1		STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
2		PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
3		
4		2018 - 10:15 a.m. 9FEB'18PW12:26
5	Concord, New	Hampshire
6		,
7	RE:	DE 17-196 EVERSOURCE ENERGY:
8		Petition for Continuation of Reliability Enhancement Program.
9		
10	DDE CENM.	Chairman Mantin D. Hanishana Draaidina
11	PRESENT:	Chairman Martin P. Honigberg, Presiding Commissioner Kathryn M. Bailey Commissioner Michael S. Giaimo
12		Commissioner Michael S. Glaimo
13		Sandy Deno, Clerk
14	1000101000	
15	APPEARANCES:	Reptg. Public Service Company of New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource Energy: Matthew J. Fossum, Esq.
16		
17		Reptg. Residential Ratepayers: Brian D. Buckley, Esq.
18		James Brennan, Finance Director Office of Consumer Advocate
19		Reptg. PUC Staff:
20		Suzanne G. Amidon, Esq. Richard Chagnon, Electric Division
21		Kurt Demmer, Electric Division
22		
23	Court Repo	rter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52
2 4		



1	
2	INDEX
3	PAGE NO.
4	WITNESS PANEL: CHRISTOPHER J. GOULDING LEE LAJOIE
5	BRIAN DICKIE
6	Direct examination by Mr. Fossum 7
7	Cross-examination by Mr. Buckley 15
8	Cross-examination by Ms. Amidon 31
9	Interrogatories by Cmsr. Bailey 45
10	Interrogatories by Cmsr. Giaimo 50
11	Redirect examination by Mr. Fossum 57
12	* * *
13	DISCUSSION REGARDING EXHIBIT 4 BY:
14	Mr. Fossum 58, 59
15	Ms. Amidon 58, 59, 60
16	Chairman Honigberg 59, 60
17	* * *
18	CLOSING STATEMENTS BY:
19	Mr. Buckley 61
20	Ms. Amidon 61
21	Mr. Fossum 64
22	
23	
24	

1		
2		EXHIBITS
3	EXHIBIT NO	DESCRIPTION PAGE NO.
4	1	Petition for Continuation of 5 Reliability Enhancement Program,
5		consisting of Testimony of Lee Lajoie and Brian Dickie,
6		including attachments, and the Testimony of Christopher J.
7		Goulding, including attachments (12-15-17)
8	2	Supplemental Testimony of 5
9	-	Christopher J. Goulding, including attachments
10		(01-24-18)
11	3	Email correspondence, including 6 attachments, relating to
12		accounting of Enhanced Tree Trimming costs
13	4	Graphs showing the reliability 6
14		contributions of Troubleshooters and the work they did on various
15		activities (14 pages)
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

1 PROCEEDING

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We're here this morning in Docket 17-196, which is Eversource's Reliability Enhancement Program, a proposal for 2018. We have the filing, we have some supplemental testimony, we have some papers that have been put in front of us on our table.

But, before we get to any of that, let's take appearances.

MR. FOSSUM: Good morning,

Commissioners. Matthew Fossum, here for Public

Service Company of New Hampshire doing business
as Eversource Energy.

MR. BUCKLEY: Good morning, Mr.

Chairman and Commissioners. My name is Brian

D. Buckley. I am the Staff attorney with the

Office of the Consumer Advocate. To my left is

Mr. Jim Brennan, the Director of Finance at the

OCA. And we are here representing the

interests of residential ratepayers.

MS. AMIDON: Good morning,

Commissioners. I'm Suzanne Amidon. I

represent the Staff. To my left is Rich

Chagnon, and to his left is Kurt Demmer, both

5

1	Analysts with the Electric Division.
2	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. How
3	are we proceeding this morning? Mr. Fossum.
4	MR. FOSSUM: This morning, our
5	intention was to we have a panel of three
6	witnesses, we were intending to present the
7	same three witnesses who filed testimony, to go
8	over their testimony and the Company's
9	proposal.
10	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Anything we need
11	to do before we put them in place?
12	MR. FOSSUM: The only thing I would
13	point out is we have premarked for
14	identification two exhibits. "We", being
15	Eversource that is. They're Eversource's
16	initial December 15th submission, which has
17	been premarked as "Exhibit 1", and the
18	January 23rd supplemental testimony has been
19	premarked for identification as "Exhibit 2".
20	That's the only items I'm aware of
21	for preliminary matters.
22	(The documents, as described,
23	were herewith marked as
24	Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2,

1	respectively, for
2	identification.)
3	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: There are a
4	couple of other exhibits up here. Are they
5	from you, Ms. Amidon?
6	MS. AMIDON: Yes, they are. Exhibit
7	3 is, I included the cover email just to
8	understand the source of the material, but it's
9	a response to some of the questions Staff and
10	the OCA had about the capitalization of the
11	Enhanced Tree Trimming costs. And Exhibit 4 is
12	a graph that was prepared by Eversource for
13	purposes of answering some questions relative
14	to the reliability contributions of
15	troubleshooters and the portion of work that
16	they did on various activities.
17	(The documents, as described,
18	were herewith marked as
19	Exhibit 3 and Exhibit 4,
20	respectively, for
21	identification.)
22	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Amidon, is
23	anyone from Staff going to testify or are you
24	just going to use these documents in

1	questioning the Company's witnesses?
2	MS. AMIDON: We just intend to use
3	them for some cross-examination. Thank you.
4	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Fair
5	enough.
6	Anything else before the witnesses
7	take the stand?
8	[No verbal response.]
9	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Why
L 0	don't we move them into place.
L1	(Whereupon <i>Christopher J.</i>
L2	Goulding, Lee Lajoie, and
L 3	Brian Dickie were duly sworn by
L 4	the Court Reporter.)
L 5	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Fossum.
L 6	MR. FOSSUM: Thank you.
L 7	CHRISTOPHER J. GOULDING, SWORN
L 8	LEE LAJOIE, SWORN
L 9	BRIAN DICKIE, SWORN
20	DIRECT EXAMINATION
21	BY MR. FOSSUM:
22	Q I'll go through the preliminaries, work down
23	the line. Mr. Goulding, could you please state
2 4	your name and your position and your

1 responsibilities for the record please. 2 Α (Goulding) Sure. My name is Christopher 3 Goulding. I'm the Manager of New Hampshire 4 Revenue Requirements. My responsibilities 5 include revenue requirement calculations 6 associated with the TCAM, distribution rates, 7 Energy Service rates, Stranded Cost Recovery 8 Charge rates. And I'll just move down. Mr. Lajoie, could you 9 Q 10 please also state your name, your place of 11 employment, and your responsibilities for the 12 record. 13 (Lajoie) My name is Lee Lajoie. I'm the 14 Manager of System Resiliency for Eversource. 15 I'm responsible for the REP Program management, 16 plus capital budget and Reliability Reporting 17 Department. 18 Q And, Mr. Dickie, could you also state your 19 name, your place of employment, and your 20 responsibilities. 21 (Dickie) Yes. I'm Brian Dickie, the Director 22 of System Operations. I am responsible for the 23 safe and reliable operation of the transmission

and distribution systems for Eversource in the

24

1 State of New Hampshire. I'm also responsible 2 for outage management and the Troubleshooter 3 Group. 4 MR. FOSSUM: And, Mr. Dickie, could 5 you just quickly check to see if the red light on your microphone is on? 6 7 WITNESS DICKIE: Oh. Yes, it's on I'm sorry about that. 8 now. 9 MR. FOSSUM: All right. Thank you. 10 BY MR. FOSSUM: Mr. Goulding, did you, back on December 15th, 11 12 submit testimony in this matter included in what has been premarked for identification as 13 14 "Exhibit 1"? 15 (Goulding) Yes, I did. Α 16 Q And was that testimony prepared by you or at 17 your direction? 18 Α (Goulding) Yes, it was. 19 And do you have any updates or changes to that Q 20 testimony today? 21 (Goulding) No, I do not. 22 And do you adopt that testimony as your sworn Q 23 testimony in this proceeding? 24 (Goulding) Yes, I do. Α

```
1
    Q
         And, Mr. Goulding, did you also, on
 2
         January 23rd, submit supplemental testimony in
 3
         what has been premarked for identification as
          "Exhibit 2"?
 4
 5
          (Goulding) Yes, I did.
         And was that testimony prepared by you or at
 6
    Q
 7
         your direction?
          (Goulding) Yes, it was.
 8
    Α
9
         And do you have any changes or updates or
    Q
10
         corrections to that testimony this morning?
11
         (Goulding) No, I do not.
12
         And do you adopt that testimony as your sworn
13
         testimony in this proceeding?
14
         (Goulding) Yes.
15
         Mr. Lajoie, did you, also back on
    Q
16
         December 15th, submit prefiled testimony in
17
         what has been marked for identification as
          "Exhibit 1"?
18
19
    Α
          (Lajoie) Yes, I did.
20
         And was that testimony prepared by you or at
21
         your direction?
22
         (Lajoie) Yes, it was.
23
         And do you adopt that testimony as your sworn
```

{DE 17-196} {01-26-18}

testimony in this proceeding?

24

```
1
    Α
          (Lajoie) Yes, I do.
         And finally, Mr. Dickie, did you also, back on
 2
    Q
         December 15th, submit prefiled testimony in
 3
         what has been premarked for identification as
 4
         "Exhibit 1"?
 5
 6
         (Dickie) Yes, I did.
    Α
 7
         And was that testimony prepared by you or at
 8
         your direction?
9
    Α
         (Dickie) Yes, it was.
10
         And do you adopt that testimony as your sworn
    Q
11
         testimony in this proceeding?
12
         (Dickie) Yes.
    Α
         Mr. Lajoie, I have a question for you
13
14
         specifically. Do you have any updates to the
15
         information contained within the testimony that
16
         is included in Exhibit 1?
17
         (Lajoie) Yes, I do. If you would turn to Bates
18
         Page 014, which is Page 10 of 12 of "Testimony
19
         of Lee Lajoie and Brian Dickie", there are two
20
         graphs on that page, one representing SAIDI and
21
         one representing SAIFI. Both charts were
22
         prepared in December, before we had year-end
23
         results for 2017. So, both included a
24
         "Projected 2017" value. We do have the final
```

results at this time.

Our actual projection was very close to where we ended up. The SAIDI number for the end of the year was 118.6. So, the dot on the graph, which was right at the "120" line, moved down just ever so slightly. And on the bottom chart, for SAIFI, the actual was 1.107. So, the dot is actually very close to where it should be on the graph.

- Q Thank you for that update. Mr. Lajoie, could you, at a very high level, explain what it is that the Company is proposing in this filing?
- A (Lajoie) As described in Attachment LGL-1, on Bates Page 017 of the filing, the 2018 Plan consists of two major components under the capital part. First is "Circuit Tie Construction". There are two projects proposed for 2018. These are incremental, projects that would not be done without the REP Program. The description of the individual circuit ties and the benefits to be gained by them are part of that filing. The other part of the Capital Plan is tree trimming, both Enhanced Tree Trimming and Hazard Tree Removal. Again, these

1 are incremental over and above what would be done under the Company's base budget. 2 3 The circuit tie project, the two of them together add up to approximately \$3 million --4 5 exactly \$3 million in capital. And the Tree Trimming Program, between ETT and Hazard Tree, 6 7 add up to a total of \$6 million, for a total of 8 \$9 million in capital. And is there any operation and maintenance, O&M 9 10 activity to be undertaken under the Company's 11 proposal? 12 (Lajoie) Yes, there is. The O&M portion of the Α 13 capital is estimated to be \$350,000, plus there 14 is \$2 million in funding to fund part of the 15 Troubleshooter Program. 16 Q Thank you. Mr. Goulding, I'd like to turn to 17 you. And could you -- well, could you please 18 explain what was proposed as part of the 19 Company's initial filing, as included in your 20 testimony in Exhibit 1, and how that has 21 changed, as explained in your testimony in 22 Exhibit 2?

{DE 17-196} {01-26-18}

(Goulding) Sure. So, as part of our initial

filing, we were requesting the reconciliation

23

24

Α

of actual capital and O&M expenses currently in rates, and seeking approval of a 12-month continuation of the Program for the 12 months ended December 2018. And there was a rate increase associated with those with the continuation of the Program of 0.021 cents. So, that was our initial proposal.

But, since the proposal was made, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act was approved, which reduced the Federal Tax rate from 35 percent, down to 21 percent. And what that does is it decreased our pre-tax rate of return from roughly 10.68 percent, down to 9.09 percent.

So, when we included that in the model to do the calculation of the return for the revenue requirement, it ended up reducing the revenue requirement by approximately \$1.5 million. So, it actually mitigated any rate increase necessary to continue the program as proposed.

And, so, just for clarity then, the Company is not, and correct me if I'm wrong, the Company is not proposing a rate change to continue the REP in 2018?

```
1
    Α
          (Goulding) That's correct.
 2
    Q
         I guess this would normally be the part where
 3
         I'd ask you if the proposed rates are just and
         reasonable. But, in that the Company is not
 4
 5
         proposing that, I will simply ask if it is the
 6
         Company's position that the REP Program, and
 7
         this is for all the witnesses, the REP, as
         proposed, do you believe is reasonable and
 8
9
         appropriate for continuation of this Program?
10
         (Goulding) Yes.
    Α
11
         (Lajoie) Yes.
12
         (Dickie) Yes.
13
                   MR. FOSSUM:
                                Thank you. And that's
14
         all I have for direct.
15
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Buckley.
16
                   MR. BUCKLEY: Great. Thank you, Mr.
17
         Chairman. And thank you to the witnesses and
18
         Mr. Fossum.
19
                      CROSS-EXAMINATION
20
    BY MR. BUCKLEY:
21
         I'm going to follow up on something that he had
22
         mentioned relative, and was discussing with
23
         Mr. Goulding, relative to the tax law changes.
24
         So, you mention that the actual change in
```

```
1
         percentage rate was incorporated into the
 2
         supplemental testimony, which is now marked as
 3
         "Exhibit 2". One question I have for you
         relative to those tax changes. Does this
 4
 5
         update include changes to the excess
 6
         accumulated deferred income tax under the REP?
 7
    Α
         (Goulding) It has not incorporated that change.
 8
         And for this filing, we had mentioned that we
9
         would pick that up in the reconciliation. But
10
         we're still getting a handle on how it would
11
         impact the filing. My understanding is that
12
         excess or surplus excess ADIT would also be a
13
         credit to rate base. So, it would act just
14
         like ADIT. It just moves into a different
15
         liability account. So, there shouldn't be a
16
         significant impact on the filing as submitted.
17
              So, when it gets picked up in the
18
         reconciliation, my thought is it should be
19
         minimal.
20
         Okay. Great. So, that would be picked up in
         the reconciliation and have little impact?
21
22
         (Goulding) Yes.
23
         Okay. Great. Thank you. And one further
24
         question about that, and I might be getting a
```

1		little out of my expertise here. But is there
2		some distinction between protected versus
3		unprotected Accumulated Deferred Income Tax and
4		has an impact on how it's treated?
5	А	(Goulding) I am not sure what you mean by
6		"protected" and "unprotected". I think there
7		is Accumulated Deferred Income Tax surplus
8		associated with the long-lived depreciable
9		assets and short-lived depreciable assets, but
10		I'm not 100 percent clear. I'm outside my
11		comfort zone even saying that.
12	Q	Okay. That's fine. Me, too. Okay. So, I
13		guess the next question is for Mr. Lajoie. So,
14		I think you mention in your testimony, at Bates
15		006, the bottom paragraph, that this filing was
16		revised fairly significantly to incorporate
17		concerns that the OCA and Staff and the
18		Commission had expressed in the past.
19		Can you just quickly summarize those, and
20		I know you already started to do this relative
21		to some of the Program, but could you just
22		quickly summarize some of those concerns?
23	A	(Lajoie) Previous versions of the Reliability
24		Enhancement Program included significantly more

Q

capital. We were on the order of \$40 million a year up through June 30th of 2017. Starting July 1 of 2017, the Program was scaled back significantly, on the order of \$10 million in capital. And then, starting in 2018, it has been scaled back again. Those reductions in scale were after discussion with both OCA and Staff. They felt that the Program should be scaled back. So, that's how we ended up where we're at.

I think that answers your question.

- Yes. That's great. One further question I have is relative to, you mentioned what the historical spending was. So, I was doing a little research and trying to understand the historical spending. And there are a series of Annual Reports, which are very helpful, that I was able to find between 2013 and 2015. I wasn't able to find one as of yet for 2016. But is it correct that those Annual Reports will continue to be issued?
- (Lajoie) Yes. We will have an Annual Report, which will include the results through June 30 of 2017. They will include the results from

```
1
         July 1, 2017 through the end of 2017, plus the
         proposal for 2018, which we're here discussing
 2
 3
         today. All of those results will be in one
         report, which will be issued by the end of the
 4
 5
         first quarter of this year.
 6
         Great. Thank you, Mr. Lajoie. And I guess
    Q
 7
         this is subject to check, but, in reviewing
         those Annual Reports, would you agree that the
 8
9
         approximate spending wax and wane from 2013 was
10
         about $30 million; 2014 about $30 million; 2015
11
         was reduced quite a bit, to around 17; and
12
         then, after that reduction, the annual spending
13
         began to grow a bit? You mentioned the
14
         "$40 million" mark in 2017.
15
    Α
         (Lajoie) I don't have any of those numbers in
16
         front of me. If they came from the reports
17
         that were filed, then I would have to agree
18
         with them.
19
              But I don't have the information in front
20
         of me. So, I can't confirm or deny your
21
         question.
22
         Great. Thank you. And then, for 2018, reduced
23
         significantly, in working with Staff and OCA
24
         and others?
```

```
1
    Α
          (Lajoie) Yes. The Plan for 2018 is a total of
         $9 million in capital, as previously described.
 2
 3
         Okay. Great. Thank you, Mr. Lajoie. So, I
    Q
         just have a few more questions for
 4
 5
         Mr. Goulding. I guess the first one, if I
 6
         could ask you to turn to Bates Page 027 of the
 7
         original testimony, that's Exhibit 1, I
 8
         believe.
         (Goulding) Okay. I'm here.
9
    Α
10
         So, on Line 17 through 26, you discuss the
    Q
11
         Enhanced Tree Trimming and Hazard Tree Removal,
12
         and how they will remain capital expenditures
13
         for 2018, and then they will be moved to become
14
         O&M expenditures starting in 2019, I think.
15
         that correct?
16
    Α
         (Goulding) That's correct.
17
         So, can you just give me a little bit more
    Q
18
         explanation regarding that change?
19
         (Goulding) As part of discussions with Staff,
    Α
20
         and hearing feedback from Commissioners, we
21
         have basically just agreed to transition from
22
         the current capitalization policy for Enhanced
23
         Tree Trimming and Hazard Tree Removal to
24
         classifying it as O&M going forward.
```

```
1
    Q
         Great. Thank you. And, so, I'm going to ask
 2
         you to turn to your schedules in that filing,
 3
         specifically Bates Page 044, and just try to
         give a little context relative to the written
 4
 5
         testimony.
 6
         (Goulding) Okay. I'm here.
 7
         So, can you just give me an explanation of what
         Bates 044 represents overall?
 8
              Is that the actual capital placed into
9
10
         service for the period July 2016 through
11
         June 2017?
12
         (Goulding) Yes. Under the REP Program.
    Α
13
         Great. Thank you. So, I have one question
14
         about this. If you look at Line 85, relative
15
         to "Hazard Tree Removal", why are some of the
16
         values in there negative?
17
         (Goulding) So, there probably would be costs
18
         that were booked in -- prior to July 2016 that
19
         were reversed. I would have to dig into why
20
         they're negative. I don't have an
21
         understanding -- or, I don't have any knowledge
         of why they're negative, but it would usually
22
23
         be associated with reversals of information,
24
         because this information comes right from our
```

```
1
         accounting system.
         Okay. That makes sense. Moving to Line 4, on
 2
    Q
 3
         that same page, can you tell me, and maybe Mr.
         Lajoie can help you with this, can you just
 4
 5
         describe what that investment is?
         (Goulding) Sorry, what line was that?
 6
    Α
 7
         Or, I guess maybe Line 1, the "DA Pole Top".
         (Lajoie) Are you looking for a description of
 8
    Α
         what "DA Pole Top" is?
9
10
         Yes.
    Q
11
         (Lajoie) Okay. The DA Pole Top Program is an
12
         initiative that we started, basically, in 2014,
13
         to install a significant number of pole top
14
         devices, which are remotely controlled from the
15
         Control Center, which Brian manages. And
16
         allows them to get information back from the
17
         system, and then to actually open and close
18
         switches as necessary to mitigate the impact of
19
         outages and to restore power when outages do
20
         occur, sectionalizing down to -- the system
21
         down to the smallest possible area.
22
              At the moment, as of the end of 2017, we
23
         had installed approximately a thousand of these
24
         devices on our system. The intent is to break
```

```
1
         the system down into blocks of no more than 500
 2
         customers. So that any one outage could
 3
         theoretically be sectionalized down to that
         block, so only 500 customers would be impacted
 4
 5
         until the actual cause of the outage is
 6
         repaired.
 7
         So, would you say these investments contribute
 8
         significantly to reduction in outage times?
9
         (Lajoie) That's correct. We find that they
10
         have had a significant impact on reliability of
         electric service to our customers.
11
12
         So, --
    Q
         (Lajoie) If you give me a second, I --
13
14
                         (Witness Dickie conferring with
15
                         Witness Lajoie.)
16
    BY THE WITNESS:
17
         (Dickie) It has more of an impact on SAIFI,
18
         which is the System Average Interruption
19
         Frequency Index, than SAIDI. You still have
20
         the outage, however there's less customers
21
         impacted.
22
    BY MR. BUCKLEY:
23
         Okay. Great. Thank you. I guess one question
24
         I have relative to distribution automation is
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

12

13

20

21

22

23

24

that, in other jurisdictions, I've read through some grid modernization investment plans, in some other jurisdictions, distribution automation is a not insignificant part of those plans. Can you just talk for a moment about how these investments might relate to investments in grid modernization? (Lajoie) At the moment, we do not have Α 9 direction from the State of New Hampshire as to 10 what an actual grid modernization plan will be. I was involved in some workshop sessions conducted here at the Commission to look into grid modernization, and make a recommendation as to what a so-called "modern grid", if you 14 will, what that would look like. 15 16 I would anticipate that these would --17 that pole top distribution automation may be a 18 part of that. I, too, have seen some proposals in other jurisdictions. It was a small part of 19 what a modern grid would look like. There were

> But, again, we do not have a plan in the State of New Hampshire for what a grid modernization program would look like. So, I

a lot of other aspects to this modern grid.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

really can't speak to how much of that program would be -- would consist of pole top automation devices.

I can tell you, the devices we are installing now are strictly being installed for reliability purposes. And we strongly believe they have made a significant difference in the reliability of electric service to our customers.

And because you are not exactly sure what a future grid modernization plan would look like, you can't be certain right now if these devices that have been a reasonably large portion of the REP for the last two years or so, you can't quite be sure whether these devices will have interoperability with a system of the future that might, let's say, have fault location, isolation, and self-repair, that sort of thing? (Lajoie) Looking into my crystal ball, I would Α definitely say that these would play into a grid modernization effort. I don't think my -again, my opinion is that these are -- these are not something that would be -- that would not play well with the rest of the program. My

Α

opinion is, they would tie in and be integrated into a modern grid -- or, a grid modernization program.

(Dickie) Right. So, I'll just -- so, these devices are very sophisticated, right? They give you all the data, all the information on a per phase basis.

As far as fault isolation/system restoration, that's what they're set up for.

And we do that process now with an operator.

In the future, you'll do that process with an operating program, a DMS or ADMS, that will do it automatically, it will take that operator function and automate it, without changing out the devices. So, in that context, it would support grid modernization.

However, we're using it just for straight-up reliability. Right? But it does enable future grid modernization in that context.

Same thing with Volt/VAR, you still get -you get VAR indications from these devices,
right, so you can control your voltage and get
your VAR flow. Right? So, for grid

```
1
         efficiency, right?
 2
    Q
         Great. Thank you, Mr. Dickie.
 3
    Α
         (Dickie) Yes.
 4
         That's very helpful to know. But, so, one
    Q
 5
         thing I'll note is that there have been rather
 6
         significant investments in this for the past
 7
         two years or so of the REP. But, for the
         forthcoming year, are there further
 8
         investments?
9
10
         (Lajoie) There will not be further investments
    Α
11
         as part of the REP Program. There will be
12
         further investments as part of the Company's
         base budget program.
13
14
                     That is very helpful to know.
    Q
         Ah.
             Okay.
15
         Thank you. So, I'm going to return to
16
         Mr. Goulding to ask one or two more questions
17
         about Enhanced Tree Trimming.
18
              Sticking with that same Bates Page 044, I
19
         think it is. If you look at Line 80?
20
         (Goulding) Okay.
21
         So, is this line, this line is a significant
22
         part, this is where, in 2019, those investments
23
         will move to -- out of 365, which is a capital
24
         investment, into a different line item, is that
```

```
correct? Into an O&M line item?
 1
 2
    Α
         (Goulding) Yes. Any cost associated with
 3
         Enhanced Tree Trimming in 2019 would be moved
         to -- would be booked to an O&M category or an
 4
 5
         O&M account. I'm not sure of the level of the
 6
         spending, but they would be booked to an O&M
 7
         account.
         So, when the Enhanced Tree Trimming is booked
 8
9
         to the -- as a capital asset, what lifetime is
10
         assigned to those investments? What's the
11
         depreciation life?
12
         (Goulding) It would be the depreciable life of
13
         a 36 -- Account 365 asset, and do the math.
14
         (Short pause) Looks like it's approximately 30
15
         years. Because if I look on Bates Page 032,
16
         Line 11, for the Plant Account 365, I have a
17
         0.27 percent depreciation rate per month, which
18
         translates into a roughly 3.25 percent
19
         depreciation rate per year. So, it comes out
20
         to a little over roughly 30 years.
         Okay. That is very helpful to know. So, in
21
22
         that context, if I could ask you to turn to
23
         Bates Page 030, Line 4.
24
         (Goulding) Okay. I'm there.
    Α
```

```
1
    Q
         So that shows about $90 million of plant
         depreciating in Account 365. Is that correct?
 2
 3
    Α
         (Goulding) It shows the cumulative investment
         under the REP Program in Account 365.
 4
 5
    Q
         And, so, could you tell me, or maybe even just
 6
         approximate, how much of that is vegetation
 7
         management versus investments in overhead
         conductors?
 8
         (Goulding) I definitely can't venture a guess.
9
    Α
10
         I can probably, if I look back at one of the
11
         other exhibits, I can look at what else can
12
         roll in there. It looks like the cost of DA
13
         Pole Top gets -- some of that gets -- a big
14
         chunk of that gets booked to the 365 Account,
15
         some DA line sensor, a portion of direct buried
16
         cable. So, it's a significant mix of all of
17
         the programs, a portion of them. Some of them
18
         go to 365. It's not just vegetation
19
         management. But, even using this exhibit, I'm
20
         not comfortable taking this as a proxy
21
         allocation, because I just don't know what's
22
         been historically in there, without going back
23
         and looking at the data.
24
                      That is absolutely fine. I guess
    Q
         Okay. Yes.
```

1		one final question I would ask you is, so,
2		moving forward, we'll no longer be capitalizing
3		this Enhanced Tree Trimming or Hazard Tree
4		Removal. But, for those investments that have
5		been made, which could be fairly significant,
6		that will be depreciating for that 30-year
7		period or so that you mentioned, ratepayers
8		will continue to pay for that. Though, we've
9		now decided they are not capital assets. Is
LO		that correct?
L 1	A	(Goulding) That was an agreement moving forward
L 2		in 2019. So, prior to that, as the testimony
L 3		states, this Enhanced Tree Trimming was kind
L 4		of was part of the capital back in a 2006
L 5		rate case, and REP in a 2009 rate case. So,
L 6		it's not something that was just enacted out of
L 7		nowhere. So, it would be the Company's
L 8		position that those were prudently incurred
L 9		costs and booked correctly.
2 0		So, yes. They would continue to stay in
21		the rate base.
22		MR. BUCKLEY: Okay. Thank you very
23		much, Mr. Goulding. No further questions.
2 4		CHAIRMAN HONIGRERG. Ms Amidon

```
1
                   MS. AMIDON:
                                 Thank you. And good
 2
         morning.
    BY MS. AMIDON:
 3
         Staff did some research concerning, as did
 4
    Q
         Attorney Buckley, concerning the history of
 5
 6
         this Program. And the principal agreement in
 7
         the 2009 distribution rate case where REP II
 8
         was created was a five-year agreement. And,
         Mr. Goulding, I don't know if you can remember
9
10
         that, but I would just offer that. The
11
         Settlement was approved in Order Number 25,123
12
         in 09-035. So, that was in, I believe,
13
         April 2010 and extended to probably May 1, 2015
14
         on that basis. Would you agree, subject to
15
         check?
16
    Α
         (Goulding) Yes. I think that the REP II
17
         Program ran through June 30 of 2015.
18
    Q
         Right. But the -- and in the course, in
19
         between 2015 and 20 -- excuse me, 2010 and
20
         2015, there were step increases that were set
21
         out in the Settlement Agreement for increase in
22
         non-REP REP and in REP-related expenses.
23
         you recall that?
24
         (Goulding) Yes.
    Α
```

```
1
    Q
         Okay. Thank you. Also, that Agreement was the
 2
         one that required the Annual Reports that
 3
         Attorney Buckley referred to. And you may not
         recall that, but I recently -- well, the Staff
 4
 5
         recently looked at that Agreement, and
 6
         reports -- the Annual Reports were required in
 7
         that Agreement on, I think, April 1 of each
 8
         year. So, subject to check, would you agree
9
         with that?
10
         (Goulding) That sounds familiar.
    Α
    Q
11
         And, so, the result being that, since the
12
         Settlement Agreement expired, and I think that
13
         this -- I think that this explains why Attorney
14
         Buckley couldn't find a June -- I mean, a 2016
15
         Annual Report, the Company did not file a
16
         report in April of 2016. I'm fairly sure of
17
         that.
18
    Α
         (Goulding) Okay. Yes. I don't believe we
19
         filed -- we filed one, I don't know if it was
20
         part of the 09-035 docket. But it was filed,
21
         Mr. Lajoie?
22
         (Lajoie) September 30th of 2016.
    Α
23
         Was that just on the GIS Program?
24
                       That was on the entire REP
    Α
         (Lajoie) No.
```

```
1
         Program.
         (Goulding) And that was for the 12-month -- or,
 2
    Α
 3
         18-month period or 12-month period?
 4
    Q
         Okay.
 5
         (Lajoie) I would have to look. It was at least
 6
         the 12-month period ending June 30 of 2016.
 7
         And I believe there was a Program Catch-Up
 8
         Report that was filed to cover the period where
9
         a program report was not filed.
10
         Okay. But you don't know what docket that was
    Q
11
         filed in?
12
         (Goulding) I don't.
    Α
13
         (Lajoie) I don't. I'd have to look.
14
         I think that's probably why we couldn't find it
15
         then.
                Thank you. And in that, in the -- so,
16
         the 2015 Plan that was proposed by the Company
17
         grew out of the agreement in the Divestiture
18
         Settlement Agreement that REP be continued for
19
         two years. Do you remember that?
20
         (Goulding) Yes. That would be the 12 months
    Α
21
         ended June 30th, 2016 and 12 months ended
22
         June 30th, 2017.
23
               Thank you. That's right. And that was,
    Q
         Yes.
24
         if anyone of you were involved in that, that
```

```
1
         was done on an expedited basis. Do you recall?
 2
    Α
         (Goulding) Yes.
 3
         Because our records show that the filing was
    Q
         made on June 10, and then the Company requested
 4
 5
         the rates to be effective July 1. Does that
 6
         sound about right to you?
 7
         (Goulding) That's what I recall.
    Α
         Okay. And in that filing, and this just
 8
    Q
9
         relates to some of the questions that Mr.
10
         -- that Attorney Buckley had, the Company, for
11
         the 12-month period ending July 2016, requested
12
         $38.9 million in capital expense. And then,
         for the period ending July 2017, the 12-month
13
14
         period, the Company requested 51.159 million in
15
         capital expense.
16
              And is there anyone who can tell me, would
17
         you agree that this was somewhat of a departure
18
         from the amounts that had been requested under
19
         the rate case? And, Mr. --
20
         (Lajoie) From previous versions of REP? Yes,
21
         it was a significant increase, if that's your
22
         question?
23
         Yes, it is. Thank you. And at that time, the
    Q
24
         Company and the Staff, because there was this
```

```
1
         agreement, and because there was Designated
         Staff and the Office of Consumer Advocate
 2
 3
         supporting the Divestiture Settlement
         Agreement, as I recall, the Company did not
 4
 5
         have an opportunity to sit down with Staff and
         the OCA to review the Plan before it was filed.
 6
 7
         Is that fair to say?
         (Lajoie) That was prior to my involvement, so I
 8
    Α
9
         can't speak to that. But I believe that to be
10
         the case.
11
         Okay. Thank you. That's was -- that at least
12
         was helpful. Though, I really appreciate you
13
         responding to those questions.
14
              So, last year, in May, the Company again
15
         made a filing to continue the REP again for two
16
         years. Does everyone recall that?
17
    Α
         (Lajoie) Yes.
18
    Q
         And similar to the approval of the agreement
19
         for the continuation for two years ending
20
         June 2017, there was a request for $39 million
21
         in capital annually. Does anyone recall that?
22
         (Lajoie) Yes. That's correct.
23
         All right. And that is when, as you recall,
24
         the Company also requested to help fund that
```

```
1
         REP by continuing certain surcharges that were
 2
         related to, I think, the 2008 ice storm, the
 3
         cost recovery for those -- for the costs of
         damages incurred in the 2008 ice storm, that
 4
 5
         was a surcharge on rates, and also something
         that's referred to as the "Medicare
 6
 7
         Amortization". Do you remember that?
         (Goulding) Yes.
 8
    Α
         Okay. And it was at that point, I believe,
9
    Q
10
         that both Staff and the OCA expressed some
11
         concern about the magnitude of capital expense
12
         being requested by the Company. Would you
13
         agree?
14
         (Goulding) Yes. I remember there was a letter
15
         submitted.
16
    Q
         Okay. So, this filing which has the support of
17
         Staff, and I'll just say that, you know, right
18
         out, we support this filing. But that's
19
         because the Company spent a lot of time and put
20
         in a lot of effort working with Staff and the
21
         OCA to develop a plan that we could support in
22
         this hearing. Is that right?
23
         (Goulding) Yes.
    Α
24
         And that's because you wanted to -- the Company
    Q
```

```
1
         was looking for an expedited approval, is that
 2
         fair to say?
 3
    Α
         (Goulding) That, and coupled with the order
         issued back in June of 2017, where we were
 4
 5
         directed by the Commission, if we were going to
 6
         seek to continue the Program beyond 2017, we
 7
         would need to work with Staff and OCA to
         develop a Program that we could all agree upon.
 8
9
         Okay. And in connection with this Program,
    Q
10
         does the Company agree that it will be
11
         providing a report on a summary of the results
12
         of the actual activities engaged in during
         2018?
13
14
         (Lajoie) Yes.
15
         Okay. It will be similar to those reports that
    Q
16
         were previously received in connection with the
17
         2010 Settlement Agreement?
18
    Α
         (Lajoie) Yes. It will be similar to that.
19
         Okay. Thank you. As you know, I -- does
    Q
20
         anyone have in front of them the exhibit marked
         for identification as "Exhibit 3"? I don't
21
22
         have very many questions on this. It's not on
23
         the substance, it's more as to what it actually
24
         is.
```

```
1
    Α
         (Lajoie) Yes. We have a copy of that.
 2
    Q
         Okay. And this was -- this was the result of
 3
         some inquiries we made with the Company on the
         basis for -- additional background, I should
 4
 5
         say, for the basis for the capitalization of
 6
         the expenses associated with the Enhanced Tree
 7
         Trimming?
         (Lajoie) There were a number of questions.
 8
    Α
9
         And, yes, that is part of what is included in
10
         Exhibit 3.
11
         And, in fact, I think it's -- attached to this
12
         is a -- I think it's like two pages from the
13
         back, it's a May 31st, 2012 memorandum.
14
         an in-house memo provided to account -- to
15
         explain the accounting recommendation for
16
         capitalizing these costs. Is that -- I just
17
         want to know what it is. I'm not asking for
18
         the rationale behind it.
19
         (Goulding) Yes. It appears to be an accounting
    Α
20
         memo talking about Enhanced Tree Trimming.
21
         Okay. Thank you. So, in this item there are
22
         several -- as you said, it's not just Enhanced
23
         Tree Trimming, which is addressed by this
24
         document that's attached to the email, but
```

```
1
         there is some other discussion on information
 2
         on the capitalizing of the Hazard Tree Removal
 3
         costs and the definition of "MBI".
 4
              And then, if you go to Page 2 of the
         initial attachment, the Item e. says "Budget
 5
 6
         and plan for O&M and capital for 2017 Base
 7
         REP". Do you see that.
         (Lajoie) Yes, I do.
 8
    Α
         Do you have the budgeted and total capital and
9
10
         non-reliability capital for these same years
11
         available yet?
12
         (Lajoie) I do not have them in front of me.
    Α
13
         do have a 2018 capital budget, which has not
14
         yet been Trustee-approved. So, it's not final.
15
    Q
         Okay.
16
         (Lajoie) But we do have numbers, what was
17
         presented. I did not bring that information
18
         with me, so I don't have it in front of me.
19
    Q
         But it's -- let me just ask, is this something
20
         that you would be willing to share with Staff
21
         and the OCA when it is available? I mean, I
22
         wouldn't ask for any internal company
23
         documents. I'm just asking if it would --
24
          (Goulding) Yes. And if I'm -- I might have my
    Α
```

{DE 17-196} {01-26-18}

```
1
         filings wrong, but we make a E-22 filing.
 2
    Q
         Oh, yes.
 3
    Α
         (Goulding) That has kind of all the capital
         budgets for the year for 2018. So, I think
 4
 5
         there would be -- that would be where the data
 6
         would be for 2018.
 7
         Thank you. Thanks for that. I forgot about
    Q
 8
         that part.
              Similarly, I'm going to move now to what
9
10
         we've asked to be marked for identification as
11
         "Exhibit 4". And that is a series of graphical
12
         depictions of certain things related to the
13
         Troubleshooter Program and some -- it looks
14
         like some safety reliability measurements.
15
              If you look at Page 6, this is probably
16
         Mr. Dickie, can you explain what is depicted on
17
         this?
18
    Α
         (Lajoie) I'll take that question.
19
         Thank you.
20
         (Lajoie) The request was made to provide
21
         various reliability indices. This one
22
         represents SAIDI duration by region, based on
23
         IEEE Criteria over a period of time. So, this
```

shows 2005 through June of 2017, by region of

```
1
         the Company. The Company is divided into five
 2
         different regions. So, each of the colored
 3
         lines represent the SAIDI for that region for
         each of those years. The exception is the
 4
 5
         June 2017 numbers are rolling 12 months. So,
         it includes part of '16 and part of '17,
 6
 7
         because we didn't have year-end 2017 figures at
         that time.
 8
         And do you have them now?
9
10
         (Lajoie) Yeah, I do. Excuse me, yes, I do.
    Α
         don't have them in front of me, but we can
11
12
         certainly provide that information.
13
                   MS. AMIDON: Okay. It doesn't need
14
         to be a record request. We just want to
15
         continue to follow these results.
16
    BY MS. AMIDON:
17
         Now, on Page 5 of this exhibit, it lists number
18
         of callouts in the Troubleshooter's primary
19
         area. First of all, what is a "callout"? Can
20
         someone answer that for me?
21
         (Dickie) Yes. A "callout" is where we call in
22
         a line crew after hours, when they're not
23
         working, to repair or respond to any kind of
```

trouble event.

1 Q And, so, there's a big drop-off in these 2 callouts as of it looks like August 2015? 3 Α (Dickie) Right, yes. Right. So, this is just the Primary Troubleshooter Area. So, the areas 4 5 of Southern and Central Regions, which includes 6 the Area Work Centers of Bedford, Hooksett, 7 Derry, and Nashua. These are just the callouts in those specific areas. So, the callouts in 8 9 the other areas, the Eastern Region, the 10 Northern Region, the Western Region are not 11 depicted on this chart. 12 Okay. Thank you. Q 13 (Dickie) So, they have dropped off in the 14 Primary Troubleshooter Area, because we have 15 troubleshooters 24/7. 16 Q Okay. Thank you. And, Mr. Goulding, similar 17 to the treatment of the capital expense and the 18 depreciation for the Hazard Tree Removal and 19 the Enhanced Tree Trimming, the cost for the 20 Troubleshooters will remain in Account 365 and 21 be subject to depreciation as well, is that 22 correct? 23 (Goulding) No. 24 They don't? Q

43

```
1
    Α
          (Goulding) The Troubleshooter costs go to O&M
         accounts right now. So, I don't know what O&M
 2
 3
         account. I'm quessing, if they're doing
         distribution work, it will be like a 588
 4
 5
         Account. But I'm not certain.
 6
         Oh. Okay. Sorry about that. Thank you.
    Q
 7
         Lajoie, you provided, I believe, some updated
 8
         information on performance in your testimony.
         And I wanted to know, if I refer to Page --
9
10
         Bates Page 007 of your testimony, are you
11
         there? You see the graph related to "Tree
12
         Related SAIFI"?
13
         (Lajoie) Yes, I do.
14
         Do you have the final performance for the end
15
         of 2017?
16
    Α
         (Lajoie) I do not have that in front of me, no.
17
         Okay. Do you have any projection, as you did
    Q
18
         for some of the other?
19
         (Lajoie) No.
    Α
20
         Okay.
21
         (Lajoie) We do have year-end results at this
         time, but I don't have them in front of me.
22
         could provide that, if you would like?
23
```

{DE 17-196} {01-26-18}

MS. AMIDON: Yes. And again, this is

```
1
         not a record request. It's just something
 2
         Staff would normally get. So, we'll deal with
 3
         the Company offline on this. Thank you.
 4
                   One moment please.
 5
                         (Short pause.)
    BY MS. AMIDON:
 6
 7
         Looks like I have one more question on what's
         marked for exhibit as "Exhibit No. 4", on Page
 8
9
              Whoever of you can explain it, would you
10
         tell what's depicted by the two lines on this
11
         chart?
12
         (Dickie) Yes. So, this is SAIDI, is calculated
13
         for the Primary Troubleshooter Areas and
14
         anything outside of those areas. So, the red
15
         line would be outside of Primary Areas. So,
16
         the Southern and Central Regions are the
17
         Primary Troubleshooter Areas. That's the blue
18
         line. And everything else is the red line.
19
         That's the SAIDI, average over time.
20
         So, what do you conclude from this graph?
21
         (Dickie) Well, it just means that the average
22
         interruption duration is much lower in the
23
         Primary Regions. So, some of that's due to
24
         Troubleshooters responding quicker. Some of
```

```
1
         that's just due to the system itself. It's
 2
         more compact. You know, you get into the Keene
 3
         area, right, or up north, obviously, the travel
         time is longer. So, it takes a little bit
 4
 5
         longer to get power back on and restored in
 6
         those areas.
 7
              But, in general, the Primary
         Troubleshooter Areas are -- it's a quicker
 8
9
         outage to repair.
10
         (Lajoie) This graph was provided in response to
11
         a direct question from Staff as part of our
12
         meetings.
13
         I understand that.
14
                   MS. AMIDON: Okay. Thank you.
15
         That's all we have.
16
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Commissioner
17
         Bailey.
18
    BY CMSR. BAILEY:
19
         I think I have a follow up to Ms. Amidon's
20
         question on Exhibit -- regarding Exhibit 4,
         Page 5. This shows that the number of callouts
21
22
         in the Troubleshooting Area has -- looks like
23
         it has significantly decreased.
24
              Does that mean the number of calls to
```

```
1
         employees that aren't necessarily
         troubleshooters that would be on overtime has
 2
 3
         decreased? Or, the number of calls to the
         Troubleshooting organization has decreased?
 4
 5
         (Dickie) No. Number of calls to the day shift
 6
         line workers. So, day shift line workers are
 7
         non-Troubleshooters.
         So, number of calls to non-Troubleshooters has
 8
    Q
         been reduced?
9
10
         (Dickie) Yes. That's correct.
    Α
11
         Because the Troubleshooters are taking those
    Q
12
         calls, as part of their regular job?
13
         (Dickie) They're responding to trouble events
14
         as we go. If they're too busy or there's too
15
         many troubles, we call someone in to respond.
16
    Q
         Okay.
17
         (Dickie) Or, if there's a pole accident, which
18
         requires more people to replace a pole, we'll
19
         call people in to do that.
20
         Okay. Thanks. Mr. Goulding, I think this
         question is for you. Can you explain to me
21
22
         what "bonus depreciation" is?
23
         (Goulding) Yes. So, as part of the tax laws,
    Α
24
         they allow you to take bonus depreciation.
                                                      So,
```

```
1
         what that does is, for tax purposes, when you
 2
         install an asset, you can depreciate whatever
 3
         the level is. So, if it's 100 percent bonus
 4
         depreciation, I take 100 percent deduction on
 5
         my tax return, so I would pay lower taxes in
 6
         year one. So, I get that benefit up front to
 7
         pay lower taxes.
         I'm not getting it. I want to know what "bonus
 8
9
         depreciation" is. Why would they -- it's an
10
         accounting thing?
11
         (Goulding) What it does is, it's passed as part
    Α
12
         of a tax law to stimulate the economy. So,
13
         it's supposed to encourage investments.
14
         Because, as a company, you can do an investment
15
         now, take all of that expense as bonus -- as
16
         depreciation when you file your taxes, so you
17
         get, basically, say, whatever the Federal Tax
18
         rate is up front on that investment. Where
19
         before, if you didn't have bonus depreciation,
20
         it would depreciate maybe 10 percent per year.
21
         Okay.
22
         (Goulding) So, your tax -- bonus depreciation
23
         allows you to get a tax benefit up front,
```

instead of having it over the life of the

[WITNESS PANEL: Goulding|Lajoie|Dickie]

```
1 asset.
```

- Q Okay. Thank you.
- 3 A (Goulding) Okay.
- 4 Q All right. I think you have all testified that
- 5 the capital dollars allocated or set aside last
- 6 year were around \$40 million? Yes?
- 7 A (Lajoie) It was \$40 million through the end of
- June, June 30, 2017. The investment in the
- 9 second half of the year was significantly less
- than that, I believe it was \$10 million.
- 11 Q And what are the rates based on? The rates
- that are currently in effect right now?
- 13 A (Goulding) It is -- they're based on all of the
- REP investments, I believe, that were made
- since our last step increase for REP, which was
- 16 April 2013, through today. So, there's all of
- that capital investment that's been placed in
- 18 service for the past almost five years, four
- 19 and a half years.
- 20 Q So, the rates are based on capital investment
- in excess of \$40 million?
- 22 A (Goulding) Yes.
- 23 Q Okay. Per year. And now we're going down to
- \$10 million, \$9 million?

```
1
    Α
         (Lajoie) Nine.
 2
    Q
         And but for the tax change, why isn't this a
 3
         rate decrease?
         (Goulding) So, the rates are developed to
 4
    Α
 5
         support the cumulative investments that have
 6
         been made. So, even when you -- so, if there
 7
         was no new investments made, then you wouldn't
         need to change the rates. But, because there
 8
9
         is new investments made, you need additional
10
         funding --
11
         Okay.
12
         (Goulding) -- for those new investments. So,
         the current funding is just supporting the
13
14
         cumulative investments that are already in
15
         service.
16
                   CMSR. BAILEY: Okay. All right.
17
         Thank you. That's all I have.
18
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Commissioner
19
         Giaimo.
20
                   CMSR. GIAIMO: Good morning.
21
                   WITNESS DICKIE: Good morning.
22
                   WITNESS LAJOIE: Good morning.
                   WITNESS GOULDING: Good morning.
23
24
                   CMSR. GIAIMO: So, I think most of my
```

{DE 17-196} {01-26-18}

```
1
         questions are for Mr. Lajoie and Mr. Dickie.
         So, Mr. Goulding, you can relax for a second.
 2
    BY CMSR. GIAIMO:
 3
 4
    Q
         And my questions are focused on fundamental
 5
         fairness, and is everyone, you know, are all
 6
         PSNH ratepayers getting a benefit from the
 7
         Program commensurate with what they're putting
         in.
              So, maybe you can articulate why an
 8
9
         investment to circuits, in Swanzey and
10
         Hinsdale, why it's fair for and what benefit it
11
         provides to improvements on those circuits
12
         circuit to people in Pittsburg? Maybe just to
13
         talk a little bit about maybe your system and
14
         how it's tightly integrated, and to the extent
15
         that one improvement could improve the
16
         reliability for the whole?
17
         (Lajoie) Okay. There's a number of things that
18
         are going to play into that. For one thing,
19
         what we're proposing as part of the REP are
20
         those two circuit ties. Those are only two of
21
         approximately fifteen that have been completed
22
         in the last two years. So, a lot of other work
23
         has been done in other areas of the state.
24
              One of the things that we look at every
```

year is our 50 worst-performing circuits, and we certainly try to propose projects that may address those worst-performing circuits. And those two areas corresponded to some of the worst-performing circuits that we've had last year, and perhaps even for a longer duration. I'm familiar with the area. I used to work there. So, yes.

A large part of the system, as it was built over the years, was actually built as a radial system, where the source is in one spot, and it's kind of like a spoke on a wheel, it just goes straight out. It doesn't tie to anything at the end, unlike a spoke, I guess. So, what these circuit ties do is actually give us the way to backfeed that system.

So, if you've got a radial circuit, and you have an outage somewhere near the source, everybody on that circuit is out until the power -- until we're able to repair the problem and get the power back on.

By building circuit ties, we can have an alternate feed to those people, so, again, we can sectionalize down to the smallest possible

```
1
         area, pick up some people from the normal
 2
         direction, and pick up the rest of the people
 3
         from the alternate feed, to get as many people
         back on quickly, and then go out and fix the
 4
 5
         problem that actually caused the outage.
 6
         (Dickie) From a distribution automation
 7
         standpoint, we're doing the -- the goal is to
 8
         do the entire system. And, so, the 500
         customer blocks that Lee had mentioned earlier,
 9
10
         that is a goal for the entire system. So, for
11
         all of Eversource customers in New Hampshire.
12
         Okay.
    Q
13
         (Dickie) But you can't do it all at once,
14
         right?
15
         I understand.
16
         (Dickie) It takes a little bit of time to get
17
         it.
18
    Q
         With respect to tree trimming, will the tree
19
         trimming be done based on need, based
20
         geographically, proportionately through the
21
         state? Maybe someone can touch upon what the
22
         plans are for that.
23
         (Lajoie) The tree trimming is going to -- the
    Α
24
         ETT portion of tree trimming is going to focus
```

on areas where the largest blocks of customers are, so that we're not taking out any more customers than we need to, or reducing the numbers of people that may be affected by a tree or a branch coming down. ETT is only performed on a section of a circuit once over the course — over the lifetime of that circuit. So, we're not going back and re-ETTing stuff that we've already done.

When you gain that additional clearance zone provided by the Enhanced Tree Trimming Program, we work to maintain that enhanced clearance zone, so we don't have to go back.

Maintaining a zone is significantly less expensive than establishing the zone. So, by maintaining that zone, it reduces the expenses going forward, but we get the benefit of that enhanced clearance zone forever.

Q But what I think I heard, and maybe I didn't hear it right, is you're looking for the places where there's the largest population in your Enhanced Tree Trimming. But that doesn't seem consistent with where the most trees are in the state?

```
1
    Α
         (Lajoie) We do a significant portion of ETT all
 2
         the way across the state, and every year look
 3
         at where we've seen tree outages, and what
 4
         areas could benefit most from ETT. But then,
 5
         within that area, we're looking for the
 6
         sections where a tree problem would cause the
 7
         most damage, the most number of customers out.
         Does that help?
 8
         Yes. I understand what you're doing.
9
10
         (Lajoie) Okay.
    Α
11
         I think I understand. Thank you. Talking
    0
12
         about the Troubleshooter Program, what are we,
13
         Page 8 on Bates, Bates Page 008?
14
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Exhibit 1?
15
    BY CMSR. GIAIMO:
16
    Q
         Exhibit 1. So, on Exhibit 1, starting at the
17
         bottom:
                 "The primary coverage area consists of
18
         Bedford, Derry, Hooksett, and Nashua." So,
19
         that's the Primary Coverage Areas. And then it
20
         later says "the Secondary Coverage Areas
21
         include Epping, Keene, Newport, Portsmouth,
22
         Rochester, and Tilton." So, nothing in
23
         Lancaster? Nothing in northern New Hampshire?
24
         (Dickie) Not at this time. You know, we try to
    Α
```

```
1
         keep the Troubleshooters -- the Troubleshooters
 2
         are always busy. They're not sitting around
 3
         waiting for something to happen. So, if
         they're not doing trouble-related work, they're
 4
 5
         doing other work, which we don't charge REP
 6
         for, we charge something else. And there's
 7
         just not enough work, because there's not
         enough circuitry in those areas to keep someone
 8
9
         busy 24/7.
10
         But when I look at the Exhibit 3, Slide 10, on
11
         Page 10, I see --
12
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Exhibit 4?
13
                   CMSR. GIAIMO: Sorry, yes. Exhibit
14
         4.
15
    BY CMSR. GIAIMO:
16
    Q
         I see there's a real value in finding myself in
17
         the primary area with respect to SAIDI, as
18
         opposed to the --
19
    Α
         (Dickie) On Page -- What page are you on?
         I'm sorry. On Slide 10 of Exhibit 4.
20
21
         (Dickie) Yes.
22
         It's more -- giving you more opportunity to
23
         comment, it seems to me that, you know, the
24
         SAIDI numbers are significantly lower if you're
```

```
1
         in those Primary Troubleshooting Areas than if
 2
         you're not?
         (Dickie) It is. I don't think it's all
 3
    Α
         Troubleshooters. I think some of it's
 4
 5
         population density, right? You're picking --
 6
         you have an outage and you pick it up quicker.
 7
         You also respond quicker with Troubleshooters,
         obviously. But, certainly, some of that is,
 8
9
         you know, customers -- so, there's SAIDI, and
10
         then there's also SAIFI, how many customers
11
         you're picking up per outage also.
12
              But, in general, yes, the SAIDI in the
13
         outlying areas tends to be higher than the more
14
         populated centers, yes.
15
                   CMSR. GIAIMO: Thank you. That's all
16
         the questions I have.
17
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: My questions
18
         have been answered.
19
                   Mr. Fossum, do you have any further
20
         questions for your witnesses?
21
                   MR. FOSSUM: I think just one at this
22
         time.
23
                    REDIRECT EXAMINATION
24
    BY MR. FOSSUM:
```

```
1
    Q
         Mr. Lajoie, I believe you said that there was a
 2
         2016 report that had been filed in September of
 3
         2016. Am I remembering your testimony
 4
         correctly?
 5
         (Lajoie) Yes. That's correct.
         Subject to check, do you believe that report
 6
    Q
 7
         was filed in Docket DE 14-238?
         (Lajoie) Yes. I believe that's correct.
 8
    Α
9
                   MR. FOSSUM: Thank you. And that's
         all I've got.
10
11
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you,
12
         Mr. Fossum.
13
                    If there's nothing else for the
14
         witnesses, I think they can probably remain
15
         where they are, because we're probably not
16
         going to be long to finish this one.
17
                   WITNESS GOULDING: Could I confer
         with Attorney Fossum real quick, just to --
18
19
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sure,
         Mr. Goulding. We don't want to leave anything
20
21
         unanswered here.
22
                         (Witness Goulding conferring
23
                         with Atty. Fossum.)
24
                   MR. FOSSUM: We are all set.
                                                  Thank
```

{DE 17-196} {01-26-18}

1 you. Appreciate the moment. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. 2 3 Without objection, we'll strike ID on Exhibits 1 through 4. 4 5 If there's nothing else, we'll allow 6 the parties to sum up. 7 MR. FOSSUM: Relative to -- I just want to raise one issue, if I may, relative to 8 9 Exhibit 4. Is that only a few pages of what is 10 in there were addressed. So, I'm not -- I 11 quess I'm not raising an objection, I'm simply 12 noting for the record that much of what is in 13 Exhibit 4 was not the subject of any questions 14 and wasn't described. 15 It is -- and, so, there's -- to the 16 extent there's information in there that has 17 not been explained, I suppose I would object to 18 the use of that information to form the part of 19 any decision in this docket to that extent. 20 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Amidon. 21 MS. AMIDON: I can't disagree with 22 And if he wants to -- if he wants to that. 23 limit the pages, maybe he could identify the

{DE 17-196} {01-26-18}

pages that he wants to be part of Exhibit 4.

```
1
                   MR. FOSSUM:
                                Well, my recollection is
         that I believe it was Pages 5 and -- 5 and 10
 2
 3
         for certain. And if I may, I believe my notes
 4
         show that there were questions on Pages 5, 6,
 5
         and 10. So, those are the ones that have been
 6
         explained and information has been offered to
 7
         understand what's exactly being shown. So,
         those would be the pages that I believe may be
 8
9
         an appropriate part of the record.
10
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Amidon.
11
                   MS. AMIDON: I think that's right, I
12
         guess. Are you --
                         (Atty. Amidon conferring with
13
14
                        Mr. Chagnon.)
15
                   MS. AMIDON: Yes, okay. Yes.
                                                   We're
16
         comfortable with that.
17
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So, Pages 5, 6,
18
         and 10 are the only three pages that will carry
19
         forward in Exhibit 4. Is that what the parties
20
         want to have happen here?
21
                   MS. AMIDON: Well, the Company has --
22
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Amidon, you
23
         can argue with him. You can disagree with him,
24
         if you would like.
```

1 MS. AMIDON: Well, I frankly do 2 disagree with him, because the Company produced 3 that. And I don't know why they don't want 4 something that they produced in the record. 5 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I don't think he 6 ultimately cares that much. He's noting for 7 the record that there were no questions about most of the pages in the exhibit. And he is 8 9 leery of seeing an order that relies on 10 information on Pages 1 and 2 as being crucial to the Commission's decision. 11 12 MS. AMIDON: I see. I think I 13 misunderstood then. I understand now. I think 14 it should be in the -- it should be introduced as an exhibit, and note for the record that 15 16 those are the three pages that are relevant to 17 the cross-examination here. 18 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think the 19 record is now clear on that point. 20 MS. AMIDON: Thank you. 21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So, we're going 22 to strike ID on all of Exhibit 4, understanding 23 the limitations, Mr. Fossum, that you 24 identified for it.

1 MR. FOSSUM: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So, ID is struck on all four exhibits.

If there's nothing else, we'll have the parties sum up. Mr. Buckley, why don't you start us off.

MR. BUCKLEY: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. The Office of the Consumer Advocate is supportive of the 2018 REP filing by the Company. We appreciate the Company working with Staff, the OCA to minimize those costs which directly fall under the REP. And we particularly appreciate the treatment of the Troubleshooter Program in this most recent filing, as well as the Enhanced Tree Trimming and Hazard Tree Removal, and Distribution Automation investments. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Amidon.

MS. AMIDON: Thank you. Staff supports the filing as well. And we're -- you know, it's satisfying for the customers, I'm sure, to know that the rates are mitigated by the accounting of the tax reduction for the Company. So, that's good.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We support the ending of the funding the troubleshooters through the REP. We also agree with the exclusion in the future of Enhanced Tree Trimming and Hazard Tree Removal from capital costs. It's unfortunate, of course, that taxpayers will be continuing to pay for these costs for some period of time due to the treatment of them as capital investment.

Going forward, we think -- we believe that the Company should address a wholesale review of the REP Program in the next distribution rate case. We think there are a lot of -- a little bit more discipline needs to be provided to this Program, including establishing budgets that are based on a not-to-exceed level, and that -- because we want to assure that the resulting rates are just and reasonable. And at some point, the benefit/cost analysis of increased investment in reliability is not going to show a commensurate improvement in reliability statistics. At some point, there has to be something where it's more on a maintenance type of activity, rather than something that needs

to be continually enhanced.

We also believe the Company should focus on vegetation management, because the testimony shows that the trees are continuing to be the problem of most outages. And that's, obviously, the biggest challenge for the Company, and we think that there should be some increased focus to those things in the Reliability Program, as opposed to, you know, distribution automation and that type of thing.

We expect that the Company will file an Annual Report on the capital projects, describing how they were selected, whether there were budget overruns or not, and provide us with the information that has been -- was provided following the 2010 rate case settlement.

And we also request that the

Commission direct them to meet with the OCA and

Staff before, I mean, I don't know when the

Company is going to be filing a rate case, but

if they intend to, say, for example, continue

REP in 2019, I ask that the Company be directed

to meet with OCA and Staff in advance of that,

so that we can make sure that this -- the filing that is made is one in which we all can agree to, and that it improves reliability for customers, as well as results in just and reasonable rates.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Fossum.

MR. FOSSUM: Thank you. I appreciate the support of the Staff and the OCA for this filing. This is a good Program. And even scaled back as it has been, it is still a good Program. And it's one that the Company supports, and certainly supports the continuation of it.

As expected by the Commission and -or, by the Staff and the OCA, the Company did
spend significant time and effort to work with
those parties, so that they understood what it
was we were proposing, why we were proposing
it, and we took their feedback under advisement
to make changes to the Program that's presented
to you today.

I have no reason to believe the Company would have any objection to continuing

working with the Staff and the OCA going forward on potential revisions or refinements to the Program.

With respect to the Troubleshooters and the Enhanced Tree Trimming and the change in their treatment, I believe the reasons for those changes are explained in the testimony.

But I would like to respond to the Staff's indication that the continuation of payments is "unfortunate", I believe was the term. And the Company, I guess, would disagree with that characterization. The ETT costs were appropriately capitalized at the time that they were capitalized, and they're treated as any other capital asset would be. The fact that their treatment will change in the future does not change the fact that they were appropriately booked and accounted for at the time they were incurred.

We will be, as Mr. Lajoie has testified, we will be filing a report summarizing the activities to date in the first quarter of this year. And we are certainly intending to file ongoing reports for this

1	Program. So, I don't anticipate that being any
2	issue.
3	With that, we're requesting that, as
4	indicated in Mr. Goulding's supplemental
5	testimony, that this Program be continued at
6	the current funding level, at the current level
7	of rates, and that no rate increase is
8	necessary. And therefore, customers will reap
9	the benefits of these programs, without having
10	to have a rate increase to do so.
11	So, I would ask that this Program be
12	approved as filed and supplemented. And that's
13	what I'm asking for this morning.
14	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you, Mr.
15	Fossum.
16	We will take the matter under
17	advisement, issue an order as quickly as we
18	can. We are adjourned.
19	MR. FOSSUM: Thank you.
20	(Whereupon the hearing was
21	adjourned at 11:33 a.m.)
22	
23	
24	