## VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Luly E. Massaro, Commission Clerk
Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission
89 Jefferson Boulevard
Warwick, RI 02888

## RE: Docket 5098 - Proposed FY 2022 Electric Infrastructure, Safety, and Reliability Plan Responses to PUC Data Requests - Set 1

Dear Ms. Massaro:

On behalf of The Narragansett Electric Company d/b/a National Grid ("National Grid" or the "Company"), enclosed ${ }^{1}$, please find the Company's responses to the Public Utilities Commission’s First Set of Data Requests in the above-referenced matter.

Thank you for your attention to this transmittal. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at 401-784-4263.

Sincerely,


Andrew S. Marcaccio

## Enclosures

cc: Docket 5098 Service List
John Bell, Division
Greg Booth, Division
Tiffany Parenteau, Esq.
Al Contente, Division

[^0]
## Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that a copy of the cover letter and any materials accompanying this certificate was electronically transmitted to the individuals listed below.

The paper copies of this filing are being hand delivered to the Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission and to the Rhode Island Division of Public Utilities and Carriers.


Joanne M. Scanlon

February 5, 2021
Date

Docket No. 5098 - National Grid's Electric ISR Plan FY 2022 Service List as of $\mathbf{1 / 2 8 / / 2 0 2 1}$

| Name/Address | E-mail Distribution | Phone |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Andrew.Marcaccio, Esq. Jennifer Hutchinson, Esq. National Grid 280 Melrose St. Providence, RI 02907 | Andrew.Marcaccio@nationalgrid.com; | 401-784-7288 |
|  | jennifer.hutchinson@nationalgrid.com; |  |
|  | celia.obrien@nationalgrid.com; |  |
|  | Joanne.scanlon@nationalgrid.com; |  |
| National Grid Melissa Little Patricia Easterly Kathy Castro Susan Toronto Ryan Constable William Richer | Melissa.Little@nationalgrid.com; |  |
|  | Patricia.easterly@nationalgrid.com; |  |
|  | Kathy.Castro2@nationalgrid.com; |  |
|  | Susan.Toronto@nationalgrid.com; |  |
|  | Ryan.Constable@nationalgrid.com; |  |
|  | William.Richer@nationalgrid.com; |  |
| Division of Public Utilities (Division) <br> Christy Hetherington, Esq. <br> Dept. of Attorney General 150 South Main St. <br> Providence, RI 02903 | christy.hetherington@dpuc.ri.gov; |  |
|  | Dmacrae@riag.ri.gov; |  |
|  | MFolcarelli@riag.ri.gov; |  |
|  | John.bell@dpuc.ri.gov; |  |
|  | Joseph.shilling@dpuc.ri.gov; |  |
|  | Margaret.l.hogan@dpuc.ri.gov; |  |
|  | Linda.george@dpuc.ri.gov; |  |
|  | Robert.Bailey@dpuc.ri.gov; |  |
| David Effron <br> Berkshire Consulting <br> 12 Pond Path <br> North Hampton, NH 03862-2243 | Djeffron@aol.com; | 603-964-6526 |


| Gregory L. Booth, PLLC 14460 Falls of Neuse Rd. <br> Suite 149-110 <br> Raleigh, N. C. 27614 | gboothpe@gmail.com; | 919-441-6440 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Linda Kushner <br> L. Kushner Consulting, LLC <br> 514 Daniels St. \#254 <br> Raleigh, NC 27605 | Lkushner33@gmail.com; | 919-810-1616 |
| Office of Energy Resources (OER) Albert Vitali, Esq. <br> Dept. of Administration Division of Legal Services One Capitol Hill, $4^{\text {th }}$ Floor Providence, RI 02908 | Albert.Vitali@doa.ri.gov; <br> Nancy.Russolino@doa.ri.gov; <br> Christopher.Kearns@energy.ri.gov; <br> Nicholas.Ucci@energy.ri.gov; <br> Carrie.Gill@energy.ri.gov ; | 401-222-3417 |
| File an original \& five (5) copies w/: Luly E. Massaro, Commission Clerk Public Utilities Commission 89 Jefferson Blvd. Warwick, RI 02888 | Luly.massaro@puc.ri.gov; <br> John.harrington@puc.ri.gov; <br> Cynthia.WilsonFrias@puc.ri.gov; <br> Todd.bianco@puc.ri.gov; <br> Alan.nault@puc.ri.gov; | 401-780-2107 |
| Matthew Sullivan, Green Development | ms@green-ri.com; |  |

## PUC 1-1

## Request:

Please update all relevant schedules using the forecast approved by the Commission in Docket 5076 and extrapolating rate class consumption from the forecast for purposes of the allocations. (NOTE: Use the Docket 5076 forecast to extrapolate April through December 2021, and the Company's most recent forecast available for the months of January through March of 2022).

Response:
Please see Attachment PUC 1-1A for the illustrative Operation \& Maintenance Factors and illustrative CapEx Factors (Section 6) calculated based in part on the forecast approved by the Commission in Docket No. 5076 and in part on the most recent forecast for the months of January 2022 through March 2022, derived on page 5. Please see Attachment PUC 1-1B for the illustrative Bill Impacts (Section 7) based on the illustrative factors presented in Attachment PUC 1-1A.

The Narragansett Electric Company
Infrastructure, Safety and Reliability Plan Factors Calculations - Summary
Summary of Illustrative Factors
(for the 12 months beginning April 1, 2021)

(1) Page 2, Line (6); Column (d) applicable to supplemental kWh deliveries only
(2) Page 4, Column (a), Line (4), applicable to backup service only
(3) Page 3, Line (6)
(4) Columns (c), (d), and (e) per Page 3, Line (8); Column (d) applicable to supplemental service only
(5) Page 4, Column (a), Line (6), applicable to backup service only

The Narragansett Electric Company
FY22 Illustrative Operations \& Maintenance Factors
(for the 12 months beginning April 1, 2021)


1) FY2022 Forecasted Vegetation Management (VM) and Inspection \& Maintenance (I\&M) O\&M Expense
(2)
rating \& Maintenance Expense - Rate Year Allowance (\$000s)
(4) (I\&M) O\&M Expens

Forecasted kWh - April 2021 through March 2022
6) Illustrative Vegetation Management (VM) and Inspection \& Maintenance (I\&M) O\&M Expense Charge per kWh
$\$ 0.00208$
$\$ 0.00212$
$\$ 11,983,000$
6,867,308,226
$\$ 4,919$
$11.13 \%$
\$22,620
51.17\%
$\$ 6,131,78$
2,943,700,985
\$1,333,432
$627,551,230$
\$7,56
-
$\$ 7,045 \quad \$ 2,036$

\$2,050,162$\$ 551,915$\$5,964
-
$\$ 0.00180$$\$ 0.00090$$\$ 0.01193$$\$ 0.00040$
(1) per Section 5: Attachment 1, page 1, line (4) column (b)
(2) per RIPUC 4770, Compliance Attachment 6, (Schedule 1B), page 3, line 88
(3) Line (2), Columns (b) through (g) $\div$ Line (2) Total
(4) Line (1) x Line (3)
(5) per page 5
(6) Line (4) $\div$ Line (5), truncated to 5 decimal places
FY22 Illustrative CapEx Factors
(for the 12 months beginning April 1, 2021)

|  |  |  |  | Lighting |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | Residential | Small C\&I | General C\&I | Large Demand | S-05/S-06 | Propulsion |  |
| (a) | $\frac{A-16 / A 60}{(b)}$ | $\frac{\text { C-06 }}{\text { (c) }}$ | $\frac{G-02}{(d)}$ | $\frac{B-32 / \mathrm{G}-32}{(\mathrm{e})}$ | $\frac{\mathrm{S}-10 / \mathrm{S}-14}{(\mathrm{f})}$ | $\underline{\text { X-01 }}$ | $(\mathrm{g})$ |

1) FY2022 Capital Investment Component of Revenue Requirement
$\$ 29,460,447$
Total Rate Base $(\$ 000 \mathrm{~s}) \quad-2$

| $\$ 729,511$ | $\$ 404,995$ | $\$ 75,009$ | $\$ 117,155$ | $\$ 123,849$ | $\$ 8,296$ | $\$ 208$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $100.00 \%$ | $55.52 \%$ | $10.28 \%$ | $16.06 \%$ | $16.98 \%$ | $1.14 \%$ | $0.03 \%$ |
| $\$ 29,460,447$ | $\$ 16,355,236$ | $\$ 3,029,140$ | $\$ 4,731,175$ | $\$ 5,001,500$ | $\$ 335,008$ | $\$ 8,388$ |
| $6,867,308,226$ | $2,943,700,985$ | $627,551,230$ | $1,134,253,593$ | $2,100,784,386$ | $46,262,213$ | $14,755,819$ |
|  | $\$ 0.00555$ | $\$ 0.00482$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\$ 0.00724$ | $\$ 0.00056$ |
|  |  |  | $3,232,304$ | $3,520,479$ |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\$ 1.4$ | $\$ 1.42$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |  | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |

(1) per Section 5: Attachment 1, page 1, Line (13), Column (b)
(2) RIPUC 4770, Compliance Attachment 6, (Schedule 1A), page 1, Line 9
(3) Line (2), Columns (b) through (g) $\div$ Line (2) Total
(4) Line (1) $x$ Line (3)
(5) per page 5
(6) For non demand-based rate classes, Line (4) $\div$ Line (5), truncated to 5 decimal places
(7) per Company forecasts
(8) For demand-based rate classes, Line (4) $\div$ Line (7), truncated to 2 decimal places

Note: charges apply to $\mathrm{kW}>10$ for rate class G-02 and $\mathrm{kW}>200$ for rate class B-32/G-32

The Narragansett Electric Company
Calculation of Illustrative Operations \& Maintenance and CapEx Factors and Illustrative Base Distribution Charge for Back-up Service Rates

## Large Demand

B-32
(a)

## Operations \& Maintenance Factors

(1) Allocated Vegetation Management (VM) and Inspection \& Maintenance (I\&M) O\&M Expense
\$1,909,744
(2) Forecasted kW - April 2021 through March 2022

3,520,479
(3) Illustrative Vegetation Management (VM) and Inspection \& Maintenance (I\&M)
O\&M Expense Charge per kW
(4) Illustrative Discounted O\&M kW Factor Charge effective 4/1/2021
$\$ 0.05$

## CapEx Factors

(5) Illustrative CapEx kW Factor Charge effective 4/01/2021
(6) Illustrative Discounted CapEx kW Factor Charge effective 4/1/2021
\$0.14
(1) Page 2, Line (4), Column (e)
(2) per Company forecasts
(3) Line (1) $\div$ Line (2), truncated to 2 decimal places
(4) Line (3) x.10, truncated to two decimal places
(5) Page 3, Line (8), Column (e)
(6) Line (5) x .10, truncated to two decimal places

Calculation of kWh Forecast for the period April 2021 - March 2022 per Information Request PUC 1-1

|  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Residential } \\ & \text { A-16 / A60 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Small C\&I $\mathrm{C}-06$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { General C\&I } \\ \underline{G-02} \end{gathered}$ | Large Demand B-32 / G-32 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Lighting } \\ \text { S-05/ /-06 } \\ \text { S-10/S-14 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Propulsion } \\ \underline{\mathrm{X}-01} \end{gathered}$ | Notes |
| 2020 Weather |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Normalized - Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1/1/2020 | 568,153,547 | 294,503,834 | 62,580,228 | 116,141,935 | 86,255,825 | 6,467,545 | 2,204,180 |  |
| 2/1/2020 | 608,314,427 | 239,877,544 | 54,795,149 | 99,925,982 | 207,276,081 | 4,225,916 | 2,213,755 |  |
| 3/1/2020 | 596,182,219 | 234,417,233 | 56,442,758 | 99,058,389 | 200,590,710 | 3,298,573 | 2,374,556 |  |
| 4/1/2020 | 566,279,899 | 224,759,655 | 50,819,647 | 90,531,717 | 193,635,087 | 5,146,676 | 1,387,116 |  |
| 5/1/2020 | 523,745,152 | 209,086,246 | 47,613,776 | 80,779,496 | 183,082,082 | 2,711,088 | 472,466 |  |
| 6/1/2020 | 543,600,694 | 222,946,156 | 48,286,602 | 86,434,827 | 182,778,030 | 2,682,390 | 472,688 |  |
| 7/1/2020 | 687,500,203 | 329,106,458 | 58,167,216 | 105,139,117 | 191,982,569 | 2,212,848 | 891,994 |  |
| 8/1/2020 | 738,887,313 | 369,235,889 | 61,435,667 | 116,096,933 | 189,095,711 | 2,215,519 | 807,594 |  |
| 9/1/2020 | 636,699,275 | 286,133,641 | 56,297,014 | 103,401,558 | 187,668,198 | 2,337,826 | 861,038 |  |
| 10/1/2020 | 561,004,393 | 222,885,124 | 53,837,022 | 98,676,784 | 180,398,013 | 4,079,858 | 1,127,593 |  |
| 11/1/2020 | 520,863,739 | 217,514,831 | 45,748,107 | 85,382,181 | 167,208,778 | 3,825,460 | 1,184,382 |  |
| 12/1/2020 | 556,078,854 | 240,794,676 | 50,252,253 | 92,546,116 | 165,735,480 | 5,233,279 | 1,517,051 |  |
|  | 7,107,309,714 | 3,091,261,287 | 646,275,437 | 1,174,115,035 | 2,135,706,565 | 44,436,979 | 15,514,411 |  |
| 2021 Forecast |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1/1/2021 | 593,178,691 | 267,500,628 | 52,450,547 | 96,335,553 | 170,210,664 | 5,093,995 | 1,587,304 |  |
| 2/1/2021 | 544,253,804 | 239,026,221 | 48,658,231 | 89,606,853 | 160,457,986 | 5,035,604 | 1,468,909 |  |
| 3/1/2021 | 529,725,921 | 225,117,967 | 48,405,341 | 89,458,375 | 161,221,034 | 4,060,332 | 1,462,873 |  |
| 4/1/2021 | 520,730,962 | 210,993,726 | 49,309,548 | 91,212,558 | 164,063,089 | 3,659,304 | 1,492,738 |  |
| 5/1/2021 | 449,411,420 | 163,900,079 | 44,806,614 | 83,393,214 | 153,013,069 | 2,944,251 | 1,354,192 |  |
| 6/1/2021 | 510,346,489 | 199,885,913 | 49,223,919 | 91,336,892 | 165,471,791 | 2,937,374 | 1,490,600 |  |
| 7/1/2021 | 650,338,728 | 288,254,246 | 58,184,513 | 107,513,431 | 191,655,004 | 2,966,058 | 1,765,475 |  |
| 8/1/2021 | 672,095,210 | 303,512,973 | 59,272,755 | 109,398,000 | 194,713,591 | 3,400,435 | 1,797,455 |  |
| 9/1/2021 | 616,035,712 | 265,069,954 | 56,228,765 | 103,764,958 | 185,203,990 | 4,064,898 | 1,703,147 |  |
| 10/1/2021 | 495,113,634 | 181,758,425 | 49,642,376 | 91,874,650 | 165,959,410 | 4,377,607 | 1,501,165 |  |
| 11/1/2021 | 478,187,794 | 178,203,642 | 47,386,219 | 87,602,946 | 158,591,994 | 4,972,866 | 1,430,127 |  |
| 12/1/2021 | 547,127,026 | 228,418,321 | 51,013,836 | 93,901,449 | 167,124,575 | 5,125,846 | 1,542,999 |  |
|  | 6,606,545,391 | 2,751,642,095 | 614,582,666 | 1,135,398,879 | 2,037,686,198 | 48,638,569 | 18,596,984 |  |
| Average |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1/1/2021 | 580,666,119 | 281,002,231 | 57,515,388 | 106,238,744 | 128,233,244 | 5,780,770 | 1,895,742 | Average from Docket 5076 |
| 2/1/2021 | 576,284,115 | 239,451,882 | 51,726,690 | 94,766,418 | 183,867,034 | 4,630,760 | 1,841,332 | Average from Docket 5076 |
| 3/1/2021 | 562,954,070 | 229,767,600 | 52,424,049 | 94,258,382 | 180,905,872 | 3,679,452 | 1,918,714 | Average from Docket 5076 |
| 4/1/2021 | 543,505,431 | 217,876,690 | 50,064,598 | 90,872,137 | 178,849,088 | 4,402,990 | 1,439,927 | Average from Docket 5076 |
| 5/1/2021 | 486,578,286 | 186,493,163 | 46,210,195 | 82,086,355 | 168,047,575 | 2,827,669 | 913,329 | Average from Docket 5076 |
| 6/1/2021 | 526,973,591 | 211,416,035 | 48,755,260 | 88,885,860 | 174,124,911 | 2,809,882 | 981,644 | Average from Docket 5076 |
| 7/1/2021 | 668,919,465 | 308,680,352 | 58,175,864 | 106,326,274 | 191,818,787 | 2,589,453 | 1,328,735 | Average from Docket 5076 |
| 8/1/2021 | 705,491,261 | 336,374,431 | 60,354,211 | 112,747,467 | 191,904,651 | 2,807,977 | 1,302,525 | Average from Docket 5076 |
| 9/1/2021 | 626,367,493 | 275,601,797 | 56,262,890 | 103,583,258 | 186,436,094 | 3,201,362 | 1,282,092 | Average from Docket 5076 |
| 10/1/2021 | 528,059,014 | 202,321,774 | 51,739,699 | 95,275,717 | 173,178,712 | 4,228,733 | 1,314,379 | Average from Docket 5076 |
| 11/1/2021 | 499,525,766 | 197,859,237 | 46,567,163 | 86,492,563 | 162,900,386 | 4,399,163 | 1,307,255 | Average from Docket 5076 |
| 12/1/2021 | 551,602,940 | 234,606,499 | 50,633,044 | 93,223,783 | 166,430,027 | 5,179,562 | 1,530,025 | Average from Docket 5076 |
| 1/1/2022 | 601,588,691 | 272,390,151 | 54,872,294 | 94,732,363 | 173,475,805 | 4,957,245 | 1,160,832 | Per Revised 2021 Forecast |
| 2/1/2022 | 568,211,573 | 254,230,878 | 51,957,757 | 89,873,915 | 166,149,324 | 4,902,762 | 1,096,937 | Per Revised 2021 Forecast |
| 3/1/2022 | 560,484,714 | 245,849,978 | 51,958,254 | 90,153,901 | 167,469,026 | 3,955,413 | 1,098,141 | Per Revised 2021 Forecast |
| Calendar Year 2020 | 6,856,927,553 | 2,921,451,691 | 630,429,051 | 1,154,756,957 | 2,086,696,381 | 46,537,774 | 17,055,697 | Matches forecast used for Energy Efficiency Charge Calculation in Docket 5076 |
| April 2021 - March |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2022 | 6,867,308,226 | 2,943,700,985 | 627,551,230 | 1,134,253,593 | 2,100,784,386 | 46,262,213 | 14,755,819 |  |


The Narragansett Electric Company
Calculation of Monthly Typical Bill
Total Bill Impact of Illustrative
Rates Applicable to A-60 Rate Customer

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Monthly } \\ \text { kWh } \\ \text { (a) } \end{gathered}$ | Rates Effective October 1, 2020 |  |  |  |  |  | Mlustrative Rates |  |  |  |  |  | S Increase (Decrease) |  |  |  | Increase (Decrease) \% of Total Bill |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Percentage } \\ \text { of Customers } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delivery Services (b) | Supply Services (c) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Low Income } \\ \text { Disount } \\ (\mathrm{d})=(\mathrm{lb})+(\mathrm{c})] \\ x-25 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Discounted } \\ & \text { Total } \\ & (\mathrm{e})=(\mathrm{b})+(\mathrm{c}) \end{aligned}$ | GET (f) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{g})=(\mathrm{e})+(\mathrm{f}) \end{gathered}$ | Delivery Services <br> (h) | Supply Services (i) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Low Income } \\ \text { Discount } \\ (\mathrm{j})=[(\mathrm{h})+(\mathrm{i})] \\ .25 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Discounted } \\ \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{k})=(\mathrm{h})+(\mathrm{i}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GET } \\ & \text { (1) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{m})=(\mathrm{k})+(\mathrm{l}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Delivery } \\ \text { Servies } \\ (\mathrm{n})=[(\mathrm{h})+(\mathrm{j})] \\ {[(\mathrm{b})+(\mathrm{d})]} \end{gathered}$ | Supply <br> Services(o) $=$ (i) - (c) | $\begin{gathered} \text { GET } \\ (\mathrm{p})=(\mathrm{l})-(\mathrm{f}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{q})=(\mathrm{n})+(\mathrm{o}) \\ +(\mathrm{p}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Delivery } \\ & \text { Services } \\ & (\mathrm{r}=(\mathrm{n}) \div \\ & \hline(\mathrm{bl})+(\mathrm{d}) \end{aligned}$ | Supply <br> Services <br> $(\mathrm{s})=(\mathrm{o}) \div(\mathrm{c})$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { GET } \\ (\mathrm{t})=(\mathrm{p}) \div(\mathrm{f}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{u})=(\mathrm{q}) \div(\mathrm{g}) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 150 | 52.53 | \$15.56 | (\$10.27) | \$30.82 | \$1.28 | \$32.10 | \$25.76 | \$15.56 | (\$10.33) | \$30.99 | \$1.29 | \$32.28 | 50.17 | 50.00 | \$0.01 | 50.18 | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.6\% | 32.1\% |
| 300 | S42. 10 | 531.11 | (\$18.30) | \$54.91 | \$2.29 | \$57.20 | \$42.56 | \$31.11 | (\$18.42) | \$55.25 | \$2.30 | \$57.55 | \$0.34 | \$0.00 | \$0.01 | S0.35 | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.6\% | 15.48 |
| 400 | \$53.14 | \$41.48 | (523.66) | \$70.96 | \$2.96 | 573.92 | \$53.76 | \$41.48 | (\$23.81) | 571.43 | \$2.98 | \$74.41 | \$0.47 | \$0.00 | \$0.02 | S0.49 | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.7\% | 12.5\% |
| 500 | \$64.19 | \$51.85 | (\$29.01) | \$87.03 | \$3.63 | \$90.66 | \$64.97 | \$51.85 | (\$29.21) | 587.61 | \$3.65 | \$91.26 | \$0.58 | \$0.00 | \$0.02 | \$0.60 | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.7\% | 9.6\% |
| 600 | \$75.24 | \$62.22 | (\$34.37) | \$103.09 | \$4.30 | \$107.39 | \$76.17 | \$62.22 | (\$34.60) | \$103.79 | \$4.32 | \$108.11 | \$0.70 | \$0.00 | \$0.02 | 50.72 | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.7\% | 7.2\% |
| 700 | \$86.28 | \$72.59 | (\$39.72) | \$119.15 | \$4.96 | \$124.11 | 587.37 | \$72.59 | (\$39.99) | \$119.97 | 55.00 | \$124.97 | \$0.82 | S0.00 | S0.04 | S0.86 | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.7\% | 16.46 |
| 1,200 | \$141.51 | \$124.44 | (S66.49) | \$199.46 | \$8.31 | \$207.77 | \$143.37 | \$124.44 | (\$66.95) | \$200.86 | 58.37 | \$209.23 | \$1.40 | 50.00 | 50.06 | \$1.46 | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.7\% | 5.2\% |
| 2,000 | \$229.88 | \$207.40 | (\$109.32) | \$327.96 | \$13.67 | \$341.63 | \$232.98 | \$207.40 | (S110.10) | \$330.28 | \$13.76 | \$344.04 | \$2.32 | \$0.00 | \$0.09 | \$2.41 | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.7\% | 1.6\% |

[^1]The Narragansett Electric Company
Calculation of Monthly Typical Bill
Total Bill Impact of Illustrative
Rates Applicable to A-60 Rate Customer

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Monthly } \\ \mathrm{kWh} \end{gathered}$ | Rates Effective October 1, 2020 |  |  |  |  |  | Mlustrative Rates |  |  |  |  |  | \$ Increase (Decrease) |  |  |  | Increase (Decrease) \% of Total Bill |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Percentage } \\ \text { of Customers } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delivery Services (b) | Supply Services <br> (c) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Low Income } \\ \text { Disount } \\ (\mathrm{d})=([(b)+(\mathrm{c})] \\ x-30 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Discounted } \\ & \text { Total } \\ & \text { (e) }=(\mathrm{b})+(\mathrm{c}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { GET } \\ \quad(\mathrm{f}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{g})=(\mathrm{e})+(\mathrm{f}) \end{gathered}$ | Delivery Services (h) | Supply Services (i) |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Discounted } \\ \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{k})=(\mathrm{h})+(\mathrm{i}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GET } \\ & \text { (1) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{m})=(\mathrm{k})+(\mathrm{l}) \end{gathered}$ | Delivery Services $(\mathrm{n})=[(\mathrm{h})+(\mathrm{j})]$ $[(\mathrm{b})+(\mathrm{d})]$ | Supply Services (o) $=$ (i) - (c) | $\begin{gathered} \text { GET } \\ (\mathrm{p})=(\mathrm{l})-(\mathrm{f}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{q})=(\mathrm{n})+(\mathrm{o}) \\ +(\mathrm{p}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Delivery } \\ & \text { Servives } \\ & (\mathrm{r})=(\mathrm{n})+ \\ & {[(\mathrm{b})+(\mathrm{d})]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Supply } \\ \text { Services } \\ (\mathrm{s})=(\mathrm{o}) \div(\mathrm{c}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { GET } \\ (t)=(p) \div(f) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{u})=(\mathrm{q}) \div(\mathrm{g}) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 150 | \$25.53 | \$15.56 | (\$12.33) | \$28.76 | \$1.20 | \$29.96 | \$25.76 | \$15.56 | (\$12.40) | \$28.92 | \$1.21 | \$30.13 | S0.16 | \$0.00 | \$0.01 | S0.17 | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.6\% | 32.1\% |
| 300 | \$42.10 | 531.11 | (\$21.96) | \$51.25 | \$2.14 | \$53.39 | \$42.56 | \$31.11 | (\$22.10) | \$51.57 | \$2.15 | \$53.72 | \$0.32 | s0.00 | \$0.01 | \$0.33 | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.6\% | 15.4 |
| 400 | \$53.14 | \$41.48 | (528.39) | \$66.23 | \$2.76 | \$68.99 | \$53.76 | \$41.48 | (\$28.57) | \$66.67 | \$2.78 | \$69.45 | \$0.44 | \$0.00 | \$0.02 | 50.46 | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.7\% | 12.5\% |
| 500 | S64.19 | \$51.85 | (\$34.81) | \$81.23 | \$3.38 | \$84.61 | \$64.97 | \$51.85 | (\$35.05) | \$81.77 | \$3.41 | 585.18 | \$0.54 | \$0.00 | \$0.03 | \$0.57 | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.7\% | 9.68 |
| 600 | \$75.24 | \$62.22 | (S41.24) | \$96.22 | 54.01 | \$100.23 | \$76.17 | \$62.22 | (541.52) | \$96.87 | \$4.04 | \$100.91 | \$0.65 | \$0.00 | \$0.03 | \$0.68 | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.7\% | 7.2\% |
| 700 | 586.28 | 572.59 | (547.66) | \$111.21 | \$4.63 | \$115.84 | 587.37 | \$72.59 | (547.99) | \$111.97 | \$4.67 | \$116.64 | S0.76 | s0.00 | 50.04 | S0.80 | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.7\% | 16.4 |
| 1,200 | \$141.51 | \$124.44 | (\$79.79) | \$186.16 | 57.76 | \$193.92 | \$143.37 | \$124.44 | (\$80.34) | \$187.47 | \$7.81 | \$195.28 | \$1.31 | 50.00 | 50.05 | \$1.36 | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.7\% | 5.2\% |
| 2.000 | \$229.88 | \$207.40 | (\$131.18) | \$306.10 | \$12.75 | \$318.85 | \$232.98 | \$207.40 | (\$132.11) | \$308.27 | \$12.84 | \$321.11 | \$2.17 | \$0.00 | \$0.09 | \$2.26 | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.7\% | 1.6\% |

[^2]The Narragansett Electric Company
Calculation of Monthly Typical Bill Total Bill Impact of Illustrative
Rates Applicable to C - 6 R Rate Custome

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Monthly } \\ \mathrm{kWh} \\ \text { (a) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Rates Effective October 1, 2020 |  |  |  | Illustrative Rates |  |  |  | \$ Increase (Decrease) |  |  |  | Increase (Decrease) \% of Total Bill |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Percentage } \\ \text { of Customers } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delivery Services (b) | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Supply } \\ \text { Services } \\ \text { (c) } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { GET } \\ \text { (d) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { (e) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Delivery Services (b) | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Supply } \\ \text { Services } \\ \text { (c) } \end{array} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { GET } \\ \text { (d) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { (e) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Delivery Services (f) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Supply } \\ & \text { Services } \end{aligned}$ $(\mathrm{g})$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { GET } \\ \text { (h) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { (i) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Delivery Services (j) | Supply Services (k) | $\begin{gathered} \text { GET } \\ \text { (I) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total |  |
| 250 | \$41.13 | \$23.34 | \$2.69 | \$67.16 | \$41.49 | \$23.34 | \$2.70 | $\$ 67.53$ | \$0.36 | \$0.00 | \$0.01 | \$0.37 | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.6\% | 56.3\% |
| 500 | \$68.11 | \$46.67 | \$4.78 | \$119.56 | \$68.82 | \$46.67 | \$4.81 | \$120.30 | \$0.71 | \$0.00 | \$0.03 | \$0.74 | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.6\% | 16.9\% |
| 1,000 | \$122.06 | \$93.34 | \$8.98 | \$224.38 | \$123.49 | \$93.34 | \$9.03 | \$225.86 | \$1.43 | \$0.00 | \$0.05 | \$1.48 | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.7\% | 8.1\% |
| 1,500 | \$176.02 | \$140.01 | \$13.17 | \$329.20 | \$178.16 | \$140.01 | \$13.26 | \$331.43 | \$2.14 | \$0.00 | \$0.09 | \$2.23 | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.7\% | 5.0\% |
| 2,000 | \$229.97 | \$186.68 | \$17.36 | \$434.01 | \$232.83 | \$186.68 | \$17.48 | \$436.99 | \$2.86 | \$0.00 | \$0.12 | \$2.98 | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.7\% | 13.6\% | Line Item on Bill


| Line Item on Bill |
| :--- |
| Customer Charge |
| LIHEAP Enhanceement Charge |
| RE Growth Program |


| Illustrative Rates |
| :---: |
| $(\mathrm{p})$ |
| $\$ 10.00$ |
| $\$ 0.80$ |
| $\$ 3.35$ |
| $\$ 0.04482$ |
| $\$ 0.00202$ |
| 0.00002 |
| $\$ 0.00482$ |
| $\$ 0.00085$ |
| $\$ 0.00118$ |

$(\$ 0.00073)$
$\$ 0.00288$
$\$ 0.002015$
$\$ 0.000005$
$\$ 0.00005$
$\$ 0.00176$
$\$ 0.00176$
$\$ 0.00931$
$\$ 0.0266$
$\$ 0.03110$
Renewable Energy Distribution Charge

(25) SOS Adminstrative Cost Adjustment Factor
(26) Renewable Energy Standard Charge
Line Item on Bill
Customer Charge
27) Customer Charge
$\underset{\substack{\text { som } \\ \text { sem }}}{ }$

| $\$ 10.00$ |
| :---: |
| $\$ 0.80$ |
| $\$ 3.35$ |
| $\$ 0.02674$ |
| $\$ 0.05792$ |
| $(\$ 0.00082)$ |
| $\$ 0.01353$ |
| $\$ 0.01197$ |
| $\$ 0.09334$ |

©
Column (o): per Summary of Retail Delivery Service Rates, R.LP.U.C. No. 2095 effective $1011 / 2020$, and Summary of Rates Standard Offer Service tariff, R.I.P.U.C. No. 2096, effective $10 / 1 / 2020$
Column (p): Line (5) per Attachment PuC 1-1A, Page 1, Line (1), Column (b). Line (7) per Attachment PuC 1-1A, Page 1 , Line (3), Column (b). All other rates per Summary of Retail Delivery Service Rates, R.IP.U.C. No. 2095 effective $10 / 1 / 2020$, and Summary of Rates
Standard Offer Service tariff, R.IP.U.C. No. 2096, effective 10/1/2020



|  |  |  |  |  |  <br>  <br>  <br>  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 年 |  |  |  |  |  <br> 웅웅응웅응응웅융웅 |
| 主 |  |  |  |  |  |



## PUC 1-2

## Request:

Please provide a schedule itemizing all the COVID-related costs expected to be incurred in FY2022, comprising the $\$ 2$ million budget referenced in Section 2 of the capital plan, including a reasonable description of the work giving rise to the cost incurrence. Of the $\$ 2$ million, please provide an estimate of the revenue requirement impact during FY2022, if any.

## Response:

The Company has completed its detailed COVID peak load scenario analysis on all 195 feeders identified during the screening review. All scope being progressed will address either voltage or overload issues created by or exacerbated by COVID load shifts. Many small-scale solutions such as fuse replacements, feeder balancing, and upgrading equipment (load break switches, step down transformers, etc.) to a larger size have been progressed to construction already and the spend has/will occur in FY2021.

COVID related work planned to occur in FY2022 is included in the two tables below. The first table shows the largest scope and highest cost recommendation projects, the 72F3 and 72F5. The Company plans to review these two highest cost recommendations with the Division in a meeting on February 12th prior to progressing them to design and construction. Since the scope is more significant for these feeders, more detailed estimates have been performed. The second table shows smaller scope projects. These smaller scale projects have only been estimated at a high level (totex only). More refined estimates will be developed during detailed design.

| Station | Feeder Id | Scope | Capex | Opex | Removal | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lincoln Avenue | $72 F 5$ | Recoductor $\sim 3200$ feet of $1 / 0$ <br> and 4/0 AL to 477 AL | $\$ 364,000.00$ | $\$ 24,000.00$ | $\$ 111,000.00$ | $\$ 499,000.00$ |
| Lincoln Avenue | $72 \mathrm{F3}$ | Reconductor ~2050 feet of 1/0 <br> CU, 2/0CU \& 4/0ALto 477 AL | $\$ 203,000.00$ | $\$ 14,000.00$ | $\$ 62,000.00$ | $\$ 279,000.00$ |
| Total |  |  | $\$ 567,000.00$ | $\$ 38,000.00$ | $\$ 173,000.00$ | $\$ 778,000.00$ |

Prepared by or under the supervision of: Caitlin Broderick and Melissa Little
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| Station | Feeder Id | Scope | Estimated cost (totex) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eldred | 45J3 | 1,600 foot phase extension, 300 foot phase extension, load balancing, \& upgrade 3 sets of fuses, | 150,000.00 |
| Peacedale | 59F3 | 1600 circuit feet of recondutoring to 477 | 166,000.00 |
| Phillipsdale | 20F2 | Reconductor 1290 feet to Al-477 Bare | 168,000.00 |
| Wompanaug | 48F1 | Reconductor 1000 feet to Al-477 Bare | 125,000.00 |
| Geneva | 71 J | 1300 feet of recondutoring to Al-477 Bare | 74,000.00 |
| Sprague Street | 36 J 5 | 600 feet of reconductoring Al-477 Bare | 43,000.00 |
| Westerly | 16F1 | 3 regulator replacements | 76,000.00 |
| Kenyon | 68F2 | Transformer/fuse replacements | 57,000.00 |
| Clarkson St | 13F5 | Replace 3 fuses and one airbreak switch | 27,239.38 |
| Coventry | $54 F 1$ | Replace 3 fuses, load balancing, place capacitor back in service | 28,195.73 |
| Small scale work* | various | fuse replacements, load balancing, equipment replacement, small scale reconductoring or phase extensions | 130,000.00 |
| TOTAL small scale |  |  | \$ 1,044,435.11 |
| TOTAL 72F3 \& 72F5 |  |  | \$ 778,000.00 |
| Overall TOTAL |  |  | \$ 1,822,435.11 |

*Small scale recommendations include work on approximately eight feeders. This work has not been estimated at a detailed level since the work is limited. Work in this category includes fuse replacements, load balancing, small scale reconductoring or phase extensions or step down transformer upgrades.

The revenue requirement calculation on any vintage year's ISR capital investment is calculated on the incremental ISR-related rate base, which is incremental to the level of ISR rate base assumed in the Company's last distribution rate case. The level of ISR rate base assumed in current distribution rates was based on a forecast of capital placed into service, set at a level equal to the approved FY 2018 ISR Plan capital in-service as a proxy. Then using that proxy level of plant in service, the Company established the rate years' forecasted levels of plant retirements, cost of removal and NOL/NOL utilization in totality. As the forecasted rate base included in distribution rates was not determined on a per project basis, determining the level of incremental ISR rate base on a per-project basis is nearly impossible. For that reason, the Company is employing a more simplistic approach, using a ratio of the total incremental FY 2022 revenue requirement associated with incremental FY2022 ISR capital investment placed

Prepared by or under the supervision of: Caitlin Broderick and Melissa Little
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into service ( $\$ 6.2$ million) over the total budgeted FY2022 capital investment placed into service amount of $\$ 114$ million, to arrive at the FY2022 revenue requirement impact on a per-project basis, as shown in Column (d) in the chart below.

The FY2022 revenue requirement of $\$ 6.2$ million includes $\$ 3.6$ million in depreciation expense, return on investment and associated income taxes on the incremental FY 2022 ISR rate base plus $\$ 2.6$ million in incremental property tax expense associated with the projected FY 2022 ISR plant in service. Please refer to the calculation of the revenue requirement ratio of $5.44 \%$ in the chart below on lines 2-6.

|  | Project Description | FY22 Plan Spend | Target Placed InService FY22 Including COR | FY22 Revenue Requirement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (b) | (c) | (d) = Line $6 \times$ (c) |
| 1 | Covid Scenario Analysis Work RI | \$2,000,000 | \$1,409,364 | \$76,669 |

2 FY22 Depreciation, Return and Taxes associated with FY22 investment
3 FY22 Property tax associated with FY22 investment \$2,566,000

4 Total FY22 revenue requirement associated with FY22 investment \$6,210,310

5 Total FY22 Capital Placed into Service plus Cost of \$114,112,000 Removal

6 Ratio of Revenue Requirement to Capital Placed into Service plus Cost of Removal

## Line notes:

2 Section 5 Attachment 1, Page 18, Line 33, Col (a)
3 Section 5 Attachment 1, Page 27, Line 52, Col (k)
4 Line 2 + Line 3
5 Section 2, Chart 18
6 Line $4 \div$ Line 5

## PUC 1-3

## Request:

Referring to the Capital Spending Key Driver table on Bates page 94, please provide an explanation and evidentiary support for the FY 2022 budget forecast of an increase of approximately $\$ 1$ million over FY 2021 in "New Business - Commercial" and over $\$ 2$ million in "New Business - Residential." In providing the response, please also address why there would be expected increases of this magnitude given the economic impacts caused by the pandemic.

## Response:

The specific work performed in the new business category is generally not known more than a year ahead, so the budget is proposed based on actual historical costs, adjusting for any known trends or one-time items.

## New Business-Commercial

The Total FY2022 New Business Commercial (NBC) budget of $\$ 9.066$ million is made up of 3 components:

1) Blanket Project ( $\$ 5.931$ million) for small scope work
2) Reserve for NBC Projects that emerge in FY2022 (\$2.850 million)
3) Project(s) forecasted to carry over into FY2022 (\$0.285 million)

The charts below show the analysis that led to the FY2022 budget estimate for these items. The data used includes New Business Commercial Moving Annual Totals (MAT) from the end of FY20216 through July 2020 (ISR Pre-filing draft submitted to the Division in August 2020). Since developing the budget estimate in FY 2022 in August, the Company noted that the volume of requests for new or upgraded Commercial New Business for the first nine months of the FY 2021 has decreased by 191 ( 863 vs. 672) from the same period last year. However, due to a great deal of uncertainty about these trends as well as the potentially significant variability in the cost per Commercial requests, the Company used the same method for estimating the upcoming fiscal year budget using the 12 -month MAT spending trends, consistent with our practices in prior years. The figures exclude Major Projects as those would be included in the upcoming fiscal year forecast and would not require a reserve. A chart, along with corresponding data is provided below as well an estimate for inflationary cost increases used in our budget estimating process.

In Re: Gas Infrastructure, Safety, and Reliability Plan FY2022
Responses to the Commission’s First Set of Data Requests
Issued on January 13, 2021
$\qquad$
PUC 1-3, page 2
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| Budget Class | Values | Blanket | Non-Major Specific | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Business - Commercial | MAT-201603 | 3,749,326 | 2,182,184 | 5,931,510 |
|  | MAT-201606 | 3,777,201 | 2,446,575 | 6,223,776 |
|  | MAT-201609 | 3,898,062 | 2,093,411 | 5,991,473 |
|  | MAT-201612 | 3,445,414 | 2,151,082 | 5,596,496 |
|  | MAT-201703 | 3,422,187 | 1,717,764 | 5,139,952 |
|  | MAT-201706 | 3,489,511 | 1,517,243 | 5,006,754 |
|  | MAT-201709 | 3,555,311 | 1,115,328 | 4,670,638 |
|  | MAT-201712 | 4,226,856 | 790,118 | 5,016,974 |
|  | MAT-201803 | 3,504,856 | 887,552 | 4,392,408 |
|  | MAT-201806 | 2,934,971 | 964,663 | 3,899,634 |
|  | MAT-201809 | 3,483,143 | 1,880,700 | 5,363,842 |
|  | MAT-201812 | 3,241,900 | 2,139,014 | 5,380,914 |
|  | MAT-201903 | 4,630,356 | 2,516,618 | 7,146,974 |
|  | MAT-201904 | 5,318,956 | 2,485,282 | 7,804,238 |
|  | MAT-201906 | 5,648,111 | 2,958,449 | 8,606,560 |
|  | MAT-201909 | 5,319,803 | 2,505,468 | 7,825,270 |
|  | MAT-201912 | 5,682,044 | 3,117,569 | 8,799,613 |
|  | MAT-202003 | 5,684,599 | 2,897,850 | 8,582,449 |
|  | MAT-202006 | 5,717,447 | 2,491,245 | 8,208,692 |
|  | MAT-202007 | 5,771,471 | 2,375,697 | 8,147,168 |
|  | MAT as July | 5,771,471 | 2,375,697 |  |
|  | Estimate used for FY 2022 | 5,725,000 | 2,750,000 |  |
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FROM DATA - FY2022 Estimates Used

| Blanket Uninflated FY2022 Estimate | $5,725,000$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment for Inflation (1.5\%), <br> Economic Increase (1\%), Materials <br> (2\%) etc. | 206,000 | $3.6 \%$ |
| Reserve Uninflated FY2022 Estimate <br> Adjustment for Inflation (1.5\%), | $2,750,000$ |  |
| Economic Increase (1\%), Materials <br> (2\%) etc. | 100,000 | $3.6 \%$ |

## New Business-Residential

The Total FY2022 New Business Residential (NBR) budget is made up of 3 components:

1) Blanket Project ( $\$ 3.720$ million), which represents $\$ 6.220$ million costs less $\$ 2.50$ million estimated Joint Owned Pole Billing credits)
2) Reserve for NBC Projects that emerge in FY2022 (\$0.300 million)
3) Project(s) forecasted to carry over into FY2022 (none)

The charts below show the analysis that led to the FY2022 budget estimate for these items. The data used includes New Business Residential Moving Annual Totals-MAT (excluding the JO Billing work order under this project) from the end of FY20216 through July 2020 (ISR Prefiling draft submitted to the Division in August 2020). Since developing the July estimate the Company noted the number of requests for new or upgraded Residential New Business service for the first nine months of FY2021 has only slightly decreased by $88(2,828$ vs. 2,740) from the same time period last year. However, due to the uncertainty about these trends the Company utilized the same method for estimating the upcoming fiscal year budget using the 12-month MAT spending trends, as consistent with our practices in prior years.

Prepared by or under the supervision of: Patricia C. Easterly
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The figures exclude Major Projects as those would be included in the upcoming fiscal year forecast and would not require a reserve. The estimated Joint Owned Pole Billing is based on FY2022 expected billings based on current agreements. A chart, along with the corresponding data, is provided below as well as an estimate for inflationary cost increases used in our budget estimating processes.

The YTD and forecasted spending in FY 2021 as of December 31, 2020, for new business residential work is $\$ 1$ million and $\$ 2.4$ million respectively. However, the New Business Residential Blanket project is where the billing for joint-owned pole installations under the Verizon Joint Owned-Pole agreement is reflected. The billing under this agreement during FY 2021 was $\$ 4.1$ million and included billing for activity for both FY 2020 and FY 2021 jointowned pole installations as the Company finalized processes with Verizon for such billing and $\$ 1.7$ million relates to FY 2020. The FY 2021 forecast excluding the one-time FY 2020 jointowed pole billing is $\$ 4.2$ million.


## PUC 1-3, page 6



FROM DATA - FY2022 Estimates Used

| Blanket Uninflated FY2022 Estimate | $6,070,000$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Adjustment for Inflation (1.5\%), Economic <br> Increase (1\%), Materials (2\%) etc. | 200,000 | $3.3 \%$ |
| JO POLE BILLING CREDIT ESTIMATE | $(2,550,000)$ |  |
|  | $\mathbf{3 , 7 2 0 , 0 0 0}$ |  |


| Reserve Uninflated FY2022 Estimate | 290,000 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Adjustment for Inflation (1.5\%), Economic <br> Increase (1\%), Materials (2\%) etc. | 10,000 | $3.4 \%$ |
|  | $\mathbf{3 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ |  |

Prepared by or under the supervision of: Patricia C. Easterly

## PUC 1-4

## Request:

Referring to the Capital Spending Key Driver table on Bates page 94, please provide an explanation and evidentiary support for the FY 2022 budget forecast of an increase of approximately $\$ 9$ million over FY 2021in Asset Replacement. Please identify all the Asset Replacement projects that make up the entire $\$ 35.4$ million in asset replacements, with an explanation why each of the projects are proposed for replacements in FY 2022. Please list the projects in order of priority.

Response:
The Asset Replacement category on Bates page 94 shows an increase of approximately $\$ 9$ million when comparing the FY 2022 Budget to the FY 2021 Forecast primarily due to the timing of large project spending. In FY 2022, we are proposing $\$ 9.7$ million for the Dyer Street project and $\$ 8.4$ million for the projects associated with the Admiral Street substation project. There is also a smaller increase in the Underground Cable program of $\$ 1.2$ million, which is more than offset by reductions in other projects and programs. In addition, when considering the Asset Condition category overall, the Southeast Substation project, which is reported separately, is expected to be nearly complete in FY 2021 and, therefore, we expect to spend approximately $\$ 10.7$ million less in FY 2022. Total Asset Condition spending, including the Southeast Substation and I\&M, is expected to be $\$ 1.6$ million less than the FY 2021 Forecast.

Please see Attachment PUC 1-4-1 for a list of projects that make up the entire $\$ 35.4$ million in asset replacements. For each project listed Attachment PUC 1-4-1 includes the project budget, a summary, and explanations as to why the project is proposed for FY2022, and a priority rank. Please see Attachment PUC 1-4-2 for specific project details for the large Asset Condition projects.

In regard to the priority rankings, the Company respectfully submits that all of the Asset Replacement projects proposed in the FY 2022 ISR plan fall within the same top priority tier and that the Company's decision to include the projects and associated budgets within the plan is an integral component of the Company's statutory responsibility to propose an investment and spending plan for review by the Commission that is reasonably needed to maintain safe and reliable distribution service over the short and long term.

The Narragansett Electric Company

| Priority | Project | Reason for Proposal | FY21 Forecast $\$ \mathbf{S O 0 0 s}$ | FY 2022 <br> Budget <br> \$'000s | $\begin{gathered} \hline \frac{\text { Increase } / 2}{\text { (Decrease) }} \\ \$ \text { \$'000s } \\ \hline \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Dyer Street Substation | Nearly 100 year old substation with significant asset condition and safety issues. | \$2,860 | \$9,717 | \$6,857 |
| 2 | Providence Study (Admiral Street Substation) | Projects resulting from the Providence area study. Addresses significant asset condition issues including indoor substations and underground cable assets. Projects are necessary to maintain reliability for the Providence area and have been carefully planned and synchronized because of the complexity of the Providence area solution and the many years to fully implement the solution. | 4,336 | 8,353 | \$4,018 |
| 3 | Battery / Charger Program | Annual program to ensure reliable operation of important assets within Company substations. | 195 | 150 | (\$45) |
| 4 | UG Cable Replacement Program | This is an annual program to address chronic asset condition issues on underground cable systems with problematic cable types. | 3,774 | 5,000 | \$1,226 |
| 5 | IRURD Projects | This is an annual program to address chronic asset condition issues on Underground Residential Development (URD) systems with problematic cable types in developments where outages have occurred so outages are avoided in the future. | 4,852 | 4,700 | (\$152) |
| 6 | Breaker Replacement projects (Franklin Sq, Kent, Pawtucket) | Circuit Breaker Replacement program replaces problematic breaker families that are either obsolete, unsafe or have caused outages in accordance with the breaker replacement program. | 1,685 | 1,829 | \$144 |
| 7 | Other smaller projects | This includes vault vent blower replacements, GE type U bushing replacements and Drumrock 1412.47 kV breaker replacements. The vault vent blowers were identified as an additional action item to help mitigate cable deterioration in vaults as part of the Underground Cable repalcement program mentioned above. There are industry known issues with the GE type $U$ bushings so the Company is replacing these proactively to prevent outages due to premature failure. The Drumrock breaker replacement project addresses asset condition issues associated with multiple 12.47 kV breakers. | 969 | 1,233 | \$264 |
| 8 | Franklin Square 1105 and 1109 lines | This substation work includes rearranging the 1105 and 1109 feeders which is required to move the feeders from Dyer Street to Franklin Square. The project is needed due to the Dyer St elimination project. | 2,035 | 529 | $(\$ 1,506)$ |
| 9 | Asset Replacement Blanket | This is small scale asset condition work to replace damaged assets that are expected to create a failure or safety issue. | 4,400 | 3,592 | (\$808) |
|  | South Street Substation | These costs relate to estimated final payments to contractors for work already done on this in-service project. | 224 | 297 | \$73 |
|  | Hope Substation Pole Replacement and Flood Restoration |  | 368 | 0 | (\$368) |
|  | Distribution Secondary Network Arc |  | 716 |  | (\$716) |
|  | Asset Replacement - subtotal |  | 26,416 | 35,401 | 8,986 |
|  | Inspection \& Maintenance Program | This is an annual program whereby distribution line assets undergo a five-yar inspection cycle to replace deteriorated assets to ensure that the distribution and sub-transmission system is safe, reliable, and environmentally sound. | 2,900 | 3,000 | \$100 |
|  | Southeast Substation |  | 12,794 | 2,082 | $(\$ 10,712)$ |
| Asset Condition - total |  |  | \$42,110 | \$40,483 | $(\$ 1,627)$ |

## Large Asset Condition projects

The following Asset Condition Project Summary includes the major projects proposed in the Asset Condition spending rationale. At the bottom of each project summary, a statement is included regarding the project’s alignment with the developing Long Range Plan.

## Projects in Progress

Southeast Sub (New Southeast Substation and Pawtucket No. 1 Indoor Substation)

| Distribution Related <br> Project Number(s): | C053657 Southeast Sub (D-Sub) <br> C053658 Southeast Sub (D-Line) <br> C055683 Pawtucket No 1 (D-Sub) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Substation(s) / <br> Feeder(s) Impacted: | Southeast 60W1, 60W2, 60W3, 60W4, 60W5, 60W6, 60W7 <br> Pawtucket No. 1 107W1, 107W2, 107W3, 107W43, 107W49, 107W50, 107W51, <br> $107 \mathrm{~W} 53,107 \mathrm{~W} 60,107 \mathrm{~W} 61,107 \mathrm{~W} 65,107 \mathrm{~W} 66,107 \mathrm{~W} 81,107 \mathrm{~W} 84$ <br> Pawtucket No. 2 148J1, 148J3, 148J5, 148J7 <br> Valley St 102W51, 102W52 |
| Voltage(s): | 13.8 kV and 4.16 kV <br> Geographic Area <br> Served: |
| Summary of Issues: | Pawtucket and Central Falls <br> an outdoor switchyard. It has nineteen 13.8 kV distribution circuits that supply <br> 36,000 customers with 114 MW of load. Three feeders supply a network in <br> downtown Pawtucket with approximately 3MW of load. |
| The brick building was part of a former power plant that was decommissioned in 1975 <br> and is less than 25\% utilized. This building houses indoor distribution switchgear and <br> other electrical equipment. The electrical equipment still in service within the building <br> is associated with both the indoor switchgear and the outdoor yard. Some electrical <br> equipment associated with the former power plant has been abandoned in place. |  |


| Recommended Plan | Construct a new eight feeder $115 / 13.8 \mathrm{kV}$ metal clad station with two transformers and breaker and a half design on a site adjacent to the transmission right of way on York Avenue in the City of Pawtucket. Supply proposed station from the existing 115 kV lines crossing the site, $\mathrm{X}-3$ and $\mathrm{T}-7$. Rearrange the 13.8 kV distribution system so that the new station supplies most of the load east of the Seekonk River. <br> Construct a new control house at the Pawtucket No 1 substation site to house the control equipment for the 115 kV station presently located in the indoor substation building. Remove the switchgear in the indoor building and remove all the previously abandoned equipment. Demolish the indoor substation building after all electrical equipment has been removed. <br> At Pawtucket No 1, install 3-phase metering on all feeders supplied from sections 73 and 74 located in the exterior yard which are remaining. Metered quantities shall include amps, volts, MVA and MVAR on all feeders. <br> Total Cost = \$38 million (includes all costs with transmission, distribution, operations \& maintenance, and removal) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Current Status and Expected In-Service Date | Current Status: <br> - Southeast Sub - Step 4.4b - Construction <br> - Pawtucket No 1 - Step 4.4a - Detail Design <br> Expected In-Service - See Detailed Budget for System Capacity \& Performance and Asset Condition Projects. |
| Alternatives: | Alternative 1: New Metal Clad 115/13.8 kV Station at the Pawtucket No 1 <br> This alternative proposes development of a new $115 / 13.8 \mathrm{kV}$ metal clad substation, breaker and a half design, in the Pawtucket No. 1 yard. The station will be constructed with two $115 / 13.8 \mathrm{kV} \mathrm{33/44/55}$ MVA LTC transformers, eight distribution circuits and two station capacitor banks. After installation of the new switchgear, load at Pawtucket No 1 will be rearranged to allow for the elimination of the 71 bus. <br> There are presently eight circuits on section 71, including three network feeders. The three network circuits are currently dedicated feeders with approximately 3.0 MVA of peak load. It is proposed to supply these network circuits from section 73. The remaining circuits will be resupplied from the new station. Three circuits in section 73 will be resupplied from the new station to free up feeders for the three network circuits. This work will reduce loading on section 73 below the rating of the 2,000 amp bus. <br> The distribution from Pawtucket No 1 is all underground. Therefore, new manhole and ductline infrastructure will be built from the new station out to city streets and intercept the existing underground system when practical. New underground feeder getaways will be installed from the new station and will intercept the existing cables or be routed directly to the riser poles. <br> The existing manhole and ductline infrastructure predominantly consists of 3-inch conduits installed on city streets. Although the age of this infrastructure is unknown, based on the age of the indoor substation it would be reasonable to assume that the majority of this infrastructure dates back to the early 1900's. The diameter on the 3inch infrastructure is not suitable to house the proposed solid dielectric cables required for the new feeders. New 5 inch diameter infrastructure is required for the new cable. This plan would install a new manhole and duct system to bypass the inadequate 3inch infrastructure. |


|  | Total Conceptual Cost = \$31 million (includes all costs with transmission, distribution, <br> operations \& maintenance, and removal). This alternative was estimated to be 33.0\% <br> more expensive than the recommended plan at the conceptual engineering phase. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Long Range Plan <br> Alignment | Pawtucket Area Study, dated December 2014. <br> This project is also aligned with National Grid’s Strategy for Indoor Substation <br> Rebuild and Refurbishment |

## Providence Study Phase 1 - Admiral Street Substation

| Distribution Related Project Number(s): | C077365 - Clarkson St 13F10 - Hawkins St (D-Line) <br> C077368 - Olneyville 6J5 Feeder Retirement (D-Line) <br> C078734 - Admiral St 4 kV \& 11 kV Retirement (D-Line) <br> C078796 - Admiral St 11 kV Rochambeau Supply (D-Line) <br> C078800 - Clarkson St \& Lippitt Hill 12 kV Rebuilds (D-Line) <br> C078802 - Olneyville 6J1, 6J3, 6J6, 6J7 Feeder Retirement (D-Line) <br> C078811 - Geneva, Olneyville, Rochambeau 4 kV Retirement (D-Line) <br> C078857 - Harris Ave 4 kV \& 11 kV Retirement (D-Line) <br> C078805 - Knightsville 4 kV Retirement (D-Line) <br> C078810 - Harris Ave 1129 and 1137 Retirement (D-Line) <br> C079317 - Harris Ave and Olneyville Supple Line Removal (D-Line) <br> C079318 - Rochambeau Supply Line Removal (D-Line)C078803 - Admiral St 12 <br> kV MH \& Duct (D-Line) <br> C078804 - Admiral St 12 kV Cables (D-Line) <br> C078797 - Admiral St Rochambeau Supply (D-Sub) <br> C078735 - Admiral St 115/12.47 kV (D-Sub) <br> C078806 - Knightsville 23/12 kV (D-Sub) <br> C078801 - Admiral St Building Demolition (D-Sub) <br> C078847 - Geneva 4 kV Removal (D-Sub) <br> C078849 - Harris Ave 4 kV \& 11 kV Removal (D-Sub) <br> C078850 - Olneyville 4 kV Removal (D-Sub) <br> C078851 - Rochambeau 4 kV Removal (D-Sub) <br> C078951 - Admiral St Switches and Taps (T-Sub) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Substation(s) / Feeder(s) Impacted: | Admiral Street 9J1, 9J2, 9J3, 9J5, 1115, 1117, 1119 <br> Clarkson Street 13F1, 13F2, 13F3, 13F5, 13F6, 13F7, 13F8, 13F9, 13F10 <br> Lippit Hill 79F1, 79F2 <br> Point Street 76F3, 76F4, 76F5 <br> Dyer Street 2J3 <br> Geneva 71J1, 71J2, 71J3, 71J4, 71J5 <br> Olneyville 6J1, 6J2, 6J3, 6J5, 6J6, 6J7, 6J8 <br> Knightsville 66J1, 66J2, 66J3, 66J4, 66J5 <br> Harris Avenue 12J1, 12J2, 12J3, 12J4, 12J5, 12J6, 1129, 1131, 1133, 1137, 1145, 1147 <br> Rochambeau Avenue 37J1, 37J2, 37J3, 37J4, 37J5 <br> Johnston 18F5, 18F7, 18F9 |
| Voltage(s): | 12.47 kV , $11.5 \mathrm{kV}, 4.16 \mathrm{kV}$ |
| Geographic Area Served: | City of Providence |
| Summary of Issues: | Providence is an urban area with a relatively concentrated load. The electrical distribution facilities consist of a mix of older 11 kV and 4.16 kV distribution systems and a newer 12.47 kV distribution system. The distribution circuits are primarily underground in the downtown business district whereas they are overhead in the surrounding residential areas. Much of the underground infrastructure dates back to the period when the system was originally installed in the 1920's. <br> The study identified the main issue to be asset condition. Six of the older stations supplying the area are indoor stations installed between 1924 and 1939 and have a number of asset related concerns. The health and condition of all indoor stations were assessed, and each station assigned a priority score. In addition to the station issues, over 25 miles of underground supply and distribution circuits were identified in the Company's cable replacement program. |


|  | Although asset condition was the main driver, the study also identified some loading, contingency loading, and breaker duty issues. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Recommended Plan | The Providence Study assessed various options to resolve issues identified within the study area and compared the economics of several supply and distribution alternatives. The preferred option recommended the expansion of the 12.47 kV distribution system, conversion of the majority of 11.5 kV and 4.16 kV load to 12.47 kV and elimination of several 4.16 kV and 11.5 kV indoor and outdoor stations. The majority of the new 12.47 kV capacity in the recommended plan would be provided by new $115 / 12.47 \mathrm{kV}$ stations at Admiral Street, Auburn and South Street. <br> The first phase of alternate analysis was considered in Part A of the Providence Long Term Study. The alternative plans considered in Part A include the items below compared against one for one asset replacement. The purpose of Part B of the Providence Area Study was to create a sequencing of the items recommended in Part A.: <br> - Install a new 23/11 kV transformer at Admiral Street substation to supply Rochambeau Avenue substation. <br> - Convert Admiral Street 11.5 kV and 4.16 kV feeders to 12.47 kV and retire stations. <br> - Demolish the Admiral Street indoor substation and prepare site for new 115/12.47 kV substation. <br> - Build new Admiral Street $115 / 12.47 \mathrm{kV}$ metal clad substation with four feeders. <br> - Convert the Olneyville 4.16 kV feeders to 12.47 kV and retire the substation. <br> - Install a modular 23/12.47 kV feeder position at Knightsville and convert Knightsville 4.16 kV feeders to 12.47 kV . <br> - Convert Harris Avenue 11.5 kV and 4.16 kV feeders to 12.47 kV and retire substation. <br> - Convert Geneva 4.16 kV feeders to 12.47 kV and retire the substation. <br> - Convert Rochambeau Avenue 4.16 kV feeders to 12.47 kV and retire substation. <br> - Convert Sprague Street and Huntington Park 4.16 kV feeders to 12.47 kV and retire both substations. <br> Total cost is $\$ 88$ million (includes all costs with transmission, distribution, operations \& maintenance, and removal values for alternative comparison purposes) |
| Current Status and Expected In-Service Date | Current Status - <br> Phase 1A - Step 4.4a Detail Design <br> Phase 1B, 2, 3 and 4 - Step 4.3 Develop \& Sanction <br> Expected In-Service - See Detailed Budget for System Capacity \& Performance and Asset Condition Projects. |
| Alternatives: | The alternative analysis for the Admiral Street plan was completed within the Part A study. Part A considered direct one for one replacement of the significant asset issues including complex indoor substation rebuilds and over 25 miles of subtransmission and distribution cable replacement with an estimated cost over \$100 million. |
| Long Range Plan Alignment | Providence Area Study Implementation Plan 2016 - 2030 (May 2017). |

Dyer Street Indoor Substation Replacement

| Distribution Related Project Number(s): | C051205 Dyer St replace indoor subst D-SUB C051211 Dyer St replace indoor subst D-LINE |
| :---: | :---: |
| Substation(s) / Feeder(s) Impacted: | Dyer St 2J1, 2J2, 2J3, 2J4,2J5, 2J7, 2J8, 2J9, 2J10, 1102, 1103, 1104, 1106, 1105 NW, 1109 NW <br> Franklin Square 1120, 1142, 1144, 1149 |
| Voltage(s): | 11.5 kV , 4.16 kV |
| Geographic Area Served: | City of Providence |
| Summary of Issues: | Providence is an urban area with a relatively concentrated load. The electrical distribution facilities consist of a mix of older 11 kV and 4.16 kV distribution systems and a newer 12.47 kV distribution system. The distribution circuits are primarily underground in the downtown business district and the East Side. Much of the underground infrastructure dates back to the period when the system was originally installed in the 1920's. <br> An Asset Condition Study of Dyer St Substation was conducted by Network Asset Planning in 2011, After a review of test records and operating history the study concluded that operation and maintenance of the existing station equipment presented challenges. The main equipment families in this station (breakers, reactors, regulators, switches, relay schemes) are deficient in the areas of performance/maintenance costs when compared to contemporary substation equipment. This station also has design aspects that make it a challenging environment to perform operations and maintenance in. The study identified the main issue to be asset condition. <br> Dyer St is one of six older stations supplying the downtown area reviewed in the Providence Long Term Study (2015). That study recommended the replacement of the 4.16 kV and 11 kV indoor substation. The sequence of planned worked, namely the completion of South St, allows the company to execute the most cost effective plan to eliminate the circa 1925 indoor substation. |
| Recommended Plan | The preferred option recommends building a new $11.5 \mathrm{kV}-4.16 \mathrm{kV}$ substation within the South St Station outdoor yard. Work at South St will include: <br> - Installing two $-11.5 \mathrm{kV}-4.16 \mathrm{KV}$ transformers, <br> - Installing one 4.16 kV metal clad walk-in switchgear <br> - Installing control panels and protective relay for all elements in the indoor substation's alternate control room. <br> - Building a new duct and manhole system within outdoor yard to accommodate two 11 kV supply lines and eight -4 kV distribution circuit <br> - Utilizing new and existing duct and manhole system to connect the new 4 kV distribution circuits to the former Dyer St 4 kV circuits. <br> Work at the Dyer St site will include: <br> - Rehabilitation of the historically significant DC / warehouse building as required by the City of Providence. <br> - Removing all retired 4 kV and 11 kV equipment and cable from the Dyer St indoor substation and yard. <br> - Demolition of the Dyer St Indoor Substation building |


| The estimated cost for this work is \$22 million <br> Current Status and Expected <br> In-Service Date <br> Alternatives: <br> Current Status - Step 4.3 - Develop \& Sanction <br> Expected In-Service - 4th quarter of FY 2024. <br> A new alternative analysis was undertaken as a result of substantial increases <br> in cost for the original plan as well as complexities involved in historical <br> building rehabilitation. The recently completed South St project resulted in <br> an opportunity for an additional alternative not previously possible <br> (recommended alternative above). The original plan is included below as the <br> alternative. <br> The alternative plan involves restoring the currently vacant DC / warehouse <br> building on the southwest corner of National Grid’s Dyer St site. Build a new <br> 11 kV to 4.16 kV indoor distribution substation within the restored DC <br> building. Retire the existing circa 1925 Dyer St Indoor Substation at the <br> southeast corner of the site. <br> Lemove all 11 kV and 4.16 kV equipment and underground distribution <br> cables associated with the old indoor substation. <br> The estimated cost of this alternative exceeded \$30 million. |
| :--- | :--- |

## PUC 1-5

## Request:

Referring to the Capital Spending Key Driver table on Bates page 94, labeled "Reliability," the budget for FY 2022 is $\$ 8.7$ million. The FY 2021 budget was $\$ 6.035$ million. The current forecast spend for FY 2021 is $\$ 3.565$.
a. Please provide the rationale for including a budget for FY 2022 that is in excess of the budgeted amount of FY 2021 when the Company does not expect to reach the budget level of spending in FY 2021.
b. Please explain why the budget is more than double most years’ actuals dating back to 2011.
c. Please identify all the projects that make up the entire $\$ 8.7$ million in expenditures, with an explanation why each of the projects are proposed for FY 2022. Please list the projects in order of priority.

## Response:

a. In reviewing the data for the response to this question, we noted that we had made a mistake in the classification of System Capacity and Performances projects between Reliability and Load Relief for the FY 2021 forecast and the FY 2022 Budget. Please see a revised summary of that portion of Attachment 1 - Capital Spending by Key Drive Category and Budget Classification table (Bates page 94) as shown below.

|  | FY 2021 | FY 2021 | FY 2022 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Budget | Forecast | Budget |
|  | \$'000's | \$'000's | \$'000's |
| System Capacity \& Performance |  |  |  |
| Load Relief | \$15,410 | \$10,912 | \$8,922 |
| Strategic DER Investments | 1,700 | 0 | 0 |
| Reliability | 6,035 | 7,696 | 9,450 |
| Reliability - Feeder Hardening | - | - | - |
| Total System Capacity \& Performance Spending | \$23,145 | \$18,608 | \$18,372 |

The Strategic DER Investments are all related to 3V0 and are classified as reliability and therefore should be combined with the reliability budget of $\$ 6.035$ when comparing to the FY 2021 forecast and FY 2022 budget. The Company forecasts to be close to budget at the end of FY 2021. As shown on Attachment PUC 1-5-1, the FY 2022 budget is $\$ 9.450$ million, an increase of $\$ 1.7$ million over the FY 2021 budget and the FY 2021 forecast. The primary drivers of this increase are related to the VVO/CVR program and the New Lafayette project.

Prepared by or under the supervision of: Patricia C. Easterly and Caitlin Broderick

## PUC 1-5, page 2

b. In the earlier years of the ISR plan, the primary programs in the Reliability category were a Feeder Hardening program, some specific project work and Cutout installation and replacement programs. While there are still cutout programs in Reliability in current years, the Feeder Hardening Program is no longer a component of the Reliability category and instead there are targeted program investments such as EMS devices, VVO and more recently 3V0. The total for EMS, VVO and 3V0 in the FY21 forecast and FY22 budget are $\$ 2.9$ million and $\$ 5.9$ million, respectively.
c. Please see Attachment PUC 1-5-1 for the projects that make up the FY 2022 proposed spending, an explanation of why each of the programs and projects are proposed, and the prioritization. Please note that the attachment totals to the revised Reliability total of $\$ 9.450$ million. Please see Attachment PUC 1-5-2 for specific project details for the New Lafayette project.

In regard to the priority rankings, the Company respectfully submits that all of the System Capacity \& Performance projects proposed in the FY 2022 ISR Plan fall within the same top priority tier and that the Company's decision to include the projects and associated budgets within the Plan is an integral component of the Company's statutory responsibility to propose an investment and spending plan for review by the Commission that is reasonably needed to maintain safe and reliable distribution service over the short and long term.

Prepared by or under the supervision of: Patricia C. Easterly and Caitlin Broderick

| Priority | Project | Reason for Proposal | FY 2022 <br> Budget <br> \$'000s |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3 V 0 | As a result of Distributed Generation (DG) penetration, including small scale sites, protection issues are emerging that are becomming increasingly difficult to assign to a specific DG site. This program's prioritization considers the DG interconnection queue. Includes some remaining mobile 3V0 spending from FY 2021. | \$1,434 |
| 2 | EMS Expansion | Projects to install Energy Management System (EMS) devices improve reliability performance, increase operational effectiveness, and provide data for asset expansion or operational studies | 1,303 |
| 3 | New Lafayette | Although the Lafayette project is in the system capacity and performance spending rationale, it also has significant asset condition drivers. The project solves loading issues in the area and addresses asset condition and reliability issues on the supply lines to the existing Lafayette substation. | 1,857 |
| 4 | Cutout Mounted Recloser Program | This category includes the annual cutout mounted recloser (CMR) program. This program recommends the installation of single phase cutout mounted reclosers at targeted locations on primary overhead lines across the Company's distribution network | 133 |
| 5 | Blankets | The Company also has blanket projects that are established to ensure that local field engineering and operations can resolve system and equipment loading and reliability issues in an efficient and effective manner. | 1,395 |
| 6 | VVO | The intent of this project is to flatten and lower the feeder voltage profile using additional voltage monitors along the feeder and centralize control of the regulating devices based on real time system performance. The lowering of feeder voltages benefits customers by reducing the demand and energy usage. | 3,228 |
| 7 | Flood Contingency Plan | This project includes installing Flood Barriers to protect substation equipment at locations at high risk to flooding in the event of a 100-year flood. It also includes the purchase and preparation of pumping systems for substation yards for use in the event of a major flood. Installation includes flood barriers around substations equipment/yard except egress points. | 45 |
| 8 | Other Projects | This category addresses small targeted reliability issues. | 57 |

## New Lafayette Substation - Project Summary

$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|}\hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Distribution Related } \\ \text { Project Number(s): }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { C081740 - Lafayette Substation (T-Line) } \\ \text { C081691 - Lafayette Substation (T-Sub) } \\ \text { C081675 - Lafayette Substation (D-Sub) } \\ \text { C081683 - Lafayette Substation (D-Line) } \\ \text { C081663 - 3312 ROW Removals (T-Line) } \\ \text { C081685 - 84T3 ROW Removals (D-Line) }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Substation(s) / Feeder(s) } \\ \text { Impacted: }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Lafayette - 30F1, 30F2 } \\ \text { Davisville - 84T3 } \\ \text { Kent County - 3312 }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Voltage(s): } & \begin{array}{l}12.47 \text { kV, 34.5 kV }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Geographic Area } \\ \text { Served: }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { North Kingstown, RI } \\ \text { Summary of Issues: } \\ \text { existing and potential future distribution system performance concerns. The major } \\ \text { concerns documented in the South County East Study report are summarized } \\ \text { below: } \\ \text { Reliability: } \\ \bullet \\ \text { Tower Hill is a single transformer station with four 12.47 kV feeders and } \\ \text { approximately 36 MW of load. For loss of the station transformer, there is } \\ \text { approximately 19 MW of unserved load exposure during peak load } \\ \text { conditions (or 495 MWh of exposure). The unserved load exposure } \\ \text { exceeds the recommendations in the distribution planning criteria } \\ \text { Loading on the Bonnet T2 transformer is projected to be loaded above SN } \\ \text { limits. } \\ \text { Three feeders are projected to be loaded above Summer Normal (SN) } \\ \text { limits and four feeders have been calculated to have unserved load } \\ \text { exposure in excess of the distribution planning criteria. } \\ \text { The 3312 line has reliability concerns. Over the last three years the 3312 } \\ \text { line has experienced a number of outages. Generally, an outage on the } \\ \text { 3312 line resulted in an outage on the under-built 12.47kV circuit. }\end{array} \\ \text { - a visual inspection of the lines identified significant deterioration on the } \\ \text { pole plant and associated equipment. Age of more than 40\% of the poles } \\ \text { on the 3312 and 84T3 lines are 60 years or older. }\end{array}\right\}$

| Recommended Plan | The recommend plan is to build a new $115 / 12.47 \mathrm{kV}$ substation at the existing Lafayette substation site. The station shall be built with 3V0 protection to accommodate existing and proposed distributed generation in the area. Details of the plan are: <br> - Build a new open air, low profile, breaker-and-one-half substation consisting of a single $115 / 12.47 \mathrm{kV} 24 / 32 / 40$ MVA transformer, four regulated feeders, and one 7.2 MVAr station capacitor bank with of two 3.6 MVAr stages. <br> - Install new single span 115 kV tap line from L190 to supply the new Lafayette substation. Install one loadbreak switch to the north in the L190 mainline. <br> - Install a manhole and ductline system for the feeder getaways out to city streets. The feeders will follow existing overhead routes and generally utilize existing overhead infrastructure. The new feeders will provide capacity to convert few commercial customers to 12.47 kV and allow for the retirement of the 34.5 kV system that supplies Lafayette. The retirement of the 34.5 kV supply to Lafayette address the asset condition concerns and mitigates the access issues associated with the right-of-way. <br> - Remove the existing $34.5 / 12.47 \mathrm{kV}$ station at Lafayette once the new station is in-service. <br> This plan eliminates approximately 17-miles of sub-transmission lines. The retirement of these assets results in the most economical option that is adequate to resolve the area concerns. These lines have significant asset condition and reliability concerns. <br> Total Cost = \$16 million (includes all costs with transmission, distribution, operations \& maintenance, and removal values for alternative comparison purposes). |
| :---: | :---: |
| Current Status and Expected In-Service Date | Current Status - Step 4.3 - Develop \& Sanction <br> Expected In-Service - See Detailed Budget for System Capacity \& Performance and Asset Condition Projects. |
| Alternatives: | Alternative 1 - New Mainsail Dr 115/12.47 kV Station: <br> The major component of this plan is a new $115 / 12.47 \mathrm{kV}$ substation in Quonset to be built on a green field site and the refurbishment of the 34.5 kV supply system to Lafayette substation. The substation site will have to be acquired from either the Quonset Development Corporation (QDC) or some other private party. The proposed substation would consist of a single $115 / 12.47 \mathrm{kV} 40$ MVA LTC transformer and four feeders. Acquiring a substation site in Quonset may be challenging. The site would have to be in close proximity to the transmission system and land availability is very limited. A site owned by the Quonset Development Corporation (QDC) may be a potential candidate; however, the QDC is unlikely to sell this site for substation development since the area has been targeted for economic development. <br> This option requires the refurbishment of the 34.5 kV supply system to Lafayette substation. Large sections of the right-of-way have wetlands and potentially sensitive vegetation. There will be anticipated wetland challenges along with restrictive backyard construction. The lines were built in the 1930's and a visual inspection identified significant deterioration of the pole plant and associated equipment. A refurbishment in place would leave all the right of way challenges unaddressed. If this option is to be pursued, it is recommended that relocating these lines to the roadway be further explored and developed. Conceptual estimates to |


|  | $\begin{array}{l}\text { relocate a portion of these lines to the roadway have been developed but not } \\ \text { included in plan costs. } \\ \text { Total Cost = \$37 million (includes all costs with transmission, distribution, } \\ \text { operations \& maintenance, and removal values for alternative comparison purposes) }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Alternative 2 - Expansion of Old Baptist Station: } \\ \text { The major component of this plan is to expand Old Baptist substation by installing a } \\ \text { third bay, two additional feeders, and station capacitor banks. This plan would also } \\ \text { refurbish the 34.5 kV supply to Lafayette substation. }\end{array}$ |
| Similar to Alternative 1, this option requires the refurbishment of the 34.5 kV |  |
| supply system to Lafayette substation. Large sections of the right-of-way have |  |
| wetlands and potentially sensitive vegetation. There will be anticipated wetland |  |
| challenges along with restrictive backyard construction. The lines were built in the |  |
| 1930’s and a visual inspection identified significant deterioration of the pole plant |  |
| and associated equipment. A refurbishment in place would leave all the right of way |  |
| challenges unaddressed. If this option is to be pursued, it is recommended that |  |
| relocating these lines to the roadway be further explored and developed. Conceptual |  |
| estimates to relocate a portion of these lines to the roadway have been developed |  |
| but not included in plan costs. |  |
| Total Cost = \$26 million (includes all costs with transmission, distribution, |  |
| operations \& maintenance, and removal values for alternative comparison purposes) |  |$\}$

## PUC 1-6

## Request:

Referring to the Capital Spending Key Driver table on Bates page 94, the budget for meters in FY 2021 was $\$ 2,995,000$ but the forecast of actual is only $\$ 2,111,000$.
a. Please provide the number of meters (and the associated dollar value) the Company forecasted it would install in FY 2021, compared to the number actually installed.
b. Of the number of meters in the FY 2021 forecast, please identify the number of meters (and associated actual dollar value) that went to inventory, if any, and
c. For FY 2022, please identify the number of meters (and associated actual dollar value) the Company forecasts it will install compared to purchases that will go to inventory, if any.

## Response:

a. For the FY 2021 Ocean St-Dist-Meter program, the Company forecasted it would meter change/install 14,809 meters with a capital budget of $\$ 1.090 \mathrm{M}$. Through December of FY 2021 the Company has meter change/installed 5,654 meters.
b. For the FY 2021 Narragansett Meter Purchase program, the Company has purchased 8,715 meters through December FY2021. Prior to delivery to support field operations, new meter shipments are received from the manufacturer at the Company's meter lab and processed, tested, and placed in inventory. The 8,715 meters purchased in FY 2021 are currently being used to support FY 2021 field operations. The meters the Company purchased in FY 2021 are expected to be installed by end of FY 2021.
c. For the FY 2022 Ocean St-Dist-Meter program, the Company forecasts it will meter change/install 15,246 meters with a capital budget of $\$ 800 \mathrm{k}$.

For the FY 2022 Narragansett Meter Purchase program, the Company forecasts the need to purchase 14,000 meters to support operational workplans. The meter purchases will initially be placed in inventory at the Company's meter lab before being used to support FY 2022 operational workplans.

For the FY 2022 RI Landline Meter Replacement program, the Company forecasts it will purchase and install 210 meters to support the program. The meter purchases will initially be placed in inventory at the Company's meter lab before being used to support the FY 2022 RI Landline Meter Replacement work.

The FY 2022 RI Meter Reprogramming program is a demand meter field reprograming effort that requires no new meter purchases or installations to support the program.

Prepared by or under the supervision of: Nicholas Ritts

## PUC 1-7

## Request:

Referring to the Capital Spending Key Driver table on Bates page 94, please provide an explanation and evidentiary support for the FY 2022 budget forecast of \$3,375,000 for distribution meters when (i) the Company has never reached that level of spending on meters in any ISR dating back to 2011, (ii) spending in FY 2021 is expected to be only $\$ 2,111,000$, and (iii) the economic impact of the pandemic is expected to continue for many months longer in calendar year 2021.

## Response:

(i) The Company's FY 2022 budget forecast includes the purchases as described in the response to PUC 1-6, part c (\$1.975M), but also includes walk-in replacement work ( $\$ 600 \mathrm{k}$ ), and the associated field labor ( $\$ 800 \mathrm{k}$ ). The FY 2022 budget forecast for walk-in replacement work has led to a higher anticipated level of spending than historical years.
(ii) Company pandemic social distancing requirements led to a decrease in customer Meter Service (CMS) field activity over the first two quarters of FY 2021. As a result, the Company's meter lab scaled back meter orders over the first two quarters of FY 2021 to align with CMS field activity. This has resulted in a lower forecasted spend for FY 2021.
(iii) As of December, CMS has resumed their normal meter change/install work load and the meter lab is experiencing an uptick in orders to support field work over the remainder of FY 2021. This is expected to continue into FY 2022.

## PUC 1-8

## Request:

Referring to the category labeled "Ocean St-Dist-Damage\&Failure Blnkt," shown on Attachment 2 of Section 2, please explain the specific assumptions used in developing the budget of $\$ 8,925,000$, including a list of all known projects that the Company expects to undertake within this category in FY 2022. For projects in this category, please attempt to categorize the types of investments typically undertaken. Please provide actual spending to budget for the last five fiscal years under this budget category, including FY 2021.

## Response:

The table below summarizes spending in the Damage/Failure Blanket for the past five years.

| Project <br> Number | Project Description |  | FY 2017 | FY 2018 | FY 2019 | FY 2020 | $\frac{\text { FY } 2021}{\text { (Forecast) }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COS0014 | Ocean St-Dist-Damage\&Failure Blankt | Actuals | \$10,172,757 | \$10,427,025 | \$8,424,098 | \$9,984,056 | \$10,200,000 |
| COS0014 | Ocean St-Dist-Damage\&Failure Blankt | Budget | \$8,243,000 | \$8,781,326 | \$10,445,000 | \$10,330,000 | \$8,520,000 |

Blanket funding projects consist of many work orders that are typically standard construction, and of short duration and small cost. The specific work that will be undertaken and charged in the Non-Discretionary category of Damage/Failure Blanket is generally not known ahead of time and is reactive in nature; therefore, the budget in this category is usually derived based on trending actual historical costs and not on specific projects. However, the Company did not use trending analysis to estimate the FY 2022 budget for this blanket project because the Company is in the process of implementing new processes related to this blanket project. Only work under a more-narrow definition of failed assets are considered Non-Discretionary and other work is considered Discretionary. At the time we developed the FY 2022 budget, this new process was getting underway and we did not know if trending actuals would be accurate. Therefore, we based the FY 2022 budget on the FY 2021 budget (\$8,520,000) with an approximately 5\% increase for general cost increases.

The categories of investments generally undertaken in this project include the replacement of any capital unit of plant that has been damaged or has failed and is no longer in service. Examples of this equipment would be reclosers, load breaks, air breaks, pad-mounted or overhead transformers, conductor such as overhead wire and underground cable, and poles. In the event the equipment is damaged or fails, there is typically an unplanned emergency customer outage condition resulting which requires us to make repairs. Some replacements are completed immediately with like-for-like equipment and some work requires temporary repairs or restoration and the permanent repair requires engineering support.

Prepared by or under the supervision of: Patricia Easterly and Parker Capwell

## PUC 1-9

## Request:

Referring to the category labeled "Ocean St-Dist-New Bus-Comm Blanket," shown on Attachment 2 of Section 2, please explain the specific assumptions used in developing the budget of $\$ 5,931,000$, including a list of all known projects and costs. For projects in this category, please attempt to categorize the types of projects investments typically undertaken. Please provide actual spending to budget for the last five fiscal years under this budget category, including FY 2021.

## Response:

See the New Business Commercial portion of the response to PUC 1-3 for detail regarding the assumptions used in developing the budget of $\$ 5,931,000$. The categories of work performed under the blanket include new services, line extensions to serve new customer, conversion to serve new customer or substantial new load, addition of one or two new phases to serve new three phase load, riser \& riser poles for new underground service and increase size of service due to added load.

See the table below for budget and actual spending for the last five years.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## PUC 1-10

## Request:

Did the Company consider ways to mitigate rate impacts on ratepayers by deferring projects that are not immediately needed, when it developed its discretionary spending budget? If so, please explain all the factors that were considered and how it affected the final proposed budget. If not, why not?

## Response:

Yes, the Company did consider ways to mitigate rate impacts as the proposed plan was developed. The Company considered a balance of system needs, customer expectations related to service reliability and costs in the development of its discretionary budget at a portfolio level. The Company did defer projects and looked for opportunities to defer projects that had less urgent system risks and those projects are not included in the current annual plan. For instance, Energy Management System (EMS) projects, underground cable and underground residential development (URD) projects, are associated with multi-year programs that we have extended beyond the original proposed program life. We did that by prioritizing specific work done under these programs and by advancing only the highest priority EMS, underground cable, URD and Asset condition projects within the annual plan.

In addition, some projects result from long term planning studies or other adhoc evaluations of the Company's system based on electric system planning guidelines. These projects address either existing or anticipated system needs and were only advanced when those system issues need to be resolved to ensure safety or avoid service reliability degradation or damaged equipment. Other projects were determined by asset and reliability programs and were prioritized to maintain or slightly improve current levels of risk. Deferral of any of these projects could result in additional risks and possibly degraded safety and reliability.

As indicated above, the factors considered include ensuring the Company meets system planning criteria, asset condition information, reliability information, work driven by state policies and work driven by other technical system needs. These factors were considered in studies and programs described above which ultimately make up the final discretionary proposed budget.

Furthermore, the Company worked in cooperation with the Division prior to submitting an annual plan with the Commission. During this period, the Company considered the Division's input and sought to address any cost concerns that were raised by the Division. For example, in this year's plan, $\$ 6.7$ million was removed to be deferred for future consideration through discussions with the Division.

## PUC 1-11

## Request:

Referring to the Capital Spending Key Driver table on Bates page 94, please explain the investment of $\$ 1$ million identified for Distributed Generation in FY 2022, clearly indicating what types of unreimbursed distributed generation customer requests the Company expects to incur. Please also provide a list of the projects (separate but anonymized) and their respective costs (type and amount) to support the \$1 million that is expected to be incurred for FY 2021.

## Response:

The Company collects Contribution In Aid of Construction (CIAC) from interconnecting customers in advance of construction. The first payment (for engineering design and permitting) is required upon execution of the interconnection service agreement and the balance is due prior to the start of construction. For projects with CIACs exceeding $\$ 1$ million, the Company has allowed two payments with the last payment still due prior to construction. Consequently, it is possible that payments received will span calendar years and, likewise, based on the complexity of the interconnection, it is also possible the costs incurred will span multiple calendar years.

Until FY2021 the Company's practice was to reflect CIAC received from customers as a credit to the capital project work order when first received and capital spend would offset the credit balance as charges are incurred which meant in any one year the annual work order capital activity could be debit or credit. During FY2021, the Company began implementing a new process at the work order level where by the CIAC is initially recorded in deferred revenue and subsequently reduced and transferred to capital to offset the construction costs when incurred on monthly basis. Therefore, the Company expects that the net capital activity for any fiscal year will be the net difference between capital expenditures and CIACs received, which the Company expects to be a minimal amount.

Implementation of this process is expected to be completed by fiscal year end 2021. Since this process implementation is still underway the Company used the same estimate for FY2022 as for FY 2021, which was $\$ 1$ million.

## PUC 1-12

## Request:

Referring to Bates page 91, please provide a more detailed explanation with specificity, supporting the $\$ 1.3$ million budget for Non-infrastructure, including the timing of spending and the nature of the equipment that is being retired and replaced by the new equipment.

## Response:

The non-infrastructure category of spending is for capital expenditures that do not fit into one of the other spending rationales. This capital spending is necessary to run the electric system, such as general and telecommunications equipment. See a summary below of the individual projects in this category.

Costs included in the General Equipment Blanket and Telecoms projects relate to small equipment such as field equipment, large tools, radios, alarms, and communications shelters that are purchased throughout the year.

In FY 2022 and FY 2023, the Company has proposed increased non-infrastructure spending related to the purchase and installation of communication equipment for substations due to the retirement of Verizon's DS0 communications lines. The Company has proposed an additional \$800,000 per year in FY 2022 and FY 2023 to purchase and install JMUX devices, DC-AC inverters and wall mount brackets inside several electric substations. These devices will be installed within the Company substations in coordination with Verizon as they convert DS0 circuits to T1 circuits. The work will ensure continued operation of substation protection systems and allow for telecommunication operations at each station. Verizon's timing schedule for DS0 retirements is communicated to National Grid on a year by year basis. Until Verizon communicates the expected retirements, the exact timing of the work is not known.

The table below shows the details available by project.

| Project \# | Project Description | $\frac{\frac{\mathrm{FY}}{2022}}{\$^{\prime} 000}$ | Timing of work |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COS0006 | Ocean St-Dist-Genl Equip Blanket | \$250 | Throughout the year |
| C040644 | Telecom Small Capital Work - RI | \$260 | Throughout the year |
| C086391 | Verizon Copper to Fiber Conversions | \$800 | Pending notification from Verizon |
|  |  | \$1,310 |  |

Prepared by or under the supervision of: David Arthur and Patricia C. Easterly

## PUC 1-13

## Request:

Referring to the Capital Spending Key Driver table on Bates page 94,
(a) please identify all the items forecasted for installation that comprise the $\$ 2.7$ million budget for FY 2022 in the category of "Strategic DER Investments,"
(b) please identify all the expenditures that are expected to have occurred in FY 2021, comprising the forecasted $\$ 2.4$ million, and
(c) please explain why the FY 2021 budget is forecasted to be exceeded by $\$ 413,000$.

## Response:

(a) The $\$ 2.7 \mathrm{M}$ budget for FY2022 in the category of Strategic DER Investments includes:

- Approximately \$150,000 Capex for Feeder Monitors on Chopmist substation feeders
- Approximately $\$ 450,000$ Capex for Feeder Monitors on Hopkins Hill substation feeders
- Approximately $\$ 20,000$ for engineering and design of full implementation of advanced devices at Chopmist substation.
- The remaining approximately $\$ 2.050 \mathrm{M}$ is being reserved to respond to reliability or performance issues that may emerge on the system in FY2022 that would require mitigations immediately and cannot be attributed to specific DER interconnections. For example, overloaded conductor and/or high voltage that could potentially result in equipment damage and/or customer outages. If these issues do arise and the estimated solution is significant, the Company will review the recommendation with the Division before implementation.

The chart below includes the forecast for Strategic DER Investments in FY2022.

| Scope | FY2022 Budget <br> (capex) |
| :--- | ---: |
| Chopmist Substation Feeder Monitors | $\$ 150,000.00$ |
| Hopkins Hill Substation Feeder Monitors | $\$ 450,000.00$ |
| Chopmist Advanced Devices engineering | $\$ 50,000.00$ |
| Strategic DER Emerging Issues | $\$ 2,050,000.00$ |
| TOTAL | $\$ 2,700,000.00$ |

Prepared by or under the supervision of: Caitlin Broderick

## PUC 1-13, page 2

(b) The forecasted $\$ 2.4 \mathrm{M}$ in FY2021 has been updated to approximately $\$ 20,000$ since the FY2022 ISR plan was filed. Originally, the Company planned to fully implement all advanced devices at the Chopmist substation in FY2021. The scope of this work is included in Division data request response R-I-11 and was estimated at approximately $\$ 2.6 \mathrm{M}$. The Company planned to address the emerging voltage issues at Chopmist substation in FY2021, but the analysis took longer than originally anticipated. The Company developed a revised plan based on negotiations with the Division. The Division requested the Company hold off on full implementation of advanced devices at Chopmist substation until the PUC has reviewed and approved the Company’s Grid Modernization Plan (GMP). The Company and the Division were able to reach a negotiated consensus on the scope of work to be undertaken, which was revised to the installation of Feeder Monitors only at Chopmist and Hopkins Hill substation in FY2022 and engineering for full implementation of advanced devices at Chopmist substation in order to be ready for potential construction in FY2023. Therefore, the revised strategy for Strategic DER Investments in FY2021 would be for engineering and design of Feeder Monitors at Chopmist and Hopkins Hill substation and for advanced devices on the Chopmist feeders.
(c) The Company was planning on full implementation of advanced devices at the Chopmist substation in FY2021. As a result of negotiated agreements with the Division on the FY2022 ISR plan, the FY2021 forecast for Strategic DER Investments was reduced from the second quarter forecast of $\$ 2.4$ million to approximately $\$ 20,000$ for engineering only. Spending currently forecasted for FY2021 will be on the engineering for Feeder Monitors at Chopmist and Hopkins Hill substations and potentially some engineering on advanced devices at Chopmist substation.

## PUC 1-14

## Request:

Referring to Bates pages 60-61, please identify any investments in the category of "Strategic DER Investments" that are contingent upon Commission approval of the Company's Grid Modernization Plan filed in January 2021. Why are the investments described on page 61 categorized as mandatory spending instead of discretionary spending?

## Response:

The Company has proposed $\$ 2.7$ million in the FY2022 ISR Plan to install feeder monitoring sensors on feeders at two substations, progress engineering for full deployment at one substation and to accommodate work that may emerge as a result of system performance or reliability issues from DER interconnections.

Consistent with the Commission's requirements in approving the FY2021 Plan, all such investments are to be classified as Non-Discretionary until the Company's Grid Modernization Plan (GMP) is approved since it is recognized that there may be a need to make such investments on a reactive basis. If the FY2022 ISR Plan is approved as proposed, none of these investments would be contingent upon Commission approval of the Company's Grid Modernization Plan filed in January 2021. Upon approval of the GMP, the classification for this type of work will shift from Non-Discretionary to the Discretionary category as implementation would be considered pro-active in nature and, therefore, Discretionary.

## PUC 1-15

## Request:

Referring to the Capital Spending Key Driver table on Bates page 94, please itemize all of the expenditures that are included in the category of Transformers \& Related Equipment and explain why the budget proposes an increase of over $\$ 700,000$ for FY 2022, compared to forecasted expenditures in FY 2021.

## Response:

Costs in the category of Transformers \& Related Equipment relate to the purchase of Transformers, Capacitors, Regulators, and Network Protectors. The budget for this category is based on a historical trending analysis with consideration of future expectations which are challenging to predict. However, as demonstrated by the increasing trend of installed quantities of these devices shown on Attachment PUC 1-15, we believe the Company will be required to purchase more in this category for FY 2022 than the previous FY 2021 forecast. As explained below, the historical trends coupled with balancing the need to ensure supply availability to avoid or minimize customer interruptions, and managing inventory with increasing lead times combine to warrant the amount proposed even with somewhat uncertain future specific needs.

The data used to base the estimate for the upcoming fiscal year budget is the 12 month Moving Annual Totals (MAT) through July 2020 (ISR Pre-filing draft submitted to the Division in August 2020). The table below summarizes the quarterly MAT data from March 2019 through June 2020 and monthly thereafter. An estimate for inflation is added to derive the budget for FY 2022, see summary below the MAT table.

| PROJECT DESCRIPTION | Values | COST GROUPING |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ALL TRANSFORMERS | CAPACITOR | PROTECTOR | REGULATOR | Other Costs - OH, CIACs Etc | Grand Total |
| Narragansett Transformer Purchases | MAT-201903 | 3,429,541 | 303,884 | - | 181,420 | 707,610 | 4,622,455 |
|  | MAT-201906 | 3,456,394 | 225,066 | 175,137 | 138,524 | 661,581 | 4,656,702 |
|  | MAT-201909 | 3,369,260 | 212,486 | 175,137 | 46,736 | 701,940 | 4,505,559 |
|  | MAT-201912 | 3,559,775 | 190,411 | 350,217 | 11,684 | 821,208 | 4,933,294 |
|  | MAT-202003 | 3,528,562 | 260,437 | 350,217 | 139,920 | 877,538 | 5,156,674 |
|  | MAT-202006 | 3,228,719 | 289,347 | 175,080 | 139,920 | 864,200 | 4,697,266 |
|  | MAT-202007 | 3,105,601 | 355,417 | 175,080 | 139,920 | 861,677 | 4,637,696 |
|  | MAT-202008 | 3,112,197 | 511,920 | 175,080 | 139,920 | 896,769 | 4,835,886 |
|  | MAT-202009 | 3,196,360 | 498,879 | 175,080 | 183,599 | 936,487 | 4,990,405 |
|  | MAT-202010 | 2,885,158 | 492,089 | 175,080 | 198,588 | 875,681 | 4,626,596 |
|  | MAT-202011 | 2,904,291 | 523,416 | 117,176 | 198,588 | 864,221 | 4,607,691 |
|  | MAT-202012 | 2,738,664 | 548,256 | 29,965 | 239,691 | 834,387 | 4,390,963 |
|  |  |  |  | MAT as of July Estimate used for FY 2022 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4,637,696 \\ & 4,770,000 \end{aligned}$ |

Prepared by or under the supervision of: Patricia C. Easterly

## PUC 1-15, page 2 <br> FY2022 Transformer Purchase Blanket Budget Estimate Calculation

| Blanket Uninflated FY2022 Estimate | $4,770,000$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adjustment for Inflation (1.5\%), <br> Economic Increase (1\%), Materials <br> (2\%) etc. | 145,000 | $3.0 \%$ |
|  | $4,915,000$ |  |

Purchases are driven by installations and the necessity to maintain specified level of stock to be kept on hand. Because of the association with installations and because there is not a perfect match of installations to purchases by year, we have summarized installed quantities in Attachment PUC 1-15 for each asset category in this project for the years from FY 2017 through YTD FY 2021 to support the increasing purchasing trend. The Company has seen a significant increase in installations of all equipment purchased over the 5 years represented.

Increases in transformer installations are caused by projects in the Discretionary category, such as Chase Hill, New London, and Aquidneck projects and the Metal Clad substation projects through FY 2021. FY 2022 installations for project requirements are expected to continue for the Providence Phase 1A and Phase 1B projects. Increases in the Non-Discretionary category are driven by the New Business blankets for both Commercial and Residential categories as well Distributed Generation projects. We assume similar requirements for projects in these categories in FY 2022. While there are trending decreases in the damage/failure category, it is difficult to predict the future requirements for that category.

Increases in installations of capacitor, regulators, and network protectors are primarily driven by VVO projects but there are also installations in other portions of the portfolio. In addition, because of the long lead time for regulators, there will be an increase in the required level of emergency stock from 1 to 9 units that will also be part of the FY 2022 purchases.

The forecast for FY2021 on Bates page 94 was based on a different method than used to estimate the FY 2022 budget. The forecast on page 94 was the second quarter forecast using actuals through September and monthly budget thereafter so does not reflect the potential changes that could occur from October through March 2021, which is what the 12 MAT method attempts to estimate.

Please see Attachment PUC 1-15-1 for a table showing installations and purchases of transformers, capacitors, regulators and network protectors for FY 2017 through December 2020.

| As of 2/5/21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TRANSFORMERS |  |  |  |  |  | CAPACITORS |  |  |  |  |  | REGULATORS |  |  |  |  |  | NETWORK PROTECTORS |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | FY17 | FY18 | FY19 | FY20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FY21 to } \\ & \text { date } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Iotal- } \\ \text { FY17-FY21 } \\ \text { to date } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | FY17 | FY18 | FY19 | FY20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FY21 to } \\ & \text { date } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Iotal- } \\ \text { FY17-FY21 } \\ \text { to date } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | FY17 | FY18 | FY19 | FY20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fr21 to } \\ & \text { date } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Iotal- } \\ \text { FY17-FY21 } \\ \text { to date } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | FY17 | FY18 | FY19 | FY20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fr21 to } \\ & \text { date } \end{aligned}$ | Total - FY17FY21 to date |
| Installed by Spending |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rationale |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Syst Cap \& Perf | 315 | 324 | 453 | 484 | 112 | 1,688 | 5 | 13 | 22 | 36 | - | 76 | 14 | - | 4 | - | 6 | 24 |  | - |  |  |  | - |
| Asset Condition | 295 | 87 | 132 | 224 | 287 | 1,025 | 2 | - | - | 2 | 3 | 7 | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 2 |
| Cust Req/Public Req | 507 | 620 | 801 | 818 | 511 | 3,257 | 2 | - | 5 | 5 | - | 12 | - | 3 | - | 1 | 3 | 7 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 4 | 6 |
| Damage/Failure | 516 | 525 | 406 | 435 | 341 | 2,223 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 18 | - | 3 | - | 1 | 1 | 5 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| WR\# not identified | (11) | 2 | 6 | (6) | 44 | 35 | 3 | - | $-$ | 3 | $-$ | 6 |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Installations per GIS | 1,622 | 1,558 | 1,798 | 1,955 | 1,295 | 8,228 | 17 | 14 | 30 | 52 | 6 | 119 | 14 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 10 | 36 | - | 2 | $\cdot$ | 4 | 6 | 12 |
| Purchases | 1,052 | 1,314 | 2,435 | 2,487 | 1,033 | 8,321 | - | 4 | 59 | 39 | 65 | 167 | - | - | 16 | 12 | 7 | 35 | - | - | - | 13 | 1 | 14 |

## PUC 1-16

## Request:

Please expand the table on Bates 96 and 97 which includes an itemization of the FY 2022 asset condition spending of $\$ 40.183$ million. The expansion should include:
a. Location of work
b. Risk assessment score
c. FY 2022 revenue requirement associated with the capital expenditure.

## Response:

Please see Attachment PUC 1-16-1 for a table itemizing the total FY 2022 asset condition spending of $\$ 40.483$ million by project, location, risk score and FY 2022 revenue requirement. The Company has employed the same methodology described in response to Data Request PUC 1-2 to calculate the FY 2022 revenue requirement by line item as shown in Column (g) of the Attachment.

|  | Project \# | Project Description | Location of Work | Risk <br> Assessment | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } 2022 \text { Plan } \\ \text { Spend } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Target Placed InService FY 2022 Including COR | FY 2022 Revenue Requirement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | $(\mathrm{g})=(\mathrm{f}) *$ Line 72 |
| 1 | C032019 | Batts/Chargers NE South OS RI | Various | 40 | \$150,000 | \$118,788 | \$6,462 |
| 2 | C036527 | Westerly Flood Restoration (D-Sub) | Westerly | 42 | $(\$ 2,105)$ | $(\$ 8,076)$ | (\$439) |
| 3 | C047378 | IRURD Willowbrook | Cranston | 36 | \$362,736 | \$217,683 | \$11,842 |
| 4 | C047394 | IRURD Tanglewood | West Warwick | 36 | \$650,000 | \$390,036 | \$21,218 |
| 5 | C047829 | IRURD High Hawk | East Greenwich | 36 | \$16,758 | \$104,066 | \$5,661 |
| 6 | C049356 | IRURD Silver Maple Phase 2 | Coventry | 36 | \$150,788 | \$90,696 | \$4,934 |
| 7 | C049462 | IRURD SIGNAL RIDGE, EAST GREENWICH | East Greenwich | 36 | \$738,000 | \$447,898 | \$24,366 |
| 8 | C050070 | IRURD Placeholder RI | Various | n/a | $(\$ 212,000)$ | \$252,000 | \$13,709 |
| 9 | C050299 | IRURD Eastward Look | Narragansett | 36 | \$168,000 | \$101,041 | \$5,497 |
| 10 | C051205 | Dyer St replace indoor subst D-SUB | Providence | 45 | \$4,431,952 | \$9,206,842 | \$500,852 |
| 11 | C051211 | Dyer St replace indoor subst D-LINE | Providence | 45 | \$5,285,000 | \$3,035,833 | \$165,149 |
| 12 | C051212 | South St repl indoor subst D-SUB | Providence | 48 | \$300,000 | \$300,000 | \$16,320 |
| 13 | C051213 | South St repl indoor subst D-LINE | Providence | 48 | $(\$ 2,655)$ | \$0 | \$0 |
| 14 | C055215 | Westerly Flood Restoration (D-Line) | Westerly | 42 | $(\$ 2,243)$ | (\$47) | (\$3) |
| 15 | C055343 | RI UG Cable Placeholder | Various | n/a | \$895,000 | \$447,168 | \$24,326 |
| 16 | C055359 | RI UG Cable Repl Program - Fdr 79F1 | Narragansett | 36 | \$220,000 | \$141,303 | \$7,687 |
| 17 | C055364 | RI UG Cable Repl Program - Fdr 13F6 | Providence | 36 | \$337,569 | \$205,859 | \$11,199 |
| 18 | C055370 | RI UG Cable Repl Prog Fdr 1144/1109 | Narragansett | 36 | \$460,000 | \$281,133 | \$15,294 |
| 19 | C055371 | RI UG Cable Repl Prog Fdr 1142/1105 | Narragansett | 36 | \$426,558 | \$291,050 | \$15,833 |
| 20 | C055392 | RI UG Cable Repl Program - Secondar | Various | 36 | \$500,000 | \$1,291,163 | \$70,239 |
| 21 | C056947 | IRURD Juniper Hills WWarwick | West Warwick | 36 | \$374,000 | \$247,948 | \$13,488 |
| 22 | C057882 | IRURD Chateau Apts URD Rehab | Cranston | 36 | \$166,000 | \$100,232 | \$5,453 |
| 23 | C057903 | IRURD Western Hills Village URD- | Cranston | 36 | $(\$ 1,918)$ | (\$959) | (\$52) |
| 24 | C057906 | IRURD Woodvale Estates URD- | Johnston | 36 | \$15,000 | \$9,541 | \$519 |
| 25 | C058045 | IRURD-Tockwotton Farm_TF Road. | North Kingstown | 28 | \$169,680 | \$112,190 | \$6,103 |
| 26 | C058046 | IRURD-Tockwotton Farm_RM Way. | North Kingstown | 28 | $(\$ 3,404)$ | $(\$ 1,202)$ | (\$65) |
| 27 | C065830 | Recloser Replacement Program RI | Various | 36 | \$200,000 | \$10,000 | \$544 |
| 28 | C069166 | Pawtucket 1 Breaker Replacement | Pawtucket | 41 | \$25,000 | \$112,526 | \$6,121 |
| 29 | C074307 | RI UG 79F1 duct Charles \& Orms Sts | Providence | 36 | \$728,587 | \$847,233 | \$46,089 |
| 30 | C076289 | IRURD Pequaw Honk URD RI-L Compton | Little Compton | 36 | \$234,022 | \$403,949 | \$21,975 |
| 31 | C078474 | Franklin Sq Sub_1105 \& 1109 NW | Providence | 14 | \$439,929 | \$283,224 | \$15,407 |
| 32 | C078488 | RI DFP100 Relay Replacement Project | various | 34 | \$40,043 | \$147,771 | \$8,039 |
| 33 | C078734 | Ph 1A - ProvStudy Admiral St 4\&11kV Convert | Providence | 35 | \$3,743,061 | \$3,000,163 | \$163,209 |
| 34 | C078735 | Ph1B - ProvStudy New Admiral St 12kV D-Sub | Providence | 35 | \$1,438,054 | \$14,526 | \$790 |
| 35 | C078796 | Ph1B - ProvStudy Admiral St-Rochamb D-Line | Providence | 35 | \$209,500 | \$24,100 | \$1,311 |
| 36 | C078797 | Ph1B - ProvStudy Admiral St-Rochamb D-Sub | Providence | 35 | \$500,530 | \$26,496 | \$1,441 |
| 37 | C078800 | Ph 1A - ProvStudy Clarkson-Lippit12kV DLine | Providence | 35 | \$1,222,937 | \$2,452,040 | \$133,391 |
| 38 | C078802 | Ph 1B - ProvStudy Olneyville 4kV D-Line | Providence | 35 | \$203,532 | \$57,406 | \$3,123 |
| 39 | C078803 | Ph 1B - ProvStudy Admiral St 12 kV MH\&Duct | Providence | 35 | \$272,326 | \$300 | \$16 |
| 40 | C078804 | Ph 1B - ProvStudy Admiral St 12kV Cables | Providence | 35 | \$271,303 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 41 | C078805 | Ph 4 - ProvStudy Knightsville 4kV Convert | Providence | 35 | \$220,000 | \$39,481 | \$2,148 |
| 42 | C078806 | Ph 4 - ProvStudy Knightsville 4kV D-Sub | Providence | 35 | \$275,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 43 | C078921 | RI UG Cable Repl Program - Fdr 1158 | Providence | 36 | \$12,699 | \$7,349 | \$400 |
| 44 | C078923 | RI UG Cable Repl Program - Fdr 1160 | Providence | 36 | \$299,699 | \$190,787 | \$10,379 |
| 45 | C078926 | RI UG Cable Repl Program - Fdr 1162 | Providence | 36 | \$280,000 | \$330,275 | \$17,967 |
| 46 | C078928 | RI UG Cable Repl Program - Fdr 1164 | Providence | 36 | \$12,699 | \$7,349 | \$400 |
| 47 | C078931 | RI UG Cable Repl Program - Fdr 1166 | Providence | 36 | \$418,000 | \$496,702 | \$27,021 |
| 48 | C079331 | Viper Recloser Replacement Pgm 1-RI | Various | 6 | \$165,000 | \$17,000 | \$925 |
| 49 | C081006 | Franklin Sq Breaker Replacement | Providence | 39 | \$1,803,905 | \$1,857,905 | \$101,070 |
| 50 | C081341 | IRURD Woodland Manor-Coventry | Coventry | 24 | \$481,476 | \$668,123 | \$36,346 |
| 51 | C082439 | Franklin Sq-Replace 11kV Sub Equip | Providence | 39 | \$48,532 | \$329,724 | \$17,937 |
| 52 | C086514 | RI GE Type U Bushing Replacement | Providence | 41 | \$275,000 | \$8,000 | \$435 |
| 53 | C083782 | Replace 12.47 Breakers Drumrock 14 | Warwick | 39 | \$196,448 | \$6,000 | \$326 |
| 54 | C084172 | IRURD Jencks Hill, Lincoln RI | Lincoln | 34 | \$270,372 | \$171,363 | \$9,322 |
| 55 | C084377 | IRURD Governor's Hills, RI | Warwick | 36 | \$402,786 | \$262,270 | \$14,267 |
| 56 | C084378 | IRURD Frenchtown Green, RI | East Greenwich | 36 | \$253,527 | \$167,505 | \$9,112 |
| 57 | C084965 | IRURD Sandy Point Farms Phase 2 | Portsmouth | 36 | \$463,000 | \$359,659 | \$19,565 |
| 58 | C085005 | RI UG Cable Repl Program - Fdr 1139 | Providence | 36 | \$409,000 | \$252,500 | \$13,736 |
| 59 | C085553 | RI Repl ACNW Vault Vent Blowers | Various | 17 | \$400,000 | \$240,014 | \$13,057 |
| 60 | COS0017 | Ocean St-Dist-Asset Replace Blankt | Various | 49 | \$3,399,000 | \$3,972,594 | \$216,109 |
| 61 | COS0026 | OS-Dist-Substation Asset Repl Blnk | Various | 34 | \$193,000 | \$191,178 | \$10,400 |
| 62 | C026281 | I\&M - OS D-Line OH Work From Insp. | Various | 45 | \$2,875,000 | \$3,127,970 | \$170,162 |
| 63 | C080076 | I\&M - OS Sub-T OH Work From Insp | Various | 45 | \$125,000 | \$75,161 | \$4,089 |
| 64 | C053657 | Southeast Substation (D-Sub) | Pawtucket | 44 | \$787,000 | \$30,053 | \$1,635 |
| 65 | C053658 | Southeast Substation (D-Line) | Pawtucket | 44 | \$1,060,000 | \$16,234 | \$883 |
| 66 | C055683 | Pawtucket No 1 (D-Sub) | Pawtucket | 44 | \$235,000 | \$3,418,519 | \$185,967 |
| 67 | Total |  |  |  | \$40,482,685 | \$41,005,635 | \$2,230,7075 |



## Line Notes:

68 Section 5 Attachment 1, Page 18, Line 33, Col (a)
69 Section 5 Attachment 1, Page 27, Line 52, Col (k)
70 Line 68 + Line 69
71 Section 2, Chart 18
72 Line $70 \div$ Line 71

## PUC 1-17

## Request:

Please expand the table on Bates 97 which includes an itemization of the FY 2022 non infrastructure spending of $\$ 1.310$ million. The expansion should include:
a. Location of work
b. Risk assessment score
c. FY 2022 revenue requirement associated with the capital expenditure.

## Response:

Please see Attachment PUC 1-17 for a table itemizing the total FY 2022 non-infrastructure spending of $\$ 1.310$ million by project, location, risk score and FY 2022 revenue requirement. The Company has employed the same methodology described in response to Data Request PUC 1-2 to calculate the FY 2022 the revenue requirement by line item as shown in Column (g) of the Attachment.

|  | Spending Rationale | Project \# | Project Description | Location | Risk <br> Assessment Score | FY 2022 Plan Spend | Target Placed InService FY22 Including COR | FY 2022 Revenue <br> Requirement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | (g) | (h)=(g)* Line 12 |
| 1 | Non-Infrastructure | C05360E | CAP OH 5360 RIE1000 | - | - | \$0 | \$10,481 | \$570 |
| 2 | Non-Infrastructure | COS0006 | OCEAN ST-DIST-GENL EQUIP BLANKET | As needed | 49 | \$250,000 | \$231,797 | \$12,610 |
| 3 | Non-Infrastructure | C040644 | TELECOM SMALL CAPITAL WORK - RI | As needed | 49 | \$259,600 | \$276,519 | \$15,043 |
| 4 | Non-Infrastructure | C086205 | RI ELEC. BARN RIGHT SIZING PROJ. | - | - | \$0 | \$4,334 | \$236 |
| 5 | Non-Infrastructure | C086260 | PROV. Yard- New Pole Storage Racks | Pending | - | \$0 | \$105,533 | \$5,741 |
| 6 | Non-Infrastructure | C086391 | Verizon Copper to Fiber Conversions | Notification | 44 | \$800,000 | \$496,000 | \$26,982 |
| 7 | Total Non-Infrastructure |  |  |  |  | \$1,309,600 | \$1,124,664 | \$61,182 |
| 8 | FY22 Depreciation, Retur | and Taxes | sociated with FY22 investment |  | \$3,644,310 |  |  |  |
| 9 | FY22 Property tax associ | ed with FY2 | investment |  | \$2,566,000 |  |  |  |
| 10 | Total FY22 revenue requi | ement associ | ted with FY22 investment |  | \$6,210,310 |  |  |  |
| 11 | Total FY22 Capital Place | into Service | plus Cost of Removal (COR) |  | \$114,112,000 |  |  |  |
|  | Ratio of Revenue Require | nent to Capit | l Placed into Service plus COR |  | 5.44\% |  |  |  |

[^3]
## PUC 1-18

## Request:

Please expand the table on Bates 98 which includes an itemization of the FY 2022 system capacity and performance spending of $\$ 18.372$ million. The expansion should include:
a. Risk assessment score
b. FY 2022 revenue requirement associated with the capital expenditure.

## Response:

Please see Attachment PUC 1-18-1 for a table itemizing the total FY 2022 system capacity and performance spending of $\$ 18.372$ million by project, risk score and FY 2022 revenue requirement. The Company has employed the same methodology described in response to Data Request PUC 1-2 to calculate the FY 2022 the revenue requirement by line item as shown in Column (g) of the Attachment.

|  | Spending Rationale | Project \# | Project Description | Project Risk Score | FY 2022 Plan Spend | FY 2022 Target <br> Placed InService <br> Including COR | FY 2022 Revenue <br> Requirement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f) | (g)=(f) * Line 48 |
| 1 | System Capacity \& Performance | C028628 | Newport SubTrans \& Dist Conversion | 41 | \$5,040,000 | \$5,907,246 | \$321,354 |
| 2 | System Capacity \& Performance | C046726 | East Providence Substation (D-Sub) | 41 | \$407,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 3 | System Capacity \& Performance | C046727 | East Providence Substation (D-Line) | 41 | \$325,000 | \$65,027 | \$3,537 |
| 4 | System Capacity \& Performance | C054054 | Jepson Substation (D-Line) | 41 | \$24,000 | \$126,974 | \$6,907 |
| 5 | System Capacity \& Performance | C058310 | Harrison Sub Improvements (D-Sub) | 41 | \$205,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 6 | System Capacity \& Performance | C058401 | Merton Sub Improvements (D-Sub) | 41 | \$190,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 7 | System Capacity \& Performance | C058404 | Kingston Sub Improvements (D-Sub) | 41 | \$325,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 8 | System Capacity \& Performance | C065166 | Warren Sub Expansion (D-Sub) | 41 | \$100,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 9 | System Capacity \& Performance | C065187 | Warren Sub Expansion (D-Line) | 41 | \$521,000 | \$53,389 | \$2,904 |
| 10 | System Capacity \& Performance | CD00656 | Jepson Substation (D-Sub) | 49 | \$650,000 | \$667,126 | \$36,292 |
| 11 | System Capacity \& Performance | C081675 | New Lafayette 115/12kV (D-Sub) | 35 | \$1,627,000 | \$2,300,000 | \$125,120 |
| 12 | System Capacity \& Performance | C081683 | New Lafayette 115/12kV (D-Line) | 39 | \$230,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 13 | System Capacity \& Performance | COS0016 | Ocean St-Dist-Load Relief Blanket. | 49 | \$335,000 | \$328,466 | \$17,869 |
| 14 | System Capacity \& Performance | C005505 | IE - OS Dist Transformer Upgrades | 40 | \$700,000 | \$796,526 | \$43,331 |
| 15 | System Capacity \& Performance | C013967 | PS\&I Activity - Rhode Island | 40 | \$100,000 | \$129,490 | \$7,044 |
| 16 | System Capacity \& Performance | C054090 | "Reconductor Anthony Road, Foster R | 31 | \$58,511 | \$43,749 | \$2,380 |
| 17 | System Capacity \& Performance | C059663 | Cutout Mnted Recloser Program_RI | 34 | \$133,000 | \$156,885 | \$8,535 |
| 18 | System Capacity \& Performance | C059882 | Flood Contingency Plan NECO - D | 41 | \$44,626 | \$258,683 | \$14,072 |
| 19 | System Capacity \& Performance | C074427 | EMS Expansion - Phillipsdale 20 | 25 | \$86,685 | \$47,342 | \$2,575 |
| 20 | System Capacity \& Performance | C074428 | EMS Expansion - Wampanoag 48 | 35 | \$109,000 | \$102,229 | \$5,561 |
| 21 | System Capacity \& Performance | C074430 | EMS Expansion - Wood River 85 | 40 | \$300,733 | \$167,641 | \$9,120 |
| 22 | System Capacity \& Performance | C074431 | EMS Expansion - Bonnet 42 | 25 | \$99,000 | \$56,381 | \$3,067 |
| 23 | System Capacity \& Performance | C074433 | Bristol 51 - EMS and breaker rplmt | 25 | \$603,614 | \$432,059 | \$23,504 |
| 24 | System Capacity \& Performance | C074438 | EMS Expansion - Merton 51 | 40 | \$103,540 | \$63,010 | \$3,428 |
| 25 | System Capacity \& Performance | C075546 | Farnum 105 EMS intallation | 39 | $(\$ 2,000)$ | $(\$ 1,173)$ | (\$64) |
| 26 | System Capacity \& Performance | C079494 | Peacedale 3V0 D-Sub | 14 | \$400,000 | \$227,554 | \$12,379 |
| 27 | System Capacity \& Performance | C080894 | RI VVO Exp - Farnum Pike 123 Dist | 21 | \$936,000 | \$561,811 | \$30,563 |
| 28 | System Capacity \& Performance | C080897 | RI VVO Exp - Pontiac 27 Dist | 21 | \$694,626 | \$420,321 | \$22,865 |
| 29 | System Capacity \& Performance | C080898 | RI VVO Exp - Farnum Pike 23 Dist | 21 | \$400,000 | \$224,000 | \$12,186 |
| 30 | System Capacity \& Performance | C080901 | RI VVO Exp - Pontiac 27 Sub | 21 | \$575,000 | \$322,500 | \$17,544 |
| 31 | System Capacity \& Performance | C084731 | RI VVO Expansion - Woonsocket 26 | 21 | \$15,000 | \$104,513 | \$5,686 |
| 32 | System Capacity \& Performance | C085038 | CHOPMIST 3V0 D-SUB | 14 | \$81,000 | \$183,966 | \$10,008 |
| 33 | System Capacity \& Performance | C085276 | PUTNAM PIKE 3V0 D-SUB | 14 | \$43,000 | \$39,391 | \$2,143 |
| 34 | System Capacity \& Performance | C08TBD1 | Natick 3V0 D-SUB | 14 | \$500,000 | \$280,000 | \$15,232 |
| 35 | System Capacity \& Performance | C08TBD2 | WAMPANOAG 3V0 D-SUB | 14 | \$80,000 | \$45,000 | \$2,448 |
| 36 | System Capacity \& Performance | C08TBD3 | Highland Park 3V0 D-SUB | 14 | \$80,000 | \$45,000 | \$2,448 |
| 37 | System Capacity \& Performance | C085540 | ELDRED 3V0 D-SUB | 14 | \$125,000 | \$296,750 | \$16,143 |
| 38 | System Capacity \& Performance | C085628 | RI Mobile 3V0 Units | 14 | \$125,000 | \$339,608 | \$18,475 |
| 39 | System Capacity \& Performance | C085688 | RI- VVO Putnam Pike | 21 | \$562,000 | \$345,862 | \$18,815 |
| 40 | System Capacity \& Performance | C085689 | RI VVO Putnam Pike | 21 | \$45,000 | \$30,545 | \$1,662 |
| 41 | System Capacity \& Performance | COS0015 | Ocean St-Dist-Reliability Blanket. | 34 | \$1,262,000 | \$1,424,196 | \$77,476 |
| 42 | System Capacity \& Performance | COS0025 | OS-Dist-Substation LR/Rel Blnkt | 34 | \$133,000 | \$128,466 | \$6,989 |
| 43 | Total System Capacity \& Performance |  |  |  | \$18,372,335 | \$16,720,533 | \$909,597 |
| 44 | FY22 Depreciation, Return and Taxes | ssociated wit | FY22 investment | \$3,644,310 |  |  |  |
| 45 | FY22 Property tax associated with FY2 | investment |  | \$2,566,000 |  |  |  |
| 46 | Total FY22 revenue requirement associ | ated with FY | investment | \$6,210,310 |  |  |  |
| 47 | Total FY22 Capital Placed into Service | Plus Cost of | emoval (COR) | \$114,112,000 |  |  |  |
| 48 | Ratio of Revenue Requirement to Capi | Placed into | Service Plus COR | 5.44\% |  |  |  |

[^4]
## PUC 1-19

## Request:

The goal of the question is to understand the timing of each of the new Lafayette substation and Wickford substation that will be located within the same fence area. Please provide two timelines on the same page showing the study dates, results, planning, design, engineering, projected inservice date, etc. of (1) the new Lafayette substation and (2) the Wickford substation. Please explain why the projects were not considered as one comprehensive project.

Response:
As shown by the project schedules below, the new Lafayette substation project, which is a Company-driven project, is still in the preliminary engineering phase, while the Wickford Junction project is on a different timeline and is approaching construction start. The Wickford Junction project is a customer-driven project that is being exclusively constructed to address impacts to the system resulting from interconnection of proposed DG projects. These types of projects are engineered to best meet the customer's desired schedule.

In addition, the Company cannot know with certainty that any specific customer driven project will progress. Customers can withdraw their application at any point in time, even after an executed Interconnection Service Agreement (ISA) has been signed. Unless a customer driven project has met satisfactory criteria (specifically, the Company is fully assured the customerdriven project will be constructed and put in service and/or risks associated with the customer driven project not moving forward are minimal), the Company cannot recommend projects determined through area studies that depend on a specific customer project moving forward as that adds risk of meeting the area study project schedule and likely requiring additional cost to ratepayers. Also, all Company-driven projects must proceed through the annual Infrastructure, Safety, and Reliability (ISR) plan process before progressing the project. If a Company-driven project is combined with a customer-driven project, both projects would need to wait for ISR approval before progressing, which could adversely impact the customer schedule. Though the new Lafayette and Wickford Junction projects are separate, the Company has considered both projects as each one progresses. The Company has and continues to work to optimize the design of both projects as best as possible.

## PUC 1-19, page 2

Schedules for the new Lafayette and Wickford Junction substations are included below.

|  | New Lafayette | Wickford Junction |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Study | South County Area <br> Study | System Impact Study |
| System Impact Study (Initial) Start | - | February-18 |
| System Impact Study (Initial) <br> Completion | - | June-18 |
| System Impact Study (Final) Start | - | October-19 |
| System Impact Study (Final) <br> Completion | - | July-20 |
| Study Completion Dates | March-18 | July-20 |
| Preliminary Engineering start | May-20 | September-18 |
| Preliminary Engineering Completion | April-21 | December-19 |
| Final Design Completed | September-22 | June-21 |
| Construction Start | February-23 | November-20 |
| Projected In-Service Date | May-24 | December-21 |

As discussed in the meeting on December 21, 2020, the Company agreed to provide additional information about the progress for the proposed new Lafayette substation and the Wickford Junction substation and the rationale as to designing them as electrically separate substations.

The Company reviewed whether the new Lafayette substation could be supplied by the Wickford Junction 34.5 kV yard. This option is not recommended considering the following:

1. There are no reliability benefits or cost benefits of supplying the 12.47 kV substation from the 34.5 kV Wickford Junction substation as an interruption in the supply to the 34.5 kV source would interrupt all the customers fed from that source (the 12.47 kV customers). This configuration would have inferior reliability for customers.
2. The configuration would result in substantially higher losses on the system resulting in potentially higher costs for other customers. This option would have losses associated with the Wickford Junction $115-34.5 \mathrm{kV}$ transformer and the $34.5-12.47 \mathrm{kV}$ transformer. If the station is $115-12.47 \mathrm{kV}$, there are only losses associated with one transformer instead of two. This option would also minimize available hosting capacity on the 12.47 kV system.

## PUC 1-19, page 3

3. When siting distribution substations, one aspect that is considered is the availability of a transmission supply source ( 69 kV or above) nearby. With a 115 kV supply available close to the new Lafayette substation, the optimal solution would be to use 115 kV as the supply source.

Supplying the new Lafayette substation and Wickford Junction substation from the same transmission line taps and ring bus would need to be investigated further to confirm feasibility, as there are physical site constraints (possibly requiring land acquisition), new permits (modifying/adding to existing granted permits), that could limit options and feasibility. Even if this configuration was determined feasible, the need for the ring bus is prompted solely due to having 20MWs or more of proposed generation connected at the substation. In order to supply the new Lafayette substation from the needed new ring bus, additional infrastructure would be required, and it is estimated costs assigned to the developer would either remain effectively the same or could potentially increase. In addition, the incremental equipment required with a revised design of the new Lafayette substation would be considerably higher than the current recommended plan.

The Company does not recommend the more costly option for Company-driven projects when both alternatives achieve the same solution as it is the Company's responsibility to recommend the least cost, fit for purpose option for our customers. Therefore, even if supplying the new Lafayette substation from the same 115 kV bus as Wickford Junction was determined feasible, it is not the preferred option for the new Lafayette substation and would have virtually no cost benefits.

Both the new Lafayette substation and Wickford Junction substation are fully optimized based upon their current electrical arrangement and there is very limited space for any additions. The current design is the best option for both projects and the Company will continue to optimize the projects wherever possible as they progress. For example, a separate control enclosure for new Lafayette substation is not being installed; instead one control enclosure will serve both the Wickford Junction and new Lafayette substations.

Wickford Junction is being executed under an EPC (Engineer, Procure, Construct) contract. Any changes to the current designs will result in significant schedule delays, contract change orders and potentially additional costs to the developer. Redesigning these projects could result in a delay of approximately 12-18 months. This could potentially be delayed further due to ISO-NE restudy requirements and any required permit re-filings.

## PUC 1-20

## Request:

Please explain why the Wickford substation was not an option for addressing the asset conditions issues identified in the South County Area Study. Was the Division provided, as part of the ISR, information on the interconnection study that would result in the Wickford substation when it was reviewing the proposed new Lafayette substation? If not, why not? If so, please provide the documentation.

## Response:

The Wickford substation project does not address existing area needs as identified by the Company through its area study. The Wickford substation project exclusively addresses system impacts specifically created by the addition of proposed large-scale solar interconnections in the area.

The Wickford substation project is a customer-driven project, and these types of projects are engineered to best meet the customer's desired schedule. The Company cannot know with certainty that any specific customer-driven project will progress to completion. Customers may withdraw their application at any point in time, even after an executed Interconnection Service Agreement (ISA) has been signed. Unless a customer-driven project has met satisfactory criteria (specifically, the Company is fully assured the customer-driven project will be constructed and placed in service and/or risks associated with the customer-driven project not moving forward are minimal), the Company cannot recommend projects determined through area studies that depend on a specific customer project moving forward, as that adds risk of meeting the area study project schedule and likely requiring additional cost to ratepayers. Therefore, the Company did not look to solve area study issues with a proposed distributed generation customer project.

The Division was not provided the interconnection study since interconnection studies are not part of annual ISR plans.

## PUC 1-21

## Request:

Please explain whether the Company revisited the results of the South County Area Study in light of construction of the Wickford Junction substation with an expected in-service date of December 2021 between July 2018 and May 2020. If not, why not? If so, what were the results of the review?

## Response:

The Company did not revisit the results of the South County East Area study in light of the construction of the Wickford Junction substation with an expected in-service date of December 2021. As explained in PUC 1-19 and 1-20, the Wickford Junction and new Lafayette projects have different drivers and address different issues.

The Wickford Junction substation built for a Distributed Generation (DG) customer does not address the loading, asset condition or reliability issues identified in the South County East Study. The South County East area study did not need to be revisited since the recommendations in the study remain the same regardless of the installation of the Wickford Junction substation.

The issues identified in the South County East area study require a new substation with a low side of 12.47 kV to supply the existing 12.47 kV distribution system and enable retirement of other higher voltage circuits that supply the existing Lafayette substation. The Company continues to evaluate ways to combine the two projects from a construction implementation perspective to maximize efficiencies.

## PUC 1-22

## Request:

When was the Division first advised that the Wickford Junction substation and New Lafayette substation would be in the same fence area?

## Response:

The Division was first advised that the Wickford Junction substation and new Lafayette substation would be in the same fence area in a meeting between the Division and the Company on August 18, 2020.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Per Commission counsel's update on October 2, 2020, concerning the COVID-19 emergency period, the Company is submitting an electronic version of this filing followed by an original and five hard copies filed with the Clerk within 24 hours of the electronic filing.
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