STATE OF NEW YORK
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

At a session of the Public Service Commission held in the City of Albany on June 17, 2010

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Garry A. Brown, Chairman
Patricia L. Acampora
Maureen F. Harris
Robert E. Curry, Jr.
James L. Larocca

CASE 07-M-0548 – Proceeding on Motion of the Commission Regarding an Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard.

CASE 09-G-0363 – Petitions for Approval of Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard (EEPS) Gas Energy Efficiency Programs.

CASE 08-G-1010 – Petition of Corning Natural Gas Corporation for Approval of an Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard (EEPS) “Fast Track” Utility-Administered Gas Energy Efficiency Program.

CASE 08-G-1021 – Petition of St. Lawrence Gas Company, Inc. for Approval of an Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard (EEPS) “Fast Track” Utility-Administered Gas Energy Efficiency Program.

ORDER ON REHEARING DENYING IN PART AND GRANTING IN PART PETITIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION

(Issued and Effective June 21, 2010)

BY THE COMMISSION:

INTRODUCTION

In this order, the Commission modifies various orders related to New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA)-administered Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard (EEPS) programs in response to petitions filed by

Corning Natural Gas Corporation (Corning) on March 19, 2010, and St. Lawrence Gas Company Inc. (St. Lawrence) on March 29, 2010. The modifications include (a) relieving St. Lawrence and Corning of their obligation to collect and transfer to NYSERDA certain System Benefit Charge (SBC) funds for NYSERDA-administered EEPS programs, (b) expanding the companies' EEPS "Fast Track" utility-administered gas energy efficiency residential program and (c) directing St. Lawrence and Corning to submit plans for Commission approval to implement utility-administered small commercial rebate programs in their service territories in the scope and manner described below.

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY

On June 23, 2008, the Commission created an Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard (EEPS) for New York State to develop and encourage cost-effective energy efficiency programs.[1] The Commission directed gas utilities serving more than 14,000 customers to submit proposals for residential heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) "Fast Track" utility-administered gas energy efficiency programs. St. Lawrence and Corning were directed to establish annual SBC surcharges of $103,766 and $148,647 for their respective service territories.[2] On April 9, 2009, the Commission authorized St. Lawrence and Corning to administer EEPS "Fast Track" Residential Gas HVAC programs (Residential "Fast Track" programs) with full-year

[1] Case 07-M-0548, Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard (EEPS), Order Establishing Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard and Approving Programs (issued June 23, 2008).

[2] Case 07-M-0548, supra, Errata Notice (issued July 3, 2008).

annual budgets of $32,815 and $72,899 respectively.[3] Including partial year funding for 2009, St. Lawrence’s total approved Residential “Fast Track” program budget was $82,038 and Corning’s was $182,247.[4] On February 6, 2010, the Commission authorized St. Lawrence to increase its “Fast Track” program budget by $86,316 with $82,000 to be used exclusively for rebates and the remaining $4,316 for evaluation, measurement and verification for a total program budget of $168,354.[5] The previously approved budgets and savings goals for both utilities are described in Table 1 located in the Appendix to this order.

In May 2009, the Commission invited NYSERDA and natural gas utilities with 14,000 or more customers to submit natural gas energy efficiency program proposals and numerous program proposals were submitted in response. Neither St. Lawrence nor Corning submitted program proposals. Upon receipt of the proposals, many of which were in the form of combined electric and gas program proposals, the Commission began considering and approving programs in phases, divided by customer market sectors. In various orders, the Commission authorized numerous NYSERDA and utility-administered EEPS

[3] Case 08-G-1004, et al., Orange & Rockland Utilities, Inc. “Fast Track” EEPS Petition, Order Approving “Fast Track” Utility-Administered Gas Energy Efficiency Programs with Modifications (issued April 9, 2009).

[4] The Commission also authorized St. Lawrence and Corning to each defer up to $100,000 annually for administrative costs associated with commencing the programs.

[5] Case 08-G-1021, St. Lawrence Gas Company, Inc. “Fast Track” EEPS Petition, Order Approving Increases in “Fast Track” Residential Gas HVAC Program Budget” (issued February 16, 2010).

programs to be funded through the utility-collected SBC.[6] In each of those orders, the Commission established annual SBC collection amounts representing each utility's share of funding for NYSERDA-administered programs. The Commission directed the utilities to establish by contract a schedule of payments to transfer those utility-collected SBC funds to NYSERDA. The orders obligated St. Lawrence and Corning to transfer to NYSERDA $630,637 and $903,400 respectively through 2014. These amounts represent approximately 1.5% of NYSERDA's gas EEPS funding.

On March 19, 2010, Corning filed a petition seeking to reduce its obligation to fund NYSERDA-administered programs and for clarification that the company is only required to transfer funds to NYSERDA once the company has collected those funds. In the alternative, Corning requests that the Commission eliminate the obligation to fund NYSERDA programs and increase funding for the company's existing Residential "Fast Track" program. Corning also asked for an extension of the deadlines imposed by the orders for tariff filings and payments to NYSERDA. The Secretary extended all the relevant deadlines for Corning until June 25, 2010. On May 18, 2010, in a letter addressed to the Secretary, Corning requested that the Commission increase its Residential "Fast Track" program budget. The letter indicated

[6] Case 08-E-1132 et al., New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA) – Energy Efficiency Program, Order Approving Multifamily Energy Efficiency Programs with Modifications (issued July 27, 2009); Order Approving Certain Large Industrial Customer Energy Efficiency Programs with Modifications and Rejecting Others (issued August 24, 2009); Order Approving Certain Commercial and Industrial Customer Energy Efficiency Programs with Modifications (issued October 23, 2009); and Order Approving Certain Commercial and Industrial; Residential; and Low-Income Residential Customer Energy Efficiency Programs with Modifications (issued January 4, 2010).

that, because of the success of the program, the entire 2009-2011 program budget could be exhausted by July 2010.

On March 29, 2010, St. Lawrence filed a petition requesting (a) that the Commission relieve the company of its obligation to transfer funds to NYSERDA and (b) an expansion of its own Residential "Fast Track" program. St. Lawrence also asked for an extension of the deadlines imposed by the orders, and the Secretary extended those deadlines until July 6, 2010.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE MAKING

A Notice of Proposed Rulemaking concerning Corning's petition was published in the State Register on April 14, 2010 [SAPA 07-M-0548SP20]. The minimum time period for the receipt of public comments pursuant to SAPA regarding that notice expired on June 1, 2010. A Notice of Proposed Rulemaking concerning St. Lawrence's petition was published in the State Register on April 21, 2010 [SAPA 07-M-0548SP21]. The minimum time period for the receipt of public comments pursuant to SAPA regarding that notice expired on June 7, 2010. Only Multiple Intervenors (MI) submitted comments. Those comments are summarized below.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

MI, an unincorporated association of over 50 large industrial, commercial and institutional energy consumers, believes that (a) the Commission should not impose EEPS-related surcharges on negotiated flex-rate contracts or interruptible gas customers and (b) costs associated with EEPS should be recovered in a manner that minimizes costs and promotes interclass equity. MI argues that imposing EEPS-related surcharges on negotiated flex-rate contracts could destroy any economic benefits provided by the contracts which will negatively impact the affected businesses' ability to retain production and jobs in New York. MI also states that exempting flex-rate contracts from EEPS-related surcharges is consistent with prior Commission treatment.

MI also argues that certain tariff categories including interruptible customers should also be exempt from EEPS related surcharges, stating that imposition of such surcharges on interruptible customers would result in increased use of alternative fuels and/or necessitate larger discounts to compensate for the surcharges. MI also states that EEPS costs must be recovered in a manner that promotes interclass equity particularly by allocating those costs solely to customers who are eligible for direct benefits of the EEPS programs.

DISCUSSION

In support of its request to reduce its funding obligations to NYSERDA, Corning argues that its calculated share of funding for NYSERDA-administered programs is excessive because, according to its own estimates, the calculation inappropriately included sales to Corning's transportation and contract customers. Corning argues that using the throughput of contract customers to determine EEPS funding obligations is inappropriate because contract customers are ineligible for NYSERDA's EEPS program as they do not pay the SBC surcharge. Corning states that the method for allocating Corning's share of NYSERDA-program funding should be revised to eliminate any inclusion of throughput from contract customers. Corning also argues that any requirement to transfer funds prior to collection from ratepayers will place a burden on the company's cash flow situation and that the Commission should state that Corning is only obligated to transfer funds to NYSERDA after the company has had the opportunity to collect those funds.

Corning and St. Lawrence make similar arguments in support of their request to expand their own EEPS “Fast Track” programs and to eliminate their obligation to fund NYSERDA-administered programs. Both companies argue that, given their size and the particular composition of their respective customer bases, the obligation to fund NYSERDA programs imposes a heavy burden on ratepayers that is unlikely to produce a corresponding benefit within their service territories through local customer participation.

Generally, in administering its EEPS programs, “NYSERDA’s goal is to achieve rough geographic equity between the source of EEPS funding and the delivery of programs.”[7] “The reasonableness of cost allocation is determined by viewing the entire energy efficiency portfolio.”[8] Because natural gas efficiency programs are less likely than electric efficiency programs to produce benefits to nonparticipants in the form of lower market prices, we have previously concluded that allocation of gas-funded programs should be more precisely aligned with the customers that contribute funds to those programs.[9] Although we continue to acknowledge that it will not be possible to achieve this goal with complete precision, the size and composition of the service territories at issue here present particular difficulties.

The most obvious difference between St. Lawrence and Corning and the rest of the gas utilities contributing funds to NYSERDA’s EEPS programs is the number of customers. St. Lawrence has less than 1/3 the average number of customers of

---

[7] Case 07-M-0548, supra, Order Establishing Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard and Approving Programs, p. 55.

[8] Ibid., at 36.

[9] Ibid., at 19.

the next largest gas utility participating in EEPS (Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp.). Corning is even smaller. Moreover, on a percentage basis, both service territories have fewer large commercial/industrial and multifamily customers than found in most other gas utility service territories. As a practical matter, the exceedingly small pool of potential program participants creates a number of potential issues.

First, because the potential participants are few in number, the likelihood of any St. Lawrence or Corning customer participating in a NYSERDA-administered program is relatively small. In addition, because the EEPS funds generated in each of these service territories is rather limited, a single large industrial or commercial project in one of the territories has the potential to consume the entire "rough equity" allotment for the territory. This could virtually eliminate the possibility of other customers within the territory participating in the programs despite the fact that those other customers would continue to bear the burden of providing funding for the programs.

Equally important is the burden placed on NYSERDA to administer its programs in a way that provides equal consideration to the very limited number of eligible St. Lawrence and Corning customers as is provided to the much larger number of potential program participants in other utility service territories. NYSERDA's program administration and delivery are, by necessity, geared toward statewide customer populations. Although none of the participating service territories directly mirrors the statewide population, those other than St. Lawrence and Corning are large enough and diverse enough to allow for the "rough equity" required by previous orders. Even if "rough equity" is reached within the St. Lawrence and Corning service territories, the number of participants and corresponding savings are likely to be minimal based on the utilities' contribution to NYSERDA's overall program budgets. Requiring NYSERDA to bear the cost of marketing, administering and evaluating its programs in those territories when, at best, the benefits of doing so are expected to be undersized, does not appear to be the most prudent use of EEPS funds at this time. Removing St. Lawrence and Corning from eligibility will allow NYSERDA to deliver its programs in a balanced manner without the burden or expense of forcing or stretching the programs to accommodate a minimal number of customers within these service territories.[10]

As we have recognized previously, these issues are not exclusive to St. Lawrence's and Corning's territories. However, given the large difference in size between these two companies and the other gas utilities participating in EEPS, the issues are sufficiently magnified in these two service territories to warrant different treatment. Therefore, we conclude that both the State's energy efficiency goals and the companies' ratepayers will be better served by granting the petitions as modified below. We hereby relieve St. Lawrence and Corning of their obligation to fund NYSERDA-administered gas energy efficiency programs.

Although we expect the reduction in NYSERDA's budget to have a minimal effect on program deliverability due to the corresponding reduction in administrative difficulty, we recognize that there may be some diminution in savings.

[10] Although this action will result in low income customers in St. Lawrence's and Corning's territories being ineligible for gas related measures through NYSERDA's EmPower program, the vast majority of those customers will remain eligible for that program's electric related measures. Moreover, their eligibility for other non-surcharge funded energy efficiency programs, such as the New York State Weatherization Assistance Program, will remain unchanged.

Therefore, we will direct Corning to increase its “Fast Track” Residential Gas HVAC program budget in accordance with Table 2 in the Appendix to this order for the period July 1, 2010 until December 31, 2010. In conformance with previous orders regarding “Fast Track” Residential Gas HVAC program budgets, 5% of the budget will be allotted for evaluation, measurement and verification and up to 17% will be allocated for administration and marketing.

As described above, we have already authorized St. Lawrence to expand its “Fast Track” Residential Gas HVAC program. However, in order to maintain consistency with the other upstate residential programs, we will authorize a small increase for the (1) administration and (2) evaluation, measurement and verification portions of St. Lawrence’s “Fast Track” Residential Gas HVAC budget. For the period July 1, 2010 through December 31, 2011, we direct St. Lawrence to increase its “Fast Track” Residential Gas HVAC budget by $18,813, with 5% ($941) allocated for evaluation, measurement and verification and up to 17% ($17,872) allocated to administration and marketing.

We will also direct both companies to submit Small Commercial Gas rebate program proposals for our approval. Eligibility for the programs will be limited to customers with average annual usage of 5000 dekatherms/mcf or less. Budgets for these programs will be as indicated in Table 3 in the Appendix to this order and the programs, if approved, will operate from October 1, 2010 until December 31, 2011. In order to minimize administrative and start-up costs, the programs will be modeled after the “Fast Track” rebate programs we have already approved. The list of eligible cost-effective measures and available rebates is found in Table 6 of the Appendix. Each program proposal should include an Evaluation, Marketing and

Verification plan as well as a Quality Assurance plan. The companies shall also indicate those service classes within their territories that contain customers eligible for the programs as well as those service classes without eligible customers.

We will direct both companies to adjust their annual level of SBC gas revenue collections to reflect the elimination of their obligation to fund NYSERDA programs and the modifications to their own EEPS programs. SBC surcharges shall only be collected from residential and small commercial customers eligible for the programs. Revised schedules of SBC collections for each utility are in Table 5 of the Appendix. The collection rates reflect budgets for both the residential and commercial programs. However, the companies are only authorized to spend funds related to their "Fast Track" Residential Gas HVAC programs until such time that we approve their small commercial rebate program proposals.

SEQRA FINDINGS

Pursuant to our responsibilities under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), in conjunction with this order, we find that programs modified here are within the overall action previously examined by us in Case 07-M-0548 and will not result in any different environmental impact than that previously examined. In addition, the SEQRA findings of the June 23, 2008, Order in Case 07-M-0548 are incorporated herein by reference and we certify that: (1) the requirements of SEQRA, as implemented by 6 NYCRR part 617, have been met; and (2) consistent with social, economic, and other essential considerations from among the reasonable alternatives available, the action being undertaken is one that avoids or minimizes adverse environmental impacts to the maximum extent practicable.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, the Commission grants, with modifications as described herein, St. Lawrence's petition dated March 29, 2010, and Corning's petition dated March 19, 2010.

The Commission orders:

1. The Commission relieves St. Lawrence Gas Company, Inc. (St. Lawrence) and Corning Natural Gas Corporation (Corning) from the obligation to collect and transfer to the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA) certain System Benefit Charge (SBC) funds for NYSERDA-administered Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard (EEPS) programs as described in the body of this order. The NYSERDA program budgets and energy reduction targets previously approved are reduced by the amounts previously allocated to St. Lawrence and Corning and contained in Table 4 of the Appendix to this order.

2. The Commission directs St. Lawrence and Corning to increase the budgets for their respective utility-administered EEPS "Fast Track" Residential Gas HVAC programs for the period July 1, 2010 until December 31, 2011, in the manner described in the body of this order. The annual program budget and energy savings goals are accordingly modified and shall be as set forth in Table 2 located in the Appendix to this order.

3. The gas SBC collection levels for St. Lawrence and Corning are adjusted such that, as of October 1, 2010, the collection levels shall be as set forth in Table 5 in the Appendix to this order. The same SBC surcharge rate shall apply to all eligible customers regardless of service class. Eligible customers shall include all residential customers and commercial

customers that typically consume 5,000 dekatherms/mcf or less per year.

4. St. Lawrence and Corning shall file tariff amendments and/or statements on not less than 30 days' notice to become effective October 1, 2010, incorporating the SBC collection revisions described herein. The requirements of Section 66(12)(b) of the Public Service Law as to newspaper publication of the changes proposed by these filings is waived.

5. St. Lawrence and Corning shall, within 30 days of the issuance of this order, submit program proposals for our approval to implement Small Commercial Energy Efficiency rebate programs in the scope and manner described in this order. The annual program budgets, evaluation, measurement and verification budgets, and energy savings goals for the Small Commercial Energy Efficiency rebate programs shall be as set forth in Table 3 located in the Appendix to this order. The proposals shall conform to the eligible measure and rebates list contained in Table 6 in the Appendix to this order and include an Evaluation, Measurement and Verification plan and a Quality Assurance plan. The proposal shall indicate all those service classes that will contain eligible customers and those service classes without eligible customers.

6. The Secretary at her sole discretion may extend the deadlines set forth herein.

7. These proceedings are continued.

By the Commission

Jaclyn A. Brilling

Digitally Signed by Secretary
New York Public Service Commission

JACLYN A. BRILLING
Secretary

Table 1

Previously Approved "Fast Track" Residential Gas Program Costs & Savings Targets

	2009	2010	2011	2009-2011	
St. Lawrence					
Residential Gas HVAC Program					
Savings (Dekatherms)	855	5,206	3,243	9,305	
Measures Costs	$12,798	$82,596	$50,596	$145,990	87%
Admin & Mktg Costs	$2,789	$5,579	$5,579	$13,946	8%
Eval., M&V Costs	$820	$4,641	$2,957	$8,418	5%
Total Budget	**$16,407**	**$92,815**	**$59,131**	**$168,354**	**100%**
Corning					
Residential Gas HVAC Program					
Savings (Dekatherms)	1,845	3,689	3,689	9,223	
Measures Costs	$ 28,431	$ 56,861	$ 56,861	$ 142,153	78%
Admin & Mktg Costs	$ 6,196	$ 12,393	$ 12,393	$ 30,982	17%
Eval., M&V Costs	$ 1,823	$ 3,645	$ 3,645	$ 9,112	5%
Total Budget	**$ 36,450**	**$ 72,899**	**$ 72,899**	**$ 182,247**	**100%**

Table 2

Revised "Fast Track" Residential Gas Program Costs & Savings Targets

	2009	2010	2011	2009-2011	
St. Lawrence					
Residential Gas HVAC Program					
Savings (Dekatherms)	855	5,206	3,243	9,305	
Measures Costs	$12,798	$82,596	$50,596	$145,990	78%
Admin & Mktg Costs	$2,789	$ 11,535	$ 17,493	$ 31,817	17%
Eval., M&V Costs	$820	$ 4,955	$ 3,584	$ 9,359	5%
Total Budget	**$16,407**	**$ 99,086**	**$ 71,673**	**$ 187,166**	**100%**
Corning					
Residential Gas HVAC Program					
Savings (Dekatherms)	1,845	7,350	11,012	20,207	
Measures Costs	$28,431	$96,365	$135,868	$260,664	78%
Admin & Mktg Costs	$6,196	$21,002	$29,613	$56,811	17%
Eval., M&V Costs	$1,823	$6,177	$8,710	$16,710	5%
Total Budget	**$36,450**	**$123,544**	**$174,191**	**$334,185**	**100%**

Table 3

Small Commercial HVAC Rebate Program Costs and Savings Targets

	2010	2011	2010-2011	
St. Lawrence				
Small Commercial Gas HVAC Program				
Savings (Dekatherms)	2,531	10,122	12,653	
Measures Costs	$45,168	$180,672	$225,840	78.0%
Admin & Mktg Costs	$9,844	$39,377	49,221	17.0%
Eval., M&V Costs	$2,895	$11,582	14,477	5.0%
Total Budget	**$57,907**	**$231,631**	**289,538**	**100.0%**
Corning				
Small Commercial Gas HVAC Program				
Savings (Dekatherms)	1,265	5,601	6,326	
Measures Costs	$22,584	$90,336	$112,920	78.0%
Admin & Mktg Costs	$4,922	$19,689	$24,611	17.0%
Eval., M&V Costs	$1,448	$5,790	$7,238	5.0%
Total Budget	**$28,954**	**$115,815**	**$144,769**	**100.0%**

Table 4

Funding and Energy Savings Reductions Associated with NYSERDA Programs

St. Lawrence - Funding

NYSERDA Program	2009	2010	2011	2012-2015	Total
Existing Facilities	$0	$4,752	$6,337	$14,257	$25,346
FlexTech	$0	$1,398	$2,117	$3,196	$6,711
High Performance New Construction	$0	$3,365	$5,343	$17,944	$26,652
Industrial and Process Efficiency	$0	$34,700	$34,700	$0	$69,400
Multifamily Performance	$12,674	$50,698	$50,698	$0	$114,070
Low-income Multifamily Performance	$3,169	$12,674	$12,674	$0	$28,517
Assisted Home Performance with Energy Star	$0	$19,448	$25,930	$0	$45,378
EmPower New York	$0	$19,448	$25,930	$0	$45,378
Home Performance with Energy Star	$0	$66,423	$88,563	$0	$154,986
New York Energy Star Homes	$0	$48,944	$65,257	$0	$114,201
Total	**$15,843**	**$261,850**	**$317,549**	**$35,397**	**$630,639**

Table 4 (continued)

Funding and Energy Savings Reductions Associated with NYSERDA Programs

St. Lawrence – Savings (Dekatherms)

NYSERDA Program	2009	2010	2011	2012-2015	Total
Existing Facilities	0	122	245	611	978
FlexTech	0	56	209	1,126	1,391
High Performance New Construction	0	189	331	1,273	1,793
Industrial and Process Efficiency	0	3,343	3,343	0	6,686
Multifamily Performance	473	947	947	0	2,367
Low-income Multifamily Performance	76	152	152	0	380
Assisted Home Performance with Energy Star	0	125	167	0	292
EmPower New York	0	169	225	0	394
Home Performance with Energy Star	0	1,080	1,441	0	2,521
New York Energy Star Homes	0	1,153	1,537	0	2,690
Total	**549**	**7,336**	**8,597**	**3,010**	**19,492**

Corning - Funding

NYSERDA Program					
Existing Facilities	$0	$6,808	$9,078	$20,424	$36,310
FlexTech	$0	$2,003	$3,033	$4,578	$9,614
High Performance New Construction	$0	$4,819	$7,655	$25,705	$38,179
Industrial and Process Efficiency	$0	$49,709	$49,709	$0	$99,418
Multifamily Performance	$18,156	$72,625	$72,625	$0	$163,406
Low-income Multifamily Performance	$4,539	$18,157	$18,157	$0	$40,853
Assisted Home Performance with Energy Star	$0	$27,859	$37,145	$0	$65,004
EmPower New York	$0	$27,859	$37,145	$0	$65,004
Home Performance with Energy Star	$0	$95,150	$126,868	$0	$222,018
New York Energy Star Homes	$0	$70,111	$93,481	$0	$163,592
Total	**$22,695**	**$375,100**	**$454,896**	**$50,707**	**$903,398**

Corning – Savings (Dekatherms)

NYSERDA Program					
Existing Facilities	0	175	350	876	1,401
FlexTech	0	80	299	1,613	1,992
High Performance New Construction	0	270	474	1,823	2,567
Industrial and Process Efficiency	0	4,789	4,789	0	9,578
Multifamily Performance	678	1,356	1,356	0	3,390
Low-income Multifamily Performance	109	217	217	0	543
AssistedHome Performance with Energy Star	0	179	239	0	418
EmPower New York	0	242	323	0	565
Home Performance with Energy Star	0	1,548	2,064	0	3,612
New York Energy Star Homes	0	1,651	2,202	0	3,853
Total	**787**	**10,507**	**12,313**	**4,312**	**27,919**

Table 5

Revised Schedule of Collections

St. Lawrence

Order	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total
07-M-0548 (6/23/08)	$25,942	$103,766	$103,766	$103,766	$0	$0	$0	$337,240
07-M-0548 (10/23/09)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$15,230	$2,223	$0	$17,453
07-M-0548 (1/4/10)	$0	$0	$93,440	$246,599	$6,779	$7,720	$3,445	$357,983
08-G-1021 (2/26/10)	$0	$0	$60,000	$26,316	$0	$0	$0	$86,316
Total Collections	$25,942	$103,766	$257,206	$376,681	$22,009	$9,943	$3,445	$798,992
Additional Collections	$0	$0	($213,512)	($73,378)	($22,009)	($9,943)	($3,445)	($322,287)
Revised Collections	**$25,942**	**$103,766**	**$43,694**	**$303,303**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$476,705**

Corning

Order	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total
07-M-0548 (6/23/08)	$37,162	$148,647	$148,647	$148,647	$0	$0	$0	$483,103
07-M-0548 (10/23/09)	$0	$0	$0	$23,743	$21,817	$3,185	$0	$48,745
07-M-0548 (1/4/1)	$0	$0	$172,689	$355,406	$9,710	$11,059	$4,935	$553,799
Total Collections	$37,162	$148,647	$321,336	$527,796	$31,527	$14,244	$4,935	$1,085,647
Additional Collections	$0	$0	($318,197)	($237,790)	($31,527)	($14,244)	($4,935)	($606,693)
Revised Collections	**$37,162**	**$148,647**	**$3,139**	**$290,006**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$478,954**

Table 6

Eligible Measures and Rebate Amounts for St. Lawrence and Corning Small Commercial HVAC Rebate Program

Measure	Rebate
Furnace (<300 MBH) ≥92% AFUE	$140
Furnace (<300 MBH) ≥92% AFUE & ECM	$280
Condensing Unit Heater (151 to 400) MBH >90% thermal efficiency	$500
Infrared Heaters (all sizes) Low Intensity	$500
Steam Boiler (<300 MBH) ≥82% AFUE	$350
Hydronic Boilers (300 - 499 MBH) ≥85% Thermal Efficiency	$2,000
Condensing Boiler (<300 MBH) ≥90% AFUE	$1,400
Condensing Boiler (301 to 499 MBH) ≥90% AFUE	$1,400
Condensing Boiler (500 to 999 MBH) ≥90% AFUE	$1,700
Indirect-fired Water Heater (>50 gallon storage)	$210