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rights on the record. On December 13th, 2010, the Wood-Fired IPPs filed a Motion to Dismiss, asserting, among other things, that PSNH had submitted a contract to this Commission for approval that exceeds the Commission's jurisdiction under 362-F:9 to approve. The motion stated that PSNH's obligation to purchase renewable energy certificates for New Hampshire Class I RECs under 362-F does not extend beyond the year 2025 as a matter of law. And, the contract that is the subject of this hearing provides for the purchase of RECs through 2034. And, therefore, the Commission lacks the authority and the power to approve PSNH to enter into that contract and to allow for cost recovery.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. So, Mr. Shulock, the same motion that we've already ruled on?

MR. SHULOCK: Yes. Yes.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Well, let's -what I said at the beginning was, first, we're going to take appearances, then we're going to have public comment, then we'll deal with any procedural issues. So, let's get the appearances on the record, and then we'll address your objection or your reservations of rights or whatever it may be at the appropriate time.

MR. SHULOCK: Fine. And, actually, I
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want to take another 20 seconds, if you'd like? Okay. We understand that the Commission has said that it can place conditions on the contract, and we agree with that. To the extent that the Commission may place conditions on the contract in the public interest, we believe that's different than placing conditions on the contract to bring it into the Commission's jurisdiction and make it a jurisdictional contract. And, in fact, you haven't imposed any conditions. And, we understand that. We simply want it clear on the record that our participation here today is not intended as a waiver of our rights to pursue the legal claims that we've made in that Motion to Dismiss, and a Motion for Rehearing or otherwise.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Your position is noted.
MR. RODIER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Jim Rodier, for Clean Power Development. And, at an appropriate time, I've just got a very brief two sentence statement that I'd like to make as a preliminary matter.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Thank you. MS. HATFIELD: Good morning,
Commissioners. Meredith Hatfield, for the Office of Consumer Advocate, on behalf of residential ratepayers. And, with me for the Office, as a witness in this proceeding, is Ken Traum.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Good morning. MS. AMIDON: Good morning,
Commissioners. Suzanne Amidon, for Commission Staff.
With me today is George McCluskey, an Analyst with the
Electric Division and a witness in this docket, he's to my immediate left; to his left is Tom Frantz, the Director of the Electric Division and a witness in this docket; and to Mr. Frantz's left is Edward Damon, who is the Director of the Legal Division, and who has worked with me in this docket. Good morning.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Good morning. Well, let's turn to opportunity for public comment. I have one public statement form indicating an interest in speaking, Mr. Makaitis. Sir. If you could come up, it might be easier to come to a microphone so you can be heard, and the court stenographer will be able to hear. If you want to use that one, that's fine, too.

MR. MAKAITIS: Thank you. I'm Max Makaitis -- is this thing on? Yes. And, I am the Housing and Economic Development Director for Tri-County Community Action Program. I have submitted, on behalf of Tri-County CAP, a written letter of support supporting the approval of this project, and essentially supporting it from the overall economic development and New Hampshire economy
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perspective. I think the essence of my letter is, and which has been submitted, is that buying $\$ 25$ million of biomass, since the raw material is grown in New Hampshire, provides New Hampshire with an economic increase in jobs and development and, through a multiplier effect, has it up to three times, that's a $\$ 75$ million effect.

On the alternative, if we buy natural gas or oil or coal or propane, then we are sending money out of state and we are losing the economic benefit.

So that the essence of my letter is
that, even if we wind up paying more for biomass, the economic benefit to New Hampshire is substantially greater by multiples than it would be if we continue to buy the lowest, cheapest form of energy and send the money out of state. For example, if we buy $\$ 25$ million of biomass, that works within New Hampshire and increases New Hampshire's economy. If we buy coal, that goes -- that money goes out of state, and we lose that wealth, we burn the coal, and we really don't have something to show for it. We're creating jobs in other entities, in foreign countries.

So that the essence of my letter, from an economic perspective, is that biomass, being the only raw material, energy raw material that New Hampshire
poses, should be approved and should be emphasized in terms of what we do for renewable energy. And, obviously, a benefit of renewable energy being a better and cleaner environment.

And, that's the essence of my letter. I don't want to go into it, take a lot of time of this body right now. I do want to say though that Councilor Burton gave me also some letters to deliver, which I did, in support of the Project. And, we hope, for the benefit of the North Country, where we have substantial unemployment now because of the mill closure, and where people have a problem, in essence, not worrying about the amount of their electric bill, but actually paying their electric bill. But we hope this would be approved, because it is in the best interest of the entire economy of New Hampshire. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you, sir. Is there anyone else who would like to make a public comment this morning?
(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Hearing nothing,
then we'll move on to dealing with the outstanding procedural issues. And, the first item I'll note is the Notice of Withdrawal that was filed by Concord Steam.
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And, we issued a letter on January 21 saying that today we'll provide an opportunity for the parties to give any reason why they think we should not treat the Concord Steam Notice of Withdrawal in the same manner that we treated the Laidlaw withdrawal in this proceeding.

So, let's -- does anyone have -- that would like to respond to that issue? Ms. Amidon.

MS. AMIDON: Yes. I just wanted to
observe that one of the distinctions between Concord Steam and Laidlaw's motion or request or Notice of Withdrawal is the timing. As you know, this was filed just a few days before the hearing, when there was still an ongoing discovery dispute with PSNH over Motions to Compel. And, so, I think that is a difference.

Secondly, Concord Steam is a regulated utility. Are they a necessary party in this docket? I think that's for the Commission to decide. But the only other point I was going to make is, Concord Steam was the only entity that offered information on wood supply and wood pricing issues. And, if the Commission determines that those -- that information is necessary for you to make a determination under RSA 362-F:9, on whether this contract is in the public interest, you should consider whether you would want to keep them in the docket for that
purpose.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Ms.
Hatfield.
MS. HATFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree with both points that Attorney Amidon raised.
Concord Steam certainly brought a different perspective about wood procurement. And, they argued actually quite strongly on their own behalf that they needed to be in the docket to protect the interest of their own ratepayers, most of which are not residential ratepayers, I would note.

It's also unfortunate, I don't believe
Concord Steam is here today. But we certainly are interested to know why the Company decided to withdraw so late in the process, when we were so close to hearing, and we're very disappointed that they did withdraw. We do think that some of the information that they put into the record of the case will be important to the Commission's decision. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Anyone else? Mr. Shulock.

MR. SHULOCK: We don't disagree with the points that were raised by the other two, by Staff and OCA. But, as parties that interact with the Commission,

Page 18
what we would like to see is the development of some clear guidelines for things that --
(Court reporter interruption.)
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, I think you just need to be closer to the microphone is the issue.

MR. SHULOCK: As parties who practice before the Commission, we're simply looking for a clear exposition of the standards that the Commission will apply as parties enter and leave the docket. We think that it calls into question the integrity of dockets before the Commission when parties can simply jump in and jump out. And, this isn't the first party to have done that in this proceeding. So, we would simply look for that exposition in your order.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Ms. Hatfield.
MS. HATFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
One practical issue that I should have raised is that some parties in their rebuttal responded to Concord Steam's testimony. So, if they -- if they are allowed to withdraw, and therefore their testimony is not in the record, I think, as we go through the hearing, we might want to make sure that we strike rebuttal that responds to their points, if it's appropriate. It may be that their response and a rebuttal is broad enough that it covers
issues raised by several parties, but something that we were mindful of in preparing for today.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Anyone else? Mr. Edwards.

MR. EDWARDS: I would agree with what everyone else has mentioned here, in particular, about timing of this. But I think probably the biggest issue I would have with this is that we've been really struggling with a benchmark as to what market price has been all along with this PPA. And, here we have Concord Steam that has come up with probably, you know, a very current PPA on a greenfield project that's providing us with a rate that's 18 percent lower than the PPA we're talking about on the Laidlaw PPA.

My concern being that, if their
intervening status is thrown out, that that comparison is also thrown out, and we don't have as much to go on.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Anyone else? Mr. Boldt, did you --

MR. BOLDT: Or, I'll -- I can wait after PSNH's. I didn't mean to take Bob's thunder.

MR. BERSAK: Go ahead.
MR. BOLDT: From the standpoint of the City, we would object to the withdrawal not being granted
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and the testimony not being stricken. Any party in a lawsuit has the right to decide they don't want to play anymore. Remember, Concord Steam was faced with a very strong challenge to its standing that raised some significant and serious issues before this Board. We would suggest that they have the right to withdraw, they should be granted that withdrawal, and their testimony, since those witnesses are not here to be crossed, and we have strong disagreement with a great deal of that testimony, because that opportunity of cross-examination is not available to us, it is a due process issue that they need to be stricken. There are portions of the rebuttal testimony of various parties that will quote a segment of the Concord Steam's witnesses' testimony, so that you are at least given the context in which that rebuttal testimony, which is of merit to the general issues before this Board, can be considered. You can strike the Concord Steam testimony, keep the rebuttal testimony, and still have the flavor of what is important on the issues of this case.

Accordingly, we ask you to strike and we ask you to grant the motion and to strike the testimony.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Bersak.

MR. BERSAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Concord Steam was a voluntary party to this proceeding. They were not a mandatory party. And, this Commission has a long-standing precedent that people who or entities or parties that come in voluntarily aren't forced to remain. This docket clearly could have gone forward without Concord Steam ever intervening, and it will continue without them being here. The fact that they're a utility is coincidental. Their utility status has had nothing to do with their grant of intervenor status in this docket.

Not only is there past precedent, you
know, from years of practice before the Commission, where the Commission has allowed parties that are not mandatory parties to withdraw. But, in this particular docket, as you're well aware, the developer, Laidlaw, was granted intervenor status and was later allowed to withdraw. So, the law of the case is that voluntary intervenors do have the ability to withdraw.

PSNH has several pending motions outstanding that would be basically mooted if the withdrawal was allowed to take place and if they -- the testimony that was filed or submitted by Concord Steam was stricken from the record. And, if you grant their withdrawal and strike their testimony from the record,
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PSNH could withdraw those motions so the Commission doesn't have to act on them, because they would, in fact, be moot.

So, we think that the withdrawal that was filed by Concord Steam Corporation is, in fact, effective, and that they are no longer parties to this proceeding.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, the motions you're talking about, is it the -- primarily, the Motion to Rescind or, in the alternative, Strike and to Compel?

MR. BERSAK: That's correct. And, I
believe Concord Steam also has a motion outstanding with
respect to confidential treatment of some data. To the
extent that they have withdrawn, I believe that
confidential data should be returned to them, and that also moots out their outstanding motion.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Were there any other motions of PSNH that --

MR. BERSAK: No, that's it, sir.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay.
(Chairman and Commissioners conferring.)
CHAIRMAN GETZ: okay. What we're going to do with this issue, and maybe with some of these other procedural issues, I want to hear all the arguments, and
then, during the day, during a break, we'll take under advisement the arguments, and render a ruling before the end of the day, and try to start into the process of the actual hearings and get some witnesses on the stand. So, we'll take that issue under advisement for the time being.

And, I'd like to move onto the issues surrounding the City of Berlin Motion for Confidentiality and the OCA Motion to Strike. And, there's a relationship here between, we have the Motion for Confidential Treatment that was filed on January 12 by the City of Berlin. And, we have the rebuttal testimony that was filed on January 19 by the City as well. And, I want to make sure I understand where we are on at least some of these related issues.

First off, Mr. Boldt, I have a couple questions for you --

MR. BOLDT: Certainly, your Honor.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: -- about the status of some of this background material. First of all, the -so, we have the Motion for Confidential Treatment, and this deals with data requests that were filed by the wood IPPs on December 28, and the date of the response is January 10. Now, I didn't see an objection to any of the data requests.
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MR. BOLDT: They were contained in the responses, Mr. Commissioner.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: The objections are?
MR. BOLDT: The objections were, and that was a late realization on my part, that some of the materials that Mr. Sansoucy had available were protected by copyright. The main two issues are --

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, let me understand. MR. BOLDT: Okay.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: So, the objection -- so, I should -- is there any words that say "we object" or I should draw the conclusion from the answers that they are objections?

MR. BOLDT: They are objections, to the degree they weren't answered, they are. We used the words "we object" in the -- we're seeking the confidentiality in those responses.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Can you direct me to where that occurs?

MR. BOLDT: Certainly. We have binders that will have them in it. But, in essence, what will be marked in the future as "Sansoucy" or "City Exhibit C", the text of the response to Number 1, I believe it is 3 , we have, at the bottom paragraph, "other documents",
begins "other documents", that they're "proprietary and confidential and are not subject to disclosure under 91-A, and that a Motion for Confidential Treatment is being filed."

Similarly, on --
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, let me ask you a question, one question there.

MR. BOLDT: Certainly.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: So, when you say
"subject to disclosure", are you saying "subject to public disclosure under 91-A" or "subject to disclosure through discovery"?

MR. BOLDT: Both is the intention, your Honor. What we're talking about at this time, other than the items that are listed in the first paragraph that are specifically set out, specifically available public information, in part, we're talking about confidential sections of Mr. Sansoucy's other files, a Ventyx publication and an Energy Solutions publication. The two prime issues are the Ventyx and the Energy Solutions. Those are publicly available for a fee. Frankly, it's a subscription service that, as our motion relates, has certain copyright materials, copyright obligations hoisted upon those subscribers. It is a service, though, that
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Staff, OCA, PSNH, anybody can subscribe to. It's not one of those things that is something that nobody else can get their hands on. So, under the rules, we were expressing in our responses the objections and the desire to keep them confidential. Hence, our motion.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, I guess I want to make one distinction. I think there's a difference between something being not subject to public disclosure, and that we could treat as confidential, is a different thing from whether it's subject to discovery and should be made available to other parties, subject to appropriate confidentiality orders or protective orders. So, I think those are two different things.

But let me, in the motion, it notes that the City is attempting to obtain permission, I guess both from Energy Solutions and Ventyx to make the information available. Can you tell me what the status of that --

MR. BOLDT: We have not received that permission to date.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. And, is it --
MR. BOLDT: And, it is one where I do not know if it will be granted.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Is that the City's obligation or is that --

MR. BOLDT: It is technically
Mr. Sansoucy's obligation, because it's not available, it's not something we have as a City document. It is, though, requested of Mr. Sansoucy. And, I would note at this time, your Honor, that these were requests from IPP. There is no Motion to Compel from IPP. There is no timely objection to our Motion for Confidentiality, Confidential Treatment. We were under the impression that our responses were subject to the same rules as the other parties that required the five day Motion to Compel that was set out in the original October order, scheduling order of this body.

In light of that, I would argue that this is not a timely or properly raised issue for the body, and to grant the confidential treatment for that reason also.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, you also indicated in the papers that the information, I assume, was going to be made available to Staff and the OCA and to the Commission. Has that been done?

MR. BOLDT: We made it contingent upon getting the permission. That, if we got the permission from those third parties, then we would provide it that way, in the hopes of limiting -- actually, of gaining the
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permission from those bodies. And, as I say, I don't have permission. And, this is something, though, that Staff, OCA, IPPs could contact --

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, let me understand -- I'm trying to understand the distinction there. Our rules, under Puc 203.08, regarding confidential documents, under Subsection (c) and (d) contemplates providing the information to Staff at least in discovery, with a statement that it be treated confidentially.

MR. BOLDT: And, I guess, because we were -- we were very concerned on having Mr. Sansoucy violate that copyright, that we took the position, we are describing it, we are telling you where you can get it, but we are telling you why we can't give it to you. We thought we were complying with the PUC rules.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: That's not the way I interpreted the motion. I thought that it would be provided.

MR. BOLDT: If we got the permission, that was the intention. And, I thought that's what our motion said.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: If you got the permission, not subject to the granting -- so, even if we granted a protective order, there is still the issue of
Page 30
the copyright problem?
MR. BOLDT: I would say so, in looking at it as dispassionately as I can.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: I guess that depends on a couple of things. Whether there's a "fair use"
exception under the copyrights law or what the contract arrangement is between Energy Solutions and Ventyx with Mr. Sansoucy.

MR. BOLDT: Okay.
(Mr. Sansoucy conferring with Mr. Boldt.)
MR. BOLDT: If you treat us as
confidential, Mr. Sansoucy is telling me we can provide the books, in essence, to Staff and the Commission.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: But not the Wood IPPs?
(Mr. Sansoucy conferring with Mr. Boldt.)
MR. BOLDT: Viewing that the bodies under you would be protected by the governmental usage.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: So, there's a specific
exception in that arrangement between Mr. --
(Mr. Sansoucy conferring with
Mr. Boldt.)
MR. BOLDT: The IPPs would be subject to
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the copyright, because they are a potential buyer.
(Mr. Sansoucy conferring with
Mr. Boldt.)
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Well, rather than
MR. BOLDT: Sorry.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: -- keep going through
this at this length, I think I understand some of your positions. It sounds like you may need to speak to your witness about the actual arrangements.

I want to find out what other positions other parties may have on this point at this juncture. So, well, I guess, you know, Mr. Shulock, this emanates from your data requests. What's your position?

MR. SHULOCK: Our position is, first,
that in an expedited proceeding, we should not have to file a Motion to Compel if the objection was filed late. They filed a late objection, we're being criticized for having filed a late Motion to Compel.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: For having filed or for
not -- I haven't seen a Motion for Compel.
MR. SHULOCK: You have not.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay.
MR. SHULOCK: The objection not having
been made, they should simply provide those materials. We also think --

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, let's stop right there, because it seems like you've said two different things. That they have filed a late-filed objection or there's not an objection. What's your position on --

MR. SHULOCK: No objection has been filed. But we do object to their withholding this information. No written objection has been filed.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: You've been aware, though, since they answered your data requests, that you didn't have the information?

MR. SHULOCK: Yes, that's true.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Have you taken any effort to try to acquire that information from --

MR. SHULOCK: We have not. We also object to the practice of requesting confidential materials be released to everyone, except to the party that actually requested them. There was nothing that prevented Mr. Boldt from requesting that the copyright be released for other parties in discovery. So, as a practice, we object to that. We also think that this goes substantially to weight and credibility that should be given to Mr. Sansoucy's testimony, that's based in large
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part on confidential materials in files that belong to his other client. The Commission will never see those files, doesn't know what's in them, and has no opportunity to test Mr. Sansoucy's statements. That's our entire position.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Anyone else want to address the Motion for Confidentiality? Ms. Hatfield.

MS. HATFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The OCA did inquire of the City's counsel on Friday to ask about the status of them seeking permission, and we were told that, consistent with what Attorney Boldt just told the Commission, that they were still awaiting the permission.

But the OCA has participated in many cases in the past where these types of copyrighted materials provided by consulting firms giving different types of market intelligence and that sort of thing have been provided to Staff and the OCA, because of that I think general exception for governmental entities, such as ourselves, who are governed by the Right to Know law. So, we're disappointed that we hear now, I believe we heard that we can receive materials, but we haven't. And, so, it makes it very difficult to cross-examine Mr. Sansoucy,
because we haven't had a chance to see those materials. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Anyone else? Ms. Amidon.

MS. AMIDON: Yes. This issue arises in connection with the OCA's motion, and Staff supports the motion. And, with respect to the Motion for Confidential Treatment, we think, at this late date, it is unfortunate that the City of Berlin persists in trying to provide us with information where they made a statement that they were attempting to provide Staff and the OCA with this information, and we never got it.

I think that I would -- well, in
addition, the Commission hasn't had a chance to examine in camera the materials where there is a claim for confidential treatment, and therefore has not been able to determine whether it is indeed confidential and protected from public disclosure or not. And, additionally, you would be making a ruling as to whether or not the parties in this docket would be able to see it in order to properly conduct an informed cross-examination of Mr. Sansoucy.

At this late date then, I would
recommend that the Commission act favorably on the OCA's
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motion, because, if you decide that you want to go forward, look at the materials, grant the Motion for Confidential Treatment, my honest assessment is that Staff would have to ask for a delay in the hearing so that we could review those materials, conduct discovery on Mr. Sansoucy, and provide an informed cross-examination before the Commission.

So, I don't think I can provide a particular opinion on the Motion for Confidential Treatment, not having seen that material myself. But I do believe that, whether we move forward today with Mr. Sansoucy's testimony in or out is something that needs to be decided rather soon.

MR. BOLDT: May I respond, your Honor?
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, let's go see Mr.

## Bersak first.

MR. BERSAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The issue of providing copyrighted materials in response to discovery requests has always been troubling. It's been troubling to, I know, for Public Service, and troubling for other utilities and parties that practice before this Commission. Because, clearly, you know, if somebody was to ask for "Please provide a copy of Dr. Morin's book on return of equity", we're not going to
take it to the copying machine and make a copy and provide it. That's clearly a copyright violation. When you come to a subscription service, such as the matters that we're discussing today, it may only be one or two pages, but that might be the entire subscription. Is that a violation of copyright? It's a troubling issue.

Sometimes I have to admit that the Company has held its nose and cooperated and provided things, but was it a violation of copyright? We don't know. You brought up the issue, "is it fair use?" It might be.

Mr. Sansoucy and the City of Berlin have been more cautious than we are. I can understand that. We have, in the past, made copyrighted materials available for people to look at, we've even lent copies of books to other parties, if need be, to try to get around the copyright issue. But it is a significant issue, and it needs to be dealt with at sometime by the Commission as to how the parties should deal with that and not get into trouble with the owners of the copyright.

The other issue that you brought up, Mr. Chairman, with respect to "well, if it's confidential, shouldn't you have provided a copy to the Commission?" I have to just remind you that that's an issue that's
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subsumed within the still outstanding Motion to Compel against Concord Steam that we have. They answered many of the questions that we seek to have them respond to that "the information is confidential, because it's owned by Concord Power \& Steam, LLC." They did not provide copies of those confidential information to the Commission under the rule that you cited. So, we've got the same issue there that's outstanding. That people or parties have claimed confidentiality have not complied with the rule, and now the Commission is in the situation where it has to figure out what does it do now. Thank you.

MR. BOLDT: Brief --
CHAIRMAN GETZ: One second please. (Chairman and Commissioners conferring.) CHAIRMAN GETZ: Mr. Boldt.
MR. BOLDT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Very briefly. I ask this body to remember that my client is a sister sovereign in the state. This is a municipality that has limited resources and limited desire to get into a slugfest over if someone in its charge violates a copyright. We did do what we believed was open and above board and in keeping with the spirit and intention of both this rocket docket and the PUC rules. We gave the express location of the information. Anybody
that needed it could go to those entities and obtain for the subscription fee the desired information.

We filed our Motion for Confidentiality 13 days ago. Nobody said "boo" until about 5:30 last night, when I get an e-mail from Ms. Hatfield, that very briefly mentions this point in her Motion to Strike. It's by no means the substance of her Motion to Strike, by the way. We have given the information to the best we believe we could give this information. It is something that -- I am not a copyright lawyer, I'm a municipal lawyer. This is not one of those waters I wish to tread in. But it is something we, in good faith, gave the information to all parties in response to IPPs' requests. And, there was no objection within five days of our Motion for Confidentiality or our responses.

I do note that your rules allow there to be an oral request for waiver of any of the applicable rules. And, I would so request, if there is some hat being hung upon a peg of these rules, that that peg be waived in this particular instance.

Mr. Sansoucy is a well-known, I would say "usual suspect" in this arena. He can be cross-examined on the strength, merits, or relative weakness of any of his positions. This Board can allow
that cross-examination, and then take into consideration the weight and merit to give to his testimony. But, to strike it wholeheartedly, because we're abiding by a provided copyright, smacks just not fair and violates our due process rights participating in this hearing. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you.
CMSR. IGNATIUS: Mr. Boldt, a couple of questions to follow up on that. And, we're moving from the confidentiality issue to the striking of testimony, and whether it's fair rebuttal. And, so, I ask that we hold off on that for a moment. It's complicated enough --

MR. BOLDT: Yes.
CMSR. IGNATIUS: -- just dealing with one issue at a time. Other than the confident -- excuse me, other than the copyright issue, does the City assert a confidentiality issue with respect to Mr. Sansoucy's materials, if it weren't copyrighted, would we be having any discussion about confidentiality here?

MR. BOLDT: The third party files that are voluminous and, again, they go to his -- to Mr. Sansoucy's background experience, that are fair game subject to cross-examination. That would be the only thing that I believe would not be covered by the copyright
petition elements of our motion. The copyright really goes to the two subscription reports, Ventyx and Energy.

CMSR. IGNATIUS: And, you've said you've made a request. Can you give a little more information on that? Is it a written request? An oral request? What date was it made?

MR. BOLDT: It is my understanding that that was handled by Mr. Sansoucy's office, and that we have not received any response back. I don't -- as I sit here today, I don't know of the date, I don't know if it was in an e-mail or a letter. And, I'm sorry.

CMSR. IGNATIUS: At some point during a break, if you could consult with Mr. Sansoucy and just put on the record the attempts that you or he have made for public release of that information or limited release to the parties, however it was phrased, would be helpful.

MR. BOLDT: I will do so.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Ms. Hatfield.
MS. HATFIELD: Thank you. Without straying over to the other motion, I did just want to point out that it appears, although I'm not sure, but it appears, starting on Page 27 of his rebuttal, that Mr. Sansoucy may have waived some of the confidential claims, because there are quoted bullet points from Energy
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Solutions. I don't recall if there are also quotes from Ventyx. But those run from Page 27 to Page 30 of his testimony. And, again, I can't say for sure if those are the same materials at issue, because I haven't seen the materials at issue. But he does quote to Energy solutions, and, you know, it looks like material from one of their -- what might be a copyrighted report.

CMSR. BELOW: What page are you referring to?

MS. HATFIELD: This is Mr. Sansoucy's revised rebuttal, starting on Page 27 of 48.

CMSR. BELOW: Got it. Thanks.
MR. BOLDT: And, I will find out if
that's the same document or a publicly available one that is quoted there in the footnote, which gives the cite to it.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Thank you. Let's turn to the OCA Motion to Strike. Well, we're at the motion, but, and I don't think you need to go through it in detail, Ms. Hatfield. Is there anything in particular that you would like to point out about it before I allow other parties an opportunity to speak to it?

MS. HATFIELD: I just wanted to say two things -- or, three things. I apologize for how late it
was filed. I apologize for the length. But I thought it might be helpful to the Commission to provide this level of detail, so that you could easily go to the pieces that are referenced. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, let me make sure I understand. From your perspective, is it effectively that, or, for the most part, you would strike everything, you'd have us strike everything up to Page 35 , and then, from Page 36 on, where there's -- it begins with a specific reference to Mr. McCluskey's testimony, that you would -- you have no objection to the last 10 or 11 pages of the --

MS. HATFIELD: Yes, that's correct.
And, actually, on Page 17 of 48 , there is a question that we view as appropriate, related to capacity, that we do see as rebuttal. So that, if we look through the sections we've requested be struck, the Page 17, Lines 4 through 19 -- or, 20, are actually not in our motion. But, otherwise, you are correct. Although, actually there's another section like that on Page 20, where Mr. Sansoucy's is asked a question that, again, makes a specific reference about the OCA and Staff's positions in their testimony, which we also view, I believe that was not covered in our motion.
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CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you.
MS. HATFIELD: So, there are sections, before you get to Page 37, that we view that that could be construed as proper rebuttal.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Boldt, we'll let anybody else speak to this issue first, and give you the opportunity to go last.

MR. BOLDT: Thank you, sir.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Ms. Amidon.
MS. AMIDON: Thank you. As I indicated before, Staff supports OCA's Motion to Strike. In order to promote the orderly conduct of this proceeding, the parties of this docket have to be mindful that rebuttal testimony should not present new argument. But is intended to counter the argument of another party. To the extent that Mr. Sansoucy's testimony direct the attention to things that the Staff did or did not relate in their testimony, it's not rebuttal.

In addition, eight pages of his
testimony are really, I think, a verbatim response to a data request, which he can submit the response to the data request when Mr. Sansoucy takes the stand.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: I'm sorry, say that again.

MS. AMIDON: I think there are about eight pages of testimony related to siting, which was a response to a data request. And, it's repeated in the rebuttal. But Mr. Sansoucy can -- the City of Berlin can enter that response to the data request through Mr. Sansoucy as a witness on the stand. It's not appropriate to put a data request response in rebuttal testimony. It's not addressing an argument that was made by any of the propounders of direct testimony.

We believe it would be in the interest of the orderly conduct of the proceeding and due process for this testimony, as identified by OCA in its motion, to be stricken. And, again, if the Commission determines not to strike the testimony, we would request that the Commission delay the hearing to first address the City's claim of confidentiality, which we have just talked about. And, then, also allow the parties to conduct some discovery of the rebuttal testimony, so that we may be properly prepared for cross-examination. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Is there anyone else? Mr. Shulock.

MR. SHULOCK: The Wood IPPs fully agree with the comments of Staff and the OCA, and we join in the motion and support it. And, we would point out that, on
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Page 2 of 48, starting on Line 20, Mr. Sansoucy says that "the purpose of [his] testimony is to rebut Staff, OCA, Concord Steam, and the Wood-Fired IPPs." Concord Steam may have your permission to withdraw. We should not have rebuttal to testimony that they filed, if that testimony is not going to be in evidence. And, then, secondly, the Wood IPPs have never filed -- not filed any testimony in the proceeding. So, there's nothing in here that could rebut Wood IPP testimony. What I believe this is referring to is probably the data request information that Ms. Amidon raised. We did ask a data request. The response appears in testimony, and not in a data request -- well, actually, it does appear in the answer to our data request, but the testimony here is not rebuttal testimony, it's direct testimony on that issue.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Mr. Bersak.
MR. BERSAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First, I'd like to start off by expressing appreciation to Attorney Hatfield for getting this to us. Even though it was late yesterday, it did give us a chance to look at it. So, thank you. No apologies necessary. This is a compressed time period we're dealing with. So, thanks again.

When I viewed the motion, I viewed it as
basically there are two issues contained inside there. One is about duplication of materials that had been in the direct testimony submitted by the City. And, a second was whether other things that were not duplication were, in fact, fair rebuttal.

With respect to duplication, yes, there is duplication, the Company agrees, but I don't think that duplication creates any harm. It's already in the record, he could restate it. Well, we do have a paper industry in the state, maybe it helps them. But I don't think it really creates a problem for the docket. So, I'll turn to the other issue of "Is it fair rebuttal?"

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, when you're saying "duplication", are you referring to the data response?

MR. BERSAK: No. I'm referring to
initial testimony. I think that there might be things in their initial testimony that were restated. With respect to the data response, I would assume that somebody asked that and thought it was relevant. The City gave an answer. And, maybe a different practice would have been to tender the data request into the record. This was a different way of getting to the same result. So, on that issue, I'm not going to take any stand.

With respect to whether the remainder of
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the testimony is fair rebuttal, I turn to the end of the Consumer Advocate's motion, and the end of Section Number 13, Paragraph 13. Where it says "New analysis and new testimony are improperly introduced on rebuttal." My contention is, "rebuttal", by definition, is new testimony. If there wasn't a need to put new testimony in, you wouldn't be filing rebuttal. So, clearly, the fact that it's new testimony is not a ground to strike it. Rebuttal testimony is testimony. And, I would assume that, in that new testimony, there is new analysis. The question is, "is it responsive to what other parties have filed?" And, my -- and, PSNH's contention is that it is.

The testimony filed by the Consumer Advocate and by the two Staff witnesses is broad and wide-ranging. It covers the topics of whether the PPA is in the public interest. It talks about market price tests. It talks about REC pricing, gas prices, REC availability, the number of RECs that should be purchased, the cumulative reduction factor. All these things that were contained within the Rebuttal Testimony of Mr. Sansoucy were dealt with in the testimony of Staff and OCA witnesses. We feel that it is, in fact, fair rebuttal to what was raised, and that it should not be stricken from the record.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Mr. Boldt.
MR. BOLDT: Yes. We believe it is fair rebuttal also, Mr. Chairman. We are expressly addressing issues raised by the various direct testimonies previously filed. And, I ask you to remember that our original direct testimony was filed, and we believe we filed everything on the day it was due. We understand there is a Puc rule that says, in the general rule, "it's not filed until when the paper lands." We would ask that that rule be waived in this instance, if it is given any strength. It is just a footnote in Ms. Hatfield's response or motion rather. But we have given clear and ample notice of our positions in support of this in our direct testimony, the same day that Staff filed its direct testimony, OCA filed its direct testimony, per the scheduling order in this matter.

The clarifications, the additional arguments, the additional analysis, that is the nature of rebuttal. And, that it is something that is addressing that which is before this Board raised by a party. Ms. Hatfield would have you believe that rebuttal cannot be in favor of the party that is taking the position. It can't be in our favor. That is not what rebuttal is, even by this Board's own rules that she cites to, first, in the
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PUC case order, where it is basically an instruction on a scheduling order going forward. And, next, in the other case she cites, which is a new analysis by the prime party involved in that docket. It's not an intervenor, such as the City.

We believe that Mr. Sansoucy's rebuttal testimony addresses the clear gaps that challenge the relative strength or weakness of the Staff and OCA's own witnesses. There are three legs of this stool. There's energy pricing, there's RECs, and there's capacity. Staff didn't address a third -- one of those three in the capacity. They give a paragraph that says, basically, "I haven't had time to look it. I don't think it's material." OCA's witness said it's "\$11 million under market in their capacity pricing." This testimony goes at length what they're wishing to strike. It's important for you to realize, goes to that capacity issue, goes to the REC pricing issue, goes to the propriety of this being in the public interest, not only for the City of Berlin and its residents, but the North Country and the state as a whole. Those are key issues that are directly in this matter. There is no doubt of that.

And, we would ask that the Motion to
Strike be overruled and denied, so that this testimony can
come forward. Mr. Sansoucy is here for cross-examination. And, that is the proper way, I believe, that this body should handle this testimony. Happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Ms. Amidon. MS. AMIDON: I just want to express my concern that Attorney Boldt would characterize Staff's testimony one way or another. And, just remind you that when Mr. McCluskey and Mr. Frantz will be on the stand, they will be able to say what their testimony does address.

And, secondly, I was concerned that Mr. Boldt's statement drifted into testimony, and just want to express concern in that regard as well. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Ms. Hatfield, you have the opportunity to go last on this issue.

MS. HATFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
I think Attorney Boldt mischaracterized the motion when he said that our position was that "rebuttal cannot be in favor of the filing party." I certainly didn't intend to suggest that. And, I think Mr. Bersak made a good point that, in Paragraph 13, it would have been more proper for me to state new analysis and new direct testimony, are properly introduced on rebuttal, and I think I do say that
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several times in the motion.
Also, Mr. Boldt discussed at length the rebuttal testimony of Mr. Sansoucy about capacity. I actually think that the other areas of his testimony are much more glaring examples of "improper rebuttal". And, I would just call the Commission's attention to those particular sections, where, for example, in my motion, in Paragraph 7(a), on Page 2, I quote a question Mr. Sansoucy is asked "Do you believe the siting of the plant in Berlin is appropriate, in the public interest and good for ratepayers?" That is a direct testimony type of question. And, I think that you'll see in my motion the quoted questions that I've provided to you, almost all of them are of that type. And, rather than filing 12 pages of direct back in December, perhaps Mr. Sansoucy should have filed something closer to the length of his rebuttal. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Thank you.
(Chairman and Commissioners conferring.)
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. We're going to basically do the same thing with this issue, as with the last issue, take them under advisement. Recognizing that what I'd like to do is get to getting some PSNH witnesses on the stand, get the direct done, start the
cross-examination. Best case, during the lunch recess, we'll deliberate these issues and give you our answers after we come out of lunch and begin the afternoon session.

So, to the extent there's some questions for PSNH witnesses relative to either the Concord Steam testimony or the rebuttal of Mr. Sansoucy, may have to defer that a little bit. But I think we can handle that. I'd prefer not to take a half hour to an hour recess now to try and resolve all these issues.

Ms. Hatfield?
MS. HATFIELD: Are you ready to turn to the PSNH panel? Because, if you are, I have something to raise on that before they call their witnesses.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Let's -- I think we had -- Mr. Rodier had one issue he wanted to raise.

MR. RODIER: Just a brief statement, Mr. Chairman, only a couple of sentences. Newco Energy, LLC, the 100 percent owner of Laidlaw Berlin BioPower and Gestamp Biometrica [sic] are discussing forming a relationship to work together to develop biomass energy projects in New Hampshire and New England. Gestamp Biotermica, S.L., headquartered in Madrid, Spain, indirectly owns 100 percent of Clean Power Development, a
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developer of biomass energy projects headquartered in Concord, New Hampshire. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Mr. Bersak.
MR. BERSAK: Mr. Chairman, one more procedural thing. At the start of today's hearing, when you were taking appearances, counsel for the Wood IPPs raised an objection to the proceeding going forward, based upon jurisdictional limits. And, you raised the fact that the Commission has already ruled on that order in Order Number 25,192 . The Company is just curious as to whether you would -- the Commission would deem that further objection this morning as a request for rehearing, which sets into play very limited time to object to such a motion for rehearing, or whether it's not a motion for rehearing?

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, I'm not sure that that's what Mr. Shulock's position was.

MR. SHULOCK: We were specifically reserving our right to file a motion for rehearing. We don't our participation in this proceeding today to be construed as a waiver of our right to file a motion for rehearing at a later time.

MR. BERSAK: Okay. With that clarification, we understand. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you.
Ms. Hatfield.
MS. HATFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I think you know, the parties agreed to circulate premarked exhibits. And, when PSNH handed out their exhibits this morning, Number 9 is called "Changes to PPA." And, so, the parties were handed a document that is titled "Changes to PPA offered by Laidlaw." And, I just wanted to bring that to the Commission's attention that the OCA has not had time to review that document.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, I don't think we
actually have -- do we have that?
MR. BERSAK: I have not supplied it to the Commissioners yet.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, actually, I'm not sure that we even have the list of -- prefiled list of exhibits.

MS. HATFIELD: And, if I could just -- I just want to express to the Commission, I'm not sure what you can do about it, but the fact that we basically -- it appears that we may have a new PPA before us, is going to make cross very challenging. And, I am absolutely willing to go forward. But I just want the Commission to understand that my cross of the Company has been developed
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based on the PPA that was proposed, that was in the record. And, so, I will do that cross. And, then, what I will need to figure out how to do is to weave in cross on the new proposals.

So, I just wanted to flag that for you, and I will do my best to weave those things together.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Well, let's -Mr. Bersak, can you tell me a little bit about --

MR. BERSAK: Absolutely, Mr. Chairman. Let me give you what will be marked as "PSNH Exhibit Number 9" for identification, so that the Commissioners can see what we are talking about. I have already provided copies of these to the Clerk and to the court reporter and to the other parties in the proceeding.

CMSR. IGNATIUS: Mr. Bersak, I think the Clerk needs a copy as well.

MS. AMIDON: I would point out he provided the copies to us about five minutes before the hearing commenced today.

CMSR. BELOW: And, do you happen to have a copy of the proposed Exhibit List?

MR. BERSAK: I'll give you my copy of
it. There you go, sir. Over the weekend, the developer was considering matters that have taken place very
recently in this proceeding. They have considered the testimonies, the criticisms of certain parts of the PPA, and came to PSNH and said "We would be willing to make these changes." We felt that, as the utility, you know, what we are trying to do is implement public policy under the Renewable Portfolio Standard law by entering into this PPA. We felt that these changes were potentially beneficial, that they addressed many of the -- at least some of the issues that the other parties have brought up. We felt that we had a responsibility to make these changes known. And, to let the Commission decide if some or any of them would be consistent -- or, more consistent with the public interest and be part of the Commission's deliberations and perhaps conditions on approval.

Again, as Ms. Hatfield said this morning, time is short. I wish we had more time to provide this earlier, but we couldn't. This is Monday morning. The first thing when I came here, I provided it to everybody. I didn't just spring it on them while the witnesses were on the stand. It is what it is, and the panel will be able to address questions with respect to these matters that are on what has been marked for identification as "PSNH Exhibit 9".

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Well,
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actually, Mr. Shulock.
MR. SHULOCK: I agree with the Office of OCA. What this presents is an entirely new contract. This is a 20-year, very complicated self-executing contract. And, every one of the terms should be studied, carefully reviewed, its economics should be tested by Staff and the OCA witnesses and others who have a need to determine whether it is a cost-efficient, cost-competitive manner of proceeding, and whether it will provide benefits to ratepayers. I don't think that we should proceed this morning. I object to that. We're, of course, willing to proceed if we're overruled.

But, I think that, if this is going to be offered as a way of conditioning the contract, then the parties should have the opportunity to conduct discovery on the meaning of its terms, the function of its terms, the economics of these terms, and then to come back with prepared testimony on these, rather than trying to develop that through cross on the fly.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Ms. Amidon. MS. AMIDON: Yes. Thank you. I have a little more pragmatic idea about this, which is, rather than allow PSNH to offer this document, which hasn't been examined, into evidence today, to defer that perhaps till
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tomorrow, so that the parties can take some time to examine it. And, I think we should still be allowed to conduct our inquiry on what was filed with the Commission. This has not been offered as an amendment to the feeling. Although, now that I said that, Mr. Bersak may call it an amendment to the filing. But I think that we need to have an opportunity to take some kind of recess to examine it and to develop some questions on it, mindful that the Commission has now opened up Wednesday to continue this hearing.

So, I would suggest we just not allow it to come into evidence on this first day, and perhaps wait until -- maybe have PSNH bring it in on rebuttal at their close, so that the parties can have some time to form some questions about it.

And, just on another matter, I did
attempt to assist the Commission by asking people to premark their testimony -- or, at least provide an exhibit list, and to identify the testimony by the parties, rather than go in sequential order. It's intended to be a good faith effort to include everything that the parties wanted on their exhibit List, but does not foreclose parties from bringing new material, if it's appropriate. So, I just wanted to add that as a tag to my statement.
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## CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Anything

 else on this issue? Ms. Hatfield.MS. HATFIELD: Mr. Chairman, I
appreciate Attorney Amidon thinking on her feet and trying to figure out how best to get this in. I guess, you know, just thinking practically about my cross, what I think I might like to do to be able to cross on this, if my time for crossing the PSNH panel comes today, as I'm doing my cross on the PPA as filed, but then also maybe be able to reserve the right to do additional cross just on the new materials tomorrow. And, I'm thinking that it might just flow better. For example, there appear to be new terms related to RECs. If I'm doing my cross on the existing PPA, it seems like it might flow better if I did some cross on the new document, and that may happen today.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Anything else on this issue?

MR. BERSAK: The Company is certainly willing, Mr. Chairman, to make the witnesses available at any time for the convenience of the other parties here. The Company still stands behind the PPA as it was submitted. These changes, as noted on the top of the -what's been marked "Exhibit 9" for identification are things that the developer has indicated that it is willing
to do. We just felt it was in the best interest of consumers to take them up on their offer, to the extent that this Commission or perhaps other parties join and say "Yes, these are better things. We would like those also." And, to just walk away from them, for expediency or because of the procedural vagaries of this docket, didn't make much sense to the Company.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Thank you.
MS. AMIDON: And, Mr. Chairman, in the alternative, and this may be a preferred mode of operation, rather than allow this come into evidence at all, if the Commission thinks that it's appropriate for the parties to conduct further settlement, you can direct that at the close of the hearing. That's just an alternative I'm offering as I am trying to think of ways to handle this.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Thank you. (Chairman and Commissioners conferring.) CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. We'll treat this issue the same way as the others. We'll deliberate during the lunch recess what's the best way to handle this. I think, for purposes of the hearing today, we'll I think use these exhibit numbers for pre-marking for identification purposes only. Of course, recognizing we
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don't make any decision about whether the evidence will actually be admitted into something into the record for our consideration till the end of the proceeding.

And, then, for purposes of today, I'm going to overrule the objection from Mr. Shulock. And, during our deliberations, we'll undertake, in the same way as we did with -- as we will with the issue from the City's rebuttal testimony and the Ventyx and Energy Solutions reports of what's the best way to give parties a fair opportunity to prepare their cross.

So, is there anything else of a procedural matter before we get to the PSNH panel?

MS. AMIDON: Yes. In the interest of having an orderly process in this proceeding, on January 20th, I sent around a proposal on the order of witnesses. Of course, no one from Concord Steam is here. So, the order of witnesses that I contemplated would be the PSNH panel, the witness for the City of Berlin, the OCA, and Staff, allowing PSNH the opportunity to call back their panel at the end of cross-examination. And, PSNH asserted an interest, with respect to the Staff and the OCA, to be the last to cross-examine, and Mr. Bersak will correct me if I'm wrong.

Finally, we wanted to be cognizant that

Mr. Edwards may have some questions, and I don't know where he would fit in, and I don't know if Mr. Edwards does have any questions, but I just wanted to be cognizant of that.

However, the City of Berlin, in an e-mail, expressed an objection to their witness following PSNH. I don't know if Mr. Boldt still has that same concern. But my feeling was that, because PSNH and the City of Berlin have common -- both support the filing, that having PSNH do rebuttal at the very end would suffice for them to present their case going last. Mr. Boldt apparently felt that Mr. Sansoucy should be the last witness. I think Staff should go last, as has been the case with the Commission. So, I don't know if there is still a concern on that.

MR. BOLDT: My only comment, Mr. Chairman, would be that we are -- we view ourselves as supportive of the PPA, but, in a large part, rebutting that which Mr. McCluskey and Mr. Traum put forward. That it may make more sense, since we're an intervenor, that it be the Applicant, Staff, and OCA, and then the intervenors. I don't have to be last. That was my suggestion. I will, obviously, go in the order that you want to hear us.
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(Chairman and Commissioners conferring.)
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. In terms of order of witnesses, it will be PSNH, the City of Berlin, the Consumer Advocate, and Staff. Let me address the issue of cross, though. Ms. Amidon, I think you said that the -PSNH would like to go last, which I think in this is appropriate with respect to the OCA and Staff testimony. But, as for the City of Berlin testimony, which is supportive of the position, I would propose that the order of cross would be the Company, Mr. Edwards, and then to the others, to Mr. Shulock, Mr. Rodier, OCA, and Staff.

MR. BERSAK: Sounds eminently appropriate, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Ms. Hatfield.
MS. HATFIELD: Mr. Chairman, I think that Mr. Rodier, on behalf of CPD, is more in the nature of friendly cross. That's been the tenor of his filings in this docket. And, then, the statement he made this morning, which was very helpful, clarifying that his company's parent is pursuing a relationship with Laidlaw's parent.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: So, you're essentially saying he should come before Mr. Shulock, instead of after?

## MS. HATFIELD: Yes. <br> CHAIRMAN GETZ: Any objection to that? <br> (No verbal response) <br> CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Hearing no objection, that will be the order of cross. And, anything else? <br> (Chairman and Commissioners conferring.) <br> CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Anything else

 before we hear from the panel?(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. All right. This is what we'll do at this point. We'll take a very brief recess. Let the panel get situated, give Mr. Patnaude his first break of the day, and then we would resume shortly. Thank you.
(Whereupon a recess was taken at 10:33
a.m. and the hearing reconvened at

10:51 a.m.)
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Mr. Bersak.
MR. BERSAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. PSNH would like to present its witnesses as a panel. They're up on the witness stand right now. We have for you Dr. Lisa Shapiro, Mr. Gary Long, Mr. Terry Large, and Mr. Rick Labrecque. And, if the reporter could please
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swear them in.
(Whereupon Lisa K. Shapiro, Gary A.
Long, Terrance J. Large, and Richard C.
Labrecque were duly sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter.)
LISA K. SHAPIRO, SWORN
GARY A. LONG, SWORN
TERRANCE J. LARGE, SWORN
RICHARD C. LABRECQUE, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION

## BY MR. BERSAK:

Q. Mr. Long, can you please provide your full name, business address, and position with the Company?
A. (Long) My name is Gary A. Long. And, my business address is 780 North Commercial Street, Manchester, New Hampshire.
Q. And, are you the President and Chief Operating Officer of Public Service Company of New Hampshire?
A. (Long) Yes, I am.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Labrecque, can you also give your full name, business address, and position with the Company?
A. (Labrecque) My name is Richard C. Labrecque. I'm the Manager of Supplemental Energy Sources at PSNH. And, my business address is the same as Mr. Long's.
Q. Mr. Large, can you provide the same information please?
A. (Large) Certainly. My name is Terrance J. Large. I am
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8 A. (Shapiro) Yes. My name is Lisa Shapiro. And, I am at
$\square$ Page 66 the Director of Business Planning and Customer Support Services for Public Service Company of New Hampshire, also at 780 North Commercial Street, in Manchester.
Q. And, finally, Dr. Shapiro, if you can provide the same information. Gallagher, Callahan \& Gartrell, 214 North Main Street, in Concord. And, I'm Chief Economist and a consultant with Public Service of New Hampshire.

MR. BERSAK: The Company has marked and provided a copy of the listing of exhibits to the parties and to the Clerk and to the reporter. We've marked as "Exhibit 1" for identification, Mr. Chairman, the Petition that Public Service filed on July 26, 2010, which initiated this proceeding. We've marked as identification -- Number "2" for identification an unredacted copy of the Power Purchase Agreement, which is the subject of this proceeding. We've marked as "Exhibit Number 3" for identification the Direct Testimony of Gary Long. We've marked as number "4" the Direct Testimony of Terry large. We've marked as number " 5 " the Direct Testimony of Rick Labrecque. And, we've provided his unredacted testimony
as a result of certain confidentiality rules that the Commission has made. So, you do have an unredacted copy marked as number "5. "Exhibit Number 6" for identification is the Direct Testimony of Dr. Shapiro. As "Exhibit Number 7", we've marked for identification the Rebuttal Testimony of Mr. Large, Mr. Long, and Mr. Labrecque. And, finally, as "Exhibit Number 8" we've marked for identification the Rebuttal Testimony of Dr. Shapiro. I believe that all the parties and everybody should have copies of all of those documents.
BY MR. BERSAK:
Q. Mr. Long, you submitted prefiled direct testimony in this docket, which has been identified as "PSNH Exhibit Number 3" for identification. Do you have any corrections, changes or updates to your testimony?
A. (Long) No. Only that that's set forth in the rebuttal.
Q. We have provided and we had some conversation this morning about what has been premarked as "PSNH Exhibit Number 9", which is titled "Changes to PPA Offered by Laidlaw". Are you familiar with that document?
A. (Long) Yes, I am.
Q. And, when the appropriate time comes, pursuant to the Commission ruling, will you be able to discuss those changes?
A. (Long) Yes, I will.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Long, do you adopt the testimony that appears in your direct testimony and in your rebuttal testimony as your testimony here today?
A. (Long) Yes, I do.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Large, you also submitted prefiled direct testimony in this docket, which we've marked as "Exhibit Number 4". Do you have any corrections, changes or updates to that testimony?
A. (Large) Yes. I have two minor corrections.
Q. Can you please state what those corrections are?
A. (Large) Certainly. In the exhibit of my testimony, on Page 5, Line 8, the number shown as "474,000" should be shown as "484,000". And, this is in response to a data request that was provided during discovery. And, secondly, a similar reference appears on Page 13 of my testimony, at Line 8. The number previously shown as "474,000", typographical error, is "484,000". Those are my corrections.
Q. Okay. With those corrections made, do you adopt the testimony that you provided in your direct testimony and in the rebuttal testimony as your testimony here today?
A. (Large) Yes, I do.
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Q. Thank you, Mr. Large. Similarly, Mr. Labrecque, you also filed direct testimony in this docket, which has been marked for identification as "PSNH Exhibit Number 5". Do you have any corrections, changes or updates to your testimony?
A. (Labrecque) No, I do not.
Q. Do you adopt the testimony that you provided in Exhibit Number 5, as well as that contained in the rebuttal testimony, which is marked as "Exhibit Number 7", as your testimony here today?
A. (Labrecque) Yes, I do.
Q. Thank you. And, Dr. Shapiro, you submitted prefiled direct testimony in this docket, which has been identified as "PSNH Exhibit Number 6". Do you have any changes, corrections or updates to your testimony? A. (Shapiro) Yes, I do.
Q. Can you tell us what that update is?
A. (Shapiro) Yes. A substantial additional economic development benefit of the PPA was publicly announced after I filed my rebuttal testimony. Specifically, the owners of the Laidlaw project have reached a preliminary agreement providing for a green technology company to collocate a production facility at the site creating an additional 65 new jobs. Excuse me. The

## DAY 1 - MORNING SESSION ONLY - January 24, 2011 DE 10-195 PSNH/LAIDLAW BERLIN BIOPOWER

| 1 | combined facility then will bring the total direct |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | production-related jobs at the site to over 100; 40 for |
| 3 | the Laidlaw project and 65 for the biomaterials plant. |
| 4 | Taking into account the potential of these additional |
| 5 | 65 new jobs, applying a range of multipliers of 1.5 to |
| 6 | 2, to estimate the indirect and induced jobs from the |
| 7 | total 105 production-related jobs at the site, assigned |
| 8 | some value to the other economic development benefits |
| 9 | discussed in my prefiled direct and rebuttal testimony, |
| 10 | I estimate the total economic development benefit from |
| 11 | this PPA is in the range of 350 to 400 new permanent |
| 12 | jobs. These jobs include the whole value added chain |
| 13 | for wood, such as logging, trucking, processing, and |
| 14 | finally producing a very high value renewable material. |
| 15 | These jobs would primarily be located in the North |
| 16 | Country of New Hampshire. |
| 17 | In addition to the 350 to 400 permanent |
| 18 | jobs, the positive economic impacts during the |
| 19 | construction phase would also be substantially |
| 20 | increased, because the construction phase would now |
| 21 | include an additional facility and improvements, |
| 22 | increasing the number of jobs, household earnings, and |
| 23 | gross state product from my estimates in my direct |
| 24 | testimony and directly in the rebuttal. |
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The value of the plant when completed would also provide greater property taxes to the city and the county, as well as more business taxes paid at the state level. State policy at the New Hampshire Resources \& Economic Development have been targeting these types of green chemistry development opportunities. For example, the University of New Hampshire has substantial research and develop initiatives targeted at these types of projects.

And, so, this is a substantial increase. And, I've provided for you the additional estimates to include in my testimony.
Q. Dr. Shapiro, I've provided to you and to the parties and to the Clerk and reporter a copy of what's been marked is "PSNH Exhibit 10", which is an article from Friday's, that's three days ago, 21st of January, Berlin Daily Sun. The article is entitled "Green company interested in locating on former mill site." Is that the development which you just provided us some information about?
A. (Shapiro) Yes, it is.
Q. Thank you. Other than that new matter, do you have any changes, corrections or updates to your either direct testimony that was filed or to your rebuttal testimony,
which has been identified as "PSNH Exhibit Number 8"?
A. (Shapiro) No, I do not.
Q. And, if you were asked those questions here today, would your responses to those questions be the same as contained in your testimony as you've updated it here?
A. (Shapiro) Yes.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Long, as the Company's president, could you provide a brief, succinct overview of what this proceeding is all about?
A. (Long) Yes, I would. Thank you. I'd first like to describe, summarize the PPA and the process, and the reasons why PSNH is supporting that. And, then, I'd like to briefly summarize our rebuttal testimony.

In its Power Purchase Agreement between Public Service and Laidlaw Berlin Biomass is a creative long-term agreement, which fulfills part of the State's goals for in-state, RPS-qualified renewable energy, that provides significant economic benefits to the State and to the North Country, at reasonable prices and with risk protection for our customers.

I'd like to point out that it's a
voluntary agreement, as PSNH is not required to enter into such agreements. We entered into this agreement after considerable effort, because PSNH supports the
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State's policies on environment, energy, and economic development, and we wanted to advance the State policies in these areas, particularly, with the in-state development of renewable energy resources.

I'd also point out that there's little, if any, benefit to PSNH's owners by PSNH entering in this agreement. There is a potential for a future opportunity at the end of the term of the agreement, but that's not what's driving this agreement. What's driving this agreement is fulfilling the State's policies regarding the matters I just mentioned. Other states do provide economic incentives for owners or companies to enter in these arrangements, regulated companies, but not the State of New Hampshire. This Power Purchase Agreement is the result of efforts by Public Service Company, Laidlaw, and others over a period of nearly four years. It is a unique Power Purchase Agreement, based on a unique set of circumstances. And, I want to describe what some of the unique features and circumstances are.

First of all, the Laidlaw Berlin Biomass Project is fundamentally designed around an infrastructure, a set of skills, and a history of the Berlin/Gorham area, which make this, in my opinion, the

|  | best site for a biomass facility in the state, and also | 1 | In addition to all of those economic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | an area that is in desperate need of economic | 2 | factors, as noted this morning, yet another benefit is |
| 3 | advancement. And, this project, along with the other | 3 | coming about, as mentioned by Dr. Shapiro, in that a |
| 4 | effects that Dr. Shapiro mentions, will create quite a | 4 | collocated synergistic relationship with a new company, |
| 5 | beneficial economic development for the state and for | 5 | a green technology company, that comprise yet |
| 6 | that area. | 6 | additional benefits to the state and to that part of |
| 7 | cludes a unique W | 7 | our state. And, I will point out that none of these |
| 8 | Adjustment provision, to ensure that the energy prices | 8 | enefits and none of this achievement of the State's |
| 9 | under the contract are reasonably related to a | 9 | environmental goals will be achieved, can be achieved, |
| 10 | benchmark fuel cost. It also contains a very unique | 10 | without approval of this Power Purchase Agreement |
| 11 | Cumulative Reduction Factor, which is the only feature | 11 | between PSNH and Laidl |
| 12 | of that type I've seen in any agreement. And, it's | 12 | And, we strongly believe that the Power |
| 13 | feature of the contract which ties the contract energy | 13 | Purchase Agreement meets all of the requirements of New |
| 14 | prices with the actual hourly day-ahead locational | 14 | Hampshire law. It further advances the State's energy |
| 15 | marginal prices. Thus, it basically sets the energy | 15 | and environmental policies. And, we ask the Commission |
| 16 | rates in the contract at the day-ahead LMP over th | 16 | to approve it as soon as possible. |
| 17 | duration of terms within the contract over a period of | 17 | In our rebuttal testimony, which I |
| 18 | many years. It's an end-of-contract adjustment | 18 | ongly hope that the Commission reads it carefully, |
| 19 | designed to protect customers against above-market | 19 | cause it really puts some of the opponents' views in |
| 20 | prices over the contract term, but yet allows customers | 20 | context and correct the errors and assumptions that |
| 21 | to achieve below-market prices. So, it's a one-way | 21 | others are making regarding the project. But we |
| 22 | protection. It protects against upper side prices, but | 22 | specifically disagree with the testimony of the N.H. |
| 23 | allows lower costs to go directly to customers. The | 23 | PUC Staff and the Consumer Advocate's witness, who are |
| 24 | REC, the Renewable Energy Certificate prices in the | 24 | opposed to the PPA and are advising against it. And, |
|  | Page 74 |  | age 76 |
| 1 | contract are increasing discounts off of the State-set | 1 | therefore, we disagree with their recommendations. |
| 2 | Alternative Compliance Payments over the term of the | 2 | And, the foundation of this is that we think their |
| 3 | PPA. So, it guarantees that the renewable attributes | 3 | assumptions are just wrong. And, if you have wrong |
| 4 | of the facility, the price paid, is always below the | 4 | assumptions, you're going to have wrong conclusions. |
| 5 | Alternative Compliance Payments set by the State. In | 5 | In our written rebuttal, we find, you |
| 6 | fact, in later years, it's 50 percent of those | 6 | know, several errors and mistakes in their assumptions. |
| 7 | alternative payment | 7 | And, one of those areas is in their assumption about |
| 8 | The capacity prices are fixed for the | 8 | what the future market prices will be. But the |
| 9 | first five years, and then increase gradually | 9 | assumptions they make are unproven, in fact, |
| 10 | thereafter. | 10 | unprovable. Neither Mr. McCluskey or Mr. Traum, PSNH |
| 11 | The base energy charge in the contract | 11 | or anyone else knows what the future market prices will |
| 12 | does not change at all over the term of the Agreement, | 12 | be. And, the assumptions they made lead them to |
| 13 | except for the Wood Price Adjustment. | 13 | certain conclusions. And, you can pick different |
| 14 | These unique terms make this contract a | 14 | assumptions about future market prices and come to |
| 15 | good contract to meet all of the State's goals and to | 15 | different conclusions. We think they have made the |
| 16 | protect customers. The direct economic benefits are | 16 | same mistake that others have made in the past, and |
| 17 | significant. And, they include construction jobs, | 17 | that is using a fixed set of numbers to draw |
| 18 | operating jobs, property taxes, fuel-related jobs, such | 18 | conclusions. PSNH does not do that. We do not assume |
| 19 | as those for loggers and foresters and truckers. | 19 | what the future market prices will be. We designed the |
| 20 | Direct grants to the City of Berlin and to community | 20 | Power Purchase Agreement to protect consumers against |
| 21 | loan funds and other direct benefits that are set forth | 21 | variances from market prices. And, that is what the |
| 22 | in the Testimony of Dr. Lisa Shapiro, some of which are | 22 | unique features I talked about are all about. And, we |
| 23 | conditions that have been set by the State's Site | 23 | urge the Commission to dismiss those recommendations, |
| 24 | Evaluation Committee when they approved the project. | 24 | because they're just flat wrong. |

And, I'd be happy to answer questions. MR. BERSAK: As my boss just said, the witnesses are available for cross-examination, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Mr. Boldt.
MR. BOLDT: On behalf of the City of Berlin, Mr. Long, Mr. Labrecque, Mr. Large, and Dr. Shapiro, I'm Chris Boldt.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BOLDT:
Q. Is the statements, Mr. Long, that you've just made, in essence, the rationale for why PSNH believes the Laidlaw PPA is the right choice for PSNH and its customers?
A. (Long) Yes. And, as I mentioned, it's unique, and the terms of the Agreement are unique. But what makes the project itself unique is the site. It has -- and, it's one of the reasons why we held discussions with Laidlaw early on. We felt that to be the most viable biomass site in the state, and the one that had the greatest chance of going forward, and also one which was in an area of the state that really needed jobs and economic development. So, it is the right project. There's a limited number of new biomass plants that I think will
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${ }^{4}$ Q. And, you say this is the result of four years of
6 A. (Long) Well, as best as I can tell from my records, our

16 A. (Long) No, it is not. It's in Unitil's service territory.
Q. Why is that important in the PUC's consideration of this PPA and Concord Steam's positions previously taken?
A. (Long) I can't speak for the Commission. But, for PSNH, it's important to us, because we try to match up, you know, our customers who will be served by these facilities with the benefits that will be received by
be achievable in the Northeast, and certainly in New Hampshire. So, this is the one that we view as most viable. negotiation, correct? introductory meeting between myself and Laidlaw officials was in April of 2007. So, we're coming up on that four year point, of when we first met each other to where we are now in the process.
Q. Allow me to go on a tangent briefly. It is my understanding that Concord Steam, whose position in this case is now -- they have asked to withdraw. But, just for clarification, is Concord Steam within PSNH's service territory?
our customers. So, our focus is on our own service territory. And, obviously, our interest is in benefiting our own service territory and our own customers. So, you know, we feel there's a very close relationship between the Company and its customers. A facility that's in Concord we feel is something that is within the realm for Unitil to work with, and their obligation or their interest to try to work with them. And, we think it's best for utilities to try to focus on their own service territories.
Q. Now, I believe it's in your rebuttal testimony, and I could be wrong, it could be in the direct, is it true that I read that PSNH would not enter into this PPA if there was not such a feature as the Cumulative Reduction Factor?
A. (Long) No. We would not have entered a PPA without that feature. And, in fact, it was one of the early meetings between myself and the officials of Laidlaw, within the first couple of meetings, that I told them that we needed protection against -- for customers in the long-term that previous experience had been, particularly with the rate orders, that customers had paid prices. And, then, at the end of the rate order, the owners had the benefit of a fully paid off
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facility, and the customers got no benefit for that. And that, I would not go forward unless we were able to reach some sort of arrangement so that customers, you know, in the event that we got into a circumstance where they paid above-market prices, that customers had to get that back. That we weren't going to proceed without that. And, because Laidlaw agreed to that condition, we were able to continue with our discussions.
Q. And, you mentioned that there were other instances where PSNH had contracts that did not have this Cumulative Reduction Factor in them?
A. (Long) There were, yes, a combination of contracts and Commission rate orders, for the most part, that came out in the 1980s, that were issued or entered into in the 1980s.
Q. So, this was a learning experience or a product of a learning experience, that had not previously protected the ratepayers?
A. (Long) Exactly. And, I think it was an experience for the whole state, but, obviously, for PSNH also.
Q. Am I correct in reading that the Cumulative Reduction Factor includes a priority lien granted to PSNH on the property?

1 A. (Long) Yes. And, it has several protections.

2
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comments is that's something that PSNH is not allowed to do. Do you have testimony addressing that issue?
A. (Long) Oh, yes. Again, we thought that one out also. And, we don't know exactly what the rules will be regarding PSNH ownership of generation, regulated -- I should say "regulated ownership of generation", that's used to serve our customers, really don't know what the rules will be there. But, in the event that it's allowable, I think, as our testimony says, and as Mr. McCluskey's testimony seems to imply, that would be the lowest cost, lowest cost approach for our customers. So, that would be one option, if it's available, that someone could consider then. But, in the event that wasn't available, there are other options for using the Cumulative Reduction Factor. We could sell it outright. We could sell that right outright. We might have some arrangements where an affiliate takes the property, and we transfer those rights, provided that customers get some payment back, you know, immediately or over time. So, we just try to keep open that several different options could be exercised. No one has to be, there's no one option, and we didn't want to exclude any options. That's what I mean by wanting to make sure that this -- the value of this, if there is
any value, and it could be zero, but, if there was any value in the 20 years, its value could be realize under a variety of circumstances.
Q. Now, there's been some discussion regarding the ability of some power generators to use PURPA, the Public Utilities Regulatory Policies Act to get new long-term rate orders. Are you aware of any developers recently asking PSNH for long-term PURPA rate orders?
A. (Long) No. We have not gotten such a request. We do purchase power from PURPA qualified facilities, on a short-term basis, but we haven't had any requests for long-term arrangements.
Q. Have any understanding of why?
A. (Long) Well, yes. It's pretty obvious to me. You can't get financing, I mean, it won't help you with financing or for project development. I can't imagine people spending a lot of money on a new project, without having some -- some level of certainty about revenue stream, from which they could design a financing arrangement that would allow it to go forward.
Q. Does PSNH use long-term energy price forecasts when it analyzed the PPA?
A. (Long) No. No, we didn't rely on a long-term forecast.
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And, in fact, there isn't any that we could rely on, because nobody knows what the future will yield. And, so, we don't -- we don't use long-term forecasts, because they're just not believable. But we can run scenarios to see "what if this" or "what if that". But our focus was on getting terms in the PPA that protect against different things happening over time.
Q. Now, in your responses in this case, have you provided forecasts or are you providing scenarios?
A. (Long) Well, scenarios on a spreadsheet, is the way I describe them. Anybody can put numbers on a spreadsheet. You can put 20 numbers on a spreadsheet, and then compare that to other numbers. But that's all they are. Nobody knows or can claim to know what the prices will be, even next week, but certainly not next year or five years or twenty years from now.

If anything that we've learned from that previous experiences is that, is that forecasts are not accurate by their nature.
Q. Can you help me understand, clarify for me, the status of the RECs produced by your Schiller plant and how they impact this PPA?
A. (Long) Yes, I can. The Schiller Project, particularly Unit Number 5, which we call the "Northern Power

| 1 | Project", it's a conversion or a new boiler to replace |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | a coal boiler, and it's a renewable Class -- it's a |
| 3 | Class I renewable facility. But, at the time that we |
| 4 | received permission from the Commission to, again, |
| 5 | another voluntary project to move forward, there was no |
| 6 | State of New Hampshire Renewable Portfolio Standard. |
| 7 | And, it was insistent on the Staff and OCA that there |
| 8 | be a risk-sharing mechanism on that project. So, that |
| 9 | project has a very unique risk-sharing mechanism that |
| 10 | depenss on the renewable attributes or Renewable Energy |
| 11 | Certificates to be sold into the market. And, that is |
| 12 | the foundation for how the financial recovery of that |
| 13 | project will go forward. |
| 14 | And, so, that's exactly what we've been |
| 15 | doing every since the project has gone into play, has |
| 16 | gone into service. And, it's a 15-year agreement, as I |
| 17 | can remember. And, so, we have to continue along those |
| 18 | ways. And, we don't use it to meet our Renewable |
| 19 | Energy Certificate requirements under the New Hampshire |
| 20 | RPS, which was passed later. We're using other sources |
| 21 | to meet the New Hampshire one. And, we continue to |
| 22 | honor the Commission order and the settlement in what |
| 23 | we call the "Northern Wood" case. |
| 24 | A. (Large) And, if I may, the requirement to sell those |
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4 Q. Now, are those -- is the wood price set at Schiller, is
RECs and utilize those proceeds, as Mr. Long has just described, has been memorialized in the Commission Orders 24,276 and 24,327. that subject to ongoing PSNH review on an annual or a periodic basis?
A. (Long) Yes. It's a regulated plant -- I mean, we're a regulated company. So, you know, everything, every aspect of that plant operation or costs is subject to review by the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.
Q. In your opinion, is there any way that a new renewable generating facility can be built that processes energy with energy based on cost, with a limited return, and with the PUC retaining its traditional authority to later alter, amend, or set aside a decision?
A. (Long) And, when you're saying "costs", are you talking about market costs or actual cost of operation?
Q. Market costs.
A. (Long) Not with market costs. I mean, that creates too much uncertainty. And, also, to have a decision that can be changed later would cause too much uncertainty. So, I can't imagine any project going forward, in fact, I have not seen any project in New England go forward

2 Q. Now, I believe in your rebuttal testimony, I think it's Pages 12 and 13, you make the statement that "PSNH, in essence, understands that, in order for a merchant developer to obtain product financing, the investment banking community needs some certainty regarding revenues over the period of years. Am I correctly summarizing your testimony?
A. (Long) Yes.
Q. And, is that a correct understanding of the financial condition of the market at this time?
A. (Long) Yes, it is. I think we hear often, it's not just in New England, but we hear often, particularly in New England, that renewable product developers are not able to go forward because of lack of certainty and they are seeking long-term power purchase agreements, in order to get the certainty they need to actually do the financing.
Q. And, is that why the term of this PPA is 20 years? A. (Long) Yes.
Q. And, is that an anomaly for agreements approved by this Commission?
A. (Long) No. Twenty years is rather common, and has been used many times. I think there's some, some contracts

Page 88
might go fifteen, there's been some rate orders that can go 30 years. The 20 years is sort of a typical duration that one could do to make a financing arrangement, to have their financing paid off in 20 years. You know, obviously, if you're a regulated utility, you'd go much longer. But, when you have different parties involved, you need a fixed term, longer is better, but I think the tolerance has been for something around 20 years.
Q. And, so, it's that term of 20 years that allows the capital costs to be amortized and a reasonable rate of return provided?
A. (Long) Well, a compensatory rate of return that would cause the investment to be made, yes.
Q. And, in this agreement, does that 20-year term allow there to be a track of future unknown or volatile pricing, taking into consideration that, so there's stability for the ratepayers?
A. No. And, I think, again, and it gets back to the Cumulative Reduction Factor, but we have pricing mechanisms that are very stable and predictable, to a large degree. But, on an hourly basis, they are tied to actual hourly prices in the market, and then adjusted after 20 years. The reason they can't be


Page 90
1 to purchase RECs in this case, in your opinion, would 2 this project be financeable or unfinanceable?
A. (Long) I would say it's unfinanceable. But, then, we haven't talked yet about what Laidlaw might be willing to do on that, that's Exhibit 9 that we haven't talked yet. But, I think, again, the first 20 years needs to have that predictable revenue stream. And, if the Commission were to put a condition that makes it not workable, either for them or for us, then, as I said earlier, this is a voluntary contract. We could walk away, as could Laidlaw.
Q. Now, if the Commission were to condition the approval of the PPA on a requirement that PSNH purchase only the amount of RECs it needs in any given year, at an amount needed to meet PSNH's requirements under the RPS law, would that make the project financeable or unfinanceable, in your opinion?
A. (Long) Yes. Again, if that resulted in a different -a lower revenue stream and greater risk to Laidlaw, it would make the commitment unfinanceable.
Q. Now, correct me if I'm wrong, but RECs in our state are resellable in the market, correct?
A. (Long) They're -- particularly at a plant like this, it qualifies in at least five of the New England states.

So, it could be sold in other places. In the course of the contract, new markets might develop. There could be a national Renewable Portfolio Standard in which it could be marketed.
Q. If the Commission were to condition the approval of the PPA on a reduction of the term from 20 years, say, to 12 , would that make the project financeable or unfinanceable in your opinion?
A. (Long) If you simply took the contract as is and reduced it from 20 years to 12 , the project would die. I mean, it would be null and void. The only way you could use a shorter term, like 12 years, would be to raise the prices, to raise the prices to amortize over 12 years, instead of 20 years, and PSNH would not want to do that.
Q. And, if the PUC were to condition its approval on the removal of the Cumulative Reduction Factor, would that be acceptable to PSNH?
A. (Long) No, that would be the deal killer. As I mentioned earlier, that is the reason we talk with them, their willingness. And, I think it was almost pleasantly surprising that I've got a developer that would be willing to consider that, but they're willing to consider that, because it was a condition of
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continuing our discussions very early on.
Q. Now, I believe Mr. Frantz's testimony in this case refers to a $\$ 26$ million figure of over-market costs. Does the panel have any opinion on how that number compares to the cost of the RECs at the Alternate Compliance Price of Class I RECs?
A. (Labrecque) Yes. I can answer that question. And, first, I want to walk through how we believe the \$26 million figure was developed in Mr. Frantz's testimony. He refers to Mr. McCluskey's testimony. And, Exhibit GRM-12 of that testimony compares a -over the 20 years of the PPA, the PPA energy price for RECs -- excuse me, for PPA energy prices relative to what is termed an "adjusted market energy price projection", which I -- I can't find much basis for this projection. It's not described or I've been unable to find where it's described. But, again, it's just a stream of numbers. And, the result on GRM-12 is a average delta between the PPA price and the market price of $\$ 29.55$. That works out to be about $\$ 14$ million on an annual basis of energy over market claimed by Mr. McCluskey.

On Exhibit GRM-13, again, he's comparing a projection of the PPA REC prices to, in this case, an

| 1 | adjusted Synapse market price for RECs. And, in our |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | rebuttal, we pointed out some significant problems we |
| 3 | have with the Synapse report, including the fact that |
| 4 | the near-term prices in that report have proven to be |
| 5 | unreliable, as have the near-term energy market |
| 6 | projections. So, we call into question the ability of |
| 7 | that report to serve as a valid basis for a 20 year |
| 8 | projection of REC pricing in New England. |
| 9 | Also, we call into question the fact |
| 10 | that the Synapse market price for RECs crashes to |
| 11 | approximately \$6 a REC in 2024. And, when we asked in |
| 12 | discovery "what was the fundamental reason for that |
| 13 | collapse?" We essentially received a non-answer, to, |
| 14 | you know, "refer to the Synapse report." |
| 15 | $\quad$ On GRM-13, the levelized average |
| 16 | difference between the PPA REC prices and the Synapse |
| 17 | prices is \$28.89 per REC. And, that works out to about |
| 18 | another 14 million on an annual basis. So, now, we're |
| 19 | at 28 million of claimed over-market costs in this |
| 20 | analysis. And, I believe we get to 26 million by |
| 21 | taking into account the GRM-14 capacity price |
| 22 | comparison, which results in a nominal savings over the |
| 23 | 20 years of 40 million. So, in my mind, that's 20 |
| 24 | million a year -- excuse me, 2 million per year. So, |
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now, you're at 26 million. And, that 26 million, again, is made up of a speculative spreadsheet comparing the PPA energy prices to a snapshot of someone's view of the next 20 years. And, the REC price comparison is even -- you know, we have even more serious issues with that. What we have done is looked at the PPA REC pricing relative to the alternative compliance payment that's dictated by the law as a cap on the additional cost of renewables that the Legislature was willing to accept for the benefits that are derived from the RPS.

Relative to a projection of the ACP over 20 years, the PPA REC prices saved, on an average, $\$ 27.44$ per REC. Over the 20 years, that's about $\$ 255$ million. And, it's roughly equivalent to the energy over-market in the analysis on GRM-12.

The other thing to take into account is GRM-12 uses a projection of the PPA prices based on $\$ 34$ a ton wood, escalated at I believe 2.5 percent per year. And, in our rebuttal, we've described how, if you were to adjust the current price to the current price of wood of approximately $\$ 27$, and instead used a one percent annual escalator, over the term of the contract that would save an additional $\$ 238$ million.

So, we believe the $\$ 26$ million number is wrong. It's based on flawed analyses, and it can't possibly serve as the basis for rejecting this contract.

MR. BOLDT: Nothing further at this time, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Thank you. We'll turn to Mr. Rodier, and then we'll come back to Mr. Edwards. Mr. Rodier, do you have any questions for the panel?

MR. RODIER: We have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Mr. Edwards.
MR. EDWARDS: Thank you, your Honor. BY MR. EDWARDS:
Q. Mr. Long, were you aware that there are a couple of biomass plants in the UES that are 100 megawatts?
A. (Long) I'm not personally familiar with them, no. I wouldn't be surprised if there were.
Q. Were you aware that these plants don't just use forest-derived wood?
A. (Long) Well, since I'm not aware of the plants you're referring to or know the names of them, I can't comment on that.
Q. There's a couple of plants that are 100 megawatts that
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use city waste, construction debris, and/or animal waste. And, I guess what I'm getting at is, would that lead you to believe that the 70-megawatt Laidlaw plant is really the largest forest-driven plant in the U.S, or certainly New England?
A. (Long) I have no reason to conclude that. I have no -I haven't researched that.
Q. Would you agree that the New Hampshire wood supply is "tapped" versus "untapped"?
A. (Long) I would like to expand on my other answer. I am told by others that, in Europe, there are much larger plants than what we have in the United States for burning biomass.
Q. But you're not certain that the 70-megawatt plant would be the largest in New England?
A. (Long) In New England? That's the largest that I know of, in New England.
Q. Okay. As far as New Hampshire wood supply, would you say that the New Hampshire wood supply is "tapped" versus "untapped"? In other words, there are other users in New Hampshire that are using wood right now?
A. (Long) There are multiple uses of wood in New Hampshire. And, I would say there is -- there continues to be a good supply for additional uses of


wood. I will also say that, from a consumer point of view, consumers only pay, under this contract, our customers only pay if it produces. So, the issue of wood and wood supply is not a PSNH issue. It's an issue for Laidlaw, because our customers are protected against that also.
Q. Would you agree that this 70-megawatt Laidlaw Project, the largest forest-derived biomass plant in New England, will be located basically in the middle of this tapped forest?
A. (Long) No. I wouldn't agree with that.
Q. Why is that?
A. (Long) Well, I think that there's quite a history up north of paper mills, and that four of them are shut down. And, I don't claim to be an expert, but every analysis I've seen said that there is more supply. Again, if the market does develop, some people remind me that, if you go back 30 years, there weren't any wood plants in New Hampshire. And, someone might make the same claim, "there's not enough wood." But, guess what? There was and is. And, as studies show, that there's more growth in the wood supply than there is use. So, it comes down to good forestry practices, which we have endorsed on many occasions. We certainly
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Q. Were you aware that liquidated harvesting is significantly happening in Berlin?
A. (Long) No. And, no, I'm not aware, nor would I agree.
Q. Were you aware that sweeping legislative change has happened in Maine, as a result of liquidated harvesting? A. (Long) No. And, I don't know that to be a fact. I have spent a fair amount of time working with experts, government experts and others in the wood industry. PSNH itself had an initiative that went on for a couple years. I know that it's -- exact information is not known. But, from what I have seen, is that there's ample supply of wood. And, I think the Site Evaluation Committee has looked at that. Again, I'm not an expert, nor is it a critical factor in the PPA. It's more of a critical factor in the siting.
Q. Where you aware that one of these harvesters that can no longer operate with this practice in Maine has purchased and liquidated thousands of acres in and around Berlin.
endorse it as part our own Schiller Project. So, you know, I personally am confident there will be enough wood. But, from a contractor view point, customers are protected if there isn't.
A. (Long) I'm not aware of that. But, as I said, we're aware of our own plant, which you would make the same sort of assertions, or you might have distinct or anecdotal information. Yet, we put a 50 megawatt plant in Portsmouth, and are able to operate it very successfully with an ample supply of wood. I have no reason to believe that a part of the state that is well-forested and has lots of expertise in that area that people won't be able to sustainably log wood up there either.
Q. Is PSNH's Schiller plant having to reach out further into New Hampshire for wood?
A. (Long) No. I don't know what you mean by "reaching out further". I mean, we could have -- we haven't had any problems with the supply of wood at Schiller.
Q. I'm just curious. I mean, with, you know, the slowdown in the economy, maybe not as much building going on, I'm just curious, with Schiller right now, and then Schiller can't go out into the ocean. So, I'm wondering if Schiller has to go out further into New Hampshire to get wood?
A. (Long) Well, as we've said in our testimony, our prices are less now than they were in the last few years. So, if we are, we are. The prices have gone down. And,
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6 A. (Long) Not yet.
7 Q. Okay. Dr. Shapiro?
8 A. (Shapiro) Yes.
9 Q. Are you aware that Berlin has a State Prison?
A. (Shapiro) I have no specific knowledge of that, other than what's been in the newspapers.
Q. Are you aware that Berlin has a federal prison that is currently being staffed with over 200 professional employees this year?
A. I have no specific knowledge of that.
Q. Do you think that an annual payroll of 50 million would significantly enhance Berlin's economy?
A. (Shapiro) I'm not sure what the assumption is, the 50 million. From where? New jobs? What you're talking about, sir?
Q. Well, I'm saying, between the State and Federal Prison, the statistics obtained are that 50 million in annual payroll is going to be produced. And, I guess what I'm asking is, do you think that an annual payroll of 50

1 million should significantly enhance Berlin's economy.
2 A. (Shapiro) I have no specific knowledge of the prison facilities, that specific number of payroll to study the impact of Berlin on those facilities.
Q. Do you agree with the statement that " 90 percent or higher of payroll stays within a community"?
A. (Shapiro) I don't have specific knowledge of that general statement.
Q. I notice that you make mention to a change in your testimony as a result of a January 21st article in the Berlin Daily Sun, which was an announcement made by Laidlaw that there's going to be another green company, unknown green company, that will be coming to Berlin. Are you aware that Laidlaw has made over 40 announcements in their tenure, of which most have never materialized?
A. (Shapiro) I'm not sure what you're referring to. I have no specific knowledge.
Q. Well, I guess this is an announcement that there may be a company coming to the area. And, I guess what I'm saying is, since Laidlaw was formed in 1999, there have been over 40 similar announcements that have never come to fruition. And, I'm asking you if you're aware of that?
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A. (Long) I will say, as I've mentioned to you, I've been in contact with Laidlaw for nearly four years. And, I don't know what you mean by " 40 announcements". I have not seen 40 announcements or any. The announcement I have seen is the one that we referred to. And, it seems very real to me.

But, no. I cannot verify that Laidlaw has made any other announcements of this type. If they would, we would have had a keen interest in it, because this Power Purchase Agreement would help make that happen. So, I dispute your claim of "40 announcements". Like I say, I've been in contact with them for nearly four years.
Q. Mr. Long, the expert for the City of Berlin, Skip Sansoucy, has stated that the existing infrastructure should save considerable and capital costs. Do you agree with that concept?
A. (Long) I agree with it in concept, yes.
Q. Okay. So, given the savings, would you agree this should lead to reduced debt service?
A. (Long) The way I look at it is that it reduces the overall cost of the plant, but there's still very substantial costs in the plant. And, as I said earlier, you know, one of our interests in talking with

Laidlaw, when they approached us, was the fact that they had a start, they already had infrastructure and a boiler, which creates a very different development opportunity than a greenfield plant. But there still is a rather substantial investment that has to be made. For instance, there is not a generator on-site, there is not a turbine on-site. So, there are still -- and the water needs to be modified. So, there is still a very substantial investment needed.
Q. So, if the project had less debt service, would you agree that the project should be able to produce power cheaper than a greenfield project, for example?
A. (Long) You're asking me to compare something to something. I think, if you were to build a 70-megawatt greenfield plant, I suspect it would cost a lot more than the Laidlaw plant. But that wasn't the basis of our negotiation. The basis of our negotiation was specifically with the Laidlaw circumstances.
Q. In your opinion, have the savings in debt service been reflected in the rate structure now being considered in the PPA?
A. (Long) I don't know if I could say that precisely. I would say that the situation that Laidlaw was in I think allowed our discussions to go forward, and for us
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to find, you know, that point where we can both agree. But we do not base our analysis on, nor do we know what Laidlaw's total investment will be or what their return on equity will be. We just -- that's not our business, it's their business. Our business is trying to obtain the products at a reasonable price.
Q. In your opinion, has the project offered to sell its -well, I don't know what they call it, is it "wrapped up", is it some sort of "wrapping up of rates", where energy, RECs, etcetera, I guess what I'm referring to is, all of the, I don't know, revenue-producing attributes of the project, are those at rates that are less than other projects?
A. (Long) I think, overall, yes. And, when you consider protection against customers, the answer is "yes", and other similar projects. There are no similar projects, but other biomass projects.
Q. Do you, with your background in, obviously, substantial background in business and management education, understand -- I'm sure you understand the concepts of supply and demand and micro and macroeconomics?
A. (Long) Sure. I have some knowledge of that.
Q. Okay. With your understanding of economics, in very generic form, can you explain "economy of scale"?

| Page 105 | Page 107 |
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| A. (Long) Generally, when something is larger, the infrastructure and the fixed costs associated with that can be spread off -- can be spread out over a larger product base. <br> Q. So, you'd agree -- <br> A. (Long) And, therefore be lower cost than something smaller. <br> Q. So, you'd agree that this project of 70 megawatts should cost less than a smaller facility? <br> A. (Long) Yes. Our own engineering studies would suggest that, and, particularly, you know, less than a greenfield facility. <br> Q. Okay. And, would you not agree that the 70-megawatt Laidlaw Project would have a significant advantage over much smaller plants in its utilization of a labor force? <br> A. (Long) Are you talking about new plants that don't exist yet, but will be built? <br> Q. Well, I'm talking about a smaller plant versus a 70-megawatt. I'm talking about scale of size and utilization of labor. Is the 70-megawatt plant going to have a advantage over a smaller plant? <br> A. (Long) Yes, it would be expected to. I'll give you an 24 example. Just environmental reporting alone, whether | contract. It has to recognize the real risks that a developer faces. <br> Q. Well, let's talk a little bit about risk. Talk about the federal grant funds. So, throughout the SEC process, and prior to the PUC process, it's been mentioned about grants. And, I guess the grants are available, they amount to, what is it, 30 percent of the capital costs? Is that right? <br> A. (Long) I'm not an expert in that. You might want to ask that of Mr. Sansoucy, who is probably more familiar with that process and the grants. PSNH is not a recipient of any of the grants. <br> Q. Okay? <br> A. (Long) So, it's not something that we've been involved with. <br> Q. Well, for purposes of discussion right now, let's assume that it's 30 percent of the capital costs. Is it true that the eligibility requires construction by a certain point? <br> A. (Long) Eligibility for what? <br> Q. The eligibility for the grant. Do you have to begin construction by a certain point? <br> A. (Long) Well, again, I'm not an expert in this. I can only repeat to you what I've heard and not what I know. |
| the plant is 20 megawatts or 70 megawatts, you have the same sort of environmental reporting required, you have the same sort of chemical tests required, you have the same sort of filings required. You know, if you assume you only need one plant manager, not two, regardless of the size. So, you know, again, I would expect that those are the sorts of things that generically you would find with larger installations. <br> Q. So, -- <br> A. (Long) And, I would also add, if they have collocated another factory on the site, you could have additional -- additional synergies. <br> Q. So, in your opinion, are the economy of scale savings in the PPA? <br> A. (Long) Well, again, I can't tell you that for sure, because it's not our plant. I don't know all of the costs and investments. I think we got prices that we felt were fair and competitive and worked for both parties. I believe that Laidlaw is taking substantial financial risk, very substantial financial risk. And, that has to be taken into account on what prices they need in there to make it work. It's not just the cost, it's not a cost-of-service contract. That's what you get if PSNH owned it. This is not a cost-of-service | 1 And, have I -- you know, I've heard that they have some 2 expiration of some of the grants. The grants go to 3 others, not them. So, I would expect they would have 4 to finance that money, even though they -- in order to 5 get the grants, it could affect their overall 6 financing. <br> 7 Q. I have to admit, I'm very confused. But I'm of the impression that there's two choices that a project has in order to get compensated on the grants. So, one of those choices is to earn what I think they call "Production Tax Credits". Now, and then the project, from what I understand, they can sell as revenue, as a revenue source, and I think it's something like a little bit over one cent per kilowatt, is that right? <br> A. (Long) Again, you're asking the wrong person. I'm not Laidlaw, and I can't testify as to what their grants and what their financing is. All I know is that time seems to be of the essence to take advantage of some of those grants. That those grants go to the benefit of the state and the region. But, other than that, again, it's not a PSNH matter. It's not something that was a requirement. It might have been a requirement of the Site Evaluation Committee, but it's not a requirement of PSNH, and it's not addressed in the Power Purchase |
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Q. Okay. I guess the other choice is you can get a cash payment 60 days after the start-up, which is really what I'm getting at. And, based on 30 percent of the capital costs, that is a way that you can go about getting this. You get the -- you can get it 60 days after the start-up, there's a 30 percent payment that's available, is that correct?
A. (Long) Again, I do not know, and I'm not Laidlaw. That's not a PSNH matter.
Q. Okay. Well, I guess my concern on that is, you know, I have a real estate background, I look at this as a owner financing type of situation, and you want -- you want your people to have as much possible risk as possible. You know, if you were to take the 60 day after start-up payment, and you get your 30 percent back, you're eliminating all the risk that you put out in this project, you're getting it back right away. Am I reading that right?
A. (Long) Again, I don't know exactly what you're reading there. I do know that the Site Evaluation Committee put conditions on Laidlaw that required them to make
should move forward.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Mr. Edwards, do you have a response?

MR. EDWARDS: Well, I have one final question for Mr. Long.
BY MR. EDWARDS:
Q. Mr. Long, would you agree, if the owners take that grant after 60 days, that they're no longer at risk for their initial investment?
A. (Long) No.

MR. EDWARDS: I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Mr. Shulock. MR. SHULOCK: I have some exhibits. (Atty. Shulock distributing documents.)
MR. SHULOCK: We have one additional
packet.
WITNESS LARGE: Thank you. Appreciate
it.
MR. SHULOCK: Good morning.
WITNESS LONG: Good morning.
BY MR. SHULOCK:
Q. This question isn't directed at anyone in particular. I imagine that any of the three PSNH employees could
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7 A. (Long) yes.
Q. And, when does PSNH expect that 20-year operating period to begin?
A. (Labrecque) I believe, in the Site Evaluation Committee hearing, we heard about "Q2 2013".
Q. That's the latest information?
A. (Labrecque) Excuse me?
Q. Is that your latest information?
A. (Labrecque) Yes.
Q. So, if the operating period begins in second quarter of 2013, when would the 20 year period end?
A. (Labrecque) Twenty years later.
(Laughter.)
BY THE WITNESS:
A. (Labrecque) I believe that would be, is it 2032? 2033? Let's call it "2033".
BY MR. SHULOCK:
Q. Okay. And, the contract provides for something called
Q. Or, I'm sorry, "June 1st, 2014"?
A. (Labrecque) That's correct.
Q. Okay. Is that --

CMSR. IGNATIUS: Excuse me, Mr. Shulock. I'm sorry. I think I'm getting too old. I am having a very hard time hearing you. So, for the sake of the record, for the sake of us, can you please sit closer or speak, maybe bring your voice up a bit? Thank you. BY MR. SHULOCK:
Q. How does the "Scheduled Operation Date" differ from the "In-Service Date"? Is there a difference?
A. (Long) All 5.2 says is "The original "Scheduled Operation Date", but the definitions, 1.25, define the "In-Service Date". And, there's another section that talks about other dates, but I have to find it.
Q. So, is it true that the In-Service Date and the Scheduled Operation Date of June 1st, 2014 may differ?
A. (Long) It depends on -- You have to look at how they're used in the contract.
Q. I mean as a factual date?
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A. (Long) Well, one talks about the "original", and the other, "In Service", it will be the actual.
Q. Now, 5.2 requires the seller to give PSNH notice at the end of each calendar quarter of any change in the original Scheduled Operation Date. Has Laidlaw provided you with any notice that the Scheduled Operation Date will be anything other than June 1st, 2014?
A. (Labrecque) Nothing in writing, no.
Q. Have they given you anything orally?
A. (Labrecque) No, other than testimony before the Site Evaluation Committee.
Q. So, it remains your best information that the operating period would begin in the second quarter of 2013?
A. (Labrecque) Yes.
Q. Thank you. Now, this term of 20 operating years, that is a term for the purchase of all products under the contract, is that correct, including New Hampshire Class I RECs?
A. (Long) Yes.
Q. And, again, you currently expect that operating term to end in the second quarter of 2032, is that correct?
A. (Long) Well, 20 years after the contract terms take effect, whatever that is. We don't know what it is.
Q. So, it may be later?
A. (Long) It could be.
Q. In fact, the contract contemplates that it may be later, is that right? You have penalty provisions in there?
6 A. (Long) Yes. I'm looking for them as we talk.
Q. This question is for Mr. Large. Mr. Large, your

8 testimony provided PSNH's projected energy gap in 2014
9 and 2025, is that correct? Isn't that one of the items
10
11 A. (Large) Researching for the documentation to be sure. 2014, and the graphics describe capacity and energy supply for 2014.
Q. And, you also described it for 2025 , is that correct?
A. (Large) I don't believe I did so in my direct testimony.
Q. Let's look at, starting, if I have it right, Page 4 to 5.
A. (Long) I have the reference to the earlier -- to the point in the contract that addresses your earlier question, if you want to get into it.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: You're talking about the penalty provisions?

WITNESS LONG: Yes.
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CHAIRMAN GETZ: Why don't you put it on the record.

WITNESS LONG: All right.

## BY THE WITNESS:

A. (Long) I'm looking at Page 18, Section 12.3.2, which is why I was hesitating on some of the dates that we were being asked about. But we recognize that the actual In-Service Date isn't known at the time that we signed the contract. So, Section 12.3.2 talks about the date of "June 1, 2014". It also talks about damages that the Seller, Laidlaw, would pay for each day that it's delayed. And, then, a more absolute date of "December 31st, 2015", but also recognizes that delays could happen as part of the regulatory process that could extend those dates.
BY MR. SHULOCK:
Q. So, you corrected me, Mr. Long. And, your projection of the energy and capacity gap is only for 2014 ?
A. (Long) Could I have that question again?

CHAIRMAN GETZ: No, I think we may be talking about two different things. I think Mr. Long was going back to what the possible In-Service Date should be, in reference to the PPA, and then I think you were inquiring of Mr. Large --

MR. SHULOCK: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: -- on a different issue.
MR. SHULOCK: Yes. And, that issue was
on PSNH's projection of the energy and capacity gap.
CHAIRMAN GETZ: Yes. And, you really need to get closer to that mike. But you referring to Page 3 or 4 , and you didn't say what document?

MR. SHULOCK: Page 4 and 5 of his original testimony.
BY THE WITNESS:
A. (Large) I have no references to " 2025 " in my initial testimony.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, what we're talking about here now has been marked for identification as "Exhibit 4"?
(Witness Large nodding in the affirmative.)
MR. BERSAK: That's correct.
BY MR. SHULOCK:
Q. And, Mr. Large, if you turn to Exhibit IPP-1?
A. (Large) I have it.
Q. Now, in this data response, you corrected your projection of the energy and capacity gap for 2014, correct?
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Q. Titled "Class I REC Forecast"?

8 A. (Large) It appears on the page, yes.
9 Q. And, it provides a delivery sales forecast for the years 2010 through 2025?
A. (Large) It does.
Q. And, it states an RPS requirement for Class I?
A. (Large) Yes. It shows what the state mandated RPS requirements are in each of those years.
Q. So, the state mandated requirements for each of those years are " 1 percent" in "2010", increasing to "16 percent" in " 2025 ", at 1 percent increases, is that right?
A. (Large) Yes.
Q. Then, below that, you have each of two different migration rate assumptions; " 31 percent migration" and "0 percent migration". This exhibit showed PSNH's forecast number of RECs required, the number of RECs under contract, and the additional RECs that PSNH

1 calculates that it needs for the years 2010 through 2025, is that right?
A. (Large) That's the arithmetic presented, yes.
Q. If you look at IPP-2 please, Exhibit 2. The OCA sent a

5 follow-up question to that data request, asking PSNH to
6 "expand the forecasts for Energy Service and Capacity
7 through the year 2020", is that right?
A. (Large) I have that document.
Q. And, Mr. Labrecque gave a response. What was that response?
A. (Labrecque) To what question?
Q. This would be IPP Exhibit 2.
A. (Labrecque) Yes.
Q. And, it's OCA 02, Q-OCA-001.
A. (Labrecque) Yes.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: I think he's just asking
you to repeat the response.
WITNESS LABRECQUE: To what question? CHAIRMAN GETZ: The question on the -WITNESS LARGE: If you answered it. BY THE WITNESS:
A. (Labrecque) Yes, I did.

BY MR. SHULOCK:
24 Q. Okay. And, what was your response, Mr. Labrecque?
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A. (Labrecque) I'll read it. "PSNH does not have the Energy and Capacity forecasts available through 2020 since the analysis was performed in support of the 2010 Least Cost Integrated Resource Plan filing, DE 10-261. However, PSNH has revised the analysis previously provided to include the energy and capacity amounts with and without Laidlaw."
Q. Now, if you turn to Page 9 of 9 of that, Exhibit IPP-2, PSNH did not revise its REC I forecast as a result of those calculations, is that correct?
A. (Labrecque) Correct.
Q. If you look now at IPP Exhibit 2.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Two or three?
MR. SHULOCK: I'm sorry, IPP Exhibit 3.
BY MR. SHULOCK:
Q. That asked PSNH to calculate the percentage of PSNH's Class I REC obligation that will be met each year with RECs purchased from Laidlaw. And, PSNH responded with percentages for 2011 through 2015, right?
A. (Labrecque) Yes.
Q. Okay. Staff's response wasn't limited to 2011 through 2015, was it?
A. (Labrecque) In reading the question, I don't see that constraint.
Q. So, Staff asked a follow-up question. And, if you look at IPP Exhibit 4?
A. (Labrecque) Got it.
Q. Staff asked why the table that you provided in response to IPP Exhibit 3 "ended in 2015". And, what was your answer?

MR. BERSAK: Mr. Shulock, can you tell me which Staff question you're referring to? On your list of exhibits, you didn't have the number for this one.

MR. SHULOCK: It's 12.
MR. BERSAK: Twelve. Thank you.

## BY THE WITNESS:

A. (Labrecque) The response was: "The table ended in 2015 to be consistent with PSNH's 2010 Least Cost Integrated Resource Plan filing timing -- 5 year time frame." BY MR. SHULOCK:
Q. Staff asked another follow-up question. Would you please turn to Exhibit 5, IPP Number 5.
A. (Labrecque) I have it in front of me.
Q. And, that request asked you to "explain why the energy service forecast is 73 percent of the delivery service forecast instead of 69." Can you explain to me the import of that question?
A. (Labrecque) Can you rephrase the question?
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Q. "Please explain why PSNH's energy service forecast", in PSNH's response to Staff 1-19, "is 73 percent of the delivery service forecast instead of 69."
A. (Labrecque) I believe in the response here, on your IPP-5, I explain the reason why. It relates to the fact that, in the earlier questions, there was an adjustment for a delivery efficiency that really should not have been made.
Q. And, the second paragraph of your answer, would you read that please.
A. (Labrecque) "The proper calculation of RPS requirements would not have used the delivery efficiency, since RPS obligations are a percentage of end-use customers sales (as measured at the meter). The table provided in the response to Staff 1-19 has been corrected below."
Q. Now, can you explain to us whether that error in computation results in an overstatement or an understatement of the number of RECs that PSNH needs to satisfy its obligation?

MR. BERSAK: An understatement or overstatement where, Mr. Shulock? Can you identify that please?

MR. SHULOCK: Well, let's start with what's shown on IPP Exhibit 5.

(a), we asked "Please provide all studies or analyses supporting the forecasts referred to by Mr. Large. Please state all assumptions made, and provide all work papers, projections, analyses, and documents, relating to these forecasts." Is that correct? I guess this would be for Mr. Large.
A. (Large) Yes, I have that.
Q. And, what was your response, Mr. Large?
A. (Large) I believe I refer to documentation in response to OCA data requests.
Q. Okay. And, that's "OCA-01, Q-OCA-003, which is -isn't it IPP-1, correct?
A. (Large) That is correct.
. And, that is the exhibit that we just established overstates PSNH's REC purchase obligation for the term 2010 through 2025, correct?
A. (Large) Based upon the assumptions included therein, yes.
Q. Okay. And, if you please turn to Exhibit IPP-8. And, this is IPP Set 02, Q-IPP-020.
A. (Large) I have it.
Q. You have it?
Q. And, here we ask Mr. Large for his analysis underlying
his projections for the New Hampshire Class I REC requirement. And, again, Mr. Large, you directed us to Q -- I'm sorry, OCA-01, Q-OCA-003, which is IPP Exhibit 1, correct?
A. (Large) That is correct.
Q. And, in Part (b), the Wood IPPs asked "Did PSNH study, analyze, or otherwise forecast the need for New Hampshire Class I RECs for each of the years of the PPA or the 20-year term of the PPA, or any set of lesser years? If so, please state all assumptions made, and provide all related work papers, projections, studies, analyses, and documents." And, what was your answer to that?
A. (Large) It states that the analysis is provided in that response of Q -- of OCA-01, Question 003 through 2025.
Q. Thank you.
A. (Large) It does not state "the forecast".
Q. I'm sorry, I didn't -- it doesn't state what, sir?
A. (Large) It doesn't say "the forecast". It says "the analysis".
Q. Now, when PSNH did these studies, analyses, projections of its RPS requirements and energy needs, did PSNH take into account -- I'm sorry, study, analyze, or otherwise forecast the effect that the Laidlaw PPA might have on
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## BY MR. SHULOCK:

Q. Thank you. Now, Mr. Labrecque, the purpose of your testimony, as I remember, was to explain the terms and conditions of the PPA, is that right?
A. (Labrecque) Correct.
Q. And, one of those terms that you explained is the Cumulative Reduction Factor, is that right?
A. (Labrecque) It is.
Q. And, you stated that "PSNH believes this to be an important feature of the PPA." And, Mr. Long, as I remember, stated that "PSNH would not have entered the PPA without it." Is that right?
A. (Labrecque) Yes.
Q. And, according to your testimony, as I understand it, that's because it provides PSNH ratepayers with the opportunity to recapture over-market energy payments, is that right?
A. (Labrecque) Yes.
Q. And, you used the term "opportunity", is that right?
A. (Labrecque) Yes.
Q. Would you agree with me that it's not a guarantee that they will recapture over-market energy payments?
A. (Labrecque) It's not a guarantee. I don't understand. There's an opportunity, depending upon conditions that
exist at the end of the PPA, and during the course of it, should there be over-market payments made, for that fund to accumulate some significant dollars.
Q. Mr. Long testified that "PSNH did not forecast what that over-market energy payment will be", didn't he?
A. (Long) Yes. As I said, we don't forecast energy prices.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Long.

9 A. (Long) Pardon me?
Q. Thank you. So, sitting here today, you don't know what that over-market energy payment would be or the amount of that over-market energy payment would be at the end of 20 years, is that correct?
A. (Long) It could be zero, it could be no over-market payment. If there was, then there would be the Cumulative Reduction Factor, which could be exercised in the ways I described earlier.
Q. And, that Cumulative Reduction Factor is a reduction in the purchase price of the facility, is that right?
A. (Long) That's one of the options.
Q. What is the other option for the Cumulative Reduction, Mr. Long?
A. (Long) Another option is to sell that right to somebody else. Another option is to sell the right or transfer
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the property to someone else, an affiliate or a non-affiliate and get a payment from them. I mean, it's whatever business arrangements can be made at the time, based on the conditions at the time.
Q. And, what are those conditions, Mr. Long?

6 A. (Long) The law. If the law allows PSNH to own additional regulated plant, that would be one option. Another option would be, as I said, to sell the plant. The conditions would be "what is the perceived market value of the plant? What's the energy marketplace like? What's PSNH's portfolio look like?" It just could be any number of circumstances that decision makers would have to look at at the time.
Q. And, currently, PSNH is not permitted under law to purchase generating facilities, is that correct?
A. (Long) Not exactly. We can purchase a generating facility. The question is, "can it be included as a rate base facility that serves customers under Default Energy Service?"
Q. I apologize. I wasn't exact. You can't -- PSNH can't place new generating facilities into rate base currently?

MR. BERSAK: Objection. That calls for a conclusion of law.

| 1 | CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, I think it's a |
| :--- | :---: |
| 2 | fair question to ask what Mr. Long's understanding is. |
| 3 | We've already delved into areas that Mr. Long has |
| 4 | addressed -- |
| 5 | MR. BERSAK: Then, I'll object on |
| 6 | relevance, because the option to purchase isn't going to |
| 7 | come to fruition until 20 plus years from now. |
| 8 | CHAIRMAN GETZ: I'm going to overrule |
| 9 | the objection. |
| 10 | MR. SHULOCK: If I may, that is the |
| 11 | point. That it's probably not going to occur until 20 |
| 12 | years from now, and we don't know what the circumstances |
| 13 | will be. And, secondly, I believe Mr. Long actually |
| 14 | answered the question that I just rephrased. So, I'll |
| 15 | consider his answer as having been made. |
| 16 | BY MR. SHULOCK: |
| 17 | Q. So, you said that the -- whether the Cumulative |
| 18 | Reduction will be realized for the ratepayers, depends, |
| 19 | in part, on the perceived market value of the facility |
| 20 | 20 years from now, is that correct? |
| 21 | A.(Long) I said that, to be more correct, there's a <br> 22 |
| 23 | process in the contract to actually appraise and |
| 24 | Q. And, when would that determination be made? |

4 Q. And, when would that determination be made?
the bottom of Page 34 of the PPA, in the section that says "Purchase Price".
BY THE WITNESS: what happens "if the parties are unable to establish a mutually-agreeable fair market valuation". And, it involves getting appraisals and valuations from independent parties.

## BY MR. SHULOCK:

Q. So, PSNH has not made that determination of fair market value sitting here today?
A. (Long) Well, we can't. Nobody can, until they get closer to that 20th year.
Q. So, it's an unknown?
A. (Long) It's unknown today what the market value will be after 20 years, yes.
Q. Now, you said that one of the things that will determine the market value of the facility 20 years from now will be the energy marketplace?
A. (Long) Yes.
Q. Has PSNH studied what the energy marketplace will be like 20 years from now?
A. (Long) There's nothing to study. Nobody knows what the price is going to be in the future. That's been the

## Page 134

A. (Long) Well, if you give me a moment, I'll point you to the point that is in the contract which talks about that.

MR. BERSAK: Mr. Long, --
CHAIRMAN GETZ: While Mr. Long is
looking for that, Mr. Shulock, I'm just trying to make a decision about when's the best time to take the lunch recess. How much further do you have? I assume you're going through this list of 17 exhibits.

MR. SHULOCK: I'm about a third of the way through. And, I'm happy to take a lunch break now, as soon as he answers the question.
BY THE WITNESS:
A. (Long) The section I'm looking at is Section 7, starts on Page 11.
BY MR. SHULOCK:
Q. I'm sorry, I didn't hear you, Mr. Long.
A. (Long) I said "Section 7", Article 7 of the contract goes to the option, the purchase option, and the use of the Cumulative Reduction Factor.
Q. Well, I'm asking, will PSNH determine the fair market value of the facility at the time that it exercises the purchase option?

MR. BERSAK: I would refer Mr. Long to
point of the whole rebuttal. The Staff doesn't know what the future energy prices will be, you don't know, the Consumer Advocate doesn't know, PSNH doesn't know. And, so, we have a process that's been defined by the contract. And, it's that process that will yield the value.

| Page 137 | Page 139 |
| :---: | :---: |
| consumers need. And, it does so in a way with an indigenous fuel source. <br> Q. And, what if the cost of operating with that indigenous fuel source is higher than operating with gas? <br> A. (Long) What if it isn't? I mean, that's -- those are all the things you'll consider in the future. <br> Q. So, sitting here today, you can't do any reasonable projection of what the value of that facility is going to be in 20 years? <br> A. (Long) I said, as the rebuttal -- as the rebuttal states, you can go by history, and power plants last much longer than 20 years. Why? Because they're economic, particularly ones whose the capital costs are pretty much paid for. So, experience would say that power plants last 40, 50, 60, maybe 70 years. And, so, 20 years is actually a very short period for a power plant to life -- in a power plant's life. And, so, equipment is designed for much longer than that. So, I fully expect it to have substantial value at that time. But can I say today what that value is? No, I can't. <br> Q. But if that facility can't meet its operated costs? <br> A. (Long) If it can't, it can't. But, you know, it hasn't been the history. It hasn't been the history of mature plants. That's why we use the word "potential" value. <br> 1 As to say, in all scenarios? No. There are, you know, 2 if the plant has no value, then there's no application 3 for the Cumulative Reduction Factor. But I think that's a very, very low likelihood of happening. <br> Q. So, can you place a dollar value on that? How much of an over-market -- can you place a percentage on that? How much of a percentage of an over-market energy payment will ratepayers recoup as a result of this Cumulative Reduction being based on the value of the facility? <br> A. (Long) We don't know -- <br> MR. BERSAK: Objection, Mr. Chairman. <br> That's been asked and answered already. <br> CHAIRMAN GETZ: Mr. Shulock, it does seem we've covered this line pretty thoroughly. MR. SHULOCK: All right. <br> BY MR. SHULOCK: <br> Q. The Cumulative Reduction Account, does that include in it any value for the value time of money or the time value of money for ratepayers? <br> A. (Long) No, it doesn't, as we have stated in our response to data requests. And, that's one of the offers that Laidlaw has made, that they're willing to include interest, if the Commission wishes to entertain | that. That would, I think, "Exhibit 9". <br> MR. SHULOCK: Are we going to cross on <br> Exhibit 9 at this point, sir? <br> CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, why don't we do <br> this. This may be a good time for the lunch recess. And, we will, as I promised earlier, we'll try to start the afternoon with the rulings on the various procedural issues. So, let's recess now and return at $1: 45$. Is there anything we need to address before we take the recess? <br> (No verbal response) <br> CHAIRMAN GETZ: Hearing nothing, then we'll recess. <br> (Whereupon the lunch recess was taken at 12:40 p.m. The Afternoon Session of Day 1 to resume under separate cover so designated.) |
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