1		STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
2	- 1	PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
3	en en ma	
4	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<b>14</b> - 10:25 a.m. <b>REDACTED</b>
5	Concord, New	Hampshire (For public use)
6		DE 14-061 NHPUC MAYO6'14 PM 4:25
7	RE:	UNITIL ENERGY SYSTEMS, INC.:
8	- 1	2014 Default Service Schedule. (Petition regarding default service
9	. 1	solicitation and procurement for its Non-G1 and G1 customers for the period
10'	8	beginning June 1, 2014)
11		
12	PRESENT:	Chairman Amy L. Ignatius, Presiding Commissioner Martin P. Honigberg
13		Sandy Deno, Clerk
14		
15	APPEARANCES:	Reptg. Unitil Energy Systems, Inc.: Gary Epler, Esq.
16		Reptg. Residential Ratepayers:
17		Susan Chamberlin, Esq., Consumer Advocate Office of Consumer Advocate
18		Reptg. PUC Staff:
19		Suzanne G. Amidon, Esq. Steven E. Mullen, Asst. Dir./Electric Div.
20		
21		
22	Cou	art Reporter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52
23		
24	RED	ACTED - For Public Usel

1		
2	INDEX	
3		PAGE NO.
4	WITNESS PANEL: TODD M. BOHAN LINDA S. McNAMARA	
5	KRISTINA M. GUAY	
6	Direct examination by Mr. Epler	6
7	Cross-examination by Ms. Chamberlin	10
8	Cross-examination by Ms. Amidon	13, 22, 30
9	Cross-examination by Mr. Mullen	21, 25
10	Interrogatories by Commissioner Honigberg	31
11	Interrogatories by Chairman Ignatius	35
12		
13	* * *	
14		
15	CLOSING STATEMENTS BY:	PAGE NO.
16	Ms. Chamberlin	43
17	Ms. Amidon	43
18	Mr. Epler	44
19		
20		
21		
22		
22		

{DE 14-061} [REDACTED - For Public Use]  $\{04-10-14\}$ 

1			
2		EXHIBITS	
3	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	AGE NO.
4	1	Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. Petition for Approval of Default Service	5
5		Solicitation and Proposed Default Service Tariffs, including the	
6		Petition, proposed tariff pages, testimony and attachments (04-04-14)	
7		(CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY)	
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

## PROCEEDING

2	CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I'd like to open the
3	hearing this morning in Docket DE 14-061. This is Unitil
4	Energy Systems' Default Service solicitation. Under the
5	system that's been in place for a number of years now, we
6	have these periodic hearings to evaluate the competitive
7	RFPs that have been issued. And, so, we are here today to
8	evaluate the results of this most recent RFP process.
9	Unitil has issued RFPs on March 4th, 2014 for a default
10	service power supply for the six-month period beginning
11	June 1st, 2014, to cover 100 percent of the power supply
12	requirements for three separate blocks, addressing the G1
13	customers, the small commercial and outdoor lighting
14	customers, and residential customers.
15	So, let's begin first with appearances,
16	and then take evidence.
17	MR. EPLER: Good morning, Commissioners.
18	Gary Epler appearing on behalf of the Unitil.
19	CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Good morning.
20	MS. CHAMBERLIN: Good morning. Susan
21	Chamberlin, Consumer Advocate for the residential
22	ratepayers.
23	CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Good morning.
24	MS. AMIDON: Good morning. Suzanne

```
1
       Amidon, for Commission Staff. With me today is Steve
 2
       Mullen, the Assistant Director for the Electric Division.
 3
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Hello, everyone.
       And, is there anything to take up before the witnesses are
 4
 5
       sworn?
 6
                         MR. EPLER: Just the identification of
 7
       the exhibit. Unitil is proposing to submit one exhibit,
       which is the binder with the filing. And, pursuant to
 8
 9
       just a change in -- a slight change in how we've done
10
       this, but in compliance with Commission's rules, we now
11
       submit a full confidential version of the binder, and then
       there's one redacted version. And, so, I would just
12
13
       propose that we mark the confidential version as "Unitil
14
       Exhibit 1".
15
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. And,
16
       this is the April 4, 2014 filing?
17
                         MR. EPLER: Yes. And, it has
18
       everything, from the cover letter, Petition, proposed
19
       tariffs, and testimony and exhibits for all of the
20
       witnesses.
21
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: So marked.
22
                         (The document, as described, was
23
                         herewith marked as Exhibit 1 for
24
                         identification.)
```

1	CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. If
2	nothing else, then, Mr. Patnaude, will you swear the
3	witnesses.
4	(Whereupon Todd M. Bohan,
5	Linda S. McNamara, and Kristina M. Guay
6	were duly sworn by the Court Reporter.)
7	TODD M. BOHAN, SWORN
8	LINDA S. McNAMARA, SWORN
9	KRISTINA M. GUAY, SWORN
10	DIRECT EXAMINATION
11	BY MR. EPLER:
12	Q. Okay. If I could have the panel identify yourselves,
13	your name and your business position with Unitil
14	please. Starting with the gentlemen.
15	A. (Bohan) Good morning. Todd Bohan. And, I'm employed
16	as a Senior Energy Analyst with Unitil Service
17	Corporation with the Energy Contracts Department.
18	A. (McNamara) Linda S. McNamara. I'm a Senior Regulatory
19	Analyst for Unitil Service Corp.
20	A. (Guay) Kristina M. Guay, Senior Financial Analyst for
21	Unitil Service Corp. I work in the Finance Department.
22	Q. Mr. Bohan, turning to you first. Could you turn your
23	attention to what's been premarked as "Exhibit 1".
24	And, could you look at the tabs in that binder that are

{DE 14-061} [REDACTED - For Public Use] {04-10-14}

1 marked "Exhibit TMB-1" and the schedules that follow,

[WITNESS PANEL: Bohan~McNamara~Guay]

- 2 through TMB-8. Were those prepared by you or under
- 3 your direction?
- 4 A. (Bohan) Yes, they were.
- 5 Q. And, do you have any changes or corrections?
- 6 A. (Bohan) I do not.
- 7 Q. Okay. And, if asked the same questions as are asked in
- 8 the prefiled testimony portion of that at Exhibit
- 9 TMB-1, would your answers be the same today?
- 10 A. (Bohan) Yes, they would.
- 11 Q. And, Mr. Bohan, you've testified before the Commission
- 12 previously, is that correct?
- 13 A. (Bohan) Yes, I have, on a number of occasions.
- 14 Q. Thank you. Ms. McNamara, could I ask you to turn to
- the same exhibit. And, looking at the tabs "Exhibit
- 16 LSM-1" and the schedules that follow, LSM-1 through
- 17 LSM-5 -- -6, were those prepared by you or under your
- 18 direction?
- 19 A. (McNamara) Yes.
- 20 Q. And, do you have any changes or corrections?
- 21 A. (McNamara) No.
- 22 Q. And, if you were asked the same questions as are asked
- in your prefiled direct testimony, would your answers
- be the same?

- 1 A. (McNamara) Yes.
- Q. And, Ms. Guay, if you can turn to the same exhibit,
- 3 Exhibit Number 1. And, the three tabs marked "Exhibit
- 4 KG-1, and the two schedules, "KG-1" and "KG-2", were
- 5 those prepared by you or under your direction?
- 6 A. (Guay) Yes, they were.
- 7 Q. And, do you have any changes or corrections?
- 8 A. (Guay) No, I do not.
- 9 Q. And, if you were asked the same questions as appear in
- 10 your prefiled direct testimony, would your answers be
- 11 the same today?
- 12 A. (Guay) Yes.
- 13 Q. Ms. McNamara, there is one area that I believe are
- addressed in your schedules, but are not addressed in
- 15 your testimony, and that concerns the RGGI refunds.
- Can you -- has the Company complied with the
- 17 Commission's requirement concerning the allocation of
- the RGGI refunds?
- 19 A. (McNamara) Yes, it has.
- 20 Q. And, can you explain to the Commission where that is
- 21 demonstrated in your schedules?
- 22 A. (McNamara) If you could turn to Bates stamp Page 189,
- as well as Bates stamp Page 201, the two pages are
- similar. One is, the first one, Page 189, is for the

```
1
          Non-G1 class, and Page 201 is for the G1 class.
                                                           Both
 2
          have a column, Column (k), titled "RGGI Auction
 3
          Proceeds". And, in that, there are four -- well, there
          are many zeros, but there are also four full dollar
 4
 5
          credits. And, these relate to the four auctions for
 6
          2013.
          And, so, this demonstrates the refund of these credits
 7
     Q.
 8
          to the default service customers, is that correct?
 9
     Α.
          (McNamara) Yes. These are all negative numbers,
10
          they're credits to the costs, and they're related to
11
          the 2013 RGGI auctions that were directed to go to the
12
          default service only customers.
13
          Okay. And, so, if there -- to the extent that there
     Q.
14
          are RGGI refunds in 2014, and the Commission directs
15
          us -- directs the Company to refund those to all
16
          customers, it would be handled differently than what's
17
          shown here, is that correct?
18
     Α.
          (McNamara) Yes. The Commission has, I believe, opened
19
          a docket on that to direct or, at least at this point,
20
```

- seek comments on where and how companies might like to handle that.
- 22 Q. Okay.

21

23 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Can I just clarify 24 one thing?

```
1
                         WITNESS McNAMARA: Uh-huh.
 2
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I think you said
 3
       that these were refunds of the "four auctions in 2014",
       but they're actually the 2013, correct?
 4
                         WITNESS McNAMARA: 2013, yes. I'm sorry
 5
 6
       if I misspoke.
 7
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I may have gotten it
       wrong, but thank you.
 8
                         MR. EPLER: Chairman Ignatius, that's
 9
10
       all the questions I have. Thank you.
11
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Okay. Thank you.
12
      Ms. Chamberlin, questions?
13
                         MS. CHAMBERLIN:
                                          Thank you.
14
                          CROSS-EXAMINATION
15
     BY MS. CHAMBERLIN:
16
     Q.
          Regarding your solicitation, and I believe this is your
17
          question, but whoever wishes to answer, did you speak
18
          to suppliers who did not ultimately bid on your RFP?
19
          (Bohan) I did. Actually, I spoke with almost -- a good
     Α.
20
          portion of the 33 suppliers that we had, I had
          telephone conversations with, some of them I couldn't
21
22
          get ahold of, I left messages, and I also had e-mail
23
          exchanges. But I did chat with a number of them.
24
          And, did they give you any explanation as to why they
     Q.
```

{DE 14-061} [REDACTED - For Public Use] {04-10-14}

11

- did not respond to the RFP?
  - A. (Bohan) They did.

1

2

3

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Could you give me some of those reasons?
- (Bohan) Certainly. At this point, I don't really want 4 Α. 5 to identify the particular entities, but I do have some 6 comments that I would share that might be helpful for the Commission. And, there are a couple of them here 7 8 that were pretty vocal about why they weren't. One is, one potential bidder indicated there were two main 9 10 reasons that they wouldn't be bidding. One is 11 migration risk, and that has to do with the ability of 12 customers to migrate from either default service to 13 competitive supply or from competitive supply back to 14 default service. And, secondly, the price cost 15 volatility that we've seen in the region, significantly 16 so this past winter, and then certainly over the last 17 year to two years.

Another entity indicated that winter issues are one reason that they wouldn't be bidding.

I'd provide a little bit of caution here, because the time period under consideration for which we're soliciting service here does not include any of the winter time period, but still bidders are a little bit unnerved by things that happened this past winter. So,

one of the things that they're concerned about is what potential winter reliability type program might be implemented in the near future, and how the costs of that program are going to be allocated or recovered.

Another explanation given had to do with ISO's collateral requirements. And, over the course of the past year, ISO-New England has gotten very strict with their requirements, and that has made it more costly for suppliers to do business. And, just a sidenote here, this entity also indicated that they recognize that this is actually a good thing for customers and suppliers and participants in the New England region, but, even with that happening, it's more expensive for them to do business. As they have opportunities to do business elsewhere in other regions of the country, that's where they're going to be focusing their efforts.

- Q. Did the number of suppliers who actually bid, is this less than the number you received for the September 3, 2013 solicitation?
- A. (Bohan) I'd have to look at the filing itself, but I think the answer is "yes".
- 23 Q. And, do you --

24 A. (Bohan) Slightly.

13

```
Q. And, do you see this as an ongoing trend or a temporary situation?
```

- A. (Bohan) That's a tough question to answer. I'm hoping that it's temporary, in that a lot of these types of issues will get resolved or there will be solutions to these types of problems that will bring bidders back into the region that are willing to bid. But, at the moment, what we've seen in this current solicitation is that there are a number that are not interested in doing so because of these risks and costs that are involved.
- Q. And, would you say that these are New England/ISO region specific or New Hampshire specific?
- 14 A. (Bohan) I would say that this is a New England issue, 15 and definitely not a New Hampshire issue.
- MS. CHAMBERLIN: Okay. Thank you.
- 17 That's all I have.
- 18 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
- 19 Ms. Amidon.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- MS. AMIDON: Thank you. Good morning.
- 21 WITNESS BOHAN: Good morning.
- 22 BY MS. AMIDON:
- Q. Since we were talking about the issue related to bidders, if I go to Exhibit 1, at Page -- beginning at

{DE 14-061} [REDACTED - For Public Use] {04-10-14}

[WITNESS PANEL: Bohan~McNamara~Guay]

- Page 32, this represents again -- well, let me know when you're there.
- 3 A. (Bohan) I'm here. Thank you.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. So, this is this exhibit provides the number of bidders for the Small Customer Group for the final bids, is that right?
- 7 A. (Bohan) That is correct.
- Q. And, the Small Customer Group is -- represents the residential customers, is that correct?
- 10 A. (Bohan) That's correct.

15

16

17

18

- 11 Q. Oh. And, is it true that this is the first
  12 solicitation where you fully implemented the changes
  13 approved by the Commission in Order Number, I think it
  14 was 25,397?
  - A. (Bohan) This is actually the second solicitation under which we've implemented the new methodology, where we have the Small Customer Group and the Medium Customer Group separated.
- Q. And, they're all -- but you've solicited 100 percent of supply this time?
- 21 A. (Bohan) And for 100 percent of supply, as we did last time as well.
- Q. Okay. So, Page 32 shows the Small Customer Group, the number of final bids; Page 33 shows the number of final

{DE 14-061} [REDACTED - For Public Use] {04-10-14}

1 bids for the Medium Customer Group?

- 2 A. (Bohan) That is correct.
- Q. Which is Small Commercial -- Small Commercial and Outdoor Lighting customers?
- 5 A. (Bohan) Correct.
- Q. Okay. And, then, if we move to Page 34, that shows the number of final bids for the Large Customer Group?
- 8 A. (Bohan) That is correct.
- 9 Q. And, for the Large Customer Group, you bid somewhat differently?
- 11 A. (Bohan) Yes.

- Q. And, just to -- if you could just for the record explain how you bid supply for the Large Customer Group?
- 15 Α. (Bohan) Yes. For the Large Customer Group, we have a 16 model in place now, as approved by the Commission, 17 where we have a LMP price, locational marginal price, 18 plus an adder, that we use to cost G1 default service. So, what we ask potential bidders to bid is just the 19 20 adder. They're not bidding the energy cost component 21 in their response to the solicitation. So, those --22 the magnitude of those numbers are generally going to 23 be much smaller.
  - Q. Thank you. And, if we look at the next page in the

confidential exhibit, Page 35, the G1 pricing is in the second column. And, if we go down that column to the most recent month of "March 2014", we can see, looking up those three months — well, I guess we would look at December, January, and February, it shows the cost of power for the winter months that resulted from your last solicitation, is that right?

A. (Bohan) That's correct.

- Q. Okay. Thank you. And, in your filing, you included notice from ISO, it's a March 18th notice. I believe that's on Bates stamp 161.
- 12 A. (Bohan) Yes. And, I have it labeled as "Schedule 13 TMB-8".
  - Q. And, just would you explain why you felt it was important to include this notice in your default service filing?
    - A. (Bohan) Certainly. I'm sure the Commission is aware, but I wanted to emphasize the fact that we had an extraordinary winter. We had a very cold winter. And, as a result, two things happened. We saw very high natural gas prices. And, natural gas prices are a large driver of electricity prices. And, as a result, we had very high electricity prices in the region as well. So, I wanted to provide some external support to

1 that position. That's why that's included as well.

- Q. And, if we turn to Page 15, Bates stamp 15, which is

  Page 13 of your testimony. Are you there?
  - A. (Bohan) I am there.

- Q. And, you also included here a table that's entitled
  "New Hampshire Load Zone: Monthly Locational
  Margin" -- "Marginal Prices". And, this was, again, to
  illustrate the costs over the -- of the winter period
  for ISO, is that correct?
  - A. (Bohan) That is correct. And, if we take a look at that table, on Bates stamp Page 15, you can see I've listed four of the winter months here, December '13 through March 2014. And, those prices range from \$97.58 a megawatt-hour, and then they increase \$149.98, and then \$150.61, and then \$113.07. Those are the four locational marginal prices in the region for those months. In comparison to the previous winter, 2012-2013, those percentage increases are shown to the right. So, that \$97.58 price in December 2013 was 126 percent higher than the locational marginal price in December 2012. And, likewise, for March 2014, the \$113 figure, that's 112 percent higher than the figure for March 2013.

And, then, I added some other

- descriptive statistics. I won't go into details here,
  unless the Commission would like. But I also included
  the highest price you could see, the degree of
  volatility, and then I also provided standard
  deviations, so you can see that that data did move
  around quite a bit. It's significant price volatility
  this past winter.
- 8 Q. I thought that information was very helpful.
- 9 A. (Bohan) Good.
- 10 Q. Thank you.
- 11 A. (Bohan) Great.
- 12 Q. I wanted to now talk a little bit about REC prices.
- And, I'm trying to look for where I referred to the
- calculation. It's at Page 151, I believe.
- 15 A. (Bohan) I'm there.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. So, again, if we go to the right,
- the column at the extreme right, this calculates the
- price of RECs at \$4.07 per megawatt-hour, is that
- 19 correct?
- 20 A. (Bohan) That's correct. So, what this is showing is
- 21 that this is our estimate in dollars per megawatt-hour
- of our Renewable Energy Credit costs for each month for
- that, for the period under consideration, June 2014
- through November 2014.

[WITNESS PANEL: Bohan~McNamara~Guay]

Q. Yet the prices, if you go to the adders that are in the tariffs, which I believe are 0.00208 cents for the Small Customer Group, and even less for the Large Customer Group, they're less than the 0.00407 cents one might expect from these prices. Is that due to an over

collection in the RPS revenues in the prior period?

- 7 A. (McNamara) Yes, primarily.
- 8 Q. But, otherwise, Mr. Bohan, the costs appear to be close 9 to the ACP, is that fair to say?
- 10 A. (Bohan) That is correct.
- Q. And, if we look at Page 38, this indicates a summary of the Company's REC purchases for 2013 RPS compliance.

  And, let me know when you're there.
- 14 A. (Bohan) Yes.

6

- Q. Okay. And, I think this does illustrate that the prices are very close to the ACP. I don't have a comparison of the ACP. But, according to this table, you've acquired all of your Class I, 80 percent of the Class II, but none for Class III, and then 106 percent for Class IV.
- 21 A. (Bohan) For 2013.
- Q. Right. And, so, with respect to Class III, are you just finding those not to be available at all?
- 24 A. (Bohan) That is correct. And, this is an issue that

{DE 14-061} [REDACTED - For Public Use] {04-10-14}

1 we've seen at least over the last year or so. I think 2 the last two or three default service hearings we've 3 been talking about this. There just do not appear to 4 be any New Hampshire Class III RECs available in the 5 market. I know at least a year ago the Commission revisited this issue, and it resulted in a change in 6 7 the percentage requirements that the utilities were 8 required to acquire. But it's still not changing what 9 we're seeing in the market. I'm not getting any bids 10 when we've run our RFP, we're not getting any responses 11 for New Hampshire Class III RECs.

- Q. But, for Class IV RECs, it looks like you have more than you need?
- A. (Bohan) That's correct. And, if we have a little bit more than we need, what we end up doing is, if there is a slight surplus there, that would get banked into 2014 obligations.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. Also, in this filing, the Company basically is wrapping up the Renewable Service Option.

  Is that fair to say?
- 21 A. (Bohan) That is correct.

12

13

14

15

16

- Q. And, Mr. Mullen was doing some research this morning, and he looked at --
- MS. AMIDON: There are two items that

21 [WITNESS PANEL: Bohan~McNamara~Guay] 1 we're talking about here. And, I think what I'll do is I 2 will let Mr. Mullen ask this question. I have some 3 additional questions for you, but I'm going to let Mr. Mullen ask this question, because he did the research. 4 5 WITNESS BOHAN: Certainly. 6 MR. MULLEN: Good morning. 7 WITNESS BOHAN: Good morning. BY MR. MULLEN: 8 If you turn to Page 14 of the filing. 9 10 (Bohan) I'm there. Α. 11 On Line 6 and 7, you have a Web address there where you Ο. 12 direct people to look for information on energy supply 13 options, renewable energy supply options. And, that 14 was consistent with the direction by the Commission, in 15 terms of being allowed to wrap this up. Is that 16 correct? 17 (Bohan) That is correct. Α. Q. And, in your TMB-6, which is Bates Page 155 and 156,

- 18 19 you include information that was provided to customers 20 about the end of this program. That's correct?
- 21 (Bohan) That is correct. We actually sent this letter 22 to all participating customers on -- I believe the date 23 is December 16th, 2013. I could check my testimony, 24 but I'm pretty confident that was the date.

22

```
Q. Okay. On Page 156, that provides a different Web
address than what was in your testimony. When I, of
course, checked them both out, and they both -- would
you agree that they both bring you to the same spot on
Unitil's website?
```

- A. (Bohan) That is correct. And, actually, I worked with the individual that handles the Web services for us, and she basically redirected the Green Neighbor website to the piece that is noted in my testimony, so that customers are informed of that.
- 11 Q. And, I'd say, from a customer perspective, it's
  12 probably easier to remember the "greenneighbor", than
  13 the one that's listed in your testimony.
- 14 A. (Bohan) Yes.

6

7

8

9

10

- Q. And, on that site, there's information there that is similar to the wording in the letter, plus there's also some links to some providers of renewable products?
  - A. (Bohan) That is correct.
- MR. MULLEN: All right. Thank you.
- MS. AMIDON: Thank you.
- 21 BY MS. AMIDON:
- Q. And, this is again for you, Mr. Bohan. You talked about the "volatility" this winter. And, I wanted to refer you to the TMB-3, the Customer Migration Report,

- which is on Page 149 and 150.
  - A. (Bohan) I'm there.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. And, I know that when I originally read this report, I kind of got things turned around. But I want to start off with Page 150. And, if you could explain to me, in the first table at the top, under "Large Customer" -
  "Large General", I mean, what this trend line demonstrates for the months from February 2013 to February 2014?
- (Bohan) Okay. So, on the top of Page 150, what we're Α. seeing here, in that middle column, is the Large General class, those are our G1 customers. And, this shows that there is at least, you know, through a good part of February -- through a good part of 2013, we see that that number, the number of Large Customers that are out in the competitive market is around 111, 112 customers. And, then, when we get into -- we get into the latter part of 2013, we see that a couple customers come back to default service. And, then, a very interesting thing happens, once we get into the thick of winter here, this past winter, in December 2013, and into the start of 2014, we see some significant migration of Large Customers back from the competitive market to default service.

[WITNESS PANEL: Bohan~McNamara~Guay]

- Q. This illustrates then what you were talking about with supplier uncertainty about the effects of customer migration on their load commitments?
  - A. (Bohan) That is correct.

- Q. And, again on the prior page there, I think it's the table at the bottom, that also illustrates that, is that correct?
  - A. (Bohan) That is correct. If we go to the previous page, 149, you can see that the raw consumption data by competitive generation and default service or by total is shown above. But, at the bottom, we see the percentages. And, what this is showing at the bottom is that this is the number, the percent of usage for that Large Customer class that is by competitive generation. And, you can see that that's about 85 percent through a good part of 2013, declines a little bit in the latter part of 2013, and then drops significantly once again when we get to the beginning of 2014.
    - Q. And, if we go to the heading in that particular column that is headed "Domestic", we can see just the opposite. There are more customers taking energy supply from competitive suppliers, is that correct?
  - A. (Bohan) That is correct.

- 1 MS. AMIDON: Thank you. Mr. Mullen does
- 2 have some additional questions, and I'm going to defer to
- 3 him at this point.
- 4 BY MR. MULLEN:

- Q. Mr. Bohan, if you could turn to Pages 39 to 43 of the filing.
- 7 A. (Bohan) Okay. I am there.
  - Q. And, Page 39 gives a brief description of what's on

    Pages 40 through 43. But could you just please briefly

    summarize what those latter four pages represent.
  - A. (Bohan) Okay. So, on Page 40 what we're showing is we're doing a calculation that's showing the ratio of the final bid prices versus a calculation rate that we do, based on the information that we had in the prior period. So, it's a comparison to last year. Okay?

    And, when we do that comparison, what we're showing, over here in the bottom right-hand side, we see a figure of 3.3 percent. That's suggesting to us that the bids that we're receiving in this round are just over 3 percent higher than what we received a year ago. And, if we continue down, if we go to Page 41, at the bottom there, what we're showing is, it's the same type of exercise, except we're showing the comparison of current bids to the last Default Service period, which

[WITNESS PANEL: Bohan~McNamara~Guay]

```
was the Winter 2013 into 2014. So, we're comparing

June 1st, 2014 to results for our December 1st, 2013

filing. So, what that's showing us, if you look down

at the bottom right-hand side, is that the prices, the

bids, are just under 5 percent higher.
```

- Q. Okay. Now, with those two pages, if you concentrate on the left-hand side, under the heading "RFP for Service Beginning June 1st, 2014", if you were to just explain the "Ratio of Final Bid to NYMEX ISO" column.
- A. (Bohan) This ratio is showing the final bid. So, if we take the 82.80 -- if we look at this line and we say, for example, June of 2014, the bid for that month was \$82.85. On the day before the final bids were received, on March 31st, 2014, the NYMEX price ratio of on-peak and off-peak prices for June 2014 was \$69.31, that's showing a ratio of 1.20.
- 17 Q. So, what does that "1.20" tell you?

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- A. (Bohan) It's telling us that the bid ratio is about
  20 percent higher than what NYMEX futures were on
  March 31st.
- Q. So, would you take that as something that tells you that the bids are about what you'd expect or what exactly is it telling you?
- 24 A. (Bohan) The bids are about what I expect, and we can

- turn to something else in a second. But what this is suggesting, and I've shown this in my testimony, is that wholesale electric prices in the Summer of 2014 are expected to be about 20 percent higher than what they were in 2013.
  - Q. Okay. And, just before we move off these two pages, actually, for all four of these pages, they're all labeled at the top "Non-G1 customers". Am I correct that this is a combination of both the small and the medium groups?
- 11 A. (Bohan) That is correct.

- Q. Thank you. Perhaps we can make the conversation on Pages 42 and 43 a little briefer. This is just a different comparison, instead of to electric prices, it's to Henry Hub natural gas prices?
  - A. (Bohan) That is correct. And, so, what we're seeing for, in comparison of June 2014 to June of 2013, this ratio is showing a number of 14.8 percent, approximately 15 percent higher. And, in the snapshot below, on Page 43, this is showing a ratio that's about 20 percent lower, which is what we'd expect coming out of the winter season.
- Q. So, compared to last year at the same time, they're higher. But compared to the last prior period, they're

- 1 lower?
- 2 A. (Bohan) Correct.
- Q. Ms. Guay, I just have a couple of quick questions on the Lead/Lag Study.
- 5 A. (Guay) Yes.
- Q. I'm not going to get into a lot of detail here. But,
  in general, I mean, you say that the study was done in
  a manner similar to the prior study, is that correct?
- 9 A. (Guay) Yes.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. And, in comparing the results of this study to the prior one, are there any major differences that come to mind?
  - A. (Guay) There were a couple significant changes year over year. For the G1 customers, the revenue lag decreased almost three days. And, I can't specifically point out a reason for that, other than they are our larger non-residential customers, they have a shorter payment window than residential, and they're the size of the class is a lot smaller. So, if one of the a few of the larger customers pay their bills a few days early, it would show it would show up more than it would, say, in the residential class, where there's like 10,000 you know, there's thousands of them. So, I can't really give you a specific reason

# [WITNESS PANEL: Bohan~McNamara~Guay]

1		for that, other than maybe the business is doing
2		better, they can pay their bills.
3		But the other significant are you all
4		set with that one?
5	Q.	Yes.
6	Α.	(Guay) Is there anything else I could
7	Q.	That's fine.
8	Α.	(Guay) Okay. The other significant change is the
9		Non-Gls. Last year, they had a lag of one day, 1.35
LO		days, and this year there's a lead of 9.86 days, in the
L1		total for the study for the Non-G1. And, the reason
L2		for that is last year we had four different default
L3		service suppliers. This year we have six. Well, I say
L 4		"this year", for 2013 we have six. And, the two new
L5		suppliers, So,
L6		the payments for the energy are
L7		
L8		We also have
L9		one that's So, with the
20		, in addition to the large percentage of
21		costs applicable to those two new service default
22		service suppliers, that is the reason for the increase
23		in the lead.
24	Q.	Okay. And, is it your understanding that, consistent

{DE 14-061} [REDACTED - For Public Use] {04-10-14}

```
1
          with prior submissions of lead/lag studies, that this
          would be subject to some further review as we go
 2
 3
          forward?
 4
          (Guay) Yes.
     Α.
 5
                         MR. MULLEN:
                                      Thank you.
 6
                         MS. AMIDON:
                                      Thank you.
 7
    BY MS. AMIDON:
 8
          I don't think we have any other questions, except I
          wanted to, Ms. McNamara, to just point out for the
 9
10
          Commission where they can find the bill impacts, if
11
          they're looking for bill impacts for the Small and
12
          Medium Customer classes?
13
          (McNamara) Yes. Schedule LSM-6. There are several
     Α.
14
          pages with various forms of bill impacts. In general,
15
          the Residential and General Service class will see a
16
          6.6 percent decrease due to this change in default
17
          service, versus current rates. And, the Outdoor
18
          Lighting class will see a 3.5 percent decrease in
19
          general due to the change in default service rates.
20
                         MS. AMIDON: Thank you. We have no
21
       further questions.
22
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS:
                                            Thank you.
23
       Commissioner Honigberg, do you have questions?
24
     BY CMSR. HONIGBERG:
```

- - A. (Bohan) There is not. And, the reason for that is that the prices for the G1 class that we get are not predetermined. We don't know what the G1 price will be until we get basically to the end of the month.
- 7 Q. With only --

4

5

- 8 A. (Bohan) So, --
- 9 Q. Why don't you finish. I'm sorry.
- 10 (Bohan) So, the model -- the price for the G1 class, Α. 11 for example, for let's say the month of April 2014, is 12 based on an adder that was bid, so, whatever that adder 13 happens to be, let's say it's \$17, plus the locational 14 marginal price weighted by all the default service 15 loads for the period that we use to set the rate, and, 16 in this example, that would be something like the 17 consumption for the month of March. So, we would take 18 the load, the hourly loads for the G1 class for the 19 month of March, multiply that by the locational 20 marginal price in each hour, we would get some weighted 21 average locational marginal price, and then we would 22 add to that the adder of \$17. And, that would be, 23 hypothetically speaking, \$85, and that would be the 24 price.

- Q. So, how do you evaluate the validity of the G1 bid that you receive?
- A. (Bohan) Two things I think to look at. One is we do

  a -- well, that's really just for our forecasting

  purpose. Really, one of the things that we look at is

  the previous bids that we've received in prior rounds

  over the last year and a half. And, these are

  generally consistent with what we see in those default

  service solicitations.
  - Q. I want to go back to, you gave four reasons for why prospective bidders didn't participate. And, one of them you called "winter issues".
- 13 A. (Bohan) Yes.

- Q. Can you do that one again for me please, because I
  wasn't -- I didn't get the logic, ultimately, as to
  what the problem was?
  - A. (Bohan) Okay. Well, there's a couple of things here.

    First of all, when we solicit, when we run our RFP for default service here, we actually run two RFPs. So, we're soliciting for UES for June through

    November 2014. At the same time, we're soliciting for our Massachusetts affiliate, Fitchburg Gas & Electric Light Company. That happens to be a 50 percent load share for various classes for a whole year. That goes

from June 1st through May 2015. So, loosely speaking,
when we're -- when potential suppliers are responding,
they're speaking both to UES and to Fitchburg, okay?

But even suppliers that are not bidding on UES have

indicated they have concerns with winter issues.

For this particular Default Service period, that argument doesn't hold a lot of water. But I do think it's something that we should bring up, and, certainly, it's something that we're going to need to keep in mind when we're back here six months from now getting ready for next winter. Is that helpful?

- Q. I have not -- the companies are not required to bid on Fitchburg when they bid here?
- 14 A. (Bohan) No. No.
- 15 Q. It's just --
- 16 A. (Bohan) Not at all.
- 17 Q. Okay.

A. (Bohan) And, could I add one other thing? This is more of a policy point, and I just wanted to mention it while we're here. A concern that I think bidders have raised, and something that policymakers could hopefully help with, is identify and figuring out whatever type of winter program for next winter is going to be in place, to get that in place early and identify how the

1 cost allocation and recovery is going to be done well 2 in advance of those next RFPs going into that round. 3 And, we, in particular, for UES, last 4 year, going into this winter, we had a few bidders that 5 dropped out particularly due to that reason, that they 6 didn't know what was going to happen with costs, how 7 they were going to be allocated. And, as a result, they just were risk-adverse, and they said "we're going 8 to sit this out." So, if the rules of all of that can 9 10 kind of get hammered out and in place towards the end 11 of the summer, I think that would go a long way to 12 helping at least potentially increase bidder 13 participation. 14 Thank you. I appreciate that. I want to ask also Ο. 15 about the Migration Report. 16 Α. (Bohan) Sure. 17 I'm struck by the dramatic increase on the Domestic, Q. 18 and I noted the somewhat dramatic decrease on the Large 19 General. But what's going on on the Domestic side that 20 the numbers went up so dramatically over the last 12 21 months, and, in particular, the last three months? 22 (Bohan) Without turning to my schedule, though, I can Α. 23 tell you right at the moment, that was due to 24 significant efforts by two competitive electric

1 suppliers, Electricity New Hampshire and North American

[WITNESS PANEL: Bohan~McNamara~Guay]

- 2 Power. In particular, late in the year, that move was
- 3 almost all North American Power signing up customers of
- 4 ours on the residential side.
- 5 Q. Understood.
- 6 A. (Bohan) Yes.
- 7 CMSR. HONIGBERG: That's all I have.
- 8 Thank you.
- 9 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you. Just a
- 10 couple more questions.
- 11 BY CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS:
- 12 Q. Let's stick with the issue of wholesale pricing for a
- moment longer. We have a 20 percent expectation, Mr.
- Bohan, that the summer will be 20 percent higher than
- it was a year before, correct?
- 16 A. (Bohan) In the prior summer, yes.
- 17 Q. And, your testimony just states that you can't
- 18 | quarantee that, but that's what it's looking like, but
- 19 without really any explanation. What is it that drives
- 20 the summer prices up? You talked about the "winter
- volatility".
- 22 A. (Bohan) Well, generally, in the summer, we have, you
- 23 know, lower natural gas prices. So, that should drive
- at least higher demand. So, we'll have higher demand

for natural gas. We also have a significant portion of generation that's natural gas fired, approximately half in New England. And, I don't know the exact dates of these retirements, but at least in the near term we're expecting, in the region, Vermont Yankee and two Salem Harbor units, one I believe is a coal unit and one is an oil unit that are going to be retired. So, that's going to put upward — that's putting upward pressure more on other units, in particular, gas-fired units.

- Q. Are there any structural changes that any of the bidders you've talked to or would-be bidders you've talked to have that would help in giving them the confidence to participate in our market?
- A. (Bohan) Well, as I had mentioned, part of it is, if we can carve out or maybe the costs of recovery of, you know, a winter-type program are handled, you know, through another mechanism that they don't have to deal with, that could potentially address that.
- Q. And, knowing those terms early on you had said?
- 20 A. (Bohan) And knowing those early on.
- 21 Q. The other 20 percent figure we've been talking about
  22 this morning is the comparison of the rates going
  23 forward to the block we're coming out of, and it's
  24 about 20 percent lower, correct?

- 1 A. (Bohan) Correct.
- Q. Help me, and this may be Ms. McNamara, if we look at your bill impacts, starting on Page 220 -- I'm sorry,

  211, how does it work out that an expectation of a roughly 20 percent drop in wholesale prices can only translate into a 6.6 percent drop in the Default

  Service Charge?
- 8 A. (Bohan) You want me to --
- 9 A. (McNamara) You can start, if you'd like.
- 10 Q. Either one is fine.
- 11 A. (Bohan) Well, it's just that, generally, that a

  12 20 percent drop in wholesale prices isn't going to

  13 translate into a 20 percent drop at the retail level,

  14 because bill comparisons include not only the Default

  15 Service of the generation portion, but also the other

  16 retail components that ratepayers have to pay.
  - Q. So, let's just go through that then. On the chart, you've got the -- you've got zeros for all of the other changes in the total bill, and the only one with a reduction or a change is the Default Service Charge itself. So, we're not talking about offsetting increases in the Distribution Charge here.
- 23 A. (McNamara) Right.

17

18

19

20

21

22

24 Q. So, the Default Service Charge I realize is more than

[WITNESS PANEL: Bohan~McNamara~Guay]

- just the wholesale price.
- 2 A. (McNamara) Correct.
- Q. So, can you just walk out a little bit more how we get to a 6.6 percent drop in the Default Service Charge?
  - A. (McNamara) Would it be helpful if we turn to the rate calculation perhaps?
- 7 O. Sure.

5

6

(McNamara) Okay. Let's just look at Non-G1. And, 8 there are two components to the Default Service rate, 9 10 power supply and RECs, with power supply being, of 11 course, the bigger of the two components. Schedule LSM-2 provides the calculation for the Non-G1 class 12 13 power supply component. And, if you are on Page 187, 14 this shows the calculation for both the Residential 15 class and the G2 Outdoor Lighting class, again, for the 16 power supply component. The fixed residential class 17 power supply component is \$0.08205 per kilowatt-hour. 18 There is an over collection of \$165,000, to make up 19 part of that rate, as well as costs of over 20 million. 20 The costs of 20 million can be seen on Page 191. And, 21 there's quite a bit of data on this page. What this is 22 doing is, in the first part, the upper part of the 23 page, is just showing the stream of costs for all the 24 different cost components, of power supply charges, bad

debt, so on. The bottom two sections of the page are breaking those common costs, what we call "common costs", bad debt, whatever else might be in there, working capital, things like that, between the Residential class and the G2/Outdoor Lighting class.

So, if you turn your attention to the middle part of that page, where it says "Total costs located to Residential Class and G2/Outdoor Lighting Class", third column over you'll see the \$20 million cost total for the Residential class. That being made up of power supply costs, plus another \$351,000 of the common costs.

To get to an exact reason why the bill impact is a decrease of 6.6 percent and the power supply costs are decreasing 20 percent, as Mr. Bohan said, I personally like to always think of it as approximately half Default Service. So, I mean, I would have expected at least a 10 percent bill decrease. However, there are other cost components that impact the dollars that go — that go into that rate. So, it's not a one-for-one.

Q. Thank you. Regarding the RPS costs that you incur, I take it, for this coming -- for the coming payments in July that cover the compliance year ending calendar

1 year 2000 --

- 2 A. (Bohan) Thirteen.
- 3 Q. Thirteen. Thank you.
- 4 A. (Bohan) Yes.
- 5 Q. There would be, for Class III, you would be making 6 ACPs, correct?
- 7 A. (Bohan) That is correct.
- 8 Q. Just because of the unavailability of Class III RECs?
- 9 A. (Bohan) That is correct. And, just to add a sidenote
- 10 here. I did have a brief phone conversation with Liz
- Nixon here, from the Commission, and briefed her on
- 12 that. She inquired and I responded, just let her know
- where we were with all our REC requirements.
- 14 Q. Do you have any projections on where you'll be
- specifically with Class III a year from now, when
- 16 you're looking at compliance year '14, paid in July of
- 17 '15?
- 18 A. (Bohan) I suspect we're going to be in the same boat,
- unless something significant changes to bring those
- 20 RECs to market.
- 21 Q. And, is it in the compliance year '14 that the Class
- 22 III requirement jumps up to I think 8 percent or is
- 23 that in a year even further out?
- 24 A. (Bohan) I believe you're correct. It does jump back

1 up. I think there was only a couple of years that that

- 2 percentage was cut.
- 3 Q. The current level that is supposed to be collected for
- 4 Class III is 3 percent?
- 5 A. (Bohan) Yes.
- 6 Q. And even that's unavailable?
- 7 A. (Bohan) Correct.
- 8 Q. And, Class III is a closed class. You can't build new
- 9 Class III. So, to find -- if you can't make 3 percent,
- I guess the question is "how do we find 8 percent?"
- 11 A. (Bohan) That's correct.
- 12 Q. Got any help on that? All right.
- 13 A. (Bohan) You could change the legislation in other
- states that makes them less valuable there and more
- valuable here.
- 16 Q. Yes, that's part of the picture, isn't it? How we --
- how we compare to other states in the region?
- 18 A. (Bohan) Exactly. Yes.
- 19 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. That's
- 20 the questions I have.
- 21 CMSR. HONIGBERG: I'm all set.
- 22 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. Any
- 23 redirect, Mr. Epler?
- MR. EPLER: No thank you.

```
1
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Then, the witnesses
 2
       are excused.
                     Thank you very much. I take it there's no
 3
       other testimony, is that correct?
 4
                         (No verbal response)
 5
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Then, is there any
 6
       objection to striking the identification of the exhibit
 7
       and make it a full exhibit?
 8
                         (No verbal response)
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Seeing none, we will
 9
10
       do so. Anything else to take up before closing
11
       statements?
12
                         MR. EPLER: Yes, just one point. As
13
       we've done in the past, we didn't move to close the
14
       hearing, because there's no one participating, other than
15
       the Company, Staff, and the Consumer Advocate. But there
16
       was some confidential discussion, and we'll work with the
       parties to mark the transcript. And, I will note that the
17
18
       Executive Director pointed out to me that we're behind in
19
      mocking up transcripts from recent hearings. And, I'm
20
       working to get those done, and should be up to speed in a
21
       couple weeks.
22
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Good.
                                                    Thank you.
23
                         MR. EPLER: We'll be current, not "up to
24
       speed", we'll be current in a couple weeks.
```

```
1
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
                                                         And, we
 2
       hadn't addressed the confidentiality request. Is there
 3
       any comment anyone wants to make on the request for
 4
       confidentiality filed by the Company?
 5
                         MS. CHAMBERLIN: No objection.
 6
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. We will
 7
       address that in the final order. So, I quess, unless
       there's anything else?
 8
 9
                         (No verbal response)
10
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Closing remarks,
11
      Ms. Chamberlin?
12
                         MS. CHAMBERLIN:
                                          Thank you. The OCA
13
       doesn't object to the filing. I am concerned that the
14
       bids are dwindling. I would expect the volatility and the
15
       winter rules to be a short-term problem. And, so, that's
16
       what I will be looking at going forward. As those things
17
       get resolved, my hope would be that we would then have
18
       more bids to make this a more fully competitive process.
19
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
20
       Ms. Amidon.
21
                         MS. AMIDON: Thank you. Staff has
       reviewed the filing. And, we've determined that the
22
23
       Company has conducted the solicitation, the bid
24
       evaluation, and the selection process consistent with
```

```
Order Number 24,511, in Docket 05-064, which set up the
 1
 2
       default service procurement process for the Company, and
 3
       as revised by a more recent order, 25,397. And, we
       believe that the resulting bids are market-based and that
 4
 5
       the solicitation was made consistent with the principles
 6
       of RSA 374-F.
 7
                         We understand that the Company has
       incorporated the results of the Lead/Lag Study for 2013
 8
 9
       into their filing in the rates. We understand, however,
10
       that the Company understands that the OCA and Staff will
11
       have time to review the Lead/Lag Study, and that any
12
       reconciling items that come out of that review will be
13
       addressed in a future Default Service filing. Thank you.
14
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS:
                                            Thank you.
15
      Mr. Epler.
16
                         MR. EPLER: Yes.
                                           Thank you. I'll just
17
       direct the Commission to the relief requested in the
18
       Petition. And, we will look forward to working with Staff
19
       in reviewing the Lead/Lag Study.
20
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS:
                                             Thank you.
21
                         MR. EPLER: And the OCA.
22
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Mr. Epler, what's
23
       the absolute deadline date on an order under our agreement
24
       of this very fast tracking of these cases?
```

```
1
                         MR. EPLER: May I direct that to Mr.
       Bohan?
 2
 3
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Please.
 4
                         WITNESS BOHAN: I think, traditionally,
 5
       we ask for it on Friday, which is, in this instance, is
 6
       tomorrow. But our -- I don't want to speak for the whole
 7
       panel in case I'm stepping on someone's toes here, but, in
 8
       terms of our agreements with the suppliers, we have given
 9
       them a deadline of the following Friday, which is the
10
       18th, 19th.
11
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Well, I think we --
12
       isn't it -- is it five business days from the date that
13
       the filing is made?
14
                         WITNESS BOHAN: Correct.
15
                         MS. AMIDON: That was the terms of the
16
       Settlement Agreement, as I recall. That hasn't changed.
17
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: And, what does that
18
       work out to then?
19
                         MS. AMIDON: It would be tomorrow.
                         WITNESS BOHAN: That would be tomorrow.
20
21
                         MS. AMIDON: Because the filing was
22
      made, completed on last Friday.
23
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right.
24
            All right. Then, unless there's anything else?
       you.
```

1	(No verbal response)
2	CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: We'll take this
3	under advisement. Appreciate everyone working quickly on
4	moving these through, because of the fact of market
5	pricing, it's just got to go quickly to be useful. So, we
6	appreciate everyone's work. And, we are adjourned.
7	(Whereupon the hearing was adjourned at
8	11:24 a.m.)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	