



Alternative Regulation for Evolving Utility Challenges:

An Updated Survey

Prepared by:

Pacific Economics Group Research LLC

Mark Newton Lowry, PhD

Matthew Makos

Gretchen Waschbusch, MBA

Prepared for:

Edison Electric Institute

January 2013

© 2013 by the Edison Electric Institute (EEI).

All rights reserved. Published 2013.

Printed in the United States of America.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system or method, now known or hereinafter invented or adopted, without the express prior written permission of the Edison Electric Institute.

Attribution Notice and Disclaimer

This work was prepared by *Pacific Economics Group (“PEG”) Research LLC* for the Edison Electric Institute (EEI). When used as a reference, attribution to EEI is requested. EEI, any member of EEI, and any person acting on its behalf (a) does not make any warranty, express or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of the information, advice or recommendations contained in this work, and (b) does not assume and expressly disclaims any liability with respect to the use of, or for damages resulting from the use of any information, advice or recommendations contained in this work.

The views and opinions expressed in this work do not necessarily reflect those of EEI or any member of EEI. This material and its production, reproduction and distribution by EEI does not imply endorsement of the material.

Published by:

Edison Electric Institute

701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004-2696

Phone: 202-508-5000

Web site: www.eei.org

Table of Contents

I. Introduction: The Problem of Financial Attrition Under Traditional Cost of Service Regulation.....	1
II. Cost Trackers and CWIP in Rate Base.....	5
III. Revenue Decoupling.....	15
A. Decoupling True Up Plans	15
B. Lost Revenue Adjustment Mechanisms	21
C. Fixed Variable Pricing.....	24
IV. Forward Test Years.....	27
V. Multiyear Rate Plans.....	31
VI. Formula Rates.....	37
VII. Conclusions	41

I. Introduction: The Problem of Financial Attrition Under Traditional Cost of Service Regulation

Many utilities are exploring alternatives to traditional rate regulation today. The underlying problem they face is a tendency of cost to grow more rapidly than the billing determinants (*e.g.* kWh of use) that determine revenue growth between rate cases. On the cost side, some utilities need large new generation or transmission investments. Others are engaged in accelerated distribution system modernization. Even without accelerated modernization, “wireco utilities” tend to experience more rate base growth than was the norm in the last years before they sold or spun off their generation. On the revenue side, growth in energy usage per customer (“average use”) helped finance utility cost growth before 1980 because it bolstered revenue appreciably more than cost. Arguably, this was a feature of the Regulatory Compact which allowed utilities to finance needed new capacity.¹ Growth in average use has been much slower since then. Few utilities have experienced much bounceback in average use since the recession thanks to sluggish economic growth, increased energy efficiency, and the spread of distributed generation (“DG”). Some utilities are experiencing declining average use.

Traditional approaches to utility regulation can fail to provide timely rate relief for such conditions. The frequency of rate cases has increased. Utilities facing a pronounced gap between cost and billing determinant growth can experience chronic underearning even with annual rate cases. Financial attrition undoubtedly has been a factor in the long-term decline of average credit ratings among investor-owned electric utilities. This is illustrated in Figure 1. Higher risk raises financing costs and can discourage needed investments.

Alternative approaches to regulation have been developed which handle today’s business conditions better. Some, such as multiyear rate plans, formula rates, and fully-forecasted test years, are comprehensive in character but involve large-scale departures from traditional regulation. Others, such as revenue decoupling and cost trackers, target cost and revenue problem areas that cause cost and revenue growth to differ. Judicious use of targeted approaches can bring revenue and cost growth into better balance and reduce the frequency of rate cases.

This survey, now updated to include precedents through late 2012, briefly explains salient alternative regulation (“Altreg”) options and details precedents for electric and natural gas utilities. A summary of states that currently use these approaches is featured in Table 1. Natural gas precedents are included because of their relevance to “wires only” utilities.

¹ See *Cost of Service Regulation in the Investor-Owned Electric Utility Industry: A History of Adaptation*, by Karl McDermott, June 2012. Prepared for the Edison Electric Institute.

Figure 1: US Electric IOUs Rating History

1970 – 2011




Table 1
Innovations to Reduce Regulatory Lag: An Overview of Current Precedents

State	Capex Cost Tracker	CWIP in Rate Base ¹	Multiyear Rate Plan ²	Revenue Decoupling			Retail Formula Rate Plans	Forward Test Years
				Decoupling True Up Plans	Lost Revenue Adjustment Mechanisms	Fixed Variable Retail Pricing		
Alabama	Yes						Yes	Yes
Arizona	Yes		Yes (electric only)	Yes (gas only)	Yes			
Arkansas	Yes			Yes (gas only)	Yes			
California	Yes		Yes	Yes				Yes
Colorado	Yes	Yes	Yes (electric only)					
Connecticut	Yes (electric only)			Yes (electric only)	Yes (gas only)	Yes		Yes
Delaware	Pending							
District of Columbia				Yes (electric only)				
Florida	Yes	Yes	Yes (electric only)			Yes (gas only)		Yes
Georgia	Yes	Yes	Yes (electric only)	Yes (gas only)		Yes (gas only)	Yes (gas only)	Yes
Hawaii	Yes (electric only)		Yes (electric only)	Yes (electric only)				Yes
Idaho				Yes (electric only)				
Illinois				Yes (gas only)		Yes	Yes (electric only)	Yes
Indiana	Yes (electric only)	Yes		Yes (gas only)	Yes (electric only)			
Iowa	Yes (electric only)		Yes (electric only)					
Kansas	Yes	Pending			Yes (electric only)			
Kentucky	Yes				Yes	Yes (gas only)		Yes
Louisiana	Yes (electric only)	Yes	Yes (electric only)		Yes (electric only)		Yes	Yes (electric only)
Maine	Yes (electric only)		Yes (electric only)					Yes
Maryland				Yes				
Massachusetts	Yes			Yes	Yes			
Michigan	Yes (gas only)	Pending		Yes (gas only)				Yes

Table 1 (continued)
Innovations to Reduce Regulatory Lag: An Overview of Current Precedent

State	Capex Cost Tracker	CWIP in Rate Base ¹	Multiyear Rate Cap ²	Revenue Decoupling			Retail Formula Rate Plans	Forward Test Years
				Decoupling True Up Plans	Lost Revenue Adjustment Mechanisms	Fixed Variable Retail Pricing		
Minnesota	Yes	Yes		Yes (gas only)				Yes
Mississippi	Yes (electric only)	Yes				Yes (electric only)	Yes	Yes
Missouri	Yes (gas only)					Yes (gas only)		
Montana	Yes				Yes			
Nebraska								
Nevada				Yes (gas only)	Yes (electric only)			
New Hampshire	Yes		Yes (electric only)		Yes (electric only)			
New Jersey	Yes			Yes (gas only)				
New Mexico		Pending						Pending
New York	Yes (electric only)		Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes
North Carolina		Yes		Yes (gas only)	Yes (electric only)			
North Dakota		Pending				Yes (gas only)		Yes
Ohio	Yes	Pending	Yes (electric only)	Yes (electric only)	Yes (electric only)	Yes (gas only)		
Oklahoma	Yes (electric only)	Pending			Yes (electric only)	Yes (gas only)	Yes (gas only)	
Oregon	Yes			Yes	Yes			Yes
Pennsylvania	Yes (electric only)							Pending
Rhode Island	Yes			Yes				Yes
South Carolina	Yes (electric only)	Yes			Yes (electric only)		Yes (gas only)	
South Dakota	Yes (electric only)	Pending						
Tennessee				Yes (gas only)				Yes
Texas	Yes	Yes					Yes (gas only)	
Utah	Yes (gas only)			Yes (gas only)				Yes
Vermont	Yes (electric only)		Yes					
Virginia	Yes	Yes	Yes (electric only)	Yes (gas only)				
Washington	Pending			Yes (gas only)				
West Virginia	Yes (electric only)	Yes						
Wisconsin		Yes		Yes				Yes
Wyoming	Yes (electric only)	Yes		Yes (gas only)	Yes			Yes (electric only)

¹ This column pertains only to electric utilities.

² This column excludes plans involving rate freezes without extensive supplemental funding from trackers.

II. Cost Trackers and CWIP in Rate Base

A cost tracker is a mechanism for expedited recovery of specific utility costs. Balancing accounts are typically used to track unrecovered allowances. Cost recovery is often implemented using tariff sheet provisions called riders.

Trackers are used in various situations where they are a more practical means of adjusting rates for particular business conditions. Utilities usually recover fuel and purchased power costs via trackers because the volatility and substantial size of these costs would otherwise lead to frequent general rate cases and high risk. Other volatile expenses that are sometimes addressed using trackers include those for pension contributions and uncollectible bills.

A second common use of trackers is for costs that must be incurred because they are required by government agencies. Examples here include franchise fees and certain taxes. Tracking costs like these is fair to utilities and encourages government agents to moderate policies that are apt to raise customer bills.

Trackers are also widely used to compensate utilities for costs that are rapidly rising and don't produce much revenue, whether or not they are volatile or mandated. This can facilitate the targeted expenditures and reduce operating risk and rate case frequency. Examples of operation and maintenance ("O&M") expenses that are sometimes tracked due in whole or part to their rapid growth include those for health care and demand side management ("DSM").

Trackers for the costs of plant additions are sometimes called capital expenditure ("capex") trackers. The costs that are recovered typically include the accumulating depreciation, return on asset value, and taxes that the capex gives rise to. Recovery is sometimes achieved by keeping a rate case open beyond the date of a final decision for the limited purpose of adding assets to the revenue requirement.

Capex costs can qualify for expedited recovery using either or both of the second or third reasons just discussed. A utility might, for example, be compelled to make capital expenditures due to highway relocations or changes in government safety or reliability standards or conductor undergrounding requirements. Capex costs might also be tracked because they are large enough to cause material growth in assets that would otherwise occasion frequent rate cases.

The construction of base load generating capacity is a common source of major plant additions for VIEUs. This kind of capacity can take years to construct, especially when it is powered by solid fuels or hydroelectric resources. An allowance in rates for funds used during construction was traditionally not permitted until assets were used and useful and a rate case was filed. Deferred recovery can strain utility cash flow, involve extra financing expenses, and induce rate "shock" when the value of the plant and construction financing is finally added to the rate base. This is particularly true if the utility is not experiencing growth in average use during the years of construction. Many commissions address these problems by making a return on construction work in progress ("CWIP") eligible for immediate recovery. Capital cost trackers are often used in lieu of frequent rate cases to obtain CWIP recovery.

The capex costs of distribution system modernization are sometimes recovered using trackers for somewhat different reasons. The annual expenditure may not be as large as that for solid-fuel generation capacity, and construction of specific assets usually takes less than a year. However, the expenditures can still be sizable and, unlike new generation or customer connections, don't automatically trigger new revenue when construction is finished. A tracker for the cost of the new investment can help a company modernize its grid and improve its services without frequent rate cases.

The capex costs of generation emissions controls are often accorded expedited recovery for a combination of the reasons just discussed. The controls are occasioned by the emissions policies of state and federal agencies. Additionally, the facilities do not produce revenue and some facilities often become used and useful each year over a series of years.

There are varied treatments of costs in approved capex trackers. Plant addition budgets are usually set in advance and commission review of these budgets can be extensive. Once a budget is established, treatment of variances from the budget becomes an issue. Some trackers permit conventional prudence review treatment of cost overruns. In other cases, no adjustments are subsequently made if cost exceeds the budget. In between these extremes are mechanisms in which deviations, of prescribed magnitude, from budgeted amounts are shared formulaically (e.g. 50-50) between the utility and its customers.

Recent precedents for capital cost trackers are listed in Table 2 and Figures 2 and 3. It can be seen that the precedents are quite numerous and continue to grow. This is one of the most widespread approaches to Altreg. On the electric side, trackers for emissions controls, generation capacity, and advanced metering infrastructure have been especially common in recent years. Trackers for gas utilities often focus on the cost of replacing old cast iron and bare steel mains. Trackers for water utilities, sometimes called distribution system improvement charges ("DSICs"), are also common for accelerated modernization. Recent electric utility precedents for CWIP in rate base are listed in Table 3 and Figure 4. It can be seen that most involve investments in generating plant.

Figure 2: Recent Capex Tracker Precedents by State: Energy Utilities




Table 2
Recent Capex Tracker Precedents

Jurisdiction	Company Name	Services Included	Tracker Name	Eligible Investments	Case Reference
Current					
AL	Alabama Power	Electric	Rate Certificated New Plant	Any approved by Commission through CPCN	Dockets 18117 and 18416 (November 1982)
AL	Mobile Gas Service	Gas	Cast Iron Replacement Factor	Replacement of cast iron mains	Docket 24794 (November 1995)
AR	CenterPoint Energy Arkla	Gas	Main Replacement Rider	Replacement of cast iron and bare steel mains and services	Docket 06-161-U (October 2007)
AR	CenterPoint Energy Arkla	Gas	Government Mandated Expenditure Surcharge Rider	Replacements resulting from highway and street rebuilding	Docket No. 10-108-U (March 2011)
AR	Oklahoma Gas & Electric	Electric	Smart Grid Rider	Systemwide smart grid implementation	Docket No. 10-109-U (August 2011)
AR	SWEPSCO	Electric	Generation Recovery Rider	New generation	Docket No. 09-008-U (November 2009)
AZ	Arizona Public Service	Electric	Environmental Improvement Surcharge	Environmental improvement projects	Docket No. E-01345A-11-024
AZ	Arizona Public Service	Electric	Renewable Energy Standard Adjustment Schedule	Renewables not recovered in base rates	Docket No. E-01345A-08-0172
AZ	Southwest Gas	Gas	Customer Owned Yard Line Cost Recovery Mechanism	Replacement and ownership of customer-owned yard lines that have been shown to be leaking	Docket No. G-01551A-10-0458 (January 2012)
CA	Pacific Gas & Electric	Electric & Gas	Smart Meter Balancing Accounts	AMI	Decision 06-07-027 (July 2006)
CA	Pacific Gas & Electric	Electric	Cornerstone Improvement Project Balancing Account	Capital and O&M expenses to improve the reliability of the electric distribution system	Decision 10-06-048 (June 2010)
CA	Pacific Gas & Electric	Gas Transmission	Pipeline Safety Implementation Plan	Pipeline replacement, automated valve installation, and upgrades to pipeline	Decision 12-12-030 (December 2012)
CA	San Diego Gas & Electric	Electric & Gas	Advanced Metering Infrastructure Balancing Account	AMI	Decision 07-04-043 (April 2007)
CA	San Diego Gas & Electric	Electric	SONGS Major Additions Adjustment Clause	Steam generator replacement for San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station	Decision 06-11-026 (November 2006)
CA	Southern California Edison	Electric	Steam Generator Replacement Project	Steam generator replacement for San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station	Decision 05-12-040 (December 2005)
CA	Southern California Edison	Electric	SmartConnect Balancing Account	Advanced Metering Infrastructure Project	Decision No. 08-09-039 (September 2008)
CA	Southern California Edison	Electric	Solar PV Balancing Account	Solar generation	Decision No. 09-06-049 (June 2009)
CA	Southern California Gas	Gas	Advanced Metering Infrastructure Balancing Account	AMI	Decision 10-04-027 (April 2010)
CO	Atmos Energy	Gas	AMI Surcharge	AMI pilot deployment	Docket No. 10A-189G (May 2010)
CO	Public Service Company of Colorado	Electric	Transmission Cost Adjustment	Transmission projects	Docket No. 07A-339E, Decision No. C07-1085 (December 2007)
CO	Public Service Company of Colorado	Gas	Pipeline Safety Integrity Adjustment	Gas distribution and transmission integrity management programs, main replacement, partial recovery of two large pipeline replacements	Docket No. 10-AL-963G (August 2011)
CT	Connecticut Light & Power	Electric	System Resiliency Plan	Structural hardening	Docket No. 12-07-06 (January 2013)
DE	All utilities may file	Electric & Gas	Utility Facility Relocation Charge	Replacements due to mandated relocations that are not otherwise reimbursed	PSC Regulation Docket No. 63 (April 2012)
FL	Chesapeake Utilities	Gas	Gas Reliability Infrastructure Program Tariff	Replacement of bare steel mains and services	Docket No. 120036-GU (September 2012)
FL	Florida Public Utilities	Gas	Gas Reliability Infrastructure Program Tariff	Replacement of bare steel mains and services	Docket No. 120036-GU (September 2012)
FL	Gulf Power	Electric	Environmental Cost Recovery Clause	Environmental	Docket No. 930613-EI (January 1994)
FL	Florida Power and Light	Electric	Environmental Cost Recovery Clause	Environmental	Docket No. 080281-EI (August 2008)
FL	Florida Power and Light	Electric	Generation Base Rate Adjustment	Generation	Docket No. 120015-EI (December 2012)
FL	Florida Power and Light	Electric	Capacity Cost Recovery Clause	Nuclear power	Docket No. 090009-EI (November 2009)
FL	Peoples Gas System	Gas	Cast Iron/Bare Steel Replacement Rider	Replacement of bare steel and cast iron pipes	Docket No. 110320-GU (September 2012)
FL	Progress Energy Florida	Electric	Capacity Cost Recovery Clause	Nuclear power	Docket No. 090009-EI (November 2009)
FL	Progress Energy Florida	Electric	Environmental Cost Recovery Clause	Environmental	Docket No. 050078-EI (September 2005)
FL	Tampa Electric	Electric	Environmental Cost Recovery Clause	Environmental	Docket No. 960688-EI (August 1996)
GA	Atmos Energy	Gas	Pipe Replacement Surcharge	Replace cast iron and bare steel pipe	Docket No. 12509-U (December 2000)
GA	Atlanta Gas Light	Gas	Strategic Infrastructure Development and Enhancement Program	Infrastructure improvements that sustain reliability and operational flexibility	Docket No. 8516-U (October 2009)
GA	Georgia Power Company	Electric	Environmental Compliance Cost Recovery	Environmental	Docket No. 25060-U (December 2007)
GA	Georgia Power Company	Electric	Nuclear Construction Cost Recovery	Nuclear generation	Docket No. 27800, Senate Bill 31

**Table 2 (continued)
Recent Capex Tracker Precedents**

Jurisdiction	Company Name	Services Included	Tracker Name	Eligible Investments	Case Reference
HI	Hawaii Electric Light	Electric	Renewable Energy Infrastructure Program Surcharge	Renewable energy infrastructure	Docket No. 2007-0416 (December 2009)
HI	Hawaiian Electric Company	Electric	Renewable Energy Infrastructure Program Surcharge	Renewable energy infrastructure	Docket No. 2007-0416 (December 2009)
HI	Maui Electric	Electric	Renewable Energy Infrastructure Program Surcharge	Renewable energy infrastructure	Docket No. 2007-0416 (December 2009)
IA	MidAmerican Energy	Electric	Cooper Tracking Mechanism	Nuclear plant	Docket APP-96-1 (June 1997), Docket No. TF-02-154 (APP-96-1, RPU-96-8) (May 2002)
IN	Duke Energy Indiana	Electric	Qualified Pollution Control Property	Environmental	Cause No. 41744 (February 2001)
IN	Duke Energy Indiana	Electric	Integrated Coal Gasification Combined Cycle Generating Facility Cost Recovery Adjustment	Integrated gasification combined cycle generating plant	Docket No. 43114 (November 2007)
IN	Indianapolis Power & Light	Electric	Environmental Compliance Cost Recovery	Environmental	Cause 42170 (November 2002)
IN	Indiana Michigan Power	Electric	Clean Coal Technology Rider	Environmental	Cause No. 43636 (June 2009)
IN	Northern Indiana Public Service	Electric	Environmental Cost Recovery Mechanism	Environmental	Cause No. 42150 (November 2002)
KS	Atmos Energy	Gas	Gas System Reliability Surcharge	Infrastructure system replacements	Docket No. 10-ATMG-133-TAR (December 2009)
KS	Black Hills Energy (Aquila)	Gas	Gas System Reliability Surcharge	Infrastructure system replacements	Docket No. 07-AQG-431-RTS (May 2007)
KS	Kansas Gas Service	Gas	Gas System Reliability Surcharge	Infrastructure system replacements	Docket 10-KGSG-155-TAR (December 2009)
KS	Kansas Gas & Electric	Electric	Environmental Cost Recovery Rider	Environmental	Docket No. 05-WSEE-981-RTS (October 2005)
KS	Midwest Energy	Gas	Gas System Reliability Surcharge	Infrastructure system replacements	Docket 09-MDWE-722-TAR (May 2009)
KS	Westar Energy Inc.	Electric	Environmental Cost Recovery Rider	Environmental	Docket No. 05-WSEE-981-RTS (October 2005)
KY	Atmos Energy	Gas	Pipe Replacement Program Rider	Replacement of bare steel service lines, curb valves, meter loops, and mandated relocates	Docket No. 2009-00354 (May 2010)
KY	Columbia Gas	Gas	Advanced Main Replacement Rider	Replacement of cast iron and bare steel mains and services	Docket No. 2009-00141 (September 2009)
KY	Delta Natural Gas	Gas	Pipe Replacement Program Surcharge	Replacement of bare steel pipe, service lines, curb valves, meter loops, and mandated pipe relocations	Case No. 2010-00116 (October 2010)
KY	Kentucky Power	Electric	Environmental Cost Recovery Surcharge	Environmental	Docket No. 2002-00169 (March 2003)
KY	Kentucky Utilities	Electric	Environmental Cost Recovery Surcharge	Environmental	Case No. 93-465 (July 1994)
KY	Louisville Gas & Electric	Electric	Environmental Cost Recovery Surcharge	Environmental	Case No. 94-332 (April 1995)
KY	Louisville Gas & Electric	Gas	Gas Line Tracker	Replacement and transfer of ownership of customer owned service risers	Case No. 2012-00222 (December 2012)
LA	Cleco Power	Electric	Infrastructure and Incremental Costs Recovery	Generation, Transmission, environmental, other projects to be determined	Docket U-30689 (October 2010)
MA	Bay State Gas	Gas	Targeted Infrastructure Recovery Factor	Replacement of bare steel mains and services	DPU 09-30
MA	Massachusetts Electric	Electric	Net CapEx Factor	All distribution above depreciation expense	DPU 09-39
MA	Massachusetts Electric	Electric	Solar Cost Adjustment Provision	Solar generation	DPU 09-38
MA	Nantucket Electric	Electric	Solar Cost Adjustment Provision	Solar generation	DPU 09-38
MA	National Grid (Boston-Essex Gas and Colonial Gas)	Gas	Targeted Infrastructure Recovery Factor	Replacement of bare steel, cast iron, and wrought iron mains, services, meters, meter installations, and house regulators	DPU 10-55
MA	New England Gas	Gas	Targeted Infrastructure Recovery Factor	Replacement of non-cathodically protected steel mains and services and small diameter cast-iron and wrought iron	DPU 10-114
MA	NSTAR Electric	Electric	Capital Projects Scheduling List	Stray voltage inspection survey and remediation program; double pole inspections, replacements, and restorations; and manhole inspection, repair, and upgrade	DTE 05-85 and DPU 10-70-B
MA	NSTAR Electric	Electric	NA	Smart grid pilot	DPU-09-33
MA	Western Massachusetts Electric	Electric	Solar Program Cost Adjustment	Solar generation	DPU 09-05
MN	Minnesota Power	Electric	Arrowhead Regional Emission Abatement Rider	Environmental	M-05-1678 (June 2006)
MN	Minnesota Power	Electric	Renewable Resource Rider	Renewable generation	Docket M-10-273 (July 2010)
MN	Minnesota Power	Electric	Transmission Cost Recovery Rider	Incremental transmission investment	Docket M-07-965 (December 2007)
MN	Northern States Power (Xcel Energy)	Electric	Renewable Energy Standard Cost Recovery Rider	Renewable generation	M-07-872 (March 2008)
MN	Northern States Power (Xcel Energy)	Electric	Metropolitan Emissions Reduction Project (later called Environmental Improvement Rider)	Environmental	Docket M-02-633 (March 2004)
MN	Northern States Power (Xcel Energy)	Electric	Mercury Cost Recovery Rider	Environmental	Docket No. M-09-847 (November 2009)
MN	Northern States Power (Xcel Energy)	Gas	State Energy Policy Rider	Cast iron replacements	Docket No. M-08-261 (November 2008)

**Table 2 (continued)
Recent Capex Tracker Precedents**

Jurisdiction	Company Name	Services Included	Tracker Name	Eligible Investments	Case Reference
ME	Central Maine Power	Electric	NA	AMI	Docket No. 2007-215(I) (February 2010)
MI	SEMCO Gas	Gas	Main Replacement Rider	Replacement of cast iron and unprotected steel mains and service lines	Case U-16169 (January 2011)
MO	AmerenUE	Gas	Infrastructure System Replacement Surcharge	Replacement of mains, valves, service lines, regulator stations, vaults, other pipeline components	Case No. GT-2008-0184 (February 2008)
MO	Atmos Energy	Gas	Infrastructure System Replacement Surcharge	Replacement of mains, valves, service lines, regulator stations, vaults, other pipeline components	Docket No. GO-2009-0046 (October 2008)
MO	Laclede Gas	Gas	Infrastructure System Replacement Surcharge	Replacement of mains, valves, service lines, regulator stations, vaults, other pipeline components	Docket No. GR-2007-0208 (July 2007)
MO	Missouri Gas Energy	Gas	Infrastructure System Replacement Surcharge	Natural gas line replacements and relocations	Docket No. GR-2009-0355 (February 2010)
MS	Mississippi Power	Electric	Environmental Compliance Overview Plan Rate	Environmental	Docket No. 92-UA-0058 and 92-UN-0059 (July 1992)
MT	Northwestern Energy	Electric	NA - Amounts recovered through electric supply service rates	Generation	Docket D.2008.6.69 (November 2008)
MT	Northwestern Energy	Gas	Natural Gas Supply Tracker	Battle Creek natural gas production resources	Docket No. D2012.3.25 (November 2012)
NH	Energy North	Gas	Cast Iron/Bare Steel Replacement Program	Replacement of cast iron and bare steel pipe	Docket DG-107 (June 2007)
NH	Granite State Electric	Electric	Reliability Enhancement Plan Capital Investment Allowance	Feeder hardening and asset replacement	Docket DG-107 (June 2007)
NH	Public Service Company of New Hampshire	Electric	Energy Service	Environmental	DE 11-250 (April 2012)
NJ	Elizabethtown Gas	Gas	Utility Infrastructure Enhancement Rate	Projects to enhance reliability and reinforce infrastructure	Docket No. GO09010053 (April 2009)
NJ	Elizabethtown Gas	Gas	Utility Infrastructure Enhancement Rate II	Projects to enhance reliability and reinforce infrastructure	Docket No. GO10120969 (May 2011)
NJ	New Jersey Natural Gas	Gas	Compressed Natural Gas Pilot Program	Compressed natural gas infrastructure	Docket No. GRI1060361 (June 2012)
NJ	Public Service Electric and Gas	Electric & Gas	Capital Infrastructure Investment Program	Electric: reliability upgrades & feeder replacement, Gas: replacement of cast iron & bare steel mains and services	Docket No. GO09010050 (April 2009)
NJ	Public Service Electric and Gas	Electric & Gas	Capital Infrastructure Investment Program II	Electric: reliability upgrades & feeder replacement, Gas: replacement of cast iron & bare steel mains and services	Docket No. EO11020088, GO1010862 (July 2011)
NJ	Public Service Electric and Gas	Electric	Solar Generation Investment Program	Solar generation	Docket No., EO09020125 (August 2009)
NJ	Rockland Electric	Electric	Smart Grid Surcharge	Smart Grid pilot	Docket No. EO09060459 (April 2010)
NJ	South Jersey Gas	Gas	Capital Investment Recovery Tracker	Bare steel replacement, expand key distribution mains for reliability	Docket No. GO09010051 (April 2009)
NJ	South Jersey Gas	Gas	Capital Investment Recovery Tracker II	Bare steel replacement, expand key distribution mains for reliability	Docket No. GO10100765 (March 2011)
NJ	South Jersey Gas	Gas	Capital Investment Recovery Tracker III	Accelerated Main Replacement Program	Docket No. GO1100632 (May 2012)
NY	Consolidated Edison	Electric	Monthly Adjustment Clause	AMI, SCADA, undergrounding	Case 09-E-0310 (October 2010)
OH	Cleveland Electric Illuminating	Electric	Rider AMI	Ohio Site Deployment	Case Nos. 09-1820-EL-ATA and 12-1230-EL-SSO
OH	Cleveland Electric Illuminating	Electric	Delivery Capital Recovery Rider	Distribution, subtransmission, general, and intangible plant not included in most recent rate case	Case No. 10-388-EL-SSO (August 2010)
OH	Columbia Gas of Ohio	Gas	Infrastructure Replacement Program Rider	Replacement of cast iron and bare steel mains & services, AMI	Case No. 08-0072-GA-AIR, 08-0073-GA-ALT, 08-0074-GA-AAM, and 08-0075-GA-AAM (December 2008); Case No. 09-1036-GA-RDR (April 2010)
OH	Columbus Southern Power	Electric	Distribution Investment Rider	Net capital additions since the date certain of most recent rate case not recovered through other riders	Case 11-346-EL-SSO
OH	Columbus Southern Power	Electric	GridSMART Rider (Phase I)	Smart grid	Case No. 08-917-EL-SSO and 08-918-EL-SSO (March 2009)
OH	Dayton Power and Light	Electric	Environmental Investment Rider	Environmental	Case No. 05-276-EL-AIR (December 2005)
OH	East Ohio Gas d/b/a Dominion East Ohio	Gas	Pipeline Infrastructure Replacement Rider	Pipelines & faulty riser replacements	Case No. 09-458-GA-RDR (December 2009)
OH	East Ohio Gas d/b/a Dominion East Ohio	Gas	Automated Meter Reading Charge	AMI	Case No. 07-0829-GA-AIR, 07-0830-GA-ALT, 07-0831-GA-AAM, 08-0169-GA-ALT, and 06-1453-GA-UNC (October 2008); Case No. 09-38-GA-UNC (May 2009); Case No. 09-1875-GA-RDR (May 2010)

**Table 2 (continued)
Recent Capex Tracker Precedents**

Jurisdiction	Company Name	Services Included	Tracker Name	Eligible Investments	Case Reference
OH	Duke Energy Ohio	Gas	Accelerated Main Replacement Program Rider	Replacement of bare steel and cast iron mains and services	Case No. 01-1228-GA-AIR, and 01-1478-GA-ALT, and 01-1539-GA-AAM (May 2002); 07-0589-GA-AIR 07-0590-GA-ALT 07-0591-GA-AAM (May 2008)
OH	Duke Energy Ohio	Gas	Advanced Utility Rider	Gas AMI	Case No. 07-0589-GA-AIR 07-0590-GA-ALT 07-0591-GA-AAM (May 2008)
OH	Duke Energy Ohio	Electric	Infrastructure Modernization Distribution Rider	Electric AMI	Case No. 08-920-EL-SSO and 08-921-EL-AAM and 08-922-EL-UNC and 08-923-EL-ATA (December 2008)
OH	Ohio Edison	Electric	Rider AMI	Ohio Site Deployment	Case Nos. 09-1820-EL-ATA and 12-1230-EL-SSO
OH	Ohio Edison	Electric	Delivery Capital Recovery Rider	Distribution, subtransmission, general, and intangible plant not included in most recent rate case (filed in 2007)	Case No. 10-388-EL-SSO (August 2010)
OH	Ohio Power	Electric	Distribution Investment Rider	Net capital additions since the date certain of most recent rate case not recovered through other riders	Case 11-346-EL-SSO
OH	Ohio Power	Electric	GridSMART Rider (Phase I)	Smart grid	Case No. 08-917-EL-SSO and 08-918-EL-SSO (March 2009)
OH	Toledo Edison	Electric	Rider AMI	Ohio Site Deployment	Case Nos. 09-1820-EL-ATA and 12-1230-EL-SSO
OH	Toledo Edison	Electric	Delivery Capital Recovery Rider	Power Distribution, subtransmission, general, and intangible plant not included in most recent rate case (filed in 2007)	Case No. 10-388-EL-SSO (August 2010)
OH	Vectren Energy Delivery	Gas	Distribution Replacement Rider	Replacement of cast iron and bare steel mains and services	Docket No. 07-1081-GA-ALT, 07-1080-GA-AIR and 08-0632-GA-AAM (January 2009)
OK	Oklahoma Gas & Electric	Electric	Smart Grid Rider	Smart grid	Cause No. PUD 201000029 (July 2010)
OK	Oklahoma Gas & Electric	Electric	System Hardening Recovery Rider	Undergrounding and other circuit hardening	Cause No. PUD 20080387, Order No. 567670 (May 2009)
OK	Oklahoma Gas & Electric	Electric	Crossroads Rider	Crossroads Wind Farm	Cause No. PUD 201000037 (July 2010)
OK	Public Service Company of Oklahoma	Electric	Reliability Vegetation/Undergrounding Rider	Conversion of overhead to underground customer service lines	Cause No. PUD 200800144 (January 2009)
OR	Northwest Natural Gas	Gas	System Integrity Program	Bare steel replacement, Transmission integrity management program, distribution integrity management program	Docket UM 1406, Order No. 09-067 (March 2009)
OR	PacifiCorp	Electric	Renewable Adjustment Clause	Renewable generation	Docket UM 1330 (December 2007)
OR	PacifiCorp	Electric	NA	Mona to Oquirrh transmission line only if line is placed into service within 6 months of May 31, 2013	Docket UE 246, Order 12-493 (December 2012)
OR	Portland General Electric	Electric	Renewable Adjustment Clause	Renewable generation	Docket UM 1330 (December 2007)
PA	All utilities may file	Electric & Gas	Distribution System Improvement Charge	Non-expense reducing, non-revenue producing infrastructure replacement projects	Docket No. M-2012-2293611 (August 2012)
PA	PPL Electric Utilities	Electric	Act 129 Compliance Rider	AMI	Docket No. M-2009-2123945 (January 2010)
PA	PECO	Electric	Smart Meter Cost Recovery Rider	AMI	Docket No. M-2009-2123944 (April 2010)
PA	Metropolitan Edison	Electric	Smart Meters Technologies Charge	AMI	Docket M-2009-2123950 (April 2010)
PA	Pennsylvania Electric	Electric	Smart Meters Technologies Charge	AMI	Docket M-2009-2123950 (April 2010)
PA	Pennsylvania Power	Electric	Smart Meters Technologies Charge	AMI	Docket M-2009-2123950 (April 2010)
PA	Duquesne Light	Electric	Smart Meter Charge Rider	AMI	Docket No. M-2009-2123948 (April 2010)
PA	West Penn Power	Electric	Smart Meter Surcharge	AMI	Docket No. M-2009-2123951 (June 2011)
RI	Narragansett Electric (electric operations)	Electric	Electric Infrastructure, Safety, and Reliability Plan Factor	Replacements and load growth	Docket No. 4218 (December 2011)
RI	Narragansett Electric (gas operations)	Gas	Gas Infrastructure, Safety, and Reliability Plan Factor	Replacement investment	Docket No. 4219 (September 2011)
SC	South Carolina Electric & Gas	Electric	NA	Nuclear generation	Docket 2008-196-E (March 2009)
SD	Black Hills Power	Electric	Environmental Improvement Adjustment tariff	Environmental	Docket EL11-001
SD	Northern States Power- MN	Electric	Environmental Cost Recovery Tariff	Environmental	Docket EL07-026 (January 2009)

**Table 2 (continued)
Recent Capex Tracker Precedents**

Jurisdiction	Company Name	Services Included	Tracker Name	Eligible Investments	Case Reference
TX	All Electric Utilities	Electric	Distribution Cost Recovery Factor	Any distribution	Docket 39465
TX	AEP Texas Central	Electric	Advanced Metering System Surcharge	AMI	Docket No. 36928
TX	AEP Texas North	Electric	Advanced Metering System Surcharge	AMI	Docket No. 36928
TX	Atmos Energy Mid Tex	Gas	Gas Reliability Infrastructure Program	Incremental investment in new and replacement pipe, pipeline integrity	Texas Utilities Code 104.301 and Gas Utilities Docket 9615
TX	Atmos Energy Pipelines	Gas	Gas Reliability Infrastructure Program	Incremental investment in new and replacement pipe, pipeline integrity	Texas Utilities Code 104.301 and Gas Utilities Docket 9615
TX	Atmos Energy West Texas Division	Gas	Gas Reliability Infrastructure Program	Incremental investment in new and replacement pipe, pipeline integrity	Texas Utilities Code 104.301 and Gas Utilities Docket 9608
TX	Centerpoint Energy Entex - Houston Division	Gas	Gas Reliability Infrastructure Program	Incremental investment in new and replacement pipe, pipeline integrity	Texas Utilities Code 104.301 and Gas Utilities Docket 10067
TX	Centerpoint Energy Houston Electric	Electric	Advanced Metering System Surcharge	AMI	Docket No. 35620 (August 2008)
TX	Oncor Electric Delivery	Electric	Advanced Metering System Surcharge	AMI	Docket No. 35718 (August 2008)
TX	Texas-New Mexico Power	Electric	Advanced Metering System Surcharge	AMI	Docket No. 38306 (July 2011)
UT	Questar Gas	Gas	Infrastructure Rate Adjustment Tracker	Replacement of aging high-pressure feeder lines	Docket 09-057-16 (June 2010)
VA	Appalachian Power	Electric	Environmental & Reliability Cost Recovery Surcharge	Environmental & reliability	Docket No. PUE-2007-00069 (December 2007)
VA	Appalachian Power	Electric	Environmental Rate Adjustment Clause	Environmental	Case No. PUE-2011-00035 (November 2011)
VA	Appalachian Power	Electric	Generation Rate Adjustment Clause	Dresden plant	Docket No. PUE-2011-00036 (January 2012)
VA	Atmos Energy	Gas	Infrastructure Reliability and Replacement Adjustment	Replacement of first generation plastic pipe and service lines and bare steel mains and services	Case No. PUE-2012-00049 (August 2012)
VA	Columbia Gas of Virginia	Gas	SAVE Rider	Replacement of bare steel and cast iron mains, some early plastic pipe, isolated bare steel services, and risers prone to failure	Case No. PUE-2011-00049 (November 2011)
VA	Virginia Electric Power	Electric	Rider R	Bear Garden Generating Station	Case No. PUE-2009-00017 (March 2010)
VA	Virginia Electric Power	Electric	Rider S	Virginia City Hybrid Energy Center	Case No. PUE-2007-00066 (March 2008)
VA	Virginia Electric Power	Electric	Rider W	Warren County Power Station	Case No. PUE-2011-00042 (February 2012)
VA	Virginia Electric Power	Electric	Rider B	Biomass conversions	Case No. PUE-2011-00073 (March 2012)
VA	Washington Gas Light	Gas	SAVE Rider	Replacement of bare and unprotected steel services and mains, mechanically coupled pipe, copper services, cast iron main, and plastic services	Case No. PUE-2010-00087 (April 2011)
VT	Central Vermont Public Service	Electric	New Initiatives Adder	AMI	Dockets 7586 and 7612
WA	All gas utilities may file	Gas	Special Pipe Replacement Program Cost Recovery Mechanism	Replacement of pipe that is at an elevated risk of failure	Docket UG-120715 (December 2012)
WV	Appalachian Power	Electric	Construction/765kW Surcharge	Generation, Environmental	Case No. 11-0274-E-GI (June 2011)
WV	Wheeling Power	Electric	Construction/765kW Surcharge	Generation, Environmental	Case No. 11-0274-E-GI (June 2011)
WY	Black Hills Power	Electric	Cheyenne Prairie Generating Station rate rider tariff	Construction of Cheyenne Prairie Generating Station	Docket No. 20002-84-ET-12 (November 2012)
WY	Cheyenne Light, Fuel, & Power	Electric	Cheyenne Prairie Generating Station rate rider tariff	Construction of Cheyenne Prairie Generating Station	Docket No. 20003-123-ET-12 (November 2012)

**Table 2 (continued)
Recent Capex Tracker Precedents**

Jurisdiction	Company Name	Services Included	Tracker Name	Eligible Investments	Case Reference
Historic					
CA	San Diego Gas & Electric	Electric & Gas	Advanced Metering Infrastructure Balancing Account	AMI	Application 05-03-015 (March 2005)
CA	Southern California Edison	Electric	Advanced Metering Infrastructure Balancing Account	AMI	Docket No. 07-07-042 (July 2007)
CO	Public Service Company of Colorado	Electric	Air Quality Improvement Rider	Environmental	Docket 98A-511E
GA	Atlanta Gas Light	Gas	Pipeline Replacement Program Cost Recovery Rider	Replacement of cast iron and bare steel pipe	Docket 8516-U later updated in Docket No. 29950 as STRIDE tracker in 2009
IL	Commonwealth Edison	Electric	Rider Systems Modernization Projects, renamed Rider Advanced Metering Pilot	AMI	Case 07-0566, Case 09-0263
IL	Peoples Gas Light & Coke	Gas	Rider Incremental Cost Recovery	Replacement of cast iron and bare steel pipe	Docket No. 09-0167 (January 2010)
KY	Union Light, Heat and Power (Duke Energy Kentucky)	Gas	Advanced Main Replacement Rider	Replacement of cast iron and bare steel mains and services	Docket No. 2001-00092 (January 2002)
NJ	Atlantic City Electric	Electric	Infrastructure Investment Surcharge	Replacements	Docket No. E009010049 and G009010054 (April 2009)
NJ	New Jersey Natural Gas	Gas	Accelerated Infrastructure Projects	Replace bare steel mains, reinforce distribution system & transmission mains	Docket No. G009010052 and GR07110889 (April 2009)
NJ	New Jersey Natural Gas	Gas	Accelerated Infrastructure Projects II	Replace bare steel mains, reinforce distribution system & transmission mains	Docket No. GR10100793 (March 2011)
NY	Coning Natural Gas	Gas	Delivery Rate Adjustment	Incremental additions	Docket No. 08-G-1137 (March 2009)
NY	NYSEG	Gas	Gas Cost Savings Incentive Mechanism	Infrastructure that reduces the cost of gas supply	Docket No. 01-G-1668 (November 2002)
OH	Cleveland Electric Illuminating	Electric	Delivery Service Improvement Rider	Distribution reliability	0021-EL-ATA, 09-0022-EL-AEM, and 09-0023-EL-AAM (March 2009)
OH	Columbus Southern Power	Electric	IGCC Surcharge (Phase I only)	Early IGCC development	Case No. 05-376-EL-UNC (April 2006)
OH	Columbus Southern Power	Electric	IGCC Surcharge (Phase II) IGCC Recovery Factor (Phase III)	IGCC	Case No. 05-376-EL-UNC (June 2006)
OH	Columbus Southern Power	Electric	Generation Cost Recovery Rider	Environmental	Case No. 07-63-EL-UNC (October 2007)
OH	Columbus Southern Power	Electric	Environmental Investment Carrying Charges (applies only to standard offer service customers)	Environmental	Case 08-917-EL-SSO (October 2011)
OH	Ohio Edison	Electric	Delivery Service Improvement Rider	Distribution reliability	Case No. 08-0935-EL-SSO, 09-0021-EL-ATA, 09-0022-EL-AEM, and 09-0023-EL-AAM (March 2009)
OH	Ohio Power	Electric	Environmental Investment Carrying Charges (applies only to standard offer service customers)	Environmental	Case 08-917-EL-SSO (October 2011)
OH	Ohio Power	Electric	Generation Cost Recovery Rider	Environmental	Case No. 07-63-EL-UNC (October 2007)
OH	Ohio Power	Electric	IGCC Surcharge (Phase I only)	Early IGCC development	Case No. 05-376-EL-UNC (April 2006)
OH	Ohio Power	Electric	IGCC Surcharge (Phase II) IGCC Recovery Factor (Phase III)	IGCC	Case No. 05-376-EL-UNC (June 2006)
OH	Toledo Edison	Electric	Delivery Service Improvement Rider	Distribution reliability	Case No. 08-0935-EL-SSO, 09-0021-EL-ATA, 09-0022-EL-AEM, and 09-0023-EL-AAM (March 2009)
OK	Empire District Electric	Electric	Capital Recovery Rider	All incremental investment between rate cases	Case No. PUD 201000033, Order 577904 (August 2010)
OK	Oklahoma Gas & Electric	Electric	OU Spirit Rider	OU Spirit Wind Farm	Case No. 200900167, Order No. 571788 (October 2009)
OK	Oklahoma Gas & Electric	Electric	Smart Power Rider	Norman, Oklahoma pilot smart grid program	Case No. 200800398
OK	Public Service Company of Oklahoma	Electric	Capital Investment Rider (CIR)	All incremental investment between rate cases	Case No. 200900181 (August 2009)
OR	Northwest Natural Gas	Gas	NA	AMI	Docket UM 1413, Order 09-105 (March 2009)
OR	Northwest Natural Gas	Gas	Bare steel replacement program	Replacement of bare steel	Docket No. UM 1030, Order No. 01-843 (September 2001)
OR	Portland General Electric	Electric	NA	AMI	Docket UE 189, Order No. 08-245 (May 2008)
PA	PPL Electric Utilities	Electric	Energy Development Rider	Renewable interconnections	Docket No. M-00031715 F0003 (August 2006); Previously R-00973954 (May 14, 1998)
RI	Narragansett Electric (gas operations)	Gas	Accelerated Capital Replacement Program	Replacement of high pressure bare steel services inside customer premises	Docket No. 3943 (January 2009)
WV	Appalachian Power	Electric	NA: tracker included in the Expanded Net Energy Cost Mechanism	Transmission line, Environmental	Case No. 05-1278-E-PC-PW-42T (July 2006)

Figure 3: Recent Capex Tracker Precedents by State: Water Utilities




Figure 4: Recent Electric Precedents for CWIP In Rate Base




Table 3
CWIP in Rate Base: Recent Electric Retail Precedents

Jurisdiction	Company	Year Approved	Type of Project	Reference
Colorado	Public Service of Colorado	2006	Transmission, generation	Docket No. 06S-234EG
Colorado	Legislation	2007	Transmission	Senate Bill 07-100
Florida	Rulemaking	2007	Nuclear and IGCC generation	Docket 060508-EL
Florida	Florida Power & Light	2008	Nuclear generation	Docket 080650-EL
Florida	Progress Energy Florida	2008	Nuclear generation	Docket 080148-EI
Georgia	Georgia Power	2009	Nuclear generation	Docket 27800
Indiana	General Policy		Environmental	
Indiana	Duke Energy Indiana	2007	IGCC generation	Docket No. 43114
Kansas	Legislation	2008	Nuclear generation	Senate Bill 586
Louisiana	Rulemaking	2007	Nuclear generation	Docket R-29712
Louisiana	Cleco Power	2006	Generation	Docket U-28765
Michigan	Legislation	2008	Significant capital projects	House Bill 5524
Minnesota	Northern States Power- MN	2004	Environmental	Docket No. M-02-633
Minnesota	Minnesota Power	2007	Transmission	Docket M-07-965
Mississippi	Mississippi Power	2001	All projects within 1 year of completion	Docket No. 01-UN-0548
New Mexico	Legislation	2009	All	Senate Bill 477
North Carolina	Duke Energy Carolinas	2009	Generation	Docket No. E-7, Sub 909
North Carolina	Legislation	2007	Generation	Senate Bill 3
North Dakota	Legislation	2007	Transmission, federally mandated environmental	Senate Bill 2031 & House Bill 1221
Ohio	Legislation	2008	New Generation, Environmental	SB 221
Oklahoma	Legislation	2005	Environmental, transmission	House Bill 1910
South Carolina	South Carolina Electric & Gas	2003	Generation	Docket No. 2002-223-E
South Carolina	South Carolina Electric & Gas	2009	Nuclear generation	Docket 2009-211-E
South Dakota	Legislation	2006/2007	Transmission, environmental	
Texas	Rulemaking	2005	All Transmission within ERCOT (conditional)	Project 28884
Virginia	Legislation	2007	Reliability-related, nuclear, renewables, new generation using Virginia coal	Senate Bill 1416
Virginia	Virginia Electric Power	2008	New generation using Virginia coal	PUE-2007-00066
West Virginia	Appalachian Power	2006	Transmission, environmental, IGCC generation	Case No. 05-1278-E-PC-PW-42T
West Virginia	Monongahela Power	2007	Environmental	Case No. 05-0750-E-PC
Wisconsin	Wisconsin Public Service	2000	Nuclear generation, transmission	Docket 6690-UR-112
Wisconsin	Wisconsin Public Service	2005	Generation	Docket 6690-UR-117
Wisconsin	Wisconsin Power & Light	2012	All Commission approved projects	Docket 6680-UR-118
Wisconsin	General Policy		Diverse operations	
Wyoming	Black Hills Power	2012	Generation	Docket 20002-84-ET-12
Wyoming	Cheyenne Light, Fuel, & Power	2012	Generation	Docket 20003-123-ET-12

III. Revenue Decoupling

We use the term revenue decoupling to describe a diverse set of rate treatments designed to facilitate recovery of allowed revenue. The link between a utility's revenue and its sales is thereby weakened. This reduces the utility's disincentive to promote energy efficiency and can alleviate the financial stress caused by DSM programs and declining average use. DSM programs to encourage energy efficiency and discourage load peakedness can yield large cost savings for customers. Three approaches to decoupling are well established: decoupling true up plans, lost revenue adjustment mechanisms ("LRAMs"), and fixed variable pricing.

A. Decoupling True Up Plans

Decoupling true up plans adjust rates periodically to ensure that a utility's actual revenue tracks the revenue allowed by regulators. Most decoupling true up plans have two basic components: a revenue decoupling mechanism ("RDM") and an allowed revenue adjustment mechanism ("RAM"). The RDM tracks variances between actual and allowed revenue and makes periodic true ups. To the extent that recovery of allowed revenue is achieved, utilities can use rate designs more aggressively to promote DSM goals.

Decoupling true ups may be made annually or more frequently. More frequent adjustments cause actual and allowed revenue each year to correlate better so that rates fluctuate less from year to year. The size of the true up that is permitted in a given year is sometimes capped. A "soft" cap permits utilities to defer for later recovery any account balances that cannot be recovered immediately.

RDMs vary in the scope of utility services to which they apply. Quite commonly, only revenues from residential and commercial business customers are decoupled. These customers account for a high share of distribution base rate revenue and are usually the primary focus of DSM programs. RDMs also vary in terms of the service classes for which revenues are pooled for true up purposes. In some plans all service classes are placed in the same "basket". Other plans have multiple baskets. These insulate customers of services in each basket from changes in demands for services in other baskets.

Some RDMs are "partial" in the sense that they exclude from decoupling the revenue impact of certain kinds of demand fluctuations. For example, true ups are sometimes allowed only for the difference between weather normalized revenue and allowed revenue. An RDM that instead accounts for *all* sources of demand variance is called a "full" decoupling mechanism. Full decoupling provides more encouragement for rate design experimentation.

The RAM component of a decoupling true up plan escalates allowed revenue between rate cases. Virtually all decoupling true up plans have some kind of RAM because if allowed revenue is static the utility will experience financial attrition as its costs rise. Utilities that do not have RAMs in their decoupling true up plans often file annual rate cases.

Some RAMs are "broad-based" in the sense that they provide enough revenue growth to compensate the utility for several kinds of cost pressures. Broad-based RAMs are essentially the same thing as the revenue cap escalators that we discuss below in the section on multiyear rate plans. When RAMs are not broad-based, utilities usually retain the right to file rate cases during the decoupling plan and frequently do file. The revenue per customer ("RPC") freeze is a popular approach to RAM design. Allowed revenue grows at

the same gradual pace as customer growth. An RPC freeze is not a broad-based RAM and will enhance expected revenue growth only when average use is expected to decline.

True up plans are the most popular approach to revenue decoupling in the United States. States that have tried gas and electric decoupling true up plans are indicated on the maps below in Figures 5a and 5b, respectively. Decoupling true up plan precedents in the United States and Canada are detailed in Table 4. It can be seen that there are more plans for gas utilities than for electric utilities. This reflects the fact that gas distributors have been much more likely to experience declining average use. Decoupling true up plans are nonetheless operative for a number of electric utilities in states with large DSM programs. Note also that RAMs for electric utilities are frequently broad-based, whereas most RAMs for gas distributors are revenue per customer freezes.

Figure 5a: Electric Decoupling True up Plans by State





Figure 5b: Gas Decoupling True up Plans by State



**Table 4
Decoupling True Up Plan Precedents**

Jurisdiction	Company Name	Services	Plan Years	Revenue Adjustment Mechanism	Case Reference
Current					
Canada					
AB	Altgas Utilities	Gas	2013-2017	RPC Index	Decision 2012-237
AB	ATCO Gas	Gas	2013-2017	RPC Index	Decision 2012-237
BC	BC Hydro	Electric	2012-2014	Stairstep	Order G-77-12A
BC	FortisBC	Electric	2012-2013	Stairstep	Order G 110-12
BC	Terasen Gas	Gas	2012-2013	Stairstep	Order G-44-12
BC	Pacific Northern Gas	Gas	2003-open 2008-2012, extended through 2013	RPC Freeze	N/A
ON	Union Gas	Gas	2003-open 2008-2012, extended through 2013	RPC Index through 2012, RPC Freeze for 2013	Docket EB-2007-0606
United States					
AR	CenterPoint Energy	Gas	2008-2015	No RAM but broad-based capex tracker	Dockets 06-161-U, 11-088-U
AR	Arkansas Oklahoma Gas	Gas	2007-2013	No RAM	Dockets 07-026-U, 07-077-TF
AR	Arkansas Western	Gas	2007-2013	No RAM	Docket 07-078-TF
AZ	Southwest Gas	Gas	2012-open	RPC Freeze	Docket No. G-01551A-10-0458
CA	California Pacific Electric	Electric	2013-2015	Indexing	Decision 12-11-030
CA	Pacific Gas & Electric	Gas & Electric	2011-2013	Stairstep	Decision 11-05-018
CA	Southwest Gas	Gas	2009-2013	Stairstep	Decision 08-11-048
CA	Southern California Edison	Electric	2012-2014	Hybrid	Decision 12-11-051
CA	Southern California Gas	Gas	2008-2011	Stairstep	Decision 08-07-046
CA	San Diego Gas & Electric	Gas & Electric	2008-2011	Stairstep	Decision 08-07-046
CT	United Illuminating	Electric	2009-open	Stairstep until 2011/No RAM for 2011 onwards	Docket No. 08-07-04
DC	Potomac Electric Power	Electric	2010-open	RPC Freeze	Order 15556
GA	Atmos Energy	Gas	2012-open	No RAM but FRP type mechanism also in effect	Docket No. 34734
HI	Hawaiian Electric Company	Electric	2011-open	Hybrid	0083
HI	Hawaiian Electric Light Company	Electric	2012-open	Hybrid	Docket No. 2008-0274, 2009-
HI	Maui Electric	Electric	2012-open	Hybrid	Dockets 2008-0274, 2009-0163
ID	Idaho Power	Electric	2012-open	RPC Freeze	Case No. IPC-E-11-19
IL	North Shore Gas	Gas	2012-open	No RAM	Case 11-0280
IL	Peoples Gas Light & Coke	Gas	2012-open	No RAM	Case 11-0281
IN	Indiana Gas	Gas	2011-2015	RPC Freeze	Cause No. 44019
IN	Vectren Southern Indiana	Gas	2011-2015	RPC Freeze	Cause No. 44019
IN	Citizens Gas	Gas	2007-open	RPC Freeze	Cause No. 42767
MA	Fitchburg Gas & Electric	Gas	2011-open	RPC Freeze	DPU 11-02
MA	Fitchburg Gas & Electric	Electric	2011-open	No RAM	DPU 11-01
MA	New England Gas	Gas	2011-open	RPC Freeze	DPU-10-14
MA	Western Massachusetts Electric	Electric	2011-open	No RAM	DPU 10-70
MA	Massachusetts Electric	Electric	2010-open	No RAM but broad-based capex tracker	DPU 09-39
MA	Bay State Gas	Gas	2009-open	RPC Freeze	DPU 09-30
MA	Boston-Essex Gas	Gas	2010-open	RPC Freeze	DPU 10-55
MA	Colonial Gas	Gas	2010-open	RPC Freeze	DPU 10-55
MD	Baltimore Gas & Electric	Electric	2008-open	RPC Freeze	Letter Orders ML 108069, 108061
MD	Delmarva Power & Light	Electric	2007-open	RPC Freeze	Order No. 81518
MD	Potomac Electric Power	Electric	2007-open	RPC Freeze	Order No. 81517
MD	Chesapeake Utilities	Gas	2006-open	RPC Freeze	Order No. 81054
MD	Washington Gas Light	Gas	2005-open	RPC Freeze	Order No. 80130
MD	Baltimore Gas & Electric	Gas	1998-open	RPC Freeze	Case No. 8780
MI	Michigan Consolidated Gas	Gas	2013-open	No RAM	Case No. U-16999
MI	Michigan Gas Utilities	Gas	2010-open	RPC Freeze	Case No. U-15990
MN	Minnesota Energy Resources	Gas	2012-2015	RPC Freeze	GR-10-977
MN	CenterPoint Energy	Gas	2010-2013	RPC Freeze	GR-08-1075
NC	Public Service Co of NC	Gas	2008-open	RPC Freeze	Docket No. G-5, Sub 495
NC	Piedmont Natural Gas	Gas	2008-open	RPC Freeze	Docket No. G-9, Sub 550
NJ	New Jersey Natural Gas	Gas	2010-2013	RPC Freeze	Docket GR05121020
NJ	South Jersey Gas	Gas	2010-2013	RPC Freeze	Docket GR05121019
NV	Southwest Gas	Gas	2009-open	RPC Freeze	D-09-04003
NY	Orange & Rockland Utilities	Gas	2012-open	RPC Freeze	Case 08-G-1398
NY	Corning Natural Gas	Gas	2012-2015	RPC Stairstep	Case 11-G-0280
NY	Orange & Rockland Utilities	Electric	2012-2015	Stairstep	Case 11-E-0408
NY	Niagara Mohawk	Electric	2011-open	No RAM	Case 10-E-0050
NY	New York State Electric & Gas	Gas & Electric	2010-2013	RPC Stairstep for Gas, Stairstep for Electric	Case 09-E-0715
NY	Rochester Gas & Electric	Gas & Electric	2010-2013	RPC Stairstep for Gas, Stairstep for Electric	Case 09-E-0717

Table 4 (continued)
Decoupling True Up Plan Precedents

Jurisdiction	Company Name	Services	Plan Years	Revenue Adjustment Mechanism	Case Reference
NY	Consolidated Edison	Gas	2010-2013	RPC Stairstep	Case 09-G-0795
NY	Consolidated Edison	Electric	2010-2013	Stairstep	Case 09-E-0428
NY	Central Hudson G&E	Gas & Electric	2010-2013	RPC Stairstep for Gas, Stairstep for Electric	Case 09-E-0588
NY	Keyspan Energy Delivery - Long Island	Gas	2010-open	RPC Stairstep through 2012, RPC Freeze After 2012	Case 06-G-1186
NY	Keyspan Energy Delivery - New York	Gas	2010-open	RPC Stairstep through 2012, RPC Freeze After 2012	Case 06-G-1185
NY	Niagara Mohawk	Gas	2009-open	RPC Freeze	Case 08-G-0609
NY	National Fuel Gas	Gas	2008-open	RPC Freeze	Case 07-G-0141
OH	AEP Ohio	Electric	2012-2015	RPC Freeze	Case 11-351-EL-AIR
OH	Duke Energy Ohio	Electric	2012-2014	RPC Freeze	Case 11-5905-EL-RDR
OR	Northwest Natural Gas	Gas	2012-open	RPC Freeze	Order No. 12-408
OR	Portland General Electric	Electric	2011-2013	RPC Freeze	Order No. 10-478
OR	Cascade Natural Gas	Gas	2007-2012	RPC Freeze	Order No. 06-191
RI	Narragansett Electric	Electric	2012-open	No RAM but broad-based capex tracker	Docket 4206
RI	Narragansett Electric	Gas	2012-open	RPC Freeze	Docket 4206
TN	Chattanooga Gas	Gas	2010-2013	RPC Freeze	Docket 09-0183
UT	Questar Gas	Gas	2010-open	RPC Freeze	Docket No. 09-057-16
VA	Washington Gas Light	Gas	2010-2013	RPC Freeze	Case No. PUE-2009-00064
VA	Columbia Gas of Virginia	Gas	2013-2015	RPC Freeze	Case No. PUE-2012-00013
WA	Avista	Gas	2013-2014	Stairstep	Docket UG-120437
WI	Wisconsin Public Service	Gas & Electric	2013-open	No RAM	Docket 6690-UR-121
WY	Questar Gas	Gas	2012-open	RPC Freeze	Docket 30010-113-GR-11
WY	SourceGas Distribution	Gas	2011-open	RPC Freeze	Docket 30022-148-GR-10
Historic					
Canada					
BC	BC Hydro	Electric	2011	No RAM	Order G-180-10
BC	BC Hydro	Electric	2009-2010	Stairstep	Order G-16-09
BC	Terasen Gas	Gas	2010-2011	Stairstep	Order G-141-09
BC	Terasen Gas	Gas	2008-2009	Hybrid	Order G-33-07
BC	Terasen Gas	Gas	2004-2007	Hybrid	Order G-51-03
BC	BC Gas	Gas	2000-2001	Hybrid	Order G-48-00
BC	BC Gas	Gas	1998-2000	Hybrid	Order G-85-97
ON	Enbridge Gas Distribution	Gas	2008-2012	RPC Index	Docket EB-2007-0615
United States					
CA	Pacific Gas & Electric	Gas & Electric	2007-2010	Stairstep	Decision 07-03-044
CA	Pacific Gas & Electric	Gas & Electric	2004-2006	Indexing	Decision 04-05-055
CA	Pacific Gas & Electric	Gas & Electric	1993-1995	Hybrid	Decision 92-12-057
CA	Pacific Gas & Electric	Electric	1990-1992	Hybrid	Decision 89-12-057
CA	Pacific Gas & Electric	Electric	1986-1989	Hybrid	Decision 85-12-076
CA	Pacific Gas & Electric	Electric	1984-1985	Hybrid	Decision 83-12-068
CA	Pacific Gas & Electric	Gas & Electric	1982-1983	Hybrid	Decision 93887
CA	Pacific Gas & Electric	Gas	1978-1981	No RAM	Decisions 89316, 91107
CA	PacifiCorp	Electric	1984-1985	Stairstep	Decision 89-09-034
CA	San Diego Gas & Electric	Gas & Electric	2005-2007	Indexing	Decision 05-03-025
CA	San Diego Gas & Electric	Gas & Electric	1994-1999	Hybrid	Decision 94-08-023
CA	San Diego Gas & Electric	Electric	1989-1993	Hybrid	Decision 89-11-068
CA	San Diego Gas & Electric	Gas & Electric	1986-1988	Hybrid	Decision 85-12-108
CA	San Diego Gas & Electric	Gas & Electric	1982-1983	Hybrid	Decision 93892
CA	Southern California Edison	Electric	2009-2011	Stairstep	Decision 09-03-025
CA	Southern California Edison	Electric	2006-2008	Hybrid	Decision 06-05-016
CA	Southern California Edison	Electric	2004-2006	Hybrid	Decision 04-07-022
CA	Southern California Edison	Electric	2001-2003	Indexing	Decision 02-04-055
CA	Southern California Edison	Electric	1986-1991	Hybrid	Decision 85-12-076
CA	Southern California Edison	Electric	1983-1984	Hybrid	Decision 82-12-055
CA	Southern California Gas	Gas	2005-2007	Indexing	Decision 05-03-025
CA	Southern California Gas	Gas	1998-2002	Indexing	Decision 97-07-054
CA	Southern California Gas	Gas	1986-1989	Hybrid	Decision 85-12-076
CA	Southern California Gas	Gas	1990-1993	Hybrid	Decision 90-01-016
CA	Southern California Gas	Gas	1981-1982	Stairstep	Decision 92497
CA	Southern California Gas	Gas	1979-1980	Stairstep	Decision 89710

**Table 4 (continued)
Decoupling True Up Plan Precedents**

Jurisdiction	Company Name	Services	Plan Years	Revenue Adjustment Mechanism	Case Reference
CO	Public Service Company of Colorado	Gas	2008-2011	RPC Freeze	Decision C07-0568
FL	Florida Power Corporation	Electric	1995-1997	RPC Freeze	Docket 930444
ID	Idaho Power	Electric	2007-2009	RPC Freeze	Case No. IPC-E-04-15
ID	Idaho Power	Electric	2010-2012	RPC Freeze	Case No. IPC-E-09-28
IL	North Shore Gas	Gas	2008-2012	RPC Freeze	Case 07-0241
IL	Peoples Gas Light & Coke	Gas	2008-2012	RPC Freeze	Case 07-0242
IN	Vectren Energy	Gas	2007-2011	RPC Freeze	Cause No. 43046
IN	Vectren Southern Indiana	Gas	2007-2011	RPC Freeze	Cause No. 43046
IN	Citizens Gas	Gas	2007-2011	RPC Freeze	Cause No. 42767
ME	Central Maine Power	Electric	1991-1993	RPC Freeze	Docket No. 90-085
MI	Consumers Energy	Electric	2009-2011	RPC Freeze	Case No. U-15645
MI	Consumers Energy	Gas	2010-2012	RPC Freeze	Case No. U-15986
MI	Detroit Edison	Electric	2010-2011	RPC Freeze	Case No. U-15768
MI	Upper Peninsula Power	Electric	2010-2011	RPC Freeze	Case No. U-15988
MI	Michigan Consolidated Gas	Gas	2010-2012	RPC Freeze	Case No. U-15985
MT	Montana Power Company	Electric	1994-1998	RPC Freeze	Docket No. 93.6.24
NC	Piedmont Natural Gas	Gas	2005-2008	RPC Freeze	Docket G-44 Sub 15
NJ	New Jersey Gas Natural	Gas	2007-2010	RPC Freeze	Docket GR05121020
NJ	South Jersey Gas	Gas	2007-2010	RPC Freeze	Docket GR05121019
NY	Central Hudson G&E	Gas	2009-open	RPC Freeze	Case 08-E-0888
NY	Central Hudson G&E	Electric	2009-open	No RAM	Case 08-E-0887
NY	Consolidated Edison	Electric	2008-open	No RAM	Case 07-E-0523
NY	Consolidated Edison	Gas	2007-2010	Stairstep	Case 06-G-1332
NY	Consolidated Edison	Electric	1992-1995	Stairstep	Opinion No. 92-8
NY	Long Island Lighting Company	Electric	1992-1994	Stairstep	Opinion No. 92-8
NY	New York State Electric & Gas	Electric	1993-1995	Stairstep	Opinion No. 93-22
NY	Niagara Mohawk	Electric	1990-1992	Stairstep	Case 94-E-0098
NY	Orange & Rockland Utilities	Gas	2009-2012	RPC Stairstep	Case 08-G-1398
NY	Orange & Rockland Utilities	Electric	2011-2012	No RAM	Case 10-E-0362
NY	Orange & Rockland Utilities	Electric	2008-2011	Stairstep	Case 07-E-0949
NY	Orange & Rockland Utilities	Electric	1991-1993	Stairstep	Case 89-E-175
NY	Rochester Gas & Electric	Electric	1993-1996	Stairstep	Opinion No. 93-19
OH	Vectren Energy	Gas	2007-2009	RPC Freeze	Case 05-1444-GA-UNC
OR	Northwest Natural Gas	Gas	2009-2012	RPC Freeze	Order No. 07-426
OR	Northwest Natural Gas	Gas	2005-2009	RPC Freeze	Order No. 05-934
OR	Northwest Natural Gas	Gas	2002-2005	RPC Freeze	Order No. 02-634
OR	PacifiCorp	Electric	1998-2001	Indexing	Order No. 98-191
OR	Portland General Electric	Electric	2009-2010	RPC Freeze	Order No. 09-020
OR	Portland General Electric	Electric	1995-1996	Stairstep	Order No. 95-0322
UT	Questar Gas	Gas	2006-2010	RPC Freeze	Docket No. 05-057-T01
VA	Virginia Natural Gas	Gas	2009-2012	RPC Freeze	Case No. PUE-2008-00060
WA	Avista	Gas	2009-2012	RPC Freeze	Docket UG-060518
WA	Avista	Gas	2007-2009	RPC Freeze	Docket UG-060518
WA	Cascade Natural Gas	Gas	2005-2010	RPC Freeze	Docket UG-060256
WA	Puget Sound & Power	Electric	1991-1995	RPC Freeze	Docket UE-901184-P
WI	Wisconsin Public Service	Gas & Electric	2009-2012	RPC Freeze	D-6690-UR-119
WY	Questar Gas	Gas	2009-2012	RPC Freeze	Docket 30010-94-GR-08

B. Lost Revenue Adjustment Mechanisms

An LRAM explicitly compensates a utility for base rate revenues that are estimated to be lost due to its DSM programs, distributed generation (“DG”), or other specific causes. Compensation for lost margins is usually effected through a rate rider. Estimates of energy (and sometimes also peak load) savings are needed for LRAM calculations. The utility remains at risk for fluctuations in volumes and peak load due to weather, local economic activity, power market prices, and other volatile demand drivers. The utility is usually kept whole for the full revenue impact of its DSM (and possibly also DG) programs and not just for the incremental effort that causes average use to decline.² This is desirable because a program to promote DSM and DG increases the gap between cost and billing determinant growth and thereby increase potential attrition and the need for more frequent rate cases even if average use does not decline. Precedents for LRAMs are detailed in Table 5 and Figure 6 below.³ It can be seen that, while LRAMs are less widely used than decoupling true up plans today, they have experienced a rebound in recent years and are more popular for electric than for gas utilities. For example, they are featured in Duke Energy’s “Save a Watt” approach to DSM regulation and are also popular in the Intermountain West states. Some utilities have LRAMs and decoupling true up plans.

² For an example of an LRAM that covers DG as well as DSM programs, see Decision 73183 of the Arizona Corporation Commission in the 2012 rate case for Arizona Public Service. A multiyear rate plan was also approved in the decision.

³ Some mechanisms similar to LRAMs are excluded from this survey.


**Table 5
Current LRAM Precedents**

State	Company	Services	Approval Date	Case Reference
AR	Arkansas Oklahoma Gas	Gas	June 2011	Docket No. 07-077-TF, Order Number 30
AR	Centerpoint Energy Arkla	Gas	June 2011	Docket No. 07-081-TF, Order Number 31
AR	Entergy Arkansas	Electric	June 2011	Docket No. 07-085-TF, Order Number 40
AR	Oklahoma Gas & Electric	Electric	June 2011	Docket No. 07-075-TF, Order No. 26
AR	SourceGas Arkansas	Gas	June 2011	Docket No. 07-078-TF, Order No. 26
AR	Southwestern Electric Power	Electric	June 2011	Docket No. 07-082-TF, Order Nos. 35 and 36
AZ	Arizona Public Service	Electric	May 2012	Docket No. E-01345A-11-0224, Decision No. 73183
AZ	UNS Gas	Gas	May 2012	Docket No. G-04204A-11-0158 Decision No. 73142
CT	Connecticut Natural Gas	Gas	August 1995	Docket No. 93-02-04
CT	Southern Connecticut Gas	Gas	August 1995	Docket No. 93-03-09
CT	Yankee Gas Service	Gas	January 2012	Docket No. 11-10-03
IN	Duke Energy Indiana (PSI)	Electric	February 2010	Cause No. 43374
IN	Indiana-Michigan Power	Electric	September 2010	Cause 43827
IN	Northern Indiana Public Service	Electric	May 2011	Cause 43618
IN	Southern Indiana Gas & Electric	Electric	August 2011 (large commercial and industrials), June 2012 (residential and small commercial)	Cause Nos. 43938 and 43405 DSMA 9 S1
KS	Kansas Gas & Electric	Electric	January 2011	Docket No. 10-WSEE-775-TAR
KS	Westar Energy	Electric	January 2011	Docket No. 10-WSEE-775-TAR
KY	Atmos Energy	Gas	September 2009	Case No. 2008-00499
KY	Columbia Gas of Kentucky	Gas	October 2009	Case No. 2009-00141
KY	Delta Natural Gas	Gas	July 2008	Docket No. 2008-00062
KY	Duke Energy Kentucky	Electric	December 1995 and February 2005	Case Nos. 95-321 and 2004-00389
KY	Duke Energy Kentucky	Gas	February 2005	Case No. 2004-00389
KY	Louisville Gas & Electric	Electric & Gas	November 1993	Case No. 93-150
KY	Kentucky Power	Electric	December 1995	Case No. 95-427
KY	Kentucky Utilities	Electric	May 2001	Case No. 2000-0459
LA	Entergy New Orleans	Electric	April 2009	New Orleans Resolution R-09-136
MA	All Electric distributors	Electric	July 2012	D.P.U. 12-01A
MA	Berkshire Gas	Gas	October 1992	D.P.U. 91-154
MA	NSTAR Electric	Electric	April 1992, June 1994, and June 2010	D.P.U. 90-335, D.P.U. 94-2/3-CC, and D.P.U. 10-06
MA	Commonwealth Gas d/b/a NSTAR Gas	Gas	November 1994	D.P.U. 94-128
MT	Northwestern Energy	Gas	February 2009	Docket No. D2008.5.44
MT	Northwestern Energy	Electric	December 2005	Docket No. D2004.6.90
MT	Montana-Dakota Utilities	Gas	October 2006	Docket No. D2005.10.156; Order No. 6697c

Table 5 (continued)
Current LRAM Precedents

State	Company	Services	Approval Date	Case Reference
NY	Central Hudson Gas & Electric	Electric	July 2006	Case No. 05-E-0934
NY	Consolidated Edison of New York	Electric	March 2005	Case No. 04-E-0572
NY	Consolidated Edison of New York	Gas	April 2002	Case No.00-G-1456
NY	Keyspan Long Island	Gas	December 2009	Case No. 06-G-1186; Currently effective for all customers not in RDM
NY	Keyspan New York	Gas	December 2009	Case No. 06-G-1185; Currently effective for all customers not in RDM
NC	Duke Energy Carolinas	Electric	February 2010	Docket No. E-7, Sub 831
NC	Progress Energy Carolinas (Carolina Power & Light)	Electric	November 2009	Docket No. E-2, Sub 931
NC	Virginia Electric Power	Electric	October 2011	Docket No. E-22, Sub 464
NH	Unitil Energy Services	Electric	June 2010	DE 09-137, Order No. 25,111
NV	Nevada Energy	Electric	May 2011	Docket 10-10024
NV	Sierra Pacific Power	Electric	May 2011	Docket 10-10025
OH	Duke Energy Ohio (Cincinnati Gas & Electric)	Electric	July 2007	Docket No. 06-0091-EL-UNC
OH	First Energy Ohio (Cleveland Electric Illuminating, Toledo Edison, Ohio Edison)	Electric	March 2009	Docket No. 08-935-EL-SSO
OH	American Electric Power (Ohio Power, Columbus Southern Power)	Electric	May 2010	Docket No. 09-1089-EL-POR; Effective for classes not included in RDM
OH	Dayton Power & Light	Electric	June 2009	Docket No. 08-1094-EL-SSO
OK	Empire District Electric	Electric	November 2009	Cause No. 200900146 Order 571326
OK	Oklahoma Gas & Electric	Electric	July 2008	Cause No. 200800059 Order 556179
OK	Public Service of Oklahoma	Electric	January 2010	Cause No. PUD 200900196; Order 572836
ON	Union Gas	Gas	January 2008	EB-2007-0606
ON	Enbridge Gas Distribution	Gas	February 2008	EB-2007-0615
ON	Toronto Hydro-Electric	Electric	September 2007	EB-2007-0096
OR	Portland General Electric	Electric	September 2001	Order No. 01-836; UE 79 (Approved 2001 LRAM) Currently non-residential customers only
OR	Cascade Natural Gas	Gas	April 2006	Order No. 06-191; UG 167 excludes classes under RDM
OR	Avista Utilities	Gas	December 1993	Order 93-1881
SC	Progress Energy Carolinas	Electric	June 2009	Docket No. 2008-251-E Order 2009-373
SC	Duke Energy Carolinas	Electric	January 2010	Docket No. 2009-226-E Order No. 2010-79
SC	South Carolina Electric & Gas	Electric	July 2010	Docket No. 2009-261-E, Order No. 2010-472
WY	Cheyenne Light, Fuel, and Power	Electric & Gas	September 2011	Docket Nos. 20003-108-EA-10 and 30005-140-GA-10
WY	Montana-Dakota Utilities	Electric	January 2007	Docket No. 20004-65-ET-06

Figure 6: Current LRAMs by State



C. Fixed Variable Pricing

Fixed variable pricing is an approach to the design of base rates that uses fixed charges (charges that do not vary with the sales volume or peak demand) to recover a high percentage of fixed costs. A *straight* fixed variable (“SFV”) rate design recovers *all* fixed costs through fixed charges. A rate design that recovers a substantial but smaller share of fixed costs through fixed charges is sometimes called *modified* fixed variable pricing. Most fixed variable rate designs implemented to date have involved the same fixed charge for all customers in a service class. However, “sliding scale” rate designs have been developed which assign lower fixed charges to customers who are likely to have lower volumes.

The lion’s share of base rate revenue from residential and commercial customers is typically raised using customer charges under fixed variable pricing. Revenue thus tends to grow at the gradual pace of customer growth.


SFV pricing has been used on a large scale by interstate gas transmission companies since the early 1990s. Precedents for fixed variable pricing in retail ratemaking are listed below on Table 6 and Figure 7. It can be seen that fixed variable retail pricing has to date been more common for gas distributors than electric utilities. This again reflects the greater problem of declining average use that gas distributors have faced. Ohio is noteworthy for having recently switched from decoupling true up plans to fixed variable pricing for its gas distributors.

Table 6
Fixed Variable Retail Pricing Precedents

Jurisdiction	Company Name	Services	Years in Place	Case Reference
CT	Connecticut Light & Power	Electric	2007-open	Docket 07-07-01
CT	Yankee Gas System	Gas	2011-open	Docket 10-12-02
FL	Peoples Gas System	Gas	2009-open	Docket 080318-GU
GA	Atlanta Gas Light	Gas	1998-open	Docket No. 8390-U
IL	Ameren CILCO	Gas	2008-2012	Case 07-0588
IL	Ameren CIPS	Gas	2008-2012	Case 07-0589
IL	Ameren IP	Gas	2008-2012	Case 07-0590
IL	Ameren Illinois	Gas	2012-open	Case 11-0282
IL	Commonwealth Edison	Electric	2011-open	Case 10-0467
IL	Nicor Gas	Gas	2009-open	Docket No. 08-0363
IL	North Shore Gas	Gas	2008-open	Case No. 07-0241
IL	Peoples Gas Light & Coke	Gas	2008-open	Case No. 07-0242
KY	Delta Natural Gas	Gas	2007-open	Case No. 2007-00089
KY	Duke Energy Kentucky	Gas	2010-open	Case No. 2009-00202
MO	AmerenUE	Gas	2007-open	Case No. GR-2007-0003
MO	Atmos Energy	Gas	2007-2010	Case GR-2006-0387
MO	Atmos Energy	Gas	2010-open	Case No. GR-2010-0192
MO	Empire District Gas	Gas	2010-open	Case GR-2009-0434
MO	Missouri Gas Energy	Gas	2007-open	Case GR-2006-0422
MO	Laclede Gas	Gas	2002-open	Case GR-2002-356
MS	Mississippi Power	Electric	Occurred over period of years	No specific case
ND	Xcel Energy	Gas	2005-open	Case PU-04-578
OH	Duke Energy Ohio (CG&E)	Gas	2008-open	Case 07-590-GA-ALT
OH	Dominion East Ohio	Gas	2008-2010	Case 07-830-GA-ALT
OH	Columbia Gas	Gas	2008-open	Case 08-0072-GA-AIR
OH	Vectren Energy Delivery of Ohio	Gas	2009-open	Case 07-1080-GA-AIR
OK	Oklahoma Natural Gas	Gas	2004-open	Cause Nos. PUD 200400610, PUD 201000048, PUD 200900110
OK	Centerpoint Energy	Gas	2010-open	Cause No. PUD 201000030

In addition to the precedents listed here, some other states have in recent years made sizable steps in the direction of fixed variable pricing by redesigning rates for small volume customers to raise customer charges and lower volumetric charges substantially. Investor-owned utilities in Canada are typically permitted to raise a much higher portion of their revenue through fixed charges than in the United States. Most fixed variable rate designs feature uniform fixed charges within service classes, but gas utilities in Florida, Georgia, and Oklahoma have fixed charges that vary in some fashion with long term consumption patterns.

Figure 7: Fixed Variable Pricing Precedents by State



IV. Forward Test Years

General rate cases involve “test years” in which revenue requirements and billing determinants are jointly considered in setting new rates. An historic test year ends before the rate case is filed. A fully-forecasted (a/k/a “forward”) test year (“FTY”) is a twelve month period that begins after the rate case is filed. An FTY typically begins about the time that the rate case is expected to end. Two-year forecasts are therefore required to span both the rate case year and the year that rates take effect.⁴ In between FTYs and historic test years is the option of a “partially forecasted” test year in which some months of historic data on utility operations are combined with some months of forecasted data. Under this approach, actual data for all months usually become available during the course of the rate case.

Historic test years are chronically uncompensatory when cost grows materially faster than billing determinants. Annual rate cases can alleviate but not eliminate underearning. Where historic test years are used in rate cases there are thus added advantages to implementing other Altreg innovations discussed in this paper.

Forward test years can compensate utilities for a tendency of cost growth to exceed billing determinant growth.⁵ If this tendency is chronic, however, it does not eliminate the problem of frequent rate cases. It is therefore not unusual for regulators to combine FTYs with other Altreg remedies, as is the case in California and New York.

Diverse approaches are used to forecast costs in FTY rate cases. Some companies rely on their budgeting process to make cost projections. Others normalized data for an historical reference period and adjust for known and measurable changes and then use indexing and other statistical methods to extend projections. Mixes of these two approaches are common.

Forward test years were adopted in many jurisdictions during the 1970s and 1980s when rapid price inflation and major plant additions coincided with slowing growth in average use. This approach to Altreg was therefore one of the earliest implemented. Several additional states have recently moved in the direction of FTYs. Many of these states are in the West, where comparatively rapid economic growth has required more rapid build out of utility infrastructure. FTYs were recently sanctioned legislatively in Pennsylvania.

Current state policies concerning test years are summarized below in Figure 8 and Table 7. The ranks of US jurisdictions that allow the use of alternatives to historic test years have swollen and now encompass well over half of the total. The “other” category in Figure 8 includes states where utilities can file FTYs but many do not (*e.g.* Illinois), states where FTYs may be approved on a case by case basis (*e.g.* New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming), and states where partially forecasted test years are the norm (*e.g.* Ohio and New Jersey). Forward test years are the norm in Canada and several jurisdictions have permitted two forward test years.

⁴ A forward test year can be the rate case year, and thereby not require two-year forecasts, if rates are allowed to be changed as proposed on an interim basis shortly after the filing.

⁵ The effect on credit metrics can be material. For evidence see “Forward Test Years for US Electric Utilities” by Mark Newton Lowry, David Hovde, Lullit Getachew, and Matt Makos, August 2010. Prepared for the Edison Electric Institute.

Figure 8: Test Year Policy by State




Table 7
Test Year Approaches of US Jurisdictions

Jurisdiction	Notes
Fully-Forecasted (15)	
Alabama	Utilities operate under forward-looking formula rate plans
California	
Connecticut	
FERC	Rate cases use forward test years but some formula rate plans use HTYs
Florida	
Georgia	
Hawaii	
Maine	
Michigan	
Minnesota	
New York	
Oregon	
Rhode Island	
Tennessee	
Wisconsin	
Partially-Forecasted (3)	
Arkansas	
Ohio	
New Jersey	
Transitional/Varying (14)	
District of Columbia	PEPCO has filed rate cases using both hybrid and historical test years recently Before restructuring FTY filings were common, but companies have used a mix of HTYs and partially-forecasted test years in recent filings
Delaware	
Idaho	
Illinois	Utilities use various test years including FTYs
Kentucky	Utilities use various test years including FTYs
Louisiana	Utilities use various test years including FTYs
Maryland	Utilities use various test years excluding FTYs
Mississippi	One electric utility operates under a forward-looking formula rate plan
Missouri	Utilities have the option to file partially-forecasted test years
New Mexico	A recently passed law allows for use of FTYs, but no rate increase based on FTY evidence has yet been approved
North Dakota	Utilities use various test years including FTYs
Pennsylvania	Partially-forecasted test years have been the norm. Law allowing fully-forecasted test years passed in 2012. First FTY case is pending.
Utah	Test year selection is part of the rate case and can be contested. Several recent rate cases have used FTYs.
Wyoming	Rocky Mountain Power has recently used FTYs
Historic (20)	
Alaska	
Arizona	
Colorado	Utilities can file FTY evidence. No FTY rates have yet been approved but a recent case made extraordinary HTY adjustments.
Indiana	
Iowa	
Kansas	
Massachusetts	
Montana	
Nebraska	Nebraska has no electric IOUs. Gas companies are legally authorized to use FTYs but commonly use HTYs.
Nevada	
New Hampshire	
North Carolina	
Oklahoma	
South Carolina	
South Dakota	
Texas	
Vermont	
Virginia	
Washington	
West Virginia	

V. Multiyear Rate Plans

Multiyear rate plans (“MRPs”) are designed to compensate a utility for changing business conditions without frequent, full true ups to its actual cost of service. Rate cases are held infrequently, most often at three to five year intervals. Any rate escalations that are made between rate cases are based in whole or in part on automatic attrition relief mechanisms (“ARMs”). The rate adjustments provided by ARMs are largely “external” in the sense that they give a utility an *allowance* for cost growth rather than reimbursement for its *actual* growth. The “externalization” of ratemaking that these two features of MRPs achieve can strengthen utility performance incentives despite a reduction in regulatory cost. Benefits of better performance can be shared between the utility and its customers. Lower regulatory cost has special appeal in jurisdictions where numerous utilities must be regulated.

ARMs typically cap the growth in either rates (*e.g.* customer charges and cents per kWh) or allowed revenue. Rate caps are favored when and where utilities are encouraged to bolster system use since they strengthen incentives to promote use and facilitate marketing flexibility by reducing concerns about cross-subsidies. Revenue caps are usually combined with decoupling true ups, and are often favored where utilities must cope with declining average use and/or large-scale DSM programs.

Several approaches to the design of ARMs are well-established. These approaches include stairsteps, indexing, and hybrids. Stairsteps provide predetermined increases in rates (or revenue) which often reflect forecasts of cost growth. Indexing escalates rates (or revenue) automatically for inflation and sometimes also for growth in the number of customers served and/or industry productivity trends. Hybrid ARMs typically involve indexing of budgets for O&M expenses and stairsteps for capital cost budgets.

The indexing approach to ARM design is more common for distribution charges because distribution cost growth is relatively gradual and predictable. Hybrid and stairstep ARMs are more adaptable to the cost growth trajectories of VIEUs, which are more uneven due to occasional major plant additions. Some VIEUs operating under MRPs have separate ratemaking treatments for generation and distribution.


Supplemental rate adjustments are usually allowed for changes in business conditions that are especially difficult to address using ARMs. A tracker that recovers a large portion of a utility’s capex cost can, for example, sometimes permit the company to operate under a multiyear freeze on rates for other non-energy costs. This is so because the value of the residual rate base is more likely to be static or decline. Trackers may also address *force majeure* events such as severe storms and changes in tax rates and other government policies that affect costs.

Some multiyear rate and revenue caps feature earnings sharing mechanisms (“ESMs”) that automatically share earnings surpluses and/or deficits that result when the rate of return on equity (“ROE”) deviates from its regulated target. Some feature “off-ramps” that permit plan suspension when earnings are unusually high or low. Plans often feature award and/or penalty mechanisms that are linked to the utility’s service quality.

MRPs were first widely used in the railroad, telecommunications, and oil pipeline industries. A major attraction was the ability of price caps to afford utilities flexibility in serving markets with diverse competitive pressures from a consolidated set of assets. The use of MRPs in the regulation of gas and electric utilities has been chiefly motivated by other advantages such as stronger performance incentives and lower regulatory cost.

Current US and Canadian precedents for MRPs are indicated in Table 8 and Figures 9a and 9b.⁶ In the US, multiyear rate plans are most common in California and the Northeast. MRPs with ARMs that escalate rate or revenue automatically are more common for energy distributors than for VIEUs. Canada is moving towards MRPs with index-based ARMs for pipe and wire utilities in all four populous provinces. MRPs with index-based ARMs are more the rule than the exception for pipe and wire utilities overseas. ARMs used in MRPs for VIEUs typically have a stairstep or hybrid form. Other VIEUs operate under a combination of a rate freeze and one or more trackers to compensate the utility for specific causes of potential attrition.

Figure 9a: Recent US Electric Multiyear Rate Cap Precedents by State



⁶ The table considers only MRPs that weren't listed in Table 4 on decoupling true up precedents. Figures 9a and 9b cover all MRPs. Rate freezes without extensive supplemental funding from trackers are excluded from Table 8 and Figures 9a and 9b.

Table 8
Multiyear Price Cap Precedents^{1,2}

Jurisdiction	Company Name	Plan Term	Services Covered	Rate Escalation Provisions	Case Reference
Current					
AZ	Arizona Public Service	2012-2016	Bundled power service	Rate freeze with an adjustment to account for purchase of SCE's share of Four Corners generating facility, additional capex and other cost trackers, LRAM	Decision No. 73183, May 2012
CA	PacifiCorp	2011-2013	Bundled power service	Price Cap Index: Rates escalated by Global Insight forecast of CPI, less 0.5% productivity factor; supplemental funding for major plant additions can be requested in annual filings.	Decision 10-09-010; September 2, 2010
CO	Public Service Company of Colorado	2012-2014	Bundled power service	Stairstep	Decision No. C12-0494
FL	Florida Power & Light	2013-2016	Bundled power service	Rate freeze with multiple capex and other cost trackers	Docket No. 120015-EI, December 2012
FL	Progress Energy Florida	2012-2016	Bundled power service	Rate Freeze with one step plus capex and other cost trackers	Docket No. 120022-EI
GA	Georgia Power	2011-2013	Bundled power service	Stairstep: Rate increases permitted for DSM and major generation plant additions	Docket 31958
IA	MidAmerican Energy	2001 - 2005, extended to 2013	Bundled power service	Rate Freeze with nuclear capex and other cost trackers	Dockets RPU-01-3 and RPU-2012-0001
LA	Cleco	2009-2014	Bundled power service	Rate freeze with capex tracker	Order No. U-30689
ME	Central Maine Power (III)	2009-2013	Power distribution	Price Cap Index: GDPPI - 1%, separate AMI tracker	Docket 2007-215
NH	Public Service Company of New Hampshire	2010-2015	Power distribution (generation regulated separately)	Stairstep: Rate increases allowed to account for distribution capital additions in 2010-2013	DE 09-035
NH	Unitil Energy Systems	2011-2016	Power distribution	Stairstep: Rate increases allowed to account for distribution capital additions in 2011-2013	DE 10-055
OH	AEP-OH	2012-2015	Power distribution	Rate Freeze supplemented by capex and other cost trackers	Case No. 11-346-EL-SSO, August 8, 2012
OH	First Energy Ohio	2011-2014, later extended to 2016	Power distribution	Rate Freeze with capex and other cost trackers	Case Nos. 11-388-EL-SSO, 12-1230-EL-SSO
VA	Virginia Electric Power	2010-2013	Bundled power service	Rate Freeze with capex and other cost trackers	Case No. PUE-2009-00019
VT	Green Mountain Power	2010-2013	Electric	Revenue cap index	Docket No. 7585
VT	Central Vermont Public Service	2011-2013	Electric	Revenue cap index	Docket No. 7627
VT	Vermont Gas Systems	2012-2015	Gas	Revenue cap hybrid	Docket No. 7803
Alberta	Enmax	2007-2013	Power distribution	Price Cap Index: Input Price Index -1.2%	Decision 2009-035
Alberta	Altgas Utilities	2013-2017	Gas	Revenue Per Customer Indexing: Input Price Index - 1.16%, separate capex trackers	Decision 2012-237
Alberta	ATCO Gas	2013-2017	Gas	Revenue Per Customer Indexing: Input Price Index - 1.16%, separate capex trackers	Decision 2012-237
Alberta	EPCOR, Fortis Alberta	2013-2017	Power distribution	Price Cap Index: Input Price Index - 1.16%, separate capex trackers	Decision 2012-237
Northwest Territories	Northland Utilities	2011-2013	Bundled power service	Stairstep	Decision 17-2011
Northwest Territories	Northland Utilities (Yellowknife)	2011-2013	Bundled power service	Stairstep	Decision 13-2011

**Table 8 (continued)
Multiyear Price Cap Precedents^{1,2}**

Jurisdiction	Company Name	Plan Term	Services Covered	Rate Escalation Provisions	Case Reference
Current					
Ontario	All Ontario distributors	2010-2013	Power distribution	Price Cap Index: GDP IPI for Final Domestic Demand - (0.92% to 1.32% depending on company's annual performance in benchmarking studies)	EB-2007-0673 (July 14, 2008, September 17, 2008, and January 28, 2009)
Prince Edward Island	Maritime Electric	2013-2016	Bundled power service	Stairstep: Bill defines rates for each year.	Bill 26 (2012) Electric Power (Energy Accord Continuation) Amendment Act

Historic

Jurisdiction	Company Name	Plan Term	Services Covered	Attrition Relief Mechanisms	Case Reference
CA	Sierra Pacific Power	2009-2011, extended to 2012	Bundled power service	Price Cap Index	Decision 09-10-041
CA	PacifiCorp	1994-1996, extended to 1999	Bundled power service	Price Cap Index	Decision 93-12-106; December 3, 1993
CA	PacifiCorp	2007-2009, extended to 2010	Bundled power service	Price Cap Index	Decisions 06-12-011 and 09-04-017
CA	San Diego Gas and Electric	1999-2002	Electric & Gas	Price Cap Index	Decision 99-05-030; May 13, 1999
CA	Southern California Edison	1997-2001	Electric	Price Cap Index	Decision 96-09-092; September 6, 1996
CT	United Illuminating	2006-2008	Power Distribution	Stairstep	Docket 05-06-04
FL	Florida Power & Light	2006-2009	Bundled power service	Rate Freeze with exception for new generating facilities after they are in service and multiple capex and other cost trackers	Docket 050045-EI
FL	Progress Energy Florida	2006-2009	Bundled power service	Rate freeze with 1 step to reflect generation brought in-service and multiple capex and other cost trackers	Docket No. 050078-EI
GA	Atlanta Gas Light	2005-2010	Gas distribution	Base rate freeze featuring a broad-based capex tracker	Docket No. 18638-U
MA	Bay State Gas	2006-2009	Gas distribution	Price Cap Index	Docket DTE 05-27
MA	Berkshire Gas	2002-2012	Gas distribution	No adjustment until September 2004, then Price Cap Index	Docket D.T.E. 01-56
MA	Boston Gas (I)	1997-2001	Gas distribution	Price Cap Index	Docket D.P.U. 96-50-C (Phase I) May 16, 1997
MA	Boston Gas (II)	2004-2010	Gas distribution	Price Cap Index	Docket DTE 03-40
MA	Blackstone Gas	November 1, 2004 - October 31, 2009	Gas distribution	Price Cap Index	Docket D.T.E. 04-79
MA	National Grid	2000-2010	Power distribution	Rate Freeze between 2000 and 2005, Price Cap Index: 2006-2010, inflation adjustment made based on index of regional power distribution charges.	Docket DTE 99-47 (November 29, 1999)
MA	Nstar	2006-2012	Power distribution	Price Cap Index	Docket D.T.E. 05-85
ME	Bangor Gas	2000-2009, extended to 2012	Gas Distribution	Price Cap Index	Docket 970795 (June 26, 1998)
ME	Bangor Hydro Electric (I)	1998-2000	Power distribution	Price Cap Index	Docket 97-116 (March 24, 1998)
ME	Bangor Hydro Electric (II)	2002-2007	Power Distribution	Stairstep	Docket No. 2001-410
ME	Central Maine Power (I)	1995-1999	Bundled power service	Price Cap Index	Docket 92-345 Phase II (January 10, 1995)
ME	Central Maine Power (II)	2001-2007	Power distribution	Price Cap Index	Docket 99-666 (November 16, 2000)

Table 8 (continued)
Multiyear Price Cap Precedents^{1,2}


Historic

Jurisdiction	Company Name	Plan Term	Services Covered	Rate Escalation Provisions	Case Reference
NY	Brooklyn Union Gas	October 1, 1991 - September 30, 1994	Gas distribution	Stairstep	Case 90-G-0981, Opinion 91-21, October 9, 1991
NY	Brooklyn Union Gas	October 1, 1994 - September 30, 1997	Gas distribution	Stairstep	Case 93-G-0941, Opinion 94-22, October 18, 1994
NY	Central Hudson Gas & Electric	July 1, 2006 - June 30, 2009	Electric & Gas	Stairstep	Case 05-E-0934 & Case 05-G-0935; July 24, 2006
NY	Consolidated Edison	October 1, 1994 - September 30, 1997	Gas Distribution	Stairstep	Case 93-G-0996, Opinion 94-21, October 12, 1994
NY	Consolidated Edison	April 1, 2005 - March 31, 2008	Power distribution	Stairstep	Case 04-E-0572, March 24, 2005
NY	Long Island Lighting Company	December 1, 1993- November 30, 1996	Gas distribution	Stairstep	Case 93-G-0002, Opinion 93-23, December 23, 1993
NY	New York State Electric & Gas	December 1, 1993 - August 31, 1995	Gas	Stairstep	Case 92-G-1086, Opinion 93-22, November 9, 1993
NY	New York State Electric & Gas	August 1, 1995 - July 31, 1998, Years 2 and 3 not implemented due to restructuring	Electric	Stairstep	Case 94-M-0349, Opinion 95-27, September 27, 1995
NY	Niagara Mohawk	July 1, 1990 - December 31, 1992	Gas	Stairstep	Case 29327, Opinion 89-37, June 28, 1991
NY	Orange & Rockland Utilities	November 1, 2003- October 31, 2006	Gas	Stairstep	Case 02-G-1553, October 23, 2003
NY	Orange & Rockland Utilities	November 1, 2006 - October 31, 2009	Gas	Stairstep	Case 05-G-1494, October 20, 2006
NY	Rochester Gas & Electric	July 1, 1993 - June 30, 1996	Gas	Stairstep	Case 92-G-0741, Opinion No. 93-19; August 24, 1993
OH	Cincinnati Gas & Electric	2009-2011	Power generation	Stairstep	Case 08-920-EL-SSO
OH	Dayton Power & Light	2009-2012	Power Distribution	Rate freeze supplemented by capex and other cost trackers	Case No. 08-1094-EL-SSO (June 2009)
VT	Green Mountain Power	2007-2010	Electric	Stairstep	Docket No. 7176
VT	Vermont Gas Systems	2007-2012	Gas	Hybrid	Docket No. 7109
Alberta	Northwestern Utilities	1999-2002	Bundled power service	Stairstep	Decision U98060 (March 31, 1998)
Alberta	EPCOR	2002-2005, Terminated 12/31/2003	Power distribution	Price Cap Index	City of Edmonton Distribution Tariff Bylaw 12367 (August 18, 2000)
BC	Fortis BC	2006-2009, extended to 2011	Bundled power service	Revenue Cap Hybrid	Order G-58-06
Ontario	All Ontario distributors	2000-2003	Power distribution	Price Cap Index	RP-1999-0034
Ontario	All Ontario Distributors	2006-2009	Power Distribution	Price Cap Index	EB-2006-0089 (December 20, 2006)
Ontario	Union Gas	2001-2003	Gas distribution	Price Cap Index	RP-1999-0017 (July 21, 2001)

¹ Rate freezes without extensive supplemental funding from capex trackers are excluded from this table.

² MRPs with revenue decoupling and broad-based revenue cap escalators are detailed in Table 4.

Figure 9b: Recent Canadian Multiyear Rate Cap Precedents by Province



VI. Formula Rates

A cost of service formula rate plan (“FRP”) is essentially a wide-scope cost tracker designed to help a utility’s revenue track its pro forma cost of service. When revenue and cost are not balanced a utility’s realized ROE deviates from the target set by regulators, and earnings surpluses or deficits occur. FRPs have earnings true up mechanisms that adjust rates so that earnings variances are substantially reduced or eliminated. Regulatory cost is reduced by limiting review of costs and revenues.

The earnings true up mechanism in an FRP calculates the revenue adjustment necessary to reduce or eliminate earnings variances. Some compare the earned ROE to the target (a/k/a benchmark) ROE and then calculate the rate adjustment needed to reduce the ROE variance. Another approach is to adjust rates for the difference between revenue and a pro forma cost of service that is calculated using a rate of return target. Both approaches often add interest on the variance to the revenue adjustment.

Earnings true up mechanisms in FRPs commonly move the ROE all, or almost all, of the way to its regulated target without sharing earnings variances. This is an important distinction between an FRP earnings true up mechanism and the earnings *sharing* mechanisms found in some multiyear rate plans. ESMs also frequently have sizable deadbands.

Expedited review of operating prudence does not always extend to major investment programs. In state-regulated FRPs for retail services, for instance, major investment programs are generally approved separately through such means as hearings on certificates of public convenience and necessity. The resultant cost is sometimes recovered through a separate tracker. Mechanisms are sometimes added to an FRP to encourage better operating performance in targeted areas. An example is a limit on the escalation of O&M expenses using an indexing formula.

Formula rates have been used at the FERC and its predecessor agency to regulate interstate services of gas and electric utilities since at least 1950. Use of FRPs was encouraged in the 1970s and early 1980s by rapid price inflation. Despite slower inflation in recent years, the FERC has made extensive use of formula rates for power transmission in an effort to simplify its daunting regulatory task and facilitate urgently needed investments.

Precedents for retail formula rates, which recover costs of generation and/or distribution, are listed in Table 9 and Figure 10⁷. It can be seen that FRPs for retail utility services are operative today in several Southeast and South Central states. Alabama was an early innovator, approving “Rate Stabilization and Equalization” plans for Alabama Power and Alabama Gas in the early 1980s.⁸ Formula rates are, additionally, now used to regulate electric utilities in Mississippi, some gas and electric utilities in Louisiana, and some gas utilities in Oklahoma, Texas, and South Carolina. Utilities in other states have cost trackers that act like formula rates to recover their transmission costs from retail customers. Most of the recent approvals of formula rates have been for gas distribution, as this is one means of avoiding the frequent rate cases that declining average use can trigger. However, formula rates were recently authorized for electric utilities in Illinois and two are now operating under FRPs there.

⁷ Some plans labeled as formula rates do not qualify for inclusion in this table and figure based on our definition.

⁸ For further discussion of the Alabama FRP experience see Edison Electric Institute, *Case Study of Alabama Rate Stabilization and Equalization Mechanism*, June 2011.

Table 9
Retail Formula Rate Plan Precedents¹


Jurisdiction	Company Name	Services	Plan Name	Plan Term	Case Reference
Current					
AL	Alabama Power	Bundled Power Service	Rate Stabilization & Equalization Factor (Rate RSE)	2006-open	Dockets No. 18117 and 18416 (October 2005)
AL	Alabama Gas	Gas	Rate Stabilization & Equalization Factor (Rate RSE)	2008-2014	Dockets No. 18406 and 18328 (December 2007)
AL	Mobile Gas Service	Gas	Rate Stabilization & Equalization Factor (Rate RSE)	2009-2013	Docket 28101 (December 2009)
GA	Atmos Energy	Gas	Georgia Rate Adjustment Mechanism (GRAM)	2012-open	Docket 34764 (December 2011)
IL	Ameren Illinois	Power Distribution	Rate Modernization Action Plan - Pricing (Rate MAP-P)	2011-2017	Case 12-0001 (September 2012)
IL	Commonwealth Edison	Power Distribution	Rate Delivery Service Pricing and Performance (Rate DSPP)	2011-2017	Case 11-0721 (May 2012)
LA	Atmos Energy - Louisiana Gas Service	Gas	Rate Stabilization Plan	2006-open	Docket No. U-21484 (May 2006)
LA	Atmos Energy - Trans Louisiana Gas	Gas	Rate Stabilization Plan	2006-open	Docket No. U-28814 and U-28588 and U-28587 (May 2006)
LA	Entergy New Orleans	Electric and Gas	Formula Rate Plan	2010-2012	Docket No. UD-08-03 (April 2009)
MS	Atmos Energy Corp	Gas	Stable/Rate Rider	2009-present	Docket No. 05-UN-0503 (December 2009)
MS	Centerpoint Energy Entex	Gas	Rate Regulation Adjustment Rider	2008-open	Docket No. 07-UN-548 (December 2007)
MS	Entergy Mississippi	Bundled Power Service	Formula Rate Plan 5 (FRP 5)	2010-open	Docket No. 2009-UN-388 (March 2010)
MS	Mississippi Power	Bundled Power Service	Performance Evaluation Plan - 5 (PEP-5)	2010-open	Docket No. 2003-UN-0898 (November 2009)
OK	Centerpoint Energy Arkla	Gas	Performance Based Rate of Change Plan	2010-open	Docket No. 201000030 (July 2010)
OK	Oklahoma Natural Gas	Gas	Performance Based Rate of Change Plan	2010-2013	Docket No. 200800348 (April 2009)
SC	Piedmont Gas	Gas	NA	2005-present	Docket No. 2005-125-G (September 2005)
SC	South Carolina Electric and Gas	Gas	NA	2005-present	Docket No. 2005-113-G (October 2005)
TX	Centerpoint Energy-Texas Coast Division	Gas	Cost of Service Adjustment Clause	2008-open	Gas Utility Docket 9791 (October 2008)
TX	Atmos Energy-Mid Texas Division	Gas	Rate Review Mechanism	2008 - conclusion of rate case to be filed on or before June 1, 2013	Various Resolutions/Ordinances across cities in service territory, including City of Fort Worth Ordinance 17989-02-2008
TX	Atmos Energy West Texas Division	Gas	Rate Review Mechanism	2009 - conclusion of rate case to be filed on or before June 1, 2013	Various Resolutions/Ordinances across cities in service territory
TX	Texas Gas Service - North Service Area	Gas	Cost of Service Adjustment Tariff	2009-open	Various Resolutions/Ordinances in service territory and Gas Utility Docket 9839 (April 2009)
Historic					
AL	Alabama Power	Bundled Power Service	Rate Stabilization & Equalization Factor (Rate RSE)	2002-2006	Dockets No. 18117 and 18416 (March 2002)
AL	Alabama Power	Bundled Power Service	Rate Stabilization & Equalization Factor (Rate RSE)	1998-2002	Dockets No. 18117 and 18416 (March 1998)
AL	Alabama Power	Bundled Power Service	Rate Stabilization & Equalization Factor (Rate RSE)	1990-1998	Dockets No. 18117 and 18416 (March 1990)
AL	Alabama Power	Bundled Power Service	Rate Stabilization & Equalization Factor (Rate RSE)	1985-1990	Dockets No. 18117 and 18416 (June 1985)
AL	Alabama Power	Bundled Power Service	Rate Stabilization & Equalization Factor (Rate RSE)	1982-1985	Dockets No. 18117 and 18416 (November 1982)
AL	Alabama Gas	Gas	Rate Stabilization & Equalization Factor (Rate RSE)	2002-2007	Dockets No. 18046 and 18328 (June 2002)

Table 9 (continued)
Retail Formula Rate Plan Precedents¹

Jurisdiction	Company Name	Services	Plan Name	Plan Term	Case Reference
AL	Alabama Gas	Gas	Rate Stabilization & Equalization Factor (Rate RSE)	1996-2001	Dockets No. 18046 and 18328 (October 1996)
AL	Alabama Gas	Gas	Rate Stabilization & Equalization Factor (Rate RSE)	1991-1995	Dockets No. 18046 and 18328 (December 1990)
AL	Alabama Gas	Gas	Rate Stabilization & Equalization Factor (Rate RSE)	1987-1990	Dockets No. 18046 and 18328 (September 1987)
AL	Alabama Gas	Gas	Rate Stabilization & Equalization Factor (Rate RSE)	1985-1987	Dockets No. 18046 and 18328 (May 1985)
AL	Alabama Gas	Gas	Rate Stabilization & Equalization Factor (Rate RSE)	1983-1985	Dockets No. 18046 and 18328 (January 1983)
AL	Mobile Gas Service	Gas	Rate Stabilization & Equalization Factor (Rate RSE)	2005-2009	Docket 28101 (June 2005)
AL	Mobile Gas Service	Gas	Rate Stabilization & Equalization Factor (Rate RSE)	2001-2005	Docket 28101 (June 2002)
LA	Atmos Energy - Louisiana Gas Service	Gas	Rate Stabilization Plan	2001-2003	Docket No. U-21484 (January 2001)
LA	Entergy New Orleans	Electric only	Formula Rate Plan	2004-2006	Docket No. UD-01-04 (May 2003)
MS	Atmos Energy Corp	Gas	Stable/Rate Rider	2006-2009	Docket No. 05-UN-0503 (October 2005)
MS	Atmos Energy Corp	Gas	Stable/Rate Rider	1992-2006	Docket 92-UA-0230 (September 1992)
MS	Centerpoint Energy Entex	Gas	Rate Regulation Adjustment Rider	1996-2007	Docket No. 96-UN-0202 (September 1996)
MS	Entergy Mississippi	Bundled Power Service	Formula Rate Plan 1 (FRP 1)	1995	Docket No. 93-UA-0301 (March 1994)
MS	Mississippi Power	Bundled Power Service	Performance Evaluation Plan - 4A (PEP-4A)	2009	Docket No. 06-UN-0511 (January 2009)
MS	Mississippi Power	Bundled Power Service	Performance Evaluation Plan - 4 (PEP-4)	2004-2009	Docket No. 03-UN-0898 (May 2004)
MS	Mississippi Power	Bundled Power Service	Performance Evaluation Plan - 3 (PEP-3)	2002-2004	Docket No. 01-UN-0826 (October 2002)
MS	Mississippi Power	Bundled Power Service	Performance Evaluation Plan - 2A (PEP-2A)	2001-2002	Docket No. 01-UN-0548 (December 2001)
MS	Mississippi Power	Bundled Power Service	Performance Evaluation Plan - 1A (PEP-1A)	1992-1993	Docket 92-UN-0059 (July 1992)
MS	Mississippi Power	Bundled Power Service	Performance Evaluation Plan - 1 (PEP-1)	1991-1992	Docket No. 90-UN-0287 (December 1990)
MS	Mississippi Power	Bundled Power Service	Performance Evaluation Plan	1986-1990	Docket No. U-4761 (August 1986)
OK	Centerpoint Energy Arkla	Gas	Performance Based Rate of Change Plan	2008-2010	Docket No. 200800062 (July 2008)
OK	Centerpoint Energy Arkla	Gas	Performance Based Rate of Change Plan	2004-2008	Docket No. 200400187 (November 2004)

¹ Table excludes some mechanisms that do not conform to our FRP definition. Some of these are called formula rate plans.

Figure 10: Current Retail Formula Rate Precedents by State



VII. Conclusions

Regulation of North American energy utilities is evolving to remedy the chronic underearning and frequent rate cases that traditional regulation tends to produce under modern operating conditions. Innovations continue, while some older forms of Altreg are again finding favor. This brief survey has not considered all noteworthy approaches to Altreg. Here are some of the other approaches that merit recognition:

- Regulatory assets can provide delayed compensation with interest for the annual cost of newly used and useful plant that doesn't automatically produce revenue.
- Attrition adjustments to rates can provide some compensation for an ongoing tendency of cost growth to exceed billing determinant growth. See, for example, a recent decision of the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission in a rate case for Avista⁹.
- Utilities can be permitted to file rate cases on a limited set of issues, such as additions to generation plant, that are salient causes of potential attrition.

The variety of Altreg approaches that have been established reflects the varied circumstances of individual utilities. Some are vertically integrated, while others are more specialized wire companies. Investment needs and trends in average use vary greatly. No single Altreg approach is right for every situation. The availability of multiple remedies for the underlying problems increases the chance that an approach has already been tried that fits the regulatory inclinations of a particular jurisdiction. Numerous precedents for an approach should raise confidence that it makes good sense under fairly common circumstances.

Taken together, the many innovations described in this survey can encourage utilities to make smart investments, reduce long run costs, and improve service quality without rate shock or unnecessarily frequent rate cases. Utilities can be encouraged to promote energy efficiency and peak load management aggressively. Regulators and stakeholders to regulation across the US should give priority attention to these options and consider which Altreg combinations work best in their situation.

⁹ Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, Dockets UE-120436/UG-120437, Order 09, December 26, 2012.