

Docket No. 4770
Forty-First Set of Data Requests of the
Division of Public Utilities and Carriers to National Grid
April 3, 2018

Multi-Jurisdictional GIS Enhancement Project

- 41-1. Referring to the response to Division 32-23 (Docket 4770), the response indicates that the Company's New York affiliate received approval to move forward with the GIS Enhancement project and, as a result, the Company proposes to move forward with a multi-jurisdictional deployment. Was the affiliate's proposal to move forward with GIS Enhancement included in the Joint Proposal settlement that was filed with the NY PSC on January 19, 2018? If yes, why didn't the Company disclose this at the January 29 technical session in Docket 4780 or disclose this prior to March 27 in any of the many data responses in this docket that addressed the GIS Enhancement project?
- 41-2. Referring to the response to Division 32-23 (Docket 4770), the response indicates that the Company's New York affiliate received approval to move forward with the GIS Enhancement project. Please describe how the costs of the GIS Enhancement project will be recovered in New York.
- 41-3. Referring to the response to Division 32-23 (Docket 4770), the response indicates that the Company's New York affiliate received approval to move forward with the GIS Enhancement project.
- a. Please state what the cost will be to Niagara Mohawk for the project and the years in which the costs will be incurred.
 - b. Please provide a breakdown between (i) GIS software enhancements approved by New York that have the potential to be utilized by other affiliated jurisdictions and (ii) the costs of populating New York specific data (as described in the response to Division 19-11). If the approved cost of the multi-jurisdictional component in (i) above for New York is different than the figure given in Table 3-7, Bates page 55 of PST-1, please explain why.
- 41-4. Referring to the response to Division 32-23 (Docket 4770), the response indicates that the Company's New York affiliate received approval to move forward with the GIS Enhancement project.
- a. Please provide a schedule showing how the costs of the multi-jurisdictional GIS Enhancement project will be allocated among the affiliates in New York, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island.

- b. Please explain whether and how the allocation of costs among affiliates would change from that which is provided in response to sub-part (a) above if the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities and the Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission do not approve cost recovery mechanisms for the multi-jurisdictional GIS Enhancement project.
 - c. If approval of cost recovery is not obtained for the multi-jurisdictional project from Massachusetts and Rhode Island, will Niagara Mohawk be charged 100% of the costs of the software enhancements as was originally proposed in the Rhode Island Only scenario to be charged to Narragansett Electric in PST-1, Bates page 55, Table 3-7, had Rhode Island chose to move forward alone? If not, explain why not. If yes, does the settlement in New York allow Niagara Mohawk to recover 100% of those multi-jurisdictional costs?
 - d. If approval of cost recovery is not obtained from the Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission for the GIS Enhancements, but New York moves forward with the project, will Narragansett Electric be allocated any costs from the project? If not, please explain why not. If yes, please explain why this would be the case.
- 41-5. Referring to the response to Division 32-23 (Docket 4770), the response indicates that the Company's New York affiliate received approval to move forward with the GIS Enhancement project. If approval of cost recovery is not obtained for the multi-jurisdictional project from Massachusetts and Rhode Island, and Narragansett Electric at a later date (after the calendar and fiscal year in which the software enhancements were made) decided to use the enhanced GIS system and populate it with Rhode Island data in a later year, would the Service Company charge Narragansett Electric any of the costs incurred in any prior years for the initial software enhancements that were incurred as a result of the New York approved project? If yes, please explain why. If not, please explain why not.