



Marc Richter
Associate General Counsel

June 26, 2008

By Overnight Mail

Hon. Jaclyn A. Brillling, Secretary
New York State
Public Service Commission
Three Empire State Plaza
Albany, NY 12223

**Re: Case No. 07-S-1315
Con Edison Steam Rate Case**

Dear Secretary Brillling:

Attached is an original and 25 copies of the Company's Statement in Support of the June 16, 2008 Joint Proposal in the referenced proceeding. All parties have been served via e-mail.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Very truly yours,

Attach.

cc Hon. Michelle L. Phillips, Administrative Law Judge
All Active Parties (via electronic mail)

**STATE OF NEW YORK
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

Case No. 07-S-1315	Proceeding on Motion of the	:	
	Commission as to the Rates, Charges,	:	Before
	Rules and Regulations of Consolidated	:	Hon. Michelle L. Phillips
	Edison Company of New York, Inc.	:	
	For Steam Service	:	

**STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF
JOINT PROPOSAL**

Chanoch Lubling
Marc Richter
Richard B. Miller
Mary Krayeske
Enver Acevedo

Attorneys for:
Consolidated Edison Company of
New York, Inc.
4 Irving Place – Room 1815-S
New York, New York 10003
(212) 460-4615

Dated: June 26, 2008
New York, New York

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. BACKGROUND2

B. OVERALL FRAMEWORK OF THE JOINT PROPOSAL4

C. RATES AND REVENUE LEVELS6

 1. Two-Year Steam Rate Plan 6

D. RATE DESIGN 11

 1. Revenue Allocation and Rate Design..... 11

 2. Demand Billing 12

 3. Fuel Costs..... 14

 4. ERRP Allocation 15

 a. Existing Allocation of the Costs of ERRP is Fair to Customers16

 b. Proposal’s Provision for Further Study of ERRP’s Cost Allocation17

E. EARNINGS SHARING 18

F. RECONCILIATIONS 19

G. STEAM BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT AND RETENTION21

H. THERMAL EFFICIENCY/LOSSES22

I. STEAM ENERGY EFFICIENCY23

J. SAFETY PERFORMANCE MEASURES24

K. STEAM RESOURCE PLAN25

L. MISCELLANEOUS TARIFF CHANGES26

M. THE REASONABLENESS OF THE PROPOSAL.....26

**STATE OF NEW YORK
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

Case No. 07-S-1315	Proceeding on Motion of the	:	
	Commission as to the Rates, Charges,	:	Before
	Rules and Regulations of Consolidated	:	Hon. Michelle L. Phillips
	Edison Company of New York, Inc.	:	
	For Steam Service	:	

**STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF
JOINT PROPOSAL**

On June 16, 2008, Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (“Con Edison” or the “Company”), New York State Department of Public Service Staff (“Staff”), the City of New York (“City”), Consumer Power Advocates (“CPA”), and New York Energy Consumers Council, Inc. (“NYECC”) entered into a Joint Proposal (the “Proposal”) to establish new rates for Con Edison’s steam service (“Steam”) for a two-year period from October 1, 2008 through September 30, 2010 (“Steam Rate Plan”). The Proposal was filed with the New York State Public Service Commission (“Commission”) on June 16, 2008. Pursuant to a procedural schedule adopted on June 17, 2008 by Administrative Law Judge Michelle L. Phillips, the presiding officer in this proceeding, Con Edison submits this Statement in Support of Joint Proposal (“Statement”).

The Proposal balances customers’ interests and the Company’s need for rate relief to cover increased expenses and to provide for the necessary investment in the Company’s steam infrastructure to maintain safe and reliable steam service over the short and long term; reflects various measures to mitigate the rate increases; provides customers with rate predictability for at least two years; reflects the Company’s commitment to steam business development and steam

energy efficiency; and addresses various other issues and concerns raised by the parties during the proceeding.

The Proposal resolves all of the issues raised by the parties in this proceeding to the satisfaction of virtually all active parties in this case, but one,¹ and establishes rates that will enable the Company to provide safe and adequate steam service at just and reasonable rates. The Proposal is supported by parties representing a broad range of diverse interests, including major commercial and governmental customers and their representatives, and comports with the Commission's goals and policies.

The Proposal fully satisfies the Commission's settlement guidelines,² and should be promptly approved by the Commission in all respects.

A. BACKGROUND

On November 2, 2007, Con Edison filed a request with the Commission to increase charges to its steam customers ("Initial Filing"). The filed steam tariff leaves reflected the traditional method (one-year rate plan) of calculating the revenue requirement for the rate year, the twelve months ending September 30, 2009 ("Rate Year"). The requested increase in base rates was designed to produce additional annual revenues of approximately \$126.6 million, including gross receipts taxes, based on a forecasted level of sales for the rate year.

The Initial Filing also presented a three-year rate proposal as an alternative to a one-year rate plan. Under this proposal, the Company sought additional increases in the second and third rate years of \$22.4 million and \$15.2 million, respectively.³

¹ To the Company's knowledge, Westchester County will likely object to the allocation of East River Repowering Project costs between electric services ("Electric") and steam services ("Steam") and, as indicated on its signature page to the Proposal, the City will likely propose an additional provision for section L of the Proposal concerning the Company's October 26, 2007 Steam Resource Plan ("Steam Resource Plan").

² Case No. 90-M-0255, Opinion No. 92-2, March 24, 1992.

³ By orders dated November 8, 2007, and March 25, 2008, the Commission suspended the proposed steam rates, first through March 30, 2008, and subsequently through September 30, 2008. Parties to the proceeding engaged in

On February 29, 2008, five of the active parties in this proceeding filed testimony in response to the Initial Filing. Staff recommended that the Company's steam base rates be increased by \$60 million (1372)⁴ and the City recommended that rates be increased by \$40 million (2104).

On March 17, 2008, Con Edison filed rebuttal and update testimony. The Company's update reflected an increase to the revenue requirement requested in the Initial Filing of approximately \$3.7 million, resulting in an updated revenue requirement increase of \$130.3 million. This increase was primarily attributable to an update to the Company's sales forecast to reflect the actual weather normalized sales that had occurred during the period November 2007 through February 2008 and the implementation of programs pursuant to the Company's December 2007 Recommendations and Action Plan, issued in response to the July 2007 steam pipe rupture, and Staff's recommendations as per the Commission's February 13, 2008 Order in Case 07-S-0984.

Evidentiary hearings on the Company's requested rate increases commenced on April 7, 2008, and concluded on April 10, 2008. During the hearings, 28 witnesses representing the Company, Staff, the City, CPA, NYECC and the County of Westchester ("Westchester") provided testimony; a majority of these witnesses were subjected to cross-examination. In total, the record comprises 2,127 pages plus 216 exhibits.

On April 11, 2008, following the completion of hearings on the Company's filing, but before the submittal of post-hearing briefs, Con Edison issued a notice of the commencement of settlement negotiations, which was filed with the Secretary to the Commission and served on all parties. Settlement negotiations began on April 16, 2008 and continued through June 16, 2008.

extensive discovery, propounding approximately 440 questions regarding the Company's filing and various aspects of the Company's business.

⁴ Parenthetical numerals without prefix refer to the stenographer's minutes in this proceeding.

Negotiations, either in person or via teleconference, took place on April 16-18, 30, May 7, 15-16, 20-21, and June 11, 13 and 16, 2008.

All settlement negotiations were conducted in accordance with the Commission's Settlement Rules, 16 NYCRR § 3.9, and all parties received appropriate advance notice of all negotiating sessions, including breakout sessions that, pursuant to agreement of the active parties, were conducted on particular issues during the same time period.

The parties' negotiations were successful and resulted in this Proposal, which will be presented to the Commission for its consideration.

B. OVERALL FRAMEWORK OF THE JOINT PROPOSAL

The Proposal provides a comprehensive resolution of all the issues raised in this proceeding and, taken in its entirety, furthers the objective of the Company's continuing to provide safe and reliable steam service at just and reasonable rates, while providing the Company with revenues consistent with the need to maintain, upgrade and enhance the steam system infrastructure.

In general, the Proposal provides a comprehensive two-year rate plan for steam service that results in an increase in base rates designed to produce an additional \$53.0 million of annual revenues in RY1 and an additional \$24.7 million in revenues on an annual basis in RY2,⁵ or, as recommended by the Signatory Parties, levelized rate increases designed to provide for \$43.7 million of additional annual revenues in each of RY1 and RY2. The revenue requirement underlying this Proposal is net of the amortization of various customer credits and debits on the Company's books of account that have been previously deferred by the Company.

As described below, the Proposal is designed to provide the Company with needed rate

⁵ The first rate year ("RY1") is the period of October 1, 2008 through September 30, 2009 and the second rate year ("RY2") is the period of October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010.

relief, while encouraging the Company to continue to make the capital expenditures required to maintain safe and reliable service. The Proposal initiates safety performance measures; continues steam business development and customer service performance measures; establishes efforts to consider Steam Energy Efficiency programs and reduce thermal efficiency/losses; and contains a Company commitment to file a supplement to its Steam Resource Plan.

In this proceeding, the collaborative process for settlement served the parties well and provided an appropriate setting for resolving the many complex and diverse issues raised by the parties. The process enabled the parties to fully explore their respective positions and reach a compromise on those diverse positions. As with any compromise, individual provisions of the Proposal may not be to the liking of one or more parties, and all parties, including the Company, made significant concessions to reach agreement.

Indeed, numerous provisions of the Proposal were very difficult for the Company to accept. For example, the Company accepted significantly lower base rate increases than supported by its rate filings, including a materially lower rate of return on its investments, which do not provide for the recovery of several legitimate business expenses.⁶ The Proposal also provides for a lower level of annual depreciation expense than supported by the Company's studies and a recent Commission ruling establishing a five-year amortization of the reserve deficiency; the institution of safety performance measures and associated negative revenue adjustments for emergency response and, starting in RY2, for year-end steam leak backlog,

⁶ For example, the rates do not provide for the recovery of certain elements of employee compensation that were recently excluded from the Company's electric rates by the Commission's March 25, 2008 decision in Case 07-E-0523, even though this matter is to be revisited by the Commission in the Company's current electric rate proceeding (Case 08-E-0539) and could have been held in abeyance pending the Commission's ultimate determination. In addition, the proposed rates reflect the elimination of the steam pension/OPEB expense or credit recorded prior to October 1, 2004 from the Company's earnings base or capitalization. The Company notes that by agreeing to this Proposal, the Company does not waive any of its rights with respect to the issue of including pension/OPEB expense in the Company's earnings base or capitalization for ratemaking purposes, and reserves all of its rights to pursue its position as to this matter in any proceeding before the Commission, except with respect to the steam base rates established by this Proposal for the term of the Steam Rate Plan.

notwithstanding recent Company performance in these areas that meet all Commission requirements and are unquestionably reasonable, if not exemplary; a number of downward-only reconciliation mechanisms; and extended amortization periods for the Company's recovery of various material expenses, thereby reducing cash that would otherwise be available to the Company to fund its O&M and capital programs.

As discussed infra, the Proposal also reflects the Company's agreement to assume a level of forecasted sales and revenues that captures only in small part the dramatically lower weather normalized sales experienced by the Company during this past winter, despite updated evidence that the experienced decrease in sales, which could not have reasonably been anticipated, clearly demonstrated that the sales forecasted in the Company's Initial Filing were materially overstated; nor does it reflect evidence presented by the Company as to the potential customer response (in terms of reduced usage) to increased steam rates. It also reflects the Company's agreement to no longer pursue in this case the implementation of revenue decoupling for its steam business (in light of surprisingly stern (and in the Company's view, unfounded) opposition to the application of Commission policy favoring revenue decoupling to the Company's steam service (1976-1985; 2033-2034; 1824-1827)).

Given the wide range of complex issues presented, the Company ultimately concluded that the Proposal was reasonable on an overall basis, accepting the many unfavorable features of the Proposal as part of the give and take inherent in any compromise.

C. RATES AND REVENUE LEVELS

1. Two-Year Steam Rate Plan

The Proposal covers Con Edison's steam rates and charges for retail steam sales and steam transportation service for the term of the Steam Rate Plan – the two-year period October 1, 2008 through September 30, 2010. As explained above, the Proposal provides for an increase in

steam base rates, designed to produce an additional \$53.0 million in revenues on an annual basis in RY1 and an additional \$24.7 million in annual revenues in RY2, and recommends that these rate increases be implemented on a levelized basis (\$43.7 million in each of RY1 and RY2) in order to mitigate the impact of the RY1 increase on the Company's steam customers.⁷ Under either scenario, the proposed increases are materially less than the Company's annual revenue increase request in its Initial Filing (approximately \$126.6 million, updated on March 17, 2008 to \$130.3 million), and even less than the \$60 million revenue requirement increase recommended by Staff in its direct case (1372).⁸

The City's direct case proposed aggregate adjustments to lower the Company's request by approximately \$79.4 million relating to return on equity, depreciation, application of Steam's share of proceeds from the sale of First Avenue Properties, and an adjustment to the sales forecast (2104). The Proposal also addresses each of those adjustments in a manner supported by the City. For example, the forecasted sales and revenues for RY1 reflected in the proposed rates (Proposal, App. C, p. 1) are, on the one hand, materially higher than those forecasted by the Company (713-717; Exh. 58) and, on the other hand, slightly lower than the level proposed by Staff (788-789; 1372) and the City (2100-2101). That is because the adjusted sales figures reflect only in small part the lower weather normalized sales experienced this past winter.⁹ Accordingly, the agreed-upon sales forecast reflects a material risk to the Company, significantly affected by matters outside the Company's control, which it accepted as part of the Proposal's

⁷ The increases to be implemented and maintained in each rate year (i.e., permanently and cumulatively) under the recommended levelized rate plan reflect, in part, the application of interest at the Other Customer Capital rate on the rate increase that would have been collected in RY1 absent the phase-in of the RY1 rate increase.

⁸ The proposed non-levelized increase for RY2 of \$24.7 million is in line with the Company's RY2 proposal in its Initial Filing. The RY2 changes, including true-up targets, are summarized in Appendices A through D.

⁹ One could also attribute to the agreed-upon sales forecast a lower price elasticity adjustment than proposed by the Company in its Initial Filing to recognize a lesser customer response to the proposed levelized rate increase for RY1, which is almost two-thirds less than the increase reflected in the Company's March 17, 2008 update filing (713-717; Exh. 58).

comprehensive resolution of a myriad of contested issues.

The Proposal reflects the Signatory Parties' agreement as to the Company's forecasted production plant capital expenditures (Proposal, p. 12) and the need for its proposed operating programs, including the steam incident-related programs being implemented by the Company pursuant to its December 2007 Recommendations and Action Plan and Staff recommendations, as per the Commission's February 13, 2008 Order in Case 07-S-0984 (544-546; Proposal, p. 16). The Proposal balances the impact of recovering 100 percent of forecasted costs for these programs in current rates with the impact of deferring all such costs to the Company's next steam base rates proceeding by providing for a substantial portion of such costs to be recovered currently, subject to reconciliation to actual costs (discussed infra).¹⁰ Recovery of program costs is also subject to the outcome of the steam pipe rupture proceeding, where such programs may be further considered, and the Company identifying that the costs for which the Company seeks recovery are incremental to the costs of programs already funded in rates and reflect any efficiencies achieved by the Company in implementing these programs.

While the proposed rates are designed to provide the Company with additional revenues necessary to implement forecasted capital and operating programs, the proposed rates also reflect the use of credits and extended amortization and cost recovery periods for various costs and expenses designed to mitigate the impact of rate increases on the Company's steam customers and lower rates during the term of this Proposal. For example, while the Company sought to increase its recovery of World Trade Center ("WTC") expenses (given that opportunities for federal or other reimbursement have been virtually exhausted and the incurrence of these costs

¹⁰ The proposed rates reflect \$3 million for O&M as compared to projected annual expenses of more than \$6 million, and \$5 million for capital in each of RYs 1 and 2, as compared to capital expenditures for such programs estimated at \$16.3 million for 2009, at \$16.3 million for 2010 and at \$12.5 million for 2011 (Proposal, App. D, pp. 2-3).

date back to 2001 (895-898)), the Proposal limits the level of WTC costs recovered in rates to the current level during the term of this Rate Plan. Similarly, the Company agreed to the extended recovery of environmental remediation costs, instead of the three-year period recommended by the Company's Accounting Panel (1003) and used in the current Steam Rate Plan.

The Proposal also provides for rates to be further reduced based upon projected proceeds from the sale of SO₂ allowances during the two-year term, as proposed by the Company in its Initial Filing (963-964), to which no party objected. In addition, the two-year term of the Proposal provided a basis for a compromise between the Company's proposal to amortize the remaining portion of Steam's share of the proceeds from the Company sale of its First Avenue Properties over a three-year period (1041) and the City's proposal to use 100 percent of the Steam's share of the remaining proceeds to reduce rates in RY1 (2094-2096).

The Company also agreed to suspend its current recovery of its depreciation reserve deficiency over a five-year amortization period using guidelines adopted by the Commission in the 2006 Steam Rate Order,¹¹ without prejudice to the Company's proposing to reinstitute such amortization in the future.

To further mitigate the impact of the rate increase, the revenue requirement reflects compromises as to various elements of the Company's projected cost of service for RY1 and RY2. For example, the Company accepted Staff's lower forecasts of interference expenses and property taxes in connection with the Proposal's employment of various traditional reconciliation mechanisms (discussed *infra*) designed to protect both customers and the Company from increases and decreases in forecasted expenses that are outside the Company's control. Although Staff had opposed such reconciliations in the context of a one-year rate plan (1443-1444; 1461-

¹¹ Case 05-S-1376, Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. – Steam Rates, Order Determining Revenue Requirement and Rate Design (September 22, 2006)(“2006 Steam Rate Order”), App. A, p. 21.

1462), as proposed by the Company (857-860; 899-902), the two-year period covered by the Proposal provided a basis for all parties to agree that such reconciliation provisions were appropriate, which provisions the Commission has historically adopted (see, for example, 2006 Steam Rate Order, App. A, pp. 16-21).

Significantly, in addition to the mitigation measures reflected in the Proposal, the Commission has the ability to further mitigate the size of the RY1 increase by recognizing unbilled revenues on the Company's books and amortizing Steam unbilled revenues over the two-year period of the Steam Rate Plan. Unbilled revenues represent customers' consumption of steam from the time during the month that their meters are read until the end of the month. This would constitute a change in accounting that would require the Commission's approval and has the effect of accruing revenues on the Company's books, which is not the Company's current practice. Accordingly, the Company plans to file a petition with the Commission seeking authorization to make this accounting change for all of its services (i.e., electric, gas and steam). If that petition is approved, the Company would not object to applying such change in accounting to the rates established in this proceeding on a revenue and earnings neutral basis. The Company estimates that the implementation of this change in accounting for the two-year period of the Rate Plan would reduce the RY1 rate increase by approximately \$5.1 million, from \$53.0 million to \$47.9 million, and increase the RY2 increase by \$0.6 million, from \$24.7 million to \$25.3 million. On a levelized basis, the overall annual increase would be reduced by \$3.3 million, from \$43.7 million to \$40.4 million. The calculation of these amounts is set forth in Appendix I.

Finally, the Proposal recognizes that phasing in of the RY1 increase under the levelized rate proposal will produce higher base revenues for the Company at the end of the two-year term

of the Rate Plan of approximately \$9.6 million than if those revenues were not phased in. However, the Proposal also recognizes that these revenues are more than offset by the full application of the remaining credits to Steam customers of their share of the proceeds from the sale of the First Avenue Properties. The application of this credit produced lower annual base revenues for the Company of approximately \$12.8 million. Accordingly, the expiration of net credits at the end of RY2 will more than offset any higher base rates resulting from levelizing the proposed rate increases during the two-year term of the Rate Plan.

D. RATE DESIGN

1. Revenue Allocation and Rate Design

The Proposal better aligns cost causation with cost responsibility than is the case for steam base rates currently in effect. The revenue allocation implemented through the Proposal eliminates surpluses and deficiencies identified in the Company's embedded cost of service ("ECOS") study outside of a 10 percent tolerance band around the system rate of return (1544; Exh. 140), by 50 percent in RY1 and the remaining 50 percent in RY2 (Proposal, p. 6).

In its direct case, Staff agreed with the results of the Company's ECOS study, but proposed to limit the elimination of the identified deficiencies by imposing an overall service class increase limited to 1.5 times the overall system revenue increase; Staff also agreed with the Company's proposed rate design (1966-1973). While the City noted some problems with the inputs to the ECOS study, it did not recommend any changes and simply asked the Commission to address these issues in the Company's next ECOS study. The City did propose some refinements regarding SC 2 Rate II rate design (2041; 2049-2065).

The Proposal reflects consideration of the City's proposals and comments of other parties participating in settlement discussions. It provides for increases in the customer charge in each class that are more reflective of the Company's cost to provide service and includes re-designed

usage rates for SC 2 Rate II demand rate customers on a revenue neutral basis, which reflect a declining block rate structure (Proposal, pp. 6-7). The manner in which the base rate increases will be allocated to the different service classifications and in which rates will be designed within each service classification is set forth in Appendix H of the Proposal. A comparison of the current and proposed steam rates and estimated bill impacts for the first rate year that will result from the non-levelized base rate increases of approximately \$53.0 million, including gross receipts tax, are included in Appendix II to this Statement. Also, a comparison of the current and proposed steam rates and estimated bill impacts for the first rate year that would result from a levelized base rate increase to produce approximately \$43.7 million of additional annual revenues, including interest and gross receipts tax, are included in Appendix III.

2. Demand Billing

The Proposal also continues the application of demand billing to more of the Company's steam customers, in a continuing effort to provide customers with the incentive to minimize their usage of steam service during peak periods and, over time, reduce the system peak demand. Reducing the system peak demand reduces the amount of steam production capacity that will need to be maintained or constructed in the future, which will help to minimize costs for all steam customers in the long term. Demand billing also better reflects the costs that customers impose on the steam system.

Parties to this proceeding advanced several proposals relating to demand billing. Staff proposed that the Company submit a proposal to expand the applicability of demand billing to customers that use less than 22,000 Mlbs annually (1898-1899). CPA proposed that (1) SC2 and SC 3 demand rates in effect during the winter peak period (December through March) be redesigned to increase the recovery of winter peak period pure base revenues from 25 percent to 50 percent (1821), and (2) the Company apply demand billing to all customers whose annual

usage exceeds 14,000 Mlbs (1822-1824). The City proposed that the demand charges be raised in order to more closely align them with demand related costs and that the differential between the winter shoulder period (November and April) and the winter peak period (December through March, inclusive) usage charges be eliminated (2058). Regarding the City's and CPA's proposed rate design changes, the Company maintained that proposed rate design changes must be carefully reviewed and must consider customer impacts and that a phased-in approach to demand billing for additional customers was a preferable approach (1574-1579; 1667).

The Proposal implements the Staff, CPA, City and Company positions, as well as comments made by other parties participating in settlement discussions, in a reasonable manner.

As to increasing from 25 percent to 50 percent the recovery of winter pure base revenues in the demand charge, the Proposal recognizes that the 25 percent threshold was a consensus arrived at by the parties to the demand billing collaborative established in Case 05-S-1376, that the implementation of demand billing for the Company's steam customers is relatively new, and, therefore, that the potential impact on customers should be further evaluated to determine if there may be adverse impacts associated with such a change (e.g., customers leaving the steam system).

As to implementing demand rates for a larger population of customers, the Proposal provides for the Company to study the impacts of demand billing on customers with an annual usage equal to or greater than 22,000 Mlbs and the potential impact of demand billing on customers with an annual usage equal to or greater than 14,000 Mlbs but less than 22,000 Mlbs, for the 2008-2009 winter period. Among other things, this study will evaluate the potential customer impacts of changing the amount of winter peak period pure base revenues recovered in

demand rates from 25 percent to 50 percent.¹² The Proposal also provides for the Company to hold a technical conference in July 2009 to present the results of the study and to provide winter demand rates that the Company plans to use to sample-bill customers in the 14,000 MIbs to 22,000 MIbs category during the 2009-2010 winter period, with actual demand billing to be implemented in the following rate year, 2010-2011 on a revenue neutral basis. Based on winter billing data available from demand meters in place, the rates for all demand billed customers will be designed to yield the same winter period revenues from the customers within each service class as the revenues that would otherwise be collected at the rates effective commencing October 1, 2010.

3. Fuel Costs

The Proposal provides that variations between the actual cost of fuel and the base cost of fuel will continue to be recovered through the Fuel Adjustment Clause (“FAC”), including continuation of (i) the annual reconciliation of the steam fuel expenses and revenues; (ii) a base cost of fuel equal to \$8.049; and (iii) recovery through the FAC of the Company’s total fuel costs associated with the actual steam system variance, to the extent such costs are not recovered in base rates (Proposal, pp. 8-9). In this regard, the Proposal reflects the Company’s Initial Filing (534-535), to which no party objected.¹³

With respect to Staff’s position in its direct case that the Company propose an alternate form of recovery for certain costs for oil storage and handling (1384-1388), which the Company

¹² The Proposal recognizes that the Company must install vortex meters for customers that will be subject to demand billing and that the Company needs to install such meters for approximately 20 customers in the 14,000 MIbs to 22,000 MIbs category. The Proposal provides for the Company to install such meters prior to the 2009-2010 winter, while also recognizing that the Company will not be required to provide these meters if there is a delay due to customer access issues or if a customer advises the Company that it will not require steam service beyond the 2010-2011 winter period (Proposal, p. 7).

¹³ The Proposal continues the existing incentive mechanism for the variance (*i.e.*, line losses) under which the Company may earn an incentive, but is also at risk for recovery of up to \$5 million in fuel costs associated with variance in excess of the target level in each rate year. Section H of this Statement explains how the Proposal addresses the issues raised by certain parties with respect to this mechanism.

addressed in its rebuttal presentation (1286-1290), the Proposal resolves the issue in a reasonable manner, as follows: for the term of this Rate Plan, the Company will continue to recover these costs through the FAC; in its next steam base rate filing, the Company will propose to recover all Company labor costs currently recovered through the FAC in base rates; by June 30, 2009, the Company will review with Staff and interested parties all costs associated with oil storage and handling, including Company labor, to enable parties to consider which costs, if any, should be recovered in base rates the next time the Company's steam base rates are reset; and the Company's next steam base rate filing will identify such costs and the Company, Staff and other parties may propose that the Company thereafter recovery such costs in base rates rather than through the FAC.

This resolution provides the parties time to reasonably consider the costs that are included in this category to determine which costs, if any, should be recovered in a different manner, prospectively.

4. ERRP Allocation

The Proposal (p. 9) continues for the duration of the term of the Steam Rate Plan the existing allocation of the costs of the East River Repowering Project ("ERRP") between Electric and Steam, based on the "incremental cost" allocation method. Only Westchester opposed this allocation method (2011). In its rebuttal testimony, the Company demonstrated that Westchester's analysis was flawed and that there is no basis for changing the allocation method (1740-1752).

The existing allocation of ERRP costs was first examined and approved by the Commission in issuing the 2004 Steam Rate Order,¹⁴ and again analyzed and affirmed by the

¹⁴ Case 03-S-1672, Order Adopting The Terms of a Joint Proposal, September 27, 2004 ("2004 Steam Rate Order"), pp. 22-28.

Commission less than two years ago in the Company's last steam rate case proceeding.¹⁵ Indeed, the circumstances in this case have changed little from those the Commission considered long ago in adopting the "incremental cost" allocation method in its Opinion 78-27¹⁶ and again, more recently, in Opinion 00-15.¹⁷

a. Existing Allocation of the Costs of ERRP is Fair to Customers

In Con Edison's steam system, steam is generated in either steam-only plants (producing "live" steam) or in steam-electric plants, which produce steam and electricity from the same heat source.¹⁸ This joint use of facilities by Steam and Electric requires the allocation of capital costs, O&M costs, property taxes, and fuel costs between those services.

While there is no single unique method for allocating joint costs, the Commission has since 1978 (and prior to 1975) used the "incremental cost" method to allocate costs to Steam; i.e., only incremental costs required for the production of steam are allocated to Steam, while common costs or those only required for the production of electricity are allocated to Electric (2004 Steam Rate Order, p. 26). Since its re-adoption of the incremental cost method in 1978, the Commission has, on several occasions, expressly considered the reasonableness of continuing this allocation method and consistently required electric customers to pay the common costs of the steam-electric plants. *See, e.g.*, Case 27877, Con Edison Steam Rates, Opinion No. 81-16, 21 NY PSC 2065, 2075-2076 (1981); Case 90-S-0938, Con Edison Steam Rates, 1991 NY PUC LEXIS 42 (1991); Case 99-S-1621, Opinion No. 00-15, supra, p. 18.¹⁹

¹⁵ 2006 Steam Rate Order, pp. 20-26.

¹⁶ Case 27276, Con Edison Steam Rates, Opinion No. 78-27, 18 NYPSC 1764, 1768-70 (1978).

¹⁷ Case 99-S-1621, Con Edison Steam Rates, Opinion No. 00-15, December 1, 2000, pp. 18-20.

¹⁸ Until the late 1990's, the Company's steam-electric stations included East River, Waterside, 74th Street, 59th Street and Hudson Avenue. The electric production facilities at the latter four stations have been retired, leaving only East River as a steam-electric station.

¹⁹ Significantly, Westchester challenged in New York's courts the Commission's use of the "incremental method" in allocating costs of jointly-used facilities, but the courts found no reason to disturb the Commission's decisions.

Significantly, the Commission’s rationale has consistently been that requiring steam customers to pay more than incremental costs would increase the likelihood that steam customers would switch to electricity for heating and cooling, thus increasing demand and infrastructure requirements for those systems, to the detriment of all customers (1740, 1794). Moreover, in rebutting Westchester’s claim that the current allocation method is unfair to electric customers, the Company demonstrated that the costs currently borne by electric customers are reasonable and commensurate with the benefits they receive from ERRP’s operation (1742-1752, 1816-1817), and that there is no basis for disturbing the Commission’s well-established methodology for allocating ERRP’s costs.

Under the Proposal, this longstanding method for allocating costs is continued for ERRP.²⁰ Under the methodology first approved by the Commission in the 2004 Steam Rate Order (p. 16; App. F), capital costs, O&M costs, property taxes, and fuel costs for the heat recovery steam generator (“HRSG”) and their associated piping, water treatment plant, and steam-related interconnections are allocated to Steam. All other costs, which would be required for electric production absent any steam production, are allocated to Electric.²¹

b. Proposal’s Provision for Further Study of ERRP’s Cost Allocation

In its 2006 Steam Rate Order (pp. 24-25), the Commission rejected Westchester’s argument that the method for allocating ERRP’s costs be re-evaluated based upon the plant’s actual operating experience, finding that “ERRP’s initial operating experience has been

County of Westchester v. Helmer, 296 AD2d 68, 74 (3d Dept 2002). Westchester’s request for leave to appeal was denied by the Court of Appeals. County of Westchester v. Helmer, 99 NY2d 502 (2002).

²⁰ Unlike the other steam-electric plants, whose capital costs were included in Electric Plant with rents charged to steam production to cover incremental capital costs, ERRP’s capital costs are included in Steam Plant, with rents charged to electric production to cover all but the incremental capital costs. However, the result is the same.

²¹ It should be noted that ERRP differs from the other steam-electric plants in that it uses a gas turbine (“GT”) and HRSG instead of a conventional boiler and steam turbine. Thus, electricity is generated in the GT and its waste heat is captured in the HRSG and used to produce steam. Additional steam is produced in the HRSG by means of duct burners. These differences in plant design and technology are taken into account when applying the incremental cost method for allocating ERRP costs (2004 Steam Rate Order, Joint Proposal, App. F).

consistent with [the Commission's] expectation" when it approved the ERRP cost allocations and that, in any event, there was sufficient doubt that "ERRP's brief operating experience to date is sufficiently representative to support a policy reappraisal." Based on that purported invitation for further review of ERRP's cost allocation when additional operating data becomes available, and based on the possibility that "the Company's Steam Resource Plan could ultimately result in the Company building another combined steam/electric plant similar to ERRP," Staff recommended that the ERRP cost allocation be re-examined following the conclusion of the rate proceeding (1919-1921). Notwithstanding the Company's effective rebuttal of Westchester's and Staff's conclusions regarding the need for re-assessing yet again ERRP's cost allocations (1753), the Company agreed, as part of the give and take of settlement negotiations, to re-examine the allocation of the ERRP costs.

Accordingly, the Proposal (p. 9) requires the Company, with input from Staff and other parties, to "perform a detailed study on the allocation of the ERRP costs (e.g., capital, property taxes, O&M and fuel) between Steam and Electric." The study will be filed with the Commission, with an opportunity for comment by interested parties. Should the study result in the Company recommending changes to the allocation of ERRP costs, the Company will reflect such changes in its next steam base rate filing.

The provision for a follow-up study is more than adequate to address any long-run issues raised by the parties, while allowing for the continued use during the duration of the Steam Rate Plan of a demonstrably reasonable allocation of costs between Steam and Electric.

E. EARNINGS SHARING

The Proposal provides that should the Company achieve earnings in excess of a 10.1 percent return on common equity in RY1 or RY2 ("Earnings Sharing Threshold"), based upon the actual average equity ratio (subject to a maximum equity ratio of 50 percent of capitalization

and excluding all components related to “other comprehensive income” that may be required by generally accepted accounting principles), earnings above the Earnings Sharing Threshold will be shared equally between customers and the Company.

For purposes of determining whether the Company has achieved earnings above the Earnings Sharing Threshold, the net revenue effect of steam sales related to colder than-normal weather will not be considered. This continues the historic treatment of such cold weather revenues for purposes of earnings sharing calculations for the Company’s steam service. Although this earnings sharing provision has never been triggered, with or without the cold weather revenue exclusion, reflective of the historically and continually low earnings for the Company’s steam business, it is an important exclusion that balances the Company’s virtually unlimited exposure to lower revenues attributable to warmer than normal weather and the Company’s agreement to not pursue in this proceeding a revenue decoupling mechanism for its steam business.

F. RECONCILIATIONS

The Proposal provides for reconciliation during each rate year of certain costs to the levels reflected in the proposed rates (Proposal, App. D), with overcollections and undercollections to be deferred with interest or carrying charges, as applicable, for future Commission disposition. For the most part, these reconciliations protect both the Company and customers against variations in costs over which the Company does not have control.

The Proposal provides for the Company to reconcile the following categories of costs to the levels provided in rates (as set forth in Appendix D of the Proposal): property taxes, municipal infrastructure support (interference) expenses, production plant expenditures, pensions/OPEBs, environmental remediation costs, proceeds from the sale of SO₂ allowances, deferred income taxes, auction rate tax exempt debt, the Ravenswood O&M contract, and steam

incident-related costs. The revenue requirement also reflects the amortization of \$4 million per rate year of World Trade Center-related costs, and deferral of the balance of the Steam department's share of WTC-related costs, as established by the 2006 Steam Rate Order (App. A, pp. 19-20).

Some of these costs are subject to full reconciliation, while other cost overcollections or undercollections are shared between customers and the Company on a percentage basis. For example, the Proposal provides that overcollections or undercollections of property taxes and municipal infrastructure support costs will be shared between customers and the Company on a 90/10 basis, respectively. On the other hand, costs associated with pension/OPEBs and environmental remediation and proceeds from the sale of SO₂ allowances are fully reconciled.

Some of these reconciliations inure solely to the benefit of customers, by providing for downward reconciliation only. Specifically, the Proposal provides for the Company to defer for the benefit of customers the revenue requirement impact if the level of steam production capital expenditures results in the steam department's average net steam production plant being less than the targeted amount set forth in the Proposal.²² The Proposal also seeks to capture for the benefit of customers the potential for reduced payments related to the daily operation of the Ravenswood A House should the Company enter into a new agreement with the current or future operator of the Ravenswood A House that results in the Company's total payments under that agreement being less than the level reflected in rates.

As discussed supra, the Proposal also provides for the Company to reconcile its actual costs of steam incident-related programs to the placeholder amounts reflected in Appendix D of the Proposal. The carrying charge rate for the over or under collection of the deferrals will be at

²² The Proposal recognizes that the Company has the flexibility to modify or reprioritize the nature and scope of both its production plant and distribution plant expenditures.

an interest rate equivalent to the pre-tax rate of return for capital expenditures and the other customer capital rate for O&M expenses.²³

As indicated above, the use of reconciliation mechanisms in the context of multi-year rate plans is consistent with prior Commission practice and facilitated, in part, the resolution of differences between the Company and Staff regarding the forecasts of various costs outside the Company's control.²⁴

G. STEAM BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT AND RETENTION

The Proposal reflects the Company's agreement to continue several performance measures for steam business development established in the current steam rate plan, which demonstrates the Company's continued commitment to steam business development and retention: (i) the commitment to meet with and/or contact developers, property owners, advisors, engineers, and/or architects ("Industry Representatives") at least 12 times per month; (ii) the commitment to conduct focus groups to identify customers' concerns and issues related to Con Edison's steam service, so as to improve the Company's service to customers; and (iii) the commitment to assess steam customer satisfaction by conducting two surveys per year of a representative sample of steam customers who have contacted the Company (Proposal, pp. 21-23).

The Company agreed to continue these performance measures for the term of the Proposal, even though there was no disagreement that the Company is fully satisfying these performance measures during the current rate plan and is otherwise aggressively seeking to

²³ The Proposal (p. 17) recognizes that deferring recovery of a portion of these steam incident-related costs until the Company's next steam base rate filing will not be construed as the Company's acknowledging that it is not entitled to full recovery of these costs, in any proceeding, including the steam pipe rupture proceeding.

²⁴ The need for such reconciliations is real. For example, the Company's current electric rates are significantly understated for property taxes due to changes in tax assessments and tax rates that were anticipated, but not yet known precisely, when electric rates were set in that proceeding. Accordingly, over the course of a multi-year rate plan, including the first year of such a plan, these types of reconciliations protect both the Company and customers from uncertain and often unknown increases or decreases in costs outside the Company's control.

attract new steam customers and retain existing customers.

H. THERMAL EFFICIENCY/LOSSES

The Proposal provides for the Company to continue the currently-effective incentive mechanism associated with the steam variance, i.e., the losses of steam on the steam transmission and distribution system, while also reasonably addressing concerns raised by parties during the course of this proceeding.

CPA and the City proposed changes to the existing steam variance incentive mechanism (1827-1828; 2042-2043). In response, the Company explained that there are two main causes of the variance – thermal losses and leaks – of which only a small portion are controllable items and that through the years, the Company has undertaken various measures to minimize these losses (1319-1323). In addition, the Company explained that it would be premature to change the mechanism before determining the effect of the steam-incident related programs that the Company is in the process of implementing (1292).

The Proposal (pp. 23-24) provides that within 60 days of the effective date of the Proposal, based upon a consensus of interested parties, the Company will select and take steps necessary to retain an independent consultant to review the thermal efficiency studies performed by the Company since 1995 (approximately 15 studies).²⁵ After reviewing the studies, the Company and the independent consultant, to the extent the findings of the review indicate, will develop a detailed action plan to prioritize, implement and maintain economic projects for reducing overall steam losses (Proposal, p. 24). Any action plan that is developed will be filed with the Commission and will include an implementation schedule, an estimate of costs and a proposed method for recovery of costs of the plan. More important, it will provide a process to

²⁵ The Company's costs for the consultant will be recovered through the FAC, contemporaneous with the payments made (Proposal, p. 24). Also, if the parties are unable to agree on a consultant within 45 days of the effective date of the Proposal, the matter will be submitted to the Commission for resolution.

assess the results and the effectiveness of the plan. In the meantime, the Signatory Parties agreed not to propose a change to the current steam variance mechanism to be effective prior to the action plan becoming effective or October 1, 2010, whichever is earlier (Proposal, p. 24).

Both the Company and customers will benefit to the extent the consultant discovers a more effective manner or method for reducing steam losses, while avoiding a premature change to the existing steam variance mechanism.

I. STEAM ENERGY EFFICIENCY

To explore methods to improve customer energy efficiency related to Steam for the long term, the Proposal recommends that an energy efficiency collaborative, to be chaired by the Company, be undertaken within 60 days of the Commission's issuance of an order adopting the Proposal. The collaborative will consider the market potential for steam energy efficiency programs for steam customers for RY2 and customer and Company incentives associated with such programs. The revenue requirement includes \$100,000 to cover the cost of program development and administration as well as an independent consultant to perform a market analysis (Proposal, pp. 24-25).

At the end of the collaborative, the Company will prepare a report for the Commission, which will contain the RY2 energy efficiency programs based on either a consensus recommendation or the Company's proposal; the report will also include the positions of parties not in agreement with either a partial consensus recommendation or with the Company's proposal. In addition to discussing the program for RY2, the report will include a proposal for cost recovery for the recommended program(s) as well as proposal for customer and Company incentives. The Proposal notes that the Commission should solicit comments from interested parties on the report.

Energy efficiency is a critical issue for energy utilities and the Company's steam business

is no exception. The Company proposed to implement a steam energy efficiency program for RY1 (1633-1643). Although Staff strongly supported such an energy efficiency initiative, Staff proposed that the Commission initiate a collaborative process to develop more fully realized proposals (1883-1884). The Proposal (p. 24) implements Staff's position on this matter.

J. SAFETY PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The Proposal establishes safety performance measures relating to emergency response and a framework for establishing a performance measure for leak management for calendar year 2010.

Currently and historically, there have not been any safety performance measures for the Company's steam service. Nor is there any evidence that the Company's emergency response performance or management of its steam leak backlog has been other than satisfactory if not exemplary. Moreover, notwithstanding the absence of safety performance measures, the Company's emergency response within 60 minutes has been above 96 percent for the past three calendar years (584). In addition, the Company set an internal goal of a year-end leak backlog of 25 for 2006 and 22 for 2007 (587) and achieved year-end levels of 18 and 19 in 2006 and 2007, respectively (586).

Notwithstanding this exemplary performance, Staff took the position in its direct case that Steam should have performance measures and associated negative rate adjustments comparable to the Company's gas business and, accordingly, proposed performance measures for 30-, 45- and 60-minute emergency response and for steam leak management (1853).

The Proposal establishes safety performance measures for 45- and 60-minute emergency response and for the Company and Staff to work together to propose a performance measure for year-end leak backlog for 2010. The 45-minute emergency response measure establishes a goal that constitutes improvement over the Company's performance during the last three years. The

60-minute goal reflects the superior performance that the Company is currently achieving in this area.²⁶ Deferring implementation of a year-end leak backlog to 2010 recognizes that, currently, there is not a viable basis for setting a reasonable performance target in light of changing circumstances on the Company's system, including the current implementation of variety of new procedures and programs and the suspension of leak sealant services.

The new performance measures provide for up to six basis points of penalties for each of RY1 and RY2 for emergency response, and the potential for an additional penalty for leak management for RY2, as compared to no penalties under the current rate plan.

K. STEAM RESOURCE PLAN

As stated in the Proposal (p. 28), the Company filed a Steam Resource Plan with the Commission on October 26, 2007 ("SRP") in accordance with the terms of the current steam rate plan. The principal purpose of the SRP was to determine the appropriate replacement for the Company's Hudson Avenue Generating Station. The SRP concluded that the studies conducted for the Company's Hudson Avenue Generating Station show that the need for replacement capacity will be best met by installing new package boilers because they provide cost and reliability advantages as well as significant environmental benefits.

Staff and the City proposed in this proceeding that the Company be required to take further actions. Staff proposed (1919) that the Commission consider instituting a proceeding in which the SRP could be "fully reviewed" and considered in the context of other statewide and New York City wide system planning objectives. The City proposed (2101-2104) that Con Edison consider the addition of significant additional cogeneration at the Hudson Avenue steam site, and that, among other things, the Commission require that Con Edison conduct a study for

²⁶ Not establishing a goal for 30-minute response reflects material differences between Steam and Gas, which has 30-minute and 45-minute response targets (585; 591-593).

Hudson Avenue to include larger projects (up to hundreds of megawatts) that would maximize reliability and economic benefits to electric and steam customers. Con Edison responded, explaining that the 2007 SRP was complete and no further study was needed (1738-1739). The Company also pointed out that it should begin the permitting process for the new Hudson Avenue Boilers as soon as possible in order to provide the benefits demonstrated in the SRP (1739).

The Proposal (pp. 28-29) constitutes a reasonable compromise of these different positions by providing for the Company to complete an investment grade study of a cogeneration plant of up to 500 MW for the Hudson Avenue site, which the Company had initiated on its own; for the Company to then file a Supplement to the SRP with the Commission on or before December 31, 2008 that incorporates updated information and considers various other cogeneration plant designs, and electric and steam outputs, as well as the Hudson Avenue options presented in the SRP; and for the Company to select an option that meets its reliability and capacity needs, and considers statewide and NYC-wide energy planning objectives.

The Proposal also provides for the Commission to establish a procedure for parties to file comments on the Supplement.

L. MISCELLANEOUS TARIFF CHANGES

As described in the Proposal, the Company will also make miscellaneous tariff changes, which were, for the most part, fully described and explained in the Company's testimony. No party to the proceeding objected to these tariff changes.

M. THE REASONABLENESS OF THE PROPOSAL

The Proposal reflects not only the tradeoffs among the Signatory Parties, but also a substantial effort to address the concerns voiced by all the parties to the process. Indeed, many aspects of the Proposal reflect the input of non-signing parties. All participants were given the

opportunity to voice their concerns and a sincere effort was made to address them. Given the balancing required to effectuate the Proposal, parties primarily interested in only one or a few discrete elements of the Proposal may have difficulty in accepting the results of the balancing process. Nevertheless, the resulting agreement represents a good-faith effort to address all interests. Should one or more parties criticize individual elements of the Proposal and/or urge its rejection, such arguments must be measured against the numerous compromises that were negotiated in order to reach an agreement.

In the final analysis, the Proposal should be approved in all aspects because it resolves the various issues presented in a manner fully consistent with the public interest and, as detailed in this Statement, within a range of reasonable results that could be expected in a litigated proceeding.

The Company faces numerous operating and regulatory risks under this Proposal. The Company assessed these risks and prospects of its operations, as well as the possible outcomes of fully litigated proceedings, and concluded that the Proposal is acceptable. If the Proposal is not approved in its entirety, the Company respectfully requests that the Commission remand the Proposal to the parties to enable them to pursue their respective positions and remedies, with appropriate relief should it be necessary to further suspend the effective date of any rate changes.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Marc Richter", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Chanoch Lubling
Marc Richter
Richard B. Miller
Mary Krayske
Enver Acevedo

Attorneys for:
Consolidated Edison Company of
New York, Inc.
4 Irving Place – Room 1815-S
New York, New York 10003
(212) 460-4615

Dated: June 26, 2008
New York, New York

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.
Case 07-S-1315
Revenue Requirement Impact of Accruing Unbilled Revenues
\$ 000's

	RY-1	RY-2
Base Rate Increase before Unbilled Adjustment	\$53,048	\$24,733
Less: amortization of unbilled revenue credit (see page 2)	(5,482)	(a)
Plus: rate base impact of passing back unbilled credit	294	587
Net unbilled revenue adjustment	(5,188)	587
Base Rate Increase after Unbilled Adjustment	\$47,860	\$25,320
Levelized Rate Increase (see page 3)	\$40,430	\$40,430

(a) The amortization of the unbilled credit in RY-2 would be reflected as part of the lower RY-1 increase to be billed to customers in the second rate year.

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.

Case 07-S-1315

Calculation of December 31, 2008 Forecast of Unbilled Revenues
\$ 000's

Service Class	Unbilled Sales MMlbs	Base Rate Revenue @ Current Rates
1	34	\$887
2	154	3,581
3	153	3,092
4	9	163
5	14	271
SC5 Special	6	86
Demand Billing	442	9,412
Total Base Revenues	811	\$17,491
Less: base rate fuel @ \$8.049 / Mlb		6,528
Base rate revenues (excl. fuel)		\$10,963
Amortization period (years)		2
Credit to be reflect in rates over two years		\$5,482

Consolidated Edison Company of NY, Inc.
Case 07-S-1315
Calculation of Levelized Rate Increase with Unbilled
\$ 000's

Other Customer Provided Capital Rate = 5.5%

Rate Increase w/Unbilled	Twelve Months Ending		Cumulative Total
	Oct. 31, 2009	Oct. 31, 2010	
R.Y. - 1	\$47,860	\$47,860	\$95,720
R.Y. - 2		25,320	25,320
Total	\$47,860	\$73,180	\$121,040
Annual rate increase w/o interest			
R.Y. - 1	\$40,347	\$40,347	\$80,693
R.Y. - 2		40,347	40,347
Total	\$40,347	\$80,693	\$121,040
Interest @ 5.5%	\$125	\$125	\$250
Annual rate increase w/ interest			
R.Y. - 1	\$40,430	\$40,430	\$80,860
R.Y. - 2		40,430	40,430
Total	\$40,430	\$80,860	\$121,290

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

CASE 07-S-1315

Appendix II

Proposed Non-Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

Appendix II
Table No. 1

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

CASE 07-S-1315
STEAM - Comparison of Present Rates with Proposed Non-Levelized
Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

	10-1-07 Current <u>Rates</u>	10-1-08 Proposed <u>Rates ^ A.</u>
<u>SC 1</u>		
Customer Charge	\$713.15	\$838.80
Usage Charge		
0-20	\$12,358	\$13,410
21-50	\$29,599	\$34,860
51-1000	\$24,056	\$27,964
>1000	\$23,314	\$27,041
<u>SC2 Rate I (Non Demand)</u>		
Summer		
Customer Charge	\$2,455.35	\$2,868.84
Usage Charge		
0-250	\$10,632	\$11,427
251-1000	\$12,902	\$14,396
>1000	\$12,312	\$13,624
Winter		
Customer Charge	\$2,455.35	\$2,868.84
Usage Charge		
0-250	\$11,519	\$12,587
251-1500	\$24,024	\$28,941
1501-5000	\$22,572	\$27,042
5001-25000	\$21,828	\$26,069
>25000	\$20,737	\$24,642
<u>SC2 Rate II (Demand)</u>		
Summer		
Customer Charge	\$2,455.35	\$4,305.17
Usage Charge		
0-250	\$10,632	\$15,111
251-1000	\$12,902	\$13,441
>1000	\$12,312	\$12,493
Winter		
Customer Charge	\$2,455.35	\$4,305.17
Four Demand Months (December Through March, Inclusive)		
Demand Charge		
On - Peak	\$898,580	\$998,38
All Time Peak	\$94,940	\$105,48
Usage Charge		
0-250	\$10,723	\$21,953
251-1500	\$20,102	\$21,397
1501-5000	\$19,013	\$19,875
5001-25000	\$18,455	\$18,761
>25000	\$17,637	\$16,750

Appendix II
Table No. 1

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

CASE 07-S-1315
STEAM - Comparison of Present Rates with Proposed Non-Levelized
Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

	10-1-07 Current Rates	10-1-08 Proposed Rates ^ A.
Two Shoulder Months (November and April)		
Usage Charge		
0-250	\$11.519	\$26.201
251-1500	\$24.024	\$25.644
1501-5000	\$22.572	\$23.065
5001-25000	\$21.828	\$21.781
>25000	\$20.737	\$17.213
<u>SC3 Rate I (Non Demand)</u>		
<u>Summer</u>		
Customer Charge	\$1,293.12	\$1,509.96
Usage Charge		
0-50	\$10.590	\$11.101
51-500	\$14.620	\$15.941
>500	\$12.325	\$13.185
<u>Winter</u>		
Customer Charge	\$1,293.12	\$1,509.96
Usage Charge		
0-150	\$11.427	\$12.106
151-500	\$22.218	\$25.067
501-4000	\$19.487	\$21.787
>4000	\$18.823	\$20.990
<u>SC3 Rate II (Demand)</u>		
<u>Summer</u>		
Customer Charge	\$1,293.12	\$1,527.24
Usage Charge		
0-50	\$10.590	\$10.947
51-500	\$14.620	\$15.544
>500	\$12.325	\$12.926
<u>Winter</u>		
Customer Charge	\$1,293.12	\$1,527.24
Four Demand Months (December Through March, Inclusive)		
Demand Charge		
On - Peak	\$939.310	\$1,071.36
All Time Peak	\$100.860	\$115.04
Usage Charge		
0-150	\$10.654	\$11.020
151-500	\$18.747	\$20.251
501-4000	\$16.699	\$17.915
>4000	\$16.201	\$17.347
Two Shoulder Months (November and April)		
Usage Charge		
0-150	\$11.427	\$11.902
151-500	\$22.218	\$24.210
501-4000	\$19.487	\$21.095
>4000	\$18.823	\$20.338

Appendix II
Table No. 1

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

CASE 07-S-1315
STEAM - Comparison of Present Rates with Proposed Non-Levelized
Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

	10-1-07 Current Rates	10-1-08 Proposed Rates ^A
<u>SC 4 Rate I</u>		
Customer Charge	\$2,455.35	\$2,868.84
Contract Demand Charge		
On-Peak Customers	\$870.08	\$897.07
Off-Peak Customers	\$655.37	\$633.45
Usage Charge		
On-Peak Customers	\$14,089	\$15,784
Off-Peak Customers	\$16,747	\$17,650
<u>SC 4 Rate II</u>		
Customer Charge	\$1,293.12	\$1,509.96
Contract Demand Charge		
On-Peak Customers	\$1,067.95	\$1,067.88
Off-Peak Customers	\$794.30	\$753.08
Usage Charge		
On-Peak Customers	\$12,932	\$14,415
Off-Peak Customers	\$14,198	\$15,056
<u>SC 4 Rate III</u>		
Customer Charge	\$2,455.35	\$4,305.17
Contract Demand Charge		
On-Peak Customers	\$870,080	\$1,317.59
Off-Peak Customers	\$655,370	\$927.86
Usage Charge		
On-Peak Customers	\$14,089	\$16,201
Off-Peak Customers	\$16,747	\$18,167
<u>SC 4 Rate IV</u>		
Customer Charge	\$1,293.12	\$1,527.24
Contract Demand Charge		
On-Peak Customers	\$1,067.95	\$1,431.87
Off-Peak Customers	\$794.30	\$1,008.33
Usage Charge		
On-Peak Customers	\$12,932	\$14,403
Off-Peak Customers	\$14,198	\$15,042
<u>SC 6 Rate I</u>		
Customer Charge	\$2,455.35	\$2,868.84
Contract Demand Charge	\$526.260	\$456.29
Usage Charge	\$17,547	\$20,941
<u>SC 6 Rate II</u>		
Customer Charge	\$1,293.12	\$1,509.96
Contract Demand Charge	\$630.110	\$547.58
Usage Charge	\$15,616	\$18,660
<u>SC 6 Rate III</u>		
Customer Charge	\$2,455.35	\$4,305.17
Contract Demand Charge	\$526.26	\$694.02
Usage Charge	\$17,547	\$21,636
<u>SC 6 Rate IV</u>		
Customer Charge	\$1,293.12	\$1,527.24
Contract Demand Charge	\$630.11	\$754.20
Usage Charge	\$15,616	\$18,638

NOTES: ^AA. Based on a Rate Year 1 Proposed Base Rate Increase, including GRT, of \$ 53,048,000 (Case 07-S-1314 Joint Proposal Appendix A Page 5 of 9).

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

Comparison of Steam Bills Calculated at the Present Rates
Effective 10/1/07 and at the Proposed Rates to be Effective 10/1/08
For Proposed Non-Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

SC No. 1 - General Service

M POUNDS USED 30 DAYS	STEAM ADJUSTMENT USED		BILL AT PROPOSED RATES	DOLLAR VARIANCE	PERCENTAGE VARIANCE
	GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FACTOR USED	BILL AT PRESENT RATES EFFECTIVE 10/1/2007			
0	\$6,41800	\$6,41800	\$859.60	\$128.76	17.62%
10	2.4800000%		\$1,062.80	\$139.55	15.12%
20			\$1,266.00	\$150.33	13.47%
30			\$1,689.01	\$204.24	13.76%
50			\$2,535.05	\$312.07	14.04%
80			\$3,592.09	\$432.22	13.68%
100			\$4,296.78	\$512.32	13.54%
150			\$5,345.95	\$712.57	13.33%
200			\$6,907.44	\$912.81	13.21%
250			\$8,468.93	\$1,113.05	13.14%
300			\$10,030.41	\$1,313.31	13.09%
400			\$11,591.89	\$1,513.55	13.03%
500			\$13,153.37	\$1,713.79	12.99%
800			\$16,276.37	\$2,114.28	12.93%
1,000			\$18,390.65	\$3,315.76	12.91%
1,500			\$23,961.05	\$4,116.75	12.79%
2,000			\$28,961.05	\$6,026.46	12.73%
2,500			\$36,007.99	\$7,936.17	12.69%
3,000			\$47,125.92	\$9,845.89	12.66%
			\$62,360.60	\$11,755.80	
			\$77,595.27		
			\$87,441.16		
			\$92,829.95		
			\$104,585.55		

Appendix II

Table No. 2

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

Comparison of Steam Bills Calculated at the Present Rates
Effective 10/1/07 and at the Proposed Rates to be Effective 10/1/08
For Proposed Non-Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

SC No. 2 - Annual Power Service - Non-Demand
Winter Period

STEAM ADJUSTMENT USED		\$6,41800	\$6,41800	
GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FACTOR USED		2.4800000%	2.4800000%	
M POUNDS USED 30 DAYS	BILL AT PRESENT RATES EFFECTIVE 10/1/2007	BILL AT PROPOSED RATES	DOLLAR VARIANCE	
			PERCENTAGE VARIANCE	
0	\$2,516.24	\$2,939.99	\$423.75	16.84%
10	\$2,700.06	\$3,134.75	\$434.69	16.10%
20	\$2,893.88	\$3,329.51	\$445.63	15.45%
30	\$3,067.70	\$3,524.28	\$456.58	14.88%
50	\$3,435.33	\$3,913.80	\$478.47	13.93%
80	\$3,986.79	\$4,498.09	\$511.30	12.82%
100	\$4,364.43	\$4,887.62	\$523.19	12.24%
150	\$5,273.62	\$5,891.44	\$587.82	11.15%
200	\$6,192.61	\$6,835.25	\$642.64	10.38%
250	\$7,111.70	\$7,809.07	\$697.37	9.81%
300	\$8,671.55	\$9,620.86	\$949.31	10.95%
400	\$11,791.25	\$13,244.45	\$1,453.20	12.32%
500	\$14,910.94	\$16,868.04	\$1,957.10	13.13%
600	\$24,270.03	\$27,738.81	\$3,468.78	14.29%
1,000	\$30,509.42	\$34,986.00	\$4,476.58	14.67%
1,500	\$46,107.90	\$53,103.85	\$6,996.05	15.17%
2,000	\$60,962.38	\$70,248.85	\$9,286.47	15.23%
2,500	\$75,816.86	\$87,393.76	\$11,576.90	15.27%
3,000	\$90,671.33	\$104,538.66	\$13,867.33	15.29%
4,000	\$120,380.28	\$138,828.47	\$18,448.19	15.32%
5,000	\$150,089.24	\$173,118.28	\$23,029.04	15.34%
6,000	\$239,928.74	\$272,986.31	\$36,057.57	15.22%
10,000	\$294,821.74	\$339,581.66	\$44,759.92	15.18%
15,000	\$439,554.24	\$506,045.05	\$66,490.81	15.13%
25,000	\$729,019.25	\$838,971.83	\$109,952.58	15.08%
30,000	\$868,161.47	\$998,123.27	\$129,961.80	14.97%
50,000	\$1,424,730.35	\$1,634,729.03	\$209,998.68	14.74%

Appendix II

Table No. 3

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

Comparison of Steam Bills Calculated at the Present Rates
Effective 10/1/07 and at the Proposed Rates to be Effective 10/1/08
For Proposed Non-Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

SC No. 2 - Annual Power Service - Non-Demand
Summer Period

M POUNDS USED 30 DAYS	STEAM ADJUSTMENT USED		BILL AT PRESENT RATES EFFECTIVE 10/1/2007	BILL AT PROPOSED RATES	DOLLAR VARIANCE	PERCENTAGE VARIANCE
	GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FACTOR USED					
		\$6.41800		\$6.41800		
		2.480000%		2.480000%		
0		\$2,516.24	\$2,339.99	\$423.75	16.84%	
10		\$2,690.97	\$3,122.86	\$431.89	16.05%	
20		\$2,865.70	\$3,305.74	\$440.04	15.36%	
30		\$3,040.43	\$3,488.61	\$448.18	14.74%	
50		\$3,389.88	\$3,854.37	\$464.49	13.70%	
80		\$3,914.07	\$4,402.99	\$488.92	12.49%	
100		\$4,263.53	\$4,768.74	\$505.21	11.85%	
150		\$5,137.17	\$5,683.12	\$545.95	10.63%	
200		\$6,010.81	\$6,597.50	\$586.69	9.76%	
250		\$6,884.45	\$7,511.88	\$627.43	9.11%	
300		\$7,874.41	\$8,578.39	\$703.98	8.94%	
400		\$9,854.32	\$10,711.40	\$857.08	8.70%	
500		\$11,834.24	\$12,844.42	\$1,010.18	8.54%	
800		\$17,773.98	\$19,243.48	\$1,469.50	8.27%	
1,000		\$21,733.80	\$23,509.52	\$1,775.72	8.17%	
1,500		\$31,331.06	\$33,779.04	\$2,447.98	7.81%	
2,000		\$40,928.31	\$44,048.56	\$3,120.25	7.62%	
2,500		\$50,525.56	\$54,318.08	\$3,792.52	7.51%	
3,000		\$60,122.81	\$64,587.60	\$4,464.79	7.43%	
4,000		\$79,317.32	\$85,126.64	\$5,809.32	7.32%	
5,000		\$98,511.82	\$105,665.68	\$7,153.86	7.26%	
8,000		\$156,095.33	\$167,282.81	\$11,187.48	7.17%	
10,000		\$194,484.34	\$208,360.89	\$13,876.55	7.14%	
15,000		\$290,456.86	\$311,056.10	\$20,599.24	7.09%	
25,000		\$482,401.90	\$516,446.52	\$34,044.62	7.06%	
30,000		\$578,374.42	\$619,141.72	\$40,767.30	7.05%	
50,000		\$962,264.50	\$1,029,922.56	\$67,658.06	7.03%	

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

Comparison of Steam Bills Calculated at the Present Rates
Effective 10/1/07 and at the Proposed Rates to be Effective 10/1/08
For Proposed Non-Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

SC No. 2 - Annual Power Service - Demand
Winter Period

STEAM ADJUSTMENT USED		\$6,41800		\$6,41800		
GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FACTOR USED		2.480000%		2.480000%		
HOURS USE		200		200		
M POUNDS USED 30 DAYS	DEMAND Mlbs/Hr Mon-Fri 6am-11am	DEMAND Mlbs/Hr All hrs - All days	BILL AT PRESENT RATES EFFECTIVE 10/1/2007	BILL AT PROPOSED RATES	DOLLAR VARIANCE	PERCENTAGE VARIANCE
0	0.00	0.00	\$2,516.24	\$4,411.94	\$1,895.70	75.34%
10	0.05	0.05	\$2,742.81	\$4,759.25	\$2,016.44	73.52%
20	0.10	0.10	\$2,969.38	\$5,106.55	\$2,137.17	71.97%
30	0.15	0.15	\$3,195.95	\$5,453.86	\$2,257.91	70.66%
50	0.25	0.25	\$3,649.09	\$6,148.48	\$2,499.39	68.49%
80	0.40	0.40	\$4,328.79	\$7,190.40	\$2,861.61	66.11%
100	0.50	0.50	\$4,781.93	\$7,885.02	\$3,103.09	64.89%
150	0.75	0.75	\$5,914.78	\$9,621.56	\$3,706.78	62.67%
200	1.00	1.00	\$7,047.62	\$11,358.09	\$4,310.47	61.16%
250	1.25	1.25	\$8,180.47	\$13,094.63	\$4,914.16	60.07%
300	1.50	1.50	\$9,793.89	\$14,832.68	\$5,008.79	51.14%
400	2.00	2.00	\$13,020.74	\$18,218.78	\$5,198.04	39.92%
500	2.50	2.50	\$16,247.59	\$21,634.88	\$5,387.29	33.16%
800	4.00	4.00	\$25,928.14	\$31,883.18	\$5,955.04	22.97%
1,000	5.00	5.00	\$32,381.84	\$38,715.38	\$6,333.54	19.56%
1,500	7.50	7.50	\$48,516.08	\$55,795.87	\$7,279.79	15.00%
2,000	10.00	10.00	\$64,092.32	\$72,096.49	\$8,004.17	12.49%
2,500	12.50	12.50	\$79,668.57	\$88,397.12	\$8,728.55	10.96%
3,000	15.00	15.00	\$95,244.81	\$104,697.74	\$9,452.93	9.92%
4,000	20.00	20.00	\$126,397.29	\$137,298.98	\$10,901.69	8.62%
5,000	25.00	25.00	\$157,549.78	\$169,900.23	\$12,350.45	7.84%
8,000	40.00	40.00	\$249,291.72	\$264,279.08	\$14,987.36	6.01%
10,000	50.00	50.00	\$310,453.01	\$327,198.32	\$16,745.31	5.39%
15,000	75.00	75.00	\$463,356.25	\$484,496.41	\$21,140.16	4.56%
25,000	125.00	125.00	\$769,162.72	\$799,092.59	\$29,929.87	3.89%
30,000	150.00	150.00	\$917,874.52	\$946,086.31	\$28,211.79	3.07%
50,000	250.00	250.00	\$1,512,721.73	\$1,534,061.21	\$21,339.48	1.41%

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

Comparison of Steam Bills Calculated at the Present Rates
Effective 10/1/07 and at the Proposed Rates to be Effective 10/1/08
For Proposed Non-Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

SC No. 2 - Annual Power Service - Demand
Winter Period

M POUNDS USED 30 DAYS	DEMAND		DEMAND Mlbs/Hr All hrs - All days	BILL AT		DOLLAR VARIANCE	PERCENTAGE VARIANCE
	Mlbs/Hr Mon-Fri 6am-11am	Mlbs/Hr 10/1/2007		PRESENT RATES	PROPOSED RATES		
0	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$2,516.24	\$4,411.94	\$1,895.70	75.34%
10	0.03	0.03	0.03	\$2,722.45	\$4,736.62	\$2,014.17	73.98%
20	0.07	0.07	0.07	\$2,938.84	\$5,072.62	\$2,133.78	72.61%
30	0.10	0.10	0.10	\$3,145.04	\$5,397.30	\$2,252.26	71.61%
50	0.17	0.17	0.17	\$3,567.63	\$6,057.98	\$2,490.35	69.80%
80	0.27	0.27	0.27	\$4,196.43	\$7,043.34	\$2,846.91	67.84%
100	0.33	0.33	0.33	\$4,608.84	\$7,692.71	\$3,083.87	66.91%
150	0.50	0.50	0.50	\$5,660.24	\$9,338.75	\$3,678.51	64.99%
200	0.67	0.67	0.67	\$6,711.63	\$10,984.79	\$4,273.16	63.67%
250	0.83	0.83	0.83	\$7,752.84	\$12,619.51	\$4,866.67	62.77%
300	1.00	1.00	1.00	\$9,264.81	\$14,237.06	\$4,962.25	53.34%
400	1.33	1.33	1.33	\$12,338.57	\$17,460.85	\$5,122.28	41.51%
500	1.67	1.67	1.67	\$15,402.52	\$20,695.96	\$5,293.44	34.37%
800	2.67	2.67	2.67	\$24,573.99	\$30,378.63	\$5,804.64	23.62%
1,000	3.33	3.33	3.33	\$30,681.51	\$36,826.21	\$6,144.70	20.03%
1,500	5.00	5.00	5.00	\$45,970.68	\$52,967.78	\$6,997.10	15.22%
2,000	6.67	6.67	6.67	\$60,701.85	\$68,329.48	\$7,627.63	12.57%
2,500	8.33	8.33	8.33	\$75,422.84	\$83,679.86	\$8,257.02	10.95%
3,000	10.00	10.00	10.00	\$90,154.01	\$99,041.56	\$8,887.55	9.86%
4,000	13.33	13.33	13.33	\$119,606.17	\$129,753.64	\$10,147.47	8.48%
5,000	16.67	16.67	16.67	\$149,068.51	\$160,477.04	\$11,408.53	7.65%
8,000	26.67	26.67	26.67	\$235,719.66	\$249,199.71	\$13,480.05	5.72%
10,000	33.33	33.33	33.33	\$293,480.30	\$308,340.62	\$14,860.32	5.06%
15,000	50.00	50.00	50.00	\$437,902.27	\$456,215.51	\$18,313.24	4.18%
25,000	83.33	83.33	83.33	\$726,736.02	\$751,963.99	\$25,217.97	3.47%
30,000	100.00	100.00	100.00	\$866,966.56	\$889,524.52	\$22,557.96	2.60%
50,000	166.67	166.67	166.67	\$1,427,878.52	\$1,439,795.34	\$11,916.82	0.83%

STEAM ADJUSTMENT USED
GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FACTOR USED
HOURS USE

\$6,41800
2.4800000%
300

\$6,41800
2.4800000%
300

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

Comparison of Steam Bills Calculated at the Present Rates
Effective 10/1/07 and at the Proposed Rates to be Effective 10/1/08
For Proposed Non-Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

SC No. 2 - Annual Power Service - Demand
Summer Period

M POUNDS USED 30 DAYS	STEAM ADJUSTMENT USED		BILL AT PRESENT RATES EFFECTIVE 10/1/2007	BILL AT PROPOSED RATES	DOLLAR VARIANCE	PERCENTAGE VARIANCE
	GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FACTOR USED					
		\$6,41800		\$6,41800		
		2.4800000%		2.4800000%		
0		\$2,516.24		\$4,411.94	\$1,895.70	75.34%
10		\$2,690.97		\$4,632.57	\$1,941.60	72.15%
20		\$2,865.70		\$4,853.20	\$1,987.50	69.36%
30		\$3,040.43		\$5,073.83	\$2,033.40	66.88%
50		\$3,389.88		\$5,515.08	\$2,125.20	62.69%
80		\$3,914.07		\$6,176.97	\$2,262.90	57.81%
100		\$4,263.53		\$6,618.23	\$2,354.70	55.23%
150		\$5,137.17		\$7,721.38	\$2,584.21	50.30%
200		\$6,010.81		\$8,624.52	\$2,613.71	46.81%
250		\$6,884.45		\$9,927.67	\$3,043.22	44.20%
300		\$7,874.41		\$10,945.24	\$3,070.83	39.00%
400		\$9,854.32		\$12,980.39	\$3,126.07	31.72%
500		\$11,834.24		\$15,015.54	\$3,181.30	26.88%
800		\$17,773.98		\$21,120.99	\$3,347.01	18.83%
1,000		\$21,733.80		\$25,191.30	\$3,457.50	15.91%
1,500		\$31,331.06		\$34,881.29	\$3,550.23	11.33%
2,000		\$40,928.31		\$44,571.29	\$3,642.98	8.90%
2,500		\$50,525.56		\$54,261.28	\$3,735.72	7.39%
3,000		\$60,122.81		\$63,951.28	\$3,828.47	6.37%
4,000		\$79,317.32		\$83,331.27	\$4,013.95	5.06%
5,000		\$98,511.82		\$102,711.27	\$4,199.45	4.26%
8,000		\$156,095.33		\$160,851.25	\$4,755.92	3.05%
10,000		\$194,484.34		\$199,611.23	\$5,126.89	2.64%
15,000		\$290,456.86		\$296,511.19	\$6,054.33	2.08%
25,000		\$482,401.90		\$490,311.12	\$7,909.22	1.64%
30,000		\$578,374.42		\$587,211.09	\$8,836.67	1.53%
50,000		\$962,264.50		\$974,810.94	\$12,546.44	1.30%

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

Comparison of Steam Bills Calculated at the Present Rates
Effective 10/1/07 and at the Proposed Rates to be Effective 10/1/08
For Proposed Non-Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

SC No. 3 - Apartment House Service - Non-Demand
Winter Period

M POUNDS USED 30 DAYS	STEAM ADJUSTMENT USED		BILL AT PRESENT RATES EFFECTIVE 10/1/2007	BILL AT PROPOSED RATES	DOLLAR VARIANCE	PERCENTAGE VARIANCE
	GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FACTOR USED	\$6.41800 2.4800000%				
0			\$1,325.19	\$1,547.41	\$222.22	16.77%
10			\$1,508.06	\$1,737.24	\$229.18	15.20%
20			\$1,690.94	\$1,927.07	\$236.13	13.96%
30			\$1,873.82	\$2,116.91	\$243.09	12.97%
50			\$2,239.57	\$2,496.58	\$257.01	11.48%
80			\$2,768.19	\$3,066.08	\$277.89	9.97%
100			\$3,153.94	\$3,445.75	\$291.81	9.25%
150			\$4,068.32	\$4,394.92	\$326.60	8.03%
200			\$5,535.63	\$6,008.21	\$472.58	8.54%
250			\$7,002.94	\$7,621.50	\$618.56	8.83%
300			\$8,470.25	\$9,234.79	\$764.54	9.03%
400			\$11,404.87	\$12,461.37	\$1,056.50	9.26%
500			\$14,339.48	\$15,687.96	\$1,348.48	9.40%
800			\$22,303.72	\$24,359.30	\$2,055.58	9.22%
1,000			\$27,613.21	\$30,140.20	\$2,526.99	9.15%
1,500			\$40,886.93	\$44,592.44	\$3,705.51	9.06%
2,000			\$54,160.65	\$59,044.68	\$4,884.03	9.02%
2,500			\$67,434.37	\$73,496.92	\$6,062.55	8.99%
3,000			\$80,708.09	\$87,949.17	\$7,241.08	8.97%
4,000			\$107,255.54	\$116,853.65	\$9,598.11	8.95%
5,000			\$133,122.51	\$144,941.37	\$11,818.86	8.88%
8,000			\$210,723.44	\$229,204.52	\$18,481.08	8.77%
10,000			\$262,457.40	\$285,379.96	\$22,922.56	8.73%
15,000			\$391,792.28	\$425,818.55	\$34,026.27	8.68%
25,000			\$650,462.05	\$706,695.74	\$56,233.69	8.65%
30,000			\$779,796.93	\$847,134.33	\$67,337.40	8.64%
50,000			\$1,297,136.47	\$1,408,888.70	\$111,752.23	8.62%
100,000			\$2,560,485.31	\$2,813,274.62	\$252,789.31	8.60%

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

Comparison of Steam Bills Calculated at the Present Rates
Effective 10/1/07 and at the Proposed Rates to be Effective 10/1/08
For Proposed Non-Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

SC No. 3 - Apartment House Service - Non-Demand
Summer Period

M POUNDS USED 30 DAYS	STEAM ADJUSTMENT USED		BILL AT PRESENT RATES EFFECTIVE 10/1/2007	BILL AT PROPOSED RATES	DOLLAR VARIANCE	PERCENTAGE VARIANCE
	\$6,41800	\$6,41800				
GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FACTOR USED	2.4800000%	2.4800000%				
0	\$1,325.19	\$1,547.41			\$222.22	16.77%
10	\$1,499.49	\$1,726.94			\$227.45	15.17%
20	\$1,673.79	\$1,906.48			\$232.69	13.90%
30	\$1,848.08	\$2,086.01			\$237.93	12.87%
50	\$2,196.68	\$2,445.08			\$248.40	11.31%
80	\$2,843.47	\$3,132.49			\$289.02	10.16%
100	\$3,274.67	\$3,590.76			\$316.09	9.65%
150	\$4,352.65	\$4,736.43			\$383.78	8.82%
200	\$5,430.64	\$5,882.11			\$451.47	8.31%
250	\$6,508.63	\$7,027.78			\$519.15	7.89%
300	\$7,586.61	\$8,173.46			\$586.85	7.74%
400	\$9,742.59	\$10,464.81			\$722.22	7.41%
500	\$11,898.56	\$12,756.16			\$857.60	7.21%
800	\$17,660.91	\$18,782.90			\$1,121.99	6.35%
1,000	\$21,502.48	\$22,800.73			\$1,298.25	6.04%
1,500	\$31,106.39	\$32,845.31			\$1,738.92	5.59%
2,000	\$40,710.30	\$42,889.89			\$2,179.59	5.35%
2,500	\$50,314.22	\$52,934.47			\$2,620.25	5.21%
3,000	\$59,918.13	\$62,979.04			\$3,060.91	5.11%
4,000	\$78,125.96	\$83,068.20			\$3,942.24	4.98%
5,000	\$98,333.78	\$103,157.35			\$4,823.57	4.91%
8,000	\$155,957.26	\$163,424.82			\$7,467.56	4.79%
10,000	\$194,372.91	\$203,603.12			\$9,230.21	4.75%
15,000	\$290,412.05	\$304,048.90			\$13,636.85	4.70%
25,000	\$482,490.31	\$504,940.44			\$22,450.13	4.65%
30,000	\$576,529.44	\$605,386.21			\$28,856.77	4.64%
50,000	\$962,685.97	\$1,007,169.30			\$44,483.33	4.62%
100,000	\$1,923,077.29	\$2,011,627.02			\$88,549.73	4.60%

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

Comparison of Steam Bills Calculated at the Present Rates
Effective 10/1/07 and at the Proposed Rates to be Effective 10/1/08
For Proposed Non-Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

SC No. 3 - Apartment House Service - Demand
Winter Period

M POUNDS USED 30 DAYS	DEMAND Mlbs/Hr Mon-Fri 6am-11am	DEMAND Mlbs/Hr All hrs - All days	STEAM ADJUSTMENT USED		BILL AT PRESENT RATES EFFECTIVE 10/1/2007	BILL AT PROPOSED RATES	DOLLAR VARIANCE	PERCENTAGE VARIANCE
			GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FACTOR USED	HOURS USE				
0	0.00	0.00	\$6,41800	400	\$1,325.19	\$1,565.12	\$239.93	18.11%
10	0.03	0.03	2.480000%	400	\$1,532.12	\$1,780.29	\$248.17	16.20%
20	0.05	0.05			\$1,728.40	\$1,983.32	\$254.92	14.75%
30	0.08	0.08			\$1,935.33	\$2,198.50	\$263.17	13.60%
50	0.13	0.13			\$2,338.53	\$2,616.70	\$278.17	11.90%
80	0.20	0.20			\$2,938.01	\$3,237.92	\$299.91	10.21%
100	0.25	0.25			\$3,341.22	\$3,656.12	\$314.90	9.42%
150	0.38	0.38			\$4,354.56	\$4,707.70	\$353.14	8.11%
200	0.50	0.50			\$5,771.93	\$6,220.12	\$448.19	7.76%
250	0.63	0.63			\$7,199.97	\$7,744.69	\$544.72	7.57%
300	0.75	0.75			\$8,617.34	\$9,257.11	\$639.77	7.42%
400	1.00	1.00			\$11,462.74	\$12,294.11	\$831.37	7.25%
500	1.25	1.25			\$14,308.14	\$15,331.10	\$1,022.96	7.15%
800	2.00	2.00			\$22,214.70	\$23,723.90	\$1,509.20	6.79%
1,000	2.50	2.50			\$27,485.75	\$29,319.11	\$1,833.36	6.67%
1,500	3.75	3.75			\$40,663.35	\$43,307.12	\$2,643.77	6.50%
2,000	5.00	5.00			\$53,840.96	\$57,295.12	\$3,454.16	6.42%
2,500	6.25	6.25			\$67,018.57	\$71,283.13	\$4,264.56	6.36%
3,000	7.50	7.50			\$80,196.18	\$85,271.14	\$5,074.96	6.33%
4,000	10.00	10.00			\$106,551.40	\$113,247.15	\$6,695.75	6.28%
5,000	12.50	12.50			\$132,396.26	\$140,641.08	\$8,244.82	6.23%
8,000	20.00	20.00			\$209,930.86	\$222,822.87	\$12,892.01	6.14%
10,000	25.00	25.00			\$261,620.60	\$277,610.73	\$15,990.13	6.11%
15,000	37.50	37.50			\$390,844.93	\$414,580.37	\$23,735.44	6.07%
25,000	62.50	62.50			\$649,293.60	\$688,519.66	\$39,226.06	6.04%
30,000	75.00	75.00			\$778,517.93	\$825,489.30	\$46,971.37	6.03%
50,000	125.00	125.00			\$1,295,415.27	\$1,373,367.88	\$77,952.61	6.02%
100,000	250.00	250.00			\$2,587,658.60	\$2,743,064.32	\$155,405.72	6.01%

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

Comparison of Steam Bills Calculated at the Present Rates
Effective 10/1/07 and at the Proposed Rates to be Effective 10/1/08
For Proposed Non-Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

SC No. 3 - Apartment House Service - Demand
Summer Period

M POUNDS USED 30 DAYS	STEAM ADJUSTMENT USED		BILL AT PRESENT RATES EFFECTIVE 10/1/2007	BILL AT PROPOSED RATES	DOLLAR VARIANCE	PERCENTAGE VARIANCE
	GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FACTOR USED	\$6,41800 2.4800000%				
0			\$1,325.19	\$1,565.12	\$239.93	18.11%
10			\$1,499.49	\$1,743.07	\$243.58	16.24%
20			\$1,673.79	\$1,921.03	\$247.24	14.77%
30			\$1,848.08	\$2,098.99	\$250.91	13.58%
50			\$2,196.68	\$2,454.90	\$258.22	11.76%
80			\$2,843.47	\$3,130.10	\$286.63	10.08%
100			\$3,274.67	\$3,580.23	\$305.56	9.33%
150			\$4,352.65	\$4,705.56	\$352.91	8.11%
200			\$5,430.64	\$5,830.90	\$400.26	7.37%
250			\$6,508.63	\$6,956.23	\$447.60	6.88%
300			\$7,586.61	\$8,081.56	\$494.95	6.52%
400			\$9,742.59	\$10,332.23	\$589.64	6.05%
500			\$11,898.56	\$12,582.89	\$684.33	5.75%
800			\$17,660.91	\$18,530.01	\$869.10	4.92%
1,000			\$21,502.48	\$22,494.76	\$992.28	4.61%
1,500			\$31,106.39	\$32,406.63	\$1,300.24	4.18%
2,000			\$40,710.30	\$42,318.49	\$1,608.19	3.95%
2,500			\$50,314.22	\$52,230.36	\$1,916.14	3.81%
3,000			\$59,918.13	\$62,142.22	\$2,224.09	3.71%
4,000			\$79,125.96	\$81,965.95	\$2,839.99	3.59%
5,000			\$98,333.78	\$101,789.68	\$3,455.90	3.51%
8,000			\$155,957.26	\$161,260.88	\$5,303.62	3.40%
10,000			\$194,372.91	\$200,908.34	\$6,535.43	3.36%
15,000			\$290,412.05	\$300,027.00	\$9,614.95	3.31%
25,000			\$482,490.31	\$498,264.31	\$15,774.00	3.27%
30,000			\$578,529.44	\$597,382.96	\$18,853.52	3.26%
50,000			\$962,685.97	\$993,857.59	\$31,171.62	3.24%
100,000			\$1,923,077.29	\$1,985,044.15	\$61,966.86	3.22%

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

CASE 07-S-1315

Appendix III

Proposed Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.
CASE 07-S-1315
STEAM - Comparison of Present Rates with Proposed Levelized
Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

	10-1-07 Current Rates	10-1-08 Proposed Rates ^ A.
<u>SC 1</u>		
Customer Charge	\$713.15	\$821.26
Usage Charge		
0-20	\$12.358	\$13.263
21-50	\$29.589	\$34.125
51-1000	\$24.056	\$27.418
>1000	\$23.314	\$26.520
<u>SC2 Rate I (Non Demand)</u>		
Summer		
Customer Charge	\$2,455.35	\$2,785.69
Usage Charge		
0-250	\$10.632	\$11.335
251-1000	\$12.902	\$14.222
>1000	\$12.312	\$13.471
Winter		
Customer Charge	\$2,455.35	\$2,785.69
Usage Charge		
0-250	\$11.519	\$12.463
251-1500	\$24.024	\$28.369
1501-5000	\$22.572	\$26.522
5001-25000	\$21.828	\$25.576
>25000	\$20.737	\$24.188
<u>SC2 Rate II (Demand)</u>		
Summer		
Customer Charge	\$2,455.35	\$4,305.17
Usage Charge		
0-250	\$10.632	\$14.902
251-1000	\$12.902	\$13.281
>1000	\$12.312	\$12.362
Winter		
Customer Charge	\$2,455.35	\$4,305.17
Four Demand Months (December Through March, Inclusive)		
Demand Charge		
On - Peak	\$898.580	\$968.81
All Time Peak	\$94.940	\$102.36
Usage Charge		
0-250	\$10.723	\$21.541
251-1500	\$20.102	\$21.002
1501-5000	\$19.013	\$19.525
5001-25000	\$18.455	\$18.444
>25000	\$17.637	\$18.492

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.
CASE 07-S-1315
STEAM - Comparison of Present Rates with Proposed Levelized
Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

	10-1-07 Current Rates	10-1-08 Proposed Rates ^ A.
Two Shoulder Months (November and April)		
Usage Charge		
0-250	\$11.519	\$25.663
251-1500	\$24.024	\$25.123
1501-5000	\$22.572	\$22.620
5001-25000	\$21.828	\$21.374
>25000	\$20.737	\$16.942
<u>SC3 Rate I (Non Demand)</u>		
Summer		
Customer Charge	\$1,293.12	\$1,474.03
Usage Charge		
0-50	\$10.590	\$11.017
51-500	\$14.620	\$15.725
>500	\$12.325	\$13.044
Winter		
Customer Charge	\$1,293.12	\$1,474.03
Usage Charge		
0-150	\$11.427	\$11.995
151-500	\$22.218	\$24.801
501-4000	\$19.487	\$21.411
>4000	\$18.823	\$20.635
<u>SC3 Rate II (Demand)</u>		
Summer		
Customer Charge	\$1,293.12	\$1,475.85
Usage Charge		
0-50	\$10.590	\$10.869
51-500	\$14.620	\$15.341
>500	\$12.325	\$12.794
Winter		
Customer Charge	\$1,293.12	\$1,475.85
Four Demand Months (December Through March, Inclusive)		
Demand Charge		
On - Peak	\$939.310	\$1,042.37
All Time Peak	\$100.860	\$111.93
Usage Charge		
0-150	\$10.654	\$10.940
151-500	\$18.747	\$19.921
501-4000	\$16.699	\$17.648
>4000	\$16.201	\$17.095
Two Shoulder Months (November and April)		
Usage Charge		
0-150	\$11.427	\$11.798
151-500	\$22.218	\$23.773
501-4000	\$19.487	\$20.742
>4000	\$18.823	\$20.005

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.
CASE 07-S-1315
STEAM - Comparison of Present Rates with Proposed Levelized
Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

	10-1-07 Current Rates	10-1-08 Proposed Rates ^ A.
<u>SC 4 Rate i</u>		
Customer Charge	\$2,455.35	\$2,795.69
Contract Demand Charge		
On-Peak Customers	\$870.080	\$872.50
Off-Peak Customers	\$655.370	\$616.09
Usage Charge		
On-Peak Customers	\$14.089	\$15.573
Off-Peak Customers	\$16.747	\$17.387
<u>SC 4 Rate ii</u>		
Customer Charge	\$1,293.12	\$1,474.03
Contract Demand Charge		
On-Peak Customers	\$1,067.950	\$1,038.63
Off-Peak Customers	\$794.300	\$732.45
Usage Charge		
On-Peak Customers	\$12.932	\$14.241
Off-Peak Customers	\$14.198	\$14.864
<u>SC 4 Rate iii</u>		
Customer Charge	\$2,455.35	\$4,305.17
Contract Demand Charge		
On-Peak Customers	\$870.080	\$1,278.56
Off-Peak Customers	\$655.370	\$900.37
Usage Charge		
On-Peak Customers	\$14.089	\$15.960
Off-Peak Customers	\$16.747	\$17.867
<u>SC 4 Rate iv</u>		
Customer Charge	\$1,293.12	\$1,475.85
Contract Demand Charge		
On-Peak Customers	\$1,067.950	\$1,393.14
Off-Peak Customers	\$794.300	\$981.05
Usage Charge		
On-Peak Customers	\$12.932	\$14.231
Off-Peak Customers	\$14.198	\$14.853
<u>SC 6 Rate i</u>		
Customer Charge	\$2,455.35	\$2,795.69
Contract Demand Charge	\$526.260	\$443.79
Usage Charge	\$17.547	\$20.588
<u>SC 6 Rate ii</u>		
Customer Charge	\$1,293.12	\$1,474.03
Contract Demand Charge	\$630.110	\$532.58
Usage Charge	\$15.616	\$18.370
<u>SC 6 Rate iii</u>		
Customer Charge	\$2,455.35	\$4,305.17
Contract Demand Charge	\$526.260	\$673.46
Usage Charge	\$17.547	\$21.234
<u>SC 6 Rate iv</u>		
Customer Charge	\$1,293.12	\$1,475.85
Contract Demand Charge	\$630.110	\$733.80
Usage Charge	\$15.616	\$18.352

NOTE: ^A. Based on a Rate Year 1 Proposed Levelized Base Rate Increase with Interest, including GRT, of \$ 43,714,000 (Case 07-S-1314 Joint Proposal Appendix A Page 5 of 9).

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

Comparison of Steam Bills Calculated at the Present Rates
Effective 10/1/07 and at the Proposed Rates to be Effective 10/1/08
For Proposed Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

SC No. 1 - General Service

M POUNDS USED 30 DAYS	STEAM ADJUSTMENT USED		BILL AT PROPOSED RATES	DOLLAR VARIANCE	PERCENTAGE VARIANCE
	GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FACTOR USED	BILL AT PRESENT RATES EFFECTIVE 10/1/2007			
0	\$6,41800	\$6,41800	\$841.63	\$110.79	15.16%
10	2.4800000%		\$1,043.32	\$120.07	13.01%
20			\$1,245.01	\$129.34	11.59%
30			\$1,660.49	\$175.72	11.83%
50			\$2,491.46	\$268.45	12.08%
80			\$3,531.72	\$371.85	11.77%
100			\$4,225.22	\$440.76	11.85%
150			\$5,345.95	\$613.03	11.47%
200			\$6,907.44	\$785.29	11.37%
250			\$8,468.93	\$957.56	11.31%
300			\$10,030.41	\$1,129.84	11.26%
400			\$13,153.39	\$1,474.37	11.21%
500			\$16,276.37	\$1,818.90	11.18%
800			\$25,645.29	\$2,852.52	11.12%
1,000			\$31,881.24	\$3,541.60	11.11%
1,500			\$47,125.92	\$5,184.35	11.00%
2,000			\$62,360.60	\$6,827.10	10.95%
2,500			\$77,595.27	\$8,469.86	10.92%
3,000			\$92,829.95	\$10,112.61	10.89%

Appendix III

Table No. 2

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

Comparison of Steam Bills Calculated at the Present Rates
Effective 10/1/07 and at the Proposed Rates to be Effective 10/1/08
For Proposed Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

SC No. 2 - Annual Power Service - Non-Demand
Winter Period

M POUNDS USED 30 DAYS	STEAM ADJUSTMENT USED		BILL AT PRESENT RATES EFFECTIVE 10/1/2007	BILL AT PROPOSED RATES	DOLLAR VARIANCE	PERCENTAGE VARIANCE
	GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FACTOR USED	\$6.41800 2.4800000%				
0			\$2,516.24	\$2,865.02	\$348.78	13.86%
10			\$2,700.06	\$3,058.52	\$358.46	13.28%
20			\$2,883.88	\$3,252.01	\$368.13	12.77%
30			\$3,067.70	\$3,445.50	\$377.80	12.32%
40			\$3,251.52	\$3,639.00	\$387.48	11.87%
50			\$3,435.33	\$3,832.49	\$397.16	11.56%
60			\$3,619.15	\$4,025.99	\$406.84	11.25%
70			\$3,802.97	\$4,219.49	\$416.52	10.94%
80			\$3,986.79	\$4,412.99	\$426.20	10.69%
90			\$4,170.61	\$4,606.49	\$435.88	10.44%
100			\$4,354.43	\$4,799.99	\$445.56	10.23%
150			\$5,273.52	\$5,767.41	\$493.89	9.37%
200			\$6,192.61	\$6,734.87	\$542.26	8.76%
250			\$7,111.70	\$7,702.34	\$590.64	8.31%
300			\$8,030.79	\$8,669.81	\$639.02	7.95%
350			\$8,949.88	\$9,537.30	\$687.42	7.64%
400			\$9,868.97	\$10,404.81	\$735.84	7.37%
450			\$10,788.06	\$11,272.33	\$784.27	7.14%
500			\$11,707.15	\$12,139.85	\$832.70	6.94%
600			\$13,546.42	\$14,424.16	\$1,087.74	7.99%
700			\$15,385.69	\$16,708.50	\$1,322.81	8.60%
800			\$17,224.96	\$19,000.00	\$1,775.04	10.31%
900			\$19,064.23	\$21,291.54	\$2,227.31	11.68%
1,000			\$20,903.50	\$23,583.05	\$2,679.55	12.82%
1,500			\$28,737.34	\$32,674.57	\$3,937.23	13.70%
2,000			\$36,571.18	\$41,766.09	\$5,194.91	14.21%
2,500			\$44,405.02	\$50,857.61	\$6,452.59	14.53%
3,000			\$52,238.86	\$60,000.00	\$7,761.14	14.86%
4,000			\$68,385.71	\$79,142.86	\$10,757.15	15.73%
5,000			\$84,532.56	\$98,285.71	\$13,753.15	16.27%
6,000			\$100,679.41	\$117,428.57	\$16,749.16	16.63%
7,000			\$116,826.26	\$136,571.43	\$19,745.17	16.90%
8,000			\$132,973.11	\$155,714.29	\$22,741.18	17.10%
9,000			\$149,119.96	\$174,857.14	\$25,737.18	17.25%
10,000			\$165,266.81	\$194,000.00	\$28,733.19	17.37%
15,000			\$243,800.17	\$286,428.57	\$42,628.40	17.48%
20,000			\$322,333.53	\$378,857.14	\$56,523.61	17.55%
25,000			\$400,866.89	\$471,285.71	\$70,418.82	17.57%
30,000			\$479,400.25	\$563,714.29	\$84,314.04	17.58%
50,000			\$799,000.42	\$942,857.14	\$143,856.72	18.00%

Appendix III

Table No. 3

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

Comparison of Steam Bills Calculated at the Present Rates
Effective 10/1/07 and at the Proposed Rates to be Effective 10/1/08
For Proposed Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

SC No. 2 - Annual Power Service - Non-Demand
Summer Period

M POUNDS USED 30 DAYS	STEAM ADJUSTMENT USED		BILL AT PRESENT RATES EFFECTIVE 10/1/2007	BILL AT PROPOSED RATES	DOLLAR VARIANCE	PERCENTAGE VARIANCE
	GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FACTOR USED	\$6,41800 2.4800000%				
0			\$2,516.24	\$2,865.02	\$348.78	13.86%
10			\$2,690.97	\$3,046.96	\$355.99	13.23%
20			\$2,865.70	\$3,228.89	\$363.19	12.67%
30			\$3,040.43	\$3,410.82	\$370.39	12.18%
50			\$3,389.88	\$3,774.69	\$384.81	11.35%
80			\$3,914.07	\$4,320.49	\$406.42	10.38%
100			\$4,263.53	\$4,684.35	\$420.82	9.87%
150			\$5,137.17	\$5,594.01	\$456.84	8.89%
200			\$6,010.81	\$6,503.68	\$492.87	8.20%
250			\$6,884.45	\$7,413.34	\$528.89	7.68%
300			\$7,874.41	\$8,470.94	\$596.53	7.58%
400			\$9,854.32	\$10,586.12	\$731.80	7.43%
500			\$11,834.24	\$12,701.31	\$867.07	7.33%
800			\$17,773.98	\$19,046.87	\$1,272.89	7.16%
1,000			\$21,733.80	\$23,277.25	\$1,543.45	7.10%
1,500			\$31,331.06	\$33,468.37	\$2,137.31	6.82%
2,000			\$40,928.31	\$43,659.49	\$2,731.18	6.67%
2,500			\$50,525.56	\$53,850.62	\$3,325.06	6.58%
3,000			\$60,122.81	\$64,041.74	\$3,918.93	6.52%
4,000			\$79,317.32	\$84,423.99	\$5,106.67	6.44%
5,000			\$98,511.82	\$104,806.23	\$6,294.41	6.39%
8,000			\$156,095.33	\$165,952.98	\$9,857.65	6.32%
10,000			\$194,484.34	\$206,717.47	\$12,233.13	6.29%
15,000			\$290,456.86	\$308,628.71	\$18,171.85	6.26%
25,000			\$482,401.90	\$512,451.18	\$30,049.28	6.23%
30,000			\$578,374.42	\$614,362.41	\$35,987.99	6.22%
50,000			\$962,264.50	\$1,022,007.36	\$59,742.86	6.21%

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

Comparison of Steam Bills Calculated at the Present Rates
Effective 10/1/07 and at the Proposed Rates to be Effective 10/1/08
For Proposed Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

SC No. 2 - Annual Power Service - Demand
Winter Period

STEAM ADJUSTMENT USED		\$6,41800		\$6,41800		
GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FACTOR USED		2.480000%		2.480000%		
HOURS USE		200		200		
M POUNDS USED 30 DAYS	DEMAND Mlbs/Hr Mon-Fri 6am-11am	DEMAND Mlbs/Hr All hrs - All days	BILL AT PRESENT RATES EFFECTIVE 10/1/2007	BILL AT PROPOSED RATES	DOLLAR VARIANCE	PERCENTAGE VARIANCE
0	0.00	0.00	\$2,516.24	\$4,411.94	\$1,895.70	75.34%
10	0.05	0.05	\$2,742.81	\$4,753.35	\$2,010.54	73.30%
20	0.10	0.10	\$2,969.38	\$5,094.76	\$2,125.38	71.58%
30	0.15	0.15	\$3,195.95	\$5,436.17	\$2,240.22	70.10%
50	0.25	0.25	\$3,649.09	\$6,118.99	\$2,469.90	67.69%
80	0.40	0.40	\$4,328.79	\$7,143.22	\$2,814.43	65.02%
100	0.50	0.50	\$4,781.93	\$7,826.04	\$3,044.11	63.66%
150	0.75	0.75	\$5,914.78	\$9,533.10	\$3,618.32	61.17%
200	1.00	1.00	\$7,047.62	\$11,240.15	\$4,192.53	59.49%
250	1.25	1.25	\$8,180.47	\$12,947.20	\$4,766.73	58.27%
300	1.50	1.50	\$9,793.89	\$14,626.64	\$4,832.75	49.34%
400	2.00	2.00	\$13,020.74	\$17,985.51	\$4,964.77	38.13%
500	2.50	2.50	\$16,247.59	\$21,344.38	\$5,096.79	31.37%
800	4.00	4.00	\$25,928.14	\$31,420.98	\$5,492.84	21.18%
1,000	5.00	5.00	\$32,381.84	\$38,138.72	\$5,756.88	17.78%
1,500	7.50	7.50	\$48,516.08	\$54,933.07	\$6,416.99	13.23%
2,000	10.00	10.00	\$79,668.57	\$70,970.60	\$6,878.28	10.73%
2,500	12.50	12.50	\$85,244.81	\$87,008.13	\$7,339.56	9.21%
3,000	15.00	15.00	\$126,397.29	\$103,045.66	\$7,800.85	8.19%
4,000	20.00	20.00	\$157,549.78	\$135,120.72	\$8,723.43	6.90%
5,000	25.00	25.00	\$249,291.72	\$167,195.78	\$9,646.00	6.12%
8,000	40.00	40.00	\$310,453.01	\$260,097.54	\$11,579.04	4.33%
10,000	50.00	50.00	\$463,356.25	\$322,032.05	\$13,512.06	2.92%
15,000	75.00	75.00	\$789,162.72	\$478,868.31	\$17,378.12	2.26%
25,000	125.00	125.00	\$917,874.52	\$786,540.84	\$13,500.53	1.47%
30,000	150.00	150.00	\$1,512,721.73	\$931,375.05	(\$2,009.82)	(0.13%)
50,000	250.00	250.00		\$1,510,711.91		

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

Comparison of Steam Bills Calculated at the Present Rates
Effective 10/1/07 and at the Proposed Rates to be Effective 10/1/08
For Proposed Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

SC No. 2 - Annual Power Service - Demand
Winter Period

STEAM ADJUSTMENT USED		\$6,41800		2,480000%		400	
GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FACTOR USED		\$6,41800		2,480000%		400	
HOURS USE		400		400		400	
M POUNDS USED 30 DAYS	DEMAND Mlbs/Hr Mon-Fri 6am-11am	DEMAND Mlbs/Hr All hrs - All days	BILL AT PRESENT RATES EFFECTIVE 10/1/2007	BILL AT PROPOSED RATES	DOLLAR VARIANCE	PERCENTAGE VARIANCE	
0	0.00	0.00	\$2,516.24	\$4,411.94	\$1,895.70	75.34%	
10	0.03	0.03	\$2,722.45	\$4,731.39	\$2,008.94	73.79%	
20	0.05	0.05	\$2,918.47	\$5,039.87	\$2,121.40	72.69%	
30	0.08	0.08	\$3,124.68	\$5,359.33	\$2,234.65	71.52%	
50	0.13	0.13	\$3,526.91	\$5,987.26	\$2,460.35	69.76%	
80	0.20	0.20	\$4,125.16	\$6,923.68	\$2,798.52	67.84%	
100	0.25	0.25	\$4,527.39	\$7,551.61	\$3,024.22	66.80%	
150	0.38	0.38	\$5,538.06	\$9,126.94	\$3,588.88	64.80%	
200	0.50	0.50	\$6,538.54	\$10,691.28	\$4,152.74	63.51%	
250	0.63	0.63	\$7,548.21	\$12,266.61	\$4,717.40	62.49%	
300	0.75	0.75	\$9,030.27	\$13,803.34	\$4,773.07	52.86%	
400	1.00	1.00	\$12,002.58	\$16,887.77	\$4,885.19	40.70%	
500	1.25	1.25	\$14,974.89	\$19,972.21	\$4,997.32	33.37%	
800	2.00	2.00	\$23,891.82	\$29,225.51	\$5,333.69	22.32%	
1,000	2.50	2.50	\$29,836.44	\$35,394.38	\$5,557.94	18.63%	
1,500	3.75	3.75	\$44,697.98	\$50,816.56	\$6,118.58	13.69%	
2,000	5.00	5.00	\$59,001.53	\$65,481.92	\$6,480.39	10.98%	
2,500	6.25	6.25	\$73,305.07	\$80,147.28	\$6,842.21	9.33%	
3,000	7.50	7.50	\$87,608.61	\$94,812.65	\$7,204.04	8.22%	
4,000	10.00	10.00	\$116,215.70	\$124,143.37	\$7,927.67	6.82%	
5,000	12.50	12.50	\$144,822.79	\$153,474.09	\$8,651.30	5.97%	
8,000	20.00	20.00	\$228,928.53	\$238,142.84	\$9,214.31	4.02%	
10,000	25.00	25.00	\$284,999.03	\$294,568.67	\$9,569.64	3.36%	
15,000	37.50	37.50	\$425,175.28	\$435,703.25	\$10,527.97	2.48%	
25,000	62.50	62.50	\$705,527.76	\$717,932.40	\$12,404.64	1.76%	
30,000	75.00	75.00	\$841,512.57	\$849,044.92	\$7,532.35	0.90%	
50,000	125.00	125.00	\$1,365,451.82	\$1,373,495.04	(\$11,953.78)	(0.86%)	

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

Comparison of Steam Bills Calculated at the Present Rates
Effective 10/1/07 and at the Proposed Rates to be Effective 10/1/08
For Proposed Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

SC No. 2 - Annual Power Service - Demand
Summer Period

M POUNDS USED 30 DAYS	STEAM ADJUSTMENT USED		GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FACTOR USED		BILL AT PROPOSED RATES	DOLLAR VARIANCE	PERCENTAGE VARIANCE
	BILL AT PRESENT RATES EFFECTIVE 10/1/2007	\$6.41800 2.4800000%	BILL AT PRESENT RATES EFFECTIVE 10/1/2007	\$6.41800 2.4800000%			
0	\$2,516.24		\$2,516.24		\$4,411.94	\$1,895.70	75.34%
10	\$2,690.97		\$2,690.97		\$4,630.43	\$1,939.46	72.07%
20	\$2,865.70		\$2,865.70		\$4,848.91	\$1,983.21	69.21%
30	\$3,040.43		\$3,040.43		\$5,067.40	\$2,026.97	66.67%
50	\$3,389.88		\$3,389.88		\$5,504.38	\$2,114.50	62.38%
80	\$3,914.07		\$3,914.07		\$6,159.84	\$2,245.77	57.38%
100	\$4,263.53		\$4,263.53		\$6,596.81	\$2,333.28	54.73%
150	\$5,137.17		\$5,137.17		\$7,689.25	\$2,552.08	49.68%
200	\$6,010.81		\$6,010.81		\$8,781.69	\$2,770.88	46.10%
250	\$6,884.45		\$6,884.45		\$9,874.12	\$2,989.67	43.43%
300	\$7,874.41		\$7,874.41		\$10,883.50	\$3,009.09	38.21%
400	\$8,854.32		\$8,854.32		\$12,802.25	\$3,047.93	30.93%
500	\$11,834.24		\$11,834.24		\$14,921.01	\$3,086.77	26.08%
800	\$17,773.98		\$17,773.98		\$20,977.27	\$3,203.29	18.02%
1,000	\$21,733.80		\$21,733.80		\$25,014.77	\$3,280.97	15.10%
1,500	\$31,331.06		\$31,331.06		\$34,637.65	\$3,306.59	10.55%
2,000	\$40,928.31		\$40,928.31		\$44,260.52	\$3,332.21	8.14%
2,500	\$50,525.56		\$50,525.56		\$53,883.39	\$3,357.83	6.65%
3,000	\$60,122.81		\$60,122.81		\$63,506.26	\$3,383.45	5.63%
4,000	\$79,317.32		\$79,317.32		\$82,752.01	\$3,434.69	4.33%
5,000	\$98,511.82		\$98,511.82		\$101,997.75	\$3,485.93	3.54%
8,000	\$156,095.33		\$156,095.33		\$159,734.98	\$3,639.65	2.33%
10,000	\$194,484.34		\$194,484.34		\$198,226.47	\$3,742.13	1.92%
15,000	\$290,456.86		\$290,456.86		\$294,455.19	\$3,998.33	1.38%
25,000	\$482,401.90		\$482,401.90		\$486,912.63	\$4,510.73	0.94%
30,000	\$578,374.42		\$578,374.42		\$583,141.35	\$4,766.93	0.82%
50,000	\$962,264.50		\$962,264.50		\$968,056.23	\$5,791.73	0.60%

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

Comparison of Steam Bills Calculated at the Present Rates
Effective 10/1/07 and at the Proposed Rates to be Effective 10/1/08
For Proposed Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

SC No. 3 - Apartment House Service - Non-Demand
Winter Period

STEAM ADJUSTMENT USED		\$6.41800	\$6.41800			
GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FACTOR USED		2.4800000%	2.4800000%			
M POUNDS USED 30 DAYS	BILL AT PRESENT RATES EFFECTIVE 10/1/2007	BILL AT PROPOSED RATES	DOLLAR VARIANCE	PERCENTAGE VARIANCE		
0	\$1,325.19	\$1,510.59	\$185.40	13.99%		
10	\$1,508.06	\$1,699.28	\$191.22	12.68%		
20	\$1,690.94	\$1,887.98	\$197.04	11.65%		
30	\$1,873.82	\$2,076.68	\$202.86	10.83%		
50	\$2,239.57	\$2,454.07	\$214.50	9.58%		
80	\$2,788.19	\$3,020.16	\$231.97	8.32%		
100	\$3,153.94	\$3,397.55	\$243.61	7.72%		
150	\$4,068.32	\$4,341.03	\$272.71	6.70%		
200	\$5,535.63	\$5,930.45	\$394.82	7.13%		
250	\$7,002.94	\$7,519.86	\$516.92	7.38%		
300	\$8,470.25	\$9,109.27	\$639.02	7.54%		
400	\$11,404.87	\$12,286.10	\$883.23	7.74%		
500	\$14,339.48	\$15,466.93	\$1,127.45	7.86%		
800	\$22,303.72	\$24,022.67	\$1,718.95	7.71%		
1,000	\$27,613.21	\$29,726.51	\$2,113.30	7.65%		
1,500	\$40,886.93	\$43,986.09	\$3,099.16	7.58%		
2,000	\$54,160.65	\$58,245.67	\$4,085.02	7.54%		
2,500	\$67,434.37	\$72,505.25	\$5,070.88	7.52%		
3,000	\$80,708.09	\$86,764.83	\$6,056.74	7.50%		
4,000	\$107,255.54	\$115,283.98	\$8,028.44	7.49%		
5,000	\$133,122.51	\$143,007.90	\$9,885.39	7.43%		
8,000	\$210,723.44	\$226,179.64	\$15,456.20	7.33%		
10,000	\$262,457.40	\$281,627.47	\$19,170.07	7.30%		
15,000	\$391,792.28	\$420,247.04	\$28,454.76	7.26%		
25,000	\$650,462.05	\$697,486.19	\$47,024.14	7.23%		
30,000	\$779,796.93	\$836,105.76	\$56,308.83	7.22%		
50,000	\$1,297,136.47	\$1,390,584.05	\$93,447.58	7.20%		
100,000	\$2,590,485.31	\$2,776,779.77	\$186,294.46	7.19%		

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

Comparison of Steam Bills Calculated at the Present Rates
Effective 10/1/07 and at the Proposed Rates to be Effective 10/1/08
For Proposed Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

SC No. 3 - Apartment House Service - Non-Demand
Summer Period

M POUNDS USED 30 DAYS	STEAM ADJUSTMENT USED		BILL AT PRESENT RATES EFFECTIVE 10/1/2007	BILL AT PROPOSED RATES	DOLLAR VARIANCE	PERCENTAGE VARIANCE
	GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FACTOR USED	\$6,41800 2.4800000%				
0			\$1,325.19	\$1,510.59	\$185.40	13.99%
10			\$1,499.49	\$1,689.26	\$189.77	12.66%
20			\$1,673.79	\$1,867.93	\$194.14	11.60%
30			\$1,848.08	\$2,046.61	\$198.53	10.74%
50			\$2,196.68	\$2,403.96	\$207.28	9.44%
80			\$2,843.47	\$3,084.72	\$241.25	8.48%
100			\$3,274.67	\$3,538.56	\$263.89	8.06%
150			\$4,352.65	\$4,673.17	\$320.52	7.36%
200			\$5,430.64	\$5,807.78	\$377.14	6.94%
250			\$6,508.63	\$6,942.38	\$433.75	6.66%
300			\$7,586.61	\$8,076.99	\$490.38	6.46%
400			\$9,742.59	\$10,346.21	\$603.62	6.20%
500			\$11,898.56	\$12,615.42	\$716.86	6.02%
800			\$17,660.91	\$18,598.82	\$937.91	5.31%
1,000			\$21,502.48	\$22,587.75	\$1,085.27	5.05%
1,500			\$31,106.39	\$32,560.08	\$1,453.69	4.67%
2,000			\$40,710.30	\$42,532.41	\$1,822.11	4.48%
2,500			\$50,314.22	\$52,504.74	\$2,190.52	4.35%
3,000			\$59,918.13	\$62,477.07	\$2,558.94	4.27%
4,000			\$79,125.96	\$82,421.72	\$3,295.76	4.17%
5,000			\$98,333.78	\$102,366.38	\$4,032.60	4.10%
8,000			\$155,957.26	\$162,200.35	\$6,243.09	4.00%
10,000			\$194,372.91	\$202,089.67	\$7,716.76	3.97%
15,000			\$290,412.05	\$301,812.96	\$11,400.91	3.93%
25,000			\$482,490.31	\$501,259.53	\$18,769.22	3.89%
30,000			\$578,529.44	\$600,952.82	\$22,453.38	3.88%
50,000			\$962,685.97	\$999,875.97	\$37,190.00	3.86%
100,000			\$1,923,077.29	\$1,997,108.55	\$74,031.26	3.85%

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

Comparison of Steam Bills Calculated at the Present Rates
Effective 10/1/07 and at the Proposed Rates to be Effective 10/1/08
For Proposed Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

SC No. 3 - Apartment House Service - Demand
Winter Period

M POUNDS USED 30 DAYS	DEMAND Mlbs/Hr Mon-Fri 6am-11am	DEMAND Mlbs/Hr All hrs - All days	STEAM ADJUSTMENT USED		BILL AT PRESENT RATES EFFECTIVE 10/1/2007	BILL AT PROPOSED RATES	DOLLAR VARIANCE	PERCENTAGE VARIANCE
			GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FACTOR USED	HOURS USE				
			\$6.41800	300	\$6,418.00			
			2.480000%	300	2,480.000%			
0	0.00	0.00			\$1,325.19	\$1,512.45	\$187.26	14.13%
10	0.03	0.03			\$1,532.12	\$1,725.82	\$193.70	12.64%
20	0.07	0.07			\$1,748.71	\$1,951.03	\$201.32	11.51%
30	0.10	0.10			\$1,956.65	\$2,164.40	\$207.75	10.62%
50	0.17	0.17			\$2,381.17	\$2,602.97	\$221.80	9.31%
80	0.27	0.27			\$3,012.63	\$3,254.82	\$242.29	8.04%
100	0.33	0.33			\$3,426.50	\$3,681.66	\$255.16	7.45%
150	0.50	0.50			\$4,482.48	\$4,772.19	\$289.71	6.46%
200	0.67	0.67			\$5,953.15	\$6,322.89	\$369.74	6.21%
250	0.83	0.83			\$7,413.16	\$7,861.77	\$448.61	6.05%
300	1.00	1.00			\$8,883.83	\$9,412.48	\$528.65	5.95%
400	1.33	1.33			\$11,814.51	\$12,502.07	\$687.56	5.82%
500	1.67	1.67			\$14,755.84	\$15,603.48	\$847.64	5.74%
800	2.67	2.67			\$22,928.90	\$24,185.26	\$1,256.36	5.48%
1,000	3.33	3.33			\$28,370.50	\$29,898.56	\$1,528.06	5.39%
1,500	5.00	5.00			\$41,995.81	\$44,205.47	\$2,209.66	5.28%
2,000	6.67	6.67			\$55,621.13	\$58,512.37	\$2,891.24	5.20%
2,500	8.33	8.33			\$69,235.78	\$72,807.45	\$3,571.67	5.16%
3,000	10.00	10.00			\$82,861.10	\$87,114.35	\$4,253.25	5.13%
4,000	13.33	13.33			\$110,101.06	\$115,716.34	\$5,615.28	5.10%
5,000	16.67	16.67			\$136,841.34	\$143,763.43	\$6,922.09	5.06%
8,000	26.67	26.67			\$217,040.86	\$227,881.07	\$10,840.21	4.99%
10,000	33.33	33.33			\$270,500.10	\$283,951.60	\$13,451.50	4.97%
15,000	50.00	50.00			\$404,169.51	\$424,151.60	\$19,982.09	4.94%
25,000	83.33	83.33			\$671,487.67	\$704,539.77	\$33,042.10	4.92%
30,000	100.00	100.00			\$805,167.08	\$844,739.77	\$39,572.68	4.91%
50,000	166.67	166.67			\$1,338,834.08	\$1,405,527.94	\$66,693.86	4.90%
100,000	333.33	333.33			\$2,675,485.57	\$2,807,480.61	\$130,995.04	4.89%

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

Comparison of Steam Bills Calculated at the Present Rates
Effective 10/1/07 and at the Proposed Rates to be Effective 10/1/08
For Proposed Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

SC No. 3 - Apartment House Service - Demand
Winter Period

M POUNDS USED 30 DAYS	DEMAND Mlbs/Hr Mon-Fri 6am-11am	DEMAND Mlbs/Hr All hrs - All days	STEAM ADJUSTMENT USED		BILL AT PRESENT RATES EFFECTIVE 10/1/2007	BILL AT PROPOSED RATES	DOLLAR VARIANCE	PERCENTAGE VARIANCE
			GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FACTOR USED	HOURS USE				
			\$6,41800	500	\$6,41800			
			2.480000%	500	2.480000%			
0	0.00	0.00	\$1,325.19		\$1,512.45	\$187.26	14.13%	
10	0.02	0.02	\$1,521.46		\$1,713.99	\$192.53	12.65%	
20	0.04	0.04	\$1,717.74		\$1,915.54	\$197.80	11.52%	
30	0.06	0.06	\$1,914.01		\$2,117.08	\$203.07	10.61%	
50	0.10	0.10	\$2,306.56		\$2,520.17	\$213.61	9.26%	
80	0.16	0.16	\$2,895.37		\$3,124.80	\$229.43	7.92%	
100	0.20	0.20	\$3,287.92		\$3,527.88	\$239.96	7.30%	
150	0.30	0.30	\$4,269.29		\$4,535.60	\$266.31	6.24%	
200	0.40	0.40	\$5,665.34		\$6,003.50	\$338.16	5.97%	
250	0.50	0.50	\$7,061.39		\$7,471.41	\$410.02	5.81%	
300	0.60	0.60	\$8,457.44		\$8,939.31	\$481.87	5.70%	
400	0.80	0.80	\$11,249.54		\$11,875.12	\$625.58	5.56%	
500	1.00	1.00	\$14,041.65		\$14,810.92	\$769.27	5.48%	
800	1.60	1.60	\$21,788.32		\$22,919.53	\$1,131.21	5.19%	
1,000	2.00	2.00	\$26,952.76		\$28,325.27	\$1,372.51	5.09%	
1,500	3.00	3.00	\$39,863.88		\$41,839.61	\$1,975.73	4.96%	
2,000	4.00	4.00	\$52,775.00		\$55,353.96	\$2,578.96	4.89%	
2,500	5.00	5.00	\$65,686.11		\$68,868.30	\$3,182.19	4.84%	
3,000	6.00	6.00	\$78,597.23		\$82,382.65	\$3,785.42	4.82%	
4,000	8.00	8.00	\$104,419.46		\$109,411.34	\$4,991.88	4.78%	
5,000	10.00	10.00	\$129,731.35		\$135,873.31	\$6,141.96	4.73%	
8,000	16.00	16.00	\$205,667.00		\$215,259.24	\$9,592.24	4.66%	
10,000	20.00	20.00	\$256,290.77		\$268,183.19	\$11,892.42	4.64%	
15,000	30.00	30.00	\$382,850.18		\$400,493.07	\$17,642.89	4.61%	
25,000	50.00	50.00	\$635,969.02		\$665,112.83	\$29,143.81	4.58%	
30,000	60.00	60.00	\$762,528.44		\$797,422.70	\$34,894.26	4.58%	
50,000	100.00	100.00	\$1,268,766.11		\$1,326,662.22	\$57,896.11	4.56%	
100,000	200.00	200.00	\$2,534,360.23		\$2,649,761.00	\$115,400.71	4.55%	

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

Comparison of Steam Bills Calculated at the Present Rates
Effective 10/1/07 and at the Proposed Rates to be Effective 10/1/08
For Proposed Levelized Rates Based on the Joint Proposal

SC No. 3 - Apartment House Service - Demand
Summer Period

STEAM ADJUSTMENT USED		\$6.41800	\$6.41800				
GROSS RECEIPTS TAX FACTOR USED		2.4800000%	2.4800000%	BILL AT PRESENT RATES EFFECTIVE 10/1/2007	BILL AT PROPOSED RATES	PERCENTAGE VARIANCE	
M POUNDS USED 30 DAYS						DOLLAR VARIANCE	
0		\$1,325.19	\$1,512.45			\$187.26	14.13%
10		\$1,499.49	\$1,689.61			\$190.12	12.68%
20		\$1,673.79	\$1,866.77			\$192.98	11.53%
30		\$1,848.08	\$2,043.92			\$195.84	10.60%
50		\$2,196.68	\$2,398.24			\$201.56	9.18%
80		\$2,843.47	\$3,067.20			\$223.73	7.87%
100		\$3,274.67	\$3,513.17			\$238.50	7.28%
150		\$4,352.65	\$4,628.10			\$275.45	6.33%
200		\$5,430.64	\$5,743.03			\$312.39	5.75%
250		\$6,508.63	\$6,857.96			\$349.33	5.37%
300		\$7,586.61	\$7,972.89			\$386.28	5.09%
400		\$9,742.59	\$10,202.76			\$460.17	4.72%
500		\$11,898.56	\$12,432.62			\$534.06	4.49%
800		\$17,660.91	\$18,339.15			\$678.24	3.84%
1,000		\$21,502.48	\$22,276.85			\$774.37	3.60%
1,500		\$31,106.39	\$32,121.08			\$1,014.69	3.26%
2,000		\$40,710.30	\$41,965.30			\$1,255.00	3.08%
2,500		\$50,314.22	\$51,809.53			\$1,495.31	2.97%
3,000		\$59,918.13	\$61,653.76			\$1,735.63	2.90%
4,000		\$79,125.96	\$81,342.22			\$2,216.26	2.80%
5,000		\$98,333.78	\$101,030.68			\$2,696.90	2.74%
8,000		\$155,957.26	\$160,096.05			\$4,138.79	2.65%
10,000		\$194,372.91	\$199,472.96			\$5,100.05	2.62%
15,000		\$290,412.05	\$297,915.25			\$7,503.20	2.58%
25,000		\$482,490.31	\$494,799.83			\$12,309.52	2.55%
30,000		\$578,529.44	\$593,242.12			\$14,712.68	2.54%
50,000		\$962,685.97	\$987,011.27			\$24,325.30	2.53%
100,000		\$1,923,077.29	\$1,971,434.15			\$48,356.86	2.51%