

ComEd Ex. 13.4
State Revenue Decoupling Ratemaking Mechanisms

State	Approx. Annual Savings	Full Revenue Decoupling	Straight Fixed-Variable Pricing	LRAM	Comments
Section 1: States With Mandate					
Arizona	2.0%				
California	0.9%	Yes			
Colorado	1.0%				
Connecticut	1.0%	Yes			Connecticut law requires Department of Public Utility Control to order distribution companies to decouple through full decoupling or other ratemaking mechanisms.
Delaware	2.5%		Yes		Decoupling and modified straight fixed-variable pricing are approved in concept, but will be evaluated on utility-by-utility basis at rate cases. Delmarva Power has a modified straight-fixed variable pricing scheme.
Hawaii	1.0%	Yes			
Illinois	1.2% (avg.)				
Indiana	0.9%			Pending	Indiana law allows Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission to approve alternative regulatory plans for utilities.
Iowa	1.5%				Iowa Utilities Board declined to require decoupling, but will reconsider on case-by-case basis.
Maryland	1.5-1.8%	Yes			
Massachusetts	2.4%	Yes			Regulatory policy is in favor of decoupling for all electric utilities. Mass. Department of Public Utilities expects all utilities to have decoupling in place by 2012.
Michigan	0.3%-1%	Yes			
Minnesota	1.5%	Yes			All utilities are directed to file proposals for decoupling pilot programs.
Nevada	0.6%				
New Mexico	0.7% (avg.)			Yes	New Mexico Public Regulation Commission has approved rate "adder" that recovers lost revenue and provides performance incentive/penalty based on savings levels.
New York	1.9%	Yes			Utilities must file proposals for true-up based decoupling mechanisms in rate cases.
North Carolina	0.75-5.0%			Yes	
Ohio	1.3% (avg.)			Yes	Decoupling permitted under Public Utilities Commission of Ohio's rules.
Pennsylvania	1.0%				
Texas	0.3%				
Vermont	2.0%				
Washington	~1%				

ComEd Ex. 13.4
State Revenue Decoupling Ratemaking Mechanisms

State	Approx. Annual Savings	Full Revenue Decoupling	Straight Fixed-Variable Pricing	LRAM	Comments
Section 2: States Without Mandate					
Alabama					
Alaska					
Arkansas					
District of Columbia		Yes			
Florida					
Georgia					LRAM is authorized under Georgia Code, but nothing has been approved yet.
Idaho		Yes (residential and small general service customers only)			
Kansas					
Kentucky				Yes	
Louisiana				Yes	
Maine					
Mississippi					
Missouri					Missouri law encourages alignment of utility financial incentives and efforts to increase energy efficiency.
Montana					
Nebraska					
New Hampshire					NH PUC allows utilities to propose rate mechanisms to promote energy efficiency in future rate filings. Lost revenue issues are also dealt with on utility-specific basis.
New Jersey		Pending			Atlantic City Electric has proposed revenue decoupling in a pending rate filing.
North Dakota					
Oregon		Yes (residential customers)		Yes (commercial and industrial customers)	
Oklahoma				Yes	Decoupling and LRAMs are determined on a case-by-case basis; Commission determined that decoupling "has merit."
Rhode Island					
South Carolina				Yes	
South Dakota				Yes	
Tennessee					
Utah					Utah House Joint Resolution 9 urges PSC "to remove financial disincentives to utility efficiency programs."
Virginia					Virginia law permits the Commission to approve lost revenue recovery if requested by utility.
West Virginia					
Wisconsin		Yes			
Wyoming				Yes (one utility)	

Sources: State "Utility-Sector Policies" webpages in ACEEE's State Energy Policy Database; The Edison Foundation, "State Energy Efficiency Regulatory Frameworks," January 2010; Arizona Corporation Commission, "Opinion and Order," December 30, 2009, Docket No. E-01345A-08-0172, Decision No. 71448; Entergy New Orleans, Inc., "Electric Formula Rate Plan Rider Schedule," May 1, 2009; New Mexico Public Regulation Commission, "Final Order Repealing and Replacing 17.7.2 NMAC," April 9, 2010, Case No. 08-00024-UT.