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PROCEEDINGS
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: We're here this morning to continue the hearing in DE 19-057 regarding the Eversource Energy Petition for Permanent Rates. We already made the necessary findings to hold this hearing remotely. I would like to remind everyone that if there is a problem during the hearing with your connection, please call
(603)271-2431. And if the public are unable to participate, the hearing will be adjourned and rescheduled.

Okay. We need to take a roll call attendance of the Commission. My name is Dianne Martin. I am the Chairwoman of the Public Utilities Commission, and I am alone.

Commissioner Bailey.
COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Commissioner
Kathryn Bailey, and I am alone.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right.
Let's take appearances from attorneys who are here for today's presentation, starting with Mr. Fossum.

MR. FOSSUM: Good morning,
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Commissioners and all. Matthew Fossum here for Public Service Company of New Hampshire, doing business as Eversource Energy.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Thank you.
And Mr. Kreis.
MR. KREIS: Good morning,
Commissioners. Good morning, colleagues.
I'm D. Maurice Kreis, the consumer advocate, here as always on behalf of residential utility customers.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: All right. Thank you.

And Ms. Amidon. You're on mute.
MS. AMIDON: Suzanne Amidon for Commission Staff, along with my two co-counsel.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

And for today I have Mr. Burke.
MR. BURKE: Good morning,
Commissioners and everyone. Raymond Burke,
New Hampshire Legal Assistance, representing The Way Home.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Thank You.
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And Mr. Skoglund is going to be in today. Do I have that right?

MR. SKOGLUND: Yes, this is Chris Skoglund, from New Hampshire DES, appearing with Becky Ohler, who will be the prime spokesperson for New Hampshire DES.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay.
Excellent. Thank you.
And Mr. Emerson.
MR. EMERSON: Eli Emerson from the law firm of Primmer, Piper \& Cramer, on behalf of Clean Energy New Hampshire. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Thank You. And Ms. Birchard. Melissa, is that right?

MS. BIRCHARD: Yes, that's right.
Good morning, Ms. Chairwoman, Commissioner Bailey and others. My name is Melissa Birchard, appearing on behalf of ChargePoint, from the law firm Keyes \& Fox.
(Pause in proceedings. Connectivity issues.)
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. I can hear you, but I don't know what's going on with my connection. But let's continue for
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the time being because I can see all of you. All right. Mr. Coffman.

MR. COFFMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Appearing on behalf of AARP, I'm John Coffman.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: (connectivity issue) Hmm. What's going on?

MR. WIND: All right. We're going to pause momentarily. It appears the Chairwoman has lost the connection. (Brief recess was taken at 10:17 a.m., and the hearing resumed at 10:22 a.m.) CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: I think we had left off with Mr. Coffman.

MR. COFFMAN: Do I need to make my appearance again? John Coffman for AARP.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Excellent. Thank you. I apologize. I missed the end of it because I lost my connection.

Okay. Is there anything we need to do before we proceed with the next panel? MS. AMIDON: This is Attorney Amidon. I just wanted to point out that for the second panel today, I'm trying to take
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care of this at the outset, Rich Chagnon should be listed as also one of the panelists. And this is for the base resilience investment section. That's the second panel.

And I also wanted to note that I added a witness for the Office of Consumer Advocate to the rate design panel; that's the third panel. Ron Nelson is their consultant on rate design, and he will be part of the panel on that issue. That's all I had. I just wanted to make sure that that housekeeping was taken care of.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: I appreciate that. Thank you.

Okay. Then why don't we go ahead with today's first panel today on electric vehicles.

Ms. Robidas, when the witnesses are brought up, can you swear them in, please? (WHEREUPON, DOUGLAS HORTON, MADELINE MINEAU, KEVIN MILLER and RICHARD CHAGNON were duly sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter.)
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[WITNESS PANEL: HORTON|MINEAU|MILLER|CHAGNON]

DOUGLAS HORTON, SWORN
MADELINE MINEAU, SWORN
KEVIN MILLER, SWORN
RICHARD CHAGNON, SWORN
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. Which attorney is going to go first with this panel?

MR. FOSSUM: You know, I don't know that we discussed that. I'm fine to do so, if that's agreeable to others.
[No verbal response]
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: You're the only volunteer, so go right ahead.

MR. FOSSUM: I guess that makes Eversource the winner.

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. FOSSUM:
Q. In that case, Mr. Horton, since you had testified yesterday, we'll forego the usual qualification, with one exception. I'll just ask you to restate for the record your name, your position and responsibilities, please.
A. (Horton) My name's Doug Horton. I'm vice-president of distribution rates and
\{DE 19-057\} [DAY 2 - MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{10-27-20\}
[WITNESS PANEL: HORTON|MINEAU|MILLER|CHAGNON]
regulatory requirements for Eversource. And my responsibility and my team's
responsibility are to facilitate the regulatory filings for any regulatory rate change filing at the Commission.
Q. And just to again refresh from yesterday, you're familiar with the terms of the settlement agreement that's pending before the Commission today?
A. (Horton) Yes.
Q. Okay. For this panel, we're looking specifically at electric vehicles. So if I could direct your attention to Section 16 of the settlement. And I know that you briefly covered this in your overview yesterday morning, but could you please just explain your understanding, the Company's understanding of what this section requires and anticipates.
A. (Horton) Yup. So it's not very long and it does speak for itself. But certainly a quick overview, if it's helpful.

No. 1 , we have committed to make a filing within four months of the Commission's
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approval of the settlement agreement that will cover a proposal for make-ready infrastructure investments related to electric vehicle charging infrastructure in New Hampshire. As part of that filing, we will include a proposal for an alternative to demand charges for electric vehicles, which at times can be an additional inhibitor to adoption of electric vehicles, or at least making it cost-prohibitive when compared to traditional fuel resources. And that we will collaborate with the interested parties to this settlement agreement in the development of that proposal that will be filed within four months of this agreement.

And then 16.3 just acknowledges that we have not reached agreement as a settlement group, anything related to cost recovery that might be accompanied by that proposal. And we acknowledge that that will need to be separately justified in that proposal, and that we'd also include in that proposal a discussion of the costs and the benefits of the make-ready proposal that we've committed
[WITNESS PANEL: HORTON|MINEAU|MILLER|CHAGNON]
to filing.
Q. Thank you. And just to be clear, as with the other provisions of this agreement, is it your position and the Company's position that this is a just and reasonable provision?
A. (Horton) Yes.
Q. Thank you.

MR. FOSSUM: That's what I have for direct on this topic.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Emerson, would you like to go next?

MR. EMERSON: Yeah, that would be great. All right. My witness is Ms. Mineau.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. EMERSON:
Q. Could you please state your name for the record.
A. (Mineau) Madeline Mineau.
Q. Could you also state your employer and your position.
A. (Mineau) I'm the executive director of Clean Energy New Hampshire.
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Q. And have you ever testified in front of the New Hampshire PUC before?
A. (Mineau) I have previously submitted testimony in Docket 17-136, the ERS for the 2019 update. And I also adopted my predecessor's testimony in DE 17-189, the Liberty Battery docket.
Q. Thank you. And do you have before you right now what's been marked as Exhibit 21, which is prefiled testimony by you, dated December 20th, 2019, that includes one attachment to that testimony?
A. (Mineau) Yes, I do.
Q. And was this prepared by you or at your direction?
A. (Mineau) Yes.
Q. Do you have any corrections to that testimony today?
A. (Mineau) No, I do not.
Q. Do you adopt that testimony for this proceeding?
A. (Mineau) Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. And did you participate in the negotiation and drafting of the settlement
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agreement?
A. (Mineau) Yes.
Q. And you're familiar with the terms thereof?
A. (Mineau) I am.
Q. Do you support the settlement agreement, specifically including Section 16 related to electric vehicles?
A. (Mineau) Yes.

MR. EMERSON: That's all I have. CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. Thank you.

And Ms. Birchard.
MR. BIRCHARD: Yes, thank you. And my witness today is Kevin Miller.

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. BIRCHARD:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Miller. Would you please state your name and position for the record.
A. (Miller) Sure. My name is Kevin George Miller. I'm the director of public policy for ChargePoint.
Q. And Mr. Miller, have you delivered testimony before this Commission or any other public utilities commission before?
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A. (Miller) Yes. I have presented in a non-adjudicated docket, IR 20-004, in New Hampshire. I have also prepared and delivered testimony and served as an expert witness in Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, and in Maryland.
Q. And Mr. Miller, you prepared direct testimony in this proceeding; correct?
A. (Miller) Yes, that is correct.
Q. Do you have that testimony before you, premarked Exhibit No. 22?
A. (Miller) Yes, I do.
Q. You prepared that testimony both on behalf of ChargePoint, Incorporated, as well as on behalf of Clean Energy New Hampshire; is that correct?
A. (Miller) Yes, that is correct.
Q. And that is the only testimony that you have provided so far in this proceeding; correct?
A. (Miller) That's correct.
Q. Do you have any corrections to make to that testimony?
A. (Miller) No, I do not.
Q. If I were to ask you the same questions that
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appear in your written testimony live today, would your answers be the same?
A. (Miller) Yes, they would.
Q. Is that testimony true and accurate to the best of your knowledge, and do you adopt that testimony here today?
A. (Miller) Yes, it is, and I do.
Q. Mr. Miller, do you also support the settlement agreement in this proceeding as just and reasonable?
A. (Miller) Yes.

MR. BIRCHARD: Honorable
Chairwoman, I move for the admission of the direct testimony of Kevin George Miller, which has been premarked as Exhibit No. 22. And I also make Witness Miller available for questions.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right.
Thank you. We will take up all of the exhibits at the end of the proceedings. I assume there is no objection to the admission of Mr. Miller's testimony -- (connectivity issue)
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
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CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: We will take up all of the exhibits at the end of the proceeding. And I assume there is no objection to admission of Mr. Miller's testimony, based upon the settlement agreement. And then Ms. Amidon was speaking.

Ms. Amidon.
MS. AMIDON: Are you ready, Sue? Thank you.

Yes, I just wanted to inquire of Mr. Chagnon if he had any additional comments or observations about this provision in the settlement agreement.

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. AMIDON:
Q. We already heard yesterday that you support the agreement. But if you have any additional comments on this particular provision, please provide them for the Commission now. You're on mute, Mr. Chagnon.
A. (Chagnon) Thank you. Staff supported this provision in the agreement in order to achieve a global settlement. Staff looks forward to reviewing any proposal made by
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PSNH regarding make-ready investments for electric vehicle charging infrastructure and reviewing any proposal for alternatives to demand charges for electric vehicle charging rates. We do not have any position at this time of what to expect from these proposals, and we do not prejudge any possible outcomes. Thank you, Mr. Chagnon.

MS. AMIDON: That's all I had, Madam Chairwoman.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

And since everyone has agreed to forego cross, I will go directly to Commissioner Bailey.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Thank You.
Good morning, everyone. I don't have any questions for this panel. As Mr. Horton said, it speaks for itself. And I think this was a good way to handle this important issue. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: I am in the same place. I do not have any questions on this section because it was very brief and it
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speaks for itself. So, thank you all for your testimony. And I think we can move to the next panel at this point.

Mr. Wind, I think we just need Mr.
Demmer and Mr. Lajoie.
(WHEREUPON, LEE LAJOIE AND KURT DEMMER were duly sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter.)

LEE LAJOIE, SWORN
KURT DEMMER, SWORN
DOUGLAS HORTON, SWORN
RICHARD CHAGNON, SWORN
MS. AMIDON: And Madam Chair and
Commissioner Bailey, my co-counsel, Brian D.
Buckley, will be conducting the inquiry in the next panel. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Great. Thank you.
(Connectivity issue)
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Let's go off
the record for a second.
(Pause in proceedings)
COMMISSIONER BAILEY: We're going
to need to take a five-minute recess. So
\{DE 19-057\} [DAY 2 - MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{10-27-20\}
[WITNESS PANEL: LAJOIE|DEMMER|HORTON|CHAGNON]
we'll try again at 10:40.
(Brief recess was taken at 10:35 a.m., and the hearing resumed at 10:56 a.m.) CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Let's proceed. Did we get to swearing in the witnesses?

Mr. Fossum, would you like to
start?
MR. FOSSUM: Certainly. Since Mr.
Horton has been qualified, I'll just do the same with Mr. Lajoie.

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. FOSSUM:
Q. Mr. Lajoie, could you please state your name, position and responsibilities for the record.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Mr. Lajoie, you're on mute.
Q. We're not hearing you.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Is your microphone on?
A. (Lajoie) Can you hear me now?
Q. Ah, there you go.
A. (Lajoie) Sorry about that. Good morning. My name is Lee Lajoie. I am employed by Eversource Energy as manager of system
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resiliency. In recent years I've had responsibility for the reliability enhancement program, which supported up to $\$ 40$ million of annual capital investment targeted at reliability projects. As the REP program matured and tapered off, I have taken on broader responsibility for the capital budgeting process. In addition, there are two internal groups which report to me, the reliability reporting group and the distribution automation group.
Q. Thank you. And Mr. Lajoie, have you previously testified before this Commission?
A. (Lajoie) Yes, I have.
Q. Now, Mr. Lajoie, did you, back on May 28th, 2019, file testimony and attachments in what has been marked for identification as Exhibit 7?
A. (Lajoie) Yes, I did.
Q. And was that testimony prepared by you or at your direction?
A. (Lajoie) Yes, it was filed -- (connectivity issue)

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Just a minute,
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Mr. Lajoie.
MR. FOSSUM: A lot of feedback in there.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Now we can't hear you. We're off the record.
(Pause in proceedings)
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Let's try this again. Go back on the record. Oh, let's go off the record. Looks like we just lost video as well.
(Pause in proceedings)
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Back on the record.

BY MR. FOSSUM:
Q. All right. I'll pick up where I left. You were answering the question about whether the testimony in Exhibit 7 was prepared by you or at your direction.
A. (Lajoie) Yes, it was, for the portions of testimony that $I$ was responsible for.
Q. And do you have any corrections to that testimony this morning?
A. (Lajoie) No, I do not.
Q. And do you adopt that as your testimony for
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this proceeding?
A. (Lajoie) Yes, I do.
Q. Mr. Lajoie, did you also file testimony and attachments as part of the Company's rebuttal on March 4, 2020, which has been marked as Exhibits 45 and 46 for the redacted and confidential versions?
A. (Lajoie) Yes, I did.
Q. And was that testimony prepared by you or at your direction?
A. (Lajoie) Yes, it was.
Q. And do you have any corrections to that testimony?
A. (Lajoie) No, I do not.
Q. And do you adopt that testimony as your testimony for this proceeding?
A. (Lajoie) Yes, I do.
Q. Mr. Lajoie, are you familiar with the terms of the agreement that is pending before the Commission today?
A. (Lajoie) Yes, I am.
Q. In particular, I'd like to, Mr. Lajoie, direct your attention to Section 11 of the agreement. And could you please discuss your
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understanding of what is required by that section and the resiliency issues that are discussed there.
A. (Lajoie) Yes, I will. The Company has concerns with the distribution system in New Hampshire, in that it is aging faster than it can be replaced. Our viewpoint is that we need to accelerate investment on a planned basis to improve the condition of the system, to increase reliability, and improve capacity to host distributed energy resources. We entered this rate case with a proposal to accelerate investment in renewing the system which was focused on poles, wires and substations. Approximately 40 percent of our poles are over 40 years old, and the poles installed back then were shorter and smaller in diameter, which means they are less able to withstand degradation from impact, decay and insects. Up until a few years ago, we were an open wire company. Since that time, we have transitioned to covered wire, which is better able to withstand the impacts of trees, limbs and other external items. We
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are also installing a larger-diameter conductor, which is physically stronger electrically, has more capacity, and enables the system to more easily host distributed energy resources and allow for two-way power flow.

Substation enhancements include the replacement of oil-filled circuit breakers with vacuum breakers and the replacement of their associated electromechanical relays with solid state devices.

Other parties to the proceeding, Staff in particular, had concerns about the need for or the value of those investments. So in the settlement we have agreed to an outside assessment of the overall Eversource distribution system in New Hampshire and a survey of our customers to attempt to balance the need for a reliable system with the level of investment necessary. The assessment will review the overall age and condition of the system and make recommendations as to shortand long-term investment plans. It will also evaluate the strategies the Company is
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currently using to upgrade system condition and resiliency; to assess cost versus strength benefit, including the larger-diameter poles, composite crossarms versus wood crossarms; covered wire and the relocation of right-of-way lines to roadside. Recommendations from this assessment will be implemented on a basis consistent with least cost planning principles.
Q. Thank you very much. Mr. Lajoie, did you listen in to the session that was conducted yesterday in this proceeding?
A. (Iajoie) Yes, I did.
Q. And did you hear and do you recall the questions and answers at that session that were asked regarding the Company's decisions to proceed or not with certain capital projects based on cost concerns in particular?
A. (Iajoie) Yes, I did.
Q. And did you hear Ms. Menard's explanation and answer?
A. (Iajoie) Yes, I did.
Q. And do you have any additional detail to
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provide on that issue beyond what Ms. Menard provided yesterday?
A. (Lajoie) Yeah, a few points. As discussed by Ms. Menard yesterday, project development is a four-step process. First, a potential project is identified as needed to resolve a particular issue -- for example, to improve reliability or to install or replace infrastructure.

Second, we develop a conceptual estimate which is used to help prioritize the list of proposed projects, to determine which projects of the entirety of the projects that are proposed will fit within the limits of the capital budget. For example: In 2020, over 50 projects were proposed by our field engineering group, each of which required a conceptual estimate in order to be evaluated. This list was narrowed to 20 projects which were included in our capital budget plan. Third, if a project is to move forward, we develop a detailed project budget by clarifying and enhancing the conceptual estimate. Depending on the project, this
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could involve performing detailed engineering, obtaining bids from contractors and so forth.

Fourth, finally, we review the final project costs and variances. As the project moves through this process, there could be changes. Depending on the justification for the project, it might be decided that the cost increase is justified and necessary, and therefore approved. Or it could be decided that the project was no longer justified and therefore would not be completed. For example: Reliability-based projects are typically evaluated on the basis of cost per saved customer minute. If a project cost is projected to significantly exceed the conceptual estimate, and therefore the cost per saved customer minute has significantly increased, the project could be cancelled. This recently happened in 2020 with a project proposed in the town of Lancaster.

Reliability in that particular area may be below average, but there is no safety or other significant risk to the public, so the
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project was cancelled. However, if a project is proposed to perhaps replace a piece of equipment which has been determined to be on the verge of failure, or to alleviate an overloaded piece of equipment, and the proposed solution is the most cost-effective method to accomplish the goal, the project would seek and likely be approved for additional funding. This funding would have to be offset with reductions in other areas in order to stay within the total capital budget.
Q. And so is it fair to say that along this project life cycle that you were describing, that there are a number of opportunities, instances to review the costs of various projects, the need for those projects, and the justification for those projects?
A. (Lajoie) Yes. Absolutely. The initial conceptual proposal is reviewed by a team of approximately a dozen managers and directors on the engineering team and the operations team. And that's where the decision is made to move forward to the next step of a
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detailed project estimate or not. As the project moves through its life cycle, a group meets monthly to review project expenditures, projections for the remainder of the year, for the remainder of the project and so forth, and that's where some of that balancing takes place. If a project requires additional funding, supplemental authorization is sought, as I mentioned, for any project that requires additional funding, and that goes through an entire approval process in itself.
Q. Thank you. Transitioning slightly, Mr.

Lajoie. Did you also hear and do you recall from yesterday's discussion on tree trimming and vegetation -- did you hear the discussion yesterday related to tree trimming and vegetation management?
A. (Lajoie) Yes, I did.
Q. And do you recall hearing, I don't think it's much of a paraphrase to say a question along the lines of, "How do you determine when the amount of trimming is enough?"
A. (Lajoie) Yes, I did.
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Q. So turning to you, in your role. How would the Company assess or propose to assess an appropriate level of trimming and veg management activity?
A. (Lajoie) As mentioned, I'm not in control of the tree trimming program. However, in my role as the manager of system resiliency, we do track reliability, which is broken out into overall reliability, and specifically events which relate to tree trimming. So there are a number of factors that we might consider to determine the correct level of tree trimming, including looking through these reliability metrics that are affected by trees, to see whether they're going up, down or staying steady.

In addition to the concerns about the impact on reliability from trees, one of the other important things to keep in mind in assessing the appropriate amount of trimming is the Commission itself has directed that electric utilities maintain a trimming cycle of no more than five years. Up until now, with trimming funding in both base rates and
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the REP program together, we have improved and have met this goal with a trimming cycle in the area of four years. The amount in the settlement is less than we had requested when we first approached with the rate case, but it is in line with our recent spending. While it appears from some of the bids we are getting from trimming contractors that costs will be higher going forward than in the recent past, we will be working with the budgets, as we have been, in the settlement to maintain our trimming in line with the Commission's requirements. As part of any assessment on trimming going forward, that is one of the factors we will need to be sure to consider.

At the end, we will have a review that will look at certain trimming activities, as well as other information on the customer's value on reliability. And we have the Commission's requirements. And we can work from that base of information to determine an appropriate level of trimming investment for New Hampshire.
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And as part of the settlement, we have agreed to file two trimming reports annually: One in November, which lays out the plan for the following year, and one by March 1st, which details the achievements of the prior year.
Q. And Mr. Lajoie, is it your opinion and the Company's position that the requirements around this section, more broadly speaking as part of the settlement, are just and reasonable?
A. (Lajoie) Yes, it is my opinion. Yes.
Q. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: That's what I have for direct at this time.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right.
Thank you. Mr. Buckley.
MR. BUCKLEY: Thank you, Madam
Chair. I'll proceed by qualifying Mr. Demmer and then just doing a brief direct with him.

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. BUCKLEY:
Q. Mr. Demmer, can you please state your full
name for the record?
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A. (Demmer) Yes. My name is Kurt Demmer. I am employed -- excuse me. Yes, this is Kurt Demmer. Sorry.
Q. And by whom are you employed, and what is your position with that employer?
A. (Demmer) I'm employed with the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission as a senior utility analysis for the Electric Division.
Q. And have you previously testified before the Commission?
A. (Demmer) Yes, I have.
Q. And did you participate in the investigation of this petition?
A. (Demmer) Yes, I have.
Q. What aspects of the petition did you examine?
A. (Demmer) My testimony largely focused on resiliency and reliability investments as part of the GTEP initiative proposed by the Company. In addition, I also performed a reliability analysis of the Company's ongoing veg management program and provided testimony to that end.
Q. And so you mentioned your testimony. Would it be accurate to say that what is marked for
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identification as Exhibit 34 reflects the prefiled testimony that you prepared for this proceeding?
A. (Demmer) Yes, it does.
Q. And do you have any corrections to make to that testimony?
A. (Demmer) No, I do not.
Q. And do you affirm that your testimony accurately represents your opinions at the time you prepared it, from facts known to you at the time you prepared it, adopting it here today for those purposes?
A. (Demmer) Yes.
Q. Would it be fair and accurate to say that you raised certain concerns in your testimony relating to the Company's planned GTEP program, Grid Transformation and Enablement Program; certain base resilience investments; enhanced tree trimming; and hazard tree removal activities, amongst other things?
A. (Demmer) Yes, I did.
Q. And did you participate in the development of the settlement agreement before the Commission?
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A. (Demmer) Yes, I did.
Q. And are you familiar with the terms of that settlement agreement?
A. (Demmer) Yes, I am.
Q. So, Settlement Sections 11.1 and 11.2 , and 11 more broadly, discuss a condition assessment. Can you tell me why there is value in such an assessment and the subsequent review of the assessment in the Company's LCIRP proceeding?
A. (Demmer) The LCIRP proceeding is a forwardlooking document in a proceeding. Going forward over the next several years, there will be hundreds of millions of dollars of infrastructure investments. The initial Company engineering assessment into the Company's infrastructure condition and investments, and follow-up subsequent Staff's engineering assessment, will demonstrate the reliability and resiliency benefit of the resiliency investments, as well as ETT and ETR, including any quantifiable or qualitative benefits that could be utilized in a cost benefit analysis. Staff feels this engineering analysis will strike a balance
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between net benefits and ratepayer impact.
Q. And do you believe the concerns addressed within your testimony are adequately alleviated by the provisions within the settlement relating to those concerns?
A. (Demmer) Yes, I do.
Q. And do you believe that this settlement agreement meets the public interest standard and will result in just and reasonable rates?
A. (Demmer) Yes, it does.
Q. And just to attempt to tie up -- or maybe, rather, tee up a loose end from yesterday's discussion, Commissioner Bailey asked yesterday about what type of metrics might be associated with the Company's resiliency programs. Can you comment on where in the settlement one might look to understand such metrics or reporting requirements associated with reliability, and provide any other comment on that issue you feel is reasonable?
A. (Demmer) Yes. There are reliability metrics, and I believe Lee had referenced this. But we do have -- as part of Attachment 4 of the settlement, there are reliability-based,
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specific capital investments that will have metrics such as dollars per Delta CI, dollars per Delta CMI, which are customers interrupted -- or customer minute interrupted, for those reliability-based, specific capital investments.
Q. And so in addition to that which is set forth in Attachment 4, is it possible that additional metrics might be developed as a result of the engineering assessment or set forth in the assessment?
A. (Demmer) Yes, they may. Utilizing a third-party assessment will allow Staff and the Commission to quantitatively assess reliability investments with additional accepted industry benchmarks, but also allow to investigate current industry practices as it relates to resiliency measurements, both qualitatively and quantitatively. At this time, bear in mind, there are no widely accepted industry benchmarks for resiliency measurement.
Q. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Demmer. That's all I have for you.
\{DE 19-057\} [DAY 2 - MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{10-27-20\}

And I would just ask Mr. Chagnon, who's also on the panel, do you have anything to add to what you've heard so far on this panel?
A. (Chagnon) I do not. Thank you.
Q. Great.

MR. BUCKLEY: No further questions for the panel.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Lajoie, are you there?
MR. LAJOIE: Yes, I am.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Can you turn your video on for this part, please?

Commissioner Bailey, would you like to ask some questions?

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Yes, thank you. Good morning, everyone.

INTERROGATORIES BY COMMISSIONERS:
BY COMMISSIONER BAILEY:
Q. Mr. Lajoie, can you explain the Company's decision on why it decided to use steel poles instead of wooden poles?
A. (Lajoie) Steel poles are only used in
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right-of-way applications and on -- those are typically more difficult to access because clearly they're not roadside. They have been shown -- they have a life span that's approximate -- (connectivity issue). Can you hear me okay? I'm getting a lot of -(connectivity issue)
Q. I can.
A. (Lajoie) They have a life span that's at least twice as long as a wood pole. They're not susceptible to rot or insects or woodpeckers, which have all been, you know, proven to be issues with wooden poles. And because we only need to access the right-of-way half as often, the environmental impacts of that, you know, track vehicles or wheeled vehicles obstructing roadways in the right-of-way and so forth, that environmental impact is reduced by only having to access the right-of-way half as often.
Q. So the life of a steel pole is 80 years?
A. (Lajoie) It's at least 80 years, yes.
Q. How much more does it cost than a wooden pole?
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A. (Lajoie) I believe that information is in our testimony, but I do not have that in front of me at this time. They are more expensive, yes.
Q. Are they twice as expensive or more than twice as expensive?
A. (Lajoie) I don't have that number in front of me, and I would hate to speculate. I don't know that off the top --
Q. Mr. Demmer, do you know?
A. (Demmer) I believe the material cost for a steel pole over a regular pole is approximately three times the cost. For installation, you're probably looking at approximately the same, maybe possibly about one and a half times more because of the deeper depth you have to use for steel poles.
Q. Do you think it's -- well, let me ask this question to Mr. Lajoie first.

Do you know if the depreciation will happen over 80 years instead of 40 years for steel poles? Maybe Mr. Horton knows the answer to that.
A. (Horton) I'm sorry. Could you repeat the
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question?
Is the depreciation for steel poles over 80 years rather than 40?
A. (Horton) I actually don't have the depreciation specifics at my fingertips either. Certainly can get it.
Q. Well, do you expect the Company to recover its investment sooner than the useful life?
A. (Horton) So with the depreciation rates that are set, the idea is to try to align the recovery for accounting purposes with the expected useful life. And it's done on a asset class basis. And so I'd have to familiarize myself with how the depreciation rate for poles is derived. You know, it's not on a specific pole-by-pole basis.
Q. Understand. Is that one of the things the engineering firm will look at?
A. (Lajoie) Yes, it is.
Q. Okay. We've reviewed a lot of water crossings and state land crossings recently because it seems like there's a lot of activity replacing transmission lines from wooden poles to steel poles. Is any part of
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that investment included in distribution?
A. (Lajoie) No. My understanding is transmission investment and rates are recovered totally separate from distribution rate cases.
A. (Horton) That's absolutely the case. That's right.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

What year did you decide to start using steel poles rather than wooden poles in rights-of-way?
A. (Lajoie) Approximately 2018. But I would have to go back and look. It has only been a couple of years now, maybe three.
Q. Okay. Thanks.

When you made that decision, did you do some cost benefit analysis to see if the benefits that you mentioned outweighed the increased cost?
A. (Lajoie) No, that analysis was not performed. With the extension of life, the stronger -- a steel pole is physically stronger than a wooden pole, and it's consistent in its strength. Wooden poles, it depends on the
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growth pattern of the tree and the type of wood used and so forth. Even poles from a particular manufacturer all received at a certain period of time will have variations in strength and between poles, and also over the length of the poles. So you may have a weak spot in a particular area where there happens to be a knot from a tree branch and so forth. So the consistent strength, the increased strength, and the extended life made sense for right-of-way purposes to transition to steel poles, and that's why the decision was made.
Q. At any cost?
A. (Lajoie) They -- (connectivity issue)
Q. They didn't factor that into the analysis.
A. (Lajoie) We received bids for steel poles and made the decision to transition to steel poles in right-of-way. Had we -- you know, had the cost been astronomical, depending how you define astronomical, I guess, you know, I suspect the decision would have been different. But it looked like a reasonable solution to extending the life of these
\{DE 19-057\} [DAY 2 - MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{10-27-20\}
[WITNESS PANEL: LAJOIE|DEMMER|HORTON|CHAGNON]
right-of-way lines and reducing the need to access them on a regular basis.
Q. Okay. Can you speak to Mr. Allen's testimony on advanced tree trimming?
A. (Lajoie) I can try. I converse with Mr. Allen on a regular basis.
Q. Okay. What year did you begin enhanced tree trimming?
A. (Lajoie) Early two thousands I would say. So it's approaching 20 years at this point.
Q. And you still have five years left to complete the first cycle?
A. (Lajoie) Yes. Enhanced tree trimming is not on a cycle basis. We only do that once. So to finish --
Q. Of enhanced.
A. (Lajoie) -- the system, yeah, there's five years left $I$ believe is what he says, yeah.
Q. Okay. How long does the Company expect it to take to complete the enhanced tree trimming?
A. (Lajoie) I was not party to any discussions at the initial -- at the onset of enhanced tree trimming, as to when it would be completed. The initial analysis, you know,
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was by increasing the clearance specification, the reliability benefit would be something that, you know, would be beneficial to our customers. So we moved toward that increased enhanced specification. We understand that ETT can only be performed on a particular piece of line once. But I don't know that anyone ever went through and looked at every mile of line that would be subject to enhanced tree trimming or a candidate for enhanced tree trimming to determine the end date of the ETT program.
Q. Well, I think Mr. Allen's testimony says 60 percent of the system had been completed, there's 40 percent left, and it's going to take another five years.
A. (Lajoie) Okay. I'm not disputing his testimony. I'm just saying at the onset of ETT back, you know, a number of years ago, I don't think anyone said, hey, to do the entire system is going to take us 10 years or 15 years or whatever. I thought that was the question you were asking. That's what I was trying to address.
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Q. It was. Okay.

Do you believe that if we had a 2008-like winter storm today, there would be significantly less damage as a result of -(connectivity issue)
A. (Lajoie) As a result of, excuse me, what?
Q. As a result of this enhanced tree trimming.
A. (Lajoie) Areas where we have performed enhanced tree trimming anecdotally have performed better under storm conditions. It depends on the particular storm, the direction of the wind, the weight of the snow and so forth. You know, trees certainly are taller than the clearance specification, even under ETT. So a tree from well outside the enhanced zone could still come into the line. But ETT seems to have proven that we do see a reduction in tree-related outages in areas that have been trimmed to that specification.
A. (Horton) May I just offer one other observation?
Q. Please.
A. (Horton) As you know, I'm not the vegetation person, by any stretch. But just one item
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I'll note from recent experience in Connecticut, where we had, you know, a recent drought, as well as insect infestation, which has affected the trees within the, you know, the fall zone and just the magnitude of the storms -- so there's several considerations that go into it. But what $I$ just wanted to add is that, even what we saw in Connecticut with the recent storm, Isaias, just the magnitude of the event caused healthy trees to fall that would not be mitigated by ETT or any veg program.

So I think as Lee was saying, it's really hard to compare two events and make a definitive statement. But clearly, if we're trimming trees to a broader specification, there's going to be fewer branches or trees to impact our lines during an event, I guess all else equal.
Q. Okay. But you haven't quantified that with data, have you, Mr. Lajoie?
A. (Lajoie) I'm not sure. I would have to check with Mr. Allen on that. I apologize. I believe it's been looked at, but I do not
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have that information in front of me. I wouldn't want to commit to something that I'm not sure of.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Commissioner Bailey, you're on mute.

BY COMMISSIONER BAILEY:
Q. Mr. Demmer, do you think that if we had a 2008-like storm, the damage would be less in the area, in the 60 percent of the area that has experienced ETT?
A. (Demmer) I would say that I would have to agree with the Company's response, as far as having a lot of variables involved. However, my thought is that right now there's no quantitative benefit given to ETT. That's what I stated in my testimony. So as far as whether or not it could withstand another ice storm depends on how much ice there is, if we had the same level of ice that hit in the previous time in 2008. It's undetermined because there's no cost benefit analysis. There's no measurement that's been made by the Company to show that it would be better or would be worse, or the same. So that's --
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it's hard for me to say.
Q. Mr. Horton, did you want to add something to that, or are you --
A. (Horton) Well, I was -- (connectivity issue) just to offer, and certainly continuing the line of the questions, but just to offer back to the settlement agreement. You know, I think it was clear there were various perspectives on these topics that you're asking about. You know, we have and still have a different understanding and appreciation for certain things and needs of the system. That's clear. And I think the reason we were able to reach a comprehensive settlement agreement with all the parties, between us and Staff and everybody else, was not because we were able to resolve these specific discrepancies and get to common understanding and agreement on the questions you're asking. We still have differences of opinion of what the system needs are. But the value that all the settling parties see in the next steps that we have agreed to is to try to bring in more perspectives to
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inform that discussion. I think, as Mr. Lajoie said in the direct testimony, we expect an outcome of the engineering assessment. We expect it's going to provide the data and the facts that you all are asking us to provide, that we were not able to produce during the case to a level of satisfaction to get Mr. Demmer and the other parties comfortable, you know, to just approve our GTEP proposal as filed. The reason for the system assessment, including ETT and hazard tree removal as part of that, you know, and doing a system assessment and then evaluating the investment decisions we make, including steel poles and other things referenced in the settlement agreement, is to try to find common ground in exactly the questions you're asking. We just were not -- we would not have been able to reach a settlement agreement on, you know, the basis of if we were to try to -- we weren't going to be convinced to a different perspective, and neither was Staff. And so the settlement agreement is our collective
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resolution to that.
A. (Lajoie) And just if I could offer a clarification. Rebuttal testimony filed by Mr. Allen in this case states that in 2018, Eversource customers saw a 50-percent reduction in tree-caused outages on circuits that had the entire three-phase ETT back-trimmed in 2017, the previous year. And in 2019, that number increased to 82 percent for circuits where ETT was performed in the prior year. So there has been some analysis performed, and it has resulted in significant improvement. ETT has resulted in significant improvement.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Actually, I was -- never mind.

In Paragraph 6.1 of the settlement, it says that you're going to spend $\$ 27.1$ million on vegetation management, which includes $\$ 11.6$ million for ETT and hazard tree removal. Do you know how much of that is for ETT?
A. (Lajoie) The two activities are performed simultaneously. When they're doing the ETT
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on a section, they're also looking for the hazard trees along that section. I don't know the cost breakdown between the two functions as they're performed going down a particular section of line.
Q. The reason $I$ ask is because in Mr. Allen's testimony, he says that you need to spend $\$ 5$ million a year over each of the next five years to finish the enhanced tree trimming. So I was wondering if you were going to finish more quickly than that if you spend $\$ 11.6 \mathrm{million}$.
A. (Lajoie) I don't know the answer to that.
A. (Horton) I mean, $I$ also don't know the specifics of that. I'll just note that the $\$ 11.6$ million was not an acceleration, as far as I'm aware, my understanding. You know, we didn't break out how much of the 11.6 was to ETT versus hazard tree removal. But that is actually less than the amount that we had spent in the test year for those activities. So, again, in recognition of the differences of opinion or value that the parties saw in the program, we landed at 11.6 , with the
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provision that's also in Section 6.1, that there's an ability for us to justify spending more than that in total on the vegetation management program and then getting that recovered through the RRAM.
Q. Okay. Thanks.

Mr. Demmer, are you comfortable with the resolution of the issues that you've raised, as proposed in the settlement?
A. (Demmer) Yes, I am.
Q. Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Commissioner,
can I jump in on that one?
COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Sure.
BY CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN:
Q. Mr. Demmer, I had read your prefiled testimony on your concerns about replacement, the plan for replacement -- (connectivity issue)
(Court Reporter interrupts.)
Q. The plan for replacement for Eversource infrastructure. And Commissioner Bailey just asked you, at a high level, if you were satisfied. I was going to ask you if you
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could go over your most significant concerns with that plan, previous plan, and how the provision in Section 11 satisfies you and your concerns.
A. (Demmer) Sure. So the investments that the Company is making are for both reliability and resiliency. And I believe the reliability aspect of that is addressed in Attachment 4 of the settlement with the associated metrics, along with the reliability, and getting the reliability reports.

As far as the resiliency benefits, as I stated earlier, there is no wildly-held metric for resiliency. However, with the settlement, and with the engineering assessment, we are looking for some sort of benefit analysis for resiliency measurement for these investments the Company is making to do a cost benefit analysis and, again, to strike that balance between ratepayer impact, cost and resiliency measurement.
Q. And you're comfortable with the provision that the Company is continuing current
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practices for the time being?
A. (Demmer) I am comfortable with the the proposal for GTEP. So, assuming the Company has not started GTEP with the accelerated replacement, so that is not an existing plan, $I$ am comfortable with the existing investments being installed as they are today.
Q. Okay. Mr. Horton or Mr. Lajoie, can you confirm that, that the GTEP is not being implemented, and the current practices referred to are those that were in place when Mr. Demmer submitted his testimony?
A. (Lajoie) That is correct. GTEP is not being implemented at this time. The current practices are what we have been doing for the past several years.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

BY COMMISSIONER BAILEY (cont'd) :
Q. I just have one last question or maybe line
of questioning.
Are you the panel responsible for
reviewing the investments being added to rate
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2. Okay. Mr. Horton or Mr. Lajoie, can you
confirm that, that the GTEP is not being
implemented, and the current practices
ererred to are those that were in place when
[WITNESS PANEL: LAJOIE|DEMMER|HORTON|CHAGNON]
base?
A. (Demmer) Is that for me, Commissioner, or is that for --
Q. Well, for each of you.
A. (Demmer) Okay. Yes, I am working with Mr. Dudley on the step adjustments, if that's what you're referring to.
Q. No, I'm talking about the investments that have been made since the last step adjustment up until today, that are being added to rate base as a result of this settlement agreement. And I wanted to ask you about prudency on those.
A. (Demmer) Okay. The projects that were reviewed as part of Mr. Dudley's testimony, I was not involved in that prudency determination. For the first step that's going to be coming in a month or so and the subsequent steps, $I$ will be involved with those. I'm sorry I'm not really...
Q. But how do we -- okay. All right. Thank you that's all I have.

BY CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN (cont'd):
Q. I had a question for Mr. Lajoie.
\{DE 19-057\} [DAY 2 - MORNING SESSION ONLY] \{10-27-20\}
[WITNESS PANEL: LAJOIE|DEMMER|HORTON|CHAGNON]

You mentioned you had a list of the concerns with the distribution system in New Hampshire. And as you read through them, said "relocation of right-of-way lines to roadside." Can you explain that to me?
A. (Lajoie) That was a part of the original GTEP proposal. So it would be covered by the engineering analysis that we have agreed to as part of the settlement agreement. The issue was in areas where a right-of-way line is parallel to an existing roadway; is it in fact more cost-effective to relocate that right-of-way line out to the roadside to make it accessible for, you know, system maintenance and construction and so forth versus continuing to maintain it in an off-road position -- an off-road location. There are definitely some lines that we have that are in some pretty difficult right-of-ways. The line that feeds Wildcat Mountain is an example. It's a very, very narrow right-of-way, too small to actually drive a vehicle in. So anytime we have to get in there to replace poles and so forth,
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we've used a helicopter to deliver poles to it before. We've used, you know, ATVs to access the right-of-way, or hiked in by foot power, you know, carrying equipment in on toboggans in the wintertime and so forth. That would be one where relocating it out to the line -- the road that leads up to Wildcat Mountain would be advantageous, as far as access goes.

There's another line that's in the Bradford to Warner area that's in a pretty, again, a very rugged, nasty right-of-way, limited width. And we are considering or have considered relocating portions of that out to Route 103, which runs parallel to that right-of-way, to provide better access and ease of maintenance.
Q. Okay. Thank you for that.

You also testified that with regard to
tree trimming, you've seen increased costs in proposals. Do you have any idea why that is?
A. (Lajoie) We went out for -- we go out for trimming services on a multi-year basis. So we reached the end of our bid, you know, our
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contract basis in 2019 -- no -- excuse me -2020. So the bids coming in for 2021 are the start of a new four-year cycle. And just based on the economic situation and, you know, other jobs that are available to people, oftentimes tree trimmers have -- you know, their labor costs vary widely, depending on whether people have access to easier, less dirty jobs. So sometimes they do have to pay more to get the people to actually perform that function. It is dirty, unskilled work, and sometimes you have to pay people more to do that work.
Q. So it's an increase over what you got for bids for four years.
A. (Lajoie) Correct. Yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: I don't have any other questions.

Mr. Buckley, Mr. Fossum, do you
have any redirect?
MR. FOSSUM: Commissioners, I
believe $I$ will have a couple of questions.
But if I may, could we have just five or ten
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minutes? I think Commissioner Bailey had asked some questions that I think we can get the answers to very quickly, in the interest of answering the questions that she had, if you would just give us a couple of minutes. I think Mr. Lajoie and/or Mr. Horton can get ahold of relevant information to answer those questions.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Does it make sense to break for lunch for an hour now and then return with that?

MR. FOSSUM: I guess my
understanding is if the Commissioners are done with their questions, subject to the redirect, we would be finished with this panel. So maybe it would make sense to break for lunch at that point and then return from lunch with the last panel for the day.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. That may be easier for your witnesses. All right. Then let's -- is ten minutes enough? Do you need more?

MR. FOSSUM: I'd say ten minutes is probably enough.
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CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Let's return at 11:55 then.

MR. FOSSUM: Thank you very much. (Brief recess was taken at 11:44 p.m., and the hearing resumed at 12:00 p.m.) CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Looks like we have everybody. Let's go back on the record. Mr. Fossum.

MR. FOSSUM: Thank you. And thank you very much for giving us those couple of minutes.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. FOSSUM:
Q. Mr. Horton and Mr. Lajoie, do you recall, earlier this morning, the questions that you'd gotten from Commissioner Bailey regarding the use of steel poles, and in particular, the questions about, for example, their life span?
A. (Lajoie) Yes.
Q. At the time, it seemed like you had given an answer that said perhaps, you know, you were, apologize for using the word, but guessing. But in the interim, have you found additional
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information relative to those issues on steel poles that the Commissioner was asking about?
A. (Lajoie) Yes, I have. Thank you.

The question was asked about the life span of steel poles versus wood poles, and it is approximately double. A steel pole is expected to last twice as long as a wood pole.

The question was asked about the cost differential between the two. A wood pole for right-of-way applications is approximately $\$ 900$, and a comparable steel pole is approximately $\$ 2100$; so a little more than twice for twice the life span.

But I need to emphasize that these are only used in limited applications, and not a large quantity of them. For example: In 2019, we installed 131. So, you know, out of a capital budget of north of $\$ 130 \mathrm{million}$ a year, steel poles represent literally \$150to $\$ 200,000$ a year in incremental costs over equivalent wood poles.

And one of the cost factors that we've mentioned but never specifically dug into or
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dove into as part of our testimony is this access to right-of-ways. Environmental costs and considerations require in many cases matting, those large timbers that they lay down in a cross-hatched pattern to prevent vehicles from causing ruts in right-of-ways. It becomes a tremendously expensive process. We are in the midst of a project in Miller State Park, which Commission Staff is aware of. Access to that right-of-way is -- the bids that we have received to put down the necessary matting for that is on the order of $\$ 300,000$ just for this one installation, you know, to get poles in that right-of-way up the side of Pack Monadnock.

So there's a tremendous environmental remediation cost associated with accessing these right-of-way locations, which, again, leads us to the conclusion that steel poles, in the long term, are a cost-effective investment. This will be part of the engineering analysis that we have agreed to as part of the settlement. So an independent third party will be looking at this, and
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their findings will guide us in future applications.
A. (Lajoie) No sound, Matthew. Sorry?

MR. FOSSUM: Apologies. I thought I was going to get away without making that mistake. That was the only question I had. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. Mr. Buckley, did you have any redirect?

MR. BUCKLEY: Yes. Just one brief question for Mr . Demmer and then maybe another for Mr. Chagnon.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. BUCKLEY:
Q. Mr. Demmer, there were a couple of questions during the panel about the Company having used its judgment and experience when deciding to switch to steel poles and right-of-ways and other similar resiliency-related investments rather than relying on a quantitative cost benefit analysis.

Is it your understanding that the purpose of the engineering assessment, as
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suggested in Section 11.2 of the settlement, would be for the Company to perform just such a cost benefit analysis so that the Staff, the Company and the Commission have that information to consider as the Company charts a path for least cost planning in Docket No. 20-161, Eversource's 2020 LCIRP, with that assessment being filed less than six months from today? Mr. Demmer, you're on mute.
A. (Demmer) Yes, and the subsequent assessment that is performed by Staff, Staff's consultant.
Q. Given that, and given that the Company has not accelerated the investments in resiliency as initially proposed under the GTEP program, does that alleviate the concerns addressed in your testimony?
A. (Demmer) Yes, it does.
Q. And now turning to Mr . Chagnon.

Commissioner Bailey asked about the prudence of plant in service as of the test year. Would it be fair to say that for the purposes of this settlement, concessions were made relating to the overall revenue
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requirement and that one just such concession is in fact explicitly stated in the revenue requirement settled on to cover all concerns raised within this proceeding, including those related to prudency?
A. (Chagnon) Yes, it does.

MR. BUCKLEY: No further questions.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank
you to the witnesses.
With that, we'll break for lunch and return at five past one. Off the record. (Lunch recess taken at 12:05 p.m. and concludes the Day 2 Morning Session. The hearing continues under separate cover in the transcript noted as Day 2 Afternoon Session.)
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| 28:23 | settling (1) | specific (4) | 50:23;57:19 | 20:24;24:5,9,13; |
| same (7) | 50:22 | 38:1,6;42:16;50:18 | still (4) | 25:4,17,19,22;26:1; |
| 15:24;16:2;18:23; | several (3) | specifically (4) | 45:11;47:16;50:10, | 31:7;45:17;46:14,21; |


| $\begin{aligned} & 50: 13,21 ; 51: 11,13 ; \\ & 58: 2,14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { timbers (1) } \\ 64: 4 \end{gathered}$ | tremendously (1) 64:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 27: 11 ; 39: 24 ; 44: 2 \\ & 59: 1,2 ; 63: 16 ; 65: 17 \end{aligned}$ | W |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T | 11:8;41:13,16 | 47:19 | 42:8,12 | Warner (1) |
|  | toboggans (1) | trimmers (1) | using (3) | 59:11 |
| talking (1) | 59:5 | 60:6 trimming | 26:1;43:9;62:23 | water (1) |
| 57:8 | today (15) | trimming (31) | usual (1) | 42:20 |
| taller (1) | $5: 19 ; 6: 2 ; 7: 24$ | 30:15,17,23;31:3,6, | 9:19 | Way (2) |
| 47:14 | $8: 17 ; 10: 9 ; 13: 18$ | $10,13,20,22,24 ; 32: 2$ | Utilities (4) | 5:23;18:20 |
| tapered (1) | 14:14;16:1,6;23:20; | 8,12,14,18,23;33:2; | 4:16;14:24;31:22; | weak (1) |
| 21:6 targeted (1) | 35:12;47:3;56:9; | 35:19;45:4,8,13,20, | 34:7 | 44:7 |
| targeted (1) | 57:10;66:9 | 23:46:10,11;47:7,9; | utility (2) | weight (1) |
| $21: 5$ | today's (2) | 48:16;53:9;59:20,23 | 5:10;34:8 | $47: 12$ |
| team (3) | 4:22;8:17 | true (1) | utilized (1) | weren't (1) |
| 29:20,22,23 | together (1) | $16: 4$ $\operatorname{try}(7)$ | 36:22 | $51: 22$ |
| team's (1) | $32: 1$ $\boldsymbol{t o p}(1)$ | try (7) | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Utilizing (1) } \\ 38: 12 \end{array}$ | what's (3) |
| tee (1) | 41:9 | 45:5;50:24;51:17,21 |  | 6:23;7:7;13: |
| 37:12 | topic (1) | trying (2) | V | $40: 17$ |
| ten (3) | 12:9 | 7:24;46:24 |  | WHEREUPON (2) |
| 60:24;61:21,23 | topics (1) | turn (1) | vacuum (1) | 8:21;19:6 |
| term (1) | 50:9 | 39:13 | $25: 9$ | who's (1) |
| 64:20 | total (2) | turning (2) | value (5) | 39:1 |
| terms (4) | 29:11;54:3 | 31:1;66:19 | $25: 14 ; 32: 20 ; 36: 7$ | widely (2) |
| 10:7;14:3;23:18; | totally (1) | twice (6) | $50: 22 ; 53: 23$ | 38:20;60:7 |
| $36: 2$ test (2) | 43:4 toward (1) | 40:10;41:5,6;63:7, 14,14 | variables (1) | width (1) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { test (2) } \\ & 53: 21 ; 66: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { toward (1) } \\ 46: 5 \end{gathered}$ | 14,14 two (8) | 49:13 variances (1) | $59: 13$ <br> Wildeat (2) |
| testified (5) | town (1) | 5:15;21:9;33:2; | 28:5 | 58:20;59:7 |
| 9:19;13:1;21:13; | 28:21 | 45:9;48:14;52:23; | variations (1) | wildly-held (1) |
| 34:9;59:19 <br> testimony (52) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { track }(\mathbf{2}) \\ & 31: 8 ; 40: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 53:3;63:10 <br> two-way (1) | $\begin{gathered} \text { 44:4 } \\ \text { various (2) } \end{gathered}$ | $55: 14$ |
| testimony (52) 13:4,6,10,12,17,20; | 31:8;40:16 traditional (1) | two-way (1) $25: 5$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { various (2) } \\ 29: 16 ; 50: 8 \end{array}$ | WIND (3) |
| 14:22;15:4,7,10,13, | tradional (1) | type (2) | vary (1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 7:8;19:4;47:12 } \\ & \text { winner (1) } \end{aligned}$ |
| 18,22;16:1,4,6,14,22; | transcript (1) | 37:14;44:1 | 60:7 | 9:15 |
| 17:5;19:2;21:16,20; | 67:15 | typically (2) | veg (3) | winter (1) |
| 22:17,20,22,24;23:3, | Transformation (1) | 28:14;40:2 | 31:3;34:21;48:12 | 47:3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 9,13,15,16 ; 34: 16,21, \\ & \text { 23;35:2,6,8,15;37:3; } \end{aligned}$ | $35: 17$ transition | $\mathbf{U}$ | vegetation (5) <br> 30:16,18;47:23 | wintertime (1) |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23 ; 35: 2,6,8,15 ; 37: 3 ; \\ & 41: 2 ; 45: 3 ; 46: 13,18 \end{aligned}$ | $44: 12,18$ | U | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 16,18 ; 47: 23 ; \\ & 52: 19 ; 54: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 59: 5 \\ \text { wire (3) } \end{gathered}$ |
| 49:16;51:2;52:3; | transitioned (1) | unable (1) | vehicle (4) | 24:21,22;26:5 |
| 53:7;54:17;56:14; | 24:22 | 4:10 | 11:4;18:2,4;58:23 | wires (1) |
| 57:15;64:1;66:17 | Transitioning (1) | under (4) | vehicles (8) | $24: 14$ |
| Thanks (3) | 30:13 transmission (2) | 47:10,15;66:15; | 8:18;10:12;11:7,9; | within (8) |
| 43:15;54:6,11 | transmission (2) | 67:14 | 14:7;40:16,17;64:6 | 10:24;11:14;27:14; |
| therefore (3) | 42:23; tree (25) | undetermined (1) | verbal (1) | $29: 11 ; 37: 3,4 ; 48: 4$ |
| 28:10,12,17 | tree (25) | 49:20 | $9: 11$ | 67:4 |
| thereof (1) | $30: 15,17 ; 31: 6,10$, $13 \cdot 35 \cdot 19,19 \cdot 44 \cdot 1,8$ | unskilled (1) | verge (1) | without (1) |
| $\begin{gathered} 14: 3 \\ \text { third (3) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 ; 35: 19,19 ; 44: 1,8 \\ & 45: 4,7,13,20,23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 60: 12 \\ \text { up (13) } \end{array}$ | 29:4 versions (1) | 65:5 |
| third (3) $8: 9 ; 27: 21 ; 64: 24$ | 45:4, $7,13,20,23 ;$ $46: 10,11 ; 47: 7,9,15 ;$ | up (13) ${ }_{\text {8:20;16:19;17:1; }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { versions (1) } \\ 23: 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { withstand (3) } \\ 24: 19,23 ; 49: 17 \end{array}$ |
| third-party (1) | 51:12;52:20;53:9,19; | 21:3;22:15;24:20; | versus (5) | witness (5) |
| 38:13 | 59:20;60:6 | 31:15,23;37:11,12; | 26:2,5;53:19; | 8:7;12:15;14:14; |
| thought (3) | tree-caused (1) | 57:10;59:7;64:14 | 58:16;63:5 | 15:5;16:16 |
| 46:22;49:14;65:4 thousands (1) | 52:6 | update (1) | vice-president (1) | witnesses (4) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { thousands (1) } \\ & \text { 45:9 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { tree-related (1) } \\ 47: 18 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 13:5 } \\ \text { upgrade (1) } \end{gathered}$ | 9:24 video (2) | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 19 ; 20: 5 ; 61: 20 \\ & 67: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| three (2) | trees (9) | 26:1 | 22:10;39:14 | wondering (1) |
| 41:13;43:14 | 24:24;31:15,18; | upon (1) | viewpoint (1) | 53:10 |
| three-phase (1) | 47:13;48:4,10,16,17; | 17:5 | $24: 7$ | wood (7) |
| $\begin{array}{r} 52: 7 \\ \text { tie (1) } \end{array}$ | $53: 2$ <br> tremendous (1) | use (3) $39: 22 ; 41: 17 ; 62: 17$ | $\underset{9: 13}{\text { volunteer (1) }}$ | 26:5;40:10;44:2; |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { tie (1) } \\ & 37: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { tremendous (1) } \\ 64: 16 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 39:22;41:17;62:17 } \\ & \text { used (7) } \end{aligned}$ | 9:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63:5,7,10,22 } \\ & \text { wooden (7) } \end{aligned}$ |
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