



Laura S. Olton  
General Counsel

December 14, 2004

**VIA HAND DELIVERY & ELECTRONIC MAIL**

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

**RE: Docket No. 3643 – In re: Complaint Regarding Line Extension Rates  
Response to Commission’s Record Request**

Dear Ms. Massaro:

Enclosed please find ten copies of The Narragansett Electric Company’s response to the Commission’s Record Request issued at the Open Meeting on November 23, 2004.

Thank you for your attention to this filing. If you have any questions regarding this transmittal, please do not hesitate to contact me at (401) 784-7667.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Laura S. Olton".

Laura S. Olton

Enclosures

cc: Cindy Wilson, Esq.  
John Spirito, Jr., Esq.  
James Lanni  
Terry O’Brien  
Scott Pollard, Esq.

Commission Record Request

Request:

Did Narragansett Electric charge any of the four customers with electric service on Tray Hollow Road a fee under its residential line extension policy?

Response:

No. According to the research we have gathered, it appears that none of the four customers with electric service on Tray Hollow Road ever paid a fee under the Company's line extension policy. In 1999, three customers building homes on Tray Hollow Road requested electric service from Narragansett (Lots 14B-1, 14B-2, and 14B-3 on the attached plot plan). At the same time a fourth home was being developed on Tray Hollow Road (Lot 14B-4), which sought electric service from the Company in 2000.

When the Company designed the line in 1999, it determined that the four homes being developed would be best served from ten poles in the public way. These poles would also be used to serve the buildable lots adjacent to and across the street from the homes being built (see Lots 28A, 18, 18A, and 17).

Under the Company's residential line extension policy, each customer applying for electric service is entitled to two poles and two pole spans at no cost. It appears that because the total number of poles and pole spans did not exceed the allowance of 16 poles and pole spans that would have resulted under the residential line extension policy for eight anticipated services (i.e., the four initial requests, plus the four adjacent parcels), Narragansett did not assess a line extension charge in connection with the initial service requests. Nevertheless, strictly construing the line extension policy, Narragansett should have charged two of the four customers a fee for the line extension. It is not clear in our records why no such charge was made. However, given the development on the road at the time, it was our understanding that these poles would clearly serve the adjacent buildable lots.

It should also be noted that a decision was likely made by field personnel of either the Company and/or Verizon (as Foster is a telephone company pole setting area), that rather than dead end the line at pole 10, additional poles should be installed for engineering purposes. Thus, the last three poles currently on Tray Hollow Road are not serving any customers.

Prepared by or under the supervision of:  
Kevin Rennick

Submitted on: December 14, 2004