



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**APPEARANCES:** *(C o n t i n u e d)*

**Reptg. New Hampshire Department of  
Environmental Services:**

Rebecca Ohler

**Reptg. Residential Ratepayers:**

Donald M. Kreis, Esq., Consumer Adv.  
Maureen Reno, Dir./Rates & Markets  
Office of Consumer Advocate

**Reptg. New Hampshire Dept. of Energy:**

David K. Wiesner, Esq.  
Elizabeth Nixon, Director/Electric Group  
Sanem Sergici *(The Brattle Group)*  
*(Regulatory Support Division)*

**ALSO PRESENT:**

James Penfold *(ReVision Energy)*

## I N D E X

## PAGE NO.

1			
2			
3	<b>SETTLEMENT PANEL:</b>	<b>MARISA PARUTA</b>	
4		<b>EDWARD DAVIS</b>	
5		<b>KEVIN BOUGHAN</b>	
6		<b>CHRISTOPHER VILLARREAL</b>	
7		<b>MATTHEW DEAL</b>	
8		<b>MAUREEN RENO</b>	
9		<b>ELIZABETH NIXON</b>	
10		<b>SANEM SERGICI</b>	
11	Direct examination by Ms. Chiavara		10
12	Direct examination by Mr. Vijaykar		27
13	Direct examination by Mr. Kreis		29
14	Direct examination by Mr. Wiesner		35
15	Direct examination by Mr. Krakoff		43
16	Interrogatories by Cmsr. Simpson	62, 110,	153
17	Interrogatories by Cmsr. Chattopadhyay	117,	185*
18	Interrogatories by Chrmn. Goldner	147, 158, 161*,	168
19	Redirect examination by Ms. Chiavara		187
20	Redirect examination by Mr. Kreis		194
21	Redirect examination by Mr. Wiesner		199

**QUESTIONS TO MS. OHLER BY:**

16	Cmsr. Simpson	106, 111,	154
17	Chairman Goldner	140, 152, 156*,	159, 163

**FINAL COMMENTS BY:**

20	Mr. Kreis	203
21	Ms. Chiavara	205

**NOTE to READER:**

\* denotes that others responded as well to the question asked

**E X H I B I T S**

<b>EXHIBIT NO.</b>	<b>D E S C R I P T I O N</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
1	Comprehensive Settlement Agreement (07-07-22)	<i>premarked</i>
2	Eversource original petition and proposals with supporting attachments (04-15-21)	<i>premarked</i>
3	Final Report, Electric Vehicle Charging Stations Infrastructure Commission, Senate Bill 517 (2018), published October 30, 2020	<i>premarked</i>
4	Testimony of Matthew Deal, ChargePoint, Inc. (02-25-22)	<i>premarked</i>
5	Testimony of Christopher Villarreal on behalf of Clean Energy New Hampshire and Conservation Law Foundation (02-25-22)	<i>premarked</i>
6	Testimony of Elizabeth Nixon, Department of Energy (02-25-22)	<i>premarked</i>
7	Testimony of Dr. Sanem Sergici for the Department of Energy, (02-25-22)	<i>premarked</i>
8	Eversource Rebuttal Testimony of Edward A. Davis, Marisa Paruta and Kevin M. Boughan (04-25-22)	<i>premarked</i>
<b>RECORD REQUESTS AS NOTED IN THE 07-15-22 PROCEDURAL ORDER IN DE 21-078:</b>		
<b>Request #1</b>	<i>(Refer to Procedural Order)</i>	<i>(99), 201</i>
<b>Request #2</b>	<i>(Refer to Procedural Order)</i>	<i>(102), 202</i>
<b>Request #3</b>	<i>(Refer to Procedural Order)</i>	<i>(130), 202</i>

**P R O C E E D I N G**

1  
2 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Good morning.  
3 I'm Commissioner Goldner. I'm joined by  
4 Commissioner Simpson and Commissioner  
5 Chattopadhyay.

6 We're here today for a hearing in  
7 Docket 21-078 for Eversource Energy's Petition  
8 for Electric Vehicle Make Ready and Demand  
9 Alternative Proposals.

10 Before we take appearances, the  
11 Commission notes that there's an outstanding  
12 Petition to Intervene from ReVision Energy. Is  
13 ReVision here today?

14 *[Indication given.]*

15 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Do you plan to  
16 participate in today's hearing?

17 MR. PENFOLD: No, I don't. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.  
19 So, the Commission grants intervention under RSA  
20 541-A:32, II. So, the Petition is granted in the  
21 hearing today. So, thank you, sir.

22 So, let's take appearances, beginning  
23 with Eversource.

24 MS. CHIAVARA: Good morning,

1           Commissioners. Jessica Chiavara, here on behalf  
2           of Public Service Company of New Hampshire, doing  
3           business as Eversource Energy.

4                       And today, I have with me Marisa  
5           Paruta, Kevin Boughan, and Edward Davis.

6                       CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. The New  
7           Hampshire Department of Environmental Services?

8                       MS. OHLER: Good morning, Commissioner.  
9           Rebecca Ohler, on behalf of the Department of  
10          Environmental Services.

11                      CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. Clean  
12          Energy New Hampshire?

13                      MR. SKOGLUND: Good morning,  
14          Commissioners. Chris Skoglund, on behalf of  
15          Clean Energy New Hampshire.

16                      CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you.  
17          ChargePoint?

18                      MR. VIJAYKAR: Good morning,  
19          Commissioners. On behalf of ChargePoint, Inc.,  
20          Nikhil Vijaykar, with the law firm Keyes & Fox,  
21          LLP.

22                      CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Very good. The  
23          Conservation Law Foundation?

24                      MR. KRAKOFF: Good morning,

1           Commissioners. Nick Krakoff, on behalf of  
2           Conservation Law Foundation. With me today is  
3           Chris Villarreal, who will be testifying  
4           remotely. And then, observing, but not  
5           participating, is a law student interning with  
6           CLF this summer, Jillian Aicher.

7                         Thank you.

8                         CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. The Town  
9           of Derry? Are they here today?

10                        *[No indication given.]*

11                        CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: No? Okay. The  
12           Office of Consumer Advocate?

13                        MR. KREIS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman,  
14           Commissioners. I'm Donald Kreis, the Consumer  
15           Advocate, here on behalf of residential utility  
16           customers, including the customers of Eversource.  
17           With me today is Maureen Reno, our Director of  
18           rates and markets, who is prepared to testify in  
19           support of the Settlement Agreement.

20                        CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. And the  
21           New Hampshire Department of Energy?

22                        MR. WIESNER: Good morning,  
23           Commissioners. Dave Wiesner, representing the  
24           Department of Energy. With me are our two

1 witnesses, Elizabeth Nixon, the Director of the  
2 Electric Group in the Regulatory Support Division  
3 of the Department, and, through remote  
4 participation, we have Dr. Sanem Sergici of The  
5 Brattle Group.

6 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.  
7 And did I miss anyone?

8 *[No verbal response.]*

9 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: No? Excellent.  
10 Okay. For preliminary matters, do the  
11 Parties plan to place the witnesses in a single  
12 panel or multiple panels?

13 MS. CHIAVARA: It was going to be a  
14 single Settlement panel, but probably addressing  
15 each party's witnesses individually.

16 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Okay. Very  
17 good.

18 And I'll just note, as we get started  
19 today, that there's a lot of moving parts in this  
20 docket, and we expect -- we, the Commission,  
21 expect to continue this hearing in early August  
22 in order to issue a timely order.

23 So, Exhibits 1 through 8 have been  
24 prefiled and premarked for identification.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Material identified as confidential in the  
2 filings will be treated as confidential during  
3 the hearing.

4 Are there any other preliminary  
5 matters, before we have the witnesses sworn in?

6 *[No verbal response.]*

7 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: All right. Okay.  
8 So, let's proceed with the witnesses.  
9 Mr. Patnaude would you please swear in the panel?

10 (Whereupon **Marisa Paruta, Edward Davis,**  
11 **Kevin Boughan, Christopher Villarreal,**  
12 **Matthew Deal, Maureen Reno,**  
13 **Elizabeth Nixon, and Sanem Sergici**  
14 were duly sworn by the Court Reporter.)

15 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.  
16 And we'll begin with the Company.

17 MS. CHIAVARA: Thank you, Chair.

18 **MARISA PARUTA, SWORN**

19 **EDWARD DAVIS, SWORN**

20 **KEVIN BOUGHAN, SWORN**

21 **CHRISTOPHER VILLARREAL, SWORN**

22 **MATTHEW DEAL, SWORN**

23 **MAUREEN RENO, SWORN**

24 **ELIZABETH NIXON, SWORN**

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**SANEM SERGICI, SWORN**

**DIRECT EXAMINATION**

BY MS. CHIAVARA:

Q I'm going to begin with Ms. Paruta. Ms. Paruta, will you state your name, your title of your role at Eversource?

A (Paruta) Sure. Yes. Good morning, Commissioners. Good morning, everyone. My name is Marisa Paruta. And I am the Director of New Hampshire and the Connecticut regulatory and revenue requirements.

Q And what are the roles of your responsibilities at Eversource?

A (Paruta) At Eversource Energy, I am responsible for all of the rate filings, in terms of the revenue requirements and cost of service, in both New Hampshire and Connecticut, for the electric and gas utility companies.

Q And have you ever testified before this Commission?

A (Paruta) Yes, I have.

Q Did you file testimony and supporting attachments as part of the Company's original filing made on April 15th, 2021 that's marked as "Exhibit 2"?

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 A (Paruta) No. I am adopting testimony on behalf  
2 of Brian Rice, as he has moved on to a different  
3 position at Eversource Energy Service Company.  
4 And I am directly familiar with the content  
5 related to the costs in the cost recovery  
6 mechanisms for the Company, as it's been  
7 proposed, which is what Mr. Rice testified to.

8 Q Do you have any changes or updates to make to  
9 that testimony?

10 A (Paruta) No, I do not.

11 Q So, do you adopt Mr. Rice's testimony today as it  
12 was written and filed?

13 A (Paruta) Yes, I do.

14 Q Thank you. Did you file testimony and supporting  
15 attachments as part of the filing made by the  
16 Company on April 25th, 2022, rebuttal testimony,  
17 marked as "Exhibit 8"?

18 A (Paruta) Yes, I did.

19 Q And do you have any changes or updates to make to  
20 that testimony?

21 A (Paruta) No, I do not.

22 Q Was that material prepared by you or at your  
23 direction?

24 A (Paruta) Yes, it was.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Q And do you adopt that rebuttal testimony today as  
2 it was written and filed?

3 A (Paruta) I do.

4 Q Thank you. Lastly, are you familiar with the  
5 terms of the Settlement Agreement entered into by  
6 the Company marked as "Exhibit 1"?

7 A (Paruta) Yes, I am.

8 Q And is it your position that the Settlement  
9 Agreement is just, reasonable, and in the public  
10 interest?

11 A (Paruta) Yes, it is.

12 Q Thank you. Moving to Mr. Davis. Mr. Davis, will  
13 you please state your name and the title of your  
14 role at evidence?

15 A (Davis) Good morning. Yes. My name is Edward A.  
16 Davis. I am the Director of Rates for Eversource  
17 Energy Service Company.

18 Q And what are the responsibilities of your role at  
19 Eversource?

20 A (Davis) I am responsible for rate and  
21 tariff-related matters and services to the  
22 operating companies of Eversource Energy,  
23 including the Public Service Company of New  
24 Hampshire.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Q And have you ever testified before this  
2 Commission?

3 A (Davis) Yes, I have.

4 Q Did you file testimony and supporting attachments  
5 as part of the Company's original filing on  
6 April 15th, 2021, that's marked as "Exhibit 2"?

7 A (Davis) Yes.

8 Q Were the testimony and supporting materials  
9 prepared by you or at your direction?

10 A (Davis) Yes.

11 Q Do you have any updates or changes to make at  
12 this time?

13 A (Davis) I do not.

14 Q So, do you adopt the testimony today as it was  
15 written and filed?

16 A (Davis) Yes.

17 Q Thank you. Did you also file testimony and  
18 supporting attachments as part of a filing made  
19 by the Company on April 25th, 2022, rebuttal  
20 testimony, marked as "Exhibit 8"?

21 A (Davis) Yes.

22 Q And were the testimony and supporting materials  
23 prepared by you or at your direction?

24 A (Davis) Yes.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Q Do you have any changes or updates to make at  
2 this time?

3 A (Davis) No.

4 Q So, do you adopt that rebuttal testimony today as  
5 it was written and filed?

6 A (Davis) Yes.

7 Q Fantastic. And, lastly, are you familiar with  
8 the terms of the Settlement Agreement entered  
9 into by the Company marked as "Exhibit 1".

10 A (Davis) Yes.

11 Q And is it your position that the Settlement  
12 Agreement and its terms and are just and  
13 reasonable and in the public interest?

14 A (Davis) Yes, it is.

15 Q Thank you. Turning last to Mr. Boughan. Please  
16 state your name and the title of your role at  
17 Eversource?

18 A (Davis) My name is Kevin Boughan. And my  
19 position is Manager, Research and Business  
20 Development, at Eversource Energy Service  
21 Company. And in that position, I provide service  
22 to the operating companies of Eversource Energy.

23 Q And what are the responsibilities of your role at  
24 Eversource?

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 A (Boughan) I'm responsible for managing Eversource  
2 Energy's electric vehicle development strategies,  
3 including the development of specific EV charging  
4 development programs across Eversource's service  
5 territories, including PSNH, in New Hampshire.

6 Q And have you ever testified before this  
7 Commission?

8 A (Boughan) Yes.

9 Q Did you file testimony and supporting attachments  
10 as part of the Company's original filing, filed  
11 on April 15th, 2021, marked as "Exhibit 2"?

12 A (Boughan) Yes.

13 Q Were the testimony and supporting materials  
14 prepared by you or at your direction?

15 A (Woods) Yes.

16 Q Do you have any changes or updates to make at  
17 this time?

18 A (Boughan) No, I do not.

19 Q And do you adopt that testimony today as it was  
20 written and filed?

21 A (Boughan) Yes, I do.

22 Q Did you also file testimony and supporting  
23 attachments as part of the filing made by the  
24 Company on April 25th, 2022, rebuttal testimony,

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 marked as "Exhibit 8"?

2 A (Boughan) Yes.

3 Q And were that testimony and supporting materials  
4 prepared by you or at your direction?

5 A (Boughan) Yes.

6 Q Do you have any changes or updates to make to  
7 that testimony?

8 A (Boughan) No.

9 Q So, you adopt that rebuttal testimony today as it  
10 was written and filed?

11 A (Boughan) Yes, I do.

12 Q Excellent. Turning to Exhibit 3, the SB 517  
13 Report, are you familiar with the "Final Report"  
14 of the "Electric Vehicle Charging Stations  
15 Infrastructure Commission" mandated by SB 517 of  
16 2018, which is marked as "Exhibit 3", and can you  
17 speak to its contents?

18 A (Boughan) Yes. I was a member of that  
19 Commission, and I can speak to the contents of  
20 the Report.

21 Q Thank you. And, lastly, are you familiar with  
22 the terms of the Settlement Agreement entered  
23 into by the Company, and marked as "Exhibit 1"?

24 A (Boughan) Yes.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Q And is it your position that the terms of the  
2 Settlement Agreement are just, reasonable, and in  
3 the public interest?

4 A (Boughan) Yes.

5 MS. CHIAVARA: Thank you. If it's all  
6 right with the Commission, I have a few questions  
7 for the Company witnesses? It's not summarizing  
8 the Settlement. It just more goes to the  
9 underlying influences supporting the Company's  
10 position in the Settlement Agreement.

11 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Please proceed.

12 MS. CHIAVARA: Thank you.

13 BY MS. CHIAVARA:

14 Q Mr. Boughan, Eversource's Electric Vehicle  
15 Make-Ready Program proposes to pair with VW Trust  
16 awardees from the recent DES RFP process for  
17 EV-DC Fast Charging stations. If these sits have  
18 already been awarded money from DES through the  
19 VW Trust, why isn't the proposed Eversource  
20 make-ready program not simply a "double subsidy"  
21 that puts existing charging stations at an even  
22 further disadvantage?

23 A (Boughan) Yes. So, our proposal is designed with  
24 a very narrow scope and a targeted purpose,

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           aiding the development of fast charging stations  
2           along the state's travel corridors within our  
3           service territory. A segment need that was  
4           identified by the EV Commission, and a segment  
5           that is underdeveloped. Within the Eversource  
6           service territory, which serves 75 percent of New  
7           Hampshire's electric customers, there are only  
8           four DC fast charging locations with universal  
9           charging installed today.

10                   As a reminder, DC fast charging  
11           stations provide a unique charging case, distinct  
12           from Level 2 destination charging, Level 2 home  
13           charging, or 110 volt home charging. They're  
14           designed for enabling longer distance travel to  
15           and through highway corridors. They can fully  
16           charge today's EVs typically within an hour, and  
17           as fast as up to 15 minutes. Level 2 charging is  
18           designed for long dwell time parking, charging  
19           cars in, you know, approximately six to eight  
20           hours. 110 volt charging can take up to 48 hours  
21           to fully charge a modern EV. DC fast charging  
22           stations will be located for those far away  
23           enough from home that home charging is not an  
24           option. It should also be noted that not all EV

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 drivers, such as multi-unit dwelling residents,  
2 have access to 110 volt home charging.

3 So, you know, the proposal is designed  
4 such that the DC fast charging travel corridors  
5 in New Hampshire will protect against the loss  
6 of -- potential loss of tourism revenue from  
7 interstate travel. Surrounding states are much  
8 farther ahead of New Hampshire, and this could  
9 start diverting interstate travelers around New  
10 Hampshire, and may already be doing so.

11 The development of these travel --  
12 charging travel corridors, which include the  
13 requirement that they must be at least 20 miles  
14 from any existing public fast charging station,  
15 will likely increase the utilization levels of  
16 these and other charging stations, generating new  
17 revenue for the state.

18 So, in summary, it's not  
19 anti-competitive. It's really an investment in  
20 an underdeveloped market.

21 Q Thank you very much. You just said that these  
22 locations will likely benefit from increased  
23 utilization due to the development of these fast  
24 charging travel corridors. If that's the case,

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           why do these customers need both the DES award  
2           and the proposed Eversource make-ready funding?

3    A       (Boughan) So, the business case for public fast  
4           charging stations is so poor at this time, that  
5           customers need both funding pieces just to get  
6           these public fast charging stations operational.  
7           Additionally, these customers also need a rate  
8           design that is absent demand charges. So, it's  
9           really a three-legged stool, if you will, to  
10          get -- required to get these charging stations  
11          off the ground in New Hampshire.

12                    Mr. Davis will speak more to the rate  
13           design proposal. But, in regards to the  
14           Eversource make-ready program, that funding will  
15           cover what the DES funding will not. So, the  
16           programs really compliment, rather than overlap,  
17           one another.

18                    We heard from applicants from DES's  
19           first round RFP, that, without both pieces of  
20           funding, it's likely that some of these stations  
21           will not be developed at all, and failing to  
22           develop the New Hampshire EV fast charging travel  
23           corridors would be ignoring what's been  
24           identified as an important state policy

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 objective. And this has already been evidenced  
2 by the lack of success of the original DES RFP.

3 Q Mr. Boughan, you mentioned that these public fast  
4 charging stations, if constructed, will generate  
5 new revenue for the state. Could you speak in a  
6 bit more detail to the benefits, should the  
7 Commission approve the investment of Eversource's  
8 make-ready program?

9 A (Boughan) Yes. The Company does not consider the  
10 Eversource make-ready program so much a subsidy  
11 as it is, again, an investment in the  
12 electrification of the transportation sector,  
13 which will generate a new source of revenue, in  
14 addition to preserving, as I said before, the  
15 interstate tourism travel that New Hampshire  
16 depends on.

17 I would like to reference Exhibit 2, at  
18 Bates Page 018, for a discussion of the possible  
19 benefits of the make-ready program. The degree  
20 of the new revenue will be influenced by a number  
21 of factors, such as the number of charging  
22 stations constructed, the number and  
23 configuration of chargers at each station, and  
24 the levels of utilization at those stations. The

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 more complete the travel corridor, the more  
2 likely the chance of greater revenue generation  
3 and utilization.

4 Should these stations have sufficient  
5 levels of utilization and the Company exceeds its  
6 revenue requirement, customers would benefit from  
7 that excess, making the make-ready program more  
8 of a long-term investment than a pure subsidy.  
9 Illustrative revenue projections based on the  
10 assumptions I discussed can be found in Exhibit  
11 2, Bates Pages 028 through 031.

12 Q Thank you. Now, I'd like to spend a moment  
13 discussing the Demand Charge Alternative rate  
14 design. Mr. Davis, the Commission recently  
15 approved a Commercial Time of Use rate to be  
16 implemented statewide across all utility service  
17 territories. Is this Demand Charge Alternative  
18 rate redundant of that rate? And, if not, why is  
19 it needed?

20 A (Davis) No, it is not redundant of the Commercial  
21 Time of Use rate. The rate in this proceeding is  
22 designed to address a particular subset of  
23 customers that would otherwise be eligible for  
24 the Commercial Time of Use rate, but this subset

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 of customers has identified needs based on their  
2 type of usage that will not be addressed by the  
3 Commercial Time of Use rate for a couple of  
4 reasons.

5 First, the Demand Charge Alternative  
6 rate was designed for public charging stations.  
7 These charging stations serve customers that  
8 don't have the flexibility to respond to  
9 time-of-use price signals. They need to cater to  
10 the charging needs of their patrons, regardless  
11 of the time of day. It's not, however, just that  
12 these public charging station customers cannot  
13 respond to time-of-use price signals, it's also  
14 that these customers have identified demand  
15 charges as a primary barrier to market entry  
16 during the Company's stakeholder outreach.

17 The Commercial Time of Use rate still  
18 has a 50 percent demand charge, and public  
19 charging station customers have said that this is  
20 insufficient to address this significant market  
21 barrier.

22 The Demand Charge Alternative rate  
23 fully resolves the issue of demand charges by  
24 folding all charges into a volumetric rate. This

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 will allow public charging station customers to  
2 better pass along costs to their patrons because  
3 their energy bills will be entirely based on  
4 usage, and not on monthly peak demand, which may  
5 be drastically out of joint compared with the  
6 overall utilization level of the station in a  
7 given month. Our customers have told us this is  
8 what they need to make a viable business case,  
9 which I why the rate is designed the way it is.

10 Q But, Mr. Davis, is it true that this rate will  
11 create a discount for stations at low utilization  
12 levels, meaning that customers from other classes  
13 will be subsidizing these public charging station  
14 customers?

15 A (Davis) I think it's important to recognize that  
16 this is a very small group of customers, fewer  
17 than ten right now, by our projections. So, any  
18 possible discount would be negligible.

19 The rate would only create a discount  
20 and possible revenue shortfall at low utilization  
21 levels, and would be very similar that of the  
22 Commercial Time of Use rate. I would direct our  
23 attention to Exhibit 1, Bates 020, where we have  
24 provided a comparison of bills at different

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 utilization levels, and compare our Rate GV with  
2 the Commercial Time of Use rate, as well as the  
3 Demand Charge Alternative proposed herein. At  
4 this point, we don't know that there will be any  
5 cross-subsidization among rate classes, and we've  
6 limited the duration of the offering to three  
7 years, at which point we will analyze the data  
8 and recalibrate as appropriate.

9 Ideally, this rate design is meant to  
10 serving to kickstart, by creating a viable  
11 business case for these customers and developing  
12 the New Hampshire fast charging travel corridors,  
13 utilization levels will go up, and as that  
14 happens, any potential revenue shortfall will  
15 disappear. By design, when utilization levels  
16 hit 10 percent, this design actually makes more  
17 sense for the public charging station customer to  
18 switch back to the Default General Service rate,  
19 in this case, Rate GV. This rate is simply to  
20 get these businesses off the ground, which is why  
21 both the scope of the offering and the duration  
22 of the offering are limited, as reflected in the  
23 Settlement Agreement that's marked as  
24 "Exhibit 1".

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Q Thank you very much, Mr. Davis. Now, Ms. Paruta,  
2 given the sharp rise in energy prices that is  
3 coming -- that is approaching in the coming  
4 months, could you please describe how the cost of  
5 the make-ready program would affect customer  
6 bills?

7 A (Paruta) Yes, of course. The total program costs  
8 that we currently estimate is approximately \$2.1  
9 million, which at this point in time we have  
10 estimated to be approximately \$650,000 in capital  
11 expense, and the remaining to be approximately  
12 \$1.5 million in O&M expenses. The division of  
13 the funding is subject to change, of course,  
14 depending on the allocation of the DES Volkswagen  
15 funding. Given the total cost, the bill impact  
16 to a residential customer using 600  
17 kilowatt-hours per month would be 15 cents per  
18 month in totality to that customer in year 1, and  
19 then, year 2 to 35, assuming a 35-year project  
20 life estimate, which we do, that would be roughly  
21 a penny per month for a 600 kilowatt-hour  
22 customer.

23 MS. CHIAVARA: Thank you very much, Ms.  
24 Paruta.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1                   That is all I have for my witnesses.

2                   Thank you.

3                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.

4                   So, we'll move to Clean Energy New Hampshire.

5                   MR. SKOGLUND: We have no questions at  
6                   this time. Thank you.

7                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. And next,  
8                   let's move to ChargePoint.

9                   MR. VIJAYKAR: Thank you,  
10                  Commissioners. I'm going to wait for our witness  
11                  to turn his video on. There we are. Good  
12                  morning, Mr. Deal.

13 BY MR. VIJAYKAR:

14 Q               Can you please state and spell your name for the  
15               record?

16 A               (Deal) Certainly. Matthew Deal, M-a-t-t-h-e-w,  
17               D-e-a-l.

18 Q               And could you please state the name of the party  
19               that you represent in this proceeding?

20 A               (Deal) ChargePoint.

21 Q               Thank you, Mr. Deal. Did you prepare and cause  
22               to be filed direct testimony and two accompanying  
23               exhibits in this case on February 25th, 2022?

24 A               (Deal) Yes.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Q And is that testimony true and correct as of the  
2 time it was written, to the best of your  
3 knowledge?

4 A (Deal) Yes.

5 Q Do you have any corrections to offer to that  
6 testimony?

7 A (Deal) No.

8 Q Mr. Deal, if asked the same questions today,  
9 would your answers to those questions be the  
10 same?

11 A (Deal) Yes.

12 Q Mr. Deal, ChargePoint is a signatory to the  
13 Settlement Agreement filed in this proceeding on  
14 July 7th, 2022, correct?

15 A (Deal) Yes.

16 MR. VIJAYKAR: Thank you, Mr. Deal.

17 And, Commissioners, no further  
18 questions for my witness at this time, and is,  
19 obviously, available for Commissioner questions  
20 or any other questions.

21 Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.

23 We'll move to the Office of Consumer Advocate.

24 MR. KREIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           have some questions for Ms. Reno. But I think I  
2           need to put her someplace where she has a  
3           microphone.

4                           *[Short pause.]*

5                   MR. KREIS: Thank you. This is a first  
6           for me, conducting a direct exam of somebody  
7           sitting right next to me. But I'm all about  
8           flexibility.

9 BY MR. KREIS:

10 Q       Good morning, Ms. Reno. Could you please state  
11       your name, your employer, and your position with  
12       that employer for the record?

13 A       (Reno) Yes. My name is Maureen Reno. I'm  
14       employed with the Office of the Consumer Advocate  
15       as the Rate and Market Policy Director.

16 Q       And what do your responsibilities in that  
17       position include?

18 A       (Reno) I serve at the behest of residential  
19       ratepayers here in New Hampshire.

20 Q       And, of course, you did not submit written  
21       prefiled direct testimony in this proceeding,  
22       correct?

23 A       (Reno) No, I did not.

24 Q       But you have been actively involved in the

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 docket, I presume?

2 A (Reno) Yes, I have. I attended a series of  
3 technical sessions, and also I was involved with  
4 the settlement discussions.

5 Q Have you had an opportunity to review the  
6 Settlement Agreement that has been marked for  
7 identification as "Exhibit 1"?

8 A (Reno) Yes.

9 Q And you're aware, therefore, that the OCA has  
10 signed that Agreement, yes?

11 A (Reno) Yes.

12 Q Could you explain to the Commission why the OCA,  
13 as the statutorily designated representative of  
14 residential utility customers, joined the  
15 Agreement?

16 A (Reno) Yes. We feel that the Settlement is in  
17 the public interest, because it addresses two  
18 major barriers to DC fast charging stations  
19 development here in New Hampshire. That is, it  
20 addresses the large upfront costs that charging  
21 customers would be facing, and also it addresses  
22 demand charges, in that it has a Demand Charge  
23 Alternative that rolls in -- the rate into a  
24 volumetric charge.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1                   It also benefits residential  
2                   ratepayers, because it provides for charging away  
3                   from home, and, in the cases of renters, it  
4                   provides an opportunity to charge their vehicles,  
5                   where it would not be available at their  
6                   apartments or place of residence.

7                   We also feel that this program would  
8                   draw tourism dollars and contribute to the  
9                   economy of New Hampshire, and the increase of  
10                  sales, and employment in the automobile industry,  
11                  and it also will reduce direct tailpipe  
12                  emissions.

13    Q            Of course, promoting tourism isn't really within  
14                  the mission of the Office of the Consumer  
15                  Advocate. But you would agree with me, would you  
16                  not, that when tourists come to New Hampshire and  
17                  spend their money here, that's good for  
18                  residential customers of New Hampshire, yes?

19    A            (Reno) Yes.

20    Q            Just to reprise a line of inquiry that Ms.  
21                  Chiavara posed to the Eversource witnesses, given  
22                  that Eversource already has a Commercial Time of  
23                  Use rate for EV charging, do you consider the  
24                  Demand Charge Alternative rate that is at issue

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 here to be redundant and, therefore, unnecessary,  
2 with respect to the Commercial TOU EV rate?

3 A (Reno) No, I do not, because it serves a  
4 different type of customer. I mean, there will  
5 be some overlap. These will be large customers,  
6 but they're serving a different purpose, in that  
7 their customers are, essentially, drivers who  
8 need on-demand charging, and which is time --  
9 which is not time-dependent. So, they're serving  
10 a totally different purpose.

11 Q Given the eternal concern of the OCA about our  
12 constituency unfairly being forced to subsidize  
13 other rate classes, do you have concerns here  
14 about the potential for cross-subsidization  
15 between ratepayers on the Demand Charge  
16 Alternative Program and other ratepayers?

17 A (Reno) No, I do not, because the Settlement  
18 addresses this concern by setting -- treating  
19 this proposal as a pilot, similar to a pilot  
20 program, in that there's a three-year limit, in  
21 which the Company will then report to the  
22 Commission key metrics, and allow for a  
23 proceeding to review the data, and, at that time,  
24 make tweaks to the program as necessary.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Q I presume that you're aware that, I think it was  
2 in Order 26,623, the Commission rejected a  
3 make-ready program proposed by Unitil, one of the  
4 other electric utilities. Do you consider the  
5 program that is described in the Settlement  
6 Agreement to be different from the Unitil  
7 program? And, if so, how does this proposal  
8 differ from that one?

9 A (Reno) Well, in this case, it's different in that  
10 it's matching already awarded funds from the  
11 Volkswagen Trust Fund, and it's a necessary  
12 investment to start this nascent industry.

13 Eversource, being the largest utility  
14 in New Hampshire, about 75 percent of the service  
15 territory, would lead to the ability to spread  
16 these costs across the large customer group, that  
17 is to a cost of only, I believe the Eversource  
18 witnesses expressed earlier, only a penny per  
19 month that ratepayers would incur. And, so, we  
20 feel that this is a necessary cost, and different  
21 from the Unitil make-ready program.

22 Q And, of course, I think you covered this in your  
23 answer, but I just want to make sure it's clear,  
24 Eversource serves the majority of the electric

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 customers in this state, and it also has a very  
2 large footprint that covers much of the  
3 transportation corridors in the state. And you  
4 consider that another reason to recommend the  
5 make-ready program favorably to the Commission,  
6 correct?

7 A (Reno) Yes. That's correct.

8 MR. KREIS: That was just an awesomely  
9 leading question, wasn't it?

10 Those are all the questions that I have  
11 for Ms. Reno on direct exam.

12 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.  
13 We'll move to the New Hampshire.

14 MR. WIESNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
15 We have two witnesses. I will, as others have  
16 done this morning, I will direct to them both the  
17 usual introductory questions, as well as ask them  
18 to briefly summarize why the Department is  
19 approving the Settlement terms that have been  
20 presented for your contribution.

21 So, I'll begin with Ms. Nixon, sitting  
22 to my immediate left, as Attorney Kreis noted, is  
23 an unusual and interesting dynamic.

24 BY MR. WIESNER:

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Q And I will ask her, for the record, would you  
2 please state your name and position with the  
3 Department of Energy?

4 A (Nixon) My name is Elizabeth Nixon.

5 *[Court reporter interruption regarding*  
6 *the microphone.]*

7 WITNESS NIXON: I'm sorry.

8 **BY THE WITNESS:**

9 A (Nixon) My name is Elizabeth Nixon. And I am the  
10 Electric Director.

11 BY MR. WIESNER:

12 Q And did you review and analyze the Company's  
13 filing that is the subject of this docket?

14 A (Nixon) Yes.

15 Q And have you previously testified before this  
16 Commission?

17 A (Nixon) Yes.

18 Q Did you submit written prefiled testimony on  
19 February 25th of this year, which has been marked  
20 for identification as "Exhibit 6"?

21 A (Nixon) Yes, I did.

22 Q And was that testimony and supporting materials  
23 prepared by you or under your direction?

24 A (Nixon) Yes.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Q And do you have any corrections to your testimony  
2 at this time?

3 A (Nixon) No, I do not.

4 Q And do you adopt that testimony for purposes of  
5 today's hearing?

6 A (Nixon) Yes, I do.

7 Q Now, moving on, Ms. Nixon, would you please  
8 describe the key reasons why the Department  
9 supports the Company's proposal to fund EV  
10 make-ready investments for certain public  
11 charging stations?

12 A (Nixon) The make-ready investments provide  
13 additional funding that is necessary to support  
14 the development of public EV public charging  
15 stations selected by DES for the VW funding. The  
16 investment is consistent with state policy  
17 objectives as described in the Settlement  
18 Agreement.

19 And, as Mr. Boughan and Ms. Reno said,  
20 we want to be able to accommodate New Hampshire  
21 residents that travel far away from home, or for  
22 multi-unit residents that don't have the access  
23 to it, as well as want to be able to encourage  
24 and accommodate tourists visiting the state. In

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           addition, the amount is reasonable in relation to  
2           Eversource's footprint and the customer load  
3           size.

4   Q       And do the Settlement terms address any concerns  
5           you may have had as expressed in your prefiled  
6           testimony?

7   A       (Nixon) Overall, my testimony was supportive of  
8           Eversource's proposal regarding the make-ready  
9           infrastructure investments. The Settlement  
10          Agreement caps the investments at 2.1 million,  
11          which is reasonable, and given that the costs for  
12          make-ready investments may differ from customer  
13          to customer, it makes sense to have the overall  
14          cap on the investments.

15   Q       And, finally, in your opinion, are the proposed  
16          Settlement terms just and reasonable and in the  
17          public interest?

18   A       (Nixon) Yes, they are.

19   Q       Thank you. I'll now turn to Dr. Sergici, who is  
20          not sitting anywhere near me.

21                   And I'll ask that she please state her  
22          name for the record?

23   A       (Sergici) My name is Sanem Sergici.

24   Q       And what is the consulting firm with which you

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 are affiliated?

2 A (Sergici) The Brattle Group. I'm a Principal  
3 with The Brattle Group.

4 Q And what's the nature of your engagement by the  
5 Department of Energy with respect to this docket?

6 A (Sergici) I was engaged by the Department of  
7 Energy to review EV and Time of Use rate design  
8 proposals in multiple related dockets, namely DE  
9 20-170 and DE 21-078.

10 Q And have you testified before this Commission  
11 previously?

12 A (Sergici) Yes, I have.

13 Q Did you submit written prefiled testimony on  
14 February 25th of this year, which has been marked  
15 for indication as "Exhibit 7"?

16 A (Sergici) Yes, I did.

17 Q And was that testimony prepared by you or under  
18 your direction?

19 A (Sergici) Yes.

20 Q Do you have any corrections to that testimony at  
21 this time?

22 A (Sergici) No, I don't.

23 Q And do you adopt that testimony for the purposes  
24 of today's hearing?

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 A (Sergici) Yes.

2 Q Thank you. Now, Dr. Sergici, would you please  
3 describe the key reasons why the Department  
4 supports implementation of the Demand Charge  
5 Alternative rate for the three-year period that's  
6 described in the Settlement?

7 A (Sergici) Sure. DOE supports the DCA rate  
8 implementation due to a few reasons.

9 First of all, the Company agrees to  
10 implement the DCA as an optional rate, to be  
11 offered in parallel with the optional Commercial  
12 EV TOU rate and General Service rate, GV rate.  
13 These two optional rates, namely, the DCA and  
14 Commercial EV TOU rate, address different issues.  
15 DCA specifically addresses public charging  
16 stations that may have a different end-use  
17 customer profile for charging needs than the  
18 broader group of commercial clustered Level 2  
19 charging stations.

20 Second, DCA rate is a  
21 starter/demonstration rate design, expected to be  
22 adopted by a small number of public charging  
23 station customers. This aspect of the rate  
24 design limits the extent of cost shift to other

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 customers, if any.

2 The third reason is that it has a  
3 narrowly defined eligibility condition, and a  
4 defined end date for eligibility, which will then  
5 start to limit the number of participating  
6 customers.

7 There will also be a utility cost study  
8 or analysis to understand the charging patterns  
9 and costs imposed by the DCA customers, and the  
10 extent to which they differ from the rate GV  
11 customers. And based on the results of this cost  
12 study or analysis, Eversource will make a  
13 recommendation to consider redesign, to better  
14 reflect the cost structure of the public charging  
15 customers, or the termination of the rate, if in  
16 the event that the DCA rate is not leading to  
17 sufficient cost recovery or any other reasons  
18 that may be identified by Eversource.

19 Another reason that the DOE supports  
20 this rate design, after Eversource filed its  
21 recommendation, there will be an opportunity for  
22 stakeholders to participate in a future  
23 adjudicative proceeding to address potential  
24 changes to the DCA rate.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           Last, but not least, the plan provides  
2           for transition of customers on the DCA rate in  
3           the event of any redesign or termination of the  
4           rate offering.

5           So, because of these reasons, DOE  
6           supports this limited scope rate offering, as it  
7           will also lead to valuable learnings about public  
8           charging customer preferences for alternative  
9           rates, charging behavior, and the impact on the  
10          grid, when compared and contrasted with the  
11          Commercial EV TOU rate. This issue had come up  
12          with the other docket, which will almost serve as  
13          a natural experiment, and we will all learn,  
14          hopefully, a lot of interesting insights from,  
15          again, customer behavior, and the impacts on the  
16          grid as a result of this implementation.

17          While this rate may not be entirely  
18          cost-reflective, the benefit of potential  
19          learning, in my opinion, outweigh the concerns  
20          with the cost-reflectivity, given the limited  
21          scope of this DCA rate.

22    Q       And, in particular, do the Settlement terms  
23            address concerns expressed in your prefiled  
24            testimony in this docket?

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 A (Sergici) Yes, they do. And, again, as I  
2 mentioned in my response to the previous  
3 question, relatively limited scale and short-term  
4 availability of the DCA rate design help mitigate  
5 concerns about potential cost-shifting. And  
6 also, as detailed in the Settlement Agreement,  
7 there will be future tracking, monitoring,  
8 reporting, study, analysis, recommendation, and  
9 education processes involved, and they will all  
10 serve to demonstrate the extent to which the DCA  
11 rate is properly cost-based and it does not  
12 involve unreasonable cross-subsidies among  
13 customers and other ratepayers.

14 Q And, again, as I asked Ms. Nixon, I'll ask you,  
15 in your opinion, are the proposed Settlement  
16 terms just and reasonable and in the public  
17 interest?

18 A (Sergici) Yes. It is.

19 MR. WIESNER: I have no further  
20 questions at this time. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.  
22 We'll move to Commissioner questions, beginning  
23 with Commissioner Simpson.

24 MR. KRAKOFF: Excuse me. Sorry to

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 interrupt. But Conservation Law Foundation  
2 hasn't had an opportunity to --

3 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Oh. My apologies,  
4 Mr. Krakoff.

5 MR. KRAKOFF: Thank you. I'll ask  
6 questions of Mr. Villarreal.

7 I'm not sure if you can see me, Chris,  
8 but can you hear me all right?

9 WITNESS VILLARREAL: Yes, I can hear  
10 you.

11 MR. KRAKOFF: Okay.

12 BY MR. KRAKOFF:

13 Q Could you please state your full name and for  
14 whom you work?

15 A (Villarreal) My name is Chris Villarreal. And I  
16 work for Plugged In Strategies.

17 Q And I'll start with what has been premarked as  
18 "Exhibit 5". Is this your prefiled testimony?

19 A (Villarreal) Yes, it is.

20 Q And do you have any changes or corrections you  
21 would like to make to your testimony at this  
22 time?

23 A (Villarreal) I do not.

24 Q And is your testimony true and accurate to the

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 best of your knowledge?

2 A (Villarreal) Yes.

3 Q And do you adopt the testimony, which has been  
4 identified as "Exhibit 5", as your sworn  
5 testimony here today?

6 A (Villarreal) I do.

7 Q Have you had an opportunity to review the  
8 Settlement Agreement?

9 A (Villarreal) Yes, I have.

10 Q And do you support the Settlement Agreement,  
11 which includes a Demand Charge Alternative for  
12 public Direct Current Fast Charger customers?

13 A (Villarreal) Yes. I support the Settlement as  
14 well.

15 Q Now, before asking about your reasons for  
16 supporting the Agreement, I have a few really  
17 basic questions about demand charges.

18 First, how do demand charges influence  
19 the business case for third party publicly  
20 accessible EVSE stations?

21 A (Villarreal) So, demand charges, especially at  
22 low utilization rates, as described earlier by  
23 several of the witnesses, has a significant  
24 negative impact on the business case for DC Fast

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Charger at the location.

2 So, for example, if a location has one  
3 charging session during the month, or just a  
4 handful, there's not enough usage over that time  
5 period to recover the cost of the demand charge.  
6 So, as a result, the bills that those locations  
7 receive are substantially higher, are very high,  
8 compared to what they otherwise would have been.  
9 And, since they do not have enough charging  
10 sessions to recover those demand charge costs,  
11 that location then is on the hook for a very high  
12 bill, which degrades the cost-effectiveness of  
13 the DC Fast Charger at that location.

14 Q Now, what's the issue that demand charges are  
15 designed to address?

16 A (Villarreal) Demand charges are designed to  
17 address, predominantly for commercial/industrial  
18 customers, the total amount of demand that is  
19 going to be consumed at a given time over a given  
20 month, and then spread out across the year.

21 It's designed to provide a recovery  
22 option through rates for the infrastructure costs  
23 that the utility has to spend in order to meet  
24 that peak demand.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Q And is it possible to design rates, you know, in  
2 such a way, you know, to address some of those  
3 concerns, without imposing demand charges, such  
4 as through pure volumetric or energy charges?

5 A (Villarreal) Yes, there certainly are. As the  
6 Settlement notes here, all of the costs are  
7 recovered through the volumetric rate. So, what  
8 that means is that, even though there's not a  
9 demand charge, the consumers on this rate are  
10 still, in fact, contributing to their demand  
11 costs through the volumetric rate.

12 Q Okay. In your testimony, you recommended a  
13 different approach for demand charge  
14 alternatives. Why do you support the Settlement  
15 Agreement Demand Charge Alternative, even though  
16 it's different from what you advocated for in  
17 your testimony?

18 A (Villarreal) One of the concerns I had in my  
19 testimony was the initial proposal by Eversource  
20 was tied very closely to its make-ready program.  
21 And the Settlement, on the other hand, divorces  
22 the two from one another.

23 So, for example, the concern I had was,  
24 as initially proposed by Eversource, the Demand

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Charge Alternative was only going to be available  
2 for some unknown period of time and available to  
3 some unknown number of customers, and was going  
4 to expire at some unknown time in the future.  
5 So, that large amount of unknowns would not be  
6 very supportive of a consumer who is looking to  
7 make an investment and install a DC Fast Charger,  
8 because they really didn't have an idea of  
9 whether they'd be eligible, for how long would  
10 they be eligible, and at what point would this  
11 rate be available to them.

12 The Settlement Agreement, on the other  
13 hand, very specifically says that this rate is  
14 available to any customer in the Eversource  
15 territory, it's open for a time period of three  
16 years, and there's a solution for what's going to  
17 happen after the three-year period. So, this  
18 provides a significant amount of certainty to the  
19 DC fast charging marketplace, and to the  
20 consumers, now that they know that this rate is  
21 available for some period of time, and then they  
22 have an idea of what's going to happen in the  
23 future.

24 Q And, just to clarify, when you said this was

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 "open to all Eversource customers", you meant  
2 just for public Direct Current Fast Charger  
3 customers, correct?

4 A (Villarreal) Oh, correct. Yes. The rate is  
5 available for public DC fast charging customers.

6 Q And, now, the fact that this, you know, is  
7 available to all of this particular customer  
8 class, you know, would you say that's  
9 pro-competition, in opening it up to all the  
10 members of that class?

11 A (Villarreal) Certainly. By allowing consumers  
12 who are interested in installing public DC Fast  
13 Chargers, that gives them, certainly, a certain  
14 amount of certainty around what their  
15 cost-effectiveness of the business case of the  
16 installation is going to be. And it now allows  
17 the DC fast charging companies themselves to go  
18 out and compete for those locations.

19 Q Now, do you think that Eversource's existing Rate  
20 GV creates barriers to investment for public  
21 Direct Current Fast Chargers?

22 A (Villarreal) Yes. I mean, it has a demand charge  
23 attached to it. And, as evidence has shown, and  
24 presented by witnesses today, the demand charge

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 is a significant barrier to the adoption of DC  
2 fast charging across the state in the Eversource  
3 territory.

4 Q And do you think that the Commercial EV TOU rate  
5 that was adopted in DE 20-170, which includes a  
6 50 percent demand charge, do you think that  
7 sufficiently reduces these barriers to investment  
8 for public District Current Fast Chargers that  
9 are created by demand charges?

10 A (Villarreal) No. In fact, studies have shown  
11 that even demand charges up to 50 percent are,  
12 you know, at 50 percent, still pose a significant  
13 barrier to the locations of site hosts who want  
14 to install a DC Fast Charger.

15 Those demand chargers, again, at low  
16 utilization rates, can be a significant component  
17 of that location's bill, and result in -- and can  
18 result in that location not wanting to invest in  
19 a DC Fast Charger, or even remove existing fast  
20 charging infrastructure.

21 Q Now, just looking at the rate approved in DE  
22 20-170 for a second, you know, under  
23 Eversource's, you know, general rate, commercial  
24 rate, you know, is their demand charge roughly

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 double than the rate for Unitil and Liberty?

2 A (Villarreal) I'm sorry, could you restate that?

3 Q Yes. Sure. Under general -- under Eversource's  
4 general commercial/industrial rate, Rate GV, is  
5 their demand charge roughly double the demand  
6 charge that Unitil and Liberty have for their  
7 commercial and industrial customers under their  
8 normal rates?

9 A (Villarreal) Sorry. Yes. Yes, that is true.  
10 That is accurate.

11 Q So, given the higher demand charge for  
12 Eversource's commercial customers under its  
13 normal commercial rate, might the Demand Charge  
14 Alternative approved in DE 20-170 have less of an  
15 effect at reducing barriers to public Direct  
16 Current Fast Charging customers, you know, for  
17 Eversource's customers, than it does for Unitil  
18 and Liberty's customers?

19 A (Villarreal) Yes. I believe that would be  
20 accurate to say.

21 Q Okay. And, in your opinion, do you think that  
22 the Settlement Agreement Demand Charge  
23 Alternative, which is a purely volumetric rate,  
24 do you think that resolves some of the issues

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 with barriers to investments in public Direct  
2 Current Fast Charger stations that, you know,  
3 demand charges create?

4 A (Villarreal) Yes. Very much so. And, as I  
5 stated, the removal of the demand charge removes  
6 a significant barrier to the business case for  
7 locations who are interested in investing in  
8 public DC fast charging infrastructure.

9 Q Now, in your testimony, you expressed concerns  
10 with both the durability and predictability for  
11 Direct Current Fast Charger developers with  
12 Eversource's, you know, that proposed rate which  
13 they filed. Does the three-year time limit in  
14 the Settlement Agreement, which limits it only to  
15 three years, does that address some of your  
16 concerns?

17 A (Villarreal) Yes. As I said earlier, as compared  
18 to what was previously filed by Eversource, this  
19 now provides consumers in the marketplace a  
20 clear -- a clear expectation for long the rate is  
21 available for, and provides a pathway for  
22 understanding of what's going to come after the  
23 expiration of this rate. It provides clarity  
24 that Eversource is to file a cost of service

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 filing after three years, and then the  
2 Commission -- then is before the Commission,  
3 which will then adjudicate whether or not to  
4 continue the rate, modify the rate, or close the  
5 rate entirely.

6 And having that level of certainty and  
7 understanding of the process does a lot to  
8 address the concerns I had around Eversource's  
9 original filing, around the durability and  
10 availability of the rate.

11 Q Now, we already heard a little bit about the  
12 funding that New Hampshire is going to receive  
13 pursuant to the, you know, Bipartisan  
14 Infrastructure Investment Act, and, you know, New  
15 Hampshire is specifically going to receive \$17  
16 million pursuant to that Act and the funding from  
17 that Act. Do you think that the Settlement  
18 Agreement terms will support the -- support the  
19 development of a public Direct Current Fast  
20 Charging network pursuant to the Act, as well as  
21 New Hampshire's implementation of policies  
22 related to the receipt of those funds?

23 A (Villarreal) I do believe that approval of this  
24 Settlement will support the development of DC

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 fast charging -- public DC fast charging in the  
2 Eversource territory in a way that would make  
3 that investment more available and more likely to  
4 be adopted and used across New Hampshire.

5 Removing the demand charge barrier  
6 certainly makes the business case a lot more  
7 attractive, and, furthermore, making -- having  
8 this funding available as well increases the  
9 likelihood that -- or, at least removes existing  
10 barriers that would otherwise delay or forestall  
11 adoption of DC fast -- public DC fast charging  
12 across New Hampshire.

13 Q Okay. I wanted to ask you a few questions about  
14 the risk of cross-subsidization or cost-shifting  
15 between rate classes. It's already been  
16 addressed to some extent by DOE's witnesses and  
17 Eversource's witnesses.

18 You know, in your testimony, you talked  
19 about how the risk -- the risk of cost-shifting  
20 between rate classes is generally going to be low  
21 at low EV adoption rate levels for, you know, as  
22 we'll likely see in the next two years. Could  
23 you just explain that a little bit more?

24 A (Villarreal) Sure. Because there's so few public

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 DC fast charging available, and because this rate  
2 is optional, I believe it's reasonable to expect  
3 that there will be -- there will still be a low  
4 number of locations that will sign up for the  
5 rate. And, as they get more experience with DC  
6 fast charging, as they better understand what the  
7 market dynamics of DC fast charging looks like,  
8 and adoption rates, as well as the benefits to  
9 facilitate tourism across the state, having  
10 the -- because of such low adoption levels, I  
11 don't believe it's likely that there will be a  
12 tremendous amount of cross-subsidization that  
13 will take place under this rate.

14 Furthermore, because this is a  
15 volumetric rate, we should be aware that that  
16 volumetric rate is also going to be a mechanism  
17 by which Eversource will recover some portion of  
18 whatever costs that would otherwise be recovered  
19 in demand charges would be instead recovered in  
20 volumetric rates. So, the locations that are on  
21 this rate are, in fact, still paying towards  
22 their infrastructure costs, it's just being done  
23 through a pure volumetric rate instead.

24 Q And the fact that utilization rates for EVs, you

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 know, are expected to be low for the next three  
2 years, you know, the time period for this  
3 proposed Settlement Agreement rate, you know,  
4 does that fact, does that decrease the likelihood  
5 of substantial costs being incurred by these  
6 stations?

7 A (Villarreal) My apologies. Can you -- can you  
8 restate the question again? Sorry, I had a dog  
9 that barked really loudly in my room.

10 Q Sorry. You know, the fact that utilization rates  
11 for EVs are expected to be low for the next few  
12 years, you know, during the period of this  
13 proposed Settlement Agreement rate, you know,  
14 does that fact sort of mean -- does that mean  
15 that the likelihood of substantial costs being  
16 incurred by these charging stations will be low?

17 A (Villarreal) Yes. Remember, because this is a  
18 limited three-year period, even if they're --  
19 that's also going to factor into minimizing any  
20 risk of cross-subsidization from this rate,  
21 because, as we have the three-year time period,  
22 and the low adoption rates, people on this --  
23 locations on this rate, those costs can be  
24 recovered solely through that rate design. And,

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           since it is limited to public DC fast charging  
2           locations, it's well within a smaller group of  
3           consumers, and it will be easily manageable, and  
4           understandable after the three-year period.

5                        So, I don't see the risk of  
6           cross-subsidization being very high under the  
7           construct of the rate proposed in the Settlement.

8   Q       And under specifically the terms of the  
9           Settlement Agreement, Eversource will perform a  
10          cost of service study after three years. Do you  
11          think that this will help inform the Commission  
12          in the future about any potential cost-shifting  
13          that might be occurring under any new rate  
14          relative to Rate GV that is targeted towards  
15          public charging stations?

16   A       (Villarreal) Certainly. The cost of service  
17          study that is going to be filed here will provide  
18          a significant amount of information and will  
19          illuminate what type of charging behavior is  
20          occurring, when the charging is occurring as  
21          well, and will do a better job -- will provide  
22          more information about the level of adoption, and  
23          how much -- how well the volumetric rate is or is  
24          not doing towards recovering all of the costs for

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 the program.

2 And, so, having this three-year  
3 initiative will -- and then having it be then  
4 presented in the cost of service study, will  
5 provide a lot of information for the Commission  
6 and for the public and for the utility, to  
7 understand how charging behavior will impact or  
8 does impact cost recovery.

9 Q Now, just turning back to the rate that was  
10 approved in DE 20-170 for a second, you know, and  
11 that particular rate that was approved included a  
12 time-of-use rate. Are there specific policy  
13 justifications for not including time-of-use  
14 rates for rates that are specifically targeted at  
15 public Direct Current Fast Chargers, like the  
16 rate included in the Settlement Agreement?

17 A (Villarreal) Yes. One of the primary concerns  
18 about putting DC Fast Chargers on a TOU rate is  
19 simply that the location has no understanding of  
20 when it will be used. DC fast charging serves a  
21 very specific purpose, which is to get people  
22 from -- largely to get people from one place to  
23 another. And it has the added benefits, as noted  
24 by prior witnesses, of being an option for

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 consumers that do not have charging  
2 infrastructure at their premise. And, as a  
3 result -- sorry, I've lost my train of thought  
4 here, because I'm watching something else going  
5 on with the dog in my house.

6 I'm sorry, Nick, could you restate the  
7 question?

8 Q I think you've -- I mean, the question was, you  
9 know, were there specific reasons to not include  
10 a time-of-use rate here, unlike the rate adopted  
11 in --

12 A (Villarreal) Oh, yes.

13 Q -- 20-170?

14 A (Villarreal) Yes. Yes. The location is simply  
15 not able to plan ahead for when it is going to be  
16 used. And, so, as a result, usage could happen  
17 at any point in time, because of the purpose of  
18 demand charges is different than a location that  
19 has a Level 2 charging, for example, which will  
20 take a lot longer and is designed for a home or  
21 at work use cases.

22 Q So, you'd agree with Eversource's and Department  
23 of Energy's witnesses, you know, there's a policy  
24 justification for a separate rate that's targeted

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 just to public Direct Current Fast Charger  
2 customers?

3 A (Villarreal) Yes, I agree.

4 Q And, then, what are the economic opportunities to  
5 New Hampshire that EVs present?

6 A (Villarreal) So, as described by other witnesses,  
7 the economic opportunities are -- there's a lot  
8 of economic opportunities. The tourism industry,  
9 in particular, is one of the primary examples.  
10 As vehicle adoption continues to grow in  
11 neighboring states, the ability of those  
12 consumers to get from one place to a place in New  
13 Hampshire is tremendous. So that, if there is,  
14 in fact, or if there are charging infrastructure  
15 locations across New Hampshire, that enables  
16 greater utilization of those locations, and  
17 promotes tourism, because now there are places  
18 for those vehicles to be charged.

19 If there are a significant lack to  
20 charging infrastructure across the state, then  
21 people may be less likely to want to visit,  
22 because they do not have the charging  
23 infrastructure that the customer otherwise  
24 desires.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           And, so, having and promoting more  
2           development and deployment of charging  
3           infrastructure, particularly DC fast charging  
4           infrastructure, can be a tremendous boon to the  
5           state, as it would enable greater visitors and  
6           transportation and tourism across the state.

7   Q       So, are you saying that a lack of EV  
8           infrastructure could discourage tourists with EVs  
9           from visiting the state?

10  A       (Villarreal) Yes.

11  Q       And can EV use help lower electricity rates for  
12           all consumers?

13  A       (Villarreal) Yes.  Again, as there are more sales  
14           through -- due to electrification, particularly  
15           of transportation, that means that the rate --  
16           that more people are paying for the costs.  And,  
17           so, that then spreads out the sales across more  
18           kilowatt-hours, more kilowatts over time, which  
19           minimizes any sort of rate impact that would  
20           otherwise be felt by customer classes.

21  Q       And, finally, in your opinion, is the Settlement  
22           Agreement just, reasonable, and in the public  
23           interest?

24  A       (Villarreal) Yes.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 MR. KRAKOFF: Thank you. I have no  
2 further questions.

3 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: All right. Thank  
4 you. Did I miss anyone else?

5 *[No verbal response.]*

6 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.  
7 We'll move to Commissioner questioners, beginning  
8 with Commissioner Simpson.

9 CMSR. SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr.  
10 Chairman. I'll start with the Company. Thank  
11 you all for being here today. I know we had a  
12 little bit of a delayed start. It appears some  
13 of you had some trouble on your commute.

14 WITNESS DAVIS: Thank you for the  
15 consideration. I had a little car trouble, but  
16 it was resolved. I appreciate the flexibility.

17 CMSR. SIMPSON: Of course. Appreciate  
18 you being here in person.

19 I'm curious, did any of the witnesses  
20 drive electric here today?

21 WITNESS BOUGHAN: I had the option, but  
22 I chose to drive my son's car instead.

23 CMSR. SIMPSON: Well, upon reviewing  
24 the evidence, and the exhibits in the record,

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           this is an interesting proposal.

2                       I did drive electric here today. And,  
3           on my commute to the Walker Building, I'm  
4           fortunate enough to have DC fast charging  
5           available to me, which I used this morning. And  
6           I recognize that there are many people who are  
7           not as fortunate and don't have that  
8           availability.

9                       So, I wanted to make that clear for the  
10          record today.

11 BY CMSR. SIMPSON:

12 Q          So, first, I'd like to dig into the Demand Charge  
13          Alternative, and the fact that this is a purely  
14          volumetric rate.

15                       We heard some testimony this morning  
16          with respect to demand charges as applied to your  
17          general Commercial rate classes. Can you  
18          articulate what those demand charges are, in  
19          terms of dollars per kilowatt?

20 A          (Davis) Certainly. In aggregate, we actually  
21          have three types of demand charges. But the  
22          largest two are the demand charge for  
23          distribution service and a demand charge for  
24          transmission service. We also have a portion of

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           our SCRC rate, which is recovered through a  
2           demand charge. But it's a very small portion.

3                         In total, it's on the order of \$18 per  
4           kilowatt-month is the rate.

5   Q    Total?

6   A    (Davis) In total, when you combine all three.  
7           And further, in the rate design we currently  
8           have, it's actually split between -- it's a  
9           tiered rate. So, I'm giving you, in general, the  
10          overall average demand charge. But, even between  
11          the two tiers, in fact, the context here is our  
12          intermediate General Service rate, Rate GV,  
13          pardon me. And the first 100 kilowatts are under  
14          the first tier rate, and the next, everything  
15          from a hundred to a thousand kilowatts are at a  
16          second rate, but they're very close.

17                         And, in the bigger picture, we are on  
18          track, coming out of our last rate case, and  
19          going into the next rate case, to ultimately  
20          collapse and remove the tiers.

21                         So, for practical purposes, consider  
22          those -- the rates are very close between the  
23          tiers, and they come to on the order of about  
24          \$18 per kilowatt.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Q So, when a customer introduces load, over what  
2 period does the Company measure that average  
3 demand?

4 A (Davis) So, we're actually measuring both peak  
5 and off-peak demand. And there's a mechanism in  
6 the rate design, where we look at the full demand  
7 for the peak period, and also the demand during  
8 the off-peak period, and whichever is greater  
9 becomes the basis for the demand. And it's a  
10 very long peak period. It's a 13-hour peak  
11 period.

12 So, that's the way the current General  
13 Service rate, Rate GV, applies. Most of the  
14 customers tend to peak during that 13-hour peak  
15 period.

16 Q Okay. So, let's assume a situation where there's  
17 a customer that, over the month, has no load,  
18 other than one event. And they exhibit, let's  
19 say, one kilowatt of load onto the system. Over  
20 what period of time would they need to have a  
21 steady state of one kilowatt of load, in order to  
22 be billed roughly \$18 for that demand charge?

23 A (Davis) Thirty (30) minutes.

24 Q Okay. So, under the proposal that is in front of

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 us today, we are contemplating charging station  
2 locations with a peak output of 300 kilowatts,  
3 correct?

4 A (Davis) Peak output?

5 Q Or, a peak load of 300 kilowatts, I should say,  
6 from a customer basis?

7 A (Davis) Yes. I mean, when we first introduced  
8 this, we modeled, for illustration purposes, a  
9 peak load of 120 kilowatts. But, eventually,  
10 that would have looked like 200 kilowatts.

11 Q Uh-huh.

12 A (Davis) I mean, this is just conventional  
13 modeling to illustrate an expected load of, let's  
14 say, a two-port station, --

15 Q Uh-huh.

16 A (Davis) -- where you had two 60-kilowatt electric  
17 vehicles charging at the same -- at that peak  
18 during the 30-minute period.

19 Q Uh-huh.

20 A (Davis) Or, as charging load from the electric  
21 vehicles increases, I think we were looking at  
22 that growing to 100 kilowatts per EV, which is  
23 about 200.

24 Q Uh-huh.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 A (Davis) So, the idea is, the applicable rate  
2 class for a 200 kilowatt or 120 kilowatt is Rate  
3 GV, that's our General Service rate, it covers a  
4 whole spectrum of General Service customers, and  
5 that's the currently available rate.

6 And, on that basis, the alternative is  
7 examined. And then, the other issues, as we  
8 talked about earlier, and certainly is well  
9 covered in our testimony and the design, are  
10 addressed. So, we looked at the demand charge  
11 itself, and the impact for public charging  
12 stations. And that scenario that I provided is a  
13 fairly realistic scenario, where you could have  
14 one or two vehicles charging at the same time,  
15 striking that peak demand for at least 30  
16 minutes, and, therefore, that became the basis  
17 for then further understanding "Well, what's that  
18 duration?" So, we targeted a design of growing  
19 from low levels of utilization, and when I say  
20 "utilization", I mean "load factor", --

21 Q Uh-huh.

22 A (Davis) -- but for the month. So, you know, 1 to  
23 3 percent perhaps, all the way up to 10 percent.  
24 And the idea was, over a course of four or five

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 years, we would expect many stations, necessarily  
2 the ones that we contemplate in this design, that  
3 could grow up to 10 percent utilization. Not  
4 necessarily every month, but, you know, given the  
5 data we had, and just our own reasoning through  
6 the scenarios, we designed a target of growing up  
7 to 10 percent utilization.

8 And, therefore -- and then, recognizing  
9 the class rate design is at more like a 50-55  
10 percent load factor, we needed to have some  
11 parity there. What would that customer be  
12 charged if they were under the demand charge  
13 rate? And what's an equivalent volumetric rate  
14 that would get you to the same point? And,  
15 again, we designed it at the 10 percent  
16 utilization point. So, we had to make an  
17 adjustment to the volumetric rates to increase  
18 the rate, the volumetric equivalent rate, so that  
19 we're at parity with that 10 percent design  
20 point.

21 Q Could you distinguish "utilization" and "load  
22 factor" for us please?

23 A (Davis) I utilize -- I use the term "utilization"  
24 synonymous with "load factor". And what I mean

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 by that is the peak demand seen at the meter, for  
2 service provided to the station, and the amount  
3 of kilowatt-hours in a month that the charging  
4 occurs. So, if that 60-kilowatt or 100-kilowatt  
5 electric vehicle charged for 100 hours of the  
6 month, that would be -- well, I should say "10  
7 percent", I should use that, because 100 hours  
8 would be out of, let's say, 730 hours overall.  
9 So, it would be like one-seventh, roughly,  
10 utilization, so instead about 17-18 percent.

11 But, if we assume 10 percent, that  
12 means that 10 percent of the hours, that an EV  
13 would charge 10 percent of the hours throughout  
14 the month at the full level.

15 Q Uh-huh.

16 A (Davis) That's kind of "load factor" definition.  
17 There's a lot of -- it's important to  
18 differentiate. I think your question is really,  
19 really important, to make sure we're clear.

20 When I refer to "utilization", I mean  
21 "load factor". But other considerations are  
22 "what's the total capacity of the station?" So,  
23 utilization might be considered. Maybe a DC Fast  
24 Charger is designed to serve a load of -- I don't

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 know the nominal numbers, let's say it's 500  
2 kilowatts, and the utilization of that is  
3 different than taking the maximum demand.

4 So, if I take those same kilowatt-hours  
5 of charging, and I divide -- and I reference that  
6 against a 500 kilowatt capacity, there are some  
7 uses of the term "utilization" that reference  
8 "capacity" of the station.

9 But, for rate design purposes, and  
10 everything that we have, we are referencing in  
11 this design all of our bill comparisons. And,  
12 basically, "what is a host station seeing for  
13 peak demand?" I'd be using the peak demand at  
14 the meter as the basis for utilization. And,  
15 again, it's synonymous with "load factor".

16 Q Thank you. That's helpful.

17 A (Davis) Okay.

18 Q Often it seems as if the terms can be used  
19 synonymously. But I believe I recognize the  
20 nuance between the two now. So, thank you.

21 A (Davis) You're welcome.

22 Q And I was asking you about the duration of load  
23 that leads to the billing of a demand charge,  
24 because it seems to me that a major

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 consideration, from a customer standpoint, is --  
2 let's use the term "utilization", and the risk  
3 that is presented by significant demand charges.

4 And I think about, from my own  
5 experience, in a half an hour charging an  
6 electric car, probably delivered around 40  
7 kilowatt-hours from a DC Fast Charger in that  
8 amount of time. So, if we take your example of  
9 200-kilowatt charging station, over a half hour,  
10 leads to roughly 80-100 kilowatt-hours, but an  
11 exhibited demand of 200 kilowatts total, with  
12 that single event in a month, that would be, at  
13 \$18 per kilowatt, \$3,600 bill for the customer to  
14 amortize over 80 to 100 kilowatts.

15 Is that a reasonable analysis of the  
16 problem that you're trying to solve?

17 A (Davis) That's exactly it. And I also recognize  
18 that that's the problem for the station, you  
19 know, the host, the owner of the station.

20 But, if that is passed through exactly,  
21 to yourself, for example, using the port to  
22 charge your vehicle, that's certainly the  
23 charge -- the electric service charge that the  
24 host is experiencing, by virtue of your charging

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           200 kilowatts for that very short duration, it's  
2           a large bill.

3   Q       Okay.

4   A       (Davis) And that's the so-called "demand charge  
5           barrier".

6   Q       Okay. I think I understand, then. Thank you.  
7           So, my notes reference the page numbers, and not  
8           the Bates numbers of your testimony.

9   A       (Davis) Okay.

10   Q       Is that sufficient to proceed?

11   A       (Davis) I can go with either one.

12   Q       Okay. So, on Page 6 of your testimony, --

13   A       (Davis) Is this the prefiled or the --

14   Q       Yes. So, we're looking at -- just a moment. I'm  
15           looking at your April 15th, 2021 testimony.

16                       Actually, just a moment. This is what  
17           I get for reviewing testimony before all of the  
18           exhibits were numbered.

19   A       (Davis) So, I have an "Exhibit 2", which it says  
20           "Petition for Electric Vehicle Make-Ready/Demand  
21           Charge Alternative Proposals", and we filed that  
22           on April 15th.

23   Q       Let's just look right at the Settlement, how  
24           about that? Let's look at Page 6 of the

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Settlement, Bates Page 006, of Exhibit 1.

2 A (Davis) And I have that.

3 Q So, the Demand Charge Alternative rate you  
4 mention will collect sufficient revenue to avoid  
5 unjust cost-shifting among customer classes. Can  
6 you elaborate on predicted cost-shifting? And  
7 I'm focusing on that word "unjust".

8 A (Davis) So, just to get the right context, we're  
9 looking at cost-shifting within the class or  
10 across classes? I'm just trying to understand  
11 what you're --

12 Q You state "among customer classes".

13 A (Davis) Okay.

14 Q So, my interpretation is you're referring to  
15 "across multiple classes". Perhaps you can  
16 confirm or refute that?

17 A (Davis) I confirm that.

18 Q Okay.

19 A (Davis) Yes, I just want to make sure. Yes.  
20 Okay. So, first of all, in the bigger picture,  
21 we do contemplate a fairly limited level of  
22 participation here. But, in terms of the rate  
23 design, and we just had a discussion about that a  
24 little bit, it's important to recognize, from my

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 perspective, I would say, that we did design the  
2 rate at that lower utilization level, such that  
3 from and during, in the range of up to 10 percent  
4 utilization, we actually first took the demand  
5 charge revenue, and we converted that to a  
6 volumetric rate.

7 And if we just focus on distribution,  
8 for example, the distribution component of that  
9 with any of the demand charges, if that -- that  
10 gives you an average rate, cents per  
11 kilowatt-hour. We actually multiply that times  
12 5.5. And the reason is, we wanted to kind of  
13 have some parity with the otherwise applicable  
14 demand charge that the class -- that, if you were  
15 charged a demand charge, you would have been  
16 charged a much higher amount. So, by design, by  
17 increasing the volumetric rate by that factor of  
18 5.5, we're trying to strike that balance where  
19 you're trying to achieve contribution toward the  
20 cost of providing service, as much as demand  
21 charge is basically trying to recover the cost of  
22 the poles and wires, you know, the infrastructure  
23 used.

24 And, so, that will -- that alone

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 mitigates any over discounted or large discount  
2 by incorporating a much larger portion, even in a  
3 volumetric rate, of the cost to provide service,  
4 that otherwise would have been recovered through  
5 the demand charge. And that's kind of a long  
6 thread there.

7 And that, especially given the fact  
8 that we've designed this revenue neutral to a  
9 rate class, and we're applying it to these public  
10 charging stations, they're going to have their  
11 own unique costs, as any customer does. And  
12 that, having a rate class and a rate design that  
13 is designed to have a volumetric rate that  
14 provides a significantly larger amount of revenue  
15 than just an average cents per kilowatt-hour, I  
16 think strikes that balance, and mitigates that --  
17 any discount that might be unjust or less than  
18 reasonable, in terms of recovering costs.

19 Certainly, any rate class, and the  
20 entire set of customers in the rate class, have  
21 all different demands in energies. It's rare  
22 that a customer has exactly the demand and usage  
23 characteristics at the class average. So,  
24 obviously, their contributions would be higher or

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           lower in any given month. So, here, in the same  
2           way. And, particularly, because we've designed  
3           it at a much lower utilization level, the  
4           expected actual utilization, you know, within 10  
5           percent, and, frankly, you know, it could be  
6           very -- it could be low at times. It could be  
7           3 percent, 4 percent. We've designed it so that  
8           we're mitigating and trying to strike that  
9           balance, and provide reasonable contributions  
10          through the volumetric rate.

11                        Again, it's much, much greater than  
12          just a simple average cents per kilowatt-hour, to  
13          allow the customer to make a sufficient  
14          contribution, and, therefore, not result in any  
15          cost-shifting.

16                        Now, again, it's a new rate. We don't  
17          have any customers on it. Their actual  
18          utilization will vary through time. And, again,  
19          as we look at that cost analysis, we'll see what  
20          the associated cost is providing the service, and  
21          how well the rate and the revenue provided  
22          sufficiency and adequacy to cover the cost to  
23          provide service. But I think the design does  
24          strike a balance, again, by increasing the

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 volumetric rate, allows the flexibility for  
2 actual utilization to vary, but also brings in a  
3 much more -- a much greater revenue contribution.

4 And, therefore, I believe, and we  
5 expect, would minimize any cost-shifting, whether  
6 it's intraclass or across classes.

7 Q And I just want to confirm my understanding of  
8 "revenue neutrality", that you've designed this  
9 rate within the class as revenue neutral, within  
10 this specific class?

11 A (Davis) That is correct.

12 Q Okay.

13 A (Davis) That's correct. And the comparable  
14 Commercial EV Time of Use has also been done on  
15 that same basis.

16 Q So, why don't we continue on that comparison.  
17 From your perspective, what analysis might a  
18 current customer host of DC fast charging perform  
19 to compare, really, the three rate options, the  
20 current Commercial rate that they're likely on  
21 today, your standard Commercial rate; your EV  
22 Time of Use rate for commercial customers; and  
23 this DCA proposed rate?

24 A (Davis) So, I guess, by virtue of what's in our

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Settlement Agreement, there is actually a working  
2 spreadsheet that we provided. But what we  
3 present in the exhibits is a snapshot, if you  
4 will. But I have -- I would consider it sort of  
5 a tool that could be used to do that very  
6 evaluation. I would refer in the Settlement  
7 Agreement, --

8 Q You have a chart on Bates Page 020.

9 A (Davis) We have a chart.

10 Q A bar graph.

11 A (Davis) Yes. And that reflects a comparison  
12 under some key assumptions.

13 Q Uh-huh.

14 A (Davis) The prior page, on Page 19, actually  
15 is -- it's a print that is really from the Excel  
16 spreadsheet that we submitted as part of this  
17 filing. But what you'll see here --

18 Q Maybe you might walk us through that?

19 A (Davis) Yes.

20 Q That would great.

21 A (Davis) I thought it would be helpful to start.

22 Q Yes.

23 A (Davis) So, I kind of give some Roman Numeral  
24 sections of this page to help get grounded here,

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 and let me walk through that.

2 So, just high level, I, that area  
3 allows us to say "what's the peak demand for the  
4 month?" So, if I'm a charging station, or a  
5 host, part of their analysis is to evaluate some  
6 charging patterns, and to maybe model out what  
7 they're trying to compare.

8 So, in this case, I'm saying, if there  
9 were a peak demand of 120 kilowatts, and a 7  
10 percent utilization, that that's important,  
11 because we want to understand how much, you know,  
12 that station is using in a given month. And  
13 then, we need to look at the time-of-use  
14 alternative, compared with the Demand Charge  
15 Alternative, compared with Rate GV.

16 So, you need the demand, you need the  
17 kilowatt-hours, you need the proportion of usage  
18 that's in three time periods here. So, we have  
19 "Peak", "Mid-peak", and "Off-peak" defined here.  
20 And that's consistent with the Commercial EV Time  
21 of Use structure. And, in this case, we're  
22 assuming "50 percent" [sic] peak usage, "30  
23 percent" of the month is mid-peak, and "20  
24 percent" [sic] is off-peak.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           So, at 7 percent, at 120 kilowatts,  
2           we're saying that the total charging load is  
3           6,132 kilowatt-hours for the month. And the  
4           numbers above it show you the proportion of that  
5           charging occurs during the three different  
6           periods, based on the assumptions that were made.

7           So, this is sort of a snapshot model.  
8           But I would say this was something that might be  
9           extended for lots of scenarios.

10           But these inputs are really critical,  
11           because you're kind of saying "Okay, I'm a  
12           charging host. And how do I understand, under  
13           this scenario, what my bill will be under the  
14           three rates?", for example.

15           Section II actually provides a summary  
16           of the various charge components and in total,  
17           based on those assumptions above in Section I.  
18           And it gives you a breakdown, a comparison of the  
19           bills under the three rates. So, if you look at  
20           Row or Line 24, you'll see this line called  
21           "Total Charge". So, under the full Rate GV,  
22           under this scenario, you would be charged  
23           "\$3,029.91"; the Demand Charge Alternative would  
24           be "\$2,407"; and the Commercial -- Eversource's

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Commercial EV Time of Use rate would be  
2 "\$2,451" [sic] in this case. And then, there's a  
3 Line 26, which gives you the difference  
4 between -- compares Rate GV, in the "Rate GV"  
5 column, the "3,029", with what the difference is  
6 to the other alternatives.

7 So, you're seeing, basically, the DC --  
8 Demand Charge Alternative and the Commercial EV  
9 Time of Use are roughly about the same, you know,  
10 in terms of how much lower they are compared to  
11 Rate GV.

12 But, you know, the key is running  
13 scenarios here. So, this kind of a tool, and  
14 having it readily available, would be very  
15 important, I think, for someone who is evaluating  
16 what their options are, and which one makes the  
17 most sense, depending on their expected  
18 utilization, not just in terms of peak demand and  
19 total charging, but time of use. And, obviously,  
20 we have all three types of structures here that  
21 provide some very interesting insights. And, if  
22 you play with the inputs in Section I, you know,  
23 you can see quite a bit of comparison.

24 And, if I refer us to Page 20, the next

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 page, you'll see a bar chart and a table. And I  
2 don't have it here, but this is a comparison,  
3 using those same peak period, peak, mid-peak, and  
4 off-peak percentages, but it's at 5 percent --  
5 or, I'm sorry, I gave a range of utilization,  
6 that's what I did, okay, so anywhere from 2 to  
7 9 percent. And, if you recall, the operating  
8 range of the Demand Charge Alternative is up to  
9 10 percent. We designed this to 10 percent. So,  
10 I provide anywhere from 2 to 9 percent  
11 utilization levels for the month. We show the  
12 monthly usage. And we have a comparison  
13 side-by-side on what the charge would be at those  
14 different utilization levels.

15 So, this is somewhat analogous to our  
16 typical bills that we do for any rate class,  
17 where you can say, well, a simple example, if I'm  
18 residential, "if I use 100 kilowatt-hours, what  
19 will my bill be?", versus up to 1,000 or even  
20 more. So, this is comparable, but it gives all  
21 the other moving parts to do that comparison. It  
22 gives you the ability to say "what's my peak  
23 demand?" It allows us to specify the utilization  
24 level, and then expected peak, mid-peak, and

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 off-peak usage, to do that kind of comparison.

2 And, so, what you can see, just to  
3 illustrate, and you can look at either the table  
4 or the chart, obviously, at the very, very low  
5 utilization levels, the lowest bill, I think  
6 that's down to 2 percent, is -- and you can see  
7 the number up above, you see a bill of "\$839".  
8 So, the orange bar is lower than the other two  
9 alternatives. As you move to increase  
10 utilization, you cross over, you kind of get to  
11 about 6, 7 percent, and you're sort of on par  
12 with the Commercial EV Time of Use. And then,  
13 you're charged a little more as you move toward  
14 that 10 percent.

15 And the glide path here, you know, the  
16 orange bar is going to move all the way up to the  
17 blue bar, because we've designed it revenue  
18 neutral at 10 percent utilization.

19 Q Uh-huh.

20 A (Davis) If you want to look at it from a  
21 different perspective, you can see the amount  
22 difference in the revenue between the rates, if  
23 you compare the blue bar, to the top of either  
24 the gray or the orange bar, you can see how much

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 of a, effectively, a discount off of the  
2 otherwise applicable General Service rate would  
3 occur at the different levels of utilization.

4 And underlying all this, of course, is  
5 the assumption of the amount of peak, mid-peak,  
6 and off-peak usage. This is for a given month.

7 So, I think this is a useful tool.  
8 And, frankly, I think would be something that we  
9 want to make available. Obviously, the rates  
10 themselves, the pricing will change as rates  
11 change. We recognize also we have seasonal rates  
12 here. So, we have winter/summer. There's a lot  
13 of other moving parts. But, in any given  
14 scenario, whatever the prices are, this kind of a  
15 tool can be used to do that kind of a comparison.  
16 And you can also use that to make projections.

17 You can almost -- I'd say you do a  
18 boundary analysis, you know, with the kind of  
19 ranges of utilization, whether it's demand or  
20 percent utilization over the month, or proportion  
21 of, you know, time-of-use charging. So, all of  
22 those can be modeled out. You can maybe bound  
23 it. If you're a host, and you're trying to see  
24 "what are my costs going to be for utility

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 service, electric service?"

2 So, I think this is -- encompasses all  
3 of those capabilities, and would be a great tool  
4 for someone assessing what rate they want to  
5 choose. And I would say they're all options.  
6 So, that's kind of the beauty of this as well.  
7 We're at the beginning here, we have new options.  
8 And, so, I think, in a nutshell, this is really  
9 the kind of tool and kind of information, first  
10 of all, the tool, as the hosts have to think  
11 about, the modeling inputs that they want to  
12 model, like what the expected charging is, and  
13 then this is part of their, I would say, their  
14 economic analysis to evaluate, among other  
15 things, their cost of charging month-to-month.

16 Q And does the Company intend to make this type of  
17 tool available to customers?

18 A (Davis) Yes. Yes.

19 Q And would that be through your website or is it  
20 calling your Customer Service line, and speaking  
21 to somebody who would do this analysis? I mean,  
22 I think, certainly, the first option is -- or  
23 both options are probably the best scenario for  
24 customers.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 A (Davis) I think this -- I think we had thought  
2 this would be a little more hands-on, because it  
3 would so a smaller number.

4 Q Uh-huh.

5 A (Davis) And, again, this is something, I think,  
6 first of all, this is immediately available now  
7 as a spreadsheet. And I think, as we engage with  
8 customers, I think I would prefer initially to  
9 have it something where we can even offer this,  
10 you know, to provide it.

11 But, I think, ultimately, sometimes the  
12 complexity of a website, you lose that  
13 interaction that's needed. But, I think,  
14 eventually, it could very well be some kind of --  
15 something of a more generic tool.

16 But I think it's always helpful to  
17 have, especially with an initial offering like  
18 this, to make available in a little bit of  
19 interaction with the customer.

20 Q Uh-huh.

21 A (Davis) So that we can both educate, but also  
22 learn what's needed, and design something a  
23 little more standardized, that then can be made  
24 more generically available.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Q I mean, I can certainly imagine that the  
2 assumptions that a customer makes, when comparing  
3 particularly with the Commercial Time of Use  
4 rate, the time periods through which most of  
5 their usage occurs. Those are critical  
6 assumptions. And the Company will presumably  
7 work with customers to inform those assumptions  
8 in their analysis?

9 A (Davis) Yes.

10 Q Okay.

11 A (Davis) Even the question of "what is  
12 "utilization" versus "load factor"?" You know,  
13 those kinds of things have had to be clearly  
14 defined and understood by whoever is, you know,  
15 trying to decide what inputs they want to model,  
16 and actually run through this kind of an  
17 analysis.

18 CMSR. SIMPSON: Thank you. So, I think  
19 we might take a brief break.

20 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Yes. Let's take a  
21 break till 11:05. And go off the record. Thank  
22 you.

23 CMSR. SIMPSON: Thank you.

24 *(Recess taken at 10:51 a.m., and the*

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1                   *hearing resumed at 11:07 a.m.)*

2                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Very good.

3                   We'll resume with Commissioner Simpson's  
4                   questions.

5                   CMSR. SIMPSON: Thank you. Just a  
6                   couple more questions for Mr. Davis.

7 BY CMSR. SIMPSON:

8 Q               So, with respect to the Demand Charge Alternative  
9               rate, it's proposed only for availability for  
10               three years. Could you explain how the Company  
11               came up with the three-year sunset?

12 A              (Davis) The three years really was part of what  
13               the Parties agreed to as a reasonable timeframe  
14               to, first of all, get -- I would say get the rate  
15               in place, but also, you know, get some experience  
16               with that. I think it was effectively just a  
17               balancing of all the different interests. Should  
18               we have it for a long time? Should we have it  
19               for a shorter time or limit it somehow?

20                         But, given that we're looking at public  
21               charging, and there is going to be some data  
22               collected and tracked and reported and examined,  
23               it seemed like a reasonable period, just like, I  
24               think, any rate offering, where you kind of get a

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 year of experience, and then it continues,  
2 especially here, because it could grow, I mean,  
3 it's hard to know even what direction it's going  
4 to go, maybe a year is not even sufficient to get  
5 started. But three years at least gave us a  
6 balance point, where we could start to see  
7 customers come on, get experience, you know,  
8 usage, charges, understand the cost, gather that  
9 information, and kind of be preparing to say  
10 "how's it working?", when we get toward that  
11 three-year point. And, at that three-year point,  
12 we'll have, we believe, sufficient data.  
13 Anything shorter might be -- may not generate  
14 enough information. And, again, just it was sort  
15 of reasoned out, I think, as part of our  
16 settlement.

17 Q So, let's say, hypothetically, the Commission  
18 were to approve the rate, and it would become  
19 available on January 1st, 2023. The three years,  
20 is it that the rate is available until  
21 January 1st, 2026? Or is it that, from the date  
22 of customer enrollment, that customer has that  
23 available rate to them for three years?

24 A (Davis) I see that as the rate itself is

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 available.

2 Q Okay.

3 A (Davis) It's a window of three years. The clock  
4 starts on January 1st, in your scenario, 2023, as  
5 opposed to each individual customer, when they  
6 first start taking service.

7 Q Uh-huh. Okay. So, if a customer were to enroll  
8 on the rate on January 1st, 2025, they only have  
9 it available to them for one year?

10 A (Davis) That's correct. And, then, obviously,  
11 it's open on what happens after that.

12 Q Uh-huh. Yes.

13 A (Davis) All the different conditions that we've  
14 talked about that are in the Settlement.

15 Q Okay. Thank you. And how do you intend to  
16 communicate that to customers, the window of  
17 availability, and the likelihood, the very high  
18 likelihood, that that rate will no longer be  
19 available after the three-year period?

20 A (Davis) I'm not sure I can predict, you know, the  
21 outcome at the three-year point.

22 Q I mean, how do you -- how are you going to  
23 communicate to customers who express interest in  
24 the rate that it's only available for three

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 years?

2 A (Davis) I think, just clearly stating what the  
3 availability is, and then that it represents --  
4 this rate is available for service starting on  
5 such and such a date. And, so, whatever that,  
6 say, application is by the customer, we would  
7 convey that this is the term, initial term of the  
8 rate, it's called an "initial term", that's how  
9 we refer to it, and that, obviously, we'd have to  
10 characterize it as "it's an option", first of  
11 all.

12 Q Uh-huh.

13 A (Davis) It's really important, we also recognize  
14 that. And that there will be an examination of  
15 the rate after that point, and these are the  
16 expected options that would be available at that  
17 three-year point.

18 Q Okay. Thank you. I think I'd like to move to  
19 Mr. Boughan for some questioning, with respect to  
20 the make-ready elements of the proposal.

21 Can you explain why the Settlement  
22 contemplates site locations that include two  
23 150-kilowatt chargers and one Level 2 charger?

24 A (Boughan) Sure. That's in alignment with the

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 requirements of the Volkswagen RFP.

2 Q Okay. And does the Company intend to install  
3 infrastructure that supports only those chargers,  
4 or are you future-proofing, as in upsizing  
5 padmount transformer, conductor, etcetera?

6 A (Boughan) No. So, as considered, the proposal  
7 only supports the DES awarded sites as they're  
8 configured. So, the minimum -- or, the suggested  
9 configuration RFP is two 150-kilowatt chargers  
10 and an accompanying Level 2 charger. But our  
11 understanding is that there could be sites that  
12 are more than that, or less than, if there's an  
13 acceptable -- accepted reason by DES to do a site  
14 that's not that configuration. But the plan was  
15 not to future-proof.

16 Q Okay. So, the proposal does contemplate sites  
17 that could be in excess of the 300 kilowatts of  
18 connected load?

19 A (Boughan) If they're awarded, if those  
20 configurations are awarded by DES as part of the  
21 New Hampshire Trust, then, yes.

22 Q So, my understanding from the Settlement is that  
23 there are five sites within the Company's service  
24 territory that have already been selected by DES.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Is that correct?

2 A (Boughan) No, that's not correct. So, that was  
3 our assumption, that there would be approximately  
4 five sites awarded in our service territory. But  
5 it was only an assumption, and not based on  
6 knowledge of sites that have been awarded. In  
7 fact, we're not aware of how many sites will be  
8 awarded by the New Hampshire Trust.

9 Q Okay. Your testimony notes that New Hampshire  
10 Trust awardees "will contract with third party  
11 electrical contractors". Is that correct?

12 A (Boughan) For the customer side work, yes.

13 Q So, the Company is proposing to pay for that  
14 work, correct, as "behind-the-meter"  
15 classification of infrastructure?

16 A (Boughan) So, the proposal intends to pay for  
17 primarily front-of-the-meter work that would not  
18 otherwise -- or, that would otherwise be borne by  
19 the customer. And, to the extent that our  
20 proposal pays for customer side infrastructure,  
21 it would be customer side infrastructure not paid  
22 for by the New Hampshire Trust.

23 Q Okay. So, why don't we start at the distribution  
24 system, and work our way to the charging station?

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 A (Boughan) Okay.

2 Q So, from the distribution system, the Company  
3 would tap off of a transformer, and then would  
4 run --

5 A *(Witness Boughan indicating in the affirmative).*

6 Q -- or may have to upgrade primary work in order  
7 to serve the customer load, correct?

8 A (Boughan) Yes.

9 Q And that primary system upgrade is classified as  
10 "front-of-the-meter infrastructure" that the  
11 Company would capitalize?

12 A (Boughan) Correct.

13 Q Okay. So, then, you would have secondary service  
14 that would go to the customer location?

15 A (Boughan) Yes.

16 Q And is that secondary work classified as  
17 "front-of-the-meter" or "behind-the-meter"?

18 A (Boughan) So, any infrastructure that -- the  
19 meter would be the line of demarcation, as far as  
20 what the utility owns, what the Company owns.

21 Q Okay. So, I'm expecting that these are -- I'm  
22 trying to walk through the --

23 A (Boughan) Sure.

24 Q -- the components very specifically.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 A (Boughan) Right.

2 Q So, I would expect that you would have -- many of  
3 these would be underground service?

4 A (Boughan) Could be, yes.

5 Q Okay. And you would have a Company meter in  
6 place?

7 A (Boughan) Yes.

8 Q And you would pay for the meter socket and  
9 anything that would be required to attach that,  
10 to site that meter?

11 A (Boughan) Correct.

12 Q And then, there would be a service transformer.  
13 Would that be behind the meter or in front of the  
14 meter?

15 A (Boughan) That would be in front of the meter.

16 Q Okay. And that would be in the capital element?

17 A (Boughan) Correct.

18 Q Okay. So, service transformer, meter?

19 A (Boughan) Yes.

20 Q And then, presumably, there is some other  
21 equipment in between the EVSE chargers themselves  
22 and the meter?

23 A (Boughan) Yes.

24 Q Can you explain to us what that equipment is?

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 A (Boughan) Sure. It could be an electrical panel,  
2 switchgear, conduit, wiring. Those are the  
3 primary components.

4 Q Okay. So, from that meter, there would be  
5 conduit and wiring that would run to that  
6 switchgear, where there's a service panel?

7 A *(Witness Boughan indicating in the affirmative)*.

8 Q And then, from that component, additional wiring,  
9 potentially conduit, to the locations where the  
10 chargers themselves are located?

11 A (Boughan) Yes.

12 Q And you would run the conduit all the way to the  
13 padmount locations where the chargers themselves  
14 would be located?

15 A (Boughan) The electrician would, yes.

16 Q Okay. So, explain to us where the Company work  
17 would end in that paradigm, and where the  
18 electrician, that the customer would contract  
19 with, where they would begin?

20 A (Boughan) So, the Company work would begin as it  
21 does today with any new customer connect.

22 Q That's at the meter?

23 A (Boughan) Correct. The funding could potentially  
24 fund part of the customer side infrastructure, in

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 the form of a rebate.

2 Q So, the customer contracts with the electrician?

3 A (Boughan) Correct.

4 Q And the customer is responsible to pay the  
5 electrician for the behind-the-meter work?

6 A (Boughan) Correct.

7 Q And the Company is proposing that the customers  
8 that receive funding under the VW Settlement for  
9 the chargers, the EVSE, --

10 A (Boughan) Yes.

11 Q -- that they then would be -- they would bring  
12 you the receipt, send you -- and proof of payment  
13 for the contracted work by the electrician behind  
14 the meter, and then the Company would cut that  
15 customer a check at 100 percent of their  
16 installation cost?

17 A (Boughan) No. So, not at 100 percent. So, at  
18 the dollar amount that's not covered by the New  
19 Hampshire Trust. So, there are eligible costs on  
20 the customer side of the meter, including the  
21 infrastructure, that are eligible costs under the  
22 VW Trust.

23 To the extent that the award doesn't  
24 cover 100 percent of that behind-the-meter costs,

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 a portion of our funding would go towards that.

2 Q Okay. And explain, from your perspective, the  
3 likelihood and what you foresee being covered by  
4 the Volkswagen Settlement and not being covered  
5 by the Volkswagen Settlement?

6 A (Boughan) So, without having knowledge of how  
7 many awardees there are, and what the costs of  
8 the customer side are of those awardees or the  
9 configuration, it's difficult to know. Which is  
10 why we -- when we made our proposal, we just made  
11 some broad assumptions that were illustrative of  
12 what the make-ready funding would look like.

13 So, I would hesitate to opine about the  
14 number of customers and the dollar amount that  
15 any one customer would be receiving on the  
16 customer side of the meter from the make-ready  
17 funds. It's difficult to say, without seeing the  
18 awardees.

19 Q So, then, the Company's request is for  
20 pre-approval of recovery of a cap amount?

21 A (Boughan) Correct.

22 Q That provides Eversource with certainty and  
23 provides the Department of Environmental Services  
24 with a figure, a known figure of make-ready

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 installation funding that would be provided by  
2 the utility, in order to inform their site  
3 selection of awardees under the VW Settlement  
4 Trust?

5 A (Boughan) I think that's correctly characterized,  
6 yes.

7 Q And can you differentiate, from the EVSE or the  
8 charger itself, elements of the charging station  
9 installations that could be covered by the VW  
10 Settlement Trust?

11 A (Boughan) The eligible costs in the VW Settlement  
12 Trust are clearly enumerated in the RFP as to  
13 what exactly the Trust -- what exactly the Trust  
14 is eligible to cover. So, that includes the EVSE  
15 itself, and all of the equipment from the meter  
16 to the EVSE is eligible. Whether or not any  
17 individual award covers all of that, I don't  
18 know.

19 In other words, whether any individual  
20 customer would receive funds from the VW Trust  
21 sufficient to fund from the charger, all the way  
22 to the meter, in that direction, I don't know.

23 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. I look to my  
24 other Commissioners, I'm not sure we have in the

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 record the terms of that Trust or the RFP. Do  
2 either of you recall seeing that?

3 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: I don't know.

4 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: I don't either.

5 CMSR. SIMPSON: I think I'd like to  
6 make a record request for the Company to provide  
7 the RFP?

8 WITNESS BOUGHAN: Absolutely. We can  
9 do that.

10 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay.

11 ***[Record request noted.]***

12 BY CMSR. SIMPSON:

13 Q And then, on Page 11 of your testimony, you also  
14 mentioned the "complementary Level 2 charger",  
15 that I take it that the installation of the Level  
16 2 you're proposing to bundle in with the DCFC?

17 A (Boughan) Yes. That's what the RFP requires.

18 Q Okay.

19 A (Boughan) It's not what we're suggesting or  
20 installing.

21 Q So, you would not install the Level 2 charger?

22 A (Boughan) The electrician and the customer would  
23 install the charger, and we would install the  
24 infrastructure to support the load.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Q So, is the Company proposing to refund to the  
2 site host customer the cost associated with  
3 installing the Level 2 charger, in addition to  
4 the DCFCs?

5 A (Boughan) To the extent that it's not covered by  
6 the Trust, it could be part of the customer side  
7 that we pay for.

8 Q Okay. Okay. And then, further on Page 11, you  
9 discuss the "average site cost", and you break  
10 that down by "front of the meter" and "behind the  
11 meter"?

12 A (Boughan) Yes.

13 Q With your total being an estimated "\$410,000" per  
14 site, with "130,000" front of the meter cost and  
15 "280,000" behind the meter costs, is that  
16 correct?

17 A (Boughan) That was our initial filing, based on a  
18 set of assumptions, and an average site cost,  
19 that estimate.

20 Q And has the Company had any experience with these  
21 types of installations, either in New Hampshire  
22 or in other jurisdictions?

23 A (Boughan) Yes.

24 Q And these estimated costs, are they reflective of

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 your experience --

2 A (Boughan) Yes.

3 Q -- for installations?

4 A (Boughan) Yes.

5 Q Because the "410,000" seems quite high to me, --

6 A (Boughan) Okay.

7 Q -- in my experience. I mean, --

8 A (Boughan) And it's reflective of our experience

9 and input from stakeholders, including

10 developers.

11 Q And what types of information do you have from

12 developers that have informed those estimates?

13 A (Boughan) Their experience with installations in

14 other jurisdictions.

15 Q Do you have any types of estimates you could

16 provide to us that, in detailed specificity,

17 break down the work that these electricians would

18 perform behind the meter?

19 A (Boughan) I think we provided that as part of an

20 information request in this docket.

21 Q Okay. Could you point us to that?

22 A (Boughan) I'd have to -- okay. I could take an

23 information -- or, I'm sorry, a record request.

24 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay, let's do a record

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 request then. For the Company to provide  
2 detailed cost breakdowns for the average site  
3 cost outlined in the Settlement of \$410,000, for  
4 both front of the meter and behind the meter.

5 ***[Record request noted.]***

6 BY CMSR. SIMPSON:

7 Q Then, a question, I think, for Ms. Paruta. It's  
8 requested that O&M costs be recovered through a  
9 reconciling mechanism. Do you have any  
10 suggestions or thoughts on what mechanism the  
11 Company is proposing? Is it a current mechanism  
12 that's in place or a new mechanism?

13 A (Paruta) It's a good question. I would  
14 recommend -- the Company recommends that it would  
15 be done through our RRA mechanism that is in  
16 existence today, similar to what we did with the  
17 rate case expenses in our Docket 19-057.

18 Q Okay. Thank you. And I think we heard some  
19 testimony this morning from the Clean Energy New  
20 Hampshire/Conservation Law Foundation witness  
21 that the revenues associated with EV charging  
22 over time could lead to rate suppression effects  
23 for customers. Can you comment on that, from  
24 your view?

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 A (Paruta) When you say "rate suppression", I'm  
2 sorry, can you ask the question differently?

3 Q Sure. It sounded as if, as new revenues are  
4 generated by what's a nonexisting load today, so,  
5 transportation moving to electrification. So,  
6 that's energy that you don't currently provide to  
7 customers today for that end use. As those  
8 kilowatt-hours increase, that, presumably, the  
9 Company would have a lower increase in capital  
10 costs and expense costs associated with those new  
11 kilowatt-hours. So, you would have more volumes  
12 of energy to spread a lower increase in fixed  
13 costs over. Has the Company done any analysis on  
14 when you foresee that possibility and the  
15 likelihood of it?

16 A (Paruta) Yes. Thank you for the clarification.  
17 I thought that's where you were headed.

18 We do have an analysis. So, the answer  
19 to your direct question is "yes". There is a  
20 point in time, assuming that there is a trending  
21 incline in the load factor, then an increase in  
22 terms of usage, that your revenue that is  
23 collected, in terms of revenue -- revenues billed  
24 by the Company, would, at some point in the

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 future, exceed the cost of service and the  
2 revenue requirements associated with the  
3 infrastructure.

4 If you look at our -- let me make sure  
5 I get you to the right page, Exhibit 2, Bates  
6 Page 028. This was a model that we established  
7 to somewhat present, based on certain assumptions  
8 that Mr. Davis has spoken to already, in terms of  
9 what we expect will happen with the load factor,  
10 i.e., utilization, and the rates, at this point  
11 in time, the Rate GV, assuming the Rate GV is  
12 what is in existence, if you look on Line 29, we  
13 have a "Cumulative Distribution Revenue". And,  
14 if you look at Line 30, that is the cumulative  
15 year-by-year. So, every year you move forward,  
16 it's a cumulative calculation of additional years  
17 out of the revenue requirement and the cost to  
18 achieve the build-out. And then, on Line 31, we  
19 show the difference of the two. And, so, if you  
20 just kind of go across, what you see is, in "Year  
21 23" of the model is the break year period.

22 Q Okay. Thank you. That's helpful. And then, on  
23 the final topic I'd like to ask these witnesses  
24 pertains to data-sharing. So, can you please

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 explain what requirements make-ready and/or DCA  
2 customers must agree to for data-sharing?

3 A (Boughan) From the make-ready program  
4 perspective, the Company included a provision for  
5 data collection, on the condition that it  
6 wouldn't be duplicative of any efforts that DES  
7 undertook as part of the VW Trust disbursement.

8 So, to the extent that data is required  
9 to be collected by DES from participating  
10 customers, the Company does not intend to collect  
11 data as part of this program in the same way.

12 Q So, the Company doesn't have a vision for  
13 leveraging actual usage information that might  
14 inform demand-side management programs or  
15 alternative metering?

16 A (Boughan) So, the data on usage that we collect  
17 from the meter will likely be sufficient to  
18 inform that. We just wouldn't have individual  
19 session charging data. But I think the meter  
20 data would be sufficient.

21 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. All right. I  
22 think that's all I have for the Eversource  
23 witnesses at this time.

24 I might ask if Ms. Ohler might be

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 willing to respond to some questions?

2 MS. OHLER: Yes. Certainly.

3 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. My understanding  
4 is we normally don't ask these witnesses to be  
5 sworn in. So, I'm going to proceed under that  
6 understanding, if that's okay with you?

7 MS. OHLER: Yes, that's fine.

8 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. I think I  
9 recognize the challenge in balancing the work  
10 that the Department of Environmental Services is  
11 trying to do in conducting this effort, with the  
12 Company's perspective in requiring some certainty  
13 in recovery of any investments that they make in  
14 conjunction with the awardees under the  
15 Settlement.

16 Is that a fair characterization of the  
17 issue?

18 MS. OHLER: Yes, I believe so.

19 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. And can you give  
20 us some perspective on where the Department of  
21 Environmental Services is with respect to the  
22 evaluation of potential awardees under the Trust?

23 MS. OHLER: Yes. As has been noted, I  
24 believe, somewhere in one of the documents, we

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 got about 30 different sites proposed, a total of  
2 I believe it was 45 different applications, some  
3 of them proposing the same general location.

4 We have gone through every application  
5 that we have received. We have evaluated it and  
6 scored it, gone back to some of the applicants  
7 for additional information as needed. And we are  
8 now in the process, because of the way the market  
9 has shifted dramatically, since we issued the RFP  
10 and since the proposals were initially developed  
11 and submitted, we've gone back to sort of our  
12 top-ranking applicants, and are giving them the  
13 opportunity to give us upgraded cost information.  
14 We don't feel that it's worth anybody's time to  
15 enter into a contract with the set costs they  
16 gave us and then have them tell us they can't  
17 afford to do it.

18 So, we are in that process right now.  
19 And, depending on where those costs come back,  
20 we'll know how far down our list of applications  
21 we can go. But we have -- we certainly have more  
22 applications that scored well enough to be funded  
23 than we have funding for.

24 And, so, that's where we are in the

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 process right now. We have updated cost  
2 information from our top applicants. We are now  
3 starting to develop contracts and contract  
4 language.

5 I will say, one of the things that we  
6 have seen many times in various grant programs,  
7 we do a lot with funding, diesel emission  
8 reduction projects, and often we see in those  
9 that we'll get all the way through the grant  
10 development process, and get right up to the  
11 point of signing the contract, and they say "You  
12 know, we can't afford to do this. We're not  
13 going to do it."

14 So, I do expect that some of the  
15 applications that we received were counting on  
16 this program going through, and that we may well  
17 see that as we get into sort of "final stage"  
18 contract negotiations.

19 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you. I  
20 mean, certainly, it appears that everybody in  
21 this proceeding has an interest in maximizing the  
22 number of installations, and based on the  
23 relatively modest pool of money within the VW  
24 Settlement Trust for EV charging sites.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           And, I mean, I can imagine that DES  
2           shares that sentiment?

3           MS. OHLER: Absolutely. You know, we  
4           have a total of 4.6 million that, under the terms  
5           of the Trust itself, that's the maximum we can  
6           spend on the EV infrastructure. And, initially,  
7           we went out with an RFP for -- that offered up to  
8           3 million, but gave ourselves the option to  
9           increase or decrease that as we saw fit. Based  
10          on the sheer volume and really great spread  
11          across the entire state, as to where the  
12          proposals came in, we have made the decision we  
13          are going to invest the entire 4.6 million in  
14          this one shot.

15          So, we are, you know, I think that the,  
16          you know, the difference, with the potential for  
17          the make-ready dollars, I mean, those  
18          expenditures, the language -- hold on, I've got  
19          it in front of me, the language that is in the  
20          RFP, basically, says that "any infrastructure  
21          that will continue to be owned by the utility is  
22          not an eligible cost."

23          And the reason for that is that we  
24          require that these recipients maintain and

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           operate those stations for a total of five years,  
2           from the date that they first start operation.  
3           And, if they don't, we have clawback provisions  
4           to get at least a portion of the funding back, so  
5           that we can turn around and fund some other  
6           location.

7                         We would not have any ability to do any  
8           clawback on infrastructure that was paid for by  
9           the applicant, but that is not owned by the  
10          applicant. And, so, we just didn't feel that  
11          that was a viable way for us to address the  
12          dollars, and it provided too high a risk.

13                         CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay.

14 BY CMSR. SIMPSON:

15 Q       So, then, I just want to confirm with the Company  
16       witnesses, that the front-of-the-meter work, the  
17       Company intends or has proposed to own, correct?

18 A       (Boughan) Yes.

19 Q       Okay. And that the behind-the-meter work, the  
20       customer contracts with the electrician for, they  
21       own that infrastructure, the Company reimburses  
22       the customer for the behind-the-meter work, and  
23       then sets up a regulatory asset on their books  
24       for the money that they reimbursed that customer?

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 A (Boughan) Correct.

2 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you.

3 So, I think the Commission would  
4 certainly feel more comfortable, if we're able to  
5 understand the precise locations that DES has  
6 selected, and then the Company provide us with  
7 definitive costs for each of those locations.  
8 And whether there's a -- I'm trying to determine  
9 whether there might be a phased approach, where  
10 there's a general amount of funding that could be  
11 agreed upon for recovery by the utility, but  
12 subject to approval by the Commission for the  
13 sites themselves?

14 Can you envision a process through  
15 which the DES might be able to select the  
16 sites -- or, I should ask it differently. What  
17 level of certainty from the Commission would  
18 enable the Department of Environmental Services  
19 to select sites that would be awardees under the  
20 Trust, that then would allow the Company to come  
21 back to the Commission with more defined costs  
22 for these sites?

23 MS. OHLER: That's a good question. I  
24 mean, I'm thinking about the recipients

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 themselves, whether they would be willing to  
2 enter into a contractual agreement with DES, if  
3 they don't know for certain what they're getting  
4 from funding on the other side. I would imagine  
5 it would be hard for them to sign a contract  
6 saying "Yes, we're going to do this project."

7 I guess we could write it into the  
8 contract, you know, that it would be subject,  
9 from their side, subject to receipt of X number  
10 of -- you know, or X services and equipment from  
11 the utility.

12 I see that as something that elongates  
13 the process, and significantly delays the  
14 installation of the infrastructure itself. So, I  
15 guess I'm saying "It's not impossible, it's  
16 complex."

17 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay.

18 MS. OHLER: But, I guess, theoretically  
19 possible. We just have to sit down and figure  
20 out and work with the AG's Office to figure out  
21 how we craft such language.

22 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. And I'm not  
23 saying that I recommend that as a course for  
24 moving forward from the Bench. I'm contemplating

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           ways in which we could more definitively  
2           understand the investment by the utility for the  
3           specific sites that would be awarded under the  
4           Settlement. And if there's a process that could  
5           help inform that more clearly?

6                       MS. OHLER: Yes. I would think that,  
7           prior to G&C approval, we could give -- we could  
8           probably provide some information, make public  
9           information the general location. But we cannot  
10          make public the actual site, and until we are --  
11          until we have presented the contract to Governor  
12          & Council for approval.

13                      CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. So, in the  
14          Settlement, and in the Company's proposal, they  
15          talk about "five locations". And it sounds as if  
16          that those are a theoretical --

17                      MS. OHLER: Uh-huh.

18                      CMSR. SIMPSON: -- set of five sites.  
19          Is that your understanding as well?

20                      MS. OHLER: Yes, that's my  
21          understanding. And, off the top of my head, I  
22          could tell you in a little bit, but I can't tell  
23          you this instant, how many, of the ones that are  
24          being contemplated, are in Eversource territory.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           But I will say that the sites that have  
2           been preliminarily selected are all over the  
3           state, and so are in all utility territories.  
4           We've gotten really fantastic distribution of  
5           proposals, --

6           CMSR. SIMPSON: Uh-huh.

7           MS. OHLER: -- and hope to be able to  
8           put charging infrastructure in every corner of  
9           the state.

10          CMSR. SIMPSON: So, DES, today, does  
11          have a preliminary list of sites?

12          MS. OHLER: Yes.

13          CMSR. SIMPSON: And recognizing the  
14          confidentiality for RFPs, is DES able to share  
15          that, and submit it into the docket, those  
16          locations?

17          MS. OHLER: I would have to discuss  
18          that with our attorneys. I don't know.

19          CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: And it would be a  
20          confidential filing. It wouldn't be a public  
21          record at this point, I think. That, when you're  
22          checking with the attorneys, maybe you can share  
23          that with them.

24          MS. OHLER: Okay. Okay, I'll ask the

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 question.

2 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you.

3 CMSR. SIMPSON: And then, I guess I  
4 would just ask, so, we're only talking with  
5 respect to Eversource today, but the contemplated  
6 portion of Settlement for sites within the  
7 Eversource territory appears to be 2.1 million,  
8 as proposed here, out of the 4.6.

9 Can you comment on the Department's --  
10 Department of Environmental Services' approach  
11 for the remainder of those funds and the  
12 distribution of those funds across the other  
13 utilities in the state, whether it's Unitil,  
14 Liberty, the New Hampshire Electric Cooperative,  
15 and/or any municipals?

16 MS. OHLER: I'm not entirely sure I'm  
17 understanding. Are you assuming that, if there's  
18 the 2.1 million investment from Eversource, that  
19 that would give us an additional 2.1 million to  
20 invest?

21 CMSR. SIMPSON: So, --

22 MS. OHLER: Because that's not  
23 necessarily the case.

24 CMSR. SIMPSON: Well, let me be more

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 clear. Let me be more clear. So, you have  
2 4.6 million out of the Volkswagen Settlement  
3 Trust.

4 MS. OHLER: Right.

5 CMSR. SIMPSON: Are you intending to  
6 provide that only to sites within the Eversource  
7 service territory?

8 MS. OHLER: No. That is across all  
9 service territories.

10 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. And do you have  
11 any sense of the proportion of the Settlement  
12 funds, as available to DES, that you would be  
13 allocating to sites within the Eversource service  
14 territory today?

15 MS. OHLER: I have that data available  
16 to me. I can pull that together during the  
17 course of today's hearing.

18 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. And, certainly,  
19 I'm asking the question because, if the  
20 Commission finds this program to be prudent, and  
21 approves it, that, presumably, the other  
22 utilities that we regulate would be coming to us  
23 for similar regulatory treatment?

24 MS. OHLER: Yes. Yes. And, again,

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 I'll check with the attorneys to see if it has to  
2 be submitted as a confidential information, or if  
3 it can just be public. I'm not sure.

4 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you so  
5 much.

6 MS. OHLER: Sure.

7 CMSR. SIMPSON: I don't have any  
8 further questions at this time, Mr. Chairman.  
9 Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.  
11 We'll move to Commissioner Chattopadhyay. And  
12 then, maybe in half an hour or so, we'll take a  
13 lunch break, just a level set.

14 So, Commissioner Chattopadhyay, please  
15 proceed.

16 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Yes. Still good  
17 morning.

18 BY CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY:

19 Q I want to first make sure I'm following some of  
20 the things that have been discussed. So, let's  
21 talk about the \$2.1 million kitty. And I heard  
22 the term from DOE that that's a "cap". Is the  
23 Company, of my reading of the testimony and all,  
24 I wasn't 100 percent sure I understood that was a

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 cap.

2 A (Witness Boughan indicating in the affirmative).

3 Q So, you are -- can you comment on it? Do you  
4 indeed believe or you have asserted that's a cap?

5 A (Boughan) That's correct.

6 Q Okay. And, right now, Eversource doesn't know  
7 where the sites are going to be, right?

8 A (Boughan) Correct.

9 Q And you don't even know how many sites are we  
10 talking about?

11 A (Boughan) Correct.

12 Q But "five" is just an estimate at your end?

13 A (Boughan) Yes.

14 Q It could be more, it could be less?

15 A (Boughan) Correct.

16 Q So, for the \$1.4 million, which is behind the  
17 meter infrastructure, is it possible that,  
18 ultimately, based on the Trust funding, that the  
19 sites end up getting quite a bit more money than  
20 what might have been assumed, and you don't  
21 really need to spend \$1.4 million?

22 A (Boughan) It's possible that the customer side  
23 costs would be fully covered by the Trust, and  
24 then none of the 2.1 million would need to be

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 spent on the customer side. That's correct.

2 Q Okay. For the customer side number here, and I'm  
3 looking at your -- I'll just give you the Bates  
4 page number, just a moment. I think it's  
5 Exhibit 2, Bates Page 015. When you look at  
6 "Figure 1", and you have the "Behind the Meter  
7 Infrastructure" at "1.4 million", and you have  
8 the "Cost Elements" -- sorry, the "Front of Meter  
9 Infrastructure" at "650,000"?

10 A (Boughan) Yes.

11 Q How did you -- how did you estimate those? Like,  
12 what goes into it? And, number two, when you go  
13 anywhere and get new customers, is the break-up  
14 that you're providing here is generally the case?  
15 Or, I'm just trying to understand where you get  
16 these numbers from?

17 A (Boughan) Right. So, for a DC fast charging  
18 customer, who's not part of a program, we would  
19 really only have exposure to the  
20 front-of-the-meter costs, because we have nothing  
21 to do with the behind-the-meter installation or  
22 payment of those costs.

23 So, that 650,000 is a good estimate of  
24 the equipment, including the transformer, the

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 primary lateral, all the conduit, up to -- and  
2 the meter, up to the meter, to serve a load of  
3 that estimated size of the configuration that we  
4 assumed.

5 As for the behind the meter  
6 infrastructure, that is based on our experience  
7 with similar type programs in our other  
8 jurisdictions, and conversations with developers  
9 of these types of sites, as a ballpark estimate.  
10 And we'll be providing the detail of that in the  
11 record request that's discussed earlier this  
12 morning.

13 Q How much do the EVSEs usually cost, if you know?

14 A (Boughan) Yes. That's a good question. And it's  
15 changing monthly these days, as supply chain  
16 issues filter through the economy.

17 And it also depends on the size of the  
18 charger. In other words, a 50-kilowatt charger  
19 versus a 150-kilowatt charger, or even a  
20 350-kilowatt charger, and the functionality of  
21 that charger. And that's just the hardware  
22 costs, that are also --

23 Q Assume the 150, because that's what you have  
24 filed for.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 A (Boughan) Yes. So, in our estimate of putting  
2 this together, one manufacturer's 150-kilowatt  
3 charger, EVSE, which is one of the most popular,  
4 a year ago was in the range of 70 to \$80,000.

5 Q Okay.

6 CMSR. SIMPSON: Commissioner  
7 Chattopadhyay, I note we have a witness available  
8 from ChargePoint, who might be able to speak to  
9 that question definitively.

10 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Thank you. That  
11 would be helpful, yes. So, okay.

12 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: That would be Mr.  
13 Deal, if you'd like to ask him.

14 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Yes. Well, are  
15 we going to wait for him or I can go ahead and  
16 ask?

17 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: No, he's on.

18 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Yes.

20 BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:

21 Q So, yes. Let's ask Mr. Deal, do you have any  
22 response here to my question?

23 A (Deal) Apologies, Commissioner. I wasn't certain  
24 if we were going to wait for a delay for me, or

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 if you wanted me to jump right in.

2 I would say, I could actually check  
3 with my team internally here to see if there  
4 isn't anything a little bit more up-to-date,  
5 ballpark, anywhere from about 60 to 80K for the  
6 150kW charger. I'm not revealing any  
7 confidential information for ChargePoint's  
8 pricing, because I cannot do that. But I do  
9 believe that range, given some of the estimates  
10 we've seen in public, as well as factoring some  
11 of the supply chain issues and supply  
12 constraints, it's probably pretty accurate.

13 But, like I said, I'm checking  
14 internally. And, if there's an updated number, I  
15 can come back later in this hearing and provide  
16 that update.

17 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Thank you.

18 BY CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY:

19 Q So, I think you have talked about this, but,  
20 again, I just want to make sure I get the numbers  
21 right.

22 So, for a particular site, you are  
23 thinking about having the ability to charge how  
24 many cars at the same time? It's four, for the

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 fast charging?

2 A (Boughan) It would be simultaneously two  
3 150-kilowatt chargers. How many kilowatts are  
4 charged simultaneously depends on the car. But  
5 the chargers would have the ability to  
6 dispense --

7 Q So, I'm an economist --

8 *[Court reporter interruption.]*

9 **CONTINUED BY THE WITNESS:**

10 A (Boughan) The capacity of the chargers would be  
11 two 150-kilowatt chargers, so, 300 kilowatts  
12 total. But the amounts dispensed at one time  
13 would depend on the capacity of the car to take a  
14 charge. So, some cars can only charge at, say,  
15 60 kilowatts, where others can charge up to 150.

16 BY CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY:

17 Q Yes. But I think what I'm asking is, when a car  
18 goes there and starts charging, there must be  
19 sort of a limitation of how many cars can access  
20 the charging port?

21 A (Boughan) Correct.

22 Q So, how many, is it about four? So, I'm just  
23 trying to get a sense?

24 A (Boughan) Yes. It's about the hose itself. So,

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 two.

2 Q So, two. And then, two times two, four, because  
3 you're talking two 150s?

4 A (Boughan) It would be -- no, two cars. Two, two  
5 150-kilowatt chargers, each dispensing 150  
6 kilowatts, would only serve two cars at the same  
7 time.

8 Q Okay. So, in a site, at any one point in time,  
9 only two cars can?

10 A (Boughan) In this configuration.

11 Q How about the Level 2 chargers, like, do they  
12 allow more cars to be accommodated?

13 A (Boughan) It's, you know, limited by the  
14 connector. So, a typical Level 2 charger,  
15 dispensing 7.2 kilowatts, would have a single  
16 hose for a single car.

17 Q So, I guess, wouldn't it be pretty easy to tell  
18 me how many cars at any point in time at most can  
19 such a site handle?

20 A (Boughan) Yes.

21 Q So, can you give me that number?

22 A (Boughan) So, if there are two 150-kilowatt  
23 chargers and one Level 2 charger, then three cars  
24 could be charging at the same time.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Q Okay. Thank you. Okay. I'm just going to go to  
2 Mr. Davis. I have -- I'm just trying to make  
3 sure I follow the rate design.

4 So, if you go to -- just a moment.  
5 Just bear with me.

6 Let's go to Bates Page 023 of  
7 Exhibit 2. And let's talk about Figure 3. Let  
8 me know when you're there.

9 A (Davis) Okay. I'm there.

10 Q Okay. So, this figure is all related to  
11 previously, when you were talking about, you  
12 know, these Excel files, they actually help you  
13 derive this figure, right?

14 A (Davis) That's correct.

15 Q So, it's -- I think it was Pages 28 -- I forget  
16 the Bates Page numbers, but you were describing  
17 it in response to Commissioner Simpson's  
18 questions.

19 A (Davis) Yes. And just to be clear, this is from  
20 our initial filing. And it's the same  
21 information, but updated pricing, in our earlier  
22 discussion, but, basically, the same concept.  
23 And this illustrates the same, it compares Rate  
24 GV just to the Demand Charge Alternative. And

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           this has a broader range of utilization.

2   Q       Okay.  So, just to make sure I'm following  
3           this, --

4   A       (Davis) Sure.

5   Q       -- you are -- this is sort of an attempt to,  
6           first of all, assume that the utilization rate is  
7           10 percent, and figure out what the Demand Charge  
8           Alternative rates are going to be, to ensure that  
9           you get the same, you know, bills as you would  
10          get for the GV customer?

11  A       (Davis) That's correct, at 10 percent.

12  Q       Right.  So, if, however, let's say you go ahead  
13          with this rate design, it's put in place.  But,  
14          ultimately, you have -- the utilization rate  
15          turns out to be 5 percent over the three years  
16          that we are talking about.  Do you have a sense  
17          of what kind of subsidies are we talking about?

18  A       (Davis) So, if the baseline to measure subsidy is  
19          the discount from Rate GV, that's easy, because  
20          it would be the difference between the two lines  
21          you see here, --

22  Q       Yes.

23  A       (Davis) -- kind of conceptually, but the numbers  
24          would be whatever is billed in comparison to Rate

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 GV, if you billed it instead. If we then  
2 determine there's a different cost of service, --  
3 Q Correct. I mean, it's possible that you end up  
4 spending a different amount in getting all of  
5 this put in place, yes.

6 A (Davis) Exactly. And that's kind of, with the  
7 initial rate, until you have sufficient  
8 customers, and you start to understand the cost  
9 to serve that group of customers, all we have to  
10 initially measure the -- if you want to refer to  
11 it as a "subsidy", is the amount of discount  
12 relative to Rate GV.

13 But, again, once we have additional  
14 cost of service for those customers who  
15 participated in the rate, then we can reevaluate  
16 that. And, effectively, as if it was its own  
17 class, and I'm not sure how homogenous or some of  
18 the other factors that come into play, but, at  
19 the end of the day, we'll be able to evaluate  
20 that and see where we fall out, at that  
21 5 percent.

22 Q But is there a quick way for you to give me a  
23 sense of what is the dollar amount that we are  
24 talking about, if we assume that the utilization

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 is -- turns out to be 5 percent, not is, but  
2 turns out to be 5 percent over the next three  
3 years, can you give me a sense how much subsidy  
4 are we talking about?

5 A (Davis) I could. For example, one way to  
6 quantify that might be to look at just the  
7 distribution component. So, while that chart,  
8 Figure 3, on Bates 023, gives you total bill, --

9 Q Uh-huh.

10 A (Davis) -- we could easily go into the  
11 distribution component and do that comparison.  
12 And I think that could give us, you know, a way  
13 to measure the difference.

14 Q Can you do it right now, you know, roughly?

15 A (Davis) Well, for example, if I knew the  
16 demand -- see, part of it's the demand level,  
17 right, but we'd have to pick an example. So, if  
18 it's a 120 kilowatt customer --

19 *[Court reporter interruption.]*

20 WITNESS DAVIS: I'm sorry. Thank you.  
21 I know I need to slow down a little.

22 MR. PATNAUDE: Thank you.

23 **CONTINUED BY THE WITNESS:**

24 A (Davis) So, if we took the distribution demand

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 charge currently, --

2 BY CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY:

3 Q And, if it may help --

4 A (Davis) -- \$6.94, for example, and I compared  
5 that to the kilowatt-hours that, at 5 percent,  
6 120 kilowatts at 5 percent, 6 -- whatever the  
7 number, 6,000, times our demand charge equivalent  
8 rate, which is 9.5 cents, I would simply just do  
9 a comparison of the dollars between those two  
10 calculations, and that would be a measure in a  
11 given month.

12 Q Okay.

13 A (Davis) Just thinking out loud on what kind of  
14 process and quick rule of thumb we could use to  
15 at least --

16 Q Yes. And then, I was going to say, I mean, don't  
17 worry about -- I mean, do it *ceteris paribus*,  
18 meaning "everything else remains unchanged."

19 A (Davis) Would you like us to provide a record  
20 request?

21 Q That would be good, if you can't do it on the  
22 stand right away, that I would appreciate it.

23 A (Davis) Okay. Oh, I can do the math real quick,  
24 yes. But, if it's easier, just so we can check

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           it and submit it, it helps.

2   Q       Yes. I'd appreciate it.

3   A       (Davis) Okay.

4                   CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: So, that would be  
5       a record request. And I'm going to phrase it  
6       here.

7                   Based on the proposed rate design  
8       for -- I think it's the "A4" design, if the  
9       utilization turns out to be 5 percent, please  
10      calculate the dollar amount associated with the  
11      subsidies that these customers will avail?

12                  WITNESS DAVIS: And I can assume a  
13      demand level of 120 kilowatts?

14                  CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Yes. So, *ceteris*  
15      *paribus*.

16                  WITNESS DAVIS: Very good.

17                           **[Record request noted.]**

18   BY CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY:

19   Q       And let's go to Exhibit 1, Bates Page 020.

20   A       (Davis) Okay. I have that.

21   Q       Yes. So, again, under the assumptions you have  
22      made in the calculations here, and I'm looking at  
23      the chart there, at the end, it would seem  
24      that -- so, I think what I understood you were

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 saying was, as you go from 9 to 10, you would  
2 expect the orange line to be the same as the blue  
3 line?

4 A (Davis) That's correct. It crosses over, yes.

5 Q Yes. And I want to get a sense of where would  
6 the gray line would be? Would it be further away  
7 from, as I notice now, as you went beyond 7, you  
8 know, it flipped, as you compare the orange with  
9 the gray. And I'm curious, why wouldn't, you  
10 know, generally, it would be better for these  
11 businesses to go with the EV TOU, right?

12 A (Davis) Compared with Rate GV, the blue line?

13 Q Compared with the orange line.

14 A (Davis) Oh. Certainly, again, given the mix of  
15 Time of Use, below that roughly 7 percent  
16 utilization level, on a bill basis, yes.

17 But, if you keep going, there still  
18 remains -- there's a convergence of the gray bar,  
19 again, under this mix of usage, I'm just looking  
20 for -- there will be some gap that goes further  
21 out to past the 10 percent, there's still a  
22 difference where the charge under the gray line  
23 is less than the blue line, if you will.

24 Q Yes. I think what I'm -- maybe I didn't convey

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           this properly, I'm really trying to compare the  
2           gray line with the orange line.

3   A       (Davis) Okay.

4   Q       And I'm saying, until 7 percent, roughly,  
5           it's the -- the orange is lower than the gray,  
6           right?

7   A       (Davis) Yes.

8   Q       And then, beyond that, it starts -- the ranking  
9           changes?

10   A       (Davis) Yes.

11   Q       So, my question is, under 10 percent load factor,  
12           the gray line would be even smaller than the  
13           orange line, is that -- would that be a fair  
14           characterization?

15   A       (Davis) Yes.

16   Q       And that kind of tells me that, for that kind of  
17           load factor, the EV TOU might be a better option  
18           for -- I mean, I know that you made other  
19           assumptions here, but --

20   A       (Davis) From a customer bill perspective, the  
21           customer would see a lower bill. So, in that  
22           sense, it would, I presume, a better -- a better  
23           option for the customer.

24   Q       So, can you -- can you give me a sense of, like,

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 I know you chose 10 percent, so, what are your  
2 expectation over the next two or three years? I  
3 mean, I know that you did some modeling in  
4 another place. But I'm asking, based on your  
5 understanding of what's going on in other states,  
6 even for your company, what is a reasonable  
7 percentage to assume right at the beginning?

8 A (Davis) So, the reasoning that went into the 10  
9 percent and my expectation is based on when  
10 customers -- two things, when customers begin  
11 service, like in terms of a new station, and,  
12 obviously, the level of charging participation.  
13 I haven't seen a lot of data, but the data I  
14 have, and what we were projecting in our -- and  
15 we certainly have a table in our initial  
16 testimony, was that it could vary, it's hard to  
17 predict. It may be -- location may be one  
18 factor, but also time of year, amount of traffic,  
19 amount of EVs deployed and using the stations.

20 But it seems to me, we did look at --  
21 we do have some existing charging stations now,  
22 and I saw quite a range. So, early on, I would  
23 expect perhaps less than 5 percent for the first  
24 couple years, on average. But there are times in

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 a month when it can go above that. And there are  
2 potentially locations that may get very, very  
3 little usage but for certain times.

4 So, I think "under 5 percent" is  
5 probably reasonable. Again, it's sort of a  
6 guess, based on, you know, an informed guess.  
7 And I do rely a little bit, I mean, we -- and  
8 maybe Mr. Boughan has some additional insights,  
9 but we made a projection, I made those  
10 assumptions in our initial filing, and I think  
11 there's a table that we provided. That's how we  
12 got to the range of "up to 15 percent". But I  
13 think we were expecting, in general, early on,  
14 there would be a lower, probably 3 to 5 percent,  
15 in the first few years of an offering, and then  
16 each station would vary within that offering.

17 Q Thank you. Mr. Boughan, I think, because you  
18 work on EVSEs and things like that, so, I'm going  
19 to ask you, you must have done some research on  
20 what's going on in other states. So, would  
21 you -- will you agree with what Mr. Davis said,  
22 that initially kind of expect this kind of load  
23 factor? Number one.

24 And then, number two is, if your

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Company is already doing this in other states,  
2 what has been your experience, even in terms of,  
3 you know, not just the first few years, but also  
4 it may be in place already for a number of years,  
5 and it's mature enough, you know, that you have a  
6 sense of what kind of usage we might get?

7 A (Boughan) Yes. So, a couple of things I can say  
8 about that.

9 We have some data on stations in our  
10 service territory, in Connecticut, for example,  
11 specifically, where we see load factors at any  
12 given station that are, as Mr. Davis  
13 characterized, widely variable. From less than  
14 1 percent, to some stations that can get, in a  
15 certain month, as high as 20 percent, and  
16 everything in between. We have data from  
17 approximately 30 locations. And I would say that  
18 it runs the range from less than a half percent  
19 to 20 percent, and the distribution of which is  
20 fairly even.

21 Our analysis in that exhibit was also  
22 informed by RMI, formally "Rocky Mountain  
23 Institute", who projected a forecast of average  
24 utilization at a typical public DC fast charging

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 station, based on their nationwide experience of  
2 zero to 5 percent in the first initial years,  
3 growing to 5 to 10 percent in five to seven  
4 years. And, so, that's how we -- that  
5 informed -- that and our experience informed the  
6 modeling done in that exhibit.

7 Q Thank you. One more question, I'm going to try  
8 and articulate this as well as I can, but I'm  
9 thinking about it.

10 So, let's say these sites become  
11 operational. Is this, the revenue that you're  
12 getting out of the charging here, is all of this  
13 load, is that incremental or do you think this  
14 will also include some, you know, cars that  
15 are -- they're already charging at home, maybe in  
16 New Hampshire, or, you know, in other places in  
17 New Hampshire that not all of this is  
18 incremental? And can you give me a sense of  
19 whether you have looked at the data to come to  
20 some conclusion?

21 A (Boughan) My informed opinion would be that most  
22 of the load would be incremental. New Hampshire  
23 is severely -- the EV adoption in New Hampshire  
24 is significantly lower than surrounding states

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           who have supporting infrastructure. And part of  
2           the reason would be that there isn't that  
3           supporting infrastructure to give drivers the  
4           confidence to purchase and drive an EV.

5                       The same could be said about drivers  
6           who are coming into the state, for example, for a  
7           vacation or tourism purposes, because that  
8           infrastructure isn't necessarily there, they may  
9           choose to drive somewhere else. If the  
10          infrastructure were in place, they may choose to  
11          drive to New Hampshire and put incremental load  
12          on those newly installed DC Fast Chargers.

13                      The same could be said for drivers who  
14          don't have access to charging at home, would  
15          potentially have the confidence now to purchase  
16          or lease a new or used EV, and charge it at a  
17          public DC fast charging station, that was --  
18          would also be incremental load.

19                      It's difficult to parse data, because,  
20          you know, as we add, as a industry, add  
21          infrastructure to support EVSE and add EVSEs,  
22          it's growing along with EV adoption in those  
23          states. But there's a pretty direct correlation  
24          between EV adoption and EV supporting

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 infrastructure.

2 If that helps answer the question, I  
3 hope?

4 Q Yes. So, you don't have a specific --

5 A (Boughan) Correct.

6 Q -- analysis or number in mind, but you still  
7 said -- you still said that's an "informed  
8 opinion".

9 A *(Witness Boughan indicating in the affirmative)*.

10 Q I'm just curious, like, do you still -- you're  
11 not comfortable even coming up with a percentage,  
12 like 80 percent, 90 percent?

13 A (Boughan) Yes. I would say north of 80 percent  
14 of that would be incremental.

15 Q Okay.

16 A (Boughan) You know, given that the drivers in New  
17 Hampshire today are charging however they're able  
18 to. If more chargers were added, more drivers  
19 would be able to have the confidence to go  
20 purchase EVs, which would be incremental load.

21 Q Do you have access to data, let's say, in  
22 Connecticut, that would tell you about people's  
23 behavior, in terms of switching from  
24 non-electric, you know, cars to electric cars,

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           being driven by a more -- being driven by more  
2           charging stations being built?

3                       And, if not, you can say --

4   A       (Boughan) So, I can say --

5   Q       -- you don't. But I'm just curious whether you  
6           do?

7   A       (Boughan) Yes. Sorry to interrupt. Yes. So, I  
8           can say it a different way. So, study after  
9           study, including a most recent study by Consumer  
10          Reports, cites the number barrier to the  
11          purchasing decision of an EV is the lack of  
12          charging infrastructure being available.

13                      CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Okay. Thank you.  
14          That's all I have.

15                      CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Let's take a  
16          lunch break. I know we have out-of-town guests.  
17          Would one o'clock be too quick to resume or do  
18          parties need until 1:15?

19                      MS. CHIAVARA: One o'clock is fine.

20                      CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: That's a good symbol  
21          for one o'clock.

22                      Okay. Very good. We'll resume at  
23          1:00 p.m. Thank you.

24                      Oh, and, Ms. Ohler, we have a few more

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 questions for you. If you could return after,  
2 that would be fantastic. Thank you.

3 MS. OHLER: I will.

4 *(Lunch recess taken at 12:18 p.m., and*  
5 *the hearing resumed at 1:06 p.m.)*

6 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. We'll pick  
7 back up with Commissioner questions.

8 And, Ms. Ohler, we'll start with you.  
9 Thanks again for coming today on such short  
10 notice.

11 Sorry, just a moment. Okay. Yes. I'd  
12 just like to follow up on some of the earlier  
13 Commissioner questions, and just maybe to clarify  
14 a little bit.

15 How many EV service stations are you  
16 estimating can be supported with the 4.6 million  
17 in funding? And I know it can vary, but does DES  
18 have kind of an estimate of 20 or 10 or 5 or  
19 something?

20 MS. OHLER: We're thinking it's going  
21 to be between the 10 and 14 range.

22 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Ten and  
23 fourteen. And we'll wait until, hopefully, your  
24 filing later, to understand how much is

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Eversource versus --

2 MS. OHLER: So, during lunch, I was  
3 able to contact the Attorney General's Office to  
4 ask them. And their response was that, because  
5 this was a Request for Proposals process, no  
6 information may be released prior to the  
7 contracts going to Governor & Council.

8 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. So, your  
9 estimate is "10 to 14". But, when DES goes to  
10 Governor & Council, that will be in the proposal?

11 MS. OHLER: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. And when do  
13 you plan on going to G&C?

14 MS. OHLER: We hope to have the  
15 first -- I mean, we won't be going with the whole  
16 10 to 14 as a bunch. We're going to be doing  
17 them as they get ready. And I'm hoping that we  
18 will have at least a few of them ready to go  
19 within a month and a half.

20 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. And then, to  
21 complete the whole process of getting all the way  
22 to the 10 to 14, because you said you want to do  
23 them in one bunch, kind of in theory?

24 MS. OHLER: I would say, within six

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 months. A lot of it depends on how quickly the  
2 applicants get the information back to us.

3 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay.

4 MS. OHLER: So, six months at the  
5 outside, it would be certainly our hope.

6 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay.

7 MS. OHLER: We'd rather get it all done  
8 in the next two to three.

9 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. But, by the  
10 end of first quarter, you expect to be done?

11 MS. OHLER: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

12 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Yes. Okay. Thank  
13 you. Okay. That's very helpful.

14 So, from that, I can deduce the average  
15 cost of the stations, because I can divide 10  
16 into 4.6 and 14 into 4.6. So, I can do that on  
17 my own.

18 But do you have sort of an average  
19 configuration for the stations? Because what the  
20 Commission is grappling with is, we understand  
21 the cost of the charging station, that was  
22 highlighted by ChargePoint earlier. But we kind  
23 of don't really grasp the amount of  
24 infrastructure that's included for the VW

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Settlement, and what each of those charging sites  
2 kind of looks like.

3 So, I was hoping you could add some  
4 color to that. What would the -- sort of the  
5 average configuration look like at each of these  
6 10 to 14 sites?

7 MS. OHLER: Well, from the -- excuse  
8 me -- from the charging infrastructure itself  
9 side, the RFP requires a minimum of two Fast  
10 Charger stations and two Level 2 chargers. But  
11 the Level 2 really are not at issue in this,  
12 because they don't -- they wouldn't trigger a  
13 demand charge, really.

14 So, there are some locations in remoter  
15 parts of the state where we may negotiate with  
16 the applicant and agree to do a single station.  
17 And there's probably going to be a couple where  
18 it may make sense to do maybe three, instead of  
19 two. We're not entirely sure yet.

20 But they are in -- I can say that we  
21 have likely locations in extremely rural parts of  
22 New Hampshire, as well as very urban parts of New  
23 Hampshire. So, I think -- I think that the only  
24 places that I can tell you we are not putting

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 stations is, per the requirements of the RFP,  
2 that we will not be putting them within a 20-mile  
3 radius of the five charging locations that  
4 currently exist in the state that are 24-hour  
5 access, public access.

6 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Very good.  
7 So, I think -- so, it sounds like, just on  
8 average, sometimes it's one, sometimes it's two,  
9 sometimes it's three, but, on average, maybe a  
10 couple of charging stations would be typical, and  
11 then the infrastructure that goes around that  
12 that's allowed by the Settlement?

13 MS. OHLER: Correct. Yes. The basis  
14 is two, and that, you know, one or three would  
15 just be probably, you know, a couple, one or so  
16 of each end of that. The majority will be two  
17 Fast Charging stations.

18 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Excellent.

19 MS. OHLER: And I'd say the reason for  
20 that is we wanted redundancy, in case one station  
21 goes down. The key to making -- the key to  
22 making EV charging successful and helping to spur  
23 the adoption of electric vehicles is making sure  
24 that there's consistency and availability of the

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 charging infrastructure. If we have unreliable  
2 charging stations, then nobody trusts them and  
3 they still don't buy the vehicles.

4 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Apparently, on I-93,  
5 Tesla thinks the answer to that question is "10".  
6 So, that's --

7 MS. OHLER: Right.

8 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: That's what they  
9 went with, it looks like, or nine or something.  
10 So, just rough math, if we say it's ten  
11 stations, there's a couple of charging stations  
12 per service area, I should say, 150K, so, I'm  
13 just kind of roughing it out. But, roughly, a  
14 third of the cost, roughly, would be the charging  
15 station itself, and about two-thirds of the cost  
16 would be the infrastructure that goes around  
17 those charging stations?

18 MS. OHLER: Well, yes, the actual  
19 equipment, plus the -- plus the --

20 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: The labor, yes.

21 MS. OHLER: -- the labor, and getting  
22 the site ready, just, you know, absent the  
23 make-ready side of it. I mean, I guess, since I  
24 don't have a good handle on what the utility side

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 costs are, I'm not sure I can really answer that,  
2 because -- excuse me -- because the proposals  
3 that we received, we did ask the applicants to  
4 work with their electric utility to get a range  
5 of what the make-ready costs were, because that  
6 was a -- that's, obviously, a factor in the  
7 viability of a proposal. If somebody's, you  
8 know, proposing a site, and they're going to  
9 invest, you know, 300,000 in the charging  
10 infrastructure, but there's a million dollars  
11 worth of make-ready, that project is not likely  
12 to be successful, as successful as another one,  
13 another site that maybe has \$50,000 worth of, you  
14 know, non-covered costs that are required.

15 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. That's very  
16 helpful. Because, as I understood the Company's  
17 testimony earlier, the hardware, except for the  
18 charging station itself, is on the utility side.  
19 It's just the charging station, and then the  
20 underground wiring and all the hook-ups that it  
21 takes to get the charging station up and running  
22 that we're talking about here?

23 MS. OHLER: It's, essentially, the VW  
24 funding can pay for any part of this charging

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 station and ancillary equipment that will be  
2 owned by the applicant. If it's going to be  
3 owned by the electric utility, then the VW  
4 costs -- the VW funding cannot cover that cost.

5 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: That's an  
6 interesting question that the Commissioners were  
7 contemplating. So, why wouldn't like the  
8 padmount transformer be in the VW funding, or  
9 maybe it is? But I understood the Company to say  
10 it's on the other side.

11 MS. OHLER: I am not an expert in what  
12 equipment is necessary for this. So, if that  
13 transformer were to be owned by the applicant,  
14 then that would be an eligible cost. If it were  
15 to be owned by the electric utility, it is not an  
16 eligible cost.

17 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Let me turn  
18 my next question to the Company then.

19 BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:

20 Q Maybe you could comment on, there's a set of  
21 equipment that appears in your mind to be on the  
22 Eversource side, and a portion to be on let's  
23 call it the "service station side". How did you  
24 determine where that line was? And maybe you

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           could reamplify what, you know, what equipment is  
2           on which side of that line?

3   A       (Boughan) Yes. The traditional line of  
4           demarcation is the meter. So, --

5   Q       And the transformer is in front of the meter or  
6           behind the meter?

7   A       (Boughan) It's in front of the meter.

8   Q       Front of the meter, okay. Are there two  
9           transformers? There's one on the pole, and then  
10          one, like a pad-mounted one before it gets to the  
11          meter, or how does that work?

12   A       (Boughan) It depends on the site. It's usually  
13          one or the other.

14   Q       Okay. Okay. And what voltage is coming into the  
15          transformer?

16   A       (Boughan) So, for these sites, it's 480/227 --

17   A       (Davis) 277.

18   A       (Boughan) -- 277.

19   Q       That's voltage?

20   A       (Boughan) I'm not an engineer.

21   Q       It's okay. It's okay. I'm just a mechanical  
22          engineer. So, I'm struggling, too.

23                        So, it's 277 volts comes into the  
24          transformer, do you guys know?

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1                   And the reason I'm asking is this  
2                   "future-proofing" question that I think  
3                   Commissioner Carleton -- or, Commissioner  
4                   Simpson, sorry, was referring to earlier. Is,  
5                   you know, "if the technology changes, and you  
6                   need a higher voltage system, then what happens  
7                   then?", is where the line of questioning was  
8                   going. Can you maybe touch on that?

9   A           (Boughan) You would need to upgrade the equipment  
10           to the size of the service.

11   Q           Yes. So, what you're contemplating now is,  
12           current technology, the only thing on the --  
13           well, everything is on the utility side, so  
14           everything is in front of the meter, except for  
15           the cabling and the charging station itself?

16   A           (Boughan) Correct. And, I mean, should the  
17           customer choose to pay for future-proofing, we  
18           would consider that. But we wouldn't consider  
19           that as part of the make-ready funding. That  
20           would be incumbent on the customer to pay those  
21           upgrade charges.

22   Q           Okay. Now, we're out of my wheelhouse, but could  
23           you put the transformer on the other side of the  
24           meter?

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 A (Boughan) No.

2 Q Walk me through how that works?

3 A (Boughan) Just from the electrical engineering,  
4 the transformer would always be on the utility  
5 side of the meter.

6 Q Okay. Because you're monitoring the voltage and  
7 current post all of the processing?

8 A (Boughan) Correct.

9 Q So, that's what you're trying to measure. Okay.  
10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: So, I'll continue  
12 with the Company questions. Then, Ms. Ohler, I  
13 will come back to you in a moment.

14 WITNESS DAVIS: Chairman?

15 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Yes.

16 WITNESS DAVIS: May I have just a  
17 moment with my colleague?

18 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Oh, sure.

19 WITNESS DAVIS: I just want to check on  
20 something.

21 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Of course. Thank  
22 you.

23 *(Witness Davis and Witness Boughan*  
24 *conferring.)*

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 WITNESS DAVIS: Thank you, Chairman.

2 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Do you have any --

3 WITNESS DAVIS: No. I was just trying  
4 to clarify what I heard, relative to, you know,  
5 the service that we provide to the customer.

6 So, nothing to clarify at this point.  
7 Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.  
9 Yes, we were just trying to figure out where all  
10 the equipment goes. So, thank you for that.

11 Just a follow-on question for the  
12 Company.

13 BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:

14 Q So, I'm trying to understand this incentive  
15 subsidy piece that goes to the service provider.  
16 So, you know, what incentive is there for these  
17 developers to keep their costs down, because  
18 they're getting reimbursed for 100 percent? So,  
19 right, the VW funding is going to pay for some  
20 portion, Eversource will refund the balance.

21 So, it kind of seems like the Wild  
22 West, where there's no incentive to keep costs  
23 down.

24 A (Boughan) Well, the awardees are responding to an

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 RFP, and being awarded, in part, I think by the  
2 costs that they have submitted to DES.

3 Q What happens if there's a cost overrun?

4 A (Boughan) On -- I don't know if that's a question  
5 for me or for Ms. Ohler.

6 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: I could ask -- I  
7 could ask Ms. Ohler.

8 What happens, so, you get a quote back,  
9 it's "Hey, we can put this in for \$50,000. The  
10 company says "Hey, we've got competitive bids",  
11 so we know it's a good price." You know, they  
12 put it in, and they say "Oh, we're so sorry. It  
13 turns out there's a rock in our way, and now  
14 it's, you know, \$100,000." What happens then?

15 MS. OHLER: We would have a grant  
16 agreement in place with the applicant, and that  
17 will have a maximum cost level. And, absent  
18 going back to Governor & Executive Council and  
19 asking for an increase, I mean, we're at that  
20 cap.

21 And, given the way we intend to try to  
22 get these funds out as quickly as possible, we,  
23 by the time an earlier -- excuse me -- an early  
24 applicant got to that point, we probably would

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 have already obligated all of the other funds.

2 So, --

3 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay.

4 MS. OHLER: Each of the applicants, in  
5 order to submit their application, were required  
6 to contact the electric utility. They will be  
7 going back out, the ones that we've already  
8 contacted to say, you know, "You're in the top  
9 scoring, and please come back to us with a final  
10 cost proposal", are already going back to the  
11 utility, and then -- and also taking a closer  
12 look at the sites right now, to give us a final  
13 project cost.

14 And, so, once we've got that cost,  
15 that's it, we won't provide any funding beyond  
16 that.

17 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. That's very  
18 helpful. Just a moment please.

19 *[Chairman Goldner and Commissioner*  
20 *Simpson conferring.]*

21 BY CMSR. SIMPSON:

22 Q So, if I may jump in, it sounds like, in the  
23 review process, the utility provided the  
24 applicants, for the RFP, an estimate of costs.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Can the Company make those estimates available to  
2 the Commission?

3 A (Boughan) So, we certainly did them and have  
4 them. I'm not sure, as part of the  
5 confidentiality of the application process, if we  
6 can or not. Or, if we can submit them  
7 confidentially, I'd have to check.

8 Q Because it would be particularly relevant, for  
9 the sites that have been preliminarily selected,  
10 to know those initial estimates.

11 A (Boughan) Right. Yes. I mean, we would have to  
12 know which ones have been preliminarily selected.

13 Q Does the Company know?

14 A (Boughan) I am not aware of it.

15 Q Okay.

16 A (Boughan) But it's possible that someone in the  
17 Company has been contacted.

18 CMSR. SIMPSON: I would guess probably  
19 not.

20 DES, has the Company been made aware of  
21 the preliminary selections?

22 MS. OHLER: We have not notified the  
23 utilities of any of this. We're working directly  
24 with the applicant.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay.

2 MS. OHLER: The applicants would be  
3 responsible to go back and get final cost  
4 proposals. But, again, because that side of the  
5 equation doesn't impact our grant to them, that  
6 number doesn't factor into our final contract  
7 negotiations.

8 CMSR. SIMPSON: But it must affect your  
9 evaluation?

10 MS. OHLER: Yes. I mean, you know, the  
11 applicants submitted the applications with the  
12 existing estimates from the utility. I would  
13 assume, if the utility then went back to them and  
14 said "Oh, wait, it's going to be twice that",  
15 they'd probably come back to us and say "Hey,  
16 we're not sure we can do this."

17 CMSR. SIMPSON: Uh-huh.

18 MS. OHLER: But they submitted a  
19 proposal with the price range that the utility  
20 did give them. And I will tell you, some of them  
21 I think -- I mean, I think that our price  
22 range -- our estimate ranges were, like, you  
23 know, less than 50,000, you know, 50 to 250,000,  
24 and more than 250,000. So, it was really a big

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 range.

2 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay.

3 MS. OHLER: So, it's not -- it's not  
4 granular at all.

5 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: So, just to kind of  
7 finish the math exercise. So, what we're really  
8 talking about, and I guess this is directed at  
9 the Department of Energy and the Office of  
10 Consumer Advocate, is what we're really talking  
11 about is ratepayer funding over time of call it  
12 10 to \$15 million, because we're talking about 10  
13 to 14 service stations, and we're talking about a  
14 couple million, per Eversource's estimate anyway,  
15 per station. So, if I've done the math right, I  
16 think I did the math right, it's about 10 to  
17 \$15 million. So, -- I'm getting a "no".

18 MS. OHLER: Can I just clarify? That  
19 it's my understanding that the Eversource  
20 proposal is spread across all of the VW money,  
21 it's not per location.

22 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. So, thank you  
23 for correcting my math.

24 MS. OHLER: So, it's the total of the

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           2. whatever million.

2                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: So, you're right.  
3           So, we have 2. -- let's call it "2 million" in  
4           ratepayer funding, for something like five  
5           stations. Is that -- that was in the proposal,  
6           right, the Settlement, that was the estimate?

7                   WITNESS BOUGHAN: That was our estimate  
8           of how many might be awarded.

9                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. And, so, if  
10          we say it's really -- okay, so, thank you for  
11          correcting my math. So, it's really, if it's 10  
12          to 14, we're talking about 4 to 6 million of  
13          ratepayer funding for the total VW Settlement,  
14          because -- Ms. Ohler, you're shaking your head,  
15          but let me see if I can clarify.

16                   So, we -- so, you're going to spend the  
17          VW money, 4.6 million, and you're going to put in  
18          10 to 14 stations. The Company is telling us, to  
19          put in five stations, it takes about \$2 million  
20          of ratepayer funding, right, of ratepayer  
21          funding, in order to execute that. And somebody  
22          can correct me if I'm getting this wrong.

23                   So, I'm just multiplying that out to  
24          see what the total impact is of spending, in

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 other words, we're getting -- we, the state, are  
2 getting \$4.6 million from VW, thank you. But now  
3 we're asking the ratepayers to spend 4 to \$6  
4 million in order to enable that technology.

5 Do you care to comment on that,  
6 Ms. Ohler?

7 MS. OHLER: Well, I'm not a rate expert  
8 at all, but it's my understanding that the only  
9 money that Eversource would be putting towards  
10 any of these stations would come to the total of  
11 2.1 million. And, if there were costs above and  
12 beyond that, that would be upon the applicant,  
13 the entity putting the station in to cover those  
14 costs.

15 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. Thank  
16 you.

17 So, I'll direct the question at the  
18 Company.

19 BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:

20 Q So, you know, I'm trying to ask if we -- I think  
21 what the Company is saying is there's \$2 million,  
22 roughly, of ratepayer funding to put in five  
23 stations. At the state level, we are planning to  
24 put in 10 to 15 stations, thus from -- I know

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           it's not all Eversource, but, roughly speaking,  
2           we're asking ratepayers to spend 4 to \$6 million  
3           to implement the VW program?

4    A       (Boughan) So, I would change that a little bit,  
5           right? So, whether there are five or ten  
6           selected in the Eversource service territory, we  
7           would spend 2.1 million.

8    Q       Okay.

9    A       (Boughan) Our budget was initially based on that  
10           split of front of the meter/behind the meter. It  
11           was initially based on an assumption that the VW  
12           funds wouldn't cover any of the customer side.  
13           So, it's entirely possible that that 2 million,  
14           given the eligible costs that VW will fund, would  
15           be able to fund more than five.

16                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Very good. That's  
17           very helpful. Thank you. Thank you. Okay.  
18           That is extremely helpful.

19                   Okay. And, sort of continuing on that  
20           theme, on Bates 011 of the Settlement, it has a  
21           line that was meant for the Commissioners, I  
22           know, because it says the Settlement -- in it it  
23           says that the make-ready funding "is needed for  
24           many", but not all, "of the sites to be viable."

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           So, I'd like to understand, from either  
2           the Company or maybe perhaps Ms. Ohler knows what  
3           that means. I'm trying to understand what that  
4           means. So, the make-ready funding "is needed for  
5           many", but not all, "of the sites to be viable."  
6           So, why not -- why not have zero ratepayer  
7           funding, and get -- enable these sites?

8           MS. OHLER: There are -- excuse me --  
9           there are some proposals that were received that  
10          have all of the adequate infrastructure on the  
11          site, and will need very little by way of  
12          additional work done. I'm trying to think of an  
13          example. But you might have a large shopping  
14          mall, that already has all of the power that they  
15          need on the site, and, really, the only  
16          additional cost is on the applicant, to dig the  
17          trench from where the power comes in, to where  
18          they're going to put the charger. And that's not  
19          going to be a utility cost. That's going to be  
20          part of the funded project.

21          CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: I see. Okay, that's  
22          very helpful. Thank you.

23          MS. OHLER: So, you could, you know, I  
24          doubt that there's one that has zero utility side

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 costs. But there's -- certainly, there were many  
2 that we got that were in the "less than \$20,000"  
3 of utility side costs.

4 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. That's  
5 very helpful.

6 Okay. And the next question is really  
7 for any of the parties.

8 BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:

9 Q And I'm just trying to understand the strategy  
10 about, you know, it seems like the winning -- the  
11 winning bidders is kind of like winning the  
12 lottery, because everything, you know, is sort  
13 of, in the end, free to them, right? And they're  
14 getting a huge marketing benefit from these  
15 charging stations, which is going to be a very  
16 nice attribute to their site, and attract  
17 customers and so forth.

18 So, I'm just wondering what the  
19 parties' thought process was, in terms of not  
20 having any contribution from the winning bidders?

21 MS. OHLER: I've got to look at the  
22 details of the proposal, but I believe that the  
23 maximum amount of the customer side cost that  
24 will be covered is 80 percent.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: So, it is a percent.  
2 Okay, that was alluded to earlier, and I wasn't  
3 clear on that. So, the maximum is 80 percent on  
4 the customer side?

5 MS. OHLER: I believe so. I'll take a  
6 quick look and confirm it.

7 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: That would be more  
8 similar to some of the other states, in terms of  
9 preliminary research, in terms of what other  
10 folks are doing.

11 Is that part of the VW Settlement, that  
12 says you can pay up to a certain amount, or is  
13 that a New Hampshire rule?

14 MS. OHLER: Again, I'd have to confirm.  
15 I don't believe the Settlement speaks to that.  
16 But, just from our experience in doing grant  
17 programs, you always want the entity being funded  
18 to have some significant skin in the game,  
19 because, otherwise, you get poorly implemented  
20 projects.

21 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. That was  
22 my thought process as well.

23 Is it possible to put something in the  
24 record to help us understand kind of how that

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 works? Because that in and of itself is a very  
2 big and important point, I think, to the  
3 Commission, in terms of having some skin in the  
4 game. I don't think we have anything in the  
5 record that shows us what the contribution is  
6 from the customer.

7 MS. OHLER: Certainly. I can -- we can  
8 put together the Request for Proposals, and that  
9 very clearly spells out what the required match  
10 is.

11 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. And that's  
12 already in the record request. So, we're covered  
13 on that. Thank you.

14 MS. OHLER: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Very good.

16 Is there -- last question for you,  
17 Ms. Ohler. Is there anything that the Commission  
18 should be aware of in the VW Settlement funds  
19 where the infrastructure, and the funds used to  
20 cover infrastructure, whether there's any sort of  
21 stipulation or clarity on where those shall not  
22 be used? Is there some education you can give us  
23 on where the VW funds cannot be used?

24 MS. OHLER: VW funds cannot be used to

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 support any new infrastructure that is within 20  
2 miles of an existing 24-hour publicly accessible  
3 charging station. The reason for that was  
4 two-fold: We didn't want to be competing with  
5 those sites. And we also -- the purpose of this  
6 is to get charging infrastructure in all regions  
7 of the state. And, so, we didn't want -- we were  
8 intentionally seeking proposals in some of the  
9 more rural parts of New Hampshire, to make sure  
10 that it's, you know, all the charging  
11 infrastructure isn't clustered between Concord  
12 and Nashua.

13 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Very good.  
14 And I guess I was -- I really meant to ask, sort  
15 of in -- in the physical sense, if we're looking  
16 at, you know, coming off the transformer, you  
17 know, into the padmount, into the meter, over to  
18 all of those things, is there anything about the  
19 infrastructure that the VW Settlement says "you  
20 can't spend our money on this"?

21 MS. OHLER: Yes. Again, that's in the  
22 Request for Proposals, and hang on, let me get to  
23 that portion of the RFP.

24 So, we do have a long list of what's

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 eligible and what's not eligible. And the things  
2 that are eligible are the things like the  
3 equipment itself, the maintenance and warranty  
4 contracts, the software network service  
5 agreements. And that's -- I'll just stress on  
6 that one, we require that these charging stations  
7 be networked, because we want the data. And we  
8 want the entire state, we want the world to have  
9 this data. They will be required to keep and  
10 report, on a regular basis, records of how many  
11 charging sessions they have, what time of day  
12 that happened, how much power was drawn, how much  
13 did they, you know, how much did they charge the  
14 customer for it. We are going to have all of  
15 that data, and that data will all be publicly  
16 accessible data, that can be used by the  
17 utilities after this sort of pilot program period  
18 to, you know, use to analyze and see how --  
19 whether the existing rate design is appropriate  
20 or whether changes should be made.

21 You know, right now, we've got five, as  
22 I said earlier, five stations that meet the  
23 24-hour public access criteria in the State of  
24 New Hampshire. None of them are publicly funded.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           So, none of them report any data whatsoever. So,  
2           in New Hampshire, we do not have access to that  
3           data right now.

4                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Okay. Thank  
5           up very much.

6                   MS. OHLER: So, you had asked about the  
7           types of things that wouldn't be covered. And,  
8           so, we do not cover anything related to the  
9           purchase, lease, or rent of real estate. We  
10          don't cover capital costs, such as building a  
11          building. You know, the site's already got to be  
12          an existing site. We don't cover general  
13          maintenance of the sites.

14                   And then, here's the line in the RFP,  
15          is "Electric utility infrastructure needed to  
16          connect and serve new EVSE. This may include  
17          traditional distribution infrastructure, such as  
18          step-down transformers, overhead service lines,  
19          and utility meters that will continue to be owned  
20          and operated by the utility."

21                   We also do not cover any charging  
22          infrastructure that doesn't meet our  
23          specifications. We don't cover signage, we don't  
24          cover taxes, we don't cover internet connection.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 We don't cover the electricity consumption,  
2 including demand charges.

3 We would have loved to, but we just  
4 didn't have enough money, so we are not covering  
5 batteries or solar panels, although those would  
6 both be good additions to an EV charging site.  
7 And we don't cover the administrative and  
8 overhead or indirect costs.

9 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: It sounds like, from  
10 a strategy perspective, DES is spending within  
11 the rules of the VW Agreement, pardon me,  
12 everything that it can. So, it's maximizing the  
13 scope of the VW Agreement, to put everything, you  
14 know, put everything towards those sites as  
15 possible?

16 MS. OHLER: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay.

18 MS. OHLER: Yes, we are.

19 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.  
20 That's extremely helpful.

21 Okay. I'll turn -- and, Ms. Ohler, if  
22 you -- I know we've ask you to be here for a long  
23 time today, if you would like to depart, that  
24 would be perfectly fine.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 MS. OHLER: I was planning to be here  
2 for this docket anyway. We are a member to the  
3 Settlement, so --

4 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: It's flattering when  
5 people want to stay.

6 *[Laughter.]*

7 MS. OHLER: Thank you for -- thank you  
8 for the offer.

9 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: So, I'll turn now to  
10 a few questions for the Company.

11 BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:

12 Q And there was an allusion to this earlier, but  
13 I'm not sure I captured everything. So, how does  
14 New Hampshire's EV charging plan differ from  
15 Massachusetts, with respect to the role that  
16 utilities are playing in funding the portion of  
17 EV charging infrastructure and costs not covered  
18 by the VW Settlement funds.

19 So, to the question by Ms. Ohler, are  
20 you seeing any differences in what Massachusetts  
21 is doing and New Hampshire is doing?

22 A (Boughan) Yes. So, my experience with New  
23 Hampshire's -- or, I'm sorry, with  
24 Massachusetts's EVIP Program, it's been

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 implemented for a few years. Generally, the  
2 awards have been to Level 2 sites. And,  
3 generally, the awards have been limited to  
4 funding the EVSE equipment itself. It's  
5 generally been open, and short windows, and then  
6 it will close again. There was --

7 Q I'm sorry. I'm sorry, if I could clarify. Is  
8 this with respect to the VW agreement or is this  
9 in general in Massachusetts?

10 A (Boughan) Yes. So, the MasseVIP Program is the  
11 Massachusetts's DEP's vehicle for disbursing the  
12 Settlement funds.

13 Q Okay. Thank you.

14 A (Boughan) They recently, last year, for a brief  
15 moment, opened up MasseVIP for DC Fast Charger  
16 applications. So, there was a round of that.  
17 But those were also limited to the chargers  
18 themselves.

19 Q Okay. But you're seeing, in terms of what's  
20 getting paid for, what's not getting paid for,  
21 you're seeing consistency across what New  
22 Hampshire and Massachusetts is doing, or do you  
23 see some differences, in terms of what parts of  
24 the infrastructure are getting paid for?

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 A (Boughan) So, given that the two biggest  
2 utilities in Massachusetts have fairly  
3 comprehensive make-ready programs that cover most  
4 of the infrastructure, including both utility  
5 side and customer side, there's a difference,  
6 right? So, in those case -- in Massachusetts,  
7 the totality of the infrastructure is covered by  
8 the utility programs, and the EVSE for awardees  
9 is -- just covers the EVSE only.

10 Q Okay. So, am I to understand that the difference  
11 is, is that DES in New Hampshire is covering from  
12 the meter into the EVSE structures, and  
13 Massachusetts is not?

14 A (Boughan) Massachusetts is not, because the  
15 utility programs that have been approved and  
16 implemented, they cover that already.

17 Q Okay. From the state?

18 A (Boughan) Correct.

19 Q Is it funded -- is it funded by the state or is  
20 it funded by the ratepayer?

21 A (Boughan) That is a ratepayer-funded program.

22 Q Okay. Okay. Thank you. I have a question on  
23 the Settlement Agreement for the Company, on  
24 Bates 008, which just says that there's an

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 estimate of "\$100,000 to implement the DCA in its  
2 automated billing system." And, so, if we -- if  
3 Eversource already has a similar program in  
4 Massachusetts, I guess I'm struggling to  
5 understand why there's an additional 100,000  
6 required to implement it in New Hampshire?

7 A (Davis) My understanding is this is really to  
8 develop, not -- we would not be utilizing the  
9 Massachusetts billing processes, but we are able  
10 to identify a process that we could develop and  
11 implement specifically in New Hampshire. So,  
12 they're really -- it's completely different  
13 systems.

14 Q You don't have like an SAP backbone or anything,  
15 do you?

16 A (Davis) No. In fact, Massachusetts actually has  
17 two different billing systems, but we do -- well,  
18 we don't really have an electric vehicle rate at  
19 this moment. We would implement through those  
20 other systems, they're not the same as the New  
21 Hampshire systems -- well, I apologize. We have  
22 a legacy CIS, and then there's a system called  
23 "C2", which we actually do also have in New  
24 Hampshire. But we also have a legacy kind of CIS

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 in New Hampshire that's different than the  
2 Massachusetts. So, there's really multiple  
3 systems. It's not an SAP backbone, *per se*.  
4 That's sort of a long-term view, when we come to  
5 a different billing system.

6 So, it's really a customized billing  
7 process specifically to be able to implement this  
8 program.

9 Q Okay. All right. That's not good news, it's not  
10 okay, you know, --

11 A (Davis) I mean, it's relatively small, because  
12 it's a manual billing, and it's --

13 Q Well, and this was the other thing I didn't  
14 understand, but then it -- the 100,000 isn't  
15 included in the cost summary you had down  
16 further, and I can find the Bates page, 033 or  
17 something, it's not included in the 2.1 million.  
18 So, it seemed like off-budget spending thing.  
19 So, why wasn't it included in the overall budget  
20 of 2.1 million?

21 A (Davis) I mean, it's really a different element  
22 of being able to implement this. This is on the  
23 billing side, --

24 Q Yes.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 A (Davis) -- as kind of the make-ready.

2 Q Yes.

3 A (Davis) Yes.

4 Q So, if I can just make sure I understand  
5 Eversource's proposal here. So, you've got  
6 \$100,000 on the DCA side, and you've got 2.1  
7 million on the make-ready side. Is that -- is  
8 that right?

9 A (Davis) Yes.

10 Q Yes. Okay. Okay. And then, I think a final  
11 question for the Company is, on Bates 033,  
12 there's a discussion of the net present value of  
13 the five estimated sites of "1.6 million", which  
14 looks for all the world like a promising business  
15 model. So, it sort of begs the question, why are  
16 subsidies required?

17 A (Paruta) I'm sorry, Chairman. Could you repeat  
18 the Bates page?

19 Q Sure. Thirty-three (33), in the Settlement.

20 A (Paruta) In the Settlement?

21 Q Yes. I'll try to find the line as well here.  
22 It's Line 15.

23 A (Paruta) So, the purpose of the attachment, and  
24 you're correct, it is a good business model, is

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 to show that, as the cost of service and revenue  
2 requirements are flowing through customers'  
3 rates, so is the revenue benefit, essentially,  
4 and the impacts to that revenue benefit, as it  
5 will flow through things like decoupling in the  
6 future, as we talked about, I think -- I think it  
7 may have been Commissioner Simpson as we were  
8 talking through this, you will also see that  
9 sales volume, volume increase,  
10 numerator/denominator creating a reduction in  
11 rates ultimately. So, that business model is  
12 essentially built into our customers' rates.

13 So that I'll say it this way, the  
14 subsidization that we are requesting as a cost of  
15 service is, essentially, into the future, going  
16 to be a benefit in those same customer rates  
17 where we're getting that revenue.

18 Q I see. And I think, I don't want to put words in  
19 your mouth, but I think this is a timing issue,  
20 right? There's not a lot of electric cars.  
21 There's the idea that there would be a lot more  
22 electric cars in the future. So, if we sort of  
23 pre-fund these charging stations, it's going to  
24 create a market, it will get bigger and bigger.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 And, eventually, it becomes a positive NPV  
2 enterprise, but investors right now maybe are a  
3 little bit nervous, because it's so early in the  
4 market stage. Is that fair?

5 A (Paruta) That is very fair.

6 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Okay. That's  
7 helpful. Okay.

8 Thank you to the Company. And I have a  
9 few lingering questions, and I'd like to direct  
10 them at the Department of Energy. And then, I'll  
11 move back to the other Commissioners to see if  
12 there's any additional questions, before we move  
13 to redirect.

14 BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:

15 Q So, just sort of a strategic question to the  
16 Department of Energy. So, there's the request  
17 from the Settlement that the \$2 million or so of  
18 ratepayer funding for this project. And it's  
19 really, I think, directed to the state's tourism  
20 business. I know there are some ancillary other  
21 benefits, and, you know, a New Hampshire person  
22 is certainly welcome to go charge their car  
23 there, but it's mostly for tourism.

24 And, so, I'm kind of wondering why the

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 state isn't funding this, as opposed to  
2 ratepayers? And maybe you could just share some  
3 of the strategy or the thinking, in terms of why  
4 it was funded through ratepayers, and not the  
5 state funding?

6 A (Nixon) I'm not sure specifically what "state  
7 funding" you're referring to, because I'm not  
8 aware of some of the state funding that's  
9 available.

10 Q Yes. If you look at how the VW funding is being  
11 implemented in other states, at least my  
12 understanding is, sometimes that funding comes  
13 from ratepayers, sometimes it comes from the  
14 state, sometimes it probably comes from other  
15 sources that I'm not thinking about. But other  
16 states have implemented the VW funding  
17 differently.

18 And I didn't know if any consideration  
19 was given to funding coming from a source other  
20 than ratepayers?

21 A (Nixon) Well, I can't speak to the VW funding,  
22 because I have not been a part of that aspect of  
23 it from its inception, others at DOE could. So,  
24 if there's a specific question you want me to go

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 back, I could go back to that.

2 In this instance, I think that this is  
3 just a small drop in the bucket, to be honest. I  
4 think that we're going to need charging stations  
5 across the state. And, I mean, I agree with what  
6 you said, that it's tourism, but it's not just  
7 tourists. It's residents, it's coming -- it's  
8 people coming to and from work. It's people that  
9 are just traveling even within the state. Or, as  
10 was mentioned earlier, it's multi-resident  
11 housing.

12 So, it's -- at this point, I mean,  
13 we're before you for the ratepayer. But, I mean,  
14 in my personal opinion, I'm not sure if it's  
15 DOE's position, but I believe that there -- we're  
16 going to need stations across the state. And, I  
17 mean, there will be some federal funding as well  
18 to help with that. But I'm not aware of specific  
19 buckets of other state funding that can be  
20 allocated for those purposes. It's, again, if  
21 there's others you know of, --

22 Q No, that's very helpful.

23 A (Nixon) -- I'd be happy to get comment on that.  
24 But I'm not aware of any off the top of my head.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: No, that's fine.

2 Thank you. That was what I was looking for.

3 Just a moment, I'm just cleaning things  
4 up here.

5 Okay. I would like to ask just one  
6 last question, really, for anyone, but I'll  
7 direct it at the Company to start with.

8 BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:

9 Q And this was addressed in the opening, but I'm  
10 just not sure I grasp it sufficiently. So, you  
11 know, when we go back to the topic of  
12 "unjustified" or "unfair cost-shifting", the  
13 proposal is for ratepayers to pay 1.4 million up  
14 front, in terms of expense, and then 650K, you  
15 know, where the Company gets a rate of return,  
16 obviously, over the life of the asset. So,  
17 really, we're talking about more than 2.1 million  
18 in this implementation.

19 So, I'm just -- I'd like somebody to  
20 sort of talk about the topic of "unjustified" or  
21 "unfair cost-shifting" with respect to this  
22 structure, because I'm not sure I'm grasping of  
23 how its fair to the, you know, average New  
24 Hampshire ratepayer?

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 A (Davis) Sorry, Chairman, to the question, our  
2 discussion earlier was more about, I believe, for  
3 the electric service and the rates for the  
4 electric service. And just want to be clear, the  
5 context here, in this question, is more about  
6 this additional cost borne by ratepayers. And I  
7 think we had some, as a year one, it was like 15  
8 cents per monthly bill for a typical residential  
9 customer, and it goes down to a penny for the  
10 remaining life.

11 Q Just so you know, I'm not a fan of that  
12 particular methodology of calculation, like  
13 having a big spread doesn't make it any less than  
14 2 million. So, just to be fair, I'd like to  
15 focus on the 2 million, and not on the -- if we  
16 divide it by a million, we get a really small  
17 number.

18 A (Davis) Okay. I appreciate that. My  
19 understanding, however, is that the amount spread  
20 over time is really more expense. So, that's  
21 more of an ongoing expense, as opposed to the  
22 revenue requirement on the capital. And maybe  
23 Ms. Paruta can clarify that.

24 And, again, I'm just trying to

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 understand the context. The earlier discussion  
2 was around "what's an appropriate rate" and  
3 cost-shifting that way. But I want to  
4 understand, this is really more about the  
5 funding?

6 Q Yes.

7 A (Davis) Yes.

8 Q And let me just put it in a simple perspective.  
9 You've got a lot of retirees that live in New  
10 Hampshire. You've got a fair number of  
11 low-income folks. And we're asking those folks  
12 who don't now, or nor will they ever probably own  
13 an electric car, to pay for this project. And,  
14 so, I'm just trying to understand how it's fair  
15 to the sort of average New Hampshire person, at  
16 least a person in those categories?

17 A (Davis) And I'm not sure I can give you the most  
18 robust response here, but actually Ms. Nixon had  
19 commented, I think we heard some other comments  
20 earlier about who actually would be starting to  
21 utilize and take advantage of these stations.  
22 And this is a small number of stations to start.  
23 The rate offering we're proposing here, it's an  
24 initial program.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 I suppose, perhaps, in the context of  
2 earlier questions, it sounded more like there's  
3 an economic development effort to that. So, if  
4 it's providing those broader benefits, even as  
5 small as it may be at this juncture, perhaps it's  
6 not as large of an issue at this juncture. But  
7 it seems like it's providing that societal  
8 benefit. But it's at -- at this very early  
9 stage, for a small number of customers, but --

10 Q But let me give the Office of Consumer  
11 Advocate --

12 A (Davis) Yes. Again, I probably don't have much  
13 more I can add, but just to start the  
14 conversation.

15 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: No, no. That's very  
16 helpful. I appreciate the Company answering.

17 Let me direct it at the Office of  
18 Consumer Advocate, whose job it is to represent  
19 residential ratepayers.

20 So, Mr. Kreis, if you or your witness  
21 would care to maybe comment on this question of,  
22 you know, you're a retiree living in the North  
23 Country, and the Commission says "Yup, go ahead  
24 and spend \$2 million", I'm just trying to

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 understand, you know, how that would be viewed  
2 or, you know, how that sort of isn't sort of some  
3 unfair cost-shifting?

4 MR. KREIS: I think all I have to say  
5 about that is that, although I don't live in the  
6 North Country, I am old enough to see retirement  
7 on the horizon. And, regardless of whether I  
8 ever own an electric vehicle myself, I would like  
9 this state to remain a viable community for those  
10 who come after me, and for those who hope that  
11 the planet and the state remain inhabitable over  
12 the long run.

13 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: And, I'm sorry, Mr.  
14 Kreis, I should have directed the comment to  
15 Ms. Reno, your witness, because I know that you,  
16 sadly, cannot provide testimony, as we discussed  
17 yesterday.

18 MR. KREIS: Well, that hasn't been an  
19 impediment so far in this hearing. But I'd be  
20 happy to have Ms. Reno address that question, if  
21 she's inclined.

22 WITNESS RENO: Yes, I am.

23 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: I just want to make  
24 sure I give you an opportunity for it to be with

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 the witness, that's all.

2 WITNESS RENO: Yes. As the analyst  
3 representing ratepayers in the State of New  
4 Hampshire, from a typical residential ratepayer  
5 perspective, what we're looking at here is a way  
6 of making some initial investments into an  
7 infrastructure that is critical to both residents  
8 in New Hampshire, but also it also has economic  
9 development implications, and also, over the  
10 long-run, would reduce direct tailpipe emissions,  
11 contributing to the environmental quality of the  
12 state. So, it's a more larger picture.

13 And, as the Company had demonstrated  
14 earlier, in regard to the rate impact of these  
15 initial investments, they would be spread over a  
16 large group of customers, and I believe it's  
17 540,000 customers, to the tune of perhaps a penny  
18 a month.

19 So, I think, if you were to ask your  
20 typical residential ratepayer, of course, that  
21 estimate is subject to check with the Company,  
22 but I believe that most residential ratepayers  
23 would not be too strapped to give up a penny a  
24 month.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           And, so, again we're looking at the big  
2 picture here, contributions to the economy of New  
3 Hampshire, and also another avenue for which  
4 residents of New Hampshire, as computers, also  
5 as, I guess, domestic tourists traveling in other  
6 parts of the state, this is another avenue of  
7 which that they can reduce their travel costs as  
8 well.

9           CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. If the  
10 Department of Energy would care to comment, that  
11 would be welcome as well?

12           WITNESS NIXON: Just to add one more  
13 thing.

14           I think that it -- I mean, as time goes  
15 on, and this was mentioned earlier, is that --  
16 well, I guess I want to add two things.

17           First, on the Settlement, on Page 10,  
18 in the middle, that middle paragraph, there's  
19 proposals of how that would be recovered. So,  
20 it's -- in some cases, there were options in the  
21 Settlement that we proposed. So, it wouldn't be  
22 all at once.

23           And, then, the second thing I wanted to  
24 add is that, was mentioned earlier, that, with

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 the stations, the kilowatt-hours will increase  
2 from all the customers, so that the load will be  
3 spread over more customers. So that, in the end  
4 -- eventually, the rates will actually go down  
5 because of the increased load.

6 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you,  
7 Ms. Nixon. Excellent.

8 Okay. Very good. So, I'll turn to my  
9 fellow Commissioners to see if there's any  
10 additional questions, before we move to redirect?

11 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Just one.

12 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Commissioner  
13 Chattopadhyay.

14 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Very quickly.

15 BY CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY:

16 Q So, all of this investment, is there an  
17 element -- is there a maintenance element that,  
18 you know, and who is -- which party is going to  
19 pay for it? Is it the customers?

20 And I'm talking about the electric  
21 vehicle, you know, businesses, charging  
22 businesses.

23 A (Boughan) So, the Company's proposal does not pay  
24 for any maintenance of anything on the customer

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 side. But I'd defer to Ms. Ohler about what the  
2 ongoing operating costs of the VW Fund does pay  
3 for.

4 MS. OHLER: Yes, I can address that.

5 The VW funds do not pay for ongoing  
6 maintenance, but the applicants, in their  
7 proposals, have demonstrated to us that those  
8 costs can and will be covered. So, that is part  
9 of their proposal, is to demonstrate how the  
10 units are going to be maintained.

11 BY CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY:

12 Q Has the Company explicitly stated this somewhere  
13 in the testimony?

14 A (Boughan) I'm sorry, explicitly stated that --

15 Q That the maintenance expenses that could happen,  
16 once the businesses are up and running, those  
17 costs will be only borne by them?

18 A (Boughan) I think we've explicitly stated what  
19 the funds will be for. But we haven't stated  
20 what they will not be for.

21 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Okay. Thank you.  
22 That's all.

23 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.

24 Let's move to redirect. Attorney

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Chiavara, would you like to begin or end?

2 MS. CHIAVARA: Why don't I just jump  
3 right in.

4 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Very good.

5 MS. CHIAVARA: Thank you, sir.

6 **REDIRECT EXAMINATION**

7 BY MS. CHIAVARA:

8 Q I'd like to start with Mr. Davis. Going back to  
9 direct examination of the CLF/CENH witness, a few  
10 times he referred to the Demand Charge  
11 Alternative as "applying to DCFC customers". Is  
12 that the only group that it applies to? Or, does  
13 the Settlement Agreement, and I'd like to maybe  
14 refer you to the Settlement Agreement, which is  
15 Exhibit 1, Bates Page 007, with the definition of  
16 "publicly accessible", meaning "charging  
17 equipment available without restriction", and  
18 then the other qualification that "the customer  
19 must qualify for Rate G [sic]."

20 So, would that create a broader  
21 category where it's not just the DCFC chargers  
22 that are eligible to take this rate?

23 A (Davis) Two things. Yes. Actually, it's "Rate  
24 GV" that's referred to. But, no, it's not

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 exclusively DC Fast Chargers. It has to fit the  
2 criteria here. So, for example, it could also  
3 include Level 2 chargers that are part of that  
4 same station.

5 Q So long as they qualify for -- otherwise quality  
6 for Rate GV?

7 A (Davis) For Rate GV, correct.

8 Q Okay. Thank you. The next question is for Mr.  
9 Boughan.

10 Mr. Boughan, why did you not drive your  
11 EV to New Hampshire today? Was it range anxiety  
12 over --

13 A (Boughan) Correct. I was concerned that I  
14 wouldn't be able to find a place to charge it up  
15 here.

16 Q And a quick follow-up there. Is there a  
17 difference in the number of Tesla proprietary  
18 stations versus universally publicly available  
19 charging stations?

20 A (Boughan) Generally, there are more Tesla  
21 stations than there are universal stations. I,  
22 myself, don't drive a Tesla. So, I would need a  
23 universal station.

24 Q Okay. Thank you very much. And bouncing back to

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Mr. Davis. Mr. Davis, I'm going to direct you  
2 back to the Settlement, at Bates Pages 007 and  
3 008, where it says this -- this is in regards to  
4 the duration of the initial offering of the rate  
5 being three years. And it says "existing public  
6 charging station customers would continue to be  
7 served under the initial DCA rate until the  
8 following [review and adjudicative] process has  
9 been completed."

10 Right now, in the sample tariff  
11 language that we provided in the Settlement, we  
12 have that rate initiation starting on, ideally  
13 and hopefully, on August 15th of this year. And,  
14 so, given the language in the Settlement  
15 Agreement, doesn't that just mean that enrollment  
16 ceases after three years, so that anybody already  
17 enrolled would continue to be served on the rate,  
18 until that rate was determined to be revised,  
19 continued as is, or discontinued as determined by  
20 the Commission, after input from stakeholders and  
21 the Company? To put it another way, so someone  
22 who enrolled in that final year of the three-year  
23 offering, wouldn't they continue on the rate  
24 until that rate was somehow modified or not

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 modified?

2 A (Davis) That's true. And we had an earlier set  
3 of questions, and I tried to inject the idea of  
4 the initial tariff. But, yes, there would be  
5 this three-year period of enrollment. Those  
6 customers could continue to remain on the rate,  
7 until that determination, one of those three  
8 criteria, and, if the rate's continued,  
9 enrollment perhaps could expand from there.

10 Q Okay. So, someone who enrolled in that, during  
11 that last year of the rate offering, it wouldn't  
12 cut off at the end of year?

13 A (Davis) That's correct.

14 Q Okay. Great. Thank you.

15 A (Davis) Yes.

16 Q And back to Mr. Boughan. Mr. Boughan,  
17 Commissioner Chattopadhyay gave -- asked a  
18 question about, "at a station with two DCFC  
19 chargers and a Level 2 charger, how many cars  
20 could charge at one time?" And you answered  
21 "three".

22 I have a slightly different question.  
23 At a station with two DCFC chargers and one Level  
24 2 charger, how many cars can a DCFC charger

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 service in eight hours, compared with a Level 2  
2 charger in the same eight hours?

3 A (Boughan) So, if a typical charging session lasts  
4 30 minutes, one DC Fast Charger would be able to  
5 serve 16 vehicles in that eight-hour period,  
6 while the Level 2 charger could serve 1.2.

7 Q Okay. And then, one more, I think one more, for  
8 Mr. Davis. Yes, one more for Mr. Davis.

9 Commissioner Chattopadhyay also  
10 referenced that, when referring to the bar graph  
11 on Exhibit 1, Bates Page 020, that the commercial  
12 time of use rate looked to be more advantageous  
13 starting at a 7 percent utilization rate, and  
14 then going up. I just wanted you to maybe expand  
15 and clarify a little bit. Is this likely to be  
16 the case for a public charging station customer  
17 or is there risk that this -- that the Commercial  
18 Time of Use rate may not appropriately serve this  
19 type of customer? And, if that is the case, if  
20 there's a risk of that, could you explain why?

21 A (Davis) Sure. Yes. Yes. The bar chart we were  
22 referencing had a particular set of assumptions.  
23 Public charging, in general, and that's really  
24 the focus of this rate, consider generally that

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           there would not be discretion. And the risk  
2           there could be that, while we, for example, in  
3           that example, had a certain percent of peak,  
4           off-peak, and mid-peak usage, very well could be  
5           the charging -- for public charging could be at a  
6           much higher rate, if, for example, it's during  
7           those peak hours. So, the alternative time of  
8           use rate could actually be a higher charge during  
9           that period. Of course, it could be lower as  
10          well. So, again, you have to recognize the  
11          assumptions.

12                         But the risk is there. That -- that  
13          bar chart just made -- maybe given that it's only  
14          one snapshot or one set of assumptions, that, in  
15          fact, public charging could likely occur during  
16          times where the costs could be higher, and that  
17          could reverse the order or the stack -- the stack  
18          of on the graph, and perhaps, especially  
19          depending on where you are in utilization level,  
20          you're looking at individual charging. So,  
21          individual customer's bills could very well be at  
22          risk of being, you know, experiencing a higher  
23          charge, than under the volumetric rate only.

24          Q         And, so, would it be accurate to say that the

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 public charging station customer, if they were on  
2 the Commercial TOU rate, couldn't really -- they  
3 couldn't, one, predict whether -- how much  
4 peak/off-peak usage there would be, and, two,  
5 wouldn't be able to do much in response to that?

6 A (Davis) Certainly, the latter. I think there  
7 would be very little you could do. But the  
8 prediction of it, yes, I think that would be  
9 difficult as well.

10 Q Okay.

11 A (Davis) Yes.

12 MS. CHIAVARA: That is all I have.  
13 Thank you very much.

14 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you.  
15 Mr. Vijaykar, did you have any redirect for your  
16 witness?

17 MR. VIJAYKAR: Thank you for asking,  
18 Commissioner. No, we have no redirect for our  
19 witness.

20 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Very good.  
21 And, Mr. Krakoff, did you have any redirect for  
22 your witness?

23 MR. KRAKOFF: I have no redirect.  
24 Thank you.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.  
2 Moving to Attorney Kreis, did you have any  
3 redirect for your witness?

4 MR. KREIS: I would like to ask my  
5 witness a couple of questions on redirect. If  
6 somebody could loan her a microphone, so that the  
7 court reporter could hear her adequately, that  
8 would be helpful.

9 Okay. Thank you.

10 BY MR. KREIS:

11 Q Ms. Reno, I have some follow-up questions for you  
12 that arise out of the colloquy you had with the  
13 Chairman a few minutes ago. You recall that  
14 colloquy, I assume?

15 A (Reno) Yes.

16 Q And you would agree with me that what the  
17 Chairman was asking you about was the extent to  
18 which the costs that ratepayers will bear,  
19 assuming approval of the Settlement Agreement,  
20 might be unfair to residential customers who are  
21 retired and/or low income?

22 A (Reno) Yes.

23 Q My first question is, in the course of your work  
24 at the OCA, do you keep abreast of trends in

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 transportation electrification and the deployment  
2 of electric vehicles?

3 A (Reno) Yes, I try to.

4 Q So, you have some notion of where the electric  
5 vehicle industry is likely to go in the future,  
6 in relation to the use of vehicles that are  
7 fueled by gasoline or diesel?

8 A (Reno) Yes.

9 Q So, given that knowledge, and given that some  
10 people actually retire at a fairly young age, for  
11 example, you know, here in New Hampshire, if you  
12 happen to be a state employee, you can start  
13 drawing on your retirement benefits at age 62.  
14 So, thinking about a person retiring this year,  
15 at age 62, how likely do you think it is that a  
16 person who is retired at that age will never own  
17 an electric vehicle?

18 A (Reno) Well, that's an interesting question, in  
19 that we're also experiencing some unprecedented  
20 inflation, in terms of gas prices. So, it's  
21 highly likely that a retired person, I guess,  
22 depending on their situation, may see an  
23 investment in electric vehicles as a way of  
24 stabilizing their transportation fuel costs.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Q So, would it be fair to say that you would not  
2 recommend to the Commission that it simply assume  
3 or even find that the state's retirees are  
4 unlikely ever to own or use an electric vehicle?

5 A (Reno) Yes.

6 Q Okay. Let's talk a little bit about low-income  
7 customers. What's your opinion about the future  
8 of reliance on electric vehicles for people who  
9 are low income? First of all, will you agree  
10 with me that, at least at present, given what we  
11 know about the cost of owning an electric  
12 vehicle, that probably is out of reach for most  
13 low-income people right now, yes?

14 A (Reno) At this point, I would say yes. But what  
15 we're starting -- what I'm starting to notice in  
16 the trade press is a lot of manufacturers are  
17 stepping up to provide more affordable electric  
18 vehicles, pairing that with federal tax breaks  
19 that are available for some manufactured models,  
20 not necessarily Tesla anymore, because they have  
21 met the maximum a few years ago. But some of the  
22 other manufacturers have been producing more  
23 affordable vehicles. So, I would see that as a  
24 trend that's imminent. And middle class, lower

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 class customers are able to -- could be able  
2 to -- would be able to afford that.

3 But, for -- I guess it also depends on  
4 your living situation. If you own your own  
5 house, that's one thing, where you can install a  
6 charger. That's always an option available.  
7 But, for a lot of folks who -- whether they're  
8 low income or they choose to live in condos or  
9 apartments, they might not have access to  
10 charging facilities, thus access to public  
11 charging is crucial to part of this decision.

12 And now I'm losing my thought on what  
13 your initial question was.

14 Q Thank you. You are aware, are you not, that the  
15 Settlement Agreement that the OCA has signed, and  
16 is pending for the Commission to approve here in  
17 this docket, also bears signatures from  
18 representatives of the Department of Energy and  
19 the Department of Environmental Services, are you  
20 not?

21 A (Reno) Yes.

22 Q And I guess I would ask you to express an opinion  
23 about whether you think that the support of those  
24 two agencies, one of which has policy expertise

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 in the field of energy, and the other of which  
2 has policy expertise in the field of  
3 environmental issues, does their support for the  
4 Settlement Agreement increase or decrease your  
5 degree of confidence that the terms of the  
6 Settlement Agreement, in the long run, are in the  
7 best interests of residential utility customers  
8 as a group?

9 A (Reno) Yes. Having both of those parties onboard  
10 in the settlement discussion was crucial.  
11 Particularly with the Department of Energy  
12 setting parameters around this pilot-like  
13 program, the three-year limit is really crucial,  
14 in terms of keeping the costs of this program in  
15 check, and allowing for a review period after  
16 three years, in which adjustments can be made to  
17 this program, if necessary.

18 Q Okay. I think I just have two more questions.  
19 My first question is, would you agree with me,  
20 that, because the Commission does not, and the  
21 utilities do not, set individual rates for each  
22 customer that are intended to align the costs  
23 that each individual customer imposes on the  
24 electricity grid, that there is, in some sense,

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 always the phenomenon of every customer  
2 cross-subsidizing every other customer. Will you  
3 agree with that proposition?

4 A (Reno) Yes.

5 Q So, therefore, is it fair to say that, to the  
6 extent there is what could be called  
7 "cross-subsidization" occurring, assuming  
8 Commission approval of the Settlement Agreement,  
9 that mere fact does not itself warrant, from the  
10 standpoint of residential utility customers, the  
11 Commission's rejection of the Settlement  
12 Agreement?

13 A (Reno) Your statement is correct.

14 MR. KREIS: Thank you. Those are all  
15 the questions I have for Ms. Reno.

16 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: You were dangerously  
17 close to a double negative. Thank you.

18 We'll turn to Attorney Wiesner, and do  
19 you have any redirect for your witnesses?

20 MR. WIESNER: I'll just ask Ms. Nixon a  
21 couple, clarifying questions, I believe.

22 BY MR. WIESNER:

23 Q So, you were asked some questions about potential  
24 other sources of funding for EV make-ready,

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 state, federal, perhaps other sources. To the  
2 best of your knowledge, is it likely that any  
3 such other sources of funding for EV make-ready  
4 would be available within the time period that's  
5 most relevant here, let's say the next six  
6 months, with respect to the public charging  
7 stations that we understand will be selected by  
8 the DES for funding through the VW Mitigation  
9 Fund?

10 A (Nixon) To the best of my knowledge, no, because,  
11 even the -- the funding that I'm aware of is the  
12 federal funding, and that won't be available  
13 within that timeframe.

14 Q And also, are you aware that any other regulated  
15 electric utility in this state has an approved  
16 program or a pending proposal to provide  
17 ratepayer-funded EV make-ready to support the  
18 public charging stations that will be selected  
19 through the DES VW Program?

20 A (Nixon) No. The only other one that I was aware  
21 of was Unitil, but that was not approved.

22 MR. WIESNER: Thank you. No further  
23 questions.

24 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1           So, now, kind of a procedural matter, first, what  
2           I'd like to do is just mention again that the  
3           Commission plans to continue this hearing and  
4           have a short hearing, I think a half day is  
5           plenty sufficient, in a few weeks, after we have  
6           a chance particularly to digest the information  
7           that's been request from DES. And, so, that's  
8           kind of the plan moving forward.

9                        So, what I'd like to do at this point  
10           is read into the record the record requests that  
11           we have, so that that's documented, and to make  
12           sure that everyone is aligned. So, I show three  
13           record requests.

14                       And one is to provide the -- for DES to  
15           provide the RFP for EV charging as funded by the  
16           VW Settlement Trust.

17                       Excuse me.

18                               *[Chairman Goldner and Commissioner*  
19                               *Simpson conferring.]*

20                       CMSR. SIMPSON: I think I asked that of  
21           the Company. But I would encourage the Company  
22           to coordinate with the DES when they provide a  
23           response.

24                       CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Very good.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 Is that acceptable?

2 MS. CHIAVARA: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Okay, thank  
4 you.

5 Second was to provide a detailed cost  
6 estimate for the front of the meter and behind  
7 the meter work, totaling approximately 410K per  
8 implementation or per site, as described on Bates  
9 Page 015, in Exhibit 2.

10 And, then, finally, was Commissioner  
11 Chattopadhyay's question relative to the proposed  
12 rate design and the utilization of 5 percent, as  
13 oppose to 10 percent, at 125 kilowatts, and to  
14 calculate the associated subsidy.

15 Is that correct, Commissioner  
16 Chattopadhyay?

17 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Yes. I think you  
18 may have said "125 kilowatts", but I think it was  
19 "120", right?

20 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Is it 120? Did I  
21 have it wrong?

22 *(Witness Davis indicating in the*  
23 *affirmative.)*

24 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Sorry. Sorry

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 about that. One twenty (120).

2 So. That's what I have for record  
3 requests. And is there anything else that we  
4 need to cover today?

5 Just a moment please.

6 *[Chairman Goldner and Commissioner*  
7 *Simpson conferring.]*

8 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Yes. Thank you.  
9 The timing on the record requests, is a week  
10 sufficient or do the parties need more time?

11 MS. CHIAVARA: A week is fine with the  
12 Company.

13 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: A week is fine.  
14 DES? Is DES okay?

15 *(Ms. Ohler indicating in the*  
16 *affirmative.)*

17 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.  
18 So, we'll just make that a week from  
19 today, so, 07/21. Thank you. And that will  
20 enable us to schedule the final hearing in a  
21 relatively quick timeframe.

22 Okay. Is there anything else that we  
23 need to cover today, before we adjourn?

24 MR. KREIS: Yes, there is.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 I would like to say, on behalf of the  
2 Office of the Consumer Advocate that the request  
3 that is pending before you today, which is not  
4 opposed by any party, at least not to my  
5 knowledge, is that you approve the Settlement  
6 Agreement that has been presented in this docket,  
7 and talked about at length today.

8 And should the Commission make that  
9 decision, I am indifferent to how you do that and  
10 what you say in support of that.

11 But, in the event you decide not to  
12 object -- or, not to approve, excuse me, the  
13 Settlement Agreement, and all of its terms, I  
14 would like to make sure that the Commission is  
15 aware that Paragraph I of RSA 541-A, Section 33,  
16 which is the relevant provision of the  
17 Administrative Procedure Act, says, and I quote,  
18 "All testimony of parties and witnesses shall be  
19 made under oath or affirmation administered by  
20 the presiding officer."

21 Now, everybody in this room is aware  
22 that we've heard a lot of testimony today that  
23 was not provided under oath. And I think, as the  
24 Chairman pointed out, I'm even guilty of having

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 provided a little bit. And I would urge the  
2 Commission not to make any factual findings based  
3 on any testimony that you from me here today, and  
4 I doubt you're likely to do that.

5 But, as to other people who have  
6 testified, although not under oath, I do not  
7 think that it would be consistent with the  
8 Administrative Procedure Act to rely on that  
9 testimony to make findings that are adverse to  
10 approval of the Settlement Agreement.

11 And I don't want to make anybody think  
12 that -- well, let me avoid the double negative.  
13 The Office of the Consumer Advocate reserves  
14 every right that it has in that respect.

15 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.  
16 Any other comments from the parties?

17 MS. CHIAVARA: I guess I have a  
18 question for the Chair for clarification. You  
19 referred to another "half day hearing". I am  
20 sure you're aware that, in the Settlement  
21 Agreement, the parties requested a decision by  
22 August 15th. This is because the train's left  
23 the station with the DES funding, and they have a  
24 construction schedule that they want to stay on.

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 And we are trying to align as best we can with  
2 that, so all these pieces come together.

3 So, I guess this is -- the hearing is  
4 to digest what's been presented at this hearing  
5 and ask further questions?

6 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: And to digest the  
7 record requests. Yes. And to just enable us to  
8 follow up and keep the record open. It might be  
9 very short. We might not need it at all.

10 But we are -- I think the deadline that  
11 you're referring to, the mid-August deadline, I  
12 don't see a problem with that.

13 MS. CHIAVARA: Okay. Great.  
14 Fantastic. Thank you. That was my question.

15 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Yes.

16 MS. CHIAVARA: And, if I may, since all  
17 three of the Company witnesses drove from  
18 Connecticut, perhaps I can just mention that I  
19 will be filing a Request for Remote Participation  
20 for those guys.

21 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Sure. Yes. And,  
22 like I said, it might be -- it will probably be  
23 quite pared-down. We just want to have the  
24 opportunity to ask some additional follow-up

[SETTLEMENT PANEL: Witnesses as noted on Page 3]

1 questions, in case there are any.

2 MS. CHIAVARA: Sure. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. Okay.

4 If there is nothing else, we'll continue this  
5 hearing. We will issue either an order or a  
6 procedural order with a new date and the record  
7 requests shortly.

8 And we are adjourned. Thank you.

9 ***(Whereupon the hearing was adjourned***  
10 ***at 2:22 p.m., and the hearing to resume***  
11 ***at the call of the Public Utilities***  
12 ***Commission.)***

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24