Company Exhibit_______

BEFORE THE
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company and The Toledo Edison Company for Authority to Provide for a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to R.C. 4928.143 in the Form of an Electric Security Plan	)))))))	Case No. 14-1297-EL-SSO

SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF

EILEEN M. MIKKELSEN

ON BEHALF OF

OHIO EDISON COMPANY
THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC ILLUMINATING COMPANY
THE TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY

DECEMBER 22, 2014

INTRODUCTION

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, POSITION, AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is Eileen M. Mikkelsen. I am employed by FirstEnergy Service Company as the Director of Rates and Regulatory Affairs for the FirstEnergy Corp. Ohio utilities (Ohio Edison Company ("Ohio Edison"), The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company ("CEI") and The Toledo Edison Company ("Toledo Edison") (collectively, the "Companies"). My business address is 76 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio 44308.

Q. HAVE YOU PROVIDED WRITTEN TESTIMONY BEFORE IN THESE PROCEEDINGS?

A. Yes. I submitted written direct testimony on August 4, 2014 in which I provided an overview of and support for the application for the Companies' fourth electric security plan entitled Powering Ohio's Progress (also referred to as "ESP IV"). My testimony also addressed a number of policy issues and included some specific recommendations related to the Powering Ohio's Progress filing.

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?

A. My supplemental testimony supports the Stipulation and Recommendation ("Stipulation") filed on December 22, 2014 in this proceeding. In particular, I provide an overview of the Stipulation and explain why the terms and conditions of the Stipulation are more favorable to customers in the aggregate than the expected results that would otherwise apply under a market rate offer ("MRO"). My testimony also discusses the criteria the Commission has used in the past when considering stipulated agreements, and I will describe how the Stipulation in this proceeding meets these criteria.

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE PROVISIONS OF THE STIPULATION.

A. The Stipulation, as a package, in large part extends the terms and conditions of the Companies' current and prior Electric Security Plan Stipulations approved in Cases No. 12-1230-EL-SSO and 10-388-EL-SSO and adds an Economic Stability Program to address retail price volatility, expected increases in prices and reliability challenges. The Economic Stability Program will help stabilize retail rates and protect against increasing market prices and volatility over the longer term. The Stipulation resolves many complex issues associated with electric service after May 31, 2016. The Stipulation is a comprehensive plan designed to provide more stable and predictable electric prices than would otherwise have been in place during the term of ESP IV and beyond, provide over $2 billion in retail rate stability credits over a fifteen-year period, assure continuous supply of power for Standard Service Offer ("SSO") customers procured through a competitive bid process, enhance delivery service, promote economic development, assure job retention, promote energy efficiency and demand response, and provide support for low income programs. Importantly, the Stipulation's provisions provide significant customer value that otherwise would not have been available under an MRO. While not all inclusive, the following provides an overview of of the salient features of the Stipulation.

- The Signatory Parties expressly agree and recommend that the Commission approve and adopt the ESP IV filing in its entirety as filed by the Companies except as modified in the Stipulation.

- In order to promote economic development and job retention, system reliability and stability, and certainty regarding retail electric service, the Economic Load Response Program Rider ("Rider ELR") that would otherwise expire will renew June 1, 2016 with modifications and participation limitations and shall expire May 31, 2019. Participation is voluntary and is limited to customers who are currently taking service under Rider ELR plus up to 75,000 kW of additional Curtailable Load from customers who have historically been eligible for Rider ELR but are not currently taking service under Rider ELR. Only Emergency Curtailment Events will apply. In order to further promote the competitive retail market, Rider ELR customers may elect to shop during the ESP IV period.

- In order to promote economic development and job retention by encouraging increased production in the state of Ohio and to provide stability and certainty regarding retail electric service, the Economic Development Rider – Automaker Credit Provision ("Rider EDR (h)") that would otherwise expire will continue with modifications and expire May 31, 2019. This credit will continue to transition the eligible automakers to market based pricing and, consistent with the principle of gradualism, the discount will be limited to $0.01 per kWh for kWh usage exceeding the automakers' Baseline Usage. The Economic Development Rider – Automaker Charge Provision ("Rider EDR (i)") will continue during ESP IV and expire on May 31, 2019 subject to final reconciliation.

- In order to transition more gradually to market based pricing customers taking service on the Companies' General Service - Transmission tariff ("Rate GT"), the Economic Development Rider – General Service – Transmission (Rate GT) Provision ("Rider EDR (d)") will be modified from the ESP IV Application to more gradually phase down the provision. The charge for June 1, 2016 through May 31, 2017 will remain at $8.00 per kVa of billing demand and will reduce by $2.00 per year in each of the subsequent years of the ESP IV.

- In order to provide more stability and certainty regarding retail electric service, the Generation Cost Reconciliation Rider ("Rider GCR") will be recovered via a bypassable charge unless the Rider balance exceeds 10% of the applicable generation expense in two consecutive quarters during the term of ESP IV.

- In order to promote economic development and job retention, the Delta Revenue Recovery Rider ("Rider DRR") rate design will be modified to provide that costs recovered through Rider DRR will be allocated to rate schedules based on a percentage of base distribution revenue collected from that rate schedule.

- In order to align the costs and benefits of the Economic Stability Program better with customers' unique load characteristics and capacity charges, the Retail Rate Stability Rider ("Rider RRS") rate design will be modified for Rate GS, GP, GSU and GT customers. The costs/credits will be allocated to the rate schedules as described in the Companies' Application, but will be recovered from customers on those rate schedules based on each customer's billing demand, rather than on energy consumed.

- In order to provide more stability and certainty regarding retail electric service and to provide customers an opportunity to learn about time-differentiated rates, the Generation Service Rider Time-Of-Day Option will continue during the period of this ESP.

- In order to promote energy efficiency, the Companies will provide additional energy efficiency and peak demand reduction programs that will be in addition to the programs approved by the Commission in Case No. 12-2190-EL-POR et al. To promote energy efficiency and peak demand reduction the Companies will:

    - provide funding to help the City of Akron achieve its energy efficiency and sustainability goals;

    - provide funding to certain energy efficiency administrators for their role in submitting completed projects that count toward the Companies' energy efficiency compliance obligations, and/or for use as seed money to provide upfront loans to assist in investments in energy efficiency, and/or to encourage the advancement and education of energy efficiency;

    - perform 300 energy efficiency audits for the Council of Smaller Enterprises ("COSE") commercial and industrial customers;

- In order to assist at-risk populations, during the period of ESP IV, the Companies, in aggregate, will provide $4.17 million to the Cleveland Housing Network ("CHN"), the Council for Economic Opportunities in Greater Cleveland ("CEOGC") and the Consumer Protection Association

("CPA") for a Fuel Fund Program to assist low income customers in paying their electric bills. CHN, CEOGC and CPA will each receive $463,333 annually for the fuel fund program. Ten percent of the annual funding will be used to offset the costs of administering the fuel fund.

- In order to assist at-risk populations, promote energy efficiency and to promote the retail competitive markets, during the period of this ESP, the Companies, in aggregate, will provide $3 million to the Citizens Coalition for its use in: 1) establishing a Customer Advisory Agency to provide independent assistance to all of the Companies' residential customers who have questions related to shopping or other energy usage concerns; 2) providing additional fuel funding to the agencies as noted above; and/or 3) providing energy efficiency assistance.

- During the term of ESP IV, the Companies will select the Administrator of the Community Connections program. The CHN will be allocated $1.7 million of the annual Community Connections program funding for each year of the ESP IV.

Q. **PLEASE DESCRIBE THE BACKGROUND CIRCUMSTANCES THAT LED TO THE STIPULATION.**

A. The Companies filed an ESP IV Application with the Commission on August 4, 2014 following pre-filing discussions about its content with a number of interested stakeholders. Following the filing date, the Companies met with various parties to review the details of the Application and communicated their interest in attempting to achieve a settlement of this proceeding. All parties were provided an opportunity to participate in the settlement process. Subsequent to those conversations the Companies engaged in negotiations with parties culminating in the development of this Stipulation. Issues and concerns raised by the Signatory Parties have been addressed in this Stipulation and reflect, as a result of these discussions and compromises by the Signatory Parties, an overall reasonable resolution of all such issues.

Q. PLEASE IDENTIFY THE PARTIES THAT HAVE SIGNED THE STIPULATION IN THIS PROCEEDING.

A. The Signatory Parties to the Stipulation include: Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, The Toledo Edison Company, Ohio Power Company, Ohio Energy Group, City of Akron, Council of Smaller Enterprises, Nucor Steel Marion Inc., Material Sciences Corporation, The Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Ohio, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers – Local 245, Council for Economic Opportunities in Greater Cleveland, Consumer Protection Association, Cleveland Housing Network and Citizens Coalition. As can be seen from this list, the Signatory Parties represent varied and diverse interests including large industrial customers, small and medium businesses, mercantile customers, colleges and universities, low income residential customers, organized labor and a large municipality.

Q. WHAT CRITERIA HAVE THE COMMISSION USED IN CONSIDERING APPROVAL OF A STIPULATION AMONG SIGNATORY PARTIES TO A PROCEEDING?

A. My understanding is that a stipulation must satisfy three criteria: (1) the stipulation must be the product of serious bargaining among capable, knowledgeable parties; (2) the stipulation must not violate any important regulatory principle or practice; and (3) the stipulation must, as a package, benefit ratepayers and the public interest.

Q. DOES THE STIPULATION IN THIS PROCEEDING SATISFY THE CRITERIA ABOVE?

A. Yes, it does.

Q. IS THE STIPULATION A PRODUCT OF SERIOUS BARGAINING AMONG CAPABLE, KNOWLEDGEABLE PARTIES?

A. Yes, it is. The Signatory Parties to the Stipulation have a history of participation and experience in matters before the Commission and are represented by experienced and competent counsel. The Signatory Parties are knowledgeable about the Companies and the importance of electric security to their clients. The Signatory Parties represent a broad range of interests including the Companies, another Ohio electric distribution utility, organized labor, various consumer groups (themselves representing a range of customer classes and varied interests), and a large municipality. The Stipulation is a product of serious bargaining among the Signatory Parties. The Signatory Parties had the opportunity to participate in the extensive discovery served on the Companies – over 2,250 questions including subparts - the vast majority of which were responded to prior to this Stipulation. Many of the provisions of the Stipulation have been the subject of litigation in the Companies' prior MRO and ESP cases, which included fully litigated cases involving extensive discovery, pre-filed testimony, days of hearings with multiple witnesses and briefs. Moreover, nearly all of the Signatory Parties to the Stipulation fully participated in prior MRO and ESP cases. For these reasons the Signatory Parties are very familiar with and knowledgeable about most of the provisions of the Stipulation. This coupled with the recent negotiations, particularly regarding the Economic Stability Program, enabled the Signatory Parties to gain familiarity with and knowledge of the various components of the Stipulation.

Q. DOES THE STIPULATION VIOLATE ANY IMPORTANT REGULATORY PRINCIPLE OR PRACTICE?

A. No, it does not. Based on my experience with the regulatory process and my understanding of the Stipulation, I believe the Stipulation is consistent with regulatory principles and practices in Ohio. In particular, the Economic Stability Program as implemented through Rider RRS, is a term, condition or charge that relates to bypassibility and default service as would have the effect of stabilizing or providing certainty regarding retail electric service and also is an economic development and job retention program. Several components of the Stipulation in this proceeding are similar to those in the stipulations approved in prior ESP proceedings.

Q. DOES THE STIPULATION AS A PACKAGE BENEFIT CUSTOMERS AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST?

A. Yes, it does. Customers will benefit from this Stipulation because it is designed to ensure the provision of adequate, safe, reliable and predictably priced electric service. The Stipulation supports economic development and job retention; continues the regulatory principle of gradualism to stabilize rates and helps transition customers to fully market based prices; supports competitive markets; encourages energy efficiency and peak demand reduction; protects at-risk populations through low income programs; and provides benefits to large industrial customers that will allow them to better compete in the global marketplace. The aforementioned provisions, in addition to other comprehensive components of the Application, will benefit customers and are in the public interest.

Q. DO YOU BELIEVE THE SIGNATORY PARTIES HAVE HAD SUFFICIENT TIME TO CONSIDER AND DISCUSS ESP IV TOPICS, AND TO BECOME KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT THE DIFFERENT COMPONENTS OF THE STIPULATION?

A. Yes. The Companies filed their Application in this proceeding on August 4, 2014 following pre-filing meetings with a number of interested parties. Since that filing, there have been numerous meetings with the Signatory Parties and others to review the Application and negotiate the Stipulation. There has been significant discovery in this proceeding on various topics by Signatory Parties and others. The Parties to this proceeding are generally knowledgeable regarding the components of the ESP IV and have litigated these topics or similar topics in other proceedings. Even the Parties who did not sign the Stipulation were involved in discussions and had adequate time to provide recommendations and input into the development of this ESP IV.

Q. HOW DOES THE STIPULATION IMPACT THE ESP VERSUS MRO "IN THE AGGREGATE TEST"?

A. The Stipulation provides additional quantitative and qualitative benefits of the proposed ESP IV compared to the expected results of an MRO that were not included in the Companies' Application. The addition of these benefits reinforces and strengthens the Companies' original conclusion that the proposed ESP IV is more favorable in the aggregate than the expected results of an MRO.

Q. WHAT ARE THE ADDITIONAL QUANTITATIVE BENEFITS OF THE PROPOSED ESP IV RESULTING FROM THE STIPULATION, AS COMPARED TO THE EXPECTED RESULTS OF AN MRO?

A. Under the Stipulation, the Companies will provide funding to the Fuel Fund Program to assist low income customers with the payment of their electric bills. Specifically, the Companies will provide CHN, CEOGC, and CPA (collectively with others, "Citizens Coalition") funding in aggregate of $1,390,000 each year for 2017, 2018, and 2019, for a total of $4,170,000 over the term of ESP IV. In addition, the Companies will provide an additional $1,000,000 to Citizens Coalition each year for 2017, 2018, and 2019, or $3,000,000 over the term of ESP IV, for use in: (1) establishing a Customer Advisory Agency, (2) providing additional fuel funding, or (3) providing energy efficiency assistance. These total funds of $7,170,000 over the term of ESP IV would not be available under an MRO, and the Companies will not seek to recover the funds from customers. Therefore, the Companies' low income funding and funding of the Customer Advisory Agency are additional quantitative benefits of the ESP compared to an MRO.

Q. QUANTITATIVELY, HOW DOES THE PROPOSED ESP IV, INCLUDING THE IMPACT OF THE STIPULATION, COMPARE TO THE RESULTS THAT WOULD OTHERWISE OCCUR UNDER AN MRO?

A. Overall, the proposed ESP IV, including the impact of the Stipulation, is estimated to be more favorable than the expected results of an MRO by $2.028 billion on a nominal basis and $779 million on a net present value basis, as summarized in the table below.

Quantitative Benefit of ESP IV		
($ in Millions)	**Total**	**NPV**
Economic Development Funding	$3.0	$2.6
Low Income & Customer Advisory Agency Funding	$7.2	$6.1
Retail Rate Stability Rider	$2,018.0	$770.0
Total Quantitative Benefit	$2,028.2	$778.7

Q. WHAT ARE THE ADDITIONAL QUALITATIVE BENEFITS OF THE PROPOSED ESP IV RESULTING FROM THE STIPULATION, AS COMPARED TO THE EXPECTED RESULTS OF AN MRO?

A. The Stipulation provides additional qualitative benefits through various tariff provisions that provide stability and certainty regarding retail electric service, promote customer optionality, economic development, job retention and retail competition, and provide enhanced system reliability via demand response that would not be available under an MRO. First, the Companies will continue, with certain modifications, the Rider ELR tariff. Rider ELR provides economic development and job retention benefits to participating customers and also provides benefits to all customers from a system reliability perspective. Under the Stipulation, the Companies will make available an additional 75,000 kW of Curtailable Load to participate under Rider ELR, thereby enhancing these benefits. In addition, the Companies are supporting the competitive retail market by allowing Rider ELR customers, which currently represent almost three million MWh annually, to shop during the ESP IV period. Second, the Companies will continue to make available an Automaker Credit provision under Rider EDR (h), which provides economic development and job retention benefits to eligible automaker facilities by encouraging increased production within the State of Ohio. Third, the slower phase out of Rider EDR (d) provided by the Stipulation will allow Rate GT customers to more gradually transition to market based pricing. Fourth, the Companies will offer a time-of-day pricing option under Rider GEN. This tariff provision will provide eligible customers the option to take SSO service under a time-differentiated pricing structure, thereby enhancing customers' opportunities to lower their electric bills. It will also provide an opportunity for customers to learn about time-differentiated pricing. These tariff provisions provide qualitative benefits compared to an MRO, and many were recognized by the Commission in the Companies' current ESP.[1]

For these reasons, the Stipulation provides additional qualitative benefits compared to an MRO that were not included in the Companies' Application.

Q. IS THE COMPANIES' PROPOSED ESP, INCLUDING THE IMPACTS OF THE STIPULATION, MORE FAVORABLE IN THE AGGREGATE THAN THE EXPECTED RESULTS OF AN MRO?

A. Yes. Combining the additional quantitative and qualitative benefits discussed above, with the benefits described in the direct testimony of Company witness Fanelli, the proposed ESP IV, including the impacts of the Stipulation, is more favorable in the aggregate than the expected results of an MRO.

---

[1] See Case No. 12-1230-EL-SSO, Opinion and Order at p. 56 (July 18, 2012).

Q. **HAVE YOU ESTIMATED RIDER RRS RATES FOR CUSTOMERS FOR THE TERM OF THE ECONOMIC STABILITY PROGRAM BASED ON THE MODIFIED RATE DESIGN?**

A. Yes. Attachment EMM-1 contains illustrative Rider RRS rates for the term of the Economic Stability Program that are calculated as demand based charges or credits for customers served on rate schedules GS, GP, GSU and GT.

Q. **HAVE THE ESTIMATED RIDER RRS RATES FOR THE RESIDENTIAL AND LIGHTING RATE SCHEDULES CHANGED AS A RESULT OF THE MODIFIED RATE DESIGN?**

A. No. The estimated Rider RRS rates for rate schedules RS, STL, POL and TRF have not changed from what is shown on Attachment JMS-2 (Revised) to Companies' witness Savage's testimony.

Q. **PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY COMMISSION APPROVAL OF THE STIPULATION IS REQUESTED BY APRIL 8, 2015.**

A. Approval of the Stipulation by April 8, 2015 is necessary in order for the Companies to have adequate time to offer capacity arising from the Economic Stability Program and eligible Rider ELR demand response resources, if any, into the 2018-2019 PJM Base Residual Auction in May 2015.

Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. Yes. I reserve the right to supplement my testimony.

Attachment EMM-1

Estimated Demand Based Rider RRS Rates 2016-2031 - Rate Schedules GS, GP, GSU, & GT
For Illustrative Purposes

I. Rider RRS Revenue Requirement Summary ($M)

Line	Line Item	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
	Estimated RRS Revenue Requirement by Company																
1	OE	$ 76.2	$ 88.8	$ 47.0	$ (48.9)	$ (86.0)	$ (90.4)	$ (72.7)	$ (78.8)	$ (57.7)	$ (101.3)	$ (78.0)	$ (117.7)	$ (116.6)	$ (154.9)	$ (114.7)	$ (16.6)
2	CEI	$ 60.2	$ 70.2	$ 37.2	$ (38.6)	$ (67.9)	$ (71.5)	$ (57.5)	$ (62.3)	$ (45.6)	$ (80.1)	$ (61.7)	$ (93.0)	$ (92.1)	$ (122.4)	$ (90.6)	$ (13.1)
3	TE	$ 30.8	$ 35.9	$ 19.0	$ (19.7)	$ (34.7)	$ (36.5)	$ (29.4)	$ (31.8)	$ (23.3)	$ (40.9)	$ (31.5)	$ (47.5)	$ (47.1)	$ (62.5)	$ (46.3)	$ (6.7)
4	Total	$ 167.2	$ 194.9	$ 103.2	$ (107.3)	$ (188.6)	$ (198.4)	$ (159.5)	$ (172.9)	$ (126.6)	$ (222.3)	$ (171.2)	$ (258.2)	$ (255.7)	$ (339.8)	$ (251.6)	$ (36.4)

II. Estimated Rider RRS Rates

Line	Line Item	Annual Billing units		Allocation Factor	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	
	OE																				
5	Rate GS	24,284,353	kW	33.31%	1.7916	1.2186	0.6448	(0.6705)	(1.1791)	(1.2404)	(0.9972)	(1.0809)	(0.7913)	(1.3896)	(1.0701)	(1.6137)	(1.5986)	(2.1242)	(1.5729)	(0.5467)	$ per kW
6	Rate GP	6,344,729	kW	10.95%	2.2554	1.5340	0.8117	(0.8441)	(1.4843)	(1.5614)	(1.2553)	(1.3607)	(0.9962)	(1.7494)	(1.3472)	(2.0315)	(2.0124)	(2.6740)	(1.9800)	(0.6882)	$ per kW
7	Rate GSU	2,449,865	kVa	3.49%	1.8633	1.2674	0.6706	(0.6973)	(1.2263)	(1.2900)	(1.0371)	(1.1241)	(0.8230)	(1.4452)	(1.1130)	(1.6783)	(1.6626)	(2.2092)	(1.6358)	(0.5686)	$ per kVa
8	Rate GT	11,348,375	kVa	14.86%	1.7105	1.1634	0.6156	(0.6401)	(1.1257)	(1.1842)	(0.9520)	(1.0319)	(0.7555)	(1.3267)	(1.0217)	(1.5407)	(1.5262)	(2.0280)	(1.5016)	(0.5220)	$ per kVa
	CEI																				
9	Rate GS	22,160,318	kW	41.90%	1.9519	1.3276	0.7025	(0.7305)	(1.2846)	(1.3513)	(1.0864)	(1.1776)	(0.8621)	(1.5140)	(1.1659)	(1.7581)	(1.7416)	(2.3142)	(1.7136)	(0.5956)	$ per kW
10	Rate GP	900,623	kW	2.21%	2.5386	1.7267	0.9137	(0.9500)	(1.6707)	(1.7575)	(1.4129)	(1.5315)	(1.1213)	(1.9690)	(1.5163)	(2.2865)	(2.2651)	(3.0098)	(2.2286)	(0.7746)	$ per kW
11	Rate GSU	8,390,252	kW	18.38%	2.2615	1.5382	0.8139	(0.8464)	(1.4884)	(1.5657)	(1.2587)	(1.3644)	(0.9989)	(1.7541)	(1.3508)	(2.0370)	(2.0179)	(2.6813)	(1.9854)	(0.6901)	$ per kW
12	Rate GT	6,155,540	kVa	8.40%	1.4093	0.9586	0.5072	(0.5274)	(0.9275)	(0.9757)	(0.7844)	(0.8502)	(0.6225)	(1.0931)	(0.8418)	(1.2694)	(1.2575)	(1.6709)	(1.2372)	(0.4300)	$ per kVa
	TE																				
13	Rate GS	7,459,593	kW	25.16%	1.7786	1.2098	0.6401	(0.6656)	(1.1706)	(1.2314)	(0.9899)	(1.0731)	(0.7856)	(1.3796)	(1.0624)	(1.6021)	(1.5870)	(2.1088)	(1.5615)	(0.5428)	$ per kW
14	Rate GP	2,636,742	kW	10.75%	2.1494	1.4620	0.7736	(0.8044)	(1.4146)	(1.4881)	(1.1963)	(1.2968)	(0.9494)	(1.6672)	(1.2839)	(1.9360)	(1.9179)	(2.5484)	(1.8870)	(0.6559)	$ per kW
15	Rate GSU	224,172	kVa	1.00%	2.3611	1.6060	0.8498	(0.8836)	(1.5539)	(1.6346)	(1.3141)	(1.4245)	(1.0429)	(1.8314)	(1.4103)	(2.1267)	(2.1068)	(2.7994)	(2.0728)	(0.7205)	$ per kVa
16	Rate GT	9,400,579	kVa	36.88%	2.0694	1.4075	0.7448	(0.7745)	(1.3619)	(1.4327)	(1.1518)	(1.2485)	(0.9140)	(1.6051)	(1.2361)	(1.8639)	(1.8465)	(2.4535)	(1.8167)	(0.6315)	$ per kVa

NOTES
1-4 Source: Attachment JMS-2 (Revised)
5-8 Calculation: Section I, Line 1 X Allocation Factor / Billing Units. (2016 and 2031 adjusted to reflect 7 and 5 months, respectively).
9-12 Calculation: Section I, Line 2 X Allocation Factor / Billing Units. (2016 and 2031 adjusted to reflect 7 and 5 months, respectively).
13-16 Calculation: Section I, Line 3 X Allocation Factor / Billing Units. (2016 and 2031 adjusted to reflect 7 and 5 months, respectively).