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PROCEEDINGS
CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Good morning.
Let's go on the record. I'm Chairman
Goldner. I'm joined by Commissioner Simpson.
Today we'll start with Docket DE 19-057.
We'll continue today with the hearing on the issues raised in Docket 21-029 and conclude with the hearing on the issues raised in Docket 21-117.

So this is a hearing in DE 19-057 on Eversource's December 15th, 2021 Petition for Base Rate Adjustment pertaining to implementation of the Fee Free credit card payment processing and the New Start Program.

Let's take appearances.
Eversource.
MS. RALSTON: Good morning.
Jessica Ralston from the law firm of Keegan Werlin, on behalf of Public Service Company of New Hampshire, doing business as Eversource Energy.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you.
New Hampshire Department of Energy.
MR. DEXTER: Good morning, Mr.
\{DE 19-057\} [Hearing] \{01-14-22\}

Chairman and Commissioner Simpson. Paul Dexter, attorney for the Department of Energy.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you.
For preliminary matters, Exhibit 69
has been prefiled and premarked for identification. All material identified as confidential in the filings will be treated as confidential, though $I$ didn't see any.

Anything else we need to cover
regarding exhibits?
[No verbal response]
CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Any other preliminary matters before we have the witnesses sworn in?
[No verbal response]
CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Nothing. And does anyone object to the witnesses in the prefiled testimony?
[No verbal response]
CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: No.
MR. DEXTER: No objection from the
Department of Energy.
CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you, Mr.
\{DE 19-057\} [Hearing] \{01-14-22\}
[PANEL: KISHIMOTO|WASHINGTON|MENARD|ULLRAM]

Dexter.
Seeing none, let's proceed with the witnesses. Ms. Robidas, would you please swear in the panel of witnesses.
(WHEREUPON, CHRISTOPHER T. KISHIMOTO, THERESA WASHINGTON, ERICA L. MENARD AND JENNIFER A. ULLRAM were duly sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter.)

CHRISTOPHER T. KISHIMOTO, SWORN
THERESA WASHINGTON, SWORN
ERICA L. MENARD, SWORN
JENNIFER A. ULLRAM, SWORN
CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Very good.
We'll move to direct examination of the witnesses. Ms. Ralston.

MS. RALSTON: Thank you.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. RALSTON:
Q. We'll start with Mr. Kishimoto. Would you please state your full name, company position and responsibilities.
A. (Kishimoto) My name is Christopher Kishimoto. I'm manager of payments and print. I manage the payment and print operations on behalf of
\{DE 19-057\} [Hearing] \{01-14-22\}
[PANEL: KISHIMOTO|WASHINGTON|MENARD|ULLRAM]

Eversource Energy operating companies, including Public Service Company of New Hampshire, doing business as Eversource Energy. And in this role I've been responsible for implementation of the Company's Fee Free Credit and Debit Card Program that was authorized by the Commission in this docket.
Q. Thank you. And are you familiar with the exhibit that has been marked as Exhibit 69, which is the Company's December 15, 2021 filing that's under consideration today?
A. (Kishimoto) Yes. Exhibit 69 includes testimony and attachments that $I$ have sponsored.
Q. And do you have any corrections or amendments to those portions of Exhibit 69 that you sponsored?
A. (Kishimoto) No.
Q. And do you adopt those portions of Exhibit 69 that you have sponsored as part of your sworn testimony today?
A. (Kishimoto) Yes, I do.
Q. Thank you.
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A. (Washington) Yes, I do.
Q. Thank you.

Next we'll move to Ms. Menard. Would you please state your full name, company position, and responsibilities for purposes of the docket.
A. (Menard) My name is Erica Menard. I'm the manager of revenue requirements. I'm employed by Eversource Energy Service Company. In that role I'm responsible for the coordination and calculation of revenue requirements, including distribution rates that are under discussion today.
Q. And are you familiar with the exhibit marked as Exhibit 69, which is the Company's December 15th filing under consideration?
A. (Menard) Yes. Exhibit 69 contains testimony that I co-sponsored with Ms. Ullram.
Q. Thank you. And do you have any corrections or amendments to those portions that you sponsored?
A. (Menard) No.
Q. And do you adopt those portions of Exhibit 69 that you have sponsored as part of your sworn \{DE 19-057\} [Hearing] \{01-14-22\}
[PANEL: KISHIMOTO|WASHINGTON|MENARD|ULLRAM]
testimony today?
A. (Menard) Yes, I do.
Q. Thank you.

And then finally, Ms. Ullram, would you please state your full name, company position, and your responsibilities for purposes of this docket.
A. (Ullram) Good morning. My name is Jennifer Ullram, and I'm the manager of rates. And in this role I'm responsible for all activities related to rate design, cost of service, and rates administration for the Eversource Energy subsidiaries in both Connecticut and New Hampshire.
Q. Thank you. And are you familiar with the exhibit marked as Exhibit 69, which is the Company's December 15th filing?
A. (Ullram) Yes. Exhibit 69 includes the testimony and attachments that Ms. Menard and I co-sponsored.
Q. Thank you. Do you have any corrections or amendments to those portions of the exhibit that you sponsored?
A. (Ullram) No, I do not.
\{DE 19-057\}
[Hearing]
Q. And do you adopt those portions of Exhibit 69 that you have sponsored as part of your sworn testimony today?
A. (Ullram) Yes, I do.
Q. Thank you. I will now turn back to Mr. Kishimoto. Would you please describe the purpose of the Fee Free Credit/Debit Program.
A. (Kishimoto) The Fee Free Credit and Debit Program was proposed to meet customer needs and expectations by eliminating the transaction fee for certain credit and debit card payments and to recover the cost of this arrangement through base distribution rates. In the Company's experience, customers want the convenience of paying their monthly bills with a credit or debit card without incurring transaction fee. And transaction fees have also been a significant driver of customer dissatisfaction.
Q. And can you just provide an overview of the structure for this program?
A. (Kishimoto) The program is available to residential customers for one-time payments. Customers who wish to use this program each

$$
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month must enter their payment information each time they make a payment.

The Company is monitoring customer adoption rates and reporting on these rates to the Department of Energy Staff and the Office of the Consumer Advocate. The Settlement Agreement approved in this docket includes certain functions related to the adoption rate and cost of this program. For the program's first year, the costs are expected to be $\$ 375,000$. This amount was included in rates beginning January 1st, 2021, and assumed a penetration rate of 5 percent.
Q. Thank you. And can you provide a brief overview of the program's implementation?
A. (Kishimoto) Sure. The program became available to customers on February 11th, 2021. As of October 31st, 2021, the adoption rate was 5.4 percent of total residential customer payments, exceeding expectation. Based on the initial experience, the Company estimates an annual adoption rate of
5.7 percent of total customer residential
\{DE 19-057\} [Hearing] \{01-14-22\}
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payments.
The Company has incurred costs of $\$ 267,110$ for the first nine months of the program, and expects total cost for the first 12 months to be $\$ 392,000$. This is based on an estimated cost of $\$ 400,000$ offset by estimated savings of $\$ 8,000$. This estimated cost will exceed the projected cost by $\$ 18,000$, but is below the annual cap of $\$ 520,500$.
Q. Thank you. And so could you summarize Eversource's request today, specifically what we're asking the Commission to approve.
A. (Kishimoto) Okay. The Company is not requesting any change to rates at this time associated with the program. Instead, the Company will reconcile any over- or underrecovery at the time of the next rate case.

Attachments CTK-1 provides a comparison of estimated and annual actual costs of the program as of October 31st, 2021. This attachment also shows projections for the first 12 months of the program. The Company is also not recommending any changes to the \{DE 19-057\}
[Hearing]
[PANEL: KISHIMOTO|WASHINGTON|MENARD|ULLRAM]
program. The Company will continue to monitor the adoption rate by customers and submit an annual report on the program's adoption rates and costs. The first compliance report was provided with my testimony as Attachment CTK-2.
Q. Thank you.

I will now turn to Ms. Washington. And would you please describe the purpose of the New Start Program.
A. (Washington) Yes. The New Start Program is an arrearage-forgiveness program. It provides payment assistance for qualifying residential customers who are struggling with past-due bills. The concept of that program is for every on-time monthly payment made, then a portion of that customer's balance is forgiven. Their past-due balance is forgiven. So the program does have some key benefits to customers, where it enables customers to develop consistent payment habits. It protects the customers from disconnection while they're participating in the program, and it enables the customer to

$$
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get a fresh start because their arrears are forgiven with each successful payment made. The program reduces cost for the Company because it reduces field visits, disconnections and reconnections of service.
Q. And can you provide an overview of the structure for the New Start Program?
A. (Washington) Yeah. The program is available to residential customers whose accounts have been coded as "financial hardship" and whose account has a balance of at least $\$ 150$, and at least that $\$ 150$ is at least 60 days past due. There's an annual forgiveness cap per customer of $\$ 12,000$.
Q. And were there any other criteria for program implementation that were set forth in the Settlement Agreement that was approved in this docket?
A. (Washington) Yes. The Company was required to convene a stakeholder group to develop a more defined set of criteria for program implementation. The Settlement Agreement also set out reporting requirements for the Company. As a result of that stakeholder \{DE 19-057\}
[Hearing]
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group, the Company filed a report with the Commission that was approved on June 1st of 2021.
Q. And can you provide an overview of the implementation for this program to date?
A. (Washington) Yeah, the Company's Information Technology Department has been outlining and developing the requirements to implement the necessary changes to the Company's billing system and processes. The program is expected to go live early 2022.
Q. Thank you. And then can you just provide a brief summary of what Eversource's request is today regarding this program?
A. (Washington) Yes. The Company's requesting approval to include that $\$ 1,077,356$ of the base rates to provide adequate funding for the program as implementation begins.

Recovery of these funds is authorized under Section 13.3 of the Settlement Agreement approved in this proceeding to fund a reserve account.
Q. Thank you.

My last series of questions can be
\{DE 19-057\} [Hearing] \{01-14-22\}
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answered by either Ms. Menard or Ms. Ulram.
So Mr. Kishimoto stated earlier that the Company is not requesting a rate change associated with the Fee Free Program. Can you please describe how the Company plans to recover the costs associated with this program?
A. (Menard) Yes, I'll take that. Ms. Menard.

As Mr. Kishimoto explained, the Company is already recovering $\$ 375,000$ through base rates associated with the Fee Free Credit Card Program. And while the Company estimates their -- for 12 months it will incur an additional $\$ 18,000$ in costs above that $\$ 375,000$ during the first year, the Company is not seeking a base distribution rate increase at this time; instead, the Company proposes to reconcile these costs in the next rate case.

Attachment ELM/JAU-1 presents the actual costs incurred for the Fee Free Credit Card Program and the variance between base distribution recovery for the first year actual estimated costs for the program.

$$
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Also in that attachment it shows the reconciliation of the program costs that will be maintained until the time of our next base distribution rate case.
Q. Thank you.

Turning to the New Start Program, Ms. Washington stated that the Company is requesting approval to begin recovering an additional $\$ 1,077,336$ in base rates beginning February 1st. Have you provided a calculation of the rates for this adjustment?
A. (Ullram) Yes, we have. Attachment ELM/JAU-3, which is on Bates 68, provides the allocation of the adjustment for each rate class. And ELM/JAU-3 also provides the overall revenue impacts and bill impacts associated with the adjustment.
Q. And what is the bill impact for an average residential customer associated with the adjustment?
A. (Ullram) So Bates 90 in ELM/JAU-3, the monthly bill impact for Rate $R$ customers using between 550 and 650 kilowatt hours a month ranges from 10 cents to 12 cents per
\{DE 19-057\}
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month.
Q. Thank you. And does this adjustment result in rates that are just and reasonable?
A. (Ullram) Yes, it does.
Q. Thank you.

MS. RALSTON: Nothing further. The panel is now available.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you.
We'll move to cross-examination, and I'll recognize Mr. Dexter.

MR. DEXTER: Thank you, Chairman Goldner. Good morning. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. DEXTER:
Q. I would like to start with a few questions on the Fee Free Program as described.

My understanding from the direct exam is that approximately $\$ 375,000$ in program-related costs was set in the base rate case -- was built into base rates as a result of the base rate case. I would ask one of the witnesses to describe for me specifically what's in the $\$ 375,000$. In other words, what types of costs was that

$$
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intended to cover?
A. (Kishimoto) Those costs, the $\$ 375,000$, represents the percentage over our original -- we had 3 percent of our customers prior to implementation were paying by credit card, with $\$ 375,000$, the cost per -- the $\$ 1.40$ that was charged for each customer credit card transaction for residential customers.
Q. So if I understood that answer, it's \$1.40 times a certain number of payments; is that right?
A. (Kishimoto) Correct.
Q. Okay. What's the $\$ 1.40$ ? What does that represent?
A. (Kishimoto) The per-transaction costs.
Q. Right. And that's my question. So is that a fee that Eversource pays to a bank or -- I'm just curious what makes up the $\$ 1.40$.
A. (Kishimoto) Yes, that's a fee we pay to our banker for each payment that's processed.
Q. And I believe I understood from the testimony that that number was predicted to be $\$ 1.48$, and the actual rate comes in at $\$ 1.40$. Do $I$
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have that right?
A. (Kishimoto) Yes.
Q. Can you explain what makes up the difference, why the rate is lower, coming in lower than what was predicted back in the rate case?
A. (Kishimoto) There is a pricing matrix that we, based on our contract, that we've agreed to, depending on two items: The percentage of credit card, pure credit card payments compared to -- and the average payment amount, that wherever our customer transactions fall on that matrix, our vendor can change the price. We had negotiated it down to $\$ 1.40$.
Q. So that $\$ 1.40$--
A. (Kishimoto) Sorry. We negotiated it to stay at that per-transaction price.
Q. Right. And it sounds like, from what you're saying, that $\$ 1.40$ is some sort of an average of all these transactions and where they fall in the matrix, and $\$ 1.40$ represents an average. Is that a fair assessment?
A. (Kishimoto) Yes.
Q. Okay. Thanks. I wanted to turn to your
testimony to Bates Page 15. And there's a statement in the testimony that you reached 5 percent penetration rate in this program. That's up on Line 3. Can you explain that? You touched on this. Can you explain what that means, a "5 percent penetration rate"?
A. (Kishimoto) Yes. The 5 percent penetration rate represents the percentage of residential customers that pay by credit card over the percentage of all residential customer payments.
Q. And am I correct that you said that the actual information has shown that percentage, penetration percentage, is a little bit higher, that it's actually up to 5.4 percent? Did I hear that right?
A. (Kishimoto) That's correct.
Q. What was the fee that was charged for using a credit card before this program took place?
A. (Kishimoto) The residential customers paid \$2.25 prior to this program.
Q. On Page 15, Line 7, there's a sentence that talks about -- begins on Line 7 that talks about the offsetting savings as a result of

$$
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this program. Could you describe what makes up the offsetting savings.
A. (Kishimoto) Yes. Customers above our original 3 percent -- the original 3 percent of our customers that were paying by credit card, the customers have since migrated from implementation date, and we assumed that 95 percent of those customers migrate from making direct debit payments, with 5 percent migrating from mailing in check payments.
Q. And so can I deduce from that, that it's less expensive for the Company to process a credit card payment than a check payment, and that's where the savings come from?
A. (Kishimoto) The savings come from, assuming that they migrated over from the other channels, there's a Company cost associated with each payment transaction that we are no longer paying as a result of them making a credit card payment.
Q. What's the nature of those costs that are saved? What's the nature of the savings?
A. (Kishimoto) The savings are from per-transaction costs charged by our
\{DE 19-057\} [Hearing] \{01-14-22\}
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payment-processing vendors for each of those channels.
Q. So you have a vendor to process payments, whether it's by credit card or by check. Is that what I'm hearing?
A. (Kishimoto) Correct.
Q. And sounds like it's less expensive to do it by debit or credit card than by check. Is that right?
A. (Kishimoto) That is correct.
Q. Per the statement in your direct testimony -I'm sorry, I don't know the Bates page reference -- rather than increase the rates at this time as the settlement would have allowed, the Company has chosen not to seek that small rate increase, but instead allow the costs to be reconciled at the time of the next rate case.

I'd like one of the witnesses to explain how that reconciliation will take place in a rate case. What will that look like?
A. (Menard) Sure, I can take that. Ms. Menard.

So we continue to track the variance between what is in base rates and the actual
\{DE 19-057\}
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costs, and we defer that over amount, over or under, actually. And so those over- or under-collections will -- sorry. Just got a little pop-up.

Those over- or under-collections will be deferred and collected in a deferred asset account and analyzed at the time of the next rate case, just like any other deferrals.
Q. Okay. And this same mechanism is proposed per the settlement concerning the $\$ 1,077,356$ that was related to the New Start Program; is that correct?
A. (Menard) Can you restate that question?
Q. Yeah. I guess what I'm asking more directly is, is it also the Company's position that, per the settlement, the $\$ 1,077,356$ that relates to the New Start Program will also be reconciled at the time of the next base rate case?
A. (Menard) Yes, that's correct.
Q. So both of these items, then, your prior answer would apply to both of these items, that you'll accumulate the over or under. You'll have a deferred amount at the
\{DE 19-057\}
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beginning of the next rate case, and then it will be --
A. (Menard) Right, it will be handled the same way.
Q. Do you know at this time how that will take place, the mechanics of how that will take place in the next base rate case, what we can expect to see?
A. (Menard) It will be similar to any other deferred asset account that exists on the books at the time of the Company's test year. And the Company would propose some kind of mechanism to adjustment or add to the base cost of service.

You know, sometimes the deferral amounts are large enough, there's a proposal to amortize those over a number of years, and sometimes there's just a base adjustment. So I can't say at this time because I don't know what the future will look like. But it will be handled the same way as any other deferred asset.
Q. Can you recall any other deferred assets that were handled in the most recent rate case,
just so we have an idea of what we're talking about?
A. (Menard) Sure. Yeah. The environmental reserve is one that comes to mind. There was a balance on the books, and the Company ended up settling to move that actually to the stranded cost rate and then recovering that over a certain time period.
Q. Right. And the stranded cost mechanism allows for dollar-for-dollar collection. Would you agree with that?
A. (Menard) Yes.
Q. Whereas reconciling in base rates may actually not result in a dollar-for-dollar collection. Would you agree with that, depending on the amortization period, the period in which base rates are in effect and various things like that?
A. (Menard) I'm not sure I would agree with that. I'm not sure, I guess, I understand that.
Q. Well, I think what you had said was you'd accumulate these costs in a bucket, and then you'd make an adjustment to base rates to \{DE 19-057\} [Hearing] \{01-14-22\}
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either collect or pass back as appropriate. And then you said if it's large enough, it might even be amortized over a number of years. But under a traditional base rate setting, that amount, whether it's a positive or a negative amount, will remain in base rates until they are changed in the next rate base; correct?
A. (Menard) Yes. Yeah, so there's a number of ways you can handle it. Unfortunately, we're looking into the future. And, you know, I don't know what the proposal will be in the next rate base case. But you would look at what the deferred asset is and make a proposal to either -- you know, if this is an ongoing cost, you would adjust your base cost of service to incorporate that. Or, you know, you could say, you know, it's going to be this amount for the first two years and then it would drop off. So there's a number of ways you could do it. It's hard to say, sitting here today, what that would look like. But the Settlement Agreement does specify exactly how this is to be handled,
[PANEL: KISHIMOTO|WASHINGTON|MENARD|ULLRAM]
and it says that we would defer this until the Company's next rate case.
Q. Okay. Is it the Company's position that when the next base rate case comes along, this item will be addressed in its prefiled materials on Day 1 of the rate case? It's not something that -- well, let me just leave it at that.

Is this something the Company agrees will be addressed in its filing up front when the case is filed?
A. (Menard) It's hard to say "Yes" or "No" sitting here today because I don't know what the balance is going to look like. It could be nothing, and the Company could forego it. But we are tracking it. So it will be an item that will be shown on the books. And then depending on what the Company decides to do to adjust, you know, we could make an adjustment to base rates or not. But it will be shown on the books, so it will be included in the test year.

And so I guess to answer your question,
yes, it will be shown, and then we could
\{DE 19-057\} [Hearing] \{01-14-22\}
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determine how to handle that in the base rate case itself.
Q. Okay. Back more to the substance of the Fee Free Credit Card Program. I'd like to turn to Bates 21 of Exhibit 69. There's a statement in the text. There's no line numbers here. But in Bullet VI, that says the recent study shows, quote, concerns about credit cards [fees] have dropped three percentage points.

Can you explain what "concerns about credit card fees" means in this context? And by you, I meant the Company if it's not -[Court Reporter interrupts.]
Q. If it's not Ms. Menard that answers, I understand that.
A. (Kishimoto) So these are from customer complaints.
Q. And how are those complaints conveyed to the Company?
A. (Kishimoto) Either via customer -- we have an internal team that I'd have to -- subject to check, but these are coming from our surveys I believe. I'd have to check that, though.

$$
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Q. So I'm just curious. Was it a situation where a question was asked on a survey like, "Are you concerned about credit card fees?" Or was it more of a situation like, "What concerns do you have about the Company?" Do you know how the question was posed to the customers?
A. (Menard) So Mr. Dexter, I can try to help out and answer that.

We have a company, J.D. Power, that does, $I$ can't remember if it's quarterly or -- there's a frequency that J.D. Power does surveys of customers, of our utility customers, and we get those results broken down into various categories. And so you can see the customer satisfaction. They'll indicate various questions. They'll indicate why they say they're -- what their sentiments are. So you can track, based on various questions, the impact of their responses on their overall customer satisfaction. So that's to answer that question about the J.D. Power residential study.

But as Mr. Kishimoto was saying, there's
\{DE 19-057\} [Hearing] \{01-14-22\}
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other channels that the Company connects with customers to receive feedback.
Q. And can one of the Company's witnesses explain to me, on the left side of the graph, I think it's the $Y$ axis, if $I$ remember algebra, the percentages going up the chart, why do the numbers repeat themselves? Why is there two 21 percents, two 22 percents, two 23 percents and so on and so forth?
A. (Menard) There's probably a percentage, half a percentage in there.
[Court Reporter interrupts.]
A. (Menard) Yes, it could be 21, 21-1/2, 22, 22-1/2. It was probably just left off. I don't have it in front of me, but that's what I would suspect.
Q. So if that's the case, then the difference between the 2020 bar, which looks like it's 25-1/2, and the 2021 bar, which looks like it hits 22-3/4, what's the difference between those absolute numbers, rather than trying to figure out the bars?
A. (Kishimoto) I do not have the actual numbers outside of the bar graph with me.
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Q. I think the testimony says that it was 3 percent. And my question would be, does the Company consider that to be a substantial change? In other words, if you can knock 3 percent off of concern, is that a substantial movement in the Company's viewpoint?
A. (Menard) So the testimony is comparing, you know, as you referred to, Item VI, Bullet Item VI, 2021 as compared to 2020. So it's comparing that 22 to the 25. And that's the 3 percent change, to answer your first question.

And then the second question, does the Company consider that a substantial change?
Q. Yeah, or significant, if that's a better word. Is that something that is significant?
A. (Menard) I can't say for sure whether it's significant. But any change, you know, producing customer dissatisfaction is important to the Company.
Q. I'd like to turn to the New Start Program, Bates Page 30 in this package, the reference at the very bottom, $\$ 340,000$, of, quote, program start-up costs. Could you describe
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what the program start-up costs are?
A. (Menard) Can you refer to that Bates page over again? Sorry.
Q. Yes. That was Bates Page 30. It's in the testimony of Ms. Washington, I believe.
A. (Washington) So the program start-up costs, I believe that refers to like the IT work, the information technology department, when it impacts changes to our customer billing systems.
Q. Thank you. And then Bates Page 31 talks about the $\$ 1,077,356$ that's proposed in this docket, in this phase of this docket. And that is described at Line 4, "to assure there is adequate funding for the program as it is implemented in early 2022." What does that mean, to -- oh, I'm sorry. I should have quoted Line 2. The money is to, "fund a reserve account in support of the program." And then Line 4 says, "to assure that there is adequate funding for the program as it is implemented."

What does that mean? What are these dollars for exactly?
[Hearing]
A. (Menard) So I could just kind of help out and set the stage a little bit. So there's two pieces that were in the Settlement Agreement for the New Start Program. The first piece was $\$ 1.7$ million to implement changes to the billing system, and that was spread over I think a five-year period. So that's the $\$ 340,000$ that's in base rates. So for five years we'll be collecting $\$ 340,000$, which totals the $\$ 1.7$ million, if 1 can remember that all right.

The second piece is -- so that's just to implement the program, the changes to the billing system. Once those billing system changes are completed, then the program can start being offered to customers. So this million dollars, $\$ 1,077,000$, is the amount that will go into a reserve account. So as customer dollars are forgiven, it goes against this reserve account. And so when the billing system changes are completed by the end of the first quarter in 2022, we'll begin offering that program to customers. So we needed to fund that reserve. And so the
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Settlement Agreement agreed that we wanted to implement this increase to base distribution rates to fund that reserve account close to when the program changes will be completed and close to or in line with when we would have an opportunity for a rate change, so we weren't having rate changes at off cycles. So the February time frame is when we change many of our rate's energy service stranded costs. So the Company agreed that we would seek the base distribution rate increase at the same time of that February 1st time frame. So that's why the $\$ 1,077,000$ increase is being done at this time, to align with when the program will begin being offered. So it funds this reserve that the forgiveness dollars will come from. Hope that answers your question.
Q. Yes, very completely. Thank you.

On Bates 28 in the testimony, there's a statement that refers to when a customer -this is on Line 10 -- "completes the program." Can you describe what completing this program means?
\{DE 19-057\}
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A. (Washington) Yes, I can. So a customer completes the program -- and New Start is a 12-month program; therefore, hypothetically, we're hoping the customers are paying each month of the 12 -month program, because at the end of the 12 months, the arrears or the forgiveness will be provided on that past-due balance that they came into the program with. Therefore, they've completed the requirements of the program with on-time monthly payments and after completion they do not have an arrears and therefore wouldn't necessarily need to have the program available. Because the intent of the program is to reduce that arrears that made them eligible for the program. So after completion, again, based on 12 on-time monthly payments, at the end of the program they've successfully completed that.
Q. Thank you. And later on in that page it says that the Company anticipates that 20 percent of enrolled customers will complete the program. Where does that estimate come from?
A. (Washington) Twenty percent is just based on, \{DE 19-057\} [Hearing] \{01-14-22\}
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because the programs are available in Connecticut and Massachusetts, just looking at what history tells us for customers that are enrolled with the other states on this program making 12 consecutive, on-time monthly payments, we've seen a 20 percent completion rate, an estimated 20 percent completion rate for those that make it to that point.
Q. And on Page 29 it talks about a cap, a per customer cap that could be forgiven of \$12,000. And this is limited to residential customers as I understand it.

In your experience in the other states that you mentioned, Connecticut and Massachusetts, has that cap been hit; and if so, is it frequently or very rarely? Or how does that work out?
A. (Washington) No. Again, successfully completing that -- you're meeting the cap. So if you're enrolled in the program, successfully complete, there's a cap forgiveness that's provided based on the balances. So you would, in essence, meet
[PANEL: KISHIMOTO|WASHINGTON|MENARD|ULLRAM]
that cap. And New Hampshire was established at $\$ 12,000$, and the other states have different caps associated with them.
Q. So certainly a residential customer could successfully complete the program but not hit the $\$ 12,000$ cap if their bills were $\$ 100$ a month or $\$ 200$ a month. Would you agree?
A. (Washington) So if their balance -- we're looking at the balance, because New Start forgives one-twelfth of that balance. There's a cap of $\$ 12,000$. So, of course, the customer that comes into the program with a \$1200 balance is having forgiveness at \$100. So $\$ 1200$ would be forgiven over the period of time.
Q. Okay. Well, $I$ wanted to talk a little bit about the rate increase that's proposed. So I'm going to jump down to Bates Page 61. We can start with a fairly insignificant question, I guess.

Bates 61 is part of a four-page exhibit, and it's part of a four-page exhibit that's labeled "Attachment ELM/JAU-2," except on Page 61 it's labeled "ELM/JAU-1." Is that
\{DE 19-057\}
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just a mislabeling of this exhibit or --
A. (Menard) Sorry. I wasn't following.
A. (Washington) So, Erica, Page 61, if we look at the header, it's "Attachment ELM/JAU-1." If you run up to Page 60, the header is "Attachment ELM" --
A. (Menard) Yeah, got it. That just looks like a mislabeling. Thank you for catching that.

I think you're on mute, Paul.
Q. Thank you. Right above that, the date where we have " $12 / \mathrm{xx} / 2021$, " was that intended to say "12/15/2021"?
A. (Menard) Yes, it was.
Q. So Bates 61 is intended to show, as I understand it, the collection of over- or under-recovery. And that's shown on Line 10; is that right?
A. (Menard) Yes.
Q. I'm sorry. Was that "Yes"? I didn't hear?
A. (Menard) Yes. Yes, Line 10.
Q. Okay. And the first third of the schedule is intended to show the costs; the second third is intended to show the recovery; and the last three lines nets out the difference. Is \{DE 19-057\} [Hearing] \{01-14-22\}
that how this schedule works?
A. (Menard) That's how the schedule works, yes.
Q. And I see in the middle of the schedule there's a bunch of recoveries because these costs have been -- or are predicted to be recovered over the course of 2022. And in particular, Line 6 shows the $\$ 1,077,000$ that's at issue in this case. Would you agree?
A. (Menard) Yes.
Q. And yet, I'm confused, I guess, why there are no cost numbers in the top third of the page. I would have expected to see both programming costs and reserve account funding costs predicted for 2022. Can you explain why those lines are all blank, Lines 1, 2 and 3?
A. (Menard) Honestly, we just put this together for illustrative purposes, you know, kind of what the Company -- what it would look like to track going forward. The important part is really Lines 5 and 6 that show, you know, the revenue streams for each of the two components. And then, you know, as the New Start dollars are forgiven, those would be
[PANEL: KISHIMOTO|WASHINGTON|MENARD|ULLRAM]
compared against that reserve account amount. So it was -- we didn't put estimates in. We didn't forecast what those New Start forgiveness dollars were. This is just the beginning of the program. So, again, all of this would be reconciled. So we just put it in more for illustrative purposes.
Q. So then, when we go to January 2023, the bottom right-hand corner of this screen -I'm sorry. When we get to the 12 -month total, that's a running balance, correct, the 12-month Total column?
A. (Menard) It would be a running balance, yes.
Q. So we would expect to not see an over-collection of $\$ 1.4$ million; would you agree? We'd expect to see something net of actual costs; is that right?
A. (Menard) Yes, one would hope, because if you saw that, that means no one subscribed to the program. So, yes, we would expect to have dollars for the payments that are being forgiven and compare that to the amount in the reserve account. Hopefully they should be close to each other.
\{DE 19-057\}
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Q. Well, as $I$ understand it, though, even if no one subscribed to the program, there still would be costs in Line 2 , the IT programming costs.
A. (Menard) So the IT programming costs, I'm not sure it would be handled this same way. The IT programming costs are capital dollars. And so the final capital amount that is incurred to make these programming changes would be compared against the $\$ 1.7 \mathrm{million}$ that's collected in rates. The variance would be deferred, and then we would determine that collection in the next base rate case. So it's in total. It's a total comparison because it's capital. It's different. The New Start is really like an ongoing expense type of thing, whereas the IT programming costs is capital expenditure that we're already recovering in base rates, those capital dollars. So it would be the difference. It probably -- the final schedule, the final results would not look like this.
Q. Okay. And the next page, if I understand the
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way this package works, is the calculation of the carrying charges on the over- or under-recovered balance; is that right?
A. (Menard) Yes.
Q. And again, this schedule works off the prior page. So we would not necessarily expect to see the level of carrying charges, because when real life happens, because the prior page just shows over-collections, doesn't have that offset predicted. Would you agree with that?
A. (Menard) Correct. Yes, I would agree.
Q. So I'd like to jump down to Bates Page 68 for a minute. Now, Bates Page 68 is where the calculated rate increase -- where the calculation of the proposed rate increase occurs in order to collect the $\$ 1,077,000$. Would you agree with that?
A. (Ullram) Yes, I would agree.
Q. And Line 19 shows that overall -- I guess this is the question: Is it correct that Line 19 shows that the overall sort of average base rate increase is .26 percent?

Would you agree?
\{DE 19-057\} [Hearing] \{01-14-22\}
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A. (Ullram) That is correct.
Q. Now, in looking at the calculation of the .26, I had a couple of questions.

On Line 11, it gives us what are called "current rate distribution revenue," 416. I'm assuming this is in thousands; so \$416 million; is that right?
A. (Ullram) That's correct.
Q. And it lists in the box a source for that, Line 55, Column A. So if $I$ jump down to Line 55, I see that number. It's actually in Column B. Would you agree that should reference Column $B$ ?
A. (Ullram) I would agree.
Q. Okay. But it doesn't really tell me where the number comes from. I see how it's broken down between the various classes in Column $B$. But could you tell us more descriptively where that $\$ 416$ million figure comes from?
A. (Ullram) Certainly. So, first of all, that 416,367, that number was originally in our Step 2 revised compliance filing. So that's where the origination of that number comes from. But then within the file itself that
\{DE 19-057\} [Hearing] \{01-14-22\}
we have here, Column B that you referenced -and thank you for correcting that it should be Column B and not Column A -- Column B that you referenced here, those all link into revenue calculations that can be seen beginning on Bates 73. And what the revenue calculation is doing is taking the current approved distribution rates, multiplying by billing determinants, and it calculates a total distribution revenue impact.

So if you look at Bates 73, you'll see on Line 26, in Column C, you'll see for Rate R there's a total distribution, current distribution revenues of $235,835,983$ on that line there. And that line, again, rounded in thousands, links back to Bates 68 for Line 27 there. So it's just the Excel version of this. And, you know, we'd be more than happy to file it. The Excel version of that links within the reference, so you would have been able to see that within the file itself.
Q. Sure, sure. No, I understand that the schedule on 68 ties to the later schedule. But I think you actually answered my question
in the first sentence, but it went a little fast. You said something about a step adjustment. So I'm really curious where the 416 was developed, not how it's spread out in subsequent sheets. So could you just repeat that again for us, please?
A. (Washington) Sure.
A. (Menard) Just to help you out, on Bates 54, in our testimony we list what makes up that permanent distribution rate, so all the different approvals that have occurred since the base rate case.
Q. Okay. So I think what you're trying to say is that you had a revenue figure or a revenue target established in your base rate case, this case 19-057, back a couple years ago. And since then you've had some step adjustments, so that revenue target figure has come up. Is that what it is, essentially?
A. (Ullram) Yes, that's correct.
A. (Menard) And if you go to Bates 54, Lines 19 through 21, it indicates the permanent distribution rates approved in this docket,
\{DE 19-057\}
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in Order 26,433, Order, 26,439 and Order 26,504. So it's layered on. You had your base, Step 1 and Step 2. And that's the basis for the current distribution revenue.
Q. Okay. So then back on Page 68. In order to determine that we're looking to implement a .26 percent increase, as I understand it, you take the 1,077,000 and divide it by that 416 million figure; is that right?
A. (Ullram) That's correct.
Q. Now, that's not what it says on Line 19. My Line 19 says you take Line 15 and divide it by Line 11.
A. (Ullram) There's different ways to get the same answer. So you can either take Line 15 divided by 11 -- and so it would be, you know, Line 15 divided by 11 minus 1 gets you to the same place as taking Line 13 divided by Line 11. The math is the same, it's just how we referenced it.
Q. Okay. Well, I don't see anywhere in the box that says take Line 15 divided by Line 11 and minus 1. Maybe that would work.
A. (Ullram) Yeah, we can easily correct that.
\{DE 19-057\}
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A. (Menard) It's just the math of how you would calculate a percentage.
A. (Ullram) Yeah, it's just the math.
Q. Just the math. So we need a numerator and a denominator. So I want you to tell me exactly what's the numerator and what's the denominator.
A. (Ullram) As I mentioned, you can do it two different ways. You can either take Line 17 divided by Line 11, or Line 13 divided by 11, either one. In this case, what this formula is doing in the reference source that we have here is taking Line 15 divided by Line 11 and getting a percentage and subtract one.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

So then I just want to take a few minutes to see how this .26 percent rate increase gets applied to the various classes. And to do that, I'd like to go to Page 69, Bates Page 69, and just look at Rate R, which is the residential class; correct?
A. (Ullram) That's correct.
Q. And when I see the residential class, of course I don't see a . 26 percent. Instead I
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see a zero percent increase to the customer charge -- this is over in the right-hand column -- and a . 37 percent increase to all kWh. Could you explain how that relates to the . 26 percent increase that we're trying to get here?
A. (Ullram) Right. So what happens is there's two steps. So if you go back to Bates Page 68 and you look in Column C, what we do is that . 26 percent -- we first need to get what the amount of revenues that $I$ need to collect from each rate class are. So that Column C for Rate $R$, specifically looking on that Line 27 , takes the total current distribution revenue that's in Column $B$ and multiplies that times Line 19 , which is the .26 incremental percentage. So what that does is allocate -- generally there's going to be some rounding issues because we can only go out to a certain number of decimal places per kilowatt-hour rates. But where that generally gets you is the allocation you need to get to collect the revenues from each of those rate classes. So in order to do
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that for Rate $R, I$ needed to change -- or increase the distribution revenues by 610,200, rounded, in order to recover a total distribution target that's shown in Column D of 236 --
[Court Reporter interrupts.]
A. (Ullram) 236,446,000. And so that is our distribution target.

So in order to do that, if you go to the total in Column G, that .019 cents per kilowatt hour, that's what I need to increase my distribution rate by in order to hit my target that I set in Column D.

So when you're then going to Bates Page 69, the difference between the current rates and the proposed rates is the .019 . And that percentage change isn't going to necessarily match the .25 percent because the . 25 percent is based on a revenue change, not a rate change --
Q. Okay. Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't mean to cut you off.
A. (Washington) No, I was going to say hopefully that explanation responds. So $I$ apologize if
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it got confusing.
Q. Now, just to sort of close the loop on this, on Bates 69, the reason there's no . 26 percent change to the customer charge, or any other change to the customer charge, is because the settlement in the basic rate case in this docket dictates that any rate changes coming out of this case will not affect the residential customer charge; is that correct?
A. (Ullram) That's correct. That was part of our Settlement Agreement.
Q. Maybe it's an oversimplification. But is it fair to say, essentially, that this . 37 percent increase in the kilowatt-hour charge is meant to collect this .26 percent overall from the residential class?
A. (Ullram) That's correct. That's a simplification of it, yes. Again, these are the same approaches that have been used in the base distribution rate case, as well as each of the two previous step adjustments. So, per the settlement, we're continuing the same process on how we allocate each rate class and then separate rates.
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Q. Very good.

So not to belabor this, but I'd just like to go through the same example for explanation for a rate class that has a demand charge because I'm curious as to how that would work.

So am I correct that if I go down to Line 34 on Bates 69, I'll get to Rate G, and Rate $G$ has a demand charge?
A. (Ullram) Line 39?
Q. Well, I see Rate G starting at Line 34.
A. (Ullram) Oh, yes, that's our load control service, Rate G.
Q. Okay. Well, let's go to a rate that's more common. Let's go to your general service rate. Is that Rate GV?
A. (Ullram) Yes.
Q. Okay. So for that I need to go to Bates Page 70, Line 17; is that correct?
A. (Ullram) Yes, Line 17.
Q. Okay. And I see here that there's no percentage increase in the customer charge, just like the residential class. There's no percentage increase in the demand charge
which shows up on Line 19 and 20 ; correct?
A. (Ullram) That's correct. So we had changed the kilowatt-hour charges for each of the rate classes.
Q. And so that's what shows up on Lines 22 and 23.
A. (Ullram) That's correct.
Q. And again, the notion of changing the kilowatt-hour charge rather than the demand charge, is that consistent -- is that spelled out in the settlement, or is it just an interpretation of how you get there?
A. (Ullram) That wasn't specifically spelled out in the settlement. You know, we said that we could maintain the consistency of how we allocated to each of the rate classes and then specifically identified that we wouldn't change the customer charge. But it's not spelled out that we have to change either the kilowatt hour or the kilowatt-hour charges.
Q. Okay. Could you -- and I'm not suggesting that DOE supports this. But could you have accomplished this . 2 percent -- . 26 percent increase by allocating some of that or all of \{DE 19-057\} [Hearing] \{01-14-22\}
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that to the demand charge?
A. (Ullram) Yes, we could have.

MR. DEXTER: All right. Thank you, Commissioners. That's all the questions I have.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you.
We'll move to Commission questions. I'll recognize Commissioner Simpson.

COMMISSIONER SIMPSON: Thank You, Mr. Chairman.

QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONERS:
BY COMMISSIONER SIMPSON:
Q. I'd like to start with Mr. Kishimoto.

Looking at Bates Page 10 of Exhibit 69, I see that you're responsible for payment and print operations; is that correct?
A. (Kishimoto) That is correct.
Q. So how will customers' bills demonstrate costs associated with the Fee Free Credit Card Program? How will that be broken out on bills?
A. (Kishimoto) Erica, is that -- I don't know --
A. (Menard) Is it okay if I assist?
[connectivity issue]
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[Court Reporter interrupts.]
A. (Kishimoto) Sorry. I said the costs are not listed on the bills.
Q. So --
A. (Menard) If I could assist? This is Ms. Menard.
Q. Please.
A. (Menard) Fee Free credit card payments, the program itself and those costs are collected through distribution rates. So it's embedded in the distribution rates, so it doesn't show up as a separate line item on the customer bill.
Q. And on the bill there's no breakdown in terms of costs associated with the distribution line item?
A. (Menard) On our bills, there's a distribution rate line item specifically.
Q. So --
A. (Menard) The Fee Free Credit Card Program is embedded in that rate.
Q. So the only breakdown would be in the tariff.
A. (Menard) The tariff does not break out the Fee Free piece. It's been a while since I
looked at it, but I don't believe they're in the tariff that breaks out the calculation associated with the Fee Free. It's just all part of the cost of service that went into developing the distribution rate. So we don't break out all the different pieces of cost of service in the distribution rate, just the distribution rate in total.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Looking at Bates Page 11 on some background introducing the fees associated with credit card/debit payments, is it true that the fees are set by the respective credit card companies? This is for Mr. Kishimoto.
A. (Kishimoto) That we initially had agreed to the fees. So I should ask, what are you -can you clarify what you mean by "set" by credit card companies?
Q. So presumably you accept Visa, MasterCard, American Express. Is that the case?
A. (Kishimoto) Yes, we do accept from those companies. That's subject to check as well. I want to clarify on that.
Q. Okay. And each of those credit companies
[PANEL: KISHIMOTO|WASHINGTON|MENARD|ULLRAM]
must have a transaction fee; correct?
A. (Kishimoto) Correct. Yes.
Q. Are those fees uniform across each individual credit card company?
A. (Kishimoto) I do not know the answer to that.
Q. Okay. Has there been or is there any effort to be able to negotiate those fees?
A. (Kishimoto) Those fees would be negotiated between our vendor and those companies.
Q. So that's --
A. (Menard) Mr. Simpson, just to help Mr.

Kishimoto, I believe how it works is we go out to bid. We, you know, establish an RFP and we contract with a vendor that we contract with that accepts those payments, and then we establish the payment rate between the vendor and Eversource. The vendors work with the credit card companies, so we don't have insight as to, you know, what the various rates are. They may negotiate. But we contract with a vendor to establish a per-transaction fee.
Q. Okay. And that vendor works with the various credit card companies on their own to
\{DE 19-057\}
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establish fees and payment of those associated fees?
A. (Kishimoto) Yes.
Q. So when a customer goes to the Eversource customer service portal to pay their bill, they're directed to a separate portal for payment via credit card?
A. (Kishimoto) When a customer goes on to Eversource.com to make a credit card payment, they go -- they're directed to SpeedPay's portal to process that payment, our vendor. That's our vendor's portal to process payment.
[Court Reporter interrupts.]
Q. So does Eversource store any of the personally identifiable information associated with customers and credit card payments?
A. (Kishimoto) No, we do not.
Q. Do you have access to that information?
A. (Kishimoto) To the credit card information?
Q. To the PII associated with credit card payments.
A. (Kishimoto) No, we do not.
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Q. And is there oversight in place to ensure that the credit card payment vendor that you use is adequately protecting that data?
A. (Kishimoto) We do -- there's oversight. We do receive a letter from them to confirm that.
Q. And do you have any agreements in place with regard to cyber security with those vendors' protection?
A. (Kishimoto) Are we talking about PTI compliance still or...
Q. I think more generally, just personally identifiable information associated with customer credit card payments.
A. (Kishimoto) Our IT team does approve our vendor is PTI-compliant. But I'm unsure of the exact agreement that we have with security, web security. But we do have a program at Eversource, a cyber security program.
Q. When you were discussing responses with Mr. Dexter, I believe you said that the former credit card transaction fee was $\$ 2.25$ per payment. Is that correct?
A. (Kishimoto) Yes.
Q. Okay. On Bates Page 15, you discuss the total cost of credit card fees for those customers that chose to pay their bills using a credit card at a cost of $\$ 1$ per -- $\$ 1.48$ per payment. So that $\$ 1.48$, what does that number represent?
A. (Kishimoto) That is the cost that we are charged for payment, Eversource is charged.
Q. So --
A. (Kishimoto) There's a --
Q. Okay. So that's an average? You average those costs historically?
A. (Kishimoto) No, that's a per-transaction cost.
Q. So what has Eversource been doing with the extra 77 cents per payment?
A. (Kishimoto) The customers are no longer assessed a fee as part of this program.
Q. I understand that. But what has the Company historically done? If your historical cost is $\$ 1.48$ per payment and you've been charging $\$ 2.25$, where has that 77 cents gone?
A. (Kishimoto) Prior to this program, we were \{DE 19-057\} [Hearing] \{01-14-22\}
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not paying per-transaction costs.
Q. Okay. You were just directly -- that \$2.25 was billed by your vendor?
A. (Kishimoto) The $\$ 2.25$, yes, that was assessed to the customers at the time of their transaction.
Q. So now the cost of each transaction has gone down because you're taking care of it individually -- or Eversource is taking care of all these residential fees?
A. (Kishimoto) Correct. Per our agreement with the vendor, the cost is lower that is charged to Eversource as part of the Fee Free Program.
Q. Thank you. You mentioned below, still on Bates Page 15, adoption. What is the dominant payment form today for residential customers?
A. (Kishimoto) The most used payment platform is direct debit.
Q. Via online means?
A. (Kishimoto) Correct.
Q. Okay.
A. (Kishimoto) For the record, that's subject to \{DE 19-057\} [Hearing] \{01-14-22\}
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check, just because I don't have those numbers in front of me.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

By offering a Fee Free Credit Card Payment Program for residential customers, has the Company analyzed how that service might impact arrears?
A. (Kishimoto) Not that I am aware of.
Q. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Kishimoto.

I'd like to turn to Ms. Washington regarding the New Start Program.

On Bates Page 27, you mentioned that for the utility, the costs associated with collection activities on these accounts are diminished, as field visits and disconnections/reconnections are avoided.

Has the Company determined the expected reduction in costs from reduced field visit activities?
A. (Washington) So, Commissioner, your question regarding have we looked at, you know, the cost -- of course there's cost to roll a truck and send field technicians out there. So it's more have we looked at the avoided
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costs --
Q. Yes, that's my question.
A. (Washington) -- of doing so. Certainly we don't want to assume so, but $I$ think it is a good assumption to say if a customer is enrolled in any payment plan or actively engaged, the customer is avoiding further collection activity; therefore, there is going to be a savings because you are not sending field technicians or rolling trucks to disconnect services.
Q. But you haven't analyzed the dollar amount for potential savings from reduced field visit activities?
A. (Washington) I might have to look at our team here to see if they've analyzed that in the cost or savings. I assume it would be, but...
A. (Menard) I don't recall whether this was -whether there was any sort of reduction in our base cost or not. So $I$ can't say, off the top of my head.
Q. Okay. Further down on Bates Page 27 you talk about eligibility to participate in the New
[PANEL: KISHIMOTO|WASHINGTON|MENARD|ULLRAM]

Start Program. Have you quantified the number of customers today that could qualify for this program?
A. (Washington) Today I was actually thinking about that question and looking at the number of customers that would be potentially eligible to participate if New Start was implemented today. I think when we reported back in -- I think there was some figures around earlier mid-2020, where we had customers that were in arrears, I think it was over 3,000 customers. I haven't looked at it recently, as far as who would be eligible, based on the eligibility rules, which were the financial hardship, $\$ 150$ in arrears over 60 days. So $I$ don't have that number in front of me to provide that.
Q. And roughly how many residential customers does PSNH serve today?
A. (Washington) $I$ can get that information. But I don't have the number of customers they serve residential as of right now.
Q. Okay. Would you be able to provide the number of customers who are in arrears,
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residential customers eligible for the program who are in arrears over $\$ 12,000$ ?
A. (Washington) Yes.
Q. Thank you.

Turning to Bates Page 37, can you help me understand the re-enrollment process for a customer that was part of the New Start Program and then was unsuccessful in meeting the terms of the program but would now like to re-enroll?
A. (Washington) Yes, $I$ can explain that. So a re-enrollment is considered someone who has been removed from the program due to nonpayment and the time frame from removal is still within one year; therefore, it's considered a re-enrollment of that versus just a brand new enrollment. So if you're missing payments, so you were dropped from the program, removed, you've dropped because of nompayment and you're looking to re-enroll, there would be a cost associated. So if you were dropped, let's say -- no. Let me start again, just to make it cleaner and clearer.
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So it was your first time enrolling ever in the New Start Program, which is going to be the scenario for New Hampshire customers. They're dropped from the program and they'd like to get reinstated. In good faith, we ask that customer to make up at least two budget payments to get back onto the program. Now, over time, if this customer enrolls in the program, drops, missing payments, likes to get back on, and there's that same pattern of dropping, enrolling, dropping, enrolling, we would ask, in good faith, that the customer make up all missed budget payments to re-enroll onto the program. So if you were just on the program once, you drop and you want to reinstate it, based on you, as a customer still being eligible to enroll -- so you're still considered financial hardship and in arrears, et cetera -- we'd say, in good faith, make two budget payments, and then we'd get you back on the program. But if you have a multiple pattern of on, off, on, off, on, off, when you're looking to re-enroll again in the future, we'd say
\{DE 19-057\} [Hearing] \{01-14-22\}
[PANEL: KISHIMOTO|WASHINGTON|MENARD|ULLRAM]
everything you missed for budget payments, please make up.
Q. And how are you intending to determine what those budget payments might be? What's the calculation to say, okay, you're at X --
[Court Reporter interrupts.]
A. (Washington) So clarifying the question, you're looking at what the budget payment is for re-enrollment? Is that --
Q. Well, let's start with just initial enrollment.
A. (Washington) Sure. So initial enrollment, you're looking at the customer's average usage over the previous 12 months. So if we're going to establish this program or this budget payment plan for you, we need something to base it on; so what's your average usage history been or your usage bill history. We take the average of that to predict what your budget will be on the program.
Q. Okay. And my questions here are really within the context of trying to determine the budget plans for those customers that are in
significant arrears.
So you propose an annual cap of $\$ 12,000$ that can be forgiven. And certainly for a residential customer that is eligible for this program, that's a significant amount of arrears. So how are -- how long are the payment budgets going to be? What do you expect for a monthly payment to be required in order to bring that customer back in line so that they're able to make monthly payments and stay on top of their bills?
A. (Washington) So the amount of the arrears is not -- does not impact what the budget is going to be. So the arrears that the customer comes into the program, that is related to how much forgiveness is going to be provided. But at the time the customer is enrolled in the program, it's looking at, of course, the last 12 months of usage. The charges determine, hey, what's the average budget payment going to be for the customer going forward. So if the customer usage is fairly low, that average bill will come out hopefully manageable for that customer. The
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customer's average usage, I mean, if it -over time during the course of the New Start Program, if they significantly increase their usage, then their budget could adjust higher to make up that different. So...
Q. How did you come up with the annual $\$ 12,000$ cap for forgiveness?
A. (Washington) The $\$ 12,000$ cap was in
discussions with the agreement. Prior to the discussions with the agreement. Prior to the stakeholder group convening, it was in the settlement to determine or provide that $\$ 12,000$ would be acceptable.
Q. From the Company's position, from what you've proposed here, that's the number that you've provided. So that just seemed like a very large number to me, and that's why I'm interested in learning how many customers would qualify for this program and are in arrears to such a degree. Because if you're in such a situation where you're not able to make your monthly payments, and you haven't been for a while, I'd like to better understand how you can build up such a balance.
\{DE 19-057\}
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A. (Washington) Understood. I mean, looking at it, I think I took an initial quick look. And of course, subject to change, it wasn't too long ago, looking at how many customers had high arrearages. And I do think that a lot of our customers that have medical protections or a medical situation have some of the higher balances versus just a customer that is financial hardship, because of course there is that discount rate that's available to help reduce the bills for the customers. There's programs out there to provide fuel assistance or fuel assistance grants for customers. But we do see just, you know, customers that do have medical protections have some of the higher arrearages.
Q. Do you intend to pursue customers for participation in this program?
A. (Washington) We do intend to promote the program, to educate, you know, our customers through various channels of communications.

We haven't put together a communications plan yet for this. But there will be a communications plan that includes, you know,
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targeted outreach, working with our Community Action agencies across the state to help educate and promote the program.
Q. So you do intend to review eligibility for the program and then target individual customers to inform them about the program?
A. (Washington) The outreach would be broadly, because customers who are not in arrears today may be in a situation in the future. So we could have both target outreach for customers and then more broad communications to help -- because this is going to be a brand new program, right. So we want to make sure that customers who may find themselves in a situation in the future know there's a program available to help for arrears management.
Q. Sure. But for customers that are in arrears today, or at the time when the program is implemented, it doesn't sound like you intend to directly target them for participation.
A. (Washington) No. I'm saying we can do targeted outreach, but I don't want to specifically, you know, target it only to
[PANEL: KISHIMOTO|WASHINGTON|MENARD|ULLRAM]
that. But we can do targeted outreach specifically to those that would qualify. We haven't put the communication plans -- it's not finalized. We are still developing that communications plan, which we can include targeted outreach.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SIMPSON: That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. Just a couple follow-up questions.

QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:
Q. Ms. Washington, you may have answered this earlier, but I'm not sure. So what is the universe today of New Start-eligible residential customers? Do you have a number that your -- that is in that universe?
A. (Washington) Yeah, that was a question that was polled, but $I$ don't have it in front of me to look at today's eligibility. The number that $I$ was quoting was what we had looked at earlier in 2020, where we saw roughly a little over 3,000 customers that would have been eligible for the program.
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But I don't have that today's number.
Q. Roughly 3,000. That's fine.

And have you taken a look at those 3,000 customers in that universe that also receive EAP, the electric assistance program? Have you cross-referenced those customers?
A. (Washington) Well, they look at those customers for being financial hardship. And I would assume that if those customers are verified as financial hardship, they would also be partaking in the EAP. And you're talking about the EAP, as far as discount rates; correct?
Q. Right, right. Those rates vary I think from 70 percent discounts to I think 8 percent, something like that.
A. (Washington) Yeah, $I$ think it's 8 to 76 or 77 percent, something like that.
Q. That's right.
A. (Washington) But we would -- you know, I don't have it in front of me. But I'm assuming that a good number of those customers that are financial hardship or verified like that are also participating in
边
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EAP .
Okay. Because I want to be very careful not to have double payments or people receiving more than is appropriate. So I'm going to make a record request, and I'm going to layer on what Commissioner Simpson mentioned, too.

So Commissioner Simpson has asked for the number of customers in arrears over \$12,000. So we'll make that a record request. That's one.

And then the second one I'd like to see is the total universe of customers today, understanding that things can change, but the total universe of customers today eligible for the New Start Program, and the number of those customers that are also in the EAP program. So I think it's important to understand the picture and make sure that we're not over-compensating or under-compensating people where this overlap exists.

So that's a -- we'll make that two record requests. We'll call that number -well, those would be Exhibits 70 and 71.
[PANEL: KISHIMOTO|WASHINGTON|MENARD|ULLRAM]

COMMISSIONER SIMPSON: Mr.
Chairman, can I add to that?
CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Yes, please.
COMMISSIONER SIMPSON: For each of those figures, I'd also like to see the average arrears in dollars.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay.
COMMISSIONER SIMPSON: Thank you. CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you.

BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:
Q. Very good. We'll move on to the next question, and that is in the New Start Program again. There was discussion earlier in the Settlement Agreement of $\$ 1.7$ million for the change in the billing system. Do I have that right, the total cost?
A. (Menard) Yes, that's accurate.
Q. Thank you. And that will be spread over five years, et cetera. And that was 340k. No problem.

And is that the total cost of the upgrade of the billing system, $\$ 1.7$ million? Is that what it costs to upgrade the billing system? And the reason I'm asking -- it's
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not a trick question. You operate in multiple states. So I'm assuming that New Hampshire is not paying the full cost of this new billing system.
A. (Menard) This is related to the New Hampshire piece of billing changes.
Q. Okay. Go ahead.
A. (Menard) We have two different billing systems. One is solely focused on New Hampshire only, so there's changes to that one. And then there are changes that need to be done. You know, each state operates differently. So while the billing system itself might be three states, these things are specific to implement the changes for New Hampshire.
Q. And Ms. Menard, can you, maybe just to avoid a record request if possible, could you maybe outline some of the differences between what New Hampshire requires and what, say, Massachusetts or Connecticut requires? 1.7 is a tremendous sum for this work, and I would have assumed the changes were pretty small relative to our other larger neighbors.
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A. (Menard) So I think $\$ 1.7$ million, when you're talking about IT changes, is not a lot of dollars. You know, we've seen anytime they need to go in and touch the billing system, there's -- you know, it impacts all, you know, all rates. So there's a lot of care that needs to be taken to make these changes. I can't speak specifically to the other states, how this program is different than the other states. Maybe Ms. Washington can. But I have been in some meetings, and there are significant differences between the New Hampshire program versus the other states. So I'm not sure if Ms. Washington can shed some light on that.
A. (Washington) So it does have to do -- so with the other states, and of course, let's say there's different requirements. So there's a lot of coding in back. If I talk about Massachusetts, there's a requirement that the customer is enrolled on a certain rate with a discount rate. But that is not a requirement in Connecticut, where in Connecticut there is no low-income discount rate available;
\{DE 19-057\} [Hearing] \{01-14-22\}
therefore, part of the requirement is this customer is considered financial hardship.

So from an IT system perspective, coding points to different pieces of the billing system to determine eligibility or ineligibility and just -- you know, working with the IT department through this year, there's a lot of technicalities behind the scenes where this option for this program was not available to a New Hampshire customer. So opening that up and expanding the program to determine eligibility, there's just a lot that is within it. Certainly I'm not an IT expert. I'm just speaking on some of the different nuances to open up the billing system to implement this program.
Q. Sadly, we don't have a Department of Energy witness today who was part of the Settlement Agreement. But I'm kind of concerned that $\$ 1.7$ million was approved. And, you know, with our larger neighbors to the south, it seems like there was a potential for a lot of overlap and perhaps simplification. And maybe there could have been funding that --
we could have spent less than $\$ 1.7$ million in New Hampshire had we maybe dovetailed on some of the other programs. But that was in the Settlement Agreement. That's for yesterday and tomorrow, and I'll move along.

A technical question for you. Is your billing system SAP? Or what are you using for your billing system?
A. (Washington) It is not SAP. That one I can confirm. It is -- I believe it's like a -it's a legacy system.
Q. Okay. So it's like a mainframe legacy system that you're having to update with the billing?
A. (Washington) We do have a mainframe legacy system. It's a customer central suite. I think it was wrote just for our company. I don't know of anyone that uses something similar to the system that we built.
Q. Are you aware of any plans at Eversource to replace your billing system?
A. (Washington) Because we do have a highly customized one, we do have plans in the future for a new billing system. I think
\{DE 19-057\}
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those are several years off when it comes to our New Hampshire and Connecticut territories. So I don't have the exact timing, but there are plans in the future --
Q. So, again, sadly, this will be wasted code, right. So we're going to put in $\$ 1.7$ million on this system that will be shortly replaced, right. Unfortunate.
A. (Washington) Well, I think the word "shortly," shortly in terms of how many years we're talking about, I think we are years off because implementing a new billing system is probably going to take some considerable time.
Q. Okay. But that will be something that you'll execute as a company across all states. That won't be state-specific, correct, your new billing?
A. (Washington) Yeah, it will be for all states.
Q. Right. And just a last question on billing systems. Does Eversource have a timeline on the implementation of that system? Is it planned for next year, the following year? Or is it just you don't know?
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A. (Washington) $0 h$, no. No way next year. We're talking years off.
Q. Okay.
A. (Washington) I would not even say -[connectivity issue]
[Court Reporter interrupts.]
A. (Washington) Yeah, I would say it's going to be several years. We should not see a new billing system even within three years.
Q. Okay.
A. (Washington) So it's going to be some time off.
Q. Very good. We can look for that in the next rate case I'm guessing.

Okay. Thank you. That was all the questions that I had.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Commissioner Simpson, anything you'd like to follow up on? COMMISSIONER SIMPSON: No. Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Very
good. So we'll move to redirect.
Do you have any redirect for your
witnesses, Ms. Ralston?
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MS. RALSTON: I think I just have one or two questions. But could we take a very brief recess so I can confer?

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Of course. Would you like -- how much time would you like?

MS. RALSTON: I think just five minutes would be sufficient.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Very good.
We'll take five minutes.
MS. RALSTON: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Off the record. (Brief recess was taken at 10:53 a.m., and the hearing resumed at 11:03 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. We'll go back on the record. We'll await Mr. Dexter.

MR. DEXTER: Sorry, Chairman. I'm here. I just forgot to put my camera back on.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: No worries, sir. Thank you.

Do we have anyone else we're waiting for? Ms. Borden, is there anybody else we should wait for, or is everyone back
\{DE 19-057\} [Hearing] \{01-14-22\}
on?
CLERK BORDEN: It appears everyone is back on. But additionally, a Mr. Raymond Burke has requested to make comments, if he could. So I have made him a panelist.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Just a moment, Ms. Borden.
(Commissioners confer off the record.)
CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. We'll allow Mr. Burke five minutes after closing.

Okay. So we'll move to redirect.
Ms. Ralston.
MS. RALSTON: Thank you.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. RALSTON:
Q. I have just a couple questions for Mr.

Kishimoto.
Mr. Kishimoto, do you recall Mr. Dexter asking you about the different rates that are -- or the different costs associated with the payment options available to residential customers?
A. (Kishimoto) Yes, I do.
Q. And can you just briefly explain how the
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costs associated with credit card or debit card payments compare to those other options?
A. (Kishimoto) The cost of credit and debit card payments are higher than the other options.
Q. Thank you.

MS. RALSTON: That's all we have.
CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.

So without objection, we'll strike I.D. on Exhibit 69 and admit it as a full exhibit. And we'll hold the record open for Exhibits 70 and 71 , which were the record requests that we -- that Commissioner Simpson and I made earlier.

And if everyone's clear on that, we can move to the closing arguments, beginning with Energy.

MR. DEXTER: Thank you, Chairman
Goldner. I have just a few brief comments.
This is essentially, in the
Department of Energy's view, an
implementation docket implementing rate changes that were contemplated in the overall settlement in this rate case. Generally
speaking, the Department of Energy has no objections or problems with the base rate changes that are proposed.

I want to comment on just a couple of issues that have come up. First, with respect to the Chair's question about the participation by a customer in both the arrearage management program and the EAP Discount Program. The Department of Energy is supportive and believes the settlement contemplated that a customer would be allowed to participate in both. There are benefits to participating in the EAP program that Ms. Washington states in her testimony at Bates Page 26, and we believe those are equally applicable to customers that participate in an EAP program as well.

With respect to the Fee Free
Program, we remain confused by the witness's -- or I am confused by the witness's answer on redirect. I thought that I had understood what made up the, quote, unquote, offsetting savings that are mentioned in the testimony. But the fact is,
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in this case, the Company is not proposing a rate change related to the Fee Free program. They plan to address that in the reconciling -- they plan to address the reconciliation in the next base rate case, as required by the settlement. So the Department of Energy can follow up with any questions that it has on the offsetting savings at that time.

We do recommend to the Company that when the next base rate case comes along, that the reconciliation of these costs, both the 375,000 for the Fee Free Program and $\$ 1,077,000$ for the arrearage management program, be addressed head-on, directly in testimony to let everyone know how this reconciliation process is being implemented. We don't recommend that it just be in the test year in a deferred account, as Ms. Menard indicated -- I think indicated might be the case. We understand it will be in a deferred account. We understand it will fall into the test year. But when the rate case comes in, we believe that it's a holdover
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issue that deserves a significant -- a direct explanation when the next case comes in.

So with that, we would recommend approval of the rates as proposed, and we thank the Commission for its time today.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you, Mr.
Dexter.
Eversource.
MS. RALSTON: Thank you, Chairman Goldner, Commissioner Simpson. The Company would also like to thank the Department of Energy for their questions today and their support of the proposal.

With respect to Mr. Dexter's further questions about the Fee Free Program, the Company would be happy to set up some additional time to provide some clarification.

Other than that, the Company has nothing additional to add today. We just reiterate our request for the Commission to approve the petition as filed with respect to the New Start and the Fee Free Program.

Thank you.
\{DE 19-057
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CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Ralston.

And we'll allow Mr. Burke five minutes for public comment now.

MR. BURKE: Thank you, Chairman Goldner and Commissioner Simpson, for giving me the opportunity to make some comments. I wasn't initially planning to comment here today. It was more to observe. But I thought it would be helpful to let the Commission know about a few things with respect to the New Start Program.

My name is Raymond Burke, as you know, and I work for New Hampshire Legal Assistance. We represented The Way Home in this docket. Unfortunately, The Way Home no longer exists, so we are no longer representing them as a party in the docket. But The Way Home and New Hampshire Legal Assistance are very supportive. We're very supportive of the New Start Program. We continue at NHLA to believe it is a really important step here in New Hampshire for the low-income Granite Staters that we serve.
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And I just wanted to note that I know this was -- this hearing today is specifically about the cost recovery. But given some of the questions from the Commission, $I$ just wanted to note that The Way Home's expert witness, Roger Colton, provided testimony in this docket about a number of the topics that you asked about today regarding, you know, the average arrears at the time at least that he analyzed, why the cap -- why he supported the cap that was ultimately agreed upon, in terms of the amount of arrears forgiven. And he also analyzed the EAP enrollment level at the time and how that related to the New Start Program.

And I just wanted to reiterate what Attorney Dexter said a moment ago, that we really see the arrearage program as a key piece to enabling low-income ratepayers to access affordable utility service. And it's really exactly that, a piece of the puzzle. All of the assistance programs that do exist -- namely, the electric assistance
\{DE 19-057\}
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program and fuel assistance program -- kind of serve different purposes. And the goal is that hopefully they all work in conjunction with eventually the New Start Program to make service more affordable. But $I$ would suggest in my comments today that they really do serve different purposes. So they should not really be seen as either/or but different programs addressing different problems that low-income ratepayers may confront with being able to afford utility service. So I just wanted to remind the Commission that that testimony is there in the docket. And also, I believe in the Company's testimony, there was a report by the National Consumer Law Center that was an attachment to, I believe, Penelope Connor's testimony, but I could be wrong. That lays out why arrears management programs are important. It looks at the success of that program in Massachusetts and how it works in conjunction with things like discount rates and fuel assistance to help achieve affordable service for low-income households.

So with that, thank you again for giving me the opportunity to share these remarks. I appreciate your time.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Burke.

So I'll thank everyone for the work in this docket today. We'll take the matter under advisement and issue an order. We are adjourned. Thank you.
(Whereupon the hearing was concluded at 11:12 a.m.)
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