28\%
Transmission - Sub Factor excluding Ohio, Penn Power and MP Gen ..... 3.97\%
Transmission - Sub Factor excluding Ohio, Penn Power, MP Gen \& TrAIL Co ..... 4.50\%
Transmission - Sub Factor Mon Power, Potomac Edison, West Penn and MAIT ..... 12.91\%
Transmission - Sub Factor AE only excluding MP Gen ..... 16.26\%
Transmission - Sub Factor Potomac Edison \& TrAIL ..... 25.21\%
Transmission - Sub Factor AE only excluding MP Gen and TrAIL Co ..... 31.41\%
Direct Charge Ratio-Distribution Center EDC
Direct Charge Ratio-Distribution Center EDC - Base (See CAM) ..... 9.26\%
Direct Charge Ratio-Distribution Center EDC - Excluding Transmission ..... 10.00\%

## FirstEnergy - Costs Allocated to Potomac Edison in 2021 by Allocation Factor and Expense Category

| Allocation Factor | Labor |  | OTL |  | Grand Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Multi-Factor Utility | \$ | 8,091,404.50 | \$ | 1,272,912.37 | \$ | 9,364,316.87 |
| Multi-Factor All | \$ | 3,385,814.33 | \$ | 3,972,426.13 | \$ | 7,358,240.46 |
| Number of Customers | \$ | 5,163,440.99 | \$ | 1,370,670.82 | \$ | 6,534,111.81 |
| Multi-Factor Utility/Non-Utility | \$ | 396,202.37 | \$ | 3,453,006.38 | \$ | 3,849,208.75 |
| Multi-Factor Utility/Transmission | \$ | 2,365,715.25 | \$ | 256,566.91 | \$ | 2,622,282.16 |
| Direct Charge | \$ | 1,790,433.65 | \$ | 437,373.81 | \$ | 2,227,807.46 |
| Participating Employees-General | \$ | 80,622.08 | \$ | (14,877.30) | \$ | 65,744.78 |
| Workstation Support | \$ | 32,324.61 | \$ | 353.59 | \$ | 32,678.20 |
| Number of Computer Workstations | \$ | 27,045.76 | \$ | 4,252.24 | \$ | 31,298.00 |
| Number of Shopping Customers | \$ | 19,307.06 | \$ | 9,673.22 | \$ | 28,980.28 |
| Headcount | \$ | 3,850,418.70 | \$ | $(4,544,170.48)$ | \$ | $(693,751.78)$ |
| Grand Total | \$ | 25,202,729.30 | \$ | 6,218,187.69 | \$ | 31,420,916.99 |

FirstEnergy Service Corporation 2021 Cost Allocation Manual
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## I. Introduction

The purpose of this Cost Allocation Manual ("CAM") is to document the methods, policies and procedures that FirstEnergy Service Company ("FESC") will follow in performing services for affiliate companies. FESC was formed upon approval of the merger between GPU, Inc. and FirstEnergy Corp., and became operational June 1, 2003. FESC provides a variety of administrative, management, engineering, construction, environmental and support services for affiliated companies within the FirstEnergy system. Services are provided at fully allocated cost as documented in the executed Service Agreements between FESC and associate companies.

FirstEnergy is a diversified energy company that holds, directly or indirectly, all of the outstanding common stock of its principal subsidiaries: Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, The Toledo Edison Company, Pennsylvania Power Company (a wholly owned subsidiary of Ohio Edison), Jersey Central Power \& Light Company, Metropolitan Edison Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, FirstEnergy Properties, FirstEnergy Ventures, FirstEnergy Fiber Holdings Corp, GPU Nuclear, Inc., Suvon LLC, FirstEnergy Service Company (FESC), Allegheny Energy Supply Company LLC, Monongahela Power Company, The Potomac Edison Company, West Penn Power Company and FirstEnergy Transmission, LLC and its principal subsidiaries (American Transmission Systems Incorporated, Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company, MidAtlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC and AET PATH Company, LLC), Green Valley Hydro, LLC, Allegheny Ventures, and Allegheny Energy Service Corporation (AESC)).

The books and records of FirstEnergy are kept in compliance with GAAP and Section 13(b)(2) of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 and where applicable, the regulations prescribed by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC).

FESC and affiliate companies utilize SAP financial systems, an integrated accounting system in which costs are accumulated utilizing a work order management process. There are four cost collectors which are equivalent to work orders, they are: work breakdown structures (WBS), cost centers, orders and networks which are also used to accumulate costs and equate to the products and services provided. The work order system accumulates costs from employee time sheets, expense reports, overheads, allocations, vendor invoices, journal entries, etc. for later billing to affiliate company benefitting from the work performed. The SAP system also captures the home company (providing the service) and the charge company (receiving the service). The SAP system is set-up to ensure:

1. Separation of costs between regulated and non-regulated affiliates will be maintained.
2. Intercompany transactions and related billings are structured so that non-regulated activities are not subsidized by regulated affiliates.
3. Adequate audit trails exist on the books and records.

All employees of FESC are required to ensure time is distributed to the appropriate accounting structure by entering a timesheet. Direct charging of time is required where a specific affiliate company can be identified as the beneficiary of the services provided. Indirect charging is used secondarily. Supervisory review of timesheets is performed to assure that time charged is appropriate and cost collector used to bill the affiliate is proper.

## II. General Description of Cost Allocation Methodology

FESC categorizes costs of services provided to affiliates into two categories, direct and indirect. Direct costs represent expenses incurred for activities and services identifiable as being applicable for the benefit of one affiliate or a group of affiliates captured through department work order systems for specific project billing purposes.

By the very nature of a service corporation, a portion of FESC's expenses will not be directly related to specific current operations or functions of individual Subsidiaries. Accordingly, it is necessary to develop formulae that recognize the overall contribution of FESC to both the current and future operations of the FirstEnergy system. After all direct charges have been made, the remaining costs (Indirect Costs) in each department in FESC must be fairly and equitably allocated among FirstEnergy and the Subsidiaries. The methodologies listed below pertain to all other costs which are not directly assigned but which make up the fully allocated cost of providing the product or service.

## III. FirstEnergy Service Company Allocations

Multiple Factor - All - For the Indirect Costs for products or services benefiting the entire FirstEnergy system, FirstEnergy and all Subsidiaries bear a fair and equitable portion of such costs. FirstEnergy, Inc. bears $5 \%$ of these Indirect Costs. The remaining Indirect Costs are initially allocated between two groups, the Utility Subsidiaries and the Non-Utility Subsidiaries benefiting from the services provided based on FirstEnergy's equity investment in the respective groups. A subsequent allocation step then occurs. Among the Utility Subsidiaries, allocations are based upon the Multiple Factor Utility method. Among the Non-Utility Subsidiaries, allocations are based upon the Multiple Factor - Non-Utility method.

Multiple Factor - Utility - For the Indirect Costs for a product or service solely benefiting one or more of the Utility Subsidiaries, each such Utility Subsidiary so benefiting is charged a portion of the Indirect Costs based on the average of its percentage share of the following three factors:

1. Gross transmission and/or distribution plant
2. Operating and maintenance expense excluding purchase power and fuel costs
3. Transmission and/or distribution revenues, excluding transactions with affiliates

These three (3) factors have been determined to be the most appropriate for the Utility Subsidiaries in the FirstEnergy system. Each factor is weighted equally so that no one facet of the electric utility operations inordinately influences the distribution of Indirect Costs.

Transmission Factor - Sub-set of Multi Factor-Utility using transmission revenue, transmission O\&M, and transmission utility plant to allocate Transmission Support costs across the Utility Subsidiaries.

Multiple Factor - Non-Utility - For the Indirect Costs for products or services solely benefiting the Non-Utility Subsidiaries, each Non-Utility Subsidiary so benefiting receiving the product or service is charged a proportion of the Indirect Costs based upon the total assets of each Non-Utility Subsidiary, including any generating assets under operating leases to the Utility Subsidiaries.

Multiple Factor - Utility and Non-Utility - For the Indirect Costs for a product or service benefiting one or more of the Utility and Non-Utility Subsidiaries, each such Subsidiary so benefiting is first assigned a distribution ratio that is in proportion to the Indirect Costs based on FirstEnergy's equity investment in such Subsidiaries. Following this distribution,
a subsequent allocation step occurs. Among the Utility Subsidiaries, allocations are based upon the Multiple FactorUtility. Among the Non-Utility Subsidiaries, allocations are based upon Multiple Factor - Non-Utility

Direct Charge Ratio - The ratio of direct charges for a particular product or service to an individual Subsidiary as a percentage of the total direct charges for a particular product or service to all Subsidiaries benefiting from such services. Indirect Costs are then allocated to each Subsidiary based on the calculated ratios.

Headcount - Used to allocate Indirect Costs that are driven by headcount, like Human Resources department costs, Safety and employment-related legal matters. The calculation uses the total number of employees for the respective Subsidiary divided by the total number of employees.

Number of Participating Employees - General - Used to allocate Investment Management department costs and administrative fees for pension trust. Allocation driven by all participating employees within the pension and 401(k) plans. The calculation uses the number of participating employees for the respective Subsidiary divided by the total number of participating employees.

Number of Customers - For costs of products and services driven by the number of Utility distribution customers, the allocation method that is used is the number of Utility distribution customers for the respective Utility Subsidiary receiving the product or service divided by the total number of utility customers.

Number of Shopping Customers - A "shopping customer" is defined as a Utility customer who has selected a competitive electric generation supplier. For costs of products and services driven by the number of shopping customers, the allocation method that will be used will be the number of shopping customers for the respective Utility Subsidiary receiving the product or service divided by the total number of shopping customers.

Gigabytes Used - Number of gigabytes utilized by a Subsidiary receiving the product or service divided by the total number of gigabytes used by the FirstEnergy system companies applicable to that respective product or service.

Number of Computer Workstations - Number of computer workstations utilized by a Subsidiary receiving the product or service divided by the total number of computer workstations in use by the FirstEnergy system companies applicable to that respective product or service.

Number of Billing Inserts - Number of billing inserts performed for a Subsidiary receiving the product or service divided by the total number of billing inserts performed for the FirstEnergy system companies applicable to that respective product or service.

Daily Print Volume - Average daily print volume performed for a Subsidiary receiving the service divided by the total average daily print volume performed for the entire FirstEnergy system.

Number of Intel Servers - Number of Intel servers utilized by a Subsidiary receiving the product or service divided by the total number of Intel servers utilized by the FirstEnergy system.

Application Development - Number of application development hours budgeted for a Subsidiary receiving the service divided by the total number of budgeted application development hours for the year.

Server Support Composite - The average ratio of Unix gigabytes, SAP gigabytes and Intel number of servers for a Subsidiary receiving the service.

## IV. FirstEnergy Service Company Allocation Codes - Allocation Percentages

Percentages shown include all companies included in calculation. FirstEnergy employs a methodology that permits inclusion or exclusion of companies within each methodology, depending upon the cost being allocated, so percentages within each method will vary by company depending on need.

| Allocation Code | 2021 \% | Operating Company |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Multiple Factor - All | 14.54 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
|  | 7.29 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 6.67 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 12.48 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 9.92 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 4.23 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 1.87 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 10.40 | American Transmission Sys, Inc. |
|  | 5.05 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 2.33 | Monongahela Power - Generation |
|  | 4.95 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 7.67 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 3.47 | Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company |
|  | 3.80 | Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC |
|  | 0.12 | FE Ventures |
|  | 0.19 | FE Properties |
|  | 0.02 | AE Ventures |
|  | 5.00 | FirstEnergy Holding Company |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
| Multiple Factor-Utility | 15.62 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
|  | 7.83 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 7.16 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 13.41 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 10.66 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 4.54 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 2.01 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 10.18 | American Transmission Sys, Inc. |
|  | 5.42 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 2.50 | Monongahela Power - Generation |
|  | 5.32 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 8.24 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 3.39 | Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company |
|  | 3.72 | Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Multi-Factor Utility - | 10.32 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
| Transmission | 11.18 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 9.04 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |


|  | 4.14 | Toledo Edison Company |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.06 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 32.39 | American Transmission Sys, Inc |
|  | 2.72 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 1.28 | Monongahela Power - Generation |
|  | 2.95 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 3.72 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 8.75 | Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company |
|  | 13.45 | Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Multiple Factor-Non | 36.86 | FE Ventures |
| Utility | 57.06 | FE Properties |
|  | 0.21 | Suvon, LLC |
|  | 5.87 | AE Ventures |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Multiple Factor - | 15.31 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
| Utility/Non-Utility | 7.67 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 7.02 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 13.14 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 10.45 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 4.45 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 1.97 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 10.95 | American Transmission Sys, Inc. |
|  | 5.31 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 2.45 | Monongahela Power - Generation |
|  | 5.21 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 8.07 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 3.65 | Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company |
|  | 4.00 | Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC |
|  | 0.13 | FE Ventures |
|  | 0.20 | FE Properties |
|  | 0.02 | AE Ventures |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Headcount | 17.37 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
|  | 9.63 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 8.19 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 14.82 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 11.70 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 4.72 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 2.47 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 14.38 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 7.11 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 9.61 | West Penn Power Company |


|  | 100.00 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Participating Employees- | 11.54 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
| General | 17.56 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
|  | 8.26 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 14.73 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 9.83 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 2.52 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 4.67 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 14.36 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 6.93 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 9.60 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
| Number of Customers | 17.21 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 2.73 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 12.26 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 5.11 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 18.62 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
|  | 9.38 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 9.55 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 6.40 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 6.87 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 11.87 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
| Number of Shopping | 31.48 | Ohio Edison Company |
| Customers | 1.83 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 24.54 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 9.37 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 9.81 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
|  | 7.08 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 6.50 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 1.72 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 7.67 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
| Application Development- | No Longer Used |  |
| Application Development RTS | No Longer Used |  |
|  |  |  |
| Direct Charge Ratio - | 15.53 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
| Emergency Management | 2.86 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |


| System (January-March) | 2.62 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4.90 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 3.90 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 1.66 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 0.74 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 30.81 | American Transmission Sys, Inc. |
|  | 4.57 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 4.75 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 6.55 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 8.32 | Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company |
|  | 12.79 | Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Direct Charge Ratio - | 15.54 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
| Emergency Management | 2.88 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
| System (April-December) | 2.64 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 4.94 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 3.93 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 1.67 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 0.74 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 30.72 | American Transmission Sys, Inc. |
|  | 4.58 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 4.76 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 6.56 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 8.29 | Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company |
|  | 12.75 | Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Gigabytes Used - SAP | No Longer Used |  |
|  |  |  |
| Gigabytes Used - Unix | No Longer Used |  |
|  |  |  |
| Number of Billing Inserts | 18.62 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
|  | 9.55 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 9.38 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 17.21 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 12.26 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 5.11 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 2.73 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 6.40 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 6.87 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 11.87 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |


| Application Development |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Network Service | No Longer Used |  |
| Number of Intel Servers | No Longer Used |  |
| Number of Computer | 15.15 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
| Workstations | 9.90 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 10.39 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 15.35 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 11.41 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 5.20 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 2.85 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 10.79 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 8.19 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 10.77 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
| Daily Print Volume | 18.62 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
|  | 9.55 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 9.38 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 17.21 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 12.26 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 5.11 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 2.73 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 6.40 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 6.87 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 11.87 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Server Support Composite | No Longer Used |  |
|  |  |  |
| Number of Computer | 15.15 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
| Workstations - Support | 9.90 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 10.39 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 15.35 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 11.41 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 5.20 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 2.85 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 10.79 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 8.19 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 10.77 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Direct Charge Ratio - | 17.56 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |


| Environmental Akron | 14.69 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.17 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 1.46 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 39.13 | Monongahela Power - Generation |
|  | 1.63 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 3.59 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 0.20 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 0.99 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 0.23 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 1.57 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 0.28 | Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company |
|  | 2.93 | Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC |
|  | 12.57 | American Transmission Sys, Inc. |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Direct Charge Ratio - | 4.76 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
| Environmental Reading | 0.27 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 13.01 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 1.56 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 2.05 | Monongahela Power - Generation |
|  | 6.16 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 7.41 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 0.09 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 8.16 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 56.53 | Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Direct Charge Ratio - | 20.32 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
| Environmental Billing ED | 7.41 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 4.33 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 2.53 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 3.25 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 0.44 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 0.84 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 3.02 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 7.81 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 25.26 | American Transmission Sys, Inc. |
|  | 3.82 | Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company |
|  | 10.65 | Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC |
|  | 10.32 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Direct Charge Ratio - | 8.37 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
| Environmental GRBG | 57.69 | Monongahela Power - Generation |
| (January - October) | 2.17 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 9.28 | American Transmission Sys, Inc. |


|  | 0.56 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.24 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 0.82 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 0.25 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 0.06 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 0.34 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 0.34 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 11.66 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 4.59 | Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company |
|  | 3.63 | Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Direct Charge Ratio - | 10.14 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
| Environmental GRBG | 69.93 | Monongahela Power - Generation |
| (November - December) | 2.63 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 0.68 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
|  | 0.29 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 1.00 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 0.30 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 0.07 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 0.41 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 0.41 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 14.14 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Direct Charge Ratio - | 1.72 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
| Environmental Field Ops | 42.98 | Monongahela Power - Generation |
|  | 1.47 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 1.40 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 1.68 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 1.48 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 1.16 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 0.40 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 1.97 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 43.82 | American Transmission Sys, Inc. |
|  | 0.45 | Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company |
|  | 1.47 | Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Direct Charge Ratio - | 33.14 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
| Broad Street Rent | 16.65 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 15.19 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 6.34 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 5.03 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 2.13 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 0.97 | Pennsylvania Power Company |


|  | 4.52 | American Transmission Sys, Inc. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.08 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 1.01 | Monongahela Power - Generation |
|  | 2.59 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 3.93 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 1.51 | Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company |
|  | 1.65 | Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC |
|  | 0.03 | FE Ventures |
|  | 0.01 | AE Ventures |
|  | 0.05 | FE Properties |
|  | 2.17 | FirstEnergy Holding Company |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Direct Charge Ratio - | 53.37 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
| Distribution Center-EDC | 24.47 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 5.34 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 9.26 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 7.56 | Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Direct Charge Ratio - | 16.12 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
| Distribution Center - SDC | 26.61 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 12.79 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 40.47 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 4.01 | Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Direct Charge Ratio - | 10.74 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
| Unit Dispatch | 81.85 | Monongahela Power - Generation |
| (January - February) | 4.60 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 2.81 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Direct Charge Ratio - | 94.61 | Monongahela Power - Generation |
| Unit Dispatch | 5.39 | Potomac Edison Company |
| (March - December) | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Direct Charge Ratio - | 1.44 | American Transmission Sys, Inc. |
| BETA Mgr/Chemistry | 1.15 | Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company |
|  | 1.29 | Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC |
|  | 14.29 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 2.42 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
|  | 2.45 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 5.74 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 29.96 | Monongahela Power - Generation |
|  | 16.39 | Ohio Edison Company |


|  | 0.40 | Potomac Edison Company |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 6.21 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 3.51 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 3.66 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 11.09 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Direct Charge Ratio - | 2.90 | American Transmission Sys, Inc. |
| BETA Fire \& Safety | 2.32 | Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company |
|  | 2.61 | Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC |
|  | 15.41 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 0.97 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
|  | 1.20 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 6.96 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 16.96 | Monongahela Power - Generation |
|  | 21.25 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 0.04 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 6.92 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 4.62 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 4.41 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 13.43 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Direct Charge Ratio - | 9.14 | Allegheny Energy Supply |
| BETA AESupply \& ED | 1.31 | American Transmission Sys, Inc. |
|  | 1.05 | Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company |
|  | 1.18 | Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC |
|  | 12.98 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 2.19 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
|  | 2.23 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 5.22 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 27.23 | Monongahela Power - Generation |
|  | 14.89 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 0.36 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 5.64 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 3.19 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 3.32 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 10.07 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Direct Charge Ratio - | 2.65 | American Transmission Sys, Inc. |
| BETA - ED | 2.12 | Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company |
|  | 2.38 | Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC |
|  | 20.05 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 3.39 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
|  | 3.44 | Metropolitan Edison Company |


|  | 8.06 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 23.00 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 0.58 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 8.71 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 4.93 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 5.13 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 15.56 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Direct Charge Ratio - | 10.60 | Allegheny Energy Supply |
| BETA - Corp Facilities | 12.40 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
| (January - June) | 2.40 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
|  | 1.50 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 8.40 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 30.30 | Monongahela Power - Generation |
|  | 12.60 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 0.80 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 6.70 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 2.60 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 3.70 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 8.00 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
| Direct Charge Ratio - | 4.71 | Allegheny Energy Supply |
| BETA - Corp Facilities | 0.09 | Allegheny Generating Company |
| (July - December) | 15.61 | Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company |
|  | 2.22 | Jersey Central Power \& Light |
|  | 1.93 | Metropolitan Edison Company |
|  | 5.82 | Monongahela Power - Delivery |
|  | 30.95 | Monongahela Power - Generation |
|  | 13.36 | Ohio Edison Company |
|  | 2.05 | Potomac Edison Company |
|  | 6.97 | Pennsylvania Electric Company |
|  | 3.42 | Pennsylvania Power Company |
|  | 4.22 | Toledo Edison Company |
|  | 8.65 | West Penn Power Company |
|  | 100.00 | Total |
|  |  |  |
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## Certification of Training Program

I am the Vice President, Controller and Chief Accounting Officer for FirstEnergy Service Company that supplies accounting services to the operating affiliates in the FirstEnergy System including The Potomac Edison Company. I am familiar with the FirstEnergy Service Company Cost Allocation Manual (CAM), which Potomac Edison files with the Commission pursuant to the requirements of Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 20.40.02.07.B. I hereby certify that the personnel responsible for accounting for transactions involving Potomac Edison and its affiliates in the FirstEnergy System are familiar with and are trained on the requirements of the CAM as necessary to comply with the provisions of the Maryland Commission's affiliate regulations.


## Verification

I declare under the penalties of perjury that the foregoing statements are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.


## STATE OF OHIO

$\qquad$

I, Kristina A. Housley a notary public in and for the State of Ohio, hereby certify that Jason J. Lisowski signed the foregoing verification statement as Vice President, Controller and Chief Accounting Officer of FirstEnergy Service Company as agent for The Potomac Edison Company and has acknowledged the same before me in my presence on the $28^{\text {th }}$ day of June 2022.


KRISTINA A. HOUSLEY NOTARY PUBLIC - STATE OF OHIO My Commission Expires Mar. 24, 2027


My commission expires: $\qquad$
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## Affidavit Relating to Cost Allocation and Asset Transfer Pricing Principles

I am Vice President, Controller and Chief Accounting Officer for FirstEnergy Service Company that supplies accounting services to the operating affiliates in the FirstEnergy System including The Potomac Edison Company (Potomac Edison). As such Vice President, Controller and Chief Accounting Officer, I am familiar with the FirstEnergy Service Company Cost Allocation Manual (CAM), which Potomac Edison files with the Commission pursuant to the requirements of Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 20.40.02.07.B. I hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, the cost allocation and asset transfer pricing principles set forth in FirstEnergy Service Company's CAM comply with COMAR Title 20, Subtitle 40.


## Verification

I declare under the penalties of perjury that the foregoing statements are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.


## STATE OF OHIO

$\qquad$
COUNTY OF Stark
1, Kristina A. Housley a notary public in and for the State of Ohio, hereby certify that Jason J. Lisowski signed the foregoing verification statement as Vice President, Controller and Chief Accounting Officer of FirstEnergy Service Company as agent for The Potomac Edison Company, and has acknowledged the same before me in my presence on the $28^{\text {th }}$ day of June 2022.


My commission expires: $\quad 3 / 24 / 2027$

## FirstEnergy Corp.

Somerhalder II, John W. Vice Chair and Executive Director
Strah, Steven E. President and Chief Executive Officer
Park, Hyun Senior Vice President and Chief Legal Officer
Taylor, K. Jon Senior Vice President, Chief Financial Officer and Strategy
Lisowski, Jason J. Vice President, Controller and Chief Accounting Officer

## The Potomac Edison Company

Belcher, Samuel L. President
Park, Hyun Senior Vice President and General Counsel
Taylor, K. Jon Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer
Lisowski, Jason J. Vice President and Controller

## Allegheny Energy Service Corporation

| Strah, Steven E. | President |
| :--- | :--- |
| Park, Hyun | Senior Vice President and General Counsel |
| Staub, Steven R. | Vice President and Treasurer |

FirstEnergy Service Company
Strah, Steven E. President and Chief Executive Officer
Belcher, Samuel L. Senior Vice President, Operations
Taylor, K. Jon Senior Vice President, Chief Financial Officer and Strategy
Walker, Christine L. Senior Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer
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# DIRECT TESTIMONY OF 

WALTER S. LARNERD

Concerning: Low-Income Assistance Initiatives

## I. INTRODUCTION

## Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is Walter S. Larnerd, and my business address is 5001 NASA Blvd, Fairmont, West Virginia.

## Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?

A. I am employed by FirstEnergy Service Company as Manager, Revenue Operations Strategy. In that capacity, I oversee the administration of the human services programs including the Electric Universal Service Program ("EUSP"), the Maryland Energy Assistance Program ("MEAP")/Utility Service Protection Program ("USPP"), and assistance grants for The Potomac Edison Company ("PE" or "Company"). I also oversee additional processes such as bankruptcy, security deposits and revenue assurance functions.
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.
A. I earned a Bachelor of Science degree in management and economics from SUNY Empire State College. Over the last 14 years, I have held a number of positions in the Customer Service organization at FirstEnergy which have included Supervisor, Customer Contact Center and Supervisor, Revenue Assurance. Most recently, I was appointed to the Manager, Revenue Operations Strategy position in 2022. In my current role, I oversee Human Services programs, energy efficiency programs and support back-office tasks for revenue assurance functions.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY.

A. I am testifying on behalf of PE in support of its distribution base rate case filing. More specifically, my testimony addresses the two new low-income assistance initiatives for residential customers that PE is proposing.

## II. LOW INCOME ASSISTANCE INITIATIVES

Q. PLEASE DISCUSS THE NEW INITIATIVES THAT PE IS PROPOSING TO FURTHER ASSIST LOW-INCOME CUSTOMERS.
A. The Company is proposing two new initiatives for residential customers. I will discuss each in turn. The first is the "Energy Assistance Outreach Team." The purpose of the team is to increase awareness, education and participation in energy assistance programs that are available to low-income customers. The team will partner with targeted organizations and strengthen the relationships within the community.
Q. WHAT SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES WILL THE TEAM ASSIST CUSTOMERS WITH?
A. On a broad level, the team will assist low-income residential customers with learning about and applying for assistance programs that will help with their utility costs. More specifically, the team will:

1) Be responsible for education, resources, tools, and technology needed to reduce and/or eliminate customer barriers to program participation;
2) Work with customers, agencies, local charities, churches and local governments to understand the types of available programs;
3) Help customers by sharing what information is required to participate in the different programs;
4) Participate in energy assistance fairs and organize additional events as necessary; and
5) Be a support system for agencies to assist with special situations or barriers.

## Q. WHY IS PE PROPOSING THE ENERGY ASSISTANCE OUTREACH TEAM?

A. A centralized, dedicated team to assist customers with information about enrollment in all the assistance programs will be a benefit to customers by helping eligible customers receive available assistance in paying their electric bills.
Q. WHAT IS THE ANNUAL BUDGET FOR THE ENERGY ASSISTANCE OUTREACH TEAM?
A. PE's annual budget for this initiative is $\$ 202,433$.
Q. WHAT ARE THE COMPONENTS OF THE ANNUAL BUDGET?
A. Staffing, program materials and travel expenses are the main budget components.
Q. WILL PE HAVE DEDICATED TEAM MEMBERS FOR ITS SERVICE TERRITORY?
A. Yes, there will be two people dedicated full time to the PE service territory.
Q. HAS PE REACHED OUT TO OTHER ENERGY ASSISTANCE GROUPS IN MARYLAND TO MAKE THEM AWARE OF THIS INITIATIVE?
A. Not yet, since the Maryland Public Service Commission ("Commission") has not yet approved the new program. Every year PE conducts a meeting with local energy assistance agencies and other stakeholders to coordinate efforts and make those stakeholders aware
of the PE programs, personnel, and resources which the agencies and stakeholders can work with in assisting customers. This year's meeting was held on March 10, 2023, and was attended by Religious Coalition for Emergency Human Needs, City of Frederick Housing and Human Services, Washington County Community Action Council, Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development, Allegany County Department of Social Services, Office of Home Energy Programs, Montgomery County Department of Health and Human Services, and the Office of People's Counsel. PE made a presentation about current Company programs at that meeting. This new program, if approved by the Commission, would have incremental costs and be additive to what was described in the meeting.

## Q. WHAT IS THE SECOND INITIATIVE?

A. The second initiative is called the " $50 \%$ Discount Program."

## Q. WHY IS PE PROPOSING THIS PROGRAM?

A. PE is proposing the $50 \%$ Discount Program in response to House Bill 606, a bill entitled Electricity and Gas - Limited-Income Mechanisms and Assistance. My understanding is that the bill was introduced in the Maryland General Assembly on January 20, 2021, and enacted May 30, 2021. The bill authorizes utilities to adopt a low-income mechanism to benefit certain low-income eligible customers subject to the approval of the Commission.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN WHAT THIS PROGRAM WILL ENTAIL.

A. The $50 \%$ Discount program will provide a $50 \%$ monthly discount to distribution charges at the primary residence of income-eligible residential customers during a five-month period beginning November 1 through March 31, i.e., during the winter heating period.

The discount will be applied as a credit to distribution charges on the participating customer's monthly bill.

## Q. HOW WAS THE DISCOUNT SET AT 50\%?

A. The discount was set at $50 \%$ based on a similar program that is currently used in PE's West Virginia service territory. It was then internally tested using data from the PE Maryland customer base. There are approximately 12,800 PE residential customers that have participated in currently-available programs (EUSP, MEAP/USPP). When the discount was applied to the average monthly distribution charges for this set of customers during the above-mentioned five-month period, the average monthly discount was $\$ 13.09$. The total average annual discount per customer was $\$ 65.47$ - provided during the 5-month period of November through March.

## Q. WHAT ARE THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR THIS PROGRAM?

A. There are two eligibility criteria as follows:

1) Customers may only receive the discount for their primary residence.
2) Customers who enroll in an energy assistance program (EUSP, MEAP/USPP) will be enrolled in the program. This second criterion has the added advantage of serving as another incentive for customers to take advantage of those programs, especially at a time when PE will be working (as discussed earlier in my testimony) to help such customers navigate the enrollment processes.

## Q. HOW WILL CUSTOMERS ENROLL IN THIS PE 50\% DISCOUNT PROGRAM?

A. Customers who enroll in an energy assistance program will automatically be enrolled. This allows the Company to provide the discount to confirmed low-income residential
customers without administrative costs for a separate application and enrollment process. This also allows the customer to receive the benefit without going through a separate enrollment process. The enrollment would be triggered with the receipt of the assistance program or grant via a batch enrollment file to the Company. If the customer transfers service within the PE service territory the enrollment will also transfer to the new premise.

## Q. HOW WILL THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROGRAM BE MONITORED?

A. PE will conduct a quarterly review on the discount program to measure the dollars included in the discount and the impact on the customer's ability to pay, including impacts on those customers' arrearages, disconnections, and resulting uncollectibles. A successful program should reduce arrearages and uncollectibles and help keep more customers on service.

## Q. WHAT IS PE'S BUDGET FOR THIS INITIATIVE?

A. The annual PE budget for this initiative is $\$ 840,000$, virtually all of which represents the discounts to the eligible customers.
Q. WHEN DOES PE PLAN TO ROLL OUT BOTH THE ENERGY ASSISTANCE OUTREACH TEAM AND THE 50\% DISCOUNT PROGRAM?
A. The Company expects to commence these programs during 2024, subject to the receipt of regulatory approvals.

## III. CONCLUSION

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE NEW LOW-INCOME ASSISTANCE INITIATIVES BEING PROPOSED BY PE FOR COMMISSION CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL.
A. PE is proposing: (1) a new "Energy Assistance Outreach Team"; and (2) a " $50 \%$ Discount Program." The "Energy Assistance Outreach Team" is designed to increase awareness, education and participation in energy assistance programs that are available to low-income residential customers at a budgeted annual incremental cost of \$202,433; whereas the " $50 \%$ Discount Program" will provide a $50 \%$ monthly discount to distribution charges at the primary residence of income-eligible residential customers during the five-month winter period at a budgeted annual incremental cost of $\$ 840,000$. The total cost for these two lowincome residential initiatives is $\$ 1,042,433$. Cost recovery for these two new initiatives is explained in the direct testimony of Company witness Valdes.

## Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY AT THIS TIME?

A. Yes, it does.
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## I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

## A. Witness Identification

## Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is Dylan W. D'Ascendis. My business address is 3000 Atrium Way, Suite 200, Mount Laurel, NJ 08054.

## Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?

A. I am a Partner at ScottMadden, Inc.
Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE AND EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND.
A. I have offered expert testimony on behalf of investor-owned utilities before over 35 state regulatory commissions in the United States, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Alberta Utility Commission, an American Arbitration Association panel, and the Superior Court of Rhode Island on issues including, but not limited to, common equity cost rate, rate of return, valuation, capital structure, class cost of service, and rate design.

On behalf of the American Gas Association ("AGA"), I calculate the AGA Gas Index, which serves as the benchmark against which the performance of the American Gas Index Fund ("AGIF") is measured on a monthly basis. The AGA Gas Index and AGIF are a market capitalization weighted index and mutual fund, respectively, comprised of the common stocks of the publicly traded corporate members of the AGA.
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I am a member of the Society of Utility and Regulatory Financial Analysts ("SURFA"). In 2011, I was awarded the professional designation "Certified Rate of Return Analyst" by SURFA, which is based on education, experience, and the successful completion of a comprehensive written examination.

I am also a member of the National Association of Certified Valuation Analysts ("NACVA") and was awarded the professional designation "Certified Valuation Analyst" by NACVA in 2015.

I am a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, where I received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Economic History. I have also received a Master of Business Administration with high honors and concentrations in Finance and International Business from Rutgers University.

The details of my educational background and expert witness appearances are shown in Appendix A.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY.

A. The purpose of my testimony is to present evidence on behalf of The Potomac Edison Company ("PE" or the "Company") and recommend an allowed rate of return on common equity ("ROE") for its Maryland jurisdictional rate base. I also calculate and recommend a credit-adjusted risk free rate.

## Q. HAVE YOU PREPARED SCHEDULES IN SUPPORT OF YOUR RECOMMENDATION?

A. Yes. I have prepared Exhibit No. 1, which consists of Schedules DWD-1 through DWD-11, which were prepared by me or under my direction.

The Potomac Edison Company
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## Q. WHAT IS YOUR RECOMMENDED ROE FOR PE?

A. I recommend that the Maryland Public Service Commission (the "PSC" or "Commission") authorize PE the opportunity to earn an ROE of $10.60 \%$ on its jurisdictional rate base. The ratemaking capital structure and cost of long-term debt is sponsored by Company Witness Wang. The overall rate of return is summarized on page 1 of Schedule DWD-1 and in Table 1 below:

## Table 1: Summary of Recommended Weighted Average Cost of Capital

| Type of Capital | $\underline{\text { Ratios }}$ | $\underline{\text { Cost Rate }}$ | Weighted Cost Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Long-Term Debt | $46.47 \%$ | $4.018 \%$ | $1.87 \%$ |
| Common Equity | $\underline{53.53 \%}$ | $10.60 \%$ | $\underline{5.67 \%}$ |
| Total | $\underline{\underline{100.00 \%}}$ |  | $\underline{\underline{7.54 \%}}$ |

## II. SUMMARY

## Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR RECOMMENDED COMMON EQUITY COST RATE.

A. My recommended common equity cost rate of $10.60 \%$ is summarized on page 2 of Schedule DWD-1. I have assessed the market-based common equity cost rates of companies of relatively similar, but not necessarily identical, risk to PE. Using companies of relatively comparable risk as proxies is consistent with the principles of fair rate of return established in the Hope ${ }^{1}$ and Bluefield $^{2}$ decisions. No proxy group can be identical in risk to any single company. Consequently, there must be
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an evaluation of relative risk between the company and the proxy group to determine if it is appropriate to adjust the proxy group's indicated rate of return. My recommendation results from applying several cost of common equity models, specifically the Discounted Cash Flow ("DCF") model, the Risk Premium Model ("RPM"), and the Capital Asset Pricing Model ("CAPM"), to the market data of a proxy group of 13 electric utilities ("Utility Proxy Group") whose selection criteria will be discussed below. Although I have not included the results in determining the recommended ROE, I have also applied these same models to a Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group, ${ }^{3}$ which I demonstrate is similar in total risk to the Utility Proxy Group. The results of the models based on the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group serve as a check on the reasonableness of my other analytical models. The results derived from each are as follows:
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Table 2: Summary of Common Equity Cost Rates

| Discounted Cash Flow Model | $9.29 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Risk Premium Model | $11.64 \%$ |
| Capital Asset Pricing Model | $11.79 \%$ |
| Cost of Equity Models Applied to Comparable | $\underline{12.58 \%}$ |
| Risk, Non-Price Regulated Companies | $\underline{10.04 \%-11.04 \%}$ |
| Indicated Range of Common Equity Cost | $0.15 \%$ |
| Rates Before Adjustments | $0.10 \%$ |
| Business Risk Adjustment | $\underline{0.19 \%}$ |
| Credit Risk Adjustment | $\underline{\underline{10.29 \%-11.29 \%}}$ |
| Flotation Cost Adjustment | $\underline{\underline{10.60 \%}}$ |
| Indicated Cost of Common Equity Cost Rates |  |
| After Adjustment |  |
| Recommended Cost of Common Equity |  |

The indicated common equity cost rates across these models is from $10.04 \%$ to $11.04 \%$ before any Company-specific adjustments. ${ }^{4}$ I then adjusted the indicated common equity cost rate upward by $0.15 \%$ and $0.10 \%$ to reflect the Company's smaller relative size and riskier bond rating, as compared to the Utility Proxy Group companies. ${ }^{5}$ These adjustments result in a Company-specific range of indicated common equity cost rates between $10.29 \%$ and $11.29 \%$. From this range, I recommend that the Commission authorize an ROE of $10.60 \%$ for the Company.
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## Q. HOW IS THE REMAINDER OF YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY ORGANIZED?

A. The remainder of my Direct Testimony is organized as follows:

- Section III - Provides a summary of financial theory and regulatory principles pertinent to the development of the Cost of Capital;
- Section IV - Explains my selection of the Utility Proxy Group used to develop my analytical results;
- Section $V$ - Describes the analyses on which my recommendation is based;
- Section VI - Summarizes my common equity cost rate before adjustments to reflect Company-specific factors;
- Section VII - Explains my adjustments to my common equity cost rate to reflect the Company-specific factors;
- Section VIII- Presents my conclusions regarding ROE; and
- Section IX - Calculates and recommends a credit-adjusted risk-free rate ("CARFR").


## III. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

## Q. WHAT GENERAL PRINCIPLES HAVE YOU CONSIDERED IN ARRIVING AT YOUR RECOMMENDED COMMON EQUITY COST RATE?

A. In unregulated industries, marketplace competition is the principal determinant of the price of products or services. For regulated public utilities, regulation must act as a substitute for marketplace competition. Assuring that the utility can fulfill its
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obligations to the public, while providing safe and reliable service, requires a level of earnings sufficient to maintain the integrity of presently invested capital. Sufficient earnings also permit the attraction of needed new capital at a reasonable cost, for which the utility must compete with other firms of comparable risk, consistent with the fair rate of return standards established by the U.S. Supreme Court in the previously cited Hope and Bluefield cases.

The U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the fair rate of return standards in Hope, when it stated:

The rate-making process under the Act, i.e., the fixing of 'just and reasonable' rates, involves a balancing of the investor and the consumer interests. Thus we stated in the Natural Gas Pipeline Co. case that 'regulation does not insure that the business shall produce net revenues.' 315 U.S. at page 590, 62 S.Ct. at page 745 . But such considerations aside, the investor interest has a legitimate concern with the financial integrity of the company whose rates are being regulated. From the investor or company point of view it is important that there be enough revenue not only for operating expenses but also for the capital costs of the business. These include service on the debt and dividends on the stock. Cf. Chicago \& Grand Trunk R. Co. v. Wellman, 143 U.S. 339, 345, 34612 S.Ct. 400,402. By that standard the return to the equity owner should be commensurate with returns on investments in other enterprises having corresponding risks. That return, moreover, should be sufficient to assure confidence in the financial integrity of the enterprise, so as to maintain its credit and to attract capital. ${ }^{6}$

In summary, the U.S. Supreme Court has found that a return should be adequate to attract capital at reasonable terms and enable the utility to provide service while maintaining its financial integrity. As discussed above, and in keeping with established regulatory standards, that return should be commensurate
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with the returns expected elsewhere for investments of equivalent risk. The Commission's decision in this proceeding, therefore, should provide the Company with the opportunity to earn a return that is: (1) adequate to attract capital at reasonable cost and terms; (2) sufficient to ensure its financial integrity; and (3) commensurate with returns on investments in enterprises having corresponding risks.

Lastly, the required return for a regulated public utility is established on a stand-alone basis, i.e., for the utility operating company at issue in a rate case. Parent entities, like other investors, have capital constraints and must look at the attractiveness of the expected risk-adjusted return of each investment alternative in their capital budgeting process. That is, utility holding companies that own many utility operating companies have choices as to where they will invest their capital within the holding company family. Therefore, the opportunity cost concept applies regardless of whether the funding source is public or corporate.

When funding is provided by a parent entity, the return still must be sufficient to provide an incentive to allocate equity capital to the subsidiary or business unit rather than other internal or external investment opportunities. That is, the regulated subsidiary must compete for capital with all the parent company's affiliates, and with other similar risk companies, which may include non-utilities. In that regard, investors value corporate entities on a sum-of-the-parts basis and expect each division within the parent company to provide an appropriate riskadjusted return.
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It therefore is important that the authorized ROE for the Company reflects the risks and prospects of its operations and supports its financial integrity from a stand-alone perspective. Consequently, the ROE authorized in this proceeding should be sufficient to support the operational (i.e., business risk) and financing (i.e., financial risk) of the Company's utility operations on a stand-alone basis.

Marketplace data must be relied on in assessing a common equity cost rate appropriate for ratemaking purposes. Just as the use of the market data for the proxy group adds reliability to the informed expert's judgment used in arriving at a recommended common equity cost rate, the use of multiple, generally accepted common equity cost rate models also adds reliability and accuracy when arriving at a recommended common equity cost rate.

## Q. WITHIN THAT BROAD FRAMEWORK, HOW IS THE COST OF CAPITAL ESTIMATED IN REGULATORY PROCEEDINGS?

A. Regulated utilities primarily use common stock and long-term debt to finance their permanent property, plant, and equipment (i.e., rate base). The fair rate of return for a regulated utility is based on its weighted average cost of capital, in which the costs of the individual sources of capital are weighted by their respective book values.

The cost of capital is the return investors require to make an investment in a firm. Investors will provide funds to a firm only if the return that they expect is equal to, or greater than, the return that they require to accept the risk of providing funds to the firm.
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The cost of capital (that is, the combination of the costs of debt and equity) is based on the economic principle of "opportunity costs." The principle of opportunity costs recognizes that investing in any asset (whether debt or equity securities) represents a forgone opportunity to invest in alternative assets. For any investment to be sensible, its expected return must be at least equal to the return expected on alternative investment opportunities with comparable risks. Because investments with like risks should offer similar returns, the opportunity cost of an investment should equal the return available on an investment of comparable risk.

The cost of debt is contractually defined and can be directly observed as the interest rate or yield on debt securities. However, the cost of equity is not directly observable and must be estimated based on market data and various financial models. Because the cost of equity is premised on opportunity costs, the models used to determine it are typically applied to a group of "comparable" or "proxy" companies.

In the end, the estimated cost of capital should reflect the return that investors require considering the subject company's business and financial risks, and the returns available on comparable investments.

## A. Business Risk

Q. PLEASE DEFINE BUSINESS RISK AND EXPLAIN WHY IT IS IMPORTANT FOR DETERMINING A FAIR RATE OF RETURN.

# The Potomac Edison Company 
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A. The investor-required return on common equity reflects investors' assessment of the total investment risk of the subject firm. Total investment risk is often discussed in the context of business and financial risk.

Business risk reflects the uncertainty associated with owning a company's common stock without the company's use of debt and/or preferred stock financing. One way of considering the distinction between business and financial risk is to view the former as the uncertainty of the expected earned return on common equity, assuming the firm is financed with no debt.

Examples of business risks generally faced by utilities include, but are not limited to, the regulatory environment, mandatory environmental compliance requirements, customer mix and concentration of customers, service territory economic growth, market demand, operations, capital intensity, size, the degree of operating leverage, emerging technologies including distributed energy resources, the vagaries of weather, and the like, all of which have a direct bearing on earnings.

Although analysts, including rating agencies, may categorize business risks individually, as a practical matter, such risks are interrelated and not wholly distinct from one another. When determining an appropriate return on common equity, the relevant issue is where investors see the subject company in relation to other similarly situated utility companies (i.e., the Utility Proxy Group). To the extent investors view a company as being exposed to higher risk, the required return will increase, and vice versa.

Case No. $\qquad$
Direct Testimony of Dylan W. D'Ascendis
Page 12 of 71

For regulated utilities, business risks are both long-term and near-term in nature. Whereas near-term business risks are reflected in year-to-year variability in earnings and cash flow brought about by economic or regulatory factors, longterm business risks reflect the prospect of an impaired ability of investors to obtain both a fair rate of return on, and return of, their capital. Moreover, because utilities accept the obligation to provide safe, adequate and reliable service (in exchange for a reasonable opportunity to earn a fair return on their investment), they generally do not have the option to delay, defer, or reject capital investments. Because those investments are capital-intensive, utilities generally do not have the option to avoid raising external funds. The obligation to serve and the corresponding need to access capital is even more acute during period of capital market distress.

Because utilities invest in long-lived assets, long-term business risks are of paramount concern to equity investors. That is, the risk of not recovering the return on their investment extends far into the future. The timing and nature of events that may lead to losses, however, also are uncertain and, consequently, those risks and their implications for the required return on equity tend to be difficult to quantify. Regulatory commissions (like investors who commit their capital) must review a variety of quantitative and qualitative data and apply their reasoned judgment to determine how long-term risks weigh in their assessment of the market-required return on common equity.
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## B. Financial Risk

## Q. PLEASE DEFINE FINANCIAL RISK AND EXPLAIN WHY IT IS IMPORTANT IN DETERMINING A FAIR RATE OF RETURN.

A. Financial risk is the additional risk created by the introduction of debt and preferred stock into the capital structure. The higher the proportion of debt and preferred stock in the capital structure, the higher the financial risk to common equity owners (i.e., failure to receive dividends due to default or other covenants). Therefore, consistent with the basic financial principle of risk and return, common equity investors require higher returns as compensation for bearing higher financial risk.

## Q. CAN BOND AND CREDIT RATINGS BE A PROXY FOR A FIRM'S COMBINED BUSINESS AND FINANCIAL RISKS TO EQUITY OWNERS (I.E., INVESTMENT RISK)?

A. Yes, similar bond ratings/issuer credit ratings reflect, and are representative of, similar combined business and financial risks (i.e., total risk) faced by bond investors. ${ }^{7}$ Although specific business or financial risks may differ between companies, the same bond/credit rating indicates that the combined risks are roughly similar from a debtholder perspective. The caveat is that these debtholder risk measures do not translate directly to risks for common equity.
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## IV. PE AND THE UTILITY PROXY GROUP

Q. WHY IS IT NECESSARY TO DEVELOP A PROXY GROUP WHEN ESTIMATING THE ROE FOR PE?
A. Because PE is not publicly traded and does not have publicly traded equity securities, it is necessary to develop groups of publicly traded, comparable companies to serve as "proxies" for the Company. In addition to the analytical necessity of doing so, the use of proxy companies is consistent with the Hope and Bluefield comparable risk standards, as discussed above. I have selected two proxy groups that, in my view, are fundamentally risk-comparable to the Company: a Utility Proxy Group and a Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group, which is comparable in total risk to the Utility Proxy Group.

Even when proxy groups are carefully selected, it is common for analytical results to vary from company to company. Despite the care taken to ensure comparability, because no two companies are identical, market expectations regarding future risks and prospects will vary within the proxy group. It therefore is common for analytical results to reflect a seemingly wide range, even for a group of similarly situated companies. At issue is how to estimate the ROE from within that range. That determination will be best informed by employing a variety of sound analyses and necessarily must consider the sort of quantitative and qualitative information discussed throughout my Direct Testimony. Additionally, a relative risk analysis between the Company and the Utility Proxy Group must be made to
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determine whether or not explicit Company-specific adjustments need to be made to the Utility Proxy Group indicated results.

My analyses are based on the Utility Proxy Group, containing U.S. electric utilities. As discussed earlier, utilities must compete for capital with other companies with commensurate risk (including non-utilities) and, to do so, must be provided the opportunity to earn a fair and reasonable return. Consequently, it is appropriate to consider the Utility Proxy Group's market data in determining the Company's ROE.

## Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH PE'S OPERATIONS?

A. Yes. PE owns and operates an electric transmission and distribution system in portions of Maryland and West Virginia and owns a transmission system in a portion of northern Virginia. ${ }^{8}$ The operations subject to this proceeding are the electric distribution operations in Maryland, which serve approximately 285,000 customers. PE is not publicly-traded but rather is an operating subsidiary of FirstEnergy Corp. ("FE" or the "Parent"), which operates in six states ${ }^{9}$ and serves approximately six million customers and is publicly-traded under symbol FE.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN HOW YOU CHOSE THE COMPANIES IN THE

 UTILITY PROXY GROUP.A. Because the cost of equity is a comparative exercise, my objective in developing a proxy group was to select companies that are comparable to the Company. Because
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the Company is a $100 \%$ rate-regulated electric transmission and distribution utility,
I applied the following criteria to select my Utility Proxy Group:
(i) They were included in the Eastern, Central, or Western Electric Utility Group of Value Line Investment Survey (Standard Edition)("Value Line");
(ii) They have $70 \%$ or greater of fiscal year 2021 total operating income derived from, and $70 \%$ or greater of fiscal year 2021 total assets attributable to, regulated electric distribution operations;
(iii) At the time of preparation of this testimony, they had not publicly announced that they were involved in any major merger or acquisition activity (i.e., one publicly-traded utility merging with or acquiring another) or any other major development;
(iv) They have not cut or omitted their common dividends during the five years ending 2021 or through the time of preparation of this testimony;
(v) They have Value Line and Bloomberg Professional Services ("Bloomberg") adjusted Beta coefficients ("beta");
(vi) They have positive Value Line five-year dividends per share ("DPS") growth rate projections; and
(vii) They have Value Line, Zacks, or Yahoo! Finance consensus five-year earnings per share ("EPS") growth rate projections.

The following 13 companies met these criteria:
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Table 3: Utility Proxy Group Companies

| Company Name | Ticker Symbol |
| :---: | :---: |
| Alliant Energy Corporation | LNT |
| Ameren Corporation | AEE |
| American Electric Power Corporation | AEP |
| Duke Energy Corporation | DUK |
| Edison International | EIX |
| Entergy Corporation | ETR |
| Evergy, Inc. | EVRG |
| Eversource Energy | ES |
| IDACORP, Inc. | IDA |
| NorthWestern Corporation | NWE |
| OGE Energy Corporation | OGE |
| Portland General Electric Company | POR |
| Xcel Energy Inc. | XEL |

## V. COMMON EQUITY COST RATE MODELS

Q. IS IT IMPORTANT THAT COST OF COMMON EQUITY MODELS BE MARKET-BASED?
A. Yes. As discussed previously, regulated public utilities, like the Company, must compete for equity in capital markets along with all other companies with commensurate risk, including non-utilities. The cost of common equity is thus determined based on equity market expectations for the returns of those companies. If an individual investor is choosing to invest their capital among companies with comparable risk, they will choose the company providing a higher return over a company providing a lower return.

## Q. ARE THE COST OF COMMON EQUITY MODELS YOU USE MARKETBASED MODELS?

A. Yes. The DCF model is market-based in that market prices are used in developing the dividend yield component of the model. The RPM and CAPM are also market-
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based in that the bond/issuer ratings and expected bond yields/risk-free rate used in the application of the RPM and CAPM reflect the market's assessment of bond/credit risk. In addition, the use of beta to determine the equity risk premium also reflects the market's assessment of market/systematic risk, as betas are derived from regression analyses of market prices. Moreover, market prices are used in the development of the monthly returns and equity risk premiums used in the Predictive Risk Premium Model ("PRPM"). Selection criteria for the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group are based on regression analyses of market prices and reflect the market's assessment of total risk.

## Q. WHAT ANALYTICAL APPROACHES DID YOU USE TO DETERMINE THE COMPANY'S ROE?

A. As discussed earlier, I have relied on the DCF model, the RPM, and the CAPM, which I apply to the Utility Proxy Group described above. I also applied these same models to a Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group described later in this section.

I rely on multiple models because reasonable investors use a variety of tools and do not rely exclusively on a single source of information or single model. Moreover, the specific models on which I rely focus on different aspects of return requirements, and provide different insights into investors' views of risk and return. The DCF model, for example, estimates the investor-required return assuming a constant expected dividend yield and growth rate in perpetuity, while Risk Premium-based methods (i.e., the RPM and CAPM approaches) provide the ability to reflect investors' views of risk, future market returns, and the relationship
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between interest rates and the ROE. Just as the use of market data for the Utility Proxy Group adds the reliability necessary to inform expert judgment in arriving at a recommended common equity cost rate, the use of multiple generally accepted common equity cost rate models also adds reliability and accuracy when arriving at a recommended common equity cost rate.

## A. Discounted Cash Flow Model

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE DCF MODEL, GENERALLY.

A. The theory underlying the DCF model is that the present value of an expected future stream of net cash flows during the investment holding period can be determined by discounting those cash flows at the cost of capital, or the investors' capitalization rate. DCF theory indicates that an investor buys a stock for an expected total return rate, which is derived from the cash flows received from dividends and market price appreciation. Mathematically, the dividend yield on market price plus a growth rate equals the capitalization rate; i.e., the total common equity return rate expected by investors, as shown in Equation [1] below:
$K_{e}=\left(D_{0}(1+g)\right) / P+g$
where:
$K_{e}=$ the required Return on Equity;
$D_{0}=$ the annualized Dividend Per Share;
$P=$ the current stock price; and
$g=$ the growth rate.
$\qquad$
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## Q. WHICH VERSION OF THE DCF MODEL DO YOU USE?

## A. I used the single-stage constant growth DCF model. <br> Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE DIVIDEND YIELD YOU USED IN APPLYING THE CONSTANT GROWTH DCF MODEL.

A. The unadjusted dividend yields are based on the proxy companies' dividends as of December 30, 2022, divided by the average closing market price for the 60 trading days ended December 30, 2022. ${ }^{10}$

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR ADJUSTMENT TO THE DIVIDEND YIELD.

A. Because dividends are paid periodically (e.g., quarterly), as opposed to continuously (daily), an adjustment must be made to the dividend yield. This is often referred to as the discrete, or the Gordon Periodic, version of the DCF model.

DCF theory calls for using the full growth rate, or $\mathrm{D}_{1}$, in calculating the model's dividend yield component. Since the companies in the Utility Proxy Group increase their quarterly dividends at various times during the year, a reasonable assumption is to reflect one-half the annual dividend growth rate in the dividend yield component, or $\mathrm{D}_{1 / 2}$. Because the dividend should be representative of the next 12-month period, this adjustment is a conservative approach that does not overstate the dividend yield. Therefore, the actual average dividend yields in Column 1, page 1 of Schedule DWD-2 have been adjusted upward to reflect one-half the average projected growth rate shown in Column 5.
$\qquad$
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## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE BASIS FOR THE GROWTH RATES YOU APPLY TO THE UTILITY PROXY GROUP IN YOUR CONSTANT GROWTH DCF MODEL.


#### Abstract

A. Investors with more limited resources than institutional investors are likely to rely on widely available financial information services, such as Value Line, Zacks, and Yahoo! Finance. Investors realize that analysts have significant insight into the dynamics of the industries and individual companies they analyze, as well as companies' abilities to effectively manage the effects of changing laws and regulations, and ever-changing economic and market conditions. For these reasons, I used analysts' five-year forecasts of EPS growth in my DCF analysis.


Over the long run, there can be no growth in DPS without growth in EPS. Security analysts' earnings expectations have a more significant influence on market prices than dividend expectations. Thus, using earnings growth rates in a DCF analysis provides a better match between investors' market price appreciation expectations and the growth rate component of the DCF.

## Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE CONSTANT GROWTH DCF MODEL RESULTS.

A. As shown on page 1 of Schedule DWD-2, the application of the Constant Growth DCF model to the Utility Proxy Group results in a wide range of indicated ROEs from $6.70 \%$ to $12.65 \%$. The mean of those results is $9.24 \%$, the median result is $9.34 \%$, and the average of the mean and median result is $9.29 \%$. In arriving at a conclusion for the constant growth DCF-indicated common equity cost rate for the
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Utility Proxy Group, I relied on an average of the mean and the median results (i.e., 9.29\%) of the DCF. By doing so, I have considered the DCF results for each company without giving undue weight to outliers on either the high or low side.

## B. The Risk Premium Model

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE THEORETICAL BASIS OF THE RPM.

A. The RPM is based on the fundamental financial principle of risk and return; namely, that investors require greater returns for bearing greater risk. The RPM recognizes that common equity capital has greater investment risk than debt capital, as common equity shareholders are behind debt holders in any claim on a company's assets and earnings. As a result, investors require higher returns from common stocks than from bonds to compensate them for bearing the additional risk.

While it is possible to directly observe bond returns and yields, investors' required common equity returns cannot be directly determined or observed. According to RPM theory, one can estimate a common equity risk premium over bonds (either historically or prospectively) and use that premium to derive a cost rate of common equity. The cost of common equity equals the expected cost rate for long-term debt capital, plus a risk premium over that cost rate, to compensate common shareholders for the added risk of being unsecured and last-in-line for any claim on the corporation's assets and earnings upon liquidation.
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## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN HOW YOU DERIVED YOUR INDICATED COST OF COMMON EQUITY BASED ON THE RPM.

A. To derive my indicated cost of common equity under the RPM, I used two risk premium methods. The first method was the Predictive Risk Premium Model ("PRPM") and the second method was a risk premium model using a total market approach. The PRPM estimates the risk-return relationship directly, while the total market approach indirectly derives a risk premium by using known metrics as a proxy for risk.

## 1. Predictive Risk Premium ModeI

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE PRPM.

A. The PRPM, published in the Journal of Regulatory Economics, ${ }^{11}$ was developed from the work of Robert F. Engle, who shared the Nobel Prize in Economics in 2003 "for methods of analyzing economic time series with time-varying volatility" or ARCH. ${ }^{12}$ Engle found that volatility changes over time and is related from one period to the next, especially in financial markets. Engle discovered that volatility of prices and returns clusters over time and is therefore highly predictable and can be used to predict future levels of risk and risk premiums. That is, historical volatility can be used to predict future volatility, which then can be translated to a predicted equity risk premium.

11 Pauline M. Ahern, Frank J. Hanley and Richard A. Michelfelder, Ph.D. "A New Approach for Estimating the Equity Risk Premium for Public Utilities", The Journal of Regulatory Economics (December 2011), 40:261-278.
12 Autoregressive conditional heteroscedasticity; See also, www.nobelprize.org.
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## Q. HOW DOES THE PRPM ESTIMATE THE INVESTOR REQUIRED RETURN?

A. The PRPM estimates the risk-return relationship directly, as the predicted equity risk premium is generated by predicting volatility or risk. The PRPM is not based on an estimate of investor behavior, but rather on an evaluation of the results of that behavior (i.e., the variance of historical equity risk premiums).

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR APPLICATION OF THE PRPM.

A. The inputs to the model are the historical returns on the common shares of each Utility Proxy Group company minus the historical monthly yield on long-term U.S. Treasury securities through December 2022. Using a generalized form of ARCH, known as GARCH, I calculated each Utility Proxy Group company's projected equity risk premium using Eviews ${ }^{\ominus}$ statistical software. When the GARCH model is applied to the historical return data, it produces a predicted GARCH variance series ${ }^{13}$ and a GARCH coefficient. ${ }^{14}$ Multiplying the predicted monthly variance by the GARCH coefficient and then annualizing it ${ }^{15}$ produces the predicted annual equity risk premium. I then added the forecasted 30-year U.S. Treasury bond yield of $3.91 \%^{16}$ to each company's PRPM-derived equity risk premium to arrive at an indicated cost of common equity. The 30 -year U.S. Treasury bond yield is a consensus forecast derived from Blue Chip. ${ }^{17}$

[^67]The Potomac Edison Company
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## Q. WHAT ARE THE RESULTS OF THE PRPM AS APPLIED TO THE UTILITY PROXY GROUP?

A. The mean PRPM indicated common equity cost rate for the Utility Proxy Group is $11.99 \%$, the median is $11.90 \%$, and the average of the two is $11.95 \%$. Consistent with my reliance on the average of the median and mean results of the DCF models, I relied on the average of the mean and median results of the Utility Proxy Group PRPM to calculate a cost of common equity rate of $11.95 \%$.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR SELECTION OF A RISK-FREE RATE OF RETURN.

A. As shown in Exhibits DWD-3 and DWD-4, the risk-free rate adopted for applications of the RPM and CAPM is $3.91 \%$. This risk-free rate is based on the average of the Blue Chip consensus forecast of the expected yields on 30-year U.S. Treasury bonds for the six quarters ending with the second calendar quarter of 2024, and long-term projections for the years 2024 to 2028 and 2029 to 2033.

## Q. WHY DO YOU USE THE PROJECTED 30-YEAR TREASURY YIELD IN YOUR ANALYSES?

A. The yield on long-term U.S. Treasury bonds is almost risk-free and its term is consistent with the long-term cost of capital to public utilities measured by the yields on Moody's A2-rated public utility bonds; the long-term investment horizon inherent in utilities' common stocks; and the long-term life of the jurisdictional rate base to which the allowed fair rate of return (i.e., cost of capital) will be applied.
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In contrast, short-term U.S. Treasury yields are more volatile and largely a function
of Federal Reserve monetary policy.
More specifically, the term of the risk-free rate used for cost of capital purposes should match the life (or duration) of the underlying investment (i.e., perpetuity). As noted by Morningstar:

The traditional thinking regarding the time horizon of the chosen Treasury security is that it should match the time horizon of whatever is being valued. When valuing a business that is being treated as a going concern, the appropriate Treasury yield should be that of a long-term Treasury bond. Note that the horizon is a function of the investment, not the investor. If an investor plans to hold stock in a company for only five years, the yield on a five-year Treasury note would not be appropriate since the company will continue to exist beyond those five years. ${ }^{18}$

Morin also confirms this when he states:
[b]ecause common stock is a long-term investment and because the cash flows to investors in the form of dividends last indefinitely, the yield on very long-term government bonds, namely, the yield on 30-year Treasury bonds, is the best measure of the risk-free rate for use in the CAPM and Risk Premium methods (footnote omitted)... The expected common stock return is based on long-term cash flows, regardless of an individual's holding time period. ${ }^{19}$

Pratt and Grabowski recommend a similar approach to selecting the risk-free rate:
"[i]n theory, when determining the risk-free rate and the matching ERP you should be matching the risk-free security and the ERP with the period in which the investment cash flows are expected. ${ }^{20}$
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As a practical matter, equity securities represent a perpetual claim on cash flows; 30-year Treasury bonds are the longest-maturity securities available to approximate that perpetual claim. Thus, the use of a 30 -year Treasury bond yield is a more appropriate risk-free rate as it more accurately reflects the life of the assets it finances.

## 2. Total Market Approach Risk Premium Model

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE TOTAL MARKET APPROACH RPM.

A. The total market approach RPM adds a prospective public utility bond yield to an average of: (1) an equity risk premium that is derived from a beta-adjusted total market equity risk premium, (2) an equity risk premium based on the S\&P Utilities Index, and (3) an equity risk premium based on authorized ROEs for electric utilities.

## Q. <br> PLEASE EXPLAIN HOW YOU DETERMINED THE EXPECTED BOND YIELD APPLICABLE TO THE UTILITY PROXY GROUP.

A. The first step in the total market approach RPM analysis is to determine the expected bond yield. Because both ratemaking and the cost of capital, including the common equity cost rate, are prospective in nature, a prospective yield on similarly-rated long-term debt is essential. Because I am unaware of any publication that provides forecasted public utility bond yields, I relied on a consensus forecast of about 50 economists of the expected yield on Aaa-rated corporate bonds for the six calendar quarters ending with the second calendar quarter of 2024, and Blue Chip's long-term projections for 2024 to 2028, and 2029
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to 2033. As shown on line 1, page 3 of Schedule DWD-3, the average expected yield on Moody's Aaa-rated corporate bonds is $5.05 \%$.

Because that $5.05 \%$ estimate represents a corporate bond yield and not a utility specific bond yield, I adjusted the expected Aaa-rated corporate bond yield to an equivalent A2-rated public utility bond yield. That resulted in an upward adjustment of $0.83 \%$, which represents a recent spread between Aaa-rated corporate bonds and A2-rated public utility bonds. ${ }^{21}$ Adding that recent $0.83 \%$ spread to the expected Aaa-rated corporate bond yield of $5.05 \%$ results in an expected A2-rated public utility bond yield of $5.88 \%$.

I then reviewed the average credit rating for the Utility Proxy Group from Moody's to determine if an adjustment to the estimated A2-rated public utility bond was necessary. Since the Utility Proxy Group's average Moody's long-term issuer rating is Baa1, another adjustment to the expected A2-rated public utility bond is needed to reflect the difference in bond ratings. An upward adjustment of $0.20 \%$, which represents two-thirds of a recent spread between A2-rated and Baa2-rated public utility bond yields, is necessary to make the A2-rated prospective bond yield applicable to an Baa1-rated public utility bond. ${ }^{22}$ Adding the $0.20 \%$ to the $5.88 \%$ prospective A2-rated public utility bond yield results in a $6.08 \%$ expected bond yield applicable to the Utility Proxy Group.
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Table 4: Summary of the Calculation of the Utility Proxy Group Projected Bond Yield ${ }^{23}$

| Prospective Yield on Moody's Aaa-Rated Corporate Bonds <br> (Blue Chip) | $5.05 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Adjustment to Reflect Yield Spread Between Moody's <br> Aaa-Rated Corporate Bonds and Moody's A2-Rated Utility <br> Bonds | $0.83 \%$ |
| Adjustment to Reflect the Utility Proxy Group's Average <br> Moody's Bond Rating of Baa1 | $\underline{0.20 \%}$ |
| Prospective Bond Yield Applicable to the Utility Proxy <br> Group | $\underline{\underline{6.08 \%}}$ |

To develop the total market approach RPM estimate of the appropriate return on equity, this prospective bond yield is then added to the average of the three different equity risk premiums, which I now discuss, in turn.

## a. Beta-Derived Equity Risk Premium

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN HOW THE BETA-DERIVED EQUITY RISK PREMIUM IS DETERMINED.

A. The components of the beta-derived risk premium model are: (1) an expected market equity risk premium over corporate bonds, and (2) the beta. The derivation of the beta-derived equity risk premium that I applied to the Utility Proxy Group is shown on lines 1 through 9 , page 8 of Schedule DWD-3. The total beta-derived equity risk premium I applied is based on an average of three historical market databased equity risk premiums, two Value Line-based equity risk premiums and a Bloomberg-based equity risk premium. Each of these is described below.

[^68]The Potomac Edison Company
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## Q. HOW DID YOU DERIVE A MARKET EQUITY RISK PREMIUM BASED ON LONG-TERM HISTORICAL DATA?

A. To derive a historical market equity risk premium, I used the most recent holding period returns for the large company common stocks from the Stocks, Bonds, Bills, and Inflation ("SBBI") Yearbook 2022 ("SBBI-2022") ${ }^{24}$ less the average historical yield on Moody's Aaa/Aa2-rated corporate bonds for the period 1928 to 2021. Using holding period returns over a very long time is appropriate because it is consistent with the long-term investment horizon presumed by investing in a going concern, i.e., a company expected to operate in perpetuity.

SBBI's long-term arithmetic mean monthly total return rate on large company common stocks was $12.11 \%$ and the long-term arithmetic mean monthly yield on Moody's Aaa/Aa2-rated corporate bonds was $5.98 \% .{ }^{25}$ As shown on line 1, page 8 of Schedule DWD-3, subtracting the mean monthly bond yield from the total return on large company stocks results in a long-term historical equity risk premium of $6.13 \%$.

I used the arithmetic mean monthly total return rates for the large company stocks and yields (income returns) for the Moody's Aaa/Aa2-rated corporate bonds, because they are appropriate for the purpose of estimating the cost of capital as noted in SBBI - 2022. ${ }^{26}$ Using the arithmetic mean return rates and yields is appropriate because historical total returns and equity risk premiums provide
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insight into the variance and standard deviation of returns needed by investors in estimating future risk when making a current investment. If investors relied on the geometric mean of historical equity risk premiums, they would have no insight into the potential variance of future returns, because the geometric mean relates the change over many periods to a constant rate of change, thereby obviating the year-to-year fluctuations, or variance, which is critical to risk analysis.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE DERIVATION OF THE REGRESSION-BASED MARKET EQUITY RISK PREMIUM.

A. To derive the regression-based market equity risk premium of $7.26 \%$ shown on line 2, page 8 of Schedule DWD-3, I used the same monthly annualized total returns on large company common stocks relative to the monthly annualized yields on Moody's Aaa/Aa2-rated corporate bonds as mentioned above. I modeled the relationship between interest rates and the market equity risk premium using the observed monthly market equity risk premium as the dependent variable, and the monthly yield on Moody's Aaa/Aa2-rated corporate bonds as the independent variable. I then used a linear Ordinary Least Squares ("OLS") regression, in which the market equity risk premium is expressed as a function of the Moody's Aaa/Aa2rated corporate bonds yield:

$$
\mathrm{RP}=\alpha+\beta\left(\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{Aaa} / \mathrm{Aa} 2}\right)
$$

The Potomac Edison Company
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## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE DERIVATION OF THE PRPM EQUITY RISK PREMIUM.

A. I used the same PRPM approach described above to the PRPM equity risk premium. The inputs to the model are the historical monthly returns on large company common stocks minus the monthly yields on Moody's Aaa/Aa2-rated corporate bonds during the period from January 1928 through December 2022. ${ }^{27}$ Using the previously-discussed generalized form of ARCH, known as GARCH, the projected equity risk premium is determined using Eviews ${ }^{\ominus}$ statistical software. The resulting PRPM predicted a market equity risk premium of $9.76 \% .{ }^{28}$

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE DERIVATION OF A PROJECTED EQUITY RISK PREMIUM BASED ON VALUE LINE DATA FOR YOUR RPM ANALYSIS.

A. As noted above, because both ratemaking and the cost of capital are prospective, a prospective market equity risk premium is needed. The derivation of the forecasted or prospective market equity risk premium can be found in note 4 , page 8 of Schedule DWD-3. Consistent with my calculation of the dividend yield component in my DCF analysis, this prospective market equity risk premium is derived from an average of the three- to five-year median market price appreciation potential by Value Line for the 13 weeks ended December 30, 2022, plus an average of the median estimated dividend yield for the common stocks of the 1,700 firms covered in Value Line's Standard Edition. ${ }^{29}$
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The average median expected price appreciation is $71 \%$, which translates to a $14.35 \%$ annual appreciation, and, when added to the average of Value Line's median expected dividend yields of $2.23 \%$, equates to a forecasted annual total return rate on the market of $16.58 \%$. The forecasted Moody's Aaa-rated corporate bond yield of $5.05 \%$ is deducted from the total market return of $16.58 \%$, resulting in an equity risk premium of $11.53 \%$, as shown on line 4 , page 8 of Schedule DWD3.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE DERIVATION OF AN EQUITY RISK PREMIUM BASED ON THE S\&P 500 COMPANIES.

A. Using data from Value Line, I calculated an expected total return on the S\&P 500 companies using expected dividend yields and long-term growth estimates as a proxy for capital appreciation. The expected total return for the S\&P 500 is $15.67 \%$. Subtracting the prospective yield on Moody's Aaa-rated corporate bonds of 5.05\% results in a $10.62 \%$ projected equity risk premium.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE DERIVATION OF AN EQUITY RISK PREMIUM BASED ON BLOOMBERG DATA.

A. Using data from Bloomberg, I calculated an expected total return on the S\&P 500 using expected dividend yields and long-term growth estimates as a proxy for capital appreciation, identical to the method described above. The expected total return for the S\&P 500 is $11.06 \%$. Subtracting the prospective yield on Moody's Aaa-rated corporate bonds of $5.05 \%$ results in a $6.01 \%$ projected equity risk premium.
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## Q. WHAT IS YOUR CONCLUSION OF A BETA-DERIVED EQUITY RISK PREMIUM FOR USE IN YOUR RPM ANALYSIS?

A. I gave equal weight to all six equity risk premiums based on each source - historical, Value Line, and Bloomberg - in arriving at an $8.55 \%$ equity risk premium.

Table 5: Summary of the Calculation of the Equity Risk Premium Using Total Market Returns ${ }^{30}$

| Historical Spread Between Total Returns of Large Stocks <br> and Aaa and Aa2-Rated Corporate Bond Yields (1928- <br> 2021) | $6.13 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Regression Analysis on Historical Data | $7.26 \%$ |
| PRPM Analysis on Historical Data | $9.76 \%$ |
| Prospective Equity Risk Premium using Total Market <br> Returns from Value Line Summary \& Index less <br> Projected Aaa Corporate Bond Yields | $11.53 \%$ |
| Prospective Equity Risk Premium using Measures of <br> Capital Appreciation and Income Returns from Value <br> Line for the S\&P 500 less Projected Aaa Corporate Bond <br> Yields | $10.62 \%$ |
| Prospective Equity Risk Premium using Measures of <br> Capital Appreciation and Income Returns from <br> Bloomberg Professional Services for the S\&P 500 less <br> Projected Aaa Corporate Bond Yields | $\underline{6.01 \%}$ |
| Average | $\underline{\underline{8.55 \%}}$ |

After calculating the average market equity risk premium of $8.55 \%$, I adjusted it by beta to account for the risk of the Utility Proxy Group. As discussed below, beta is a meaningful measure of prospective relative risk to the market as a whole, and is a logical way to allocate a company's, or proxy group's, share of the market's total equity risk premium relative to corporate bond yields. As shown on page 1 of Schedule DWD-4, the average of the mean and median beta for the Utility Proxy Group is 0.78 . Multiplying the 0.78 average beta by the market equity risk
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premium of $8.55 \%$ results in a beta-adjusted equity risk premium for the Utility Proxy Group of 6.67\%.

## b. S\&P Utility Index Derived Equity Risk Premium

## Q. HOW DID YOU DERIVE THE EQUITY RISK PREMIUM BASED ON THE S\&P UTILITY INDEX AND MOODY'S A2-RATED PUBLIC UTILITY BONDS?

A. I estimated three equity risk premiums based on S\&P Utility Index holding period returns, and two equity risk premiums based on the expected returns of the $\mathrm{S} \& \mathrm{P}$ Utilities Index, using Value Line and Bloomberg data, respectively. Turning first to the S\&P Utility Index holding period returns, I derived a long-term monthly arithmetic mean equity risk premium between the $\mathrm{S} \& P$ Utility Index total returns of $10.74 \%$ and monthly Moody's A2-rated public utility bond yields of $6.46 \%$ from 1928 to 2021 to arrive at an equity risk premium of $4.28 \%{ }^{31}$ I then used the same historical data to derive an equity risk premium of $4.80 \%$ based on a regression of the monthly equity risk premiums. The final S\&P Utility Index holding period equity risk premium involved applying the PRPM using the historical monthly equity risk premiums from January 1928 to December 2022 to arrive at a PRPMderived equity risk premium of $5.56 \%$ for the S\&P Utility Index.

I then derived expected total returns on the S\&P Utilities Index of 9.50\% and $9.20 \%$ using data from Value Line and Bloomberg, respectively, and subtracted
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the prospective Moody's A2-rated public utility bond yield of $5.88 \%,{ }^{32}$ which resulted in equity risk premiums of $3.62 \%$ and $3.32 \%$, respectively. As with the market equity risk premiums, I averaged each risk premium based on each source (i.e., historical, Value Line, and Bloomberg) to arrive at my utility-specific equity risk premium of $4.32 \%$.

Table 6: Summary of the Calculation of the Equity Risk Premium Using S\&P Utility Index Holding Returns ${ }^{33}$

| Historical Spread Between Total Returns of the S\&P <br> Utilities Index and A2-Rated Utility Bond Yields (1928- <br> 2021) | $4.28 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Regression Analysis on Historical Data | $4.80 \%$ |
| PRPM Analysis on Historical Data | $5.56 \%$ |
| Prospective Equity Risk Premium using Measures of <br> Capital Appreciation and Income Returns from Value <br> Line for the S\&P Utilities Index less Projected A2 Utility <br> Bond Yields | $3.62 \%$ |
| Prospective Equity Risk Premium using Measures of <br> Capital Appreciation and Income Returns from <br> Bloomberg Professional Services for the S\&P Utilities <br> Index less Projected A2 Utility Bond Yields | $\underline{3.32 \%}$ |
| Average | $\underline{4.32 \%}$ |

## c. Authorized Return Derived Equity Risk Premium <br> Q. HOW DO YOU DERIVE AN EQUITY RISK PREMIUM OF 4.77\% BASED ON AUTHORIZED ROEs FOR ELECTRIC UTILITIES?

A. The equity risk premium of $4.77 \%$ shown on line 3 , page 7 of Schedule DWD-3 is the result of a regression analysis based on regulatory awarded ROEs related to the yields on Moody's A2-rated public utility bonds. That analysis is shown on page 13
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of Schedule DWD-3. Page 13 of Schedule DWD-3 contains the graphical results of a regression analysis of 1,207 rate cases for electric utilities which were fully litigated during the period from January 1, 1980 through December 31, 2022. It shows the implicit equity risk premium relative to the yields on A2-rated public utility bonds immediately prior to the issuance of each regulatory decision.

It is readily discernible that there is an inverse relationship between the yield on A2-rated public utility bonds and equity risk premiums. In other words, as interest rates decline, the equity risk premium rises and vice versa, a result consistent with financial literature on the subject. ${ }^{34}$ I used the regression results to estimate the equity risk premium applicable to the projected yield on Moody's A2rated public utility bonds. Given the expected A2-rated utility bond yield of $5.88 \%$, it can be calculated that the indicated equity risk premium applicable to that bond yield is $4.77 \%$, which is shown on line 3, page 7 of Schedule DWD-3.

## Q. WHAT IS YOUR CONCLUSION OF AN EQUITY RISK PREMIUM FOR

 USE IN YOUR TOTAL MARKET APPROACH RPM ANALYSIS?A. The equity risk premium I apply to the Utility Proxy Group is $5.25 \%$, which is the average of the beta-adjusted equity risk premium for the Utility Proxy Group, the S\&P Utilities Index, and the authorized return utility equity risk premiums of $6.67 \%, 4.32 \%$, and $4.77 \%$, respectively. ${ }^{35}$
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Q. WHAT IS THE INDICATED RPM COMMON EQUITY COST RATE BASED ON THE TOTAL MARKET APPROACH?
A. As shown on line 7, page 3 of Schedule DWD-3 and shown on Table 7, below, I calculated a common equity cost rate of $11.33 \%$ for the Utility Proxy Group based on the total market approach RPM.

Table 7: Summary of the Total Market Return Risk Premium Model ${ }^{36}$

| Prospective Moody's A3/Baa1-Rated Utility Bond <br> Applicable to the Utility Proxy Group | $6.08 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Prospective Equity Risk Premium | $\underline{5.25 \%}$ |
| Indicated Cost of Common Equity | $\underline{11.33 \%}$ |

## Q. WHAT ARE THE RESULTS OF YOUR APPLICATION OF THE PRPM

 AND THE TOTAL MARKET APPROACH RPM?A. As shown on page 1 of Schedule DWD-3, the indicated RPM-derived common equity cost rate is $11.64 \%$, which gives equal weight to the PRPM (11.95\%) and the adjusted-market approach results (11.33\%).

## C. The Capital Asset Pricing Model

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE THEORETICAL BASIS OF THE CAPM.

A. CAPM theory defines risk as the co-variability of a security's returns with the market's returns as measured by beta ( $\beta$ ). A beta less than 1.0 indicates lower variability than the market as a whole, while a beta greater than 1.0 indicates greater variability than the market.

[^71]
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The CAPM assumes that all non-market or unsystematic risk can be eliminated through diversification. The risk that cannot be eliminated through diversification is called market, or systematic, risk. In addition, the CAPM presumes that investors only require compensation for systematic risk, which is the result of macroeconomic and other events that affect the returns on all assets. The model is applied by adding a risk-free rate of return to a market risk premium, which is adjusted proportionately to reflect the systematic risk of the individual security relative to the total market as measured by the beta. The traditional CAPM model is expressed as:

|  | $\mathrm{R}_{\text {s }}$ | $=$ | $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}+\beta\left(\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{m}}-\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Where: | $\mathrm{R}_{\text {s }}$ | $=$ | Return rate on the common stock |
|  | $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ | $=$ | Risk-free rate of return |
|  | $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{m}}$ | $=$ | Return rate on the market as a whole |
|  | $\beta$ | = | Adjusted beta (volatility of the |
|  |  |  | security relative to the market as a w |

Numerous tests of the CAPM have measured the extent to which security returns and beta are related as predicted by the CAPM, confirming its validity. The empirical CAPM ("ECAPM") reflects the reality that while the results of these tests support the notion that the beta is related to security returns, the empirical Security Market Line ("SML") described by the CAPM formula is not as steeply sloped as the predicted SML. ${ }^{37}$ The ECAPM reflects this empirical reality.
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## Q. WHY IS THE USE OF THE ECAPM APPROPRIATE IN DETERMINING

 THE ROE FOR PE?The ECAPM is a well-established model that has been relied on in both academic and regulatory settings. Fama and French clearly state regarding Figure 2, below, that " $[t]$ he returns on the low beta portfolios are too high, and the returns on the high beta portfolios are too low." ${ }^{38}$

Figure 2 htpp//pubs.aeawe..org/doi/ddplus/10.1257/0895330042162430
Average Annualized Monthly Return versus Beta for Value Weight Portfolios Formed on Prior Beta, 1928-2003


In addition, Morin observes that while the results of these tests support the notion that beta is related to security returns, the empirical SML described by the CAPM formula is not as steeply sloped as the predicted SML. Morin states:
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With few exceptions, the empirical studies agree that ... low-beta securities earn returns somewhat higher than the CAPM would predict, and high-beta securities earn less than predicted. ${ }^{39}$

Therefore, the empirical evidence suggests that the expected return on a security is related to its risk by the following approximation:

$$
K=R_{F}+x \beta\left(R_{M}-R_{F}\right)+(1-x) \beta\left(R_{M}-R_{F}\right)
$$

where x is a fraction to be determined empirically. The value of x that best explains the observed relationship [is] Return $=0.0829+$ $0.0520 \beta$ is between 0.25 and 0.30 . If $x=0.25$, the equation becomes:

$$
K=R_{F}+0.25\left(\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{M}}-\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{F}}\right)+0.75 \beta\left(\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{M}}-\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{F}}\right)^{40}
$$

Fama and French provide similar support for the ECAPM when they state:
The early tests firmly reject the Sharpe-Lintner version of the CAPM. There is a positive relation between beta and average return, but it is too 'flat.'... The regressions consistently find that the intercept is greater than the average risk-free rate... and the coefficient on beta is less than the average excess market return... This is true in the early tests... as well as in more recent crosssection regressions tests, like Fama and French (1992). ${ }^{41}$

Finally, Fama and French further note:
Confirming earlier evidence, the relation between beta and average return for the ten portfolios is much flatter than the Sharpe-Linter CAPM predicts. The returns on low beta portfolios are too high, and the returns on the high beta portfolios are too low. For example, the predicted return on the portfolio with the lowest beta is 8.3 percent per year; the actual return as 11.1 percent. The predicted return on the portfolio with the highest beta is 16.8 percent per year; the actual is 13.7 percent. ${ }^{42}$

$$
\text { Morin, at } 207 .
$$

Morin, at 221.
Fama \& French, at 32.
Fama \& French, at 33.
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Research from Dianna R. Harrington also supports the use of the ECAPM.
Harrington summarizes studies on the predicted results of the CAPM versus the actual returns in her text Modern Portfolio Theory \& the Capital Asset Pricing

Model:
So far we have learned some very interesting things about the CAPM and reality. Some of the earliest work tested realized data (history) against data generated by simulated portfolios. Early studies by Douglas (1969) and Lintner (Douglas [1969]) showed discrepancies between what was expected on the basis of the CAPM and the actual relationships that were apparent in the capital markets. Theoretically, the minimal rate of return from the portfolios (the intercept) and the actual risk-free rate for the period should have been equal. They were not.

Another study, now more famous than Lintner's was done by Black, Jensen, and Scholes (1972). Lintner had used what is called a cross-sectional method (looking at a number of stock returns during one time period), whereas Black, Jensen, and Scholes used a time-series method (using returns for a number of stocks over several time periods). To make their test, Black, Jensen, and Scholes assumed that what had happened in the past was a good proxy for the investor expectations (a frequent assumption in CAPM tests). Using historical data, they generated estimates using what we call the market model:

$$
\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{jt}}=\alpha_{\mathrm{j}}+\beta_{\mathrm{j}}\left(\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{mt}}\right)+\varepsilon_{\mathrm{j}}
$$

Where:
$\mathrm{R}=$ total returns
$\beta=$ the slope of the line (the incremental return for risk)
$\alpha=$ the intercept or a constant (expected to be 0 over time and across all firms)
$\varepsilon=$ an error term (expected to be random, without information)
$\mathrm{m}=$ the market proxy
$j=$ the firm or portfolio
$\mathrm{t}=$ the time period
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Instead of using single stocks, they formed portfolios in an effort to wash out one source of error; because betas of single firms are quite unstable. On the basis of the CAPM, they expected to find

1. That the intercept was equal to the risk-free rate (their proxy was the Treasury bill rate)
2. That the capital market line had a positive slope and that riskier (higher beta) securities provided higher return

Instead they found

1. That the intercept was different from the risk-free rate
2. That high-risk securities earned less and low-risk securities earned more than predicted by the model
3. That the intercept seemed to depend on the beta of any asset: high-beta stocks had a different intercept than low-beta stocks

Fama and MacBeth (1974) criticized the Black, Jensen, and Scholes study (hereafter called BJS). In a reformation of the study, they supported the first of the BJS findings. They found that the intercept exceeded the risk-free proxy, but did not find the evidence to support the other BJS conclusions. ${ }^{43}$

Harrington discusses Black's potential solution to this phenomenon:
Black's replacement for the risk-free asset was a portfolio that had no covariability with the market portfolio. Because the relevant risk in the CAPM is systematic risk, a risk-free asset would be the one with no volatility relative to the market - that is, a portfolio with a beta of zero. All investor-perceived levels of risk could be obtained from various linear combinations of Black's zero-beta portfolio and the market portfolio... Since $R_{z}$ (the rate of return of the zero-beta asset) and $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{m}}$ are uncorrelated (as $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}$ and $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{m}}$ were assumed to be in the simple CAPM), the

[^72] Guide, Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1983, at 43-45.
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investor can choose from various combinations of $R_{z}$ and $R_{m}$. On segment $R_{m} Y, R_{z}$, is sold short and proceeds are invested in $R_{m}$. On segment $R_{z} R_{m}$, portions of the zero-beta portfolio are purchased. At $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{m}}$, the investor is fully invested in the market portfolio. The equilibrium CAPM was rewritten by Black as follows:

$$
\mathrm{E}\left(\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)=\left(1-\beta_{\mathrm{i}}\right) \mathrm{E}\left(\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{z}}\right)+\beta_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{E}\left(\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{m}}\right)
$$

Where:
E indicates expected, $E\left(R_{z}\right)$ is less than $E\left(R_{m}\right)$, and $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{z}}$ holdings over the whole market must be in equilibrium. That is, the number of short sellers and lenders of securities must be equal.

Black's adaptation is intriguing. The result of using this model is a capital market line that has a less steep slope and a higher intercept than those of the simple CAPM. If Black's model is more correct in its description of investor behavior in the marketplace, then the use of the simple model would produce equity return predictions that would be too low for stocks with betas greater than one and too high for stocks with betas of less than one. ${ }^{44}$

Clearly, the justification from Morin, Fama and French, and Harrington, along with their reviews of other academic research on the CAPM, validate the use of the ECAPM. In addition, the New York Public Service Commission has been using this form of the CAPM, with factors of 0.25 and 0.75 , since the mid-1990s. As such, the ECAPM is a well-established model that has been relied on in both academic and regulatory settings. I continue to believe it is an appropriate model to estimate PE's ROE, and in view of theory and practical research, I have applied
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both the traditional CAPM and the ECAPM to the companies in the Utility Proxy Group and averaged the results.

## Q. WHAT BETA COEFFICIENTS DID YOU USE IN YOUR CAPM ANALYSIS?

A. For the beta in my CAPM analysis, I considered two sources: Value Line and Bloomberg Professional Services. While both of those services adjust their calculated (or "raw") betas to reflect the tendency of beta to regress to the market mean of 1.00, Value Line calculates beta over a five-year period, while Bloomberg calculates it over a two-year period.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR SELECTION OF A RISK-FREE RATE OF RETURN.

A. As described previously, the risk-free rate adopted for both applications of the CAPM is $3.91 \%$. This risk-free rate is based on the average of the Blue Chip consensus forecast of the expected yields on 30 -year U.S. Treasury bonds for the six quarters ending with the second calendar quarter of 2024, and long-term projections for the years 2024 to 2028 and 2029 to 2033.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE ESTIMATION OF THE EXPECTED RISK PREMIUM FOR THE MARKET USED IN YOUR CAPM ANALYSES.

A. The basis of the market risk premium is explained in detail in note 1 on Schedule DWD-4. As discussed above, the market risk premium is derived from an average of three historical data-based market risk premiums, two Value Line data-based market risk premiums, and one Bloomberg data-based market risk premium.
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The long-term income return on U.S. Government securities of $5.02 \%$ was deducted from the SBBI-2022 monthly historical total market return of $12.37 \%$, which results in an historical market equity risk premium of $7.35 \%{ }^{45}$ I applied a linear OLS regression to the monthly annualized historical returns on the S\&P 500 relative to historical yields on long-term U.S. Government securities from SBBI 2022. That regression analysis yielded a market equity risk premium of $8.71 \%$. The PRPM market equity risk premium is $10.86 \%$, and is derived using the PRPM relative to the yields on long-term U.S. Treasury securities from January 1926 through December 2022.

The Value Line-derived forecasted total market equity risk premium is derived by deducting the forecasted risk-free rate of $3.91 \%$, discussed above, from the Value Line projected total annual market return of $16.58 \%$, resulting in a forecasted total market equity risk premium of $12.67 \%$. The S\&P 500 projected market equity risk premium using Value Line data is derived by subtracting the projected risk-free rate of $3.91 \%$ from the projected total return of the S\&P 500 of $15.67 \%$. The resulting market equity risk premium is $11.76 \%$.

The S\&P 500 projected market equity risk premium using Bloomberg data is derived by subtracting the projected risk-free rate of $3.91 \%$ from the projected total return of the $\mathrm{S} \& \mathrm{P} 500$ of $11.06 \%$. The resulting market equity risk premium is $7.15 \%$. These six measures, when averaged, result in an average total market equity risk premium of $9.75 \%$.
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Table 8: Summary of the Calculation of the Market Risk Premium for Use in the CAPM ${ }^{46}$

| Historical Spread Between Total Returns of Large Stocks <br> and Long-Term Government Bond Yields (1926-2021) | $7.35 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Regression Analysis on Historical Data | $8.71 \%$ |
| PRPM Analysis on Historical Data | $10.86 \%$ |
| Prospective Equity Risk Premium using Total Market <br> Returns from Value Line Summary \& Index less <br> Projected 30-Year Treasury Bond Yields | $12.67 \%$ |
| Prospective Equity Risk Premium using Measures of <br> Capital Appreciation and Income Returns from Value <br> Line for the S\&P 500 less Projected 30-Year Treasury <br> Bond Yields | $11.76 \%$ |
| Prospective Equity Risk Premium using Measures of <br> Capital Appreciation and Income Returns from | $\underline{\text { Bloomberg Professional Services for the S\&P 500 less }}$Projected 30-Year Treasury Bond Yields |
| Average | $\underline{\underline{9.75 \%}}$ |

## WHAT ARE THE RESULTS OF YOUR APPLICATION OF THE TRADITIONAL AND EMPIRICAL CAPM TO THE UTILITY PROXY

 GROUP?A. As shown on page 1 of Schedule DWD-4, the mean result of my CAPM/ECAPM analyses is $11.80 \%$, the median is $11.78 \%$, and the average of the two is $11.79 \%$. Consistent with my reliance on the average of mean and median DCF results discussed above, the indicated common equity cost rate using the CAPM/ECAPM is $11.79 \%$.
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## D. Common Equity Cost Rates for a Proxy Group of Domestic, NonPrice Regulated Companies Based on the DCF, RPM, and CAPM

## Q. WHY DO YOU ALSO CONSIDER A PROXY GROUP OF DOMESTIC, NON-PRICE REGULATED COMPANIES?

A. Although I am not an attorney, my interpretation of the Hope and Bluefield cases is that they did not specify that comparable risk companies had to be utilities. Since the purpose of rate regulation is to be a substitute for marketplace competition, nonprice regulated firms operating in the competitive marketplace make an excellent proxy if they are comparable in total risk to the Utility Proxy Group being used to estimate the cost of common equity. The selection of such domestic, non-price regulated competitive firms theoretically and empirically results in a proxy group which is comparable in total risk to the Utility Proxy Group, since all of these companies compete for capital in the exact same markets.

## Q. HOW DID YOU SELECT NON-PRICE REGULATED COMPANIES THAT ARE COMPARABLE IN TOTAL RISK TO THE UTILITY PROXY GROUP?

A. In order to select a proxy group of domestic, non-price regulated companies similar in total risk to the Utility Proxy Group, I relied on the betas and related statistics derived from Value Line regression analyses of weekly market prices over the most recent 260 weeks (i.e., five years). These selection criteria resulted in a proxy group of 50 domestic, non-price regulated firms comparable in total risk to the Utility Proxy Group. Total risk is the sum of non-diversifiable market risk and
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diversifiable company-specific risks. The criteria used in selecting the domestic, non-price regulated firms was:
(i) They must be covered by Value Line Investment Survey (Standard Edition);
(ii) They must be domestic, non-price regulated companies, i.e., not utilities;
(iii) Their betas must lie within plus or minus two standard deviations of the average unadjusted betas of the Utility Proxy Group; and
(iv) The residual standard errors of the Value Line regressions which gave rise to the unadjusted betas must lie within plus or minus two standard deviations of the average residual standard error of the Utility Proxy Group. Betas measure market, or systematic, risk, which is not diversifiable. The residual standard errors of the regressions measure each firm's company-specific, diversifiable risk. Companies that have similar betas and similar residual standard errors resulting from the same regression analyses have similar total investment risk.
Q. HAVE YOU PREPARED A SCHEDULE WHICH SHOWS THE DATA FROM WHICH YOU SELECTED THE 50 DOMESTIC, NON-PRICE REGULATED COMPANIES THAT ARE COMPARABLE IN TOTAL RISK TO THE UTILITY PROXY GROUP?
A. Yes, the basis of my selection and both proxy groups' regression statistics are shown in Schedule DWD-5.
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## Q. IS THE USE OF UNADJUSTED BETAS AND STANDARD ERRORS OF THE REGRESSION SUPPORTED BY ACADEMIC AND FINANCIAL LITERATURE?

A. Yes, it is. Business and financial risks may vary between companies and proxy groups, but if the collective average betas and standard errors of the regression of the group are similar, then the total, or aggregate, non-diversifiable market risks and diversifiable risks are similar, as noted in "Comparable Earnings: New Life for an Old Precept" provided in Schedule DWD-6. ${ }^{47}$ Thus, because the non-price regulated companies are selected based on analyses of market data, they are comparable in total risk (even though individual risks may vary) to the Utility Proxy Group. This is demonstrated clearly on page 273 of Jack C. Francis' Investments: Analysis and Management (page 3 of Schedule DWD-7), which shows that total risk can be "partitioned into its systematic and unsystematic components." Essentially, companies that have similar betas and standard errors of regression have similar total investment risk.
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## Q. IN ADDITION TO YOUR SELECTION CRITERIA, HAVE YOU CONDUCTED ADDITIONAL STUDIES TO SHOW THAT THE NONPRICE REGULATED PROXY GROUP IS SIMILAR IN TOTAL RISK TO YOUR UTILITY PROXY GROUP?

A. Yes, I have. Value Line's Safety Ranking is a proxy for total risk. ${ }^{48}$ As shown in Table 9, below, my Non-Price Regulated Group is similar in total risk to my Utility Proxy Group:

Table 9: Risk Assessment of Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group and Utility
Proxy Groups Using Value Line Metric

| Group | Safety Rank |
| :--- | :---: |
| Utility Proxy Group | 1.88 |
| Non-Price Reg. Proxy Group | 1.96 |

Q. DID YOU CALCULATE COMMON EQUITY COST RATES USING THE DCF MODEL, RPM, AND CAPM FOR THE NON-PRICE REGULATED PROXY GROUP?
A. Yes. Because the DCF model, RPM, and CAPM have been applied in an identical manner as described above, I will not repeat the details of the rationale and application of each model. One exception is in the application of the RPM, where

Case No. $\qquad$
Direct Testimony of Dylan W. D'Ascendis
Page 52 of 71

I did not use public utility-specific equity risk premiums, nor did I apply the PRPM to the individual non-price regulated companies.

Page 2 of Schedule DWD-8 derives the Constant Growth DCF model common equity cost rate. As shown, the indicated common equity cost rate is $11.72 \%$.

Pages 3 through 5 of Schedule DWD-8 contain the data and calculations that support the $13.40 \%$ RPM common equity cost rate. As shown on line 1, page 3 of Schedule DWD-8, the consensus prospective yield on Moody's Baa-rated corporate bonds for the six quarters ending in the second quarter of 2024, and for the years 2024 to 2028 and 2029 to 2033, is $6.05 \%{ }^{49}$ Since the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group has an average Moody's long-term issuer rating of Baa1, a downward adjustment of $0.17 \%$ to the projected Baa2-rated corporate bond yield is necessary to reflect a difference in ratings which results in a projected Baa1-rated corporate bond yield of $5.88 \%$ for the Non-Regulated Proxy group.

When the beta-adjusted risk premium of $7.52 \%{ }^{50}$ relative to the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group is added to the prospective Baa1-rated corporate bond yield of $5.88 \%$, the indicated RPM common equity cost rate is $13.40 \%$.

Page 6 of Schedule DWD-8 contains the inputs and calculations that support my indicated CAPM/ECAPM common equity cost rate of $12.59 \%$.

Blue Chip Financial Forecasts, January 1, 2023 at 2 and December 1, 2022 at 14. Derived on page 5 of Schedule DWD-8.
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## Q. HOW IS THE COST RATE OF COMMON EQUITY BASED ON THE NONPRICE REGULATED PROXY GROUP COMPARABLE IN TOTAL RISK TO THE UTILITY PROXY GROUP?

A. As shown on page 1 of Schedule DWD-8, the results of the common equity models applied to the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group -- which group is comparable in total risk to the Utility Proxy Group -- are as follows: $11.72 \%$ (DCF), $13.40 \%$ (RPM), and $12.59 \%$ (CAPM). The average of the mean and median of these models is $12.58 \%$, which I used as the indicated common equity cost rates for the NonPrice Regulated Proxy Group.

## VI. CONCLUSION OF COMMON EQUITY COST RATE BEFORE ADJUSTMENTS <br> Q. WHAT IS THE INDICATED COMMON EQUITY COST RATE BEFORE ADJUSTMENTS?

A. By applying multiple cost of common equity models to the Utility Proxy Group and the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group, the indicated range of common equity cost rates attributable to the Utility Proxy Group before any relative risk adjustments is between $10.04 \%$ and $11.04 \%$. I used multiple cost of common equity models as primary tools in arriving at my recommended common equity cost rate, because each of these models is theoretically sound and available to investors, and because no single model is so inherently precise that it can be relied on to the exclusion of other theoretically sound models. Using multiple models adds reliability to the estimated common equity cost rate, with the prudence of using multiple cost of
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common equity models supported in both the financial literature and regulatory precedent.

Based on these common equity cost rate results, I conclude that a range of common equity cost rates between $10.04 \%$ and $11.04 \%$ is reasonable and appropriate before any adjustments for relative risk differences between PE and the Utility Proxy Group are made.

## VII. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE COMMON EQUITY COST RATE

## A. Size Adjustment

## Q. DOES PE'S SMALLER SIZE RELATIVE TO THE UTILITY PROXY GROUP COMPANIES INCREASE ITS BUSINESS RISK?

A. Yes. PE's smaller size relative to the Utility Proxy Group companies indicates greater relative business risk for the Company because, all else being equal, size has a material bearing on risk.

Size affects business risk because smaller companies generally are less able to cope with significant events that affect sales, revenues and earnings. For example, smaller companies face more risk exposure to business cycles and economic conditions, both nationally and locally. Additionally, the loss of revenues from a few larger customers would have a greater effect on a small company than on a bigger company with a larger, more diverse, customer base. This is true for utilities, as well as for non-regulated companies.

As further evidence that smaller firms are riskier, investors generally demand greater returns from smaller firms to compensate for less marketability and
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liquidity of their securities. Kroll's Cost of Capital Navigator: U.S. Cost of Capital Module ("Kroll") discusses the nature of the small-size phenomenon, providing an indication of the magnitude of the size premium based on several measures of size.

In discussing "Size as a Predictor of Equity Premiums," Kroll states:
The size effect is based on the empirical observation that companies of smaller size are associated with greater risk and, therefore, have greater cost of capital [sic]. The "size" of a company is one of the most important risk elements to consider when developing cost of equity capital estimates for use in valuing a business simply because size has been shown to be a predictor of equity returns. In other words, there is a significant (negative) relationship between size and historical equity returns - as size decreases, returns tend to increase, and vice versa. (footnote omitted) (emphasis in original) ${ }^{51}$

Furthermore, in "The Capital Asset Pricing Model: Theory and Evidence," Fama and French note size is indeed a risk factor which must be reflected when estimating the cost of common equity. On page 14 , they note:
. . . the higher average returns on small stocks and high book-to-market stocks reflect unidentified state variables that produce undiversifiable risks (covariances) in returns not captured in the market return and are priced separately from market betas. ${ }^{52}$

Based on this evidence, Fama and French proposed their three-factor model which includes a size variable in recognition of the effect size has on the cost of common equity.
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Also, it is a basic financial principle that the use of funds invested, and not the source of funds, is what gives rise to the risk of any investment. ${ }^{53}$ Eugene Brigham, a well-known authority, states:

A number of researchers have observed that portfolios of smallfirms (sic) have earned consistently higher average returns than those of large-firm stocks; this is called the "small-firm effect." On the surface, it would seem to be advantageous to the small firms to provide average returns in a stock market that are higher than those of larger firms. In reality, it is bad news for the small firm; what the small-firm effect means is that the capital market demands higher returns on stocks of small firms than on otherwise similar stocks of the large firms. (emphasis added) ${ }^{54}$

Consistent with the financial principle of risk and return discussed above, increased relative risk due to small size must be considered in the allowed rate of return on common equity. Therefore, the Commission's authorization of a cost rate of common equity in this proceeding must appropriately reflect the unique risks of PE, including its small relative size, which is justified and supported above by evidence in the financial literature.

## Q. DO CREDIT RATING AGENCIES HAVE A MINIMUM SIZE CRITERION FOR A GIVEN RATING LEVEL?

A. No, they do not. S\&P states in its "General Corporate Methodology, Section 2: Analyzing Subfactors for Scale, Scope, and Diversity", that there is no minimum size criterion, although size often provides a measure of diversification. Size and
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scope of operations is important relative to those of industry peers, though not in absolute terms. While relatively smaller companies can enjoy a high degree of diversification, they will likely be, almost by definition, more concentrated in terms of product, number of customers, or geography, than their larger peers in the same industry. ${ }^{55}$

Moody's, in its "Ratings Methodology for Regulated Electric and Gas Companies" states that size and scale of a regulated utility has generally not been a major determinant of its credit strength in the same way that it has been for most other industrial sectors. While size brings certain economies of scale that can somewhat affect the utility's cost structure and competitiveness, rates are more heavily impacted by costs related to fuel and fixed assets. Smaller utilities have sometimes been better able to focus their attention on meeting the expectations of a single regulator than their multi-state peers.

However, size can be a very important factor in our assessment of certain risks that impact ratings, including exposure to natural disasters, customer concentration (primarily to industrial customers in a single sector) and construction risks associated with large projects. While the scorecard attempts to incorporate the first two of these into Factors [diversification], for some issuers these considerations may be sufficiently important that the rating reflects a greater weight for these risks. ${ }^{56}$
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The above statements by S\&P and Moody's reinforce that they do not specifically take size into account (i.e.., there is no minimum size criterion for any given rating) in the rating process. Given this, one must adjust for size differences between the proxy group and the target company, even when credit ratings are similar

## Q. HAVE YOU PERFORMED STUDIES SPECIFIC TO UTILITY COMPANIES THAT LINK SIZE AND RISK?

A. Yes, I have performed two studies that link size and risk for utility companies. My first study included the universe of electric, gas, and water companies included in Value Line Standard and Small and Mid-Cap Editions. From each of the utilities' Value Line Ratings \& Reports, I calculated the 10-year annualized volatility of daily prices (a measure of risk) and current market capitalization (a measure of size) for each company. After ranking the companies by size (largest to smallest) and risk (least risky to most risky), I made a scatter plot of the data, as shown on Chart 1, below:
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## Chart 1: Relationship Between Size and Risk for the

Value Line Universe of Utility Companies ${ }^{57}$


As shown in Chart 1 above, as company size decreases (increasing size rank), the annualized volatility increases, linking size and risk for utilities, which is significant at $95.0 \%$ confidence level.

The second study used the same universe of companies, but instead of using annualized volatility, I used the Value Line Safety Ranking, which, as discussed previously, is a measure of total risk. After ranking the companies by size and Safety Ranking, I made a scatterplot of those data, as shown on Chart 2, below:
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Chart 2: Relationship Between Size and Safety Ranking for the
Value Line Universe of Utility Companies ${ }^{58}$


Similar to the first study, as company size decreases, Safety Ranking degrades, indicating a link between size and risk for utilities. This study is also significant at the $95 \%$ confidence level.

## Q. ARE YOU AWARE OF ANOTHER ACADEMIC ARTICLE RELATING TO THE APPLICABILITY OF A SIZE PREMIUM? <br> A. Yes. An article by Michael A. Paschall, ASA, CFA, and George B. Hawkins ASA, CFA, "Do Smaller Companies Warrant a Higher Discount Rate for Risk?" also supports the applicability of a size premium. As the article makes clear, all else equal, size is a risk factor which must be taken into account when setting the cost of capital or capitalization (discount) rate. Paschall and Hawkins state in their conclusion as follows:

The current challenge to traditional thinking about a small stock premium is a very real and potentially troublesome issue. The
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challenge comes from bright and articulate people and has already been incorporated into some court cases, providing further ammunition for the IRS. Failing to consider the additional risk associated with most smaller companies, however, is to fail to acknowledge reality. Measured properly, small company stocks have proven to be more risky over a long period of time than have larger company stocks. This makes sense due to the various advantages that larger companies have over smaller companies. Investors looking to purchase a riskier company will require a greater return on investment to compensate for that risk. There are numerous other risks affecting a particular company, yet the use of a size premium is one way to quantify the risk associated with smaller companies. ${ }^{59}$

Hence, Paschall and Hawkins corroborate the need for a small size adjustment, all else equal.

## Q. IS THERE A WAY TO QUANTIFY A RELATIVE RISK ADJUSTMENT DUE

 TO PE'S SMALL SIZE WHEN COMPARED TO THE UTILITY PROXY GROUP?A. Yes. PE has greater relative risk than the average utility in the Utility Proxy Group because of its smaller size, as measured by an estimated market capitalization of common equity for PE.
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Table 10: Size as Measured by Market Capitalization for PE's Electric Operations and the Utility Proxy Group

|  | Market <br> Capitalization* <br> \$ Millions) | Times <br> Greater than <br> The Company |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| PE | $\$ 681.540$ |  |
| Utility Proxy Group | $\$ 22,798.483$ | 33.5 x |
| *From page 1 of Schedule DWD-9. |  |  |

PE's estimated market capitalization was $\$ 681.5$ million as of December 30 , 2022, compared with the market capitalization of the average company in the Utility Proxy Group of $\$ 22.8$ billion as of December 30, 2022. The average company in the Utility Proxy Group has a market capitalization 33.5 times the size of PE's estimated market capitalization.

As a result, it is necessary to upwardly adjust the indicated range of common equity cost rates attributable to the Utility Proxy Group to reflect the Company's greater risk due to their smaller relative size. The determination is based on the size premiums for portfolios of New York Stock Exchange, American Stock Exchange, and NASDAQ listed companies ranked by deciles for the 1926 to 2021 period. ${ }^{60}$ The average size premium for the Utility Proxy Group with a market capitalization of $\$ 22.8$ billion falls in the $2^{\text {nd }}$ decile, while the Company's estimated market capitalization of $\$ 681.5$ million places it in the $8^{\text {th }}$ decile. The size premium spread between the $2^{\text {nd }}$ decile and the $8^{\text {th }}$ decile is $0.78 \%$. Even though a $0.78 \%$
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upward size adjustment is indicated, I applied a size premium of $0.15 \%$ to the Company's indicated common equity cost rate in order to be conservative.

## Q. SINCE PE IS PART OF A LARGER COMPANY, WHY IS THE SIZE OF THE TOTAL COMPANY NOT MORE APPROPRIATE TO USE WHEN DETERMINING THE SIZE ADJUSTMENT?

A. As discussed previously, rates are set using the stand-alone principle, which maintains that the utility operations of a diversified firm should be regulated as though they were independent (i.e., without subsidies to or from affiliated companies). Because of this, the return derived in this proceeding will not apply to FE's operations as a whole, but only PE's. FE is the sum of its constituent parts, including those constituent parts' ROEs. Potential investors in the Parent are aware that it is a combination of operations in each state, and that each state's operations experience the operating risks specific to their jurisdiction. The market's expectation of FE's return is commensurate with the realities of the Company's composite operations in each of the states in which it operates.

## B. Credit Risk Adjustment

## Q. PLEASE DISCUSS YOUR PROPOSED CREDIT RISK ADJUSTMENT.

A. PE's long-term issuer ratings are Baa2 and BBB from Moody's Investors Services and S\&P, respectively, which are slightly more risky than the average long-term issuer ratings for the Utility Proxy Group of Baal and BBB+, respectively. ${ }^{61}$ Hence, an upward credit risk adjustment is necessary to reflect the lower credit
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rating, i.e., Baa2, of PE relative to the Baa1 average Moody's bond rating of the Utility Proxy Group. ${ }^{62}$

An indication of the magnitude of the necessary upward adjustment to reflect the greater credit risk inherent in a Baa2 bond rating is one-third of a recent three-month average spread between Moody's A2 and Baa2-rated public utility bond yields of $0.30 \%$, shown on page 4 of Schedule DWD-3, or $0.10 \%{ }^{63}$

## Q. DO EXPECTED DEFAULT RATES CHANGE BASED ON A COMPANY'S

 CREDIT RATING?A. Yes, they do. Chart 3 below presents Moody's Idealized Cumulative Expected Default Rates for debt obligations with maturities lasting 30-years based on the respective rating.
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# Chart 3: Moody's Idealized Cumulative Expected Default Rates Based on Debt Obligations with 30-Year Maturities 



As shown in Chart 3, Moody's notes an observable difference in the default rates based on each respective rating. Therefore, even though credit ratings might be similar, the default rates indicate that different ratings equate to different risks, which should be reflected in the Company's authorized ROE.

## C. Flotation Cost Adjustment

## Q. WHAT ARE FLOTATION COSTS?

A. Flotation costs are those costs associated with the sale of new issuances of common stock. They include market pressure and the mandatory unavoidable costs of issuance (e.g., underwriting fees and out-of-pocket costs for printing, legal, registration, etc.). For every dollar raised through debt or equity offerings, the Company receives less than one full dollar in financing.
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## Q. WHY IS IT IMPORTANT TO RECOGNIZE FLOTATION COSTS IN THE ALLOWED COMMON EQUITY COST RATE?

A. It is important because there is no other mechanism in the ratemaking paradigm through which such costs can be recognized and recovered. Because these costs are real, necessary, and legitimate, recovery of these costs should be permitted. As noted by Morin:

The costs of issuing these securities are just as real as operating and maintenance expenses or costs incurred to build utility plants, and fair regulatory treatment must permit recovery of these costs....

The simple fact of the matter is that common equity capital is not free....[Flotation costs] must be recovered through a rate of return adjustment. ${ }^{64}$

## Q. SHOULD FLOTATION COSTS BE RECOGNIZED ONLY IF THERE WAS AN ISSUANCE DURING THE TEST YEAR OR THERE IS AN IMMINENT POST-TEST YEAR ISSUANCE OF ADDITIONAL COMMON STOCK?

A. No. As noted above, there is no mechanism to recapture such costs in the ratemaking paradigm other than an adjustment to the allowed common equity cost rate. Flotation costs are charged to capital accounts and are not expensed on a utility's income statement. As such, flotation costs are analogous to capital investments, albeit negative, reflected on the balance sheet. Recovery of capital investments relates to the expected useful lives of the investment. Since common equity has a very long and indefinite life (assumed to be infinity in the standard
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regulatory DCF model), flotation costs should be recovered through an adjustment to common equity cost rate, even when there has not been an issuance during the test year, or in the absence of an expected imminent issuance of additional shares of common stock.

Historical flotation costs are a permanent loss of investment to the utility and should be accounted for. When any company, including a utility, issues common stock, flotation costs are incurred for legal, accounting, printing fees and the like. For each dollar of issuing market price, a small percentage is expensed and is permanently unavailable for investment in utility rate base. Since these expenses are charged to capital accounts and not expensed on the income statement, the only way to restore the full value of that dollar of issuing price with an assumed investor required return of $10 \%$ is for the net investment to earn more than $10 \%$ to net back to the investor a fair return on that dollar. In other words, if a company issues stock at $\$ 1.00$ with $5 \%$ in flotation costs, it will net $\$ 0.95$ in investment. Assuming the investor in that stock requires a $10 \%$ return on their invested $\$ 1.00$ (i.e., a return of $\$ 0.10$ ), the company needs to earn approximately $10.5 \%$ on its invested $\$ 0.95$ to receive a $\$ 0.10$ return.

## Q. DO THE COMMON EQUITY COST RATE MODELS YOU HAVE USED ALREADY REFLECT INVESTORS' ANTICIPATION OF FLOTATION COSTS?

A. No. All of these models assume no transaction costs. The literature is quite clear that these costs are not reflected in the market prices paid for common stocks. For
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example, Brigham and Daves confirm this and provide the methodology utilized to calculate the flotation adjustment. ${ }^{65}$ In addition, Morin confirms the need for such an adjustment even when no new equity issuance is imminent. ${ }^{66}$ Consequently, it is proper to include a flotation cost adjustment when using cost of common equity models to estimate the common equity cost rate.

## Q. HOW DID YOU CALCULATE THE FLOTATION COST ALLOWANCE?

A. I modified the DCF calculation to provide a dividend yield that would reimburse investors for issuance costs in accordance with the method cited in literature by Brigham and Daves, as well as by Morin. The flotation cost adjustment recognizes the actual costs of issuing equity that were incurred by FE. Based on the issuance costs shown on page 1 of Schedule DWD-10, an adjustment of $0.19 \%$ is required to reflect the flotation costs applicable to the Utility Proxy Group.
Q. DID YOU INCLUDE A 19-BASIS POINT ADJUSTMENT TO YOUR RECOMMENDED RANGE TO REFLECT FLOTATION COSTS?
A. No, I did not. Although I believe a flotation cost adjustment is warranted in this proceeding, I have not reflected it in my recommended range, because I recognize the Commission has typically not made such an adjustment in prior cases. Given that, I believe my recommendation is a conservative estimate of the Company's required return.
$\qquad$
Direct Testimony of Dylan W. D'Ascendis
Page 69 of 71

## Q. WHAT IS THE INDICATED COST OF COMMON EQUITY AFTER YOUR COMPANY-SPECIFIC ADJUSTMENTS?

A. Applying the $0.15 \%$ size adjustment and the $0.10 \%$ credit risk adjustment to the indicated range of common equity cost rates between $10.05 \%$ and $11.05 \%$ results in a range of common equity cost rates between $10.29 \%$ and $11.29 \%$.
VIII. CONCLUSIONS REGARDING RETURN ON COMMON EQUITY
Q. WHAT IS YOUR RECOMMENDED ROE FOR PE?
A. Given the discussion above and the results from the analyses in this testimony, I recommend that an ROE of $10.60 \%$, within a range between $10.29 \%$ and $11.29 \%$, is appropriate for the Company at this time.
Q. IN YOUR OPINION, IS YOUR PROPOSED ROE OF 10.60\% FAIR AND REASONABLE TO PE AND ITS CUSTOMERS?
A. Yes, it is.
IX. CREDIT-ADJUSTED RISK-FREE RATE
Q. HAVE YOU CALCULATED A CREDIT-ADJUSTED RISK-FREE RATE FOR PE?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. WHAT IS A CREDIT-ADJUSTED RISK-FREE RATE?
A. A credit-adjusted risk-free rate equates to a risk-free interest rate adjusted for the effect of its credit standing. ${ }^{67}$ The credit-adjusted risk-free rate is used solely by
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Maryland as a discount rate in present value calculations for net salvage costs in depreciation studies.

## Q. WHY WAS A CREDIT-ADJUSTED RISK-FREE RATE CALCULATED?

A. In the May 26, 2021 Proposed Order of Public Utility Law Judge ("PULJ") in Case No. 9490, the PULJ ruled that a credit-adjusted risk-free rate is the rate that should be used as the discount rate in the SFAS 143 methodology to calculate net salvage costs for the purpose of depreciation accounting (i.e., the "MD Present Value Method"), but there was insufficient evidence as to what a credit-adjusted risk-free rate might be for PE. ${ }^{68}$ Although the Company and Company witness Spanos dispute the continued use of the MD Present Value Method, a credit-adjusted riskfree rate has been calculated in the event the MD Present Value Method is ordered by the Commission for the calculation of the Company's net salvage costs for the purposes of depreciation accounting.
Q. HOW DID YOU CALCULATE THE CREDIT-ADJUSTED RISK-FREE RATE?
A. To calculate the credit-adjusted risk-free rate, I started with the three-month average yield on 30 -year Treasury bonds as a proxy for the risk-free rate. The average yield on 30 -year Treasury bonds is $3.90 \%$ for the three months ending December 2022. To reflect the Company's credit standing (Baa2 Moody's bond rating), I applied the three-month average yield spread between 30-year Treasury bonds and Baa2-rated public utility bonds. The average yield spread between 30-
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6
year Treasury bonds and Baa2-rated utility bonds for the three months ended December 2022 is $2.03 \%$. Applying the credit spread to the three-month average risk-free rate results in a credit-adjusted risk-free rate of $5.93 \%$ as shown on Schedule DWD-11.

## Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?

A. Yes, it does.

## Summary

Dylan is an experienced consultant and a Certified Rate of Return Analyst (CRRA) and Certified Valuation Analyst (CVA). Dylan joined ScottMadden in 2016 and has become a leading expert witness with respect to cost of capital and capital structure. He has served as a consultant for investor-owned and municipal utilities and authorities for 14 years. Dylan has testified as an expert witness on over 125 occasions regarding rate of return, cost of service, rate design, and valuation before more than 35 regulatory jurisdictions in the United States and Canada, an American Arbitration Association panel, and the Superior Court of Rhode Island. He also maintains the benchmark index against which the Hennessy Gas Utility Mutual Fund performance is measured. Dylan holds a B.A. in economic history from the University of Pennsylvania and an M.B.A. with concentrations in finance and international business from Rutgers University.

## Areas of Specialization

## - Regulation and Rates <br> - Rate of Return <br> - Valuation <br> - Mutual Fund Benchmarking <br> - Capital Market Risk <br> - Regulatory Strategy <br> - Cost of Service

## Recent Expert Testimony Submission/Appearance

- Regulatory Commission of Alaska - Capital Structure
- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission - Rate of Return
- Public Utility Commission of Texas - Return on Equity
- Hawaii Public Utilities Commission - Cost of Service / Rate Design
- Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission - Valuation


## Recent Assignments

- Provided expert testimony on the cost of capital for ratemaking purposes before numerous state utility regulatory agencies
- Sponsored valuation testimony for a large municipal water company in front of an American Arbitration Association Board to justify the reasonability of their lease payments to the City
- Co-authored a valuation report on behalf of a large investor-owned utility company in response to a new state regulation which allowed the appraised value of acquired assets into rate base


## Recent Articles and Speeches

- Co-Author of: "Decoupling, Risk Impacts and the Cost of Capital", co-authored with Richard A. Michelfelder, Ph.D., Rutgers University and Pauline M. Ahern. The Electricity Journal, March, 2020
- Co-Author of: "Decoupling Impact and Public Utility Conservation Investment", co-authored with Richard A. Michelfelder, Ph.D., Rutgers University and Pauline M. Ahern. Energy Policy Journal, 130 (2019), 311-319
- "Establishing Alternative Proxy Groups", before the Society of Utility and Regulatory Financial Analysts: 51st Financial Forum, April 4, 2019, New Orleans, LA
- "Past is Prologue: Future Test Year", Presentation before the National Association of Water Companies 2017 Southeast Water Infrastructure Summit, May 2, 2017, Savannah, GA.
- Co-author of: "Comparative Evaluation of the Predictive Risk Premium Model ${ }^{\text {TM }}$, the Discounted Cash Flow Model and the Capital Asset Pricing Model", co-authored with Richard A. Michelfelder, Ph.D., Rutgers University, Pauline M. Ahern, and Frank J. Hanley, The Electricity Journal, May, 2013
- "Decoupling: Impact on the Risk and Cost of Common Equity of Public Utility Stocks", before the Society of Utility and Regulatory Financial Analysts: 45th Financial Forum, April 17-18, 2013, Indianapolis, IN


## Dylan W. D'Ascendis, CRRA, CVA

scottmadden
MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS

| Sponsor | Date | Case/Applicant | Docket No. | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regulatory Commission of Alaska |  |  |  |  |
| ENSTAR Natural Gas Company | 08/22 | ENSTAR Natural Gas Company | Docket No. TA334-4 | Rate of Return |
| Cook Inlet Natural Gas Storage Alaska, LLC | 07/21 | Cook Inlet Natural Gas Storage Alaska, LLC | Docket No. TA45-733 | Capital Structure |
| Alaska Power Company | 09/20 | Alaska Power Company; Goat Lake Hydro, Inc.; BBL Hydro, Inc. | Tariff Nos. TA886-2; TA6-521; TA4-573 | Capital Structure |
| Alaska Power Company | 07/16 | Alaska Power Company | Docket No. TA857-2 | Rate of Return |
| Alberta Utilities Commission |  |  |  |  |
| AltaLink, L.P., and EPCOR Distribution \& Transmission, Inc. | 01/20 | AltaLink, L.P., and EPCOR Distribution \& Transmission, Inc. | 2021 Generic Cost of Capital, Proceeding ID. 24110 | Rate of Return |
| Arizona Corporation Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Arizona Water Company | 12/22 | Arizona Water Company - Eastern Group | Docket No. W-01445A-22-0286 | Rate of Return |
| EPCOR Water Arizona, Inc. | 08/22 | EPCOR Water Arizona, Inc. | Docket No. WS-01303A-22- $0236$ | Rate of Return |
| EPCOR Water Arizona, Inc. | 06/20 | EPCOR Water Arizona, Inc. | Docket No. WS-01303A-200177 | Rate of Return |
| Arizona Water Company | 12/19 | Arizona Water Company - Western Group | Docket No. W-01445A-19-0278 | Rate of Return |
| Arizona Water Company | 08/18 | Arizona Water Company - Northern Group | Docket No. W-01445A-18-0164 | Rate of Return |
| Arkansas Public Service Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Southwestern Electric Power Co. | 07/21 | Southwestern Electric Power Co. | Docket No. 21-070-U | Return on Equity |
| CenterPoint Energy Resources Corp. | 05/21 | CenterPoint Arkansas Gas | Docket No. 21-004-U | Return on Equity |
| Colorado Public Utilities Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Atmos Energy Corporation | 08/22 | Atmos Energy Corporation | Docket No. 22AL-0348G | Rate of Return |
| Summit Utilities, Inc. | 04/18 | Colorado Natural Gas Company | Docket No. 18AL-0305G | Rate of Return |
| Atmos Energy Corporation | 06/17 | Atmos Energy Corporation | Docket No. 17AL-0429G | Rate of Return |
| Delaware Public Service Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Delmarva Power \& Light Co. | 01/22 | Delmarva Power \& Light Co. | Docket No. 22-002 (Gas) | Return on Equity |
| Delmarva Power \& Light Co. | 11/20 | Delmarva Power \& Light Co. | Docket No. 20-0149 (Electric) | Return on Equity |
| Delmarva Power \& Light Co. | 10/20 | Delmarva Power \& Light Co. | Docket No. 20-0150 (Gas) | Return on Equity |
| Tidewater Utilities, Inc. | 11/13 | Tidewater Utilities, Inc. | Docket No. 13-466 | Capital Structure |
| Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia |  |  |  |  |
| Washington Gas Light Company | 04/22 | Washington Gas Light Company | Formal Case No. 1169 | Rate of Return |
| Washington Gas Light Company | 09/20 | Washington Gas Light Company | Formal Case No. 1162 | Rate of Return |
| Federal Energy Regulatory Commission |  |  |  |  |
| LS Power Grid California, LLC | 10/20 | LS Power Grid California, LLC | Docket No. ER21-195-000 | Rate of Return |
| Florida Public Service Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Tampa Electric Company | 04/21 | Tampa Electric Company | Docket No. 20210034-EI | Return on Equity |
| Peoples Gas System | 09/20 | Peoples Gas System | Docket No. 20200051-GU | Rate of Return |
| Utilities, Inc. of Florida | 06/20 | Utilities, Inc. of Florida | Docket No. 20200139-WS | Rate of Return |
| Hawail Public Utilities Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Launiupoko Irrigation Company, Inc. | 12/20 | Launiupoko Irrigation Company, Inc. | Docket No. 2020-0217 I <br> Transferred to 2020-0089 | Capital Structure |

MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS

| Sponsor | Date | Case/Applicant | Docket No. | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lanai Water Company, Inc. | 12/19 | Lanai Water Company, Inc. | Docket No. 2019-0386 | Cost of Service I Rate Design |
| Manele Water Resources, LLC | 08/19 | Manele Water Resources, LLC | Docket No. 2019-0311 | Cost of Service / Rate Design |
| Kaupulehu Water Company | 02/18 | Kaupulehu Water Company | Docket No. 2016-0363 | Rate of Return |
| Aqua Engineers, LLC | 05/17 | Puhi Sewer \& Water Company | Docket No. 2017-0118 | Cost of Service / Rate Design |
| Hawaii Resources, Inc. | 09/16 | Laie Water Company | Docket No. 2016-0229 | Cost of Service / Rate Design |
| Illinois Commerce Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Utility Services of Illinois, Inc. | 02/21 | Utility Services of Illinois, Inc. | Docket No. 21-0198 | Rate of Return |
| Ameren Illinois Company d/b/a Ameren Illinois | 07/20 | Ameren Illinois Company d/b/a Ameren Illinois | Docket No. 20-0308 | Return on Equity |
| Utility Services of Illinois, Inc. | 11/17 | Utility Services of Illinois, Inc. | Docket No. 17-1106 | Cost of Service I Rate Design |
| Aqua Illinois, Inc. | 04/17 | Aqua Illinois, Inc. | Docket No. 17-0259 | Rate of Return |
| Utility Services of Illinois, Inc. | 04/15 | Utility Services of Illinois, Inc. | Docket No. 14-0741 | Rate of Return |
| Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Aqua Indiana, Inc. | 03/16 | Aqua Indiana, Inc. Aboite Wastewater Division | Docket No. 44752 | Rate of Return |
| Twin Lakes, Utilities, Inc. | 08/13 | Twin Lakes, Utilities, Inc. | Docket No. 44388 | Rate of Return |
| Kansas Corporation Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Atmos Energy Corporation | 07/19 | Atmos Energy Corporation | 19-ATMG-525-RTS | Rate of Return |
| Kentucky Public Service Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Water Service Corporation of KY | 06/22 | Water Service Corporation of KY | 2022-00147 | Rate of Return |
| Atmos Energy Corporation | 07/21 | Atmos Energy Corporation | 2021-00304 | PRP Rider Rate |
| Atmos Energy Corporation | 06/21 | Atmos Energy Corporation | 2021-00214 | Rate of Return |
| Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc. | 06/21 | Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc. | 2021-00190 | Return on Equity |
| Bluegrass Water Utility Operating Company | 10/20 | Bluegrass Water Utility Operating Company | 2020-00290 | Return on Equity |
| Louisiana Public Service Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Utilities, Inc. of Louisiana | 05/21 | Utilities, Inc. of Louisiana | Docket No. U-36003 | Rate of Return |
| Southwestern Electric Power Company | 12/20 | Southwestern Electric Power Company | Docket No. U-35441 | Return on Equity |
| Atmos Energy | 04/20 | Atmos Energy | Docket No. U-35535 | Rate of Return |
| Louisiana Water Service, Inc. | 06/13 | Louisiana Water Service, Inc. | Docket No. U-32848 | Rate of Return |
| Maine Public Utilities Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Summit Natural Gas of Maine, Inc. | 03/22 | Summit Natural Gas of Maine, Inc. | Docket No. 2022-00025 | Rate of Return |
| The Maine Water Company | 09/21 | The Maine Water Company | Docket No. 2021-00053 | Rate of Return |
| Maryland Public Service Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Washington Gas Light Company | 08/20 | Washington Gas Light Company | Case No. 9651 | Rate of Return |
| FirstEnergy, Inc. | 08/18 | Potomac Edison Company | Case No. 9490 | Rate of Return |
| Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities |  |  |  |  |
| Unitil Corporation | 12/19 | Fitchburg Gas \& Electric Co. (Elec.) | D.P.U. 19-130 | Rate of Return |
| Unitil Corporation | 12/19 | Fitchburg Gas \& Electric Co. (Gas) | D.P.U. 19-131 | Rate of Return |
| Liberty Utilities | 07/15 | Liberty Utilities d/b/a New England Natural Gas Company | Docket No. 15-75 | Rate of Return |
| Minnesota Public Utilities Commission |  |  |  |  |

MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS

| Sponsor | Date | Case/Applicant | Docket No. | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Northern States Power Company | 11/01 | Northern States Power Company | Docket No. G002/GR-21-678 | Return on Equity |
| Northern States Power Company | 10/21 | Northern States Power Company | Docket No. E002/GR-21-630 | Return on Equity |
| Northern States Power Company | 11/20 | Northern States Power Company | Docket No. E002/GR-20-723 | Return on Equity |
| Mississippi Public Service Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Great River Utility Operating Co. | 07/22 | Great River Utility Operating Co. | Docket No. 2022-UN-86 | Rate of Return |
| Atmos Energy | 03/19 | Atmos Energy | Docket No. 2015-UN-049 | Capital Structure |
| Atmos Energy | 07/18 | Atmos Energy | Docket No. 2015-UN-049 | Capital Structure |
| Missouri Public Service Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Spire Missouri, Inc. | 12/20 | Spire Missouri, Inc. | Case No. GR-2021-0108 | Return on Equity |
| Indian Hills Utility Operating Company, Inc. | 10/17 | Indian Hills Utility Operating Company, Inc. | Case No. SR-2017-0259 | Rate of Return |
| Raccoon Creek Utility Operating Company, Inc. | 09/16 | Raccoon Creek Utility Operating Company, Inc. | Case No. SR-2016-0202 | Rate of Return |
| Public Utilities Commission of Nevada |  |  |  |  |
| Southwest Gas Corporation | 09/21 | Southwest Gas Corporation | Docket No. 21-09001 | Return on Equity |
| Southwest Gas Corporation | 08/20 | Southwest Gas Corporation | Docket No. 20-02023 | Return on Equity |
| New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Aquarion Water Company of New Hampshire, Inc. | 12/20 | Aquarion Water Company of New Hampshire, Inc. | Docket No. DW 20-184 | Rate of Return |
| New Jersey Board of Public Utilities |  |  |  |  |
| Middlesex Water Company | 05/21 | Middlesex Water Company | Docket No. WR21050813 | Rate of Return |
| Atlantic City Electric Company | 12/20 | Atlantic City Electric Company | Docket No. ER20120746 | Return on Equity |
| FirstEnergy | 02/20 | Jersey Central Power \& Light Co. | Docket No. ER20020146 | Rate of Return |
| Aqua New Jersey, Inc. | 12/18 | Aqua New Jersey, Inc. | Docket No. WR18121351 | Rate of Return |
| Middlesex Water Company | 10/17 | Middlesex Water Company | Docket No. WR17101049 | Rate of Return |
| Middlesex Water Company | 03/15 | Middlesex Water Company | Docket No. WR15030391 | Rate of Return |
| The Atlantic City Sewerage Company | 10/14 | The Atlantic City Sewerage Company | Docket No. WR14101263 | Cost of Service / Rate Design |
| Middlesex Water Company | 11/13 | Middlesex Water Company | Docket No. WR1311059 | Capital Structure |
| New Mexico Public Regulation Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Southwestern Public Service Co. | 01/21 | Southwestern Public Service Co. | Case No. 20-00238-UT | Return on Equity |
| North Carolina Utilities Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Carolina Water Service, Inc. | 07/22 | Carolina Water Service, Inc. | Docket No. W-354 Sub 400 | Rate of Return |
| Aqua North Carolina, Inc. | 06/22 | Aqua North Carolina, Inc. | Docket No. W-218 Sub 573 | Rate of Return |
| Carolina Water Service, Inc. | 07/21 | Carolina Water Service, Inc. | Docket No. W-354 Sub 384 | Rate of Return |
| Piedmont Natural Gas Co., Inc. | 03/21 | Piedmont Natural Gas Co., Inc. | Docket No. G-9, Sub 781 | Return on Equity |
| Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC | 07/20 | Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC | Docket No. E-7, Sub 1214 | Return on Equity |
| Duke Energy Progress, LLC | 07/20 | Duke Energy Progress, LLC | Docket No. E-2, Sub 1219 | Return on Equity |
| Aqua North Carolina, Inc. | 12/19 | Aqua North Carolina, Inc. | Docket No. W-218 Sub 526 | Rate of Return |
| Carolina Water Service, Inc. | 06/19 | Carolina Water Service, Inc. | Docket No. W-354 Sub 364 | Rate of Return |
| Carolina Water Service, Inc. | 09/18 | Carolina Water Service, Inc. | Docket No. W-354 Sub 360 | Rate of Return |
| Aqua North Carolina, Inc. | 07/18 | Aqua North Carolina, Inc. | Docket No. W-218 Sub 497 | Rate of Return |
| North Dakota Public Service Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Northern States Power Company | 09/21 | Northern States Power Company | Case No. PU-21-381 | Rate of Return |
| Northern States Power Company | 11/20 | Northern States Power Company | Case No. PU-20-441 | Rate of Return |
| Public Utilities Commission of Ohio |  |  |  |  |
| Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. | 10/21 | Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. | Case No. 21-887-EL-AIR | Return on Equity |

MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS

| Sponsor | Date | Case/Applicant | Docket No. | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aqua Ohio, Inc. | 07/21 | Aqua Ohio, Inc. | Case No. 21-0595-WW-AIR | Rate of Return |
| Aqua Ohio, Inc. | 05/16 | Aqua Ohio, Inc. | Case No. 16-0907-WW-AIR | Rate of Return |
| Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Borough of Ambler | 06/22 | Borough of Ambler - Bureau of Water | Docket No. R-2022-3031704 | Rate of Return |
| Citizens' Electric Company of Lewisburg | 05/22 | C\&T Enterprises | Docket No. R-2022-3032369 | Rate of Return |
| Valley Energy Company | 05/22 | C\&T Enterprises | Docket No. R-2022-3032300 | Rate of Return |
| Community Utilities of Pennsylvania, Inc. | 04/21 | Community Utilities of Pennsylvania, Inc. | Docket No. R-2021-3025207 | Rate of Return |
| Vicinity Energy Philadelphia, Inc. | 04/21 | Vicinity Energy Philadelphia, Inc. | Docket No. R-2021-3024060 | Rate of Return |
| Delaware County Regional Water Control Authority | 02/20 | Delaware County Regional Water Control Authority | Docket No. A-2019-3015173 | Valuation |
| Valley Energy, Inc. | 07/19 | C\&T Enterprises | Docket No. R-2019-3008209 | Rate of Return |
| Wellsboro Electric Company | 07/19 | C\&T Enterprises | Docket No. R-2019-3008208 | Rate of Return |
| Citizens' Electric Company of Lewisburg | 07/19 | C\&T Enterprises | Docket No. R-2019-3008212 | Rate of Return |
| Steelton Borough Authority | 01/19 | Steelton Borough Authority | Docket No. A-2019-3006880 | Valuation |
| Mahoning Township, PA | 08/18 | Mahoning Township, PA | Docket No. A-2018-3003519 | Valuation |
| SUEZ Water Pennsylvania Inc. | 04/18 | SUEZ Water Pennsylvania Inc. | Docket No. R-2018-000834 | Rate of Return |
| Columbia Water Company | 09/17 | Columbia Water Company | Docket No. R-2017-2598203 | Rate of Return |
| Veolia Energy Philadelphia, Inc. | 06/17 | Veolia Energy Philadelphia, Inc. | Docket No. R-2017-2593142 | Rate of Return |
| Emporium Water Company | 07/14 | Emporium Water Company | Docket No. R-2014-2402324 | Rate of Return |
| Columbia Water Company | 07/13 | Columbia Water Company | Docket No. R-2013-2360798 | Rate of Return |
| Penn Estates Utilities, Inc. | 12/11 | Penn Estates, Utilities, Inc. | Docket No. R-2011-2255159 | Capital Structure / Long-Term Debt Cost Rate |
| South Carolina Public Service Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Blue Granite Water Co. | 12/19 | Blue Granite Water Company | Docket No. 2019-292-WS | Rate of Return |
| Carolina Water Service, Inc. | 02/18 | Carolina Water Service, Inc. | Docket No. 2017-292-WS | Rate of Return |
| Carolina Water Service, Inc. | 06/15 | Carolina Water Service, Inc. | Docket No. 2015-199-WS | Rate of Return |
| Carolina Water Service, Inc. | 11/13 | Carolina Water Service, Inc. | Docket No. 2013-275-WS | Rate of Return |
| United Utility Companies, Inc. | 09/13 | United Utility Companies, Inc. | Docket No. 2013-199-WS | Rate of Return |
| Utility Services of South Carolina, Inc. | 09/13 | Utility Services of South Carolina, Inc. | Docket No. 2013-201-WS | Rate of Return |
| Tega Cay Water Services, Inc. | 11/12 | Tega Cay Water Services, Inc. | Docket No. 2012-177-WS | Capital Structure |
| South Dakota Public Service Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Northern States Power Company | 06/22 | Northern States Power Company | Docket No. EL22-017 | Rate of Return |
| Tennessee Public Utility Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Piedmont Natural Gas Company | 07/20 | Piedmont Natural Gas Company | Docket No. 20-00086 | Return on Equity |
| Public Utility Commission of Texas |  |  |  |  |
| Oncor Electric Delivery Co. LLC | 05/22 | Oncor Electric Delivery Co. LLC | Docket No. 53601 | Return on Equity |
| Southwestern Public Service Co. | 02/21 | Southwestern Public Service Co. | Docket No. 51802 | Return on Equity |
| Southwestern Electric Power Co. | 10/20 | Southwestern Electric Power Co. | Docket No. 51415 | Rate of Return |
| Virginia State Corporation Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Washington Gas Light Company | 06/22 | Washington Gas Light Company | PUR-2022-00054 | Return on Equity |
| Virginia Natural Gas, Inc. | 04/21 | Virginia Natural Gas, Inc. | PUR-2020-00095 | Return on Equity |
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Subject

| Sponsor | Date | Case/Applicant | Docket No. | Subject |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Massanutten Public Service <br> Corporation | $12 / 20$ | Massanutten Public Service <br> Corporation | PUE-2020-00039 | Return on Equity |
| Aqua Virginia, Inc. | $07 / 20$ | Aqua Virginia, Inc. | PUR-2020-00106 | Rate of Return |
| WGL Holdings, Inc. | $07 / 18$ | Washington Gas Light Company | PUR-2018-00080 | Rate of Return |
| Atmos Energy Corporation | $05 / 18$ | Atmos Energy Corporation | PUR-2018-00014 | Rate of Return |
| Aqua Virginia, Inc. | $07 / 17$ | Aqua Virginia, Inc. | PUR-2017-00082 | Rate of Return |
| Massanutten Public Service Corp. | $08 / 14$ | Massanutten Public Service Corp. | PUE-2014-00035 | Rate of Return / <br> Rate Design |
| Public Service Commission of West Virginia |  |  |  |  |
| Monongahela Power Company and <br> The Potomac Edison Company | $12 / 21$ | Monongahela Power Company and <br> The Potomac Edison Company | Case No. 21-0857-E-CN (ELG) | Return on Equity |
| Monongahela Power Company and <br> The Potomac Edison Company | $11 / 21$ | Monongahela Power Company and <br> The Potomac Edison Company | Case No. 21-0813-E-P (Solar) | Return on Equity |

The Potomac Edison Company<br>Table of Contents<br>Schedules to the Direct Testimony of Dylan W. D'Ascendis
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The Potomac Edison Company<br>Recommended Capital Structure and Cost Rates

for Ratemaking Purposes
at December 31, 2022

| Type Of Capital | Ratios (1) | Cost Rate |  | Weighted Cost Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Long-Term Debt | 46.47\% | 4.018\% | (1) | 1.87\% |
| Common Equity | 53.53\% | 10.60\% | (2) | 5.67\% |
| Total | 100.00\% |  |  | 7.54\% |

Notes:
(1) Company-provided.
(2) From page 2 of this Schedule.

The Potomac Edison Company<br>Brief Summary of Common Equity Cost Rate

| $\underline{\text { Line No. }}$ | $\underline{\text { Principal Methods }}$ | Proxy Group of <br> Thirteen <br> Electric <br> Utilities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Discounted Cash Flow Model (DCF) (1) | 9.29\% |
| 2. | Risk Premium Model (RPM) (2) | 11.64\% |
| 3. | Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) (3) | 11.79\% |
| 4. | Market Models Applied to Comparable Risk, Non-Price Regulated Companies (4) | 12.58\% |
| 5. | Indicated Common Equity Cost Rate before Adjustment for Unique Risk | 10.04\%-11.04\% |
| 6. | Business Risk Adjustment (5) | 0.15\% |
| 7. | Credit Risk Adjustment (6) | 0.10\% |
| 8. | Flotation Costs (7) | 0.19\% |
| 9. | Indicated Common Equity Cost Rate after Adjustment | 10.29\%-11.29\% |
| 10. | Recommended Common Equity Cost Rate | 10.60\% |

Notes: (1) From Schedule DWD-2.
(2) From page 1 of Schedule DWD-3.
(3) From page 1 of Schedule DWD-4.
(4) From page 1 of Schedule DWD-8.
(5) Business risk adjustment to reflect The Potomac Edison Company's unique risk compared to the Utility Proxy Group as detailed in the accompanying Direct Testimony.
(6) Company-specific risk adjustment to reflect PE's greater risk due to a lower long-term rating relative to the proxy group as detailed in Mr. D'Ascendis' Direct Testimony.
(7) From page 1 of Schedule DWD-10. Flotation costs not contemplated in range of recommended ROEs.
The Potomac Edison Company
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Indicated Common Equity Cost Rate Using the Discounted Cash Flow Model for the
Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Utilities
Average of Mean and Median



 | Zack's Five |
| :---: |
| Year Projected |
| Growth Rate |
| in EPS |


$\cdots$ $\begin{array}{ccc}\begin{array}{c}\text { Average } \\ \text { Dividend Yield } \\ (1)\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Value Line } \\ \text { Projected Five } \\ \text { Year Growth } \\ \text { in EPS (2) }\end{array} \\ 3.20 \quad \% & 6.00 \quad \% \\ 2.81 & 6.50 \\ 3.64 & 6.50 \\ 4.19 & & 5.00 \\ 4.80 & & 16.00 \\ 3.90 & & 4.00 \\ 4.08 & & 6.50 \\ 3.22 & & 4.50 \\ 3.05 & 2.50 \\ 4.61 & 6.50 \\ 4.37 & 4.50 \\ 3.90 & 6.00 \\ 2.93 & & \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{ccc}\begin{array}{c}\text { Average } \\ \text { Dividend Yield } \\ (1)\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Value Line } \\ \text { Projected Five } \\ \text { Year Growth } \\ \text { in EPS (2) }\end{array} \\ 3.20 \quad \% & 6.00 \quad \% \\ 2.81 & 6.50 \\ 3.64 & 6.50 \\ 4.19 & & 5.00 \\ 4.80 & & 16.00 \\ 3.90 & & 4.00 \\ 4.08 & & 6.50 \\ 3.22 & & 4.50 \\ 3.05 & 2.50 \\ 4.61 & 6.50 \\ 4.37 & 4.50 \\ 3.90 & 6.00 \\ 2.93 & & \end{array}$
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|  |
| :--- |
| Alliant Energy Corporation |
| Ameren Corporation |
| American Electric Power Corporation |
| Duke Energy Corporation |
| Edison International |
| Entergy Corporation |
| Evergy, Inc. |
| Eversource Energy |
| IDACORP, Inc. |
| NorthWestern Corporation |
| OGE Energy Corporation |
| Portland General Electric Company |
| Xcel Energy Inc. |

Proxy Group of Thirteen
Electric Utilities
American Electric Power Edison International

IDACORP, Inc.
NorthWestern Corporation
Porl
Portland General Electric Company


| \% Change Retail Sales (KWH) | 2019-2.2 |  | 2020-2.3 |  | 2021+37 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1448 |  | 11134 | NA |
| Avg. Indust. Revs. per KWH (c)Capacity at Peak (Nw) |  | 6.98 |  | 7.55 | 7.64 |
|  |  | NA |  | NA | NA |
| Peak Load, Summer (Mw) |  | 5626 |  | 5496 | 5486 |
| Annual Load Factor \%) |  | NA |  | NA | NA |
| \% Change Cusiomers (yrend) |  | +. 6 |  | +. 6 | +. 8 |
| Fixed Charge Cov. (\%) |  | 265 |  | 251 | 259 |
| ANNUAL RATES P | Past |  | Past |  | d '19-21 |
| of change (per sh) 10 | 10 Yrs. |  | Yrs. |  |  |
| Revenues | -1.0\% |  | -.5\% |  | 4.5\% |
| "Cash Flow" | 7.0\% |  | 7.5\% |  | 5.5\% |
| Earnings | 7.0\% |  | 8.0\% |  | 6.0\% |
| Dividends | 6.5\% |  | 6.5\% |  | 6.0\% |
| Book Value | 5.5\% |  | 7.0\% |  | 5.0\% |


| Calendar | QUARTERLY REVENUES (\$ mill.) Mar. 31 Jun. 30 Sep. 30 Dec. 31 |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Full } \\ & \text { Year } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 987.2 | 790.2 | 990.2 | 880.1 | 3647.7 |
| 2020 | 916 | 763 | 920 | 817 | 3416.0 |
| 2021 | 901 | 817 | 1024 | 927 | 3669.0 |
| 2022 | 1068 | 943 | 1135 | 954 | 4100 |
| 2023 | 1100 | 925 | 1175 | 1050 | 4250 |
| Calendar | EARNINGS PER SHARE A |  |  |  | Full Year |
| 2019 | . 53 | 40 | . 94 | . 46 | 2.33 |
| 2020 | . 72 | . 54 | . 94 | . 26 | 2.47 |
| 2021 | . 68 | . 57 | 1.02 | . 35 | 2.63 |
| 2022 | . 77 | . 63 | . 90 | . 40 | 2.70 |
| 2023 | . 80 | . 65 | 1.05 | . 45 | 2.95 |
|  | QUARTERLY DIVIDENDS PAID ${ }^{\text {- }} \dagger$ |  |  |  | Full |
| endar | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 | Year |
| 2018 | . 335 | . 335 | . 335 | . 335 | 1.34 |
| 2019 | . 355 | . 355 | . 355 | . 355 | 1.42 |
| 2020 | . 38 | . 38 | . 38 | . 38 | 1.52 |
| 2021 | . 4025 | . 4025 | . 4025 | . 4025 | 1.61 |
| 2022 | . 4275 | . 4275 | . 4275 | . 4275 |  |

BUSINESS: Alliant Energy Corporation (formerly Interstate Energy) is a holding company formed through the merger of WPL Holdings, IES Industries, and Interstate Power. Supplies electricity to 985,000 customers and gas to 425,000 customers in Wisconsin, lowa, and Minnesota. Electric revenue by state: WI, 43\%; IA, $56 \%$. MN, $1 \%$. Electric revenue: residential, $36 \%$; commercial, $25 \%$; industrial,
Alliant Energy came up a bit short in the September quarter. Indeed, on a reported basis, the Wisconsin-based electric utility earned $\$ 0.90$ a share in the period, down $12 \%$ year over year, even as overall revenue rose $11 \%$, to nearly $\$ 1.14$ billion. Weighing on EPS was, among other things, a one-time charge below the operating line (included in our estimates). Notably, Alliant wrote down the value of tax assets on its balance sheet after Iowa's Department of Revenue announced a reduction in state levies on corporate income beginning next year. That said, operating conditions remained generally favorable, with warmer-than-normal weather driving increased air-conditioner and electricity use across Alliant's three-state footprint.
The utility's investment roadmap includes a notable amount of energy storage. In late September, Alliant filed a plan with the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin, calling for the addition of 175 megawatts of battery storage in the state. Specifically, the facilities would be located in Grant and Wood counties, alongside two previously-approved solar arrays. Importantly, they'd provide bridge
$29 \%$; wholesale, $8 \%$; other, $2 \%$. Generating sources: coal, $32 \%$; gas, $32 \%$; wind, $16 \%$; other, $1 \%$; purchased, $19 \%$. Fuel costs: $25 \%$ of revs. ' 21 reported deprec. rates: $2.9 \%-6.1 \%$. Has 3,300 employees. Chairman, President \& CEO: John O. Larsen. Inc.: Wisconsin. Address: 4902 N. Biltmore Lane, Madison, Wisconsin 53718-2148. Tel.: 608-458-3311. Internet: www.alliantenergy.com.
power for more than 180,000 homes at times when sun- and wind-power generation is inadequate.
The Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) that was signed into law in midAugust is expected to be a big benefit. As we understand it, new financing options under the IRA will enable Alliant Energy to take full ownership of 12 solarpower farms that it currently shares with several investment partners. According to a recent report, the transition could save the utility and its customers upwards of $\$ 138$ million.
Shares of Alliant Energy are ranked 4 (Below Average) for relative yearahead price performance. At the recent quotation, we think that buy-and-hold investors will also do better elsewhere. Notably, at $3.2 \%$, the dividend yield is below both the utility average and less-risky returns offered by United States Treasuries. Prospects over the next 18 months and the 3 - to 5 -year period are also subpar. Like many electric utility issues, the recent quotation is within our 2025-2027 Target Price Range.
Nils C. Van Liew
December 9, 2022
(A) Diluted EPS. Excl. nonrecurring losses: '11, $\quad$ May, Aug., and Nov. Dividend reinvestment $\quad$ base: Orig. cost. Rates all'd on com. eq. in IA $\begin{gathered}\text { Company's Financial Strength }\end{gathered}$

14; '12, 8c. '20 \& '21 EPS don't sum due to plan avail. t Shareholder investment plan avail. in '20: various; in WI in '22: $10 \%$; earned on Stock's Price Stability rounding. Next earnings report due late Feb. (C) Incl. deferred charges. In '21: $\$ 1,980$ mill., avg. com. eq., $21: 11.3 \%$. Regulatory Climate: Price Growth Persistence (B) Dividends historically paid in mid-Feb., $\$ 7.91$ /sh. (D) In millions, adj. for split. (E) Rate Wisconsin, Above Average; lowa, Average.
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Earnings Predictability

| AN | 1 | N | E |  |  |  |  | $\overline{\mathrm{NT}}$ | $87$ | RA | $20$ | $\left(\begin{array}{l} \mathrm{llog} \\ \mathrm{Me} \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { y: 22.0) } \\ & 1: 19.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { RELAT } \\ \text { P/E R } \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { DIV'D } \\ & \text { YLD } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ALUE } \\ & \text { _INE } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIMELINESS $\mathbf{4}$ Lowered 12/2/22 <br> SAFETY $\mathbf{1}$ Raised 9/10/21 <br> TECHNICAL 4 Lowered 129/22 <br> BETA .85 ( 1.00 = Market)  |  |  |  | High: Low: | 34.1 25.5 | 35.3 <br> 28.4 | 37.3 30.6 | $\begin{aligned} & 48.1 \\ & 35.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46.8 \\ & 37.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54.1 \\ & 41.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 64.9 \\ & 51.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{l\|} \hline 70.9 \\ 51.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80.9 \\ & 63.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 87.7 \\ & 58.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90.8 \\ & 69.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99.2 \\ & 73.3 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \text { Target Pric } \\ 2025 \mid 202 \end{array}$ | Range $2027$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $-160$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 120 100 |
| 18-Month Target Price Range <br> Low-High Midpoint (\% to Mid) <br> \$81-\$129 \$105 (20\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\left.4111\right\|^{1,14}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 80 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ',1"1110 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40 |
|  | 7 PR | ECTIO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30 |
|  | Price | ain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\because \because$. |  |  |  |  |  | 20 |
| High Low |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\cdots, \cdots$ | ,**.....* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% TOT. RETURN 10/22 |  | -15 |
| Institutional Decisions |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Percent } & 30 \\ \text { shares } & 20 \\ \text { traded } & 10 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 102022 | 202022 | 302022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | STOCK INDEX <br> IND  <br> -0.8  <br> -13.4  |  |
| to Buy to Sell | $\begin{aligned} & 294 \\ & 262 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 305 \\ 257 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 287 \\ & 274 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 yr. 3 yr. | -0.8 -13.4 <br> 12.7 35.8 |  |
| Hld's(000) | 200507 | 01631 | 204282 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Wلل11 | $1{ }^{1}$ |  | 5 yr . | $49.5 \quad 45.6$ |  |
| 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |  | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |  | JE LINE PUB. LL | -27 |
| 33.30 | 36.23 | 36.92 | 29.87 | 31.77 | 31.04 | 28.14 | 24.06 | 24.95 | 25.13 | 25.04 | 25.46 | 25.73 | 24.00 | 22.87 | 24.81 | 27.25 | 28.10 | Revenu | sper sh | 30.00 |
| 6.02 | 6.76 | 6.44 | 6.06 | 6.33 | 5.87 | 5.87 | 5.25 | 5.77 | 6.08 | 6.59 | 6.80 | 7.64 | 7.83 | 8.08 | 8.89 | 9.50 | 10.05 | "Cash | ow" per sh | 11.75 |
| 2.66 | 2.98 | 2.88 | 2.78 | 2.77 | 2.47 | 2.41 | 2.10 | 2.40 | 2.38 | 2.68 | 2.77 | 3.32 | 3.35 | 3.50 | 3.84 | 4.10 | 4.35 | Earning | per sh A | 5.25 |
| 2.54 | 2.54 | 2.54 | 1.54 | 1.54 | 1.56 | 1.60 | 1.60 | 1.61 | 1.66 | 1.72 | 1.78 | 1.85 | 1.92 | 2.00 | 2.20 | 2.36 | 2.52 | Div'd D | cl'd per sh B $\quad$ - | 3.10 |
| 4.99 | 6.96 | 9.75 | 7.51 | 4.66 | 4.50 | 5.49 | 5.87 | 7.66 | 8.12 | 8.78 | 9.05 | 9.56 | 9.92 | 13.02 | 13.67 | 12.90 | 12.55 | Cap'I S | ending per sh | 13.00 |
| 31.86 | 32.41 | 32.80 | 33.08 | 32.15 | 32.64 | 27.27 | 26.97 | 27.67 | 28.63 | 29.27 | 29.61 | 31.21 | 32.73 | 35.29 | 37.64 | 40.20 | 42.90 | Book V | ue per sh C | 51.25 |
| 206.60 | 208.30 | 212.30 | 237.40 | 240.40 | 242.60 | 242.63 | 242.63 | 242.63 | 242.63 | 242.63 | 242.63 | 244.50 | 246.20 | 253.30 | 257.70 | 262.50 | 267.00 | Common Shs Outst'g |  | 280.00 |
| 19.4 | 17.4 | 14.2 | 9.3 | 9.7 | 11.9 | 13.4 | 16.5 | 16.7 | 17.5 | 18.3 | 20.6 | 18.3 | 22.1 | 22.2 | 21.4 | Bold figures are Value Line estimates |  | Avg An | IP/E Ratio | 17.5 |
| 1.05 | . 92 | . 85 | . 62 | . 62 | . 75 | . 85 | . 93 | . 88 | . 88 | . 96 | 1.04 | . 99 | 1.18 | 1.14 | 1.14 |  |  | Relative P/E Ratio Avg Ann'l Div'd Yield |  | . 95 |
| 4.9\% | 4.9\% | 6.2\% | 6.0\% | 5.8\% | 5.3\% | 5.0\% | 4.6\% | 4.0\% | 4.0\% | 3.5\% | 3.1\% | 3.0\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% | 2.7\% |  |  | 3.4\% |
| CAPITAL STRUCTURE as of 9/30/22 <br> Total Debt $\$ 14798$ mill. Due in 5 Yrs $\$ 3446$ mill. <br> LT Debt $\$ 13577$ mill. LT Interest $\$ 436$ mill. <br> (LT interest earned: 3.8x) <br> Pension Assets-12/21 \$5745 mill. |  |  |  |  |  | 6828.0 | 5838.0 | 6053.0 | 6098.0 | 6076.0 | 6177.0 | 6291.0 | 5910.0 | 5794.0 | 6394.0 | 7150 | 7500 |  |  | Revenues (\$mill) |  | 8400 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 589.0 | 518.0 | 593.0 | 585.0 | 659.0 | 683.0 | 821.0 | 834.0 | 877.0 | 995.0 | 1075 | 1165 | Net Profit (\$mill) |  | 1455 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 36.9\% | 37.5\% | 38.9\% | 38.3\% | 36.7\% | 38.2\% | 22.4\% | 17.9\% | 15.0\% | 13.6\% | 12.0\% | 12.0\% | Income Tax Rate AFUDC \% to Net Profit |  | 12.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.1\% | 7.1\% | 5.7\% | 5.1\% | 4.1\% | 5.6\% | 6.9\% | 5.8\% | 5.5\% | 6.0\% | 6.0\% | 5.0\% |  |  | 4.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | blig \$54 | 57 mill. | 49.5\% | 45.2\% | 47.2\% | 49.3\% | 47.7\% | 49.2\% | 50.3\% | 52.1\% | 55.0\% | 56.1\% | 55.5\% | 53.5\% | Long-Term Debt Ratio Common Equity Ratio |  | 51.0\% |
| Pfd Stock $\$ 129$ mill. Pfd Div'd $\$ 5$ mill. 807,595 sh. $\$ 3.50$ to $\$ 5.50$ cum. (no par), $\$ 100$ |  |  |  |  |  | 49.4\% | 53.7\% | 51.7\% | 49.7\% | 51.3\% | 49.8\% | 48.8\% | 47.1\% | 44.3\% | 43.3\% | 44.0\% | 46.0\% |  |  | 48.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 13384 | 12190 | 12975 | 13968 | 13840 | 14420 | 15632 | 17116 | 20158 | 22391 | 23900 | 24950 | Total Capital (\$mill) |  | 29500 |
| stated v | \% to 5.16 | \% \$102 | 176-\$110 | sh.; 48 | ,508 | 16096 | 16205 | 17424 | 18799 | 20113 | 21466 | 22810 | 24376 | 26807 | 29261 | 31225 | 33050 | Net Plant (\$mill) |  | 38400 |
| \$104.30 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.0\% | 5.6\% | 5.8\% | 5.3\% | 6.0\% | 6.0\% | 6.4\% | 6.0\% | 5.3\% | 5.3\% | 5.5\% | 5.5\% | Return on Total Cap'I |  | 6.0\% |
| Common Stock 258,522,169 shs. as of $10 / 31 / 22$ <br> MARKET CAP: $\$ 23$ billion (Large Cap) |  |  |  |  |  | 8.7\% | 7.7\% | 8.7\% | 8.3\% | 9.1\% | 9.3\% | 10.6\% | 10.2\% | 9.7\% | 10.1\% | 10.0\% | 10.0\% | Return on Shr. Equity Return on Com Equity E |  | 10.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.8\% | 7.8\% | 8.7\% | 8.3\% | 9.2\% | 9.4\% | 10.7\% | 10.3\% | 9.7\% | 10.2\% | 10.0\% | 10.0\% |  |  | 10.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3.0 \% \\ & 66 \% \end{aligned}$ | 1.9\% | 2.9\% | 2.5\% | 3.3\% | 3.4\% | 4.8\% | 4.4\% | 4.2\% | 4.4\% | 4.5\% | 4.5\% | Retained to Com Eq |  | 4.0\% |
| ELECTRIC OPERATING STATISTICS |  |  |  |  |  |  | 76\% | 67\% | 70\% | 64\% | 64\% | 56\% | 57\% | 57\% | 57\% | 58\% | 58\% | All Div'ds to Net Prof |  | 60\% |


|  |  |  | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Change Retail Sales (KWH) |  |  | -3.5 | -5.6 | +2.1 |
| Avg. Inoust. Use (MWH) |  |  | NA | NA | NA |
|  | . Revs. per KW | WH(c) | NA | NA | NA |
| Capacity a Peak (Mw) |  |  | NA | NA | NA |
| Peak Load, Sunmer (Mw) |  |  | NA | NA | NA |
| Annual Load Factor (\%) \% Change Customers yr-end) |  |  | NA | NA | NA |
|  |  |  | NA | NA | NA |
| Fixed Charge Cov. $\%$ \% |  |  | 307 |  | 325 |
| ANNUAL RATES |  | Past | Past Est'd '19-'21 |  |  |
|  |  | 10 Yrs. | 5 Yrs |  | 25-27 |
| Revenues ${ }^{\text {"Cash Flow" }}$ |  | -2.5\% | - -1.0\% |  | .0\% |
|  |  | 3.0\% |  |  | .0\% |
| Earnings |  | 3.0\% | 7.5\% |  | .5\% |
| DividendsBook Value |  | 3.0\% | - 4.0\% |  | 7.0\% |
|  |  | 1.0\% | 4.5\% |  |  |
| Calendar | QUARTERLY REVENUES (\$ mill.) |  |  |  | Full Year |
|  | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 3 |  |
| 2019 | 1556 | 1379 | 1659 | 1316 | 5910 |
| 2020 | 1440 | 1398 | 1628 | 1328 | 5794 |
| 2021 | 1566 | 1472 | 1811 | 1545 | 6394 |
| 2022 | 1879 | 1726 | 2306 | 1239 | 7150 |
| 2023 | 1900 | 1700 | 2100 | 1800 | 7500 |
| Calendar | EARNINGS PER SHARE A |  |  |  | Full Year |
|  | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 |  |
| 2019 | . 78 | . 72 | 1.47 | . 38 | 3.35 |
| 2020 | . 59 | . 98 | 1.47 | . 46 | 3.50 |
| 2021 | . 91 | . 80 | 1.65 | . 48 | 3.84 |
| 2022 | . 97 | . 80 | 1.74 | . 59 | 4.10 |
| 2023 | 1.00 | . 90 | 1.80 | . 65 | 4.35 |
| $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Cal- } \\ \text { endar } \end{array}$ | QUARTERLY DIVIDENDS PAID ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | Full |
|  | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 | Year |
| 2018 | . 4575 | . 4575 | . 4575 | . 475 | 1.85 |
| 2019 | . 475 | . 475 | 475 | 495 | 1.92 |
| 2020 | . 495 | 495 | . 495 | . 515 | 2.00 |
| 2021 | . 55 | . 55 | . 55 | . 55 | 2.20 |
| 2022 | . 59 | . 59 | . 59 | . 59 |  |

BUSINESS: Ameren Corporation is a holding company formed
through the merger of Union Electric and CIPSCO. Has 1.2 million electric and 127,000 gas customers in Missouri; 1.2 million electric and 813,000 gas customers in Illinois. Discontinued nonregulated power-generation operation in '13. Electric revenue breakdown: residential, $49 \%$; commercial, $34 \%$; industrial, $8 \%$; other, $9 \%$. Gen-
Ameren reported in-line results for the September quarter. Earnings per share of $\$ 1.74$ were a penny higher than our estimate and 5\% greater than the year-ago tally. Earnings at Ameren Missouri, the largest segment, benefited from higher electric service rates. This was partially offset by higher operations and maintenance expenses derived from unfavorable market returns and companyowned life insurance investments. Earnings at the three remaining business segments were solid, primarily due to increased investments in infrastructure.
The company's guidance has improved a bit. Due to strong execution, management narrowed the 2022 earnings guidance to a range of $\$ 4.00$ to $\$ 4.15 \mathrm{per}$ share. This compares to the initial guidance range of $\$ 3.95$ to $\$ 4.15$ per share. Importantly, the year-to-date benefits it has seen from weather and higher-thanexpected 30-year Treasury rates are mostly being offset by the aforementioned company-owned life insurance investment performance, as well as higher than expected short-term and long-term borrow-
ing rates. The current five-year plan in-
erating sources: coal, $73 \%$; nuclear, $11 \%$; hydro \& other, $9 \%$; purchased, $7 \%$. Fuel costs: $25 \%$ of revenues. '21 reported deprec. rates: $3 \%-4 \%$. Has 9,100 employees. Chairman: Warner L. Baxter. President \& CEO: Martin J. Lyons, Jr. Inc.: Missouri. Address: One Ameren Plaza, 1901 Chouteau Ave., P.O. Box 66149, St. Louis, MO 63166-6149. Tel.: 314-621-3222. Internet: www.ameren.com.
cludes a $6 \%$ to $8 \%$ compounded annual growth rate for earnings from 2022 through 2026. This should be driven primarily by strong rate base growth and infrastructure investment. It expects dividend growth to be in line with long-term earnings growth and is planning for a payout ratio range of $55 \%$ to $70 \%$.
Business investment is paying off. At Ameren Missouri, the company estimates that over 6.5 million minutes of customer outages have been avoided in 2022 due to recent infrastructure investments. Meanwhile, the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) was enacted in August, and is designed to help reduce the cost of the clean energy transition. It provides tax credits for wind, solar, and nuclear energy centers, as well as energy storage, carbon capture utilization and hydrogen development. The incentives in the IRA align well with the companywide goal of reaching net zero carbon emissions by 2045 .
The dividend yield of this highquality stock is below the utility mean. The recent price is within our 2025-2027 Target Price Range.

## Kevin Downing

December 9, 2022
(A) Diluted EPS. Excl. nonrec. gain (losses):

10, (\$2.19); '11, (32c); '12, (\$6.42); '17, (63¢) gain (loss) from discontinued ops.: '13, (92c); '15, 21c. Next earnings report due mid-Feb.

| (B) Div'ds paid late Mar., June, Sept., \& Dec. - | $\begin{array}{l}\text { 22: elec. \& gas, none specified; in IL: electric, } \\ \text { Div'd reinvest. plan avail. (C) Incl. intang. In } \\ \text { varies; in '21: gas, } 9.67 \% \text {; earned on avg. com. }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- | | Div'd reinvest. plan avail. (C) Incl. intang. In | $\begin{array}{l}\text { varies; in '21: gas, } 9.67 \% \text {; earned on avg. com. } \\ \text { '21: } \$ 6.60 / \text { sh. (D) In mill. (E) Rate base: Orig. }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| eq., '21: $10.6 \%$ Regulatory Climate: MO, Aver- |  | cost depr. Rate allowed on com. eq. in MO in age; IL, Below Average.
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| A | $\{$ | $N$ | $\underline{L}$ | $F$ | $R$ | $Q$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CENT } \\ & \text { ICE } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $18$ | $\overline{\mathrm{Tr}} \mathrm{Me}$ | $\text { : } 19.7$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { RELAT } \\ \text { P/E R } \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { DIV'D } \\ & \text { YLD } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JALUE } \\ & \text { LINE } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Raised 4/1/22 |  | High: Low: | 41.7 33.1 | 45.4 <br> 37.0 | 51.6 41.8 | 63.2 45.8 | 65.4 52.3 | $\begin{aligned} & 71.3 \\ & 56.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78.1 \\ & 61.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81.1 \\ & 62.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96.2 \\ & 72.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 105.0 \\ 65.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 91.5 \\ & 74.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 105.6 \\ 80.3 \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Target Pric } \\ & 2025 \mid 202 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Range } \\ & 2027 \end{aligned}$ |
| SAFE <br> TECH | $\begin{array}{ll} Y & 1 \\ I C A L & 2 \end{array}$ | Rased <br> Lowered | 11/18/22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -200 |
| BETA | $(1.00=$ | Market) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 160 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | H1/n, |  | 1 |  |  |  | 80 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 恠 |  | "111" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 111, 1 | 'ill ${ }^{\text {rin }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50 |
| 2025-27 PROJECTIONS   <br> Price Gain Ann'l Total <br> Return   <br> 120 $(+25 \%)$ $9 \%$ <br> 100 $(+5 \%)$ $5 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | ル!1" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |  |  | -20 |
| Institutional Decisions |  |  |  | Percent shares traded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% | RETURN 10/22 |  |
|  | 102022 | 202022 | 302022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | STOCK INDEX |  |
| to Buy to Sell | $\begin{aligned} & 673 \\ & 475 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 634 \\ 521 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 624 \\ & 499 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{yr} . \\ & 3 \mathrm{yr} . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{rr} 66.7 & -13.4 \\ -7.5 & 35.8 \end{array}$ |  |
| Hld's(000) | 382433 | 85400 | 384675 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $25.7 \quad 45.6$ |  |
| 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |  | ELINE PUB. LLC | -27 |
| 31.82 | 33.41 | 35.56 | 28.22 | 30.01 | 31.27 | 30.77 | 31.48 | 34.78 | 33.51 | 33.31 | 31.35 | 32.84 | 31.49 | 30.04 | 33.30 | 35.20 | 35.95 | Revenu | ser sh | 38.55 |
| 6.67 | 6.80 | 6.84 | 6.32 | 6.29 | 6.83 | 6.92 | 7.02 | 7.57 | 7.98 | 8.47 | 7.95 | 8.77 | 9.35 | 10.28 | 10.98 | 11.50 | 11.95 | "Cash | low" per sh | 14.00 |
| 2.86 | 2.86 | 2.99 | 2.97 | 2.60 | 3.13 | 2.98 | 3.18 | 3.34 | 3.59 | 4.23 | 3.62 | 3.90 | 4.08 | 4.42 | 4.96 | 5.00 | 5.35 | Earning | per sh A | 6.50 |
| 1.50 | 1.58 | 1.64 | 1.64 | 1.71 | 1.85 | 1.88 | 1.95 | 2.03 | 2.15 | 2.27 | 2.39 | 2.53 | 2.71 | 2.84 | 3.00 | 3.17 | 3.35 | Div'd D | cl'd per sh ${ }^{\text {B }}$ - $\dagger$ | 4.00 |
| 8.89 | 8.88 | 9.83 | 6.19 | 5.07 | 5.74 | 6.45 | 7.75 | 8.68 | 9.37 | 9.98 | 11.79 | 12.89 | 12.43 | 12.72 | 11.43 | 15.35 | 14.15 | Cap'I S | ending per sh | 14.00 |
| 23.73 | 25.17 | 26.33 | 27.49 | 28.33 | 30.33 | 31.37 | 32.98 | 34.37 | 36.44 | 35.38 | 37.17 | 38.58 | 39.73 | 41.38 | 44.49 | 47.30 | 50.30 | Book V | lue per sh c | 59.00 |
| 396.67 | 400.43 | 406.07 | 478.05 | 480.81 | 483.42 | 485.67 | 487.78 | 489.40 | 491.05 | 491.71 | 492.01 | 493.25 | 494.17 | 496.60 | 504.21 | 514.00 | 523.00 | Comm | Shs Outst'g ${ }^{\text {D }}$ | 545.00 |
| 12.9 | 16.3 | 13.1 | 10.0 | 13.4 | 11.9 | 13.8 | 14.5 | 15.9 | 15.8 | 15.2 | 19.3 | 18.0 | 21.4 | 19.6 | 17.1 | Bold figu | res are | Avg A | 'I P/E Ratio | 17.0 |
| . 70 | . 87 | . 79 | . 67 | . 85 | . 75 | . 88 | . 81 | . 84 | . 80 | . 80 | . 97 | . 97 | 1.14 | 1.01 | . 93 |  |  | Relati | P/E Ratio | . 95 |
| 4.1\% | 3.4\% | 4.2\% | 5.5\% | 4.9\% | 5.0\% | 4.6\% | 4.2\% | 3.8\% | 3.8\% | 3.5\% | 3.4\% | 3.6\% | 3.1\% | 3.3\% | 3.5\% |  |  | Avg An | Div'd Yield | 3.6\% |
| CAPITAL STRUCTURE as of 9/30/22 <br> Total Debt $\$ 36349$ mill. Due in 5 Yrs $\$ 12886$ mill. LT Debt $\$ 33647$ mill. LT Interest $\$ 1067$ mill. Incl. $\$ 549.4$ mill. securitized bonds. Incl. $\$ 500.7$ mill. finance leases. <br> (LT interest earned: 3.2x) <br> Leases, Uncapitalized Annual rentals $\$ 119.6$ mill. Pension Assets-12/21 \$5352.9 mill. Oblig $\$ 5187.0$ mill. |  |  |  |  |  | 14945 | 15357 | 17020 | 16453 | 16380 | 15425 | 16196 | 15561 | 14919 | 16792 | 18100 | 18800 | Revenu | (\$mill) | 21000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 1443.0 | 1549.0 | 1634.0 | 1763.4 | 2073.6 | 1783.2 | 1923.8 | 2019.0 | 2200.1 | 2488.1 | 2580 | 2775 | Net Pro | it (\$mill) | 3565 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 33.9\% | 36.2\% | 37.8\% | 35.1\% | 26.8\% | 33.7\% | 5.8\% | .7\% | 1.9\% | 4.6\% | 7.0\% | 7.0\% | Income | Tax Rate | 7.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.2\% | 7.3\% | 9.0\% | 11.0\% | 8.0\% | 8.0\% | 10.7\% | 12.7\% | 9.7\% | 7.8\% | 7.0\% | 7.0\% | AFUDC | \% to Net Profit | 5.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 50.6\% | 51.1\% | 49.0\% | 49.8\% | 50.0\% | 51.5\% | 53.2\% | 56.1\% | 58.5\% | 58.3\% | 58.0\% | 58.0\% | Long-T | rm Debt Ratio | 57.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 49.4\% | 48.9\% | 51.0\% | 50.2\% | 50.0\% | 48.5\% | 46.8\% | 43.9\% | 41.5\% | 41.7\% | 42.0\% | 42.0\% | Commo | Equity Ratio | 42.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 30823 | 32913 | 33001 | 35633 | 34775 | 37707 | 40677 | 44759 | 49537 | 53734 | 57775 | 62950 | Total C | pital (\$mill) | 75900 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 38763 | 40997 | 44117 | 46133 | 45639 | 50262 | 55099 | 60138 | 63902 | 66001 | 70650 | 74600 | Net Pla | (\$mill) | 87300 |
| Pfd Stock None |  |  |  |  |  | 6.1\% | 6.0\% | 6.3\% | 6.1\% | 7.2\% | 5.9\% | 5.9\% | 5.6\% | 5.6\% | 5.6\% | 4.5\% | 4.5\% | Return | on Total Cap'l | 5.5\% |
| Common Stock $513,863,678$ shs. as of 10/27/22 |  |  |  |  |  | 9.5\% | 9.6\% | 9.7\% | 9.9\% | 11.9\% | 9.8\% | 10.1\% | 10.3\% | 10.7\% | 11.1\% | 11.0\% | 10.5\% | Return | on Shr. Equity | 11.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.5\% | 9.6\% | 9.7\% | 9.9\% | 11.9\% | 9.8\% | 10.1\% | 10.3\% | 10.7\% | 11.1\% | 11.0\% | 10.5\% | Return | on Com Equity E | 11.0\% |
| MARKET CAP: $\$ 48.9$ billion (Large Cap) |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5\% | 3.7\% | 3.8\% | 3.9\% | 5.5\% | 3.2\% | 3.5\% | 3.4\% | 3.8\% | 4.3\% | 4.0\% | 4.0\% |  | to Com Eq | 4.5\% |
| ELECTRIC OPERATING STATISTICS |  |  |  |  |  | 63\% | 62\% | 61\% | 60\% | 54\% | 67\% | 65\% | 67\% | 65\% | 61\% | 63\% | 63\% | All Div' | s to Net Prof | 62\% |



| Cal- <br> endar | QUARTERLY REVENUES (\$ mill.) <br> Mar.31 |  |  |  | Fun. 30 <br> Fell |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 4056 | 3573 | 4315 | 3616 | 15561 |
| Year |  |  |  |  |  |

BUSINESS: American Electric Power Company Inc. (AEP), through 10 operating utilities, serves 5.5 million customers in Arkansas, Kentucky, Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, \& West Virginia. Has a transmission subsidiary. Electric revenue breakdown: residential, $43 \%$; commercial, $23 \%$; industrial, $18 \%$; wholesale, $10 \%$; other, $6 \%$. Sold commercial
American Electric Power will soon complete a divestiture, and the company is interested in shedding other assets. AEP expects to raise $\$ 1.45$ billion from the sale of its Kentucky Power subsidiary. The motivation for the sale is the entity's lack of an adequate return on equity. The last remaining hurdle before the deal can go through is the approval of an application, which should be received by mid December. The transaction would then close by early January. The company has also started accepting initial bids for its 1,600-megawatt portfolio of nonregulated renewable-energy projects, either piecemeal or as a whole. Management is now moving on to the due diligence process with select bidders. It expects the process to close in the June quarter of 2023. Meanwhile, the company is conducting a strategic review of the retail business which it expects to complete in the first half of 2023. Following divestitures, AEP plans to expand its investments in regulated renewable-energy projects, which have less risk than nonutility assets, and electric transmission.
The company appear
barge operation in '15. Generating sources not available. Fuel costs: $33 \%$ of revenues. '21 reported depreciation rates (utility): $2.6 \%-12.5 \%$. Has 16,700 employees. Chairman, President \& CEO: Nicholas K. Akins. COO: Lisa Barton. Incorporated: New York. Address: 1 Riverside Plaza, Columbus, Ohio 43215-2373. Telephone: 614-716-1000. Internet: www.aep.com.
to meet or exceed its full-year guidance. American continues to realize above-forecast, weather-normalized load (the amount of electricity on the grid at any given time), which is now $2.6 \%$ above pre-pandemic levels. Year to date, residential, commercial, and industrial sales comparisons are up $.3 \%, 3.8 \%$, and $5.5 \%$, respectively. This compares to the company's $2.9 \%$ (revised upward from 1.6\%) retail sales forecast for 2022 . The company should continue to benefit from rate relief, increased investment in its transmission business, and volume growth. Our $\$ 5.00$ GAAP earnings estimate is within management's guidance (on a GAAP basis) of \$4.97-\$5.07 a share. At the analyst day in early October, the company established its 2023 earnings per share guidance range at \$5.19-\$5.39 and the long-term bottom line growth rate at $6 \%-7 \%$.
The dividend yield of this top-quality stock is at the utility average. Total return potential is unspectacular for the next 18 months and Timeliness is average. Further, the recent quotation is just below our 2025-2027 Target Price Range.
Kevin Downing
December 9, 2022

[^80]

| C OPERATING STATIS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | -. 9 |  | 0 |
| \%\% Change Retal Sales (KWH)Avg. Inoust. Use (MWH) |  |  | NA | NA | NA |
| Avg. Indust. Revs. per KWH (c) |  |  | NA | NA | NA |
| Summer (M) |  |  | NA | NA | NA |
|  |  |  | NA | NA | NA |
| Annual Load Factor (\%) |  |  | A | NA | NA |
| \% Change Customers avg.) |  |  | NA | NA | NA |
| Fixed Charge Cov. (\%) |  |  | 233 | 183 | 209 |
| ANNUAL RATES |  |  | Past Est'd '19-'21 |  |  |
| of change (per sh) |  | 10 Yrs. | 5 Yrs. to '25-27 |  |  |
| Revenues |  | .5\% | -.5\% |  | 2.5\% |
| "Cash Flow |  | 4.0\% |  |  | 5.0\% |
| Earnings |  | 3.0\% | 5.0\% |  | 5.0\% |
| Book Value |  | 3.0\% | 3.5\% |  | 2.0\% |
|  |  | 2.0\% | 1.0\% |  |  |
| Calendar | QUARTERLY REVENUES (\$ mill.) |  |  |  | Full |
|  | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 | Year |
| 2019 | 6163 | 5873 | 6940 | 6103 | 25079 |
| 2020 | 5949 | 5421 | 6721 | 5777 | 23868 |
| 2021 | 6150 | 5758 | 6951 | 6238 | 25097 |
| 2022 | 7132 | 6685 | 7255 | 5928 | 27000 |
| 2023 | 7250 | 6750 | 7375 | 6375 | 27750 |
| Calendar | EARNINGS PER SHARE A |  |  |  | Full Year |
|  | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | ec. 31 |  |
| 2019 | 1.24 | 1.12 | 1.79 | . 91 | 5.06 |
| 2020 | 1.14 | 1.08 | 1.87 | 1.03 | 5.12 |
| 2021 | 1.26 | 1.15 | 1.88 | . 94 | 5.24 |
| 2022 | 1.30 | 1.14 | 1.86 | 1.15 | 5.45 |
| 2023 | 1.30 | 1.20 | 2.00 | 1.10 | 5.75 |
| Calendar | QUARTERLY DIVIDENDS PAID ${ }^{\text {B }}$ |  |  |  | Full |
|  | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 | Year |
| 2018 | . 89 | . 89 | . 9275 | . 9275 | 3.64 |
| 2019 | . 9275 | . 9275 | . 945 | . 945 | 3.75 |
| 2020 | . 945 | . 945 | . 965 | . 965 | 3.82 |
| 2021 | . 965 | . 965 | . 985 | . 985 | 3.90 |
| 2022 | . 985 | . 985 | 1.005 |  |  |

BUSINESS: Duke Energy Corporation is a holding company for util-
ities with 7.6 mill. elec. customers in NC, FL, IN, SC, OH, \& KY, and
1.6 mill. gas customers in OH, KY, NC, SC, and TN. Owns inde-
pendent power plants \& has $25 \%$ stake in National Methanol in Saudi Arabia. Acq'd Progress Energy 7/12; Piedmont Natural Gas 10/16; discontinued most int'l ops. in '16. Elec. rev. breakdown:
Duke Energy has a number of rate cases pending. In North Carolina, Duke Energy Progress requested a boost of \$326 million ( $8.5 \%$ ) in 2023, $\$ 151$ million ( $3.9 \%$ ) in 2024, and $\$ 138$ million (3.6\%) in 2025. In South Carolina, Duke Energy Progress proposed its first base rate case in four years, and expects rates to go into effect in early 2023. In Ohio, the utility is seeking a $\$ 55$ million (3\%) hike, as the rate case hearing nears a conclusion. Adjusted second-quarter earnings of $\$ 1.14$ a share, slightly outperformed our call of $\$ 1.10$. Our 2022 full-year estimate remains at $\$ 5.45$ a share. Management reaffirmed a range of $\$ 5.30$ to $\$ 5.60$, and a long-term earnings growth rate of $5 \%$ to $7 \%$ through 2026. Rate relief and strong retail volumes were the main drivers to the bottom line in the second period. Volume growth increased $2.6 \%$ year over year, which is higher than 2019 levels.
We look for a strong earnings performance in 2023, near the company's growth target of between $5 \%$ and $7 \%$. Higher electric volumes should continue, and Duke Energy raised its load growth
residential, $45 \%$; commercial, $28 \%$; industrial, $13 \%$; other, $14 \%$. Generating sources: gas, $32 \%$; nuclear, $30 \%$; coal, $18 \%$; other, $1 \%$; purchased, $19 \%$. Fuel costs: $28 \%$ of revs. '21 reported deprec. rate: $2.9 \%$. Has 27,600 employees. Chairman, President \& CEO: Lynn J. Good. Inc.: DE. Address: 550 South Tryon St., Charlotte, NC 28202-1803. Tel.: 704-382-3853. Internet: www.duke-energy.com.
ty is estimating cost mitigation of $\$ 200$ million starting in 2023, due to rising interest rates and inflation.
The company is very focused on carbon reduction and the development of clean and renewable energy projects. Currently, the utility has 5,000 megawatts of Commericial wind, solar, and battery projects, ranking it within the top- 10 largest renewable companies in the United States. By 2035, the company intends to reach 30,000 megawatts of renewable energy. Duke plans to invest $\$ 145$ billion over the next 10 years and achieve netzero carbon emissions by 2050 in its clean energy transition. Management expects carbon emission reduction to exceed $50 \%$ by 2030 , and $80 \%$ by 2040 .
The stock has dropped $20 \%$ in value since our August report, alongside losses by most of its peers over that time due to rising interest rates. Despite the stock's price reduction, its 18month and 3- to 5-year capital appreciation potential does not stand out. Meanwhile, this issue is ranked 3 (Average) for Timeliness.
Zachary J. Hodgkinson November 11, 2022
(A) Dil. EPS. Excl. net nonrec. losses: '12, 64c; ${ }^{\text {( due to rounding. Next egs. due early Feb. }}$ (E) Rate base: Net orig. cost. Rate all'd on Company's Financial Strength
'13, 22c; '14, 59c; '15, 5c; '16, 60c; '18, 96; (B) Div'ds paid mid-Mar., June, Sept., \& Dec. . 1 com. eq. in '21 in NC: $9.6 \%$; in' 19 in SC: $9.5 \%$; Stock's Price Stability '20, \$3.40; '21, 30c; 1Q22, 22¢; net nonrec Div'd reinv. plan avail. (C) Incl. intang. In ' 21 : in ' 20 in FL : $9.5 \%-11.5 \%$; in ' 20 in IN: $9.7 \%$. Price Growth Persistence gain: '17, 14c. 2021 EPS don't sum to annual $\$ 41.34 / \mathrm{sh}$. (D) In mill., adj. for rev. split. $\operatorname{Reg}$. Clim.: NC, SC Avg.; OH, IN Above Avg.
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| \% Change Retail Sales (KWH) Avg. Indust. Use (MWH) Avg. Indust. Revs. per KWH (c) Capacity at Peak (Mw) Peak Load, Summer (Mw) Annual Load Factor (\%) \% Change Customers (yr-end) |  |  | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | KWH) | -2.7 | + 7 | -3.9 |
|  |  |  | 657 | 589 | NA |
|  |  | NH (c) | NA | NA | NA |
|  |  |  | NA | NA | NA |
|  |  | w) | 22009 | 23133 | 21190 |
|  |  |  | 49.6 | 46.7 | 52.7 |
|  |  |  | +. 5 | +. 6 | +. 3 |
| Fixed Charge Cov. (\%) |  |  | 172 | NMF | 113 |
| ANNUAL RATES <br> of change (per sh) <br> Revenues <br> "Cash Flow" <br> Earnings <br> Dividends <br> Book Value |  |  |  | st Est'd |  |
|  |  | 10 Yrs. |  |  |  |
|  |  | -.5\% |  | .5\% | 4.5\% |
|  |  |  |  | 5\% | 8.0\% |
|  |  | -2.5\% |  | 0\% | 6.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1.5\% |  |  | 4.5 |
| Calendar | QUARTERLY REVENUES (\$ mill.) |  |  |  | Full Year |
|  | Q 31 Jun 30 Sep 30 Dec |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 2824 | 2812 | 3741 | 2970 | 12347 |
| 2020 | 2790 | 2987 | 4644 | 3157 | 13578 |
| 2021 | 2960 | 3315 | 5299 | 3331 | 14905 |
| 2022 | 3968 | 4008 | 5000 | 3324 | 16300 |
| 2023 | 3425 | 3725 | 5675 | 3725 | 16550 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Cal- } \\ \text { endar } \end{gathered}$ | EARNINGS PER SHARE A |  |  |  | Full Year |
|  | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 |  |
| 2019 | . 64 | 1.57 | 1.35 | . 45 | 3.98 |
| 2020 | . 50 | . 85 | d. 76 | 1.13 | 1.72 |
| 2021 | . 68 | . 84 | d. 90 | 1.38 | 2.00 |
| 2022 | 1.07 | 94 | 1.65 | . 84 | 4.50 |
| 2023 | 1.10 | 1.00 | 1.70 | 1.05 | 4.85 |
| Cal-endar | QUARTERLY DIVIDENDS PAID ${ }^{\text {B }}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 | Year |
| 2018 | . 605 | . 605 | . 605 | . 605 | 2.42 |
| 2019 | . 6125 | . 6125 | . 6125 | . 6125 | 2.45 |
| 2020 | . 6375 | . 6375 | . 6375 | . 6375 | 2.55 |
| 2021 | . 6625 | . 6625 | . 6625 | . 6625 | 2.65 |
| 2022 | . 70 | . 70 | . 70 | . 70 |  |

BUSINESS: Edison International (formerly SCECorp) is a holding company for Southern California Edison Company (SCE), which supplies electricity to 5.2 mill. customers in a $50,000-\mathrm{sq}$-mi. area in central, coastal, \& southern CA (excl. Los Angeles \& San Diego). Edison Energy is an energy svcs. co. Disc. Edison Mission Energy (independent power producer) in '12. Elec. rev. breakdown: resi-
Edison International's earnings are set for a sharp rise in 2022. In 2018, wildfires and mudslides wreaked havoc on the company's bottom line. The claims tied to these disasters then landed on the books in 2020 and 2021. For 2022, we expect a much cleaner ledger, which should result in core share net climbing to the $\$ 4.50$ level. Looking ahead to next year, we look for something in line with the inhouse goal of $5 \%$ to $7 \%$ earnings growth, so we are reiterating our $\$ 4.85$ target. Of course, there are potential hurdles to such gains, most notably the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). This entity could potentially trim Edison's 2022 ROE from $10.3 \%$ to $9.72 \%$ retroactively, but at this time we still do not think this will happen, given the current market conditions. Once this proceeding is completed, additional regulatory decisions will be made on 2023 through 2025. The rulings of the CPUC will have a noticeable impact on year-over-year earnings, and for now we view the regulatory climate here as average, so we are not factoring in any shakeups in the ROE path.
Doing business in California is expen-
dential, $43 \%$; commercial, $45 \%$; industrial, $3 \%$; other, $9 \%$. Generating sources: nuclear, $8 \%$; gas, $3 \%$; hydro, $3 \%$; purch., $86 \%$. Power costs: $37 \%$ of revs. '21 reported depr. rate: $3.7 \%$. Has 13,000 empls. Chairman: William P. Sullivan. Pres. \& CEO: Pedro J. Pizzaro. Inc.: CA. Address: 2244 Walnut Grove Ave., P.O. Box 976, Rosemead, CA 91770. Tel.: 626-302-2222. Web: www.edison.com.
sive, and the electricity industry is particularly cost heavy. The state's size and geography inflate fixed operating costs. More specifically, generation, maintenance, distribution, wildfire-related expenditures, and public programs are all costly. EIX bears some of this burden, while a good chunk is passed onto residents. The average Californian pays $28 \%$ more annually for their electric than the national average.
Investments by Edison in wildfire risk mitigation will continue. In the last three and a half years, 3,500 circuit miles of bare wire were replaced with covered conductor, and in the next couple of years a 1,200 mile pace is expected. With that, capital spending and long-term debt should head higher in the coming years.
This utility's dividend yield is a full percentage point above the industry's average. The payout is running higher as investor fears about California heightened during a September heat wave. Elsewhere, this untimely selection also has slightly below average readings for the 18 -month window and for the pull to 2025-2027.
Erik M. Manning
October 21, 2022

[^81] 25c; gains (loss) from disc. ops.: '12, (\$5.11); Jan., Apr., July, \& Oct. - Div'd reinv. plan avail. eq., '21:5.4\%. Regulatory Climate: Average.
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|  |  | $V$ |  | $N Y$ |  |  |  |  | $3$ |  | $17$ | $\left(\begin{array}{l} \mathrm{m} \\ \mathrm{M} \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.1 \\ & 14.0) \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{P} \mid$ | $1.0$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DIV'D } \\ & \text { YLD } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IALUE } \\ & \text { LINE } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\text { VESS } 3$ |  |  | High: | 74.5 <br> 57.6 | 74.5 <br> 61.6 | 72.6 60.2 | $\begin{aligned} & 92.0 \\ & 60.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90.3 \\ & 61.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 82.1 \\ & 65.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 87.9 \\ & 69.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90.8 \\ & 71.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 122.1 \\ 83.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 135.5 \\ 75.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 115.0 \\ 85.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 126.8 \\ 94.9 \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Target Pri } \\ & 2025 \text { 20: } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Range } \\ 2027 \end{gathered}$ |
| SAFE |  | Raised | 213/19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LEGEN } \\ & \hline 27 \end{aligned}$ | S <br> S x Divid |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2027 -320 |
| TECH <br> BETA | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAL } 4 \\ & 5(1.00=1 \end{aligned}$ | Lowered =Market) |  | - - | ed by | ds p sh Strength |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 320 200 |
| 18-M | Targ | et Pric | nge | Shaded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 160 |
| Low-H | Mi | int (\% | Mid) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 120 |
| \$99-\$1 | \$12 | 15\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1' |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\overline{20}$ | 5-27 PRO <br> Price | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OJECTIO } \\ & \text { Gain An } \end{aligned}$ | Total turn |  | 少 | 为 | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60 40 |
| $\begin{array}{\|ll} \text { High } \\ \text { Low } & 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60 \\ & 115 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} +40 \%) \\ (\text { Nil) } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Institu | tional D | Decision |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | RETURN 10/22 <br> this vLarith. |  |
|  | 102222 | 202222 | 302022 | Perce |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.8 -13.4 |  |
| to Buy | 327 281 | $\begin{aligned} & 348 \\ & 260 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r}348 \\ 258 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | shares traded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{rr} 7.8 & -13.4 \\ -2.6 & 35.8 \end{array}$ |  |
| Hld's (000) | 79128 | 184330 | 184841 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 yr . | $49.1 \quad 45.6$ |  |
| 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |  | JE LINE PUB. LLC | -27 |
| 53.94 | 59.47 | 69.15 | 56.82 | 64.27 | 63.67 | 57.94 | 63.86 | 69.71 | 64.54 | 60.55 | 61.35 | 58.23 | 54.63 | 50.51 | 57.95 | 63.10 | 56.45 | Revenu | sper sh | 61.50 |
| 10.69 | 11.73 | 12.89 | 13.29 | 16.54 | 17.53 | 15.98 | 16.25 | 17.68 | 17.71 | 18.72 | 16.70 | 16.50 | 17.19 | 18.21 | 17.90 | 17.75 | 17.95 | "Cash | ow" per sh | 20.50 |
| 5.36 | 5.60 | 6.20 | 6.30 | 6.66 | 7.55 | 6.02 | 4.96 | 5.77 | 5.81 | 6.88 | 5.19 | 5.88 | 6.30 | 6.90 | 6.87 | 6.65 | 6.80 | Earning | per sh A | 8.50 |
| 2.16 | 2.58 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.24 | 3.32 | 3.32 | 3.32 | 3.32 | 3.34 | 3.42 | 3.50 | 3.58 | 3.66 | 3.74 | 3.86 | 4.10 | 4.30 | Div'd | cl'd per sh ${ }^{\text {B }}$ - $\dagger$ | 5.10 |
| 9.44 | 10.29 | 13.92 | 12.99 | 13.33 | 15.21 | 18.18 | 15.73 | 14.82 | 16.79 | 17.28 | 22.07 | 22.45 | 21.72 | 24.52 | 30.86 | 18.15 | 19.00 | Cap'IS | ending per sh | 19.75 |
| 40.45 | 40.71 | 42.07 | 45.54 | 47.53 | 50.81 | 51.73 | 54.00 | 55.83 | 51.89 | 45.12 | 44.28 | 46.78 | 51.34 | 54.56 | 57.42 | 60.00 | 63.55 | Book V | lue per sh c | 74.00 |
| 202.67 | 193.12 | 189.36 | 189.12 | 178.75 | 176.36 | 177.81 | 178.37 | 179.24 | 178.39 | 179.13 | 180.52 | 189.06 | 199.15 | 200.24 | 202.65 | 206.00 | 209.00 | Comm | Shs Outst'g ${ }^{\text {D }}$ | 214.00 |
| 14.3 | 19.3 | 16.6 | 12.0 | 11.6 | 9.1 | 11.2 | 13.2 | 12.9 | 12.5 | 10.9 | 15.0 | 13.8 | 16.5 | 15.3 | 15.0 | Bold figu | res are | Avg A | IP/E Ratio | 16.0 |
| . 77 | 1.02 | 1.00 | . 80 | . 74 | . 57 | . 71 | . 74 | . 68 | . 63 | . 57 | . 75 | . 75 | . 88 | . 79 | . 80 |  |  | Relat | P/E Ratio | . 90 |
| 2.8\% | 2.4\% | 2.9\% | 4.0\% | 4.2\% | 4.9\% | 4.9\% | 5.1\% | 4.5\% | 4.6\% | 4.6\% | 4.5\% | 4.4\% | 3.5\% | 3.6\% | 3.7\% |  |  | Avg An | I Div'd Yield | 3.7\% |
| CAPITAL STRUCTURE as of 9/30/22 <br> Total Debt $\$ 27606$ mill. Due in 5 Yrs $\$ 11117$ mill. <br> LT Debt $\$ 24635$ mill. LT Interest $\$ 824.0$ mill. <br> Incl. $\$ 54.7$ mill. of securitization bonds. <br> (LT interest earned: 2.8x) <br> Leases, Uncapitalized Annual rentals $\$ 65.3$ mill. <br> Pension Assets-12/21 \$6993.1 mill. <br> Oblig $\$ 8409.6$ mill. <br> Pfd Stock $\$ 254.4$ mill. Pfd Div'd $\$ 18.3$ mill. <br> 200,000 shs. $6.25 \%-7.5 \%, \$ 100$ par; 250,000 shs. <br> $8.75 \%, 1.4$ mill. shs. $5.375 \%$; all cum., without sinking fund. <br> Common Stock 203,483,660 shs. as of 10/31/22 <br> MARKET CAP: $\$ 23.0$ billion (Large Cap) |  |  |  |  |  | 10302 | 11391 | 12495 | 11513 | 10846 | 11074 | 11009 | 10879 | 10114 | 11743 | 13000 | 11800 | Revenu | (\$mill) | 13150 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 1091.9 | 904.5 | 1060.0 | 1061.2 | 1249.8 | 950.7 | 1092.1 | 1258.2 | 1406.7 | 1402.8 | 1370 | 1420 | Net Pro | t (\$mill) | 1845 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.0\% | 26.7\% | 37.8\% | 2.2\% | 11.3\% | 1.8\% | NMF | NMF | NMF | 16.1\% | 23.0\% | 23.0\% | Incom | Tax Rate | 23.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.9\% | 10.1\% | 9.3\% | 7.4\% | 8.1\% | 14.7\% | 17.5\% | 16.7\% | 12.2\% | 7.1\% | 8.0\% | 8.0\% | AFUDC | \% to Net Profit | 7.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 55.8\% | 55.1\% | 54.9\% | 57.8\% | 63.6\% | 63.6\% | 63.2\% | 62.0\% | 65.5\% | 67.6\% | 66.5\% | 66.5\% | Long-T | $m$ Debt Ratio | 66.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 42.9\% | 43.6\% | 43.8\% | 40.8\% | 35.5\% | 35.5\% | 35.9\% | 37.1\% | 33.7\% | 31.7\% | 32.5\% | 33.0\% | Commo | Equity Ratio | 33.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 21432 | 22109 | 22842 | 22714 | 22777 | 22528 | 24602 | 27557 | 32386 | 36733 | 38050 | 40200 | Total C | pital (\$mill) | 47300 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 27299 | 27882 | 28723 | 27824 | 27921 | 29664 | 31974 | 35183 | 38853 | 42244 | 43750 | 45425 | Net Pla | (\$mill) | 50800 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.4\% | 5.4\% | 6.0\% | 6.0\% | 6.9\% | 5.7\% | 5.8\% | 5.9\% | 5.6\% | 4.8\% | 3.0\% | 4.5\% | Return | Total Cap'l | 5.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.5\% | 9.1\% | 10.3\% | 11.1\% | 15.1\% | 11.6\% | 12.0\% | 12.0\% | 12.6\% | 11.6\% | 9.5\% | 10.5\% | Return | Shr. Equity | 11.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.6\% | 9.2\% | 10.4\% | 11.2\% | 15.2\% | 11.7\% | 12.2\% | 12.1\% | 12.7\% | 11.9\% | 9.5\% | 10.5\% | Return | Com Equity E | 11.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 5.2 \% \\ 56 \% \end{gathered}$ | 3.0\% | 4.4\% | 4.8\% | 7.7\% | 3.9\% | 4.9\% | 5.2\% | 5.9\% | 5.2\% | 3.5\% | 4.0\% |  | to Com Eq | 4.5\% |
| ELECTRIC OPERATING STATISTICS |  |  |  |  |  |  | 68\% | 58\% | 58\% | 50\% | 68\% | 61\% | 58\% | 55\% | 57\% | 62\% | 64\% | All Div' | to Net Prof | 60\% |


|  |  |  | 2019 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Change | Retail Sales (KWH) |  | -1.4 | -4.1 | +3.2 |
| Avg. Inoust | Use (MWH) |  | 1070 | 1017 | 1015 |
| Avg. Indust | Revs. per KWH( |  | 5.24 | 4.95 | 5.91 |
| Capacity | Peak (N1w) |  | 23887 | 25665 | NA |
| Peak Load | Summer (Mw) |  | 21598 | 21340 | NA |
| Annual Loa | Factor (\%) |  |  |  | NA |
| \% Change | Customers yrend |  | +. 8 | +1.0 | +1.0 |
| Fixed Char | ye Cov. (\%) |  | 165 | 202 | 243 |
| ANN | RATES | Pa |  | t Est'd | '19-21 |
| of chan | per sh) | 10 Yrs. |  |  |  |
| Reven |  | -1.0\% |  | 5\% | 2.0\% |
| "Cash | Flow" | 1.0\% |  |  | 2.5\% |
| Earnin |  |  |  | 5\% | 4.0\% |
| Dividen |  | 1.5\% |  | \% | 5.0\% |
| Book V | alue | 1.5\% |  | 5\% | 5.0\% |
| Cal- | QUARTER | TERLY REV | VENUES | \$ mill.) | Full |
| endar | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 | Year |
| 2019 | 2610 | 2666 | 3141 | 2462 | 10879 |
| 2020 | 2427 | 2413 | 2904 | 2370 | 10114 |
| 2021 | 2845 | 2822 | 3353 | 2723 | 11743 |
| 2022 | 2878 | 3395 | 4219 | 2508 | 13000 |
| 2023 | 2950 | 2850 | 3250 | 2750 | 11800 |
|  |  | RNINGS PE | ER SHAR |  | Full |
| endar | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 | Year |
| 2019 | 1.32 | 1.22 | 1.82 | 1.94 | 6.30 |
| 2020 | . 59 | 1.79 | 2.59 | 1.93 | 6.90 |
| 2021 | 1.66 | 1.30 | 2.63 | 1.28 | 6.87 |
| 2022 | 1.36 | 1.78 | 2.84 | . 67 | 6.65 |
| 2023 | 1.40 | 1.75 | 2.90 | . 75 | 6.80 |
|  | QUARTER | RLY DIVID | DENDS P | ID ${ }^{\text {- }} \dagger$ | Full |
| end | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 | Year |
| 2018 | . 89 | . 89 | . 89 | . 91 | 3.58 |
| 2019 | . 91 | . 91 | . 91 | . 93 | 3.66 |
| 2020 | . 93 | . 93 | . 93 | . 95 | 3.74 |
| 2021 | . 95 | . 95 | . 95 | 1.01 | 3.86 |
| 2022 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.07 |  |

BUSINESS: Entergy Corporation supplies electricity to 3 million customers through subsidiaries in Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, and New Orleans (regulated separately from Louisiana). Distributes gas to 206,000 customers in Louisiana. Is selling its last nonutility nuclear unit (shut down $5 / 22$ ). Electric revenue breakdown: residential, $37 \%$; commercial, $24 \%$; industrial, $27 \%$; other,
Entergy Corp. recorded solid thirdquarter results. Revenues expanded to $\$ 4.2$ billion, aided by strong growth across its electric services business and higher energy prices. Positives included healthy demand from industrial companies, while population growth across the southern United States was positive. The company also benefited from several rate cases being approved, allowing for more recoveries, and a few projects were placed into service. Still, costs rose at a quick rate, especially those related to fuel costs, while operational maintenance was much higher. Overall, adjusted earnings rose to $\$ 2.84$ per share during the quarter. The fourth-quarter performance will likely be lackluster as the company faces tough comparisons from 2021, which had cooler-than-usual weather. It exited some nonregulated nuclear operations in Michigan over the past year, and it sold some shares to fund capital expenditures. We estimate adjusted earnings will reach $\$ 0.67$ per share in the final quarter of 2022.
The long-term outlook is decent. Entergy should gain from population and industrial growth across its coverage area.
$12 \%$. Generating sources: gas, $46 \%$; nuclear, $30 \%$; coal, $6 \%$; purchased, $18 \%$. Fuel costs: $32 \%$ of revenues. '21 reported depreciation rate: $2.7 \%$. Has 12,400 employees. Chairman \& CEO: Leo P. Denault. Incorporated: Delaware. Address: 639 Loyola Avenue, P.O. Box 61000, New Orleans, Louisiana 70161. Telephone: 504-576-4000. Internet: www.entergy.com.
Additionally, it has filed for several rate cases, including for Entergy New Orleans and Entergy Texas, with a decision on the latter due in the second quarter of 2023. Additionally, the company has been investing in renewable energy projects that will come online in the years ahead, helping to bolster revenues, and regulators could approve more. Costs for fuel and maintenance will likely increase with the added operations. The company has been funding capital expenditures with debt and equity sales, which should limit profit-per-share gains. Bad-debt expenses may well pick up if the economy slows further. We project adjusted earnings per share of $\$ 6.80$ in 2023 and \$8.50 in 2025-2027.
The board raised the quarterly dividend by $6 \%$ to $\$ 1.07$. This payout remains well covered by profits and should expand steadily in the years ahead.
Shares of Entergy Corp. are neutrally ranked for Timeliness. This stock has a good dividend yield and long-term upside potential is subpar. Overall, we think this is best suited for conservative incomeseeking accounts.
John E. Seibert III
December 9, 2022

[^82]
. 5725 . 5725 oriented investors. Management is target-
(A) Diluted earnings. '19 EPS don't sum to full- - Dividend reinvestment plan available. equity in Missouri in '18: none specified; in year total due to rounding. Next earnings report (C) Incl. intangibles. In '21: \$4,327.7 mill., Kansas in '18: 9.3\%; earned on average comdue late February. (B) Dividends paid in mid- $\$ 18.87 /$ sh. (D) In millions. (E) Rate base: Origi- mon equity, '21: 9.8\%. Regulatory Climate: March, June, September, and December. nal cost depreciated. Rate allowed on common Average.
© 2022 Value Line, Inc. All rights reserved. Factual material is obtained from sources believed to be reliable and is provided without warranties of any kind. of it may be reproduced, resold, stored or transmitted in any printed, electronic or other form, or used for generating or marketing any printed or electronic publicaction, senvice or product

Company's Financial Strength
Stock's Price Stability
Price Growth Persistence
Earnings Predictability


To subscribe call 1-800-VALUELINE



| Cal- <br> endar | QUARTERLY REVENUES (\$ mill.) <br> Mar.31 |  |  | Full <br> Yun.30 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | 2416 | 1884 | 2176 | 2050 | 8526.5 |
| 2020 | 2373 | 1953 | 2344 | 2234 | 8904.4 |
| 2021 | 2826 | 2122 | 2433 | 2482 | 9863.1 |
| 2022 | 3471 | 2573 | 2750 | 2606 | 11400 |
| 2023 | 3650 | 2700 | 2900 | 2750 | 12000 |
| Cal- | EARNINGS PER SHARE A |  |  |  | Full |
| endar | Mar.31 |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | .97 | .74 | .98 | .76 | 3.45 |
| 2020 | 1.02 | .76 | 1.01 | .85 | 3.64 |
| 2021 | 1.15 | .79 | 1.02 | .91 | 3.86 |
| 2022 | 1.30 | .86 | 1.03 | .91 | 4.10 |
| 2023 | 1.35 | .92 | 1.11 | 1.02 | 4.40 |
| Cal- | QUARTERLY DIVIDENDS PAID B | Full |  |  |  |
| endar | Mar.31 | Jun.30 | Sep.30 | Dec. 31 | Year |
| 2018 | .505 | .505 | .505 | .505 | 2.02 |
| 2019 | .535 | .535 | .535 | .535 | 2.14 |
| 2020 | .5675 | .5675 | .5675 | .5675 | 2.27 |
| 2021 | .6025 | .6025 | .6025 | .6025 | 2.41 |
| 2022 | .6375 | .6375 | .6375 |  |  |

BUSINESS: Eversource Energy (formerly Northeast Utilities) is the parent of utilities with 3.3 mill. electric, 887,000 gas, 226,000 water customers. Supplies power to most of Connecticut and gas to part of Connecticut; supplies power to $3 / 4$ of New Hampshire's population; supplies power to western Massachusetts and parts of eastern MA \& gas to central \& eastern MA; supplies water to CT, MA, \& NH.
Eversource Energy is on pace for a solid year. The company is receiving a full year's effect from last November's natural gas price hike in Massachusetts, with the rate set to rise again this November. Eversource is also benefiting from transmission and distribution (T\&D) capital projects, which raise the rate base (property, plant, and equipment on which utilities are allowed to earn an economic rate of return). The rising rate base increases the company's electric rates annually through a forward-looking algorithm that takes regulatory lag out of the equation for T\&D investments. We expect earnings will be up about $6.5 \%$ this year to $\$ 4.10$ per share. (Note: Eversource is due to report thirdquarter financial results shortly after this report goes to press.)
We look for more of the same going forward. NSTAR has a pending electric rate case in Massachusetts, with a decision due in December. The utility requested increases of $\$ 46$ million and $\$ 47$ million at the start of 2023 and 2024, respectively, based on a $10.5 \%$ return on equity ( 50 basis points higher than the
rate of return granted in 2018). This may

Acq'd NSTAR 4/12; Aquarion 12/17; Columbia Gas 10/20. Electric rev. breakdown: residential, $53 \%$; commercial, $33 \%$; industrial, $5 \%$; other, $9 \%$. Fuel costs: $34 \%$ of revs. ' 21 reported depr. rate: $3.1 \%$. Has 9,200 empls. Chairman: James J. Judge. Pres. \& CEO: Joseph R. Nolan, Jr. Inc.: MA. Address: 300 Cadwell Drive, Springfield, MA 01104. Tel.: 413-785-5871. Internet: www.eversource.com.
be a bit of a stretch. Nevertheless, we think a constructive outcome is likely and rates should increase in January.
Leadership has adjusted its cleanenergy strategy. Eversource is shopping its stake in non-regulated offshore wind ventures, deeming them outside of its risk tolerance and too high a drain on capital. Instead, the company plans to benefit from this new power source's growth in New England through the relative safety of regulated T\&D projects, such as those necessary to connect wind generation to the grid. Modernization programs that ready its territories for the electrification of the transportation system will also serve to grow its rate base. Regulated renewable-power-generation ventures will likely remain a viable option, as well.
Total returns for this issue over the 18-month time frame look attractive. We view Eversource as a desirable holding for utility investors due to its superior earnings and dividend growth rates relative to its peer group. Its yield is 30 basis points below the industry average, but we think the valuation premium is justified. Anthony J. Glennon November 11, 2022
(A) Diluted EPS. Excl. nonrecurring gain $\begin{aligned} & \text { paid late Mar., June, Sept., \& Dec. - Div'd rein- } \\ & 10.0 \% \text {; (gas) '20, } 9.7 \%-9.9 \% \text {; in CT: (elec.) '18, } \\ & \text { Company's Financial Strength }\end{aligned}$
 (9¢); '21, (32¢); 1Q-2Q '22, (3¢). Next earnings $\operatorname{In}$ '21: $\$ 9064$ mill., $\$ 26.32 / s h$. (D) In mill. ulatory Climate: CT, Below Average; NH, Aver- Price Growth Persistence report due early Feb. (B) Div'ds historically (E) Rate allowed on com. eq. in MA: (elec.) '18, age; MA, Above Average.
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of it may be reproduced, resold, stored or transmitted in any printed, electronic or other form, or used for generating or marketing any printed or electronic publication, service or product.

| ｜D／ | $0 \cap$ | ， | $\mathrm{V}_{1}$ | E－ |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { RECENT } \\ \text { PRICE } & 96.53 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P/E } \\ & \text { RATIO } \end{aligned} 19.2\binom{\text { Trailing: } 20.3}{\text { Median: } 19.0}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RELATIVE } \\ & \text { P／E RATIO } \\ & 1.31\end{aligned} \left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll}\text { DIV＇D } & \mathbf{3 , 1} \% \\ \text { YALD } & \text { VALUE }\end{array}\right.$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIMELIN | $\text { NESS } 4$ | Lowered | ／23／22 | High： Low： | $\begin{aligned} & 42.7 \\ & 33.9 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45.7 \\ & 38.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54.7 \\ & 43.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70.1 \\ & 50.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70.5 \\ & 55.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83.4 \\ & 65.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100.0 \\ 77.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 102.4 \\ 79.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 114.0 \\ 89.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 113.6 \\ 69.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 113.8 \\ 85.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 118.9 \\ 95.8 \end{array}$ |  |  | Target Pric 2025 2026 | Range 2027 |
| SAFET TECHN | CAL | Raised <br> Raised | $22 / 21$ $/ 14 / 22$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { LEGEN } \\ \hline \ldots \mathrm{Ra} \end{gathered}$ | $\times$ Divid tive Pric | nds $p$ sh Strength |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\left[\begin{array}{r} \mathbf{2 0} 8 \\ -200 \end{array}\right.$ |
| BETA ． 8 | $(1.00=$ | larket) |  | Options： <br> Shaded | a ind | s recess |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 160 |
| 18－Mon | th Targ | Price | Range |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\left\\|_{1!}\right\\|^{\text {d }}$ |  |  |  | －100 |
| Low-Hi | M Mid | int（\％to |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | ハ！ |  | ｜｜11｜｜ | －－－ |  |  |  |  | －80 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{1} 山_{1},\left.\ldots\right\|^{11}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60 |
| \＄94－\＄14 | \＄121 | 25\％） |  |  |  |  | 曲 | 111 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50 |
|  | 27 PR | ETIO |  |  |  | 年 | ， |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40 |
|  |  |  | n＇l Total | 1＇｜ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | －30 |
| High |  | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{lin} \\ & 5 \% \end{aligned}$ | $10 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ．00＊＊＊ |  |  |  | －20 |
| Institu | tional D | cision |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | THIS VL ARITH. |  |
|  | 4 Q 2021 | 1 Q2022 | 2 Q2022 | Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{cc} \text { STOCK } & \text { INDEX } \\ -1.5 & -18.2 \end{array}$ | － |
| to Buy | 208 | 181 164 | 174 164 | shares traded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 yr. 3 yr. | $\begin{array}{rr} -1.5 & -18.2 \\ -4.9 & 24.1 \end{array}$ | － |
| Hld＇s（000） | 39410 | 39894 | 40518 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 yr ． | 28.232 .9 |  |
| 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |  | JE LINE PUB．LLC | 25－27 |
| 21.23 | 19.51 | 20.47 | 21.92 | 20.97 | 20.55 | 21.55 | 24.81 | 25.51 | 25.23 | 25.04 | 26.76 | 27.19 | 26.70 | 26.77 | 28.86 | 28.40 | 28.65 | Rev | s per sh | 34.25 |
| 4.58 | 4.11 | 4.27 | 5.07 | 5.35 | 5.84 | 5.93 | 6.29 | 6.58 | 6.70 | 6.86 | 7.50 | 7.85 | 8.07 | 8.19 | 8.41 | 8.30 | 8.85 | ＂Cas | low＂per sh | 10.40 |
| 2.35 | 1.86 | 2.18 | 2.64 | 2.95 | 3.36 | 3.37 | 3.64 | 3.85 | 3.87 | 3.94 | 4.21 | 4.49 | 4.61 | 4.69 | 4.85 | 5.00 | 5.25 | Earn | per sh A | 6.00 |
| 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.37 | 1.57 | 1.76 | 1.92 | 2.08 | 2.24 | 2.40 | 2.56 | 2.72 | 2.88 | 3.05 | 3.25 | Div＇ | cl＇d per sh B－$\dagger$ | 4.00 |
| 5.16 | 6.39 | 5.19 | 5.26 | 6.85 | 6.76 | 4.78 | 4.68 | 5.45 | 5.84 | 5.89 | 5.66 | 5.51 | 5.53 | 6.16 | 5.94 | 10.15 | 14.20 | Cap | ending per sh | 10.10 |
| 25.77 | 26.79 | 27.76 | 29.17 | 31.01 | 33.19 | 35.07 | 36.84 | 38.85 | 40.88 | 42.74 | 44.65 | 47.01 | 48.88 | 50.73 | 52.82 | 54.65 | 56.45 | Book | lue per sh c | 63.95 |
| 43.63 | 45.06 | 46.92 | 47.90 | 49.41 | 49.95 | 50.16 | 50.23 | 50.27 | 50.34 | 50.40 | 50.42 | 50.42 | 50.42 | 50.46 | 50.52 | 50.70 | 51.00 | Com | Shs Outst＇g D | 52.00 |
| 15.1 | 18.2 | 13.9 | 10.2 | 11.8 | 11.5 | 12.4 | 13.4 | 14.7 | 16.2 | 19.1 | 20.6 | 20.5 | 22.3 | 19.9 | 20.8 | Bold fig | es are | Avg | ＇IP／E Ratio | 19.5 |
| ． 82 | ． 97 | ． 84 | ． 68 | ． 75 | ． 72 | ． 79 | ． 75 | ． 77 | ． 82 | 1.00 | 1.04 | 1.11 | 1.19 | 1.02 | 1.14 | Value | Line | Rela | P／E Ratio | 1.10 |
| 3．4\％ | 3．5\％ | 4．0\％ | 4．5\％ | 3．4\％ | 3．1\％ | 3．3\％ | 3．2\％ | 3．1\％ | 3．1\％ | 2．8\％ | 2．6\％ | 2．6\％ | 2．5\％ | 2．9\％ | 2．9\％ | estim | ates | Avg A | ＇I Div＇d Yield | 3．4\％ |
| CAPITAL STRUCTURE as of $6 / 30 / 22$ <br> Total Debt $\$ 2150.7$ mill．Due in 5 Yrs $\$ 325.0$ mill． LT Debt $\$ 2075.7$ mill．LT Interest $\$ 100.0$ mill． （LT interest earned：3．8x） |  |  |  |  |  | 1080.7 | 1246.2 | 1282.5 | 1270.3 | 1262.0 | 1349.5 | 1370.8 | 1346.4 | 1350.7 | 1458.1 | 1440 | 1460 | Rev | （\＄mill） | 1780 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 168.9 | 182.4 | 193.5 | 194.7 | 198.3 | 212.4 | 226.8 | 232.9 | 237.4 | 245.6 | 255 | 270 | Net P | it（\＄mill） | 310 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 13．4\％ | 28．3\％ | 8．0\％ | 19．0\％ | 15．5\％ | 18．6\％ | 7．1\％ | 9．5\％ | 10．8\％ | 13．1\％ | 13．0\％ | 13．0\％ | Inco | Tax Rate | 13．0\％ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 20．3\％ | 12．3\％ | 13．6\％ | 16．3\％ | 16．3\％ | 13．9\％ | 15．2\％ | 16．2\％ | 17．3\％ | 17．7\％ | 20．0\％ | 21．0\％ | AFUD | \％to Net Profit | 16．0\％ |
| Pension Assets－12／21 \＄984．5 mill． <br> Oblig $\$ 1346.5$ mill． |  |  |  |  |  | 45．5\％ | 46．6\％ | 45．3\％ | 45．6\％ | 44．8\％ | 43．7\％ | 43．6\％ | 41．3\％ | 43．9\％ | 42．8\％ | 43．5\％ | 47．5\％ | Long | rm Debt Ratio | 50．0\％ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 54．5\％ | 53．4\％ | 54．7\％ | 54．4\％ | 55．2\％ | 56．3\％ | 56．4\％ | 58．7\％ | 56．1\％ | 57．2\％ | 56．5\％ | 52．5\％ | Comm | Equity Ratio | 50．0\％ |
| Pfd Stock None |  |  |  |  |  | 3225.4 | 3465.9 | 3567.6 | 3783.3 | 3898.5 | 3997.5 | 4205.1 | 4201.3 | 4560.4 | 4669.1 | 4920 | 5505 | Total | pital（\＄mill） | 6675 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 3536.0 | 3665.0 | 3833.5 | 3992.4 | 4172.0 | 4283.9 | 4395.7 | 4531.5 | 4709.5 | 4901.8 | 5300 | 5800 | Net P | （\＄mill） | 6730 |
| Common Stock $50,560,040$ shs． as of 7／29／22 |  |  |  |  |  | 6．5\％ | 6．4\％ | 6．6\％ | 6．2\％ | 6．1\％ | 6．3\％ | 6．4\％ | 6．5\％ | 6．1\％ | 6．2\％ | 6．0\％ | 5．5\％ | Return | n Total Cap＇l | 5．5\％ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 9．6\％ | 9．9\％ | 9．9\％ | 9．5\％ | 9．2\％ | 9．4\％ | 9．6\％ | 9．4\％ | 9．3\％ | 9．2\％ | 9．0\％ | 9．0\％ | Return | n Shr．Equity | 9．0\％ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 9．6\％ | 9．9\％ | 9．9\％ | 9．5\％ | 9．2\％ | 9．4\％ | 9．6\％ | 9．4\％ | 9．3\％ | 9．2\％ | 9．0\％ | 9．0\％ | Retur | Com Equity E | 9．0\％ |
| MARKET CAP：$\$ 4.9$ billion（Mid Cap） |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 5.7 \% \\ 41 \% \end{gathered}$ | 5．6\％ | 5．4\％ | 4．8\％ | 4．3\％ | 4．4\％ | 4．4\％ | 4．2\％ | 3．9\％ | 3．7\％ | 3．5\％ | 3．5\％ | Retain | to Com Eq | 3．0\％ |
| ELECTRIC OPERATING STATISTICS |  |  |  |  |  |  | 43\％ | 46\％ | 50\％ | 53\％ | 53\％ | 54\％ | 56\％ | 58\％ | 60\％ | 61\％ | 62\％ | All D | s to Net Prof | 67\％ |



| Cal－ endar | QUARTERLY REVENUES（\＄mill．） |  |  |  | Full Year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mar． 31 | Jun． 30 | Sep． 30 | Dec． 31 |  |
| 2019 | 350.3 | 316.9 | 386.3 | 292.9 | 1346.4 |
| 2020 | 291.0 | 318.8 | 425.3 | 315.6 | 1350.7 |
| 2021 | 316.1 | 360.1 | 446.9 | 335.0 | 1458.1 |
| 2022 | 344.3 | 358.7 | 425 | 312.0 | 1440 |
| 2023 | 350 | 360 | 430 | 320 | 1460 |
| Cal－ endar | $\underset{\text { Mar. } 31}{\text { EA }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ARNINGS P } \\ & \text { Jun. } 30 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ERR SHAR } \\ & \text { Sep. } 30 \end{aligned}$ | Dec． 31 | Full Year |
| 2019 | ． 84 | 1.05 | 1.78 | ． 93 | 4.61 |
| 2020 | ． 74 | 1.19 | 2.02 | ． 74 | 4.69 |
| 2021 | ． 89 | 1.38 | 1.93 | ． 65 | 4.85 |
| 2022 | ． 91 | 1.27 | 2.00 | ． 82 | 5.00 |
| 2023 | ． 95 | 1.40 | 2.05 | ． 85 | 5.25 |
| Cal－ endar | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { QUARTE } \\ \text { Mar. } 31 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ERLY DIVI } \\ & \text { Jun. } 30 \end{aligned}$ | DENDS PA Sep． 30 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ID } \quad \mathrm{B} \dagger \\ & \text { Dec. } 31 \end{aligned}$ | Full Year |
| 2018 | ． 59 | ． 59 | ． 59 | ． 63 | 2.40 |
| 2019 | ． 63 | ． 63 | ． 63 | ． 67 | 2.56 |
| 2020 | ． 67 | ． 67 | ． 67 | ． 71 | 2.72 |
| 2021 | ． 71 | ． 71 | ． 71 | ． 75 | 2.88 |
| 2022 | ． 75 | ． 75 | ． 75 |  |  |

BUSINESS：IDACORP，Inc．is a holding company for Idaho Power Company，a regulated electric utility that serves 604,000 customers throughout a 24,000 －square－mile area in southern Idaho and east－ ern Oregon（population： 1.3 million）．Most of the company＇s reve－ nues are derived from the Idaho portion of its service area．Reve－ nue breakdown：residential， $45 \%$ ；commercial， $24 \%$ ；industrial，
Annual earnings growth at IDACORP
is pegged to be $3 \%$ and $5 \%$ ，respective－ ly，in 2022 and 2023．Weather－related usage and transmission wheeling revenues are trending higher，aided by solid popula－ tion growth in the areas that IDA serves． Air conditioning and irrigation have been primary drivers and should be for the foreseeable future．Too，the likelihood of a rate increase is certainly on the table （more color below）for next year，though nothing is set in stone on that front．With that，we think share net can climb to $\$ 5.00$ this year，followed by an expected $5 \%$ an－ nual increase to $\$ 5.25$ in 2023.
One would need to go back to 2011 for the most recent rate case in Idaho Power＇s jurisdiction．That is more than a decade of no rate applications，a period marked by a lofty influx of people into IDA＇s areas of operation．Management has capital budget plans that will require funding，notably the increased stake it is taking in a transmission line and the financing of larger battery storage capabil－ ities．Dipping in to debt markets will prob－ ably be the first move，even as rates are
heading north，with an issuance of equity
$15 \%$ ；irigation， $13 \%$ ；other， $3 \%$ ．Generating sources：hydro， $30 \%$ ； coal，17\％；gas，15\％；purchased， $38 \%$ ．Fuel costs： $36 \%$ of reve－ nues．＇21 reported depreciation rate： $2.9 \%$ ．Has 2,000 employees． Chairman：Richard J．Dahl．President \＆CEO：Lisa Grow．Incor－ porated：Idaho．Address： 1221 W．Idaho St．，Boise，Idaho 83702. Telephone：208－388－2200．Internet：www．idacorpinc．com

## on the slate for 2024

Capital expenditures are primed for an uptick next year，but should recede after that．For 2022，we look for the cap ex number to come in around $\$ 515$ million．However，in 2023，we have that amount climbing to $\$ 725$ million，with the vast majority earmarked for new capacity resources．A recent integrated resources plan came back stating that IDA could have a 125 MW capacity deficit by 2025. This is where using the battery storage comes into the situation．Too，the compa－ ny＇s exit from coal－fired manufacturing will require adding significant generation capabilities．A new transmission line will help，but it will not come cheap．
IDACORP＇s shares are of high quality， but we are not recommending them at this time．For starters，the issue＇s yield is noticeably below what we deem as average for the utility stocks in our coverage uni－ verse．Add to this，the equity has dipped one notch to Below Average（4）on our Timeliness Ranking Scale．Lastly，total re－ turn potential three to five years hence does little to quicken the pulse．
Erik M．Manning
October 21， 2022

[^83]17c．＇19 earnings don＇t sum due to rounding．plan available．$\dagger$ Shareholder investment plan equity in＇12： $10 \%$（imputed）；earned on avg．Stock＇s Price Stability Next earnings report due last week of October．available．（C）Incl．intangibles．In＇21：$\$ 1,462.4$ com．eq．，＇21： $9.4 \%$ ．Regulatory Climate：Price Growth Persistence （B）Dividends historically paid in late Feb．，mill．，$\$ 28.95 / \mathrm{sh}$ ．（D）In millions．（E）Rate base： Above Average． © 2022 Value Line，Inc．All rights reserved．Factual material is obtained from sources believed to be reliable and is provided without warranties of any kind．
THE PUBLISHER IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS HEREIN．This publication is strictly for subscriber＇s own，non－commercial，internal use．No part of it may be reproduced，resold，stored or transmitted in any printed，electronic or other form，or used for generating or marketing any printed or electronic publication，service or produc


|  |  |  | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Change Retail Sales (KWH) |  |  | +4.6 | -4.4 | +.7 |
| Avg. Indust. Use (MWH) |  |  | 37808 | 33526 | 31792 |
| Avg. Indust. Revs. per KWH $(6)$Capacity P Peak ( Ww |  |  | NA | NA | NA |
|  |  |  | NA | NA | NA |
| Peak Load, Winter (Mw) |  |  | 2237 | NA | NA |
| Annual Load Factor (\%) |  |  | NA | NA | NA |
| \% Change Cusisiomers (y-end) |  |  | +1.2 | +1.2 | +1.6 |
| Fixed Charge Cov. $\%$ \%) |  |  | 284 |  | 252 |
| ANNUAL RATES |  | Past | Past Est'd '19-'21 |  |  |
|  |  | 10 Yrs. |  |  |  |
| Revenues |  | -2.5\% |  |  | 5\% |
| "Cash Flow" |  | 3.5\% | \% 3.0\% |  | 2.5\% |
| Earnings |  | 4.5\% | 2.0\% |  | 2.5\% |
| Dividends |  | 5.5\% | 5.5\% |  | 2.0\% |
| Book Value |  | 6.0\% |  |  | 3.0\% |
| Calendar | QUARTERLY REVENUES (\$ mill.) |  |  |  | Full |
|  | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 | Year |
| 2019 | 384.2 | 270.7 | 274.8 | 328.2 | 1257.9 |
| 2020 | 335.3 | 269.4 | 280.6 | 313.4 | 1198.7 |
| 2021 | 400.8 | 298.2 | 326.0 | 347.3 | 1372.3 |
| 2022 | 394.5 | 323.0 | 330.5 | 352 | 1400 |
| 2023 | 415 | 330 | 345 | 370 | 1460 |
| Calendar | EARNINGS PER SHARE A |  |  |  | Full |
|  | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 | Year |
| 2019 | 1.44 | 49 | . 42 | 1.18 | 3.53 |
| 2020 | 1.00 | . 43 | . 58 | 1.21 | 3.21 |
| 2021 | 1.24 | . 59 | . 70 | . 97 | 3.50 |
| 2022 | 1.08 | . 58 | . 64 | 1.05 | 3.35 |
| 2023 | 1.15 | . 60 | . 70 | 1.10 | 3.55 |
| Calendar | QUARTERLY DIVIDENDS PAID ${ }^{\text {B }} \dagger$ |  |  |  | Full |
|  | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 | Year |
| 2018 | . 55 | . 55 | . 55 | . 55 | 2.20 |
| 2019 | . 575 | . 575 | . 575 | . 575 | 2.30 |
| 2020 | . 60 | . 60 | . 60 | . 60 | 2.40 |
| 2021 | . 62 | . 62 | . 62 | . 62 | 2.48 |
| 2022 | 63 | . 63 | . 63 |  |  |

BUSINESS: NorthWestern Corporation (doing business as NorthWestern Energy) supplies electricity \& gas in the Upper Midwest and Northwest, serving 456,000 electric customers in Montana and South Dakota and 298,000 gas customers in Montana ( $85 \%$ of gross margin), South Dakota (14\%), and Nebraska (1\%). Electric revenue breakdown: residential, $43 \%$; commercial, $49 \%$; industrial,
NorthWestern shares have flatlined for years, commensurate with EPS. Since 2015, this issue has mainly traded within the $\$ 50-\$ 60$ price range, breaking out briefly from time to time. While net profits have grown gradually over the past several years (the 2016-2022 average annual rate is $2 \%$ ), shares outstanding have also risen, diluting per-share gains. The main constraint, besides dilution, has been years of underearning the utility's allowable ROE. This is largely due to the relative constraints of the rate-relief mechanisms available in the company's utility territories, which results in regulatory lag. In other words, the company foots the bill for grid maintenance and upgrades but has to justify it and wait for the payback.
Management has a solid plan in place that should help reignite growth. In an effort to become less reliant on purchased power, while modernizing and shoring up reliability, the company is looking to add significant gas-fired capacity in both South Dakota and Montana. An \$83 million, 58-megawatt plant in South Dakota was completed in the second quarter. And in April, NWE broke ground on a
$4 \%$; other, $4 \%$. Generating sources: coal, $28 \%$; hydro, $27 \%$; wind, $6 \%$; other, $4 \%$; purchased, $35 \%$. Fuel costs: $31 \%$ of revenues. ' 21 reported deprec. rate: $2.8 \%$. Has 1,500 employees. Chairman: Dana J. Dykhouse. CEO: Robert C. Rowe. President \& COO: Brian B. Bird. Inc.: DE. Address: 3010 West 69th Street, Sioux Falls, SD 57108. Tel.: 605-978-2900. Internet: www.northwesternenergy.com.
$\$ 275$ million, $175-\mathrm{mw}$ facility in Montana, expected to be operational by late 2023 . Financing is via a $\$ 200$ million equity offering ( $\$ 53.50$ a share) completed in fourth quarter 2021, with $\$ 300$ million more expected in early 2023 via a forward sale.
Results depend on an upcoming general rate case decision. NWE has filed its case, and likely will obtain rate relief early next year. The company is also asking for pricing mechanisms that would help alleviate regulatory lag. This may be a tough sell in a historically difficult regulatory environment. Assuming the capacity expansion is allowed to proceed, it would lift the rate base and help to narrow the gap between NWE's earned and allowable ROE. Our projections assume an annual growth rate in share net from 2023 to mid-decade of $4 \%$. It's somewhat below the industry average, yet significantly better than what's transpired in recent years. This issue is untimely. However, at the recent valuation there may be some appeal for utility investors seeking outsized income. The yield is 115 basis points above the electric utility industry median.
Anthony J. Glennon
October 21, 2022
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| , |  |  | 2019 | 2020 | 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Change Retail Sales (KWH) |  |  | +1.1 | -4.9 | +2.6 |
| Avg. Indust. Use (MWH) |  |  | NA | NA | NA |
| Avg. Indust. Revs. per KWH (c) |  |  | 4.69 | 4.40 | 7.68 |
| Capacity at Peak (Mw) |  |  | NA | NA | NA |
| Peak Load, Summer (Mw) |  |  | 6817 | 6437 | NA |
| Annual Load Factor (\%) |  |  | NA | NA | NA |
| \% Change Customers (yr-end) |  |  | +1.0 | +1.1 | +1.4 |
| Fixed Charge Cov. (\%) |  |  | 335 | 326 | 336 |
| ANNUAL RATES Past |  |  | Pa |  | 19-'21 |
| of change (per sh) |  | 10 Yrs. |  |  |  |
| Revenues |  | -3.0\% |  | . $\%$ | 5.5\% |
| "Cash Flo |  | 3.5\% |  | \% | 7.0\% |
| Earnings |  | 4.0\% |  | \% | 6.5\% |
| Dividends |  | 8.0\% |  | 5\% | 3.0\% |
| Book Value |  | 5.5\% | 3.5\% |  | 5.5\% |
| Calendar | QUARTERLY REVENUES (\$ mill.) |  |  |  | Full Year |
|  | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 |  |
| 2019 | 490.0 | 513.7 | 755.4 | 472.5 | 2231.6 |
| 2020 | 431.3 | 503.5 | 702.1 | 485.4 | 2122.3 |
| 2021 | 1630.6 | 577.4 | 864.4 | 581.3 | 3653.7 |
| 2022 | 589.3 | 803.71 | 1270.8 | 536.2 | 3200 |
| 2023 | 600 | 8001 | 1200 | 700 | 3300 |
| Calendar | EARNINGS PER SHARE A |  |  |  | Full Year |
|  | Mar 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 |  |  |
| 2019 | . 24 | . 50 | 1.25 | . 26 | 2.24 |
| 2020 | . 23 | . 51 | 1.04 | . 30 | 2.08 |
| 2021 | . 26 | . 56 | 1.26 | . 27 | 2.36 |
| 2022 | . 33 | . 36 | 1.31 | . 25 | 2.25 |
| 2023 | . 32 | . 33 | 1.25 | . 20 | 2.10 |
| Calendar | QUARTERLY DIVIDENDS PAID ${ }^{\text {B }}$ |  |  |  | Full |
|  | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 | Year |
| 2018 | . 3325 | . 3325 | . 3325 | . 365 | 1.36 |
| 2019 | . 365 | . 365 | . 365 | . 388 | 1.48 |
| 2020 | . 3875 | . 3875 | . 3875 | . 4025 | 1.57 |
| 2021 | . 4025 | . 4025 | . 4025 | . 41 | 1.62 |
| 2022 | . 41 | . 41 | . 41 | . 4141 |  |

(A) Diluted EPS. Excl. nonrecurring gains (losses): '15, (33c);' '17, \$1.18; '19, (8c); '20, (\$2.95); '21, \$1.32; '22, \$1.06; gain on discon

BUSINESS: OGE Energy Corp. is a holding company for Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company (OG\&E), which supplies electricity to 879,000 customers in Oklahoma ( $84 \%$ of electric revenues) and western Arkansas (8\%); wholesale is (8\%). Owns 3\% of Energy Transfer's limited partnership units. Electric revenue breakdown: residential, $44 \%$; commercial, $25 \%$; industrial, $11 \%$; oilfield, $10 \%$;
OGE Energy's utility subsidiary in Oklahoma agreed to a $\$ 30$ million settlement in its general rate case. The company initially requested a $\$ 164$ million increase which was reduced drastically by the Oklahoma Corporation Commission after regulatory hearings. The commission is now considering spreading out monthly price increases of $\$ 9.72$ over a three to four year time frame, compared to the current two-year span to help mitigate the impact on customer bills. In Arkansas, the utility implemented its new fuel rates which went into effect on November 1st. The increases will recover $\$ 40$ million over the next 17 months.
We see earnings declining through 2023. Management continues to expect long-term share-earnings growth of $5 \%-7 \%$ annually, based off 2021 profits. (Excluding equity income.) For 2022, the company expects share earnings in a range of $\$ 2.08$ $\$ 2.12$ a share. Our full-year 2022 and 2023 bottom-line estimates are $\$ 2.25$ a share (including equity income from Energy Transfer stake), and $\$ 2.10$ a share, respectively. We have lowered our 2023 forecasts due to the macroeconomic climate, includ-
other, $10 \%$. Generating sources: gas, $25 \%$; coal, $21 \%$; wind, $6 \%$; purchased, $48 \%$. Fuel costs: $58 \%$ of revenues. ' 21 reported depreciation rate (utility): $2.6 \%$. Has 2,200 employees. Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer: Sean Trauschke. Incorporated: Oklahoma. Address: 321 North Harvey, P.O. Box 321, Oklahoma City, OK 73101-0321. Tel.: 405-553-3000. Internet: www.oge.com.
ing margin pressures from rising interest rates, along with depreciation rates and pending rate reviews.
In the third quarter, OGE completed its transformation to an electric utility, after selling its Energy Transfer units. The exit from midstream operations should reduce business risk and attract investors as it becomes a pure-play electric utility. The natural gas midstream segment has long been a weakness, and the exit should improve performance.
These shares are ranked to mirror the broader market averages in the coming six to 12 months. Equities in the utilties industry have faced immense pressure as of late due to rising interest rates. Rising Treasury yields are becoming more appealing to income-oriented investors, challenging the attractiveness of the utility industry. As a result, the stock is down more than $5 \%$ in value since our last report in September. While total return potential is below average for the 18month and 3- to 5 -year period, these shares hold an attractive dividend yield that is well above the utility average.
Zachary J. Hodgkinson December 9, 2022 © 2022 Value Line, Inc. All rights reserved. Factual material is charges. In $21 . \$ 6.1 / s h$. (D) $\mathrm{Cleq} .$, , 21. 12.7\%. Regulatory Climate. Average. THE PUBLISHER IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS HEREIN. This publication is strictly for subscriber's own, non-commercial, internal use. No part of it may be reproduced, resold, stored or transmitted in any printed, electronic or other form, or used for generating or marketing any printed or electronic publication, service or product


remains for contracts to be executed with

Generating sources: gas, $37 \%$; wind, $9 \%$; coal, $8 \%$; hydro, $4 \%$; purchased, $42 \%$. Fuel costs: $34 \%$ of revenues. '21 reported depreciation rate: $3.4 \%$. Has 2,800 full-time employees. Chairman: Jack E . Davis. President and Chief Executive Officer: Maria M. Pope. Incorporated: Oregon. Address: 121 S.W. Salmon Street, Portland, OR 97204. Tel.: 503-464-8000. Internet: www.portlandgeneral.com.
the winning bidders by year end.
PGE leadership's long-term earnings growth target of 4\%-6\% looks achievable. Next year will benefit from a full year of rate relief against an easy comparison. From 2023 out to mid-decade we're projecting a $5.5 \%$ growth rate in earnings. Accelerating load growth, thanks to the healthy economy of the utili ty's service territory, where there is a vibrant tech sector, is a key factor.
The board of directors raised the payout $5.2 \%$ this year. PGE targets a longterm growth rate of $5 \%-7 \%$ and a payout ratio of $60 \%-70 \%$. Our projections assume a $6 \%$ rate of growth to mid-decade.
Utility investors may want to consider this issue for a long-term holding. Neutrally ranked PGE offers a healthy dividend yield that's 40 basis points above the electric utility median. This despite EPS and dividend growth rates being decently above the industry averages. Market weakness has the stock down $13 \%$ since our July report, and near the bottom of our 18-month Target Price Range, thereby offering solid recovery potential. Anthony J. Glennon

October 21, 2022
(A) Diluted earnings. Excl. nonrecurring (B) Dividends paid mid-Jan., Apr., July, and $\$ 5.96 / \mathrm{sh}$. (D) In mill. gains/(losses): '13, (42¢); '17, (19¢); '20, Oct. Dividend reinvestment plan available. $\dagger$ (\$1.03); '22, (144). Next earnings report due Shareholder investment plan available. (C) Incl. deferred charges. In '21: $\$ 533$ mill.
(E) Rate base: Net original cost. Rate allowed on common equity in '22: 9.5\%. Regulatory Climate: Average.

Company's Financial Strength
Stock's Price Stability
Price Growth Persistence
Earnings Predictability
© 2022 Value Line, Inc. All rights reserved. Factual material is obtained from sources believed to be reliable and is provided without warranties of any kind. of it may be reproduced, resold, stored or transmitted in any printed, electronic or other form, or used for generating or marketing any printed or electronic publication, service or product



BUSINESS: Xcel Energy Inc. is the parent of Northern States Power Company (NSP), which supplies electricity to MN, WI, ND, SD \& MI \& gas to MN, WI, ND \& MI; Public Service Company of Colorado (PSCo), which supplies electricity \& gas to CO; \& Southwestern Public Service Company (SPS), which supplies electricity to TX and NM. Customers: 3.7 mill. electric, 2.1 mill. gas. Electric
At Xcel Energy, rate relief should continue to drive steady earnings gains. Upcoming price hikes will be largely due to the approval of renewable-energy projects inclusion in the rate base, for which regulated utilities are allowed to earn a specified return on equity (ROE). The company is also effectively controlling costs despite inflationary headwinds. Our 2022 earnings estimate remains at the midpoint of Xcel's reaffirmed guidance of \$3.10-\$3.20 per share, given that first-half results were in line with expectations. (Entering this year our first-half share-net estimate tally was $\$ 1.33$; Xcel earned $\$ 1.30$ per share.) Meanwhile, our projections for 6\%-6.5\% profit gains in 2023 and beyond are based on the same factors. Namely, growing the rate base at its utility subsidiaries as Xcel works with its regulatory commissions to bring about a green-energy future. Company leadership has a stated earnings and dividend growth objective of $5 \%-7 \%$ and a solid track record that underscores its goal (see Annual Rates box). Notably, a consistently solid ROE has been delivered during both good and difficult economic times.
revenue breakdown: residential, $31 \%$; small comm'l \& ind'l, $36 \%$; large comm'l \& ind'l, $18 \%$; other, $15 \%$. Generating sources not available. Fuel costs: $43 \%$ of revenues. '21 reported deprec. rate: $3.5 \%$. Has 11,300 employees. Chrmn: Ben Fowke. Pres. \& CEO: Bob Frenzel. Inc.: MN. Address: 414 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, MN Bob Frenzel. Inc.: MN. Address: 414 Nicoliet Mall, Minneap
55401 . Tel.: $612-330-5500$. Internet: www.xcelenergy.com.
Xcel has numerous renewable-energy proposals up for review. The Colorado commission approved Xcel's resource plan, which includes about 4,000 megawatts (mw) of renewable (e.g., wind and solar) additions and the conversion of a major plant from coal to natural gas. This is in addition to the approved Minnesota plan, which adds $6,000 \mathrm{mw}$ of renewables. RFPs (request for proposals) are being filed and commission decisions on the finer details are expected in the second half of next year. In the electric-vehicle (EV) arena, Xcel is making progress on its goal to power 1.5 million EVs by 2030. It filed transportation plans in Minnesota and Wisconsin in the third quarter. The company is looking to accelerate EV adoption through the development of high-speed public charging infrastructure in partnership with its states.
This high-quality issue offers utility investors solid risk-adjusted 3- to 5year total returns. Its valuation is down $14 \%$ since our July report. The stock has significant recovery potential to the midpoint of our 18-month Target Price Range. Anthony J. Glennon

October 21, 2022
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Price Growth Persistence
Earnings Predictability

# The Potomac Edison Company 

Summary of Risk Premium Models for the
Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Utilities

Proxy Group of
Thirteen
Electric
Utilities

Predictive Risk
Premium Model
(PRPM) (1)
11.95 \%

Risk Premium Using
an Adjusted Total
Market Approach (2)
11.33

Average 11.64 \%

Notes:
(1) From page 2 of this Schedule.
(2) From page 3 of this Schedule.


 | Rate (4) |
| :--- | $3.91 \%$

$3.91 \%$
$3.91 \%$
$3.91 \%$
$3.91 \%$
$3.91 \%$
$3.91 \%$
$3.91 \%$
$3.91 \%$
$3.91 \%$
$3.91 \%$
$3.91 \%$
$3.91 \%$

Average

Median Median



Indicated ROE
Derived by the Predictive Risk Premium Model (1) ~~웅
\%8z'0
Proxy Group of Thirteen Alliant Energy Corporation Ameren Corporation American Electric Power Corporation Duke Energy Corporation Edison International Entergy Corporation Evergy, Inc.
Eversource Energy
IDACORP, Inc.
0.28\%

0.43\% $0.35 \%$
$0.44 \%$
0

$$
0
$$

[^87]$\stackrel{\aleph}{\infty}$

| Recommended |
| :---: |
| Variance (2) |

The Potomac Edison Company
Indicated Common Equity Cost Rate
Through Use of a Risk Premium Model
Using an Adjusted Total Market Approach

| Line No. |  | Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Utilities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Prospective Yield on Aaa Rated Corporate Bonds (1) | 5.05 \% |
| 2. | Adjustment to Reflect Yield Spread Between Aaa Rated Corporate Bonds and A2 Rated Public Utility Bonds (2) | 0.83 |
| 3. | Adjusted Prospective Yield on A2 Rated Public Utility Bonds | 5.88 \% |
| 4. | Adjustment to Reflect Bond Rating Difference of Proxy Group (3) | 0.20 |
| 5. | Adjusted Prospective Bond Yield | 6.08 \% |
| 6. | Equity Risk Premium (4) | 5.25 |
| 7. | Risk Premium Derived Common Equity Cost Rate | 11.33 \% |

Notes: (1) Consensus forecast of Moody's Aaa Rated Corporate bonds from Blue Chip Financial Forecasts (see pages 10 and 11 of this Schedule).
(2) The average yield spread of A2 rated public utility bonds over Aaa rated corporate bonds of $0.83 \%$ from page 4 of this Schedule.
(3) Adjustment to reflect the Baa1 Moody's LT issuer rating of the Electric Utility Proxy Group as shown on page 5 of this Schedule. The $0.20 \%$ upward adjustment is derived by taking $2 / 3$ of the spread between A2 and Baa2 Public Utility Bonds ( $2 / 3 * 0.3 \%=0.20 \%$ ) as derived from page 4 of this Schedule.
(4) From page 7 of this Schedule.

The Potomac Edison Company
Interest Rates and Bond Spreads for Moody's Corporate and Public Utility Bonds

Selected Bond Yields
[1]
[2]
[3]

|  | Aaa Rated Corporate Bond | A2 Rated Public Utility Bond | Baa2 Rated Public Utility Bond |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dec-2022 | 4.41 \% | 5.27 \% | 5.56 \% |
| Nov-2022 | 4.90 | 5.75 | 6.05 |
| Oct-2022 | 5.10 | 5.88 | 6.18 |
| Average | 4.80 \% | 5.63 \% | 5.93 \% |

Selected Bond Spreads

A2 Rated Public Utility Bonds Over Aaa Rated Corporate Bonds:

$$
0.83 \%(1)
$$

Baa2 Rated Public Utility Bonds Over A2 Rated Public Utility Bonds:

$$
0.30 \%(2)
$$

Notes:
(1) Column [2] - Column [1].
(2) Column [3] - Column [2].

Source of Information:
Bloomberg Professional Services

The Potomac Edison Company
Comparison of Long-Term Issuer Ratings for Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Utilities

| Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Utilities (2) | Moody's |  | Standard \& Poor's |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Long-Term Issuer Rating |  | Long-Term Issuer Rating |  |
|  | December 2022 |  | December 2022 |  |
|  | Long-Term Issuer Rating | Numerical <br> Weighting (1) | Long-Term Issuer Rating | Numerical <br> Weighting (1) |
| Alliant Energy Corporation | A3/Baa1 | 7.5 | A/A- | 6.5 |
| Ameren Corporation | A3 | 7.0 | BBB+ | 8.0 |
| American Electric Power Corporation | Baa1 | 8.0 | A- | 7.0 |
| Duke Energy Corporation | A3 | 7.0 | BBB+ | 8.0 |
| Edison International | Baa2 | 9.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| Entergy Corporation | Baa1 | 8.0 | BBB+ | 8.0 |
| Evergy, Inc. | Baa1 | 8.0 | A- | 7.0 |
| Eversource Energy | A3 | 7.0 | A- | 7.0 |
| IDACORP, Inc. | Baa1 | 8.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| NorthWestern Corporation | Baa2 | 9.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| OGE Energy Corporation | A3 | 7.0 | A- | 7.0 |
| Portland General Electric Company | A3 | 7.0 | BBB+ | 8.0 |
| Xcel Energy Inc. | A3 | 7.0 | A- | 7.0 |
| Average | Baa1 | 7.7 | BBB+ | 7.7 |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |
| (1) From page 6 of this Schedule. |  |  |  |  |
| (2) Based on the ratings of the subsidaries for Utility Proxy Group |  |  |  |  |
| Source of Information: | Standard \& Poor's Global Utilities Rating Service | ors Service r's Global Utilit | Rating Servi |  |

Numerical Assignment for
Moody's and Standard \& Poor's Bond Ratings

| Moody's Bond <br> Rating | Numerical Bond <br> Weighting |  <br> Poor's Bond <br> Rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aaa | 1 | AAA |
| Aa1 | 2 |  |
| Aa2 | 3 | AA+ |
| Aa3 | 4 | AA |
| A1 | 5 | AA- |
| A2 | 6 | A+ |
| A3 | 7 | A |
|  |  | A- |
| Baa1 | 8 | BBB+ |
| Baa2 | 9 | BBB |
| Baa3 | 10 | BBB- |
| Ba1 |  |  |
| Ba2 | 11 | BB+ |
| Ba3 | 12 | BB |
|  | 13 | BB- |
| B1 |  |  |
| B2 | 14 | B+ |
| B3 | 15 | B |
|  | 16 | B- |

## The Potomac Edison Company

Judgment of Equity Risk Premium for the Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Utilities

Line
No.

1. Calculated equity risk premium based on the total market using the beta approach (1)

Mean equity risk premium based on a study using the holding period returns of public utilities with A2 rated bonds (2)

Predicted Equity Risk Premium
Based on Regression Analysis
of 1207 Fully-Litigated
Electric Utility Rate Cases (3)

Average equity risk premium

Notes: (1) From page 8 of this Schedule.
(2) From page 12 of this Schedule.
(3) From pages 13 of this Schedule.

The Potomac Edison Company
Derivation of Equity Risk Premium Based on the Total Market Approach
Using the Beta for the
Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Utilities

| Line No. | Equity Risk Premium Measure | Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Utilities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Kroll Equity Risk Premium (1) | 6.13 \% |
| 2. | Regression on Kroll Risk Premium Data (2) | 7.26 |
| 3. | Kroll Equity Risk Premium based on PRPM (3) | 9.76 |
| 4. | Equity Risk Premium Based on Value Line Summary and Index (4) | 11.53 |
| 5. | Equity Risk Premium Based on Value Line S\&P 500 Companies (5) | 10.62 |
| 6. | Equity Risk Premium Based on Bloomberg S\&P 500 Companies (6) | 6.01 |
| 7. | Conclusion of Equity Risk Premium | 8.55 \% |
| 8. | Adjusted Beta (7) | 0.78 |
| 9. | Forecasted Equity Risk Premium | 6.67 \% |

Notes provided on page 9 of this Schedule.

The Potomac Edison Company
Derivation of Equity Risk Premium Based on the Total Market Approach
Using the Beta for the Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Utilities

Notes:
(1) Based on the arithmetic mean historical monthly returns on large company common stocks from Kroll 2022 SBBI® Yearbook minus the arithmetic mean monthly yield of Moody's average Aaa and Aa corporate bonds from 1928-2021.
(2) This equity risk premium is based on a regression of the monthly equity risk premiums of large company common stocks relative to Moody's average Aaa and Aa2 rated corporate bond yields from 1928-2021 referenced in Note 1 above.
(3) The Predictive Risk Premium Model (PRPM) is discussed in the accompanying direct testimony. The SBBI equity risk premium based on the PRPM is derived by applying the PRPM to the monthly risk premiums between SBBI large company common stock monthly returns and average Aaa and Aa2 corporate monthly bond yields, from January 1928 through December 2022.
(4) The equity risk premium based on the Value Line Summary and Index is derived by subtracting the average consensus forecast of Aaa corporate bonds of 5.05\% (from page 3 of this Schedule) from the projected 3-5 year total annual market return of $16.58 \%$ (described fully in note 1 on page 2 of Schedule DWD-4).
(5) Using data from Value Line for the S\&P 500, an expected total return of $15.67 \%$ was derived based upon expected dividend yields and long-term earnings growth estimates as a proxy for capital appreciation. Subtracting the average consensus forecast of Aaa corporate bonds of $5.05 \%$ results in an expected equity risk premium of $10.62 \%$.
(6) Using data from Bloomberg for the S\&P 500, an expected total return of $11.06 \%$ was derived based upon expected dividend yields and long-term earnings growth estimates as a proxy for capital appreciation. Subtracting the average consensus forecast of Aaa corporate bonds of $5.05 \%$ results in an expected equity risk premium of $6.01 \%$.
(7) Average of mean and median beta from Schedule DWD-4.

## Sources of Information:

Stocks, Bonds, Bills, and Inflation - 2022 SBBI Yearbook, Kroll, Inc. Industrial Manual and Mergent Bond Record Monthly Update.
Value Line Summary and Index.
Blue Chip Financial Forecasts, January 1, 2023 and December 2, 2022
Bloomberg Professional Services.

## Consensus Forecasts of U.S. Interest Rates and Key Assumptions

| Interest Rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Consensus Forecasts-Quarterly Avg. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1Q | 2 Q | 3Q | 4Q | 1 Q | 2Q |
|  | $\underline{\text { Dec } 23}$ | Dec 16 | $\underline{\text { Dec } 9}$ | $\underline{\text { Dec } 2}$ | Nov | Oct | Sep | 4Q 2022* | $\underline{2023}$ | 2023 | $\underline{2023}$ | 2023 | $\underline{2024}$ | $\underline{2024}$ |
| Federal Funds Rate | 4.33 | 3.83 | 3.83 | 3.83 | 3.78 | 3.08 | 2.56 | 3.59 | 4.7 | 5.0 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 4.4 | 4.0 |
| Prime Rate | 7.50 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 6.95 | 6.25 | 5.73 | 6.76 | 7.8 | 8.1 | 8.0 | 7.8 | 7.5 | 7.2 |
| SOFR | 4.30 | 4.01 | 3.80 | 3.81 | 3.73 | 3.04 | 2.50 | 3.55 | 4.6 | 4.9 | 4.8 | 4.6 | 4.4 | 4.1 |
| Commercial Paper, 1-mo. | 4.28 | 4.23 | 4.15 | 4.00 | 3.88 | 3.28 | 2.80 | 3.71 | 4.8 | 5.1 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 4.4 | 4.0 |
| Treasury bill, 3-mo. | 4.35 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.37 | 4.32 | 3.87 | 3.22 | 4.17 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 4.8 | 4.6 | 4.3 | 3.9 |
| Treasury bill, 6-mo. | 4.68 | 4.71 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.61 | 4.31 | 3.71 | 4.53 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 4.8 | 4.5 | 4.3 | 4.0 |
| Treasury bill, 1 yr . | 4.64 | 4.66 | 4.72 | 4.73 | 4.73 | 4.43 | 3.89 | 4.61 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 3.9 |
| Treasury note, 2 yr . | 4.25 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 4.37 | 4.50 | 4.38 | 3.86 | 4.39 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.5 |
| Treasury note, 5 yr. | 3.78 | 3.67 | 3.72 | 3.79 | 4.06 | 4.18 | 3.70 | 4.00 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.4 |
| Treasury note, 10 yr . | 3.67 | 3.51 | 3.52 | 3.63 | 3.89 | 3.98 | 3.52 | 3.82 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.5 |
| Treasury note, 30 yr . | 3.73 | 3.53 | 3.51 | 3.71 | 4.00 | 4.04 | 3.56 | 3.89 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| Corporate Aaa bond | 4.88 | 4.66 | 4.68 | 4.87 | 5.23 | 5.41 | 4.87 | 5.15 | 5.1 | 5.2 | 5.2 | 5.1 | 4.9 | 4.8 |
| Corporate Baa bond | 5.56 | 5.34 | 5.38 | 5.57 | 5.95 | 6.22 | 5.64 | 5.90 | 6.1 | 6.3 | 6.2 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 5.8 |
| State \& Local bonds | 4.24 | 4.18 | 4.19 | 4.26 | 4.50 | 4.62 | 4.31 | 4.46 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.2 |
| Home mortgage rate | 6.27 | 6.31 | 6.33 | 6.49 | 6.81 | 6.90 | 6.11 | 6.69 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.3 | 6.2 | 6.0 | 5.8 |
|  |  |  |  | --Hist |  |  |  |  |  | nsens | S For | casts- | Quarte |  |
|  | 1Q | 2Q | 3Q | 4Q | 1Q | 2Q | 3Q | 4Q | 1Q | 2 Q | 3Q | 4Q | 1 Q | 2 Q |
| Key Assumptions | $\underline{2021}$ | $\underline{2021}$ | $\underline{2021}$ | $\underline{2021}$ | $\underline{2022}$ | $\underline{2022}$ | $\underline{2022}$ | 2022** | $\underline{2023}$ | 2023 | 2023 | 2023 | 2024 | $\underline{2024}$ |
| Fed's AFE \$ Index | 103.4 | 102.9 | 105.0 | 107.0 | 108.4 | 113.7 | 119.0 | 120.6 | 118.7 | 118.1 | 117.6 | 117.1 | 116.8 | 116.9 |
| Real GDP | 6.3 | 7.0 | 2.7 | 7.0 | -1.6 | -0.6 | 3.2 | 1.0 | -0.2 | -0.7 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 1.7 |
| GDP Price Index | 5.2 | 6.3 | 6.2 | 6.8 | 8.3 | 9.0 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 2.2 |
| Consumer Price Index | 4.1 | 8.2 | 6.7 | 7.9 | 9.2 | 10.5 | 5.7 | 4.5 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.3 |
| PCE Price Index | 4.5 | 6.4 | 5.6 | 6.2 | 7.5 | 7.3 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 3.2 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.2 |

Forecasts for interest rates and the Federal Reserve's Advanced Foreign Economies Index represent averages for the quarter. Forecasts for Real GDP, GDP Price Index, CPI and PCE Price Index are seasonally-adjusted annual rates of change (saar). Individual panel members' forecasts are on pages 4 through 9 . Historical data: Treasury rates from the Federal Reserve Board's H.15; AAA-AA and A-BBB corporate bond yields from Bank of America-Merrill Lynch and are 15+ years, yield to maturity; State and local bond yields from Bank of America-Merrill Lynch, A-rated, yield to maturity; Mortgage rates from Freddie Mac, 30-year, fixed; SOFR from the New York Fed. *Interest rate data for 4Q 2022 based on historical data through the week ended December 23. **Data for 4Q 2022 for the Fed's AFE \$ Index based on data through the week ended December 23. Figures for 4Q 2022 Real GDP, GDP Chained Price Index, Consumer Price Index, and PCE Price Index are consensus forecasts from the December 2022 survey.


## Long-Range Survey:

The table below contains the results of our twice-annual long-range CONSENSUS survey. There are also Top 10 and Bottom 10 averages for each variable. Shown are consensus estimates for the years 2024 through 2028 and averages for the five-year periods 2024-2028 and 2029-2033. Apply these projections cautiously. Few if any economic, demographic and political forces can be evaluated accurately over such long time spans.

|  |  | ----------------------- Average For The Year -------------------------- |  |  |  |  | Five-Year Averages |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | 2024-2028 | 2029-2033 |
| 1. Federal Funds Rate | CONSENSUS | 3.7 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.8 |
|  | Top 10 Average | 4.5 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 3.4 |
|  | Bottom 10 Average | 2.7 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| 2. Prime Rate | CONSENSUS | 6.8 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 6.1 | 5.9 |
|  | Top 10 Average | 7.6 | 6.8 | 6.7 | 6.6 | 6.5 | 6.8 | 6.5 |
|  | Bottom 10 Average | 5.9 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 5.4 | 5.3 |
| 3. SOFR | consensus | 3.7 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.8 |
|  | Top 10 Average | 4.4 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 3.3 |
|  | Bottom 10 Average | 3.0 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 |
| 4. Commercial Paper, 1-Mo | CONSENSUS | 3.7 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 2.9 |
|  | Top 10 Average | 4.4 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 3.3 |
|  | Bottom 10 Average | 3.2 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.5 |
| 5. Treasury Bill Yield, 3-Mo | CONSENSUS | 3.7 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 2.8 |
|  | Top 10 Average | 4.4 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 3.4 |
|  | Bottom 10 Average | 2.9 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.3 |
| 6. Treasury Bill Yield, 6-Mo | consensus | 3.7 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.0 |
|  | Top 10 Average | 4.4 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 3.5 |
|  | Bottom 10 Average | 3.1 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.4 |
| 7. Treasury Bill Yield, 1-Yr | CONSENSUS | 3.8 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.1 |
|  | Top 10 Average | 4.4 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 3.6 |
|  | Bottom 10 Average | 3.1 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.6 |
| 8. Treasury Note Yield, 2-Yr | consensus | 3.6 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.1 |
|  | Top 10 Average | 4.4 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 3.8 |
|  | Bottom 10 Average | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 |
| 9. Treasury Note Yield, 5-Yr | CONSENSUS | 3.6 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.4 |
|  | Top 10 Average | 4.4 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 3.9 |
|  | Bottom 10 Average | 2.9 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.9 |
| 10. Treasury Note Yield, $10-\mathrm{Yr}$ | consensus | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.7 |
|  | Top 10 Average | 4.4 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.3 |
|  | Bottom 10 Average | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.0 |
| 11. Treasury Bond Yield, $30-\mathrm{Yr}$ | CONSENSUS | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 4.0 |
|  | Top 10 Average | 4.6 | 4.5 | 4.7 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.7 |
|  | Bottom 10 Average | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| 12. Corporate Aaa Bond Yield | CONSENSUS | 5.1 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.1 |
|  | Top 10 Average | 5.7 | 5.5 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.7 |
|  | Bottom 10 Average | 4.6 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 4.5 |
| 13. Corporate Baa Bond Yield | consensus | 6.2 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 6.0 | 5.9 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
|  | Top 10 Average | 6.6 | 6.4 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.6 |
|  | Bottom 10 Average | 5.7 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 5.5 |
| 14. State \& Local Bonds Yield | CONSENSUS | 4.4 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.4 |
|  | Top 10 Average | 4.8 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.8 |
|  | Bottom 10 Average | 3.9 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.9 |
| 15. Home Mortgage Rate | CONSENSUS | 5.9 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 5.6 | 5.5 |
|  | Top 10 Average | 6.6 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 6.3 | 6.2 |
|  | Bottom 10 Average | 5.3 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 4.9 |
| A. Fed's AFE Nominal \$ Index | consensus | 117.6 | 116.0 | 114.5 | 113.5 | 112.2 | 114.8 | 110.7 |
|  | Top 10 Average | 120.7 | 119.3 | 118.5 | 118.0 | 117.9 | 118.9 | 116.7 |
|  | Bottom 10 Average | 115.1 | 112.9 | 110.7 | 109.2 | 107.2 | 111.0 | 105.4 |
|  |  | ------- | ---- Ye | -Year, | ge -- | ---- | Five-Year | verages |
|  |  | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | 2024-2028 | 2029-2033 |
| B. Real GDP | CONSENSUS | 1.4 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
|  | Top 10 Average | 2.2 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.3 |
|  | Bottom 10 Average | 0.5 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 1.6 |
| C. GDP Chained Price Index | consensus | 2.3 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 |
|  | Top 10 Average | 2.7 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 2.2 |
|  | Bottom 10 Average | 2.0 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| D. Consumer Price Index | CONSENSUS | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.1 |
|  | Top 10 Average | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.3 |
|  | Bottom 10 Average | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| E. PCE Price Index | CONSENSUS | 2.3 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 |
|  | Top 10 Average | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 |
|  | Bottom 10 Average | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 1.9 |

# The Potomac Edison Company <br> Derivation of Mean Equity Risk Premium Based Studies <br> Using Holding Period Returns and <br> Projected Market Appreciation of the S\&P Utility Index 

Equity Risk Premium based on S\&P Utility Index
Holding Period Returns (1):

Historical Equity Risk Premiu
2. Regression of Historical Equity Risk Premium
3.
4. Projected Total Return on the S\&P Utilities Index
(Value Line Data) (4)

Forecasted Equity Risk Premium based on
Projected Total Return on the S\&P Utilities Index
(Bloomberg Data) (5)

Average Equity Risk Premium (6)
6.

Notes: (1) Based on S\&P Public Utility Index monthly total returns and Moody's Public Utility Bond average monthly yields from 1928-2021. Holding period returns are calculated based upon income received (dividends and interest) plus the relative change in the market value of a security over a one-year holding period.
(2) This equity risk premium is based on a regression of the monthly equity risk premiums of the S\&P Utility Index relative to Moody's A2 rated public utility bond yields from 1928-2021 referenced in note 1 above. Using the equation generated from the regression, an expected equity risk premium is calculated using the relevant bond yield. The projected A2 rated utiliy bond yields are shown on line 3 of page 3 of this Schedule.
(3) The Predictive Risk Premium Model (PRPM) is applied to the risk premium of the monthly total returns of the S\&P Utility Index and the monthly yields on Moody's A2 rated public utility bonds from January 1928 - December 2022.
(4) Using data from Value Line for the S\&P Utilities Index, an expected return of 9.50\% was derived based on expected dividend yields and long-term growth estimates as a proxy for market appreciation. Subtracting the expected A2 rated public utility bond yield of $5.88 \%$, calculated on line 3 of page 3 of this Schedule results in an equity risk premium of $3.62 \%$. $(9.50 \%-5.88 \%=3.62 \%)$
(5) Using data from Bloomberg Professional Services for the S\&P Utilities Index, an expected return of $9.20 \%$ was derived based on expected dividend yields and longterm growth estimates as a proxy for market appreciation. Subtracting the expected A2 rated public utility bond yield of $5.88 \%$, calculated on line 3 of page 3 of this Schedule results in an equity risk premium of $3.32 \%$. $(9.20 \%-5.88 \%=3.32 \%)$
(6) Average of lines 1 through 5.

The Potomac Edison Company
Prediction of Equity Risk Premiums Relative to
Moody's A2 Rated Utility Bond Yields - Electric Utilities


|  |  | Prospective |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | A2 Rated | Prospective |
|  | Slope | Utility Bond <br> (1) | Equity Risk Premium |
| 7.5941 \% | -0.4811 | 5.88 | 4.77 |

Notes:
(1) From line 3 of page 3 of this Schedule.

Source of Information: Regulatory Research Associates.
Indicated Common Equity Cost Rate Through Use
of the Traditional Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) and Empirical Capital Asset Pricing Model (ECAPM)
$\propto$


$\sigma$

|  | - | $\stackrel{4}{ }$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## $\sqrt{\boxed{2}}$ <br> ت

Risk-Free
oㅇ
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Proxy Group of Thirteen
Electric Utilities
Proxy Group of Thirteen
Electric Utilities
Alliant Energy Corporation
Ameren Corporation
American Electric Power Corporation
Duke Energy Corporation
Edison International
Entergy Corporation
Evergy, Inc.
Eversource Energy
IDACORP, Inc.
NorthWestern Corporation
OGE Energy Corporation
Portland General Electric Company
Xcel Energy Inc.
Average of Mean and Median
Mean
Median
Average of Mean and Median
Notes on page 2 of this Schedule.

## The Potomac Edison Company

Notes to Accompany the Application of the CAPM and ECAPM
Notes:
(1) The market risk premium (MRP) is derived by using six different measures from three sources: Kroll, Value Line, and Bloomberg as illustrated below:

Historical Data MRP Estimates:
Measure 1: Kroll Arithmetic Mean MRP (1926-2021)

| Arithmetic Mean Monthly Returns for Large Stocks 1926-2021: | $12.37 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Arithmetic Mean Income Returns on Long-Term Government Bonds: | 5.02 |
| MRP based on Kroll Historical Data: | $7.35 \%$ |

Measure 2: Application of a Regression Analysis to Kroll Historical Data
(1926-2022)
8.71 \%

Measure 3: Application of the PRPM to Kroll Historical Data:
(January 1926 - December 2022)
10.86 \%

Value Line MRP Estimates:
Measure 4: Value Line Projected MRP (Thirteen weeks ending December 30, 2022)
Total projected return on the market 3-5 years hence*:
16.58 \%

Projected Risk-Free Rate (see note 2):
MRP based on Value Line Summary \& Index:
3.91
*Forcasted 3-5 year capital appreciation plus expected dividend yield

Measure 5: Value Line Projected Return on the Market based on the S\&P 500

| Total return on the Market based on the S\&P 500: | $15.67 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Projected Risk-Free Rate (see note 2): | 3.91 |
| MRP based on Value Line data | $11.76 \%$ |

Measure 6: Bloomberg Projected MRP
$\begin{array}{lc}\text { Total return on the Market based on the S\&P 500: } & 11.06 \%\end{array}$
Projected Risk-Free Rate (see note 2):

| MRP based on Bloomberg data | $\frac{3.91}{} \%$ <br> Average of Value Line, Kroll, and Bloomberg MRP: |
| ---: | :--- |

(2) For reasons explained in the direct testimony, the appropriate risk-free rate for cost of capital purposes is the average forecast of 30 year Treasury Bonds per the consensus of nearly 50 economists reported in Blue Chip Financial Forecasts. (See pages 10-11 of Schedule DWD-3.) The projection of the risk-free rate is illustrated below:

| First Quarter 2023 | $4.00 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- |
| Second Quarter 2023 | 4.00 |
| Third Quarter 2023 | 3.90 |
| Fourth Quarter 2023 | 3.90 |
| First Quarter 2024 | 3.80 |
| Second Quarter 2024 | 3.80 |
| 2024-2028 | 3.90 |
| 2029-2033 | \begin{tabular}{\|}
\hline
\end{tabular} |

(3) Average of Column 6 and Column 7.

Sources of Information:
Value Line Summary and Index
Blue Chip Financial Forecasts, January 1, 2023 and December 2, 2022
Stocks, Bonds, Bills, and Inflation - 2022 SBBI Yearbook, Kroll, Inc.
Bloomberg Professional Services

The Potomac Edison Company
Basis of Selection of the Groups of Non-Price Regulated Companies
Comparable in Total Risk to the Utility Proxy Groups

The criteria for selection of the proxy group of non-price regulated companies comparable in total risk to the Utility Proxy Group was that the non-price regulated companies be domestic and reported in Value Line Investment Survey (Standard Edition).

The proxy group of non-price regulated companies was selected based on the unadjusted beta range of $0.65-0.93$ and residual standard error of the regression range of 2.5574 - 3.0502 of the Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Utilities.

These ranges are based upon plus or minus two standard deviations of the unadjusted beta and standard error of the regression. Plus or minus three standard deviations captures $95.50 \%$ of the distribution of unadjusted betas and residual standard errors of the regression.

The standard deviation of the Electric Utility Proxy Group's residual standard error of the regression is 0.1232 . The standard deviation of the standard error of the regression is calculated as follows:

Standard Deviation of the Std. Err. of the Regr. $=\frac{\text { Standard Error of the Regression }}{\sqrt{2 N}}$
$\sqrt{2 N}$
where: $\mathrm{N}=\quad$ number of observations. Since Value Line betas are derived from weekly price change observations over a period of five years, $\mathrm{N}=259$

$$
\text { Thus, } 0.1232=\frac{2.8038}{\sqrt{518}}=\frac{2.8038}{22.7596}
$$

Source of Information: Value Line, Inc., December 2022. Value Line Investment Survey (Standard Edition).

The Potomac Edison Company
Basis of Selection of Comparable Risk Domestic Non-Price Regulated Companies

|  | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Utilities | Value Line <br> Adjusted Beta | Unadjusted Beta | Residual <br> Standard <br> Error of the <br> Regression | Standard Deviation of Beta |
| Alliant Energy Corporation | 0.85 | 0.71 | 2.7441 | 0.0683 |
| Ameren Corporation | 0.80 | 0.69 | 2.5700 | 0.0640 |
| American Electric Power Corporation | 0.75 | 0.59 | 2.6606 | 0.0662 |
| Duke Energy Corporation | 0.85 | 0.76 | 2.7262 | 0.0679 |
| Edison International | 0.95 | 0.91 | 3.2762 | 0.0816 |
| Entergy Corporation | 0.95 | 0.86 | 2.7816 | 0.0692 |
| Evergy, Inc. | 0.95 | 0.87 | 3.1310 | 0.0806 |
| Eversource Energy | 0.90 | 0.83 | 3.0490 | 0.0759 |
| IDACORP, Inc. | 0.80 | 0.68 | 2.5804 | 0.0642 |
| NorthWestern Corporation | 0.95 | 0.89 | 2.7689 | 0.0689 |
| OGE Energy Corporation | 1.05 | 1.05 | 2.6629 | 0.0663 |
| Portland General Electric Company | 0.90 | 0.79 | 2.8012 | 0.0697 |
| Xcel Energy Inc. | 0.80 | 0.66 | 2.6976 | 0.0672 |
| Average | 0.88 | 0.79 | 2.8038 | 0.0700 |
| Beta Range ( $+/-2$ std. Devs. of Beta) 2 std. Devs. of Beta | $\begin{aligned} & 0.65 \\ & 0.14 \end{aligned}$ | 0.93 |  |  |
| Residual Std. Err. Range (+/- 2 std. |  |  |  |  |
| Devs. of the Residual Std. Err.) | 2.5574 | 3.0502 |  |  |
| Std. dev. of the Res. Std. Err. | 0.1232 |  |  |  |
| 2 std. devs. of the Res. Std. Err. | 0.2464 |  |  |  |

Source of Information: Value Line Proprietary Database, December 2022

The Potomac Edison Company
Proxy Group of Non-Price Regulated Companies
Comparable in Total Risk to the
Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Utilities

|  | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proxy Group of Fifty Non-Price Regulated Companies | VL Adjusted Beta | Unadjusted Beta | Residual <br> Standard <br> Error of the <br> Regression | Standard Deviation of Beta |
| Agilent Technologies | 0.85 | 0.77 | 2.6442 | 0.0658 |
| Abbott Labs. | 0.90 | 0.81 | 2.7622 | 0.0688 |
| Analog Devices | 0.95 | 0.87 | 2.8417 | 0.0707 |
| Assurant Inc. | 0.95 | 0.85 | 2.7366 | 0.0681 |
| Smith (A.O.) | 0.85 | 0.76 | 2.7272 | 0.0679 |
| Air Products \& Chem. | 0.90 | 0.79 | 2.6237 | 0.0653 |
| Ball Corp. | 0.95 | 0.91 | 2.8314 | 0.0705 |
| Brown-Forman 'B' | 0.90 | 0.80 | 2.6915 | 0.0670 |
| Bristol-Myers Squibb | 0.85 | 0.76 | 3.0330 | 0.0755 |
| Broadridge Fin'l | 0.85 | 0.70 | 2.7610 | 0.0687 |
| Brady Corp. | 1.00 | 0.93 | 2.7641 | 0.0688 |
| CACI Int'l | 0.90 | 0.84 | 2.9846 | 0.0743 |
| Chemed Corp. | 0.85 | 0.70 | 2.7215 | 0.0677 |
| Cooper Cos. | 0.95 | 0.90 | 2.7720 | 0.0690 |
| CSW Industrials | 0.90 | 0.80 | 2.9127 | 0.0725 |
| Quest Diagnostics | 0.80 | 0.69 | 3.0218 | 0.0752 |
| Dolby Labs. | 0.95 | 0.88 | 2.6152 | 0.0651 |
| Lauder (Estee) | 0.95 | 0.92 | 2.9395 | 0.0732 |
| Exponent, Inc. | 0.90 | 0.80 | 2.8742 | 0.0715 |
| FactSet Research | 1.00 | 0.93 | 2.6951 | 0.0671 |
| Gentex Corp. | 0.95 | 0.90 | 2.7524 | 0.0685 |
| Ingredion Inc. | 0.90 | 0.85 | 2.8617 | 0.0712 |
| Hunt (J.B.) | 0.95 | 0.90 | 2.9072 | 0.0724 |
| J\&J Snack Foods | 0.95 | 0.87 | 2.9766 | 0.0741 |
| Henry (Jack) \& Assoc | 0.85 | 0.70 | 2.8821 | 0.0717 |
| L3Harris Technologie | 0.95 | 0.92 | 2.5815 | 0.0709 |
| McCormick \& Co. | 0.80 | 0.66 | 2.8331 | 0.0705 |
| Altria Group | 0.95 | 0.88 | 2.9551 | 0.0736 |
| MSA Safety | 0.95 | 0.92 | 3.0013 | 0.0747 |
| MSCI Inc. | 0.95 | 0.85 | 3.0171 | 0.0751 |
| Motorola Solutions | 0.90 | 0.79 | 2.6757 | 0.0666 |
| Mettler-Toledo Int'l | 0.95 | 0.89 | 2.7628 | 0.0688 |
| Northrop Grumman | 0.85 | 0.74 | 2.9186 | 0.0727 |
| Old Dominion Freight | 0.95 | 0.85 | 2.9677 | 0.0739 |
| Packaging Corp. | 0.95 | 0.90 | 2.8815 | 0.0717 |
| Post Holdings | 0.95 | 0.86 | 2.9244 | 0.0728 |
| RLI Corp. | 0.80 | 0.66 | 2.8575 | 0.0711 |
| Rollins, Inc. | 0.85 | 0.72 | 2.9831 | 0.0743 |
| Service Corp. Int'l | 0.95 | 0.89 | 2.6275 | 0.0654 |
| Sherwin-Williams | 0.90 | 0.84 | 2.5643 | 0.0638 |
| Selective Ins. Group | 0.90 | 0.81 | 2.9464 | 0.0733 |
| Sirius XM Holdings | 0.95 | 0.86 | 2.9589 | 0.0737 |
| Sensient Techn. | 0.90 | 0.82 | 2.6393 | 0.0657 |
| Thermo Fisher Sci. | 0.85 | 0.70 | 2.6279 | 0.0654 |
| Texas Instruments | 0.85 | 0.75 | 2.6590 | 0.0662 |
| U-Haul Holding | 0.95 | 0.92 | 2.7274 | 0.0679 |
| UniFirst Corp. | 0.95 | 0.91 | 2.7167 | 0.0676 |
| VeriSign Inc. | 0.90 | 0.78 | 2.5863 | 0.0644 |
| Waters Corp. | 0.95 | 0.87 | 2.8032 | 0.0698 |
| Watsco, Inc. | 0.85 | 0.75 | 2.6936 | 0.0671 |
| Average | 0.91 | 0.82 | 2.8049 | 0.0700 |
| Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric |  |  |  |  |
| Utilities | 0.88 | 0.79 | 2.8038 | 0.0700 |
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Accelerating deregulation has greatly increased the investment risk of naural gas uilities. As a result, the authors believe it more appropriate than ever to employ the comparable earnings model. We believe our application of the model overcomes the greatest traditional objection to it -lack of comparability of the selected nonutility proxy firms. Our illustration focuses on a target gas pipeline company with a beta of 0.96 - almost equal to the market's beta of 1.00 .

## Introduction

The comparable eamings model used to determine a common equity cost rate is deeply rooted in the standard of "corresponding risk" enunciated in the landmark Bluefield and Hope decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. ' With such solid grounding in the foundations of rate of return regulation, comparable earnings should be accepted as a principal model, along with the currently popular marketbased models, provided that its most common criticism, non-comparability of the proxy companies, is overcome.

Our comparable earnings model overcomes the non-comparability issue of the non-utility firms selected as a proxy for the target utility, in this example, a gas pipeline company. We should note that in the absence of common stock prices for the target utility (as wilh a wholly-owned subsidiary), it is appropriate to use the average of a proxy group of similar risk gas pipeline companies whose common stocks are actively traded. As we will demonstrate, our selection process results in a group of domestic, non-utility firms that is comparable in total risk, the sum of business and financial risk, which reflects both non-diversifiable systematic, or market, risk as well as diversifiable unsystematic, or firm-specific, risk.


Frank J. Hanley is president of AUS Consultants - Utility Services Group. He has testified in several hundred rate proceedings on the subject of cost of capital before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and 27 state regulatory commissions. Before joining AUS in 197J, he was an assistant treasurer of a number of operating companies in the American Water Works System, as well as a financial planning officer with the Philadelphia National Bank. He is a Certified Rate of Return Analyst.

Pauline M. Ahern is a senior financial analyst with AUS Consultants -Utility Services Group. She has participated in many cost-of-capital studies. A former employee of the U.S. Department of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, she holds an MBA degree from Rutgers University and is a Certified Rate of Return Analyst.

## Embedded in the Landmark Decisions

As stated in Bluefield in 1922: "A public utility is entitled to such rates as will permit it to earn a return ... on investments in other business undertakings which are attended by corresponding risks and uncertainties ..."

In addition, the court stated in Hope in 1944: "By that standard the return to the equity owner should be commensurate with returns on investments in other enterprises having corresponding risks."

Thus, the "comesponding risk" pre-
cept of Bluefield and Hope predates the use of such market-based cost-of-equity models as the Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) and Capital Asset Pricing (CAPM), which were developed later and are currently popular in rate-base/rate-of-return regulation Consequently, the comparable earnings model has a longer regulatory and judicial history. However, it has far greater relevance now than ever before in its history because significant deregulation has substantially increased natural gas utilities' investment risk to a level similar to that of non-utility firms. As a result, it is
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more important than ever to look to similar-risk non-utility firms for insight into common equity cost rate, especially in view of the deficiencies inherent in the currently popular market-based cost of common equity models, particularly the DCF model

Despite the fact that the landmark decisions are still regarded as having set the standards for determining a fair rate of return, the comparable earnings model has experienced decreased usage by expert witnesses, as well as less regulatory acceptance over the years. We believe the decline in the popularity of the comparable earnings model, in large measure, is attributable to the difficulty of selecting non-utility proxy firms that regulators will accept as comparable to the target utility. Regulatory acceptance is difficult to gain when the selection process is arbitrary. Our application of the model is objective and consistent with fundamental financial tenets.

## Principles of Comparable Earnings

Regulation is a substitute for the competition of the marketplace Moreover, regulated public utilities compete in the capital markets with all firms, including unregulated non-utilities. The comparable earnings model is based upon the opportunity cost principle; i.e, that the true cost of an investment is the return that could have been earned on the next best available alternative investment of similar risk. Consequently, the comparable earnings model is consistent with regulatory and financial principles, as it is a surrogate for the competition of the marketplace, and investors seek the greatest available rate of return for bearing similar risk.

The selection of comparable firms is the most difficult step in applying the comparable eamings model, as noted by Phillips ${ }^{2}$ as well as by Bonbright, Danielsen and Kamerschen ${ }^{3}$ The selection of non-utility proxy firms should result in a sufficiently broad-based group in order to minimize the effect of company-specific aberrations. How-
ever, if the selection process is arbitrary, it likely would result in a proxy group that is too broad-based, such as the Standard \& Poor's 500 Composite Index or the Value Line Industrial Composite. The use of such groups would require subjective adjustments to the comparable earnings results to reflect risk differences between the group(s) and the target utility, a gas pipeline company in this example.

## Authors' Selection Criteria

We base the selection of comparable non-utility firms on market-based, objective, quantitative measures of risk resulting from market prices that subsume investors' assessments of all elements of risk. Thus, our approach is based upon the principle of risk and return; namely, that firms of comparable risk should be expected to earn comparable returns. It is also consistent with the "corresponding risk" standard established in Bluefield and Hope We measure total investment risk as the sum of non-diversifiable systematic and diversifiable unsystematic risk. We use the unadjusted beta as a measure of systematic risk and the standard error of the estimate (residual standard error) as a measure of unsystematic risk. Both the unadjusted beta and the residual standard error are derived from a regression of the target utility's security returns relative to the market's returns, which takes the general form:

$$
r_{i t}=a_{i}+b_{i} r_{m t}+e_{i t}
$$

where:

$$
\left.\begin{array}{rl}
r_{i t}= & t \text { th observation of the } i \text { th } \\
& \text { utility's rate of retum }
\end{array}\right\} \begin{aligned}
r_{m t}= & t \text { th observation of the } \\
& \text { market's rate of return } \\
e_{i t}= & t \text { th random error term } \\
a_{i}= & \text { constant least-squares } \\
& \text { regression coefficient } \\
b_{i}= & \text { least-squares regression } \\
& \text { slope coefficient, the } \\
& \text { unadjusted beta. }
\end{aligned}
$$

As shown by Francis, ${ }^{4}$ the total variation or risk of a firm's return, Var $\left(r_{i}\right)$, comes from two sources:
$\operatorname{Var}\left(r_{i}\right)=$ total risk of $i$ th asset

$$
\begin{aligned}
= & \operatorname{var}\left(a_{i}+b_{i} r_{m}+e\right) \\
& \operatorname{substituting}\left(a_{i}+b_{i} r_{m}+e\right) \\
& \text { for } r_{i} \\
= & \operatorname{var}\left(b_{i} r_{m}\right)+\operatorname{var}(e) \text { since } \\
& \operatorname{var}\left(a_{i}\right)=0 \\
= & b_{i}^{2} \operatorname{var}\left(r_{m}\right)+\operatorname{var}(e) \\
& \operatorname{since} \operatorname{var}\left(b_{i} r_{n}\right)=b_{i}^{2} \\
& \operatorname{var}\left(r_{n}\right) \\
= & \text { systematic }+ \\
& \text { unsystematic risk }
\end{aligned}
$$

Francis ${ }^{5}$ also notes: "The term $\sigma^{2}\left(r_{i} \mid r_{m}\right)$ is called the residual variance around the regression line in statistical terms or unsystematic risk in capital market theory language. $\sigma^{2}\left(r_{i} \mid r_{m}\right)=\ldots$ $=\operatorname{var}(e)$. The residual variance is the squared standard error in regression language, a measure of unsystematic risk," Application of these criteria results in a group of non-utility firms whose average total investment risk is indeed comparable to that of the target gas pipeline.

As a measure of systematic risk, we use the Value Line unadjusted beta. Beta measures the extent to which marketwide or macro-economic events affect a firm's stock price. We use the unadjusted beta of the target utility as a starting point because it results from the regression of the target utility's security returns relative to the market's retums. Thus, the resulting standard deviation of beta relates to the unadjusted beta. We use the standard deviation of the unadjusted beta to determine the range around it as the selection criterion based on systematic risk.

We use the residual standard error of the regression as a measure of unsystematic risk. The residual standard error reflects the extent to which events specific to the firm's operations affect a firm's stock price. Thus, it is a measure of diversifiable, unsystematic, firmspecific risk.

## An Illustration of Authors' Approach

Step One: We begin our approach by establishing the selection criteria as a range of both unadjusted beta and residual standard error of the target gas
continued on page 6
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pipeline company.
As shown in table 1, our target gas pipeline company has a Value Line unadjusted beta of 0.90 , whose standard deviation is 0.1250 . The selection criterion range of unadjusted beta is the unadjusted beta plus ( + ) and minus ( - ) three of its standard deviations. By using three standard deviations, 99.73 percent of the comparable unadjusted betas is captured

Three standard deviations of the target utility's unadjusted beta equals 0.38 ( $0.1250 \times 3=0.3750$, rounded to 0.38 ) Consequently, the range of unadjusted betas to be used as a selection criteria is $0.52-1.28(0.52=0.90-0.38)$ and (1.28 $=0.90+0.38$ )

Likewise, the selection criterion range of residual standard error equals the residual standard error plus ( + ) and
minus (-) three of its standard deviations. The standard deviation of the residual standard error is defined as: $\sigma / \sqrt{2 \mathrm{~N}}$.

As also shown in table 1, the target gas pipeline company has a residual standard error of 3.7867 . According to the above formula, the standard deviation of the residual standard error would be $0.1664(0.1664=3.7867 / \sqrt{2(259)}=$ $37867 / 22.7596$, where $259=\mathrm{N}$, the number of weekly price change observations over a period of five years). Three standard deviations of the target utility's residual standard error would be $0.4992(0.1664 \times 3=4992)$. Consequently, the range of residual standard errors to be used as a selection criterion is $3.2875-4.2859(3.2875=3.7867-$ $0.4992)$ and $(4.2859=3.7867+$ 0.4992 )

Step Two: The step one criteria are applied to Value Line's data base of nearly 4,000 firms for which Value Line derives unadjusted betas and residual standard errors on a weekly basis All firms with unadjusted betas and residual standard errors within the criteria ranges are then selected

Step Three: In the regulatory ratemaking environment, authorized common equity return rates are applied to a book-value rate base. Thus, the earnings rates on book common equity, or net worth, of competitive, non-utility firms are highly relevant provided those firms are indeed comparable in total risk to the target gas pipeline. The use of the return rates of other utilities has no relevance because their allowed, and hence subsequently achieved, earnings rates are dependent upon the regulatory

## table 1

> Summary of the Comparable Earnings Analysis for the Proxy Group of 248 Non-Utility Companies Comparable in Total Risk to the Target Gas Pipeline Company'

conclusion ${ }^{5}$
$13.8 \%$

[^88]
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process Consequently, we believe all utilities must be eliminated to avoid circularity. Moreover, we believe nondomestic firms must be eliminated because their reporting methods differ significantly from U.S. firms.

Step Four: We then eliminated those firms for which Value Line does not publish a "Ratings \& Report" in Value Line Investment Survey so that the historical and projected returns on net worth ${ }^{6}$ are from a consistent source. We use historical retums on net worth for the most recent five years, as well as those projected three to five years into the future. We believe it is logical to evaluate both historical and projected return rates because it is reasonable to assume that investors avail themselves of both when they are available from widely disseminated information ser-
vices, such as Value Line Inc. The use of Value Line's return rates on net worth understates the common equity return rates for two reasons. First, preferred stock is included in net worth. Second, the net worth return rates are as of the end of each period. Thus, the use of average common equity retum rates would yield higher results

Step Five: Median retums based on the historical average three, four and five years ending 1992 and projected 1996-1998 or 1997-1999 rates of retum on net worth are then determined as shown in columns 4 through 7 of table 1 . The median is used due to the wide variations and skewness in rates of retum on net worth for the non-utility firms as evidenced by the frequency distributions of those returns as shown in illustration 1 .


However, we show the average unadjusted beta, 0.92 , and residual standard error, 3.7705 , for the proxy group in columns 2 and 3 of table 1 because their frequency distributions are not significantly skewed, as shown in illustration 2

Step Six: Our conclusion of a com-
continued on page 8

unadjusted hetas



## Comparable Earnings from page $_{7}$

parable earnings cost rate is based upon the mid-point of the average of the median three-, four- and five-year historical rates of return on net worth of 12.1 percent as shown in column 5 and the median projected 1996-1998/19971999 rate of retum on net worth of 155 percent as shown in column 7 of table 1 . As shown in column 8 , it is 138 percent.

## Summary

Our comparable earnings approach demonstrates that it is possible to select a proxy group of non-utility firms that is comparable in total risk to a target utility. In our example, the 13.8 percent comparable earnings cost rate is very conservative as it is an expected achieved rate on book common equity (a regulatory allowed rate should be
greater) and because it is based on end-of-period net worth. A similar rate on average net worth would be about 20 to 40 basis points higher (i.e., 14.0 to 14.2 percent) and still understate the appropriate regulatory allowed rate of retum on book common equity.

Our selection criteria are based upon measures of systematic and unsystematic risk, specifically unadjusted beta and residual standard error. They provide the basis for the objective selection of comparable non-utility firms. Our selection criteria rely on changes in market prices over approximately five years We compare the aggregate total risk, or the sum of systematic and unsystematic risk, which reflects investors' aggregate assessment of both business and financial risk. Thus, no adjustments are necessary to the proxy group results to

## Report Lists Pipeline, Storage Projects

More than $\$ 9$ billion worth of projects to expand the nation's natural gas pipeline network are in various stages of development, according to an A.G.A. report. These projects involve nearly 8,000 miles of new pipelines and capacity additions to existing lines and represent 15.3 billion cubic feet (Bcf) per day of new pipeline capacity.

During 1993 and early 1994, construction on 3,100 miles of pipeline was completed or under way, at a cost of nearly $\$ 4$ billion, says A.G.A. These projects are adding 5.4 Bcf in daily delivery capacity nationwide.

Among the projects completed in 1993 were Pacific Gas Transmission Co's 805 miles of looping that allows increased deliveries of Canadian gas to the West Coast; Northwest Pipeline Corp.'s addition of 433 million cubic feet of daily capacity for customers in the Pacific Northwest and Rocky Mountain areas; and the 156 -mile Empire State Pipeline in New York.

In addition, major construction projects were started on the systems of Texas Eastern Transmission Corp, and Algonquin Gas Transmission Co.both subsidiaries of Panhandle Eastern Corp.- and along Florida Gas Transmission Co's pipeline.

The report goes on to discuss another $\$ 5$ billion in proposed projects, which, if completed, will add nearly 5,000 miles of pipeline and 9.8 Bcf per day in capacity, much of it serving Flonida and West Coast markets.
A. G.A. also identifies 47 storage projects and says that if all of them are built, existing storage capacity will increase by more than 500 Bcf, or 15 percent.

For a copy of New Pipeline Construction: Status Report 1993-94 (\#F00103), call A.G.A. at (703) $841-8490$. Price per copy is $\$ 6$ for employees of member companies and associates and $\$ 12$ for other customers.
compensate for the differences in business risk and financial risk, such as accounting practices and debt/equity ratios. Moreover, it is inappropriate to attempt a comparison of the target utility with any individual firm, or subset of firms, in the proxy group because only the average firm of the group is relevant.

Because the comparable earnings model is firmly anchored in the "corresponding risk" precept established in the landmark court decisions, it is worthy of consideration as a principal model for use in estimating the cost rate of common equity capital of a regulated utility. Our approach to the comparable earnings model produces a proxy group that is indeed comparable in total risk because the selection process is objective and quantitative It therefore overcomes criticism linked to arbitrary selection processes.

All cost-of-common-equity models, including the DCF and CAPM, are fraught with deficiencies, usually stemming from the many necessary but unrealistic assumptions that underlie them. The effects of the deficiencies of individual models can be mitigated by using more than one model when estimating a utility's common equity cost rate. Therefore, when the non-comparability issue is overcome, the comparable earnings model deserves to receive the same consideration as a primary model, as do the currently popular market-based models.
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Beta Measurements The beta coefficient is an index of systematic risk. Beta coefficients may be used for ranking the systematic risk of different assets. If the beta is larger than $1, b>1.0$, then the asset is more volatile than the market and is called an aggressive asset. If the beta is less than $1, b<1.0$, the asset is a defensive asset; its price fluctuations are less volatile than the market's. Figure 10-1 illustrates the characteristic lines for three different assets that have low, medium, and high levels of beta (or undiversifiable risk).

Figure $10-2$ shows that IBM is a stock with an average amount of systematic risk. IBM's beta of 1.02 indicates that its return tends to increase 2 percent more than the return on the market average when the market is rising. When the market falls, IBM's return tends to fall 2 percent more than the market's. The characteristic line for IBM has an above average correlation coefficient of $p=.7495$, indicating that the returns on this security follow its particular characteristic line slightly more closely than those of the average stock.

Partitioning Risk Total risk can be measured by the variance of returns, denoted $\operatorname{Var}(r)$. This measure of total risk is partitioned into its systematic and unsystematic components in Equation (10-8).7

$$
\begin{align*}
\operatorname{Var}\left(r_{i}\right)= & \text { total risk of } i \text { th asset } \\
= & \operatorname{Var}\left(a_{i}+b_{i} r_{m, t}+e_{i, t}\right) \\
& \text { by substituting }\left(a_{i}+b_{i} r_{m, t}+e_{l, t}\right) \text { for } r_{i, t} \\
= & 0+\operatorname{Var}\left(b_{i} r_{m, i}\right)+\operatorname{Var}\left(e_{i, t}\right) \\
& \text { since } \operatorname{Var}\left(a_{i}\right)=0  \tag{10-8}\\
\operatorname{Var}\left(r_{i}\right)= & b_{i}^{2} \operatorname{Var}\left(r_{m}\right)+\operatorname{Var}(e) \quad \text { since } \operatorname{Var}\left(b_{i} r_{m}\right)=b_{i}^{2} \operatorname{Var}\left(r_{m}\right) \\
= & \text { systematic }+ \text { unsystematic risk } \tag{10-8a}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
.01389=.00780+.00609 \quad \text { for IBM }
$$

The unsystematic risk measure $\operatorname{Var}(e)$ is called in regression language the residual variance or, synonymously, the standard error squared.

Undiversifiable Proportion The percentage of total risk that is systematic can be measured by the coefficient of determination $\rho^{2}$ (that is, the characteristic line's squared correlation coefficient).
${ }^{1}$ In this context, partition is a technical statistical term that means to divide the total variance into mutually exclusive and exhaustive pieces. This partition is only possible if the returns from the market are statistically independent from the residual error terms that occur simultaneously, $\operatorname{Cov}\left(r_{\text {m.t. }}, e_{., l}\right)=0$. The mathematics of regression analysis will orthogonalize the residuals and thus ensure that the needed statistical independence exists.

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{\text { Systematic risk }}{\text { Total risk }} & =\frac{b_{i}^{2} \operatorname{Var}\left(r_{m}\right)}{\operatorname{Var}\left(r_{m}\right)}=\rho^{2}  \tag{10-9}\\
\frac{.007802}{.01389} & =\frac{(1.021)^{2}(.00749)}{.00749}=5617 \times 100=56.17 \% \quad \text { for IBM }
\end{align*}
$$

Diversifiable Proportion The percentage of unsystematic risk equals (1,0 $\rho^{2}$ ).

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{\text { Unsystematic risk }}{\text { Total risk }} & =\frac{\operatorname{Var}(e)}{\operatorname{Var}\left(r_{i}\right)}=\left(1.0-\rho^{2}\right) \\
\frac{.00609}{.01389} & =(1.0-.5617)=.438 \times 100  \tag{10-10}\\
& =43.8 \% \text { unsystematic for IBM }
\end{align*}
$$

Studies of the characteristic lines of hundreds of stocks listed on the NYSE indicate that the average correlation coefficient is approximately $\rho=.5{ }^{8}$ This means that about $p^{2}=25$ percent of the total variability of return in most NYSE securities is explained by movements in the market.

|  | NYSE <br> average | IBM |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Systematic risk: $\rho^{2}$ | .25 | .5617 |
| Unsystematic risk: $\left(1.0-\rho^{2}\right)$ | $\frac{.75}{1.00}$ | $\frac{.4383}{1.0000}$ |
| Total risk: $100 \%$ |  |  |

As explained above, systematic changes are common to all stocks and are therefore undiversifiable.

A primary use of the characteristic line (or market model, or the single-index model, as it is also called) is to assess the risk characteristics of one asset. ${ }^{9}$ The statistics in Table 10-2, for instance, indicate that IBM's common stock is slightly more risky than the average common stock in terms of total risk and
${ }^{8} T h e$ average $\rho$ was found to be about.5, as reported in Marshall Blume, "On the Assessment of Risk," Journal of Finance, March 1971, p. 4. For similar estimates, see J. C. Francis, "Statistical Analysis of Risk Surrogates for NYSE Stocks," Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis, Dec, 1979.
${ }^{9}$ Professor Jensen reformulated the characteristic line in a risk-premium form. See M. C. Jensen, "The Performance of Mutual Funds in the Period 1945 through 1964," Journal of Finance, May 1968, pp. 389-416. See also M. C. Jensen, "Risk, the Pricing of Capital Assets, and the Evaluation of Investment Portfolios," Journal of Business, vol. XLII, 1969. Jensen interprets the alpha intercept term of the characteristic line, as he formulates it, as an investment performance measure. It has been suggested that Jensen's performance measure is biased. See Keith V. Smith and Dennis A. Tito, "RiskReturn Measures of Ex-Post Portfolio Performance," Journal of Financial and Quantifalive Analysis, Dec. 1969, vol. IV, no. 4, p. 466.
systematic risk. ${ }^{10}$ New risk measurements must be made periodically, however, because the risk and return of an asset may change with the passage of time. ${ }^{11}$

## CAPITAL ASSET PRICING MODEL. (CAPM)

An old axiom states "there is no such thing as a free lunch." This means that you cannot expect to get something for nothing-a rule that certainly applies to investment returns. Investors who want to earn high average rates of return must take high risks and endure the associated loss of sleep, the possibility of ulcers, and the chance of bankruptcy. The question to which we now turn is: Should investors worry about total risk, undiversifiable risk, diversifiable risk, or all three?

In Chapter 1 it was suggested that investors should seek investments that have the maximum expected return in their risk class. Their happiness from investing is presumed to be derived as indicated in the expected utility $E(U)$ function below.

$$
E(U)=f[E(r), \sigma]
$$

The investment preferences of wealth-seeking risk-averse investors represented by the function above cause them to maximize their expected utility (or, equivalently, happiness) by (1) maximizing their expected return in any given risk class, $\partial E(U) / \partial E(r)>0$, or, conversely, (2) minimizing their total risk at any given rate of expected return, $\partial E(U) / \partial \sigma<0$. However, in selecting individual assets, investors will not be particularly concerned with the asset's total risk $\sigma$. Figure 9-1 showed that the unsystematic portion of total risk can be easily diversified by holding a portfolio of different securities. But, systematic risk affects all stocks in the market because it is undiversifiable. Portfolio theory therefore suggests that only the undiversifiable (or systematic) risk is worth avoiding. ${ }^{12}$
${ }^{10}$ Statements about the relative degree of total risk are made in the context of a longrun horizon-that is, over at least one complete business cycle. Obviously, an accurate short-run forecast which says that some particular company will go bankrupt next quarter makes it more risky than IBM, although IBM may have had more historical variability of return.
${ }^{11}$ Empirical studies documenting the intertemporal instability of betas have been published. Marshall Blume, "Betas and Their Regression Tendencies," Journal of Finance, June 1975, pp. 785-795. See also J. C. Francis, "Statistical Analysis of Risk Coefficients for NYSE Stocks," Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis, Dec. 1979, vol. XIV, no. 5, pp. 981-997. An appendix at the end of this chapter reviews some evidence about shifting betas, standard deviations, and correlations.
${ }^{12}$ Both the systematic and unsystematic portions of total risk must be considered by undiversified investors. Entrepreneurs who have their entire net worth invested in one business, for example, can be bankrupted by a piece of bad luck that could be easily averaged away to zero in a diversified portfolio. Poorly diversified investors should not treat diversifiable risk lightly. Only well-diversified investors can afford to ignore diversifiable risk.

## The Potomac Edison Company

Summary of Cost of Equity Models Applied to Proxy Group of Fifty Non-Price Regulated Companies Comparable in Total Risk to the Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Utilities

| Principal Methods |  | Proxy Group of Fifty Non-Price Regulated Companies |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Discounted Cash Flow Model (DCF) (1) |  | 11.72 \% |
| Risk Premium Model (RPM) (2) |  | 13.40 |
| Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) (3) |  | 12.59 |
|  | Mean | 12.57 \% |
|  | Median | 12.59 \% |
| Average of M | Median | 12.58 \% |

Notes:
(1) From page 2 of this Schedule.
(2) From page 3 of this Schedule.
(3) From page 6 of this Schedule.

|  | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [6] | [7] | [8] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proxy Group of Fifty Non-Price Regulated Companies | Average Dividend Yield | Value Line Projected Five Year Growth in EPS | Zack's Five Year Projected Growth Rate in EPS | Yahoo! Finance Projected Five Year Growth in EPS | Average Projected Five Year Growth Rate in EPS | Adjusted Dividend Yield | Indicated <br> Common Equity Cost Rate (1) |
| Agilent Technologies | 0.63 \% | 12.00 \% | 10.00 \% | 11.97 \% | 11.32 \% | 0.67 \% | 11.99 \% |
| Abbott Labs. | 1.97 | 7.00 | 5.10 | 8.30 | 6.80 | 2.04 | 8.84 |
| Analog Devices | 1.94 | 11.50 | 12.30 | 14.87 | 12.89 | 2.07 | 14.96 |
| Assurant Inc. | 2.12 | 15.50 | 12.70 | 17.40 | 15.20 | 2.28 | 17.48 |
| Smith (A.O.) | 2.14 | 11.50 | 9.00 | 8.00 | 9.50 | 2.24 | 11.74 |
| Air Products \& Chem. | 2.28 | 11.00 | 12.20 | 10.65 | 11.28 | 2.41 | 13.69 |
| Ball Corp. | 1.54 | 21.50 | 5.00 | 4.51 | 10.34 | 1.62 | 11.96 |
| Brown-Forman 'B' | 1.21 | 14.50 | NA | 8.62 | 11.56 | 1.28 | 12.84 |
| Bristol-Myers Squibb | 3.02 | NA | 5.60 | 4.14 | 4.87 | 3.09 | 7.96 |
| Broadridge Fin'l | 2.05 | 9.50 | NA | 11.80 | 10.65 | 2.16 | 12.81 |
| Brady Corp. | 2.00 | 12.50 | 7.00 | 7.00 | 8.83 | 2.09 | 10.92 |
| CACI Int'l | - | 7.00 | 6.70 | 2.40 | 5.37 | - | NA |
| Chemed Corp. | 0.31 | 7.00 | 6.90 | 6.95 | 6.95 | 0.32 | 7.27 |
| Cooper Cos. | 0.02 | 12.00 | 11.00 | 10.00 | 11.00 | 0.02 | 11.02 |
| CSW Industrials | 0.57 | 11.50 | NA | 12.00 | 11.75 | 0.60 | 12.35 |
| Quest Diagnostics | 1.83 | 4.00 | NA | (15.60) | 4.00 | 1.87 | 5.87 |
| Dolby Labs. | 1.57 | 9.50 | 16.00 | 16.00 | 13.83 | 1.68 | 15.51 |
| Lauder (Estee) | 1.18 | 14.00 | 9.60 | 5.03 | 9.54 | 1.24 | 10.78 |
| Exponent, Inc. | 0.98 | 10.50 | NA | 15.00 | 12.75 | 1.04 | 13.79 |
| FactSet Research | 0.84 | 10.50 | 10.00 | 11.90 | 10.80 | 0.89 | 11.69 |
| Gentex Corp. | 1.79 | 10.00 | 16.60 | 15.80 | 14.13 | 1.92 | 16.05 |
| Ingredion Inc. | 3.06 | 8.00 | NA | 9.90 | 8.95 | 3.20 | 12.15 |
| Hunt (J.B.) | 0.91 | 11.00 | 15.00 | 14.98 | 13.66 | 0.97 | 14.63 |
| J\&J Snack Foods | 1.88 | 9.00 | NA | 73.10 | 9.00 | 1.96 | 10.96 |
| Henry (Jack) \& Assoc | 1.06 | 8.00 | 9.00 | 9.00 | 8.67 | 1.11 | 9.78 |
| L3Harris Technologie | 1.98 | 17.50 | 2.70 | 41.80 | 10.10 | 2.08 | 12.18 |
| McCormick \& Co. | 1.93 | 5.00 | 5.30 | 5.10 | 5.13 | 1.98 | 7.11 |
| Altria Group | 8.27 | 5.50 | 4.00 | 4.16 | 4.55 | 8.46 | 13.01 |
| MSA Safety | 1.40 | 7.00 | NA | 18.00 | 12.50 | 1.49 | 13.99 |
| MSCI Inc. | 1.07 | 14.50 | NA | 12.53 | 13.52 | 1.14 | 14.66 |
| Motorola Solutions | 1.40 | 10.50 | 9.00 | 11.18 | 10.23 | 1.47 | 11.70 |
| Mettler-Toledo Int'l | - | 13.50 | 12.20 | 12.20 | 12.63 | - | NA |
| Northrop Grumman | 1.32 | 6.50 | 3.30 | 3.00 | 4.27 | 1.35 | 5.62 |
| Old Dominion Freight | 0.42 | 10.50 | 14.10 | 14.54 | 13.05 | 0.45 | 13.50 |
| Packaging Corp. | 3.98 | 11.00 | 5.00 | (5.16) | 8.00 | 4.14 | 12.14 |
| Post Holdings | - | 5.00 | NA | 32.40 | 5.00 | - | NA |
| RLI Corp. | 0.83 | 12.00 | NA | 9.80 | 10.90 | 0.88 | 11.78 |
| Rollins, Inc. | 1.33 | 10.50 | NA | 8.20 | 9.35 | 1.39 | 10.74 |
| Service Corp. Int'l | 1.61 | 2.00 | 12.00 | 12.00 | 8.67 | 1.68 | 10.35 |
| Sherwin-Williams | 1.03 | 11.50 | 12.80 | 11.46 | 11.92 | 1.09 | 13.01 |
| Selective Ins. Group | 1.31 | 9.50 | 6.60 | 13.40 | 9.83 | 1.37 | 11.20 |
| Sirius XM Holdings | 1.57 | 32.50 | 7.00 | 3.54 | 5.27 | 1.61 | 6.88 |
| Sensient Techn. | 2.29 | 2.50 | NA | 3.80 | 3.15 | 2.33 | 5.48 |
| Thermo Fisher Sci. | 0.23 | 10.50 | 12.50 | 3.51 | 8.84 | 0.24 | 9.08 |
| Texas Instruments | 2.97 | 7.50 | 9.30 | 10.00 | 8.93 | 3.10 | 12.03 |
| U-Haul Holding | - | 11.50 | NA | 15.00 | 13.25 | - | NA |
| UniFirst Corp. | 0.68 | 10.50 | NA | 10.00 | 10.25 | 0.71 | 10.96 |
| VeriSign Inc. | - | 11.00 | NA | 8.00 | 9.50 | - | NA |
| Waters Corp. | - | 6.00 | 7.20 | 8.34 | 7.18 | - | NA |
| Watsco, Inc. | 3.35 | 11.50 | NA | 15.00 | 13.25 | 3.57 | 16.82 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Mean | 11.57 \% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Median | 11.87 \% |
|  |  |  |  |  | Average of M | and Median | 11.72 \% |

(1) The application of the DCF model to the domestic, non-price regluated comparable risk companies is identical to the application of the DCF to the utility proxy group. The dividend yield is derived by using the 60 day average price and the spot indicated dividend as of December 30,2022 . The dividend yield is then adjusted by $1 / 2$ the average projected growth rate in EPS, which is calculated by averaging the 5 year projected growth in EPS provided by Value Line, Bloomberg, www.zacks.com, and www.yahoo.com (excluding any negative growth rates) and then adding that growth rate to the adjusted dividend yield.

The Potomac Edison Company
Indicated Common Equity Cost Rate
Through Use of a Risk Premium Model
Using an Adjusted Total Market Approach

| Line No. |  | Proxy Group of Fifty Non-Price Regulated Companies |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Prospective Yield on Baa2 Rated Corporate Bonds (1) | 6.05 \% |
| 2. | Adjustment to Reflect Proxy Group Bond Rating (2) | (0.17) |
| 3. | Adjusted Bond Yield Applicable to the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group | 5.88 \% |
| 4. | Equity Risk Premium (3) | 7.52 |
| 5. | Risk Premium Derived Common Equity Cost Rate | 13.40 \% |

Notes: (1) Average forecast of Baa2 corporate bonds based upon the consensus of nearly 50 economists reported in Blue Chip Financial Forecasts dated January 1, 2023 and December 2, 2022 (see pages 10 and 11 of Schedule DWD-3). The estimates are detailed below.

| First Quarter 2023 | $6.10 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- |
| Second Quarter 2023 | 6.30 |
| Third Quarter 2023 | 6.20 |
| Fourth Quarter 2023 | 6.10 |
| First Quarter 2024 | 5.90 |
| Second Quarter 2024 | 5.80 |
| 2024-2028 | 6.00 |
| 2029-2033 | 6.00 |
| Average |  |

(2) To reflect the Baa1 average rating of the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group, the prosepctive yield on Baa2 corporate bonds must be adjusted downward by $1 / 3$ of the spread between A2 and Baa2 corporate bond yields as shown below:

|  | A2 Corp. Bond <br> Yield |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dec-2022 | 5.10 | Baa2 Corp. <br> Bond Yield | Spread |  |

(3) From page 5 of this Schedule.

The Potomac Edison Company
Comparison of Long-Term Issuer Ratings for the
Proxy Group of Fifty Non-Price Regulated Companies of Comparable risk to the Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Utilities

| Moody's | Standard \& Poor's |
| :---: | :---: |
| Long-Term Issuer Rating | Long-Term Issuer Rating |
| December 2022 | December 2022 |


| Proxy Group of Fifty Non-Price Regulated Companies | Long-Term Issuer Rating | Numerical <br> Weighting (1) | Long-Term Issuer Rating | Numerical <br> Weighting (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agilent Technologies | Baa2 | 9.0 | BBB+ | 8.0 |
| Abbott Labs. | A1 | 5.0 | AA- | 4.0 |
| Analog Devices | A3 | 7.0 | A- | 7.0 |
| Assurant Inc. | Baa2 | 9.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| Smith (A.O.) | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Air Products \& Chem. | A2 | 6.0 | A | 6.0 |
| Ball Corp. | Ba1 | 11.0 | BB+ | 11.0 |
| Brown-Forman 'B' | A1 | 5.0 | A- | 7.0 |
| Bristol-Myers Squibb | A2 | 6.0 | A+ | 5.0 |
| Broadridge Fin'l | Baa1 | 8.0 | BBB+ | 8.0 |
| Brady Corp. | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| CACI Int'l | NA | -- | BB+ | 11.0 |
| Chemed Corp. | WR | -- | NR | -- |
| Cooper Cos. | WR | -- | NR | -- |
| CSW Industrials | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Quest Diagnostics | Baa2 | 9.0 | BBB+ | 8.0 |
| Dolby Labs. | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Lauder (Estee) | A1 | 5.0 | A+ | 5.0 |
| Exponent, Inc. | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| FactSet Research | Baa3 | 10.0 | NA | -- |
| Gentex Corp. | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Ingredion Inc. | Baa1 | 8.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| Hunt (J.B.) | Baa1 | 8.0 | BBB+ | 8.0 |
| J\&J Snack Foods | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Henry (Jack) \& Assoc | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| L3Harris Technologie | Baa2 | 9.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| McCormick \& Co. | Baa2 | 9.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| Altria Group | A3 | 7.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| MSA Safety | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| MSCI Inc. | Ba1 | 11.0 | BB+ | 11.0 |
| Motorola Solutions | Baa3 | 10.0 | BBB- | 10.0 |
| Mettler-Toledo Int'l | WR | -- | NR | -- |
| Northrop Grumman | Baa1 | 8.0 | BBB+ | 8.0 |
| Old Dominion Freight | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Packaging Corp. | Baa2 | 9.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| Post Holdings | B2 | 15.0 | B+ | 14.0 |
| RLI Corp. | Baa2 | 9.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| Rollins, Inc. | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Service Corp. Int'l | Ba3 | 13.0 | BB+ | 11.0 |
| Sherwin-Williams | Baa2 | 9.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| Selective Ins. Group | Baa2 | 9.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| Sirius XM Holdings | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Sensient Techn. | WR | -- | NR | -- |
| Thermo Fisher Sci. | A3 | 7.0 | A- | 7.0 |
| Texas Instruments | Aa3 | 4.0 | A+ | 5.0 |
| U-Haul Holding | WR | -- | NR | -- |
| UniFirst Corp. | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| VeriSign Inc. | Baa3 | 10.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| Waters Corp. | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Watsco, Inc. | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Average | Baa1 | 8.4 | BBB+ | 8.4 |

Notes:
(1) From page 6 of Schedule DWD-3.

Source of Information:
Bloomberg Professional Services

## The Potomac Edison Company

Derivation of Equity Risk Premium Based on the Total Market Approach Using the Beta for
Proxy Group of Fifty Non-Price Regulated Companies of Comparable risk to the Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Utilities

| Line No. | Equity Risk Premium Measure | Proxy Group of Fifty Non-Price Regulated Companies |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Kroll Equity Risk Premium (1) | 6.13 \% |
| 2. | Regression on Kroll Risk Premium Data (2) | 7.26 |
| 3. | Kroll Equity Risk Premium based on PRPM (3) | 9.76 |
| 4. | Equity Risk Premium Based on Value Line Summary and Index (4) | 11.53 |
| 5 | Equity Risk Premium Based on Value Line S\&P 500 Companies (5) | 10.62 |
| 6. | Equity Risk Premium Based on Bloomberg S\&P 500 Companies (6) | 6.01 |
| 7. | Conclusion of Equity Risk Premium | 8.55 \% |
| 8. | Adjusted Beta (7) | 0.88 |
| 9. | Forecasted Equity Risk Premium | 7.52 \% |

Notes:
(1) From note 1 of page 9 of Schedule DWD-3.
(2) From note 2 of page 9 of Schedule DWD-3.
(3) From note 3 of page 9 of Schedule DWD-3.
(4) From note 4 of page 9 of Schedule DWD-3.
(5) From note 5 of page 9 of Schedule DWD-3.
(6) From note 6 of page 9 of Schedule DWD-3.
(7) Average of mean and median beta from page 6 of this Schedule.

Sources of Information:
Stocks, Bonds, Bills, and Inflation - 2022 SBBI Yearbook, Kroll, Inc.
Value Line Summary and Index
Blue Chip Financial Forecasts, January 1, 2023 and December 2, 2022
Bloomberg Professional Services

The Potomac Edison Company
Traditional CAPM and ECAPM Results for the Proxy Group of Non-Price-Regulated Companies Comparable in Total Risk to the
Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Utilities

|  | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] | [6] | [7] | [8] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proxy Group of Fifty Non-Price Regulated Companies | Value Line <br> Adjusted Beta | Bloomberg <br> Beta | Average Beta | Market Risk <br> Premium (1) | Risk-Free Rate <br> (2) | Traditional CAPM Cost Rate | ECAPM Cost Rate | Indicated Common Equity Cost Rate (3) |
| Agilent Technologies | 0.85 | 0.77 | 0.81 | 9.75 \% | 3.91 \% | 11.81 \% | 12.27 \% | 12.04 \% |
| Abbott Labs. | 0.90 | 0.81 | 0.86 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.29 | 12.64 | 12.47 |
| Analog Devices | 1.00 | 0.87 | 0.94 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 13.07 | 13.22 | 13.15 |
| Assurant Inc. | 0.90 | 0.85 | 0.88 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.49 | 12.78 | 12.64 |
| Smith (A.O.) | 0.90 | 0.76 | 0.83 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.00 | 12.42 | 12.21 |
| Air Products \& Chem. | 0.90 | 0.79 | 0.85 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.20 | 12.56 | 12.38 |
| Ball Corp. | 1.05 | 0.91 | 0.98 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 13.46 | 13.51 | 13.49 |
| Brown-Forman ' $\mathrm{B}^{\prime}$ | 0.85 | 0.80 | 0.83 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.00 | 12.42 | 12.21 |
| Bristol-Myers Squibb | 0.80 | 0.76 | 0.78 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 11.51 | 12.05 | 11.78 |
| Broadridge Fin'l | 0.90 | 0.70 | 0.80 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 11.71 | 12.20 | 11.95 |
| Brady Corp. | 0.95 | 0.93 | 0.94 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 13.07 | 13.22 | 13.15 |
| CACI Int'l | 0.90 | 0.84 | 0.87 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.39 | 12.71 | 12.55 |
| Chemed Corp. | 0.80 | 0.70 | 0.75 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 11.22 | 11.83 | 11.53 |
| Cooper Cos. | 0.95 | 0.90 | 0.93 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.98 | 13.15 | 13.06 |
| CSWIndustrials | 0.85 | 0.80 | 0.83 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.00 | 12.42 | 12.21 |
| Quest Diagnostics | 0.80 | 0.69 | 0.75 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 11.22 | 11.83 | 11.53 |
| Dolby Labs. | 0.95 | 0.88 | 0.92 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.88 | 13.07 | 12.98 |
| Lauder (Estee) | 1.05 | 0.92 | 0.99 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 13.56 | 13.59 | 13.57 |
| Exponent, Inc. | 0.90 | 0.80 | 0.85 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.20 | 12.56 | 12.38 |
| FactSet Research | 1.00 | 0.93 | 0.97 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 13.37 | 13.44 | 13.40 |
| Gentex Corp. | 0.95 | 0.90 | 0.93 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.98 | 13.15 | 13.06 |
| Ingredion Inc. | 0.90 | 0.85 | 0.88 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.49 | 12.78 | 12.64 |
| Hunt (J.B.) | 0.95 | 0.90 | 0.93 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.98 | 13.15 | 13.06 |
| J\&JSnack Foods | 0.90 | 0.87 | 0.89 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.59 | 12.86 | 12.72 |
| Henry (Jack) \& Assoc | 0.85 | 0.70 | 0.78 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 11.51 | 12.05 | 11.78 |
| L3Harris Technologie | 0.90 | 0.92 | 0.91 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.78 | 13.00 | 12.89 |
| McCormick \& Co. | 0.75 | 0.66 | 0.71 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 10.83 | 11.54 | 11.19 |
| Altria Group | 0.90 | 0.88 | 0.89 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.59 | 12.86 | 12.72 |
| MSA Safety | 1.00 | 0.92 | 0.96 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 13.27 | 13.37 | 13.32 |
| MSCI Inc. | 1.05 | 0.85 | 0.95 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 13.17 | 13.29 | 13.23 |
| Motorola Solutions | 0.90 | 0.79 | 0.85 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.20 | 12.56 | 12.38 |
| Mettler-Toledo Int'l | 0.95 | 0.89 | 0.92 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.88 | 13.07 | 12.98 |
| Northrop Grumman | 0.80 | 0.74 | 0.77 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 11.42 | 11.98 | 11.70 |
| Old Dominion Freight | 0.95 | 0.85 | 0.90 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.68 | 12.93 | 12.81 |
| Packaging Corp. | 0.95 | 0.90 | 0.93 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.98 | 13.15 | 13.06 |
| Post Holdings | NMF | 0.86 | 0.86 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.29 | 12.64 | 12.47 |
| RLI Corp. | 0.80 | 0.66 | 0.73 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 11.03 | 11.69 | 11.36 |
| Rollins, Inc. | 0.85 | 0.72 | 0.79 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 11.61 | 12.12 | 11.87 |
| Service Corp. Int'l | 0.95 | 0.89 | 0.92 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.88 | 13.07 | 12.98 |
| Sherwin-Williams | 0.95 | 0.84 | 0.90 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.68 | 12.93 | 12.81 |
| Selective Ins. Group | 0.85 | 0.81 | 0.83 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.00 | 12.42 | 12.21 |
| Sirius XM Holdings | 0.90 | 0.86 | 0.88 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.49 | 12.78 | 12.64 |
| Sensient Techn. | 0.95 | 0.82 | 0.89 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.59 | 12.86 | 12.72 |
| Thermo Fisher Sci. | 0.85 | 0.70 | 0.78 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 11.51 | 12.05 | 11.78 |
| Texas Instruments | 0.90 | 0.75 | 0.83 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.00 | 12.42 | 12.21 |
| U-Haul Holding | 0.95 | 0.92 | 0.94 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 13.07 | 13.22 | 13.15 |
| UniFirst Corp. | 0.95 | 0.91 | 0.93 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.98 | 13.15 | 13.06 |
| VeriSign Inc. | 0.95 | 0.78 | 0.87 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.39 | 12.71 | 12.55 |
| Waters Corp. | 0.95 | 0.87 | 0.91 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 12.78 | 13.00 | 12.89 |
| Watsco, Inc. | 0.85 | 0.75 | 0.80 | 9.75 | 3.91 | 11.71 | 12.20 | 11.95 |
| Mean |  |  | 0.87 |  |  | 12.38 \% | 12.70 \% | 12.54 \% |
| Median |  |  | 0.88 |  |  | 12.49 \% | 12.78 \% | 12.64 \% |
| Average of Mean and Median |  |  | 0.88 |  |  | 12.44 \% | 12.74 \% | 12.59 \% |

NMF $=$ Not Meaningful Figure

Notes:
(1) From Schedule DWD-4, note 1.
(2) From Schedule DWD-4, note 2.
(3) Average of CAPM and ECAPM cost rates.
[4]

| Spread from |
| :---: |
| Applicable Size |
| Premium (4) |
|  |
| $0.78 \%$ |
| $[D]$ |
| Size Premium |
| (Return in |
| Excess of |
| CAPM)* |

$$
\begin{array}{r}
-0.22 \% \\
0.43 \% \\
0.55 \% \\
0.54 \% \\
0.89 \% \\
1.18 \% \\
1.34 \% \\
1.21 \% \\
2.10 \% \\
4.80 \%
\end{array}
$$

[^90]The Potomac Edison Company
Market Capitalization of The Potomac Edison Company and
the Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Utilities

Source of Information: 2021 Annual Forms 10K
Bloomberg Financial Services

The Potomac Edison Company
Derivation of the Flotation Cost Adjustment to the Cost of Common Equity
\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Equity Issuances since } 2003 \\
& \begin{array}{ll}
\text { [Column 5] } \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text { Issuance } \\
\text { Expense }
\end{array} \\
\hline & \$ \\
\hline
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{c}
\text { [Column 16] } \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text { Flotation Cost } \\
\text { Adjustment } \\
\text { (11) }
\end{array} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \% \text {. } 3.85 \% \quad 9.24 \%{ }^{9.43} \% \text { 0.19 } \%
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{c}
\text { Date of Offering } \\
\hline 9 / 11 / 2003 \\
12 / 13 / 2021
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

## The Potomac Edison Company <br> Derivation of Credit Adjusted Risk Free Rate

Observed Spreads

|  | 30 Year T-Bond | Baa Utility Bond | Spread |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dec-2022 | 3.66 \% | 5.56 \% | 1.90 | \% |
| Nov-2022 | 4.00 | 6.05 | 2.05 |  |
| Oct-2022 | 4.04 | 6.18 | 2.14 |  |
| Average | 3.90 \% | 5.93 \% | 2.03 | \% |
| 3 month average 30 Year/Baa Bond Spread |  |  | 3.90 | \% |
|  |  |  | 2.03 |  |
| Credit Adjusted Risk-Free Rate |  |  | 5.93 | \% |

Sources of Information:
Bloomberg Professional Services

# BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION <br> OF MARYLAND 

| In the Matter of the Verified Petition of | $*$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| the Potomac Edison Company for | $*$ |  |
| Review and Approval of Increases in and | $*$ |  |
| Other Adjustments to Its Rates and | $*$ | Case No. |
| Charges for Electric Service, and for | $*$ |  |
| Approval of Other Proposed Tariff | $*$ |  |
| Revisions in Connection Therewith | $*$ |  |
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## I. INTRODUCTION

## Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is Timothy S. Lyons. My business address is 3 Speen Street, Suite 150, Framingham, Massachusetts 01701.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR CURRENT POSITION.

A. I am a Partner at ScottMadden, Inc. ("ScottMadden").
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR WORK EXPERIENCE.
A. I have more than 30 years of experience in the energy industry. I started my career in 1985 at Boston Gas Company, eventually becoming Director of Rates and Revenue Analysis. In 1993, I moved to Providence Gas Company, eventually becoming Vice President of Marketing and Regulatory Affairs. Starting in 2001, I held several management consulting positions in the energy industry, first at KEMA and then at Quantec, LLC. In 2005, I became Vice President of Sales and Marketing at Vermont Gas Systems, Inc. before joining Sussex Economic Advisors, LLC ("Sussex") in 2013. Sussex was acquired by ScottMadden in 2016.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND.

A. I hold a bachelor's degree from St. Anselm College, a master's degree in Economics from The Pennsylvania State University, and a master's degree in Business Administration from Babson College.

## Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY SPONSORED TESTIMONY BEFORE THE MARYLAND PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION ("COMMISSION")?

A. Yes. A summary of my testimony experience is included in Exhibit TSL-1.

## Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to sponsor the results of the lead-lag study conducted on behalf of The Potomac Edison Company ("PE" or the "Company"), a subsidiary of FirstEnergy Corp. ("FirstEnergy"). The lead-lag study is submitted as part of the Company's March 2023 distribution base rate filing with the Commission. The lead-lag study was used to determine the Company's Cash Working Capital ("CWC") requirement, which is included in the Company's rate base.
Q. ARE YOU SPONSORING EXHIBITS IN CONNECTION WITH YOUR TESTIMONY?
A. Yes. I am sponsoring the following exhibits that were prepared by me or under my direction:

- Exhibit TSL-1 - Qualifications
- Exhibit TSL-2 - Summary of the Cash Working Capital Requirement
- Exhibit TSL-3 - Workpapers supporting the Lead-Lag Study


## II. OVERVIEW OF TESTIMONY

## Q. PLEASE DEFINE THE TERM "WORKING CAPITAL" AS A RATE BASE COMPONENT.

A. The term "working capital" refers to the net funds required by the Company to finance goods and services used to provide service to customers from the time those goods and services are paid for by the Company to the time that payment is received from customers. Goods and services considered in the lead-lag study include: operations and maintenance ("O\&M") expenses, including labor and non-labor expenses; federal, state, and local taxes; and employment taxes.

## Q. HOW WAS THE COMPANY'S CASH WORKING CAPITAL REQUIREMENT DETERMINED?

A. The Company's cash working capital requirement was determined by applying the results of the lead-lag study to the Company's adjusted test year expenses. The lead-lag study compares differences between the Company's revenue lag and expense leads.

The revenue lag represents the number of days from the time customers receive their electric service to the time customers pay for their electric service, i.e., when the funds are available to the Company. The longer the revenue lag, the more cash the Company needs to finance its day-to-day operations.

The expense lead represents the number of days from the time the Company receives goods and services used to provide electric service to the time payments are made for those goods and services, i.e., when the funds are no longer available to the Company.

The longer the expense lead, the less cash the Company needs to fund its day-to-day operations.

Together, the revenue lag and expense leads are used to measure the lead-lag days. The lead-lag days are then applied to the Company's adjusted test year expenses to derive the CWC requirement, which is included in the Company's rate base.

## III. LEAD-LAG STUDY APPROACH

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE DATA USED IN THE LEAD-LAG STUDY.

A. The lead-lag study was based on data from the period January 1, 2021 through December 31, 2021 (the "study period"). The data included: customer meter reading and billing schedules; O\&M expenses; and federal, state, local, and employment taxes. The data generally included service periods, payment dates, and payment amounts.

## 1. REVENUE LAG

## Q. HOW WAS THE REVENUE LAG DETERMINED?

A. The revenue lag was based on the number of days from the time electric service was provided to customers to the time payment was received from customers. There are two categories of revenues that comprise the revenue lag: (1) retail electric revenues, and (2) other revenues.

Retail electric revenues represent the largest revenue category, consisting of revenues related to retail electric service for residential, commercial, public streetlights, and industrial customers. The revenue lag for retail electric service was measured as the sum of three components: (1) the service lag; (2) the billing lag; and (3) the collection lag.

## Q. WHAT IS THE SERVICE LAG?

A. The service lag measures the average number of days in the service period, i.e., the time between the start and end of the billing month. The service lag in this lead-lag study was based on the midpoint of the service period, which reflects that electricity is delivered evenly over the service period.

## Q. WHAT IS THE BILLING LAG?

A. The billing lag measures the number of days from the time meters are read to the time bills are calculated and recorded. The billing lag in this lead-lag study was based on the Company's meter reading schedule.

## Q. WHAT IS THE COLLECTION LAG?

A. The collection lag measures the number of days from the time bills are calculated and recorded to the time customer payments are received (i.e., funds are available to the Company). The collection lag in this lead-lag study was based on monthly accounts receivable balances and billed revenue data. Specifically, the collection lag was determined by dividing the average accounts receivable balance during the study period by the average billed revenues per day during the same period.

## Q. HOW WAS THE REVENUE LAG FOR OTHER OPERATING REVENUES DETERMINED?

A. The revenue lag for other operating revenues was determined by first identifying the revenue lag for each of the four categories of other revenues; second converting the revenue lags to "dollar-days" that reflect a weighting of the categories by revenues; and finally
summing the dollar days across all other operating revenues. The four categories of other revenues were: (1) late payment charges revenues, (2) miscellaneous service revenues, (3) telephone/cable pole rentals, and (4) other electric revenues.

## Q. WHAT IS THE TOTAL REVENUE LAG USED IN THE LEAD-LAG STUDY?

A. The total revenue lag used in the lead-lag study is based on a weighted average of the revenue lags for retail electricity revenues and other operating revenues. The derivation of the revenue lag is shown in Exhibit TSL-3 at page 1.

## 2. EXPENSE LEADS

## a. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE DEVELOPMENT OF LEAD DAYS FOR O\&M EXPENSES.

A. Lead days for O\&M expenses were measured separately for the following expense categories: (1) energy purchases; (2) regular payroll; (3) incentive compensation; (4) employee benefits; (5) pension and other post-employment benefits ("OPEB"); (6) Commission annual assessment; (7) service company; (8) uncollectible; and (9) other O\&M expenses.

## Q. HOW WERE LEAD DAYS DETERMINED FOR ENERGY PURCHASES?

A. Lead days for energy purchases were based on a review of the Company's invoices. Lead days were measured as the number of days from the midpoint of the service period to the payment date.

## Q. HOW WERE LEAD DAYS DETERMINED FOR PAYROLL EXPENSES?

A. Lead days for payroll expenses were based on the Company's payroll process, which pays employees on a weekly and bi-weekly basis. Lead days were measured for each payroll period as the number of days from the midpoint of the weekly and bi-weekly payroll period, individually, to the weekly and bi-weekly payment date, converted to "dollar-days" to reflect a weighting of the expense amounts, and then summed across all regular payroll expenses.
Q. DID THE STUDY SEPARATELY DETERMINE LEAD DAYS FOR INCENTIVE COMPENSATION EXPENSES?
A. Yes. Lead days for the Company's incentive compensation expenses were measured separately as the number of days from the midpoint of the performance period (i.e., when the incentive compensation was earned) to the payment date.
Q. HOW WERE LEAD DAYS DETERMINED FOR EMPLOYEE BENEFIT EXPENSES?
A. Lead days for employee benefit expenses were based on a review of the Company's payments for individual benefit items, including medical, dental, and 401(k) plans. Lead days were measured for each benefit item as the number of days from the midpoint of the benefit period to the payment date, converted to "dollar-days" to reflect a weighting of the expense amounts, and then summed across all benefit expenses.
Q. HOW WERE LEAD DAYS DETERMINED FOR PENSION PLAN AND OPEB PAYMENTS?
$\qquad$
A. Lead days for pension plan and OPEB payments were zero to reflect that services are provided to the pension plan at the time payment is made.

## Q. HOW WERE LEAD DAYS DETERMINED FOR THE COMMISSION ANNUAL ASSESSMENT FEES?

A. Lead days for the Commission annual assessment fees were measured as the number of days from the midpoint of the assessment period to the payment date.
Q. HOW WERE LEAD DAYS DETERMINED FOR FIRSTENERGY SERVICE COMPANY (AFFILIATE) EXPENSES?
A. Lead days for the FirstEnergy Service Company (Affiliate) ("FESC") expenses were based on the number of days from the midpoint of the service period to the financial settlement (payment) date via the money pool. The FESC service period is based on the calendar month. Intercompany charges are recorded during the month and are billed by FESC and settled by the various FirstEnergy companies on the first business day following the conclusion of the service period. Lead days for FESC expenses were measured as the number of days from midpoint of the service period to the financial settlement via the money pool, which is on the first business day following the conclusion of the service period.

## Q. HOW WERE LEAD DAYS DETERMINED FOR UNCOLLECTIBLE EXPENSES?

A. Lead days for uncollectible expenses were based on the Company's approach to create a reserve account for uncollectible expenses prior to the actual write-off and are zero since it is a non-cash item, consistent with the Company's most recently approved lead-lag study.

## Q. HOW WERE LEAD DAYS DETERMINED FOR OTHER O\&M EXPENSES?

A. Lead days for other O\&M expenses were based on the sum of two components: (1) lead days from the midpoint of the service period to the invoice date; and (2) lead days from the invoice date to the payment date.

Lead days from the midpoint of the service period to the invoice date were based on a stratified sample of invoices paid by the Company over the period January 1, 2021, through December 31, 2021. Lead days were measured for each invoice in the sample as the number of days from the midpoint of the service period to the invoice date. Invoices were then converted to "dollar days" to reflect a weighting by expense amount and then summed by invoice amounts to determine the lead days. The study relied on a sample of invoices to measure the lead days because the service periods were not readily available electronically and required detailed inspection of individual invoices.

Lead days from the invoice date to the payment date were based on the full population of invoices paid by the Company over the period January 1, 2021, through December 31, 2021. Lead days were measured for each invoice as the number of days from the invoice date to the payment date. Invoices were then converted to "dollar days" to reflect a weighting by expense amount and then summed by invoice amounts to determine the lead days.

## b. CURRENT INCOME TAX EXPENSE

$\qquad$

## Q. HOW WERE LEAD DAYS DETERMINED FOR FEDERAL INCOME TAXES?

A. Lead days for federal income taxes were based on due dates for tax payments: April 15, June 15, September 15, and December 15. Lead days for federal income taxes were measured as the number of days from the midpoint of the taxing period (i.e., the calendar year) to the due dates. The study assumes the tax payments reflect equal installments.

## Q. HOW WERE LEAD DAYS DETERMINED FOR STATE INCOME TAXES?

A. Lead days for state income taxes were based on due dates for tax payments: April 15, May 15, and June 15. Lead days for state income taxes were measured as the number of days from the midpoint of the taxing period (i.e., the calendar year) to the due dates. The study assumes the tax payments reflect equal installments.

## c. TAXES OTHER THAN INCOME TAXES

Q. HOW WERE LEAD DAYS DETERMINED FOR TAXES OTHER THAN INCOME TAXES?
A. Lead days for Taxes Other Than Income Taxes were measured separately for the following categories: (1) payroll-related taxes (Federal Insurance Contributions Act ("FICA"), federal unemployment, and state unemployment); (2) property taxes; (3) gross receipt taxes; (5) kilowatt-hour ("kWh") taxes; and (7) sales and use taxes.

## Q. HOW WERE LEAD DAYS DETERMINED FOR EACH OF THESE TAXES?

A. Lead days for FICA taxes were measured as the number of days from the payroll payment date of the applicable pay period to the FICA payment date plus the payroll lead days.
$\qquad$

Lead days for federal and state unemployment taxes were measured as 30 days after the end of each quarter. These taxes were then converted to "dollar days" to reflect a weighting by expense amount and then summed by payment amounts to determine the lead days.

Lead days for property taxes were measured as the number of days from the midpoint of the taxing period to the payment date. These taxes were then converted to "dollar days" to reflect a weighting by expense amount and then summed by payment amounts to determine the lead days.

Lead days for gross receipts, kWh , and sales and use taxes were measured as the number of days from the midpoint of the taxing period to the payment date. These taxes were then converted to "dollar days" to reflect a weighting by expense amount and then summed by payment amounts to determine the lead days.

## d. INTEREST EXPENSES

## Q. DID YOU CALCULATE LEAD DAYS FOR INTEREST PAYMENTS?

A. Yes. Lead days for interest payments related to long-term debt were measured as the number of days from the midpoint of the service period to the payment date for the study period. These interest payments were then converted to "dollar days" to reflect a weighting by expense amount and then summed by payment amounts to determine the lead days.

Lead days for interest on customer deposits were measured as the midpoint of the service period of one year for Residential customers and of the service period of two years for Non-Residential customers.

## IV. CONCLUSION

## Q. WHAT WERE THE RESULTS OF THE LEAD-LAG STUDY?

A. The results of the lead-lag study are included in Exhibit TSL-2.
Q. ARE THE RESULTS OF THIS LEAD-LAG STUDY REASONABLE?
A. Yes, the study provides an accurate assessment of the Company's actual cash working capital requirements. The resulting cash working capital requirement should be included in the Company's rate base.
Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?
A. Yes, it does.

## Summary of Qualifications

Tim Lyons is a partner with ScottMadden with more than 30 years of experience in the energy industry. Tim has held senior positions at several gas utilities and energy consulting firms. His experience includes rates and regulatory support, sales and marketing, customer service and strategy development. Prior to joining ScottMadden, Tim served as Vice President of Sales and Marketing for Vermont Gas. He has also served as Vice President of Marketing and Regulatory Affairs for Providence Gas Company, Director of Rates at Boston Gas Company, and Project Director at Quantec, LLC, an energy consulting firm.

Tim has sponsored testimony and evidence before 23 state regulatory commissions and 2 Canadian regulatory boards. Tim holds a B.A. from St. Anselm College, an M.A. in Economics from The Pennsylvania State University, and an M.B.A. from Babson College.

## Areas of Specialization

- Regulation and Rates
- Retail Energy
- Utilities
- Natural Gas


## Capabilities

- Regulatory Strategy and Rate Case Support
- Strategic and Business Planning
- Capital Project Planning
- Process Improvements


## Articles and Speeches

- "Country Strong: Vermont Gas shares its comprehensive effort to expand natural gas service into rural communities." American Gas Association, June 2011 (with Don Gilbert).

■ "Talking Safety With Vermont Gas." American Gas Association, February 2009 (with Dave Attig).
■ "Consumers Say ‘Act Now’ To Stabilize Prices." Power \& Gas Marketing, September/ October 2001 (with Jim DeMetro and Gerry Yurkevicz).
■ "Rate Reclassification: Who Buys What and When." Public Utilities Fortnightly, October 15, 1991 (with John Martin).

# The Potomac Edison Company <br> Case No. <br> $\qquad$ 

Exhibit TSL-1-Qualifications

| Sponsor | Date | Docket No. | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regulatory Commission of Alaska |  |  |  |
| Cook Inlet Natural Gas Storage Alaska, LLC | 7/21 | Docket No. U-21-058 | Sponsored testimony supporting the lead-lag study/cash working capital requirement for a general rate case proceeding. |
| ENSTAR Natural Gas Company | 06/16 | Docket No. U-16-066 | Adopted and sponsored testimony supporting a lead-lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Arizona Corporation Commission |  |  |  |
| Southwest Gas Corporation | 12/21 | Docket No. G-01551A-21-0368 | Sponsored testimony supporting class cost of service, rate design and bill impact analysis for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Arkansas Public Service Commission |  |  |  |
| Liberty Utilities (The Empire District Electric Company) | 2/23 | Docket No. 22-085-U | Sponsored testimony supporting the class cost of service, rate design, bill impact studies, and revenue decoupling for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Liberty Utilities (Pine Bluff Water) | 10/18 | Docket No. 18-027-U | Sponsored testimony supporting the cost of service, rate design and bill impact studies for a general rate case proceeding. |
| California Public Utilities Commission |  |  |  |
| Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc. | 10/22 | Application No. 22-08-010 | Sponsored testimony supporting marginal cost study, rate design and bill impact analysis for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Liberty Utilities (CalPeco Electric) | 5/21 | Application No. 21-05-017 | Sponsored testimony supporting the lead-lag study/cash working capital, marginal cost study, rate design and bill impact analysis for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Southwest Gas Corporation <br> (Southern California, <br> Northern California, <br> and  <br> South Lake <br> jurisdictions)  <br> $l$  | 8/19 | Application No. 19-08-015 | Sponsored testimony on behalf of three separate rate jurisdictions supporting revenue requirements, lead-lag/ cash working capital, and class cost of service, rate design and bill impact analysis for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Connecticut Public Utilifies Regulatory Authority |  |  |  |
| Yankee Gas Company | 07/14 | Docket No. 13-06-02 | Sponsored report and testimony supporting the review and evaluation of gas expansion policies, procedures and analysis. |
| Illinois Commerce Commission |  |  |  |
| Ameren Illinois Company d/b/a Ameren Illinois | 1/23 | Docket No. 22-0487 | Sponsored testimony supporting a Multi-Year Integrated Grid Plan (Grid Plan). Prepared research and analysis evaluating the reasonableness of the Grid Plan through comparison to how other electric utilities have responded to the changing energy landscape. |
| Liberty Utilities (Midstates Natural Gas) | 07/16 | Docket No. 16-0401 | Sponsored testimony supporting the cost of service, rate design and bill impact studies for a general rate case proceeding. The testimony includes proposal for new commercial classes and a decoupling mechanism. |
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Exhibit TSL-1 - Qualifications

| Sponsor | Date | Docket No. | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Liberty Utilities (Midstates Natural Gas) | 07/16 | Docket No. RPU-2016-0003 | Sponsored testimony supporting the cost of service, rate design and bill impact studies for a general rate case proceeding. The testimony includes proposal for new commercial classes. |
| Kansas Corporation Commission |  |  |  |
| The Empire District Electric Company | 12/18 | Docket No. 19-EPDE-223-RTS | Sponsored testimony supporting cost of service, rate design, bill impact and lead-lag studies for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Kentucky Public Service Commission |  |  |  |
|  Bluegrass Water <br> (Central Utility  <br> Company)  Water <br>    <br>    | 02/23 | Case No. 2022-00432 | Sponsored testimony supporting the rate design and bill impact studies for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Maine Public Utilities Commission |  |  |  |
| Maine Water Company | 03/21 | Docket No. 2021-00053 | Sponsored testimony supporting a proposed rate smoothing mechanism. |
| Northern Utilities, Inc. d/b/a Unitil | 06/19 | Docket No. 2019-00092 | Sponsored testimony supporting a proposed capital investment cost recovery mechanism. |
| Northern Utilities, Inc. d/b/a Unitil | 06/15 | Docket No. 2015-00146 | Sponsored testimony supporting the proposed gas expansion program, including a zone area surcharge. |
| Maryland Public Service Commission |  |  |  |
| Sandpiper Energy, a <br> Chesapeake <br> company Utilities | 12/15 | Case No. 9410 | Sponsored testimony supporting the cost of service, rate design and bill impact studies for a general rate case proceeding. The testimony includes proposal for new residential and commercial classes. |
| Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities |  |  |  |
| Berkshire Gas Company, Eversource Energy, Liberty Utilities, National Grid, and Unitil | 03/22 | Docket No. DPU 20-80 | Sponsored report that summarizes research, findings, and recommendations for regulatory mechanisms, methodologies, and policies that support Massachusetts's achievement of its net zero climate goal by 2050. The regulatory designs were informed by the results of quantitative and qualitative analysis of decarbonization pathways to achieve the Commonwealth's climate goals. |
| Liberty Utilities (New England Gas Company) | 08/20 | Docket No. DPU 20-92 | Sponsored the Long-Range Forecast and Supply Plan filing for the five-year forecast period 2020/2021 through 2024/2025. |
| Eversource Energy, National Grid, and Unitil | 02/20 | Docket No. DPU 19-55 | Sponsored report that summarizes research and evaluation of funding approaches for infrastructure modifications that interconnect Distributed Generation (DG) projects. |
| Liberty Utilities (New England Gas Company) | 07/18 | Docket No. DPU 18-68 | Sponsored the Long-Range Forecast and Supply Plan filing for the five-year forecast period 2018/2019 through 2022/2023. |
| Liberty Utilities (New England Gas Company) | 07/16 | Docket No. DPU 16-109 | Sponsored the Long-Range Forecast and Supply Plan filing for the five-year forecast period 2016/2017 through 2020/2021. |

# The Potomac Edison Company <br> Case No. <br> $\qquad$ 

Exhibit TSL-1 - Qualifications

| Sponsor | Date | Docket No. | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boston Gas | 10/93 | Docket No. DPU 92-230 | Sponsored testimony describing the Company's position regarding rate treatment of vehicular natural gas investments and expenses. |
| Boston Gas | 03/90 | Docket No. DPU 90-55 | Sponsored testimony supporting the weather and other cost of service adjustments, rate design and customer bill impact studies for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Boston Gas | 03/88 | Docket No. DPU 88-67-II | Sponsored testimony supporting the rate reclassification of commercial and industrial customers for a rate design proceeding. |
| Michigan Public Service Commission |  |  |  |
| Lansing Board of Water \& Light and Michigan State University | 04/20 | Docket No. U-20650 | Sponsored testimony evaluating Consumer Energy's cost of service and rate design proposals. |
| Lansing Board of Water \& Light and Michigan State University | 04/19 | Docket No. U-20322 | Sponsored testimony evaluating Consumer Energy's cost of service and rate design proposals. |
| Midland Cogeneration Ventures, LLC | 09/18 | Docket No. U-18010 | Sponsored testimony evaluating Consumer Energy's cost of service and rate design proposals. |
| Minnesota Public Utilities Commission |  |  |  |
| Northern States Power Company (XcelEnergy) | 10/21 | Docket No. E002/GR-21-630 | Sponsored testimony supporting a Return on Equity (ROE)adjustment mechanism that would allow the Company to symmetrically adjust its ROE to reflect significant changesin financial market conditions. |
| Missouri Public Service Commission |  |  |  |
| Confluence Rivers Utility Operating Company | 12/22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Case No. WR-2023-0006/ SR-2023- } \\ & 0007 \end{aligned}$ | Sponsored testimony supporting the rate design and bill impact studies for a general rate case proceeding. |
| The Empire District Gas Company | 08/21 | Docket No. GR-2021-0320 | Sponsored testimony supporting the cost of service, rate design, bill impact and lead-lag studies for a general rate case proceeding. |
| The Empire District Electric Company | 05/21 | Docket No. ER-2021-0312 | Sponsored testimony supporting the cost of service, rate design, bill impact and lead-lag studies for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Spire Missouri, Inc. | 12/20 | Docket No. GR-2021-0108 | Sponsored testimony supporting class cost of service, rate design, and lead-lag study proposals for a general rate case proceeding. The testimony also included support for a proposed revenue adjustment mechanism. |
| The Empire District Electric Company | 08/19 | Docket No. ER-2019-0374 | Sponsored testimony supporting the cost of service, rate design, bill impact and lead-lag studies for a general rate case proceeding. The testimony also included proposals for a weather normalization mechanism. |
| Liberty Utilities (Midstates Natural Gas) | 09/17 | Docket No. GR-2018-0013 | Sponsored testimony supporting the cost of service, rate design, bill impact and lead-lag studies for a general rate case proceeding. The testimony also included proposals for a revenue decoupling/ weather normalization |

## The Potomac Edison Company <br> Case No.

Exhibit TSL-1-Qualifications

| Sponsor | Date | Docket No. | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | mechanism as well as tracker accounts for certain O\&M expenses and capital costs. |
| Missouri Gas Energy | 04/17 | Docket No. GR-2017-0216 | Sponsored testimony supporting the cost of service, rate design, bill impact and Lead/Lag studies for a general rate case proceeding. The testimony included support for a decoupling mechanism. |
| Laclede Gas Company | 04/17 | Docket No. GR-2017-0215 | Sponsored testimony supporting the cost of service, rate design, bill impact and Lead/Lag studies for a general rate case proceeding. The testimony included support for a decoupling mechanism. |
| Nevada Public Utilitites Commission |  |  |  |
| Southwest Gas Corporation | 09/21 | Docket No. 21-09001 | Sponsored testimony supporting the class cost of service, rate design, bill impact and Lead/Lag studies for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Southwest Gas Corporation | 02/20 | Docket No. 20-02023 | Sponsored testimony supporting the class cost of service, rate design, bill impact and Lead/Lag studies for a general rate case proceeding. |
| New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission |  |  |  |
| Unitil (Northern Utilities, Inc.) | 8/21 | Docket No. DG 21-104 | Sponsored testimony supporting a revenue decoupling mechanism. |
| Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. | 4/21 | Docket No. DE 21-030 | Sponsored testimony supporting a revenue decoupling mechanism. |
| Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp. d/b/a Liberty Utilities | 11/17 | Docket No. DG 17-198 | Sponsored testimony supporting a levelized cost analysis for approval of firm supply and transportation agreements. |
| Liberty Utilities d/b/a Granite State Electric Company | 04/16 | Docket No. DE 16-383 | Adopted testimony and sponsored Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| New Jersey Board of Public Utilities |  |  |  |
| South Jersey Gas Company | 04/22 | Docket No. GR22040253 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Elizabethtown Gas Company | 12/21 | Docket No. GR21121254 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| South Jersey Gas Company | 03/20 | Docket No. GR20030243 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Elizabethtown Gas Company | 04/19 | Docket No. GR19040486 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Pivotal Utility Holdings, Inc. d/b/a Elizabethtown Gas Company | 08/16 | Docket No. GR16090826 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |

# The Potomac Edison Company <br> Case No. 

Exhibit TSL-1-Qualifications

| Sponsor | Date | Docket No. | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Corporation Commission of Oklahoma |  |  |  |
| The Empire District Electric Company | 02/21 | Cause No. PUD 202100163 | Sponsored testimony supporting the cost of service, rate design, bill impact and Lead/Lag studies for a general rate case proceeding. The proposed rate design included a three-year phase-in of the proposed rate increase. |
| The Empire District Electric Company | 03/19 | Cause No. PUD 201800133 | Sponsored testimony supporting the cost of service, rate design, bill impact and Lead/Lag studies for a general rate case proceeding. |
| The Empire District Electric Company | 04/17 | Cause No. PUD 201600468 | Adopted direct testimony and sponsored rebuttal testimony supporting the revenue requirements for a general rate case proceeding. The testimony included proposals for alternative ratemaking mechanisms. |
| Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission |  |  |  |
| Providence Gas Company | $\begin{aligned} & 08 / 01 \\ & 09 / 00 \\ & 08 / 96 \end{aligned}$ | Docket No. 1673 | Sponsored testimony supporting the changes in cost of gas adjustment factor related to projected under-recovery of gas costs; Filed testimony and witness for pilot hedging program to mitigate price risks to customers; Filed testimony and witness for changes in cost of gas adjustment factor related to extension of rate plan. |
| Providence Gas Company | 08/00 | Docket No. 2581 | Sponsored testimony supporting the extension of a rate plan that began in 1997 and included certain modifications, including a weather normalization clause. |
| Providence Gas Company | 03/00 | Docket No. 3100 | Sponsored testimony supporting the de-tariff and deregulation of appliance repair service, enabling the Company to have needed pricing flexibility. |
| Providence Gas Company | 06/97 | Docket No. 2581 | Sponsored testimony supporting a rate plan that fixed all billing rates for three-year period; included funding for critical infrastructure investments in accelerated replacement of mains and services, digitized records system, and economic development projects. |
| Providence Gas Company | 04/97 | Docket No. 2552 | Sponsored testimony supporting the rate design, customer bill impact studies and retail access tariffs for commercial and industrial customers, including redesign of cost of gas adjustment clause, for a rate design proceeding. |
| Providence Gas Company | 02/96 | Docket No. 2374 | Sponsored testimony supporting the rate design, customer bill impact studies and retail access tariffs for largest commercial and industrial customers for a rate design proceeding. |
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Exhibit TSL-1-Qualifications

| Sponsor | Date | Docket No. | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Providence Gas Company | 01/96 | Docket No. 2076 | Sponsored testimony supporting the rate reclassification of customers into new rate classes, rate design (including introduction of demand charges), and customer bill impact studies for a rate design proceeding. |
| Providence Gas Company | 11/92 | Docket No. 2025 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Integrated Resource Plan filing, including a performancebased incentive mechanism. |
| Railroad Commission of Texas |  |  |  |
| Texas Gas Service Company - West Texas, North Texas, and Borger/ Skellytown Service Areas | 06/22 | Case No. 00009896 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Texas Gas Service Company <br> - Central Texas and Gulf Coast Service Areas | 12/19 | GUD No. 10928 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
|    <br> CenterPoint Energy - <br> Beaumont/ East Texas <br> Division   | 11/19 | GUD No. 10920 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Texas Gas Service Company - Borger/ Skellytown Service Area | 08/18 | GUD No. 10766 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Texas Gas Service Company <br> - North Texas Service Area | 06/18 | GUD No. 10739 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| CenterPoint Energy - South Texas Division | 11/17 | GUD No. 10669 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Texas Gas Service Company - Rio Grande Valley Service Area | 06/17 | GUD No. 10656 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Atmos Pipeline - Texas | 01/17 | GUD No. 10580 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| CenterPoint Energy - Texas Gulf Division | 11/16 | GUD No. 10567 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Public Utility Commission of Texas |  |  |  |
| CenterPoint Energy Houston Electric, LLC | 04/19 | Docket No. 49421 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Vermont Public Utilities Commission |  |  |  |
| Vermont Gas Systems | 12/12 | Docket No. 7970 | Sponsored testimony describing the market served by $\$ 90$ million natural gas expansion project to Addison County, VT. Also described the terms and economic benefits of a special contract with International Paper. |
| Vermont Gas Systems | 02/11 | Docket No. 7712 | Sponsored testimony supporting the market evaluation and analysis for a system expansion and reliability regulatory fund. |
| Virginia State Corporation Commission |  |  |  |
| Rappahannock Electric Cooperative | 10/22 | Case No. PUR-2022-00160 | Sponsored report and studies related to revenue requirements, class cost of service, rate design, and bill impact analysis for a streamlined application to increase base rates. |
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Exhibit TSL-1 - Qualifications
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|}\hline \text { Sponsor } & \text { Date } & \text { Docket No. } & \text { Subject } \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { American Electric Power - } \\ \text { Appalachian Power Company }\end{array} & 3 / 20 & \text { Case No. PUR-2020-00015 } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Sponsored testimony Supporting the Lead/Lag } \\ \text { study for the 2020 triennial review of base } \\ \text { rates, terms, and conditions. }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Nova Scotia Utility and Review Board } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Sponsored evidence supporting the cash } \\ \text { working capital requirement and lead/Lag study } \\ \text { for a general rate case proceeding. }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Nova Scotia Power } & 01 / 22 & \text { Matter No. M10431 } \\ \hline \text { Ontario Energy Board } & \text { Ontario Energy Association } & 01 / 21 & \text { Docket No. EB-2020-0133 }\end{array} \begin{array}{l}\text { Sponsored evidence regarding policies and } \\ \text { ratemaking treatment related to COVID-19 } \\ \text { costs in U.S. and Canadian regulatory } \\ \text { jurisdictions. The evidence was used to } \\ \text { support Ontario Energy Association's response } \\ \text { to Staff's proposals }\end{array}\right]$

| Line | Description | Maryland Distribution Expenses |  | Average Daily Expenses |  | Revenue Lag | Ref. | Expense Lead | Ref. | (Lead)/Lag Days |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (1) | (2) |  | (3) |  | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |  |  |
| 1 | Operations and Maintenance Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Energy Purchases | \$ | - | \$ | - | 40.56 | A | (22.33) | B | 18.22 | \$ | - |
| 3 | Payroll |  | - |  | - | 40.56 | A | (29.72) | C | 10.84 |  | - |
| 4 | Benefits |  | - |  | - | 40.56 | A | (36.90) | C | 3.66 |  | - |
| 5 | Pension and OPEB |  | - |  | - | 40.56 | A | 0.00 | C | 40.56 |  | - |
| 6 | Annual PSC Assessment |  | - |  | - | 40.56 | A | 34.02 | C | 74.58 |  | - |
| 7 | Service Company |  | - |  | - | 40.56 | A | (16.80) | C | 23.76 |  | - |
| 8 | Uncollectibles |  | - |  | - | 40.56 | A | 0.00 | C | 40.56 |  | - |
| 9 | Other O\&M Expenses |  | - |  | - | 40.56 | A | (27.79) | C | 12.77 |  | - |
| 10 | Total O\&M Expenses | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
| 11 | Income Taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Federal Income Taxes | \$ | - | \$ | - | 40.56 | A | (37.00) | D | 3.56 | \$ | - |
| 13 | State Income Taxes |  | - |  | - | 40.56 | A | (37.00) | D | 3.56 |  | - |
| 14 | Total Income Taxes | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
| 15 | Taxes Other Than Income Taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | Payroll Taxes | \$ | - | \$ | - | 40.56 | A | (31.46) | E | 9.10 | \$ | - |
| 17 | Property Taxes |  | - |  | - | 40.56 | A | 56.74 | E | 97.29 |  | - |
| 18 | Gross Receipts Taxes |  | - |  | - | 40.56 | A | (54.00) | E | (13.44) |  | - |
| 19 | KWH Taxes |  | - |  | - | 40.56 | A | (37.86) | E | 2.70 |  | - |
| 20 | Sales and Use Tax |  | - |  | - | 40.56 | A | (27.90) | E | 12.65 |  | - |
| 21 | Total Taxes Other Than Income Taxes | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
| 22 | Interest Expense |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 | Interest on Long-Term Debt | \$ | - | \$ | - | 40.56 | A | (92.82) | F | (52.27) | \$ | - |
| 24 | Interest on Customer Deposits |  | - |  | - | 40.56 | A | (240.52) | F | (199.96) |  | - |
| 25 | Total Interest Expense | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |
| 26 | Cash Working Capital Requirement | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | - |


| Line | Description |  | Maryland <br> Distribution | (Lead)/Lag Days | Reference | Dollar Days |
| :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Retail Electric Revenues | $\$$ | $500,062,082$ | 40.81 | WP A-1 | $\$ 20,406,283,396$ |
| 2 | Other Revenues | $3,530,510$ | 4.98 | WP A-4 | $17,595,436$ |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Exhibit TSL-3 - Workpapers Supporting the Lead-Lag Study

## The Potomac Edison Company - Maryland <br> 2021 Lead-Lag Study Energy Purchases

|  |  | (Lead)/Lag |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Line | Description | Payments | Days | Dollar Days | Reference |  |
| 1 | Energy Purchases | $\$$ | $348,863,804$ | $(22.33)$ | $\$(7,790,754,368)$ | Workpaper (B) - Energy Purchases |
| 2 | Total | $\$$ | $348,863,804$ | $(22.33)$ | $\$(7,790,754,368)$ |  |

# The Potomac Edison Company - Maryland 2021 Lead-Lag Study O\&M Expenses Summary 

| Line | Description | (Lead)/Lag <br> Days | Reference |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Payroll | $(29.72)$ | WP C-1 |
| 2 | Benefits | $(36.90)$ | WP C-3 |
| 3 | Pension and OPEB | - |  |
| 4 | Annual PSC Assessment | 34.02 | WP C-4 |
| 5 | Service Company | $(16.80)$ | WP C-5 |
| 6 | Uncollectibles | - |  |
| 7 | Other O\&M Expenses | $(27.79)$ | WP C-6 |

# The Potomac Edison Company - Maryland 2021 Lead-Lag Study Income Taxes 

Line
Description
(Lead)/Lag Days
1 Income Taxes
2 Federal Income Taxes
3 State Income Taxes (37.00)

## The Potomac Edison Company - Maryland <br> 2021 Lead-Lag Study <br> Taxes Other Than Income Taxes

| Line | Description | Expense |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { (Lead)/Lag } \\ \text { Days } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Reference | Dollar Days |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Payroll Taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | FICA | \$ | 4,281,473 | (31.49) | E-1 | \$ | $(134,826,360)$ |
| 3 | Federal Unemployment |  | 23,854 | (30.00) | E-2 |  | $(715,580)$ |
| 4 | State Unemployment |  | 78,085 | (30.00) | E-3 |  | $(2,342,201)$ |
| 5 | Payroll Taxes | \$ | 4,383,412 | (31.46) |  | \$ | $(137,884,140)$ |
| 6 | Property Taxes |  |  | 56.74 | E-4 |  |  |
| 7 | Gross Receipts Taxes |  |  | (54.00) | E-5 |  |  |
| 8 | KWH Taxes |  |  | (37.86) | E-6 |  |  |
| 9 | Sales and Use Tax |  |  | (27.90) | E-7 |  |  |

# The Potomac Edison Company - Maryland <br> 2021 Lead-Lag Study <br> Interest Expense 

| Line | Description | (Lead)/Lag <br> Days | Ref. |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Long-Term Debt | (92.82) | $\mathrm{H}-1$ |
| 2 | Interest on Customer Deposits | $(240.52)$ | $\mathrm{H}-2$ |
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## I. INTRODUCTION

Q. Please state your name and business address.
A. My name is Timothy S. Lyons. My business address is 3 Speen Street, Suite 150, Framingham, Massachusetts 01701.
Q. Please describe your current position.
A. I am a Partner at ScottMadden, Inc. ("ScottMadden").
Q. Please describe your work experience.
A. I have more than 30 years of experience in the energy industry. I started my career in 1985 at Boston Gas Company, eventually becoming Director of Rates and Revenue Analysis. In 1993, I moved to Providence Gas Company, eventually becoming Vice President of Marketing and Regulatory Affairs. Starting in 2001, I held several management consulting positions in the energy industry, first at KEMA and then at Quantec, LLC. In 2005, I became Vice President of Sales and Marketing at Vermont Gas Systems, Inc. before joining Sussex Economic Advisors, LLC ("Sussex") in 2013. Sussex was acquired by ScottMadden in 2016.

## Q. Please describe your educational background.

A. I hold a bachelor's degree from St. Anselm College, a master's degree in Economics from The Pennsylvania State University, and a master's degree in Business Administration from Babson College.
Q. Have you previously sponsored testimony before the Maryland Public Service Commission ("Commission")?
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A. Yes. A summary of my testimony experience is included in Exhibit TSL-1.
Q. What is the purpose of your Direct Testimony?
A. The purpose of my Direct Testimony is to sponsor the proposed electric distribution rates in Maryland on behalf of The Potomac Edison Company ("PE" or the "Company"), a subsidiary of FirstEnergy Corp. ("FirstEnergy"). My Direct Testimony includes: (a) a description of the current rate classes; (b) development of the Class Cost of Service ("CCOS") study; and (c) development of the proposed revenue targets, rate design, and bill impact analyses for each rate class. The CCOS study was used as a guide to develop the proposed electric distribution rates.

The Direct Testimony also describes development of two CCOS studies.

- The first CCOS study was prepared generally consistent with methodologies used in the Company's most recent base rate case filing ("Case No. 9490"), except as noted below including modifications based on the Commission's order in Case No. 9490, the Company's most recent base rate case filing. The first CCOS study classifies distribution plant (Accounts 364 through 368) as customer and demand, as explained below.
- The second CCOS study ("Alternative CCOS study") is identical to the first CCOS study except the second CCOS study classifies distribution plant (Accounts 364 through 368) as demand.


## Q. Are you sponsoring exhibits in connection with your testimony?
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A. Yes. I am sponsoring the following exhibits that were prepared by me or under my direction:

- Exhibit TSL-1 - Qualifications
- Exhibit TSL-2 - Summary of CCOS study
- Exhibit TSL-3 - Summary of rate design and bill impact analysis
- Exhibit TSL-4 - Summary of Alternative CCOS study
- Exhibit TSL-5 - 2019-2021 Demands


## II. OVERVIEW

Q. Please summarize your Direct Testimony.
A. The results of the Company's CCOS study show differences in class rates of return ("ROR") at current base rates for each rate class as compared to the system or overall ROR, as shown in Figure 1 (below).
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Figure 1: CCOS Study Results


The Figure compares class RORs to the system or overall ROR at current base rates.
The Figure shows the Residential (Schedule "R") rate class produces an ROR below the system ROR. The Figure also shows the General and Commercial Service (Schedules "C" and "G", collectively "C\&G"), ${ }^{1}$ General Service - All Electric (Schedule "C-A", including the church and school heating ("CSH") subset), Power Service (Schedule "PH"), ${ }^{2}$ Large Power Service ("Schedule "PP"), and Street and Area Outdoor Lighting (Schedules "EMU", "MU", "EM", "LED", "OL", "AL", and "MSL", collectively "STLTNG") rate
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classes produce RORs above the system ROR. The Company's CCOS study was prepared generally consistent with methodologies used in the Company's most recent base rate case filing in Case No. 9490, except as noted below including modifications related to the Commission's order in Case No. 9490.

The results of the CCOS study support a movement toward a more equitable rate structure where class RORs move closer to the system ROR. However, the proposed movement to the system ROR was subject to certain limitations to address customer bill impact considerations.

The proposed distribution base rates reflect three important rate design principles: (a) rates should recover the overall cost of providing service; (b) rates should be fair, minimizing inter- and intra-class inequities to the extent possible; and (c) rate changes should be tempered by rate continuity concerns.

The proposed rate design generally reflects a uniform increase in kilowatt-hour ("kWh") usage charges and kilowatt ("kW") demand charges following increases in the customer charges.

The Company prepared a bill impact analysis to evaluate the impact of the proposed base rate changes. The bill impact analysis evaluated a wide range of customer usage. The bill impact analysis was prepared in two ways:

1. Proposed base rates compared to current base rates; and
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2. Proposed total bill that includes proposed base rates plus other charges compared to current base rates plus other charges. ${ }^{3}$

Overall, the proposed base rates will increase a monthly bill for a Residential customer using $1,000 \mathrm{kWh}$ per month by $\$ 9.18$ per month, or 9.3 percent prior to the proposed rate increment for new low-income residential assistance programs as discussed by Company witness Valdes and presented in the tariff exhibits presented by Company witness Fall. Inclusive of the proposed 32 cent rate increment, the proposed base rates will increase a monthly bill for a Residential customer using $1,000 \mathrm{kWh}$ per month by $\$ 9.50$ per month, or 9.7 percent.

## Q. Did the Company's CCOS study address the Commission's directives from the prior

 base rate case in Case No. 9490?A. Yes. The Company's CCOS study addressed the Commission's directives from the Company's prior base rate case in Case No. 9490, as summarized in Figure 2 (below).

Figure 2: The Company's Response to Commission Directives

## Commission Directive ${ }^{4}$

Update to the CCOS Study
"Specifically, the Commission directs that, in conjunction with its next base rate case, Potomac Edison file updated studies utilized in both the JCOSS and the CCOSS, such that all updated studies are current to within one year of

The Company has updated supporting studies in the CCOS study to be based on data within one year of the test year.

[^92]$\qquad$

## Commission Directive ${ }^{4}$

## Update to the CCOS Study

the test year in the Company's next base rate case."
"Moreover, if Potomac Edison files a zero intercept study in its next rate case, the Company is directed to also submit a COSS without a zero intercept study, to enable consideration of the appropriateness of using such a study to allocate costs for Potomac Edison's service territory."
"The Company is also required to provide a COSS in its next base rate case that includes a labor allocator to better reflect the functionalization of general and intangible plant and to be more consistent with cost causation."
"The Company is also directed in its next rate case to submit testimony supporting or rejecting the use of the ACP methodology to allocate costs related to subtransmission and FERC Accounts 362 and 368 capacitors based on current system conditions and cost causation."
"Finally, Potomac Edison is required in its next rate case to provide three years of demand at transmission, subtransmission, primary, and secondary levels, as well as their resulting allocators that are used in the COSS."

The Company's CCOS study includes a labor allocator to reflect functionalization of general and intangible plant.

The Company's testimony describes rationale for the ACP methodology.

The Company has included 2019-2021 coincident peak demands as Exhibit TSL-5.
Q. Please describe the Company's service classifications.
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A. The Company provides electric service to approximately 285,000 residential, commercial and industrial ("C\&I"), and lighting customers, as shown in Figure 3 (below).

Figure 3: Test Year Customers and Sales

| Rate Class | Number of <br> Customers | $\%$ of <br> Customers | Sales <br> kWh | $\%$ of <br> Sales | kWh usage <br> per Customer |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential (R) | 250,592 | $88.04 \%$ | $3,349,359,320$ | $49.16 \%$ | 13,366 |
| General and Commercial (C \& G) | 31,204 | $10.96 \%$ | $905,501,412$ | $13.29 \%$ | 29,018 |
| General Service - All Electric (C-A) | 327 | $0.11 \%$ | $23,294,131$ | $0.34 \%$ | 71,269 |
| Power Service (PH) | 1,682 | $0.59 \%$ | $1,802,181,245$ | $26.45 \%$ | $1,071,717$ |
| Large Power Service (PP) | 10 | $0.00 \%$ | $709,402,478$ | $10.41 \%$ | $70,353,965$ |
| Lighting (STLTNG) | 809 | $0.28 \%$ | $23,391,160$ | $0.34 \%$ | 28,920 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 284,623 | $100.00 \%$ | $6,813,129,746$ | $100.00 \%$ | 23,937 |

The Figure shows that during 2022 the Company served, on average, 250,592 Residential ("R") customers ( 88.0 percent), 31,204 General and Commercial Service ("C\&G") customers (11.0 percent), 327 General Service - All Electric ("C-A") customers (0.1 percent), 1,682 Power Service ("PH") customers ( 0.6 percent), 10 Large Power Service ("PP") customers, and 809 Lighting ("STLNG") customers ( 0.3 percent).

## Q. Please describe the characteristics of the service classifications

A. Figure 3 (above) provides a breakdown of test year customers and kWh sales by rate class. The test year is based on the period January 1, 2022 through December 31, 2022.

The Figure shows the Residential rate class represents a majority ( 88.0 percent) of the Company's customers. The Figure also shows variations in annual use per customer among the rate classes. Residential customers, for example, use on average $13,366 \mathrm{kWh}$ per year, while Large Power Service customers use on average $70,353,965 \mathrm{kWh}$ per year.
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Figure 4 (below) shows monthly kWh sales by rate class as a percentage of system peak month (February) sales for that rate class. The Figure shows sales vary seasonally for certain rate classes.

Figure 4: Monthly kWh Sales as \% of System Peak Month (February)


The Residential rate class, for example, shows a seasonal load pattern, with monthly sales increasing during the winter and summer months, reflecting heating and cooling use, respectively. The General Service and Power Service rate classes show a relatively consistent load pattern throughout the year, with slight increases during the summer months. The Lighting rate classes show a relatively consistent load pattern throughout the
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year. Load pattern differences, as discussed below, have implications on the allocation of costs in the CCOS study.
Q. Please describe the Company's current rate structure.
A. The Company's current rate structure consists of base rates and rider charges. ${ }^{5}$ The base rates include monthly customer charges, usage $(\mathrm{kWh})$ charges, and demand $(\mathrm{kW})$ charges.

## III. ALLOCATED COST OF SERVICE STUDY

Q. What is the purpose of a CCOS study?
A. The purpose of a CCOS study is to allocate a utility's overall cost of service to each rate class in a manner that reflects its underlying cost of service. This approach is well established in industry literature. ${ }^{6}$

## Q. What was the approach used to develop the CCOS study for this case?

A. The approach used to develop the CCOS study for this case was based on three steps. First, costs were functionalized or assigned into functional categories. Next, functionalized costs were classified into one of three cost drivers, based on whether the costs are related to: (1) serving peak demands, (2) serving energy demands, or (3) meeting customer service requirements. Finally, classified costs were allocated to each rate class based on methods that best reflect how the costs were incurred.
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The three steps were performed using two types of assignments: direct assignment and indirect assignment. Direct assignments utilized the Company's financial data and certain assignments of plant investments and expenses to certain functions, classifications, and rate classes. Indirect assignments utilized composite allocators based on direct and indirect assignments developed during the functionalization, classification, and allocation process. The three steps were utilized to prepare the two CCOS studies.

- The first CCOS study was prepared generally consistent with methodologies used in the Company's most recent base rate case filing ("Case No. 9490"), except as noted below including modifications related to the Commission's order in Case No. 9490, the Company's most recent base rate case filing. The first CCOS study classified distribution plant (Accounts 364 through 368) as customer and demand, as explained below.
- The second or Alternative CCOS study is identical to the first CCOS study except the Alternative CCOS study classified distribution plant accounts (Accounts 364 through 368) as demand.


## Q. What is functionalization?

A. Functionalization is the process of assigning rate base and expense items into operational components. The functionalization of costs in the CCOS study was based on the Company's accounting records, which are maintained in accordance with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("FERC") Uniform System of Accounts ("USOA").

## Q. What is classification?
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A. Classification is the process of assigning rate base and expense items into categories that reflect cost-causation. There are three principle causes or drivers of costs related to the electric system:

- Customer-related - costs that vary with the number of customers, such as costs associated with connecting customers to the electric system and providing basic customer services, such as metering and billing;
- Demand-related - costs that vary with maximum customer demands at the time of the system peak, at the time of the rate class peak, or at the time of the individual customer peak; and
- Energy-related - costs that vary with production, transmission, and/or delivery of energy, such as fuel and purchased power expenses. ${ }^{7}$


## Q. What is allocation?

A. Allocation is the process of assigning rate base and expense items to each rate class based on allocators that best reflect how the costs were incurred. In other words, cost allocation should follow how costs were incurred.

## Q. What types of allocators were used to develop the CCOS study?

A. There were three types of allocators used to develop the CCOS study:

1. Class determinants - class characteristics, such as number of customers, peak demands, kWh sales, and revenues by rate class;
[^94]The Potomac Edison Company
Case No. $\qquad$
Direct Testimony of Timothy S. Lyons
Page 13 of 34
2. Special studies - detailed analysis of specific plant or expense items, such as meters and services; and
3. Indirect - composite allocators based on how other costs were allocated.

## Q. What was the approach used to develop the CCOS study for this case?

A. The CCOS study was based on a spreadsheet model developed by ScottMadden for this filing. Rate base and expense items in the CCOS study were assigned to each rate class based on the three-step process described above. The results of the CCOS study are shown in Figure 1 (above).
Q. What conclusions can be reached when a rate class ROR is lower or higher than the system or overall ROR?
A. If a rate class produces a ROR that is lower than the system ROR, then the revenues recovered from the rate class are less than its cost of service. Conversely, if a rate class produces a ROR that is higher than the system ROR, then the revenues recovered from the rate class are more than its cost of service. As discussed below, the CCOS study results were used to establish revenue targets for each rate class, subject to bill continuity concerns, that move the Company's proposed rates in aggregate closer to the system ROR to achieve more fair and equitable rates across customer classes.

## Q. What data was used to prepare the CCOS study?

A. The CCOS study was based on test year data for the period January 1, 2022 through December 31, 2022. The CCOS study includes the number of customers, sales, and revenues by rate class. The CCOS study also includes rate base items, including intangible
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plant, sub-transmission, distribution, and general plant-in-service as well as (a) additions to rate base, such as working capital and (b) reductions to rate base, such as accumulated depreciation. The CCOS study also includes operations and maintenance ("O\&M") expenses, including distribution, customer service, customer account, sales, and administrative and general expenses as well as taxes other than income, such as payroll and property taxes, and income taxes.

## Q. What was the approach to functionalize costs in the CCOS study?

A. As discussed earlier, functionalization is an important first step in development of the CCOS study. The functionalization process in this study generally followed the USOA. However, distribution plant was further functionalized into primary and secondary distribution facilities to ensure that the cost of service at these functional levels was separately identified and applied.

The overall cost of service was functionalized into one of the following categories:

- Sub-transmission - plant investment and expenses associated with the Company's sub-transmission facilities. These include sub-transmission plant, accumulated depreciation, and depreciation expense.
- Primary Distribution - plant investment and expenses associated with the Company's primary voltage distribution facilities. These include primary distribution plant, accumulated depreciation, depreciation expense, and related O\&M expenses. Some costs that support both the primary and secondary distribution systems were functionalized into primary and secondary functions.
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Such costs include poles and towers, overhead conductors and devices, underground conduit, underground conductors and devices, and transformers.

- Secondary Distribution - plant investment and expenses associated with the Company's secondary voltage distribution facilities. These include secondary distribution plant, accumulated depreciation, depreciation expense, and related O\&M expenses. The secondary portion of poles and towers, overhead conductors and devices, underground conduit, underground conductors and devices, and transformers are also included in this function.
- Customer Service - plant investment and expenses associated with the Company's customer service facilities. These costs are largely related to customer service, customer accounts, and sales expenses.

The remaining rate base and cost of service accounts were assigned to one of the functional categories based on composite functionalization of the plant accounts. For example, general plant and labor-related administrative and general ("A\&G") expenses were assigned to the functional categories based on the composite functionalization of laborrelated sub-transmission, and distribution expenses.

In addition, the distribution $O \& M$ expenses were assigned to one of the functional categories based on functionalization of the relevant distribution plant accounts. For example, the overhead line $O \& M$ costs (Account 583) was functionalized based on overhead plant (Account 365). The approach to functionalize distribution O\&M expenses is a refinement to the Company's CCOS study filed in the most recent base rate case.
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## Q. What was the approach to classify costs in the CCOS study?

A. The CCOS study classified costs into one of the following three categories:

- Customer - costs associated with providing customer access to the electric system as well as providing on-going customer services, such as meter reading and billing services.
- Demand - costs associated with meeting customer peak demand requirements.
- Energy - costs associated with meeting customer energy requirements.
Q. What was the approach to classify sub-transmission plant?
A. Sub-transmission plant was classified as demand since the facilities are used to meet demand requirements.


## Q. What was the general approach to classify distribution plant?

A. Distribution plant represents the largest portion of the Company's investment in utility plant. Distribution plant was classified based on specific functions. For example, distribution plant related to facilities associated with distribution substations (Account 362) was classified based on demand since substations are generally designed based on peak demands of customers served from the substation.
Q. What was the approach to classify distribution plant related to overhead and underground lines (Accounts 364-368)?
A. Classification of distribution plant related to overhead and underground lines (Accounts 364-368) reflected two primary cost drivers. The first cost driver is the number of customers, i.e., distribution facilities are designed to provide customer access to the electric
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system. The second driver is peak demands, i.e., distribution facilities are designed to meet customer peak demands throughout the year. This approach to classification of distribution facilities is well-established and recognized by the National Association of Regulatory Commissioners ("NARUC"). Specifically, NARUC states,
"Distribution plant accounts 364 through 370 involve demand and customer costs. The customer component of distribution facilities is that portion of costs which varies with the number of customers. Thus, the number of poles, conductors, transformers, services and meters are directly related to the number of customers on the utility's system...each primary plant account can be separately classified into demand and customer components" ${ }^{8}$

The classification of distribution plant (Accounts 364-368) in this study is consistent with the approach described in the NARUC manual as well as the approach in Case No. 9490. Specifically, distribution plant (Accounts 364-368) is classified based on the zero- or minimum-intercept method.

## Q. What is the zero- or minimum-intercept method?

A. The zero- or minimum-intercept method represents the cost of connecting customers to the system with a hypothetical "zero size" facility. The method includes a regression analysis conducted to examine the relationship between the facility sizes and their average costs. The intercept of the regression equation represents the average cost of a hypothetical zero

[^95]$\qquad$
size facility. The "zero size" facility costs are classified as customer-related, while distribution plant in excess reflects the cost of serving customer peak demands and is classified as demand-related. The approach is described in the NARUC manual:

The minimum-intercept method seeks to identify that portion of plant related to a hypothetical no-load or zero-intercept situation.... The technique is related to installed cost to current carrying capacity or demand rating, creating a curve for various sizes of the equipment involved, using regression techniques, and extend the curve to a no-load intercept. The cost related to the zero-intercept is the customer component. ${ }^{9}$

## Q. How was the zero-intercept method used to classify distribution plant (Accounts 364-

 368)?A. The Company performed a regression of distribution plant (Accounts 364-368) facility sizes on their respective average costs. The intercept of the regression equation represents the average cost of a hypothetical zero size facility. The "zero size" facility costs are classified as customer, while the remaining costs are classified as demand. The method generally utilized current costs for each plant account or installed costs adjusted for current dollars utilizing the Handy-Whitman Index of Public Utility Construction Costs ("HandyWhitman").
Q. How was distribution plant (Accounts 364-368) classified based on the zero-intercept method?

[^96]The Potomac Edison Company
Case No.
Direct Testimony of Timothy S. Lyons
Page 19 of 34
A. Classification of distribution plant (Accounts 364-368) is summarized below.

- Poles, Towers, and Fixtures (Account 364). The Company's zero-intercept study resulted in 27.05 percent and 31.73 percent of primary and secondary costs, respectively, classified as customer with the remaining portion classified as demand.
- Overhead conductors and devices (Account 365). The Company's zero-intercept study resulted in 43.36 percent and 69.04 percent of primary and secondary costs, respectively, classified as customer with the remaining portion classified as demand.
- Underground Conduits (Account 366). The Company classified primary and secondary costs, respectively, as demand since the Company installs underground conduit for purposes of serving customer demands and not to connect customers to the electric grid.
- Underground Conductors and Devices (Account 367). The Company's zerointercept study resulted in 49.92 percent and 80.25 percent of primary and secondary costs, respectively, classified as customer with the remaining portion classified as demand.
- Line Transformers (Account 368). The Company's zero-intercept study resulted in 29.79 percent and 75.35 percent of primary and secondary costs, respectively, classified as customer with the remaining portion classified as demand.
- Services (Account 369). Service plant was classified as customer.
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- Meters (Account 370). Meter plant was classified as customer.


## Q. How were other plant items classified?

A. Other plant items were similarly classified based on their underlying cost drivers. Rate base items not directly associated with one of the classification categories, such as intangible plant, were classified through a composite classifier based on the classification of labor expenses.

## Q. Please discuss the classification of O\&M expenses.

A. Distribution O\&M expenses were classified in a manner similar to the respective plant items. For example, distribution O\&M expenses followed the classification of their respective plant accounts. Classification of overhead line O\&M costs (Account 583) was based on classification of overhead plant (Account 365). The classification of distribution O\&M expenses is a refinement to the Company's CCOS study filed in the most recent base rate case proceeding.

O\&M expense items not directly associated with one of the classification categories, such as non-labor related A\&G expenses, were classified through a composite classifier based on related costs.
Q. Please describe the allocation process used in developing the CCOS study.
A. Costs were allocated to each rate class based on how costs are incurred to serve that class. In other words, for each component of cost, the Company developed an allocator that best reflected how costs are incurred.
Q. Please describe the allocators used in developing the CCOS study.
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A. The CCOS study was based on three types of allocators:

- Class determinants - class characteristics, such as number of customers, peak demands, kWh sales, and revenues by rate class;
- Special studies - detailed analysis of specific plant or expense items, such as meters and uncollectible expenses; and
- Indirect - composite allocators based on how other costs are allocated.
Q. How was sub-transmission plant and FERC accounts 362 and 368 capacitors allocated?
A. Sub-transmission plant and FERC accounts 362 and 368 capacitors were allocated to each rate class consistent with their design objectives to meet peak demand requirements throughout the year. Specifically, sub-transmission and capacitors plant were allocated to each rate class based on the Average Coincident Peak ("ACP") method, which is derived as the average of twelve-monthly coincident peaks. The approach is consistent with the Company's prior approach, which has been accepted by the Commission. The ACP method is recognized by NARUC. ${ }^{10}$


## Q. How was distribution demand plant allocated?

A. Distribution demand plant was allocated to each rate class consistent with its design objectives to adequately serve local area loads since distribution circuits and transformers are designed to serve specific customers or groups of customers. Specifically, distribution demand plant was allocated to each rate class based on Non-Coincident Peak ("NCP")
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customer peak demands, which is derived as the maximum of twelve-monthly noncoincident peaks.

## Q. How was meter plant allocated?

A. Meter plant was allocated based on the results of a study that reflects the current cost of meters in each rate class. The meter study complies with the Commission's directive from the Company's prior base rate case in Case No. 9490, as described in Figure 2 (above). The allocator reflects the Company's estimated cost of meter and meter installation for each rate class.
Q. Please describe the process to develop the composite allocators.
A. There are several composite allocators developed internally based on the allocation of various plant investments and expenses. These are used to allocate cost items that cannot be readily categorized. For example, general plant is allocated based on the composite allocation of all labor-related sub-transmission, distribution, customer accounts, and customer service O\&M expenses. This approach is recognized in industry literature ${ }^{11}$ and is generally consistent with the methodologies described in the Company's prior base rate case filing.

## Q. How were O\&M expenses allocated to each rate class?

A. O\&M expenses were allocated to each rate class consistent with their respective plant accounts. For example, allocation of overhead line O\&M costs (Account 583) was based on allocation of overhead plant (Account 365). The approach to allocation of distribution
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O\&M expenses is a refinement to the Company's CCOS study filed in its most recent base rate case.
Q. Does the cost of service vary across the Company's rate classes?
A. Yes, the cost of service per customer and per kWh (i.e., unit cost of service) varies across the Company's rate classes, as shown in Figure 5 (below).

Figure 5: Unit Cost of Service by Rate Class

|  | Revenue Requirements |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Rate Class | Per Customer | Per kWh |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Residential (R) | $\$$ | 488 | $\$$ |
| General and Commercial (C, G, Hag\&Fred) | 665 | 0.036 |  |
| General Service (CA, CSH) | 1,290 | 0.023 |  |
| Power Service (PH, AGS) | 10,886 | 0.018 |  |
| Large Power Service (PP) | 139,005 | 0.010 |  |
| Lighting (STLTNG) | 5,490 | 0.002 |  |
|  |  | 0.190 |  |

The Figure shows, for example, the unit cost of service for the Residential rate class is $\$ 488$ per customer, while the unit cost of service for the PP rate class is $\$ 139,005$ per customer. By comparison, the unit cost of service for the Residential rate class is $\$ 0.036$ per kWh , while the unit cost of service for the PP rate class is $\$ 0.002$ per kWh .
Q. How are variations in the unit cost of service used to support the Company's rate design?
A. Variations in the unit cost of service support the need for distinct rate classes and rate designs.
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## IV. OVERVIEW OF RATE DESIGN

## Q. Please describe the principles used to guide the proposed rate design.

A. The proposed rate design was guided by several principles commonly used throughout the industry, including: (a) rates should recover the overall cost of providing service; (b) rates should be fair, minimizing inter- and intra-class inequities to the extent possible; and (c) rate changes should be tempered by rate continuity concerns. ${ }^{12}$

Because these principles can conflict, the proposed rate design reflects a level of judgment to balance these principles.

## Q. How were these principles applied in this proceeding?

A. First, rates were designed to recover the overall cost of service. This was done by developing customer, demand, and energy charges based on test year bills, kW billing demands and kWh sales. In addition, rates were designed to be fair and equitable. This was done by setting revenue targets for each rate class that reflect in aggregate a movement toward the system ROR based on the results of the CCOS study. Specifically, the results of the CCOS study show that some rate classes produce a ROR that is less than the overall ROR. The proposed rate design reduces that difference by proposing rate increases for certain rate classes that are higher than the system average. Another rate design objective
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is to moderate rate changes to address rate continuity concerns. This objective was considered while setting revenue targets and then again while setting rate elements.
Q. Please summarize the steps taken to develop the proposed rates.
A. The first step to develop the proposed rates was to establish the overall revenue requirement to be recovered from base distribution rates. The next step was to set revenue targets for each rate class based on the results of the CCOS study, moderated by rate continuity concerns. Rates within each rate class were then designed to recover the revenue targets based on test year bills, kW demand, and kWh usage data.
Q. What is the total revenue requirement that you used as a starting point?
A. To determine the total revenue requirement, I relied on the overall cost of service presented in the testimony and exhibits of Company witness Soltis, which in Exhibit JAS-1 indicates an increase in the revenue requirement of $\$ 47.5$ million. This equates to a total revenue requirement of $\$ 186.3$ million when added to the existing $\$ 138.8$ million of operating revenues.
Q. Please describe the process to set the revenue targets for each rate class.
A. Since each rate class currently produces a ROR that is different than the overall system ROR, the starting point for setting the revenue targets was to compare current class revenues to class revenues at equalized rates of return.
Q. In general, how did you determine the appropriate rate design within each rate class?
A. The proposed rates were designed by first ensuring the rates recover the proposed revenue target for each rate class. The proposed rates were then designed to reflect a uniform
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increase in sales ( kWh ) charges and demand ( kW ) charges following increases in customer charges.

## V. PROPOSED RATE DESIGN

Q. Please describe the process used to set the revenue requirement targets for each rate class.
A. The starting point for setting the class revenue targets was first identifying the base rate changes necessary to achieve equalized rates of return for all rate classes. For those rate classes that produce a ROR less than the system ROR, the rate increases necessary to achieve equalized rates of return were higher relative to the system average; however, the movement to equalized rates of return for all rate classes was moderated by bill continuity concerns.

Specifically, to mitigate bill impact concerns the proposed revenue targets for each rate class were based on a 20.0 percent movement toward Equalized Rates of Return ("EROR"), as shown in Figure 6 (below).
$\qquad$

Figure 6: Proposed Class Revenue Targets

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) Target Revenues | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total } \\ \text { Company } \end{array}$ |  | Residential Service R |  | Small C \& I Schedule C\&G |  | Small C \& I <br> Schedule CA-CSH |  | Medium Power Schedule PH |  | Large Power Schedule PP |  | $\qquad$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Revenue Requirements at EROR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delivery Revenues at EROR | 167,686,930 |  | 122,365,061 |  | 20,761,563 |  | 419,160 |  | 18,309,580 |  | 1,390,045 |  | 4,441,521 |
| Current Delivery Revenues | 120,194,282 |  | 76,638,469 |  | 22,321,797 |  | 382,670 |  | 15,098,581 |  | 938,268 |  | 4,814,496 |
| Increase / (Decrease) (\$) | 47,492,648 |  | 45,726,592 |  | $(1,560,234)$ |  | 36,490 |  | 3,210,998 |  | 451,777 |  | $(372,975)$ |
| Increase / (Decrease) (\%) | 39.5\% |  | 59.7\% |  | -7.0\% |  | 9.5\% |  | 21.3\% |  | 48.2\% |  | -7.7\% |
| Revenue Requirements at Uniform \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uniform Increase in Revenues | 167,686,930 |  | 106,920,807 |  | 31,141,861 |  | 533,875 |  | 21,064,519 |  | 1,309,009 |  | 6,716,859 |
| Current Retail Revenues | 120,194,282 |  | 76,638,469 |  | 22,321,797 |  | 382,670 |  | 15,098,581 |  | 938,268 |  | 4,814,496 |
| Increase | 47,492,648 |  | 30,282,338 |  | 8,820,064 |  | 151,205 |  | 5,965,938 |  | 370,740 |  | 1,902,363 |
| Increase (\%) | 39.5\% |  | 39.5\% |  | 39.5\% |  | 39.5\% |  | 39.5\% |  | 39.5\% |  | 39.5\% |
| Movement to EROR | 20.00\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revenue Targets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Step 1: $20 \%$ Movement to EROR (excl. Lighting) | 161,425,139 | \$ | 110,009,658 | \$ | 29,065,801 | \$ | 510,932 | \$ | 20,513,531 | \$ | 1,325,216 |  |  |
| Step 2: Set Lighting at $2 \times$ Total Increase | 5,688,019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 5,688,019 |
| Step 3: Lighting Adjustment Assigned to Non-Res | 573,772 |  |  | \$ | 324,361 | \$ | 5,702 | \$ | 228,921 | \$ | 14,789 |  |  |
| Adjusted Revenue Targets | 167,686,930 | \$ | 110,009,658 | \$ | 29,390,162 | \$ | 516,634 | \$ | 20,742,452 | \$ | 1,340,005 | \$ | 5,688,019 |
| Current Retail Revenues | 120,194,282 |  | 76,638,469 |  | 22,321,797 |  | 382,670 |  | 15,098,581 |  | 938,268 |  | 4,814,496 |
| Increase | 47,492,648 |  | 33,371,189 |  | 7,068,365 |  | 133,964 |  | 5,643,871 |  | 401,736 |  | 873,523 |
| Increase (\%) | 39.5\% |  | 43.5\% |  | 31.7\% |  | 35.0\% |  | 37.4\% |  | 42.8\% |  | 18.1\% |

Figure 6 shows revenue requirements for each rate class based on three approaches to setting class revenue targets: (1) a full movement to EROR, (2) a uniform increase in revenues, and (3) a partial movement to EROR, which is the Company's proposal. A full movement to EROR would result in a residential class distribution-only increase of 59.7 percent. A uniform increase would result in a residential class distribution-only increase of 39.5 percent, consistent with the overall revenue increase, but achieves no movement to EROR. The Company's proposed revenue targets reflect a partial movement to EROR of 20.0 percent.

The Company believes a 20.0 percent movement to EROR strikes an appropriate balance between moving to cost-based rates (full movement to EROR) and addressing rate continuity considerations (uniform increase in revenues).

## Q. Please describe the process to set the proposed base rates for each rate class?
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A. To mitigate bill impact concerns, the proposed rates for each rate class were generally based on a uniform increase in kWh sales and kW demand charges after increases in the customer charges.
Q. What are the proposed changes to Schedule $R$, the residential rate class?
A. The Company proposes to increase the residential customer charge from $\$ 5.70$ per month to $\$ 8.00$ per month, consistent with the underlying customer related costs as shown in Exhibit TSL-3. The class revenue requirement not recovered in the customer charge is recovered through a single-block kWh energy charge.
Q. What are the proposed changes to Schedules G and C, the general service rate class?
A. Schedules G and C are both general service rate schedules, with Schedule G available to all non-residential, non-streetlighting customers. Schedule C is designed to serve the same type of customers as those receiving service under Schedule G but was closed to new customers as of November 26, 1991. The primary difference between these two rate schedules is that Schedule C has a demand charge which is embedded in kWh energy rates by expanding the size of the second energy block based upon the magnitude of the kW demand, whereas Schedule G has a kW rate laid out separately from the kWh rate. Since these two rate schedules are intrinsically related, any change in rates to Schedule G results in a corresponding change in rates to Schedule C.

Although the underlying customer-related costs shown in Exhibit TSL-3 support a customer charge of $\$ 13.00$ per month for general service rates Schedule G and C, the Company limited the increase in customer charges to no more than double the existing
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customer charge. This results in an increase in the customer charge from $\$ 4.00$ per month to $\$ 8.00$ per month, which helps to ensure all customers pay a minimum contribution to fixed costs. Exhibit TSL-3 shows calculation of customer costs that support the customer charge, which is applied equally to Schedules G, C, C-A and the CSH subset of Schedule C-A.

The same general rate design principles for Schedule $G$ have been applied to Schedule C, with the rate of the first and third kWh energy blocks on Schedule C identical to the kWh energy rate for Schedule G. However, the rate for the second energy block for Schedule C is larger than the first and third kWh energy blocks since the second energy block embeds the pricing of demand which is tied to the kW demand rate for Schedule G.

## Q. What are the proposed changes to Schedule C-A and the CSH subset?

A. Schedule C-A is an all-electric general service rate schedule, with the CSH subset for churches and schools with electric space heating. Schedule C-A and the CSH subset has been closed to new customers as of April 9, 1973.

Schedule C-A and the CSH subset have a customer charge identical to Schedules G and C to ensure the customers pay a minimum contribution to fixed costs. In addition, consistent with the distribution rates approved in the Company's last base rate case, the Schedules have a flat rate per kWh.

## Q. What are the proposed changes to Schedule $\mathbf{P H}$ ?

A. Schedule PH is available to all non-residential, non-streetlighting customers with demands of 50 kW or greater. The Company proposes to introduce a customer charge to recover
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customer-related costs. When customer charges for Schedules G, C, C-A and the CSH subset of Schedule C-A were introduced to the rate design in the Company's last base rate case, the approved value was approximately one-third of the value proposed by the Company and supported through the underlying customer related costs, Similarly, the Company has limited the new customer charge for Schedule PH to $\$ 17.00$ per month, which is one-third of the underlying customer related costs. The minimum demand on Schedule PH is 50 kW , so the application of the pre-existing minimum demand to demand rates also results in a minimum contribution to fixed costs.

## Q. What are the proposed changes to Schedule AGS?

A. Schedules AGS provides standby and maintenance power for customers with generating facilities, such as qualifying facilities as defined in the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978.

The CCOS study results for Schedule AGS are included within Schedule PH; consequently, the two rate schedules share the same pro forma revenue percentage change and share the same pro forma rate design characteristics. The Company also proposes to introduce a customer charge to recover customer related costs, which is an identical \$17.00 per month value from Schedule PH.

## Q. What are the proposed changes to Schedules PP?

A. Schedule PP is a large power service rate schedule available to all non-residential, nonstreetlighting customers with demands of $5,000 \mathrm{~kW}$ or greater and high-voltage service facilities.
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Similar to the introduction of customer charges for Schedules G, C, C-A and the CSH subset of Schedule C-A during the Company's last base rate case, the Company has limited the new customer charge for Schedule PP to $\$ 453.00$ per month, which is one-third of the underlying customer related costs. The minimum demand on Schedule PP is 5,000 kW , so the application of the pre-existing minimum demand to demand rates also results in a minimum contribution to fixed costs.

## Q. What are the proposed changes to special streetlighting contracts?

A. The special lighting contracts are with the City of Hagerstown and the City of Frederick, whereby by the Company supplies secondary energy to streetlights and traffic signals. This service shares characteristics with general service Schedules G and C instead of the Company's streetlighting rate schedules since the customers are responsible to provide, install and maintain the lighting facilities beyond the point of service delivery by the Company.

The Company proposes to increase the kWh charges to recover the increase in class revenue targets. The Company does not propose to introduce a customer charge since the relatively constant usage ensures a minimum contribution to fixed costs.

## Q. What are the proposed changes to streetlighting?

A. Three of the street lighting rate schedules are legacy rate schedules that are closed to new customers, with Schedules OL and MSL closed to new customers as of November 18, 1998, and Schedule AL closed to new customers as of September 9, 1985. The remaining
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street lighting rate schedules are available to all customers, with most customers gravitating to service under Schedules EMU and LED.

The pro forma change in revenue is collected as an equal percentage from all street lighting rates at a level necessary to collect the street lighting pro forma revenue increase, with the exception for long-term service. Long-term service remains as a 50 cent per light discount from its equivalent standard term service counterpart fixture.
Q. Have you examined the impact of your proposed changes in base rates on customers for each rate class?
A. Yes. The Company evaluated the customer bill impacts of the proposed base rate changes based on a range of annual usage within each rate class, as included in Exhibit TSL-3. The bill impact analysis was prepared in two ways:

1. Proposed base rates compared to current base rates; and
2. Proposed total bill that includes proposed base rates plus other charges compared to current total bill that includes current base rates plus other charges

## Q. What is the monthly revenue impact on customers?

A. Figure 7 (below) shows the monthly bill impact on residential, commercial, and industrial rate classes. Please note, the amount provided below for residential Schedule R is prior to the proposed rate increment for new low-income residential assistance programs as discussed by Company witness Valdes and presented in the tariff exhibits presented by Company witness Fall.
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Figure 7: Monthly Bill Impact by Rate Class

| Rate <br> Schedule | Average <br> Monthly Usage | Proposed <br> Monthly Bill | Current <br> Monthly Bill | Increase/ <br> (Decrease) (\$) | Increase / <br> (Decrease) <br> (\%) |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R | 1,000 | $\$$ | 107.51 | $\$$ | 98.33 | $\$$ | 9.18 |
| C | 2,400 | $\$$ | 295.99 | $\$$ | 276.46 | $\$$ | 19.53 |
| G | 2,400 | $\$$ | 271.11 | $\$$ | 253.15 | $\$$ | 17.96 |
| C-A | 5,100 | $\$$ | 621.29 | $\$$ | 590.95 | $\$$ | 30.34 |
| CSH | 7,500 | $\$$ | 876.06 | $\$$ | 848.81 | $\$$ | 27.25 |
| PH | 89,200 | $\$$ | $8,373.42$ | $\$$ | $8,148.50$ | $\$$ | 224.92 |
| PP | $5,850,000$ | $\$$ | $494,512.99$ | $\$$ | $491,286.66$ | $\$$ | $3,226.33$ |

## VI. ALTERNATIVE CCOS STUDY

## Q. Has the Company prepared an Alternative CCOS study?

A. Yes. Consistent with the Commission's directive in Case No. 9490, the Company's most recent base rate case, the Company has prepared an Alternative CCOS study that classifies distribution plant (Accounts 364-368) as demand. The results of the Alternative CCOS study are presented in Exhibit TSL-4 and summarized in Figure 8 (below). Although the Alternative CCOS was not used in the previously-discussed rate design, it is being provided in compliance with the Commission's directive, as described in Figure 2 (above).
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Figure 8: Comparison of Proposed and Alternative CCOS Study


3 Q. Does this conclude your Direct Testimony?
4 A. Yes, it does.

## Summary of Qualifications

Tim Lyons is a partner with ScottMadden with more than 30 years of experience in the energy industry. Tim has held senior positions at several gas utilities and energy consulting firms. His experience includes rates and regulatory support, sales and marketing, customer service and strategy development. Prior to joining ScottMadden, Tim served as Vice President of Sales and Marketing for Vermont Gas. He has also served as Vice President of Marketing and Regulatory Affairs for Providence Gas Company, Director of Rates at Boston Gas Company, and Project Director at Quantec, LLC, an energy consulting firm.

Tim has sponsored testimony and evidence before 23 state regulatory commissions and 2 Canadian regulatory boards. Tim holds a B.A. from St. Anselm College, an M.A. in Economics from The Pennsylvania State University, and an M.B.A. from Babson College.

## Areas of Specialization

- Regulation and Rates
- Retail Energy
- Utilities
- Natural Gas


## Capabilities

- Regulatory Strategy and Rate Case Support
- Strategic and Business Planning
- Capital Project Planning
- Process Improvements


## Articles and Speeches

- "Country Strong: Vermont Gas shares its comprehensive effort to expand natural gas service into rural communities." American Gas Association, June 2011 (with Don Gilbert).

■ "Talking Safety With Vermont Gas." American Gas Association, February 2009 (with Dave Attig).
■ "Consumers Say ‘Act Now’ To Stabilize Prices." Power \& Gas Marketing, September/ October 2001 (with Jim DeMetro and Gerry Yurkevicz).
■ "Rate Reclassification: Who Buys What and When." Public Utilities Fortnightly, October 15, 1991 (with John Martin).
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Exhibit TSL-1 - Qualifications

| Sponsor | Date | Docket No. | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Liberty Utilities (Midstates Natural Gas) | 07/16 | Docket No. RPU-2016-0003 | Sponsored testimony supporting the cost of service, rate design and bill impact studies for a general rate case proceeding. The testimony includes proposal for new commercial classes. |
| Kansas Corporation Commission |  |  |  |
| The Empire District Electric Company | 12/18 | Docket No. 19-EPDE-223-RTS | Sponsored testimony supporting cost of service, rate design, bill impact and lead-lag studies for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Kentucky Public Service Commission |  |  |  |
|  Bluegrass Water <br> (Central Utility  <br> Company)  Water <br>    <br>    <br>    | 02/23 | Case No. 2022-00432 | Sponsored testimony supporting the rate design and bill impact studies for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Maine Public Utilities Commission |  |  |  |
| Maine Water Company | 03/21 | Docket No. 2021-00053 | Sponsored testimony supporting a proposed rate smoothing mechanism. |
| Northern Utilities, Inc. d/b/a Unitil | 06/19 | Docket No. 2019-00092 | Sponsored testimony supporting a proposed capital investment cost recovery mechanism. |
| Northern Utilities, Inc. d/b/a Unitil | 06/15 | Docket No. 2015-00146 | Sponsored testimony supporting the proposed gas expansion program, including a zone area surcharge. |
| Maryland Public Service Commission |  |  |  |
| Sandpiper Energy, a <br> Chesapeake <br> company Utilities | 12/15 | Case No. 9410 | Sponsored testimony supporting the cost of service, rate design and bill impact studies for a general rate case proceeding. The testimony includes proposal for new residential and commercial classes. |
| Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities |  |  |  |
| Berkshire Gas Company, Eversource Energy, Liberty Utilities, National Grid, and Unitil | 03/22 | Docket No. DPU 20-80 | Sponsored report that summarizes research, findings, and recommendations for regulatory mechanisms, methodologies, and policies that support Massachusetts's achievement of its net zero climate goal by 2050. The regulatory designs were informed by the results of quantitative and qualitative analysis of decarbonization pathways to achieve the Commonwealth's climate goals. |
| Liberty Utilities (New England Gas Company) | 08/20 | Docket No. DPU 20-92 | Sponsored the Long-Range Forecast and Supply Plan filing for the five-year forecast period 2020/2021 through 2024/2025. |
| Eversource Energy, National Grid, and Unitil | 02/20 | Docket No. DPU 19-55 | Sponsored report that summarizes research and evaluation of funding approaches for infrastructure modifications that interconnect Distributed Generation (DG) projects. |
| Liberty Utilities (New England Gas Company) | 07/18 | Docket No. DPU 18-68 | Sponsored the Long-Range Forecast and Supply Plan filing for the five-year forecast period 2018/2019 through 2022/2023. |
| Liberty Utilities (New England Gas Company) | 07/16 | Docket No. DPU 16-109 | Sponsored the Long-Range Forecast and Supply Plan filing for the five-year forecast period 2016/2017 through 2020/2021. |
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| Sponsor | Date | Docket No. | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boston Gas | 10/93 | Docket No. DPU 92-230 | Sponsored testimony describing the Company's position regarding rate treatment of vehicular natural gas investments and expenses. |
| Boston Gas | 03/90 | Docket No. DPU 90-55 | Sponsored testimony supporting the weather and other cost of service adjustments, rate design and customer bill impact studies for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Boston Gas | 03/88 | Docket No. DPU 88-67-II | Sponsored testimony supporting the rate reclassification of commercial and industrial customers for a rate design proceeding. |
| Michigan Public Service Commission |  |  |  |
| Lansing Board of Water \& Light and Michigan State University | 04/20 | Docket No. U-20650 | Sponsored testimony evaluating Consumer Energy's cost of service and rate design proposals. |
| Lansing Board of Water \& Light and Michigan State University | 04/19 | Docket No. U-20322 | Sponsored testimony evaluating Consumer Energy's cost of service and rate design proposals. |
| Midland Cogeneration Ventures, LLC | 09/18 | Docket No. U-18010 | Sponsored testimony evaluating Consumer Energy's cost of service and rate design proposals. |
| Minnesota Public Utilities Commission |  |  |  |
| Northern States Power Company (XcelEnergy) | 10/21 | Docket No. E002/GR-21-630 | Sponsored testimony supporting a Return on Equity (ROE)adjustment mechanism that would allow the Company to symmetrically adjust its ROE to reflect significant changesin financial market conditions. |
| Missouri Public Service Commission |  |  |  |
| Confluence Rivers Utility Operating Company | 12/22 | Case No. WR-2023-0006/ SR-2023- 0007 | Sponsored testimony supporting the rate design and bill impact studies for a general rate case proceeding. |
| The Empire District Gas Company | 08/21 | Docket No. GR-2021-0320 | Sponsored testimony supporting the cost of service, rate design, bill impact and lead-lag studies for a general rate case proceeding. |
| The Empire District Electric Company | 05/21 | Docket No. ER-2021-0312 | Sponsored testimony supporting the cost of service, rate design, bill impact and lead-lag studies for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Spire Missouri, Inc. | 12/20 | Docket No. GR-2021-0108 | Sponsored testimony supporting class cost of service, rate design, and lead-lag study proposals for a general rate case proceeding. The testimony also included support for a proposed revenue adjustment mechanism. |
| The Empire District Electric Company | 08/19 | Docket No. ER-2019-0374 | Sponsored testimony supporting the cost of service, rate design, bill impact and lead-lag studies for a general rate case proceeding. The testimony also included proposals for a weather normalization mechanism. |
| Liberty Utilities (Midstates Natural Gas) | 09/17 | Docket No. GR-2018-0013 | Sponsored testimony supporting the cost of service, rate design, bill impact and lead-lag studies for a general rate case proceeding. The testimony also included proposals for a revenue decoupling/ weather normalization |


| Sponsor | Date | Docket No. | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | mechanism as well as tracker accounts for certain O\&M expenses and capital costs. |
| Missouri Gas Energy | 04/17 | Docket No. GR-2017-0216 | Sponsored testimony supporting the cost of service, rate design, bill impact and Lead/Lag studies for a general rate case proceeding. The testimony included support for a decoupling mechanism. |
| Laclede Gas Company | 04/17 | Docket No. GR-2017-0215 | Sponsored testimony supporting the cost of service, rate design, bill impact and Lead/Lag studies for a general rate case proceeding. The testimony included support for a decoupling mechanism. |
| Nevada Public Utilities Commission |  |  |  |
| Southwest Gas Corporation | 09/21 | Docket No. 21-09001 | Sponsored testimony supporting the class cost of service,rate design, bill impact and Lead/Lag studies for a general <br> rate case proceeding. |
| Southwest Gas Corporation | 02/20 | Docket No. 20-02023 | Sponsored testimony supporting the class cost of service, rate design, bill impact and Lead/Lag studies for a general rate case proceeding. |
| New Hampshire Public Utilifities Commission |  |  |  |
| Unitil (Northern Utilities, Inc.) | 8/21 | Docket No. DG 21-104 | Sponsored testimony supporting a revenue decoupling mechanism. |
| Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. | 4/21 | Docket No. DE 21-030 | Sponsored testimony supporting a revenue decoupling mechanism. |
| Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp. d/b/a Liberty Utilities | 11/17 | Docket No. DG 17-198 | Sponsored testimony supporting a levelized cost analysis for approval of firm supply and transportation agreements. |
| Liberty Utilities d/b/a Granite State Electric Company | 04/16 | Docket No. DE 16-383 | Adopted testimony and sponsored Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| New Jersey Board of Public Utilitites |  |  |  |
| South Jersey Gas Company | 04/22 | Docket No. GR22040253 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Elizabethtown Gas Company | 12/21 | Docket No. GR21121254 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| South Jersey Gas Company | 03/20 | Docket No. GR20030243 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Elizabethtown Gas Company | 04/19 | Docket No. GR19040486 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Pivotal Utility Holdings, Inc. d/b/a Elizabethtown Gas Company | 08/16 | Docket No. GR16090826 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
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| Sponsor | Date | Docket No. | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Corporation Commission of Oklahoma |  |  |  |
| The Empire District Electric Company | 02/21 | Cause No. PUD 202100163 | Sponsored testimony supporting the cost of service, rate design, bill impact and Lead/Lag studies for a general rate case proceeding. The proposed rate design included a three-year phase-in of the proposed rate increase. |
| The Empire District Electric Company | 03/19 | Cause No. PUD 201800133 | Sponsored testimony supporting the cost of service, rate design, bill impact and Lead/Lag studies for a general rate case proceeding. |
| The Empire District Electric Company | 04/17 | Cause No. PUD 201600468 | Adopted direct testimony and sponsored rebuttal testimony supporting the revenue requirements for a general rate case proceeding. The testimony included proposals for alternative ratemaking mechanisms. |
| Rhode Island Public Utilitities Commission |  |  |  |
| Providence Gas Company | $\begin{aligned} & 08 / 01 \\ & 09 / 00 \\ & 08 / 96 \end{aligned}$ | Docket No. 1673 | Sponsored testimony supporting the changes in cost of gas adjustment factor related to projected under-recovery of gas costs; Filed testimony and witness for pilot hedging program to mitigate price risks to customers; Filed testimony and witness for changes in cost of gas adjustment factor related to extension of rate plan. |
| Providence Gas Company | 08/00 | Docket No. 2581 | Sponsored testimony supporting the extension of a rate plan that began in 1997 and included certain modifications, including a weather normalization clause. |
| Providence Gas Company | 03/00 | Docket No. 3100 | Sponsored testimony supporting the de-tariff and deregulation of appliance repair service, enabling the Company to have needed pricing flexibility. |
| Providence Gas Company | 06/97 | Docket No. 2581 | Sponsored testimony supporting a rate plan that fixed all billing rates for three-year period; included funding for critical infrastructure investments in accelerated replacement of mains and services, digitized records system, and economic development projects. |
| Providence Gas Company | 04/97 | Docket No. 2552 | Sponsored testimony supporting the rate design, customer bill impact studies and retail access tariffs for commercial and industrial customers, including redesign of cost of gas adjustment clause, for a rate design proceeding. |
| Providence Gas Company | 02/96 | Docket No. 2374 | Sponsored testimony supporting the rate design, customer bill impact studies and retail access tariffs for largest commercial and industrial customers for a rate design proceeding. |
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| Sponsor | Date | Docket No. | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Providence Gas Company | 01/96 | Docket No. 2076 | Sponsored testimony supporting the rate reclassification of customers into new rate classes, rate design (including introduction of demand charges), and customer bill impact studies for a rate design proceeding. |
| Providence Gas Company | 11/92 | Docket No. 2025 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Integrated Resource Plan filing, including a performancebased incentive mechanism. |
| Railroad Commission of Texas |  |  |  |
| Texas Gas Service Company - West Texas, North Texas, and Borger/ Skellytown Service Areas | 06/22 | Case No. 00009896 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Texas Gas Service Company - Central Texas and Gulf Coast Service Areas | 12/19 | GUD No. 10928 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| CenterPoint Energy  <br> Beaumont/ <br> Division East Texas <br>    | 11/19 | GUD No. 10920 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Texas Gas Service Company - Borger/ Skellytown Service Area | 08/18 | GUD No. 10766 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Texas Gas Service Company <br> - North Texas Service Area | 06/18 | GUD No. 10739 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| CenterPoint Energy - South Texas Division | 11/17 | GUD No. 10669 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Texas Gas Service Company - Rio Grande Valley Service Area | 06/17 | GUD No. 10656 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Atmos Pipeline - Texas | 01/17 | GUD No. 10580 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| CenterPoint Energy - Texas Gulf Division | 11/16 | GUD No. 10567 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Public Utility Commission of Texas |  |  |  |
| CenterPoint Energy Houston Electric, LLC | 04/19 | Docket No. 49421 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag study for a general rate case proceeding. |
| Vermont Public Utilities Commission |  |  |  |
| Vermont Gas Systems | 12/12 | Docket No. 7970 | Sponsored testimony describing the market served by $\$ 90$ million natural gas expansion project to Addison County, VT. Also described the terms and economic benefits of a special contract with International Paper. |
| Vermont Gas Systems | 02/11 | Docket No. 7712 | Sponsored testimony supporting the market evaluation and analysis for a system expansion and reliability regulatory fund. |
| Virginia State Corporation Commission |  |  |  |
| Rappahannock Electric Cooperative | 10/22 | Case No. PUR-2022-00160 | Sponsored report and studies related to revenue requirements, class cost of service, rate design, and bill impact analysis for a streamlined application to increase base rates. |


| Sponsor | Date | Docket No. | Subject |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| American Electric Power - <br> Appalachian Power Company | $3 / 20$ | Case No. PUR-2020-00015 | Sponsored testimony supporting the Lead/Lag <br> study for the 2020 triennial review of base <br> rates, terms, and conditions. |
| Nova Scotia Utility and Review Board | Sponsored evidence supporting the cash <br> working capital requirement and lead/Lag study <br> for a general rate case proceeding. |  |  |
| Nova Scotia Power | $01 / 22$ | Matter No. M10431 |  |
| Ontario Energy Board | Ontario Energy Association | $01 / 21$ | Sponsored evidence regarding policies and <br> ratemaking treatment related to COVID-19 <br> costs in U.S. and Canadian regulatory <br> jurisdictions. The evidence was used to <br> support Ontario Energy Association's response <br> to Staff's proposals |
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| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) <br> Income Statement <br> Current Rates | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total } \\ \text { Company } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Residential } \\ \text { Service } \\ \mathrm{R} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | Small C \& I Schedule C\&G |  | Small C \& I Schedule CA-CSH |  | Medium Power Schedule PH |  | Large Power <br> Schedule PP |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Street and } \\ \text { Area Lighting } \\ \text { ST LTNG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Going-Level Income Statement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Revenues | \$ | 138,842,885 | \$ | 86,532,923 | \$ | 25,361,406 | \$ | 447,672 | \$ | 19,989,257 | \$ | 1,427,087 | \$ | 5,084,540 |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| O\&M Expenses | \$ | 56,655,385 | \$ | 42,125,174 | \$ | 7,139,442 | \$ | 135,661 | \$ | 5,454,835 | \$ | 602,358 | \$ | 1,197,916 |
| Depreciation \& Amortization |  | 33,822,024 |  | 24,109,232 |  | 4,170,259 |  | 86,586 |  | 4,204,947 |  | 337,175 |  | 913,825 |
| Regulatory Debits and Credits |  | 1,288,352 |  | 991,766 |  | 143,497 |  | 2,089 |  | 75,729 |  | 60,707 |  | 14,563 |
| Taxes Other than Income |  | 30,607,318 |  | 18,969,699 |  | 4,747,773 |  | 95,888 |  | 5,794,482 |  | 213,560 |  | 785,916 |
| Total Operating Expenses | \$ | 122,373,079 | \$ | 86,195,871 | \$ | 16,200,971 | \$ | 320,224 | \$ | 15,529,994 | \$ | 1,213,800 | \$ | 2,912,220 |
| Income Before Tax | \$ | 16,469,806 | \$ | 337,053 | \$ | 9,160,435 | \$ | 127,448 | \$ | 4,459,263 | \$ | 213,287 | \$ | 2,172,321 |
| Income Adjustments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adjustment to Income - MD | \$ | 8,141,525 |  | 5,816,391 |  | 996,694 |  | 21,214 |  | 986,420 |  | 84,824 |  | 235,982 |
| Interest Expense |  | 13,420,137 |  | 9,587,488 |  | 1,642,907 |  | 34,968 |  | 1,625,972 |  | 139,821 |  | 388,982 |
| Schedule M Adjustments |  | 31,522,110 |  | 22,519,728 |  | 3,858,970 |  | 82,134 |  | 3,819,190 |  | 328,420 |  | 913,667 |
| Total Income Adjustments | \$ | 53,083,772 | \$ | 37,923,607 | \$ | 6,498,572 | \$ | 138,315 | \$ | 6,431,582 | \$ | 553,065 | \$ | 1,538,630 |
| Adjusted Taxable Income | \$ | $(36,613,966)$ | \$ | $(37,586,555)$ | \$ | 2,661,863 | \$ | $(10,868)$ | \$ | $(1,972,319)$ | \$ | $(339,778)$ | \$ | 633,690 |
| State Income Tax | \$ | $(3,020,652)$ | \$ | $(3,100,891)$ | \$ | 219,604 | \$ | (897) | \$ | $(162,716)$ | \$ | $(28,032)$ | \$ | 52,279 |
| Federal Income Tax |  | $(7,054,596)$ |  | $(7,241,989)$ |  | 512,874 |  | $(2,094)$ |  | $(380,017)$ |  | $(65,467)$ |  | 122,096 |
| Deferred Taxes |  | 8,298,486 |  | 5,928,526 |  | 1,015,910 |  | 21,623 |  | 1,005,437 |  | 86,460 |  | 240,531 |
| Total Income Taxes | \$ | $(1,776,762)$ | \$ | $(4,414,354)$ | \$ | 1,748,388 | \$ | 18,632 | \$ | 462,704 | \$ | $(7,039)$ | \$ | 414,907 |
| AFUDC |  | 2,609,343 |  | 1,864,142 |  | 319,438 |  | 6,799 |  | 316,146 |  | 27,186 |  | 75,632 |
| Interest on Customer Deposits |  | $(17,180)$ |  | $(12,273)$ |  | $(2,103)$ |  | (45) |  | $(2,081)$ |  | (179) |  | (498) |
| Total Operating Income | \$ | 20,838,731 | \$ | 6,603,275 | \$ | 7,729,383 | \$ | 115,570 | \$ | 4,310,623 | \$ | 247,333 | \$ | 1,832,547 |
| Rate Base | \$ | 718,525,219 | \$ | 513,322,007 | \$ | 87,962,622 | \$ | 1,872,194 | \$ | 87,055,863 | \$ | 7,486,116 | \$ | 20,826,416 |
| ROR @ Current Rates |  | 2.90\% |  | 1.29\% |  | 8.79\% |  | 6.17\% |  | 4.95\% |  | 3.30\% |  | 8.80\% |
| Rate Base \% |  | 100.00\% |  | 71.44\% |  | 12.24\% |  | 0.26\% |  | 12.12\% |  | 1.04\% |  | 2.90\% |
| Pro-Forma Income Tax Increase Calculation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rate Base |  | 718,525,219 |  | 513,322,007 |  | 87,962,622 |  | 1,872,194 |  | 87,055,863 |  | 7,486,116 |  | 20,826,416 |
| Required ROR |  | 7.54\% |  | 7.54\% |  | 7.54\% |  | 7.54\% |  | 7.54\% |  | 7.54\% |  | 7.54\% |
| Required Income |  | 54,188,230 |  | 38,712,644 |  | 6,633,781 |  | 141,193 |  | 6,565,397 |  | 564,572 |  | 1,570,643 |
| Increase in Earnings Requested |  | 33,349,500 |  | 32,109,369 |  | $(1,095,602)$ |  | 25,624 |  | 2,254,774 |  | 317,239 |  | $(261,904)$ |
| Increase in Revenues Requested |  | 47,492,648 |  | 45,726,592 |  | $(1,560,234)$ |  | 36,490 |  | 3,210,998 |  | 451,777 |  | $(372,975)$ |
| Pro-Forma Uncollectible Expense |  | 400,682 |  | 385,782 |  | $(13,163)$ |  | 308 |  | 27,090 |  | 3,812 |  | $(3,147)$ |
| Pro-Forma Regulatory Assessment |  | 131,697 |  | 126,800 |  | $(4,327)$ |  | 101 |  | 8,904 |  | 1,253 |  | $(1,034)$ |
| Pro-Forma Maryland Gross Receipt Tax |  | 949,853 |  | 914,532 |  | $(31,205)$ |  | 730 |  | 64,220 |  | 9,036 |  | $(7,460)$ |
| State Taxable Income |  | 46,010,416 |  | 44,299,478 |  | $(1,511,540)$ |  | 35,351 |  | 3,110,784 |  | 437,677 |  | $(361,335)$ |
| State Income Tax Increase |  | 3,795,859 |  | 3,654,707 |  | $(124,702)$ |  | 2,916 |  | 256,640 |  | 36,108 |  | (29,810) |
| Federal Taxable Income |  | 42,214,557 |  | 40,644,771 |  | $(1,386,838)$ |  | 32,435 |  | 2,854,144 |  | 401,569 |  | (331,525) |
| Federal Income Tax Increase |  | 8,865,057 |  | 8,535,402 |  | $(291,236)$ |  | 6,811 |  | 599,370 |  | 84,329 |  | (69,620) |
| Revenue Requirement Calculation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Required Income |  | 54,188,230 |  | 38,712,644 |  | 6,633,781 |  | 141,193 |  | 6,565,397 |  | 564,572 |  | 1,570,643 |
| Add: Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Current Expenses |  | 122,373,079 |  | 86,195,871 |  | 16,200,971 |  | 320,224 |  | 15,529,994 |  | 1,213,800 |  | 2,912,220 |
| Proforma Expense Increase |  | 1,482,232 |  | 1,427,114 |  | $(48,694)$ |  | 1,139 |  | 100,214 |  | 14,100 |  | $(11,640)$ |
| Add: Taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Current Taxes |  | $(1,776,762)$ |  | $(4,414,354)$ |  | 1,748,388 |  | 18,632 |  | 462,704 |  | $(7,039)$ |  | 414,907 |
| Proforma Tax Increase |  | 12,660,916 |  | 12,190,109 |  | $(415,938)$ |  | 9,728 |  | 856,010 |  | 120,438 |  | $(99,430)$ |
| Less: Other Revenues |  | $(2,592,163)$ |  | $(1,851,869)$ |  | $(317,335)$ |  | $(6,754)$ |  | $(314,064)$ |  | $(27,007)$ |  | $(75,134)$ |
| Revenue Requirement |  | 186,335,533 |  | 132,259,515 |  | 23,801,172 |  | 484,162 |  | 23,200,255 |  | 1,878,864 |  | 4,711,565 |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Total | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | ST LTNG | Factor |
| UTILITY PLANT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Plant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (360) Land and Land Rights |  | 22,832,423 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 17,881,293 | 11,136,534 | 2,367,055 | 67,605 | 4,112,972 | 97,798 | 99,329 |  |
| - Customer |  | 4,951,130 | 4,360,759 | 542,746 | 5,639 | 27,907 | 1 | 14,078 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 22,832,423 | 15,497,293 | 2,909,801 | 73,244 | 4,140,880 | 97,799 | 113,407 |  |
| (361) Structures and Improvements |  | 11,490,605 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 11,490,605 | 7,051,472 | 1,542,653 | 45,423 | 2,757,913 | 24,799 | 68,345 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 11,490,605 | 7,051,472 | 1,542,653 | 45,423 | 2,757,913 | 24,799 | 68,345 |  |
| (362) Station Equipment |  | 190,214,295 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 190,214,295 | 116,743,761 | 25,505,973 | 750,704 | 45,638,656 | 448,509 | 1,126,692 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 190,214,295 | 116,743,761 | 25,505,973 | 750,704 | 45,638,656 | 448,509 | 1,126,692 |  |
| (362) Station Equipment - Capacitors |  | 1,528,215 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 1,528,215 | 962,922 | 151,304 | 3,909 | 339,726 | 69,416 | 938 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 1,528,215 | 962,922 | 151,304 | 3,909 | 339,726 | 69,416 | 938 |  |
| (364) Poles, Towers \& Fixtures |  | 134,210,133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 104,424,307 | 66,800,055 | 12,953,535 | 344,253 | 22,091,524 | 1,804,418 | 430,522 |  |
| - Customer |  | 29,785,825 | 26,234,070 | 3,265,163 | 33,924 | 167,971 | 5 | 84,693 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 134,210,133 | 93,034,124 | 16,218,698 | 378,177 | 22,259,495 | 1,804,423 | 515,214 |  |
| (365) Overhead Conductors \& Devices |  | 245,148,184 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 150,243,366 | 95,316,912 | 16,694,226 | 438,564 | 32,671,817 | 4,774,049 | 347,800 |  |
| - Customer |  | 94,904,817 | 83,588,494 | 10,403,516 | 108,086 | 534,856 | 11 | 269,853 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 245,148,184 | 178,905,406 | 27,097,742 | 546,650 | 33,206,673 | 4,774,060 | 617,653 |  |
| (366) Underground Conduit |  | 70,132,572 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 70,132,572 | 44,988,805 | 8,987,118 | 239,504 | 14,697,227 | 890,704 | 329,214 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 70,132,572 | 44,988,805 | 8,987,118 | 239,504 | 14,697,227 | 890,704 | 329,214 |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) Allocation to Customer Classes Total | Allocation Factor | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total } \\ \text { Company } \end{array}$ | Residential Service R | Small C \& I Schedule C\&G | Small C \& I Schedule CA-CSH | Medium Power Schedule PH | Large Power Schedule PP | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Street and } \\ \text { Area Lighting } \\ \text { ST LTNG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Classification } \\ & \text { Factor } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (367) Underground Conductors \& Device |  | 319,482,180 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 142,323,156 | 90,389,394 | 15,923,854 | 418,025 | 30,841,943 | 4,405,834 | 344,106 |  |
| - Customer |  | 177,159,024 | 156,035,964 | 19,420,051 | 201,753 | 997,507 | 9 | 503,740 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 319,482,180 | 246,425,358 | 35,343,905 | 619,779 | 31,839,450 | 4,405,843 | 847,846 |  |
| (368) Line Transformers |  | 207,846,214 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 51,392,381 | 33,272,620 | 7,174,563 | 191,934 | 10,430,032 | 518 | 322,715 |  |
| - Customer |  | 156,453,834 | 137,800,143 | 17,150,242 | 178,167 | 880,414 | 0 | 444,868 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 207,846,214 | 171,072,763 | 24,324,804 | 370,101 | 11,310,445 | 518 | 767,582 |  |
| (368) Line Transformers - Capacitors |  | 1,518,797 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 1,518,797 | 928,164 | 146,877 | 3,768 | 327,464 | 111,621 | 905 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 1,518,797 | 928,164 | 146,877 | 3,768 | 327,464 | 111,621 | 905 |  |
| (369) Services |  | 73,051,113 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 73,051,113 | 64,524,857 | 8,030,589 | 83,427 | 412,241 | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - |  |  |  | . | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 73,051,113 | 64,524,857 | 8,030,589 | 83,427 | 412,241 | - | - |  |
| (370, 371) Meters and Installation |  | 58,934,191 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 58,934,191 | 35,003,730 | 16,591,288 | 366,058 | 5,986,423 | 986,692 | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 58,934,191 | 35,003,730 | 16,591,288 | 366,058 | 5,986,423 | 986,692 | - |  |
| Street Lighting \& Signal Systems |  | 33,964,292 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 33,964,292 | - | - | - | - | - | 33,964,292 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 33,964,292 | - | - | - | - | - | 33,964,292 |  |
| Total Distribution Plant |  | 1,370,353,215 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 741,148,989 | 467,590,638 | 91,447,157 | 2,503,690 | 163,909,274 | 12,627,665 | 3,070,565 |  |
| - Customer |  | 629,204,227 | 507,548,017 | 75,403,594 | 977,055 | 9,007,319 | 986,718 | 35,281,524 |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 1,370,353,215 | 975,138,655 | 166,850,751 | 3,480,745 | 172,916,593 | 13,614,383 | 38,352,088 |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)  <br> Allocation to Customer Classes Allocation <br> Total Factor  | Total Company | Residential Service R | Small C \& I Schedule C\&G | Small C \& I Schedule CA-CSH | Medium Power Schedule PH | Large Power Schedule PP | Street and Area Lighting ST LTNG | Classification Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General and Intangible Plant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Plant | 58,345,763 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 23,863,649 | 14,974,261 | 2,870,550 | 79,075 | 5,368,742 | 481,812 | 89,210 |  |
| - Customer | 34,482,114 | 26,544,032 | 5,184,145 | 83,194 | 924,191 | 127,414 | 1,619,138 |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 58,345,763 | 41,518,293 | 8,054,695 | 162,269 | 6,292,933 | 609,225 | 1,708,347 |  |
| Intangible Plant | 36,519,232 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 14,936,511 | 9,372,549 | 1,796,708 | 49,494 | 3,360,353 | 301,571 | 55,837 |  |
| - Customer | 21,582,721 | 16,614,191 | 3,244,811 | 52,072 | 578,461 | 79,750 | 1,013,436 |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 36,519,232 | 25,986,740 | 5,041,519 | 101,566 | 3,938,814 | 381,321 | 1,069,273 |  |
| Total General and Intangible Plant | 94,864,996 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 38,800,160 | 24,346,810 | 4,667,257 | 128,568 | 8,729,095 | 783,383 | 145,047 |  |
| - Customer | 56,064,835 | 43,158,223 | 8,428,956 | 135,266 | 1,502,652 | 207,164 | 2,632,573 |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 94,864,996 | 67,505,034 | 13,096,214 | 263,834 | 10,231,747 | 990,546 | 2,777,620 |  |
| Additions to Utility Plant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COVID-19 Regulatory Asset Adj excl. Res Adj | 9,651,602 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 5,220,023 | 4,332,967 | 392,790 | 6,934 | 308,273 | 157,236 | 21,822 |  |
| - Customer | 4,431,579 | 3,678,506 | 333,462 | 5,887 | 261,711 | 133,487 | 18,526 |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 9,651,602 | 8,011,472 | 726,253 | 12,821 | 569,984 | 290,722 | 40,349 |  |
| COVID-19 Residential Adjustment | $(2,391,373)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | $(1,293,363)$ | $(1,293,363)$ | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer | $(1,098,010)$ | $(1,098,010)$ | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | $(2,391,373)$ | $(2,391,373)$ | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| MD Electric Vehicle Program Reg Asset excl. Res Direct | 670,401 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 456,359 | - | 158,433 | 4,311 | 271,063 | 16,810 | 5,742 |  |
| - Customer | 214,042 | - | 152,242 | 1,818 | 14,094 | 1,206 | 44,682 |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 670,401 | - | 310,675 | 6,130 | 285,156 | 18,016 | 50,424 |  |
| MD EV Reg Asset - Residential Direct | 855,889 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 462,903 | 462,903 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer | 392,985 | 392,985 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 855,889 | 855,889 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Additional to Utility Plant | 8,786,519 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 4,845,923 | 3,502,507 | 551,224 | 11,246 | 579,336 | 174,046 | 27,564 |  |
| - Customer | 3,940,596 | 2,973,481 | 485,704 | 7,705 | 275,805 | 134,693 | 63,209 |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 8,786,519 | 6,475,988 | 1,036,928 | 18,951 | 855,141 | 308,739 | 90,773 |  |
| Total Utility Plant | 1,474,004,730 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 784,795,072 | 495,439,955 | 96,665,638 | 2,643,504 | 173,217,705 | 13,585,094 | 3,243,176 |  |
| - Customer | 689,209,658 | 553,679,721 | 84,318,255 | 1,120,026 | 10,785,776 | 1,328,574 | 37,977,306 |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 1,474,004,730 | 1,049,119,676 | 180,983,892 | 3,763,530 | 184,003,481 | 14,913,668 | 41,220,482 |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) Allocation to Customer Classes Total | Allocation Factor | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total } \\ \text { Company } \end{array}$ | Residential Service R | Small C \& I Schedule C\&G | Small C \& I Schedule CA-CSH | Medium Power Schedule PH | Large Power Schedule PP | Street and Area Lighting ST LTNG | Classification Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACCUMULATED DEPRECIATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Accumulated Depreciation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Plant A/D |  | (524,692,906) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(283,777,651)$ | (179,035,221) | $(35,014,093)$ | $(958,635)$ | $(62,759,026)$ | $(4,834,992)$ | $(1,175,685)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(240,915,255)$ | $(194,334,454)$ | (28,871,192) | $(374,103)$ | $(3,448,802)$ | $(377,803)$ | $(13,508,900)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| Total |  | (524,692,906) | $(373,369,675)$ | $(63,885,285)$ | $(1,332,738)$ | $(66,207,828)$ | (5,212,795) | $(14,684,585)$ |  |
| General Plant A/D |  | $(27,506,237)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(11,250,161)$ | $(7,059,392)$ | $(1,353,278)$ | $(37,279)$ | $(2,531,013)$ | (227,143) | $(42,057)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(16,256,077)$ | $(12,513,787)$ | $(2,443,988)$ | $(39,221)$ | $(435,696)$ | $(60,067)$ | $(763,318)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | $(27,506,237)$ | $(19,573,178)$ | $(3,797,265)$ | $(76,499)$ | $(2,966,709)$ | $(287,210)$ | $(805,375)$ |  |
| Intangible Plant A/D |  | $(24,687,910)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(12,882,646)$ | $(8,120,915)$ | $(1,583,094)$ | $(43,386)$ | $(2,857,247)$ | $(225,480)$ | $(52,525)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(11,805,264)$ | $(9,918,552)$ | (1,469,911) | $(18,944)$ | $(157,878)$ | $(15,954)$ | $(224,025)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | $(24,687,910)$ | $(18,039,467)$ | $(3,053,005)$ | $(62,330)$ | $(3,015,125)$ | $(241,434)$ | $(276,549)$ |  |
| COVID Reg Asset A/D |  | $(726,023)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(392,666)$ | $(303,960)$ | $(39,279)$ | (693) | $(30,827)$ | $(15,724)$ | $(2,182)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(333,357)$ | $(258,050)$ | $(33,346)$ | (589) | $(26,171)$ | $(13,349)$ | $(1,853)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | $(726,023)$ | $(562,010)$ | $(72,625)$ | $(1,282)$ | $(56,998)$ | (29,072) | $(4,035)$ |  |
| EV Reg Asset A/D |  | $(152,629)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(91,926)$ | $(46,290)$ | $(15,843)$ | (431) | $(27,106)$ | $(1,681)$ | (574) |  |
| - Customer |  | $(60,703)$ | $(39,299)$ | $(15,224)$ | (182) | $(1,409)$ | (121) | $(4,468)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | $(152,629)$ | $(85,589)$ | (31,067) | (613) | $(28,516)$ | $(1,802)$ | $(5,042)$ |  |
| CWIP A/D |  | $(162,583)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(87,839)$ | $(55,466)$ | $(10,831)$ | (296) | $(19,373)$ | $(1,508)$ | (365) |  |
| - Customer |  | $(74,744)$ | (60,722) | $(9,033)$ | (117) | $(1,085)$ | (129) | $(3,658)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | $(162,583)$ | $(116,188)$ | (19,864) | (413) | $(20,458)$ | $(1,637)$ | $(4,022)$ |  |
| Total Accumulated Depreciation |  | (577,928,288) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(308,482,889)$ | (194,621,244) | $(38,016,418)$ | $(1,040,720)$ | $(68,224,593)$ | $(5,306,527)$ | $(1,273,387)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | (269,445,399) | (217,124,864) | $(32,842,694)$ | $(433,156)$ | $(4,071,041)$ | $(467,423)$ | $(14,506,222)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| Total Accumulated Depreciation |  | $(577,928,288)$ | (411,746,107) | (70,859,112) | (1,473,876) | $(72,295,634)$ | $(5,773,950)$ | $(15,779,609)$ |  |
| OTHER RATE BASE ITEMS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Rate Base litems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Work in Progress |  | 50,574,771 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 26,927,207 | 16,999,106 | 3,316,707 | 90,702 | 5,943,296 | 466,120 | 111,277 |  |
| - Customer |  | 23,647,564 | 18,997,378 | 2,893,055 | 38,429 | 370,072 | 45,585 | 1,303,044 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 50,574,771 | 35,996,484 | 6,209,762 | 129,131 | 6,313,368 | 511,705 | 1,414,321 |  |
| Plant Held for Future Use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Prepayments |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  |  |  | - |  | - | - | - |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) Allocation to Customer Classes Total | Allocation Factor | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total } \\ \text { Company } \end{array}$ | Residential Service R | Small C \& I Schedule C\&G | Small C \& I Schedule CA-CSH | Medium Power Schedule PH | Large Power Schedule PP | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Street and } \\ \text { Area Lighting } \\ \text { ST LTNG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Classification Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Working Capital |  | 16,435,549 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 8,750,676 | 5,524,289 | 1,077,848 | 29,476 | 1,931,424 | 151,477 | 36,162 |  |
| - Customer |  | 7,684,873 | 6,173,678 | 940,171 | 12,489 | 120,264 | 14,814 | 423,457 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 16,435,549 | 11,697,967 | 2,018,019 | 41,964 | 2,051,688 | 166,291 | 459,619 |  |
| ADIT |  | (225,475,241) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(120,048,365)$ | $(75,786,353)$ | $(14,786,729)$ | $(404,371)$ | (26,496,729) | (2,078,082) | $(496,101)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(105,426,876)$ | $(84,695,161)$ | $(12,897,977)$ | $(171,328)$ | $(1,649,876)$ | $(203,229)$ | $(5,809,304)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | (225,475,241) | $(160,481,515)$ | $(27,684,705)$ | $(575,699)$ | $(28,146,605)$ | $(2,281,311)$ | $(6,305,406)$ |  |
| Customer Advances |  | $(5,061,698)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(2,737,595)$ | $(1,727,148)$ | $(337,780)$ | $(9,248)$ | $(605,435)$ | $(46,643)$ | $(11,342)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(2,324,103)$ | $(1,874,739)$ | $(278,520)$ | $(3,609)$ | $(33,270)$ | $(3,645)$ | $(130,320)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - |  |  |  | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | $(5,061,698)$ | $(3,601,887)$ | $(616,300)$ | $(12,857)$ | $(638,705)$ | $(50,288)$ | $(141,662)$ |  |
| Customer Deposits |  | $(14,024,604)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(7,467,032)$ | $(4,079,756)$ | $(1,112,198)$ | - | $(2,253,073)$ | - | $(22,005)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(6,557,572)$ | $(3,582,855)$ | $(976,736)$ | - | $(1,978,657)$ | - | $(19,325)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | $(14,024,604)$ | $(7,662,611)$ | $(2,088,934)$ | - | $(4,231,730)$ | - | $(41,330)$ |  |
| Deferred Investment Tax Credit |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Other Rate Base Items |  | (177,551,223) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(94,575,108)$ | $(59,069,862)$ | $(11,842,151)$ | $(293,442)$ | (21,480,517) | $(1,507,127)$ | $(382,009)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(82,976,114)$ | $(64,981,700)$ | $(10,320,006)$ | $(124,019)$ | $(3,171,467)$ | $(146,475)$ | $(4,232,448)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | (177,551,223) | (124,051,562) | (22,162,158) | $(417,460)$ | (24,651,984) | $(1,653,602)$ | $(4,614,456)$ |  |
| Total Rate Base |  | 718,525,219 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 381,737,074 | 241,748,849 | 46,807,068 | 1,309,343 | 83,512,595 | 6,771,440 | 1,587,780 |  |
| - Customer |  | 336,788,145 | 271,573,158 | 41,155,554 | 562,851 | 3,543,268 | 714,677 | 19,238,636 |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  | 718,525,219 | 513,322,007 | 87,962,622 | 1,872,194 | 87,055,863 | 7,486,116 | 20,826,416 |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& 1 | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Total | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | St ling | Factor |
| OPERATIONS \& MAINTENANCE EXPENSES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operations Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (580) Operation Supervision \& Engineering |  | 68,716 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 27,202 | 17,245 | 3,158 | 84 | 5,928 | 704 | 83 |  |
| - Customer |  | 41,514 | 30,337 | 7,080 | 126 | 1,750 | 266 | 1,954 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 68,716 | 47,582 | 10,238 | 210 | 7,678 | 971 | 2,037 |  |
| (581) Load Dispatching |  | 116,085 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 116,085 | 71,237 | 15,588 | 459 | 27,864 | 247 | 691 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | $-$ | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 116,085 | 71,237 | 15,588 | 459 | 27,864 | 247 | 691 |  |
| (582) Station Expenses |  | 16,885 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 16,885 | 10,362 | 2,267 | 67 | 4,053 | 36 | 101 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 16,885 | 10,362 | 2,267 | 67 | 4,053 | 36 | 101 |  |
| (583) Overhead line expenses |  | 1,298,766 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 657,122 | 416,889 | 73,016 | 1,918 | 142,897 | 20,880 | 1,521 |  |
| - Customer |  | 641,644 | 565,707 | 70,408 | 731 | 3,618 | 0 | 1,180 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 1,298,766 | 982,596 | 143,423 | 2,650 | 146,515 | 20,880 | 2,701 |  |
| (584) Underground line expenses |  | 1,434,107 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 741,566 | 472,531 | 86,950 | 2,295 | 158,952 | 18,487 | 2,350 |  |
| - Customer |  | 692,541 | 610,155 | 75,939 | 789 | 3,900 | 0 | 1,758 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 1,434,107 | 1,082,685 | 162,889 | 3,084 | 162,852 | 18,487 | 4,108 |  |
| (585) Street lighting and signal system expenses |  | 107,100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 107,100 | - | - | - | - | - | 107,100 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 107,100 | - | - | - | - | - | 107,100 |  |
| (586) Meter expenses |  | 896,233 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 896,233 | 532,314 | 252,310 | 5,567 | 91,038 | 15,005 | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 896,233 | 532,314 | 252,310 | 5,567 | 91,038 | 15,005 | - |  |
| (588) Miscellaneous distribution expenses |  | 4,440,902 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 1,757,982 | 1,114,500 | 204,097 | 5,439 | 383,085 | 45,509 | 5,352 |  |
| - Customer |  | 2,682,919 | 1,960,582 | 457,563 | 8,134 | 113,119 | 17,222 | 126,298 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 4,440,902 | 3,075,082 | 661,661 | 13,574 | 496,203 | 62,731 | 131,650 |  |



| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) <br> Allocation to Customer Classes <br> Total <br> Allocation <br> Factor | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total } \\ \text { Company } \end{array}$ | Residential Service R | Small c \& Schedule c8, | Small C \& 1 Schedule CA-CSH | Medium Power Schedule PH | $\begin{gathered} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Large Power } \\ \text { Schedule } \\ \text { pp } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Street and } \\ \text { Area Lighting } \\ \text { ST LTNG } \end{array}$ | Classification Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (597) Maintenance of meters | 914,278 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer | 914,278 | 543,032 | 257,390 | 5,679 | 92,871 | 15,307 | - |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 914,278 | 543,032 | 257,390 | 5,679 | 92,871 | 15,307 | - |  |
| (598) Maintenance of miscellaneous distribution plant | 157,146 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 83,018 | 52,336 | 9,631 | 260 | 18,413 | 2,122 | 256 |  |
| - Customer | 74,129 | 60,975 | 8,823 | 111 | 971 | 99 | 3,149 |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 157,146 | 113,311 | 18,453 | 371 | 19,384 | 2,221 | 3,405 |  |
| Total Dist. Maintenance Expenses | 24,335,905 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 12,856,238 | 8,104,857 | 1,491,443 | 40,280 | 2,851,500 | 328,583 | 39,574 |  |
| - Customer | 11,479,668 | 9,442,679 | 1,366,271 | 17,219 | 150,365 | 15,407 | 487,727 |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 24,335,905 | 17,547,537 | 2,857,714 | 57,498 | 3,001,865 | 343,990 | 527,301 |  |
| Total Distribution Expenses | 33,783,804 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 16,596,297 | 10,475,926 | 1,925,655 | 51,852 | 3,666,502 | 425,402 | 50,960 |  |
| - Customer | 17,187,507 | 13,613,765 | 2,339,724 | 34,524 | 391,022 | 52,047 | 756,423 |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 33,783,804 | 24,089,691 | 4,265,379 | 86,376 | 4,057,525 | 477,450 | 807,384 |  |
| Customer Accounts and Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meter Reading \& Billing | 6,854,217 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer | 6,854,217 | 5,857,097 | 934,546 | 12,631 | 44,634 | - | 5,309 |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 6,854,217 | 5,857,097 | 934,546 | 12,631 | 44,634 | - | 5,309 |  |
| Other-Direct to Other | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity | - | . | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Uncollectibles | 1,132,614 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer | 1,132,614 | 1,131,744 | 330 | 6 | 259 | 275 | - |  |
| - Commodity | , | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 1,132,614 | 1,131,744 | 330 | 6 | 259 | 275 | - |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) Allocation to Customer Classes Total | Allocation Factor | Total Company | Residential Service | Small C \& I Schedule C\&G | Small C \& I Schedule CA-CSH | Medium Power Schedule PH | Large Power Schedule PP | Street and Area Lighting ST LTNG | Classification Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Misc. Cust Serv and Info Exp |  | 2,381,813 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 2,381,813 | 2,178,507 | 182,913 | 2,013 | 6,213 | - | 12,167 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 2,381,813 | 2,178,507 | 182,913 | 2,013 | 6,213 | - | 12,167 |  |
| Customer Rebates \& Incentives |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Customer Assistance |  | 233,396 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 233,396 | 233,396 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 233,396 | 233,396 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Sales Expense |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |  |
| All Other Cust Accts \& Services |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Customer Accounts and Services |  | 10,602,041 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 10,602,041 | 9,400,745 | 1,117,789 | 14,650 | 51,106 | 275 | 17,476 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 10,602,041 | 9,400,745 | 1,117,789 | 14,650 | 51,106 | 275 | 17,476 |  |
| Administrative \& General Expense |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative and General Salaries |  | 3,795,263 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 1,552,278 | 974,043 | 186,723 | 5,144 | 349,225 | 31,341 | 5,803 |  |
| - Customer |  | 2,242,985 | 1,726,631 | 337,217 | 5,412 | 60,117 | 8,288 | 105,321 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 3,795,263 | 2,700,673 | 523,940 | 10,555 | 409,341 | 39,629 | 111,124 |  |
| Outside Services |  | 7,307,223 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 2,988,683 | 1,875,376 | 359,508 | 9,903 | 672,381 | 60,342 | 11,173 |  |
| - Customer |  | 4,318,540 | 3,324,374 | 649,262 | 10,419 | 115,746 | 15,957 | 202,781 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 7,307,223 | 5,199,751 | 1,008,770 | 20,323 | 788,127 | 76,299 | 213,953 |  |
| Employee Benefits (Acct. 926) |  | $(2,265,273)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(926,506)$ | $(581,375)$ | $(111,449)$ | $(3,070)$ | $(208,441)$ | $(18,706)$ | $(3,464)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(1,338,768)$ | $(1,030,572)$ | $(201,274)$ | $(3,230)$ | $(35,882)$ | $(4,947)$ | $(62,863)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | $\stackrel{-}{-}$ |  |
| Total |  | $(2,265,273)$ | $(1,611,947)$ | $(312,723)$ | $(6,300)$ | $(244,323)$ | $(23,653)$ | $(66,327)$ |  |
| Regulatory Commission Expenses (Acct 928) |  | 1,326,184 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 717,260 | 457,341 | 133,205 | 2,284 | 90,101 | 5,599 | 28,731 |  |
| - Customer |  | 608,924 | 388,263 | 113,086 | 1,939 | 76,492 | 4,753 | 24,391 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 1,326,184 | 845,604 | 246,291 | 4,222 | 166,593 | 10,353 | 53,122 |  |
| General Advertising Expense |  | 45,306 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 16,940 | 10,693 | 1,966 | 53 | 3,742 | 434 | 52 |  |
| - Customer |  | 28,365 | 23,491 | 3,529 | 50 | 451 | 53 | 790 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 45,306 | 34,185 | 5,495 | 103 | 4,194 | 488 | 842 |  |
| All Other O\&M |  | 2,060,838 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 842,891 | 528,908 | 101,391 | 2,793 | 189,630 | 17,018 | 3,151 |  |
| - Customer |  | 1,217,947 | 937,565 | 183,110 | 2,939 | 32,643 | 4,500 | 57,190 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | . | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 2,060,838 | 1,466,473 | 284,501 | 5,732 | 222,274 | 21,519 | 60,341 |  |
| Total A\&G Expense |  | 12,269,540 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 5,191,547 | 3,264,985 | 671,344 | 17,106 | 1,096,638 | 96,028 | 45,445 |  |
| - Customer |  | 7,077,994 | 5,369,753 | 1,084,930 | 17,528 | 249,567 | 28,606 | 327,610 |  |
| - Commodity |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 12,269,540 | 8,634,738 | 1,756,274 | 34,635 | 1,346,205 | 124,634 | 373,055 |  |
| Total O\&M Expenses |  | 56,655,385 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 21,787,844 | 13,740,911 | 2,596,998 | 68,958 | 4,763,140 | 521,430 | 96,406 |  |
| - Customer |  | 34,867,542 | 28,384,262 | 4,542,443 | 66,703 | 691,695 | 80,928 | 1,101,510 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 56,655,385 | 42,125,174 | 7,139,442 | 135,661 | 5,454,835 | 602,358 | 1,197,916 |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) Allocation to Customer Classes Total | Allocation Factor | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total } \\ \text { Company } \end{array}$ | Residential Service | Small C \& I Schedule C\&G | Small C \& I Schedule CA-CSH | Medium Power Schedule PH | Large Power Schedule PP | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Street and } \\ \text { Area Lighting } \\ \text { ST LTNG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Classification Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEPRECIATION EXPENSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation Expense |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Plant Deprexp |  | 28,696,459 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 15,520,343 | 9,791,779 | 1,914,988 | 52,430 | 3,432,411 | 264,435 | 64,300 |  |
| - Customer |  | 13,176,116 | 10,628,523 | 1,579,021 | 20,460 | 188,622 | 20,663 | 738,828 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 28,696,459 | 20,420,302 | 3,494,008 | 72,890 | 3,621,033 | 285,098 | 803,128 |  |
| General Plant DeprExp |  | 2,947,291 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 1,205,454 | 756,413 | 145,004 | 3,994 | 271,198 | 24,338 | 4,506 |  |
| - Customer |  | 1,741,837 | 1,340,851 | 261,873 | 4,202 | 46,685 | 6,436 | 81,790 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 2,947,291 | 2,097,265 | 406,877 | 8,197 | 317,883 | 30,775 | 86,296 |  |
| Intangible Plant Deprexp |  | 2,178,273 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 1,136,667 | 716,528 | 139,680 | 3,828 | 252,102 | 19,895 | 4,634 |  |
| - Customer |  | 1,041,607 | 875,138 | 129,694 | 1,671 | 13,930 | 1,408 | 19,766 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 2,178,273 | 1,591,665 | 269,374 | 5,500 | 266,032 | 21,302 | 24,401 |  |
| Total Depreciation Expenses |  | 33,822,024 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 17,862,463 | 11,264,720 | 2,199,672 | 60,252 | 3,955,711 | 308,668 | 73,441 |  |
| - Customer |  | 15,959,561 | 12,844,512 | 1,970,588 | 26,334 | 249,236 | 28,507 | 840,383 |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| Total |  | 33,822,024 | 24,109,232 | 4,170,259 | 86,586 | 4,204,947 | 337,175 | 913,825 |  |
| Regulatory Debits and Credits <br> MDEDIS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(393,539)$ | $(250,019)$ | $(54,188)$ | $(1,501)$ | $(85,104)$ | (303) | $(2,425)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | $(393,539)$ | $(250,019)$ | $(54,188)$ | $(1,501)$ | $(85,104)$ | (303) | $(2,425)$ |  |
| MD Electric Vehicle Program |  | 305,258 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 180,864 | 91,234 | 31,064 | 846 | 53,259 | 3,340 | 1,122 |  |
| - Customer |  | 124,394 | 79,944 | 30,594 | 372 | 3,018 | 278 | 10,188 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 305,258 | 171,178 | 61,657 | 1,218 | 56,277 | 3,618 | 11,310 |  |
| MD Conservation Voltage Reduction (CVR) |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Deferral of Rate Case Expenses |  | $(75,413)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(40,193)$ | $(25,352)$ | $(4,954)$ | (136) | $(8,896)$ | (690) | (166) |  |
| - Customer |  | $(35,219)$ | $(28,061)$ | $(4,269)$ | (57) | (545) | (63) | $(2,226)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | $(75,413)$ | $(53,412)$ | $(9,223)$ | (192) | $(9,441)$ | (753) | $(2,391)$ |  |
| COVID-19 |  | 1,930,321 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 1,044,005 | 866,593 | 78,558 | 1,387 | 61,655 | 31,447 | 4,364 |  |
| - Customer |  | 886,316 | 735,701 | 66,692 | 1,177 | 52,342 | 26,697 | 3,705 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 1,930,321 | 1,602,295 | 145,251 | 2,564 | 113,997 | 58,145 | 8,070 |  |
| COVID-19-Residential Adjustment |  | $(478,275)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(258,673)$ | $(258,673)$ | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | $(219,602)$ | $(219,602)$ | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  | (478,275) | $(478,275)$ | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Regulatory Debits and Credits |  | 1,288,352 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 532,464 | 423,784 | 50,480 | 596 | 20,914 | 33,794 | 2,896 |  |
| - Customer |  | 755,889 | 567,982 | 93,017 | 1,493 | 54,816 | 26,913 | 11,668 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 1,288,352 | 991,766 | 143,497 | 2,089 | 75,729 | 60,707 | 14,563 |  |
| Taxes Other than Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Payroll Taxes |  | 621,313 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 308,114 | 193,339 | 37,063 | 1,021 | 69,318 | 6,221 | 1,152 |  |
| - Customer |  | 313,199 | 229,842 | 49,005 | 832 | 11,078 | 1,645 | 20,798 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 621,313 | 423,181 | 86,068 | 1,853 | 80,396 | 7,866 | 21,950 |  |
| Customer Account Payroll Taxes |  | 228,896 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 228,896 | 195,719 | 31,088 | 420 | 1,483 | - | 186 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 228,896 | 195,719 | 31,088 | 420 | 1,483 | - | 186 |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& 1 | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Total | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | ST LTNG | Factor |
| A\&G Payroll Taxes |  | 12,736 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 5,209 | 3,269 | 627 | 17 | 1,172 | 105 | 19 |  |
| - Customer |  | 7,527 | 5,794 | 1,132 | 18 | 202 | 28 | 353 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 12,736 | 9,063 | 1,758 | 35 | 1,374 | 133 | 373 |  |
| Gross Receipt Taxes |  | 6,955,508 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 3,703,278 | 2,301,554 | 680,565 | 12,015 | 534,127 | 37,929 | 137,089 |  |
| - Customer |  | 3,252,231 | 2,021,233 | 597,674 | 10,551 | 469,072 | 33,309 | 120,392 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 6,955,508 | 4,322,787 | 1,278,239 | 22,566 | 1,003,199 | 71,238 | 257,480 |  |
| Property Taxes |  | 13,480,260 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 7,177,210 | 4,530,962 | 884,039 | 24,176 | 1,584,133 | 124,240 | 29,660 |  |
| - Customer |  | 6,303,050 | 5,063,584 | 771,118 | 10,243 | 98,639 | 12,150 | 347,315 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 13,480,260 | 9,594,546 | 1,655,157 | 34,419 | 1,682,773 | 136,390 | 376,975 |  |
| Sales \& Use Tax |  | $(202,486)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(107,808)$ | $(67,002)$ | $(19,812)$ | (350) | $(15,549)$ | $(1,104)$ | $(3,991)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(94,677)$ | $(58,841)$ | $(17,399)$ | (307) | $(13,655)$ | (970) | $(3,505)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | $(202,486)$ | $(125,843)$ | $(37,211)$ | (657) | $(29,205)$ | $(2,074)$ | $(7,496)$ |  |
| Montgomery County Fuel Energy |  | 9,510,444 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 5,063,586 | 2,422,413 | 922,475 | 19,833 | 1,626,227 | - | 72,638 |  |
| - Customer |  | 4,446,858 | 2,127,371 | 810,120 | 17,417 | 1,428,158 | - | 63,791 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 9,510,444 | 4,549,784 | 1,732,595 | 37,251 | 3,054,385 | - | 136,430 |  |
| Other Taxes |  | 646 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 344 | 218 | 42 | 1 | 75 | 6 | 1 |  |
| - Customer |  | 302 | 244 | 37 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 17 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 646 | 462 | 79 | 2 | 78 | 7 | 18 |  |
| Total Taxes Other than Income |  | 30,607,318 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 16,149,933 | 9,384,754 | 2,504,998 | 56,713 | 3,799,503 | 167,397 | 236,569 |  |
| - Customer |  | 14,457,385 | 9,584,945 | 2,242,775 | 39,175 | 1,994,979 | 46,163 | 549,347 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Taxes Other than Income |  | 30,607,318 | 18,969,699 | 4,747,773 | 95,888 | 5,794,482 | 213,560 | 785,916 |  |
| Total Operating Expenses |  | 122,373,079 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 56,332,704 | 34,814,169 | 7,352,148 | 186,519 | 12,539,268 | 1,031,289 | 409,311 |  |
| - Customer |  | 66,040,375 | 51,381,702 | 8,848,823 | 133,705 | 2,990,726 | 182,511 | 2,502,908 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 122,373,079 | 86,195,871 | 16,200,971 | 320,224 | 15,529,994 | 1,213,800 | 2,912,220 |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& I | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Sub-Transmission | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | Pp | St LTNG | Factor |
| UTILITY PLANT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Plant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (360) Land and Land Rights |  | 1,580,034 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DEM |
| - Demand | ${ }^{12} \mathrm{CP}$-SUB | 1,580,034 | 995,572 | 156,434 | 4,042 | 351,246 | 71,769 | 970 | 100\% |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 1,580,034 | 995,572 | 156,434 | 4,042 | 351,246 | 71,769 | 970 |  |
| (361) Structures and Improvements |  | 8,742 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DEM |
| - Demand | 12CP-SUB | 8,742 | 5,508 | 866 | 22 | 1,943 | 397 | 5 | 100\% |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 8,742 | 5,508 | 866 | 22 | 1,943 | 397 | 5 |  |
| (362) Station Equipment |  | 1,021,961 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DEM |
| - Demand | ${ }^{12 C P-S U B}$ | 1,021,961 | 643,933 | 101,181 | 2,614 | 227,185 | 46,420 | 628 | 100\% |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 1,021,961 | 643,933 | 101,181 | 2,614 | 227,185 | 46,420 | 628 |  |
| (362) Station Equipment - Capacitors |  | 1,528,215 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DEM |
| - Demand | 12CP-SUB | 1,528,215 | 962,922 | 151,304 | 3,909 | 339,726 | 69,416 | 938 | 100\% |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 1,528,215 | 962,922 | 151,304 | 3,909 | 339,726 | 69,416 | 938 |  |
| (364) Poles, Towers \& Fixtures |  | 39,543,103 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DEM |
| - Demand | 12 CP -SUB | 39,543,103 | 24,915,934 | 3,915,037 | 101,153 | 8,790,542 | 1,796,154 | 24,283 | 100\% |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 39,543,103 | 24,915,934 | 3,915,037 | 101,153 | 8,790,542 | 1,796,154 | 24,283 |  |
| (365) Overhead Conductors \& Devices |  | 104,904,585 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DEM |
| - Demand | 12CP-SUB | 104,904,585 | 66,099,913 | 10,386,270 | 268,352 | 23,320,581 | 4,765,048 | 64,421 | 100\% |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 104,904,585 | 66,099,913 | 10,386,270 | 268,352 | 23,320,581 | 4,765,048 | 64,421 |  |
| (366) Underground Conduit |  | 19,489,104 | 12,279,998 |  |  |  |  |  | DEM |
| - Demand | 12CP-SUB | 19,489,104 |  | 1,929,554 | 49,854 | 4,332,482 | 885,247 | 11,968 | 100\% |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 19,489,104 | 12,279,998 | 1,929,554 | 49,854 | 4,332,482 | 885,247 | 11,968 |  |





| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Sub-Transmission | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | ST LTNG | Factor |
| Working Capital |  | 3,158,071 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SUB |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | 3,158,071 | 1,991,912 | 312,748 | 8,068 | 699,934 | 143,392 | 2,017 | 100\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 3,158,071 | 1,991,912 | 312,748 | 8,068 | 699,934 | 143,392 | 2,017 |  |
| ADIT |  | $(43,324,794)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SUB |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | $(43,324,794)$ | $(27,326,552)$ | $(4,290,508)$ | $(110,679)$ | $(9,602,226)$ | $(1,967,158)$ | $(27,672)$ | 100\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | (43,324,794) | $(27,326,552)$ | $(4,290,508)$ | $(110,679)$ | $(9,602,226)$ | $(1,967,158)$ | $(27,672)$ |  |
| Customer Advances |  | $(978,681)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | DISTPLT-SUB |
| - Demand | DISTPLT-SUB-D | $(978,681)$ | $(616,663)$ | $(96,896)$ | $(2,504)$ | $(217,564)$ | $(44,454)$ | (601) | 100\% |
| - Customer | DISTPLT-SUB-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | DISTPLT-SUB-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(978,681)$ | $(616,663)$ | $(96,896)$ | $(2,504)$ | $(217,564)$ | $(44,454)$ | (601) |  |
| Customer Deposits |  | $(2,694,811)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SUB |
| - Demand | Deposits | $(2,694,811)$ | $(1,472,361)$ | $(401,386)$ | - | $(813,122)$ | - | $(7,941)$ | 100\% |
| - Customer | Deposits | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | Deposits | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(2,694,811)$ | $(1,472,361)$ | $(401,386)$ | - | $(813,122)$ | - | $(7,941)$ |  |
| Deferred Investment Tax Credit |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SUB |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Other Rate Base Items |  | $(34,122,334)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(34,122,334)$ | $(21,294,236)$ | $(3,513,669)$ | $(80,289)$ | $(7,779,169)$ | $(1,426,981)$ | $(27,991)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | $(34,122,334)$ | (21,294,236) | $(3,513,669)$ | $(80,289)$ | $(7,779,169)$ | $(1,426,981)$ | $(27,991)$ |  |
| Total Rate Base |  | 137,876,780 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll} & \text { - Demand } \\ \\ \text { - Customer } \\ \text { - Commodity }\end{array}$ |  | 137,876,780 | 87,245,134 | 13,521,641 | 358,821 | 30,286,130 | 6,381,146 | 83,908 |  |
|  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  |  | 137,876,780 | 87,245,134 | 13,521,641 | 358,821 | 30,286,130 | 6,381,146 | 83,908 |  |




| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Sub-Transmission | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | Pp | ST LTNG | Factor |
| (597) Maintenance of meters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| (598) Maintenance of miscellaneous distribution plant |  | 45,853 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DistMtExp-SUB |
| - Demand | DistMtExp-SUB-D | 45,853 | 28,892 | 4,540 | 117 | 10,193 | 2,083 | 28 | 100\% |
| - Customer | DistMtexp-SUB-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | DistMtExp-SUB-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 45,853 | 28,892 | 4,540 | 117 | 10,193 | 2,083 | 28 |  |
| Total Dist. Maintenance Expenses |  | 7,100,863 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 7,100,863 | 4,474,222 | 703,034 | 18,164 | 1,578,542 | 322,540 | 4,361 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 7,100,863 | 4,474,222 | 703,034 | 18,164 | 1,578,542 | 322,540 | 4,361 |  |
| Total Distribution Expenses |  | 9,213,081 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 9,213,081 | 5,805,122 | 912,158 | 23,568 | 2,048,094 | 418,483 | 5,658 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 9,213,081 | 5,805,122 | 912,158 | 23,568 | 2,048,094 | 418,483 | 5,658 |  |
| Customer Accounts and Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meter Reading \& Billing |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Other-Direct to Other |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Uncollectibles |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| $\begin{array}{ll} & \text { - Demand } \\ \\ \text { - Customer } \\ \text { Total }\end{array}$ |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
|  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
|  |  | $-$ | - | - | - | - | - | $-$ | N/A |
|  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |




| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Sub-Transmission | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | ST LTNG | Factor |
| Taxes Other than Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Payroll Taxes |  | 131,591 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DISTLAB-SUB |
| - Demand | DISTLAB-SUB-D | 131,591 | 82,915 | 13,028 | 337 | 29,253 | 5,977 | 81 | 100\% |
| - Customer | distiab-Sub-c | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | DISTLAB-SUB-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 131,591 | 82,915 | 13,028 | 337 | 29,253 | 5,977 | 81 |  |
| Customer Account Payroll Taxes |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | CUSTLAB-SUB |
| - Demand | CUSTLAB-SUB-D | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | CUSTLAB-SUB-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | CUSTLAB-SUB-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| A\&G Payroll Taxes |  | 2,225 |  |  |  |  |  |  | AGLAB-SUB |
| - Demand | AGLAB-SUB-D | 2,225 | 1,402 | 220 | 6 | 495 | 101 | 1 | 100\% |
| - Customer | AGLAB-SUB-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | AGLAB-SUB-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 2,225 | 1,402 | 220 | 6 | 495 | 101 | 1 |  |
| Gross Receipt Taxes |  | 1,336,493 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SUB |
| - Demand | Revenue | 1,336,493 | 830,618 | 245,612 | 4,336 | 192,763 | 13,688 | 49,475 | 100\% |
| - Customer | Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 1,336,493 | 830,618 | 245,612 | 4,336 | 192,763 | 13,688 | 49,475 |  |
| Property Taxes |  | 2,590,216 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SUB |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | 2,590,216 | 1,633,745 | 256,512 | 6,617 | 574,079 | 117,608 | 1,654 | 100\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 2,590,216 | 1,633,745 | 256,512 | 6,617 | 574,079 | 117,608 | 1,654 |  |
| Sales \& Use Tax |  | $(38,907)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SUB |
| - Demand | Revenue | $(38,907)$ | $(24,181)$ | $(7,150)$ | (126) | $(5,612)$ | (398) | $(1,440)$ | 100\% |
| - Customer | Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(38,907)$ | $(24,181)$ | $(7,150)$ | (126) | $(5,612)$ | (398) | $(1,440)$ |  |
| Montgomery County Fuel Energy |  | 1,827,420 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SUB |
| - Demand | MontCoFuel | 1,827,420 | 874,235 | 332,916 | 7,158 | 586,896 | - | 26,215 | 100\% |
| - Customer | MontCoFuel | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | MontCoFue | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 1,827,420 | 874,235 | 332,916 | 7,158 | 586,896 | - | 26,215 |  |
| Other Taxes |  | 124 |  |  |  |  |  |  | RB-SUB |
| - Demand | RB-SUB-D | 124 | 78 | 12 | 0 | 27 | 6 | 0 | 100\% |
| - Customer | Rb-SUB-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | RB-SUB-E | - | - | - | - | $-$ | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 124 | 78 | 12 | 0 | 27 | 6 | 0 |  |
| Total Taxes Other than Income |  | 5,849,161 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 5,849,161 | 3,398,814 | 841,151 | 18,327 | 1,377,902 | 136,982 | 75,986 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Taxes Other than Income |  | 5,849,161 | 3,398,814 | 841,151 | 18,327 | 1,377,902 | 136,982 | 75,986 |  |
| Total Operating Expenses |  | 23,965,511 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 23,965,511 | 14,853,379 | 2,655,736 | 64,530 | 5,341,157 | 952,493 | 98,215 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | , | , | - | , | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 23,965,511 | 14,853,379 | 2,655,736 | 64,530 | 5,341,157 | 952,493 | 98,215 |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) Allocation to Customer Classes Primary | Allocation Factor | Total Company | Residential Service R | Small C \& I Schedule C\&G | Small C \& I Schedule CA-CSH | Medium Power Schedule PH | Large Power Schedule PP | Street and Area Lighting ST LTNG | Classification Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UTILITY PLANT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Plant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (360) Land and Land Rights |  | 12,433,259 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 360P |
| - Demand | 1NCP-PRI | 12,247,291 | 7,515,677 | 1,644,569 | 48,427 | 2,939,694 | 26,029 | 72,895 | 99\% |
| - Customer | Customers-PRI | 185,968 | 163,736 | 20,396 | 212 | 1,093 | 1 | 529 | 1\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 12,433,259 | 7,679,413 | 1,664,966 | 48,640 | 2,940,787 | 26,030 | 73,424 |  |
| (361) Structures and Improvements |  | 11,481,863 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DEM |
| - Demand | 1NCP-PRI | 11,481,863 | 7,045,964 | 1,541,787 | 45,401 | 2,755,970 | 24,402 | 68,340 | 100\% |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 11,481,863 | 7,045,964 | 1,541,787 | 45,401 | 2,755,970 | 24,402 | 68,340 |  |
| (362) Station Equipment |  | 189,192,334 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DEM |
| - Demand | 1NCP-PRI | 189,192,334 | 116,099,828 | 25,404,792 | 748,090 | 45,411,471 | 402,088 | 1,126,064 | 100\% |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 189,192,334 | 116,099,828 | 25,404,792 | 748,090 | 45,411,471 | 402,088 | 1,126,064 |  |
| (362) Station Equipment - Capacitors |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | DEM |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| (364) Poles, Towers \& Fixtures |  | 5,330,296 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 364 P |
| - Demand | 1NCP-PRI | 3,888,518 | 2,386,229 | 522,151 | 15,376 | 933,354 | 8,264 | 23,144 | 73\% |
| - Customer | Customers-PRI | 1,441,778 | 1,269,423 | 158,131 | 1,646 | 8,475 | 5 | 4,098 | 27\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 5,330,296 | 3,655,652 | 680,282 | 17,022 | 941,828 | 8,269 | 27,242 |  |
| (365) Overhead Conductors \& Devices |  | 7,476,890 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 365P |
| - Demand | 1NCP-PRI | 4,235,205 | 2,598,977 | 568,704 | 16,747 | 1,016,568 | 9,001 | 25,208 | 57\% |
| - Customer | Customers-PRI | 3,241,684 | 2,854,162 | 355,540 | 3,702 | 19,055 | 11 | 9,214 | 43\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 7,476,890 | 5,453,139 | 924,245 | 20,448 | 1,035,623 | 9,012 | 34,422 |  |
| (366) Underground Conduit |  | 2,567,410 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 366 P |
| - Demand | 1 NCP-PRI | 2,567,410 | 1,575,517 | 344,752 | 10,152 | 616,250 | 5,456 | 15,281 | 100\% |
| - Customer | Customers-PRI | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 2,567,410 | 1,575,517 | 344,752 | 10,152 | 616,250 | 5,456 | 15,281 |  |




| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)Allocation to Customer ClassesPrimary |  |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
|  | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | ST LTNG | Factor |
| Intangible Plant A/D |  | $(4,209,994)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | LABOR-PRI |
| - Demand | LABOR-PRI-D | $(4,073,897)$ | $(2,499,989)$ | $(547,044)$ | $(16,109)$ | $(977,850)$ | $(8,658)$ | $(24,248)$ | 97\% |
| - Customer | LABOR-PrI-C | $(136,097)$ | $(119,828)$ | $(14,927)$ | (155) | (800) | (0) | (387) | 3\% |
| - Commodity | LABOR-PRILE | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(4,209,994)$ | $(2,619,816)$ | $(561,971)$ | $(16,264)$ | $(978,650)$ | $(8,659)$ | $(24,634)$ |  |
| COVID Reg Asset A/D |  | $(123,808)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | COVIDREGASSET-PRI |
| - Demand | COVIDREGASSET-PRI-D | $(119,889)$ | $(92,805)$ | $(11,993)$ | (212) | $(9,412)$ | $(4,801)$ | (666) | 97\% |
| - Customer | COVIDREGASSET-PRI-C | $(3,919)$ | $(3,034)$ | (392) | (7) | (308) | (157) | (22) | 3\% |
| - Commodity | COVIDREGASSET-PRI-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(123,808)$ | $(95,839)$ | $(12,385)$ | (219) | $(9,720)$ | $(4,958)$ | (688) |  |
| EV Reg Asset A/D |  | $(26,028)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | EVREGASSET-PRI |
| - Demand | EVREGASSET-PRI-D | $(25,451)$ | $(14,133)$ | $(3,934)$ | (116) | $(7,032)$ | (62) | (174) | 98\% |
| - Customer | EVREGASSET-PRI-C | (576) | (462) | (105) | (1) | (6) | (0) | (3) | 2\% |
| - Commodity | EVREGASSET-PRI-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(26,028)$ | $(14,595)$ | $(4,039)$ | (117) | $(7,037)$ | (62) | (177) |  |
| CWIP A/D |  | $(27,725)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-PRI |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-PRI-D | $(26,847)$ | $(16,494)$ | $(3,601)$ | (106) | $(6,424)$ | (62) | (160) | 97\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-PRI-C | (878) | (773) | (96) | (1) | (5) | (0) | (3) | 3\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-PRI-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(27,725)$ | $(17,267)$ | $(3,697)$ | (107) | $(6,429)$ | (62) | (162) |  |
| Total Accumulated Depreciation |  | $(98,188,518)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(95,075,123)$ | $(58,361,599)$ | $(12,763,116)$ | $(375,692)$ | $(22,802,236)$ | $(206,621)$ | $(565,858)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(3,113,395)$ | $(2,740,746)$ | $(341,474)$ | $(3,558)$ | $(18,588)$ | (168) | $(8,861)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Accumulated Depreciation |  | $(98,188,518)$ | $(61,102,345)$ | (13,104,590) | $(379,250)$ | (22,820,824) | $(206,789)$ | $(574,720)$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OTHER RATE BASE ITEMS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Rate Base Items |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Work in Progress |  | 8,581,279 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-PRI |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-PRI-D | 8,309,402 | 5,105,240 | 1,114,557 | 32,772 | 1,988,162 | 19,222 | 49,449 | 97\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-PRI-C | 271,877 | 239,217 | 29,820 | 311 | 1,697 | 55 | 777 | 3\% |
|  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 8,581,279 | 5,344,457 | 1,144,377 | 33,083 | 1,989,859 | 19,277 | 50,226 |  |
| Plant Held for Future Use |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-PRI |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-PRI-D | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 97\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-PRI-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-PRI-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Prepayments |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-PRI |
| Total $\begin{aligned} & \text { - Demand } \\ & \text { - Customer } \\ & \text { - Commodity }\end{aligned}$ | TOTPLT-PRI-D | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 97\% |
|  | TOTPLT-PRI-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3\% |
|  | TOTPLT-PRI-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& I | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Primary | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | St LTNG | Factor |
| Working Capital |  | 2,788,703 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-PRI |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-PRI-D | 2,700,350 | 1,659,077 | 362,203 | 10,650 | 646,104 | 6,247 | 16,070 | 97\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-PRI-C | 88,353 | 77,740 | 9,691 | 101 | 551 | 18 | 252 | 3\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-PRI-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 2,788,703 | 1,736,816 | 371,894 | 10,751 | 646,655 | 6,265 | 16,322 |  |
| ADIT |  | $(38,257,533)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-PRI |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-PRI-D | $(37,045,437)$ | $(22,760,465)$ | $(4,968,979)$ | $(146,104)$ | $(8,863,735)$ | $(85,699)$ | $(220,455)$ | 97\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-PRI-C | $(1,212,096)$ | $(1,066,491)$ | $(132,946)$ | $(1,388)$ | $(7,564)$ | (244) | $(3,463)$ | 3\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-PRI-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(38,257,533)$ | $(23,826,956)$ | $(5,101,925)$ | $(147,493)$ | $(8,871,298)$ | $(85,943)$ | $(223,919)$ |  |
| Customer Advances |  | $(863,164)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | DISTPLT-PRI |
| - Demand | DISTPLT-PRI-D | $(835,843)$ | $(512,924)$ | $(112,237)$ | $(3,305)$ | $(200,626)$ | $(1,776)$ | $(4,975)$ | 97\% |
| - Customer | DISTPIT-PRI-C | $(27,321)$ | $(24,055)$ | $(2,997)$ | (31) | (161) | (0) | (78) | 3\% |
| - Commodity | DISTPLT-PRI-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(863,164)$ | $(536,979)$ | $(115,234)$ | $(3,336)$ | $(200,786)$ | $(1,777)$ | $(5,053)$ |  |
| Customer Deposits |  | $(2,379,626)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-PRI |
| - Demand | Deposits | $(2,304,233)$ | $(1,258,962)$ | $(343,211)$ | - | $(695,270)$ | - | $(6,790)$ | 97\% |
| - Customer | Deposits | $(75,393)$ | $(41,192)$ | $(11,230)$ | - | $(22,749)$ | - | (222) | 3\% |
| - Commodity | Deposits | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | (2,379,626) | (1,300,154) | $(354,440)$ | - | $(718,019)$ | - | $(7,013)$ |  |
| Deferred Investment Tax Credit |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-PRI |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-PRI-D | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 97\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-PRI-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-PRI-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Other Rate Base Items |  | $(30,130,341)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(29,175,761)$ | $(17,768,034)$ | $(3,947,666)$ | $(105,988)$ | $(7,125,365)$ | $(62,006)$ | $(166,702)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(954,580)$ | $(814,781)$ | $(107,661)$ | $(1,007)$ | $(28,225)$ | (172) | $(2,734)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | (30,130,341) | $(18,582,815)$ | $(4,055,327)$ | $(106,995)$ | (7,153,590) | $(62,177)$ | $(169,436)$ |  |
| Total Rate Base |  | 121,783,036 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 117,927,146 | 72,662,906 | 15,773,042 | 473,452 | 28,017,505 | 291,612 | 708,628 |  |
| - Customer |  | 3,855,891 | 3,416,468 | 419,976 | 4,512 | 2,633 | 1,257 | 11,045 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 121,783,036 | 76,079,374 | 16,193,018 | 477,964 | 28,020,138 | 292,869 | 719,673 |  |



| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& I | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Primary | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | St LTNG | Factor |
| Distribution Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operations Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (580) Operation Supervision \& Engineering |  | 3,402 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DistOpExp-PRI |
| - Demand | Distopexp-PRI-D | 3,000 | 1,841 | 403 | 12 | 720 | 6 | 18 | 88\% |
| - Customer | Distopexp-PRI-C | 402 | 354 | 44 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 12\% |
| - Commodity | DistOPExp-PRI-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 3,402 | 2,195 | 447 | 12 | 723 | 6 | 19 |  |
| (581) Load Dispatching |  | 116,085 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DEM |
| - Demand | 1NCP-PRI | 116,085 | 71,237 | 15,588 | 459 | 27,864 | 247 | 691 | 100\% |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 116,085 | 71,237 | 15,588 | 459 | 27,864 | 247 | 691 |  |
| (582) Station Expenses |  | 16,885 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DEM |
| - Demand | 1NCP-PRI | 16,885 | 10,362 | 2,267 | 67 | 4,053 | 36 | 101 | 100\% |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 16,885 | 10,362 | 2,267 | 67 | 4,053 | 36 | 101 |  |
| (583) Overhead line expenses |  | 32,702 |  |  |  |  |  |  | OHLines-PRI |
| - Demand | OHLines-PRI-D | 18,524 | 11,367 | 2,487 | 73 | 4,446 | 39 | 110 | 57\% |
| - Customer | OHLines-PRI-C | 14,178 | 12,483 | 1,555 | 16 | 83 | 0 | 40 | 43\% |
| - Commodity | OHLines-PRI-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 32,702 | 23,850 | 4,042 | 89 | 4,530 | 39 | 151 |  |
| (584) Underground line expenses |  | 25,908 |  |  |  |  |  |  | UGLines-PRI |
| - Demand | UGLines-PRI-D | 17,448 | 10,707 | 2,343 | 69 | 4,188 | 37 | 104 | 67\% |
| - Customer | UGLines-PRI-C | 8,460 | 7,449 | 928 | 10 | 50 | 0 | 24 | 33\% |
| - Commodity | UGLines-PRI-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 25,908 | 18,156 | 3,271 | 79 | 4,238 | 37 | 128 |  |
| (585) Street lighting and signal system expenses |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| (586) Meter expenses |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| (588) Miscellaneous distribution expenses |  | 219,890 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DistOpExp-PRI |
| - Demand | Distopexp-PRI-D | 193,906 | 118,993 | 26,038 | 767 | 46,543 | 412 | 1,154 | 88\% |
| - Customer | DistOpExp-PRI-C | 25,983 | 22,877 | 2,850 | 30 | 153 | 0 | 74 | 12\% |
| - Commodity | DistOpExp-PRI-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 219,890 | 141,870 | 28,888 | 796 | 46,696 | 412 | 1,228 |  |



| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& 1 | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Primary | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | St LTNG | Factor |
| (597) Maintenance of meters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| (598) Maintenance of miscellaneous distribution plant |  | 19,760 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DistMtExp-PRI |
| - Demand | DistMtExp-PRI-D | 18,360 | 11,267 | 2,465 | 73 | 4,407 | 39 | 109 | 93\% |
| - Customer | DistMtExp-PRI-C | 1,400 | 1,233 | 154 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 7\% |
| - Commodity | DistMtExp-PRI-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 19,760 | 12,499 | 2,619 | 74 | 4,415 | 39 | 113 |  |
| Total Dist. Maintenance Expenses |  | 3,060,047 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 2,843,252 | 1,744,791 | 381,793 | 11,243 | 682,460 | 6,043 | 16,923 |  |
| - Customer |  | 216,795 | 190,878 | 23,778 | 248 | 1,274 | 1 | 616 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 3,060,047 | 1,935,669 | 405,570 | 11,490 | 683,735 | 6,043 | 17,539 |  |
| Total Distribution Expenses |  | 3,527,856 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 3,255,782 | 1,997,944 | 437,187 | 12,874 | 781,479 | 6,919 | 19,378 |  |
| - Customer |  | 272,074 | 239,549 | 29,840 | 311 | 1,599 | 1 | 773 |  |
| - Commodity |  | , | - |  | - | - | , | - |  |
| Total |  | 3,527,856 | 2,237,494 | 467,028 | 13,184 | 783,078 | 6,920 | 20,152 |  |
| Customer Accounts and ServicesMeter Reading \& Billing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Other-Direct to Other |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Uncollectibles |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
|  - Demand <br>  - Customer <br> - Commodity  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
|  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
|  |  | $-$ | $-$ | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
|  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |




\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)} \& Residential \& Small C \& I \& Small C \& 1 \& Medium Power \& Large Power \& Street and \& <br>
\hline Allocation to Customer Classes \& Allocation \& Total \& Service \& Schedule \& Schedule \& Schedule \& Schedule \& Area Lighting \& Classification <br>
\hline Primary \& Factor \& Company \& R \& C\&G \& CA-CSH \& PH \& PP \& ST LTNG \& Factor <br>
\hline - Commodity \& AGLAB-PRI-E \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline Total \& \& 2,003 \& 1,246 \& 267 \& 8 \& 466 \& 4 \& 12 \& <br>
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Gross Receipt Taxes} \& 1,180,177 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& TOTPLT-PRI <br>
\hline - Demand \& Revenue \& 1,142,786 \& 710,231 \& 210,014 \& 3,708 \& 164,825 \& 11,704 \& 42,304 \& 97\% <br>
\hline - Customer \& Revenue \& 37,391 \& 23,238 \& 6,871 \& 121 \& 5,393 \& 383 \& 1,384 \& 3\% <br>
\hline - Commodity \& Revenue \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline Total \& \& 1,180,177 \& 733,469 \& 216,885 \& 3,829 \& 170,218 \& 12,087 \& 43,688 \& <br>
\hline Property Taxes \& \& 2,287,264 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& TOTPLT-PRI <br>
\hline - Demand \& TOTPLT-PRI-D \& 2,214,798 \& 1,360,757 \& 297,075 \& 8,735 \& 529,927 \& 5,124 \& 13,180 \& 97\% <br>
\hline - Customer \& TOTPLT-PRI-C \& 72,466 \& 63,761 \& 7,948 \& 83 \& 452 \& 15 \& 207 \& 3\% <br>
\hline - Commodity \& TOTPLT-PRIE \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline Total \& \& 2,287,264 \& 1,424,518 \& 305,024 \& 8,818 \& 530,379 \& 5,138 \& 13,387 \& <br>
\hline Sales \& Use Tax \& \& $(34,357)$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& TOTPLT-PRI <br>
\hline - Demand \& Revenue \& $(33,268)$ \& $(20,676)$ \& $(6,114)$ \& (108) \& $(4,798)$ \& (341) \& $(1,232)$ \& 97\% <br>
\hline - Customer \& Revenue \& $(1,089)$ \& (676) \& (200) \& (4) \& (157) \& (11) \& (40) \& 3\% <br>
\hline - Commodity \& Revenue \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline Total \& \& $(34,357)$ \& $(21,352)$ \& $(6,314)$ \& (111) \& $(4,955)$ \& (352) \& $(1,272)$ \& <br>
\hline Montgomery County Fuel Energy \& \& 1,613,685 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& TOTPLT-PRI <br>
\hline - Demand \& Montcofuel \& 1,562,560 \& 747,527 \& 284,664 \& 6,120 \& 501,833 \& - \& 22,415 \& 97\% <br>
\hline - Customer \& Montcofuel \& 51,126 \& 24,458 \& 9,314 \& 200 \& 16,420 \& - \& 733 \& 3\% <br>
\hline - Commodity \& MontCoFuel \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline Total \& \& 1,613,685 \& 771,985 \& 293,978 \& 6,320 \& 518,253 \& - \& 23,149 \& <br>
\hline Other Taxes \& \& 110 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& RB-PRI <br>
\hline - Demand \& RB-PRI-D \& 106 \& 65 \& 14 \& 0 \& 25 \& 0 \& 1 \& 97\% <br>
\hline - Customer \& RB-PRI-C \& 3 \& 3 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 3\% <br>
\hline - Commodity \& RB-PRI-E \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline Total \& \& 110 \& 68 \& 15 \& 0 \& 25 \& 0 \& 1 \& <br>
\hline Total Taxes Other than Income \& \& 5,167,356 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline - Demand \& \& 5,003,564 \& 2,869,446 \& 801,308 \& 18,916 \& 1,219,795 \& 16,735 \& 77,362 \& <br>
\hline - Customer \& \& 163,793 \& 114,213 \& 24,361 \& 405 \& 22,131 \& 386 \& 2,295 \& <br>
\hline - Commodity \& \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& <br>
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Total Taxes Other than Income} \& 5,167,356 \& 2,983,660 \& 825,670 \& 19,322 \& 1,241,926 \& 17,122 \& 79,658 \& <br>
\hline Total Operating Expenses \& \& 16,587,252 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{- Demand

- Customer
- Commodity} \& \& 15,898,080 \& 9,595,739 \& 2,268,305 \& 61,331 \& 3,772,837 \& 50,241 \& 149,625 \& <br>
\hline \& \& 689,172 \& 574,125 \& 82,535 \& 1,026 \& 26,650 \& 758 \& 4,079 \& <br>
\hline \& \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& <br>
\hline \& \& 16,587,252 \& 10,169,864 \& 2,350,841 \& 62,357 \& 3,799,487 \& 50,999 \& 153,704 \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}






| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& I | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Secondary | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | St LTNG | Factor |
| Working Capital |  | 8,193,648 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SEC |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SEC-D | 2,892,255 | 1,873,300 | 402,897 | 10,758 | 585,386 | 1,839 | 18,076 | 35\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SEC-C | 5,301,392 | 4,665,531 | 581,714 | 6,063 | 31,838 | 1,078 | 15,169 | 65\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SEC-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 8,193,648 | 6,538,831 | 984,611 | 16,821 | 617,224 | 2,917 | 33,245 |  |
| ADIT |  | $(112,406,627)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SEC |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SEC-D | $(39,678,134)$ | $(25,699,336)$ | $(5,527,242)$ | $(147,588)$ | $(8,030,768)$ | $(25,226)$ | $(247,974)$ | 35\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SEC-C | $(72,728,493)$ | $(64,005,265)$ | $(7,980,388)$ | $(83,174)$ | $(436,771)$ | $(14,794)$ | $(208,102)$ | 65\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SEC-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(112,406,627)$ | $(89,704,601)$ | $(13,507,630)$ | $(230,762)$ | $(8,467,540)$ | $(40,019)$ | $(456,075)$ |  |
| Customer Advances |  | $(2,606,881)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | DISTPLT-SEC |
| - Demand | DISTPLT-SEC-D | $(923,071)$ | $(597,561)$ | $(128,647)$ | $(3,439)$ | $(187,245)$ | (412) | $(5,766)$ | 35\% |
| - Customer | DISTPLT-SEC-C | $(1,683,811)$ | $(1,483,054)$ | $(184,577)$ | $(1,917)$ | $(9,475)$ | - | $(4,788)$ | 65\% |
| - Commodity | DISTPLT-SEC-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(2,606,881)$ | $(2,080,615)$ | $(313,223)$ | $(5,357)$ | $(196,720)$ | (412) | $(10,554)$ |  |
| Customer Deposits |  | $(6,991,714)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SEC |
| - Demand | Deposits | $(2,467,988)$ | $(1,348,432)$ | $(367,601)$ | - | $(744,681)$ | - | $(7,273)$ | 35\% |
| - Customer | Deposits | $(4,523,727)$ | $(2,471,625)$ | $(673,799)$ | - | $(1,364,972)$ | - | $(13,331)$ | 65\% |
| - Commodity | Deposits | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(6,991,714)$ | $(3,820,057)$ | $(1,041,401)$ | - | $(2,109,653)$ | - | $(20,604)$ |  |
| Deferred Investment Tax Credit |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SEC |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SEC-D | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 35\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SEC-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 65\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SEC-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Other Rate Base Items |  | $(88,598,432)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(31,277,013)$ | $(20,007,592)$ | $(4,380,816)$ | $(107,165)$ | $(6,575,983)$ | $(18,141)$ | $(187,316)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(57,321,419)$ | $(48,937,840)$ | $(6,467,025)$ | $(60,372)$ | $(1,681,411)$ | $(10,397)$ | $(164,374)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | (88,598,432) | $(68,945,432)$ | $(10,847,841)$ | $(167,537)$ | $(8,257,394)$ | $(28,538)$ | $(351,690)$ |  |
| Total Rate Base |  | 355,642,109 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 125,933,149 | 81,840,810 | 17,512,385 | 477,070 | 25,208,959 | 98,682 | 795,244 |  |
| - Customer |  | 229,708,960 | 203,564,819 | 25,043,875 | 268,562 | 95,631 | 76,632 | 659,441 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 355,642,109 | 285,405,628 | 42,556,260 | 745,632 | 25,304,590 | 175,313 | 1,454,685 |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& 1 | Small c \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Secondary | Factor | Company | R | c\& | CA-CSH | PH | Pp | Stitng | Factor |




| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& 1 | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Secondary | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | ST LTNG | Factor |
| (597) Maintenance of meters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| (598) Maintenance of miscellaneous distribution plant |  | 60,458 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DistMtExp-SEC |
| - Demand | DistMtExp-SEC-D | 18,805 | 12,178 | 2,626 | 70 | 3,813 | - | 118 | 31\% |
| - Customer | DistMtExp-SEC-C | 41,653 | 36,687 | 4,566 | 47 | 234 | - | 118 | 69\% |
| - Commodity | DistMEExp-SEC-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 60,458 | 48,865 | 7,192 | 118 | 4,047 | - | 237 |  |
| Total Dist. Maintenance Expenses |  | 9,362,622 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 2,912,123 | 1,885,844 | 406,617 | 10,873 | 590,498 | - | 18,291 |  |
| - Customer |  | 6,450,499 | 5,681,420 | 707,094 | 7,346 | 36,298 | - | 18,342 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 9,362,622 | 7,567,264 | 1,113,711 | 18,219 | 626,796 | - | 36,633 |  |
| Total Distribution Expenses |  | 13,046,172 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 4,127,434 | 2,672,860 | 576,309 | 15,410 | 836,929 | - | 25,924 |  |
| - Customer |  | 8,918,739 | 7,855,377 | 977,659 | 10,157 | 50,187 | - | 25,360 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - |  | 位 | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 13,046,172 | 10,528,237 | 1,553,968 | 25,567 | 887,116 | - | 51,284 |  |
| Customer Accounts and ServicesMeter Reading \& Billing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Other-Direct to Other |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Uncollectibles |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
|  - Demand <br>  - Customer <br> - Commodity  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
|  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
|  |  | $-$ | $-$ | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
|  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |




| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) <br> Allocation to Customer Classes <br> Secondary | Allocation Factor | Total Company | Residential Service R | Small C \& I Schedule C\&G | Small C \& I Schedule CA-CSH | Medium Power Schedule PH | Large Power Schedule PP | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Street and } \\ \text { Area Lighting } \\ \text { ST LTNG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Classification Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Commodity | AGLAB-SEC-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 3,296 | 2,659 | 393 | 6 | 225 | - | 13 |  |
| $\underline{\text { Gross Receipt Taxes }}$ |  | 3,467,544 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SEC |
| - Demand | Revenue | 1,224,000 | 760,705 | 224,939 | 3,971 | 176,538 | 12,536 | 45,310 | 35\% |
| - Customer | Revenue | 2,243,544 | 1,394,343 | 412,304 | 7,279 | 323,588 | 22,978 | 83,052 | 65\% |
| - Commodity | Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 3,467,544 | 2,155,048 | 637,243 | 11,250 | 500,127 | 35,514 | 128,362 |  |
| Property Taxes |  | 6,720,341 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SEC |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SEC-D | 2,372,196 | 1,536,460 | 330,452 | 8,824 | 480,127 | 1,508 | 14,825 | 35\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SEC-C | 4,348,145 | 3,826,618 | 477,115 | 4,973 | 26,113 | 884 | 12,442 | 65\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SEC-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 6,720,341 | 5,363,078 | 807,567 | 13,796 | 506,240 | 2,393 | 27,267 |  |
| Sales \& Use Tax |  | $(100,946)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SEC |
| - Demand | Revenue | $(35,633)$ | $(22,145)$ | $(6,548)$ | (116) | $(5,139)$ | (365) | $(1,319)$ | 35\% |
| - Customer | Revenue | $(65,313)$ | $(40,591)$ | $(12,003)$ | (212) | $(9,420)$ | (669) | $(2,418)$ | 65\% |
| - Commodity | Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(100,946)$ | $(62,737)$ | $(18,551)$ | (327) | $(14,559)$ | $(1,034)$ | $(3,737)$ |  |
| Montgomery County Fuel Energy |  | 4,741,261 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SEC |
| - Demand | MontCoFuel | 1,673,606 | 800,651 | 304,894 | 6,555 | 537,497 | - | 24,008 | 35\% |
| - Customer | MontCoFuel | 3,067,655 | 1,467,562 | 558,860 | 12,015 | 985,212 | - | 44,006 | 65\% |
| - Commodity | MontCoFuel | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 4,741,261 | 2,268,213 | 863,754 | 18,571 | 1,522,709 | - | 68,014 |  |
| Other Taxes |  | 322 |  |  |  |  |  |  | RB-SEC |
| - Demand | Rb-SEC-D | 114 | 74 | 16 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 1 | 35\% |
| - Customer | Rb-SEC-C | 208 | 184 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 65\% |
| - Commodity | Rb-SEC-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 322 | 258 | 39 | 1 | 23 | 0 | 1 |  |
| Total Taxes Other than Income |  | 15,026,790 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 5,297,208 | 3,116,494 | 862,538 | 19,470 | 1,201,806 | 13,679 | 83,221 |  |
| - Customer |  | 9,729,582 | 6,767,322 | 1,451,135 | 24,209 | 1,326,254 | 23,194 | 137,467 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Taxes Other than Income |  | 15,026,790 | 9,883,816 | 2,313,674 | 43,679 | 2,528,060 | 36,873 | 220,688 |  |
| Total Operating Expenses |  | 48,920,028 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 16,524,069 | 10,400,639 | 2,435,780 | 60,863 | 3,436,417 | 28,555 | 161,816 |  |
| - Customer |  | 32,395,959 | 26,556,550 | 3,979,336 | 51,378 | 1,542,690 | 45,980 | 220,025 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 48,920,028 | 36,957,189 | 6,415,116 | 112,241 | 4,979,107 | 74,534 | 381,841 |  |



| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Customer Service | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | St LTNG | Factor |
| (367) Underground Conductors \& Device |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| (368) Line Transformers |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| (368) Line Transformers - Capacitors |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| (369) Services |  | 73,051,113 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 369 |
| - Demand | 1NCPxLT-SEC | - | - | -- | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | CUSxLT-SEC | 73,051,113 | 64,524,857 | 8,030,589 | 83,427 | 412,241 | - | - | 100\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | , | , |  | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 73,051,113 | 64,524,857 | 8,030,589 | 83,427 | 412,241 | - | - |  |
| $(370,371)$ Meters and Installation |  | 58,934,191 |  |  |  |  |  |  | CUS |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | Meters | 58,934,191 | 35,003,730 | 16,591,288 | 366,058 | 5,986,423 | 986,692 | - | 100\% |
|  |  | - |  |  | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 58,934,191 | 35,003,730 | 16,591,288 | 366,058 | 5,986,423 | 986,692 | - |  |
| Street Lighting \& Signal Systems |  | 33,964,292 |  |  |  |  |  |  | CUS |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | StreetLighting | 33,964,292 | - | - | - | - | - | 33,964,292 | 100\% |
|  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 33,964,292 | - | - | - | - | - | 33,964,292 |  |
| Total Distribution Plant |  | 165,949,597 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  |  | - | 8 | , | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 165,949,597 | 99,528,588 | 24,621,876 | 449,485 | 6,398,664 | 986,692 | 33,964,292 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 165,949,597 | 99,528,588 | 24,621,876 | 449,485 | 6,398,664 | 986,692 | 33,964,292 |  |
| General and Intangible Plant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Plant |  | 23,877,340 |  |  |  |  |  |  | LABOR-CS |
| - Demand | LABOR-CS-D | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | LABOR-CS-C | 23,877,340 | 17,203,736 | 4,021,648 | 71,117 | 864,442 | 127,413 | 1,588,984 | 100\% |
| - Commodity | LABOR-CS-E |  | , | , | , | , | , | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 23,877,340 | 17,203,736 | 4,021,648 | 71,117 | 864,442 | 127,413 | 1,588,984 |  |



| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) Allocation to Customer Classes Customer Service | Allocation Factor | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total } \\ \text { Company } \end{array}$ | Residential Service R | Small C \& I Schedule $\qquad$ | Small C \& 1 Schedule CA-CSH | Medium Power Schedule PH | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Large Power } \\ \text { Schedule } \\ \text { pp } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Street and } \\ \text { Area Lighting } \\ \text { ST LTNG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Classification Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intangible Plant A/D |  | $(2,989,703)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | LABOR-CS |
| - Demand | LABOR-CS-D | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | Labor-Cs-C | $(2,989,703)$ | $(2,154,095)$ | (503,554) | $(8,905)$ | $(108,238)$ | $(15,953)$ | (198,958) | 100\% |
| - Commodity | Labor-CS.E | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(2,989,703)$ | $(2,154,095)$ | (503,554) | $(8,905)$ | $(108,238)$ | $(15,953)$ | $(198,958)$ |  |
| COVID Reg Asset A/D |  | $(87,921)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | COVIDREGASSET-CS |
| - Demand | Covioregasset-Cs-d |  |  | - |  | - | - |  | 0\% |
| - Customer | covioregasset-Cs-C | $(87,921)$ | $(68,059)$ | (8,795) | (155) | $(6,903)$ | $(3,521)$ | (489) | 100\% |
| - Commodity | Covioregasset-Cs-E | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(87,921)$ | $(68,059)$ | (8,795) | (155) | $(6,903)$ | $(3,521)$ | (489) |  |
| EV Reg Asset A/D |  | $(18,483)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | EVREGASSET-CS |
| - Demand | EvkEGASSET-CS-D | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | EvkEGASSET-CSC | $(18,483)$ | $(10,365)$ | $(3,009)$ | (55) | (782) | (121) | $(4,151)$ | 100\% |
| - Commodity | EviREGASET-CSEE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(18,483)$ | $(10,365)$ | $(3,009)$ | (55) | (782) | (121) | $(4,151)$ |  |
| CWIP A/D |  | $(19,689)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-CS |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-Cs-D | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | тотPLT-Cs.c | $(19,689)$ | (12,271) | $(2,992)$ | (54) | (754) | (118) | $(3,500)$ | 100\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-CSEE |  |  | - |  | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(19,689)$ | $(12,271)$ | $(2,992)$ | (54) | (754) | ${ }^{(118)}$ | $(3,500)$ |  |
| Total Accumulated Depreciation |  | (77,912,654) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | (77,912,654) | (48,463,616) | (11,841,737) | $(214,799)$ | $(2,974,181)$ | $(457,573)$ | $(13,960,748)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| Total Accumulated Depreciation |  | (77,912,654) | (48,463,616) | (11,841,737) | (214,799) | $(2,974,181)$ | (457,573) | (13,960,748) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OTHER RATE BASE ITEMS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Rate Base litems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Work in Progress |  | 7,062,468 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-CS |
| - Demand | TOTPLTCSS-D | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | тотPLT-Cs.c | 7,062,468 | 4,401,589 | 1,073,210 | 19,462 | 270,407 | 42,212 | 1,255,590 | 100\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPIT-CS.E | - |  | - | - | - | - |  | 0\% |
| Total |  | 7,062,468 | 4,401,589 | 1,073,210 | 19,462 | 270,407 | 42,212 | 1,255,590 |  |
| Plant Held for Future Use |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-CS |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-CS-D | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-CS.C | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-CS.E | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Prepayments |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-CS |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-CS-D | - |  | - | - | - | - |  | 0\% |
| - Customer | тOTPLT-CS-C | - |  | - |  | - | - | - | 100\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-CS-E | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) Allocation to Customer Classes Customer Service | Allocation Factor | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total } \\ \text { Company } \end{array}$ | Residential Service R | Small C \& 1 Schedule $\qquad$ | Small C \& 1 Schedule CA-CSH | Medium Power Schedule PH | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Large Power } \\ \text { Schedule } \\ \text { Pp } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Street and } \\ \text { Area Lighting } \\ \text { ST LTNG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Classification |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Working Capital |  | 2,295,128 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-CS |
| - Demand | TOTPITCS-D | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | Totplicss | 2,295,128 | 1,430,407 | 348,767 | 6,325 | 87,875 | 13,718 | 408,036 | 100\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-CS-E | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 2,295,128 | 1,430,407 | 348,767 | 6,325 | 87,875 | 13,718 | 408,036 |  |
| ADIT |  | $(31,486,287)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-CS |
| - Demand | TOTPIT-CS-D | - |  | - | - | - | - |  | 0\% |
| - Customer | Totplicss | $(31,486,287)$ | $(19,623,406)$ | $(4,784,643)$ | $(86,766)$ | $(1,205,542)$ | $(188,191)$ | (5,597,740) | 100\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-CS.E |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(31,486,287)$ | $(19,623,406)$ | $(4,784,643)$ | $(86,766)$ | $(1,205,542)$ | $(188,191)$ | $(5,597,740)$ |  |
| Customer Advances |  | $(612,971)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | DISTPLT-CS |
| - Demand | DIITPLT-CS-D | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | DISTPLT-CS.C | $(612,971)$ | $(367,630)$ | $(90,946)$ | $(1,660)$ | $(23,635)$ | $(3,645)$ | $(125,454)$ | 100\% |
| - Commodity | DISTPLT-CSEE |  |  |  | - |  |  |  | 0\% |
| Total |  | (612,971) | $(367,630)$ | $(90,946)$ | $(1,660)$ | $(23,635)$ | $(3,645)$ | $(125,454)$ |  |
| Customer Deposits |  | $(1,958,453)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-CS |
| - Demand | Deposits | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | Deposits | $(1,958,453)$ | $(1,070,038)$ | $(291,707)$ | - | $(590,936)$ | - | $(5,771)$ | 100\% |
| - Commodity | Deposits | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(1,958,453)$ | $(1,070,038)$ | $(291,707)$ | - | $(590,936)$ | - | $(5,771)$ |  |
| Deferred Investment Tax Credit |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-CS |
| - Demand | TOTPIT-CS-D | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | Totplecsec | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPIT-CS.E | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Total Other Rate Base Items |  | (24,700,115) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | (24,700,115) | ( $15,229,079$ ) | $(3,745,320)$ | $(62,640)$ | $(1,461,831)$ | $(135,906)$ | $(4,065,340)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | (24,700,115) | $(15,229,079)$ | $(3,745,320)$ | $(62,640)$ | (1,461,831) | $(135,906)$ | $(4,065,340)$ |  |
| Total Rate Base |  | 103,223,294 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 103,223,294 | 64,591,871 | 15,691,703 | 289,778 | 3,445,004 | 636,788 | 18,568,150 |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| Total |  | 103,223,294 | 64,591,871 | 15,691,703 | 289,778 | 3,445,004 | 636,788 | 18,568,150 |  |




| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& 1 | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes <br> Customer Service | Allocation <br> Factor | Total Company | Service | Schedule C\&G | Schedule CA-CSH | Schedule PH | Schedule PP | Area Lighting ST LTNG | Classification Factor |
| (597) Maintenance of meters |  | 914,278 |  |  |  |  |  |  | CUS |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | Meters | 914,278 | 543,032 | 257,390 | 5,679 | 92,871 | 15,307 | - | 100\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 914,278 | 543,032 | 257,390 | 5,679 | 92,871 | 15,307 | - |  |
| (598) Maintenance of miscellaneous distribution plant |  | 31,075 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DistMtExp-CS |
| - Demand | DistMtExp-CS-D | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | DistMtExp-CS-C | 31,075 | 23,055 | 4,103 | 62 | 728 | 99 | 3,027 | 100\% |
| - Commodity | DistMtExp-CS-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 31,075 | 23,055 | 4,103 | 62 | 728 | 99 | 3,027 |  |
| Total Dist. Maintenance Expenses |  | 4,812,374 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 4,812,374 | 3,570,381 | 635,399 | 9,625 | 112,793 | 15,407 | 468,769 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 4,812,374 | 3,570,381 | 635,399 | 9,625 | 112,793 | 15,407 | 468,769 |  |
| Total Distribution Expenses |  | 7,996,694 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 7,996,694 | 5,518,839 | 1,332,225 | 24,057 | 339,236 | 52,046 | 730,290 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 7,996,694 | 5,518,839 | 1,332,225 | 24,057 | 339,236 | 52,046 | 730,290 |  |
| Customer Accounts and Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meter Reading \& Billing |  | 6,854,217 |  |  |  |  |  |  | CUS |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | MeterReading | 6,854,217 | 5,857,097 | 934,546 | 12,631 | 44,634 | - | 5,309 | 100\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 6,854,217 | 5,857,097 | 934,546 | 12,631 | 44,634 | - | 5,309 |  |
| Other-Direct to Other |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | CUS |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | Customers-SEC | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Uncollectibles |  | 1,132,614 |  |  |  |  |  |  | CUS |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | Uncollectibles | 1,132,614 | 1,131,744 | 330 | 6 | 259 | 275 | - | 100\% |
| - Commodity |  | , | - | - | - |  | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 1,132,614 | 1,131,744 | 330 | 6 | 259 | 275 | - |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) Allocation to Customer Classes Customer Service | Allocation Factor | Total $\begin{array}{r}\text { Total } \\ \text { Company }\end{array}$ | Residential Service R | Small C \& I Schedule C\&G | Small C \& I Schedule CA-CSH | Medium Power Schedule PH | Large Power Schedule PP | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Street and } \\ \text { Area Lighting } \\ \text { ST LTNG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Classification |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Misc. Cust Serv and Info Exp |  | 2,381,813 |  |  |  |  |  |  | cus |
| - Demand |  | - |  | - | - | - | - |  | 0\% |
| - Customer | Custervices | 2,381,813 | 2,178,507 | 182,913 | 2,013 | 6,213 | - | 12,167 | 100\% |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0\% |
| Total |  | 2,381,813 | 2,178,507 | 182,913 | 2,013 | 6,213 | - | 12,167 |  |
| Customer Rebates \& Incentives |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | Cus |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | Customers.EEC | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Customer Assistance |  | 233,396 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Cus |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | Custassist | 233,396 | 233,396 | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| - Commodity |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 233,396 | 233,396 | - |  | - | - |  |  |
| Sales Expense |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Cus |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | Customers.EEC | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 100\% |
| - Commodity |  |  |  | - | - | - | - |  | 0\% |
| Total |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |  |
| All Other Cust Acts \& Services |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | Cus |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | Customers.EEC | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Total Customer Accounts and Services |  | 10,602,041 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 10,602,041 | 9,400,745 | 1,117,789 | 14,650 | 51,106 | 275 | 17,476 |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  | 10,602,041 | 9,400,745 | 1,117,789 | 14,650 | 51,106 | 275 | 17,476 |  |
| Administrative \& General Expense |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative and General Salaries |  | 1,553,168 |  |  |  |  |  |  | NONAGLAB-CS |
| - Demand | NoNaGLAB-Cs-d | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | nonaglab-cs.c | 1,553,168 | 1,119,065 | 261,599 | 4,626 | 56,230 | 8,288 | 103,360 | 100\% |
| - Commodity | NoNaGLAB-CSEE |  |  | - | - | - | - |  | 0\% |
| Total |  | 1,553,168 | 1,119,065 | 261,599 | 4,626 | 56,230 | 8,288 | 103,360 |  |
| Outside Services |  | 2,990,398 |  |  |  |  |  |  | NONAGLAB-CS |
| - Demand | nonactab-Cs-d | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | nonaglab-cs.c | 2,990,398 | 2,154,596 | 503,671 | 8,907 | 108,263 | 15,957 | 199,004 | 100\% |
| - Commodity | NONAGLAB-CS-E | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | 0\% |
| Total |  | 2,990,398 | 2,154,596 | 503,671 | 8,907 | 108,263 | 15,957 | 199,004 |  |
| Employee Benefits (Acct. 926) |  | $(927,037)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | NONAGLAB-CS |
| - Demand | NONAGLAB-CSD | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | nonaglab-cs.c | $(927,037)$ | $(667,935)$ | $(156,140)$ | $(2,761)$ | $(33,562)$ | $(4,947)$ | $(61,692)$ | 100\% |
| - Commodity | NONAGAB-CSEE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(927,037)$ | $(667,935)$ | $(156,140)$ | $(2,761)$ | $(33,562)$ | $(4,947)$ | $(61,692)$ |  |
| Regulatory Commission Expenses (Acct 928) |  | 160,601 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DISTPLT-CS |
| - Demand | Saleskev | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | Saleskev | 160,601 | 102,402 | 29,826 | 511 | 20,174 | 1,254 | 6,433 | 100\% |
| - Commodity | Saleskev | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 160,601 | 102,402 | 29,826 | 511 | 20,174 | 1,254 | 6,433 |  |
| General Advertising Expense |  | 18,984 |  |  |  |  |  |  | OpExp-CS |
| - Demand | Opexp-Cs-D | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | Opexp-CSC ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 18,984 | 15,229 | 2,501 | 40 | 398 | 53 | 763 | 100\% |
| - Commodity | OpExp-CSE.E | - |  | - |  | - | - |  | 0\% |
| Total |  | 18,984 | 15,229 | 2,501 | 40 | 398 | 53 | 763 |  |
| All Other O\&M |  | 843,375 |  |  |  |  |  |  | NONAGLAB-CS |
| - Demand | Nonatiab-Cs-d | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | nonaglab-cs-C | 843,375 | 607,655 | 142,049 | 2,512 | 30,533 | 4,500 | 56,125 | 100\% |
| - Commodity | NONAGLAB-CSE | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 843,375 | 607,655 | 142,049 | 2,512 | 30,533 | 4,500 | 56,125 |  |
| Total A\&G Expense |  | 4,639,488 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 4,639,488 | 3,331,013 | 783,506 | 13,834 | 182,037 | 25,106 | 303,993 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 4,639,488 | 3,331,013 | 783,506 | 13,834 | 182,037 | 25,106 | 303,993 |  |
| Total O\&M Expenses |  | 23,238,223 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 23,238,223 | 18,250,596 | 3,233,520 | 52,541 | 572,378 | 77,427 | 1,051,760 |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Total |  | 23,238,223 | 18,250,596 | 3,233,520 | 52,541 | 572,378 | 77,427 | 1,051,760 |  |



| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Customer Service | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | Pp | St LTNG | Factor |
| Total - Commodity | AGLAB-CS-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
|  |  | 5,212 | 3,755 | 878 | 16 | 189 | 28 | 347 |  |
| Gross Receipt Taxes |  | 971,296 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-CS |
| - Demand | Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | Revenue | 971,296 | 603,652 | 178,498 | 3,151 | 140,091 | 9,948 | 35,956 | 100\% |
| - Commodity | Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 971,296 | 603,652 | 178,498 | 3,151 | 140,091 | 9,948 | 35,956 |  |
| Property Taxes |  | 1,882,439 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-CS |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-CS-D | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-CS-C | 1,882,439 | 1,173,205 | 286,055 | 5,187 | 72,074 | 11,251 | 334,666 | 100\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-CS-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 1,882,439 | 1,173,205 | 286,055 | 5,187 | 72,074 | 11,251 | 334,666 |  |
| Sales \& Use Tax |  | $(28,276)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-CS |
| - Demand | Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | Revenue | $(28,276)$ | $(17,573)$ | $(5,196)$ | (92) | $(4,078)$ | (290) | $(1,047)$ | 100\% |
| - Commodity | Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(28,276)$ | $(17,573)$ | $(5,196)$ | (92) | $(4,078)$ | (290) | $(1,047)$ |  |
| Montgomery County Fuel Energy |  | 1,328,077 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-CS |
| - Demand | MontCoFuel | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | MontCoFuel | 1,328,077 | 635,350 | 241,947 | 5,202 | 426,527 | - | 19,052 | 100\% |
| - Commodity | MontCoFuel | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 1,328,077 | 635,350 | 241,947 | 5,202 | 426,527 | - | 19,052 |  |
| Other Taxes |  | 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  | RB-CS |
| - Demand | RB-CS-D | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | RB-CS-C | 90 | 56 | 14 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 16 | 100\% |
| - Commodity | RB-CS-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 90 | 56 | 14 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 16 |  |
| Total Taxes Other than Income |  | 4,564,010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 4,564,010 | 2,703,409 | 767,279 | 14,560 | 646,594 | 22,583 | 409,585 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Taxes Other than Income |  | 4,564,010 | 2,703,409 | 767,279 | 14,560 | 646,594 | 22,583 | 409,585 |  |
| Total Operating Expenses |  | 32,900,289 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { - Demand } \\ & \text { - Customer } \\ \text { - Commodity }\end{array}$ |  | $(54,955)$ | $(35,588)$ | $(7,673)$ | (205) | $(11,143)$ | - | (345) |  |
|  |  | 32,955,244 | 24,251,027 | 4,786,952 | 81,301 | 1,421,386 | 135,773 | 2,278,805 |  |
|  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  |  | 32,900,289 | 24,215,439 | 4,779,278 | 81,096 | 1,410,243 | 135,773 | 2,278,460 |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& I | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation Summary | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting |
|  | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | St LTNG |
| Revenue Requirement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-Transmission |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 36,236,875 | 22,682,439 | 3,824,041 | 95,950 | 8,009,588 | 1,519,392 | 105,465 |
| - Customer | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Primary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 26,378,552 | 16,116,243 | 3,631,138 | 102,789 | 6,241,385 | 76,148 | 210,849 |
| - Customer | 1,033,733 | 880,706 | 118,822 | 1,421 | 26,882 | 870 | 5,033 |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Secondary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 27,721,624 | 17,744,735 | 3,948,896 | 102,637 | 5,657,512 | 37,321 | 230,523 |
| - Customer | 52,922,704 | 44,823,714 | 6,143,192 | 74,895 | 1,551,116 | 52,788 | 276,999 |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sub-Transmission |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | $(54,955)$ | $(35,588)$ | $(7,673)$ | (205) | $(11,143)$ | - | (345) |
| - Customer | 42,097,001 | 30,047,266 | 6,142,756 | 106,675 | 1,724,916 | 192,345 | 3,883,042 |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total Revenue Requirement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 90,282,094 | 56,507,828 | 11,396,401 | 301,171 | 19,897,341 | 1,632,861 | 546,491 |
| - Customer | 96,053,439 | 75,751,686 | 12,404,771 | 182,991 | 3,302,914 | 246,003 | 4,165,074 |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total Revenue Requirement | 186,335,533 | 132,259,515 | 23,801,172 | 484,162 | 23,200,255 | 1,878,864 | 4,711,565 |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& I | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation Summary | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting |
|  | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | ST LTNG |
| Rate Base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-Transmission |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 137,876,780 | 87,245,134 | 13,521,641 | 358,821 | 30,286,130 | 6,381,146 | 83,908 |
| - Customer | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Primary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 117,927,146 | 72,662,906 | 15,773,042 | 473,452 | 28,017,505 | 291,612 | 708,628 |
| - Customer | 3,855,891 | 3,416,468 | 419,976 | 4,512 | 2,633 | 1,257 | 11,045 |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Secondary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 125,933,149 | 81,840,810 | 17,512,385 | 477,070 | 25,208,959 | 98,682 | 795,244 |
| - Customer | 229,708,960 | 203,564,819 | 25,043,875 | 268,562 | 95,631 | 76,632 | 659,441 |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sub-Transmission |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| - Customer | 103,223,294 | 64,591,871 | 15,691,703 | 289,778 | 3,445,004 | 636,788 | 18,568,150 |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total Rate Base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 381,737,074 | 241,748,849 | 46,807,068 | 1,309,343 | 83,512,595 | 6,771,440 | 1,587,780 |
| - Customer | 336,788,145 | 271,573,158 | 41,155,554 | 562,851 | 3,543,268 | 714,677 | 19,238,636 |
| - Commodity | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total Rate Base | 718,525,219 | 513,322,007 | 87,962,622 | 1,872,194 | 87,055,863 | 7,486,116 | 20,826,416 |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)Allocation Summary |  | Residential | Small C \& | Small C \& I | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting |
|  | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | ST LTNG |
| Total Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-Transmission |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 23,965,511 | 14,853,379 | 2,655,736 | 64,530 | 5,341,157 | 952,493 | 98,215 |
| - Customer | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Primary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 15,898,080 | 9,595,739 | 2,268,305 | 61,331 | 3,772,837 | 50,241 | 149,625 |
| - Customer | 689,172 | 574,125 | 82,535 | 1,026 | 26,650 | 758 | 4,079 |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Secondary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 16,524,069 | 10,400,639 | 2,435,780 | 60,863 | 3,436,417 | 28,555 | 161,816 |
| - Customer | 32,395,959 | 26,556,550 | 3,979,336 | 51,378 | 1,542,690 | 45,980 | 220,025 |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sub-Transmission |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | $(54,955)$ | $(35,588)$ | $(7,673)$ | (205) | $(11,143)$ | - | (345) |
| - Customer | 32,955,244 | 24,251,027 | 4,786,952 | 81,301 | 1,421,386 | 135,773 | 2,278,805 |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 56,332,704 | 34,814,169 | 7,352,148 | 186,519 | 12,539,268 | 1,031,289 | 409,311 |
| - Customer | 66,040,375 | 51,381,702 | 8,848,823 | 133,705 | 2,990,726 | 182,511 | 2,502,908 |
| - Commodity | - |  |  | . |  | - |  |
| Total Expenses | 122,373,079 | 86,195,871 | 16,200,971 | 320,224 | 15,529,994 | 1,213,800 | 2,912,220 |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) <br> Allocation to Customer Classes <br> ALLOCATION FACTORS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| UTILITY PLANT |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Plant |  |  |  |  |
| (360) Land and Land Rights |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 12CP-SUB | 1NCP-PRI | 1NCP-SEC |  |
| - Customer |  | Customers-PRI | Customers-SEC |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (361) Structures and Improvements |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 12CP-SUB | 1NCP-PRI |  |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (362) Station Equipment |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 12CP-SUB | 1NCP-PRI |  |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (362) Station Equipment - Capacitors |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 12CP-SUB |  |  |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (364) Poles, Towers \& Fixtures |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 12CP-SUB | 1NCP-PRI | 1NCP-SEC |  |
| - Customer |  | Customers-PRI | Customers-SEC |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (365) Overhead Conductors \& Devices |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 12CP-SUB | 1NCP-PRI | 1NCP-SEC |  |
| - Customer |  | Customers-PRI | Customers-SEC |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (366) Underground Conduit |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 12CP-SUB | 1NCP-PRI | 1NCP-SEC |  |
| - Customer |  | Customers-PRI | Customers-SEC |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (367) Underground Conductors \& Device |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 12CP-SUB | 1NCP-PRI | 1NCP-SEC |  |
| - Customer |  | Customers-PRI | Customers-SEC |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (368) Line Transformers |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 12CP-SUB | 1NCP-PRI | 1NCP-SEC |  |
| - Customer |  | Customers-PRI | Customers-SEC |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes <br> ALLOCATION FACTORS |  |  |  |  |
| (368) Line Transformers - Capacitors |  |  | 12CP-GEN |  |
| - Demand |  |  |  |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (369) Services |  |  |  | 1NCPxLT-SEC <br> CUSxLT-SEC |
| - Demand |  |  |  |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  | Meters |
| $(370,371)$ Meters and Installation |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  |  |  |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  | StreetLighting |
| Street Lighting \& Signal Systems |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  |  |  |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| General and Intangible Plant | LABOR-SUB-D | LABOR-PRI-D | LABOR-SEC-D |  |
| General Plant |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand- Customer- Commodity |  |  |  |  |
|  | LABOR-SUB-C | LABOR-PRI-C | LABOR-SEC-C | LABOR-CS-C |
|  | LABOR-SUB-E | LABOR-PRI-E | LABOR-SEC-E | LABOR-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Intangible Plant |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | LABOR-SUB-D | LABOR-PRI-D | LABOR-SEC-D | LABOR-CS-D |
| - Customer | LABOR-SUB-C | LABOR-PRI-C | LABOR-SEC-C | LABOR-CS-C |
| - Commodity | LABOR-SUB-E | LABOR-PRI-E | LABOR-SEC-E | LABOR-CS-E |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes ALLOCATION FACTORS |  |  |  |  |
| Additions to Utility Plant |  |  |  |  |
| COVID-19 Regulatory Asset Adj excl. Res Adj |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | COVID | COVID | COVID | COVID |
| - Customer | COVID | COVID | COVID | COVID |
| - Commodity | COVID | COVID | COVID | COVID |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| COVID-19 Residential Adjustment |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct |
| - Customer | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct |
| - Commodity | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| MD Electric Vehicle Program Reg Asset excl. Res Direct |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | DISTPLTxRES-SUB-D | DISTPLTxRES-PRI-D | DISTPLTxRES-SEC-D | DISTPLTxRES-CS-D |
| - Customer | DISTPLTxRES-SUB-C | DISTPLTxRES-PRI-C | DISTPLTxRES-SEC-C | DISTPLTxRES-CS-C |
| - Commodity | DISTPLTxRES-SUB-E | DISTPLTxRES-PRI-E | DISTPLTxRES-SEC-E | DISTPLTxRES-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| MD EV Reg Asset - Residential Direct |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct |
| - Customer | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct |
| - Commodity | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| ACCUMULATED DEPRECIATION |  |  |  |  |
| Accumulated Depreciation |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Plant A/D |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | DISTPLT-SUB-D | DISTPLT-PRI-D | DISTPLT-SEC-D | DISTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | DISTPLT-SUB-C | DISTPLT-PRI-C | DISTPLT-SEC-C | DISTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | DISTPLT-SUB-E | DISTPLT-PRI-E | DISTPLT-SEC-E | DISTPLT-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| General Plant A/D |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | LABOR-SUB-D | LABOR-PRI-D | LABOR-SEC-D | LABOR-CS-D |
| - Customer | LABOR-SUB-C | LABOR-PRI-C | LABOR-SEC-C | LABOR-CS-C |
| - Commodity | LABOR-SUB-E | LABOR-PRI-E | LABOR-SEC-E | LABOR-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Intangible Plant A/D |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | LABOR-SUB-D | LABOR-PRI-D | LABOR-SEC-D | LABOR-CS-D |
| - Customer | LABOR-SUB-C | LABOR-PRI-C | LABOR-SEC-C | LABOR-CS-C |
| - Commodity | LABOR-SUB-E | LABOR-PRI-E | LABOR-SEC-E | LABOR-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| COVID Reg Asset A/D |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | COVIDREGASSET-SUB-D | COVIDREGASSET-PRI-D | COVIDREGASSET-SEC-D | COVIDREGASSET-CS-D |
| - Customer | COVIDREGASSET-SUB-C | COVIDREGASSET-PRI-C | COVIDREGASSET-SEC-C | COVIDREGASSET-CS-C |
| - Commodity | COVIDREGASSET-SUB-E | COVIDREGASSET-PRI-E | COVIDREGASSET-SEC-E | COVIDREGASSET-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| EV Reg Asset A/D |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | EVREGASSET-SUB-D | EVREGASSET-PRI-D | EVREGASSET-SEC-D | EVREGASSET-CS-D |
| - Customer | EVREGASSET-SUB-C | EVREGASSET-PRI-C | EVREGASSET-SEC-C | EVREGASSET-CS-C |
| - Commodity | EVREGASSET-SUB-E | EVREGASSET-PRI-E | EVREGASSET-SEC-E | EVREGASSET-CS-E |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes <br> ALLOCATION FACTORS |  |  |  |  |
| CWIP A/D |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | TOTPLT-PRI-D | TOTPLT-SEC-D | TOTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | TOTPLT-PRI-C | TOTPLT-SEC-C | TOTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | TOTPLT-PRI-E | TOTPLT-SEC-E | TOTPLT-CS-E |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes <br> ALLOCATION FACTORS |  |  |  |  |
| OTHER RATE BASE ITEMS |  |  |  |  |
| Other Rate Base Items |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Work in Progress |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | TOTPLT-PRI-D | TOTPLT-SEC-D | TOTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | TOTPLT-PRI-C | TOTPLT-SEC-C | TOTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | TOTPLT-PRI-E | TOTPLT-SEC-E | TOTPLT-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Plant Held for Future Use |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | TOTPLT-PRI-D | TOTPLT-SEC-D | TOTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | TOTPLT-PRI-C | TOTPLT-SEC-C | TOTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | TOTPLT-PRI-E | TOTPLT-SEC-E | TOTPLT-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Prepayments |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | TOTPLT-PRI-D | TOTPLT-SEC-D | TOTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | TOTPLT-PRI-C | TOTPLT-SEC-C | TOTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | TOTPLT-PRI-E | TOTPLT-SEC-E | TOTPLT-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Working Capital |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | TOTPLT-PRI-D | TOTPLT-SEC-D | TOTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | TOTPLT-PRI-C | TOTPLT-SEC-C | TOTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | TOTPLT-PRI-E | TOTPLT-SEC-E | TOTPLT-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| ADIT |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | TOTPLT-PRI-D | TOTPLT-SEC-D | TOTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | TOTPLT-PRI-C | TOTPLT-SEC-C | TOTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | TOTPLT-PRI-E | TOTPLT-SEC-E | TOTPLT-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Customer Advances |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | DISTPLT-SUB-D | DISTPLT-PRI-D | DISTPLT-SEC-D | DISTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | DISTPLT-SUB-C | DISTPLT-PRI-C | DISTPLT-SEC-C | DISTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | DISTPLT-SUB-E | DISTPLT-PRI-E | DISTPLT-SEC-E | DISTPLT-CS-E |

Total

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes ALLOCATION FACTORS | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| Customer Deposits |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | Deposits | Deposits | Deposits | Deposits |
| - Customer | Deposits | Deposits | Deposits | Deposits |
| - Commodity | Deposits | Deposits | Deposits | Deposits |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Deferred Investment Tax Credit |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | TOTPLT-PRI-D | TOTPLT-SEC-D | TOTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | TOTPLT-PRI-C | TOTPLT-SEC-C | TOTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | TOTPLT-PRI-E | TOTPLT-SEC-E | TOTPLT-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| OPERATIONS \& MAINTENANCE EXPENSES |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Expenses | DistOpExp-SUB-D <br> DistOpExp-SUB-C <br> DistOpExp-SUB-E |  |  |  |
| Operations Expenses |  |  |  |  |
| (580) Operation Supervision \& Engineering |  | DistOpExp-PRI-D <br> DistOpExp-PRI-C <br> DistOpExp-PRI-E | DistOpExp-SEC-D <br> DistOpExp-SEC-C <br> DistOpExp-SEC-E |  |
| - Demand <br> - Customer <br> - Commodity |  |  |  | DistOpExp-CS-D <br> DistOpExp-CS-C <br> DistOpExp-CS-E |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (581) Load Dispatching |  | 1NCP-PRI |  |  |
| - Demand- Customer- Commodity |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  | 1NCP-PRI |  |  |
| (582) Station Expenses |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  |  |  |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (583) Overhead line expenses | OHLines-SUB-D | OHLines-PRI-D |  |  |
| - Demand- Customer- Commodity |  |  | OHLines-SEC-D | OHLines-CS-D |
|  | OHLines-SUB-C | OHLines-PRI-C | OHLines-SEC-C | OHLines-CS-C |
|  | OHLines-SUB-E | OHLines-PRI-E | OHLines-SEC-E | OHLines-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (584) Underground line expenses |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | UGLines-SUB-D | UGLines-PRI-D | UGLines-SEC-D | UGLines-CS-D |
| - Customer | UGLines-SUB-C | UGLines-PRI-C | UGLines-SEC-C | UGLines-CS-C |
| - Commodity | UGLines-SUB-E | UGLines-PRI-E | UGLines-SEC-E | UGLines-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (585) Street lighting and signal system expenses |  |  |  | StreetLighting |
| - Demand |  |  |  |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)
Allocation to Customer Classes
Sub-Transmission
Primary
Secondary
Customer Service
ALLOCATION FACTORS
(586) Meter expenses

| - Demand |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Customer |  |  |  | Meters |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (588) Miscellaneous distribution expenses |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | DistOpExp-SUB-D | DistOpExp-PRI-D | DistOpExp-SEC-D | DistOpExp-CS-D |
| - Customer | DistOpExp-SUB-C | DistOpExp-PRI-C | DistOpExp-SEC-C | DistOpExp-CS-C |
| - Commodity | DistOpExp-SUB-E | DistOpExp-PRI-E | DistOpExp-SEC-E | DistOpExp-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (589) Rents |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | DistOpExp-SUB-D | DistOpExp-PRI-D | DistOpExp-SEC-D | DistOpExp-CS-D |
| - Customer | DistOpExp-SUB-C | DistOpExp-PRI-C | DistOpExp-SEC-C | DistOpExp-CS-C |
| - Commodity | DistOpExp-SUB-E | DistOpExp-PRI-E | DistOpExp-SEC-E | DistOpExp-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Maintenance Expense |  |  |  |  |
| (590) Maintenance Supervision and Engineering |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | DistMtExp-SUB-D | DistMtExp-PRI-D | DistMtExp-SEC-D | DistMtExp-CS-D |
| - Customer | DistMtExp-SUB-C | DistMtExp-PRI-C | DistMtExp-SEC-C | DistMtExp-CS-C |
| - Commodity | DistMtExp-SUB-E | DistMtExp-PRI-E | DistMtExp-SEC-E | DistMtExp-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (591) Maintenance of Structures |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | DistMtExp-SUB-D | DistMtExp-PRI-D | DistMtExp-SEC-D | DistMtExp-CS-D |
| - Customer | DistMtExp-SUB-C | DistMtExp-PRI-C | DistMtExp-SEC-C | DistMtExp-CS-C |
| - Commodity | DistMtExp-SUB-E | DistMtExp-PRI-E | DistMtExp-SEC-E | DistMtExp-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (592) Maintenance of Station Equipment |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 1NCP-PRI |  |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |

Total
(593) Maintenance of Overhead Lines

| - Demand | OHLines-SUB-D | OHLines-PRI-D | OHLines-SEC-D | OHLines-CS-D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Customer | OHLines-SUB-C | OHLines-PRI-C | OHLines-SEC-C | OHLines-CS-C |
| - Commodity | OHLines-SUB-E | OHLines-PRI-E | OHLines-SEC-E | OHLines-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (594) Maintenance of underground lines |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | UGLines-SUB-D | UGLines-PRI-D | UGLines-SEC-D | UGLines-CS-D |
| - Customer | UGLines-SUB-C | UGLines-PRI-C | UGLines-SEC-C | UGLines-CS-C |
| - Commodity | UGLines-SUB-E | UGLines-PRI-E | UGLines-SEC-E | UGLines-CS-E |

(595) Maintenance of line transformers

| - Demand | 12CP-SUB | 1NCP-PRI | 1NCP-SEC |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Customer |  | Customers-PRI | Customers-SEC |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |

Total

The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)
Allocation to Customer Classes
ALLOCATION FACTORS
(596) Maintenance of street lighting and signal systems

- Demand
- Customer StreetLighting
- Commodity

Total
(597) Maintenance of meters

- Demand
- Customer Meters
- Commodity $\qquad$
Total
(598) Maintenance of miscellaneous distribution plant

| - Demand | DistMtExp-SUB-D | DistMtExp-PRI-D | DistMtExp-SEC-D | DistMtExp-CS-D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Customer | DistMtExp-SUB-C | DistMtExp-PRI-C | DistMtExp-SEC-C | DistMtExp-CS-C |
| - Commodity | DistMtExp-SUB-E | DistMtExp-PRI-E | DistMtExp-SEC-E | DistMtExp-CS-E |

Total

Customer Accounts and Services
Meter Reading \& Billing

- Demand

| - Customer | MeterReading |
| :--- | :--- |
| - Commodity |  |

Total

Other-Direct to Other

- Demand
- Customer Customers-SEC
- Commodity $\qquad$
Total

Uncollectibles

- Demand
- Customer Uncollectibles

Total

Misc. Cust Serv and Info Exp

- Demand
- Customer CustServices
- Commodity

Total

Customer Rebates \& Incentives

- Demand
- Customer

Customers-SEC

- Commodity $\qquad$
Total

Customer Assistance

> - Demand

- Customer CustAssist
- Commodity

Total

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes ALLOCATION FACTORS |  |  |  |  |
| Sales Expense |  |  |  | Customers-SEC |
| - Demand |  |  |  |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  | Customers-SEC |
| All Other Cust Accts \& Services |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  |  |  |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative \& General Expense |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative and General Salaries |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | NONAGLAB-SUB-D | NONAGLAB-PRI-D | NONAGLAB-SEC-D | NONAGLAB-CS-D |
| - Customer | NONAGLAB-SUB-C | NONAGLAB-PRI-C | NONAGLAB-SEC-C | NONAGLAB-CS-C |
| - Commodity | NONAGLAB-SUB-E | NONAGLAB-PRI-E | NONAGLAB-SEC-E | NONAGLAB-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Outside Services | NONAGLAB-SUB-D | NONAGLAB-PRI-D | NONAGLAB-SEC-D | NONAGLAB-CS-D |
| - Demand- Customer- Commodity |  |  |  |  |
|  | NONAGLAB-SUB-C | NONAGLAB-PRI-C | NONAGLAB-SEC-C | NONAGLAB-CS-C |
|  | NONAGLAB-SUB-E | NONAGLAB-PRI-E | NONAGLAB-SEC-E | NONAGLAB-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Employee Benefits (Acct. 926) |  | NONAGLAB-PRI-D NONAGLAB-PRI-C NONAGLAB-PRI-E | NONAGLAB-SEC-D <br> NONAGLAB-SEC-C <br> NONAGLAB-SEC-E | NONAGLAB-CS-D <br> NONAGLAB-CS-C <br> NONAGLAB-CS-E |
| - Demand |  |  |  |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Regulatory Commission Expenses (Acct 928) | SalesREV <br> SalesREV <br> SalesREV | SalesREV <br> SalesREV <br> SalesREV | SalesREV <br> SalesREV <br> SalesREV | SalesREV <br> SalesREV <br> SalesREV |
| - Demand |  |  |  |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| General Advertising Expense | OpExp-SUB-D <br> OpExp-SUB-C <br> OpExp-SUB-E | OpExp-PRI-D <br> OpExp-PRI-C <br> OpExp-PRI-E |  |  |
| - Demand |  |  | OpExp-SEC-D | OpExp-CS-D |
| - Customer |  |  | OpExp-SEC-C | OpExp-CS-C |
| - Commodity |  |  | OpExp-SEC-E | OpExp-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| All Other O\&M | NONAGLAB-SUB-D | NONAGLAB-PRI-D | NONAGLAB-SEC-D | NONAGLAB-CS-D |
| - Demand |  |  |  |  |
| - Customer | NONAGLAB-SUB-C | NONAGLAB-PRI-C | NONAGLAB-SEC-C | NONAGLAB-CS-C |
| - Commodity | NONAGLAB-SUB-E | NONAGLAB-PRI-E | NONAGLAB-SEC-E | NONAGLAB-CS-E |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) Allocation to Customer Classes ALLOCATION FACTORS | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| DEPRECIATION EXPENSE |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation Expense |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Plant DeprExp |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | DISTPLT-SUB-D | DISTPLT-PRI-D | DISTPLT-SEC-D | DISTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | DISTPLT-SUB-C | DISTPLT-PRI-C | DISTPLT-SEC-C | DISTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | DISTPLT-SUB-E | DISTPLT-PRI-E | DISTPLT-SEC-E | DISTPLT-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| General Plant DeprExp |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | LABOR-SUB-D | LABOR-PRI-D | LABOR-SEC-D | LABOR-CS-D |
| - Customer | LABOR-SUB-C | LABOR-PRI-C | LABOR-SEC-C | LABOR-CS-C |
| - Commodity | LABOR-SUB-E | LABOR-PRI-E | LABOR-SEC-E | LABOR-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Intangible Plant DeprExp |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | LABOR-SUB-D | LABOR-PRI-D | LABOR-SEC-D | LABOR-CS-D |
| - Customer | LABOR-SUB-C | LABOR-PRI-C | LABOR-SEC-C | LABOR-CS-C |
| - Commodity | LABOR-SUB-E | LABOR-PRI-E | LABOR-SEC-E | LABOR-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Regulatory Debits and Credits |  |  |  |  |
| MD EDIS |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 1NCP-PRI | 1NCP-PRI | 1NCP-SEC | 1NCP-SEC |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| MD Electric Vehicle Program |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | EVREGASSET-SUB-D | EVREGASSET-PRI-D | EVREGASSET-SEC-D | EVREGASSET-CS-D |
| - Customer | EVREGASSET-SUB-C | EVREGASSET-PRI-C | EVREGASSET-SEC-C | EVREGASSET-CS-C |
| - Commodity | EVREGASSET-SUB-E | EVREGASSET-PRI-E | EVREGASSET-SEC-E | EVREGASSET-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| MD Conservation Voltage Reduction (CVR) |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | DISTPLT-SUB-D | DISTPLT-PRI-D | DISTPLT-SEC-D | DISTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | DISTPLT-SUB-C | DISTPLT-PRI-C | DISTPLT-SEC-C | DISTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | DISTPLT-SUB-E | DISTPLT-PRI-E | DISTPLT-SEC-E | DISTPLT-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Deferral of Rate Case Expenses |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | DISTPLT-SUB-D | DISTPLT-PRI-D | DISTPLT-SEC-D | DISTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | DISTPLT-SUB-C | DISTPLT-PRI-C | DISTPLT-SEC-C | DISTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | DISTPLT-SUB-E | DISTPLT-PRI-E | DISTPLT-SEC-E | DISTPLT-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| COVID-19 |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | COVID | COVID | COVID | COVID |
| - Customer | COVID | COVID | COVID | COVID |
| - Commodity | COVID | COVID | COVID | COVID |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| COVID-19-Residential Adjustment |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct |
| - Customer | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct |
| - Commodity | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes <br> ALLOCATION FACTORS |  |  |  |  |
| TAXES |  |  |  |  |
| Taxes Other than Income |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Payroll Taxes |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | DISTLAB-SUB-D | DISTLAB-PRI-D | DISTLAB-SEC-D | DISTLAB-CS-D |
| - Customer | DISTLAB-SUB-C | DISTLAB-PRI-C | DISTLAB-SEC-C | DISTLAB-CS-C |
| - Commodity | DISTLAB-SUB-E | DISTLAB-PRI-E | DISTLAB-SEC-E | DISTLAB-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Customer Account Payroll Taxes |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | CUSTLAB-SUB-D | CUSTLAB-PRI-D | CUSTLAB-SEC-D | CUSTLAB-CS-D |
| - Customer | CUSTLAB-SUB-C | CUSTLAB-PRI-C | CUSTLAB-SEC-C | CUSTLAB-CS-C |
| - Commodity | CUSTLAB-SUB-E | CUSTLAB-PRI-E | CUSTLAB-SEC-E | CUSTLAB-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| A\&G Payroll Taxes |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | AGLAB-SUB-D | AGLAB-PRI-D | AGLAB-SEC-D | AGLAB-CS-D |
| - Customer | AGLAB-SUB-C | AGLAB-PRI-C | AGLAB-SEC-C | AGLAB-CS-C |
| - Commodity | AGLAB-SUB-E | AGLAB-PRI-E | AGLAB-SEC-E | AGLAB-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Receipt Taxes |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue |
| - Customer | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue |
| - Commodity | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Property Taxes |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | TOTPLT-PRI-D | TOTPLT-SEC-D | TOTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | TOTPLT-PRI-C | TOTPLT-SEC-C | TOTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | TOTPLT-PRI-E | TOTPLT-SEC-E | TOTPLT-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Sales \& Use Tax |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue |
| - Customer | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue |
| - Commodity | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Montgomery County Fuel Energy |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | MontCoFuel | MontCoFuel | MontCoFuel | MontCoFuel |
| - Customer | MontCoFuel | MontCoFuel | MontCoFuel | MontCoFuel |
| - Commodity | MontCoFuel | MontCoFuel | MontCoFuel | MontCoFuel |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Other Taxes |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | RB-SUB-D | RB-PRI-D | RB-SEC-D | RB-CS-D |
| - Customer | RB-SUB-C | RB-PRI-C | RB-SEC-C | RB-CS-C |
| - Commodity | RB-SUB-E | RB-PRI-E | RB-SEC-E | RB-CS-E |

$\qquad$
Exhibit TSL-2 Proposed CCOS Study

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes CLASSIFICATION FACTORS | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| UTILITY PLANT |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Plant |  |  |  |  |
| (360) Land and Land Rights | DEM | 360P | 3605 | CUS |
| (361) Structures and Improvements | DEM | DEM |  |  |
| (362) Station Equipment | DEM | DEM |  |  |
| (362) Station Equipment - Capacitors | DEM | DEM |  |  |
| (364) Poles, Towers \& Fixtures | DEM | 364P | 364S | CUS |
| (365) Overhead Conductors \& Devices | DEM | 365P | 365S |  |
| (366) Underground Conduit | DEM | 366P | 366S |  |
| (367) Underground Conductors \& Device | DEM | 367P | 3675 |  |
| (368) Line Transformers | DEM | 368P | 368 S |  |
| (368) Line Transformers - Capacitors |  |  | DEM |  |
| (369) Services |  |  |  | 369 |
| $(370,371)$ Meters and Installation |  |  |  | CUS |
| Street Lighting \& Signal Systems |  |  |  | cus |
| General and Intangible Plant |  |  |  |  |
| General Plant | LABOR-SUB | LABOR-PRI | LABOR-SEC | LABOR-CS |
| Intangible Plant | LABOR-SUB | LABOR-PRI | LABOR-SEC | LABOR-CS |
| Additions to Utility Plant |  |  |  |  |
| COVID-19 Regulatory Asset Adj excl. Res Adj | DISTPLT-SUB | DISTPLT-PRI | DISTPLT-SEC | DISTPLT-CS |
| COVID-19 Residential Adjustment | DISTPLT-SUB | DISTPLT-PRI | DISTPLT-SEC | DISTPLT-CS |
| MD Electric Vehicle Program Reg Asset excl. Res [ | DISTPLTxRES-SUB | DISTPLTxRES-PRI | DISTPLTxRES-SEC | DISTPLTxRES-CS |
| MD EV Reg Asset - Residential Direct | DISTPLT-SUB | DISTPLT-PRI | DISTPLT-SEC | DISTPLT-CS |

$\qquad$
Exhibit TSL-2 Proposed CCOS Study

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes CLASSIFICATION FACTORS | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| ACCUMULATED DEPRECIATION |  |  |  |  |
| Accumulated Depreciation |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Plant A/D | DISTPLT-SUB | DISTPLT-PRI | DISTPLT-SEC | DISTPLT-CS |
| General Plant A/D | LABOR-SUB | LABOR-PRI | LABOR-SEC | LABOR-CS |
| Intangible Plant A/D | LABOR-SUB | LABOR-PRI | LABOR-SEC | LABOR-CS |
| COVID Reg Asset A/D | COVIDREGASSET-SUB | COVIDREGASSET-PRI | COVIDREGASSET-SEC | COVIDREGASSET-CS |
| EV Reg Asset A/D | EVREGASSET-SUB | EVREGASSET-PRI | EVREGASSET-SEC | EVREGASSET-CS |
| CWIP A/D | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| OTHER RATE BASE ITEMS |  |  |  |  |
| Other Rate Base Items |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Work in Progress | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| Plant Held for Future Use | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| Prepayments | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| Working Capital | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| ADIT | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| Customer Advances | DISTPLT-SUB | DISTPLT-PRI | DISTPLT-SEC | DISTPLT-CS |
| Customer Deposits | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| Deferred Investment Tax Credit | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| OPERATIONS \& MAINTENANCE EXPENSES |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Expenses |  |  |  |  |
| Operations Expenses |  |  |  |  |
| (580) Operation Supervision \& Engineering | DistOpExp-SUB | DistOpExp-PRI | DistOpExp-SEC | DistOpExp-CS |
| (581) Load Dispatching | DEM | DEM |  |  |
| (582) Station Expenses | DEM | DEM |  |  |
| (583) Overhead line expenses | OHLines-SUB | OHLines-PRI | OHLines-SEC | OHLines-CS |
| (584) Underground line expenses | UGLines-SUB | UGLines-PRI | UGLines-SEC | UGLines-CS |
| (585) Street lighting and signal system expenses |  |  |  | CUS |
| (586) Meter expenses |  |  |  | CUS |
| (588) Miscellaneous distribution expenses | DistOpExp-SUB | DistOpExp-PRI | DistOpExp-SEC | DistOpExp-CS |
| (589) Rents | DistOpExp-SUB | DistOpExp-PRI | DistOpExp-SEC | DistOpExp-CS |
| Maintenance Expense |  |  |  |  |
| (590) Maintenance Supervision and Engineering | DistMtExp-SUB | DistMtExp-PRI | DistMtExp-SEC | DistMtExp-CS |
| (591) Maintenance of Structures | DistMtExp-SUB | DistMtExp-PRI | DistMtExp-SEC | DistMtExp-CS |
| (592) Maintenance of Station Equipment | DEM | DEM |  |  |
| (593) Maintenance of Overhead Lines | OHLines-SUB | OHLines-PRI | OHLines-SEC | OHLines-CS |
| (594) Maintenance of underground lines | UGLines-SUB | UGLines-PRI | UGLines-SEC | UGLines-CS |
| (595) Maintenance of line transformers | DEM | 368P | 368S |  |
| (596) Maintenance of street lighting and signal sys | ms |  |  | CUS |
| (597) Maintenance of meters |  |  |  | CUS |
| (598) Maintenance of miscellaneous distribution । | DistMtExp-SUB | DistMtExp-PRI | DistMtExp-SEC | DistMtExp-CS |
| Customer Accounts and Services |  |  |  |  |
| Meter Reading \& Billing |  |  |  | CUS |
| Other-Direct to Other |  |  |  | CUS |
| Uncollectibles |  |  |  | CUS |
| Misc. Cust Serv and Info Exp |  |  |  | CUS |
| Customer Rebates \& Incentives |  |  |  | CUS |
| Customer Assistance |  |  |  | CUS |
| Sales Expense |  |  |  | CUS |
| All Other Cust Accts \& Services |  |  |  | CUS |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes CLASSIFICATION FACTORS | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| Administrative \& General Expense |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative and General Salaries | NONAGLAB-SUB | NONAGLAB-PRI | NONAGLAB-SEC | NONAGLAB-CS |
| Outside Services | NONAGLAB-SUB | NONAGLAB-PRI | NONAGLAB-SEC | NONAGLAB-CS |
| Employee Benefits (Acct. 926) | NONAGLAB-SUB | NONAGLAB-PRI | NONAGLAB-SEC | NONAGLAB-CS |
| Regulatory Commission Expenses (Acct 928) | DISTPLT-SUB | DISTPLT-PRI | DISTPLT-SEC | DISTPLT-CS |
| General Advertising Expense | OpExp-SUB | OpExp-PRI | OpExp-SEC | OpExp-CS |
| All Other O\&M | NONAGLAB-SUB | NONAGLAB-PRI | NONAGLAB-SEC | NONAGLAB-CS |
| DEPRECIATION EXPENSE |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation Expense |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Plant DeprExp | DISTPLT-SUB | DISTPLT-PRI | DISTPLT-SEC | DISTPLT-CS |
| General Plant DeprExp | LABOR-SUB | LABOR-PRI | LABOR-SEC | LABOR-CS |
| Intangible Plant DeprExp | LABOR-SUB | LABOR-PRI | LABOR-SEC | LABOR-CS |
| Regulatory Debits and Credits |  |  |  |  |
| MD EDIS | DEM | DEM | DEM | DEM |
| MD Electric Vehicle Program | EVREGASSET-SUB | EVREGASSET-PRI | EVREGASSET-SEC | EVREGASSET-CS |
| MD Conservation Voltage Reduction (CVR) | DISTPLT-SUB | DISTPLT-PRI | DISTPLT-SEC | DISTPLT-CS |
| Deferral of Rate Case Expenses | DISTPLT-SUB | DISTPLT-PRI | DISTPLT-SEC | DISTPLT-CS |
| COVID-19 | DISTPLT-SUB | DISTPLT-PRI | DISTPLT-SEC | DISTPLT-CS |
| COVID-19-Residential Adjustment | DISTPLT-SUB | DISTPLT-PRI | DISTPLT-SEC | DISTPLT-CS |
| TAXES |  |  |  |  |
| Taxes Other than Income |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Payroll Taxes | DISTLAB-SUB | DISTLAB-PRI | DISTLAB-SEC | DISTLAB-CS |
| Customer Account Payroll Taxes | CUSTLAB-SUB | CUSTLAB-PRI | CUSTLAB-SEC | CUSTLAB-CS |
| A\&G Payroll Taxes | AGLAB-SUB | AGLAB-PRI | AGLAB-SEC | AGLAB-CS |
| Gross Receipt Taxes | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| Property Taxes | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| Sales \& Use Tax | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| Montgomery County Fuel Energy | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| Other Taxes | RB-SUB | RB-PRI | RB-SEC | RB-CS |
| Income Taxes |  |  |  |  |
| State |  |  |  |  |
| Federal |  |  |  |  |
| Income Taxes Deferred - Net |  |  |  |  |
| Allowance for Funds Used During Construction | CWIP-SUB | CWIP-PRI | CWIP-SEC | CWIP-CS |
| Interest on Customer Deposits | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& I | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Summary of Allocators |  | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting |
|  | Description | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | pp | ST LTNG |
| External Allocators |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12CP-GEN | Demand at Generation Level (ACP) | 100.00\% | 61.11\% | 9.67\% | 0.25\% | 21.56\% | 7.35\% | 0.06\% |
| 12 CP -SUB | Demand for Subtransmission (ACP) | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| 1NCP-GEN | Demand at Generation Level (NCP) | 100.00\% | 55.41\% | 12.35\% | 0.36\% | 22.64\% | 8.70\% | 0.54\% |
| 1 NCP -PRI | Demand at Primary Level (NCP) | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| 1NCP-SEC | Demand at Secondary Level (NCP) | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 13.96\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| 1NCPxLT-SEC | Demand at Sec Level w/o St Ltg (NCP) | 100.00\% | 65.17\% | 14.05\% | 0.38\% | 20.41\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Customers | Average Number of Customers | 100.00\% | 88.04\% | 10.97\% | 0.11\% | 0.59\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| Customers-PRI | Number of Customers at Primary Level | 100.00\% | 88.05\% | 10.97\% | 0.11\% | 0.59\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| Customers-SEC | Number of Customers at Secondary Level | 100.00\% | 88.08\% | 10.96\% | 0.11\% | 0.56\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| Revenue | Revenue from Sales (Distr) | 100.00\% | 62.15\% | 18.38\% | 0.32\% | 14.42\% | 1.02\% | 3.70\% |
| LatePayment | Late Payment Charges | 100.00\% | 65.45\% | 17.55\% | 0.20\% | 15.14\% | 1.66\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSxLT-SEC | Number of Secondary Cust Excl St. Lighting | 100.00\% | 88.33\% | 10.99\% | 0.11\% | 0.56\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Meters | Meters | 100.00\% | 59.39\% | 28.15\% | 0.62\% | 10.16\% | 1.67\% | 0.00\% |
| StreetLighting | Direct to Street \& Area Lighting | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% |
| Deposits | Customer Deposits | 100.00\% | 54.64\% | 14.89\% | 0.00\% | 30.17\% | 0.00\% | 0.29\% |
| SalesREV | Revenue from Sales | 100.00\% | 63.76\% | 18.57\% | 0.32\% | 12.56\% | 0.78\% | 4.01\% |
| MontCoFuel | Montgomery Co. Fuel Tax | 100.00\% | 47.84\% | 18.22\% | 0.39\% | 32.12\% | 0.00\% | 1.43\% |
| MeterReading | Acct. 902-903 Meter Reading | 100.00\% | 85.45\% | 13.63\% | 0.18\% | 0.65\% | 0.00\% | 0.08\% |
| Uncollectibles | Acct. 904 Uncollectibles | 100.00\% | 99.92\% | 0.03\% | 0.00\% | 0.02\% | 0.02\% | 0.00\% |
| CustServices | Misc. Cust Serv and Info Exp | 100.00\% | 91.46\% | 7.68\% | 0.08\% | 0.26\% | 0.00\% | 0.51\% |
| COVID | Covid Allocation | 100.00\% | 83.01\% | 7.52\% | 0.13\% | 5.91\% | 3.01\% | 0.42\% |
| Res-Direct | Residential Direct Allocation | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CustAssist | Acct. 908 Customer Assistance | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Internal Allocators |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTPLT-SUB-D |  | 100.00\% | 63.07\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.16\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| TOTPLT-SUB-C |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| TOTPLT-SUB-E |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| TOTPLT-PRI-D |  | 100.00\% | 61.44\% | 13.41\% | 0.39\% | 23.93\% | 0.23\% | 0.60\% |
| TOTPLT-PRI-C |  | 100.00\% | 87.99\% | 10.97\% | 0.11\% | 0.62\% | 0.02\% | 0.29\% |
| TOTPLT-PRI-E |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| TOTPLT-SEC-D |  | 100.00\% | 64.77\% | 13.93\% | 0.37\% | 20.24\% | 0.06\% | 0.62\% |
| TOTPLT-SEC-C |  | 100.00\% | 88.01\% | 10.97\% | 0.11\% | 0.60\% | 0.02\% | 0.29\% |
| TOTPLT-SEC-E |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| TOTPLT-CS-D |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| TOTPLT-CS-C |  | 100.00\% | 62.32\% | 15.20\% | 0.28\% | 3.83\% | 0.60\% | 17.78\% |
| TOTPLT-CS-E |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DISTPLT-SUB-D |  | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| DISTPLT-SUB-C |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DISTPLT-SUB-E |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DISTPLT-PRI-D |  | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| DISTPLT-PRI-C |  | 100.00\% | 88.05\% | 10.97\% | 0.11\% | 0.59\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| DISTPLT-PRI-E |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DISTPLT-SEC-D |  | 100.00\% | 64.74\% | 13.94\% | 0.37\% | 20.29\% | 0.04\% | 0.62\% |
| DISTPLT-SEC-C |  | 100.00\% | 88.08\% | 10.96\% | 0.11\% | 0.56\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| DISTPLT-SEC-E |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DISTPLT-CS-D |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DISTPLT-CS-C |  | 100.00\% | 59.98\% | 14.84\% | 0.27\% | 3.86\% | 0.59\% | 20.47\% |
| DISTPLT-CS-E |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GENPLT-SUB-D |  | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| GENPLT-SUB-C |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| GENPLT-SUB-E |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GENPLT-PRI-D |  | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| GENPLT-PRI-C |  | 100.00\% | 88.05\% | 10.97\% | 0.11\% | 0.59\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| GENPLT-PRI-E |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GENPLT-SEC-D |  | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 13.96\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| GENPLT-SEC-C |  | 100.00\% | 88.08\% | 10.96\% | 0.11\% | 0.56\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| GENPLT-SEC-E |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GENPLT-CS-D |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| GENPLT-CS-C |  | 100.00\% | 72.05\% | 16.84\% | 0.30\% | 3.62\% | 0.53\% | 6.65\% |
| GENPLT-CS-E |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| INTPLT-SUB-D |  | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| INTPLT-SUB-C |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| INTPLT-SUB-E |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& I | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Summary of Allocators | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting |
| Summary of Allocators Description | Company | R | c\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | St ling |
| INTPLT-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| INTPLT-PRI-C | 100.00\% | 88.05\% | 10.97\% | 0.11\% | 0.59\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| INTPLT-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| INTPLT-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 13.96\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| INTPLT-SEC-C | 100.00\% | 88.08\% | 10.96\% | 0.11\% | 0.56\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| INTPLT-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| INTPLT-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| INTPLT-CS-C | 100.00\% | 72.05\% | 16.84\% | 0.30\% | 3.62\% | 0.53\% | 6.65\% |
| INTPLT-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A\&G-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.10\% | 10.93\% | 0.26\% | 21.09\% | 4.10\% | 0.53\% |
| A\&G-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| A\&G-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A\&G-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 61.65\% | 14.03\% | 0.39\% | 22.67\% | 0.28\% | 0.99\% |
| A\&G-PRI-C | 100.00\% | 85.28\% | 11.83\% | 0.14\% | 1.95\% | 0.09\% | 0.71\% |
| A\&G-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A\&G-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.55\% | 14.94\% | 0.36\% | 18.64\% | 0.17\% | 1.34\% |
| A\&G-SEC-C | 100.00\% | 83.56\% | 12.37\% | 0.15\% | 2.79\% | 0.14\% | 0.98\% |
| A\&G-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A\&G-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| A\&G-CS-C | 100.00\% | 71.80\% | 16.89\% | 0.30\% | 3.92\% | 0.54\% | 6.55\% |
| A\&G-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RB-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.28\% | 9.81\% | 0.26\% | 21.97\% | 4.63\% | 0.06\% |
| RB-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| RB-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RB-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 61.62\% | 13.38\% | 0.40\% | 23.76\% | 0.25\% | 0.60\% |
| RB-PRI-C | 100.00\% | 88.60\% | 10.89\% | 0.12\% | 0.07\% | 0.03\% | 0.29\% |
| RB-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rb-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.99\% | 13.91\% | 0.38\% | 20.02\% | 0.08\% | 0.63\% |
| Rb-SEC-C | 100.00\% | 88.62\% | 10.90\% | 0.12\% | 0.04\% | 0.03\% | 0.29\% |
| Rb-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RB-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| RB-CS-C | 100.00\% | 62.57\% | 15.20\% | 0.28\% | 3.34\% | 0.62\% | 17.99\% |
| RB-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CWIP-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.07\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.16\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| CWIP-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CWIP-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CWIP-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 61.44\% | 13.41\% | 0.39\% | 23.93\% | 0.23\% | 0.60\% |
| CWIP-PRI-C | 100.00\% | 87.99\% | 10.97\% | 0.11\% | 0.62\% | 0.02\% | 0.29\% |
| CWIP-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CWIP-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.77\% | 13.93\% | 0.37\% | 20.24\% | 0.06\% | 0.62\% |
| CWIP-SEC-C | 100.00\% | 88.01\% | 10.97\% | 0.11\% | 0.60\% | 0.02\% | 0.29\% |
| CWIP-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CWIP-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CWIP-CS-C | 100.00\% | 62.32\% | 15.20\% | 0.28\% | 3.83\% | 0.60\% | 17.78\% |
| CWIP-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LABOR-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| LABOR-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| LABOR-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LABOR-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| LABOR-PRI-C | 100.00\% | 88.05\% | 10.97\% | 0.11\% | 0.59\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| LABOR-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LABOR-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 13.96\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| LABOR-SEC-C | 100.00\% | 88.08\% | 10.96\% | 0.11\% | 0.56\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| LABOR-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LABOR-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| LABOR-CS-C | 100.00\% | 72.05\% | 16.84\% | 0.30\% | 3.62\% | 0.53\% | 6.65\% |
| LABOR-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DISTLAB-SUB-DDISTLAB-SUB-CDISTLAB-SUB-E | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
|  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Summary of Allocators | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting |
| Description | Company | R | c\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | St LTNG |
|  | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| DISTLAB-PRI-C | 100.00\% | 88.05\% | 10.97\% | 0.11\% | 0.59\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| DISTLAB-PRIE | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DISTLAB-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 13.96\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| distlab-EEC-C | 100.00\% | 88.08\% | 10.96\% | 0.11\% | 0.56\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| DISTLAB-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DISTLAB-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DISTLAB-CS-C | 100.00\% | 61.97\% | 19.29\% | 0.38\% | 5.85\% | 0.93\% | 11.58\% |
| DISTLAB-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSTLAB-SUB-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSTLAB-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSTLAB-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSTLAB-PRI-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSTLAB-PRI-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSTLAB-PRIE | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSTLAB-SEC-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSTLAB-SEC-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSTLAB-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSTLAB-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSTLAB-CS-C | 100.00\% | 85.51\% | 13.58\% | 0.18\% | 0.65\% | 0.00\% | 0.08\% |
| CUSTLAB-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| AGLAB-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| AGLAB-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| AGLAB-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| AGLAB-Pri-d | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| AGLAB-PRI-C | 100.00\% | 88.05\% | 10.97\% | 0.11\% | 0.59\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| AGLAB-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| AGLAB-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 13.96\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| Aglab-Sec-C | 100.00\% | 88.08\% | 10.96\% | 0.11\% | 0.56\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| AGLAb-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| AGLAB-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| AGLAB-CS-C | 100.00\% | 72.05\% | 16.84\% | 0.30\% | 3.62\% | 0.53\% | 6.65\% |
| AGLAB-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| nonaglab-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| NONAGLAB-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NONAGLAB-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NONAGLAB-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| NONAGLAB-PRI-C | 100.00\% | 88.05\% | 10.97\% | 0.11\% | 0.59\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| NONAGLAB-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NONAGLAB-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 13.96\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| nonaglab-sec-c | 100.00\% | 88.08\% | 10.96\% | 0.11\% | 0.56\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| NONAGLAB-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NoNAGLAB-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NONAGLAB-CS-C | 100.00\% | 72.05\% | 16.84\% | 0.30\% | 3.62\% | 0.53\% | 6.65\% |
| NONAGLAB-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| ratebase-sub-d | 100.00\% | 63.28\% | 9.81\% | 0.26\% | 21.97\% | 4.63\% | 0.06\% |
| ratebase-sub-c | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| ratebase-sub-e | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| RATEBASE-Pri-D | 100.00\% | 61.62\% | 13.38\% | 0.40\% | 23.76\% | 0.25\% | 0.60\% |
| Ratebase-pri-c | 100.00\% | 88.60\% | 10.89\% | 0.12\% | 0.07\% | 0.03\% | 0.29\% |
| RATEBASE-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Ratebase-sec-d | 100.00\% | 64.99\% | 13.91\% | 0.38\% | 20.02\% | 0.08\% | 0.63\% |
| Ratebase-sec-c | 100.00\% | 88.62\% | 10.90\% | 0.12\% | 0.04\% | 0.03\% | 0.29\% |
| ratebase-sec-e | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RATEBASE-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| RATEBASE-CS-C | 100.00\% | 62.57\% | 15.20\% | 0.28\% | 3.34\% | 0.62\% | 17.99\% |
| ratebase-cs-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Distopexp-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| Distopexp-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistOpExp-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistopExp-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| Distopexp-PRI-C | 100.00\% | 88.05\% | 10.97\% | 0.11\% | 0.59\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| Distopexp-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Distopexp-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 13.96\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| Distopexp-SEC-C | 100.00\% | 88.08\% | 10.96\% | 0.11\% | 0.56\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| DistopExp-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |

Exhibit TSL-2 Proposed CCOS Study

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  | Residential | Small C \& | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Summary of Allocators | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting |
| Description | Company | R | c\& 6 | CA-CSH | PH | pp | St LTNG |
| DistOpExp-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistOpExp-CS-C | 100.00\% | 61.19\% | 21.88\% | 0.45\% | 7.11\% | 1.15\% | 8.21\% |
| Distopexp-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| OHLines-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| OHLines-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| OHLines-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| OHLines-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| OHLines-PRI-C OHLines-PRI-E | 100.00\% | 88.05\% | 10.97\% | 0.11\% | 0.59\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
|  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| OHLines-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 13.96\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| OHLines-SEC-C | 100.00\% | 88.08\% | 10.96\% | 0.11\% | 0.56\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| OHLines-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| OHLines-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| OHLines-CS-C OHLines-CS-E | 100.00\% | 88.33\% | 10.99\% | 0.11\% | 0.56\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| UGLines-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| UGLines-SUB-C UGLines-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| UGLines-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| UGLines-PRI-C UGLines-PRI-E | 100.00\% | 88.05\% | 10.97\% | 0.11\% | 0.59\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
|  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| UGLines-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 13.96\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| UGLines-SEC-C UGLines-SEC-E | 100.00\% | 88.08\% | 10.96\% | 0.11\% | 0.56\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
|  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| UGLines-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| UGLines-CS-C | 100.00\% | 88.33\% | 10.99\% | 0.11\% | 0.56\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| UGLines-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistMtExp-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| DistMtExp-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistMtExp-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistMtExp-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| DistMtExp-PRI-C | 100.00\% | 88.05\% | 10.97\% | 0.11\% | 0.59\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| DistMtExp-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistMtExp-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 13.96\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| DistMtExp-SEC-C | 100.00\% | 88.08\% | 10.96\% | 0.11\% | 0.56\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| DistMtExp-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistMtExp-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistMtExp-CS-C <br> DistMtExp-CS-E | 100.00\% | 74.19\% | 13.20\% | 0.20\% | 2.34\% | 0.32\% | 9.74\% |
|  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Opexp-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| OpExp-SUB-C <br> OpExp-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| OpExp-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| OpExp-PRI-C | 100.00\% | 88.05\% | 10.97\% | 0.11\% | 0.59\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| OpExp-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| OpExp-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 13.96\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| OpExp-SEC-C | 100.00\% | 88.08\% | 10.96\% | 0.11\% | 0.56\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| OpExp-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| OpExp-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| OpExp-CS-C | 100.00\% | 80.22\% | 13.17\% | 0.21\% | 2.10\% | 0.28\% | 4.02\% |
| OpExp-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DISTPLTxRES-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 26.77\% | 0.69\% | 60.10\% | 12.28\% | 0.17\% |
| DISTPLTxRES-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DISTPLTXRES-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DISTPLTxRES-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 34.76\% | 1.02\% | 62.13\% | 0.55\% | 1.54\% |
| DISTPLTxRES-PRI-C | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 91.75\% | 0.96\% | 4.92\% | 0.00\% | 2.38\% |
| DISTPLTxRES-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DISTPLTxRES-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 39.52\% | 1.06\% | 57.52\% | 0.13\% | 1.77\% |
| DISTPLTxRES-SEC-C | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 91.94\% | 0.96\% | 4.72\% | 0.00\% | 2.38\% |
| DISTPLTxRES-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DISTPLTXRES-CS-D DISTPLTxRES-CS-C DISTPLTxRES-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 37.07\% | 0.68\% | 9.63\% | 1.49\% | 51.13\% |
|  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Summary of Classifiers    <br> Classifier Description Classifier Code  Total | - Demand | - Customer |  |

## External Classifiers

| Common |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Customer Factor | CUS | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Demand Factor | DEM | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Commodity Factor | COM | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% |
| 360 Primary Classifier | 360P | 100.00\% | 98.50\% | 1.50\% | 0.00\% |
| 360 Secondary Classifier | 360S | 100.00\% | 45.97\% | 54.03\% | 0.00\% |
| 364 Primary Classifier | 364P | 100.00\% | 72.95\% | 27.05\% | 0.00\% |
| 364 Secondary Classifier | 364S | 100.00\% | 68.27\% | 31.73\% | 0.00\% |
| 365 Primary Classifier | 365P | 100.00\% | 56.64\% | 43.36\% | 0.00\% |
| 365 Secondary Classifier | 365S | 100.00\% | 30.96\% | 69.04\% | 0.00\% |
| 366 Primary Classifier | 366P | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 366 Secondary Classifier | 366 S | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 367 Primary Classifier | 367P | 100.00\% | 50.08\% | 49.92\% | 0.00\% |
| 367 Secondary Classifier | 367S | 100.00\% | 19.75\% | 80.25\% | 0.00\% |
| 368 Primary Classifier | 368P | 100.00\% | 70.21\% | 29.79\% | 0.00\% |
| 368 Secondary Classifier | 368 S | 100.00\% | 24.65\% | 75.35\% | 0.00\% |
| 369 Classifier | 369 | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% |

Internal Classifiers - Derivation and Supporting Data

## TOTPLT

Total Plant Subtransmission
Total Plant Primary
Total Plant Secondary
Total Plant Customer

TOTPLT-SUB TOTPLT-PRI TOTPLT-SEC TOTPLT-CS

| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $100.00 \%$ | $96.83 \%$ | $3.17 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $35.30 \%$ | $64.70 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |



DISTPLT-SUB
DISTPLT-PRI DISTPLT-SEC DISTPLT-CS

| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $100.00 \%$ | $96.83 \%$ | $3.17 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $35.41 \%$ | $64.59 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |

## GENPLT

General Plant Subtransmission
GENPLT-SUB
General Plant Primary GENPLT-PRI
General Plant Secondary
General Plant Customer
GENPLT-SEC GENPLT-CS

| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $100.00 \%$ | $96.77 \%$ | $3.23 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $31.74 \%$ | $68.26 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |

## INTPLT

Intangible Plant Subtransmission
Intangible Plant Primary
Intangible Plant Secondary
Intangible Plant Customer

INTPLT-SUB INTPLT-PRI INTPLT-SEC INTPLT-CS

| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $100.00 \%$ | $96.77 \%$ | $3.23 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $31.74 \%$ | $68.26 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |

## The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) <br> Summary of Classifiers

Classifier Description
Classifier Code
Total
Demand

- Customer
- Commodity


## A\&G <br> A\&G Subtransmission A\&G-SUB

A\&G Primary A\&G-PRI
A\&G Secondary A\&G-SEC
A\&G Customer A\&G-CS

| RB |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Rate Base Subtransmission | RB-SUB |
| Rate Base Primary | RB-PRI |
| Rate Base Secondary | RB-SEC |
| Rate Base Customer | RB-CS |


| CWIP |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| CWIP Subtransmission | CWIP-SUB |
| CWIP Primary | CWIP-PRI |
| CWIP Secondary | CWIP-SEC |
| CWIP Customer |  |
| CWIP-CS |  |
| LABOR |  |
| LABOR Subtransmission | LABOR-SUB |
| LABOR Secondary | LABOR-PRI |
| LABOR Customer | LABOR-SEC |


| CWIP |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| CWIP Subtransmission | CWIP-SUB |
| CWIP Primary | CWIP-PRI |
| CWIP Secondary | CWIP-SEC |
| CWIP Customer |  |
| CWIP-CS |  |
| LABOR |  |
| LABOR Subtransmission Primary | LABOR-SUB |
| LABOR Secondary | LABOR-PRI |
| LABOR Customer | LABOR-CS |

DISTLAB-SUB DISTLAB-PRI DISTLAB-SEC DISTLAB-CS

| Cust Labor |
| :--- |
| Cust Labor Subtransmission |

CUSTLAB-SUB CUSTLAB-PRI CUSTLAB-SEC CUSTLAB-CS


A\&G Labor Subtransmission
A\&G Labor Primary
A\&G Labor Secondary
A\&G Labor Customer
AGLAB-SUB AGLAB-PRI AGLAB-SEC AGLAB-CS

## Dist+Cust Labor

Dist+Cust Labor Subtransmission
Dist+Cust Labor Primary
Dist+Cust Labor Secondary
Dist+Cust Labor Customer

NONAGLAB-SUB NONAGLAB-PRI NONAGLAB-SEC NONAGLAB-CS
Dist Labor

Dist Labor Subtransmission
Dist Labor Primary

Cust Labor Primary

| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $100.00 \%$ | $96.77 \%$ | $3.23 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $32.45 \%$ | $67.55 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |


| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $100.00 \%$ | $96.83 \%$ | $3.17 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $35.30 \%$ | $64.70 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |


| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $100.00 \%$ | $96.77 \%$ | $3.23 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $31.74 \%$ | $68.26 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |


| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $100.00 \%$ | $96.77 \%$ | $3.23 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $31.74 \%$ | $68.26 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |


| $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |

Rate Base

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Summary of Classifiers Classifier Description | Classifier Code | Total | - Demand | - Customer | - Commodity |
| Rate Base Subtransmission | RATEBASE-SUB | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Rate Base Primary | RATEBASE-PRI | 100.00\% | 96.83\% | 3.17\% | 0.00\% |
| Rate Base Secondary | RATEBASE-SEC | 100.00\% | 35.41\% | 64.59\% | 0.00\% |
| Rate Base Customer | RATEBASE-CS | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistOpExp |  |  |  |  |  |
| DistOpExp Subtransmission | DistOpExp-SUB | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistOpExp Primary | DistOpExp-PRI | 100.00\% | 88.18\% | 11.82\% | 0.00\% |
| DistOpExp Secondary | DistOpExp-SEC | 100.00\% | 32.99\% | 67.01\% | 0.00\% |
| DistOpExp Customer | DistOpExp-CS | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Overhead Lines |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overhead Lines Subtransmission | OHLines-SUB | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Overhead Lines Primary | OHLines-PRI | 100.00\% | 56.64\% | 43.36\% | 0.00\% |
| Overhead Lines Secondary | OHLines-SEC | 100.00\% | 30.96\% | 69.04\% | 0.00\% |
| Overhead Lines Customer | OHLines-CS | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% |
| U/G Lines |  |  |  |  |  |
| U/G Lines Subtransmission | UGLines-SUB | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| U/G Lines Primary | UGLines-PRI | 100.00\% | 67.35\% | 32.65\% | 0.00\% |
| U/G Lines Secondary | UGLines-SEC | 100.00\% | 34.27\% | 65.73\% | 0.00\% |
| U/G Lines Customer | UGLines-CS | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistMtExp |  |  |  |  |  |
| DistMtExp Subtransmission | DistMtExp-SUB | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistMtExp Primary | DistMtExp-PRI | 100.00\% | 92.92\% | 7.08\% | 0.00\% |
| DistMtExp Secondary | DistMtExp-SEC | 100.00\% | 31.10\% | 68.90\% | 0.00\% |
| DistMtExp Customer | DistMtExp-CS | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Expenses Subtransmission | OpExp-SUB | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Operating Expenses Primary | OpExp-PRI | 100.00\% | 92.29\% | 7.71\% | 0.00\% |
| Operating Expenses Secondary | OpExp-SEC | 100.00\% | 31.64\% | 68.36\% | 0.00\% |
| Operating Expenses Customer | OpExp-CS | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Dist. Plant excl. Residential |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dist. Plant excl. Res Subtransmission | DISTPLTxRES-SUB | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Dist. Plant excl. Res Primary | DISTPLTxRES-PRI | 100.00\% | 99.00\% | 1.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Dist. Plant excl. Res Secondary | DISTPLTxRES-SEC | 100.00\% | 61.85\% | 38.15\% | 0.00\% |
| Dist. Plant excl. Res Customer | DISTPLTxRES-CS | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% |

$\qquad$
Exhibit TSL-2 Proposed CCOS Study

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Factors |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Code | Total | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EXTERNAL FUNCTIONAL FACTORS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Customer Service Only | CUSTSERVICE | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Primary Distribution Only | PRIMARY | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Secondary Distribution Only | SECONDARY | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Subtransmission Only | SUBTRANSMISSION | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Account 360 Land and Land Rights | ACC360 | 100.0\% | 6.9\% | 54.5\% | 38.6\% | 0.0\% |
| Account 361 Structures and Improvements | ACC361 | 100.0\% | 0.1\% | 99.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Account 362 Station Equipment | ACC362 | 100.0\% | 0.5\% | 99.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Account 364 Poles, Towers \& Fixtures | ACC364 | 100.0\% | 29.5\% | 4.0\% | 66.6\% | 0.0\% |
| Account 365 Overhead Conductors \& Devices | ACC365 | 100.0\% | 42.8\% | 3.0\% | 54.2\% | 0.0\% |
| Account 366 Underground Conduit | ACC366 | 100.0\% | 27.8\% | 3.7\% | 68.6\% | 0.0\% |
| Account 367 Underground Conductors \& Device | ACC367 | 100.0\% | 30.3\% | 1.5\% | 68.2\% | 0.0\% |
| Account 368 Transformers | ACC368 | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.2\% | 99.8\% | 0.0\% |
| INTERNAL FUNCTIONAL FACTORS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rate Base Factor | RB | 100.0\% | 19.2\% | 16.9\% | 49.5\% | 14.4\% |
| Total Distribution Plant Factor | DISTPLT | 100.0\% | 19.3\% | 17.1\% | 51.5\% | 12.1\% |
| Total Utility Plant Factor | TOTPLT | 100.0\% | 19.2\% | 17.0\% | 49.9\% | 14.0\% |
| Total General Plant Factor | GENPLT | 100.0\% | 17.5\% | 15.7\% | 25.9\% | 40.9\% |
| Overhead and Service Lines Factor | OHLINES | 100.0\% | 35.3\% | 2.5\% | 44.7\% | 17.4\% |
| Underground Lines Factor | UG LINES | 100.0\% | 28.3\% | 1.8\% | 64.7\% | 5.2\% |
| Distribution Operating Expenses Factor | DISTOPEXP | 100.0\% | 22.4\% | 5.0\% | 39.0\% | 33.7\% |
| Distribution Maintenance Expenses Factor | DISTMTEXP | 100.0\% | 29.2\% | 12.6\% | 38.5\% | 19.8\% |
| Labor Expenses | LABOR | 100.0\% | 17.5\% | 15.7\% | 25.9\% | 40.9\% |
| Dist Labor Expenses | distlab | 100.0\% | 21.2\% | 19.1\% | 31.4\% | 28.4\% |
| Customer Labor Expenses | CUSTLAB | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| A\&G Labor Expenses | AGLAB | 100.0\% | 17.5\% | 15.7\% | 25.9\% | 40.9\% |
| Non-A\&G Labor Expenses | NONAGLAB | 100.0\% | 17.5\% | 15.7\% | 25.9\% | 40.9\% |
| Total Operating Expenses excl. A\&G Factor | OPEXP | 100.0\% | 20.8\% | 7.9\% | 29.4\% | 41.9\% |
| INTERNAL FUNCTIONAL FACTORS DERIVATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Distribution Plant |  | 1,370,353,215 | 264,958,327 | 233,684,367 | 705,760,924 | 165,949,597 |
| Total Distribution Plant Factor | DISTPLT | 100.0\% | 19.3\% | 17.1\% | 51.5\% | 12.1\% |
| Total General Plant |  | 94,864,996 | 16,571,017 | 14,919,176 | 24,552,383 | 38,822,420 |
| Total General Plant Factor | GENPLT | 100.0\% | 17.5\% | 15.7\% | 25.9\% | 40.9\% |
| Total Utility Plant |  | 1,474,004,730 | 283,228,221 | 250,101,895 | 734,838,550 | 205,836,063 |
| Total Utility Plant Factor | TOTPLT | 100.0\% | 19.2\% | 17.0\% | 49.9\% | 14.0\% |
| Overhead and Service Lines (Accts. 365, 3690H) |  | 296,947,998 | 104,904,585 | 7,476,890 | 132,766,709 | 51,799,814 |
| Overhead and Service Lines Factor | Ohlines | 100.0\% | 35.3\% | 2.5\% | 44.7\% | 17.4\% |
| Underground Lines (Acct. 366-367, 369UG) |  | 410,866,051 | 116,371,686 | 7,422,638 | 265,820,427 | 21,251,299 |
| Underground Lines Factor | UG LINES | 100.0\% | 28.3\% | 1.8\% | 64.7\% | 5.2\% |
| Distribution Operating Expenses |  | 3,869,177 | 865,012 | 191,581 | 1,508,516 | 1,304,067 |
| Distribution Operating Expenses Factor | DISTOPEXP | 100.0\% | 22.4\% | 5.0\% | 39.0\% | $33.7 \%$ |
| Distribution Maintenance Expenses |  | 24,178,759 | 7,055,010 | 3,040,287 | 9,302,164 | 4,781,299 |
| Distribution Maintenance Expenses Factor | DISTMTEXP | 100.0\% | 29.2\% | 12.6\% | 38.5\% | 19.8\% |
| Total Operating Expenses excl. A\&G |  | 44,385,845 | 9,213,081 | 3,527,856 | 13,046,172 | 18,598,735 |
| Total Operating Expenses excl. A\&G Factor | OPEXP | 100.0\% | 20.8\% | 7.9\% | 29.4\% | 41.9\% |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) Functional Factors |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revenue Requirement |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rate Base |  | 718,525,219 | 137,876,780 | 121,783,036 | 355,642,109 | 103,223,294 |
| Required Return on Rate Base |  | 7.54\% | 7.54\% | 7.54\% | 7.54\% | 7.54\% |
| Required Net Income |  | 54,188,230 | 10,398,102 | 9,184,378 | 26,821,072 | 7,784,678 |
| O\&M Expenses |  | 56,655,385 | 11,382,575 | 5,471,518 | 16,563,069 | 23,238,223 |
| Depreciation \& Amortization |  | 33,822,024 | 6,484,474 | 5,728,537 | 16,663,941 | 4,945,072 |
| Regulatory Debits and Credits |  | 1,288,352 | 249,300 | 219,841 | 666,228 | 152,984 |
| Taxes Other than Income |  | 30,607,318 | 5,849,161 | 5,167,356 | 15,026,790 | 4,564,010 |
| Total Expenses |  | 122,373,079 | 23,965,511 | 16,587,252 | 48,920,028 | 32,900,289 |
| Allowance for Funds Used During Construction |  | 2,609,343 | 501,382 | 442,740 | 1,300,841 | 364,379 |
| Interest on Customer Deposits |  | $(17,180)$ | $(3,301)$ | $(2,915)$ | $(8,565)$ | $(2,399)$ |
| Income Taxes |  | 10,884,154 | 2,088,545 | 1,844,758 | 5,387,234 | 1,563,617 |
| Revenue Requirement |  | 190,037,627 | 36,950,239 | 28,056,213 | 82,420,611 | 42,610,564 |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential |  |  |  | Small C \& I |  | Medium Power |  | Large Power |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Target Revenues | Total |  | Service |  | Schedule |  | Schedule |  | Schedule |  | Schedule |  | Area Lighting |
|  | Company |  | R |  | C\&G |  | CA-CSH |  | PH |  | PP |  | ST LTNG |
| Revenue Requirements at EROR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delivery Revenues at EROR | 167,686,930 |  | 122,365,061 |  | 20,761,563 |  | 419,160 |  | 18,309,580 |  | 1,390,045 |  | 4,441,521 |
| Current Delivery Revenues | 120,194,282 |  | 76,638,469 |  | 22,321,797 |  | 382,670 |  | 15,098,581 |  | 938,268 |  | 4,814,496 |
| Increase / (Decrease) (\$) | 47,492,648 |  | 45,726,592 |  | $(1,560,234)$ |  | 36,490 |  | 3,210,998 |  | 451,777 |  | $(372,975)$ |
| Increase / (Decrease) (\%) | 39.5\% |  | 59.7\% |  | -7.0\% |  | 9.5\% |  | 21.3\% |  | 48.2\% |  | -7.7\% |
| Revenue Requirements at Uniform \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uniform Increase in Revenues | 167,686,930 |  | 106,920,807 |  | 31,141,861 |  | 533,875 |  | 21,064,519 |  | 1,309,009 |  | 6,716,859 |
| Current Retail Revenues | 120,194,282 |  | 76,638,469 |  | 22,321,797 |  | 382,670 |  | 15,098,581 |  | 938,268 |  | 4,814,496 |
| Increase | 47,492,648 |  | 30,282,338 |  | 8,820,064 |  | 151,205 |  | 5,965,938 |  | 370,740 |  | 1,902,363 |
| Increase (\%) | 39.5\% |  | 39.5\% |  | 39.5\% |  | 39.5\% |  | 39.5\% |  | 39.5\% |  | 39.5\% |
| Movement to EROR | 20.00\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revenue Targets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Step 1: $20 \%$ Movement to EROR (excl. Lighting) | 161,425,139 | \$ | 110,009,658 | \$ | 29,065,801 | \$ | 510,932 | \$ | 20,513,531 | \$ | 1,325,216 |  |  |
| Step 2: Set Lighting at $2 \times$ Total Increase | 5,688,019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 5,688,019 |
| Step 3: Lighting Adjustment Assigned to Non-Res | 573,772 |  |  | \$ | 324,361 | \$ | 5,702 | \$ | 228,921 | \$ | 14,789 |  |  |
| Adjusted Revenue Targets | 167,686,930 | \$ | 110,009,658 | \$ | 29,390,162 | \$ | 516,634 | \$ | 20,742,452 | \$ | 1,340,005 | \$ | 5,688,019 |
| Current Retail Revenues | 120,194,282 |  | 76,638,469 |  | 22,321,797 |  | 382,670 |  | 15,098,581 |  | 938,268 |  | 4,814,496 |
| Increase | 47,492,648 |  | 33,371,189 |  | 7,068,365 |  | 133,964 |  | 5,643,871 |  | 401,736 |  | 873,523 |
| Increase (\%) | 39.5\% |  | 43.5\% |  | 31.7\% |  | 35.0\% |  | 37.4\% |  | 42.8\% |  | 18.1\% |

$\qquad$
The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)
Customer Charge Analysis
Test Period 12 Months Ended December 2022

| Plant-In-Service: CCOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Account <br> Number | Description | Total |  | Schedule <br> R |  | Schedules <br> G, C, C-A \& CSH |  | Schedule PH |  | Schedule PP |  |
| 369 | Services | \$ | 73,051,113 | \$ | 64,524,857 | \$ | 8,114,015 | \$ | 412,241 | \$ |  |
| 370, 371 | Meters and Installation | \$ | 58,934,191 | \$ | 35,003,730 | \$ | 16,957,346 | \$ | 5,986,423 | \$ | 986,692 |
|  | Total |  |  | \$ | 99,528,588 | \$ | 25,071,361 | \$ | 6,398,664 | \$ | 986,692 |
| O\&M: Separation Study |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Account |  |  |  |  | edule |  | edules |  | dule |  |  |
| Number | Description |  | Total |  | R |  | --A \& CSH |  | H |  |  |
| 586 | Meter | \$ | 896,233 | \$ | 532,314 | \$ | 257,876 | \$ | 91,038 | \$ | 15,005 |
| 588 | Misc. Distribution (Customer-related) | \$ | 2,682,919 | \$ | 1,960,582 | \$ | 465,698 | \$ | 113,119 | \$ | 17,222 |
| 597 | Maintenance of Meters | \$ | 914,278 | \$ | 543,032 | \$ | 263,069 | \$ | 92,871 | \$ | 15,307 |
| 902,903 | Meter Reading \& Billing | \$ | 6,854,217 | \$ | 5,857,097 | \$ | 947,177 | \$ | 44,634 | \$ | - |
| 905, 907, 910 | Misc. Cust Serv and Info Exp | \$ | 2,381,813 | \$ | 2,178,507 | \$ | 184,926 | \$ | 6,213 | \$ | - |
| 908 | Customer Assistance | \$ | 233,396 | \$ | 233,396 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |
|  | Total | \$ | 13,962,857 | \$ | 11,304,928 | \$ | 2,118,746 | \$ | 347,874 | \$ | 47,534 |
| Customer Charge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plant Accounts Carrying Charge |  |  |  | \$ | 11,756,223 | \$ | 2,961,406 | \$ | 755,804 | \$ | 116,547 |
| Plus: Related Expenses |  |  |  | \$ | 11,304,928 | \$ | 2,118,746 | \$ | 347,874 | \$ | 47,534 |
| Total |  |  |  | \$ | 23,061,151 | \$ | 5,080,151 | \$ | 1,103,678 | \$ | 164,081 |
| Divided by: Customer Count (Annual) |  |  |  |  | 3,007,098 |  | 377,906 |  | 20,167 |  | 121 |
| Total Monthly Customer Charge ${ }^{\text {Total Monthly Customer Charge (rounded) }}$ |  |  |  | \$ | 7.67 | \$ | 13.44 | \$ | 54.73 | \$ | 1,356.05 |
|  |  |  |  | \$ | 8.00 | \$ | 13.00 | \$ | 50.00 | \$ | 1,360.00 |

The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)
Proposed Distribution Rates
Test Period 12 Months Ended December 2022

10 Correction Factor
1.00042

| Total Target | $\$$ | $116,805,235$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total Adj. Target | $\$$ | $116,854,214$ |
| Base Adj. Target | $\$$ | $110,058,637$ |
| Base Current | $\$$ | $76,673,455$ |


| Schedule R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Energy | Distribution Current Bill |  | Distribution <br> Proposed Bill |  | Distribution Incr/(Decr) |  | Distribution \% Change | Total Bill* \% Change |
| kWh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100 | \$ | 7.54 | \$ | 10.52 | \$ | 2.98 | 40\% | 19.5\% |
| 200 | \$ | 9.37 | \$ | 13.05 | \$ | 3.68 | 39\% | 15.0\% |
| 300 | \$ | 11.21 | \$ | 15.57 | \$ | 4.36 | 39\% | 12.9\% |
| 400 | \$ | 13.04 | \$ | 18.10 | \$ | 5.06 | 39\% | 11.8\% |
| 500 | \$ | 14.88 | \$ | 20.62 | \$ | 5.74 | 39\% | 11.0\% |
| 600 | \$ | 16.72 | \$ | 23.14 | \$ | 6.42 | 38\% | 10.5\% |
| 700 | \$ | 18.55 | \$ | 25.67 | \$ | 7.12 | 38\% | 10.1\% |
| 800 | \$ | 20.39 | \$ | 28.19 | \$ | 7.80 | 38\% | 9.8\% |
| 900 | \$ | 22.22 | \$ | 30.72 | \$ | 8.50 | 38\% | 9.5\% |
| 1,000 | \$ | 24.06 | \$ | 33.24 | \$ | 9.18 | 38\% | 9.3\% |
| 1,100 | \$ | 25.90 | \$ | 35.76 | \$ | 9.86 | 38\% | 9.2\% |
| 1,200 | \$ | 27.73 | \$ | 38.29 | \$ | 10.56 | 38\% | 9.0\% |
| 1,300 | \$ | 29.57 | \$ | 40.81 | \$ | 11.24 | 38\% | 8.9\% |
| 1,400 | \$ | 31.40 | \$ | 43.34 | \$ | 11.94 | 38\% | 8.8\% |
| 1,500 | \$ | 33.24 | \$ | 45.86 | \$ | 12.62 | 38\% | 8.7\% |
| 1,600 | \$ | 35.08 | \$ | 48.38 | \$ | 13.30 | 38\% | 8.7\% |
| 1,700 | \$ | 36.91 | \$ | 50.91 | \$ | 14.00 | 38\% | 8.6\% |
| 1,800 | \$ | 38.75 | \$ | 53.43 | \$ | 14.68 | 38\% | 8.5\% |
| 1,900 | \$ | 40.58 | \$ | 55.96 | \$ | 15.38 | 38\% | 8.5\% |
| 2,000 | \$ | 42.42 | \$ | 58.48 | \$ | 16.06 | 38\% | 8.4\% |
| 2,100 | \$ | 44.26 | \$ | 61.00 | \$ | 16.74 | 38\% | 8.4\% |
| 2,200 | \$ | 46.09 | \$ | 63.53 | \$ | 17.44 | 38\% | 8.3\% |
| 2,300 | \$ | 47.93 | \$ | 66.05 | \$ | 18.12 | 38\% | 8.3\% |
| 2,400 | \$ | 49.76 | \$ | 68.58 | \$ | 18.82 | 38\% | 8.3\% |
| 2,500 | \$ | 51.60 | \$ | 71.10 | \$ | 19.50 | 38\% | 8.2\% |
| 2,600 | \$ | 53.44 | \$ | 73.62 | \$ | 20.18 | 38\% | 8.2\% |
| 2,700 | \$ | 55.27 | \$ | 76.15 | \$ | 20.88 | 38\% | 8.2\% |
| 2,800 | \$ | 57.11 | \$ | 78.67 | \$ | 21.56 | 38\% | 8.2\% |
| 2,900 | \$ | 58.94 | \$ | 81.20 | \$ | 22.26 | 38\% | 8.1\% |
| 3,000 | \$ | 60.78 | \$ | 83.72 | \$ | 22.94 | 38\% | 8.1\% |
| 3,100 | \$ | 62.62 | \$ | 86.24 | \$ | 23.62 | 38\% | 8.1\% |
| 3,200 | \$ | 64.45 | \$ | 88.77 | \$ | 24.32 | 38\% | 8.1\% |
| 3,300 | \$ | 66.29 | \$ | 91.29 | \$ | 25.00 | 38\% | 8.0\% |
| 3,400 | \$ | 68.12 | \$ | 93.82 | \$ | 25.70 | 38\% | 8.0\% |
| 3,500 | \$ | 69.96 | \$ | 96.34 | \$ | 26.38 | 38\% | 8.0\% |
| 3,600 | \$ | 71.80 | \$ | 98.86 | \$ | 27.06 | 38\% | 8.0\% |
| 3,700 | \$ | 73.63 | \$ | 101.39 | \$ | 27.76 | 38\% | 8.0\% |
| 3,800 | \$ | 75.47 | \$ | 103.91 | \$ | 28.44 | 38\% | 8.0\% |
| 3,900 | \$ | 77.30 | \$ | 106.44 | \$ | 29.14 | 38\% | 8.0\% |
| 4,000 | \$ | 79.14 | \$ | 108.96 | \$ | 29.82 | 38\% | 7.9\% |

*Includes Distribution, Surcharges and SOS (Transmission \& Generation) as of March 2023

The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)
Proposed Distribution Rates
Test Period 12 Months Ended December 2022

| Line No. | Current |  |  | Weather Norm Adjustment | Pro Forma |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Billing Determinants | Rate | Revenue |  | Norm Billing Determinants | Rate | Revenue | Revenue Change | Percent Change |
| SCHEDULE G (General Service) | [a] | [b] | [c]=[a]x[b] | [d] | $[e]=[a]+[d]$ | [f] | $[g]=[e] x[f]$ | $[h]=[g]-[c]$ | [i]=[h]/[c] |


| 1 | Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Fixed Distribution Charge | 323,003 | \$ | 4.00 | \$ | 1,292,011 |  | 323,003 | \$ | 8.00 | \$ | 2,584,022 | \$ | 1,292,011 | 100.00\% |
| 3 | Minimum kW | 115,326 | \$ | 1.42 | \$ | 163,763 |  | 115,326 | \$ | 1.80 | \$ | 207,728 | \$ | 43,965 | 26.85\% |
| 4 | kWh in Minimum | 1,972,506 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 508 | 1,973,013 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |
| 5 | Capacity Charge (kW) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 1st Block (0-7.5) | 39,591 | \$ | - | \$ | - |  | 39,591 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |
| 7 | 2nd Block (over 7.5) | 1,692,148 | \$ | 1.77 | \$ | 2,995,102 |  | 1,692,148 | \$ | 2.25 | \$ | 3,799,188 | \$ | 804,086 | 26.85\% |
| 8 | Energy Charge (kWh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | All kWh | 821,069,347 | \$ | 0.01869 | \$ | 15,345,786 | 211,299 | 821,280,646 | \$ | 0.02371 | \$ | 19,470,632 | \$ | 4,124,846 | 26.88\% |
| 10 | Voltage Discount (kW) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | 2 kV to 15 kV | 30,557 | \$ | (0.25) | \$ | $(7,639)$ |  | 30,557 | \$ | (0.25) | \$ | $(7,639)$ | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
| 12 | Over 15 kV | 41,599 | \$ | (0.50) | \$ | $(20,799)$ |  | 41,599 | \$ | (0.50) | \$ | $(20,799)$ | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
| 13 | Reactive kVA Charge (kVAR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | Billing kVAR | 149,460 | \$ | 0.40 | \$ | 59,784 |  | 149,460 | \$ | 0.40 | \$ | 59,784 | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
| 15 | Unbilled | 2,654,290 |  |  | \$ | 53,290 |  | 2,654,290 |  |  | \$ | 70,221 | \$ | 16,932 | 31.77\% |
| 16 | Franchise Tax Surcharge |  |  |  | \$ | 511,921 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 511,921 | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
| 17 | Montgomery County Energy Tax |  |  |  | \$ | 1,618,759 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 1,618,759 | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
| 18 | TOTAL SCHEDULE G |  |  |  | \$ | 22,011,979 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 28,293,818 | \$ | 6,281,839 | 28.54\% |
| 19 | Per Books Revenue |  |  |  | \$ | 22,058,743 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 28,334,098 | \$ | 6,275,355 | 28.45\% |
| 20 | Correction Factor |  |  |  |  | 0.99858 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.99858 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31.60\% |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Target |  |  | \$ | 28,369,114 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Adj. Target |  |  | \$ | 28,328,784 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Base Adj. Target |  |  | \$ | 26,198,103 | \$ | 26,163,137 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Base Current |  |  | \$ | 19,881,298 |  |  |  |


| Schedule G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Demand } \\ \mathrm{kW} \end{gathered}$ | Energy kWh | Load Factor | Distribution Current Bill |  | Distribution Proposed Bill |  | Distribution Incr/(Decr) |  | Distribution \% Change | Total Bill* \% Change |
| 5.0 | 730 | 20\% | \$ | 14.28 | \$ | 25.31 | \$ | 11.03 | 77\% | 10.0\% |
| 5.0 | 1,095 | 30\% | \$ | 21.42 | \$ | 33.96 | \$ | 12.54 | 59\% | 8.8\% |
| 5.0 | 1,460 | 40\% | \$ | 28.56 | \$ | 42.62 | \$ | 14.06 | 49\% | 8.1\% |
| 5.0 | 1,825 | 50\% | \$ | 35.70 | \$ | 51.27 | \$ | 15.57 | 44\% | 7.6\% |
| 5.0 | 2,190 | 60\% | \$ | 42.84 | \$ | 59.92 | \$ | 17.08 | 40\% | 7.3\% |
| 5.0 | 2,555 | 70\% | \$ | 49.98 | \$ | 68.58 | \$ | 18.60 | 37\% | 7.0\% |
| 5.0 | 2,920 | 80\% | \$ | 57.12 | \$ | 77.23 | \$ | 20.11 | 35\% | 6.8\% |
| 7.5 | 1,095 | 20\% | \$ | 21.42 | \$ | 33.96 | \$ | 12.54 | 59\% | 8.8\% |
| 7.5 | 1,643 | 30\% | \$ | 32.14 | \$ | 46.96 | \$ | 14.82 | 46\% | 7.9\% |
| 7.5 | 2,190 | 40\% | \$ | 42.84 | \$ | 59.92 | \$ | 17.08 | 40\% | 7.3\% |
| 7.5 | 2,738 | 50\% | \$ | 53.56 | \$ | 72.92 | \$ | 19.36 | 36\% | 6.9\% |
| 7.5 | 3,285 | 60\% | \$ | 64.25 | \$ | 85.89 | \$ | 21.64 | 34\% | 6.6\% |
| 7.5 | 3,833 | 70\% | \$ | 74.97 | \$ | 98.88 | \$ | 23.91 | 32\% | 6.4\% |
| 7.5 | 4,380 | 80\% | \$ | 85.67 | \$ | 111.85 | \$ | 26.18 | 31\% | 6.2\% |
| 10.0 | 1,460 | 20\% | \$ | 32.98 | \$ | 48.24 | \$ | 15.26 | 46\% | 7.6\% |
| 10.0 | 2,190 | 30\% | \$ | 47.26 | \$ | 65.55 | \$ | 18.29 | 39\% | 6.9\% |
| 10.0 | 2,920 | 40\% | \$ | 61.54 | \$ | 82.86 | \$ | 21.32 | 35\% | 6.5\% |
| 10.0 | 3,650 | 50\% | \$ | 75.82 | \$ | 100.17 | \$ | 24.35 | 32\% | 6.3\% |
| 10.0 | 4,380 | 60\% | \$ | 90.10 | \$ | 117.47 | \$ | 27.37 | 30\% | 6.1\% |
| 10.0 | 5,110 | 70\% | \$ | 104.38 | \$ | 134.78 | \$ | 30.40 | 29\% | 5.9\% |
| 10.0 | 5,840 | 80\% | \$ | 118.66 | \$ | 152.09 | \$ | 33.43 | 28\% | 5.8\% |
| 20.0 | 2,920 | 20\% | \$ | 79.24 | \$ | 105.36 | \$ | 26.12 | 33\% | 5.9\% |
| 20.0 | 4,380 | 30\% | \$ | 107.80 | \$ | 139.97 | \$ | 32.17 | 30\% | 5.7\% |
| 20.0 | 5,840 | 40\% | \$ | 136.36 | \$ | 174.59 | \$ | 38.23 | 28\% | 5.5\% |
| 20.0 | 7,300 | 50\% | \$ | 164.91 | \$ | 209.21 | \$ | 44.30 | 27\% | 5.4\% |
| 20.0 | 8,760 | 60\% | \$ | 193.47 | \$ | 243.82 | \$ | 50.35 | 26\% | 5.4\% |
| 20.0 | 10,220 | 70\% | \$ | 222.03 | \$ | 278.44 | \$ | 56.41 | 25\% | 5.3\% |
| 20.0 | 11,680 | 80\% | \$ | 250.59 | \$ | 313.06 | \$ | 62.47 | 25\% | 5.3\% |
| 30.0 | 4,380 | 20\% | \$ | 125.50 | \$ | 162.47 | \$ | 36.97 | 29\% | 5.4\% |
| 30.0 | 6,570 | 30\% | \$ | 168.33 | \$ | 214.40 | \$ | 46.07 | 27\% | 5.3\% |
| 30.0 | 8,760 | 40\% | \$ | 211.17 | \$ | 266.32 | \$ | 55.15 | 26\% | 5.2\% |
| 30.0 | 10,950 | 50\% | \$ | 254.01 | \$ | 318.25 | \$ | 64.24 | 25\% | 5.2\% |
| 30.0 | 13,140 | 60\% | \$ | 296.84 | \$ | 370.17 | \$ | 73.33 | 25\% | 5.1\% |
| 30.0 | 15,330 | 70\% | \$ | 339.68 | \$ | 422.10 | \$ | 82.42 | 24\% | 5.1\% |
| 30.0 | 17,520 | 80\% | \$ | 382.52 | \$ | 474.02 | \$ | 91.50 | 24\% | 5.1\% |
| 40.0 | 5,840 | 20\% | \$ | 171.76 | \$ | 219.59 | \$ | 47.83 | 28\% | 5.2\% |
| 40.0 | 8,760 | 30\% | \$ | 228.87 | \$ | 288.82 | \$ | 59.95 | 26\% | 5.1\% |
| 40.0 | 11,680 | 40\% | \$ | 285.99 | \$ | 358.06 | \$ | 72.07 | 25\% | 5.1\% |
| 40.0 | 14,600 | 50\% | \$ | 343.10 | \$ | 427.29 | \$ | 84.19 | 25\% | 5.1\% |
| 40.0 | 17,520 | 60\% | \$ | 400.22 | \$ | 496.52 | \$ | 96.30 | 24\% | 5.0\% |
| 40.0 | 20,440 | 70\% | \$ | 457.33 | \$ | 565.76 | \$ | 108.43 | 24\% | 5.0\% |
| 40.0 | 23,360 | 80\% | \$ | 514.45 | \$ | 634.99 | \$ | 120.54 | 23\% | 5.0\% |
| 50.0 | 7,300 | 20\% | \$ | 218.01 | \$ | 276.71 | \$ | 58.70 | 27\% | 5.1\% |
| 50.0 | 10,950 | 30\% | \$ | 289.41 | \$ | 363.25 | \$ | 73.84 | 26\% | 5.0\% |
| 50.0 | 14,600 | 40\% | \$ | 360.80 | \$ | 449.79 | \$ | 88.99 | 25\% | 5.0\% |
| 50.0 | 18,250 | 50\% | \$ | 432.20 | \$ | 536.33 | \$ | 104.13 | 24\% | 5.0\% |
| 50.0 | 21,900 | 60\% | \$ | 503.59 | \$ | 622.87 | \$ | 119.28 | 24\% | 5.0\% |
| 50.0 | 25,550 | 70\% | \$ | 574.98 | \$ | 709.42 | \$ | 134.44 | 23\% | 5.0\% |
| 50.0 | 29,200 | 80\% | \$ | 646.38 | \$ | 795.96 | \$ | 149.58 | 23\% | 4.9\% |

*Includes Distribution, Surcharges and SOS (Transmission \& Generation) as of March 2023

The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)
Proposed Distribution Rates
Test Period 12 Months Ended December 2022


19 *2nd energy block increases by 53 kWh for each one-half kW in excess of 7.5 kW , with the 3 rd energy block including all kWh in excess of the 1 st and 2 nd energy blocks as adjusted

| Total Target | $\$$ | $3,341,500$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Total Adj. Target | $\$$ | $3,328,654$ |
| Base Adj. Target | $\$$ | $3,110,592$ |
| Base Current | $\$$ | $2,362,290$ |


| Schedule C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demand kW | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Energy } \\ & \mathrm{kWh} \end{aligned}$ | Load Factor | Distribution Current Bill |  | Distribution Proposed Bill |  | Distribution Incr/(Decr) |  | Distribution \% Change | Total Bill* \% Change |
| 5.0 | 730 | 20\% | \$ | 20.13 | \$ | 32.72 | \$ | 12.59 | 63\% | 9\% |
| 5.0 | 1,095 | 30\% | \$ | 27.27 | \$ | 41.38 | \$ | 14.11 | 52\% | 9\% |
| 5.0 | 1,460 | 40\% | \$ | 34.41 | \$ | 50.03 | \$ | 15.62 | 45\% | 8\% |
| 5.0 | 1,825 | 50\% | \$ | 41.55 | \$ | 58.68 | \$ | 17.13 | 41\% | 8\% |
| 5.0 | 2,190 | 60\% | \$ | 48.68 | \$ | 67.34 | \$ | 18.66 | 38\% | 7\% |
| 5.0 | 2,555 | 70\% | \$ | 55.82 | \$ | 75.99 | \$ | 20.17 | 36\% | 7\% |
| 5.0 | 2,920 | 80\% | \$ | 62.96 | \$ | 84.65 | \$ | 21.69 | 34\% | 7\% |
| 7.5 | 1,095 | 20\% | \$ | 27.27 | \$ | 41.38 | \$ | 14.11 | 52\% | 9\% |
| 7.5 | 1,643 | 30\% | \$ | 37.99 | \$ | 54.37 | \$ | 16.38 | 43\% | 8\% |
| 7.5 | 2,190 | 40\% | \$ | 48.68 | \$ | 67.34 | \$ | 18.66 | 38\% | 7\% |
| 7.5 | 2,738 | 50\% | \$ | 59.40 | \$ | 80.33 | \$ | 20.93 | 35\% | 7\% |
| 7.5 | 3,285 | 60\% | \$ | 70.10 | \$ | 93.30 | \$ | 23.20 | 33\% | 7\% |
| 7.5 | 3,833 | 70\% | \$ | 80.82 | \$ | 106.29 | \$ | 25.47 | 32\% | 6\% |
| 7.5 | 4,380 | 80\% | \$ | 91.52 | \$ | 119.26 | \$ | 27.74 | 30\% | 6\% |
| 10.0 | 1,460 | 20\% | \$ | 38.83 | \$ | 55.64 | \$ | 16.81 | 43\% | 7\% |
| 10.0 | 2,190 | 30\% | \$ | 53.11 | \$ | 72.95 | \$ | 19.84 | 37\% | 7\% |
| 10.0 | 2,920 | 40\% | \$ | 67.39 | \$ | 90.26 | \$ | 22.87 | 34\% | 7\% |
| 10.0 | 3,650 | 50\% | \$ | 81.67 | \$ | 107.57 | \$ | 25.90 | 32\% | 6\% |
| 10.0 | 4,380 | 60\% | \$ | 95.95 | \$ | 124.88 | \$ | 28.93 | 30\% | 6\% |
| 10.0 | 5,110 | 70\% | \$ | 110.23 | \$ | 142.18 | \$ | 31.95 | 29\% | 6\% |
| 10.0 | 5,840 | 80\% | \$ | 124.51 | \$ | 159.49 | \$ | 34.98 | 28\% | 6\% |
| 20.0 | 2,920 | 20\% | \$ | 85.10 | \$ | 112.71 | \$ | 27.61 | 32\% | 6\% |
| 20.0 | 4,380 | 30\% | \$ | 113.66 | \$ | 147.33 | \$ | 33.67 | 30\% | 6\% |
| 20.0 | 5,840 | 40\% | \$ | 142.22 | \$ | 181.94 | \$ | 39.72 | 28\% | 6\% |
| 20.0 | 7,300 | 50\% | \$ | 170.78 | \$ | 216.56 | \$ | 45.78 | 27\% | 5\% |
| 20.0 | 8,760 | 60\% | \$ | 199.33 | \$ | 251.18 | \$ | 51.85 | 26\% | 5\% |
| 20.0 | 10,220 | 70\% | \$ | 227.89 | \$ | 285.79 | \$ | 57.90 | 25\% | 5\% |
| 20.0 | 11,680 | 80\% | \$ | 256.45 | \$ | 320.41 | \$ | 63.96 | 25\% | 5\% |
| 30.0 | 4,380 | 20\% | \$ | 131.37 | \$ | 169.78 | \$ | 38.41 | 29\% | 5\% |
| 30.0 | 6,570 | 30\% | \$ | 174.21 | \$ | 221.70 | \$ | 47.49 | 27\% | 5\% |
| 30.0 | 8,760 | 40\% | \$ | 217.05 | \$ | 273.63 | \$ | 56.58 | 26\% | 5\% |
| 30.0 | 10,950 | 50\% | \$ | 259.88 | \$ | 325.55 | \$ | 65.67 | 25\% | 5\% |
| 30.0 | 13,140 | 60\% | \$ | 302.72 | \$ | 377.48 | \$ | 74.76 | 25\% | 5\% |
| 30.0 | 15,330 | 70\% | \$ | 345.56 | \$ | 429.40 | \$ | 83.84 | 24\% | 5\% |
| 30.0 | 17,520 | 80\% | \$ | 388.39 | \$ | 481.33 | \$ | 92.94 | 24\% | 5\% |
| 40.0 | 5,840 | 20\% | \$ | 177.64 | \$ | 226.84 | \$ | 49.20 | 28\% | 5\% |
| 40.0 | 8,760 | 30\% | \$ | 234.76 | \$ | 296.08 | \$ | 61.32 | 26\% | 5\% |
| 40.0 | 11,680 | 40\% | \$ | 291.88 | \$ | 365.31 | \$ | 73.43 | 25\% | 5\% |
| 40.0 | 14,600 | 50\% | \$ | 348.99 | \$ | 434.54 | \$ | 85.55 | 25\% | 5\% |
| 40.0 | 17,520 | 60\% | \$ | 406.11 | \$ | 503.78 | \$ | 97.67 | 24\% | 5\% |
| 40.0 | 20,440 | 70\% | \$ | 463.22 | \$ | 573.01 | \$ | 109.79 | 24\% | 5\% |
| 40.0 | 23,360 | 80\% | \$ | 520.34 | \$ | 642.24 | \$ | 121.90 | 23\% | 5\% |
| 50.0 | 7,300 | 20\% | \$ | 223.92 | \$ | 283.91 | \$ | 59.99 | 27\% | 5\% |
| 50.0 | 10,950 | 30\% | \$ | 295.31 | \$ | 370.45 | \$ | 75.14 | 25\% | 5\% |
| 50.0 | 14,600 | 40\% | \$ | 366.70 | \$ | 456.99 | \$ | 90.29 | 25\% | 5\% |
| 50.0 | 18,250 | 50\% | \$ | 438.10 | \$ | 543.54 | \$ | 105.44 | 24\% | 5\% |
| 50.0 | 21,900 | 60\% | \$ | 509.49 | \$ | 630.08 | \$ | 120.59 | 24\% | 5\% |
| 50.0 | 25,550 | 70\% | \$ | 580.89 | \$ | 716.62 | \$ | 135.73 | 23\% | 5\% |
| 50.0 | 29,200 | 80\% | \$ | 652.28 | \$ | 803.16 | \$ | 150.88 | 23\% | 5\% |

*Includes Distribution, Surcharges and SOS (Transmission \& Generation) as of March 2023

The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)
Proposed Distribution Rates
Test Period 12 Months Ended December 2022

| $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { Line } \\ \text { No. } \end{array}$ |  | Current |  |  |  |  | Weather Norm Adjustment | Pro Forma |  |  |  |  | Revenue <br> Change |  | Percent <br> Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Billing <br> Determinants | Rate |  | Revenue |  |  | Norm Billing Determinants | $\frac{\text { Rate }}{[f]}$ |  | Revenue |  |  |  |  |
|  | HAGERSTOWN \& FREDERICK (Special Lighting Contracts) | [a] | [b] |  | [c]=[a]x[b] |  | [d] | $[e]=[a]+[d]$ |  |  | $[g]=[e] x[f]$ |  | [h]=[g]-[c] |  | [i]=[h]/[c] |
| 1 | Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Energy Charge (kWh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | All kWh | 1,157,521 | \$ | 0.01844 | \$ | 21,345 | - | 1,157,521 | \$ | 0.02428 | \$ | 28,104 | \$ | 6,759 | 31.67\% |
| 4 | Unbilled | 6,374 |  |  | \$ | 118 |  | 6,374 |  |  | \$ | 155 | \$ | 37 | 31.67\% |
| 5 | Franchise Tax Surcharge |  |  |  | \$ | 722 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 722 | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
| 6 | Montgomery County Energy Tax |  |  |  | \$ | - |  |  |  |  | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |
| 7 | TOTAL HAGERSTOWN \& FREDERICK |  |  |  | \$ | 22,184 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 28,980 | \$ | 6,796 | 30.64\% |
| 8 | Per Books Revenue |  |  |  | \$ | 22,208 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 29,012 | \$ | 6,804 | 30.64\% |

9 Correction Factor 0.99890

|  |  | 0.99890 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Target | $\$$ | 29,012 |
| Total Adj. Target | $\$$ | 28,980 |
| Base Adj. Target | $\$$ | 28,259 |
| Base Current | $\$$ | 21,462 |

The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)
Proposed Distribution Rates
Test Period 12 Months Ended December 2022

| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \text { Line } \\ \text { No. } \end{array}$ | Current |  |  | Weather Norm Adjustment | Pro Forma |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Billing Determinants | Rate | Revenue |  | Norm Billing Determinants | Rate | Revenue | Revenue Change | Percent Change |
| SCHEDULE C-A <br> (General Service - All Electric) | [a] | [b] | [c]=[a]x[b] | [d] | $[e]=[a]+[d]$ | [f] | $[g]=[e] x[f]$ | [h]=[g]-[c] | [i]=[h]/[c] |


| 1 | Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Fixed Distribution Charge | 2,515 | \$ | 4.00 | \$ | 10,061 |  | 2,515 | \$ | 8.00 | \$ | 20,121 | \$ | 10,061 | 100.00\% |
| 3 | Minimum kW | 1,960 | \$ | 1.09 | \$ | 2,136 |  | 1,960 | \$ | 1.44 | \$ | 2,816 | \$ | 680 | 31.86\% |
| 4 | kWh in Minimum | 24,135 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 6 | 24,141 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |
| 5 | Energy Charge (kWh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | All kWh | 12,847,061 | \$ | 0.01757 | \$ | 225,723 | 3,306 | 12,850,367 | \$ | 0.02317 | \$ | 297,711 | \$ | 71,988 | 31.89\% |
| 7 | Voltage Discount (kW) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 2 kV to 15 kV | 15,336 | \$ | (0.25) | \$ | $(3,834)$ |  | 15,336 | \$ | (0.25) | \$ | $(3,834)$ | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
| 9 | CSH (Church \& School Space Heating) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Fixed Distribution Charge | 1,407 | \$ | 4.00 | \$ | 5,628 |  | 1,407 | \$ | 8.00 | \$ | 11,256 | \$ | 5,628 | 100.00\% |
| 11 | Energy Charge (kWh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | All kWh | 10,447,069 | \$ | 0.01357 | \$ | 141,767 | 2,694 | 10,449,763 | \$ | 0.01789 | \$ | 186,979 | \$ | 45,213 | 31.89\% |
| 13 | Unbilled | 66,093 |  |  | \$ | 656 |  | 66,093 |  |  | \$ | 885 | \$ | 230 | 35.01\% |
| 14 | Franchise Tax Surcharge |  |  |  | \$ | 14,498 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 14,498 | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
| 15 | Montgomery County Energy Tax |  |  |  | \$ | 38,374 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 38,374 | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
| 16 | TOTAL SCHEDULE C-A |  |  |  | \$ | 435,008 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 568,808 | \$ | 133,800 | 30.76\% |
| 17 | Per Books Revenue |  |  |  | \$ | 435,542 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 569,506 | \$ | 133,964 | 30.76\% |
| 18 | Correction Factor |  |  |  |  | 0.99877 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.99877 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 35.34\% |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Target |  |  | \$ | 569,506 |  | 34.49\% |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Adj. Target |  |  | \$ | 568,808 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Base Adj. Target |  |  | \$ | 515,936 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Base Current |  |  | \$ | 382,136 |  |  |  |


| Schedule C-A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demand kW | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Energy } \\ & \mathrm{kWh} \end{aligned}$ | Load <br> Factor | Distribution Current Bill |  | Distribution Proposed Bill |  | Distribution Incr/(Decr) |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Distribution } \\ \text { \% Change } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total Bill* \% Change |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.0 | 730 | 20\% | \$ | 13.72 | \$ | 24.91 | \$ | 11.19 | 82\% | 8\% |
| 5.0 | 1,095 | 30\% | \$ | 20.58 | \$ | 33.37 | \$ | 12.79 | 62\% | 7\% |
| 5.0 | 1,460 | 40\% | \$ | 27.43 | \$ | 41.83 | \$ | 14.40 | 52\% | 7\% |
| 5.0 | 1,825 | 50\% | \$ | 34.29 | \$ | 50.29 | \$ | 16.00 | 47\% | 6\% |
| 5.0 | 2,190 | 60\% | \$ | 41.15 | \$ | 58.74 | \$ | 17.59 | 43\% | 6\% |
| 5.0 | 2,555 | 70\% | \$ | 48.01 | \$ | 67.20 | \$ | 19.19 | 40\% | 6\% |
| 5.0 | 2,920 | 80\% | \$ | 54.87 | \$ | 75.66 | \$ | 20.79 | 38\% | 6\% |
| 7.5 | 1,095 | 20\% | \$ | 20.58 | \$ | 33.37 | \$ | 12.79 | 62\% | 7\% |
| 7.5 | 1,643 | 30\% | \$ | 30.87 | \$ | 46.07 | \$ | 15.20 | 49\% | 7\% |
| 7.5 | 2,190 | 40\% | \$ | 41.15 | \$ | 58.74 | \$ | 17.59 | 43\% | 6\% |
| 7.5 | 2,738 | 50\% | \$ | 51.45 | \$ | 71.44 | \$ | 19.99 | 39\% | 6\% |
| 7.5 | 3,285 | 60\% | \$ | 61.73 | \$ | 84.11 | \$ | 22.38 | 36\% | 6\% |
| 7.5 | 3,833 | 70\% | \$ | 72.02 | \$ | 96.81 | \$ | 24.79 | 34\% | 5\% |
| 7.5 | 4,380 | 80\% | \$ | 82.30 | \$ | 109.48 | \$ | 27.18 | 33\% | 5\% |
| 10.0 | 1,460 | 20\% | \$ | 27.43 | \$ | 41.83 | \$ | 14.40 | 52\% | 6\% |
| 10.0 | 2,190 | 30\% | \$ | 41.15 | \$ | 58.74 | \$ | 17.59 | 43\% | 6\% |
| 10.0 | 2,920 | 40\% | \$ | 54.87 | \$ | 75.66 | \$ | 20.79 | 38\% | 6\% |
| 10.0 | 3,650 | 50\% | \$ | 68.58 | \$ | 92.57 | \$ | 23.99 | 35\% | 5\% |
| 10.0 | 4,380 | 60\% | \$ | 82.30 | \$ | 109.48 | \$ | 27.18 | 33\% | 5\% |
| 10.0 | 5,110 | 70\% | \$ | 96.02 | \$ | 126.40 | \$ | 30.38 | 32\% | 5\% |
| 10.0 | 5,840 | 80\% | \$ | 109.73 | \$ | 143.31 | \$ | 33.58 | 31\% | 5\% |
| 20.0 | 2,920 | 20\% | \$ | 54.87 | \$ | 75.66 | \$ | 20.79 | 38\% | 5\% |
| 20.0 | 4,380 | 30\% | \$ | 82.30 | \$ | 109.48 | \$ | 27.18 | 33\% | 5\% |
| 20.0 | 5,840 | 40\% | \$ | 109.73 | \$ | 143.31 | \$ | 33.58 | 31\% | 5\% |
| 20.0 | 7,300 | 50\% | \$ | 137.17 | \$ | 177.14 | \$ | 39.97 | 29\% | 5\% |
| 20.0 | 8,760 | 60\% | \$ | 164.60 | \$ | 210.97 | \$ | 46.37 | 28\% | 4\% |
| 20.0 | 10,220 | 70\% | \$ | 192.03 | \$ | 244.80 | \$ | 52.77 | 27\% | 4\% |
| 20.0 | 11,680 | 80\% | \$ | 219.47 | \$ | 278.63 | \$ | 59.16 | 27\% | 4\% |
| 30.0 | 4,380 | 20\% | \$ | 82.30 | \$ | 109.48 | \$ | 27.18 | 33\% | 4\% |
| 30.0 | 6,570 | 30\% | \$ | 123.45 | \$ | 160.23 | \$ | 36.78 | 30\% | 4\% |
| 30.0 | 8,760 | 40\% | \$ | 164.60 | \$ | 210.97 | \$ | 46.37 | 28\% | 4\% |
| 30.0 | 10,950 | 50\% | \$ | 205.75 | \$ | 261.71 | \$ | 55.96 | 27\% | 4\% |
| 30.0 | 13,140 | 60\% | \$ | 246.90 | \$ | 312.45 | \$ | 65.55 | 27\% | 4\% |
| 30.0 | 15,330 | 70\% | \$ | 288.05 | \$ | 363.20 | \$ | 75.15 | 26\% | 4\% |
| 30.0 | 17,520 | 80\% | \$ | 329.20 | \$ | 413.94 | \$ | 84.74 | 26\% | 4\% |
| 40.0 | 5,840 | 20\% | \$ | 109.73 | \$ | 143.31 | \$ | 33.58 | 31\% | 4\% |
| 40.0 | 8,760 | 30\% | \$ | 164.60 | \$ | 210.97 | \$ | 46.37 | 28\% | 4\% |
| 40.0 | 11,680 | 40\% | \$ | 219.47 | \$ | 278.63 | \$ | 59.16 | 27\% | 4\% |
| 40.0 | 14,600 | 50\% | \$ | 274.33 | \$ | 346.28 | \$ | 71.95 | 26\% | 4\% |
| 40.0 | 17,520 | 60\% | \$ | 329.20 | \$ | 413.94 | \$ | 84.74 | 26\% | 4\% |
| 40.0 | 20,440 | 70\% | \$ | 384.07 | \$ | 481.59 | \$ | 97.52 | 25\% | 4\% |
| 40.0 | 23,360 | 80\% | \$ | 438.93 | \$ | 549.25 | \$ | 110.32 | 25\% | 4\% |
| 50.0 | 7,300 | 20\% | \$ | 137.17 | \$ | 177.14 | \$ | 39.97 | 29\% | 4\% |
| 50.0 | 10,950 | 30\% | \$ | 205.75 | \$ | 261.71 | \$ | 55.96 | 27\% | 4\% |
| 50.0 | 14,600 | 40\% | \$ | 274.33 | \$ | 346.28 | \$ | 71.95 | 26\% | 4\% |
| 50.0 | 18,250 | 50\% | \$ | 342.92 | \$ | 430.85 | \$ | 87.93 | 26\% | 4\% |
| 50.0 | 21,900 | 60\% | \$ | 411.50 | \$ | 515.42 | \$ | 103.92 | 25\% | 4\% |
| 50.0 | 25,550 | 70\% | \$ | 480.08 | \$ | 599.99 | \$ | 119.91 | 25\% | 4\% |
| 50.0 | 29,200 | 80\% | \$ | 548.67 | \$ | 684.56 | \$ | 135.89 | 25\% | 4\% |

*Includes Distribution, Surcharges and SOS (Transmission \& Generation) as of March 2023

| Schedule CSH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Energy | Distribution Current Bill |  | Distribution <br> Proposed Bill |  | Distribution Incr/(Decr) |  | Distribution \% Change 38\% | Total Bill* \% Change |
| kWh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1,000 | \$ | 18.79 | \$ | 25.89 | \$ | 7.10 |  | 6\% |
| 2,000 | \$ | 33.58 | \$ | 43.78 | \$ | 10.20 | 30\% | 4\% |
| 3,000 | \$ | 48.37 | \$ | 61.67 | \$ | 13.30 | 27\% | 4\% |
| 4,000 | \$ | 63.16 | \$ | 79.56 | \$ | 16.40 | 26\% | 4\% |
| 5,000 | \$ | 77.95 | \$ | 97.45 | \$ | 19.50 | 25\% | 3\% |
| 6,000 | \$ | 92.74 | \$ | 115.34 | \$ | 22.60 | 24\% | 3\% |
| 7,000 | \$ | 107.53 | \$ | 133.23 | \$ | 25.70 | 24\% | 3\% |
| 8,000 | \$ | 122.32 | \$ | 151.12 | \$ | 28.80 | 24\% | 3\% |
| 9,000 | \$ | 137.11 | \$ | 169.01 | \$ | 31.90 | 23\% | 3\% |
| 10,000 | \$ | 151.90 | \$ | 186.90 | \$ | 35.00 | 23\% | 3\% |
| 11,000 | \$ | 166.69 | \$ | 204.79 | \$ | 38.10 | 23\% | 3\% |
| 12,000 | \$ | 181.48 | \$ | 222.68 | \$ | 41.20 | 23\% | 3\% |
| 13,000 | \$ | 196.27 | \$ | 240.57 | \$ | 44.30 | 23\% | 3\% |
| 14,000 | \$ | 211.06 | \$ | 258.46 | \$ | 47.40 | 22\% | 3\% |
| 15,000 | \$ | 225.85 | \$ | 276.35 | \$ | 50.50 | 22\% | 3\% |
| 16,000 | \$ | 240.64 | \$ | 294.24 | \$ | 53.60 | 22\% | 3\% |
| 17,000 | \$ | 255.43 | \$ | 312.13 | \$ | 56.70 | 22\% | 3\% |
| 18,000 | \$ | 270.22 | \$ | 330.02 | \$ | 59.80 | 22\% | 3\% |
| 19,000 | \$ | 285.01 | \$ | 347.91 | \$ | 62.90 | 22\% | 3\% |
| 20,000 | \$ | 299.80 | \$ | 365.80 | \$ | 66.00 | 22\% | 3\% |
| 21,000 | \$ | 314.59 | \$ | 383.69 | \$ | 69.10 | 22\% | 3\% |
| 22,000 | \$ | 329.38 | \$ | 401.58 | \$ | 72.20 | 22\% | 3\% |
| 23,000 | \$ | 344.17 | \$ | 419.47 | \$ | 75.30 | 22\% | 3\% |
| 24,000 | \$ | 358.96 | \$ | 437.36 | \$ | 78.40 | 22\% | 3\% |
| 25,000 | \$ | 373.75 | \$ | 455.25 | \$ | 81.50 | 22\% | 3\% |
| 26,000 | \$ | 388.54 | \$ | 473.14 | \$ | 84.60 | 22\% | 3\% |
| 27,000 | \$ | 403.33 | \$ | 491.03 | \$ | 87.70 | 22\% | 3\% |
| 28,000 | \$ | 418.12 | \$ | 508.92 | \$ | 90.80 | 22\% | 3\% |
| 29,000 | \$ | 432.91 | \$ | 526.81 | \$ | 93.90 | 22\% | 3\% |
| 30,000 | \$ | 447.70 | \$ | 544.70 | \$ | 97.00 | 22\% | 3\% |

*Includes Distribution, Surcharges and SOS (Transmission \& Generation) as of March 2023

The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)
Proposed Distribution Rates
Test Period 12 Months Ended December 2022

| Line <br> No. |  | Current |  |  | Weather Norm Adjustment | Pro Forma |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Billing Determinants | Rate | Revenue |  | Norm Billing Determinants | Rate | Revenue | Revenue Change | Percent Change |
|  | SCHEDULE PH <br> (Power Service) | [a] | [b] | [c]=[a]x[b] | [d] | [e]=[a]+[d] | [f] | [g]=[e]x[f] | [h]=[g]-[c] | $[i]=[h] /[c]$ |


| 1 | Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Fixed Distribution Charge | 20,167 | \$ | - | \$ | - |  | 20,167 | \$ | 17.00 | \$ | 342,839 | \$ | 342,839 |  |
| 3 | Minimum kW | 27,928 | \$ | 1.14 | \$ | 31,838 |  | 27,928 | \$ | 1.54 | \$ | 43,114 | \$ | 11,276 | 35.42\% |
| 4 | kWh in Minimum | 855,103 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 219 | 855,322 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |
| 5 | Capacity Charge (kW) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | All kW | 4,399,978 | \$ | 1.78 | \$ | 7,831,960 |  | 4,399,978 | \$ | 2.41 | \$ | 10,605,838 | \$ | 2,773,877 | 35.42\% |
| 7 | Energy Charge (kWh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | All kWh | 1,798,447,287 | \$ | 0.00386 | \$ | 6,942,007 | 461,553 | 1,798,908,840 | \$ | 0.00523 | \$ | 9,403,098 | \$ | 2,461,091 | 35.45\% |
| 9 | Voltage Discount (kW) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | 2 kV to 15 kV | 656,641 | \$ | (0.25) | \$ | $(164,160)$ |  | 656,641 | \$ | (0.25) | \$ | $(164,160)$ | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
| 11 | Over 15 kV | 168,302 | \$ | (0.50) | \$ | $(84,151)$ |  | 168,302 | \$ | (0.50) | \$ | $(84,151)$ | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
| 12 | Reactive kVA Charge (kVAR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Billing kVAR | 909,857 | \$ | 0.40 | \$ | 363,943 |  | 909,857 | \$ | 0.40 | \$ | 363,943 | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
| 14 | Unbilled | 3,351,544 |  |  | \$ | 31,487 |  | 3,351,544 |  |  | \$ | 43,281 | \$ | 11,794 | 37.46\% |
| 15 | Franchise Tax Surcharge |  |  |  | \$ | 1,117,645 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 1,117,645 | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
| 16 | Montgomery County Energy Tax |  |  |  | \$ | 3,146,485 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 3,146,485 | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
| 17 | TOTAL SCHEDULE PH |  |  |  | \$ | 19,217,053 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 24,817,931 | \$ | 5,600,878 | 29.15\% |
| 18 | Per Books Revenue |  |  |  | \$ | 19,356,146 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 24,997,563 | \$ | 5,641,417 | 29.15\% |
| 19 | Correction Factor |  |  |  |  | 0.99281 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.99281 |  |  |  |


| Total Target | $\$$ | $24,997,563$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total Adj. Target | $\$$ | $24,817,931$ |
| Base Adj. Target | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 , 5 5 3 , 8 0 1}$ |
| Base Current | $\$$ | $14,952,923$ |


| Schedule PH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demand <br> kW | Energy kWh | Load <br> Factor | Distribution Current Bill |  | Distribution Proposed Bill |  | Distribution Incr/(Decr) |  | Distribution \% Change | Total Bill* \% Change |
| 50.0 | 14,600 | 40\% | \$ | 153.82 | \$ | 213.86 | \$ | 60.04 | 39\% | 4\% |
| 50.0 | 18,250 | 50\% | \$ | 170.03 | \$ | 232.95 | \$ | 62.92 | 37\% | 4\% |
| 50.0 | 21,900 | 60\% | \$ | 186.24 | \$ | 252.04 | \$ | 65.80 | 35\% | 3\% |
| 50.0 | 25,550 | 70\% | \$ | 202.44 | \$ | 271.13 | \$ | 68.69 | 34\% | 3\% |
| 50.0 | 29,200 | 80\% | \$ | 218.65 | \$ | 290.22 | \$ | 71.57 | 33\% | 3\% |
| 50.0 | 32,850 | 90\% | \$ | 234.85 | \$ | 309.31 | \$ | 74.46 | 32\% | 3\% |
| 75.0 | 21,900 | 40\% | \$ | 230.74 | \$ | 312.29 | \$ | 81.55 | 35\% | \% |
| 75.0 | 27,375 | 50\% | \$ | 255.05 | \$ | 340.92 | \$ | 85.87 | 34\% | 3\% |
| 75.0 | 32,850 | 60\% | \$ | 279.35 | \$ | 369.56 | \$ | 90.21 | 32\% | 3\% |
| 75.0 | 38,325 | 70\% | \$ | 303.66 | \$ | 398.19 | \$ | 94.53 | 31\% | 3\% |
| 75.0 | 43,800 | 80\% | \$ | 327.97 | \$ | 426.82 | \$ | 98.85 | 30\% | 3\% |
| 75.0 | 49,275 | 90\% | \$ | 352.28 | \$ | 455.46 | \$ | 103.18 | 29\% | 3\% |
| 100.0 | 29,200 | 40\% | \$ | 307.65 | \$ | 410.72 | \$ | 103.07 | 34\% | 3\% |
| 100.0 | 36,500 | 50\% | \$ | 340.06 | \$ | 448.90 | \$ | 108.84 | 32\% | 3\% |
| 100.0 | 43,800 | 60\% | \$ | 372.47 | \$ | 487.07 | \$ | 114.60 | 31\% | 3\% |
| 100.0 | 51,100 | 70\% | \$ | 404.88 | \$ | 525.25 | \$ | 120.37 | 30\% | 3\% |
| 100.0 | 58,400 | 80\% | \$ | 437.30 | \$ | 563.43 | \$ | 126.13 | 29\% | 3\% |
| 100.0 | 65,700 | 90\% | \$ | 469.71 | \$ | 601.61 | \$ | 131.90 | 28\% | 3\% |
| 250.0 | 73,000 | 40\% | \$ | 769.12 | \$ | 1,001.29 | s | 232.17 | 30\% | 3\% |
| 250.0 | 91,250 | 50\% | S | 850.15 | 5 | 1,096.74 | 5 | 246.59 | 29\% | 3\% |
| 250.0 | 109,500 | 60\% | \$ | 931.18 | \$ | 1,192.19 | \$ | 261.01 | 28\% | 3\% |
| 250.0 | 127,750 | 70\% | \$ | 1,012.21 | \$ | 1,287.63 | \$ | 275.42 | 27\% | 3\% |
| 250.0 | 146,000 | 80\% | \$ | 1,093.24 | \$ | 1,383.08 | \$ | 289.84 | 27\% | 3\% |
| 250.0 | 164,250 | 90\% | \$ | 1,174.27 | \$ | 1,478.53 | \$ | 304.26 | 26\% | 3\% |
| 500.0 | 146,000 | 40\% | \$ | 1,538.24 | \$ | 1,985.58 | \$ | 447.34 | 29\% | 3\% |
| 500.0 | 182,500 | 50\% | \$ | 1,700.30 | \$ | 2,176.48 | \$ | 476.18 | 28\% | 3\% |
| 500.0 | 219,000 | 60\% | \$ | 1,862.36 | \$ | 2,367.37 | \$ | 505.01 | 27\% | 3\% |
| 500.0 | 255,500 | 70\% | \$ | 2,024.42 | \$ | 2,558.27 | \$ | 533.85 | 26\% | 3\% |
| 500.0 | 292,000 | 80\% | \$ | 2,186.48 | \$ | 2,749.16 | \$ | 562.68 | 26\% | 3\% |
| 500.0 | 328,500 | 90\% | \$ | 2,348.54 | \$ | 2,940.06 | \$ | 591.52 | 25\% | 2\% |
| 1,000.0 | 292,000 | 40\% | \$ | 3,076.48 | \$ | 3,954.16 | \$ | 877.68 | 29\% | 3\% |
| 1,000.0 | 365,000 | 50\% | \$ | 3,400.60 | \$ | 4,335.95 | \$ | 935.35 | 28\% | 3\% |
| 1,000.0 | 438,000 | 60\% | \$ | 3,724.72 | \$ | 4,717.74 | \$ | 993.02 | 27\% | 2\% |
| 1,000.0 | 511,000 | 70\% | \$ | 4,048.84 | \$ | 5,099.53 | \$ | 1,050.69 | 26\% | 2\% |
| 1,000.0 | 584,000 | 80\% | \$ | 4,372.96 | \$ | 5,481.32 | \$ | 1,108.36 | 25\% | 2\% |
| 1,000.0 | 657,000 | 90\% | \$ | 4,697.08 | \$ | 5,863.11 | \$ | 1,166.03 | 25\% | 2\% |
| 2,000.0 | 584,000 | 40\% | \$ | 6,152.96 | \$ | 7,891.32 | \$ | 1,738.36 | 28\% | 3\% |
| 2,000.0 | 730,000 | 50\% | \$ | 6,801.20 | \$ | 8,654.90 | \$ | 1,853.70 | 27\% | 3\% |
| 2,000.0 | 876,000 | 60\% | \$ | 7,449.44 | \$ | 9,418.48 | \$ | 1,969.04 | 26\% | 2\% |
| 2,000.0 | 1,022,000 | 70\% | \$ | 8,097.68 | \$ | 10,182.06 | \$ | 2,084.38 | 26\% | 2\% |
| 2,000.0 | 1,168,000 | 80\% | \$ | 8,745.92 | \$ | 10,945.64 | \$ | 2,199.72 | 25\% | 2\% |
| 2,000.0 | 1,314,000 | 90\% | \$ | 9,394.16 | \$ | 11,709.22 | \$ | 2,315.06 | 25\% | 2\% |
| 3,000.0 | 876,000 | 40\% | \$ | 9,229.44 | \$ | 11,828.48 | \$ | 2,599.04 | 28\% | 3\% |
| 3,000.0 | 1,095,000 | 50\% | \$ | 10,201.80 | \$ | 12,973.85 | \$ | 2,772.05 | 27\% | 3\% |
| 3,000.0 | 1,314,000 | 60\% | \$ | 11,174.16 | \$ | 14,119.22 | \$ | 2,945.06 | 26\% | 2\% |
| 3,000.0 | 1,533,000 | 70\% | \$ | 12,146.52 | \$ | 15,264.59 | \$ | 3,118.07 | 26\% | 2\% |
| 3,000.0 | 1,752,000 | 80\% | \$ | 13,118.88 | \$ | 16,409.96 | \$ | 3,291.08 | 25\% | 2\% |
| 3,000.0 | 1,971,000 | 90\% | \$ | 14,091.24 | \$ | 17,555.33 | \$ | 3,464.09 | 25\% | 2\% |
| 4,000.0 | 1,168,000 | 40\% | \$ | 12,305.92 | \$ | 15,765.64 | \$ | 3,459.72 | 28\% | 3\% |
| 4,000.0 | 1,460,000 | 50\% | \$ | 13,602.40 | \$ | 17,292.80 | \$ | 3,690.40 | 27\% | 3\% |
| 4,000.0 | 1,752,000 | 60\% | \$ | 14,898.88 | \$ | 18,819.96 | \$ | 3,921.08 | 26\% | 2\% |
| 4,000.0 | 2,044,000 | 70\% | \$ | 16,195.36 | \$ | 20,347.12 | \$ | 4,151.76 | 26\% | 2\% |
| 4,000.0 | 2,336,000 | 80\% | \$ | 17,491.84 | \$ | 21,874.28 | \$ | 4,382.44 | 25\% | 2\% |
| 4,000.0 | 2,628,000 | 90\% | \$ | 18,788.32 | \$ | 23,401.44 | \$ | 4,613.12 | 25\% | 2\% |
| 5,000.0 | 1,460,000 | 40\% | \$ | 15,382.40 | \$ | 19,702.80 | \$ | 4,320.40 | 28\% | 3\% |
| 5,000.0 | 1,825,000 | 50\% | \$ | 17,003.00 | \$ | 21,611.75 | \$ | 4,608.75 | 27\% | 3\% |
| 5,000.0 | 2,190,000 | 60\% | \$ | 18,623.60 | \$ | 23,520.70 | \$ | 4,897.10 | 26\% | 2\% |
| 5,000.0 | 2,555,000 | 70\% | \$ | 20,244.20 | \$ | 25,429.65 | \$ | 5,185.45 | 26\% | 2\% |
| 5,000.0 | 2,920,000 | 80\% | \$ | 21,864.80 | \$ | 27,338.60 | \$ | 5,473.80 | 25\% | 2\% |
| 5,000.0 | 3,285,000 | 90\% | \$ | 23,485.40 | \$ | 29,247.55 | \$ | 5,762.15 | 25\% | 2\% |

*Includes Distribution, Surcharges and SOS (Transmission \& Generation) as of March 2023

The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)
Proposed Distribution Rates
Test Period 12 Months Ended December 2022

|  | Current |  |  | Weather Norm Adjustment | Pro Forma |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Line No. | Billing <br> Determinants | Rate | Revenue |  | Norm Billing <br> Determinants | Rate | Revenue | Revenue Change | Percent <br> Change |
| SCHEDULE AGS <br> (Alternative Generation Service) | [a] | [b] | [c]=[a]x[b] | [d] | [e]=[a]+[d] | [f] | $[g]=[e] x[f]$ | [h]=[g]-[c] | $[i]=[h] /[c]$ |



The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)
Proposed Distribution Rates
Test Period 12 Months Ended December 2022


14 Correction Factor

| Total Target | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $1,776,695$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total Adj. Target | $\$$ | $1,773,669$ |
| Base Adj. Target | $\mathbf{\$}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 3 3 6 , 9 7 9}$ |
| Base Current | $\$$ | 935,927 |


| Schedule PP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demand | Energy | Load | Distribution Current Bill |  | Distribution <br> Proposed Bill |  | Distribution Incr/(Decr) |  | Distribution \% Change | Total Bill* \% Change |
| kW | kWh | Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5,000.0 | 1,825,000 | 50\% | \$ | 2,543.25 | \$ | 3,977.75 | \$ | 1,434.50 | 56\% | 1\% |
| 5,000.0 | 2,190,000 | 60\% | \$ | 2,765.90 | \$ | 4,280.70 | \$ | 1,514.80 | 55\% | 1\% |
| 5,000.0 | 2,555,000 | 70\% | \$ | 2,988.55 | \$ | 4,583.65 | \$ | 1,595.10 | 53\% | 1\% |
| 5,000.0 | 2,920,000 | 80\% | \$ | 3,211.20 | \$ | 4,886.60 | \$ | 1,675.40 | 52\% | 1\% |
| 5,000.0 | 3,285,000 | 90\% | \$ | 3,433.85 | \$ | 5,189.55 | \$ | 1,755.70 | 51\% | 1\% |
| 5,000.0 | 3,650,000 | 100\% | \$ | 3,656.50 | \$ | 5,492.50 | \$ | 1,836.00 | 50\% | 1\% |
| 7,500.0 | 2,737,500 | 50\% | \$ | 3,814.88 | \$ | 5,740.13 | \$ | 1,925.25 | 50\% | 1\% |
| 7,500.0 | 3,285,000 | 60\% | \$ | 4,148.85 | \$ | 6,194.55 | \$ | 2,045.70 | 49\% | 1\% |
| 7,500.0 | 3,832,500 | 70\% | \$ | 4,482.83 | \$ | 6,648.98 | \$ | 2,166.15 | 48\% | 1\% |
| 7,500.0 | 4,380,000 | 80\% | \$ | 4,816.80 | \$ | 7,103.40 | \$ | 2,286.60 | 47\% | 1\% |
| 7,500.0 | 4,927,500 | 90\% | \$ | 5,150.78 | \$ | 7,557.83 | \$ | 2,407.05 | 47\% | 1\% |
| 7,500.0 | 5,475,000 | 100\% | \$ | 5,484.75 | \$ | 8,012.25 | \$ | 2,527.50 | 46\% | 1\% |
| 10,000.0 | 3,650,000 | 50\% | \$ | 5,086.50 | \$ | 7,502.50 | \$ | 2,416.00 | 47\% | 1\% |
| 10,000.0 | 4,380,000 | 60\% | \$ | 5,531.80 | \$ | 8,108.40 | \$ | 2,576.60 | 47\% | 1\% |
| 10,000.0 | 5,110,000 | 70\% | \$ | 5,977.10 | \$ | 8,714.30 | \$ | 2,737.20 | 46\% | 1\% |
| 10,000.0 | 5,840,000 | 80\% | \$ | 6,422.40 | \$ | 9,320.20 | \$ | 2,897.80 | 45\% | 1\% |
| 10,000.0 | 6,570,000 | 90\% | \$ | 6,867.70 | \$ | 9,926.10 | \$ | 3,058.40 | 45\% | 1\% |
| 10,000.0 | 7,300,000 | 100\% | \$ | 7,313.00 | \$ | 10,532.00 | \$ | 3,219.00 | 44\% | 1\% |
| 20,000.0 | 7,300,000 | 50\% | \$ | 10,173.00 | \$ | 14,552.00 | \$ | 4,379.00 | 43\% | 1\% |
| 20,000.0 | 8,760,000 | 60\% | \$ | 11,063.60 | \$ | 15,763.80 | \$ | 4,700.20 | 42\% | 1\% |
| 20,000.0 | 10,220,000 | 70\% | \$ | 11,954.20 | \$ | 16,975.60 | \$ | 5,021.40 | 42\% | 1\% |
| 20,000.0 | 11,680,000 | 80\% | \$ | 12,844.80 | \$ | 18,187.40 | \$ | 5,342.60 | 42\% | 1\% |
| 20,000.0 | 13,140,000 | 90\% | \$ | 13,735.40 | \$ | 19,399.20 | \$ | 5,663.80 | 41\% | 1\% |
| 20,000.0 | 14,600,000 | 100\% | \$ | 14,626.00 | \$ | 20,611.00 | \$ | 5,985.00 | 41\% | 0\% |
| 30,000.0 | 10,950,000 | 50\% | \$ | 15,259.50 | \$ | 21,601.50 | \$ | 6,342.00 | 42\% | 1\% |
| 30,000.0 | 13,140,000 | 60\% | \$ | 16,595.40 | \$ | 23,419.20 | \$ | 6,823.80 | 41\% | 1\% |
| 30,000.0 | 15,330,000 | 70\% | \$ | 17,931.30 | \$ | 25,236.90 | \$ | 7,305.60 | 41\% | 1\% |
| 30,000.0 | 17,520,000 | 80\% | \$ | 19,267.20 | \$ | 27,054.60 | \$ | 7,787.40 | 40\% | 1\% |
| 30,000.0 | 19,710,000 | 90\% | \$ | 20,603.10 | \$ | 28,872.30 | \$ | 8,269.20 | 40\% | 1\% |
| 30,000.0 | 21,900,000 | 100\% | \$ | 21,939.00 | \$ | 30,690.00 | \$ | 8,751.00 | 40\% | 0\% |
| 40,000.0 | 14,600,000 | 50\% | \$ | 20,346.00 | \$ | 28,651.00 | \$ | 8,305.00 | 41\% | 1\% |
| 40,000.0 | 17,520,000 | 60\% | \$ | 22,127.20 | \$ | 31,074.60 | \$ | 8,947.40 | 40\% | 1\% |
| 40,000.0 | 20,440,000 | 70\% | \$ | 23,908.40 | \$ | 33,498.20 | \$ | 9,589.80 | 40\% | 1\% |
| 40,000.0 | 23,360,000 | 80\% | \$ | 25,689.60 | \$ | 35,921.80 | \$ | 10,232.20 | 40\% | 1\% |
| 40,000.0 | 26,280,000 | 90\% | \$ | 27,470.80 | \$ | 38,345.40 | \$ | 10,874.60 | 40\% | 0\% |
| 40,000.0 | 29,200,000 | 100\% | \$ | 29,252.00 | \$ | 40,769.00 | \$ | 11,517.00 | 39\% | 0\% |
| 50,000.0 | 18,250,000 | 50\% | \$ | 25,432.50 | \$ | 35,700.50 | \$ | 10,268.00 | 40\% | 1\% |
| 50,000.0 | 21,900,000 | 60\% | \$ | 27,659.00 | \$ | 38,730.00 | \$ | 11,071.00 | 40\% | 1\% |
| 50,000.0 | 25,550,000 | 70\% | \$ | 29,885.50 | \$ | 41,759.50 | \$ | 11,874.00 | 40\% | 1\% |
| 50,000.0 | 29,200,000 | 80\% | \$ | 32,112.00 | \$ | 44,789.00 |  | 12,677.00 | 39\% | 1\% |
| 50,000.0 | 32,850,000 | 90\% | \$ | 34,338.50 | \$ | 47,818.50 | \$ | 13,480.00 | 39\% | 0\% |
| 50,000.0 | 36,500,000 | 100\% | \$ | 36,565.00 | \$ | 50,848.00 | \$ | 14,283.00 | 39\% | 0\% |

*Includes Distribution, Surcharges and SOS (Transmission \& Generation) as of March 2023

The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)
Proposed Distribution Rates
Street \& Area Lighting Rate Schedules


The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)
Proposed Distribution Rates
Street \& Area Lighting Rate Schedules

|  | kWh | Current |  |  |  |  | Pro Forma |  |  |  |  | Revenue Change |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Facility Counts | Rate |  |  | Revenue | Facility Counts | Rate |  |  | Revenue |  |  | Percent Change |
| MH Shoe Box/30' Mounting Height |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| With Base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36,000 Lumen (400 Watt) | 157 | - | \$ | 41.68 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 49.21 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| No Base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36,000 Lumen (400 Watt) | 157 | - | \$ | 37.77 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 44.60 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| Each Additional Luminaire Per Pole |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36,000 Lumen (400 Watt) | 157 | - | \$ | 21.54 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 25.43 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| MH Shoe Box/40' Mounting Height |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No Base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90,000 Lumen (1,000 Watt) | 379 | - | \$ | 47.05 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 55.55 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| Each Additional Luminaire Per Pole |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90,000 Lumen(1,000 Watt) | 379 | - | \$ | 28.00 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 33.06 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |

SCHEDULE EMU - Long Term Service
(Equipment, Maintenance \& Unmetered Svc)

Overhead Service
HPS-Vertical Open Lens Luminaire/OL
9,500 Lumen (100 Watt)

> With Pole 9,500 Lumen (100 Watt) Without Pole
MV-Horizontal/Cobra Head 8,150 Lumen (175 Watt)
HPS-Horizontal/Cobra Head 9,500 Lumen (100 Watt) 22,000 Lumen (200 Watt) 50,000 Lumen (400 Watt)
MH-Horizontal/Cobra Head 36,000 Lumen (400 Watt) 90,000 Lumen (1,000 Watt)
HPS Floodlight
22,000 Lumen (200 Watt) 50,000 Lumen(400 Watt)
MH Floodlight
36,000 Lumen (400 Watt) 90,000 Lumen (1,000 Watt)

Underground Service
HPS Colonial Post Top 14' Mounting Height 9,500 Lumen (100 Watt)
MV Colonial Post Top 14' Mounting Height 11,600 Lumen (175 Watt)
HPS Cobra Head/30' Mounting Height
Single Luminaire Per Pole
9,500 Lumen (100 Watt)
22,000 Lumen (200 Watt)
50,000 Lumen (400 Watt)
Each Additional Luminaire Per Pole
9,500 Lumen (100 Watt)
22,000 Lumen (200 Watt)
50,000 Lumen (400 Watt)

| 17 | $\$$ | 16.91 | $\$$ | 286 |
| ---: | :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 227 | $\$$ | 8.31 | $\$$ | 1,886 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | $\$$ | 7.48 | $\$$ | 90 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 2,484 | $\$$ | 8.63 | $\$$ | 21,437 |
| 454 | $\$$ | 13.42 | $\$$ | 6,093 |
| 53 | $\$$ | 19.07 | $\$$ | 1,006 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | $\$$ | 20.78 | $\$$ | 104 |
|  | $\$$ | 21.08 | $\$$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | $\$$ | 15.16 | $\$$ | 440 |
| 32 | $\$$ | 23.10 | $\$$ | 732 |
| 16 | $\$$ | 24.27 | $\$$ | 388 |
| 11 | $\$$ | 23.44 | $\$$ | 258 |


| 17 | $\$$ | 20.06 | $\$$ | 339 | $\$$ | 53 | $18.61 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 227 | $\$$ | 9.90 | $\$$ | 2,248 | $\$$ | 361 | $19.16 \%$ |
| 12 | $\$$ | 8.92 | $\$$ | 107 | $\$$ | 17 | $19.28 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2,484 | $\$$ | 10.28 | $\$$ | 25,535 | $\$$ | 4,098 | $19.12 \%$ |
| 454 | $\$$ | 15.94 | $\$$ | 7,235 | $\$$ | 1,142 | $18.74 \%$ |
| 53 | $\$$ | 22.61 | $\$$ | 1,193 | $\$$ | 187 | $18.54 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | $\$$ | 24.63 | $\$$ | 123 | $\$$ | 19 | $18.51 \%$ |
| - | $\$$ | 24.98 | $\$$ | - | $\$$ | - | $18.50 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | $\$$ | 17.99 | $\$$ | 522 | $\$$ | 82 | $18.67 \%$ |
| 32 | $\$$ | 27.36 | $\$$ | 867 | $\$$ | 135 | $18.46 \%$ |
| 16 | $\$$ | 28.75 | $\$$ | 460 | $\$$ | 72 | $18.44 \%$ |
| 11 | $\$$ | 27.77 | $\$$ | 305 | $\$$ | 48 | $18.46 \%$ |

MH Horizontal Cobra Head/30' Mounting Height
Single Luminaire Per Pole
36,000 Lumen (400 Watt)
90,000 Lumen (1,000 Watt)
Each Additional Luminaire Per Pole 36,000 Lumen (400 Watt) 90,000 Lumen (1,000 Watt)
hoe Box/30' Mounting Height With Base

9,500 Lumen (100 Watt)
22,000 Lumen (200 Watt)
50,000 Lumen (400 Watt)
No Base
9,500 Lumen (100 Watt) 22,000 Lumen (200 Watt) 50,000 Lumen (400 Watt)
Each Additional Luminaire Per Pole
9,500 Lumen (100 Watt)
22,000 Lumen (200 Watt)
50,000 Lumen (400 Watt)

| - | $\$$ | 38.86 | $\$$ | - |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 23 | $\$$ | 39.41 | $\$$ | 906 |
| 2 | $\$$ | 39.54 | $\$$ | 79 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | $\$$ | 37.07 | $\$$ | 630 |
| 426 | $\$$ | 37.87 | $\$$ | 16,133 |
| 1 | $\$$ | 36.27 | $\$$ | 36 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | $\$$ | 20.22 | $\$$ | 81 |
| - | $\$$ | 21.06 | $\$$ | - |
| - | $\$$ | 19.45 | $\$$ | - |


| 4,762 | \$ | 18.72 | \$ | 89,154 | \$ | 14,009 | 18.64\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 601 | \$ | 26.36 | \$ | 15,843 | \$ | 2,471 | 18.48\% |
| 26 | \$ | 28.24 | \$ | 734 | \$ | 114 | 18.45\% |
| 135 | \$ | 31.54 | \$ | 4,258 | \$ | 662 | 18.41\% |
| 1 | \$ | 38.22 | \$ | 38 | \$ | 6 | 18.35\% |
| - | \$ | 10.28 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 19.12\% |
| - | \$ | 15.94 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.74\% |
| - | \$ | 22.61 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.54\% |
| 1 | \$ | 39.99 | \$ | 40 | \$ | 6 | 18.34\% |
| - | \$ | 49.69 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.29\% |
| - | \$ | 24.63 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.51\% |
| - | \$ | 24.98 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.50\% |
| - | \$ | 45.97 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.30\% |
| 23 | \$ | 46.62 | \$ | 1,072 | \$ | 166 | 18.30\% |
| 2 | \$ | 46.78 | \$ | 94 | \$ | 14 | 18.30\% |
| 17 | \$ | 43.86 | \$ | 746 | \$ | 115 | 18.31\% |
| 426 | \$ | 44.80 | \$ | 19,086 | \$ | 2,954 | 18.31\% |
| 1 | \$ | 42.91 | \$ | 43 | \$ | 7 | 18.32\% |
| 4 | \$ | 23.96 | \$ | 96 | \$ | 15 | 18.52\% |
| - | \$ | 24.96 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.50\% |
| - | \$ | 23.06 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.54\% |

The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)
Proposed Distribution Rates
Street \& Area Lighting Rate Schedules

|  | kWh | Current |  |  |  |  | Pro Forma |  |  |  |  | Revenue Change |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Facility Counts | Rate |  | Revenue |  | Facility Counts | Rate |  | Revenue |  |  |  | Percent Change |
| MH Shoe Box/30' Mounting Height |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| With Base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36,000 Lumen (400 Watt) | 157 | - | \$ | 41.18 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 48.71 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.29\% |
| No Base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36,000 Lumen (400 Watt) | 157 | 113 | \$ | 37.27 | \$ | 4,212 | 113 | \$ | 44.10 | \$ | 4,983 | \$ | 771 | 18.31\% |
| Each Additional Luminaire Per Pole |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36,000 Lumen (400 Watt) | 157 | 94 | \$ | 21.04 | \$ | 1,978 | 94 | \$ | 24.93 | \$ | 2,344 | \$ | 366 | 18.50\% |
| MH Shoe Box/40' Mounting Height |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No Base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90,000 Lumen (1,000 Watt) | 379 | - | \$ | 46.55 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 55.05 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.26\% |
| Each Additional Luminaire Per Pole |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90,000 Lumen(1,000 Watt) | 379 | - | \$ | 27.50 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 32.56 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.40\% |

SCHEDULE MU
(Maintenance \& Unmetered Service)

HPS Vapor
Customer Owned Pole
9,500 Lumen (100 Watt)
22,000 Lumen (200 Watt)
50,000 Lumen (400 Watt)
Company Distr. System
9,500 Lumen (100 Watt) 22,000 Lumen (200 Watt) 50,000 Lumen (400 Watt)
Mercury Vapor
Customer Owned Pole
8,150 Lumen (175 Watt)
11,500 Lumen (250 Watt) 21,500 Lumen (400 Watt) 60,000 Lumen (1,000 Watt)
Company Distr. System
8,150 Lumen (175 Watt)
11,500 Lumen (250 Watt)
21,500 Lumen (400 Watt) 60,000 Lumen (1,000 Watt)
Metal Halide
Customer Owned Pole
11,600 Lumen (175 Watt)
15,000 Lumen (250 Watt)
36,000 Lumen (400 Watt) 90,000 Lumen (1,000 Watt)
Company Distr. System
11,600 Lumen (175 Watt)
15,000 Lumen (250 Watt) 36,000 Lumen (400 Watt) 90,000 Lumen (1,000 Watt)
Incandescent
Customer Owned Pole
1,000 Lumen (100 Watt)
2,500 Lumen (200 Watt)
4,000 Lumen (325 Watt) 6,000 Lumen (450 Watt)
Company Distr. System
1,000 Lumen (100 Watt)
2,500 Lumen (200 Watt)
4,000 Lumen (325 Watt)
6,000 Lumen (450 Watt)

| 51 | 1,279 | \$ | 2.71 | \$ | 3,466 | 1,279 | \$ | 3.20 | \$ | 4,092 | \$ | 626 | 18.07\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 86 | 240 | \$ | 2.75 | \$ | 660 | 240 | \$ | 3.25 | \$ | 779 | \$ | 119 | 18.07\% |
| 167 | 69 | \$ | 6.77 | \$ | 467 | 69 | \$ | 7.99 | \$ | 552 | \$ | 84 | 18.07\% |
| 51 | 122 | \$ | 4.08 | \$ | 498 | 122 | \$ | 4.82 | \$ | 588 | \$ | 90 | 18.07\% |
| 86 | 52 | \$ | 4.12 | \$ | 214 | 52 | \$ | 4.86 | \$ | 253 | \$ | 39 | 18.07\% |
| 167 | - | \$ | 8.10 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 9.56 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 74 | 199 | \$ | 2.58 | \$ | 513 | 199 | \$ | 3.05 | \$ | 606 | \$ | 93 | 18.07\% |
| 103 | - | \$ | 5.05 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 5.96 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 162 | - | \$ | 5.47 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 6.46 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 386 | - | \$ | 7.61 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 8.99 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 74 | 1 | \$ | 3.96 | \$ | 4 | 1 | \$ | 4.68 | \$ | 5 | \$ | 1 | 18.07\% |
| 103 | 4 | \$ | 6.42 | \$ | 26 | 4 | \$ | 7.58 | \$ | 30 | \$ | 5 | 18.07\% |
| 162 | - | \$ | 6.81 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 8.04 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 386 | - | \$ | 8.95 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 10.57 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 74 | 62 | \$ | 4.20 | \$ | 260 | 62 | \$ | 4.96 | \$ | 307 | \$ | 47 | 18.07\% |
| 103 | 49 | \$ | 4.45 | \$ | 218 | 49 | \$ | 5.25 | \$ | 257 | \$ | 39 | 18.07\% |
| 157 | 8 | \$ | 7.30 | \$ | 58 | 8 | \$ | 8.62 | \$ | 69 | \$ | 11 | 18.07\% |
| 379 | - | \$ | 8.93 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 10.54 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 74 | - | \$ | 5.54 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 6.54 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 103 | 28 | \$ | 5.80 | \$ | 162 | 28 | \$ | 6.85 | \$ | 192 | \$ | 29 | 18.07\% |
| 157 | 72 | \$ | 8.68 | \$ | 625 | 72 | \$ | 10.25 | \$ | 738 | \$ | 113 | 18.07\% |
| 379 | 3 | \$ | 10.27 | \$ | 31 | 3 | \$ | 12.13 | \$ | 36 | \$ | 6 | 18.07\% |
| 37 | - | \$ | 4.29 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 5.07 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 71 | - | \$ | 4.36 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 5.15 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 115 | - | \$ | 4.58 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 5.41 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 158 | - | \$ | 4.75 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 5.61 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 37 | 10 | \$ | 5.63 | \$ | 56 | 10 | \$ | 6.65 | \$ | 66 | \$ | 10 | 18.07\% |
| 71 | - | \$ | 5.70 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 6.73 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 115 | - | \$ | 5.92 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 6.99 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 158 | - | \$ | 6.10 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 7.20 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |

The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)
Proposed Distribution Rates
Street \& Area Lighting Rate Schedules


The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)
Proposed Distribution Rates
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SCHEDULE EM - Long Term Service
(Equipment \& Maintenance Service)
Overhead Service
MV Horizontal Cobra Head 8,150 Lumen (175 Watt)
HPS Horizontal Cobra Head
9,500 Lumen (100 Watt) 22,000 Lumen (200 Watt) 50,000 Lumen (400 Watt)
MH Horizontal Cobra Head 36,000 Lumen (400 Watt) 90,000 Lumen (1,000 Watt)
HPS Floodlight
22,000 Lumen (200 Watt)
50,000 Lumen (400 Watt)
MH Floodlight
36,000 Lumen (400 Watt) 90,000 Lumen (1000 Watt)

| - | \$ | 8.26 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 9.84 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 19.16\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | \$ | 8.58 | \$ | 36 | 4 | \$ | 10.22 | \$ | 43 | \$ | 7 | 19.12\% |
| - | \$ | 13.37 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 15.88 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.75\% |
| - | \$ | 15.39 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 18.26 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.66\% |
| - | \$ | 16.17 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 19.18 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.63\% |
| 1 | \$ | 20.68 | \$ | 17 | 1 | \$ | 24.51 | \$ | 20 | \$ | 3 | 18.51\% |
| - | \$ | 15.12 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 17.94 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.67\% |
| - | \$ | 17.93 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 21.26 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.57\% |
| - | \$ | 19.16 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 22.71 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.54\% |
| - | \$ | 22.44 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 26.59 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.47\% |
| 6 | \$ | 22.20 | \$ | 133 | 6 | \$ | 26.30 | \$ | 158 | \$ | 25 | 18.48\% |
| - | \$ | 24.10 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 28.55 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.45\% |
| - | \$ | 27.68 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 32.77 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.40\% |
| - | \$ | 30.94 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 36.62 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.36\% |
| - | \$ | 8.58 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 10.22 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 19.12\% |
| - | \$ | 13.37 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 15.88 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.75\% |
| - | \$ | 15.39 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 18.26 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.66\% |
| - | \$ | 33.60 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 39.76 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.34\% |
| 8 | \$ | 41.61 | \$ | 333 | 8 | \$ | 49.22 | \$ | 394 | \$ | 61 | 18.29\% |
| - | \$ | 16.17 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 19.18 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.63\% |
| - | \$ | 20.68 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 24.51 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.51\% |
| - | \$ | 39.38 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 46.59 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.30\% |
| - | \$ | 39.88 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 47.18 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.30\% |
| - | \$ | 39.94 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 47.25 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.30\% |
| - | \$ | 36.33 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 42.99 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.32\% |
| - | \$ | 37.10 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 43.89 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.31\% |
| - | \$ | 37.31 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 44.14 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.31\% |
| - | \$ | 20.73 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 24.57 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.51\% |
| - | \$ | 21.51 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 25.49 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.49\% |
| - | \$ | 21.71 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 25.72 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.49\% |
| - | \$ | 40.95 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 48.44 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.29\% |
| - | \$ | 38.32 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 45.34 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.31\% |
| - | \$ | 22.72 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 26.92 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.47\% |
| - | \$ | 46.86 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 55.42 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.26\% |
| - | \$ | 27.10 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 32.09 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.40\% |

The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)
Proposed Distribution Rates
Street \& Area Lighting Rate Schedules


SCHEDULE OL
(Outdoor Lighting Service)

High Pressure Sodium
9,500 Lumen (100 Watt)
22,000 Lumen (200 Watt)
Mercury Vapor
8,150 Lumen (175 Watt)
21,500 Lumen (400 Watt)
Standard Wood Pole
Wire
Transformer Capacity

SCHEDULE AL
(Area Lighting Service)

Underground Service(Area Lighting) 8,150 Lumen (175 Watt)

74
Floodlighting
Mercury Vapor
21,500 Lumen (400 Watt) 60,000 Lumen (1,000 Watt)
High Pressure Sodium
50,000 Lumen (400 Watt)
Quartz lodine (500 Watt)
Poles - Wood Standard
30 foot
35 foot
40 foot
Poles - Wood Other
14 foot
35 foot
Poles - Metal
14 foot
30 foot
Wire
Customer Owned Equipment
Mercury Vapor

## 250 Watt 400 Watt 1,000 Watt

High Pressure Sodium
400 Watt Bracket
400 Watt Post Top
162
162

| 451 | $\$$ | 8.81 | $\$$ | 3,973 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 47 | $\$$ | 15.93 | $\$$ | 749 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 2,001 | $\$$ | 8.37 | $\$$ | 16,748 |
| 109 | $\$$ | 14.58 | $\$$ | 1,583 |
| 320 | $\$$ | 3.60 | $\$$ | 1,152 |
| 54,944 | $\$$ | 0.022 | $\$$ | 1,209 |
| 72 | $\$$ | 3.60 | $\$$ | 259 |


| 451 | $\$$ | 10.40 | $\$$ | 4,691 | $\$$ | 718 | $18.07 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| 47 | $\$$ | 18.81 | $\$$ | 884 | $\$$ | 135 | $18.07 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2,001 | $\$$ | 9.88 | $\$$ | 19,775 | $\$$ | 3,027 | $18.07 \%$ |
| 109 | $\$$ | 17.21 | $\$$ | 1,869 | $\$$ | 286 | $18.07 \%$ |
| 320 | $\$$ | 4.25 | $\$$ | 1,360 | $\$$ | 208 | $18.07 \%$ |
| 54,944 | $\$$ | 0.026 | $\$$ | 1,427 | $\$$ | 218 | $18.07 \%$ |
| 72 | $\$$ | 4.25 | $\$$ | 306 | $\$$ | 47 | $18.07 \%$ |


| 1 | $\$$ | 14.03 | $\$$ | 14 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 | $\$$ | 17.73 | $\$$ | 1,067 |
| 23 | $\$$ | 22.43 | $\$$ | 516 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 81 | $\$$ | 23.60 | $\$$ | 1,911 |
| - | $\$$ | 18.61 | $\$$ | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | $\$$ | 3.67 | $\$$ | 15 |
| 45 | $\$$ | 5.13 | $\$$ | 228 |
| 8 | $\$$ | 5.50 | $\$$ | 43 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | $\$$ | 7.42 | $\$$ | - |
| 1 | $\$$ | 5.81 | $\$$ | 8 |
| 1 | $\$$ | 15.46 | $\$$ | 5 |
| 11,421 | $\$$ | 0.023 | $\$$ | 263 |


| 1 | \$ | 16.57 | \$ | 17 | \$ | 3 | 18.07\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 60 | \$ | 20.93 | \$ | 1,260 | \$ | 193 | 18.07\% |
| 23 | \$ | 26.48 | \$ | 609 | \$ | 93 | 18.07\% |
| 81 | \$ | 27.86 | \$ | 2,257 | \$ | 345 | 18.07\% |
| - | \$ | 21.97 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 4 | \$ | 4.33 | \$ | 17 | \$ | 3 | 18.07\% |
| 45 | \$ | 6.06 | \$ | 270 | \$ | 41 | 18.07\% |
| 8 | \$ | 6.49 | \$ | 51 | \$ | 8 | 18.07\% |
| - | \$ | 8.76 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 1 | \$ | 9.22 | \$ | 9 | \$ | 1 | 18.07\% |
| 1 | \$ | 6.09 | \$ | 6 | \$ | 1 | 18.07\% |
| - | \$ | 18.18 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 11,421 | \$ | 0.027 | \$ | 310 | \$ | 47 | 18.07\% |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \$ \\
& \$
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \$ \\
& \$ \\
& \$ \\
& \$
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
5.05 & \$ \\
5.47 & \$ \\
7.61 & \$ \\
6.77 & \$ \\
6.77 & \$
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| kWh |  | Current |  |  |  |  | Pro Forma |  |  |  |  | Revenue Change |  | Percent Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Facility Counts |  | Rate |  | Revenue | Facility <br> Counts |  | Rate |  | Revenue |  |  |  |
| SCHEDULE MSL <br> (Street \& Highway Service) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High Pressure Sodium |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overhead Supply - Wood Pole |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5,800 Lumen (70 Watt) | 37 | 95 | \$ | 8.65 | \$ | 822 | 95 | \$ | 10.21 | \$ | 970 | \$ | 148 | 18.07\% |
| 9,500 Lumen (100 Watt) | 51 | 3,560 | \$ | 8.56 | \$ | 30,469 | 3,560 | \$ | 10.11 | \$ | 35,975 | \$ | 5,506 | 18.07\% |
| 22,000 Lumen (200 Watt) | 86 | 298 | \$ | 13.35 | \$ | 3,975 | 298 | \$ | 15.76 | \$ | 4,693 | \$ | 718 | 18.07\% |
| 50,000 Lumen (400 Watt) | 167 | 61 | \$ | 19.00 | \$ | 1,151 | 61 | \$ | 22.43 | \$ | 1,359 | \$ | 208 | 18.07\% |
| Multiple Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5,800 Lumen (70 Watt) | 37 | - | \$ | 8.65 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 10.21 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 9,500 Lumen (100 Watt) | 51 | 1 | \$ | 8.56 | \$ | 9 | 1 | \$ | 10.11 | \$ | 10 | \$ | 2 | 18.07\% |
| 22,000 Lumen (200 Watt) | 86 | 18 | \$ | 13.35 | \$ | 240 | 18 | \$ | 15.76 | \$ | 284 | \$ | 43 | 18.07\% |
| 50,000 Lumen (400 Watt) | 167 | - | \$ | 19.00 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 22.43 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| Overhead Supply - Metal Pole |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50,000 Lumen (400 Watt) | 167 | 1 | \$ | 32.22 | \$ | 32 | 1 | \$ | 38.04 | \$ | 38 | \$ | 6 | 18.07\% |
| Underground Supply - Standard Pole |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low mount |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5,800 Lumen (70 Watt) | 37 | - | \$ | 15.79 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 18.64 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 9,500 Lumen (100 Watt) | 51 | 4,431 | \$ | 15.64 | \$ | 69,301 | 4,431 | \$ | 18.47 | \$ | 81,824 | \$ | 12,523 | 18.07\% |
| High mount |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5,800 Lumen (70 Watt) | 37 | - | \$ | 23.87 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 28.18 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 9,500 Lumen (100 Watt) | 51 | 4 | \$ | 23.77 | \$ | 95 | 4 | \$ | 28.07 | \$ | 112 | \$ | 17 | 18.07\% |
| 22,000 Lumen (200 Watt) | 86 | 733 | \$ | 26.57 | \$ | 19,476 | 733 | \$ | 31.37 | \$ | 22,995 | \$ | 3,519 | 18.07\% |
| 50,000 Lumen (400 Watt) | 167 | 2 | \$ | 32.22 | \$ | 64 | 2 | \$ | 38.04 | \$ | 76 | \$ | 12 | 18.07\% |
| High Pressure Sodium - Rectangular Enclosed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Underground Supply - Standard Pole |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High mount |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9,500 Lumen (100 Watt) | 51 | 19 | \$ | 37.01 | \$ | 703 | 19 | \$ | 43.70 | \$ | 830 | \$ | 127 | 18.07\% |
| 22,000 Lumen (200 Watt) | 86 | 40 | \$ | 37.80 | \$ | 1,512 | 40 | \$ | 44.63 | \$ | 1,785 | \$ | 273 | 18.07\% |
| 50,000 Lumen (400 Watt) | 167 | - | \$ | 36.19 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 42.73 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| Multiple Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9,500 Lumen (100 Watt) | 51 | - | \$ | 20.16 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 23.80 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 22,000 Lumen (200 Watt) | 86 | - | \$ | 20.99 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 24.78 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 50,000 Lumen (400 Watt) | 167 | - | \$ | 19.37 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 22.87 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| Mercury Vapor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overhead Supply - Wood Pole |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4,000 Lumen (100 Watt) | 45 | 6 | \$ | 8.46 | \$ | 51 | 6 | \$ | 9.99 | \$ | 60 | \$ | 9 | 18.07\% |
| 8,150 Lumen (175 Watt) | 74 | 712 | \$ | 7.40 | \$ | 5,269 | 712 | \$ | 8.74 | \$ | 6,222 | \$ | 952 | 18.07\% |
| 11,500 Lumen (250 Watt) | 103 | 1 | \$ | 10.81 | \$ | 11 | 1 | \$ | 12.76 | \$ | 13 | \$ | 2 | 18.07\% |
| 21,500 Lumen (400 Watt) | 162 | 73 | \$ | 10.90 | \$ | 793 | 73 | \$ | 12.87 | \$ | 936 | \$ | 143 | 18.07\% |
| Overhead Supply - Metal Pole |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21,500 Lumen (400 Watt) | 162 | - | \$ | 24.51 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 28.94 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| Multiple Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8,150 Lumen (175 Watt) | 74 | - | \$ | 6.93 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 8.18 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 21,500 Lumen (400 Watt) | 162 | 2 | \$ | 10.23 | \$ | 20 | 2 | \$ | 12.08 | \$ | 24 | \$ | 4 | 18.07\% |
| Underground Supply |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low Mount |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4,000 Lumen (100 Watt) | 45 | 6 | \$ | 12.20 | \$ | 73 | 6 | \$ | 14.40 | \$ | 86 | \$ | 13 | 18.07\% |
| 8,150 Lumen (175 Watt) | 74 | 1,058 | \$ | 13.97 | \$ | 14,773 | 1,058 | \$ | 16.49 | \$ | 17,443 | \$ | 2,670 | 18.07\% |
| High Mount |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11,500 Lumen (250 Watt) | 103 | - | \$ | 24.73 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 29.20 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 21,500 Lumen (400 Watt) | 162 | 24 | \$ | 24.51 | \$ | 588 | 24 | \$ | 28.94 | \$ | 695 | \$ | 106 | 18.07\% |
| Continuous Burn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overhead Supply - Wood Pole |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22,000 Lumen (200 Watt) | 86 | 2 | \$ | 21.36 | \$ | 43 | 2 | \$ | 25.22 | \$ | 50 | \$ | 8 | 18.07\% |
| 50,000 Lumen (400 Watt) | 167 | 1 | \$ | 30.40 | \$ | 23 | 1 | \$ | 35.89 | \$ | 27 | \$ | 4 | 18.07\% |
| Overhead wire |  | 1,575 | \$ | 0.022 | \$ | 35 | 1,575 | \$ | 0.026 | \$ | 41 | \$ | 6 | 18.07\% |
| Underground wire |  | - | \$ | 0.029 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 0.034 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| Customer Owned Equipment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5,800 Lumen (70 Watt) | 37 | - | \$ | 3.07 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 3.62 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| 9,500 Lumen (100 Watt) | 51 | 261 |  | 2.95 | \$ | 770 | 261 | \$ | 3.48 | \$ | 909 | \$ | 139 | 18.07\% |
| 22,000 Lumen (200 Watt) | 86 | 157 | \$ | 3.60 | \$ | 565 | 157 | \$ | 4.25 | \$ | 667 | \$ | 102 | 18.07\% |
| 50,000 Lumen (400 Watt) | 167 | - | \$ | 6.08 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 7.18 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |

The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)
Proposed Distribution Rates
Street \& Area Lighting Rate Schedules

|  | kWh | Current |  |  |  |  | Pro Forma |  |  |  |  | Revenue Change |  | Percent Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Facility Counts |  | Rate |  | Revenue | Facility Counts |  | Rate |  | Revenue |  |  |  |
| SCHEDULE LED <br> (Light Emitting Diode Service) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Short Term |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cobra 4,000 Lumen (50 Watt) | 18 | 6 | \$ | 6.80 | \$ | 41 | 6 | \$ | 8.03 | \$ | 48 | \$ | 7 | 18.07\% |
| Cobra 7,000 Lumen (90 Watt) | 32 | - | \$ | 8.55 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 10.10 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| Cobra 11,500 Lumen (130 Watt) | 46 | - | \$ | 9.10 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 10.74 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| Cobra 24,000 Lumen (260 Watt) | 91 | - | \$ | 14.16 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 16.72 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| Acorn 2,500 Lumen (50 Watt) | 18 | - | \$ | 18.27 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 21.57 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| Acorn 5,000 Lumen (90 Watt) | 32 | - | \$ | 19.30 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 22.79 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| Colonial 2,500 Lumen (50 Watt) | 18 | 9 | \$ | 10.93 | \$ | 98 | 9 | \$ | 12.91 | \$ | 116 | \$ | 18 | 18.07\% |
| Colonial 5,000 Lumen (90 Watt) | 32 | - | \$ | 12.04 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 14.22 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.07\% |
| Long Term |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cobra 4,000 Lumen (50 Watt) | 18 | 487 | \$ | 6.30 | \$ | 3,068 | 487 | \$ | 7.53 | \$ | 3,667 | \$ | 598 | 19.50\% |
| Cobra 7,000 Lumen (90 Watt) | 32 | 618 | \$ | 8.05 | \$ | 4,975 | 618 | \$ | 9.60 | \$ | 5,930 | \$ | 955 | 19.19\% |
| Cobra 11,500 Lumen (130 Watt) | 46 | 108 | \$ | 8.60 | \$ | 929 | 108 | \$ | 10.24 | \$ | 1,106 | \$ | 178 | 19.12\% |
| Cobra 24,000 Lumen (260 Watt) | 91 | 78 | \$ | 13.66 | \$ | 1,065 | 78 | \$ | 16.22 | \$ | 1,265 | \$ | 200 | 18.73\% |
| Acorn 2,500 Lumen (50 Watt) | 18 | - | \$ | 17.77 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 21.07 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.58\% |
| Acorn 5,000 Lumen (90 Watt) | 32 | - | \$ | 18.80 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 22.29 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.55\% |
| Colonial 2,500 Lumen (50 Watt) | 18 | 573 | \$ | 10.43 | \$ | 5,976 | 573 | \$ | 12.41 | \$ | 7,108 | \$ | 1,132 | 18.94\% |
| Colonial 5,000 Lumen (90 Watt) | 32 | - | \$ | 11.54 | \$ | - | - | \$ | 13.72 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 18.85\% |
| Customer Owned Equipment | 243,420 |  | \$ | 0.03033 | \$ | 7,383 | 243,420 | \$ | 0.03581 | \$ | 8,717 | \$ | 1,334 | 18.07\% |
| PE-CO-LED-260W-SB-with pole | 91 | 82 | \$ | 34.16 | \$ | 2,801 | 91 | \$ | 40.33 | \$ | 3,670 | \$ | 869 | 18.07\% |
| PE-CO-LED-260W-SB-without pole | 91 | 149 | \$ | 16.60 | \$ | 2,473 | 91 | \$ | 19.60 | \$ | 1,784 | \$ | (690) | 18.07\% |
| Total - Monthly | 1,949,263 |  |  |  | \$ | 408,179 |  |  |  | \$ | 482,199 | \$ | 74,020 | 18.13\% |
| Total - Annual | 23,391,160 |  |  |  | \$ | 4,898,153 |  |  |  | \$ | 5,786,392 | \$ | 888,240 | 18.13\% |
| Franchise Tax Surcharge |  |  |  |  | \$ | 14,582 |  |  |  | \$ | 14,582 | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
| Montgomery County Energy Tax |  |  |  |  | \$ | 140,543 |  |  |  | \$ | 140,543 | \$ | - | 0.00\% |
| Unbilled | 49,257 |  |  |  | \$ | $(2,486)$ |  |  |  | \$ | $(2,935)$ | \$ | (449) | 18.07\% |
| TOTAL STREET \& AREA LIGHTING |  |  |  |  | \$ | 5,050,792 |  |  |  | \$ | 5,938,583 | \$ | 887,791 | 17.58\% |
| Per Books Revenue |  |  |  |  | \$ | 4,969,621 |  |  |  | \$ | 5,843,144 | \$ | 873,523 | 17.58\% |
| Correction Factor |  |  |  |  |  | 1.01633 |  |  |  |  | 1.01633 |  |  |  |

$\qquad$
Exhibit TSL-3 Proposed Rate Design and Bill Impacts

| Rate Schedule | Average Monthly Usage |  | Proposed Monthly Bil |  | Current Monthly Bill |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Increase / } \\ \text { (Decrease) (\$) } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Increase / } \\ \text { (Decrease) (\%) } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Rates Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R | 1,000 | \$ | 33.24 | \$ | 24.06 | \$ | 9.18 | 38.2\% |
| C | 2,400 | \$ | 72.32 | \$ | 52.79 | \$ | 19.53 | 37.0\% |
| G | 2,400 | \$ | 64.90 | \$ | 46.94 | \$ | 17.96 | 38.3\% |
| C-A | 5,100 | \$ | 126.17 | \$ | 95.83 | \$ | 30.34 | 31.7\% |
| CSH | 7,500 | \$ | 142.18 | \$ | 114.93 | \$ | 27.25 | 23.7\% |
| PH | 89,200 | \$ | 1,009.32 | \$ | 784.40 | \$ | 224.92 | 28.7\% |
| PP | 5,850,000 | \$ | 10,459.40 | \$ | 7,233.07 | \$ | 3,226.33 | 44.6\% |
| Total Rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R | 1,000 | \$ | 107.51 | \$ | 98.33 | \$ | 9.18 | 9.3\% |
| C | 2,400 | \$ | 295.99 | \$ | 276.46 | \$ | 19.53 | 7.1\% |
| G | 2,400 | \$ | 271.11 | \$ | 253.15 | \$ | 17.96 | 7.1\% |
| C-A | 5,100 | \$ | 621.29 | \$ | 590.95 | \$ | 30.34 | 5.1\% |
| CSH | 7,500 | \$ | 876.06 | \$ | 848.81 | \$ | 27.25 | 3.2\% |
| PH | 89,200 | \$ | 8,373.42 | \$ | 8,148.50 | \$ | 224.92 | 2.8\% |
| PP | 5,850,000 | \$ | 494,512.99 | \$ | 491,286.66 | \$ | 3,226.33 | 0.7\% |

$\qquad$
Exhibit TSL-3 Proposed Rate Design and Bill Impacts
The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)
Summary of Rate Impact

*Distribution plus tax surcharges for the Franchise Tax and the Montgomery County Fuel Energy Local Tax
**Includes Distribution, Surcharges and SOS (Transmission \& Generation) as of March 2023
$\qquad$
Exhibit TSL-4 Alternative CCOS Study


Exhibit TSL-4 Alternative CCOS Study

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) | Total Company |  | Residential |  | Small C \& I |  |  | Small C \& I | Medium Power |  | Large Power |  |  | Street and |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COSS Summary |  |  |  | Schedule |  | Schedule |  | Schedule |  | Schedule |  | Area Lighting |
| Alternative |  |  |  | R |  | C\&G |  | CA-CSH |  | PH |  | PP |  | ST LTNG |
| Current Delivery Service Rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rate base | \$ | 718,525,219 |  |  | \$ | 458,185,599 | \$ | 94,965,517 | \$ | 2,485,237 | \$ | 133,759,198 | \$ | 7,494,295 | \$ | 21,635,372 |
| Net operating income | \$ | 20,838,731 | \$ | 10,312,671 | \$ | 7,265,095 | \$ | 74,331 | \$ | 1,161,788 | \$ | 246,570 | \$ | 1,778,276 |
| Rate of return |  | 2.90\% |  | 2.25\% |  | 7.65\% |  | 2.99\% |  | 0.87\% |  | 3.29\% |  | 8.22\% |
| Relative rate of return |  | 100\% |  | 78\% |  | 264\% |  | 103\% |  | 30\% |  | 113\% |  | 283\% |
| Revenues | \$ | 138,842,885 | \$ | 86,346,045 | \$ | 25,385,332 | \$ | 449,749 | \$ | 20,147,360 | \$ | 1,427,114 | \$ | 5,087,285 |
| Test Period Usage (MWh) |  | 6,819,525,904 |  | 3,354,870,600 |  | 905,734,700 |  | 23,300,136 |  | 1,802,643,017 |  | 709,586,291 |  | 23,391,160 |
| Revenue per MWh | \$ | 0.02 | \$ | 0.03 | \$ | 0.03 | \$ | 0.02 | \$ | 0.01 | \$ | 0.00 | \$ | 0.22 |
| Revenues at Equalized Rates of Return |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rate of return |  | 7.54\% |  | 7.54\% |  | 7.54\% |  | 7.54\% |  | 7.54\% |  | 7.54\% |  | 7.54\% |
| Return requirement | \$ | 54,188,230 | \$ | 34,554,482 | \$ | 7,161,911 | \$ | 187,426 | \$ | 10,087,571 | \$ | 565,189 | \$ | 1,631,651 |
| Revenue required | \$ | 186,335,533 | \$ | 120,868,536 | \$ | 25,238,388 | \$ | 610,807 | \$ | 32,858,468 | \$ | 1,880,856 | \$ | 4,878,478 |
| Revenue deficiency | \$ | 47,492,648 | \$ | 34,522,491 | \$ | $(146,944)$ | \$ | 161,058 | \$ | 12,711,108 | \$ | 453,742 | \$ | $(208,807)$ |
| Percent increase required |  | 34.2\% |  | 40.0\% |  | -0.6\% |  | 35.8\% |  | 63.1\% |  | 31.8\% |  | -4.1\% |
| Test Period Usage (MWh) |  | 6,819,525,904 |  | 3,354,870,600 |  | 905,734,700 |  | 23,300,136 |  | 1,802,643,017 |  | 709,586,291 |  | 23,391,160 |
| Revenue Required per MWh | \$ | 0.03 | \$ | 0.04 | \$ | 0.03 | \$ | 0.03 | \$ | 0.02 | \$ | 0.00 | \$ | 0.21 |
| Revenue Deficiency per MWh | \$ | 0.01 | \$ | 0.01 | \$ | (0.00) | \$ | 0.01 | \$ | 0.01 | \$ | 0.00 | \$ | (0.01) |
| Rate Class |  | osed Class ROR |  | Overall ROR |  | native Class ROR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R |  | 2.25\% |  | 2.90\% |  | 2.25\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C\&G |  | 7.65\% |  | 2.90\% |  | 7.65\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CA-CSH |  | 2.99\% |  | 2.90\% |  | 2.99\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PH |  | 0.87\% |  | 2.90\% |  | 0.87\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PP |  | 3.29\% |  | 2.90\% |  | 3.29\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ST LTNG |  | 8.22\% |  | 2.90\% |  | 8.22\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Exhibit TSL-4 Alternative CCOS Study



| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) Allocation to Customer Classes Total | Allocation Factor | Total Company | Residential Service R | Small C \& I Schedule C\&G | Small C \& I Schedule CA-CSH | Medium Power Schedule PH | Large Power Schedule PP | Street and Area Lighting ST LTNG | Classification Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UTILITY PLANT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Plant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (360) Land and Land Rights |  | 22,832,423 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 22,832,423 | 14,336,498 | 3,057,381 | 86,132 | 5,123,853 | 98,194 | 130,365 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 22,832,423 | 14,336,498 | 3,057,381 | 86,132 | 5,123,853 | 98,194 | 130,365 |  |
| (361) Structures and Improvements |  | 11,490,605 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 11,490,605 | 7,051,472 | 1,542,653 | 45,423 | 2,757,913 | 24,799 | 68,345 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 11,490,605 | 7,051,472 | 1,542,653 | 45,423 | 2,757,913 | 24,799 | 68,345 |  |
| (362) Station Equipment |  | 190,214,295 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 190,214,295 | 116,743,761 | 25,505,973 | 750,704 | 45,638,656 | 448,509 | 1,126,692 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 190,214,295 | 116,743,761 | 25,505,973 | 750,704 | 45,638,656 | 448,509 | 1,126,692 |  |
| (362) Station Equipment - Capacitors |  | 1,528,215 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 1,528,215 | 962,922 | 151,304 | 3,909 | 339,726 | 69,416 | 938 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 1,528,215 | 962,922 | 151,304 | 3,909 | 339,726 | 69,416 | 938 |  |
| (364) Poles, Towers \& Fixtures |  | 134,210,133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 134,210,133 | 86,039,970 | 17,104,788 | 455,780 | 28,184,980 | 1,807,482 | 617,131 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 134,210,133 | 86,039,970 | 17,104,788 | 455,780 | 28,184,980 | 1,807,482 | 617,131 |  |
| (365) Overhead Conductors \& Devices |  | 245,148,184 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 245,148,184 | 156,665,789 | 29,928,350 | 793,618 | 52,036,659 | 4,780,938 | 942,829 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | $-$ | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 245,148,184 | 156,665,789 | 29,928,350 | 793,618 | 52,036,659 | 4,780,938 | 942,829 |  |
| (366) Underground Conduit |  | 70,132,572 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 70,132,572 | 44,988,805 | 8,987,118 | 239,504 | 14,697,227 | 890,704 | 329,214 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 70,132,572 | 44,988,805 | 8,987,118 | 239,504 | 14,697,227 | 890,704 | 329,214 |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) <br> Allocation to Customer Classes <br> Total | Allocation Factor | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total } \\ \text { Company } \end{array}$ | Residential Service R | Small C \& 1 Schedule $\qquad$ | Small C \& 1 Schedule CA-CSH | Medium Power Schedule $\qquad$ | Large Power Schedule pp | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Street and } \\ \text { Area Lighting } \\ \text { ST LTNG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Classification Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (367) Underground Conductors \& Device |  | 319,482,180 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 319,482,180 | 205,032,531 | 40,647,424 | 1,080,006 | 66,855,191 | 4,410,985 | 1,456,042 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Total |  | 319,482,180 | 205,032,531 | 40,647,424 | 1,080,006 | 66,855,191 | 4,410,985 | 1,456,042 |  |
| (368) Line Transformers |  | 207,846,214 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 207,846,214 | 134,586,123 | 29,019,500 | 776,097 | 42,158,392 | 738 | 1,305,365 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 207,846,214 | 134,586,123 | 29,019,500 | 776,097 | 42,158,392 | 738 | 1,305,365 |  |
| (368) Line Transformers - Capacitors |  | 1,518,797 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 1,518,797 | 928,164 | 146,877 | 3,768 | 327,464 | 111,621 | 905 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - |  | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Total |  | 1,518,797 | 928,164 | 146,877 | 3,768 | 327,464 | 111,621 | 905 |  |
| (369) Services |  | 73,051,113 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 73,051,113 | 64,524,857 | 8,030,589 | 83,427 | 412,241 | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 73,051,113 | 64,524,857 | 8,030,589 | 83,427 | 412,241 | - | - |  |
| (370, 371) Meters and Installation |  | 58,934,191 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 58,934,191 | 35,003,730 | 16,591,288 | 366,058 | 5,986,423 | 986,692 | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 58,934,191 | 35,003,730 | 16,591,288 | 366,058 | 5,986,423 | 986,692 | - |  |
| Street Lighting \& Signal Systems |  | 33,964,292 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 33,964,292 | - | - | - | - | - | 33,964,292 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 33,964,292 | - | - | - | - | - | 33,964,292 |  |
| Total Distribution Plant |  | 1,370,353,215 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 1,204,403,618 | 767,336,035 | 156,091,369 | 4,234,942 | 258,120,061 | 12,643,385 | 5,977,826 |  |
| - Customer |  | 165,949,597 | 99,528,588 | 24,621,876 | 449,485 | 6,398,664 | 986,692 | 33,964,292 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 1,370,353,215 | 866,864,623 | 180,713,245 | 4,684,427 | 264,518,725 | 13,630,077 | 39,942,118 |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)  <br> Allocation to Customer Classes Allocation <br> Total Factor  | Total Company | Residential Service R | Small C \& I Schedule C\&G | Small C \& I Schedule CA-CSH | Medium Power Schedule PH | Large Power Schedule PP | $\qquad$ | Classification Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General and Intangible Plant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Plant | 58,345,763 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 34,468,423 | 21,831,681 | 4,349,697 | 118,734 | 7,530,148 | 482,442 | 155,720 |  |
| - Customer | 23,877,340 | 17,203,736 | 4,021,648 | 71,117 | 864,442 | 127,413 | 1,588,984 |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 58,345,763 | 39,035,418 | 8,371,345 | 189,851 | 8,394,590 | 609,855 | 1,744,704 |  |
| Intangible Plant | 36,519,232 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 21,574,152 | 13,664,681 | 2,722,522 | 74,317 | 4,713,200 | 301,966 | 97,467 |  |
| - Customer | 14,945,080 | 10,768,001 | 2,517,192 | 44,513 | 541,063 | 79,749 | 994,562 |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 36,519,232 | 24,432,682 | 5,239,714 | 118,830 | 5,254,263 | 381,715 | 1,092,029 |  |
| Total General and Intangible Plant | 94,864,996 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 56,042,575 | 35,496,362 | 7,072,219 | 193,051 | 12,243,348 | 784,408 | 253,188 |  |
| - Customer | 38,822,420 | 27,971,737 | 6,538,840 | 115,629 | 1,405,506 | 207,162 | 2,583,546 |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 94,864,996 | 63,468,100 | 13,611,059 | 308,681 | 13,648,854 | 991,570 | 2,836,734 |  |
| Additions to Utility Plant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COVID-19 Regulatory Asset Adj excl. Res Adj | 9,651,602 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 8,482,794 | 7,041,284 | 638,304 | 11,269 | 500,959 | 255,516 | 35,463 |  |
| - Customer | 1,168,808 | 970,188 | 87,949 | 1,553 | 69,025 | 35,206 | 4,886 |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 9,651,602 | 8,011,472 | 726,253 | 12,821 | 569,984 | 290,722 | 40,349 |  |
| COVID-19 Residential Adjustment | $(2,391,373)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | $(2,101,778)$ | (2,101,778) | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer | $(289,595)$ | $(289,595)$ | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | $(2,391,373)$ | $(2,391,373)$ | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| MD Electric Vehicle Program Reg Asset excl. Res Direct | 670,401 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 589,216 | - | 211,106 | 5,721 | 347,571 | 16,701 | 8,117 |  |
| - Customer | 81,186 | - | 30,095 | 549 | 7,821 | 1,206 | 41,514 |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 670,401 | - | 241,201 | 6,270 | 355,392 | 17,907 | 49,631 |  |
| MD EV Reg Asset - Residential Direct | 855,889 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 752,241 | 752,241 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer | 103,648 | 103,648 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 855,889 | 855,889 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Additional to Utility Plant | 8,786,519 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 7,722,473 | 5,691,747 | 849,410 | 16,989 | 848,530 | 272,217 | 43,579 |  |
| - Customer | 1,064,046 | 784,241 | 118,044 | 2,102 | 76,846 | 36,412 | 46,400 |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 8,786,519 | 6,475,988 | 967,454 | 19,091 | 925,376 | 308,629 | 89,980 |  |
| Total Utility Plant | 1,474,004,730 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 1,268,168,666 | 808,524,144 | 164,012,998 | 4,444,983 | 271,211,939 | 13,700,010 | 6,274,593 |  |
| - Customer | 205,836,063 | 128,284,566 | 31,278,760 | 567,216 | 7,881,016 | 1,230,267 | 36,594,238 |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 1,474,004,730 | 936,808,710 | 195,291,758 | 5,012,199 | 279,092,955 | 14,930,276 | 42,868,831 |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Total | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | STITNG | Factor |
| ACCUMULATED DEPRECIATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Accumulated Depreciation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Plant A/D |  | (524,692,906) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(461,152,663)$ | $(293,804,378)$ | $(59,765,638)$ | $(1,621,512)$ | (98,831,282) | $(4,841,011)$ | $(2,288,843)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(63,540,243)$ | $(38,108,382)$ | $(9,427,441)$ | $(172,103)$ | $(2,449,977)$ | $(377,793)$ | $(13,004,547)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | (524,692,906) | (331,912,760) | (69,193,079) | (1,793,615) | $(101,281,259)$ | $(5,218,804)$ | (15,293,390) |  |
| General Plant A/D |  | $(27,506,237)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(16,249,623)$ | $(10,292,220)$ | $(2,050,600)$ | $(55,976)$ | $(3,549,976)$ | $(227,440)$ | $(73,412)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(11,256,615)$ | $(8,110,444)$ | $(1,895,946)$ | $(33,527)$ | $(407,528)$ | $(60,067)$ | $(749,103)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | $(27,506,237)$ | $(18,402,664)$ | $(3,946,545)$ | $(89,502)$ | $(3,957,504)$ | $(287,507)$ | $(822,515)$ |  |
| Intangible Plant A/D |  | $(24,687,910)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(21,698,207)$ | $(13,825,115)$ | $(2,813,274)$ | $(76,330)$ | $(4,649,869)$ | $(225,769)$ | $(107,850)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(2,989,703)$ | $(2,154,095)$ | $(503,554)$ | $(8,905)$ | $(108,238)$ | $(15,953)$ | $(198,958)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | $(24,687,910)$ | $(15,979,210)$ | $(3,316,828)$ | $(85,234)$ | $(4,758,107)$ | $(241,722)$ | $(306,809)$ |  |
| COVID Reg Asset A/D |  | $(726,023)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(638,102)$ | $(493,951)$ | $(63,830)$ | $(1,127)$ | $(50,096)$ | $(25,552)$ | $(3,546)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(87,921)$ | $(68,059)$ | $(8,795)$ | (155) | $(6,903)$ | $(3,521)$ | (489) |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | $(726,023)$ | $(562,010)$ | $(72,625)$ | $(1,282)$ | $(56,998)$ | $(29,072)$ | $(4,035)$ |  |
| EV Reg Asset A/D |  | $(152,629)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(134,146)$ | $(75,224)$ | $(21,111)$ | (572) | $(34,757)$ | $(1,670)$ | (812) |  |
| - Customer |  | $(18,483)$ | $(10,365)$ | $(3,009)$ | (55) | (782) | (121) | $(4,151)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | $(152,629)$ | $(85,589)$ | $(24,120)$ | (627) | $(35,539)$ | $(1,791)$ | $(4,963)$ |  |
| CWIP A/D |  | $(162,583)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(142,894)$ | $(91,126)$ | $(18,502)$ | (501) | $(30,533)$ | $(1,521)$ | (710) |  |
| - Customer |  | $(19,689)$ | $(12,271)$ | $(2,992)$ | (54) | (754) | (118) | $(3,500)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | $(162,583)$ | $(103,397)$ | $(21,494)$ | (556) | $(31,287)$ | $(1,639)$ | $(4,210)$ |  |
| Total Accumulated Depreciation |  | (577,928,288) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(500,015,635)$ | $(318,582,013)$ | $(64,732,955)$ | $(1,756,018)$ | $(107,146,513)$ | $(5,322,963)$ | $(2,475,173)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(77,912,654)$ | $(48,463,616)$ | $(11,841,737)$ | $(214,799)$ | $(2,974,181)$ | $(457,573)$ | $(13,960,748)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Accumulated Depreciation |  | $(577,928,288)$ | (367,045,629) | (76,574,692) | $(1,970,816)$ | $(110,120,695)$ | $(5,780,535)$ | (16,435,921) |  |
| OTHER RATE BASE ITEMS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Rate Base Items |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Work in Progress |  | 50,574,771 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 43,512,302 | 27,741,379 | 5,627,472 | 152,512 | 9,305,589 | 470,063 | 215,288 |  |
| - Customer |  | 7,062,468 | 4,401,589 | 1,073,210 | 19,462 | 270,407 | 42,212 | 1,255,590 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 50,574,771 | 32,142,967 | 6,700,681 | 171,974 | 9,575,995 | 512,275 | 1,470,878 |  |
| Plant Held for Future Use |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Prepayments |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& I | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes Total | Allocation Factor | Total <br> Company | Service $\qquad$ | Schedule C\&G | Schedule <br> CA-CSH | Schedule <br> PH | Schedule PP | Area Lighting ST LTNG | Classification Factor |
| Working Capital |  | 16,435,549 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 14,140,422 | 9,015,262 | 1,828,789 | 49,563 | 3,024,086 | 152,759 | 69,963 |  |
| - Customer |  | 2,295,128 | 1,430,407 | 348,767 | 6,325 | 87,875 | 13,718 | 408,036 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 16,435,549 | 10,445,669 | 2,177,556 | 55,887 | 3,111,962 | 166,477 | 477,999 |  |
| ADIT |  | (225,475,241) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | (193,988,954) | $(123,678,149)$ | $(25,088,705)$ | $(679,939)$ | $(41,486,690)$ | $(2,095,660)$ | $(959,811)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(31,486,287)$ | $(19,623,406)$ | $(4,784,643)$ | $(86,766)$ | $(1,205,542)$ | $(188,191)$ | $(5,597,740)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | (225,475,241) | (143,301,555) | $(29,873,348)$ | $(766,705)$ | $(42,692,232)$ | $(2,283,851)$ | $(6,557,550)$ |  |
| Customer Advances |  | $(5,061,698)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(4,448,727)$ | $(2,834,323)$ | $(576,557)$ | $(15,643)$ | $(953,423)$ | $(46,701)$ | $(22,080)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(612,971)$ | $(367,630)$ | $(90,946)$ | $(1,660)$ | $(23,635)$ | $(3,645)$ | $(125,454)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | $(5,061,698)$ | $(3,201,953)$ | $(667,504)$ | $(17,303)$ | $(977,057)$ | $(50,346)$ | $(147,535)$ |  |
| Customer Deposits |  | $(14,024,604)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(12,066,151)$ | $(6,592,572)$ | $(1,797,227)$ | - | $(3,640,794)$ | - | $(35,558)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(1,958,453)$ | $(1,070,038)$ | $(291,707)$ | - | $(590,936)$ | - | $(5,771)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | $-$ | - |  |
| Total |  | $(14,024,604)$ | $(7,662,611)$ | $(2,088,934)$ | - | (4,231,730) | - | $(41,330)$ |  |
| Deferred Investment Tax Credit |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Other Rate Base Items |  | (177,551,223) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(152,851,107)$ | $(96,348,403)$ | $(20,006,229)$ | $(493,507)$ | $(33,751,232)$ | $(1,519,540)$ | $(732,197)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(24,700,115)$ | $(15,229,079)$ | $(3,745,320)$ | $(62,640)$ | $(1,461,831)$ | $(135,906)$ | $(4,065,340)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | (177,551,223) | (111,577,482) | (23,751,549) | $(556,146)$ | $(35,213,062)$ | $(1,655,446)$ | $(4,797,538)$ |  |
| Total Rate Base |  | 718,525,219 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 615,301,924 | 393,593,728 | 79,273,814 | 2,195,459 | 130,314,194 | 6,857,508 | 3,067,222 |  |
| - Customer |  | 103,223,294 | 64,591,871 | 15,691,703 | 289,778 | 3,445,004 | 636,788 | 18,568,150 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 718,525,219 | 458,185,599 | 94,965,517 | 2,485,237 | 133,759,198 | 7,494,295 | 21,635,372 |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& 1 | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Total | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | STITNG | Factor |
| OPERATIONS \& MAINTENANCE EXPENSES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operations Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (580) Operation Supervision \& Engineering |  | 68,716 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 45,556 | 29,117 | 5,719 | 153 | 9,664 | 705 | 198 |  |
| - Customer |  | 23,160 | 14,171 | 5,068 | 105 | 1,647 | 266 | 1,902 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 68,716 | 43,288 | 10,787 | 258 | 11,311 | 972 | 2,100 |  |
| (581) Load Dispatching |  | 116,085 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 116,085 | 71,237 | 15,588 | 459 | 27,864 | 247 | 691 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 116,085 | 71,237 | 15,588 | 459 | 27,864 | 247 | 691 |  |
| (582) Station Expenses |  | 16,885 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 16,885 | 10,362 | 2,267 | 67 | 4,053 | 36 | 101 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 16,885 | 10,362 | 2,267 | 67 | 4,053 | 36 | 101 |  |
| (583) Overhead line expenses |  | 1,298,766 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 1,072,208 | 685,211 | 130,898 | 3,471 | 227,593 | 20,910 | 4,124 |  |
| - Customer |  | 226,558 | 200,115 | 24,906 | 259 | 1,279 | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 1,298,766 | 885,326 | 155,804 | 3,730 | 228,872 | 20,910 | 4,124 |  |
| (584) Underground line expenses |  | 1,434,107 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 1,359,930 | 872,687 | 173,247 | 4,606 | 284,655 | 18,505 | 6,231 |  |
| - Customer |  | 74,177 | 65,519 | 8,154 | 85 | 419 | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 1,434,107 | 938,206 | 181,401 | 4,690 | 285,073 | 18,505 | 6,231 |  |
| (585) Street lighting and signal system expenses |  | 107,100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 107,100 | - | - | - | - | - | 107,100 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | $-$ | - | $-$ | - |  |
| Total |  | 107,100 | - | - | - | - | - | 107,100 |  |
| (586) Meter expenses |  | 896,233 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 896,233 | 532,314 | 252,310 | 5,567 | 91,038 | 15,005 | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 896,233 | 532,314 | 252,310 | 5,567 | 91,038 | 15,005 | - |  |
| (588) Miscellaneous distribution expenses |  | 4,440,902 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 2,944,140 | 1,881,756 | 369,580 | 9,874 | 624,573 | 45,564 | 12,793 |  |
| - Customer |  | 1,496,762 | 915,856 | 327,537 | 6,784 | 106,438 | 17,222 | 122,926 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 4,440,902 | 2,797,611 | 697,117 | 16,657 | 731,010 | 62,786 | 135,719 |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes Allocation <br> Total Factor | Total <br> Company | Service | Schedule C\&G | Schedule CA-CSH | Schedule PH | Schedule PP | Area Lighting ST LTNG | Classification Factor |
| (589) Rents | 1,069,104 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 708,773 | 453,015 | 88,973 | 2,377 | 150,360 | 10,969 | 3,080 |  |
| - Customer | 360,331 | 220,483 | 78,851 | 1,633 | 25,624 | 4,146 | 29,593 |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 1,069,104 | 673,498 | 167,824 | 4,010 | 175,984 | 15,115 | 32,673 |  |
| Total Dist. Operations Expenses | 9,447,898 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 6,263,578 | 4,003,384 | 786,272 | 21,006 | 1,328,762 | 96,937 | 27,218 |  |
| - Customer | 3,184,320 | 1,948,458 | 696,826 | 14,432 | 226,443 | 36,640 | 261,521 |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | , | - |  |
| Total | 9,447,898 | 5,951,842 | 1,483,098 | 35,438 | 1,555,205 | 133,577 | 288,739 |  |
| Maintenance Expense |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (590) Maintenance Supervision and Engineering | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| (591) Maintenance of Structures | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| (592) Maintenance of Station Equipment | 2,539,262 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 2,539,262 | 1,558,244 | 340,973 | 10,041 | 609,494 | 5,397 | 15,114 |  |
| - Customer | - | - | - | - |  | - | - |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 2,539,262 | 1,558,244 | 340,973 | 10,041 | 609,494 | 5,397 | 15,114 |  |
| (593) Maintenance of Overhead Lines | 19,221,152 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 15,868,201 | 10,140,823 | 1,937,233 | 51,370 | 3,368,282 | 309,465 | 61,028 |  |
| - Customer | 3,352,951 | 2,961,607 | 368,594 | 3,829 | 18,921 | - | - |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 19,221,152 | 13,102,430 | 2,305,826 | 55,199 | 3,387,203 | 309,465 | 61,028 |  |
| (594) Maintenance of underground lines | 934,344 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 886,017 | 568,570 | 112,873 | 3,001 | 185,457 | 12,056 | 4,060 |  |
| - Customer | 48,327 | 42,687 | 5,313 | 55 | 273 | - | - |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 934,344 | 611,256 | 118,186 | 3,056 | 185,730 | 12,056 | 4,060 |  |
| (595) Maintenance of line transformers | 103,981 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 103,981 | 67,330 | 14,518 | 388 | 21,091 | 0 | 653 |  |
| - Customer | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 103,981 | 67,330 | 14,518 | 388 | 21,091 | 0 | 653 |  |
| (596) Maintenance of street lighting and signal systems | 465,742 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer | 465,742 | - | - | - | - | - | 465,742 |  |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | 465,742 | - | - | - | - | - | 465,742 |  |



| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) Allocation to Customer Classes Total | Allocation Factor | Total Company | Residential Service | Small C \& I Schedule C\&G | Small C \& I Schedule CA-CSH | Medium Power Schedule PH | Large Power Schedule PP | Street and Area Lighting ST LTNG | Classification Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Misc. Cust Serv and Info Exp |  | 2,381,813 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 2,381,813 | 2,178,507 | 182,913 | 2,013 | 6,213 | - | 12,167 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 2,381,813 | 2,178,507 | 182,913 | 2,013 | 6,213 | - | 12,167 |  |
| Customer Rebates \& Incentives |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Customer Assistance |  | 233,396 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 233,396 | 233,396 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 233,396 | 233,396 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Sales Expense |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |  |
| All Other Cust Accts \& Services |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Customer Accounts and Services |  | 10,602,041 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 10,602,041 | 9,400,745 | 1,117,789 | 14,650 | 51,106 | 275 | 17,476 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 10,602,041 | 9,400,745 | 1,117,789 | 14,650 | 51,106 | 275 | 17,476 |  |
| Administrative \& General Expense |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative and General Salaries |  | 3,795,263 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 2,242,095 | 1,420,103 | 282,938 | 7,723 | 489,819 | 31,382 | 10,129 |  |
| - Customer |  | 1,553,168 | 1,119,065 | 261,599 | 4,626 | 56,230 | 8,288 | 103,360 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 3,795,263 | 2,539,168 | 544,537 | 12,349 | 546,050 | 39,670 | 113,489 |  |
| Outside Services |  | 7,307,223 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 4,316,825 | 2,734,200 | 544,756 | 14,870 | 943,076 | 60,421 | 19,502 |  |
| - Customer |  | 2,990,398 | 2,154,596 | 503,671 | 8,907 | 108,263 | 15,957 | 199,004 |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  | - | - |  | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 7,307,223 | 4,888,795 | 1,048,427 | 23,777 | 1,051,338 | 76,378 | 218,507 |  |
| Employee Benefits (Acct. 926) |  | $(2,265,273)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(1,338,236)$ | $(847,615)$ | $(168,877)$ | $(4,610)$ | $(292,358)$ | $(18,731)$ | $(6,046)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(927,037)$ | $(667,935)$ | $(156,140)$ | $(2,761)$ | $(33,562)$ | $(4,947)$ | $(61,692)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  |  | - | - | , | - | - | $\stackrel{-}{ }$ |  |
| Total |  | $(2,265,273)$ | $(1,515,550)$ | $(325,017)$ | $(7,371)$ | $(325,920)$ | $(23,678)$ | $(67,738)$ |  |
| Regulatory Commission Expenses (Acct 928) |  | 1,326,184 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 1,165,583 | 743,201 | 216,465 | 3,711 | 146,418 | 9,099 | 46,689 |  |
| - Customer |  | 160,601 | 102,402 | 29,826 | 511 | 20,174 | 1,254 | 6,433 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 1,326,184 | 845,604 | 246,291 | 4,222 | 166,593 | 10,353 | 53,122 |  |
| General Advertising Expense |  | 45,306 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 26,322 | 16,759 | 3,274 | 88 | 5,655 | 435 | 111 |  |
| - Customer |  | 18,984 | 15,229 | 2,501 | 40 | 398 | 53 | 763 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 45,306 | 31,988 | 5,775 | 128 | 6,054 | 488 | 874 |  |
| All Other O\&M |  | 2,060,838 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 1,217,464 | 771,120 | 153,636 | 4,194 | 265,973 | 17,040 | 5,500 |  |
| - Customer |  | 843,375 | 607,655 | 142,049 | 2,512 | 30,533 | 4,500 | 56,125 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 2,060,838 | 1,378,775 | 295,685 | 6,706 | 296,506 | 21,541 | 61,625 |  |
| Total A\&G Expense |  | 12,269,540 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 7,630,052 | 4,837,767 | 1,032,193 | 25,977 | 1,558,584 | 99,646 | 75,885 |  |
| - Customer |  | 4,639,488 | 3,331,013 | 783,506 | 13,834 | 182,037 | 25,106 | 303,993 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 12,269,540 | 8,168,780 | 1,815,699 | 39,811 | 1,740,621 | 124,752 | 379,878 |  |
| Total O\&M Expenses |  | 56,655,385 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 33,417,162 | 21,256,287 | 4,239,696 | 112,203 | 7,098,865 | 525,627 | 184,484 |  |
| - Customer |  | 23,238,223 | 18,250,596 | 3,233,520 | 52,541 | 572,378 | 77,427 | 1,051,760 |  |
| - Commodity |  |  | - | , | - | - |  | , |  |
| Total |  | 56,655,385 | 39,506,884 | 7,473,216 | 164,745 | 7,671,243 | 603,054 | 1,236,243 |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) Allocation to Customer Classes Total | Allocation Factor | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Total } \\ \text { Company } \end{array}$ | Residential Service | Small C \& I Schedule C\&G | Small C \& I Schedule CA-CSH | Medium Power Schedule PH | Large Power Schedule PP | Street and Area Lighting ST LTNG | Classification Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEPRECIATION EXPENSE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation Expense |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Plant Deprexp |  | 28,696,459 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 25,221,322 | 16,068,724 | 3,268,697 | 88,684 | 5,405,272 | 264,764 | 125,181 |  |
| - Customer |  | 3,475,137 | 2,084,220 | 515,605 | 9,413 | 133,994 | 20,662 | 711,244 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 28,696,459 | 18,152,944 | 3,784,302 | 98,096 | 5,539,266 | 285,426 | 836,425 |  |
| General Plant Deprexp |  | 2,947,291 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 1,741,146 | 1,102,811 | 219,722 | 5,998 | 380,380 | 24,370 | 7,866 |  |
| - Customer |  | 1,206,145 | 869,034 | 203,150 | 3,592 | 43,667 | 6,436 | 80,266 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 2,947,291 | 1,971,844 | 422,872 | 9,590 | 424,046 | 30,806 | 88,132 |  |
| Intangible Plant Deprexp |  | 2,178,273 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 1,914,485 | 1,219,823 | 248,222 | 6,735 | 410,269 | 19,920 | 9,516 |  |
| - Customer |  | 263,789 | 190,061 | 44,430 | 786 | 9,550 | 1,408 | 17,555 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 2,178,273 | 1,409,884 | 292,652 | 7,520 | 419,819 | 21,328 | 27,070 |  |
| Total Depreciation Expenses |  | 33,822,024 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 28,876,952 | 18,391,357 | 3,736,641 | 101,416 | 6,195,921 | 309,054 | 142,563 |  |
| - Customer |  | 4,945,072 | 3,143,315 | 763,185 | 13,791 | 187,211 | 28,506 | 809,064 |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| Total |  | 33,822,024 | 21,534,672 | 4,499,826 | 115,207 | 6,383,131 | 337,560 | 951,628 |  |
| Regulatory Debits and Credits <br> MDEDIS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(393,539)$ | $(250,019)$ | $(54,188)$ | $(1,501)$ | $(85,104)$ | (303) | $(2,425)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | $(393,539)$ | $(250,019)$ | $(54,188)$ | $(1,501)$ | $(85,104)$ | (303) | $(2,425)$ |  |
| MD Electric Vehicle Program |  | 305,258 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 262,631 | 147,274 | 41,263 | 1,119 | 68,074 | 3,319 | 1,582 |  |
| - Customer |  | 42,627 | 23,904 | 6,941 | 127 | 1,804 | 278 | 9,574 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 305,258 | 171,178 | 48,204 | 1,245 | 69,878 | 3,597 | 11,156 |  |
| MD Conservation Voltage Reduction (CVR) |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Deferral of Rate Case Expenses |  | $(75,413)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(6,882)$ | $(41,326)$ | $(8,399)$ | (228) | $(13,917)$ | (691) | (321) |  |
| - Customer |  | $(10,531)$ | $(6,316)$ | $(1,562)$ | (29) | (406) | (63) | $(2,155)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | $(75,413)$ | $(47,642)$ | $(9,961)$ | (256) | $(14,323)$ | (754) | $(2,476)$ |  |
| COVID-19 |  | 1,930,321 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 1,696,559 | 1,408,257 | 127,661 | 2,254 | 100,192 | 51,103 | 7,093 |  |
| - Customer |  | 233,762 | 194,038 | 17,590 | 311 | 13,805 | 7,041 | 977 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 1,930,321 | 1,602,295 | 145,251 | 2,564 | 113,997 | 58,145 | 8,070 |  |
| COVID-19-Residential Adjustment |  | $(478,275)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(420,356)$ | $(420,356)$ | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | $(57,919)$ | $(57,919)$ | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  | (478,275) | $(478,275)$ | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Regulatory Debits and Credits |  | 1,288,352 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 1,080,413 | 843,830 | 106,337 | 1,644 | 69,245 | 53,428 | 5,929 |  |
| - Customer |  | 207,939 | 153,707 | 22,968 | 409 | 15,203 | 7,257 | 8,396 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 1,288,352 | 997,537 | 129,305 | 2,052 | 84,448 | 60,685 | 14,325 |  |
| Taxes Other than Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Payroll Taxes |  | 621,313 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 445,037 | 281,879 | 56,161 | 1,533 | 97,225 | 6,229 | 2,011 |  |
| - Customer |  | 176,276 | 109,245 | 33,995 | 676 | 10,306 | 1,645 | 20,409 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 621,313 | 391,124 | 90,156 | 2,209 | 107,531 | 7,874 | 22,419 |  |
| Customer Account Payroll Taxes |  | 228,896 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 228,896 | 195,719 | 31,088 | 420 | 1,483 | - | 186 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 228,896 | 195,719 | 31,088 | 420 | 1,483 | - | 186 |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& 1 | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Total | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | ST LTNG | Factor |
| A\&G Payroll Taxes |  | 12,736 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 7,524 | 4,766 | 949 | 26 | 1,644 | 105 | 34 |  |
| - Customer |  | 5,212 | 3,755 | 878 | 16 | 189 | 28 | 347 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 12,736 | 8,521 | 1,827 | 41 | 1,832 | 133 | 381 |  |
| Gross Receipt Taxes |  | 6,955,508 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 5,984,213 | 3,719,136 | 1,099,740 | 19,415 | 863,108 | 61,290 | 221,525 |  |
| - Customer |  | 971,296 | 603,652 | 178,498 | 3,151 | 140,091 | 9,948 | 35,956 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 6,955,508 | 4,322,787 | 1,278,239 | 22,566 | 1,003,199 | 71,238 | 257,480 |  |
| Property Taxes |  | 13,480,260 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 11,597,821 | 7,394,220 | 1,499,953 | 40,651 | 2,480,323 | 125,291 | 57,383 |  |
| - Customer |  | 1,882,439 | 1,173,205 | 286,055 | 5,187 | 72,074 | 11,251 | 334,666 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 13,480,260 | 8,567,425 | 1,786,008 | 45,838 | 2,552,397 | 136,542 | 392,050 |  |
| Sales \& Use Tax |  | $(202,486)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(174,210)$ | $(108,270)$ | $(32,015)$ | (565) | $(25,126)$ | $(1,784)$ | $(6,449)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | $(28,276)$ | $(17,573)$ | $(5,196)$ | (92) | $(4,078)$ | (290) | $(1,047)$ |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | $(202,486)$ | $(125,843)$ | $(37,211)$ | (657) | $(29,205)$ | $(2,074)$ | $(7,496)$ |  |
| Montgomery County Fuel Energy |  | 9,510,444 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 8,182,366 | 3,914,433 | 1,490,648 | 32,049 | 2,627,858 | - | 117,378 |  |
| - Customer |  | 1,328,077 | 635,350 | 241,947 | 5,202 | 426,527 | - | 19,052 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 9,510,444 | 4,549,784 | 1,732,595 | 37,251 | 3,054,385 | - | 136,430 |  |
| Other Taxes |  | 646 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 555 | 355 | 72 | 2 | 118 | 6 | 3 |  |
| - Customer |  | 90 | 56 | 14 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 16 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 646 | 412 | 85 | 2 | 121 | 7 | 19 |  |
| Total Taxes Other than Income |  | 30,607,318 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 26,043,307 | 15,206,519 | 4,115,508 | 93,110 | 6,045,149 | 191,137 | 391,884 |  |
| - Customer |  | 4,564,010 | 2,703,409 | 767,279 | 14,560 | 646,594 | 22,583 | 409,585 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Taxes Other than Income |  | 30,607,318 | 17,909,928 | 4,882,787 | 107,670 | 6,691,743 | 213,720 | 801,469 |  |
| Total Operating Expenses |  | 122,373,079 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 89,417,835 | 55,697,994 | 12,198,182 | 308,373 | 19,409,180 | 1,079,246 | 724,860 |  |
| - Customer |  | 32,955,244 | 24,251,027 | 4,786,952 | 81,301 | 1,421,386 | 135,773 | 2,278,805 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 122,373,079 | 79,949,021 | 16,985,134 | 389,674 | 20,830,566 | 1,215,019 | 3,003,665 |  |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& I | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Sub-Transmission | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | Pp | St LTNG | Factor |
| UTILITY PLANT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Plant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (360) Land and Land Rights |  | 1,580,034 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DEM |
| - Demand | ${ }^{12} \mathrm{CP}$-SUB | 1,580,034 | 995,572 | 156,434 | 4,042 | 351,246 | 71,769 | 970 | 100\% |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 1,580,034 | 995,572 | 156,434 | 4,042 | 351,246 | 71,769 | 970 |  |
| (361) Structures and Improvements |  | 8,742 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DEM |
| - Demand | 12CP-SUB | 8,742 | 5,508 | 866 | 22 | 1,943 | 397 | 5 | 100\% |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 8,742 | 5,508 | 866 | 22 | 1,943 | 397 | 5 |  |
| (362) Station Equipment |  | 1,021,961 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DEM |
| - Demand | ${ }^{12 C P-S U B}$ | 1,021,961 | 643,933 | 101,181 | 2,614 | 227,185 | 46,420 | 628 | 100\% |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 1,021,961 | 643,933 | 101,181 | 2,614 | 227,185 | 46,420 | 628 |  |
| (362) Station Equipment - Capacitors |  | 1,528,215 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DEM |
| - Demand | 12CP-SUB | 1,528,215 | 962,922 | 151,304 | 3,909 | 339,726 | 69,416 | 938 | 100\% |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 1,528,215 | 962,922 | 151,304 | 3,909 | 339,726 | 69,416 | 938 |  |
| (364) Poles, Towers \& Fixtures |  | 39,543,103 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DEM |
| - Demand | 12 CP -SUB | 39,543,103 | 24,915,934 | 3,915,037 | 101,153 | 8,790,542 | 1,796,154 | 24,283 | 100\% |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 39,543,103 | 24,915,934 | 3,915,037 | 101,153 | 8,790,542 | 1,796,154 | 24,283 |  |
| (365) Overhead Conductors \& Devices |  | 104,904,585 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DEM |
| - Demand | 12CP-SUB | 104,904,585 | 66,099,913 | 10,386,270 | 268,352 | 23,320,581 | 4,765,048 | 64,421 | 100\% |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 104,904,585 | 66,099,913 | 10,386,270 | 268,352 | 23,320,581 | 4,765,048 | 64,421 |  |
| (366) Underground Conduit |  | 19,489,104 | 12,279,998 |  |  |  |  |  | DEM |
| - Demand | 12CP-SUB | 19,489,104 |  | 1,929,554 | 49,854 | 4,332,482 | 885,247 | 11,968 | 100\% |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 19,489,104 | 12,279,998 | 1,929,554 | 49,854 | 4,332,482 | 885,247 | 11,968 |  |





| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& 1 | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Sub-Transmission | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | ST LTNG | Factor |
| Working Capital |  | 3,158,071 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SUB |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | 3,158,071 | 1,991,912 | 312,748 | 8,068 | 699,934 | 143,392 | 2,017 | 100\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 3,158,071 | 1,991,912 | 312,748 | 8,068 | 699,934 | 143,392 | 2,017 |  |
| ADIT |  | $(43,324,794)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SUB |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | $(43,324,794)$ | $(27,326,552)$ | $(4,290,508)$ | $(110,679)$ | $(9,602,226)$ | $(1,967,158)$ | $(27,672)$ | 100\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(43,324,794)$ | $(27,326,552)$ | $(4,290,508)$ | $(110,679)$ | $(9,602,226)$ | $(1,967,158)$ | $(27,672)$ |  |
| Customer Advances |  | $(978,681)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | DISTPLT-SUB |
| - Demand | DISTPLT-SUB-D | $(978,681)$ | $(616,663)$ | $(96,896)$ | $(2,504)$ | $(217,564)$ | $(44,454)$ | (601) | 100\% |
| - Customer | DISTPLT-SUB-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | DISTPLT-SUB-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(978,681)$ | $(616,663)$ | $(96,896)$ | $(2,504)$ | $(217,564)$ | $(44,454)$ | (601) |  |
| Customer Deposits |  | $(2,694,811)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SUB |
| - Demand | Deposits | $(2,694,811)$ | $(1,472,361)$ | $(401,386)$ | - | $(813,122)$ | - | $(7,941)$ | 100\% |
| - Customer | Deposits | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | Deposits | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | (2,694,811) | $(1,472,361)$ | $(401,386)$ | - | $(813,122)$ | - | $(7,941)$ |  |
| Deferred Investment Tax Credit |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SUB |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Other Rate Base Items |  | $(34,122,334)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(34,122,334)$ | $(21,294,236)$ | $(3,513,669)$ | $(80,289)$ | $(7,779,169)$ | $(1,426,981)$ | $(27,991)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | $(34,122,334)$ | $(21,294,236)$ | $(3,513,669)$ | $(80,289)$ | $(7,779,169)$ | $(1,426,981)$ | $(27,991)$ |  |
| Total Rate Base |  | 137,876,780 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 137,876,780 | 87,245,134 | 13,521,641 | 358,821 | 30,286,130 | 6,381,146 | 83,908 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 137,876,780 | 87,245,134 | 13,521,641 | 358,821 | 30,286,130 | 6,381,146 | 83,908 |  |




| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Sub-Transmission | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | Pp | ST LTNG | Factor |
| (597) Maintenance of meters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| (598) Maintenance of miscellaneous distribution plant |  | 45,853 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DistMtExp-SUB |
| - Demand | DistMtExp-SUB-D | 45,853 | 28,892 | 4,540 | 117 | 10,193 | 2,083 | 28 | 100\% |
| - Customer | DistMtexp-SUB-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | DistMtExp-SUB-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 45,853 | 28,892 | 4,540 | 117 | 10,193 | 2,083 | 28 |  |
| Total Dist. Maintenance Expenses |  | 7,100,863 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 7,100,863 | 4,474,222 | 703,034 | 18,164 | 1,578,542 | 322,540 | 4,361 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 7,100,863 | 4,474,222 | 703,034 | 18,164 | 1,578,542 | 322,540 | 4,361 |  |
| Total Distribution Expenses |  | 9,213,081 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 9,213,081 | 5,805,122 | 912,158 | 23,568 | 2,048,094 | 418,483 | 5,658 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 9,213,081 | 5,805,122 | 912,158 | 23,568 | 2,048,094 | 418,483 | 5,658 |  |
| Customer Accounts and Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meter Reading \& Billing |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Other-Direct to Other |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Uncollectibles |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| $\begin{array}{ll} & \text { - Demand } \\ \\ \text { - Customer } \\ \text { Total }\end{array}$ |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
|  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
|  |  | $-$ | - | - | - | - | - | $-$ | N/A |
|  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |




| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Sub-Transmission | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | ST LTNG | Factor |
| Taxes Other than Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Payroll Taxes |  | 131,591 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DISTLAB-SUB |
| - Demand | DISTLAB-SUB-D | 131,591 | 82,915 | 13,028 | 337 | 29,253 | 5,977 | 81 | 100\% |
| - Customer | distiab-Sub-c | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | DISTLAB-SUB-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 131,591 | 82,915 | 13,028 | 337 | 29,253 | 5,977 | 81 |  |
| Customer Account Payroll Taxes |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | CUSTLAB-SUB |
| - Demand | CUSTLAB-SUB-D | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | CUSTLAB-SUB-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | CUSTLAB-SUB-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| A\&G Payroll Taxes |  | 2,225 |  |  |  |  |  |  | AGLAB-SUB |
| - Demand | AGLAB-SUB-D | 2,225 | 1,402 | 220 | 6 | 495 | 101 | 1 | 100\% |
| - Customer | AGLAB-SUB-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | AGLAB-SUB-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 2,225 | 1,402 | 220 | 6 | 495 | 101 | 1 |  |
| Gross Receipt Taxes |  | 1,336,493 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SUB |
| - Demand | Revenue | 1,336,493 | 830,618 | 245,612 | 4,336 | 192,763 | 13,688 | 49,475 | 100\% |
| - Customer | Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 1,336,493 | 830,618 | 245,612 | 4,336 | 192,763 | 13,688 | 49,475 |  |
| Property Taxes |  | 2,590,216 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SUB |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | 2,590,216 | 1,633,745 | 256,512 | 6,617 | 574,079 | 117,608 | 1,654 | 100\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 2,590,216 | 1,633,745 | 256,512 | 6,617 | 574,079 | 117,608 | 1,654 |  |
| Sales \& Use Tax |  | $(38,907)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SUB |
| - Demand | Revenue | $(38,907)$ | $(24,181)$ | $(7,150)$ | (126) | $(5,612)$ | (398) | $(1,440)$ | 100\% |
| - Customer | Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(38,907)$ | $(24,181)$ | $(7,150)$ | (126) | $(5,612)$ | (398) | $(1,440)$ |  |
| Montgomery County Fuel Energy |  | 1,827,420 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SUB |
| - Demand | MontCoFuel | 1,827,420 | 874,235 | 332,916 | 7,158 | 586,896 | - | 26,215 | 100\% |
| - Customer | MontCoFuel | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | MontCoFue | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 1,827,420 | 874,235 | 332,916 | 7,158 | 586,896 | - | 26,215 |  |
| Other Taxes |  | 124 |  |  |  |  |  |  | RB-SUB |
| - Demand | RB-SUB-D | 124 | 78 | 12 | 0 | 27 | 6 | 0 | 100\% |
| - Customer | Rb-SUB-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | RB-SUB-E | - | - | - | - | $-$ | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 124 | 78 | 12 | 0 | 27 | 6 | 0 |  |
| Total Taxes Other than Income |  | 5,849,161 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 5,849,161 | 3,398,814 | 841,151 | 18,327 | 1,377,902 | 136,982 | 75,986 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Taxes Other than Income |  | 5,849,161 | 3,398,814 | 841,151 | 18,327 | 1,377,902 | 136,982 | 75,986 |  |
| Total Operating Expenses |  | 23,965,511 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 23,965,511 | 14,853,379 | 2,655,736 | 64,530 | 5,341,157 | 952,493 | 98,215 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | , | , | - | , | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 23,965,511 | 14,853,379 | 2,655,736 | 64,530 | 5,341,157 | 952,493 | 98,215 |  |






| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& 1 | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Classification } \\ & \text { Factor } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting |  |
| Primary | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | St LTNG |  |
| Working Capital |  | 2,788,703 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-PRI |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-PRI-D | 2,788,703 | 1,713,378 | 374,048 | 10,998 | 667,233 | 6,451 | 16,595 | 100\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-PRI-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-PRI-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 2,788,703 | 1,713,378 | 374,048 | 10,998 | 667,233 | 6,451 | 16,595 |  |
| ADIT |  | $(38,257,533)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-PRI |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-PRI-D | $(38,257,533)$ | $(23,505,408)$ | $(5,131,477)$ | $(150,882)$ | $(9,153,601)$ | $(88,501)$ | $(227,665)$ | 100\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-PRI-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-PRILE | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(38,257,533)$ | $(23,505,408)$ | $(5,131,477)$ | $(150,882)$ | $(9,153,601)$ | $(88,501)$ | $(227,665)$ |  |
| Customer Advances |  | $(863,164)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | DISTPLT-PRI |
| - Demand | DISTPLT-PRI-D | $(863,164)$ | $(529,690)$ | $(115,906)$ | $(3,413)$ | $(207,184)$ | $(1,834)$ | $(5,138)$ | 100\% |
| - Customer | DISTPLT-PRI-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | DISTPLT-PRI-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(863,164)$ | $(529,690)$ | $(115,906)$ | $(3,413)$ | $(207,184)$ | $(1,834)$ | $(5,138)$ |  |
| Customer Deposits |  | $(2,379,626)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-PRI |
| - Demand | Deposits | $(2,379,626)$ | $(1,300,154)$ | $(354,440)$ | - | $(718,019)$ | - | $(7,013)$ | 100\% |
| - Customer | Deposits | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | Deposits | - - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | (2,379,626) | (1,300,154) | $(354,440)$ | - | $(718,019)$ | - | $(7,013)$ |  |
| Deferred Investment Tax Credit |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-PRI |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-PRI-D | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-PRI-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-PRILE | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Other Rate Base Items |  | $(30,130,341)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(30,130,341)$ | $(18,349,540)$ | $(4,076,769)$ | $(109,454)$ | $(7,358,391)$ | $(64,033)$ | $(172,154)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | $(30,130,341)$ | $(18,349,540)$ | $(4,076,769)$ | $(109,454)$ | $(7,358,391)$ | $(64,033)$ | $(172,154)$ |  |
| Total Rate Base |  | 121,783,036 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 121,783,036 | 75,040,026 | 16,288,345 | 488,920 | 28,932,827 | 301,140 | 731,779 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 121,783,036 | 75,040,026 | 16,288,345 | 488,920 | 28,932,827 | 301,140 | 731,779 |  |





| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& 1 | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Primary | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | ST LTNG | Factor |
| (597) Maintenance of meters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| (598) Maintenance of miscellaneous distribution plant |  | 19,760 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DistMtExp-PRI |
| - Demand | DistMtExp-PRI-D | 19,760 | 12,126 | 2,653 | 78 | 4,743 | 42 | 118 | 100\% |
| - Customer | DistMtExp-PRIL-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | DistMAExp-PRI-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 19,760 | 12,126 | 2,653 | 78 | 4,743 | 42 | 118 |  |
| Total Dist. Maintenance Expenses |  | 3,060,047 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 3,060,047 | 1,877,829 | 410,904 | 12,100 | 734,497 | 6,503 | 18,213 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 3,060,047 | 1,877,829 | 410,904 | 12,100 | 734,497 | 6,503 | 18,213 |  |
| Total Distribution Expenses |  | 3,527,856 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 3,527,856 | 2,164,905 | 473,721 | 13,950 | 846,785 | 7,498 | 20,998 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 3,527,856 | 2,164,905 | 473,721 | 13,950 | 846,785 | 7,498 | 20,998 |  |
| Customer Accounts and Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meter Reading \& Billing |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Other-Direct to Other |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | $-$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Uncollectibles |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| $\begin{array}{ll} & \\ \\ \text { Total } \\ \\ \text { - } \\ \text { - Cemand } \\ \text { - Commodity }\end{array}$ |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
|  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
|  |  | $-$ | - | - | - | - | - | $-$ | N/A |
|  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |




| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) Allocation to Customer Classes Primary | Allocation Factor | Total Company | Residential Service R | Small C \& I Schedule C\&G | Small C \& I Schedule CA-CSH | Medium Power Schedule PH | Large Power Schedule PP | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Street and } \\ \text { Area Lighting } \\ \text { ST LTNG } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Classification Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Commodity | AGLAB-PRI-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 2,003 | 1,229 | 269 | 8 | 481 | 4 | 12 |  |
| $\underline{\text { Gross Receipt Taxes }}$ |  | 1,180,177 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-PRI |
| - Demand | Revenue | 1,180,177 | 733,469 | 216,885 | 3,829 | 170,218 | 12,087 | 43,688 | 100\% |
| - Customer | Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 1,180,177 | 733,469 | 216,885 | 3,829 | 170,218 | 12,087 | 43,688 |  |
| Property Taxes |  | 2,287,264 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-PRI |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-PRI-D | 2,287,264 | 1,405,294 | 306,790 | 9,021 | 547,257 | 5,291 | 13,611 | 100\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-PRI-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-PRIE | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 2,287,264 | 1,405,294 | 306,790 | 9,021 | 547,257 | 5,291 | 13,611 |  |
| Sales \& Use Tax |  | $(34,357)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-PRI |
| - Demand | Revenue | $(34,357)$ | $(21,352)$ | $(6,314)$ | (111) | $(4,955)$ | (352) | $(1,272)$ | 100\% |
| - Customer | Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | Revenue | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(34,357)$ | $(21,352)$ | $(6,314)$ | (111) | $(4,955)$ | (352) | $(1,272)$ |  |
| Montgomery County Fuel Energy |  | 1,613,685 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-PRI |
| - Demand | MontCoFuel | 1,613,685 | 771,985 | 293,978 | 6,320 | 518,253 | - | 23,149 | 100\% |
| - Customer | MontCoFuel | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | MontCoFuel | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 1,613,685 | 771,985 | 293,978 | 6,320 | 518,253 | - | 23,149 |  |
| Other Taxes |  | 110 |  |  |  |  |  |  | RB-PRI |
| - Demand | RB-PRI-D | 110 | 67 | 15 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 1 | 100\% |
| - Customer | RB-PRI-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | RB-PRI-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 110 | 67 | 15 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 1 |  |
| Total Taxes Other than Income |  | 5,167,356 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 5,167,356 | 2,963,395 | 827,532 | 19,535 | 1,259,717 | 17,283 | 79,894 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Taxes Other than Income |  | 5,167,356 | 2,963,395 | 827,532 | 19,535 | 1,259,717 | 17,283 | 79,894 |  |
| Total Operating Expenses |  | 16,587,252 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 16,587,252 | 10,013,737 | 2,365,102 | 64,003 | 3,936,645 | 52,242 | 155,522 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 16,587,252 | 10,013,737 | 2,365,102 | 64,003 | 3,936,645 | 52,242 | 155,522 |  |



| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)Allocation to Customer Classes |  |  | Residential | Small C \& 1 | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Secondary | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | ST LTNG | Factor |
| (367) Underground Conductors \& Device |  | 217,744,370 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3675 |
| - Demand | 1NCP-SEC | 217,744,370 | 141,007,785 | 30,403,426 | 812,977 | 44,152,533 | - | 1,367,649 | 100\% |
| - Customer | Customers-SEC | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 217,744,370 | 141,007,785 | 30,403,426 | 812,977 | 44,152,533 | - | 1,367,649 |  |
| (368) Line Transformers |  | 207,499,128 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3685 |
| - Demand | 1NCP-SEC | 207,499,128 | 134,373,129 | 28,972,893 | 774,725 | 42,075,082 | - | 1,303,299 | 100\% |
| - Customer | Customers-SEC | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 207,499,128 | 134,373,129 | 28,972,893 | 774,725 | 42,075,082 | - | 1,303,299 |  |
| (368) Line Transformers - Capacitors |  | 1,518,797 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DEM |
| - Demand | 12CP-GEN | 1,518,797 | 928,164 | 146,877 | 3,768 | 327,464 | 111,621 | 905 | 100\% |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 1,518,797 | 928,164 | 146,877 | 3,768 | 327,464 | 111,621 | 905 |  |
| (369) Services |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| $(370,371)$ Meters and Installation |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Street Lighting \& Signal Systems |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Distribution Plant |  | 705,760,924 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 705,760,924 | 456,984,146 | 98,479,492 | 2,633,147 | 143,128,280 | 111,621 | 4,424,238 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 705,760,924 | 456,984,146 | 98,479,492 | 2,633,147 | 143,128,280 | 111,621 | 4,424,238 |  |
| General and Intangible Plant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Plant |  | 15,100,697 |  |  |  |  |  |  | LABOR-SEC |
| $\begin{array}{ll} & \text { - Demand } \\ \\ \text { - Customer } \\ \text { - Commodity }\end{array}$ | Labor-sec-d | 15,100,697 | 9,778,971 | 2,108,495 | 56,380 | 3,062,003 | - | 94,847 | 100\% |
|  | LABOR-SEC-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
|  | LABOR-SEC-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
|  |  | 15,100,697 | 9,778,971 | 2,108,495 | 56,380 | 3,062,003 | - | 94,847 |  |



| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& I | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Secondary | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | St LTNG | Factor |
| Intangible Plant A/D |  | $(12,714,796)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | LABOR-SEC |
| - Demand | Labor-SEC-D | $(12,714,796)$ | $(8,233,900)$ | $(1,775,354)$ | $(47,472)$ | $(2,578,209)$ | - | $(79,861)$ | 100\% |
| - Customer | Labor-Sec-c | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | LABor-SEC-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(12,714,796)$ | (8,233,900) | $(1,775,354)$ | $(47,472)$ | $(2,578,209)$ | - | $(79,861)$ |  |
| COVID Reg Asset A/D |  | $(373,917)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | COVIDREGASSET-SEC |
| - Demand | COVIDREGASSET-SEC-D | $(373,917)$ | $(289,447)$ | $(37,404)$ | (660) | $(29,355)$ | $(14,973)$ | $(2,078)$ | 100\% |
| - Customer | COVIDREGASSET-SEC-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | COVIDREGASSET-SEC-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(373,917)$ | $(289,447)$ | $(37,404)$ | (660) | $(29,355)$ | $(14,973)$ | $(2,078)$ |  |
| EV Reg Asset A/D |  | $(78,607)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | EVREGASSET-SEC |
| - Demand | EVREGASSET-SEC-D | $(78,607)$ | $(44,080)$ | $(13,668)$ | (365) | $(19,864)$ | (15) | (614) | 100\% |
| - Customer | EVREGASSET-SEC-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | EVREGASSET-SEC-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(78,607)$ | $(44,080)$ | $(13,668)$ | (365) | $(19,864)$ | (15) | (614) |  |
| CWIP A/D |  | $(83,734)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SEC |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SEC-D | $(83,734)$ | $(54,264)$ | $(11,670)$ | (312) | $(16,933)$ | (30) | (525) | 100\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SEC-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SEC-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(83,734)$ | $(54,264)$ | $(11,670)$ | (312) | $(16,933)$ | (30) | (525) |  |
| Total Accumulated Depreciation |  | $(290,598,009)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(290,598,009)$ | $(188,205,955)$ | $(40,538,809)$ | $(1,083,592)$ | $(58,890,113)$ | $(57,756)$ | $(1,821,784)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Accumulated Depreciation |  | $(290,598,009)$ | $(188,205,955)$ | $(40,538,809)$ | $(1,083,592)$ | $(58,890,113)$ | $(57,756)$ | (1,821,784) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OTHER RATE BASE ITEMS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Rate Base Items |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Work in Progress |  | 25,213,142 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SEC |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SEC-D | 25,213,142 | 16,339,618 | 3,514,092 | 93,843 | 5,098,601 | 8,972 | 158,016 | 100\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SEC-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SEC-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 25,213,142 | 16,339,618 | 3,514,092 | 93,843 | 5,098,601 | 8,972 | 158,016 |  |
| Plant Held for Future Use |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SEC |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SEC-D | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SEC-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SEC-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Prepayments |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SEC |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SEC-D | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SEC-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SEC-E | - | - | $-$ | - | - | - | - | 0\% |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Classification } \\ & \text { Factor } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting |  |
| Secondary | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | St LTNG |  |
| Working Capital |  | 8,193,648 |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SEC |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SEC-D | 8,193,648 | 5,309,972 | 1,141,993 | 30,497 | 1,656,919 | 2,916 | 51,351 | 100\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SEC-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SEC-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 8,193,648 | 5,309,972 | 1,141,993 | 30,497 | 1,656,919 | 2,916 | 51,351 |  |
| ADIT |  | $(112,406,627)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SEC |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SEC-D | $(112,406,627)$ | $(72,846,189)$ | $(15,666,720)$ | $(418,378)$ | $(22,730,864)$ | $(40,002)$ | $(704,474)$ | 100\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SEC-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SEC-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(112,406,627)$ | $(72,846,189)$ | $(15,666,720)$ | $(418,378)$ | $(22,730,864)$ | $(40,002)$ | $(704,474)$ |  |
| Customer Advances |  | $(2,606,881)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | DISTPLT-SEC |
| - Demand | DISTPLT-SEC-D | $(2,606,881)$ | $(1,687,970)$ | $(363,755)$ | $(9,726)$ | $(528,675)$ | (412) | $(16,342)$ | 100\% |
| - Customer | DISTPLT-SEC-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | DISTPLT-SEC-E | - | - - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | $(2,606,881)$ | $(1,687,970)$ | $(363,755)$ | $(9,726)$ | $(528,675)$ | (412) | $(16,342)$ |  |
| Customer Deposits |  | $(6,991,714)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SEC |
| - Demand | Deposits | $(6,991,714)$ | $(3,820,057)$ | $(1,041,401)$ | - | $(2,109,653)$ | - | $(20,604)$ | 100\% |
| - Customer | Deposits | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | Deposits | - - | - | - - | - | - - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | (6,991,714) | (3,820,057) | $(1,041,401)$ | - | (2,109,653) | - | $(20,604)$ |  |
| Deferred Investment Tax Credit |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTPLT-SEC |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SEC-D | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SEC-C | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SEC-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total Other Rate Base Items |  | $(88,598,432)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | $(88,598,432)$ | $(56,704,627)$ | $(12,415,791)$ | $(303,764)$ | $(18,613,672)$ | $(28,526)$ | $(532,053)$ |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | (88,598,432) | (56,704,627) | $(12,415,791)$ | $(303,764)$ | $(18,613,672)$ | $(28,526)$ | $(532,053)$ |  |
| Total Rate Base |  | 355,642,109 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 355,642,109 | 231,308,568 | 49,463,829 | 1,347,718 | 71,095,237 | 175,222 | 2,251,535 |  |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 355,642,109 | 231,308,568 | 49,463,829 | 1,347,718 | 71,095,237 | 175,222 | 2,251,535 |  |








\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)} \& Residential \& Small C \& I \& Small C \& 1 \& Medium Power \& Large Power \& Street and \& <br>
\hline Allocation to Customer Classes \& Allocation \& Total \& Service \& Schedule \& Schedule \& Schedule \& Schedule \& Area Lighting \& Classification <br>
\hline Secondary \& Factor \& Company \& R \& C\&G \& CA-CSH \& PH \& PP \& ST LTNG \& Factor <br>
\hline - Commodity \& AGLAB-SEC-E \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline Total \& \& 3,296 \& 2,135 \& 460 \& 12 \& 668 \& - \& 21 \& <br>
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Gross Receipt Taxes} \& 3,467,544 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& TOTPLT-SEC <br>
\hline - Demand \& Revenue \& 3,467,544 \& 2,155,048 \& 637,243 \& 11,250 \& 500,127 \& 35,514 \& 128,362 \& 100\% <br>
\hline - Customer \& Revenue \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline - Commodity \& Revenue \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline Total \& \& 3,467,544 \& 2,155,048 \& 637,243 \& 11,250 \& 500,127 \& 35,514 \& 128,362 \& <br>
\hline Property Taxes \& \& 6,720,341 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& TOTPLT-SEC <br>
\hline - Demand \& TOTPLT-SEC-D \& 6,720,341 \& 4,355,181 \& 936,650 \& 25,013 \& 1,358,987 \& 2,392 \& 42,118 \& 100\% <br>
\hline - Customer \& TOTPLT-SEC-C \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline - Commodity \& TOTPLT-SEC-E \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline Total \& \& 6,720,341 \& 4,355,181 \& 936,650 \& 25,013 \& 1,358,987 \& 2,392 \& 42,118 \& <br>
\hline Sales \& Use Tax \& \& $(100,946)$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& TOTPLT-SEC <br>
\hline - Demand \& Revenue \& $(100,946)$ \& $(62,737)$ \& $(18,551)$ \& (327) \& $(14,559)$ \& $(1,034)$ \& $(3,737)$ \& 100\% <br>
\hline - Customer \& Revenue \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline - Commodity \& Revenue \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline Total \& \& $(100,946)$ \& $(62,737)$ \& $(18,551)$ \& (327) \& $(14,559)$ \& $(1,034)$ \& $(3,737)$ \& <br>
\hline Montgomery County Fuel Energy \& \& 4,741,261 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& TOTPLT-SEC <br>
\hline - Demand \& MontCoFuel \& 4,741,261 \& 2,268,213 \& 863,754 \& 18,571 \& 1,522,709 \& - \& 68,014 \& 100\% <br>
\hline - Customer \& MontCoFuel \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline - Commodity \& MontCoFuel \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline Total \& \& 4,741,261 \& 2,268,213 \& 863,754 \& 18,571 \& 1,522,709 \& - \& 68,014 \& <br>
\hline Other Taxes \& \& 322 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& RB-SEC <br>
\hline - Demand \& Rb-SEC-D \& 322 \& 209 \& 45 \& 1 \& 64 \& 0 \& 2 \& 100\% <br>
\hline - Customer \& Rb-SEC-C \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline - Commodity \& Rb-SEC-E \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline Total \& \& 322 \& 209 \& 45 \& 1 \& 64 \& 0 \& 2 \& <br>
\hline Total Taxes Other than Income \& \& 15,026,790 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline - Demand \& \& 15,026,790 \& 8,844,310 \& 2,446,825 \& 55,247 \& 3,407,531 \& 36,872 \& 236,005 \& <br>
\hline - Customer \& \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& <br>
\hline - Commodity \& \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& <br>
\hline Total Taxes Other than Income \& \& 15,026,790 \& 8,844,310 \& 2,446,825 \& 55,247 \& 3,407,531 \& 36,872 \& 236,005 \& <br>
\hline Total Operating Expenses \& \& 48,920,028 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{- Demand

- Customer
- Commodity} \& \& 48,920,028 \& 30,866,466 \& 7,185,018 \& 180,045 \& 10,142,521 \& 74,511 \& 471,468 \& <br>
\hline \& \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& <br>
\hline \& \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& <br>
\hline \& \& 48,920,028 \& 30,866,466 \& 7,185,018 \& 180,045 \& 10,142,521 \& 74,511 \& 471,468 \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}



| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Customer Service | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | St LTNG | Factor |
| (367) Underground Conductors \& Device |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| (368) Line Transformers |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| (368) Line Transformers - Capacitors |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | \#N/A |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Customer |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | N/A |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| (369) Services |  | 73,051,113 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 369 |
| - Demand | 1NCPxLT-SEC | - | - | -- | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | CUSxLT-SEC | 73,051,113 | 64,524,857 | 8,030,589 | 83,427 | 412,241 | - | - | 100\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | , | , |  | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 73,051,113 | 64,524,857 | 8,030,589 | 83,427 | 412,241 | - | - |  |
| $(370,371)$ Meters and Installation |  | 58,934,191 |  |  |  |  |  |  | CUS |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | Meters | 58,934,191 | 35,003,730 | 16,591,288 | 366,058 | 5,986,423 | 986,692 | - | 100\% |
|  |  | - |  |  | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 58,934,191 | 35,003,730 | 16,591,288 | 366,058 | 5,986,423 | 986,692 | - |  |
| Street Lighting \& Signal Systems |  | 33,964,292 |  |  |  |  |  |  | CUS |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | StreetLighting | 33,964,292 | - | - | - | - | - | 33,964,292 | 100\% |
|  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 33,964,292 | - | - | - | - | - | 33,964,292 |  |
| Total Distribution Plant |  | 165,949,597 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  |  | - | 8 | , | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 165,949,597 | 99,528,588 | 24,621,876 | 449,485 | 6,398,664 | 986,692 | 33,964,292 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 165,949,597 | 99,528,588 | 24,621,876 | 449,485 | 6,398,664 | 986,692 | 33,964,292 |  |
| General and Intangible Plant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Plant |  | 23,877,340 |  |  |  |  |  |  | LABOR-CS |
| - Demand | LABOR-CS-D | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | LABOR-CS-C | 23,877,340 | 17,203,736 | 4,021,648 | 71,117 | 864,442 | 127,413 | 1,588,984 | 100\% |
| - Commodity | LABOR-CS-E |  | , | , | , | , | , | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 23,877,340 | 17,203,736 | 4,021,648 | 71,117 | 864,442 | 127,413 | 1,588,984 |  |







| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& 1 | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes | Allocation | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting | Classification |
| Customer Service | Factor | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | St LTNG | Factor |
| (597) Maintenance of meters |  | 914,278 |  |  |  |  |  |  | CUS |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | Meters | 914,278 | 543,032 | 257,390 | 5,679 | 92,871 | 15,307 | - | 100\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 914,278 | 543,032 | 257,390 | 5,679 | 92,871 | 15,307 | - |  |
| (598) Maintenance of miscellaneous distribution plant |  | 31,075 |  |  |  |  |  |  | DistMtExp-CS |
| - Demand | DistMtExp-CS-D | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | DistMtExp-CS-C | 31,075 | 23,055 | 4,103 | 62 | 728 | 99 | 3,027 | 100\% |
| - Commodity | DistMtExp-CS-E | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 31,075 | 23,055 | 4,103 | 62 | 728 | 99 | 3,027 |  |
| Total Dist. Maintenance Expenses |  | 4,812,374 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 4,812,374 | 3,570,381 | 635,399 | 9,625 | 112,793 | 15,407 | 468,769 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 4,812,374 | 3,570,381 | 635,399 | 9,625 | 112,793 | 15,407 | 468,769 |  |
| Total Distribution Expenses |  | 7,996,694 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| - Customer |  | 7,996,694 | 5,518,839 | 1,332,225 | 24,057 | 339,236 | 52,046 | 730,290 |  |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total |  | 7,996,694 | 5,518,839 | 1,332,225 | 24,057 | 339,236 | 52,046 | 730,290 |  |
| Customer Accounts and ServicesMeter Reading \& Billing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 6,854,217 |  |  |  |  |  |  | CUS |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | MeterReading | 6,854,217 | 5,857,097 | 934,546 | 12,631 | 44,634 | - | 5,309 | 100\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | 6,854,217 | 5,857,097 | 934,546 | 12,631 | 44,634 | - | 5,309 |  |
| Other-Direct to Other |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | CUS |
| - Demand |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| - Customer | Customers-SEC | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
| Total |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Uncollectibles |  | 1,132,614 |  |  |  |  |  |  | CUS |
|  - Demand <br>  - Customer <br> Total - Commodity |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0\% |
|  | Uncollectibles | 1,132,614 | 1,131,744 | 330 | 6 | 259 | 275 | - | 100\% |
|  |  | - | - | - |  | - | - | - | 0\% |
|  |  | 1,132,614 | 1,131,744 | 330 | 6 | 259 | 275 | - |  |




\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)} \& Residential \& Small C \& I \& Small C \& 1 \& Medium Power \& Large Power \& Street and \& <br>
\hline Allocation to Customer Classes \& Allocation \& Total \& Service \& Schedule \& Schedule \& Schedule \& Schedule \& Area Lighting \& Classification <br>
\hline Customer Service \& Factor \& Company \& R \& C\&G \& CA-CSH \& PH \& PP \& ST LTNG \& Factor <br>
\hline - Commodity \& AGLAB-CS-E \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline Total \& \& 5,212 \& 3,755 \& 878 \& 16 \& 189 \& 28 \& 347 \& <br>
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Gross Receipt Taxes} \& 971,296 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& TOTPLT-CS <br>
\hline - Demand \& Revenue \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline - Customer \& Revenue \& 971,296 \& 603,652 \& 178,498 \& 3,151 \& 140,091 \& 9,948 \& 35,956 \& 100\% <br>
\hline - Commodity \& Revenue \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline Total \& \& 971,296 \& 603,652 \& 178,498 \& 3,151 \& 140,091 \& 9,948 \& 35,956 \& <br>
\hline Property Taxes \& \& 1,882,439 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& TOTPLT-CS <br>
\hline - Demand \& TOTPLT-CS-D \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline - Customer \& TOTPLT-CS-C \& 1,882,439 \& 1,173,205 \& 286,055 \& 5,187 \& 72,074 \& 11,251 \& 334,666 \& 100\% <br>
\hline - Commodity \& TOTPLT-CSEE \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline Total \& \& 1,882,439 \& 1,173,205 \& 286,055 \& 5,187 \& 72,074 \& 11,251 \& 334,666 \& <br>
\hline Sales \& Use Tax \& \& $(28,276)$ \& \& \& \& \& \& \& TOTPLT-CS <br>
\hline - Demand \& Revenue \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline - Customer \& Revenue \& $(28,276)$ \& $(17,573)$ \& $(5,196)$ \& (92) \& $(4,078)$ \& (290) \& $(1,047)$ \& 100\% <br>
\hline - Commodity \& Revenue \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline Total \& \& $(28,276)$ \& $(17,573)$ \& $(5,196)$ \& (92) \& $(4,078)$ \& (290) \& $(1,047)$ \& <br>
\hline Montgomery County Fuel Energy \& \& 1,328,077 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& TOTPLT-CS <br>
\hline - Demand \& MontCofuel \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline - Customer \& MontCofuel \& 1,328,077 \& 635,350 \& 241,947 \& 5,202 \& 426,527 \& - \& 19,052 \& 100\% <br>
\hline - Commodity \& MontCofuel \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline Total \& \& 1,328,077 \& 635,350 \& 241,947 \& 5,202 \& 426,527 \& - \& 19,052 \& <br>
\hline Other Taxes \& \& 90 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& RB-CS <br>
\hline - Demand \& RB-CS-D \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline - Customer \& RB-CS-C \& 90 \& 56 \& 14 \& 0 \& 3 \& 1 \& 16 \& 100\% <br>
\hline - Commodity \& RB-CS-E \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& 0\% <br>
\hline Total \& \& 90 \& 56 \& 14 \& 0 \& 3 \& 1 \& 16 \& <br>
\hline Total Taxes Other than Income \& \& 4,564,010 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline - Demand \& \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& <br>
\hline - Customer \& \& 4,564,010 \& 2,703,409 \& 767,279 \& 14,560 \& 646,594 \& 22,583 \& 409,585 \& <br>
\hline - Commodity \& \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& <br>
\hline Total Taxes Other than Income \& \& 4,564,010 \& 2,703,409 \& 767,279 \& 14,560 \& 646,594 \& 22,583 \& 409,585 \& <br>
\hline Total Operating Expenses \& \& 32,900,289 \& \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{- Demand

- Customer
- Commodity} \& \& $(54,955)$ \& $(35,588)$ \& $(7,673)$ \& (205) \& $(11,143)$ \& - \& (345) \& <br>
\hline \& \& 32,955,244 \& 24,251,027 \& 4,786,952 \& 81,301 \& 1,421,386 \& 135,773 \& 2,278,805 \& <br>
\hline \& \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& - \& <br>
\hline \& \& 32,900,289 \& 24,215,439 \& 4,779,278 \& 81,096 \& 1,410,243 \& 135,773 \& 2,278,460 \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)Allocation Summary |  | Residential | Small C \& | Small C \& I | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting |
|  | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | ST LTNG |
| Revenue Requirement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-Transmission |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 36,261,840 | 22,645,044 | 3,830,873 | 96,458 | 8,064,548 | 1,519,431 | 105,486 |
| - Customer | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Primary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 27,439,862 | 16,715,391 | 3,780,688 | 107,507 | 6,538,344 | 78,997 | 218,934 |
| - Customer | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Secondary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 80,600,091 | 51,524,109 | 11,483,816 | 299,963 | 16,535,550 | 90,079 | 666,575 |
| - Customer | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sub-Transmission |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | $(54,955)$ | $(35,588)$ | $(7,673)$ | (205) | $(11,143)$ | - | (345) |
| - Customer | 42,088,695 | 30,019,581 | 6,150,685 | 107,085 | 1,731,168 | 192,349 | 3,887,828 |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total Revenue Requirement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 144,246,838 | 90,848,956 | 19,087,703 | 503,722 | 31,127,300 | 1,688,507 | 990,650 |
| - Customer | 42,088,695 | 30,019,581 | 6,150,685 | 107,085 | 1,731,168 | 192,349 | 3,887,828 |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total Revenue Requirement | 186,335,533 | 120,868,536 | 25,238,388 | 610,807 | $32,858,468$ | 1,880,856 | $4,878,478$ |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  | Residential | Small C \& | Small C \& I | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation Summary | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting |
|  | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | St LTNG |
| Rate Base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-Transmission |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 137,876,780 | 87,245,134 | 13,521,641 | 358,821 | 30,286,130 | 6,381,146 | 83,908 |
| - Customer | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Primary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 121,783,036 | 75,040,026 | 16,288,345 | 488,920 | 28,932,827 | 301,140 | 731,779 |
| - Customer | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Secondary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 355,642,109 | 231,308,568 | 49,463,829 | 1,347,718 | 71,095,237 | 175,222 | 2,251,535 |
| - Customer | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sub-Transmission |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| - Customer | 103,223,294 | 64,591,871 | 15,691,703 | 289,778 | 3,445,004 | 636,788 | 18,568,150 |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total Rate Base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 615,301,924 | 393,593,728 | 79,273,814 | 2,195,459 | 130,314,194 | 6,857,508 | 3,067,222 |
| - Customer | 103,223,294 | 64,591,871 | 15,691,703 | 289,778 | 3,445,004 | 636,788 | 18,568,150 |
| - Commodity | - | - | - | . |  | - |  |
| Total Rate Base | 718,525,219 | 458,185,599 | 94,965,517 | 2,485,237 | 133,759,198 | 7,494,295 | 21,635,372 |




| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes ALLOCATION FACTORS |  |  |  |  |
| (368) Line Transformers - Capacitors |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  |  | 12CP-GEN |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (369) Services |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  |  |  | 1NCPxLT-SEC |
| - Customer |  |  |  | CUSxLT-SEC |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| $(370,371)$ Meters and Installation |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  |  |  |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  | Meters |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Street Lighting \& Signal Systems |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll} & \text { - Demand } \\ \\ \text { Total } \\ \text { - Customer } \\ \text { - Commod }\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | StreetLighting |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| General and Intangible Plant |  |  |  |  |
| General Plant |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | LABOR-SUB-D | LABOR-PRI-D | LABOR-SEC-D | LABOR-CS-D |
| - Customer | LABOR-SUB-C | LABOR-PRI-C | LABOR-SEC-C | LABOR-CS-C |
| - Commodity | LABOR-SUB-E | LABOR-PRI-E | LABOR-SEC-E | LABOR-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Intangible Plant |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | LABOR-SUB-D | LABOR-PRI-D | LABOR-SEC-D | LABOR-CS-D |
| - Customer | LABOR-SUB-C | LABOR-PRI-C | LABOR-SEC-C | LABOR-CS-C |
| - Commodity | LABOR-SUB-E | LABOR-PRI-E | LABOR-SEC-E | LABOR-CS-E |



| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes <br> ALLOCATION FACTORS |  |  |  |  |
| CWIP A/D |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | TOTPLT-PRI-D | TOTPLT-SEC-D | TOTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | TOTPLT-PRI-C | TOTPLT-SEC-C | TOTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | TOTPLT-PRI-E | TOTPLT-SEC-E | TOTPLT-CS-E |

Exhibit TSL-4 Alternative CCOS Study

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes ALLOCATION FACTORS |  |  |  |  |
| OTHER RATE BASE ITEMS |  |  |  |  |
| Other Rate Base Items |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Work in Progress |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | TOTPLT-PRI-D | TOTPLT-SEC-D | TOTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | TOTPLT-PRI-C | TOTPLT-SEC-C | TOTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | TOTPLT-PRI-E | TOTPLT-SEC-E | TOTPLT-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Plant Held for Future Use |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | TOTPLT-PRI-D | TOTPLT-SEC-D | TOTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | TOTPLT-PRI-C | TOTPLT-SEC-C | TOTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | TOTPLT-PRI-E | TOTPLT-SEC-E | TOTPLT-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Prepayments |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | TOTPLT-PRI-D | TOTPLT-SEC-D | TOTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | TOTPLT-PRI-C | TOTPLT-SEC-C | TOTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | TOTPLT-PRI-E | TOTPLT-SEC-E | TOTPLT-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Working Capital |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | TOTPLT-PRI-D | TOTPLT-SEC-D | TOTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | TOTPLT-PRI-C | TOTPLT-SEC-C | TOTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | TOTPLT-PRI-E | TOTPLT-SEC-E | TOTPLT-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| ADIT |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | TOTPLT-PRI-D | TOTPLT-SEC-D | TOTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | TOTPLT-PRI-C | TOTPLT-SEC-C | TOTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | TOTPLT-PRI-E | TOTPLT-SEC-E | TOTPLT-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Customer Advances |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | DISTPLT-SUB-D | DISTPLT-PRI-D | DISTPLT-SEC-D | DISTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | DISTPLT-SUB-C | DISTPLT-PRI-C | DISTPLT-SEC-C | DISTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | DISTPLT-SUB-E | DISTPLT-PRI-E | DISTPLT-SEC-E | DISTPLT-CS-E |

Total

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes ALLOCATION FACTORS | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| Customer Deposits |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | Deposits | Deposits | Deposits | Deposits |
| - Customer | Deposits | Deposits | Deposits | Deposits |
| - Commodity | Deposits | Deposits | Deposits | Deposits |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Deferred Investment Tax Credit |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | TOTPLT-PRI-D | TOTPLT-SEC-D | TOTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | TOTPLT-PRI-C | TOTPLT-SEC-C | TOTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | TOTPLT-PRI-E | TOTPLT-SEC-E | TOTPLT-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| OPERATIONS \& MAINTENANCE EXPENSES |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Expenses |  |  |  |  |
| Operations Expenses |  |  |  |  |
| (580) Operation Supervision \& Engineering |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | DistOpExp-SUB-D | DistOpExp-PRI-D | DistOpExp-SEC-D | DistOpExp-CS-D |
| - Customer | DistOpExp-SUB-C | DistOpExp-PRI-C | DistOpExp-SEC-C | DistOpExp-Cs-C |
| - Commodity | DistOpExp-SUB-E | DistOpExp-PRI-E | DistOpExp-SEC-E | DistOpExp-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (581) Load Dispatching |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 1NCP-PRI |  |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (582) Station Expenses |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 1NCP-PRI |  |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (583) Overhead line expenses |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | OHLines-SUB-D | OHLines-PRI-D | OHLines-SEC-D | OHLines-CS-D |
| - Customer | OHLines-SUB-C | OHLines-PRI-C | OHLines-SEC-C | OHLines-CS-C |
| - Commodity | OHLines-SUB-E | OHLines-PRI-E | OHLines-SEC-E | OHLines-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (584) Underground line expenses |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | UGLines-SUB-D | UGLines-PRI-D | UGLines-SEC-D | UGLines-CS-D |
| - Customer | UGLines-SUB-C | UGLines-PRI-C | UGLines-SEC-C | UGLines-CS-C |
| - Commodity | UGLines-SUB-E | UGLines-PRI-E | UGLines-SEC-E | UGLines-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (585) Street lighting and signal system expenses |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  |  |  |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  | StreetLighting |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)
Allocation to Customer Classes
Sub-Transmission
Primary
Secondary
Customer Service
ALLOCATION FACTORS
(586) Meter expenses

| - Demand |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Customer |  |  |  | Meters |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (588) Miscellaneous distribution expenses |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | DistOpExp-SUB-D | DistOpExp-PRI-D | DistOpExp-SEC-D | DistOpExp-CS-D |
| - Customer | DistOpExp-SUB-C | DistOpExp-PRI-C | DistOpExp-SEC-C | DistOpExp-CS-C |
| - Commodity | DistOpExp-SUB-E | DistOpExp-PRI-E | DistOpExp-SEC-E | DistOpExp-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (589) Rents |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | DistOpExp-SUB-D | DistOpExp-PRI-D | DistOpExp-SEC-D | DistOpExp-CS-D |
| - Customer | DistOpExp-SUB-C | DistOpExp-PRI-C | DistOpExp-SEC-C | DistOpExp-CS-C |
| - Commodity | DistOpExp-SUB-E | DistOpExp-PRI-E | DistOpExp-SEC-E | DistOpExp-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Maintenance Expense |  |  |  |  |
| (590) Maintenance Supervision and Engineering |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | DistMtExp-SUB-D | DistMtExp-PRI-D | DistMtExp-SEC-D | DistMtExp-CS-D |
| - Customer | DistMtExp-SUB-C | DistMtExp-PRI-C | DistMtExp-SEC-C | DistMtExp-CS-C |
| - Commodity | DistMtExp-SUB-E | DistMtExp-PRI-E | DistMtExp-SEC-E | DistMtExp-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (591) Maintenance of Structures |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | DistMtExp-SUB-D | DistMtExp-PRI-D | DistMtExp-SEC-D | DistMtExp-CS-D |
| - Customer | DistMtExp-SUB-C | DistMtExp-PRI-C | DistMtExp-SEC-C | DistMtExp-CS-C |
| - Commodity | DistMtExp-SUB-E | DistMtExp-PRI-E | DistMtExp-SEC-E | DistMtExp-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (592) Maintenance of Station Equipment |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  | 1NCP-PRI |  |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |

Total
(593) Maintenance of Overhead Lines

| - Demand | OHLines-SUB-D | OHLines-PRI-D | OHLines-SEC-D | OHLines-CS-D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Customer | OHLines-SUB-C | OHLines-PRI-C | OHLines-SEC-C | OHLines-CS-C |
| - Commodity | OHLines-SUB-E | OHLines-PRI-E | OHLines-SEC-E | OHLines-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| (594) Maintenance of underground lines |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | UGLines-SUB-D | UGLines-PRI-D | UGLines-SEC-D | UGLines-CS-D |
| - Customer | UGLines-SUB-C | UGLines-PRI-C | UGLines-SEC-C | UGLines-CS-C |
| - Commodity | UGLines-SUB-E | UGLines-PRI-E | UGLines-SEC-E | UGLines-CS-E |

(595) Maintenance of line transformers

| - Demand | 12CP-SUB | 1NCP-PRI | 1NCP-SEC |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Customer |  | Customers-PRI | Customers-SEC |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |

Total

The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland)
Allocation to Customer Classes
ALLOCATION FACTORS
(596) Maintenance of street lighting and signal systems

- Demand
- Customer StreetLighting
- Commodity

Total
(597) Maintenance of meters

- Demand
- Customer Meters
- Commodity $\qquad$
Total
(598) Maintenance of miscellaneous distribution plant

| - Demand | DistMtExp-SUB-D | DistMtExp-PRI-D | DistMtExp-SEC-D | DistMtExp-CS-D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Customer | DistMtExp-SUB-C | DistMtExp-PRI-C | DistMtExp-SEC-C | DistMtExp-CS-C |
| - Commodity | DistMtExp-SUB-E | DistMtExp-PRI-E | DistMtExp-SEC-E | DistMtExp-CS-E |

Total

Customer Accounts and Services
Meter Reading \& Billing

- Demand

| - Customer | MeterReading |
| :--- | :--- |
| - Commodity |  |

Total

Other-Direct to Other

- Demand
- Customer Customers-SEC
- Commodity $\qquad$
Total

Uncollectibles

- Demand

| - Customer | Uncollectibles |
| :--- | :--- |
| - Commodity |  |

Total

Misc. Cust Serv and Info Exp

- Demand
- Customer CustServices
- Commodity

Total

Customer Rebates \& Incentives

- Demand
- Customer

Customers-SEC

- Commodity $\qquad$
Total

Customer Assistance

> - Demand - Customer - Commodity

- Customer CustAssist

Total

Exhibit TSL-4 Alternative CCOS Study

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes <br> ALLOCATION FACTORS |  |  |  |  |
| Sales Expense |  |  |  | Customers-SEC |
| - Demand |  |  |  |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  | Customers-SEC |
| All Other Cust Accts \& Services |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand |  |  |  |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative \& General Expense |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative and General Salaries |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | NONAGLAB-SUB-D | NONAGLAB-PRI-D | NONAGLAB-SEC-D | NONAGLAB-CS-D |
| - Customer | NONAGLAB-SUB-C | NONAGLAB-PRI-C | NONAGLAB-SEC-C | NONAGLAB-CS-C |
| - Commodity | NONAGLAB-SUB-E | NONAGLAB-PRI-E | NONAGLAB-SEC-E | NONAGLAB-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Outside Services | NONAGLAB-SUB-D | NONAGLAB-PRI-D | NONAGLAB-SEC-D | NONAGLAB-CS-D |
| - Demand- Customer- Commodity |  |  |  |  |
|  | NONAGLAB-SUB-C | NONAGLAB-PRI-C | NONAGLAB-SEC-C | NONAGLAB-CS-C |
|  | NONAGLAB-SUB-E | NONAGLAB-PRI-E | NONAGLAB-SEC-E | NONAGLAB-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Employee Benefits (Acct. 926) | NONAGLAB-SUB-D NONAGLAB-SUB-C NONAGLAB-SUB-E | NONAGLAB-PRI-D NONAGLAB-PRI-C NONAGLAB-PRI-E | NONAGLAB-SEC-D <br> NONAGLAB-SEC-C <br> NONAGLAB-SEC-E | NONAGLAB-CS-D <br> NONAGLAB-CS-C <br> NONAGLAB-CS-E |
| - Demand |  |  |  |  |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Regulatory Commission Expenses (Acct 928) | SalesREV <br> SalesREV <br> SalesREV |  |  | SalesREV <br> SalesREV <br> SalesREV |
| - Demand- Customer- Commodity |  | SalesREV | SalesREV |  |
|  |  | SalesREV | SalesREV |  |
|  |  | SalesREV | SalesREV |  |
| Total | OpExp-SUB-D <br> OpExp-SUB-C <br> OpExp-SUB-E |  |  |  |
| General Advertising Expense |  | OpExp-PRI-D <br> OpExp-PRI-C <br> OpExp-PRI-E |  |  |
| - Demand |  |  | OpExp-SEC-D | OpExp-CS-D |
| - Customer |  |  | OpExp-SEC-C | OpExp-CS-C |
| - Commodity |  |  | OpExp-SEC-E | OpExp-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| All Other O\&M | NONAGLAB-SUB-D | NONAGLAB-PRI-D |  |  |
| - Demand |  |  | NONAGLAB-SEC-D | NONAGLAB-CS-D |
| - Customer | NONAGLAB-SUB-C | NONAGLAB-PRI-C | NONAGLAB-SEC-C | NONAGLAB-CS-C |
| - Commodity | NONAGLAB-SUB-E | NONAGLAB-PRI-E | NONAGLAB-SEC-E | NONAGLAB-CS-E |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) Allocation to Customer Classes ALLOCATION FACTORS | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEPRECIATION EXPENSE |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation Expense |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Plant DeprExp |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | DISTPLT-SUB-D | DISTPLT-PRI-D | DISTPLT-SEC-D | DISTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | DISTPLT-SUB-C | DISTPLT-PRI-C | DISTPLT-SEC-C | DISTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | DISTPLT-SUB-E | DISTPLT-PRI-E | DISTPLT-SEC-E | DISTPLT-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| General Plant DeprExp |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | LABOR-SUB-D | LABOR-PRI-D | LABOR-SEC-D | LABOR-CS-D |
| - Customer | LABOR-SUB-C | LABOR-PRI-C | LABOR-SEC-C | LABOR-CS-C |
| - Commodity | LABOR-SUB-E | LABOR-PRI-E | LABOR-SEC-E | LABOR-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Intangible Plant DeprExp |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | LABOR-SUB-D | LABOR-PRI-D | LABOR-SEC-D | LABOR-CS-D |
| - Customer | LABOR-SUB-C | LABOR-PRI-C | LABOR-SEC-C | LABOR-CS-C |
| - Commodity | LABOR-SUB-E | LABOR-PRI-E | LABOR-SEC-E | LABOR-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Regulatory Debits and Credits |  |  |  |  |
| MD EDIS |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | 1NCP-PRI | 1NCP-PRI | 1NCP-SEC | 1NCP-SEC |
| - Customer |  |  |  |  |
| - Commodity |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| MD Electric Vehicle Program |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | EVREGASSET-SUB-D | EVREGASSET-PRI-D | EVREGASSET-SEC-D | EVREGASSET-CS-D |
| - Customer | EVREGASSET-SUB-C | EVREGASSET-PRI-C | EVREGASSET-SEC-C | EVREGASSET-CS-C |
| - Commodity | EVREGASSET-SUB-E | EVREGASSET-PRI-E | EVREGASSET-SEC-E | EVREGASSET-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| MD Conservation Voltage Reduction (CVR) |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | DISTPLT-SUB-D | DISTPLT-PRI-D | DISTPLT-SEC-D | DISTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | DISTPLT-SUB-C | DISTPLT-PRI-C | DISTPLT-SEC-C | DISTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | DISTPLT-SUB-E | DISTPLT-PRI-E | DISTPLT-SEC-E | DISTPLT-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Deferral of Rate Case Expenses |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | DISTPLT-SUB-D | DISTPLT-PRI-D | DISTPLT-SEC-D | DISTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | DISTPLT-SUB-C | DISTPLT-PRI-C | DISTPLT-SEC-C | DISTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | DISTPLT-SUB-E | DISTPLT-PRI-E | DISTPLT-SEC-E | DISTPLT-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| COVID-19 |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | COVID | COVID | COVID | COVID |
| - Customer | COVID | COVID | COVID | COVID |
| - Commodity | COVID | COVID | COVID | COVID |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| COVID-19-Residential Adjustment |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct |
| - Customer | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct |
| - Commodity | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct | Res-Direct |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes <br> ALLOCATION FACTORS |  |  |  |  |
| TAXES |  |  |  |  |
| Taxes Other than Income |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Payroll Taxes |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | DISTLAB-SUB-D | DISTLAB-PRI-D | DISTLAB-SEC-D | DISTLAB-CS-D |
| - Customer | DISTLAB-SUB-C | DISTLAB-PRI-C | DISTLAB-SEC-C | DISTLAB-CS-C |
| - Commodity | DISTLAB-SUB-E | DISTLAB-PRI-E | DISTLAB-SEC-E | DISTLAB-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Customer Account Payroll Taxes |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | CUSTLAB-SUB-D | CUSTLAB-PRI-D | CUSTLAB-SEC-D | CUSTLAB-CS-D |
| - Customer | CUSTLAB-SUB-C | CUSTLAB-PRI-C | CUSTLAB-SEC-C | CUSTLAB-CS-C |
| - Commodity | CUSTLAB-SUB-E | CUSTLAB-PRI-E | CUSTLAB-SEC-E | CUSTLAB-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| A\&G Payroll Taxes |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | AGLAB-SUB-D | AGLAB-PRI-D | AGLAB-SEC-D | AGLAB-CS-D |
| - Customer | AGLAB-SUB-C | AGLAB-PRI-C | AGLAB-SEC-C | AGLAB-CS-C |
| - Commodity | AGLAB-SUB-E | AGLAB-PRI-E | AGLAB-SEC-E | AGLAB-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Gross Receipt Taxes |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue |
| - Customer | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue |
| - Commodity | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Property Taxes |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | TOTPLT-SUB-D | TOTPLT-PRI-D | TOTPLT-SEC-D | TOTPLT-CS-D |
| - Customer | TOTPLT-SUB-C | TOTPLT-PRI-C | TOTPLT-SEC-C | TOTPLT-CS-C |
| - Commodity | TOTPLT-SUB-E | TOTPLT-PRI-E | TOTPLT-SEC-E | TOTPLT-CS-E |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Sales \& Use Tax |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue |
| - Customer | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue |
| - Commodity | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue | Revenue |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Montgomery County Fuel Energy |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | MontCoFuel | MontCoFuel | MontCoFuel | MontCoFuel |
| - Customer | MontCoFuel | MontCoFuel | MontCoFuel | MontCoFuel |
| - Commodity | MontCoFuel | MontCoFuel | MontCoFuel | MontCoFuel |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Other Taxes |  |  |  |  |
| - Demand | RB-SUB-D | RB-PRI-D | RB-SEC-D | RB-CS-D |
| - Customer | RB-SUB-C | RB-PRI-C | RB-SEC-C | RB-CS-C |
| - Commodity | RB-SUB-E | RB-PRI-E | RB-SEC-E | RB-CS-E |

$\qquad$
Exhibit TSL-4 Alternative CCOS Study

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes CLASSIFICATION FACTORS | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| UTILITY PLANT |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Plant |  |  |  |  |
| (360) Land and Land Rights | DEM | 360P | 3605 | CUS |
| (361) Structures and Improvements | DEM | DEM |  |  |
| (362) Station Equipment | DEM | DEM |  |  |
| (362) Station Equipment - Capacitors | DEM | DEM |  |  |
| (364) Poles, Towers \& Fixtures | DEM | 364P | 364S | CUS |
| (365) Overhead Conductors \& Devices | DEM | 365P | 365S |  |
| (366) Underground Conduit | DEM | 366P | 366S |  |
| (367) Underground Conductors \& Device | DEM | 367P | 3675 |  |
| (368) Line Transformers | DEM | 368P | 368 S |  |
| (368) Line Transformers - Capacitors |  |  | DEM |  |
| (369) Services |  |  |  | 369 |
| $(370,371)$ Meters and Installation |  |  |  | CUS |
| Street Lighting \& Signal Systems |  |  |  | cus |
| General and Intangible Plant |  |  |  |  |
| General Plant | LABOR-SUB | LABOR-PRI | LABOR-SEC | LABOR-CS |
| Intangible Plant | LABOR-SUB | LABOR-PRI | LABOR-SEC | LABOR-CS |
| Additions to Utility Plant |  |  |  |  |
| COVID-19 Regulatory Asset Adj excl. Res Adj | DISTPLT-SUB | DISTPLT-PRI | DISTPLT-SEC | DISTPLT-CS |
| COVID-19 Residential Adjustment | DISTPLT-SUB | DISTPLT-PRI | DISTPLT-SEC | DISTPLT-CS |
| MD Electric Vehicle Program Reg Asset excl. Res [ | DISTPLTxRES-SUB | DISTPLTxRES-PRI | DISTPLTxRES-SEC | DISTPLTxRES-CS |
| MD EV Reg Asset - Residential Direct | DISTPLT-SUB | DISTPLT-PRI | DISTPLT-SEC | DISTPLT-CS |

$\qquad$
Exhibit TSL-4 Alternative CCOS Study

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes CLASSIFICATION FACTORS | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| ACCUMULATED DEPRECIATION |  |  |  |  |
| Accumulated Depreciation |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Plant A/D | DISTPLT-SUB | DISTPLT-PRI | DISTPLT-SEC | DISTPLT-CS |
| General Plant A/D | LABOR-SUB | LABOR-PRI | LABOR-SEC | LABOR-CS |
| Intangible Plant A/D | LABOR-SUB | LABOR-PRI | LABOR-SEC | LABOR-CS |
| COVID Reg Asset A/D | COVIDREGASSET-SUB | COVIDREGASSET-PRI | COVIDREGASSET-SEC | COVIDREGASSET-CS |
| EV Reg Asset A/D | EVREGASSET-SUB | EVREGASSET-PRI | EVREGASSET-SEC | EVREGASSET-CS |
| CWIP A/D | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| OTHER RATE BASE ITEMS |  |  |  |  |
| Other Rate Base Items |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Work in Progress | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| Plant Held for Future Use | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| Prepayments | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| Working Capital | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| ADIT | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| Customer Advances | DISTPLT-SUB | DISTPLT-PRI | DISTPLT-SEC | DISTPLT-CS |
| Customer Deposits | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| Deferred Investment Tax Credit | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| OPERATIONS \& MAINTENANCE EXPENSES |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Expenses |  |  |  |  |
| Operations Expenses |  |  |  |  |
| (580) Operation Supervision \& Engineering | DistOpExp-SUB | DistOpExp-PRI | DistOpExp-SEC | DistOpExp-CS |
| (581) Load Dispatching | DEM | DEM |  |  |
| (582) Station Expenses | DEM | DEM |  |  |
| (583) Overhead line expenses | OHLines-SUB | OHLines-PRI | OHLines-SEC | OHLines-CS |
| (584) Underground line expenses | UGLines-SUB | UGLines-PRI | UGLines-SEC | UGLines-CS |
| (585) Street lighting and signal system expenses |  |  |  | CUS |
| (586) Meter expenses |  |  |  | CUS |
| (588) Miscellaneous distribution expenses | DistOpExp-SUB | DistOpExp-PRI | DistOpExp-SEC | DistOpExp-CS |
| (589) Rents | DistOpExp-SUB | DistOpExp-PRI | DistOpExp-SEC | DistOpExp-CS |
| Maintenance Expense |  |  |  |  |
| (590) Maintenance Supervision and Engineering | DistMtExp-SUB | DistMtExp-PRI | DistMtExp-SEC | DistMtExp-CS |
| (591) Maintenance of Structures | DistMtExp-SUB | DistMtExp-PRI | DistMtExp-SEC | DistMtExp-CS |
| (592) Maintenance of Station Equipment | DEM | DEM |  |  |
| (593) Maintenance of Overhead Lines | OHLines-SUB | OHLines-PRI | OHLines-SEC | OHLines-CS |
| (594) Maintenance of underground lines | UGLines-SUB | UGLines-PRI | UGLines-SEC | UGLines-CS |
| (595) Maintenance of line transformers | DEM | 368P | 368S |  |
| (596) Maintenance of street lighting and signal sys | ms |  |  | CUS |
| (597) Maintenance of meters |  |  |  | CUS |
| (598) Maintenance of miscellaneous distribution । | DistMtExp-SUB | DistMtExp-PRI | DistMtExp-SEC | DistMtExp-CS |
| Customer Accounts and Services |  |  |  |  |
| Meter Reading \& Billing |  |  |  | CUS |
| Other-Direct to Other |  |  |  | CUS |
| Uncollectibles |  |  |  | CUS |
| Misc. Cust Serv and Info Exp |  |  |  | CUS |
| Customer Rebates \& Incentives |  |  |  | CUS |
| Customer Assistance |  |  |  | CUS |
| Sales Expense |  |  |  | CUS |
| All Other Cust Accts \& Services |  |  |  | CUS |

$\qquad$
Exhibit TSL-4 Alternative CCOS Study

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allocation to Customer Classes CLASSIFICATION FACTORS | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| Administrative \& General Expense |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative and General Salaries | NONAGLAB-SUB | NONAGLAB-PRI | NONAGLAB-SEC | NONAGLAB-CS |
| Outside Services | NONAGLAB-SUB | NONAGLAB-PRI | NONAGLAB-SEC | NONAGLAB-CS |
| Employee Benefits (Acct. 926) | NONAGLAB-SUB | NONAGLAB-PRI | NONAGLAB-SEC | NONAGLAB-CS |
| Regulatory Commission Expenses (Acct 928) | DISTPLT-SUB | DISTPLT-PRI | DISTPLT-SEC | DISTPLT-CS |
| General Advertising Expense | OpExp-SUB | OpExp-PRI | OpExp-SEC | OpExp-CS |
| All Other O\&M | NONAGLAB-SUB | NONAGLAB-PRI | NONAGLAB-SEC | NONAGLAB-CS |
| DEPRECIATION EXPENSE |  |  |  |  |
| Depreciation Expense |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Plant DeprExp | DISTPLT-SUB | DISTPLT-PRI | DISTPLT-SEC | DISTPLT-CS |
| General Plant DeprExp | LABOR-SUB | LABOR-PRI | LABOR-SEC | LABOR-CS |
| Intangible Plant DeprExp | LABOR-SUB | LABOR-PRI | LABOR-SEC | LABOR-CS |
| Regulatory Debits and Credits |  |  |  |  |
| MD EDIS | DEM | DEM | DEM | DEM |
| MD Electric Vehicle Program | EVREGASSET-SUB | EVREGASSET-PRI | EVREGASSET-SEC | EVREGASSET-CS |
| MD Conservation Voltage Reduction (CVR) | DISTPLT-SUB | DISTPLT-PRI | DISTPLT-SEC | DISTPLT-CS |
| Deferral of Rate Case Expenses | DISTPLT-SUB | DISTPLT-PRI | DISTPLT-SEC | DISTPLT-CS |
| COVID-19 | DISTPLT-SUB | DISTPLT-PRI | DISTPLT-SEC | DISTPLT-CS |
| COVID-19-Residential Adjustment | DISTPLT-SUB | DISTPLT-PRI | DISTPLT-SEC | DISTPLT-CS |
| TAXES |  |  |  |  |
| Taxes Other than Income |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Payroll Taxes | DISTLAB-SUB | DISTLAB-PRI | DISTLAB-SEC | DISTLAB-CS |
| Customer Account Payroll Taxes | CUSTLAB-SUB | CUSTLAB-PRI | CUSTLAB-SEC | CUSTLAB-CS |
| A\&G Payroll Taxes | AGLAB-SUB | AGLAB-PRI | AGLAB-SEC | AGLAB-CS |
| Gross Receipt Taxes | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| Property Taxes | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| Sales \& Use Tax | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| Montgomery County Fuel Energy | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |
| Other Taxes | RB-SUB | RB-PRI | RB-SEC | RB-CS |
| Income Taxes |  |  |  |  |
| State |  |  |  |  |
| Federal |  |  |  |  |
| Income Taxes Deferred - Net |  |  |  |  |
| Allowance for Funds Used During Construction | CWIP-SUB | CWIP-PRI | CWIP-SEC | CWIP-CS |
| Interest on Customer Deposits | TOTPLT-SUB | TOTPLT-PRI | TOTPLT-SEC | TOTPLT-CS |

Exhibit TSL-4 Alternative CCOS Study

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& I | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Summary of Allocators | Description | Total Company | Service <br> R | Schedule C\&G | Schedule CA-CSH | Schedule <br> PH | Schedule PP | Area Lighting ST LTNG |
| External Allocators |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12CP-GEN | Demand at Generation Level (ACP) | 100.00\% | 61.11\% | 9.67\% | 0.25\% | 21.56\% | 7.35\% | 0.06\% |
| 12CP-SUB | Demand for Subtransmission (ACP) | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| 1NCP-GEN | Demand at Generation Level (NCP) | 100.00\% | 55.41\% | 12.35\% | 0.36\% | 22.64\% | 8.70\% | 0.54\% |
| 1NCP-PRI | Demand at Primary Level (NCP) | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| 1NCP-SEC | Demand at Secondary Level (NCP) | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 13.96\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| 1NCPxLT-SEC | Demand at Sec Level w/o St Ltg (NCP) | 100.00\% | 65.17\% | 14.05\% | 0.38\% | 20.41\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Customers | Average Number of Customers | 100.00\% | 88.04\% | 10.97\% | 0.11\% | 0.59\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| Customers-PRI | Number of Customers at Primary Level | 100.00\% | 88.05\% | 10.97\% | 0.11\% | 0.59\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| Customers-SEC | Number of Customers at Secondary Level | 100.00\% | 88.08\% | 10.96\% | 0.11\% | 0.56\% | 0.00\% | 0.28\% |
| Revenue | Revenue from Sales (Distr) | 100.00\% | 62.15\% | 18.38\% | 0.32\% | 14.42\% | 1.02\% | 3.70\% |
| LatePayment | Late Payment Charges | 100.00\% | 65.45\% | 17.55\% | 0.20\% | 15.14\% | 1.66\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSxLT-SEC | Number of Secondary Cust Excl St. Lighting | 100.00\% | 88.33\% | 10.99\% | 0.11\% | 0.56\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Meters | Meters | 100.00\% | 59.39\% | 28.15\% | 0.62\% | 10.16\% | 1.67\% | 0.00\% |
| StreetLighting | Direct to Street \& Area Lighting | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% |
| Deposits | Customer Deposits | 100.00\% | 54.64\% | 14.89\% | 0.00\% | 30.17\% | 0.00\% | 0.29\% |
| SalesREV | Revenue from Sales | 100.00\% | 63.76\% | 18.57\% | 0.32\% | 12.56\% | 0.78\% | 4.01\% |
| MontCoFuel | Montgomery Co. Fuel Tax | 100.00\% | 47.84\% | 18.22\% | 0.39\% | 32.12\% | 0.00\% | 1.43\% |
| MeterReading | Acct. 902-903 Meter Reading | 100.00\% | 85.45\% | 13.63\% | 0.18\% | 0.65\% | 0.00\% | 0.08\% |
| Uncollectibles | Acct. 904 Uncollectibles | 100.00\% | 99.92\% | 0.03\% | 0.00\% | 0.02\% | 0.02\% | 0.00\% |
| CustServices | Misc. Cust Serv and Info Exp | 100.00\% | 91.46\% | 7.68\% | 0.08\% | 0.26\% | 0.00\% | 0.51\% |
| COVID | Covid Allocation | 100.00\% | 83.01\% | 7.52\% | 0.13\% | 5.91\% | 3.01\% | 0.42\% |
| Res-Direct | Residential Direct Allocation | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CustAssist | Acct. 908 Customer Assistance | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |

## Internal Allocators

TOTPLT-SUB-D
TOTPLT-SUB-C

| 100.00\% | 63.07\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.16\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 100.00\% | 61.44\% | 13.41\% | 0.39\% | 23.93\% | 0.23\% | 0.60\% |
| 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 100.00\% | 64.81\% | 13.94\% | 0.37\% | 20.22\% | 0.04\% | 0.63\% |
| 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |

TOTPLT-CS-D
TOTPLT-CS-C
TOTPLT-CS-E
DISTPLT-SUB-D
DISTPLT-SUB-C
DISTPLT-SUB-E
DISTPLT-PRI-D
DISTPLT-PRI-C
DISTPLT-PRI-E
DISTPLT-SEC-D
DISTPLT-SEC-C
DISTPLT-SEC-E
DISTPLT-CS-D
DISTPLT-CS-C
DISTPLT-CS-E
GENPLT-SUB-D
GENPLT-SUB-C
GENPLT-SUB-E
GENPLT-PRI-D
GENPLT-PRI-C
GENPLT-PRI-E
GENPLT-SEC-D
GENPLT-SEC-C
GENPLT-SEC-E
GENPLT-CS-D
GENPLT-CS-C
GENPLT-CS-E
INTPLT-SUB-D
INTPLT-SUB-C
INTPLT-SUB-E

| 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100.00\% | 62.32\% | 15.20\% | 0.28\% | 3.83\% | 0.60\% | 17.78\% |
| 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 100.00\% | 64.75\% | 13.95\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.02\% | 0.63\% |
| 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |


| 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100.00\% | 59.98\% | 14.84\% | 0.27\% | 3.86\% | 0.59\% | 20.47\% |
| 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $100.00 \%$ | $64.76 \%$ | $13.96 \%$ | $0.37 \%$ | $20.28 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.63 \%$ |
| $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $72.05 \%$ | $16.84 \%$ | $0.30 \%$ | $3.62 \%$ | $0.53 \%$ | $6.65 \%$ |
| $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $100.00 \%$ | $63.01 \%$ | $9.90 \%$ | $0.26 \%$ | $22.23 \%$ | $4.54 \%$ | $0.06 \%$ |
| $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |


| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) Summary of Allocators |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& I | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting |
| INTPLT-PRI-D Description | Company | R | C\&, | CA-CSH | PH | PP | St LTNG |
|  | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| INTPLT-PRI-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| INTPLT-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| INTPLT-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 13.96\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| INTPLT-SEC-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| INTPLT-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| INTPLT-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| INTPLT-CS-C | 100.00\% | 72.05\% | 16.84\% | 0.30\% | 3.62\% | 0.53\% | 6.65\% |
| INTPLT-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| A\&G-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.10\% | 10.93\% | 0.26\% | 21.09\% | 4.10\% | 0.53\% |
| A\&G-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| A\&G-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A\&G-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 61.64\% | 14.03\% | 0.39\% | 22.67\% | 0.28\% | 0.99\% |
| A\&G-PRI-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| A\&G-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A\&G-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.56\% | 14.86\% | 0.36\% | 18.78\% | 0.15\% | 1.28\% |
| A\&G-SEC-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| A\&G-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A\&G-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| A\&G-CS-C | 100.00\% | 71.80\% | 16.89\% | 0.30\% | 3.92\% | 0.54\% | 6.55\% |
| A\&G-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RB-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.28\% | 9.81\% | 0.26\% | 21.97\% | 4.63\% | 0.06\% |
| RB-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| RB-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RB-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 61.62\% | 13.37\% | 0.40\% | 23.76\% | 0.25\% | 0.60\% |
| RB-PRI-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Rb-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rb-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 65.04\% | 13.91\% | 0.38\% | 19.99\% | 0.05\% | 0.63\% |
| Rb-SEC-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Rb-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RB-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| RB-CS-C | 100.00\% | 62.57\% | 15.20\% | 0.28\% | 3.34\% | 0.62\% | 17.99\% |
| RB-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CWIP-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.07\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.16\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| CWIP-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CWIP-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CWIP-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 61.44\% | 13.41\% | 0.39\% | 23.93\% | 0.23\% | 0.60\% |
| CWIP-PRI-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CWIP-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CWIP-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.81\% | 13.94\% | 0.37\% | 20.22\% | 0.04\% | 0.63\% |
| CWIP-SEC-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CWIP-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CWIP-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CWIP-CS-C | 100.00\% | 62.32\% | 15.20\% | 0.28\% | 3.83\% | 0.60\% | 17.78\% |
| CWIP-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LABOR-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| LABOR-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| LABOR-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LABOR-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| LABOR-PRI-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| LABOR-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LABOR-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 13.96\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| LABOR-SEC-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| LABOR-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LABOR-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| LABOR-CS-C | 100.00\% | 72.05\% | 16.84\% | 0.30\% | 3.62\% | 0.53\% | 6.65\% |
| LABOR-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  | 22.23\% |  |  |
| DISTLAB-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| DISTLAB-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DISTLAB-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |

Exhibit TSL-4 Alternative CCOS Study

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& | Medium Power | Large Power Schedule PP | Street andArea LightingST LTNG |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Summary of Allocators | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule |  |  |
| Description | Company | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH |  |  |
| DISTLAB-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| DISTLAB-PRI-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DISTLAB-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DISTLAB-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 1396\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| distlab-EEC-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DISTLAB-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DISTLAB-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DISTLAB-CS-C | 100.00\% | 61.97\% | 19.29\% | 0.38\% | 5.85\% | 0.93\% | 11.58\% |
| DISTLAB-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSTLAB-SUB-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSTLAB-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSTLAB-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSTLAB-PRI-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSTLAB-PRI-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSTLAB-PRIE | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSTLAB-SEC-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSTLAB-SEC-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSTLAB-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| CUSTLAB-CS-d | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| custlab-Cs-c | 100.00\% | 85.51\% | 13.58\% | 0.18\% | 0.65\% | 0.00\% | 0.08\% |
| CUSTLAB-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| AGLAB-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| AGLAB-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| AGLAB-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| AGLAB-PrI-D | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| AGLAB-PRI-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| AGLAB-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| AGLAB-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 13.96\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| Aglab-sec-c | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| AGLAb-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| AGLAB-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| AGLAB-CS-C | 100.00\% | 72.05\% | 16.84\% | 0.30\% | 3.62\% | 0.53\% | 6.65\% |
| AGLAB-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NONAGLAB-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| NONAGLAB-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NONAGLAB-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NONAGLAB-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| nonaglab-pl-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| nonaglab-pri-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NONAGLAB-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 13.96\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| nonaglab-sec-c | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NONAGLAB-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NonagLAB-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| NoNAGLAB-CS-C | 100.00\% | 72.05\% | 16.84\% | 0.30\% | 3.62\% | 0.53\% | 6.65\% |
| NONAGLAB-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| ratebase-sub-d | 100.00\% | 63.28\% | 9.81\% | 0.26\% | 21.97\% | 4.63\% | 0.06\% |
| Ratebase-sub-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| ratebase-sub-e | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| RATEBASE-Pri-D | 100.00\% | 61.62\% | 13.37\% | 0.40\% | 23.76\% | 0.25\% | 0.60\% |
| RATEBASE-Pri-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| RATEBASE-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Ratebase-sec-d | 100.00\% | 65.04\% | 13.91\% | 0.38\% | 19.99\% | 0.05\% | 0.63\% |
| Ratebase-sec-c | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Ratebase-sec-e | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| RATEBASE-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| ratebase-cs-c | 100.00\% | 62.57\% | 15.20\% | 0.28\% | 3.34\% | 0.62\% | 17.99\% |
| ratebase-cs-e | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Distopexp-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| Distopexp-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistOpexp-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Distopexp-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| Distopexp-PRI-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Distopexp-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Distopexp-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 13.96\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| Distopexp-SEC-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistOpExp-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |

Exhibit TSL-4 Alternative CCOS Study

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  | Residential | Small C \& I | Small C \& 1 | Medium Power | Large Power | Street and |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Summary of Allocators Description | Total | Service | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Schedule | Area Lighting |
|  | Company | R | c\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | St LTNG |
| Distopexp-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistOpExp-Cs-C <br> DistOpExp-CS-E | 100.00\% | 61.19\% | 21.88\% | 0.45\% | 7.11\% | 1.15\% | 8.21\% |
|  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| OHLines-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| OHLines-SUB-C OHLines-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| OHLines-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| OHLines-PRI-C <br> OHLines-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| OHLines-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 13.96\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| OHLines-SEC-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| OHLines-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| OHLines-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| OHLines-CS-C | 100.00\% | 88.33\% | 10.99\% | 0.11\% | 0.56\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| OHLines-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| UGLines-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| UGLines-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| UGLines-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| UGLines-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| UGLines-PRI-C UGLines-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| UGLines-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 13.96\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| UGLines-SEC-C UGLines-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| UGLines-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| UGLines-CS-C | 100.00\% | 88.33\% | 10.99\% | 0.11\% | 0.56\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| UGLines-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistMtexp-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| DistMtExp-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistMtExp-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistMtExp-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| DistMtExp-PRI-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistMtExp-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistMtExp-SEC-D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 13.96\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| DistMtExp-SEC-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistMtExp-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DistMtExp-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistMtExp-CS-C | 100.00\% | 74.19\% | 13.20\% | 0.20\% | 2.34\% | 0.32\% | 9.74\% |
| DistMtExp-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OpExp-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 63.01\% | 9.90\% | 0.26\% | 22.23\% | 4.54\% | 0.06\% |
| OpExp-SUB-C OpExp-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| OpExp-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 61.37\% | 13.43\% | 0.40\% | 24.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.60\% |
| OpExp-PRI-C <br> OpExp-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OpExp-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 64.76\% | 13.96\% | 0.37\% | 20.28\% | 0.00\% | 0.63\% |
| OpExp-SEC-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| OpExp-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OpExp-CS-D | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| OpExp-CS-C | 100.00\% | 80.22\% | 13.17\% | 0.21\% | 2.10\% | 0.28\% | 4.02\% |
| OpExp-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DISTPLTxRES-SUB-D | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 26.77\% | 0.69\% | 60.10\% | 12.28\% | 0.17\% |
| DISTPLTxRES-SUB-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DISTPLTxRES-SUB-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DISTPLTxRES-PRI-D | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 34.76\% | 1.02\% | 62.13\% | 0.55\% | 1.54\% |
| DISTPLTxRES-PRI-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DISTPLTxRES-PRI-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DISTPLTxRES-SEC-D | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 39.59\% | 1.06\% | 57.53\% | 0.04\% | 1.78\% |
| DISTPLTxRES-SEC-C | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DISTPLTxRES-SEC-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DISTPLTxRES-CS-D DISTPLTXRES-CS-C DISTPLTxRES-CS-E | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
|  | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 37.07\% | 0.68\% | 9.63\% | 1.49\% | 51.13\% |
|  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |

$\qquad$

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Summary of Classifiers    <br> Classifier Description Classifier Code  Total | - Demand | - Customer |  |

## External Classifiers

| Common |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Customer Factor | CUS | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Demand Factor | DEM | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Commodity Factor | COM | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% |
| 360 Primary Classifier | 360P | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 360 Secondary Classifier | 360S | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 364 Primary Classifier | 364P | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 364 Secondary Classifier | 364S | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 365 Primary Classifier | 365P | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 365 Secondary Classifier | 365S | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 366 Primary Classifier | 366P | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 366 Secondary Classifier | 366 S | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 367 Primary Classifier | 367P | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 367 Secondary Classifier | 367S | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 368 Primary Classifier | 368P | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 368 Secondary Classifier | 368 S | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| 369 Classifier | 369 | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% |

Internal Classifiers - Derivation and Supporting Data

## TOTPLT

Total Plant Subtransmission
Total Plant Primary
Total Plant Secondary
Total Plant Customer

TOTPLT-SUB TOTPLT-PRI TOTPLT-SEC TOTPLT-CS

| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |



DISTPLT-SUB
DISTPLT-PRI DISTPLT-SEC DISTPLT-CS

| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |

## GENPLT

General Plant Subtransmission
General Plant Primary
General Plant Secondary
General Plant Customer
GENPLT-SUB GENPLT-PRI GENPLT-SEC GENPLT-CS

| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |

## INTPLT

Intangible Plant Subtransmission
Intangible Plant Primary
Intangible Plant Secondary
Intangible Plant Customer

INTPLT-SUB INTPLT-PRI INTPLT-SEC INTPLT-CS

| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |

## The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) <br> Summary of Classifiers

Classifier Description
Classifier Code
Total


- Demand
- Customer
- Commodity


## A\&G

| A\&G Subtransmission | A\&G-SUB |
| :--- | :--- |
| A\&G Primary | A\&G-PRI |
| A\&G Secondary | A\&G-SEC |


| RB |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Rate Base Subtransmission | RB-SUB |
| Rate Base Primary | RB-PRI |
| Rate Base Secondary | RB-SEC |
| Rate Base Customer | RB-CS |


| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |


| CWIP |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| CWIP Subtransmission |  |
| CWIP Primary | CWIP-SUB |
| CWIP Secondary | CWIP-PRI |
| CWIP Customer | CWIP-CS |
|  |  |
| LABOR |  |
| LABOR Subtransmission | LABOR-SUB |
| LABOR Primary | LABOR-PRI |
| LABOR Secondary | LABOR-SEC |
| LABOR Customer | LABOR-CS |


| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |


| Dist Labor |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Dist Labor Subtransmission | DISTLAB-SUB |
| Dist Labor Primary | DISTLAB-PRI |
| Dist Labor Secondary | DISTLAB-SEC |
| Dist Labor Customer | DISTLAB-CS |


| Cust Labor |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Cust Labor Subtransmission | CUSTLAB-SUB |
| Cust Labor Primary | CUSTLAB-PRI |
| Cust Labor Secondary | CUSTLAB-SEC |
| Cust Labor Customer | CUSTLAB-CS |


| A\&G Labor |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| A\&G Labor Subtransmission |  |
| A\&G Labor Primary | AGLAB-SUB |
| A\&G Labor Secondary | AGLAB-PRI |
| A\&G Labor Customer | AGLAB-SEC |

nonaglab-sub NONAGLAB-PRI nonaglab-sec NONAGLAB-CS

| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |

$\qquad$

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Summary of Classifiers <br> Classifier Description | Classifier Code | Total | - Demand | - Customer | - Commodity |
| Rate Base Subtransmission | RATEBASE-SUB | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Rate Base Primary | RATEBASE-PRI | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Rate Base Secondary | RATEBASE-SEC | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Rate Base Customer | RATEBASE-CS | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistOpExp |  |  |  |  |  |
| DistOpExp Subtransmission | DistOpExp-SUB | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistOpExp Primary | DistOpExp-PRI | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistOpExp Secondary | DistOpExp-SEC | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistOpExp Customer | DistOpExp-CS | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Overhead Lines |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overhead Lines Subtransmission | OHLines-SUB | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Overhead Lines Primary | OHLines-PRI | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Overhead Lines Secondary | OHLines-SEC | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Overhead Lines Customer | OHLines-CS | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% |
| U/G Lines |  |  |  |  |  |
| U/G Lines Subtransmission | UGLines-SUB | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| U/G Lines Primary | UGLines-PRI | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| U/G Lines Secondary | UGLines-SEC | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| U/G Lines Customer | UGLines-CS | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistMtExp |  |  |  |  |  |
| DistMtExp Subtransmission | DistMtExp-SUB | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistMtExp Primary | DistMtExp-PRI | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistMtExp Secondary | DistMtExp-SEC | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| DistMtExp Customer | DistMtExp-CS | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Expenses Subtransmission | OpExp-SUB | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Operating Expenses Primary | OpExp-PRI | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Operating Expenses Secondary | OpExp-SEC | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Operating Expenses Customer | OpExp-CS | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Dist. Plant excl. Residential |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dist. Plant excl. Res Subtransmission | DISTPLTxRES-SUB | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Dist. Plant excl. Res Primary | DISTPLTxRES-PRI | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Dist. Plant excl. Res Secondary | DISTPLTxRES-SEC | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Dist. Plant excl. Res Customer | DISTPLTxRES-CS | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% |

$\qquad$
Exhibit TSL-4 Alternative CCOS Study

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Factors |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Code | Total | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EXTERNAL FUNCTIONAL FACTORS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Customer Service Only | CUSTSERVICE | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Primary Distribution Only | PRIMARY | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Secondary Distribution Only | SECONDARY | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Subtransmission Only | SUBTRANSMISSION | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Account 360 Land and Land Rights | ACC360 | 100.0\% | 6.9\% | 54.5\% | 38.6\% | 0.0\% |
| Account 361 Structures and Improvements | ACC361 | 100.0\% | 0.1\% | 99.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Account 362 Station Equipment | ACC362 | 100.0\% | 0.5\% | 99.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Account 364 Poles, Towers \& Fixtures | ACC364 | 100.0\% | 29.5\% | 4.0\% | 66.6\% | 0.0\% |
| Account 365 Overhead Conductors \& Devices | ACC365 | 100.0\% | 42.8\% | 3.0\% | 54.2\% | 0.0\% |
| Account 366 Underground Conduit | ACC366 | 100.0\% | 27.8\% | 3.7\% | 68.6\% | 0.0\% |
| Account 367 Underground Conductors \& Device | ACC367 | 100.0\% | 30.3\% | 1.5\% | 68.2\% | 0.0\% |
| Account 368 Transformers | ACC368 | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.2\% | 99.8\% | 0.0\% |
| INTERNAL FUNCTIONAL FACTORS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rate Base Factor | RB | 100.0\% | 19.2\% | 16.9\% | 49.5\% | 14.4\% |
| Total Distribution Plant Factor | DISTPLT | 100.0\% | 19.3\% | 17.1\% | 51.5\% | 12.1\% |
| Total Utility Plant Factor | TOTPLT | 100.0\% | 19.2\% | 17.0\% | 49.9\% | 14.0\% |
| Total General Plant Factor | GENPLT | 100.0\% | 17.5\% | 15.7\% | 25.9\% | 40.9\% |
| Overhead and Service Lines Factor | OHLINES | 100.0\% | 35.3\% | 2.5\% | 44.7\% | 17.4\% |
| Underground Lines Factor | UG LINES | 100.0\% | 28.3\% | 1.8\% | 64.7\% | 5.2\% |
| Distribution Operating Expenses Factor | DISTOPEXP | 100.0\% | 22.4\% | 5.0\% | 39.0\% | 33.7\% |
| Distribution Maintenance Expenses Factor | DISTMTEXP | 100.0\% | 29.2\% | 12.6\% | 38.5\% | 19.8\% |
| Labor Expenses | LABOR | 100.0\% | 17.5\% | 15.7\% | 25.9\% | 40.9\% |
| Dist Labor Expenses | distlab | 100.0\% | 21.2\% | 19.1\% | 31.4\% | 28.4\% |
| Customer Labor Expenses | CUSTLAB | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| A\&G Labor Expenses | AGLAB | 100.0\% | 17.5\% | 15.7\% | 25.9\% | 40.9\% |
| Non-A\&G Labor Expenses | NONAGLAB | 100.0\% | 17.5\% | 15.7\% | 25.9\% | 40.9\% |
| Total Operating Expenses excl. A\&G Factor | OPEXP | 100.0\% | 20.8\% | 7.9\% | 29.4\% | 41.9\% |
| INTERNAL FUNCTIONAL FACTORS DERIVATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Distribution Plant |  | 1,370,353,215 | 264,958,327 | 233,684,367 | 705,760,924 | 165,949,597 |
| Total Distribution Plant Factor | DISTPLT | 100.0\% | 19.3\% | 17.1\% | 51.5\% | 12.1\% |
| Total General Plant |  | 94,864,996 | 16,571,017 | 14,919,176 | 24,552,383 | 38,822,420 |
| Total General Plant Factor | GENPLT | 100.0\% | 17.5\% | 15.7\% | 25.9\% | 40.9\% |
| Total Utility Plant |  | 1,474,004,730 | 283,228,221 | 250,101,895 | 734,838,550 | 205,836,063 |
| Total Utility Plant Factor | TOTPLT | 100.0\% | 19.2\% | 17.0\% | 49.9\% | 14.0\% |
| Overhead and Service Lines (Accts. 365, 3690H) |  | 296,947,998 | 104,904,585 | 7,476,890 | 132,766,709 | 51,799,814 |
| Overhead and Service Lines Factor | Ohlines | 100.0\% | 35.3\% | 2.5\% | 44.7\% | 17.4\% |
| Underground Lines (Acct. 366-367, 369UG) |  | 410,866,051 | 116,371,686 | 7,422,638 | 265,820,427 | 21,251,299 |
| Underground Lines Factor | UG LINES | 100.0\% | 28.3\% | 1.8\% | 64.7\% | 5.2\% |
| Distribution Operating Expenses |  | 3,869,177 | 865,012 | 191,581 | 1,508,516 | 1,304,067 |
| Distribution Operating Expenses Factor | DISTOPEXP | 100.0\% | 22.4\% | 5.0\% | 39.0\% | $33.7 \%$ |
| Distribution Maintenance Expenses |  | 24,178,759 | 7,055,010 | 3,040,287 | 9,302,164 | 4,781,299 |
| Distribution Maintenance Expenses Factor | DISTMTEXP | 100.0\% | 29.2\% | 12.6\% | 38.5\% | 19.8\% |
| Total Operating Expenses excl. A\&G |  | 44,385,845 | 9,213,081 | 3,527,856 | 13,046,172 | 18,598,735 |
| Total Operating Expenses excl. A\&G Factor | OPEXP | 100.0\% | 20.8\% | 7.9\% | 29.4\% | 41.9\% |

Exhibit TSL-4 Alternative CCOS Study

| The Potomac Edison Company (Maryland) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Functional Factors |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Code | Total | Sub-Transmission | Primary | Secondary | Customer Service |
| Revenue Requirement |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rate Base |  | 718,525,219 | 137,876,780 | 121,783,036 | 355,642,109 | 103,223,294 |
| Required Return on Rate Base |  | 7.54\% | 7.54\% | 7.54\% | 7.54\% | 7.54\% |
| Required Net Income |  | 54,188,230 | 10,398,102 | 9,184,378 | 26,821,072 | 7,784,678 |
| O\&M Expenses |  | 56,655,385 | 11,382,575 | 5,471,518 | 16,563,069 | 23,238,223 |
| Depreciation \& Amortization |  | 33,822,024 | 6,484,474 | 5,728,537 | 16,663,941 | 4,945,072 |
| Regulatory Debits and Credits |  | 1,288,352 | 249,300 | 219,841 | 666,228 | 152,984 |
| Taxes Other than Income |  | 30,607,318 | 5,849,161 | 5,167,356 | 15,026,790 | 4,564,010 |
| Total Expenses |  | 122,373,079 | 23,965,511 | 16,587,252 | 48,920,028 | 32,900,289 |
| Allowance for Funds Used During Construction |  | 2,609,343 | 501,382 | 442,740 | 1,300,841 | 364,379 |
| Interest on Customer Deposits |  | $(17,180)$ | $(3,301)$ | $(2,915)$ | $(8,565)$ | $(2,399)$ |
| Income Taxes |  | 10,884,154 | 2,088,545 | 1,844,758 | 5,387,234 | 1,563,617 |
| Revenue Requirement |  | 190,037,627 | 36,950,239 | 28,056,213 | 82,420,611 | 42,610,564 |

PE Operating Company Peaks - Potomac Edison Maryland January 2019 - December 2019

Rate Class Coincident Monthly Peaks

| Monthly |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | Hour (HE EST) | Peak (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| 1/31/2019 | 8 | 1,681,432 | 1,134,896 | 151,826 | 5,749 | 304,066 | 83,304 | 1,590 |
| 2/1/2019 | 8 | 1,474,898 | 926,554 | 130,192 | 5,653 | 295,979 | 116,521 | - |
| 3/6/2019 | 7 | 1,355,177 | 861,906 | 125,846 | 4,639 | 255,353 | 106,470 | 964 |
| 4/1/2019 | 8 | 1,087,826 | 673,856 | 92,335 | 2,710 | 224,109 | 94,816 | - |
| 5/28/2019 | 18 | 1,229,482 | 600,894 | 116,633 | 2,703 | 391,570 | 117,682 | - |
| 6/28/2019 | 17 | 1,255,981 | 677,024 | 138,431 | 3,331 | 332,287 | 104,907 | - |
| 7/21/2019 | 18 | 1,439,123 | 923,396 | 146,193 | 3,501 | 284,778 | 81,255 | - |
| 8/19/2019 | 18 | 1,325,301 | 764,553 | 135,708 | 2,954 | 313,998 | 108,088 | - |
| 9/4/2019 | 18 | 1,258,278 | 740,193 | 115,539 | 2,729 | 300,290 | 99,528 | - |
| 10/2/2019 | 17 | 1,185,141 | 500,848 | 175,475 | 4,290 | 382,565 | 121,963 | - |
| 11/13/2019 | 8 | 1,158,620 | 727,807 | 106,022 | 3,251 | 221,274 | 100,267 | - |
| 12/20/2019 | 8 | 1,337,163 | 859,872 | 132,459 | 4,897 | 237,004 | 101,741 | 1,191 |
|  | Average 12 CP | 1,315,702 | 782,650 | 130,555 | 3,867 | 295,273 | 103,045 | 312 |
| \% ACP | Allocator (Gen) | 100.00\% | 59.49\% | 9.92\% | 0.29\% | 22.44\% | 7.83\% | 0.02\% |

Rate Class Coincident Monthly Peaks
At Sub-transmission Voltage Level

| Date | Hour (HE EST) | Monthly Peak (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1/31/2019 | 8 | 1,628,174 | 1,134,896 | 151,826 | 5,749 | 283,899 | 50,214 | 1,590 |
| 2/1/2019 | 8 | 1,423,777 | 926,554 | 130,192 | 5,653 | 268,325 | 93,053 | - |
| 3/6/2019 | 7 | 1,292,830 | 861,906 | 125,846 | 4,639 | 231,279 | 68,197 | 964 |
| 4/1/2019 | 8 | 1,029,946 | 673,856 | 92,335 | 2,710 | 203,626 | 57,419 | - |
| 5/28/2019 | 18 | 1,143,959 | 600,894 | 116,633 | 2,703 | 352,574 | 71,155 | - |
| 6/28/2019 | 17 | 1,188,095 | 677,024 | 138,431 | 3,331 | 302,327 | 66,981 | - |
| 7/21/2019 | 18 | 1,403,219 | 923,396 | 146,193 | 3,501 | 278,413 | 51,715 | - |
| 8/19/2019 | 18 | 1,283,990 | 764,553 | 131,476 | 2,954 | 313,998 | 71,008 | - |
| 9/4/2019 | 18 | 1,219,915 | 740,193 | 112,001 | 2,729 | 300,290 | 64,703 | - |
| 10/2/2019 | 17 | 1,132,848 | 500,848 | 169,901 | 4,290 | 382,565 | 75,244 | - |
| 11/13/2019 | 8 | 1,116,807 | 727,807 | 102,598 | 3,251 | 221,274 | 61,878 | - |
| 12/20/2019 | 8 | 1,294,764 | 859,872 | 128,003 | 4,897 | 237,004 | 63,798 | 1,191 |
|  | Average 12 CP | 1,263,194 | 782,650 | 128,786 | 3,867 | 281,298 | 66,280 | 312 |
| \% ACP | Allocator (Sub) | 100.00\% | 61.96\% | 10.20\% | 0.31\% | 22.27\% | 5.25\% | 0.02\% |

Rate Class Coincident Monthly Peaks
At Primary Voltage Level

| Monthly |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | Hour (HE EST) | Peak (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| 1/31/2019 | 8 | 1,570,408 | 1,134,896 | 151,407 | 5,749 | 274,967 | 1,799 | 1,590 |
| 2/1/2019 | 8 | 1,326,208 | 926,554 | 129,874 | 5,653 | 259,697 | 4,429 | - |
| 3/6/2019 | 7 | 1,219,775 | 861,906 | 125,483 | 4,639 | 223,894 | 2,890 | 964 |
| 4/1/2019 | 8 | 968,681 | 673,856 | 92,031 | 2,710 | 197,131 | 2,953 | - |
| 5/28/2019 | 18 | 1,064,665 | 600,894 | 116,190 | 2,703 | 341,380 | 3,498 | - |
| 6/28/2019 | 17 | 1,114,910 | 677,024 | 137,979 | 3,331 | 293,026 | 3,550 | - |
| 7/21/2019 | 18 | 1,346,333 | 923,396 | 145,831 | 3,501 | 270,460 | 3,145 | - |
| 8/19/2019 | 18 | 1,207,423 | 764,553 | 131,117 | 2,954 | 304,744 | 4,055 | - |
| 9/4/2019 | 18 | 1,149,907 | 740,193 | 111,684 | 2,729 | 291,606 | 3,696 | - |
| 10/2/2019 | 17 | 1,049,695 | 500,848 | 169,458 | 4,290 | 371,183 | 3,916 | - |
| 11/13/2019 | 8 | 1,050,746 | 727,807 | 102,290 | 3,251 | 214,420 | 2,979 | - |
| 12/20/2019 | 8 | 1,223,870 | 859,872 | 127,654 | 4,897 | 227,574 | 2,683 | 1,191 |
|  | Average 12 CP | 1,191,052 | 782,650 | 128,416 | 3,867 | 272,507 | 3,299 | 312 |
| \% AC | Allocator (Pri) | 100.00\% | 65.71\% | 10.78\% | 0.32\% | 22.88\% | 0.28\% | 0.03\% |

Rate Class Coincident Monthly Peaks
At Secondary Voltage Level

| Monthly |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | Hour (HE EST) | Peak (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| 1/31/2019 | 8 | 1,508,966 | 1,134,896 | 149,744 | 5,231 | 217,506 | - | 1,590 |
| 2/1/2019 | 8 | 1,265,809 | 926,554 | 128,381 | 5,147 | 205,727 | - | - |
| 3/6/2019 | 7 | 1,168,735 | 861,906 | 124,263 | 4,192 | 177,410 | - | 964 |
| 4/1/2019 | 8 | 923,310 | 673,856 | 91,098 | 2,364 | 155,993 | - | - |
| 5/28/2019 | 18 | 990,640 | 600,894 | 114,843 | 2,305 | 272,599 | - | - |
| 6/28/2019 | 17 | 1,053,404 | 677,024 | 136,529 | 2,880 | 236,971 | - | - |
| 7/21/2019 | 18 | 1,290,584 | 923,396 | 144,472 | 3,006 | 219,709 | - | - |
| 8/19/2019 | 18 | 1,144,108 | 764,553 | 129,895 | 2,526 | 247,134 | - | - |
| 9/4/2019 | 18 | 1,090,957 | 740,193 | 110,650 | 2,324 | 237,790 | - | - |
| 10/2/2019 | 17 | 972,551 | 500,848 | 167,471 | 3,569 | 300,662 | - | - |
| 11/13/2019 | 8 | 1,003,580 | 727,807 | 100,958 | 2,810 | 172,005 | - | - |
| 12/20/2019 | 8 | 1,172,848 | 859,872 | 126,190 | 4,342 | 181,254 | - | 1,191 |
|  | Average 12 CP | 1,132,124 | 782,650 | 127,041 | 3,391 | 218,730 | - | 312 |
| \% AC | Allocator (Sec) | 100.00\% | 69.13\% | 11.22\% | 0.30\% | 19.32\% | 0.00\% | 0.03\% |

Rate Class Coincident Monthly Peaks

| TVonthly |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | Hour (HE EST) | Peak (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| 1/22/2020 | 8 | 1,343,948 | 850,656 | 137,571 | 4,353 | 259,699 | 89,923 | 1,746 |
| 2/15/2020 | 8 | 1,295,673 | 903,826 | 99,629 | 3,644 | 206,564 | 82,010 | - |
| 3/1/2020 | 8 | 1,058,995 | 689,888 | 94,814 | 2,986 | 190,014 | 81,294 | - |
| 4/17/2020 | 8 | 898,931 | 588,419 | 77,442 | 2,187 | 155,521 | 75,362 | - |
| 5/29/2020 | 14 | 1,060,603 | 427,410 | 140,904 | 3,593 | 360,221 | 128,475 | - |
| 6/10/2020 | 17 | 1,244,677 | 675,320 | 141,843 | 2,797 | 317,159 | 107,558 | - |
| 7/20/2020 | 17 | 1,420,327 | 832,746 | 160,596 | 3,456 | 317,227 | 106,303 | - |
| 8/12/2020 | 17 | 1,323,681 | 723,848 | 163,373 | 3,382 | 325,817 | 107,262 | - |
| 9/10/2020 | 18 | 1,113,265 | 613,173 | 103,881 | 2,329 | 295,455 | 98,427 | - |
| 10/31/2020 | 9 | 858,675 | 560,283 | 65,609 | 1,346 | 151,669 | 79,768 | - |
| 11/19/2020 | 8 | 1,066,543 | 676,661 | 89,613 | 2,434 | 197,260 | 100,574 | - |
| 12/16/2020 | 18 | 1,270,938 | 773,688 | 142,169 | 4,167 | 257,694 | 88,795 | 4,424 |
|  | Average 12 CP | 1,163,021 | 692,993 | 118,120 | 3,056 | 252,858 | 95,479 | 514 |
| \% ACP | Allocator (Gen) | 100.00\% | 59.59\% | 10.16\% | 0.26\% | 21.74\% | 8.21\% | 0.04\% |

Rate Class Coincident Monthly Peaks
At Sub-transmission Voltage Level

| Monthly |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | Hour (HE EST) | Peak (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| 1/22/2020 | 8 | 1,303,150 | 850,656 | 133,607 | 4,353 | 259,699 | 53,090 | 1,746 |
| 2/15/2020 | 8 | 1,272,157 | 903,826 | 96,967 | 3,644 | 206,564 | 61,155 | - |
| 3/1/2020 | 8 | 1,029,741 | 689,888 | 91,892 | 2,986 | 190,014 | 54,961 | - |
| 4/17/2020 | 8 | 866,662 | 588,419 | 75,260 | 2,187 | 155,521 | 45,275 | - |
| 5/29/2020 | 14 | 999,633 | 427,410 | 137,779 | 3,593 | 360,221 | 70,630 | - |
| 6/10/2020 | 17 | 1,198,654 | 675,320 | 139,240 | 2,797 | 317,159 | 64,138 | - |
| 7/20/2020 | 17 | 1,377,311 | 832,746 | 158,448 | 3,456 | 317,227 | 65,435 | - |
| 8/12/2020 | 17 | 1,279,985 | 723,848 | 161,419 | 3,382 | 325,817 | 65,520 | - |
| 9/10/2020 | 18 | 1,076,863 | 613,173 | 102,431 | 2,329 | 295,455 | 63,475 | - |
| 10/31/2020 | 9 | 829,647 | 560,283 | 64,545 | 1,346 | 151,669 | 51,803 | - |
| 11/19/2020 | 8 | 1,023,511 | 676,661 | 87,716 | 2,434 | 197,260 | 59,438 | - |
| 12/16/2020 | 18 | 1,230,507 | 773,688 | 139,995 | 4,167 | 257,694 | 50,539 | 4,424 |
|  | Average 12 CP | 1,123,985 | 692,993 | 115,775 | 3,056 | 252,858 | 58,788 | 514 |
| \% ACP | Allocator (Sub) | 100.00\% | 61.66\% | 10.30\% | 0.27\% | 22.50\% | 5.23\% | 0.05\% |

Rate Class Coincident Monthly Peaks
At Primary Voltage Level

| Monthly |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | Hour (HE EST) | Peak (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| 1/22/2020 | 8 | 1,243,541 | 850,656 | 133,260 | 4,353 | 251,311 | 2,216 | 1,746 |
| 2/15/2020 | 8 | 1,206,951 | 903,826 | 96,640 | 3,644 | 199,918 | 2,923 | - |
| 3/1/2020 | 8 | 970,750 | 689,888 | 91,617 | 2,986 | 183,821 | 2,438 | - |
| 4/17/2020 | 8 | 817,735 | 588,419 | 75,039 | 2,187 | 150,263 | 1,827 | - |
| 5/29/2020 | 14 | 918,571 | 427,410 | 137,318 | 3,593 | 347,624 | 2,625 | - |
| 6/10/2020 | 17 | 1,126,323 | 675,320 | 138,824 | 2,797 | 306,424 | 2,959 | - |
| 7/20/2020 | 17 | 1,305,339 | 832,746 | 157,984 | 3,456 | 307,422 | 3,732 | - |
| 8/12/2020 | 17 | 1,204,817 | 723,848 | 161,007 | 3,382 | 312,815 | 3,765 | - |
| 9/10/2020 | 18 | 1,008,114 | 613,173 | 102,224 | 2,329 | 286,369 | 4,018 | - |
| 10/31/2020 | 9 | 774,914 | 560,283 | 64,347 | 1,346 | 146,679 | 2,260 | - |
| 11/19/2020 | 8 | 960,900 | 676,661 | 87,388 | 2,434 | 191,224 | 3,193 | - |
| 12/16/2020 | 18 | 1,173,724 | 773,688 | 139,411 | 4,167 | 249,708 | 2,326 | 4,424 |
| Average 12 CP |  | 1,059,307 | 692,993 | 115,422 | 3,056 | 244,465 | 2,857 | 514 |
| \% ACP Allocator (Pri) |  | 100.00\% | 65.42\% | 10.90\% | 0.29\% | 23.08\% | 0.27\% | 0.05\% |

Rate Class Coincident Monthly Peaks
At Secondary Voltage Level

| Monthly |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | Hour (HE EST) | Peak (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| 1/22/2020 | 8 | 1,187,869 | 850,656 | 132,118 | 3,904 | 199,445 | - | 1,746 |
| 2/15/2020 | 8 | 1,161,317 | 903,826 | 95,347 | 3,305 | 158,839 | - | - |
| 3/1/2020 | 8 | 929,305 | 689,888 | 90,396 | 2,671 | 146,350 | - | - |
| 4/17/2020 | 8 | 783,861 | 588,419 | 74,122 | 1,883 | 119,437 | - | - |
| 5/29/2020 | 14 | 840,224 | 427,410 | 135,999 | 2,968 | 273,848 | - | - |
| 6/10/2020 | 17 | 1,059,936 | 675,320 | 137,356 | 2,256 | 245,005 | - | - |
| 7/20/2020 | 17 | 1,240,156 | 832,746 | 156,556 | 2,886 | 247,968 | - | - |
| 8/12/2020 | 17 | 1,140,548 | 723,848 | 159,832 | 2,820 | 254,048 | - | - |
| 9/10/2020 | 18 | 948,423 | 613,173 | 101,280 | 1,968 | 232,002 | - | - |
| 10/31/2020 | 9 | 742,888 | 560,283 | 63,484 | 1,082 | 118,039 | - | - |
| 11/19/2020 | 8 | 916,466 | 676,661 | 85,904 | 2,048 | 151,853 | - | - |
| 12/16/2020 | 18 | 1,115,869 | 773,688 | 137,502 | 3,569 | 196,686 | - | 4,424 |
|  | Average 12 CP | 1,005,572 | 692,993 | 114,158 | 2,613 | 195,293 | - | 514 |
| \% ACP | Allocator (Sec) | 100.00\% | 68.92\% | 11.35\% | 0.26\% | 19.42\% | 0.00\% | 0.05\% |

PE 2023 Base Rate Case Filing
PE Operating Company Peaks - Potomac Edison Maryland
January 2021 - December 2021
Rate Class Coincident Monthly Peaks

| Monthly |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | Hour (HE EST) | Peak (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| 1/29/2021 | 8 | 1,269,576 | 816,372 | 132,118 | 4,927 | 245,526 | 68,859 | 1,775 |
| 2/8/2021 | 8 | 1,272,091 | 833,263 | 120,302 | 4,192 | 224,034 | 90,300 | - |
| 3/8/2021 | 7 | 1,166,644 | 770,928 | 112,598 | 3,769 | 197,069 | 81,472 | 809 |
| 4/2/2021 | 8 | 1,068,081 | 697,785 | 94,179 | 2,520 | 188,900 | 84,696 | - |
| 5/26/2021 | 15 | 1,112,704 | 433,906 | 164,558 | 3,681 | 393,172 | 117,386 | - |
| 6/29/2021 | 18 | 1,365,845 | 837,464 | 119,677 | 2,166 | 307,849 | 98,689 | - |
| 7/13/2021 | 18 | 1,377,013 | 828,179 | 131,199 | 2,761 | 315,144 | 99,730 | - |
| 8/12/2021 | 18 | 1,432,400 | 882,333 | 152,221 | 3,182 | 297,293 | 97,371 | - |
| 9/15/2021 | 17 | 1,200,727 | 603,700 | 158,687 | 3,581 | 334,056 | 100,704 | - |
| 10/4/2021 | 17 | 997,587 | 351,811 | 149,024 | 3,349 | 369,501 | 123,903 | - |
| 11/24/2021 | 8 | 1,131,849 | 704,389 | 100,706 | 2,427 | 221,176 | 103,150 | - |
| 12/20/2021 | 8 | 1,229,401 | 784,395 | 118,903 | 3,814 | 222,746 | 98,485 | 1,059 |
|  | Average 12 CP | 1,218,660 | 712,044 | 129,514 | 3,364 | 276,372 | 97,062 | 304 |
| \% ACP | Allocator (Gen) | 100.00\% | 58.43\% | 10.63\% | 0.28\% | 22.68\% | 7.96\% | 0.02\% |

Rate Class Coincident Monthly Peaks
At Sub-transmission Voltage Level

| Date | Hour (HE EST) | Monthly Peak (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1/29/2021 | 8 | 1,238,666 | 816,372 | 130,155 | 4,927 | 245,526 | 39,911 | 1,775 |
| 2/8/2021 | 8 | 1,248,041 | 833,263 | 118,589 | 4,192 | 224,034 | 67,963 | - |
| 3/8/2021 | 7 | 1,134,266 | 770,928 | 110,921 | 3,769 | 197,069 | 50,771 | 809 |
| 4/2/2021 | 8 | 1,030,500 | 697,785 | 92,675 | 2,520 | 188,900 | 48,618 | - |
| 5/26/2021 | 15 | 1,060,188 | 433,906 | 162,020 | 3,681 | 393,172 | 67,408 | - |
| 6/29/2021 | 18 | 1,323,247 | 837,464 | 118,185 | 2,166 | 307,849 | 57,583 | - |
| 7/13/2021 | 18 | 1,333,163 | 828,179 | 129,822 | 2,761 | 315,144 | 57,257 | - |
| 8/12/2021 | 18 | 1,393,307 | 882,333 | 150,475 | 3,182 | 297,293 | 60,024 | - |
| 9/15/2021 | 17 | 1,161,641 | 603,700 | 156,978 | 3,581 | 334,056 | 63,327 | - |
| 10/4/2021 | 17 | 945,813 | 351,811 | 147,155 | 3,349 | 369,501 | 73,997 | - |
| 11/24/2021 | 8 | 1,089,273 | 704,389 | 99,361 | 2,427 | 221,176 | 61,918 | - |
| 12/20/2021 | 8 | 1,186,763 | 784,395 | 117,013 | 3,814 | 222,746 | 57,737 | 1,059 |
|  | Average 12 CP | 1,178,739 | 712,044 | 127,779 | 3,364 | 276,372 | 58,876 | 304 |
| \% ACP | Allocator (Sub) | 100.00\% | 60.41\% | 10.84\% | 0.29\% | 23.45\% | 4.99\% | 0.03\% |

Rate Class Coincident Monthly Peaks
At Primary Voltage Level

| Date | Hour (HE EST) | Monthly Peak (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1/29/2021 | 8 | 1,192,169 | 816,372 | 129,498 | 4,927 | 237,660 | 1,939 | 1,775 |
| 2/8/2021 | 8 | 1,175,792 | 833,263 | 117,908 | 4,192 | 216,707 | 3,722 | - |
| 3/8/2021 | 7 | 1,078,523 | 770,928 | 109,803 | 3,769 | 190,726 | 2,487 | 809 |
| 4/2/2021 | 8 | 976,911 | 697,785 | 91,490 | 2,520 | 182,632 | 2,482 | - |
| 5/26/2021 | 15 | 975,841 | 433,906 | 160,459 | 3,681 | 374,414 | 3,380 | - |
| 6/29/2021 | 18 | 1,257,468 | 837,464 | 117,700 | 2,166 | 298,134 | 2,004 | - |
| 7/13/2021 | 18 | 1,267,786 | 828,179 | 129,325 | 2,761 | 305,367 | 2,153 | - |
| 8/12/2021 | 18 | 1,326,250 | 882,333 | 150,030 | 3,182 | 288,333 | 2,372 | - |
| 9/15/2021 | 17 | 1,089,514 | 603,700 | 156,503 | 3,581 | 323,155 | 2,576 | - |
| 10/4/2021 | 17 | 861,301 | 351,811 | 146,633 | 3,349 | 357,107 | 2,401 | - |
| 11/24/2021 | 8 | 1,021,061 | 704,389 | 98,960 | 2,427 | 213,393 | 1,891 | - |
| 12/20/2021 | 8 | 1,122,654 | 784,395 | 116,617 | 3,814 | 215,108 | 1,663 | 1,059 |
|  | Average 12 CP | 1,112,106 | 712,044 | 127,077 | 3,364 | 266,895 | 2,423 | 304 |
| \% AC | Allocator (Pri) | 100.00\% | 64.03\% | 11.43\% | 0.30\% | 24.00\% | 0.22\% | 0.03\% |

Rate Class Coincident Monthly Peaks
At Secondary Voltage Level

| Monthly |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date | Hour (HE EST) | Peak (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| 1/29/2021 | 8 | 1,137,163 | 816,372 | 127,922 | 4,442 | 186,653 | - | 1,775 |
| 2/8/2021 | 8 | 1,123,877 | 833,263 | 116,588 | 3,788 | 170,237 | - | - |
| 3/8/2021 | 7 | 1,033,151 | 770,928 | 108,285 | 3,343 | 149,787 | - | 809 |
| 4/2/2021 | 8 | 932,724 | 697,785 | 90,139 | 2,174 | 142,626 | - | - |
| 5/26/2021 | 15 | 893,504 | 433,906 | 157,887 | 3,091 | 298,620 | - | - |
| 6/29/2021 | 18 | 1,194,474 | 837,464 | 116,056 | 1,751 | 239,203 | - | - |
| 7/13/2021 | 18 | 1,203,940 | 828,179 | 127,778 | 2,329 | 245,654 | - | - |
| 8/12/2021 | 18 | 1,263,700 | 882,333 | 148,225 | 2,677 | 230,466 | - | - |
| 9/15/2021 | 17 | 1,021,565 | 603,700 | 154,427 | 3,015 | 260,424 | - | - |
| 10/4/2021 | 17 | 783,858 | 351,811 | 144,272 | 2,783 | 284,993 | - | - |
| 11/24/2021 | 8 | 973,445 | 704,389 | 97,340 | 2,054 | 169,662 | - | - |
| 12/20/2021 | 8 | 1,072,475 | 784,395 | 114,710 | 3,385 | 168,926 | - | 1,059 |
|  | Average 12 CP | 1,052,823 | 712,044 | 125,302 | 2,903 | 212,271 | - | 304 |
| \% AC | Allocator (Sec) | 100.00\% | 67.63\% | 11.90\% | 0.28\% | 20.16\% | 0.00\% | 0.03\% |

PE 2023 Base Rate Case Filing
PE Operating Company Peaks - Potomac Edison Maryland January 2019 - December 2019

Rate Class Non-Coincident Monthly Peaks
At Generation Voltage Level

| Month | Total (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| January | $1,769,876$ | $1,134,896$ | 193,078 | 7,313 | 340,683 | 88,381 | 5,525 |
| February | $1,656,387$ | 985,981 | 174,538 | 7,579 | 360,334 | 122,697 | 5,258 |
| March | $1,528,978$ | 861,906 | 155,462 | 5,727 | 364,580 | 131,839 | 9,464 |
| April | $1,295,391$ | 673,856 | 126,964 | 3,726 | 360,414 | 121,591 | 8,840 |
| May | $1,443,822$ | 668,454 | 167,529 | 3,881 | 441,297 | 150,673 | 11,989 |
| June | $1,410,166$ | 715,770 | 168,878 | 4,061 | 385,054 | 126,741 | 9,662 |
| July | $1,673,871$ | 923,396 | 210,202 | 5,033 | 399,289 | 126,397 | 9,554 |
| August | $1,501,534$ | 815,550 | 202,912 | 4,417 | 342,056 | 127,444 | 9,155 |
| September | $1,704,229$ | 763,100 | 284,252 | 6,714 | 388,584 | 248,826 | 12,753 |
| October | $1,669,144$ | 744,897 | 292,848 | 7,161 | 460,552 | 154,816 | 8,870 |
| November | $1,317,850$ | 727,807 | 135,199 | 4,143 | 310,097 | 132,719 | 7,887 |
| December | $1,466,576$ | 872,917 | 162,719 | 6,017 | 288,472 | 130,004 | 6,448 |
| Max NCP | $2,157,454$ | $1,134,896$ | 292,848 | 7,579 | 460,552 | 248,826 | 12,753 |
| \% NCP Allocator (Gen) | $100.00 \%$ | $52.60 \%$ | $13.57 \%$ | $0.35 \%$ | $21.35 \%$ | $11.53 \%$ | $0.59 \%$ |

Rate Class Non-Coincident Monthly Peaks
At Sub-transmission Voltage Level
At Sub-transmission Voltage Level

| Date | Total (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| January | $1,683,404$ | $1,134,896$ | 193,078 | 7,313 | 340,683 | 1,909 | 5,525 |
| February | $1,538,354$ | 985,981 | 174,538 | 7,579 | 360,334 | 4,664 | 5,258 |
| March | $1,400,718$ | 861,906 | 155,462 | 5,727 | 364,580 | 3,578 | 9,464 |
| April | $1,177,587$ | 673,856 | 126,964 | 3,726 | 360,414 | 3,787 | 8,840 |
| May | $1,297,628$ | 668,454 | 167,529 | 3,881 | 441,297 | 4,479 | 11,989 |
| June | $1,287,713$ | 715,770 | 168,878 | 4,061 | 385,054 | 4,289 | 9,662 |
| July | $1,552,365$ | 923,396 | 210,202 | 5,033 | 399,289 | 4,892 | 9,554 |
| August | $1,372,546$ | 815,550 | 196,586 | 4,417 | 342,056 | 4,781 | 9,155 |
| September | $1,455,941$ | 763,100 | 275,549 | 6,714 | 388,584 | 9,241 | 12,753 |
| October | $1,509,996$ | 744,897 | 283,546 | 7,161 | 460,552 | 4,971 | 8,870 |
| November | $1,184,711$ | 727,807 | 130,835 | 4,143 | 310,097 | 3,943 | 7,887 |
| December | $1,334,526$ | 872,917 | 157,245 | 6,017 | 288,472 | 3,429 | 6,448 |
| Max NCP | $1,908,567$ | $1,134,896$ | 283,546 | 7,579 | 460,552 | 9,241 | 12,753 |
| \% NCP Allocator (Sub) | $100.00 \%$ | $59,46 \%$ | $14.86 \%$ | $0.40 \%$ | $24.13 \%$ | $0.48 \%$ | $0.67 \%$ |

Rate Class Non-Coincident Monthly Peaks
At Primary Voltage Level

| At Primary Voltage Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Date | Total (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| January | $1,672,863$ | $1,134,896$ | 192,545 | 7,313 | 330,675 | 1,909 | 5,525 |
| February | $1,527,424$ | 985,981 | 174,113 | 7,579 | 349,830 | 4,664 | 5,258 |
| March | $1,389,726$ | 861,906 | 155,014 | 5,727 | 354,037 | 3,578 | 9,464 |
| April | $1,166,724$ | 673,856 | 126,547 | 3,726 | 349,969 | 3,787 | 8,840 |
| May | $1,284,378$ | 668,454 | 166,894 | 3,881 | 428,682 | 4,479 | 11,989 |
| June | $1,276,371$ | 715,770 | 168,327 | 4,061 | 374,263 | 4,289 | 9,662 |
| July | $1,540,690$ | 923,396 | 209,681 | 5,033 | 388,134 | 4,892 | 9,554 |
| August | $1,361,923$ | 815,550 | 196,049 | 4,417 | 331,971 | 4,781 | 9,155 |
| September | $1,443,912$ | 763,100 | 274,768 | 6,714 | 377,337 | 9,241 | 12,753 |
| October | $1,495,546$ | 744,897 | 282,806 | 7,161 | 446,842 | 4,971 | 8,870 |
| November | $1,174,713$ | 727,807 | 130,442 | 4,143 | 300,492 | 3,943 | 7,887 |
| December | $1,322,499$ | 872,917 | 156,816 | 6,017 | 276,874 | 3,429 | 6,448 |
| Max NCP | $1,894,117$ | $1,134,896$ | 282,806 | 7,579 | 446,842 | 9,241 | 12,753 |
| \% NCP Allocator (Pri) | $100.00 \%$ | $59.92 \%$ | $14.93 \%$ | $0.40 \%$ | $23.59 \%$ | $0.49 \%$ | $0.67 \%$ |

Rate Class Non-Coincident Monthly Peaks
At Secondary Voltage Level

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Datal (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |  |
| January | $1,583,111$ | $1,134,896$ | 190,429 | 6,653 | 243,699 | 1,909 | 5,525 |
| February | $1,425,373$ | 985,981 | 172,111 | 6,901 | 250,459 | 4,664 | 5,258 |
| March | $1,286,929$ | 861,906 | 153,507 | 5,176 | 253,298 | 3,578 | 9,464 |
| April | $1,065,865$ | 673,856 | 125,263 | 3,250 | 250,869 | 3,787 | 8,840 |
| May | $1,160,407$ | 668,454 | 164,959 | 3,309 | 307,217 | 4,479 | 11,989 |
| June | $1,174,383$ | 715,770 | 166,560 | 3,510 | 274,592 | 4,289 | 9,662 |
| July | $1,457,945$ | 923,396 | 207,729 | 4,320 | 308,053 | 4,892 | 9,554 |
| August | $1,296,700$ | 815,550 | 194,223 | 3,777 | 269,213 | 4,781 | 9,155 |
| September | $1,370,737$ | 763,100 | 272,224 | 5,718 | 307,700 | 9,241 | 12,753 |
| October | $1,406,131$ | 744,897 | 279,489 | 5,958 | 361,947 | 4,971 | 8,870 |
| November | $1,113,013$ | 727,807 | 128,746 | 3,581 | 241,051 | 3,943 | 7,887 |
| December | $1,263,664$ | 872,917 | 155,017 | 5,335 | 220,520 | 3,429 | 6,448 |
| Max NCP | $1,805,227$ | $1,134,896$ | 279,489 | 6,901 | 361,947 | 9,241 | 12,753 |
| \% NCP Allocator (Sec) | $100.00 \%$ | $62.87 \%$ | $15.48 \%$ | $0,38 \%$ | $20.05 \%$ | $0.51 \%$ | $0.71 \%$ |

PE 2023 Base Rate Case Filing
PE Operating Company Peaks - Potomac Edison Maryland January 2020 - December 2020

Rate Class Non-Coincident Monthly Peaks
At Generation Voltage Level

| Month | Total (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| January | $1,443,309$ | 850,656 | 195,817 | 6,198 | 290,344 | 93,333 | 6,961 |
| February | $1,456,958$ | 903,826 | 148,509 | 5,431 | 289,627 | 101,564 | 8,001 |
| March | $1,343,800$ | 703,536 | 162,126 | 5,103 | 319,951 | 144,294 | 8,789 |
| April | $1,129,162$ | 552,732 | 136,155 | 3,845 | 296,523 | 128,400 | 11,508 |
| May | $1,280,701$ | 596,494 | 153,669 | 3,920 | 372,670 | 142,986 | 10,961 |
| June | $1,562,943$ | 735,880 | 204,161 | 4,024 | 444,523 | 162,780 | 11,575 |
| July | $1,673,569$ | 879,427 | 222,022 | 4,777 | 410,462 | 147,015 | 9,865 |
| August | $1,560,001$ | 821,341 | 205,414 | 4,251 | 386,124 | 133,202 | 9,669 |
| September | $1,247,347$ | 608,272 | 164,035 | 3,677 | 338,034 | 125,734 | 7,595 |
| October | $1,128,731$ | 517,443 | 135,192 | 2,774 | 331,974 | 133,882 | 7,466 |
| November | $1,222,907$ | 626,185 | 132,296 | 3,591 | 320,778 | 131,687 | 8,370 |
| December | $1,476,736$ | 857,463 | 168,359 | 4,931 | 310,237 | 128,607 | 7,139 |
| Max NCP | $1,750,923$ | 903,826 | 222,022 | 6,198 | 444,523 | 162,780 | 11,575 |
| \% NCP Allocator (Gen) | $100.00 \%$ | $51.62 \%$ | $12.68 \%$ | $0.35 \%$ | $25.39 \%$ | $9.30 \%$ | $0.66 \%$ |

Rate Class Non-Coincident Monthly Peaks
At Sub-transmission Voltage Level
At Sub-transmission Voltage Level

| Date | Total (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| January | $1,399,434$ | 850,656 | 190,173 | 6,198 | 290,344 | 55,103 | 6,961 |
| February | $1,427,163$ | 903,826 | 144,542 | 5,431 | 289,627 | 75,736 | 8,001 |
| March | $1,292,066$ | 703,536 | 157,133 | 5,103 | 319,951 | 97,554 | 8,789 |
| April | $1,074,064$ | 552,732 | 132,318 | 3,845 | 296,523 | 77,138 | 11,508 |
| May | $1,212,913$ | 596,494 | 150,260 | 3,920 | 372,670 | 78,608 | 10,961 |
| June | $1,493,486$ | 735,880 | 200,416 | 4,024 | 444,523 | 97,068 | 11,575 |
| July | $1,614,080$ | 879,427 | 219,053 | 4,777 | 410,462 | 90,495 | 9,865 |
| August | $1,505,707$ | 821,341 | 202,957 | 4,251 | 386,124 | 81,365 | 9,669 |
| September | $1,200,410$ | 608,272 | 161,746 | 3,677 | 338,034 | 81,085 | 7,595 |
| October | $1,079,603$ | 517,443 | 133,000 | 2,774 | 331,974 | 86,946 | 7,466 |
| November | $1,166,248$ | 626,185 | 129,498 | 3,591 | 320,778 | 77,826 | 8,370 |
| December | $1,418,754$ | 857,463 | 165,786 | 4,931 | 310,237 | 73,198 | 7,139 |
| Max NCP | $1,682,728$ | 903,826 | 219,053 | 6,198 | 444,523 | 97,554 | 11,575 |
| \% NCP Allocator (Sub) | $100.00 \%$ | $53.71 \%$ | $13.02 \%$ | $0.37 \%$ | $26.42 \%$ | $5.80 \%$ | $0.69 \%$ |

Rate Class Non-Coincident Monthly Peaks
At Primary Voltage Level

| At Primary Voltage Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Date | Total (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| January | $1,336,759$ | 850,656 | 189,678 | 6,198 | 280,966 | 2,300 | 6,961 |
| February | $1,345,241$ | 903,826 | 144,055 | 5,431 | 280,309 | 3,620 | 8,001 |
| March | $1,187,943$ | 703,536 | 156,663 | 5,103 | 309,524 | 4,328 | 8,789 |
| April | 989,624 | 552,732 | 131,929 | 3,845 | 286,498 | 3,113 | 11,508 |
| May | $1,123,692$ | 596,494 | 149,757 | 3,920 | 359,638 | 2,922 | 10,961 |
| June | $1,385,251$ | 735,880 | 199,817 | 4,024 | 429,478 | 4,478 | 11,575 |
| July | $1,515,418$ | 879,427 | 218,412 | 4,777 | 397,776 | 5,161 | 9,865 |
| August | $1,412,929$ | 821,341 | 202,439 | 4,251 | 370,553 | 4,676 | 9,669 |
| September | $1,113,702$ | 608,272 | 161,420 | 3,677 | 327,604 | 5,133 | 7,595 |
| October | 985,094 | 517,443 | 132,591 | 2,774 | 321,028 | 3,792 | 7,466 |
| November | $1,082,301$ | 626,185 | 129,014 | 3,591 | 310,962 | 4,180 | 8,370 |
| December | $1,338,620$ | 857,463 | 165,095 | 4,931 | 300,622 | 3,369 | 7,139 |
| Max NCP | $1,574,649$ | 903,826 | 218,412 | 6,198 | 429,478 | 5,161 | 11,575 |
| \% NCP Allocator (Pri) | $100.00 \%$ | $57.40 \%$ | $13.87 \%$ | $0.39 \%$ | $27.27 \%$ | $0.33 \%$ | $0.74 \%$ |

Rate Class Non-Coincident Monthly Peaks
At Secondary Voltage Level

|  | Total (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Date | $1,274,209$ | 850,656 | 188,053 | 5,558 | 222,980 | - | 6,961 |
| January | $1,281,591$ | 903,826 | 142,127 | 4,926 | 222,711 | - | 8,001 |
| February | $1,117,896$ | 703,536 | 154,577 | 4,565 | 246,429 | - | 8,789 |
| March | 925,592 | 552,732 | 130,317 | 3,311 | 227,724 | - | 11,508 |
| April | $1,042,322$ | 596,494 | 148,317 | 3,238 | 283,312 | - | 10,961 |
| May | $1,291,798$ | 735,880 | 197,705 | 3,246 | 343,393 | - | 11,575 |
| June | $1,430,567$ | 879,427 | 216,438 | 3,989 | 320,848 | - | 9,865 |
| July | $1,336,455$ | 821,341 | 200,963 | 3,545 | 300,938 | - | 9,669 |
| August | $1,044,313$ | 608,272 | 159,929 | 3,107 | 265,409 | - | 7,595 |
| September | 916,297 | 517,443 | 130,813 | 2,230 | 258,346 | - | 7,466 |
| October | $1,011,338$ | 626,185 | 126,824 | 3,021 | 246,938 | - | 8,370 |
| November | $1,268,451$ | 857,463 | 162,835 | 4,224 | 236,790 | - | 7,139 |
| December | $1,480,790$ | 903,826 | 216,438 | 5,558 | 343,393 | - | 11,575 |
| Max NCP | $100.00 \%$ | $61.04 \%$ | $14.62 \%$ | $0.38 \%$ | $23.19 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.78 \%$ |

PE 2023 Base Rate Case Filing
PE Operating Company Peaks - Potomac Edison Maryland January 2021 - December 2021

Rate Class Non-Coincident Monthly Peaks
At Generation Voltage Level

| Month | Total (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| January | $1,388,777$ | 822,095 | 173,879 | 6,485 | 308,607 | 71,743 | 5,968 |
| February | $1,444,670$ | 876,096 | 166,592 | 5,806 | 287,191 | 102,544 | 6,442 |
| March | $1,387,268$ | 770,928 | 151,169 | 5,058 | 348,368 | 104,117 | 7,628 |
| April | $1,336,405$ | 697,785 | 142,438 | 3,811 | 356,731 | 125,921 | 9,718 |
| May | $1,328,057$ | 610,606 | 166,061 | 3,715 | 403,648 | 134,631 | 9,395 |
| June | $1,626,616$ | 876,028 | 195,760 | 3,537 | 400,141 | 141,159 | 9,991 |
| July | $1,591,925$ | 864,726 | 206,520 | 4,347 | 380,577 | 126,404 | 9,351 |
| August | $1,650,982$ | 908,055 | 209,299 | 4,374 | 386,409 | 134,814 | 8,030 |
| September | $1,375,605$ | 703,151 | 179,017 | 4,038 | 362,163 | 119,101 | 8,135 |
| October | $1,202,545$ | 504,495 | 164,647 | 3,699 | 371,543 | 147,509 | 10,651 |
| November | $1,273,766$ | 704,389 | 130,744 | 3,150 | 305,513 | 122,409 | 7,561 |
| December | $1,400,059$ | 784,395 | 149,838 | 4,806 | 329,283 | 125,894 | 5,843 |
| Max NCP | $1,685,647$ | 908,055 | 209,299 | 6,485 | 403,648 | 147,509 | 10,651 |
| \% NCP Allocator (Gen) | $100.00 \%$ | $53.87 \%$ | $12.42 \%$ | $0,38 \%$ | $23.95 \%$ | $8.75 \%$ | $0.63 \%$ |

Rate Class Non-Coincident Monthly Peaks
At Sub-transmission Voltage Level
At Sub-transmission Voltage Level

| Date | Total (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| January | $1,356,033$ | 822,095 | 171,296 | 6,485 | 308,607 | 41,583 | 5,968 |
| February | $1,416,932$ | 876,096 | 164,220 | 5,806 | 287,191 | 77,178 | 6,442 |
| March | $1,345,783$ | 770,928 | 148,919 | 5,058 | 348,368 | 64,883 | 7,628 |
| April | $1,280,493$ | 697,785 | 140,164 | 3,811 | 356,731 | 72,283 | 9,718 |
| May | $1,268,175$ | 610,606 | 163,500 | 3,715 | 403,648 | 77,310 | 9,395 |
| June | $1,565,384$ | 876,028 | 193,323 | 3,537 | 400,141 | 82,363 | 9,991 |
| July | $1,535,923$ | 864,726 | 204,352 | 4,347 | 380,577 | 72,571 | 9,351 |
| August | $1,596,874$ | 908,055 | 206,900 | 4,374 | 386,409 | 83,106 | 8,030 |
| September | $1,329,473$ | 703,151 | 177,090 | 4,038 | 362,163 | 74,896 | 8,135 |
| October | $1,141,067$ | 504,495 | 162,583 | 3,699 | 371,543 | 88,095 | 10,651 |
| November | $1,223,092$ | 704,389 | 129,000 | 3,150 | 305,513 | 73,479 | 7,561 |
| December | $1,345,588$ | 784,395 | 147,455 | 4,806 | 329,283 | 73,806 | 5,843 |
| Max NCP | $1,623,834$ | 908,055 | 206,900 | 6,485 | 403,648 | 88,095 | 10,651 |
| \% NCP Allocator (Sub) | $100.00 \%$ | $55.92 \%$ | $12.74 \%$ | $0.40 \%$ | $24.86 \%$ | $5.43 \%$ | $0.66 \%$ |

Rate Class Non-Coincident Monthly Peaks
At Primary Voltage Level

| Date | Total (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| January | 1,305,717 | 822,095 | 170,430 | 6,485 | 298,720 | 2,020 | 5,968 |
| February | 1,333,644 | 876,096 | 163,276 | 5,806 | 277,798 | 4,226 | 6,442 |
| March | 1,271,367 | 770,928 | 147,419 | 5,058 | 337,156 | 3,179 | 7,628 |
| April | 1,198,273 | 697,785 | 138,372 | 3,811 | 344,895 | 3,691 | 9,718 |
| May | 1,173,278 | 610,606 | 161,925 | 3,715 | 383,761 | 3,876 | 9,395 |
| June | 1,472,458 | 876,028 | 192,532 | 3,537 | 387,504 | 2,866 | 9,991 |
| July | 1,453,488 | 864,726 | 203,570 | 4,347 | 368,765 | 2,729 | 9,351 |
| August | 1,504,787 | 908,055 | 206,289 | 4,374 | 374,754 | 3,284 | 8,030 |
| September | 1,245,270 | 703,151 | 176,555 | 4,038 | 350,345 | 3,046 | 8,135 |
| October | 1,042,791 | 504,495 | 162,007 | 3,699 | 359,080 | 2,858 | 10,651 |
| November | 1,140,585 | 704,389 | 128,479 | 3,150 | 294,762 | 2,244 | 7,561 |
| December | 1,262,117 | 784,395 | 146,956 | 4,806 | 317,991 | 2,126 | 5,843 |
| Max NCP | 1,523,210 | 908,055 | 206,289 | 6,485 | 387,504 | 4,226 | 10,651 |
| \% NCP Allocator (Pri) | 100.00\% | 59.61\% | 13.54\% | 0.43\% | 25.44\% | 0.28\% | 0.70\% |

Rate Class Non-Coincident Monthly Peaks
At Secondary Voltage Level

| Date | Total (kW) | R | C\&G | CA-CSH | PH | PP | LIGHTING |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| January | $1,236,874$ | 822,095 | 168,356 | 5,846 | 234,609 | - | 5,968 |
| February | $1,267,461$ | 876,096 | 161,448 | 5,247 | 218,228 | - | 6,442 |
| March | $1,193,209$ | 770,928 | 145,382 | 4,486 | 264,785 | - | 7,628 |
| April | $1,116,463$ | 697,785 | 136,328 | 3,287 | 269,344 | - | 9,718 |
| May | $1,088,524$ | 610,606 | 159,329 | 3,119 | 306,074 | - | 9,395 |
| June | $1,389,633$ | 876,028 | 189,847 | 2,859 | 310,908 | - | 9,991 |
| July | $1,375,533$ | 864,726 | 201,135 | 3,666 | 296,655 | - | 9,351 |
| August | $1,423,114$ | 908,055 | 203,807 | 3,680 | 299,543 | - | 8,030 |
| September | $1,171,234$ | 703,151 | 174,212 | 3,400 | 282,336 | - | 8,135 |
| October | 964,187 | 504,495 | 159,399 | 3,074 | 286,568 | - | 10,651 |
| November | $1,075,347$ | 704,389 | 126,377 | 2,665 | 234,355 | - | 7,561 |
| December | $1,188,779$ | 784,395 | 144,554 | 4,266 | 249,722 | - | 5,843 |
| Max NCP | $1,439,267$ | 908,055 | 203,807 | 5,846 | 310,908 | - | 10,651 |
| \% NCP Allocator (Sec) | $100.00 \%$ | $63.09 \%$ | $14,16 \%$ | $0.41 \%$ | $21.60 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.74 \%$ |
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# DIRECT TESTIMONY OF J OHN J . SPANOS 

## I. INTRODUCTION

Q. Please state your name and address.
A. My name is J ohn J. Spanos. My business address is 207 Senate Avenue, Camp Hill, Pennsylvania, 17011.

## Q. Are you associated with any firm?

A. Yes. I am associated with the firm of Gannett Fleming Valuation and Rate Consultants, LLC ("Gannett Fleming").
Q. How long have you been associated with Gannett Fleming?
A. I have been associated with the firm since J une 1986.
Q. What is your position with the firm?
A. I am President.

## Q. On whose behalf are you testifying in this case?

A. I am testifying on behalf of The Potomac Edison Company ("Potomac Edison" or "the Company").

## Q. Please state your qualifications.

A. I have over 36 years of depreciation experience, which includes expert testimony in over 420 cases before approximately 46 regulatory commissions in the United States and Canada. The cases include depreciation studies in the electric, gas, water, wastewater, and pipeline industries. In addition to the cases where I have submitted testimony, I have supervised over 800 other depreciation or valuation assignments. Please refer to Exhibit JJ S-1A for additional information on my qualifications, which includes my leadership in the Society of Depreciation Professionals.

## II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY

## Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

A. My testimony will support and explain the Depreciation Study performed for Potomac Edison attached hereto as Exhibit JJS-2A ("Depreciation Study"). The Depreciation Study sets forth the calculated annual depreciation accrual rates by account as of J une 30, 2022. My testimony presents depreciation concepts and an overview of the Depreciation Study. I also discuss the method of the recovery of net salvage (which is the net cost to remove or retire the Company's assets). I have discussed in detail in previous cases ${ }^{1}$ problems with the design and implementation of the present value method for the recovery of net salvage that has been used in Maryland since 2007, referred to in my testimony as the "MD Present Value Method." It is my belief that the traditional straight line method for the recovery of net salvage would remedy the problems with the MD Present Value Method, would be most equitable to each generation of customers (otherwise referred to as "intergenerational equity"), and has not been accurately described in testimonies of other parties in previous cases. However, I also recognize that the Commission has adopted the MD Present Value Method in recent cases. In light of this precedent, the Company's proposal is to use the MD Present Value Method with a discount rate based on their credit-adjusted risk-free rate ("CARFR"). As both Staff ${ }^{2}$ and I agree, recent Commission precedent supports the use of a $\mathrm{CARFR}^{3}$ as the discount rate to be used to calculate the net salvage component of

[^100]depreciation rates, rather than a discount rate based on a utility's rate of return. The Company's proposal using the CARFR results in an overall increase in depreciation expense of $\$ 2.5$ million as of June 30, 2022.4

## Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE RESULTS OF YOUR STUDY.

A. Theresults of the Depreciation Study are summarized by plant function in the table below, which sets forth the original cost and recommended annual depreciation rates and accruals based on electric plant in service as of J une 30, 2022. A table summarizing the results by plant account using the traditional method can be found on page VI-4 of the study. Results using the MD Present Value Method with a $5.93 \%$ CARFR discount rate can be found in the Appendix of the study. The table below summarizes the results using both methods.

Table 1: Summary of Original Cost, Proposed Depreciation Rates and Amounts as of J une 30, 2022 Based on Traditional and MD Present Value Methods

| FUNCTION | $\begin{gathered} \text { ORIG. } \\ \text { COST, } \\ \text { MILLIONS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | TRADITIONAL METHOD |  | PRESENT VALUE METHOD |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DEPR. } \\ & \text { RATE } \end{aligned}$ | DEPR. AMOUNT, MILLIONS | DEPR. <br> RATE | DEPR. <br> AMOUNT, MILLIONS |
| ELECTRICPLANT |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intangible Plant | 25.5 | 7.21 | 1.8 | 7.21 | 1.8 |
| Distribution Plant | 1,305.7 | 2.92 | 38.1 | 2.11 | 27.5 |
| General Plant | 67.5 | 3.80 | 2.6 | 3.70 | 2.5 |
| Total Electric Plant | 1,398.7 | 3.04 | 42.5 | 2.28 | 31.8 |

## Q. ARE THE METHODS AND PROCEDURES OF THIS DEPRECIATION STUDY CONSISTENT WITH PAST PRACTICES?

[^101]A. Yes. Most of the methods and procedures in this study are the same as those used in the previous Depreciation Study. Depreciation rates are determined based on the straight line method, the average service life procedure, and the remaining life technique. The study also provides the results using theMD Present Value Method with a discount rate based on the Company's CARFR. As will be discussed in more detail later in my testimony, these latter results are consistent with Commission precedent.
Q. ARE THE RECOMMENDED DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RATES
PRESENTED IN THE DEPRECIATION STUDY REASONABLE AND APPLICABLE TO THE PLANT IN SERVICE AS OF J UNE 30, 2022 ?
A. Yes, they are. Based on the Depreciation Study, I am recommending depreciation rates using the J une 30, 2022 plant and reserve balances for approval. However, the Company has recently provided my firm with updated plant data as well as plant and reserve balances as of December 31, 2022 to synchronize with the end of the test year in the Company's distribution base rate case filing. Upon completion of updating my analysis with data as of December 31, 2022, I will update the Depreciation Study and the Company will file an update to its distribution base rate case to reflect the depreciation rate results of the updated Depreciation Study.
Q. HAVE YOU PREPARED A COMPARISON OF THE IMPACT OF THE NEW DEPRECIATION STUDY RESULTS TO THE CURRENT DEPRECIATION LEVELS?
A. Yes. Exhibit JJ S-3A sets forth the currently approved depreciation rates and resultant depreciation expense to the proposed depreciation rates and expense as of J une 30, 2022. The proposed depreciation rates set forth an increased annual
depreciation expense of $\$ 2.5$ million.

## Q. ARE POTOMAC EDISON'S PROPOSED DEPRECIATION RATES CONSISTENT WITH COMMISSION PRECEDENT AS IT APPLIES TO POTOMAC EDISON?

A. Yes. Potomac Edison's proposed depreciation rates use the same methods for estimating service lives, net salvage and calculating depreciation for the original cost of plant that have been used in previous depreciation studies. For net salvage the proposed depreciation rates are based on the MD Present Value Method using a CARFR for the discount rate, which is consistent with more recent Commission precedent. ${ }^{5}$

## Q. HAS THE NET SALVAGE METHOD BEEN AN ISSUE IN PREVIOUS CASES BEFORE THE COMMISSION?

A. Yes. Maryland has used theMD Present Value Method since 2007. However, other than the use of a modified version with an inflation-based discount in the District of Columbia, present value methods are not used for net salvage by any other U.S. regulatory jurisdiction. I have discussed in detail many reasons for concern that the continued use of the MD Present Value Method, ${ }^{6}$ even with a more reasonable discount rate based on the CARFR, will result in an insufficient recovery of future net salvage, resulting in large regulatory asset balances and intergenerational inequity. While I still have these concerns, the depreciation rates proposed in this

[^102] proceeding, based on the MD Present Value Method, are reasonable in the context of Commission precedent.
Q. BECAUSE THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED DEPRECIATION RATES USE THE MD PRESENT VALUE METHOD, WOULD YOU EXPECT DEPRECIATION TO BE A LESS CONTENTIOUS ISSUE THAN IN OTHER RECENT CASES?
A. Yes. Not only is the Company's proposal consistent with Commission precedent, it also results in a small percentage increase in depreciation expense. That is, the depreciation rates proposed by the Company result in an increase in the Company's revenue requirement. Because the Company is ultimately proposing net salvage depreciation rates based on recent Commission precedent and the Company has not proposed a large increase in depreciation, I would expect depreciation to be a less contentious issue than it has been in previous cases. Had the Company solely proposed to use the traditional method, which is used in almost every state in the country, the increase to depreciation would have been larger than what the Company is proposing using the CARFR.

## III. DEPRECIATION CONCEPTS

## Q. PLEASE DEFINE DEPRECIATION.

A. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") and the American Institute of Certified Public Accounts ("AICPA") provide two commonly used definitions for depreciation. FERC defines depreciation as follows:

Depreciation, as applied to depreciable electric plant, means the loss in service value not restored by current maintenance, incurred in connection with the consumption or prospective retirement of electric plant in the course of service from causes which are known to be in current operation and against which the utility is not
protected by insurance. Among the causes to be given consideration are wear and tear, decay, action of the elements, inadequacy, obsolescence, changes in the art, changes in demand and requirements of public authorities. ${ }^{7}$

The AICPA defines depreciation as:
Depreciation accounting is a system of accounting which aims to distribute cost or other basic value of tangible capital assets, less salvage (if any) over the estimate useful life of the unit (which may be a group of assets) in a systematic and rational manner. It is a process of allocation, not of valuation. Depreciation for the year is the portion of the total charge under such a system that is allocated to theyear. Although the allocation may properly take into account occurrences during the year, it is not intended to be a measurement of the effect of all such occurrences. ${ }^{8}$

## Q. PLEASE DEFINE "SERVICE LIFE."

A. The term service life refers to amount of time that an asset is providing utility service, or the period of time an asset is "in service." The term "useful life" is also used interchangeably with the term service life. FERC defines service life as follows:

Service life means the time between the date electric plant is includible in electric plant in service, or electric plant leased to others, and the date of its retirement. ${ }^{9}$

Depreciation is a process of allocating the service value of an asset or group
of assets over the service life or lives of the asset or assets.

## Q. WHAT IS "SERVICE VALUE"?

A. Service value, as defined by FERC, is "the difference between original cost and net salvage value of electric plant." 10

## Q. WHAT IS "NET SALVAGE"?

[^103]A. Net salvage represents the cost to retire an asset, as well as any residual value of the asset, at the end of its service life. The FERC definition is that "Net salvage value means the salvage value of property retired less the cost of removal." 11 Net salvage is described as "positive net salvage" if the salvage value exceeds removal costs and described as "negative net salvage" (i.e., a net cost) if removal costs exceed the salvage value. It is common in utility operation for the cost of removal (also referred to as "cost of retirement") to exceed any salvage value at the end of an asset's life. Thus, net salvage is often a negative amount.

## Q. WHY IS IT IMPORTANT TO INCLUDE NET SALVAGE IN DEPRECIATION RATES?

A. The net salvage related to an asset is a part of the service value of the asset. That is, any costs involved with retiring an asset (less any salvage), are part of the cost of providing electric or gas service to customers. For this reason, it is important that the net salvage costs are allocated to depreciation expense (and included in customer rates) while the asset is providing service. If the net salvage costs are instead recovered after an asset is retired, then future customers will have to pay these costs even though they received no benefit of the asset.

The National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners ("NARUC"), in its publication Public Utility Depreciation Practices, explains this concept:

The goal of accounting for net salvage is to allocate the net cost of an asset to accounting periods, making due allowance for the net salvage, positive or negative, that will be obtained when the asset is retired. This concept carries with it the premise that property ownership includes the responsibility for the property's ultimate abandonment or removal. Hence, if current users benefit from its use, they should pay their pro rata share of the costs involved in the

[^104]abandonment or removal of the property and also receive their pro rata share of the benefits of the proceeds realized. ${ }^{12}$

The concept that customers should pay their share of the costs of the assets that provide service to them is often referred to as "intergenerational equity." This concept is also similar to the accounting principle referred to as the "matching principle," under which costs of an asset are matched with the revenues generated during its service life. For depreciation accounting, intergenerational equity is typically understood to mean that depreciation rates are designed to allocate an equal amount of the asset's service value to each year of service. ${ }^{13}$

## Q. HOW IS DEPRECIATION DETERMINED?

A. The first step in the depreciation process is to estimate the service lives and net salvage for each group of assets being studied. I will describe this process of estimation in the next section and the process is also described in more detail in the Depreciation Study. Once service lives and net salvage estimates have been determined, a depreciation system needs to be established in order to calculate depreciation.

## Q. WHAT IS A "DEPRECIATION SYSTEM"?

A. The term "depreciation system" refers to the methods, procedures and techniques used to calculate depreciation expense. To calculate depreciation, one must determine the appropriate depreciation concept, depreciation method, calculation or grouping procedure, and technique to be used.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN WHAT YOU MEAN BY A "CONCEPT."

[^105]A. The term "concept" refers to the accounting concept (or concepts) by which depreciation is determined. As noted in the definitions provided above, depreciation for accounting and ratemaking is typically based on a cost allocation concept. Capital costs that have been or will be expended (i.e., the service value of an asset) are allocated to the accounting periods in which an asset is in service (i.e., its service life). A cost allocation concept contrasts with a value or valuation concept, in which depreciation is determined based on estimates of the value of an asset and the change in value over time.

## Q. WHAT IS A "DEPRECIATION METHOD?"

A. The term "depreciation method" refers to the method by which costs are allocated to each period for which an asset renders service. There are three general categories of depreciation methods: straight line, deferred (also referred to as "decelerated") and accelerated. For the straight line method, costs are allocated ratably, or in an equal amount, to each period that the asset is in service. For a deferred method, fewer costs are allocated to earlier periods and more to later periods. For an accelerated method, more is allocated to early periods than to later periods.

Similar to the cost allocation concept, the straight line method is used almost universally for accounting and ratemaking and is supported by depreciation textbooks and precedent in most regulatory jurisdictions. However, Maryland has used different methods for different aspects of depreciation. The straight line method is used for the original cost of a company's assets but the Present Value Method, which is a deferred method, has been used for future net salvage.

## Q. WHAT IS A "PROCEDURE"?

A. A depreciation procedure, or "grouping procedure," describes the manner in which a group of assets is organized to calculate depreciation. Utilities typically have a large number of assets, and therefore group similar assets into property groups (as opposed to depreciating each unit individually). There are different procedures that can be used to calculate depreciation for a group of property. Under the average service life (or "broad group" or "average life group") procedure, a group of similar assets, such as poles, is organized as a single group and depreciated over the average service life or average remaining life of the group. Under the "vintage group" procedure, depreciation is calculated separately for each vintage ${ }^{14}$ of assets within a group. Under the "equal life group" (or "unit summation") procedure a group of assets is subdivided based on the estimated survivor curve ${ }^{15}$ into groups that have the same service life. Depreciation is then calculated separately for each of these "equal life groups."

Each of these procedures is recognized and accepted in regulatory jurisdictions in the U.S. However, the average service life procedure is the most common.

## Q. WHAT IS A "TECHNIQUE?"

A. The term "technique" refers to the manner by which depreciation is calculated to ensure that the full service value of an asset is recovered through depreciation expense. Under the "whole life technique," depreciation expense is simply

[^106]calculated based on the "whole life" of an asset or group of assets. That is, an asset with a 10-year life and no net salvage would have a $10 \%$ (or 1/10) depreciation rate. In contrast, remaining life technique allocates the remaining undepreciated service value of an asset or group of assets over the estimated remaining life of the asset or group of assets. Theremaininglife technique therefore incorporates a selfcorrectingmechanism that will adjust depreciation expense for any over- or underrecoveries that have occurred in the past. The remaining life technique ensures that the full service value of the Company's assets are recovered through depreciation expense - no more, no less.

For this reason, the remaining life technique is the most common technique used for utility depreciation. There are certain jurisdictions that use whole life depreciation, but these jurisdictions will often use an explicit adjustment to depreciation in an effort to ensure that the correct amount of costs is recovered through depreciation expense.

## Q. HOW DOES THE DEPRECIATION SYSTEM IMPACT DEPRECIATION EXPENSE?

A. Depending on the concept, method, procedure, and technique used, different amounts of annual depreciation expense will be calculated, even if the service life and net salvage estimates remain the same. The depreciation system used also has an impact on intergenerational equity, as different depreciation systems will allocate different amounts to different generations of customers. If too little is allocated to today's customers (as is the case with the MD Present Value Method), future customers will have to pay more than their fair share. Similarly, if too much expense is allocated to today's customers, future generations will pay less than
their fair share. Depreciation expense (and therefore the depreciation system selected) also has an impact on rate base because accumulated depreciation is a deduction from rate base. Therefore, if too little depreciation is allocated to today's customers, future customers will pay more depreciation expense in the future and will also pay a higher return on rate base.

## IV. DEPRECIATION STUDY

Q. DID YOU PREPARE THE DEPRECIATION STUDY FILED BY POTOMAC EDISON IN THIS PROCEEDING?
A. Yes. I prepared the Depreciation Study, and Exhibit JJ S-2A is a true and accurate copy of my report. My report is entitled: "2022 Depreciation Study - Calculated Annual Depreciation Accruals Related to Electric Plant as of J une 30, 2022." This report sets forth the results of my Depreciation Study for Potomac Edison.
Q. IN PREPARING THE DEPRECIATION STUDY, DID YOU FOLLOW GENERALLY ACCEPTED PRACTICES IN THE FIELD OF DEPRECIATION VALUATION?
A. Yes.
Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE DEPRECIATION STUDY?
A. The purpose of my Depreciation Study was to estimate the annual depreciation accruals for Potomac Edison's plant in service for financial and ratemaking purposes, and to determine appropriate average service lives and net salvage percentages for each plant account.

## Q. ARE THE METHODS AND PROCEDURES OF THIS DEPRECIATION STUDY CONSISTENT WITH POTOMAC EDISON'S PAST PRACTICES?

A. Yes. The depreciation methods and procedures of this study are determined based
on the average service life procedure and the remaining life method. However, the methodology of net salvage has a different discount rate utilized since the last study.

For general plant assets, amortization periods were established based on the nature of the assets in each account.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE CONTENTS OF THE DEPRECIATION STUDY.

A. The Depreciation Study is presented in nine parts. Part I, Introduction, presents the scope and basis for the Depreciation Study. Part II, Estimation of Survivor Curves, includes descriptions of the methodology of estimating survivor curves. Parts III and IV set forth the analysis for determining service life and net salvage estimates. Part V, Calculation of Annual and Accrued Depreciation, includes the concepts of depreciation and amortization using the remaining life. Part VI, Results of Study, presents a description of the results of my analysis and a summary of the depreciation calculations. Part VI also includes Table 1 (see page VI-4), which presents the estimated survivor curve, the net salvage percent, the original cost as of J une 30, 2022, the book depreciation reserve, and the calculated annual depreciation accrual and rate for each account or subaccount. Parts VII, VIII and IX include graphs and tables that relate to the service life and net salvage analyses, and the detailed depreciation calculations by account. The section beginning on page VIII-2 presents the results of the salvage analysis. The section beginning on page IX-2 presents the depreciation calculations related to surviving original cost as of J une 30, 2022. The Appendix to the study provides the study results using the MD Present Value Method with a CARFR of 5.93\%.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN HOW YOU PERFORMED YOUR DEPRECIATION

 STUDY.A. I used the straight line remaining life method of depreciation, with the average service life procedure. The annual depreciation is based on a method of depreciation accounting that seeks to distribute the unrecovered cost of fixed capital assets over the estimated remaining useful life of each unit, or group of assets, in a systematic and reasonable manner.

For General Plant Accounts 391.0, 391.15, 391.2, 393.0, 394.0, 395.0, 397.0 and 398.0, I used the straight line remaining life method of amortization. ${ }^{16}$ The annual amortization is based on amortization accounting that distributes the unrecovered cost of fixed capital assets over the remaining amortization period selected for each account and vintage.

## Q. HOW DID YOU DETERMINE THE RECOMMENDED ANNUAL

 DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RATES?A. I did this in two phases. In the first phase, I estimated the service life and net salvage characteristics for each depreciable group, that is, each plant account or subaccount identified as having similar characteristics. In the second phase, I calculated the composite remaining lives and annual depreciation aocrual rates based on the service life and net salvage estimates determined in the first phase.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE FIRST PHASE OF THE DEPRECIATION

 STUDY, IN WHICH YOU ESTIMATED THE SERVICE LIFE AND NET SALVAGE CHARACTERISTICS FOR EACH DEPRECIABLE GROUP.A. The service life and net salvage study consisted of compiling historical data from

[^107]records related to Potomac Edison's plant; analyzing these data to obtain historical trends of survivor characteristics; obtaining supplementary information from Potomac Edison's management and operating personnel concerning practices and plans as they relate to plant operations; and interpreting the data and the estimates used by other electric utilities to form judgments of average service life and net salvage characteristics.

## Q. WHAT HISTORICAL DATA DID YOU ANALYZE FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTIMATING SERVICE LIFE CHARACTERISTICS?

A. I analyzed the Company's accounting entries that record plant transactions during the period 1997 through June 2022 to the extent available. The transactions I analyzed included additions, retirements, transfers, sales, and the related balances.

## Q. WHAT METHOD DID YOU USE TO ANALYZE THESE SERVICE LIFE DATA?

A. I used the retirement rate method for most plant accounts. This is the most appropriate method when retirement data covering a long period of time is available because this method determines the average rates of retirement actually experienced by the Company during the period of time covered by the Depreciation Study.
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW YOU USED THE RETIREMENT RATE METHOD TO ANALYZE POTOMAC EDISON'S SERVICE LIFE DATA.
A. I applied the retirement rate analysis to each different group of property in the study. For each property group, I used the retirement rate data to form a life table which, when plotted, shows an original survivor curve for that property group.

Each original survivor curve represents the average survivor pattern experienced by the several vintage groups during the experience band studied. The survivor patterns do not necessarily describe the life characteristics of the property group; therefore, interpretation of the original survivor curves is required in order to use them as valid considerations in estimating service life. The "Iowa-type survivor curves" were used to perform these interpretations.

## Q. WHAT ARE "IOWA-TYPE SURVIVOR CURVES" AND HOW DID YOU

 USE SUCH CURVES TO ESTIMATE THE SERVICE LIFE CHARACTERISTICS FOR EACH PROPERTY GROUP?A. Iowa-type survivor curves are a widely-used group of survivor curves that contain the range of survivor characteristics usually experienced by utilities and other industrial companies. These curves were developed at the Iowa State College Engineering Experiment Station through an extensive process of observing and classifying the ages at which various types of property used by utilities and other industrial companies had been retired.

Iowa-type survivor curves are used to smooth and extrapolate original survivor curves determined by the retirement rate method. The Iowa curves were used in the Depreciation Study to describe the forecasted rates of retirement based on the observed rates of retirement and the outlook for future retirements. The estimated survivor curve designations for each depreciable property group indicate the average service life, the family within the Iowa system to which the property group belongs, and the relative height of the mode. For example, the Iowa 50-R1.5 indicates an average service life of 50 years; a right-moded, or $R$, type curve (the mode occurs after average life for right-moded curves); and a low height, 1.5, for
the mode (possible modes for R type curves range from 0.5 to 5 ).

## Q. HAVE POTOMAC EDISON'S PLANT AND EQUIPMENT BEEN PHYSICALLY OBSERVED AS PART OF YOUR DEPRECIATION STUDY?

A. Yes. A field review of Potomac Edison's property was conducted on February 6, 2023 to observe representative portions of plant. Field reviews in 2020 had also been reviewed for Potomac Edison as well as visits of the similar assets of other FirstEnergy properties. Field reviews are conducted to become familiar with Company operations and obtain an understanding of the function of the plant and information with respect to the reasons for past retirements and the expected future causes of retirements. This knowledge, as well as information from other discussions with Potomac Edison's management and operating personnel, was incorporated in the interpretation and extrapolation of the statistical analyses.

## Q. HOW DID YOUR EXPERIENCE IN DEVELOPMENT OF OTHER DEPRECIATION STUDIES AFFECT YOUR WORK IN THIS CASE FOR POTOMAC EDISON?

A. Because I customarily conduct field reviews for my depreciation studies, I have had the opportunity to visit scores of similar facilities and meet with management and operations personnel at many other companies other than Potomac Edison. The knowledge I have accumulated from those visits and meetings provides me with useful information to draw upon to confirm or challenge my numerical analyses concerning asset condition and remaining life estimates.

## Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE CONCEPT OF "NET SALVAGE".

A. Net salvage is a component of the service value of capital assets that is recovered
through depreciation rates. The service value of an asset is its original cost less its net salvage. Net salvage is the salvage value received for the asset upon retirement less the cost to retire the asset. When the cost to retire the asset exceeds the salvage value, the result is negative net salvage.

Because depreciation expense is the loss in service value of an asset during a defined period (e.g., one year), it must include a ratable portion of both the original cost of the asset and the net salvage. That is, the net salvage related to an asset should be incorporated in the cost of service during the same period as its original cost, so that customers receiving service from the asset pay rates that include a portion of both elements of the asset's service value, the original cost and the net salvage value. For example, the full service value of a \$500 line transformer also includes $\$ 200$ of cost of removal and $\$ 25$ gross salvage, for a total service value of $\$ 675$.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW YOU ESTIMATED NET SALVAGE PERCENTAGES.

A. Using the widely accepted traditional method, I estimated the net salvage percentages by incorporating the Company's actual historical data for the period, 2001 through June 2022, and considered industry experience of net salvage estimates for other electric companies. The net salvage percentages in the Depreciation Study are based on a combination of statistical analyses and informed judgment. The statistical analyses consider the cost of removal and gross salvage ratios to the associated retirements during the 22-year period. Trends of these data are also measured based on three-year moving averages and the most recent five-year indications.
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE SECOND PHASE OF THE PROCESS THAT YOU USED IN THE DEPRECIATION STUDY IN WHICH YOU CALCULATED COMPOSITE REMAINING LIVES AND ANNUAL DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RATES.
A. After I estimated the service life and net salvage characteristics for each depreciable property group, I calculated the annual depreciation accrual rates for each group using the straight line remaining life method, and using remaininglives weighted consistent with the average service life procedure. The calculation of annual depreciation accrual rates was developed for electric plant in service as of June 30, 2022.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE STRAIGHT LINE REMAINING LIFE METHOD OF DEPRECIATION.

A. The straight line remaining life method of depreciation allocates the original cost of the property, less accumulated depreciation, less future net salvage, in equal amounts to each year of remaining service life. The use of the remaining life technique incorporates a self-correcting mechanism that will adjust depreciation expense for any over-or under-recoveries that have occurred in the past. The remaining life technique, therefore, ensures that the entire service value of the Company's assets is recovered through depreciation expense. The entire service value of the Company's assets is the original cost less net salvage. I also calculated depreciation rates based on the MD Present Value Method, which are provided in Appendix A of the Depreciation Study.
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE AVERAGE SERVICE LIFE PROCEDURE FOR CALCULATING REMAINING LIFE ACCRUAL RATES.
A. The average service life procedure defines the group or account for which the remaining life annual accrual is determined. Under this procedure, the annual accrual rate is determined for the entire group or account based on its average remaining life and the rate is then applied to the surviving balance of the group's cost. The average remaining life of the group is calculated by first dividing the future book accruals (original cost less allocated book reserve less future net salvage) by the average remaining life for each vintage. The average remaininglife for each vintage is derived from the area under the survivor curve between the attained age of the vintage and the maximum age. The sum of the future book accruals is then divided by the sum of the annual accrual s to determine the average remaining life of the entire group for use in calculating the annual depreciation accrual rate.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE AMORTIZATION ACCOUNTING IN CONTRASTTO DEPRECIATION ACCOUNTING.

A. Amortization accounting is used for accounts with a large number of units, but small asset values. In amortization accounting, units of property are capitalized in the same manner as they are in depreciation accounting. However, depreciation accounting is difficult for these types of assets because depreciation accounting requires periodic inventories to properly reflect plant in service. Consequently, amortization accounting is used for these types of assets, such that retirements are recorded when a vintage is fully amortized rather than as the units are removed from service. That is, there is no dispersion of retirement in amortization accounting. All units are retired when the age of the vintage reaches the amortization period. Each plant account or group of assets is assigned a fixed
period that represents an anticipated life during which the asset will render full benefit. For example, in amortization accounting, assets that have a 20 -year amortization period will be fully recovered after 20 years of service and taken off the Company's books at that time, but not necessarily removed from service. In contrast, assets that are taken out of service before 20 years remain on the books until the amortization period for that vintage has expired.

## Q. IS AMORTIZATION ACCOUNTING BEING UTILIZED FOR CERTAIN PLANT ACCOUNTS?

A. Yes. However, amortization accounting is only appropriate for certain General Plant accounts. These accounts are 391.0, 391.15, 391.2, 393.0, 394.0, 395.0, 397.0 and 398.0, which represent slightly more than two percent of Potomac Edison's depreciable plant.

## Q. PLEASE USE AN EXAMPLE TO ILLUSTRATE HOW THE ANNUAL DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RATE FOR A PARTICULAR GROUP OF PROPERTY IS PRESENTED IN YOUR DEPRECIATION STUDY.

A. I will use Account 367.0, Underground Conductors and Devices, as an example because it is the largest depreciable account and represents approximately 21 percent of depreciable plant. The retirement rate method was used to analyze the survivor characteristics of this property group. Aged plant accounting data was compiled from 1997 through June 2022 and analyzed in periods that best represent the overall service life of this property. The life tables for the 1997-2022 and 2013-2022 experience bands are presented on pages VII-27 through VII-31 of the Depreciation Study. The life table displays the retirement and surviving ratios of the aged plant data exposed to retirement by age interval. For example, page

VII-28 of the study shows $\$ 1,939,728$ retired at age 0.5 with $\$ 252,365,753$ exposed to retirement. Consequently, the retirement ratio is 0.0077 and the surviving ratio is 0.9923 . The life tables, or original survivor curves, are plotted along with the estimated smooth survivor curve, the 44-R3 on page VII-27 of the study.

The net salvage analysis for Account 367.0 is presented on pages VIII-12 and VIII-13 of the Depreciation Study. The percentages are based on the result of annual gross salvage minus the cost to remove plant assets as compared to the original cost of plant retired during the period 2001 through 2022. This 22-year period experienced $\$ 15,757,576(\$ 28,388-\$ 15,785,964)$ in net salvage for $\$ 29,239,056$ plant retired. The result is negative net salvage of 54 percent (\$15,757,576/\$29,239,056). Based on the overall negative 54 percent net salvage and the most recent five years of negative 66 percent, as well as industry ranges and Company expectations, it was determined that negative 50 percent is the most appropriate estimate.

My calculation of the annual depreciation related to the original cost of the account as of J une 30, 2022 is presented on pages IX-17 and IX-18 of the study. The calculation is based on the 44 -R3 survivor curve, 50 percent negative net salvage, the attained age, and the allocated book reserve. The tabulation sets forth the installation year, the original cost, calculated accrued depreciation, allocated book reserve, future accruals, remaining life, and annual accrual. These totals are brought forward to the table on page VI-4 of the Depreciation Study.

## Q. DID YOU DEVELOP RATES FOR NEW AND FUTURE ASSETS THAT MAY BE PLACED IN SERVICE?

A. Yes. There are two new plant accounts that the Company has added and expects
to add to plant in service in the near future. One of the accounts is Account 363.00 Electric Storage Battery which should be depreciated based on a 15 -year life and zero percent net salvage. The depreciation rate for this account will be 6.67\%. The othernew plant account is Account 371.10 Electric VehicleCharging Stations which should be depreciated based on a 10-year life and a zero percent net salvage. The depreciation rate for this account will be $10.00 \%$. These depreciation rates are set forth in the Depreciation Study on page VI-4.

## V. NET SALVAGE METHODOLOGY

Q. IN SECTION III, YOU EXPLAINED THE CONCEPT OF NET SALVAGE. DO THE COSTS INCLUDED IN DEPRECIATION EXPENSE NORMALLY INCLUDE AN ESTIMATE OF NET SALVAGE?
A. Yes, they do. As required by the FERC Uniform System of Accounts ("USofA") and explained in authoritative depreciation texts, the service value of an asset includes the net salvage costs at the end of the asset's life. For this reason, depreciation must include an estimate of net salvage in order to allocate these costs over the lives of the assets.

## Q. HOW IS NET SALVAGE NORMALLY INCLUDED IN DEPRECIATION EXPENSE?

A. By far, the most common approach is to use what has often been referred to as the "traditional method." This method is called the "traditional method" in part because it is so widely used in the industry for the recovery of net salvage. In the traditional method, an estimate of future net salvage costs is made based on informed judgment that incorporates a statistical analysis of historical net salvage data in which net salvage is expressed as a percentage of retirements. The
estimated net salvage is then allocated on a straight line basis over the service lives of the Company's assets. This approach is consistent with the concept of depreciation as a method of cost allocation. The traditional method is also widely accepted by almost all jurisdictions and by authoritative depreciation texts.

## Q. IS THIS METHOD CURRENTLY IN USE IN MARYLAND?

A. No. Maryland currently uses the MD Present Value Method, which is a method that is unique to Maryland. When using this method, net salvage has been estimated in a similar manner to the traditional method. However, the MD Present Value Method does not allocate these costs on a straight line basis but instead uses a deferred method of recovery based on a discount rate. The deferred method of recovery is used only for net salvage, while the straight line method is used for the original cost of the Company's assets.

## Q. HOW DOES THE MD PRESENT VALUE METHOD WORK?

A. Unlike in most jurisdictions, in which net salvage is recovered in equal amounts over the life of property using the straight line method, the MD Present Value method discounts future net salvage cost to an estimated present value. This present value is then recovered through current depreciation rates. As the present value increases over the life of the property, customers pay interest at a rate equal to the discount rate used in the calculations, and the annual amount of net salvage recovered increases over the life of the property. ${ }^{17}$ Because utility property service lives typically span decades, the discount rate used for the MD Present Value

[^108]Method calculations has a significant impact on the resultant annual net salvage accruals.

## Q. WHAT DISCOUNT RATE HAS BEEN USED IN PRIOR CASES IN MARYLAND FOR THE MD PRESENT VALUE METHOD?

A. The MD Present Value method was first adopted in 2007 in Case No. 9092 for the Potomac Electric Power Company ("Pepco"). In that case, the Staff of the Maryland Public Service Commission ("Staff") hired an external consultant, William Dunkel, who provided testimony discussing methods for recovering net salvage through depreciation and recommended the use of the MD Present Value Method. The MD Present Value Method had not, to my knowledge, been previously used in any other regulatory jurisdiction. ${ }^{18}$ Mr. Dunkel's rebuttal testimony (Mr. Dunkel did not provide direct testimony in that case) assessed three methods that had been proposed by either the Company or by Maryland Office of People's Counsel ("OPC") - the traditional straight line method, a Historical Recovery method, ${ }^{19}$ and the MD Present Value Method. The only depreciation proposal using the MD Present Value Method in Case No. 9092 incorporated Pepco's overall rate of return as the discount rate. The Commission adopted the MD Present Value Method in that case, establishing a precedent for both the method and the use of the rate of return as the discount rate.

[^109]Q. WAS THE IMPACT OF THE DISCOUNT RATE GIVEN FULL CONSIDERATION IN CASE NO. 9092?
A. No. The focus of testimony in that case was on the method, rather than specifics such as the discount rate. Indeed, the Commission concluded that the MD Present Value Method was a middle ground between the traditional method and the Historical Recovery method, stating:

The Present Value Method strikes a balance between the straight line and historical recovery proposals. It is a forward looking approach like the Straight Line Method and recovers projected costs over the life of the plant. However, because future costs are discounted to a "present value," today's ratepayers will pay only their fair share of recovery costs in "real" dollars rather than the inflated amounts under the Straight Line Method. In our opinion, the Present Value Method strikes an appropriate balance between the interests of current and future ratepayers." ${ }^{20}$

As my associate Ned W. Allis recently discussed in detail in Case No. 9670,21 Case No. 9092 was, to my knowledge, the first time the MD Present Value Method was adopted in the utility industry in any jurisdiction. The experience in Maryland since Case No. 9092 concluded in 2007 is, therefore, the only experience in the industry of using this method. Based on the experience of Maryland utilities, the MD Present Value Method has not struck a balance between the traditional and Historical Recovery methods, as, for each of the electric utilities in the state, it has recovered less in net salvage through depreciation than has been incurred and has not resulted in customers paying their fair share of net salvage costs in "real" (i.e., inflation-adjusted) dollars. There are several reasons the MD Present Value

[^110]Method has not worked as the Commission intended, one of which is the use of the overall rate of return as the discount rate.

## Q. HAVE ANY CHANGES BEEN MADE TO MD PRESENT VALUE METHOD SINCE IT WAS INITIALLY ADOPTED IN CASE NO. 9092?

A. Yes. The Commission has approved several changes to the MD Present Value Method since Case No. 9092. These include modifications in Case Nos. 9103, ${ }^{22}$ $9096,{ }^{23} 9610^{24}$ and 9670. ${ }^{25}$ The fact that the MD Present Value Method has repeatedly been modified since its adoption provides further evidence that an additional refinement to change the discount rate would be reasonable if the Method is going to continue to be used.

## Q. HAVE THE COMMISSION OR OTHER PARTIES SUGGESTED THAT A CHANGE TO THE DISCOUNT RATE FOR THE MD PRESENT VALUE METHOD COULD BE APPROPRIATE?

A. Yes. While for several years the Commission, Staff and OPC continued to support the rate of return as the discount rate, in more recent cases parties, including the Commission, appear to have begun to recognize that the rate of return is too high of a discount rate and that an alternative would be more appropriate. Statements of this conclusion include:

[^111]- In Case No. 9609, the Public Utilities Law Judge ("PULJ"), in reviewing the record in that case, found several issues with the MD Present Value Method. These included that the use of the rate of return as the discount rate meant that "customers toward the end of an asset's life will pay much more for the removal of the asset than customers early in the asset's life (in dollars that reflect the time value of money or 'real dollars')," which the PULJ found to be "troubling." The PULJ also found that the record was "replete with evidence that the [MD Present Value Method] has an upward impact on a utility's rate of return revenue due to the upward impact on a utility's net plant" and that "rates will be higher over the long term than if the traditional straight line method is used." While the PULJ suggested that the Commission might find that the benefits of the MD Present Value Method do not outweigh the costs and might consider "reverting to the use of the traditional straight line method," the PULJ opted to continue to use the MD Present Value Method but with a more reasonable 2.5\% inflation-based discount rate rather than the rate of return as the discount rate. ${ }^{26}$ The Commission eventually declined to use this refinement because it believed the record did not support the $2.5 \%$ discount rate. ${ }^{27}$
- In the settlement in Case No. 9644 for Columbia Gas of Maryland ("Columbia"), the parties agreed that "In its next base rate case, the Company agrees to use a discount factor in the development of a net salvage

[^112]component that is consistent with the Company's credit-adjusted risk-free rate." ${ }^{28}$

- In Columbia's next case, Case No. 9664, the PULJ found that "[t]here is evidence that a credit-adjusted risk-free rate is appropriate to use as the discount rate in the SFAS 143 methodology, ${ }^{29}$ but there is insufficient evidence in the record to support what that rate should be for Columbia. Without further expert testimony, there is no way to compare which discount rate, a credit-adjusted risk-free rate or the ROR, would be more appropriate. Columbia has failed to meet its burden of proof on the issue by using a discount factor based solely on inflation. Therefore, consistent with Commission decisions, I accept the positions of Staff and OPC, that the Company's authorized ROR will be used as the discount rate." 30 This finding was not appealed to the Commission.
- In Phase II of Case No. 9490 for Potomac Edison, the Commission also appeared to find that, while the record in that case did not support a specific credit-adjusted risk-free rate, the use of a credit-adjusted risk-free rate would be appropriate. The Commission explained that "[ $t$ ]he PULJ found substantial evidence that the discount rate that should be used with the Present Value Method is a credit-adjusted risk-free rate, which 'takes into account inflation, but it is not the same as inflation." 31 The Commission

[^113]also stated that "[d]eveloping a credit-adjusted risk-free rate requires analyzing market data such as theinterest rate environment and the general state of the economy, as well as a company's financial condition, including financing arrangements. As the PULJ observed, however, no such analysis was performed in this case." ${ }^{32}$

- In Case No. 9670 for Delmarva Power \& Light Company ("DPL"), in response to several issues identified with the MD Present Value Method, Staff supported the use of DPL's credit-adjusted risk-free rate as an alternative to the rate of return. Mr. Valcarenghi testified that "[i]n this alternative I utilized the present value method for recovering net salvage costs, just as I did in my direct testimony, except I have utilized a lower discount factor of $3.04 \%$. This alternative discounts the net salvage costs based on the use of a credit-adjusted risk free rate, rather than by using the rate of return."
- In Case No. 968 o for Columbia Gas of Maryland, Columbia's proposal was based on the MD Present Value Method using the CARFR as the discount rate. Staff supported the use of the CARFR as the discount rate, testifying that "[g]iven recent guidance from the Commission, Staff believes it is appropriate to recommend a discount rate developed on a basis other than rate of return. Staff believes a discount rate based on a credit-adjusted riskfree rate ("CAFR") is a preferred rate because provides a more stable pathway for recovery of costs." ${ }^{33}$ Staff's proposal supported a different

[^114]CARFR than Columbia's proposal, however, as will be discussed in more detail later in this testimony.

- MD and DC OPC have hired several consulting firms in the past five years in the only two jurisdictions using any version of the Present Value Method. In recognition of issues with the MD Present Value Method, each firm has proposed or recognized alternatives to the approach:
- In BGE's most recent case, Case No. 9610, OPC witness William Dunkel proposed to use significantly more negative net salvage estimates than those used in the traditional method. His proposal resulted in recovery of net salvage that was similar to the recovery resulting from the traditional method. ${ }^{34}$
- In Case No. 9609, OPC witness David Garrett suggested a different rate might be appropriate. As described by the PULJ, "OPC Witness Garrett testified that a negative impact of the [MD Present Value] Method might not indicate a problem with the [MD Present Value] Method itself, but with the discount rate being used. He suggested that the methodology might need to be modified. OPC and Staff used rate of return as the discount factor because that is what has been accepted in the past. However, as Witness Garrett testified, there is not just one way to apply a

[^115]present value methodology and there is no requirement that the discount rate be equal to the rate of return." 35

- OPC has hired the consulting firm Snavely King in several recent cases. When testifyingin the District of Columbia, Snavely King ${ }^{36}$ testified that the discount rate for the Present Value Method should be the rate of inflation. The Snavely King witness explained that "[t]he primary objective of the present value method is to match charges for future inflation to future periods instead of the current period. The 7.96\% discount rate reflects the 'current approved cost of capital for PEPCO in the District of Columbia jurisdiction...' Use of a rate of return as the discount rate implies that such rate bears some relationship to earnings. However, the purpose of using a discount rate in this context is simply to remove the effects of future inflation from PEPCO's charges to current customers." 37

In the overall context of these testimonies and Orders, there appears to be at least some measure of consensus that an alternative to the use of a utility's rate of return would be reasonable for the discount rate for the MD Present Value Method. Additionally, both the Commission and Staff have acknowledged that the use of a CARFR interest rate may be appropriate.

[^116]Q. DOES SFAS 143 SUPPORT THE USE OF THE RATE OF RETURN AS THE DISCOUNT RATE?
A. No. To the contrary, paragraph 8 of SFAS 143 makes clear that a CARFR must be used when accounting for asset retirement obligations ("AROs")38 :

An expected present value technique will usually be the only appropriate technique with which to estimate the fair value of a liability for an asset retirement obligation. An entity, when using that technique, shall discount the expected cash flows using a credit-adjusted risk-free rate. Thus, the effect of an entity's credit standing is reflected in the discount rate rather than in the expected cash flows.

I will note that I have reviewed the depreciation-related testimonies and Order in Case No. 9092, in which the MD Present Value Method was initially adopted. I have not found any testimony as to why, for a method allegedly based on SFAS 143, both OPC and Staff consultants used a much higher discount rate than required by SFAS 143. Neither party provided testimony in Case No. 9092 explaining this deviation from SFAS 143. It is unclear whether this was inadvertent - perhaps the witnesses supporting this method did not fully understand the implications of the discount rate - or whether it was intended as a way to further reduce depreciation. I also find it puzzling because I have seen both of these consulting firms propose the use of different discount rates elsewhere - Staff's consultant from Case No. 9092 has used a CARFR - that is, a lower rate than the rate of return - when proposing a present value method elsewhere ${ }^{39}$ and, as noted

[^117]above, OPC's consultant in Case No. 9092 supported an inflation-based discount rate in the District of Columbia.

With all of this in mind, there really is not a conceptual justification for using the rate of return as the discount rate, particularly because the use of a high discount rate has contributed to a myriad of problems resulting from the use of the MD Present Value Method since Case No. 9092.40 If the Commission intends for the MD Present Value Method to be more consistent with the accounting pronouncement on which the method is apparently based, then the use of a CARFR would be more appropriate.

## Q. HOW IS A CARFR RATE DETERMINED?

A. SFAS 143 defines the CARFR as "an interest rate that equates to a risk-free interest rate adjusted for the effect of its credit standing (a credit-adjusted risk-free rate)." ${ }^{41}$ This definition sets forth two components in determining a CARFR. The first is determining the risk-free rate. The risk-free rate is typically considered to be the interest rate for U.S. Treasury bonds, since it is assumed the default risk for U.S. government bonds is minimal. The second is determining an adjustment for the effect of a company's credit standing. There is a third component as well, which is the duration to which the interest rate applies (i.e., five-year, ten-year, thirty-year, etc.). Thus, the CARFR is effectively the interest rate for a company's debt for a given time and duration.

[^118]Q. HAS THE COMMISSION PROVIDED ANY INDICATION OF HOW A CARFR RATE SHOULD BE DETERMINED?
A. Yes. In Phase II of Case No. 9490, the Commission stated "[d]eveloping a creditadjusted risk-free rate requires analyzing market data such as the interest rate environment and the general state of the economy, as well as a company's financial condition, including financing arrangements." 42

## Q. HAVE ANY OTHER PARTIES SUPPORTED A CARFR IN PREVIOUS PROCEEDINGS AND, IF SO, HOW WAS THE CARFR DETERMINED?

A. Yes. As discussed above, in Case No. 9670, Staff supported an alternative proposal which used a CARFR as the discount rate. For Case No. 9670, the 3.04\% rate Staff witness Valcarenghi supported was based on the most recently available interest rates at the time, which were determined as of J une 30, 2021. The 3.04\% rate was determined for a 30-year duration and based on a 2.09\% treasury rate and a $0.95 \%$ adjustment for DPL's credit standing. Both of these were generally in line with 30year treasuries and the spreads between these rates and the interest rates of the same duration that were consistent with the company's credit rating as of June 30, 2021. A 30-year duration was used because the service lives of most electric distribution plant assets have service lives of 30 years or more.

In case No. 9680 , Columbia proposed to use a discount rate based on the CARFR. My firm provided testimony in support of the discount rate proposed in that case, which included analyses of 30-year U.S. treasury yields, utility bond yields of the same duration, and the spreads between these two yields. Staff's

[^119]witness also supported the use of the CARFR in that case. ${ }^{43}$ While Staff's proposed discount rate differed from Columbia's proposal, Staff's analysis supporting their proposal was fundamentally similar to my firm's and the differences were due more to the time periods analyzed and data incorporated in the analysis, rather than with the general approach of considering the three variables discussed above.

## Q. WHAT IS YOUR RECOMMENDATION FOR THE CARFR?

A. The recommendation for this proceeding is to use a CARFR rate consistent with the Company's discount rate utilized for the recent utility bond yield of 5.93\% for the most recent period available at the time the study was completed, which was the three months ending December 31, 2022. This discount rate was based on the average of the yield on Potomac utility bonds for the final three months of 2022. This is slightly higher than the range of the 30-year treasury bond through the end of 2022.

## Q. WHAT IS YOUR RECOMMENDATION REGARDING THE NET SALVAGE METHOD IN THIS PROCEEDING?

A. While I continue to believe the traditional method is most appropriate, the Company's proposal in this case is to use depreciation rates based on the estimates in the Depreciation Study calculated with the MD Present Value Method and a discount rate based on the CARFR, consistent with recent MD Commission precedent. These depreciation rates are set forth in the appendix to the Depreciation Study.

[^120]6 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?
7 A. Yes.
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## JOHN SPANOS

## DEPRECIATION EXPERIENCE

## Q. Please state your name.

A. My name is John J. Spanos.
Q. What is your educational background?
A. I have Bachelor of Science degrees in Industrial Management and Mathematics from Carnegie-Mellon University and a Master of Business Administration from York College.
Q. Do you belong to any professional societies?
A. Yes. I am a member and past President of the Society of Depreciation Professionals and a member of the American Gas Association/Edison Electric Institute Industry Accounting Committee.

## Q. Do you hold any special certification as a depreciation expert?

A. Yes. The Society of Depreciation Professionals has established national standards for depreciation professionals. The Society administers an examination to become certified in this field. I passed the certification exam in September 1997 and was recertified in August 2003, February 2008, January 2013, February 2018 and February 2023.

## Q. Please outline your experience in the field of depreciation.

A. In June 1986, I was employed by Gannett Fleming Valuation and Rate Consultants, Inc. as a Depreciation Analyst. During the period from June 1986 through December 1995, I helped prepare numerous depreciation and original cost studies for utility companies in various industries. I helped perform depreciation studies for the following telephone companies: United Telephone of Pennsylvania, United Telephone of New Jersey, and Anchorage Telephone Utility. I helped perform depreciation studies for the following companies in
the railroad industry: Union Pacific Railroad, Burlington Northern Railroad, and Wisconsin Central Transportation Corporation.

I helped perform depreciation studies for the following organizations in the electric utility industry: Chugach Electric Association, The Cincinnati Gas and Electric Company (CG\&E), The Union Light, Heat and Power Company (ULH\&P), Northwest Territories Power Corporation, and the City of Calgary - Electric System.

I helped perform depreciation studies for the following pipeline companies: TransCanada Pipelines Limited, Trans Mountain Pipe Line Company Ltd., Interprovincial Pipe Line Inc., Nova Gas Transmission Limited and Lakehead Pipeline Company.

I helped perform depreciation studies for the following gas utility companies: Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania, Columbia Gas of Maryland, The Peoples Natural Gas Company, T. W. Phillips Gas \& Oil Company, CG\&E, ULH\&P, Lawrenceburg Gas Company and Penn Fuel Gas, Inc.

I helped perform depreciation studies for the following water utility companies: Indiana-American Water Company, Consumers Pennsylvania Water Company and The York Water Company; and depreciation and original cost studies for Philadelphia Suburban Water Company and Pennsylvania-American Water Company.

In each of the above studies, I assembled and analyzed historical and simulated data, performed field reviews, developed preliminary estimates of service life and net salvage, calculated annual depreciation, and prepared reports for submission to state public utility commissions or federal regulatory agencies. I performed these studies under the general direction of William M. Stout, P.E.

In January 1996, I was assigned to the position of Supervisor of Depreciation Studies. In July 1999, I was promoted to the position of Manager, Depreciation and

Valuation Studies. In December 2000, I was promoted to the position as Vice-President of Gannett Fleming Valuation and Rate Consultants, Inc., in April 2012, I was promoted to the position as Senior Vice President of the Valuation and Rate Division of Gannett Fleming Inc. (now doing business as Gannett Fleming Valuation and Rate Consultants, LLC) and in January of 2019, I was promoted to my present position of President of Gannett Fleming Valuation and Rate Consultants, LLC. In my current position I am responsible for conducting all depreciation, valuation and original cost studies, including the preparation of final exhibits and responses to data requests for submission to the appropriate regulatory bodies.

Since January 1996, I have conducted depreciation studies similar to those previously listed including assignments for Pennsylvania-American Water Company; Aqua Pennsylvania; Kentucky-American Water Company; Virginia-American Water Company; Indiana-American Water Company; Iowa-American Water Company; New JerseyAmerican Water Company; Hampton Water Works Company; Omaha Public Power District; Enbridge Pipe Line Company; Inc.; Columbia Gas of Virginia, Inc.; Virginia Natural Gas Company National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation - New York and Pennsylvania Divisions; The City of Bethlehem - Bureau of Water; The City of Coatesville Authority; The City of Lancaster - Bureau of Water; Peoples Energy Corporation; The York Water Company; Public Service Company of Colorado; Enbridge Pipelines; Enbridge Gas Distribution, Inc.; Reliant Energy-HLP; Massachusetts-American Water Company; St. Louis County Water Company; Missouri-American Water Company; Chugach Electric Association; Alliant Energy; Oklahoma Gas \& Electric Company; Nevada Power Company; Dominion Virginia Power; NUI-Virginia Gas Companies; Pacific Gas \& Electric Company; PSI Energy; NUI - Elizabethtown Gas Company; Cinergy Corporation - CG\&E; Cinergy

Corporation - ULH\&P; Columbia Gas of Kentucky; South Carolina Electric \& Gas Company; Idaho Power Company; El Paso Electric Company; Aqua North Carolina; Aqua Ohio; Aqua Texas, Inc.; Aqua Illinois, Inc.; Ameren Missouri; Central Hudson Gas \& Electric; Centennial Pipeline Company; CenterPoint Energy-Arkansas; CenterPoint Energy - Oklahoma; CenterPoint Energy - Entex; CenterPoint Energy - Louisiana; NSTAR Boston Edison Company; Westar Energy, Inc.; United Water Pennsylvania; PPL Electric Utilities; PPL Gas Utilities; Wisconsin Power \& Light Company; TransAlaska Pipeline; Avista Corporation; Northwest Natural Gas; Allegheny Energy Supply, Inc.; Public Service Company of North Carolina; South Jersey Gas Company; Duquesne Light Company; MidAmerican Energy Company; Laclede Gas; Duke Energy Company; E.ON U.S. Services Inc.; Elkton Gas Services; Anchorage Water and Wastewater Utility; Kansas City Power and Light; Duke Energy North Carolina; Duke Energy South Carolina; Monongahela Power Company; Potomac Edison Company; Duke Energy Ohio Gas; Duke Energy Kentucky; Duke Energy Indiana; Duke Energy Progress; Northern Indiana Public Service Company; Tennessee- American Water Company; Columbia Gas of Maryland; Maryland-American Water Company; Bonneville Power Administration; NSTAR Electric and Gas Company; EPCOR Distribution, Inc.; B. C. Gas Utility, Ltd; Entergy Arkansas; Entergy Texas; Entergy Mississippi; Entergy Louisiana; Entergy Gulf States Louisiana; the Borough of Hanover; Louisville Gas and Electric Company; Kentucky Utilities Company; Madison Gas and Electric; Central Maine Power; PEPCO; PacifiCorp; Minnesota Energy Resource Group; Jersey Central Power \& Light Company; Cheyenne Light, Fuel and Power Company; United Water Arkansas; Central Vermont Public Service Corporation; Green Mountain Power; Portland General Electric Company; Atlantic City Electric; Nicor Gas Company; Black Hills Power; Black Hills Colorado Gas; Black Hills Energy Arkansas, Inc.; Black Hills Kansas

Gas; Black Hills Service Company; Black Hills Utility Holdings; Public Service Company of Oklahoma; City of Dubois; Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company; North Shore Gas Company; Connecticut Light and Power; New York State Electric and Gas Corporation; Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation; Greater Missouri Operations; Tennessee Valley Authority; Omaha Public Power District; Indianapolis Power \& Light Company; Vermont Gas Systems, Inc.; Metropolitan Edison; Pennsylvania Electric; West Penn Power; Pennsylvania Power; PHI Service Company - Delmarva Power and Light; Atmos Energy Corporation; Citizens Energy Group; PSE\&G Company; Berkshire Gas Company; Alabama Gas Corporation; Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC; SUEZ Water; WEC Energy Group; Rocky Mountain Natural Gas, LLC; Illinois-American Water Company; Northern Illinois Gas Company; Public Service of New Hampshire and Newtown Artesian Water Company.

My additional duties include determining final life and salvage estimates, conducting field reviews, presenting recommended depreciation rates to management for its consideration and supporting such rates before regulatory bodies.

## Q. Have you submitted testimony to any state utility commission on the subject of utility plant depreciation?

A. Yes. I have submitted testimony to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission; the Commonwealth of Kentucky Public Service Commission; the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio; the Nevada Public Utility Commission; the Public Utilities Board of New Jersey; the Missouri Public Service Commission; the Massachusetts Department of Telecommunications and Energy; the Alberta Energy \& Utility Board; the Idaho Public Utility Commission; the Louisiana Public Service Commission; the State Corporation Commission of Kansas; the Oklahoma Corporate Commission; the Public Service

Commission of South Carolina; Railroad Commission of Texas - Gas Services Division; the New York Public Service Commission; Illinois Commerce Commission; the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission; the California Public Utilities Commission; the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC"); the Arkansas Public Service Commission; the Public Utility Commission of Texas; Maryland Public Service Commission; Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission; The Tennessee Regulatory Commission; the Regulatory Commission of Alaska; Minnesota Public Utility Commission; Utah Public Service Commission; District of Columbia Public Service Commission; the Mississippi Public Service Commission; Delaware Public Service Commission; Virginia State Corporation Commission; Colorado Public Utility Commission; Oregon Public Utility Commission; South Dakota Public Utilities Commission; Wisconsin Public Service Commission; Wyoming Public Service Commission; the Public Service Commission of West Virginia; Maine Public Utility Commission; Iowa Utility Board; Connecticut Public Utilities Regulatory Authority; New Mexico Public Regulation Commission; Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities; Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission and the North Carolina Utilities Commission.

## Q. Have you had any additional education relating to utility plant depreciation?

A. Yes. I have completed the following courses conducted by Depreciation Programs, Inc.: "Techniques of Life Analysis," "Techniques of Salvage and Depreciation Analysis," "Forecasting Life and Salvage," "Modeling and Life Analysis Using Simulation," and "Managing a Depreciation Study." I have also completed the "Introduction to Public Utility Accounting" program conducted by the American Gas Association.

## Q. Does this conclude your qualification statement?

A. Yes.
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|  | Year | Jurisdiction | Docket No. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01. | 1998 | PA PUC | R-00984375 |
| 02. | 1998 | PA PUC | R-00984567 |
| 03. | 1999 | PA PUC | R-00994605 |
| 04. | 2000 | D.T.\&E. | DTE 00-105 |
| 05. | 2001 | PA PUC | R-00016114 |
| 06. | 2001 | PA PUC | R-00017236 |
| 07. | 2001 | PA PUC | R-00016339 |
| 08. | 2001 | OH PUC | 01-1228-GA-AIR |
| 09. | 2001 | KY PSC | 2001-092 |
| 10. | 2002 | PA PUC | R-00016750 |
| 11. | 2002 | KY PSC | 2002-00145 |
| 12. | 2002 | NJ BPU | GF02040245 |
| 13. | 2002 | ID PUC | IPC-E-03-7 |
| 14. | 2003 | PA PUC | R-0027975 |
| 15. | 2003 | IN URC | R-0027975 |
| 16. | 2003 | PA PUC | R-00038304 |
| 17. | 2003 | MO PSC | WR-2003-0500 |
| 18. | 2003 | FERC | ERO3-1274-000 |
| 19. | 2003 | NJ BPU | BPU 03080683 |
| 20. | 2003 | NV PUC | 03-10001 |
| 21. | 2003 | LA PSC | U-27676 |
| 22. | 2003 | PA PUC | R-00038805 |
| 23. | 2004 | AB En/Util Bd | 1306821 |
| 24. | 2004 | PA PUC | R-00038168 |
| 25. | 2004 | PA PUC | R-00049255 |
| 26. | 2004 | PA PUC | R-00049165 |
| 27. | 2004 | OK Corp Cm | PUC 200400187 |
| 28. | 2004 | OH PUC | 04-680-EI-AIR |
| 29. | 2004 | RR Com of TX | GUD\# |
| 30. | 2004 | NY PUC | 04-G-1047 |
| 31. | 2004 | AR PSC | 04-121-U |
| 32. | 2005 | IL CC | 05-ICC-06 |
| 33. | 2005 | IL CC | 05-ICC-06 |
| 34. | 2005 | KY PSC | 2005-00042 |

Client Utility
City of Bethlehem - Bureau of Water
City of Lancaster
The York Water Company
Massachusetts-American Water Company
City of Lancaster
The York Water Company
Pennsylvania-American Water Company
Cinergy Corp - Cincinnati Gas \& Elect Company
Cinergy Corp - Union Light, Heat \& Power Co.
Philadelphia Suburban Water Company
Columbia Gas of Kentucky
NUI Corporation/Elizabethtown Gas Company Idaho Power Company
The York Water Company
Cinergy Corp - PSI Energy, Inc.
Pennsylvania-American Water Company
Missouri-American Water Company
NSTAR-Boston Edison Company
South Jersey Gas Company
Nevada Power Company
CenterPoint Energy - Arkla
Pennsylvania Suburban Water Company
EPCOR Distribution, Inc.
National Fuel Gas Distribution Corp (PA)
PPL Electric Utilities
The York Water Company
CenterPoint Energy - Arkla
Cinergy Corp. - Cincinnati Gas and
Electric Company
CenterPoint Energy - Entex Gas Services Div.
National Fuel Gas Distribution Gas (NY)
CenterPoint Energy - Arkla
North Shore Gas Company
Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company
Union Light Heat \& Power

## Subject

Original Cost and Depreciation
Original Cost and Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Original Cost and Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation

Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation

# Exhibit JJS-1A 
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|  | Year | Jurisdiction | Docket No. | Client Utility | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35. | 2005 | IL CC | 05-0308 | MidAmerican Energy Company | Depreciation |
| 36. | 2005 | MO PSC | GF-2005 | Laclede Gas Company | Depreciation |
| 37. | 2005 | KS CC | 05-WSEE-981-RTS | Westar Energy | Depreciation |
| 38. | 2005 | RR Com of TX | GUD \# | CenterPoint Energy - Entex Gas Services Div. | Depreciation |
| 39. | 2005 | US District Court | Cause No. 1:99-CV-1693LJM/VSS | Cinergy Corporation | Accounting |
| 40. | 2005 | OK CC | PUD 200500151 | Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company | Depreciation |
| 41. | 2005 | MA Dept Telecom \& Ergy | DTE 05-85 | NSTAR | Depreciation |
| 42. | 2005 | NY PUC | 05-E-934/05-G-0935 | Central Hudson Gas \& Electric Company | Depreciation |
| 43. | 2005 | AK Reg Com | U-04-102 | Chugach Electric Association | Depreciation |
| 44. | 2005 | CA PUC | A05-12-002 | Pacific Gas \& Electric | Depreciation |
| 45. | 2006 | PA PUC | R-00051030 | Aqua Pennsylvania, Inc. | Depreciation |
| 46. | 2006 | PA PUC | R-00051178 | T.W. Phillips Gas and Oil Company | Depreciation |
| 47. | 2006 | NC Util Cm. | G-5, Sub522 | Pub. Service Company of North Carolina | Depreciation |
| 48. | 2006 | PA PUC | R-00051167 | City of Lancaster | Depreciation |
| 49. | 2006 | PA PUC | R00061346 | Duquesne Light Company | Depreciation |
| 50. | 2006 | PA PUC | R-00061322 | The York Water Company | Depreciation |
| 51. | 2006 | PA PUC | R-00051298 | PPL GAS Utilities | Depreciation |
| 52. | 2006 | PUC of TX | 32093 | CenterPoint Energy - Houston Electric | Depreciation |
| 53. | 2006 | KY PSC | 2006-00172 | Duke Energy Kentucky | Depreciation |
| 54. | 2006 | SC PSC |  | SCANA | Accounting |
| 55. | 2006 | AK Reg Com | U-06-6 | Municipal Light and Power | Depreciation |
| 56. | 2006 | DE PSC | 06-284 | Delmarva Power and Light | Depreciation |
| 57. | 2006 | IN URC | IURC43081 | Indiana American Water Company | Depreciation |
| 58. | 2006 | AK Reg Com | U-06-134 | Chugach Electric Association | Depreciation |
| 59. | 2006 | MO PSC | WR-2007-0216 | Missouri American Water Company | Depreciation |
| 60. | 2006 | FERC | IS05-82-002, et al | TransAlaska Pipeline | Depreciation |
| 61. | 2006 | PA PUC | R-00061493 | National Fuel Gas Distribution Corp. (PA) | Depreciation |
| 62. | 2007 | NC Util Com. | E-7 SUB 828 | Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC | Depreciation |
| 63. | 2007 | OH PSC | 08-709-EL-AIR | Duke Energy Ohio Gas | Depreciation |
| 64. | 2007 | PA PUC | R-00072155 | PPL Electric Utilities Corporation | Depreciation |
| 65. | 2007 | KY PSC | 2007-00143 | Kentucky American Water Company | Depreciation |
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LIST OF CASES IN WHICH JOHN J. SPANOS SUBMITTED TESTIMONY, cont.

|  | Year | Jurisdiction | Docket No. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 66. | 2007 | PA PUC | R-00072229 |
| 67. | 2007 | KY PSC | 2007-0008 |
| 68. | 2007 | NY PSC | 07-G-0141 |
| 69. | 2008 | AK PSC | U-08-004 |
| 70. | 2008 | TN Reg Auth | 08-00039 |
| 71. | 2008 | DE PSC | 08-96 |
| 72. | 2008 | PA PUC | R-2008-2023067 |
| 73. | 2008 | KS CC | 08-WSEE1-RTS |
| 74. | 2008 | IN URC | 43526 |
| 75. | 2008 | IN URC | 43501 |
| 76. | 2008 | MD PSC | 9159 |
| 77. | 2008 | KY PSC | 2008-000251 |
| 78. | 2008 | KY PSC | 2008-000252 |
| 79. | 2008 | PA PUC | 2008-20322689 |
| 80. | 2008 | NY PSC | 08-E887/08-00888 |
| 81. | 2008 | WVTC | VE-080416/VG-8080417 |
| 82. | 2008 | ILCC | ICC-09-166 |
| 83. | 2009 | ILCC | ICC-09-167 |
| 84. | 2009 | DC PSC | 1076 |
| 85. | 2009 | KY PSC | 2009-00141 |
| 86. | 2009 | FERC | ER08-1056-002 |
| 87. | 2009 | PA PUC | R-2009-2097323 |
| 88. | 2009 | NC Util Cm | E-7, Sub 090 |
| 89. | 2009 | KY PSC | 2009-00202 |
| 90. | 2009 | VA St. CC | PUE-2009-00059 |
| 91. | 2009 | PA PUC | 2009-2132019 |
| 92. | 2009 | MS PSC | Docket No. 2011-UA-183 |
| 93. | 2009 | AK PSC | 09-08-U |
| 94. | 2009 | TX PUC | 37744 |
| 95. | 2009 | TXPUC | 37690 |
| 96. | 2009 | PA PUC | R-2009-2106908 |
| 97. | 2009 | KS CC | 10-KCPE-415-RTS |
| 98. | 2009 | PA PUC | R-2009- |

Client Utility
Pennsylvania American Water Company
NiSource - Columbia Gas of Kentucky
National Fuel Gas Distribution Corp (NY)
Anchorage Water \& Wastewater Utility
Tennessee-American Water Company
Artesian Water Company
The York Water Company
Westar Energy
Northern Indiana Public Service Company
Duke Energy Indiana
NiSource - Columbia Gas of Maryland
Kentucky Utilities
Louisville Gas \& Electric
Pennsylvania American Water Co. - Wastewater
Central Hudson
Avista Corporation
Peoples Gas, Light and Coke Company
North Shore Gas Company
Potomac Electric Power Company
NiSource - Columbia Gas of Kentucky
Entergy Services
Pennsylvania American Water Company
Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC
Duke Energy Kentucky
Aqua Virginia, Inc.
Aqua Pennsylvania, Inc.
Entergy Mississippi
Entergy Arkansas
Entergy Texas
El Paso Electric Company
The Borough of Hanover
Kansas City Power \& Light
United Water Pennsylvania

Subject
Depreciation Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
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|  | Year | Jurisdiction | Docket No. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 99. | 2009 | OH PUC |  |
| 100. | 2009 | WI PSC | 3270-DU-103 |
| 101. | 2009 | MO PSC | WR-2010 |
| 102. | 2009 | AK Reg Cm | U-09-097 |
| 103. | 2010 | IN URC | 43969 |
| 104. | 2010 | WI PSC | 6690-DU-104 |
| 105. | 2010 | PA PUC | R-2010-2161694 |
| 106. | 2010 | KY PSC | 2010-00036 |
| 107. | 2010 | PA PUC | R-2009-2149262 |
| 108. | 2010 | MO PSC | GR-2010-0171 |
| 109. | 2010 | SC PSC | 2009-489-E |
| 110. | 2010 | NJ BD OF PU | ER09080664 |
| 111. | 2010 | VA St. CC | PUE-2010-00001 |
| 112. | 2010 | PA PUC | R-2010-2157140 |
| 113. | 2010 | MO PSC | ER-2010-0356 |
| 114. | 2010 | MO PSC | ER-2010-0355 |
| 115. | 2010 | PA PUC | R-2010-2167797 |
| 116. | 2010 | PSC SC | 2009-489-E |
| 117. | 2010 | PA PUC | R-2010-22010702 |
| 118. | 2010 | AK PSC | 10-067-U |
| 119. | 2010 | IN URC | Cause No. 43894 |
| 120. | 2010 | IN URC | Cause No. 43894 |
| 121. | 2010 | PA PUC | R-2010-2166212 |
| 122. | 2010 | NC Util Cn. | W-218,SUB310 |
| 123. | 2011 | OH PUC | 11-4161-WS-AIR |
| 124. | 2011 | MS PSC | EC-123-0082-00 |
| 125. | 2011 | CO PUC | 11AL-387E |
| 126. | 2011 | PA PUC | R-2010-2215623 |
| 127. | 2011 | PA PUC | R-2010-2179103 |
| 128. | 2011 | IN URC | 43114 IGCC 4S |
| 129. | 2011 | FERC | IS11-146-000 |
| 130. | 2011 | IL CC | 11-0217 |
| 131. | 2011 | OK CC | 201100087 |
| 132. | 2011 | PA PUC | 2011-2232243 |

Aqua Ohio Water Company
Madison Gas \& Electric Company
Missouri American Water Company
Chugach Electric Association
Northern Indiana Public Service Company
Wisconsin Public Service Corp.
PPL Electric Utilities Corp.
Kentucky American Water Company
Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania
Laclede Gas Company
South Carolina Electric \& Gas Company
Atlantic City Electric
Virginia American Water Company
The York Water Company
Greater Missouri Operations Company
Kansas City Power and Light
T.W. Phillips Gas and Oil Company

SCANA - Electric
Peoples Natural Gas, LLC
Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company
Northern Indiana Public Serv. Company - NIFL
Northern Indiana Public Serv. Co. - Kokomo
Pennsylvania American Water Co. - WW
Aqua North Carolina, Inc.
Ohio American Water Company
Entergy Mississippi
Black Hills Colorado
Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania
City of Lancaster - Bureau of Water
Duke Energy Indiana
Enbridge Pipelines (Southern Lights)
MidAmerican Energy Corporation
Oklahoma Gas \& Electric Company
Pennsylvania American Water Company

Subject
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation

## LIST OF CASES IN WHICH JOHN J. SPANOS SUBMITTED TESTIMONY, cont.

|  | Year | Jurisdiction | Docket No. | Client Utility | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 133. | 2011 | FERC | RP11-_-000 | Carolina Gas Transmission | Depreciation |
| 134. | 2012 | WA UTC | UE-120436/UG-120437 | Avista Corporation | Depreciation |
| 135. | 2012 | AK Reg Cm | U-12-009 | Chugach Electric Association | Depreciation |
| 136. | 2012 | MA PUC | DPU 12-25 | Columbia Gas of Massachusetts | Depreciation |
| 137. | 2012 | TX PUC | 40094 | El Paso Electric Company | Depreciation |
| 138. | 2012 | ID PUC | IPC-E-12 | Idaho Power Company | Depreciation |
| 139. | 2012 | PA PUC | R-2012-2290597 | PPL Electric Utilities | Depreciation |
| 140. | 2012 | PA PUC | R-2012-2311725 | Borough of Hanover - Bureau of Water | Depreciation |
| 141. | 2012 | KY PSC | 2012-00222 | Louisville Gas and Electric Company | Depreciation |
| 142. | 2012 | KY PSC | 2012-00221 | Kentucky Utilities Company | Depreciation |
| 143. | 2012 | PA PUC | R-2012-2285985 | Peoples Natural Gas Company | Depreciation |
| 144. | 2012 | DC PSC | Case 1087 | Potomac Electric Power Company | Depreciation |
| 145. | 2012 | OH PSC | 12-1682-EL-AIR | Duke Energy Ohio (Electric) | Depreciation |
| 146. | 2012 | OH PSC | 12-1685-GA-AIR | Duke Energy Ohio (Gas) | Depreciation |
| 147. | 2012 | PA PUC | R-2012-2310366 | City of Lancaster - Sewer Fund | Depreciation |
| 148. | 2012 | PA PUC | R-2012-2321748 | Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania | Depreciation |
| 149. | 2012 | FERC | ER-12-2681-000 | ITC Holdings | Depreciation |
| 150. | 2012 | MO PSC | ER-2012-0174 | Kansas City Power and Light | Depreciation |
| 151. | 2012 | MO PSC | ER-2012-0175 | KCPL Greater Missouri Operations Company | Depreciation |
| 152. | 2012 | MO PSC | GO-2012-0363 | Laclede Gas Company | Depreciation |
| 153. | 2012 | MN PUC | G007,001/D-12-533 | Integrys - MN Energy Resource Group | Depreciation |
| 154. | 2012 | TX PUC | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOAH 582-14-1051/ } \\ & \text { TECQ 2013-2007-UCR } \end{aligned}$ | Aqua Texas | Depreciation |
| 155. | 2012 | PA PUC | 2012-2336379 | York Water Company | Depreciation |
| 156. | 2013 | NJ BPU | ER12121071 | PHI Service Company- Atlantic City Electric | Depreciation |
| 157. | 2013 | KY PSC | 2013-00167 | Columbia Gas of Kentucky | Depreciation |
| 158. | 2013 | VA St CC | 2013-00020 | Virginia Electric and Power Company | Depreciation |
| 159. | 2013 | IA Util Bd | 2013-0004 | MidAmerican Energy Corporation | Depreciation |
| 160. | 2013 | PA PUC | 2013-2355276 | Pennsylvania American Water Company | Depreciation |
| 161. | 2013 | NY PSC | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13-E-0030, 13-G-0031, } \\ & 13-S-0032 \end{aligned}$ | Consolidated Edison of New York | Depreciation |
| 162. | 2013 | PA PUC | 2013-2355886 | Peoples TWP LLC | Depreciation |
| 163. | 2013 | TN Reg Auth | 12-0504 | Tennessee American Water | Depreciation |
| 164. | 2013 | ME PUC | 2013-168 | Central Maine Power Company | Depreciation |
| 165. | 2013 | DC PSC | Case 1103 | PHI Service Company - PEPCO | Depreciation |

LIST OF CASES IN WHICH JOHN J. SPANOS SUBMITTED TESTIMONY, cont.

|  | Year | Jurisdiction | Docket No. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 166. | 2013 | WY PSC | 2003-ER-13 |
| 167. | 2013 | FERC | ER13-2428-0000 |
| 168. | 2013 | FERC | ER13- -0000 |
| 169. | 2013 | FERC | ER13-2410-0000 |
| 170. | 2013 | PA PUC | R-2013-2372129 |
| 171. | 2013 | NJ BPU | ER12111052 |
| 172. | 2013 | PA PUC | R-2013-2390244 |
| 173. | 2013 | OK CC | UM 1679 |
| 174. | 2013 | IL CC | 13-0500 |
| 175. | 2013 | WY PSC | 20000-427-EA-13 |
| 176. | 2013 | UT PSC | 13-035-02 |
| 177. | 2013 | OR PUC | UM 1647 |
| 178. | 2013 | PA PUC | 2013-2350509 |
| 179. | 2014 | IL CC | 14-0224 |
| 180. | 2014 | FERC | ER14- -0000 |
| 181. | 2014 | SD PUC | EL14-026 |
| 182. | 2014 | WY PSC | 20002-91-ER-14 |
| 183. | 2014 | PA PUC | 2014-2428304 |
| 184. | 2014 | PA PUC | 2014-2406274 |
| 185. | 2014 | IL CC | 14-0225 |
| 186. | 2014 | MO PSC | ER-2014-0258 |
| 187. | 2014 | KS CC | 14-BHCG-502-RTS |
| 188. | 2014 | KS CC | 14-BHCG-502-RTS |
| 189. | 2014 | KS CC | 14-BHCG-502-RTS |
| 190. | 2014 | PA PUC | 2014-2418872 |
| 191. | 2014 | WV PSC | 14-0701-E-D |
| 192 | 2014 | VA St CC | PUC-2014-00045 |
| 193. | 2014 | VA St CC | PUE-2013 |
| 194. | 2014 | OK CC | PUD201400229 |
| 195. | 2014 | OR PUC | UM1679 |
| 196. | 2014 | IN URC | Cause No. 44576 |
| 197. | 2014 | MA DPU | DPU. 14-150 |
| 198. | 2014 | CT PURA | 14-05-06 |
| 199. | 2014 | MO PSC | ER-2014-0370 |

Client Utility
Cheyenne Light, Fuel and Power Company
Kentucky Utilities
MidAmerican Energy Company
PPL Utilities
Duquesne Light Company
Jersey Central Power and Light Company
Bethlehem, City of - Bureau of Water
Oklahoma, Public Service Company of
Nicor Gas Company
PacifiCorp
PacifiCorp
Pacificorp
Dubois, City of
North Shore Gas Company
Duquesne Light Company
Black Hills Power Company
Black Hills Power Company
Borough of Hanover - Municipal Water Works
Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania
Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company
Ameren Missouri
Black Hills Service Company
Black Hills Utility Holdings
Black Hills Kansas Gas
Lancaster, City of - Bureau of Water
First Energy - MonPower/PotomacEdison
Aqua Virginia
Virginia American Water Company
Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company
Portland General Electric
Indianapolis Power \& Light
NSTAR Gas
Connecticut Light and Power
Kansas City Power \& Light

Subject
Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation Depreciation
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|  | Year | Jurisdiction | Docket No. | Client Utility | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 200. | 2014 | KY PSC | 2014-00371 | Kentucky Utilities Company | Depreciation |
| 201. | 2014 | KY PSC | 2014-00372 | Louisville Gas and Electric Company | Depreciation |
| 202. | 2015 | PA PUC | R-2015-2462723 | United Water Pennsylvania Inc. | Depreciation |
| 203. | 2015 | PA PUC | R-2015-2468056 | NiSource - Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania | Depreciation |
| 204. | 2015 | NY PSC | 15-E-0283/15-G-0284 | New York State Electric and Gas Corporation | Depreciation |
| 205. | 2015 | NY PSC | 15-E-0285/15-G-0286 | Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation | Depreciation |
| 206. | 2015 | MO PSC | WR-2015-0301/SR-2015-0302 | Missouri American Water Company | Depreciation |
| 207. | 2015 | OK CC | PUD 201500208 | Oklahoma, Public Service Company of | Depreciation |
| 208. | 2015 | WV PSC | 15-0676-W-42T | West Virginia American Water Company | Depreciation |
| 209. | 2015 | PA PUC | 2015-2469275 | PPL Electric Utilities | Depreciation |
| 210. | 2015 | IN URC | Cause No. 44688 | Northern Indiana Public Service Company | Depreciation |
| 211. | 2015 | OH PSC | 14-1929-EL-RDR | First Energy-Ohio Edison/Cleveland Electric/ Toledo Edison | Depreciation |
| 212. | 2015 | NM PRC | 15-00127-UT | El Paso Electric | Depreciation |
| 213. | 2015 | TX PUC | PUC-44941; SOAH 473-15-5257 | El Paso Electric | Depreciation |
| 214. | 2015 | WI PSC | 3270-DU-104 | Madison Gas and Electric Company | Depreciation |
| 215. | 2015 | OK CC | PUD 201500273 | Oklahoma Gas and Electric | Depreciation |
| 216. | 2015 | KY PSC | Doc. No. 2015-00418 | Kentucky American Water Company | Depreciation |
| 217. | 2015 | NC UC | Doc. No. G-5, Sub 565 | Public Service Company of North Carolina | Depreciation |
| 218. | 2016 | WA UTC | Docket UE-17 | Puget Sound Energy | Depreciation |
| 219. | 2016 | NY PSC | Case No. 16-W-0130 | SUEZ Water New York, Inc. | Depreciation |
| 220. | 2016 | MO PSC | ER-2016-0156 | KCPL - Greater Missouri | Depreciation |
| 221. | 2016 | WI PSC |  | Wisconsin Public Service Corporation | Depreciation |
| 222. | 2016 | KY PSC | Case No. 2016-00026 | Kentucky Utilities Company | Depreciation |
| 223. | 2016 | KY PSC | Case No. 2016-00027 | Louisville Gas and Electric Company | Depreciation |
| 224. | 2016 | OH PUC | Case No. 16-0907-WW-AIR | Aqua Ohio | Depreciation |
| 225. | 2016 | MD PSC | Case 9417 | NiSource - Columbia Gas of Maryland | Depreciation |
| 226. | 2016 | KY PSC | 2016-00162 | Columbia Gas of Kentucky | Depreciation |
| 227. | 2016 | DE PSC | 16-0649 | Delmarva Power and Light Company - Electric | Depreciation |
| 228. | 2016 | DE PSC | 16-0650 | Delmarva Power and Light Company - Gas | Depreciation |
| 229. | 2016 | NY PSC | Case 16-G-0257 | National Fuel Gas Distribution Corp - NY Div | Depreciation |
| 230. | 2016 | PA PUC | R-2016-2537349 | Metropolitan Edison Company | Depreciation |
| 231. | 2016 | PA PUC | R-2016-2537352 | Pennsylvania Electric Company | Depreciation |
| 232. | 2016 | PA PUC | R-2016-2537355 | Pennsylvania Power Company | Depreciation |

## LIST OF CASES IN WHICH JOHN J. SPANOS SUBMITTED TESTIMONY, cont.

|  | Year | Jurisdiction | Docket No. | Client Utility | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 233. | 2016 | PA PUC | R-2016-2537359 | West Penn Power Company | Depreciation |
| 234. | 2016 | PA PUC | R-2016-2529660 | NiSource - Columbia Gas of PA | Depreciation |
| 235. | 2016 | KY PSC | Case No. 2016-00063 | Kentucky Utilities / Louisville Gas \& Electric Co | Depreciation |
| 236. | 2016 | MO PSC | ER-2016-0285 | KCPL Missouri | Depreciation |
| 237. | 2016 | AR PSC | 16-052-U | Oklahoma Gas \& Electric Co | Depreciation |
| 238. | 2016 | PSCW | 6680-DU-104 | Wisconsin Power and Light | Depreciation |
| 239. | 2016 | ID PUC | IPC-E-16-23 | Idaho Power Company | Depreciation |
| 240. | 2016 | OR PUC | UM1801 | Idaho Power Company | Depreciation |
| 241. | 2016 | ILLCC | 16- | MidAmerican Energy Company | Depreciation |
| 242. | 2016 | KY PSC | Case No. 2016-00370 | Kentucky Utilities Company | Depreciation |
| 243. | 2016 | KY PSC | Case No. 2016-00371 | Louisville Gas and Electric Company | Depreciation |
| 244. | 2016 | IN URC | Cause No. 45029 | Indianapolis Power \& Light | Depreciation |
| 245. | 2016 | AL RC | U-16-081 | Chugach Electric Association | Depreciation |
| 246. | 2017 | MA DPU | D.P.U. 17-05 | NSTAR Electric Company and Western Massachusetts Electric Company | Depreciation |
| 247. | 2017 | TX PUC | PUC-26831, SOAH 973-17-2686 | El Paso Electric Company | Depreciation |
| 248. | 2017 | WA UTC | UE-17033 and UG-170034 | Puget Sound Energy | Depreciation |
| 249. | 2017 | OH PUC | Case No. 17-0032-EL-AIR | Duke Energy Ohio | Depreciation |
| 250. | 2017 | VA SCC | Case No. PUE-2016-00413 | Virginia Natural Gas, Inc. | Depreciation |
| 251. | 2017 | OK CC | Case No. PUD201700151 | Public Service Company of Oklahoma | Depreciation |
| 252. | 2017 | MD PSC | Case No. 9447 | Columbia Gas of Maryland | Depreciation |
| 253. | 2017 | NC UC | Docket No. E-2, Sub 1142 | Duke Energy Progress | Depreciation |
| 254. | 2017 | VA SCC | Case No. PUR-2017-00090 | Dominion Virginia Electric and Power Company | Depreciation |
| 255. | 2017 | FERC | ER17-1162 | MidAmerican Energy Company | Depreciation |
| 256. | 2017 | PA PUC | R-2017-2595853 | Pennsylvania American Water Company | Depreciation |
| 257. | 2017 | OR PUC | UM1809 | Portland General Electric | Depreciation |
| 258. | 2017 | FERC | ER17-217-000 | Jersey Central Power \& Light | Depreciation |
| 259. | 2017 | FERC | ER17-211-000 | Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission, LLC | Depreciation |
| 260. | 2017 | MN PUC | Docket No. G007/D-17-442 | Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation | Depreciation |
| 261. | 2017 | IL CC | Docket No. 17-0124 | Northern Illinois Gas Company | Depreciation |
| 262. | 2017 | OR PUC | UM1808 | Northwest Natural Gas Company | Depreciation |
| 263. | 2017 | NY PSC | Case No. 17-W-0528 | SUEZ Water Owego-Nichols | Depreciation |
| 264. | 2017 | MO PSC | GR-2017-0215 | Laclede Gas Company | Depreciation |
| 265. | 2017 | MO PSC | GR-2017-0216 | Missouri Gas Energy | Depreciation |

## LIST OF CASES IN WHICH JOHN J. SPANOS SUBMITTED TESTIMONY, cont.

|  | Year | Jurisdiction | Docket No. | Client Utility | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 266. | 2017 | ILL CC | Docket No. 17-0337 | Illinois-American Water Company | Depreciation |
| 267. | 2017 | FERC | Docket No. ER18-22-000 | PPL Electric Utilities Corporation | Depreciation |
| 268. | 2017 | IN URC | Cause No. 44988 | Northern Indiana Public Service Company | Depreciation |
| 269. | 2017 | NJ BPU | BPU Docket No. WR17090985 | New Jersey American Water Company, Inc. | Depreciation |
| 270. | 2017 | RIPUC | Docket No. 4800 | SUEZ Water Rhode Island | Depreciation |
| 271. | 2017 | OK CC | Cause No. PUD 201700496 | Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company | Depreciation |
| 272. | 2017 | NJ BPU | ER18010029 \& GR18010030 | Public Service Electric and Gas Company | Depreciation |
| 273. | 2017 | NC Util Com. | Docket No. E-7, SUB 1146 | Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC | Depreciation |
| 274. | 2017 | KY PSC | Case No. 2017-00321 | Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc. | Depreciation |
| 275. | 2017 | MA DPU | D.P.U. 18-40 | Berkshire Gas Company | Depreciation |
| 276. | 2018 | IN IURC | Cause No. 44992 | Indiana-American Water Company, Inc. | Depreciation |
| 277. | 2018 | IN IURC | Cause No. 45029 | Indianapolis Power and Light | Depreciation |
| 278. | 2018 | NC Util Com. | Docket No. W-218, Sub 497 | Aqua North Carolina, Inc. | Depreciation |
| 279. | 2018 | PA PUC | Docket No. R-2018-2647577 | NiSource - Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania, Inc. | Depreciation |
| 280. | 2018 | OR PUC | Docket UM 1933 | Avista Corporation | Depreciation |
| 281. | 2018 | WA UTC | Docket No. UE-108167 | Avista Corporation | Depreciation |
| 282. | 2018 | ID PUC | AVU-E-18-03, AVU-G-18-02 | Avista Corporation | Depreciation |
| 283. | 2018 | IN URC | Cause No. 45039 | Citizens Energy Group | Depreciation |
| 284. | 2018 | FERC | Docket No. ER18- | Duke Energy Progress | Depreciation |
| 285. | 2018 | PA PUC | Docket No. R-2018-3000124 | Duquesne Light Company | Depreciation |
| 286. | 2018 | MD PSC | Case No. 948 | NiSource - Columbia Gas of Maryland | Depreciation |
| 287. | 2018 | MA DPU | D.P.U. 18-45 | NiSource - Columbia Gas of Massachusetts | Depreciation |
| 288. | 2018 | OH PUC | Case No. 18-0299-GA-ALT | Vectren Energy Delivery of Ohio | Depreciation |
| 289. | 2018 | PA PUC | Docket No. R-2018-3000834 | SUEZ Water Pennsylvania Inc. | Depreciation |
| 290. | 2018 | MD PSC | Case No. 9847 | Maryland-American Water Company | Depreciation |
| 291. | 2018 | PA PUC | Docket No. R-2018-3000019 | The York Water Company | Depreciation |
| 292. | 2018 | FERC | ER-18-2231-000 | Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC | Depreciation |
| 293. | 2018 | KY PSC | Case No. 2018-00261 | Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc. | Depreciation |
| 294. | 2018 | NJ BPU | BPU Docket No. WR18050593 | SUEZ Water New Jersey | Depreciation |
| 295. | 2018 | WA UTC | Docket No. UE-180778 | PacifiCorp | Depreciation |
| 296. | 2018 | UT PSC | Docket No. 18-035-36 | PacifiCorp | Depreciation |
| 297. | 2018 | OR PUC | Docket No. UM-1968 | PacifiCorp | Depreciation |
| 298. | 2018 | ID PUC | Case No. PAC-E-18-08 | PacifiCorp | Depreciation |
| 299. | 2018 | WY PSC | 20000-539-EA-18 | PacifiCorp | Depreciation |
| 300. | 2018 | PA PUC | Docket No. R-2018-3003068 | Aqua Pennsylvania, Inc. | Depreciation |
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|  | Year | Jurisdiction | Docket No. | Client Utility | Subject |
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| 301. | 2018 | IL CC | Docket No. 18-1467 | Aqua Illinois, Inc. | Depreciation |
| 302. | 2018 | KY PSC | Case No. 2018-00294 | Louisville Gas \& Electric Company | Depreciation |
| 303. | 2018 | KY PSC | Case No. 2018-00295 | Kentucky Utilities Company | Depreciation |
| 304. | 2018 | IN URC | Cause No. 45159 | Northern Indiana Public Service Company | Depreciation |
| 305. | 2018 | VA SCC | Case No. PUR-2019-00175 | Virginia American Water Company | Depreciation |
| 306. | 2019 | PA PUC | Docket No. R-2018-3006818 | Peoples Natural Gas Company, LLC | Depreciation |
| 307. | 2019 | OK CC | Cause No. PUD201800140 | Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company | Depreciation |
| 308. | 2019 | MD PSC | Case No. 9490 | FirstEnergy - Potomac Edison | Depreciation |
| 309. | 2019 | SC PSC | Docket No. 2018-318-E | Duke Energy Progress | Depreciation |
| 310. | 2019 | SC PSC | Docket No. 2018-319-E | Duke Energy Carolinas | Depreciation |
| 311. | 2019 | DE PSC | DE 19-057 | Public Service of New Hampshire | Depreciation |
| 312. | 2019 | NY PSC | Case No. 19-W-0168 \& 19-W- | SUEZ Water New York | Depreciation |
| 313. | 2019 | PA PUC | Docket No. R-2019-3006904 | Newtown Artesian Water Company | Depreciation |
| 314. | 2019 | MO PSC | ER-2019-0335 | Ameren Missouri | Depreciation |
| 315. | 2019 | MO PSC | EC-2019-0200 | KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operations Company | Depreciation |
| 316. | 2019 | MN DOC | G011/D-19-377 | Minnesota Energy Resource Corp. | Depreciation |
| 317. | 2019 | NY PSC | Case 19-E-0378 \& 19-G-0379 | New York State Electric and Gas Corporation | Depreciation |
| 318. | 2019 | NY PSC | Case 19-E-0380 \& 19-G-0381 | Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation | Depreciation |
| 319. | 2019 | WA UTC | Docket UE-190529 / UG-190530 | Puget Sound Energy | Depreciation |
| 320. | 2019 | PA PUC | Docket No. R-2019-3010955 | City of Lancaster | Depreciation |
| 321. | 2019 | IURC | Cause No. 45253 | Duke Energy Indiana | Depreciation |
| 322. | 2019 | KY PSC | Case No. 2019-00271 | Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc. | Depreciation |
| 323. | 2019 | OH PUC | Case No. 18-1720-GA-AIR | Northeast Ohio Natural Gas Corp | Depreciation |
| 324. | 2019 | NC Util. Com. | Docket No. E-2, Sub 1219 | Duke Energy Carolinas | Depreciation |
| 325. | 2019 | FERC | Docket No. ER20-277-000 | Jersey Central Power \& Light Company | Depreciation |
| 326. | 2019 | MA DPU | D.P.U. 19-120 | NSTAR Gas Company | Depreciation |
| 327. | 2019 | SC PSC | Docket No. 2019-290-WS | Blue Granite Water Company | Depreciation |
| 328. | 2019 | NC Util. Com. | Docket No. E-2, Sub 1219 | Duke Energy Progress | Depreciation |
| 329. | 2019 | MD PSC | Case No. 9609 | NiSource Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc. | Depreciation |
| 330. | 2020 | NJ BPU | Docket No. ER20020146 | Jersey Central Power \& Light Company | Depreciation |
| 331. | 2020 | PA PUC | Docket No. R-2020-3018835 | NiSource - Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania, Inc. | Depreciation |
| 332. | 2020 | PA PUC | Docket No. R-2020-3019369 | Pennsylvania-American Water Company | Depreciation |
| 333. | 2020 | PA PUC | Docket No. R-2020-3019371 | Pennsylvania-American Water Company | Depreciation |
| 334. | 2020 | MO PSC | GO-2018-0309, GO-2018-0310 | Spire Missouri, Inc. | Depreciation |
| 335. | 2020 | NM PRC | Case No. 20-00104-UT | El Paso Electric Company | Depreciation |
| 336. | 2020 | MD PSC | Case No. 9644 | Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc. | Depreciation |
| 337. | 2020 | MO PSC | GO-2018-0309, GO-2018-0310 | Spire Missouri, Inc. | Depreciation |
| 338. | 2020 | VA St CC | Case No. PUR-2020-00095 | Virginia Natural Gas Company | Depreciation |
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| 339. | 2020 | SC PSC | Docket No. 2020-125-E | Dominion Energy South Carolina, Inc. | Depreciation |
| 340. | 2020 | WV PSC | Case No. 20-0745-G-D | Hope Gas, Inc. d/b/a Dominion Energy West Virginia | Depreciation |
| 341. | 2020 | VA St CC | Case No. PUR-2020-00106 | Aqua Virginia, Inc. | Depreciation |
| 342. | 2020 | PA PUC | Docket No. R-2020-3020256 | City of Bethlehem - Bureau of Water | Depreciation |
| 343. | 2020 | NE PSC | Docket No. NG-109 | Black Hills Nebraska | Depreciation |
| 344. | 2020 | NY PSC | Case No. 20-E-0428 \& 20-G-0429 | Central Hudson Gas \& Electric Corporation | Depreciation |
| 345. | 2020 | FERC | ER20-598 | Duke Energy Indiana | Depreciation |
| 346. | 2020 | FERC | ER20-855 | Northern Indiana Public Service Company | Depreciation |
| 347. | 2020 | OR PSC | UE 374 | PacifiCorp | Depreciation |
| 348. | 2020 | MD PSC | Case No. 9490 Phase II | Potomac Edison - Maryland | Depreciation |
| 349. | 2020 | IN URC | Case No. 45447 | Southern Indiana Gas and Electric Company | Depreciation |
| 350. | 2020 | IN URC | IURC Cause No. 45468 | Indiana Gas Company, Inc. d/b/a Vectren Energy Delivery of | Depreciation |
| 351. | 2020 | KY PSC | Case No. 2020-00349 | Kentucky Utilities Company | Depreciation |
| 352. | 2020 | KY PSC | Case No. 2020-00350 | Louisville Gas and Electric Company | Depreciation |
| 353. | 2020 | FERC | Docket No. ER21-000 | South FirstEnergy Operating Companies | Depreciation |
| 354. | 2020 | OH PUC | Case Nos 20-1651-EL-AIR, 20-1652-EL-AAM \& 20-1653-EL-ATA | Dayton Power and Light Company | Depreciation |
| 355. | 2020 | OR PSC | UG 388 | Northwest Natural Gas Company | Depreciation |
| 356. | 2020 | MO PSC | Case No. GR-2021-0241 | Ameren Missouri Gas | Depreciation |
| 357. | 2021 | KY PSC | Case No. 2021-00103 | East Kentucky Power Cooperative | Depreciation |
| 358. | 2021 | MPUC | Docket No. 2021-00024 | Bangor Natural Gas | Depreciation |
| 359. | 2021 | PA PUC | Docket No. R-2021-3024296 | Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania, Inc. | Depreciation |
| 360. | 2021 | NC Util. Com. | Doc. No. G-5, Sub 632 | Public Service of North Carolina | Depreciation |
| 361. | 2021 | MO PSC | ER-2021-0240 | Ameren Missouri | Depreciation |
| 362. | 2021 | PA PUC | Docket No. R-2021-3024750 | Duquesne Light Company | Depreciation |
| 363. | 2021 | KS PSC | 21-BHCG-418-RTS | Black Hills Kansas Gas | Depreciation |
| 364. | 2021 | KY PSC | Case No. 2021-00190 | Duke Energy Kentucky | Depreciation |
| 365. | 2021 | OR PSC | Docket UM 2152 | Portland General Electric | Depreciation |
| 366. | 2021 | ILL CC | Docket No. 20-0810 | North Shore Gas Company | Depreciation |
| 367. | 2021 | FERC | ER21-1939-000 | Duke Energy Progress | Depreciation |
| 368. | 2021 | FERC | ER21-1940-000 | Duke Energy Carolina | Depreciation |
| 369. | 2021 | KY PSC | Case No. 2021-00183 | NiSource Columbia Gas of Kentucky | Depreciation |
| 370. | 2021 | MD PSC | Case No. 9664 | NiSource Columbia Gas of Maryland | Depreciation |
| 371. | 2021 | OH PUC | Case No. 21-0596-ST-AIR | Aqua Ohio | Depreciation |
| 372. | 2021 | PA PUC | Docket No. R-2021-3026116 | Hanover Borough Municipal Water Works | Depreciation |
| 373. | 2021 | OR PSC | UM-2180 | Idaho Power Company | Depreciation |
| 374. | 2021 | ID PUC | Case No. IPC-E-21-18 | Idaho Power Company | Depreciation |
| 375. | 2021 | WPSC | 6690-DU-104 | Wisconsin Public Service Company | Depreciation |
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## LIST OF CASES IN WHICH JOHN J. SPANOS SUBMITTED TESTIMONY, cont.

|  | Year | Jurisdiction | Docket No. | Client Utility | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 376. | 2021 | PAPUC | Docket No. R-2021-3026116 | Borough of Hanover | Depreciation |
| 377. | 2021 | OH PUC | Case No. 21-637-GA-AIR; | NiSource Columbia Gas of Ohio | Depreciation |
|  |  |  | Case No. 21-638-GA-ALT; |  |  |
|  |  |  | Case No. 21-639-GA-UNC; |  |  |
|  |  |  | Case No. 21-640-GA-AAM |  |  |
| 378. | 2021 | TX PUC | Texas PUC Docket No. 52195; | El Paso Electric | Depreciation |
|  |  |  | SOHA Docket No. 473-21-2606 |  |  |
| 379. | 2021 | MO PSC | Case No. GR.2021-0108 | Spire Missouri | Depreciation |
| 380. | 2021 | WV PSC | Case No. 21-0215-WS-P | West Virginia American Water Company | Depreciation |
| 381. | 2021 | FERC | ER21-2736 | Duke Energy Carolinas | Depreciation |
| 382. | 2021 | FERC | ER21-2737 | Duke Energy Progress | Depreciation |
| 383. | 2021 | IN URC | Cause \#45621 | Northern Indiana Public Service Company | Depreciation |
| 384. | 2021 | PA PUC | Docket No. R-2021-3026682 | City of Lancaster | Depreciation |
| 385. | 2021 | OH PUC | Case No. 21-887-EL-AIR; | Duke Energy Ohio | Depreciation |
|  |  |  | Case No. 21-888-EL-ATA; |  |  |
|  |  |  | Case No. 889-EI-AAM |  |  |
| 386. | 2021 | AK PSC | Docket No. 21-097-U | Black Hills Energy Arkansas, Inc. | Depreciation |
| 387. | 2021 | OK CC | Cause No. PUD202100164 | Oklahoma Gas \& Electric | Depreciation |
| 388. | 2021 | FERC | Case ER-22-392-001 | El Paso Electric | Depreciation |
| 389. | 2021 | FERC | Case ER-21-XXX | MidAmerican Electric | Depreciation |
| 390. | 2021 | PA PUC | Docket Nos. R-2021-3027385, | Aqua Pennsylvania, Inc. | Depreciation |
|  |  |  | R-2021-3027386 | Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater, Inc. |  |
| 391. | 2022 | FERC | Case ER-22-282-000 | El Paso Electric | Depreciation |
| 392. | 2022 | ILL CC | Docket No. 22-0154 | MidAmerican Gas | Depreciation |
| 393. | 2022 | MO PSC | Case No. ER-2022-0129 | Evergy Metro | Depreciation |
| 394. | 2022 | MO PSC | Case No. ER-2022-0130 | Evergy Missouri West | Depreciation |
| 395. | 2022 | PA PUC | Docket No. R-2022-3031211 | NiSource Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania, Inc. | Depreciation |
| 396. | 2022 | MA DPU | D.P.U. 22-20 | The Berkshire Gas Company | Depreciation |
| 397. | 2022 | PA PUC | R-2022-3031672; R-2022- | Pennsylvania-American Water Company | Depreciation |
| 398. | 2022 | SD PUC | Docket No. NG22- | MidAmerican Gas | Depreciation |
| 399. | 2022 | MD PSC | Case No. 9680 | NiSource Columbia Gas of Maryland | Depreciation |
| 400. | 2022 | WYPSC | Docket No. 20003-214-ER-22 | Black Hills Energy - Cheyenne Light, Fuel and Power Company | Depreciation |
| 401. | 2022 | MA DPU | D.P.U. 22.22 | NSTAR Electric Company d/b/a Eversource Energy | Depreciation |
| 402. | 2022 | NC Util Com | Docket No. W-218, Sub 573 | Aqua North Carolina, Inc. | Depreciation |
| 403. | 2022 | OR PUC | UM2213 | Northwest Natural Gas | Depreciation |
| 404. | 2022 | OR PUC | UM2214 | Northwest Natural Gas | Depreciation |
| 405. | 2022 | ME PUC | Docket No. 2022-00152 | Central Maine Power | Depreciation |

LIST OF CASES IN WHICH JOHN J. SPANOS SUBMITTED TESTIMONY, cont.

|  | Year | Jurisdiction | Docket No. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 406. | 2022 | SC PSC | Docket No. 2022-254-E |
| 407. | 2022 | NC Util Com | Docket No. E-2, SUB 1300 |
| 408. | 2022 | IN URC | Cause \#45772 |
| 409. | 2022 | PA PUC | R-2022-3031340 |
| 410. | 2022 | PA PUC | R-2022-3032806 |
| 411. | 2022 | PA PUC | R-2022-3031704 |
| 412. | 2022 | MO PSC | ER-2022-0337 |
| 413. | 2022 | OH PUC | Case No. 22-507-GA-AIR |
| 414. | 2022 | PA PUC | R-2022-3035730 |
| 415. | 2022 | WY PSC | 20003-214-ER-22 |
| 416. | 2022 | NJ BPU | BPU Docket No. |
| 417. | 2022 | KY PSC | Case No. 2022-00372 |
| 418. | 2022 | TX PUC | SOAH Docket No. 473-23-04521 |
| 419. | 2022 | NC Util Com | Docket No. E-7, Sub 1276 |
| 420. | 2022 | ILL CC | Docket No. 23-0069 |
| 421. | 2023 | ILL CC | Docket No. 23-0068 |
| 422. | 2023 | WV PSC | Case No. 23-0030-E-D |
| 423. | 2023 | ID PUC | AVU-E-23-01; AVU-G-23-01 |
| 424. | 2023 | ILL CC | Docket No. 23- |

Client Utility
Duke Energy Progress
Duke Energy Progress
Northern Indiana Public Service Company
The York Water Company
The York Water Company
Borough of Ambler
Ameren Missouri
Duke Energy Ohio
National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation - PA Division
Cheyenne Light, Fuel and Power Company
Jersey Central Power \& Light Company
Duke Energy Kentucky
Aqua Texas, Inc.
Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC
The Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company
North Shore Gas Company
Monongahela Power Company and The Potomac Edison Company
Avista Corporation
Northern Illinois Gas Company d/b/a Nicor Gas Company

Subject
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
Depreciation
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Ladies and Gentlemen:

Pursuant to your request, we have conducted a depreciation study related to the electric plant in service of The Potomac Edison Company Maryland assets as of June 30, 2022. The attached report presents a description of the methods used in the estimation of depreciation, the summary of annual and accrued depreciation, the statistical support for the service life and net salvage estimates, and the detailed tabulations of annual and accrued depreciation.
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## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

 DEPRECIATION STUDY
## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Pursuant to The Potomac Edison Company's ("Company") request, Gannett Fleming Valuation and Rate Consultants, LLC ("Gannett Fleming") conducted a depreciation study related to the electric plant as of June 30, 2022. The purpose of this study was to determine the annual depreciation accrual rates and amounts for book and ratemaking purposes.

The depreciation rates are based on the straight line method using the average service life ("ASL") procedure and were applied on a remaining life basis. The calculations were based on attained ages and estimated average service life and forecasted net salvage characteristics for each depreciable group of assets.

For most accounts, the service lives proposed in this depreciation study are similar to those that were proposed by the Company in the prior study. The data and Company information received since the last depreciation study support these service lives. There have been some changes in the life estimates which produce some longer lives and some shorter lives. For net salvage the proposed estimates are typically more negative than what was approved in the last study which is due to the required costs to remove assets from service. Also, the currently approved net salvage estimates are based on a present value method used only in Maryland (the "MD Present Value Method"). This method along with the net salvage estimates have been significantly deficient at recovering the net salvage costs the Company has incurred.

The Company proposed rates from the Appendix of the depreciation study use the MD Present Value Method with a discount rate based on the credit-adjusted risk-
free rate (CARFR). Gannett Fleming does not support this method for calculating net salvage accruals, however due to Commission precedent it has been decided that the proposed rates should be calculated using the MD Present Value Method with the CARFR as the discount rate.

Gannett Fleming continues to recommend the traditional method as the most appropriate method for the recovery of net salvage. The resultant depreciation rates for electric plant in service as of June 30, 2022 are summarized in Table 1 on pages $\mathrm{VI}-4$ and VI-5 of the study. Supporting analysis and calculations are provided within the study. Additionally, depreciation rates based on the MD Present Value Method using a credit-adjusted risk-free rate are provided in the Appendix to this report which is consistent with recent precedent in . The depreciation rates set forth in the Appendix are the most reasonable rates that align with the use of the MD Present Value Method.

The study results from the Appendix set forth an annual depreciation expense of $\$ 31.8$ million when applied to depreciable plant balances as of June 30, 2022. The results are summarized at the functional level as follows:


## PART I. INTRODUCTION

# THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY DEPRECIATION STUDY 

## PART I. INTRODUCTION

## SCOPE

This report sets forth the results of the depreciation study for The Potomac Edison Company ("Company"), as applied to electric plant in service as of June 30, 2022. The rates and amounts are based on the straight line remaining life method of depreciation. This report also describes the concepts, methods and judgments which underlie the recommended annual depreciation accrual rates related to current electric plant in service.

The service life and net salvage estimates resulting from the study were based on informed judgment which incorporated analyses of historical plant retirement data as recorded through June 2022; the net salvage analyses of historical plant retirement data recorded through June 2022; a review of Company practice and outlook as they relate to plant operation and retirement; and consideration of current practice in the electric industry, including knowledge of service lives and net salvage estimates used for other electric companies.

## PLAN OF REPORT

Part I, Introduction, contains statements with respect to the plan of the report, and the basis of the study. Part II, Estimation of Survivor Curves, presents descriptions of the considerations and the methods used in the service life study. Part III, Service Life Considerations, presents the factors and judgment utilized in the average service life analysis. Part IV, Net Salvage Considerations, presents the judgment utilized for the net salvage study. Part V, Calculation of Annual and Accrued Depreciation, describes the procedures used in the calculation of group depreciation. Part VI, Results of Study, presents a summary by depreciable group of annual depreciation accrual rates and

[^121]amounts, as well as composite remaining lives. Part VII, Service Life Statistics, presents the statistical analysis of service life estimates, Part VIII, Net Salvage Statistics, sets forth the statistical indications of net salvage percents, and Part IX, Detailed Depreciation Calculations, presents the detailed tabulations of annual depreciation.

## BASIS OF THE STUDY

## Depreciation

Depreciation, in public utility regulation, is the loss in service value not restored by current maintenance, incurred in connection with the consumption or prospective retirement of utility plant in the course of service from causes which are known to be in current operation and against which the utility is not protected by insurance. Among causes to be given consideration are wear and tear, deterioration, action of the elements, inadequacy, obsolescence, changes in the art, changes in demand, and the requirements of public authorities.

Depreciation, as used in accounting, is a method of distributing fixed capital costs, less net salvage, over a period of time by allocating annual amounts to expense. Each annual amount of such depreciation expense is part of that year's total cost of providing electric utility service. Normally, the period of time over which the fixed capital cost is allocated to the cost of service is equal to the period of time over which an item renders service, that is, the item's service life. The most prevalent method of allocation is to distribute an equal amount of cost to each year of service life. This method is known as the straight-line method of depreciation.

For most accounts, the annual depreciation was calculated by the straight line method using the average service life procedure and the remaining life basis. For certain General Plant accounts, the annual depreciation is based on amortization accounting. Both types of calculations were based on original cost, attained ages, and estimates of service lives and net salvage. The straight line method, average service
life procedure is the most commonly used depreciation calculation procedure that has been widely accepted in jurisdictions throughout North America. Gannett Fleming recommends its continued use. Amortization accounting is used for certain General Plant accounts because of the disproportionate plant accounting effort required when compared to the minimal original cost of the large number of items in these accounts. An explanation of the calculation of annual and accrued amortization is presented beginning on page $\mathrm{V}-4$ of the report.

## Service Life and Net Salvage Estimates

The service life and net salvage estimates used in the depreciation calculations were based on informed judgment which incorporated a review of management's plans, policies and outlook, a general knowledge of the electric utility industry, and comparisons of the service life and net salvage estimates from our studies of other electric utilities. The use of survivor curves to reflect the expected dispersion of retirement provides a consistent method of estimating depreciation for utility property. lowa type survivor curves were used to depict the estimated survivor curves for the plant accounts.

The procedure for estimating service lives consisted of compiling historical data for the plant accounts or depreciable groups, analyzing this history through the use of widely accepted techniques, and forecasting the survivor characteristics for each depreciable group on the basis of interpretations of the historical data analyses and the probable future. The combination of the historical experience and the estimated future yielded estimated survivor curves from which the average service lives were derived.

The estimates of net salvage by account incorporated a review of experienced costs of removal and gross salvage related to plant retirements, and consideration of trends exhibited by the historical data. Each component of net salvage, i.e., cost of removal and gross salvage, was stated in dollars and as a percent of retirement.

An understanding of the function of the plant and information with respect to the reasons for past retirements and the expected causes of future retirements was obtained through discussions with operating and management personnel. The supplemental information obtained in this manner was considered in the interpretation and extrapolation of the statistical analyses.

## PART II. ESTIMATION OF SURVIVOR CURVES

## PART II. ESTIMATION OF SURVIVOR CURVES

The calculation of annual depreciation based on the straight line method requires the estimation of survivor curves and the selection of group depreciation procedures. The estimation of survivor curves is discussed below and the development of net salvage is discussed in later sections of this report.

## SURVIVOR CURVES

The use of an average service life for a property group implies that the various units in the group have different lives. Thus, the average life may be obtained by determining the separate lives of each of the units or by constructing a survivor curve by plotting the number of units which survive at successive ages.

The survivor curve graphically depicts the amount of property existing at each age throughout the life of an original group. From the survivor curve, the average life of the group, the remaining life expectancy, the probable life, and the frequency curve can be calculated. In Figure 1, a typical smooth survivor curve and the derived curves are illustrated. The average life is obtained by calculating the area under the survivor curve, from age zero to the maximum age, and dividing this area by the ordinate at age zero. The remaining life expectancy at any age can be calculated by obtaining the area under the curve, from the observation age to the maximum age, and dividing this area by the percent surviving at the observation age. For example, in Figure 1, the remaining life at age 30 is equal to the crosshatched area under the survivor curve divided by 29.5 percent surviving at age 30 . The probable life at any age is developed by adding the age and remaining life. If the probable life of the property is calculated for each year of age, the probable life curve shown in the chart can be developed. The frequency curve presents the number of units retired in each age interval. It is derived by obtaining the differences between the amount of property surviving at the beginning and at the end of each interval.

This study has incorporated the use of lowa curves developed from a retirement rate analysis of historical retirement history. A discussion of the concepts of survivor curves and of the development of survivor curves using the retirement rate method is presented below.

## Iowa Type Curves

The range of survivor characteristics usually experienced by utility and industrial properties is encompassed by a system of generalized survivor curves known as the lowa type curves. There are four families in the lowa system, labeled in accordance with the location of the modes of the retirements (or the portion of the frequency curve with the highest level of retirements) in relationship to the average life and the relative height of the modes. The left moded curves, presented in Figure 2, are those in which the greatest frequency of retirement occurs to the left of, or prior to, average service life. The symmetrical moded curves, presented in Figure 3, are those in which the greatest frequency of retirement occurs at average service life. The right moded curves, presented in Figure 4, are those in which the greatest frequency occurs to the right of, or after, average service life. The origin moded curves, presented in Figure 5, are those in which the greatest frequency of retirement occurs at the origin, or immediately after age zero. The letter designation of each family of curves (L, S, R or O) represents the location of the mode of the associated frequency curve with respect to the average service life. The numbers represent the relative heights of the modes of the frequency curves within each family. A higher number designates a higher mode curve.

The lowa curves were developed at the lowa State College Engineering Experiment Station through an extensive process of observation and classification of the ages at which industrial property had been retired. A report of the study which resulted in the classification of property survivor characteristics into 18 type curves, which constitute three of the four families, was published in 1935 in the form of the Experiment Station's Bulletin 125.

FIGURE 1. TYPICAL SURVIVOR CURVE AND DERIVED CURVES

FIGURE 2.. LEFT MODAL OR "L" IOWA TYPE SURVIVOR CURVES

FIGURE 3.. SYMMETRICAL OR "S" IOWA TYPE SURVIVOR CURVES
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FIGURE 4.. RIGHT MODAL OR "R" IOWA TYPE SURVIVOR CURVES

FIGURE 5. ORIGIN MODAL OR "O" IOWA TYPE SURVIVOR CURVES

These curve types have also been presented in subsequent Experiment Station bulletins and in the text, "Engineering Valuation and Depreciation." ${ }^{1}$ In 1957, Frank V. B. Couch, Jr., an Iowa State College graduate student, submitted a thesis presenting his development of the fourth family consisting of the four O type survivor curves.

## Retirement Rate Method of Analysis

The retirement rate method is an actuarial method of deriving survivor curves using the average rates at which property of each age group is retired. The method relates to property groups for which aged accounting experience is available and is the method used to develop the original stub survivor curves in this study. The method (also known as the annual rate method) is illustrated through the use of an example in the following text and is also explained in several publications including "Statistical Analyses of Industrial Property Retirements," 2 "Engineering Valuation and Depreciation,"3 and "Depreciation Systems."4

The average rate of retirement used in the calculation of the percent surviving for the survivor curve (life table) requires two sets of data: first, the property retired during a period of observation, identified by the property's age at retirement; and second, the property exposed to retirement at the beginning of the age intervals during the same period. The period of observation is referred to as the experience band. The band of years which represent the installation dates of the property exposed to retirement during the experience band is referred to as the placement band. An example of the calculations used in the development of a life table follows. The example includes schedules of annual aged property transactions, a schedule of plant exposed to retirement, a life table and illustrations of smoothing the stub survivor curve.

[^122]
## Schedules of Annual Transactions in Plant Records

The property group used to illustrate the retirement rate method is observed for the experience band 2013-2022 for which there were placements during the years 20082022. In order to illustrate the summation of the aged data by age interval, the data were compiled in the manner presented in Schedules 1 and 2 on pages II-11 and II-12. In Schedule 1, the year of installation (year placed) and the year of retirement are shown. The age interval during which a retirement occurred is determined from this information. In the example which follows, \$10,000 of the dollars invested in 2008 were retired in 2013. The $\$ 10,000$ retirement occurred during the age interval between $41 / 2$ and $51 / 2$ years on the basis that approximately one-half of the amount of property was installed prior to and subsequent to July 1 of each year. That is, on the average, property installed during a year is placed in service at the midpoint of the year for the purpose of the analysis. All retirements also are stated as occurring at the midpoint of a one-year age interval of time, except the first age interval which encompasses only one-half year.

The total retirements occurring in each age interval in a band are determined by summing the amounts for each transaction year-installation year combination for that age interval. For example, the total of $\$ 143,000$ retired for age interval $41 / 2-51 / 2$ is the sum of the retirements entered on Schedule 1 immediately above the stair step line drawn on the table beginning with the 2013 retirements of 2008 installations and ending with the 2022 retirements of the 2017 installations. Thus, the total amount of 143 for age interval $41 / 2-$ $51 / 2$ equals the sum of:

$$
10+12+13+11+13+13+15+17+19+20
$$

Experience Band 2013-2022

| Experi | nce Ba | 2013-2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | acement Band | 2008-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Retir | nts, Th | sands of | ollars |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year |  |  |  |  | Duri | Year |  |  |  |  | Total During | Age |
| Placed | $\underline{2013}$ | $\underline{2014}$ | $\underline{2015}$ | $\underline{2016}$ | $\underline{2017}$ | $\underline{2018}$ | $\underline{2019}$ | $\underline{2020}$ | $\underline{2021}$ | $\underline{2022}$ | Age Interval | Interval |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) |
| 2008 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 16 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 26 | $131 / 2-141 / 2$ |
| 2009 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 16 | 18 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 19 | 44 | $121 / 2-131 / 2$ |
| 2010 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 16 | 17 | 19 | 21 | 22 | 18 | 64 | $111 / 2-12^{1 / 2}$ |
| 2011 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 83 | $101 / 2-11 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 2012 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 16 | 17 | 19 | 20 | 93 | $91 / 2-101 / 2$ |
| 2013 | 4 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 20 | 105 | $81 / 2-91 / 2$ |
| 2014 |  | 5 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 18 | 20 | 113 | $71 / 2-81 / 2$ |
| 2015 |  |  | 6 | 12 | 13 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 19 | 19 | 124 | $61 / 2-71 / 2$ |
| 2016 |  |  |  | 6 | 13 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 19 | 19 | 131 | $51 / 2-61 / 2$ |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  | 7 | 14 | 16 | 17 | 19 | 20 | 143 | $41 / 2-51 / 2$ |
| 2018 |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 18 | 20 | 22 | 23 | 146 | $31 / 2-41 / 2$ |
| 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 20 | 22 | 25 | 150 | $21 / 2-31 / 2$ |
| 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 | 23 | 25 | 151 | $11 / 2-21 / 2$ |
| 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 | 24 | 153 | 1/2-11/2 |
| 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13 | 80 | 0-1/2 |
| Total | 53 | 68 | 86 | 106 | 128 | 157 | 196 | 231 | 273 | 308 | 1,606 |  |

SCHEDULE 2. OTHER TRANSACTIONS FOR EACH YEAR 2013-2022
SUMMARIZED BY AGE INTERVAL
Acquisitions, Transfers and Sales, Thousands of Dollars



${ }^{a}$ Transfer Affecting Exposures at Beginning of Year
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Transfer Affecting Exposures at End of Year
${ }^{\text {c }}$ Sale with Continued Use
Parentheses Denote Credit Amount.

In Schedule 2, other transactions which affect the group are recorded in a similar manner. The entries illustrated include transfers and sales. The entries which are credits to the plant account are shown in parentheses. The items recorded on this schedule are not totaled with the retirements, but are used in developing the exposures at the beginning of each age interval.

## Schedule of Plant Exposed to Retirement

The development of the amount of plant exposed to retirement at the beginning of each age interval is illustrated in Schedule 3 on page II-14. The surviving plant at the beginning of each year from 2013 through 2022 is recorded by year in the portion of the table headed "Annual Survivors at the Beginning of the Year." The last amount entered in each column is the amount of new plant added to the group during the year. The amounts entered in Schedule 3 for each successive year following the beginning balance or addition are obtained by adding or subtracting the net entries shown on Schedules 1 and 2. For the purpose of determining the plant exposed to retirement, transfers-in are considered as being exposed to retirement in this group at the beginning of the year in which they occurred, and the sales and transfers-out are considered to be removed from the plant exposed to retirement at the beginning of the following year. Thus, the amounts of plant shown at the beginning of each year are the amounts of plant from each placement year considered to be exposed to retirement at the beginning of each successive transaction year. For example, the exposures for the installation year 2018 are calculated in the following manner:

| Exposures at age $0=$ amount of addition | $=\$ 750,000$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Exposures at age $1 / 2=\$ 750,000-\$ 8,000$ | $=\$ 742,000$ |
| Exposures at age $11 / 2=\$ 742,000-\$ 18,000$ | $=\$ 724,000$ |
| Exposures at age $21 / 2=\$ 724,000-\$ 20,000-\$ 19,000$ | $=\$ 685,000$ |
| Exposures at age $3112=\$ 685,000-\$ 22,000$ | $=\$ 663,000$ |

Experience Band 2013-2022

$$
\underline{\underline{2,824}}
$$

SCHEDULE 3. PLANT EXPOSED TO RETIREMENT JANUARY 1 OF EACH YEAR 2013-2022
Dlacoment Band 2008-2022
Placement Band 2008-2022

| $\begin{array}{c}\text { Year } \\ \text { Placed }\end{array}$ |
| :---: |
| $(1)$ |
| 2008 |
| 2009 |
| 2010 |
| 2011 |
| 2012 |
| 2013 |
| 2014 |
| 2015 |
| 2016 |
| 2017 |
| 2018 |
| 2019 |
| 2020 |
| 2021 |
| 2022 |
| Total |

For the entire experience band 2013-2022, the total exposures at the beginning of an age interval are obtained by summing diagonally in a manner similar to the summing of the retirements during an age interval (Schedule 1). For example, the figure of 3,789, shown as the total exposures at the beginning of age interval $41 / 2-51 / 2$, is obtained by summing:

$$
255+268+284+311+334+374+405+448+501+609
$$

## Original Life Table

The original life table, illustrated in Schedule 4 on page II-16, is developed from the totals shown on the schedules of retirements and exposures, Schedules 1 and 3, respectively. The exposures at the beginning of the age interval are obtained from the corresponding age interval of the exposure schedule, and the retirements during the age interval are obtained from the corresponding age interval of the retirement schedule. The retirement ratio is the result of dividing the retirements during the age interval by the exposures at the beginning of the age interval. The percent surviving at the beginning of each age interval is derived from survivor ratios, each of which equals one minus the retirement ratio. The percent surviving is developed by starting with 100\% at age zero and successively multiplying the percent surviving at the beginning of each interval by the survivor ratio, i.e., one minus the retirement ratio for that age interval. The calculations necessary to determine the percent surviving at age $51 / 2$ are as follows:

Percent surviving at age $41 / 2=88.15$
Exposures at age $41 / 22=3,789,000$
Retirements from age $41 / 2$ to $51 / 2=143,000$
Retirement Ratio $=143,000 \div 3,789,000=0.0377$
Survivor Ratio $=1.000-0.0377=0.9623$
Percent surviving at age $51 / 2=(88.15) \times(0.9623)=84.83$
The totals of the exposures and retirements (columns 2 and 3 ) are shown for the purpose of checking with the respective totals in Schedules 1 and 3. The ratio of the total retirements to the total exposures, other than for each age interval, is meaningless.

## SCHEDULE 4. ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE

 CALCULATED BY THE RETIREMENT RATE METHOD(Exposure and Retirement Amounts are in Thousands of Dollars)

| Age at Beginning of Interval | Exposures at Beginning of Age Interval | Retirements During Age Interval | Retirement Ratio | Survivor Ratio | Percent Surviving at Beginning of Age Interval |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 0.0 | 7,490 | 80 | 0.0107 | 0.9893 | 100.00 |
| 0.5 | 6,579 | 153 | 0.0233 | 0.9767 | 98.93 |
| 1.5 | 5,719 | 151 | 0.0264 | 0.9736 | 96.62 |
| 2.5 | 4,955 | 150 | 0.0303 | 0.9697 | 94.07 |
| 3.5 | 4,332 | 146 | 0.0337 | 0.9663 | 91.22 |
| 4.5 | 3,789 | 143 | 0.0377 | 0.9623 | 88.15 |
| 5.5 | 3,057 | 131 | 0.0429 | 0.9571 | 84.83 |
| 6.5 | 2,463 | 124 | 0.0503 | 0.9497 | 81.19 |
| 7.5 | 1,952 | 113 | 0.0579 | 0.9421 | 77.11 |
| 8.5 | 1,503 | 105 | 0.0699 | 0.9301 | 72.65 |
| 9.5 | 1,097 | 93 | 0.0848 | 0.9152 | 67.57 |
| 10.5 | 823 | 83 | 0.1009 | 0.8991 | 61.84 |
| 11.5 | 531 | 64 | 0.1205 | 0.8795 | 55.60 |
| 12.5 | 323 | 44 | 0.1362 | 0.8638 | 48.90 |
| 13.5 | 167 | 26 | 0.1557 | 0.8443 | 42.24 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 35.66 |
| Total | 44,780 | 1,606 |  |  |  |

Column 2 from Schedule 3, Column 12, Plant Exposed to Retirement.
Column 3 from Schedule 1, Column 12, Retirements for Each Year.
Column 4 = Column 3 Divided by Column 2.
Column $5=1.0000$ Minus Column 4.
Column 6 = Column 5 Multiplied by Column 6 as of the Preceding Age Interval.

The original survivor curve is plotted from the original life table (column 6, Schedule 4). When the curve terminates at a percent surviving greater than zero, it is called a stub survivor curve. Survivor curves developed from retirement rate studies generally are stub curves.

## Smoothing the Original Survivor Curve

The smoothing of the original survivor curve eliminates any irregularities and serves as the basis for the preliminary extrapolation to zero percent surviving of the original stub curve. Even if the original survivor curve is complete from $100 \%$ to zero percent, it is desirable to eliminate any irregularities, as there is still an extrapolation for the vintages which have not yet lived to the age at which the curve reaches zero percent. In this study, the smoothing of the original curve with established type curves was used to eliminate irregularities in the original curve.

The lowa type curves are used in this study to smooth those original stub curves which are expressed as percents surviving at ages in years. Each original survivor curve was compared to the lowa curves using visual and mathematical matching in order to determine the better fitting smooth curves. In Figures 6, 7, and 8, the original curve developed in Schedule 4 is compared with the L, S, and R lowa type curves which most nearly fit the original survivor curve. In Figure 6, the L1 curve with an average life between 12 and 13 years appears to be the best fit. In Figure 7, the S0 type curve with a 12-year average life appears to be the best fit and appears to be better than the L1 fitting. In Figure 8, the R1 type curve with a 12-year average life appears to be the best fit and appears to be better than either the L1 or the S0.

In Figure 9, the three fittings, 12-L1, 12-S0 and 12-R1 are drawn for comparison purposes. It is probable that the 12-R1 lowa curve would be selected as the most representative of the plotted survivor characteristics of the group.


## PART III. SERVICE LIFE CONSIDERATIONS

## PART III. SERVICE LIFE CONSIDERATIONS

## FIELD TRIPS

In order to be familiar with the operation of the Company and to observe representative portions of the plant, a field trip was conducted. A general understanding of the function of the plant and information with respect to the reasons for past retirements and the expected future causes of retirements was obtained during this trip. This knowledge and information were incorporated in the interpretation and extrapolation of the statistical analyses.

The plant facilities visited on the most recent field trip are as follows:
February 6, 2022
Frederick Service Center
Cabin Branch Substation
Crystal Rock Substation
Lime Kiln Substation
July 30, 2020
Williamsport Service Center
Halfway Substation
General Office Substation
Maple Avenue Substation
Garfield Substation
Frederick A Substation
Frederick Service Center

## SERVICE LIFE ANALYSIS

The service life estimates were based on judgment which considered a number of factors. The primary factors were the statistical analyses of data, current Company policies and outlook as determined during conversations with management; and the survivor curve estimates from previous studies of this company and other electric utility companies.

For 10 plant accounts and subaccounts for which survivor curves were estimated, the statistical analyses using the retirement rate method resulted in good to
excellent indications of the survivor patterns experienced. Generally, the information external to the statistics led to minimal or no significant departure from the indicated survivor curves for the accounts listed below. The statistical support for the service life estimates is presented in the section beginning on page VII-2.

DISTRIBUTION PLANT<br>362.00 Station Equipment<br>364.00 Poles, Towers and Fixtures<br>365.00 Overhead Conductors and Devices<br>367.00 Underground Conductors and Devices<br>368.00 Line Transformers<br>369.00 Services<br>370.00 Meters<br>373.10 Street Lighting and Signal Systems

## GENERAL PLANT

390.10 Structures and Improvements
392.00 Transportation Equipment

Account 368.00, Line Transformers, is used to illustrate the manner in which the study was conducted for the groups in the preceding list. Aged plant accounting data for line transformers have been compiled for the years 1997 through June 2022. These data have been coded in the course of the Company's normal record keeping according to account or property group, type of transaction, year in which the transaction took place, and year in which the electric plant was placed in service. The retirements, other plant transactions, and plant additions were analyzed by the retirement rate method.

The survivor curve estimate is based on the statistical indications for the period 1997 through June 2022. The Iowa $50-\mathrm{R} 1.5$ is a reasonable fit of the original survivor curve. The 50-year service life is at the upper end of the typical service life range of 35 to 50 years for line transformers. The 50-year life reflects the Company's plans to
continue current practices of replacement for newer technology or high load needs and increase of padmounted transformers.

The currently approved estimate for Account 362.00 Station Equipment is the 75R1.5. The 65-R2.5 is a good fit of the data through age 45.5 which represents the most relevant portion of the original life table. The plant exposed to retirement at ages older than that are less than ideal for this type of property, especially considering the large amount of exposures through the youngest few age intervals. For station equipment, the emphasis on high level exposures in appropriate due to the cost of significant assets, such as transformers. Within the industry, the range of average service lives is 45-60 years based on the nature of the assets so longer than 60 years is not appropriate.

The survivor curve estimates for the remaining accounts were based on judgment incorporating the statistical analyses and previous studies for this and other electric utilities.

## PART IV. NET SALVAGE CONSIDERATIONS

## PART IV. NET SALVAGE CONSIDERATIONS

## NET SALVAGE ANALYSIS

The estimates of net salvage by account were based in part on historical data compiled through June 2022. Cost of removal and gross salvage were expressed as percents of the original cost of plant retired, both on annual and three-year moving average bases. The most recent five-year average also was calculated for consideration. The net salvage estimates by account are expressed as a percent of the original cost of plant retired.

## Net Salvage Considerations

The estimates of future net salvage are expressed as percentages of surviving plant in service, i.e., all future retirements. In cases in which removal costs are expected to exceed salvage receipts, a negative net salvage percentage is estimated. The net salvage estimates were based on judgment which incorporated analyses of historical cost of removal and gross salvage data, expectations with respect to future removal requirements and markets for retired equipment and materials.

The analyses of historical cost of removal and gross salvage data are presented in the section titled "Net Salvage Statistics" for the plant accounts for which the net salvage estimate relied partially on those analyses.

Statistical analyses of historical data for the period 2001 through June 2022 for electric plant were analyzed. The analyses contributed significantly toward the net salvage estimates for 10 plant accounts and subaccount of the depreciable plant, as follows:

## DISTRIBUTION PLANT

362.00 Station Equipment
365.00 Overhead Conductors and Devices
366.00 Underground Conduit
367.00 Underground Conductors and Devices

| 368.00 | Line Transformers |
| :---: | :--- |
| 370.00 | Meters |
| 371.00 | Installations on Customers' Premises |
| 373.10 | Street Lighting and Signal Systems |
|  |  |
| GENERAL PLANT |  |
| 390.10 | Structures and Improvements |
| 392.00 | Transportation Equipment |

Account 362.00, Station Equipment, is used to illustrate the manner in which the study was conducted for the groups in the preceding list. Net salvage data for the period 2001 through June of 2022 were analyzed for this account. The data include cost of removal, gross salvage and net salvage amounts and each of these amounts is expressed as a percent of the original cost of regular retirements. Three-year moving averages for the 2001-2003 through 2020-2022 periods were computed to smooth the annual amounts.

Cost of removal has fluctuated throughout the twenty-two year period with a trend higher in the last few years. The primary cause of the fluctuations in cost of removal relates to the type and size of the station equipment removed each year. The large projects or inside the building assets have lower cost to remove per asset. Cost of removal for the most recent five years averaged 60 percent.

Gross salvage has also varied throughout the period, however, in most years has been zero. The most recent five-year average of 1 percent gross salvage reflects recent lower salvage value of station equipment.

The net salvage percent based on the overall period 2001 through June 2022 is 15 percent negative net salvage and based on the most recent five-year period is negative 59 percent. This shows a trend towards more negative net salvage. The range of estimates made by other electric companies for Station Equipment is negative 5 to negative 25 percent. The net salvage estimate for station equipment is negative 20
percent, is within the range of other estimates and reflects the trend in recent years of more negative net salvage.

The net salvage percents for the remaining accounts of plant were based on judgment incorporating estimates of previous studies of this and other electric utilities.

## PART V. CALCULATION OF ANNUAL AND ACCRUED DEPRECIATION
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## GROUP DEPRECIATION PROCEDURES

A group procedure for depreciation is appropriate when considering more than a single item of property. Normally the items within a group do not have identical service lives, but have lives that are dispersed over a range of time. There are two primary group procedures, namely, average service life and equal life group. In the average service life procedure, the rate of annual depreciation is based on the average life or average remaining life of the group, and this rate is applied to the surviving balances of the group's cost. A characteristic of this procedure is that the cost of plant retired prior to average life is not fully recouped at the time of retirement, whereas the cost of plant retired subsequent to average life is more than fully recouped. Over the entire life cycle, the portion of cost not recouped prior to average life is balanced by the cost recouped subsequent to average life.

## Single Unit of Property

The calculation of straight line depreciation for a single unit of property is straightforward. For example, if a $\$ 1,000$ unit of property attains an age of four years and has a life expectancy of six years, the annual accrual over the total life is:

$$
\frac{\$ 1,000}{(4+6)}=\$ 100 \text { per year. }
$$

The accrued depreciation is:

$$
\$ 1,000\left(1-\frac{6}{10}\right)=\$ 400 .
$$

## Remaining Life Annual Accruals

For the purpose of calculating remaining life accruals as of June 30, 2022, the depreciation reserve for each plant account is allocated among vintages in proportion to the calculated accrued depreciation for the account. Explanations of remaining life accruals and calculated accrued depreciation follow. The detailed calculations as of June 30, 2022, are set forth in the Results of Study section of the report.

## Average Service Life Procedure

In the average service life procedure, the remaining life annual accrual for each vintage is determined by dividing future book accruals (original cost less book reserve) by the average remaining life of the vintage. The average remaining life is a directly weighted average derived from the estimated future survivor curve in accordance with the average service life procedure.

The calculated accrued depreciation for each depreciable property group represents that portion of the depreciable cost of the group which would not be allocated to expense through future depreciation accruals if current forecasts of life characteristics are used as the basis for such accruals. The accrued depreciation calculation consists of applying an appropriate ratio to the surviving original cost of each vintage of each account based upon the attained age and service life. The straight line accrued depreciation ratios are calculated as follows for the average service life procedure:

$$
\text { Ratio }=1-\frac{\text { Average Remaining Life }}{\text { Average Service Life }} .
$$

## CALCULATION OF ANNUAL AND ACCRUED AMORTIZATION

Amortization, as defined in the Uniform System of Accounts, is the gradual extinguishment of an amount in an account by distributing such amount over a fixed period, over the life of the asset or liability to which it applies, or over the period during which it is anticipated the benefit will be realized. Normally, the distribution of the amount is in equal amounts to each year of the amortization period.

The calculation of annual and accrued amortization requires the selection of an amortization period. The amortization periods used in this report were based on judgment which incorporated a consideration of the period during which the assets will render most of their service, the amortization periods and service lives used by other utilities, and the service life estimates previously used for the asset under depreciation accounting.

Amortization accounting is appropriate for certain General and Common Plant accounts that represent numerous units of property, but a very small portion of total depreciable electric plant in service. The accounts and their amortization periods are as follows:

| General <br> Plant <br> 391.00 | Amortization <br> Period, |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 391.15 | Office Furniture and Equipment - Furniture | $\frac{\text { Account }}{\text { Years }}$ |

For the purpose of calculating annual amortization amounts as of June 30, 2022, the book reserve for each plant account or subaccount is assigned or allocated to vintages. The book reserve assigned to vintages with an age greater than the
amortization period is equal to the vintage's original cost. The remaining book reserve is allocated among vintages with an age less than the amortization period in proportion to the calculated accrued amortization. The calculated accrued amortization is equal to the original cost multiplied by the ratio of the vintage's age to its amortization period. The annual amortization amount is determined by dividing the future amortizations (original cost less allocated book reserve) by the remaining period of amortization for the vintage.

## PART VI. RESULTS OF STUDY
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## QUALIFICATION OF RESULTS

The calculated annual and accrued depreciation are the principal results of the study. Continued surveillance and periodic revisions are normally required to maintain continued use of appropriate annual depreciation accrual rates. An assumption that accrual rates can remain unchanged implies service lives, net salvage percentages and the change in the composition of property in service will not change. The annual accrual rates were calculated in accordance with the straight line remaining life method of depreciation, using the average service life procedure based on estimates which reflect considerations of current historical evidence and expected future conditions.

The annual depreciation accrual rates are applicable specifically to the electric plant in service as of June 30, 2022 and the application of such rates to future balances that reflect additions subsequent to June 30, 2022.

## DESCRIPTION OF STATISTICAL SUPPORT

The service life and net salvage estimates were based on judgment which incorporated statistical analyses of retirement data, discussions with management and consideration of estimates made for other electric utility companies. The results of the statistical analyses of service life are presented in the section titled "Service Life Statistics".

The estimated survivor curves for each account are presented in graphical form. The charts depict the estimated smooth survivor curve and original survivor curve(s), when applicable, related to each specific group. For groups where the original survivor curve was plotted, the calculation of the original life table is also presented.

The analyses of net salvage data are presented in the section titled, "Net Salvage Statistics". The tabulations present annual cost of removal and gross salvage data, three-year moving averages and the most recent five-year average. Data are shown in dollars and as percentages of original costs retired.

## DESCRIPTION OF DEPRECIATION TABULATIONS

A summary of the results of the study using the traditional method for net salvage, as applied to the original cost of electric plant as of June 30, 2022, is presented on page $\mathrm{VI}-4$. The schedule sets forth the original cost, the book reserve, future accruals, the calculated annual depreciation rate and amount, and the composite remaining life related to electric plant.

The tables of the calculated annual depreciation accruals are presented in account sequence in the section titled "Detailed Depreciation Calculations." The tables indicate the estimated survivor curve and net salvage percent for the account and set forth, for each installation year, the original cost, the calculated accrued depreciation, the allocated book reserve, future accruals, the remaining life and the calculated annual accrual amount. The Appendix of this report provides proposed depreciation rates and accruals using the MD Present Value Method for net salvage that has previously been used only in Maryland. A credit-adjusted risk-free rate of $5.93 \%$ was established for these calculations.





| account |
| :---: |
| ${ }^{(1)}$ |
| Electric plant |
| Intangible plant |
| miscellaneous intangible plant |
| total intangible plant |
| distribution plant |
| LAND AND LAND RIGHTS - EASEMENTS |
| STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS |
| STATION EQUIPMENT |
| POLES, TOW ERS AND FIXTURES |
| OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES |
| OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES - CLEARING |
| UNDERGROUND CONDUIT |
| UNDERGROUND CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES |
| LINE TRANSFORMERS |
| SERVICES |
| METERS |
| INSTALLATIONS ON CUSTOMERS' PREMISES |
| STREET LIGHTING AND SIGNAL SYSTEMS |
| total distribution plant |
| general plant |
|  |
| LAND RIGHTS STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS |
| OFFICE FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT - OFFICE FURNITURE |
| OFFICE FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT - OFFICE EQUIPMENT |
| OFFICE FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT - PERSONAL COMPUTERS |
| TRANSPORTATION EQUIPMENT |
| STORES EQUIPMENT |
| TOOLS, SHOP AND GARAGE EQUIPMENT |
| LABORATORY EQUIPMENT |
| POWER OPERATED EQUIPMENT |
| COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT |
| MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT |
| total general plant |
| total depreciable plant |




## 



## 

* FOR NEW ADDITIONS TO ACCOUNT 391.15 OFFICE FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT - OFFICE EQUIPMENTA A $10.00 \%$ DEPRECIATION RATE IS RECOMMENDED BASED ON A 10-SQ AND O PERCENT NET SALVAGE
.". FOR NEW ADDTIONS TO ACCOUNT 396.00 POWER OPERATED EQUIPMENTA A.75\% DEPRECIATION RATE IS RECOMMENDED BASED ON A 20 -SO. 5 SURVIVOR CURVE ANO 5 PERCENT NET SALVAGE

[^123]
GANNETT FLEMING

## PART VII. SERVICE LIFE STATISTICS



ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE

| PLACEMENT | ND 1945-2020 |  | EXPERIENCE BAND |  | 1997-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 0.0 | 7,497,675 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 0.5 | 7,604,588 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 1.5 | 8,311,828 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 2.5 | 8,334,623 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 3.5 | 8,535,282 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 4.5 | 7,390,455 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 5.5 | 7,514,232 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 6.5 | 7,581,105 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 7.5 | 7,620,976 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 8.5 | 7,644,676 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 9.5 | 7,664,487 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 10.5 | 7,416,769 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 11.5 | 6,424,447 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 12.5 | 4,767,158 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 13.5 | 4,806,260 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 14.5 | 3,836,838 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 15.5 | 2,930,522 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 16.5 | 3,011,500 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 17.5 | 2,427,589 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 18.5 | 2,418,332 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 19.5 | 2,311,722 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 20.5 | 2,334,168 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 21.5 | 2,337,151 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 22.5 | 2,227,469 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 23.5 | 2,243,375 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 24.5 | 2,211,994 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 25.5 | 2,105,003 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 26.5 | 2,072,024 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 27.5 | 1,406,894 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 28.5 | 1,460,964 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 29.5 | 1,522,018 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 30.5 | 1,516,468 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 31.5 | 1,425,221 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 32.5 | 1,397,161 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 33.5 | 1,412,361 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 34.5 | 1,436,238 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 35.5 | 1,496,297 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 36.5 | 1,463,262 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 37.5 | 1,476,180 | 20 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 38.5 | 1,524,214 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |


| PLACEMENT | ND 1945-2020 |  | EXPERIENCE BAND |  | 1997-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 39.5 | 1,502,281 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 40.5 | $1,435,936$ |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 41.5 | 1,347,299 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 42.5 | 1,298,115 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 43.5 | $1,541,327$ | 181 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 100.00 |
| 44.5 | 1,511,015 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.99 |
| 45.5 | $1,479,425$ |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.99 |
| 46.5 | $1,456,979$ |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.99 |
| 47.5 | $1,436,422$ |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.99 |
| 48.5 | $1,401,841$ |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.99 |
| 49.5 | $1,375,393$ |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.99 |
| 50.5 | $1,135,470$ |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.99 |
| 51.5 | $1,197,625$ | 9 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.99 |
| 52.5 | $1,129,540$ |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.99 |
| 53.5 | 1,099,573 | 189 | 0.0002 | 0.9998 | 99.99 |
| 54.5 | $1,022,617$ | 2 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.97 |
| 55.5 | 941,942 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.97 |
| 56.5 | 893,575 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.97 |
| 57.5 | 861,044 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.97 |
| 58.5 | 822, 232 | 3 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.97 |
| 59.5 | 767,158 | 2 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.97 |
| 60.5 | 719,579 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.97 |
| 61.5 | 639,709 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.97 |
| 62.5 | 629,790 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.97 |
| 63.5 | 576,928 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.97 |
| 64.5 | 500,173 | 94 | 0.0002 | 0.9998 | 99.97 |
| 65.5 | 482,910 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.95 |
| 66.5 | 463,382 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.95 |
| 67.5 | 418, 057 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.95 |
| 68.5 | 386,263 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.95 |
| 69.5 | 127,639 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.95 |
| 70.5 | 127,639 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.95 |
| 71.5 | 127,639 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.95 |
| 72.5 | 127,639 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.95 |
| 73.5 | 127,639 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.95 |
| 74.5 | 127,639 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.95 |
| 75.5 | 127,639 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.95 |
| 76.5 | 127,639 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.95 |
| 77.5 |  |  |  |  | 99.95 |

the potomac edison company


PCT SURV

| RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |


| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL |

BEGIN OF INTERVAL
0.0
$0.5 \quad 6,409,753$
1.5 5,714,261
2.5 6,491,053
3.5 6,206,278
$4.5 \quad 7,040,596$
$5.5 \quad 7,176,267$
6.5 7,087,111
7.5 7,055,721
$8.5 \quad 7,086,248$
9.5 7,097,770
10.5 7,267,795
11.5 7,421,573
12.5 6,721,949
$13.5 \quad 6,612,627$
$14.5 \quad$ 5,635,079
15.5 6,009,956
16.5 5,812,244
$17.5 \quad 5,636,801$
$18.5 \quad 5,685,709$
19.5 4,675,959
20.5 4,999,436
21.5 5,062,226
22.5 4,668,335
23.5 4,704,812
24.5 4,432,358
25.5 4,538,856
26.5 4,488,294
27.5 3,815,182
$28.5 \quad 2,835,769$
29.5 2,583,777
$30.5 \quad 1,738,287$
$31.5 \quad 1,647,106$
$32.5 \quad 1,413,067$
33.5 1,419,944
$34.5 \quad 1,416,895$
$35.5 \quad 1,410,910$
$36.51,420,146$
$37.5 \quad 1,036,534$
38.5

988,868

|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 320 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 7,343 | 0.0010 | 0.9990 | 100.00 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.90 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.90 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.90 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.90 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.90 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.90 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.90 |
| 6,010 | 0.0013 | 0.9987 | 99.90 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.77 |
| 9,087 | 0.0018 | 0.9982 | 99.77 |
| 1,951 | 0.0004 | 0.9996 | 99.59 |
| 4,364 | 0.0009 | 0.9991 | 99.55 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.46 |
| 2,852 | 0.0006 | 0.9994 | 99.46 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.39 |
| 3,954 | 0.0010 | 0.9990 | 99.39 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.29 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.29 |
| 252 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 99.29 |
| 4,004 | 0.0024 | 0.9976 | 99.28 |
| 5,406 | 0.0038 | 0.9962 | 99.03 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 98.66 |
| 372 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 98.66 |
| 12,445 | 0.0088 | 0.9912 | 98.63 |
| 3,507 | 0.0025 | 0.9975 | 97.76 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 97.52 |
|  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 97.52 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 361.00 STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.

| PLACEMENT | ND 1950-2022 | EXPERIENCE BAND 1997-2022 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 39.5 | 1,014,186 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 97.52 |
| 40.5 | 995,264 | 1,064 | 0.0011 | 0.9989 | 97.52 |
| 41.5 | 827,137 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 97.41 |
| 42.5 | 764,333 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 97.41 |
| 43.5 | 769,671 | 233 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 97.41 |
| 44.5 | 711,483 | 5,217 | 0.0073 | 0.9927 | 97.38 |
| 45.5 | 604,563 | 89 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 96.67 |
| 46.5 | 521,137 | 2,002 | 0.0038 | 0.9962 | 96.66 |
| 47.5 | 394,455 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 96.28 |
| 48.5 | 400,278 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 96.28 |
| 49.5 | 403,269 | 2,306 | 0.0057 | 0.9943 | 96.28 |
| 50.5 | 401,976 | 6,598 | 0.0164 | 0.9836 | 95.73 |
| 51.5 | 333,799 | 210 | 0.0006 | 0.9994 | 94.16 |
| 52.5 | 226,256 | 333 | 0.0015 | 0.9985 | 94.10 |
| 53.5 | 223,455 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.96 |
| 54.5 | 160,963 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.96 |
| 55.5 | 146,731 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.96 |
| 56.5 | 127,921 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.96 |
| 57.5 | 127,678 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.96 |
| 58.5 | 116,198 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.96 |
| 59.5 | 112,666 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.96 |
| 60.5 | 114,868 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.96 |
| 61.5 | 68,715 | 51 | 0.0007 | 0.9993 | 93.96 |
| 62.5 | 113,096 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.89 |
| 63.5 | 106,940 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.89 |
| 64.5 | 101,780 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.89 |
| 65.5 | 22,286 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.89 |
| 66.5 | 21,791 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.89 |
| 67.5 | 19,183 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.89 |
| 68.5 | 17,609 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.89 |
| 69.5 | 10,486 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.89 |
| 70.5 | 2,284 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.89 |
| 71.5 | 2,284 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.89 |
| 72.5 |  |  |  |  | 93.89 |

the potomac edison company


ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE

PLACEMENT BAND 1923-2022
EXPERIENCE BAND 1997-2022

| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 0.0 | 134,678,801 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 0.5 | 129,808,863 | 43,498 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 100.00 |
| 1.5 | 126,055,818 | 47,371 | 0.0004 | 0.9996 | 99.97 |
| 2.5 | 126,063,463 | 26,670 | 0.0002 | 0.9998 | 99.93 |
| 3.5 | 120,184,565 | 25,838 | 0.0002 | 0.9998 | 99.91 |
| 4.5 | 120,373,354 | 181,489 | 0.0015 | 0.9985 | 99.89 |
| 5.5 | 117,667,581 | 177,128 | 0.0015 | 0.9985 | 99.74 |
| 6.5 | 112,064,551 | 103,795 | 0.0009 | 0.9991 | 99.59 |
| 7.5 | 116,747,853 | 462,248 | 0.0040 | 0.9960 | 99.49 |
| 8.5 | 115,274,937 | 526,921 | 0.0046 | 0.9954 | 99.10 |
| 9.5 | 110,894,557 | 103,018 | 0.0009 | 0.9991 | 98.65 |
| 10.5 | 110,102,723 | 150,229 | 0.0014 | 0.9986 | 98.55 |
| 11.5 | 112,315,574 | 442,591 | 0.0039 | 0.9961 | 98.42 |
| 12.5 | 110,495,529 | 291,850 | 0.0026 | 0.9974 | 98.03 |
| 13.5 | 105,181,411 | 204,087 | 0.0019 | 0.9981 | 97.77 |
| 14.5 | 85,269,286 | 299,985 | 0.0035 | 0.9965 | 97.58 |
| 15.5 | 81,750,907 | 1,146,789 | 0.0140 | 0.9860 | 97.24 |
| 16.5 | 78,820,368 | 133,647 | 0.0017 | 0.9983 | 95.88 |
| 17.5 | 73,217,634 | 215,373 | 0.0029 | 0.9971 | 95.71 |
| 18.5 | 66,696,691 | 113,593 | 0.0017 | 0.9983 | 95.43 |
| 19.5 | 65,967,297 | 1,177,864 | 0.0179 | 0.9821 | 95.27 |
| 20.5 | 65,516,038 | 694,734 | 0.0106 | 0.9894 | 93.57 |
| 21.5 | 63,343,256 | 225,176 | 0.0036 | 0.9964 | 92.58 |
| 22.5 | 58,483,110 | 731,708 | 0.0125 | 0.9875 | 92.25 |
| 23.5 | 57,820,165 | 124,553 | 0.0022 | 0.9978 | 91.09 |
| 24.5 | 54,538,065 | 49,206 | 0.0009 | 0.9991 | 90.90 |
| 25.5 | 54,681,262 | 85,533 | 0.0016 | 0.9984 | 90.82 |
| 26.5 | 53,223,085 | 166,947 | 0.0031 | 0.9969 | 90.67 |
| 27.5 | 48,187,879 | 83,834 | 0.0017 | 0.9983 | 90.39 |
| 28.5 | 40,431,032 | 75,498 | 0.0019 | 0.9981 | 90.23 |
| 29.5 | 38,697,669 | 72,980 | 0.0019 | 0.9981 | 90.06 |
| 30.5 | 35,590,942 | 89,433 | 0.0025 | 0.9975 | 89.89 |
| 31.5 | 31,925,550 | 135,128 | 0.0042 | 0.9958 | 89.67 |
| 32.5 | 28,593,707 | 73,084 | 0.0026 | 0.9974 | 89.29 |
| 33.5 | 23,850,047 | 55,130 | 0.0023 | 0.9977 | 89.06 |
| 34.5 | 22,554,664 | 287,793 | 0.0128 | 0.9872 | 88.85 |
| 35.5 | 21,871,515 | 184,352 | 0.0084 | 0.9916 | 87.72 |
| 36.5 | 21,525,007 | 145,897 | 0.0068 | 0.9932 | 86.98 |
| 37.5 | 18,478,980 | 68,155 | 0.0037 | 0.9963 | 86.39 |
| 38.5 | 17,128,207 | 131,917 | 0.0077 | 0.9923 | 86.07 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

## ACCOUNT 362.00 STATION EQUIPMENT

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.

PLACEMENT BAND 1923-2022
EXPERIENCE BAND 1997-2022

| Age At | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 39.5 | 15,850,717 | 94,509 | 0.0060 | 0.9940 | 85.41 |
| 40.5 | 15,002,778 | 43,372 | 0.0029 | 0.9971 | 84.90 |
| 41.5 | 14,273,114 | 64,554 | 0.0045 | 0.9955 | 84.65 |
| 42.5 | 13,469,487 | 44,110 | 0.0033 | 0.9967 | 84.27 |
| 43.5 | 12,773,588 | 65,709 | 0.0051 | 0.9949 | 84.00 |
| 44.5 | 11,993,471 | 41,904 | 0.0035 | 0.9965 | 83.56 |
| 45.5 | 10,457,513 | 43,674 | 0.0042 | 0.9958 | 83.27 |
| 46.5 | 8,891,219 | 113,284 | 0.0127 | 0.9873 | 82.92 |
| 47.5 | 7,941,800 | 23,439 | 0.0030 | 0.9970 | 81.87 |
| 48.5 | 7,392,832 | 21,309 | 0.0029 | 0.9971 | 81.63 |
| 49.5 | 6,601,276 | 28,255 | 0.0043 | 0.9957 | 81.39 |
| 50.5 | 6,259,182 | 157,279 | 0.0251 | 0.9749 | 81.04 |
| 51.5 | 5,569,441 | 10,658 | 0.0019 | 0.9981 | 79.01 |
| 52.5 | 3,770,185 | 4,941 | 0.0013 | 0.9987 | 78.85 |
| 53.5 | 3,338,710 | 37,216 | 0.0111 | 0.9889 | 78.75 |
| 54.5 | 2,896,260 | 2,675 | 0.0009 | 0.9991 | 77.87 |
| 55.5 | 2,635,256 | 20,391 | 0.0077 | 0.9923 | 77.80 |
| 56.5 | 2,374,719 | 28,372 | 0.0119 | 0.9881 | 77.20 |
| 57.5 | 2,290,384 | 19,055 | 0.0083 | 0.9917 | 76.28 |
| 58.5 | 2,118,332 | 39,776 | 0.0188 | 0.9812 | 75.64 |
| 59.5 | 1,962,456 | 19,929 | 0.0102 | 0.9898 | 74.22 |
| 60.5 | 1,901,834 | 35,741 | 0.0188 | 0.9812 | 73.47 |
| 61.5 | 1,591,758 | 34,325 | 0.0216 | 0.9784 | 72.09 |
| 62.5 | 1,228,256 | 19,238 | 0.0157 | 0.9843 | 70.53 |
| 63.5 | 952,279 | 2,821 | 0.0030 | 0.9970 | 69.43 |
| 64.5 | 796,076 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 69.22 |
| 65.5 | 693,422 | 28,318 | 0.0408 | 0.9592 | 69.22 |
| 66.5 | 499,895 | 94 | 0.0002 | 0.9998 | 66.40 |
| 67.5 | 444,801 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 66.38 |
| 68.5 | 362,908 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 66.38 |
| 69.5 | 297,668 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 66.38 |
| 70.5 | 193,556 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 66.38 |
| 71.5 | 125,219 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 66.38 |
| 72.5 | 117,313 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 66.38 |
| 73.5 | 61,283 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 66.38 |
| 74.5 | 60,149 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 66.38 |
| 75.5 | 30,997 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 66.38 |
| 76.5 | 27,944 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 66.38 |
| 77.5 | 27,944 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 66.38 |
| 78.5 | 27,944 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 66.38 |

```
THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY ACCOUNT 362.00 STATION EQUIPMENT
ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.
```

| PLACEMENT | ND 1923-2022 |  | EXPERIENCE BAND |  | 1997-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 79.5 | 22,193 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 66.38 |
| 80.5 | 22,193 | 4,766 | 0.2148 | 0.7852 | 66.38 |
| 81.5 | 17,427 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 52.13 |
| 82.5 | 7,786 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 52.13 |
| 83.5 | 7,786 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 52.13 |
| 84.5 | 7,786 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 52.13 |
| 85.5 | 7,786 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 52.13 |
| 86.5 | 7,786 | 7,786 | 1.0000 |  | 52.13 |
| 87.5 |  |  |  |  |  |

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE
PLACEMENT BAND 1940-2022
EXPERIENCE BAND 2013-2022

| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 0.0 | 60,520,898 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 0.5 | 52,287,940 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 1.5 | 45,189,432 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 2.5 | 38,825,786 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 3.5 | 36,915,375 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 4.5 | 55,333,254 | 1,803 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 5.5 | 53,145,252 | 139,982 | 0.0026 | 0.9974 | 100.00 |
| 6.5 | 46,325,057 | 52,140 | 0.0011 | 0.9989 | 99.73 |
| 7.5 | 53,152,769 | 387,250 | 0.0073 | 0.9927 | 99.62 |
| 8.5 | 58,303,817 | 431,155 | 0.0074 | 0.9926 | 98.90 |
| 9.5 | 55,775,669 | 63,674 | 0.0011 | 0.9989 | 98.16 |
| 10.5 | 55,602,992 | 12,929 | 0.0002 | 0.9998 | 98.05 |
| 11.5 | 57,451,490 | 10,591 | 0.0002 | 0.9998 | 98.03 |
| 12.5 | 59,463,833 | 7,281 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 98.01 |
| 13.5 | 53,750,240 | 29,730 | 0.0006 | 0.9994 | 98.00 |
| 14.5 | 36,660,060 | 12,723 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 97.94 |
| 15.5 | 33,425,297 | 19,198 | 0.0006 | 0.9994 | 97.91 |
| 16.5 | 34,104,224 | 49,872 | 0.0015 | 0.9985 | 97.85 |
| 17.5 | 33,577,840 | 83,525 | 0.0025 | 0.9975 | 97.71 |
| 18.5 | 34,343,003 | 7,349 | 0.0002 | 0.9998 | 97.47 |
| 19.5 | 33,929,022 | 1,138,604 | 0.0336 | 0.9664 | 97.45 |
| 20.5 | 35,148,380 | 353,811 | 0.0101 | 0.9899 | 94.18 |
| 21.5 | 35,768,684 | 85,529 | 0.0024 | 0.9976 | 93.23 |
| 22.5 | 34,591,985 | 683,571 | 0.0198 | 0.9802 | 93.01 |
| 23.5 | 37,883,177 | 85,713 | 0.0023 | 0.9977 | 91.17 |
| 24.5 | 35,501,875 | 3,040 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 90.96 |
| 25.5 | 35,765,749 | 16,270 | 0.0005 | 0.9995 | 90.95 |
| 26.5 | 32,810,926 | 106,753 | 0.0033 | 0.9967 | 90.91 |
| 27.5 | 30,788,216 | 74,273 | 0.0024 | 0.9976 | 90.62 |
| 28.5 | 24,431,845 | 27,712 | 0.0011 | 0.9989 | 90.40 |
| 29.5 | 23,829,993 | 27,313 | 0.0011 | 0.9989 | 90.30 |
| 30.5 | 21,585,937 | 25,329 | 0.0012 | 0.9988 | 90.19 |
| 31.5 | 18,627,790 | 101,192 | 0.0054 | 0.9946 | 90.09 |
| 32.5 | 15,795,668 | 41,470 | 0.0026 | 0.9974 | 89.60 |
| 33.5 | 11,684,105 | 24,926 | 0.0021 | 0.9979 | 89.36 |
| 34.5 | 11,295,917 | 126,888 | 0.0112 | 0.9888 | 89.17 |
| 35.5 | 12,574,731 | 791 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 88.17 |
| 36.5 | 13,677,209 | 94,089 | 0.0069 | 0.9931 | 88.16 |
| 37.5 | 11,371,388 | 32,679 | 0.0029 | 0.9971 | 87.56 |
| 38.5 | 10,439,279 | 68,980 | 0.0066 | 0.9934 | 87.31 |

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.
PLACEMENT BAND 1940-2022
EXPERIENCE BAND 2013-2022

| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 39.5 | 9,847,495 | 4,312 | 0.0004 | 0.9996 | 86.73 |
| 40.5 | 9,147,050 | 12,055 | 0.0013 | 0.9987 | 86.69 |
| 41.5 | 8,913,145 | 49,384 | 0.0055 | 0.9945 | 86.58 |
| 42.5 | 9,765,619 | 12,073 | 0.0012 | 0.9988 | 86.10 |
| 43.5 | 9,478,500 | 46,148 | 0.0049 | 0.9951 | 85.99 |
| 44.5 | 8,967,722 | 8,596 | 0.0010 | 0.9990 | 85.57 |
| 45.5 | 7,595,533 | 27,887 | 0.0037 | 0.9963 | 85.49 |
| 46.5 | 6,284,222 | 39,699 | 0.0063 | 0.9937 | 85.18 |
| 47.5 | 5,381,640 | 21,215 | 0.0039 | 0.9961 | 84.64 |
| 48.5 | 5,112,681 | 14,661 | 0.0029 | 0.9971 | 84.30 |
| 49.5 | 4,427,957 | 155 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 84.06 |
| 50.5 | 4,147,276 | 118,190 | 0.0285 | 0.9715 | 84.06 |
| 51.5 | 3,829,427 | 8,776 | 0.0023 | 0.9977 | 81.66 |
| 52.5 | 2,361,712 | 4,002 | 0.0017 | 0.9983 | 81.48 |
| 53.5 | 2,203,701 | 5,178 | 0.0023 | 0.9977 | 81.34 |
| 54.5 | 1,986,305 | 1,640 | 0.0008 | 0.9992 | 81.15 |
| 55.5 | 1,848,996 | 767 | 0.0004 | 0.9996 | 81.08 |
| 56.5 | 1,787,066 | 3,527 | 0.0020 | 0.9980 | 81.05 |
| 57.5 | 1,771,533 | 2,188 | 0.0012 | 0.9988 | 80.89 |
| 58.5 | 1,684,088 | 18,435 | 0.0109 | 0.9891 | 80.79 |
| 59.5 | 1,618,081 | 18,819 | 0.0116 | 0.9884 | 79.90 |
| 60.5 | 1,662,866 | 35,741 | 0.0215 | 0.9785 | 78.97 |
| 61.5 | 1,463,681 | 29,137 | 0.0199 | 0.9801 | 77.28 |
| 62.5 | 1,113,804 | 19,238 | 0.0173 | 0.9827 | 75.74 |
| 63.5 | 901,642 | 2,821 | 0.0031 | 0.9969 | 74.43 |
| 64.5 | 745,439 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 74.20 |
| 65.5 | 671,938 | 25,278 | 0.0376 | 0.9624 | 74.20 |
| 66.5 | 479,736 | 94 | 0.0002 | 0.9998 | 71.41 |
| 67.5 | 424,643 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 71.39 |
| 68.5 | 342,749 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 71.39 |
| 69.5 | 283,261 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 71.39 |
| 70.5 | 179,148 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 71.39 |
| 71.5 | 109,677 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 71.39 |
| 72.5 | 111,412 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 71.39 |
| 73.5 | 47,597 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 71.39 |
| 74.5 | 47,597 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 71.39 |
| 75.5 | 18,445 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 71.39 |
| 76.5 | 15,392 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 71.39 |
| 77.5 | 15,392 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 71.39 |
| 78.5 | 15,392 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 71.39 |

```
THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY ACCOUNT 362.00 STATION EQUIPMENT
ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.
```

| PLACEMENT BAND 1940-2022 |  | EXPERIENCE BAND 2013-2022 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |  |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |  |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |  |
| 79.5 |  | 9,641 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 71.39 |
| 80.5 | 9,641 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 71.39 |  |
| 81.5 | 9,641 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 71.39 |  |
| 82.5 |  |  |  |  |  | 71.39 |

the potomac edison company


| Age At | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 0.0 | 89,704,276 | 51,187 | 0.0006 | 0.9994 | 100.00 |
| 0.5 | 87,685,345 | 78,182 | 0.0009 | 0.9991 | 99.94 |
| 1.5 | 82,691,297 | 58,886 | 0.0007 | 0.9993 | 99.85 |
| 2.5 | 79,493,235 | 49,741 | 0.0006 | 0.9994 | 99.78 |
| 3.5 | 77,245,268 | 50,492 | 0.0007 | 0.9993 | 99.72 |
| 4.5 | 73,656,584 | 40,064 | 0.0005 | 0.9995 | 99.66 |
| 5.5 | 71,881,505 | 41,733 | 0.0006 | 0.9994 | 99.60 |
| 6.5 | 69,667,867 | 30,786 | 0.0004 | 0.9996 | 99.54 |
| 7.5 | 67,876,496 | 21,233 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 99.50 |
| 8.5 | 64,682,373 | 13,935 | 0.0002 | 0.9998 | 99.47 |
| 9.5 | 63,439,591 | 6,669 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 99.45 |
| 10.5 | 58,063,965 | 25,683 | 0.0004 | 0.9996 | 99.44 |
| 11.5 | 56,100,963 | 23,924 | 0.0004 | 0.9996 | 99.39 |
| 12.5 | 52,144,825 | 16,694 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 99.35 |
| 13.5 | 52,192,449 | 40,168 | 0.0008 | 0.9992 | 99.32 |
| 14.5 | 46,517,583 | 20,384 | 0.0004 | 0.9996 | 99.24 |
| 15.5 | 45,021,177 | 35,536 | 0.0008 | 0.9992 | 99.20 |
| 16.5 | 45,574,214 | 30,846 | 0.0007 | 0.9993 | 99.12 |
| 17.5 | 43,783,837 | 19,647 | 0.0004 | 0.9996 | 99.05 |
| 18.5 | 43,483,597 | 14,374 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 99.01 |
| 19.5 | 43,736,845 | 20,974 | 0.0005 | 0.9995 | 98.98 |
| 20.5 | 44,412,104 | 10,770 | 0.0002 | 0.9998 | 98.93 |
| 21.5 | 41,426,487 | 8,971 | 0.0002 | 0.9998 | 98.90 |
| 22.5 | 41,558,827 | 12,993 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 98.88 |
| 23.5 | 40,827,673 | 9,867 | 0.0002 | 0.9998 | 98.85 |
| 24.5 | 36,934,874 | 11,043 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 98.83 |
| 25.5 | 35,414,293 | 9,796 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 98.80 |
| 26.5 | 34,024,550 | 9,915 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 98.77 |
| 27.5 | 32,494,758 | 12,232 | 0.0004 | 0.9996 | 98.74 |
| 28.5 | 30,304,691 | 12,436 | 0.0004 | 0.9996 | 98.70 |
| 29.5 | 28,972,029 | 15,244 | 0.0005 | 0.9995 | 98.66 |
| 30.5 | 27,710,439 | 11,814 | 0.0004 | 0.9996 | 98.61 |
| 31.5 | 26,305,071 | 11,924 | 0.0005 | 0.9995 | 98.57 |
| 32.5 | 24,889,504 | 17,096 | 0.0007 | 0.9993 | 98.53 |
| 33.5 | 24,180,551 | 20,218 | 0.0008 | 0.9992 | 98.46 |
| 34.5 | 23,612,047 | 26,855 | 0.0011 | 0.9989 | 98.38 |
| 35.5 | 22,964,087 | 28,087 | 0.0012 | 0.9988 | 98.26 |
| 36.5 | 22,020,920 | 23,353 | 0.0011 | 0.9989 | 98.14 |
| 37.5 | 20,756,145 | 32,437 | 0.0016 | 0.9984 | 98.04 |
| 38.5 | 19,647,220 | 51,160 | 0.0026 | 0.9974 | 97.89 |


| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 39.5 | 18,586,044 | 87,065 | 0.0047 | 0.9953 | 97.63 |
| 40.5 | 17,218,615 | 48,526 | 0.0028 | 0.9972 | 97.17 |
| 41.5 | 15,963,631 | 28,323 | 0.0018 | 0.9982 | 96.90 |
| 42.5 | 14,804,759 | 28,429 | 0.0019 | 0.9981 | 96.73 |
| 43.5 | 15,196,496 | 27,251 | 0.0018 | 0.9982 | 96.54 |
| 44.5 | 14,354,282 | 20,062 | 0.0014 | 0.9986 | 96.37 |
| 45.5 | 13,460,805 | 26,895 | 0.0020 | 0.9980 | 96.23 |
| 46.5 | 12,657,238 | 22,715 | 0.0018 | 0.9982 | 96.04 |
| 47.5 | 12,015,866 | 24,670 | 0.0021 | 0.9979 | 95.87 |
| 48.5 | 10,976,853 | 21,133 | 0.0019 | 0.9981 | 95.67 |
| 49.5 | 10,328,255 | 22,586 | 0.0022 | 0.9978 | 95.49 |
| 50.5 | 9,479,304 | 24,225 | 0.0026 | 0.9974 | 95.28 |
| 51.5 | 9,417,882 | 36,895 | 0.0039 | 0.9961 | 95.04 |
| 52.5 | 8,626,760 | 70,152 | 0.0081 | 0.9919 | 94.66 |
| 53.5 | 7,908,723 | 138,934 | 0.0176 | 0.9824 | 93.89 |
| 54.5 | 7,004,171 | 64,154 | 0.0092 | 0.9908 | 92.25 |
| 55.5 | 6,377,844 | 46,971 | 0.0074 | 0.9926 | 91.40 |
| 56.5 | 5,832,472 | 55,562 | 0.0095 | 0.9905 | 90.73 |
| 57.5 | 5,324,228 | 54,660 | 0.0103 | 0.9897 | 89.86 |
| 58.5 | 4,828,618 | 62,399 | 0.0129 | 0.9871 | 88.94 |
| 59.5 | 4,305,000 | 59,864 | 0.0139 | 0.9861 | 87.79 |
| 60.5 | 3,776,233 | 63,797 | 0.0169 | 0.9831 | 86.57 |
| 61.5 | 3,281,979 | 54,054 | 0.0165 | 0.9835 | 85.11 |
| 62.5 | 3,009,571 | 69,451 | 0.0231 | 0.9769 | 83.71 |
| 63.5 | 2,555,547 | 58,815 | 0.0230 | 0.9770 | 81.77 |
| 64.5 | 2,215,377 | 48,729 | 0.0220 | 0.9780 | 79.89 |
| 65.5 | 2,022,138 | 44,619 | 0.0221 | 0.9779 | 78.13 |
| 66.5 | 1,836,217 | 38,704 | 0.0211 | 0.9789 | 76.41 |
| 67.5 | 1,603,043 | 24,725 | 0.0154 | 0.9846 | 74.80 |
| 68.5 | 1,465,915 | 12,390 | 0.0085 | 0.9915 | 73.65 |
| 69.5 | 333,341 | 2,948 | 0.0088 | 0.9912 | 73.02 |
| 70.5 | 330,393 | 9,208 | 0.0279 | 0.9721 | 72.38 |
| 71.5 | 321,184 | 10,892 | 0.0339 | 0.9661 | 70.36 |
| 72.5 | 310,292 | 12,843 | 0.0414 | 0.9586 | 67.97 |
| 73.5 | 297,450 | 14,512 | 0.0488 | 0.9512 | 65.16 |
| 74.5 | 282,938 | 14,936 | 0.0528 | 0.9472 | 61.98 |
| 75.5 | 268,002 | 12,124 | 0.0452 | 0.9548 | 58.71 |
| 76.5 | 255,878 | 5,288 | 0.0207 | 0.9793 | 56.05 |
| 77.5 |  |  |  |  | 54.90 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY
ACCOUNT 365.00 OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES


## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 365.00 OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE

PLACEMENT BAND 1945-2022
EXPERIENCE BAND 1997-2022

| Age At | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 0.0 | 120,782,030 | 377,052 | 0.0031 | 0.9969 | 100.00 |
| 0.5 | 118,916,739 | 755,061 | 0.0063 | 0.9937 | 99.69 |
| 1.5 | 114,096,154 | 732,977 | 0.0064 | 0.9936 | 99.05 |
| 2.5 | 107,283,809 | 592,397 | 0.0055 | 0.9945 | 98.42 |
| 3.5 | 99,600,759 | 599,400 | 0.0060 | 0.9940 | 97.88 |
| 4.5 | 92,747,225 | 462,281 | 0.0050 | 0.9950 | 97.29 |
| 5.5 | 88,272,438 | 909,146 | 0.0103 | 0.9897 | 96.80 |
| 6.5 | 82,439,705 | 1,597,944 | 0.0194 | 0.9806 | 95.80 |
| 7.5 | 78,211,530 | 1,202,609 | 0.0154 | 0.9846 | 93.95 |
| 8.5 | 71,152,403 | 714,194 | 0.0100 | 0.9900 | 92.50 |
| 9.5 | 68,037,844 | 699,688 | 0.0103 | 0.9897 | 91.57 |
| 10.5 | 54,816,586 | 305,168 | 0.0056 | 0.9944 | 90.63 |
| 11.5 | 51,783,436 | 504,761 | 0.0097 | 0.9903 | 90.13 |
| 12.5 | 48,304,989 | 626,205 | 0.0130 | 0.9870 | 89.25 |
| 13.5 | 47,547,653 | 361,587 | 0.0076 | 0.9924 | 88.09 |
| 14.5 | 45,200,660 | 196,669 | 0.0044 | 0.9956 | 87.42 |
| 15.5 | 44,259,715 | 162,387 | 0.0037 | 0.9963 | 87.04 |
| 16.5 | 44,399,402 | 239,495 | 0.0054 | 0.9946 | 86.72 |
| 17.5 | 41,714,325 | 211,845 | 0.0051 | 0.9949 | 86.25 |
| 18.5 | 41,243,384 | 326,041 | 0.0079 | 0.9921 | 85.82 |
| 19.5 | 41,304,313 | 271,417 | 0.0066 | 0.9934 | 85.14 |
| 20.5 | 41,958,392 | 154,148 | 0.0037 | 0.9963 | 84.58 |
| 21.5 | 39,350,922 | 169,968 | 0.0043 | 0.9957 | 84.27 |
| 22.5 | 39,326,145 | 144,522 | 0.0037 | 0.9963 | 83.90 |
| 23.5 | 38,948,502 | 86,683 | 0.0022 | 0.9978 | 83.60 |
| 24.5 | 33,902,887 | 83,947 | 0.0025 | 0.9975 | 83.41 |
| 25.5 | 31,713,633 | 285,976 | 0.0090 | 0.9910 | 83.20 |
| 26.5 | 30,352,608 | 173,274 | 0.0057 | 0.9943 | 82.45 |
| 27.5 | 28,289,105 | 1,020,153 | 0.0361 | 0.9639 | 81.98 |
| 28.5 | 24,865,249 | 846,469 | 0.0340 | 0.9660 | 79.03 |
| 29.5 | 22,587,074 | 307,272 | 0.0136 | 0.9864 | 76.34 |
| 30.5 | 20,731,277 | 56,372 | 0.0027 | 0.9973 | 75.30 |
| 31.5 | 19,961,791 | 65,074 | 0.0033 | 0.9967 | 75.09 |
| 32.5 | 19,011,945 | 73,138 | 0.0038 | 0.9962 | 74.85 |
| 33.5 | 18,712,053 | 73,078 | 0.0039 | 0.9961 | 74.56 |
| 34.5 | 18,575,810 | 67,310 | 0.0036 | 0.9964 | 74.27 |
| 35.5 | 18,349,183 | 86,709 | 0.0047 | 0.9953 | 74.00 |
| 36.5 | 17,587,695 | 86,758 | 0.0049 | 0.9951 | 73.65 |
| 37.5 | 16,702,157 | 78,443 | 0.0047 | 0.9953 | 73.29 |
| 38.5 | 16,287,258 | 73,885 | 0.0045 | 0.9955 | 72.94 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 365.00 OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.
PLACEMENT BAND 1945-2022
EXPERIENCE BAND 1997-2022

| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT |
| :---: | :--- |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL |

40.5
41.5
42.5
43.5
44.5
45.5
46.5
47.5
48.5
49.5
50.5
51.5
52.5
53.5
54.5
55.5
56.5
57.5
58.5
59.
60.
61.
62.
63.
64.
65.
66.
67.
68.5
69.5
70.5
71.5
72.5
73.5
74.5
75.5
76.5
77.5

15,649,936
14,500,861
13,315,028
12,127,385
12,299,072
11,548,875
10,585,455
9,566,956
9,548,413
8,980,627
8,596,676
7,913,792
8,381,428
7,704,131
7,058,364
6,138,835
5,581,196
5,090,291
4, 656,227
4, 247,784
3,849,043
3,377,993
2,940,666
2,732,715
2,395,586
2,164,706
2,033,399
1,893,547
1,728,761
1,602,010
695,970
689,556
683,009
677,746
670,786
663,500
654,753
648,071
RETIREMENTS
DURING AGE
INTERVAL

PCT SURV BEGIN OF INTERVAL

| 74,151 | 0.0047 | 0.9953 | 72.61 |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 76,380 | 0.0053 | 0.9947 | 72.27 |
| 64,924 | 0.0049 | 0.9951 | 71.89 |
| 60,410 | 0.0050 | 0.9950 | 71.54 |
| 59,853 | 0.0049 | 0.9951 | 71.18 |
| 63,385 | 0.0055 | 0.9945 | 70.83 |
| 56,405 | 0.0053 | 0.9947 | 70.44 |
| 43,706 | 0.0046 | 0.9954 | 70.07 |
| 47,913 | 0.0050 | 0.9950 | 69.75 |
| 38,740 | 0.0043 | 0.9957 | 69.40 |
| 41,536 | 0.0048 | 0.9952 | 69.10 |
| 37,252 | 0.0047 | 0.9953 | 68.77 |
| 35,812 | 0.0043 | 0.9957 | 68.44 |
| 59,996 | 0.0078 | 0.9922 | 68.15 |
| 61,200 | 0.0087 | 0.9913 | 67.62 |
| 38,303 | 0.0062 | 0.9938 | 67.03 |
| 31,812 | 0.0057 | 0.9943 | 66.61 |
| 34,864 | 0.0068 | 0.9932 | 66.23 |
| 39,009 | 0.0084 | 0.9916 | 65.78 |
| 35,378 | 0.0083 | 0.9917 | 65.23 |
| 39,563 | 0.0103 | 0.9897 | 64.69 |
| 36,962 | 0.0109 | 0.9891 | 64.02 |
| 27,366 | 0.0093 | 0.9907 | 63.32 |
| 26,932 | 0.0099 | 0.9901 | 62.73 |
| 21,656 | 0.0090 | 0.9910 | 62.11 |
| 18,914 | 0.0087 | 0.9913 | 61.55 |
| 16,206 | 0.0080 | 0.9920 | 61.01 |
| 12,564 | 0.0066 | 0.9934 | 60.53 |
| 15,560 | 0.0090 | 0.9910 | 60.13 |
| 10,641 | 0.0066 | 0.9934 | 59.59 |
| 6,414 | 0.0092 | 0.9908 | 59.19 |
| 6,547 | 0.0095 | 0.9905 | 58.64 |
| 5,263 | 0.0077 | 0.9923 | 58.09 |
| 6,959 | 0.0103 | 0.9897 | 57.64 |
| 7,286 | 0.0109 | 0.9891 | 57.05 |
| 8,748 | 0.0132 | 0.9868 | 56.43 |
| 6,681 | 0.0102 | 0.9898 | 55.68 |
| 3,592 | 0.0055 | 0.9945 | 55.12 |
|  |  |  | 54.81 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY
ACCOUNT 365.10 OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES - CLEARING


ACCOUNT 365.10 OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES - CLEARING

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE

| PLACEMENT | ND 1945-2022 |  | EXPERIENCE BAND |  | 1997-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 0.0 | 73,463,323 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 0.5 | 73,744,099 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 1.5 | 69,864,881 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 2.5 | 66,218,314 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 3.5 | 62,492,716 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 4.5 | $54,430,966$ |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 5.5 | 52,250,172 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 6.5 | 42,767,414 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 7.5 | 33,275,151 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 8.5 | $30,626,785$ |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 9.5 | 7,510,388 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 10.5 | 7,560,012 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 11.5 | 4,076,351 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 12.5 | 4,134,720 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 13.5 | 4,176,526 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 14.5 | 4,268,390 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 15.5 | 4,285,567 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 16.5 | 4,257,220 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 17.5 | 3,326,447 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 18.5 | 3,255,782 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 19.5 | 3,259,662 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 20.5 | 3,279,608 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 21.5 | 3,047,251 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 22.5 | 3,082,253 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 23.5 | 3,067,552 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 24.5 | 2,691,176 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 25.5 | 2,774,009 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 26.5 | $2,619,733$ |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 27.5 | $2,387,394$ |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 28.5 | $2,258,859$ |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 29.5 | 2,037,412 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 30.5 | $1,946,941$ |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 31.5 | 1,782,816 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 32.5 | $1,688,925$ |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 33.5 | $1,695,066$ |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 34.5 | $1,685,221$ |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 35.5 | 1,691,376 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 36.5 | $1,675,320$ |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 37.5 | $1,644,041$ |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 38.5 | $1,649,179$ |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 365.10 OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES - CLEARING

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.

| PLACEMENT | ND 1945-2022 |  | EXPERIENCE BAND |  | 1997-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 39.5 | 1,633,264 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 40.5 | 1,558,911 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 41.5 | 1,591,442 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 42.5 | 1,591,940 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 43.5 | 1,815,913 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 44.5 | 1,771,385 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 45.5 | 1,754,468 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 46.5 | 1,728,345 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 47.5 | 1,691,402 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 48.5 | 1,629,858 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 49.5 | 1,579,927 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 50.5 | 1,444,564 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 51.5 | 1,482,821 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 52.5 | 1,425,969 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 53.5 | 1,321,424 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 54.5 | 1,202,488 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 55.5 | 1,130,300 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 56.5 | 1,051,210 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 57.5 | 992,905 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 58.5 | 941,278 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 59.5 | 877,664 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 60.5 | 811,201 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 61.5 | 748,694 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 62.5 | 713,127 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 63.5 | 644,456 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 64.5 | 580,950 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 65.5 | 549,452 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 66.5 | 531,940 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 67.5 | 482,232 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 68.5 | 455,714 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 69.5 | 198,446 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 70.5 | 198,446 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 71.5 | 198,446 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 72.5 | 198,446 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 73.5 | 198,446 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 74.5 | 198,446 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 75.5 | 198,446 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 76.5 | 198,446 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 77.5 |  |  |  |  | 100.00 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY
ACCOUNT 366.00 UNDERGROUND CONDUIT


ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE
PLACEMENT BAND 1954-2022
EXPERIENCE BAND 1997-2022

| Age At | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 0.0 | 48,679,625 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 0.5 | 50,028,161 | 3,600 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 100.00 |
| 1.5 | 50,332,816 | 24,173 | 0.0005 | 0.9995 | 99.99 |
| 2.5 | 50,040,249 | 5,741 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 99.94 |
| 3.5 | 48,909,199 | 667 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.93 |
| 4.5 | 48,897,457 | 2,192 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.93 |
| 5.5 | 48,728,881 | 26 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.93 |
| 6.5 | 48,952,520 | 11 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.93 |
| 7.5 | 49,168,499 | 318 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.93 |
| 8.5 | 49,554,580 | 663 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.93 |
| 9.5 | 49,212,601 | 421 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.93 |
| 10.5 | 49,234,883 | 2,749 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 99.92 |
| 11.5 | 48,146,103 | 3,734 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 99.92 |
| 12.5 | 47,360,033 | 50,414 | 0.0011 | 0.9989 | 99.91 |
| 13.5 | 47,364,448 | 17,096 | 0.0004 | 0.9996 | 99.80 |
| 14.5 | 44,557,742 | 51,816 | 0.0012 | 0.9988 | 99.77 |
| 15.5 | 42,434,552 | 49,813 | 0.0012 | 0.9988 | 99.65 |
| 16.5 | 41,951,233 | 35,240 | 0.0008 | 0.9992 | 99.54 |
| 17.5 | 39,665,276 | 50,350 | 0.0013 | 0.9987 | 99.45 |
| 18.5 | 37,731,473 | 38,111 | 0.0010 | 0.9990 | 99.33 |
| 19.5 | 37,733,664 | 61,094 | 0.0016 | 0.9984 | 99.23 |
| 20.5 | 37,757,737 | 28,907 | 0.0008 | 0.9992 | 99.07 |
| 21.5 | 31,941,016 | 49,244 | 0.0015 | 0.9985 | 98.99 |
| 22.5 | 29,860,422 | 14,258 | 0.0005 | 0.9995 | 98.84 |
| 23.5 | 29,843,797 | 9,548 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 98.79 |
| 24.5 | 24,807,607 | 11,842 | 0.0005 | 0.9995 | 98.76 |
| 25.5 | 21,371,227 | 11,794 | 0.0006 | 0.9994 | 98.71 |
| 26.5 | 19,683,403 | 9,903 | 0.0005 | 0.9995 | 98.66 |
| 27.5 | 17,221,866 | 10,945 | 0.0006 | 0.9994 | 98.61 |
| 28.5 | 15,403,747 | 19,282 | 0.0013 | 0.9987 | 98.54 |
| 29.5 | 13,911,460 | 66,148 | 0.0048 | 0.9952 | 98.42 |
| 30.5 | 12,575,644 | 33,379 | 0.0027 | 0.9973 | 97.95 |
| 31.5 | 11,418,417 | 41,526 | 0.0036 | 0.9964 | 97.69 |
| 32.5 | 10,073,499 | 49,516 | 0.0049 | 0.9951 | 97.34 |
| 33.5 | 8,919,775 | 9,740 | 0.0011 | 0.9989 | 96.86 |
| 34.5 | 7,882,864 | 17,672 | 0.0022 | 0.9978 | 96.75 |
| 35.5 | 7,061,521 | 23,168 | 0.0033 | 0.9967 | 96.54 |
| 36.5 | 6,154,881 | 10,528 | 0.0017 | 0.9983 | 96.22 |
| 37.5 | 5,323,156 | 6,297 | 0.0012 | 0.9988 | 96.05 |
| 38.5 | 4,940,696 | 10,698 | 0.0022 | 0.9978 | 95.94 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 366.00 UNDERGROUND CONDUIT

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.

| PLACEMENT | AND 1954-2022 |  | EXPERIENCE BAND |  | 1997-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 39.5 | 4,483,086 | 7,105 | 0.0016 | 0.9984 | 95.73 |
| 40.5 | 4,127,815 | 4,654 | 0.0011 | 0.9989 | 95.58 |
| 41.5 | 3,752,394 | 1,253 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 95.47 |
| 42.5 | 3,164,924 | 5,123 | 0.0016 | 0.9984 | 95.44 |
| 43.5 | 2,620,986 | 624 | 0.0002 | 0.9998 | 95.29 |
| 44.5 | 2,083,418 | 369 | 0.0002 | 0.9998 | 95.26 |
| 45.5 | 1,678,832 | 601 | 0.0004 | 0.9996 | 95.25 |
| 46.5 | 1,198,942 | 340 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 95.21 |
| 47.5 | 948,930 | 495 | 0.0005 | 0.9995 | 95.19 |
| 48.5 | 619,006 | 419 | 0.0007 | 0.9993 | 95.14 |
| 49.5 | 299,242 | 131 | 0.0004 | 0.9996 | 95.07 |
| 50.5 | 192,751 | 82 | 0.0004 | 0.9996 | 95.03 |
| 51.5 | 162,033 | 64 | 0.0004 | 0.9996 | 94.99 |
| 52.5 | 136,633 | 58 | 0.0004 | 0.9996 | 94.95 |
| 53.5 | 96,895 | 110 | 0.0011 | 0.9989 | 94.91 |
| 54.5 | 71,999 | 133 | 0.0018 | 0.9982 | 94.81 |
| 55.5 | 47,668 | 174 | 0.0037 | 0.9963 | 94.63 |
| 56.5 | 4,508 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 94.28 |
| 57.5 | 1,066 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 94.28 |
| 58.5 |  |  |  |  | 94.28 |

XN甘dWOD NOSIGヨ J甘WOIOd đHI
ACCOUNT 367.00 UNDERGROUND CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES


ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE

PLACEMENT BAND 1954-2022
EXPERIENCE BAND 1997-2022

| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL |


| 0.0 | $252,092,588$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| 0.5 | $252,365,753$ |
| 1.5 | $234,689,058$ |
| 2.5 | $217,735,162$ |
| 3.5 | $200,061,915$ |
| 4.5 | $187,931,506$ |
| 5.5 | $181,507,906$ |
| 6.5 | $175,258,036$ |
| 7.5 | $167,470,438$ |
| 8.5 | $162,259,046$ |
| 9.5 | $154,633,522$ |
| 10.5 | $148,946,174$ |
| 11.5 | $143,257,681$ |
| 12.5 | $137,924,156$ |
| 13.5 | $135,985,454$ |
| 14.5 | $129,349,758$ |
| 15.5 | $117,979,617$ |
| 16.5 | $117,199,043$ |
| 17.5 | $114,791,779$ |
| 18.5 | $115,254,642$ |
| 19.5 | $115,738,370$ |
| 20.5 | $116,406,921$ |
| 21.5 | $104,105,861$ |
| 22.5 | $102,105,926$ |
| 23.5 | $101,234,728$ |
| 24.5 | $82,031,924$ |
| 25.5 | $72,447,675$ |
| 26.5 | $64,573,383$ |
| 27.5 | $58,374,909$ |
| 28.5 | $52,062,427$ |
| 29.5 | $46,073,938$ |
| 30.5 | $40,613,259$ |
| 31.5 | $34,174,226$ |
| 32.5 | $28,681,532$ |
| 33.5 | $24,449,910$ |
| 34.5 | $20,101,754$ |
| 35.5 | $17,903,658$ |
| 36.5 | $15,217,820$ |
| 37.5 | $12,660,570$ |
| 38.5 | $10,952,188$ |
|  |  |


| 407,512 | 0.0016 | 0.9984 | 100.00 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1,939,728$ | 0.0077 | 0.9923 | 99.84 |
| $1,931,038$ | 0.0082 | 0.9918 | 99.07 |
| $1,556,698$ | 0.0071 | 0.9929 | 98.26 |
| $1,212,197$ | 0.0061 | 0.9939 | 97.55 |
| 816,488 | 0.0043 | 0.9957 | 96.96 |
| 577,008 | 0.0032 | 0.9968 | 96.54 |
| 475,250 | 0.0027 | 0.9973 | 96.23 |
| 435,637 | 0.0026 | 0.9974 | 95.97 |
| 294,464 | 0.0018 | 0.9982 | 95.72 |
| 303,528 | 0.0020 | 0.9980 | 95.55 |
| 130,865 | 0.0009 | 0.9991 | 95.36 |
| 158,843 | 0.0011 | 0.9989 | 95.28 |
| 144,693 | 0.0010 | 0.9990 | 95.17 |
| 168,251 | 0.0012 | 0.9988 | 95.07 |
| 144,107 | 0.0011 | 0.9989 | 94.96 |
| 128,858 | 0.0011 | 0.9989 | 94.85 |
| 311,655 | 0.0027 | 0.9973 | 94.75 |
| 267,020 | 0.0023 | 0.9977 | 94.49 |
| 333,655 | 0.0029 | 0.9971 | 94.27 |
| 200,851 | 0.0017 | 0.9983 | 94.00 |
| 454,657 | 0.0039 | 0.9961 | 93.84 |
| 455,729 | 0.0044 | 0.9956 | 93.47 |
| 423,323 | 0.0041 | 0.9959 | 93.06 |
| 472,971 | 0.0047 | 0.9953 | 92.68 |
| 371,047 | 0.0045 | 0.9955 | 92.24 |
| 497,238 | 0.0069 | 0.9931 | 91.83 |
| 697,376 | 0.0108 | 0.9892 | 91.20 |
| 871,154 | 0.0149 | 0.9851 | 90.21 |
| $1,060,766$ | 0.0204 | 0.9796 | 88.86 |
| $1,398,975$ | 0.0304 | 0.9696 | 87.05 |
| $1,602,991$ | 0.0395 | 0.9605 | 84.41 |
| $1,152,603$ | 0.0337 | 0.9663 | 81.08 |
| $1,023,583$ | 0.0357 | 0.9643 | 78.34 |
| 997,097 | 0.0408 | 0.9592 | 75.55 |
| $1,010,530$ | 0.0503 | 0.9497 | 72.47 |
| 985,942 | 0.0551 | 0.9449 | 68.82 |
| $1,027,714$ | 0.0675 | 0.9325 | 65.03 |
| 786,073 | 0.0621 | 0.9379 | 60.64 |
| 618,187 | 0.0564 | 0.9436 | 56.88 |
| 10 |  |  |  |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY ACCOUNT 367.00 UNDERGROUND CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.

| PLACEMENT BAND 1954-2022 |  |  | EXPERIENCE BAND 1997-2022 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 39.5 | 9,270,838 | 531,775 | 0.0574 | 0.9426 | 53.67 |
| 40.5 | 7,936,214 | 418,868 | 0.0528 | 0.9472 | 50.59 |
| 41.5 | 6,544,307 | 304,949 | 0.0466 | 0.9534 | 47.92 |
| 42.5 | 5,341,145 | 213,817 | 0.0400 | 0.9600 | 45.69 |
| 43.5 | 4,198,582 | 166,649 | 0.0397 | 0.9603 | 43.86 |
| 44.5 | 3,124,727 | 147,748 | 0.0473 | 0.9527 | 42.12 |
| 45.5 | 2,177,402 | 90,319 | 0.0415 | 0.9585 | 40.12 |
| 46.5 | 1,541,405 | 58,426 | 0.0379 | 0.9621 | 38.46 |
| 47.5 | 964,871 | 33,686 | 0.0349 | 0.9651 | 37.00 |
| 48.5 | 464,405 | 25,141 | 0.0541 | 0.9459 | 35.71 |
| 49.5 | 374,664 | 10,677 | 0.0285 | 0.9715 | 33.78 |
| 50.5 | 292,846 | 6,316 | 0.0216 | 0.9784 | 32.81 |
| 51.5 | 191,024 | 12,661 | 0.0663 | 0.9337 | 32.11 |
| 52.5 | 102,756 | 4,734 | 0.0461 | 0.9539 | 29.98 |
| 53.5 | 49,653 | 1,214 | 0.0245 | 0.9755 | 28.60 |
| 54.5 | 16,805 | 292 | 0.0174 | 0.9826 | 27.90 |
| 55.5 | 9,177 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 27.41 |
| 56.5 |  |  |  |  | 27.41 |

ACCOUNT 367.00 UNDERGROUND CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE

PLACEMENT BAND 1965-2022
EXPERIENCE BAND 2013-2022

| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 0.0 | 145,151,001 | 304,260 | 0.0021 | 0.9979 | 100.00 |
| 0.5 | 146,616,301 | 1,921,845 | 0.0131 | 0.9869 | 99.79 |
| 1.5 | 132,240,740 | 1,917,190 | 0.0145 | 0.9855 | 98.48 |
| 2.5 | 116,335,116 | 1,547,020 | 0.0133 | 0.9867 | 97.05 |
| 3.5 | 97,186,876 | 1,198,882 | 0.0123 | 0.9877 | 95.76 |
| 4.5 | 89,465,823 | 792,573 | 0.0089 | 0.9911 | 94.58 |
| 5.5 | 91,116,980 | 559,435 | 0.0061 | 0.9939 | 93.74 |
| 6.5 | 82,844,445 | 323,711 | 0.0039 | 0.9961 | 93.17 |
| 7.5 | 75,850,356 | 279,787 | 0.0037 | 0.9963 | 92.81 |
| 8.5 | 68,394,248 | 140,841 | 0.0021 | 0.9979 | 92.46 |
| 9.5 | 59,541,796 | 71,784 | 0.0012 | 0.9988 | 92.27 |
| 10.5 | 51,440,632 | 41,340 | 0.0008 | 0.9992 | 92.16 |
| 11.5 | 55,902,674 | 137,321 | 0.0025 | 0.9975 | 92.09 |
| 12.5 | 51,993,145 | 90,171 | 0.0017 | 0.9983 | 91.86 |
| 13.5 | 49,755,583 | 88,898 | 0.0018 | 0.9982 | 91.70 |
| 14.5 | 60,915,110 | 104,583 | 0.0017 | 0.9983 | 91.54 |
| 15.5 | 57,529,067 | 59,355 | 0.0010 | 0.9990 | 91.38 |
| 16.5 | 62,843,746 | 127,488 | 0.0020 | 0.9980 | 91.29 |
| 17.5 | 64,566,162 | 201,268 | 0.0031 | 0.9969 | 91.10 |
| 18.5 | 68,900,047 | 163,958 | 0.0024 | 0.9976 | 90.82 |
| 19.5 | 73,159,792 | 135,035 | 0.0018 | 0.9982 | 90.60 |
| 20.5 | 76,937,568 | 342,619 | 0.0045 | 0.9955 | 90.43 |
| 21.5 | 68,798,471 | 386,170 | 0.0056 | 0.9944 | 90.03 |
| 22.5 | 70,039,304 | 325,881 | 0.0047 | 0.9953 | 89.53 |
| 23.5 | 71,599,642 | 432,737 | 0.0060 | 0.9940 | 89.11 |
| 24.5 | 55,476,899 | 364,675 | 0.0066 | 0.9934 | 88.57 |
| 25.5 | 47,558,974 | 494,132 | 0.0104 | 0.9896 | 87.99 |
| 26.5 | 42,342,043 | 693,622 | 0.0164 | 0.9836 | 87.07 |
| 27.5 | 38,659,868 | 836,627 | 0.0216 | 0.9784 | 85.65 |
| 28.5 | 33,906,232 | 924,945 | 0.0273 | 0.9727 | 83.79 |
| 29.5 | 29,904,279 | 1,038,728 | 0.0347 | 0.9653 | 81.51 |
| 30.5 | 26,190,824 | 946,940 | 0.0362 | 0.9638 | 78.68 |
| 31.5 | 22,160,033 | 840,215 | 0.0379 | 0.9621 | 75.83 |
| 32.5 | 18,612,838 | 782,814 | 0.0421 | 0.9579 | 72.96 |
| 33.5 | 16,339,669 | 813,100 | 0.0498 | 0.9502 | 69.89 |
| 34.5 | 13,894,158 | 749,343 | 0.0539 | 0.9461 | 66.41 |
| 35.5 | 13,487,559 | 753,387 | 0.0559 | 0.9441 | 62.83 |
| 36.5 | 12,099,460 | 702,447 | 0.0581 | 0.9419 | 59.32 |
| 37.5 | 10,903,648 | 663,115 | 0.0608 | 0.9392 | 55.88 |
| 38.5 | 10,267,287 | 597,957 | 0.0582 | 0.9418 | 52.48 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY ACCOUNT 367.00 UNDERGROUND CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.

| PLACEMENT | ND 1965-2022 |  | EXPERIENCE BAND |  | 2013-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 39.5 | 8,731,144 | 523,614 | 0.0600 | 0.9400 | 49.42 |
| 40.5 | 7,499,926 | 410,990 | 0.0548 | 0.9452 | 46.46 |
| 41.5 | 6,253,493 | 292,991 | 0.0469 | 0.9531 | 43.91 |
| 42.5 | 5,167,993 | 211,465 | 0.0409 | 0.9591 | 41.85 |
| 43.5 | 4,098,156 | 165,811 | 0.0405 | 0.9595 | 40.14 |
| 44.5 | 3,076,340 | 147,128 | 0.0478 | 0.9522 | 38.52 |
| 45.5 | 2,142,816 | 89,899 | 0.0420 | 0.9580 | 36.68 |
| 46.5 | 1,534,637 | 57,699 | 0.0376 | 0.9624 | 35.14 |
| 47.5 | 964,871 | 33,686 | 0.0349 | 0.9651 | 33.82 |
| 48.5 | 464,405 | 25,141 | 0.0541 | 0.9459 | 32.64 |
| 49.5 | 374,664 | 10,677 | 0.0285 | 0.9715 | 30.87 |
| 50.5 | 292,846 | 6,316 | 0.0216 | 0.9784 | 29.99 |
| 51.5 | 191,024 | 12,661 | 0.0663 | 0.9337 | 29.34 |
| 52.5 | 102,756 | 4,734 | 0.0461 | 0.9539 | 27.40 |
| 53.5 | 49,653 | 1,214 | 0.0245 | 0.9755 | 26.13 |
| 54.5 | 16,805 | 292 | 0.0174 | 0.9826 | 25.50 |
| 55.5 | 9,177 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 25.05 |
| 56.5 |  |  |  |  | 25.05 |




ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE
PLACEMENT BAND 1916-2022
EXPERIENCE BAND 1997-2022

| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT |
| :---: | :---: |
| BEGIN OF |  |
| INTERVAL | BEGINNING OF INTERVAL |
| AGE |  |

RETIREMENTS
DURING AGE
INTERVAL

|  |  | PCT SURV |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |


| 455,198 | 0.0032 | 0.9968 | 100.00 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $1,058,703$ | 0.0077 | 0.9923 | 99.68 |
| $1,465,155$ | 0.0096 | 0.9904 | 98.91 |
| $1,663,739$ | 0.0113 | 0.9887 | 97.96 |
| $1,017,967$ | 0.0072 | 0.9928 | 96.85 |
| 564,624 | 0.0042 | 0.9958 | 96.16 |
| 767,626 | 0.0058 | 0.9942 | 95.76 |
| 540,159 | 0.0041 | 0.9959 | 95.21 |
| 638,079 | 0.0048 | 0.9952 | 94.82 |
| 632,174 | 0.0048 | 0.9952 | 94.36 |
| 777,389 | 0.0059 | 0.9941 | 93.91 |
| 506,249 | 0.0039 | 0.9961 | 93.36 |
| 452,710 | 0.0038 | 0.9962 | 92.99 |
| 266,843 | 0.0023 | 0.9977 | 92.64 |
| 199,611 | 0.0018 | 0.9982 | 92.42 |
| 451,112 | 0.0043 | 0.9957 | 92.26 |
| 292,281 | 0.0029 | 0.9971 | 91.87 |
| 401,474 | 0.0039 | 0.9961 | 91.60 |
| $1,038,603$ | 0.0102 | 0.9898 | 91.24 |
| 587,975 | 0.0058 | 0.9942 | 90.31 |
| 561,042 | 0.0055 | 0.9945 | 89.79 |
| 738,395 | 0.0072 | 0.9928 | 89.29 |
| 506,752 | 0.0054 | 0.9946 | 88.65 |
| 643,459 | 0.0070 | 0.9930 | 88.17 |
| 710,327 | 0.0077 | 0.9923 | 87.56 |
| 555,749 | 0.0067 | 0.9933 | 86.89 |
| 526,838 | 0.0063 | 0.9937 | 86.31 |
| 503,153 | 0.0060 | 0.9940 | 85.76 |
| 542,412 | 0.0086 | 0.9914 | 85.25 |
| 683,364 | 0.0115 | 0.9885 | 84.52 |
| 724,574 | 0.0131 | 0.9869 | 83.54 |
| 589,123 | 0.0112 | 0.9888 | 82.45 |
| 649,661 | 0.0131 | 0.9869 | 81.53 |
| 687,303 | 0.0152 | 0.9848 | 80.46 |
| 525,812 | 0.0135 | 0.9865 | 79.24 |
| 463,404 | 0.0137 | 0.9863 | 78.17 |
| 408,322 | 0.0137 | 0.9863 | 77.10 |
| 279,558 | 0.0107 | 0.9893 | 76.04 |
| 205,691 | 0.0087 | 0.9913 | 75.23 |
| 178,052 | 0.0083 | 0.9917 | 74.58 |
|  | 0. |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 368.00 LINE TRANSFORMERS

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.
PLACEMENT BAND 1916-2022
EXPERIENCE BAND 1997-2022

| Age At | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 39.5 | 19,601,375 | 209,569 | 0.0107 | 0.9893 | 73.96 |
| 40.5 | 17,588,872 | 159,795 | 0.0091 | 0.9909 | 73.16 |
| 41.5 | 15,742,098 | 220,351 | 0.0140 | 0.9860 | 72.50 |
| 42.5 | 14,303,151 | 361,679 | 0.0253 | 0.9747 | 71.49 |
| 43.5 | 12,762,389 | 636,274 | 0.0499 | 0.9501 | 69.68 |
| 44.5 | 10,482,056 | 419,111 | 0.0400 | 0.9600 | 66.20 |
| 45.5 | 8,726,945 | 328,066 | 0.0376 | 0.9624 | 63.56 |
| 46.5 | 7,606,652 | 249,617 | 0.0328 | 0.9672 | 61.17 |
| 47.5 | 6,690,920 | 516,149 | 0.0771 | 0.9229 | 59.16 |
| 48.5 | 5,458,484 | 182,165 | 0.0334 | 0.9666 | 54.60 |
| 49.5 | 4,796,568 | 134,055 | 0.0279 | 0.9721 | 52.77 |
| 50.5 | 4,302,810 | 128,996 | 0.0300 | 0.9700 | 51.30 |
| 51.5 | 3,716,919 | 121,877 | 0.0328 | 0.9672 | 49.76 |
| 52.5 | 3,098,201 | 107,676 | 0.0348 | 0.9652 | 48.13 |
| 53.5 | 2,322,112 | 102,047 | 0.0439 | 0.9561 | 46.46 |
| 54.5 | 1,664,124 | 52,789 | 0.0317 | 0.9683 | 44.42 |
| 55.5 | 1,300,808 | 28,063 | 0.0216 | 0.9784 | 43.01 |
| 56.5 | 921,033 | 31,476 | 0.0342 | 0.9658 | 42.08 |
| 57.5 | 701,650 | 21,662 | 0.0309 | 0.9691 | 40.64 |
| 58.5 | 582,977 | 24,597 | 0.0422 | 0.9578 | 39.39 |
| 59.5 | 497,919 | 14,212 | 0.0285 | 0.9715 | 37.72 |
| 60.5 | 453,255 | 17,141 | 0.0378 | 0.9622 | 36.65 |
| 61.5 | 384,534 | 20,267 | 0.0527 | 0.9473 | 35.26 |
| 62.5 | 331,054 | 10,375 | 0.0313 | 0.9687 | 33.40 |
| 63.5 | 281,558 | 8,680 | 0.0308 | 0.9692 | 32.36 |
| 64.5 | 231,295 | 7,323 | 0.0317 | 0.9683 | 31.36 |
| 65.5 | 181,362 | 9,865 | 0.0544 | 0.9456 | 30.37 |
| 66.5 | 120,161 | 4,730 | 0.0394 | 0.9606 | 28.71 |
| 67.5 | 94,627 | 2,949 | 0.0312 | 0.9688 | 27.58 |
| 68.5 | 80,962 | 413 | 0.0051 | 0.9949 | 26.72 |
| 69.5 | 22,140 | 1,127 | 0.0509 | 0.9491 | 26.59 |
| 70.5 | 13,215 | 3,888 | 0.2942 | 0.7058 | 25.23 |
| 71.5 | 5,968 | 555 | 0.0931 | 0.9069 | 17.81 |
| 72.5 | 4,923 | 922 | 0.1873 | 0.8127 | 16.15 |
| 73.5 | 4,174 | 6 | 0.0015 | 0.9985 | 13.13 |
| 74.5 | 3,831 | 218 | 0.0568 | 0.9432 | 13.11 |
| 75.5 | 3,277 | 410 | 0.1252 | 0.8748 | 12.36 |
| 76.5 | 3,530 | 1,036 | 0.2936 | 0.7064 | 10.82 |
| 77.5 | 2,493 | 1,100 | 0.4412 | 0.5588 | 7.64 |
| 78.5 | 1,393 | 507 | 0.3642 | 0.6358 | 4.27 |

```
THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY ACCOUNT 368.00 LINE TRANSFORMERS
ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.
```

| PLACEMENT | BAND $1916-2022$ |  | EXPERIENCE BAND |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 79.5 |  | 1,581 | 110 | 0.0697 | 0.9303 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY


## ACCOUNT 369.00 SERVICES

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE
PLACEMENT BAND 1953-2022
EXPERIENCE BAND 1997-2022

| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL |


|  |  | PCT SURV |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |


| 0.0 | 40,334,078 | 8,105 | 0.0002 | 0.9998 | 100.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.5 | 40,500,654 | 1,397 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.98 |
| 1.5 | 39,780,386 | 119 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.98 |
| 2.5 | 38,563,431 | 183 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.98 |
| 3.5 | 38,530,747 | 348 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.98 |
| 4.5 | 37,916,268 | 82,057 | 0.0022 | 0.9978 | 99.97 |
| 5.5 | 36,885,179 | 126 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.76 |
| 6.5 | 36,602,529 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.76 |
| 7.5 | 36,609,810 | 123 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.76 |
| 8.5 | 36,470,770 | 495 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.76 |
| 9.5 | 36,020,308 | 2,241 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 99.76 |
| 10.5 | 36,121,187 | 384 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.75 |
| 11.5 | 35,927,999 | 15,986 | 0.0004 | 0.9996 | 99.75 |
| 12.5 | 36,407,442 | 4 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.70 |
| 13.5 | 36,757,005 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.70 |
| 14.5 | 36,854,947 | 3,216 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 99.70 |
| 15.5 | 35,418,608 | 774 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.70 |
| 16.5 | 36,297,087 | 1,541 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.69 |
| 17.5 | 36,869,506 | 465 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.69 |
| 18.5 | 37,588,983 | 988 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.69 |
| 19.5 | 38,295,053 | 3,762 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 99.69 |
| 20.5 | 39,165,355 | 9,912 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 99.68 |
| 21.5 | 34,360,111 | 10,117 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 99.65 |
| 22.5 | 34,811,619 | 1,434 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.62 |
| 23.5 | 35,556,152 | 3,295 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 99.62 |
| 24.5 | 31,215,991 | 1,543 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.61 |
| 25.5 | 30,979,913 | 1,406 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.60 |
| 26.5 | 28,780,768 | 702 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.60 |
| 27.5 | 27,802,223 | 969 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.60 |
| 28.5 | 26,446,062 | 148,381 | 0.0056 | 0.9944 | 99.59 |
| 29.5 | 24,126,944 | 2,263 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 99.03 |
| 30.5 | 22,620,239 | 2,249 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 99.02 |
| 31.5 | 21,138,633 | 10,183 | 0.0005 | 0.9995 | 99.01 |
| 32.5 | 19,168,374 | 24,374 | 0.0013 | 0.9987 | 98.97 |
| 33.5 | 17,528,593 | 52,829 | 0.0030 | 0.9970 | 98.84 |
| 34.5 | 16,223,060 | 22,056 | 0.0014 | 0.9986 | 98.54 |
| 35.5 | 15,250,498 | 25,863 | 0.0017 | 0.9983 | 98.41 |
| 36.5 | 14,258,939 | 37,425 | 0.0026 | 0.9974 | 98.24 |
| 37.5 | 13,418,901 | 25,800 | 0.0019 | 0.9981 | 97.98 |
| 38.5 | 12,527,532 | 6,581 | 0.0005 | 0.9995 | 97.80 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 369.00 SERVICES

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.

| PLACEMENT BAND 1953-2022 |  |  | EXPERIENCE BAND 1997-2022 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 39.5 | 11,542,947 | 7,600 | 0.0007 | 0.9993 | 97.74 |
| 40.5 | 10,891,665 | 7,433 | 0.0007 | 0.9993 | 97.68 |
| 41.5 | 9,788,213 | 17,681 | 0.0018 | 0.9982 | 97.61 |
| 42.5 | 8,888,602 | 16,333 | 0.0018 | 0.9982 | 97.44 |
| 43.5 | 8,308,105 | 16,906 | 0.0020 | 0.9980 | 97.26 |
| 44.5 | 7,480,376 | 26,108 | 0.0035 | 0.9965 | 97.06 |
| 45.5 | 6,740,621 | 28,701 | 0.0043 | 0.9957 | 96.72 |
| 46.5 | 5,833,065 | 33,429 | 0.0057 | 0.9943 | 96.31 |
| 47.5 | 4,984,107 | 24,513 | 0.0049 | 0.9951 | 95.76 |
| 48.5 | 4,215,320 | 30,693 | 0.0073 | 0.9927 | 95.29 |
| 49.5 | 3,433,456 | 34,697 | 0.0101 | 0.9899 | 94.59 |
| 50.5 | 2,791,400 | 27,931 | 0.0100 | 0.9900 | 93.64 |
| 51.5 | 2,229,483 | 31,771 | 0.0143 | 0.9857 | 92.70 |
| 52.5 | 1,817,440 | 38,628 | 0.0213 | 0.9787 | 91.38 |
| 53.5 | 1,559,079 | 22,005 | 0.0141 | 0.9859 | 89.44 |
| 54.5 | 1,251,725 | 20,249 | 0.0162 | 0.9838 | 88.17 |
| 55.5 | 1,105,358 | 20,347 | 0.0184 | 0.9816 | 86.75 |
| 56.5 | 957,698 | 19,721 | 0.0206 | 0.9794 | 85.15 |
| 57.5 | 831,948 | 18,290 | 0.0220 | 0.9780 | 83.40 |
| 58.5 | 720,230 | 16,732 | 0.0232 | 0.9768 | 81.56 |
| 59.5 | 625,482 | 21,717 | 0.0347 | 0.9653 | 79.67 |
| 60.5 | 525,102 | 19,724 | 0.0376 | 0.9624 | 76.90 |
| 61.5 | 431,816 | 12,334 | 0.0286 | 0.9714 | 74.02 |
| 62.5 | 367,831 | 13,496 | 0.0367 | 0.9633 | 71.90 |
| 63.5 | 301,558 | 13,788 | 0.0457 | 0.9543 | 69.26 |
| 64.5 | 239,135 | 8,943 | 0.0374 | 0.9626 | 66.10 |
| 65.5 | 171,477 | 8,229 | 0.0480 | 0.9520 | 63.62 |
| 66.5 | 126,164 | 7,702 | 0.0610 | 0.9390 | 60.57 |
| 67.5 | 118,463 | 4,169 | 0.0352 | 0.9648 | 56.87 |
| 68.5 | 88,503 | 6,418 | 0.0725 | 0.9275 | 54.87 |
| 69.5 |  |  |  |  | 50.89 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY


ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE

PLACEMENT BAND 1945-2022

| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL |

EXPERIENCE BAND 1997-2022

|  |  | PCT SURV |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |


| 0.0 | 40,827,460 | 44,319 | 0.0011 | 0.9989 | 100.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.5 | 40,246,056 | 155,517 | 0.0039 | 0.9961 | 99.89 |
| 1.5 | 41,473,994 | 57,959 | 0.0014 | 0.9986 | 99.51 |
| 2.5 | 38,142,418 | 72,392 | 0.0019 | 0.9981 | 99.37 |
| 3.5 | 37,915,408 | 47,937 | 0.0013 | 0.9987 | 99.18 |
| 4.5 | 35,777,390 | 54,315 | 0.0015 | 0.9985 | 99.05 |
| 5.5 | 33,438,117 | 64,772 | 0.0019 | 0.9981 | 98.90 |
| 6.5 | 32,779,547 | 32,025 | 0.0010 | 0.9990 | 98.71 |
| 7.5 | 30,828,020 | 67,144 | 0.0022 | 0.9978 | 98.61 |
| 8.5 | 30,904,789 | 36,571 | 0.0012 | 0.9988 | 98.40 |
| 9.5 | 29,903,993 | 74,396 | 0.0025 | 0.9975 | 98.28 |
| 10.5 | 29,534,079 | 36,565 | 0.0012 | 0.9988 | 98.04 |
| 11.5 | 28,761,227 | 55,519 | 0.0019 | 0.9981 | 97.92 |
| 12.5 | 28,097,236 | 93,347 | 0.0033 | 0.9967 | 97.73 |
| 13.5 | 28,034,422 | 14,568 | 0.0005 | 0.9995 | 97.40 |
| 14.5 | 27,918,462 | 83,806 | 0.0030 | 0.9970 | 97.35 |
| 15.5 | 25,758,895 | 35,470 | 0.0014 | 0.9986 | 97.06 |
| 16.5 | 26,053,441 | 58,473 | 0.0022 | 0.9978 | 96.93 |
| 17.5 | 25,817,866 | 149,193 | 0.0058 | 0.9942 | 96.71 |
| 18.5 | 26,094,151 | 92,128 | 0.0035 | 0.9965 | 96.15 |
| 19.5 | 26,397,608 | 113,759 | 0.0043 | 0.9957 | 95.81 |
| 20.5 | 26,617,266 | 132,651 | 0.0050 | 0.9950 | 95.40 |
| 21.5 | 24,767,461 | 164,011 | 0.0066 | 0.9934 | 94.92 |
| 22.5 | 23,216,046 | 159,938 | 0.0069 | 0.9931 | 94.29 |
| 23.5 | 23,320,735 | 173,751 | 0.0075 | 0.9925 | 93.64 |
| 24.5 | 19,819,074 | 198,670 | 0.0100 | 0.9900 | 92.95 |
| 25.5 | 19,551,243 | 494,725 | 0.0253 | 0.9747 | 92.01 |
| 26.5 | 18,917,540 | 323,414 | 0.0171 | 0.9829 | 89.69 |
| 27.5 | 14,244,108 | 193,110 | 0.0136 | 0.9864 | 88.15 |
| 28.5 | 12,903,339 | 175,375 | 0.0136 | 0.9864 | 86.96 |
| 29.5 | 12,013,273 | 193,461 | 0.0161 | 0.9839 | 85.78 |
| 30.5 | 11,369,130 | 200,230 | 0.0176 | 0.9824 | 84.39 |
| 31.5 | 10,378,717 | 230,020 | 0.0222 | 0.9778 | 82.91 |
| 32.5 | 9,450,315 | 185,604 | 0.0196 | 0.9804 | 81.07 |
| 33.5 | 8,531,172 | 165,614 | 0.0194 | 0.9806 | 79.48 |
| 34.5 | 7,628,596 | 163,346 | 0.0214 | 0.9786 | 77.94 |
| 35.5 | 7,020,523 | 164,893 | 0.0235 | 0.9765 | 76.27 |
| 36.5 | 6,453,638 | 160,149 | 0.0248 | 0.9752 | 74.48 |
| 37.5 | 5,937,129 | 144,071 | 0.0243 | 0.9757 | 72.63 |
| 38.5 | 5,365,420 | 129,978 | 0.0242 | 0.9758 | 70.87 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 370.00 METERS

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.

| PLACEMENT | ND 1945-2022 |  | EXPERIENCE BAND |  | 1997-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 39.5 | 4,837,041 | 127,857 | 0.0264 | 0.9736 | 69.15 |
| 40.5 | 4,464,926 | 110,294 | 0.0247 | 0.9753 | 67.32 |
| 41.5 | 4,019,011 | 110,657 | 0.0275 | 0.9725 | 65.66 |
| 42.5 | 3,628,093 | 108,364 | 0.0299 | 0.9701 | 63.85 |
| 43.5 | 3,446,445 | 145,898 | 0.0423 | 0.9577 | 61.94 |
| 44.5 | 3,030,266 | 133,769 | 0.0441 | 0.9559 | 59.32 |
| 45.5 | 2,657,677 | 205,996 | 0.0775 | 0.9225 | 56.70 |
| 46.5 | 2,238,483 | 122,603 | 0.0548 | 0.9452 | 52.31 |
| 47.5 | 1,985,478 | 264,583 | 0.1333 | 0.8667 | 49.44 |
| 48.5 | 1,495,666 | 206,038 | 0.1378 | 0.8622 | 42.85 |
| 49.5 | 1,100,641 | 145,724 | 0.1324 | 0.8676 | 36.95 |
| 50.5 | 895,936 | 104,609 | 0.1168 | 0.8832 | 32.06 |
| 51.5 | 754,286 | 96,483 | 0.1279 | 0.8721 | 28.31 |
| 52.5 | 609,473 | 82,680 | 0.1357 | 0.8643 | 24.69 |
| 53.5 | 493,454 | 73,671 | 0.1493 | 0.8507 | 21.34 |
| 54.5 | 383,159 | 53,714 | 0.1402 | 0.8598 | 18.16 |
| 55.5 | 300,692 | 32,441 | 0.1079 | 0.8921 | 15.61 |
| 56.5 | 231,589 | 20,017 | 0.0864 | 0.9136 | 13.93 |
| 57.5 | 189,013 | 9,432 | 0.0499 | 0.9501 | 12.72 |
| 58.5 | 161,925 | 3,133 | 0.0193 | 0.9807 | 12.09 |
| 59.5 | 142,240 | 3,911 | 0.0275 | 0.9725 | 11.85 |
| 60.5 | 134,940 | 5,155 | 0.0382 | 0.9618 | 11.53 |
| 61.5 | 114,488 | 1,251 | 0.0109 | 0.9891 | 11.09 |
| 62.5 | 94,375 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 10.97 |
| 63.5 | 74,491 | 6 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 10.97 |
| 64.5 | 59,312 | 3 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 10.97 |
| 65.5 | 47,291 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 10.97 |
| 66.5 | 28,074 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 10.97 |
| 67.5 | 20,624 | 523 | 0.0254 | 0.9746 | 10.97 |
| 68.5 | 13,184 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 10.69 |
| 69.5 |  |  |  |  | 10.69 |

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE

PLACEMENT BAND 1945-2022
EXPERIENCE BAND 2013-2022

| Age At | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 0.0 | 24,577,165 | 39,721 | 0.0016 | 0.9984 | 100.00 |
| 0.5 | 24,121,778 | 143,353 | 0.0059 | 0.9941 | 99.84 |
| 1.5 | 21,960,162 | 49,054 | 0.0022 | 0.9978 | 99.25 |
| 2.5 | 18,533,408 | 64,598 | 0.0035 | 0.9965 | 99.02 |
| 3.5 | 17,894,618 | 28,534 | 0.0016 | 0.9984 | 98.68 |
| 4.5 | 15,600,092 | 28,161 | 0.0018 | 0.9982 | 98.52 |
| 5.5 | 14,915,622 | 35,216 | 0.0024 | 0.9976 | 98.34 |
| 6.5 | 13,416,333 | 21,900 | 0.0016 | 0.9984 | 98.11 |
| 7.5 | 10,977,797 | 28,900 | 0.0026 | 0.9974 | 97.95 |
| 8.5 | 10,004,036 | 17,810 | 0.0018 | 0.9982 | 97.69 |
| 9.5 | 8,373,246 | 16,682 | 0.0020 | 0.9980 | 97.52 |
| 10.5 | 7,406,697 | 18,198 | 0.0025 | 0.9975 | 97.32 |
| 11.5 | 7,967,592 | 30,284 | 0.0038 | 0.9962 | 97.09 |
| 12.5 | 8,421,118 | 29,713 | 0.0035 | 0.9965 | 96.72 |
| 13.5 | 7,727,952 | 9,692 | 0.0013 | 0.9987 | 96.38 |
| 14.5 | 11,089,117 | 81,232 | 0.0073 | 0.9927 | 96.25 |
| 15.5 | 8,641,757 | 27,339 | 0.0032 | 0.9968 | 95.55 |
| 16.5 | 8,794,325 | 38,028 | 0.0043 | 0.9957 | 95.25 |
| 17.5 | 13,255,543 | 113,242 | 0.0085 | 0.9915 | 94.84 |
| 18.5 | 14,563,304 | 65,949 | 0.0045 | 0.9955 | 94.02 |
| 19.5 | 15,412,884 | 90,178 | 0.0059 | 0.9941 | 93.60 |
| 20.5 | 15,947,876 | 117,916 | 0.0074 | 0.9926 | 93.05 |
| 21.5 | 15,003,298 | 145,402 | 0.0097 | 0.9903 | 92.36 |
| 22.5 | 14,111,464 | 151,569 | 0.0107 | 0.9893 | 91.47 |
| 23.5 | 14,959,018 | 167,127 | 0.0112 | 0.9888 | 90.49 |
| 24.5 | 12,186,176 | 191,457 | 0.0157 | 0.9843 | 89.47 |
| 25.5 | 12,399,642 | 206,914 | 0.0167 | 0.9833 | 88.07 |
| 26.5 | 12,560,555 | 168,272 | 0.0134 | 0.9866 | 86.60 |
| 27.5 | 8,610,929 | 125,179 | 0.0145 | 0.9855 | 85.44 |
| 28.5 | 7,914,463 | 120,020 | 0.0152 | 0.9848 | 84.20 |
| 29.5 | 7,673,695 | 137,284 | 0.0179 | 0.9821 | 82.92 |
| 30.5 | 7,294,169 | 140,345 | 0.0192 | 0.9808 | 81.44 |
| 31.5 | 6,747,060 | 143,880 | 0.0213 | 0.9787 | 79.87 |
| 32.5 | 6,152,634 | 141,797 | 0.0230 | 0.9770 | 78.17 |
| 33.5 | 5,444,200 | 132,954 | 0.0244 | 0.9756 | 76.37 |
| 34.5 | 4,812,067 | 138,357 | 0.0288 | 0.9712 | 74.50 |
| 35.5 | 4,495,841 | 142,543 | 0.0317 | 0.9683 | 72.36 |
| 36.5 | 4,144,878 | 131,799 | 0.0318 | 0.9682 | 70.06 |
| 37.5 | 3,667,803 | 109,853 | 0.0300 | 0.9700 | 67.84 |
| 38.5 | 3,378,600 | 107,944 | 0.0319 | 0.9681 | 65.80 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 370.00 METERS

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.

| PLACEMENT | ND 1945-2022 |  | EXPERIENCE BAND |  | 2013-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 39.5 | 3,027,059 | 106,929 | 0.0353 | 0.9647 | 63.70 |
| 40.5 | 2,758,123 | 100,012 | 0.0363 | 0.9637 | 61.45 |
| 41.5 | 2,359,654 | 91,991 | 0.0390 | 0.9610 | 59.22 |
| 42.5 | 2,058,900 | 94,977 | 0.0461 | 0.9539 | 56.91 |
| 43.5 | 1,771,222 | 81,118 | 0.0458 | 0.9542 | 54.29 |
| 44.5 | 1,508,011 | 70,244 | 0.0466 | 0.9534 | 51.80 |
| 45.5 | 1,291,031 | 62,107 | 0.0481 | 0.9519 | 49.39 |
| 46.5 | 1,150,412 | 66,779 | 0.0580 | 0.9420 | 47.01 |
| 47.5 | 1,073,403 | 62,610 | 0.0583 | 0.9417 | 44.28 |
| 48.5 | 943,687 | 71,605 | 0.0759 | 0.9241 | 41.70 |
| 49.5 | 814,701 | 71,668 | 0.0880 | 0.9120 | 38.54 |
| 50.5 | 744,106 | 104,464 | 0.1404 | 0.8596 | 35.15 |
| 51.5 | 610,628 | 95,987 | 0.1572 | 0.8428 | 30.21 |
| 52.5 | 486,971 | 79,615 | 0.1635 | 0.8365 | 25.46 |
| 53.5 | 396,032 | 68,052 | 0.1718 | 0.8282 | 21.30 |
| 54.5 | 307,703 | 51,943 | 0.1688 | 0.8312 | 17.64 |
| 55.5 | 240,596 | 32,196 | 0.1338 | 0.8662 | 14.66 |
| 56.5 | 192,171 | 20,017 | 0.1042 | 0.8958 | 12.70 |
| 57.5 | 158,642 | 9,432 | 0.0595 | 0.9405 | 11.38 |
| 58.5 | 138,822 | 3,127 | 0.0225 | 0.9775 | 10.70 |
| 59.5 | 141,711 | 3,911 | 0.0276 | 0.9724 | 10.46 |
| 60.5 | 134,411 | 5,155 | 0.0384 | 0.9616 | 10.17 |
| 61.5 | 113,960 | 1,251 | 0.0110 | 0.9890 | 9.78 |
| 62.5 | 93,846 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 9.67 |
| 63.5 | 73,962 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 9.67 |
| 64.5 | 58,789 | 3 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 9.67 |
| 65.5 | 46,768 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 9.67 |
| 66.5 | 27,551 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 9.67 |
| 67.5 | 20,624 | 523 | 0.0254 | 0.9746 | 9.67 |
| 68.5 | 13,184 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 9.43 |
| 69.5 |  |  |  |  | 9.43 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY
ACCOUNT 371.00 INSTALLATIONS ON CUSTOMERS


## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 371.00 INSTALLATIONS ON CUSTOMERS' PREMISES

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE

| PLACEMENT | ND 1966-2022 |  | EXPERIENCE BAND |  | 1997-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 0.0 | 655,704 | 25,484 | 0.0389 | 0.9611 | 100.00 |
| 0.5 | 618,771 | 28,545 | 0.0461 | 0.9539 | 96.11 |
| 1.5 | 419,700 | 43,590 | 0.1039 | 0.8961 | 91.68 |
| 2.5 | 340,711 | 70,744 | 0.2076 | 0.7924 | 82.16 |
| 3.5 | 230,090 | 1,042 | 0.0045 | 0.9955 | 65.10 |
| 4.5 | 509,364 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.80 |
| 5.5 | 597,107 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.80 |
| 6.5 | 593,283 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.80 |
| 7.5 | 784,568 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.80 |
| 8.5 | 724,659 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.80 |
| 9.5 | 710,727 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.80 |
| 10.5 | 726,248 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.80 |
| 11.5 | 427,744 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.80 |
| 12.5 | 324,163 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.80 |
| 13.5 | 296,846 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.80 |
| 14.5 | 278,650 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.80 |
| 15.5 | 274,910 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.80 |
| 16.5 | 274,414 | 263 | 0.0010 | 0.9990 | 64.80 |
| 17.5 | 360,617 | 41 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 64.74 |
| 18.5 | 356,895 | 41 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 64.73 |
| 19.5 | 363,195 | 41 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 64.73 |
| 20.5 | 366,271 | 41 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 64.72 |
| 21.5 | 148,328 | 41 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 64.71 |
| 22.5 | 137,898 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.70 |
| 23.5 | 144,324 | 41 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 64.70 |
| 24.5 | 61,844 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.68 |
| 25.5 | 69,549 | 105 | 0.0015 | 0.9985 | 64.68 |
| 26.5 | 74,865 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.58 |
| 27.5 | 80,101 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.58 |
| 28.5 | 77,333 | 112 | 0.0015 | 0.9985 | 64.58 |
| 29.5 | 98,290 | 98 | 0.0010 | 0.9990 | 64.49 |
| 30.5 | 135,643 | 442 | 0.0033 | 0.9967 | 64.42 |
| 31.5 | 152,566 | 545 | 0.0036 | 0.9964 | 64.21 |
| 32.5 | 169,033 | 710 | 0.0042 | 0.9958 | 63.98 |
| 33.5 | 201,623 | 582 | 0.0029 | 0.9971 | 63.71 |
| 34.5 | 211,298 | 494 | 0.0023 | 0.9977 | 63.53 |
| 35.5 | 245,954 | 679 | 0.0028 | 0.9972 | 63.38 |
| 36.5 | 229,262 | 813 | 0.0035 | 0.9965 | 63.21 |
| 37.5 | 192,177 | 836 | 0.0044 | 0.9956 | 62.98 |
| 38.5 | 169,493 | 485 | 0.0029 | 0.9971 | 62.71 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

```
ACCOUNT 371.00 INSTALLATIONS ON CUSTOMERS' PREMISES
    ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.
```

| PLACEMENT | ND 1966-2022 |  | EXPERIENCE BAND |  | 1997-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 39.5 | 153,918 | 340 | 0.0022 | 0.9978 | 62.53 |
| 40.5 | 118,423 | 311 | 0.0026 | 0.9974 | 62.39 |
| 41.5 | 112,478 | 426 | 0.0038 | 0.9962 | 62.23 |
| 42.5 | 94,776 | 241 | 0.0025 | 0.9975 | 61.99 |
| 43.5 | 115,083 | 456 | 0.0040 | 0.9960 | 61.83 |
| 44.5 | 115,130 | 434 | 0.0038 | 0.9962 | 61.59 |
| 45.5 | 116,050 | 396 | 0.0034 | 0.9966 | 61.35 |
| 46.5 | 130,925 | 502 | 0.0038 | 0.9962 | 61.15 |
| 47.5 | 154,037 | 598 | 0.0039 | 0.9961 | 60.91 |
| 48.5 | 156,166 | 607 | 0.0039 | 0.9961 | 60.67 |
| 49.5 | 158,099 | 626 | 0.0040 | 0.9960 | 60.44 |
| 50.5 | 124,521 | 703 | 0.0056 | 0.9944 | 60.20 |
| 51.5 | 116,741 | 1,099 | 0.0094 | 0.9906 | 59.86 |
| 52.5 | 98,830 | 765 | 0.0077 | 0.9923 | 59.30 |
| 53.5 | 74,210 | 798 | 0.0108 | 0.9892 | 58.84 |
| 54.5 | 40,113 | 128 | 0.0032 | 0.9968 | 58.20 |
| 55.5 | 26,260 | 45 | 0.0017 | 0.9983 | 58.02 |
| 56.5 |  |  |  |  | 57.92 |

## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 371.00 INSTALLATIONS ON CUSTOMERS' PREMISES

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE

| PLACEMENT | ND 1966-2022 |  | EXPERIENCE BAND |  | 2013-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 0.0 | 567,669 | 25,484 | 0.0449 | 0.9551 | 100.00 |
| 0.5 | 618,771 | 28,545 | 0.0461 | 0.9539 | 95.51 |
| 1.5 | 419,700 | 43,590 | 0.1039 | 0.8961 | 91.10 |
| 2.5 | 340,711 | 70,744 | 0.2076 | 0.7924 | 81.64 |
| 3.5 | 230,090 | 1,042 | 0.0045 | 0.9955 | 64.69 |
| 4.5 | 509,364 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 5.5 | 597,107 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 6.5 | 593,283 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 7.5 | 784,568 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 8.5 | 724,659 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 9.5 | 710,727 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 10.5 | 726,248 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 11.5 | 427,744 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 12.5 | 324,163 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 13.5 | 296,846 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 14.5 | 278,650 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 15.5 | 274,910 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 16.5 | 274,414 | 263 | 0.0010 | 0.9990 | 64.40 |
| 17.5 | 360,617 | 41 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 64.34 |
| 18.5 | 356,895 | 41 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 64.33 |
| 19.5 | 363,195 | 41 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 64.32 |
| 20.5 | 366,271 | 41 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 64.31 |
| 21.5 | 148,328 | 41 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 64.31 |
| 22.5 | 137,898 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.29 |
| 23.5 | 144,324 | 41 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 64.29 |
| 24.5 | 61,844 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.27 |
| 25.5 | 69,549 | 105 | 0.0015 | 0.9985 | 64.27 |
| 26.5 | 74,865 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.17 |
| 27.5 | 80,101 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.17 |
| 28.5 | 77,333 | 112 | 0.0015 | 0.9985 | 64.17 |
| 29.5 | 98,290 | 98 | 0.0010 | 0.9990 | 64.08 |
| 30.5 | 135,643 | 442 | 0.0033 | 0.9967 | 64.02 |
| 31.5 | 152,566 | 545 | 0.0036 | 0.9964 | 63.81 |
| 32.5 | 169,033 | 710 | 0.0042 | 0.9958 | 63.58 |
| 33.5 | 201,623 | 582 | 0.0029 | 0.9971 | 63.31 |
| 34.5 | 211,298 | 494 | 0.0023 | 0.9977 | 63.13 |
| 35.5 | 245,954 | 679 | 0.0028 | 0.9972 | 62.98 |
| 36.5 | 229,262 | 813 | 0.0035 | 0.9965 | 62.81 |
| 37.5 | 192,177 | 836 | 0.0044 | 0.9956 | 62.59 |
| 38.5 | 169,493 | 485 | 0.0029 | 0.9971 | 62.31 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

```
ACCOUNT 371.00 INSTALLATIONS ON CUSTOMERS' PREMISES
    ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.
```

| PLACEMENT | ND 1966-2022 |  | EXPERIENCE BAND |  | 2013-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 39.5 | 153,918 | 340 | 0.0022 | 0.9978 | 62.14 |
| 40.5 | 118,423 | 311 | 0.0026 | 0.9974 | 62.00 |
| 41.5 | 112,478 | 426 | 0.0038 | 0.9962 | 61.84 |
| 42.5 | 94,776 | 241 | 0.0025 | 0.9975 | 61.60 |
| 43.5 | 115,083 | 456 | 0.0040 | 0.9960 | 61.44 |
| 44.5 | 115,130 | 434 | 0.0038 | 0.9962 | 61.20 |
| 45.5 | 116,050 | 396 | 0.0034 | 0.9966 | 60.97 |
| 46.5 | 130,925 | 502 | 0.0038 | 0.9962 | 60.76 |
| 47.5 | 154,037 | 598 | 0.0039 | 0.9961 | 60.53 |
| 48.5 | 156,166 | 607 | 0.0039 | 0.9961 | 60.29 |
| 49.5 | 158,099 | 626 | 0.0040 | 0.9960 | 60.06 |
| 50.5 | 124,521 | 703 | 0.0056 | 0.9944 | 59.82 |
| 51.5 | 116,741 | 1,099 | 0.0094 | 0.9906 | 59.48 |
| 52.5 | 98,830 | 765 | 0.0077 | 0.9923 | 58.92 |
| 53.5 | 74,210 | 798 | 0.0108 | 0.9892 | 58.47 |
| 54.5 | 40,113 | 128 | 0.0032 | 0.9968 | 57.84 |
| 55.5 | 26,260 | 45 | 0.0017 | 0.9983 | 57.65 |
| 56.5 |  |  |  |  | 57.55 |

## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 371.00 INSTALLATIONS ON CUSTOMERS' PREMISES

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE

| PLACEMENT | BAND 1966-2022 |  | EXPERIENCE BAND |  | $\begin{array}{r} 1997-2012, \\ 2017-2022 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 0.0 | 386,525 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 0.5 | 318,183 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 1.5 | 204,274 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 2.5 | 252,033 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 3.5 | 226,676 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 4.5 | 206,941 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 5.5 | 490,233 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 6.5 | 565,966 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 7.5 | 536,666 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 8.5 | 701,409 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 9.5 | 710,138 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 10.5 | 708,355 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 11.5 | 423,824 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 12.5 | 320,870 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 13.5 | 296,846 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 14.5 | 48,943 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 15.5 | 255,400 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 16.5 | 274,321 | 263 | 0.0010 | 0.9990 | 100.00 |
| 17.5 | 256,259 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.90 |
| 18.5 | 356,656 | 41 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 99.90 |
| 19.5 | 353,562 | 41 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 99.89 |
| 20.5 | 363,154 | 41 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 99.88 |
| 21.5 | 136,786 | 41 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 99.87 |
| 22.5 | 128,777 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.84 |
| 23.5 | 137,805 | 41 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 99.84 |
| 24.5 | 40,170 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.81 |
| 25.5 | 61,605 | 105 | 0.0017 | 0.9983 | 99.81 |
| 26.5 | 59,811 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.64 |
| 27.5 | 71,749 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.64 |
| 28.5 | 68,558 | 112 | 0.0016 | 0.9984 | 99.64 |
| 29.5 | 68,101 | 98 | 0.0014 | 0.9986 | 99.48 |
| 30.5 | 91,672 | 263 | 0.0029 | 0.9971 | 99.33 |
| 31.5 | 113,631 | 330 | 0.0029 | 0.9971 | 99.05 |
| 32.5 | 144,077 | 545 | 0.0038 | 0.9962 | 98.76 |
| 33.5 | 153,382 | 394 | 0.0026 | 0.9974 | 98.39 |
| 34.5 | 192,787 | 353 | 0.0018 | 0.9982 | 98.14 |
| 35.5 | 202,141 | 526 | 0.0026 | 0.9974 | 97.96 |
| 36.5 | 215,690 | 813 | 0.0038 | 0.9962 | 97.70 |
| 37.5 | 185,372 | 836 | 0.0045 | 0.9955 | 97.33 |
| 38.5 | 153,267 | 379 | 0.0025 | 0.9975 | 96.89 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY ACCOUNT 371.00 INSTALLATIONS ON CUSTOMERS' PREMISES

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.

| PLACEMENT | BAND 1966-2022 |  | EXPERIENCE BAND |  | $\begin{array}{r} 1997-2012, \\ 2017-2022 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AgE At | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 39.5 | 144,382 | 340 | 0.0024 | 0.9976 | 96.65 |
| 40.5 | 106,651 | 311 | 0.0029 | 0.9971 | 96.43 |
| 41.5 | 99,884 | 366 | 0.0037 | 0.9963 | 96.14 |
| 42.5 | 69,460 | 174 | 0.0025 | 0.9975 | 95.79 |
| 43.5 | 81,219 | 261 | 0.0032 | 0.9968 | 95.55 |
| 44.5 | 107,920 | 389 | 0.0036 | 0.9964 | 95.24 |
| 45.5 | 98,788 | 307 | 0.0031 | 0.9969 | 94.90 |
| 46.5 | 106,316 | 376 | 0.0035 | 0.9965 | 94.61 |
| 47.5 | 118,879 | 448 | 0.0038 | 0.9962 | 94.27 |
| 48.5 | 141,144 | 531 | 0.0038 | 0.9962 | 93.92 |
| 49.5 | 130,846 | 490 | 0.0037 | 0.9963 | 93.56 |
| 50.5 | 124,521 | 703 | 0.0056 | 0.9944 | 93.21 |
| 51.5 | 116,741 | 1,099 | 0.0094 | 0.9906 | 92.69 |
| 52.5 | 98,830 | 765 | 0.0077 | 0.9923 | 91.81 |
| 53.5 | 74,210 | 798 | 0.0108 | 0.9892 | 91.10 |
| 54.5 | 40,113 | 128 | 0.0032 | 0.9968 | 90.12 |
| 55.5 | 26,260 | 45 | 0.0017 | 0.9983 | 89.83 |
| 56.5 |  |  |  |  | 89.68 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY
ACCOUNTS 373.10 STREET LIGHTING AND SIGNAL SYSTEMS


## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

## ACCOUNTS 373.10 STREET LIGHTING AND SIGNAL SYSTEMS

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE

PLACEMENT BAND 1945-2022
EXPERIENCE BAND 1996-2022

| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL |


| 0.0 | $30,272,826$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| 0.5 | $30,841,350$ |
| 1.5 | $30,349,981$ |
| 2.5 | $29,782,576$ |
| 3.5 | $29,260,508$ |
| 4.5 | $28,551,777$ |
| 5.5 | $27,625,742$ |
| 6.5 | $27,007,709$ |
| 7.5 | $25,781,869$ |
| 8.5 | $25,116,828$ |
| 9.5 | $24,563,158$ |
| 10.5 | $23,766,380$ |
| 11.5 | $18,418,741$ |
| 12.5 | $16,212,970$ |
| 13.5 | $15,796,550$ |
| 14.5 | $13,796,078$ |
| 15.5 | $13,221,446$ |
| 16.5 | $12,967,793$ |
| 17.5 | $12,750,197$ |
| 18.5 | $12,658,391$ |
| 19.5 | $12,491,099$ |
| 20.5 | $12,356,123$ |
| 21.5 | $9,566,826$ |
| 22.5 | $9,314,945$ |
| 23.5 | $9,281,116$ |
| 24.5 | $7,303,406$ |
| 25.5 | $5,761,830$ |
| 26.5 | $5,015,998$ |
| 27.5 | $4,310,279$ |
| 28.5 | $3,803,211$ |
| 29.5 | $3,393,519$ |
| 30.5 | $3,011,494$ |
| 31.5 | $2,562,425$ |
| 32.5 | $2,324,145$ |
| 33.5 | $2,017,530$ |
| 34.5 | $1,788,417$ |
| 35.5 | $1,639,533$ |
| 36.5 | $1,475,293$ |
| 37.5 | $1,356,404$ |
| 38.5 | $1,240,072$ |
|  |  |


| 8,960 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 100.00 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 22,847 | 0.0007 | 0.9993 | 99.97 |
| 21,970 | 0.0007 | 0.9993 | 99.90 |
| 64,363 | 0.0022 | 0.9978 | 99.82 |
| 58,682 | 0.0020 | 0.9980 | 99.61 |
| 170,115 | 0.0060 | 0.9940 | 99.41 |
| 102,670 | 0.0037 | 0.9963 | 98.82 |
| 108,196 | 0.0040 | 0.9960 | 98.45 |
| 134,764 | 0.0052 | 0.9948 | 98.05 |
| 161,041 | 0.0064 | 0.9936 | 97.54 |
| 134,481 | 0.0055 | 0.9945 | 96.92 |
| 162,267 | 0.0068 | 0.9932 | 96.39 |
| 297,633 | 0.0162 | 0.9838 | 95.73 |
| 325,073 | 0.0201 | 0.9799 | 94.18 |
| 330,664 | 0.0209 | 0.9791 | 92.29 |
| 91,179 | 0.0066 | 0.9934 | 90.36 |
| 115,888 | 0.0088 | 0.9912 | 89.76 |
| 79,904 | 0.0062 | 0.9938 | 88.98 |
| 102,359 | 0.0080 | 0.9920 | 88.43 |
| 100,512 | 0.0079 | 0.9921 | 87.72 |
| 113,956 | 0.0091 | 0.9909 | 87.02 |
| 86,478 | 0.0070 | 0.9930 | 86.23 |
| 101,386 | 0.0106 | 0.9894 | 85.62 |
| 111,320 | 0.0120 | 0.9880 | 84.72 |
| 137,047 | 0.0148 | 0.9852 | 83.70 |
| 147,218 | 0.0202 | 0.9798 | 82.47 |
| 234,854 | 0.0408 | 0.9592 | 80.81 |
| 175,948 | 0.0351 | 0.9649 | 77.51 |
| 124,556 | 0.0289 | 0.9711 | 74.79 |
| 52,029 | 0.0137 | 0.9863 | 72.63 |
| 40,215 | 0.0119 | 0.9881 | 71.64 |
| 44,258 | 0.0147 | 0.9853 | 70.79 |
| 58,096 | 0.0227 | 0.9773 | 69.75 |
| 24,395 | 0.0105 | 0.9895 | 68.17 |
| 12,311 | 0.0061 | 0.9939 | 67.45 |
| 15,861 | 0.0089 | 0.9911 | 67.04 |
| 15,585 | 0.0095 | 0.9905 | 66.45 |
| 30,294 | 0.0205 | 0.9795 | 65.81 |
| 47,092 | 0.0347 | 0.9653 | 64.46 |
| 29,172 | 0.0235 | 0.9765 | 62.23 |
|  | 0.0 |  |  |

## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

## ACCOUNTS 373.10 STREET LIGHTING AND SIGNAL SYSTEMS

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.

| PLACEMENT | ND 1945-2022 | EXPERIENCE BAND 1996-2022 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 39.5 | 1,164,952 | 26,963 | 0.0231 | 0.9769 | 60.76 |
| 40.5 | 1,073,466 | 34,347 | 0.0320 | 0.9680 | 59.36 |
| 41.5 | 980,598 | 39,357 | 0.0401 | 0.9599 | 57.46 |
| 42.5 | 847,586 | 25,989 | 0.0307 | 0.9693 | 55.15 |
| 43.5 | 750,249 | 27,086 | 0.0361 | 0.9639 | 53.46 |
| 44.5 | 660,132 | 24,775 | 0.0375 | 0.9625 | 51.53 |
| 45.5 | 564,398 | 15,338 | 0.0272 | 0.9728 | 49.60 |
| 46.5 | 497,812 | 7,374 | 0.0148 | 0.9852 | 48.25 |
| 47.5 | 399,986 | 4,213 | 0.0105 | 0.9895 | 47.53 |
| 48.5 | 327,919 | 4,190 | 0.0128 | 0.9872 | 47.03 |
| 49.5 | 241,537 | 2,721 | 0.0113 | 0.9887 | 46.43 |
| 50.5 | 213,558 | 1,874 | 0.0088 | 0.9912 | 45.91 |
| 51.5 | 171,573 | 2,239 | 0.0130 | 0.9870 | 45.51 |
| 52.5 | 155,331 | 4,671 | 0.0301 | 0.9699 | 44.91 |
| 53.5 | 127,211 | 1,834 | 0.0144 | 0.9856 | 43.56 |
| 54.5 | 96,613 | 1,238 | 0.0128 | 0.9872 | 42.93 |
| 55.5 | 67,491 | 757 | 0.0112 | 0.9888 | 42.38 |
| 56.5 | 38,711 | 861 | 0.0222 | 0.9778 | 41.91 |
| 57.5 | 37,582 | 914 | 0.0243 | 0.9757 | 40.98 |
| 58.5 | 36,475 | 1,983 | 0.0544 | 0.9456 | 39.98 |
| 59.5 | 33,351 | 2,758 | 0.0827 | 0.9173 | 37.80 |
| 60.5 | 30,451 | 3,324 | 0.1091 | 0.8909 | 34.68 |
| 61.5 | 26,944 | 4,078 | 0.1513 | 0.8487 | 30.89 |
| 62.5 | 18,827 | 3,711 | 0.1971 | 0.8029 | 26.22 |
| 63.5 | 14,968 | 3,211 | 0.2145 | 0.7855 | 21.05 |
| 64.5 | 11,757 | 2,220 | 0.1888 | 0.8112 | 16.53 |
| 65.5 | 9,131 | 1,216 | 0.1331 | 0.8669 | 13.41 |
| 66.5 | 6,597 | 809 | 0.1227 | 0.8773 | 11.63 |
| 67.5 | 4,910 | 410 | 0.0835 | 0.9165 | 10.20 |
| 68.5 | 3,186 | 91 | 0.0286 | 0.9714 | 9.35 |
| 69.5 | 1,827 | 236 | 0.1291 | 0.8709 | 9.08 |
| 70.5 | 1,591 | 471 | 0.2964 | 0.7036 | 7.91 |
| 71.5 | 1,119 | 236 | 0.2106 | 0.7894 | 5.56 |
| 72.5 | 884 | 236 | 0.2668 | 0.7332 | 4.39 |
| 73.5 | 648 | 118 | 0.1819 | 0.8181 | 3.22 |
| 74.5 | 530 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 2.64 |
| 75.5 | 530 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 2.64 |
| 76.5 | 530 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 2.64 |
| 77.5 |  |  |  |  | 2.64 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY
ACCOUNT 389.20 LAND RIGHTS
ORIGINAL AND SMOOTH SURVIVOR CURVES


THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 389.20 LAND RIGHTS

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE

| PLACEMENT BAND 2005-2005 |  |  | EXPERIENCE BAND 2005-2022 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 0.0 | 3,778 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 0.5 | 3,778 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 1.5 | 3,778 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 2.5 | 3,778 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 3.5 | 3,778 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 4.5 | 3,778 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 5.5 | 3,778 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 6.5 | 3,778 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 7.5 | 3,778 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 8.5 | 3,778 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 9.5 | 3,778 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 10.5 | 3,778 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 11.5 | 3,778 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 12.5 | 3,778 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 13.5 | 3,778 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 14.5 | 3,778 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 15.5 | 3,778 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 16.5 | 3,778 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 17.5 |  |  |  |  | 100.00 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY
ACCOUNT 390.10 STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS ORIGINAL AND SMOOTH SURVIVOR CURVES


| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 0.0 | 17,114,466 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 0.5 | 17,254,711 | 116,073 | 0.0067 | 0.9933 | 100.00 |
| 1.5 | 17,739,041 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 99.33 |
| 2.5 | 17,586,707 | 24,389 | 0.0014 | 0.9986 | 99.33 |
| 3.5 | 18,707,539 | 1,754 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 99.19 |
| 4.5 | 18,596,685 | 6,367 | 0.0003 | 0.9997 | 99.18 |
| 5.5 | 23,507,182 | 56,413 | 0.0024 | 0.9976 | 99.15 |
| 6.5 | 22,156,412 | 70,062 | 0.0032 | 0.9968 | 98.91 |
| 7.5 | 23,026,735 | 87,176 | 0.0038 | 0.9962 | 98.60 |
| 8.5 | 25,289,696 | 684,666 | 0.0271 | 0.9729 | 98.22 |
| 9.5 | 26,205,537 | 29,939 | 0.0011 | 0.9989 | 95.56 |
| 10.5 | 23,694,267 | 22,644 | 0.0010 | 0.9990 | 95.45 |
| 11.5 | 23,535,235 | 16,001 | 0.0007 | 0.9993 | 95.36 |
| 12.5 | 22,538,867 | 10,967 | 0.0005 | 0.9995 | 95.30 |
| 13.5 | 21,710,466 | 20,720 | 0.0010 | 0.9990 | 95.25 |
| 14.5 | 17,893,626 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 95.16 |
| 15.5 | 17,564,614 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 95.16 |
| 16.5 | 16,672,656 | 89,631 | 0.0054 | 0.9946 | 95.16 |
| 17.5 | 16,524,042 | 400,666 | 0.0242 | 0.9758 | 94.65 |
| 18.5 | 15,572,749 | 131,566 | 0.0084 | 0.9916 | 92.35 |
| 19.5 | 14,899,906 | 17,024 | 0.0011 | 0.9989 | 91.57 |
| 20.5 | 13,997,947 | 28,741 | 0.0021 | 0.9979 | 91.47 |
| 21.5 | 12,128,373 | 31,853 | 0.0026 | 0.9974 | 91.28 |
| 22.5 | 12,034,214 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 91.04 |
| 23.5 | 12,158,977 | 81,501 | 0.0067 | 0.9933 | 91.04 |
| 24.5 | 11,732,272 | 100,331 | 0.0086 | 0.9914 | 90.43 |
| 25.5 | 11,477,587 | 166,752 | 0.0145 | 0.9855 | 89.66 |
| 26.5 | 11,128,852 | 83,338 | 0.0075 | 0.9925 | 88.36 |
| 27.5 | 10,797,087 | 11,922 | 0.0011 | 0.9989 | 87.69 |
| 28.5 | 10,558,159 | 33,172 | 0.0031 | 0.9969 | 87.60 |
| 29.5 | 9,776,587 | 87,821 | 0.0090 | 0.9910 | 87.32 |
| 30.5 | 8,676,234 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 86.54 |
| 31.5 | 8,102,096 | 38,228 | 0.0047 | 0.9953 | 86.54 |
| 32.5 | 6,348,230 | 564 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 86.13 |
| 33.5 | 5,139,413 | 129,729 | 0.0252 | 0.9748 | 86.12 |
| 34.5 | 2,649,167 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 83.95 |
| 35.5 | 1,922,727 | 11,981 | 0.0062 | 0.9938 | 83.95 |
| 36.5 | 1,644,341 | 1,333 | 0.0008 | 0.9992 | 83.42 |
| 37.5 | 1,522,920 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 83.36 |
| 38.5 | 1,761,033 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 83.36 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 390.10 STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.

| PLACEMENT | ND 1911-2022 |  | EXPERIENCE BAND |  | 1997-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 39.5 | 1,741,457 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 83.36 |
| 40.5 | 1,734,557 | 6,322 | 0.0036 | 0.9964 | 83.36 |
| 41.5 | 1,673,737 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 83.05 |
| 42.5 | 1,428,879 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 83.05 |
| 43.5 | 1,397,442 | 160,052 | 0.1145 | 0.8855 | 83.05 |
| 44.5 | 1,216,253 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 73.54 |
| 45.5 | 1,205,258 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 73.54 |
| 46.5 | 1,196,483 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 73.54 |
| 47.5 | 1,196,338 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 73.54 |
| 48.5 | 1,097,149 | 28,151 | 0.0257 | 0.9743 | 73.54 |
| 49.5 | 1,017,491 | 67,043 | 0.0659 | 0.9341 | 71.65 |
| 50.5 | 950,448 | 6,606 | 0.0070 | 0.9930 | 66.93 |
| 51.5 | 943,842 | 12,962 | 0.0137 | 0.9863 | 66.47 |
| 52.5 | 930,880 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 65.55 |
| 53.5 | 925,924 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 65.55 |
| 54.5 | 925,610 | 477 | 0.0005 | 0.9995 | 65.55 |
| 55.5 | 766,270 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 65.52 |
| 56.5 | 728,303 | 1,003 | 0.0014 | 0.9986 | 65.52 |
| 57.5 | 323,638 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 65.43 |
| 58.5 | 323,638 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 65.43 |
| 59.5 | 323,143 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 65.43 |
| 60.5 | 323,143 | 5,082 | 0.0157 | 0.9843 | 65.43 |
| 61.5 | 318,061 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 62.5 | 318,061 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 63.5 | 312,123 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 64.5 | 11,784 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 65.5 | 11,759 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 66.5 | 7,090 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 67.5 | 2,815 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 68.5 | 2,815 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 69.5 | 1,653 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 70.5 | 1,653 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 71.5 | 1,653 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 72.5 | 1,653 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 73.5 | 1,653 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 74.5 | 1,653 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 75.5 | 1,653 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 76.5 | 11,499 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 77.5 | 11,499 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 78.5 | 11,499 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 390.10 STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.

| PLACEMENT | ND 1911-2022 |  | EXPERIENCE BAND |  | 1997-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 79.5 | 11,499 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 80.5 | 11,499 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 81.5 | 9,846 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 82.5 | 9,846 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 83.5 | 9,846 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 84.5 | 9,846 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 85.5 | 48,514 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 86.5 | 48,514 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 87.5 | 48,514 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 88.5 | 48,514 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 89.5 | 48,514 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 90.5 | 48,514 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 91.5 | 48,514 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 92.5 | 48,514 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 93.5 | 48,514 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 94.5 | 48,514 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 95.5 | 48,514 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 96.5 | 48,514 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 97.5 | 48,514 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 98.5 | 48,514 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 99.5 | 48,514 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 100.5 | 48,514 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 101.5 | 48,514 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 102.5 | 38,669 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 103.5 | 38,669 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 104.5 | 38,669 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 105.5 | 38,669 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 106.5 | 38,669 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 107.5 | 38,669 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 108.5 | 38,669 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 109.5 | 38,669 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 110.5 | 38,669 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 64.40 |
| 111.5 |  |  |  |  | 64.40 |


| Age At | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 0.0 | 7,983,872 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 0.5 | 10,490,873 | 116,073 | 0.0111 | 0.9889 | 100.00 |
| 1.5 | 10,633,579 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 98.89 |
| 2.5 | 10,096,525 | 24,389 | 0.0024 | 0.9976 | 98.89 |
| 3.5 | 9,764,304 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 98.65 |
| 4.5 | 8,531,562 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 98.65 |
| 5.5 | 8,496,341 | 40,683 | 0.0048 | 0.9952 | 98.65 |
| 6.5 | 5,895,690 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 98.18 |
| 7.5 | 5,187,934 | 87,075 | 0.0168 | 0.9832 | 98.18 |
| 8.5 | 5,075,523 | 171,968 | 0.0339 | 0.9661 | 96.53 |
| 9.5 | 4,646,474 | 264 | 0.0001 | 0.9999 | 93.26 |
| 10.5 | 3,321,367 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.26 |
| 11.5 | 4,850,801 | 10,430 | 0.0022 | 0.9978 | 93.26 |
| 12.5 | 4,956,575 | 10,967 | 0.0022 | 0.9978 | 93.06 |
| 13.5 | 4,398,958 | 8,559 | 0.0019 | 0.9981 | 92.85 |
| 14.5 | 4,543,146 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 92.67 |
| 15.5 | 4,255,940 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 92.67 |
| 16.5 | 3,910,691 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 92.67 |
| 17.5 | 4,197,440 | 14,166 | 0.0034 | 0.9966 | 92.67 |
| 18.5 | 3,938,361 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 92.36 |
| 19.5 | 4,878,623 | 224 | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 92.36 |
| 20.5 | 5,093,822 | 28,741 | 0.0056 | 0.9944 | 92.35 |
| 21.5 | 4,434,462 | 30,558 | 0.0069 | 0.9931 | 91.83 |
| 22.5 | 6,065,624 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 91.20 |
| 23.5 | 7,316,962 | 79,749 | 0.0109 | 0.9891 | 91.20 |
| 24.5 | 9,362,664 | 100,331 | 0.0107 | 0.9893 | 90.21 |
| 25.5 | 10,059,943 | 151,014 | 0.0150 | 0.9850 | 89.24 |
| 26.5 | 9,980,387 | 75,538 | 0.0076 | 0.9924 | 87.90 |
| 27.5 | 9,740,235 | 11,922 | 0.0012 | 0.9988 | 87.23 |
| 28.5 | 9,569,323 | 32,353 | 0.0034 | 0.9966 | 87.13 |
| 29.5 | 8,773,148 | 87,821 | 0.0100 | 0.9900 | 86.83 |
| 30.5 | 7,685,502 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 85.96 |
| 31.5 | 6,711,185 | 38,228 | 0.0057 | 0.9943 | 85.96 |
| 32.5 | 5,202,177 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 85.47 |
| 33.5 | 4,026,028 | 129,729 | 0.0322 | 0.9678 | 85.47 |
| 34.5 | 1,557,975 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 82.72 |
| 35.5 | 857,088 | 11,981 | 0.0140 | 0.9860 | 82.72 |
| 36.5 | 605,006 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 81.56 |
| 37.5 | 478,981 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 81.56 |
| 38.5 | 512,376 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 81.56 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 390.10 STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.

| PLACEMENT | ND 1911-2022 |  | EXPERIENCE BAND |  | 2013-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 39.5 | 732,485 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 81.56 |
| 40.5 | 720,916 | 6,322 | 0.0088 | 0.9912 | 81.56 |
| 41.5 | 655,822 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 80.85 |
| 42.5 | 410,964 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 80.85 |
| 43.5 | 394,272 | 160,052 | 0.4059 | 0.5941 | 80.85 |
| 44.5 | 213,397 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 48.03 |
| 45.5 | 354,475 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 48.03 |
| 46.5 | 399,048 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 48.03 |
| 47.5 | 874,353 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 48.03 |
| 48.5 | 775,165 | 28,151 | 0.0363 | 0.9637 | 48.03 |
| 49.5 | 696,001 | 67,043 | 0.0963 | 0.9037 | 46.28 |
| 50.5 | 628,958 | 6,606 | 0.0105 | 0.9895 | 41.83 |
| 51.5 | 622,352 | 12,962 | 0.0208 | 0.9792 | 41.39 |
| 52.5 | 609,390 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 40.52 |
| 53.5 | 610,372 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 40.52 |
| 54.5 | 915,480 | 477 | 0.0005 | 0.9995 | 40.52 |
| 55.5 | 754,511 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 40.50 |
| 56.5 | 721,213 | 1,003 | 0.0014 | 0.9986 | 40.50 |
| 57.5 | 320,822 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 40.45 |
| 58.5 | 320,822 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 40.45 |
| 59.5 | 321,489 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 40.45 |
| 60.5 | 321,489 | 5,082 | 0.0158 | 0.9842 | 40.45 |
| 61.5 | 316,407 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 39.81 |
| 62.5 | 316,407 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 39.81 |
| 63.5 | 310,469 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 39.81 |
| 64.5 | 10,130 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 39.81 |
| 65.5 | 10,106 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 39.81 |
| 66.5 | 5,437 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 39.81 |
| 67.5 | 1,162 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 39.81 |
| 68.5 | 1,162 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 39.81 |
| 69.5 |  |  |  |  | 39.81 |
| 70.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 71.5 | 1,653 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 72.5 | 1,653 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 73.5 | 1,653 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 74.5 | 1,653 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 75.5 | 1,653 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 76.5 | 1,653 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 77.5 | 1,653 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 78.5 | 1,653 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 390.10 STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.

| PLACEMENT BAND 1911-2022 |  |  | EXPERIENCE BAND |  | 2013-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age At | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 79.5 | 1,653 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 80.5 | 1,653 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 81.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 82.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 83.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 84.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 85.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 86.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 87.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 88.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 89.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 91.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 92.5 | 9,846 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 93.5 | 9,846 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 94.5 | 9,846 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 95.5 | 9,846 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 96.5 | 9,846 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 97.5 | 9,846 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 98.5 | 9,846 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 99.5 | 9,846 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 100.5 | 9,846 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 101.5 | 48,514 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 102.5 | 38,669 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 103.5 | 38,669 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 104.5 | 38,669 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 105.5 | 38,669 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 106.5 | 38,669 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 107.5 | 38,669 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 108.5 | 38,669 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 109.5 | 38,669 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 110.5 | 38,669 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 111.5 |  |  |  |  |  |



ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE

PLACEMENT BAND 1960-2022
EXPERIENCE BAND 1997-2022

| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 0.0 | 5,360,684 | 15,366 | 0.0029 | 0.9971 | 100.00 |
| 0.5 | 5,219,519 | 6,778 | 0.0013 | 0.9987 | 99.71 |
| 1.5 | 4,793,357 | 85,233 | 0.0178 | 0.9822 | 99.58 |
| 2.5 | 4,222,690 | 22,843 | 0.0054 | 0.9946 | 97.81 |
| 3.5 | 3,038,895 | 73,120 | 0.0241 | 0.9759 | 97.28 |
| 4.5 | 2,778,549 | 52,054 | 0.0187 | 0.9813 | 94.94 |
| 5.5 | 2,396,294 | 164,838 | 0.0688 | 0.9312 | 93.16 |
| 6.5 | 5,387,898 | 180,935 | 0.0336 | 0.9664 | 86.76 |
| 7.5 | 5,565,597 | 184,274 | 0.0331 | 0.9669 | 83.84 |
| 8.5 | 5,044,205 | 157,219 | 0.0312 | 0.9688 | 81.07 |
| 9.5 | 5,229,961 | 1,307,797 | 0.2501 | 0.7499 | 78.54 |
| 10.5 | 3,791,297 | 1,038,778 | 0.2740 | 0.7260 | 58.90 |
| 11.5 | 2,752,519 | 263,370 | 0.0957 | 0.9043 | 42.76 |
| 12.5 | 2,489,149 | 522,031 | 0.2097 | 0.7903 | 38.67 |
| 13.5 | 1,924,420 | 127,472 | 0.0662 | 0.9338 | 30.56 |
| 14.5 | 1,796,947 | 39,825 | 0.0222 | 0.9778 | 28.54 |
| 15.5 | 1,757,122 | 113,756 | 0.0647 | 0.9353 | 27.90 |
| 16.5 | 1,643,366 | 47,597 | 0.0290 | 0.9710 | 26.10 |
| 17.5 | 1,487,915 | 379,925 | 0.2553 | 0.7447 | 25.34 |
| 18.5 | 1,099,493 | 206,594 | 0.1879 | 0.8121 | 18.87 |
| 19.5 | 545,596 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 15.32 |
| 20.5 | 545,596 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 15.32 |
| 21.5 | 545,596 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 15.32 |
| 22.5 | 545,596 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 15.32 |
| 23.5 | 545,596 | 71,294 | 0.1307 | 0.8693 | 15.32 |
| 24.5 | 474,302 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 13.32 |
| 25.5 | 475,681 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 13.32 |
| 26.5 | 475,681 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 13.32 |
| 27.5 | 475,681 | 280 | 0.0006 | 0.9994 | 13.32 |
| 28.5 | 475,401 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 13.31 |
| 29.5 | 483,689 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 13.31 |
| 30.5 | 533,108 | 8,288 | 0.0155 | 0.9845 | 13.31 |
| 31.5 | 486,234 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 13.11 |
| 32.5 | 297,674 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 13.11 |
| 33.5 | 68,979 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 13.11 |
| 34.5 | 68,979 | 8,608 | 0.1248 | 0.8752 | 13.11 |
| 35.5 | 1,451 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 11.47 |
| 36.5 | 10,506 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 11.47 |
| 37.5 | 10,506 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 11.47 |
| 38.5 | 10,506 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 11.47 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 392.00 TRANSPORTATION EQUIPMENT

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE, CONT.

| PLACEMENT | AND 1960-2022 |  | EXPERIENCE BAND |  | 1997-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 39.5 | 10,506 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 11.47 |
| 40.5 | 10,506 | 1,451 | 0.1381 | 0.8619 | 11.47 |
| 41.5 | 9,055 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 9.89 |
| 42.5 | 9,055 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 9.89 |
| 43.5 | 9,055 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 9.89 |
| 44.5 | 9,055 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 9.89 |
| 45.5 | 9,055 | 9,055 | 1.0000 |  | 9.89 |
| 46.5 |  |  |  |  |  |

ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE

PLACEMENT BAND 1987-2022

| AGE AT | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 0.0 | 3,911,443 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 0.5 | 3,916,512 | 6,778 | 0.0017 | 0.9983 | 100.00 |
| 1.5 | 3,490,350 | 85,233 | 0.0244 | 0.9756 | 99.83 |
| 2.5 | 2,919,683 | 22,843 | 0.0078 | 0.9922 | 97.39 |
| 3.5 | 1,778,586 | 55,946 | 0.0315 | 0.9685 | 96.63 |
| 4.5 | 1,703,349 | 52,054 | 0.0306 | 0.9694 | 93.59 |
| 5.5 | 1,258,716 | 164,838 | 0.1310 | 0.8690 | 90.73 |
| 6.5 | 1,042,376 | 180,935 | 0.1736 | 0.8264 | 78.85 |
| 7.5 | 1,034,580 | 184,274 | 0.1781 | 0.8219 | 65.16 |
| 8.5 | 469,240 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 53.55 |
| 9.5 | 1,105,912 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 53.55 |
| 10.5 | 975,045 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 53.55 |
| 11.5 | 975,045 | 15,366 | 0.0158 | 0.9842 | 53.55 |
| 12.5 | 959,679 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 52.71 |
| 13.5 | 916,981 | 88,316 | 0.0963 | 0.9037 | 52.71 |
| 14.5 | 828,665 | 32,318 | 0.0390 | 0.9610 | 47.63 |
| 15.5 | 796,347 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 45.78 |
| 16.5 | 796,347 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 45.78 |
| 17.5 | 688,492 | 332,693 | 0.4832 | 0.5168 | 45.78 |
| 18.5 | 347,302 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 23.66 |
| 19.5 |  |  |  |  | 23.66 |
| 20.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21.5 | 40,037 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 22.5 | 236,106 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 23.5 | 536,095 | 71,294 | 0.1330 |  |  |
| 24.5 | 464,801 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 25.5 | 474,302 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 26.5 | 474,302 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 27.5 | 474,302 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 28.5 | 474,302 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 29.5 | 474,302 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 30.5 | 523,721 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 31.5 | 483,684 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 32.5 | 287,615 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 33.5 | 58,920 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |
| 34.5 | 58,920 |  | 0.0000 |  |  |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY
ACCOUNT 396.00 POWER OPERATED EQUIPMENT


ORIGINAL LIFE TABLE

| PLACEMENT | ND 1987-2022 |  | EXPERIENCE BAND |  | 1997-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age At | EXPOSURES AT | RETIREMENTS |  |  | PCT SURV |
| BEGIN OF | BEGINNING OF | DURING AGE | RETMT | SURV | BEGIN OF |
| INTERVAL | AGE INTERVAL | INTERVAL | RATIO | RATIO | INTERVAL |
| 0.0 | 272,514 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 0.5 | 272,409 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 1.5 | 272,233 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 2.5 | 271,887 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 100.00 |
| 3.5 | 271,887 | 9,398 | 0.0346 | 0.9654 | 100.00 |
| 4.5 | 262,489 | 8,400 | 0.0320 | 0.9680 | 96.54 |
| 5.5 | 240,066 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 6.5 | 341,084 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 7.5 | 635,138 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 8.5 | 651,224 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 9.5 | 678,351 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 10.5 | 552,041 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 11.5 | 552,041 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 12.5 | 552,041 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 13.5 | 594,093 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 14.5 | 594,093 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 15.5 | 594,093 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 16.5 | 594,093 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 17.5 | 589,955 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 18.5 | 589,955 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 19.5 | 589,955 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 20.5 | 589,955 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 21.5 | 589,955 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 22.5 | 589,955 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 23.5 | 589,955 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 24.5 | 589,955 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 25.5 | 589,955 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 26.5 | 589,955 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 27.5 | 589,955 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 28.5 | 589,955 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 29.5 | 589,955 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 30.5 | 547,904 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 31.5 | 547,904 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 32.5 | 446,886 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 33.5 | 51,035 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 34.5 | 34,948 |  | 0.0000 | 1.0000 | 93.45 |
| 35.5 |  |  |  |  | 93.45 |

## PART VIII. NET SALVAGE STATISTICS

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 361.00 STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS


THREE-YEAR MOVING AVERAGES

| 01-03 | 4,574 | 6,386 | 140 | 44 | 1 | 6,343- | 139- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02-04 | 3,120 | 6,320 | 203 | 44 | 1 | 6,276- | 201- |
| 03-05 | 2,052 | 4,848 | 236 | 44 | 2 | 4,804- | $234-$ |
| 04-06 | 7,720 | 216 | 3 |  | 0 | 216- | $3-$ |
| 05-07 | 7,720 | 216 | 3 |  | 0 | 216- | $3-$ |
| 06-08 | 10,128 | 216 | 2 |  | 0 | 216 | $2-$ |
| 07-09 | 3,157 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 08-10 | 4,605 | 605 | 13 |  | 0 | 605- | $13-$ |
| 09-11 | 4,209 | 1,264 | 30 |  | 0 | 1,264- | $30-$ |
| 10-12 | 4,209 | 1,264 | 30 |  | 0 | 1,264- | $30-$ |
| 11-13 | 2,761 | 659 | 24 |  | 0 | 659- | $24-$ |
| 12-14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13-15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14-16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-17 | 1,058 | 1,403 | 133 |  | 0 | 1,403- | 133- |
| 16-18 | 1,058 | 1,403 | 133 |  | 0 | 1,403- | 133- |

VIII-2
The Potomac Edison Company
June 30, 2022


THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 362.00 STATION EQUIPMENT

SUMMARY OF BOOK SALVAGE

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | REGULAR | COST OF |  | GROSS | NET | SALVAGE |

THREE-YEAR MOVING AVERAGES

| $01-03$ | 408,544 |
| ---: | ---: |
| $02-04$ | 406,350 |
| $03-05$ | 83,816 |
| $04-06$ | 320,551 |
| $05-07$ | 326,797 |
| $06-08$ | 434,436 |
| $07-09$ | 205,048 |
| $08-10$ | $1,088,500$ |
| $09-11$ | 998,082 |
| $10-12$ | 985,010 |
| $11-13$ | 579,798 |
| $12-14$ | 602,672 |
| $13-15$ | 849,798 |
| $14-16$ | 390,597 |
| $15-17$ | 375,548 |
| $16-18$ | 279,244 |


| 31,171 | 8 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 27,252 | 7 |
| 12,241 | 15 |
| 29,114 | 9 |
| 30,769 | 9 |
| 58,619 | 13 |
| 42,872 | 21 |
| 204,374 | 19 |
| 179,344 | 18 |
| 169,024 | 17 |
| 35,104 | 6 |
| 43,763 | 7 |
| 44,867 | 5 |
| 22,892 | 6 |
| 16,338 | 4 |
| 103,312 | 37 |


| 74,078 | 18 | 42,907 | 11 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 69,408 | 17 | 42,156 | 10 |
| 603 | 1 | $11,639-$ | $14-$ |
| 525 | 0 | $28,589-$ | $9-$ |
|  | 0 | $30,769-$ | $9-$ |
|  | 0 | $58,619-$ | $13-$ |
| 58,665 | 0 | $42,872-$ | $21-$ |
| 68,068 | 7 | $145,709-$ | $13-$ |
| 68,068 | 7 | $111,276-$ | $11-$ |
| 16,268 | 3 | $100,956-$ | $10-$ |
| 6,865 | 1 | $18,836-$ | $3-$ |
| 6,865 | 1 | $36,898-$ | $6-$ |
|  | 0 | $38,002-$ | $4-$ |
|  | 0 | $22,892-$ | $6-$ |
| 3,291 | 1 | $16,338-$ | $4-$ |
|  |  | $100,021-$ | $36-$ |



ACCOUNT 364.00 POLES, TOWERS AND FIXTURES SUMMARY OF BOOK SALVAGE

|  | REGULAR | COST OF <br> REMOVAL |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { GROSS } \\ \text { SALVAG } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { NET } \\ \text { SALVAGE } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | RETIREMENTS | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT |
| 2001 | 30,170 | 248,903 | 825 | 117,935 | 391 | 130,968- | 434- |
| 2002 | 68,004 | 211,868 | 312 | 8,980 | 13 | 202,888- | 298- |
| 2003 | 61,258 | 143,475 | 234 | 12,682 | 21 | 130,792- | 214- |
| 2004 | 97,844 | 569,284 | 582 | 92,997 | 95 | 476,288- | 487- |
| 2005 | 76,165 | 436,445 | 573 | 24,052 | 32 | 412,394- | 541- |
| 2006 | 89,746 | 369,083 | 411 | 886 | 1 | 368,197- | 410- |
| 2007 | 69,150 | 164,715 | 238 | 4,875 | 7 | 159,841- | 231- |
| 2008 | 144,554 | $1,653,481$ |  |  | 0 | 1,653,481- |  |
| 2009 | 89,826 | 351,455 | 391 | 1,688 | 2 | 349,768- | $389-$ |
| 2010 | 65,106 | $1,064,950$ |  |  | 0 | 1,064,950- |  |
| 2011 | 58,224 | 768,267 |  | 3 | 0 | 768,265- |  |
| 2012 | 41,785 | 52,606 | 126 |  | 0 | 52,606- | 126- |
| 2013 | 64,509 | $3,130,042$ |  | 3,531 | 5 | 3,126,511- |  |
| 2014 | 46,585 | 1,269,772 |  |  | 0 | 1,269,772- |  |
| 2015 | 91,799 | 823,833 | 897 |  | 0 | 823,833- | 897- |
| 2016 | 155,864 | 417,199 | 268 |  | 0 | 417,199- | 268- |
| 2017 | 192,690 | 730,134 | 379 |  | 0 | 730,134- | 379 - |
| 2018 | 182,093 | 1,026,978 | 564 |  | 0 | 1,026,978- | $564-$ |
| 2019 | 122,415 | 928,299 | 758 |  | 0 | 928,299- | 758- |
| 2020 | 116,245 | $1,068,283$ | 919 |  | 0 | 1,068,283- | 919- |
| 2021 | 86,886 | 887,382 |  |  | 0 | 887,382- |  |
| 2022 | 75,880 | 461,420 | 608 |  | 0 | 461,420- | 608- |
| TOTAL | $2,026,798$ | 16,777,877 | 828 | 267,627 | 13 | 16,510,250- | 815- |

## THREE-YEAR MOVING AVERAGES

| $01-03$ | 53,144 | 201,415 | 379 | 46,532 | 88 | $154,883-291-$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $02-04$ | 75,702 | 308,209 | 407 | 38,220 | 50 | $269,989-957-$ |
| $03-05$ | 78,423 | 383,068 | 488 | 43,243 | 55 | $339,825-433-$ |
| $04-06$ | 87,919 | 458,271 | 521 | 39,311 | 45 | $418,959-477-$ |
| $05-07$ | 78,354 | 323,415 | 413 | 9,937 | 13 | $313,477-400-$ |
| $06-08$ | 101,150 | 729,093 | 721 | 1,920 | 2 | $727,173-719-$ |
| $07-09$ | 101,177 | 723,217 | 715 | 2,187 | 2 | $721,030-713-$ |
| $08-10$ | 99,829 | $1,023,295$ | 563 | 1 | $1,022,733-$ |  |
| $09-11$ | 71,052 | 728,224 | 563 | 1 | $727,661-$ |  |
| $10-12$ | 55,038 | 628,608 | 1 | 0 | $628,607-$ |  |
| $11-13$ | 54,839 | $1,316,972$ | 1,178 | 2 | $1,315,794-$ |  |
| $12-14$ | 50,959 | $1,484,140$ | 1,177 | 2 | $1,482,963-$ |  |
| $13-15$ | 67,631 | $1,741,216$ |  | 1,177 | 2 | $1,740,039-$ |
| $14-16$ | 98,083 | 836,935 | 853 |  | 0 | $836,935-853-$ |
| $15-17$ | 146,784 | 657,056 | 448 |  | 0 | $657,056-448-$ |
| $16-18$ | 176,882 | 724,770 | 410 |  |  | $724,770-410-$ |

[^124]| THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACCOUNT 364.00 POLES, TOWERS AND FIXTURES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUMMARY OF BOOK SALVAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | REGULAR | COST OF REMOVAL |  | GROS |  | NET <br> SALVAGE |  |
| YEAR | RETIREMENTS | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT |
| THREE-YEAR MOVING AVERAGES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-19 | 165,733 | 895,137 | 540 |  | 0 | 895,137- | $540-$ |
| 18-20 | 140,251 | 1,007,853 | 719 |  | 0 | 1,007,853- | 719 - |
| 19-21 | 108,515 | 961,322 | 886 |  | 0 | 961,322- | 886- |
| 20-22 | 93,004 | 805,695 | 866 |  | 0 | 805,695- | 866- |
| FIVE-YEAR AVERAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-22 | 116,704 | 874,472 | 749 |  | 0 | 874,472- | 749 - |

## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

## ACCOUNT 365.00 OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES

|  | SUMMARY OF BOOK SALVAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | REGULAR | COST OF REMOVAL |  | GROSS <br> SALVAGE |  | NET <br> SALVAGE |  |
| YEAR | RETIREMENTS | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT |
| 2001 | 214,180 | 14,690 | 7 | 199,287 | 93 | 184,597 | 86 |
| 2002 | 523,695 | 294,733 | 56 | 409,214 | 78 | 114,481 | 22 |
| 2003 | 378,701 | 411,724 | 109 | 300,700 | 79 | 111,024- | $29-$ |
| 2004 | 708,982 | 713,738 | 101 | 198,771 | 28 | 514,967- | $73-$ |
| 2005 | 683,397 | 343,858 | 50 | 20,670 | 3 | 323,187- | $47-$ |
| 2006 | 794,991 | 252,530 | 32 | 753,725 | 95 | 501,195 | 63 |
| 2007 | 437,427 | 179,029 | 41 | 2,182 | 0 | 176,847- | $40-$ |
| 2008 | 486,157 | 318,478 | 66 |  | 0 | 318,478- | 66 |
| 2009 | 260,088 | 137,019 | 53 | 581 | 0 | 136,437- | $52-$ |
| 2010 | 283,073 | 221,405 | 78 | 36,363 | 13 | 185,041- | $65-$ |
| 2011 | 629,929 | 262,514 | 42 |  | 0 | 262,514- | $42-$ |
| 2012 | 302,299 | 88,148 | 29 |  | 0 | 88,148- | $29-$ |
| 2013 | 894,225 | 5,054,736 | 565 |  | 0 | 5,054,736- | 565- |
| 2014 | 666,225 | 1,263,589 | 190 |  | 0 | 1,263,589- | 190- |
| 2015 | 881,656 | 1,338,463 | 152 |  | 0 | 1,338,463- | 152- |
| 2016 | 746,232 | 678,270 | 91 |  | 0 | 678,270- | 91 - |
| 2017 | 893,682 | 1,100,714 | 123 |  | 0 | 1,100,714- | 123- |
| 2018 | 1,009,111 | 2,014,348 | 200 |  | 0 | 2,014,348- | 200 |
| 2019 | 944,065 | 1,954,781 | 207 |  | 0 | 1,954,781- | 207- |
| 2020 | 1,105,145 | 2,131,341 | 193 |  | 0 | 2,131,341- | 193- |
| 2021 | 856,660 | 1,451,644 | 169 |  | 0 | 1,451,644- | 169- |
| 2022 | 492,872 | 700,623 | 142 |  | 0 | 700,623- | 142- |
| TOTAL | 14,192,792 | 20,926,372 | 147 | 1,921,494 | 14 | 19,004,878- | 134 |

THREE-YEAR MOVING AVERAGES

| $01-03$ | 372,192 | 240,382 | 65 | 303,067 | 81 | 62,685 | 17 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $02-04$ | 537,126 | 473,398 | 88 | 302,895 | 56 | $170,503-$ | $32-$ |
| $03-05$ | 590,360 | 489,773 | 83 | 173,381 | 29 | $316,393-$ | $54-$ |
| $04-06$ | 729,124 | 436,709 | 60 | 324,389 | 44 | $112,320-$ | $15-$ |
| $05-07$ | 638,605 | 258,472 | 40 | 258,859 | 41 | 387 | 0 |
| $06-08$ | 572,858 | 250,012 | 44 | 251,969 | 44 | 1,957 | 0 |
| $07-09$ | 394,557 | 211,509 | 54 | 921 | 0 | $210,587-$ | $53-$ |
| $08-10$ | 343,106 | 225,634 | 66 | 12,315 | 4 | $213,319-$ | $62-$ |
| $09-11$ | 391,030 | 206,979 | 53 | 12,315 | 3 | $194,664-$ | $50-$ |
| $10-12$ | 405,100 | 190,689 | 47 | 12,121 | 3 | $178,568-$ | $44-$ |
| $11-13$ | 608,818 | $1,801,799$ | 296 |  | 0 | $1,801,799-296-$ |  |
| $12-14$ | 620,916 | $2,135,491$ | 344 |  | 0 | $2,135,491-$ | $344-$ |
| $13-15$ | 814,036 | $2,552,262$ | 314 |  | 0 | $2,552,262-$ | $314-$ |
| $14-16$ | 764,704 | $1,093,441$ | 143 |  | 0 | $1,093,441-143-$ |  |
| $15-17$ | 840,523 | $1,039,149$ | 124 |  |  | $1,039,149-$ | $124-$ |
| $16-18$ | 883,008 | $1,264,444$ | 143 |  |  | $1,264,444-$ | $143-$ |



## SUMMARY OF BOOK SALVAGE

|  | REGULAR | COST OF REMOVAL |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { GROSS } \\ \text { SALVAG } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { NET } \\ \text { SALVAGE } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | RETIREMENTS | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT |
| 2001 | 39,700 | 5,630 | 14 | 5,883 | 15 | 253 | 1 |
| 2002 | 62,209 | 5,625 | 9 | 3,384 | 5 | 2,241- | 4 - |
| 2003 | 29,811 | 9,329 | 31 | 5,520 | 19 | 3,809- | 13- |
| 2004 | 42,032 | 106,697 | 254 | 19,358 | 46 | 87,339- | 208- |
| 2005 | 42,441 | 42,277 | 100 | 5,253 | 12 | 37,023- | 87- |
| 2006 | 48,121 | 1,478 | 3 |  | 0 | 1,478- | 3- |
| 2007 | 34,117 | 16,948 | 50 | 195 | 1 | 16,753- | 49- |
| 2008 | 46,845 | 9,627 | 21 |  | 0 | 9,627- | 21- |
| 2009 | 35,412 | 16,239 | 46 | 218 | 1 | 16,021- | 45- |
| 2010 | 24,222 | 8,226 | 34 |  | 0 | 8,226- | $34-$ |
| 2011 | 22,129 | 22,294 | 101 |  | 0 | 22,294- | 101- |
| 2012 | 14,137 | 32 | 0 |  | 0 | 32- | 0 |
| 2013 | 8,693 | 16,619 | 191 |  | 0 | 16,619- | 191- |
| 2014 | 35,996 | 208,086 | 578 |  | 0 | 208,086- | 578- |
| 2015 | 15,641 | 142,134 | 909 |  | 0 | 142,134- | 909- |
| 2016 | 73,247 | 33,505 | 46 |  | 0 | 33,505- | 46- |
| 2017 | 9,432 | 82,644 | 876 |  | 0 | 82,644- | 876- |
| 2018 | 7,904 | 2,397 | 30 |  | 0 | 2,397- | $30-$ |
| 2019 | 4,618 | 15,185 | 329 |  | 0 | 15,185- | 329- |
| 2020 | 693 | 8,897 |  |  | 0 | 8,897- |  |
| 2021 |  | 5,510 |  |  |  | 5,510- |  |
| 2022 | 6,291 | 172 | 3 |  | 0 | 172- | $3-$ |
| TOTAL | 603,691 | 759,549 | 126 | 39,811 | 7 | 719,738- | 119- |

THREE-YEAR MOVING AVERAGES

| $01-03$ | 43,907 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $02-04$ | 44,684 |
| $03-05$ | 38,095 |
| $04-06$ | 44,198 |
| $05-07$ | 41,560 |
| $06-08$ | 43,028 |
| $07-09$ | 38,792 |
| $08-10$ | 35,493 |
| $09-11$ | 27,255 |
| $10-12$ | 20,163 |
| $11-13$ | 14,986 |
| $12-14$ | 19,609 |
| $13-15$ | 20,110 |
| $14-16$ | 41,628 |
| $15-17$ | 32,773 |
| $16-18$ | 30,194 |


| 6,861 | 16 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 40,550 | 91 |
| 52,768 | 139 |
| 50,151 | 113 |
| 20,234 | 49 |
| 9,351 | 22 |
| 14,271 | 37 |
| 11,364 | 32 |
| 15,586 | 57 |
| 10,184 | 51 |
| 12,982 | 87 |
| 74,912 | 382 |
| 122,280 | 608 |
| 127,908 | 307 |
| 86,094 | 263 |
| 39,515 | 131 |


| 4,929 | 11 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 9,421 | 21 |
| 10,044 | 26 |
| 8,204 | 19 |
| 1,816 | 4 |
| 65 | 0 |
| 138 | 0 |
| 73 | 0 |
| 73 | 0 |
|  | 0 |
|  | 0 |
|  | 0 |
|  | 0 |
|  | 0 |
|  | 0 |

$$
\begin{array}{rr}
1,932- & 4- \\
31,130- & 70- \\
42,724- & 112- \\
41,947- & 95- \\
18,418- & 44- \\
9,286- & 22- \\
14,134- & 36- \\
11,291- & 32- \\
15,513- & 57- \\
10,184- & 51- \\
12,982- & 87- \\
74,912- & 382- \\
122,280- & 608- \\
127,908- & 307- \\
86,094- & 263- \\
39,515- & 131-
\end{array}
$$

| THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACCOUNT 366.00 UNDERGROUND CONDUIT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUMMARY OF BOOK SALVAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | COST OF |  | GROS |  | NET |  |
|  | REGULAR | REMOVAL |  | SALVA |  | SALVAGE |  |
| YEAR | RETIREMENTS | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT |
| THREE-YEAR MOVING AVERAGES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-19 | 7,318 | 33,409 | 457 |  | 0 | 33,409- | 457- |
| 18-20 | 4,405 | 8,826 | 200 |  | 0 | 8,826- | 200- |
| 19-21 | 1,770 | 9,864 | 557 |  | 0 | 9,864- | $557-$ |
| 20-22 | 2,328 | 4,859 | 209 |  | 0 | 4,859- | 209- |
| FIVE-YEAR AVERAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-22 | 3,901 | 6,432 | 165 |  | 0 | 6,432- | 165- |

## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 367.00 UNDERGROUND CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES

|  | SUMMARY OF BOOK SALVAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | REGULAR | COST OF |  | GROSS |  | NET |  |
|  |  | REMOVAL |  | SALVAGE |  | SALVAGE |  |
| YEAR | RETIREMENTS | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT |
| 2001 | 53,986 | 68,709 | 127 | 10,540 | 20 | 58,168- | 108- |
| 2002 | 373,964 | 2,834 | 1 | 351 | 0 | 2,483- | $1-$ |
| 2003 | 220,217 | 33,846 | 15 | 25,332 | 12 | 8,514- | $4-$ |
| 2004 | 494,594 | 500,099 | 101 | 78,739 | 16 | 421,360- | 85- |
| 2005 | 484,632 | 199,688 | 41 | 9,507 | 2 | 190,181- | 39- |
| 2006 | 448,213 | 51,572 | 12 | 149 | 0 | 51,423- | 11- |
| 2007 | 241,313 | 249,689 | 103 | 573 | 0 | 249,115- | 103- |
| 2008 | 546,516 | 188,061 | 34 |  | 0 | 188,061- | $34-$ |
| 2009 | 402,516 | 138,035 | 34 | 122 | 0 | 137,914- | $34-$ |
| 2010 | 308,993 | 176,278 | 57 |  | 0 | 176,278- | 57- |
| 2011 | 409,224 | 314,064 | 77 | 96,926- | 24- | 410,990- | 100- |
| 2012 | 364,370 | 47,507 | 13 |  | 0 | 47,507- | 13- |
| 2013 | 2,489,610 | 1,221,941 | 49 |  | 0 | 1,221,941- | 49- |
| 2014 | 1,627,142 | 911,944 | 56 |  | 0 | 911,944- | $56-$ |
| 2015 | 3,074,515 | 792,308 | 26 |  | 0 | 792,308- | 26- |
| 2016 | 1,813,125 | 613,650 | 34 |  | 0 | 613,650- | 34- |
| 2017 | 1,276,644 | 631,723 | 49 |  | 0 | 631,723- | 49- |
| 2018 | 1,270,270 | 1,301,056 | 102 |  | 0 | 1,301,056- | 102- |
| 2019 | 4,118,520 | 2,953,803 | 72 |  | 0 | 2,953,803- | 72- |
| 2020 | 3,806,762 | 2,563,284 | 67 |  | 0 | 2,563,284- | 67- |
| 2021 | 3,328,915 | 1,955,014 | 59 |  | 0 | 1,955,014- | $59-$ |
| 2022 | 2,085,014 | 870,858 | 42 |  | 0 | 870,858- | 42- |
| TOTAL | 29,239,056 | 15,785,964 | 54 | 28,388 | 0 | 15,757,576- | $54-$ |

## THREE-YEAR MOVING AVERAGES

| $01-03$ | 216,056 | 35,130 | 16 | 12,075 | 6 | $23,055-$ | $11-$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $02-04$ | 362,925 | 178,926 | 49 | 34,807 | 10 | $144,119-$ | $40-$ |
| $03-05$ | 399,814 | 244,544 | 61 | 37,859 | 9 | $206,685-$ | $52-$ |
| $04-06$ | 475,813 | 250,453 | 53 | 29,465 | 6 | $220,988-$ | $46-$ |
| $05-07$ | 391,386 | 166,983 | 43 | 3,410 | 1 | $163,573-$ | $42-$ |
| $06-08$ | 412,014 | 163,107 | 40 | 241 | 0 | $162,866-$ | $40-$ |
| $07-09$ | 396,782 | 191,928 | 48 | 232 | 0 | $191,697-$ | $48-$ |
| $08-10$ | 419,342 | 167,458 | 40 | 41 | 0 | $167,418-$ | $40-$ |
| $09-11$ | 373,577 | 209,459 | 56 | $32,268-$ | $9-$ | $241,727-$ | $65-$ |
| $10-12$ | 360,862 | 179,283 | 50 | $32,309-$ | $9-$ | $211,592-$ | $59-$ |
| $11-13$ | $1,087,735$ | 527,837 | 49 | $32,309-$ | $3-$ | $560,146-$ | $51-$ |
| $12-14$ | $1,493,707$ | 727,131 | 49 |  | 0 | $727,131-$ | $49-$ |
| $13-15$ | $2,397,089$ | 975,398 | 41 |  | 0 | $975,398-$ | $41-$ |
| $14-16$ | $2,171,594$ | 772,634 | 36 |  | 0 | $772,634-$ | $36-$ |
| $15-17$ | $2,054,761$ | 679,227 | 33 |  |  | $679,227-$ | $33-$ |
| $16-18$ | $1,453,346$ | 848,810 | 58 |  |  | $848,810-$ | $58-$ |



|  | REGULAR | COST OF REMOVAL |  | GROSS <br> SALVAGE |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { NET } \\ \text { SALVAGE } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | RETIREMENTS | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT |
| 2001 | 441,813 | 227,681 | 52 | 329,394 | 75 | 101,713 | 23 |
| 2002 | 896,475 | 162,276 | 18 | 21,366 | 2 | 140,910- | 16 - |
| 2003 | 566,476 | 269,683 | 48 | 53,561 | 9 | 216,122- | $38-$ |
| 2004 | 852,125 | 778,297 | 91 | 112,640 | 13 | 665,657- | 78- |
| 2005 | 732,780 | 410,953 | 56 | 16,340 | 2 | 394,613- | $54-$ |
| 2006 | 821,384 | 233,318 | 28 | 2,817 | 0 | 230,501- | 28- |
| 2007 | 658,806 | 134,828 | 20 | 994 | 0 | 133,834- | $20-$ |
| 2008 | 779,212 | 544,513 | 70 |  | 0 | 544,513- | $70-$ |
| 2009 | 642,481 | 266,886 | 42 | 382 | 0 | 266,504- | 41- |
| 2010 | 571,425 | 502,814 | 88 |  | 0 | 502,814- | 88- |
| 2011 | 724,210 | 806,369 | 111 |  | 0 | 806,369- | 111- |
| 2012 | 525,370 | 56,086 | 11 |  | 0 | 56,086- | 11- |
| 2013 | 2,659,290 | 1,231,840 | 46 |  | 0 | 1,231,840- | 46 |
| 2014 | 1,245,625 | 900,580 | 72 |  | 0 | 900,580- | $72-$ |
| 2015 | 1,702,389 | 475,277 | 28 |  | 0 | 475,277- | 28- |
| 2016 | 1,624,413 | 265,192 | 16 |  | 0 | 265,192- | $16-$ |
| 2017 | 1,501,969 | 365,767 | 24 |  | 0 | 365,767- | $24-$ |
| 2018 | 2,057,459 | 572,830 | 28 |  | 0 | 572,830- | $28-$ |
| 2019 | 2,429,685 | 707,884 | 29 |  | 0 | 707,884- | $29-$ |
| 2020 | 2,368,606 | 752,109 | 32 |  | 0 | 752,109- | 32- |
| 2021 | 2,099,679 | 590,687 | 28 |  | 0 | 590,687- | $28-$ |
| 2022 | 974,274 | 252,587 | 26 |  | 0 | 252,587- | 26 |
| TOTAL | 26,875,948 | 10,508,457 | 39 | 537,494 | 2 | 9,970,963- | $37-$ |

THREE-YEAR MOVING AVERAGES

| $01-03$ | 634,921 |
| ---: | ---: |
| $02-04$ | 771,692 |
| $03-05$ | 717,127 |
| $04-06$ | 802,096 |
| $05-07$ | 737,657 |
| $06-08$ | 753,134 |
| $07-09$ | 693,500 |
| $08-10$ | 664,373 |
| $09-11$ | 646,039 |
| $10-12$ | 607,002 |
| $11-13$ | $1,302,957$ |
| $12-14$ | $1,476,762$ |
| $13-15$ | $1,869,102$ |
| $14-16$ | $1,524,142$ |
| $15-17$ | $1,609,590$ |
| $16-18$ | $1,727,947$ |


| 219,880 | 35 | 134,774 | 21 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 403,419 | 52 | 62,522 | 8 |
| 486,311 | 68 | 60,847 | 8 |
| 474,189 | 59 | 43,932 | 5 |
| 259,700 | 35 | 6,717 | 1 |
| 304,220 | 40 | 1,270 | 0 |
| 315,409 | 45 | 458 | 0 |
| 438,071 | 66 | 127 | 0 |
| 525,356 | 81 | 127 | 0 |
| 455,090 | 75 |  | 0 |
| 698,098 | 54 |  | 0 |
| 729,502 | 49 |  | 0 |
| 869,232 | 47 |  | 0 |
| 547,016 | 36 |  | 0 |
| 368,745 | 23 |  | 0 |
| 401,263 | 23 |  | 0 |


| $85,106-$ | $13-$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $340,896-$ | $44-$ |
| $425,464-$ | $59-$ |
| $430,257-$ | $54-$ |
| $252,983-$ | $34-$ |
| $302,949-$ | $40-$ |
| $314,950-$ | $45-$ |
| $437,944-$ | $66-$ |
| $525,229-$ | $81-$ |
| $455,090-$ | $75-$ |
| $698,098-$ | $54-$ |
| $729,502-$ | $49-$ |
| $869,232-$ | $47-$ |
| $547,016-$ | $36-$ |
| $368,745-$ | $23-$ |
| $401,263-$ | $23-$ |


| THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACCOUNT 368.00 LINE TRANSFORMERS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUMMARY OF BOOK SALVAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | REGULAR | COST OF REMOVAL |  | GROS |  | NET <br> SALVAGE |  |
| YEAR | RETIREMENTS | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT |
| THREE-YEAR MOVING AVERAGES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-19 | 1,996,371 | 548,827 | 27 |  | 0 | 548,827- | 27- |
| 18-20 | 2,285,250 | 677,608 | 30 |  | 0 | 677,608- | 30- |
| 19-21 | 2,299,324 | 683,560 | 30 |  | 0 | 683,560- | 30- |
| 20-22 | 1,814,187 | 531,794 | 29 |  | 0 | 531,794- | 29- |
| FIVE-YEAR AVERAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-22 | 1,985,941 | 575,220 | 29 |  | 0 | 575,220- | $29-$ |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

|  | ACCOUNT 369.00 SERVICES |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SUMMARY OF BOOK SALVAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | REGULAR | COST OF REMOVAL |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { GROSS } \\ \text { SALVAGE } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { NET } \\ \text { SALVAGE } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| YEAR | RETIREMENTS | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT |
| 2001 | 26,339 | 18,141 | 69 | 36,286 | 138 | 18,144 | 69 |
| 2002 | 32,925 | 3,270 | 10 |  | 0 | 3,270- | 10- |
| 2003 | 31,522 | 24,980 | 79 | 7,558 | 24 | 17,423- | 55- |
| 2004 | 53,789 | 221,997 | 413 | 45,346 | 84 | 176,651- | 328- |
| 2005 | 32,423 | 187,337 | 578 | 33,545 | 103 | 153,792- | 474- |
| 2006 | 57,748 | 8,015 | 14 | 1,051 | 2 | 6,964- | 12- |
| 2007 | 14,702 | 79,065 | 538 | 1,405 | 10 | 77,660- | 528- |
| 2008 | 16,449 | 52,808 | 321 |  | 0 | 52,808- | 321- |
| 2009 | 11,486 | 50,880 | 443 | 531 | 5 | 50,349- | 438- |
| 2010 | 19,669 | 39,136 | 199 |  | 0 | 39,136- | 199- |
| 2011 | 13,271 | 109,864 | 828 |  | 0 | 109,864- | 828- |
| 2012 | 20,595 | 14,172 | 69 |  | 0 | 14,172- | 69- |
| 2013 | 50,234 | 104,056 | 207 |  | 0 | 104,056- | 207- |
| 2014 | 36,645 | 123,391 | 337 |  | 0 | 123,391- | 337- |
| 2015 | 36,500 | 114,902 | 315 |  | 0 | 114,902- | 315- |
| 2016 | 36,457 | 106,095 | 291 |  | 0 | 106,095- | 291- |
| 2017 | 136,375 | 404,689 | 297 |  | 0 | 404,689- | 297- |
| 2018 | 31,824 | 117,230 | 368 |  | 0 | 117,230- | 368- |
| 2019 | 20,246 | 193,840 | 957 |  | 0 | 193,840- | 957- |
| 2020 | 47,351 | 239,994 | 507 |  | 0 | 239,994- | 507- |
| 2021 | 9,161 | 199,219 |  |  | 0 | 199,219- |  |
| 2022 | 55,746 | 144,374 | 259 |  | 0 | 144,374- | 259- |
| TOTAL | 791,457 | 2,557,459 | 323 | 125,722 | 16 | 2,431,737- | 307- |

THREE-YEAR MOVING AVERAGES

| $01-03$ | 30,262 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $02-04$ | 39,412 |
| $03-05$ | 39,245 |
| $04-06$ | 47,987 |
| $05-07$ | 34,957 |
| $06-08$ | 29,633 |
| $07-09$ | 14,212 |
| $08-10$ | 15,868 |
| $09-11$ | 14,809 |
| $10-12$ | 17,845 |
| $11-13$ | 28,033 |
| $12-14$ | 35,825 |
| $13-15$ | 41,126 |
| $14-16$ | 36,534 |
| $15-17$ | 69,778 |
| $16-18$ | 68,219 |


| 15,464 | 51 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 83,416 | 212 |
| 144,772 | 369 |
| 139,116 | 290 |
| 91,472 | 262 |
| 46,629 | 157 |
| 60,918 | 429 |
| 47,608 | 300 |
| 66,627 | 450 |
| 54,391 | 305 |
| 76,031 | 271 |
| 80,540 | 225 |
| 114,116 | 277 |
| 114,796 | 314 |
| 208,562 | 299 |
| 209,338 | 307 |


| 14,614 | 48 | $850-$ | $3-$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 17,634 | 45 | $65,781-$ | $167-$ |
| 28,816 | 73 | $115,955-$ | $295-$ |
| 26,648 | 56 | $112,469-$ | $234-$ |
| 12,001 | 34 | $79,472-227-$ |  |
| 819 | 3 | $45,810-$ | $155-$ |
| 645 | 5 | $60,272-424-$ |  |
| 177 | 1 | $47,431-299-$ |  |
| 177 | 1 | $66,450-449-$ |  |
|  | 0 | $54,391-305-$ |  |
|  | 0 | $76,031-271-$ |  |
|  | 0 | $80,540-225-$ |  |
|  | 0 | $114,116-277-$ |  |
|  | 0 | $114,796-314-$ |  |
|  | 0 | $208,562-$ | $299-$ |
|  | 0 | $209,338-$ | $307-$ |


| THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACCOUNT 369.00 SERVICES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUMMARY OF BOOK SALVAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | COST OF |  | GROS |  | NET |  |
|  | REGULAR | REMOVAL |  | SALV |  | SALVAGE |  |
| YEAR | RETIREMENTS | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT |
| THREE-YEAR MOVING AVERAGES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-19 | 62,815 | 238,587 | 380 |  | 0 | 238,587- | 380- |
| 18-20 | 33,140 | 183,688 | 554 |  | 0 | 183,688- | $554-$ |
| 19-21 | 25,586 | 211,018 | 825 |  | 0 | 211,018- | 825- |
| 20-22 | 37,419 | 194,529 | 520 |  | 0 | 194,529- | 520- |
| FIVE-YEAR AVERAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-22 | 32,866 | 178,932 | 544 |  | 0 | 178,932- | $544-$ |

## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

## ACCOUNT 370.00 METERS

## SUMMARY OF BOOK SALVAGE

|  | REGULAR | COST OF REMOVAL |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { GROSS } \\ \text { SALVAGE } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { NET } \\ \text { SALVAGE } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | RETIREMENTS | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT |
| 2001 | 417,990 | 34,975 | 8 | 16,956 | 4 | 18,019- | $4-$ |
| 2002 | 42,212 | 1,403 | 3 | 3,171 | 8 | 1,768 | 4 |
| 2003 | 36,804 | 6,972 | 19 | 2,318 | 6 | 4,654- | 13- |
| 2004 | 106,479 | 40,480 | 38 | 12,607 | 12 | 27,873- | 26- |
| 2005 | 57,516 | 75,980 | 132 | 1,761 | 3 | 74,219- | 129- |
| 2006 | 95,704 | 1,793- | 2- | 339 | 0 | 2,132 | 2 |
| 2007 | 79,864 | 58,890 | 74 | 120 | 0 | 58,770- | $74-$ |
| 2008 | 190,465 | 78,375 | 41 |  | 0 | 78,375- | 41- |
| 2009 | 167,901 | 114,185 | 68 |  | 0 | 114,185- | 68- |
| 2010 | 159,025 | 231,792 | 146 |  | 0 | 231,792- | 146- |
| 2011 | 141,361 | 223,395 | 158 |  | 0 | 223,395- | 158- |
| 2012 | 250,242 | 107,596 | 43 |  | 0 | 107,596- | 43- |
| 2013 | 797,927 | 724,195 | 91 |  | 0 | 724,195- | 91- |
| 2014 | 104,719 | 182,830 | 175 |  | 0 | 182,830- | 175- |
| 2015 | 376,096 | 772,895 | 206 |  | 0 | 772,895- | 206- |
| 2016 | 580,856 | 327,956 | 56 |  | 0 | 327,956- | $56-$ |
| 2017 | 612,348 | 976,838 | 160 |  | 0 | 976,838- | 160- |
| 2018 | 565,051 | 785,885 | 139 |  | 0 | 785,885- | 139- |
| 2019 | 541,293 | 333,590 | 62 |  | 0 | 333,590- | 62- |
| 2020 | 627,528 | 249,195 | 40 |  | 0 | 249,195- | $40-$ |
| 2021 | 548,818 | 603,110 | 110 |  | 0 | 603,110- | 110- |
| 2022 | 299,481 | 46,010 | 15 |  | 0 | 46,010- | 15- |
| TOTAL | 6,799,681 | 5,974,754 | 88 | 37,272 | 1 | 5,937,483- | 87- |

THREE-YEAR MOVING AVERAGES

| 01-03 | 165,669 | 14,450 | 9 | 7,482 | 5 | 6,968- | $4-$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02-04 | 61,832 | 16,285 | 26 | 6,032 | 10 | 10,253- | 17- |
| 03-05 | 66,933 | 41,144 | 61 | 5,562 | 8 | 35,582- | 53- |
| 04-06 | 86,566 | 38,222 | 44 | 4,902 | 6 | 33,320- | 38- |
| 05-07 | 77,695 | 44,359 | 57 | 740 | 1 | 43,619- | 56- |
| 06-08 | 122,011 | 45,158 | 37 | 153 | 0 | 45,004- | 37- |
| 07-09 | 146,077 | 83,817 | 57 | 40 | 0 | 83,777- | 57- |
| 08-10 | 172,464 | 141,451 | 82 |  | 0 | 141,451- | 82- |
| 09-11 | 156,096 | 189,791 | 122 |  | 0 | 189,791- | 122- |
| 10-12 | 183,543 | 187,594 | 102 |  | 0 | 187,594- | 102- |
| 11-13 | 396,510 | 351,729 | 89 |  | 0 | 351,729- | 89- |
| 12-14 | 384,296 | 338,207 | 88 |  | 0 | 338,207- | 88- |
| 13-15 | 426,248 | 559,973 | 131 |  | 0 | 559,973- | 131- |
| 14-16 | 353,890 | 427,894 | 121 |  | 0 | 427,894- | 121- |
| 15-17 | 523,100 | 692,563 | 132 |  | 0 | 692,563- | 132- |
| 16-18 | 586,085 | 696,893 | 119 |  | 0 | 696,893- | 119 - |


|  |  | THE POTO | MAC | COMPANY |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ACCOUN | T 37 | EtERS |  |  |  |
|  |  | SUMMARY | OF | ALVAGE |  |  |  |
|  | REGULAR | COST OF REMOVAI |  | GROS |  | NET <br> SALVAGE |  |
| YEAR | RETIREMENTS | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT |
| THREE-YEAR MOVING AVERAGES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-19 | 572,897 | 698,771 | 122 |  | 0 | 698,771- | 122- |
| 18-20 | 577,957 | 456,223 | 79 |  | 0 | 456,223- | $79-$ |
| 19-21 | 572,546 | 395,298 | 69 |  | 0 | 395,298- | 69- |
| 20-22 | 491,942 | 299,439 | 61 |  | 0 | 299,439- | 61- |
| FIVE-YEAR AVERAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-22 | 516,434 | 403,558 | 78 |  | 0 | 403,558- | $78-$ |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY ACCOUNT 371.00 INSTALLATIONS ON CUSTOMERS' PREMISES

|  | SUMMARY OF BOOK SALVAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | COST OF |  | GROSS |  | NET |  |
|  | REGULAR | REMOVAL |  | SALVA |  | SALVAGE |  |
| YEAR | RETIREMENTS | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT |
| 2012 |  | 4,159 |  |  |  | 4,159- |  |
| 2013 | 29,004 | 65,226 | 225 |  | 0 | 65,226- | 225- |
| 2014 | 17,563 | 16,806 | 96 |  | 0 | 16,806- | $96-$ |
| 2015 | 117,291 | 20,987 | 18 |  | 0 | 20,987- | 18- |
| 2016 | 7,678 | 6,382 | 83 |  | 0 | 6,382- | 83- |
| 2017 | 2,954 | 3,928 | 133 |  | 0 | 3,928- | 133- |
| 2018 | 3,880 | 3,154 | 81 |  | 0 | 3,154- | 81- |
| 2019 | 1,718 | 6,545 | 381 |  | 0 | 6,545- | 381- |
| 2020 | 2,049 | 8,339 | 407 |  | 0 | 8,339- | 407- |
| 2021 | 765 | 2,869 | 375 |  | 0 | 2,869- | 375- |
| 2022 | 1,389 | 2,721 | 196 |  | 0 | 2,721- | 196- |
| TOTAL | 184,291 | 141,116 | 77 |  | 0 | 141,116- | $77-$ |

THREE-YEAR MOVING AVERAGES

| $12-14$ | 15,522 | 28,730 | 185 | 0 | $28,730-185-$ |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $13-15$ | 54,619 | 34,340 | 63 | 0 | $34,340-$ | $63-$ |
| $14-16$ | 47,511 | 14,725 | 31 | 0 | $14,725-$ | $31-$ |
| $15-17$ | 42,641 | 10,432 | 24 | 0 | $10,432-$ | $24-$ |
| $16-18$ | 4,837 | 4,488 | 93 | 0 | $4,488-$ | $93-$ |
| $17-19$ | 2,851 | 4,542 | 159 | 0 | $4,542-159-$ |  |
| $18-20$ | 2,549 | 6,013 | 236 | 0 | $6,013-236-$ |  |
| $19-21$ | 1,511 | 5,918 | 392 | 0 | $5,918-392-$ |  |
| $20-22$ | 1,401 | 4,643 | 331 | 0 | $4,643-331-$ |  |

FIVE-YEAR AVERAGE
18-22
1,960
4,726241
0
4,726-241-

## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

## ACCOUNTS 373.10 STREET LIGHTING AND SIGNAL SYSTEMS

## SUMMARY OF BOOK SALVAGE

|  | REGULAR | COST OF REMOVAL |  | GROSS <br> SALVAGE |  | NET <br> SALVAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | RETIREMENTS | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT |
| 2001 | 77,115 | 244,165 | 317 | 60,641 | 79 | 183,524- | 238- |
| 2002 | 119,379 | 12,781 | 11 |  | 0 | 12,781- | 11- |
| 2003 | 165,947 | 22,072 | 13 | 7,416 | 4 | 14,656- | $9-$ |
| 2004 | 216,385 | 137,503 | 64 | 23,380 | 11 | 114,123- | 53- |
| 2005 | 140,133 | 23,036 | 16 | 523 | 0 | 22,513- | 16- |
| 2006 | 160,678 | 1,384 | 1 |  | 0 | 1,384- | 1- |
| 2007 | 150,269 | 30,171 | 20 | 13 | 0 | 30,157- | $20-$ |
| 2008 | 245,263 | 436,000 | 178 |  | 0 | 436,000- | 178- |
| 2009 | 311,990 | 165,971 | 53 |  | 0 | 165,971- | 53- |
| 2010 | 494,234 | 370,112 | 75 |  | 0 | 370,112- | 75- |
| 2011 | 211,666 | 528,626 | 250 | 8,068 | 4 | 520,558- | 246- |
| 2012 | 134,829 | 16,292 | 12 |  | 0 | 16,292- | 12- |
| 2013 | 128,420 | 317,601 | 247 |  | 0 | 317,601- | 247- |
| 2014 | 42,701 | 44,347 | 104 |  | 0 | 44,347- | 104- |
| 2015 | 100,094 | 87,612 | 88 |  | 0 | 87,612- | 88- |
| 2016 | 156,605 | 59,517 | 38 |  | 0 | 59,517- | 38- |
| 2017 | 136,545 | 71,016 | 52 |  | 0 | 71,016- | 52- |
| 2018 | 164,007 | 93,999 | 57 |  | 0 | 93,999- | 57- |
| 2019 | 141,598 | 111,979 | 79 |  | 0 | 111,979- | 79- |
| 2020 | 197,640 | 101,537 | 51 |  | 0 | 101,537- | 51- |
| 2021 | 170,877 | 124,200 | 73 |  | 0 | 124,200- | 73- |
| 2022 | 90,619 | 99,248 | 110 |  | 0 | 99,248- | 110- |
| TOTAL | 3,756,995 | 3,099,168 | 82 | 100,042 | 3 | 2,999,126- | 80- |

THREE-YEAR MOVING AVERAGES

| $01-03$ | 120,814 |
| ---: | ---: |
| $02-04$ | 167,237 |
| $03-05$ | 174,155 |
| $04-06$ | 172,399 |
| $05-07$ | 150,360 |
| $06-08$ | 185,403 |
| $07-09$ | 235,841 |
| $08-10$ | 350,496 |
| $09-11$ | 339,297 |
| $10-12$ | 280,243 |
| $11-13$ | 158,305 |
| $12-14$ | 101,983 |
| $13-15$ | 90,405 |
| $14-16$ | 99,800 |
| $15-17$ | 131,081 |
| $16-18$ | 152,386 |


| 93,006 | 77 | 22,686 | 19 | $70,320-$ | $58-$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 57,452 | 34 | 10,265 | 6 | $47,187-$ | $28-$ |
| 60,870 | 35 | 10,440 | 6 | $50,431-$ | $29-$ |
| 53,974 | 31 | 7,968 | 5 | $46,007-$ | $27-$ |
| 18,197 | 12 | 179 | 0 | $18,018-$ | $12-$ |
| 155,852 | 84 | 4 | 0 | $155,847-$ | $84-$ |
| 210,714 | 89 | 4 | 0 | $210,710-$ | $89-$ |
| 324,028 | 92 |  | 0 | $324,028-$ | $92-$ |
| 354,903 | 105 | 2,689 | 1 | $352,214-$ | $104-$ |
| 305,010 | 109 | 2,689 | 1 | $302,321-$ | $108-$ |
| 287,506 | 182 | 2,689 | 2 | $284,817-$ | $180-$ |
| 126,080 | 124 |  | 0 | $126,080-$ | $124-$ |
| 149,853 | 166 |  | 0 | $149,853-$ | $166-$ |
| 63,825 | 64 |  | 0 | $63,825-$ | $64-$ |
| 72,715 | 55 |  | 0 | $72,715-$ | $55-$ |
| 74,844 | 49 |  |  | $74,844-$ | $49-$ |


| THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACCOUNTS 373.10 STREET LIGHTING AND SIGNAL SY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUMMARY OF BOOK SALVAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | COST OF |  | GROS |  | NET |  |
|  | REGULAR | REMOVAL |  | SALVA |  | SALVAGE |  |
| YEAR | RETIREMENTS | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT |
| THREE-YEAR MOVING AVERAGES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-19 | 147,383 | 92,331 | 63 |  | 0 | 92,331- | 63- |
| 18-20 | 167,748 | 102,505 | 61 |  | 0 | 102,505- | 61- |
| 19-21 | 170,038 | 112,572 | 66 |  | 0 | 112,572- | 66- |
| 20-22 | 153,046 | 108,328 | 71 |  | 0 | 108,328- | 71 - |
| FIVE-YEAR AVERAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-22 | 152,948 | 106,192 | 69 |  | 0 | 106,192- | $69-$ |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 390.10 STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS

SUMMARY OF BOOK SALVAGE

|  | REGULAR | COST OF REMOVAL |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { GROSS } \\ \text { SALVAGE } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { NET } \\ \text { SALVAGE } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | RETIREMENTS | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT |
| 2006 | 454,028 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 2007 | 26,885 | 4,703 | 17 |  | 0 | 4,703- | 17- |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 96,974 | 32,000 | 33 | 19,479 | 20 | 12,521- | 13- |
| 2010 | 40,699 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 | 1,023,837 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 2014 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 270,256 | 43,954 | 16 |  | 0 | 43,954- | 16- |
| 2016 | 11,922 | 4,813 | 40 |  | 0 | 4,813- | 40- |
| 2017 | 332,755 | 156,954 | 47 |  | 0 | 156,954- | 47- |
| 2018 | 95,836 | 9,092 | 9 |  | 0 | 9,092- | $9-$ |
| 2019 | 157,597 | 14,014 | 9 |  | 0 | 14,014- | 9- |
| 2020 | 88,161 | 16,849 | 19 |  | 0 | 16,849- | 19- |
| 2021 | 240,425 | 97,785 | 41 |  | 0 | 97,785- | 41- |
| 2022 | 70,597 | 7,365 | 10 |  | 0 | 7,365- | 10- |
| TOTAL | 2,909,970 | 387,529 | 13 | 19,479 | 1 | 368,050- | 13- |

THREE-YEAR MOVING AVERAGES

| $06-08$ | 160,304 |
| ---: | ---: |
| $07-09$ | 41,286 |
| $08-10$ | 45,891 |
| $09-11$ | 45,891 |
| $10-12$ | 13,566 |
| $11-13$ | 341,279 |
| $12-14$ | 341,279 |
| $13-15$ | 431,364 |
| $14-16$ | 94,059 |
| $15-17$ | 204,978 |
| $16-18$ | 146,838 |
| $17-19$ | 195,396 |
| $18-20$ | 113,864 |
| $19-21$ | 162,061 |
| $20-22$ | 133,061 |


| 1,568 | 1 |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 12,234 | 30 | 6,493 | 16 |
| 10,667 | 23 | 6,493 | 14 |
| 10,667 | 23 | 6,493 | 14 |
|  | 0 |  | 0 |
|  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 14,651 | 3 |  | 0 |
| 16,256 | 17 | 0 |  |
| 68,574 | 33 |  | 0 |
| 56,953 | 39 |  | 0 |
| 60,020 | 31 |  | 0 |
| 13,319 | 12 |  | 0 |
| 42,883 | 26 |  | 0 |
| 40,666 | 31 |  |  |


| $1,568-$ | $1-$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $5,741-$ | $14-$ |
| $4,174-$ | $9-$ |
| $4,174-$ | $9-$ |
|  | 0 |
|  | 0 |
| $14,651-$ | $3-$ |
| $16,256-$ | $17-$ |
| $68,574-$ | $33-$ |
| $56,953-$ | $39-$ |
| $60,020-$ | $31-$ |
| $13,319-$ | $12-$ |
| $42,883-$ | $26-$ |
| $40,666-$ | $31-$ |

FIVE-YEAR AVERAGE
18-22 130,523
$29,021 \quad 22$
29,021- 22-

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 392.00 TRANSPORATION EQUIPMENT

SUMMARY OF BOOK SALVAGE

|  | REGULAR | COST OF REMOVAL |  | GROSS <br> SALVAGE |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { NET } \\ \text { SALVAGE } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | RETIREMENTS | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT |
| 2001 | 736,499 |  | 0 | 161,801 | 22 | 161,801 | 22 |
| 2002 | 176,870 |  | 0 | 76,365 | 43 | 76,365 | 43 |
| 2003 | 407,402 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 2004 |  | 41 |  | 43,167 |  | 43,126 |  |
| 2005 | 15,366 |  | 0 | 18,467 | 120 | 18,467 | 120 |
| 2006 | 180,465 |  | 0 | 17,932 | 10 | 17,932 | 10 |
| 2007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 83,462 |  | 0 | 869 | 1 | 869 | 1 |
| 2009 | 187,538 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 2010 |  | 20,500- |  | 65,630 |  | 86,130 |  |
| 2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 |  |  |  | 5,834 |  | 5,834 |  |
| 2013 | 224,530 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 2014 | 6,778 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 2015 | 9,126 |  | 0 | 60,066 | 658 | 60,066 | 658 |
| 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | 55,448 |  | 0 | 65,872 | 119 | 65,872 | 119 |
| 2018 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 194,819 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 2020 | 216,243 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 2021 | 585,946 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | 3,080,489 | 20,459- | 1- | 516,003 | 17 | 536,462 | 17 |

THREE-YEAR MOVING AVERAGES

| 01-03 | 440,257 |  | 0 | 79,389 | 18 | 79,389 | 18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02-04 | 194,757 | 14 | 0 | 39,844 | 20 | 39,830 | 20 |
| 03-05 | 140,923 | 14 | 0 | 20,544 | 15 | 20,531 | 15 |
| 04-06 | 65,277 | 14 | 0 | 26,522 | 41 | 26,508 | 41 |
| 05-07 | 65,277 |  | 0 | 12,133 | 19 | 12,133 | 19 |
| 06-08 | 87,976 |  | 0 | 6,267 | 7 | 6,267 | 7 |
| 07-09 | 90,333 |  | 0 | 290 | 0 | 290 | 0 |
| 08-10 | 90,333 | 6,833- | 8- | 22,166 | 25 | 29,000 | 32 |
| 09-11 | 62,513 | 6,833- | 11- | 21,877 | 35 | 28,710 | 46 |
| 10-12 |  | 6,833- |  | 23,822 |  | 30,655 |  |
| 11-13 | 74,843 |  | 0 | 1,945 | 3 | 1,945 | 3 |
| 12-14 | 77,102 |  | 0 | 1,945 | 3 | 1,945 | 3 |
| 13-15 | 80,144 |  | 0 | 20,022 | 25 | 20,022 | 25 |
| 14-16 | 5,301 |  | 0 | 20,022 | 378 | 20,022 | 378 |
| 15-17 | 21,525 |  | 0 | 41,979 | 195 | 41,979 | 195 |
| 16-18 | 18,483 |  | 0 | 21,957 | 119 | 21,957 | 119 |


| THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACCOUNT 392.00 TRANSPORATION EQUIPMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUMMARY OF BOOK SALVAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | COST |  | GROSS |  | NET |  |
|  | REGULAR | REMOV |  | SALVAGE |  | SALVAGE |  |
| YEAR | RETIREMENTS | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT |
| THREE-YEAR MOVING AVERAGES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17-19 | 83,422 |  | 0 | 21,957 | 26 | 21,957 | 26 |
| 18-20 | 137,021 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 19-21 | 332,336 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 20-22 | 267,396 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| FIVE-YEAR AVERAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-22 | 199,402 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

| ACCOUNT 396.00 POWER OPERATED EQUIPMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SUMMARY OF BOOK SALVAGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | REGULAR | $\begin{aligned} & \text { COST } \\ & \text { REMOT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I OF } \\ & \text { OVAL } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GRO } \\ & \text { SALV } \end{aligned}$ |  | NET |  |
| YEAR | RETIREMENTS | AMOUNT |  | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT | AMOUNT | PCT |
| 2006 | 8,400 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 2007 | 9,398 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 2008 |  |  | 680 |  | 17,8 |  | 17,20 |  |
| 2009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | 17,797 |  | 680 | 4 | 17, 8 | 100 | 17,20 | 97 |



## PART IX. DETAILED DEPRECIATION CALCULATIONS

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 303.00 MISCELLANEOUS INTANGIBLE PLANT

CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| YEAR <br> (1) | COST <br> (2) | ACCRUED <br> (3) | RESERVE <br> (4) | ACCRUALS <br> (5) | LIFE (6) | $\begin{gathered} \text { ACCRUAL } \\ (7) \end{gathered}$ |

SURVIVOR CURVE. . 7-SQUARE NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. 0

| 2012 | 4,065,813.52 | 4,065,814 | 4,065,814 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2013 | $3,319,463.95$ | 3,319,464 | 3,319,464 |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 999,423.57 | 999,424 | 999,424 |  |  |  |
| 2015 | $1,146,068.99$ | 1,146,069 | 1,146,069 |  |  |  |
| 2016 | $1,436,850.15$ | 1,231,582 | 1,394,690 | 42,160 | 1.00 | 42,160 |
| 2017 | $1,627,201.29$ | 1,162,294 | 1,316,226 | 310,975 | 2.00 | 155,488 |
| 2018 | 5,255,955.54 | 3,003,411 | 3,401,177 | 1,854,779 | 3.00 | 618,260 |
| 2019 | $3,362,807.35$ | 1,441,198 | $1,632,067$ | 1,730,740 | 4.00 | 432,685 |
| 2020 | $2,695,896.65$ | 770,245 | 872,255 | 1,823,642 | 5.00 | 364,728 |
| 2021 | 995,109.46 | 142,161 | 160,988 | 834,121 | 6.00 | 139,020 |
| 2022 | $614,340.14$ | 21,938 | 24,844 | 589,496 | 6.75 | 87,333 |
|  | $25,518,930.61$ | 17,303,600 | 18,333,018 | 7,185,913 |  | 1,839,674 |

[^125]
## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 360.20 LAND AND LAND RIGHTS - EASEMENTS

CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | ACCRUAL |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 75-R3 NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. 0

| 1945 | 127,639.47 | 103,439 | 107,749 | 19,890 | 14.22 | 1,399 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1953 | 258,623.23 | 195,933 | 204,097 | 54,526 | 18.18 | 2,999 |
| 1954 | 31,794.44 | 23,854 | 24,848 | 6,946 | 18.73 | 371 |
| 1955 | 45,324.46 | 33,667 | 35,070 | 10,254 | 19.29 | 532 |
| 1956 | 19,528.59 | 14,355 | 14,953 | 4,576 | 19.87 | 230 |
| 1957 | 17,168.80 | 12,485 | 13,005 | 4,164 | 20.46 | 204 |
| 1958 | 76,754.87 | 55,202 | 57,502 | 19,253 | 21.06 | 914 |
| 1959 | 52,861.82 | 37,588 | 39,154 | 13,708 | 21.67 | 633 |
| 1960 | 9,919.21 | 6,971 | 7,261 | 2,658 | 22.29 | 119 |
| 1961 | 79,869.77 | 55,462 | 57,773 | 22,097 | 22.92 | 964 |
| 1962 | 47,576.87 | 32,632 | 33,992 | 13,585 | 23.56 | 577 |
| 1963 | 55,071.15 | 37,287 | 38,841 | 16,230 | 24.22 | 670 |
| 1964 | 38,812.46 | 25,937 | 27,018 | 11,794 | 24.88 | 474 |
| 1965 | 32,530.21 | 21,448 | 22,342 | 10,188 | 25.55 | 399 |
| 1966 | 48,367.86 | 31,445 | 32,755 | 15,613 | 26.24 | 595 |
| 1967 | 80,671.70 | 51,705 | 53,859 | 26,813 | 26.93 | 996 |
| 1968 | 76,766.98 | 48,486 | 50,506 | 26,261 | 27.63 | 950 |
| 1969 | 29,966.67 | 18,643 | 19,420 | 10,547 | 28.34 | 372 |
| 1970 | 68,076.58 | 41,699 | 43,437 | 24,640 | 29.06 | 848 |
| 1971 | 65,784.35 | 39,663 | 41,316 | 24,468 | 29.78 | 822 |
| 1972 | 239,923.05 | 142,291 | 148,220 | 91,703 | 30.52 | 3,005 |
| 1973 | 26,447.98 | 15,424 | 16,067 | 10,381 | 31.26 | 332 |
| 1974 | 34,581.39 | 19,822 | 20,648 | 13,933 | 32.01 | 435 |
| 1975 | 20,556.27 | 11,575 | 12,057 | 8,499 | 32.77 | 259 |
| 1976 | 22,446.30 | 12,408 | 12,925 | 9,521 | 33.54 | 284 |
| 1977 | 31,589.74 | 17,138 | 17,852 | 13,738 | 34.31 | 400 |
| 1978 | 30,131.51 | 16,034 | 16,702 | 13,430 | 35.09 | 383 |
| 1979 | 15,591.98 | 8,133 | 8,472 | 7,120 | 35.88 | 198 |
| 1980 | 80,977.96 | 41,374 | 43,098 | 37,880 | 36.68 | 1,033 |
| 1981 | 133,961.66 | 67,017 | 69,809 | 64,153 | 37.48 | 1,712 |
| 1982 | 85,874.00 | 42,033 | 43,784 | 42,090 | 38.29 | 1,099 |
| 1983 | 39,101.68 | 18,711 | 19,491 | 19,611 | 39.11 | 501 |
| 1984 | 28,701.03 | 13,421 | 13,980 | 14,721 | 39.93 | 369 |
| 1985 | 39,963.23 | 18,244 | 19,004 | 20,959 | 40.76 | 514 |
| 1986 | 42,954.73 | 19,129 | 19,926 | 23,029 | 41.60 | 554 |
| 1987 | 19,810.30 | 8,600 | 8,958 | 10,852 | 42.44 | 256 |
| 1988 | 23,699.91 | 10,020 | 10,438 | 13,262 | 43.29 | 306 |
| 1989 | 39,871.50 | 16,406 | 17,090 | 22,782 | 44.14 | 516 |
| 1990 | 66,872.81 | 26,740 | 27,854 | 39,019 | 45.01 | 867 |
| 1991 | 123,777.04 | 48,075 | 50,078 | 73,699 | 45.87 | 1,607 |
| 1992 | 53,917.66 | 20,309 | 21,155 | 32,763 | 46.75 | 701 |
| 1993 | 19,617.26 | 7,162 | 7,460 | 12,157 | 47.62 | 255 |
| 1994 | 22,697.40 | 8,017 | 8,351 | 14,346 | 48.51 | 296 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 360.20 LAND AND LAND RIGHTS - EASEMENTS

CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | $(7)$ |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 75-R3 NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. 0

| 1995 | 695,096.71 | 237,257 | 247,143 | 447,954 | 49.40 | 9,068 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1996 | 101,055.79 | 33,281 | 34,668 | 66,388 | 50.30 | 1,320 |
| 1997 | 172,774.99 | 54,827 | 57,112 | 115,663 | 51.20 | 2,259 |
| 1998 | 271,304.17 | 82,837 | 86,289 | 185,015 | 52.10 | 3,551 |
| 1999 | 10,542.15 | 3,091 | 3,220 | 7,322 | 53.01 | 138 |
| 2000 | 144,263.08 | 40,528 | 42,217 | 102,046 | 53.93 | 1,892 |
| 2001 | 17,573.59 | 4,721 | 4,918 | 12,656 | 54.85 | 231 |
| 2003 | 138,199.40 | 33,703 | 35,107 | 103,092 | 56.71 | 1,818 |
| 2004 | 39,388.75 | 9,117 | 9,497 | 29,892 | 57.64 | 519 |
| 2005 | 599,503.49 | 131,249 | 136,718 | 462,785 | 58.58 | 7,900 |
| 2007 | 1,040,277.74 | 201,679 | 210,082 | 830,196 | 60.46 | 13,731 |
| 2008 | 1,055,295.22 | 191,219 | 199,187 | 856,108 | 61.41 | 13,941 |
| 2010 | 1,685,990.40 | 262,559 | 273,499 | 1,412,491 | 63.32 | 22,307 |
| 2011 | 1,032,285.12 | 147,545 | 153,693 | 878,592 | 64.28 | 13,668 |
| 2012 | 290,672.10 | 37,825 | 39,401 | 251,271 | 65.24 | 3,851 |
| 2018 | 1,198,711.03 | 62,812 | 65,429 | 1,133,282 | 71.07 | 15,946 |
| 2020 | 1.00 |  | 0 | 1 | 73.03 |  |
|  | 10,999,110.61 | 3,030,234 | 3,156,497 | 7,842,614 |  | 143,090 |
| COMPOSITE REMAINING LIFE AND ANNUAL ACCRUAL RATE, PERCENT .. 54.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.30 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 361.00 STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS

CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | ACCRUAL |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 65-S4
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. -20

| 1950 | 2,283.85 | 2,453 | 2,741 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1952 | 8,202.64 | 8,721 | 9,843 |  |  |  |
| 1953 | 7,122.83 | 7,532 | 8,547 |  |  |  |
| 1954 | 1,574.04 | 1,655 | 1,889 |  |  |  |
| 1955 | 2,607.32 | 2,726 | 3,129 |  |  |  |
| 1956 | 495.06 | 514 | 594 |  |  |  |
| 1957 | 79,494.63 | 82,053 | 95,394 |  |  |  |
| 1958 | 5,159.30 | 5,289 | 6,191 |  |  |  |
| 1959 | 6,687.89 | 6,806 | 8,025 |  |  |  |
| 1960 | 21,615.83 | 21,829 | 25,939 |  |  |  |
| 1961 | 46,479.75 | 46,560 | 55,776 |  |  |  |
| 1962 | 542.50 | 539 | 651 |  |  |  |
| 1963 | 5,057.50 | 4,978 | 6,069 |  |  |  |
| 1964 | 11,839.33 | 11,543 | 14,207 |  |  |  |
| 1965 | 738.45 | 713 | 886 |  |  |  |
| 1966 | 20,478.61 | 19,561 | 24,337 | 237 | 13.26 | 18 |
| 1967 | 16,751.91 | 15,822 | 19,685 | 417 | 13.84 | 30 |
| 1968 | 62,491.61 | 58,331 | 72,572 | 2,418 | 14.44 | 167 |
| 1969 | 2,833.73 | 2,613 | 3,251 | 149 | 15.06 | 10 |
| 1970 | 116,038.87 | 105,592 | 131,371 | 7,876 | 15.71 | 501 |
| 1971 | 61,579.33 | 55,274 | 68,768 | 5,127 | 16.38 | 313 |
| 1972 | 1,666.69 | 1,474 | 1,834 | 166 | 17.08 | 10 |
| 1973 | 8,849.05 | 7,709 | 9,591 | 1,028 | 17.81 | 58 |
| 1974 | 674.59 | 578 | 719 | 91 | 18.56 | 5 |
| 1975 | 135,648.10 | 114,371 | 142,293 | 20,485 | 19.33 | 1,060 |
| 1976 | 83,443.84 | 69,123 | 85,999 | 14,134 | 20.13 | 702 |
| 1977 | 121,789.69 | 99,043 | 123,223 | 22,925 | 20.95 | 1,094 |
| 1978 | 63,847.48 | 50,933 | 63,368 | 13,249 | 21.79 | 608 |
| 1979 | 13,159.73 | 10,289 | 12,801 | 2,991 | 22.65 | 132 |
| 1980 | 74,236.30 | 56,835 | 70,711 | 18,373 | 23.53 | 781 |
| 1981 | 173,571.73 | 130,002 | 161,740 | 46,546 | 24.43 | 1,905 |
| 1982 | 35,274.38 | 25,827 | 32,132 | 10,197 | 25.34 | 402 |
| 1983 | 2,105.70 | 1,506 | 1,874 | 653 | 26.27 | 25 |
| 1984 | 50,704.79 | 35,375 | 44,011 | 16,835 | 27.21 | 619 |
| 1985 | 387,179.03 | 263,330 | 327,619 | 136,996 | 28.16 | 4,865 |
| 1986 | 11,421.22 | 7,565 | 9,412 | 4,293 | 29.12 | 147 |
| 1987 | 26,541.46 | 17,106 | 21,282 | 10,568 | 30.09 | 351 |
| 1988 | 13,791.68 | 8,642 | 10,752 | 5,798 | 31.06 | 187 |
| 1989 | 52,993.65 | 32,236 | 40,106 | 23,486 | 32.05 | 733 |
| 1990 | 246,551.07 | 145,519 | 181,046 | 114,815 | 33.03 | 3,476 |
| 1991 | 92,671.75 | 53,003 | 65,943 | 45,263 | 34.02 | 1,330 |
| 1992 | 889,281.27 | 492,356 | 612,558 | 454,580 | 35.01 | 12,984 |
| 1993 | 332,351.31 | 177,874 | 221,300 | 177,522 | 36.01 | 4,930 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 361.00 STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS

CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | ACCRUAL |
|  | $(2)$ | $7)$ |  |  |  |  |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 65-S4
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. -20

| 1994 | $1,008,542.02$ | 521,158 | 648,392 | 561,858 | 37.01 | 15,181 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1995 | $689,934.43$ | 343,902 | 427,861 | 400,060 | 38.00 | 10,528 |
| 1996 | $113,966.53$ | 54,704 | 68,059 | 68,701 | 39.00 | 1,762 |
| 1998 | $340,345.48$ | 150,799 | 187,615 | 220,800 | 41.00 | 5,385 |
| 2000 | $386,592.21$ | 157,015 | 195,348 | 268,563 | 43.00 | 6,246 |
| 2001 | $31,824.63$ | 12,338 | 15,350 | 22,840 | 44.00 | 519 |
| 2003 | $1,169,905.60$ | 410,370 | 510,557 | 893,330 | 46.00 | 19,420 |
| 2004 | $28,610.63$ | 9,507 | 11,828 | 22,505 | 47.00 | 479 |
| 2005 | $255,819.02$ | 80,288 | 99,889 | 207,094 | 48.00 | 4,314 |
| 2006 | $197,711.71$ | 58,400 | 72,658 | 164,596 | 49.00 | 3,359 |
| 2007 | $54,033.83$ | 14,963 | 18,616 | 46,225 | 50.00 | 924 |
| 2008 | $1,011,054.43$ | 261,313 | 325,109 | 888,156 | 51.00 | 17,415 |
| 2009 | $111,569.20$ | 26,777 | 33,314 | 100,569 | 52.00 | 1,934 |
| 2010 | $701,575.54$ | 155,430 | 193,377 | 648,514 | 53.00 | 12,236 |
| 2013 | $19,438.11$ | 3,230 | 4,019 | 19,307 | 56.00 | 345 |
| 2015 | $40,278.62$ | 5,205 | 6,476 | 41,858 | 58.00 | 722 |
| 2016 | $193,887.04$ | 21,477 | 26,720 | 205,944 | 59.00 | 3,491 |
| 2017 | $87,812.46$ | 8,105 | 10,084 | 95,291 | 60.00 | 1,588 |
| 2018 | $98,943.80$ | 7,307 | 9,091 | 109,642 | 61.00 | 1,797 |
| 2019 | $333,954.57$ | 18,494 | 23,009 | 377,736 | 62.00 | 6,093 |
| 2020 | $91,440.48$ | 3,376 | 4,200 | 105,529 | 63.00 | 1,675 |
| 2021 | $1,079,386.76$ | 19,921 | 24,784 | $1,270,480$ | 64.00 | 19,851 |
| 2022 | 103.66 |  | 0 | 125 | 64.75 | 2 |


| $11,344,560.25$ | $4,605,879$ | $5,716,535$ | $7,896,937$ | 172,709 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| COMPOSITE REMAINING LIFE AND ANNUAL ACCRUAL RATE, PERCENT . . 45.7 | 1.52 |  |  |  |

## ACCOUNT 362.00 STATION EQUIPMENT

## CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ |  |

SURVIVOR CURVE. IOWA 65-R2. 5 NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. -20

| 1940 | 9,640.98 | 9,876 | 11,569 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1943 | 5,751.03 | 5,802 | 6,901 |  |  |  |
| 1946 | 3,052.69 | 3,028 | 3,663 |  |  |  |
| 1947 | 29,151.96 | 28,739 | 34,982 |  |  |  |
| 1949 | 63,815.53 | 62,111 | 76,579 |  |  |  |
| 1950 | 7,906.15 | 7,642 | 9,487 |  |  |  |
| 1951 | 69,471.01 | 66,666 | 83,365 |  |  |  |
| 1952 | 104,112.13 | 99,179 | 124,935 |  |  |  |
| 1953 | 65,240.02 | 61,667 | 78,281 | 7 | 13.80 | 1 |
| 1954 | $81,893.07$ | 76,773 | 97,457 | 815 | 14.22 | 57 |
| 1955 | $54,999.34$ | 51,134 | 64,910 | 1,089 | 14.64 | 74 |
| 1956 | 169,975.77 | 156,650 | 198,853 | 5,118 | 15.08 | 339 |
| 1957 | 102,653.57 | 93,753 | 119,011 | 4,173 | 15.53 | 269 |
| 1958 | 153,381.37 | 138,752 | 176,133 | 7,925 | 16.00 | 495 |
| 1959 | 256,208.47 | 229,499 | 291,329 | 16,121 | 16.48 | 978 |
| 1960 | 329,176.92 | 291,882 | 370,518 | 24,494 | 16.97 | 1,443 |
| 1961 | 286,104.78 | 251,050 | 318,686 | 24,640 | 17.47 | 1,410 |
| 1962 | $38,104.15$ | 33,070 | 41,979 | 3,746 | 17.99 | 208 |
| 1963 | 114,576.17 | 98,295 | 124,777 | 12,714 | 18.53 | 686 |
| 1964 | 168,270.51 | 142,684 | 181,125 | 20,800 | 19.07 | 1,091 |
| 1965 | 66,964.57 | 56,090 | 71,201 | 9,156 | 19.63 | 466 |
| 1966 | 239,646.11 | 198,206 | 251,605 | 35,970 | 20.20 | 1,781 |
| 1967 | 255,809.78 | 208,836 | 265,099 | 41,873 | 20.78 | 2,015 |
| 1968 | $405,816.69$ | 326,876 | 414,940 | 72,040 | 21.37 | 3,371 |
| 1969 | 436,900.46 | 347,074 | 440,580 | 83,701 | 21.97 | 3,810 |
| 1970 | 1,779,890.83 | 1,393,569 | 1,769,012 | 366,857 | 22.59 | 16,240 |
| 1971 | $543,554.34$ | 419,354 | 532,333 | 119,932 | 23.21 | 5,167 |
| 1972 | 299,355.87 | 227,419 | 288,688 | 70,539 | 23.85 | 2,958 |
| 1973 | 775,480.67 | 579,824 | 736,035 | 194,542 | 24.50 | 7,940 |
| 1974 | $535,678.50$ | 394,097 | 500,271 | 142,543 | 25.15 | 5,668 |
| 1975 | 938,734.10 | 679,009 | 861,942 | 264,539 | 25.82 | 10,246 |
| 1976 | $1,535,342.37$ | 1,091,555 | 1,385,632 | 456,779 | 26.49 | 17,243 |
| 1977 | $1,610,099.30$ | 1,124,204 | 1,427,077 | 505,042 | 27.18 | 18,581 |
| 1978 | 848,715.42 | 581,774 | 738,511 | 279,948 | 27.87 | 10,045 |
| 1979 | 730,435.21 | 491,124 | 623,438 | 253,084 | 28.58 | 8,855 |
| 1980 | $700,312.38$ | 461,685 | 586, 068 | 254,307 | 29.29 | 8,682 |
| 1981 | $734,783.11$ | 474,649 | 602,525 | 279,215 | 30.01 | 9,304 |
| 1982 | 1,000,941.88 | 633,272 | 803,883 | 397,247 | 30.73 | 12,927 |
| 1983 | 1,344,679.90 | 832,384 | 1,056,638 | 556,978 | 31.47 | 17,699 |
| 1984 | 1,568,993.54 | 949,793 | 1,205,678 | 677,114 | 32.21 | 21,022 |
| 1985 | 3,170,882.80 | 1,875,590 | 2,380,895 | 1,424,164 | 32.96 | 43,209 |
| 1986 | 299,037.64 | 172,687 | 219,211 | 139,634 | 33.72 | 4,141 |
| 1987 | 657,344.64 | 370,253 | 470,003 | 318,811 | 34.49 | 9,244 |

## ACCOUNT 362.00 STATION EQUIPMENT

## CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ |  |

SURVIVOR CURVE. IOWA 65-R2. 5 NET SALVAGE PERCENT . . -20

| 1988 | 1,251,601.71 | 687,189 | 872,325 | 629,597 | 35.26 | 17,856 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1989 | $4,757,670.32$ | 2,543,679 | 3,228,975 | 2,480,229 | 36.04 | 68,819 |
| 1990 | 3,477,561.38 | $1,808,527$ | 2,295,765 | 1,877,309 | 36.83 | 50,972 |
| 1991 | 3,700,768.94 | $1,869,984$ | 2,373,779 | 2,067,144 | 37.63 | 54,933 |
| 1992 | 3,241,727.09 | $1,590,145$ | 2,018,548 | 1,871,525 | 38.43 | 48,700 |
| 1993 | $1,908,304.68$ | 907,880 | $1,152,473$ | 1,137,493 | 39.23 | 28,995 |
| 1994 | 8, 081,773.61 | 3,722,627 | 4,725,545 | 4,972,583 | 40.05 | 124,159 |
| 1995 | 5,220,997.51 | $2,325,829$ | 2,952,434 | 3,312,763 | 40.87 | 81,056 |
| 1996 | $3,248,391.63$ | $1,397,302$ | 1,773,751 | 2,124,319 | 41.70 | 50,943 |
| 1997 | 409,823.49 | 170,006 | 215,808 | 275,980 | 42.53 | 6,489 |
| 1998 | $3,545,998.40$ | $1,416,002$ | 1,797,489 | 2,457,709 | 43.37 | 56,668 |
| 1999 | 787,452.51 | 302,089 | 383,475 | 561,468 | 44.22 | 12,697 |
| 2000 | 5,222,558.00 | $1,921,609$ | 2,439,312 | 3,827,758 | 45.07 | 84,929 |
| 2001 | $2,715,863.66$ | 956,136 | 1,213,730 | 2,045,306 | 45.93 | 44,531 |
| 2002 | 730,515.38 | 245,585 | 311,748 | 564,870 | 46.79 | 12,072 |
| 2003 | $2,695,764.67$ | 862,979 | 1,095,475 | 2,139,443 | 47.66 | 44,890 |
| 2004 | $7,406,797.74$ | $2,252,081$ | $2,858,817$ | 6,029,340 | 48.53 | 124,239 |
| 2005 | $6,192,694.63$ | 1,782,381 | 2,262,575 | 5,168,659 | 49.41 | 104,608 |
| 2006 | $2,678,445.78$ | 726,877 | 922,706 | 2,291,429 | 50.30 | 45,555 |
| 2007 | $3,807,344.70$ | 971,421 | 1,233,133 | 3, 335,681 | 51.18 | 65,175 |
| 2008 | 20,793,537.73 | 4,959,758 | 6,295,973 | 18,656,272 | 52.08 | 358,223 |
| 2009 | $6,457,259.06$ | $1,432,892$ | $1,818,929$ | 5,929,782 | 52.98 | 111,925 |
| 2010 | 3,296,161.94 | 676,689 | 858,997 | 3,096,397 | 53.88 | 57,468 |
| 2011 | $1,315,598.87$ | 248, 222 | 315,096 | 1,263,623 | 54.78 | 23,067 |
| 2012 | 839,518.24 | 144,142 | 182,975 | 824,447 | 55.70 | 14,802 |
| 2013 | 5,028,130.10 | 778,837 | 988,664 | 5,045,092 | 56.61 | 89,120 |
| 2014 | $2,070,479.77$ | 285,527 | 362,451 | 2,122,125 | 57.53 | 36,887 |
| 2015 | 74,087.90 | 8,959 | 11,373 | 77,532 | 58.45 | 1,326 |
| 2016 | 9,437,900.40 | 979,201 | 1,243,009 | 10,082,471 | 59.38 | 169,796 |
| 2017 | 5,265,034.23 | 455,847 | 578,657 | 5,739,384 | 60.31 | 95,165 |
| 2018 | $3,215,263.97$ | 223,204 | 283,338 | 3,574,979 | 61.24 | 58,377 |
| 2019 | 8,462,656.34 | 442,157 | 561,279 | 9,593,909 | 62.17 | 154,317 |
| 2020 | 9, 676,534.50 | 337,672 | 428,645 | 11,183,196 | 63.11 | 177,202 |
| 2021 | 8,232,991.60 | 142,859 | 181,347 | 9,698,243 | 64.06 | 151,393 |
| 2022 | 9,093,435.03 | 40,266 | 51,114 | 10,861,008 | 64.76 | 167,712 |
|  | 186,933,531.24 | 55,414,136 | $70,335,515$ | 153,984,723 |  | 3,042,731 |

COMPOSITE REMAINING LIFE AND ANNUAL ACCRUAL RATE, PERCENT .. 50.6 1.63

## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 364.00 POLES, TOWERS AND FIXTURES

CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL
RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | $(7)$ |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 70-R4
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. -125

| 1945 | 250,590.32 | 503,578 | 430,712 | 133,116 | 7.48 | 17,796 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1953 | 1,120,183.68 | 2,134,437 | 1,825,591 | 694,822 | 10.72 | 64,815 |
| 1954 | $112,403.12$ | 212,369 | 181,640 | 71,267 | 11.22 | 6,352 |
| 1955 | 194,470.11 | 364,109 | 311,424 | 126,134 | 11.75 | 10,735 |
| 1956 | 141,301.65 | 262,110 | 224,184 | 93,745 | 12.29 | 7,628 |
| 1957 | $144,510.04$ | 265,415 | 227,010 | 98,138 | 12.86 | 7,631 |
| 1958 | 281,354.97 | 511,415 | 437,415 | 195,634 | 13.45 | 14,545 |
| 1959 | $384,573.30$ | 691,488 | 591,432 | 273,858 | 14.06 | 19,478 |
| 1960 | 218, 353.28 | 388,123 | 331,963 | 159,332 | 14.70 | 10,839 |
| 1961 | 430,457.01 | 756,285 | 646,853 | 321,675 | 15.34 | 20,970 |
| 1962 | 468,903.19 | 813,883 | 696,117 | 358,915 | 16.00 | 22,432 |
| 1963 | $461,218.63$ | 790,614 | 676,215 | 361,527 | 16.67 | 21,687 |
| 1964 | $440,950.39$ | 746,227 | 638,250 | 353,888 | 17.35 | 20,397 |
| 1965 | 452,682.16 | 756,048 | 646,650 | 371,885 | 18.04 | 20,614 |
| 1966 | 498, 400.68 | 821,191 | 702,367 | 419,035 | 18.74 | 22,360 |
| 1967 | $562,172.65$ | 913,249 | 781,105 | 483,783 | 19.46 | 24,860 |
| 1968 | $765,618.70$ | 1,226,022 | 1,048,621 | 674,021 | 20.18 | 33,400 |
| 1969 | 647,884.90 | 1,022,299 | 874,376 | 583,365 | 20.91 | 27,899 |
| 1970 | $755,795.59$ | 1,174,580 | 1,004,622 | 695,918 | 21.65 | 32,144 |
| 1971 | 919,843.84 | 1,407,361 | 1,203,720 | 865,929 | 22.40 | 38,658 |
| 1972 | 826,364.23 | 1,243,885 | 1,063,899 | 795,421 | 23.17 | 34,330 |
| 1973 | 627,465.80 | 928,963 | 794,545 | 617,253 | 23.94 | 25,783 |
| 1974 | 1,014,342.56 | 1,475,967 | 1,262,399 | 1,019,872 | 24.73 | 41,240 |
| 1975 | $618,656.81$ | 884,504 | 756,519 | 635,459 | 25.52 | 24,900 |
| 1976 | $776,671.06$ | 1,090,202 | 932,453 | 815,057 | 26.33 | 30,955 |
| 1977 | 873,414.74 | 1,202,967 | 1,028,902 | 936,281 | 27.15 | 34,485 |
| 1978 | 816,798.28 | 1,103,468 | 943,800 | 893,996 | 27.97 | 31,963 |
| 1979 | 859,210.57 | 1,137,567 | 972,965 | 960,259 | 28.81 | 33,331 |
| 1980 | 1,251,725.95 | 1,623,054 | 1,388,203 | 1,428,180 | 29.66 | 48,152 |
| 1981 | 1,426,651.93 | 1,810,421 | 1,548,459 | 1,661,508 | 30.52 | 54,440 |
| 1982 | 1,437,996.85 | 1,785,054 | 1,526,762 | 1,708,731 | 31.38 | 54,453 |
| 1983 | 1,174,422.94 | 1,424,651 | 1,218,509 | 1,423,943 | 32.26 | 44,140 |
| 1984 | 1,402,996.81 | 1,662,246 | 1,421,724 | 1,735,019 | 33.14 | 52,354 |
| 1985 | $1,660,324.45$ | 1,919,642 | 1,641,876 | 2,093,854 | 34.03 | 61,530 |
| 1986 | 1,162,359.71 | 1,310,270 | 1,120,678 | 1,494,631 | 34.93 | 42,789 |
| 1987 | 1,094,541.81 | 1,201,807 | 1,027,909 | 1,434,810 | 35.84 | 40,034 |
| 1988 | 1,082,111.35 | 1,156,166 | 988,873 | 1,445,878 | 36.76 | 39,333 |
| 1989 | 1,192,811.96 | 1,239,150 | 1,059,849 | 1,623,978 | 37.68 | 43,099 |
| 1990 | 1,882,932.42 | 1,899,818 | 1,624,920 | 2,611,678 | 38.61 | 67,643 |
| 1991 | $1,915,315.32$ | 1,875,218 | 1,603,880 | 2,705,579 | 39.54 | 68,426 |
| 1992 | 1,809,617.45 | 1,717,051 | 1,468,599 | 2,603,040 | 40.48 | 64,304 |
| 1993 | 1,923,128.52 | 1,766,038 | 1,510,498 | 2,816,541 | 41.43 | 67,983 |
| 1994 | 2,988, 080.66 | 2,652,766 | 2,268,919 | 4,454,262 | 42.38 | 105,103 |

## CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ |  |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 70-R4
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. -125

| 1995 | $2,210,611.02$ | $1,895,046$ | $1,620,839$ | $3,353,036$ | 43.33 | 77,384 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1996 | $2,173,675.95$ | $1,796,331$ | $1,536,408$ | $3,354,363$ | 44.29 | 75,736 |
| 1997 | $2,472,530.23$ | $1,966,199$ | $1,681,696$ | $3,881,497$ | 45.26 | 85,760 |
| 1998 | $4,720,518.43$ | $3,606,629$ | $3,084,762$ | $7,536,404$ | 46.23 | 163,020 |
| 1999 | $1,370,911.74$ | $1,004,669$ | 859,297 | $2,225,254$ | 47.20 | 47,145 |
| 2000 | $892,373.59$ | 626,165 | 535,561 | $1,472,280$ | 48.17 | 30,564 |
| 2001 | $3,611,680.68$ | $2,420,494$ | $2,070,256$ | $6,056,026$ | 49.15 | 123,215 |
| 2002 | $94,743.94$ | 60,512 | 51,756 | 161,418 | 50.13 | 3,220 |
| 2003 | $640,277.74$ | 388,767 | 332,514 | $1,108,111$ | 51.11 | 21,681 |
| 2004 | $1,103,082.66$ | 635,028 | 543,142 | $1,938,794$ | 52.09 | 37,220 |
| 2005 | $2,646,366.81$ | $1,439,220$ | $1,230,970$ | $4,723,355$ | 53.08 | 88,986 |
| 2006 | $679,984.58$ | 348,174 | 297,794 | $1,232,171$ | 54.07 | 22,788 |
| 2007 | $2,939,932.49$ | $1,411,807$ | $1,207,523$ | $5,407,325$ | 55.06 | 98,208 |
| 2008 | $7,083,953.91$ | $3,176,463$ | $2,716,839$ | $13,222,057$ | 56.05 | 235,898 |
| 2009 | $1,131,529.96$ | 471,356 | 403,152 | $2,142,790$ | 57.04 | 37,566 |
| 2010 | $5,354,577.72$ | $2,060,174$ | $1,762,074$ | $10,285,726$ | 58.03 | 177,248 |
| 2011 | $3,613,055.10$ | $1,273,954$ | $1,089,617$ | $7,039,757$ | 59.03 | 119,257 |
| 2012 | $6,541,671.66$ | $2,098,454$ | $1,794,815$ | $12,923,946$ | 60.02 | 215,327 |
| 2013 | $2,347,409.29$ | 677,586 | 579,541 | $4,702,130$ | 61.02 | 77,059 |
| 2014 | $4,303,700.82$ | $1,105,255$ | 945,328 | $8,737,999$ | 62.01 | 140,913 |
| 2015 | $2,997,318.75$ | 673,453 | 576,007 | $6,167,960$ | 63.01 | 97,889 |
| 2016 | $4,103,649.97$ | 790,086 | 675,763 | $8,557,449$ | 64.01 | 133,689 |
| 2017 | $3,680,927.97$ | 590,430 | 504,997 | $7,777,091$ | 65.01 | 119,629 |
| 2018 | $5,383,870.25$ | 692,177 | 592,021 | $11,521,687$ | 66.00 | 174,571 |
| 2019 | $4,209,358.42$ | 405,929 | 347,192 | $9,123,864$ | 67.00 | 136,177 |
| 2020 | $6,082,965.92$ | 391,028 | 334,448 | $13,352,225$ | 68.00 | 196,356 |
| 2021 | $7,024,249.33$ | 225,847 | 193,167 | $15,611,394$ | 69.00 | 226,252 |
| 2022 | $3,167,199.58$ | 25,441 | 21,760 | $7,104,439$ | 69.75 | 101,856 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $131,651,738.90$ | $82,128,352$ | $70,244,646$ | $225,971,766$ |  | $4,620,624$ |

COMPOSITE REMAINING LIFE AND ANNUAL ACCRUAL RATE, PERCENT .. 48.9 3.51

## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 365.00 OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES

CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL
RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | $(7)$ |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 62-R1
NET SALVAGE PERCENT. . -100

| 1945 | 644,479.04 | 954,873 | 684,358 | 604,600 | 16.07 | 37,623 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1953 | 895,398.75 | 1,227,556 | 879,791 | 911,006 | 19.50 | 46,718 |
| 1954 | 111,190.94 | 150,826 | 108,097 | 114,285 | 19.95 | 5,729 |
| 1955 | 152,221.62 | 204,224 | 146,368 | 158,075 | 20.41 | 7,745 |
| 1956 | 123,645.44 | 164,050 | 117,575 | 129,716 | 20.87 | 6,215 |
| 1957 | 112,393.94 | 147,418 | 105,655 | 119,133 | 21.34 | 5,583 |
| 1958 | 209,224.37 | 271,251 | 194,406 | 224,043 | 21.81 | 10,272 |
| 1959 | 310,197.01 | 397,350 | 284,781 | 335,613 | 22.29 | 15,057 |
| 1960 | 180,585.58 | 228,527 | 163,786 | 197,385 | 22.77 | 8,669 |
| 1961 | 400,364.55 | 500,328 | 358,586 | 442,143 | 23.26 | 19,009 |
| 1962 | 431,487.68 | 532,404 | 381,574 | 481,401 | 23.75 | 20,270 |
| 1963 | 369,959.70 | 450,515 | 322,885 | 417,034 | 24.25 | 17,197 |
| 1964 | 369,804.46 | 444,246 | 318,392 | 421,217 | 24.76 | 17,012 |
| 1965 | 402,574.73 | 476,987 | 341,857 | 463,292 | 25.27 | 18,334 |
| 1966 | 462,636.30 | 540,387 | 387,296 | 537,977 | 25.79 | 20,860 |
| 1967 | 524,877.14 | 604,291 | 433,096 | 616,658 | 26.31 | 23,438 |
| 1968 | 862,985.97 | 978,799 | 701,506 | 1,024,466 | 26.84 | 38,169 |
| 1969 | 596,143.19 | 665,952 | 477,288 | 714,998 | 27.37 | 26,123 |
| 1970 | 656,803.99 | 722,274 | 517,654 | 795,954 | 27.91 | 28,519 |
| 1971 | 425,447.84 | 460,445 | 330,001 | 520,895 | 28.45 | 18,309 |
| 1972 | 652,132.00 | 694,208 | 497,540 | 806,724 | 29.00 | 27,818 |
| 1973 | 355,831.35 | 372,363 | 266,873 | 444,790 | 29.56 | 15,047 |
| 1974 | 542,330.32 | 557,722 | 399,720 | 684,941 | 30.12 | 22,740 |
| 1975 | 1,777.61 | 1,795 | 1,286 | 2,269 | 30.69 | 74 |
| 1976 | 989,433.43 | 981,142 | 703,185 | 1,275,682 | 31.26 | 40,809 |
| 1977 | 940,522.51 | 915,034 | 655,806 | 1,225,239 | 31.84 | 38,481 |
| 1978 | 735,727.15 | 702,031 | 503,146 | 968,308 | 32.42 | 29,868 |
| 1979 | 778,635.94 | 728,149 | 521,865 | 1,035,407 | 33.01 | 31,366 |
| 1980 | 1,272,085.73 | 1,164,976 | 834,939 | 1,709,232 | 33.61 | 50,855 |
| 1981 | 1,299,608.75 | 1,165,463 | 835,288 | 1,763,930 | 34.20 | 51,577 |
| 1982 | 1,227,085.50 | 1,076,277 | 771,369 | 1,682,802 | 34.81 | 48,342 |
| 1983 | 735,887.76 | 630,965 | 452,213 | 1,019,563 | 35.42 | 28,785 |
| 1984 | 595,161.43 | 498,591 | 357,341 | 832,982 | 36.03 | 23,119 |
| 1985 | 1,178,245.00 | 963,498 | 690,540 | 1,665,950 | 36.65 | 45,456 |
| 1986 | 866,553.19 | 691,007 | 495,245 | 1,237,861 | 37.28 | 33,204 |
| 1987 | 612,538.73 | 476,004 | 341,153 | 883,924 | 37.91 | 23,316 |
| 1988 | 602,186.81 | 455,723 | 326,617 | 877,757 | 38.54 | 22,775 |
| 1989 | 690,700.86 | 508,439 | 364,399 | 1,017,003 | 39.18 | 25,957 |
| 1990 | 1,369,164.76 | 979,610 | 702,087 | 2,036,243 | 39.82 | 51,136 |
| 1991 | 1,185,870.74 | 823,611 | 590,283 | 1,781,458 | 40.47 | 44,019 |
| 1992 | 2,073,849.04 | 1,396,820 | 1,001,102 | 3,146,596 | 41.12 | 76,522 |
| 1993 | 2,071,334.86 | 1,351,712 | 968,773 | 3,173,897 | 41.77 | 75,985 |
| 1994 | 3,377,400.65 | 2,132,153 | 1,528,116 | 5,226,685 | 42.43 | 123,184 |

## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 365.00 OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES

CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL
RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC . BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | ACCRUAL |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 62-R1
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. -100

| 1995 | $2,545,801.14$ | $1,552,939$ | $1,112,993$ | $3,978,609$ | 43.09 | 92,333 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1996 | $1,876,746.05$ | $1,104,840$ | 791,840 | $2,961,652$ | 43.75 | 67,695 |
| 1997 | $3,065,237.60$ | $1,738,296$ | $1,245,838$ | $4,884,637$ | 44.42 | 109,965 |
| 1998 | $5,931,495.97$ | $3,235,512$ | $2,318,895$ | $9,544,097$ | 45.09 | 211,668 |
| 1999 | $846,969.46$ | 443,710 | 318,007 | $1,375,932$ | 45.76 | 30,068 |
| 2000 | $1,076,056.29$ | 540,116 | 387,102 | $1,765,011$ | 46.44 | 38,006 |
| 2001 | $3,109,471.60$ | $1,492,546$ | $1,069,709$ | $5,149,234$ | 47.12 | 109,279 |
| 2002 | $201,570.18$ | 92,331 | 66,174 | 336,966 | 47.80 | 7,049 |
| 2003 | $677,300.12$ | 295,384 | 211,702 | $1,142,898$ | 48.48 | 23,575 |
| 2004 | $1,136,683.78$ | 470,451 | 337,173 | $1,936,195$ | 49.17 | 39,378 |
| 2005 | $3,303,623.82$ | $1,294,822$ | 928,000 | $5,679,248$ | 49.85 | 113,927 |
| 2006 | $1,112,958.05$ | 411,438 | 294,878 | $1,931,038$ | 50.54 | 38,208 |
| 2007 | $2,263,823.54$ | 785,773 | 563,164 | $3,964,483$ | 51.24 | 77,371 |
| 2008 | $4,467,470.82$ | $1,451,213$ | $1,040,086$ | $7,894,856$ | 51.93 | 152,029 |
| 2009 | $1,241,586.69$ | 375,282 | 268,965 | $2,214,208$ | 52.63 | 42,071 |
| 2010 | $3,783,934.89$ | $1,058,291$ | 758,478 | $6,809,392$ | 53.33 | 127,684 |
| 2011 | $4,624,473.45$ | $1,187,472$ | 851,062 | $8,397,885$ | 54.04 | 155,401 |
| 2012 | $13,497,172.13$ | $3,161,038$ | $2,265,519$ | $24,728,825$ | 54.74 | 451,751 |
| 2013 | $3,060,191.13$ | 646,618 | 463,432 | $5,656,950$ | 55.45 | 102,019 |
| 2014 | $6,833,681.97$ | $1,285,142$ | 921,063 | $12,746,301$ | 56.17 | 226,924 |
| 2015 | $3,911,265.73$ | 645,985 | 462,978 | $7,359,553$ | 56.88 | 129,387 |
| 2016 | $6,478,185.01$ | 919,514 | 659,017 | $12,297,353$ | 57.60 | 213,496 |
| 2017 | $5,598,530.18$ | 662,754 | 474,996 | $10,722,064$ | 58.33 | 183,817 |
| 2018 | $9,064,774.07$ | 859,703 | 616,150 | $17,513,398$ | 59.06 | 296,536 |
| 2019 | $9,602,616.32$ | 684,667 | 490,702 | $18,714,531$ | 59.79 | 313,004 |
| 2020 | $10,084,138.09$ | 481,417 | 345,032 | $19,823,244$ | 60.52 | 327,549 |
| 2021 | $7,177,268.13$ | 171,393 | 122,837 | $14,231,699$ | 61.26 | 232,316 |
| 2022 | $2,526,404.97$ | 15,462 | 11,082 | $5,041,728$ | 61.81 | 81,568 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $151,495,917.54$ | $56,454,105$ | $40,460,712$ | $262,531,123$ |  | $5,315,360$ |

## CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | ACCRUAL |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 70-R4 NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. 0

| 1945 | 198,445.64 | 177,240 | 198,446 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1953 | 257,267.91 | 217,870 | 257,268 |  |  |  |
| 1954 | 26,518.65 | 22,268 | 26,519 |  |  |  |
| 1955 | 49,708.01 | 41,364 | 49,708 |  |  |  |
| 1956 | 17,511.50 | 14,437 | 17,512 |  |  |  |
| 1957 | 31,497.90 | 25,711 | 31,498 |  |  |  |
| 1958 | 63,506.77 | 51,305 | 63,507 |  |  |  |
| 1959 | 68,670.28 | 54,877 | 68,670 |  |  |  |
| 1960 | 35,567.72 | 28,098 | 35,568 |  |  |  |
| 1961 | 62,506.71 | 48,809 | 62,507 |  |  |  |
| 1962 | 66,463.18 | 51,272 | 66,463 |  |  |  |
| 1963 | 63,613.40 | 48,465 | 63,613 |  |  |  |
| 1964 | 51,627.12 | 38,831 | 51,627 |  |  |  |
| 1965 | 58,305.14 | 43,279 | 58,305 |  |  |  |
| 1966 | 79,089.94 | 57,917 | 79,090 |  |  |  |
| 1967 | 72,188.05 | 52,120 | 72,188 |  |  |  |
| 1968 | 118,936.55 | 84,648 | 118,937 |  |  |  |
| 1969 | 104,544.79 | 73,316 | 104,545 |  |  |  |
| 1970 | 56,851.56 | 39,268 | 56,852 |  |  |  |
| 1971 | 160,188.37 | 108,928 | 160,188 |  |  |  |
| 1972 | 135,363.03 | 90,558 | 135,363 |  |  |  |
| 1973 | 49,931.61 | 32,855 | 49,932 |  |  |  |
| 1974 | 61,543.99 | 39,801 | 61,544 |  |  |  |
| 1975 | 36,942.81 | 23,475 | 36,943 |  |  |  |
| 1976 | 26,122.80 | 16,297 | 26,123 |  |  |  |
| 1977 | 16,917.10 | 10,356 | 16,917 |  |  |  |
| 1978 | 44,528.17 | 26,736 | 44,528 |  |  |  |
| 1979 | 33,294.54 | 19,592 | 33,295 |  |  |  |
| 1980 | 26,021.09 | 14,996 | 26,021 |  |  |  |
| 1981 | 17,176.51 | 9,688 | 17,177 |  |  |  |
| 1982 | 91,864.42 | 50,683 | 90,455 | 1,409 | 31.38 | 45 |
| 1983 | 47,413.39 | 25,562 | 45,621 | 1,792 | 32.26 | 56 |
| 1984 | 58,369.07 | 30,735 | 54,854 | 3,515 | 33.14 | 106 |
| 1985 | 99,949.36 | 51,360 | 91,664 | 8,285 | 34.03 | 243 |
| 1986 | 51,623.71 | 25,863 | 46,158 | 5,466 | 34.93 | 156 |
| 1987 | 56,351.74 | 27,500 | 49,080 | 7,272 | 35.84 | 203 |
| 1988 | 76,307.29 | 36,235 | 64,670 | 11,637 | 36.76 | 317 |
| 1989 | 57,472.69 | 26,536 | 47,360 | 10,113 | 37.68 | 268 |
| 1990 | 145,517.80 | 65,255 | 116,462 | 29,056 | 38.61 | 753 |
| 1991 | 222,430.29 | 96,788 | 172,740 | 49,690 | 39.54 | 1,257 |
| 1992 | 169,561.57 | 71,506 | 127,619 | 41,943 | 40.48 | 1,036 |
| 1993 | 293,634.53 | 119,844 | 213,889 | 79,746 | 41.43 | 1,925 |
| 1994 | 247,471.71 | 97,645 | 174,270 | 73,202 | 42.38 | 1,727 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 365.10 OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES - CLEARING

CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL
RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 70-R4 NET SALVAGE PERCENT. . 0

| 1995 | $336,884.25$ | 128,353 | 229,075 | 107,809 | 43.33 | 2,488 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1996 | $211,127.65$ | 77,545 | 138,397 | 72,731 | 44.29 | 1,642 |
| 1997 | $77,354.70$ | 27,339 | 48,793 | 28,562 | 45.26 | 631 |
| 1998 | $511,739.12$ | 173,771 | 310,134 | 201,605 | 46.23 | 4,361 |
| 1999 | $64,632.73$ | 21,052 | 37,572 | 27,061 | 47.20 | 573 |
| 2000 | $26,542.18$ | 8,277 | 14,772 | 11,770 | 48.17 | 244 |
| 2001 | $269,299.37$ | 80,214 | 143,160 | 126,139 | 49.15 | 2,566 |
| 2002 | $6,176.60$ | 1,753 | 3,129 | 3,048 | 50.13 | 61 |
| 2003 | $13,037.11$ | 3,518 | 6,279 | 6,758 | 51.11 | 132 |
| 2004 | $115,193.78$ | 29,473 | 52,601 | 62,593 | 52.09 | 1,202 |
| 2005 | $964,066.98$ | 233,025 | 415,886 | 548,181 | 53.08 | 10,327 |
| 2006 | $54,368.26$ | 12,373 | 22,082 | 32,286 | 54.07 | 597 |
| 2009 | $5,607.89$ | 1,038 | 1,853 | 3,755 | 57.04 | 66 |
| 2011 | $3,583,609.65$ | 561,587 | $1,002,280$ | $2,581,330$ | 59.03 | 43,729 |
| 2012 | $2,000.53$ | 285 | 509 | 1,492 | 60.02 | 25 |
| 2013 | $23,172,747.85$ | $2,972,832$ | $5,305,698$ | $17,867,050$ | 61.02 | 292,806 |
| 2014 | $2,724,673.77$ | 310,994 | 555,040 | $2,169,634$ | 62.01 | 34,988 |
| 2015 | $9,549,735.28$ | 953,637 | $1,701,983$ | $7,847,752$ | 63.01 | 124,548 |
| 2016 | $9,628,276.49$ | 823,892 | $1,470,423$ | $8,157,853$ | 64.01 | 127,447 |
| 2017 | $2,403,223.79$ | 171,326 | 305,770 | $2,097,454$ | 65.01 | 32,264 |
| 2018 | $8,220,756.12$ | 469,734 | 838,348 | $7,382,408$ | 66.00 | 111,855 |
| 2019 | $4,013,147.47$ | 172,004 | 306,980 | $3,706,167$ | 67.00 | 55,316 |
| 2020 | $3,903,913.96$ | 111,535 | 199,060 | $3,704,854$ | 68.00 | 54,483 |
| 2021 | $4,108,534.21$ | 58,711 | 104,783 | $4,003,751$ | 69.00 | 58,025 |
| 2022 | $38,208.87$ |  | 136 | 243 | 3 | 37,966 |
|  |  |  | 69.75 | 544 |  |  |

## CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | $(7)$ |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 65-R4
NET SALVAGE PERCENT . . 50

| 1964 | $1,065.97$ | 1,270 | 1,220 | 379 | 13.37 | 28 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1965 | $3,441.97$ | 4,050 | 3,892 | 1,271 | 14.01 | 91 |
| 1966 | $42,985.37$ | 49,926 | 47,975 | 16,503 | 14.67 | 1,125 |
| 1967 | $24,198.31$ | 27,731 | 26,648 | 9,649 | 15.34 | 629 |
| 1968 | $24,786.03$ | 28,016 | 26,921 | 10,258 | 16.02 | 640 |
| 1969 | $39,680.53$ | 44,219 | 42,491 | 17,030 | 16.71 | 1,019 |
| 1970 | $25,335.98$ | 27,825 | 26,738 | 11,266 | 17.41 | 647 |
| 1971 | $30,636.17$ | 33,144 | 31,849 | 14,105 | 18.12 | 778 |
| 1972 | $106,360.09$ | 113,297 | 108,871 | 50,669 | 18.84 | 2,689 |
| 1973 | $319,345.25$ | 334,795 | 321,715 | 157,303 | 19.57 | 8,038 |
| 1974 | $329,428.91$ | 339,664 | 326,394 | 167,749 | 20.32 | 8,255 |
| 1975 | $249,671.72$ | 253,111 | 243,222 | 131,286 | 21.07 | 6,231 |
| 1976 | $479,289.48$ | 477,372 | 458,722 | 260,212 | 21.84 | 11,914 |
| 1977 | $404,216.25$ | 395,323 | 379,878 | 226,446 | 22.62 | 10,011 |
| 1978 | $536,944.55$ | 515,346 | 495,212 | 310,205 | 23.41 | 13,251 |
| 1979 | $538,814.09$ | 507,062 | 487,252 | 320,969 | 24.22 | 13,252 |
| 1980 | $586,246.21$ | 540,742 | 519,616 | 359,753 | 25.03 | 14,373 |
| 1981 | $370,766.47$ | 334,886 | 321,802 | 234,348 | 25.86 | 9,062 |
| 1982 | $348,166.71$ | 307,804 | 295,779 | 226,471 | 26.69 | 8,485 |
| 1983 | $446,912.40$ | 386,340 | 371,246 | 299,123 | 27.54 | 10,861 |
| 1984 | $376,162.61$ | 317,714 | 305,301 | 258,943 | 28.40 | 9,118 |
| 1985 | $821,197.23$ | 677,303 | 650,842 | 580,954 | 29.26 | 19,855 |
| 1986 | $883,472.99$ | 710,723 | 682,956 | 642,253 | 30.14 | 21,309 |
| 1987 | $803,670.10$ | 630,021 | 605,407 | 600,098 | 31.03 | 19,339 |
| 1988 | $1,027,170.99$ | 784,122 | 753,488 | 787,268 | 31.92 | 24,664 |
| 1989 | $1,104,286.16$ | 819,800 | 787,772 | 868,657 | 32.83 | 26,459 |
| 1990 | $1,305,531.46$ | 941,784 | 904,990 | $1,053,307$ | 33.74 | 31,218 |
| 1991 | $1,127,295.33$ | 789,281 | 758,445 | 932,498 | 34.66 | 26,904 |
| 1992 | $1,335,101.81$ | 906,441 | 871,028 | $1,131,625$ | 35.58 | 31,805 |
| 1993 | $1,500,777.35$ | 986,348 | 947,813 | $1,303,353$ | 36.52 | 35,689 |
| 1994 | $1,837,020.52$ | $1,167,491$ | $1,121,879$ | $1,633,652$ | 37.46 | 43,611 |
| 1995 | $2,547,665.21$ | $1,563,872$ | $1,502,774$ | $2,318,724$ | 38.40 | 60,383 |
| 1996 | $1,723,797.10$ | $1,020,367$ | 980,503 | $1,605,193$ | 39.35 | 40,793 |
| 1997 | $3,498,702.66$ | $1,993,473$ | $1,915,591$ | $3,332,463$ | 40.31 | 82,671 |
| 1998 | $5,071,671.78$ | $2,777,349$ | $2,668,842$ | $4,938,666$ | 41.27 | 119,667 |
| 1999 | $230,354.02$ | 121,043 | 116,314 | 229,217 | 42.23 | 5,428 |
| 2000 | $2,242,005.30$ | $1,127,886$ | $1,083,821$ | $2,279,187$ | 43.20 | 52,759 |
| 2001 | $5,911,100.92$ | $2,841,407$ | $2,730,397$ | $6,136,254$ | 44.17 | 138,924 |
| 2002 | $338,059.67$ | 154,855 | 148,805 | 358,285 | 45.15 | 7,935 |
| 2003 | $264,990.08$ | 115,394 | 110,886 | 286,599 | 46.13 | 6,213 |
| 2004 | $2,246,607.61$ | 927,501 | 891,265 | $2,478,646$ | 47.11 | 52,614 |
| 2005 | $2,616,416.24$ | $1,020,991$ | 981,102 | $2,943,522$ | 48.09 | 61,209 |
| 2006 | $770,525.36$ | 283,076 | 272,017 | 883,771 | 49.08 | 18,007 |

## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 366.00 UNDERGROUND CONDUIT

CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL
RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC . BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE | ACCRUAL |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ |  |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 65-R4
NET SALVAGE PERCENT . . 50

| 2007 | $2,257,391.75$ | 778,292 | 747,885 | $2,638,203$ | 50.06 | 52,701 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2008 | $2,187,063.81$ | 704,081 | 676,573 | $2,604,023$ | 51.05 | 51,009 |
| 2009 | $382,527.20$ | 114,402 | 109,932 | 463,859 | 52.04 | 8,914 |
| 2010 | $1,022,572.17$ | 282,230 | 271,204 | $1,262,654$ | 53.04 | 23,806 |
| 2011 | $1,437,126.81$ | 363,816 | 349,602 | $1,806,088$ | 54.03 | 33,428 |
| 2012 | $939,020.96$ | 216,266 | 207,817 | $1,200,714$ | 55.02 | 21,823 |
| 2013 | $1,267,034.71$ | 262,561 | 252,303 | $1,648,249$ | 56.02 | 29,423 |
| 2014 | $759,422.93$ | 139,852 | 134,388 | $1,004,746$ | 57.02 | 17,621 |
| 2015 | $961,871.62$ | 155,160 | 149,098 | $1,293,709$ | 58.01 | 22,301 |
| 2016 | $1,203,095.28$ | 166,298 | 159,801 | $1,644,842$ | 59.01 | 27,874 |
| 2017 | $1,060,830.00$ | 122,160 | 117,387 | $1,473,858$ | 60.01 | 24,560 |
| 2018 | $1,233,635.40$ | 113,877 | 109,428 | $1,741,025$ | 61.00 | 28,541 |
| 2019 | $2,642,034.18$ | 182,895 | 175,750 | $3,787,301$ | 62.00 | 61,086 |
| 2020 | $2,012,718.13$ | 92,897 | 89,268 | $2,929,809$ | 63.00 | 46,505 |
| 2021 | $2,183,234.73$ | 50,367 | 48,399 | $3,226,453$ | 64.00 | 50,413 |
| 2022 | $713,219.22$ | 4,119 | 3,958 | $1,065,871$ | 64.75 | 16,461 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $66,754,673.86$ | $31,149,438$ | $29,932,474$ | $70,199,537$ |  | $1,574,419$ |

[^126]
(1)

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 44-R3
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. -50

| 1966 | 9,176.93 | 12,323 | 8,902 | 4,863 | 4.61 | 1,055 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1967 | 7,336.06 | 9,784 | 7,068 | 3,936 | 4.88 | 807 |
| 1968 | 31,633.89 | 41,875 | 30,251 | 17,200 | 5.17 | 3,327 |
| 1969 | 48,368.58 | 63,550 | 45,910 | 26,643 | 5.46 | 4,880 |
| 1970 | 75,607.49 | 98,538 | 71,186 | 42,225 | 5.77 | 7,318 |
| 1971 | 95,505.53 | 123,397 | 89,145 | 54,113 | 6.10 | 8,871 |
| 1972 | 71,140.41 | 91,092 | 65,807 | 40,904 | 6.44 | 6,352 |
| 1973 | 64,600.01 | 81,946 | 59,200 | 37,700 | 6.79 | 5,552 |
| 1974 | 466,780.44 | 586,078 | 423,396 | 276,775 | 7.17 | 38,602 |
| 1975 | 518,107.46 | 643,629 | 464,972 | 312,189 | 7.56 | 41,295 |
| 1976 | 545,677.88 | 670,071 | 484,075 | 334,442 | 7.98 | 41,910 |
| 1977 | 799,577.34 | 969,855 | 700,645 | 498,721 | 8.42 | 59,231 |
| 1978 | 909,243.36 | 1,088,610 | 786,437 | 577,428 | 8.88 | 65,026 |
| 1979 | 929,138.65 | 1,097,224 | 792,660 | 601,048 | 9.36 | 64,215 |
| 1980 | 898,439.97 | 1,045,663 | 755,411 | 592,249 | 9.86 | 60,066 |
| 1981 | 973,038.38 | 1,115,233 | 805,670 | 653,888 | 10.38 | 62,995 |
| 1982 | 803,004.97 | 905,296 | 654,007 | 550,500 | 10.93 | 50,366 |
| 1983 | 1,063,162.86 | 1,178,293 | 851,226 | 743,518 | 11.49 | 64,710 |
| 1984 | 922,308.95 | 1,003,634 | 725,048 | 658,415 | 12.08 | 54,505 |
| 1985 | 1,529,705.48 | 1,632,785 | 1,179,561 | 1,114,997 | 12.69 | 87,864 |
| 1986 | 1,699,896.09 | 1,778,516 | 1,284,841 | 1,265,003 | 13.31 | 95,042 |
| 1987 | 1,187,678.48 | 1,216,688 | 878,963 | 902,555 | 13.95 | 64,699 |
| 1988 | 3,351,058.70 | 3,357,509 | 2,425,541 | 2,601,047 | 14.61 | 178,032 |
| 1989 | 3,210,119.56 | 3,141,905 | 2,269,784 | 2,545,395 | 15.29 | 166,474 |
| 1990 | 4,344,150.31 | 4,149,663 | 2,997,812 | 3,518,413 | 15.98 | 220,176 |
| 1991 | 4,844,431.62 | 4,510,263 | 3,258,317 | 4,008,330 | 16.69 | 240,164 |
| 1992 | 4,100,610.94 | 3,717,122 | 2,685,334 | 3,465,582 | 17.41 | 199,057 |
| 1993 | 4,958,686.59 | 4,369,843 | 3,156,875 | 4,281,155 | 18.15 | 235,876 |
| 1994 | 5,523,451.17 | 4,726,279 | 3,414,372 | 4,870,805 | 18.90 | 257,715 |
| 1995 | 5,640,300.29 | 4,678,206 | 3,379,643 | 5,080,807 | 19.67 | 258,302 |
| 1996 | 7,642,536.21 | 6,138,294 | 4,434,444 | 7,029,360 | 20.44 | 343,902 |
| 1997 | 9,565,815.32 | 7,425,464 | 5,364,325 | 8,984,398 | 21.23 | 423,193 |
| 1998 | 19,391,468.99 | 14,523,822 | 10,492,342 | 18,594,861 | 22.03 | 844,070 |
| 1999 | 1,622,208.68 | 1,170,205 | 845,383 | 1,587,930 | 22.84 | 69,524 |
| 2000 | 3,079,053.96 | 2,134,015 | 1,541,661 | 3,076,920 | 23.67 | 129,992 |
| 2001 | 13,046,630.51 | 8,673,009 | 6,265,581 | 13,304,365 | 24.50 | 543,035 |
| 2002 | 496,490.76 | 315,664 | 228,043 | 516,693 | 25.35 | 20,382 |
| 2003 | 860,220.03 | 521,706 | 376,892 | 913,438 | 26.21 | 34,851 |
| 2004 | 1,329,976.40 | 767,603 | 554,534 | 1,440,431 | 27.07 | 53,211 |
| 2005 | 4,082,035.89 | 2,233,506 | 1,613,536 | 4,509,518 | 27.95 | 161,342 |
| 2006 | 2,598,819.60 | 1,343,135 | 970,312 | 2,927,917 | 28.84 | 101,523 |
| 2007 | 13,251,425.48 | 6,446,553 | 4,657,138 | 15,220,000 | 29.73 | 511,941 |
| 2008 | 8,880,665.84 | 4,044,788 | 2,922,047 | 10,398,952 | 30.64 | 339,391 |


| ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE | ACCRUAL |
| $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | $(7)$ |


|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | ACCRUAL |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 44-R3
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. -50

| 2009 | $3,779,648.61$ | $1,604,177$ | $1,158,894$ | $4,510,579$ | 31.55 | 142,966 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2010 | $6,959,022.10$ | $2,735,418$ | $1,976,129$ | $8,462,404$ | 32.47 | 260,622 |
| 2011 | $8,894,737.98$ | $3,214,247$ | $2,322,046$ | $11,020,061$ | 33.40 | 329,942 |
| 2012 | $8,529,129.58$ | $2,808,856$ | $2,029,182$ | $10,764,512$ | 34.34 |  |
| 2013 | $9,575,207.99$ | $2,846,422$ | $2,056,320$ | $12,306,492$ | 35.28 | 313,469 |
| 2014 | $8,511,521.45$ | $2,254,574$ | $1,628,756$ | $11,138,526$ | 36.23 | 348,823 |
| 2015 | $10,780,715.96$ | $2,502,797$ | $1,808,078$ | $14,362,996$ | 37.199 | 386,206 |
| 2016 | $10,321,458.62$ | $2,058,357$ | $1,487,004$ | $13,995,184$ | 38.15 | 366,846 |
| 2017 | $11,191,819.68$ | $1,865,788$ | $1,347,888$ | $15,439,842$ | 39.11 | 394,780 |
| 2018 | $15,538,152.07$ | $2,076,441$ | $1,500,069$ | $21,807,159$ | 40.08 | 544,091 |
| 2019 | $21,467,511.48$ | $2,151,689$ | $1,554,429$ | $30,646,838$ | 41.06 | 746,392 |
| 2020 | $20,971,113.06$ | $1,401,395$ | $1,012,400$ | $30,444,270$ | 42.04 | 724,174 |
| 2021 | $21,355,188.74$ | 713,370 | 515,355 | $31,517,428$ | 43.02 | 732,623 |
| 2022 | $7,375,638.23$ | 62,840 | 45,397 | $11,018,061$ | 43.75 | 251,841 |

## ACCOUNT 368.00 LINE TRANSFORMERS

## CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | ACCRUAL |

SURVIVOR CURVE. IOWA 50-R1. 5
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. -35

| 1939 | 270.99 | 329 | 366 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1947 | 337.03 | 390 | 455 |
| 1948 | 336.35 | 387 | 454 |
| 1950 | 868.31 | 986 | 1,172 |
| 1951 | $4,523.73$ | 5,098 | 6,107 |
| 1952 | $9,649.36$ | 10,796 | 13,027 |
| 1953 | $59,213.45$ | 65,773 | 79,938 |
| 1954 | $11,178.62$ | 12,323 | 15,091 |
| 1955 | $21,377.60$ | 23,382 | 28,860 |
| 1956 | $52,350.33$ | 56,807 | 70,673 |
| 1957 | $42,701.93$ | 45,957 | 57,648 |
| 1958 | $41,583.45$ | 44,382 | 55,726 |
| 1959 | $39,120.74$ | 41,395 | 51,976 |
| 1960 | $33,616.92$ | 35,253 | 44,264 |
| 1961 | $52,455.79$ | 54,499 | 68,429 |
| 1962 | $32,010.81$ | 32,938 | 41,357 |
| 1963 | $56,475.73$ | 57,548 | 72,258 |
| 1964 | $96,781.14$ | 97,599 | 122,546 |
| 1965 | $187,613.70$ | 187,223 | 235,079 |
| 1966 | $355,336.24$ | 350,760 | 440,418 |
| 1967 | $309,126.77$ | 301,640 | 378,742 |
| 1968 | $556,125.38$ | 536,350 | 673,446 |
| 1969 | $658,350.77$ | 627,296 | 787,639 |
| 1970 | $484,374.00$ | 455,772 | 572,272 |
| 1971 | $517,145.06$ | 480,185 | 602,925 |
| 1972 | $361,920.54$ | 331,559 | 416,309 |
| 1973 | $498,389.76$ | 450,121 | 565,176 |
| 1974 | $720,616.95$ | 641,486 | 805,456 |
| 1975 | $666,340.04$ | 584,174 | 733,495 |
| 1976 | $799,441.92$ | 689,854 | 866,187 |
| 1977 | $1,340,682.91$ | $1,138,441$ | $1,429,438$ |
| 1978 | $1,690,530.24$ | $1,411,322$ | $1,772,070$ |
| 1979 | $1,352,727.62$ | $1,109,588$ | $1,393,209$ |
| 1980 | $1,287,528.89$ | $1,037,336$ | $1,302,489$ |
| 1981 | $1,844,340.01$ | $1,458,061$ | $1,830,756$ |
| 1982 | $1,950,776.43$ | $1,512,183$ | $1,898,712$ |
| 1983 | $1,685,030.09$ | $1,279,797$ | $1,606,926$ |
| 1984 | $2,411,476.80$ | $1,793,777$ | $2,252,284$ |
| 1985 | $2,314,631.54$ | $1,684,242$ | $2,114,751$ |
| 1986 | $3,348,837.83$ | $2,382,531$ | $2,991,529$ |
| 1987 | $3,986,653.47$ | $2,769,568$ | $3,477,496$ |
| 1988 | $4,729,559.94$ | $3,206,500$ | $4,026,113$ |
| 1989 | $5,665,301.95$ | $3,744,538$ | $4,701,678$ |
| 193 |  | 2 |  |


| 412 | 10.47 | 39 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 837 | 10.81 | 77 |
| 1,119 | 11.16 | 100 |
| 2,386 | 11.52 | 207 |
| 1,858 | 11.89 | 156 |
| 3,984 | 12.26 | 325 |
| 8,109 | 12.65 | 641 |
| 18,199 | 13.04 | 1,396 |
| 39,286 | 13.44 | 2,923 |
| 38,579 | 13.86 | 2,783 |
| 77,323 | 14.28 | 5,415 |
| 101,135 | 14.71 | 6,875 |
| 81,633 | 15.15 | 5,388 |
| 95,221 | 15.61 | 6,100 |
| 72,284 | 16.07 | 4,498 |
| 107,650 | 16.55 | 6,505 |
| 167,377 | 17.03 | 9,828 |
| 166,064 | 17.53 | 9,473 |
| 213,060 | 18.04 | 11,810 |
| 380,484 | 18.55 | 20,511 |
| 510,146 | 19.08 | 26,737 |
| 432,973 | 19.62 | 22,068 |
| 435,675 | 20.16 | 21,611 |
| 659,103 | 20.72 | 31,810 |
| 734,836 | 21.29 | 34,516 |
| 667,865 | 21.87 | 30,538 |
| $1,003,210$ | 22.45 | 44,686 |
| $1,010,002$ | 23.05 | 43,818 |
| $1,529,402$ | 23.65 | 64,668 |
| $1,904,486$ | 24.27 | 78,471 |
| $2,358,793$ | 24.89 | 94,769 |
| $2,946,480$ | 25.52 | 115,458 |

## ACCOUNT 368.00 LINE TRANSFORMERS

## CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC . BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | ACCRUAL |
|  |  |  | $(7)$ |  |  |  |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 50-R1.5
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. -35

| 1990 | 4,077,600.57 | 2,624,670 | 3,295,561 | 2,209,200 | 26.16 | 84,450 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1991 | 2,990,186.41 | 1,872,245 | 2,350,809 | 1,685,943 | 26.81 | 62,885 |
| 1992 | 2,683,717.18 | 1,632,532 | 2,049,823 | 1,573,195 | 27.47 | 57,270 |
| 1993 | 3,695,898.93 | 2,182,391 | 2,740,231 | 2,249,233 | 28.13 | 79,959 |
| 1994 | 4,421,347.89 | 2,530,780 | 3,177,672 | 2,791,148 | 28.80 | 96,915 |
| 1995 | 20,490,785.85 | 11,352,715 | 14,254,579 | 13,407,982 | 29.48 | 454,816 |
| 1996 | 183,271.02 | 98,125 | 123,207 | 124,209 | 30.17 | 4,117 |
| 1997 | 120,154.01 | 62,061 | 77,924 | 84,284 | 30.87 | 2,730 |
| 1998 | 8,865,849.58 | 4,411,735 | 5,539,417 | 6,429,480 | 31.57 | 203,658 |
| 1999 | 305,075.71 | 146,043 | 183,373 | 228,479 | 32.27 | 7,080 |
| 2000 | 1,976,336.78 | 907,672 | 1,139,682 | 1,528,373 | 32.99 | 46,328 |
| 2001 | 9,837,948.70 | 4,327,025 | 5,433,055 | 7,848,176 | 33.71 | 232,814 |
| 2002 | 202,226.11 | 85,014 | 106,744 | 166,261 | 34.43 | 4,829 |
| 2003 | 266,077.83 | 106,612 | 133,863 | 225,342 | 35.16 | 6,409 |
| 2004 | 1,143,356.98 | 435,276 | 546,537 | 996,995 | 35.90 | 27,771 |
| 2005 | 1,901,898.48 | 686,053 | 861,415 | 1,706,148 | 36.64 | 46,565 |
| 2006 | 924,068.25 | 314,618 | 395,037 | 852,455 | 37.39 | 22,799 |
| 2007 | 6,086,846.05 | 1,949,130 | 2,447,347 | 5,769,895 | 38.14 | 151,282 |
| 2008 | 8,078,958.52 | 2,421,264 | 3,040,163 | 7,866,431 | 38.90 | 202,222 |
| 2009 | 2,599,447.34 | 725,714 | 911,214 | 2,598,040 | 39.66 | 65,508 |
| 2010 | 8,119,970.37 | 2,098,119 | 2,634,418 | 8,327,542 | 40.43 | 205,974 |
| 2011 | 10,254,105.21 | 2,436,375 | 3,059,136 | 10,783,906 | 41.20 | 261,745 |
| 2012 | 6,412,076.84 | 1,388,471 | 1,743,378 | 6,912,926 | 41.98 | 164,672 |
| 2013 | 4,271,971.21 | 835,085 | 1,048,541 | 4,718,620 | 42.76 | 110,351 |
| 2014 | 4,147,103.37 | 722,218 | 906,824 | 4,691,766 | 43.55 | 107,733 |
| 2015 | 4,707,380.98 | 719,382 | 903,263 | 5,451,701 | 44.34 | 122,952 |
| 2016 | 5,010,597.56 | 658,843 | 827,250 | 5,937,057 | 45.13 | 131,555 |
| 2017 | 5,317,916.65 | 584,386 | 733,761 | 6,445,426 | 45.93 | 140,332 |
| 2018 | 7,814,819.25 | 687,860 | 863,683 | 9,686,323 | 46.74 | 207,238 |
| 2019 | 8,016,216.75 | 532,437 | 668,533 | 10,153,360 | 47.54 | 213,575 |
| 2020 | 8,547,565.30 | 378,486 | 475,231 | 11,063,982 | 48.36 | 228,784 |
| 2021 | 7,127,753.61 | 157,808 | 198,145 | 9,424,322 | 49.18 | 191,629 |
| 2022 | 3,651,454.36 | 20,704 | 25,996 | 4,903,468 | 49.79 | 98,483 |
|  | 204,527,694.78 | 80,841,995 | 101,500,754 | 174,611,634 |  | 4,749,630 |

## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

## ACCOUNT 369.00 SERVICES

## CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022


CALCULATED
ACCRUED
(3)
ALLOC. BOOK RESERVE
(4)
FUTURE BOOK ACCRUALS
(5)
REM.
LIFE
(6)
ANNUAL
ACCRUAL
(7)

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 65-R4
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. -125

| 1953 | $82,085.86$ | 162,445 | 158,473 | 26,220 | 7.83 | 3,349 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1954 | $25,790.71$ | 50,691 | 49,452 | 8,577 | 8.22 | 1,043 |
| 1956 | $37,083.33$ | 71,808 | 70,052 | 13,385 | 9.06 | 1,477 |
| 1957 | $58,715.17$ | 112,780 | 110,022 | 22,087 | 9.51 | 2,323 |
| 1958 | $48,636.17$ | 92,613 | 90,349 | 19,082 | 9.99 | 1,910 |
| 1959 | $52,776.26$ | 99,583 | 97,148 | 21,599 | 10.49 | 2,059 |
| 1960 | $51,651.76$ | 96,513 | 94,153 | 22,063 | 11.02 | 2,002 |
| 1961 | $73,561.95$ | 136,053 | 132,726 | 32,788 | 11.57 | 2,834 |
| 1962 | $78,663.43$ | 143,909 | 140,390 | 36,603 | 12.15 | 3,013 |
| 1963 | $78,015.59$ | 141,104 | 137,654 | 37,881 | 12.75 | 2,971 |
| 1964 | $93,427.72$ | 166,974 | 162,891 | 47,321 | 13.37 | 3,539 |
| 1965 | $106,029.39$ | 187,146 | 182,570 | 55,996 | 14.01 | 3,997 |
| 1966 | $127,312.49$ | 221,804 | 216,381 | 70,072 | 14.67 | 4,777 |
| 1967 | $126,118.35$ | 216,797 | 211,496 | 72,270 | 15.34 | 4,711 |
| 1968 | $285,348.15$ | 483,798 | 471,969 | 170,064 | 16.02 | 10,616 |
| 1969 | $219,733.13$ | 367,299 | 358,318 | 136,082 | 16.71 | 8,144 |
| 1970 | $380,272.73$ | 626,438 | 611,121 | 244,493 | 17.41 | 14,043 |
| 1971 | $533,986.71$ | 866,536 | 845,349 | 356,121 | 18.12 | 19,653 |
| 1972 | $607,358.53$ | 970,460 | 946,732 | 419,825 | 18.84 | 22,284 |
| 1973 | $751,171.82$ | $1,181,270$ | $1,152,387$ | 537,750 | 19.57 | 27,478 |
| 1974 | $744,273.53$ | $1,151,097$ | $1,122,952$ | 551,663 | 20.32 | 27,149 |
| 1975 | $815,529.02$ | $1,240,144$ | $1,209,822$ | 625,118 | 21.07 | 29,669 |
| 1976 | $878,855.45$ | $1,313,010$ | $1,280,906$ | 696,519 | 21.84 | 31,892 |
| 1977 | $713,647.20$ | $1,046,920$ | $1,021,322$ | 584,384 | 22.62 | 25,835 |
| 1978 | $810,823.05$ | $1,167,312$ | $1,138,771$ | 685,581 | 23.41 | 29,286 |
| 1979 | $903,294.95$ | $1,275,096$ | $1,243,919$ | 788,495 | 24.22 | 32,556 |
| 1980 | $922,062.39$ | $1,275,738$ | $1,244,545$ | 830,095 | 25.03 | 33,164 |
| 1981 | $1,096,018.59$ | $1,484,927$ | $1,448,620$ | $1,017,422$ | 25.86 | 39,343 |
| 1982 | $697,225.09$ | 924,594 | 901,987 | 666,769 | 26.69 | 24,982 |
| 1983 | $1,057,132.82$ | $1,370,781$ | $1,337,265$ | $1,041,284$ | 27.54 | 37,810 |
| 1984 | $928,838.50$ | $1,176,773$ | $1,148,000$ | 941,887 | 28.40 | 33,165 |
| 1985 | $870,221.94$ | $1,076,606$ | $1,050,282$ | 907,717 | 29.26 | 31,022 |
| 1986 | $1,027,977.40$ | $1,240,458$ | $1,210,128$ | $1,102,821$ | 30.14 | 36,590 |
| 1987 | $1,039,892.48$ | $1,222,804$ | $1,192,906$ | $1,146,852$ | 31.03 | 36,959 |
| 1988 | $1,345,071.05$ | $1,540,201$ | $1,502,542$ | $1,523,868$ | 31.92 | 47,740 |
| 1989 | $1,704,635.35$ | $1,898,231$ | $1,851,818$ | $1,983,612$ | 32.83 | 60,421 |
| 1990 | $2,066,694.24$ | $2,236,308$ | $2,181,629$ | $2,468,433$ | 33.74 | 73,160 |
| 1991 | $1,609,467.09$ | $1,690,315$ | $1,648,986$ | $1,972,315$ | 34.66 | 56,905 |
| 1992 | $1,700,215.22$ | $1,731,491$ | $1,689,155$ | $2,136,329$ | 35.58 | 60,043 |
| 1993 | $2,364,757.38$ | $2,331,267$ | $2,274,266$ | $3,046,438$ | 36.52 | 83,418 |
| 1994 | $1,757,798.05$ | $1,675,713$ | $1,634,741$ | $2,320,305$ | 37.46 | 61,941 |
| 1995 | $1,350,609.22$ | $1,243,597$ | $1,213,190$ | $1,825,681$ | 38.40 | 47,544 |
| 1996 | $2,599,926.16$ | $2,308,461$ | $2,252,018$ | $3,597,816$ | 39.35 | 91,431 |

## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

## ACCOUNT 369.00 SERVICES

## CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC . BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | ACCRUAL |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 65-R4
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. -125

| 1997 | $789,763.83$ | 674,982 | 658,478 | $1,118,491$ | 40.31 | 27,747 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1998 | $4,959,085.61$ | $4,073,542$ | $3,973,941$ | $7,184,002$ | 41.27 | 174,073 |
| 1999 | $16,199.57$ | 12,768 | 12,456 | 23,993 | 42.23 | 568 |
| 2000 | $288,118.68$ | 217,416 | 212,100 | 436,167 | 43.20 | 10,096 |
| 2001 | $5,613,507.78$ | $4,047,536$ | $3,948,571$ | $8,681,822$ | 44.17 | 196,555 |
| 2002 | $7,587.00$ | 5,213 | 5,086 | 11,985 | 45.15 | 265 |
| 2003 | $11,349.51$ | 7,413 | 7,232 | 18,304 | 46.13 | 397 |
| 2004 | $96,108.09$ | 59,517 | 58,062 | 158,181 | 47.11 | 3,358 |
| 2005 | $337,224.60$ | 197,390 | 192,564 | 566,191 | 48.09 | 11,774 |
| 2006 | $46,378.56$ | 25,558 | 24,933 | 79,419 | 49.08 | 1,618 |
| 2007 | $2,531,030.72$ | $1,308,954$ | $1,276,949$ | $4,417,870$ | 50.06 | 88,251 |
| 2008 | $601,410.78$ | 290,418 | 283,317 | $1,069,857$ | 51.05 | 20,957 |
| 2009 | $713,968.13$ | 320,290 | 312,459 | $1,293,969$ | 52.04 | 24,865 |
| 2010 | $438,728.95$ | 181,634 | 177,193 | 809,947 | 53.04 | 15,270 |
| 2011 | $1,084,549.28$ | 411,839 | 401,769 | $2,038,467$ | 54.03 | 37,728 |
| 2012 | $928,868.29$ | 320,891 | 313,045 | $1,776,909$ | 55.02 | 32,296 |
| 2013 | $1,493,452.74$ | 464,221 | 452,870 | $2,907,399$ | 56.02 | 51,899 |
| 2014 | $1,482,599.73$ | 409,542 | 399,529 | $2,936,320$ | 57.02 | 51,496 |
| 2015 | $1,698,228.26$ | 410,912 | 400,865 | $3,420,149$ | 58.01 | 58,958 |
| 2016 | $2,350,254.57$ | 487,296 | 475,381 | $4,812,692$ | 59.01 | 81,557 |
| 2017 | $2,560,180.92$ | 442,226 | 431,413 | $5,328,994$ | 60.01 | 88,802 |
| 2018 | $2,315,660.48$ | 320,638 | 312,798 | $4,897,438$ | 61.00 | 80,286 |
| 2019 | $2,398,695.73$ | 249,075 | 242,985 | $5,154,080$ | 62.00 | 83,130 |
| 2020 | $2,975,159.09$ | 205,978 | 200,942 | $6,493,166$ | 63.00 | 103,066 |
| 2021 | $2,839,318.15$ | 98,255 | 95,853 | $6,292,613$ | 64.00 | 98,322 |
| 2022 | $1,621,455.72$ | 14,046 | 13,702 | $3,634,573$ | 64.75 | 56,132 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $73,021,590.19$ | $55,275,415$ | $53,923,896$ | $110,374,681$ |  | $2,573,714$ |

COMPOSITE REMAINING LIFE AND ANNUAL ACCRUAL RATE, PERCENT .. 42.9 3.52

## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

## ACCOUNT 370.00 METERS

## CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ |  |

SURVIVOR CURVE. IOWA 42-R2. 5 NET SALVAGE PERCENT . . -30

| 1953 | 13,183.95 | 16,168 | 17,139 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1954 | 6,916.76 | 8,427 | 8,992 |  |  |  |
| 1955 | 7,449.82 | 9,021 | 9,685 |  |  |  |
| 1956 | 19,217.81 | 23,133 | 24,983 |  |  |  |
| 1957 | 12,018.05 | 14,385 | 15,600 | 23 | 3.33 | 7 |
| 1958 | 15,173.10 | 18,058 | 19,583 | 142 | 3.55 | 40 |
| 1959 | 19,884.25 | 23,529 | 25,516 | 334 | 3.77 | 89 |
| 1960 | 18,862.17 | 22,197 | 24,072 | 449 | 3.98 | 113 |
| 1961 | 15,296.04 | 17,896 | 19,408 | 477 | 4.20 | 114 |
| 1962 | 3,389.01 | 3,941 | 4,274 | 132 | 4.43 | 30 |
| 1963 | 16,552.35 | 19,131 | 20,747 | 771 | 4.66 | 165 |
| 1964 | 17,656.51 | 20,281 | 21,994 | 959 | 4.89 | 196 |
| 1965 | 22,558.27 | 25,744 | 27,919 | 1,407 | 5.13 | 274 |
| 1966 | 36,663.30 | 41,568 | 45,079 | 2,583 | 5.37 | 481 |
| 1967 | 28,752.31 | 32,376 | 35,111 | 2,267 | 5.62 | 403 |
| 1968 | 36,623.60 | 40,945 | 44,404 | 3,207 | 5.88 | 545 |
| 1969 | 33,339. 84 | 37,006 | 40,132 | 3,210 | 6.14 | 523 |
| 1970 | 48,329.92 | 53,225 | 57,721 | 5,108 | 6.42 | 796 |
| 1971 | 46,057.55 | 50,324 | 54,575 | 5,300 | 6.70 | 791 |
| 1972 | 58,980.37 | 63,895 | 69,292 | 7,382 | 7.00 | 1,055 |
| 1973 | 188,986.94 | 202,863 | 219,998 | 25,685 | 7.32 | 3,509 |
| 1974 | 225,229.65 | 239,468 | 259,695 | 33,104 | 7.65 | 4,327 |
| 1975 | 130,401.78 | 137,232 | 148,824 | 20,698 | 8.00 | 2,587 |
| 1976 | 213,198.36 | 221,923 | 240,668 | 36,490 | 8.37 | 4,360 |
| 1977 | 238,819.61 | 245,786 | 266,547 | 43,918 | 8.75 | 5,019 |
| 1978 | 270,280.95 | 274,732 | 297,938 | 53,427 | 9.16 | 5,833 |
| 1979 | 245,441.43 | 246,220 | 267,018 | 52,056 | 9.59 | 5,428 |
| 1980 | 299,881.56 | 296,653 | 321,711 | 68,135 | 10.04 | 6,786 |
| 1981 | 402,139.91 | 391,961 | 425,069 | 97,713 | 10.51 | 9,297 |
| 1982 | 312,464.32 | 299,819 | 325,144 | 81,060 | 11.00 | 7,369 |
| 1983 | 497,832.07 | 469,822 | 509,507 | 137,675 | 11.51 | 11,961 |
| 1984 | 499,130.41 | 462,858 | 501,955 | 146,915 | 12.04 | 12,202 |
| 1985 | 503,699.90 | 458,524 | 497,255 | 157,555 | 12.59 | 12,514 |
| 1986 | 535,338.55 | 477,881 | 518,247 | 177,693 | 13.16 | 13,503 |
| 1987 | 553,792.05 | 484,412 | 525,329 | 194,601 | 13.74 | 14,163 |
| 1988 | 881,118.78 | 754,087 | 817,783 | 327,671 | 14.35 | 22,834 |
| 1989 | 886,382.58 | 741,584 | 804,224 | 348,073 | 14.97 | 23,251 |
| 1990 | 861,939.66 | 704,057 | 763,527 | 356,995 | 15.61 | 22,870 |
| 1991 | 931,173.55 | 741,883 | 804,548 | 405,978 | 16.26 | 24,968 |
| 1992 | 602,950.69 | 467,872 | 507,392 | 276,444 | 16.93 | 16,329 |
| 1993 | 818,450.57 | 617,867 | 670,057 | 393,929 | 17.61 | 22,370 |
| 1994 | 1,245,957.81 | 913,617 | 990,788 | 628,957 | 18.31 | 34,350 |
| 1995 | 4,418,117.65 | 3,142,528 | 3,407,971 | 2,335,582 | 19.02 | 122,796 |

## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

## ACCOUNT 370.00 METERS

## CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC . BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | ACCRUAL |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 42-R2.5
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. -30

| 1996 | $309,666.31$ | 213,263 | 231,277 | 171,289 | 19.75 | 8,673 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1997 | $272,099.35$ | 181,244 | 196,553 | 157,176 | 20.48 | 7,675 |
| 1998 | $3,642,165.05$ | $2,341,460$ | $2,539,238$ | $2,195,577$ | 21.23 | 103,419 |
| 1999 | $29,937.95$ | 18,542 | 20,108 | 18,811 | 21.99 | 855 |
| 2000 | $1,740,589.74$ | $1,036,573$ | $1,124,130$ | $1,138,637$ | 22.76 | 50,028 |
| 2001 | $1,904,634.62$ | $1,088,263$ | $1,180,187$ | $1,295,838$ | 23.54 | 55,048 |
| 2002 | $42,133.15$ | 23,031 | 24,976 | 29,797 | 24.34 | 1,224 |
| 2003 | $33,815.98$ | 17,647 | 19,138 | 24,823 | 25.14 | 987 |
| 2004 | $1,681.89$ | 836 | 907 | 1,279 | 25.95 | 49 |
| 2005 | $532,763.20$ | 250,982 | 272,182 | 420,410 | 26.78 | 15,699 |
| 2006 | $131,792.45$ | 58,701 | 63,659 | 107,671 | 27.61 | 3,900 |
| 2007 | $2,644,171.23$ | $1,108,981$ | $1,202,654$ | $2,234,769$ | 28.45 | 78,551 |
| 2008 | $509,037.52$ | 199,941 | 216,830 | 444,919 | 29.31 | 15,180 |
| 2009 | $693,390.53$ | 253,900 | 275,346 | 626,062 | 30.17 | 20,751 |
| 2010 | $1,321,242.78$ | 448,212 | 486,072 | $1,231,544$ | 31.04 | 39,676 |
| 2011 | $1,451,279.33$ | 453,252 | 491,537 | $1,395,126$ | 31.91 | 43,721 |
| 2012 | $992,941.98$ | 282,755 | 306,639 | 984,186 | 32.80 | 30,006 |
| 2013 | $1,646,796.31$ | 423,586 | 459,365 | $1,681,470$ | 33.69 | 49,910 |
| 2014 | $946,813.59$ | 217,160 | 235,503 | 995,355 | 34.59 | 28,776 |
| 2015 | $2,964,263.30$ | 596,374 | 646,749 | $3,206,793$ | 35.50 | 90,332 |
| 2016 | $1,597,954.51$ | 276,494 | 299,849 | $1,777,492$ | 36.41 | 48,819 |
| 2017 | $3,372,298.77$ | 487,456 | 528,631 | $3,855,357$ | 37.33 | 103,278 |
| 2018 | $2,779,959.08$ | 322,689 | 349,946 | $3,264,001$ | 38.25 | 85,333 |
| 2019 | $1,282,771.70$ | 111,963 | 121,420 | $1,546,183$ | 39.18 | 39,464 |
| 2020 | $4,719,566.88$ | 274,622 | 297,819 | $5,837,618$ | 40.12 | 145,504 |
| 2021 | $3,498,134.05$ | 101,775 | 110,371 | $4,437,203$ | 41.06 | 108,066 |
| 2022 | $1,500,666.88$ | 11,139 | 12,080 | $1,938,787$ | 41.76 | 46,427 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $56,802,201.89$ | $24,335,740$ | $26,390,587$ | $47,452,275$ |  | $1,635,599$ |

[^127]
## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 371.00 INSTALLATIONS ON CUSTOMERS' PREMISES

CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL
RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | $(7)$ |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 30-R0.5
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. -40

| 1966 | 26,215.33 | 34,353 | 22,345 | 14,356 | 1.92 | 7,477 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1967 | 13,724.01 | 17,689 | 11,506 | 7,708 | 2.38 | 3,239 |
| 1968 | 33,299.17 | 42,221 | 27,463 | 19,156 | 2.83 | 6,769 |
| 1969 | 23,854.83 | 29,768 | 19,363 | 14,034 | 3.26 | 4,305 |
| 1970 | 16,811.88 | 20,649 | 13,431 | 10,106 | 3.68 | 2,746 |
| 1971 | 7,076.82 | 8,553 | 5,563 | 4,345 | 4.10 | 1,060 |
| 1972 | 32,952.90 | 39,214 | 25,507 | 20,627 | 4.50 | 4,584 |
| 1973 | 24,712.67 | 28,947 | 18,829 | 15,769 | 4.90 | 3,218 |
| 1974 | 12,294.21 | 14,171 | 9,218 | 7,994 | 5.30 | 1,508 |
| 1975 | 11,544.00 | 13,091 | 8,515 | 7,647 | 5.70 | 1,342 |
| 1976 | 9,337.57 | 10,415 | 6,774 | 6,299 | 6.10 | 1,033 |
| 1977 | 15,907.68 | 17,453 | 11,352 | 10,919 | 6.49 | 1,682 |
| 1978 | 6,706.70 | 7,233 | 4,705 | 4,684 | 6.89 | 680 |
| 1979 | 13,315.88 | 14,112 | 9,179 | 9,463 | 7.29 | 1,298 |
| 1980 | 42,591.34 | 44,343 | 28,843 | 30,785 | 7.69 | 4,003 |
| 1981 | 18,228.08 | 18,629 | 12,117 | 13,402 | 8.10 | 1,655 |
| 1982 | 46,927.20 | 47,062 | 30,612 | 35,086 | 8.51 | 4,123 |
| 1983 | 24,625.43 | 24,213 | 15,749 | 18,727 | 8.93 | 2,097 |
| 1984 | 38,073.98 | 36,690 | 23,865 | 29,439 | 9.35 | 3,149 |
| 1985 | 43,076.82 | 40,667 | 26,452 | 33,856 | 9.77 | 3,465 |
| 1986 | 29,585.22 | 27,323 | 17,772 | 23,647 | 10.21 | 2,316 |
| 1987 | 8,662.35 | 7,822 | 5,088 | 7,039 | 10.65 | 661 |
| 1988 | 8,253.80 | 7,284 | 4,738 | 6,817 | 11.09 | 615 |
| 1989 | 14,941.20 | 12,864 | 8,367 | 12,551 | 11.55 | 1,087 |
| 1990 | 7,944.02 | 6,669 | 4,338 | 6,784 | 12.01 | 565 |
| 1991 | 21,569.24 | 17,635 | 11,471 | 18,726 | 12.48 | 1,500 |
| 1992 | 6,519.20 | 5,187 | 3,374 | 5,753 | 12.95 | 444 |
| 1993 | 9,120.15 | 7,048 | 4,584 | 8,184 | 13.44 | 609 |
| 1994 | 11,542.45 | 8,656 | 5,630 | 10,529 | 13.93 | 756 |
| 1995 | 3,116.27 | 2,264 | 1,473 | 2,890 | 14.43 | 200 |
| 1996 | 9,632.96 | 6,774 | 4,406 | 9,080 | 14.93 | 608 |
| 1997 | 238.97 | 162 | 105 | 230 | 15.45 | 15 |
| 1998 | 104,113.25 | 68,167 | 44,340 | 101,419 | 15.97 | 6,351 |
| 1999 | 92.63 | 58 | 38 | 92 | 16.50 | 6 |
| 2000 | 19,509.70 | 11,799 | 7,675 | 19,639 | 17.04 | 1,153 |
| 2001 | 229,444.18 | 132,986 | 86,502 | 234,720 | 17.58 | 13,352 |
| 2003 | 3,292.21 | 1,738 | 1,130 | 3,479 | 18.69 | 186 |
| 2004 | 3,919.88 | 1,966 | 1,279 | 4,209 | 19.25 | 219 |
| 2005 | 17,892.61 | 8,500 | 5,529 | 19,521 | 19.82 | 985 |
| 2006 | 588.70 | 264 | 172 | 652 | 20.39 | 32 |
| 2007 | 23,249.73 | 9,797 | 6,373 | 26,177 | 20.97 | 1,248 |
| 2008 | 247,902.43 | 97,757 | 63,587 | 283,476 | 21.55 | 13,154 |
| 2009 | 27,317.07 | 10,020 | 6,518 | 31,726 | 22.14 | 1,433 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

|  | ACCOUNT 371.00 INSTALLATIONS ON CUSTOMERS' PREMISES |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUALRELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE | ACCRUAL |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 30-R0.5
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. -40

| 2010 | $106,873.86$ | 36,258 | 23,584 | 126,039 | 22.73 | 5,545 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2011 | $302,423.70$ | 94,277 | 61,323 | 362,070 | 23.32 | 15,526 |
| 2012 | $2,371.54$ | 673 | 438 | 2,882 | 23.92 | 120 |
| 2013 | $14,520.85$ | 3,720 | 2,420 | 17,909 | 24.51 | 731 |
| 2014 | $83,158.70$ | 18,977 | 12,343 | 104,079 | 25.11 | 4,145 |
| 2015 | $56,616.95$ | 11,309 | 7,356 | 71,908 | 25.72 | 2,796 |
| 2016 | $31,141.74$ | 5,348 | 3,479 | 40,119 | 26.32 | 1,524 |
| 2017 | $19,130.97$ | 2,741 | 1,783 | 25,000 | 26.93 | 928 |
| 2018 | $22,106.96$ | 2,538 | 1,651 | 29,299 | 27.54 | 1,064 |
| 2019 | $39,878.17$ | 3,443 | 2,239 | 53,590 | 28.15 | 1,904 |
| 2020 | $35,399.12$ | 2,048 | 1,332 | 48,227 | 28.76 | 1,677 |
| 2021 | $170,525.77$ | 4,935 | 3,210 | 235,526 | 29.38 | 8,017 |
| 2022 | $11,449.09$ | 85 | 55 | 15,974 | 29.84 | 535 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $2,165,322.14$ | $1,148,565$ | 747,090 | $2,284,361$ |  | 151,440 |

## ACCOUNT 373.10 STREET LIGHTING AND SIGNAL SYSTEMS

 CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | ACCRUAL |
|  |  | $(7)$ |  |  |  |  |

SURVIVOR CURVE. IOWA 44-S0.5 NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. -45

| 1945 | 530.06 | 702 | 688 | 81 | 3.80 | 21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1953 | 1,267.86 | 1,568 | 1,536 | 302 | 6.48 | 47 |
| 1954 | 1,314.23 | 1,610 | 1,577 | 329 | 6.82 | 48 |
| 1955 | 877.32 | 1,065 | 1,043 | 229 | 7.16 | 32 |
| 1956 | 1,318.89 | 1,586 | 1,554 | 358 | 7.51 | 48 |
| 1957 | 405.56 | 483 | 473 | 115 | 7.85 | 15 |
| 1959 | 148.29 | 173 | 169 | 46 | 8.55 | 5 |
| 1960 | 4,039.12 | 4,672 | 4,577 | 1,280 | 8.90 | 144 |
| 1961 | 183.27 | 210 | 206 | 60 | 9.25 | 6 |
| 1962 | 141.68 | 161 | 158 | 47 | 9.61 | 5 |
| 1963 | 1,140.62 | 1,279 | 1,253 | 401 | 9.97 | 40 |
| 1964 | 192.65 | 214 | 210 | 69 | 10.33 | 7 |
| 1965 | 267.87 | 294 | 288 | 100 | 10.70 | 9 |
| 1966 | 28,023.49 | 30,411 | 29,791 | 10,843 | 11.07 | 979 |
| 1967 | 27,884.01 | 29,920 | 29,310 | 11,122 | 11.44 | 972 |
| 1968 | 28,764.24 | 30,504 | 29,882 | 11,826 | 11.82 | 1,001 |
| 1969 | 23,448.46 | 24,573 | 24,072 | 9,928 | 12.20 | 814 |
| 1970 | 14,004.11 | 14,500 | 14,204 | 6,102 | 12.58 | 485 |
| 1971 | 40,110.71 | 41,017 | 40,181 | 17,980 | 12.97 | 1,386 |
| 1972 | 29,705.99 | 29,995 | 29,384 | 13,690 | 13.36 | 1,025 |
| 1973 | 54,938.79 | 54,749 | 53,633 | 26,028 | 13.76 | 1,892 |
| 1974 | 52,831.79 | 51,953 | 50,894 | 25,712 | 14.16 | 1,816 |
| 1975 | 55,293.70 | 53,645 | 52,552 | 27,624 | 14.56 | 1,897 |
| 1976 | 26,639.25 | 25,485 | 24,966 | 13,661 | 14.97 | 913 |
| 1977 | 53,698.36 | 50,629 | 49,597 | 28,266 | 15.39 | 1,837 |
| 1978 | 53,783.99 | 49,965 | 48,947 | 29,040 | 15.81 | 1,837 |
| 1979 | 37,091.77 | 33,932 | 33,240 | 20,543 | 16.24 | 1,265 |
| 1980 | 77,000.35 | 69,351 | 67,937 | 43,714 | 16.67 | 2,622 |
| 1981 | 55,375.76 | 49,071 | 48,071 | 32,224 | 17.11 | 1,883 |
| 1982 | 61,314.10 | 53,445 | 52,356 | 36,549 | 17.55 | 2,083 |
| 1983 | 48,353.29 | 41,430 | 40,585 | 29,527 | 18.00 | 1,640 |
| 1984 | 58,104.21 | 48,904 | 47,907 | 36,344 | 18.46 | 1,969 |
| 1985 | 84,378.58 | 69,711 | 68,290 | 54,059 | 18.93 | 2,856 |
| 1986 | 135,709.32 | 110,017 | 107,774 | 89,005 | 19.40 | 4,588 |
| 1987 | 97,331.79 | 77,365 | 75,788 | 65,343 | 19.88 | 3,287 |
| 1988 | 199,207.65 | 155,191 | 152,028 | 136,823 | 20.36 | 6,720 |
| 1989 | 250,124.97 | 190,738 | 186,850 | 175,831 | 20.86 | 8,429 |
| 1990 | 172,187.78 | 128,469 | 125,850 | 123,822 | 21.36 | 5,797 |
| 1991 | 400,612.06 | 292,157 | 286,202 | 294,685 | 21.87 | 13,474 |
| 1992 | 331,698.71 | 236,220 | 231,405 | 249,558 | 22.39 | 11,146 |
| 1993 | 443,869.69 | 308,348 | 302,063 | 341,548 | 22.92 | 14,902 |
| 1994 | 448,716.20 | 303,731 | 297,540 | 353,098 | 23.46 | 15,051 |
| 1995 | 607,702.32 | 400,332 | 392,172 | 488,996 | 24.01 | 20,366 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 373.10 STREET LIGHTING AND SIGNAL SYSTEMS CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | ACCRUAL |

SURVIVOR CURVE. IOWA 44-S0.5
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. -45

| 1996 | 551,979.75 | 353,436 | 346,232 | 454,139 | 24.57 | 18,483 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1997 | $1,426,809.01$ | 886,802 | 868,725 | 1,200,148 | 25.14 | 47,739 |
| 1998 | $1,926,769.80$ | $1,160,691$ | 1,137,031 | 1,656,785 | 25.72 | 64,416 |
| 1999 | 39,686.74 | 23,136 | 22,664 | 34,882 | 26.31 | 1,326 |
| 2000 | 309,954.60 | 174,565 | 171,007 | 278,427 | 26.91 | 10,347 |
| 2001 | $2,804,611.74$ | 1,522,242 | 1,491,212 | 2,575,475 | 27.53 | 93,552 |
| 2002 | 137,986.85 | 72,075 | 70,606 | 129,475 | 28.15 | 4,599 |
| 2003 | 112,173.02 | 56,225 | 55,079 | 107,572 | 28.79 | 3,736 |
| 2004 | 83,541.94 | 40,057 | 39,240 | 81,896 | 29.45 | 2,781 |
| 2005 | 117,059.23 | 53,582 | 52,490 | 117,246 | 30.11 | 3,894 |
| 2006 | 225,217.39 | 98,045 | 96,046 | 230,519 | 30.79 | 7,487 |
| 2007 | 646,657.28 | 266,594 | 261,160 | 676,493 | 31.49 | 21,483 |
| 2008 | $1,590,374.45$ | 618,435 | 605,829 | 1,700,214 | 32.20 | 52,802 |
| 2009 | 338,019.73 | 123,311 | 120,797 | 369,332 | 32.93 | 11,216 |
| 2010 | 2,073,595.14 | 705,886 | 691,497 | 2,315,216 | 33.67 | 68,762 |
| 2011 | $5,399,003.36$ | 1,704,511 | 1,669,766 | 6,158,789 | 34.42 | 178,931 |
| 2012 | $854,765.12$ | 247,882 | 242,829 | 996,580 | 35.20 | 28,312 |
| 2013 | 617,115.89 | 162,902 | 159,582 | 735,236 | 35.99 | 20,429 |
| 2014 | 698,792.88 | 165,808 | 162,428 | 850,822 | 36.80 | 23,120 |
| 2015 | $1,141,356.99$ | 239,590 | 234,706 | 1,420,262 | 37.63 | 37,743 |
| 2016 | $838,710.76$ | 152,564 | 149,454 | 1,066,677 | 38.48 | 27,720 |
| 2017 | $865,476.03$ | 132,911 | 130,202 | 1,124,738 | 39.34 | 28,590 |
| 2018 | 848,721.28 | 105,442 | 103,293 | 1,127,353 | 40.23 | 28,023 |
| 2019 | $1,044,014.86$ | 98,398 | 96,392 | 1,417,430 | 41.14 | 34,454 |
| 2020 | $1,175,386.54$ | 74,751 | 73,227 | 1,631,083 | 42.07 | 38,771 |
| 2021 | $1,145,187.49$ | 36,980 | 36,227 | 1,624,295 | 43.02 | 37,757 |
| 2022 | $533,656.40$ | 4,395 | 4,305 | 769,497 | 43.75 | 17,589 |
|  | $31,556,357.13$ | 12,350,991 | 12,099,229 | $33,657,489$ |  | 1,049,421 |

[^128]| THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACCOUNT 389.20 LAND RIGHTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUALRELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| YEAR <br> (1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ORIGINAL } \\ & \text { COST } \\ & (2) \end{aligned}$ | CALCULATED ACCRUED (3) | ALLOC. BOOK RESERVE <br> (4) | FUTURE BOOK ACCRUALS (5) | REM. LIFE (6) | ANNUAL ACCRUAL (7) |
| SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 75-R3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | 3,778.48 | 827 | 859 | 2,920 | 58.58 | 50 |
|  | 3,778.48 | 827 | 859 | 2,920 |  | 50 |
| COMPOSITE REMAINING LIFE AND ANNUAL ACCRUAL RATE, PERCENT .. 58.4 1.32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 390.10 STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS

CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL
RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | $(7)$ |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 60-R2
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. -15

| 1911 | 38,668.75 | 44,247 | 44,469 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1920 | 9,845.61 | 10,854 | 11,322 |  |  |  |
| 1941 | 1,653.26 | 1,629 | 1,901 |  |  |  |
| 1953 | 1,162.16 | 1,053 | 1,336 |  |  |  |
| 1955 | 4,274.73 | 3,809 | 4,916 |  |  |  |
| 1956 | 4,668.83 | 4,124 | 5,369 |  |  |  |
| 1957 | 24.58 | 22 | 28 |  |  |  |
| 1958 | 300,339.19 | 260,365 | 345,390 |  |  |  |
| 1959 | 5,938.00 | 5,096 | 6,829 |  |  |  |
| 1963 | 494.79 | 407 | 553 | 16 | 17.08 | 1 |
| 1965 | 403,662.54 | 324,405 | 440,437 | 23,775 | 18.07 | 1,316 |
| 1966 | 37,967.07 | 30,141 | 40,922 | 2,740 | 18.58 | 147 |
| 1967 | 160,516.33 | 125,832 | 170,839 | 13,755 | 19.10 | 720 |
| 1968 | 313.87 | 243 | 330 | 31 | 19.63 | 2 |
| 1969 | 4,956.08 | 3,783 | 5,136 | 563 | 20.17 | 28 |
| 1973 | 51,507.04 | 37,090 | 50,356 | 8,877 | 22.43 | 396 |
| 1974 | 97,601.93 | 69,178 | 93,921 | 18,321 | 23.02 | 796 |
| 1977 | 19,915.67 | 13,425 | 18,227 | 4,676 | 24.83 | 188 |
| 1978 | 21,136.90 | 13,993 | 18,998 | 5,309 | 25.46 | 209 |
| 1979 | 32,599.18 | 21,188 | 28,766 | 8,723 | 26.09 | 334 |
| 1980 | 244,857.83 | 156,140 | 211,988 | 69,599 | 26.73 | 2,604 |
| 1981 | 58,772.42 | 36,734 | 49,873 | 17,715 | 27.39 | 647 |
| 1982 | 11,568.71 | 7,087 | 9,622 | 3,682 | 28.04 | 131 |
| 1983 | 19,601.15 | 11,755 | 15,959 | 6,582 | 28.71 | 229 |
| 1984 | 67,308.39 | 39,490 | 53,615 | 23,790 | 29.39 | 809 |
| 1985 | 126,025.40 | 72,295 | 98,153 | 46,776 | 30.07 | 1,556 |
| 1986 | 237,695.32 | 133,211 | 180,857 | 92,493 | 30.76 | 3,007 |
| 1987 | 726,440.54 | 397,378 | 539,511 | 295,896 | 31.46 | 9,405 |
| 1988 | 2,359,460.61 | 1,258,547 | 1,708,699 | 1,004,681 | 32.17 | 31,230 |
| 1989 | 1,208,748.08 | 628,307 | 853,037 | 537,023 | 32.88 | 16,333 |
| 1990 | 1,715,638.00 | 867,777 | 1,178,160 | 794,824 | 33.61 | 23,648 |
| 1991 | 1,050,006.97 | 516,608 | 701,386 | 506,122 | 34.33 | 14,743 |
| 1992 | 1,011,394.30 | 483,269 | 656,123 | 506,980 | 35.07 | 14,456 |
| 1993 | 908,371.68 | 420,985 | 571,561 | 473,066 | 35.82 | 13,207 |
| 1994 | 227,320.87 | 102,084 | 138,597 | 122,822 | 36.57 | 3,359 |
| 1995 | 280,870.13 | 122,094 | 165,764 | 157,237 | 37.32 | 4,213 |
| 1996 | 22,147.88 | 9,301 | 12,628 | 12,842 | 38.09 | 337 |
| 1997 | 125,276.70 | 50,760 | 68,916 | 75,152 | 38.86 | 1,934 |
| 1998 | 333,021.74 | 129,955 | 176,437 | 206,538 | 39.64 | 5,210 |
| 1999 | 102,467.31 | 38,454 | 52,208 | 65,629 | 40.42 | 1,624 |
| 2000 | 138,129.55 | 49,747 | 67,540 | 91,309 | 41.21 | 2,216 |
| 2001 | 1,810,011.58 | 624,100 | 847,325 | 1,234,188 | 42.01 | 29,378 |
| 2002 | 819,274.78 | 269,931 | 366,479 | 575,687 | 42.81 | 13,447 |

## THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 390.10 STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS

CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | $(7)$ |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 60-R2
NET SALVAGE PERCENT . . 15

| 2003 | 6,426.71 | 2,018 | 2,740 | 4,651 | 43.62 | 107 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2004 | $477,453.38$ | 142,484 | 193,447 | 355,624 | 44.43 | 8,004 |
| 2005 | $38,844.06$ | 10,981 | 14,909 | 29,762 | 45.25 | 658 |
| 2006 | $404,591.13$ | 107,945 | 146,554 | 318,726 | 46.08 | 6,917 |
| 2007 | 412,482.86 | 103,490 | 140,506 | 333,849 | 46.91 | 7,117 |
| 2008 | 180,274.08 | 42,328 | 57,468 | 149,847 | 47.75 | 3,138 |
| 2009 | $649,117.41$ | 141,959 | 192,734 | 553,751 | 48.59 | 11,396 |
| 2010 | $21,925.94$ | 4,438 | 6,025 | 19,190 | 49.44 | 388 |
| 2011 | 289,354.72 | 53,850 | 73,111 | 259,647 | 50.29 | 5,163 |
| 2012 | $2,144,343.10$ | 363,734 | 493,833 | 1,972,162 | 51.15 | 38,556 |
| 2013 | 263,507.52 | 40,303 | 54,718 | 248,316 | 52.02 | 4,773 |
| 2014 | $502,789.16$ | 68,616 | 93,158 | 485,050 | 52.88 | 9,173 |
| 2015 | 746,600.13 | 89,293 | 121,231 | 737,359 | 53.76 | 13,716 |
| 2016 | $2,964,558.39$ | 304,548 | 413,477 | 2,995,765 | 54.64 | 54,827 |
| 2017 | $454,557.99$ | 39,033 | 52,994 | 469,748 | 55.52 | 8,461 |
| 2018 | $1,422,897.66$ | 97,902 | 132,919 | 1,503,413 | 56.41 | 26,652 |
| 2019 | 967,379.64 | 50,062 | 67,968 | 1,044,519 | 57.30 | 18,229 |
| 2020 | 558,979.55 | 19,394 | 26,331 | 616,495 | 58.19 | 10,595 |
| 2021 | 30,575.90 | 527 | 716 | 34,446 | 59.10 | 583 |
| 2022 | 60,248.17 | 265 | 360 | 68,926 | 59.77 | 1,153 |
|  | $27,398,563.95$ | 9,080,063 | 12,299,682 | 19,208,667 |  | 427,466 |

COMPOSITE REMAINING LIFE AND ANNUAL ACCRUAL RATE, PERCENT . . 44.9 1.56

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 391.00 OFFICE FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT - OFFICE FURNITURE

CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ | $(7)$ |

SURVIVOR CURVE. . 20-SQUARE
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. 0

| 1992 | 144,687.53 | 144,688 | 144,688 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1993 | 138,901.64 | 138,902 | 138,902 |  |  |  |
| 1994 | 130,991.64 | 130,992 | 130,992 |  |  |  |
| 1995 | $14,508.85$ | 14,509 | 14,509 |  |  |  |
| 1996 | 175,869.48 | 175,869 | 175,869 |  |  |  |
| 1997 | 151,171.18 | 151,171 | 151,171 |  |  |  |
| 1998 | 172,940.19 | 172,940 | 172,940 |  |  |  |
| 1999 | 232,412.65 | 232,413 | 232,413 |  |  |  |
| 2000 | 449,917.78 | 449,918 | 449,918 |  |  |  |
| 2001 | 119,484.80 | 119,485 | 119,485 |  |  |  |
| 2002 | 5,239.43 | 5,239 | 5,239 |  |  |  |
| 2003 | 3,043.52 | 2,891 | 376 | 2,668 | 1.00 | 2,668 |
| 2010 | 15,369.75 | 9,222 | 1,200 | 14,170 | 8.00 | 1,771 |
| 2011 | $51,623.98$ | 28,393 | 3,694 | 47,930 | 9.00 | 5,326 |
| 2012 | 819,236.78 | 409,618 | 53,291 | 765,946 | 10.00 | 76,595 |
| 2013 | $48,782.87$ | 21,952 | 2,856 | 45,927 | 11.00 | 4,175 |
| 2015 | $4,726.10$ | 1,654 | 215 | 4,511 | 13.00 | 347 |
| 2016 | 172,197.07 | 51,659 | 6,721 | 165,476 | 14.00 | 11,820 |
| 2017 | 75,916.21 | 18,979 | 2,469 | 73,447 | 15.00 | 4,896 |
| 2020 | 3,036.00 | 304 | 40 | 2,996 | 18.00 | 166 |
| 2021 | 1,545.92 | 77 | 10 | 1,536 | 19.00 | 81 |
| 2022 | 921.93 | 12 | 1 | 921 | 19.75 | 47 |
|  | $2,932,525.30$ | $2,280,887$ | 1,806,999 | 1,125,526 |  | 107,892 |

[^129]THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

|  | ACCOUNT 391.15 OFFICE FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT - OFFICE EQUIPMENT |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| YEAR <br> (1) | $\operatorname{cosT}$ (2) | ACCRUED <br> (3) | RESERVE <br> (4) | ACCRUALS <br> (5) | LIFE <br> (6) | ACCRUAL <br> (7) |

SURVIVOR CURVE. . 10-SQUARE
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. 0

| 1992 | $92,657.35$ | 92,657 | 92,657 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1993 | $2,616.48$ | 2,616 | 2,616 |
| 1994 | $14,762.75$ | 14,763 | 14,763 |
| 1995 | $10,305.09$ | 10,305 | 10,305 |
| 1996 | $87,870.26$ | 87,870 | 87,870 |
| 1997 | $37,263.00$ | 37,263 | 37,263 |
| 1998 | $29,948.34$ | 29,948 | 29,948 |
| 1999 | $1,954.26$ | 1,954 | 1,954 |
| 2004 | $11,088.74$ | 11,089 | 11,090 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $288,466.27$ | 288,465 | 288,466 |

COMPOSITE REMAINING LIFE AND ANNUAL ACCRUAL RATE, PERCENT .. 0.0 0.00

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 391.20 OFFICE FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT - PERSONAL COMPUTERS

CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  |  | CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUALRELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| YEAR | Cost | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE | ACCRUAL |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | ( 5 ) | (6) | (7) |

SURVIVOR CURVE. . 10-SQUARE
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. 0

| 2007 | 1,450.37 | 1,450 | 1,450 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012 | $21,361.90$ | 21,362 | 21,362 |  |  |  |
| 2013 | $11,787.75$ | 10,609 | 2,232 | 9,556 | 1.00 | 9,556 |
| 2014 | 292,991.31 | 234,393 | 49,319 | 243,672 | 2.00 | 121,836 |
| 2015 | $236,568.34$ | 165,598 | 34,844 | 201,724 | 3.00 | 67,241 |
| 2016 | 79,812.72 | 47,888 | 10,076 | 69,737 | 4.00 | 17,434 |
| 2017 | 102,918.30 | 51,459 | 10,828 | 92,090 | 5.00 | 18,418 |
| 2018 | 101, 015.72 | 40,406 | 8,502 | 92,514 | 6.00 | 15,419 |
| 2019 | 572,532.56 | 171,760 | 36,140 | 536,393 | 7.00 | 76,628 |
| 2020 | $1,214,927.06$ | 242,985 | 51,126 | 1,163,801 | 8.00 | 145,475 |
| 2021 | 159,219.69 | 15,922 | 3,350 | 155,870 | 9.00 | 17,319 |
| 2022 | $36,170.83$ | 904 | 190 | 35,980 | 9.75 | 3,690 |
|  | $2,830,756.55$ | 1,004,736 | 229,419 | $2,601,337$ |  | 493,016 |

COMPOSITE REMAINING LIFE AND ANNUAL ACCRUAL RATE, PERCENT . . 5. 3 17.42

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 392.00 TRANSPORTATION EQUIPMENT

|  |  | CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUALRELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| YEAR | Cost | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE | ACCRUAL |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | ( 4 ) | ( 5 ) | (6) | (7) |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 13-L2
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. +20

| 1987 | 58,919.69 | 45,758 | 47,136 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1989 | 228,694.96 | 172,824 | 182,956 |  |  |  |
| 1990 | 196,069.35 | 146,117 | 156,855 |  |  |  |
| 1991 | 40,036.61 | 29,393 | 32,029 |  |  |  |
| 2003 | $347,301.90$ | 201,330 | 277,842 |  |  |  |
| 2004 | 8,496.99 | 4,795 | 6,798 |  |  |  |
| 2005 | 107,854.93 | 59,204 | 86,284 |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 42,698.00 | 20,863 | 34,158 |  |  |  |
| 2012 | 130,867.46 | 57,582 | 104,694 |  |  |  |
| 2013 | 53,705.53 | 22,507 | 42,964 |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 389,562.57 | 153,428 | 298,793 | 12,857 | 6.60 | 1,948 |
| 2015 | 213,568.14 | 77,411 | 150,754 | 20,101 | 7.11 | 2,827 |
| 2016 | $51,502.56$ | 16,702 | 32,526 | 8,676 | 7.73 | 1,122 |
| 2017 | 392,578.98 | 109,922 | 214,068 | 99,995 | 8.45 | 11,834 |
| 2018 | 19,290.33 | 4,440 | 8,647 | 6,785 | 9.26 | 733 |
| 2019 | $1,160,951.80$ | 205,043 | 399,311 | 529,450 | 10.13 | 52,266 |
| 2020 | 468,981.59 | 56,567 | 110,162 | 265,023 | 11.04 | 24,006 |
| 2021 | 391,828.48 | 23,870 | 46,485 | 266,978 | 12.01 | 22,230 |
| 2022 | 125,567.19 | 1,932 | 3,763 | 96,691 | 12.75 | 7,584 |
|  | 4,428,477.06 | $1,409,688$ | $2,236,225$ | $1,306,557$ |  | 124,550 |
|  | MPOSITE REMAI | G LIFE AND | NUAL ACCRU | AE, PERCE | . 10.5 | 2.81 |


| ACCOUNT 393.00 | STORES EQUIPMENT |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL |
|  | RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022 |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. 20-SQUARE
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. 0

| 1992 | 5,974.08 | 5,974 | 5,974 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1993 | 44,689.40 | 44,689 | 44,689 |  |  |  |
| 1994 | 14,283.10 | 14,283 | 14,283 |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 6,620.85 | 6,621 | 6,621 |  |  |  |
| 2000 | 28,942.21 | 28,942 | 28,942 |  |  |  |
| 2001 | 23,972.98 | 23,973 | 23,973 |  |  |  |
| 2002 | 6,046.78 | 6,047 | 6,047 |  |  |  |
| 2017 | 17,342.10 | 4,336 | 1,414 | 15,928 | 15.00 | 1,062 |
| 2019 | 14,277.70 | 2,142 | 699 | 13,579 | 17.00 | 799 |
| 2020 | 48.50 | 5 | 2 | 46 | 18.00 | 3 |
| 2021 | 24.71 | 1 |  | 25 | 19.00 | 1 |
| 2022 | 14.72 |  | 0 | 15 | 19.75 | 1 |
|  | 162,237.13 | 137,013 | 132,644 | 29,593 |  | 1,866 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 394.00 TOOLS, SHOP AND GARAGE EQUIPMENT

CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | ORIGINAL | CALCULATED | ALLOC. BOOK | FUTURE BOOK | REM. | ANNUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR | COST | ACCRUED | RESERVE | ACCRUALS | LIFE |  |
| $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ | $(5)$ | $(6)$ |  |

SURVIVOR CURVE. . 20-SQUARE
NET SALVAGE PERCENT. . 0

| 933.62 | 934 | 934 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1,386.42$ | 1,386 | 1,386 |  |  |  |
| 587.39 | 587 | 587 |  |  |  |
| 5,711.73 | 5,712 | 5,712 |  |  |  |
| 94,551.71 | 94,552 | 94,552 |  |  |  |
| 18,065.90 | 18,066 | 18,066 |  |  |  |
| 60,645.45 | 60,645 | 60,645 |  |  |  |
| 98,393.94 | 98,394 | 98,394 |  |  |  |
| 76,097.16 | 76,097 | 76,097 |  |  |  |
| 72,807.18 | 72,807 | 72,807 |  |  |  |
| 19,516.57 | 19,517 | 19,517 |  |  |  |
| 82,411.35 | 82,411 | 82,411 |  |  |  |
| 74,260.31 | 74,260 | 74,260 |  |  |  |
| 120,048.40 | 120,048 | 120,048 |  |  |  |
| $245,200.00$ | 245,200 | 245,200 |  |  |  |
| 240,962.37 | 240,962 | 240,962 |  |  |  |
| 93,393.84 | 93,394 | 93,394 |  |  |  |
| 103,500.76 | 98,326 | 91,809 | 11,692 | 1.00 | 11,692 |
| 16,078.30 | 14,470 | 13,511 | 2,567 | 2.00 | 1,284 |
| 319,904.61 | 271,919 | 253,896 | 66,009 | 3.00 | 22,003 |
| 110,262.83 | 88,210 | 82,363 | 27,900 | 4.00 | 6,975 |
| 26,978.38 | 20,234 | 18,893 | 8, 085 | 5.00 | 1,617 |
| 474,248.40 | 331,974 | 309,970 | 164,278 | 6.00 | 27,380 |
| $52,260.29$ | 33,969 | 31,717 | 20,543 | 7.00 | 2,935 |
| 53,441.72 | 32,065 | 29,940 | 23,502 | 8.00 | 2,938 |
| $36,874.20$ | 20,281 | 18,937 | 17,937 | 9.00 | 1,993 |
| 1,273,222.13 | 636,611 | 594,415 | 678,807 | 10.00 | 67,881 |
| 1,358,602.80 | 543,441 | 507,420 | 851,183 | 12.00 | 70,932 |
| 19,207.55 | 6,723 | 6,277 | 12,931 | 13.00 | 995 |
| 162,710.46 | 48,813 | 45,578 | 117,132 | 14.00 | 8,367 |
| $535,899.60$ | 133,975 | 125,095 | 410,805 | 15.00 | 27,387 |
| 707,050.69 | 141,410 | 132,037 | 575,014 | 16.00 | 35,938 |
| $39,165.04$ | 5,875 | 5,486 | 33,679 | 17.00 | 1,981 |
| 248,492.84 | 24,849 | 23,202 | 225,291 | 18.00 | 12,516 |
| 716,955.42 | 35,848 | 33,471 | 683,484 | 19.00 | 35,973 |
| $1,689,033.46$ | 21,113 | 19,713 | 1,669,320 | 19.75 | 84,523 |
| 9,248,862.82 | 3,815,078 | 3,648,702 | $5,600,161$ |  | 425,310 |

COMPOSITE REMAINING LIFE AND ANNUAL ACCRUAL RATE, PERCENT .. 13.2 4.60

| $c$ | CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022 |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. 20-SQUARE
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. 0

| 1992 | $14,917.73$ | 14,918 | 14,918 |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1993 | $43,749.36$ | 43,749 | 43,749 |  |  |  |
| 1994 | $119,393.10$ | 119,393 | 119,393 |  |  |  |
| 1995 | $142,907.96$ | 142,908 | 142,908 |  |  |  |
| 1996 | $11,683.59$ | 11,684 | 11,684 |  |  |  |
| 1997 | $6,062.10$ | 6,062 | 6,062 |  |  |  |
| 1998 | $56,555.34$ | 56,555 | 56,555 | 2,222 | 2.00 | 1,111 |
| 2004 | $44,007.52$ | 39,607 | 41,786 | 3,908 | 3.00 | 1,303 |
| 2005 | $37,856.44$ | 32,178 | 33,948 | 1,687 | 5.00 | 337 |
| 2007 | $8,080.93$ | 6,061 | 6,394 | 50,182 | 6.00 | 8,364 |
| 2008 | $191,900.59$ | 134,330 | 141,719 | 3,842 | 8.00 | 480 |
| 2010 | $10,470.35$ | 6,282 | 6,628 | 18,613 | 10.00 | 1,861 |
| 2012 | $39,393.46$ | 19,697 | 20,780 | 3 | 19.00 |  |
| 2021 | 3.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $726,981.47$ | 633,424 | 646,524 |  |  | 13,456 |

COMPOSITE REMAINING LIFE AND ANNUAL ACCRUAL RATE, PERCENT .. 6.0 1.85

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 396.00 POWER OPERATED EQUIPMENT

| $c$ | CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022 |

SURVIVOR CURVE.. IOWA 20-S0.5 NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. +5

| 1987 | $34,948.48$ | 30,329 | 33,201 |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1988 | $16,086.55$ | 13,708 | 15,282 |  |
| 1989 | $395,850.64$ | 330,931 | 376,058 |  |
| 1990 | $101,018.50$ | 82,868 | 95,968 |  |
| 1992 | $42,051.15$ | 33,137 | 39,949 |  |
| 2005 | $4,137.27$ | 2,256 | 3,930 |  |
| 2012 | $126,309.90$ | 46,618 | 119,994 |  |
| 2013 | $7,821.55$ | 2,656 | 7,430 |  |
| 2015 | $101,796.87$ | 28,093 | 96,707 |  |
| 2017 | $14,023.84$ | 2,898 | 13,323 | $3,573-$ |
| 2020 | 345.84 | 31 | 329 |  |
| 2021 | 176.12 | 8 | 167 | $3,573-$ |
| 2022 | 105.04 |  | 1 | 3,673 |

COMPOSITE REMAINING LIFE AND ANNUAL ACCRUAL RATE, PERCENT .. 0.0 0.00

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

ACCOUNT 397.00 COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT

CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL
RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022

|  | CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE | DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | RELATED TO ORIGINAL | COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022 |

SURVIVOR CURVE. . 10-SQUARE
NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. 0

| 1990 | 84,958.81 | 84,959 | 84,959 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1991 | $21,379.33$ | 21,379 | 21,379 |  |  |  |
| 1992 | $37,457.57$ | 37,458 | 37,458 |  |  |  |
| 1993 | $51,885.80$ | 51,886 | 51,886 |  |  |  |
| 1994 | 8,347.25 | 8,347 | 8,347 |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 87,269.38 | 87,269 | 87,269 |  |  |  |
| 1998 | 33,293.37 | 33,293 | 33,293 |  |  |  |
| 1999 | $2,060.16$ | 2,060 | 2,060 |  |  |  |
| 2000 | 65,311.97 | 65,312 | 65,312 |  |  |  |
| 2001 | 99,815.00 | 99,815 | 99,815 |  |  |  |
| 2002 | 49,195.49 | 49,195 | 49,195 |  |  |  |
| 2003 | $4,836.00$ | 4,836 | 4,836 |  |  |  |
| 2004 | 8,242.04 | 8,242 | 8,242 |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 75,617.37 | 75,617 | 75,617 |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 397,467.73 | 397,468 | 397,468 |  |  |  |
| 2010 | $2,478,361.02$ | 2,478,361 | $2,478,361$ |  |  |  |
| 2011 | $1,478,630.89$ | 1,478,631 | $1,478,631$ |  |  |  |
| 2012 | 570,414.87 | 570,415 | 570,415 |  |  |  |
| 2013 | $2,653,945.70$ | 2,388,551 | 2,653,946 |  |  |  |
| 2014 | 106,904.71 | 85,524 | 95,944 | 10,961 | 2.00 | 5,480 |
| 2016 | 105,791.73 | 63,475 | 71,208 | 34,584 | 4.00 | 8,646 |
| 2017 | 62,515.01 | 31,258 | 35,066 | 27,449 | 5.00 | 5,490 |
| 2018 | $2,235,835.15$ | 894,334 | 1,003,295 | 1,232,540 | 6.00 | 205,423 |
| 2019 | $4,426,833.25$ | 1,328, 050 | $1,489,852$ | 2,936,981 | 7.00 | 419,569 |
| 2020 | 1,799,077.31 | 359,815 | 403,653 | 1,395,424 | 8.00 | 174,428 |
| 2021 | 1,244,022.68 | 124,402 | 139,559 | 1,104,464 | 9.00 | 122,718 |
| 2022 | $316,697.52$ | 7,917 | 8,881 | 307,816 | 9.75 | 31,571 |
|  | 18,506,167.11 | $10,837,869$ | 11,455,947 | 7,050,220 |  | 973,325 |
|  | OMPOSITE REMAI | NG LIFE AND | NNUAL ACCRU | TE, PERCE | . 7.2 | . 26 |

THE POTOMAC EDISON COMPANY

| ACCOUNT 398.00 MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CALCULATED REMAINING LIFE DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RELATED TO ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| YEAR <br> (1) | ORIGINAL COST <br> (2) | CALCULATED ACCRUED (3) | ALLOC. BOOK RESERVE <br> (4) | FUTURE BOOK ACCRUALS (5) | REM. LIFE <br> (6) | ANNUAL ACCRUAL (7) |
| SURVIVOR CURVE.. 15-SQUARE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NET SALVAGE PERCENT.. 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1998 | 3,699.67 | 3,700 | 3,700 |  |  |  |
| 2000 | 6,746.94 | 6,747 | 6,747 |  |  |  |
| 2001 | 14,653.26 | 14,653 | 14,653 |  |  |  |
| 2002 | 2,782.47 | 2,782 | 2,782 |  |  |  |
| 2004 | 19,003.28 | 19,003 | 19,003 |  |  |  |
| 2007 | 48,706.43 | 48,706 | 48,706 |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 60,040.71 | 56,038 | 59,372 | 669 | 1.00 | 669 |
| 2010 | 5,452.80 | 4,362 | 4,622 | 831 | 3.00 | 277 |
|  | 161,085.56 | 155,991 | 159,585 | 1,501 |  | 946 |

Exhibit JJS-2A
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APPENDIX

## SUMMARY OF PRESENT VALUE RESULTS
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| ACCOUNT | ORIGINAL COST AS OF JUNE 30, 2022 | CURRENTLY APPROVED |  |  |  | PROPOSED |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { NET } \\ \text { SALVAGE } \end{gathered}$ | CALCULATED ANNUAL |  | SURVIVOR | $\begin{gathered} \text { NET } \\ \text { SALVAGE } \end{gathered}$ | CALCULATED ANNUAL |  | INCREASE <br> (DECREASE) |
|  |  | SURVIVOR CURVE |  | ACCRUAL AMOUNT | ACCRUAL RATE |  |  | ACCRUAL AMOUNT | $\begin{gathered} \text { ACCRUAL } \\ \text { RATE } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) $=(6)^{*}(2)$ | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11)=(9)-(5) |

ELECTRIC PLANT
INTANGIBLE PLANT
303.00

| MISCELLANEOUS INTANGIBLE PLANT |
| :--- |
| TOTAL INTANGIBLE PLANT |
| DISTRIBUTION PLANT |


|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| 360.20 | LAND AND LAND RIGHTS - EASEMENTS |
| 361.00 | STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS |
| 362.00 | STATION EQUIPMENT |
| 364.00 | POLES, TOWERS AND FIXTURES |
| 365.00 | OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES |
| 365.10 | OVERHEAD CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES - CLEARING |
| 366.00 | UNDERGROUND CONDUIT |
| 367.00 | UNDERGROUND CONDUCTORS AND DEVICES |
| 368.00 | LINE TRANSFORMERS |
| 366.00 | SERVIEES |
| 370.00 | METERS |
| 371.00 | METER INSTALLATIONS |
| 373.10 | STREET LIGHTING AND SIGNAL SYSTEMS |


| 10,999,110.61 | 75-R3 | 0 | 144,088 | 1.31 | 75-R3 | 0 | 143,090 | 1.30 | (998) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11,344,560.25 | 65-S4 | (20) | 136,135 | 1.20 | 65-S4 | (20) | 144,001 | 1.27 | 7,867 |
| 186,933,531.24 | 75-R1.5 | (15) | 2,018,882 | 1.08 | 65-R2. 5 | (20) | 2,532,124 | 1.35 | 513,241 |
| 131,651,738.90 | 76-R4 | (120) | 1,711,473 | 1.30 | 70-R4 | (125) | 2,384,226 | 1.81 | 672,753 |
| 151,495,917.54 | 76-R0. 5 | (80) | 2,333,037 | 1.54 | 62-R1 | (100) | 3,066,725 | 2.02 | 733,688 |
| 77,713,677.02 | 70-R4 | 0 | 948,107 | 1.22 | 70-R4 | 0 | 969,012 | 1.25 | 20,905 |
| 66,754,673.86 | 65-R4 | (40) | 954,592 | 1.43 | 65-R4 | (50) | 1,080,369 | 1.62 | 125,777 |
| 300,720,151.63 | 46-R2.5 | (40) | 8,089,372 | 2.69 | 44-R3 | (50) | 9,719,926 | 3.23 | 1,630,554 |
| 204,527,694.80 | 48-R1.5 | (35) | 3,722,404 | 1.82 | 50-R1.5 | (35) | 3,747,659 | 1.83 | 25,255 |
| 73,021,590.19 | 65-R4 | (125) | 1,029,604 | 1.41 | 65-R4 | (125) | 1,322,641 | 1.81 | 293,037 |
| 56,802,201.89 | 42-R2.5 | (30) | 1,147,404 | 2.02 | 42-R2.5 | (30) | 1,426,806 | 2.51 | 279,402 |
| 2,165,322.14 | 30-R0.5 | (40) | 175,391 | 8.10 | 30-R0.5 | (40) | 134,213 | 6.20 | $(41,178)$ |
| 31,556,357.13 | 42-S0.5 | (40) | 855,177 | 2.71 | 44-S0.5 | (45) | 825,337 | 2.62 | (29,841) |
| 1,305,686,527.20 |  |  | 23,265,667 | 1.78 |  |  | 27,496,130 | 2.11 | 4,230,463 |
| 3,778.48 | 75-R3 | 0 | 50 | 1.32 | 75-R3 | 0 | 50 | 1.32 | 0 |
| 27,398,563.95 | 57-R2 | (15) | 383,580 | 1.40 | 60-R2 | (15) | 371,343 | 1.36 | $(12,237)$ |
| 2,932,525.30 | 20-SQ | 0 | 85,923 | 2.93 | 20-SQ | 0 | 107,892 | 3.68 | 21,969 |
| 288,466.27 | 10-SQ | 0 | 0 | - | 10-SQ | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| 2,830,756.55 | 10-SQ | 0 | 274,300 | 9.69 | 10-SQ | 0 | 493,016 | 17.42 | 218,716 |
| 4,428,477.06 | 14-L2 | 20 | 36,756 | 0.83 | 13-L2 | 20 | 111,593 | 2.52 | 74,837 |
| 162,237.13 | 20-SQ | 0 | 4,478 | 2.76 | 20-SQ | 0 | 1,866 | 1.15 | $(2,612)$ |
| 9,248,862.82 | 20-SQ | 0 | 408,800 | 4.42 | 20-SQ | 0 | 425,310 | 4.60 | 16,510 |
| 726,981.47 | 20-SQ | 0 | 16,502 | 2.27 | 20-SQ | 0 | 13,456 | 1.85 | $(3,046)$ |
| 844,671.75 | 20-S0.5 | 5 | 1,689 | 0.20 | 20-S0.5 | 5 | $(2,538)$ | (0.30) | $(4,228)$ |
| 18,506,167.11 | 10-SQ | 0 | 1,676,659 | 9.06 | 10-SQ | 0 | 973,325 | 5.26 | $(703,334)$ |
| 161,085.56 | 15-SQ | 0 | 7,571 | 4.70 | 15-SQ | 0 | 947 | 0.59 | $(6,624)$ |
| 67,532,573.45 |  |  | 2,896,308 | 4.29 |  |  | 2,496,259 | 3.70 | $(400,049)$ |
| 1,398,738,031.26 |  |  | 29,313,563 | 2.10 |  |  | 31,832,063 | 2.28 | 2,518,499 |


| 301.00 | ORGANIZATION | $124,448.78$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 360.10 | LAND AND LAND RIGHTS - LAND | $11,931,025.07$ |
| 389.10 | LAND AND LAND RIGHTS - LAND | $1,382,979.33$ |
| 399.10 | ASSET RETIREMENT COSTS - GENERAL PLANT | $14,235.89$ |
|  |  |  |
|  | TOTAL NONDEPRECIABLE PLANT | $\mathbf{1 3 , 4 5 2 , 6 8 9 . 0 7}$ |
|  | TOTAL ELECTRIC PLANT | $\mathbf{1 , 4 1 2 , 1 9 0 , \mathbf { 7 2 0 . 3 3 }}$ |
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## I. INTRODUCTION

## Q1. What is your name, business address, and business affiliation?

A1. My name is Mark Warner and my business address is 417 Denison Street, Highland Park, New Jersey, 08904. I am presently employed as a Vice President at Gabel Associates, Inc. ("Gabel Associates"), an energy, environmental, and public utility consulting firm. Gabel Associates specializes in energy consulting with deep experience in energy procurement, project development, energy policy, environmental analysis, in-depth economic analysis, and overall energy markets including generation, regional operators (especially PJM Interconnection, LLC ("PJM")), and utilities. Over the last six years, I have led our firm's development of a specialized practice related to Plug-In Electric Vehicles ${ }^{1}$ ("EVs"), especially regarding utility EV programs and the grid impacts of EV charging.

## Q2. What is your professional experience and educational background?

A2. At Gabel Associates, I lead a team of analysts that provides specialized economic, financial, environmental, and policy analysis related to energy markets and a variety of clean energy technology applications. I have been leading technical teams for over 35 years across a variety of utility industries, and I have been specializing in energy market policy and analysis since 2001. I have documented expertise in economic modeling and policy development for new clean energy technologies, particularly regarding utility implications and energy market impacts. My primary
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focus areas include renewable energy, energy storage, microgrids, advanced "behind the meter" energy project development, and EVs. I support a wide variety of public and private clients, including electric utilities, and I interact closely with a variety of government agencies and regulatory authorities. I lead our firm's practice on EV research and policy development, where we have been active for over six years. I am a co-founder of the ChargEVC ${ }^{2}$ electric vehicle coalition, which is currently active in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, and I lead the research, analysis, and policy development efforts of that group. I received my education from the Georgia Institute of Technology where I received a B.S. and M.S. in Mechanical Engineering. I was recognized as Clean Energy Market Innovator of the Year by the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities in 2008, and I served on the board of the Mid-Atlantic Solar Industry Association for four years.

## Q3. What experience do you have with the electric vehicle market?

A3. The emerging EV market has been my primary focus area for the last six years. I routinely monitor industry developments, support a variety of clients with specialized market research, work with utilities that are developing programs as a subject matter expert, and interact with a wide variety of policy makers in multiple states regarding market development initiatives for EVs. A key focus area has been the development of tools and methodologies for assessing EV impacts on energy markets and electric
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utility infrastructure, and rigorous methods for analyzing and documenting potential benefits, costs, and the net-benefits resulting from widespread EV adoption. I have worked with ten different electric utilities in five states on the development of their EV programs, including tasks such as forecasting, opportunity assessment, strategic planning, EV program design, budgeting, regulatory filing support (including preparation of testimony), benefit-cost analysis, and program implementation support. In addition, in support of market development efforts by ChargEVC in New Jersey, I was the lead investigator for a comprehensive benefit-cost study for the State entitled Electric Vehicles in New Jersey, Costs and Benefits: The Opportunities, Impacts, and Market Barriers to Widespread Vehicle Electrification in New Jersey.3 I recently issued an updated version of this study that considered the potential for electrification of the entire on-road transportation market, including medium- and heavy-duty vehicles. ${ }^{4}$ This most recent analysis involved a substantial expansion of the data involved in EV analysis ${ }^{5}$, and completely revised methodologies for assessing both costs and benefits of widespread EV adoption. Those updated tools and datasets enable a highly specialized analysis of EV impacts on electricity markets and infrastructure, and rigorous determination of benefits, costs, and Benefit-Cost Analysis (BCA) using net-benefit assessments specific to the electric utility EV programs. I am also a
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frequent public speaker in a wide variety of forums regarding the EV market, policy development for EVs, and electric utility implications of widespread EV adoption.

## Q4. Have you previously appeared before the Maryland Public Service Commission ("Commission") in matters related to plug-in electric vehicles?

A4. Yes. I have been actively supporting multiple electric utilities in the State of Maryland for the last four years, including presenting both studies and testimony to the Commission. I supported Baltimore Gas and Electric ("BGE") during the early stages of their EV program design, and provided opinion letters to the Commission on various EV-related matters. In 2020 I provided testimony on a benefit-cost analysis of EV programs (herein generally referred to as "EV-BCA") as part of BGE's Multi-Year Plan ("MYP") in Case No. 9645. Also in 2020, I supported Potomac Electric Power Company ("PEPCO") and Delmarva Power \& Light Company ("DPL") in preparation of BCA analysis for the proposed off-peak/off-bill filings. I provided BCA testimony on EV programs as part of PEPCO's MYP in 2020 in Case No. 9655. I have supported Potomac Edison ("PE" or "Company") in quarterly surveys of the public charging market in Maryland, including detailed pricing studies in support of proposed utility pricing for that company's public chargers. Most recently, I supported the joint utilities (BGE, PEPCO, DPL, PE, and Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative ("SMECO")) in the year-long EV-BCA working group, and I authored the consensus document for the methodology that was approved by the Commission in January 2022 ${ }^{6}$. Based on that new approved EV-BCA methodology, I prepared an EV-BCA and written
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testimony for DPL's MYP in Case No. 9681. That approved methodology, as adapted for PE's program design, is the basis for this testimony.

## Q5. What is the purpose of your Direct Testimony?

A5. The purpose of my Direct Testimony is to present the methodology and results of the analysis that I performed regarding the suite of EV charging program offerings developed and implemented by PE, in support of its current rate case. The offerings I analyzed are part of the "EV Driven" program the Company launched in year 2019.

Q6. Have you completed analysis of PE's EV programs based specifically on the methodology the EV-BCA working group proposed and the Commission adopted?

A6. Yes. Based on the EV-BCA Methodology developed by the EV-BCA working group, as approved and adopted by the Commission, I developed assessments of cost effectiveness and ratepayer impact. ${ }^{7}$ Within this Testimony, I will refer to that methodology as the "MD EV-BCA Methodology".

## Q7. What are the assessments used in the MD-EV-BCA Methodology?

A7. As summarized in the Electric Vehicle Benefit/Cost Analysis Methodology by the Maryland Joint-Utilities ("EV BCA Whitepaper"), and defined in Section 3 of that document, the Commission approved five separate assessments for evaluation of electric utility EV programs:

1. Primary Test - MD EV-JST: Quantifies the cost effectiveness of electric utility EV programs resulting from impacts on the utility system, host customers (i.e.,
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participants), and society, consistent with Maryland policy goals (i.e., a Jurisdiction Specific Test, or JST).
2. Market-Wide Test-MW: The same methodology as the MD EV-JST, but applied market-wide ${ }^{8}$ to quantify the net benefits of vehicle electrification overall when considered on a societal basis. Three sensitivities will be considered: all natural charging, all managed charging, and an intermediate "likely case" as expected results from currently approved utility filings. Natural charging reflects scenarios where customers charge EVs as per their usual practice (typically when returning home from work), without incentives that encourage charging during off-peak times. Managed charging refers to modified customer behaviors in response to offpeak charging incentives, which can take a variety of forms (including Time-OfUse ("TOU") rate designs and off-bill rebates). The " $100 \%$ natural" and " $100 \%$ managed" represent opposite boundary conditions, with real-world results likely to be somewhere between these two extremes.
3. ANRI (all): Aggregate non-participating-ratepayer impact ("ANRI") as induced by the electric utility program, including both monetized impacts (on utility bills) and important externalities (such as environmental benefits and improved public health). This assessment is provided for both each electric utility EV-programs individually and for the entire portfolio of programs.

[^135]4. ANRI (bills-only): A sensitivity of the ANRI calculation that considers only monetized impact on utility bills (i.e., does not include environmental or public health benefits). Both individual-program and portfolio-level variations have been developed.
5. Other Strategic Considerations: An inventory of other qualitative factors that provide important context for the quantified assessments.

Q8. Can you provide an executive summary of the BCA and the associated results?
A8. Yes. I implemented all the assessments specified in the MD EV-BCA Methodology approved by the Commission. The electric utility implemented these programs as pilot projects approved by the Commission to help jump-start charging infrastructure development, and to provide learning on which programs are most effective.

- The best aggregate measure of program cost effectiveness is the outcome for the MD EV-JST for the overall portfolio, and that outcome was above 1.0, indicating that the Net Present Value ("NPV") of benefits exceeded costs.
- Both the public L2 and public DCFC also has MD EV-JST results above 1.0, indicating that those individual programs are cost effective on a stand-alone basis. The outcomes for the two residential programs were both below the 1.0 threshold, but likely reflect the very small scale of the pilot programs.
- For the market-wide assessment, the benefit/cost ratios were greater than 1.0 in all three scenarios considered ( $100 \%$ natural residential charging, $100 \%$ managed residential charging, and for the degree of residential managed charging currently
approved and being deployed by PE). The managed-charging case had a slightly stronger outcome, reflecting the benefit of avoiding the costs associated with charging during peak time. The "Approved" variation of the Market-Wide JST was essentially identical to the "Natural" case, since a relatively small fraction of the full market has been approved for participation in the managed charging programs.
- The ANRI assessments of net ratepayer impact demonstrate mixed results: for the "all" case where externalities (e.g. reduced emissions) are included, ratepayers are better off (i.e. lower net costs) for the portfolio overall, and for the L2 and DCFC public offerings. Both the residential programs had costs that exceeded benefits. For the "bills-only" case where externalities are not considered, ratepayer costs exceed benefits for all programs. This result is not unexpected, since the "billsonly" case excludes externalities (such as lower emissions) that are a primary strategic motivation for these programs.

The result sections below summarize all these results in more detail.

## II. ASSESSMENT APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

## Q9. How did you complete the analysis of the PE EV programs?

A9. The analysis depended on three phases of work: a) working with PE to identify the exact offerings that would be assessed, and collecting the program data required as inputs to the EV-BCA model, b) developing the assessment model as guided by the Maryland EV-BCA Methodology, including research and analysis on additional inputs
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needed for the computation, and c) computing assessment results. This section of the testimony summarizes the details of those three phases of work.

## Q10. Which PE "EV Driven" offerings were included in the analysis?

A10. I worked with PE to identify an appropriate portfolio of "EV Driven" offerings for inclusion in the analysis. I performed this study during the latter half of the currently approved lifecycle for PE's "EV Driven" program, and real-world data on program costs and customer vehicle charging behaviors is now available. In selecting program offerings appropriate for this analysis, I focused on those offerings for which sufficient data are available for a meaningful analysis per the Maryland EV-BCA Methodology. In addition, when identifying the base of offerings to be assessed, I also considered the fact that some of these programs are used together by customers in the "EV Driven" program. Based on those factors, the analysis is based on four separate offerings, which can also be combined to provide a portfolio-view:

1. Off-Peak/Off-Bill Incentive (OPOB-Only): This off-bill incentive is structured as a $\$ 0.02$ payment for each kilowatt-hour (" $k W h "$ ) of off-peak charging, net of any on-peak charging ${ }^{9}$. On-Peak for this incentive offering is defined as 6:00 AM to 11:00 PM, Monday-Friday, except for holidays. The incentive is paid directly to the customer (via an off-bill payment) and provides a recurring tangible feedback to the customer about the benefits of off-peak charging.
2. Charger Rebate and Off-Peak/Off-Bill: This offering combines the $\$ 300$ rebate for customers that install a utility-approved smart charger with opt-in use of an

[^136]incentive that encourages off-peak charging. The off-bill incentive is structured as a $\$ 0.02$ payment for each kWh of off-peak charging, net of any on-peak charging, as described in the offering above.
3. Public L2 Chargers: Under this offering the electric utility develops, owns, and operates L2 chargers for public use, with the goal of reducing range anxiety concerns and increasing EV adoption. As defined in the Maryland EV-BCA Methodology, assessment of this offering is based on the degree of increased adoption resulting from the improved availability of public L2 chargers and the full scope of costs and benefits associated with that stimulated adoption.
4. Public Direct-Current Fast Chargers ("DCFC"): Under this offering the electric utility develops, owns, and operates high-powered fast chargers for public use, with the goal of reducing range anxiety concerns and increasing EV adoption. These chargers can be particularly impactful on EV market development, since many mainstream consumers value the speed and convenience these chargers offer. As defined in the Maryland EV-BCA Methodology, assessment of this program is based on degree of increased adoption resulting from the increased availability of public DCFC chargers, and the full scope of costs and benefits associated with that stimulated adoption.
5. BCA was not performed for the multi-family offers since sufficient charging data was not yet available.

Q11. How did you develop the quantitative model used in the analysis?
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A11. I applied the framework developed by the EV-BCA working group during 2021, as approved by the Commission in January 2022. My guiding principles for development of that model were to strictly apply the principles and details defined in the Maryland EV-BCA Methodology, while adapting the generally defined assessments in that methodology to the details of the "EV Driven" program. Key inputs were aligned with similar inputs used by the EmPOWER program (where possible). The offerings defined above align directly with the "generic offers" outlined in the Maryland EV-BCA Methodology, and therefore its portfolio of impact factors could be applied in a straight-forward way.

## Q12. What impacts did you consider in performing the assessments?

A12. I analyzed both cost effectiveness and ratepayer impacts, and also identified a variety of strategic factors that are relevant to program assessment, as defined in the MD EV-BCA. These calculations depend on quantification of impacts to the electric utility, to society as a whole, to the EV owner/operators (program participants), and PE ratepayers. Please refer to Section 4 of the MD EV-BCA Methodology whitepaper for details on the impact factors used in my analysis. I used all of the impacts defined in the whitepaper for each assessment.

How these generic impacts apply to a particular offering varies depending on the details of the offering design, the assessment being performed, and how a given program is expected to impact the market (e.g., changing consumer charging behavior or increasing EV adoption). Those variations are addressed through offering-specific templates that clarify impact interpretation for each assessment/offering combination,
as outlined in more detail below. These templates are outlined specifically in the Maryland EV-BCA Methodology, and were the authoritative reference for design of the assessments used in this testimony.

Q13. How do these impact factors relate to the assessments being performed?
A13. For the societal-scope assessments (the MD EV-JST and Market-Wide), these impact factors are quantified (NPV dollars) as either costs or benefits. For the ANRI ratepayer impact assessments, each factor either increases or decreases ratepayer impact, the net sum of which (on an NPV basis) provide the aggregate outcome. The generic mapping of these impacts to each of those four assessments is summarized in Figure 1 below:
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Figure 1: Quantitative Assessment Framework
(from Figure 5.1-1 in MD EV-BCA Whitepaper)

| Impact-Factor | MD EV-JST | MW-Test | ANRI (AII) | ANRI (Bills Only) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Utility (and Power Sector) Impacts |  |  |  |  |
| Utility Program Administration Costs | Cost | Cost | Increase | Increase |
| Utility Program Implementation Costs | Cost | Cost | Increase | Increase |
| Impacts On Capacity Costs | Cost or Benefit | Cost or Benefit | Increase or Decrease | Increase or Decrease |
| Impacts On Transmission Costs | Cost or Benefit | Cost or Benefit | Increase or Decrease | Increase or Decrease |
| Wholesale Energy Cost Impacts | Cost or Benefit | Cost or Benefit | Increase or Decrease | Increase or Decrease |
| Increased Electricity (KWHr) Costs (for EV charging) | Cost | Cost | Increase | Increase |
| Impacts on Grid Reinforcement | Cost or Benefit | Cost or Benefit | Increase or Decrease | Increase or Decrease |
| Utility-Owned EV Chargers - Costs | Cost | Cost | Increase | Increase |
| Utility-Owned EV Chargers - Usage \$ From EV Drivers | Transfer | Transfer | Decrease | Decrease |
| Increased RPS Compliance Costs | Cost | Cost | Increase | Increase |
| T\&D Losses | Cost or Benefit | Cost or Benefit | Increase or Decrease | Increase or Decrease |
| Utility Equipment Incentives | Transfer | Transfer | Increase | Increase |
| Utility Rate Incentives | Transfer | Transfer | Increase | Increase |
| Increased Utility Revenues | Transfer | Transfer | Decrease | Decrease |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Participant Impacts(from EV Driver Perspective) |  |  |  |  |
| Incremental EV Purchase Costs | Cost | Cost | N/A | N/A |
| EV Charger Costs (equipment and installation) | Cost | Cost | N/A | N/A |
| Avoided Vehicle Fuel Costs | Benefit | Benefit | N/A | N/A |
| Savings From Decreased Vehicle Maintenance | Benefit | Benefit | N/A | N/A |
| Federal Tax Incentive (EV purchase) | Benefit | Benefit | N/A | N/A |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Societal Costs or Benefits (from Society's Perspective) |  |  |  |  |
| Value Of Reduced GHG Emissions | Benefit | Benefit | Decrease | N/A |
| Public Health Value Of Reduced/Shifted Emissions | Benefit | Benefit | Decrease | N/A |

The first two tests (MD EV-JST and MW-Test) represent classic benefit/cost ratios (of NPVs) at "societal scale" from two different perspectives: the MD EV-JST considers just the fraction of the EV market directly impacted by the utility EV programs, while the MW-Test quantifies a similar benefit/cost ratio for the entire number of EVs on the road. The factors included in these tests vary by utility EV offering, since each offering impacts the market differently, as noted in Figure 2.
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Figure 2: Factors Considered In Societal-Scale Assessments
(from Figure 5.3-1 in Maryland EV-BCA Whitepaper )

The two ANRI assessments are based on a NPV of impacts for nonparticipating ratepayers (i.e., those ratepayers who bear some cost for the utility EV offering, but who are not participating directly in that offering). The ANRI-all assessment considers the case where all ratepayer impacts are considered (including externalities such as reduced Carbon Dioxide ("CO2") emissions and impacts on public health), and also considering direct impacts on customer utility bills only. The ANRI-bills-only considers the case where only impacts that are monetized onto the electric utility bill are included. Figure 3 summarizes the factors for the two ANRI ratepayer impact assessments.
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Figure 3: Factors Considered In ANRI Assessments
(from Figure 5.4-1 in the EV-BCA Whitepaper)

| Impact-Factor | UO-1: Residential Managed Charging | UO-2: Multi-Family Charging | UO-3: Utility Owned Public Chargers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Computation Scope: | Induced Charging Behavior | Induced Adoption | Induced Adoption |
| Baseline: | EV Owner, Nat-Chrging | No EV Adoption | Pull-Through Adoption |
| Utility (and Power Sector) Impacts |  |  |  |
| Utility Program Administration Costs | Increase | Increase | Increase |
| Utility Program Implementation Costs | Increase | Increase | Increase |
| Impacts On Capacity Costs | Decrease | Increase | Increase |
| Impacts On Transmission Costs | Decrease | Increase | Increase |
| Wholesale Energy Cost Impacts | Decrease | Increase or Decrease | Increase or Decrease |
| Increased Electricity (KWHr) Costs (for EV charging) | Increase | Increase | Increase |
| Impacts on Grid Reinforcement | Decrease | Increase | Increase |
| Utility-Owned EV Chargers - Costs | N/A | N/A | Increase |
| Utility-Owned EV Chargers - Usage \$ From EV Drivers | N/A | N/A | Decrease |
| Increased RPS Compliance Costs | Increase | Increase | Increase |
| T\&D Losses | Decrease | Increase | Increase |
| Utility Equipment Incentives | Increase | Increase | Increase |
| Utility Rate Incentives | Increase | Increase | Increase |
| Increased Utility Revenues | Decrease | Decrease | Decrease |
|  |  |  |  |
| Participant Impacts(from EV Driver Perspective) |  |  |  |
| Incremental EV Purchase Costs | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| EV Charger Costs (equipment and installation) | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Avoided Vehicle Fuel Costs | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Savings From Decreased Vehicle Maintenance | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Federal Tax Incentive (EV purchase) | N/A | N/A | N/A |
|  |  |  |  |
| Societal Costs or Benefits (from Society's Perspective) |  |  |  |
| Value Of Reduced GHG Emissions | N/A | "All" Case Only | "All" Case Only |
| Public Health Value Of Reduced/Shifted Emissions | N/A | "All" Case Only | "AII" Case Only |

Q14. Are there qualitative factors identified as a result of your analysis?
A14. Yes. The Maryland EV-BCA Methodology includes a fifth assessment that allows for the consolidation of strategic factors that are relevant to interpretation of the other quantified results. I created an inventory of these factors as they were identified during the data collection and analysis process, in consultation with PE. They are summarized in the results sections below.

Q15. What sources of information were provided as inputs to the analysis?
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A15. Consistent with the guidelines established in the MD EV-BCA Methodology, the analysis depends on inputs that represent assumptions, boundary conditions, data about program costs and real-world impacts, and selection of key sources for other necessary inputs. Since this analysis is being completed as part of the PE rate case, I included input factors consistent with other analyses the Company performed as part of that rate case. A summary of key input factors is provided below:
a) Utility Program Design Details: I worked with PE to inventory key design parameters for each of the offerings described above, including details such as customer eligibility criteria, tariff linkages, time-of-day boundaries (for off-peak incentives), incentive levels, and approved program sizing.
b) Projected Utility Program Deployment Rates: Since all assessments are based on NPVs, it is necessary to consider how costs and benefits are realized over time. I worked with PE to establish a projection of expected deployment over time, which equates roughly to "customer sign-ups" each year of the program.
c) Planned Utility Program Costs: As defined in the Maryland EV-BCA Methodology, it is necessary to account for administrative costs (including operations costs like charging network fees and implementation contractor costs) ${ }^{10}$, implementation costs (during program start-up), and the costs for construction, maintenance, and long-term operation of utility-owned public chargers. Due to unpredicted supply chain issues over the last few years, PE pre-bought a lot of equipment in advance, incurring costs before benefits were realized. This was done
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to ensure materials were in stock when jobs were ready, a necessary operations decision post-COVID. However, this necessity may have negatively impacted the BCA outcomes. Note that most of these costs are budgeted as part of the program, and terminate at the approved program sunset. In some cases, costs may continue past program sunset, such as the costs of operating public charging over the full period during which benefits are realized. Therefore, the electric utility program cost plan accounts for formally budgeted costs within approved program boundaries, as well as longer term costs where necessary.
d) Customer Charging Behaviors: One of the most important data sets associated with the assessment is an understanding of exactly how and when customers charge their EVs. Statistics such as usage frequency, average kWhs dispensed per charging transaction, and the extent of charging coincidence with peak periods have a direct impact on the assessment computation. These statistics were based on an in-depth analysis of charging data collected from the smart chargers installed by EV owners under the residential smart charging rebate program, and/or data collected directly from utility-owned chargers. ${ }^{11}$ Within the residential charging segment, two sub-groups were defined: a) those customers that use a smart charger but are not on an off-peak incentive program (like OPOB), and b) those customers with a smart charger that are on an off-peak incentive program. The first group

[^138]The Potomac Edison Company
Case No.
Direct Testimony of Mark Warner
Page 18 of 39
represents the control group for "natural charging" ${ }^{12}$, while the second group represents the charging behavior of the "managed charging" segment. This managed charging segment is evaluated as part of the assessment. A variety of other vehicle-specific statistics, such as vehicle efficiency (miles $/ \mathrm{kWh}$ or miles/gallon), and emission factors (or traditional non-electric vehicles), were developed based on research of market sources.
e) Induced Adoption Factors: The public charging programs are motivated by the need to increase the number of public chargers active in the market, and to thereby reduce consumer concerns about range anxiety to encourage and increase EV adoption. As specified in the Maryland EV-BCA Methodology, the assessment is based on the impacts from that induced vehicle adoption. I considered multiple sources of information to develop a conservative set of factors that translate the number of utility-owned chargers deployed to the associated induced adoption.
f) Service Life: As with other BCA computations (in the energy efficiency market, for example), benefit/cost calculations are performed over a multi-year period based on the length of the service life of the investment. The residential smart charging programs are assumed to induce changed charging behavior over an eightyear period due to the customer charging-habit established during the incentive period. For utility-owned chargers (both L2 and DCFC), service life is assumed to be 15 years to align with the depreciation period established by the Commission for
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these assets. These factors are consistent with my understanding of industry practices and expectations.
g) Economic Factors: A wide variety of economic factors are needed to combine the data outlined above into an impact computation as needed for each assessment. These factors came from both PE and research I (or my team) completed as part of this project. Key economic factors include:
a. Inflation Factor: Provided by PE to be consistent with EmPOWER assumptions.
b. NPV Discount Rate: Set at $2.0 \%$, consistent with the discount rate used in the computation of the Social Cost of Carbon ("SCOC"), as specified in the MD EV-BCA Methodology.
c. Tariffed Rates: Detailed rates for residential, small-commercial, and the rates charged to EV-Drivers (Schedule EVP Tariff), including historical for 2019-2022, and a forward projection of rates based on the inflation factor. PE provided all listed tariffed rates.
d. Energy and Power Cost Factors: A variety of factors, including those mostly related to the PJM market, are relevant to the impact calculations. Primary examples include capacity costs, transmission and distribution costs, the period of typical PJM-specific coincident peak for PE, DRIPE ${ }^{13}$ for both energy (MWhs) and demand (MWs), and wholesale energy costs (marginal $\$ / \mathrm{MWh}$ ). All these factors were based on information provided
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by PE to be consistent with assumptions used in EmPOWER MD program analysis. PJM capacity reserve factors were also used based on data provided by PJM. Loss factors were also provided by PE for its territory.
e. Generation Emissions: Emission factors (pounds per MWh ${ }^{14}$ ) for electricity, based on current real-world emissions from eGrid, as projected forward by changing supply mix details in the Maryland Department of Energy 2030 plan. $\mathrm{CO}_{2}, \mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}, \mathrm{SO}_{2}$, and $\mathrm{PM}_{2.5}{ }^{15}$ were considered for all assessments. ${ }^{16}$
f. Mobile Emissions: The emissions from traditional internal combustion engine vehicles based on standardized pound/gallon emission factors from the EPA combined with published national mile-per-gallon efficiency factors.
g. Value Of Reduced Emissions: For each ton of reduced emissions, it is possible to compute the associated economic impact (in dollars) using standardized factors. For $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$, a recent New York State study provided "Social Cost of Carbon" \$-impact factors, based on a $2 \%$ discount. ${ }^{17}$ Similar factors for $\mathrm{NOx}, \mathrm{SO}_{2}$, and $\mathrm{PM}_{2.5}$ were referenced from a recent

[^141]National Highway Transportation Safety Administration Study ("NHTSA") on those emissions. ${ }^{18}$
h. Fuel Costs: Projections of gasoline costs (for use in traditional non-EV vehicles) taken from the federal Department of Energy ("DOE") 2022 Annual Energy Outlook ((https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/aeo/).
i. Incremental Costs Of EVs: Taken from a National Renewable Energy Laboratory ("NREL") projection of vehicle costs. ${ }^{19}$
j. Maintenance Savings: Taken from an annually published American Automobile Association ("AAA") study on maintenance costs for different vehicle types (2021 Edition).
k. Federal Tax Credits: A projection of average federal tax credits used in the EV market based on a changing mix of brands over time, and which accounts for changing eligibility over time. These projections have been updated to reflect changes in the tax credit program through the recently passed "Inflation Reduction Act" legislation.

1. Charging Equipment Costs: Taken from an analysis of real charging costs (equipment and installation) collected through the PE EV programs.
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## III. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

## Q16. Please summarize your analysis results.

A16. I used the Maryland EV-BCA Methodology to assess four of PE's EV offerings, and a portfolio view considering all offerings taken together. My results are consistent with the multiple assessments specified in the Maryland EV-BCA Methodology to provide several perspectives on the net-impact of those programs. Figure 4 summarizes the outcomes associated with each of the four quantified assessments. ${ }^{20}$

Figure 4: Potomac Edison EV-Program Assessments

| CURRENT MODEL RESULTS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Overall Results Summary | (>1.0 Beneficial) | ( $>1.0$ Beneficial) | Negative Number = Lower Impact |  |
|  | Primary JST | Market-Wide | ANRI (AII) | ANRI (Bill Only) |
| Portfolio | 1.03 |  | -\$6,589,261 | \$3,277,059 |
| (ANRI Allocation, impact PER Monthly BILL): | N/A |  | -\$0.153109 | \$0.076146 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| OPOB-Only | 0.77 |  | \$27,864 |  |
| (ANRI Allocation, impact PER Monthly BILL): | N/A |  | \$0.001214 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Charger \& OPOB | 0.12 |  | \$356,990 |  |
| (ANRI Allocation, impact PER Monthly BILL): | N/A |  | \$0.015553 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Public L2 | 1.07 |  | -\$2,432,673 | \$1,960,003 |
| (ANRI Allocation, impact PER Monthly BILL): | N/A |  | -\$0.056526 | \$0.045543 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Public DCFC | 1.01 |  | -\$4,541,443 | \$932,202 |
| (ANRI Allocation, impact PER Monthly BILL): | N/A |  | -\$0.105526 | \$0.021661 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Market-Wide JST (100\% Natural) | N/A | 2.33 |  |  |
| Market-Wide JST (100\% Managed) | N/A | 2.40 |  |  |
| Market-Wide JST (Currently Approved Programs) | N/A | 2.33 |  |  |

Note that the first two assessments (MD EV-JST and the Market-Wide test) are classic benefit/cost ratios, in which a ratio greater than one indicates positive net benefit. The third and fourth ANRI assessments are not benefit/cost ratios, but instead

[^143]represent net present values of ratepayer impacts, where a positive number indicates an increase in impacts to ratepayers (a non-beneficial outcome), and a negative number indicates a decrease in impacts on ratepayers (a beneficial outcome).

As highlighted in the MD EV-BCA Methodology, the primary assessment is the Jurisdiction Specific Test (MD EV-JST), which is a social-scope assessment tuned specifically to Maryland policy conditions.

- For the primary MD EV-JST test, the overall portfolio had an outcome above 1.0, indicating that the NPV of benefits exceeded costs.
- Both the Public L2 and Public DCFC offers are also deemed cost-effective based on MD EV-JST outcomes above 1.0.
- The two residential offers both had MD EV-JST outcomes below 1.0 , which likely reflects the very small scale of the pilot programs, as further detailed below. Of the two, the OPOB-Only offer is the strongest, since it doesn't bear the additional administrative costs associated with the charger rebate.
- The Market-Wide test quantifies whether vehicle electrification is beneficial overall, considering all vehicles in the market, not just those directly impacted by the approved utility programs. Three scenarios are defined in the MD EV-BCA Methodology: a) $100 \%$ of residential customers are on managed charging, b) $0 \%$ of residential customers use managed charging (i.e. natural charging only), and c) an intermediate case where managed charging is limited to the scope of utility programs already approved. There is net-benefit for the Market-Wide assessment
in all three cases, with the benefit/cost ratio being slightly higher in the $100 \%$ managed charging case.
- The ANRI-all test yields favorable results (i.e. net ratepayer impacts go down) for the portfolio overall, and for the Public L2 and Public DCFC offers. The two residential programs demonstrated unfavorable results for the two residential programs. I consider this assessment to be the most relevant assessment of direct ratepayer impact, since utility EV programs are intended to lower emissions through EV adoption and optimal use, and this test reflects both environmental impacts (which are not monetized) and direct economic impacts (on utility bills) when taken together.
- The ANRI-bills-only test considers only the monetized impacts that show up on a customer's utility bill, and the unfavorable outcome (i.e. a number $>0$ ) associated with that assessment means that ratepayer costs will increase slightly.
- As specified in the methodology, the ANRI result is divided by the number of residential customers over a specified period of time to arrive at an absolute dollarimpact per residential bill. It is important to emphasize that these ANRI impacts allocated to residential bills is an illustrative metric only, intended to provide context for the ANRI outcome.

In addition to providing absolute assessments of each offer (and the portfolio), these results can be used to understand relative cost-effectiveness and ratepayer impacts across programs. The electric utility implemented these programs as required by the Commission, and given the real-world results that have now been measured, these
$\qquad$
outcomes can help identify the relative merit of different offer designs. As further detailed below, some care is required when interpreting the absolute results since the Pilot programs are of fairly small scale, which likely had an impact on BCA outcomes. The following sections provides results on a per assessment method (across all offerings), as well as on an offering-by-offering basis (across all assessments).

## Q17. What is the assessment outcome for the Primary Test (MD EV-JST)?

A17. The Maryland EV-BCA Methodology defines a single primary test that is intended to be the principal basis for determining cost-effectiveness of electric utility EV programs. This assessment is similar to a traditional "societal cost test," and covers a broad range of both costs and benefits associated with either EV adoption, or the shifting of charging behavior to off-peak time (depending on the offering considered). Figure 5 summarizes the results of the MD EV-JST for each offering and the portfolio of offerings.

Figure 5: MD EV-JST Results

| Results Summary: MD EV-JST | (>1.0 Beneficial) |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | Primary JST |
| Portfolio | 1.03 |
| OPOB-Only | 0.77 |
| Charger \& OPOB | 0.12 |
| Public L2 | 1.07 |
| Public DCFC | 1.01 |

The portfolio overall, and both public charging programs, have outcomes above 1.0, which implies cost-effectiveness. The two residential programs (OPOB-only, and
$\qquad$

OPOB when combined with a charger rebate) demonstrate unfavorable outcomes less than 1.0.

The Maryland EV-BCA Methodology puts programs on an equivalent assessment basis so that programs can be compared with each other, although that is best done within program types. In this case, the OPOB-only offer is significantly more beneficial than the Charger \& OPOB offer, since it avoids certain administrative costs. It is worth noting that these simple BCA-outcomes can mask the absolute numbers involved - especially since these pilot programs are of very small scale. In the case of the OPOB-only program, for example, reducing administrative costs by only $\$ 18,000$ over a multi-year period would have resulted in a favorable outcome ( $>1.0$ ). These outcomes should therefore be considered within the small scale of these initial pilot offerings, and the results are best used to consider the costeffectiveness of pilot offerings relative to each other.

Q18. What is the outcome for the Market-Wide Assessment?
A18. The NPV of benefits exceeds the NPV of costs for all three scenarios of the Market-Wide case, demonstrating that society overall is better off as a result of widespread vehicle electrification. This assessment does not measure costeffectiveness of specific electric utility offerings, although the currently approved electric utility offerings were included in the inventory of costs. As summarized in Figure 6 below, the net benefits were higher in the case where residential managed charging becomes dominant as a result of avoided capacity, transmission, and distribution costs. The average of the two OPOB programs (with and without the
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charger rebate) was used as the reference point for residential managed charging, scaled up to full market participation in the $100 \%$ managed charging case.

Figure 6: Market-Wide Test Results

| Results Summary: Market-Wide Test | (>1.0 Beneficial) |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | Primary JST |
| Market-Wide (100\% Natural Residential Charging) | $\mathbf{2 . 3 3}$ |
| Market-Wide (100\% Managed Residential Charging) | $\mathbf{2 . 4 0}$ |
| Market-Wide (Approved Managed Charging) | $\mathbf{2 . 3 3}$ |

## Q19. In the case where all ratepayer impacts are considered, what is the outcome for ANRI-all assessment?

The MD EV-BCA ANRI-all assessment evaluates the impact on ratepayers when all impacts are considered, including changes in utility costs (or avoided costs) and the impact of externalities, such as reduced emissions. Consideration of those reduced emissions is meaningful since that is a primary motivation for many of the electric utility "EV Driven" offerings. The scope of this assessment is exclusively nonparticipating ratepayers, and specifically addresses the policy question about how rate payers who do not participate directly in a given program (i.e., EV owner/operators) are impacted. As emphasized in the Maryland EV-BCA Methodology, the ANRI assessment is not a measure of utility program cost-effectiveness. Instead, it quantifies an estimate of aggregate impact on utility ratepayers through a net-NPV assessment of factors that increase utility costs, compared with factors that decrease utility costs. Therefore, the ANRI outcome is not a ratio like the societal-scale tests summarized above; it is an absolute measure of net dollar-impact, in which a negative number means
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ratepayer impacts go down (i.e., are beneficial). Figure 7 summarizes the results of the ANRI-all assessment.

Figure 7: ANRI - All Impacts

| Results Summary: ANRI (ALL) | Negative = Better |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | ANRI (AII) |
| Portfolio | -\$6,589,261 |
| (ANRI Allocation, impact PER BILL): | -\$0.153109 |
| OPOB Only | \$27,864 |
| (ANRI Allocation, impact PER BILL): | \$0.001214 |
| Charger \& OPOB | \$356,990 |
| (ANRI Allocation, impact PER BILL): | \$0.015553 |
| Public L2 | -\$2,432,673 |
| (ANRI Allocation, impact PER BILL): | -\$0.056526 |
| Public DCFC | -\$4,541,443 |
| (ANRI Allocation, impact PER BILL): | -\$0.105526 |

The ANRI-All outcome for the portfolio overall is favorable (i.e. an outcome $<$ 0 ), and also a favorable outcome for both the Public L2 and Public DCFC offers. The outcomes for the two residential programs are unfavorable, although for Public-L2 the absolute magnitude of that outcome is relatively small.

## Q20. Can you provide ratepayer context for those ANRI outcomes?

A20. Yes. The Maryland EV-BCA specifies that in addition to the NPV outcome, each ANRI-all result is translated to a "per residential customer monthly bill" impact, which is the ANRI result, divided by the average number of residential customers and the number of monthly bills received by those customers during the period over which
$\qquad$
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benefits are realized. These results are therefore an average dollar-change, either up or down, per monthly residential bill. This allocation of ANRI results is only illustrative, to provide context (as specified in the MD EV-BCA Methodology) for the primary ANRI outcome. It is a comparison metric only, and inherently assumes (to provide a standardized benchmark) the quantified impacts apply only to residential customers. In the case of the ANRI-all assessment, this is a hypothetical scenario that contemplates externalized impacts (such as air emissions) were monetized to the ratepayer, in addition to impacts on the electric utility bill. It is a useful perspective on ratepayer impact, but does not represent a real-world cash flow.

As noted in Figure 7, both the portfolio and both public charging programs demonstrate favorable ANRI-all impact (i.e. ratepayer costs go down), however the two residential programs demonstrate an unfavorable impact (i.e. ratepayer costs go up).

Q21. In the case where only utility-bill impacts are considered, what is the ANRI-BillsOnly result?

A21.
The ANRI-bills-only case quantifies ratepayer impact in the case where only monetized impacts on the utility bill are considered. As with the ANRI-all assessment, the scope is aggregate impact on non-participating ratepayers. Figure 8 summarizes the results of the ANRI-bills-only assessment:
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Figure 8: ANRI - Bill Impacts Only

| Results Summary: ANRI (Bill Only) | Negative $=$ Better |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | ANRI (Bill Only) |
| Portfolio | \$3,277,059 |
| (ANRI Allocation, impact PER BILL): | \$0.076146 |
| OPOB-Only | \$27,864 |
| (ANRI Allocation, impact PER BILL): | \$0.001214 |
| Charger \& OPOB | \$356,990 |
| (ANRI Allocation, impact PER BILL): | \$0.015553 |
| Public L2 | \$1,960,003 |
| (ANRI Allocation, impact PER BILL): | \$0.045543 |
| Public DCFC | \$932,202 |
| (ANRI Allocation, impact PER BILL): | \$0.021661 |

This test yields unfavorable outcomes (impacts $>0$ ) for all four programs and the portfolio, which implies that utility costs to non-participating ratepayers go up for the ANRI-bill-only case. It is important to emphasize that the ANRI-bill-only case excludes externalities (such as CO 2 reductions or improvements in public health) that are the strategic motivation for key programs. In all cases, however, the absolute impact is modest, measured in pennies per residential bill.

Q22. Please summarize the assessment results for the full portfolio of offerings taken together.

A22. Figure 9 summarizes the results of each assessment for the portfolio of offerings.
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Figure 9: Summary Of All Assessments For The Portfolio Of Offerings

| Results Summary: Portfolio | (>1.0 Beneficial) |  | Negative Number = Lower Impact |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Primary JST | ANRI (AlI) | ANRI (Bill Only) |  |
| Assessment Result | $\mathbf{1 . 0 3}$ | $-\$ 6,589, \mathbf{2 6 1}$ | $\$ \mathbf{3 , 2 7 7 , 0 5 9}$ |  |
| ANRI Allocation, impact PER BILL: | N/A | $-\$ 0.153109$ | $\$ 0.076146$ |  |

Each assessment for the portfolio of offerings represents the simple sum of benefits and costs (for the MD EV-JST) or the ratepayer cost increases or decreases (for the two ANRI assessments) each year, combined in an aggregate net NPV of impacts. Since each offering impacts the market in different ways - some change when charging happens, others stimulate increased adoption - the portfolio assessment represents a perspective on how these offerings impact the market when deployed together. The portfolio view also allows for electric utility costs to be captured in the most comprehensive way, and in my view is a good way to consider utility EV program impacts since it provides a single overall assessment of program merit, and accounts for the reality that the programs are impacting the market simultaneously. The portfolio results are both favorable for the MD EV-JST (above 1.0), and for the ANRI-All case (below 0), but unfavorable for the ANRI-bills-only case that ignores externalities.

## Q23. Please summarize the assessment results for the OPOB-Only Offering.

A23. Figure 10 summarizes the results of each assessment for the OPOB-Only offering.

Figure 10: All Assessments For The OPOB-Only Offering

| Results Summary: OPOB-Only | (>1.0 Beneficial) | Negative Number = Lower Impact |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Primary JST | ANRI (AlI) | ANRI (Bill Only) |
| Assessment Result | $\mathbf{0 . 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 7 , 8 6 4}$ |  |
| ANRI Allocation, impact PER BILL: | N/A | $\mathbf{\$ 0 . 0 0 1 2 1 4}$ |  |
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The baseline for the Off-Peak/Off-Bill Offering is a customer that has already decided to purchase an EV, and who is charging it using a natural charging pattern (typically, plugging in when returning home from work). The impact of this offering is therefore not to induce adoption, but to change the timing of when an existing EV owner charges their vehicle. Based on real-world measurement of the difference in charging patterns between customers on the OPOB-Only offering and customers in the "natural charging" control group, this assessment quantifies the benefits associated with avoided incremental costs associated with additional PJM-coincident peak load. This offering returns a primary MD EV-JST result less than 1.0 (i.e., not cost-effective), and an unfavorable impact on the ratepayer in both the ANRI-all and ANRI-bills-only scenarios. This unfavorable outcome is mostly likely the result of relatively small pilot program scale. To demonstrate the sensitivity, if the administrative costs had been only $\$ 18,000$ lower over a multi-year period, the JST for the OPOB-Only offer would have been cost-effective. I therefore consider this outcome a measure of the pilot-scale implementation, which may not be representative of larger-scale offers of similar design.

## Q24. Please summarize the assessment results for the residential charger \& OPOB Offering.

A24.
Figure 11 summarizes the results of each assessment for the residential Charger \& OPOB) offering.
$\qquad$

Figure 11: All Assessments For The Residential Charger Rebate \& OPOB Offering

| Results Summary: Charger \& OPOB | (>1.0 Beneficial) | Negative Number = Lower Impact |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Primary JST | ANRI (All) | ANRI (Bill Only) |
| Assessment Result | $\mathbf{0 . 1 2}$ | $\$ 356,990$ |  |
| ANRI Allocation, impact PER BILL: | N/A | $\$ 0.015553$ |  |

As with the OPOB-Only offering (without the charger rebate), this offering's only impact is to change an EV driver's charging behavior. The baseline is an EV owner-operator who has already made the adoption decision, ${ }^{21}$ and who charges according to the "natural charging" profile. This offering accomplishes that behavior modification through an off-bill rebate paid in proportion to net-kWhs during the offpeak period, and is a particularly visible way to deliver incentives to customers. It also encourages customers to make use of a networked smart charger approved by the electric utility, and to provide charging data which is critical for assessing impacts. This offering returns a primary MD EV-JST result significantly less than 1.0 (i.e., not cost-effective), and an unfavorable impact on the ratepayer in both the ANRI-all and ANRI-bills-only scenarios. These outcomes, especially compared with the OPOBOnly program, reflect the additional administrative costs associated with delivering the charger rebate.

## Q25. Please summarize the assessment results for the Public L2 Offering.

A25. Figure 12 summarizes the results of each assessment for the Public L2 Offering.

[^144]$\qquad$

Figure 12: Summary Of All Assessments For The Public L2 Offering

| Results Summary: Public L2 |  | (>1.0 Beneficial) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Negative Number = Lower Impact |  |  |  |
|  | Primary JST | ANRI (AlI) | ANRI (Bill Only) |
| Assessment Result | 1.07 | $-\$ 2,432,673$ | $\$ 1,960,003$ |
| ANRI Allocation, impact PER BILL: | N/A | $-\$ 0.056526$ | $\$ 0.045543$ |

The primary motivation for the public L2 offering is to increase the availability of public charging to reduce range anxiety, provide access to charging (especially for those that may not have access to a charger at home), and increase consumer EV adoption as a result. The primary market impact for this offering is therefore induced EV adoption, and as identified in the Maryland EV-BCA Methodology, the assessments for this offering account for the comprehensive portfolio of benefits and costs (or ratepayer decreases or increases) associated with increased EV adoption. As noted in the methodology section of this testimony, that inventory of impacts is comprehensive and in addition to electric utility program costs, includes factors such as the incremental cost of the EV, federal tax credits, charger costs, increased electricity costs, incremental capacity and transmission costs associated with charging during PJM-coincident peak times, fuel savings, maintenance savings, and increased electric utility revenues, (as appropriate per assessment). The public L2 offering has a favorable outcome for the Primary MD EV-JST, and is also projected to reduce ratepayer costs as quantified through both ANRI assessments. It is also worth noting that administrative costs for all programs include the costs for networking services
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provided by the charger-vendors, and the costs for data licenses, which are significant elements of the administrative line ${ }^{22}$ that impacts this outcome.

## Q26. Please summarize the assessment results for the Public DCFC Offering.

A26. Figure 13 summarizes the results of each assessment for the Public DCFC Offering.

Figure 13: Summary Of All Assessments For The Public DCFC Offering

| Results Summary: Public DCFC | (>1.0 Beneficial) |  | Negative Number $=$ Lower Impact |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Primary JST | ANRI (AlI) | ANRI (Bill Only) |  |
| Assessment Result | $\mathbf{1 . 0 1}$ | $-\$ 4,541,443$ | $\$ 932,202$ |  |
| ANRI Allocation, impact PER BILL: | N/A | $-\$ 0.105526$ | $\$ 0.021661$ |  |

As with the Public L2 offering, the Public DCFC offering is assessed based on the impacts associated with the increased EV adoption induced by the availability of additional fast charging in the market. This offering realizes a favorable outcome under the primary MD EV-JST with a ratio of the NPVs of benefits divided by costs being >1.0. Both ANRI assessments are also favorable, indicating that ratepayer costs (in the ALL case) go down. It is worth noting that this particular program was implemented during the COVID-19 Global Pandemic. These conditions are especially impactful for the construction-cost intensive DCFC program, and the BCA outcomes were likely negatively impacted by significant supply-chain constraints and other related factors.

## Q27. Are there additional qualitative factors that should be taken into consideration regarding the PE EV Programs?

[^145]$\qquad$
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A27. Yes. The Maryland EV-BCA Methodology allows for consideration of additional strategic factors that provide important context for the four quantitative assessments summarized above. Several of these strategic considerations became evident when preparing this analysis, and I believe they provide important context for considering the quantitative results:

1. Scale: All of the current electric utility EV pilot programs are relatively small scale, and that typically drags down BCA outcomes. A primary reason is utility administrative costs that include some fixed costs, but which are diluted as program scale increases. The results presented in this testimony reflect the currently approved programs, at their current relatively small size, and may not reflect the net benefit of potential larger scale programs.
2. Start-up Investment: This assessment has been done during the mid-point of an initial set of electric utility EV pilot programs. There are hard-to-document costs associated with new programs such as these, such as organizational learning, Information Technology investments, process infrastructure, and consumer awareness development. Although those costs have been captured in this analysis in some cases, the extent to which those early-phase investments can be leveraged with larger-scale offerings longer term is probably under-represented.
3. Untapped Potential: The residential managed charging program, especially the OPOB program, establishes a platform that enables more advanced managed charging capabilities beyond what are currently being realized. More advanced "grid interactive" opportunities may be made possible by the platform being
developed, and if leveraged, could deliver benefits beyond those captured in the current analysis. The potential for leveraging the platform being developed is important context for considering the net benefit of the current utility EV programs.
4. Unquantified Benefits: As defined in the Maryland EV-BCA Methodology, this portfolio of assessments focuses on hard measures that can be quantified, like program costs, emissions reductions, and impacts on electricity costs. There are other potential benefits associated with widespread EV adoption that are not yet accommodated fairly in this methodology, with two primary examples being improved vehicle safety and the strategic benefits of diversifying energy sources for transportation. Regarding the latter point, it is important to note that the transportation system in the United States is overwhelmingly based on a single source of energy (petroleum); by contrast, EVs can be powered from any electricity sourced from any generation fuel type. Increased EV adoption, especially if optimized to minimize additional loading during peak time, is a primary strategy for reducing those strategic vulnerabilities. Neither the safety nor reduced-petroleum-use considerations are represented fairly in the current methodology.
5. The Value of Charging Data: As noted in the methodology section of this testimony, these assessments depend heavily on knowing customer EV charging behaviors. These programs encourage the deployment of networked smart chargers, or networked public chargers, and collect detailed charging transaction data. That data itself is extremely valuable, and in addition to its use for policy analysis (such as these BCA and ratepayer impact assessments), could help inform
long term grid loading analysis, and optimal program design. The value inherent in the data captured through these programs is not quantified in this analysis, and in my view is an important factor in considering the merit of the electric utility EV programs.

## IV. CONCLUSIONS

## Q28. In summary, what were the results of your analysis?

A28. This testimony summarizes the results of a detailed analysis performed on the PE EV Pilot program portfolio using the MD EV-BCA Methodology defined by the EV-BCA work group in 2021, and approved by the Commission in January of 2022. The combination of these assessments provides multiple perspectives on the merit of each offering and the portfolio of offerings when considered together. The portfolio, public L2, and public DCFC programs deliver a MD EV-JST above 1.0, and also delivers cost reductions for ratepayers when externalities are included. The two residential programs are not cost-effective at the current level of scale, and they also increase net-costs to ratepayers even under the ANRI-All case. The ANRI-Bills-Only case was unfavorable, which implies ratepayer costs would go up slightly, when the impact of externalities are considered. The Market-Wide assessment demonstrated that widespread electrification overall was beneficial in all cases considered, especially in the scenario where managed residential charging becomes dominant. All of these results are strongly impacted by the small scale of the currently approved pilot offers, but can be used to compare relative effectiveness of similar programs to guide program optimization and prioritization.
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1 Q29. Does this conclude your Direct Testimony?
2 A29. Yes, but I reserve the right to modify this analysis or conclusions if new 3 information is made available.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1} \mathrm{Mr}$. Lyons will be providing two pieces of testimony: one regarding cash working capital, and one regarding the Company's class cost of service ("CCOS") and rate design.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ As discussed in the testimony supporting this Application, however, the $\$ 48.5$ million increase in distribution revenues will be accompanied by an approximate $\$ 4.8$ million decrease in the EDIS, resulting in a net change in revenues of $\$ 43.8$ million.

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ Mr. Lyons will be providing two pieces of testimony: one regarding cash working capital, and one regarding the Company's class cost of service ("CCOS") and rate design.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ PE also provides retail electric service to customers in West Virginia and owns transmission facilities in Maryland, West Virginia, and Virginia.
    ${ }^{2}$ For purposes of my testimony, residential consists of customers billed on Schedule R, commercial consists of customers billed on Schedules G, C, C-A, the CSH subset of C-A, and PH (less than 600 kW ), and industrial consists of customers billed on Schedules PH ( 600 kW and greater), PP and AGS.

[^4]:    ${ }^{3}$ Distribution rates for PE in this chart include the Electric Distribution Investment Surcharge since that surcharge represents costs that will eventually be rolled into distribution rates.

[^5]:    ${ }^{4}$ Surcharges exclude generation reconciliation mechanisms (identified as an energy cost adjustment or procurement cost adjustment) and decoupling bill stabilization adjustment mechanisms since those mechanisms alternate between charges and credits throughout the year and, as such, rates effective during March 2023 are not necessarily representative of annual rates. The inclusion in March 2023 rates of these mechanisms would not materially affect the results depicted on the chart.
    ${ }^{5}$ Table 5.6.A. Average Price of Electricity to Ultimate Customers by End-Use Sector, December 2022.

[^6]:    ${ }^{6}$ Only North Dakota was lower at 9.62 cents per kWh, per Table 5.6.A as of December 2022.

[^7]:    ${ }^{7}$ Order at 12.

[^8]:    ${ }^{8}$ The requested increase is also displayed on the income statement sponsored by Company witness Soltis in Exhibit JAS-1 (column 6).

[^9]:    ${ }^{9}$ The winter heating period is the five-month period of November through March.

[^10]:    ${ }^{1}$ Distribution includes tax surcharges for the Franchise Tax and the Montgomery County Fuel Energy Local Tax
    ${ }^{2} \$ 1,042,433$ grossed-up for Maryland gross receipts tax and the Commission assessment factor
    ${ }^{3}$ Based upon rates as of March 2023

[^11]:    ${ }^{10}$ The percentage increase of $9.7 \%$ differs slightly from the class average $9.5 \%$ provided in Table 1 since the actual average monthly kWh usage is slightly higher than $1,000 \mathrm{kWh}$ per month.

[^12]:    ${ }^{11}$ Table 5.6.A. Average Price of Electricity to Ultimate Customers by End-Use Sector, December 2022.
    ${ }^{12}$ Only North Dakota was lower at 9.62 cents per kWh, per Table 5.6.A as of December 2022.

[^13]:    ${ }^{13}$ The Commission did note that, "...the Commission declines to adopt Potomac Edison's proposal for a storm fund at this time." Order at 16. [emphasis added]

[^14]:    ${ }^{14}$ Direct Testimony of Yulia Poberesky, pg 11, filed November 20, 2018 in Case No. 9490.
    ${ }^{15}$ Please see Case No. 9667 for filings and information provided in response to OPC's petition to investigate the relationship of FirstEnergy with PE, as well as the definition of Ohio HB6 activities.

[^15]:    ${ }^{16}$ The test year in the Company's last distribution base rate case was the 12 -month period of July 2017 through June 2018. Therefore, any O\&M expenses that occurred prior to July 2017 or after June 2018 would not have been reflected in customer rates. Capital costs that were incurred after June 2018 would also not have been reflected in customer rates.

[^16]:    ${ }^{17}$ As indicated in Exhibit RV-3, the Miscellaneous category includes amounts related to FE Foundation, FE Products, IT for FE Products, trade association dues, lobbying and vendors.

[^17]:    ${ }^{18}$ Customer credits will be a fixed dollar amount per rate schedule, with the exception of streetlighting customers (which will have a per kWh credit due to their fixed kWh consumption per month) and Schedule PP customers (which due to their unique size will have individual credits for each of the ten customers on that rate schedule).

[^18]:    ${ }^{1}$ PE-MD GP01 A\&G O\&M allocator per Exhibit LMO-1 Actuals, Distribution Base Rate Filing dated October 22, 2018 in Case No. 9490

[^19]:    ${ }^{1}$ High-voltage service is typically 34,500 volts or higher but can be as low as 12,470 volts in certain situations.

[^20]:    ${ }^{2}$ FERC Order issued in Docket Number QM22-4-000.

[^21]:    ${ }^{3}$ Commission letter order dated June 15, 2022 (ML\#s 240413 and 240434)

[^22]:    ${ }^{4}$ For purposes of my testimony and accompanying exhibits, the return on and of capital are at depreciation and rate of return rates proposed by the Company.

[^23]:    Issued under Order No. 89971 dated October 26, 2021 in Case No. 9490.

[^24]:    Issued under Order No. 89971 dated October 26, 2021 in Case No. 9490.

[^25]:    Issued under Order No. 89971 dated October 26, 2021 in Case No. 9490.

[^26]:    ${ }^{1}$ See Case No. 9490.
    ${ }^{2}$ See Case No. 9490, ML\#s 240413 and 240434. In the initial approval of the EDIS, the Commission stated that the Company could return prior to the sunset of the program to make a case for the extension of any of the three EDIS programs.

[^27]:    ${ }^{3}$ SAID ${ }^{\text {MED }}$ is "the SAIDI that a system experiences during major event days and can be a useful measure of that system's resilience". Engineering Division's Review of Annual Performance Reports on Electric Service Reliability (July 21, 2022), 72.

[^28]:    ${ }^{4}$ System Average Interruption Frequency Index ("SAIFI") is a measure of how often, on average, a customer experienced an interruption of service in a given year.
    ${ }^{5}$ System Average Interruption Duration Index ("SAIDI") is a measure of the number of minutes of service interruption the average customer experienced in a given year.

[^29]:    ${ }^{6}$ There were two years in the previous five-year period where PE did not meet all ten COMAR standards: 2019 (SAIFI, SAIDI, and restoration within eight hours standards), and 2020 (poorest performing feeder).

[^30]:    ${ }^{7}$ COMAR 20.50.12.02.D(7).

[^31]:    ${ }^{8}$ Due to supply chain issues experienced throughout 2022, materials were not available to complete the planned 14 recloser installations.
    ${ }^{9}$ Due to the lead time required for design of the recloser installations and sourcing of materials, no installations will be completed in 2024.

[^32]:    ${ }^{10}$ Engineering Division's Review of Annual Performance Reports on Electric Service Reliability (July 21, 2022), 72.

[^33]:    ${ }^{1}$ The capital structure approved by the Commission in the Company's prior distribution rate case (Case No. 9490) was $52.82 \%$ equity, $47.18 \%$ long-term debt, and no short-term debt.

[^34]:    ${ }^{1}$ Deferred income taxes also arise from other (non-depreciation) book-tax timing differences for items of income and expense.

[^35]:    ${ }^{2}$ The ARAM determines how quickly excess ADIT related to the difference between accelerated tax depreciation and book depreciation can be refunded in compliance with the normalization provisions of the Code. Section $13001(\mathrm{~d})(3)(B)$ of the TCJA defines the ARAM as the method under which the excess in the reserve for deferred taxes is reduced over the remaining lives of the property as used in the regulated books of account which gave rise to the reserve for deferred taxes. Under such a method, during the time period in which the timing differences for the property reverse, the amount of the adjustment to the reserve for the deferred taxes is calculated by multiplying the ratio of the aggregate deferred taxes for the property to the aggregate timing differences for the property as of the beginning of the period in question, by the amount of the timing differences which reverse during such period.

[^36]:    ${ }^{3}$ PLRs 202141001 (October 2021), 202211004 (March 2022), and 202230005 (July 2022). A PLR is only binding on the taxpayer to whom it is issued. Therefore, the PLRs are not binding on the Company. However, any PLR provides insight into the IRS's legal position on issues and similarly situated taxpayers should expect that the IRS would apply the law in like kind to their situation.
    ${ }^{4}$ In essence, the IRS explained that COR is deductible under the Code independent of accelerated depreciation and, therefore, it reverses through the actual incurred COR expenditures, not through book-tax depreciation timing differences.
    ${ }^{5}$ The configuration changes were made with respect to excess and deficient ADIT balances as of January 1, 2021.

[^37]:    ${ }^{6}$ When COR is removed, the accumulated book depreciation reserve is reduced, causing an increase (approximately $\$ 22$ million) in the balance of federal excess ADIT related to book-tax depreciation differences that will reverse in the future, and an offsetting decrease (approximately $\$ 22$ million) in the excess ADIT related to non-depreciation differences.

[^38]:    ${ }^{1}$ Order at 94.

[^39]:    ${ }^{2}$ The CAM has been filed in this proceeding as Exhibit TMA-2 to the direct testimony of Company witness Ashton.

[^40]:    ${ }^{1}$ Ordering Paragraph (8) at 122

[^41]:    ${ }^{1}$ National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissions (NARUC). Electric Utility Cost Allocation Manual, 1992.
    ${ }^{2}$ ibid, p. 21.
    ${ }^{3}$ ibid, p. 19.

[^42]:    ${ }^{4}$ SAP, www.sap.com.
    ${ }^{5}$ ISO/IEC 9075-1:2011, Information technology -- Database languages -- SQL -- Part 1: Framework (SQL/Framework),
    ${ }^{6}$ Quest Software, https://www.quest.com/.
    ${ }^{7}$ Microsoft,www.microsoft.com.
    ${ }^{8}$ Handy-Whitman Index of Public Utility Construction, Whitman, Requardt and Associates, LLP, 801 South Caroline Street, Baltimore, MD 21231,

[^43]:    ${ }^{9}$ National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissions (NARUC). Electric Utility Cost Allocation Manual, 1992.

[^44]:    ${ }^{10}$ Per The Potomac Edison Company - MD, FERC Form No. 1, Year/Period of Report, End of 2021/Q4, Account 364, Balance at End of Year, pg. 206.

[^45]:    ${ }^{11}$ Per The Potomac Edison Company - MD, FERC Form No. 1, Year/Period of Report, End of 2021/Q4, Account 365, Balance at End of Year, pg. 206.

[^46]:    ${ }^{12}$ Per The Potomac Edison Company - MD, FERC Form No. 1, Year/Period of Report, End of 2021/Q4, Account 367, Balance at End of Year, pg. 206.

[^47]:    ${ }^{13}$ Per The Potomac Edison Company - MD, FERC Form No. 1, Year/Period of Report, End of 2021/Q4, Account 368, Balance at End of Year, pg. 206.

[^48]:    ${ }^{14}$ Per The Potomac Edison Company - MD, FERC Form No. 1, Year/Period of Report, End of 2021/Q4, Account 364, Balance at End of Year, pg. 206.

[^49]:    ${ }^{15}$ Per The Potomac Edison Company - MD, FERC Form No. 1, Year/Period of Report, End of 2021/Q4, Account 365, Balance at End of Year, pg. 206.

[^50]:    ${ }^{16}$ Per The Potomac Edison Company - MD, FERC Form No. 1, Year/Period of Report, End of 2021/Q4, Account 366, Balance at End of Year, pg. 206.

[^51]:    ${ }^{17}$ Per The Potomac Edison Company - MD, FERC Form No. 1, Year/Period of Report, End of 2021/Q4, Account 367, Balance at End of Year, pg. 206.

[^52]:    ${ }^{18}$ Per The Potomac Edison Company - MD, FERC Form No. 1, Year/Period of Report, End of 2021/Q4, Account 364, Balance at End of Year, pg. 206.

[^53]:    ${ }^{19}$ Per The Potomac Edison Company - MD, FERC Form No. 1, Year/Period of Report, End of 2021/Q4, Account 368, Balance at End of Year, pg. 206.

[^54]:    ${ }^{20}$ Per The Potomac Edison Company - MD, FERC Form No. 1, Year/Period of Report, End of 2021/Q4, Account 368, Balance at End of Year, pg. 206.

[^55]:    ${ }^{1}$ Order at 29-30.

[^56]:    1 "Promotional" means advertising directed toward selling services or promoting the addition of new customers or seeking additional use of utility service. "Community affairs" means advertising directed toward influencing public opinion on a controversial issue, or the result of any legislative or administrative matter that would justify the utility civic and community position. "Institutional" means advertising directed toward establishing a favorable image of the utility company or its employees and which serves to identify the sponsor.
    2 "Informational" means advertising directed toward informing customers of charges and conditions of service, safety precautions, energy conservation, temporary or emergency conditions, employment opportunities, rate cases, annual reports, legal and financial matters.

[^57]:    ${ }^{3}$ Such an analysis was required in accordance with Order No. 88997 in Case No. 9478 , footnote 170.
    ${ }^{4}$ Order No. 89971 in Case No. 9490 affirmed the Proposed Order of the Public Utility Law Judge dated May 26, 2021, which, among other items, authorized the deferral of such depreciation study expenses into a regulatory asset for consideration in the Company's next base rate case (pgs. 25-26).

[^58]:    ${ }^{5}$ For example, if a Commission order is received on October 18, 2023, the change in depreciation rates will be effective on November 1, 2023.
    ${ }^{6}$ Order at pgs. 76-77.
    ${ }^{7}$ Proposal to Implement a Statewide Electric Vehicle Portfolio (pg. 54), filed January 22, 2018 in Case No. 9478.

[^59]:    ${ }^{1}$ It should be noted that not all of the FirstEnergy transmission assets are part of the three independent transmission businesses. Some of FirstEnergy's utilities, including PE, currently own their own transmission assets for which they are provided with transmission support services through FESC, and the costs for such transmission support services are addressed in proceedings related to transmission rates before the FERC and not as part of this proceeding. However, I should also clarify that the same personnel who provide the transmission support services, which are not addressed in this proceeding, also provide some distribution support services, which are addressed in this proceeding.

[^60]:    ${ }^{2}$ For instance, the predecessor to PUHCA 2005, the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 ("the '35Act"), and the regulations (e.g., Rules $87,88,90,91$ and 93 ) promulgated thereunder, permitted, and regulated, the use of, and charging of costs by, mutual service companies that provided services within registered public utility holding company systems.

[^61]:    ${ }^{3}$ Please note that FESC also provides, on a limited basis, goods in connection with such services. However, for the sake of simplicity and clarity, I only refer to "services" in my testimony.

[^62]:    1 Federal Power Comm 'n v. Hope Natural Gas Co., 320 U.S. 591 (1944) ("Hope").
    Bluefield Water Works Improvement Co. v. Public Serv. Comm'n, 262 U.S. 679 (1922) ("Bluefield").

[^63]:    3 The development of the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group is explained in more detail in Section V, part D.

[^64]:    4
    My indicated range of common equity cost rates are 50 basis points above and below the midpoint of my three model results.
    5 My indicated range of common equity cost rates after adjustment does not include flotation costs.

[^65]:    3 Risk distinctions within S\&P's bond rating categories are recognized by a plus or minus, e.g., within the A category, an S\&P rating can by at A+, A, or A-. Similarly, risk distinction for Moody's ratings are distinguished by numerical rating gradations, e.g., within the A category, a Moody's rating can be A1, A2 and A3.

[^66]:    8 The Company serves approximately 285,000 customers in Maryland and approximately 150,000 customers in West Virginia.
    9 FirstEnergy Corp., 2021 SEC Form 10-K, at 1, In addition to Maryland, FE also serves customers in Ohio, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, New Jersey, and New York.

[^67]:    Illustrated on Columns 1 and 2, page 2 of Schedule DWD-3.
    Illustrated on Column 4, page 2 of Schedule DWD-3.
    Annualized Return $=(1+\text { Monthly Return })^{\wedge} 12-1$.
    See, Column 6, page 2 of Schedule DWD-3.
    Blue Chip Financial Forecasts ("Blue Chip"), January 1, 2023 at 2 and December 1, 2022 at 14.

[^68]:    23
    As shown on page 3 of Exhibit DWD-3.

[^69]:    32 Derived on line 3, page 3 of Schedule DWD-3.
    33 As shown on page 12 of Exhibit DWD-3. As shown on page 12 of Exhibit DWD-3.

[^70]:    See, e.g., Robert S. Harris and Felicia C. Marston, The Market Risk Premium: Expectational Estimates Using Analysts'Forecasts, Journal of Applied Finance, Vol. 11, No. 1, 2001, at pages 11 to 12; Eugene F. Brigham, Dilip K. Shome, and Steve R. Vinson, The Risk Premium Approach to Measuring a Utility's Cost of Equity, Financial Management, Spring 1985, at pages 33 to 45.

[^71]:    36
    As shown on page 3 of Exhibit DWD-3.

[^72]:    43 Dianna R. Harrington, Modern Portfolio Theory \& the Capital Asset Pricing Model - A User's

[^73]:    44 Dianna R. Harrington, Modern Portfolio Theory \& the Capital Asset Pricing Model - A User's Guide, Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1983, at 43-45.

[^74]:    47 Frank J. Hanley, Pauline M. Ahern, Comparable Earnings: New Life for an Old Precept, Financial Quarterly Review, Summer 1994.

[^75]:    Kroll, Cost of Capital Navigator: U.S. Cost of Capital Module, Size as a Predictor of Equity Returns, at 1.

[^76]:    ${ }^{61}$ Source of Information: S\&P Global Market Intelligence.

[^77]:    62 As shown on page 5 of Schedule DWD-3.
    $630.10 \%=0.30 \% *(1 / 3)$.

[^78]:    67 SFAS 143, Paragraph A21.

[^79]:    (1) Indicated dividend at $12 / 30 / 2022$ divided by the average closing price of the last 60 trading days ending
    $12 / 30 / 2022$ for each company.
    (2) From pages 2 through 14 of this Schedule.
    (3) Average of columns 2 through 4 excluding negative growth rates.
    (4) This reflects a growth rate component equal to one-half the conclusion of growth rate (from column 6$) \times$
    column 1 to reflect the periodic payment of dividends (Gordon Model) as opposed to the continuous payment.
    Thus, for Alliant Energy Corporation, $3.20 \% \times(1+(1 / 2 \times 5.81 \%))=3.29 \%$.
    (5) Column $6+$ column 7 .
    Value Line Investment Survey
    www.zacks.com Downloaded on $12 / 30 / 2022$
    www.yahoo.com Downloaded on $12 / 30 / 2022$
    Bloomberg Professional Services

[^80]:     ${ }^{0} 06,(20 \mathrm{c})$; ' $07,(20 \mathrm{c})$; '08, 40c; ' 10 , ( 7 C ); ' '11, ings report due late Jan. (B) Div'ds paid early ( (E) Rate base: various. Rates allowed on com. Stock's Price Stability 89c; '12, (38c); '13,' (14c);' '16, (\$2.99); '17,' Mar., June, Sept., \& Dec. - Div'd reinvestment eq.: $9.3 \%$-10.9\%; earned on avg. com. eq., '21: Price Growth Persistence 26¢; '19', (20¢); gains (loss) from disc. ops.: | plan avail. † Shareholder invest. plan avail. $11.6 \%$. Regulatory Climate: Average.
    © 2022 Value Line, Inc. All rights reserved. Factual material is obtained from sources believed to be reliable and is provided without warranties of any kind.
    THE PUBLISHER IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS HEREIN. This publication is strictly for subscriber's own, non-commercial internal use. No part
    of it may be reproduced, resold, stored or transmitted in any printed, electronic or other form, or used for generating or marketing any printed or electronic publication, service or product

[^81]:    
    (644); '10, 544 c ; 11 , ( $\$ 3.33$ ); '13, ( $\$ 1.12$ ); '15, don't sum due to change in shs. Next earnings mill. (E) Rate base: net orig. cost. Rate all'd on Stock's Price Stability (\$1.18); '17, (\$1.37); '18, (15¢);' '19, (21¢); '20, report due early November. (B) Div'ds paid late $\quad$ com. eq. in '20: 10.3\%; earned on avg. com. Price Growth Persistence

[^82]:    (A) Diluted EPS. Excl. nonrec. Losses: '12, ${ }^{\text {Div'ds historically paid in early Mar., June, }}$ (E) Rate base: Net original cost. Allowed ROE Company's Financial Strength $\$ 1.26$; '13, \$1.14; '14, 56 c ; '15, \$6.99; '16, Sept., \& Dec. - Div'd reinvestment plan avail. $\dagger$ (blended): 9.95\%; earned on avg. com. eq., $\$ 10.14$; '17, $\$ 2.91$; '18, $\$ 1.25$; '21, $\$ 1.33$; '22, Shareholder investment plan avail. (C) Incl. '21: 12.1\%. Regulatory Climate: Average. $\$ 1.19$. Next earnings report due early Feb. (B) deferred charges. In '21: $\$ 35.95 / \mathrm{sh}$. (D) In mill.
    © 2022 Value Line, Inc. All rights reserved. Factual material is obtained from sources believed to be reliable and is provided without warranties of any kind.
    of it may be reproduced, resold, stored or transmitted in any printed, electronic or other form, or used for generating or marketing any printed or electronic publication, service or product

[^83]:    （A）Diluted EPS．Excl．nonrecurring gain：＇06， May，Aug．，and Nov．－Dividend reinvestment $^{\prime}$ Net original cost．Rate allowed on common $\begin{gathered}\text { Company＇s Financial Strength }\end{gathered}$

[^84]:    (A) Diluted EPS. Excl. nonrec. gains/(losses): $\begin{aligned} & \text { Oct. (B) Div'ds historically paid in late Mar., } \\ & \text { base: Net orig. cost. Rate allowed on com. eq. } \\ & \text { Company's Financial Strength }\end{aligned}$
    '12, 40¢; '15, 27c; '18, 52¢; '19, 45¢; '20, June, Sept. \& Dec. - Div'd reinvest. plan avail'. in MT in '19 (elec.): $9.65 \%$; in '17 (gas): $9.55 \%$; Stock's Price Stability (15¢); '21, 10¢; Q1-Q2 '22, (4¢). '20 EPS don't † Shareholder invest. plan avail. (C) Incl. def'd in SD in '15: none specified; in NE in '07: sum due to rounding. Next egs. report due late charges. In '21: $\$ 19.39 / \mathrm{sh}$. (D) In mill. (E) Rate $10.4 \%$. Regulatory Climate: Below Average.

[^85]:    (A) Diluted EPS. Excl. nonrecurring gain (losses): '10, 5¢; '15, (16¢); '17, (5c); gains (loss) on discontinued ops.: '06, 1c; '09, (1c); '10, 14. '20 EPS don't sum due to rounding.

[^86]:    | Next earnings report due late October. | intangibles. In '21: \$2738 mill., \$4.42/sh. |
    | :--- | :--- |
    | (B) Div'ds historically paid mid-Jan., Apr., July, | (D) In mill. (E) Rate base: Varies. Rate allo | |  | NB) Div'ds historically paid mid-Jan., Apr., July, | (D) In mill. (E) Rate base: Varies. Rate allowed |
    | :--- | :--- | :--- |
    | and Oct. - Div'd reinvestment plan available. $\dagger$ | on common equity (blended): $9.6 \%$. Regulatory |  | Shareholder investment plan available. (C) Incl. Climate: Average.

[^87]:    The Predictive Risk Premium Model uses historical data to generate a predicted variance and a GARCH coefficient. The historical data used are the equity risk premiums for the first available trading month as reported by Bloomberg Professional Service.
     $\left(1+\left(\right.\right.$ Column [3] * Column [4]) $\left.{ }^{\wedge 12}\right)-1$.

    From note 2 on page 2 of Schedule DWD-4.
    Column [5] + Column [6].
    (1)

    제 ®

[^88]:    1 The criteria for selection of the non-utility group was that the non-utility companies be domestic and Included in Value Line Invesiment Survey. The non-utility group was selected based on an unadjusted beta range of 0.52 to 1.28 and a residual standard error range of 3.2875 to 4.2859 .
    2Ending 1992.
    31996-1998/1997-1999.
    4 The average standard deviation of the target gas plpellne company's unadjusted beta is 0.1250 .
    5 Equal weight given to both the average of the 3 . 4 - and 5 -year historical medians $(12.1 \%)$ and 5 -year projected median rate of return on net worth $(15.5 \%)$. Thus, $13.8 \%=(12.1 \%+15.5 \% / 2)$.
    Source: Value Line Inc, March 15, 1994
    Value Line Investment Survey

[^89]:    ${ }^{1}$ Bluefield Water Works Improvement Ca. v. Public Senice Commission. 262 U S 679 (1922) and Federal Power Commission $י$ Hope Natural Gas Co. 320 US 519 (1944).
    ${ }^{2}$ Charles F Phillips Jr. The Regulation of Public Utilities: Theory and Practice. Public Utilities Reports Inc. 1988. p 379
    ${ }^{3}$ James C Bonbright. Albert L. Danielsen and David R Kamerschen Principles of Public Uiblilies Rates. 2nd edition. Public Utilities Reports Inc 1988, p 329.
    ${ }^{4}$ Jack Clark Francis, Investments: Analysis and Management, 3rd edition. McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1980, p 363.
    ${ }^{5}$ Id. p. 548
    ${ }^{6}$ Retums on net worth must be used when relying on Value Line data because returns on book common equity for non-utility firms are not available from Value Line

[^90]:    Notes:
    (2) Gleaned from Columns [B] and [C] on the bottom of this page. The appropriate decile (Column [A]) corresponds
    to the market capitalization of the proxy group, which is found in Column [1].
    (3) Corresponding risk premium to the decile is provided in Column [D] on the bottom of this page.
    (4) Line No. 1 Column [3] - Line No. 2 Column [3]. For example, the $0.78 \%$ in Column [4], Line No. 2 is derived as
    follows $0.78 \%=1.21 \%-0.43 \%$.
    (2) Gleaned from Columns [B] and [C] on the bottom of this page. The appropriate decile (Column [A]) corresponds
    to the market capitalization of the proxy group, which is found in Column [1].
    (3) Corresponding risk premium to the decile is provided in Column [D] on the bottom of this page.
    (4) Line No. 1 Column [3] - Line No. 2 Column [3]. For example, the $0.78 \%$ in Column [4], Line No. 2 is derived as
    follows $0.78 \%=1.21 \%-0.43 \%$.
    (2) Gleaned from Columns [B] and [C] on the bottom of this page. The appropriate decile (Column [A]) corresponds
    to the market capitalization of the proxy group, which is found in Column [1].
    (3) Corresponding risk premium to the decile is provided in Column [D] on the bottom of this page.
    (4) Line No. 1 Column [3] - Line No. 2 Column [3]. For example, the $0.78 \%$ in Column [4], Line No. 2 is derived as
    follows $0.78 \%=1.21 \%-0.43 \%$.
    (2) Gleaned from Columns [B] and [C] on the bottom of this page. The appropriate decile (Column [A]) corresponds
    to the market capitalization of the proxy group, which is found in Column [1].
    (3) Corresponding risk premium to the decile is provided in Column [D] on the bottom of this page.
    (4) Line No. 1 Column [3] - Line No. 2 Column [3]. For example, the $0.78 \%$ in Column [4], Line No. 2 is derived as
    follows $0.78 \%=1.21 \%-0.43 \%$.
    (2) Gleaned from Columns [B] and [C] on the bottom of this page. The appropriate decile (Column [A]) corresponds
    to the market capitalization of the proxy group, which is found in Column [1].
    (3) Corresponding risk premium to the decile is provided in Column [D] on the bottom of this page.
    (4) Line No. 1 Column [3] - Line No. 2 Column [3]. For example, the $0.78 \%$ in Column [4], Line No. 2 is derived as
    follows $0.78 \%=1.21 \%-0.43 \%$.

    Notes

[^91]:    ${ }^{1}$ Special lighting contracts for the City of Hagerstown and City of Frederick are included in Schedules C\&G for purposes of developing the CCOS study.
    ${ }^{2}$ Alternative Generation Schedule (Schedule AGS) is included in Schedule PH for purposes of developing the CCOS study.

[^92]:    ${ }^{3}$ Other charges which are not part of distribution base rates include: Standard Offer Service Transmission and Electric Supply (Generation), Universal Service Program Surcharge, Cogeneration PURPA Project Surcharge, Franchise Tax Surcharge, Maryland Environmental Surcharge, EmPower MD Surcharge, Electric Distribution Investment Surcharge, and Administrative Credit.
    ${ }^{4}$ Case No. 9490 , Order No. 89072 (Issued: March 22, 2019), at 97-98

[^93]:    ${ }^{5}$ The Company's tariffs are available at:
    https://www.firstenergycorp.com/customer_choice/maryland/maryland_tariffs.html.
    ${ }^{6}$ See Principles of Public Utility Rates by James C. Bonbright

[^94]:    ${ }^{7}$ The CCOS study classified costs as customer or demand since the CCOS study reflects only distribution costs. The primary drivers of distribution costs are customers and demands.

[^95]:    ${ }^{8}$ NARUC Electric Utility Cost Allocation Manual, Pg. 90

[^96]:    ${ }^{9}$ Id. at p. 92.

[^97]:    ${ }^{10}$ NARUC Electric Utility Cost Allocation Manual, Pg. 79

[^98]:    ${ }^{11}$ NARUC Electric Utility Cost Allocation Manual, Pg. 105

[^99]:    ${ }^{12}$ See Bonbright, James, Danielsen, Albert, and Kamerschen, David. "Principles of Public Utility Rates." Public Utilities Reports, Inc. pp. 377-407 (2 $2^{\text {nd }} E d .1988$ ).

[^100]:    ${ }^{1}$ See, for example Case No. 9490, Phase II for Potomac Edison and Case No. 9644 for Columbia Gas of Maryland.
    ${ }^{2}$ Direct Testimony of David Valcarenghi in Case No. 9680, p. 5.
    ${ }^{3}$ See Proposed Order from Case No. 9490, Phase II, p. 16, Point 45.

[^101]:    ${ }^{4}$ The Company's proposed depreciation adjustment of $\$ 3.0$ million differs from the $\$ 2.5$ million due primarily to differences between plant assets as of June 30, 2022 as compared to the 13 -month average of plant assets during December 2021 through December 2022. Please refer to adjustment number 16 sponsored by Company witness Ward for additional details.

[^102]:    ${ }^{5}$ In Order No. 89971 in Case No. 9490, Phase II, the Commission explained that "The Commission explained that " $[t]$ he PULJ found substantial evidence that the discount rate that should be used with the Present Value Method is a credit-adjusted risk-free rate, which 'takes into account inflation, but it is not the same as inflation." As discussed in more detail later in my testimony, Staff has agreed in at least two recent cases that using the CARFR is consistent with Commission guidance.
    ${ }^{6}$ See, for example, my Direct and Rebuttal testimonies in Case No. 9680.

[^103]:    ${ }^{7} 18$ C.F.R. 101 (FERC Uniform System of Accounts), Definition 12.
    ${ }^{8}$ Accounting Research and Terminology Bulletin \#1, AICPA, p. 25. (Emphasis added).
    ${ }^{9}$ FERC Uniform System of Accounts, Definition 36.
    ${ }^{10}$ FERC Uniform System of Accounts, definition 37.

[^104]:    ${ }^{11} I d$., definition 19.

[^105]:    ${ }^{12}$ National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, Public Utility Depreciation Practices, 1996, p. 18. (Emphasis added).
    ${ }^{13}$ This understanding is set forth in the NARUC passage cited above with the use of the term "pro rata share."

[^106]:    ${ }^{14}$ The "vintage" for an asset refers to the year in which the asset was placed into service. The term "installation year" is also used.
    ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~A}$ survivor curve is a mathematical description of the percentage of plant installed that is expected to survive, or remain in service, to a given age. A survivor begins at 100 percent surviving at age zero and declines to zero percent surviving over time.

[^107]:    ${ }^{16}$ The account numbers identified throughout my testimony represent those in effect as of June 30, 2022.

[^108]:    ${ }^{17}$ Customers also pay a higher revenue return on rate base because the low historical recovery of the present value of net salvage costs results in a higher rate base on which customers pay a return.

[^109]:    ${ }^{18}$ Subsequent to Case No. 9092, the District of Columbia ("DC") Public Service Commission adopted a Present Value method with similar formulas to the MD Present Value Method. However, inflation-based discount rates were used in DC rather than the overall cost of capital or a CARFR.
    ${ }^{19}$ The term "historical recovery" method was used by the Commission in Case No. 9092. This method may also be referred to as the net salvage expense method, the net salvage normalization method, the five-year average net salvage method or the Pennsylvania method.

[^110]:    ${ }^{20}$ Order No. 81517 in Case No. 9092, p. 31.
    ${ }^{21}$ See the Rebuttal Testimony of Ned W. Allis in Case No. 9670 beginning on page 44 for a discussion of the history of the MD Present Value Method in Maryland.

[^111]:    ${ }^{22}$ A change to perform calculations by vintage was proposed by Staff and adopted on pages 15 and 16 of the Proposed Order in Case No. 9103.
    ${ }^{23}$ See the discussion on pages 28 and 29 of the Surrebuttal Testimony of William Dunkel in Case No. 9096 as well as Order No. 83310.
    ${ }^{24}$ In Case No. 9610, OPC witness William Dunkel proposed to use significantly more negative net salvage estimates to address issues with the MD Present Value Method results. See pages 77 to 81 of my rebuttal testimony in Case No. 9610 for a further discussion of this proposal, which resulted in depreciation rates that were similar to those resulting from the traditional method. Mr. Dunkel's modifications to the MD Present Value Method were included in the settlement agreement in Case No. 9610 that was approved by the Commission.
    ${ }^{25}$ In the settlement in Case No. 9670, the parties agreed to allow the amortization of the negative reserve for net salvage. The settlement agreement was approved in Order No. 90098 on pages 13 and 14.

[^112]:    ${ }^{26}$ See pp. 32 to 35 of the Proposed Order in Case No. 9609.
    ${ }^{27}$ See Order No. 89403 in Case No. 9609 , pp. 11 and 12.

[^113]:    ${ }^{28}$ See paragraph 1.g of the settlement agreement in Case No. 9644.
    ${ }^{29}$ SFAS 143 is an acronym for Statement of Financial Accounting Standard No. 143 and is the purported basis for the establishment of the MD Present Value Method (although the MD Present Value Method is inconsistent with both the intended use and the proper operation of SFAS 143).
    ${ }^{30}$ See Proposed Order in Case No. 9664, p. 18.
    ${ }^{31}$ See Order No. 89971 in Case No. 9490 , p. 4.

[^114]:    ${ }^{32}$ See Order No. 89971 in Case No. 9490, p. 20.
    ${ }^{33}$ See Direct Testimony of David Valcarenghi in Case No. 9680, p. 5, lines 10-14.

[^115]:    ${ }^{34}$ See pp. 77 to 81 of my rebuttal testimony in Case No. 9610 for a further discussion of this proposal, which resulted in depreciation rates that were similar to those resulting from the traditional method.

[^116]:    ${ }^{35}$ See Proposed Order in Case No. 9609, pp. 32-33.
    ${ }^{36}$ The Snavely King witness in the District of Columbia case was a different witness from James Garren, who also worked for Snavely King and has testified on behalf of OPC in recent Maryland cases.
    ${ }^{37}$ See Direct Testimony of Michael Majoros, District of Columbia Public Service Commission Case No. 1076, p. 20.

[^117]:    ${ }^{38}$ I note here that SFAS 143 is not intended to recover net salvage costs through depreciation but is instead a method to recognize liabilities for AROs on the balance sheet. However, because the MD Present Value Method is purportedly based on SFAS 143, the guidance of this accounting standard has relevance to the application of the MD Present Value Method.
    ${ }^{39}$ For example, in Utah Case No. 13-035-02, Mr. Dunkel used a $5.50 \%$ discount rate that was consistent with the CARFR for Rocky Mountain Power, rather than a higher discount rate based on the overall rate of return. Mr. Dunkel's proposal was not adopted in that case.

[^118]:    ${ }^{40}$ For a more complete discussion of the issues that have arisen due to the MD Present Value Method, see the rebuttal testimony of Ned W. Allis in Case No. 9670.
    ${ }^{41}$ See SFAS 143, paragraph A21.

[^119]:    ${ }^{42}$ See Order No. 89971 in Case No. 9490, p. 20.

[^120]:    ${ }^{43}$ See Direct Testimony of David Valcarenghi in Case No. 9680, p. 5.

[^121]:    GANNETT FLEMING

[^122]:    ${ }^{1}$ Marston, Anson, Robley Winfrey and Jean C. Hempstead. Engineering Valuation and Depreciation, 2nd Edition. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company. 1953.
    ${ }^{2}$ Winfrey, Robley, Statistical Analyses of Industrial Property Retirements. Iowa State College, Engineering Experiment Station, Bulletin 125. 1935.
    ${ }^{3}$ Marston, Anson, Robley Winfrey, and Jean C. Hempstead, Supra Note 1.
    ${ }^{4}$ Wolf, Frank K. and W. Chester Fitch. Depreciation Systems. Iowa State University Press. 1994.

[^123]:    NOTE: THE ANNUAL ACCRUAL RATE FOR NEW ADDITIONS AS OF JULY 1, 2022 ARE AS FOLLOWS:

[^124]:    GANNETT FLEMING

[^125]:    COMPOSITE REMAINING LIFE AND ANNUAL ACCRUAL RATE, PERCENT . . 3.9 7.21

[^126]:    COMPOSITE REMAINING LIFE AND ANNUAL ACCRUAL RATE, PERCENT .. 44.6 2.36

[^127]:    COMPOSITE REMAINING LIFE AND ANNUAL ACCRUAL RATE, PERCENT .. 29.0 2.88

[^128]:    COMPOSITE REMAINING LIFE AND ANNUAL ACCRUAL RATE, PERCENT .. 32.1 3.33

[^129]:    COMPOSITE REMAINING LIFE AND ANNUAL ACCRUAL RATE, PERCENT .. 10.4 3.68

[^130]:    ${ }^{1}$ Within the scope of this testimony, all references to "EVs" includes the general category of on-road vehicles that have a plug and can be re-charged from any external source of electricity, including pure battery electric vehicles and plug-in hybrids that include a fueled back-up engine to extend range. This does not include traditional hybrids (without a plug) or fuel-cell vehicles.

[^131]:    2 ChargEVC is a not-for-profit coalition of diverse stakeholders that support development of the electric vehicle market in New Jersey. Stakeholders include all four New Jersey electric utilities, both local and national environmental groups, New Jersey car retailers, vehicle manufacturers, charging companies, consumer advocates, and others.

[^132]:    3 See http://www.chargevc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/ChargEVC-New-Jersey-Study.pdf.
    4 See http://www.chargevc.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/ChargEVC-Full-Market-Electrification-Study-FINAL-Oct-7-2020.pdf
    5 Including details on vehicle specifications, charging technology, consumer adoption and usage behaviors, a wide range of economic and environmental factors, detailed analysis of real-world vehicle charging data, and details related to electricity markets such as energy cost, capacity costs, and time-of-day distributions, data provided by the utilities, information about utility EV programs, and relevant policy documents.

[^133]:    ${ }^{6}$ Commission Letter Order, Case No. 9478 (Jan. 12, 2022), ML238539.

[^134]:    ${ }^{7}$ ELECTRIC VEHICLE BENEFIT/COST ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY BY THE MARYLAND JOINTUTILITIES (FINAL DRAFT), Mark Warner, November 30, 2021.

[^135]:    8 "Market-Wide", in this context, refers to ALL the EVs in the EV territory, not just the customers participating in EV-related utility programs. As explained in the MD EV-BCA Methodology, this assessment quantifies the net benefit (within a JST context) of vehicle electrification overall.

[^136]:    ${ }^{9}$ As an example, if over a given period the customer has 100 kWhs of charging during off-peak times, but 40 additional kWhs during on-peak times, the 2 cents $/ \mathrm{kWh}$ incentive it paid was $60 \mathrm{kWhs}(100-40)$.

[^137]:    10 "Costs" as defined in the MD EV-BCA Methodology are not equivalent to "budgets" as managed internally by the electric utility.

[^138]:    ${ }^{11}$ The location where public chargers are deployed have a significant impact on BCA outcome, since different sites could experience different traffic patterns and therefore different time-of-day profiles. Two physically identical installations, with all other details being equivalent but with different charging profiles could result in different BCA outcomes. Customer behavior is therefore a significant part of the BCA result.

[^139]:    ${ }^{12}$ Assessment of this "control group" were not completed as part of this analysis, since the "control group" cannot be compared to itself.

[^140]:    ${ }^{13}$ DRIPE = "Demand Response Induced Pricing Effect", which quantifies the impact that changes in aggregate load profile will have on wholesale pricing.

[^141]:    ${ }^{14} \mathrm{MWh}=$ Megawatt-Hour, $=1000 \mathrm{kWh}$.
    ${ }^{15} \mathrm{CO}_{2}=$ Carbon Dioxide, $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}=$ the family of Nitrous Oxides, $\mathrm{SO}_{2}=$ Sulfur Dioxide, PM2.5 $=$ Particulate Matter sized 2.5 Microns or smaller.
    ${ }^{16}$ The BCA model computes the net change in emissions-mass for all four emissions identified. Net changes for SO2 and PM2.5 were found to be negligible for projections focused on gasoline light-duty vehicles. The analysis therefore attributed CO2 impacts to the "GHG Impact" and NOx to "Public Health Impact" elements of the MD EV-BCA Methodology.
    ${ }^{17}$ "Establishing a Value for Carbon, Guidelines for Use by State Agencies", New York Department of Environmental Conservation, May 2022, \$-impact factors found in the Appendix.

[^142]:    ${ }^{18}$ National Highway Transportation Safety Administration, "Technical Support Document: Final Rulemaking for Model Years 2024-2026 Light-Duty Vehicle Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards, March 2022, Tables 6-22 and 6-23.
    ${ }^{19}$ These numbers are from NREL's 2017 Electrification Report, Figure 4, for the Rapid Advancement Case.

[^143]:    ${ }^{20}$ The Maryland EV-BCA Methodology also allows for identification of qualitative factors relevant to consideration of the results. This chart summarizes the result of the quantitative assessments, and the inventory of qualitative strategic details are summarized separately in the testimony.

[^144]:    ${ }^{21}$ The utility providing an incentive for a smart charger, combined with "paying the customer" to charge offpeak, may have an impact on customer adoption, in concert with multiple other factors (unrelated to the utility program) that influence customer EV purchase decisions. Little studies or empirical evidence exists on that dynamic, and it is therefore not captured in the assessment of this offer.

[^145]:    ${ }^{22}$ These networking and data costs are also applicable for the public DCFC offer as well, and are mostly the result of charger-company pricing policies rather than factors directly under PE's control.

