

Allocation of T&D Revenue Increase @ 8.08% ROE	Con Edison's Proposal	RY'09 Increase	Original Increase	Difference
Proposed Increase		1,132,875		
Con Edison customer revenues	2,754,185			
Less: Surplus	(13,060)			
Con Edison Adjusted Revenues		2,741,125		
NYPA Delivery revenues	301,378			
Add: Deficiency	14,281			
NYPA Adjusted Revenues		315,659		
EDDS Revenues	20,651			
Add: Surplus	(1,221)			
EDDS Adjusted Revenues		19,430		
Total Con Edison		3,076,214		
Allocation to NYPA				
- NYPA Revenue requirement	10.3%	116,248		
- Add: Deficiency		14,281		
Proposed annual increase (\$)		130,529	152,313	(21,784)
Proposed Annual Increases - PASNY		43%		
Allocation to EDDS				
- EDDS Revenue Requirement	0.6%	7,155		
- Less: Surplus		(1,221)		
Proposed annual increase (\$)		5,934	7,466	(1,531)
Proposed Annual Increases - EDDS		29%		
Allocation to Con Edison				
- Con Edison Revenue Requirement	89.1%	1,009,472		
- Less: NYPA Deficiency		(14,281)		
- Add: EDDS Surplus		1,221		
Proposed annual increase (\$)		996,412	973,097	23,315
Proposed Annual Increases - Con Edison		36%		

Company Name: Con Edison
Case Description: Electric Rate Filing
Case: 07-E-0523

Response to NYPA Interrogatories – Set NYPA6

Date of Response: 08/30/2007

Responding Witness: Rate Panel

Question No. :65

Regarding the 2005 class demand study (ERP-2) for all non-street lighting (SC66, SC80) NYPA classes, the coincidence factor percentages are calculated in Report 2A. The only exceptions are for the traction high tension (SC65 HT), and the substations high tension (SC85 HT) classes, where the coincidence factor percentages are only presented in special reports 2C (Summer Page 56, Summer Page 81). 1. What analysis method was used to derive the coincidence factors for the high tension accounts? 2. Why does it differ from the other accounts? 3. Please provide all data and calculations used to derive the coincidence factors for SC65 HT and SC85 HT.

Response:

1. The coincidence factor method used for SC 65 HT relates the maximum hourly demand based on a five-day average load shape to the sum of the maximum demands for each railroad across the five days. For SC 85 HT the denominator in the coincidence factor calculation is simply the maximum demand across the five days.
2. This calculation is similar to the calculation used for other classes where the numerator of the coincidence factor is the maximum hourly demand based on a five-day average load shape. However, the denominator of the coincidence factor for SC 65 HT and SC 85 HT relates to the maximum values across the five days as opposed to July and August (December and January for winter) maximum demands used for other classes. This is done because, in general, traction load shapes are not available for all stations across all days in July and August (or December and January).
3. See attached.

Allocation of T&D Revenue Increase Revised D03 Allocator	Con Edison's Proposal	RY'09 Increase	Original Increase	Difference
Proposed Increase		1,132,875		
Con Edison customer revenues	2,754,185			
Less: Surplus	(26,512)			
Con Edison Adjusted Revenues		2,727,673		
NYPA Delivery revenues	301,378			
Add: Deficiency	26,689			
NYPA Adjusted Revenues		328,067		
EDDS Revenues	20,651			
Add: Surplus	(177)			
EDDS Adjusted Revenues		20,474		
Total Con Edison		3,076,214		
Allocation to NYPA				
- NYPA Revenue requirement	10.7%	120,817		
- Add: Deficiency		26,689		
Proposed annual increase (\$)		147,506	152,313	(4,807)
Proposed Annual Increases - PASNY		49%		
Allocation to EDDS				
- EDDS Revenue Requirement	0.7%	7,540		
- Less: Surplus		(177)		
Proposed annual increase (\$)		7,363	7,466	(103)
Proposed Annual Increases - EDDS		36%		
Allocation to Con Edison				
- Con Edison Revenue Requirement	88.7%	1,004,518		
- Less: NYPA Deficiency		(26,689)		
- Add: EDDS Surplus		177		
Proposed annual increase (\$)		978,006	973,097	4,910
Proposed Annual Increases - Con Edison		36%		

Service Class	Original Class Coincidence Factor	Revised Class Coincidence Factor
(1)	(2)	(3)
62	53.00%	53.00%
64	94.35%	94.35%
64 TOD	95.76%	95.76%
65	90.56%	65.02%
66	100.00%	100.00%
68	94.92%	94.92%
68 TOD	92.62%	92.62%
69	84.82%	84.82%
69 TOD	84.72%	84.72%
80	100.00%	100.00%
82	94.69%	94.69%
85	94.05%	74.95%
91	88.96%	88.96%
91 TOD	88.88%	88.88%
99	86.19%	86.19%

4-HR System Peak Response KW	Con Edison	NYPA	NYPA %	EDDS	EDDS %
2005 ECOS	12,390,723	1,699,098	13.7127%	123,503	0.9967%
Revised Class Coincidence Factor	12,390,723	1,605,326	12.9559%	122,311	0.9871%

Allocation of T&D Revenue Increase Revised D04 Allocator	Con Edison's Proposal	RY'09 Increase	Original Increase	Difference
Proposed Increase		1,132,875		
Con Edison customer revenues	2,754,185			
Less: Surplus	(29,099)			
Con Edison Adjusted Revenues		2,725,086		
NYPA Delivery revenues	301,378			
Add: Deficiency	29,228			
NYPA Adjusted Revenues		330,606		
EDDS Revenues	20,651			
Add: Surplus	(129)			
EDDS Adjusted Revenues		20,522		
Total Con Edison		3,076,214		
Allocation to NYPA				
- NYPA Revenue requirement	10.7%	121,752		
- Add: Deficiency		29,228		
Proposed annual increase (\$)		150,980	152,313	(1,333)
Proposed Annual Increases - PASNY		50%		
Allocation to EDDS				
- EDDS Revenue Requirement	0.7%	7,558		
- Less: Surplus		(129)		
Proposed annual increase (\$)		7,429	7,466	(37)
Proposed Annual Increases - EDDS		36%		
Allocation to Con Edison				
- Con Edison Revenue Requirement	88.6%	1,003,565		
- Less: NYPA Deficiency		(29,228)		
- Add: EDDS Surplus		129		
Proposed annual increase (\$)		974,466	973,097	1,370
Proposed Annual Increases - Con Edison		35%		

D04 - HT 60 CYCLE		High Tension NCP kW's at the Generator Level					
		Report 6 Col. 7 Summer	Report 6 Col. 7 Winter	Higher Measure [1]	Percentage	Summer only	Percentage
Con Edison							
SC No	1	4,344,966	2,373,896	4,344,966	32.146%	4,344,966	32.183%
SC No	1-WH	-	-	-	0.000%	-	0.000%
SC No	2	606,709	449,459	606,709	4.489%	606,709	4.494%
SC No	14-I	-	-	-	0.000%	-	0.000%
SC No	4	455,615	307,131	455,615	3.371%	455,615	3.375%
SC No	4TOD	1,080,349	829,249	1,080,349	7.993%	1,080,349	8.002%
SC No	5	120	194	194	0.001%	120	0.001%
SC No	5 TOD	24,698	16,153	24,698	0.183%	24,698	0.183%
SC No	6	2,555	2,571	2,571	0.019%	2,555	0.019%
SC No	7	36,310	77,166	36,310	0.269%	36,310	0.269%
SC No	8	457,086	284,684	457,086	3.382%	457,086	3.386%
SC No	8TOD	40,297	22,769	40,297	0.298%	40,297	0.298%
SC No	9	3,592,740	2,670,880	3,592,740	26.580%	3,592,740	26.612%
SC No	9TOD	759,132	569,536	759,132	5.616%	759,132	5.623%
SC No	12	28,483	48,076	28,483	0.211%	28,483	0.211%
SC No	12TOD	35,607	68,030	35,607	0.263%	35,607	0.264%
SC No	13TOD	4,432	5,244	5,244	0.039%	4,432	0.033%
CO Use G&S		-	-	-	0.000%	-	0.000%
TOTAL CON ED		11,469,099	7,725,038	11,470,001	84.8592%	11,469,099	84.9525%
		84.952%	80.955%				
PASNY Delivery Service							
SC 62	Gen S	3,748	4,151	4,151		3,748	0.028%
SC 64	CR	2,612	2,592	2,612		2,612	0.019%
SC 64TOD	CR	123,583	112,055	123,583		123,583	0.915%
SC 65	Traction	147,167	161,765	161,765		147,167	1.090%
SC 66	St. Ltg.	16,098	16,098	16,098		16,098	0.119%
SC 68	MUDWR	197,244	152,550	197,244		197,244	1.461%
SC 68TOD	MUDWR	55,476	36,632	55,476		55,476	0.411%
SC 69	Gen L	137,627	117,327	137,627		137,627	1.019%
SC 69TOD	Gen L	114,044	95,561	114,044		114,044	0.845%
SC 80	SL NYC	74,449	74,293	74,449		74,449	0.551%
SC 82	MUDWHT	1,091	2,030	1,091		1,091	0.008%
SC 85	TA Sub	328,461	309,533	328,461		328,461	2.433%
SC 85	TA Pit	-	-	-		-	0.000%
SC 88TOD	WTC	-	-	-		-	0.000%
SC 91	NYCPublg	399,131	370,130	399,131		399,131	2.956%
SC 91TOD	NYCPublg	302,193	237,603	302,193		302,193	2.238%
TOTAL PASNY D/S		1,902,924	1,692,320	1,917,925	14.1895%	1,902,924	14.0951%
		14.095%	17.735%				
EDDS/PFJ Delivery Service							
EDDSPFJCON		12,643	11,639	12,643		12,643	0.094%
EDDSPFJTOD		115,942	113,379	115,942		115,942	0.859%
TOTAL EDDS/PFJ		128,585	125,018	128,585	0.9513%	128,585	0.9524%
		0.952%	1.310%				
TOTAL SYSTEM		13,500,608	9,542,376	13,516,511	100.000%	13,500,608	100.000%
Note:							

[1] - Based on 'higher of' summer/ winter except for SC-7, SC-12, SC-12(TOD) & SC-82, which are based on summer only.

Company Name: Con Edison
Case Description: Electric Rate Filing
Case: 07-E-0523

Response to NYC Interrogatories – Set NYC3

Date of Response: 06/15/2007

Question No. :88

Please explain why D04 uses the higher of summer and winter demands for some classes, but only the summer demands for other classes.

Response:

Each component of the electrical delivery system is sized to meet peak kW demands imposed on that component. Since it is not possible to measure peak demands at each location on the grid and, further, to associate each location with a particular customer, electrical equipment is grouped in three main categories and customers are grouped into service classes for cost allocation purposes. The equipment categories are: the secondary delivery system (low tension system), which is electrically closest to customers, the primary delivery system (high tension system) which is electrically further removed, and the transmission system, which is electrically furthest from individual customers. Also, as a practical matter, there are three categories of demands that are used for cost allocations: individual customer maximum demand (ICMD), which corresponds to billing demand, class non-coincident peak demand (NCP), which is the total class peak demand, coincident within the class but non-coincident with the system peak, and system peak demand, which is the maximum coincident demand for the entire system.

The principal involved in selecting the appropriate allocation factors is diversity of demand. At the delivery point to the customer, the system is designed to meet the customer's ICMD. However, as one proceeds upstream from the customer, diversity of demand is reflected in system designs, and equipment is designed to meet class NCPs. For example, a substation that serves only residential customers would generally be designed for the residential class NCP. Similarly, a substation that serves only commercial load would be designed for the commercial class NCP. Substations that serve load that is composed of a mixture of various classes would be designed to serve the diversified demand of the customer class mix. In this latter case, the class NCP allocation reflects a reasonable sharing of the benefits of diversity among classes. Finally at the transmission level, only the peak demand of all customers is reflected in system designs.

The SC7, SC12, SC12TOD and NYPA Multiple Dwellings Space Heating classes are 100% low tension and their winter peak loads are much greater than their summer peak loads. Therefore, the demand responsibility for the low tension system should be based on their winter peak demands. However, their high tension allocation is based on summer peak demands to recognize that these customers are geographically dispersed throughout the service territory and that the high tension system is generally summer peaking.

Company Name: Con Edison
Case Description: Electric Rate Filing
Case: 07-E-0523

Response to DPS Interrogatories – Set Staff4
Date of Response: 07/02/2007
Responding Witness: Electric Rate Panel

Question No. :73

Subject: Embedded Cost-of-Service Study (ECOS) Provide the complete basis and supporting documents for using a 75% weighting of the non-coincident demands and 25 % of the billing demands for developing allocators DO8 and DO9 in the Company's ECOS.

Response:

In general, the Company uses a 50/50 weighting of the non-coincident demands (NCP) and the billing demands (ICMD) for developing the D08/D09 allocators used in allocating low tension system costs to customer classes in the ECOS. The low tension system is designed to reflect peak demands occurring on various parts of the low tension grid. The closer the grid equipment is to the customer, the greater the importance of the ICMDs and the further the grid equipment is from the customer, the greater the importance of class diversified peak demand (NCP in the ECOS study). To reflect this design principle, the low tension allocation factor is equal to the average of the class NCP and the class ICMD. However, underlying the use of the class ICMD is the assumption that the individual customer ICMDs are actually experienced at the customer's connection to the grid. While this is a correct assumption for non-residential customer classes, it is not correct for the residential class because many residential customers, while individually metered, reside in apartment buildings. For apartment buildings, simply adding individual customer peak demands would overstate the demand experienced on the building's connection to the grid because of the diversity of residential load within the building. To account for this diversity, the residential NCP is averaged with the residential ICMD to derive the peak demand at the residential class' connection to the low tension grid. This adjusted demand is then averaged with the NCP to derive the residential class low tension demand allocation factor. The net result is a weighting of 75% and 25% for the residential ICMD and NCP, respectively.

Allocation of T&D Revenue Increase Revised D08/D09 Allocators	Con Edison's Proposal	RY'09 Increase	Original Increase	Difference
Proposed Increase		1,132,875		
Con Edison customer revenues	2,754,185			
Less: Surplus	(16,989)			
Con Edison Adjusted Revenues		2,737,196		
NYPA Delivery revenues	301,378			
Add: Deficiency	17,913			
NYPA Adjusted Revenues		319,291		
EDDS Revenues	20,651			
Add: Surplus	(924)			
EDDS Adjusted Revenues		19,727		
Total Con Edison		3,076,214		
Allocation to NYPA				
- NYPA Revenue requirement	10.4%	117,585		
- Add: Deficiency		17,913		
Proposed annual increase (\$)		135,498	152,313	(16,814)
Proposed Annual Increases - PASNY		45%		
Allocation to EDDS				
- EDDS Revenue Requirement	0.6%	7,265		
- Less: Surplus		(924)		
Proposed annual increase (\$)		6,340	7,466	(1,125)
Proposed Annual Increases - EDDS		31%		
Allocation to Con Edison				
- Con Edison Revenue Requirement	89.0%	1,008,025		
- Less: NYPA Deficiency		(17,913)		
- Add: EDDS Surplus		924		
Proposed annual increase (\$)		991,036	973,097	17,940
Proposed Annual Increases - Con Edison		36%		

D08/D09 Allocator								
		Maximum ICMD kW's - Per Con Edison			NYPA Proposal			
		KW			100% ICMD			
		Report 6A	Report 6A					
		Col. 7	Col. 7	Higher	ICMD	LT kW	Weighted	
		Summer	Winter	Measure	Weight	Weight	Average	%
Con Edison								
SC No	1	8,375,876	5,956,721	8,375,876	100%	0%	8,375,876	47.380%
SC No	1-WH	-	-	-	100%	0%	-	0.000%
SC No	2	992,990	847,535	992,990	100%	0%	992,990	5.617%
SC No	14-I	-	-	-	100%	0%	-	0.000%
SC No	4	447,097	317,219	447,097	100%	0%	447,097	2.529%
SC No	4TOD	991,782	767,652	991,782	100%	0%	991,782	5.610%
SC No	5	145	262	262	100%	0%	262	0.001%
SC No	5 TOD	5,283	3,618	5,283	100%	0%	5,283	0.030%
SC No	6	2,425	2,440	2,440	100%	0%	2,440	0.014%
SC No	7	101,293	144,938	144,938	100%	0%	144,938	0.820%
SC No	8	458,347	286,705	458,347	100%	0%	458,347	2.593%
SC No	8TOD	41,070	23,466	41,070	100%	0%	41,070	0.232%
SC No	9	4,101,012	3,296,565	4,101,012	100%	0%	4,101,012	23.198%
SC No	9TOD	635,628	487,025	635,628	100%	0%	635,628	3.596%
SC No	12	30,765	50,759	50,759	100%	0%	50,759	0.287%
SC No	12TOD	37,077	68,064	68,064	100%	0%	68,064	0.385%
SC No	13TOD	-	-	-	100%	0%	-	0.000%
CO Use G&S		-	-	-	100%	0%	-	0.000%
TOTAL CON ED		16,220,790	12,252,969	16,315,548			16,315,548	92.292%
		92.300%	91.231%					
PASNY Delivery Service								
SC 62	Gen S	6,437	5,593	6,437	100%	0%	6,437	0.036%
SC 64	CR	2,551	2,900	2,900	100%	0%	2,900	0.016%
SC 64TOD	CR	13,395	12,353	13,395	100%	0%	13,395	0.076%
SC 65	Traction	70,923	79,252	79,252	100%	0%	79,252	0.448%
SC 66	St. Ltg.	15,279	15,279	15,279	100%	0%	15,279	0.086%
SC 68	MUDWR	186,855	145,327	186,855	100%	0%	186,855	1.057%
SC 68TOD	MUDWR	58,080	37,573	58,080	100%	0%	58,080	0.329%
SC 69	Gen L	151,562	127,940	151,562	100%	0%	151,562	0.857%
SC 69TOD	Gen L	55,806	43,928	55,806	100%	0%	55,806	0.316%
SC 80	SL NYC	70,686	70,504	70,686	100%	0%	70,686	0.400%
SC 82	MUDWHT	1,057	1,869	1,869	100%	0%	1,869	0.011%
SC 85	TA Sub	3,215	3,127	3,215	100%	0%	3,215	0.018%
SC 85	TA Plt	-	-	-	100%	0%	-	0.000%
SC 88TOD	WTC	-	-	-	100%	0%	-	0.000%
SC 91	NYCPublg	419,351	387,518	419,351	100%	0%	419,351	2.372%
SC 91TOD	NYCPublg	214,783	166,565	214,783	100%	0%	214,783	1.215%
TOTAL PASNY D/S		1,269,980	1,099,728	1,279,470			1,279,470	7.238%
		7.226%	8.188%					
EDDS/PFJ Delivery Service								
EDDSPFJCON		13,760	12,712	13,760	100%	0%	13,760	0.078%
EDDSPFJTOD		69,410	65,288	69,410	100%	0%	69,410	0.393%
TOTAL EDDS/PFJ		83,170	78,000	83,170			83,170	0.470%
		0.473%	0.581%					
TOTAL SYSTEM		17,573,940	13,430,697	17,678,188			17,678,188	100.000%

Company Name: Con Edison
Case Description: Electric Rate Filing
Case: 07-E-0523

Response to NYPA Interrogatories – Set NYPA6

Date of Response: 08/30/2007

Responding Witness: Rate Panel

Question No. :64

Please refer to page 16 of Mr. Kressner's testimony. a. Please identify the amount of R&D spending included in the ECOS. b. Please explain the allocation methodology (along with supporting exhibits and workpapers) used to allocate R&D costs to NYPA. c. Please state how much of Con Ed's R&D costs are allocated to NYPA? d. Please explain, and provide support for, why R&D costs should be allocated to NYPA given that NYPA has extensive R&D programs of its own.

Response:

a. The breakdown is as follows:

A&G:	PSC 920	\$ 1,310,619
	921	150,037
	930.2	127,492
	930.2	380,941
Transmission:	566	3,632,912
Distribution:	588	<u>5,798,729</u>
		<u>\$11,400,730</u>

b. R&D costs encompass various PSC Accounts, each account was functionalized based on cost causation. Therefore, R&D costs are applicable to all functions and are allocated to NYPA, as well as all service classes, based on allocation factors found in Exhibit __ (ERP-1) Schedule 1, Embedded Cost-of-Service Study Year 2005, Table 7, pages 1 through 10.

c. This would require a study, which we are not required to do.

d. Research that reduces the Company's costs or improves reliability on its system directly benefits NYPA customers. The fact that NYPA may engage in its own R&D efforts does not diminish the benefits that NYPA customers will enjoy as a result of the Company's efforts.

R&D Adjustment						
Source: Con Edison response to NYPA 64	Total R&D	Direct Allocations	Direct Allocations	Indirect Allocations	Indirect Allocations	Total Allocations
Breakdown of R&D						
A&G - PSC 920	1,310,619		-	12.16%	159,368	159,368
A&G - PSC 921	150,037		-	12.16%	18,244	18,244
A&G - PSC 930.2	127,492		-	12.16%	15,503	15,503
A&G - PSC 930.2	380,941		-	12.16%	46,321	46,321
Transmission - PSC 566	3,632,912	12.96%	470,675	0.00%	-	470,675
Distribution - PSC 588	5,798,729	11.66%	676,187	0.00%	-	676,187
Total	11,400,730		1,146,863		239,436	1,386,299
Indirect Allocator			12.16%			
2005 ECOS; O&M: Table 3, Page 21						
	Total System	NYPA				
Transmission						
Transmission	145,959,489	18,910,323	12.96%			
Distribution						
Total Distribution	518,602,894	60,474,079	11.66%			
NYPA R&D						
	2005	2006	Average			
EPRI	1,809,500	1,758,000	1,783,750			
NYSERDA	3,100,000	2,814,000	2,957,000			
Other	4,395,500	4,204,000	4,299,750			
Total	9,305,000	8,776,000	9,040,500			

Allocation of T&D Revenue Increase Removal of R&D Expenses	Con Edison's Proposal	RY'09 Increase	Original Increase	Difference
Proposed Increase		1,132,875		
Con Edison customer revenues	2,754,185			
Less: Surplus	(27,767)			
Con Edison Adjusted Revenues		2,726,418		
NYPA Delivery revenues	301,378			
Add: Deficiency	27,896			
NYPA Adjusted Revenues		329,274		
EDDS Revenues	20,651			
Add: Surplus	(129)			
EDDS Adjusted Revenues		20,522		
Total Con Edison		3,076,214		
Allocation to NYPA				
- NYPA Revenue requirement	10.7%	121,262		
- Add: Deficiency		27,896		
Proposed annual increase (\$)		149,158	152,313	(3,155)
Proposed Annual Increases - PASNY		49%		
Allocation to EDDS				
- EDDS Revenue Requirement	0.7%	7,558		
- Less: Surplus		(129)		
Proposed annual increase (\$)		7,428	7,466	(37)
Proposed Annual Increases - EDDS		36%		
Allocation to Con Edison				
- Con Edison Revenue Requirement	88.6%	1,004,056		
- Less: NYPA Deficiency		(27,896)		
- Add: EDDS Surplus		129		
Proposed annual increase (\$)		976,289	973,097	3,192
Proposed Annual Increases - Con Edison		35%		

Functionalization Analysis	2005	2005 weights	2007-2011 Estimated Construction Expenditures	Total	2011 weights	2005 re- weighted	Adjustment factor
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Net Plant	Exhibit (ERP-1), Table 2	(2)/Total (2)	AP Workpapers to Exhibit (AP 6&7)	(2)+(4)	(5)/Total (5)	(6)*Total (2)	(7)/(2)
Production	13	0.10%	199	212	1.02%	127	991%
Transmission	1,828	14.69%	969	2,797	13.49%	1,679	92%
Substations & Sub-transmission	4,668	37.50%	2,445	7,113	34.31%	4,270	91%
Distribution	5,939	47.71%	4,673	10,612	51.18%	6,371	107%
Total	12,448	100%	8,286	20,734	100%	12,448	
Depreciation Reserve (*)							
Production	30	0.84%	77	106	1.69%	59	201%
Transmission	767	21.77%	562	1,329	21.11%	744	97%
Substations & Sub-transmission	1,276	36.19%	816	2,091	33.22%	1,171	92%
Distribution	1,452	41.20%	1,317	2,769	43.98%	1,550	107%
Total	3,525	100%	2,771	6,296	100%	3,525	

(*) 2011 Depreciation reserve estimated based on ratio of 2005 depreciation reserve to 2005 net plant

Allocation of T&D Revenue Increase Impact of Plant Additions	Con Edison's Proposal	RY'09 Increase	Original Increase	Difference
Proposed Increase		1,132,875		
Con Edison customer revenues	2,754,185			
Less: Surplus	(26,054)			
Con Edison Adjusted Revenues		2,728,131		
NYPA Delivery revenues	301,378			
Add: Deficiency	26,646			
NYPA Adjusted Revenues		328,024		
EDDS Revenues	20,651			
Add: Surplus	(592)			
EDDS Adjusted Revenues		20,059		
Total Con Edison		3,076,214		
Allocation to NYPA				
- NYPA Revenue requirement	10.7%	120,801		
- Add: Deficiency		26,646		
Proposed annual increase (\$)		147,447	152,313	(4,866)
Proposed Annual Increases - PASNY		49%		
Allocation to EDDS				
- EDDS Revenue Requirement	0.7%	7,387		
- Less: Surplus		(592)		
Proposed annual increase (\$)		6,795	7,466	(670)
Proposed Annual Increases - EDDS		33%		
Allocation to Con Edison				
- Con Edison Revenue Requirement	88.7%	1,004,687		
- Less: NYPA Deficiency		(26,646)		
- Add: EDDS Surplus		592		
Proposed annual increase (\$)		978,633	973,097	5,536
Proposed Annual Increases - Con Edison		36%		