

**STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS
BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

IN RE: THE NARRAGANSETT ELECTRIC COMPANY)
d/b/a NATIONAL GRID – ELECTRIC AND GAS)
DISTRIBUTION RATE FILING)

Docket No. 4770

ISSUED MAY 1, 2018

**THE NARRAGANSETT ELECTRIC COMPANY D/B/A NATIONAL GRID’S
FIFTH SET OF DATA REQUESTS TO
THE DIVISION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES AND CARRIERS**

TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES TIM WOOLF AND MELISSA WHITED

A. Performance Incentive Mechanisms

- 5-1. In assigning basis points for the unquantified benefits, as explained on page 22-23 and Exhibit TW/MW-3 of testimony from Witnesses Tim Woolf and Melissa Whited, did the witnesses seek stakeholder input as to how to rank the importance of each unquantified benefit in light of Docket 4600 goals and state energy policies? If yes, please list by name the stakeholders who provided input.
- 5-2. On page 9 of the testimony of Witnesses Tim Woolf and Melissa Whited discussing ROE and PIMs, they state that “Because of this inter-relationship, it is critical for the Commission to consider the authorized ROE and the PIMs together; otherwise the ultimate impacts of these two mechanisms treated separately could lead to unintended consequences, uneconomic decision-making; undesirable performance outcomes, and over-recovery (or under-recovery) of revenues by the Company.” How does the Division define “over-recovery” of revenues in a regulatory framework that includes performance incentives?
- 5-3. How does the Division define “PST Support” as noted in numerous instances in the testimony of Witnesses Tim Woolf and Melissa Whited?
- 5-4. Please provide all relevant supporting documentation to support the assessment referenced on page 45 of the testimony from Witnesses Tim Woolf and Melissa Whited in the following statement: “The targets [for the Division’s proposed Non-Wires Alternative PIM] are based on our assessment of the potential NWA savings that might be available in the next three years.”
- 5-5. For the Division’s proposal for a Low-Income Discount PIM, how did the Division conclude that a baseline should be the average of the low-income participation percentage of the previous five years? Did the Division evaluate alternative baselines?