"Quarterly Review"

Selected Financial and Operational Data: Re:

Electric Companies

- Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC
- Duke Energy Progress, Inc., d/b/a Duke Energy Progress
- Virginia Electric and Power Company, d/b/a Dominion North Carolina Power

Natural Gas Local Distribution Companies

- Piedmont Natural Gas Company, Inc.
- Public Service Company of North Carolina, Inc., d/b/a PSNC Energy

■ Quarter Ending September 30, 2013 ■

Prepared by:

North Carolina Utilities Commission Operations Division

430 N. Salisbury Street Raleigh, NC 27603 919-733-3979

www.ncuc.net

Mailing Address: 4325 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-4325



State of North Carolina Htilities Commission

4325 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-4325

COMMISSIONERS
EDWARD S. FINLEY, JR., CHAIRMAN
BRYAN E. BEATTY
SUSAN W. RABON

January 8, 2014

COMMISSIONERS
TONOLA D. BROWN-BLAND
DON M. BAILEY
JERRY C. DOCKHAM
JAMES G. PATTERSON

MEMORANDUM

TO:

Chairman Edward S. Finley, Jr. Commissioner Bryan E. Beatty Commissioner Susan W. Rabon

Commissioner ToNola D. Brown-Bland

Commissioner Don M. Bailey Commissioner Jerry C. Dockham Commissioner James G. Patterson

FROM:

Donald R. Hoover, Director

Operations Division

The Operations Division hereby presents for your consideration the *Quarterly Review* for the calendar quarter ending September 30, 2013. Such report, which has been prepared by the Operations Division, presents an overview of selected financial and

Should you have questions concerning the report, Freda Hilburn, Bliss Kite, or I will be pleased to be of assistance.

operational information and data for five major investor-owned public utilities regulated

Thank you for your consideration.

DRH/FHH/BBK/ime

by the Commission.

www.ncuc.net

Table of Contents

| Part | | | | Page | | | |
|--------------|-------|---|--|------|--|--|--|
| I | Intro | oductio | n | 1 | | | |
| II | Revi | ew of I | Key Financial Ratios: | 9 | | | |
| | | Con Retu Equ | nmary Statement of Key Financial Ratios For Five Selected appanies For The Twelve Months Ended September 30, 2013—urns on Common Equity, Overall Rates of Return, Common wity Capitalization Ratios, and Debt Ratios—And Certain Rate e Data | 10 | | | |
| | | Rate Age | tement of Authorized Returns on Common Equity and Overall es of Return Granted By Various Public Utility Regulatory ncies As Reported By <u>Public Utilities Reports</u> , Volume 207-306, from June 2012 Through August 2013 | 12 | | | |
| III | Over | views (| of Selected Financial and Operational Data By Utility: | 14 | | | |
| | | Elec | ctric Companies: | | | | |
| | | • | Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC | 15 | | | |
| | | • | Duke Energy Progress, Inc., d/b/a Duke Energy Progress | 16 | | | |
| | | • | Virginia Electric and Power Company, d/b/a | | | | |
| | | | Dominion North Carolina Power | 17 | | | |
| | | Natural Gas Local Distribution Companies: | | | | | |
| | | • | Piedmont Natural Gas Company, Inc. | 18 | | | |
| | | • | Public Service Company of North Carolina, Inc., d/b/a PSNC Energy | 19 | | | |
| IV | Tele | commi | unications Companies – Annual Report Filings | 20 | | | |
| \mathbf{V} | Appe | endix A | A – Electronic Distribution List | | | | |

Part I

Introduction

The purpose, structure, focus, and an abbreviated synopsis of the nature of the contents of this report is presented here.

The Quarterly Review has been designed and is structured so as to provide, in a clear and concise format, relevant and useful financial and operational information pertaining to five major investor-owned public utilities regulated by the North Carolina Utilities Commission (Commission): three electric companies and two natural gas local distribution companies. The primary focus of this report is one of a jurisdictional financial nature. However, albeit limited, certain jurisdictional operational information is also included.

To a vast extent the information presented herein is organized into individual company overviews and covers a period of five years. From a general viewpoint, the individual company overviews provide information that users of this report will find helpful from the standpoint of gaining insight into each company's jurisdictional financial standing and in acquiring a sense of the magnitude of each company's overall jurisdictional economic dimension.

Significant changes have taken place with regard to the annual reporting requirements for the price plan regulated telephone companies which have impacted the conformity and comparability of the financial and operational information provided by such companies for the 12-month reporting period ending December 31, 2011 and beyond. Specifically, on June 30, 2011, in Docket No. P-100, Sub 72b, the Commission issued an Order ruling on a petition filed by the North Carolina Telecommunications Industry Association, Inc. on March 16, 2011, requesting modification or elimination of certain reporting requirements relating to incumbent local exchange companies (ILECs) and/or competing local providers. The June 30, 2011 Order, among other things, revised Commission Rule R1-32 by adding a new Subsection (e1). Such revision allows ILECs, that are price plan regulated under G.S. 62-133.5(a), and any carrier electing regulation under G.S. 62-133.5(h) or (m) to satisfy all of their annual reporting obligations by one of the two following ways: (1) by providing a link to their annual filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), if they are publicly traded entities, or (2) by filing copies of their audited financial statements with the Commission, if they are not publicly traded entities. The foregoing would be in lieu of filing annual reports regarding the North Carolina Operations on forms furnished or approved by the Commission. Price plan regulated telephone companies are to either provide their annual reports to the Commission or otherwise satisfy their annual reporting obligations under Commission Rule R1-32, Subsection (e1) as soon as possible after the close of the calendar vear, but in no event later than the 30th day of April of each year for the preceding calendar year.

Seven of the eight ILECs for which the Commission last reported financial information for the 12-month period ending December 31, 2010, have since chosen to meet their annual reporting obligation by providing links to their annual filings with the SEC. As a result of such significant changes in the annual reporting requirements, financial information related to the telecommunications companies is no longer being provided in this report. However, for the following ILECs: (1) BellSouth Telecommunications, LLC, d/b/a AT&T North Carolina (AT&T North Carolina); (2) Carolina Telephone and Telegraph Company LLC, d/b/a

CenturyLink (Carolina); (3) Central Telephone Company, d/b/a CenturyLink (Central); (4) Mebtel, Inc., d/b/a CenturyLink (Mebtel); (5) Frontier Communications of the Carolinas Inc. (Frontier); (6) Verizon South Inc. (Verizon South); (7) Windstream Concord Telephone, Inc. (Concord); (8) Windstream Lexcom Communications, Inc. (Lexcom); and (9) Windstream North Carolina, LLC (Windstream NC) the url addresses/links to their 2012 annual filings with the SEC are provided in the report in Part IV.

With respect to other changes related to matters concerning the price plan regulated telephone companies, on June 30, 2009, House Bill 1180 (HB1180) became law as set forth in Session Law 2009-238. Said law, entitled "An Act Establishing the Consumer Choice and Investment Act of 2009," created a new category of price plan operation whereby any local exchange carrier or competing local provider may choose to adopt by simply "filing notice of its intent to do so with the Commission," with such election being effective immediately upon filing. Subsection (h) price plans provide for extensive deregulation of an electing telecommunications company's "terms, conditions, rates, or availability" relating to its retail services. A local exchange company electing Subsection (h) is required to continue to offer stand-alone basic residential lines to all customers who subscribe to that service at rates that can be increased annually by no more than the percentage increase over the prior year in the Gross Domestic Product Price Index (GDP-PI). While such deregulation is very extensive by historical standards, it is not a complete deregulation of carriers electing Subsection (h).

Currently, there are 10 incumbent local exchange carriers operating under Subsection (h) price plans as a result of their notices of election filed pursuant to G.S. 62-133.5(h): (1) Verizon South³ (notice filed on July 21, 2010 to become effective immediately, in Docket No. P-19, Sub 277M); (2) Frontier (notice filed January 30, 2012 to become effective immediately, in Docket No. P-1488, Sub 1A); (3) Carolina (notice filed March 8, 2012 to become effective April 1, 2012, in Docket No. P-7, Sub 825M); (4) Central (notice filed March 8, 2012 to become effective April 1, 2012, in Docket No. P-10, Sub 479N); (5) Mebtel (notice filed March 8, 2012 to become effective April 1, 2012, in Docket No. P-35, Sub 96I); (6) Concord (notice filed July 26, 2012 to become effective immediately, in Docket No. P-31, Sub 145C); (8) Windstream NC (notice filed July 26, 2012 to become effective immediately, in Docket No. P-31, Sub 145C); (8) Windstream NC (notice filed July 26, 2012 to become effective immediately, in Docket No. P-118, Sub 86L); (9) North State Telephone Company, d/b/a North State Communications (North State) (notice filed November 30, 2012 to become effective immediately, in Docket No. P-42, Sub 137F); and (10) Ellerbe Telephone Company (Ellerbe) (notice filed December 30, 2013 to become effective January 1, 2014, in Docket No. P-21,

¹ In general, the Commission refers to the new price plan category which resulted from the passage of HB1180 as "Subsection (h) price plans".

² See Docket No. P-100, Sub 165 for additional information regarding the implications of the enactment of HB1180 and the implementation of Subsection (h) price plans.

³ Such election relates to Verizon South's only exchange, the Knotts Island exchange.

Sub 75). As a result of such elections, these 10 ILECs are no longer required to provide an annual report to the Commission as directed by Commission Rule R1-32, commencing with the calendar year in which such election becomes effective (2010: Verizon South; 2012: Frontier, Carolina, Central, Mebtel, Concord, Lexcom, Windstream NC, and North State; and 2014: Ellerbe). Alternatively, as required by the Commission's March 30, 2010 Order in Docket No. P-100, Sub 165, these ILECs will provide the Commission, on an annual basis, a link to their financial filings with the SEC.

Furthermore, on April 26, 2011, Senate Bill 343 (SB 343) became law as set forth in Session Law 2011-52. Said law, entitled "An Act Establishing the Communications Reform and Investment Act of 2011," created a new category of price plan operation outlined in G.S. 62-133.5(m)⁴ whereby any local exchange company that forgoes receipt of any funding from a state universal service fund or alternative funding mechanism and whose territory is open to competition from competing local providers may choose to adopt a Subsection (m) price plan⁵ by simply "filing notice of its intent to do so with the Commission," with such election being effective immediately upon filing. Subsection (m) price plans provide, among other things, that "the Commission shall not impose any requirements related to the terms, conditions, rates, or availability of any of the local exchange company's retail services."

Currently, AT&T North Carolina⁷ is the only incumbent local exchange carrier operating under a Subsection (m) price plan. On October 14, 2011, in Docket No. P-55, Sub 1013M, AT&T North Carolina filed its notice of election of a Subsection (m) price plan. Prior to such election, AT&T North Carolina was operating under a Subsection (h) price plan.⁸ As set forth by the Commission's November 22, 2011 Order in Docket No. P-100, Sub 165A, AT&T North Carolina will continue to provide the Commission, on an annual basis, a link to its financial filings with the SEC.

⁴The enabling legislation was initially specified in G.S. 62-133.5(l); however such reference has been renumbered and codified in the General Statutes of North Carolina as G.S. 62-133.5(m). Consequently, on April 27, 2012, the Commission issued an Errata Order to correct the reference of Subsection (l) in prior Commission orders to Subsection (m) for consistency with the codification in the General Statutes.

⁵ In general, the Commission refers to the new price plan category which resulted from the passage of SB 343 as "Subsection (m) price plans".

⁶ Such retail services include stand-alone basic residential lines. See Docket No. P-100, Sub 165A for additional information regarding the implications of the enactment of SB 343 and the implementation of Subsection (m) price plans.

⁷ Effective July 1, 2011, BellSouthTelecommunications, Inc., d/b/a AT&T North Carolina changed its legal classification from a corporation to an LLC and began transacting business as BellSouth Telecommunications, LLC d/b/a AT&T North Carolina.

⁸ On October 5, 2009, in Docket No. P-55, Sub 1013M, AT&T North Carolina filed its notice of election of a Subsection (h) price plan.

This report has been prepared solely for the use of the Commission. The responsibility for developing and preparing the report is that of the Commission's Operations Division. The preponderance of the information and data included in and/or on which the report is based has been provided by the companies. Such data has not been audited or otherwise verified. Therefore, the Operations Division, although it believes the aforesaid data to be true and correct in each and every respect, cannot and does not offer any attestation in that regard.

A Specific Objective

A specific objective of this reporting process is to present to the Commission, on an ongoing basis, meaningful information regarding the financial viability of the subject companies, including the reasonableness of the overall levels of rates and charges currently being charged by jurisdictional utilities, whose rates are cost based, for their sales of services. Cost based regulation is synonymous with rate base, rate of return regulation.

Under rate base, rate of return regulation, the cost of service of a public utility is defined as the sum total of reasonable operating expenses, depreciation, taxes, and a reasonable return on the net valuation of property used and useful in providing public utility services. Therefore, the reasonableness of a public utility's rates is a function of the reasonableness of the level of each individual component of its cost of service.

The reasonable return component of the cost of service equation refers to the overall rate of return related to investment funded by all investors, including debt investors as well as preferred and common equity investors. The costs of debt capital and preferred stock, which are essentially fixed by contract, must be deducted from revenue, like all other components of the cost of service, in determining income available for distribution to common stockholders. Therefore, generally speaking, a very meaningful measure of the profitability of any utility, and consequently the reasonableness of its overall rates and charges, is the return earned on its common shareholders' investment, i.e., its return on common equity, over some specified period of time. Typically, such returns are measured over a period of one year. Thus, annual returns on common equity and certain other key financial ratios, which among other things give significant perspective to the common equity returns, are the focal points of this report.

The Key Financial Ratios

Specifically, the key financial ratios presented herein for use in reviewing the companies' financial viabilities, including their profitability and consequently the reasonableness of their rates and charges are (1) the return on common equity, (2) the common

⁹ Regarding Limited Liability Corporations (LLCs), equity investors are, typically, referred to as "members" rather than as "shareholders or stockholders". Consequently, references to "common shareholders/stockholders", as contained herein, are also intended to apply to equity investors of LLCs as well. Additionally, discussion regarding "return on common equity" and the "common equity capitalization ratio" would also apply to the LLC's "return on members' equity" and "members' equity capitalization ratio".

equity capitalization ratio, (3) the pretax interest coverage ratio, and (4) the overall rate of return.

The Return on Common Equity

As indicated, the return on common equity is a key financial indicator which measures the profitability of an enterprise from the standpoint of its common stockholders over some specified period of time. That return or earnings rate reflects the ratio of earnings available for common equity to the common-equity investors' capital investment. As previously stated, the ratio is significant because it traditionally represents profitability after all revenues and costs, other than the cost of common equity capital, have been considered. From the standpoint of measuring profitability, return on common equity is indeed "the bottom line".

The Common Equity Capitalization Ratio

The common equity capitalization ratio is the ratio of common equity capital to total investor-supplied capital of the firm. That ratio is significant because it is a major indicator of the financial riskiness of the firm, particularly from the standpoint of the common stockholders. The issuance of debt capital, assuming no offsetting decrease in preferred stock, decreases the common equity capitalization ratio, and its existence creates what has come to be known as financial leverage. The risk borne by shareholders that accompanies that leverage is known as financial risk. As the proportion of debt in the capital structure increases, so does the degree of financial leverage and thus shareholders' risk and consequently the shareholders' requirements regarding expected return, i.e., the expected return on common equity or, in regulatory jargon, the cost of common equity capital.

Alternatively, the financial riskiness of the firm, some might argue, is more appropriately revealed when expressed in terms of debt leverage, particularly when preferred stock is present in the capital structure. Such leverage is the ratio of long-term debt capital to total investor-supplied capital. Both approaches are clearly insightful and useful. In evaluating the superiority of one approach in comparison to the other, one should consider the context within which the information is to be used. Since a major objective of this report is to review the reasonableness of the levels of earnings of the companies' common stockholders, and in consideration of the other key financial benchmarks which are also presented herein, the common equity capitalization ratio appears to be the most appropriate and meaningful measure of the financial riskiness of the companies for use in this regard.

The Pretax Interest Coverage Ratio

The pretax interest coverage ratio is the number of times earnings, determined before consideration of income taxes and interest charges, cover annual interest charges. That financial indicator is particularly important to debt investors because holders of the company's outstanding debt, including long-term bonds, receive interest payments from the company

before any earnings are determined to be available for distribution to preferred or common equity investors. Pretax interest coverage is measured before income taxes because interest expense is deductible in arriving at taxable income. Therefore, generally speaking, debt holders can expect to be paid before the company incurs any liability for the payment of income taxes. From the debt holder's perspective, all other things remaining equal, the higher the pretax interest coverage the better.

The Overall Rate of Return

The overall rate of return measures the profitability of a firm from the standpoint of earnings on total investment, including investment funded by both debt and equity investors. Specifically, in the public utility regulatory environment, it is the ratio of operating income to total investment.

The Propriety of the Methodology

The foregoing financial benchmarks, as presented in this report, have been determined on the basis of the companies' actual operating experience. Under rate base, rate of return regulation, North Carolina statutes require that the companies' rates be determined on a normalized, pro forma, end-of-period basis based upon an historical test period. Stated alternatively, the Commission, in setting prospective rates, essentially, must take into account the company's current level of operations adjusted for known and material changes in the levels of revenues and costs that the company can reasonably be expected to experience over a reasonable period of time into the future. Thus, rates, which are established for use prospectively, are set, to a certain extent and within certain constraints, on the basis of revenue and cost expectations, including investor expectations regarding their return requirements, as opposed to simply setting prospective rates solely on the basis of actual operating experience.

The process of setting prospective rates is inherently and exceedingly time consuming, difficult, and otherwise costly to both companies and regulators. It involves the assimilation, investigation, and evaluation of enormous amounts of complex information and data which invariably leads to multifarious issues; many, if not most, of which must be resolved through adjudication.

It is far less difficult and costly to perform an intellectual, financial analysis of the need to undertake the aforesaid process. Such preliminary analysis avoids the unnecessary incursion of the immense costs of setting prospective rates. Those are precisely the reasons why this report is focused on a review of the returns on common equity and other key financial ratios which the companies are currently earning or achieving under their existing rates and charges. Those ratios, when considered in conjunction with statutory ratemaking requirements, prevailing economic conditions, and certain other financial indicators, including returns on common equity and overall rates of return currently being authorized by other public utility regulatory agencies, are meaningful indicators of the need, if any, for further, more extensive regulatory review.

From the standpoint of giving an added measure of meaning to the aforesaid ratios of the individual companies and in the interest of providing a sense of current financial market conditions, certain financial information has been included herein as notes to the first statement included in Part II of this report. Such notes are an integral part of this report.

Additionally, also from the standpoint of providing perspective, returns on common equity and overall rates of return currently being authorized by a number of other public utility regulatory agencies are provided in the second statement presented in Part II.

A Final Note

It is emphasized that the information contained in this report is not intended and should not be construed to be all inclusive from the standpoint of the criteria to be used in assessing the reasonableness of the companies existing rates. But rather, it is submitted that such information is clearly relevant to such a determination and as such should be considered in conjunction with all other pertinent information and data.

The Operations Division will be pleased to receive and respond to any questions or comments.

Part II

A Review of Key Financial Ratios

- Summary Statement of Key Financial Ratios For Five Selected Companies For The Twelve Months Ended September 30, 2013 Returns on Common Equity, Overall Rates of Return, Common Equity Capitalization Ratios, and Debt Ratios And Certain Rate Case Data
- Statement of Authorized Returns on Common Equity and Overall Rates of Return Granted By Various Public Utility Regulatory Agencies As Reported By Public Utilities Reports, Volume Nos. 297-306 from June 2012 Through August 2013

Summary Statement

Of Key Financial Ratios Achieved By And Authorized For Selected Companies

"Estimated Returns on Common Equity, Overall Rates of Return, Common Equity Capitalization Ratios, and Debt Ratios are for Twelve Months Ended September 30, 2013

"Rate Case Data are from Orders with Various Issue Dates as Indicated in Column (i)"

| | | Estimated for 12 Months Ended 09/30/2013 | | | | Authorized - Last Rate Case | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|
| Line <u>No.</u> | <u>Item</u> (a) | Return On Equity (b) | Overall Rate of Return (c) | Equity Ratio (d) | Debt Ratio (e) | Return On <u>Equity</u> (f) | Overall Rate of <u>Return</u> (g) | Equity <u>Ratio</u> (h) | Date of Last <u>Order</u> (i) |
| | Electric Companies | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC | 9.74% | 7.57% | 53.43% | 46.57% | 10.20% | 7.88% | 53.00% | 09/24/2013 |
| 2. | Duke Energy Progress, Inc. d/b/a Duke Energy Progress | 9.78% | 7.31% | 52.83% | 46.91% | 10.20% | 7.55% | 53.00% | 05/30/2013 |
| 3. | Virginia Electric and Power Company, d/b/a Dominion North Carolina Power | 14.10% | 10.11% | 55.46% | 43.04% | 10.20% | 7.80% | 51.00% | 12/21/2012 |
| | Natural Gas Local Distribution Companies | | | | | | | | |
| 4. | Piedmont Natural Gas Company, Inc. | 10.83% | 6.99% | 44.68% | 55.32% | 10.00% | 7.51% | 50.66% | 12/17/2013 |
| 5. | Public Service Company of North Carolina, Inc., d/b/a PSNC Energy | 11.45% | 9.06% | 57.49% | 42.51% | 10.60% | 8.54% | 54.00% | 10/24/2008 |

Summary Statement Of Key Financial Ratios Achieved by And Authorized for Selected Companies

"Estimated Returns on Common Equity, Overall Rates of Return, Common Equity Capitalization Ratios, and Debt Ratios are for Twelve Months Ended September 30, 2013"

NOTES: [1] Selected financial market indicators from "Moody's Credit Trends" updated on December 20, 2013 follow:

Part I

| | | U.S | Treasury Secur | ities | Dealer- Placed | Moody's Long-Term |
|----------|------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Line No. | <u>Date</u> (a) | 3-Month Bill <u>%</u> (b) | 10-Year Note <u>%</u> (c) | 30-Year Bond <u>%</u> (d) | 3-Month CP <u>%</u> (e) | Corporate Bond Yield <u>%</u> (f) |
| 1. | December 19, 2013 | 0.06 | 2.94 | 3.91 | 0.09 | 4.90 |
| 2. | December 18, 2013 | 0.07 | 2.89 | 3.90 | 0.10 | 4.93 |
| 3. | December 17, 2013 | 0.07 | 2.85 | 3.88 | 0.09 | 4.90 |
| 4. | December 16, 2013 | 0.07 | 2.89 | 3.90 | 0.09 | 4.93 |
| 5. | December 13, 2013 | 0.07 | 2.88 | 3.88 | 0.08 | 4.92 |
| 6. | Month of November 2013 | 0.07 | 2.72 | 3.80 | 0.27 | 4.91 |
| 7. | Month of October 2013 | 0.05 | 2.62 | 3.68 | 0.31 | 4.82 |

Part II

Moody's public utility long-term bond yield averages (%):

| Line No. | | | _Past 12 | Months_ | Monthly Average | | |
|----------|---------------|-------------------|-------------|------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| | Rating (a) | 12/20/2013 (b) | High (c) | Low (d) | <u>Dec. 2013</u> (e) | Nov. 2013 (f) | |
| 1. | Aa | 4.51 | 4.60 | 3.74 | 4.60 | 4.56 | |
| 2. | Α | 4.73 | 4.81 | 4.00 | 4.81 | 4.77 | |
| 3. | Baa | 5.14 | 5.31 | 4.49 | 5.26 | 5.24 | |

[2] Most recent data available when this edition of the *Quarterly Review* was prepared. According to "Moody's Credit Trends", updated on December 23, 2013, such long-term bond yield averages are derived from pricing data on a regularly-replenished population of nearly 90 seasoned corporate bonds in the United States market, each with current outstandings over \$100 million. Further, the bonds have maturities as close as possible to 30 years; bonds are dropped from the list if their remaining life falls below 20 years or if their ratings change.

Statement of Authorized Returns

On Common Equity and Overall Rates of Return

Granted By Various Public Utility Regulatory Agencies As Reported In Public Utilities Reports, Volume Nos. 297-306, from June 2012 through August 2013 (Statement Is All Inclusive With Respect To Returns Published)

| | | Authorize | d Returns | | Volume No. |
|--------------------|--|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|---|
| Line <u>No.</u> | Company (Jurisdiction) (a) | Common <u>Equity</u> (b) | Overall (c) | Date Of Order (d) | Public Utilities <u>Reports</u> (e) |
| | Electric Companies | | | | |
| 1. | Puget Sound Energy, Inc. (WA) | 9.80% | 7.80% | 05/22/2012 | Volume 297 |
| 2. | Consumers Energy Company (MI) | 10.30% | 6.70% | 06/07/2012 | Volume 297 |
| 3. | Northern States Power Company, d/b/a Xcel Energy (MN) | 10.37% | N/A | 05/14/2012 | Volume 298 |
| 4. | Delmarva Power & Light Company (MD) | 9.81% | 7.56% | 07/20/2012 | Volume 298 |
| 5. | Black Diamond Power Company (WV) | 9.75% | 8.78% | 08/10/2012 | Volume 299 |
| 6. | Potomac Electric Power Company (DC) | 9.50% | 8.03% | 09/27/2012 | Volume 300 |
| 7. | Entergy Texas, Inc. (TX) | 9.80% | 8.27% | 09/14/2012 | Volume 300 |
| 8. | Rocky Mountain Power (UT) | 9.80% | 7.86% | 09/19/2012 | Volume 300 |
| 9. | Southern California Edison Company (CA) | 10.45% | 7.90% | 12/20/2012 | Volume 302 |
| 10. | San Diego Gas & Electric Company (CA) | 10.30% | 7.79% | 12/20/2012 | Volume 302 |
| 11. | Pacific Gas & Electric Company (CA) | 10.40% | 8.06% | 12/20/2012 | Volume 302 |
| 12. | Wisconsin Electric Power Company, d/b/a We Energies (WI) | 10.40% | 7.71% | 12/21/2012 | Volume 302 |
| 13. | Avista Corporation d/b/a Avista Utilities (WA) | 9.80% | 7.64% | 12/26/2012 | Volume 303 |
| 14. | Narragansett Electric Company, d/b/a National Grid (RI) | 9.50% [| [1] N/A | 02/01/2013 | Volume 303 |
| 15. | Indiana Michigan Power Company (IN) | 10.20% | 6.97% | 02/13/2013 | Volume 303 |
| 16. | Baltimore Gas and Electric Company (MD) | 9.75% | 7.60% | 02/22/2013 | Volume 303 |
| 17. | Duke Energy Progress, Inc., d/b/a Duke Energy Progress (NC) | 10.20% | 7.55% | 05/30/2013 | Volume 306 |
| 18. | Potomac Electric Power Company (MD) | 9.36% | 7.63% | 07/12/2013 | Volume 306 |
| | Natural Gas Local Distribution Companies | | | | |
| 19. | Puget Sound Energy, Inc. (WA) | 9.80% | 7.80% | 05/22/2012 | Volume 297 |
| 20. | SourceGas Distribution LLC (NE) | 9.60% | N/A | 05/22/2012 | Volume 297 |
| 21. | Atmos Energy (KS) | N/A | N/A | 08/22/2012 | Volume 299 |
| 22. | Vermont Gas Systems, Inc. (VT) | 9.75% | N/A | 08/21/2012 | Volume 300 |
| 23. | San Diego Gas & Electric Company (CA) | 10.30% | 7.79% | 12/20/2012 | Volume 302 |

Statement of Authorized Returns

On Common Equity and Overall Rates of Return

Granted By Various Public Utility Regulatory Agencies As Reported In Public Utilities Reports, Volume Nos. 297-306, from June 2012 through August 2013 (Statement Is All Inclusive With Respect To Returns Published)

| | | Authoriz | zed R | eturns | | Volume No. |
|--------------------|--|---------------|-------|---------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Line <u>No.</u> | Company (Jurisdiction) | Common Equity | | Overall | Date Of <u>Order</u> | Public Utilities Reports |
| | (a) | (b) | | (c) | (d) | (e) |
| | Natural Gas Local Distribution Companies (continued) | | | | | |
| 24. | Southern California Gas Company (CA) | 10.10% | | 8.02% | 12/20/2012 | Volume 302 |
| 25. | Pacific Gas & Electric Company (CA) | 10.40% | | 8.06% | 12/20/2012 | Volume 302 |
| 26. | Wisconsin Natural Gas, LLC, d/b/a We Energies (WI) | 10.50% | | 6.90% | 12/21/2012 | Volume 302 |
| 27. | Bluefield Gas Company (WV) | 9.90% | | 6.62% | 01/30/2013 | Volume 303 |
| 28. | Avista Corporation d/b/a Avista Utilities (WA) | 9.80% | | 7.64% | 12/26/2012 | Volume 303 |
| 29. | Narragansett Electric Company, d/b/a National Grid (RI) | 9.50% | [1] | N/A | 02/01/2013 | Volume 303 |
| 30. | Baltimore Gas and Electric Company (MD) | 9.60% | | 7.53% | 02/22/2013 | Volume 303 |
| 31. | Washington Gas Light Company (DC) | 9.25% | | 7.93% | 05/15/2013 | Volume 305 |
| 32. | Brooklyn Union Gas Company, d/b/a National Grid New York (NY) | 9.40% | | 6.98% | 06/13/2013 | Volume 306 |
| | Water Companies | | | | | |
| 33. | Tennessee American Water Company (TN) | 10.00% | | 7.83% | 04/27/2012 | Volume 298 |
| 34. | California Water Service Company (CA) | 9.99% | [2] | 8.24% | 07/12/2012 | Volume 298 |
| 35. | San Jose Water Company (CA) | 9.99% | [2] | 8.38% | 07/12/2012 | Volume 298 |
| 36. | California-American Water Company (CA) | 9.99% | [2] | 8.41% | 07/12/2012 | Volume 298 |
| 37. | Golden State Water Company (CA) | 9.99% | [2] | 8.64% | 07/12/2012 | Volume 298 |
| 38. | Lakes Region Water Company (NH) | 9.75% | | 8.43% | 07/13/2012 | Volume 299 |
| 39. | Illinois-American Water Company (IL) | 9.34% | | 7.56% | 09/19/2012 | Volume 301 |
| 40. | Utilities Services of South Carolina, Inc. (SC) | 9.42% | | 7.73% | 02/12/2013 | Volume 304 |
| 41. | Arizona Water Company (AZ) | 10.55% | | 8.72% | 02/20/2013 | Volume 304 |

Notes:

- [1] The Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission approved a settlement which includes an earnings sharing mechanism whereby accumulated earnings over the authorized 9.50% ROE, up to and including 100 basis points above the authorized ROE, would be shared 50/50 with customers. Earnings over 100 basis points above the authorized ROE would be shared 75% to ratepayers and 25% to the utility.
- [2] The California Public Utilities Commission approved a settlement agreement that established, for the period 2011 through 2014, the costs of debt and equity, capital structures, and rates of return for the four Class A water utilities doing business in California. An identical cost of common equity of 9.99% was established for each of the four utilities, but the settlement agreement provided for a different cost of debt and capital structure for each of the utilities, yielding a different overall rate of return for each of the utilities.
- [3] N/A denotes that information is not available.

Part III

Overviews of Selected Financial and Operational Data by Utility:

- Electric Companies
 - Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC
 - Duke Energy Progress, Inc., d/b/a Duke Energy Progress
 - Virginia Electric and Power Company, d/b/a Dominion North Carolina Power
- Natural Gas Local Distribution Companies
 - Piedmont Natural Gas Company, Inc.
 - Public Service Company of North Carolina, Inc., d/b/a PSNC Energy

DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS, LLC

SELECTED FINANCIAL AND OPERATIONAL DATA

North Carolina Retail Jurisdiction (Amounts In Thousands)

| | | | 12 | Annual Growth Rate | | | | |
|------------|---|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Line | | September | September | September | September | September | Four | Current |
| <u>No.</u> | <u>ltem</u> | <u>2013</u> | <u>2012</u> | <u>2011</u> | <u>2010</u> | <u>2009</u> | <u>Year</u> | <u>Year</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | (g) | (h) |
| 1. | Operating Revenue | \$4,783,693 | \$4,582,164 | \$4,481,344 | \$4,331,882 | \$3,909,940 | 5.17% | 4.40% |
| 2. | Operating Expenses: | | | | | | | |
| 3. | Fuel | 1,133,504 | 974,187 | 1,166,247 | 1,146,651 | 1,020,584 | 2.66% | 16.35% |
| 4. | Purchased Power | 187,477 | 235,751 | 193,979 | 155,923 | 146,653 | 6.33% | -20.48% |
| 5. | Maintenance | 435,141 | 421,454 | 435,708 | 416,893 | 380,985 | 3.38% | 3.25% |
| 6. | Other Operating Expenses | 936,341 | <u>858,741</u> | 883,107 | 856,699 | 730,098 | 6.42% | 9.04% |
| 7. | Total Operating Expenses | 2,692,463 | 2,490,133 | 2,679,041 | 2,576,166 | 2,278,320 | 4.26% | 8.13% |
| 8. | Depreciation & Amortization | 642,918 | 625,050 | 531,002 | 495,266 | 473,504 | <u>7.95%</u> | 2.86% |
| 9. | Total Expenses & Depreciation | 3,335,381 | 3,115,183 | 3,210,043 | 3,071,432 | 2,751,824 | 4.93% | 7.07% |
| 10. | Total Operating Taxes | 632,404 | 648,313 | <u>575,961</u> | <u>556,923</u> | 505,208 | <u>5.77%</u> | <u>-2.45%</u> |
| 11. | Total Expenses, Depr. & Taxes | 3,967,785 | 3,763,496 | 3,786,004 | 3,628,355 | 3,257,032 | <u>5.06%</u> | 5.43% |
| 12. | Operating Income | <u>\$815,908</u> | <u>\$818,668</u> | <u>\$695,340</u> | <u>\$703,527</u> | <u>\$652,908</u> | <u>5.73%</u> | <u>-0.34%</u> |
| 13. | Net Plant Investment | <u>\$14,046,007</u> | <u>\$12,408,597</u> | <u>\$11,351,973</u> | <u>\$10,972,871</u> | <u>\$9,817,185</u> | <u>9.37%</u> | <u>13.20%</u> |
| 14. 15. | Oper. Exp. as a % of Total Revenue Net Plt. Investment per \$ of Revenue | 56.28% \$2.94 | 54.34% \$2.71 | 59.78% \$2.53 | 59.47% \$2.53 | 58.27% \$2.51 | -0.86% 4.03% | 3.57% 8.49% |
| 16. | Number of Customers Served (000s include | 404): | | | | | | |
| 17. | Residential | 1,610,815 | 1,598,686 | 1,588,687 | 1,582,462 | 1,574,597 | 0.57% | 0.76% |
| 18. | Commercial | 254,339 | 252,424 | 251,025 | 249,322 | 248,662 | 0.57% | 0.76% |
| 19. | Industrial | | | | | | | |
| 20. | Other | 4,911 | 4,995 | 5,190 | 5,370 | 5,538 <u>10,753</u> | -2.96% | -1.68% |
| 20. 21. | | 10,999 1 991 064 | 10,993 | 10,901 | 10,821 | | <u>0.57%</u> | 0.05% 0.75% |
| ۷۱. | Total Number of Customers | <u>1,881,064</u> | <u>1,867,098</u> | <u>1,855,803</u> | <u>1,847,975</u> | <u>1,839,550</u> | <u>0.56%</u> | <u>0.75%</u> |
| 22. | Annual Sales Volume: (Millions kWh) | | | | | | | |
| 23. | Residential | 20,398 | 20,017 | 22,123 | 22,586 | 21,012 | -0.74% | 1.90% |
| 24. | Commercial | 21,977 | 21,795 | 22,000 | 21,966 | 21,387 | 0.68% | 0.84% |
| 25. | Industrial | 12,370 | 12,244 | 12,233 | 12,066 | 11,693 | 1.42% | 1.03% |
| 26. | Other | 2,367 | <u>574</u> | <u>714</u> | <u>1,234</u> | <u>1,172</u> | <u>19.21%</u> | 312.37% |
| 27. | Total Sales | <u>57,112</u> | <u>54,630</u> | <u>57,070</u> | <u>57,852</u> | <u>55,264</u> | <u>0.83%</u> | <u>4.54%</u> |
| 28. | Estimated Overall Rate of Return | 7.57% | 8.00% | 7.36% | 8.01% | 7.59% | -0.07% | -5.38% |
| 29. | Estimated Return on Common Equity | 9.74% | 10.42% | 8.99% | 10.19% | 9.47% | 0.71% | -6.53% |
| 30. | Common Equity Ratio | 53.43% | 53.35% | 53.45% | 52.85% | 52.03% | 0.67% | 0.15% |
| 31. | Debt Ratio | 46.57% | 46.65% | 46.55% | 47.15% | 47.97% | -0.74% | -0.17% |
| 32. | Estimated Pretax Interest Coverage Ratio (Times) | 4.55 | 4.75 | 4.17 | 4.33 | 3.98 | 3.40% | -4.21% |
| | | | | | | | | |

33. LAST RATE CASE (Docket No. E-7, Sub 1026)

Authorized Returns: Common Equity 10.20%, Overall 7.88%; Equity Ratio: 53.00%; Date of Order: 9-24-13

Notes:

^[1] North Carolina retail jurisdictional revenue equates to 70% of total company electric utility revenue.

^[2] Net Plant Investment reflects net plant in service.

^[3] Source of Data: NCUC ES-1 Reports.

^[4] The increase from September 2012 to September 2013 in "Other" annual sales volume (millions kWh) can be attributed to energy sales by DEC to Duke Energy Progress, Inc., d/b/a Duke Energy Progress (DEP) pursuant to the Joint Dispatch Agreement between DEC and DEP filed in Docket Nos. E-2, Sub 998 and E-7, Sub 986.

DUKE ENERGY PROGRESS, INC., d/b/a **DUKE ENERGY PROGRESS**

SELECTED FINANCIAL AND OPERATIONAL DATA

North Carolina Retail Jurisdiction (Amounts In Thousands)

| | | | 40 | M 41 | al . | | | ual |
|------------|---|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Line | | September | September 12 | Months Ende September | September | September | <u>Growth</u> Four | Current |
| No. | | 2013 | 2012 | 2011 | 2010 | 2009 | Year | Year |
| 140. | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | (g) | (h) |
| 1. | Operating Revenue | \$3,456,915 | \$3,329,765 | \$3,406,263 | \$3,571,805 | \$3,342,905 | 0.84% | 3.82% |
| 2. | Operating Expenses: | | | | | | | |
| 3. | Fuel | 1,005,629 | 1,001,902 | 976,323 | 1,197,585 | 1,093,070 | -2.06% | 0.37% |
| 4. | Purchased Power | 276,659 | 226,509 | 216,737 | 178,796 | 184,875 | 10.60% | 22.14% |
| 5. | Maintenance | 291,278 | 331,953 | 263,856 | 254,801 | 229,885 | 6.10% | -12.25% |
| 6. | Other Operating Expenses | <u>704,885</u> | <u>747,755</u> | 636,895 | 628,595 | <u>560,079</u> | <u>5.92%</u> | <u>-5.73%</u> |
| 7. | Total Operating Expenses | 2,278,451 | 2,308,119 | 2,093,811 | 2,259,777 | 2,067,909 | 2.45% | -1.29% |
| 8. | Depreciation & Amortization | 339,514 | <u>360,110</u> | 338,680 | 326,686 | 360,612 | <u>-1.50%</u> | <u>-5.72%</u> |
| 9. | Total Expenses & Depreciation | 2,617,965 | 2,668,229 | 2,432,491 | 2,586,463 | 2,428,521 | 1.90% | -1.88% |
| 10. | Total Operating Taxes | <u>382,325</u> | 305,633 | 422,270 | 448,238 | 427,507 | <u>-2.75%</u> | 25.09% |
| 11. | Total Expenses, Depr. & Taxes | 3,000,290 | 2,973,862 | 2,854,761 | 3,034,701 | 2,856,028 | 1.24% | 0.89% |
| 12. | Operating Income | <u>\$456,625</u> | <u>\$355,903</u> | <u>\$551,502</u> | <u>\$537,104</u> | \$486,877 | <u>-1.59%</u> | 28.30% |
| 13. | Net Plant Investment | <u>\$6,454,040</u> | <u>\$6,135,400</u> | <u>\$5,968,221</u> | <u>\$5,295,383</u> | <u>\$5,260,230</u> | <u>5.25%</u> | <u>5.19%</u> |
| 14. | Oper. Exp. as a % of Total Revenue | 65.91% | 69.32% | 61.47% | 63.27% | 61.86% | 1.60% | -4.92% |
| 15. | Net Plt. Investment per \$ of Revenue | \$1.87 | \$1.84 | \$1.75 | \$1.48 | \$1.57 | 4.47% | 1.63% |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 16. | Number of Customers Served (000s inclu | , | | | | | | |
| 17. | Residential | 1,109,307 | 1,117,444 | 1,109,190 | 1,103,946 | 1,095,481 | 0.31% | -0.73% |
| 18. | Commercial | 191,386 | 194,816 | 192,860 | 191,804 | 190,627 | 0.10% | -1.76% |
| 19. 20. | Industrial Other | 3,647 | 3,874 | 3,954 | 3,970 | 4,026 | -2.44% | -5.86% 1.45% |
| 21. | Total Number of Customers | <u>1,492</u> <u>1,305,832</u> | <u>1,514</u> 1,317,648 | <u>1,611</u> 1,307,615 | <u>1,748</u> 1,301,468 | <u>1,818</u> <u>1,291,952</u> | <u>-4.82%</u> <u>0.27%</u> | <u>-1.45%</u> <u>-0.90%</u> |
| 22. | Annual Sales Volume: (Millions kWh) | | | | | | | |
| 23. | Residential | 15,025 | 14,533 | 16,149 | 16,282 | 15,165 | -0.23% | 3.39% |
| 24. | Commercial | 11,808 | 11,963 | 12,151 | 12,237 | 11,984 | -0.37% | -1.30% |
| 25. | Industrial | 8,366 | 8,295 | 8,391 | 8,349 | 8,181 | 0.56% | 0.86% |
| 26. | Other | 4,380 | 2,728 | <u>1,616</u> | <u>2,181</u> | <u>1,838</u> | 24.25% | 60.56% |
| 27. | Total Sales | <u>39,579</u> | <u>37,519</u> | <u>38,307</u> | <u>39,049</u> | <u>37,168</u> | <u>1.58%</u> | <u>5.49%</u> |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 28. | Estimated Overall Rate of Return | 7.31% | 5.81% | 9.68% | 9.93% | 8.95% | -4.93% | 25.82% |
| 29. | Estimated Return on Common Equity | 9.78% | 6.57% | 12.80% | 13.41% | 11.78% | -4.55% | 48.86% |
| 30. | Common Equity Ratio | 52.83% | 54.11% | 59.04% | 57.55% | 55.35% | -1.16% | -2.37% |
| 31. | Debt Ratio | 46.91% | 45.29% | 40.32% | 41.78% | 43.94% | 1.65% | 3.58% |
| 32. | Estimated Pretax Interest Coverage Ratio (Times) | 4.89 | 3.51 | 6.65 | 6.77 | 5.65 | -3.55% | 39.32% |

33. LAST RATE CASE (Docket No. E-2, Sub 1023) Authorized Returns: Common Equity 10.20%, Overall 7.55%; Equity Ratio: 53.00%; Date of Order: 5-30-13

Annual

Notes: [1] North Carolina retail jurisdictional revenue equates to 71% of total company electric utility revenue.

^[2] Net Plant Investment reflects net plant in service.

^[3] Source of Data: NCUC ES-1 Reports.

^[4] The decrease from September 2012 to September 2013 in the number of customers was primarily due to a change in reporting by DEP. Beginning with the December 2012 NCUC ES-1 Report, PEC now reports the number of active customers rather than the

total number of customers which includes both active and inactive customers.

[5] The increase from September 2012 to September 2013 in "Other" annual sales volume (millions kWh) can be attributed to energy sales by DEP to Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC (DEC) pursuant to the Joint Dispatch Agreement between DEC and DEP filed in Docket Nos. E-2, Sub 998 and E-7, Sub 986.

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY, d/b/a DOMINION NORTH CAROLINA POWER

SELECTED FINANCIAL AND OPERATIONAL DATA

North Carolina Retail Jurisdiction (Amounts In Thousands)

| | | | 13 | Annual Growth Rate | | | | |
|------|--|------------------|------------------|--------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Line | | September | September | Months Ende September | September | September | Four | Current |
| No. | <u>ltem</u> | <u>2013</u> | <u>2012</u> | <u>2011</u> | <u>2010</u> | <u>2009</u> | <u>Year</u> | <u>Year</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | (g) | (h) |
| 1. | Operating Revenue | \$363,535 | \$328,844 | \$327,970 | \$343,641 | \$322,191 | 3.06% | 10.55% |
| 2. | Operating Expenses: | | | | | | | |
| 3. | Fuel | 68,909 | 84,203 | 50,410 | 95,514 | 82,803 | -4.49% | -18.16% |
| 4. | Purchased Power | 50,480 | 62,070 | 85,868 | 75,588 | 68,524 | -7.36% | -18.67% |
| 5. | Maintenance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 6. | Other Operating Expenses | 81,481 | 73,829 | 79,360 | 78,796 | 72,339 | 3.02% | 10.36% |
| 7. | Total Operating Expenses | 200,870 | 220,102 | 215,638 | 249,898 | 223,666 | -2.65% | -8.74% |
| 8. | Depreciation & Amortization | 48,208 | 47,592 | 36,939 | <u>34,575</u> | 33,621 | 9.43% | 1.29% |
| 9. | Total Expenses & Depreciation | 249,078 | 267,694 | 252,577 | 284,473 | 257,287 | -0.81% | -6.95% |
| 10. | Total Operating Taxes | <u>33,534</u> | 33,667 | <u>35,821</u> | <u>26,602</u> | <u>32,704</u> | 0.63% | <u>-0.40%</u> |
| 11. | Total Expenses, Depr. & Taxes | <u>282,612</u> | <u>301,361</u> | <u>288,398</u> | <u>311,075</u> | <u>289,991</u> | <u>-0.64%</u> | <u>-6.22%</u> |
| 12. | Operating Income | <u>\$80,923</u> | <u>\$27,483</u> | <u>\$39,572</u> | <u>\$32,566</u> | <u>\$32,200</u> | <u>25.91%</u> | <u>194.45%</u> |
| 13. | Net Plant Investment | <u>\$963,316</u> | <u>\$905,091</u> | <u>\$813,746</u> | <u>\$661,174</u> | <u>\$633,374</u> | <u>11.05%</u> | <u>6.43%</u> |
| 14. | Oper. Exp. as a % of Total Revenue | 55.25% | 66.93% | 65.75% | 72.72% | 69.42% | -5.55% | -17.45% |
| 15. | Net Plt. Investment per \$ of Revenue | \$2.65 | \$2.75 | \$2.48 | \$1.92 | \$1.97 | 7.69% | -3.64% |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 16. | Number of Customers Served (000s inclu | , | | | | | | |
| 17. | Residential | 101,163 | 101,139 | 100,916 | 100,933 | 100,727 | 0.11% | 0.02% |
| 18. | Commercial | 15,574 | 15,548 | 15,426 | 15,432 | 15,486 | 0.14% | 0.17% |
| 19. | Industrial | 50 | 50 | 53 | 58 | 59 | -4.05% | 0.00% |
| 20. | Other | <u>2,241</u> | 2,233 | 2,244 | 2,252 | <u>2,261</u> | <u>-0.22%</u> | 0.36% |
| 21. | Total Number of Customers | <u>119,028</u> | <u>118,970</u> | <u>118,639</u> | <u>118,675</u> | <u>118,533</u> | <u>0.10%</u> | <u>0.05%</u> |
| 22. | Annual Sales Volume: (Millions kWh) | | | | | | | |
| 23. | Residential | 1,569 | 1,472 | 1,677 | 1,690 | 1,597 | -0.44% | 6.59% |
| 24. | Commercial | 886 | 828 | 813 | 825 | 804 | 2.46% | 7.00% |
| 25. | Industrial | 1,675 | 1,607 | 1,632 | 1,624 | 1,464 | 3.42% | 4.23% |
| 26. | Other | <u>136</u> | <u>133</u> | <u>144</u> | <u>148</u> | <u>145</u> | <u>-1.59%</u> | 2.26% |
| 27. | Total Sales | <u>4,266</u> | <u>4,040</u> | <u>4,266</u> | <u>4,287</u> | <u>4,010</u> | <u>1.56%</u> | <u>5.59%</u> |
| 20 | Estimated Overall Pate of Potura | 10 110/ | 2 60% | 5.96% | 6 200/ | G /119/ | 12.070/ | 172 000/ |
| 28. | Estimated Overall Rate of Return | 10.11% | 3.69% | 5.96% | 6.39% | 6.41% | 12.07% | 173.98% |
| 29. | Estimated Return on Common Equity | 14.10% | 2.31% | 6.37% | 7.05% | 7.08% | 18.79% | 510.39% |
| 30. | Common Equity Ratio | 55.46% | 54.65% | 54.92% | 52.72% | 50.49% | 2.37% | 1.48% |
| 31. | Debt Ratio | 43.04% | 43.80% | 43.47% | 45.51% | 47.56% | -2.47% | -1.74% |
| 32. | Estimated Pretax Interest Coverage Ratio (Times) | 5.15 | 2.30 | 3.43 | 2.87 | 3.39 | 11.02% | 123.91% |

33. LAST RATE CASE (Docket No. E-22, Sub 479)

Authorized Returns: Common Equity - 10.20%, Overall - 7.80%; Equity Ratio: 51%; Date of Order: 12-21-12

Notes:

- [1] North Carolina retail jurisdictional revenue equates to 5% of total company electric utility revenue.
- [2] Net Plant Investment reflects net plant in service.
- [3] Source of Data: NCUC ES-1 Reports.
- [4] The results for the 12 months ended September 30, 2013, reflect income tax reductions related to (i) an adjustment to North Carolina state accumulated deferred income taxes to recognize tax rate reductions effective January 1, 2014 and January 1, 2015, as enacted in 2013 North Carolina Session Law 2013-316 (HB 998), and (ii) a change in the Company's determination of North Carolina state income taxes that has been filed with, but not yet accepted by, the North Carolina Department of Revenue. According to the Company, the return on common equity for the 12 months ended September 30, 2013, excluding such adjustments, would have been 10.43%.
- [5] N/A denotes that the data is not available or not applicable or that information is, essentially, unmeaningful.

Annual

PIEDMONT NATURAL GAS COMPANY, INC. SELECTED FINANCIAL AND OPERATIONAL DATA

North Carolina Jurisdiction (Amounts In Thousands)

| | | | 12 | ? Months Ende | ed | | | nual :h Rate |
|------|---|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Line | | September | September | September | September | September | Four | Current |
| No. | <u>ltem</u> | <u>2013</u> | 2012 | <u>2011</u> | <u>2010</u> | 2009 | <u>Year</u> | <u>Year</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | (g) | (h) |
| 1. | Operating Revenue: | | | | | | | |
| 2. | Residential | \$405,990 | \$378,300 | \$454,102 | \$532,561 | \$558,664 | -7.67% | 7.32% |
| 3. | Commercial | 228,689 | 214,848 | 262,548 | 313,645 | 337,268 | -9.26% | 6.44% |
| 4. | Industrial | 18,709 | 17,388 | 25,470 | 37,985 | 51,334 | -22.30% | 7.60% |
| 5. | Public Authorities | 373 | 443 | 644 | 983 | 215 | 14.77% | -15.80% |
| 6. | Other | 134,490 | 93,685 | 87,509 | 80,152 | <u>78,138</u> | 14.54% | 43.56% |
| 7. | Total Operating Revenue | 788,251 | 704,664 | 830,273 | 965,326 | 1,025,619 | -6.37% | 11.86% |
| 8. | Cost of Gas | 357,048 | 304,591 | 438,935 | 583,167 | 642,695 | <u>-13.67%</u> | 17.22% |
| 9. | Margin | 431,203 | 400,073 | 391,338 | 382,159 | 382,924 | 3.01% | 7.78% |
| 10. | O & M Expenses | 179,348 | 169,304 | 158,043 | 160,334 | 149,163 | 4.71% | 5.93% |
| 11. | Other Deductions | 143,787 | 134,253 | 129,888 | 123,870 | 128,733 | <u>2.80%</u> | 7.10% |
| 12. | Operating Income | <u>\$108,068</u> | <u>\$96,516</u> | <u>\$103,407</u> | <u>\$97,955</u> | <u>\$105,028</u> | <u>0.72%</u> | <u>11.97%</u> |
| 13. | Net Plant Investment | \$2,450,099 | <u>\$1,873,047</u> | <u>\$1,707,392</u> | <u>\$1,606,257</u> | <u>\$1,569,133</u> | <u>11.78%</u> | <u>30.81%</u> |
| 14. | Operating Exp. as a % of Margin | 41.59% | 42.32% | 40.39% | 41.95% | 38.95% | 1.65% | -1.72% |
| | Net Plt. Investment per \$ of Margin | \$5.68 | \$4.68 | \$4.36 | \$4.20 | \$4.10 | 8.49% | 21.37% |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 16. | Gas Delivered in DTs (000s omitted): | | | | | | | |
| 17. | Residential | 37,373 | 29,468 | 38,371 | 39,249 | 37,186 | 0.13% | 26.83% |
| 18. | Commercial | 28,298 | 24,023 | 28,267 | 28,407 | 27,562 | 0.66% | 17.80% |
| 19. | Industrial | 2,703 | 2,580 | 3,339 | 4,559 | 5,305 | -15.51% | 4.77% |
| 20. | Public Authorities | 67 | 48 | 66 | 82 | 16 | 43.05% | 39.58% |
| 21. | Other | <u>259,613</u> | 215,023 | 148,732 | 122,802 | <u>98,193</u> | <u>27.52%</u> | 20.74% |
| 22. | Total DTs | <u>328,054</u> | <u>271,142</u> | <u>218,775</u> | <u>195,099</u> | <u>168,262</u> | <u>18.17%</u> | 20.99% |
| 23. | Number of Customers (000s included): | | | | | | | |
| 24. | Residential | 606,286 | 600,350 | 593,848 | 587,461 | 580,665 | 1.09% | 0.99% |
| 25. | Commercial | 64,642 | 64,172 | 63,358 | 62,790 | 63,041 | 0.63% | 0.73% |
| 26. | Industrial | 1,070 | 1,069 | 1,083 | 1,076 | 1,101 | -0.71% | 0.09% |
| 27. | Public Authorities | 1,807 | 1,323 | 1,576 | 1,609 | 360 | 49.68% | 36.58% |
| 28. | Other | 601 | <u>599</u> | <u>568</u> | <u>569</u> | <u>557</u> | 1.92% | 0.33% |
| 29. | Total Number of Customers | <u>674,406</u> | 667,513 | 660,433 | 653,505 | 645,724 | 1.09% | 1.03% |
| 30. | Estimated Overall Rate of Return | 6.99% | 7.54% | 8.21% | 8.08% | 8.38% | -4.43% | -7.29% |
| 31. | Estimated Return on Common Equity | 10.83% | 11.21% | 11.07% | 10.52% | 12.13% | -2.79% | -3.39% |
| 32. | Common Equity Ratio | 44.68% | 48.48% | 51.45% | 50.16% | 45.33% | -0.36% | -7.84% |
| 33. | Debt Ratio | 55.32% | 51.52% | 48.55% | 49.84% | 54.67% | 0.30% | 7.38% |
| 34. | Estimated Pretax Interest Coverage Ratio (Times) | 4.73 | 5.25 | 4.74 | 4.13 | 4.20 | 3.02% | -9.90% |
| 35. | LAST RATE CASE | Authorized Returns: | Common Equ | uity 10.00%, Ov | /erall 7.51%; E | quity Ratio: 50.66% | 5; Date of Order: | 12-17-13 |

Notes:

(Docket No. G-9, Sub 631)

^[1] North Carolina retail jurisdictional revenue equates to approximately 71% of total company gas utility revenue.

^[2] Net Plant Investment reflects net plant in service.
[3] Source of Data: Shareholders' reports and the NCUC GS-1 Reports.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NORTH CAROLINA, INC. SELECTED FINANCIAL AND OPERATIONAL DATA

North Carolina Jurisdiction

(Amounts In Thousands)

| | | | 12 | 2 Months Ende | ed | | Ann Growt | |
|------------|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Line | | September | September | September | September | September | Four | Curren |
| No. | <u>ltem</u> | <u>2013</u> | 2012 | <u>2011</u> | <u>2010</u> | <u>2009</u> | Year | Year |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | (g) | (h) |
| 1. | Operating Revenue: | | | | | | | |
| 2. | Residential | \$334,932 | \$252,825 | \$330,258 | \$332,587 | \$388,730 | -3.66% | 32.48 |
| 3. | Commercial | 124,087 | 99,088 | 127,737 | 129,870 | 157,891 | -5.85% | 25.23 |
| J. 1. | Industrial | 16,516 | 14,773 | 18,223 | 22,109 | 28,468 | -12.73% | 11.80 |
| +. 5. | Public Authorities | | | | | 26,406 | | 11.01 |
| | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | N/A | |
|). • | Resale | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4 | N/A | 1 |
| 7. | Other | <u>31,953</u> | <u>27,864</u> | <u>27,318</u> | <u>26,177</u> | <u>26,155</u> | <u>5.13%</u> | <u>14.6</u> |
| 3. | Total Operating Revenue | <u>507,488</u> | <u>394,550</u> | <u>503,539</u> | <u>510,749</u> | 601,248 | <u>-4.15%</u> | <u>28.6</u> |
|). | Cost of Gas | <u>271,743</u> | <u>164,762</u> | 278,023 | <u>288,801</u> | <u>382,886</u> | <u>-8.21%</u> | 64.9 |
| 0. | Margin | 235,745 | 229,788 | 225,516 | 221,948 | 218,362 | 1.93% | 2.5 |
| 1. | O & M Expenses | 85,771 | 85,135 | 84,735 | 85,301 | 83,838 | 0.57% | 0.7 |
| 2. | Other Deductions | <u>82,713</u> | <u>79,445</u> | 75,298 | 74,091 | 72,130 | 3.48% | <u>4.1</u> |
| 3. | Operating Income | <u>\$67,261</u> | <u>\$65,208</u> | <u>\$65,483</u> | <u>\$62,556</u> | <u>\$62,394</u> | <u>1.90%</u> | <u>3.1</u> |
| 4. | Net Plant Investment | <u>\$858,321</u> | <u>\$831,731</u> | <u>\$784,731</u> | <u>\$768,185</u> | <u>\$770,970</u> | <u>2.72%</u> | <u>3.2</u> |
| 5. | Operating Exp. as a % of Margin | 36.38% | 37.05% | 37.57% | 38.43% | 38.39% | -1.34% | -1.8 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 6. | Net Plt. Investment per \$ of Margin | \$3.64 | \$3.62 | \$3.48 | \$3.46 | \$3.53 | 0.77% | 0.5 |
| 7. | Gas Delivered in DTs (000s omitted): | | | | | | | |
| 8. | Residential | 27,951 | 21,697 | 28,308 | 28,544 | 26,683 | 1.17% | 28.8 |
| 9. | Commercial | 14,196 | 11,838 | 14,172 | 14,169 | 13,423 | 1.41% | 19.9 |
|).). | Industrial | 2,938 | 2,699 | 2,721 | 3,200 | 3,165 | -1.84% | 8.8 |
|). 1. | Public Authorities | | | , | 3,200 | 0 | | 0.0 |
| | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | N/A | |
| 2. | Resale | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A | |
| 3. | Other | <u>36,859</u> | 32,982 | <u>29,635</u> | 28,924 | <u>27,303</u> | <u>7.79%</u> | <u>11.</u> |
| ŀ. | Total DTs | <u>81,944</u> | <u>69,216</u> | <u>74,836</u> | <u>74,837</u> | <u>70,574</u> | <u>3.80%</u> | <u>18.:</u> |
| i. | Number of Customers (000s included): | | | | | | | |
| i . | Residential | 453,101 | 443,728 | 434,601 | 427,873 | 420,807 | 1.87% | 2. |
| | Commercial | 41,251 | 40,800 | 40,446 | 39,219 | 38,994 | 1.42% | 1. |
| | Industrial | 167 | 165 | 172 | 170 | 172 | -0.73% | 1.3 |
| ١. | Public Authorities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | N/A | |
|). | Resale | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | N/A | |
| | Other | <u>460</u> | <u>476</u> | <u>461</u> | <u>465</u> | <u>456</u> | 0.22% | <u>-3.</u> : |
| | Citici | 494,979 | 485,169 | <u>475,681</u> | <u>467,729</u> | 460,431 | 1.83% | 2. |
| | Estimated Overall Rate of Return | 9.06% | 8.96% | 9.13% | 8.90% | 8.32% | 2.15% | 1. |
| 3. I. | | | | | | | | |
| | Estimated Return on Common Equity | 11.45% | | 11.51% | 11.22% | 11.82% | -0.79% | 0.8 |
|). | Common Equity Ratio | 57.49% | | 55.52% | 54.97% | 49.47% | 3.83% | 2.4 |
| i. | Debt Ratio | 42.51% | 43.89% | 44.48% | 45.03% | 50.53% | -4.23% | -3. |
| | Estimated Pretax Interest Coverage Ratio (Times) | 5.38 | 5.10 | 4.75 | 4.63 | 4.79 | 2.95% | 5.4 |

Notes: [1] Net Plant Investment reflects net plant in service.

^[2] Source of Data: Shareholders' Reports and the NCUC GS-1 Reports.
[3] N/A denotes that the data is not available or not applicable or that information is, essentially, unmeaningful.

Part IV

Telecommunications Companies Annual Report Filings

Telecommunications Companies 2012 Annual Report Filings¹

A. The following companies provided the Commission with links to their 2012 Annual Report filings, as submitted to the SEC:

- BellSouth Telecommunications, LLC, d/b/a AT&T North Carolina http://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/732717/000073271713000017/ye12 10k.htm
- Carolina Telephone and Telegraph Company LLC, d/b/a CenturyLink; Central Telephone Company, d/b/a CenturyLink; and Mebtel, Inc., d/b/a CenturyLink http://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/18926/000104746913002037/a2213129z10-k.htm
- Frontier Communications of the Carolinas, Inc. http://investor.frontier.com/sec.cfm?DocType=Annual&Year=&FormatFilter=
- •Verizon South Inc.² http://www22.verizon.com/investor/anualreports.htm
- Windstream Concord Telephone, Inc.; Windstream Lexcom Communications, Inc.; and Windstream North Carolina, LLC –

http://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1282266/000128226613000020/a201210k.htm

B. The following companies provided the Commission with copies of their 2012 audited financial statements:

- North State Telephone Company, d/b/a North State Communications
- Citizens Telephone Company, d/b/a Comporium³

¹ The deadline for a price plan regulated company to either provide its annual report to the Commission or to otherwise satisfy its annual reporting obligations under Commission Rule R1-32, Subsection (e1) is as soon as possible after the close of the calendar year, but in no event later than the 30th day of April each year for the preceding calendar year.

² Verizon South Inc. Knotts Island Exchange.

³ Such report has been filed as confidential and proprietary information.

Quarterly Review Electronic Distribution List

Commission Staff

Kimberly Duffley Roy Ericson Corrie Foster

Bill Gilmore

Len Green

Freda Hilburn Lemuel Hinton

Don Hoover

Kim Jones

Bliss Kite

Gail Mount

Bridget Paschal

George Sessoms

Sam Watson

Public Staff

Christopher Ayers

Jeff Davis

David Furr

John Garrison

Carl Goolsby

Robert Hinton

Jim Hoard James McLawhorn

Antoinette Wike

Attorney General's Office

Margaret Force

Others

Alexander Bailey

Virginia Electric and Power

Company,d/b/a Dominion North

Carolina Power

David Baker

North Carolina Department of Revenue

Bruce Barkley

Manager - Regulatory Affairs

Duke Energy

Laura Bateman, Manager

Carolinas Rates & Regulatory Strategy

Duke Energy

Felisa Bullock, Manager

Executive and Regulatory Services

CenturyLink

David Carpenter

Managing Director Regulatory Affairs

Piedmont Natural Gas Company, Inc.

Matthew L. Dosch

Senior Vice President of External Affairs

Comporium Communications

Rick Feathers

Associate General Counsel

N.C. Electric Corporation

Mary Lynne Grigg McGuire Woods LLP

Grea Locke

ElectriCities of North Carolina

William McAulay

Director – Legislative & Regulatory Relations Public Service Company of NC, Inc.

Ralph McDonald Bailey & Dixon, LLP

-

Sharon Miller Carolina Utility Customers Association, Inc.

Kevin O'Donnell

Nova Energy Consultants

Adam Olls

Bailey & Dixon, LLP

Stan Pace, Director

State Government Relations

Frontier Communications of

the Carolinas Inc.

Robert F. Page

Crisp, Page & Currin, L.L.P.

Candace A. Paton, Lead Analyst

Public Service Company of NC, Inc.

Rates & Regulatory Affairs

Pia K. Powers

Manager Regulatory Affairs

Piedmont Natural Gas Company, Inc.

Jo Anne Sanford

Sanford Law Office, PLLC

Carol Shrum, Vice President Rates

Duke Energy Corporation

Robert Smith, Director-External Affairs

BellSouth Telecommunications. Inc..

d/b/a AT&T North Carolina

Lawrence Somers

Deputy General Counsel

Duke Energy Corporation

State Library of North Carolina

Laura A. Sykora

Regulatory Affairs Manager

CenturyLink

Royster M. Tucker, Jr.

North State Telephone Company, d/b/a North State Communications

Susan Warner

Bailey & Dixon, LLP

Bob Wells, Executive Director North Carolina Telephone Alliance

Bettye J. Willis

Regional Vice President

State Government Affairs

Windstream Communications, Inc.