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## $\vec{y}$

## Long Island T\&D

## YTD favorability due to LIPA storm receivables

| Month |  | Year to Date |  |  | \$millions | Annual |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual | $\begin{gathered} \text { Variance to } \\ \hline \text { Cntrl Fcst } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Actual | Variance to |  |  | FCST | Variance to |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Cntri Fcst | 2008/09 |  |  | Prev Fcst | Budget | Cntrl Fcst | 2008/09 |
| 3.4 | 0.4 | 17.5 | 1.9 | (4.2) | Base PR incl TNW | 39.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | (4.8) |
| 0.6 | (0.2) | 4.2 | (2.2) | (1.4) | Overtime | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.4 |
| 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.8 | Misc Pay \& Empl Expense | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| 4.1 | 0.2 | 22.1 | 0.0 | (4.7) | Employee Costs | 44.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | (0.9) |
| 0.5 | 0.1 | 2.5 | 0.8 | 0.4 | Materials | 6.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (1.8) |
| 1.6 | (0.1) | 10.1 | (0.9) | (3.6) | Consultant/Contractor | 19.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 |
| 0.3 | 0.4 | 3.4 | 1.4 | (0.1) | Transportation | 9.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (1.2) |
| 0.9 | (0.4) | 3.6 | (0.2) | 0.8 | Other | 6.7 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 2.5 |
| 7.4 | 0.3 | 41.6 | 1.1 | (7.3) | Total O\&M Costs | 86.2 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Allocation By Segment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7.0 | 0.5 | 40.3 | 1.2 | (7.0) | Distribution | 83.8 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| 0.3 | (0.2) | 0.4 | (0.2) | (0.3) | Gas | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (0.2) |
| 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Generation | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (0.2) |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (0.0) | (0.0) | Transmission | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Other | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
| 7.4 | 0.3 | 41.6 | 1.1 | (7.3) | Total | 86.2 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Allocation By Work |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.4 | 0.1 | 8.8 | (0.5) |  | LI Construction Delivery | 16.6 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |  |
| 0.2 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.7 |  | LI Distrib Support | 3.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| 1.2 | 0.1 | 6.7 | 0.3 |  | LI Elec Lines | 14.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |  |
| 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.5 | (0.5) |  | LI Elec Plan Ops | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.3 | (0.1) |  | LI Investmt Mgmt | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| 0.3 | (0.1) | 0.9 | 0.2 |  | LI Network Strat Eng | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.7 |  | LI VP Network Strategy | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| 0.0 | (0.0) | 0.1 | 0.0 |  | LI Program Mgmt | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| 1.5 | (0.1) | 8.2 | (0.5) |  | LI Sub Prot Tele | 15.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| 2.5 | 0.3 | 14.5 | 1.0 |  | LI System Ops | 31.4 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |  |
| 0.1 | (0.0) | 0.5 | (0.3) |  | LI VP T\&D Management | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | LI-Dist Stand\&Work Methods | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| 7.4 | 0.3 | 41.6 | 1.1 | n/a | Total | 86.2 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | n/a |

## Continuing Generation
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## Continuing Generation

YTD overspending due to timing \& modifications to outage schedule;
September 2009
also costs associated with repairs to EF Barrett GT \& Holtsville sites

| Month |  | Year to Date |  |  | Smillions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Variance to |  | Varia |  |  |
| Actual | Cntrl Fcst | Actual | Cntrl Fcst | 2008/09 |  |
| 4.7 | (0.0) | 23.3 | 0.9 | (6.5) | Base PR incl TNW |
| 0.6 | (0.1) | 3.6 | (1.2) | (0.5) | Overtime |
| 0.1 | (0.1) | 0.4 | (0.4) | (0.3) | Misc Pay \& Empl Expense |
| 5.3 | (0.2) | 27.3 | (0.8) | (7.3) | Net Employee Costs |
| (0.1) | 0.7 | 6.6 | (0.5) | (0.9) | Materials |
| 0.3 | 0.5 | 6.1 | 5.5 | (3.3) | ConsultanUContractor |
| 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.2 | (0.6) | Transportation |
| 1.2 | (0.2) | 5.7 | (5.4) | 2.2 | Other |
| 6.8 | 0.9 | 46.2 | (1.0) | (9.9). | Total 0\&M Costs |


| Annual |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FCST | Variance to |  |  |  |
|  | Prev Fcst | Budget | Cntrl Fcst | 2008/09 |
| 48.9 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | (7.8) |
| 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 |
| (0.0) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| 53.4 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | (5.6) |
| 13.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (4.7) |
| 21.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (15.6) |
| 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (1.7) |
| (0.0) | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 19.5 |
| 89.3 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | (8.1) |


|  |  | Allocation By Segment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0.2 | $(0.0)$ | 1.0 | $(0.1)$ | $(0.2)$ | Distribution | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.0 | $(0.0)$ | 0.1 | $(0.1)$ | 0.2 | Gas | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| 6.6 | 0.9 | 45.1 | $(0.9)$ | $(9.9)$ | Generation | 0.1 | 0.0 | $(0.0)$ | 0.0 |
| 0.0 | $(0.0)$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Other | 87.5 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 |
| 6.8 | 0.9 | 46.2 | $(1.0)$ | $(9.9)$ | Total | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

## Niagara Mohawk Inspection Maintenance

| NY INSPECTION MAINTENANCE SUMMARY | NY Central | NY East | NY West | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FY10 Budget - Based on MAT as of June 2008 (Normal Ops O\&M) | 1,516,052 | 1,836,235 | 1,53, , 463 | 4,883,751 |
| FY10 Forecasted Cap Related O\&M Funding - To be confirmed with Mary Fuller | 1,377,052 | 1,594,272 | 994,375 | 3,965,699 |
| Total FY10 Funding | 2,893,104 | 3,430,508 | 2,525,838 | 8,849,450 |
| FY10 YTD Actuals by Project |  |  |  |  |
| E02588 Touch Potential Tests \& Insp |  | 104,875 |  | 104,875 |
| E07209 FH - NE D-Line Work Found by Insp | 615 | 1,590,290 |  | 1,590,905 |
| E07210 FH - NC D-Line Work Found by Insp | 1,416,811 | 2 |  | 1,416,813 |
| E07211 FH - NW D-Line Work Found by Insp | 1,567 |  | 1,240,254 | 1,241,821 |
| E07212 FH - NE UG Work Found by Insp |  | 28,450 |  | 28,450 |
| E07213 FH-NC UG Work Found by Insp | 13,552 |  |  | 13,552 |
| E07214 FH - NW UG Work Found by Insp |  |  | 47,421 | 47,421 |
| E07216 FH - NC SubT Work Found by Insp. | 2,764 |  |  | 2,764 |
| E07309 NY Inspection Project Forecast | 3,209 | 8,202 | 794 | 12,204 |
| ENC008 Cent NY - Dist - PM - B Maint | 37.299 |  |  | 37,299 |
| ENE008 East NY - Dist - PM - B Maint |  | 18,136 |  | 18.136 |
| Total FY10 - As of September 30, 2009 | 1,475,817 | 1,749,955 | 1,288,469 | 4,514,241 |
| FY10 YTD Actuals by Expense Type |  |  |  |  |
| 110 Contractors | 738,827 | 962,568 | 472,971 | 2,174,366 |
| 200 Employee Expenses | 827 | 1,824 | 3,957 | 6,608 |
| 400 Other |  | 240 | 1,195 | 1,435 |
| A70 Sales Tax | 9,305 | 12,015 | 14,904 | 36,224 |
| M10 Materials Outside Vendor |  | 2,330 | 1,981 | 4,311 |
| M20 Materials From Inventory | 133,935 | 172,286 | 196,697 | 502,918 |
| M50 Materials Stores Handling | 21,364 | 26,376 | 31,542 | 79,282 |
| P10 Regular Pay Weekly | 360,372 | 379,166 | 375,781 | 1,115,318 |
| P20 Base OT Pay Weekly | 24,779 | 22,831 | 18,930 | 66,539 |
| P21 Incremental OT Pay Weekly | 13,159 | 11,644 | 10,667 | 35,469 |
| P50 Time Not Worked | 70,052 | 72,352 | 71,004 | 213,409 |
| T10 Transportation | 103.198 | 86,323 | 88,842 | 278,362 |
| Total FY10 - As of September 30, 2009 | 1,476,817 | 1,749,955 | 1,288,469 | 4,514,241 |
| Available Funding through September 30, 2009 | 1,446,552 | 1,715,254 | 1,262,919 | 4,424,725 |
| Total FY10 as of Sept 30, 2009 (as shown above) | 1,475,817 | 1,749,955 | 1.288,469 | 4,514,241 |
| YTD Variance - (Over) I Under | $(29,265)$ | $(34,701)$ | (25,550) | $(89,516)$ |

## FTEs

|  |  | September 2009DistualTran Gen Gas |  |  |  | Total |  | September 2009 - Budget |  |  | Total | Actual (Over) Under Budget |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Dist | Tran | Gen | Gas | Dist |  | Tran | Gen | Gas |  |
| cOO Exac Non Represented |  | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 7 | 8 | COO Exec |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Represented |  | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Network Strategy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Represented |  | 273 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 302 | 226 | 1 | - | 0 | 227 | (47) | (28) | 0 | 0 | (75) |
|  | Total | 538 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 648 | 523 | 47 | 2 | 0 | 573 | (15) | (63) | 2 | 0 | (75) |
| Program Management |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Represented |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | Total | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 4 | (1) | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Operations - Legacy Grid |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non Represented |  | 365 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 463 | 354 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 464 | (11) | 12 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 1 |
| Represented |  | 1,971 | 237 | 0 | 3 | 2.212 | 1,957 | 258 | 0 | 4 | 2,220 | (14) | 21 | $\bigcirc$ | 1 | 8 |
|  | Total | 2,336 | 336 | 0 | 4 | 2,675 | 2,311 | 368 | 0 | 5 | 2,684 | (25) | 33 | 0 | 1 | 9 |
| Operations - LI T\&D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Represented |  | 743 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 743 | 799 | o | - | 0 | 799 | 56 | - | 0 | 0 | 56 |
|  | Total | 1,079 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,079 | 1,145 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,146 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |
| Construction Delivery |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Represented |  | 85 | 7 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 92 | 46 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 51 | (39) | (2) | 0 | 0 | (41) |
|  | Total | 201 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 212 | 170 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 179 | (31) | (2) | (0) | 0 | (33) |
| Distribution Support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Represented |  | 185 | 1 | $\bigcirc$ | - | 186 | 127 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 134 | (58) | 4 | 0 | 2 | (52) |
|  | Total | 409 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 413 | 366 | 10 | 2 | 9 | 387 | (43) | 6 | 2 | 9 | (26) |
| Operations Performance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non Represented |  | 16 | 0 | 0 | o | 15 | 22 | 0 | 0 | - | 22 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Represented |  | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ |
|  | Total | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Generation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Represented |  | 0 | 0 | 499 | 0 | 499 | 0 | 0 | 529 | 0 | 529 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 30 |
|  | Total | 0 | 0 | 698 | 0 | 698 | 0 | 0 | 747 | 0 | 747 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 49 |
| Total All Functions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Represented |  | 3,257 | 274 | 499 | 3 | 4,034 | 3,756 | 269 | 529 | 6 | 3,961 | (101) | (5) | 30 |  | (73) |
|  | Total | 4,603 | 461 | 698 | 4 | 5,766 | 4,667 | 434 | 761 | 15 | 5,766 | (36) | (28) | 53 | 11 | 0 |
| Pending FTE Adjustments: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution Support All Long Island T\&D |  |  | Lab \& Testing outsourcing has been limited to 5 position form 48 in original business case Temps included above ( 13 Cust Ops, 5 Gen Ops, 5 LI T\&D, 16 Network Strategy, 2 Ops Performance, 1 Distribution Support \& 1 Construction Delivery Increase FTE budget by 2. Increase comes form the Transformation team |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adjusted FTE Favor | bility |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 86 |

Customer Operations:
Network Strategy:

Budgeted FTE's will increase by 42 positions in October. This includes 12 for Distribution \& 30 for Transmission. Cher Warren included in NS currently on assignment in UK Lou debrino included in NS, but falls under Davi Pretyman's group
nationalgrid
The power of action.

## Electric Distribution and Generation Operations - Capex detail



For the period anding September 30, 2009
nationalgrid
The power of action.

## Results against $\$ 1.47 \mathrm{~b}$ NY Commitment

Total T\&D Commitment for CY 2009 is $\$ 300 \mathrm{~m}$. Calendar year to date spend is $\$ \mathbf{2 1 6 m}$, or $\mathbf{7 2 \%}$ of total commitment. Cumulative surplus as of September 2009 is $\$ 59 \mathrm{~m}$.
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## System Total - Capex, Related Opex and Removal Legacy Grid US GAAP - September 09

| Sm | Year to Date - Actual |  |  |  |  | Year to Date - Variance |  |  |  |  | Annual Forecast |  |  |  |  | Forecast Variance to Budget |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Capex | Opex |  | Removal |  | Capex | Opex |  | Removal |  | Capex | Opex |  | Removal |  | Capex Opex |  |  | Removal |  |
|  | \$ | \$ | \% | \$s | \% | \$ | \$\$ | \% | \$\$ | \% | \$\$ | \$\$ | \% | \$\$ | \% | \$\$ | \$ $\$$ | \% | \$5 | \% |
| Distribution Line |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Line Specifics | 31.3 | 3.3 | 10.4\% | 2.9 | 9.4\% | 16.4 | 0.5 | -2.7\% | 2.2 | 1.3\% | 82.8 | 7.2 | 8.7\% | 6.7 | 8.1\% | 14.5 | 0.3 | -1.0\% | 3.7 | 2.6\% |
| Infrastructure-Line <br> Feeder Hardening/\&M | $\begin{array}{r} 30.8 \\ 14.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.5 \\ & 3.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8.2 \% \\ 21.8 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.4 \\ & 1.8 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.0 \% \\ & 12.5 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (3.0) \\ 9.6 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (0.3) \\ 4.9 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.3 \% \\ 11.4 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.1 \\ 1.8 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.6 \% \\ & 2.5 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 52.3 \\ 44.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.2 \\ 10.1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.0 \% \\ 22.9 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.0 \\ & 5.3 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.5 \% \\ & 12.0 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.5 \\ 4.2 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 5.9 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.1 \% \\ 10.3 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.1 \\ & 1.9 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1.1.1\% } \\ & \text { 2.9 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Total REP | 44.9 | 5.6 | 12.4\% | 5.2 | 11.5\% | 6.5 | 4.7 | 7.1\% | 1.9 | 2.2\% | 96.4 | 14.3 | 14.8\% | 11.3 | 11.7\% | 8.6 | 6.2 | 4.7\% | 3.0 | 1.9\% |
| Mandatory Blankets | 64.8 | 6.3 | 9.8\% | 8.1 | 12.5\% | 3.5 | (1.2) | -2.4\% | (0.2) | -0.9\% | 133.5 | 15.2 | 11.4\% | 16.7 | 12.5\% | 5.8 | (4.9) | -4.0\% | (0.6) | -0.9\% |
| Non-Mandatory Blankets | 17.7 | 2.4 | 13.4\% | 3.1 | 17.7\% | (2.0) | (0.5) | -1.4\% | (1.5) | -7.5\% | 31.4 | 3.9 | 12.4\% | 5.2 | 16.6\% | 0.8 | (0.1) | -0.5\% | (1.9) | -6.4\% |
| XfimrMeter Purchases | 22.3 | 0.0 | 0.0\% | 0.1 | 0.4\% | 3.4 | (0.0) | 0.0\% | (0.1) | -0.4\% | 52.3 | 0.0 | 0.0\% | 0.1 | 0.2\% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0\% | (0.1) | -0.2\% |
| Storm Costs | 1.6 | 0.4 | 28.0\% | 0.2 | 10.5\% | 0.1 | (0.2) | -14.8\% | 0.0 | 1.1\% | 3.9 | 0.9 | 23.1\% | 0.4 | 10.3\% | (0.4) | (0.4) | -9.8\% | 0.0 | 1.3\% |
| Total Dist. Line | 182.6 | 18.0 | 9.9\% | 19.6 | 10.7\% | 27.9 | 3.3 | 0.0\% | 2.3 | -0.3\% | 400.2 | 41.5 | 10.4\% | 40.4 | 10.1\% | 29.4 | 1.1 | -0.5\% | 4.2 | 0.3\% |
| Distribution Substation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Substation Specifics | 22.6 | 0.3 | 1.3\% | 0.7 | 2.9\% | 7.0 | 0.3 | 0.6\% | 0.5 | 1.1\% | 67.7 | 0.9 | 1.3\% | 2.0 | 3.0\% | (7.3) | 0.3 | 0.6\% | 0.4 | 1.0\% |
| Blankets | 2.8 | 0.5 | 16.9\% | 0.2 | 5.8\% | (1.4) | (0.4) | -10.1\% | (0.0) | 3.0\% | 3.2 | 0.3 | 9.3\% | 0.2 | 6.2\% | (0.4) | (0.1) | -2.4\% | 0.1 | 2.6\% |
| Infrastructure Sub | 10.3 | 0.0 | 0.4\% | 0.5 | 5.2\% | 4.7 | 0.2 | 1.3\% | 0.9 | 4.4\% | 22.9 | 0.1 | 0.4\% | 1.5 | 6.5\% | 7.7 | 0.4 | 1.2\% | 1.5 | 3.1\% |
| Total Dist Substation | 35.7 | 0.8 | 2.3\% | 1.4 | 3.8\% | 10.3 | 0.1 | -0.3\% | 1.4 | 2.2\% | 93.9 | 1.3 | 1.4\% | 3.7 | 3.9\% | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.6\% | 1.9 | 2.0\% |
| Total Other (Incl. Allow. For Sch.Chg.) | (0.1) | 1.0 | -705.8\% | 0.0 | -20.1\% | 1.7 | (0.9) | 708.4\% | (0.0) | 20.8\% | 5.9 | 2.9 | 49.2\% | 0.0 | 0.0\% | (2.8) | (2.8) | -46.5\% | 0.0 | 0.7\% |
| Total Dist before PY Adj. | 218.1 | 19.8 |  | 21.0 |  | 39.9 | 2.5 |  | 3.6 |  | 500.0 | 45.7 |  | 44.1 |  | 26.6 | (1.1) |  | 6.1 |  |
| Prior Years Adjustments | (7.9) | 5.7 | -72.5\% | (0.6) | 7.2\% | 7.9 | (5.7) |  | 0.6 |  | (3.7) | (0.5) | 14.3\% | 0.0 | -0.1\% | 3.7 | 0.5 |  | (0.0) |  |
| Total Distribution | 210.2 | 25.5 | 12.2\% | 20.4 | 9.7\% | 47.8 | (3.3) | -3.7\% | 4.2 | -0.2\% | 496.3 | 45.2 | 9.1\% | 44.1 | 8.9\% | 30.2 | (0.6) | -0.6\% | 6.1 | 0.6\% |
| EDOFunctions |  | 17.2 |  |  |  |  | 3.9 |  |  |  |  | 43.1 |  |  |  |  | (0.8) |  |  |  |
| Storm Costs (incl PY Adj) |  | (0.1) |  |  |  |  | 0.3 |  |  |  |  | 0.4 |  |  |  |  | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| Non-EDO Functions |  | 2.1 |  |  |  |  | (1.2) |  |  |  |  | 1.7 |  |  |  |  | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| Total |  | 19.3 |  |  |  |  | 3.0 |  |  |  |  | $\underline{\underline{45.2}}$ |  |  |  |  | (0.6) |  |  |  |
| TxD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Line | 10.0 | 0.5 | 4.7\% | 2.1 | 20.9\% | 3.9 | 0.1 |  | (0.4) |  | 34.8 | 1.7 | 4.9\% | 7.7 | 22.1\% | (6.4) | (0.6) |  | (4.2) |  |
| Substation | 6.5 | 0.2 | 3.2\% | 0.2 | 2.3\% | 3.0 | (0.1) |  | 0.9 |  | 12.9 | 0.4 | 3.1\% | 0.3 | 2.3\% | 6.4 | (0.1) |  | 1.9 |  |
| Total TxD | 16.5 | 0.7 | 4.1\% | 2.3 | 13.6\% | 6.9 | (0.0) |  | 0.5 |  | 47.7 | 2.1 | 4.4\% | 8.0 | 16.8\% | 0.0 | (0.8) |  | (2.3) |  |
| 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | nationalgrid |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | The power of action. |  |  |  |  |

## LIPA Capital

| Month |  | Year to Date |  |  | \$m | Annual |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Varia | ce to |  |  | Vari | ce to |
| Actual | Var | Actual | Budget | Prior Year |  | Fcst | Budget | Prior Year |
| 1 | (0) | 5 | (1) | 4 | Transmission interconnections - New Pow er Plants | 9 | (2) | 5 |
| 0 | (0) | 0 | (0) | 10 | Transmission Interconnections - NUSCO | 0 | (0) | 19 |
| 1 | 0 | 6 | (1) | 3 | Nassau Substations and Lines | 10 | (1) | 8 |
| 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | (0) | Western Suffolk Substations and Lines | 14 | (1) | (3) |
| 2 | 1 | 16 | 3 | 7 | Eastern Suffolk Substations and Lines | 35 | 3 | 4 |
| 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | Other Transmission | 11 | 1 | (2) |
| 4 | (1) | 27 | (9) | (10) | New Load | 39 | (3) | (12) |
| 1 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 1 | New Business | 21 | - 1 | (1) |
| 1 | (0) | 8 | (2) | (2) | Reliability | 13 | (0) | 4 |
| 1 | (0) | 10 | (2) | ) | Replacements | 17 | (1) | 6 |
| 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | (1) | Storm Hardening | 11 | 2 | (3) |
| 1 | 0 | 7 | (1) | (2) | Substation Blankets | 13 | (0) | (2) |
| 0 | 0 | 3 | (0) | (0) | Public Works | 5 | (0) | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | Damage to Property | 3 | 0 | 2 |
| 2 | 0 | 15 | (1) | 16 | Transformers and Meters | 26 | 1 | 16 |
| 0 | 0 | 3 | (0) | (0) | All Other | 7 | (1) | (4) |
| 17 | 2 | 123 | (4) | 29 | Total LIPA Capital \& Removal | 234 | 0 | 39 |


nationalgrid
The power of action.

## Generation Capital

| Month |  | Year to Date |  |  | \$m | Annual |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual | Var to Budget | Actual | Variance to |  |  | Sep Fcst | Prior Fcst | Sep Fcst Variance to |  |
|  |  |  | Budget | 2008/09 |  |  |  | Jun QPR | Budget |
| 0 | (0) | 4 | (0) | (2) | EF Barrett | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | Far Rockaw ay | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) | Glenw ood | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | (0) | 5 | (1) | 4 | Port Jefferson | 11 | -1 | -1 | -1 |
| 2 | 0 | 15. | (0) | (5) | Northport | 37 | -1 | -1 | -1 |
| 1 | (0) | 5 | 2 | (1) | Combustion turbines | 7 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 0 | (0) | 0 | 0 | (0) | Other Generation | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | (1) | 29 | 1 | (4) | Subtotal Generation | 64 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (0) | Facilities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | (0) | IS | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | (0) | 0 | (0) | (0) | Other Allocated | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | (1) | 29 | 2 | (5) | Total Generation Investment GAAP | 66 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| (0) | (0) | (1) | (2) | 0 | IFRS | (4) | -1 | -1 | -3 |
| 5 | (1) | 28 | 1 | (5) | Total Generation Investment IFRS | 62 | 1 | 1 | -1 |


nationalgrid
The power of action.
$\qquad$

# Case No.10-E-0050 - Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid Electric Rates <br> Request for Information 

FROM: Robert Visalli

TO: Theodore Skerpon

## Request:

A. With reference to the Memorandum of Agreement between Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation and Local Union 97 of the IBEW for the extension of the labor agreement for the period April 1, 2008 through March 31, 2011, please provide any terms that specifically discuss IBEW's involvement and role in any Niagara Mohawk rate cases filed during the period of time covered by the extension.
B. Same as A. for any agreed upon contract extensions beyond March 31, 2011.

Response:
A. The terms that specifically discuss IBEW's involvement and role in any Niagara Mohawk rate cases filed during the period of time covered by the extension appear in Section VII of the Memorandum of Agreement between Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation and Local Union 97 and that Section is provided below.

> VII. RATE CASES AND RELATED MATTERS
> Upon execution of this Memorandum of Agreement, the Union's Officer's and Executive Board members will take supportive positions relative to the Company's rate cases before the State of New York Public Service Commission and neither the Union, its officers nor the Executive Board Members will take any actions or make any statements in opposition to rate cases in any forum, in any way or by any means. In addition, the Union agrees to support local matters pertaining to the Company's business that are of mutual interest.

It should be noted that while the above agreement requires the Union's Officer's and Executive Board Members to take supportive positions relative to the Company's rate cases before the State of New York Public Service Commission, it does not require these individuals to file testimony on the Company's behalf. Mr. Skerpon filed testimony in this case because he believes that the amounts included in the Company's revenue requirements request are integral to maintaining and continuing the improvement of operation, safety and reliability of the Company's electric system in upstate New York based on the reasons set forth in his direct
testimony. An additional reason for his conclusion includes an initiative that Local 97 had agreed to in 2007 that involved the agreement by which new hires in the Customer Service Department would start at substantially lower wage rates than their comparable counterparts, thus providing ratepayers with more service at lower cost. These lower rates for new hires in the Customers Service Department are embedded in the represented salary levels used by the Company in this proceeding and provide further evidence of the reasonableness of the labor expenses requested by the Company in this case.
B. The three year extension of the Existing Agreement that is effective from March 31, 2011 through March 31, 2014 states that:

The terms of the Existing Agreement shall remain in effect for the duration of the extension except as amended below.

There is no reference to terms in the amended articles that appear below that statement, that specifically discuss IBEW's involvement and role in any Niagara Mohawk rate cases filed during the period of time covered by the most recent extension.

# NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a National Grid <br> Docket 10-E-0050 Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation Rate Case 

## Request for Information

## FROM: Allison Esposito

TO: Revenue Requirement Panel

## Request:

1. Please provide the amount of expenses, by cost component, for the security department at the Syracuse Office Complex (SOC) in the HTY. For labor costs, please provide the amounts by employee position included in the charges.
2. Please explain how the costs in \#1, above, are allocated to affiliates other than NMPC. To the extent that these costs are not allocated to National Grid and are instead absorbed fully by NMPC, please explain why. Additionally, if the Commission were to rule that the portion of the rate year security department costs for areas in the SOC where services are performed for affiliates other than NMPC should be allocated to those affiliates, what is the proper adjustment amount? Include supporting calculations and explain how the amounts were derived.
3. The Company's response to IR AAE-53 shows total payroll for the position of Janitor AA at NY Facilities of $\$ 229,007$. Please state how many employees are included in this category.

## Response:

1. Please see Attachment 1 to this response for the amount of historic test year expenses by expense type for the security department at the SOC. For labor costs, all employees held the position of Plant Guard C.
2. The costs in Part 1 above were erroneously fully absorbed by NMPC and the Company will make the appropriate allocation adjustment. The amount of that adjustment is reflected in Attachment 2 to this response.
3. There are nine employees in the job category "Janitor AA" totaling $\$ 229,007$ in the Company's response to IR AAE-53.

## Name of Respondent:

## Date of Reply:

James M. Molloy
August 10, 2010

## NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a NATIONAL GRID

SOC Security Department by Expense Type
Historic Test Year Ended September 30, 2009

| Location | Syracuse |  | Employee Position |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sum of NIMO ELECTRIC |  |  |  |
| Chrg Dept Descr | Expense Type | Total |  |
| Security-NY North | 110 | 270,256.18 |  |
|  | 200 | 380.24 |  |
|  | A70 | 3,138.36 |  |
|  | M10 | 311.12 |  |
|  | P10 | 166,640.75 | Plant Guard C |
|  | P20 | 4,046.16 | Plant Guard C |
|  | P21 | 2,090.76 | Plant Guard C |
|  | P50 | 20,349.31 |  |
|  | T10 | 26,730.88 |  |
| Grand Total |  | 493,943.77 |  |

# Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation 

d/b/a National Grid
Case 10-E-0050 Attachment 2 to AAE-55

# NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a NATIONAL GRID 

## SOC Security Department Allocation to Affiliates

For the Rate Year 2011

## Amount of HTY SOC security department costs <br> Inflation to Rate Year <br> Amount of Rate Year SOC security department costs <br> $\%$ to be allocated to service company

Amount to be allocated to service company
\% of service company costs allocated to others (excluding NIMO)
Amount of SOC security costs allocated to affiliates in Rate Year
\$ 493,944 Per Attachment
$2.5021 \%$
$\$ \quad 506,303$
$\mathbf{5 2 \%}$ Percent used to allocate all SOC costs to affiliates
\$ 263,277
$69.57 \%$ using bill pool 00382
$\$ \quad 183,162$

Date of Request: August 3, 2010
Due Date: August 13, 2010

Request No. RAV-151
NMPC Req. No. NM 964 DPS-603

# NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a National Grid <br> Docket 10-E-0050 Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation Rate Case 

## Request for Information

## FROM: Robert Visalli

TO: Revenue Requirement Panel
Request:

For calendar years 2008 and 2009 and the historic test year, please provide the following information on National Grid - USA employees who were sent to work overseas at NationalGrid - UK on a temporary basis:
A. Provide a list of the employees' names, their individual work durations in the UK, their salaries while in the UK, and their overseas expenses broken down by type (air fares along with the number of trips; lodging costs; health care; car rentals; spousal / children costs; education costs; etc.)
B. For each employee and for each expense listed in Part A., please provide how the expenses were accounted for. Were the costs charged to National Grid - UK expense accounts? If so, which accounts and what was the basis for such accounting allocations? Were the costs charged back to National Grid - USA affiliates expense accounts? If so, which accounts and what was the basis for such accounting allocations?

## Response:

A. Please refer to RAV-151 Attachment_1_xls.

## B. Employee expenses that are incurred locally while on assignment (in the UK) are charged to the UK entities and remain in the UK.

For salaries, while the underlying accounting impact is the same, the process under which each employee listed in Part A is treated, varies according to the legacy company that the employee works for.

For each legacy National Grid employee, their salary expense is charged to a National Grid Billing Entity (PeopleSoft Business Unit \# 00072).

Legacy KeySpan employees, are not set up to be able to charge the National Grid Billing Entity directly. Consequently, employee salary expense is manually journalized to the National Grid Billing

Entity and correspondingly credited to their original US accounting. All the expenses charged to Business Unit \# 00072 are billed over to the UK.

The National Grid Billing Entity is not consolidated within the US financial statements and hence there is no charge to the US income statement for these expenses.

Upon receipt by the UK, the charges are subsequently recharged to the relevant UK business unit. This recharge is based upon the companies receiving the underlying benefit of the work. The costs are not charged back to the National Grid - USA affiliates expense accounts.

However, as denoted in the salary detail within RAV-151 Attachment_1_.xls, there can be an amount of salary expense that remains in the US and does not get charged to the UK. This would occur if an employee maintained US responsibilities or performed a global role subsequent to a move to the UK.

Name of Respondent:
Stephen Pocock \& John O Shaughnessy

Date of Reply:
August 20, 2010


* Note: home leave includes airfare and other travel related costs. Return aiffares for Martied/partner accompanied employees is one flight per assignment year, for Single/Unaccompanied employees two fights per assignment per year.
* Note: Includes the amount of annual salary received while located in the UK
... Note: amount of salary expense that remains in the US results from employees who maintained US responsibilities or performed a global role subsequent to a move to the UK.

- Note: home leave includes aiffare and other travel related costs. Return airfares for Mamied/parther accompanied employees is one fight per assignment year, for Single/Unaccompanied employees two flights per assignment per year.
-*Note: includes the amount of annual salary received while located in the UK
... Note: amount of salary expense that remains in the US results from employees who maintained US responsibilities or performed a glopal role subsequent to a move to the UK
historic test year


[^0]- Note: Includes the amount of annual salary received while located in the UK

N

Date of Request: August 3, 2010
Due Date: August 13, 2010

Request No. RAV-152
NMPC Req. No. NM 965 DPS-604

# NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a National Grid Docket 10-E-0050 Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation Rate Case 

## Request for Information

FROM: Robert Visalli<br>TO: Revenue Requirement Panel

## Request:

A. Please provide a comprehensive list of all National Grid employees who took a VERO offer and who have been re-hired as employees of National Grid (as opposed to being rehired as contractors). Include the employee's salary before being VERO'ed, the VERO payment, and the salary after being re-hired as employees. Also include when the employee was VERO'ed, when the employee was re-hired, and which affiliate or service company the employee worked for prior to taking the VERO and after taking the VERO..
B. Fully explain why the Company rehired each of these VERO'ed employees, what their pre-VERO and post-VERO job titles and departments were / are, and whether each of the VERO'ed employees were considered to be "realized KeySpan synergy savings".
C. Fully explain the pension plan and OPEB / medical care ramifications of rehiring these VERO'ed employees.

## Response:

A. Please see Attachment 1.
B. Please see Attachment 1 for all responses except an explanation why each VERO was rehired which is listed below:

Employee ID - Employee was rehired due to his past experience with the Company. He was the most qualified person for the position. He was in a position that was unrelated to his job prior to taking the VERO.

Employee ID - Employee was gone from company for almost 7 years. Job was posted but no qualified candidates applied. HR had this employee's resume. He is doing essentially the same job he had prior to taking VERO.

Employee ID - Employee worked as a contractor as a Substation Trainer for several years. He applied for Lead Training Representative position in 2009 and was
awarded the position since he was considered the most qualified candidate. It is a very different position from the one he held prior to accepting the VERO.

Employee ID - Employee was gone from company for 4 years. Job was posted internally and externally. He was the most qualified candidate. Job is different from the job he did prior to taking the VERO.

Employee ID - Employee was rehired due to her past experience with the Company. She was the most qualified person for the position. She was in a position that was unrelated to her job prior to taking the VERO. Please note that this rehired employee had no allocated charges to Niagara Mohawk in the historic test year.

Employee ID - Employee was retired for 7 years prior to being rehired in 2009 although he did work as a contractor for several years. He was brought back mainly for his historical knowledge of the Company and an accounting software system. He is doing a similar job to the one he did prior to accepting the VERO.

Employee ID - Employee was gone from the company for 7 years. Rehired in July 2009 to help transition a specific task to a new department. He will separate from service in the next 6 months to one year. Job is different from the job he did prior to taking the VERO.
C. When these VERO'ed employees were rehired, their current pension benefit annuity payments, if applicable, and their retiree medical benefits were suspended; they remain suspended throughout their period of re-employment with National Grid. Upon their subsequent separation of service, the suspended pension benefit will be reactivated and the employees will be put back into the retiree medical plans that were in effect at the time of their original retirement.

During their re-employment, these employees are eligible to participate in the active medical plans as well as a pension plan. Employee ID and
are participants in the Niagara Mohawk Cash Balance Pension Plan and Employee ID $\square$ and $\square$ are participants in the National Grid Final Average Pay Plan. Upon their subsequent separation of service, they will be eligible to receive any benefits that have accrued under the pension plan they participated in while re-employed.

Name of Respondent:
Ed Considine

Date of Reply: 8/13/2010

$\stackrel{N}{E}$

# NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a National Grid <br> Docket 10-E-0050 Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation <br> Rate Case 

Request for Information
FROM: Robert Visalli
TO: Revenue Requirement Panel
Request:
A. For each National Grid USA affiliate, provide its actual earned return on equity for either calendar years 20062009 or fiscal years 2007 -2010. Also, provide the actual earned return for the aggregate of all National Grid USA affiliates for the same year periods.
B. For each National Grid USA regulated affiliate, for either the calendar years 2006-2009 or fiscal years 2007-2010, indicate whether the affiliate had service quality penalty mechanisms for customer service and reliability measures, and, if so, provide the maximum amount of potential penalty in each year and the actual amount of penalty incurred in each year. Also provide the total potential and actual penalties incurred for the aggregate of all National Grid regulated affiliates for each year.

Note: In responding to this request, use whichever years (i.e., calendar years or fiscal years) are easiest for the Company to retrieve.

## Response:

A. Please see Attachment 1 (RAV-155_Attach1_ROE)
B. Please see Exhibits 1,2,3 and 4 in Attachment 2 (RAV-155_Attach 2_SQ Electric Results CY 2006-2009) for the service quality penalties of the Niagara Mohawk, Massachusetts Electric, Nantucket Electric and Narragansett Electric electricity regulated affiliates respectively. Please note that there are no service quality penalties for Granite State Electric.

Name of Respondent:
Date of Reply:
Nancy Cianflone
Stephanie Briggs
8/23/2010
Andrew Dinkle

## Information Request RAV-155 Attachment 1

|  | Earned ROE ${ }^{(1)}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CY 2006 | CY 2007 | CY 2008 | CY2009 |
| Gas Distribution | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| KEDNY | 11.5\% | 14.9\% | 11.9\% | 11.2\% |
| KEDLI | 11.0\% | 10.4\% | 11.1\% | 10.5\% |
| Niagara Mohawk Gas | 4.0\% | 5.9\% | 4.8\% | 3.8\% |
| Boston Gas | 7.8\% | 7.4\% | 7.0\% | 2.5\% |
| Essex Gas | 33.3\% | 25.7\% | 28.0\% | 9.7\% |
| Colonial Gas | 11.1\% | 12.7\% | 9.9\% | 3.7\% |
| Rhode Island Gas | ------- | 3.2\% | 7.6\% | 6.7\% |
| Energy North | 3.5\% | 4.9\% | 4.4\% | 3.8\% |
| Electric Distribution |  |  |  |  |
| Niagara Mohawk Electric | 9.9\% | 9.1\% | 6.7\% | 5.1\% |
| Massachusetts Electric Co. | 10.4\% | 9.6\% | 7.2\% | 5.0\% |
| Rhode Island Electric | 5.2\% | 6.8\% | 2.3\% | -2.9\% |
| Granite State Electric | 16.0\% | 9.3\% | 6.3\% | 0.4\% |
| Electric Generation |  |  |  |  |
| National Grid Generation | 9.5\% | 9.1\% | 6.1\% | 13.8\% |
| Glenwood Energy Center | 11.0\% | 11.3\% | 11.2\% | 11.7\% |
| Port Jefferson Energy Center | 11.2\% | 11.0\% | 10.6\% | 11.8\% |
| Electric Transmission |  |  |  |  |
| New England Power Co. | 12.8\% | 11.6\% | 11.7\% | 11.8\% |
| Narragansett Transmission | 11.2\% | 11.5\% | 11.6\% | 11.5\% |
| Interconnectors | 13.0\% | 13.0\% | 13.5\% | 13.0\% |
| Total | 9.5\% | 9.8\% | 8.2\% | 6.8\% |

(1) Actual earned ROEs calculated based on authorized capital structures used to set rates and include the companies' share of any excess earnings and discreet incentives where applicable.

## Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation Service Quality Penalties

| 2006: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Standard | Target | Maximum Penalty | Actual Results | Actual Penalty |
| PSC Complaint Rate | < 3.0 | (\$4,000,000) | 0.98 | \$0 |
| Res Transaction Satisfaction Index | $>82.0$ | (\$2,000,000) | 80.3 | (\$993,750) |
| C\&I Transaction Satisfaction Index | $>79.0$ | (\$2,000,000) | 77.0 | (\$1,125,000) |
| Meters Read | $>96.0 \%$ | (\$2,000,000) | 97.9\% | \$0 |
| Calls Answered in 30 Seconds | $>76.0 \%$ | (\$2,000,000) | 78.8\% | \$0 |
| Low Income Customer Assistance Program (LICAP) Enrollments | $\begin{gathered} >95 \% \text { of } \\ 3,780 \end{gathered}$ | (\$1,000,000) | 4,096 | \$0 |
| Reliability - System Frequency (SAIFI)* | $<0.93$ | (\$8,800,000) | 1.01 | (\$8,800,000) |
| Reliability - Customer Duration (CAIDI) | $<2.07$ | (\$4,400,000) | 2.05 | \$0 |
| Momentary Interruptions - 115 KV | $<=200$ | (\$733,000) | 134 | \$0 |
| Momentary Interruptions - 23-69 KV | < $=725$ | (\$733,000) | 388 | \$0 |
| Momentary Interruptions - Distribution | $<=2,000$ | (\$733,000) | 1,670 | \$0 |
| Total Penalty |  | (\$28,399,000) |  | (\$10,918,750) |

*In November 2007, the NYPSC issued an order that doubled the Company's 2006 SAIFI penalty due to multiple years at the maximum penaity.

| 2007: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Standard | Target | Maximum Penalty | Actual Results | Actual Penalty |
| PSC Complaint Rate | < 3.0 | (\$4,000,000) | 0.96 | \$0 |
| Res Transaction Satisfaction Index | $>82.0$ | (\$2,000,000) | 80.2 | (\$1,037,500) |
| C\&I Transaction Satisfaction Index | $>79.0$ | (\$2,000,000) | 80.5 | \$0 |
| Meters Read | > 96.0\% | (\$2,000,000) | 98.3\% | \$0 |
| Calls Answered in 30 Seconds | > 78.0\% | (\$2,000,000) | 80.2\% | \$0 |
| Low Income Customer Assistance Program (LICAP) Enroliments | $\begin{gathered} >95 \% \text { of } \\ 3,780 \end{gathered}$ | (\$1,000,000) | 4,013 | \$0 |
| Reliability - System Frequency (SAIFI)* | $<0.93$ | (\$13,200,000) | 0.95 | (\$13,200,000) |
| Reliability - Customer Duration (CAIDI) | <2.07 | (\$4,400,000) | 2.01 | \$0 |
| Momentary Interruptions - 115 KV | $<=200$ | (\$733,000) | 148 | \$0 |
| Momentary Interruptions - 23-69 KV | < $=725$ | (\$733,000) | 496 | \$0 |
| Momentary interruptions - Distribution | $<=2,000$ | $(\$ 733,000)$ | 1,641 | \$0 |
| Total Penalty |  | (\$32,799,000) |  | (\$14,237,500) |

*In accordance with the KeySpan merger order, in the event that a SQ reliability measure is doubled pursuant to the doubling provision in the existing Niagara Mohawk rate plan, the incentive payment will be further increased by the amount of the original exposure in any period subsequent to the doubling where the performance target for a doubled measure is not satisfied by the Company.

## Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation Service Quality Penalties

| 2008: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Standard | Target | Maximum Penalty | Actual Results | Actual Penalty |
| PSC Complaint Rate | < 3.0 | (\$4,000,000) | 0.88 | \$0 |
| Res Transaction Satisfaction Index | $>82.0$ | (\$2,000,000) | 81.4 | (\$512,500) |
| C\&I Transaction Satisfaction Index | $>79.0$ | (\$2,000,000) | 80.1 | \$0 |
| Meters Read | > 96.0\% | (\$2,000,000) | 98.6\% | \$0 |
| Calls Answered in 30 Seconds | > 78.0\% | (\$2,000,000) | 78.6\% | \$0 |
| Low Income Customer Assistance Program (LICAP) Enrollments | $\begin{gathered} \hline>95 \% \text { of } \\ 3,780 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | (\$1,000,000) | 3,943 | \$0 |
| Reliability - System Frequency (SAIFI) | $<0.93$ | (\$17,600,000) | 0.75 | \$0 |
| Reliability - Customer Duration (CAIDI) | $<2.07$ | (\$4,400,000) | 1.96 | \$0 |
| Momentary Interruptions - 115 KV | $<=200$ | (\$733,000) | 190 | \$0 |
| Momentary Interruptions - 23-69 KV | $<=725$ | (\$733,000) | 501 | \$0 |
| Momentary Interruptions - Distribution | $<=2,000$ | (\$733,000) | 1,570 | \$0 |
| Total Penalty |  | (\$37,199,000) |  | (\$512,500) |


| 2009: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Standard | Target | Maximum Penalty | Actual Results | Actual Penalty |
| PSC Complaint Rate | < 3.0 | (\$4,000,000) | 1.03 | \$0 |
| Res Transaction Satisfaction Index | $>82.0$ | (\$2,000,000) | 82.3 | \$0 |
| C\&I Transaction Satisfaction Index | $>79.0$ | (\$2,000,000) | 82.0 | \$0 |
| Meters Read | > 96.0\% | (\$2,000,000) | 98.7\% | \$0 |
| Calls Answered in 30 Seconds | $>78.0 \%$ | (\$2,000,000) | 81.8\% | \$0 |
| Low Income Customer Assistance Program (LICAP) Enrollments | $\begin{gathered} >95 \% \text { of } \\ 3,780 \end{gathered}$ | (\$1,000,000) | 3,956 | \$0 |
| Reliability - System Frequency (SAIFI) | $<0.93$ | (\$8,800,000) | 0.88 | \$0 |
| Reliability - Customer Duration (CAIDI) | $<2.07$ | (\$4,400,000) | 1.91 | \$0 |
| Momentary Interruptions - 115 KV | $<=200$ | (\$733,000) | 134 | \$0 |
| Momentary Interruptions - 23-69 KV | $<=725$ | (\$733,000) | 426 | \$0 |
| Momentary Interruptions - Distribution | $<=2,000$ | (\$733,000) | 1,564 | \$0 |
| Total Penalty |  | $(\$ 28,399,000)$ |  | \$0 |

## Massachusetts Electric Company

 Service Quality Penalties| 2006: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Standard | Target Range |  | Maximum Penalty | Actual Results | Actual Incentive/(Penalty) |
| Reliability - System Frequency (SAIFI) | 1.113 | 1.304 | (\$3,667,250) | 1.435 | (\$3,667, 250) |
| Reliability - System Duration (SAIDI) | 78.44 | 105.52 | (\$7,334,499) | 188.06 | (\$7,334,499) |
| Lost Time Accident Rate | 1.00 | 1.98 | (\$1,629,889) | 1.04 | \$0 |
| Calls Answered in 20 Seconds | 69.3\% | 92.9\% | (\$2,037,361) | 88.6\% | \$0 |
| Regulatory Cases | 622 | 996 | (\$814,944) | 705 | \$0 |
| Regulatory Billing Adjustments | \$7.94 | \$32.08 | (\$814,944) | \$3.08 | \$400,837 |
| Service Appointments Met | 91.4\% | 96.4\% | (\$2,037,361) | 99.3\% | \$2,037,361 |
| Meters Read | 87.9\% | 98.2\% | (\$1,629,889) | 99.1\% | \$560,726 |
| Net Penalty* |  |  | (\$19,966,137) |  | (\$8,002,825) |


| 2007: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Standard | Target Range |  | Maximum Penalty | Actual <br> Results | Actual Offset(Penalty) |
| Reliability - System Frequency (SAIFI) | 1.075 | 1.461 | (\$3,418,588) | 1.159 | \$0 |
| Reliability - System Duration (SAIDI) | 77.64 | 152.20 | (\$3,418,588) | 138.49 | \$0 |
| Lost Time Accident Rate | 0.92 | 1.98 | (\$1,519,372) | 1.87 | \$0 |
| Calls Answered in 20 Seconds | 70.5\% | 93.3\% | (\$1,899,215) | 81.3\% | \$0 |
| Regulatory Cases per 1,000 Customers | 0.57 | 0.93 | (\$759,686) | 0.69 | \$0 |
| \# Regulatory Billing Adj per 1,000 Cust | 0.009 | 0.067 | (\$759,686) | 0.025 | \$0 |
| Service Appointments Met | 91.8\% | 98.2\% | (\$1,899,215) | 99.3\% | \$857,336 |
| Meters Read | 88.9\% | 99.3\% | (\$1,519,372) | 99.2\% | \$539,984 |
| Net Penalty* |  |  | (\$15,193,722) |  | \$0 |

*Beginning in 2007, the Company is no longer allowed to earn incentives, but can earn penalty offsets. Offsets have no value other than to offset penalties in any other performance measure, and they expire at the end of each year. Since there are no penalties, the offsets has no value.

| 2008: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Standard | Target Range |  | Maximum Penalty | Actual Results | Actual Offset/(Penalty) |
| Reliability - System Frequency (SAIFI) | 1.075 | 1.461 | (\$3,952,114) | 1.053 | \$1,274,134 |
| Reliability - System Duration (SAIDI) | 77.64 | 152.20 | (\$3,952,114) | 124.48 | \$0 |
| Lost Time Accident Rate | 0.92 | 1.98 | (\$1,756,495) | 0.86 | \$713,302 |
| Calls Answered in 20 Seconds | 70.5\% | 933\% | (\$2,195,619) | 74.0\% | \$0 |
| Regulatory Cases per 1,000 Customers | 0.57 | 0.93 | (\$878,248) | 0.64 | \$0 |
| \# Regulatory Billing Adj per 1,000 Cust | 0.010 | 0.064 | $(\$ 878,248)$ | 0.031 | \$0 |
| Service Appointments Met | 92.3\% | 99.1\% | (\$2,195,619) | 97.9\% | \$0 |
| Meters Read | 88.9\% | 99.3\% | (\$1,756,495) | 97.0\% | \$0 |
| Net Penalty* |  |  | (\$17,564,952) |  | \$0 |

*Beginning in 2007, the Company is no longer allowed to earn incentives, but can earn penalty offsets. Offsets have no value other than to offset penalties in any other performance measure, and they expire at the end of each year. Since there are no penalties, the offsets has no value.

## Massachusetts Electric Company

 Service Quality Penalties| 2009: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Standard | Target Range |  | Maximum Penalty (est) | Actual Results* | Actual Offset/(Penalty)* |
| Reliability - System Frequency (SAIFI) | 1.075 | 1.461 | (\$3,952,114) | 0.875 | \$4,940,003 |
| Reliability - System Duration (SAIDI) | 77.64 | 152.20 | $(\$ 3,952,114)$ | 92.72 | \$0 |
| Lost Time Accident Rate | 0.92 | 1.98 | (\$1,756,495) | 0.57 | \$1,864,662 |
| Calis Answered in 20 Seconds | 70.5\% | 93.3\% | (\$2,195,619) | 85.0\% | \$0 |
| Regulatory Cases per 1,000 Customers | 0.57 | 0.93 | $(\$ 878,248)$ | 0.75 | \$0 |
| \# Regulatory Billing Adj per 1,000 Cust | 0.010 | 0.062 | (\$878,248) | 0.052 | \$0 |
| Service Appointments Met | 92.8\% | 99.2\% | (\$2,195,619) | 97.2\% | \$0 |
| Meters Read | 88.9\% | 99.3\% | (\$1,756,495) | 99.2\% | \$780,300 |
| Net Penalty* |  |  | (\$17,564,952) |  | \$0 |

*Beginning in 2007, the Company is no longer allowed to earn incentives, but can earn penalty offsets. Offsets have no value other than to offset penalties in any other performance measure, and they expire at the end of each year. Since there are no penalties, the offsets has no value.

Nantucket Electric Company Service Quality Penalties

| 2006: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Standard | Target Range |  | Maximum Penalty | Actual Results | Actual Incentive/(Penalty) |
| Reliability - System Frequency (SAIFI) | 0.149 | 0.703 | (\$38,704) | 0.671 | \$0 |
| Reliability - System Duration (SAIDI) | 9.75 | 33.22 | $(\$ 38,704)$ | 51.20 | (\$38,704) |
| Lost Time Accident Rate | 0.00 | 6.51 | (\$17,202) | 0.00 | \$0 |
| Calls Answered in 20 Seconds | 69.1\% | 94.9\% | (\$21,502) | 89.5\% | \$0 |
| Regulatory Cases | 2 | 4 | $(\$ 8,601)$ | 1 | \$8,601 |
| Regulatory Billing Adjustments | \$0.00 | $\$ 88.30$ | $(\$ 8,601)$ | \$0.00 | \$0 |
| Service Appointments Met | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | (\$21,502) | - | \$0 |
| Meters Read | 93.4\% | 100.0\% | $(\$ 17,202)$ | 99.8\% | \$0 |
| Net Penalty |  |  | (\$172,018) |  | $(\$ 30,103)$ |


| 2007: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Standard | Target Range |  | Maximum Penalty | Actual Results | Actual Offset(Penalty) |
| Reliability - System Frequency (SAIFI) | 0.186 | 0.712 | (\$49,921) | 0.267 | \$0 |
| Reliability - System Duration (SAIDI) | 11.34 | 44.14 | (\$49,921) | 24.82 | \$0 |
| Lost Time Accident Rate | 0.00 | 6.22 | (\$22,187) | 0.00 | \$0 |
| Calls Answered in 20 Seconds | 70.4\% | 95.2\% | (\$27,734) | 82.6\% | \$0 |
| Regulatory Cases per 1,000 Customers | 0.11 | 0.35 | (\$11,094) | 0.18 | \$0 |
| \# Regulatory Billing Adj per 1,000 Cust | 0.000 | 0.000 | (\$11,094) | 0.090 | (\$11,094) |
| Service Appointments Met | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | (\$27,734) | - | \$0 |
| Meters Read | 93.8\% | 100.0\% | $(\$ 22,187)$ | 99.8\% | \$0 |
| Net Penalty |  |  | (\$221,872) |  | (\$11,094) |


| 2008: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Standard | Target Range |  | Maximum Penalty | Actual Results | Actual Offset/(Penalty) |
| Reliability - System Frequency (SAIFI) | 0.186 | 0.712 | (\$49,448) | 0.373 | \$0 |
| Reliability - System Duration (SAIDI) | 11.34 | 44.14 | (\$49,448) | 50.25 | $(\$ 37,989)$ |
| Lost Time Accident Rate | 0.00 | 6.22 | (\$21,977) | 13.82 | (\$21,977) |
| Calls Answered in 20 Seconds | 70.4\% | 95.2\% | $(\$ 27,471)$ | 72.3\% | \$0 |
| Regulatory Cases per 1,000 Customers | 0.11 | 0.35 | (\$10,988) | 0.09 | \$4,292 |
| \# Regulatory Billing Adj per 1,000 Cust | 0.000 | 0.043 | (\$10,988) | 0.000 | \$0 |
| Service Appointments Met | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | (\$27,471) | 72.7\% | (\$27,471) |
| Meters Read | 93.8\% | 100.0\% | (\$21,977) | 99.6\% | \$0 |
| Net Penalty |  |  | (\$219,768) |  | (\$83,145) |

Nantucket Electric Company Service Quality Penalties

| 2009: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Standard | Target Range |  | Maximum Penalty (est) | Actual Results* | Actual Offset(Penalty)* |
| Reliability - System Frequency (SAIFI) | 0.186 | 0.712 | (\$49,448) | 0.336 | \$0 |
| Reliability - System Duration (SAIDI) | 11.34 | 44.14 | (\$49,448) | 27.03 | \$0 |
| Lost Time Accident Rate | 0.00 | 6.22 | $(\$ 21,977)$ | 0.00 | \$0 |
| Calls Answered in 20 Seconds | 70.4\% | 95.2\% | (\$27,471) | 84.1\% | \$0 |
| Regulatory Cases per 1,000 Customers | 0.11 | 0.35 | $(\$ 10,988)$ | 0.09 | \$4,082 |
| \# Regulatory Billing Adj per 1,000 Cust | 0.000 | 0.040 | (\$10,988) | 0.000 | \$0 |
| Service Appointments Met | 82.3\% | 100.0\% | $(\$ 27,471)$ | 90.9\% | $\$ 0$ |
| Meters Read | 93.8\% | 100.0\% | (\$21,977) | 99.8\% | \$0 |
| Net Penalty |  |  | (\$219,768) |  | \$0 |

*Beginning in 2007, the Company is no longer allowed to earn incentives, but can earn penalty offsets. Offsets have no value other than to offset penalties in any other performance measure, and they expire at the end of each year. Since there are no penalties, the offsets has no value.

Narragansett Electric Company
Service Quality Penalties

| 2006: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Standard | Target Range |  | Maximum Penalty | Actual Results | Actual Offset(Penalty) ** |
| Reliability - System Frequency (SAIFI) | 0.91 | 1.19 | (\$916,000) | 0.98 | \$0 |
| Reliability - System Duration (SAIDI) | 53.4 | 77.3 | (\$916,000) | 74.1 | \$0 |
| Calls Answered in 20 Seconds | 65.8\% | 90.4\% | (\$184,000) | 91.2\% | \$2,992 |
| Customer Contact Satisfaction | 76.8\% | 81.4\% | (\$184,000) | 81.6\% | \$4,000 |
| Net Offset |  |  | (\$2,200,000) |  | \$0 |


| 2007: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Standard | Targe |  | Maximum Penalty | Actual Results | Actual Offset(Penalty) ** |
| Reliability - System Frequency (SAIFI)* | 0.84 | 1.05 | (\$916,000) | 0.92 | \$0 |
| Reliability - System Duration (SAIDI)* | 45.9 | 71.9 | (\$916,000) | 59.0 | \$0 |
| Calls Answered in 20 Seconds | 65.8\% | 90.4\% | (\$184,000) | 83.8\% | \$0 |
| Customer Contact Satisfaction | 76.8\% | 81.4\% | (\$184,000) | 80.3\% | \$0 |
| Net Penalty |  |  | $(\$ 2,200,000)$ |  | \$0 |

*Based on IEEE Standard 1366-2003.

| 2008: | Target Range |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Performance Standard |  |  | Maximum Penalty | Actual Results | Actual Offset(Penalty) ** |
| Reliability - System Frequency (SAIFI)* | 0.84 | 1.05 | (\$916,000) | 1.00 | \$0 |
| Reliability - System Duration (SAIDI)* | 45.9 | 71.9 | (\$916,000) | 64.4 | \$0 |
| Calls Answered in 20 Seconds | 65.8\% | 90.4\% | (\$184,000) | 72.6\% | \$0 |
| Customer Contact Satisfaction | 76.8\% | 81.4\% | (\$184,000) | 83.1\% | \$34,000 |
| Net Penalty |  |  | $(\$ 2,200,000)$ |  | \$0 |

*Based on IEEE Standard 1366-2003.
**Offsets have no value other than to offset penalties in any other performance measure, and they expire at the end of each year. Since there are no penalties, the offsets has no value.

| 2009: | Target Range |  | Maximum Penalty | Actual Results** | Actual <br> Offset/(Penalty) ${ }^{\star \star}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reliability - System Frequency (SAIFI)* | 0.84 | 1.05 | (\$916,000) | 0.83 | \$30,533 |
| Reliability - System Duration (SAIDI)* | 45.9 | 71.9 | (\$916,000) | 50.0 | \$0 |
| Calls Answered in 20 Seconds | 65.8\% | 90.4\% | (\$184,000) | 85.1\% | \$0 |
| Customer Contact Satisfaction | 76.8\% | 81.4\% | (\$184,000) | 80.2\% | \$0 |
| Net Penalty |  |  | (\$2,200,000) |  | \$0 |

*Based on IEEE Standard 1366-2003.
**Offsets have no value other than to offset penalties in any other performance measure, and they expire at the end of each year. Since there are no penalties, the offsets has no value.

# NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a National Grid <br> Docket 10-E-0050 Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation Rate Case 

Request for Information

## FROM: Robert Visalli

## TO: Revenue Requirement Panel

Request:
A. As shown on Exhibit _(SAP-I), Schedule 6, page 3, Staffs major storm adjustment was $\$ 18.928$ million. On page 126 of your rebuttal testimony, you state that Staffs major storm adjustment should be reduced by $\$ 16.568$ million to correct for the problems described on pages 121-126 of your rebuttal testimony.

We agree that our major storm adjustment is overstated, but the overstatement for the reasons described in your rebuttal testimony is $\$ 6.622$ million, not $\$ 16.568$ million. As your rebuttal testimony states, the Company has $\$ 6.622$ million in its rate year forecast for incremental costs associated with minor storms and $\$ 21.525$ million in its rate year forecast for incremental costs associated with major storms, for a total incremental storm cost allowance of $\$ 28.147$ million. Since Staff is proposing a rate year allowance of only $\$ 9.219$ million for incremental costs associated with major storms and we are not proposing any adjustment to the Company's $\$ 6.622$ million forecast of incremental costs associated with minor storms, our rate year forecast for incremental costs associated with minor and major storms should be $\$ 15.841$ million ( $\$ 6.622$ million $+\$ 9.219$ million), as compared to the Company's Corrections \& Updates forecast of $\$ 28.147$. Thus, our adjustment should have been $\$ 12.306$ million or $\$ 6.622$ million less than our originally filed adjustment of $\$ 18.928$ million.

Please indicate if you agree with the above explanation and if your rebuttal testimony on page 126 should be changed from $\$ 16.568$ million to $\$ 6.622$ million. If you disagree, explain in full how Staff's proposal to reduce the Company's allowance for incremental costs associated with major storms can only be $\$ 2.368$ million ( $\$ 18.928$ million per Staff's original testimony minus your proposed rebuttal correction of $\$ 16.568$ million) when our position is that the Company should be allowed $\$ 9.219$ million for incremental costs associated with major storms.
B. Your rebuttal testimony states that the Company's rate year forecast for major and minor incremental costs is $\$ 28.147$ million. From the Company's response to IR CVB 23, Attachments 23-3 Major and 23-3 Minor, total major and minor storm costs (incremental and non-incremental) are shown to be $\$ 39.231$ million. Thus, non-
incremental costs must be $\$ 11.084$ million ( $\$ 39.231$ million total minus $\$ 28.147$ million incremental). It appears that $\$ 9.915$ million of "base labor" makes up the vast majority of the non-incremental costs. Regarding this "base labor" amount, please indicate (a) how much of this base labor is for NMPC employees and (b) how much is for employees of affiliates of National Grid who worked on NMPC storm restoration. Include supporting work-papers. Also, (c) fully explain why the portion of "base labor" related to employees of affiliates of National Grid who worked on NMPC storm restoration is not considered an incremental expense. If no costs associated with employees of affiliates of National Grid who worked on NMPC storm restoration are included in "base labor," please indicate in which cost component such costs are included and provide supporting work-papers for the amounts.

## Response:

The Company agrees that Staff inadvertently omitted the incremental minor storm costs of $\$ 6.622$ million when Staff proposed its adjustment. However, as described in the Revenue Requirements Panel testimony, we believe Staff also inadvertently and incorrectly omitted an entire category of incremental storm response costs in calculating its adjustment, and therefore we do not agree with the remainder of Staff's adjustment. We provide the following tabular expression of the Company's total incremental storm costs incurred during the test year compared to Staff's recovery proposal in an effort to simplify the issue (a more detailed expression of this information is found in Attachment 1 to this response, and at Exhibit __(RRP-14R), Sheet 1 of 4).

|  | Cost Category | Total Historic Test Year Costs |  | Incremental Portion of Historic Test Year Costs (inflated to Rate Year) | Staff's Proposed Rate Year Allowance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1) | Minor Storms (non-deferrable) | \$8.221 million |  | \$6.622 million | \$6.622 million ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| (2) | Major Storms (non-deferrable) | \$18.086 million |  | \$9.945 million | --b |
| (3) | Major Storms (deferrable) | $\$ 55.972$ million | $\$ 11.015$ million non-deferrable | \$11.580 million | \$9.219 million |
|  |  |  | $\$ 44.957$ million recovery through deferral account |  |  |
|  | Total |  |  | \$28.147 million | \$15.841 million |

Notes: a-Minor Storm allowance initially omitted from Staff adjustment calculation.
b-Staff's calculation of Storm adjustment does not mention this category of storm costs.
As described in its testimony (SAP, pp. 256-57), the Staff based its proposed rate allowance of $\$ 9.219$ million on:
(1) the annual storm costs actually incurred for individual storms costing under $\$ 20$ million over the period February 2002, the beginning of the MJP, through September 2009, the end of the historic test year, as derived from the Company's response to Part B of IR DPS-41 (RAV-27), (2)
minus $\$ 2$ million per major storm to give consideration to the estimated amount saved by the Company in post-storm O\&M costs due to incurrence of costs during the storm; we explain the savings later in our testimony, plus (3) inflationary increases to restate the 2002 through 2009 costs in rate year dollars.

However, RAV-27, part B, relates only to deferrable major storm costs (category (3) in the table above). It does not include non-deferrable major storm costs (category (2)). Thus, Staff's calculated allowance based on "the annual storm costs actually incurred for individual storms costing under $\$ 20$ million," is not complete because it omits an entireand substantial-category of storm costs; i.e., the costs of non-deferrable major storms. In order for the proposed allowance to reflect the annual storm costs actually incurred as Staff says it does, it must include the costs in category (2): non-deferrable major storm costs. Had Staff intended to exclude all of the costs in this category, we think it would have said so explicitly. Further, if Staff was attempting to exclude these costs, we do not think it would have used the inclusive language it used, which says it include actually incurred major storm costs for individual storms under $\$ 20$ million. The language used by Staff to describe the calculation, coupled with the fact that there is no mention of this entire category of costs, suggests that its omission from the adjustment calculation was unintentional. Therefore, in order to be complete and consistent with the calculation described in the testimony, the adjustment should be revised to include the omitted $\$ 9.945$ million for non-deferrable major storm costs.

In addition to omitting the category of non-deferrable major storm costs, the Company believes the calculation used to arrive at the rate allowance for deferrable major storms contains a number of errors. As explained at pp. 127-128 of the Revenue Requirements Panel rebuttal testimony, the calculation did not include $\$ 26$ million associated with the $\$ 2$ million per-event deductible for 13 storms during the period used by Staff. Nor did the calculation include the $\$ 6$ million annual deductible for 2008, despite the fact that it did include the annual deductible for all the other years in the period. If the calculation is corrected for these errors, it produces an annual allowance of $\$ 13.38$ million, versus the $\$ 9.219$ million calculated by Staff.
B. The $\$ 9.915$ million of "base labor" consists of $\$ 0.378$ million that originated from affiliates and $\$ 9.537$ million that originated from Niagara Mohawk. Detail supporting this information is included in Attachment 1 to this response. The Company included the affiliate costs in the rate year since they were incurred for storm restoration associated with events that were not eligible for deferral. Affiliate base labor storm charges have been incurred in the past on non-deferrable events and it is reasonable to expect that similar costs will be incurred in future rate years.

Name of Respondent:

RAV-157_Attach 1
Niagara Mchawk Power Corp.
Rate Year 2011 Storm Costs

|  | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Deferrable Major } \\ \text { Storm } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Non-deferrable Major Storm | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total Major } \\ \text { Storm } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total Minor } \\ \text { Storm } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Historic Test Year Storm Costs | \$55,971,640 | \$18.086,136 | \$74,057,776 | \$8,220,962 |
| Historic Test Year Deferred Storm Costs (IR DPS343 CVB-23) | \$44,957,075 | 0 | \$44,957,075 | 0 |
| Historic Test Year Storm Costs Excluding Deferrals | \$11,014,565 | \$18,086,136 | \$29,100,701 | \$8,220,962 |
| Rate Year 2011 Inflation Rate | 5.13\% | 5.13\% | 5.13\% | 5.06\% |
| Total Rate Year 2011 Storm Costs Excluding Deferrals (IR DPS-343 CVB-23) | \$11,579,923 | \$19,014,465 | \$30,594,388 | \$8,637,334 |
| Less Non-incremental Costs |  |  |  |  |
| Base Labor |  | \$8,095,783 | \$8,095,783 | \$1,818.825 |
| Variable Pay |  | \$973.246 | \$973,246 | \$196,314 |
| Contractor Exclusion |  |  | so |  |
| Total Incremental Costs per DPS-343 CVB-23 | \$11,579,923 | \$9,945,436 | \$21,525,359 | \$6,622,195 |

Base labor breakdown
From Niagara Mohawk
From Affiliates
Total

| \$0 | \$7,742,216 | \$7,742,216 | \$1,814,456 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$0 | \$353,567 | \$353,567 | \$4,369 |
| so | \$8,095,783 | \$8,095,783 | \$1,818,825 |

Historic lest year costs by expense tyne

| Contractors | 8,354,155 | 35,632,668 | 43,986,824 | 980,304 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Employee Expenses |  | 889,757 | 889,757 | 225,019 |
| Hardware |  | 1,373 | 1,373 |  |
| Other |  | (43,218,533) | (43,218,533) | 32,530 |
| Service Co Operating Costs |  | 18,876 | 18,876 | 26 |
| Supervision \& Admin |  | 693 | 693 | - |
| Sales Tax |  | 139,162 | 139,162 | 3,686 |
| Materials Outside Vendor |  | 639,313 | 639,313 | 25,998 |
| Materials From Inventory |  | 1,519,938 | 1,519,938 | 1,182 |
| Materials Stores Handling |  | 247,625 | 247,625 | 315 |
| Other Benefits |  | 256.637 | 256,637 | 4,024 |
| Transporation |  | 1,958,573 | 1,958,573 | 773,423 |

Date of Request: August 11, 2010
Due Date: August 23, 2010

Request No. VVP-33
NMPC Req. No. NM 983 DPS-614

# NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a National Grid <br> Docket 10-E-0050 Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation <br> Rate Case 

Request for Information
FROM: Staff Infrastructure Panel
TO: Infrastructure and Operations Panel

## Request:

1. The $1 O P$ rebuttal testimony at page 21 of 167 states, "The Transmission Station Failures budget accounts for only a small proportion of the overall spend on damage/failures. The remaining spend comes from the overall 'Budgetary Reserve' line ... which the Company uses to balance its overall spending budget."
a) Please identify the dollar amounts of the overall "Budgetary Reserve" line referred to above for FY11, FY12, FY13 and FY14.
b) If the amounts are negative, explain how the negative amounts can be used to fund the remaining spending for transmission station failures, for example.

Response:
1.a) The Budgetary Reserve line for FY11, FY12, FY13 and FY14 are negative $\$ 21.5$ million, $\$ 36.3$ million, $\$ 37.4$ million and $\$ 36.9$ million, respectively.
1.b) All Budgetary Reserve values are negative. The Reserve line is used to balance the forecasted spend for the fiscal year to the budget for the fiscal year. The Reserve line balances the Company's forecast of potential projects with the amount approved in the Business Plan budget. This allows the Company to manage its budget in the face of circumstances such as delays in project spend, cancelled projects, and projects completed for less than estimated spend. The Budgetary Reserve amount represents a forecast of the amount of work that may be moved into the future if any of these above circumstances occur. It is expected that reduced project spending due to these circumstances will occur by at least the amount shown in the Reserve, therefore, those dollars would be available to cover the spend for Transmission Station Failures.

Name of Respondent:
Tom Sullivan

Date of Reply:
August 20, 2010

# NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a National Grid 

Docket 10-E-0050 Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation Rate Case

## Request for Information

FROM: Staff Infrastructure Panel
TO: Infrastructure and Operations Panel
Request:

Please state whether the $\$ 11.9$ million -FY08, $\$ 14.1$ million FY09, and $\$ 10.4$ million FY10 mentioned on page 22 of 167 of the IOP rebuttal testimony were associated entirely with Transmission Station Failures. Provide supporting work-papers showing how these expenditures were incurred.

## Response:

As the Company explained in its rebuttal testimony, "the Transmission Station Failures budget accounts for only a small proportion of the [Company's] overall spend on damage/failures" (page 21 of 167 ). The $\$ 11.9$ million-FY08, $\$ 14.1$ million-FY09, and $\$ 10.4$ million-FY10 amounts mentioned on page 22 of 167 of the IOP rebuttal testimony represent the Company's entire expenditure on Damage/Failure. The corresponding actual Transmission Station Failures spending reflected in these overall annual amounts are: FY08--\$931,782, FY09--\$927,812, and FY10--\$1,591,520, as shown on page 22 of 167, lines 1-2.

The entire Damage/Failure budget represented by the $\$ 11.9$ million FY08, $\$ 14.1$ million FY09, and $\$ 10.4$ million FY10 includes expenditures on: unforeseeable transformer failures (walked in from the Budgetary Reserve), multiple low cost damage/failure projects, the Transmission Line Replacements budgetary reserve, the Transmission Station Failures budgetary reserve, the Transmission Storm budgetary reserve, Visual Grade 6 Tower replacements and the Wood Pole Management strategy.

The Transmission Station Failures budgetary reserve (Project C03792) is intended to cover the failures of station equipment less than $\$ 100,000$. For equipment damage/failures greater than $\$ 100,000$, individual funding projects are created under the Other Damage Failure spending program.

Attachment 1 (VVP-34_Attach1) lists all work orders in the Transmission Station Failures and Other Damage/Failure spending rationale for the years FY08-10.

| Name of Respondent: | $\quad$ Date of Reply: |
| :--- | :--- |
| Alan Roe | $8 / 20 / 10$ |

Date of Request: August 11, 2010
Due Date: August 23, 2010

Request No. VVP-36
NMPC Req. No. NM 986 DPS-617
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## Request for Information

## FROM: Staff Infrastructure Panel

TO: $\quad$ Infrastructure and Operations Panel

## Request:

1. The IOP rebuttal testimony at page 22 of 167 states, "The replacement cost for transformer failures is currently not included within the Damage/Failure budget. The procurement, installation and commissioning costs for these failures are walked-in to the business plan and projects are walked out of the plan or the 'Budgetary Reserve' line is adjusted to manage the overall budget."
a) Explain why the cost of replacement for unforeseeable transformer failures should now be included in the Damage/Failure budget as proposed in the IOP rebuttal testimony.
b) Confirm that projects walked-in to the business plan are funded by unused budgeted expenditures for projects that were originally included in the business plan but were ultimately delayed, cancelled, walked-out or completed below the forecast cost. If no, explain in detail how walk-in projects are funded.
c) Assume that all projects included in the business plan are completed at the forecast cost (no project is delayed, cancelled, walked-out or completed above or below the forecast cost); explain in an example, how the 'Budgetary Reserve' line can be adjusted to manage the overall budget while still funding a walk-in project.

## Response:

a) In its testimony, the Staff Infrastructure Panel ("SIP") stated "we think that the Company should strive to minimize its budgetary reserves" and "the Company should have a clearer understanding of what projects are likely to be undertaken and at what cost, especially in the near-term." SIP Testimony, p. 66. The Company agrees with Staff on these points. As a result, going forward the Company intends to include the costs for the procurement, installation and commissioning of the replacements for the unforeseeable transformer failures that will continue to occur within the Damage/Failure
budget. The investment level has been set using the historic level of failures cited and acknowledged in the SIP's testimony and the IOP's rebuttal testimony, respectively.

In addition, in its testimony, the SIP proposed downward adjustments to the Budgetary Reserve, Station Failures and Transformer Replacement programs. Reductions in all three of these areas would prevent the Company from being able to implement all the projects in the infrastructure plan and to manage the transformer failures when they inevitably occur. Therefore, the Company wanted to make it clear that transformer failures were currently not explicitly budgeted but going forward they would be and therefore should be included as part of the investment plan in the Damage / Failure budget.
b) Projects that are walked-in to the business plan are funded by both budgetary reserves and unused budgeted expenditures for projects that were originally included in the business plan but were ultimately delayed, cancelled, walked-out or completed below the forecast cost.
c) If all projects included in the investment plan are completed at the forecast cost (no project is delayed, canceled, walked-out or completed above or below the forecast cost), then the Company would be unable to meet its budget. This is because the "budgetary reserve" line is used to manage to an approved budget with the assumption that projects will be delayed, canceled, walked out or be completed below their forecast cost. For example, if the approved budget is $\$ 100$ million, the Company could manage this by including work of $\$ 115$ million in the investment plan, balanced with a reserve of negative $\$ 15$ million. However, if all work in the plan is completed at the budgeted amounts, then the Company will have overspent the budget by $\$ 15$ million. However, this is an unlikely scenario, and in such circumstances the Company would likely anticipate the potential overspend and reduce the level of work to meet the budget.

## Name of Respondent:

Alan Roe
Date of Reply:
08/22/2010

Date of Request: August 12, 2010
Due Date: August 23, 2010

Request No. DAG-58
NMPC Req. No. NM 987 DPS-618

# NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a National Grid 

Docket 10-E-0050 Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation
Rate Case

## Request for Information

FROM: Denise Gerbsch
TO: $\quad$ Revenue Requirement Panel
Subject: Follow up to DAG-3 SUPP 2, Attachments A and B

## Request

The Company's provides Attachments A and B in its response to DAG-3 SUPP 2, which include a listing of invoices and the charges coming through as company 36 or 99 , with a total payable and a total sum to Niagara Mohawk electric.

1. For each Alston and Bird invoice shown on Attachment A that is coming through as a Company 99 charge, please provide the associated billing pool that each was assigned in allocating the total invoice charge.

Response:

1. Please refer to Attachment 1 to DAG-58 for the associated billing pool for each Alston and Bird invoice shown on Attachment A of DAG-3 SUPP 2.
Name of Respondent:
Date of Reply:
James Molloy
August 22, 2010

NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a NATIONAL GRID (COMPANY 36) Alston and Bird - Billing Pool
12 Months Ending September 2009

| Sum of Total Payables \$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vendor | Jmm Id | Invoice No | Billing Pool | Allocation \% | Total |
| ALSTON \& BIRD LLP | AP00199426 | 10226847-D2 | 100233 | 56.43\% | 20,814.80 |
|  |  | 10249882 | 00233 | 56.43\% | 15,726.05 |
|  | AP00199426 Total |  |  |  | 36,540.85 |
|  | AP00203129 | 10256855 | 100236 | 44.55\% | 34.89 |
|  | AP00203129 Total |  |  |  | 34.89 |
|  | AP00205491 | 10256846 | 100233 | 56.43\% | 462.25 |
|  | AP00205491 Total |  |  |  | 462.25 |
|  | AP00207592 | 10264811 | 00236 | 44.55\% | 6,041.60 |
|  | AP00207592 Total |  |  |  | 6,041.60 |
|  | AP00208768 | 10273433 | 00236 | 44.55\% | 3,965.40 |
|  |  | 10273438 | 00233 | 56.43\% | 926.20 |
|  | AP00208768 Total |  |  |  | 4,891.60 |
|  | AP00216524 | 10264804 | 00233 | 55.43\% | 10,534.30 |
|  |  | 10276640 | 00233 | 56.43\% | 4,128.81 |
|  |  | 10276649 | 00236 | 44.55\% | 1,530.00 |
|  |  | 10276684 | 00238 | 54.43\% | 3.485 .60 |
|  | AP00216524 Total |  |  |  | 19,678.71 |
|  | AP00216854 | 10283721 | 00236 | 44.55\% | 35,844.70 |
|  | AP00216854 Total |  |  |  | 35,844.70 |
|  | AP00221760 | 10283714 | 00233 | 56.43\% | 10,019.30 |
|  |  | 10283754 | 00238 | 54.43\% | 33,607.10 |
|  |  | 10290236 | 00233 | 56.43\% | 7,977.46 |
|  |  | 10290242 | 00236 | 44.55\% | 39,333,75 |
|  |  | 10290259 | 00238 | 54.43\% | 20,819.35 |
|  | AP00221760 Total |  |  |  | 111,756.96 |
|  | AP00228043 | 10296336 | 00233 | 54.01\% | 17,983.45 |
|  |  | 10296347 | 00236 | 44.21\% | 686.60 |
|  |  | 10296371 | 00238 | 54.68\% | 10,140.20 |
|  | AP00228043 Total |  |  |  | 28,810.25 |
|  | AP00234810 | 10308238 | 00233 | 54.01\% | 26,468.57 |
|  | AP00234810 Total |  |  |  | 26.468.57 |
|  | AP00243136 | 10316427 | 00236 | 44.21\% | 2,397.40 |
|  | AP00243136 Total |  |  |  | 2,397.40 |
| ALSTON \& BIRD LLP Total |  |  |  |  | 272,927.78 |
| Arand Total |  |  |  | - | 272,927.78 |
|  |  |  |  | FFnc | $\text { rusis } \delta$ |


| Charged to |
| ---: |
| NIMO Electric |
| $11,746.01$ |
| $8,874.37$ |
| $20,620.38$ |
| 15.54 |
| 15.54 |
| 260.85 |
| 260.85 |
| $2,691.72$ |
| $2,691.72$ |
| $1,766.71$ |
| 522.66 |
| $2,289.37$ |
| $5,944.61$ |
| $2,329.93$ |
| 681.66 |
| $1,897.04$ |
| $10,853.24$ |
| $15,969.89$ |
| $15,969.89$ |
| $5,653.99$ |
| $18,290.67$ |
| $4,501.76$ |
| $17,524.34$ |
| $11,330.94$ |
| $57,301.71$ |
| $9,713.41$ |
| 303.56 |
| $5,544.67$ |
| $15,561.64$ |
| $14,296.48$ |
| $14,296.48$ |
| $1,059.94$ |
| $1,059.94$ |
| $140,920.76$ |
| $140,920.76$ |

Date of Request: August 13, 2010
Due Date: August 23, 2010

Request No. CVB-31
NMPC Req. No. NM 992 DPS-623
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## Request for Information

FROM: Christian Bonvin
TO: Infrastructure and Operations Panel

## Request:

On page 58 of 167 of the Infrastructure and Operations Panel's Rebuttal Testimony, the Company states that project C36274 is a "sub project" of Project C33173.

1. Please indicate why this project is a "sub project" in the budget and not a standalone item.
2. Please describe how the Company uses "sub projects" and why this process has not been identified as part of its description of its budget process.
3. Please include documentation in support of how the "sub project" process works, when it is applied, how spending within the project is tracked, etc.
4. Please list all "sub projects" contained in the five year budget and the projects the "sub projects" are associated with.

## Response:

1-4. At the time the FY2011-FY2015 capital plan was being developed, the Albany Network Study was known to be underway but had not yet been finalized. The study was far enough along that Distribution Planning understood a large capital project outcome would be required with estimated timing of construction during FY2011 and FY2012. In order to prevent a "walk-in" to the budget of such large size (approximately $\$ 1.5$ million per annum), an estimate of capital funding required, using the best information available at the time, was included as one budget line item (C33173). This funding was meant to cover any resulting construction required from the outcome of the study. Project C36274 is one of the resulting projects and its initial funding would have been included in the C33173 budget. As estimates for the resulting pieces of the study progress, the newly estimated required funding will be included in subsequent capital plans under the project structure deemed appropriate in the capital planning process.

The term "sub-project" as used on page 58 of 167 of the Infrastructure and Operations Panel's Rebuttal Testimony was used to indicate that C36274 was a project resulting from the Albany Network Study and that its funding was provided for in project C33173 - so that it was not a
replacement project. Occasionally, Distribution line projects may be broken into more than one project to separately track phases or give the ability to report on different portions of a project.
"Sub Project" is not a term consistently used within the capital budgeting process.

Name of Respondent:
Glen DiConza

Date of Reply:
08/22/2010
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## FROM: Christian Bonvin

TO: Infrastructure and Operations Panel
Request:

Beginning on page 60 of 167 of the Infrastructure and Operations Panel's Rebuttal Testimony, the Company discusses its Mercury Vapor (MV) Replacement program. The following questions relate to this discussion.

1. The Company states its basis for the Mercury Vapor Replacement program is pending legislation that will terminate the production of mercury vapor lamps beginning in 2016. Please indicate why the Company is proposing to eliminate all mercury vapor fixtures by $3 / 31 / 13$, nearly three years before production may possibly be stopped. Please indicate how inventory levels of manufacture bulbs factor into the Company's decision.
2. Please indicate how long it would take the Company to replace all MV fixtures at the funding level proposed by Staff.
3. Please identify the number of MV fixtures replaced as part of planned replacement projects performed, as compared to spot replacements, and the total number of MV fixtures replaced for each of the past four years.
4. Do you believe that the funding level proposed by Staff allows for some planned MV replacements projects?

## Response:

1. The Company's plan to eliminate MV luminaires over the three (3) year rate plan period is designed to minimize pricing increases and supply depletion anticipated as lamp manufacturing is curtailed following the adoption of the proposed legislation. The program is also structured to optimize resources, and make use of economies of scale to achieve pricing and logistic benefits. The program fosters positive customer satisfaction by promoting energy efficient lighting at a reduced net cost to the customer and maintains lighting color and luminaire style uniformity throughout the community. These project considerations are not achieved through a spot replacement process.
2. Based upon the project estimates and the number of MV luminaires estimated to be inservice at the beginning of 2011, the conversion project would take approximately 13 years to complete at Staff's recommended funding level using the project's anticipated production efficiencies.
3. The Company is unable to segregate the MV luminaires that have been changed as a function of planned projects versus spot inoperative luminaire replacements. The annual quantity of MV luminaires replaced is presented below.

| Year | MV Luminaires Replaced |
| :---: | ---: |
| 2007 | 270 |
| 2008 | 2,387 |
| 2009 | 1,543 |
| 2010 (To Date) | 773 |

4. Yes. The objective of providing dedicated funding for this conversion program is to enable the conversion work to proceed with minimum impact on the established street lighting capital budget utilized for customer-requested work and/or general end-of-life asset replacement work. As noted in the response to question 2, above, some level of conversion work can occur at the Staff's proposed funding level; however, funding at the Staff-proposed level would significantly delay program completion.

Name of Respondent:
Date of Reply:
John Walter
8/22/2010

Date of Request: August 13, 2010
Due Date: August 23, 2010

Request No. CVB-33
NMPC Req. No. NM 994 DPS-625
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## Request for Information

| FROM: $\quad$ Christian Bonvin |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| TO: | Infrastructure and Operations Panel |

Request:

On page 65 of 167 of the Infrastructure and Operations Panel's Rebuttal Testimony, the Company states that "the Company believes that Engineering Reliability Reviews resulting from identification of pockets of poor performance are the appropriate tool to identify mitigations and recommend action."

1. Please provide all Engineering Reliability Reviews performed to date as part of the Pockets of Poor Performance program.
2. Please provide revised Pockets of Poor Performance Strategy (March 2010).
3. Please provide the sanction papers for all projects included in the Pockets of Poor Performance Strategy.
4. Please state why the projects were not specifically identified as part of the original filing or updated filing.
5. Please indicate if any of these projects will result in the elimination of other previously budgeted work (e.g. the project will cover costs previously included in the capex related to inspection and maintenance).

Response:

1. The Rebuttal Testimony should have referenced a local Engineering Review and not the formal 'Engineering Reliability Review' which applies at the feeder level rather than at the pocket level. The term Pocket Reliability Review would have been a more appropriate term to use.

In FY11, to date, each division in Upstate NY has performed three Pocket Reliability reviews and developed proposed actions based on those reviews. Summary information identifying
the reviews and their findings appears in Appendix 1; the summary information shows the variability in root causes and the need for focused and local responses in each case.
2. Please see Attachment 1 (CVB-33_Attach1_Pockets of Poor Performance).
3. Sanction papers are drafted to address projects which have an estimated budget value of greater than $\$ 1 \mathrm{M}$. Pockets of Poor Performance is used in a programmatic manner with individual work identified by the reviews and addressed locally. Thus there have been no sanction papers for the Pockets of Poor Performance Program.
4. Analyses were undertaken with the new Pockets of Poor Performance Strategy after approval earlier this year. At the time of the filing, analysis had not yet commenced.
5. As stated in the rebuttal testimony, it is not expected that remediation work included in a Pockets of Poor Performance project would result in the elimination of other, previously budgeted work. It is expected that a pocket reliability review would identify any such previously identified and budgeted work.

Name of Respondent:
Tony McGrail

Date of Reply:
8/22/2010

## Appendix 1: Pockets of Poor Performance Reviews and Recommendations:

 Q1 FY11
## New York West

## Frewsburg 6962 - Underwent Repeated Tree Outages

Replace the 65K's on Pole 3 on Bragg Rd with 25 k 's; Replace the 40 k 's on Pole 18 on Munson Rd; with 15 k 's; install new 25 k 's on Pole 39 on Page Rd (Line 38, TD 5365).

## York Center 5352 - Lightning Related Outages and Overloaded Ratio Transformer

Replace ratios with 333 kVA units and install arresters every third pole beyond the ratio ( 25 locations).

Orangeville 1961 - Repeated Blown Fuses
Install 2-40K fuses on Pole 35 on Center Line Rd to fuse 4.8 kv single phase lateral with 400 ft spans; field check for wire slackness.

## New York Central

Newport 62257 - Tree Limb, Deteriorated Equipment and Recloser Events
Extended hazard tree review is recommended for all sections of the feeder beyond the recloser on P171 to the next isolation device; infrared the three phase portions of the circuit from the recloser up to the corner of Haskell Rd to identify any overheating components.

## Hooper Rd. 62258 - Tree Limb, Phase Balancing

Rephase all single phase taps beyond the recloser up to the corner of Route 8 and Haskell Rd. Move all connections from B or C to A . Extended hazard tree review for all sections of the feeder beyond the recloser on P171 to the next isolation device. Reconductor $\sim 2$ miles of 3-phase oh on NYS Route 8 beyond the recloser up to P205 from \#4 to 1/0

## Lighthouse Hill 41- Repeated Outages Related to Trees and Unknown Causes

Review fusing; initial patrol showed no obvious causes

## New York East

Old NYS 30: 39051 - Events Related to Unsectionalized Line Between Recloser
Add sectionalizing switches approximately every mile on Route 30 between the pole 12 and pole 154 reclosers. Perform a coordination study of the 2 reclosers to assure they are coordinated. Change settings as necessary. Have the pole 154 recloser tested for proper operation.

## Elm St.: 45053 - Tree, Storm and MVA Related Events

Review Stony Creek/Hadley Road as it will be configured after ongoing construction is completed for the possible addition of a $3 \varnothing$ recloser.

## Manorton Rd: 30351 - Animal, Tree and MVA Related Events

Add animal guards and review animal protection for entire feeder.

# NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a National Grid <br> Docket 10-E-0050 Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation Rate Case 

Request for Information
FROM: Christian Bonvin
TO: Infrastructure and Operations Panel

## Request:

The following question relates to the Infrastructure and Operations Panel's Rebuttal Testimony:

1. On page 99 of 167 , the Company states "the Company is willing to direct a reasonable portion of the work that would otherwise have gone to Harlan to other providers in order to better assess Harlan's performance." Please indicate what the Company considers a "reasonable portion" and how it relates to Staff's proposal.

## Response:

The Company anticipates that up to $20 \%$ of distribution and sub-transmission line construction will be directed to the Distribution Line Construction (DLC) pilot program, competitively bid, or supplied under other contracting arrangements for specialized resources. The specific amount will vary to provide the flexibility needed to manage cost and delivery performance in light of dynamic factors, including workload optimization, work scopes, timing, and specialty skills.

In an effort to continually improve capital plan work delivery, a suite of Key Performance Indicators (KPI) was agreed and implemented with the Alliance contractors and DLC to measure, benchmark, and optimize contract performance on several fronts including safety, environmental, costs, schedule, documentation, and quality. These KPIs are not applicable to individually bid project work as trend data and an on-going relationship are critical to incentivize and drive continuous improvement.

Name of Respondent:
Annemarie Loftus

Date of Reply: 8/27/2010
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## Request for Information

| FROM: | Christian Bonvin |
| :--- | :--- |
| TO: | Infrastructure and Operations Panel |

Request:
The following questions relate to the Infrastructure and Operations Panel's Rebuttal Testimony:

1. Please explain how the Company determined the $25 \%$ sampling size for the QA Inspection program discussed on page 116 of 167 , including its statistical basis and significance (confidence level, etc.).
2. On page 117 , the Company states "audit of data collections results alone may result in reductions of identified work." Please explain why the Company believes that its inspection program may be incorrectly identifying work, particularly where the Company is in the sixth year of a mandated inspection program?

## Response:

1. As noted in the testimony, the Company implemented $100 \% \mathrm{QA} / \mathrm{QC}$ in a prior program which was similar in nature to the Inspection and Maintenance Program. This led to the success of the program in terms of improving overall quality of work and increasing accountability, which benefited both the Company and customers. The Company felt that performing $25 \%$ QA/QC on work identified from the inspection process would be appropriate given the experience level gained over the last five years since the 2005 Safety Order. Statistical analysis was not performed to determine the $25 \%$ QA/QC level.
2. The Company believes it can improve its ability to identify work through inspections. Improvements in data collection will be a continuous process throughout the life of any program such as the Inspection Program. A more robust audit program and the recommendations that would ensue would provide for a process review and continuous evaluation of the Inspection Program. These recommendations may lead to improved descriptions of codes, improvements to technology, etc.

## Name of Respondent: Date of Reply: <br> John Gavin

Date of Request: August 17, 2010
Due Date: August 27, 2010

Request No. VVP-37
NMPC Req. No. NM 999 DPS-630
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Request for Information

## FROM: Christian Bonvin

TO: Infrastructure and Operations Panel

## Request:

Reference page 115 of 167 of the IOP rebuttal testimony. For Activity TO1166 - Perform Aerial Patrol - Post Fault, please provide:
a) The actual spending for each of the four months for FY11.
b) The actual number of post fault emergency patrols conducted for each of the four months for FY11.
c) The actual number of miles patrolled during the post fault emergency patrols for each of the four months for FY11.
d) Supporting calculations for the anticipated $\$ 321,000$ annual cost.

## Response:

a. The actual spending for each of the four months for FY11 is as follows:


The table above records the cost of the work during the month of the activity. However, the receipt of invoices from the vendors and accounting for the costs may not be reflected in these months. The numbers were derived from actual invoices received from the vendors to correspond with the patrols completed during these time periods. Due to clerical lags, invoices are often not received until a month after work is performed and accrual estimates may not accurately capture all the costs incurred.
b. The actual number of post fault emergency patrols conducted for each of the four months for FY11 is as follows:

|  | April | May | June | July |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Contractor \#1 |  |  | 47 |  |  |  |
| Contractor \#2 |  |  |  | 30 |  |  |
| Total |  | - | - | 47 |  | 30 |

Annualized \# of Lines Flown

The nature of the incidents drives the cost differential in each month. The patrols that occurred in June related to follow-up from the Ottawa, Ontario earthquake on June 23rd. Two helicopters flew 47 lines within a 125 mile radius in 4 days. The patrols that occurred in July were storm-related and involved flying 30 lines over 3 weeks, including weekends, stand-by time, and ferrying costs from the hangar to the patrol area.
c. The actual number of miles patrolled during the post fault emergency patrols for each of the four months for FY11 is as follows:

|  | April | May | June | July |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Contractor \#1 | - | - | 725 | - |  |  |
| Contractor \#2 | - | - | - | 821 |  |  |
| Total |  | - | - | 725 |  | 821 |

$\begin{array}{r}\text { Annualized Miles for Lines Flow } \\ 2,175 \\ 2,462 \\ \hline 4,637 \\ \hline\end{array}$

The nature of the incidents drives the per miles patrolled cost differential. In June, the helicopters were already operating in the vicinity of the earthquake impact area. As a result, ferrying costs were kept to a minimum. It should be noted that ferrying miles are not included in the patrol mile figure. In July, the Company incurred many costs not directly related to the number of miles flown, such as ferrying costs to and from Syracuse, weekend overtime, stand-by time, and higher per diems due to the 3 week patrol period.
d. Supporting calculations for the anticipated $\$ 321,000$ annual cost are as follows:

|  | April | May | June | July |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Contractor \#1 | $\$$ | - | $\$$ | - | $\$$ | 36,360 | $\$$ |
| Contractor \#2 | $\$$ | - | $\$$ | - | $\$$ | - | $\$$ |
| Total $\$ \$$ |  | - | $\$$ | - | $\$$ | 36,360 | $\$ 946$ |


| Annualized Cost (Current $\times 3$ ) |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\$$ | 109,080 |
| $\$$ | 281,838 |
| $\$$ | 390,918 |

Note: the increase from the $\$ 321,000$ reflected in the rebuttal testimony to the $\$ 391,000$ calculated above includes four days not captured in the rebuttal response, as well as a more complete dollar figure for emergency patrol costs that were ongoing at the time the rebuttal was being prepared.

```
Name of Respondent:
Date of Reply:
Matt Bard 8/26/2919
Nick Gibson
Kathy Hammer
Jim McGrath
```
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Request for Information

## FROM: William Lysogorski

TO: Infrastructure and Operations Panel

Request:

1. On pages 51 thru 53 of 167 of the Infrastructure and Operations Panel Rebuttal Testimony, the Company discusses its Distribution RTU Program. The following questions relate to this discussion.
a. Please provide an updated schedule for the 88 RTU replacements, include a list of the Stations and the associated cost (provide the estimated cost for each Station) to replace existing obsolete RTUs.
b. Please provide a list of the 32 original and the 24 additional stations receiving new distribution RTU installations, include the estimated cost for each station and the start /inservice date for each.
c. Please provide the number of RTUs installed in CY10 include the stations where RTU's were installed and the actual cost for each installation.
d. The Company's RAV-3 year to date report for the month of June, CY10, shows a variance of ( $\$ 1,220,605$ ) for CY10 EMS Expansion Actuals vs Forecast. The report explains that the EMS Expansion is on hold pending a review of the overall strategy, yet the Company is recommending that the Staff's proposed adjustments be rejected. Please explain in detail how this effects the Company's recommended capital investment levels for FY11 thru FY14.
2. On page 53 of 167 of the Infrastructure and Operations Panel Rebuttal Testimony, the Company states RTUs at stations will improve energy efficiency by controlling line losses through phase balancing.
a. For years 2006 to YTD, please provide a list of RTU equipped distribution substations where phase balancing has occurred. Include the estimated reduction in line losses.
b. Please explain the process whereby the phase loading data collected is reviewed and addressed when required. Include the percent of unbalance that triggers remediation.

## Response:

1a) Table 1 below lists the 88 stations identified for RTU replacements, their estimated costs and approximate in service dates. Thus 6 RTU replacement projects have been completed in FY10. Estimates and in service dates are subject to change as further work scopes and outage availability become further defined.

Table 1

| R TU Site | Total RTU's | Status | Estimate | Completion |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spier Falls | 1 | Engineering Complete | 275,000 | FY11 |
| Reynolds Rd | 1 | Complete | 556,000 | FY11 |
| Dewitt | 1 | Engineering Complete | 417,000 | FY11 |
| Phillips Road | 1 | Complete | 135,000 | FY10 |
| Mohican | 1 | Complete | 209,000 | FY10 |
| Queensbury | 1 | Complete | 485,000 | FY10 |
| North Creek | 1 | Complete | 209,000 | FY10 |
| Rosa Rd 2 | 1 | Engineering Complete | 209,000 | FY11 |
| Marcy 345 | 1 | Complete | 70,000 | FY10 |
| Marcy 765 | 1 | Complete | 70,000 | FY10 |
| Peat Street | 1 | Engineering Complete | 139,000 | FY11 |
| Adirondack | 1 | Engineering Complete | 207,000 | FY11 |
| Plattsburgh | 1 | Engineering Complete | 245,000 | FY11 |
| Lowville | 1 | Engineering Complete | 105,000 | FY11 |
| Albion | 1 | Engineering Complete | 139,000 | FY11 |
| Alabama SW | 1 | Engineering Complete | 110,000 | FY11 |
| Ischua | 1 | Engineering Complete | 110,000 | FY11 |
| Oakfield | 1 | Engineering Complete | 139,000 | FY11 |
| Valley SW | 1 | Engineering Complete | 174,000 | FY11 |
| Brady | 1 | Engineering Complete | 139,000 | FY11 |
| Pyrites Sw | 1 | Engineering Complete | 110,000 | FY11 |
| Bridge St | 1 | Engineering Complete | 139,000 | FY11 |
| Brighton Ave | 1 | Engineering Complete | 139,000 | FY11 |
| Deerfield | 1 | Engineering Complete | 209,000 | FY11 |
| East Pulaski | 1 | Engineering Complete | 168,000 | FY11 |
| East Watertown | 1 | Engineering Complete | 140,000 | FY11 |
| Elnora | 1 | Engineering Complete | 140,000 | FY11 |
| Euclid | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 140,000 | FY12 |
| Farmington | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 202,000 | FY12 |
| Franklin Falls | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 110,000 | FY12 |
| Fraser | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 202,000 | FY12 |
| Getzville-(AKA Stn 60) | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 279,000 | FY12 |
| Gibson | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 131,000 | FY12 |
| Golah | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 140,000 | FY12 |
| Grooms | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 209,000 | FY12 |
| Hamilton Rd | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 110,000 | FY12 |
| Headson | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 140,000 | FY12 |
| Hopkins Rd | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 209,000 | FY 12 |
| Indian River | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 140,000 | FY12 |
| Kenmore (Sta 64) | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 70,000 | FY12 |
| Lawrence Ave | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 140,000 | FY12 |
| Machias | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 140,000 | FY12 |
| Malta | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 140,000 | FY12 |
| Maplewood | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 209,000 | FY12 |
| Moon Switch | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 110,000 | FY12 |
| N. Catskill | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 202,000 | FY 12 |
| N. Lakeville | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 140,000 | FY 12 |
| N. Leroy | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 209,000 | FY12 |
| Niagara | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 205,000 | FY12 |
| North Carthage 1 | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 209,000 | FY12 |
| Oakdale | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 275,000 | FY12 |
| St. Lawrence | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 240,000 | FY12 |
| Sta 041 | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 125,000 | FY12 |
| Swann Rd | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 140,000 | FY12 |
| Willis | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 202,000 | FY12 |
| Youngstown | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 110,000 | FY12 |
| Zimmerman Switch | 1 | Preliminary Engineering | 110,000 | FY12 |
| Attica | 1 | Conceptual Engineering | 140,000 | FY13 |
| Border City | 1 | Conceptual Engineering | 110,000 | FY13 |
| Cobble Hill | 1 | Conceptual Engineering | 285,000 | FY13 |
| Cobleskill | 1 | Conceptual Engineering | 285,000 | FY13 |
| Depew | 1 | Conceptual Engineering | 110,000 | FY13 |
| ERCC | 1 | Conceptual Engin eering | 110,000 | FY13 |
| Erie St | 1 | Conceptual Engin eering | 135,000 | FY13 |
| Gardenville (F-NYSEG) | 1 | Conceptual Engineering | 175,000 | FY13 |
| N. Broadway | 1 | Conceptual Engineering | 285,000 | FY13 |
| NASC (N. Albany Sve. Ctr) | 1 | Conceptual Engineering | 285,000 | FY 13 |
| Pannell 122A 115kV \& 345 kV | 1 | Conceptual Engineering | 285,000 | FY13 |
| PCC 1 | 1 | Conceptual Engineering | 285,000 | FY13 |
| PCC 2 (Was CRCC) | 1 | Conceptual Engineering | 285,000 | FY13 |
| Pebble Hill | 1 | Conceptual Engineering | 140,000 | FY13 |
| Peterboro |  | Conceptual Engineering | 209,000 | FY13 |
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1b. Table 2 below lists the original 32 stations identified for the installation of RTU's in WEL-4, their estimated costs, and approximate in service dates for those RTU's projects that are currently being engineered. For those projects with in service dates of FY11, final engineering has been completed and material is on order. Budgetary estimates of $\$ 250,000$ have been used for those locations which have not been scoped.

Table 2

| WEL-4 RTU Additions - 32 Original Stations |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Substation | Division | State | Voltages (kV) | FERC | Estimated Cost | In Service |
| Station 068 | West | NY | 23, 4.2 | D | \$250,000 | FY13 |
| Station 127 - Delaware Rd | West | NY | 23, 4.2 | D | \$250,000 | FY13 |
| Station 058 | West | NY | 34.5, 4.2 | D | \$250,000 | FY13 |
| Station 124 - Almeda Ave | West | NY | 34.5, 4.2 | D | \$250,000 | FY13 |
| Chatauqua | West | NY | 34.5, 4.8 | D | \$352,000 | FY12 |
| Middleburgh | West | NY | 69, 13.2 | D | \$300,000 | FY12 |
| French Creek | West | NY | 34.5,13.8 | D | \$308,000 | FY12 |
| Barker | West | NY |  | D | \$363,000 | FY12 |
| Richmond | West | NY | 34.5, 13.2 | D | \$363,000 | FY12 |
| Indian Lake Station 310 | East | NY | 34.5, 4.8 | D | \$250,000 | FY13 |
| Schuylerville Station 39 | East | NY | 34.5, 4.8 | D | \$300,000 | FY12 |
| Ballina Station 221 | Central | NY | 34.5, 13.2 | D | \$319,000 | FY12 |
| Niles Station 294 | Central | NY | 34.5, 132 | D | \$99,000 | FY12 |
| Fort Gage Station 319 | East | NY | 34.5, 13.2 | D | \$250,000 | FY13 |
| Selkirk Station 149 | East | NY | 34.5, 13.2 | D | 341,000 | FY12 |
| Delanson Station 269 | East | NY | 69, 13.2 | D | \$250,000 | FY14 |
| Sharon Station 363 | East | NY | 69,13.2 | D | \$250,000 | FY14 |
| Summit Station 347 | East | NY | 69,23 | D | \$250,000 | FY14 |
| Canajoharie Station 31 (To Be Re | East | NY | 69, 4.8 | D | \$0 | 0 |
| Station 054 | West | NY | 115, 4.2 | D | \$250,000 | FY13 |
| Station 061 | West | NY | 115, 4.2 | D | \$250,000 | FY13 |
| Chadwicks Station 668 | Central | NY | 115, 13.2 | D | \$250,000 | FY13 |
| Lehigh Station 669 | Central | NY | 115, 13.2 | D | \$300,000 | FY13 |
| Southwood Station 244 | Central | NY | 115, 13.2 | D | \$319,000 | FY11 |
| Tully Center Station 278 | Central | NY | 115, 13.2 | D | \$308,000 | FY11 |
| Levitt Station 665 | Central | NY | 115, 4.8 | D | \$250,000 | FY14 |
| Madison Station 654 | Central | NY | 115, 4.8 | D | \$250,000 | FY14 |
| Prospect Hill Station 413 | East | NY | 115, 13.2 | D | \$250,000 | FY11 |
| Saint Johns ville Station 335 | East | NY | 115, 13.2 | D | \$250,000 | FY14 |
| Butternut | East | NY | 115,13.2 | D | \$200,000 | FY11 |
| New Krumkill Station 421 | East | NY | 115, 13,2,4.2 | D | \$250,000 | FY12 |
| Glenwood | Central | NY | 34.5-4.8 | D | \$255,000 | FY11 |

Table 3 below lists the additional 24 stations identified for the installation of RTU's as part of the Company's Rebuttal. Estimated costs are budgetary figures as locations have not been scoped and in service dates are approximate for RTU's projects listed in Table 2.

Table 3

| NG Rebuttal RTU Additions - 24 Additional Stations |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Substation | Division | State | Voltages (kV) | FERC | Estimated Cost | In Service |
| Station 055 | West | NY | 115, 4.2 | D | 250,000 | FY14 |
| Station 139 - Martin Rd | West | NY | 115, 4.2 | D | 250,000 | FY14 |
| Station 129 - Brompton Rd | West | NY | 115, 4.3 | D | 250,000 | FY14 |
| Bremen Station 815 | Central | NY | 115, 13.2 | D | 250,000 | FY14 |
| Bridgeport Station 168 | Central | NY | 115, 13.2 | D | 250,000 | FY14 |
| Dekalb Station 984 | Central | NY | 115, 13.2 | D | 250,000 | FY14 |
| Delphi Station 262 | Central | NY | 115,132 | D | 250,000 | FY14 |
| Gilbert Mills Station 247 | Central | NY | 115,13.2 | D | 250,000 | FY14 |
| Lake Road No. 2 Station 299 | Central | NY | 115, 13.2 | D | 250,000 | FY14 |
| New Haven Station 256 | Central | NY | 115, 13.2 | D | 250,000 | FY14 |
| Raybrook Station 839 | Central | NY | 115, 13.2 | D | 250,000 | FY14 |
| Stitville Station 670 | Central | NY | 115, 13.2 | D | 250,000 | FY14 |
| Wine Creek Station 283 | Central | NY | 115, 13.2 | D | 250,000 | FY14 |
| Clinton Road Station 366 | East | NY | 115,13.2 | D | 250,000 | FY15 |
| Crown Point Station 249 | East | NY | 115, 13.2 | D | 250,000 | FY15 |
| Port Henry Station 385 | East | NY | 115, 13.2 | D | 250,000 | FY15 |
| Station 086 - Lewiston Heights | West | NY | 34.5, 4.8 | D | 250,000 | FY15 |
| Wethersfield Station 23 | West | NY | 34.5, 5.04 | D | 250,000 | FY15 |
| Avenue A Station 291 | East | NY | 34.5, 4.2 | D | 250,000 | FY15 |
| Scotia Station 255 | East | NY | 34.5,4.2 | D | 250,000 | FY15 |
| Ephratah Station 18 | East | NY | 69, 23 | D | 250,000 | FY15 |
| Cattaraugus Station 15. | West | NY | $34.5,4.8$ | D | 250,000 | FY15 |
| Clymer Station 55 | West | NY | 34.5, 4.8 | D | 250,000 | FY15 |
| Station 087 - Lewiston | West | NY | 34.5, 5.04 | D | 250,000 | FY15 |

1c. To date in CY10, no RTU's have been installed, therefore, actual costs are not available. Refer to Table 1 above for the RTU installation schedule to be completed in the remainder of FY11. Many of the RTUs with listed "completion" dates of FY11 are scheduled for installation commencing in November 2010.

1d. The EMS Strategy referenced in RAV-3 is currently being revised to reflect both additional stations being added for RTU installations and a recent review of the Company's approach to EMS. The revised strategy is scheduled for DCIG approval in October 2010. Based upon estimates for the RTU installations referenced in Table 1, the Company's recommended investment levels will likely increase if the Strategy is approved by DCIG.

2a. A list of RTU equipped substations where phase balancing has occurred is not available. Estimated reductions in line losses are also not available. In previous years, there has not been a formal program for feeder phase balancing. Instead, feeder phase balancing has been performed on an ad-hoc basis to address voltage, loading and reliability issues as they arise within operating areas. There is currently a phase balancing pilot underway in the Company's Eastern Division as described in Attachment 1 (WEL-24_Attach 1_Feeder Balancing Pilot). The feeders selected for the pilot have actual EMS data available with which to complete the pre and post balancing analysis. The Company expects to have the analysis available after calendar year 2012 when a full year of post correction history will be available.
$2 b$. The process for reviewing phase balancing for a feeder is dependent on the information available. In some cases, manual peak load readings are obtained at stations not equipped with an RTU. RTU equipped substations have data collected automatically into the ESR 2 K
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application. Manual peak readings and data collected from ESR2K are then collated in the Company's Feedpro database for analysis. Typically, feeder phase balancing is performed on an ad-hoc basis to address voltage, loading and reliability issues as they arise within operating areas. Phase unbalance criteria for evaluation in the feeder balancing pilot described in question (2a) are provided on Page 4 of Attachment 1.
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## 8. Proposed Programs

### 8.1 Proposed Feeder Balancing Program:

As a result of a favorable benefit-cost analysis to reduce losses by improving the distribution feeder load balancing, a pilot program is proposed for National Grid's Eastern Division. The potential loss reduction savings incurred by load balancing in the Eastern Division is assumed to be the highest amongst the divisions.

The effective implementation of load balancing, as described on the benefit-cost analysis, requires the full knowledge of the circuit load profile, which can be obtained by monitoring the feeder loading conditions on an hourly basis via an EMS. The pilot feeder balancing program will then focus only on EMS-equipped distribution feeders. In National Grid's Eastern Division, this corresponds to 68\% of the total number of distribution feeders and $70 \%$ of the served load. This will be limited by the load allocation program utilized by the Company to optimize the feeder loading. However, the company does anticipate that, if it begins Smart Grid pilots, National Grid may be able to optimize the feeder loading through enhanced loading information that would be provided by the advanced meters.

The current percentage of unbalanced distribution EMS-equipped feeders in the NY-National Grid's Eastern Division is shown as follows:
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Figure 8-1: Unbalanced Distribution for EMS-Equipped Feeders in the Eastern Division
In terms of served load, Figure 8-2 as follows depicts the cumulative load distribution for all EMS-equipped feeders in the Eastern Division in relation to their percent unbalance.
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Figure 8-2: Cumulative Load Percent in Terms of Percent Unbalance for all EMS-Equipped Feeders in the Eastern Division

The identification of distribution feeders for which load balancing is economically viable will depend on the magnitude of the served load, and the feeder load unbalance factor. Using a cost estimate of $\$ 435 / \mathrm{re}$-phase, an average of 3 rephases per feeder to improve the unbalance factor, and the incurred loss reduction savings, the minimum kW loss reduction necessary to justify the load balancing can be calculated. A typical distribution feeder was utilized to estimate how the line losses, in kW, change with load and unbalance factor. The combination of both minimum required loss reduction and typical line loss characteristic curves for different unbalance factors can be used as a reference to help identify potential candidate feeders for load balancing. The results of this analysis can be observed in the following graphic.
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Figure 8-3: Reference Chart for Loss Reduction Requirements for Load Balancing Justification

Based on the graphic shown in Figure 8-3, a total of 135 EMS-equipped feeders have been identified for load balancing in accordance with the following criteria.

| Criteria | Number of Feeders |
| :--- | :---: |
| Feeders <100A, \%UNB $\geq 25 \%$ | 8 |
| Feeders 100A - 200A, \%UNB $\geq 15 \%$ | 35 |
| Feeders 200A - 300A, \%UNB $210 \%$ | 59 |
| Feeders $>300 \mathrm{~A}, \%$ UNB $\geq 7 \%$ | Total : |
|  | 135 |

Table 8-1: Criteria for Identification of Feeders for Load Balancing

For the purposes of this proposed pilot program, load balancing is achieved only by means of phase changes in the field. When a feeder requires more than phase changes for effective load balancing, such as installation of additional phase(s) to
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long single phase laterals, the magnitude of loss reduction savings is not sufficient to justify the required capital investment and shall be avoided.

The revenue requirements and proposed timeframe for the implementation of this pilot program are summarized in Table 8-2 as follows.

| Year | Required Investment |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2010 | $\$ 88,740$ |
| 2011 | $\$ 90,060$ |
|  | Total: |

Table 8-2: Pilot Program Required Investments
It is estimated that the implementation of this program will incur a total of 808 MWh/year in loss savings.

It should be noted that where service interruptions are necessary to effectuate the re-phasing of circuits, these interruptions should not be included in the Company's reliability metrics.

# NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a National Grid <br> Docket 10-E-0050 Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation <br> Rate Case 

Request for Information
FROM: Staff Infrastructure Panel
TO: Infrastructure and Operations Panel
Request:

1. The IOP rebuttal testimony at page 25 of 167 states, "In the Company's response to IR DPS-415 (VVP-29), we stated that the cost per span (to bring it up to code) was expected to average about $\$ 75,000$. However, we also stated that for four projects (C31136, C31137, C31138, and C31141) the conceptual cost to correct each substandard span was approximately $\$ 105,000-\$ 150,000$."
a. Identify where in the Company's response to VVP-29 (response to which question) the Company stated that "for four projects (C31136, C31137, C31138, and C31141) the conceptual cost to correct each substandard span was approximately $\$ 105,000$ $\$ 150,000$."
b. Identify where in the Company's response to VVP-29 conceptual costs from approximately $\$ 105,000$ to $\$ 150,000$ could be developed (if it was not specifically stated).
c. Confirm that the conceptual cost to correct each substandard span mentioned in response to question 1.d. of VVP-29 ranged from approximately $\$ 76,500$ to $\$ 97,800$.
d. Confirm that the conceptual cost to correct the average substandard span mentioned in response to question 1.d. of VVP-29 was $\$ 82,000$.
e. Confirm that the conceptual cost to correct the average substandard span mentioned in response to question 1.d. of VVP-29 included costs for live line work similar to some projects identified in Exhibit_(IOP-4R) of the IOP rebuttal testimony.

Response:
In responding to this IR, the Company identified some inaccuracies in the information presented in the rebuttal testimony, and also identified the need to update and clarify information included in the response to IR VVP-29. Below, the Company provides specific responses to the questions presented in this IR, followed by background information on the Conductor Clearance Strategy and details of the cost estimates to address clearance issues on a per span basis. To the extent corrections to the rebuttal testimony are necessary, they are briefly described below, and will be formally presented at the hearings.
1.a. The rebuttal testimony incorrectly referenced the response to IR VVP-29. The response to VVP-29, question 1.d, indicated that the approximate average cost to address a substandard span under the referenced projects was $\$ 82,000$.
1.b. The referenced conceptual costs of approximately $\$ 105,000$ to $\$ 150,000$ can not be directly developed from the information provided in response to VVP-29.
1.c. Based on the information provided in VVP-29, question 1,d, the range of approximate costs per substandard span is $\$ 76,500$ to $\$ 97,800$.
1.d. The response to VVP-29, question 1,d, indicates that the cost per substandard span is $\$ 82,000$.
1.e. The response to VVP-29, question 1,d, states that "[M]uch of the work for these 345 kV lines is anticipated to be live line . . .." However, as clarified below, the current estimates of costs for this work do not include additional costs associated with live line work.

Background:
When the Conductor Clearance Strategy Paper SG029 was approved in April 2009, it assumed a typical cost of bringing a substandard span up to code would be $\$ 75,000$. While this estimate was an order-of-magnitude estimate, it was based upon experience with conductor clearance refurbishment projects on other areas of National Grid.

Subsequent to the strategy approval, the Company completed conceptual engineering on a number of transmission lines. The conceptual engineering process for conductor clearance refurbishment projects involves a four step approach:

- Conceptual Phase 1 - The "raw" PLS-CADD model is used for comparison against the latest version of the National Electric Safety Code (NESC). Relatively minor quality assurance checking of the model is done.
- Conceptual Phase 2 -For circuits with more than $1 \%$ of the spans determined to be Level 1 and 2 substandard spans, the "raw" PLS-CADD model is used for comparison against the governing code of the NESC (if different from the latest version).
- Conceptual Phase 3 - Desktop quality assurance checking is performed based upon the overall cumulative circuit risk.
- Conceptual Phase 4 - Field walk down and final determination of spans failing to meet the governing or current codes.

At the conclusion of Phase 4 to the conceptual engineering process, a conceptual engineering report (CER) is prepared, reviewed, and approved. The Phase 4 CER covers a specific transmission line and provides project cost estimates based upon actual field conditions. (Copies of several CERs were provided with the response to IR VVP- 38.) A conductor clearance refurbishment conceptual engineering report is more detailed than the typical conceptual
engineering report. However, during preliminary and final engineering, the design solutions may change if better engineering solutions are identified.

Another key assumption for estimating the strategy was that only $25 \%$ of the spans initially identified as Level 1 or 2 substandard spans during Phase 2 would be confirmed as requiring work after completion of the Phase 4 analysis. The actual result was that approximately $45 \%$ of the Level 1 or 2 spans identified during the Level 2 process required correction.

## Development of per span estimate:

Table 1 below shows the latest summary of the project related information, primarily derived from the approved CERs.

Table 1. Conductor Clearance Refurbishment Summary Information and Cost Analysis

| Cktic \# | Operating Name | Funding Order | Voltage (kV) | Capital | Removal | O8M | Allowable <br> Variance <br> Used | Total Conceptual Estimate | Estimate Source | Phase: <br> Level 1 <br> 82 <br> Spans | Phase 3 Leve | Phase 4 CER spans to fix |  | Avg. Capital Cost Per Span | Total Trans. Cost Per Span |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T2720 | Voiney - Clay 6 | C31136 | 345 | 1,760,000 | 223,000 | 112,000 | 105,000 | \$2,200,000 | Final CER | 32 | 25 | 23 | 71.9\% | \$76,522 | \$95,652 |
| T2350 | Nine Mile Pt One - Clay 8 | C31137 | 345 | 960,000 | 95,000 | 205,000 | 65,000 | \$1,325,000 | Final CER | 28 | 13 | 11 | 39.3\% | \$87,273 | \$120,455 |
| T2090 | Clay - Teall 10 | C31147 | 115 | 975,000 | 129,000 | 142,000 | 77,000 | \$1,323,000 | Draft | 27 |  | 15 | 55.6\% | \$65,000 | \$88,200 |
| T2540 | Scriba - Volney 20 | C31138 | 345 | 577,000 | 65,000 | 85,000 | 37,000 | \$764,000 | Final CER | 28 | 7 | 7 | 25.0\% | \$82,429 | \$109,143 |
| T2420 | Oswego - Lafayette 17 | C31141 | 345 | 782,000 | 95,000 | 48,000 | 55,000 | \$980,000 | Final CER | 17 | 9 | 8 | 47.1\% | \$97,750 | \$122,500 |
| T1490 | Lockport - Batavia 107 | C31149 | 115 | 348,000 | 56,000 | 26,000 | 21,500 | \$451,500 | Final CER | 18 | 6 | 4 | 22.2\% | \$87,000 | \$112,875 |
| T1580 | Mortimer - Golah 110 | C31150 | 115 | 1,000,000 | 190,000 | 90,000 | 0 | \$1,280,000 | Final CER | 34 | 18 | 16 | 47.1\% | \$62,500 | \$80,000 |
| T1690 | Niagara - Lockport 101 | C31151 | 115 | 143,000 | 22,000 | 11,000 | 4,000 | \$180,000 | Final CER | 0 | 6 | 1 | * | \$143,000 | \$180,000 |
| T1700 | Niagara - Lockport 102 | C31152 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 160,000 | 0 | \$160,000 | Final CER | 41 | 4 | 1 | 4.9\% | So | \$160,000 |
| T1820 | Packard - Huntley 130 | C31154 | 115 | 2,049,000 | 287,500 | 93,500 | 121.500 | \$2,551,500 | Final CER | 26 | 18 | 15 | 57.7\% | \$136,600 | \$170,100 |
| $\begin{gathered} T 1240 \& \\ T 1250 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Gardenville - Dunkirk 73 \& 74 | C31153 | 230 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Final CER | 17 | 4 | 1 | 5.9\% | \$0 | . |
| $\begin{gathered} T 1210 \& \\ T 1220 \end{gathered}$ | Gardenville - Buffalo River $145 \& 146$ | C31155 | 115 | 293,000 | 32,000 | 440,000 | 5,000 | \$770,000 | Final CER | 19 | 23 | 11 | 57.9\% | \$26,636 | \$70,000 |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { T1400 \& } \\ T 1419 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Huntley - Gardenville 79 \& 80 | C31156 | 230 | 2,923,000 | 388,500 | 484,500 | 174,000 | \$3,970,000 | Draft | 20 |  | 22 | 110.0\% | \$132,864 | \$180,455 |
|  |  | Totals |  | \$11,810,000 | \$1,583,000 | \$1,897,000 | \$665,000 | \$15,955,000 |  |  |  | 135 | 45.4\% | \$87,481 | \$118,185 |
|  |  | Ave/Span |  | \$87,481 | \$11.726 | \$14,052 | \$4,926 | \$118,185 |  |  |  |  | Average | Average | Average |

Notes:

- $\left(^{*}\right)$ indicates a value of $(0)$.
- The average percentage of spans requiring correction at the end of Phase 4 versus Phase 2 is approximately $45 \%$ which is above the strategy SG029 assumption of $25 \%$.
- Substandard Level 3 spans are not included in this analysis.
- Distribution related costs are not included in this analysis. For example, with Funding Order C31153, moving a distribution structure corrects the problem.
- The costs associated with this table do not factor into consideration the increased costs associated with live line work. A decision on whether or not to pursue live-line work is usually made by the conclusion of Step 2A of the Project Management Playbook (preliminary engineering and sanctioning).

Per Table 1, the average capital cost per span is $\$ 87,481$. The expected variance typically is $\pm 5 \%$. Thus the ranges for de-energized work would be as follows:

Table 2. Average Cost Per Span with Expected Variances

| AvelSpan | Capital | Removal | O8M | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variance $($ <br> $5 \%)$ | 83,107 | 11,140 | 13,349 | 107,596 |
| Variance <br> $(+5 \%)$ | 91,856 | 12,312 | 14,754 | 118,922 |

The capital costs per span have an average rounded off range from approximately $\$ 83,000$ to 92,000 for de-energized line work.

However, the costs associated with Table 1 or 2 do not factor into consideration the potential for live line work. This was not clearly stated in the response to VVP-29, question 1.d. Live line work can be expected to increase the cost per span by up to $50 \%$ as illustrated in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Average Cost Per Span Utilizing Live Line Work Methods

|  | Range | Ave/Span | Capital | Removal | O8M | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Live line Adjustment - higher | $150 \%$ | - | 124,867 | 14,633 | 13,776 | 153,276 |

Therefore, the complete range of capital costs to correct conductor clearance issues is approximately $\$ 83,000$ to $\$ 125,000$, or an average cost of $\$ 104,000$ per span.

The average costs described in the IOP rebuttal testimony were based on the total cost of the project, including Removal and $O \& M$. The testimony will be clarified at the hearing to indicate the associated capital-only costs for the conductor clearance work.

Name of Respondent:
Date of Reply:
Art J. Peterson, Jr.
Keith Tornifoglio

# NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a National Grid 

Docket 10-E-0050 Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation Rate Case

## Request for Information

FROM: Staff Infrastructure Panel
TO: Infrastructure and Operations Panel
Request:

1. Please explain what study has been undertaken or on what basis the Company determined that the average cost per span developed from projects shown in Exhibit_(IOP-4R) of the IOP rebuttal testimony represent a true average cost for all spans intended to be remediated under the conductor clearance strategy.
2. Please explain if any normalizing adjustments were conducted to develop the average cost per span shown in Exhibit_(IOP-4R) of the IOP rebuttal testimony. If not, please explain why no normalizing adjustments were conducted.

## Response:

1. As discussed in IR DPS-634 (VVP-39), the Company based its estimates on thirteen projects, of which, eleven have completed and approved Conceptual Engineering Reports (CERs) and two currently have draft CERs in the review process. These estimates included line specific field walk downs and analyses. The capital costs per span have an average range of $\$ 83,000$ to $\$ 92,000$ for de-energized line work and up to $\$ 125,000$ for live line work.
2. Since the average cost per span was based upon specific transmission lines following an engineering field verification process, normalizing adjustments were not used. The Company plans to continue the four phase conceptual engineering process described in VVP39 on a project-by-project basis. These project cost estimates will be used to update the Company's cost projections for each conductor clearance refurbishment project as it is identified. Following construction completion of 10 or more conductor clearance refurbishment projects, the overall strategy cost projection will be re-examined using a revised average cost per span based on actual costs.

Name of Respondent:
Art Petersen

Date of Reply: 8/3/2010

Date of Request: August 20, 2010
Due Date: August 30, 2010

Request No. WEL-25
NMPC Req. No. NM 1046 DPS-637

NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a National Grid
Docket 10-E-0050 Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation Rate Case

Request for Information
FROM: William Lysogorski
TO:
Infrastructure and Operations Panel

## Request:

1. On pages 90 thru 92 of 167 of the Infrastructure and Operations Panel's Rebuttal Testimony, the Company discusses the benefits of control center consolidation. The following questions relate to this discussion.
a. Please provide a detailed explanation or description of best practices the Company follows in the existing control rooms that require consolidation for these practices to be shared. Explain why these practices are not incorporated into System and Electric Operating Procedures and the day -to- day operation of the existing control centers.
b. Provide a detailed explanation describing how consolidation leads to a more consistent application of real time monitoring and response to events.
c. Provide a detailed explanation describing how consolidation allows for more efficient management of emergency events excluding major storms.
d. Provide a detailed explanation describing how consolidation allows for more efficient management of major storms. Include a description of the changes consolidation will make to existing storm procedures.
e. For each year, beginning in 2006 thru 2010, provide the number of times the local storm boards were activated in each control area (East, West, \& Central); include locality name, example: Albany, Saratoga, Buffalo, etc., the date and duration the storm board was open.
f. Provide a detailed explanation of the procedures presently in place for opening local storm boards. Include the rationale for determining the scale (small, medium, or large) of a storm/event. If procedures are to be changed due to consolidation, provide the new procedures as well as current procedures.
2. On page 91 of 167 , the Company stated that Staff based its conclusion on the benefits of the consolidation, in part, on the incorrect view that consolidation will actually adversely affect
the efficiency of the system operators, and that the benefits from the consolidation arise from the upgraded system s alone. Please explain (a) how the Company derived this conclusion when in Staffs Testimony it stated "considering the fact operators are familiar with the geographic area, area operating personnel, and the areas infrastructure, consolidation would in effect reduce efficiency - Staff Infrastructure Panel Testimony pg 150 lines 5-9; (b) include an explanation of why geographic knowledge would not affect efficiency.

## Response:

1a. While Niagara Mohawk's three divisional control centers follow the same operational practices as outlined in the System and Electric Operating Procedures, we believe the three control centers each bring individual efficiencies when implementing these procedures and handling routine operations. The consolidation will allow the interaction of System Operators to collaborate and select best practices while adopting them across the three divisions as well as manage events more consistently across Niagara Mohawk.

1b. Consolidation will allow a greater number of resources to be available for events. The vast majority of events rarely impact the entire network simultaneously. Therefore, System Operators from non-affected areas will be in place to monitor and respond to these events. This will allow for a faster restoration process, which under the existing arrangement could be delayed due to local resource constraints until additional System Operators or Field personnel can be contacted and brought on the property.

1c. The ability of a consolidated control room to handle a greater number of storm events, not classified as major storms, in place of the local Storm Boards than occurs today is expected to realize savings of approximately $\$ 306 \mathrm{~K}$. The savings involves two components; Field Storm Board savings from the reduction of Clerical and Supervisors overtime by not opening the local Storm Boards, and increased crew efficiency by having supervisors, who would normally man the local Storm Boards, in the field with their crews during restoration.

1d. We do not anticipate a significant difference with the consolidated control center of the management of major storms versus divisional control centers. A major storm will have local storm boards open that will be manned by local supervision. As stated previously, the consolidated control room will allow additional resources to be placed on restoration since it is rare that all divisions are affected simultaneously by a major event.
le. Notification of local storm board openings is provided to the PSC as the event occurs. However, the Company does not maintain a list of the storm board openings.

1f. The procedure we follow to open local storm boards is provided in Attachment 1 (WEL25 Attach 1 CRCC 3.9). Pages 4 and 5 of the NY Electric Emergency Procedure EEP.01, provided in Attachment 2 (WEL-25_Attach 2_EEP 01), define our Classifications of Emergencies and cross reference our classifications to the PSC storm classifications. We do not anticipate any modifications to EEP. 01 due to consolidation.
2. As described above, the Company believes that long-term benefits will be created from consolidation of the control centers. In the short term, the Company does expect that Operator efficiency will be temporarily reduced due to less local knowledge of the area's geography, infrastructure design and Operations personnel. The Company experienced this when it consolidated the Northern Regional Control Center into the Central Regional Control Center in 1998. The new Northern Operators took approximately one year to gain the required knowledge to efficiently perform their duties. It is reasonable to anticipate the same time frame for any new operators to acquire the local knowledge necessary to perform their duties in the consolidation of the three existing control centers.

The consolidation will require both a comprehensive training plan for new Operators and incentives for current Operators in the East and West to transfer to the consolidated control center to retain as much local knowledge as practical .

Name of Respondent:
Ted Pytel

Date of Reply:
Aug 230, 2010

## nationalgrid

SECTION 3: CRCC
TOPIC 3.9: Decentralization During Storms

CRCC MEMOS \& PROCEDURES

This procedure offers guidelines to the Shift Supervisor for making the decision to decentralize during a storm event.

1. A decision to open a line barn storm board and decentralize operations must be made in consultation with the appropriate T\&D supervision and the CRCC SS. Regional Operators should communicate any information associated with opening a Line Barn Storm Board to the Shift Supervisor.
2. Triggers that determine when it is necessary to open a storm board:

- Two qualified operators cannot handle the workload on the desk. -or-
- All qualified and available line mechanics are on duty and Trouble Orders are still coming in.
-or-
- Numerous outages that will last more than six hours

3. CRCC must log the time that the line barn is opened and the time the barn is closed.

- CRCC SS must run the appropriate ARCOS scenario whenever a line barn is opened or closed and place an announcement that the barn has been opened /closed on the Operating District Message Board.
- The Line Barn is responsible for the updates of Broadcast Message System and PORD.

4. Opening the line barn, means that the local barn has assumed the duties of trouble dispatch only. This responsibility includes tracking and documenting 911 response in CAD Look UP. Per EOP G014, all switching and tagging must continue to be directed by the controller, CRCC.
5. If the magnitude of the storm warrants, controllership may be delegated to field forces. Again this requires agreement between the CRCC SS and the field supervisor. Per EOP G014 this information must be documented when controllership is delegated to an individual. It must also be documented when controllership is relinquished back to CRCC. When delegated, the "new" controller is responsible for all documentation per EOP G014.

NOTE: Generally, CRCC will delegate controllership of single phase distribution to field forces as deemed necessary and agreed to by the CRCC SS and field personnel. CRCC will normally retain controllership of 3 phase to facilitate tying circuits, sectionalizing, etc.

| Approved by |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Derek D. Olson | Page 1 of 2 | $02 / 14 / 06$ |
| Manager CRCC |  |  |

## nationalgrid

SECTION 3: CRCC
TOPIC 3.9: Decentralization During Storms

- In major storms, (ice storm or Labor Day Storm), consideration will be given to delegating 3 phase distribution circuits on a circuit by circuit basis.

6. Trouble Dispatch Responsibility will not be accepted back by CRCC from the Barn until PORD and 911 Documentation is updated to the time of transfer of responsibility.

Approved by
Derek D. Olson

| nationalgrid <br> NY ELECTRIC EMERGENCY PROCEDURES MANUAL | Doc No:: | EEP. 01 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Dage: <br> Date: $08 / 01 / 10$ <br> Supercedes: 02/01/10 6 |  |
|  | SECTION: EEP.01 |  |

> It is the responsibility of each Divisional Director Electric Customer Operations or Supt. T\&D to closely monitor all emergencies and to evaluate their severity. The importance of evaluation cannot be overstated and must be made at the earliest possible moment of occurrence.
> The Director Electric Customer Operations or Supt. T\&D has the responsibility to implement emergency procedures within the Region associated with the emergency severity. The respective Vice President-Division Customer Operations as well as the Senior VP Customer Operations and the Emergency Planning shall be immediately notified by the Region of Class III, IV, and V emergencies. A major storm number will be issued by Emergency Planning, by region affected, for every Class IV or V storm event.

## MAJOR EVENT JUSTIFICATION DOCUMENTATION FOR PSC RELIABILITY AND DEFERRAL

Emergency (Major Storm) Evaluation for Class III or Greater Events - The Director Electric Customer Operations or Manager T\&D shall evaluate the event from its onset to determine if a major storm classification may be applicable. This evaluation shall be based upon the following criteria:

1. The weather event has caused either ten percent ( $10 \%$ ) of the customers in an *Operating Region to experience interrupted service at one point in time during the event; (Reliability and Deferral) or
2. Customers within an *Operating Region have experienced interrupted service for at least twenty-four (24) hours. (Reliability) or

At least 1\% or more of customers within an *Operating Region have experienced interrupted service for at least twenty-four (24) hours. (Deferral)
*Note: The New York Operating Regions are Frontier, Genesee, Southwest, Central, Northern, Mohawk, Capital, and Northeast.

To justify that an event has qualified as a major storm for PSC reliability or PSC deferral, Electric Customer Operations will need to fax the following information to Asset Strategy and Performance (fax: 315-460-9124) for review and concurrence. A major storm work order number shall be issued by Emergency Planning on a regional basis.

| nationalgrid NY ELECTRIC EMERGENCY PROCEDURES MANUAL | Doc No: EEP. 01 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Page: 2 of 6 |
|  | Date: 08/01/10 <br> Supercedes: 02/01/10 |
| SUBJECT: CLASSIFICATION OF EMERGENCIES | SECTION: EEP 01 |

Once all supporting documentation has been reviewed and accepted, an event will be qualified as a major storm for either reliability purposes and/or deferral treatment. Asset Strategy and Performance shall notify Distribution Finance of the results of the review. Distribution Finance shall process the deferral requirements when it is determined the event is qualified. Asset Strategy and Performance shall be responsible for obtaining and retention of all supporting documentation for the classification of major storms for PSC reliability and deferral:
A. When an event causes ten percent (10\%) of the customers in an *Operating Region to experience interrupted service, the documented validation by the Regional Control Center of facility lockouts comprising the ten percent of customers (at one point in time) shall be provided. The validation should include the date and time of the lockout, Operating Region involved, customers affected and restored date and time if restoration of the facility has occurred.
B. When an event causes an *Operating Region to experience interrupted customer service for more than twenty-four (24) hours, copies of the associated actual interruption (SIR System) tickets completed by the line crews shall be provided for either Reliability or Deferral qualification. In order to process the deferral storm successfully, interruption tickets for 1 percent of the regions customers out of service greater than 24 hours are required. The Power-On order sheets sent by the Regional Control Center are not acceptable. However, the Power On order \# should be noted on the interruption ticket. The event qualifies only on SIR interruption tickets. In order to eliminate reporting mistakes, durations and customers affected are to be verified by Electric Customer Operations before sending the interruption tickets to Asset Strategy and Performance for review and concurrence.

Note: Power-On/Portis reporting sheets cannot be accepted at this time as a valid source for justifying the evaluation of events.
C. If an event necessitates that Mutual Aid assistance will be required by National Grid or other reasons as determined necessary by the Director Distribution Engineering Services, a Work Order Number will be issued by Emergency Planning for that event. However, documentation as noted above to qualify an event as a major storm is still required

For all major storms the divisions shall capture the following information required in Attachment 1, by region and submit to Director Emergency Planning upon storm completion. Distribution Engineering Services shall provide the information to Distribution Construction for review prior to forwarding to Finance. Each Division requested to provide assistance in National Grid NY service territory must also complete the bottom section of Attachment 1 and submit to Director Emergency Planning upon completion of the storm.

| nationalgrid | Doc No.: EEP 01 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Page: 3 of 6 |
| NY ELECTRIC EMERGENCY PROCEDURES MANUAL | Date: 08/01/10 <br> Supercedes: 02/01/10 |
| SUBJECT: CLASSIFICATION OF EMERGENCIES | SECTION: EEP 01 |

For all storms where a storm Work Order Number is issued that is not a Class V Emergency, Electric Customer Operations is to provide the Director Emergency Planning with a storm summary report. If the storm is classified as a Class $V$ Emergency, then the requirements of EEP 08 are to be followed, unless directed otherwise by the Director Emergency Planning.

PRELIMINARY WEATHER REPORTS

It is of great importance that the weather be monitored closely, particularly during periods of impending adverse conditions. Forecasts may be obtained from weather websites, Regional Control Centers, and National Grid's retained weather service provider.

Weather reports as well as severity and tracking should be communicated to NE.

Forecasts of severe weather may dictate the need to alert key supervision convene a storm conference call or place personnel on standby status. The respective Vice Presidents Division Operations shall be notified

| nationalgrid | Doc No: EEP 01 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Page: 4 of 6 |
| NY ELECTRIC EMERGENCY PROCEDURES MANUAL | Date: 08/01/10 <br> Supercedes: 02/01/10 |
| SUBJECT: CLASSIFICATION OF EMERGENCIES | SECTION: EEP. 01 |

CLASSIFICATIONS Whenever failure of electric service does occur, the Emergency Organization is alerted progressively to the class necessary. The classification of an emergency is dependent upon how geographically widespread the emergency is

The following are guidelines to determine the severity of emergencies and their classifications:

CLASS I The severity within a District is such that complete restoration can be accomplished by the District manpower in an eight (8) hour period. Events in this classification typically possess any of the following characteristics: gusty winds, heat, rain, freezing rain, snow and/or lightning resulting in minor line problems, light system outages, and possible occasional damaged circuits that are relatively local in nature

CLASS II The severity within a District is such that complete restoration cannot be accomplished by District personnel resources in an eight (8) hour period. Assistance from other Districts within a Region is required to accomplish complete restoration within an eight (8) hour period. Events in this classification typically possess any of the following characteristics: gusty winds, heat, rain, freezing rain, snow and/or lightning resulting in minor line problems, light system outages, and possible occasional damaged circuits that are relatively local in nature.

CLASS III The severity within a Region is such that complete restoration can be accomplished with its own Regional manpower in an eight (8) to twenty-four (24) hour period. Events in this classification typically possess any of the following characteristics: gusty winds, heat, rain, freezing rain, snow and/or lightning resulting in minor line problems, light system outages, and possible occasional damaged circuits that are relatively local in nature

| nationalgrid <br> NY ELECTRIC EMERGENCY PROCEDURES MANUAL | Doc No.: |
| :---: | :--- |
|  | Page: <br> Date: 01 <br> Supercedes: $01 / 10$ <br> SUBJECT: 6 |


| PSC CLASSIFICATIONS | CLASS I | Restoration using normal division resources - <br> PSC Class I = NG Class I, II or III |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | CLASS II | Restoration using company resources - <br> PSC Class I = NG Class IV |
|  | CLASS IIII | Restoration requiring outside mutual assistance - <br> PSC Class III = NG Class V |


| nationalgrid | Doc No.: | EEP. 01 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Page: | 6 of 6 |
| NY ELECTRIC EMERGENCY PROCEDURES MANUAL | Date: 08/01/10 <br> Supercedes: 02/01/10 |  |
| SUBJECT: CLASSIFICATION OF EMERGENCIES | SECTION |  |

Attachment 1

MEW YORK MAUOR STORM DALY DATA FORA
nationalgrid



# NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a National Grid <br> Docket 10-E-0050 Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation Rate Case 

## Request for Information

FROM: Vijay Puran
TO: Infrastructure and Operations Panel
Request:

1. Provide the studies referenced on page 28 of 167 of the IOP rebuttal testimony that the Company maintains demonstrate that Maplewood plus the Central and Mohawk Valley areas show the combined need for at least 18 breaker replacements, and possibly as many as 22 .

## Response:

The Company's rebuttal testimony states that "full documentation will be available in the fall upon completion of area studies in progress." All that is available at this time are the fault study results from the Aspen fault current analysis software used to perform the calculations. The table below lists the 18 breakers that the program shows are at or above their interrupting capability plus four others that are very close to their capability. These screening level study results are being confirmed in the ongoing area studies.

|  | Station | Breaker | \% of Capability |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Ash St | R80 | 113 |
| 2 | Ash St | R8105 | 113 |
| 3 | Ash St | R8305 | 113 |
| 4 | Ash St | R70 | 111 |
| 5 | Oswego | R30 | 127 |
| 6 | Oswego | R20 | 133 |
| 7 | Oswego | R50 | 132 |
| 8 | Oswego | R85 | 132 |
| 9 | Teall | R15 | 125 |
| 10 | Teall | R8105 | 104 |
| 11 | Temple | R805 | 112 |
| 12 | Temple | R815 | 112 |
| 13 | Temple | R825 | 112 |
| 14 | Temple | R835 | 112 |
| 15 | Maplewood | R15 | 117 |
| 16 | New Scotland | R19 | 100 |
| 17 | New Scotland | R20 | 100 |
| 18 | Geres Lock | R815 | 100 |


| 19 | New Scotland | R3 | 99 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 20 | New Scotland | R9 | 99 |
| 21 | New Scotland | R13 | 99 |
| 22 | New Scotland | R7 | 98 |

Name of Respondent:
Joseph J. Hipius
Date of Reply:
8/30/10

# NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a National Grid <br> Docket 10-E-0050 Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation Rate Case 

Request for Information
FROM: Vijay Puran
TO: Infrastructure and Operations Panel
Request:

1. Please provide workpapers to support the $\$ 500,000$ average circuit breaker installed replacement cost referenced on page 41 of 167 of the IOP rebuttal testimony. Include a detailed description of (a) the breaker specifications and (b) the specific retrofit and ancillary equipment work assumed in developing the estimate.
2. Please explain how the cost estimates for (a) different site conditions, (b) each separate voltage class, (c) current interrupting capability (d) along with the expected mix of each type were taken into account in determining the $\$ 500,000$ average circuit breaker replacement cost.

## Response:

1. There are no specific workpapers to support the $\$ 500,000$ per breaker estimate. The Company's response to question (1c) of IR DPS-399 (VVP-22) outlines the assumptions made in order to develop budgetary estimates for breaker replacements.

Breaker types used to determine study grade cost estimates were Mitsubishi $115 \mathrm{kV}, 230 \mathrm{kV}$ and 345 kV , SF6 Gas Circuit Breakers with 50 kA of interrupting capability, up to (6) sets of CTs, local annunciators and field service. Summary manufacturer specifications are provided in Attachment 1 (VVP-42_Attach 1_Breaker Spec). In addition, the most recent breaker pricing sheets are provided in Attachment 2 (VVP-42_Attach 2_Breaker Pricing).

Note: Attachment 1 references a 345 kV Gas Circuit breaker. The 115 kV and $230 \mathrm{kV} \mathrm{SF}{ }_{6}$ Gas Circuit Breakers are of similar design and specification.
2. The $\$ 500,000$ per breaker cost estimate is for budgetary purposes only. Cost adjustments associated with varying requirements such as site conditions, voltages and interrupting capabilities are incorporated during full engineering reviews on a site by site basis.

| Name of Respondent: | $\quad$ Date of Reply: |
| :--- | :--- |
| Kelley Csizmesia | $8 / 31 / 10$ |

# NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a National Grid 

Docket 10-E-0050 Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation Rate Case

## Request for Information

FROM: Denise Gerbsch
TO: $\quad 1$

Request: Follow up to RAV-154
In its response to IR RAV-154, James Malloy provided information on behalf of the Company related to various employee expenses in calendar years 2008 and 2009 for National Grid USA Service Company and National Grid officers and directors, that have been reimbursed by the Company. This information has been provided by the Company in its responses to Massachusetts Attorney General (AG) data requests in the current on-going Massachusetts Docket No. DPU 10-55 involving Boston Gas Co., Essex Gas Co., and Colonial Gas Co.

1. Referring to Attachment AG-32-19, the Company provides information related to "entertainment" expenses in calendar years 2008 and 2009, which includes the employee identification number, the business purpose of the expenditure, and the amount allocated to the Massachusetts gas companies (pages 64-77 of the pdf file in the Company's response to RAV-154). In the same format as already established in its response to the Massachusetts AG data request, which the Company indicates is the data that is stored and retrievable in the Company's expense report system, please provide the percent and associated dollar amount that has been allocated to (a) Niagara Mohawk electric and (b) Niagara Mohawk gas expense, for each itemized expense.
2. Referring to Attachment AG-32-20, the Company provides information related to "miscellaneous" expenses in calendar years 2008 and 2009, which includes the employee identification number, the business purpose of the expenditure, and the amount allocated to the Massachusetts gas companies (pages 79-97 of the pdf file in the Company's response to RAV-154). In the same format as already established in its response to the Massachusetts AG data request, which the Company indicates is the data that is stored and retrievable in the Company's expense report system, please provide the percent and associated dollar amount that has been allocated to (a) Niagara Mohawk electric and (b) Niagara Mohawk gas expense, for each itemized expense.
3. Referring to Attachment AG-32-21, the Company provides information related to "lodging" expenses in calendar years 2008 and 2009, which includes the employee identification number, the business purpose of the expenditure, and the amount allocated to the Massachusetts gas companies (pages 99-110 of the pdf file in the Company's response to RAV-154). In the same format as already established in its response to the Massachusetts AG data request, which the Company indicates is the data that is stored and retrievable in the Company's expense report system, please provide the percent and associated dollar amount that has been allocated to (a) Niagara Mohawk electric and (b) Niagara Mohawk gas expense, for each itemized expense.
4. Referring to Attachment AG-32-22, the Company provides information related to "transportation air" expenses in calendar years 2008 and 2009, which includes the employee identification number, the business purpose of the expenditure, and the amount allocated to the Massachusetts gas companies (pages 112-128 of the pdf file in the Company's response to RAV-154). In the same format as already established in its response to the Massachusetts AG data request, which the Company indicates is the data that is stored and retrievable in the Company's expense report system, please provide the percent and associated dollar amount that has been allocated to (a) Niagara Mohawk electric and (b) Niagara Mohawk gas expense, for each itemized expense.
5. Referring to Attachment AG-32-42, the Company provides information related to "hotel" expenses in calendar years 2008 and 2009, which includes the employee identification number, the business purpose of the expenditure, and the amount allocated to the Massachusetts gas companies (pages 149-179 of the pdf file in the Company's response to RAV-154). In the same format as already established in its response to the Massachusetts AG data request, which the Company indicates is the data that is stored and retrievable in the Company's expense report system, please provide the percent and associated dollar amount that has been allocated to (a) Niagara Mohawk electric and (b) Niagara Mohawk gas expense, for each itemized expense.
6. Referring to Attachment AG-32-43, the Company provides information related to "airfare" expenses in calendar years 2008 and 2009, which includes the employee identification number, the business purpose of the expenditure, and the amount allocated to the Massachusetts gas companies (pages 181-206 of the pdf file in the Company's response to RAV-154). In the same format as already established in its response to the Massachusetts AG data request, which the Company indicates is the data that is stored and retrievable in the Company's expense report system, please provide the percent and associated dollar amount that has been allocated to (a) Niagara Mohawk electric and (b) Niagara Mohawk gas expense, for each itemized expense.
7. Referring to Attachment AG-32-44, the Company provides information related to "other" expenses in calendar years 2008 and 2009, which includes the employee identification number, the business purpose of the expenditure, and the amount allocated to the Massachusetts gas companies (pages 208-246 of the pdf file in the Company's response to RAV-154). In the same format as already established in its response to the Massachusetts AG data request, which the Company indicates is the data that is stored and retrievable in the Company's expense report system, please provide the percent and associated dollar amount that has been allocated to (a) Niagara Mohawk electric and (b) Niagara Mohawk gas expense, for each itemized expense.
8. Referring to Attachment AG-32-45, the Company provides information related to "EXother" expenses in calendar years 2008 and 2009, which includes the employee identification number, the business purpose of the expenditure, and the amount allocated to the Massachusetts gas companies (pages 248-257 of the pdf file in the Company's response to RAV-154). In the same format as already established in its response to the Massachusetts AG data request, which the Company indicates is the data that is stored and retrievable in the Company's expense report system, please provide the percent and associated dollar amount that has been allocated to (a) Niagara Mohawk electric and (b) Niagara Mohawk gas expense, for each itemized expense.
9. Referring to Attachment AG-32-46, the Company provides information related to "Busmtg" expenses in calendar years 2008 and 2009, which includes the employee identification number, the business purpose of the expenditure, and the amount allocated to the Massachusetts gas companies (pages 259-270 of the pdf file in the Company's response to RAV-154). In the same format as already established in its response to the Massachusetts AG data request, which the Company indicates is the data that is stored and retrievable in the Company's expense report system, please provide the percent and associated dollar amount that has been allocated to (a) Niagara Mohawk electric and (b) Niagara Mohawk gas expense, for each itemized expense.
10. Referring to Attachment AG-32-47, the Company provides information related to "Transp" expenses in calendar years 2008 and 2009, which includes the employee identification number, the business purpose of the expenditure, and the amount allocated to the Massachusetts gas companies (pages 272-318 of the pdf file in the Company's response to RAV-154). In the same format as already established in its response to the Massachusetts AG data request, which the Company indicates is the data that is stored and retrievable in the Company's expense report system, please provide the percent and associated dollar amount that has been allocated to (a) Niagara Mohawk electric and (b) Niagara Mohawk gas expense, for each itemized expense.
11. Referring to Attachment AG-32-48, the Company provides information related to "EXPHCA" expenses in calendar years 2008 and 2009, which includes the employee identification number, the business purpose of the expenditure, and the amount allocated to the Massachusetts gas companies (pages 320-323of the pdf file in the Company's response to RAV-154). In the same format as already established in its response to the Massachusetts AG data request, which the Company indicates is the data that is stored and retrievable in the Company's expense report system, please provide the percent and associated dollar amount that has been allocated to (a) Niagara Mohawk electric and (b) Niagara Mohawk gas expense, for each itemized expense.
12. Referring to Attachment AG-32-49, the Company provides information related to "EXUTIL" expenses in calendar years 2008 and 2009, which includes the employee identification number, the business purpose of the expenditure, and the amount allocated to the Massachusetts gas companies (pages 325-33lof the pdf file in the Company's response to RAV-154). In the same format as already established in its response to the Massachusetts AG data request, which the Company indicates is the data that is stored and retrievable in the Company's expense report system, please provide the percent and associated dollar amount that has been allocated to (a) Niagara Mohawk electric and (b) Niagara Mohawk gas expense, for each itemized expense.
13. Referring to Attachment AG-32-50, the Company provides information related to "EXFURN" expenses in calendar years 2008 and 2009, which includes the employee identification number, the business purpose of the expenditure, and the amount allocated to the Massachusetts gas companies (pages 333-335 of the pdf file in the Company's response to RAV-154). In the same format as already established in its response to the Massachusetts AG data request, which the Company indicates is the data that is stored and retrievable in the Company's expense report system, please provide the percent and associated dollar amount that has been allocated to (a) Niagara Mohawk electric and (b) Niagara Mohawk gas expense, for each itemized expense.
14. Referring to Attachment AG-32-51, the Company provides information related to "EXHMLV" expenses in calendar years 2008 and 2009, which includes the employee identification number, the business purpose of the expenditure, and the amount allocated to the Massachusetts gas companies (pages 337-338 of the pdf file in the Company's response to RAV-154). In the same format as already established in its response to the Massachusetts AG data request, which the Company indicates is the data that is stored and retrievable in the Company's expense report system, please provide the percent and associated dollar amount that has been allocated to (a) Niagara Mohawk electric and (b) Niagara Mohawk gas expense, for each itemized expense.
15. Referring to Attachment AG-32-52, the Company provides information related to "EXLEASE" expenses in calendar years 2008 and 2009, which includes the employee identification number, the business purpose of the expenditure, and the amount allocated to the Massachusetts gas companies (pages 340-343 of the pdf file in the Company's response to RAV-154). In the same format as already established in its response to the Massachusetts AG data request, which the Company indicates is the data that is stored and retrievable in the Company's expense report system, please provide the percent and associated dollar amount that has been allocated to (a) Niagara Mohawk electric and (b) Niagara Mohawk gas expense, for each itemized expense.
16. Referring to Attachment AG-32-53, the Company provides information related to "EXINSU" expenses in calendar years 2008 and 2009, which includes the employee identification number, the business purpose of the expenditure, and the amount allocated to the Massachusetts gas companies (page 345 of the pdf file in the Company's response to RAV-154). In the same format as already established in its response to the Massachusetts AG data request, which the Company indicates is the data that is stored and retrievable in the Company's expense report system, please provide the percent and associated dollar amount that has been allocated to (a) Niagara Mohawk electric and (b) Niagara Mohawk gas expense, for each itemized expense.

Response:

1.     - 16. Please see Attachment 1 through 16 to this response for the percent and associated dollar amount that has been allocated to Niagara Mohawk electric and gas expense for each itemized expense. In the Company's supplemental testimony filed on August 30, 2010, the Company removed all of the allocated electric expenses from the historic test year.

Name of Respondent:<br>James M. Molloy

Date of Reply:
August 31, 2010

Massachueters Intormation Request AG-32-19- Entertrionnent


Aassachusctrs hnformation Requect AG-32-19-Enertainmen


## 

 Aloction to Ningra Mohawk Pomer Corporation| Employe Id | $\mathrm{CaHP}^{\text {Pr }}$ | Total Voucher Amount | $\begin{gathered} \text { Voucher } \\ \text { Type } \end{gathered}$ | Trip Stari Date | Trip End Date | Project | Activity | Cont Tipe | Cout Type Descripion |  | Work Order Amount | Allocation Code | $\begin{gathered} \text { NBMO } \\ \text { Electric } \% \end{gathered}$ | NIMO Electric Alocated $\$$ | $\text { лімо } G_{x}$ | NIMO Gas Allocated $S$ | NLMO Electric included in HTY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 38853 Rm Worring Lunch | 2008 |  |  |  |  | Naulio | 003952 | 481 | ENTER-NONAP | s | 4810 | cover | 0.000\%" |  | 0.000\%'s |  |  |
| 89853 Mething NY Paring | 2008 | 1196 |  |  |  | NAUl20 | 003352 | 481 | Enter-nonap | 5 | 119.60 | c0900 | 0.000\% |  | 0.000\%s |  | 3 |
| 89883 Working Lumeh Mexting NYP | 2008 |  |  |  |  | mavizo | 003952 | 481 | Entib-monap | 5 | 2998 | croso | 0.000\% |  | 0.006\%s |  | 3 |
| 89853 Contrat Mangememit Thp NE | 2008 | 56024 |  | 06/13200s | 06132008 | naulzo | 003952 | 481 | Enitr-nov $A$ AP | 5 | 2807 | C0900 | 0.006\% | s | 0.000\%s |  | 5 |
| g9853 3 Luesmen P Planung Trp NE | 2088 | 57892 |  | 05906/2008 | U56720088 | nalizo | buns2 | 481 | enitr-nonap | 5 | 4675 | crovo | 0.00\% |  | 0000\%s |  | 5 |
| 898 S3 Workng Lurch Conssuction NYC | 2008 |  |  |  |  | nauliz | 0.33592 | 481 | enier-nonap | 5 | 1905 | crovo | 0.000\% |  | 0000\%s |  | , |
| 998s3 Network Stratery Raadsiow | 2008 | 1978.63 |  | 06.6952 mm | 0610602008 | nauliz | 003352 | 481 | enter-nonap | s | 6292 | cratio | 0000\% |  | 0000\%, |  | $3 \quad$. |
| 88883 W Oorkny Lunck RM Tams US \& UK | 2008 |  |  |  |  | nalizo | 003952 | 481 | Enter-nonap | 5 | 20135 | cr990 | $00000 \%$ |  | $0.005 \%$, |  | $s \quad$. |
| 88853 Dimer Resourte Manazemer TEam UKK | 2008 | 5359 |  |  |  | knuizo | 003952 | 481 | enter-nonar | s | 53591 | cormo | 0000\% |  | 0 ¢60\% \% |  | 3 |
|  | 2028 | 3474 |  | $09 / 222008$ | 092350088 | NaU120 | 003552 | 488 | EmTER-NONAP | 5 | 13330 | co900 | 0000\% | s | $0000 \%$ s |  | $3 \quad$. |
| 8985s 3 Busnes Luwch Witt hallen Censtroction | 2918 7009 |  |  |  |  | NAU120 | on9952 | 481 |  | $5$ |  | 00906 60900 |  | s |  |  | 3 |
| 88853 Bumes Diner Investment Pauring | 2093 | 1134 |  |  |  | NAULI20 | 003952 | 481 | ENTER-NONAP | 5 | 11340 | croso | 0.con\% | s | 0.000\% 3 |  | s |
| 88853 Eumans Luch NTP " | 2000 |  |  |  |  | NaUl20 | 0035s2 | 481 | EnTER-NON AP | 5 | 4928. | G0900 | 0.000\% |  | 0.000\% \% |  | s |
| 89853 Recrutun Duner Simon Hummat | 2009 |  |  |  |  | Nauizo | 0.3952 | 481 | enter-nonat | s | 7311 | covo | 0.000\% | s | 0.000\% 5 |  | 3 |
| gegs3 3 Cas Luvestment Panming Trip A ibany | 2009 | 31164 |  | $0 / 11312009$ | 07/14/2009 | Navizo | 003952 | 481 | Enternonap | 3 | 9190 | coso | 0.00\%\% | s | 0.000\%s |  | 3 |
| 89883 Busnes Diner | 2009 |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{K03468}$ | 020204 | 481 | ENTER-NONAPP | 5 | 148000 | G0200 | 0 0,00\% |  | 0.005\%s |  |  |
| 898s3 Recoymit len Dimer Phase II inuatives syracue | 2009 | 48718 |  |  |  | K03466 | 002094 | 481 | ENTER-NONAP | 5 | 48718 | G1220 | $0000 \%$ |  | 0000\%s |  | 3 |
| 898s3 3 Ciohal Prociurment Mangemen M Mceliry | 2009 |  |  |  |  | K04466 | 902004 | 481 | entrenotap | s | 141003 | G6200 | 0.000\% | s | $0000 \%$ s |  | 3 |
|  | 2009 | 2770.75 |  | 077132009 | 077162003 | K03466 | 002004 | 481 | Enternonap | , | 12145 | \% 6200 | 000008 |  | $0800 \%$ s |  |  |
| 89853 Pmourmen Meeings strause | 2009 |  |  | 077127009 | 07222009 | K03468 | 902044 | 4 is | entrrnonam | 5 | ${ }^{63} 84$ | crize | 0.000\% |  | $0.960 \%$ s |  | 5 |
|  | 2069 |  |  |  |  | K03466 | con2004 | 481 | Emitrenonap | , 3 | 12540 | criol | 6000\% |  | 0.000\%s |  | s |
| 88893 Procuremen Trp Wailtam | 2009 | 51154 |  | agichioce | 766172099 | K03466" | 802004 | 981 | emier-nonam | 3 | 16270 | coizo | -006\% | 3 | 0.000\%s |  | 5 |
| gyss Pmocuremen Inp Waitham | 2013 |  |  | 966997n09 | D6/102009 |  | goritics | 481 | emternowar | s | 6073 | G2200 | 0 con\% | 5 | 0 cron\% s |  | 5 |
| 89833 US Prowerment Conetrence | 2009 |  |  | 10262009 | $1026 / 20097$ | K03466 | bozom | 48 | Enter-nonas | s | 41610 | croze | $0.006 \%$ | s | 0.000\% s |  | 5 |
| 89833 UK Prowement Contierece | 2009 | 263238 |  | \%/122009 | 107152009 | Kiushs | \%22004 | 481 | ENTER-NONAP | s | 9120 | co200 | 0000\%\% |  | 0 0000\% 5 |  | , |
| 93394 Trp to Westhreif fer heldyy paty | 2008 |  |  | nimilizoes | Dhaszons | xomios | 0.02731 | 488 | Emtreronam | 3 | 183210 | coris | 0 0.00\% |  |  |  | 3 |
| 93394 Ensinerity Diversive Meeting | 2008 |  |  |  |  | Komos | "102631 | 481 | Entir-nonap | s | 79910 | cor80 | $0 \times 0 \%$ | s | $0000 \%$ s |  | 3 |
|  | 2008 | 19763 |  | 017092098 | 01702008 | kowas | 902631 | 481 | enter-nonap | s | 3725 | cosmon | 0000\%\% | 5 | $0.000 \%$ \% |  | s |
| 93394 Tnp to New Engi ind-Metining urh Legal Deparmemi | 2008 |  |  | 9330:3008 | 030420098 | koccos | 002731 | 481 | enternonap | 3 | 12389 | cr800 | ¢ $00 \%$ |  | 0000\% s |  | 3 |
| 93334 Exillunch mieeing whh Slevic Greatpan | 2008 |  |  |  |  | kossos | 002331 | 481 | Enternonap | s | 4325 | cobso | -000\% |  | $0.000 \%$ s |  | 5 |
| 99394 Meesng a M Miliennium | 2003 ' |  |  |  |  | K00291 | 002337 | 481 | Enternonar | s | 71610 | crsio | 0000\% | s | 0000\%s |  | 3 |
| 93394 Mecting mil $D$ R Ricobbono re. Peromance Reriew | 2008 |  |  |  |  | Kooos | 002331 | 481 | ENTER-NONAP | s | 35.00. | criso | $0.000 \%$ |  | $0.000 \%$ s |  | 3 |
| 93394 Retily retrenent dimer | 2008 |  |  |  |  | K00291 | 002337 | 481 | Enter-nonap | 5 | 15750 | G0800 | 0.000\% |  | 0000\% s |  | 3 |
| 93394 Mectugs u UK met Natenal Grd Legal | 2003 | 675294 |  | 088022008 | 68M7minos | K00201 | 402937 | 481 | enitr-nonap | 5 | 30585 | cr800 | 0000\% | 3 | 0000\%s |  | 5 |
| 93394 Buaress Mecthegs in Waillam.Westbomukh | 2008 | 76176 |  | 99722008 | 095570008 | K0020' | 002337 | 481 | enitr-nonat | 3 | 10740 | cixao | $0.003 \%$ |  | 0.30\% ' |  | s |
| 93344 Dinner Mesing wh L Legal Dept | 2008 |  | Mi |  |  | K0020 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 002397 | 481 | enter nonas | 5 | 50.00 | 60860 | 0.00\% | 5 | $0000 \%$ s |  | 3 |
| 93394 EET Conference | 2008 | 224559 |  | 0/292008 | 10912008 | K00201 | .02237 | 48t | enter-nonap | 5 | 40123 | cos80 | $0.800 \%$ | 5 | $0000 \%$ ? |  | s |
| 93344 Meeing wit Real Estale Growp | 2008 |  |  |  |  | K00201 | 022937 | 481 | Enter-Non ar | , | 19153 |  | $0.000 \%$ |  | 0 -600\% 9 |  | 5 |
| 93394 Envinmmal lineriew | 2008 |  |  |  |  | X602901 | 082237 | 481 | ENTER-NONAP | s | \$6.44 | cos80 | $0.0 .00 \%$ \% | s | $0.000 \% 9$ |  | 3 |

## Rassachusetts Information Request Acr-32-47-Trans <br> Alocation to Napara Mohawk Power Corporation



# Niagara Mohawh power Corporation <br> d/h/a National Grid <br> Case 10-E-0050 <br> $\frac{\text { Attachment } 11 \text { to DAG-60 }}{\text { Sheet } 4 \text { of } 4}$ 

Massachusetts Information Request AG-32-48-EXPHCA
Allocation to Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation


## Massachusetts Information Request AG-32-49- EXUTIL <br> Allocation to Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation



## Massachusetts Information Request AG-32-50 - EXFURN Allocation to Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation

| Calendar Yr | Exp Empl Id | Exp Type | Exp Type Descr | Regulatory Acct | Regulatory Acct Descr | Billing Pool | Expense \$ |  | NIMO <br> Electric \% | NIMO Electric NIMO Gas Allocated \$ $\%$ |  |  | NIMO Gas <br> Allocated \$ |  | NIMO Electric Included in HTY |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 100051366 | EXFURN |  | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00200 | \$ | 166.65 | 0.000\% | \$ |  | 13.066\% | \$ | 21.77 | \$ |  |
| 2009 | 100051366 | EXFURN | Furniture Rental | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00203 | \$ | 166.65 | 44.671\% | \$ | 74.44 | 0.000\% | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 2009 | 100051366 | EXFURN | Furniture Rental | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00200 | \$ | 166.65 | 0.000\% | \$ | - | 13.066\% | \$ | 21.77 | \$ | - |
| 2009 | 100051366 | EXFURN | Jan '10 Furniture Rental | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00203 | \$ | 166.65 | 44.671\% | \$ | 7444 | 0000\% | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 2009 | 100051366 | EXFURN | Jan '10 Furniture Rental | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00200 | \$ | 166.65 | 0.000\% | \$ | - | 13.066\% | S | 21.77 | \$ | - |
| 2008 | 100054644 | EXFURN | Furniture rental Sep 25 to Oct 24 | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | \$ | 890.70 | 44.016\% | \$ | 392.05 | 9015\% | \$ | 80.30 | \$ | 392.05 |
| 2008 | 100054644 | EXFURN |  | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | \$ | 1.498 .00 | 44.016\% | \$ | 65936 | 9.015\% | \$ | 135:05 | \$ | 659.36 |
| 2008 | 100054644 | EXFURN | Churchill: Sep 25 to Oct 24 | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | \$ | 890.70 | 44.016\% | \$ | 392.05 | 9.015\% | \$ | 80.30 | \$ | 392.05 |
| 2008 | 100054644 | EXFURN | Churchill: Oct 25 to Nov 24 | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | \$ | 890.70 | 44.016\% | \$ | 392.05 | 9.015\% | S | 80.30 | \$ | 392.05 |
| 2008 | 100054644 | EXFURN | Churchill: Nov 25 to Dec 24 | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | \$ | 890.70 | 44.016\% | \$ | 392.05 | 9.015\% | \$ | 80.30 | \$ | 392.05 |
| 2008 | 100054644 | EXFURN | Churchill: Dec 25 to Jan 24 | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | \$ | 890.70 | 44.016\% | \$ | 392.05 | 9.015\% | \$ | 80.30 | \$ | 392.05 |
| 2008 | 100054644 | EXFURN | Beethoven: Oct 12 to Nov 11 | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | \$ | 298.00 | 44.016\% | \$ | 131.17 | 9.015\% | \$ | 26.87 | \$ | 131.17 |
| 2008 | 100054644 | EXFURN | Beethoven: Nov 12 to Dec 11 | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | \$ | 298.00 | 44.016\% | \$ | 131.17 | 9.015\% | \$ | 26.87 | \$ | 131.17 |
| 2008 | 100054644 | EXFURN | Beethoven: Dec 12 to Jan 11 | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | \$ | 298.00 | 44.016\% | \$ | 131.17 | 9.015\% | \$ | 26.87 | \$ | 131.17 |
| 2009 | 100054644 | EXFURN |  | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | \$ | 890.70 | 44.016\% | \$ | 392.05 | 9.015\% | S | 80.30 | \$ | 392.05 |
| 2009 | 100054644 | EXFURN |  | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | \$ | 890.70 | 44.016\% | \$ | 392.05 | 9.015\% | \$ | 80.30 | \$ | 392.05 |
| 2009 | 100054644 | EXFURN |  | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | \$ | 890.70 | 44.016\% | \$ | 392.05 | 9.015\% | \$ | 80.30 | \$ | 392.05 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 24,300.87 |  | \$ | 10,435.19 |  | \$ | 1,468.87 | \$ | 5,226.62 |

# Niagara Mohawk Power Corporgtion 

d/b/a National Grid

Massachusetts Information Request AG-32-51-EXHMLV
Allocation to Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calendar } \\ & \dot{Y} r \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Exp EmpI } \\ \text { Id } \end{gathered}$ | Exp Type | Exp Type Descr | Regulatory Acct | Regulatory Acct Descr | Billing Pool | Expense \$ | NIMO <br> Electric \% |  | NIMO Electric Allocated $\$$ | NIMO <br> Gas \% |  | NIMO Gas <br> Allocated S | NIMO Electric Included in HTY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 100053543 | EXHMLV | Andrew Ryan-Smith's home leave expenses for Christmas Holidays | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | \$ 1,907.60 | 27.305\% | \$ | 520.87 | 0.000\% | \$ | - | \$ |
| 2008 | 100054644 | EXHMLV |  | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | $\$ \quad 4,664.00$ | 44016\% | \$ | 2,052.91 | 9.015\% | s | 420.47 | \$ 2052.91 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ 63,037.62 |  | \$ | 19,074.13 |  |  | 1,379,88 | \$ 13,923.09 |

## Massachusetts Information Request AG-32-52-EXLEASE

Allocation to Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation


# Massachusetts Information Request AG-32-53-EXINSI 

Allocation to Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation

| $\text { Calendar } \mathrm{Yr}$ | Exp Emplid | Exp Type | Exp Type Descr | Regulatory Acct | Regulatory Acct Descr | Billing Pool | Expense \$ | NIMO <br> Electric \% | NIMO Electric Allocated \$ |  | NIMO Gas \% | NIMO Gas Allocated S |  | MMO Electric Included in HTY |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 100053313 | EX-INSU | Personal Liability Policy (Umbrella") | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | 394 | 43.749\% | \$ | 172.37 | 8.961\% | \$ | 3593 | S |  |
| 2009 | 100053313 | EX-INSU | Non-Auto Insurance | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | 279 | 43.749\% | \$ | 122.06 | 8.961\% | S | 25.00 | s | - |
| 2009 | 100053313 | EX-INSU | Personal Liability | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | 394 | 44.016\% | S | 173.42 | 9.015\% | s | 35.52 | S | 173.42 |
| 2009 | 100053313 | EX-INSU | Auto Insurance | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | 279 | 44.016\% | S | 1122.80 | 9.015\% | S | 25.15 | \$ | 112.80 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$\$1,346.00 |  | S | 590.66 |  | - | 120.98 | \$ | 296.23 |



Mansachusets Information Request AG-32-20-Miscellaneous

| Mansachusetry Information Request AG-32-20-Miscellaneous Allocation to Niagara Mohawk Power Cornoration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\qquad$ | $\mathrm{Cal}_{2 \mathrm{Yr}}^{2008}$ | Total Voucher Amount | Trip Start Date | Trip End Date | Project | Activity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cost } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Cost Type Description |  | Order ount | Allocation Code | Nimo Electric \% |  | Electric cated $\$$ | $\mathrm{NimO}_{\mathrm{G}} \mathrm{\%}$ |  | MO G2s located S | Nimo Electric Incleded in HTY |
| 7179 Trip to UK - $9 / 9 / 08-9 / 12 / 08$ | 2008 | 9764.31 45.18 | 38700 |  | K00081 | 002004 | 488 | OTHEREE-NON AP | \$ | 18.00 | N4800 | 0.000\% | s |  | 0.000\% |  |  | Whaseman |
| 7179 Travel to UK-9/29-10/3/18 | 2008 | 10390.22 | 39720 | 39724 | K0008 $K 00081$ | 002004 | 480 | OTHER EE-NON AP | s | 5.00 | N4800 | 0.000\% | 5 |  | 0.000\% |  |  | $5 \quad-$ |
| 7179 Local Travel to Meetings | 2008 | 24.84 |  |  | K00081 | 002004 | 480 | OTHEREE-NONAP | s | $\begin{array}{r}18.30 \\ \hline 5.00\end{array}$ | N4800 | 0000\% | 5 |  | 0000\% | 5 | - | 5 |
| 7179 Travel to Westboro - $11 / 6 / 088$ | 2008 | 839.3 | 39758 | 39758 | K00081 | 002004 | 480 | OTHEREE-NONA/P | 5 | 38.00 | N4800 |  | 5 |  | 0000\% |  |  | 5 - |
| 7179 Travel to UK Nov 10 | 2008 | 805.75 | 39751 | 39751 | K00081 | 002004 | 480 | OTHEREE-NONAP | \$ | 76.00 | N4800 | 0.0070\% | s |  | 00000 | S |  |  |
| 7179 Miscellaneous | 2008 | 9965.62 31.94 | 39762 | 39765 | K00081 | 002004 | 480 | OTHEREE-NONAP | s | 207.04 | N4800 | 0.000\% | 5 | - | 0.000\% | \$ |  | $\stackrel{\square}{5}$ |
| 7179 Travel to Westboro-11/20/08 | 2008 | 877.4 | 39772 |  | K00081 | 0002004 | 480 | OTHEREE-NONAP | s | 31.94 | N4800 | 0.000\% | 5 |  | 0.000\% |  |  | 8 |
| 7179 Travel to Boston MY - 1211108 | 2008 | 2771.2 | 39783 | 39783 | K00081 | 002004 | 480 | OTHER EENONAP | s |  | N4800 | 0.000\% | s |  | $0.000 \%$ | 5 |  | $5 \quad$. |
| 7179 Travel to UK. Dec 9 | 2008 | 9166.99 | 39791 | 39794 | K00081 | 002004 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | 5 |  | N4800 | 0.000\% | 5 |  | 0.000\% | 5 |  | 5 |
| 7592 Meeting with CEO of Sierra Pacific Resource | 2008 | 1765.8 | 39428 | 38429 | K00004 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONA/P | s | 50.00 | G5700 | 0.0000\% | s |  | 0.000\% | 5 |  | s |
| 7592 Attendance at Climate Cnange Seminar | 2008 | 1595 |  |  | K00004 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | s | 1,595.00 | 65700 | 0.000\% | s |  | 0.000\% |  |  | s |
| 7592 AGA Leadersthip Council Meoting | 2008 | 2044.92 | $39552$ | 39553 | K00004 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | 5 | 1,01490 | G5700 | 0.000\% |  |  | 0.000\% | 5 |  | s |
| 7582 Meetings and Leadership Conference in the UK | 2008 | 4812.69 | 39541 39565 | 39541 | K00004 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NON AP | s | 467.38 | G5700 | 0.000\% | \$ | - | 0.000\% | s | - | s |
| 7592 Meetings with Edward Astle | 2008 | 915.62 | 39561 |  | K00004 | 002031 | 480 | OTHEREE-NON APP | 5 | 89.84 | G5700 | 0.000\% | \$ |  | . 0,000\% | s | - | $5 \quad-$ |
| 7592 Attend Spectra and Kinder Morgan meetings | 2008 | 1825.43 | 38581 | 39582 | K00004 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NON A/P | 5 |  | G5700 | 0.000\% | \$ |  | 0.000\% |  |  | s |
| 7592 Subscription to Enertax Daily | 2008 | 795 |  |  | K00004 | 002031 | 480 | OTHEREE-NONAP | 5 | 795.00 | G5700 |  | S |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| 7592 Crain's New York Subscrition | 2008 | 350 |  |  | K00004 | 002031 | 480 | OTHEREE-NONAP | 5 | 350.00 | G5700 | 0.000\% | s |  | 0.000\% |  |  | s |
| 7592 EDSG QPR Mesting | 2008 | 69.95 |  |  | K00004 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | 5 | 69.95 | 65700 | 0.000\% |  | - | 0.007\% | s |  | s |
| 7592 Attend and Speak at AGA Legal Forum | 2008 | 5504.61 | 39644 39647 | 39645 | K00004 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONA/P | 5 | 3.50 | 65700 | 0.000\% | $s$ |  | 0.000\% |  |  | s |
| 7592 American Bar Association Dues | 2008 | 514 |  | 39852 | K00004 | 002031 | 480 | OTHEREE-NONAP | 5 | 909.85 | G5700 | 0.000\% | 5 | - | 0.000\% |  |  | s … |
| 7592 Annual Dues for Society of Gas Lighting | 2008 | 300 |  |  | K00004 | 002031 | 480 | OTHEREE-NONAP | 5 | 30000 | 65700 | $0.000 \%$ | s |  | 0.000\% |  |  | 5 |
| 7592 New York State Bar Association Dues | 2008 | 425 |  |  | K00004 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NON AP | 5 | 42500 | G5700 | 0.000\% | 3 |  | 0.0008 | s |  | 5 - |
| 7592 Attendance at Forbes Media Energy Conference | 2008 | 1200 |  |  | K00004 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NON A/P | 5 | 1,200.00 | G5700 | 0.000\% | s |  | 0.000\% |  |  | 5 |
| 7592 Offstite Meeting to Discuss LIPA Project | 2009 | 2261.9 |  |  | K00004 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | 5 | 2,261.90 | 65700 | 0.000\%\% | s |  | 0.000\% |  | - |  |
| 7942 Membership Dues | 2008 | 2709.38 |  |  | K00009 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | s | 27.709 .38 | 65100 | 28440\% | s | 770.55 | 0.000\% | 5 | - | 5 |
| 7942 Attend National Gria Executive Committee Mito. | 2008 | 2266.89 | 39456 | 39457 | K00001 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | s | 19.00 | G5100 | 28.440\% | s | 5.40 | 0.000\% |  |  | $s$ |
| 7942 Service Fees | 2008 | 30 | 39663 | 39464 | K000091 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | S | 71.78 | G5100 | 28.440\% | 5 | 20.41 | 0000\% |  |  | 5 |
| 7942 Club Membership | 2008 | 15 |  |  | K00001 | 002031 | 480 | OTHEREEE-NONAP | 5 | 30.00 | G5100 | 28446\% | s | 8.53 | 0.000\% |  |  | 5 |
| 7942 Hydrogen Economy Publication | 2008 | 347 |  |  | K00001 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | 5 | 347.00 | G5500 | 28.440\% | s | 89.59 | 0, 0 00\% |  | - | 5 |
| 7942 Memebership Fee | 2008 | 306 |  |  | k00001 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NON A/P | \$ | 306.00 | G5100 | 28.440\% | s | 88.69 87.03 | $0.000 \%$ |  |  | 5 |
| 7942 Renew Subscription | 2008 | 49 |  |  | K00001 | 002039 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | s | 49.00 | GS100 | 28.440\% | 5 | 13.94 | 0000\% | s |  | 5 |
| 7942 Registration | 2008 | 1890 |  |  | K00001 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONA/P | \$ | 1.880 .00 | 65100 | 28.440\% | s | 537.52 | 0.000\% |  |  | 5 |
| 7942 ABNY Breakfast | 2008 | 65 |  |  | K00009 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | s | 65.00 | Gs100 | 22.520\% | 5 | 14.64 | 5.420\% |  | 3.52 | $\frac{5}{5}$ |
| 7942 Membership Fee | 2008 | 350 |  |  | K00001 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | 5 | 350.00 | 65100 | 22.520\% | 5 | 78.82 | 5.420\% |  | 18.97 | s |
| 7942 Registration Fee | 2008 | 70 |  |  | к00001 | 002031 | 480 | OTMER EE-NONAP | \$ | 70.00 | GS100 | 22.520\% | s | 15.76 | 5.420\% | 5 | 3.79 | 5 |
| 77942 Registration Fes (eepor on Sman Grid | 2008 | 347 |  |  | K00001 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | s | 347.00 | 65100 | 22520\% | 5 | 78.14 | 5.420\% | s | 18.81 | $s$ |
| 7942 Purchase Energy Repon | 2008 | 547 |  |  | K00001 | 002031 | 480 | OTHEREENONAP | 5 | 250.00 | G5100 |  | s | 56.30 | 5.420\% |  | 13.55 | s |
| 7942 Registration Fee | 2008 | 70 |  |  | K00001 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EEENONAP | ${ }^{5}$ | 70.00 | G5100 | 22.520\% | s | 123.18 | 5.420\% | s | 29.65 | 5 - |
| 7942 Memenership Renewal | 2008 | 250 |  |  | K0000 ${ }^{1}$ | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NON ATP | 3 | 250,00 | G5100 | 22.520\% | 5 | 56.30 | 5.420\% | 5 | 13.5 |  |
| 7942 Membership Fee | 2008 | 500 |  |  | k00001 | 002031 | 480 | OThEREE-NONAPP | 5 | 500.00 | c5100 | 22.520\% | 5 | 112.60 | 5.420\% | s | 27.10 | s |
| 7942 Ll Business News | 2008 | 53 |  |  | K00001 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | s | 53.00 | 65100 | 22.520\% | 5 | 11.94 | 5.420\% |  | 2.87 | s |
| 7942 Biomass and Biofuels Report | 2008 | 747 |  |  | K00001 | 002031 | 480 | OThER EE-NoNap | \$ | 747.00 | 6S100 | 22520\% | 5 | 168.22 | 5.420\% | \$ | 40.49 |  |
| 7942 Membership Renewal | 2008 | 400 |  |  | K00009 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | 5 | 400.00 | G5100 | 22.520\% | 5 | 90.08 | 5.420\% | \$ | 21.68 | 90.08 |
| 7042 Chinistmas Cards | 2008 | 4027.5 |  |  | K00001 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NON AP | s | 4.027 .60 | G5100 | 22520\% | 5 | 907.02 | 5.420\% | 5 | 218.30 | 90702 |
| 7942 Energy Report | 2008 | 347 |  |  | K00001 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | s | 347.00 | 6s100 | 22.520\% | 5 | 78.14 | 5.420\% | s | 18.81 | 78.11 |
| 7942 Attend National Grid Board Meeting | 2008 | 16564.03 | 30768 | 39770 | k00002 | 002039 | 480 | OTHEREE-NONAP | \$ | 99.08 | 65100 | 22520\% | 5 | 22.31 | S $420 \%$ | 5 | 5.37 | 2231 |
|  | 2008 | 89 |  |  | K00001 | 002034 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | 5 | 89.00 | GS100 | 22520\% | 5 | 20.04 | 5.420\% | 5 | 4.82 | 20.04 |
| 7942 Order Publication | 2008 | 2486.48 | 39778 | 39784 | K00001 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NON ATP | \$ | 38.00 | 65100 | 22.520\% | 5 | 8.56 | 5420\% | 5 | 2.06 | 8.56 |
| 8343 Manchester, New Hampshire | 2008 | 788.23 | 39454 | 39454 | K00208 | 002031 | 480 | OTHEREE-NONAP | s | 497.00 | G5100 | 22.520\% | 5 | 111.92 | 5420\% | 5 | 26.94 | 1192 |
| 8343 Home Office Supplias | 2008 | 147.64 |  |  | K00208 | 002031 | 480 | OTHEREE-NONAP | 5 | 147.64 | G5100 | 28.440\% | s | 41.99 | $0.000 \%$ | s |  | $\frac{5}{5}$ |
| 8343 Internet Access from home | 2008 | 272.7 |  |  | K00208 | 002031 | 480 | OTHEREE-NONAP | s | 272.70 | 65100 | 28.440\% | s | 77.56 | 0.000\% | s | - | 5 . |
| 8343 EEIMeeting in Anizona 4 AGA Mesting in Houston | 2008 | 1895.27 | 39455 | 39458 | k00208 | 002033 | 480 | OTHEREE-NONAP | 3 | 3.20 | 65100 | 28.440\% | 5 | 0.91 | 0.000\% | 5 |  | s |
| 8343 Speaking engagement at Cazenovia | 2008 | 1010.64 | 38548 | 39548 | K00208 | 002031 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | $s$ | 38.00 | 65100 | 22.520\% |  | d, | 5.420\% | 5 | 2.06 | \$ . |

$\frac{\text { Massachuscts Information Recuest AG- } 32-20-\text { Miscellaneous }}{\text { Allocation Io Nispara Mobawk Power Comoration }}$

| Employee Id | Expense Purpose | Cal Yr | Total Voucher Amount | $\begin{gathered} \text { Trip Start } \\ \text { pate } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Trip End } \\ & \text { Date } \end{aligned}$ | Project | Activity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cost } \\ & \text { yype } \end{aligned}$ | Cost Type Description |  | Work Order Amount | Allocation Code | Nimo Electric $\%$ | NIMO Electric Allocated s | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Nimo } \\ & \text { Gas \% } \end{aligned}$ |  | IMO Gas llocated S | Nimo Electric Included in HTY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 92080 | Optimization 101 Meeting in Boston Travel to Res. Woods for Gas Pon. Mgm strat. Mg | 2009 | 518.63 | 39986 | 39986 | K05454 | 002478 | 480 | OTHEREENONAMP | s | 64.40 | A9900 | 0.000\% | \$ ${ }^{\text {cmemme }}$ | 0.000\% | s |  | ${ }_{5}$ |
| 92080 |  | 2009 | 639.6 | 40018 | 40018 | K05454 | 002478 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | \$ | 64,40 | A9900 | 0.000\% | $5 \quad$ - | 0.000\% | s |  | 5 |
| 92050 | Mesting at Connecticut Yankee Stie in Hedodam, CT | 2008 | 301.94 | 40043 | 400043 | K05454 K05454 | 002478 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | \$ | 64.40 | A9900 | 0.000\% | 5 | 0.000\% | s |  | 5 s |
| 92080 | Vanous trip from Hicksville to NYC for bus. event | 2009 | 88.75 |  |  | K05454 | 002478 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | s | 184.50 32.50 | A9900 | 0.000\% | \$ - | 0.000\% | 5 |  | 5 |
| 92080 | Lunch to celebrate Barret Oill Delivery Success | 2009 | 43.74 |  |  | K05454 | 002478 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | s | 43.74 | A9900 | 0.000\% | 3 | 0.000\% | s | - | 5 |
| 92080 | DFL Traning, Brmingham, UK | 2009 | 4461.54 | 40069 | 40074 | K05454 | 002478 | 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP | 5 | 38.00 | A9900 | 0.000\% | \$ | 0.000\% | s | . | \$ |
| 92080 | Archer Contingent Energy Risk Seminar | 2009 | 1748.17 | 40087 | 40090 | K05454 | 002478 | 480 | OTMER EE-NONAP | s | 131.00 | A9900 | 0.000\% | $s$ | 0.000\% |  | - | 5 |
|  | Mag in Watham, Presentation Supply and Forecastin | 2009 | 607.2 | 40128 | 40128 | K05454 | 002478 | 480 | OTHEREE-NONAP | s | 38.00 | A9900 | 0000\% | \$ | 0.000\% | 5 | - | S |
| $\begin{aligned} & 92080 \\ & 92000 \end{aligned}$ | Mitg. in Boston. Presentiation Supply \& Forecasting | 2009 | 534.39 511.6 | 40122 | 40123 40150 | K05454 K05454 | 002478 002478 | 480 480 | OTHER EE-NONAP OTHER EE-NONAIP | \$ | 302.00 | A9900 | 0.000\% | $s$ | 0.000\% | s |  | 5 - - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | 5 | 64.40 | A9900 | 0.000\% | \$ | 0.000\% | 5 |  | 7.521.84 |

Massachusetts Information Request AG-32-21-Lodzing


| Expense Purpose | Cal Yr | Total Voucher Amount | Trip Start Date | Trip End Date | Project | Activity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cost } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Cost Type Description | Work Order Amount |  | Allocation Code | NIMO Electric $\%$ | NIMO Electric Allocated $\$$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NMMO } \\ & \text { Gas } \% \end{aligned}$ | NIMO Gas Allocateds |  | NIMO Electric Included in HTY |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24762 Tip P4G Cofacilitate Inm Fox Hollow Woodbury | 2008 | 653.82 | 39617 | 39618 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | s' | 401.17 | 65800 | $24350 \%$ | 5 | 97.68 | 6680\% | $s$ | 26.80 | 5 |  |
| 24762 Trip $6111 / 12 / 08$ Migs MetroTech/Hicks ville | 2008 | 1009.15 | 39610 | 39611 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | 5 | 401.17 | G5800 | 24.350\% | $s$ | 97.68 | 6.680\% | 5 | 26.80 | 5 |  |
| 2476271108 J.Caroselli Strategy Staff Mig - MetroTeen | 2008 | 425.17 | 39630 | 39630 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON A/P | \$ | 401.17 | 65800 | 24 350\% | \$ | 97.68 | 6.680\% | $s$ | 26.80 | 5 |  |
| 24762 Tnp 6/25-27/08 Hub OriUniondale/NYC/Brklynill | 2008 | 1802.45 | 39624 | 39626 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | \$ | 481.94 | G5800 | 24350\% | s | 117.35 | 6.680\% | s | 32.19 | s |  |
| 24762 Trip $7 / 15 / 08$ Hix/Brkty : Funct Review/other Migs | 2008 | 425.17 | 39644 | 39644 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | \$ | 401.17 | G5800 | 24.350\% | s | 97.68 | 6.680\% | s | 26.80 | 5 |  |
| 24782 Tip 7123-24/08 MetroTech/Uniondale Meetings | 2008 | 1009.9 | 39652 | 39653 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | , | 401.17 | G5800 | 24.350\% | 5 | 97.68 | 6680\% | s | 26.80 | s |  |
| 24762 Tip $8 / 25 / 08$ JCarosell Financial Reviow/Other Mtg | 2008 | 425.17 | 39685 | 39685 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | s | 401.17 | G5800 | 24.350\% | \$ | 97.688 | 6.680\% | s | 25.80 | s |  |
| 24762 Tnp 8/19/08 Cust. Satn Exec Cmte-LIPA Unionda | 2008 | 425.17 | 39679 | 39679 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | s | 401.17 | G5800 | 24.350\% | 3 | 97.68 | 6.680\% | s | 26.80 | 5 |  |
| 24762 Thip 8 H/08 LiPA Montrily \& AE Migs-Uniondale | 2008 | 425.17 | 39667 | 39667 | K99210 | 002031 | 479 | AIR-NONAPP | 5 | 401.17 | G5800 | $24350 \%$ | $s$ | 97.68 | 6.680\% | $s$ | 26.80 | s |  |
| 24762 Trip 10/9/08 DPSC. J. Caroselli Staff $\&$ One on One | 2008 | 425.17 | 39730 | 39730 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | 3 | 401.17 | 65800 | 24.350\% | s | 97.68 | 6.680\% | s | 26.80 | s | 9768 |
| $247629 / 19 / 08$ CustsatExeouniondale Fly Down/Drive B | 2008 | 405.92 | 39710 | 39710 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | \$ | 219.59 | G5800 | 24.350\% | s | 53.47 | 6.080\% | $s$ | 14.67 | s | 53.47 |
| 24762 Trip 10/3/08 s.Zelikomit/Scorecard/Social Poliey | 2008 | 425.17 | 39724 | 39724 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | s | 401.17 | G5800 | $24.350 \%$ | \$ | 97.68 | 6.680\% | s | 26.80 | 5 | 97.68 |
| $24762 \mathrm{Tm9} 9 / 9-10 / 08$ Migs:ESS Staff Mig/OneonOnes/OtI | 2008 | 9963 | 39700 | 39701 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | s | 401.17 | G5800 | 24.350\% | $s$ | 97.68 | 66880\% | $s$ | 26.80 | s | 97.68 |
| 24762 Trnp 9/4/08 Caroselli Staff Mig/Lipa is Cmte/Other | 2008 | 425.17 | 39695 | 39695 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | 3 | 401.17 | 65800 | $24350 \%$ | s | 97.58 | 6680\% | s | 26.80 | s | 97. |
| 24762 Tin 10/21-22108 Metrotech/Hicksville/New HydePa | 2008 | 711.62 | 39742 | 39743 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON APP | \$ | 363.17 | 65800 | $24.350 \%$ | 5 | 88.43 | 6.680\% | $s$ | 24.26 | s | 8843 |
| 24762 Trin UK 11/9-11/08 Social Policy Cmie/Other Mig: | 2008 | 6741.93 | 39761 | 39763 | K992to | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | 9 | 5,843.20 | G5800 | 24.350\% | \$ | 1.422 .82 | 6.680\% | 5 | 390.33 | s | 1.42282 |
| 24762 Trip 10/30/08 Canarsie': LIPA-Uniondale, NY | 2008 | 425.17 | 39751 | 39751 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | , | 363.17 | 65800 | 24.350\% | \$ | 88.43 | 6.680\% | 5 | 24.26 | 5 | 88.43 |
| 24762 Trip 10/27/08 LIPA Ops Mig - Hicksville | 2008 | 423.17 | 39748 | 39748 | K93210 | 002039 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | 5 | 363.17 | 65800 | 24.350\% | 5 | 88.43 | 6.680\% | s | 24.2 | s | 8843 |
| 24762 Tnip 10/13-1408 MetroTech \& Buffalo various mtgs | 2008 | 872.59 | 39734 | 39735 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AlR-NONAP | 5 | 570.59 | G5800 | 24.350\% | s | 138.94 | 6.680\% | s | 38.12 | s | 13894 |
| 24762 Trip 11/17-98/08 Brooklyn/Uniondale//ickswile Mts | 2009 | 909.87 | 39769 | 39770 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONA/P | $s$ | 363.17 | 65800 | 24,350\% | \$ | 88.43 | 6.680\% | \$ | 24.26 | s | 8843 |
| 24762 Trip 1/30/09 Uniondale NY: LIPA Retail Services | 2009 | 491.37 | 39843 | 39843 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | \$ | 363.37 | G5800 | 24.350\% | s | 88.48 | 6680\%\% | \$ | 24.27 | s | 88.48 |
| 24762 3/10-12/09 Senior Exec Otrsite Marrioth Uniondale | 2009 | 279.29 | 39882 | 39884 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | 5 | 241.29 | G5800 | 24.350\% | 5 | 58.75 | 6.680\% | s | 16.12 | s | 58.75 |
| 24762 NY 3/4/09 LIPA/Uniondale Synchronize Goals/Obj. | 2009 | 425.37 | 39876 | 39876 | K99210 | 002039 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | 9 | 363.37 | G5800 | 24.350\% | s | 88.48 | 6680\% | s | 24.27 | s | 88.48 |
| 24762 Tnp 2/27/09 CustSatExecComte 8 Retail Sves - Lip, | 2009 | 425.37 | 39871 | 398? 1 | k99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON A/P | , | 363.37 | G5800 | 24.350\% | \$ | 88.48 | 6.880\% | \$ | 24.27 | s | 8848 |
| 24762 Trip 2/19/09 Univ of Buffalo Tour 8 Other Migs | 2009 | 333.04 | 39863 | 39863 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | 5 | 239.20 | 65800 | 24.350\% | $s$ | 58.25 | 6.680\% | \$ | 15.98 | s | 58.25 |
| 24762 Trip 2/11-12/09 Various Mtgs at Hix \& Melville | 2009 | 642.68 | 39855 | 39856 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | \$ | 363.37 | 65800 | 24350\% | 5 | 88.48 | 6.680\% | s | 24.27 | \$ | 88.48 |
| 24762 Paricicipate in Town Hall Mtgs © 2 2 Melville Offices | 2009 | 746.94 | 39898 | 39899 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | ALR-NONAP | 3 | 401.37 | G5800 | 23.930\% | s | 96.05 | 6.740\% | $s$ | 27.05 | s | 96.05 |
| 24762 C8M Strategic Alignment Session | 2009 | 425.37 | 39906 | 39906 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | s | 401.37 | 65800 | 23.930\% | 5 | 96.05 | 6.740\% | \$ | 27.05 | s | 9605 |
| 24762 To MetroTech Office/Steve Holiday Mig/C8M Towr | 2009 | 724.6 | 39903 | 39904 | k99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | \$ | 401.37 | G5800 | 23.930\% | 5 | 96.05 | 6740\% | \$ | 27.05 | s | 9605 |
| 24762 LIPA Meetings | 2009 | 418.79 | 39937 | 39937 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON A/P | \$ | 394.79 | 65800 | 27930\% | s | 94.47 | 6740\% | s | 26.61 | s | 9447 |
| 24762 Trip to Staten Island for a conferrence | 2009 | 222.2 | 39931 | 39931 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | $s$ | 198.20 | 65800 | 23.930\% | s | 47.43 | 6740\% | s | 13.36 | s | 47.43 |
| 24762 Mike Calviou Visit | 2009 | 425.37 | 39932 | 39932 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | s | 401.37 | 65800 | 23.930\% | s | 96.05 | 6740\% | \$ | 27.05 | $s$ | 96.05 |
| 24762 Travel to NY for LIPA Meetings | 2009 | 425.37 | 39927 | 39927 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | 5 | 401.37 | G5800 | 23.930\% | s | 96.05 | 6.740\% | s | 27.05 | s | 96.05 |
| 24762 Trip to MetroTech, NY | 2009 | 418.77 | 39952 | 39952 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON A/P | \$ | 394.77 | 65800 | 25,930\% | 5 | 94.47 | 6740\% | \$ | 26.61 | 5 | 94.47 |
| 24762 Trip to Hicksville, NY | 2009 | 41877 | 39951 | 39951 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON A/P | $s$ | 394.77 | G5800 | 23.930\% | s | 94.47 | 6.740\% | s | 26.61 | s | 94.47 |
| 24762 Trip to NY-Hicksvilie Office | 2009 | 435.81 | 39944 | 39944 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | s | 411.81 | 65800 | 23.930\% | s | 98.55 | 6.740\% | s | 27.76 | \$ | 98.55 |
| 24762 Trip to Uniondale | 2009 | 418.77 | 39959 | 39959 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | 5 | 394.77 | 65800 | 23.930\% | 5 | 94.47 | 6.740\% | 3 | 26.61 | s | 94.47 |
| 24762 Trip to Hicksville, NY | 2009 | 775.63 | 39946 | 39947 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | \$ | 479.86 | G5800 | 23,930\% | s | 114.83 | 6.740\% | \$ | 32.34 | \$ | 11483 |
| 24762 Trip to Uniondale - LIPA | 2009 | 694.31 | 39961 | 39962 | k99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON APP | \$ | 394.77 | 65800 | 23930\% | $s$ | 94.47 | 6740\% | \$ | 26.61 | s | 94.47 |
| 24762 Trip to Matrotech | 2009 | 379.99 | 39954 | 39954 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | \$ | 355.99 | G5800 | 23,930\% | $s$ | 85.19 | 6740\% | s | 23.99 | S | 85.19 |
| 24752 Trip to NY - Uniondale | 2009 | 626.95 | 39967 | 39968 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | s | 394.77 | G5800 | 23.930\% | s | 94.47 | 6.740\% | \$ | 26.61 | s | 94.47 |
| 24762 Trip to Hicksville and Uniondale | 2009 | 418.77 | 39965 | 39965 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | s | 394.77 | G5800 | 23.930\% | s | 94.47 | 6.740\% | s | 26.61 | s | 94.47 |
| 24762 Trip to Hicksville $6 / 19$ | 2009 | 575.29 | 39983 | 39983 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | 5 | 404.96 | G5800 | 23930\% | s | 96.91 | 6.740\% | \$ | 27.29 | s | 96.91 |
| 24762 Hicks ville Trio for 2 Migs. | 2009 | 628.76 | 39982 | 39982 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | \$ | 404.96 | 65800 | 23930\% | $s$ | 96.91 | 6740\% | \$ | 27.29 | s | 96.91 |
| 24762 Tnp 10 Uniondale, NY 6/9/09 | 2009 | 418.77 | 39973 | 39973 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | s | 394.77 | G5800 | 23.930\% | s | 94.47 | 6.740\% | 5 | 26.61 | \$ | 94.47 |
| 24762 Uniondale, NY | 2009 | 418.77 | 39969 | 39969 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | s | 394.77 | 65800 | 23.930\% | s | 94.47 | 6.740\% | s | 26.61 | s | 94.47 |
| 24762 Uniondale. NY | 2009 | 805.88 | 39974 | 39975 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | s | 394.77 | G5800 | 23.930\% | s | 94.47 | 6740\% | \$ | 26.69 | s | 9447 |
| 24762 Travel to Brooklyn-2 Days | 2009 | 859.99 | 40000 | 40001 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AR-NON APP | \$ | 404.96 | 65800 | 23,930\% | s | 96.91 | 6740\% | \$ | 27.29 | s | 969 |
| 24762 Travel to Now York | 2009 | 466.96 | 39990 | 39990 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | s | 442.96 | G5800 | 23930\% | s | 106.00 | 6740\% | \$ | 29.86 | s | 106 m |
| 24762 To Attend LIPA Meetings | 2009 | 946.65 | 39993 | 39995 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON APP | 5 | 404.96 | 65800 | 23.930\% | 5 | 96.91 | 6.740\% | \$ | 27.29 | 8 | 96.91 |
| 24762 Trip to MTC/Brooklyn. | 2009 | 655.61 | 40009 | 40010 | k 99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | s | 317.20 | 65800 | 23.930\% | , | 75.91 | 6770\% | 5 | 21.38 | 8 | 75.91 |
| 24762 Travel to Butfalo, NY | 2009 | 623.1 | 40010 | 40011 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON AP |  | 327.20 | 65800 | 23,930\% | s | 78.30 | 6.740\% | \$ | 22.05 | 5 | 7830 |
| 24762 Travel to Metrotech Office | 2009 | 379.2 | 40021 | 40021 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAIP | s | 355.20 | 65800 | $23.930 \%$ | s | 85.00 | 6740\% | 8 | 23.94 | s | 85.0 |
| 24762 Traval to Hicksvilie, NY | 2009 | 615.58 | 40015 | 40016 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | 5 | 317.20 | 65800 | 23.930\% |  | 75.91 | 6.740\% | $s$ | 21.38 | \$ | 75.91 |
| 24762 Trip to Metrotech 8 Uniondale | 2009 | 381.2 | 40037 | 40037 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | s | 357.20 | G5800 | 23.930\% | . | 85.48 | 6.740\% | , | 24.08 | s | 85.48 |
| 24762 MetroTech Tnip | 2009 | 410.9 | 40046 | 40046 | K99210 | 002031 | 471 | AIR-NON A/P | s | 357.20 | 65800 | 23930\% | - | 85.48 | 6770\% | \$ | 24.08 | s | 85.48 |
| 24762 Travel To MetroTech | 2009 | 381.2 | 40052 | 40052 | K99210 | 002031 | 479 | AIR-NON A/P | s | 357.20 | G5800 | 23.930\% | s | 85.48 | 6740\% | \$ | 24.08 | \$ | 85.48 |

Massachusetts Information Request AC-32-22-Transportation Air
Allocation to Viagara Mohawk Power Corporation

| Employee <br> id | Expense Purpose | Cal $\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{r}}$ | Total Voucher Amount | Trip Start Date | Trip End Date | Project | Activity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cost } \\ & \text { Type } \end{aligned}$ | Cost Type Description |  | Work Order Amount | Allocation Code | Nimo <br> Electric \% | Nimo Electric Allocated | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NiMO } \\ & \text { Gas } \% \end{aligned}$ | NIMO Gas Allocated $S$ | NIMO Electric Included in HTY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{89853}$ | RM TTP NE | 2008 | 994.32 | 39532 | 39533 | NAUT20 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NONAMP | \$ | 400.85 | cosoio | 0.000\% | S | 00000\% |  |  |
| 89853 | RM Trip NE | 2008 | 644.45 | 39490 | 39490 | NaUl20 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | s | 400.85 | G0900 | 0.000\% | $\stackrel{5}{ }$ | 0.000\% | s | s |
| 88853 | RM trp NE | 2008 | 825.82 | 39477 | 39478 | nautzo | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NON A/P | 5 | 400.85 | cosoo | 0.000\% | $\leqslant \quad$. | 0.000\% | $5 \cdots$ | S |
| 89853 | Contractor Meetings NE | 2008 | 632.85 | 39570 | 39570 | Nauliz | 003952 | 479 | AIR-NONAP | 5 | 400.85 | 60900 | 0.000\% | $\leqslant \quad-$ | 0.000\% | \$ | 5 |
| 89853 | RM TTip NE | 2008 | 525.85 | 39549 | 39549 | NAU120 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NONAPP | \$ | 400.85 | G0900 | 0.000\% | s $\quad$ | 0.000\% | \$ | $s$ - |
| 89853 | RM Trip NE | 2008 | 537.85 | 39546 | 39546 | NAU120 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | s | 400.85 | G0900 | 0.000\% | \$ $\quad$. | 0.000\% | \$ $\quad$. | s |
| 89853 | RM trip NE | 2008 | 620.85 | 39540 | 39540 | NAU120 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | s | 400.85 | c0900 | 0.000\% | \$ | 0.000\% | \$ . | 8 |
| 89853 | Tri-podigdxuk Meeting | 2008 | 947.87 | 39552 | 39554 | Naul20 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | $s$ | 400.85 | G0900 | 0000\% | \$ | 0000\% | \$ | \$ $\quad$ |
| 89853 | RM Tmp NE | 2008 | 431.17 | 39603 | 39603 | NAU120 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NONAP' | 5 | 401.17 | G0900 | 0000\% | $s \quad-$ | 0000\% | \$ | \$ - |
| 89853 | RM Trip UK | 2008 | 4141.16 | 39615 | 39617 | navizo | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | \$ | 2,585.90 | ¢0900 | 0.000\% | \$ | 0.000\% | 5 ¢ | S |
| 89853 | Contract Management Trip NE | 2008 | 560.24 | 39612 | 39612 | NAU120 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | \$ | 401.17 | G0900 | 0.000\% | \$ - | 0.000\% | \$ - | $s \quad$. |
| 89853 | RM Training Eraintree | 2008 | 434.67 | 39589 | 39589 | NaUl20 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NON A/P | 5 | 401.17 | G0900 | 0000\% | $5 \cdots$ | 0.000\% | \$ | , |
| 89853 | Investment Planning Trip NE | 2008 | 578.92 | 39574 | 39575 | NAU120 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | - | 401.17 | 60900 | 0000\% | $s$ | 0000\% | \$ | \$ |
| 89853 | Investment Planning Trip NE | 2008 | 740.92 | 39598 | 39598 | NAU120 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | s | 401.17 | 60900 | 0000\% | s | 0.000\% | 3 | \$ |
| 89853 | SRP Meeting NE | 2008 | 789.44 | 39595 | 39596 | NAU120 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | 5 | 401.17 | G0900 | 0000\% | \$ . | 0.000\% | \$ | s |
| 89853 | Investment Pianning Staf Meeting | 2008 | 544.17 | 39643 | 39643 | Nauti20 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | s | 401.17 | G0900 | 0.000\% | \$ - | 0.000\% | s | S |
| 89853 | Investment Planning meeting | 2008 | 656.2 | 39645 | 39646 | NAU120 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | $s$ | 439.17 | G0900 | 0.000\% | \$ | 0.000\% | s | $5 \cdots \cdots \cdots$ |
| 89853 | Contract Strategy Meeting | 2008 | 891.24 | 39651 | 39652 | NaU120 | 003952 | 47: | AIR-NONAP | s | 401.17 | G0900 | 0000\% | s | 0.000\% | \$ | \$ - |
| 89853 | GAM Conference | 2008 | 3114.63 | 39636 | 39640 | Nauizo | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | 5 | 2,491.30 | 60900 | 0.000\% | s | 0.000\% | $3 \quad-$ | 8 |
| 89853 | Notwork Strategy Roadshow | 2008 | 1078.63 | 39604 | 39605 | NAU120 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NON APP | 5 | 824.50 | 60900 | 0000\% | \$ | 0.000\% | s | \$ |
| 89853 | Contractor Meetings NE | 2008 | 631 | 39661 | 39661 | naU120 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | s | 417.00 | G0900 | 0.000\% | \$ | 0000\% | $s$ | \$ |
| 89853 | PAS 55 Meetings Syracuse | 2008 | 546.37 | 39657 | 39658 | Naut20 | 003952 | 479 | AIR-NONAP | s | 417.00 | G0900 | 0.000\% | \$ - | 0.000\% | \$ - | s |
| 89853 | Manager Innterveiws ConstructionNE | 2008 | 642.56 | 39710 | 39710 | Nalit 12 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | s | 401.17 | G0900 | 0.000\% | , | 0.000\% | \$ | \$ |
| 89853 | Contractor Meeting Syracuse | 2008 | 458.71 | 39701 | 39701 | NAU120 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | \$ | 387.00 | 60900 | 0000\% | \$ | 0.000\% | \$ | \$ |
| 89853 | Investment Planning Staff Meeting NE | 2008 | 431.17 | 39706 | 39706 | NAU120 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | S | 401.17 | G0900 | 1000\% | $\$$ - | 0000\% | s | 5 \% |
| 89853 | Contractor Meetings NE | 2008 | 431.17 | 39696 | 39696 | NAU120 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NON AP' | $s$ | 401.17 | G0900 | 0.000\% | $s$ | 0.0004\% | \$ | 5 |
| 89853 | New Service Meeting NE | 2008 | 633.17 | 39743 | 39743 | Navi20 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | 5 | 401.17 | G0900 | 0000\% | $3 \quad$. | 0.000\% | \$ | 8 |
| 89853 | Work Out Session UK Work Delivery | 2009 | 3829.2 | 39769 | 39773 | nautio | 903952 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | 5 | 2,233.20 | 60900 | 0.000\% | \$ - | 0.000\% | \$ | s |
| 89853 | X-LOB work oul session AM Boston | 2009 | 1043.22 | 39783 | 39786 | NAU120 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | \$ | 401.17 | 60900 | 0.000\% | S | 0.000\% | \$ | s |
| 89853 | Contractor Negotiations NE | 2009 | 642.17 | 39794 | 39794 | NAU120 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | $s$ | 401.17 | 60900 | 0.000\% | s | 0.000\% | s | \$ |
| 89853 | Rober Mango's Recruting Trio | 2009 | 475.7 | 39668 | 39868 | NAU120 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | s | 475.70 | 60900 | 0.000\% | \$ | 0.000\% | s | \$ |
| 89853 | Procurement Trip Syracuse | 2009 | 407.2 | 39842 | 39842 | nau120 | 003952 | 479 | AIR-NONAP | s | 377.20 | 60900 | 0.000\% | , | 0.000\% | s | \$ |
| 89853 | GDX Meeting Watham | 2009 | 651.37 | 38867 | 39868 | naut20 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NON A/P | s | 401.37 | G0900 | 0.000\% | $\stackrel{ }{ }$ | $0000 \%$ | \$ | 5 |
| 89853 | Procurement Trip Wath | 2009 | 621.38 | 39899 | 39899 | nau120 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | s | 401.37 | 60900 | 0.000\% | \$ | 0.000\% | $s$ | \$ |
| 89853 | Procurement Trip Syracuse | 2009 | 251.8 | 39895 | 39895 | naul20 | 003952 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | , | 157.20 | 60900 | 0000\% | s - | 0.000\% | 5 | s |
| 89853 | Procurement Meetings Syracuse \& Waltham | 2009 | 557.1 | 39994 | 39995 | K03466 | 002004 | 471 | AR-NON AP | 5 | 277.20 | 60200 | 0.000\% | \$ . | 0.000\% | s | s |
| 89853 | Glosal Asset management Meetings | 2009 | 2770.75 | 40007 | 40010 | K03466 | 002004 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | 5 | 2,141,30 | 60200 | 0.000\% | $\$$ - | 0.000\% | \$ | 8 |
| 89853 | Procurement Meetings Walitham | 2009 | 540.2 | 40014 | 40014 | k03466 | 002004 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | 5 | 317.20 | G0200 | 0.000\% | \$ | 0.000\% | , | 8 |
| 89853 | Procurement Meetings Waltham | 2009 | 540.2 | 40002 | 40002 | K03466 | 002004 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | s | 317.20 | G0200 | 0.000\% | \$ - | 0000\% | \$ | \$ |
| 89853 | Procurement Meetings Watham | 2009 | 618.2 | 40023 | 40023 | K03466 | 002004 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | s | 357.20 | 60200 | 0.000\% | S | 0.000\% | s | $s$ |
| 89853 | Procurement Trip Waltham | 2009 | 589.58 | 40030 | 40030 | K03466 | 002004 | 471 | AIR-NON A/P. | s | 357.20 | 60200 | 0000\% | , | 0000\% | s | s |
| 89853 | Procurement Meetings Waltham | 2009 | 584.54 | 40050 | 40050 | K03466 | 002004 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | s | 357.20 | 60200 | 0000\% | , | 0.000\% | $s$ | s |
| 89853 | Procurement Meetings Syracuse | 2009 | 289.54 | 40056 | 40056 | K03466 | 002004 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | s | 187.20 | G0200 | 0.000\% | \$ | 0.000\% | s | $\$$ |
| 89853 | Developing Future Leaders training | 2009 | 4023.92 | 40069 | 40074 | K03456 | 002004 | 471 | AIR-NONAP | 5 | 2,375.80 | G0200 | 0.000\% | S | 0000\% | \$ | \$ |
| 89853 | Power Advocate Conference | 2009 | 482.54 | 40066 | 40066 | K03466 | 002004 | 471 | AIR-NON A/P | 5 | 377.20 | 60200 | 0.000\% | $3 \quad-$ | 0.000\% | $s$ | \$ |
| 89853 | Procurement Meetings Waltham | 2009 | 604.54 | 40078 | 40078 | k03466 | 002004 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | s | 377.20 | 60200 | 0.000\% | \$ - | 0.000\% | \$ | s |
| 89853 | Procurement Meetings Watham | 2009 | 523.71 | 40105 | 40105 | K03466 | 002004 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | 5 | 387.20 | G0200 | 0.000\% | \$ - | 0.000\% | 3 | $s$ |
| 89853 | UK Procurement Conference | 2009 | 2632.38 | 40098 | 40101 | K03466 | 002004 | 471 | AIR-NON AIP | 5 | 2,398.10 | G0200 | 0.000\% | s | 0.000\% | \$ | $\$$ |
| 89853 | Procurement Meetings Watham | 2009 | 424.54 | 40091 | 40091 | K03466 | 002004 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | $s$ | 387.20 | 60200 | 0.000\% | s | 0000\% | $s$ | s |
| 89853 | Procurement Meetings Waltham | 2009 | 597.32 | 40086 | 40086 | K03466 | 002004 | 471 | AIR-NON A/P | $s$ | 349.20 | 60200 | 0.000\% | \$ - | 0.000\% | s | \$ |
| 89853 | Procurement Meetings Syracuse | 2009 | 409.8 | 40081 | 40081 | K03466 | 002004 | 471 | AIR-NON AP | s | 247.30 | G0200 | 0.000\% |  | 0.000\% | $s$ | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | s | 1,285,021.05 |  |  | ( 119,410.80 |  | 3 40,656.93 | \$ 56,267.52 |

Massachusetts Information Request AG-32-42-Hotel
Calendar Yr

| Calendar Yr | Exp Empl Id | Exp Type | Exp Type Descr | Regulatory Acct | Regulatory Acct Descr | Billing Pool | Expense \$ |  | NIMO <br> Electric \% | NIMO Electric Allocated \$ |  | NMO Gas \% | NIMO Gas Allocated $\$$ |  | NIMO Electric Included in HTY |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 100054831 | HOTEL | Renaissance Hotel | 928000 | Regulatory Comm Expenses | 00239 | \$ | 12317 | $27306 \%$ | s | 3363 | 4 594\% | \$ | 56 | \$ | 33.63 |
| 2009 | 100054831 | HOTEL | Lodging while at EEI Rate School | 928000 | Regulatory Comm Expenses | 00239 | 5 | 930.95 | 27.306\% | 5 | 254.21 | 4.594\% | 8 | 42.77 | \$ | 254.21 |
| 2009 | 100054831 | HOTEL | Trip to UK for U.S. Strategy presentation to the Exec Commitree | 928000 | Regulatory Comm Expenses | 00239 | \$ | 52891 | 27305\% | 5 | 14442 | 4.594\% | \$ | 2430 | \$ | - |
| 2009 | 100054831 | HOTEL | Trip to make Exec Committee presentation | 928000 | Regulatory Comm Expenses | 00239 | S | 802.22 | 27.305\% | \$ | 219.05 | 4.594\% | s | 36.85 |  | - |
| 2009 | 100054831 | HOTEL | Hotel stay in UK for Exec Committee Mtg | 928000 | Regulatory Comm Expenses | 00239 | S | 597.94 | 27.305\% | \$ | 163.27 | 4.594\% | S | 27.47 | \$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 490,362.76 |  | \$ | 153,478.00 |  | s | 29,533.26 | \$ | 66,652.89 |

$\frac{\text { Massachusets Information Request AG-32-43-Airfare }}{\text { Allocation to Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation }}$


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calendar } \\ & \mathbf{n}_{1} \end{aligned}$ | Exp Empl Id | Exp Type | Exp Type Descr | Regulatory Acct | Regulatory Acct Descr | Billing <br> Pool |  | Expense S | NIMO Electric $\%$ |  | Electric cated S | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Nimo } \\ & \text { Gas } \% \end{aligned}$ |  | 0 Gas ated 5 |  | ectric <br> din |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Airfare to Boston on Continental - meetings in Waltham | 921000 | AkG-Office Supplies | 00203 | \$ | 94.66 | 44.671\% | s | 42.29 | 0.000\% | \$ | - | \$ | 42.29 |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Airfare to Boston on Continental - meetings in Waltham | 921000 | AXG-Office Supplies | 00200 | \$ | 9465 | 0000\% | \$ | - | 13.066\% | \$ |  | 5 |  |
| 2009 | 100051366 | ARRFARE | Airfare from Boston to LGA on US Air - meetings in Waltham | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00203 | \$ | 53.19 | $44671 \%$ | $s$ | 2376 | 0000\% | $s$ |  | $\checkmark$ | 6 |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Airfare from Boston to LGA on US Air - meetings in Waltham | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00200 | \$ | 53.20 | 0000\% | s |  | 13066\% | s | 6.95 | s |  |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Newark to Boston - meetings in Reservoir Woods | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00203 | 8 | 200.40 | 44.671\% | s | 89.52 | 0.000\% | 8 |  | \$ | 89.52 |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE" | Newark to Boston - meetings in Reservoir Woods | 921000 | A8G-Office Supplies | 00200 | \$ | 200.39 | 0.000\% | s |  | 13066\% | $s$ | 26.18 | \$ |  |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Newark to Boston - meetings in Res Woods | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00203 | \$ | 200.40 | 44 671\% | 5 | 8952 | 0000\% | 5 |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Newark to Boston - meetings in Res Woods | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00200 | \$ | 200.39 | 0.000\% | 5 |  | 13066\% | 5 | 26.18 | 5 |  |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Newark to Boston - meetings in Res Woods | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00203 | \$ | 200.40 | 44.671\% | \$ | 89.52 | 00000\% | 5 |  | s | - |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Newark to Boston - meetings in Res Woods | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00200 | 8 | 20039 | 0.000\% | \$ | - | 13066\% | 8 | 26.18 | 5 |  |
| 20091 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Airfare to Washington, DC-EE A wards Dinner | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00203 | 8 | 192.19 | 44671\% | \$ | 8585 | 0000\% | 5 |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Airfare to Washington, DC-EE Awards Dinner | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00200 | \$ | 192.18 | 0000\% | 8 | - | 13066\% | s | 2511 |  |  |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Airfare to Denver, CO -Autovation Conference in Denver, CO | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00203 | \$ | 156.66 | 44671\% | s | 69.98 | 0.000\% | 5 |  | \$ |  |
| 000 | 100051365 | AIR | Aiffare to Denver, CO - Autovation Conference in Denver |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Airfare to Califor | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00200 | 5 | 156.66 | 0.000\% | \$ |  | 13066\% | \$ | 2047 | s |  |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Airfare to Califormia - meetings with utilities | 921000 | AkG-Office Supplies | 00200 | \$ | 526.57 | 0.000\% | s |  | 13.066\% | s | 68.80 | \$ |  |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Airfare to Boston - Meetings in Res Woods | 921000 | AdG-Office Supplies | 00203 | 5 | 21306 | 44.671\% | 5 | 95.18 | $0.000 \%$ | 5 |  | 5 |  |
| 2009 | 100051366 | ARFARE | Airfare to Boston-Meetings in Res Woods | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00200 | 8 | 213.06 | 0.000\% | s |  | 13066\% | \$ | 2784 | $s$ |  |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Aiffare to Boston - meetings in Res Woods | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00203 | s | 22923 | 44.671\% | 5 | 10240 | 0.000\% | 8 | - | S |  |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Airfare to Boston - meetings in Res Woods | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00200 | \$ | 22922 | 0.000\% | \$ | ". | 13.066\% | \$ | 29.95 | s |  |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Airfare Santa Ana, CA to San Francisco, CA - meeting with PG\&E | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00203 | \$ | 23.20 | 44.671\% | s | 10.36 | 0000\% | \$ |  | \$ | - |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Aiffare Santa Ana, CA to San Francisco, CA - meeting with PG\&E | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00200 | \$ | 23.20 | 0.000\% | \$ |  | 13.066\% | s | 3.03 | \$ |  |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Contnental Airlines one way arfare - Newark to Tokyo | 921000 | AdG-Office Supplies | 00203 | \$ | 2,197.48 | 44,671\%. | 5 | 981.64 | 0.000\% | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 20091 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Continental Airlines one way airfare - Newark to Tokyo | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00200 | \$ | 2,19748 | 0000\% | 8 |  | 13.066\% | \$ | 287.12 | \$ | - |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Airfare - Tokyo to Osaka | 921000 | AbG-Office Supplies | 00203 | \$ | 84.02 | 44671\% | \$ | 3753 | 0000\% | \$ | - | $s$ | - |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Aiffare - Tokyo to Osaka | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00200 | \$ | 84.03 | 0.000\% | s |  | 13066\% | \$ | 10.98 | \$ | - |
| 2009 | 100051366 | ATRFARE | Airare - Tokyo to JFK Airport | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00203 | 8 | 2,601.61 | 44.671\% | \$ | 1,162.17 | 0.000\% | \$ |  | \$ | - |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Airfare - Tokyo to JFK Aiport | 921000 | AkG-Office Supplies | 00200 | \$ | 2,60160 | 0.000\% | \$ |  | 13.066\% | s | 339.93 | s | - |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Airare-Osaka to Tokyo | 921000 | AdG-Office Supplies | 00203 | 8 | 83.66 | 44.671\% | \$ | 37.37 | 0.000\% | \$ | $\cdots$ | $\$$ | - |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Airare-Osaka to Tohyo | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00200 | \$ | 83.66 | 0000\% | 5 | - | 13066\% | , | 10.93 | s | - |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIPFARE | Travel to Waltham - meetings in Reservoir Woods | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00203 | \$ | 24631 | 44671\% | § | 11003 | 0.000\% | s | - | 5 | - |
| 2009 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | Travel to Waltham - meetings in Reservoir Woods | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00200 | 5 | 24631 | 0000\% | s |  | 13066\% | 5 | 3218 | $\stackrel{1}{5}$ | - |
| 200 | 100051366 | AIRFARE | airfare to Boston - meetings in Reservoir Woods | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00203 | s | 24631 | 44.671\% | \$ | 110.03 | 0.000\% | s | - | 5 |  |
| 200 | 100051366 | ARFARE | airfare to Boston - meetings in Reservoir Woods | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00200 | s | 246.31 | 0.000\% | 5 |  | 13066\% | S | 32.18 | 5 | - |
| 2008 | 100051448 | AIRFARE | Tzell Fee | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00282 | 8 | 38.00 | 32.064\% | \$ | 1218 | 6.567\% | s | 250 | S | - |
| 2008 | 100051448 | ARFARE | Tzell Agent Fee | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00282 | \$ | 38.00 | 32064\% | \$ | 12.18 | 6.567\% | \$ | 2.50 | 5 | - |
| 2008 | 100051448 | AIRFARE | Tzell Agent Fee | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00282 | S | 38.00 | 32.064\% | \$ | 12.18 | 6.567\% | 5 | 2.50 | \$ | - |
| 2008 | 100051448 | AIRFARE | Boston LGA Boston | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00282 | \$ | 362.65 | 32.064\% | 5 | 116.28 | 6567\% | $\$$ | 23.82 | 5 | - |
| 2008 | 100051448 | AIRFARE | Boston LGA Boston | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00282 | \$ | 362.65 | 32064\% | s | 11628 | 6.567\% | \$ | 23.82 | 5 | - |
| 2008 | 100051448 | AIRFARE | Boston, Chariston, Phoenix, Boston - EEI CEO Mtg. | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00282 | \$ | 503.70 | 32064\% | \$ | 16151 | 6567\% | \$ | 33.08 | s | - |
| 2008 | 100051448 | AIRFARE | Boston London Boston | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00282 | $\$$ | 8,852.72 | 32.064\% | \$ | 2,83854 | 6.567\% | \$ | 58136 | 5 | - |
| 2008 | 100051448 | AIRFARE | This was because the ucker was billed as 666 and 315 was paid last month. | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00282 | s | 35100 | 32 064\% | \$ | 11254 | 6844\% | \$ | 24.02 | \$ | - |

Massachusets Information Request AG-32-43-Airfare
Allocation to Niapara Mohawk Power Corporation

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Calendar } \\ \mathbf{Y r} \end{gathered}$ | Exp Empl Id | Exp Type |  | Exp Type Descr |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 100711508 | AIRFARE | It Boston-London |  |

## Massnchusetts Information Request AG-32-44-Other Allocation to Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation



| $\begin{gathered} \text { Calendar } \\ \mathbf{Y}_{\mathbf{r}} \end{gathered}$ | Exp Empl Id | Exp Type | Exp Type Descr | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Regulatory } \\ & \text { Acet } \end{aligned}$ | Reguatory Acct Descr | Billing Pool | Expense $\$$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NIMO } \\ & \text { Electric \% } \end{aligned}$ | NIMO <br> Electric Allocated 5 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { NIMO Gas } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Nimo Gas Allocated S |  | NIMO Electric Included in HTY |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20091 | 100048687 | OTHER | Tzell Service Fee | 9210000 | AeGoffice Supplies | 00236 | 5 | 15.00 | 44.553\% | $s$ | 6.68 | 9.125\% | s | 137 | s | 6.68 |
| 2009 | 100048687 | OTHER | Tzell Service Fee | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00236 | s | 15.00 | 44.553\% | s | 6.68 | 9.125\% | s | 137 | s | 6.68 |
| 20091 | 100048687 | OTMER | Tzell Service Charge | 921000 | A\&GOffice Supplies | 00236 | 5 | 1500 | 44.553\% | 5 | 6.68 | 9.125\% | 5 | 1.37 | s | 6.68 |
| 20091 | 10004868 | OTHER | Acela from Providence to NYC | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00236 | $s$ | 10400 | 44.553\% | 5 | 46.34 | 9.125\% | s | 949 | s | 4634 |
| 20091 | 100048687 | OTHER | Acela from NYC to Providence | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00236 | \$ | 133.00 | 44.553\% | 5 | 59.26 | 9.125\% | s | 1214 | 5 | 5926 |
| 20091 | 100048687 | OTHER | Tristar Car Service from Airport to Hotel | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00236 | 5 | 26372 | 44.212\% | 5 | 11660 | 9055\% | 5 | 23.88 | s | 116.60 |
| 20091 | 100048887 | OTHER | Travel IEaders Service Fee | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00236 | 5 | 3800 | 44.212\% | s | 1680 | 9055\% | 5 | 3.44 | s | 16.80 |
| 2009 | 100048687 | OTHER | Round tnp car service to/from aiporthome | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00236 | 5 | 330.00 | 44.212\% | s | 14590 | 9.055\% | s | 29.88 | \$ | 14590 |
| 2009 | 100048687 | OTHER | Car Service from Office to Airport | 921000 | ARG-Office Supplies | 00236 | 5 | 309.01 | 44.212\% | s | 13662 | 9.055\% | s | 27.98 | 8 | 136.62 |
| 2009 | 100048687 | OTHER | Beverages | 921000 | AdG-Office Supplies | 00236 | 5 | 2.88 | 44.212\% | 5 | 1.01 | 9.055\% | \$ | 0.21 | 5 | 1.01 |
| 20091 | 100048687 | OTHER | Travel Leaders Service Fee | 921000 | ARG-Office Supplies | 00236 | 5 | 15.00 | 44.212\% | 5 | 6.63 | 9.055\% | 5 | 1.36 | 5 | 6.63 |
| 2009 | 100048687 | OTHER | Travel Leaders Fee | 921000 | AdG-Office Supplies | 00236 | s | 38.00 | 44.212\% | 5 | 16.80 | 9.055\% | s | 3.44 | s | 16.80 |
| 2009 | 100048687 | OTHER | Travel Leader Service Fee | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00236 | 9 | 15.00 | 44.212\% | s | 6.63 | 9055\% | S | 1.36 | ¢ | 6.63 |
| 2009 | 100048687 | OTHFR | Port Jefferson Ferry | 921000 | AdG-Office Supplies | 00236 | 5 | 51.00 | 44.212\% | 5 | 22.55 | 9055\% | 5 | 4.62 | $s$ | 22.55 |
| 2009 | 100048687 | OTHER | Aitport Connection for AGA Seminar | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00236 | $s$ | 16000 | 44212\% | 5 | 7074 | 9055\% | s | 14.49 | $s$ | 7074 |
| 2009 | 100048687 | OTHER | Aipor Connection for AGA Conference | 921000 | A 6 G-Office Supplies | 00236 | s | 16000 | 44212\% | 5 | 70.74 | 9055\% | \$ | 1449 | s | 70.74 |
| 2009 | 100048687 | OTHER | Acela Fee for June 3 for I\&D Training on June 4 | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00236 | s | 208.00 | 44.212\% | \$ | 9196 | 9055\% | $s$ | 1883 | $s$ | 9196 |
| 2009 | 100048687 | OTHER | Travel Leaders Service Fee | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00236 | 5 | 38.00 | 44212\% | s | 16.80 | 9.055\% | s | 3.44 | s | 16.80 |
| 2009 | 100048687 | OTHER | Refreshments | 921000 | AxCooffice Supplies | 00236 | 8 | 767 | 44 $212 \%$ | s | 339 | 9.055\% | 5 | 069 | 5 | 339 |
| 2009 | 100048687 | OTHER | Hotel food \& Beverages for Sullivan, Woycik, Gullick, Mango various dates | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00236 | $s$ | 66.69 | 44.212\% | 5 | 29.49 | 9.055\% | \$ | 6.04 | s | 29.49 |
| 2009 | 100048687 | OTHER | Change fee for Amtrak - FERC meeting | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00236 | 5 | 15.00 | 44.212\% | 5 | 6.63 | 9.055\% | s | 1.36 | s | 6.63 |
| 2009 | 100048687 | OTHER | Car Service to Logan Aiport | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00236 | $s$ | 18121 | 44.212\% | s | 80.12 | 9.055\% | 5 | 1641 | \$ | 80.12. |
| 2009 | 100048687 | OTHER | Car Service from Logan to home | 921000 | A8G-Office Supplies | 00236 | 5 | 18181 | 44.212\% | 8 | 80.38 | 9.055\% | s | 16.46 | \$ | 8038 |
| 2009 | 100048887 | OTHER | Cab from Alveston Manor to Warwhick | 921000 | AEG-Office Supplies | 00236 | s | 42.00 | 44.212\% | S | 1857 | 9.055\% | s | 3.80 | \$ | 1857 |
| 2009 | 100048687 | OTHER | Travel Leaders Service Fee | 921000 | A \&G-Office Supplies | 00236 | 8 | 38.00 | 44.210\% | 8 | 16.80 | 9.055\% | s | 3.44 | \$ | $\cdots$ |
| 2009 | 100048687 | OTHER | Acela Train roundtrip from Providence/NYC | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00236 | 5 | 19300 | 44.210\% | 5 | 8533 | 9.055\% | 5 | 1748 | S |  |
| 2009 | 100048687 | OTHER | Travel Leaders Service fee for $11 / 4$ stay in Melville Marnitt | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00236 | \$ | 1500 | 44.210\% | 8 | 663 | 9055\% | s | 1.36 | s |  |
| 2009 | 100048887 | OTHER | Travel Leaders Service Fee | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00236 | 8 | 38.00 | 44210\% | \$ | 1680 | 9055\% | \$ | 344 | s |  |
| 2009 | 100048687 | OTHER | Refreshments | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00236 | 5 | 14.05 | 44.210\% | 8 | 6.22 | 9055\% | s | 127 | s | - |
| 2009 | 100048887 | OTHER | Car Service to Logan Aiport | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00236 | 8 | 179.00 | 44.210\% | 5 | 79.14 | 9.055\% | s | 1621 | $s$ |  |
| 2009 | 100048887 | OTHER | Car Service from Logan to home | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00236 | s | 17900 | 44.210\% | 5 | 79.14 | 9.055\% | 5 | 16.21 | 5 |  |
| 2008 | 100050973 | OTHER | Tzell travel fee-cxld trip | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | s | 38.00 | 37.997\% | $s$ | 1444 | 0.000\% | 5 |  | s | 1444 |
| 2008 | 100050973 | OTHER | Cancelled UK flight 550 penalty plus $\$ 38$ Tzell fee | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | 8 | 88.00 | 37.997\% | 5 | 33.44 | 0.000\% | s |  | 5 | 3344 |
| 2008 | 100050973 | OTHER | Team Gifts | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00203 | 8 | 60689 | 41.563\% | $s$ | 252.24 | 0000\% | $s$ | - | S | - |
| 2008 | 100050973 | OTHER | Tzell fee for hotel reservation | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00203 | ¢ | 1500 | 41.563\% | 5 | 6.23 | 0000\% | $s$ |  | s |  |
| 2008 | 100050973 | OTHER | Tickets to show for Direct Reports (post-holday gathening) | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00203 | 5 | 78320 | 41.563\% | $s$ | 325.52 | 0000\% | 5 |  | 5 | - |
| 2008 | 100050973 | OTHER | Coast to Coast-rain jackets-gifts | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00203 | 5 | 19.02 | 41.563\% | $s$ | 791 | 0000\% | 5 |  | s |  |
| 2008 | 100050973 | OTHER | Tzell fee to reserve hotel | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00203 | 8 | 15.00 | 41.563\% | 5 | 6.23 | 0.000\% | s |  | s | - |
| 2008 | 100050973 | OTHER | Refrestments-Albary | 921000 | A EG-Office Supplies | 00203 | $s$ | 1700 | 41.563\% | S | 7.07 | 0.000\% | s |  | s |  |
| 2008 | 100050973 | OTHER | fuel for car | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00203 | S | 6700 | 41.563\% | 5 | 27.85 | 0.000\% | S |  | s | - |
|  |  | OTHER | Refreshment for Alliance of Black Professionals Mtg $\boldsymbol{~}$ JP agre Sponsor for ED | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00203 | $s$ | 405.05 | 41.563\% | 5 | 168.35 | 0000\% |  | - | $\delta$ | - |
| 2008 | 100050973 | OTHER | Fee at airport to catch earlier flight | 921000 | A\&G-office Supplies | 00203 | s | 25.00 | 43.767\% | s | 1094 | 0.000\% | 5 | $\cdots$ | S | - |
| 2008 | 100050973 | OTHER | Tzell travel fee to change UK flight time | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | s | 3800 | 0.000\% | $s$ | $\cdots$ | 0000\% | 5 | - | 5 | - |
| 2008 | 100050973 | OTHER | Harvard Business Review Article - April 07 | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | s | 650 | 0000\% | $s$ | - | 0.000\% | S | - | 5 | - |
| 2008 | 100050973 | OTHER | Parking at Logan | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | \$ | 36.00 | 0000\% | 5 | - | 0000\% | 5 | - | 5 | . |
| 2008 | 100050973 | OTMER | Parking at Logan | 921000 | A\&G-office Supplies | 00201 | \$ | 4800 | 0.000\% | $s$ | - | 0.000\% | $s$ | - | 5 | - |
| 2008 | 100050973 | OTHER | Parking at Boston Logan - UK imp | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | 5 | 108.00 | 0.000\% | 5 | - | 0000\% | 5 | - | 5 | - |
| 2008 | 100050973 | OTHER | Hyatt Regency Bimingham UK (GTB Mtgs) | 921000 | AsC-OOffice Supplies | 00201 | \$ | 642.52 | 0.000\% | s | - | 0.000\% | 5 | - | 5 | - |
| 2008 | 100050973 | OTHER | Global Transformaton Bd Mig in UK | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | $s$ | 709.08 | 0000\% |  | . | 0000\% | 5 | - | 5 | - |
|  | 100051351 | OTHER | Year-End Celebration-US Finance/Tax\&Treasury - 05/07/09Luciano's Rest - Bklyn | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00236 | s | 4,003.48 | 44212\% | s | 1,770.02 | 9055\% | s | 362.52 | \$ | 1,770.02 |



## Massachusetts Information Request AG-32-44- Other Allocation to Niagara Mohawk Power Cornoration

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calendar } \\ & \mathbf{Y r} \end{aligned}$ | Exp Empl id | Exp Type | Exp Type Descr | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Regulatory } \\ & \text { Acct } \end{aligned}$ | Regulatory Acct Descr | Billing Pool | Expense 5 |  | NIMO Electric \% | NIMO Electric Allocated 5 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { NIMO Gas } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | NIMO Gas Allocated $\$$ |  | NIMO Electric Included in HTY |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20091 | 100054831 | OTHER | TnStar Car Service fare from LHR aimort to Mallory Court | 928000 | Regulatory Comm Expenses | 00239 | \$ | 381.93 | 27.305\% | $s$ | 104.29 | 4.594\% | s | 17 | 5 |  |
| 2009 | 100054831 | OTHER | TriStar Car Service fare from Intercontinental hotel to LHR airport | 928000 | Regulatory Comm Expenses | 00239 | $s$ | 106.95 | 27.305\% | \$ | 29.20 | 4.594\% | s | 4.91 | 5 |  |
| 2009 | 100054831 | OTHER | Travel Agent Fee | 928000 | Regulatory Comm Expenses | 00239 | \$ | 38.00 | 27.305 | \$ | 10.38 | 4.594\% | s | 1.75 | 5 |  |
| 2009 | 100054831 | OTHER | Travel Agent Fee | 928000 | Regulatory Comm Expenses | 00239 | s | 38.00 | 27.305\% | \$ | 10.3 | 4.594 | s | 1.75 | s |  |
| 2009 | 100054831 | OTHER | Travel Agen Fee | 928000 | Regulatory Comm Expenses | 00239 | $s$ | 3800 | 27.305\% | 5 | 1038 | 4.594\% | s | 1.7 | 5 |  |
| 20091 | 100054831 | OTHER | Taxi to dinner with Bill Bollbach to discuss team collaboration initative | 928000 | Regulatory Comm Expenses | 00239 | s | 16.50 | 27.305\% | s | 4.51 | 4.594\% |  | 0.76 | \$ |  |
| 2009 | 100054831 | OTHER | Subscription to The Electricity Journal 1 1-09 10 12-09 | 928000 | Regulatory Comm Expenses | 00239 | 5 | 10700 | 27.305\% | 5 | 29.22 | 4.594\% | s | 4.92 | s |  |
| 2009 | 100054831 | OTHER | Car Service to Logan arport to fly to UK for U.S. Strategy Presentation | 928000 | Re | 00239 | \$ | 7450 | 27305\% | s | 2034 |  |  |  | 5 |  |
| 2009 | 100054831 | OTHER | Car Service from Logan arport aft U.S. Strategy Presentation | 928000 | Regulatory Comm Expenses | 00239 | \$ | 74.50 | 27.305\% | \$ | 20.34 | 4.594\% | s | 3.42 | s |  |
| 2008 | 100054904 | OTHER | Realtor'sfe | 928000 | Regulatory Comm Expenses | 00233 | 5 | 2,300,00 | $56.431 \%$ | s | 1,297.91 | 0.000\% | s |  | s |  |
| 2008 | 100054904 | OTHER | Meals (13) at hotel | 928000 | Repulator Comm Expenses | 00233 | 8 | 280.92 | 56.431\% | s | 158.53 | 0.000\% | s |  | 5 | 15853 |
| 2009 | 100056326 | OTHER | Beibin Associates-Team Roles w/Work Delivery Direct reports and Executive admin | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00233 | $s$ | 388.80 | 54.013\% | $s$ | 210.00 | 0.000\% |  |  | 5 | 210.00 |
| 2009 | 100056326 | OTHER | mileage - UK allowance 20 cents per mule - W'boro to Marlboro. NEA Program Directorate Mt, - Lincoln | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00233 | s |  | 54.013\% | s | 713 | 0.000\% |  |  | $s$ |  |
| 2009 | 100056326 | OTHER | mileage - UK allowance 20 cents per mile - Tx conf. - Lincoln to |  | A GG-office Supplies |  | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 100056326 | OTHER | mileage- UK allowance 20 cents per mule Lincoln to Whoro to meet | 921000 | ARG-Office Supplies | 00233 | S | 13.20 | 54.013\% | 5 | 713 | 0.000\% | s |  | s |  |
|  |  |  | mileage - UK allowance 20 cents per mile - Lincoln to Sandy Pond, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 100056326 | OTHER | Ayeer, MA JES review to and from | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00233 | 5 | 8.40 | 54.013\% | \$ | 454 | 0000\% | $s$ |  | s |  |
| 2009 | 100056326 | OTHER | mileage- UK allowance 20 cents per mile-Lexinton to D.C -D.C. to Lexington - attended Utility Perpective Conference | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00233 | \$ | 181.00 | 54.013\% | s | 97.76 | 0.000\% | \$ |  | s |  |
|  |  |  | health ck up required by school - BUPA insurance not covered for |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 100056326 | OTHER | Kathenne Hibbitt health ck up required by school - BUPA insurance not covered for | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00233 | \$ | 370.00 | 54.013\% | s | 19985 | 0.000\% | 5 |  | s |  |
| 2009 | 100056326 | OTHER | Jasmine Hibbitt | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00233 | \$ | 180.00 | 54.013\% | s | 9722 | 0000\% | 5 |  | 5 |  |
| 2009 | 100056326 | OTHER | health ck up required by school - BUPA insurance not covered for Amy Hibbitt | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00233 | \$ | 200.00 | 54013\% | s | 108.03 | 0.000\% | 5 |  | s |  |
| 2009 | 100056326 | OTHER | Waltham to Natick, MA - Business Mtg. w/Nick Winser to Lincoln, MA | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00233 | s | 6.00 | 54.013\% | \$ | 3.24 | 0.000\% | \$ |  | 5 |  |
|  |  |  | Waltham-Marlboro, MA for NEPA mig in Marboro, MA to |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 100056326 | OTHER | Lincoln, MA | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00233 | 5 | 14.00 | 54.013\% | $s$ | 756 | 0000\% | s | - | $s$ | - |
| 2009 | 100056326 | OTHER | Waiham office to No Attleboro office - NEEWS MTgt | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00233 | s | 19.00 | 54.013\% | s | 10.26 | 0.000\% | s | - | s |  |
| 2009 | 100056326 | OTHER | Lincoln, MA to Malloro, MA NEA Mtg, back to Lincoln, MA | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00233 | \$ | 14.00 | 54.013\% | s | 756 | 0000\% | s | - | s |  |
| 2009 | 100056326. | OTHER | Lincoln, MA to Ayer, MA to for mtg. to Waltham | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00233 | s | 13.00 | 54013\% | 5 | 702 | 0000\% | 5 |  | \$ |  |
| 2009 | 100711139 | OTHER | Travel agent fee for car rental | 925000 | Injuries \& Damages Insurance | 00354 | s | 1500 | 31110\% | s | 467 | 6.259\% | s | 0.94 | 5 | 4.67 |
| 2009 | 100711139 | OTHER | Limo 18-Waltham office to Logan Aiport | 925000 | Injuries \& Damages Insurance | 00354 | s | 96.80 | 31110\% | 5 | 30.11 | 6259\% | s | 6.06 | s | 30.11 |
| 2009 | 100711139 | OTHER | Limo 18-Melville office to LaGuardia Aiport | 925000 | Injuries \& Damages Insurance | 00354 | s | 158.40 | 31.110\% | s | 49.28 | 6.259\% | \$ | 9.91 | \$ | 49.28 |
| 2009 | 100711139 | OTHER | Limo 18-Logan Airport to home | 925000 | Injuries \& Damages Insurance | 00354 | 5 | 11720 | 31110\% | s | 36.46 | 6.259\% | \$ | 734 | \$ | 36.46 |
| 2009 | 100711139 | OTHER | Limo 18-LaGuardia Airport to horel | 925000 | Injuries \& Damages Insurance | 00354 | 5 | 16440 | 31.110\% | s | 51.14 | 6.259\% | 8 | 10.29 | s | 51.14 |
| 2009 | 100711139 | OTHER | Hotel taxes | 925000 | Injuries \& Damages Insurance | 00354 | 5 | 15.85 | 31110\% | s | 4.93 | 66259\% | s | 0.99 | \$ | 4.93 |
| 2009 | 100711139 | OTHER | US Air excess baggage fee | 925000 | Injuries \& Damages Insurance | 00354 | s | 1500 | 31590\% | s | 4.74 | 6470\% | S | 09 | s | 4.74 |
|  |  |  | Limo 18 hired cas Framingham (home) to Logan Aiport, Boston - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 100711139 | OTHER | EEI conference, Virginia | 925000 | Injuries \& Damages Insurance | 00354 | s | 11020 | 31.590\% | $s$ | 34.81 | 6.470\% | $s$ | 7.13 | \$ | 34.81 |
| 2009 | 100711139 | OTHER | Limo 18 Airport to home | 925000 | Injuries \& Damages Insurance | 00354 | s | 110.20 | 31590\% | $s$ | 3481 | 6470\% | s | 7.13 | s | 34.81 |
| 2009 | 100711139 | OTHER | Hotel taxes | 925000 | Injuries \& Damages Insurance | 00354 | s | 75.12 | 31590\% | \$ | 23.73 | 6.470\% | s | 486 | \$ | 23.73 |
| 2009 | 100711139 | OTHER | Hotel taxes | 925000 | Injures \& Damages Insurance | 00354 | s | 1965 | 31590\% | \$ | 621 | 6.470\% | 5 | 1.27 | s | 6.21 |
| 2009 | 100711139 | OTHER | Excess baggage fee - US Air | 925000 | Injunes \& Damages Insurance | 00354 | s | 15.00 | 31.590\% | s | 4.74 | 6470\% | 5 | 0.97 | 8 | 4.74 |
| 2009 | 100711139 | OTHER | Refreshments for Safery \& Health mieting, Walcham | 925000 | Injuries \& Damages Insurance | 00354 | s | 21.89 | 31.590\% | $s$ | 6.92 | 6.470\% | s | 1.42 | s | 6.92 |



Massachusetts Information Request AG-32-45-Exother
Allocation to Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Calendar } \\ & \text { Yr } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Exp Empl } \\ & \text { Id } \end{aligned}$ | Exp Type | Exp Type Descr | Regulatory Acct | Regulatory Acct Descr | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Billing } \\ & \text { Pool } \end{aligned}$ | Expense $\mathbf{S}$ |  | NIMO <br> Electric \% |  | NIMO Electric <br> Allocated $\$$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NIMO Gas } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Nimo Gss Allochted 5 |  | NIMO Electric Included in HTY |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 100053037 | EXOTHER | waste bills incuudes tv pick up fees. | 921000 | A\&G-Office Suplies | 000380 | \$ | 160.00 |  | S | 8 \% ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 8.963\% | \$ | 14.34 | S | 70.02 |
| 2009 | 100053037 | EXOTHER | waste bills | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | \$ | 110.00 | 43.763\% | 5 | $5 \quad 48.14$ | 8.963\% | \$ | 986 | \$ | 48.14 |
| 2009 | 100053037 | EXOTHER | Eye test and glasses for son | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | \$ | 306.00 | 43.763\% | s | $5 \quad 133.91$ | 8.963\% | s | 27.43 | \$ | 133.91 |
|  |  |  | dental reimbursement for difference in UK and |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 100053037 | EXOTHER | US dental coverage | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | \$ | 4.147.00 | 43.763\% | \$ | \$ 1,81485 | 8.963\% | \$ | 371.70 | \$ | 1,814.85 |
| 2009 | 100053037 | EXOTHER | waste bills | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | \$ | 55.00 | 43.749\% | s | $5 \quad 24.06$ | 8.961\% | \$ | 4.93 | \$ | 1,34.3. |
| 2009 | 100053037 | EXOTHER | waste bills | 921000 | AQG-Office Supplies | 00380 | \$ | 165.00 | 43.749\% | S | \$ $\quad 7219$ | 8.961\% | $s$ | 14.79 | \$ |  |
| 2009 | 100053037 | EXOTHER | heating oil | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | $\$$ | 299.13 | 43.749\% | s | $5 \quad 130.87$ | 8.961\% | s | 26.80 | \$ | - |
|  |  |  | Additonal transportation costs for personal goods (wine) that needed to be shipped |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2008 | $1000533+3$ | EXOTHER | separately from main shipment | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00380 | \$ | 1,254.00 | 44016\% | \$ | \$ 551.96 | 44.016\% | \$ | 551.96 | \$ | 55196 |
| 2008 | 100053543 | EXOTHER | Marriott Residnece Inn-House was not ready to move into | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | \$ | 1,866.21 | 0.000\% | s | \$ | 0000\% |  |  | s |  |
| 2008 | 100053543 | EXOTHER | Invoice for License Fees for Linda Ryan-Smith | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | \$ | 90.00 | 0.000\% | \$ | \$ | 0000\% | \$ | - | \$ |  |
|  |  |  | Invoice for License Fees for Andrew J. Ryan- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 100053543 | EXOTHER | Smith | 921000 | A8G-Office Supplies | 00201 | \$ | 60.00 | 0000\% | \$ | \$ | 0000\% | s |  | s | - |
|  |  |  | Dover Trucking-Refuse Collection 1st |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 100053543 | EXOTHER | installment | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | \$ | 24.36 | 0.000\% | \$ | \$ | 0.000\% | \$ | - | 5 | - |
| 2008 | 100053543 | EXOTHER | Dover Trucking Trash Pickup invoice | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | \$ | 43.02 | 0000\% | \$ | \$ | 0.000\% | \$ |  | s |  |
| 2008 | 100053543 | EXOTHER | Strawberry Hill landscaping and lrigation. Inc. | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | \$ | 92.00 | 0.000\% | $\$$ | \$ | 0000\% | \$ |  | \$ |  |
| 2008 | 100053543 | EXOTHER | meal at Heathrow Airpot prior to fight to US | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | \$ | 32.14 | 0.000\% | \$ | s | 0.000\% | 5 |  | s |  |
|  |  |  | Meal at Heathrow Airport for family prior to |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 100053543 | EXOTHER | flying to US | 921000 | A8.G-Office Supplies | 00201 | \$ | 46.74 | 0.000\% |  | \$ | 0000\% | \$ |  | \$ | - |
| 2008 | 100053543 | EXOTHER | Lunch-waiting to move into house | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | \$ | 18.44 | 0.000\% |  | \$ | 0.000\% | s | - | \$ | - |
|  |  |  | Lunch in London while getting VISAs for US |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 100053543 | EXOTHER | move | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | \$ | 19.30 | 0000\% |  | \$ | 0000\% | $s$ |  | \$ | - |
| 2008 | 100053543 | EXOTHER | Herrz Car Lease until purchased car arrived | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | \$ | 7,895.61 | 0.000\% |  | \$ | 0.000\% | 5 | - | \$ | - |
| 2008 | 100053543 | EXOTHER | Dover trucking, Inc. - Weekly Wast Removal | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | \$ | 43.40 | 0.000\% |  | \$ | 0.000\% | $s$ | - | s | - |
| 2008 | 100053543 | EXOTHER | Bill for 4 mandatory medical exams prior to coming to US | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | $s$ | 671.53 | 0000\% |  | \$ | 0000\% | s | - | \$ |  |
| 2008 | 100053543 | EXOTHER | Wellesley Driving School invoice for requirement of MA law for expats | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | \$ | 195.00 | 37 997\% | \$ | \$ 74.09 | 37997\% | S | 74.09 | \$ | 7409 |
| 2008 | 100053543 | EXOTHER | Dover Trucking Inc. weekly waste removal bill | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | \$ | 42.69 | 37.997\% |  | \$ 16.22 | 37997\% | s | 16.22 | s | 1622 |
|  |  |  | Bear hill Mobil-fil up of company pool car |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 100053543 | EXOTHER | prior to returning to the pool | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | \$ | 74.92 | 37.997\% |  | \$ $\quad 28.47$ | 37997\% | $s$ | 28.47 | \$ | 28.47 |
| 2008 | 100053543 | EXOTHER | Strawberry Hill Landscaping | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | \$ | 138.00 | 37997\% |  | \$ 52.44 | 37.997\% | s | 52.44 | \$ | 52.44 |
| 2008 | 100053543 | EXOTHER | Dover Trucking - Trash Pick up | 921000 | A\&G-Office Supplies | 00201 | \$ | 42.36 | 37997\% |  | $8 \quad 16.10$ | 37.997\% | s | 16.10 | 8 | 16.10 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 248,460.24 |  |  | ¢ 100,346.64 |  | \$ | 25,178.76 | \$ | 45,964.97 |

## Alocation to Niggara Mohawk Power Corneration



# NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a National Grid <br> Docket 10-E-0050 Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation <br> Rate Case 

## Request for Information

## FROM: Jerry Ancona

TO: Infrastructure and Operations Panel
Request:
Subject: Northeast Region Reinforcement Follow-Up
Reference: [Niagara Mohawk Rebuttal Testimony, 8/6/2010, Book 4-IOP, pgs. 5-12 of 167] With respect to this strategy/program/project and the associated Niagara Mohawk rebuttal testimony as referenced above, please provide the following:
(A)Given that the Company's transmission planning design criteria is based upon single contingency ( $\mathrm{N}-1$ ) evaluations (as per the response to IR DPS-421 (JJA-032)), please indicate both the rationale and the authorization for proposing capital project expenditures based upon N -1-1 evaluations;
(B) Regarding the Company's quote from its TP28, Transmission Planning Guide: "When the expected restoration for a particular contingency is expected to be greater than 24 hours, analysis should be performed to determine the potential impacts if a second design contingency were to occur prior to restoration of the failed equipment." Please explain how this specifically mandates or authorizes installation of additional equipment pre-emptively, as opposed to simply providing operational and planning information to facilitate operational plans that can be developed in the event the contingency occurs;
(C) Please indicate what steps the Company has taken and/or plans to take - including consultations/collaborations with other utilities - to help expedited replacement of a failed transformer with a spare or mobile substation to minis outage time;
(D)With respect to the Company stating that "if no spare is available, the time the system will be without the transformer will be longer," please indicate all Niagara Mohawk transmission transformers (i.e., those with $345 \mathrm{kV}, 230 \mathrm{kV}$ and/or 115 kV on the primary side) that do not have a suitable spare or mobile substation for replacement;
(E) For transmission transformers (as identified in "D" above), please explain in detail why a suitable spare or mobile substation is not available, and in each case what the Company's plans are to remedy this situation;
(F) Please explain on what basis the Company is inferring (pg. 9) that NERC standards for planning the bulk system for N-1-1 contingencies applies to any and/or all of the Company's transmission transformers;
(G)With respect to the Company stating that "Certain sections of the Con Edison system are designed and operated for the occurrence of a second contingency," please explain:

1) Whether the Con Edison transmission planning criteria specifically and formally define its "double contingency" criteria areas as well as "single contingency;"
2) How the Niagara Mohawk system compares with Con Edison's double contingency areas versus Con Edison's single contingency areas;
3) Whether other investor owned electric utilities in New York have specific double contingency rules formally included within their transmission planning criteria;
(H)Please explain whether Niagara Mohawk has performed a detailed economic analysis on whether the incremental reliability value of adopting an N-1-1 transmission planning criteria is commensurate with the incremental costs, and if so, please provide the results of that study.
(I) With regard to the projected load for Advanced Micro Devices growing to 74 MW , please provide:
4) An estimated timeline for this load increase;
5) A detailed description of the impact on the transmission system in terms of potential $\mathrm{N}-1$ planning criteria violations;
6) The source that projected this level of load growth.
(J) With respect to the Company stating that "Without Turner Road, several N-1 contingencies would trigger the potential need to reconductor $20-25$ miles of 115 kV lines, at substantial cost," please provide:
7) An explanation of why the response to IR DPS-486 (JJA-65) indicates no N-1 criteria violations;
8) Whether the evaluation referring to "several N-1 contingencies" assumes that the new SpierRotterdam 115 kV line is in service;
9) A description of the specific criteria violation associated with the "several N-1 contingencies" in terms of : (a) the specific limiting contingency defined by a specific transmission element that results in the criteria violation; and (b) the specific transmission element that is over-loaded by that contingency (or is over-loaded with all elements in service);
10) A description of the specific relevant assumptions associated with the "several N-1 contingencies" in terms of : (a) real and reactive load and loss levels and local generation, that drive the prediction of the criteria violation, including specific assumptions used for the AMD real and reactive load;
11) A detailed description and cost estimate of the referenced reconductoring of 20-25 miles of 115 kV lines "at substantial cost."

## Response:

A. This request mischaracterizes the response to IR DPS-421 (JJA-32). The request in IR DPS421 (JJA-32) described several scenarios and asked for clarification that the Company's planning criteria addressed the scenarios. In response, the Company stated that the "descriptions of the provisions of TGP28 with respect to the areas of inquiry in this request are generally accurate." However, nowhere in the response does it state that the Company's transmission planning design criteria is based solely upon single contingency ( $\mathrm{N}-1$ ) evaluations. Indeed, use of N-1-1 evaluations is also consistent with the provisions of TGP28.

The rationale for proposing capital projects based on $\mathrm{N}-1-1$ evaluations is that equipment failures, construction, maintenance, storms, and many other factors cause the transmission system to operate with one or more elements out of service very frequently. In other words, the system is frequently in an $\mathrm{N}-1$ (or more) state. To ensure that the system is sufficiently robust to enable system operators to maintain reliability, transmission planners study $\mathrm{N}-1-1$ contingencies and initiate projects to address certain $\mathrm{N}-1-1$ contingencies, as specified in various planning criteria.

As evidenced by the presence of $\mathrm{N}-1-1$ testing requirements in various industry standards and criteria, and by the prevalence of this practice throughout the country, $\mathrm{N}-1-1$ testing is firmly established as Good Utility Practice. Some examples include:

- NERC Standards require N-1-1 testing for all Bulk Electric System elements. Compliance is mandatory.
- The New York State Reliability Council Reliability Rules, which utilize the Northeast Power Coordinating Council criteria as a foundation, require N-1-1 testing for elements of the Bulk Power System. The New York State Public Service Commission has ordered compliance with these rules.
B. As noted previously, TGP28 requires N-1-1 analysis. If the results of the analysis indicate that operating actions, operating constraints or adaptive measures that do not unduly interfere with reliable and economical system operation can sufficiently address the $\mathrm{N}-1-1$ contingency of concern, then such approaches may be considered. However, if such measures are not available and load shedding or overloading of equipment cannot be avoided, then capital projects are initiated.
C. On July 11, 2006, Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation entered into a Spare Transformer Equipment Program (STEP) Sharing Agreement managed by the Edison Electric Institute (EEI). The STEP program permits the transfer of certain large, long lead time spare transformers among participants in the case of specific triggering events as outlined in Case 07-E-0683 (Petition of Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid for Authority to Transfer Certain Utility Property and for Related Relief).

The Company's affiliates have recently been involved in a transformer spares working group in conjunction with a number of New England utilities. The aim of this working group was to identify opportunities to help expedite replacement of a failed transformer with a spare to minimize outage time. However, because of the differences in voltage ratios, impedances, vector groups, etc. it became evident that such an approach would not work very easily. The Company has not considered a similar approach with other utilities in New York and it is likely that a similar problem would exist.

The Company would welcome discussions with Staff on the sharing of spare transformers between Niagara Mohawk and National Grid affiliate companies.
D. Please refer to Attachment 1 (JJA-74_Attachement 1) for a list of transformers currently in service and the number of 'spares' and mobile units currently available. It should be noted that in some cases, the term 'spare' refers to a transformer that has been decommissioned after many years of service but remains in a standby state and is available for use in an emergency. These back-up spares may not be reliable in the longer-term.
E. As noted on page 39 (of 167) of the Infrastructure and Operations Panel rebuttal testimony, the Company agrees with Staff's recommendation to conduct a detailed analysis to determine the appropriate number of additional spare transformers that are needed for back-up and or replacement of transformers that do fail. This detailed analysis is currently underway using a statistical approach for the larger populations of transformers and a criticality approach for one-off or smaller populations. For one-off or small populations the Company would only recommend a spare transformer where customer load could not be picked-up following a failure or in the case of inter-bus transformers where Planning standards indicate a need.

The Company does not have any mobile transformers with high side windings of 345 kV and 230 kV , though we do have some spares. Since we do not have mobile transformers at those voltages, there is no quick remedy when a failure occurs. However, the Company does generally have sufficient transformation capacity in the system to carry it over until a spare arrives and is installed.
F. As noted in the IOP's rebuttal testimony, NERC planning standard TPL-003-0a requires N-11 testing for Bulk Electric System (BES) elements. Some of the Company's transformers are BES elements (at least one side connected to a BES station) and some are not. For any given $\mathrm{N}-1-1$ contingency, NERC standards apply if both transformers that trip are BES elements, or if the first is a BES element and another BES element exceeds its ratings after the second element (BES or non-BES) trips. If an N-1-1 contingency is not covered by NERC standards, it may still be covered by NPCC, NYSRC, and/or TGP28 criteria.

G1. The Company is not in a position to interpret or explain Con Edison's planning criteria. The reference was made solely to point out that other utilities invoke multiple contingencies in their planning processes.

G2. The Company does not have the information necessary to conduct the requested comparison.

G3. The Company does not have the requested information. At a minimum, every transmission owner in the State is subject to NERC, NPCC and NYSRC standards and criteria and must plan their systems to reflect the $\mathrm{N}-1-1$ contingencies those documents specify.
H. The Company has not performed a detailed economic analysis of the type described in the question. To the extent that NERC, NPCC and NYSRC standards and criteria are involved, the Company is committed to full compliance by law and Commission order.

I1 Global Foundries (GF) projects a 74 MW peak demand by 2012. GF has replaced Advanced Micro Devices in terms of building a chip manufacturing plant in Luther Forest.

I2. Table A below shows only critical single-contingency thermal criteria violations with Global Foundries interconnected at 74MW without system reinforcement for summer peak 2012 conditions. This is not an exhaustive list of criteria violations. Rather, these concerns are in addition to those which have already been identified, such as long-restoration contingencies which overload the remaining $230-115 \mathrm{kV}$ transformer at Rotterdam with any combination of two Rotterdam $230-115 \mathrm{kV}$ transformers out as detailed in the Company's response to IR DPS-486 JJA-65.

It should be noted that except for the Mohican/Battenkill-North Troy contingency, the contingency loadings shown do not assume Indeck Corinth out of service; generally, the loadings would be higher for that condition.

Table A: Summer 2012 without reinforcement (Without Turner Rd/Without New SpierRotterdam) with Luther Forest Station in service and Global Foundries load at 74MW

| Contingency | Affected Facility | Flow (\% <br> LTE Rating) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rotterdam 77G 115kV Bus | Rotterdam-Woodlawn \#35 115kV | 111 |
| Rotterdam 99G 115kV Bus | Rotterdam 230-115kV \#7 | 140 |
|  | Reynolds Rd 345-115kV \#2 | 101 |
|  | Wynantskill-Reynolds Rd \#13 115kV | 100 |
|  | Curry Rd-Rotterdam \#11 115kV | 105 |
|  | North Troy-Reynolds Rd \#16 115kV | 101 |
| Mohican/Battenkill-North Troy \#3/\#10 <br> 115 kV Double Circuit (Note 1) | Spier-Rotterdam \#1 115kV | 122 |
|  | Spier-Rotterdam \#2 115kV | 136 |

Note 1 - Indeck Corinth out of service.

I3. Global Foundries supplied the projected growth in demand for their facility.
J1. The contingencies which were previously described in IR DPS-486 (JJA-65) were not an exhaustive list. They are among the most critical to consider. For the purpose of succinctness, additional single contingencies, such as those in Table A above, were not presented in the response to IR JJA-65.

J2. The issue was evaluated with and without the proposed new Spier-Rotterdam transmission line. Table B below illustrates the same information as in Table A, only with the new SpierRotterdam in-service.

Table B: Summer 2012 Without Turner Rd/With New Spier-Rotterdam with Luther Forest Station in service and Global Foundries load at 74MW

| Contingency | Affected Facility | Flow (\% LTE <br> Rating) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rotterdam 77G 115kV Bus | Rotterdam-Woodlawn \#35 115kV | 100 |
| Rotterdam 99G 115kV Bus | Rotterdam 230-115kV \#7 | 140 |
|  | Reynolds Rd 345-115k \#2 | 101 |
|  | Wynantskill-Reynolds Rd \#13 115kV | 99 |
|  | Curry Rd-Rotterdam \#11 115kV | 105 |
|  | North Troy-Reynolds Rd \#16 115kV | 99 |
| Mohican/Battenkill-North Troy <br> \#3/\#10 115kV Double Circuit (Note 1) | Spier-Rotterdam \#1 115kV | $<90$ |
|  | Spier-Rotterdam \#2 115kV | $<90$ |

Note 1 - Indeck Corinth out of service
J3. This information is tabulated above in Tables A and B; without and with the proposed new Spier-Rotterdam 115 kV respectively.

J4a.While a wide range of load and generation levels were examined, the assumptions corresponding to summer peak 2012 and the conditions in Table A are as follows for Niagara Mohawk's Eastern Division (Capital and Northeast Regions):

Load: 2372MW +976MVAR,
Losses: 104MW, Generation 1327.4MW,
Global Foundries Load: 74MW + 24.3MVAR.

J5. The estimate was developed as follows. Table C below shows the effect of the addition of Turner Rd on conditions shown in Table B above. By comparison of Tables B and C, the facilities in bold text below are relieved by the addition of Turner Road. This avoids the cost of reconductoring 21.2 circuit-miles of the Rotterdam-Woodlawn/Curry \#35/\#11 115kV double circuit.

An order of magnitude estimate of the cost to reconductor the \#35/\#11 is provided below:

Approximate cost to reconductor the \#35/\#11 115kV double circuit: Both circuits of the 10.6 mile double circuit line would need to be reconductored between Rotterdam and Woodlawn to increase the conductor rating and balance physical load between both circuits. An approximate cost for this work, which upgrades 21.2 circuit miles of conductor, is $\$ 1,000,000$ /circuit mile or $\$ 21,200,000$.

| Table C: Summer 2012 With Turner Rd/With New Spier-Rotterdam with Luther Forest |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Station in service and Global Foundries load at 74MW. |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Rotterdam 77G 115kV Bus | Rotterdam-Woodlawn \#35 115kV | $<90$ |
| Rotterdam 99G 115kV Bus | Rotterdam 230-115kV \#7 | $<90$ |
|  | Reynolds Rd 345-115kV \#2 | $<90$ |
|  | Wynantskill-Reynolds Rd \#13 <br> 115 kV | $<90$ |
|  | Curry Rd-Rotterdam \#11 115kV | $<90$ |
|  | North Troy-Reynolds Rd \#16 115kV | $<90$ |
| Mohican/Battenkill-North Troy <br> \#3/\#10 115kV Double Circuit (Note 1) | Spier-Rotterdam \#1 115kV | $<90$ |
|  | Spier-Rotterdam \#2 115kV | $<90$ |

Note 1 - Indeck Corinth out of service

Name of Respondent:
Joseph J. Hipius
Mark S. Forchilli

Date of Reply:
8/31/10

| Description | MVA rating range | High Side Vector | Low Side Vector | LTC | Total <br> Population | Number of Spares Available | Number of Mobile Transf. Avaiłable |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 115 to 13.8/13.2KV | 2.5/3.13 | Delta | Wye Grounded | N | 1 |  |  |
| 115 to 13.8/13.2KV | 0.5 | Delta | Wye Grounded | Y | 1 |  |  |
| 115 to $13.8 / 13.2 \mathrm{KV}$ | 5-12.5 | Delta | Wye Grounded | Y | 33 |  | 2 |
| 115 to $13.8 / 13.2 \mathrm{KV}$ | 5-12.5 | Delta | Wye Grounded | N | 2 | 1 |  |
| 115 to 13.8/13.2KV | 12-22.4 | Delta | Wye Grounded | Y | 64 | 1 |  |
| 115 to 13.8/13.2KV | 15-33.3 | Delta | Wye Grounded | Y | 123 | 7 | 1 |
| 115 to 13.8/13.2KV | 24-56 | Delta | Wye Grounded | Y | 13 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | -1/ | - |  | Whememer |
| 115 to 34.5 kv | 7.5-12.5 | Delta | Wye Grouded | N | 17 | 2 |  |
| 115 to 34.5 kv | 15-33.3 | Delta | Wye Grouded | $N$ | 27 | 3 |  |
| 115 to 34.5 kv | 25-50 | Delta | Wye Grouded | Y | 14 | 1 |  |
| 115 to 34.5 kv | 25-50 | Delta | Wye Grouded | N | 9 |  |  |
| 115 to 34.5 kv | 40/53/66/74.6 | Delta | Wye Grouded | Y | 2 |  |  |
| 115 to 34.5 kv | 15--33.3 | Wye Grouded | Wye Grouded | Y | 3 |  |  |
| 115 to 34.5 kv | 15-33.3 | Wye Grouded | Wye Grouded | N | 12 | 2 |  |
| 115 to 34.5 kv | 50/75 | Wye Grouded | Wye Grouded | Y | 1 |  |  |
|  |  |  | W- | Y | - 5 ¢ |  |  |
| 115 to 46kv | 18--50 | Delta | Wye Grouded | Y | 5 | 1 |  |
| 115 to 46kv | 5-9.375 | Delta | Wye Grouded | N | 3 |  |  |
| 115 to 46 kv | 15-35 | Delta | Wye Grouded | N | 6 |  | 1 |
|  |  |  | Whoshy | Wenem |  |  |  |
| 115 to 69 kv | $20-56$ | Wye Grouded | Wye Grouded | Y | 6 | $1$ |  |
| 115 to 12 kv | 24/32/40 | Wye Grouded | ZZ | $Y$ | 2 |  |  |
| 115 to 12 kv | 25/33.33 | Delta | Wye Grouded | Y | 2 |  |  |
| 115 to 12 kv | 30/40 | Wye Grounded | Delta | Y | 2 |  |  |
| 115 to 12 kv | 7.5 | Delta | Wye | N | 1 |  |  |
|  |  |  | W17 |  | - | - M- M |  |
| 115-4.16kv | 3.75 | Delta | Wye Grouded | Y | 2 |  |  |
| 115-4.16kv | 3.75-5 | Delta | Wye Grouded | N | 7 |  |  |
| 115-4.8kv | 2.5-4.68 | Wye Grounded | Delta | N | 2 |  |  |
| 115-4.16kv | 7.5/9.375 | Delta | Wye Grouded | Y | 3 | 1 |  |
| 115-4.16kv | 7.5--12.5 | Delta | Wye Grouded | N | 8 | 1 |  |
| 115-2.4kv | 10/12.5 | Delta | Delta | N | 3 |  |  |
| 115-4.4kv | 7.5/9.375 | Wye Grouded | Wye Grouded | Y | 3 |  |  |
| $14-4.8 \mathrm{kv}$ | 7.5--12.5 | Wye Grounded | Delta | Y | 2 |  |  |
| - , <1, |  |  |  | - ${ }^{\text {a }}$ - | - | - |  |
| 115-23kv | 30-50 | Delta | Wye Grouded | $Y$ | 9 |  |  |
| 115-23kv | 7.5--22.5 | Delta | Wye Grouded | N | 7 |  |  |
| 115-23kv | 7.5--10.5 | Wye Grounded | Delta | N | 3 |  |  |
| 115-23kv | 7.5 | Wye Grounded | Wye Grounded | $N$ | 2 |  |  |
| 115-23kv | 15-25 | Delta | Wye Grounded | Y | 3 | 1 |  |
| 115-23kv | 15-25 | Delta | Wye Grounded | N | 6 |  |  |
| 115-23kv | 20-63 | Delta | Wye Grounded | Y | 2 |  |  |
|  | M |  | , ${ }^{\text {a }}$ - | \|y |  |  | \%4. |
| $230-23 \mathrm{kv}$ | $45 \text { or } 60$ | Wye Grounded | Delta | Y | $6$ |  |  |
| 230-115kv | 75--125 | Wye Grounded | Wye Grounded | $\bigcirc$ | 6 | 3 |  |
| 230-115kv | 200-298 | Wye Grounded | Wye Grounded | Y | 5 | 2 |  |
| 230-115kv | 349 | Wye Grounded | Wye Grounded | Y | 1 |  |  |
|  | NTM ${ }^{\text {a }}$ - | Wxillill | , | W, |  |  |  |
| 230 |  |  |  | REACT | 3 |  |  |
| W) - | M |  | 1. | - |  | \% |  |
| $345-13.8 \mathrm{kv}$ single phase transformer | 90/95/100 | Wye Grounded | Delta | N | 3 | 1 |  |
| - - < | W) | W) | M |  |  | W: | OR \% \% \% |
| 345-115kv | 224-448 | Wye Grounded | Wye Grounded | Y | 13 |  |  |
|  |  |  | T) U) |  |  | - | U- |
| $345-230 \mathrm{kv}$ | $340 / 443$ | Wye Grounded | Delta | N | $1$ |  | \%Mram |
| 115kv single phase transformer | Whermanaramarat |  | \% | <! | (1) | Use three phase transformer to spare the single phase transformers if failure happens | ¢a\% |
|  | TM | - ${ }_{\text {a }}$ |  | W\%ment |  | W O\% |  |

# NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a National Grid <br> Docket 10-E-0050 Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation Rate Case 

Request for Information
FROM: Jerry Ancona
TO: Infrastructure and Operations Panel
Request:

Subject: Reliability Criteria Compliance Program Follow-Up
Reference: [Niagara Mohawk Rebuttal Testimony, 8/6/2010, Book 4 - IOP, pgs. 14 - 21 of 167]
With respect to this strategy/program/project and the associated Niagara Mohawk rebuttal testimony as referenced above, please provide the following:
(A)Whether any other investor owned electric utility in New York State treats generator outages as part of base conditions in transmission planning studies (as opposed to $\mathrm{N}-1$ contingencies). If so, provide the specific qualifications they employ;
(B) Please explain whether Niagara Mohawk has performed a detailed economic analysis on whether the incremental reliability value of treating generator outages as a part of base conditions in transmission planning studies (as opposed to an $\mathrm{N}-1$ contingency) is commensurate with the incremental costs, and if so, please provide the results of that study;
(C) With respect to the Company stating that: "there have been cases where generators have gone off line and never returned to service because of equipment failures that the owners considered too expensive to repair," please explain whether the Company believes its proposal to treat loss of a generator as a base condition will result in an unnecessary preemptive installation of equipment driven by speculation that a certain generator may retire;
(D) Please provide a list of $\mathrm{N}-1$ criteria violations predicted to occur with the Olean generator in service and with the Warren-Falconer \#171 line considered out-of- service as part of the base assumptions - including the load level assumed for Jamestown BPU and other pertinent assumptions;
(E) Presuming the Southwest Area Substation were to be constructed, please explain on what basis the reconductoring of the Warren-Falconer 115 kV line \#171 would be justified;
(F) For the Mortimer-Golah \#109 project, please provide a detailed description along with associated pertinent assumptions of $\mathrm{N}-1$ criteria violations that are predicted to occur with the Seneca Power generator in service.

## Response:

(A) The Company does not know the modeling approaches used by the other investor-owned utilities in New York State with respect to generators out of service in the base cases used in their studies.
(B) The Company has not performed detailed economic analysis of the type described. The Company views its practice of taking a generator out of service in the base case as important to ensuring that its studies sufficiently stress the system to identify potential vulnerabilities so that they may be addressed. Planning the system with sufficiently stressed cases is necessary in order to design a system that provides the necessary flexibility for system operators to provide safe and reliable service to customers. Since a planning study cannot and does not attempt to identify every combination of generation dispatch, line outages, equipment outages (due to either maintenance or forced outages due to failures that routinely occur on a power system), it is important to begin the study with a stressed base case that is appropriate for that area of study and then apply the design contingencies to that base case. The Company also notes that a study of the type indicated cannot yield meaningful results that would generically apply system-wide, as each area of the system is unique, with generators contributing differently to system reliability. The incremental costs would be localized and the incremental benefits would be very difficult to quantify in economic terms.
(C) The Company does not believe that its practice of taking a generator out of service as a base case condition results in "unnecessary preemptive installation of equipment driven by speculation that a certain generator may retire." While unit retirement, especially one forced by unanticipated equipment failure, is one circumstance that would leave the system without the support of a generator, less severe forced outages that might take a generator down for a week or more, without retirement, are not unusual, and should be factored into planning. Interruptions of fuel supply, tightened air quality regulations, plant economics, downstream transmission constraints, labor disputes, and any number of other events could have short or long term impacts on the availability of a generator. It is the full range of possibilities that the Company is concerned with, not just permanent retirement.

The purpose behind studying the system with a key generator out of service is to stress the system and identify its weaknesses, so they can be addressed. Doing so ensures that the system is planned to be robust, and that system operators will be able to reliably run the system for a wide range of conditions, including some that may not be explicitly studied in planning studies.
(D) Using a 2011 summer peak system representation, with 75 MW and up to 21 MVAr of generation at Indeck Olean in service, voltage problems in the Falconer/Homer Hill area will develop for two separate single contingencies. This analysis assumes that the Andover capacitor bank is in service at 10 MVAr , and line \#157 was open at Andover, per the existing arrangement. The town of Jamestown is modeled as a $78 \mathrm{MW}, 39$ MVAr load, which is consistent with typical summer peak demands that Niagara Mohawk sees from this customer; however, it is less than the 100 MW the Company is required to make available, per existing agreements. The existing 27

MVAr capacitor bank at Homer Hill and the two existing 25 MVAr capacitor banks at Falconer are modeled in service. It was also assumed that line \#171 is out of service in the base case. No proposed upgrades were included in the base case.

For an outage of the Dunkirk bus section M2, the area voltage will fall to $77 \%$. The voltage at Falconer was at $82 \%$ and Homer Hill was at $88 \%$. It is expected that the Homer Hill voltage would be low enough for the under voltage relaying at Indeck Olean to operate. If the generation did trip off, the area voltage would fall below $70 \%$.

For an outage of the Homer Hill bus south bus section, the voltage at the load buses along line $\# 157$ would be at $89 \%$.
(E) Construction of the Southwest Station is not, by itself, sufficient to resolve all of the issues in the Southwest area. Reconductoring of line \#171 is one of several projects that, together, yield a satisfactory solution. The following discussion is for a summer 2011 case with no generation at Indeck Olean and line $\# 171$ out of service pre-contingency. This analysis assumes that the Andover capacitor bank is in service at 10 MVAr , and line \#157 was open at Andover, per the existing arrangement. The town of Jamestown is modeled as a 78 MW, 39 MVAr load, which is consistent with typical summer peak demands that Niagara Mohawk sees from this customer; however, it is less than the 100 MW the Company is required to make available, per existing agreements. The existing 27 MVAr capacitor bank at Homer Hill and the two existing 25 MVAr capacitor banks at Falconer are modeled in service.

If the Southwest Station were constructed, area voltages with all lines in service are above $95 \%$. However, for an outage of the $345 / 115 \mathrm{kV}$ transformer, the voltage at the load buses along line $\# 157$ would be at $88 \%$. For a double circuit tower outage of the Southwest Station-Homer Hill circuits, the voltage would fall below $75 \%$. A fault on the Dunkirk 115 kV bus section M2 would result in voltages between Dunkirk and Falconer at $85 \%$. N-1-1 contingency testing was not performed so other outage combinations, may result in voltage outside of acceptable limits.

If the projects to add a second capacitor bank at Homer Hill, increase the Andover capacitor bank to 15 MVAr and close line \#157 at Andover were added to the base cases most, but not all, of these N-1 issues would be addressed. For a fault on Dunkirk 115 kV bus section M2, voltages between Dunkirk and Falconer will still fall to $87 \%$. The Company also does N-1-1 planning when considering loss of a long lead time item. For outages of the $345 / 115 \mathrm{kV}$ transformer or the $230 / 115 \mathrm{kV}$ transformers at Dunkirk, followed by other area design contingencies, voltage problems would be present. This includes outages around Dunkirk and on the circuits between Gardenville and Southwest Station as the second outage. The impact of an N-1-1 outage involving the Homer City - Southwest 345 kV circuit as the first outage was also considered when developing the area upgrades.

These existing $\mathrm{N}-1$ and $\mathrm{N}-1-1$ concerns, including problems that may develop later within the 10 year horizon of planning studies, can be addressed by having line \#171 in service. To make sure that the line will be in service pre-contingency, it will need to be reconductored because First Energy may otherwise choose to open the line to avoid potential overload. If not reconductored, relaying at the First Energy end could trip the line if the loading exceeds limits, making it an undependable source of support for the Southwest area. Reconductoring and having line \#171 in
service is thus part of a larger set of projects that will bring the whole area into compliance with all $\mathrm{N}-1$ and $\mathrm{N}-1-1$ criteria through the 10 year planning horizon.
(F) Using a 2011 summer peak system representation, with 50 MW , 19.5 MVAr of generation at Seneca Power, voltage problems in the Golah area will develop for two contingencies. For an outage of the Mortimer - Golah 115 kV line \#110, the voltage at Golah and along radial line \#116 will fall to $88 \%$. For a fault on Mortimer bus section $2,115 / 69 \mathrm{kV} \mathrm{TB} \mathrm{\# 3} \mathrm{or} \mathrm{the} \mathrm{Mortimer}$ 69 kV bus, circuits \#110, \#114, \#2, \#25, both 75 MVAr capacitor banks and $115 / 69 \mathrm{kV} \mathrm{TB}$ \#3 will be taken out of service. For this bus outage, the 115 kV voltage in the Golah area would be below $75 \%$. The system response was very similar if only line \#110 and TB \#3 were taken out. Mortimer TB \#3 is the only source to the Mortimer - Golah 69 kV circuit \#109. Thus, when the transformer is out of service, the 69 kV line is out of service. Therefore, even with the Seneca Power generation in service, there are several $\mathrm{N}-1$ contingency situations that could result in unacceptable system performance. However, as discussed in response to question $B$, the full requirements and system reinforcements should still be based on the system performance when the system is stressed, i.e. with the most critical unit assumed out.

Name of Respondent:
Date of Reply:
Joseph J. Hipius
8/30/10
Jeffery M. Maher

# NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a National Grid <br> Docket 10-E-0050 Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation <br> Rate Case 

## Request for Information

## FROM: Multiple Intervenors

## Request:

With respect to the electric line repair work, identified on page 12 , line 3 , of the direct testimony of the Revenue Requirements Panel:
a. identify each project that the utility intends to defer as an austerity measure;
b. set forth the estimated cost savings and revenue requirement reduction associated with each austerity measure during the rate years ending December 31, 2011, December 31, 2012, and December 31, 2013; and
c. identify the date on which each austerity measure was implemented (i.e., the date on which the utility decided to defer the project).

## Response:

As described in page 12, line 4 , these measures represent level 3 maintenance work in the short term. Since these costs were avoided in the test year and the Company can only defer these costs for a limited time, the Company has added these costs as a rate year adjustment. The rate year adjustments are presented on pages 214 to 218 of the infrastructure and operations panel testimony.

Name of Respondent:
Date of Reply:
James Molloy \& Keith McAfee
April 14, 2010

# NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a National Grid <br> Docket 10-E-0050 Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation <br> Rate Case 

## Request for Information

FROM: Multiple Intervenors

## Request:

The utility provided a list of capital projects deferred as an austerity measure in its response to RAV-46(a). Regarding the set of capital projects described therein, set forth:
(a) the total amount of capital investment, in dollars, that will continue to be deferred during the rate years ending December 31, 2011, December 31, 2012, and December 31, 2013; and
(b) the total amount of capital investment, in dollars, that will be "reinstated" during the rate years ending December 31, 2011, December 31, 2012, and December 31, 2013; and

## Response:

(a) \& (b) - As an initial matter, the Company notes that the infrastructure investment plan presented in this case represents a minimum level of spending the Company can undertake consistent with its obligations to achieve applicable reliability targets in the near-term and to make small progress towards addressing some of the longer term reliability risks on the electric system. The capital plan presented in this case is nearly $\$ 888$ million lower than the Company's prior five-year capital plan over the period FY10-FY14 (see, e.g., Exhibit $\qquad$ (IOP-2), comparing the rate case filing with the Company's January 2009 Capital Investment Plan). While perhaps not satisfying the specific definition of an austerity measure established in the Commission's Case 09-M0435, the Company's capital plan nevertheless will result in significant savings to customers as compared to previous plans, while still providing for safe and adequate service.

With respect to the specific austerity deferrals referenced in this request, they will result in an overall budget reduction that affects each year of the rate plan. Whether a specific project shown in RAV46 (a) is deferred to a point within the rate plan period or deferred beyond the rate plan period, there is no "incremental" effect to the rate plan. A specific deferred project would have only been "reinstated" at the point where the risk of not
performing that project would affect the Company's ability to continue to efficiently provide safe and adequate service. Besides specific projects, RAV46 (a) shows program or blanket projects which were scaled due to austerity as well. There would be no "reinstated" amount for these types of projects; there is only a budget level set for each fiscal year. In light of this, we have supplemented the project detail provided in Attachment 1, Exhibits 2 (Distribution and Sub-Transmission) and 3 (Transmission), of data request RAV46(a) with the budgeted levels for each project in the plan years to indicate whether future capital spending is anticipated and at what level for each given project number. See Attachment 1, Exhibits 2 (Distribution and Sub-Transmission) and 3 (Transmission) (MM-200_Attach 1_Deferral Projects). For clarity and ease of cross reference, the attachment to this response includes only the corresponding exhibits referenced in IR RAV46(a) (i.e., "Exhibit 2" and "Exhibit 3"); and there no pages relating to an "Exhibit 1."

Name of Respondent:
Date of Reply:
Glen DiConza
April 29, 2009
Tom Sullivan

| Project Number | Project Description |  | Budgo Adiustmemt |  | Does project have dollars in Plan 2 H so when does cash flow begin (FY11-YY14) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C00469 | Witton-Install 34.5 kV C Circuil erk | 200,000 | [200, 0609 |  | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan |  |  |  |  |
| c0047 | Seneca Terminal Sta Repl 23 kV Bkr | 150,000 | [50,000) | - | Project removed/deferred fom current FY2011-FY 2014 Plan |  |  | - |  |
| c00476 | Kensington Terminal Station - Rpl 2 | 150,000 | [3500009] | - | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - | - |  |  |
| coos | Westem Rgn Stations - McG Ed 38kV. | 300,000 | . . 3000000$)^{\text {a }}$ | - | Project removed/deferred trom current FY2011-FY2014 Plan |  |  |  |  |
| c0433 | Spares | 1,494,000 | 5 713549300 | 100,000 | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - | - | - |  |
| C66375 | Bremen.Automate 115 KV Switches | 80,000 | . $880 \times 007$ | - | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | . |  | - |  |
| c06379 | NR-Lowille-Automate 115 kV switch | 797,000 | [797,0003 |  | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan |  |  |  |  |
| C15658 | Sawyer Sta - Add Cable Positions | 500,000 | . 0 (50,000 | 350,000 | Project removeddeferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan |  |  | - |  |
| C23353 | instail Animal Fences 8 Line Guards | 249,000 | (149300\% | 100,000 | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan |  | - | - |  |
| C25321 | NY Moble Station Readiness Program | 448,000 | . 4488602 | - | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan |  |  |  |  |
| C25324 | NY Asset Replacement Conceptual | 151,000 | 126.000 | 25,000 | Project removed/deferred trom current FY2011-FY2014 Plan |  |  |  |  |
| C25811 | NY ARP Batts/Chargers Repl Prog | 398,000 | - 2200003 | 378,000 | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan |  |  |  |  |
| C25999 | NY ARP FOR TXD SUBSTATIONS | 500,000 | $\cdots$ (200.000) | 300,000 | Project removed/ceferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - |  |  |  |
| C26050 | NY ARP Caps 8 Swiches | 249,000 | . +1889.0000 | 50,000 | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - | - |  |  |
| C26561 | S.LWvingston-1 19-13.2KV- Bus 88 BkF | 1,494,000 | - . 31254.5008 | 200,000 | Project removed/deferred from Current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - | - | - |  |
| C28124 | Replace Schuyler 210 breaker | 1,425.000 | + $11,425.3003$ | - | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - | - | - |  |
| C28146 | Seneca Reactors Purchase | 1.611,000 |  | 500,000 | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan |  |  |  |  |
| C28876 | Buter Sub - Add 3rd Breaker, R530 | 299.000 | [299000\% | - | Project removed/deferred from current FY 2011 -FY2014 Plan |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {c } 29026 ~}$ | Norn Collins -Replace TBi | 498,000 | 4998,000 | - | Project removed/deferred trom current FY 2011 -FY2014 Plan |  |  |  |  |
| C29027 | North Eden-Replace T81 | 597,000 | + 6957.060$)$ | - | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan |  | - |  |  |
| C29028 | South Newtane 71 -Replace ${ }^{\text {TB }}$ | 498,000 | . 449880003 | - | Project removedideferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - | - |  |  |
| C29048 | Town of Elberla - DC in a box | 398,000 | - 3688000 |  | Project removediceferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan |  | - |  |  |
| C17991 | NW HUF Relief | 100,000 | - 80080008 | - | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan |  |  | - |  |
| C26222 | Butfalo State $U G 23 \mathrm{kv}$ | 400,000 | - (3995,000) | 1,000 | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - |  | - |  |
| C26818 | Town of Eberta - DC in a box | 398,000 | 2 $=$ (3988000) | - | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - | - |  |  |
| C29106 | Swann RdF10552 tee with F10557 | 299,000 | - 2090000 | - | Project removed/deferred from current FY 2011 -FY2014 Plan |  |  |  |  |
| C28724 | Lakeview t8251-18254 Feeder Tie | 146,000 | - - ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 1480ag | - | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - | - |  |  |
| C28725 | Cloverbank 9153 -Lakeview 18254 Tie | 108,000 | 2. 7088000 | - | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan |  | - | - | - |
| C2883 | Station 43 -Load Relief | 115,000 | $\cdots$ |  | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - | - |  | - |
| C28890 | Buffalo 23kV Reconductor - Seneca | 250,000 | \%. ${ }^{(22500003}$ | 25,000 | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan |  |  | - | - |
| C28899 | Farmersvill bank relief | 5,000 | $\cdots \times$ |  | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan |  | - | $\div$ | - |
| ${ }^{\text {c29045 }}$ | Whithaven Rd 64 - F6454 Relie? | 199.000 996,000 |  | - | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | : | - | - | - |
| C29047 C29185 | Whison sta 93-Load Relief 23kV Cable Replacement Program | 996.000 $2.879,000$ | \%. $\begin{gathered}1996000 \\ 1600000\end{gathered}$ | 2,719,000 | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | : | - | - | - |
| $\left\{\begin{array}{c} c 29185 \\ c 07469 \\ C \end{array}\right.$ | 23kV Cable Replacement Program Whitehall 18752-Rebuild Route 40 | $2,879,000$ 398,000 |  | 2,719,000 | Project removed/deferted from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | : | - | - | - |
| ${ }^{\text {c14063 }}$ | IE-NE Targeted Poie Replace | 1,494,000 | \#. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 1403,000 | 1,091,000 | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {C16085 }}$ | Quail Hollow- new 13.2 kV feeders | 50,000 | - (50,000) | - | Project removed/deterred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - | - | - |  |
| C17992 | ne huf Relief | 100,000 | 700000) | - | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan |  | - | - |  |
| C25400 | PIN 1248.14 State Route 149 DOT | 498,000 | $\cdots$ (498 0000 | - | Project removed/deterred from curtent FY2011-FY2014 Plan |  | - |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {c28766 }}$ | Woll Rd 34453 -add feeder tie | 203,000 | (203000) | - | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - | - | $\cdot$ |  |
| C29786 | Liberty 9490-replace getaway | 121,000 | - 438,000) | -- | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - | - |  |  |
| C28790 | Aps - new dist sub-0 Line work | 200,000 | - 3050,0003 | 50,000 | Project removed/deferred from curent FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - | - | - |  |
| C28845 | Queensbury 29557 Exten. Bay St. | 30,000 | $\cdots$. 380000 | - | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - | - | - |  |
| C28875 | Queensbury 29552 Exten Aviation Rd | 20,000 | - 600000 | - | Project removed/deferred from curent FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - |  | $\div$ | - |
| C28878 | Buter - Construct Feeder 36253 | 299,000 | , (299800) | - | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - | $\bullet$ | - | - |
| C29110 | Colvin 34387 Gelaway cable repl | 278,000 | - ${ }^{278,000}$ ) | - | Project removed/ddeferred from current FY2019-FY2014 Plan | - | $\bullet$ | - |  |
| C29114 | Cobleskill 21412 Getaway cable rept | 62,000 |  | - | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - | - | - | - |
| c00253 C08918 | Hinstaie Fdr Releft IE.NC Targeted Pole Replace | 224,000 1.494 .000 | (224,000\% <br> $803000 \%$ | 69:,000 | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - | - | - | - |
| C08918 Cob999 | IE-NC Targeted Pole Replace Erie Bivg 132 VV - New Rome 76252 | $\begin{array}{r}1,494,000 \\ 125.000 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | (803,000) <br> 125,0005 | 69:,000 | Project removedddeferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | : | - | - | - |
| C17990 | NC HUF Retel | 100.000 | (100,000 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | . | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - |  | - |  |
| C26776 | Yannundasis 64656 Reconductor Rte 5 | 209,000 | (141,000) | 68,000 | Project removed/deferred from curent FY2011-FY2014 Plan | . | - | - | - |
| C26816 | Carthage-high Falls\#21 | 500,000 | (499,000) | 1.000 | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | . | - | - | - |
| \| C26922 | NR-N Gouvernuer 98352-CoRt 10 | 203.000 | - 2 [203,000)] | 1 - | Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan | - | - | - |  |

$\qquad$
-


| Project Number | Project Description |
| :---: | :---: |
| C26971 | NR-Heuvelton 92372_MCASoo 92451 |
| C27682 | Fort Covington sub-T work TxD |
| C28027 | NR 89865 Bilcw Farm |
| C28065 | Union-L. Clear 35 Bloomindale tap |
| C28289 | Lehigh 66953 te with LHH 6144 |
| C28344 | CNY Network Protector Replacement |
| C28587 | Southwood 52 Reconductor |
| C28589 | Southwood 51 Reconductor |
| C28605 | Jewett Ra 56 correct low votage |
| C28827 | NR-David 97957 Jay St Exten. |
| C28829 | MV-Ader Creek Dustin Rd Ext/Conv. |
| C28850 | Tinker Tavem Step Down |
| C28855 | Conking Relief |
| C1665 | Mairline Recondutoring |
| obeprogio | IE- UG Stuectures \& Equip. - NY Placeholder |
| DBEPROG22 | IE- Pockets of Poor Pertormance - NY Place |
| DBEPROG24 | IE- UG Cable Replacement - NY Placenolde |
| C00279 | NR-Btoomingdale-Replace Sta Stuct |
| C06360 | Whitestora R260-R290 replacement |
| C06368 |  |
| C15791 | York Cen Sta $53-$ - New 195913.2 TB |
| C15805 | E Batavia-Repl TB1 \& TB2 $^{\text {a }}$ |
| C20474 | TXO Mobile Substations in NY |
| C20211 | Mabile Sub SW Rewind |
| C24066 | LTC Filtration Systems NY DXT FYO9 |
| C24419 | Replace Metal Clad at Springfeld |
| C24559 | Animel fences for NYED Substations |
| C25262 | Chestertown replace SW688 w brkr |
| C25559 | Southwood - Inst. Mobile Sub Access |
| C25599 | NY ARP Breakers 8 Reclosers |
| C25684 | NY ARP Spare Breaker \& Redoser |
| C26879 | Stoner - install 4th Breaker R540 |
| C28126 | NY PCB Bushing Spill Containment |
| C28838 | Clinton St Cooling/3rd Feeder Canaj |
| C29209 | Elm 23WV Shunt Reactor |
| C29741 | Liberty St. Sub Control Building |
| C00492 | Youngstom - Mountain \#01 Line |
| C06820 | Line 218 - Reconductor |
| C14951 | DOI Reloc Conduit Babcock St |
| C15081 | Cityoot Eabcock St-23kV Cables |
| C15667 | Reguators 34.5 KV on Line 2088225 |
| C26396 | DOT-Main St Buffalo Road Work |
| c26406 | F2471Reconductor Mang Ave |
| C26476 | Mumford 5051 Tie with E. Golah 5155 |
| C26557 | F13864 Extend \& Transter to F23251 |
| c26558 | F13862 Extend \& transfer to F23255 |
| c26659 | F7654-Extend \& Transter to 23251 |
| C26696 | F20655 - Hendix Cable installation |
| C2684 1 | Helt Rd. Conversion to 13.2 KV |
| C27438 | Oakfeld-Caledonia 201-34.5kv Rbld. |
| C27505 | 856 line refurtish |
| C28012 | F13862 relabilily improvement |
| C28085 | Darien F 1662 feeder tie |
| C28715 | W.Hamlin 8254 - Tie w/F8252 \% F7458 |
| C29722 | New Langord 18061 - New Regulators |
| \| 288841 | Stajon 97 - New F9755 |

TOTAL ADJUSTMENT
Extibit 2


Does project have dollars in Plan ? If so when does cash flow hegin (FY11FY14)

| NWM |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $\cdots$ | - |  |

Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan
Project removed/deferred from current FY 2011-FY2014 Plan Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan roject removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan Project removed/de ferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan Project removed/deferred from curtent FY2011-FY2014 Pia Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan Project removed/deterred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Plan Project removed/deterred from current FY2011-FY2014 Pla
Project removed/deferred from current FY2011-FY2014 Pla No Spending Deyond FY10 in current FY11-FY14 plan
No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY 19 -FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY1 1-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond $F Y 10$ in current $F Y 11-F Y 14$ plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY 11 -FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond $F Y 10$ in current $F Y 11-F Y 14$ plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY14 plan No Spending beyond $F Y 10$ in current $F Y 11-F Y 14$ plan No Spending beyond $F Y 10$ in current $F Y 11$-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY 11 -FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY 11 -FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY 11 -FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY 1 1-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY 1 -FY F 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY14 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in curtent FY11-FY14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond $F Y 10$ in current FY11-FY 4 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY14 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY14 plan

TOTAL ADJUSTMENT
Exnibit 2 $\square$

| Project <br> Number | Project Description |
| :--- | :--- |


|  | Eud |
| :---: | :---: |
| 149,000 |  |

NYDOT_Wherte Dive
Byron Station Load Relief
DYOUMLLE COLLEGE New 23 KV
New Walmart Leroy Proiect 23 KV Service
REBULD 2361 FOR NEW WALMART
Capitalizeable B -Maintenance
Watt 32052 -Conversion
Rott - Schoharie \#i8 refurtishment
Maplewood_Lib $2 / 13$ repl cable
Farman RO 51 - Woodscape Phs 2 URD
St. Peter's Hospita Itsp S. Peters Hospital Tap
LFTC POD 10 URD

Park Place (a) Mata, Ph
Park Place @ Mata, Ph
Battenkill-CM Mt $\mathbf{4 5}$ : Thompson Tap Stoner 35854 Getaway DOINR-PIN \# 1248.14 NY-Eastem Div V. 344

Canajoharie 03124 Clinton Rd Roterdam.Schohanie $\# 18$ Middleburg V -16 James \& State St Roof Replac ${ }^{-}$- 66 Jurch St 04351 Ductiank City of Abany - Delaware Ava Extend 3 phase for Midewaters Proj Dor Colonie, Maxwell Rd. Seneca Hilit Rebuild Rt 48 Colony-Bromis Falts \#21 Rebuild Emerwille-Mine Ro 213 Rbld $\&$ sWs NR-Westrill-TB\#1 (Fdr Rework) Piercefeid-T Tupper Lake 339 Rebuild NR-Paul Smiths 83462 Line Upgrac CR W. Cleveland Vothage Noth Syracuse instay Cap Huricane Rd. Rebuild CR-Central Square 1562 -Rebuild DestiNY Expansion-subT New Swgr DOT- Taft Road Relocations Akwasasne Mohawk Casino Line Tap Galevile Load Relief Richuvile -Batte hilltw26 Retireme Niles 29451 Reconductoring Rathbun-tabrador 39 Undert Harns Ra 51 Rebuild Cortand Relief
DOTR PIN 3501.42 Bartel Rd
Saina Landifili 34.5 kv relocations NR-32356 RT 37 Cont Devoe Rd. Rebuild Jefferson Commons
Fayetrevile Rebireme
Hins cola $F$ th Relief


No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY44 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan So Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY14 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY 11 -FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current $F Y 11-$ FYY4 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in Ourrent FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current $F Y 11$-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY14 plan
No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY14 plan NO Spending beyond FY 10 in current $F Y 11$-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY 11 -FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond $F Y 10$ in current $F Y 11-F Y 14$ plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current $F Y 11-F Y 14$ plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current $F Y 11$ FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY 11 -FY 14 plan Na Soending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY14 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FYO in curtent FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FYYO in current FY1 1 FY FY 1 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11.FY14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY14 pla No Spending beyond FY 10 in curtent FY11-FY14 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY14 pla No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in curtent FY11-FY44 pla No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY14 pla No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY 11 -FY 14 pla No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY14 pla No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY4 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY14 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY 11 -FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current $F Y 11$-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY14.FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan

| Project <br> Number |
| :--- |

TAL ADJUSTM
Attachment 1
Exhibit 2

| $4 \hat{2}$ |
| ---: |

No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY14 plan
No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY14 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY14 plan
No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY14 plan No Spending beyond FY 10 in current $F Y 11$-FY14 plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY14 plan
No Spending beyond FY 10 in current $F Y 11-F Y 14$ plan No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY1--Y14 plan
No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY 11 -FY 14 plan
No Spending beyond FY10 in current FY11-FY 14 plan
N/A- Allowance for Schedute Change
N/A - Allowance for Schedule Change
N/A - Allowance for Schedule Chang
N/A - Allowance for Schedule Change
N/A - Allowance for Schedule Chang
N/A - Allowance for Schedule Change
N/A - Allowance for Schedute Change
N/A - Allowance for Schedule Change
N/A - Allowance for Schedule Change
N/A - Allowance for Schedule Change
FY2012
FY2012
FY2012
FY2012
FY2012
FY2012
FY2012
FY2012
FY2012
FY 2012
FY2012
00.000

| 500.000 | $2,300,00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 800000 | $1,300,000$ |

1,0000000
$1,000.000$
1.000 .000
500000
110.

100
100.0
25,0
$\begin{array}{r}1,100 \\ 1050 \\ \hline\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ccc}105,000 & 110,000 & 115,000 \\ - & - & - \\ 250,000 & 250,000 & 250,000\end{array}$
250
150,
1

150
1,500
1,0
$1,500.000$
$1,875.000$
$1,875.000$
$2.187,000$
2000000
15
2,533,000 $\quad$ 3.217,000

| 15,000 |
| :---: |
| $\cdot$ |
| 250,000 |
| 150,000 |

2550,000
150,000
255,000
$2,000,000$
3,000 Inman Rd-add WC \& 13.2 kV Bus werk Frankiauser-115-132KV- Bus 8 Ekis IE - NW Dist Transtormer Upgrades L630 8631 Hendrix Ca + LESwitches 208 line refurbishment
305 line refurbishmen
Buffato Station 52 Rebuidd - Fdrs F20871 rebuild ties F4768/F2569 Delameter F9352 new bes w/ 18251,53 F9753 Rebuild/Conv tie w/F21754 N.Leroy 0455 - Mumford 5052 Fdt $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{i}}$ E.Batavia 2855 - N.L.eroy 0456 Tie Batavia 0155 - Knapp Rd 22651 Tie Sweet Home F22457 tie with F2165 Eutfaco 23 kV Recon ductor - Huntley Buffalo 23kV Reconductor - Huntey2 Chestertown 52 - Duell hill Rd. Delmar 440, Jun, Voon 52 C FH-NE Feeder Hardening
$\qquad$

Arachment 1
TOTAL ADJUSTMEN
Exhibit

|  |  |  | - | nen |  | 4 $\times$ W |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Number | Project Description |  | Budgen Adiusmment |  | Does project have dollars in Plan H so when does cash flow begin (FY11-FY14) |  |  | 4- $=2$ |  |
| ${ }^{213265}$ | IE-NE Recdoser Installations | 2,656,000 | 1240007 | 2,632,000 | FY2011 | 1.650,000 | 2.000 .000 | 2,000,000 | 3,333,000 |
| C15828 | IE - NE Dist Transtormer Upgrades | 597,000 | , 1147000 | 450,000 | FY2011 | 1.500,000 | 1,534,000 | 2,533,000 | 3.217,000 |
| C18991 | Part Henry 51 - Convert Westport | 348,000 | - (948060) | - | FY2011 | 350,000 | - | - | . |
| C27564 | Battenkill-Cambridge 34.5kv Returbi | 250,000 | * 2000000 | 150,000 | FY2011 | 1,400,000 | 1,000,000 | - | - |
| C28022 | Sycaway-add new feeders | 558,000 | - (498000) | 150,000 | FY2011 | 270,000 | - |  | - |
| C28023 | Reynolds Rd-add new feeders | 698,000 |  | 75,000 | FY2011 | 630,000 | - | - | - |
| C28765 | Johnson 35251 -getaway replacement | 84,000 | =. $\quad$ ( 84.0006$)$ | - | FY2011 | 90,000 | - | - | - |
| C28772 | Inman Rd-add new feeders | 263,000 | - (223.500) | 40,000 | FY2011 | 1,000,000 | - |  | - |
| C28780 | Seminole 33904-add feeder tie | 115,000 | - 11150000 | - | FY2011 | 100,000 | - | - | - |
| C28781 | Riverside 28854 - replace getaway | 101,000 | - v04000) | - | FY2011 | 155,000 | - | - | - |
| C28844 | Brook Rd 36957 Exten. Adams Road | 498,000 | . 2 (448,000 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 50,000 | FY2011 | 473,000 | - |  | - |
| C29113 | Brook Road 36954 Getaway cable repl | 607,000 | $\cdots \times$ (300,000) | 307,000 | FY2011 | 400.000 | - |  |  |
| C29434 | Midolleburg 51 - Tie to Schoharie | 169,000 | $\cdots$ - 0050005 | , | FY2011 | 120,000 | - | - | - |
| C29438 | Scofield Ra 53 - Tee to Corints 51 | 698,000 | - (555.000) | 143,000 | FY2011 | 800.000 | - | - |  |
| C13145 | FH-NC Feeder Hardening | 2.340,000 | - 31,2220003 | 1.118.000 | FY2011 | 1,000,000 | $\cdot$ | - | - |
| ${ }^{\text {c13267 }}$ | IE. NC Redoser Instaliations | 2,656.000 | - 7 1886.0003 | 2,470.000 | FY2011 | 1,650,000 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 3.333.000 |
| ${ }^{\text {c14846 }}$ | IE-NC Dist Transtormer Upgrades | 597,000 | - +1487000 | 450.000 | FY2019 | 1,500,000 | 1.534,000 | 2.533.000 | 3,217,000 |
| C22959 | NR-WAdams 87554-Church St | 39,000 | C. 3980003 | - | FY2011 | 100,000 |  |  |  |
| C26973 | NR-State St 95463-Judson St Rebuild | 166,000 | $\cdots$. $\times$ 8000003 | 86,000 | FY2019 | 160,000 | - | - | - |
| C26977 | Doghouse Replacement - Central Div | 498.000 |  | 50,000 | FY2011 | ${ }^{125,000}$ |  | - |  |
| C28017 | Trenton-Deerfield $21 / 27$-6ik | 500,000 | - $\quad(450000)$ | 50,000 | FY2011 | 750,000 | - | - | - |
| C28607 | Lehigh 66952 Tie Whth Colosse 3215; | 398,000 | - . $\quad$ - 3988000$)$ |  | FY2011 | 760,000 | - | - | - |
| C28610 | Peterboro Reconductor Main St. | 175,000 | \%. 5750005 | - | FY2011 | 200,000 | - | - | - |
| C28816 | Walesville Reconductor Utica St | 61,000 | 2. $=$ (55:000) | 6,000 | FY2011 | 100.000 | - | - | - |
| C28617 | Lehigh 66954 Teelin Rd Relocate | 179,000 | 2. $\quad$ (179000 | - | FY2011 | 100,000 | - | - |  |
| C28771 | Trenton Whitesbero 25 Reconductor | 1,260,000 | : 11200009 | 50,000 | FY2019 | 2,000.000 | - |  |  |
| C28816 | Chittenango Relief | 299.000 | - . $\quad 1000000$ | 199,000 | FY2011 | 300.000 | - | - |  |
| C28820 | Park Load Reliet | 164,000 | $2=$ (424:000) | 40,000 | FY2011 | 124,000 | - | - | - |
| c28832 | Bartell 56 Orangeport | 199.000 | - 1789000 | - | FY2011 | 250,000 |  | - |  |
| C28848 | Mexico Load Reiet | 339,000 | . 7003000 | 189,000 | FY2011 | 200.000 | - | - | - |
| C28849 | Phoenix Load Relief | 279,000 | - . $\quad 12720000$ | - | FY2011 | 200.000 | - | - |  |
| C28852 | Starr 53 step Down | 253,000 | - | 153,000 | FY2011 | 500.000 | - | - |  |
| C29101 | NR-N Gouvemeur 98352-Rt58 Transter | 50,000 | $\pm .2(80000)$ | - | FY2011 | 300.000 | - | - |  |
| C29742 | DOTR $1-81$ bridge reconstruction Syr | 187.000 | \% . ${ }^{\text {a }}$ (87000\% | , 0 | FY2011 | 17.000 2500000 | 3000000 | 2,800,000 |  |
| C26839 | Mecrury Vapor Replacement | 1,992,000 | 1-72242000 | 750,000 | FY2011 | 2,500,000 | 3,000,000 | 2,800,000 | - |
| c06533 | East Golah 51 - Second Bank | - | \% \$500000 | 1,500,000 | FY2011 | $1.379,000$ 100000 | 110.000 | 125,000 | 150,000 |
| ${ }^{C 18595}$ | DXT Substation Dmg/Fail Reseve C36 | 149,000 | $\pm \quad$ \% 610000 | 250,000 550,000 | FY2011 | 100,000 $1.800,000$ | 110.000 $1.800,000$ | 125,000 $1.800,000$ | 150,000 $2,000,000$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & C 22151 \\ & c 24240 \end{aligned}$ |  | - | $\cdots$ | 550,000 | FY2011 | +125,000 | 125,000 | 125,000 | 2, 125,000 |
| C25139 |  | 750,000 | $\cdots$ - $\quad$ - 5000000 | 2,300,000 | FY2011 | 300.000 | 1,900,000 | - | - |
| C25639 | Buffalo indoor Sub. \#23 Refturb. | 2,358,000 | -570000 | 3,928,000 | FY2011 | 650.000 | - | - | - |
| C25659 | Buffale Indoor Sub. $\mathbf{\# 5 2}$ Returb. | 2,551,000 | $\cdots 236000$ | 2,787,000 | FY2011 | 1.060.000 | - | - | $\cdot$ |
| C25660 | Buffalo indoor Sub. $\# 43$ Returb. | 1,738,000 | - \$800,000 | 3,338,000 | FY2011 | 950.000 | - | - | - |
| ${ }^{\text {c26418 }}$ | Sycaway - Add MC and 13.2 kV Bus | 747,000 | $\cdots$ - $\quad$ - 3000 | 750,000 | FY2011 | 2.066 .000 | - | - | - |
| ${ }^{2} 26481$ | S. Newfane 71 - Replace Bank | 100,000 | 550,000 | 650,000 | FY2011 | 25.000 | -- | 100000 |  |
| ${ }^{\text {c26760 }}$ | NY Small Captal ltems | 100,000 | 150900 | 250,000 | FY2011 | 100,000 | 100.000 | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| ${ }^{\text {c27323 }}$ | NR-Mortistown 2.5 MVA | 299,000 | 245000 | 544,000 | FY2011 | 142.000 | - | - |  |
| C27449 | Swann Rd TE2 Replacement | 1,245,000 | 850000 | 2,095,000 | FY2011 | 2.200.000 | - | - |  |
| C28885 | North Troy Metal Clad Repl. | 750,000 | $\bigcirc \quad 3.750 .000$ | 2,500,000 | FY2011 | 950,000 100000 | 1.500 .000 | 1.400,000 |  |
| C28788 | Alps - new dist sub - add feeder |  | $\cdots 300000$ | 100,000 | FY2011 | 100.000 89,000 | 1,500.000 | 1.400,000 | - |
| ${ }^{\text {C06724 }}$ | Suffale Station 29 Rebuild -23 kV IE. NW Redoser Instalations | 250,000 $2.656,000$ | $\bigcirc \quad 246000$ | 496,000 $2.660,000$ | FY2011 | 89,000 $1.700,000$ | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 3,334,000 |
| ${ }_{\text {C13268 }}$ | IE - NW Redoser Instalations IE - NW Cable Replacements | 2.656,000 | $\bigcirc 800,000$ | $2.600,000$ 800,000 | FY2011 | 1,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 1,000.000 | 1,500,000 |
| C15724 | NYSDOT Ridge Rd Eridge | . | \$70,000 | 170,000 | FY2011 | 85,000 | - | - |  |
| C16119 | IE - NWERR and Fuse | - | 325.000 | 325,000 | FY201; | 400.000 | 400,000 | 400,000 | 400.000 |
| C25940 | Batavia-Atica 206-34.5kv | - | 100,000 | 100,000 | FY2014 | 2,500,000 | 500,000 |  |  |



Distribution \& Sub-Transmission Changes to budgeted projects
$(8,864,000)$
TOTAL ADJUSTMENT

| Project <br> Number |
| :---: |


|  |  | 46 RE | NSE |  |  |  | Hilaso |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Distribution \& Sub-Transmission Changes to budgeted projects Ravers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (8,864,000) <br> TOTAL ADJUSTMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proiect Number | Project Description |  | gudgentajusmme |  | Does project have dollars in Plan? H so when does cash flow begin (FY11FY14) |  |  |  |  |


[^0]:    - Note: home leave includes airfare and other travel refated costs. Return aiffares for Married $/$ partser accompanied employees is one fight per assignment year, for Singie/Unaccomponied employees two fights per assignment per year.

