

# EEI Summary of State Regulatory Smart Grid Decisions

August 2011

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
CA (Generic)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 7/28/11</li> <li>Case R.08-12-009</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. Approves rules to protect privacy/security of customer usage data generated by smart meters.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In PUC-required utility applications for providing authorized third parties data access (as described in Summary of Key Findings column), utilities may seek rate recovery of related incremental costs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mandates w/in 6 mos. a study, to be conducted separately or jointly by covered IOUs, on real time or near-real time access by customers to price data</li> <li>Requires IOUs to submit w/in 4 mos. advice letters for developing smart meter HAN implementation plans. Plans must include initial service rollout to up to 5,000 HAN devices, and full rollout to transmit via smart meters energy usage data to the home so it can be received by customer-selected HAN device.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rules apply to PG&amp;E, SDG&amp;E, SCE and authorized third parties. Phase 2 of proceeding to consider application to community choice aggregators and electrical service providers.</li> <li>Re customer access: IOUs must file w/in 6 mos. advice letter including tariff changes to make price, usage and cost data available to customers online and updated at least daily. Each day's data, w/hourly or 15-min granularity, must be made available by next day. Tariff changes must offer residential customers bill-to-date, bill forecast data, projected month-end tiered rate, and notifications. Prices must state "all in" price to be paid by customers for electricity.</li> <li>IOUs must work w/CAISO to develop methodology to make wholesale prices available via website to customers</li> <li>Re third-party access: IOUs must file w/in 6 mos. application including tariff</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
						<p>changes to provide authorized third parties, e.g., utility contractors, access to customer usage data via the utility's backhaul. Applications should propose common data format, be consistent w/PUC order, and propose eligibility criteria, process for determining eligibility, and process for PUC oversight of third parties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopts reporting/audit requirements</li> </ul>
CA (Generic)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decided 6/24/10</li> <li>• Case R.08-12-009</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None. Adopts requirements for smart grid deployment plans pursuant to 2009 law (SB 17)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Investments must be consistent w/utility's Smart Grid Deployment Plan, which is filed in advance of any investments</li> <li>• Assessments regarding reasonableness of a project can only be made close to the time of deployment because of rapidly changing technologies and capabilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deployment plan must be filed by 7/1/11 and cover: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. compliance w/policy initiatives of SB 17</li> <li>b. Vision Statement</li> <li>c. Deployment Baseline</li> <li>d. strategy</li> <li>e. security and cyber security strategy</li> <li>f. Smart Grid Roadmap</li> <li>g. cost estimates</li> <li>h. benefits estimates</li> <li>i. metrics</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Technology inventory required to help ensure customers don't pay twice for same technology</li> <li>• Subjecting cyber security assessments to broad review will improve their quality, provide benefit of industry, academic and public interest expertise</li> <li>• Requires annual reports on SG developments</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
CA (Generic)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 9/10/09</li> <li>Case R.08-12-009</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. Establishes processes by which PUC will review individual projects and proposed investments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PUC will not review projects that do not require ratepayer funding</li> <li>Memorandum account allowed for booking costs of projects for which DOE funding sought</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires utilities to provide notice and information to PUC when they apply for federal grants</li> </ul>
CA (Pacific Gas and Electric)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 5/5/11</li> <li>Case A0912020</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$55m</b> (electric) related to recovery of and return on conventional meter investment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$1.1m for transmission modernization</li> <li>\$25m for storage project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves settlement providing for continuation of previously approved smart meter benefits calculation mechanism from which benefit amounts are booked to smart meter balancing account</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Per settlement, approves independent audit of smart meter-related costs and treatment of PUC consultant costs for smart meter evaluation as eligible cost in smart meter balancing accounts</li> <li>Addressing issue not resolved by settlement, accelerates amortization of undepreciated plant balance related to electromechanical meters replaced by smart meters to 6 yrs. vs. 18 yrs.</li> <li>Lowers associated rate of return on above unamortized balance from 8.79% to 6.3% (incorporating 6.55% ROE) to reflect reduced regulatory risk resulting from accelerated amortization</li> </ul>
CA (Pacific Gas and Electric)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 3/12/09</li> <li>Case A.07-12-009</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$466.8m</b> for upgrade to smart meters, to include an integrated load-limiting connect-disconnect switch, home area network (HAN) gateway device and advanced solid state meter</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$1.1m for transmission modernization</li> <li>\$25m for storage project</li> </ul> <p>Note: Awarded after PUC order</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PG&amp;E to determine revenue requirements based on approved costs and file advice letter to implement related rates</li> <li>PG&amp;E must show in next general rate case that it has avoided double recovery of any upgrade costs</li> <li>Approves costs for upgrades based on a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopts two-tier peak-time rebate incentive design</li> <li>PG&amp;E to file separately a proposal to implement this design in Nov 2009 rate design filing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PG&amp;E should work w/ major CA utilities on statewide, easily understandable information/other resources to increase consumer awareness of commercially available HAN technologies and HAN-enabled benefits</li> <li>Devices for in-home displays of energy use should be paid for by private industry who will profit from the device</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
				PG&E solicitation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disallows costs of recently deployed electromechanical meters in risk-based allowance for these upgrades because they were included in allowance for original installations</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires quarterly reports on project status and annual reports on energy savings/related financial benefits</li> </ul>
<b>CA</b> (Pacific Gas and Electric)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 7/20/06</li> <li>Case A.05-06-028</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$1.7b</b> for implementation of smart meters/related infrastructure, including risk-based allowance of \$128.8m and pre-deployment costs of \$49m</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$1.1m for transmission modernization</li> <li>\$25m for storage project</li> </ul> Note: Awarded after PUC order	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conventional rate base amortization of capital costs and annual recovery of operating costs via balancing account</li> <li>10% shareholder and 90% ratepayer risk-sharing of cost overruns up to \$100m</li> <li>Post-fact reasonableness review required only if costs exceed \$1.7846b</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves voluntary CPP program for residential and small commercial or industrial customers (&lt; 200 kW)</li> <li>PG&amp;E must consult w/ Office of the Public Advisor about marketing, promotional materials for CPP program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Customers must be provided web access to usage data for free on day-after basis</li> <li>PG&amp;E must hold public workshops, file proposal for automated data exchange to provide detailed TOU data to customers</li> <li>Adopts 20-year depreciation schedule for AMI communications</li> <li>Requires semi-annual progress reports on AMI deployment</li> </ul>
<b>CA</b> (San Diego Gas & Electric)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 4/12/07</li> <li>Case A.05-03-015</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$572m</b> for implementation of AMI Project (1.4m electric meters and 900,000 gas meters) from 2008 thru 2011</li> <li>Includes HAN communications systems and remote connect/disconnect function</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$572m in project costs deemed reasonable, recoverable in rates w/o after-the-fact reasonableness review</li> <li>90% of up to the first \$50m in project costs exceeding \$572m to be recovered in rates w/o after-the-fact reasonableness review; 10% to be borne by shareholders</li> <li>Project costs above \$622m may be recoverable in rates following PUC review</li> <li>10% of first \$50m in costs below \$572m to go to shareholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PTR, CPP and AMI-related dynamic rates to be determined in 1/31/07 general rate case Phase 2 (A.07-01-047)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finds AMI project as originally proposed and amended by SDG&amp;E would not be cost-effective, but finds the changes made by settlement resulted in project cost-effectiveness</li> <li>SDG&amp;E to seek proposals for HAN communications interface, based on an open standard capability for residential, C&amp;I customers.</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advanced Metering Infrastructure Balancing Account (AMIBA) to be established for recording/reconciling O&amp;M and capital costs/other items</li> </ul>		
CA (Southern California Edison)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 8/12/10</li> <li>Case E-4355</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$26m</b> for Tehachapi Wind Energy Storage Project (TSP)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$25m demonstration grant for TSP</li> <li>Additional cost share: \$1m from CEC, \$5.3m from third-party vendors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costs/funding amounts to be recorded in Smart Grid ARRA Memorandum Account (SGARRAMA), to be transferred after PUC review to distribution subaccount of Base Revenue Requirement Balancing Account for later recovery via distribution rates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires SCE to investigate feasibility of continued O&amp;M beyond projected 5-yr. demo life</li> <li>Finds TSP purpose is to generate data, not revenue, but if revenue were to be generated due to market/design regulatory changes, it must be recorded in SGARRAMA</li> </ul>
CA (Southern California Edison)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 9/18/08</li> <li>Case A.07-07-026</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$1.63b</b> for deployment of 5.3m AMI-enabled electric meters and related infrastructure over 5 years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$1.1m for transmission modernization</li> <li>\$40.1m for Irvine Smart Grid Demonstration</li> <li>\$24.9m for wind storage project</li> </ul> <p>Note: Awarded after PUC order</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costs to be recovered via SmartConnect Balancing Account</li> <li>SCE authorized to collect up to \$1.63b from the account</li> <li>Capital operational benefits to be credited to customers monthly</li> <li>Rate design as determined in general rate cases</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SCE to propose two-tiered PTR incentive program</li> <li>SCE to propose programmable communicating thermostat tariff</li> <li>Refuses to impose penalties on utility for failing to meet forecast demand response from its business case</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SCE to offer AMR services to other utilities at negotiated rates, subject to PUC approval</li> <li>Provides for cost sharing between shareholders (10%) and customers (90%) for cost overruns up to \$100m</li> <li>Authorizes up to \$3.5m on in-home information displays</li> <li>Requires annual reports on energy cost savings, related financial benefits</li> </ul>
CA (Southern California Edison)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 7/26/07</li> <li>Case A.06-12-026</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$45.2m</b> for pre-deployment activities, including AMI product mgt., information technology, business process/organizational readiness, field deployment, customer tariffs and programs, systems integration, and program mgt. and organization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$1.1m for transmission modernization</li> <li>\$40.1m for Irvine SG Demonstration</li> <li>\$24.9m for wind storage project</li> </ul> <p>Note: Awarded after PUC order</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides for rate-basing \$5.6m in capital costs related to meters, telecommunications</li> <li>Denies rate base treatment of \$14.1m in capital costs related to development of system architecture</li> <li>Non rate-based costs to be transferred to Base Revenue Requirement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides \$1.2m in funding for development of tariffs/programs that take advantage of proposed AMI deployment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finds expenditures will have value to PUC and state, whether or not AMI deployment is ultimately approved</li> <li>Requires SCE to share AMI technical/business requirements and testing results, subject to appropriate confidentiality requirements, w/other CA IOUs</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
				Balancing Account, to be recovered via distribution rates		
<b>CO</b> (Xcel Energy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 1/5/11</li> <li>Case 10A-124E</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$27.9m</b> for SmartGridCity (SGC) project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None for this project; other award totals for Xcel not available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disallows \$16.6m in costs unless and until company can prove benefits to ratepayers; limits amount that can be collected from ratepayers to \$27.9m as estimated in initial company filing. Xcel had been collecting costs up to \$44.5m cap per previous settlement agreement</li> <li>Collected disallowed costs expected to be reflected in rates as negative rider on monthly customer bills</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Says Xcel experienced difficulties w/planning and budgeting of SGC and costs quickly escalated, but that in itself does not necessarily indicate imprudence</li> <li>Nevertheless, cites concern whether SGC can achieve potential to justify higher costs, and about lack of detail on planned use of project</li> <li>Allows Xcel to seek recovery of disallowed investment in future application that shows “coherent and valuable” future for SGC</li> <li>Directs Xcel, consumer counsel and possibly staff to develop guidelines for use of tracking mechanism for intellectual property/patents that arise out of SGC</li> </ul>
<b>DE</b> (Delmarva Power & Light)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 9/16/08</li> <li>Case 07-28, Reg. 59</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. Approves plan for “diffusion” of advanced metering technology into electric and natural gas service areas; investment amount not addressed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delmarva to establish regulatory asset for recovery of/on operating costs related to AMI deployment, DR equipment</li> <li>Recovery of regulatory asset to be considered in general rate case</li> <li>Parties may challenge recovery of investment, other items in rate case</li> <li>Modified straight-fixed variable rate design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be considered in next general rate case</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Denies company proposals for surcharges for energy efficiency programs and lost revenues due to conservation; further consideration to be given in next general rate case</li> </ul>
<b>DC</b> (Pepco)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 12/17/09</li> <li>Formal Case</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$44.6m</b> to match federal stimulus grant for smart meter deployment and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$44.6m for smart meters (DC only)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pepco to establish regulatory asset for costs incurred net of federal</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TBD in later phases of proceeding</li> <li>Pepco to submit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finds benefit to cost ratio of 1.871 for the program</li> <li>Types of smart meters to be</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
	1056, et al.	related infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$4.4m for training</li> </ul>	funding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recovery of regulatory asset to be considered in general rate case</li> <li>Proposed rate design to be filed by 4/1/10</li> </ul>	proposal by 4/1/10, taking into account experience in "PowerCentsDC" smart meter pilot	installed and desired functionalities of SG systems, as well as reporting/customer education requirements, TBD in later phases <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires test data on proposed meter choices</li> </ul>
<b>GA</b> (Georgia Power)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 12/21/10</li> <li>Case 31958</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General rate case order does not specify Investment amount</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$165m investment grant to Southern Company Services to integrate SG technology into T&amp;D systems; GA share not specified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing DSM tariffs</li> <li>Base rates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$31.6m increase in DSM tariffs for existing real-time-pricing/other programs</li> <li>\$341m increase includes recovery for smart grid costs (amount not specified)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific findings not made on smart grid</li> </ul>
<b>HI</b> (Hawaiian Electric)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 2/25/11</li> <li>Case 2008-0083</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$5.3m for distribution automation and training</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves in general rate case certain AMI-related expenses previously in question per 7/2/09 interim decision, including: 1) \$244,000 of R&amp;D consulting costs, and 2) \$253,000 legal &amp; regulatory costs, amortized over two years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finds generally that HECO proved costs were reasonable and prudent</li> </ul>
<b>HI</b> (Hawaiian Electric)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 7/26/10</li> <li>Case 2008-0303</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Rejected</u>: Company request to spend approx. \$1.7m on extended pilot testing for AMI project; suspend remaining procedural steps pending completion of proposed extension; defer certain costs related to extension; and provide update on developments in the SG, CIS, cyber-security areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$5.3m for distribution automation and training</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dismisses application w/o prejudice</li> <li>Cites concerns by several consumer groups that pilot would not provide useful information on overall cost-effectiveness</li> <li>States that any new SG application should include or be preceded by an overall SG plan or proposal</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
ID (Avista)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 10/8/04</li> <li>Case AVU-E-0401, et al.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$16.4m</b> to install meter reading devices on all ID electric and gas meters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$5.9m for SG demonstration spanning 5 states</li> </ul> <p>Note: Awarded after PUC order</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costs to be capitalized as CWIP and recovered in rates when project is completed – cost recovery not requested at this time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Company to provide TOU rate proposal in next rate case</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff anticipates critical peak TOU pricing will become cost-effective by approx. when Avista completes AMR project and that additional components necessary for such a pricing system should begin to be installed at that time</li> </ul>
ID (Idaho Power)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 5/28/10</li> <li>Case IPC-E-10-06, et al.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$2.36m</b> for AMI investments in 2<sup>nd</sup> yr. of previously approved 3-yr. installation totaling \$70.9m</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$47m for smart meters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$2.36m to be added to rate base, resulting in 0.41% rate increase for customer classes receiving meters; reflects capital cost, accelerated depreciation of existing metering equipment, and inclusion of related net O&amp;M expenses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continues to find that AMI implementation will benefit customers and lower pressure for increased rates</li> </ul>
ID (Idaho Power)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 5/29/09</li> <li>Case IPC-E-09-07</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$10.5m</b> for AMI investments in 1<sup>st</sup> year of previously approved 3-yr. installation totaling \$70.9m</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$47m for smart meters</li> </ul> <p>Note: Awarded after PUC order</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$3.8m in capital cost to be added to rate base</li> <li>Recovery for non-capital expenses approved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encourages IP to institute appropriate and effective demand-side measures enabled by AMI</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rejects company-proposed test year (6/09 -6/10); instead requires actual costs through 2009 to be utilized</li> <li>Allows for accelerated 3-year depreciation of meters as of 6/1/09</li> </ul>
ID (Idaho Power)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 2/12/09</li> <li>Case IPC-E-08-16</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$70.9m</b> for AMI investments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$47m for smart meters</li> </ul> <p>Note: Awarded after PUC order</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TBD in future rate cases (See entry above for 5/29/09 decision in Case IPC-E-09-07.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires report detailing plan to introduce TOD, Energy Watch and/or other pilots throughout service territory once requisite AMI technology is fully deployed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3-year accelerated depreciation for <u>existing</u> meters required, but company is to make maximum efforts to resell existing meters and report on those efforts</li> </ul>
IL (Commonwealth Edison)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 5/24/11</li> <li>Case 10-0527</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. Rejects alternative rate plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$4m for alternative vehicle testing</li> <li>\$5m for testing high PV penetration impacts to grid</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rejects company-requested alternative rate plan featuring surcharge mechanism (Rate ACEP) by which future distribution automation and other smart grid programs would be funded.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<p>Regarding surcharge rejection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Says next step in commission process is to set a smart grid policy docket as the appropriate proceeding to consider funding proposals</li> <li>Notes absence of specific company proposal for SG</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Finds proposed Rate ACEP not likely to result in rates lower than would be in effect under traditional rate of return regulation</li> <li>- Finds other substantial benefits not likely to be realized that would not result in absence of alternative plan</li> </ul>		<p>programs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cites lack of reporting requirements in proposed Rate ACEP to enable effective monitoring</li> <li>• Cites lack of provision for equitable sharing of any economic benefits between ComEd/customers</li> </ul>
IL (Commonwealth Edison)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decided 10/14/09</li> <li>• Case 09-0263</li> </ul> <p>(See also Note in entry below for 9/10/08 decision in Case 07-0566.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>\$70.7m</b> (\$49.1m in capital costs and \$21.5m in O&amp;M costs) for pilot to install 141,000 AMI meters and related infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$4m for alternative vehicle testing</li> <li>• \$5m for testing high PV penetration impacts to grid</li> </ul> <p>Note: \$5m grant awarded after CC decision</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• O&amp;M costs related to Customer Applications Plan (\$12.6m) and amortized capital costs to be recovered via Rider AMP (Advanced Metering Pilot); rider previously approved as Rider SMP (See entry below for 9/10/08 decision in Case 07-0566.)</li> <li>• Unamortized capital costs to be added to rate base in general rate cases w/according removal from rider</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pilot customers to be on TOU rates</li> <li>• Use of inclining block rates and various DSM incentives to be tested as part of Customer Applications Program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary goal of AMI pilot is to demonstrate and confirm benefits and costs of AMI deployment throughout service territory</li> <li>• Approves specific technologies, vendors for pilot</li> <li>• Allows 10-year depreciation for retired meters</li> <li>• Company prohibited from disconnecting meters w/o site visit, as required by current regulation</li> </ul>
IL (Commonwealth Edison)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decided 9/10/08</li> <li>• Case 07-0566</li> </ul> <p>Note: The 2nd District Appellate Court of Illinois on 9/30/10 held that the IL Commerce Commission (CC) “abused its discretion” in portions of its 9/10/08 decision. The court</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None. General rate case order approves special rate treatment for future SG and AMI projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$4m for alternative vehicle testing</li> <li>• \$5m for testing high PV penetration impacts to grid</li> </ul> <p>Note: Awarded after CC decision</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approves new Rider SMP (Systems Modernization Projects) – later renamed Rider AMP in Case 09-0263</li> <li>• Allows recovery of costs of Phase 0 – a scaled deployment of AMI – via Rider SMP</li> <li>• Company to forgo recovery under Rider SMP if and to the extent actual earnings exceed last authorized rate of return</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rider SMP would cover only pre-approved costs</li> <li>• Existing meters not yet fully depreciated to be recorded as regulatory asset</li> <li>• Requires company to hold workshops to develop specific proposals for CC review</li> <li>• Establishes Statewide Smart Grid Collaborative</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
	reversed the CC's approval of Rider SMP, saying it violates a rule against single-use ratemaking. (Gen. No. 02-08-0959).					
<b>IN</b> (AEP-Indiana Michigan Power)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 6/13/07</li> <li>Case 43231</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. As part of broader settlement agreement, primarily involving depreciation rates, company agrees to explore w/consumer counsel a smart meter pilot program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None (in IN)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Company to collaborate w/ consumer counsel on appropriateness and timing of providing smart meters to I&amp;M's general body of IN retail customers.</li> <li>Collaborative to address ratemaking treatment of capital costs and O&amp;M expenses of any such smart metering program</li> <li>Scope, cost recovery and other aspects to be considered in future filing</li> </ul>
<b>IN</b> (Duke Energy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 11/4/09</li> <li>Case 43501</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Rejected</u>: Settlement calling for \$445m for smart meters/related infrastructure for all customers in IN, distribution automation, and distributed generation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$21.8m for wind storage project</li> <li>\$200m for grid modernization, including smart meters, over service area</li> </ul> <p>Note: Awarded after URC decision; company had argued that approval delay could jeopardize chances for obtaining funds</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finds settlement was incomplete and gave rise to too much uncertainty around next steps; therefore, URC says it could not find the proposed collaborative approach would result in long-term ratepayer benefits.</li> <li>Alternative regulatory plan for which Duke originally sought approval is still under consideration</li> <li>Duke submitted proposed order on 8/20/10</li> </ul>
<b>LA</b> (Generic)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 9/22/09</li> <li>Case R-29213 and R-29213 Subdocket A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. Approves regulatory framework for certification/cost recovery of advanced metering system (AMS)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilities will be allowed to recover prudently incurred costs under a mechanism approved by the PSC in an order</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See certification parameters in Summary of Other Key Findings column.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sets monitoring requirements, including utility biannual (min.) reports</li> <li>Sets certification parameters for any new AMS</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
		and demand response (DR) programs		<p>authorizing an AMS or DR plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilities will be able to recover prudently incurred, smart grid-related costs including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>capital costs/return on investment</li> <li>implementation, operating, marketing, other expenses</li> <li>depreciation for capital investments related to meters/associated data transmission systems, w/depreciation TBD by PSC</li> <li>any additional costs related to updating legacy systems or other indirect costs</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<p>pilot/program, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>benefits outweigh costs</li> <li>one or more functional/operational applications, e.g., DR management, distribution asset optimization</li> <li>specific DR programs that facilitate customer attainment of net benefits</li> <li>previous testing/installation of technology in other locations</li> <li>one or more advanced system capabilities, e.g., automated meter reading, support for dynamic or incentive pricing and ancillary services, remote disconnection/reconnection capability; provision of price signals to facilitate DR programs, response to load control events, other incentive pricing</li> <li>provide customers information and technological ability to pre-program response to DR/load control events</li> <li>utility may not transfer customer information from any AMS outside the customer-utility working relationship w/o prior PSC approval, except for aggregated data</li> <li>certification means utility decision to deploy AMS or DR pilot or program is deemed prudent</li> </ul>
<b>ME</b> (Bangor Hydro-Electric)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 1/8/10</li> <li>Case 2006-661 (II), et al.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$7.8m</b> for future investments in MDMS, advanced meters and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves rate recovery and regulatory asset to track related costs and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Declines to approve cost recovery related to proposed dynamic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finds AMI program cost-effective based on revised BHE filing, despite company failure</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
		additional AMI investments to complete ongoing deployment initiative		carrying costs using last approved wgted. avg. cost of capital <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disallows \$280,000 related to revenue protection software, citing lack of cost-effectiveness</li> </ul>	pricing trials, citing lack of immediate cost recovery need and possible excessive costs related to certain HAN technology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initiates separate investigation into dynamic pricing trials in Case 2010-14</li> </ul>	to win DOE \$4.3m stimulus grant <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagrees w/Public Advocate stance that due to evolving nature of technology, investments should not proceed. Says this is right time for AMI deployment, noting significant investment made already</li> </ul>
<b>ME</b> (Bangor Hydro-Electric)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 7/28/09</li> <li>Case 2006-661, et al.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. Approves AMI deployment subject to conditions (described in Summary of Other Key Findings)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific funding not approved</li> <li>States that full/timely cost recovery will be allowed for prudently incurred smart grid investments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves installation of AMI technology conditioned on BHE receiving \$4.3m stimulus grant</li> <li>Approval is also contingent on subsequent cost-effectiveness review of a future specific SG proposal</li> </ul>
<b>ME</b> (Central Maine Power)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 5/19/11 (Part 1) and 6/22/11 (Part 2)</li> <li>Case 2010-345, et al.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. Approves customer opt-out program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allows CMP to defer for future recovery variances in costs of opt-out program caused by difference between the assumed and actual opt-out participation levels</li> <li>Treatment of deferred amounts to be separately addressed in conjunction w/CMP alternative rate plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Orders CMP to implement opt-out program under which customers may choose to retain existing analog meter or obtain receive-only smart meter w/transmission function disabled</li> <li>Opt-out customers to pay initial one-time charge (\$40 for analog, \$20 for receive-only smart meter) and recurring mo. charge (\$12 for analog, \$10.50 for receive-only SM); customers who choose later (after 30 days) to opt out to pay \$25 surcharge, which may be waived subject to CMP review</li> <li>LIHEAP customers to receive discount on both one-time and mo. recurring charges</li> <li>Affirms support for CMP's AMI initiative and smart grid technology generally</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
ME (Central Maine Power)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 1/7/11</li> <li>Case 2010-345, et al.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. Initiates limited investigation into whether customer inability to opt out of AMI initiative is unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$95.9m investment grant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Probe will include opt-out alternatives and impact of opt-out options on AMI performance and benefits.</li> </ul>
ME (Central Maine Power)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 2/25/10</li> <li>Case 2007-215(II)</li> </ul> <p>Note: In this docket on 7/28/09, the PUC approved CMP installation of AMI technology subject to receipt of a DOE grant.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$95.9m</b>, matched by stimulus grant, to install 650,000 smart meters and related systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$95.9m investment grant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Levelized ratemaking dictated by previous stipulations on revenue requirement/reorganization; levelized amount to remain in distribution rates for 22-yr. life of AMI investment</li> <li>During existing alternative regulation plan(ARP) (thru 2013), annual reconciliations to update costs; methodology for adjustments beyond ARP period is left open</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PUC to open proceeding to consider pricing programs, e.g., dynamic pricing, supported by AMI platform</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finds operational and supply-side benefits likely to exceed investment cost.</li> <li>Will allow CMP to defer/recover incremental customer communication costs, including carrying costs, subject to PUC approval</li> <li>Declines to delay approval until taxability of DOE grants is resolved; says taxability is unlikely</li> <li>Approves CMP proposal to record value of retired meters in regulatory asset account, to be amortized at related existing depreciation amounts</li> <li>Cost allocation/rate design to be addressed in separate proceeding</li> </ul>
MD (Generic)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 9/28/07</li> <li>Case 9111</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. Primarily establishes scope and parameters for potential AMI and DSM programs that will help achieve state efficiency targets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sets minimum requirements for AMI implementation, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hourly meter reads delivered one time/day</li> <li>Nondiscriminatory access for other providers to meter data and DR control functions that is equivalent to electric company's own access to those functions</li> <li>AMI to be implemented for all customers of electric co.</li> <li>Metering, meter data mgt. generally continues to be electric co. function</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All AMI meters to have ability to monitor voltage, report data in way that allows utility reaction to info; have remote programming capability; two-way communications capability; time-stamp capability; 14 days data storage; ability to communicate outages, restorations; net metering, bi-directional capability</li> <li>Remote dis-/reconnect for meters ≤ 200 amps.</li> </ul>
<b>MD</b> (Baltimore Gas and Electric)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 8/13/10</li> <li>Case 9208</li> </ul> <p>Note: The PSC on 6/21/10 in Case 9208 rejected BGE initial proposal as placing too much risk on customers. The 8/13/10 order accepts BGE's revised proposal w/modifications.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$713m</b> deployment plan for AMI and related infrastructure, but approval of specific cost recovery is deferred to future proceedings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$200m for smart meters</li> </ul> <p>Note: Awarded funding was jeopardized by rejection of initial plan in 6/21/10 PSC decision, and preserved with subsequent approval in this order</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rejects BGE-proposed hybrid cost recovery method that would have allowed some (25%) costs to be recovered during implementation, in favor of creation of regulatory asset account, w/all cost recovery TBD in a rate case upon project completion</li> <li>Cost recovery of existing meters to be considered in future proceeding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rejects initial company-proposed mandatory TOU rates</li> <li>Approves revised proposal allowing customers to opt into TOU rates and incorporating peak time rebates into existing TOU and non-TOU rate schedules</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BGE must submit for approval updated customer education plan, related proposed messaging to be provided customers prior to/during installation of meters, before PTRs, and before other programmatic changes take effect</li> <li>Company w/other parties to develop, submit for approval a comprehensive set of metrics by which the PSC may measure effectiveness of customer education plan</li> <li>Company and other parties must develop, submit for approval comprehensive set of installation, performance, benefits and budgetary metrics that will allow PSC to assess initiative's progress, performance</li> </ul>
<b>MD</b> (Delmarva Power & Light, Pepco)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 9/2/10</li> <li>Case 9207</li> </ul> <p>Note: The PSC on 8/5/09 in Case</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conditionally approves Pepco proposal, projected @<b>\$69.4m</b> (total \$137.7m offset by \$68.3m of DOE award)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None for DP&amp;L</li> <li>Total \$104.8m for Pepco for smart meters (MD share not</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authorizes Pepco to establish regulatory asset for incremental costs related to AMI deployment, including</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prohibits both companies from implementing critical peak pricing rate structure at this time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finds Delmarva P&amp;L, in absence of stimulus funding, must make better showing of cost-effectiveness; requires as condition for future AMI</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
	9207 rejected companies' request for approval to establish a regulatory asset for cost recovery, citing need for careful review, and initiated this proceeding to consider AMI proposal and cost recovery mechanisms.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Defers approval of Delmarva P&amp;L proposal, projected @\$51m</li> </ul>	specified)	<p>startup costs. After delivery of cost-effective AMI system, Pepco may seek cost recovery in base rate proceeding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Defers approval of Delmarva P&amp;L regulatory asset, pending submission of revised business case and approval of AMI deployment</li> <li>Cost recovery for legacy meters to be considered in future depreciation proceeding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires both companies to submit plan detailing how proposed critical peak rebate (CPR) pricing structures will be funded, including how companies intend to monetize peak demand and energy use reductions attributable to AMI (for Delmarva P&amp;L, subject to authorization of AMI deployment)</li> <li>Approves concept of dynamic rate schedule that combines Standard Offer Service rates w/CPR opportunities for residential and sm./med. commercial customers once AMI is installed by Pepco and subject to approval of Delmarva P&amp;L deployment</li> <li>Directs staff to convene working group to develop proposal for uniformity of critical peak period seasons, times, frequency, duration and other aspects of dynamic pricing implementation</li> </ul>	<p>approval submittal of amended business case, including 10-year life for AMI meters (vs. company-requested 15-year life) and full analysis of projected benefits (operational, &amp; supply-side savings)/costs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires Pepco, not as condition of approval of AMI, to submit revised business case, including 10-year life for AMI meters (vs. company-requested 15-year life) and full analysis of projected benefits (operational, &amp; supply-side savings)/costs</li> <li>Reiterates requirements for Pepco to develop w/other parties plan for metric and consumer education and communications. (See entry below for 8/13/10 order in Case 9207.)</li> </ul>
<b>MD</b> (Pepco)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 8/13/10</li> <li>Case 9207</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. Approves regulatory treatment for cost recovery (See also entry above for 9/2/10 decision in Case 9207.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total \$104.8m for smart meters (MD share not specified)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mimics 8/13/10 BG&amp;E order above (Case 9208) – regulatory asset to be created w/recovery in future rate case</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See entry above for 9/2/10 order in Case 9207.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Purpose of order is to send appropriate signal in time to ensure Pepco does not lose opportunity to reduce customer costs by funding in part w/ARRA grant</li> <li>Company to submit modified business case showing cost</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
						<p>effectiveness, including full analysis of projected benefits (operational, &amp; supply-side savings)/costs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pepco w/other parties must: develop/submit for approval detailed, comprehensive customer education &amp; communications plan</li> <li>• Pepco w/other parties must develop, submit metrics for all aspects of system installation, performance, customer benefits, customer education/communications, and budget.</li> </ul>
<b>MA</b> (NSTAR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decided 3/15/10</li> <li>• Case DPU 09-33</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>\$15.5m</b> for pilot w/dynamic pricing, urban grid/renewables integration, and distribution automation components</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$7.6m for demonstrations and \$10.1m investment grant supporting distribution automation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approves recovery of dynamic pricing-related costs via basic service (supply) rates</li> <li>• Approves recovery of distribution infrastructure-related costs via distribution rates</li> <li>• Costs not capped but company must show prudence when it seeks recovery</li> <li>• Requires cost tracking report, revised tariff to ensure recovery of incremental-only costs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accepts dynamic pricing component as in compliance w/2008 state law (GCA), including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TOU-CPP and CPR</li> <li>- marketing/evaluation plan, even though not final</li> <li>- technology platform</li> </ul> </li> <li>• States intent to convene statewide process to achieve uniformity for evaluation of all utility pilots</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accepts distribution infrastructure component as in compliance w/GCA, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- urban grid &amp; RE integration</li> <li>- distribution automation</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Approves performance incentive per GCA, based on load reduction/customer participation in dynamic pricing program; rejects intervenor requests to exclude DOE funding from calculation, saying this could be disincentive to pursuing federal grants</li> </ul>
<b>MA</b> (National Grid – Massachusetts Electric and Nantucket Electric)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decided 3/4/11</li> <li>• Case DPU 09-32</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None. Approves w/o comment company motion to withdraw smart grid pilot filed 4/1/09 (See also entry below for 7/27/10 decision in Case DPU 09-32.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Company said in motion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New pilot proposal to be filed by end of 2011</li> <li>- Technology proposed for 4/1/09 proposal may no longer represent most innovative solution in today's advancing market</li> <li>- Close coordination w/administration and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
						<p>stakeholders will better enable pilot proposal that best serves customers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fresh look at smart technology may allow design that demonstrates benefits in more cost-effective manner</li> </ul> <p>Note: National Grid also has filed to withdraw similar pilot proposal in New York (Case 09-E-0310)</p>
<b>MA</b> (National Grid – Massachusetts Electric and Nantucket Electric)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 7/27/10</li> <li>Case DPU 09-32</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Defers approval of <b>\$56.4m</b> pilot filed 4/1/09 until review of revised filings, as directed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recovery of customer-facing costs allowed via basic service (supply) rates</li> <li>Distribution grid-facing costs allowed via distribution rates</li> <li>Costs related to proposed technology center disallowed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dynamic pricing program allowed w/3 TOU price tiers, opt-out, bill protection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires revised marketing/evaluation plans w/more detail</li> <li>Requires participation in statewide SG evaluation collaborative</li> <li>Requires further info on IT investments, performance mechanism, cost recovery</li> <li>Allows 5-yr depreciation life for all pilot SG technologies</li> </ul>
<b>MA</b> (Northeast Utilities – Western Massachusetts Electric)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 7/21/09</li> <li>Case DPU 09-34</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Rejected</u>: Proposed 6-mo. pilot as not in compliance w/2008 Green Communities Act (GCA)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finds proposal not in compliance w/GCA because it lacked rate treatment for projected \$2.5m of program costs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finds proposal not in compliance w/GCA because it lacked TOU or CPP pricing, automated load mgt. technologies</li> <li>Finds merit in inclining block component but does not accept, saying scope of effects to be studied should be broader</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires refiling to correct statutory deficiencies and to broaden scope beyond proposed low-income segment</li> <li>Requires more detailed explanation of why distribution automation technologies would not be included</li> <li>Dismisses pay-as-you-go component under which customers pre-pay for electricity; saying related request for temp. waiver of certain billing/termination regs would inappropriately revise consumer protections in too targeted a proceeding</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
MA (Unitil)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 4/12/10</li> <li>Case DPU 09-31</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$204,424</b> for 3-mo. pilot in MA, NH</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves cost recovery for all pilot components via basic service (supply) rates</li> <li>Requires proportional allocation between MA/NH customers</li> <li>Requires cost tracking report and revised tariff language to ensure incremental-only costs recovered</li> <li>Finds proposed contingency budget for cost overruns inappropriate for pilot; Unitil must address cost changes in future filings</li> <li>Costs not capped but company must show prudence when it seeks recovery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves demand reduction plan including TOU-CPP pricing and differentials between on-peak, off-peak and critical peak periods</li> <li>Approves related technology platform</li> <li>Approved related evaluation plan but requires filing of formal plan w/more detail</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves demand reduction component as compliant w/2008 state law (GCA)</li> <li>Requires filing of formal evaluation plan for overall pilot</li> </ul>
MA (Unitil)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 2/29/08</li> <li>Case DPU 07-71</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$4.5m</b> for AMI investment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allows \$4.5m of AMI investment in rate base, finding plant was placed in service/used &amp; useful in 2006 test year</li> <li>Disallows \$700k of post-test year expenditures, saying not significant increase to year-end rate base</li> <li>Requires related depreciation/property tax adjustments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires report on plans for demand response/conservation programs under AMI strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires report on AMI features, e.g., disconnection, and future cost/benefit savings for each system capability</li> <li>Requires master timetable for future application development</li> </ul>
MI (Consumers Energy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 11/4/10</li> <li>Case U-16191</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves continuation of previously approved AMI/SG pilot (See also entry for 11/2/09 decision in Case U-15645.)</li> <li>Post-2009 investment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Defers rate inclusion of pilot costs until pilot completion; costs are included in rate base as CWIP w/AFUDC offset</li> <li>Disallows \$41m, mostly related to full</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Withholds approval of full deployment in absence of cost/benefit data</li> <li>Warns generally favorable view of AMI/ SG should not be seen as "blank check"</li> <li>Disallows cost related to</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
		amount not specified		deployment, which is delayed per company decision made in light of budget and economy		expanding existing A/C load control pilot, citing use of non-AMI technology and sufficient number of participants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopts guidelines to ensure ratepayers do not pay costs exceeding benefits, e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Direct pilot expenses are recoverable w/o cost/benefit analysis (and subject to continued CWIP treatment)</li> <li>Capitalized expenditures for full deployment incurred during pilot are subject to "used and useful" principle</li> <li>Any future approval of full deployment subject to conditions, e.g., detailed lifecycle cost/benefit analysis</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>MI</b> (Consumers Energy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 11/2/09</li> <li>Case U-15645</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$40.7m</b> in 2009 for AMI pilot</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Base rate recovery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rejects staff proposal to refund any portion of ARRA or other funds received, saying project is essential to MI future and it expects utility "to expend all the available monies on AMI infrastructure"</li> </ul>
<b>MI</b> (Detroit Edison)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 9/14/10</li> <li>Case U-16276</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. Approves experimental TOU rate to facilitate SmartCurrents program implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$84m investment grant for SmartCurrents program</li> <li>\$5m demonstration grant for storage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Optional TOU rate includes dynamic pricing period for 5,000 residential/100 commercial customers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>MT</b> (NorthWestern Energy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 3/15/11</li> <li>Case D2011.1.7</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. Issues accounting order authorizing expense deferral</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authorizes company to defer recognition during 2011-12 of up to \$16.93m of expense-related portion of Phase 1 of multiyear distribution infrastructure repair and improvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Company said in 1/24/11 motion for accounting order that the project's goals are, among other things, to position NWE to adopt smart grid by accomplishing necessary tasks, regardless of</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
				<p>plan. These costs to be amortized over five years beginning in 2013.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost recovery not allowed until specific phase-in expenses approved by PSC</li> </ul>		<p>scale and form of any future smart grid deployment</p>
<b>NV</b> (NV Energy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decided 3/14/11</li> <li>• Case 10-08014, et al.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None. Approves dynamic pricing component of Advanced Service Delivery smart grid initiative (See also entry below for 7/28/10 decision in Case 10-02009.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$138m to integrate SG technologies, install 1.3m meters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approves company-proposed Nevada Dynamic Pricing Trial (NDPT) with two advanced rate options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Enhanced TOU rate that will more closely match system hourly variation in costs throughout year than current TOU options</li> <li>- CPP schedule that overlays TOU-E option w/dispatchable rate that can be called day ahead during limited hours in summer</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approves rate design and rate options; specific rates to be set in general rate cases</li> <li>• Approves tariffs containing best bill guarantee for first year, specifying voluntary nature of advanced rate options, and providing for opt-out after first year of participation</li> <li>• Approves equal payment plan (EPP) despite concerns that price signals will be muted; cites Consumer Bill of Rights, which authorizes EPP for all customers</li> <li>• Requires study of whether NDPT participants enrolled in EPP behave differently than those not enrolled</li> <li>• Requires arrearsages study</li> </ul>
<b>NV</b> (NV Energy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decided 7/28/10</li> <li>• Case 10-02009, et al.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approves integrated resource plan (IRP) calling for <b>\$301m</b> investment in electric/gas Advanced Service Delivery smart grid initiative</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$138m to integrate SG technologies, install 1.3m meters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost recovery not included in approved IRP</li> <li>• Allows regulatory asset for stranded non-AMI electric meter costs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approves dynamic pricing study in concept; project details/tariffs to be filed, subject to review</li> </ul> <p>(See entry above for 3/14/11 decision in Case 10-08014.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approves IRP w/SG project</li> <li>• Requires showing of ratepayer benefits, cost prudence in future rate proceedings</li> <li>• Says SG project likely not viable w/o stimulus grant</li> <li>• Cites concern about customer acceptance in light of rollout experience in CA, TX</li> <li>• Requires company review of existing customer privacy policies, report to PUC</li> <li>• Will open investigation of remote termination</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
<b>NJ</b> (Jersey Central Power & Light)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 8/19/09</li> <li>Case EO08050326</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$11.9m</b> expansion of previously approved integrated distributed energy resource (IDER) pilot</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves recovery via existing rider, RGGI Recovery Charge (RRC), subject to annual true-up and reconciliation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finds settlement adequately shields ratepayers from future unnecessary or imprudent costs</li> <li>Says initial integration of residential and commercial customer load mgt. devices w/SG utility operations will improve system reliability needs &amp; optimum resource utilization</li> <li>Cites total resource cost test, which found project cost-effective</li> <li>Notes EPRI selected IDER pilot as SG demo project</li> </ul>
<b>NY</b> (Generic)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 8/18/11</li> <li>Case 10-E-0285</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. Approves SG policy statement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cost recovery to be addressed through traditional methods for most smart grid projects; risk-sharing mechanisms to be considered for novel or unproven technology</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In short term, utilities must pursue established reliable technologies that can provide relatively certain ROI. In longer term, stimulus funding &amp; continued standards dvmt. will help identify most effective, efficient technologies.</li> <li>Utilities/communication providers should jointly ensure appropriate use of commercial facilities and limit utility capex in dedicated communications infrastructure</li> <li>Utilities must provide consumers w/basic information and develop customer education plans before implementing customer-centric technologies</li> <li>SG projects must have demonstrable net benefits</li> <li>Utilities should develop SG plans/projects using existing industry standards as building blocks</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilities must develop capability to build/maintain cyber security standards</li> <li>Utilities/third-party providers must protect customer privacy; customer data should be made available timely to authorized third parties w/compensation to utilities of related costs</li> </ul>
<b>NY</b> (Central Hudson Gas & Electric, Consolidated Edison, New York State Electric & Gas, National Grid, Orange and Rockland Utilities, Rochester Gas and Electric)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 10/19/10</li> <li>Case 09-E-0310</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$145.2m</b> for Con Edison</li> <li><b>\$21.3m</b> for NGrid</li> <li><b>\$3.3m</b> for CHG&amp;E</li> <li><b>\$3.6m</b> for RG&amp;E</li> <li><b>\$11m</b> for NYSEG</li> <li><b>\$3.7m</b> for ORU</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approx. \$187m to ConEd for investment and demo grant projects</li> <li>Approx. \$30m to NYSEG for storage demonstration</li> <li>\$37.4 to NYISO on behalf of transmission owner utilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves surcharge recovery for Con Edison via existing Monthly Adjustment Clause collected on volumetric basis from all customers</li> <li>Approves separate mo. Con Edison surcharges under PASNY, EDDS tariffs</li> <li>Requires deferral mechanisms for approved ARRA projects of remaining 5 utilities; amounts to be considered in future rate cases</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves NGrid request for customer funding for energy storage demo project even though it received less (48%) than the 50% matching funds grant required by 7/27/09 order (see below); finds project worthy of funding, says NGrid portion (\$.16m) is less than half of total project cost (\$6.5m)</li> </ul>
<b>NY</b> (Central Hudson Gas & Electric, Consolidated Edison, New York State Electric & Gas, National Grid, Orange and Rockland Utilities, Rochester Gas and Electric)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 7/27/09</li> <li>Case 09-E-0310, et al.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total <b>\$825m</b>, contingent on award of DOE 50% matching grants (included in approved total), for various SG initiatives:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-\$175m for ConEd</li> <li>-\$145m for NGrid</li> <li>-\$36m for RG&amp;E</li> <li>-\$20m for NYSEG</li> <li>-\$10m for CHG&amp;E</li> <li>-\$5m for ORU</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approx. \$187m to ConEd for investment and demo grant projects</li> <li>Approx. \$30m to NYSEG for storage demonstration</li> <li>\$37.4 to NYISO on behalf of transmission owner utilities</li> </ul> <p>Note: Awarded after PSC decision</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves surcharge recovery, effective upon completion of each project and contingent on award of 50% matching DOE grant</li> <li>Companies to propose individual surcharge mechanisms after DOE grants announced</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed rate designs include:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ConEd: PTR, CPP, HPP, TOU-dynamic block</li> <li>- ORU: TOU-dynamic block</li> <li>- CHG&amp;E: HPP, TOU-static block</li> <li>- NGrid: PTR, CPP, HPP</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agrees w/DOE that appropriate time to consider net benefits of pilots is at their conclusion</li> <li>Applies criteria beyond that of DOE to qualitatively assess ratepayer value, e.g., expansion of existing programs, leveraging other funds, system wide benefits, foundational information</li> <li>Requires quarterly reports on surcharge, other info</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
<b>OH</b> (AEP-Columbus Southern Power, Ohio Power)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 3/18/09</li> <li>Reheard 7/23/09</li> <li>Case 08-917-EL-SSO, et al.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$32m</b> for 3-yr. pilot (Phase 1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$75.2m SG demonstration grant for gridSMART pilot</li> </ul> <p>Note: Awarded after PUC order; PUC had directed company to seek ARRA funds for balance of projected costs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decreases company-requested \$64m to \$32m over 3 yrs., citing availability of federal funds</li> <li>Approves recovery via rider, subject to annual true-up/reconciliation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On rehearing, clarifies intent to approve recovery of all prudently incurred Phase 1 costs once company properly seeks federal stimulus funds</li> </ul>
<b>OH</b> (Dayton Power and Light)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 1/5/11</li> <li>Case 08-1094-EL-SSO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. Approves DP&amp;L withdrawal of AMI/SG plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DP&amp;L cited several factors, including economic conditions, lack of federal stimulus funding, and other AMI/SG plans being implemented in the state from which the company can learn</li> </ul>
<b>OH</b> (Dayton Power and Light)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 6/24/09</li> <li>Case 08-1094-EL-SSO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. Approves settlement providing for DP&amp;L to present independent business cases for AMI/SG plans for review/approval</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DP&amp;L agreed to delay implementation of proposed infrastructure investment rider until review/approval by PUC of AMI/SG plans</li> <li>Rider would recover prudently incurred costs related to approved plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finds settlement furthers policy for PUC review of AMI/SG plans</li> </ul>
<b>OH</b> (Duke Energy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 5/13/10</li> <li>Case 09-543-GE-UNC, et al.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$4.2m</b> for SG pilot w/telecom, AMI, distribution automation and IT components</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total \$22m for storage demonstration</li> <li>Total \$200m investment grant for grid modernization</li> <li>Total \$3.5m for workforce training</li> </ul> <p>Note: Duke to advise on OH portion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves rider charges of \$0.49 for residential, \$0.71 for non-residential (Distribution Reliability-Infrastructure Modernization rider was previously approved in Case 08-920-EL-SSO)</li> <li>All stimulus funds to be applied to offset project costs</li> <li>Disallows costs for Envision Center</li> <li>Duke to continue</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Duke to work w/collaborative on dynamic pricing options including CPP, TOU, PTR, RTP</li> <li>Duke to work w/C&amp;I customers to design SG rates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Duke to study momentary interruptions from SG deployment</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
				recognizing accumulated deferred income taxes as rate base offset and apply pre-tax rate of return in future rider		
<b>OH</b> (Duke Energy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 12/17/08</li> <li>Case 08-920-EL-SSO, et al.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. Approves settlement providing for cost recovery mechanism for SG technologies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total \$22m for storage demonstration</li> <li>Total \$200m investment grant for grid modernization</li> <li>Total \$3.5m for workforce training</li> </ul> <p>Note: Awarded after PUC decision; Duke to advise on OH portion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves Distribution Reliability-Infrastructure Modernization rider to recover costs related to SG technologies; initially set at zero</li> <li>For each annual rider filing, 85% of revenue requirement to be recovered from residential on per-meter basis, capped @\$0.50 in '09, increasing annually to \$5.50 in '13; 15% to be recovered from non-residential</li> <li>Allows regulatory asset for replaced meters, w/recovery thru existing depreciation rates</li> </ul>	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Duke to convene working group or collaborative to explore ways to maximize project benefits</li> <li>Provides for various reporting requirements</li> </ul>
<b>OH</b> (FirstEnergy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 8/25/10</li> <li>Case 10-388-EL-SSO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unspecified level of incremental costs that must be matched by federal funds for previously approved pilot (See entry below for 6/30/10 decision in Case 09-1820-EL-ATA.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$36.1m for OH share of \$57.5m investment grant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves recovery of incremental costs over 10 years that are matched by DOE stimulus funds</li> <li>FE may not complete any part of OH deployment for which matching funds not available; must seek PUC guidance on how to proceed in that event</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See entry below for 6/30/10 decision in Case 09-1820-EL-ATA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See 6/30/10 entry for Case 09-1820-EL-ATA</li> </ul>
<b>OH</b> (FirstEnergy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 6/30/10</li> <li>Case 09-1820-EL-ATA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. Approves pilot but defers cost recovery resolution</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$36.1m for OH share of \$57.5m investment grant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cost recovery sought via previously approved rider mechanism (Rider AMI), which will be fixed monthly charge vs. initially proposed usage sensitive charge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PTR pricing available initially to 5,000 randomly selected customers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves staff recommendations previously agreed to by FE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create database of momentary interruption data</li> <li>Keep accounting records separate for actual costs</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost recovery TBD when separate electric supply plan reviewed</li> <li>• Conditionally approves recovery of lost distribution revenue</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Set/report on target values for service reliability performance indices in project area</li> <li>- Share w/PUC metrics developed w/DOE</li> <li>- Report results of initial 5,000 meter deployment</li> </ul>
<b>OH</b> (FirstEnergy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decided 3/25/09</li> <li>• Case 08-935-EL-SSO, et al.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None. Approves settlement for FE to develop proposal to pursue stimulus funding for SG investment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$36.1m for OH share of \$57.5m investment grant</li> </ul> <p>Note: Awarded after PUC decision</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approves unavoidable rider recovery w/annual true-up</li> <li>• Any over-/under-recovery due to time-differentiated rate structures to be passed thru via rider, allocated on voltage-differentiated basis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FE to work w/parties to develop CPP, TOD, RTP tariffs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides for consideration of load factor pricing for two-non-residential rates</li> </ul>
<b>OH</b> (FirstEnergy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decided 1/21/09</li> <li>• Case 07-551-EL-AIR, et al.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None. Approves as part of general distribution rate case an AMI cost recovery mechanism</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$36.1m for OH share of \$57.5m investment grant</li> </ul> <p>• Note: Awarded after PUC decision</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approves AMI/Modern Grid rider, set at zero balance until further eval of costs/benefits of a completed smart grid project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Directs FE to work w/staff on study of SG technology and deployment options</li> </ul>
<b>OK</b> (AEP-Public Service Co. of Oklahoma)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decided 1/5/11</li> <li>• Case PUD 201000050</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None. As part of general rate case, approves expansion of time of day pilots to include gridSMART customers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low-interest loan from OK Department of Commerce as part of ARRA Loan Program to finance \$20m pilot</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PSO will expand/modify existing experimental TOD tariffs by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Allowing gridSMART customers to take TOD service</li> <li>- Eliminate lesser of TOD or standard tariff rate feature</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>
<b>OK</b> (AEP-Public Service Co. of Oklahoma)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decided 1/14/09</li> <li>• Case PUD 200800144</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$2m annually to expand gridSMART pilot begun in 2007 by AEP system to test feasibility of implementing SG throughout company system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low-interest loan from OK Dept. of Commerce as part of ARRA loan program to finance \$20m pilot</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Base rates</li> <li>• Approved funding is to be used to repay ARRA loan and for O&amp;M costs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires PSO to maintain data on benefits from increased reliability and whether customers will take advantage of increased capabilities re usage information</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
<b>OK</b> (Oklahoma Gas and Electric)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 7/1/10</li> <li>Case PUD 201000029</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$366.4m</b> full deployment throughout service territory (Phase II)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$130m investment grant for 771,000 smart meters/related projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves rider recovery of levelized costs thru 2012, followed by true-up; any over-/under-recovery to flow to ratepayers via fuel clause adjustment (FCA)</li> <li>Authorizes regulatory assets for pre-implementation O&amp;M, stranded meter, web portal costs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves provision calling for OG&amp;E to evaluate feasibility of implementing in 2011 rate case an hourly-differentiated FCA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finds guarantees of operational savings, customer web portal were key to approval</li> </ul>
<b>OK</b> (Oklahoma Gas and Electric)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 7/24/09</li> <li>Case PUD 200800398</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to <b>\$20m</b> for SG pilot in Norman OK (Phase I)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$130m investment grant for 771,000 smart meters/related projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves tariff rider w/6-mo. true-up for recovery of up to \$20m of capital/O&amp;M costs related to pilot in Norman, OK</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves residential/general service VPP tariffs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costs to be allocated via distribution plan allocator</li> <li>Requires annual progress reports</li> </ul>
<b>OR</b> (Portland General Electric)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 5/5/08</li> <li>Case UE-189</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$132.2m</b> for AMI deployment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$3m for solar PV integration systems</li> </ul> <p>Note: Awarded after PUC decision</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costs to be recovered in rate base w/monthly adjustments as meters are received by PGE, but w/6-month lag</li> <li>Rates also to reflect O&amp;M savings and accelerated depreciation of existing meters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Company commits to filing an experimental CPP tariff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Company agreed in stipulation to set of "AMI Conditions" that must be satisfied</li> <li>Rate impacts are mitigated by timing deployment w/tax decrease</li> <li>PGE to file general rate case after 2010 to fully capture operational benefits</li> </ul>
<b>PA</b> (Duquesne Light)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 2/24/11</li> <li>Case R-2010-2179522, et al.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. Approves ROE/cost of capital component of SG plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves settlement in general rate case providing for 10% ROE and cap structure up to 46% common equity for purpose of establishing company Smart Meter Charge for three years (See entry below for 4/15/10 decision in Case M-2009-2123948)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approval given without comment</li> </ul>
<b>PA</b> (Duquesne Light)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 4/15/10</li> <li>Case M-2009-2123948</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. Approves smart meter technology procurement and installation plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves Smart Meter Charge (SMC) rider w/annual reconciliation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capital structure, cost of capital based on litigated base rate case if less than 3 yrs. old; if last rate case is older, specifies other bases</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows interest on net over-/under-collections @6%/yr.</li> <li>• Requires use of projected avg. plant balance for quarter when setting SMC vs. company-requested use of actual timing of when investment placed in service</li> <li>• Finds it premature to require deployment of smart meters that include home area networks</li> <li>• Requires parties to address need, ability and cost of sub-hourly metering</li> <li>• Non-direct common costs to be allocated on per-meter vs. per-customer basis</li> </ul>
<b>PA</b> (FirstEnergy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decided 4/15/10</li> <li>• Case M-2009-2123950</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None. Approves smart meter technology procurement and installation plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total \$57.5m investment grant</li> </ul> <p>Note: PA share not specified</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approves Smart Meter Technologies Charge, a reconcilable (annual) adjustment clause expressed as mo. customer charge, directly assigned to each customer class</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capital structure, cost of capital based on litigated base rate case if less than 3 yrs. old; if last rate case is older, specifies other bases</li> <li>• Allows interest on net over-/under-collections @6%/yr.</li> <li>• Allows current recovery of startup, Assessment Period costs vs. capitalization/depreciation</li> <li>• Requires costs savings to be reflected in tracker</li> <li>• Non-direct common costs to be allocated on per-meter vs. per-customer basis</li> </ul>
<b>PA</b> (PECO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decided 4/22/10</li> <li>• Case M-2009-2123944</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None. Approves smart meter technology procurement and installation plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$200m investment grant for 600,000 smart meters and related systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved settlement provides for Smart Meter Cost Recovery Surcharge (SMCRS) w/annual reconciliation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PECO to file dynamic pricing and customer acceptance program in mid-2010</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SMCRS charges allocated to the residential class to be recovered on per-kWh basis; costs for all C&amp;I customers to be recovered via customer charge.</li> <li>• SMCRS was calculated based on federal taxability. if federal</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
						<p>funds are subsequently deemed not subject to taxes, then corresponding reduction in smart metering costs to be reflected as over-recovery through the SMCRS reconciliation mechanism.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Common costs to be allocated based on number of meters connected to system.</li> <li>• Interest on both over and under recoveries will be at the rate of six percent.</li> <li>• Solicits comments on appropriateness of requiring PECO to implement Electric Data Interchange Historic Interval Usage protocols</li> </ul>
<b>PA</b> (PPL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decided 4/15/10</li> <li>• Case M-2009-2123945</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None. Approves smart meter plan to study/test extended capabilities for existing AMI system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$19.1m investment grant for distribution mgt. system and SG technologies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annually reconcilable automatic adjustment clause</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capital structure, cost of capital based on litigated base rate case if less than 3 yrs. old; if last rate case is older, specifies other bases</li> <li>• Allows interest on net over-/under-collections @6%/yr.</li> <li>• Denies feeder meter pilot, saying such meters are distribution system upgrade, not smart meter project</li> <li>• Requires PPL to ensure pilots address data access and sub-hourly metering issues</li> </ul>
<b>TX</b> (CenterPoint Energy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decided 5/12/11</li> <li>• Case 38339</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approves adjustments to previously approved project total (\$640m) to reflect stimulus award</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$200m for smart meters and distribution automation, less \$50m designated by company to pursue separate intelligent grid initiative</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approves reduction of previously approved 12-yr. surcharge period to 6 yrs. to reflect stimulus grant</li> <li>• Says CenterPoint anticipates receiving an additional \$124m in stimulus funding for AMS, which amount has been applied to reduce</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approves acceleration of AMS deployment from 5 yrs. to 3 yrs. as condition of stimulus grant</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
				estimated future costs		
TX (CenterPoint Energy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 12/22/08</li> <li>Case 35639</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$640m</b> for AMI and related infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$200m for smart meters and distribution automation, less \$50m designated by company to pursue separate intelligent grid (IG) initiative</li> </ul> <p>Note: Awarded after PUC decision</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monthly surcharge to be recovered over 12 years for the 5 years of deployment costs</li> <li>Surcharge subject to future reconciliation and inclusion of costs in base rates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves 10.75% ROE for use in calculating surcharge</li> <li>Approves terms and conditions of specific vendor contracts</li> <li>Surcharge recovery of \$5.6m approved to cover costs of consumer education</li> <li>Surcharge recovery of \$7.5m to pay for specified number of in-home monitors for low-income customers</li> <li>Company must support HAN functionality</li> <li>Common AMS web portal to be developed</li> </ul>
TX (CenterPoint Energy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 8/29/08</li> <li>Case 35620</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. Approves settlement allowing installation of 125,000 meters while AMS deployment plan under consideration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$200m for smart meters and distribution automation</li> </ul> <p>Note: Awarded after PUC decision</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finds accelerated deployment consistent w/intent of legislature that net metering and advanced meter information networks be deployed as rapidly as possible.</li> <li>Under the settlement, retail electric providers are to finance advanced meter buildout before CenterPoint implements AMS plan.</li> </ul>
TX (Oncor)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decided 8/29/08</li> <li>Case 35718</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>\$686m</b> for AMI and related infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$3.5m for dynamic line rating project</li> <li>\$188,000 for workforce training</li> </ul> <p>Note: Awarded after PUC decision</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monthly surcharge – Rider AMCRF - Advanced Metering Cost Recovery Factor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approves 10.75% ROE for use in calculating surcharge</li> <li>After deployment plan is completed, Oncor to seek to recover additional costs in base rate cases</li> <li>Approves terms and conditions of specific vendor contracts</li> <li>Allows for waiver of meter requirements in certain situations</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Company must support HAN functionality</li> <li>• \$15.1m approved for customer education to be included in surcharge</li> <li>• \$10m approved for low-income home monitors</li> <li>• Common AMS web portal to be developed</li> </ul>
<b>TX</b> (Texas-New Mexico Power)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decided 7/8/11</li> <li>• Case 38306</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>\$113.4m</b> per settlement for AMS deployment, including \$66.3m of capital</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approves 12-yr. surcharge recovery w/annual reconciliation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approves 10.125% ROE for calculating surcharge</li> <li>• Approves 7-yr. depreciation meter investment</li> <li>• Approves 5-yr. depreciation for IT/software assets</li> <li>• Surcharge recovery of \$1.95m approved to cover costs of consumer education</li> <li>• Requires TNMP to annually reduce two meter-related discretionary service charges – standard disconnecting service for non-payment (DNP) and standard reconnect after DNP – over 5-yr. deployment period to reflect progressive reduction in costs. Thereafter, TNMP must reduce all discretionary service charges.</li> </ul>
<b>VT</b> (Central Vermont Public Service)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decided 8/6/10</li> <li>• Case 7612</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to <b>\$31m</b> for AMI implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$31m via Energy Vermont Project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recovery proposed via “new initiative adder,” which is under review in Case 7586</li> <li>• Non-power cost cap per existing alternative regulatory plan may be adjusted to accommodate incremental costs/benefits, subject to outcome of Case 7586</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CVPS to develop dynamic pricing programs over time and present rate design filings for approval</li> <li>• CVPS to conduct PTR trial</li> <li>• CVPS to file voluntary RTP for general service and residential customers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cites as a basis for approval CVPS collaboration w/other utilities via eEnergy Vermont Project and adoption of open architecture</li> <li>• Says it will play ongoing role in ensuring customer interests met via outreach, education</li> <li>• Approves review, change-control processes</li> <li>• Bases approval on assumption that stimulus funds will not be</li> </ul>

State/Company	Decision Date/ Docket	Approved Investment	Stimulus Funding	Cost Recovery	Dynamic Pricing/ DSM	Summary of Other Key Findings
						reduced by taxes

Note: Public utility commission cases are listed first by any generic orders, then alphabetically by company and chronologically for each company, starting with the most recent.

Source: State commission decisions

EI contact: Martha Rowley, Manager of Regulatory Analysis, 202-508-5251, [mrowley@eei.org](mailto:mrowley@eei.org)

## Acronym Glossary

AFUDC – allowance for funds used during construction

AMI – advanced metering infrastructure

AMR – automated meter reading

AMS – advanced metering system

ARRA – American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009

CAISO – California Independent System Operator

C&I – commercial and industrial

CIS – customer information system

CPP – critical peak pricing

CPR – critical peak rebate

CWIP – construction work in progress

DOE – U.S. Department of Energy

DR – demand response

DSM – demand-side management

EDDS – Economic Development Delivery Service (NY)

GCA – Green Communities Act (2008 MA law)

HAN – home area network

HPP – hourly pricing program

IOUs – investor-owned utilities

IRP – integrated resource plan

LIHEAP – low-income home energy assistance program

MDMS – meter data management system

N/A – not applicable or not addressed

NYISO – New York Independent System Operator

O&M – operation and maintenance

PASNY – Power Authority of the State of New York

PG&E – Pacific Gas and Electric

PSC – public service commission

PTR – peak time rebate

PUC – public utility or utilities commission

PV – photovoltaic

RE – renewable energy

RGGI – regional greenhouse gas initiative

ROI – return on investment

RTP – real time pricing

SB – Senate bill

SDG&E – San Diego Gas & Electric

SCE – Southern California Edison

SG – smart grid

TBD – to be determined

TOD – time of day

TOU – time of use

TOU-CPP – time of use rates w/critical peak pricing

URC – utility regulatory commission

VPP – variable peak pricing