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## MEMORANDUM

## TO: Officials of Municipalities with Electric Systems

 and the Certified Public Accountants auditing these unitsFROM: Sharon Edmundson, Director Fiscal Management Section

## SUBJECT: Statistical Information on Electric System Operations

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. These payments should not be accounted for or reported as transfers. 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. Electric power purchases and other operating expenses. 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

Memorandum 1093
November 26, 2008
Page 4
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. Transfers out (in). 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.
d. Net income before capital contributions. 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. Coverage ratio. 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. Days sales in receivables. 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. Days cash on hand. 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
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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 non-electric 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

1. 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 Results and Key Ratios of Municipal Electric Systems

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004

|  |  | Financial Results |  |  |  |  |  | Key Ratios |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | As a \% of Total Electric Fund Operating Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit | Fiscal <br> Year | Total Operating Revenues | Electric <br> Power <br> Purchases | Other <br> Operating <br> Expenses | Operating <br> Margin | Transfers <br> Out(In) | Net Inc <br> Before <br> Cap Contr | Quick <br> Ratio | Coverage <br> Ratio | Days <br> Sales in <br> Receivables | $\begin{gathered} \text { Days } \\ \text { Cash } \\ \text { on Hand } \end{gathered}$ |

N.C. Eastern Municipal Power Agency Participants

| Apex | 2007 | 22,727,919 | 72.6 | 18.9 | 8.5 | (1.5) | 10.4 | 2.2 | 1.18 | 58.0 | 36.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2006 | 20,854,364 | 75.5 | 18.0 | 6.5 | - | 7.3 | 1.9 | 1.15 | 56.3 | 33.6 |
|  | 2005 | 17,285,619 | 75.2 | 18.3 | 6.5 | - | 7.2 | 3.7 | 1.14 | 58.2 | 150.4 |
|  | 2004 | 16,469,672 | 71.3 | 19.2 | 9.5 | - | 10.0 | 5.9 | 1.18 | 60.9 | 206.1 |
| Ayden | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 10,096,324 | 77.2 | 21.8 | 1.0 | 2.2 | (1.1) | 8.3 | 1.04 | 53.1 | 226.2 |
|  | 2004 | 10,498,016 | 70.7 | 15.8 | 13.5 | 2.3 | 11.3 | 4.7 | 1.23 | 53.4 | 229.3 |
| Belhaven | 2007 | 2,822,745 | 67.7 | 18.2 | 14.1 | 16.3 | 0.3 | 5.3 | 1.26 | 47.4 | 247.3 |
|  | 2006 | 2,688,484 | 68.1 | 29.7 | 2.2 | 4.7 | (0.7) | 5.7 | 1.07 | 48.6 | 220.3 |
|  | 2005 | 2,524,105 | 65.6 | 27.8 | 6.6 | 5.2 | 2.6 | 6.0 | 1.13 | 51.5 | 253.4 |
|  | 2004 | 2,540,362 | 65.1 | 26.8 | 8.1 | 5.3 | 3.4 | 6.1 | 0.86 | 52.7 | 241.6 |
| Benson | 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 | 0.98 | 40.8 | 12.5 |
|  | 2005 | 3,881,632 | 77.5 | 21.6 | 0.9 | 4.5 | (3.4) | 2.0 | 1.05 | 35.7 | 23.1 |
|  | 2004 | 4,018,143 | 83.2 | 18.3 | (1.5) | 1.8 | (4.4) | 2.2 | 0.80 | 44.8 | 48.6 |
| Clayton | 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 | 0.97 | 43.8 | 105.9 |
|  | 2005 | 9,338,233 | 69.3 | 24.0 | 6.7 | - | 6.8 | 3.4 | 1.08 | 42.7 | 121.1 |
|  | 2004 | 9,147,538 | 68.2 | 24.6 | 7.2 | - | 7.1 | 2.4 | 1.06 | 41.4 | 103.6 |
| Edenton | 2007 | 10,682,632 | 78.5 | 18.7 | 2.8 | 0.8 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 1.06 | 23.2 | 1.6 |
|  | 2006 | 10,498,476 | 86.5 | 15.3 | (1.8) | 1.4 | (2.9) | 0.9 | 1.01 | 15.6 | 4.5 |
|  | 2005 | 9,519,874 | 86.4 | 19.2 | (5.6) | 2.6 | (7.9) | 1.2 | 0.97 | 21.3 | 21.5 |
|  | 2004 | 9,703,932 | 82.4 | 17.9 | (0.3) | 1.7 | (2.0) | 2.3 | 1.03 | 36.6 | 44.5 |
| Elizabeth City | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 28,256,685 | 74.0 | 15.2 | 10.8 | 3.4 | 7.7 | 5.1 | 1.19 | 38.7 | 159.3 |
|  | 2004 | 27,623,450 | 76.8 | 17.5 | 5.7 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 4.4 | 1.14 | 40.9 | 108.8 |

## Financial Results and Key Ratios of Municipal Electric Systems

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004

| Unit | Fiscal Year | Financial Results |  |  |  |  |  | Key Ratios |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | As a \% of Total Electric Fund Operating Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Operating Revenues | Electric <br> Power Purchases | Other Operating Expenses | Operating <br> Margin | Transfers Out(In) | Net Inc <br> Before <br> Cap Contr | Quick <br> Ratio | $\begin{gathered} \text { Coverage } \\ \text { Ratio } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Days <br> Sales in Receivables |  |
| N.C. Eastern Municipal Power Agency Participants (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Farmville | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 5,880,888 | 74.3 | 20.8 | 4.9 | 3.0 | 1.4 | 3.1 | 1.07 | 54.6 | 87.9 |
|  | 2004 | 5,885,019 | 74.2 | 18.9 | 6.9 | 2.9 | 4.2 | 2.9 | 1.10 | 56.9 | 80.9 |
| Fremont | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 1,271,574 | 86.8 | 19.3 | (6.1) | 3.0 | (8.7) | 7.8 | 0.95 | 56.3 | 220.6 |
|  | 2004 | 1,292,328 | 77.6 | 18.8 | 3.6 | 2.3 | 1.4 | 32.7 | 1.09 | 60.4 | 241.2 |
| Greenville | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 137,771,356 | 79.7 | 16.9 | 3.4 | 2.7 | 1.4 | 3.0 | 1.10 | 39.5 | 96.3 |
|  | 2004 | 137,000,037 | 78.9 | 15.9 | 5.2 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 3.2 | 1.10 | 39.7 | 96.3 |
| Hamilton | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 355,630 | 84.5 | 22.3 | (6.8) | - | (5.1) | 12.2 | 0.96 | 105.4 | 656.5 |
|  | 2004 | 362,900 | 82.7 | 19.6 | (2.3) | - | (4.5) | 13.6 | 0.96 | 44.7 | 513.3 |
| Hertford | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 2,445,502 | 77.7 | 19.4 | 2.9 | 2.7 | (0.9) | 3.7 | 1.04 | 52.5 | 157.0 |
|  | 2004 | 2,384,619 | 78.1 | 30.0 | (8.1) | - | 4.1 | 4.3 | 1.07 | 52.3 | 145.4 |
| Hobgood | 2007 | 561,285 | 66.6 | 20.2 | 13.2 | 1.1 | 12.4 | 6.1 | 1.20 | 49.9 | 71.1 |
|  | 2006 | 488,696 | 74.9 | 25.4 | (0.3) | - | - | 11.9 | 1.00 | 29.5 | 77.5 |
|  | 2005 | 491,888 | 66.7 | 30.0 | 3.3 | - | 3.5 | 3.8 | 1.05 | 33.8 | 91.9 |
|  | 2004 | 480,131 | 66.2 | 34.2 | (0.4) | 31.0 | (31.0) | 5.8 | 1.00 | 45.6 | 51.7 |
| Hookerton | 2007 | 686,142 | 87.0 | 22.0 | (9.0) | 5.8 | (10.5) | 7.2 | 0.97 | 38.1 | 316.8 |
|  | 2006 | 678,315 | 83.0 | 21.7 | (4.7) | - | (1.2) | 8.4 | 0.86 | 40.8 | 361.7 |
|  | 2005 | 648,712 | 80.1 | 21.2 | (1.3) | - | 0.5 | 8.2 | 0.40 | 40.9 | 404.7 |
|  | 2004 | 643,244 | 78.2 | 22.3 | (0.5) | - | 0.2 | 8.1 | 0.93 | 46.1 | 410.8 |
| Kinston | 2007 | 46,817,025 | 89.9 | 10.9 | (0.8) | 1.1 | (2.2) | 1.5 | 0.99 | 39.8 | 9.1 |
|  | 2006 | 44,686,861 | 86.9 | 11.3 | 1.8 | 2.2 | (0.8) | 1.5 | 1.05 | 49.3 | 0.2 |
|  | 2005 | 39,727,807 | 87.5 | 12.7 | (0.2) | 2.5 | (3.2) | 1.8 | 0.84 | 46.1 | 10.7 |
|  | 2004 | 39,259,547 | 85.9 | 10.8 | 3.3 | 2.5 | (0.2) | 1.9 | 1.04 | 50.6 | 7.8 |
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## Financial Results and Key Ratios of Municipal Electric Systems

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004

| Unit | Fiscal Year | Financial Results |  |  |  |  |  | Key Ratios |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | As a \% of Total Electric Fund Operating Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Operating Revenues | Electric <br> Power Purchases | Other Operating Expenses | Operating <br> Margin | Transfers Out(In) | Net Inc <br> Before <br> Cap Contr | Quick <br> Ratio | $\begin{gathered} \text { Coverage } \\ \text { Ratio } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Days <br> Sales in Receivables |  |
| N.C. Eastern Municipal Power Agency Participants (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| La Grange | 2007 | 3,160,090 | 76.6 | 16.0 | 7.4 | 2.6 | 5.5 | 1.5 | 1.10 | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 2,830,663 | 77.9 | 18.9 | 3.2 | - | 3.1 | 1.1 | 1.04 | 35.5 | 19.8 |
|  | 2004 | 2,826,680 | 77.0 | 14.1 | 8.9 | - | 10.8 | 3.5 | 1.13 | 38.8 | 16.1 |
| Laurinburg | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 12,931,826 | 82.0 | 16.9 | 1.1 | - | (0.2) | 6.1 | 1.03 | 81.3 | 180.9 |
|  | 2004 | 12,410,564 | 86.1 | 14.0 | (0.1) | 4.7 | (4.1) | 7.0 | 1.04 | 108.4 | 189.7 |
| Louisburg | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 5,553,798 | 76.5 | 24.2 | (0.7) | 8.0 | (7.5) | 7.2 | 1.06 | 27.2 | 376.9 |
|  | 2004 | 5,644,828 | 73.3 | 22.1 | 4.6 | 10.6 | (5.4) | 7.9 | 1.13 | 25.8 | 411.8 |
| Lumberton | 2007 | 32,817,228 | 80.2 | 11.0 | 8.8 | 2.9 | 6.2 | 1.7 | 1.12 | 31.3 | 35.8 |
|  | 2006 | 30,793,094 | - | 95.9 | 4.1 | 0.5 | 3.5 | 1.3 | 4.54 | 26.0 | 33.5 |
|  | 2005 | 28,118,785 | 82.6 | 16.0 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 2.7 | 0.8 | 1.06 | 25.6 | 10.9 |
|  | 2004 | 26,856,355 | 86.1 | 17.1 | (3.2) | 0.4 | (1.2) | 0.7 | 1.01 | 29.7 | - |
| New Bern | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 43,395,746 | 77.6 | 22.5 | (0.1) | 3.0 | (3.1) | 1.3 | 1.03 | 43.9 | 8.1 |
|  | 2004 | 44,805,720 | 74.6 | 21.7 | 3.7 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 1.8 | 1.10 | 44.8 | 14.1 |
| Pikeville | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 861,289 | 85.3 | 9.0 | 5.7 | 2.9 | 3.9 | 6.0 | 1.08 | 33.3 | 204.3 |
|  | 2004 | 852,155 | 83.4 | 9.0 | 7.6 | 2.9 | 5.5 | 5.9 | 1.10 | 36.8 | 300.6 |
| Red Springs | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 3,729,191 | 70.5 | 18.2 | 11.3 | 15.4 | (3.8) | 5.0 | 1.14 | 59.7 | 140.5 |
|  | 2004 | 3,631,458 | 71.3 | 17.4 | 11.3 | 4.4 | 7.8 | 5.7 | 1.15 | 52.4 | 204.4 |
| Robersonville | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 2,187,896 | 86.3 | 19.8 | (6.1) | 1.4 | (5.2) | 14.2 | 0.97 | 35.2 | 542.1 |
|  | 2004 | 2,307,547 | 86.3 | 16.6 | (2.9) | 0.6 | (1.1) | 14.8 | 1.00 | 44.1 | 528.7 |

Page 9

## Financial Results and Key Ratios of Municipal Electric Systems

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004

| Unit | Fiscal <br> Year | Financial Results |  |  |  |  |  | Key Ratios |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | As a \% of Total Electric Fund Operating Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Operating Revenues | Electric <br> Power <br> Purchases | Other Operating Expenses | Operating <br> Margin | Transfers <br> Out(In) | Net Inc <br> Before <br> Cap Contr | Quick <br> Ratio | Coverage Ratio | Days Sales in Receivables |  |
| N.C. Eastern Municipal Power Agency Participants (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rocky Mount | 2007 | 82,835,445 | 78.2 | 15.2 | 6.6 | 1.8 | 4.6 | 266.0 | 1.09 | 44.7 | 27.6 |
|  | 2006 | 78,239,181 | 90.5 | 4.2 | 5.3 | 1.3 | 3.8 | 1.8 | 1.07 | 46.5 | 13.6 |
|  | 2005 | 69,650,344 | 82.1 | 15.9 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.05 | 51.7 | 0.9 |
|  | 2004 | 70,099,299 | 80.5 | 18.3 | 1.2 | 2.5 | (0.8) | 1.5 | 1.04 | 49.9 | 0.3 |
| Scotland Neck | 2007 | 3,284,600 | 85.0 | 17.8 | (2.8) | 0.9 | (1.6) | 5.6 | 1.02 | 31.2 | 107.9 |
|  | 2006 | 3,200,869 | 88.0 | 19.2 | (7.2) | 1.1 | (5.7) | 5.8 | 0.97 | 28.5 | 106.0 |
|  | 2005 | 2,919,444 | 85.3 | 20.4 | (5.7) | 1.2 | (5.0) | 5.4 | 0.99 | 30.8 | 131.2 |
|  | 2004 | 3,051,803 | 78.9 | 24.0 | (2.9) | 1.3 | (2.1) | 12.4 | 1.02 | 33.0 | 117.8 |
| Selma | 2007 | 7,299,341 | 81.6 | 9.3 | 9.1 | 3.8 | 4.9 | 2.0 | 1.08 | 42.8 | 82.3 |
|  | 2006 | 6,846,436 | 79.8 | 11.7 | 8.5 | 1.8 | (7.8) | 2.3 | 0.94 | - | 113.0 |
|  | 2005 | 6,142,726 | 78.3 | 16.8 | 4.9 | 2.4 | 3.3 | 3.7 | 1.09 | 31.2 | 153.6 |
|  | 2004 | 6,177,225 | 75.8 | 22.6 | 1.6 | 2.4 | (0.6) | 3.7 | 1.05 | 45.1 | 118.2 |
| Smithfield | 2007 | 17,619,038 | 81.2 | 15.2 | 3.6 | - | 4.9 | 3.1 | 1.08 | 53.5 | 72.1 |
|  | 2006 | 16,892,110 | 82.4 | 14.6 | 3.0 | - | 4.0 | 4.0 | 1.06 | 47.7 | 100.9 |
|  | 2005 | 15,339,323 | 80.4 | 16.9 | 2.7 | 0.3 | 2.9 | 4.2 | 1.06 | 55.0 | 97.5 |
|  | 2004 | 15,127,948 | 79.5 | 14.8 | 5.7 | - | 6.1 | 4.3 | 1.09 | 50.2 | 108.4 |
| Southport | 2007 | 5,732,143 | 93.8 | 2.6 | 3.6 | - | 6.4 | 3.8 | 1.09 | 26.3 | 208.7 |
|  | 2006 | 5,610,349 | 78.9 | 16.1 | 5.0 | - | 6.9 | 5.3 | 1.11 | 29.5 | 207.5 |
|  | 2005 | 5,038,421 | 77.3 | 15.7 | 7.0 | - | 7.9 | 6.7 | 1.13 | 24.1 | 236.7 |
|  | 2004 | 4,906,532 | 74.0 | 13.6 | 12.4 | - | 12.6 | 24.5 | 1.19 | 31.7 | 193.5 |
| Tarboro | 2007 | 24,015,002 | 86.3 | 15.6 | (1.9) | 0.5 | (1.9) | 1.7 | 1.05 | 38.4 | 28.0 |
|  | 2006 | 23,310,763 | 86.4 | 15.2 | (1.6) | 4.6 | (6.0) | 1.6 | 1.06 | 39.7 | 20.8 |
|  | 2005 | 22,001,588 | 84.1 | 15.9 | 0.0 | 4.6 | (4.5) | 1.8 | 1.08 | 41.7 | 28.3 |
|  | 2004 | 22,309,811 | 83.3 | 16.1 | 0.6 | 5.1 | (4.2) | 2.2 | 1.09 | 40.0 | 39.9 |
| Wake Forest | 2007 | 14,348,899 | 71.3 | 29.7 | (1.0) | - | (0.8) | 1.0 | 1.01 | 46.6 | 2.2 |
|  | 2006 | 13,819,974 | 70.6 | 32.4 | (3.0) | 1.6 | (4.0) | 1.6 | 0.93 | - | 29.6 |
|  | 2005 | 12,271,899 | 68.1 | 25.8 | 6.1 | 2.0 | 4.2 | 3.2 | 1.13 | 56.5 | 80.2 |
|  | 2004 | 11,552,691 | 67.1 | 21.8 | 11.1 | 1.9 | 9.0 | 3.1 | 1.18 | 63.1 | 72.3 |
| Washington | 2007 | 31,988,163 | 76.9 | 19.0 | 4.1 | 0.7 | 6.2 | 1.9 | 1.11 | 46.7 | 45.7 |
|  | 2006 | 29,079,443 | 81.1 | 19.1 | (0.2) | (3.8) | 4.6 | 1.7 | 1.04 | 42.9 | 43.1 |
|  | 2005 | 26,114,337 | 79.3 | 20.7 | 0.0 | 3.9 | (2.1) | 2.1 | 1.07 | 47.2 | 36.5 |
|  | 2004 | 26,156,161 | 78.3 | 21.1 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 1.07 | 44.4 | 48.0 |

Table A

## Financial Results and Key Ratios of Municipal Electric Systems

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004

| Unit | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fiscal } \\ \text { Year } \end{gathered}$ | Financial Results |  |  |  |  |  | Key Ratios |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | As a \% of Total Electric Fund Operating Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Operating Revenues | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Electric } \\ \text { Power } \\ \text { Purchases } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Other Operating Expenses | $\begin{gathered} \text { Operating } \\ \text { Margin } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Transfers } \\ \text { Out(In) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Net Inc } \\ \text { Before } \end{array} \\ \hline \text { Cap Contr } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Quick } \\ & \text { Ratio } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Coverage Ratio | Days Sales in Receivables | $\begin{gathered} \text { Days } \\ \text { Cash } \\ \text { on Hand } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| N.C. Eastern Municipal Power Agency Participants (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wilson | 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 | 1.01 | 40.8 | 107.8 |
|  | 2005 | 100,083,060 | 85.0 | 14.5 | 0.5 | 1.9 | (1.2) | 5.1 | 1.04 | 41.2 | 149.6 |
|  | 2004 | 103,045,493 | 83.6 | 13.6 | 2.8 | 1.8 | 1.3 | 5.5 | 1.05 | 40.1 | 162.7 |
| N.C. Municipal Power Agency Number 1 Participants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albemarle | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 25,280,287 | 82.2 | 19.5 | (1.7) | 3.2 | (4.5) | 3.1 | 1.01 | 40.4 | 59.5 |
|  | 2004 | 25,611,106 | 80.0 | 19.3 | 0.7 | 7.7 | (6.7) | 3.1 | 1.04 | 40.7 | 70.2 |
| Bostic | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 306,545 | 62.2 | 15.0 | 22.8 | 9.8 | 13.8 | 8.2 | 1.43 | 48.1 | 302.8 |
|  | 2004 | 308,949 | 62.4 | 26.4 | 11.2 | 12.0 | (0.8) | 7.1 | 1.23 | 47.8 | 230.7 |
| Cherryville | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 4,430,584 | 75.0 | 19.9 | 5.1 | 5.3 | 0.1 | 9.3 | 1.10 | 33.3 | 56.8 |
|  | 2004 | 4,437,694 | 73.4 | 17.3 | 9.3 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 28.8 | 1.16 | 37.0 | 57.0 |
| Cornelius | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 3,895,118 | 62.2 | 19.5 | 18.3 | - | 17.4 | 1.3 | 1.24 | 41.1 | 78.7 |
|  | 2004 | 3,424,724 | 67.9 | 23.4 | 8.7 | - | 7.2 | 1.3 | 1.09 | 52.5 | 59.1 |
| Drexel | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 1,815,401 | 69.3 | 27.2 | 3.5 | - | 5.4 | 13.6 | 1.09 | 33.4 | 525.9 |
|  | 2004 | 1,776,033 | 69.7 | 28.2 | 2.1 | - | 3.3 | 12.8 | 1.06 | 30.9 | 504.8 |
| Gastonia | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 53,869,434 | 82.1 | 15.3 | 2.6 | 4.3 | (1.4) | 2.6 | 1.08 | 41.9 | 62.4 |
|  | 2004 | 54,020,286 | 80.8 | 14.9 | 4.3 | 4.5 | (0.1) | 2.9 | 1.10 | 44.8 | 62.5 |

## Financial Results and Key Ratios of Municipal Electric Systems

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004

| Unit | Fiscal <br> Year | Financial Results |  |  |  |  |  | Key Ratios |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | As a \% of Total Electric Fund Operating Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Operating Revenues | Electric <br> Power <br> Purchases | Other Operating Expenses | Operating <br> Margin | Transfers Out(In) | Net Inc <br> Before <br> Cap Contr | Quick <br> Ratio | Coverage Ratio | Days Sales in Receivables | Days <br> Cash on Hand |
| N.C. Municipal Power Agency Number 1 Participants (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Granite Falls | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 3,963,673 | 74.0 | 27.0 | (1.0) | - | (0.9) | 2.7 | 1.03 | 45.8 | 76.3 |
|  | 2004 | 4,052,951 | 72.3 | 32.7 | (5.0) | - | (5.3) | 3.2 | 0.97 | 50.9 | 69.0 |
| High Point | 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 | - | 103.2 | (3.2) | 0.6 | (2.8) | 2.9 | - | 12.9 | 100.9 |
|  | 2005 | 86,256,922 | 87.0 | 10.4 | 2.6 | 0.2 | 2.6 | 3.5 | 1.08 | 14.0 | 118.8 |
|  | 2004 | 82,791,841 | 89.3 | 10.3 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 3.9 | 1.05 | 14.9 | 122.5 |
| Huntersville | 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 | 1.43 | 58.7 | 123.8 |
|  | 2005 | 6,343,749 | 63.9 | 17.6 | 18.5 | - | 18.1 | 3.2 | 1.32 | 43.2 | 134.5 |
|  | 2004 | 6,296,981 | 63.3 | 17.0 | 19.7 | - | 18.8 | 3.9 | 1.33 | 47.6 | 182.9 |
| Landis | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 3,957,017 | 74.4 | 23.2 | 2.4 | 9.2 | (6.5) | 2.8 | 1.07 | 46.4 | 57.6 |
|  | 2004 | 4,060,523 | 72.9 | 21.4 | 5.7 | (6.7) | 12.4 | 3.7 | 1.11 | 47.2 | 80.4 |
| Lexington | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 42,026,569 | 78.5 | 18.2 | 3.3 | (15.2) | 18.5 | 2.3 | 1.06 | 47.9 | 44.1 |
|  | 2004 | 43,253,873 | 76.8 | 18.0 | 5.2 | 3.1 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 1.10 | 47.1 | 43.2 |
| Lincolnton | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 5,663,947 | 78.2 | 21.0 | 0.8 | - | 2.7 | 6.2 | 1.07 | 32.0 | 244.0 |
|  | 2004 | 5,702,845 | 76.8 | 20.9 | 2.3 | - | 3.0 | 8.2 | 1.08 | 36.0 | 324.7 |
| Maiden | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 4,193,288 | 91.8 | 18.4 | (10.2) | - | (10.1) | 7.5 | 0.80 | 19.2 | 25.3 |
|  | 2004 | 4,608,833 | 85.8 | 18.3 | (4.1) | 0.1 | (4.7) | 12.8 | 0.98 | 33.8 | 35.6 |
| Monroe | 2007 | 39,853,672 | 83.7 | 12.0 | 4.3 | 3.7 | 11.7 | 11.2 | 1.21 | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 35,992,619 | 85.1 | 13.2 | 1.7 | - | 8.1 | 11.6 | 1.13 | 34.5 | 420.3 |
|  | 2004 | 34,513,093 | 85.0 | 12.7 | 2.3 | - | 6.7 | 12.3 | 1.12 | 33.5 | 428.9 |

## Financial Results and Key Ratios of Municipal Electric Systems

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004

| Unit | Fiscal <br> Year | Financial Results |  |  |  |  |  | Key Ratios |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | As a \% of Total Electric Fund Operating Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Operating Revenues | Electric <br> Power <br> Purchases | Other Operating Expenses | Operating <br> Margin | Transfers Out(In) | Net Inc <br> Before <br> Cap Contr | Quick <br> Ratio | Coverage Ratio | Days <br> Sales in Receivables |  |
| N.C. Municipal Power Agency Number 1 Participants (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Morganton | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 22,227,843 | 86.6 | 16.5 | (3.1) | 3.9 | (5.0) | 9.7 | 1.01 | 34.1 | 299.2 |
|  | 2004 | 22,549,633 | 83.5 | 14.8 | 1.7 | 2.2 | 0.4 | 10.6 | 1.06 | 38.2 | 346.2 |
| Newton | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 9,121,661 | 73.0 | 30.8 | (3.8) | (0.9) | (0.7) | 1.9 | 0.78 | 30.0 | 54.9 |
|  | 2004 | 8,896,199 | 70.2 | 34.4 | (4.6) | - | (3.8) | 1.6 | 0.83 | 31.0 | 42.2 |
| Pineville | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 9,304,422 | 81.4 | 12.4 | 6.2 | - | 6.8 | 4.7 | 1.11 | 51.9 | 199.5 |
|  | 2004 | 9,367,539 | 80.4 | 11.2 | 8.4 | - | 8.5 | 5.4 | 1.13 | 54.1 | 193.1 |
| Shelby | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 14,894,860 | 74.9 | 18.3 | 6.8 | 2.8 | 3.1 | 4.2 | 1.07 | 42.5 | 207.2 |
|  | 2004 | 14,803,063 | 73.2 | 19.4 | 7.4 | 2.3 | 4.5 | 2.6 | 1.09 | 42.8 | 99.7 |
| Statesville | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 33,597,354 | 85.0 | 13.1 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 1.6 | 5.0 | 1.05 | 50.7 | 159.4 |
|  | 2004 | 34,190,549 | 83.4 | 12.0 | 4.6 | 0.5 | 4.2 | 5.2 | 1.08 | 58.1 | 147.9 |
| Other Units with Electric Systems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Creek | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 1,005,328 | 49.1 | 37.8 | 13.1 | 7.8 | 4.7 | 7.0 | 1.21 | 66.0 | 406.5 |
|  | 2004 | 1,085,854 | 44.7 | 32.3 | 23.0 | 6.0 | 15.4 | 6.4 | 1.36 | 54.7 | 428.4 |
| Concord | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 50,625,078 | 61.6 | 26.8 | 11.6 | 8.8 | 1.7 | 4.3 | 1.22 | 39.9 | 131.6 |
|  | 2004 | 48,828,093 | 60.1 | 26.6 | 13.3 | 7.7 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 1.24 | 44.2 | 147.0 |

## Financial Results and Key Ratios of Municipal Electric Systems

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004

| Unit | Fiscal <br> Year | Financial Results |  |  |  |  |  | Key Ratios |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | As a \% of Total Electric Fund Operating Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Operating Revenues | Electric <br> Power Purchases | Other Operating Expenses | Operating <br> Margin | Transfers Out(In) | Net Inc <br> Before <br> Cap Contr | Quick <br> Ratio | Coverage Ratio | Days <br> Sales in <br> Receivables | $\begin{gathered} \text { Days } \\ \text { Cash } \\ \text { on Hand } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Other Units with Electric Systems (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dallas | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 4,390,477 | 48.2 | 25.8 | 26.0 | 13.3 | 12.9 | 5.4 | 1.56 | 49.5 | 220.9 |
|  | 2004 | 4,055,869 | 55.2 | 31.3 | 13.5 | 15.7 | (1.3) | 3.6 | 1.18 | 36.8 | 158.3 |
| Enfield | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 3,207,543 | 52.6 | 14.3 | 33.1 | 13.4 | 19.4 | 3.0 | 1.54 | 42.7 | 106.6 |
|  | 2004 | 3,231,988 | 54.8 | 11.7 | 33.5 | 15.0 | 18.2 | 1.1 | 1.52 | 34.9 | 11.6 |
| Fayetteville | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 146,069,329 | 72.2 | 15.5 | 12.3 | 5.9 | 4.9 | 1.7 | 1.20 | 46.7 | 63.2 |
|  | 2004 | 141,981,920 | 52.6 | 37.1 | 10.3 | 6.2 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.26 | 48.4 | 44.6 |
| Forest City | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 8,703,806 | 48.6 | 18.0 | 33.4 | 28.7 | 5.2 | 5.0 | 1.80 | 49.2 | 105.8 |
|  | 2004 | 8,356,158 | 51.5 | 18.3 | 30.2 | 28.7 | 2.0 | 3.9 | 1.68 | 54.1 | 65.6 |
| Fountain | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 498,612 | 50.7 | 34.0 | 15.3 | 0.5 | 13.9 | 2.9 | 1.15 | 26.5 | 209.3 |
|  | 2004 | 518,211 | 48.8 | 29.7 | 21.5 | 2.7 | 17.2 | 2.6 | 1.28 | 31.1 | 191.8 |
| Highlands | 2007 | 3,150,674 | - | 79.2 | 20.8 | - | 24.3 | 13.7 | - | 39.6 | 370.7 |
|  | 2006 | 3,105,990 | - | 93.0 | 7.0 | 32.2 | (23.2) | 14.2 | - | 49.3 | 230.6 |
|  | 2005 | 3,245,296 | 72.2 | 2.7 | 25.1 | 88.4 | (61.1) | 19.5 | 1.42 | 55.7 | 365.3 |
|  | 2004 | 2,961,819 | 53.6 | 24.0 | 22.4 | 31.1 | (7.1) | 34.2 | 1.50 | 41.7 | 718.6 |
| Kings Mountain | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 8,186,695 | 52.7 | 28.6 | 18.7 | 16.5 | 1.9 | 2.4 | 1.35 | 46.9 | 54.9 |
|  | 2004 | 8,234,831 | 48.2 | 27.2 | 24.6 | 15.2 | 8.9 | 2.8 | 1.45 | 50.2 | 95.2 |
| Lucama | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 1,707,463 | 49.6 | 23.4 | 27.0 | 6.7 | 20.6 | 13.9 | 1.51 | 30.2 | 680.8 |
|  | 2004 | 1,618,487 | 53.1 | 24.2 | 22.7 | 7.0 | 14.9 | 10.8 | 1.38 | 25.1 | 615.2 |
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## Financial Results and Key Ratios of Municipal Electric Systems

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004

| Unit | Fiscal <br> Year | Financial Results |  |  |  |  |  | Key Ratios |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | As a \% of Total Electric Fund Operating Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Operating Revenues | Electric <br> Power <br> Purchases | Other Operating Expenses | Operating Margin | Transfers Out(In) | Net Inc <br> Before <br> Cap Contr | Quick <br> Ratio | Coverage Ratio | Days Sales in Receivables | Days <br> Cash on Hand |
| Other Units with Electric Systems (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Macclesfield | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 415,221 | 60.1 | 32.7 | 7.2 | 32.2 | (26.2) | 9.6 | 1.12 | 39.5 | 406.6 |
|  | 2004 | 438,987 | 59.1 | 30.5 | 10.4 | - | 10.3 | 11.1 | 1.21 | 36.7 | 495.5 |
| Oak City | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 312,864 | 81.5 | 15.5 | 3.0 | - | 5.1 | 11.0 | 1.09 | 32.2 | 506.7 |
|  | 2004 | 338,056 | 75.9 | 11.0 | 13.1 | (1.6) | 17.8 | 10.8 | 1.23 | 46.3 | 538.7 |
| Pinetops | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 1,792,791 | 65.6 | 24.1 | 10.3 | 12.4 | (1.9) | 1.7 | 1.17 | 31.0 | 73.4 |
|  | 2004 | 1,731,862 | 66.5 | 24.6 | 8.9 | 20.2 | (11.4) | 1.8 | 1.17 | 39.1 | 112.0 |
| Sharpsburg | 2007 | 1,744,142 | 69.3 | 5.5 | 25.2 | (2.7) | 26.1 | 5.8 | 1.32 | 34.6 | 76.3 |
|  | 2006 | 2,017,770 | - | 76.4 | 23.6 | 11.1 | 9.6 | 3.7 | 4.13 | 42.4 | 21.0 |
|  | 2005 | 1,727,263 | 56.7 | 30.2 | 13.1 | 22.7 | (11.8) | 3.0 | 1.29 | 27.3 | 168.4 |
|  | 2004 | 1,691,319 | 59.6 | 38.0 | 2.4 | 26.2 | (23.1) | 1.7 | 1.15 | 27.0 | 414.6 |
| Stantonsburg | 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 | 74.4 | 3.3 | 22.3 | 11.0 | 12.2 | 9.3 | 1.43 | 15.5 | 466.9 |
|  | 2005 | 1,651,145 | 55.6 | 28.9 | 15.5 | 12.1 | 4.4 | 8.7 | 1.28 | 20.7 | 431.9 |
|  | 2004 | 1,724,851 | 56.5 | 25.7 | 17.8 | 11.6 | 6.1 | 8.7 | 1.26 | 23.0 | 410.6 |
| Walstonburg | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 154,298 | 77.5 | 24.7 | (2.2) | 2.3 | (4.4) | 8.6 | 0.99 | 30.7 | 275.2 |
|  | 2004 | 159,180 | 76.3 | 25.3 | (1.6) | - | (1.7) | 9.0 | 1.02 | 32.2 | 284.0 |
| Waynesville | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 6,308,998 | 69.5 | 17.0 | 13.5 | 15.9 | (1.9) | 2.7 | 1.22 | 29.5 | 60.0 |
|  | 2004 | 6,165,919 | 62.6 | 17.0 | 20.4 | 22.0 | (1.0) | 3.6 | 1.37 | 26.6 | 92.9 |
| Windsor | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 3,662,105 | 58.7 | 26.7 | 14.6 | 5.2 | 11.6 | 6.1 | 1.36 | 43.9 | 164.0 |
|  | 2004 | 3,360,796 | 61.5 | 31.5 | 7.0 | 16.5 | (14.5) | 4.1 | 1.12 | 52.7 | 143.8 |

Financial Results and Key Ratios of Municipal Electric Systems
For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004

| Unit | Fiscal Year | Financial Results |  |  |  |  |  | Key Ratios |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | As a \% of Total Electric Fund Operating Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Operating Revenues | Electric <br> Power <br> Purchases | Other Operating Expenses | Operating <br> Margin | Transfers Out(In) | Net Inc <br> Before <br> Cap Contr | Quick <br> Ratio | Coverage <br> Ratio | Days Sales in $\underline{\text { Receivables }}$ |  |
| Other Units with Electric Systems (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Winterville | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 4,284,432 | 62.9 | 24.1 | 13.0 | 3.9 | 9.7 | 5.3 | 1.18 | 31.9 | 137.6 |
|  | 2004 | 4,056,996 | 54.8 | 20.5 | 24.7 | 3.7 | 20.5 | 6.8 | 1.37 | 38.4 | 236.0 |

## Financial Results and Key Ratios of Municipal Electric Systems

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004

## 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:

|  | Fiscal Year | Total <br> Operating <br> Revenues | As a \% of Total Electric Fund Operating Revenues |  |  |  |  | Key Ratios |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit |  |  | Electric <br> Power <br> Purchases | Other Operating Expenses | Operating <br> Margin | Transfers Out(In) | Net Income | Quick <br> Ratio | Coverage <br> Ratio | Days Sales in Receivables | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Days } \\ \text { Cash } \\ \text { on Hand } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Murphy Power |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Board | 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 |
|  | 2005 | 11,144,287 | 73.8 | 21.6 | 4.6 | - | 5.4 | 4.7 | 1.13 | 29.6 | 159.5 |
|  | 2004 | 10,902,896 | 75.2 | 21.4 | 3.4 | - | 4.0 | 1.2 | 1.10 | 30.2 | 148.1 |

Table A (cont.)

Financial Results and Key Ratios of Municipal Electric Systems
Statistical Analysis - NC Eastern Municipal Power Agency
For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004

|  | Fiscal Year | Financial Results |  |  |  |  |  |  | Key Ratios |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total Operating Revenues |  | As a \% of Total Operating Revenues |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Quick } \\ & \text { Ratio } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Coverage <br> Ratio | Days Sales in Receivables |  |
|  |  |  |  | Electric Power Purchases | Other Operating Expenses | Operating Margin | Transfers Out(In) | $\qquad$ |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum | 2007 | \$ | 434,054 | 66.6 | 2.6 | (9.3) | (1.5) | (18.4) | 1.0 | 0.85 | 22.0 | - |
|  | 2006 |  | 419,352 | - | 4.2 | (7.2) | (3.8) | (7.8) | 0.9 | 0.86 | - | 0.2 |
|  | 2005 |  | 355,630 | 65.6 | 9.0 | (6.8) | - | (8.7) | 0.8 | 0.40 | 21.3 | 0.9 |
|  | 2004 |  | 362,900 | 65.1 | 9.0 | (8.1) | - | (31.0) | 0.7 | 0.80 | 25.8 | - |
| Maximum | 2007 |  | 162,201,876 | 93.8 | 29.7 | 14.1 | 21.0 | 12.4 | 266.0 | 1.26 | 60.7 | 668.9 |
|  | 2006 |  | 153,895,541 | 90.5 | 95.9 | 10.6 | 7.3 | 7.4 | 13.1 | 4.54 | 90.9 | 640.1 |
|  | 2005 |  | 137,771,356 | 87.5 | 30.0 | 11.3 | 15.4 | 7.9 | 14.2 | 1.19 | 105.4 | 656.5 |
|  | 2004 |  | 137,000,037 | 86.3 | 34.2 | 13.5 | 31.0 | 12.6 | 32.7 | 1.23 | 108.4 | 528.7 |
| Mean | 2007 |  | 22,937,381 | 80.7 | 16.9 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 1.0 | 12.2 | 1.06 | 41.1 | 129.9 |
|  | 2006 |  | 21,737,041 | 78.2 | 20.5 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 4.5 | 1.15 | 39.8 | 138.7 |
|  | 2005 |  | 19,645,818 | 78.8 | 19.3 | 1.9 | 2.5 | (0.1) | 4.6 | 1.03 | 45.4 | 158.7 |
|  | 2004 |  | 19,658,475 | 77.5 | 19.0 | 3.5 | 3.1 | 1.3 | 6.5 | 1.06 | 47.0 | 158.0 |
| Median | 2007 |  | 8,876,413 | 80.9 | 17.7 | 2.5 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 3.2 | 1.06 | 41.4 | 74.2 |
|  | 2006 |  | 8,419,189 | 80.1 | 18.1 | 1.7 | 1.7 | (0.4) | 4.0 | 1.06 | 40.8 | 106.0 |
|  | 2005 |  | 7,740,480 | 78.8 | 19.3 | 1.7 | 2.3 | 0.2 | 3.8 | 1.06 | 42.2 | 135.9 |
|  | 2004 |  | 7,662,382 | 78.2 | 18.3 | 3.5 | 2.1 | 1.4 | 4.4 | 1.07 | 44.8 | 113.3 |
| Standard Deviation | 2007 |  | 36,114,826 | 6.2 | 4.9 | 5.3 | 4.6 | 6.3 | 46.4 | 0.07 | 9.8 | 145.1 |
|  | 2006 |  | 33,981,734 | 15.2 | 14.8 | 4.2 | 2.0 | 4.5 | 3.2 | 0.62 | 16.9 | 146.1 |
|  | 2005 |  | 30,607,151 | 6.1 | 4.3 | 4.7 | 3.0 | 4.6 | 3.1 | 0.13 | 16.8 | 153.9 |
|  | 2004 |  | 30,807,109 | 6.1 | 5.3 | 5.2 | 5.6 | 7.7 | 6.8 | 0.09 | 14.3 | 143.9 |

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.

Table A (cont.)

Financial Results and Key Ratios of Municipal Electric Systems
Statistical Analysis - NC Municipal Power Agency Number 1
For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004

|  | Fiscal Year | Financial Results |  |  |  |  |  | Key Ratios |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total Operating Revenues | As a \% of Total Operating Revenues |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Quick } \\ & \text { Ratio } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | CoverageRatio | Days <br> Sales in Receivables | Days Cash on Hand |
|  |  |  | Electric <br> Power <br> Purchases | Other Operating Expenses | Operating Margin | Transfers Out(In) | Net Income Before Cap Contr |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum | 2007 | \$ 335,862 | 64.0 | 7.2 | (9.3) | (3.7) | (11.1) | 0.6 | 0.95 | 18.2 | - |
|  | 2006 | 334,151 | - | 10.5 | (7.1) | (1.4) | (8.6) | 1.0 | - | 12.9 | 12.5 |
|  | 2005 | 306,545 | 62.2 | 10.4 | (10.2) | (15.2) | (10.1) | 1.3 | 0.78 | 14.0 | 25.3 |
|  | 2004 | 308,949 | 62.4 | 10.3 | (5.0) | (6.7) | (6.7) | 1.3 | 0.83 | 14.9 | 35.6 |
| Maximum | 2007 | 97,956,590 | 90.1 | 33.9 | 12.5 | 11.3 | 13.1 | 14.3 | 1.30 | 77.6 | 521.3 |
|  | 2006 | 89,650,166 | 87.8 | 103.2 | 23.0 | 12.0 | 18.1 | 12.6 | 1.46 | 58.7 | 458.5 |
|  | 2005 | 86,256,922 | 91.8 | 30.8 | 22.8 | 9.8 | 18.5 | 13.6 | 1.43 | 51.9 | 525.9 |
|  | 2004 | 82,791,841 | 89.3 | 34.4 | 19.7 | 12.0 | 18.8 | 28.8 | 1.33 | 58.1 | 504.8 |
| Mean | 2007 | 21,085,163 | 76.1 | 19.4 | 4.5 | 1.9 | 4.8 | 5.1 | 1.12 | 40.8 | 132.9 |
|  | 2006 | 20,184,548 | 73.6 | 24.2 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 0.9 | 4.8 | 1.02 | 38.3 | 146.7 |
|  | 2005 | 19,323,226 | 77.2 | 18.8 | 4.0 | 1.2 | 3.6 | 5.4 | 1.08 | 38.4 | 164.6 |
|  | 2004 | 19,192,985 | 76.2 | 19.6 | 4.2 | 1.6 | 2.9 | 6.9 | 1.08 | 41.5 | 163.2 |
| Median | 2007 | 9,543,881 | 77.9 | 19.6 | 4.4 | 0.4 | 4.5 | 3.3 | 1.11 | 40.4 | 77.5 |
|  | 2006 | 9,390,454 | 77.8 | 18.7 | 0.4 | 0.6 | (0.7) | 3.3 | 1.04 | 37.3 | 100.9 |
|  | 2005 | 9,121,661 | 78.2 | 18.3 | 2.6 | - | 2.6 | 4.2 | 1.07 | 41.1 | 118.8 |
|  | 2004 | 8,896,199 | 76.8 | 18.3 | 4.3 | 0.1 | 3.0 | 3.9 | 1.09 | 42.8 | 99.7 |
| Standard Deviation | 2007 | 24,975,056 | 7.6 | 6.7 | 5.4 | 3.2 | 5.7 | 4.0 | 0.08 | 12.0 | 151.8 |
|  | 2006 | 23,464,306 | 19.3 | 20.1 | 7.6 | 3.9 | 7.1 | 3.4 | 0.28 | 10.5 | 142.0 |
|  | 2005 | 22,512,432 | 8.6 | 5.4 | 8.1 | 5.1 | 8.4 | 3.6 | 0.15 | 10.2 | 139.7 |
|  | 2004 | 22,005,204 | 7.6 | 6.9 | 6.0 | 3.8 | 6.3 | 6.5 | 0.10 | 10.3 | 141.5 |

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.

Table A (cont.)

Financial Results and Key Ratios of Municipal Electric Systems
Statistical Analysis - Other Units With Electric Systems
For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004

|  | Fiscal Year | Financial Results |  |  |  |  |  |  | Key Ratios |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total Operating Revenues |  | As a \% of Total Operating Revenues |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Quick } \\ & \text { Ratio } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Coverage } \\ \text { Ratio } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Days <br> Sales in Receivables | $\begin{gathered} \text { Days } \\ \text { Cash } \\ \text { on Hand } \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  |  | Electric Power Purchases | Other Operating Expenses | Operating Margin | Transfers Out(In) | $\qquad$ |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum | 2007 | \$ | 172,214 | - | 5.5 | (3.3) | (2.7) | (3.2) | 0.7 | - | 17.6 | 49.2 |
|  | 2006 |  | 162,364 | - | 3.3 | (4.5) | - | (23.2) | 0.4 | - | 15.5 | 21.0 |
|  | 2005 |  | 154,298 | 48.2 | 2.7 | (2.2) | - | (61.1) | 1.7 | 0.99 | 20.7 | 54.9 |
|  | 2004 |  | 159,180 | 44.7 | 11.0 | (1.6) | (1.6) | (23.1) | 1.1 | 1.02 | 23.0 | 11.6 |
| Maximum | 2007 |  | 159,647,302 | 85.0 | 79.2 | 33.6 | 33.2 | 26.1 | 26.5 | 1.74 | 56.2 | 726.6 |
|  | 2006 |  | 155,773,020 | 87.8 | 93.0 | 32.7 | 32.2 | 21.1 | 19.2 | 4.13 | 69.8 | 671.8 |
|  | 2005 |  | 146,069,329 | 81.5 | 37.8 | 33.4 | 88.4 | 20.6 | 19.5 | 1.80 | 66.0 | 680.8 |
|  | 2004 |  | 141,981,920 | 76.3 | 38.0 | 33.5 | 31.1 | 20.5 | 34.2 | 1.68 | 54.7 | 718.6 |
| Mean | 2007 |  | 14,442,315 | 57.1 | 26.2 | 16.7 | 7.4 | 10.1 | 7.5 | 1.17 | 40.5 | 239.1 |
|  | 2006 |  | 13,999,448 | 55.4 | 29.4 | 15.2 | 12.0 | 3.8 | 6.7 | 1.36 | 40.5 | 219.5 |
|  | 2005 |  | 13,049,934 | 60.3 | 23.7 | 16.0 | 15.6 | 0.5 | 6.4 | 1.30 | 38.9 | 240.5 |
|  | 2004 |  | 12,660,063 | 57.7 | 25.6 | 16.7 | 12.3 | 4.0 | 6.8 | 1.30 | 39.1 | 273.9 |
| Median | 2007 |  | 3,150,674 | 61.3 | 26.7 | 15.6 | 5.6 | 7.7 | 5.8 | 1.22 | 39.9 | 178.3 |
|  | 2006 |  | 3,105,990 | 61.6 | 26.1 | 15.9 | 11.0 | 5.1 | 4.9 | 1.26 | 42.4 | 161.1 |
|  | 2005 |  | 3,207,543 | 58.7 | 24.7 | 13.5 | 12.1 | 4.7 | 5.3 | 1.22 | 39.5 | 168.4 |
|  | 2004 |  | 2,961,819 | 55.2 | 25.7 | 17.8 | 11.6 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 1.26 | 38.4 | 191.8 |
| Standard Deviation | 2007 |  | 37,414,407 | 17.4 | 15.3 | 9.4 | 8.8 | 9.0 | 5.9 | 0.35 | 10.1 | 181.1 |
|  | 2006 |  | 36,430,729 | 22.1 | 20.9 | 10.1 | 8.3 | 10.4 | 4.6 | 0.76 | 13.4 | 181.9 |
|  | 2005 |  | 34,100,563 | 10.3 | 8.3 | 9.4 | 19.7 | 18.4 | 4.6 | 0.20 | 11.6 | 178.0 |
|  | 2004 |  | 33,124,424 | 8.4 | 7.5 | 9.3 | 10.0 | 12.2 | 7.5 | 0.16 | 10.1 | 211.6 |

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 <br> Statistical Analysis <br> For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004 

## 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.

## Key to Financial Statistics and Ratios

Financial Results - These statistics were compiled by the staff of the Local Government 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

## Table A (cont.)

## Key to Financial Statistics and Ratios

Key Ratios - 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.

# Analysis of Transfers to the General Fund by Municipal Electric Systems 

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004


# Analysis of Transfers to the General Fund by Municipal Electric Systems 

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004

| Unit | Popu- <br> lation | $\underline{\text { Year }}$ | (A) <br> Gross <br> Electric Fund <br> Fixed Assets <br> at Cost | (B) | (C) | (D) | (D/A) | (E) | (F) | (E+F) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Est. Loss in Prop. Tax Revenues Due to City Ownership of Utility |  | Transfers From the Electric Fund to the General Fund |  |  | Tax Rate per \$100-Adjusted for Assessment-to-Sales Ratio |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | As a \% of | As a | Effec- | Without | Non- |
|  |  |  |  | Amount | Tax Rate Equivalent | Amount | Elec. Fixed Assets | Tax Rate Equivalent | tive Actual | Electric <br> Transfers | Electric Avg. |
| N.C. Eastern Municipal Power Agency Participants (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Farmville | 4,619 | 2007 | 5,971,396 | 29,260 | 0.0100 | $(116,000)$ | (1.9) | (0.04) | 0.45 | 0.41 | 0.26 |
|  |  | 2006 | 5,103,879 | 25,009 | 0.0089 | 116,000 | 2.3 | 0.04 | 0.47 | 0.51 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 4,644,966 | 22,760 | 0.0080 | - | - | - | 0.48 | 0.48 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 4,704,502 | 23,052 | 0.0096 | 64,009 | 1.4 | 0.03 | 0.39 | 0.42 |  |
| Fremont | 1,419 | 2007 | 1,167,914 | 7,591 | 0.0158 | 38,600 | 3.3 | 0.08 | 0.59 | 0.67 | 0.27 |
|  |  | 2006 | 1,030,646 | 6,699 | 0.0141 | 38,600 | 3.7 | 0.08 | 0.61 | 0.69 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 1,163,896 | 6,401 | 0.0135 | 38,600 | 3.3 | 0.08 | 0.64 | 0.72 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 1,163,895 | 7,565 | 0.0156 | 30,000 | 2.6 | 0.06 | 0.55 | 0.61 |  |
| Greenville | 72,233 | 2007 | 187,328,475 | 1,049,039 | 0.0245 | 3,986,161 | 2.1 | 0.09 | 0.52 | 0.61 | 0.44 |
|  |  | 2006 | 171,483,804 | 960,309 | 0.0240 | $(3,340,677)$ | (1.9) | (0.08) | 0.54 | 0.46 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 163,570,683 | 1,005,960 | 0.0264 | 3,235,744 | 2.0 | 0.08 | 0.55 | 0.63 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 157,508,160 | 882,046 | 0.0287 | - | - | - | 0.49 | 0.49 |  |
| Hamilton | 489 | 2007 | 296,292 | 1,689 | 0.0141 | - | - | - | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.28 |
|  |  | 2006 | 290,906 | 1,658 | 0.0139 | - | - | - | 0.51 | 0.51 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 270,143 | 1,540 | 0.0133 | - | - | - | 0.50 | 0.50 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 270,143 | 1,540 | 0.0131 | - | - | - | 0.52 | 0.52 |  |
| Hertford | 2,159 | 2007 | 2,763,301 | 13,540 | 0.0163 | 82,481 | 3.0 | 0.10 | 0.35 | 0.45 | 0.27 |
|  |  | 2006 | 2,764,601 | 13,547 | 0.0165 | 66,874 | 2.4 | 0.08 | 0.43 | 0.51 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 2,749,351 | 13,197 | 0.0163 | 66,874 | 2.4 | 0.08 | 0.42 | 0.50 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 2,623,922 | 12,857 | 0.0166 | - | - | - | 0.42 | 0.42 |  |
| Hobgood | 387 | 2007 | 409,918 | 1,845 | 0.0180 | 3,000 | 0.7 | 0.03 | 0.37 | 0.40 | 0.28 |
|  |  | 2006 | 409,918 | 1,845 | 0.0183 | - | - | - | 0.35 | 0.35 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 409,918 | 1,845 | 0.0184 | - | - | - | 0.39 | 0.39 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 406,918 | 1,831 | 0.0180 | 149,027 | 36.6 | 1.47 | 0.39 | 1.86 |  |
| Hookerton | 487 | 2007 | 546,998 | 2,735 | 0.0192 | - | - | - | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.28 |
|  |  | 2006 | 538,444 | 2,692 | 0.0192 | - | - | - | 0.50 | 0.50 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 512,540 | 2,819 | 0.0279 | - | - | - | 0.43 | 0.43 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 498,015 | 2,490 | 0.0241 | - | - | - | 0.39 | 0.39 |  |
| Kinston | 22,962 | 2007 | 37,772,174 | 226,633 | 0.0186 | 833,190 | 2.2 | 0.07 | 0.57 | 0.64 | 0.43 |
|  |  | 2006 | 37,614,094 | 225,685 | 0.0191 | 955,000 | 2.5 | 0.08 | 0.58 | 0.66 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 36,352,460 | 218,115 | 0.0189 | 955,000 | 2.6 | 0.08 | 0.58 | 0.66 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 36,299,778 | 217,799 | 0.0187 | 955,000 | 2.6 | 0.08 | 0.58 | 0.66 |  |

# Analysis of Transfers to the General Fund by Municipal Electric Systems 

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004

|  |  |  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (D/A) | (E) | (F) | (E+F) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Gross | Est. Loss in Prop. Revenues Due to |  | Transfer to | rom the Elec <br> e General Fu | Fund |  | ate per \$10 sessment-t | djusted <br> Ratio |
|  |  |  | Electric Fund | Ownership of Ut |  |  | As a \% of |  |  |  |  |
| Unit | Popu- <br> lation | Year | Fixed Assets at Cost | Amount | Tax Rate Equivalent | Amount | Elec. Fixed Assets | Tax Rate Equivalent | tive Actual | Electric <br> Transfers | Electric Avg. |
| N.C. Eastern Municipal Power Agency Participants (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| La Grange | 2,804 | 2007 | 1,731,071 | 8,655 | 0.0076 | 66,692 | 3.9 | 0.06 | 0.47 | 0.53 | 0.26 |
|  |  | 2006 | 1,698,236 | 8,491 | 0.0077 | 66,768 | 3.9 | 0.06 | 0.48 | 0.54 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 1,633,236 | 8,166 | 0.0076 | - | - | - | 0.49 | 0.49 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 1,546,017 | 7,730 | 0.0072 | - | - | - | 0.48 | 0.48 |  |
| Laurinburg | 16,087 | 2007 | 12,239,541 | 48,958 | 0.0066 | 50,000 | 0.4 | 0.01 | 0.37 | 0.38 | 0.43 |
|  |  | 2006 | 12,045,196 | 45,772 | 0.0063 | 180,500 | 1.5 | 0.02 | 0.37 | 0.39 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 11,919,010 | 53,636 | 0.0074 | 319,000 | 2.7 | 0.04 | 0.38 | 0.42 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 11,754,895 | 47,020 | 0.0065 | 475,604 | 4.0 | 0.07 | 0.45 | 0.52 |  |
| Louisburg | 3,620 | 2007 | 6,911,786 | 33,522 | 0.0146 | 180,335 | 2.6 | 0.08 | 0.46 | 0.54 | 0.26 |
|  |  | 2006 | 6,802,437 | 32,992 | 0.0147 | 179,650 | 2.6 | 0.08 | 0.48 | 0.56 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 6,573,245 | 34,510 | 0.0145 | 176,510 | 2.7 | 0.07 | 0.49 | 0.56 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 6,537,446 | 31,707 | 0.0175 | 204,234 | 3.1 | 0.11 | 0.35 | 0.46 |  |
| Lumberton | 22,804 | 2007 | 24,100,686 | 151,834 | 0.0115 | $(938,380)$ | (3.9) | (0.07) | 0.57 | 0.50 | 0.43 |
|  |  | 2006 | 23,608,778 | 153,457 | 0.0113 | 150,000 | 0.6 | 0.01 | 0.63 | 0.64 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 22,446,741 | 145,904 | 0.0155 | - | - | - | 0.59 | 0.59 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 23,076,980 | 145,385 | 0.0153 | - | - | - | 0.59 | 0.59 |  |
| New Bern | 25,461 | 2007 | 47,406,273 | 222,809 | 0.0106 | $(609,202)$ | (1.3) | (0.03) | 0.39 | 0.36 | 0.43 |
|  |  | 2006 | 43,310,549 | 203,560 | 0.0104 | 847,500 | 2.0 | 0.04 | 0.43 | 0.47 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 41,378,097 | 194,477 | 0.0105 | 1,130,000 | 2.7 | 0.06 | 0.44 | 0.50 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 39,981,207 | 187,912 | 0.0108 | 1,100,000 | 2.8 | 0.06 | 0.46 | 0.52 |  |
| Pikeville | 709 | 2007 | 1,160,220 | 5,801 | 0.0161 | - | - | - | 0.45 | 0.45 | 0.18 |
|  |  | 2006 | 1,139,256 | 5,696 | 0.0160 | - | - | - | 0.47 | 0.47 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 1,139,256 | 6,836 | 0.0196 | - | - | - | 0.49 | 0.49 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 1,144,596 | 5,723 | 0.0166 | 25,000 | 2.2 | 0.07 | 0.60 | 0.67 |  |
| Red Springs | 3,497 | 2007 | 4,665,779 | 28,928 | 0.0179 | - | - | - | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.26 |
|  |  | 2006 | 3,196,063 | 21,094 | 0.0123 | 167,673 | 5.2 | 0.10 | 0.64 | 0.74 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 3,169,624 | 19,969 | 0.0185 | 573,982 | 18.1 | 0.53 | 0.60 | 1.13 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 3,126,210 | 19,383 | 0.0179 | 160,000 | 5.1 | 0.15 | 0.57 | 0.72 |  |
| Robersonville | 1,625 | 2007 | 1,023,493 | 6,141 | 0.0093 | 5,500 | 0.5 | 0.01 | 0.49 | 0.50 | 0.27 |
|  |  | 2006 | 1,017,208 | 6,103 | 0.0094 | 4,100 | 0.4 | 0.01 | 0.54 | 0.55 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 933,513 | 5,601 | 0.0093 | 30,000 | 3.2 | 0.05 | 0.53 | 0.58 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 919,821 | 5,519 | 0.0088 | 24,000 | 2.6 | 0.04 | 0.55 | 0.59 |  |

# Analysis of Transfers to the General Fund by Municipal Electric Systems 

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004

| Unit | Popu- <br> lation | Year | (A) (B) |  | (C) | (D) | (D/A) | (E) | (F) | (E+F) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Gross <br> Electric Fund Fixed Assets at Cost | Est. Loss in Prop. Tax Revenues Due to City Ownership of Utility |  | Transfers From the Electric Fund to the General Fund |  |  | Tax Rate per \$100-Adjusted for Assessment-to-Sales Ratio |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | As a \% of | As a | Effec- | Without | Non- |
|  |  |  |  | Amount | Tax Rate Equivalent | Amount | Elec. Fixed Assets | Tax Rate Equivalent | tive Actual | Electric <br> Transfers | Electric Avg. |
| N.C. Eastern Municipal Power Agency Participants (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rocky Mount | 56,364 | 2007 | 63,270,308 | 173,993 | 0.0054 | 1,250,000 | 2.0 | 0.04 | 0.24 | 0.28 | 0.44 |
|  |  | 2006 | 62,048,763 | 310,244 | 0.0100 | 1,016,500 | 1.6 | 0.03 | 0.46 | 0.49 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 60,382,246 | 301,911 | 0.0099 | 946,406 | 1.6 | 0.03 | 0.45 | 0.48 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 59,436,057 | 163,449 | 0.0054 | 1,729,180 | 2.9 | 0.06 | 0.46 | 0.52 |  |
| Scotland Neck | 2,228 | 2007 | 1,517,012 | 9,102 | 0.0124 | 30,000 | 2.0 | 0.04 | 0.49 | 0.53 | 0.27 |
|  |  | 2006 | 1,517,012 | 9,102 | 0.0133 | 35,000 | 2.3 | 0.05 | 0.47 | 0.52 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 1,517,012 | 9,102 | 0.0141 | 35,000 | 2.3 | 0.05 | 0.57 | 0.62 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 1,440,608 | 8,644 | 0.0133 | 39,520 | 2.7 | 0.06 | 0.52 | 0.58 |  |
| Selma | 7,008 | 2007 | 6,831,949 | 33,477 | 0.0108 | 280,000 | 4.1 | 0.09 | 0.45 | 0.54 | 0.26 |
|  |  | 2006 | 5,184,924 | 22,814 | 0.0074 | - | - | - | 0.43 | 0.43 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 2,488,610 | 12,941 | 0.0039 | 150,000 | 6.0 | 0.05 | 0.42 | 0.47 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 2,454,358 | 12,026 | 0.0041 | 148,000 | 6.0 | 0.05 | 0.51 | 0.56 |  |
| Smithfield | 12,456 | 2007 | 2,551,209 | 14,542 | 0.0017 | - | - | - | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.43 |
|  |  | 2006 | 7,964,308 | 45,397 | 0.0054 | - | - | - | 0.55 | 0.55 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 7,773,822 | 48,975 | 0.0060 | - | - | - | 0.55 | 0.55 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 7,123,828 | 40,606 | 0.0050 | - | - | - | 0.62 | 0.62 |  |
| Southport | 2,860 | 2007 | 6,479,028 | 17,493 | 0.0038 | - | - | - | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.26 |
|  |  | 2006 | 5,292,605 | 14,290 | 0.0034 | - | - | - | 0.22 | 0.22 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 4,093,891 | 13,510 | 0.0033 | - | - | - | 0.26 | 0.26 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 3,828,406 | 10,337 | 0.0027 | - | - | - | 0.33 | 0.33 |  |
| Tarboro | 10,585 | 2007 | 48,204,914 | 202,461 | 0.0283 | 110,527 | 0.2 | 0.02 | 0.32 | 0.34 | 0.43 |
|  |  | 2006 | 47,052,038 | 197,619 | 0.0278 | 1,079,711 | 2.3 | 0.15 | 0.36 | 0.51 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 46,291,247 | 194,423 | 0.0271 | 1,022,658 | 2.2 | 0.14 | 0.35 | 0.49 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 45,006,684 | 189,028 | 0.0265 | 1,144,233 | 2.5 | 0.16 | 0.36 | 0.52 |  |
| Wake Forest | 22,631 | 2007 | 20,082,760 | 108,447 | 0.0054 | - | - | - | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.43 |
|  |  | 2006 | 18,431,229 | 99,529 | 0.0057 | 225,000 | 1.2 | 0.01 | 0.48 | 0.49 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 16,147,086 | 85,580 | 0.0060 | 240,195 | 1.5 | 0.02 | 0.49 | 0.51 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 15,446,102 | 83,409 | 0.0066 | 224,885 | 1.5 | 0.02 | 0.49 | 0.51 |  |
| Washington | 9,938 | 2007 | 47,869,286 | 287,216 | 0.0472 | 126,527 | 0.3 | 0.02 | 0.46 | 0.48 | 0.26 |
|  |  | 2006 | 44,941,304 | 247,177 | 0.0423 | 738,287 | 1.6 | 0.13 | 0.49 | 0.62 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 43,557,419 | 239,566 | 0.0415 | $(196,446)$ | (0.5) | (0.03) | 0.51 | 0.48 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 40,740,359 | 244,442 | 0.0431 | 155,098 | 0.4 | 0.03 | 0.52 | 0.55 |  |

# Analysis of Transfers to the General Fund by Municipal Electric Systems 

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004
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# Analysis of Transfers to the General Fund by Municipal Electric Systems 

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004


## Analysis of Transfers to the General Fund by Municipal Electric Systems

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004

| Unit | Popu- <br> lation |  | (A) | (B) | (C) | (D) | (D/A) | (E) | (F) | (E+F) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\underline{\text { Year }}$ | Gross <br> Electric Fund Fixed Assets $\qquad$ at Cost | Est. Loss in Prop. Tax Revenues Due to City Ownership of Utility |  | Transfers From the Electric Fund to the General Fund |  |  | Tax Rate per \$100-Adjusted for Assessment-to-Sales Ratio |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  As a \% of <br> Elec. Fixed <br> Assets <br>   |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Amount | Tax Rate Equivalent |  |  | Tax Rate Equivalent | tive Actual | Electric Transfers | Electric Avg. |
| Other Units with Electric Systems (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Winterville | 8,192 | 2007 | 4,499,088 | 20,246 | 0.0038 | - | - | - | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.26 |
|  |  | 2006 | 4,117,817 | 18,530 | 0.0038 | 85,146 | 2.1 | 0.02 | 0.44 | 0.46 |  |
|  |  | 2005 | 3,568,270 | 16,057 | 0.0039 | 168,769 | 4.7 | 0.04 | 0.45 | 0.49 |  |
|  |  | 2004 | 3,232,498 | 14,546 | 0.0052 | 149,031 | 4.6 | 0.05 | 0.36 | 0.41 |  |

## 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.

Table B (cont.)
Statistical Analysis of Transfers to the General Fund by Municipal Electric Systems
NC Eastern Municipal Power Agency
For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004

|  | Year | (A) |  | (B) | (C) |  | (D) | (D/A) | (E) | (F) | ( $\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{F}$ ) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Gross <br> Electric Fund <br> Fixed Assets at Cost | Est. Loss in Prop. Tax Revenues Due to City Ownership of Utility |  |  | Transfers From the Electric Fund to the General Fund |  |  |  | Tax Rate per \$100-Adjusted for Assessment-to-Sales Ratio |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Ownershi Amount | f Utility <br> Tax Rate <br> Equivalent | Amount |  | As a \% of Elec. Fixed Assets | As a Tax Rate Equivalent | Effective Actual | Without Electric Transfers | Non- <br> Electric <br> Avg. |
| Minimum | 2007 | \$ 296,292 | \$ | 1,689 | 0.00 | \$ | $(1,874,350)$ | (3.90) | (0.07) | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.18 |
|  | 2006 | 290,906 |  | 1,658 | 0.00 |  | $(3,340,677)$ | (1.90) | (0.08) | 0.22 | 0.22 |  |
|  | 2005 | 270,143 |  | 1,540 | 0.00 |  | $(196,446)$ | (0.50) | (0.03) | 0.26 | 0.26 |  |
|  | 2004 | 270,143 |  | 1,540 | 0.00 |  | - | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.33 | 0.33 |  |
| Maximum | 2007 | 187,328,475 |  | 1,049,039 | 0.05 |  | 3,986,161 | 49.10 | 0.58 | 0.59 | 0.98 | 0.44 |
|  | 2006 | 171,483,804 |  | 960,309 | 0.04 |  | 1,625,000 | 6.00 | 0.28 | 0.64 | 0.78 |  |
|  | 2005 | 163,570,683 |  | 1,005,960 | 0.04 |  | 3,235,744 | 18.10 | 0.53 | 0.64 | 1.13 |  |
|  | 2004 | 157,508,160 |  | 882,046 | 0.04 |  | 1,729,180 | 36.60 | 1.47 | 0.62 | 1.86 |  |
| Mean | 2007 | 22,910,226 |  | 113,054 | 0.01 |  | 181,679 | 2.43 | 0.04 | 0.44 | 0.48 | 0.33 |
|  | 2006 | 21,496,629 |  | 111,595 | 0.01 |  | 182,845 | 1.54 | 0.05 | 0.47 | 0.51 |  |
|  | 2005 | 20,288,357 |  | 108,900 | 0.01 |  | 370,641 | 2.07 | 0.06 | 0.47 | 0.53 |  |
|  | 2004 | 19,517,905 |  | 96,328 | 0.01 |  | 304,685 | 3.33 | 0.10 | 0.48 | 0.57 |  |
| Median | 2007 | 6,871,868 |  | 31,369 | 0.01 |  | 17,750 | 0.35 | 0.02 | 0.46 | 0.48 | 0.27 |
|  | 2006 | 7,383,373 |  | 37,201 | 0.01 |  | 75,479 | 1.55 | 0.04 | 0.47 | 0.50 |  |
|  | 2005 | 7,173,534 |  | 36,652 | 0.01 |  | 52,737 | 2.00 | 0.04 | 0.48 | 0.50 |  |
|  | 2004 | 6,830,637 |  | 28,842 | 0.01 |  | 84,735 | 2.35 | 0.05 | 0.48 | 0.52 |  |
| Standard Deviation | 2007 | 38,052,328 |  | 205,183 | 0.01 |  | 891,913 | 8.72 | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.14 | 0.09 |
|  | 2006 | 34,781,785 |  | 188,380 | 0.01 |  | 773,099 | 1.71 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.12 |  |
|  | 2005 | 33,088,505 |  | 192,220 | 0.01 |  | 683,348 | 3.30 | 0.10 | 0.08 | 0.14 |  |
|  | 2004 | 31,843,870 |  | 170,963 | 0.01 |  | 492,082 | 6.75 | 0.26 | 0.08 | 0.25 |  |

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 ( $\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{F}$ ) because each entry is a separately calculated statistic.

Table B (cont.)

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, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004

|  | Year | (A) |  | (B) | (C) |  | (D) | (D/A) | (E) | (F) | (E+F) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Gross <br> Electric Fund Fixed Assets at Cost | Est. Loss in Prop. Tax Revenues Due to City Ownership of Utility |  |  | Transfers From the Electric Fund to the General Fund |  |  |  | Tax Rate per \$100-Adjusted for Assessment-to-Sales Ratio |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Ownershi <br> Amount | $\begin{aligned} & \text { of Utility } \\ & \hline \text { Tax Rate } \\ & \text { Equivalent } \end{aligned}$ | Amount |  | As a \% of Elec. Fixed Assets | As a Tax Rate Equivalent | Effective Actual | Without Electric Transfers | NonElectric <br> Avg. |
| Minimum | 2007 | \$ 657,836 | \$ | 1,645 | 0.00 | \$ | - | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
|  | 2006 | 257,836 |  | 645 | 0.00 |  | $(247,110)$ | (6.30) | (0.13) | 0.22 | 0.18 |  |
|  | 2005 | 257,836 |  | 645 | 0.00 |  | $(6,057,264)$ | (11.40) | (0.47) | 0.22 | 0.03 |  |
|  | 2004 | 257,836 |  | 645 | 0.00 |  | - | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.28 |  |
| Maximum | 2007 | 125,875,315 |  | 765,322 | 0.02 |  | 2,100,000 | 5.80 | 0.28 | 0.58 | 0.64 | 0.44 |
|  | 2006 | 121,872,704 |  | 722,705 | 0.02 |  | 2,199,681 | 15.50 | 0.32 | 0.59 | 0.60 |  |
|  | 2005 | 118,117,389 |  | 734,690 | 0.02 |  | 2,300,000 | 11.60 | 0.24 | 0.55 | 0.59 |  |
|  | 2004 | 111,969,327 |  | 680,774 | 0.02 |  | 2,426,800 | 14.40 | 0.29 | 0.54 | 0.60 |  |
| Mean | 2007 | 25,908,804 |  | 133,323 | 0.01 |  | 385,891 | 1.46 | 0.04 | 0.39 | 0.43 | 0.37 |
|  | 2006 | 24,721,447 |  | 125,060 | 0.01 |  | 250,010 | 1.18 | 0.02 | 0.40 | 0.42 |  |
|  | 2005 | 23,522,577 |  | 120,820 | 0.01 |  | $(34,144)$ | 1.36 | 0.01 | 0.40 | 0.41 |  |
|  | 2004 | 22,394,131 |  | 116,205 | 0.01 |  | 326,653 | 2.27 | 0.04 | 0.39 | 0.44 |  |
| Median | 2007 | 14,346,852 |  | 43,630 | 0.01 |  | - | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.39 | 0.42 | 0.43 |
|  | 2006 | 13,143,480 |  | 38,238 | 0.01 |  | - | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.42 | 0.42 |  |
|  | 2005 | 10,941,800 |  | 38,777 | 0.01 |  | - | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.41 | 0.44 |  |
|  | 2004 | 10,128,454 |  | 30,385 | 0.01 |  | 124,565 | 0.70 | 0.01 | 0.40 | 0.44 |  |
| Standard Deviation | 2007 | 33,035,079 |  | 196,592 | 0.01 |  | 620,382 | 1.98 | 0.07 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.08 |
|  | 2006 | 31,883,234 |  | 185,182 | 0.01 |  | 592,331 | 4.01 | 0.08 | 0.11 | 0.12 |  |
|  | 2005 | 30,700,957 |  | 184,462 | 0.00 |  | 1,565,851 | 4.33 | 0.13 | 0.10 | 0.14 |  |
|  | 2004 | 29,314,822 |  | 174,411 | 0.00 |  | 597,660 | 3.47 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.10 |  |

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.

Table B (cont.)

Statistical Analysis of Transfers to the General Fund by Municipal Electric Systems
Other Units With Electric Systems
For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2004


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

$$
\frac{\text { Amount calculated above x } 100}{\text { The unit's assessed valuation }}
$$

## 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 $\times 100$
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.

Table C

Ten Years of Comparative Data on Electric Fund Transfers as a
Percentage of General Fund Revenues
For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 1998 through 2007

Transfers from the Electric Fund to the General Fund

| Unit | as a Percentage of General Fund Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 | 2000 | 1999 | 1998 |

N.C. Eastern Municipal Power Agency Participants

| Apex | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ayden | 6.8 | 15.0 | 7.2 | 9.6 | 15.1 | 20.7 | 9.6 | 10.2 | - | 14.8 |
| Belhaven | 24.8 | - | - | 6.6 | 7.3 | 8.1 | 7.6 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 9.7 |
| Benson | 3.0 | 3.3 | 4.1 | 3.2 | 10.2 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 2.8 | - | 1.8 |
| Clayton | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Edenton | (0.1) | 4.1 | 6.5 | 1.6 | 4.3 | 8.2 | 10.0 | 6.5 | 9.1 | 10.7 |
| Elizabeth City | 10.8 | 7.5 | 7.9 | 7.4 | 9.4 | 6.8 | 4.6 | 4.5 | 5.6 | - |
| Farmville | (3.3) | 3.3 | - | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 7.4 |
| Fremont | 4.4 | 3.8 | 4.9 | 3.0 | 5.1 | 4.6 | 4.1 | 6.4 | 7.4 | 7.2 |
| Greenville | 6.5 | (5.9) | 6.2 | - | 7.5 | 8.3 | 8.1 | 8.4 | 9.1 | 9.0 |
| Hamilton | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Hertford | 6.3 | 5.3 | 5.3 | - | - | 5.8 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.0 | - |
| Hobgood | 1.9 | - | - | 132.8 | 6.7 | 27.1 | 5.5 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.6 |
| Hookerton | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Kinston | 5.3 | 6.3 | 6.4 | 6.6 | 5.9 | 6.2 | 5.8 | 5.1 | 6.4 | 13.3 |
| La Grange | 4.4 | 4.7 | - | - | 0.4 | 2.4 | - | 0.4 | - | 2.6 |
| Laurinburg | 0.8 | 2.8 | 5.4 | 7.8 | 8.3 | - | 3.1 | - | - | - |
| Louisburg | 6.6 | 6.9 | 7.3 | 8.4 | 7.2 | 6.8 | 4.8 | 5.8 | 5.7 | 5.8 |
| Lumberton | (5.2) | 0.9 | - | - | (2.8) | - | - | - | - | 5.3 |
| New Bern | (2.6) | 3.9 | 5.5 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 5.3 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 5.3 |
| Pikeville | - | - | - | 6.1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Red Springs | - | 6.3 | 23.5 | 6.6 | 7.0 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.6 | 7.0 | 7.3 |
| Robersonville | 0.4 | 0.4 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 3.9 | 1.5 | (0.4) | (5.5) |
| Rocky Mount | 2.8 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 5.3 | 5.0 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 4.6 |
| Scotland Neck | 2.1 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 5.5 | 5.9 | 10.2 | 13.0 |
| Selma | 6.9 | - | 4.2 | 3.8 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 5.2 | 1.7 | 4.8 | 5.2 |
| Smithfield | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Southport | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | (4.4) |

Table C

Ten Years of Comparative Data on Electric Fund Transfers as a
Percentage of General Fund Revenues
For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 1998 through 2007

Transfers from the Electric Fund to the General Fund

| Unit | as a Percentage of General Fund Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 | 2000 | 1999 | 1998 |
| N.C. Eastern Municipal Power Agency Participants (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tarboro | 1.4 | 13.6 | 13.1 | 17.9 | 12.7 | 1.7 | 8.6 | 3.9 | 4.6 | 5.7 |
| Wake Forest | - | 1.1 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 3.4 |
| Washington | 1.1 | 7.0 | (2.0) | 1.6 | 4.6 | 3.7 | 2.6 | 4.5 | 16.3 | 12.4 |
| Wilson | (5.5) | 5.1 | 5.0 | 5.4 | 6.1 | 6.5 | 7.2 | 8.1 | 10.1 | 12.2 |
| N.C. Municipal Power Agency Number 1 Participants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albemarle | 8.4 | - | 10.0 | 9.7 | 9.2 | 8.3 | 8.1 | 7.9 | 9.7 | 11.3 |
| Bostic | 28.1 | 35.8 | 28.2 | 35.6 | 19.1 | - | 9.9 | 11.9 | 14.5 | 36.8 |
| Cherryville | - | 0.8 | 4.7 | 4.7 | - | - | - | 7.4 | 13.0 | 15.3 |
| Cornelius | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.1 | - |
| Drexel | - | - | - | - | - | 10.0 | - | - | - | - |
| Gastonia | 4.0 | 4.4 | 4.7 | 5.0 | 7.1 | - | 7.0 | 8.3 | 10.7 | 13.0 |
| Granite Falls | - | - | - | - | - | 0.1 | 2.2 | 5.1 | 5.5 | 10.4 |
| High Point | 1.2 | - | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | - | 0.7 | 1.6 | 4.2 |
| Huntersville | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Landis | 11.0 | (14.2) | 11.2 | 10.9 | 23.7 | 6.1 | - | 1.2 | 10.3 | 4.8 |
| Lexington | - | 9.1 | (43.5) | 7.8 | 7.1 | 8.1 | 8.2 | 9.0 | 9.3 | 16.7 |
| Lincolnton | - | 0.1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maiden | - | - | - | 4.0 | 14.1 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 0.7 | - | - |
| Monroe | 4.9 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | (0.1) | - |
| Morganton | 4.8 | 4.8 | 6.3 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 1.2 | 4.4 | 5.1 | 5.8 |
| Newton | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pineville | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Shelby | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 5.0 | 8.3 | 9.6 |
| Statesville | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Other Units with Electric Systems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Creek | - | 24.9 | 26.3 | 21.4 | 20.7 | 12.2 | 14.7 | 26.5 | 22.9 | 14.5 |
| Concord | - | - | - | - | (0.1) | - | - | - | - | - |
| Dallas | 21.9 | 31.4 | 34.3 | 37.6 | 41.3 | 29.1 | 27.1 | 38.4 | 32.7 | 34.2 |
| Enfield | 45.2 | 46.0 | (27.4) | 25.9 | 69.7 | 79.3 | 70.7 | 29.5 | 62.6 | 65.9 |
|  |  |  |  | Page |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Ten Years of Comparative Data on Electric Fund Transfers as a 

Percentage of General Fund Revenues
For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 1998 through 2007

Transfers from the Electric Fund to the General Fund

| Unit | as a Percentage of General Fund Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 | 2000 | 1999 | 1998 |
| Other Units with Electric Systems (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fayetteville | 7.5 | 9.3 | 9.8 | 11.3 | - | 12.9 | 11.1 | 11.6 | 12.1 | 12.7 |
| Forest City | (67.9) | - | 59.2 | 60.2 | 39.3 | 66.8 | 129.6 | 47.2 | 102.0 | 85.9 |
| Fountain | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.2 | - | - | - |
| Highlands | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Kings Mountain | (10.5) | 23.5 | 18.8 | 16.6 | 21.1 | 17.2 | 17.2 | 20.2 | 21.0 | 23.3 |
| Lucama | (12.2) | 8.1 | 26.1 | 22.1 | 30.7 | 30.8 | 33.6 | 44.5 | 43.3 | 38.4 |
| Macclesfield | 1.3 | 22.3 | 60.6 | - | 1.3 | 9.2 | - | - | - | - |
| Oak City | 20.7 | 16.3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pinetops | 23.3 | 44.3 | 38.2 | 38.8 | 69.2 | 49.5 | 32.7 | 24.6 | 83.9 | 48.0 |
| Sharpsburg | 5.4 | 27.0 | 52.8 | 57.8 | 20.3 | 1.9 | 7.0 | 9.2 | 6.1 | 8.3 |
| Stantonsburg | (46.8) | 52.9 | 57.3 | 55.6 | 58.4 | - | 62.7 | 70.5 | 70.6 | 84.4 |
| Walstonburg | - | 9.9 | - | - | - | - | - | 1.7 | 5.6 | 18.3 |
| Waynesville | 8.6 | 10.8 | 11.6 | 16.0 | 12.3 | 13.8 | 14.5 | 19.0 | 14.4 | 34.8 |
| Windsor | 35.3 | 26.9 | 17.6 | 47.3 | 45.5 | 39.5 | 43.8 | 40.5 | 45.7 | 29.1 |
| Winterville | - | 1.6 | 4.1 | 4.5 | - | 8.1 | 17.2 | 25.4 | 18.4 | 4.3 |

Statistical Analysis of Electric Fund Transfers

## As a Percentage of General Fund Revenues

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 1998 through 2007

| Transfers from the Electric Fund to the General Fund As a Percentage of General Fund Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 | 2000 | 1999 | 1998 |

N.C. Eastern Municipal Power Agency Participants

| Minimum | (5.5) | (5.9) | (2.0) | - | (2.8) | - | - | - | (0.4) | (5.5) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum | 24.8 | 15.0 | 23.5 | 132.8 | 15.1 | 27.1 | 10.0 | 10.2 | 16.3 | 14.8 |
| Mean | 2.7 | 3.1 | 4.0 | 7.8 | 4.5 | 4.9 | 4.0 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 4.9 |
| Median | 1.1 | 2.8 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 4.6 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 5.2 |
| Standard Deviation | 5.5 | 4.1 | 5.0 | 22.8 | 4.2 | 5.8 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 4.2 | 5.3 |

## N.C. Municipal Power Agency Number 1 Participants

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum | - | $(14.2)$ | $(43.5)$ | - | $(0.1)$ | - | - | - | $(0.1)$ |
| Maximum | 45.2 | 46.0 | 34.3 | 37.6 | 69.7 | 79.3 | 70.7 | 38.4 | 62.6 |
| Mean | 4.9 | 5.5 | 0.8 | 6.0 | 9.6 | 7.8 | 6.9 | 6.4 | 8.5 |
| Median | - | - | - | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.2 | - | 0.0 |  |
| Standard Deviation | 10.9 | 13.5 | 15.7 | 10.4 | 17.8 | 18.2 | 16.5 | 11.3 | 15.4 |

## Other Units with Electric Systems

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum | $(67.9)$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Maximum | 35.3 | 52.9 | 60.6 | 60.2 | 69.2 | 66.8 | 129.6 | 70.5 | 102.0 |
| Mean | $(3.1)$ | 17.4 | 24.7 | 22.8 | 21.3 | 16.9 | 25.6 | 21.6 | 29.4 |
| Median | - | 13.6 | 18.2 | 16.3 | 16.3 | 8.7 | 15.9 | 19.6 | 16.4 |
| Standard Deviation | 26.7 | 16.6 | 24.2 | 24.1 | 23.9 | 21.6 | 35.6 | 22.1 | 34.4 |

## Statistical Analysis of Electric Fund Transfers as a <br> 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
For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005, 2004 and 2003

| Unit | Electric Fund Capital Outlay Expenditures |  |  |  |  | Five Year Average |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Dollars | As a \% of Electric Fund Revenues |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 |  |  |
| N.C. Eastern Municipal Power Agency Participants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apex | 2,938,106 | 6,640,410 | 3,944,106 | 1,379,108 | 1,058,850 | 3,192,116 | 17.2 |
| Ayden | 0 | 55,544 | 14,695 | 45,777 | 141,022 | 51,408 | 0.5 |
| Belhaven | 21,019 | 50,471 | 23,745 | 2,250 | 0 | 19,497 | 0.7 |
| Benson | 53,086 | 0 | 0 | 150,681 | 0 | 40,753 | 1.0 |
| Clayton | 665,366 | 28,167 | 325,505 | 166,852 | 513,396 | 339,857 | 3.5 |
| Edenton | 58,016 | 191,423 | 454,246 | 19,733 | 74,880 | 159,660 | 1.6 |
| Elizabeth City | 1,495,797 | 790,733 | 712,448 | 738,909 | 690,046 | 885,587 | 3.1 |
| Farmville | 979,414 | 436,049 | 5,235 | 23,232 | 72,873 | 303,361 | 5.1 |
| Fremont | 0 | 4,019 | 0 | 0 | 19,406 | 4,685 | 0.4 |
| Greenville | 12,699,238 | 9,974,747 | 7,366,337 | 4,474,357 | 9,896,589 | 8,882,254 | 6.1 |
| Hamilton | 5,386 | 0 | 0 | 18,365 | 3,453 | 5,441 | 1.4 |
| Hertford | 0 | 15,250 | 125,594 | 394,790 | 7,916 | 108,710 | 4.3 |
| Hobgood | 0 | 0 | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 600 | 0.1 |
| Hookerton | 8,555 | 28,724 | 14,525 | 14,028 | 0 | 13,166 | 2.0 |
| Kinston | 195,454 | 1,244,550 | 224,257 | 313,791 | 265,860 | 448,782 | 1.1 |
| La Grange | 32,836 | 65,000 | 87,220 | 32,464 | 50,918 | 53,688 | 1.8 |
| Laurinburg | 213,071 | 192,941 | 164,115 | 0 | 0 | 114,025 | 0.8 |
| Louisburg | 208,263 | 206,893 | 127,833 | 572,037 | 0 | 223,005 | 3.8 |
| Lumberton | 0 | 498,688 | 281,297 | 643,206 | 758,189 | 436,276 | 1.5 |
| New Bern | 2,407,899 | 3,347,996 | 2,282,241 | 2,046,231 | 1,032,457 | 2,223,365 | 4.8 |
| Pikeville | 20,964 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 750 | 4,343 | 0.5 |
| Red Springs | 476,300 | 26,439 | 614 | 249,352 | 214,611 | 193,463 | 5.0 |
| Robersonville | 6,676 | 101,031 | 13,692 | 14,431 | 4,124 | 27,991 | 1.2 |
| Rocky Mount | 1,365,665 | 2,219,119 | 1,412,597 | 1,035,838 | 1,328,149 | 1,472,274 | 2.0 |
| Scotland Neck | 0 | 0 | 76,405 | 1,200 | 32,147 | 21,950 | 0.7 |
| Selma | 1,647,025 | 0 | 34,252 | 37,653 | 134,376 | 370,661 | 5.7 |
| Smithfield | 2,041,906 | 419,771 | 649,994 | 899,342 | 1,025,823 | 1,007,367 | 6.3 |
| Southport | 1,197,516 | 0 | 265,485 | 85,355 | 211,940 | 352,059 | 6.8 |

Analysis of Capital Outlay Expenditures of Municipal Electric Systems
For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005, 2004 and 2003

| Unit | Electric Fund Capital Outlay Expenditures |  |  |  |  | Five Year Average |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | As a \% of Electric Fund Revenues |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 | Dollars |  |
| N.C. Eastern Municipal Power Agency Participants (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tarboro | 1,187,983 | 799,973 | 1,331,651 | 2,153,089 | 0 | 1,094,539 | 4.8 |
| Wake Forest | 1,651,532 | 2,194,611 | 738,460 | 882,826 | 1,308,198 | 1,355,125 | 10.7 |
| Washington | 2,788,185 | 1,461,048 | 1,699,297 | 1,553,873 | 1,498,968 | 1,800,274 | 6.5 |
| Wilson | 16,298,495 | 7,761,360 | 4,550,386 | 3,805,505 | 3,248,200 | 7,132,789 | 6.7 |
| N.C. Municipal Power Agency Number 1 Participants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Albemarle | 217,674 | 0 | 0 | 463,802 | 48,497 | 145,995 | 0.6 |
| Bostic | 400,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80,000 | 25.2 |
| Cherryville | 233,647 | 374,882 | 235,872 | 115,284 | 43,085 | 200,554 | 4.6 |
| Cornelius | 380,908 | 247,297 | 576,383 | 159,535 | 498,339 | 372,492 | 10.2 |
| Drexel | 0 | 150,505 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30,101 | 1.6 |
| Gastonia | 3,117,230 | 2,495,492 | 2,215,285 | 2,723,362 | 2,535,308 | 2,617,335 | 4.7 |
| Granite Falls | 660,874 | 149,493 | 87,485 | 151,290 | 115,305 | 232,889 | 5.6 |
| High Point | 4,002,611 | 0 | 6,173,466 | 8,178,842 | 5,148,792 | 4,700,742 | 5.3 |
| Huntersville | 1,388,624 | 0 | 2,106,615 | 841,607 | 305,600 | 928,489 | 14.1 |
| Landis | 307,971 | 276,129 | 122,353 | 155,428 | 344,838 | 241,344 | 5.8 |
| Lexington | 58,500 | 1,311,950 | 803,272 | 1,848,272 | 744,319 | 953,263 | 2.2 |
| Lincolnton | 86,217 | 139,828 | 40,176 | 470,867 | 107,525 | 168,923 | 2.9 |
| Maiden | 0 | 29,199 | 24,390 | 104,391 | 119,950 | 55,586 | 1.2 |
| Monroe | 5,299,020 | 6,056,381 | 3,602,954 | 2,029,772 | 1,821,356 | 3,761,897 | 10.3 |
| Morganton | 990,125 | 758,751 | 768,221 | 449,380 | 307,087 | 654,713 | 2.9 |
| Newton | 1,222,241 | 2,271,073 | 186,211 | 718,521 | 220,385 | 923,686 | 9.8 |
| Pineville | 1,976,425 | 1,154,140 | 813,346 | 200,954 | 354,178 | 899,809 | 9.6 |
| Shelby | 1,235,630 | 2,285,917 | 272,449 | 1,022,428 | 2,437,178 | 1,450,720 | 9.4 |
| Statesville | 1,924,565 | 1,259,710 | 1,226,523 | 1,422,011 | 1,258,996 | 1,418,361 | 4.1 |
| Other Units with Electric Systems |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black Creek | 0 | 21,574 | 2,147 | 22,290 | 0 | 9,202 | 0.9 |
| Concord | 9,448,180 | 4,370,925 | 4,761,591 | 5,341,684 | 6,270,125 | 6,038,501 | 11.7 |
| Dallas | 317,916 | 0 | 128,112 | 71,546 | 902,083 | 283,931 | 6.6 |
| Enfield | 5,519 | 108,860 | 0 | 0 | 4,440 | 23,764 | 0.7 |

Analysis of Capital Outlay Expenditures of Municipal Electric Systems
For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005, 2004 and 2003

| Unit | Electric Fund Capital Outlay Expenditures |  |  |  |  | Five Year Average |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Dollars | As a \% of Electric Fund Revenues |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 |  |  |
| Other Units with Electric Systems (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fayetteville | 18,472,700 | 15,324,508 | 12,625,941 | 11,275,282 | 13,779,554 | 14,295,597 | 9.5 |
| Forest City | 391,997 | 0 | 319,953 | 709,426 | 2,515,936 | 787,462 | 8.8 |
| Fountain | 0 | 71,821 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14,364 | 2.8 |
| Highlands | 298,558 | 0 | 0 | 104,471 | 0 | 80,606 | 2.6 |
| Kings Mountain | 549,036 | 440,214 | 1,000,779 | 480,284 | 937,707 | 681,604 | 8.0 |
| Lucama | 13,386 | 10,666 | 98,747 | 44,908 | 0 | 33,541 | 2.0 |
| Macclesfield | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| Oak City | 0 | 0 | 2,500 | 15,328 | 13,196 | 6,205 | 1.9 |
| Pinetops | 0 | 12,713 | 116,058 | 42,208 | 72,571 | 48,710 | 2.6 |
| Sharpsburg | 3,680 | 0 | 45,705 | 0 | 48,934 | 19,664 | 1.1 |
| Stantonsburg | 59,043 | 81,608 | 37,518 | 13,766 | 46,392 | 47,665 | 2.7 |
| Walstonburg | 3,669 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 734 | 0.5 |
| Waynesville | 64,226 | 71,557 | -315,885 | 202,990 | 307,657 | 66,109 | 1.0 |
| Windsor | 303,604 | 937,204 | 390,678 | 502,490 | 11,991 | 429,193 | 11.3 |
| Winterville | 381,271 | 296,950 | 249,437 | 332,392 | 317,826 | 315,575 | 7.3 |

## Statistical Analysis of Capital Outlay Expenditures of Municipal Electric Systems

For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2007, 2006, 2005, 2004 and 2003

|  | Five Year Average |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N.C. Eastern Municipal Power Agency Participants |  | N.C. Municipal Power Agency Number 1 Participants |  | Other Units With <br> Electric Systems |  |
|  | Dollars | As a \% of Electric Fund Revenues | Dollars | As a \% of Electric Fund Revenues | Dollars | As a \% of Electric Fund Revenues |
| Minimum | 600 | 0.10 | 30,101 | 0.6 | 0 | - |
| Maximum | 8,882,254 | 17.20 | 4,700,742 | 25.2 | 14,295,597 | 11.7 |
| Mean | 1,010,596 | 3.68 | 1,044,047 | 6.8 | 1,220,128 | 4.3 |
| Median | 263,183 | 2.55 | 654,713 | 5.3 | 48,710 | 2.6 |
| Standard Deviation | 1,995,733 | 3.57 | 1,306,373 | 5.8 | 3,448,100 | 3.9 |

## 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.

