

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF STATE TREASURER STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE DIVISION AND THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION

JANET COWELL TREASURER

Memorandum #2010-31

T. VANCE HOLLOMAN DEPUTY TREASURER

- TO: Officials of Municipalities with Electric Systems and Their Independent Auditors
- FROM: Sharon Edmundson, Director, Fiscal Management Section
- SUBJECT: Statistical Information on Electric System Operations
- DATE: April 29, 2010

This publication has been prepared to enable local officials to compare their locality's electric system operations with the operations of other similar municipalities with electric systems. Local officials are encouraged to compare their own performances to similar units and to statewide averages. Such comparisons may identify opportunities for improvement or may indicate improved performances from previous fiscal years. Key items are provided to indicate the comprehensive financial condition of each electric system. To facilitate the analysis of these key items, this report is segregated into the following four tables:

- Table A "Financial Results and Key Ratios of Municipal Electric Systems". This table summarizes the financial results of each municipal electric system for the last four fiscal years and includes key financial ratios.
- Table B "Analysis of Transfers to the General Fund by Municipal Electric Systems and Effects on Property Taxes". This table includes statistics for the last four fiscal years on the extent to which Electric Fund transfers have been used to subsidize the General Fund and the effects of transfers and the unit's ownership of the electric system on the tax rate.
- Table C -"Ten Years of Comparative Data on Electric Fund Transfers as a
Percentage of General Fund Revenues". This table presents ten years
of comparative data to highlight the extent to which Electric Fund
transfers have been used to subsidize the General Fund.
- Table D "Analysis of Capital Outlay Expenditures of Municipal Electric Systems". This table includes an analysis of capital outlay expenditures of each municipal electric system for the last five fiscal years, which should assist units in determining if they are adequately funding the maintenance and/or expansion of their electric systems.

To facilitate the analysis of this information and to give an indication of how the statistics in this report are distributed, a statistical analysis is included, which shows the minimum, maximum, mean, median, and standard deviation of key items. For the statistical information in this report to be meaningful, financial reporting between local governments must be consistent. We are

concerned that some local governments may not be using appropriate financial reporting practices in two areas: potential accrual of unbilled electric services, accounting for reimbursements, and quasi-external transactions.

Accrual of Unbilled Electric Services

Since the Electric Fund operates in a manner similar to a commercial business, it should generally follow financial reporting standards similar to commercial organizations. These standards require that the full accrual basis of accounting be used and that revenues be recorded when they are measurable and earned. In the Electric Fund, revenues and receivables should be accrued at the end of each month for electric services provided to customers even if the customers have not yet been billed. If a municipality has provided services to its customers, it has "earned" the revenues for these services and should record a revenue and receivable. The failure to record such unbilled receivables results in a potential misstatement of the Electric Fund financial statements because expenses that have been incurred are recognized while the related revenues and receivables are not recognized.

Accounting for Reimbursements and Quasi-External Transactions

If the General Fund provides administrative services for the Electric Fund, payments for these shared services should be allocated correctly between the two funds. <u>These payments should</u> <u>not be accounted for or reported as transfers.</u> The appropriate accounting treatment involves recording expenditures or expenses in the reimbursing fund (i.e., Electric Fund) and reductions of expenditures or expenses in the fund that is reimbursed (i.e., General Fund). The failure to properly record reimbursements understates the costs of operations in the Electric Fund. In addition, it overstates expenditures in the General Fund, which causes fund balances available for appropriation as a percentage of expenditures to be understated. Incorrectly reporting these reimbursements as transfers to the General Fund also overstates the level of transfers between funds.

Transactions that would be treated as revenues, expenditures, or expenses if they involved organizations external to the municipality, such as certain payments in lieu of taxes (PILOT) from the Electric Fund to the General Fund or sales of electricity to other funds of the municipality should be accounted for as revenues, expenditures, or expenses in the funds involved. Units that have adopted transfer policies often base payments in lieu of taxes upon the gross value of fixed assets and the tax rate of the unit. These PILOTs should be treated as transfers but should be segregated from other operating transfers out from the Electric Fund. The municipal use of electricity for street lighting should be recorded as operating revenues in the Electric Fund and as expenditures in the General Fund. In addition, a similar entry should be made for the use of electricity by a Water and Sewer Fund. For further information on this subject, see Memorandum #814, "Issues of Concern for the Fiscal Year 1995-96 and Future Years".

Municipalities that are members of the N.C. Eastern Municipal Power Agency and N.C. Municipal Power Agency No. 1 have adopted transfer policies that limit the amount of transfers that can be made from the Electric Fund to the General Fund, authorize payments in lieu of taxes by the Electric Fund and authorize transfers to an electric rate stabilization fund. Inappropriate reporting of reimbursements, transfers and quasi-external transactions between funds may cause management, citizens and other financial statement users to reach incorrect conclusions about the unit's compliance with its transfer policy.

Since these amounts are material to the financial statements, auditors should be cognizant of these issues when conducting audits of municipalities that operate electric systems. In addition to being alert to possible misclassification of transactions, the auditor should determine that reimbursements are based upon costs and a reasonable allocation of expenses.

Each year our staff reviews the reports of municipalities that are members of the power agencies to determine that each unit is in compliance with its transfer policy. During our review of those reports, we found that some units are transferring money from the Electric Fund to a fund other than the General Fund. These transfers are not addressed in the transfer policy. The staff will consider these transfers as they review the financial practices of the unit for determining if approval of a debt issue can be recommended to the Local Government Commission. Transfers made to other funds that will provide a long-term economic benefit to the unit will not negatively impact that review. If a unit transfers money to a fund and that fund transfers money to the General Fund, we will consider the transfer as having been made directly to the General Fund for determining compliance with the transfer policy. Under GASB Statement 34 payments in lieu of taxes that are based on the tax rate of the unit are now accounted as transfers. These payments are not to be counted in applying the transfer policy.

How to Interpret Figures in this Report

In analyzing the statistics in this memorandum, the amounts for a particular unit should be compared to similar units, to statewide averages, and to national performance indicators published by organizations such as the credit rating agencies. In addition, the mean and standard deviation statistics should be analyzed to determine if the amounts for a unit are significantly above or below the amounts reported by other units. The amounts reported for a unit may be significantly out of line if they are more than one standard deviation above or below the mean. If an amount is determined to be significantly out of line, the reasons for the variance should be investigated. However a significant deviation from the mean is not necessarily an indication of a financial weakness, but instead may be an indication of a significant event having taken place, such as an expansion of the electric system or the occurrence of abnormal weather. It should be noted that even though there may be variations from one unit to another in some of the accounting policies used to arrive at the figures presented in this report, the effects of such variations should not materially affect the overall comparability of these statistics. In analyzing the attached tables, the following items should be considered:

Table A - Financial Results and Key Ratios of Municipal Electric Systems

(Note: See "Key to Financial Statistics and Ratios" at the end of this table.)

Financial Results

a. <u>Electric power purchases and other operating expenses.</u> Units should be working to control expenses in the Electric Fund, particularly within the category "Other Operating Expenses", which is the major expense area within a unit's control. Although the largest operating expense item is "Electric Power Purchases", this amount is not entirely within a unit's control since the wholesale rates are set by the power agency. If the percentage of electric power purchases is significantly above other units, it may be that cost increases imposed by the power agency have not been passed on to customers but instead have been absorbed by the Electric Fund, or possibly that an effective load management system has not been implemented. Because of the changes in the utility industry, units may be forced to absorb future cost increases to remain competitive with investor-owned utilities. According to the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) compilation of Form EIA-412 "Annual Report of Public Electric Utilities" (the last year of

the report is 2003 as it was terminated thereafter), the mean percentage of operating revenues for electric power purchases for major publicly owned non-generator electric utilities was 71.2% in 2003. The mean percentage for other operating expenses for this group was 21.0% in 2003.

b. **Operating margin.** This ratio is an indicator of the profitability of the electric operating activities. If a unit's operating margin is significantly below the amounts for other similar units, it may be an indication that user fees are too low or that operating expenses are too high. In the U.S. DOE's compilation of Form EIA-412 "Annual Report of Public Electric Utilities", the mean operating margin for major publicly owned non-generator electric utilities was 7.8% in 2003.

c. <u>**Transfers out (in).</u>** This ratio shows the net transfers made to (from) all other funds of the municipality. A positive ratio gives an indication of the extent to which the Electric Fund is being used to subsidize other funds. A negative ratio gives an indication of the extent to which the Electric Fund is being subsidized by other funds. As a goal, units should only make transfers to other funds if they have met their working capital needs and if they have sufficient reserves for rate stabilization purposes and capital outlays.</u>

d. <u>Net income before capital contributions.</u> This ratio is an indicator of the overall profitability of the electric system after payments are made for interest on long-term debt and miscellaneous expenses. In the U.S. DOE's 2003 compilation of Form EIA-412 "Annual Report of Public Electric Utilities", the mean net income as a percentage of operating revenues for major publicly owned non-generator electric utilities was 5.0%.

Key Ratios

e. **Quick ratio.** This ratio gives an indication of the Electric Fund's ability to pay its current bills, thereby providing a measure of short-term liquidity. Because the quick ratio is snapshot of a utility's liquidity at a point in time, it may vary considerably throughout the year. A widely accepted minimum benchmark for the ratio of quick assets to current liabilities is 2 to 1; in other words, an electric system should have at least \$2 in quick assets for each \$1 of current liabilities. A quick ratio that is significantly below this level may be explained in part by excessive transfers being made from the Electric Fund.

f. <u>Coverage ratio</u>. This ratio is a measure of the degree of protection creditors have from a default on debt obligations. As the ratio approaches 1 to 1, there is a greater risk that the Electric Fund will not be able to make its debt service payments and power purchases from its current year's cash flows.

g. <u>Days sales in receivables</u>. This ratio gives an indication of how quickly payments are being collected. Each unit should have procedures in place to ensure that electric customers are making payments within the prescribed due date. If this ratio is much greater than the maximum number of days allowed before payment is due, the unit may be inefficient in collecting payments from its customers. The inability to convert receivables into cash on a timely basis negatively affects cash flows, and therefore, investment earnings. Situations where the "Days Sales in Receivables" ratio is significantly lower than the maximum number of days allowed may indicate that units have not accrued unbilled receivables at the end of the fiscal year. (See section on unbilled receivables in Memorandum #814.)

h. <u>Days cash on hand</u>. This ratio provides an indication of the adequacy of an electric system's unrestricted cash and investment balances. The Electric Fund needs to maintain adequate cash and investment balances to enable it to finance its operations, respond to changing market

conditions, survive a prolonged economic downturn, or to take advantage of strategic opportunities. A unit whose "Days Cash on Hand" ratio is significantly below the averages presented in this report may find that its cash reserves are inadequate. A below average ratio may be an indication that large transfers have been made to other funds. Also, it may indicate that a rate stabilization fund is not being maintained and/or that sufficient reserves for future capital outlays are not being set aside.

Table B- Analysis of Transfers to the General Fund by Municipal Electric Systems and Effects on Property Taxes (Note: See "Key to Definitions and Formulas" at the end of this table.)

i. This table shows the actual transfers from the Electric Fund to the General Fund for the last four years in dollars, as a percentage of Electric Fund Fixed assets, and as a tax rate equivalent. The staff of the Local Government Commission recommends that each power agency participant adopts a transfer policy and that transfers not exceed 3 percent of gross Fixed assets. (See Memo #814 for LGC guidelines on developing a transfer policy.) In situations where a unit's transfers are significantly greater than 3 percent of gross Fixed assets, the unit may face the need for significant increases in property taxes and/or large budget cuts in future years.

j. Units with electric systems that are making substantial transfers to the General Fund should determine if their costs of providing general governmental services are in line with the costs incurred by non-electric municipalities of a similar size. To assist in making this determination, Table B includes a computation of what the unit's tax rate would have to be in order for the General Fund to operate without Electric Fund transfers. Also, this table presents the corresponding average tax rate for non-electric municipalities of a similar size. The tax rates presented in the last three columns of this table have been adjusted by multiplying the tax rate by the assessment-to-sales ratio of the county in which a unit is located. (Note: An assessment-tosales ratio is calculated annually for each county by the N.C. Department of Revenue. This ratio is based on a sample of selected real estate transactions within a county and equals the assessed valuation divided by the actual sales price. At the beginning of a revaluation cycle, market values and assessed values for a unit are approximately the same. However, by the end of a revaluation cycle, assessed values are usually much lower than market values. This adjustment makes tax rates between units more comparable, given that units are at different points in their revaluation cycles.) If a unit's tax rate without Electric Fund transfers is significantly above the non-electric average, then the unit may be providing an above average level of general governmental services, incurring higher costs to provide a basic level of general governmental services, or may not be fully utilizing all available General Fund revenue sources. The electric fund transfers as tax rate equivalent and the tax rate without Electric Fund transfers could be overstated as a result of the unit using transfers to reimburse the General Fund for administrative services rather than using the proper accounting for reimbursements. (See "Accounting for Reimbursements and Quasi-External Transactions" above.) The local governing board and management team should immediately investigate the cause of any significant tax rate variations from comparable nonelectric municipalities

k. The first part of this table presents statistics on the gross fixed assets of the Electric Fund and the estimated loss in property tax revenues that results from the unit's ownership of the utility. Local officials can use this information in estimating a payment-in-lieu of taxes amount from the Electric Fund to the General Fund. However, this estimate would normally exceed the amount of property taxes that would have been paid by an investor-owned utility since the N.C. Department of Revenue reduces the cost amounts of utility assets in calculating the assessed values subject to taxation. This reduction is determined according to complex guidelines specified in the General

Statutes. In addition, the gross fixed assets amount used in this calculation was not reduced for Electric Fund Fixed assets located outside the unit's corporate boundaries.

Table C - Ten Years of Comparative Data on Electric Fund Transfers as a Percentage of General Fund Revenues

l. Units making large transfers from the Electric Fund to the General Fund should be looking for ways to reduce the level of transfers made each year. This memorandum includes an analysis of transfers made over the last ten fiscal years, which can be used to determine if the General Fund has been reducing its reliance on Electric Fund transfers.

Table D - Analysis of Capital Outlay Expenditures of Municipal Electric Systems

This table shows capital outlays made in each of the last five fiscal years. Units should continue to make capital improvements to their electric systems and are encouraged to utilize sound management practices by adopting long-range capital improvement plans to address their projected needs. Situations where capital outlays are not being made on a consistent basis might indicate the lack of a capital improvement plan.

For further information or assistance, please contact George Harris at (919) 807-2387.

				Financial R		D.			• •	Dette	
		T (1			ectric Fund Ope	rating Revenue			Ке	y Ratios	
		Total	Electric	Other		— •	Net Inc		~	Days	Days
TT	Fiscal	Operating	Power	Operating	Operating	Transfers	Before	Quick	Coverage	Sales in	Cash
Unit	Year	Revenues	Purchases	Expenses	Margin	Out(In)	Cap Contr	Ratio	Ratio	Receivables	on Hand
C. Eastern Mu	unicipal Po	ower Agency Pa	rticipants								
Apex	2009	26,739,405	74.9	19.6	5.5	_	5.6	2.4	1.13	56.6	57.5
ripen	2009	24,781,873	71.4	19.1	9.5	_	10.0	2.4	1.20	57.8	52.5
	2000	22,727,919	72.6	18.9	8.5	(1.5)	10.0	2.4	1.18	58.0	36.7
	2006	20,854,364	75.5	18.0	6.5	-	7.3	1.9	1.15	56.3	33.0
Ayden	2009	11,942,214	83.6	17.8	(1.4)	3.4	(4.7)	7.6	1.00	40.3	182.6
<u>j</u>	2008	11,817,675	76.5	20.0	3.5	(2.5)	6.2	8.2	1.05	41.4	217.4
	2007	11,176,362	81.0	17.0	2.0	4.8	(2.6)	7.6	1.04	39.6	206.3
	2006	11,234,783	78.3	18.4	3.3	7.3	(3.9)	7.8	1.07	45.2	206.9
Belhaven	2009	2,631,494	82.7	15.3	2.0	4.2	(0.8)	4.5	1.06	45.3	264.
	2008	2,721,418	70.7	21.3	8.0	4.2	6.0	5.2	1.17	47.7	252.
	2007	2,822,745	67.7	18.2	14.1	16.3	0.3	5.3	1.26	47.4	247.
	2006	2,688,484	68.1	29.7	2.2	4.7	(0.7)	5.7	0.86	48.6	220.3
Benson	2009	4,653,849	83.2	19.5	(2.7)	1.6	(4.2)	2.4	0.89	48.6	37.
	2008	4,382,913	80.1	17.3	2.6	1.9	1.3	2.7	0.93	46.5	55.
	2007	4,232,178	82.0	17.5	0.5	2.0	(0.9)	2.3	0.85	45.0	45.4
	2006	3,905,095	84.5	18.5	(3.0)	2.2	(4.8)	1.4	0.82	40.8	12.:
Clayton	2009	11,936,594	77.3	26.0	(3.3)	-	(2.7)	3.2	0.95	47.3	97.
	2008	11,247,076	71.2	25.1	3.7	-	5.5	3.5	1.00	50.7	139.0
	2007	10,453,484	74.3	23.3	2.4	-	4.0	3.2	1.02	22.0	84.2
	2006	9,991,942	72.8	26.0	1.2	-	1.5	3.9	1.01	43.8	105.
Edenton	2009	12,151,526	83.3	13.8	2.9	1.6	1.4	1.3	1.06	36.0	11.
	2008	10,676,561	86.0	15.8	(1.8)	2.0	(1.4)	1.0	1.03	38.7	2.
	2007	10,682,632	78.5	18.7	2.8	0.8	2.4	2.0	1.06	23.2	1.
	2006	10,498,476	86.5	15.3	(1.8)	1.4	(2.9)	0.9	1.01	15.6	4.
Elizabeth City	2009	36,959,378	82.9	15.5	1.6	2.9	(1.0)	2.8	1.06	47.0	46.4
	2008	31,969,290	83.2	16.7	0.1	2.2	(1.2)	3.0	1.05	46.0	61.
	2007	30,092,399	87.7	17.3	(5.0)	5.2	(8.9)	3.3	0.99	40.4	73.9
	2006	29,855,617	83.3	16.0	0.7	3.3	(1.3)	4.4	1.06	38.1	121.9

				Financial R						5.4	
					ectric Fund Ope	rating Revenu			Ke	y Ratios	
	Fiscal	Total	Electric Power	Other	Or creating	Transfers	Net Inc Before	Orrigh	Comment	Days Sales in	Days Cash
Unit	Fiscal Year	Operating		Operating	Operating Margin	Out(In)		Quick Ratio	Coverage	Receivables	on Hand
Ullit	rear	Revenues	Purchases	Expenses	Margin	Out(III)	Cap Contr	Katio	Ratio	Receivables	
.C. Eastern N	Iunicinal Po	ower Agency Pa	rticinants (cor	ntinued)							
Farmville	2009	7,040,261	76.4	15.6	8.0	3.7	2.4	2.1	0.93	48.6	55.1
	2008	6,207,899	78.4	17.2	4.4	5.6	(5.9)	2.1	0.80	51.2	56.9
	2007	6,174,885	78.1	19.3	2.6	2.0	1.8	3.3	1.08	45.3	74.5
	2006	6,050,323	78.9	21.7	(0.6)	1.9	(3.8)	2.5	0.99	40.1	55.1
Fremont	2009	1,652,460	81.6	17.6	0.8	2.3	(1.4)	3.2	1.02	34.1	44.2
	2008	1,491,628	80.2	21.3	(1.5)	2.7	(3.4)	4.5	1.01	67.6	32.7
	2007	1,428,100	80.8	17.9	1.3	21.0	(18.4)	6.5	1.05	60.7	68.1
	2006	1,424,955	80.3	18.1	1.6	2.7	0.1	8.0	1.05	56.7	209.9
Greenville	2009	186,820,806	83.4	14.1	2.5	2.3	0.3	2.8	1.06	39.6	74.5
	2008	168,615,014	79.7	16.5	3.8	2.4	2.1	3.0	1.09	41.3	89.7
	2007	162,201,876	80.8	15.7	3.5	2.5	3.3	2.9	1.11	41.9	84.5
	2006	153,895,541	80.0	15.7	4.3	2.5	2.7	2.9	1.10	39.2	91.6
Hamilton	2009	441,125	87.1	22.8	(9.9)	-	(7.8)	7.0	0.94	49.9	516.2
	2008	434,537	82.1	21.5	(3.6)	-	(0.8)	3.8	1.01	46.5	680.8
	2007	434,054	82.6	18.8	(1.4)	-	1.5	4.8	1.04	52.8	668.9
	2006	419,352	78.2	18.2	3.6	-	6.3	9.4	1.10	44.1	640.1
Hertford	2009	2,981,274	88.6	18.4	(7.0)	-	(7.8)	2.5	0.93	64.8	35.9
	2008	2,791,899	81.9	17.0	1.1	-	0.8	3.0	1.03	82.9	72.1
	2007	2,697,288	81.4	19.5	(0.9)	3.1	(4.2)	3.1	0.99	49.8	110.2
	2006	2,579,474	80.1	20.9	(1.0)	2.6	(4.5)	3.2	0.99	52.3	126.0
Hobgood	2009	660,718	70.8	21.1	8.1	0.6	7.4	2.8	1.11	71.8	103.4
	2008	536,306	71.3	28.4	0.3	1.2	0.1	4.2	1.02	61.8	70.0
	2007	561,285	66.6	20.0	13.4	1.1	11.4	6.1	1.19	49.9	71.4
	2006	488,696	74.9	25.4	(0.3)	-	-	11.9	1.00	29.5	77.5
Hookerton	2009	767,169	88.1	19.8	(7.9)	-	(7.3)	6.3	0.94	34.7	254.9
	2008	695,037	85.8	23.6	(9.4)	(2.9)	(3.5)	7.1	0.95	41.9	293.9
	2007	686,142	87.0	22.0	(9.0)	5.8	(10.5)	7.2	0.94	38.1	316.8
	2006	678,315	83.0	21.7	(4.7)	-	(1.2)	8.4	0.86	40.8	361.7
Kinston	2009	53,128,905	87.5	8.7	3.8	1.6	1.6	1.9	1.04	42.8	23.7
	2008	48,105,623	88.5	10.5	1.0	1.3	(0.9)	2.0	1.01	44.4	30.6
	2007	46,817,025	89.9	10.9	(0.8)	1.1	(2.2)	1.5	1.00	39.8	9.1
	2006	44,686,861	86.9	11.3	1.8	2.2	(0.8)	1.5	1.03	49.3	0.2

			10	Financial R	esults ectric Fund Ope	rating Rovanu	95		Ka	v Ratios	
		Total	Electric	Other	ectric Fund Ope	rating Kevenu	Net Inc		Ke	y Katios Days	Days
	Fiscal	Operating	Power	Operating	Operating	Transfers	Before	Quick	Coverage	Sales in	Cash
Unit	Year	Revenues	Purchases	Expenses	Margin	Out(In)	Cap Contr	Ratio	Ratio	Receivables	on Hand
	I cui	ite venues	T ut chuses	Lapenses	- Mai gin		cup contr	Rutio	Ratio	Receivables	on man
C. Eastern Mu	unicipal Po	ower Agency Pa	rticipants (cor	<u>tinued)</u>							
La Grange	2009	3,839,076	75.5	16.9	7.6	1.0	7.0	1.7	1.10	36.1	50.8
	2008	3,294,089	82.5	15.2	2.3	1.2	2.8	1.6	1.05	33.4	49.2
	2007	3,160,090	76.6	16.0	7.4	2.6	5.5	1.5	0.98	33.8	47.2
	2006	3,083,083	78.7	16.3	5.0	2.2	3.6	1.2	1.07	32.7	28.1
Laurinburg	2009	15,758,081	90.1	17.1	(7.2)	3.9	(10.4)	1.9	0.96	33.5	134.6
	2008	14,817,731	86.2	17.3	(3.5)	2.1	(2.7)	3.1	1.02	43.8	160.1
	2007	14,985,386	83.7	11.5	4.8	0.3	6.9	2.9	1.11	38.8	224.5
	2006	14,446,251	82.8	10.8	6.4	1.2	7.0	6.5	1.12	90.9	161.8
Louisburg	2009	7,460,380	79.6	26.4	(6.0)	2.8	(7.5)	3.9	0.99	23.2	142.5
	2008	6,546,513	79.8	27.3	(7.1)	3.4	(6.4)	5.3	1.01	26.0	179.6
	2007	6,248,750	79.4	23.0	(2.4)	2.9	(2.4)	9.3	1.06	27.2	316.3
	2006	5,964,932	79.8	22.8	(2.6)	3.0	(4.0)	6.4	1.04	28.9	329.8
Lumberton	2009	35,512,332	85.7	12.6	1.7	1.5	0.1	1.4	1.03	23.7	41.3
	2008	32,411,260	81.7	17.8	0.5	1.4	(0.7)	1.8	1.02	23.7	41.9
	2007	32,817,228	77.8	13.4	8.8	2.9	6.2	1.7	1.13	31.3	35.8
	2006	30,793,094	81.7	14.1	4.2	0.5	3.5	1.3	1.06	26.0	33.5
New Bern	2009	61,254,933	75.8	17.8	6.4	3.0	4.0	1.3	1.12	42.4	4.0
	2008	53,163,797	74.2	23.3	2.5	2.3	0.8	0.9	1.07	48.0	-
	2007	51,057,029	78.2	19.4	2.4	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.06	42.4	-
	2006	48,829,249	77.4	20.6	2.0	1.7	0.4	1.2	1.06	43.4	1.0
Pikeville	2009	1,063,947	88.0	17.2	(5.2)	-	(6.4)	4.6	0.93	30.7	270.7
	2008	994,776	85.1	10.2	4.7	-	7.3	3.8	1.09	28.6	306.2
	2007	971,886	86.1	10.7	3.2	-	7.0	7.2	1.08	27.2	298.6
	2006	943,889	85.5	11.5	3.0	-	5.7	7.2	1.07	31.4	289.2
Red Springs	2009	4,576,161	79.6	29.0	(8.6)	-	(7.0)	3.8	0.95	59.9	36.5
	2008	4,331,916	74.9	25.6	(0.5)	-	-	4.0	1.03	56.7	55.5
	2007	4,115,729	77.3	17.4	5.3	0.7	5.5	5.0	1.07	53.2	99.8
	2006	4,113,504	73.5	15.9	10.6	4.1	7.4	5.5	1.14	65.8	124.8
Robersonville	2009	2,866,559	92.9	17.8	(10.7)	3.7	(11.7)	9.7	0.93	33.6	319.6
	2008	2,684,221	90.5	18.0	(8.5)	2.1	(5.9)	11.0	0.97	38.8	385.8
	2007	2,575,824	91.1	18.2	(9.3)	0.2	(3.5)	11.9	0.98	37.5	404.6
	2006	2,439,268	88.7	18.1	(6.8)	0.2	(3.4)	13.1	0.98	37.1	460.8

As a % of Total Electric FunTotalElectricOtherUnitYearOperating RevenuesPowerOperating PurchasesOperating ExpensesN.C. Eastern Municipal Power Agency Participants (continued) Rocky Mount200990,529,00581.114.6200883,286,30478.215.9200782,835,44578.215.2200678,239,18179.615.1Scotland Neck20093,674,57986.313.1	$\begin{array}{c cccc} & & & & \\ \hline \text{ting} & & & \\ \hline \text{Transfers} & \\ \hline \text{Out(In)} & \\ \hline \\ 4.3 & & \\ 1.8 \\ 5.9 & & \\ 1.8 \\ 6.6 & & \\ 1.8 \\ 5.3 & & \\ 1.3 \\ 0.6 & & \\ 1.0 \\ 1.6 & & \\ 4.4 \\ (2.8) & & \\ 0.9 \\ (7.2) & & \\ 1.1 \\ \hline \\ 2.3 & & \\ 2.0 \end{array}$	s Net Inc Before Cap Contr 2.4 4.3 4.6 3.8 0.6 (0.5) (1.6) (5.7) (0.7)	Quick Ratio 2.6 2.3 1.8 5.5 5.5 5.6 5.8	Coverage Ratio 1.06 1.09 1.09 1.07 1.04 1.07 1.02 0.97	y Ratios Days Sales in Receivables 43.5 43.5 43.5 44.7 46.5 31.8 34.1 31.2	Days Cash on Hand 45.0 47.0 27.6 13.6 106.4 112.6 107.9
UnitFiscal YearOperating RevenuesPower PurchasesOperating ExpensesOperating MargC. Eastern Municipal Power Agency Participants (continued)Rocky Mount200990,529,00581.114.6200883,286,30478.215.9200782,835,44578.215.2200678,239,18179.615.1	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Before Cap Contr 2.4 4.3 4.6 3.8 0.6 (0.5) (1.6) (5.7)	Ratio 2.6 2.3 1.8 5.5 5.5 5.6	Ratio 1.06 1.09 1.09 1.07 1.04 1.07 1.02	Sales in Receivables 43.5 43.5 43.5 44.7 46.5 31.8 34.1	Cash on Hand 45.0 47.0 27.6 13.6 106.4 112.6
Unit Year Revenues Purchases Expenses Marg C. Eastern Municipal Power Agency Participants (continued) Rocky Mount 2009 90,529,005 81.1 14.6 2008 83,286,304 78.2 15.9 2007 82,835,445 78.2 15.2 2006 78,239,181 79.6 15.1 14.6	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	2.4 4.3 4.6 3.8 0.6 (0.5) (1.6) (5.7)	Ratio 2.6 2.3 1.8 5.5 5.5 5.6	1.06 1.09 1.09 1.07 1.04 1.07 1.02	43.5 43.5 44.7 46.5 31.8 34.1	45.0 47.0 27.6 13.6 106.4 112.6
Rocky Mount 2009 90,529,005 81.1 14.6 2008 83,286,304 78.2 15.9 2007 82,835,445 78.2 15.2 2006 78,239,181 79.6 15.1	$\begin{array}{ccccc} 5.9 & 1.8 \\ 6.6 & 1.8 \\ 5.3 & 1.3 \\ \hline 0.6 & 1.0 \\ 1.6 & 4.4 \\ (2.8) & 0.9 \\ (7.2) & 1.1 \\ \hline 2.3 & 2.0 \end{array}$	4.3 4.6 3.8 0.6 (0.5) (1.6) (5.7)	2.6 2.3 1.8 5.5 5.5 5.6	1.09 1.09 1.07 1.04 1.07 1.02	43.5 44.7 46.5 31.8 34.1	47.0 27.6 13.6 106.4 112.6
Rocky Mount 2009 90,529,005 81.1 14.6 2008 83,286,304 78.2 15.9 2007 82,835,445 78.2 15.2 2006 78,239,181 79.6 15.1	$\begin{array}{ccccc} 5.9 & 1.8 \\ 6.6 & 1.8 \\ 5.3 & 1.3 \\ \hline 0.6 & 1.0 \\ 1.6 & 4.4 \\ (2.8) & 0.9 \\ (7.2) & 1.1 \\ \hline 2.3 & 2.0 \end{array}$	4.3 4.6 3.8 0.6 (0.5) (1.6) (5.7)	2.6 2.3 1.8 5.5 5.5 5.6	1.09 1.09 1.07 1.04 1.07 1.02	43.5 44.7 46.5 31.8 34.1	47.0 27.6 13.6 106.4 112.6
2008 83,286,304 78.2 15.9 2007 82,835,445 78.2 15.2 2006 78,239,181 79.6 15.1	$\begin{array}{ccccc} 5.9 & 1.8 \\ 6.6 & 1.8 \\ 5.3 & 1.3 \\ \hline 0.6 & 1.0 \\ 1.6 & 4.4 \\ (2.8) & 0.9 \\ (7.2) & 1.1 \\ \hline 2.3 & 2.0 \end{array}$	4.3 4.6 3.8 0.6 (0.5) (1.6) (5.7)	2.6 2.3 1.8 5.5 5.5 5.6	1.09 1.09 1.07 1.04 1.07 1.02	43.5 44.7 46.5 31.8 34.1	47.0 27.6 13.6 106.4 112.6
200782,835,44578.215.2200678,239,18179.615.1	$\begin{array}{cccc} 6.6 & 1.8 \\ 5.3 & 1.3 \\ 0.6 & 1.0 \\ 1.6 & 4.4 \\ (2.8) & 0.9 \\ (7.2) & 1.1 \\ 2.3 & 2.0 \\ \end{array}$	4.6 3.8 0.6 (0.5) (1.6) (5.7)	2.3 1.8 5.5 5.5 5.6	1.09 1.07 1.04 1.07 1.02	44.7 46.5 31.8 34.1	27.6 13.6 106.4 112.6
2006 78,239,181 79.6 15.1	$\begin{array}{cccc} 5.3 & 1.3 \\ 0.6 & 1.0 \\ 1.6 & 4.4 \\ (2.8) & 0.9 \\ (7.2) & 1.1 \\ 2.3 & 2.0 \end{array}$	3.8 0.6 (0.5) (1.6) (5.7)	1.8 5.5 5.5 5.5 5.6	1.07 1.04 1.07 1.02	46.5 31.8 34.1	13.6 106.4 112.6
	$\begin{array}{cccc} 0.6 & 1.0 \\ 1.6 & 4.4 \\ (2.8) & 0.9 \\ (7.2) & 1.1 \\ 2.3 & 2.0 \\ \end{array}$	0.6 (0.5) (1.6) (5.7)	5.5 5.5 5.6	1.04 1.07 1.02	31.8 34.1	106.4 112.6
	1.6 4.4 (2.8) 0.9 (7.2) 1.1 2.3 2.0	(0.5) (1.6) (5.7)	5.5 5.6	1.07 1.02	34.1	112.6
	(2.8) 0.9 (7.2) 1.1 2.3 2.0	(1.6) (5.7)	5.6	1.02		
	(7.2) 1.1 2.3 2.0	(5.7)			51.2	
	2.3 2.0		5.0		28.5	
			2.2	1.06	42.9	106.0 90.2
		3.3	2.2	0.96	42.9	90.2 86.4
20087,401,93679.814.920077,299,34181.69.3	5.31.49.13.8	3.3 4.9	2.2	1.08	43.8	80.2
2007 7,299,341 81.6 9.5 2006 6,846,436 79.8 11.7	9.1 5.8 8.5 1.8	4.9 (7.8)	2.0	0.94	42.8 59.5	82.3 113.0
Smithfield 2009 18,753,209 90.1 9.5	0.4 -	(0.9)	3.0	1.00	53.2	87.5
2008 17,200,191 88.6 11.1	0.3 2.8	(0.9)	2.1	1.00	45.6	52.8
2007 17,619,038 81.2 15.2	3.6 -	4.9	3.1	1.04	53.5	72.1
2007 17,019,058 81.2 15.2 2006 16,892,110 82.4 14.6	3.0 -	4.9	4.0	1.08	55.5 47.7	100.9
	(0.1) -	0.3	4.0	1.00	24.9	131.8
•	0.0 -	2.1	4.0 5.4	1.04	24.9	151.6
2008 5,710,200 81.5 18.7 2007 5,732,143 79.9 16.5	3.6 -	2.1 6.4	3.4 3.8	1.00	23.2 26.3	208.7
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	7 0	6.4 6.9	5.8 5.3	1.11	20.5 29.5	208.7
	<u>5.0</u> - (1.6) 3.3	(4.9)	1.4	1.11	37.0	207.3
	(3.1) 4.7	(4.9)	1.4	1.03	37.0	20.3
	(1.9) (1.5)	(7.3)	1.5	1.04	39.8	20.3
	(1.6) 4.6	(6.0)	1.7	1.05	38.4 39.7	20.8
Wake Forest 2009 16,601,160 73.9 22.2	3.9 -	3.3	0.7	1.00	45.0	3.3
2008 14,827,940 71.6 23.6	4.8 -	3.3 4.5	0.7	1.07	45.3	-
	(1.0) -	(0.8)	1.0	1.07	45.5	- 2.2
	(3.0) 1.6	(0.8) (4.0)	1.0 1.6	0.99	- 40.0	2.2 29.6
Z000 13,819,974 70.0 52.4 Washington 2009 36,335,609 77.8 16.4	(3.0) 1.0 5.8 1.5	4.6	2.0	1.09	40.9	
2008 33,185,887 75.1 18.2	5.8 1.3 6.7 2.7	4.0 5.2	2.0	1.09	40.9 49.5	55.7 71.7
2008 55,185,887 75.1 18.2 2007 31,988,163 76.9 19.0	4.1 0.7	5.2 6.2	2.2 1.9	1.12	49.3 46.7	45.7
	$\begin{array}{c} 4.1 & 0.7 \\ (0.2) & (3.8) \end{array}$	0.2 4.6	1.9 1.7	1.11	40.7	43.7

				Financial R	esults						
			Asa	a % of Total Ele	ectric Fund Ope	rating Revenu	es		Ke	y Ratios	
		Total	Electric	Other			Net Inc			Days	Days
	Fiscal	Operating	Power	Operating	Operating	Transfers	Before	Quick	Coverage	Sales in	Cash
Unit	Year	Revenues	Purchases	Expenses	Margin	Out(In)	Cap Contr	Ratio	Ratio	Receivables	on Hand
.C. Eastern M	Iunicipal Po	ower Agency Pa	rticipants (coi	ntinued)							
Wilson	2009	143,457,739	79.4	12.7	7.9	1.5	5.3	3.5	1.11	39.8	93.6
	2008	123,908,744	80.7	14.0	5.3	1.7	3.7	3.2	1.09	39.0	77.9
	2007	117,753,253	83.8	13.9	2.3	5.4	(4.6)	2.5	1.04	40.9	58.3
	2006	108,720,650	86.9	15.1	(2.0)	1.7	(3.4)	4.0	1.00	40.8	107.8
.C. Municipal	Power Age	ency Number 1	<u>Participants</u>								
Albemarle	2009	28,667,789	77.9	16.2	5.9	3.2	3.0	3.3	1.08	39.4	85.1
	2008	27,897,332	79.7	16.2	4.1	4.5	0.1	3.5	1.08	37.3	104.7
	2007	27,027,733	78.5	16.0	5.5	2.8	3.4	3.2	1.10	37.1	77.5
	2006	26,610,131	81.6	18.7	(0.3)	3.6	(3.2)	2.7	1.03	35.1	58.9
Bostic	2009	356,943	63.6	22.9	13.5	6.4	8.4	12.2	1.35	43.1	498.1
	2008	347,035	65.6	29.9	4.5	7.2	(0.7)	5.6	1.22	48.9	434.1
	2007	335,862	64.0	23.7	12.3	11.3	4.6	10.0	1.30	47.0	390.0
	2006	334,151	62.5	14.5	23.0	12.0	13.5	8.5	1.46	51.7	410.0
Cherryville	2009	4,777,925	78.2	23.1	(1.3)	5.4	(6.8)	1.7	1.01	30.5	4.7
	2008	4,931,046	73.7	21.6	4.7	4.9	(0.6)	3.7	1.08	36.1	1.7
	2007	4,523,631	71.0	23.9	5.1	4.5	2.0	4.3	1.10	33.9	33.1
	2006	4,459,341	77.8	21.8	0.4	1.6	(0.7)	5.5	1.04	34.0	40.3
Cornelius	2009	3,998,099	69.5	29.3	1.2	_	1.1	2.2	1.12	49.0	64.2
	2008	4,753,904	57.7	21.6	20.7	-	20.8	2.6	1.32	36.7	58.8
	2007	4,050,721	67.8	21.6	10.6	-	10.6	1.5	1.11	40.4	36.8
	2006	3,760,433	71.6	21.4	7.0	-	5.8	1.2	1.01	44.8	44.3
Drexel	2009	1,882,942	72.9	33.5	(6.4)	-	(4.2)	13.8	0.96	34.5	488.2
	2008	2,007,382	67.6	27.2	5.2	-	10.3	12.8	1.17	43.7	514.9
	2007	1,889,827	67.3	29.3	3.4	-	9.5	14.3	1.16	32.3	521.3
	2006	1,860,552	72.5	30.8	(3.3)	-	0.1	12.6	1.02	31.4	458.5
Gastonia	2009	64,915,490	78.0	15.1	6.9	3.4	3.6	3.0	1.12	43.3	55.9
	2008	64,204,033	78.0	13.5	8.5	3.3	5.8	2.6	1.15	43.3	51.6
	2007	58,651,015	81.0	14.1	4.9	3.6	1.7	2.4	1.10	45.8	39.9
	2006	56,871,858	83.0	14.7	2.3	3.9	(1.0)	2.5	1.07	41.0	47.7

				Financial R					T 7		
					ectric Fund Ope	rating Revenue			Ke	y Ratios	
		Total	Electric	Other			Net Inc		~	Days	Days
-	Fiscal	Operating	Power	Operating	Operating	Transfers	Before	Quick	Coverage	Sales in	Cash
Unit	Year	Revenues	Purchases	Expenses	Margin	Out(In)	Cap Contr	Ratio	Ratio	Receivables	on Hand
.C. Municipal	Power Ag	ency Number 1	Participants (c	ontinued)							
Granite Falls	2009	5,185,923	70.2	26.4	3.4	-	3.5	3.1	1.08	56.0	65.7
	2008	4,986,506	68.2	36.0	(4.2)	-	(4.1)	2.4	0.98	60.4	50.8
	2007	4,613,113	69.4	18.1	12.5	-	13.1	2.2	1.22	77.6	44.2
	2006	4,267,406	73.4	27.2	(0.6)	-	(0.3)	2.5	1.03	42.4	62.4
High Point	2009	100,515,253	76.9	22.4	0.7	2.6	(3.9)	3.7	1.03	20.4	115.7
0	2008	101,806,115	75.6	19.6	4.8	2.0	3.5	3.5	1.12	20.8	115.8
	2007	97,956,590	74.9	22.1	3.0	(3.7)	8.2	3.3	1.11	18.2	107.9
	2006	89,650,166	83.1	20.1	(3.2)	0.6	(2.8)	2.9	1.02	12.9	100.9
Huntersville	2009	9,427,103	71.1	19.8	9.1	-	8.8	2.6	1.18	46.7	93.6
	2008	9,308,061	65.4	18.0	16.6	-	16.5	2.4	1.30	55.0	78.9
	2007	7,355,631	70.4	21.3	8.3	-	8.3	2.7	1.17	46.8	101.2
	2006	7,140,993	63.1	18.6	18.3	-	18.1	3.3	1.33	58.7	123.8
Landis	2009	4,959,757	65.5	22.9	11.6	2.8	8.8	2.5	1.22	39.1	44.2
	2008	4,796,978	65.6	21.9	12.5	4.2	8.4	1.3	1.24	37.6	31.0
	2007	4,371,003	68.8	26.3	4.9	5.0	(0.2)	1.0	1.11	33.3	10.7
	2006	4,242,394	74.4	27.1	(1.5)	7.4	(8.6)	1.3	1.02	35.9	29.7
Lexington	2009	42,552,553	78.3	18.9	2.8	4.0	(1.5)	2.0	1.04	46.9	31.5
	2008	43,229,954	78.2	17.8	4.0	8.4	(4.2)	2.4	1.07	46.2	34.2
	2007	42,010,804	78.3	19.6	2.1	1.0	1.5	2.5	1.05	44.3	36.7
	2006	42,646,571	79.1	18.0	2.9	4.2	(0.9)	2.1	1.06	43.0	39.9
Lincolnton	2009	6,197,694	81.0	25.9	(6.9)	0.4	(6.0)	6.7	0.96	32.4	245.6
	2008	6,226,419	79.6	22.9	(2.5)	0.4	0.1	7.0	1.04	32.3	265.3
	2007	6,041,584	77.9	22.3	(0.2)	-	3.5	7.2	1.08	32.5	266.0
	2006	5,817,435	80.4	20.7	(1.1)	0.1	1.5	6.7	1.05	28.9	245.9
Maiden	2009	4,443,326	102.3	4.0	(6.3)	0.5	(6.6)	9.5	0.98	30.5	48.3
	2008	5,104,978	86.7	12.7	0.6	-	0.9	12.7	1.05	30.0	50.5
	2007	4,868,453	85.8	12.0	2.2	-	2.5	10.9	1.07	30.4	35.8
	2006	4,587,233	87.2	15.8	(3.0)	-	(2.8)	7.7	1.00	27.4	17.2
Monroe	2009	40,925,590	85.9	14.7	(0.6)	6.4	(4.2)	7.7	1.06	30.2	283.0
	2008	43,050,885	82.2	11.5	6.3	-	14.0	6.1	1.21	35.5	318.3
	2007	39,853,672	83.7	12.0	4.3	3.7	11.7	11.2	1.23	33.7	405.2
	2006	39,118,010	83.8	10.5	5.7	(1.4)	12.4	11.0	1.17	28.6	405.9

				Financial R							
			Asa	a % of Total Ele	ectric Fund Ope	rating Revenue			Ke	y Ratios	
		Total	Electric	Other			Net Inc			Days	Days
	Fiscal	Operating	Power	Operating	Operating	Transfers	Before	Quick	Coverage	Sales in	Cash
Unit	Year	Revenues	Purchases	Expenses	Margin	Out(In)	Cap Contr	Ratio	Ratio	Receivables	on Hand
.C. Municipal	Power Age	ency Number 1	Participants (c	<u>continued)</u>							
Morganton	2009	23,925,934	94.8	17.2	(12.0)	2.1	(13.5)	4.6	0.91	37.4	83.7
	2008	23,422,320	94.5	18.6	(13.1)	3.0	(14.1)	5.4	0.91	39.0	130.4
	2007	23,094,949	90.1	19.2	(9.3)	4.0	(11.1)	7.2	0.95	40.7	19.6
	2006	23,116,052	87.8	19.1	(6.9)	3.1	(6.9)	8.5	0.98	36.6	233.7
Newton	2009	11,872,571	70.7	28.4	0.9	-	1.0	0.5	1.02	34.3	-
	2008	11,395,268	70.7	29.2	0.1	(3.4)	3.5	1.3	1.01	33.7	6.4
	2007	11,097,763	69.0	33.9	(2.9)	-	(0.4)	0.6	1.02	36.8	-
	2006	9,669,207	73.3	33.8	(7.1)	1.4	(6.3)	1.0	0.89	37.3	12.5
Pineville	2009	9,920,434	84.9	13.6	1.5	0.4	1.7	3.9	1.06	51.7	134.8
	2008	10,233,367	82.2	12.2	5.6	-	6.7	3.8	1.11	52.5	126.2
	2007	9,543,881	84.7	12.7	2.6	-	4.5	3.4	1.07	52.2	112.9
	2006	9,390,454	85.1	14.1	0.8	-	2.5	4.0	1.05	51.1	188.9
Shelby	2009	17,397,799	82.9	8.1	9.0	3.1	5.8	3.9	1.11	48.2	129.8
	2008	17,333,313	73.0	17.1	9.9	2.7	8.2	3.5	1.15	46.5	145.6
	2007	16,906,669	80.9	7.2	11.9	2.8	12.1	3.1	1.18	44.2	123.0
	2006	15,529,360	76.0	17.3	6.7	11.4	(4.8)	2.6	1.08	39.2	111.9
Statesville	2009	36,661,251	85.7	15.6	(1.3)	0.7	(0.7)	5.6	1.03	47.4	129.6
	2008	37,804,704	83.4	13.9	2.7	0.5	3.3	4.7	1.07	44.9	141.7
	2007	36,425,195	82.7	12.9	4.4	0.4	6.0	5.0	1.11	48.2	163.9
	2006	34,434,669	86.5	12.7	0.8	0.5	1.3	5.0	1.05	48.0	155.4
other Units wit	h Electric S	<u>Systems</u>									
Black Creek	2009	1,411,932	66.0	26.1	7.9	4.2	6.1	11.9	1.22	34.1	403.0
	2008	1,277,417	52.7	33.5	13.8	3.7	12.9	9.5	1.41	33.6	447.3
	2007	1,232,270	49.4	32.0	18.6	5.0	14.4	11.5	1.00	55.3	394.6
	2006	1,123,251	46.5	29.7	23.8	7.5	21.1	9.1	1.48	69.8	483.0
Concord	2009	61,902,700	74.6	25.1	0.3	-	(0.1)	3.8	0.91	45.0	105.8
	2008	61,920,483	65.6	25.3	9.1	(0.3)	9.3	3.0	1.19	43.1	83.5
	2007	57,784,175	65.9	26.7	7.4	1.8	5.6	3.0	1.16	43.3	106.1
	2006	55,127,472	61.6	26.0	12.4	4.1	7.9	4.0	1.24	40.1	120.2

				Financial R							
				a % of Total Ele	ectric Fund Ope	rating Revenu			Ke	y Ratios	
		Total	Electric	Other			Net Inc			Days	Days
	Fiscal	Operating	Power	Operating	Operating	Transfers	Before	Quick	Coverage	Sales in	Cash
Unit	Year	Revenues	Purchases	Expenses	Margin	Out(In)	Cap Contr	Ratio	Ratio	Receivables	on Hand
ther Units with	Electric	Systems (contin	ued)								
Dallas	2009	5,668,774	60.3	27.4	12.3	9.3	3.0	6.1	1.27	31.1	213.7
	2008	5,029,477	55.8	29.9	14.3	8.9	5.5	5.7	1.34	31.9	228.5
	2007	4,661,353	53.6	28.9	17.5	9.6	7.6	5.7	1.40	33.0	242.4
	2006	4,476,392	52.9	26.9	20.2	12.9	7.7	4.9	1.48	30.8	239.0
Enfield	2009	3,849,926	69.1	16.8	14.1	16.5	(2.5)	7.2	1.24	41.1	248.4
	2008	3,785,034	57.5	15.9	26.6	13.9	12.9	7.0	1.49	54.1	270.3
	2007	3,401,906	50.4	16.0	33.6	20.9	12.7	6.5	1.67	47.3	246.1
	2006	3,339,138	51.8	15.5	32.7	21.1	11.5	4.5	1.62	50.0	161.1
Fayetteville	2009	169,451,426	68.5	15.4	16.1	4.7	11.3	3.8	1.27	49.6	109.2
•	2008	166,899,655	66.0	14.5	19.5	6.0	13.4	1.8	0.97	41.7	104.9
	2007	159,647,302	63.8	14.2	22.0	5.6	14.4	0.7	0.83	43.6	89.3
	2006	155,773,020	63.8	20.7	15.5	6.4	6.3	0.4	0.99	44.8	62.3
Forest City	2009	10,884,651	58.0	15.9	26.1	23.3	3.6	5.1	1.53	54.7	140.6
	2008	10,251,107	51.8	18.6	29.6	24.4	6.1	5.0	1.67	52.6	124.6
	2007	9,782,899	49.8	18.4	31.8	33.2	(0.6)	4.2	1.74	56.2	98.3
	2006	9,302,539	48.7	19.1	32.2	29.6	3.5	10.8	1.77	51.7	85.4
Fountain	2009	487,356	53.0	45.3	1.7	-	1.8	6.7	1.14	46.6	305.3
	2008	504,941	45.4	40.6	14.0	-	13.5	7.3	1.41	50.2	305.1
	2007	515,659	47.2	39.2	13.6	-	12.9	5.0	1.12	37.7	252.6
	2006	518,930	55.0	34.0	11.0	-	10.4	2.7	1.06	23.6	223.5
Highlands	2009	3,225,482	53.6	35.6	10.8	22.9	(10.5)	15.6	1.30	40.4	319.0
	2008	3,226,295	54.9	29.5	15.6	9.5	8.7	17.0	1.39	43.7	355.1
	2007	3,150,674	56.5	22.8	20.7	-	24.3	13.7	1.48	39.6	370.7
	2006	3,105,990	52.6	40.4	7.0	32.2	(23.2)	14.2	1.22	49.3	230.6
Kings Mountain	2009	11,633,394	60.6	23.8	15.6	14.8	0.6	2.7	1.28	48.7	46.9
	2008	10,468,667	55.9	28.1	16.0	15.0	1.0	2.5	1.32	50.5	48.4
	2007	9,091,722	58.3	26.9	14.8	8.5	6.4	2.5	1.29	50.1	49.2
	2006	8,719,439	53.9	27.7	18.4	18.9	(0.5)	2.4	1.38	49.6	39.3
Lucama	2009	2,063,705	73.7	25.7	0.6	1.2	1.7	14.8	1.08	39.6	608.6
	2008	2,016,755	51.4	25.9	22.7	2.9	23.9	16.6	1.58	41.6	772.5
	2007	1,802,265	47.8	29.7	22.5	3.5	23.3	26.5	1.16	33.2	726.6
	2006	1,802,011	51.6	27.7	20.7	4.4	18.9	19.2	1.43	29.9	671.8

				Financial R							
					ectric Fund Ope	rating Revenu			Ke	y Ratios	
		Total	Electric	Other			Net Inc			Days	Days
	Fiscal	Operating	Power	Operating	Operating	Transfers	Before	Quick	Coverage	Sales in	Cash
Unit	Year	Revenues	Purchases	Expenses	Margin	Out(In)	Cap Contr	Ratio	Ratio	Receivables	on Hand
ther Units wit	h Electric S	Systems (contin	ued)								
Macclesfield	2009	487,426	75.0	30.5	(5.5)	-	(2.0)	9.3	0.98	52.9	311.5
	2008	480,460	67.3	27.5	5.2	-	6.7	9.4	1.10	50.1	361.7
	2007	485,647	64.0	30.7	5.3	0.6	5.9	8.7	1.11	39.9	341.5
	2006	447,082	64.1	30.0	5.9	12.1	(6.0)	8.9	1.10	35.8	350.9
Oak City	2009	399,159	66.6	9.5	23.9	11.3	19.1	11.1	1.48	53.0	635.7
-	2008	359,900	76.0	11.8	12.2	1.8	14.6	10.8	1.24	38.2	528.0
	2007	325,487	85.0	9.8	5.2	9.6	(2.5)	9.6	1.11	35.8	477.1
	2006	321,876	87.8	16.7	(4.5)	6.4	(6.7)	7.5	1.02	56.8	435.6
Pinetops	2009	2,884,664	64.0	22.1	13.9	14.6	(0.5)	2.9	1.24	18.7	69.5
	2008	2,307,676	62.9	27.3	9.8	8.7	1.6	3.0	1.19	18.4	95.9
	2007	2,159,431	65.7	20.3	14.0	14.8	0.2	2.6	1.24	29.9	83.1
	2006	2,042,376	63.4	18.8	17.8	12.7	5.1	3.9	1.29	26.1	64.8
Sharpsburg	2009	2,231,839	76.3	32.1	(8.4)	18.8	(27.7)	2.0	0.89	39.5	81.1
	2008	1,915,355	78.6	0.4	21.0	16.4	3.5	4.8	1.24	47.0	129.9
	2007	1,744,142	51.5	23.2	25.3	(2.7)	26.1	5.8	1.41	34.6	76.3
	2006	2,017,770	49.2	27.1	23.7	11.1	9.6	3.7	1.38	42.4	21.0
Stantonsburg	2009	2,265,296	71.5	22.2	6.3	8.8	(1.0)	12.6	1.15	24.4	383.8
	2008	2,203,907	50.3	23.2	26.5	9.1	20.5	12.1	1.64	18.8	522.4
	2007	2,011,419	46.6	25.6	27.8	9.9	20.8	13.6	1.24	17.6	455.3
	2006	1,811,952	52.9	24.8	22.3	11.0	12.2	9.3	1.41	15.5	466.9
Walstonburg	2009	261,301	70.2	17.6	12.2	1.5	10.1	3.6	1.17	39.7	110.4
	2008	201,894	74.0	18.6	7.4	-	7.4	3.4	1.12	45.0	78.7
	2007	172,214	76.4	26.9	(3.3)	-	(3.2)	5.8	0.98	41.1	178.3
	2006	162,364	74.8	27.6	(2.4)	6.8	(9.2)	7.5	0.98	32.5	206.5
Waynesville	2009	8,340,871	73.5	15.1	11.4	10.5	0.3	1.8	1.17	34.1	84.5
	2008	7,676,949	69.3	14.0	16.7	11.4	6.1	1.9	1.28	31.6	95.4
	2007	7,310,728	69.3	15.1	15.6	12.3	4.5	3.6	1.26	28.7	84.3
	2006	7,036,064	69.0	15.1	15.9	14.2	2.2	2.9	1.26	27.4	68.9
Windsor	2009	5,076,976	63.8	22.4	13.8	12.5	2.5	6.4	1.26	40.2	177.4
	2008	4,846,910	59.4	27.8	12.8	9.5	4.9	4.1	1.27	52.7	133.7
	2007	4,479,536	61.4	24.2	14.4	9.5	7.7	4.7	1.30	46.8	161.7
	2006	4,121,698	68.4	26.1	5.5	9.0	(1.7)	3.9	1.12	50.6	146.4

			Asa	Financial R a % of Total Ele	esults ectric Fund Ope	rating Revenue	es		Ke	y Ratios	
Unit	Fiscal Year	Total Operating Revenues	Electric Power Purchases	Other Operating Expenses	Operating Margin	Transfers Out(In)	Net Inc Before Cap Contr	Quick Ratio	Coverage Ratio	Days Sales in Receivables	Days Cash on Hand
Other Units wit	h Electric S	Systems (contin	ued)								
Winterville	2009	5,782,977	64.7	25.4	9.9	1.9	6.7	4.0	1.15	44.9	129.4
	2008	5,088,797	53.1	29.3	17.6	5.2	15.3	14.6	1.43	48.4	310.2
	2007	4,645,162	61.3	28.0	10.7	(0.6)	12.1	8.4	1.22	55.4	110.1
	2006	4,740,155	65.4	23.4	11.2	8.5	3.1	7.1	1.15	43.6	94.0

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2009, 2008, 2007 and 2006

Additional information to Table A:

Murphy Power Board is not included in Table A because its operations are separate from the Town of Murphy and are not included in the Town's financial statements.

Statistics pertinent to this unit are as follows:

			As	a % of Total El	ectric Fund Ope	rating Revenues	S	Key Ratios				
Unit	Fiscal Year	Total Operating Revenues	Electric Power Purchases	Other Operating Expenses	Operating Margin	Transfers Out(In)	Net Income	Quick Ratio	Coverage Ratio	Days Sales in Receivables	Days Cash on Hand	
Murphy Power												
Board	2009	14,374,918	75.3	20.4	4.3	-	4.7	1.2	1.11	26.4	15.3	
	2008	13,022,514	73.2	22.0	4.8	-	6.5	1.9	1.14	33.8	40.5	
	2007	12,664,388	73.4	21.8	4.8	-	6.6	0.9	1.14	28.0	3.6	
	2006	12,012,326	74.7	22.5	2.8	-	4.6	1.0	1.11	31.0	11.3	

Financial Results and Key Ratios of Municipal Electric Systems Statistical Analysis - NC Eastern Municipal Power Agency

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2009, 2008, 2007 and 2006

				Financial	Results				Key I	Ratios	
				As a % of 7	Fotal Operating	g Revenues					
	Fiscal	Total Operating	Electric Power	Other Operating	Operating	Transfers	Net Income Before	Quick	Coverage	Days Sales in	Days Cash
	Year	Revenues	Purchases	Expenses	Margin	Out(In)	Cap Contr	Ratio	Ratio	Receivables	on Hand
Minimum	2009	\$ 441,125	70.8	8.7	(10.7)	-	(11.7)	0.7	0.89	23.2	3.3
	2008	434,537	70.7	10.2	(9.4)	(2.9)	(7.5)	0.7	0.80	23.7	-
	2007	434,054	66.6	9.3	(9.3)	(1.5)	(18.4)	1.0	0.85	22.0	-
	2006	419,352	68.1	10.8	(7.2)	(3.8)	(7.8)	0.9	0.82	-	0.2
Maximum	2009	186,820,806	92.9	29.0	8.1	4.2	7.4	9.7	1.13	71.8	516.2
	2008	168,615,014	90.5	28.4	9.5	5.6	10.0	11.0	1.20	82.9	680.8
	2007	162,201,876	91.1	29.7	14.1	21.0	11.4	11.9	1.26	60.7	668.9
	2006	153,895,541	88.7	32.4	10.6	7.3	7.4	13.1	1.15	90.9	640.1
Mean	2009	26,366,075	82.4	17.4	0.1	1.6	(1.3)	3.3	1.02	42.2	107.2
	2008	23,671,347	80.3	18.5	1.2	1.6	0.8	3.5	1.04	44.7	122.1
	2007	22,937,381	80.2	17.4	2.4	2.8	1.0	3.9	1.06	41.1	130.0
	2006	21,737,041	80.4	18.2	1.4	1.6	0.2	4.5	1.03	41.6	138.7
Median	2009	10,091,751	83.1	17.0	1.2	1.6	(0.8)	2.8	1.04	41.7	66.0
	2008	9,039,249	80.5	17.6	1.3	1.8	0.5	3.0	1.04	44.1	70.9
	2007	8,876,413	80.8	17.7	2.5	1.2	1.7	3.1	1.06	41.4	74.2
	2006	8,419,189	80.1	18.1	1.7	1.7	(0.4)	4.0	1.05	40.8	106.0
Standard Deviation	2009	42,126,433	5.3	4.5	5.6	1.4	5.1	2.0	0.07	11.2	111.4
	2008	37,528,501	5.6	4.6	4.5	1.9	4.2	2.2	0.07	12.1	139.6
	2007	36,114,826	5.7	4.0	5.4	4.6	6.2	2.6	0.08	9.8	145.1
	2006	33,981,734	5.0	5.0	4.2	2.0	4.5	3.2	0.08	15.7	146.1

Note: Electric Power Purchases plus Other Operating Expenses plus Operating Margin do not necessarily sum to 100% because each entry is a separately calculated statistic.

Financial Results and Key Ratios of Municipal Electric Systems Statistical Analysis - NC Municipal Power Agency Number 1

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2009, 2008, 2007 and 2006

				Financial	Results				Key l	Ratios	
				As a % of]	Fotal Operating	g Revenues					
	Fiscal Year	Total Operating Revenues	Electric Power Purchases	Other Operating Expenses	Operating Margin	Transfers Out(In)	Net Income Before Cap Contr	Quick Ratio	Coverage Ratio	Days Sales in Receivables	Days Cash on Hand
Minimum	2009 2008	\$ 356,943 347,035	63.6 57.7	4.0 11.5	(12.0) (13.1)	- (3.4)	(13.5) (14.1)	0.5 1.3	0.91 0.91	20.4 20.8	- 1.7
	2007 2006	335,862 334,151	64.0 62.5	7.2 10.5	(9.3) (7.1)	(3.7) (1.4)	(11.1) (8.6)	0.6 1.0	0.95 0.89	18.2 12.9	- 12.5
Maximum	2009 2008 2007 2006	100,515,253 101,806,115 97,956,590 89,650,166	102.3 94.5 90.1 87.8	33.5 36.0 33.9 33.8	13.5 20.7 12.5 23.0	6.4 8.4 11.3 12.0	8.8 20.8 13.1 18.1	13.8 12.8 14.3 12.6	1.35 1.32 1.30 1.46	56.0 60.4 77.6 58.7	498.1 514.9 521.3 458.5
Mean	2009 2008 2007 2006	22,030,757 22,254,716 21,085,163 20,184,548	78.4 75.1 76.1 78.0	19.9 20.1 19.4 19.8	1.7 4.8 4.5 2.2	2.2 2.0 1.9 2.5	(0.1) 4.1 4.8 0.9	4.9 4.6 5.1 4.8	1.07 1.12 1.12 1.07	40.1 41.1 40.8 38.3	136.9 140.0 132.9 146.7
Median	2009 2008 2007 2006	9,920,434 10,233,367 9,543,881 9,390,454	78.0 75.6 77.9 79.1	19.8 18.6 19.6 18.7	1.2 4.7 4.4 0.4	2.1 0.5 0.4 0.6	1.0 3.5 4.5 (0.7)	3.7 3.5 3.3 3.3	1.06 1.11 1.11 1.04	39.4 39.0 40.4 37.3	85.1 104.7 77.5 100.9
Standard Deviation	2009 2008 2007 2006	25,930,067 26,183,291 24,975,056 23,464,306	9.7 9.0 7.6 7.5	7.4 6.7 6.2	6.7 7.4 5.4 7.6	2.2 2.9 3.2 3.9	6.1 8.1 5.7 7.1	3.6 3.3 4.0 3.4	0.10 0.11 0.08 0.13	9.1 9.5 12.0 10.5	144.5 143.5 151.8 142.0

Note: Electric Power Purchases plus Other Operating Expenses plus Operating Margin do not necessarily sum to 100% because each entry is a separately calculated statistic.

Financial Results and Key Ratios of Municipal Electric Systems Statistical Analysis - Other Units With Electric Systems

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2009, 2008, 2007 and 2006

				Financial	Results				Key l	Ratios	
				As a % of]	Fotal Operating	g Revenues					
		Total	Electric	Other			Net Income			Days	Days
	Fiscal	Operating	Power	Operating	Operating	Transfers	Before	Quick	Coverage	Sales in	Cash
	Year	Revenues	Purchases	Expenses	Margin	Out(In)	Cap Contr	Ratio	Ratio	Receivables	on Hand
Minimum	2009	\$ 261,301	53.0	9.5	(8.4)	-	(27.7)	1.8	0.89	18.7	46.9
	2008	201,894	45.4	0.4	5.2	(0.3)		1.8	0.97	18.4	48.4
	2007	172,214	46.6	9.8	(3.3)	(2.7)	(3.2)	0.7	0.83	17.6	49.2
	2006	162,364	46.5	15.1	(4.5)	-	(23.2)	0.4	0.98	15.5	21.0
Maximum	2009	169,451,426	76.3	45.3	26.1	23.3	19.1	15.6	1.53	54.7	635.7
	2008	166,899,655	78.6	40.6	29.6	24.4	23.9	17.0	1.67	54.1	772.5
	2007	159,647,302	85.0	39.2	33.6	33.2	26.1	26.5	1.74	56.2	726.6
	2006	155,773,020	87.8	40.4	32.7	32.2	21.1	19.2	1.77	69.8	671.8
Mean	2009	15,700,519	66.5	23.9	9.6	9.3	1.2	6.9	1.20	41.0	236.0
	2008	15,287,457	60.4	23.2	16.3	7.7	9.9	7.3	1.33	41.7	263.0
	2007	14,442,315	59.2	24.1	16.7	7.4	10.1	7.5	1.25	40.5	239.1
	2006	13,999,448	59.7	25.1	15.2	12.0	3.8	6.7	1.28	40.5	219.5
Median	2009	3,225,482	66.6	23.8	11.4	9.3	1.7	6.1	1.22	40.4	177.4
	2008	3,226,295	57.5	25.9	15.6	8.7	8.7	5.7	1.32	43.7	228.5
	2007	3,150,674	58.3	25.6	15.6	5.6	7.7	5.8	1.24	39.9	178.3
	2006	3,105,990	55.0	26.1	15.9	11.0	5.1	4.9	1.26	42.4	161.1
Standard Deviation	2009	39,670,490	7.1	8.3	8.9	7.8	9.4	4.4	0.16	9.6	174.7
	2008	39,187,909	9.5	9.2	6.7	6.6	6.2	4.9	0.18	10.7	197.4
	2007	37,414,407	10.5	7.2	9.4	8.8	9.0	5.9	0.22	10.1	181.1
	2006	36,430,729	10.5	6.4	10.1	8.3	10.4	4.6	0.22	13.4	181.9

Note: Electric Power Purchases plus Other Operating Expenses plus Operating Margin do not necessarily sum to 100% because each entry is a separately calculated statistic.

Financial Results and Key Ratios of Municipal Electric Systems Statistical Analysis For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2009, 2008, 2007 and 2006

Definitions:

Minimum - The smallest value found within a set of numbers.

Maximum - The largest value found within a set of numbers.

Mean - The mean or average is a measure reflecting the center of a distribution of values.

Median - The middle value of an ordered set of numbers. From the ordered set, an equal number of values will be above and below the middle value. If there is an even number of numbers in the set, then the median is an average of the two numbers in the middle.

Standard Deviation - measures the degree to which individual values in a list vary from the mean (average). The lower the standard deviation, the less individual values vary from the mean, and the more reliable the mean. As a general rule, if the data are normally distributed, 68% of the values will be within one standard deviation of the mean and 95% of the values will be within two standard deviations of the mean. The standard deviation can be particularly useful in identifying "outliers," i.e., values that are unusually high or low.

 $\frac{Financial\ Results}{Commission\ from\ the\ unit's\ audited\ financial\ statements}.$

Total Operating Revenues

Charges for services plus other operating revenues.

Electric Power Purchases

Wholesale cost of power purchased from the power agency as a percentage of total operating revenues.

Other Operating Expenses

Total operating expenses less electric power purchases as a percentage of total operating revenues.

NOTE: Other operating expenses do not include interest expense or capital outlay. Interest expense is reported as a non-operating expense, and capital outlay is not an expense but is reported on the balance sheet as part of fixed assets.

Operating Margin

Total operating revenues less total operating expenses as a percentage of total operating revenues.

Transfers Out (In)

Total transfers out less total transfers in as a percentage of total operating revenues.

Note: Negative amounts indicate transfers from other funds to the Electric Fund.

Net Income

Total operating revenues plus total nonoperating revenues less total operating expenses, total non-operating expenses, and transfers to (from) other funds as a percentage of total operating revenues. The income shown here is before capital contributions

Key to Financial Statistics and Ratios

<u>Key Ratios</u> - These ratios were compiled by the staff of the Local Government Commission from the unit's audited financial statements.

Quick Ratio

Total quick assets Total current liabilities

Note: Quick assets are defined as current assets less inventories and prepaid items.

Coverage Ratio

Net income before capital contributions plus transfers out (in), purchased power expense, depreciation expense, and interest expense Purchased power expense plus principal payments and interest expense on electric system debt

Note: A coverage ratio of less than 1.0 indicates the electric system does not generate adequate income to cover the cost of purchased power and debt service payments on electric system debt.

Days Sales in Receivables

Net accounts receivable x 365 days Charges for services

Note: Net accounts receivable includes any unbilled receivables.

Days Cash on Hand

Unrestricted cash and investments x 365 days Total operating expenses less depreciation and amortization expenses

Group and Statewide Averages

These statistics were compiled by the staff of the Local Government Commission from audited financial statements.

			(A) Gross	(B) Est. Loss in Prop. Tax Revenues Due to City	(C)		(D/A) From the Electr the General Fun			(E+F) Rate per \$100 - .ssessment-to-S	•
Unit	Popu- lation	Year	Electric Fund Fixed Assets at Cost	Ownership of Utility Amount	Tax Rate Equivalent	Amount	As a % of Elec. Fixed Assets	As a Tax Rate Equivalent	Effec- tive Actual	Without Electric Transfers	Non- Electric Avg.
.C. Eastern Mun	icipal Power	Agency	Participants								
Apex	31,250	2009	37,441,258	127,300	0.0030	-	-	-	0.34	0.34	0.40
		2008	35,560,624	142,242	0.0049	-	-	-	0.33	0.33	
		2007	33,499,451	133,998	0.0049	-	-	-	0.34	0.34	
		2006	30,680,250	104,313	0.0040	-	-	-	0.36	0.36	
Ayden	4,943	2009	8,445,744	42,229	0.0206	405,000	4.8	0.20	0.50	0.70	0.25
		2008	8,084,818	42,041	0.0229	330,000	4.1	0.18	0.46	0.64	
		2007	8,128,579	42,269	0.0232	230,000	2.8	0.13	0.48	0.61	
		2006	8,147,607	40,738	0.0233	485,000	6.0	0.28	0.50	0.78	
Belhaven	1,945	2009	972,769	5,058	0.0057	109,383	11.2	0.12	0.35	0.47	0.26
		2008	972,769	5,058	0.0060	115,140	11.8	0.14	0.35	0.49	
		2007	940,342	4,890	0.0062	461,411	49.1	0.58	0.40	0.98	
		2006	919,324	4,780	0.0061	-	-	-	0.47	0.47	
Benson	3,581	2009	2,626,436	13,920	0.0056	76,159	2.9	0.03	0.45	0.48	0.25
		2008	2,598,216	13,771	0.0064	83,766	3.2	0.04	0.47	0.51	
		2007	2,591,716	12,181	0.0055	83,766	3.2	0.04	0.49	0.53	
		2006	2,802,779	14,855	0.0070	84,083	3.0	0.04	0.46	0.50	
Clayton	13,700	2009	10,187,641	55,013	0.0041	-	-	-	0.46	0.46	0.40
		2008	9,721,394	52,496	0.0040	-	-	-	0.48	0.48	
		2007	9,116,406	44,670	0.0042	-	-	-	0.45	0.45	
		2006	8,451,040	45,636	0.0047	-	-	-	0.48	0.48	
Edenton	5,143	2009	9,957,763	28,878	0.0059	168,958	1.7	0.03	0.28	0.31	0.25
		2008	9,977,495	28,935	0.0062	208,194	2.1	0.04	0.18	0.22	
		2007	9,706,320	41,737	0.0095	(4,165)	-	-	0.29	0.29	
		2006	9,648,303	27,980	0.0103	146,694	1.5	0.05	0.31	0.36	
Elizabeth City	20,121	2009	37,620,595	154,244	0.0116	1,050,000	2.8	0.08	0.35	0.43	0.40
		2008	36,607,627	150,091	0.0118	691,450	1.9	0.05	0.34	0.39	
		2007	35,169,412	235,635	0.0197	1,537,645	4.4	0.13	0.40	0.53	
		2006	33,682,981	138,100	0.0201	983,772	2.9	0.14	0.45	0.59	

			(A)	(B) Est. Loss in Prop. Tax	(C)		(D/A) From the Electr			(E+F) Rate per \$100 -	0
	-		Gross Electric Fund	Revenues Due to City Ownership of Utility		to	the General Fun As a % of	As a	Effec-	ssessment-to-Sa Without	Non-
Unit	Popu- lation	Year	Fixed Assets at Cost	Amount	Tax Rate Equivalent	Amount	Elec. Fixed Assets	Tax Rate Equivalent	tive Actual	Electric Transfers	Electric Avg.
.C. Eastern Mu	nicipal Power	Agency	Participants (co	ntinued)							
Farmville	4,680	2009	7,547,011	36,980	0.0121	242,345	3.2	0.08	0.49	0.57	0.25
	,	2008	7,267,860	35,613	0.0129	(130,349)	(1.8)	(0.05)	0.43	0.38	
		2007	5,971,396	29,260	0.0100	(116,000)	(1.9)	(0.04)	0.45	0.41	
		2006	5,103,879	25,009	0.0089	116,000	2.3	0.04	0.47	0.51	
Fremont	1,408	2009	1,191,059	7,742	0.0157	37,591	3.2	0.08	0.54	0.62	0.26
	,	2008	1,167,914	7,591	0.0156	40,000	3.4	0.08	0.57	0.65	
		2007	1,167,914	7,591	0.0158	38,600	3.3	0.08	0.59	0.67	
		2006	1,030,646	6,699	0.0141	38,600	3.7	0.08	0.61	0.69	
Greenville	81,092	2009	105,397,420	590,226	0.0106	4,208,481	4.0	0.08	0.56	0.64	0.44
	- ,	2008	199,449,079	1,116,915	0.0245	3,973,326	2.0	0.09	0.49	0.58	
		2007	187,328,475	1,049,039	0.0245	3,986,161	2.1	0.09	0.52	0.61	
		2006	171,483,804	960,309	0.0240	(3,340,677)	(1.9)	(0.08)	0.54	0.46	
Hamilton	460	2009	321,761	1,834	0.0156	-	-	-	0.42	0.42	0.24
		2008	324,367	1,849	0.0151	-	-	-	0.46	0.46	
		2007	296,292	1,689	0.0141	-	-	-	0.46	0.46	
		2006	290,906	1,658	0.0139	-	-	-	0.51	0.51	
Hertford	2,213	2009	2,815,685	9,855	0.0066	-	-	-	0.35	0.35	0.26
	_,	2008	2,809,160	13,765	0.0162	-	-	-	0.29	0.29	
		2007	2,763,301	13,540	0.0163	82,481	3.0	0.10	0.35	0.45	
		2006	2,764,601	9,676	0.0118	66,874	2.4	0.08	0.43	0.51	
Hobgood	384	2009	409,918	2,337	0.0196	4,000	1.0	0.03	0.49	0.52	0.24
11005004	201	2008	409,918	2,050	0.0168	(3,000)	(0.7)	(0.02)	0.49	0.47	0.21
		2007	409,918	1,845	0.0180	3,000	0.7	0.03	0.37	0.40	
		2006	409,918	2,337	0.0232	-	-	-	0.35	0.35	
Hookerton	485	2009	576,798	2,884	0.0205	-	-	-	0.45	0.45	0.24
		2008	567,180	2,836	0.0201	(20,000)	(3.5)	(0.14)	0.48	0.34	
		2000	546,998	2,735	0.0192	-	-	-	0.49	0.49	
		2006	538,444	2,692	0.0192	-	-	-	0.50	0.50	
Kinston	22,675	2009	41,466,325	273,678	0.0214	800,000	1.9	0.06	0.60	0.66	0.40
	,070	2009	38,250,017	229,500	0.0179	828,166	2.2	0.06	0.55	0.61	0.10
		2000	37,772,174	226,633	0.0186	833,190	2.2	0.07	0.57	0.64	
		2007	37,614,094	248,253	0.0210	955,000	2.5	0.08	0.58	0.66	

			(A)	(B) Est. Loss in Prop. Tax	(C)		(D/A) From the Electr			(E+F) Rate per \$100 -	
			Gross Electric Fund	Revenues Due to City Ownership of Utility		to	the General Fun As a % of	As a	for A Effec-	ssessment-to-Sa Without	ales Ratio Non-
Unit	Popu- lation	Year	Fixed Assets at Cost	Amount	Tax Rate Equivalent	Amount	Elec. Fixed Assets	Tax Rate Equivalent	tive Actual	Electric Transfers	Electric Avg.
.C. Eastern Mur	niginal Dawar	Agonov	Participants (a)	ntinued)							
La Grange	2,783	2009	1,782,423	8,912	0.0077	40,000	2.2	0.03	0.46	0.49	0.25
La Oralige	2,785	2009	1,782,423	8,912	0.0077	13,542	0.8	0.03	0.40	0.49	0.25
		2008	1,782,423	8,655	0.0077	66,692	0.8 3.9	0.01	0.40	0.47	
.	15011	2006	1,698,236	8,491	0.0077	66,768	3.9	0.06	0.48	0.54	0.40
Laurinburg	15,911	2009	13,979,090	58,712	0.0080	611,977	4.4	0.08	0.37	0.45	0.40
		2008	13,714,897	54,860	0.0074	-	-	-	0.37	0.37	
		2007	12,239,541	46,510	0.0063	50,000	0.4	0.01	0.37	0.38	
		2006	12,045,196	50,590	0.0069	180,500	1.5	0.02	0.37	0.39	
Louisburg	3,608	2009	10,505,958	56,207	0.0235	207,355	2.0	0.09	0.48	0.57	0.25
		2008	8,830,757	42,829	0.0186	223,505	2.5	0.10	0.44	0.54	
		2007	6,911,786	33,522	0.0146	180,335	2.6	0.08	0.46	0.54	
		2006	6,802,437	36,393	0.0162	179,650	2.6	0.08	8 0.48 0.50	0.56	
Lumberton	23,026	2009	26,349,502	166,002	0.0123	525,000	2.0	0.04	0.53	0.57	0.40
		2008	25,252,844	159,093	0.0116	450,000	1.8	0.03	0.57	0.60	
		2007	24,100,686	156,654	0.0118	(938,380)	(3.9)	(0.07)	0.57	0.50	
		2006	23,608,778	148,735	0.0109	150,000	0.6	0.01	0.63	0.64	
New Bern	26,153	2009	52,665,264	265,960	0.0113	1,299,320	2.5	0.06	0.33	0.39	0.40
	,	2008	50,318,443	254,108	0.0114	1,198,590	2.4	0.05	0.35	0.40	
		2007	47,406,273	222,809	0.0106	(609,202)	(1.3)	(0.03)	0.39	0.36	
		2006	43,310,549	218,718	0.0111	847,500	2.0	0.04	0.43	0.47	
Pikeville	703	2009	1,924,772	11,549	0.0311	-	-	-	0.50	0.50	0.17
1 1110 / 1110	,	2008	1,875,448	9,377	0.0257	-	_	_	0.44	0.44	0117
		2007	1,160,220	5,801	0.0161	_	_	-	0.45	0.45	
		2007	1,139,256	6,836	0.0192	-	_	-	0.43	0.43	
Red Springs	3,513	2000	4,217,077	26,146	0.0192				0.52	0.52	0.25
Neu Springs	5,515	2009	4,163,870	25,816	0.0163	-	-	-	0.52	0.52	0.25
		2008	4,665,779	30,794	0.0103	-	-	-	0.56	0.56	
						-	-	-			
	1 500	2006	3,196,063	19,816	0.0115	167,673	5.2	0.10	0.64	0.74	0.00
Robersonville	1,589	2009	1,111,834	6,671	0.0095	106,000	9.5	0.15	0.44	0.59	0.26
		2008	1,081,416	6,488	0.0097	55,000	5.1	0.08	0.49	0.57	
		2007	1,023,493	6,141	0.0093	5,500	0.5	0.01	0.49	0.50	
		2006	1,017,208	6,103	0.0094	4,100	0.4	0.01	0.54	0.55	

			(A)	(B) Est. Loss in Prop. Tax	(C)	(D)	(D/A) From the Elect	(E)	(F)	(E+F) Rate per \$100 -	Adjusted
			Gross	Revenues Due to City			the General Fur			ssessment-to-S	
	P		Electric Fund	Ownership of Utility	T D (As a % of	As a	Effec-	Without	Non-
Unit	Popu- lation	Year	Fixed Assets at Cost	Amount	Tax Rate Equivalent	Amount	Elec. Fixed Assets	Tax Rate Equivalent	tive Actual	Electric Transfers	Electric Avg.
C. Eastern Muni	cinal Power	Agency	Particinants (co	ntinued)							
Rocky Mount	59,228	2009	61,231,331	336,772	0.0099	1,600,000	2.6	0.05	0.45	0.50	0.44
noonly noonle	07,220	2008	58,669,809	322,684	0.0099	1,500,000	2.6	0.05	0.46	0.51	011
		2007	63,270,308	316,352	0.0099	1,250,000	2.0	0.04	0.24	0.28	
		2006	62,048,763	341,268	0.0110	1,016,500	1.6	0.03	0.46	0.49	
Scotland Neck	2,195	2009	1,539,304	9,236	0.0104	35,000	2.3	0.04	0.52	0.56	0.26
Scotland Titeek	2,175	2009	1,524,015	9,144	0.0103	146,630	9.6	0.17	0.52	0.76	0.20
		2000	1,517,012	9,102	0.0124	30,000	2.0	0.04	0.49	0.53	
		2007	1,517,012	9,102	0.0124	35,000	2.3	0.05	0.47	0.52	
Selma	7,497	2009	7,110,317	37,685	0.0098	162,500	2.3	0.04	0.47	0.49	0.2
Sellina	7,127	2009	6,948,728	34,049	0.0089	100,000	1.4	0.03	0.44	0.47	0.2.
		2000	6,831,949	30,061	0.0097	280,000	4.1	0.09	0.44	0.54	
		2007	5,184,924	27,480	0.0090	-	-	-	0.43	0.43	
Smithfield	13,088	2000	13,959,617	79,570	0.0090			-	0.49	0.49	0.40
Sintincia	15,000	2009	13,740,159	78,319	0.0088	_	_	_	0.51	0.51	0.10
		2000	2,551,209	14,542	0.0017	_	_	_	0.51	0.52	
		2007	7,964,308	45,397	0.0054	_	_	-	0.52	0.55	
Southport	2,964	2000	8,215,330	14,788	0.0016		_		0.35	0.18	0.2
Soumport	2,704	2009	7,519,598	11,279	0.0010	_	_	_	0.15	0.15	0.2.
		2000	6,479,028	17,493	0.0038	_	_	_	0.15	0.17	
		2007	5,292,605	9,527	0.0022	_	_	_	0.17	0.17	
Tarboro	10,383	2009	49,397,949	207,471	0.0297	897,461	1.8	0.13	0.32	0.45	0.40
10000	10,505	2009	48,514,576	203,761	0.0290	1,128,779	2.3	0.16	0.32	0.49	0.40
		2000	48,204,914	202,461	0.0283	110,527	0.2	0.02	0.32	0.34	
		2006	47,052,038	197,619	0.0278	1,079,711	2.3	0.15	0.32	0.51	
Wake Forest	27,496	2009	24,267,003	133,469	0.0039	-	-	-	0.55	0.55	0.40
	27,000	2008	23,016,124	126,589	0.0055	-	_	-	0.52	0.52	011
		2000	20,082,760	108,447	0.0054	-	-	-	0.32	0.46	
		2007	18,431,229	101,372	0.0054	225,000	1.2	0.01	0.48	0.40	
Washington	10,216	2000	53,261,004	319,566	0.0501	680,000	1.2	0.01	0.43	0.52	0.40
, asimigion	10,210	2009	50,535,800	303,215	0.0487	785,846	1.5	0.13	0.41	0.52	0.+
		2003	47,869,286	263,281	0.0432	126,527	0.3	0.02	0.46	0.48	
		2007	44,941,304	269,648	0.0452	738,287	1.6	0.13	0.40	0.43	

			(A) Gross	(B) Est. Loss in Prop. Tax Revenues Due to City	(C)		(D/A) From the Electr the General Fun			(E+F) Rate per \$100 - ssessment-to-Sa	•
Unit	Popu- lation	Year	Electric Fund Fixed Assets at Cost	Ownership of Utility Amount	Tax Rate Equivalent	Amount	As a % of Elec. Fixed Assets	As a Tax Rate Equivalent	Effec- tive Actual	Without Electric Transfers	Non- Electric Avg.
C. Eastern Mu	nicipal Power	Agency	Participants (co	ntinued)							
Wilson	50,643	2009 2008	126,211,455	649,989	0.0172	2,015,360	1.6	0.05	0.52	0.57	0.44
		2007	115,983,947 101,673,230	597,317 477,864	0.0186 0.0155	1,839,577 (1,874,350)	1.6 (1.8)	0.06 (0.06)	0.45 0.47	0.51 0.41	
C Municipal P	ower Agency	2006 Number	89,073,645 • 1 Participants	458,729	0.0153	1,625,000	1.8	0.05	0.43	0.48	
	ower Agency	Tunnoci	<u>1 1 ai ticipants</u>								
Albemarle	16,197	2009 2008	21,146,707 21,046,523	118,422 117,861	0.0118 0.0119	300,000 950,000	1.4 4.5	0.03 0.10	0.46 0.51	0.49 0.61	0.40
		2007 2006	20,792,140 20,659,582	116,436 115,694	0.0118 0.0119	940,000	4.5	0.10	0.54 0.56	0.64 0.56	
Bostic	316	2009	657,836	1,645	0.0104	23,000	3.5	0.15	0.23	0.38	0.2
		2008	657,836	1,645	0.0107	25,000	3.8	0.16	0.23	0.39	
		2007	657,836	1,645	0.0121	38,000	5.8	0.28	0.21	0.49	
		2006	257,836	645	0.0051	40,000	15.5	0.32	0.22	0.54	
Cherryville	5,767	2009 2008 2007 2006	3,752,129 3,633,032 3,699,012 4,135,013	16,509 15,985 16,276 18,194	0.0046 0.0046 0.0050 0.0057	259,984 240,600 - 30,400	6.9 6.6 - 0.7	0.07 0.07 - 0.01	0.41 0.43 0.41 0.43	0.48 0.50 0.41 0.44	0.2
Cornelius	23,929	2000	7,890,566	21,699	0.0006	-	-	-	0.43	0.44	0.4
	- ,	2008 2007	7,020,455 6,571,540	19,306 17,086	0.0005 0.0005	-	-	-	0.24 0.26	0.24 0.26	
		2007	6,190,632	17,080	0.0005	-	-	-	0.20	0.20	
Drexel	1,923	2009	1,200,337	3,841	0.0037	-	-	-	0.23	0.31	0.2
		2008	1,200,337	3,841	0.0038	-	-	-	0.32	0.32	
		2007 2006	1,095,743 1,095,743	4,164 3,506	0.0050 0.0043	-	-	-	0.31 0.32	0.31 0.32	
Gastonia	74,518	2008	82,378,566	436,606	0.0043	- 2 100 000	- 2.5	- 0.04	0.32	0.32	0.4
Gasiollia	/4,318	2009 2008	82,378,566 79,422,084	430,000 420,937	0.0085	2,100,000 2,100,000	2.5 2.6	0.04	0.49	0.55	0.4
		2007 2006	76,054,898 72,941,573	410,696 386,590	0.0092 0.0089	2,100,000 2,199,681	2.8 3.0	0.05 0.05	0.50 0.53	0.55 0.58	

			(A)	(B) Est. Loss in Prop. Tax	(C)		(D/A) From the Electr			(E+F) Rate per \$100 -	
	Denn		Gross Electric Fund Fixed Assets	Revenues Due to City Ownership of Utility	Tax Rate	to	the General Fun As a % of	As a	Effec-	ssessment-to-Sa Without Electric	Non-
Unit	Popu- lation	Year	at Cost	Amount	Equivalent	Amount	Elec. Fixed Assets	Tax Rate Equivalent	tive Actual	Transfers	Electric Avg.
.C. Municinal P	ower Agency	Number	· 1 Participants (continued)							
Granite Falls	4,979	2009	5,978,708	25,111	0.0069	-	-	-	0.36	0.36	0.25
	y	2008	5,977,541	25,106	0.0073	-	-	-	0.37	0.37	
		2007	5,876,035	24,679	0.0073	-	-	-	0.39	0.39	
		2006	5,219,945	21,924	0.0067	-	-	-	0.42	0.42	
High Point	100,645	2009	119,459,066	756,176	0.0083	2,543,564	2.1	0.03	0.58	0.61	0.44
8		2008	129,532,067	819,938	0.0092	1,960,000	1.5	0.02	0.59	0.61	
		2007	125,875,315	746,441	0.0086	1,160,000	0.9	0.01	0.58	0.59	
		2007	121,872,704	771,454	0.0092	-	-	-	0.59	0.59	
Huntersville	40,167	2009	17,683,955	51,283	0.0011	-	-	-	0.24	0.24	0.40
Trancers vince	10,107	2009	16,634,097	48,239	0.0011	-	-	-	0.25	0.25	0.10
		2000	15,044,905	42,126	0.0011	-	-	-	0.23	0.27	
		2007	13,656,281	39,603	0.0010	_	-	-	0.27	0.27	
Landis	3,101	2000	4,715,559	18,862	0.0010	140,000	3.0	0.06	0.27	0.45	0.25
Landis	5,101	2009	4,535,330	18,141	0.0083	200,000	4.4	0.09	0.39	0.49	0.23
		2003	4,188,402	13,403	0.0071	200,000	4.4	0.05	0.40	0.49	
		2007	3,950,916	15,804	0.0084	(247,110)	(6.3)	(0.13)	0.30	0.18	
Lexington	21,378	2000	58,085,139	325,277	0.0084	1,663,921	2.9	0.11	0.56	0.18	0.40
Lexington	21,378	2009	57,948,506	310,025	0.0210		(2.6)		0.50	0.07	0.40
				305,745	0.0211	(1,508,108)	(2.0)	(0.10)	0.34		
		2007	56,100,059			-	-	-		0.51	
T 1 .	11.016	2006	55,117,871	308,660	0.0237	1,350,000	2.4	0.10	0.50	0.60	0.40
Lincolnton	11,316	2009	4,314,985	24,164	0.0028	23,000	0.5	-	0.56	0.56	0.40
		2008	4,244,678	23,770	0.0033	22,500	0.5	-	0.47	0.47	
		2007	4,119,246	23,068	0.0032	-	-	-	0.50	0.50	
	2,422	2006	4,033,028	22,585	0.0032	4,277	0.1	-	0.54	0.54	0.05
Maiden	3,433	2009	5,083,923	20,336	0.0055	-	-	-	0.39	0.39	0.25
		2008	5,044,564	20,178	0.0057	-	-	-	0.39	0.39	
		2007	5,044,564	19,169	0.0054	-	-	-	0.38	0.38	
		2006	5,044,564	20,178	0.0063	-	-	-	0.37	0.37	
Monroe	37,280	2009	93,772,908	464,176	0.0142	-	-	-	0.48	0.48	0.40
		2008	82,550,400	454,027	0.0166	6,200	-	-	0.46	0.46	
		2007	68,209,750	334,228	0.0131	1,494,020	2.2	0.06	0.48	0.54	
		2006	63,726,503	315,446	0.0130	-	-	-	0.46	0.46	

			(A)	(B) Est. Loss in Prop. Tax	(C)		(D/A) From the Elect			(E+F) Rate per \$100 -	•
Unit	Popu- lation	Year	Gross Electric Fund Fixed Assets at Cost	Revenues Due to City Ownership of Utility Amount	Tax Rate Equivalent	Amount	the General Fur As a % of Elec. Fixed Assets	d As a Tax Rate Equivalent	Effec- tive Actual	ssessment-to-S: Without Electric Transfers	Non- Electric Avg.
N.C. Municipal P	ower Agency	Number	· 1 Participants (continued)							
Morganton	17,120	2009	21,822,540	100,384	0.0059	618,161	2.8	0.04	0.44	0.48	0.40
C	,	2008	21,138,902	97,239	0.0058	637,495	3.0	0.04	0.46	0.50	
		2007	20,605,366	103,027	0.0073	771,459	3.7	0.05	0.41	0.46	
		2006	19,615,241	90,230	0.0067	722,754	3.7	0.05	0.42	0.47	
Newton	13,670	2009	17,414,462	83,589	0.0088	-	-	-	0.47	0.47	0.40
		2008	15,241,266	70,110	0.0075	-	-	-	0.45	0.45	
		2007	14,346,852	63,126	0.0072	-	-	-	0.44	0.44	
		2006	13,143,480	63,089	0.0075	-	-	-	0.42	0.42	
Pineville	7,501	2009	14,881,749	47,622	0.0038	39,555	0.3	-	0.27	0.27	0.25
		2008	14,513,476	43,540	0.0036	-	-	-	0.26	0.26	
		2007	14,068,741	42,206	0.0036	-	-	-	0.28	0.28	
		2006	12,082,445	38,664	0.0035	-	-	-	0.29	0.29	
Shelby	20,808	2009	21,748,298	94,605	0.0055	535,000	2.5	0.03	0.43	0.46	0.40
		2008	19,339,857	84,128	0.0052	475,000	2.5	0.03	0.37	0.40	
		2007	18,509,253	77,739	0.0051	475,000	2.6	0.03	0.39	0.42	
		2006	17,308,660	75,293	0.0051	474,350	2.7	0.03	0.39	0.42	
Statesville	27,039	2009	35,379,450	134,442	0.0045	261,857	0.7	0.01	0.35	0.36	0.40
		2008	34,064,901	129,447	0.0046	206,229	0.6	0.01	0.38	0.39	
		2007	31,407,616	119,349	0.0049	153,453	0.5	0.01	0.35	0.36	
		2006	29,655,475	112,691	0.0047	175,847	0.6	0.01	0.35	0.36	
Other Units with	Electric Syste	<u>ms</u>									
Black Creek	770	2009	1,846,356	10,155	0.0364	60,000	3.2	0.22	0.55	0.77	0.17
		2008	1,846,356	10,155	0.0453	47,614	2.6	0.21	0.48	0.69	
		2007	1,817,097	9,994	0.0443	-	-	-	0.50	0.50	
		2006	1,817,097	9,994	0.0450	84,368	4.6	0.38	0.50	0.88	
Concord	79,264	2009	121,838,253	511,721	0.0049	-	-	-	0.42	0.42	0.44
	, -	2008	116,680,673	522,146	0.0063	-	-	-	0.40	0.40	
		2007	106,897,502	459,659	0.0061	-	-	-	0.43	0.43	
		2006	97,633,345	410,060	0.0057	-	-	-	0.42	0.42	

			(A)	(B) Est. Loss in Prop. Tax	(C)		(D/A) From the Electr			(E+F) Rate per \$100 -	-
			Gross Electric Fund	Revenues Due to City Ownership of Utility		to	the General Fun As a % of	As a	Effec-	ssessment-to-Sa Without	Non-
Unit	Popu- lation	Year	Fixed Assets at Cost	Amount	Tax Rate Equivalent	Amount	Elec. Fixed Assets	Tax Rate Equivalent	tive Actual	Electric Transfers	Electric Avg.
ther Units with E	lactric Syste	ms (con	tinued)								
Dallas	4,005	2009	6,121,700	23,262	0.0106	526,839	8.6	0.24	0.35	0.59	0.25
Dunus	4,005	2009	5,950,533	22,612	0.0110	426,869	7.2	0.21	0.33	0.59	0.20
		2003	5,603,455	19,612	0.0110	446,153	8.0	0.26	0.35	0.61	
	200		5,285,539	20,085	0.0114	576,892	10.9	0.20	0.33	0.01	
Enfield	2,250	2000	2,428,839	18,216	0.0124	535,000	22.0	0.30	0.65	1.36	0.26
Lineu	2,250	2009	2,428,839	18,216	0.0242	525,000	22.0	0.71	0.03	1.30	0.20
		2008	2,398,385	16,789	0.0240	600,000	21.0	0.09	0.74	1.43	
		2007	2,396,383	17,976	0.0238	600,000	25.0	0.92	0.01	1.33	
Fayetteville	181,481	2008	443,680,080	2,351,504	0.0279	7,966,049	1.8	0.93	0.33	0.51	0.44
rayetteville	101,401	2009	443,080,080	2,259,686	0.0224	9,991,013	2.3	0.08	0.43	0.51	0.44
			420,555,895	2,239,080	0.0221	9,991,013 8,891,099			0.48	0.58	
		2007					2.2	0.09			
	7.1.0	2006	396,917,033	2,103,660	0.0277	8,623,219	2.2	0.11	0.49	0.60	0.00
Forest City	7,162	2009	11,486,772	34,460	0.0057	2,540,000	22.1	0.42	0.28	0.70	0.25
		2008	11,260,772	32,656	0.0055	2,500,000	22.2	0.42	0.27	0.69	
		2007	10,843,034	32,529	0.0063	(3,250,000)	(30.0)	(0.63)	0.25	(0.38)	
		2006	10,353,374	31,060	0.0061	-	-	-	0.27	0.27	
Fountain	578	2009	742,716	4,456	0.0193	-	-	-	0.60	0.60	0.17
		2008	722,495	4,335	0.0213	-	-	-	0.53	0.53	
		2007	708,800	4,253	0.0211	-	-	-	0.56	0.56	
		2006	708,800	4,253	0.0209	-	-	-	0.58	0.58	
Highlands	983	2009	3,109,335	4,198	0.0002	-	-	-	0.13	0.13	0.17
		2008	3,109,335	4,198	0.0002	-	-	-	0.14	0.14	
		2007	2,933,751	4,694	0.0004	-	-	-	0.36	0.36	
		2006	2,635,193	3,558	0.0003	-	-	-	0.14	0.14	
Kings Mountain	10,757	2009	8,649,508	34,598	0.0048	1,720,000	19.9	0.24	0.39	0.63	0.40
		2008	8,589,684	34,359	0.0052	1,570,000	18.3	0.24	0.37	0.61	
		2007	8,437,354	30,374	0.0047	(777,000)	(9.2)	(0.12)	0.37	0.25	
		2006	8,015,841	32,063	0.0052	1,600,000	20.0	0.26	0.33	0.59	
Lucama	881	2009	1,721,705	7,748	0.0205	-	-	-	0.45	0.45	0.17
		2008	1,721,705	7,748	0.0251	45,000	2.6	0.15	0.39	0.54	
		2007	1,660,435	7,472	0.0238	(45,000)	(2.7)	(0.14)	0.41	0.27	
		2006	1,647,049	7,412	0.0240	30,000	1.8	0.10	0.41	0.51	

			(A)	(B) Est. Loss in Prop. Tax	(C)		(D/A) From the Electr			(E+F) Rate per \$100 -	0
			Gross Electric Fund	Revenues Due to City Ownership of Utility		to	the General Fun As a % of	As a	Effec-	ssessment-to-Sa Without	Non-
Unit	Popu- lation	Year	Fixed Assets at Cost	Amount	Tax Rate Equivalent	Amount	Elec. Fixed Assets	Tax Rate Equivalent	tive Actual	Electric Transfers	Electric Avg.
ther Units with	Electric Syste	ems (con	tinued)								
Macclesfield	406	2009	246,360	1,109	0.0080	-	-	-	0.34	0.34	0.24
		2008	246,360	1,109	0.0081	-	-	-	0.35	0.35	
		2007	246,360	1,109	0.0080	3,147	1.3	0.02	0.35	0.37	
		2006	246,360	1,109	0.0080	54,320	22.0	0.39	0.38	0.77	
Oak City	353	2009	216,979	976	0.0066	45,000	20.7	0.30	0.33	0.63	0.24
our only	000	2008	237,314	1,068	0.0075	6,515	2.7	0.05	0.37	0.42	0.2
		2007	237,314	1,068	0.0073	31,370	13.2	0.22	0.36	0.58	
		2007	237,309	1,068	0.0076	20,726	8.7	0.15	0.40	0.55	
Pinetops	1,277	2009	1,064,776	3,833	0.0084	422,217	39.7	0.93	0.10	1.20	0.2
i metops	-,_,	2008	1,057,801	3,808	0.0083	70,000	6.6	0.15	0.28	0.43	0.2
		2000	1,040,801	3,747	0.0083	250,000	24.0	0.55	0.28	0.43	
		2006	1,040,801	3,747	0.0084	259,300	24.9	0.58		0.89	
Sharpsburg	2,612	2009	2,844,542	12,800	0.0205	418,601	14.7	0.67	0.37	1.04	0.2
Sharpsburg	2,012	2009	2,817,843	12,680	0.0208	313,730	11.1	0.51	0.37	0.88	0.2.
		2000	2,806,990	12,631	0.0200	48,750	1.7	0.08	0.48	0.56	
		2007	2,474,808	11,137	0.0182	223,447	9.0	0.36	0.40	0.77	
Stantonsburg	732	2000	2,227,230	9,577	0.0231	200,000	9.0	0.48	0.41	0.91	0.1
Stantonsburg	152	2009	2,227,230	9,476	0.0261	200,000	9.1	0.43	0.38	0.91	0.1
		2003	2,155,580	9,269	0.0269	(200,000)	(9.3)	(0.58)	0.38	(0.19)	
		2007	2,096,537	9,015	0.0205	200,000	9.5	0.61	0.39	1.00	
Walstonburg	231	2000	135,231	676	0.0275	4,000	3.0	0.01	0.39	0.49	0.24
waistonourg	251	2009	378,670	1,893	0.0193	4,000	5.0	-	0.43	0.49	0.2
		2003	318,334	1,592	0.0175	_	_	-	0.40	0.40	
		2007	314,665	1,573	0.0170	11,000	3.5	0.12	0.50	0.62	
Waynesville	9,957	2000	8,041,567	32,166	0.0030	875,000	10.9	0.12	0.34	0.42	0.2
waynesvine),))1	2009	5,806,167	23,225	0.0030	875,000 875,000	15.1	0.08	0.34	0.42	0.2.
		2008	4,701,066	20,215	0.0022	900,000	19.1	0.08	0.33	0.43	
		2007	4,647,960	18,592	0.0020	1,000,000	21.5	0.09	0.40	0.49	
Windsor	3,165	2008	6,803,654	10,205	0.0024	535,000	7.9	0.13	0.34	0.47	0.2
windsor	5,105	2009	6,913,624	10,203	0.0087	,	7.9 6.7		0.13	0.59	0.2.
		2008	6,780,449	10,370	0.0090	462,700 426,500	6.7 6.3	0.40	0.13	0.53	
								0.37			
		2006	5,023,717	7,536	0.0067	370,000	7.4	0.33	0.14	0.47	

			(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(D /A)	(E)	(F)	(E + F)		
				Est. Loss in Prop. Tax		Transfers	From the Electr	ric Fund	Tax l	Rate per \$100 -	Adjusted	
			Gross	Revenues Due to City		to	the General Fun	d	for A	ssessment-to-Sa	Sales Ratio	
			Electric Fund	Ownership of Utility			As a % of	As a	Effec-	Without	Non-	
	Popu-		Fixed Assets		Tax Rate		Elec. Fixed	Tax Rate	tive	Electric	Electric	
Unit	lation	Year	at Cost	Amount	Equivalent	Amount	Assets	Equivalent	Actual	Transfers	Avg.	
Other Units with	Electric Syste	ms (con	<u>tinued)</u>									
Winterville	8,949	2009	6,132,989	27,598	0.0041	202,803	3.3	0.03	0.45	0.48	0.25	
		2008	5,743,857	25,847	0.0045	356,322	6.2	0.06	0.40	0.46		
		2007	4,499,088	20,246	0.0038	-	-	-	0.42	0.42		
		2006	4,117,817	18,530	0.0038	85,146	2.1	0.02	0.44	0.46		

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2009, 2008, 2007 and 2006

Additional information to Table B:

The Local Government Commission requested copies of transfer policies from all the members of the NC Eastern Municipal Power Agency and the NC Municipal Power Agency Number 1 to analyze their efforts to reduce transfers from the Electric Fund to the General Fund. Presently, each member of both Power Agencies has adopted a transfer policy that either prohibits transfers to the General Fund or provides for an adequate reduction of transfers to the General Fund.

The Murphy Power Board is not included in this table. See Table A for further explanation.

Statistical Analysis of Transfers to the General Fund by Municipal Electric Systems NC Eastern Municipal Power Agency

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2009, 2008, 2007 and 2006

		(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(D /A)	(E)	(F)	(E+F)	
	-		Est. Loss in	Prop. Tax	Transfers F	rom the Electi	ric Fund	Tax Rat	e per \$100 - A	djusted
		Gross	Revenues D	ue to City	 to th	e General Fun	d	for Asse	ssment-to-Sale	s Ratio
		Electric Fund	Ownership	of Utility		As a % of	As a	Effec-	Without	Non-
		Fixed Assets		Tax Rate		Elec. Fixed	Tax Rate	tive	Electric	Electric
	Year	at Cost	Amount	Equivalent	Amount	Assets	Equivalent	Actual	Transfers	Avg.
Minimum	2009	\$ 321,761	\$ 1,834	0.00	\$ -	-	-	0.18	0.18	0.17
	2008	324,367	1,849	0.00	(130,349)	(3.50)	(0.14)	0.15	0.15	
	2007	296,292	1,689	0.00	(1,874,350)	(3.90)	(0.07)	0.17	0.17	
	2006	290,906	1,658	0.00	(3,340,677)	(1.90)	(0.08)	0.22	0.22	
Maximum	2009	126,211,455	649,989	0.05	4,208,481	11.20	0.20	0.60	0.70	0.44
	2008	199,449,079	1,116,915	0.05	3,973,326	11.80	0.18	0.59	0.76	
	2007	187,328,475	1,049,039	0.04	3,986,161	49.10	0.58	0.59	0.98	
	2006	171,483,804	960,309	0.05	1,625,000	6.00	0.28	0.64	0.78	
Mean	2009	22,647,107	116,903	0.01	477,559	2.23	0.05	0.44	0.49	0.32
	2008	24,601,290	127,894	0.01	423,693	1.76	0.04	0.43	0.48	
	2007	22,910,226	118,694	0.01	181,679	2.43	0.04	0.44	0.48	
	2006	21,496,629	112,152	0.01	182,845	1.54	0.05	0.47	0.51	
Median	2009	9,201,754	39,957	0.01	107,692	1.95	0.04	0.45	0.50	0.26
	2008	8,457,788	38,827	0.01	69,383	1.60	0.04	0.46	0.49	
	2007	6,871,868	32,158	0.01	17,750	0.35	0.02	0.46	0.48	
	2006	7,383,373	32,187	0.01	75,479	1.55	0.04	0.47	0.50	
Standard Deviation	2009	30,712,520	165,210	0.01	856,430	2.56	0.05	0.09	0.11	0.08
	2008	40,520,360	222,893	0.01	816,124	2.92	0.07	0.10	0.13	
	2007	38,052,328	205,715	0.01	891,913	8.72	0.11	0.10	0.14	
	2006	34,781,785	192,030	0.01	773,099	1.71	0.07	0.09	0.12	

Note: The "Transfers as a Tax Rate Equivalent" column (E) plus the "Effective Actual" Tax Rate column (F) will not necessarily equal the amount shown in the "Tax Rate Without Electric Transfers" column (E+F) because each entry is a separately calculated statistic.

Statistical Analysis of Transfers to the General Fund by Municipal Electric Systems NC Municipal Power Agency No. 1

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2009, 2008, 2007 and 2006

		(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(D /A)	(E)	(F)	(E+F)	
	-		Est. Loss in	Prop. Tax	Transfers	From the Elect	ric Fund	Tax Rat	te per \$100 - A	djusted
		Gross	Revenues D	ue to City	to	he General Fun	d	for Asse	ssment-to-Sale	es Ratio
		Electric Fund	Ownership	of Utility		As a % of	As a	Effec-	Without	Non-
		Fixed Assets		Tax Rate		Elec. Fixed	Tax Rate	tive	Electric	Electric
	Year	at Cost	Amount	Equivalent	Amount	Assets	Equivalent	Actual	Transfers	Avg.
Minimum	2009	\$ 657,836	\$ 1,645	0.00	\$-	0.00	0.00	0.23	0.23	0.24
	2008	657,836	1,645	0.00	(1,508,108		(0.10)	0.23	0.24	
	2007	657,836	1,645	0.00	-	0.00	0.00	0.21	0.26	
	2006	257,836	645	0.00	(247,110) (6.30)	(0.13)	0.22	0.18	
Maximum	2009	119,459,066	756,176	0.02	2,543,564	6.90	0.15	0.58	0.67	0.44
	2008	129,532,067	819,938	0.02	2,100,000	6.60	0.16	0.59	0.61	
	2007	125,875,315	746,441	0.02	2,100,000	5.80	0.28	0.58	0.64	
	2006	121,872,704	771,454	0.02	2,199,681	15.50	0.32	0.59	0.60	
Mean	2009	28,282,468	144,460	0.01	447,792	1.53	0.03	0.40	0.43	0.35
	2008	27,565,571	143,340	0.01	279,732	1.44	0.02	0.40	0.43	
	2007	25,908,804	130,558	0.01	385,891	1.46	0.04	0.39	0.43	
	2006	24,721,447	128,278	0.01	250,010	1.18	0.02	0.40	0.42	
Median	2009	17,414,462	51,283	0.01	39,555	0.70	0.01	0.41	0.46	0.40
	2008	15,241,266	48,239	0.01	22,500	0.50	0.00	0.40	0.44	
	2007	14,346,852	42,206	0.01	-	0.00	0.00	0.39	0.42	
	2006	13,143,480	39,603	0.01	-	0.00	0.00	0.42	0.42	
Standard Deviation	2009	34,714,782	204,524	0.00	772,990	1.83	0.04	0.11	0.12	0.08
	2008	35,063,181	213,471	0.01	771,555	2.23	0.05	0.10	0.11	
	2007	33,035,079	191,693	0.01	620,382	1.98	0.07	0.11	0.11	
	2006	31,883,234	193,784	0.01	592,331	4.01	0.08	0.11	0.12	

Note: The "Transfers as a Tax Rate Equivalent" column (E) plus the "Effective Actual" Tax Rate column (F) will not necessarily equal the amount shown in the "Tax Rate Without Electric Transfers" column (E+F) because each entry is a separately calculated statistic.

Statistical Analysis of Transfers to the General Fund by Municipal Electric Systems Other Units With Electric Systems

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2009, 2008, 2007 and 2006

		(A)	(B)	(C)		(D)	(D /A)	(E)	(F)	(E + F)	
	-		Est. Loss in	Prop. Tax		Transfers F	rom the Electi	ric Fund	Tax Rat	e per \$100 - Ao	ljusted
		Gross	Revenues I	Due to City		to th	e General Fun	d	for Asse	ssment-to-Sale	s Ratio
		Electric Fund	Ownership	o of Utility	_		As a % of	As a	Effec-	Without	Non-
		Fixed Assets		Tax Rate	_		Elec. Fixed	Tax Rate	tive	Electric	Electric
	Year	at Cost	Amount	Equivalent		Amount	Assets	Equivalent	Actual	Transfers	Avg.
Minimum	2009	\$ 135,231	\$ 676	0.00	\$	-	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.13	0.17
	2008	237,314	1,068	0.00		-	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.14	
	2007	237,314	1,068	0.00		(3,250,000)	(30.00)	(0.63)	0.13	(0.38)	
	2006	237,309	1,068	0.00		-	0.00	0.00	0.14	0.14	
Maximum	2009	443,680,080	2,351,504	0.04		7,966,049	39.70	0.93	0.65	1.36	0.44
	2008	426,355,893	2,259,686	0.05		9,991,013	22.20	0.69	0.74	1.43	
	2007	412,552,988	2,186,531	0.04		8,891,099	25.00	0.92	0.61	1.53	
	2006	396,917,033	2,103,660	0.05		8,623,219	25.00	0.93	0.58	1.48	
Mean	2009	33,123,084	163,119	0.01		844,764	9.83	0.26	0.39	0.65	0.26
	2008	31,793,239	158,189	0.01		915,251	7.07	0.20	0.38	0.58	
	2007	30,349,410	150,103	0.01		385,527	2.61	0.06	0.40	0.46	
	2006	28,821,580	142,759	0.01		723,075	9.11	0.25	0.39	0.64	
Median	2009	2,844,542	10,205	0.01		202,803	7.90	0.22	0.39	0.59	0.25
	2008	2,817,843	10,370	0.01		200,000	6.20	0.15	0.37	0.53	
	2007	2,806,990	10,171	0.01		-	0.00	0.00	0.40	0.49	
	2006	2,474,808	9,994	0.01		85,146	7.40	0.15	0.40	0.59	
Standard Deviation	2009	103,085,872	542,193	0.01		1,846,392	10.86	0.28	0.13	0.30	0.08
	2008	99,044,174	522,188	0.01		2,289,243	7.39	0.21	0.13	0.27	
	2007	95,588,708	503,772	0.01		2,224,269	12.48	0.34	0.11	0.38	
	2006	91,768,616	483,631	0.01		1,957,771	9.07	0.25	0.12	0.29	

Note: The "Transfers as a Tax Rate Equivalent" column (E) plus the "Effective Actual" Tax Rate column (F) will not necessarily equal the amount shown in the "Tax Rate Without Electric Transfers" column (E+F) because each entry is a separately calculated statistic.

Key to Definitions and Formulas

Populations

Estimates of the permanent residents as of July 1 at the beginning of the fiscal year obtained from the Office of State Budget and Management.

Gross Electric Fund Fixed Assets

The total cost of the Electric Fund fixed assets, before depreciation, as reported in the audited financial statements.

Estimated Loss in Property Tax Revenues Due to City Ownership of Utility

Amount

Gross Electric Fund fixed assets x tax rate

100

Tax Rate Equivalent

Amount calculated above x 100 The unit's assessed valuation

Transfers From the Electric Fund to the General Fund

Amount

Actual transfers from the Electric Fund to the General Fund less any transfers from the General Fund to the Electric Fund as reported in the unit's audited financial statements.

As a % of Electric Fund Fixed Assets

The transfer amount above x 100 The unit's gross Electric Fund fixed assets

As a Tax Rate Equivalent

The transfer amount above x 100 The unit's assessed valuation

Table B (cont.)

Key to Definitions and Formulas

Tax Rate per \$100 - Adjusted for the Assessment-to-Sales Ratio

Effective Actual

The unit-wide tax rate for the year indicated, multiplied by the assessment-to sales-ratio of the county in which the unit is located. For municipalities whose corporate limits are in more than one county, the assessment-to-sales ratio of the county with the largest assessed valuation has been used.

Without Electric Fund Transfers

The effective actual tax rate above plus the tax rate equivalent of transfers from the Electric Fund to the General Fund.

Non-electric Average

The average unit-wide tax rate for non-electric municipalities of a comparable size. In calculating the non-electric averages, the following six population groupings were used: 50,000 and above; 10,000 to 49,999; 2,500 to 9,999; 1,000 to 2,499; 500 to 999; and 499 and below.

Group and Statewide Averages

These statistics were compiled by the staff of the Local Government Commission from audited financial statements.

Ten Years of Comparative Data on Electric Fund Transfers as a

Percentage of General Fund Revenues

				as a Pero	entage of Gen	eral Fund Rev	enues			
Unit	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000
N.C. Eastern Municipal	Power Agency Par	<u>ticipants</u>								
Apex	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ayden	11.9	9.1	6.8	15.0	7.2	9.6	15.1	20.7	9.6	10.2
Belhaven	6.9	7.2	24.8	-	-	6.6	7.3	8.1	7.6	6.9
Benson	2.6	2.9	3.0	3.3	4.1	3.2	10.2	3.4	3.0	2.8
Clayton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Edenton	4.5	5.5	(0.1)	4.1	6.5	1.6	4.3	8.2	10.0	6.5
Elizabeth City	6.6	4.4	10.8	7.5	7.9	7.4	9.4	6.8	4.6	4.5
Farmville	6.5	(3.6)	(3.3)	3.3	-	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.7	1.8
Fremont	4.4	4.7	4.4	3.8	4.9	3.0	5.1	4.6	4.1	6.4
Greenville	6.7	6.1	6.5	(5.9)	6.2	-	7.5	8.3	8.1	8.4
Hamilton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hertford	-	-	6.3	5.3	5.3	-	-	5.8	3.4	3.0
Hobgood	2.7	(1.5)	1.9	-	-	132.8	6.7	27.1	5.5	3.4
Hookerton	-	(5.1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kinston	4.7	5.2	5.3	6.3	6.4	6.6	5.9	6.2	5.8	5.1
La Grange	2.7	0.9	4.4	4.7	-	-	0.4	2.4	-	0.4
Laurinburg	8.1	-	0.8	2.8	5.4	7.8	8.3	-	3.1	-
Louisburg	7.3	7.8	6.6	6.9	7.3	8.4	7.2	6.8	4.8	5.8
Lumberton	2.9	2.5	(5.2)	0.9	-	-	(2.8)	-	-	-
New Bern	5.1	4.8	(2.6)	3.9	5.5	4.7	4.7	5.3	5.2	5.4
Pikeville	-	-	-	-	-	6.1	-	-	-	-
Red Springs	-	-	-	6.3	23.5	6.6	7.0	6.7	6.7	6.6
Robersonville	9.2	4.8	0.4	0.4	3.2	2.5	2.2	2.5	3.9	1.5
Rocky Mount	3.5	3.3	2.8	2.4	2.5	4.7	4.8	5.3	5.0	4.6
Scotland Neck	2.4	10.6	2.1	2.9	3.1	3.6	3.1	3.6	5.5	5.9
Selma	3.6	2.3	6.9	-	4.2	3.8	4.3	4.4	5.2	1.7
Smithfield	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Southport	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Ten Years of Comparative Data on Electric Fund Transfers as a

Percentage of General Fund Revenues

				Transfers from						
					entage of Gene					
Unit	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000
N.C. Eastern Municipal	Power Agency Par	ticipants (cont	tinued)							
Tarboro	11.1	13.6	1.4	13.6	13.1	17.9	12.7	1.7	8.6	3.9
Wake Forest	-	-	-	1.1	1.5	1.6	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.2
Washington	6.1	7.1	1.1	7.0	(2.0)	1.6	4.6	3.7	2.6	4.5
Wilson	5.2	5.0	(5.5)	5.1	5.0	5.4	6.1	6.5	7.2	8.1
N.C. Municipal Power A	gency Number 1 P	<u>articipants</u>								
Albemarle	2.6	8.0	8.4	-	10.0	9.7	9.2	8.3	8.1	7.9
Bostic	14.6	15.0	28.1	35.8	28.2	35.6	19.1	-	9.9	11.9
Cherryville	6.7	5.0	-	0.8	4.7	4.7	-	-	-	7.4
Cornelius	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Drexel	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.0	-	-
Gastonia	3.8	3.9	4.0	4.4	4.7	5.0	7.1	-	7.0	8.3
Granite Falls	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	2.2	5.1
High Point	2.7	1.9	1.2	-	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	-	0.7
Huntersville	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Landis	6.0	9.0	11.0	(14.2)	11.2	10.9	23.7	6.1	-	1.2
Lexington	10.6	(9.5)	-	9.1	(43.5)	7.8	7.1	8.1	8.2	9.0
Lincolnton	0.3	0.3	-	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maiden	-	-	-	-	-	4.0	14.1	4.0	3.5	0.7
Monroe	-	-	4.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Morganton	3.7	3.7	4.8	4.8	6.3	3.8	3.7	3.5	1.2	4.4
Newton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pineville	0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Shelby	3.4	3.1	3.4	3.5	3.2	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.7	5.0
Statesville	1.1	0.9	0.7	0.8	0.8	1.0	1.0	-	-	-
Other Units with Electri	ic Systems									
Black Creek	15.8	13.4	-	24.9	26.3	21.4	20.7	12.2	14.7	26.5
Concord	-	-	-	-	-	-	(0.1)	-	-	-
Dallas	23.9	19.5	21.9	31.4	34.3	37.6	41.3	29.1	27.1	38.4
Enfield	41.1	38.3	45.2	46.0	(27.4)	25.9	69.7	79.3	70.7	29.5

Table C

Ten Years of Comparative Data on Electric Fund Transfers as a

Percentage of General Fund Revenues

					n the Electric l					
					centage of Gen					
Unit	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000
Other Units with Electri	c Systems (continue	<u>ed)</u>								
Fayetteville	6.9	8.6	7.5	9.3	9.8	11.3	-	12.9	11.1	11.6
Forest City	51.2	50.5	(67.9)	-	59.2	60.2	39.3	66.8	129.6	47.2
Fountain	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	-
Highlands	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kings Mountain	23.3	21.7	(10.5)	23.5	18.8	16.6	21.1	17.2	17.2	20.2
Lucama	-	12.7	(12.2)	8.1	26.1	22.1	30.7	30.8	33.6	44.5
Macclesfield	-	-	1.3	22.3	60.6	-	1.3	9.2	-	-
Oak City	28.0	4.1	20.7	16.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pinetops	67.6	9.3	23.3	44.3	38.2	38.8	69.2	49.5	32.7	24.6
Sharpsburg	42.8	34.2	5.4	27.0	52.8	57.8	20.3	1.9	7.0	9.2
Stantonsburg	42.6	44.6	(46.8)	52.9	57.3	55.6	58.4	-	62.7	70.5
Walstonburg	2.4	-	-	9.9	-	-	-	-	-	1.7
Waynesville	7.4	7.5	8.6	10.8	11.6	16.0	12.3	13.8	14.5	19.0
Windsor	40.1	35.7	35.3	26.9	17.6	47.3	45.5	39.5	43.8	40.5
Winterville	3.3	6.0	-	1.6	4.1	4.5	-	8.1	17.2	25.4

Statistical Analysis of Electric Fund Transfers As a Percentage of General Fund Revenues

					n the Electric F centage of Geno					
	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000
N.C. Eastern Municipa	l Power Agency	<u>Participants</u>								
Minimum	-	(5.1)	(5.5)	(5.9)	(2.0)	-	(2.8)	-	-	-
Maximum	11.9	13.6	24.8	15.0	23.5	132.8	15.1	27.1	10.0	10.2
Mean	3.9	3.2	2.7	3.1	4.0	7.8	4.5	4.9	4.0	3.6
Median	3.5	2.9	1.1	2.8	3.2	3.2	4.6	3.7	4.1	3.4
Standard Deviation	3.4	4.1	5.5	4.1	5.0	22.8	4.2	5.8	3.2	3.1
N.C. Municipal Power	Agency Number									
Minimum	-	(9.5)	-	(14.2)	(43.5)	-	(0.1)	-	-	-
Maximum	41.1	38.3	45.2	46.0	34.3	37.6	69.7	79.3	70.7	38.4
Mean	5.6	4.2	4.9	5.5	0.8	6.0	9.6	7.8	6.9	6.4
Median	0.8	0.2	-	-	-	0.7	0.7	0.2	-	0.7
Standard Deviation	10.4	10.0	10.9	13.5	15.7	10.4	17.8	18.2	16.5	11.3
Other Units with Elect	ric Systems									
Minimum	-	-	(67.9)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maximum	67.6	50.5	35.3	52.9	60.6	60.2	69.2	66.8	129.6	70.5
Mean	22.1	16.2	(3.1)	17.4	24.7	22.8	21.3	16.9	25.6	21.6
Median	15.4	8.4	-	13.6	18.2	16.3	16.3	8.7	15.9	19.6
Standard Deviation	23.3	17.9	26.7	16.6	24.2	24.1	23.9	21.6	35.6	22.1

Statistical Analysis of Electric Fund Transfers as a Percentage of General Fund Revenues

Definitions:

Minimum - The smallest value found within a set of numbers.

Maximum - The largest value found within a set of numbers.

Mean - The mean or average is a measure reflecting the center of a distribution of values.

Median - The middle value of an ordered set of numbers. From the ordered set, an equal number of values will be above and below the middle value. If there is an even number of numbers in the set, then the median is an average of the two numbers in the middle.

Standard Deviation - measures the degree to which individual values in a list vary from the mean (average). The lower the standard deviation, the less individual values vary from the mean, and the more reliable the mean. As a general rule, if the data are normally distributed, 68% of the values will be within one standard deviation of the mean and 95% of the values will be within two standard deviations of the mean. The standard deviation can be particularly useful in identifying "outliers," i.e., values that are unusually high or low.

Analysis of Capital Outlay Expenditures of Municipal Electric Systems

						Five Year	Average
		Electric Fund	l Capital Outlay Exp	enditures			As a % of Electric Fund
Unit	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	Dollars	Revenues
N.C. Eastern Mun	icipal Power Agency	<u>y Participants</u>					
Apex	1,892,062	2,164,447	2,938,106	6,640,410	3,944,106	3,515,826	15.6
Ayden	373,543	186,709	0	55,544	14,695	126,098	1.1
Belhaven	0	155,998	21,019	50,471	23,745	50,247	1.9
Benson	28,220	0	53,086	0	0	16,261	0.4
Clayton	466,247	604,988	665,366	28,167	325,505	418,055	3.9
Edenton	0	271,175	58,016	191,423	454,246	194,972	1.8
Elizabeth City	1,040,360	1,473,310	1,495,797	790,733	712,448	1,102,530	3.5
Farmville	279,151	1,713,477	979,414	436,049	5,235	682,665	10.9
Fremont	70,705	0	0	4,019	0	14,945	1.0
Greenville	10,895,289	14,018,665	12,699,238	9,974,747	7,366,337	10,990,855	6.8
Hamilton	1,894	30,908	5,386	0	0	7,638	1.8
Hertford	6,525	45,858	0	15,250	125,594	38,645	1.4
Hobgood	0	0	0	0	3,000	600	0.1
Hookerton	9,618	20,182	8,555	28,724	14,525	16,321	2.3
Kinston	2,452,117	622,090	195,454	1,244,550	224,257	947,694	2.0
La Grange	36,621	51,352	32,836	65,000	87,220	54,606	1.7
Laurinburg	264,193	1,475,356	213,071	192,941	164,115	461,935	3.2
Louisburg	1,691,371	1,933,362	208,263	206,893	127,833	833,544	13.1
Lumberton	1,188,143	343,418	0	498,688	281,297	462,309	1.4
New Bern	2,374,001	3,193,302	2,407,899	3,347,996	2,282,241	2,721,088	5.3
Pikeville	51,677	695,711	20,964	0	0	153,670	15.9
Red Springs	63,707	491,507	476,300	26,439	614	211,713	5.1
Robersonville	30,418	57,923	6,676	101,031	13,692	41,948	1.6
Rocky Mount	1,356,055	1,513,046	1,365,665	2,219,119	1,412,597	1,573,296	1.9
Scotland Neck	15,289	7,000	0	0	76,405	19,739	0.6
Selma	161,589	116,779	1,647,025	0	34,252	391,929	5.5
Smithfield	319,526	3,757,727	2,041,906	419,771	649,994	1,437,785	8.4
Southport	695,732	1,052,519	1,197,516	0	265,485	642,250	11.3

Analysis of Capital Outlay Expenditures of Municipal Electric Systems

						Five Year	Average
			l Capital Outlay Exp				As a % of Electric Fund
Unit	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	Dollars	Revenues
N.C. Eastern Mur	nicipal Power Agency	y Participants (cont	tinued)				
Tarboro	985,370	0	1,187,983	799,973	1,331,651	860,995	3.6
Wake Forest	1,285,394	3,014,103	1,651,532	2,194,611	738,460	1,776,820	12.4
Washington	2,493,255	2,678,371	2,788,185	1,461,048	1,699,297	2,224,031	7.1
Wilson	10,823,306	14,693,854	16,298,495	7,761,360	4,550,386	10,825,480	9.1
N.C. Municipal Pe	ower Agency Numbe	r 1 Participants					
Albemarle	162,121	330,386	217,674	0	0	142,036	0.5
Bostic	0	0	400,000	0	0	80,000	23.8
Cherryville	119,098	142,852	233,647	374,882	235,872	221,270	4.8
Cornelius	719,256	843,141	380,908	247,297	576,383	553,397	13.5
Drexel	0	104,594	0	150,505	0	51,020	2.7
Gastonia	2,871,139	3,456,476	3,117,230	2,495,492	2,215,285	2,831,124	4.7
Granite Falls	1,167	159,855	660,874	149,493	87,485	211,775	4.6
High Point	1,507,867	3,656,752	4,002,611	0	6,173,466	3,068,139	3.2
Huntersville	1,049,858	1,589,192	1,388,624	0	2,106,615	1,226,858	15.5
Landis	180,330	346,927	307,971	276,129	122,353	246,742	5.5
Lexington	58,702	988,160	58,500	1,311,950	803,272	644,117	1.5
Lincolnton	80,323	125,433	86,217	139,828	40,176	94,395	1.6
Maiden	39,359	0	0	29,199	24,390	18,590	0.4
Monroe	11,245,226	16,094,296	5,299,020	6,056,381	3,602,954	8,459,575	21.3
Morganton	683,638	531,342	990,125	758,751	768,221	746,415	3.2
Newton	2,178,813	955,982	1,222,241	2,271,073	186,211	1,362,864	12.8
Pineville	368,273	466,598	1,976,425	1,154,140	813,346	955,756	9.9
Shelby	2,408,441	859,259	1,235,630	2,285,917	272,449	1,412,339	8.6
Statesville	1,579,832	0	1,924,565	1,259,710	1,226,523	1,198,126	3.3
Other Units with	<u>Electric Systems</u>						
Black Creek	0	29,259	0	21,574	2,147	10,596	0.9
Concord	5,930,301	9,959,746	9,448,180	4,370,925	4,761,591	6,894,149	12.0
Dallas	171,168	347,079	317,916	0	128,112	192,855	4.0
Enfield	0	26,554	5,519	108,860	0	28,187	0.8

Analysis of Capital Outlay Expenditures of Municipal Electric Systems

						Five Year	Average
		Electric Fund	l Capital Outlay Exp	penditures			As a % of Electric Fund
Unit	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	Dollars	Revenues
Other Units with E	lectric Systems (cor	ntinued)					
Fayetteville	19,590,313	16,096,156	18,472,700	15,324,508	12,625,941	16,421,924	10.3
Forest City	226,000	417,738	391,997	0	319,953	271,138	2.8
Fountain	20,221	13,695	0	71,821	0	21,147	4.2
Highlands	0	200,288	298,558	0	0	99,769	3.1
Kings Mountain	139,712	211,041	549,036	440,214	1,000,779	468,156	4.9
Lucama	0	61,270	13,386	10,666	98,747	36,814	2.0
Macclesfield	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Oak City	0	0	0	0	2,500	500	0.1
Pinetops	0	0	0	12,713	116,058	25,754	1.2
Sharpsburg	26,700	10,853	3,680	0	45,705	17,388	0.9
Stantonsburg	23,614	49,500	59,043	81,608	37,518	50,257	2.5
Walstonburg	35,558	60,336	3,669	0	0	19,913	10.5
Waynesville	2,331,936	1,112,653	64,226	71,557	315,885	779,251	10.6
Windsor	35,313	181,716	303,604	937,204	390,678	369,703	8.3
Winterville	2,423,117	1,244,768	381,271	296,950	249,437	919,109	18.7

Table D (cont.)

Statistical Analysis of Capital Outlay Expenditures of Municipal Electric Systems

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2009, 2008, 2007, 2006 and 2005

			Five Year A	Verage		
	N.C. Eastern	Municipal	N.C. Municipal	Power Agency	Other Units	s With
	Power Agency	Participants	Number 1 Pa	articipants	Electric Sy	vstems
		As a % of Electric Fund		As a % of Electric Fund		As a % of Electric Fund
	Dollars	Revenues	Dollars	Revenues	Dollars	Revenues
Minimum	600	0.10	18,590	0.4	0	-
Maximum	10,990,855	15.90	8,459,575	23.8	16,421,924	18.7
Mean	1,338,015	5.05	1,238,134	7.4	1,401,400	5.1
Median	439,995	3.35	644,117	4.7	50,257	3.1
Standard Deviation	2,654,443	4.65	1,958,518	6.9	3,956,917	5.1

Definitions:

Minimum - The smallest value found within a set of numbers.

Maximum - The largest value found within a set of numbers.

Mean - The mean or average is a measure reflecting the center of a distribution of values.

Median - The middle value of an ordered set of numbers. From the ordered set, an equal number of values will be above and below the

middle value. If there is an even number of numbers in the set, then the median is an average of the two numbers in the middle.

Standard Deviation - measures the degree to which individual values in a list vary from the mean (average). The lower the standard deviation, the less individual values vary from the mean, and the more reliable the mean. As a general rule, if the data are normally distributed, 68% of the values will be within one standard deviation of the mean and 95% of the values will be within two standard deviations of the mean. The standard deviation can be particularly useful in identifying "outliers," i.e., values that are unusually high or low.