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## I. Introduction and Qualifications

## Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Elizabeth D. Arangio. My business address is 40 Sylvan Road, Waltham, Massachusetts 02451.

## Q. Please describe your business position and responsibilities.

A. I am the Director of Gas Supply Planning with responsibility for the gas supply resource portfolios of National Grid USA's ("National Grid") local gas distribution companies in New York, including The Brooklyn Union Gas Company d/b/a National Grid NY ("KEDNY") and KeySpan Gas East Corporation d/b/a National Grid ("KEDLI") (collectively the "Companies"). In addition to the New York portfolios, I am responsible for planning the gas resource portfolios of National Grid's New England subsidiaries. I also manage National Grid's gas Customer Choice programs.
Q. Please summarize your educational background and your professional experience.
A. I graduated from the University of Massachusetts in 1991 with a Bachelor of Business Administration. In 1995, I graduated from Bentley College with a Master of Business Administration. From 1991 to 1994, I worked as a Gas Accounting Analyst in the Marketing Operations Department at Algonquin Gas Transmission Company. In 1994, I joined Boston Gas Company as a Gas Supply Analyst. In 1997, I was promoted to Group Leader Transportation Services, with
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responsibility for managing all activities associated with the customer choice program. In 1998, I was promoted to Director of Gas Acquisition and Transportation Services and assumed responsibility for the administration of Boston Gas's gas resource portfolio and customer choice program in Massachusetts and, in 2000, the resource portfolio of EnergyNorth Natural Gas, Inc. in New Hampshire. In February 2004, I assumed the additional responsibility for gas supply planning for the Companies' resource portfolios. Following the acquisition of KeySpan Corporation by National Grid, I was named to my current position and assumed added responsibility for National Grid's gas resource portfolios in Upstate New York and Rhode Island. In August 2018, I assumed the added responsibility of managing National Grid's gas Customer Choice programs.

## II. Purpose of Testimony

## Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to:
(i) describe the Companies' efforts to purchase gas supply, pipeline transportation, and storage services on a reliable, least-cost basis in the twelve months ended December 31, 2018 ("Historic Test Year"), the twelve months ending March 31, 2021 ("Rate Year"), the twelve months ending March 31, 2022 ("Data Year 1"), the twelve months ending March 31, 2023 ("Data Year 2") and the twelve months ending March 31, 2024
("Data Year 3," and together with Data Years 1 and 2, "Data Years");
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(ii) discuss the Companies' efforts to supplant pipeline capacity with additional indigenous and renewable gas supplies;
(iii) discuss the existing gas supply constraints in the downstate New York area and the potential impact on the Companies' ability to meet forecast demand, the Companies' efforts to alleviate the supply shortage by supporting additional pipeline capacity to the region, and the potential need to impose a moratorium on new or additional gas service if constraints are not resolved;
(iv) present the Companies' forecast of gas costs for the Rate Year;
(v) describe the results of the marginal cost gas supply studies for the Rate Year;
(vi) discuss the Companies' Gas Cost Volatility Program; and
(vii) discuss the Companies' Customer Choice Program.

Pursuant to the New York State Public Service Commission's ("Commission") "Order Authorizing Combined Gas Portfolios" issued October 28, 2005 in Case 05-G-0903, as of November 2005, the Companies have combined the planning and dispatching of their gas supply portfolios to provide the Companies' customers enhanced reliability of supply and lower costs. Therefore, my testimony addresses the combined portfolios of the Companies and the material I present is applicable to both KEDNY and KEDLI.
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## Q. Does your testimony include any exhibits?

A. Yes. My testimony includes the following exhibits that were prepared under my supervision and direction:

Exhibit _ (EDA-1) KEDNY \& KEDLI Portfolio Schematics;
Exhibit _ (EDA-2) KEDNY \& KEDLI Pipeline Transportation Contracts;
Exhibit _ (EDA-3) KEDNY \& KEDLI Storage Contracts;
Exhibit _ (EDA-4) KEDNY/KEDLI Projected Monthly Gas Stored Volumes and Dollars for the Rate Year and Data Years Summarized by Market Area, Gulf Coast and LNG storage;

Exhibit _ (EDA-5) KEDNY/KEDLI Purchased Gas Expense for the Twelve Months Ending ("TME") December 31, 2018;

Exhibit _ (EDA-6) KEDNY/KEDLI Forecast of Variable Gas Expense for the TME March 31, 2021, 2022, 2023 and 2024;

Exhibit $\qquad$ (EDA-7) KEDNY/KEDLI Forecast of Purchased Gas Expense for the TME March 31, 2021, 2022, 2023 and 2024;

Exhibit __(EDA-8) KEDNY \& KEDLI Estimated Marginal Commodity Cost of Gas;

Exhibit $\qquad$ (EDA-9) KEDNY \& KEDLI Estimated Annualized Marginal Capacity Cost of Gas;

Exhibit __(EDA-10) KEDNY \& KEDLI Non-Migration Capacity Release Revenues; and

Exhibit __ (EDA-11) KEDNY \& KEDLI OSS Transaction Revenues.

## III. Gas Supply Portfolio

## Q. Please describe the Companies' gas distribution systems.

A. KEDNY's gas distribution system serves Brooklyn, Staten Island, and portions of Queens, all located within New York City. KEDLI's gas distribution system serves a portion of Queens not served by KEDNY, as well as Nassau and Suffolk Page 4 of 45
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counties on Long Island. KEDNY and KEDLI are parties to an agreement with Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. ("Con Edison") concerning the ownership and operation of the New York Facilities System ("NYFS"), the highpressure gas transmission system serving the three downstate New York distribution companies. This agreement permits the parties to contract for the transportation and receipt of gas from various interstate pipelines that interconnect with the NYFS, including Transcontinental Gas Pipeline Company LLC ("Transco"), Texas Eastern Transmission LP ("Texas Eastern"), Iroquois Gas Transmission System LP ("Iroquois"), and Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC ("Tennessee"). KEDNY and KEDLI contract for service from each of these pipelines as well as various other upstream pipelines and storage service providers.

## Q. Please describe the Companies' gas supply planning process.

A. Typically, in the spring of each year, the Gas Supply Department develops plans to meet the Companies' gas supply obligation for the annual period from November 1 of that year through October 31 of the following year. This planning process begins with an updated ten-year demand forecast that provides the foundation for customer requirements that ultimately determine incremental pipeline, storage, or peaking needs.
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## Q. What are the Companies' combined forecast design day requirements for the Rate Year and Data Years?

A. The Companies' design day requirements are as follows:

- Rate Year $=2,894$ MDth (thousand dekatherms)/day
- Data Year $1=2,912$ MDth/day
- Data Year 2 = 2,954 MDth/day
- Data Year $3=2,987 \mathrm{MDth} /$ day


## Q. What is the basis for the Companies' city gate requirements?

A. The primary firm demand (i.e., core customer load forecast) forms the basis for the Companies' gas supply portfolio. The primary firm demand is the demand imposed on the Companies by their firm customers, regardless of whether they purchase gas commodity from the Companies or energy service companies ("ESCOs"). Pipeline and storage capacity, along with peaking assets, are used to satisfy the primary firm demand. An annual load duration curve or similar approach is utilized to structure capacity contracts to best meet the shape and frequency of the anticipated loads and to assure the Companies' ability to meet those loads. The Companies do not incorporate any reserve margin assumptions when developing their design weather forecasts and capacity requirement determinations.
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## Q. What contracts or assets are included in the Companies' existing portfolio?

A. Exhibit $\qquad$ (EDA-1) sets forth schematics of the Companies' gas portfolios and provides their maximum delivery entitlements from various sources of supply, including underground storage contracts.
Q. Please describe Exhibit _ (EDA-2) - Pipeline Transportation Contracts.
A. Exhibit _ (EDA-2) summarizes the firm pipeline transportation capacity and bundled peaking assets in the Companies' gas supply portfolio for the 2018-2019 winter season (November 1, 2018 to March 31, 2019). Listed for each contract is information concerning the service provider (pipeline or supplier), tariff rate schedule, contract volume, and contract expiration date.
Q. Please describe Exhibit __ (EDA-3) - Storage Contracts.
A. Exhibit _ (EDA-3) summarizes the Companies' firm storage contracts and the transportation contracts used to deliver storage withdrawal volumes to the city gate for the 2018-2019 winter season. Listed for each contract is information concerning the storage service provider, tariff rate schedule, contract volume, and contract expiration date.

The Companies source gas supply at the following liquid points:

- Dawn, Ontario
- Transco, zone 4
- Dominion, South Point
- Tx. Eastern, M-3
- Transco, zone 6 N.Y.
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- Transco, zone 6 non-N.Y.
- Transco, zone 6 non-N.Y. North
- Transco, zone 3
- Iroquois, receipts (Waddington)
- Texas Eastern, M-2 receipts
- Tennessee, zone 4-300 Leg (Marcellus)
- Iroquois, zone 2
- Transco, zone 1
- Millennium, East receipts
- Dominion, North Point
- Leidy Hub
- Transco, zone 2
- Transco, Leidy Line receipts
- Tennessee, zone 5 White Plains (no index)
Q. What is the role of underground storage in satisfying customer requirements?
A. Approximately 31 percent of the Companies' normal winter supply obligation and 28 percent of their design day demand requirement are met by deliveries of gas withdrawn from storage. Under the Companies' storage contracts, storage deliverability typically declines as inventory decreases (known as "withdrawal ratchets"). Once reached, these ratchets cannot be reversed until the following year. Therefore, the Companies establish a storage withdrawal plan prior to the winter season to maintain inventories at levels that allow sufficient storage deliverability to meet forecast winter peak conditions (storage rule curve).

Market area storage provides the Companies with services that cannot be easily duplicated with other assets. The most important attribute of storage assets is flexibility, which is vital in serving changing customer requirements. The Companies' Transco storage service contracts provide end-of-day balancing that Page 8 of 45
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minimize the risk of over/under run penalties. Whereas typical supply purchases must be dispatched at the same volume for each day of a weekend or holiday, storage allows enhanced flexibility by allowing intraday adjustments to meet changing conditions. In addition, storage improves the load factor of flowing pipeline assets and is critical in meeting design weather conditions. This value cannot be duplicated by replacing storage with Marcellus production. The Companies utilize a least-cost dispatch to fill storage. Where Marcellus shale supplies present an opportunity to displace long haul supplies for storage refill, the Companies take advantage of the economically priced supply.

The Companies also have approximately 20 billion cubic feet ("Bcf") of Gulf Coast storage capacity. These storage fields are made available to ESCOs as part of the optional Gulf Coast storage release that occurs every April. Assuming no ESCOs opt-in for the Gulf Coast storage release, approximately 4.5 Bcf of the total capacity is reserved for force majeure purposes. The remaining 15 Bcf of capacity, usually the entire KEDNY Washington Storage Service ("WSS") field, is utilized for off-system sales ("OSS"). If all ESCOs opt-in, the capacity utilized for OSS would be reduced accordingly.

## Q. What is the role of liquefied natural gas ("LNG") in the Companies' portfolio?

A. The Companies maintain two on-system LNG facilities in Greenpoint, Brooklyn and Holtsville, Long Island. The Greenpoint LNG facility allows KEDNY to
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store approximately 1.6 Bcf of gas and has peak day vaporization capability of approximately 291,000 dekatherms (Dth) per day. The Holtsville LNG facility allows KEDLI to store approximately 0.6 Bcf of gas and has vaporization capability of 103,000 Dth/day. Collectively, the Greenpoint and Holtsville LNG facilities provide the Companies with approximately 10 percent of their peak day gas supplies.

LNG provides the Companies with on-system services that cannot be easily duplicated with other assets. Because these resources can be brought on line quickly, the LNG plants can be used to meet hourly fluctuations in demand, maintain deliveries to customers, and balance pressures across portions of the distribution system during periods of high demand. Most importantly, these resources are vital in preserving delivery pressures in the event that an off-system resource becomes unavailable.

## Q. What changes are planned related to swing services, peak shaving or winter peaking assets, facilities, or operations for the Rate Year through a five-year planning horizon?

A. As further discussed in the direct testimony of the Gas Infrastructure and Operations Panel ("GIOP"), the Companies plan to take the Holtsville LNG facility out of service for critical maintenance repairs in April 2022. This planned capital work, however, is contingent on the availability of additional supply expected to be provided by the Northeast Supply Enhancement ("NESE") project
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by December 2020. There are no other planned changes related to swing services, peak shaving or winter peaking assets, facilities or operations through a five-year planning horizon.
Q. What are the projected monthly beginning and ending volumes and dollar balances for gas stored through the end of the Rate Year and Data Years?
A. Exhibit _ (EDA-4) provides the projected monthly volume and cost of injections and withdrawals for the Companies' underground and LNG storage facilities for the Rate Year and Data Years, summarized by market area, Gulf Coast, and LNG storage.

## A. Indigenous and Renewable Natural Gas

Q. Do the Companies purchase supply from any local natural gas production?
A. Currently, the Fresh Kills Landfill ("Landfill"), located in Staten Island, is the Companies' only source of local production and accounts for less than one percent of the total system throughput. The Landfill is owned by the City of New York. KEDNY has a supply agreement with the Landfill for up to 6,500 Dth/day, but there is no contractual minimum daily quantity. Landfill supply is directly fed into the distribution system.

The Companies' use of local production has not changed over the past several years; the Companies continue to purchase any supply the Landfill can provide. There is no forecast of Landfill production, but the Gas Control department
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communicates with the Landfill regularly and is notified of maintenance work and outages. When the Landfill is unable to sell supply, the Companies replace planned volumes with other resources in the portfolio.

The table below shows the Landfill's production for the last three years:

| Year | Total (Dth) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2016 | 510,838 |
| 2017 | 406,245 |
| 2018 | 448,990 |

Additionally, as discussed in the direct testimony of the Future of Heat Panel, the Companies expect a new bio-gas facility at Newtown Creek to be placed into service by November 2019. The new facility is expected to produce approximately 275,000 Dth/year ( $750 \mathrm{Dth} /$ day) of renewable natural gas ("RNG").
Q. What steps are the Companies taking to capture the benefits of connecting additional indigenous and RNG gas supplies directly to their distribution systems?
A. KEDNY and KEDLI recently updated their Gas Transportation Operating Procedures ("GTOP") manual to include a "Renewable Natural Gas Engineering Services Agreement" template and "Gas Sales (Interconnect) Agreement" template. These documents define the respective responsibilities of the developer and the Companies in connecting new RNG projects. The agreements also list the
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billing and payment terms and conditions, gas quality specifications, and other relevant provisions for interconnecting to the Companies' distribution systems. The "Gas Sales (Interconnect) Agreement" template is modeled after the existing agreement with the Landfill.

Further, the Companies recently collaborated in the development of the "NYS Interconnect Guide for RNG" document along with the Gas Technology Institute ("GTI"), Northeast Gas Association ("NGA"), and other gas distribution companies in New York State. The document establishes a clear process for both project developers and utilities to successfully connect RNG projects. Please refer to the testimonies of GIOP and Future of Heat Panel for further discussion.

## Q. What efforts are the Companies making to reduce their pipeline capacity?

A. Pipeline capacity is an integral component of the Companies' gas supply portfolio to deliver sufficient natural gas to serve our customers. While pipeline capacity cannot be entirely displaced, the Companies continue to explore ways to reduce reliance on pipeline capacity. As discussed in the Future of Heat Panel's testimony, the Companies are pursuing various decarbonization initiatives including renewable gas projects to reduce their carbon footprint while meeting customer needs.
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## B. Northeast Supply Enhancement Project

## Q. Do the Companies plan to add any incremental pipeline capacity in the next

 five years to meet forecast design day load requirements?A. Yes. Due to continued customer interest in conversions from oil to natural gas for space and water heating, as well as increased demand from existing customers and new construction in their service territories, the Companies have continued to experience growth in the demand for natural gas. The Companies' ten-year load forecasts show that demand for gas will continue to grow. KEDNY and KEDLI expect the demand for gas to grow at an annual rate of more than 1.3 percent and 1.0 percent for the next ten years, respectively. The graph below shows the balance between the forecast demand and the Companies' supply portfolio for the ten-year period ending 2027/28. The graph shows that without significant additional pipeline capacity, as further described below, supply falls short of the demand.
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In response to the forecast growth, KEDNY and KEDLI signed precedent agreements with Transco to deliver an additional 400,000 Dth of natural gas per day to the downstate New York area. To provide the additional supply, Transco will expand its existing pipeline system along Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York to connect to the Companies' system in the Rockaway Peninsula. The NESE project will provide access to abundant and economical gas supplies, thereby relieving supply constraints in the Companies' service territories. Furthermore, NESE will include a fully looped pipeline segment to interconnect with the existing delivery lateral in New York Bay, further enhancing reliability of the system. The Companies have contracted for 100 percent of the incremental pipeline capacity that will become available via NESE.
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Q. What will be the impact to the Companies' ability to meet forecast demand if the NESE project is not completed in time?
A. In the absence of additional pipeline capacity, the Companies cannot continue to add new gas load without creating an unacceptable risk of significant supply shortfalls and corresponding drops in system pressure to below minimum thresholds. Such conditions will jeopardize the reliability of service and public safety for the Companies' existing firm customers.

As can be seen in the graph above, the Companies' current supply planning assumes that the NESE project will be completed in time to meet the forecast growth in demand for natural gas. Currently, NESE is awaiting permit approval from New York Department of Environmental Conservation. If the project does not become available by the 2020/21 winter season, the Companies will not be able to prudently satisfy new or additional service requests without jeopardizing the Companies' ability to provide safe, reliable service to its existing firm customers. In that case, National Grid will have no choice but to impose a moratorium on new and additional gas service in affected areas to maintain system reliability.

The GIOP direct testimony addresses NESE's impact to the Companies' capital projects. Notably, as mentioned above, the Companies will not be able to take their LNG facilities out of service to complete necessary maintenance repairs if NESE is not completed in time.
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## IV. Portfolio Management

## Q. Please describe the Companies' gas supply planning goals.

## A. The Companies' primary gas supply planning goals are to:

(i) Dispatch the gas supply portfolio assets under a least-cost strategy to reliably meet projected primary firm demand;
(ii) Maintain a diverse portfolio of gas supply, storage, and transportation capacity contracts with varying terms and pricing provisions; and
(iii) Implement a formal hedging program to mitigate price volatility.

These goals are consistent with the Commission's "Statement of Policy Regarding Gas Purchasing Practices" issued in Case 97-G-0600 and updated by letter issued March 31, 2011. The Companies maintain a portfolio that meets requirements under design conditions while maintaining sufficient flexibility for mild winters.

The Companies monitor these goals with regular meetings (monthly supply plan, quarterly review, and annual RFP review). Pursuant to Recommendation IX-4 from the final audit report in the Commission's previous gas management audit (Case 13-G-0009), the Companies established a process for the quarterly review of gas supply procurement plans compared to actual purchases for a sample of days during the quarter. The review identifies variances in volumes and the use of storage and delivery pipelines caused by weather, market conditions, operational constraints, or other factors. Variances are reviewed for patterns and opportunities to improve the procurement process. The Companies' Energy
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Procurement group has been conducting quarterly reviews since 2015. Reviews are attended by representatives from Gas Supply Planning, Gas Trading, and Origination and Price Volatility Management.

## Q. Please describe the Companies' gas purchasing process.

A. The Companies contract for quantities of gas to ensure sufficient supply to reliably meet design conditions, as well as to account for daily and seasonal load variations. A combination of term and spot contracts provides necessary flexibility with respect to volume, which allows the Companies to respond to fluctuations in demand. Both term and spot contracts are firm to ensure reliability. The varying provisions in these contracts allow for pricing diversity as well.

## Term Contracts

Term contracts have durations of longer than one month and less than one year. These contracts generally have a specified fixed daily base load quantity necessary to satisfy requirements under a "warm winter" scenario and may include some summer storage refill quantities. Other term contracts provide call options to buy bundled gas supplies delivered either to the Companies' city gates or other upstream supply points. KEDNY and KEDLI also utilize no-notice storage to manage variations in load that allow the Companies to automatically withdraw or inject gas at the end of the day to balance system load.
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Term contracts are generally priced monthly. In addition to first-of-the-month (FOM) published indices, monthly prices for some term domestic supply contracts also use the New York Mercantile Exchange ("NYMEX") last day settle price plus a competitively bid location basis differential. Monthly pricing ensures the effectiveness of the NYMEX futures contracts entered as part of the Companies' hedging strategy.

## Spot Contracts

Spot contracts are firm contracts with a term of one month or less. There are no specific contractual triggers that require the purchase of spot gas. These contracts are made throughout the year to supplement term contract supplies, manage demand variations due to weather, and maintain storage inventory targets. Spot contracts also provide pricing diversity (i.e., daily index vs. monthly index).

The Companies purchase spot gas from a number of qualified and reliable suppliers who have North American Energy Standards Board ("NAESB") contracts to minimize risk and obtain competitive pricing. The amount of capacity available depends on the time of year and storage availability.

Daily spot purchases are priced either at reliable, daily published index prices or at a negotiated short-term (daily) fixed price.
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Q. What is the current level of natural gas supply used by the Companies to meet normal customer requirements, and how will that amount change in the Rate Year?
A. Of the 230 Bcf of forecast normal customer requirements for November 2018 to October 2019, the Companies are required to purchase approximately 201 Bcf. The remainder will be procured by ESCOs. For the Rate Year, forecast normal customer requirements are approximately 221 Bcf , with 208 Bcf served by the Companies and the remainder by ESCOs.

## Q. How do the Companies evaluate expiring contracts for gas supply?

A. As decision dates for contract extension/termination approach, the Companies determine the need to maintain and or modify (to the extent possible) each contract as part of the resource portfolio. The Companies use several criteria to assess the need for transportation and storage contracts including but not limited to: receipt point liquidity, reliability, complement to the existing portfolio, and economics.

Also, the Companies consider options to replace long-haul capacity with shorterhaul capacities. For example, as supplies from the Marcellus shale region became abundant and readily accessible, the Companies did not renew expiring long-haul contracts with Union, TransCanada, and Empire pipelines that delivered more expensive supplies from Dawn, Canada.

## Testimony of Elizabeth D. Arangio

While the current level of Transco long haul capacity is required to serve the Companies' peak day and peak season needs, it is not always the least cost option for supply. Recently, the Companies were able to reduce the path on Transco long-haul contracts to reduce fixed costs. Effective March 1, 2019, the Companies have agreed to turnback 40 percent (27,473 Dth/day) of their combined entitlements from Zone 1 (Sta 30). Transco will allow the remaining portion (41,210 Dth/day) to be turned back as early as October 2020. After the turnbacks, the Companies will still be able to reliably fill 100 percent of the original contract volumes at downstream points. The option to reduce capacity paths is not one typically offered by the pipelines, so, when the opportunities occur, the Companies will seek to take full advantage of such de-contracting providing such options do not have an adverse effect on the reliability and economics of the portfolio.

## Q. Does the Companies' supply purchasing strategy enable them to benefit from the increased production from the Marcellus and Utica shale regions? <br> A. Yes. KEDNY and KEDLI purchased approximately 75.6 Bcf from the Northeast producing region during the 2017/18 winter. In addition, KEDNY and KEDLI purchased approximately 17.0 Bcf from the Gulf Coast and 3.7 Bcf from Canadian transportation paths.

The table below shows the Companies' actual purchases from November 2017 through March 2018. Over the last several years, the Companies have decreased
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reliance on Gulf Coast and Canadian resources, while increasing reliance on points associated with Marcellus shale.

## Firm Transportation

| Gulf Coast | $11.0 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Canadian | $2.0 \%$ |
| Marcellus Shale | $50.0 \%$ |
| Total Firm Transportation | $\mathbf{6 4 . 0 \%}$ |
| Storage Withdrawals | $34.0 \%$ |
| Peaking Supplies | $1.6 \%$ |
| Local LNG Vapor | $0.4 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ |

For the Historic Test Year, the Companies met their city gate requirements as follows:
96.4\% Domestic purchases and underground storage
3.4\% Canadian purchases at Dawn and Waddington
$<1 \% \quad$ LNG and Landfill

Based on current and forecast prices, the Companies expect continued reliance on domestic supply purchases and underground storage going forward.
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## Q. Do the Companies engage in off-system sales, capacity release and other arrangements to reduce their total gas costs?

A. Yes. The Companies constantly monitor their gas resource portfolio to ensure that the appropriate mix of pipeline transportation capacity, market area storage, bundled city gate supply, and peaking resources are available to serve projected firm design requirements. To further minimize costs, the Companies seek to optimize portfolio assets when they are not being utilized for the benefit of firm customers. Except for Gulf Coast storage, for the Rate Year and beyond, the Companies have no plans to enter any pre-arranged off-system sales, capacity release, or streaming arrangements that would encumber upstream assets. As in years past, once the winter heating season begins, the Companies will actively pursue opportunities to sell available supply and/or capacity in a manner that does not diminish overall supply adequacy, reliability or operational flexibility to firm customers. For example, on warm days in shoulder months when pipeline capacity is not fully utilized, the Companies will seek to sell excess capacity to off-system customers. Under this type of transaction, the Companies will purchase supply and transport gas on available pipeline capacity and then assess the associated variable costs plus a negotiated margin to the off-system customers. The Companies will also look for opportunities to execute physical pipeline trades where available. Under such trades, the Companies would purchase firm supply delivered to the city gate on one interstate pipeline and sell a like amount of supply to another third party at a higher price on a different interstate pipeline.
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The Companies hold approximately 20 Bcf of production area storage that is used to:

1. maintain supply reliability during force majeure supply outages in the Gulf coast;
2. balance on-system loads;
3. support the Companies' Price Volatility Management Program; and
4. make off-system production area sales.

KEDNY and KEDLI used approximately 15.4 Bcf of that capacity for production area off-system sales for the 2018/19 winter. The amount of Gulf Coast storage capacity released to marketers under the retail access program for 2018/19 was 12,920 Dth. At this time, the Companies do not propose to modify their OSS practices.
Q. Do the Companies enter into asset management agreements ("AMAs") to maximize the value of their supply portfolio and reduce their overall supply costs?
A. Yes. The Companies currently have eight AMAs in place for the 2018/19 period. These arrangements permit the Companies to benefit from the expertise of thirdparties who are more familiar with market conditions and opportunities in particular regions or on particular pipeline systems while still maintaining access to essential firm supply sources. The terms of these arrangements do not exceed one year. The Companies will explore beneficial opportunities to enter asset optimization agreements in the future as current agreements expire.
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Below are the list of current AMAs and a summary of the terms:

## KEDNY:

- Counterparty: Nextera Energy Marketing, LLC
- Key terms: Baseload or Daily Call (April 2019-October 2019); Transco Contract 1006500; Transco Z2/Z3 Gulf to Transco Z6 Leidy NNY; November 2018-October 2019; 10,688 Dth/day;
- Counterparty: J. Aron \& Company LLC
o Key terms: Daily Call (November 2018-March 2019); Transco Long-Haul Station 65 to Transco Z6 Narrows NY; November 2018-October 2019; 25,000 Dth/day;
- Counterparty: EQT Energy, LLC ("EQT")
- Key terms: Daily Call (November 2018-March 2019); Transco Long-Haul Station 65 to Transco Z6 Narrows NY; November 2018-October 2019; 25,000 Dth/day; and
- Counterparty: Emera Energy Services, Inc. ("Emera")
- Key terms: Daily Call (December 2018- April 2019); Union Dawn to Iroquois S. Commack; December 2018-October 2019; 57,498 Dth/day.


## KEDLI

- Counterparty: EQT
- Key terms: Daily Call (November 2018-March 2019); Transco Long-Haul Station 65 to Transco Z6 Long Beach NY; November 2018-October 2019; 25,000 Dth/day;
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- Counterparty: Emera
- Key terms: Daily Call (December 2018- April 2019); Union Dawn to TransCanada Waddington; December 2017-October 2018; 25,357 Dth/day;
- Counterparty: Emera
- Key terms: November Daily Call; Base-Load Winter Supplies (December 2018-March 2019); Off-Peak Season Daily Call on any 60 days during April 2019-October 2019; Additional Call on any Day during the Term; NE07 capacity; Millennium Corning to Iroquois S. Commack; November 2018-October 2019; 25,000 Dth/day; and
- Counterparty: Consolidated Edison Energy, Inc.
- Key terms: November Daily Call; Base-Load Winter Supplies December 2018-March 2019; Off-Peak Season Daily Call on any 60 days during the period April 2019-October 2019; Additional Call on any Day during the Term; NE07 capacity; Millennium Corning to Iroquois S. Commack; November 2018-October 2019; 50,000 Dth/day.

The Companies regularly evaluate the contracts in their supply portfolio, taking into account market interest in the asset, whether the resource is utilized by the Companies to meet baseload or swing requirements on a seasonal or year-round basis, intraday flexibility of the asset, and whether the Companies believe the resource may be better managed by a third party. At this time, the Companies
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determined that the existing AMAs are in the best interest of the firm gas customer but will consider additional opportunities in future years based on market conditions.
Q. Do the Companies have existing or previous gas supply arrangements with any affiliated marketing/trading organizations?
A. No.
Q. What are the revenues received over the last five fiscal years (April 2014 January 2019) from releases to shippers other than on-system customers that have migrated from bundled sales to transportation service?
A. Exhibit _ (EDA-10) summarizes the revenues received from non-migration capacity releases. Over the five-year period (April 2014 - January 2019), the revenues received from such capacity releases totaled $\$ 37.5$ million, of which $\$ 31.9$ million (85 percent) was credited to customers and the remaining \$5.6 (15 percent) was retained by the Companies.
Q. What are the revenues received over the last five fiscal years (April 2014 January 2019) from OSS transactions, WSS transactions, and AMAs?
A. Exhibit __ (EDA-11) summarizes the revenues received from revenues received from off-system sales transactions. Over the five-year period (April 2014 January 2019), the revenues received from off-system sales transactions, WSS transactions and AMAs totaled $\$ 284.2$ million, of which $\$ 241.7$ million (85
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percent) was credited to customers and the remaining $\$ 42.5$ million (15 percent) was retained by the Companies.

## Q. Please describe Exhibit __ (EDA-5) - Purchased Gas Expense.

A. Exhibit _ (EDA-5) shows the Companies' purchased gas expense for the Historic Test Year. This expense includes the purchased cost of gas minus the cost of storage injections plus the cost of storage withdrawals, and all pipeline fixed and variable charges.
Q. Please describe Exhibit __ (EDA-6) - Forecast of Variable Gas Expense TME March 31, 2021, 2022, 2023 and 2024.
A. Exhibit _ (EDA-6) shows the projected commodity prices of the various natural gas supplies that are forecast to be purchased and delivered to the Companies for the Rate Year and the Data Years to serve the estimated requirements of the Companies' firm customers under the assumption of normal weather. This commodity price projection serves as the basis for the forecast of purchased gas expense developed for these periods. A least cost dispatch analysis was performed to determine the mix of flowing supplies and storage withdrawals that would be dispatched to the city gate each month to serve estimated normal firm customer demand.
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Q. Please describe Exhibit _ (EDA-7) - Forecast of Purchased Gas Expense TME March 31, 2021, 2022, 2023 and 2024.
A. Exhibit __ (EDA-7) shows a forecast of purchased gas expense for the Rate Year and Data Years. This expense includes the purchased cost of gas minus the cost of storage injections plus the cost of storage withdrawals, and all pipeline fixed and variable charges. The forecast assumes the NESE project is available by the 2020/21 winter season. If it is not, the Companies will update the forecast in corrections and updates.
Q. How do the Companies review and monitor the costs associated with their pipeline capacity?
A. The Companies closely monitors and reviews all rate and tariff filings submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") by the interstate natural gas pipelines with whom the Companies contract for service. The Companies will intervene, and when necessary, actively participate in such proceedings to ensure the Companies continue to pay fair rates and receive just and reasonable service. In interstate pipeline base rate proceedings, the Companies often participate with other local distribution company customers in a shipper group, which will retain an expert witness to advance commonly-held positions and enhance the Companies' influence. The Companies also regularly engage in settlement discussions with gas pipelines and FERC Staff to settle tariff-related matters without the need for a formal and costly hearing process. More broadly, the Companies monitor all natural gas related activity at FERC to stay abreast of
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and influence policy developments that could impact the Companies and their customers. The Companies track FERC orders, attend technical conferences convened by FERC to address major policy issues, and submit comments in response to notices of proposed rulemaking and notices of inquiry issued by FERC on policy matters impacting wholesale gas markets.

## V. Marginal Cost Studies

Q. Please describe Exhibit _ (EDA-8) - Estimated Marginal Commodity Cost of Gas For Period: November 1, 2020 through March 31, 2021.
A. Exhibit _ (EDA-8) shows the projected marginal gas commodity costs for the period November 1, 2020 to March 31, 2021. By running two dispatch simulations, the marginal gas supply sources that would be dispatched to serve an incremental increase in customer demand were identified. First, a baseline dispatch on the simulation model was prepared to establish the least-cost mix of gas supplies that would be dispatched to serve firm sales customer demand under normal weather. Then, the simulation model was rerun with an increased customer demand of 1,000 Dth per day over the winter months (November through March) to identify those marginal supplies that would be dispatched to serve the increased demand. The exhibit reflects the average monthly commodity cost of the marginal supplies that were dispatched.
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Q. Please describe Exhibit _ (EDA-9) - Estimated Annualized Marginal Capacity Cost of Gas for Period November 1, 2020 through March 31, 2021.
A. Exhibit _ (EDA-9) shows the projected annualized marginal gas capacity cost for the period November 1, 2020 to March 31, 2021. This study incorporates the fixed costs of new capacity that the Companies would acquire for the Rate Year to reliably meet projected design demand growth. Based on this calculation, the annualized marginal capacity cost was determined to be $\$ 1.12$ per dekatherm, as set forth on Exhibit $\qquad$ (EDA-9).

## VI. Customer Choice Program

## Q. Describe the Companies' Customer Choice Program.

The Companies' Customer Choice Program provides customers the option to purchase their supplies from Marketers. There are two service options, Daily and Monthly Balancing. The Companies currently assign to Marketers at maximum rates such interstate pipeline transportation and storage capacity as is necessary to meet migrating firm customers' load. This practice is consistent with the Commission's August 30, 2007 Order in Case 07-G-0299. City gate pipeline and storage capacity contracted for core customers is assigned to Retail Marketers for migrating customers in proportion to the anticipated design day load of the customers. All migrating firm customers are required to participate in the Companies' mandatory assignment program.
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## Q. What service classes are available to transportation customers?

A. For KEDNY, transportation customers can receive service under Service Classification ("SC") 17 Firm and SC-18 Non-firm. For KEDLI, transportation service is available under SC-5 Firm, SC-7 Non-Firm, and SC-13 Non-Firm.

## Q. How are transportation customer imbalances tracked and reconciled?

A. When an ESCO customer's meter is read, the customer's account transaction is sent from the customer system to the Companies' Gas Transportation Information System ("GTIS"). GTIS then compares the ESCO's expected deliveries, adjusted for actual weather for the billing period, to the customer's actual usage for that same period. The usage is prorated into the applicable calendar month based on actual degree days. Thereafter, a cash-out index price is applied to the difference between the ESCO's deliveries and customer usage. Cancel and rebill activity will be captured in the month in which the cancel or the rebill occurred as far back as three years. There have been no imbalance penalties assessed to a customer in the last three years.
Q. Were there any problems or issues arising from implementation of the Commission's August 30, 2007 and March 28, 2008 Mandatory Capacity Release Orders (in Case 07-G-0299) and FERC Order 712?
A. The Companies have not experienced any issues from implementation of the Commission's Mandatory Release orders. The Companies no longer have any ESCO capacity that is grandfathered to the city gate.
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Q. What are the pipelines and allocation percentages being utilized for the mandatory assignment of capacity?
A. The table below provides a list of the pipelines being utilized for mandatory assignment of capacity, and the allocated percentage of each, for Winter 20182019.

| Transco Long Haul | $29.7 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Transco Leidy | $4.4 \%$ |
| Transco Leidy Seasonal | $2.5 \%$ |
| Transco Rockaway | $17 \%$ |
| Tetco Long Haul | $7.1 \%$ |
| Tetco Leidy Short Haul | $5.6 \%$ |
| Dominion Leidy | $7.0 \%$ |
| Tennessee | $2.6 \%$ |
| Northeast 07 | $15.1 \%$ |
| Dawn to Iroquois | $9.0 \%$ |

Q. What process, if any, is utilized to true-up any differences between the Companies' weighted average cost of capacity ("WACOC") and the charges paid by marketers and direct customers for released capacity?
A. For the 2017/2018 winter season (November 2017 through October 2018), the Companies' WACOC was between $\$ 0.8872$ and $\$ 0.9006$ per Dth. There is no true-up and/or reconciliation process in place to account for any differences in cost.
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Q. Did the Companies implement any changes to their Customer Choice Programs as a result of the non-firm service collaborative in the 2016 KEDNY Rate Case?
A. Yes. In accordance with the "Order Approving Tariff Provisions and Directing Further Tariff Filings" issued February 7, 2019 following the non-firm service collaborative in the 2016 KEDNY Rate Case, the Companies modified their Customer Choice Programs to address concerns raised by ESCOs that participated in the collaborative.

First, the Companies modified their procedures for accepting month-ahead and day-ahead nominations to allow ESCOs more flexibility with the delivery points. Whereas ESCOs were previously required to deliver 100 percent of their supplies on Transco, they are now permitted to deliver gas supply on behalf of their temperature controlled ("TC") and interruptible ("IT") customers up to the following percentage of their TC and IT customers' total requirements:

- Transco - up to 100 percent
- Texas Eastern - up to 50 percent
- Iroquois - up to 50 percent
- Tennessee - up to 6 percent

These modifications do not apply to power generation customers who have negotiated points of receipt in their gas transportation agreements.
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Second, the Companies modified their operating procedures to allow ESCOs serving non-firm loads and power generation customers to request access to any available city gate capacity on an intra-day basis. To request access to such capacity, ESCOs must notify the Companies by phone or email between $8: 30$ A.M. and 10:00 A.M. prior to the start of the effective Gas Day. Between 10:00 A.M. and 11:00 A.M., the Companies will allocate available capacity on a pro rata basis to each requesting ESCO and notify the ESCOs of the capacity they have received. If there is any remaining capacity after allocation, it will be made available on a first-come, first-served basis after 11:00 A.M.

Both changes to the Companies' Customer Choice Programs have been reflected in the latest version of the GTOPs.

[^0]
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This modified TC/IT penalty language provides a strong incentive for customers to switch to their alternate fuel at the designated temperature thresholds.
Q. Are the Companies proposing to make any further changes to their Customer Choice Programs?
A. No.

## VII. Gas Cost Volatility Management

Q. What steps do the Companies take to mitigate the impact of gas cost volatility on their customers?
A. The Companies mitigate volatility in the gas commodity markets in several ways. First, they maintain a balanced portfolio that includes contract storage. This allows the Companies to inject gas during the summer for withdrawal during the winter, which enables the Companies to mitigate price volatility during the winter when demand is greatest. Second, the Companies maintain a geographically diverse gas supply portfolio that helps to reduce exposure to volatility in any single supply region. Third, the portfolio incorporates pricing diversity that minimizes exposure to volatility at a single pricing point or market index. Finally, the Companies mitigate price volatility with a formal hedging program.

## Q. Please describe the Companies' hedging program.

A. The Companies' overall pricing diversity and volatility mitigation plan is to protect prices for approximately 50 percent, but no more than 60 percent, of
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forecast winter firm sales and to allow prices to float with the market for the remaining forecast winter sales. For this purpose, the "winter period" is defined as November through March. Prices are fixed through a combination of planned storage withdrawals, which provide a natural hedge at the average price of summer period injections, and financial hedging using NYMEX gas futures contracts or NYMEX Over the Counter ("OTC") financial settled swaps and options using bilateral master agreements. Beginning in the 2015-2016 winter, the Companies are also using basis hedges for forecast purchases in the Northeast producing region. Locational basis swaps in conjunction with NYMEX hedges are being used because of an observed disconnect between prices in the Marcellus and Utica supply basins and NYMEX prices. The use of these locational basis swaps ensures that the Companies are mitigating volatility in the markets where they purchase supplies.

To determine the quantity to be hedged, the Companies forecast firm sales for each month November through March, assuming normal winter weather conditions, and multiply the results by 50 percent (Step 1). Next, monthly storage withdrawals to meet system operational needs are forecast and subtracted from the result obtained in Step 1 (Step 2). The results from Step 2 equal the quantity of gas to be financially hedged to achieve the 50 percent target in each month.

Once the volume of gas to be financially hedged each month is known, a monthly hedging plan is created. The purchases are spread evenly over 16 months starting
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18 months prior to the start of each November. Each financial transaction is settled against the expiring month's last day settlement price and the applicable Inside FERC "First of the Month" index price. The gross settlement payout or gain is included in the gas cost for that month.

The table below summarizes the percentage of forecasted gas supply hedged physically and financially for November 2017-March 2018:

| Pricing Mechanism | Downstate NY |
| :---: | :---: |
| Physical (storage) | $30 \%$ |
| Financial (swaps and options) | $19 \%$ |
| Index | $51 \%$ |

The table below itemizes the number of financial swap (futures) and option contracts hedged for the November 2017 through March 2018 winter season. The units for the data below are in contracts; one contract equals 10,000 Dth.

| Pricing Mechanism | Quantity |
| :---: | :---: |
| Swaps | 1,815 |
| Options | 750 |

## Q. Have the Companies' hedging practices changed in the past year?

A. Yes. The derivatives market at Dominion South Point has developed with enough liquidity so that the Companies can adequately acquire financially settled Dominion South Point options. The Companies have incorporated these options in the winter 2018-19 hedge portfolio. The Companies continue to monitor the
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effectiveness of NYMEX and South Point for all receipt points in the forecast to determine the most appropriate hedging location.

Lower market volatility and market prices have translated to lower option premiums. Options provide superior downside protection versus swaps. As a result, "lessons learned" include favoring up to 100 percent of options for the financial hedge component of the portfolios for the next winter

## Q. Please explain how the Companies calculate gas price volatility.

A. Gas price volatility is measured as the standard deviation of the lognormal of the ratio of the monthly hedged price change through the winter, November through March. This standard deviation is compared against a similar calculation for the NYMEX and South Point Natural Gas monthly settlement prices for the same November through March period.
Q. Discuss how the Companies determine the success or failure of their gas price mitigation program.
A. The success or failure of the gas price mitigation program is determined by comparing the physical and financial hedged prices with natural gas market price indices over the same period. The hedge program is expected to show lower month-to-month price volatility than that of the market index.
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## Q. Please discuss internal reporting, oversight, and the audit structure of the Companies' gas price mitigation program.

A. The Companies' hedging program reporting and oversight is documented in the US Energy Commodity Risk Management Policy. National Grid's US based energy procurement activities are managed under the direction of National Grid plc's Finance Committee. The Finance Committee authorized the Energy Procurement Risk Management Committee ("EPRMC") and delegated authority to focus on energy risk, metrics, energy strategies, financial impacts and other opportunities to the EPRMC. The EPRMC provides Vice President level review of strategies, with a focus on market risks, inclusive of price, credit, operational, liquidity and reputational risks and Policy compliance. The EPRMC serves to administer a consistent and comprehensive sanctioning process for such strategies and commitments across the organization. The EPRMC has delegated some of its authority to the Commodity Management Committee ("CMC"). The EPRMC appoints the CMC members and chairperson. The CMC provides detailed review of strategies, products and new opportunities with a focus on energy risk, metrics, financial impacts and opportunities. The CMC conducts research to understand market rules, regulatory requirements, customer needs, risks, barriers to entry, logistical requirements, competition, deal economics, risk measurement and valuation requirements, all related requirements and exposures (including credit, liquidity, tax and legal), and the impact of current and proposed strategies on existing controls and limits, while administering a consistent and comprehensive sanctioning process for such strategies and commitments across the organization.
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The Companies review the hedging program and highlights any changes with the Commission on an annual basis. The Companies have a comprehensive internal approval process to authorize a hedge strategy and maintain oversight requirements. Prior to execution, a hedging strategy is documented with details that may include: risks to be hedged, volumetric targets, duration and cadence of hedge plan transactions, and types of instruments to be used. This documentation is then reviewed and approved by the CMC prior to going to the EPRMC for approval and authorization.

The Companies employs the industry standard best practice of an independent three-office model:

- The Front Office develops and executes the hedge strategies hedges in accordance with the prevailing policies and strategies by entering into transactions with counterparties to mitigate natural gas price volatility.
- Risk Management is part of the Middle Office and maintains the overall control environment and assesses compliance with the Companies' risk policy. The Middle Office reports through the Treasury organization and provides a significant level of control and independent policing of the Front Office's activities. The Middle Office confirms all trades with counterparties and monitors the risk exposures of the deals, as well as verifying approved strategies are executed in accordance with the plan.
- The Accounting Department is part of the Back Office whose functions include processes in support of the Front Office, such as accounting,
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invoicing, check-outs, actualization, accounts receivable and payable, and financial reporting. The Back Office is also independent of both the Front and Middle Offices and reports up through the Finance organization.

Additionally, the Companies' internal auditing department has performed audits to ensure compliance, for example, with Sarbanes-Oxley.
Q. Please provide the actual price hedging performance versus planned price hedging performance for the last winter season.
A. A comparison of actual price hedging performance versus planned price hedging performance for winter 2017/2018, which includes separate quantities for each hedging instrument, is shown in the tables below:
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Winter 2017-18 Purchasing Plan \& Projected Prices


Winter 2017-18 Actual Purchases \& Prices

note 1 In the ground volumes and WACOG
note 2 Financial hedges settled against Domionion SP index.
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## Q. What percentage of the Companies' gas supply is physically hedged?

A. As a result of planned storage withdrawals, which are based on normal weather, approximately 30 percent of the forecasted November through March firm sales demand is physically hedged. The Companies do not hedge storage injections. The Companies do not have any physical supply contracts with fixed price terms.

## Q. How do the Companies use swaps/futures?

A. The Companies use OTC swaps to execute fixed price hedged transactions. OTC swaps do not have any execution, transaction or commission fees. The Companies rely on credit thresholds in their bilateral master agreements to limit the amount and frequency of margin calls associated with the daily mark-tomarket valuation of each hedge transaction. When the mark-to-market with each OTC counterparty exceeds the credit threshold, the Companies use their various credit facilities to meet the cash collateral margin calls.

## Q. What types of options do the Companies use?

A. The Companies use calls, puts, and collars.

## Q. Describe how the Companies decide which types of options to use.

A. When the underlying futures price is expected to fall, then call options are preferred over swaps. Collars may be purchased instead to reduce the premiums paid or when the underlying futures prices are expected to be stable.
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Q. Do the Companies place a limit on what they spend on options in any year?
A. The Companies cap their option premiums at $\$ 13$ million per year.
VIII. Conclusion
Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
A. Yes, it does.
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Brooklyn Union Gas \& KeySpan Gas East Combined Flow Diagram


## Brooklyn Union Gas \& KeySpan Gas East

## Combined Flow Diagram
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Exhibit __ (EDA-2)
KEDNY \& KEDLI Pipeline Transportation Contracts

## KEDNY Pipeline Transportation Contracts

| Pipeline Company Name | Rate Schedule | Daily Quanity (DT) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Expiration } \\ & \text { Date } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flowing Gas To Citygate |  |  |  |
| Transco Year-Round | FT | 245,955 | 5/31/2020 |
| Transco Year-Round | FT | 1,969 | 3/19/2020 |
| Transco Seasonal - 90 Day | FT | 4,244 | 7/31/2020 |
| Texas Eastern | CDS | 51,315 | 10/31/2020 |
| Texas Eastern | CDS | 5,403 | 10/31/2020 |
| Tennessee | FT-A | 57,822 | 5/31/2022 |
| Iroquois | RTS | 80,936 | 11/1/2022 |
| Transco* 1/ | FT (X-265) | 3,500 | 1/1/2014 |
| Transco | FT (X-266) | 3,250 | 12/31/2020 |
| Texas Eastern | FTS | 2,560 | 10/31/2020 |
| Texas Eastern * | FT-1 | 27,500 | 3/31/2023 |
| Texas Eastern | FTS-4-2 | 5,000 | 12/1/2019 |
| Texas Eastern | X-130 | 12,161 | 10/31/2019 |
| Transco (avail Nov - Mar) | FT | 13,945 | 3/31/2013 |
| Transco | FDLS | 353,700 | 5/14/2030 |
| Upstream Pipeline Support ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |
| First Leg |  |  |  |
| Transco | FT | 10,688 | 10/31/2019 |
| Texas Eastern | FT-1 | 20,604 | 10/31/2024 |
| Dominion | FTNN | 40,301 | 3/31/2023 |
| Dominion - New Market Project 5/ | FT | 82,000 | 10/31/2031 |
| TransCanada (Dawn to Wad) | FT | 12,142 | 10/31/2022 |
| TransCanada (Dawn to Wad) | FT | 28,326 | 10/31/2022 |
| Union (Dawn to Parkway) | M12 | 28,640 | 10/31/2020 |
| Union (Dawn to Parkway) | M12 | 12,277 | 10/31/2020 |
| Equitrans Keystone SS-3 Storage, Winter 2/ | STS-1 | 16,193 | 4/1/2020 |
| Equitrans Keystone SS-3 Storage, Summer 2/ | STS-1 | 8,465 | 4/1/2020 |
| Transco | FT | 100,000 | 5/14/2030 |
| Transco | FT | 115,000 | 11/1/2032 |
| Deliveries from Storage |  |  |  |
| Dominion GSS Storage 1/ | FT (X-285) | 50,075 | 12/13/2019 |
| Transco GSS Market Area Storage 3/ | GSS | 180,137 | 3/31/2023 |
| Transco LSS Market Area Storage 3/ | LSS | 31,940 | 3/31/2023 |
| Transco S-2 Market Area Storage 3/ | S-2 | 22,838 | 4/15/2020 |
| Equitrans Keystone SS-3 Storage | FTS-2 | 17,477 | 3/31/2020 |
| Texas Eastern SS-1 Market Area Storage 3/ | SS-1 | 114,190 | 4/30/2024 |
| Dominion GSS-TE Storage | FTS-7 | 21,332 | 4/15/2020 |
| Dominion GSS-TE Storage | FTS-8 | 10,340 | 3/31/2020 |
| Winter Peaking Service |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total (Flowing Gas to City Gate, Deliveries from Storage, and Winter Peaking Service) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1,178,889 |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ Capacity used to deliver gas to pipelines that deliver to the citygate. |  |  |  |
| * Contract does NOT have renewal rights. |  |  |  |
| 1/ Effective 10/1/2016, contract consolidation |  |  |  |
| 2/ Transportation associated with Keystone Storage. |  |  |  |

## KEDLI Pipeline Transportation Contracts

| Pipeline Company Name | Rate Schedule | Daily Quanity (DT) | Expiration Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flowing Gas To Citygate |  |  |  |
| Transco Year-Round 2/ | FT | 154,287 | 5/31/2020 |
| Transco Year-Round | FT | 1,811 | 2/24/2020 |
| Transco Seasonal - 90 Day | FT | 1,863 | 7/31/2020 |
| Texas Eastern | CDS | 8,106 | 10/31/2019 |
| Texas Eastern | CDS | 25,001 | 10/31/2019 |
| Tennessee | FT-A | 7,720 | 5/31/2022 |
| Iroquois | RTS | 87,760 | 11/1/2021 |
| Iroquois | RTS | 25,000 | 11/1/2021 |
| Iroquois NE07 | RTS | 200,000 | 11/1/2023 |
| Transco | FT (X-271) | 2,100 | 1/31/2019 |
| Transco 3/ | FT (X-287) | 536 | 10/31/2019 |
| Texas Eastern | FTS | 1,110 | 10/31/2019 |
| Texas Eastern * | FT-1 | 22,500 | 3/31/2023 |
| Transco (avail Nov - Mar) | FT | 17,433 | 3/31/2020 |
| Transco Leidy East | FT | 25,000 | 3/31/2020 |
| Transco Market Link | FT | 25,000 | 11/30/2019 |
| Transco | FDLS | 293,300 | 5/14/2030 |
| Iroquois | RTS | 7,000 | 11/1/2021 |
| Upstream Pipeline Support ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |
| Texas Eastern | FT-1 | 12,578 | 10/31/2019 |
| Dominion | FTNN | 26,021 | 3/31/2023 |
| TransCanada (Dawn to Wad) | FT | 16,086 | 10/31/2024 |
| TransCanada (Dawn to Wad) | FT | 21,347 | 10/31/2024 |
| Union (Dawn to Parkway) | M12 | 21,584 | 10/31/2020 |
| Union (Dawn to Parkway) | M12 | 16,266 | 10/31/2020 |
| Millennium | FT-1 | 150,000 | 12/31/2023 |
| Millennium | FT-1 | 50,000 | 12/31/2023 |
| Millennium | FT-1 | 50,000 | 12/31/2023 |
| Algonquin | AFT-1 | 196,000 | 10/31/2023 |
| Deliveries from Storage |  |  |  |
| Dominion GSS Storage 3/ | FT (X-287) | 35,689 | 10/31/2007 |
| Leidy to Long Island for Dominion DTI GSS | FT | 50,000 | 12/12/2027 |
| Leidy to Long Island for Dominion DTI GSS | FT | 50,000 | 12/12/2027 |
| Transco GSS Market Area Storage 4/ | GSS | 112,484 | 3/31/2023 |
| Transco LSS Market Area Storage 4/ | LSS | 19,807 | 3/31/2023 |
| Transco SS-2 Market Area Storage 4/ | SS-2 | 23,184 | 3/31/2020 |
| Texas Eastern SS-1 Market Area Storage 4/ | SS-1 | 2,076 | 4/30/2020 |
| Texas Eastern SS-1 Market Area Storage 4/ | SS-1 | 15,572 | 4/30/2020 |
| Dominion GSS N. Summit | FTS-5 | 20,000 | 3/31/2020 |
| Dominion GSS N. Summit | FTS-5 | 15,000 | 3/31/2020 |
| Dominion GSS Apec | FTS-5 | 15,000 | 3/31/2020 |
| Dominion GSS-TE Storage | FTS-8 | 14,771 | 3/31/2020 |
| GSS "Apec" | FT-GSS | 15,000 | 3/31/2022 |
| DTI GSS | FT-GSS | 100,000 | 3/31/2022 |
| Winter Peaking Service |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total (Flowing Gas to City Gate, Deliveries from Storage, and Winter Peaking Service) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 985,810 |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ Capacity used to deliver gas to pipelines that deliver to the citygate. |  |  |  |
| * Contract does NOT have renewal rights. |  |  |  |
| 2/ The actual max daily contract volume is $154,287 \mathrm{dt} / \mathrm{day}, 30,303 \mathrm{dt} /$ day is released to the Brooklyn Navy Yard. <br> $3 / \mathrm{MDQ}$ is $36,225 \mathrm{dth} /$ day <br> 4/ Bundled Transportation and Storage contracts. |  |  |  |

Exhibit __ (EDA-3)
KEDNY \& KEDLI Storage Contracts

## KEDNY Storage Contracts

| Storage Company Name | Rate Schedule | MDWQ Dth/Day | Expiration Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Area Storage |  |  |  |
| Transco | GSS | 180,137 | 3/31/2023 |
| Transco | LSS (1) | 31,940 | 3/31/2023 |
| Transco | S-2 | 22,838 | 4/16/2020 |
| Texas Eastern | SS-1 | 114,190 | 4/30/2024 |
| Equitrans-Keystone | SS-3/STS-1 | 16,193 | 4/1/2020 |
| Tennessee | FS-MA (5) | 20,808 | 10/31/2019 |
| Honeoye | SS-NY (7) | 10,220 | 4/1/2020 |
| Dominion | GSS (3) | 46,351 | 3/31/2023 |
| Dominion | GSS-TE (4) | 32,267 | 3/31/2021 |
| Total |  | 474,944 |  |
| Gulf Coast Storage |  |  |  |
| Transco | WSS (2) | 162,680 | 8/31/2019 |
| Transco | ESS (6) | 54,855 | 4/11/2019 |
| Total |  | 217,535 |  |

** Deliveries do not reflect fuel losses at the Citygate
(1) Extended term of LSS from March 31, 1994 to March 31, 2013 by amendment dated March 31, 2008.
(2) Quantity reduced to 162,680 from 181,819 by amendment dated $5 / 1 / 2011$.
(3) Extended term of GSS to March 31, 2013 by amendment dated July 20, 2006.
(4) Extended term of GSS-TE from March 31, 2006 to March 31, 2013 by amendment dated July 20, 2006.
(5) Extended term of FS-MA to October 31, 2014 by amendment dated August 1, 2008.
(6) Contract volumes reduced to reflect the abandonment of ESS caverns 1-4
(7) The Company cannot withdraw maximum amount from Honeoye Storage due to transportation MDQ

## KEDLI Storage Contracts

| Storage Company Name | Rate <br> Schedule | MDWQ <br> Dth/Day | Expiration <br> Date |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Area Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transco | GSS | 112,484 | $3 / 31 / 2023$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transco | LSS (1) | 19,807 | $3 / 31 / 2023$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transco | SS-2 | 23,184 | $3 / 31 / 2028$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Texas Eastern | SS-1 | 15,572 | $4 / 30 / 2024$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Texas Eastern | SS-1 | 2,076 | $4 / 30 / 2020$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tennessee | FS-MA | 5,202 | $10 / 31 / 2020$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dominion | GSS | 35,814 | $3 / 31 / 2023$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dominion | GSS-TE (3) | 15,000 | $3 / 31 / 2021$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dominion | GSS-N Summit | 35,000 | $3 / 31 / 2022$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dominion | GSS-APEC | 15,000 | $3 / 31 / 2022$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dominion | GSS | 100,000 | $3 / 31 / 2022$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 379,139 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gulf Coast Storage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transco |  | 46,939 | $8 / 31 / 2020$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transco | WSS (2) | 33,074 | $3 / 4 / 2019$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{8 0 , 0 1 3}$ |  |

** Deliveries do not reflect fuel losses at the Citygate
(1) Extended term of LSS from March 31, 1994 to March 31, 2013 by amendment dated March 31, 2008.
(2) Quantity reduced to 46,939 from 52,461 by amendment dated $5 / 1 / 2011$.
(3) Extended term of GSS-TE from March 31, 2006 to March 31, 2011 by amendment dated August 20, 2004.
(4) Contract volumes reduced to reflect the abandonment of ESS caverns 1-4

## Exhibit __ (EDA-4)

KEDNY/KEDLI Projected Monthly Gas Stored Volumes and Dollars for the Rate Year and Data Years Summarized by Market Area, Gulf Coast and LNG storage
Projected Gas Storage Inventory
Twelve Months Ended March 2021

| Market Area |  | Forecast Apr-2020 | Forecast May-2020 | Forecast Jun-2020 | Forecast Jul-2020 |  | Forecast Aug-2020 | Forecast <br> Sep-2020 | Forecast Oct-2020 |  | Forecast Nov-2020 |  | Forecast <br> Dec-2020 |  | Forecast <br> Jan-202 |  | Forecast <br> Feb-2021 |  | Forecast Mar-2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beginning Inventory |  | 686,000 | 3,864,000 | 13,632,000 | 23,109,000 |  | 32,356,000 | 41,675,000 | 50,763,000 |  | 59,072,000 |  | ,950,000 |  | 44,896,000 |  | 24,834,000 |  | 730,000 |
| Injections |  | 3,613,000 | 9,768,000 | 9,477,000 | 9,247,000 |  | 9,319,000 | 9,088,000 | 8,308,000 |  | 1,484,000 |  | 5,000 |  |  |  |  |  | 5,000 |
| Withdrawal |  | 5,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,605,000 |  | 13,059,000 |  | 20,062,000 |  | 16,104,000 |  | 3,000 |
| EndingBalance |  | 3,864,000 | 13,632,000 | 23,109,000 | 32,356,000 |  | 41,675,000 | 50,763,000 | 59,072,000 |  | 57,950,000 |  | 44,896,000 |  | 24,834,000 |  | 8,730,000 |  | 773,000 |
| \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning Inventory | \$ | 1,691,000 | 8,892,000 | \$ 29,119,000 | 48,739,000 | \$ | 67,490,000 | \$ 86,405,000 | \$ 103,414,000 | \$ | 118,808,000 | \$ | 116,746,000 | \$ | 90,485,000 | \$ | 49,992,000 | \$ | 17,642,000 |
| Injections | \$ | 8,172,000 | \$ 20,227,000 | \$ 19,620,000 | \$ 18,751,000 | \$ | 18,915,000 | \$ 17,008,000 | \$ 15,395,000 | \$ | 3,212,000 | \$ | 12,000 | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | 13,000 |
| Withdrawals | \$ | 971,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 5,275,000 | \$ | 26,273,000 | \$ | 40,493,000 | \$ | 32,350,000 | \$ | 15,967,000 |
| EndingBalance | \$ | 8,892,000 | \$ 29,119,000 | \$ 48,739,000 | \$ 67,490,000 | \$ | 86,405,000 | \$ 103,414,000 | \$118,808,000 | \$ | 116,746,000 | \$ | 90,485,000 | \$ | 49,992,000 | \$ | 17,642,000 | \$ | 1,688,000 |
| Average Rate | \$ | 2.3012 | 2.1361 | 2.1091 | 2.0859 | \$ | 2.0733 | 2.0372 | 2.0112 | \$ | 2.0146 | \$ | 2.0154 | \$ | 2.0130 | \$ | 2.0208 | \$ | 2.1837 |


| Gulf Coast |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Forecast } \\ & \text { Apr-2020 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Forecast } \\ & \text { May-2020 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Forecast } \\ & \text { Jun-2020 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Forecast } \\ & \text { Jul-2020 } \end{aligned}$ |  | Forecast Aug-2020 |  | Forecast Sep-2020 |  | Forecast Oct-2020 |  | Forecast Nov-2020 |  | Forecast Dec-2020 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Forecast } \\ & \text { Jan-2021 } \end{aligned}$ |  | Forecast Feb-2021 |  | Forecast Mar-2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beginning $\frac{\text { Dth }}{\text { Inventory }}$ |  | 2,553,000 |  | 2,767,000 |  | 3,397,000 |  | 3,611,000 |  | 3,616,000 |  | 3,616,000 |  | 3,831,000 |  | 4,053,000 |  | 4,053,000 |  | 4,053,000 |  | 4,053,000 |  | 4,053,000 |
| Injections |  | 214,000 |  | 629,000 |  | 214,000 |  | 5,000 |  |  |  | 214,000 |  | 222,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Withdrawals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,500,000 |
| EndingBalance |  | 2,767,000 |  | 3,397,000 |  | 3,611,000 |  | 3,616,000 |  | 3,616,000 |  | 3,831,000 |  | 4,053,000 |  | 4,053,000 |  | 4,053,000 |  | 4,053,000 |  | 4,053,000 |  | 2,553,000 |
| \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning Inventory | \$ | 6,696,000 | \$ | 7,239,000 | \$ | 8,814,000 | \$ | 9,353,000 | \$ | 9,366,000 | \$ | 9,366,000 | \$ | 9,902,000 | \$ | 10,457,000 | \$ | 10,457,000 | \$ | 10,457,000 | \$ | 10,457,000 | \$ | 10,457,000 |
| Injections | \$ | 543,000 |  | 1,576,000 |  | 538,000 |  | 13,000 |  |  | \$ | 536,000 | \$ | 555,000 | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  |
| Withdrawals | \$ |  |  |  |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 3,870,000 |
| EndingBalance | \$ | 7,239,000 | \$ | 8,814,000 | \$ | 9,353,000 | \$ | 9,366,000 |  | 9,366,000 | \$ | 9,902,000 |  | 10,457,000 | \$ | 10,457,000 | \$ | 10,457,000 | \$ | 10,457,000 | \$ | 10,457,000 | \$ | 6,587,000 |
| Average Rate | \$ | 2.6162 | \$ | 2.5946 | \$ | 2.5901 | \$ | 2.5902 | \$ | 2.5902 | \$ | 2.5847 | \$ | 2.5801 | \$ | 2.5801 | \$ | 2.5801 | \$ | 2.5801 | \$ | 2.5801 | \$ | 2.5801 |


| LNG |  | Forecast Apr-2020 |  | Forecast May-2020 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Forecast } \\ & \text { Jun-2020 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Forecast } \\ & \text { Jul-2020 } \end{aligned}$ |  | Forecast Aug-2020 |  | Forecast Sep-2020 |  | Forecast <br> Oct-2020 |  | Forecast <br> Nov-2020 |  | Forecast <br> Dec-2020 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Forecast } \\ & \text { Jan-2021 } \end{aligned}$ |  | Forecast Feb-2021 |  | Forecast Mar-2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beginning $\frac{\text { Dth }}{}$ |  | 2,191000 |  | 211300 |  | 2077000 |  | 199900 |  | 191800 |  | 2040 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2,19,0. |  | 44,000 |  | 2,077,000 |  | 1,99,00. |  | 202,000 |  | 245,000 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 2,207,000 \\ 169,000 \end{array}$ |  |  |  | 2,298,000 |  | 2,268,000 |  | 2,236,000 |  | $2,207,000$ 12,000 |
| Withdrawals |  | 78,000 |  | 80,000 |  | 78,000 |  | 80,000 |  | 80,000 |  | 78,000 |  | 80,000 |  | 26,000 |  | 30,000 |  | 32,000 |  | 29,000 |  | 27,000 |
| EndingBalance |  | 2,113,000 |  | 2,077,000 |  | 1,999,000 |  | 1,918,000 |  | 2,040,000 |  | 2,207,000 |  | 2,295,000 |  | 2,298,000 |  | 2,268,000 |  | 2,236,000 |  | 2,207,000 |  | 2,192,000 |
| \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning Inventory | \$ | 4,671,000 | \$ | 4,504,000 |  | 4,418,000 | \$ | 4,252,000 |  | 4,081,000 | \$ | 4,293,000 | \$ | 4,555,000 | \$ | 4,681,000 | \$ | 4,686,000 | \$ | 4,624,000 | \$ | 4,559,000 | \$ | 4,501,000 |
| Injections | \$ |  | \$ | 85,000 | \$ |  | \$ | - | \$ | 382,000 | \$ | 424,000 | \$ | 291,000 | \$ | 59,000 | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | 27,000 |
| Withdrawals | \$ | 166,000 | \$ | 172,000 | \$ | 166,000 | \$ | 171,000 | \$ | 170,000 | \$ | 162,000 | \$ | 165,000 | \$ | 53,000 | \$ | 62,000 | \$ | 65,000 | \$ | 58,000 | \$ | 55,000 |
| EndingBalance | \$ | 4,504,000 | \$ | 4,418,000 | \$ | 4,252,000 | \$ | 4,081,000 | \$ | 4,293,000 | \$ | 4,555,000 | \$ | 4,681,000 | \$ | 4,686,000 | \$ | 4,624,000 | \$ | 4,559,000 | \$ | 4,501,000 | \$ | 4,472,000 |
| Average Rate | \$ | 2.1316 | \$ | 2.1271 | \$ | 2.1271 | \$ | 2.1277 | \$ | 2.1044 | \$ | 2.0639 | \$ | 2.0397 | \$ | 2.0392 | \$ | 2.0388 | \$ | 2.0389 | \$ | 2.0394 | \$ | 2.0401 |

## Projected Gas Storage Inventory

Twelve Months Ended March 2022


| Gulf Coast |  | Forecast Apr-2021 |  | Forecast May-2021 |  | Forecast Jun-2021 |  | Forecast Jul-2021 |  | Forecast Aug-2021 |  | Forecast Sep-2021 |  | Forecast Oct-2021 |  | Forecast Nov-2021 |  | Forecast Dec-2021 |  | Forecast Jan-2022 |  | Forecast Feb-2022 |  | Forecast Mar-2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beginning Inventory |  | 2,553,00 |  | 2,767,000 |  | 3,397,000 |  | 3,616,000 |  | 3,838,000 |  | 3,838,000 |  | 4,053,000 |  | 4,053,000 |  | 4,053,000 |  | 4,053,000 |  | 4,053,000 |  | 4,053,000 |
| Injections |  | 214,000 |  | 629 |  | 220 |  | 222 |  |  |  | 214 |  |  |  | - |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |
| Withdrawals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  | - |  | - |  | ,500 |
| EndingBalance |  | 2,767,000 |  | 3,397,000 |  | 3,616,000 |  | 3,838,000 |  | 3,838,000 |  | 4,053,000 |  | 4,053,000 |  | 4,053,000 |  | 4,053,000 |  | 4,053,000 |  | 4,053,000 |  | 2,553,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\$$ |  | 6587000 |  |  |  | 8,650,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \$ | 6,587,000 |  | 7,113,000 |  | 8,650,000 | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ | 10,274,000 |  | ,274,000 | \$ | 10,274,000 | \$ | 10,274,000 | \$ | 10,274,000 | \$ | ,074,000 |
| Withdrawals | \$ | ${ }^{526,000}$ |  | 1,537,000 |  | 54,000 | \$ | 56,00 | \$ | - | \$ | 53,00 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 3,802,000 |
| EndingBalance | \$ | 7,113,000 | \$ | 8,650,000 | \$ | 9,192,000 | \$ | 9,742,000 | \$ | 9,742,000 |  | 10,274,000 | \$ | 10,274,000 | \$ | 10,274,000 | \$ | 10,274,000 | \$ | 10,274,000 | \$ | 10,274,000 | \$ | 6,472,000 |
| Average Rate | s | 2.5707 | s | 2.5464 | \$ | 2.5420 | \$ | 2.5383 | \$ | 2.5383 | \$ | 2.5349 | \$ | 2.5349 | \$ | 2.5349 | \$ | 2.5349 | \$ | 2.5349 | \$ | 2.5349 | \$ | 2.5351 |


Projected Gas Storage Inventory
Twelve Months Ended March 2023




## Projected Gas Storage Inventory

Twelve Months Ended March 2024

| Market Area |  | Forecast Apr－2023 | Forecast <br> May－2023 | Forecast Jun－2023 |  | Forecast Jul－2023 |  | Forecast Aug－2023 | Forecast Sep－2023 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Forecast } \\ & \text { Oct-2023 } \end{aligned}$ |  | Forecast Nov－2023 |  | Forecast Dec－2023 |  | Forecast Jan－2024 |  | Forecast Feb－2024 |  | Forecast Mar－2024 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beginning $\frac{\text { Dth }}{\text { Inventory }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| （ ${ }^{\text {Beginning }}$ Inventory |  | 2，491，000 | 4，981，000 | 15，181，000 |  | 24，701，000 |  | 34，082，000 | 43，027，000 | 51，866，000 |  | 59，893，000 |  | 58，224，000 |  | 45，579，000 |  | 26，924，000 |  | $1,481,000$ 9,000 |
| Withdrawals |  | 127，000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3，151，000 |  | 12，650，000 |  | 18，655，000 |  | 15，443，000 |  | 9，366，000 |
| EndingBalance |  | 4，981，000 | 15，181，000 | 24，701，000 |  | 34，082，000 |  | 43，027，000 | 51，866，000 | 59，893，000 |  | 58，224，000 |  | 45，579，000 |  | 26，924，000 |  | 11，481，000 |  | 2，123，000 |
| \＄ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beginning Inventory | \＄ | 4，942，000 | \＄10，352，000 | \＄30，893，000 | \＄ | 50，066，000 | \＄ | 68，252，000 | \＄85，553，000 | \＄101，113，000 | \＄ | 116，051，000 | \＄ | 113，056，000 | \＄ | 88，570，000 | \＄ | 52，389，000 | \＄ | 22，506，000 |
| Injections | \＄ | 5，650，000 | \＄20，541，000 | \＄19，172，000 | \＄ | 18，187，000 | \＄ | 17，301，000 | \＄15，560，000 | \＄14，938，000 | \＄ | 3，095，000 |  | 11，000 | \＄ |  | \＄ | 1，000 | \＄ | 21，000 |
| Withdrawals | \＄ | 240，000 | \＄ | \＄ | \＄ |  | \＄ |  |  |  | \＄ | 6，089，000 | \＄ | 24，498，000 | \＄ | 36，181，000 | \＄ | 29，884，000 | \＄ | 18，183，000 |
| EndingBalance | \＄ | 10，352，000 | \＄30，893，000 | \＄50，066，000 | \＄ | 68，252，000 | \＄ | 85，553，000 | \＄101，113，000 | \＄116，051，000 | \＄ | 113，056，000 | \＄ | 88，570，000 | \＄ | 52，389，000 | \＄ | 22，506，000 | \＄ | 4，344，000 |
| Average Rate | \＄ | 2.0783 | 2.0350 | 2.0269 | \＄ | 2.0026 | \＄ | 1.9884 | 1.9495 | 1.9376 | \＄ | 1.9417 | \＄ | 1.9432 | \＄ | 1.9458 | \＄ | 1.9603 | \＄ | 2.0462 |




## Exhibit __ (EDA-5)

KEDNY/KEDLI Purchased Gas Expense for the Twelve Months Ending ("TME") December 31, 2018
Note: No hedging costs/credits included.

## Exhibit __ (EDA-6)

KEDNY/KEDLI Forecast of Variable Gas Expense for the TME March 31, 2021, 2022, 2023 and 2024



## Exhibit __ (EDA-7)

KEDNY/KEDLI Forecast of Purchased Gas Expense for the TME March 31, 2021, 2022, 2023 and 2024


KEDNY / KEDLI



Exhibit __ (EDA-8)
KEDNY \& KEDLI Estimated Marginal Commodity Cost of Gas

## KEDNY

## Estimated Marginal Commodity Cost of Gas

For Period: November 1, 2020 through March 31, 2021
(\$ / dt )

| Nov-16 | $\underline{\text { Dec-16 }}$ | $\underline{\text { Jan-17 }}$ | Feb-17 | Mar-17 | Winter <br> (Nov-Mar) <br> Average |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\$$ | 2.67 | $\$$ | 3.37 | $\$$ | 5.64 | $\$$ | 5.54 | $\$$ |

## KEDLI

## Estimated Marginal Commodity Cost of Gas

For Period: November 1, 2020 through March 31, 2021 (\$ / dt )

| Nov-16 | $\underline{\text { Dec-16 }}$ | $\underline{\text { Jan-17 }}$ | $\underline{\text { Feb-17 }}$ | $\underline{\text { Mar-17 }}$ | Winter <br> (Nov-Mar) <br> Average |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\$$ | 2.67 | $\$$ | 3.37 | $\$$ | 5.64 | $\$$ | 5.54 | $\$$ |

## Exhibit __ (EDA-9)

KEDNY \& KEDLI Estimated Annualized Marginal Capacity Cost of Gas

## KEDNY

Estimated Annualized Marginal Capacity Cost of Gas For Period: November 1, 2020 through March 31, 2021

Units (\$ per dt)

|  | Peak Day |  | Annual Capacity Costs |  |  | Peak Day <br> Capacity Costs \$/dt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Marginal Supplies | Quantity dt/day |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost } \\ \$ \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Quantity } \\ \mathrm{dt} \end{gathered}$ | Unitized \$/dt |  |
| Transco NESE Project | 400,000 | \$ | 176,880,000 | 134,000,000 | \$1.32 | \$442.20 |
| 15 Day City Gate Peaking Supplies | 160,468 | \$ | 8,856,378 | 2,407,020 | \$3.68 | \$55.19 |
| Grand Total | 560,468 |  | 185,736,378 | 136,407,020 | \$1.36 | \$331.40 |
| Annualized Marginal Capacity Cost of Gas |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Peak Day Capacity Cost
Ratio: Peak Day Requirements to Annual Normalized Firm Sales Annual Marginal Capacity Cost
$\$ 331.40$ per dt
1 to 72 dt
$\$ 4.48$ per dt

KEDLI
Estimated Annualized Marginal Capacity Cost of Gas

## For Period: November 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017

 Units (\$ per dt)| Marginal Supplies | Peak Day |  | Annual Capacity Costs |  |  | Peak Day Capacity Costs \$/dt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Quantity dt/day |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost } \\ \$ \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Quantity } \\ \mathrm{dt} \end{gathered}$ | Unitized \$/dt |  |
| DTI New Market Project | 400,000 | \$ | 176,880,000 | 146,000,000 | \$1.21 | \$442.20 |
| 15 Day City Gate Peaking Supplies | 160,468 | \$ | 8,856,378 | 2,407,020 | \$3.68 | \$55.19 |
| Grand Total | 560,468 |  | 185,736,378 | 148,407,020 | \$1.25 | \$331.40 |
| Annualized Marginal Capacity Cost of Gas |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Peak Day Capacity Cost

Ratio: Peak Day Requirements to Annual Normalized Firm Sales
Annual Marginal Capacity Cost
$\$ 331.40$ per dt
1 to 72 dt
$\$ 4.48$ per dt

Exhibit __ (EDA-10)
KEDNY \& KEDLI Non-Migration Capacity Release Revenues

KEDNY \& KEDLI Non-Migration Capacity Release Revenues
KEDNY

|  | Total Margin | Customer Share | Nat Grid Share |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Apr 14-Mar 15 | $\$ 4,392,667$ | $\$ 3,733,767$ | $\$ 658,900$ |
| Apr 15-Mar 16 | $\$ 5,278,667$ | $\$ 4,486,867$ | $\$ 791,800$ |
| Apr 16-Mar 17 | $\$ 4,898,667$ | $\$ 4,163,867$ | $\$ 734,800$ |
| Apr 17-Mar 18 | $\$ 3,538,000$ | $\$ 3,007,300$ | $\$ 530,700$ |
| Apr 18-Jan 19 | $\$ 4,380,000$ | $\$ 3,723,000$ | $\$ 657,000$ |
| Total: | $\$ \mathbf{2 2 , 4 8 8 , 0 0 0}$ | $\$ \mathbf{1 9 , 1 1 4 , 8 0 0}$ | $\$ \mathbf{3 7 3}$ |

KEDLI

|  | Total Margin | Customer Share | Nat Grid Share |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Apr 14-Mar 15 | $\$ 3,148,667$ | $\$ 2,676,367$ | $\$ 472,300$ |
| Apr 15-Mar 16 | $\$ 3,318,000$ | $\$ 2,820,300$ | $\$ 497,700$ |
| Apr 16-Mar 17 | $\$ 3,304,000$ | $\$ 2,808,400$ | $\$ 495,600$ |
| Apr 17-Mar 18 | $\$ 2,364,000$ | $\$ 2,009,400$ | $\$ 354,600$ |
| Apr 18-Jan 19 | $\$ 2,891,333$ | $\$ 2,457,633$ | $\$ 433,700$ |
| Total: | $\$ \mathbf{1 5 , 0 2 6 , 0 0 0}$ | $\$ \mathbf{1 2 , 7 7 2 , 1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 2 5 3 , 9 0 0}$ |

Exhibit __ (EDA-11)
KEDNY \& KEDLI Off-System Sales ("OSS") Transaction Revenues

KEDNY \& KEDLI OSS Transaction Revenues
Exhibit_(EDA-11)
Page 1 of 1
KEDNY

|  |  | Total Margin | Customer Share | Nat Grid Share |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Apr 14-Mar 15 | OSS Sales | \$14,983,333 | \$12,735,833 | \$2,247,500 |
|  | Capacity Release | \$4,392,667 | \$3,733,767 | \$658,900 |
|  | AMA's | \$14,934,667 | \$12,694,467 | \$2,240,200 |
|  | Total | \$34,310,667 | \$29,164,067 | \$5,146,600 |
| Apr 15-Mar 16 | OSS Sales | \$28,524,000 | \$24,245,400 | \$4,278,600 |
|  | Capacity Release | \$5,278,667 | \$4,486,867 | \$791,800 |
|  | AMA's | \$13,758,000 | \$11,694,300 | \$2,063,700 |
|  | Total | \$47,560,667 | \$40,426,567 | \$7,134,100 |
| Apr 16-Mar 17 | OSS Sales | \$14,092,000 | \$11,978,200 | \$2,113,800 |
|  | Capacity Release | \$4,898,667 | \$4,163,867 | \$734,800 |
|  | AMA's | \$11,064,000 | \$9,404,400 | \$1,659,600 |
|  | Total | \$30,054,667 | \$25,546,467 | \$4,508,200 |
| Apr 17-Mar 18 | OSS Sales | \$20,882,000 | \$17,749,700 | \$3,132,300 |
|  | Capacity Release | \$3,538,000 | \$3,007,300 | \$530,700 |
|  | AMA's | \$9,731,333 | \$8,271,633 | \$1,459,700 |
|  | Total | \$34,151,333 | \$29,028,633 | \$5,122,700 |
| Apr 18-Jan 19 | OSS Sales | \$13,009,333 | \$11,057,933 | \$1,951,400 |
|  | Capacity Release | \$4,380,000 | \$3,723,000 | \$657,000 |
|  | AMA's | \$7,186,667 | \$6,108,667 | \$1,078,000 |
|  | Total | \$24,576,000 | \$20,889,600 | \$3,686,400 |
|  | Grand Total: | \$170,653,333 | \$145,055,333 | \$25,598,000 |

KEDLI

| Apr 14-Mar 15 |  | Total Margin | Customer Share | Nat Grid Share |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | OSS Sales | \$9,972,667 | \$8,476,767 | \$1,495,900 |
|  | Capacity Release | \$3,148,667 | \$2,676,367 | \$472,300 |
|  | AMA's | \$10,210,000 | \$8,678,500 | \$1,531,500 |
|  | Total | \$23,331,333 | \$19,831,633 | \$3,499,700 |
| Apr 15-Mar 16 | OSS Sales | \$17,931,333 | \$15,241,633 | \$2,689,700 |
|  | Capacity Release | \$3,318,000 | \$2,820,300 | \$497,700 |
|  | AMA's | \$8,648,667 | \$7,351,367 | \$1,297,300 |
|  | Total | \$29,898,000 | \$25,413,300 | \$4,484,700 |
| Apr 16-Mar 17 | OSS Sales | \$9,426,667 | \$8,012,667 | \$1,414,000 |
|  | Capacity Release | \$3,304,000 | \$2,808,400 | \$495,600 |
|  | AMA's | \$7,487,333 | \$6,364,233 | \$1,123,100 |
|  | Total | \$20,218,000 | \$17,185,300 | \$3,032,700 |
| Apr 17-Mar 18 | OSS Sales | \$14,121,333 | \$12,003,133 | \$2,118,200 |
|  | Capacity Release | \$2,364,000 | \$2,009,400 | \$354,600 |
|  | AMA's | \$7,402,933 | \$6,437,333 | \$965,600 |
|  | Total | \$23,888,267 | \$20,449,867 | \$3,438,400 |
| Apr 18-Jan 19 | OSS Sales | \$8,532,000 | \$7,252,200 | \$1,279,800 |
|  | Capacity Release | \$2,891,333 | \$2,457,633 | \$433,700 |
|  | AMA's | \$4,755,333 | \$4,042,033 | \$713,300 |
|  | Total | \$16,178,667 | \$13,751,867 | \$2,426,800 |
|  | Grand Total: | \$113,514,267 | \$96,631,967 | \$16,882,300 |


[^0]:    Q. Did the Companies modify the TC/IT penalties as suggested in the non-firm service collaborative in Cases 16-G-0058 and 16-G-0059?
    A. Yes. The Companies submitted revised tariff leaves for changing the current penalties from:

    - the higher of (i) two times the sum of the market gas price plus the applicable IT or TC transportation rate; or (ii) nine times the applicable IT or TC sales rate, to
    - the lower of (i) two times the sum of the market gas rate plus the applicable or IT or TC transportation rate; or (ii) nine times the applicable IT or TC sales rate

