

**STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**IN RE: THE NARRAGANSETT ELECTRIC COMPANY :
d/b/a RHODE ISLAND ENERGY APPLICATION FOR : DOCKET NO. 25-45-GE
APPROVAL OF A CHANGE IN ELECTRIC AND GAS :
BASE DISTRIBUTION RATES :**

**SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY
OF
WILLIAM F. WATSON, PhD
ON BEHALF OF THE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES AND CARRIERS**

May 26, 2026

Prefiled Surrebuttal Testimony of

William F. Watson, PhD

**On Behalf of Rhode Island Division of Public Utilities and Carriers
Docket No. 25-45-GE**

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page Nos.</u>
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Purpose of Surrebuttal Testimony	1
III.	Tiverton and Weaver Hill	2
IV.	EDCC Relocation Expenses	3

Summary

William F. Watson is Principal Consultant with Econalytics, LLC, testifying on behalf of the Rhode Island Division of Public Utilities and Carriers. Mr. Watson reiterates the witness's positions presented in his direct testimony and refutes the claims made in rebuttal testimony by Rhode Island Energy Company's witnesses Kathy Castro and Thomas Camara.

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM F. WATSON

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 **Q. Please state your name and the business address of your employer.**

3 A. My name is William Franklin Watson. I am Principal and owner of Econalytics,
4 LLC, a Virginia consulting firm located at 1603 Logwood Circle, Richmond,
5 Virginia 23238, and am contracting with and filing testimony under Gregory L.
6 Booth, PLLC ("Booth, PLLC"), mailing address 14660 Falls of Neuse Road, Suite
7 149-110, Raleigh, North Carolina 27614.

8 **Q. On whose behalf are you testifying in this matter?**

9 A. I am testifying on behalf of the Rhode Island Division of Public Utilities and Carriers
10 ("Division").

11 **Q. Did you previously file direct testimony in this Docket on April 16, 2026?**

12 A. Yes.

13 **II. PURPOSE OF YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

14 **Q. What is the purpose of this surrebuttal testimony?**

15 A. The purpose of my surrebuttal testimony is to respond to the rebuttal testimony of
16 Kathy Castro and Thomas Camara filed on behalf of Rhode Island Energy
17 ("Company").

18 **Q. Have you read Kathy Castro's rebuttal testimony and does anything she stated
19 change your or the Division's position on Weaver Hill, Tiverton?**

20 A. I have read her rebuttal testimony. Ms. Castro did not present anything in her rebuttal
21 testimony which changes the Division's position and my direct testimony.

1 **Q. Have you read Thomas Camara’s rebuttal testimony and does anything she**
2 **stated change your or the Division’s position on the cost of relocation of the**
3 **Electric Distribution Control Center?**

4 A. I have read his rebuttal testimony. Mr. Thomas did not present anything in his
5 rebuttal testimony which changes the Division’s position and my direct testimony.

6 **III. TIVERTON AND WEAVER HILL**

7 **Q. In Ms. Castro’s rebuttal testimony, she states that the Tiverton and Weaver Hill**
8 **accelerated modifications projects for which the Company is seeking**
9 **reimbursement through this rate case are currently necessary.¹ Has Ms. Castro**
10 **provided new information that would change the Division’s position or your**
11 **direct testimony in anyway?**

12 A. No, my testimony remains.

13 **Q. Has Ms. Castro demonstrated that accelerated modifications at the Tiverton**
14 **and Weaver Hill substations are currently needed?**

15 A. No. Ms. Castro states that the Tiverton 33F6 feeder was initially identified for capital
16 investment for four reasons; overloaded feeders, voltage violations, contingency
17 load-at-risk, and reliability; and that the Weaver Hill substation project was
18 identified for capital investment for three primary reasons; overloaded feeders,
19 voltage performance issues on one feeder, and reliability.² Division witness Mr.
20 Booth addresses these engineering issues in his surrebuttal testimony filed in this

¹ Rebuttal Testimony of Kathy Castro, Page 8, Lines 8-9.

² *Id.* Page 10, Line 16 to Page 12, Line 3.

1 case. The Division's position remains that overloaded feeders are not expected to
2 develop until 2035 or later, and voltage violations and reliability concerns can be
3 remedied with much less expensive alternatives.

4 **IV. EDCC RELOCATION EXPENSES**

5 **Q: Have you read Thomas Camara's rebuttal testimony and does anything she**
6 **stated change your or the Division's position with regard to the relocation**
7 **expenses for moving the Electric Distribution Control Center from Lincoln to**
8 **Cumberland?**

9 A: I have read Mr. Camara's rebuttal testimony and nothing in it changes the Division's
10 position. The crucial question remains; would this have occurred in the absence of the
11 acquisition of Narragansett Electric Company by PPL and the answer remains no.

12 **Q: Does this conclude your testimony?**

13 A: Yes.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

IN RE: THE NARRAGANSETT ELECTRIC COMPANY)
d/b/a RHODE ISLAND ENERGY APPLICATION FOR) DOCKET NO. 2S-45-GE
APPROVAL OF A CHANGE IN ELECTRIC AND GAS)
BASE DISTRIBUTION RATES)

AFFIDAVIT OF William F. Watson

I, William F. Watson under oath, depose and say:

1. The attached testimony and attachments/schedules were prepared by me or under my direct supervision and are true and accurate to the best of my information and belief.
2. The attached pre-filed direct testimony and related attachments/schedules are submitted on behalf of the RI Division of Public Utilities & Carriers.

State of Virginia
County Henrico

Subscribed and sworn to before me on this 22th day of May, 2026, by William F. Watson, who proved to me through satisfactory evidence of identification, to be the person who appeared before me.

Brian S. Bailey
Notary signature

Notary Name: Brian S. Bailey

Commission expires: 5-31-28

