1		STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
2		PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
3		
4	•	0 - 10:10 a.m.
5	Concord, New	Hampsnire
6	RE:	DE 18-057
7		ELECTRIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM: Request for Approval to EAP Design
8		Change. (Regarding Eversource Energy and Liberty Utilities (Granite State
9		Electric) Joint Petition for Recovery of Costs to Implement EAP Changes)
LO	2224	
11	PRESENT:	Chairwoman Dianne Martin, Presiding Cmsr. Kathryn M. Bailey Cmsr. Michael S. Giaimo
L2		Jody Carmody, Clerk
L3 L4	APPEARANCES:	Reptg. Public Service Company of New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource Energy:
		Jessica Chiavara, Esq.
L5		Matthew J. Fossum, Esq.
L6		Reptg. Liberty Utilities (Granite State Electric) Corp. d/b/a Liberty Utilities:
L7		Michael J. Sheehan, Esq.
L8		Reptg. Residential Ratepayers: Christa Shute, Esq.
L9		Pradip Chattopadhyay, Asst. Cons. Adv. Office of Consumer Advocate
20		
21		Reptg. PUC Staff: Mary E. Schwarzer, Esq.
22		Amanda Noonan, Dir./Consumer Services & External Affairs Div.
23		Rorie Patterson, Asst. Dir./Consumer Services & External
24		Affairs Division
	Court Rep	orter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52

1		
2	INDE	Х
3		PAGE NO.
4	WITNESS PANEL: LINDA M. E	
5	NICOLE M. AMANDA O.	
6	Direct examination by Ms. Chia	vara 8
7	Direct examination by Mr. Shee	ehan 10
8	Direct examination by Ms. Schw	varzer 13
9	Interrogatories by Cmsr. Baile	у 16
10	Interrogatories by Cmsr. Giaim	no 22
11	Interrogatories by Chairwoman	Martin 24
12		
13	* *	*
14		
15	CLOSING STATEMENTS BY:	
16	Ms. Shute	26
17	Ms. Schwar	zer 28
18	Ms. Chiava	ra 29
19	Mr. Sheeha	n 29
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

1			
2		EXHIBITS	
3	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
4	1	Settlement Agreement between Eversource Energy, Liberty	6
5		Utilities (Granite State Electric), Office of the	
6		Consumer Advocate, and the PUC Staff (02-28-20)	
7	0		C
8	2	Eversource Energy and Liberty Utilities (Granite State	6
9		Electric) Joint Petition for Recovery of Costs to Implement	
10	2	EAP Changes (05-16-19)	7
11	3	Data Request No. TS 2-001	·
12	4	Data Request No. Staff TS 1-2	7
13	5	Data Request No. Staff 1-4	7
14	6	Data Request No. Staff TS 2-3	7
15	7	Data Request No. Staff 1-5	7
16	8	Data Request No. Staff 2-2	7
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

## PROCEEDING

2.

1.3

2.2

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. We have a pretty good crowd this morning. We're here in Docket DE 18-057 for a hearing regarding the Joint Petition for Recovery of Costs of EAP Changes. And I understand that there is a Settlement for consideration today.

Before we do anything, can we take appearances?

MS. CHIAVARA: Yes. Absolutely. Good morning, Commission. Jessica Chiavara, counsel for Public Service Company of New Hampshire, doing business as Eversource Energy.

MR. SHEEHAN: Good morning,

Commissioners. Michael Sheehan, for Liberty

Utilities (Granite State Electric) Corp.

MS. SHUTE: Good morning,

Commissioners. Christa Shute, Office of the

Consumer Advocate, on behalf of residential

ratepayers. And with me is our analyst, Pradip

Chattopadhyay.

MS. SCHWARZER: Good morning,

Commissioners. I'm Mary Schwarzer, Staff

attorney with the PUC. And with me this morning

is Amanda Noonan, the Director of the Commission's Consumer Services and External Affairs Division.

2.

1.3

2.2

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. And I was going to ask if you have any preliminary matters. I know that we do have a request to accept the late-filed Settlement Agreement. And I believe that there are no objections, and everyone is in agreement on that?

[Non-verbal indications given.]

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. So, in that

case, we will accept that request as a late

filing.

Any other preliminary matters?

MS. CHIAVARA: Just entering exhibits, if we can mark them. We have two exhibits to mark for identification. And the first is the proposed Settlement Agreement, and this is between Eversource, Liberty, the Office of the Consumer Advocate, and Commission Staff. As well as Unitil and — Unitil Energy Systems, Incorporated, and — yes, sorry — and the New Hampshire Electric Cooperative, they are both signatories to the Agreement, but they're not

active Settling Parties, as they do not seek cost 1 2 recovery in this docket, so -- but they did sign. 3 Exhibit 2 is the Joint Prepared 4 Testimony of Linda Enderwick, on behalf of 5 Eversource, and Nicole Harris, on behalf of 6 Liberty, for cost recovery from the Electric 7 Assistance Program Fund. And that was prefiled on May 17th, 2019. 9 (The documents, as described, were 10 herewith marked as **Exhibit 1** and 11 Exhibit 2, respectively, for identification.) 12 13 CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. And I see on this list that we have in front of us that there 14 15 are other exhibits. 16 MS. CHIAVARA: Yes. 17 CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Did you want to 18 walk through those? 19 MS. SCHWARZER: Yes. Thank you. As 20 one of the provisions of the Settlement 21 Agreement, all data requests and responses may be 2.2 admitted as full exhibits. And, so, Staff would

given by the utilities.

like to admit answers and requests and responses

23

24

1	Exhibit 3 is Eversource's response to a
2	question about capitalization threshold.
3	Exhibit 4 is Liberty's response to a similar
4	question. Five (5) and 6 in the same vein
5	regarding that capitalization question. And then,
6	7 and 8 are responses from Liberty regarding a
7	comparative software coding question in another
8	matter that came up at the prehearing conference.
9	(The documents, as described, were
10	herewith marked as <b>Exhibit 3</b>
11	through <b>Exhibit 8,</b> respectively,
12	for identification.)
13	CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Anything
14	else as a preliminary matter or should we proceed
15	with the witnesses?
16	[No verbal response.]
17	CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. If the
18	witnesses could take their seats.
19	(Whereupon <b>Linda M. Enderwick</b> ,
20	Nicole M. Harris, and Amanda O.
21	<b>Noonan</b> were duly sworn by the
22	Court Reporter.)
23	CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: I assume each
24	counsel will introduce their own witnesses?

1		MS. CHIAVARA: Yes.
2		CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Proceed.
3		LINDA M. ENDERWICK, SWORN
4		NICOLE M. HARRIS, SWORN
5		AMANDA O. NOONAN, SWORN
6		DIRECT EXAMINATION
7	BY M	S. CHIAVARA:
8	Q	Ms. Enderwick, will up please state your full
9		name, company position, and your primary
LO		responsibilities for Eversource Energy for the
L1		record?
L2	А	(Enderwick) Sure. I'm Linda Enderwick. I'm an
L3		IT Business Services Manager at Eversource. And
L 4		I'm responsible for leading some of the IT large
L5		enhancements, as well as project delivery. I
L 6		have a team of analysts that support that project
L7		delivery, as well as working with third party
L8		suppliers, such as Tata Consulting Services, who
L 9		is the party that delivered these coding changes.
20	Q	Thank you. Marked as "Exhibit 1" [Exhibit 2?] is
21		your prefiled joint testimony, completed with
22		Nicole Harris of Liberty Utilities, dated May
23		17th, 2019. Was this testimony prepared by you
24		or at your direction?

(Enderwick) Yes. 1 Α 2 Do you have any corrections or adjustments to 3 make to this testimony? 4 (Enderwick) No. 5 So, do you adopt Exhibit 1 [Exhibit 2?] as your 6 testimony here today? 7 (Enderwick) Yes, I do. Α 8 As part of your involvement in this docket, were 9 you present for the settlement negotiations and 10 are you familiar with the Settlement terms? 11 (Enderwick) Yes, I am. Α 12 And what is Eversource receiving in the proposed 13 Settlement Agreement, compared to what they 14 requested as reflected in your testimony? 15 (Enderwick) Eversource is receiving the full Α 16 recovery cost of \$70,345. That was documented in 17 the testimony and it was also approved by the 18 Commission Staff and the office of the OCA. 19 Okay. Do you believe that this remedy is just 20 and reasonable given all the relevant 21 circumstances? 22 Α (Enderwick) Yes, I do. We did complete all of 23 the system changes that were expected. 24 actually were able to utilize some of the

```
functionality of our current system, and that
 1
 2
          allowed us to bring the cost in under the initial
 3
          project estimate.
 4
          All right. Does that conclude your testimony?
 5
          (Enderwick) Yes, it does.
 6
                    MS. CHIAVARA: Thank you very much.
 7
          am going to turn it over to Attorney Sheehan, for
          Liberty Utilities, for his witness.
 8
 9
                    CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Mr. Sheehan.
10
                    MR. SHEEHAN: Thank you.
11
     BY MR. SHEEHAN:
12
          Ms. Harris, could you state your name and your
13
          position with the Company please?
14
          (Harris) My name is Nicole M. Harris. I'm the
15
          Director of Customer Experience for the East
16
          Region.
17
          And, in the context of this case, were you the
18
          primary person responsible for what turned out to
19
          be the testimony and the Settlement Agreement
20
          that's before the Commission today?
21
          (Harris) Yes, I am.
     Α
22
          Exhibit 2, actually, is the testimony that's been
          marked today. Did you draft that testimony,
23
24
          along with Ms. Enderwick?
```

(Harris) Yes, I did. 1 Α 2 Do you have any changes to those portions of the 3 testimony that you were responsible for? 4 (Harris) No, I do not. 5 And do you adopt that testimony here today? 6 (Harris) Yes, I do. 7 You were also involved with the parties here in 8 the settlement conversations that resulted in the 9 Agreement that's before the Commission today, is 10 that right? 11 (Harris) Yes. Α 12 And, if you could turn to Page 6 of the 13 Settlement Agreement, the table that lists the 14 Liberty costs. Do you have that in front of you? 15 (Harris) I have the table, yes. Α 16 And that table shows four columns, one -- or, 17 five, one a description, then the "Estimate" of 18 what the Company thought it would cost to make 19 these changes, the "Actual", the "Revised", and 20 the "Settlement". The estimate was the number 21 provided to the Commission sometime ago, is that 22 right? (Harris) That is correct. 23 Α 24 And that was part of, I think, the last order of

the Commission approving the companies to go 1 2 forward with these changes, is that right? 3 Α (Harris) Yes. 4 The actual number, the 195,000, please explain, 5 if you can, the difference between the actual and 6 the revised. What happened between the 195 and 7 the 160,000? 8 (Harris) The original estimate did not include 9 burdens and AFDUC. 10 And, then, from the estimate to the actual, how 11 about from the actual to the revised, what made 12 it go down by thirty some thousand dollars? 13 (Harris) There was an invoice which was charged 14 incorrectly to the project that wasn't associated 15 to this particular enhancement. 16 So, that was discovered. And, so, our actual 17 costs, as revised, was \$160,000 to make these 18 changes? 19 (Harris) Yes. Α 20 And, then, through the course of our discussions, 21 the Company agreed, in this docket, to obtain 22 recovery of the 140,000, is that correct? 23 Α (Harris) Yes. 24 And that is just a settled amount that the

```
Company agreed to. There's no particular math
 1
 2
          that gets us to that number, is that correct?
 3
     Α
          (Harris) That is correct.
 4
          And, as the notes suggest, the difference between
 5
          the 140 and the 160 would be dealt with in the
 6
          ongoing rate case, is that correct?
 7
     Α
          (Harris) Yes.
 8
                    MR. SHEEHAN: Thank you. I have
 9
          nothing further.
10
                    CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.
11
          Ms. Schwarzer.
12
                    MS. SCHWARZER: Thank you.
1.3
     BY MS. SCHWARZER:
14
          Ms. Noonan, would you state your full name for
15
          the record please and your position?
16
          (Noonan) Certainly. My name is Amanda Noonan.
17
          I'm the Director of the Commission's Consumer
18
          Services and External Affairs Division.
19
          And what was your involvement with this process,
     Q
20
          the Settlement Agreement?
21
          (Noonan) Sure. I participated in all the
     Α
22
          technical sessions and settlement processes, as
23
          well as preparing and reviewing discovery that
24
          went out to Eversource and Liberty, and then
```

```
reviewing those responses.
 1
 2
                    MS. SCHWARZER: I'd like to ask if the
 3
          exhibits are in as full exhibits at this time?
 4
                    CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: No. I would do
 5
          that at the end. They are marked for ID at this
 6
          point.
 7
                    MS. SCHWARZER: Is it agreed that
          they're full exhibits? I just don't know if I
 8
 9
          need to ask my witness to identify them?
10
                    CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN:
                                        I would walk
11
          through. I think Eversource walked through
12
          theirs. And, if you can just walk through, just
1.3
          to --
                    MS. SCHWARZER: Okay. I think I will
14
15
          just -- if I may approach?
16
                    CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Yes.
17
    BY MS. SCHWARZER:
18
          Ms. Noonan, there are Exhibits 3 through 8 that
19
          have been marked in the upper left-hand corner.
20
          (Noonan) Uh-huh.
21
          For each exhibit, if you could answer as to
22
          whether you were part of drafting those questions
23
          and reviewing those responses in the course of
24
          this proceeding? Or, excuse me, reading those
```

1		responses?
2	А	(Noonan) Yes. For all of the exhibits, I
3		reviewed the questions and reviewed the
4		responses.
5	Q	And did you take them into account in the
6		Settlement Agreement?
7	А	(Noonan) Yes.
8	Q	Okay. Would you summarize Staff's position
9		please about the Settlement Agreement and why we
10		have chosen to support it?
11	А	(Noonan) Certainly. You know, Staff supports the
12		Agreement as filed as a reasonable resolution
13		regarding the IT costs that Eversource and
14		Liberty incurred to implement the program design
15		changes that the Commission approved in 2018,
16		earlier in this proceeding. And we believe that
17		the costs in here are appropriate for recovery
18		from the EAP fund.
19		MS. SCHWARZER: Thank you.
20		WITNESS NOONAN: Uh-huh.
21		CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. I understand
22		from the Settlement Agreement that there's an
23		agreement that there will not be cross from the
24		Parties. Is that correct? Everyone's on the

```
same page with that?
 1
 2
                         [Non-verbal indications given.]
 3
                    CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Then, I'm
 4
          going to go to Commissioner Bailey.
 5
                    CMSR. BAILEY:
                                   Thank you.
 6
     BY CMSR. BAILEY:
 7
          Ms. Noonan, did Staff review the invoices to
 8
          determine whether the costs were prudent?
 9
          (Noonan) So, we certainly received considerable
10
          amount of information through discovery that
11
          supported the costs that Liberty and Eversource
12
          requested. So, yes. We reached the conclusion
          that we did based on a review of that and the
13
          other information that we received.
14
15
          So, you're convinced that they spent that money,
16
          that they spent -- that Liberty spent at least
17
          $140,000 on making this change?
18
          (Noonan) Yes.
     Α
19
          And that Eversource spent $70,000?
20
          (Noonan) Yes.
21
          Okay. Rounded?
22
     Α
          (Noonan) Yes.
23
          Okay. Ms. Harris, does Liberty have an IT
24
          manager?
```

```
(Harris) We have a corporate IT.
                                             So, whenever
 1
 2
          there's a project that's underway, they assign a
 3
          program manager -- excuse me -- an IT program
 4
          manager to the particular --
 5
          Project?
 6
          (Harris) Thank you.
 7
          Okay. Was an IT manager -- I mean, a program
 8
          manager assigned to this project?
 9
          (Harris) Yes, they were.
10
          And where was that person located?
11
          (Harris) Out of Oakville, Ontario, Canada.
          Okay. There's a detailed account of Eversource
12
1.3
          invoices attached to the testimony, but there's
14
          no similar detailed account of your invoices.
15
          Can you explain why?
16
          (Harris) I'm sorry, in the original --
17
     Q
          In the testimony.
18
          (Harris) In the testimony?
19
          Exhibit 2, yes.
20
          (Harris) There were subsequent data requests that
21
          had come through, which had the -- we provided
22
          that information at that point.
23
          Can you tell me why it wasn't provided initially
24
          in the testimony?
```

```
(Harris) I provided a chart, and we broke down
 1
     Α
 2
          the charges.
 3
     Q
          And I'm just comparing how you did it to how
 4
          Eversource did it, because your costs were more
 5
          than twice Eversource's costs. And I'm trying to
 6
          understand whether that was reasonable and why
 7
          that happened. So, you know, Eversource shows
 8
          how much analysis and design costs, how much
 9
          build and testing costs, how much integration
10
          testing costs, how much user acceptance testing
11
          costs, and you just say "our vendor costs are
          $133,665."
12
13
          (Harris) Correct. I believe there was a
     Α
14
          following request where it was broken out by
15
          design and specifications for 19,000; development
16
          was 45,000; QA, quality assurance, was 40,000;
17
          and project management was 25,000. So, we're
18
          looking at about 129,000 for the total Cogsdale
19
          vendor costs.
20
                    CMSR. GIAIMO: Could you do that one
21
          more time?
22
    BY CMSR. BAILEY:
          Yes. Could you do that one more time?
23
24
     Α
          (Harris) Oh, I'm sorry.
```

Just talk more slowly. 1 Q 2 (Harris) Okay. So, there's four categories: 3 Design and specification, for 19,000, rounded; 4 development, 45,000; QA, for "Quality Assurance", 5 40,000; and project management, 25,000. And was project management the project manager in 6 7 Oakdale [Oakville?]? 8 (Harris) No. From the vendor side. 9 Okay. And was all the system acceptance testing 10 and the integration testing included in the QA? 11 (Harris) That is Q&A on their side. So, once the Α 12 vendor, Cogsdale, provides us with the code, it 13 goes through a process with our corporate IT 14 folks, that department up there, and they put 15 that code into a test environment. Those IT 16 folks, corporate IT folks, test the code. And, 17 then, once it's tested successfully, it's handed 18 off to the business to do user acceptance 19 testing. 20 Okay. Why did you choose Cogsdale? 21 (Harris) Cogsdale is our primary CIS provider. Α 22 So, they --23 (Harris) So, they own the code to our CIS system. We don't own the system. So, any enhancements or 24

code changes within the system has to go through 1 2 Cogsdale. 3 Do you think that might be one of the reasons why 4 it was twice as expensive to make these changes? 5 (Harris) I think it is, that every CIS system is 6 different. 7 Do you understand what kind of changes were made 8 and what kind of difficult coding was necessary? 9 (Harris) Yes. Α 10 Can you explain that? 11 (Harris) At a high level. So, there was various 12 decisioning that needed to be made. Although the 13 calculation, when you look at it on paper, is 14 easy, but to have the system do that decisioning, 15 to identify the customer, okay, does this 16 customer have the EAP program? They have to look 17 at what type of rate they're on, time-of-use rate 18 or the regular rate. And then they have to 19 identify whether or not they're enrolled with a 20 marketer. So, there's certain decisioning that 21 needs to be put in there and flags within the 22 system. And, when those flags are triggered, if 23 they have a marketer, then they have to not bill 24 on that marketer rate, but go to another table to

```
bill on the default service rate.
 1
 2
          That seems pretty standard to me. Ms. Enderwick,
 3
          did your programmers have to do anything
 4
          different than that kind of analysis and
 5
          decision-making?
 6
          (Enderwick) No, that was similar. I believe that
 7
          we had some existing code that possibly Liberty
 8
          did not. For some of that processing, we had
 9
          already had in our system.
10
          Can you tell me which, what kind of the code you
11
          already had in your system?
12
          (Enderwick) So, the whole process of looking to
13
          see if somebody is on a supplier and looking --
14
          comparing the rates, I believe. And I don't want
15
          to speak for them. But, again, every system is
16
          different.
17
    Q
          Yes. And that's what you already had in place in
18
          your system?
19
          (Enderwick) Correct.
    Α
20
                    CMSR. BAILEY: Okay.
                                          Thank you. Okay.
21
          I think that's it. Thank you.
22
                    CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Commissioner
23
          Giaimo.
24
                    CMSR. GIAIMO: Good morning.
```

```
WITNESS HARRIS: Good morning.
 1
 2
                    WITNESS ENDERWICK:
                                        Good morning.
 3
                    CMSR. GIAIMO: So, I have a couple of
 4
          questions in order to clarify my understanding.
 5
     BY CMSR. GIAIMO:
 6
          There was a suggestion that Liberty needs to use
 7
          a vendor to work on Cogsdale. And that are you
 8
          precluded from having someone internally working
 9
          on Cogsdale?
10
          (Harris) On the code, any changes to the core
11
          code has to be done by the vendor.
12
          And that's part of the agreement that you -- that
1.3
          the Company worked through in purchasing Cogsdale
14
          or the agreement you have with that company?
15
          (Harris) That's correct.
     Α
          Do you know if you're the only utility that finds
16
17
          itself in the situation where you outsourced code
18
          to the vendor?
19
          (Harris) I can't answer that question. I'm not
     Α
20
          an IT expert. But, if there's, you know, the
21
          entire -- or, there's several Liberty Utilities
22
          companies on the same system. And, if any code
23
          changes are needed, they have to follow the same
24
          process.
```

So, Attorney Sheehan said, in his 1 Q Okay. 2 questioning to you, and I think what I heard him 3 say was "there's nothing magical about the 4 \$140,000 number." To me, that sounds like it's 5 arbitrary. Can you help me understand why that 6 number is or is not arbitrary? 7 (Harris) There was no numbers that were Α 8 associated to that. I know that, in the 9 settlement discussions and in the Settlement, or 10 proposed Settlement, it indicated that -- that 11 there were additional code changes put in 12 conjunction with the EAP supplier changes. it had to do with the low income rate and the 13 14 time-of-use rate, to change that from a manual 15 process to an automated process. 16 Okay. So, is there a way of -- is the suggestion 17 that there are certain benefits that are going to 18 flow beyond the EAP, and, as such, the costs 19 should be recovered differently than through this 20 mechanism? 21 (Harris) Yes. Α 2.2. Okay. When were the upgrades put into service? 23 My question is for both. 24 Α (Enderwick) October 1st, 2018.

```
(Harris) December 2018.
 1
     Α
 2
          And have you received any feedback as to whether
          the upgrades have been successful and, in fact,
 3
 4
          are working?
 5
          (Enderwick) Yes.
 6
          (Harris) Yes.
 7
          Okay. Do we know if any low income customers
          have begun taking advantage of the competitive
 8
 9
          market in response to the putting in of the
10
          software?
11
          (Enderwick) That I don't know, I'm sorry. We
     Α
12
          could find that out.
          (Harris) We have under 100 customers on EAP with
13
14
          a marketer, low income rate with a marketer.
15
          Okay. Has that number grown since December?
     0
16
          (Harris) I would say it's probably about the
17
          same.
18
                    CMSR. GIAIMO: Okay. All right.
19
          That's all the questions I have. Thank you.
20
                    CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.
21
     BY CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN:
22
          Ms. Harris, I'm looking at Page 6, I believe, of
23
          the Settlement Agreement with the table that
          we've all been looking at. And there are costs
24
```

```
in your "Actual" column for "Labor-Corporate" and
 1
 2
          then "New Hampshire". And, then, in your
 3
          "Revised" column, those numbers go down. So, I
 4
          just want to be clear. The actual numbers
 5
          related to this are, for Corporate, $347, and,
          for New Hampshire, 6,515?
 7
    Α
          (Harris) Yes. That was -- that was that project
 8
          that was misassigned.
 9
          Okay. And could you just describe what, even at
10
          the 6,900 number approximately, what that covers?
11
          (Harris) It covers requirement gathering,
    Α
12
          testing, and implementation.
13
          Done by Liberty itself?
14
         (Harris) Correct.
15
                    CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. That's my
16
          only question.
17
                    Is there follow-up from the utilities or
18
          the Staff?
19
                    MS. SCHWARZER: I have a point of
20
          clarification. I believe Commissioner Giaimo
21
          asked Liberty if the difference between the 160
22
          and the 140 ought to be recovered in the rate
23
          case. And it is certainly Liberty's position
24
          that it ought to be.
```

But, in our Settlement Agreement, on Page 3, we have, as part of the Agreement, the Parties agreed that this Settlement would not be construed to imply that, by Staff or OCA, that recovery — about whether those costs should be recovered or not. And that matter is left totally open, to be addressed in the rate case. Just a point of clarification.

1.3

2.2

CMSR. GIAIMO: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. So, we have no objection on any of the exhibits. So, we will strike ID on those, and they will be admitted as full exhibits.

And, then, I think we'll go to sum up, starting with Ms. Shute.

MS. SHUTE: Thank you, Commissioners.

The Office of the Consumer Advocate supports the Settlement Agreement as filed. The Energy Assistance Program is important to low income residential ratepayers, and ensuring that those ratepayers can also engage in the advantage of the competitive supply is a matter of fairness, and justified the expense to the EAP fund.

The recommendation of the Electric

Assistance Advisory Board for the supplement software implementation was based on the necessity for consolidated billing to facilitate this equity opportunity.

2.

1.3

2.2.

The order required that we determine prudence and reasonableness in this docket. The audit report in 19-064 assigned evaluation of this entire amount to this case, to 18-057, with removal from the rate case. We have diligently investigated the costs that Eversource and Liberty have been seeking through recovery.

We recommended and settled at 140K as suggested, because there were a portion of the costs that were not specifically incremental to the EAP program. And we do note that the difference between the 160 and the 195 is still a little bit in limbo. Right? The audit has assigned it to 18-057, and the 18-057 has looked at the costs, it's then been reduced from 195 to 160, and we settled on 140 to be recovered through this.

So, we will be taking a look at that through the other rate case. And we have communicated with the Company and submitted a

request regarding those additional funds.

So, in essence, we support this recovery and we support the Settlement Agreement, and recommend your approval.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Thank you.

Ms. Schwarzer.

1.3

2.2

MS. SCHWARZER: Thank you.

Staff has diligently investigated the request that both Eversource and Liberty made for recovery from the EAP fund in connection with the software work at issue here. There were three technical sessions and multiple data requests in some detail.

Based on the work of all of the Parties,
Staff recommends that paying Liberty the \$140,000
and Eversource 70,345 is just and reasonable, and
will -- accurately supports the work that was
necessary to achieve the design changes that were
necessary to comply with the Commission's order.

We particularly want to thank the Office of the Consumer Advocate for the work they did in the discovery requests, and all parties worked hard to reach this agreement.

Thank you.

1 CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Thank you. 2. Ms. Chiavara. 3 MS. CHIAVARA: Yes. Just echoing the 4 previous comments, Eversource followed the 5 Advisory Board's recommendation for implementing 6 software modifications to accommodate applying the EAP discount to customers' energy supplier 7 charges, even for those customers that were getting their supply from competitive suppliers. 9 10 And that all Parties to this Settlement 11 Agreement enter them into with good faith. And we 12 respectfully request that the Commission approve and execute this Settlement Agreement. 1.3 14 Thank you. 15 CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Thank you. 16 Mr. Sheehan. 17 MR. SHEEHAN: Thank you. 18 Recalling that this started with an 19 April 2018 recommendation to the Commission to do 20 this project, and that recommendation included 2.1 Liberty's estimate of \$180,000 to do the work. 2.2. The Commission approved that recommendation in its 23 order, aware of the estimate that we made.

24

Company came in well under that estimate, at

\$160,000. And due to the fact that some of the computer work done may not be directly related to adjusting the rate for a supplier, some of the work had to be done for adjusting the time-of-use calculations for EAP customers. There was some gray there. And the Parties discussed that gray, whether it would be -- fall squarely under the recommendation order, or whether it should be treated a little bit separately. That's where the source of the agreement came from.

2.2

There was not precise itemization where we could deduct X dollars, so we agreed that 140 would be a reasonable approximation of the costs that were directly in the four corners of the recommendation and order. So, that's sort of a high-level history of how we got here.

And I support and echo the other parties. And, so, we ask you to approve this as a just and reasonable resolution of this matter.

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you very much. We are going to close the record then. We'll take the matter under advisement, and we will issue an order as soon as we can.

1	And thank you, everyone, as always, for
2	working hard together to reach agreement. We're
3	adjourned.
4	(Whereupon the hearing was
5	adjourned at 10:41 a.m.)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	