

STATE OF ILLINOIS
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY :
 :
Annual formula rate update and revenue : Docket No. 16-_____
requirement reconciliation authorized by Section :
16-108.5 of the Public Utilities Act. :

Direct Testimony of
JOHN L. LEICK
Principal Rate Administrator
Regulatory Department

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
A.	Witness Identification	1
B.	Purpose of Direct Testimony	1
C.	Background and Qualifications.....	2
D.	Itemized Attachments	3
II.	UPDATED EMBEDDED COST OF SERVICE STUDY	4
III.	UPDATED BILLING DETERMINANTS.....	10
IV.	UPDATED DELIVERY SERVICE CHARGES.....	10
V.	IMPACTS	15
VI.	OTHER TARIFF RELATED UPDATES	18
A.	SBO Credit Update	19
B.	DLFs Update.....	19
VII.	PUBLIC NOTICE.....	20
VIII.	CONCLUSION.....	21

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 **A. Witness Identification**

3 **Q. What is your name and what is your business address?**

4 A. My name is John L. Leick. My business address is 3 Lincoln Centre, Oakbrook Terrace,
5 Illinois 60181.

6 **Q. By what entity and in what position are you employed?**

7 A. I am employed by Commonwealth Edison Company (“ComEd”) as a Principal Rate
8 Administrator in the Regulatory Department.

9 **B. Purpose of Direct Testimony**

10 **Q. What is the purpose of your direct testimony?**

11 A. The purpose of my direct testimony is to present the updated delivery service charges that
12 are to be applicable beginning with the January 2017 monthly billing period and
13 extending through the December 2017 monthly billing period. I also provide the
14 applicable information used in determining those charges, including an updated
15 embedded cost of service study (“ECOSS”) and rate design model populated with 2015
16 cost and billing data. The updated data are presented in accordance with the provisions
17 of Rate DSPP – Delivery Service Pricing and Performance (“Rate DSPP”), and the
18 updated delivery service charges provide for the recovery of the 2017 Rate Year Net
19 Revenue Requirement amount, \$2,652,852,000, presented by Mr. Chad A. Newhouse
20 (ComEd Exhibit (“Ex.”) 2.0). In addition, I show the impact on delivery class rates of
21 return under the updated delivery service charges as compared to the currently effective
22 delivery service charges, and I present information that reflects bill impacts resulting

23 from the application of the updated delivery service charges. I also describe how ComEd
24 submitted an updated ECOSS to support the filing made in compliance with the Illinois
25 Commerce Commission's ("ICC" or "Commission") final Order in the 2015 Formula
26 Rate Update Case ("FRU") ("2015 FRU") in Docket No. 15-0287. Further, I present
27 updates to the Single Bill Option ("SBO") credit and Distribution Loss Factors ("DLFs").
28 Finally, I provide the form of the public notice ComEd is distributing to provide
29 notification of this filing.

30 **C. Background and Qualifications**

31 **Q. What are your duties and responsibilities at ComEd?**

32 A. As a Principal Rate Administrator in the Retail Rates area of the Regulatory Department,
33 my duties include developing and recommending business and regulatory strategies and
34 requirements, along with administering the application of ComEd's tariffs and policies.
35 My duties also include the preparation of ComEd's cost of service studies to determine
36 the allocation of Illinois jurisdictional delivery service related costs to support ComEd's
37 formula rate filings.

38 **Q. What is your professional experience?**

39 A. I have been employed by ComEd since 1990. From 1990 to 1995, I held positions that
40 directly served customers by analyzing customers' usage patterns and billing impacts and
41 helping to ensure that their concerns with billing, reliability, and electric service were
42 addressed. During that period I was promoted to an Account Representative for a
43 specific portfolio of some of ComEd's largest commercial customers. From 1995
44 through 1998, I worked as a Customer Facilities Engineer responsible for designing and

45 ordering distribution facilities. My duties in that position included project design and
46 administering ComEd's tariffs and policies pertaining to standard and nonstandard
47 customer requests. In 1998, I was promoted to Senior Rate Administrator in Retail Rates
48 with responsibility for the administration of tariffs, including overseeing the calculation
49 of customer-specific Customer Transition Charges. In 2013, I was promoted to Principal
50 Rate Administrator with responsibility for overseeing the update of the ECOSS and rate
51 design for presentation in ComEd's formula rate update proceedings. Prior to my
52 employment with ComEd, I interned at 3M Company as an apprentice Electrical
53 Facilities Designer assisting with electrical facilities upgrades and modifications at the
54 3M Company campus in St. Paul, Minnesota.

55 **Q. What is your educational background?**

56 A. I graduated from Iowa State University in Ames, Iowa, with a Bachelor of Science degree
57 in Electrical Engineering. I received my Masters of Business Administration degree with
58 a concentration in business and project management from North Central College in
59 Naperville, Illinois.

60 **Q. Have you previously testified before the Commission?**

61 A. Yes. I presented testimony supporting ComEd's ECOSS and rate design model in the
62 2014 FRU (Docket No. 14-0312) and the 2015 FRU.

63 **D. Itemized Attachments**

64 **Q. What exhibits are attached to your direct testimony?**

65 A. The following exhibits are attached to my direct testimony:

- 66
- ComEd Ex. 7.01 presents ComEd's updated ECOSS.

- 67 • ComEd Ex. 7.02 presents 2015 historical weather normalized billing
68 determinants.
- 69 • ComEd Ex. 7.03 presents the updated rate design model populated with cost data
70 from ComEd Ex. 7.01 and 2015 historical weather normalized billing determinant
71 data from ComEd Ex. 7.02.
- 72 • ComEd Ex. 7.04 presents delivery class rates of return of the currently effective
73 delivery service charges on file with the ICC and applicable beginning with the
74 January 2016 monthly billing period, as well as the updated delivery service
75 charges to be applicable beginning with the January 2017 monthly billing period
76 presented in this direct testimony.
- 77 • ComEd Ex. 7.05 presents a summary of bill impacts based on comparisons of
78 ComEd's currently effective charges on file with the ICC to the updated delivery
79 service charges to be applicable beginning with the January 2017 monthly billing
80 period presented in this direct testimony.
- 81 • ComEd Ex. 7.06 presents the computation of the updated SBO credit.
- 82 • ComEd Ex. 7.07 presents the determination of the updated DLFs.
- 83 • ComEd Ex. 7.08 presents the form of public notice that ComEd will be publishing
84 regarding the filing of which this direct testimony is a part.

85 **II. UPDATED EMBEDDED COST OF SERVICE STUDY**

86 **Q. Did ComEd update the ECOSS it submitted to support the filing made in**
87 **compliance with the Commission's final Order in the 2015 FRU?**

88 A. Yes. ComEd’s updated ECOSS, prepared under my direction and supervision, is
89 presented in ComEd Ex. 7.01. It is based upon the ECOSS model ComEd submitted to
90 the ICC Staff on December 11, 2015, in compliance with the 2015 FRU Order, and is
91 consistent with the ECOSS approved by the ICC in its Order in Docket No. 13-0387, the
92 2013 Rate Design Investigation (“2013 RDI”), with other minor Commission approved
93 adjustments¹. The updated ECOSS presented in ComEd Ex. 7.01 includes a revised cost
94 allocation work paper that more accurately allocates cost responsibility for decorative
95 fixtures provided in the Fixture-Included Lighting (“FIL”) Delivery Class. Additionally,
96 ComEd has begun using interval usage data from its advanced metering infrastructure
97 (“AMI”) metering installations to determine residential class usage profiles.

98 **Q. Did the Commission direct ComEd to make any revisions to its ECOSS in the 2015**
99 **FRU Order?**

100 A. No, the Commission did not issue any directives to modify ComEd’s ECOSS from the
101 ECOSS initially filed in the proceeding. The 2015 FRU Order stated:

102 “Cost of service issues in formula rate proceedings are traditionally
103 uncontested. ComEd has supported all of the cost of service issues in this
104 docket, and neither Staff nor any Intervenor has disagreed. Basic rate
105 design issues are not at issue in this formula rate update case – instead,
106 they were addressed in the rate design tariff filing that was filed on April
107 30, 2013 in Docket No. 13-0387, the 2013 Rate Design Investigation. The
108 Commission entered a final Order in that docket on December 18, 2013,
109 and the Order was affirmed by the Appellate Court of Illinois for the
110 Second District on March 6, 2015. *See Coalition to Request Equitable*
111 *Allocation of Costs Together (REACT) v. Illinois Commerce Comm’n,*
112 *2015 IL App (2d) 140202 (Ill. App. Ct. March 6, 2015).* The Commission

¹ The Commission approved three additional Light Emitting Diode (“LED”) fixtures on March 29, 2016 and an adjustment to assign costs related to Rider Market Settlement Service to customers with usage over 400 kW in the 2015 FRU.

113 finds that cost of service and rate design issues are uncontested and are
114 approved.”

115 (2015 FRU Order at 72). The only difference between the initially filed ECOSS and the
116 ECOSS submitted with the compliance filing for the 2015 FRU was an updated revenue
117 requirement to match the approved revenue requirement.

118 **Q. What is the purpose of the FIL work paper?**

119 A. ComEd’s FIL cost allocation work paper calculates the current purchase and operational
120 costs for various lighting fixtures and brackets. The purchase and operational costs are
121 applied to the facilities provided by ComEd to determine the percentage of the FIL
122 Delivery Class’ embedded costs allocable to those lighting facilities.

123 **Q. What were the revisions made to the FIL work paper?**

124 A. ComEd’s billing system previously did not provide billing kilowatt-hours (“kWhs”) for
125 certain decorative fixtures. ComEd is addressing this programming issue so that the
126 inputs to the work papers can reflect the actual fixture installations.

127 **Q. What changes will customers with decorative fixtures experience as result of these
128 revisions?**

129 A. Those customers for which ComEd provides decorative fixtures will receive more
130 accurate listings and billings for the fixtures provided. The Distribution Facilities
131 Charges for decorative fixtures will have modest increases, but the total amounts paid by
132 the affected customers will change minimally because of the more accurate reflection of
133 the fixtures on the customer’s bill. Billing for the associated kWhs will be similar to
134 what they were before.

135 Q. **Why is ComEd making this change now?**

136 A. ComEd is making these adjustments to more accurately determine charges that apply to
137 FIL customers and to align the billing system for the introduction of LED decorative
138 fixtures in the future.

139 Q. **How did ComEd use its residential AMI interval data in this formula rate update
140 filing for cost allocation purposes?**

141 A. ComEd has historically used a residential load research sample to determine typical load
142 profiles for each residential delivery class in order to determine distribution losses and
143 Coincident Peak (“CP”) and Noncoincident Peak (“NCP”) cost allocators. Instead of
144 using this residential load research sample, ComEd determined the typical load profiles
145 from samples of premises with AMI metering in place and operational for all of 2015.

146 Q. **Why did ComEd use a sample of residential premises with AMI metering instead of
147 its residential load research sample?**

148 A. Recent investigations into the residential load research sample accounts indicated that the
149 sample may be disproportionately comprised of customers that have higher kWh usage
150 relative to the kWh usage levels for the entire residential population. Sampling AMI
151 metered customers provides an opportunity to sample customers with a more uniform
152 distribution of kWh usage levels, which will result in a better representation of all the
153 customers on ComEd’s system.

154 Q. **How were the sampled residential premises with AMI metering used to determine
155 the residential delivery class load profiles?**

156 A. First, ComEd evaluated all of the premises in its entire service territory by grouping each
157 of the premises into one of 100 percentile groupings for each residential delivery class
158 based upon the maximum monthly kWh usage (“MMU”) delivered during 2015. Each
159 percentile grouping has approximately the same number of premises based upon a MMU
160 range. Second, ComEd identified all of the residential premises that had an AMI meter
161 installed for all of 2015 and assigned the percentile ranking to each of these premises.
162 Third, a random number was assigned to all of these premises and the lowest assigned
163 random numbers were selected to be in the sample based upon the number of premises
164 selected in each residential delivery class. For the Single Family Without Electric Space
165 Heat, Multi Family Without Electric Space Heat and Multi Family With Electric Space
166 Heat Delivery Classes, 25 premises from each of the 100 percentiles were selected for a
167 total of 2,500 premises in each class’ sample. The Single Family With Electric Space
168 Heat Delivery Class did not have 25 premises in each percentile so a smaller sample of
169 five premises in each percentile² was selected for a total of 500 premises.

170 Q. **Were any adjustments made to any of the residential hourly load profiles?**

171 A. Yes, modifications were made to the Single Family Without Electric Space Heat and
172 Single Family With Electric Space Heat delivery classes. Both of these delivery classes
173 have rural customers, including farms and properties with larger lots that may have
174 multiple buildings. To date, AMI metering has not been deployed in most rural areas of
175 ComEd’s service territory, and these types of multi-building customers typically have

² Five premises were not available in the 99th and 100th percentiles so they were substituted with premises from the 98th percentile.

176 lower load factors³ than customers in areas in which AMI metering has been deployed.
177 ComEd sampled some rural customers in each of these delivery classes from the load
178 research data and used that data to make slight adjustments to the sample AMI data.
179 Once ComEd's AMI metering deployment is complete, these types of adjustments will
180 not be necessary. ComEd expects to have AMI metering deployed to all customers by
181 the end of 2018.

182 **Q. Were any other changes made to the ECOSS presented in ComEd Ex. 7.01?**

183 A. Other than the previously listed revisions, the updated ECOSS presented in ComEd Ex.
184 7.01 is unchanged from the ECOSS submitted with the compliance filing for the 2015
185 FRU. The updated ECOSS includes updated input values using cost data presented in
186 ComEd's 2015 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") Form 1 (filed in 2016)
187 that is also used to populate the updated revenue requirement formula and is reflected in
188 the resulting 2017 Rate Year Net Revenue Requirement of \$2,652,852,000 presented by
189 Mr. Newhouse (ComEd Ex. 2.0). Other inputs included in the updated ECOSS reflect
190 updated allocation factors, including applicable billing determinants, as well as updated
191 delivery class load and loss data from the updated Distribution System Loss ("DSL")
192 Study, which is presented by Mr. Frank A. Luedtke. (ComEd Ex. 6.01).

³ Load factor is a commonly used measure related to the utilization of electrical facilities, and is represented by the formula: $\text{Load Factor} = \text{kWhs in Period} / [\text{Maximum kW} \times \text{Hours in Period}]$. A higher load factor indicates electrical facilities are utilized more consistently for longer durations while a lower load factor indicates electrical facilities are utilized more sporadically for shorter durations.

193 **III. UPDATED BILLING DETERMINANTS**

194 **Q. Did ComEd compile historical weather normalized billing determinants for the year**
195 **2015?**

196 A. Yes. ComEd Ex. 7.02 presents historical weather normalized billing determinants for the
197 year 2015. These billing determinants were weather normalized, as applicable, in
198 accordance with the provisions of the Determination of Billing Determinants section of
199 Rate DSPP using the same methodology as has been used in all of ComEd's rate case and
200 formula updates since 2009.

201 **Q. Did ComEd make any Commission-directed adjustments to the historical weather**
202 **normalized billing determinants?**

203 A. Yes. The numbers of customers are adjusted consistent with the methodology initially
204 approved by the ICC in its Order in Docket No. 11-0721, and as subsequently directed by
205 the Commission in its Order in the 2013 RDI and other proceedings.⁴

206 **IV. UPDATED DELIVERY SERVICE CHARGES**

207 **Q. Did ComEd update the rate design model it submitted to support the filing made in**
208 **compliance with the 2015 FRU Order?**

209 A. Yes. ComEd's updated rate design model, prepared under my direction and supervision,
210 is presented in ComEd Ex. 7.03. It is based upon the rate design model ComEd
211 submitted to the ICC Staff on December 11, 2015, in compliance with the 2015 FRU

⁴ 2013 RDI Order at 51, Docket No. 13-0318, ("2013 FRU") final Order at 80, and 2014 FRU Order at 82.

212 Order and is consistent with the rate design approved by the ICC in the 2013 RDI Order.⁵
213 This updated rate design model uses inputs from ComEd’s updated ECOSS presented in
214 ComEd Ex. 7.01 and ComEd’s updated weather normalized billing determinant data
215 presented in ComEd Ex. 7.02 to determine the updated delivery service charges. The
216 updated rate design model presents updated delivery service charges which allow for the
217 recovery of exactly \$2,652,852,000, the 2017 Rate Year Net Revenue Requirement
218 presented by Mr. Newhouse (ComEd Ex. 2.0).

219 **Q. What are the delivery service charges that result from populating the rate design**
220 **model with updated data?**

221 **A.** The updated delivery service charges that result from populating the rate design model
222 with updated data are shown in the following three tables: Table JLL-D1: Updated
223 Delivery Service Charges - Residential Sector; Table JLL-D2: Updated Delivery Service
224 Charges - Nonresidential Sector; and Table JLL-D3: Updated Delivery Service Charges -
225 Lighting Sector. For each delivery class the charges include, as applicable, the Customer
226 Charge (“CC”), Standard Metering Service Charge (“SMSC”), Distribution Facilities
227 Charge (“DFC”), Transformer Charge (“TC”), and Illinois Electricity Distribution Tax
228 Charge (“IEDT”).

⁵ The Commission approved three additional LED fixtures on March 29, 2016, which are included in ComEd Ex. 7.03.

229

Table JLL-D1: Updated Delivery Service Charges - Residential Sector

Delivery Class	CC (\$/month)	SMSC (\$/month)	DFC (\$/kWh)	IEDT (\$/kWh)
Single Family Without Electric Space Heat	\$10.57	\$4.67	\$0.03476	\$0.00116
Multi Family Without Electric Space Heat	\$7.50	\$4.67	\$0.02776	\$0.00116
Single Family With Electric Space Heat	\$12.21	\$4.67	\$0.01746	\$0.00116
Multi Family With Electric Space Heat	\$8.09	\$4.67	\$0.01753	\$0.00116

230

Table JLL-D2: Updated Delivery Service Charges - Nonresidential Sector

Delivery Class	CC (\$/month)	SMSC (\$/month)	DFC (\$/kWh)		IEDT (\$/kWh)
Watt-Hour	\$11.09	\$4.76	\$0.01995		\$0.00116
			DFC (\$/kW)	TC (\$/kW)	
Small Load Primary Voltage Secondary Voltage	\$12.70	\$13.26	\$2.53 \$6.66	\$0.65	\$0.00116
Medium Load Primary Voltage Secondary Voltage	\$19.68	\$29.41	\$3.86 \$6.86	\$0.18	\$0.00116
Large Load Primary Voltage Secondary Voltage	\$92.01	\$30.47	\$5.26 \$7.13	\$0.26	\$0.00116
Very Large Load Primary Voltage Secondary Voltage	\$496.63	\$31.18	\$5.26 \$7.09	\$0.26	\$0.00116
Extra Large Load Primary Voltage Secondary Voltage	\$1,099.93	\$68.08	\$5.56 \$5.04	\$0.30	\$0.00116
High Voltage (“HV”) Primary Voltage Secondary Voltage HV >10 Megawatts (“MW”) HV ≤10 MW	\$439.65	\$40.16	\$3.70 \$4.18 \$0.16 \$0.24	\$0.36 \$0.91 \$2.93	\$0.00116
Railroad	\$4,448.93	\$137.25	\$3.53		\$0.00116

Table JLL-D3: Updated Delivery Service Charges - Lighting Sector

Delivery Class		DFC (\$/Fixture)	IEDT (\$/kWh)
Fixture-Included Lighting			\$0.00116
<i>Fixture-Included Lighting Public</i>			
LED Cobra (40-60 Watts (“W”))		\$2.70	
LED Cobra (61-80 W)		\$3.32	
LED Cobra (81-119 W)		\$3.68	
LED Cobra (120-160 W)		\$4.12	
100 W Mercury Vapor (“MV”)		\$4.23	
175 W MV		\$4.26	
250 W MV		\$4.45	
400 W MV		\$5.01	
70 W High Pressure Sodium (“HPS”)		\$4.67	
100 W HPS		\$4.76	
150 W HPS		\$4.60	
250 W HPS		\$4.99	
400 W HPS		\$5.45	
1,000 W HPS		\$12.40	
<i>Fixture-Included Lighting Equipment</i>			
Mounting Bracket ≤ 8 Feet		\$4.22	
Mounting Bracket > 8 Feet		\$5.65	
Post Top Luminaire		\$11.05	
Acorn Style Luminaire		\$12.91	
<i>Fixture-Included Lighting Private</i>			
LED National Electrical Manufacturing Association (“NEMA”) Security (40-60 W)		\$7.97	
LED NEMA Security (61-80 W)		\$8.07	
LED Floodlight Security (70-100 W)		\$7.08	
LED Floodlight Security (101-130 W)		\$7.73	
175 W MV		\$7.91	
400 W MV		\$8.01	
100 W HPS Flood		\$7.63	

Table JLL-D3: Updated Delivery Service Charges - Lighting Sector

Delivery Class		DFC (\$/Fixture)	IEDT (\$/kWh)
250 W HPS Flood		\$8.06	
100 W HPS		\$8.15	
150 W HPS		\$8.24	
	SMSC (\$/kWh)	DFC (\$/kWh)	IEDT (\$/kWh)
Dusk to Dawn Lighting			\$0.00116
Non Alley Lights	\$0.00111	\$0.00577	
Alley Lights	\$0.00000	\$0.00247	
General Lighting	\$0.00075	\$0.01307	\$0.00116

232 **V. IMPACTS**

233 **Q. Did ComEd provide the class rates of return under the currently effective delivery**
 234 **service charges as well as the updated delivery service charges presented in this**
 235 **direct testimony?**

236 **A.** Yes, ComEd Ex. 7.04 presents the class rates of return of the currently effective delivery
 237 service charges on file with the ICC effective beginning with the January 2016 monthly
 238 billing period as well as the updated delivery service charges to be effective beginning
 239 with the January 2017 monthly billing period.

240 **Q. Did ComEd analyze the impact that the updated delivery service charges would**
 241 **have on overall bills that customers may see for electric service?**

242 A. Yes, ComEd completed an analysis of overall electric service bill impacts⁶ that may
243 result from the application of the updated delivery service charges presented in this direct
244 testimony compared to the currently effective delivery service charges. This analysis is
245 presented in accordance with the Commission’s Part 285 rules. These bill impacts are
246 presented in ComEd Ex. 7.05. It is important to note, however, that many of ComEd’s
247 customers obtain electric supply service from entities other than ComEd. As a result,
248 ComEd is not able to determine with specificity the impacts that changes in delivery
249 service charges will have on customers’ costs for overall electric service, which includes
250 delivery from ComEd but supply from other providers.

251 Q. **What is the estimated impact on overall electric service bills for residential**
252 **customers?**

253 A. For the residential sector, the overall annual impact due to the application of the updated
254 delivery service charges presented in this direct testimony is an increase of approximately
255 2.7% in the total bill for bundled electric service under Rate BES - Basic Electric Service
256 (“Rate BES”) compared to total bill amounts for residential customers for currently
257 effective charges on file with the ICC. For the four residential delivery classes
258 individually, the change (“(x)” denotes a decrease) on an annual bill for bundled electric
259 service under Rate BES at average electricity usage is as follows:

- 260 • Single Family Without Electric Space Heat 4.0%
- 261 • Multi Family Without Electric Space Heat (1.1)%

⁶ These bill impacts are the total annual bill impacts for bundled electric service under Rate BES – Basic Electric Service, and, as applicable, include the currently effective fixed price supply charges on file with the ICC. Approximately 59% of ComEd’s residential customers and 48% of ComEd’s nonresidential customers received service under Rate BES at the end of 2015.

- 262 • Single Family With Electric Space Heat (0.4)%
- 263 • Multi Family With Electric Space Heat (0.9)%

264 Q. **What is the impact on the delivery service bills for each of the delivery classes?**

265 A. For each delivery class, the expected average annual impact to delivery service bills when
 266 comparing current charges to updated charges is shown in Table JLL-D4: Average
 267 Annual Delivery Service Bill Impact. The values shown in this table were developed
 268 using 2015 billing determinants.

269

Table JLL-D4: Average Annual Delivery Service Bill Impact

Delivery Class	2016 Current Delivery ¢/kWh* ⁷	2017 Updated Delivery ¢/kWh*	Change %
Residential Sector	5.26	5.60	6.46%
Single Family Without Electric Space Heat	5.18	5.66	9.27%
Multi Family Without Electric Space Heat	6.63	6.49	(2.11)%
Single Family With Electric Space Heat	2.91	2.87	(1.37)%
Multi Family With Electric Space Heat	3.58	3.49	(2.51)%

⁷ See Schedule A-3 submitted in this proceeding and Ill. C. C. No. 10 Informational Sheets Nos. 24-31.

Table JLL-D4: Average Annual Delivery Service Bill Impact

Delivery Class	2016 Current Delivery ¢/kWh*⁷	2017 Updated Delivery ¢/kWh*	Change %
Nonresidential Sector	1.79	1.89	5.59%
Watt-Hour	5.90	6.38	8.14%
Small Load (0 ≤ 100 kW)	2.82	3.03	7.45%
Medium Load (Over 100 kW ≤ 400 kW)	1.88	2.04	8.51%
Large Load (Over 400 kW ≤ 1,000 kW)	1.75	1.85	5.71%
Very Large Load (Over 1,000 kW ≤ 10,000 kW)	1.61	1.63	1.24%
Extra Large Load (Over 10,000 kW)	1.13	1.17	3.54%
High Voltage	0.31	0.31	0.00%
Railroad	1.05	1.11	5.71%
Lighting Sector	2.50	2.81	12.40%
Fixture-Included*	\$4.35	\$5.06	16.32%
Dusk to Dawn	0.74	0.75	1.35%
General	1.42	1.50	5.63%
Overall Company	2.87	3.04	5.92%

* Fixture-Included Lighting is computed using the average \$/(lighting facility).

270 **VI. OTHER TARIFF RELATED UPDATES**

271 **Q. What other tariff-related items is ComEd updating?**

272 A. ComEd is updating the SBO credit listed in Informational Sheet No. 34, supplemental to
 273 Rate RDS - Retail Delivery Service (“Rate RDS”) and Rider SBO - Single Bill Option
 274 (“Rider SBO”), and the DLFs listed in Informational Sheet No. 33, supplemental to Rate
 275 RDS, Rate BESH – Basic Electric Service Hourly Pricing (“Rate BESH”) and Rider PE –

276 Purchased Electricity (“Rider PE”). The computation of the updated SBO credit is
277 presented in ComEd Ex. 7.06 and the determination of the updated DLFs is presented in
278 ComEd Ex. 7.07. Revisions to the informational sheets with these updated values will be
279 filed with the Commission prior to their application, which begins with the January 2017
280 monthly billing period.

281 **A. SBO Credit Update**

282 **Q. Why is it appropriate to update the SBO credit?**

283 A. As a result of updating the ECOSS for use in determining updated delivery service
284 charges, the embedded costs associated with the SBO change. It is therefore appropriate
285 to correspondingly update the SBO credit to properly reflect the changes in the embedded
286 costs associated with this credit that are included in the updated ECOSS.

287 **Q. What is the updated SBO credit?**

288 A. As shown in ComEd Ex. 7.06, the updated SBO credit is \$0.50 per month.

289 **B. DLFs Update**

290 **Q. Why is it appropriate to update the DLFs?**

291 A. As a result of the updated DSL Study, which is addressed by Mr. Luedtke
292 (ComEd Ex. 6.0), the DLFs associated with each delivery class change. Therefore, it is
293 appropriate to update the DLFs listed in Informational Sheet No. 33 to properly reflect
294 the changes in the DLFs.

295 **Q. What are the updated DLFs that are reflective of the DSL Study addressed by**
296 **Mr. Luedtke (ComEd Ex. 6.0)?**

297 A. The updated DLFs for the delivery classes and the updated system average DLF that are
298 reflective of the DSL Study addressed by Mr. Luedtke (ComEd Ex. 6.0) are provided in
299 ComEd Ex. 7.07 and shown in Table JLL-D5: Updated Distribution Loss Factors.

300 **Table JLL-D5: Updated Distribution Loss Factors**

Delivery Class	DLF
Residential Single Family Without Electric Space Heat	0.0629
Residential Multi Family Without Electric Space Heat	0.0656
Residential Single Family With Electric Space Heat	0.0728
Residential Multi Family With Electric Space Heat	0.0718
Nonresidential Watt-Hour	0.0659
Nonresidential Small Load	0.0625
Nonresidential Medium Load	0.0682
Nonresidential Large Load	0.0596
Nonresidential Very Large Load	0.0596
Nonresidential Extra Large Load	0.0528
Nonresidential High Voltage	
At or above 138 kilovolts	0.0041
Other exceeding 10 MW	0.0090
Other	0.0075
Nonresidential Railroad	0.0268
Lighting Fixture-Included	0.0916
Lighting Dusk to Dawn	0.0916
Lighting General	0.0796
System Average	0.0589

301 **VII. PUBLIC NOTICE**

302 Q. **Did ComEd prepare a form of public notice for this update filing that is consistent**
303 **with the Commission rules for the filing of a general rate case?**

304 A. Yes. In the interest of transparency, ComEd Ex. 7.08 presents the form of public notice
305 that ComEd will, beginning not later than ten (10) days following the petition filing to
306 update its delivery service revenue requirement and corresponding charges, cause to be
307 published once each week, for two consecutive weeks in a secular newspaper (that has
308 been regularly published for at least six months prior to the first publication of such
309 notice) in general circulation in the ComEd service territory.

310 **VIII. CONCLUSION**

311 **Q. What is your recommendation?**

312 A. The Commission should approve ComEd's updated ECOSS presented in ComEd
313 Ex. 7.01 and the updated delivery service charges presented in ComEd Ex. 7.03 that
314 provide for the recovery of \$2,652,852,000.

315 **Q. Does this complete your direct testimony?**

316 A. Yes.