

Hypothetical BG&E Case Study with Assumed Prevailing Wage Cost Increases

Summary Table

	Proposed Rate Increase	Approved Rate Increase Without Prevailing Wage	Added Increase w/Prevailing Wage 2% Cost Impact	Added Increase w/Prevailing Wage 5% Cost Impact	Added Increase w/Prevailing Wage 10% Cost Impact
Revenue Increase	\$67.6 million	\$54.0 million	\$1.45 million	\$3.47 million	\$6.84 million
Residential Bill Increase		\$3.53	\$0.09	\$0.22	\$0.43
Total Bill	\$76.38	\$75.12	\$75.21	\$75.34	\$75.55

Key inputs and assumptions for these calculations:

- Assumes 2%, 5% and 10% increases in BG&E infrastructure costs from prevailing wage floor. Note that the 10% scenario is highly unlikely as it is 100% higher than the high end of the impact range estimated by the Maryland Department of Legislative Services.
- Uses the \$653 million delta between BG&E's \$1,245,166 adjusted test-year rate base in 2015 and its \$1,898,929 adjusted test-year rate base in 2019 as a proxy for the capital expenditures that might have increased because of the prevailing wage. It then applies the 2, 5 and 10 percent cost increases to the entire \$653 million delta as follows:
 - \$653 million x 2% = \$13.075 million
 - \$653 million x 5% = \$32.7 million
 - \$653 million x 10% = \$65.4 million
- The next step in the methodology was to increase BG&E's 2019 adjusted test-year rate base of \$1,898,929 by the assumed capital cost increases from the prevailing wage, based on the \$653 million rate base delta for each of the three cost scenarios, 2%, 5% and 10%, as follows:
 - 2% Scenario: \$1,898,929 + \$13,075 = \$1,912,004
 - 5% Scenario: \$1,898,929 + \$32,688 = \$1,931,617
 - 10% Scenario: \$1,898,929 + \$65,376 = \$1,964,305
- The next step was to calculate the total dollar rate increase associated with each of these three adjusted rate base amounts, using the exact same formula that BG&E used to calculate its proposed \$67.6 million rate increase in Company Exhibit DMV-2. The \$67.6 million increase increased minimally in each scenario as follows:
 - 2% Scenario: \$1.45 million
 - 5% Scenario: \$3.47 million
 - 10% Scenario: \$6.84 million (highly unlikely)
- Finally, the potential residential bill impact was calculated by simply working off of the reduced \$54 million overall rate increase approved by the Commission as follows: (a) reduced the estimated revenue impacts of the prevailing wage by 20% to reflect the 20% reduction in the overall rate increase approved by the MPSC; (b) allocated the revenue impact to the residential class using the MPSC's approved allocation formula; and (c) divided that number into the number of residential customers & calculated the monthly bill impact under each scenario:
 - 2% Scenario: \$0.09
 - 5% Scenario: \$0.22
 - 10% Scenario: \$0.43

These possible bill increases identified on the previous page are clearly minimal. And they also likely overestimate bill impacts for several reasons:

- First, not all utility construction work is affected by the prevailing wage proposal and, in fact, above-ground construction is not impacted at all.
- Second, only a portion of construction costs are attributable to labor and some portion of current labor costs already reflect the prevailing wage.
- Third, the overwhelming majority of peer-reviewed studies and Maryland Department of Legislative Services have all concluded that prevailing wages increase worker productivity and generally have a minimal impact on construction project costs.
- Fourth, the regulatory rate-setting process substantially mitigates rate impacts that might otherwise result from specific factors. The State's regulatory commission sets utility rates through a rigorous process that involves detailed review and the application of multiple factors. For example, relatively small reductions in only one input, the Company's authorized ROE, can have a substantial downward impact on a utility's rates simply that could easily offset any modest increase in capital costs resulting from a prevailing wage.