

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. Community Power Coalition of
New Hampshire:**

Clifton Below
Deana Dennis

Reptg. Clean Energy New Hampshire:

Christopher Skoglund
Sam Evans Brown

Reptg. Standard Power of America:

Robert Hayden

Reptg. the Conservation Law Foundation:

Nicholas Krakoff, Esq.

Reptg. Residential Ratepayers:

Donald M. Kreis, Esq., Consumer Advocate
Office of Consumer Advocate

Reptg. New Hampshire Dept. of Energy:

Paul B. Dexter, Esq.
Alexandra K. Ladwig, Esq.
(Regulatory Support Division)

I N D E X

		PAGE NO.
1		
2		
3		
4	SUMMARY OF THE DOCKET BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER	4
5	STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER RE: SCOPE	5
6	PROCEDURAL HISTORY BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER	6
7	OPENING STATEMENTS BY:	
8	Mr. Dexter	10, 15
9	Mr. Sheehan	12
10	Mr. Kreis	19
11	Mr. Skoglund	21
12	Mr. Below	22
13	Mr. Krakoff	23
14	Ms. Mineau	24
15	Mr. Hayden	25
16	INITIAL QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER	11, 18, 26
17	QUESTION BY CMSR. SIMPSON	27
18	QUESTIONS BY CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY	31
19	QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER	38
20	FINAL STATEMENTS BY:	
21	Mr. Aalto	81
22	Ms. Chiavara	82
23	Mr. Kreis	82
24	Mr. Evans Brown	83
25	Mr. Krakoff	83
26	STATEMENTS ON REMOTE PARTICIPATION REQUESTS:	
27	Ms. Chiavara	84
28	Mr. Evans Brown	85
29	STATEMENTS ON HEARING DATES:	
30	Mr. Dexter	86, 88
31	Chairman Goldner	87, 88, 89
32	Ms. Chiavara	89

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 today by
4 Commissioner Simpson and Commissioner
5 Chattopadhyay.

6 We're here today for a prehearing
7 conference in Docket Number DE 22-060, pursuant
8 to the Notice of Adjudicative Proceeding issued
9 on September 20th, 2022. The Commission convened
10 this docket to consider whether any changes to
11 the net metering tariff are warranted, in
12 response to the DOE's Value of Distributed Energy
13 Resources Study, or VDER, which the Department
14 filed on October 31st, 2022, and which it has
15 supplemented twice since.

16 The purpose of this docket is
17 consistent with Order Number 26,029, in Docket
18 Number 16-576, in which the Commission last
19 approved changes to the net metering tariff, and
20 stated it would consider revising the tariff
21 after receiving the VDER Study, and RSA 362-A:9,
22 VIII, which directed the Commission to open an
23 adjudicative docket to consider changes to the
24 net metering tariff after the DOE completed the

1 VDER Study.

2 At the outset, I would like to outline
3 the Commission's understanding of the scope of
4 this proceeding. As the Commission understands,
5 there are currently three categories of net
6 metering participants: Installations under 100
7 kilowatts; installations between 100 kilowatts
8 and 1 megawatt; and installations greater than
9 1 megawatt.

10 With respect to the first two
11 categories, there are currently tariffs in place,
12 and the question before the Commission is whether
13 to make any changes to those existing tariffs.
14 With respect to installations greater than 1
15 megawatt, there are currently no tariffs in
16 place, and the Commission is tasked with
17 implementing a new tariff.

18 I would appreciate it if the parties
19 could, in their opening remarks, comment on
20 whether this understanding comports with their
21 own.

22 Prior to taking appearances and opening
23 statements, I want to briefly review the
24 procedural history of this docket and the reason

1 the Commission has scheduled this prehearing
2 conference.

3 The Commission received testimony from
4 the parties in December 2023, and rebuttal
5 testimony in January 2024. Pursuant to the then
6 operative procedural schedule, there was a
7 hearing scheduled for March 12th, 2024. However,
8 on February 29th, 2004, the parties to this
9 docket filed a letter requesting the Commission
10 (1) cancel the March hearing to allow more time
11 for the parties to reach a settlement; and (2)
12 schedule a three-day hearing to review the
13 parties' then pending settlement.

14 In response, the Commission scheduled
15 this prehearing conference to gain a better
16 understanding of what the parties intend to ask
17 the Commission to approve, the information they
18 intend to present, and how the parties intend to
19 present that information.

20 The Commission has reviewed the DOE's
21 VDER Study and the parties' testimony with
22 recommendations as to how the Commission should
23 proceed. However, the Commission notes that it
24 has an independent obligation to ensure that all

1 rates charged are just and reasonable. To that
2 end, the Commission would like to highlight
3 certain data points it would like the parties to
4 consider when preparing testimony for the
5 hearings in this docket. The Commission will do
6 so after taking appearances and listening to the
7 parties' opening statements.

8 Finally, the Commission acknowledges
9 that the parties submitted a letter referencing
10 numerous dates on which they're available to hold
11 hearings. However, prior to scheduling hearings,
12 the Commission wants to get a better
13 understanding of the scope of the parties'
14 requests and evidence, and thus the Commission
15 does not address that letter just yet. In
16 addition, given the Commission's calendar,
17 hearings are likely to be in late July or early
18 August.

19 Okay. Let's take appearances, starting
20 with the New Hampshire Department of Energy.

21 MR. DEXTER: Good morning, Mr.
22 Chairman, Commissioners. Paul Dexter and
23 Alexandra Ladwig, appearing on behalf of the
24 Department of Energy.

1 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you.

2 Eversource?

3 MS. CHIAVARA: Good morning,
4 Commission. Jessica Chiavara, on behalf of
5 Public Service Company of New Hampshire, doing
6 business as Eversource Energy.

7 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Very good. Liberty?

8 MR. SHEEHAN: Good morning,
9 Commissioners. Mike Sheehan, for Liberty
10 Utilities (Granite State Electric) Corp.

11 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. Unitil
12 Energy Systems?

13 MR. TAYLOR: Good morning,
14 Commissioners. Patrick Taylor, on behalf of
15 Unitil Energy Systems, Inc.

16 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. The
17 Office of the Consumer Advocate?

18 MR. KREIS: Good morning. I'm Donald
19 Kreis, the Consumer Advocate, here on behalf of
20 residential utility customers.

21 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. Clean
22 Energy New Hampshire?

23 MR. SKOGLUND: Good morning,
24 Commissioners. Chris Skoglund and Sam Evans

1 Brown, on behalf of Clean Energy New Hampshire.

2 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: The Colonial Power
3 Group?

4 *[No verbal response.]*

5 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: The Community Power
6 Coalition of New Hampshire?

7 MR. BELOW: Good morning,
8 Commissioners. Clifton Below and Deana Dennis,
9 on behalf of Community Power Coalition.

10 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. The
11 Conservation Law Foundation?

12 MR. KRAKOFF: Good morning,
13 Commissioners. I'm Nick Krakoff, on behalf of
14 the Conservation Law Foundation.

15 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: The Consumer Energy
16 Alliance?

17 *[No verbal response.]*

18 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Granite State
19 Hydropower Association?

20 MS. MINEAU: Good morning,
21 Commissioners. I'm Madeleine Mineau, on behalf
22 of Granite State Hydropower Association.

23 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. IBEW
24 Local 490?

1 *[No verbal response.]*

2 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Standard Power of
3 America?

4 MR. HAYDEN: Good morning. Bob Hayden.

5 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. Walmart,
6 Incorporated?

7 *[No verbal response.]*

8 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. And did I
9 miss anyone?

10 *[No indication given.]*

11 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Seeing none.
12 Okay. Thank you.

13 Before moving to opening statements,
14 are there any other matters for the Commission to
15 address today?

16 *[No verbal response.]*

17 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Again, seeing
18 none.

19 Let's move to opening statements,
20 beginning with the New Hampshire Department of
21 Energy.

22 MR. DEXTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

23 The last communications to the
24 Commission indicated that a settlement was in the

1 making, and that was communicated by the
2 utilities. Since that communication, the
3 Department of Energy came to the conclusion that
4 it wouldn't be joining the settlement that was
5 being worked on, and, therefore, we stopped
6 attending the settlement conferences. We've been
7 updated by the utilities as to where those stand
8 now.

9 But, if it please the Commission, I
10 would recommend that the utilities go first this
11 morning, as far as where this case is. And,
12 then, the Department would be happy to offer
13 where it believes it will fit into the hearings.

14 I think that would make for a more
15 logical presentation this morning.

16 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. And is the
17 Department comfortable sharing where it disagrees
18 with the utilities' current position?

19 MR. DEXTER: No, because we haven't
20 seen the settlement document yet. That's kind of
21 one of the reasons that I recommended that they
22 describe where they are first. We have an idea
23 what the settlement might look like, based on
24 where we were -- where we were when we stopped

1 attending the talks. But we have not been
2 presented with a term sheet or a settlement
3 document yet.

4 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: I see. Okay.
5 Attorney Chiavara, would you be comfortable going
6 first?

7 MS. CHIAVARA: Actually, Attorney
8 Sheehan is going to be speaking for the group
9 today.

10 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay.

11 MR. SHEEHAN: Even though I'm hiding in
12 the back.

13 Pretty much this whole room had a
14 conversation the other day about how to approach
15 today's hearing. So, I will outline what I think
16 is a general agreement, as far as process goes.
17 And, of course, folks can chime in.

18 All parties, but two, have reached a
19 handshake agreement. There is no signed
20 document, we're working on that. All but the DOE
21 and the Community Power Coalition. So, assuming
22 that follows through, and that the handshake
23 becomes a final, signed agreement, the process
24 that we see is a hearing where day one would be

1 the Settling Parties present a panel of witnesses
2 to support the settlement agreement. And,
3 unlikely to finish day one, because likely DOE
4 and Coalition would want to present their
5 testimony. So, we kind of see a two-day hearing,
6 day one with the settlement panel, day two with
7 the two parties that did not join the settlement.

8 Again, this is all subject to change.
9 But I think the parties are comfortable that
10 that's the most likely place we'll be in come a
11 hearing.

12 The next step there would be to file a
13 settlement, to finish it and file it. So, it
14 would be helpful to get a deadline for that to
15 hold our feet to the fire to finish.

16 We had proposed hearing dates, the
17 first being the middle of May, and I just heard
18 the Chairman say "that won't happen". But I was
19 thinking that there would be a separate date,
20 some reasonable time before that first hearing
21 date. And, if the May date is still held, maybe
22 by the first of May or something like that, and
23 that will be the target for the settlement. If
24 the dates are later, the Commission can still set

1 a date for a settlement to help us wrap things
2 up.

3 So, I think that was really the gist of
4 what we talked about the other day, as far as
5 process.

6 Now, on the merits, it's going to be
7 difficult to talk, because we haven't finished
8 things, and there's been a lot of back-and-forth
9 and give-and-take. And, as Mr. Dexter said, it's
10 awkward or perhaps impermissible for us to
11 disclose where things stand or not. Other than,
12 again, there's a handshake among most of the
13 parties, and two have a couple points that they
14 can't sign on to.

15 So, that's where we are.

16 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.

17 I don't know if that helped your
18 opening, Mr. Dexter, or not, but if you'd like to
19 go next.

20 I think the utilities, that covers all
21 the utilities, correct?

22 *[Atty. Chiavara indicating in the*
23 *affirmative.]*

24 MR. TAYLOR: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Attorney
2 Dexter.

3 MR. DEXTER: Yes. And, so, what we
4 would expect to do at the hearing, as Attorney
5 Sheehan indicated, would be to present, on behalf
6 of the Department of Energy, the testimony that
7 we submitted back in December, and have our
8 witnesses testify to the positions we took in
9 that.

10 In addition to that, once we have
11 gotten the settlement, we would expect that our
12 witnesses at the hearing would indicate any areas
13 of agreement that are contained in the
14 settlement, and the areas of disagreement. So,
15 it could be that, when the settlement comes out,
16 that our panel presents its original testimony
17 and finds that, you know, two-thirds of it is
18 consistent with the settlement, in which case we
19 would let the Department [sic] know that at the
20 hearing.

21 So, I don't think we will have a lot of
22 hearing time needed for the Department's
23 witnesses. Our testimony was fairly short and
24 fairly straightforward. Of course, I can't

1 predict cross-examination by any of the parties.
2 And, again, I don't know what the settlement
3 looks like, but my sense is that we wouldn't need
4 an awful lot of time to cross-examine whatever
5 witness panel the utilities and the Settling
6 Parties come up with. Again, I haven't seen the
7 document yet, but I think a couple of hours
8 allotted to the Department at the hearings when
9 they take place would be sufficient.

10 Our secondary role in this process has
11 been facilitating the presentation of the
12 materials coming from Dunsky Associates. And
13 that, as you indicated, has consisted of the
14 Study that was filed back in October, as well as
15 an addendum, as well as initial testimony and
16 rebuttal testimony.

17 And we -- again, this isn't the
18 Department's testimony, but we have been acting
19 as facilitators. The scope of the Study was
20 decided on by a stakeholder group back in the
21 prior docket, and the scope was approved by the
22 Commission, but we have been acting as
23 facilitators for this information.

24 We have always expected that, when the

1 hearings took place, that the two witnesses from
2 Dunsky would appear before the Commission.

3 Mostly, we believe to ask questions from the
4 Bench, because the parties to the case have had
5 ample opportunity, through discovery and
6 technical sessions, to, you know, to question
7 Dunsky Associates. So, we would see it largely
8 as an opportunity for the Bench to ask questions.

9 And we would be renewing our request
10 that we made earlier this year that Dunsky be
11 allowed to appear remotely, once that hearing
12 date is set. I don't believe that request was
13 acted on, because the hearings were rescheduled.
14 But we will be renewing that request, because
15 they work out of Toronto, and it would be more
16 efficient for them to appear remotely.

17 That said, if we were to learn sometime
18 prior to the hearing that neither the Commission,
19 nor the utilities or the Settling Parties, have
20 any questions for Dunsky, maybe we could go about
21 handling their materials differently. But, as I
22 said, our plan all along has been for them to
23 appear. So that, if the Commission has questions
24 about the study or their testimony, they could

1 ask it live.

2 We are nearing the end of the budget
3 that's been put aside in the contract, and we're
4 actually going to have to extend the time,
5 particularly if we go into July or August, I
6 think, actually, even going into June, we were
7 going to have to negotiate a time extension in
8 their contract, which we will take care of. But
9 there is time in the budget for them to attend a
10 robust hearing, but we are drawing near to the
11 end of the budget as far as that goes.

12 So, procedurally, I think that's where
13 the Department stands in this case. As I said,
14 substantively, we'll wait to comment on the
15 settlement when it comes in.

16 As far as what the Commission laid out,
17 in terms of the three groups of net metering
18 customers, I believe that's accurate, and we
19 don't have anything to add to that demarcation.

20 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. And the
21 utilities also agree with those three categories
22 that I highlighted in the opening?

23 *[Atty. Sheehan indicating in the*
24 *affirmative.]*

1 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Mr. Sheehan, if you
2 could go the record?

3 MR. SHEEHAN: My understanding is
4 that's correct, yes.

5 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.
6 Thank you.

7 Okay. Yes, I would say, Mr. Dexter,
8 and I think this prehearing conference, I hope
9 you find it to be constructive today, because the
10 Commission I think has some questions that we'd
11 like to get out there in preparation for the
12 hearings. And it will hopefully give some scope
13 to what we're looking for and the amount of time
14 you may or may not need from Dunsky, so -- and I
15 know you have to go through the G&C process to
16 get additional dollars. And, so, hopefully, this
17 prehearing conference will be helpful in that
18 exercise.

19 Okay. Great. I think that we can
20 continue with the opening statements, with the
21 Office of the Consumer Advocate.

22 MR. KREIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23 And good morning again.

24 On the merits, given the posture that

1 we're in today, it's very difficult for me to say
2 anything other than the OCA continues to support
3 the positions it took in its prefiled direct
4 testimony, and hopes that those positions are
5 ultimately vindicated in this proceeding.

6 I will say that we've been
7 participating in the settlement negotiations, and
8 they have been constructive and useful. And I
9 would like to thank all the parties for their
10 thoughtful participation.

11 I do feel queasy about the prospect of
12 coming into the hearing room at some point with
13 everybody, except the Department of Energy,
14 making a set of recommendations to the
15 Commission. Believe it or not, it gives the OCA
16 no pleasure ever to disagree with the Department
17 of Energy about anything. We vastly prefer to
18 align our position with theirs, when it is
19 feasible and possible for us to do so.

20 So, I'm tempted to suggest that the
21 Commission appoint some kind of settlement judge,
22 and try to browbeat all the parties into coming
23 to a united and comprehensive settlement
24 agreement, because that would be a better and

1 more orderly way of presenting things to you at
2 hearing.

3 Your question was "do we agree with the
4 three different flavors of net metering customers
5 that you laid out at the beginning of the
6 hearing?" And the answer is that the OCA does
7 agree with that.

8 And I think that's all I really have to
9 say at this point.

10 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Because, in
11 the end, I think, it's just a -- in the end, for
12 the Commission, it's a question of what is the
13 correct tariff for those three categories. And,
14 so, there's a lot of effort, a lot of energy, a
15 lot of ideas, and I know it's complicated to get
16 to the answer. But, in the end, that's, I think,
17 just why we're here, is those three categories,
18 three tariffs, and then we move onto the next
19 docket.

20 Okay. Great. Thank you, Attorney
21 Kreis.

22 Let's move now to Clean Energy New
23 Hampshire.

24 MR. SKOGLUND: Thank you, Chair

1 Goldner, and Commissioners.

2 I think we would just generally agree
3 with what we've heard today, in terms of the --
4 it's hard to talk about many of this stuff, given
5 where we're at.

6 We would also agree with Consumer
7 Advocate Kreis, that the Commission is looking at
8 the three flavors of net energy metering.

9 And we look forward to participating in
10 the dockets that come up.

11 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you
12 very much.

13 Let's move now to the Community Power
14 Coalition of New Hampshire.

15 MR. BELOW: Thank you, Chairman
16 Goldner.

17 The Coalition did actively participate
18 in settlement discussions up until a couple of
19 weeks ago, when it became apparent that we had
20 some fundamental differences that we would expect
21 to present at the hearing.

22 There may be aspects of the settlement
23 that we can support, and, you know, we would do
24 that at hearing.

1 We agree that there are these three
2 current categories. I'm not sure any party has
3 proposed any changes to that in their testimony.

4 And we agree with your general
5 description of the scope, and just note that
6 there's a number of issues and questions that RSA
7 362-A:9 direct the Commission to consider in
8 updating tariffs. And those are some of the
9 things we addressed in our prefiled testimony.

10 So, in terms of time, because of the
11 substantive nature of some of the disagreements,
12 from our point of view, and just reflecting on
13 what happened seven or eight years ago in the
14 hearing on net metering, I would suggest that on
15 the, you know, order of up to half a day for our
16 testimony, cross-examination, redirect, would be
17 appropriate to set aside, or plan on.

18 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: All right. Thank
19 you, Mr. Below.

20 Let's move now to the Conservation Law
21 Foundation.

22 MR. KRAKOFF: Yes. Thank you
23 Commissioners.

24 Yes, I largely agree with what most of

1 the parties have said. CLF has been engaged in
2 the settlement discussions, I think they have
3 been pretty productive so far, definitely
4 interested in the settlement. But, you know,
5 it's hard to say anything in particular about
6 that given where we are, and that there's no
7 draft of the agreement yet.

8 With respect to the scope of this
9 document *[sic]*, I agree that's the three
10 categories, the three tariffs. As well as what's
11 stated in the Order of Notice on the scope there,
12 and that we should, you know, stick to what's
13 there, and not address issues outside of that
14 scope that might be raised by other parties.

15 And, then, yes, I think this matter is
16 ripe for a hearing.

17 Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you, Attorney
19 Krakoff.

20 Let's move now to Granite State
21 Hydropower.

22 MS. MINEAU: Thank you, Commissioner.

23 I just want to make one comment on your
24 statement regarding the scope of this docket.

1 You stated that "there is currently no tariff for
2 the greater than 1 megawatt customer-generators."
3 That's correct. I do just want to clarify,
4 though, that the enacting legislation did make
5 the same tariff that's currently available for
6 the 100 kilowatt to 1 megawatt
7 customer-generators available for the municipal
8 hosts.

9 We, GSHA, have many projects that have
10 been participating as municipal hosts under that
11 tariff for almost two years now. And it's our
12 understanding that this docket would set a tariff
13 for municipal hosts going forward, and that the
14 projects already participating under the existing
15 tariff would remain at that tariff.

16 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.

17 And, then, finally, the Standard Power
18 of America.

19 MR. HAYDEN: Good morning. And thank
20 you.

21 Standard Power participates in all
22 three versions of net metering. So, we're in
23 agreement that those are what exist.

24 In addition, we have various

1 applications of each. So, we have a lot of
2 history there.

3 We are consistent with the general
4 settlement agreement, and look forward to where
5 we get. And Don's point about having a joint
6 settlement is very strong. I hope we can get to
7 that point.

8 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Just one
9 final question, before I turn to Commissioner
10 questions.

11 So, I guess the part where I'm
12 confused, and I'll address my question to
13 Attorney Sheehan, is in, as I said in the
14 opening, we haven't received any testimony or any
15 information at least that we -- at least that
16 I've seen that indicates anything other than
17 "continue with the current tariffs". So, it's
18 sort of, can you give us any insight on what the
19 dispute is? If there's -- if everyone -- the
20 testimony we've seen all looks very similar.
21 So, --

22 MR. SHEEHAN: I think there are a lot
23 of -- there's certainly an agreement amongst all
24 parties to continue with net metering. But there

1 has been a lot of tweaks here and there,
2 grandfathering, how long should the
3 grandfathering be?

4 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: I see.

5 MR. SHEEHAN: And, once you start going
6 down those important rabbit holes, there's a lot
7 of detail, a lot of opinions, and that's what
8 we've been working through. So, --

9 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. That's
10 helpful. Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you.
11 That's very helpful.

12 Okay. Thank you very much for the
13 opening statements. I believe I covered
14 everyone.

15 So, at this point, we'll turn to
16 Commissioner questions, beginning with
17 Commissioner Simpson.

18 CMSR. SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr.
19 Chairman.

20 Just have one question, in follow-up to
21 the suggestion that the Consumer Advocate made,
22 with respect to the appointment of a adjudicator
23 for settlement purposes. This is novel, at least
24 in my experience. So, I was hoping you may

1 enlighten us as to what you envisioned?

2 MR. KREIS: I was afraid you would ask
3 me that.

4 I agree that it's novel. And, of
5 course, you know that FERC does that all the
6 time, to useful ends.

7 One of the -- I was around for the last
8 net metering docket. And, in that docket, of
9 course, there was no Department of Energy, there
10 was only the PUC and there was its Staff. And
11 the Director of the Commission's Electric
12 Division at that time really did his best, I
13 thought at the time, to try to sort of marshal
14 everybody together.

15 Because the way that docket came
16 together, as you, I'm sure, recall, is there were
17 actually two rival settlement agreements, and it
18 just didn't prove to be possible to bridge the
19 gap between those two agreements. I've always
20 regretted that, and thought that a more muscular
21 effort to cause a settlement in that docket might
22 have led to a single settlement agreement being
23 presented to the Commission.

24 At the end of that docket, the

1 Commission essentially cut the baby in half and
2 found a middle ground between the two
3 settlements. And, since I like settlements, I
4 thought it would have been better if the parties
5 had been able to do that themselves. And I guess
6 I have a somewhat similar reaction here.

7 Is there a section in your procedural
8 rules that I can cite to that says "Yes, there is
9 a mechanism for doing that." As you know, there
10 is no such provision in the procedural rules. It
11 would be great if there was one. But, just
12 because there isn't specific authorization in the
13 rules doesn't mean that the Commission could not,
14 say, appoint one of its attorneys, to see if it
15 could -- to see if that person could crack the
16 whip and get all the parties together to agree on
17 something.

18 But I think it depends on whether
19 that's something that the Commission itself has
20 the appetite for. You may or may not, depending
21 on how you perceive your management of your
22 docket.

23 I hope that was somewhat helpful in
24 response.

1 CMSR. SIMPSON: That is. Thank you.

2 MR. DEXTER: And, Commissioner Simpson,
3 could I respond please?

4 CMSR. SIMPSON: Please.

5 MR. DEXTER: Because the Consumer
6 Advocate's suggestion of "a settlement judge to
7 browbeat the parties" was prefaced by a reference
8 to the Department of Energy.

9 And I want to assure the Commission
10 that the Department of Energy negotiated in the
11 settlement discussions in good faith. And, when
12 it became clear that there was terms that we
13 would not agree with, we bowed out. We did that
14 to further the process, not to clog the process
15 up or slow it down.

16 If there was area for agreement, we
17 would have reached it. We don't need a judge to
18 browbeat us to do that. We, too, prefer
19 settlements in many instances, and we'll pursue
20 them when it's fruitful. And it became apparent
21 in this instance that it wasn't going to result
22 in an agreement. So, we stepped aside to let the
23 other parties go forward.

24 I just wanted to put that on the

1 record.

2 MR. KREIS: I would say I agree with
3 that characterization. And I didn't mean to
4 imply that I had any criticism of the way the
5 Department of Energy has conducted itself in this
6 docket. Mr. Dexter has accurately described the
7 nature of his team's participation.

8 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. Very good.
9 Thank you. I don't have any further questions.

10 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: We'll turn now to
11 Commissioner Chattopadhyay.

12 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Good morning. I
13 know this is a prehearing conference. So, I will
14 try to be sort of -- I have some questions that
15 are broad in nature, and simply meant for me to
16 later process the information better. So, if
17 anyone is willing to answer these questions would
18 be helpful.

19 Are there any party here that are aware
20 of states having factored in the -- not
21 necessarily -- let me put it differently.

22 So, any attempt by other states to
23 implement the rates locationally? So, meaning,
24 for example, in New Hampshire, different regions

1 may have different distribution needs. So, are
2 you aware of any such work in other states?

3 MS. MINEAU: We participate in net
4 metering in several New England states. I can
5 tell you that, in Vermont, it's not locational
6 adders, as in regions, as you mentioned, but
7 there are net metering adders in some states.
8 For example, for locating a project on a former
9 brownfield, or for putting it over a parking lot,
10 something that was already impervious, or a
11 landfill, or things like that, in some other New
12 England states.

13 So, it's mostly targeted usually at the
14 former use of the actual parcel of land where a
15 new project may be located, rather than trying to
16 direct development to an entire region.

17 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: So, if I
18 understand you, can you elaborate a little bit
19 more, like are the rates set differently?

20 MS. MINEAU: So, there is a set base
21 net metering credit rate, and then there are
22 adders --

23 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Okay.

24 MS. MINEAU: -- to encourage. So,

1 it's -- no one will be charged less, for example,
2 for developing over a forest or a farm field.
3 There's a base rate for everyone. And, then, to
4 encourage certain types of development, there are
5 adders in addition to those credits.

6 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Okay. And this
7 is again just to confirm my understanding, so the
8 following questions.

9 So, when the consumption is less than
10 production of a net metering customer, the energy
11 component is the Default Service rate, right?

12 MS. MINEAU: Currently, it depends on
13 the size of the customer-generator.

14 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Okay. It depends
15 on in terms of what the distribution component
16 is, what the transmission component is. But, in
17 terms of the energy piece, it is the Default
18 Service, correct?

19 MS. MINEAU: Yes. That's correct.

20 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: For exports, when
21 a customer is producing more than what it needs,
22 they receive avoided costs, correct? And speak
23 generally.

24 MS. MINEAU: And anybody else is

1 welcome to talk about this.

2 But, no, the export credit is the
3 net -- there's only one net metering credit. So,
4 for -- and, in the example of also group net
5 metering, which are hosts that export quite a
6 bit, and then allocate those credits to a group
7 of members. For larger projects, large
8 customer-generators, the export credit is default
9 service energy only. For the small projects, it
10 is default energy service, plus transmission,
11 plus 25 percent of distribution.

12 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Please. I can
13 see somebody itching to speak.

14 MR. EVANS BROWN: Well, and I believe,
15 briefly, what you may be referring to is the fact
16 that, for small customer-generators, in the
17 original net metering tariff, any excess
18 kilowatt-hours over, I believe, 600
19 kilowatt-hours that are banked annually, the
20 customer has the option to be reimbursed for
21 those at the avoided cost rate that the
22 Department of Energy calculates once a year.

23 So, I believe that may be what you're
24 thinking of.

1 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Okay. But, as
2 the previous response indicated, and I'm
3 refreshing my understanding here, right now it's,
4 for the exports, they get paid the default
5 service rate?

6 And, then, there's the issue of
7 distribution and transmission, which is a
8 separate issue. I'm not asking that.

9 MS. MINEAU: Correct. And the only
10 other time that I'm aware of where avoided cost
11 comes into play is for group net metering. You
12 have to demonstrate annually that your members
13 consumed at least as much electricity as was
14 generated by the host. And, if that's not the
15 case, there's a true-up calculation that's done.
16 And, then, the excess generation from the host
17 that is not matched to member load is only
18 compensated at avoided cost. And, if the host
19 was already paid at default service, they would
20 have to pay back the difference to the utility.

21 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Okay. This is
22 almost a philosophical question. I'm struggling
23 with this. So, for exports, will you consider a
24 net metering customer more like a generator or

1 more like a energy supplier?

2 MR. EVANS BROWN: Maybe you could say
3 who you're asking that question of?

4 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Well, if anybody
5 has any opinion. I'm just raising it, because I
6 need to think about it. And, if you don't want
7 to answer, that's fine, too. Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: I'll just jump in.
9 We'll issue a post PHC order. And, in the post
10 PHC order, we'll highlight issues that we'd like
11 additional information on in preparation for the
12 hearing. So, I have a fairly lengthy list, after
13 Commissioner Chattopadhyay finishes.

14 So, just for context, we don't have to
15 answer anything here today, we don't know what's
16 on the record. We're just trying to put
17 headlights on what the Commission is interested
18 in.

19 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: This, the last
20 question, goes back to the issue of "locational",
21 I'll call it, "VDER". So that there was some
22 study that was done I believe in 2022, it was
23 about locational pricing, or locational
24 realities.

1 Are the parties thinking in terms of
2 relying on that? Because I can personally see a
3 lot of use for net metering in targeting, you
4 know, locational situations.

5 So, that's just -- I'm just asking, are
6 you all thinking in terms of bringing that into
7 the fray as well? Or, right now, that is not
8 part of the conversation?

9 And, again, you don't have to answer.
10 So, I'm -- but I'm sort of flagging that.

11 MR. KRAKOFF: Commissioner, if I may?

12 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Go ahead.

13 MR. AALTO: This is Pentti Aalto. I'm
14 not an intervenor in this particular case. I'm
15 not sure what appropriate position I might take
16 in this.

17 But I certainly have spent a lot of
18 time looking at the issue of "how do we
19 efficiently price power, as a way of also
20 simultaneously determining its value?" And I
21 believe we should be heading, although I don't
22 know that this is the docket to do it, to begin
23 heading into a locational real-time pricing
24 structure, that includes both the energy, but

1 also the transmission and distribution costs,
2 presented in a way that shows up as a
3 kilowatt-hour charge that's highly variable.

4 We're not ready for that yet. But we
5 should begin to look at how to get there.

6 Thank you.

7 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Thank you.

8 That's all I have.

9 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Just want to
10 follow up on one question from Commissioner
11 Chattopadhyay.

12 When talking about Vermont, there was
13 the discussion on the base rate with the adder.
14 So, my question is, who decides what the adder
15 is, and how, in Vermont?

16 MS. MINEAU: There are also adders in
17 Massachusetts. The PUC rate in -- sorry, the net
18 metering rate in Vermont is reviewed every two
19 years, by the PSC or the PUC. So, I am -- I
20 would have to check. I think those adders are
21 also updated, you know, reviewed and updated
22 every two years.

23 So, they are set by the Utilities
24 Commission, and they are reviewed and updated

1 every two years, in the case of Vermont.

2 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: And it's a
3 case-by-case. So, Parking Lot A has Adder X,
4 and --

5 MS. MINEAU: No.

6 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: No?

7 MS. MINEAU: It's whole categories.

8 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay.

9 MS. MINEAU: And it's of certain types.
10 So, I -- yes.

11 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: No, that's helpful.
12 No, thank you. That's --

13 MS. MINEAU: It's not a
14 project-by-project basis.

15 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Yes, that --
16 it would be a good thing, they're a small state,
17 to do that, because that would be a lot of work,
18 I would think.

19 So, okay. Thank you. So, sort of as
20 previously noted, the Commission believes the
21 information I'm about to ask about would be
22 helpful in making its independent determination
23 as to whether to make any changes to the net
24 metering tariff, you know, whether or not there

1 is a settlement.

2 So, I'm going to follow up on one of
3 Commissioner Chattopadhyay's questions, but turn
4 to the State of California, which obviously has a
5 lot of experience in this area. And, in the
6 trade press, there is discussion about that they
7 have implemented a Net Metering Tariff 3.0, which
8 provides 100 percent generation, but does not
9 provide anything on distribution and
10 transmission.

11 Do the parties -- and the study here is
12 now a little bit dated, sadly, right? Because
13 Dunsky was doing the work probably in 2021, they
14 delivered it in 2022. So, time has marched on.

15 Do the parties have any thoughts on New
16 Hampshire's current approach, or perhaps proposed
17 approach, and what California has done recently?

18 And I'll look to the utilities first on
19 that. And, again, this is in the spirit of
20 guiding the parties, in terms of what we want to
21 hear more about at hearing. So, any response now
22 is helpful. And, if there is no insight, then
23 that would be something we'll put in the PHC
24 order, in terms of an area we'd like to hear more

1 about at hearing.

2 MR. TAYLOR: I'm sorry, I was just --
3 if I could just, and I'll let the others, I can't
4 speak for the other utilities, I can only speak
5 for Unitil at this time.

6 We had understood this was going to be
7 a procedural conference. And, so, I actually
8 don't have witnesses here today. And, so, I
9 cannot respond substantively to your question on
10 behalf of Unitil. But wouldn't want that to be,
11 you know, received as us not having a position on
12 this issue.

13 And I also have some concerns about
14 weighing in on some of these issues while
15 settlement discussions are still in negotiation,
16 and there is testimony that has been submitted on
17 a prefiled basis before the Commission.

18 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Fair enough. Fair
19 enough. And, again, this is in the spirit of
20 preparing for the hearing. So, if anyone would
21 like to comment, that's always welcome. And, if
22 not, we completely understand.

23 Mr. Evans Brown.

24 MR. EVANS BROWN: I suppose I'll take

1 the bait on that one.

2 Very briefly, I would simply argue that
3 California is the state in the nation that has
4 the highest solar penetration of any state. And
5 that is a fundamental question, when setting and
6 determining the value of distributed energy
7 resources, is how much -- how many of those
8 resources are already in the grid, and to what
9 extent are they cannibalizing the value of the
10 next marginal addition?

11 And, so, comparing a state that is so
12 far down the road, to a state that is just
13 beginning down this path, I think is perhaps not
14 the right -- is not the way I would approach this
15 question.

16 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: And you could -- I
17 suppose you could make an argument in the other
18 direction, where the solar load in California and
19 Arizona and those places is much higher than it
20 is in New Hampshire. In fact, in northern New
21 Hampshire, if my memory of the solar load chart
22 is correct, has actually, I think, some of the --
23 well, I think it's tied for the worst or the
24 lowest in the country. There's some bars in

1 Seattle, some bars in the northern United States.
2 But, up in Coos County, for example, the solar
3 loading is not very good.

4 So, I know there's tradeoffs, I guess
5 is my point. You're bringing in an important
6 tradeoff.

7 MR. EVANS BROWN: And I think you're
8 referring to insulation. So, the radiation that
9 falls on the planet from the Sun --

10 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Yes. Correct.
11 And --

12 MR. EVANS BROWN: Well, I would also
13 respond that net metering is not just about solar
14 resources. There are other -- there are other,
15 you know, combined heat and power participates in
16 net metering, as can hydro generation. So, this
17 is not just a question of how we reimburse solar
18 installations, though, it's certainly
19 overwhelmingly looking forward about the solar
20 markets.

21 But, you know, I think that, from here,
22 I'd say I'm going to not take the bait further,
23 and simply suggests that I would agree that these
24 are the types of questions that we would hope to

1 address in the settlement, and at the hearing.

2 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: And I think the
3 Dunsky Study just talked about small-scale hydro
4 and solar. So, the data that we have is just
5 those two categories, as I understand it. And,
6 if there's a clarification on that, the
7 Commission would appreciate that. But that's the
8 information we have, is on those two, those two
9 areas.

10 So, this is rhetorical, I suppose.
11 But, you know, we'll put this in the PHC order.
12 But we'd like the parties to provide information
13 on how prior studies completed in dockets in net
14 metering support, you know, any settlement or
15 individual positions in this docket.

16 The Dunsky Study, for example, has a
17 lot of graphs and tables and information, but it
18 doesn't seem to draw any conclusions. So, you
19 know, we were sort of struggling with what to do
20 with the Dunsky Study, other than, you know, it's
21 sort of an information array that's before us.

22 I'll say one more thing about
23 California. The average avoided cost, from what
24 we've seen, are 4 to 8 cents per kilowatt in

1 California. And I think Mr. Evans Brown touched
2 on some of the aspects of that 4 to 8 cents. And
3 it also looks to be locational. In other words,
4 San Diego has a different reimbursement scheme
5 than, you know, San Francisco, or Riverside, or
6 something like that.

7 Now, New Hampshire is a much smaller
8 state. And, so, maybe all that isn't necessary.
9 But it was just interesting for us to note the
10 California compensation schemes, given their
11 experience in this area, and given that the
12 avoided cost was much, much lower than was
13 presented in the Dunskey Study.

14 So, again, we would be interested in
15 learning more about that, and why that would be.
16 And, you know, that -- and it goes to the
17 creditability of the Dunskey Study, not anything
18 other than we're trying to understand. We have
19 only one source. So, a lot of times you have two
20 or three or four studies you're looking at, you
21 can cross-fertilize different things. And, in
22 this case, we just have a single -- a single
23 study. So, we need to triangulate that as a
24 Commission, to make sure that the data is

1 reasonable. And, so, that's why we're looking
2 for different triangulation points.

3 A question, I'll ask this question to
4 Attorney Sheehan, but anyone from the utilities
5 can answer. You know, California has hourly
6 consumption and production data. Do the New
7 Hampshire meters today have that capability at
8 the net metering sites? Or, is that -- are we
9 behind from a technology standpoint?

10 MR. SHEEHAN: Liberty does not. We
11 have AMI on our horizon, and that's when we can
12 have those kind of capabilities.

13 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. What about
14 Eversource?

15 MS. CHIAVARA: Eversource has a small
16 number of interval meters that record at an
17 hourly interval. They aren't necessarily tied to
18 net metered customers. I think some are. It's a
19 very small number compared to our entire service
20 area, and compared to the total percentage of net
21 metered customers.

22 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.
23 And Unitil is probably the same?

24 MR. TAYLOR: Unitil does have AMI

1 deployed in its service territory. If I started
2 trying to talk to you about the specifics of its
3 functionality, I might get some things wrong, but
4 I might get some things right. So, I'd prefer to
5 leave that to the experts. And we'll certainly
6 talk about that when we come see you at the
7 hearing.

8 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Well, we would
9 certainly be -- so, writ large, I think we'd be
10 very interested in the current metering, and I
11 know it's not just the metering, it's the back
12 office work and all the other things that go with
13 the metering, but we'd be very interested in
14 hearing more about that. And why, you know,
15 places, like California, would have this
16 technology in place, and New Hampshire does not.
17 So, we'd like to hear more about that.

18 I'm going to turn now to a topic that I
19 think has wide and broad interest in the room.
20 So, please raise your hand, if you want to talk.
21 There might be twelve or thirteen people wanting
22 to talk at the same time on this one. And what
23 I'm going to turn to now is community
24 aggregation.

1 My first question is, does the utility
2 receive any compensation for distribution or
3 transmission from a community aggregator today?

4 MS. CHIAVARA: I'm sorry, "does the
5 utility receive?"

6 *[Chairman Goldner indicating in the*
7 *affirmative.]*

8 MS. CHIAVARA: Yes. No, not that I
9 know of.

10 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Okay. That's
11 helpful.

12 So, the community aggregator is
13 generating power, it's, you know, moving
14 electrons. And the -- maybe walk me through,
15 Attorney Chiavara, how the compensation scheme
16 works today.

17 So, if you have, and I know CPCNH will
18 want to comment on this as well, and I will
19 certainly make sure we allow time for that. But
20 walk me through kind of the compensation scheme
21 for a community aggregator today. How does it
22 work? How does the money flow?

23 MS. CHIAVARA: It might be easier if I
24 walk you through how the compensation scheme

1 flows through the utility, and then I can move
2 into how it flows for or doesn't flow for
3 municipal aggregations.

4 So, net metering compensation, right
5 now the utility distributes the net meter credits
6 to net metered customers, and the utility is
7 reimbursed, for Eversource, I'll say, through the
8 Stranded Cost Recovery Charge for those net meter
9 credits. To a certain extent, they are offset
10 by -- for those customer-generators that are
11 registered with ISO-New England, we take those
12 revenues so that the customer-generator isn't
13 getting double compensation. And those revenues
14 from ISO-New England help offset the costs of net
15 metering. But the utility is -- receives cost
16 recovery, for Eversource, through the Stranded
17 Cost Recovery Charge.

18 There is no cost recovery mechanism for
19 municipal aggregators. So, right now, it would
20 be up to the aggregation to set up their own
21 crediting structure and process. And we're not
22 privy to -- Eversource isn't privy to any of
23 those existing right now.

24 So, to the extent that a net metered

1 customer is enrolled with a municipal
2 aggregation, they would not receive any
3 compensation for the supply portion of their
4 energy. So, therefore, only, I believe I have
5 this right, only small projects would receive any
6 compensation from the utility, and that would be
7 for the transmission and distribution portions of
8 the credit.

9 And, for those on the original net
10 metering tariff, the grandfathered customers, I
11 believe they would -- I believe they would
12 receive the entire credit. But it's not a
13 monetary credit, it's a kilowatt-hour credit.

14 So, sorry it's not the most
15 straightforward flow. So, people on the existing
16 current net metered tariff, large
17 customer-generators that are with a municipal
18 aggregation would receive no credit, I believe.
19 Small customer-generators that's under the
20 100-kilowatt threshold would receive transmission
21 and distribution. And, then, the grandfathered,
22 first-generation net metered customers would
23 receive that entire per kilowatt-hour credit.

24 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. And the

1 reason that I'm asking these questions, and we'll
2 want to learn more at hearing as well, is that,
3 if community aggregation is successful, meaning
4 that community aggregation becomes the bulk of
5 the load in New Hampshire, does that put a load
6 on default service customers, or other,
7 Eversource customers in this example, given all
8 of these credits that are potentially being paid
9 for transmission and distribution? The folks
10 left to pay for the balance would be fewer and
11 fewer. And, so, you would be putting potentially
12 a significant cost load on the customers that
13 aren't in community aggregation.

14 MS. CHIAVARA: Well, right now, since
15 Eversource recovers through the Stranded Cost
16 Recovery Charge, that's a non-bypassable charge.
17 So, all customers pay that, no matter who
18 migrates onto or off of utility default service.

19 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay.

20 MS. CHIAVARA: But I think the question
21 might be somewhat different, that you're asking
22 about "how many credits would be given out?"
23 And, to that extent, I guess that number would
24 fluctuate, given that the energy supply portion

1 is only given to those who are on utility default
2 service right now.

3 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. I think
4 that's helpful.

5 Mr. Below, would you like to comment?

6 MR. BELOW: Sure.

7 Under the current system as it has
8 evolved, for customers, net metered
9 customer-generators on utility default service,
10 which is where the vast majority of them are,
11 essentially all, at least for Unitil and
12 Eversource, Liberty is a little bit different,
13 but, for those two, essentially all the costs to
14 compensate net metered customers is socialized,
15 if you will, across all the customer base through
16 a non-bypassable charge that everyone pays, and
17 all of the benefits are also, in effect,
18 socialized.

19 If a customer switches to Community
20 Power Aggregation or a competitive supply, the
21 benefits, under the current load settlement
22 system, continue to be socialized, but the cost
23 to compensate net metered customers would be
24 limited to the aggregation or the competitive

1 supplier. As a result, it's not economically
2 practical or sustainable for us to serve net
3 metered customers, if we don't get the benefit of
4 those exports to the grid to use to offset our
5 own load.

6 So, that's an issue that's, you know,
7 in another proceeding, in part, right now. But
8 we also raised it in our testimony in this
9 docket, because the statute does ask or direct
10 the Commission to answer the question or address
11 the issue of whether, for default service,
12 exports to the grid by default service customers
13 should be used to offset the load of the default
14 service supplier. So, that's a question that the
15 statute puts to the Commission to answer.

16 So, that's just a little bit of the
17 background. Yes, we also, obviously, to serve
18 net metered customers, and we have many net
19 metered customers who would like to switch to
20 Community Power, and some who have switched just
21 because they're on Net Metering 1.0 and continue
22 to get kilowatt-hour credits, or because they
23 don't have net exports in a given month.

24 And, so, for instance, with Liberty,

1 I'm not quite sure this is how it works with
2 Eversource, if a large customer has net metering,
3 and the example I would give is the City's water
4 treatment plant and wastewater treatment plant
5 both have some PV, but they never have net
6 monthly exports. So, Liberty nets that out
7 within the month, so that we're only presented
8 with the charge for the net load for the month.
9 And, so, we're able to serve those particular
10 group of customers, because we're not needing to
11 compensate them for excess generation beyond what
12 they consume within a month.

13 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you,
14 Mr. Below.

15 And I think, you know, the big picture
16 here is that we would like to make sure we spend
17 time at hearing talking about any
18 cross-subsidization, whether it's with community
19 aggregation or any other category that we should
20 be considering, to make sure that that piece of
21 it has been fully considered.

22 And, Attorney Chiavara, you can -- you
23 can help me with this one, I think, because I'm
24 remembering, it might have been Attorney Wiesner

1 in the docket, so I know that Eversource has
2 different folks covering different dockets. But,
3 in the SCRC docket with Eversource, I remember
4 there being a significant charge relative to net
5 metering, a significant dollar value that the
6 ratepayers were paying for.

7 So, help me understand how sort of that
8 charge is large, and then how that's not a
9 cross-subsidization issue?

10 MS. CHIAVARA: Well, that charge is
11 large in that it covers all credits that are
12 distributed to net metered customers. So, that
13 is -- that it's all but I think some small
14 administrative charges, and also any lost base
15 revenue that is collected elsewhere. So, that is
16 the whole of the net metering credit. So, that
17 is socialized across, through the SCRC, because
18 it's non-bypassable, so it's socialized across
19 the entire customer base.

20 And I guess, to the degree that net
21 metering is a subsidy is more of a philosophical
22 one, and one for subject matter experts, and not
23 for an attorney. So, I will stop there, and
24 since I don't have any subject matter experts

1 here with me today either.

2 But the extent to which it is or is not
3 subsidy, I would say is one for the subject
4 matter folks.

5 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: And, so, I would say
6 at hearing, you know, it would be helpful to
7 understand the SCRC offset. So, there,
8 obviously, are benefits somewhere that are
9 offsetting the SCRC costs. And, so, helping the
10 Commission understand that balance would be
11 helpful, and that way we'll be comfortable that
12 we're not cross-subsidizing in this process.

13 MR. EVANS BROWN: Chair Goldner, if I
14 may?

15 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Yes, please.

16 MR. EVANS BROWN: Just to, I think, I
17 am hesitant to speak at length, because I am
18 wondering the degree to which we're wading into
19 matters that will be addressed at hearing. I do
20 appreciate understanding what the Commission
21 wants to hear, and understand better when we get
22 to hearing.

23 So, that's my short preface to simply
24 saying that I think you've really put your finger

1 on the heart of the issue here, which is that the
2 costs, because of the way the utilities do their
3 billing and their metering are very easily
4 quantifiable.

5 But, similarly, because of our data
6 infrastructure, because of our metering
7 infrastructure, the benefits are very difficult
8 to quantify, because we don't have the -- we
9 don't have the necessary data infrastructure to
10 develop a defined picture of what the avoided
11 costs are.

12 And, until that fundamental
13 infrastructure is put into place in New
14 Hampshire, it's very difficult to answer a lot of
15 these questions, which is why I think -- I think,
16 perhaps, the Commission is asking them. And, in
17 fact, why many of us have been asking them for
18 years. But there's a sort of "cart before the
19 horse" aspect of this, which is that we need the
20 data in order to answer the questions, but we
21 simply don't have it, and won't, for years.

22 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: And that's very
23 helpful. And that's, I think, part of the reason
24 for the sort of questions that we started with,

1 which is, you know, California is very
2 sophisticated, has a lot of data, they're showing
3 4 to 8 cents. So, you say "okay, well, that's an
4 interesting data point." It's only one. And
5 there are differences between California and New
6 Hampshire, I'm pretty sure.

7 But, then, you look at the Dunsky
8 Study, which says "well, it's more like 12 to
9 16 cents." And you want to understand, "well,
10 why?" You have a very sophisticated entity
11 that's done a lot of work over 20 or 25 years
12 that arrives at one conclusion, and a local
13 study, a much smaller study, that says something
14 different. And that's not to be critical of
15 Dunsky, it's just, to Mr. Evans Brown's point,
16 there's a lot more data available in California.

17 MR. EVANS BROWN: And I would take as a
18 marching order from this prehearing conference
19 the suggestion that we should ensure that any
20 settlement document includes other data points
21 that will help to, you know, verify the position
22 that the Settling Parties come to.

23 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. That's
24 very well put, Mr. Evans Brown. Thank you for

1 that. Yes, it's just triangulation. We just
2 need to be comfortable that we've seen multiple
3 perspectives, and that that all triangulates to,
4 you know, to something like a single point.

5 And this is just a couple of questions
6 for understanding. I don't -- I haven't -- just
7 a couple of other things, I guess.

8 Can someone just explain -- and maybe,
9 Mr. Evans Brown, you might be the right person to
10 ask, but if somebody else would like to answer,
11 no problem. Can someone just sort of explain why
12 the compensation scheme for sub 100 kilowatts is
13 different than 100 kilowatts to 1 megawatt? It's
14 just, the Dunsky Study has a bunch of data, and
15 it shows, you know, the math, and avoided costs
16 and so forth. And, then, you get to the tariff,
17 and then suddenly it divides into two. So, I
18 actually don't understand why the two tariffs
19 would be different?

20 *[No verbal response.]*

21 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Looks like that
22 might be a study -- one for the hearing.

23 MS. CHIAVARA: I'm sorry.

24 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Or, Attorney

1 Chiavara, would you like to offer --

2 MS. CHIAVARA: Could I get the question
3 one more time?

4 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Sure. The tariff
5 for sub 100 kilowatts is generation, plus
6 transmission, and plus a quarter of distribution.
7 The tariff for 100 kilowatts to 1 megawatt is
8 just generation.

9 But the Dunskey Study, so far as I could
10 see, doesn't explain why those two tariffs are
11 different?

12 MS. CHIAVARA: Yes. That's outside my
13 corner of the store.

14 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. No problem.
15 That could be one for the hearing.

16 MR. EVANS BROWN: I suppose I'll try
17 to -- and, again, I think these are sort of
18 philosophical questions. But, fundamentally,
19 what's at play here is a balance between the
20 administrative cost of creating more refined
21 tariffs, with the benefit of deploying these
22 assets out on the grid that do have quantifiable
23 benefits, both to the grid itself, as well as to
24 the customers that deploy them.

1 And, so, certainly, there's the
2 potential to create more and more refined
3 tariffs, as is true in every customer class. We
4 could create tariffs for residential customers
5 that are precisely representative of the cost to
6 serve that customer, but we don't, because of the
7 cost of the administrative complexity of doing
8 so. And, so, as is the case with every other
9 type of customer class, in net metering, this is
10 a tradeoff between complexity and trying to, you
11 know, deploy beneficial assets out onto the grid.

12 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Okay. Thank
13 you. Yes, sir.

14 MR. AALTO: Again, this is Pentti
15 Aalto. I am not an intervenor at this point.

16 There's a strong movement to make
17 pricing more efficient, and that would provide
18 for locational and time-varying pricing. And, if
19 the pricing were efficient, it would
20 automatically recognize differences in costs in
21 providing service to customers in different parts
22 of the system.

23 To do that, we could, individually,
24 come up with, as we have done in the past, a

1 water heater rate and a regular rate, and other
2 air conditioner rates in some jurisdictions. The
3 other approach is to come up with a pricing
4 structure that reflects the cost in itself, and
5 have the customers respond to that pricing
6 structure by using or not using.

7 That eliminates much of the -- trying
8 to figure out, when my toaster is running, should
9 I have a toaster rate. The argument is "don't
10 bother, come up with a price for serving at
11 that -- at different times." If I make my toast
12 in the middle of the night, I don't have to worry
13 about loading up the transmission system.

14 But I see that as a direction we need
15 to go. Today, my sense is the full retail price
16 is the value of power as it's delivered to a
17 customer. That's what I recognize when I turn
18 the lights out when I leave the room. If it's 20
19 cents, that's what I get. And that was for
20 deferring all of the upstream activity that I'm
21 paying for.

22 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: I think the other
23 perspective might be, you could look at a solar
24 array on somebody's house as -- you could have

1 the perspective that they're a merchant
2 generator. So, they're putting power on the
3 grid, and that's valuable. And particularly, and
4 locationally, it can be even more valuable than
5 at other locations.

6 MR. AALTO: Absolutely. So, --

7 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: So, that would be --
8 oh, I'm sorry. I was just going to say, so that
9 would be -- you can see the value there. But, if
10 you were a merchant generator, you would get the
11 ISO-New England energy rate, capacity, and so
12 forth, the ancillary charges and so forth. And,
13 so, you would get, I think our math is, over the
14 last four or five years, that would be about \$50
15 a megawatt-hour, in terms of the value
16 proposition.

17 So, again, this is all the Commission
18 trying to understand the different perspectives,
19 and what that value really is.

20 MR. AALTO: Of course, that is a
21 different market. My market, in my neighborhood,
22 my neighbors are paying somewhat the same price
23 that I'm paying. And, when I generate a
24 kilowatt-hour, it goes to my downstream neighbor

1 who pays fully for it, even though the services
2 weren't provided fully. In other words, they pay
3 the full transmission and distribution charges.
4 If I get that as a credit, it looks just like
5 turning out the lights.

6 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: And that's why --

7 MR. AALTO: And lost revenue.

8 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: That's why this is a
9 difficult problem.

10 MR. AALTO: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Because there is
12 another perspective, which is everyone is a
13 merchant power generator, I'll just use that word
14 loosely, --

15 MR. AALTO: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: -- and that power is
17 being put on the grid. And that those electrons
18 have the same value, regardless of whether it
19 comes from a solar array on my house, or whether
20 it comes from, you know, the gas plant or the
21 nuclear plant, or what have you.

22 MR. AALTO: Yes. In a given location,
23 it would have the same value, but not necessarily
24 elsewhere or at a different time, at least from

1 an economic point of view.

2 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: And that's why that
3 2020 locational study was interesting.

4 MR. AALTO: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: So, we read that as
6 well. And, so, that, you know, that is a
7 perspective that we should consider for sure,
8 yes. Thank you.

9 MR. DAVIS: Chairman?

10 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Yes.

11 MR. DAVIS: Not so much on the Dunskey
12 Study, and, again, with the intent of trying to
13 provide more understanding, I presume, when we
14 get to hearing.

15 *[Court reporter interruption regarding*
16 *the use of a microphone.]*

17 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: A microphone, yes.
18 Just start at the beginning, Mr. Davis, if you
19 could.

20 MR. DAVIS: Thank you. With the idea,
21 not so much focusing on the Dunskey Study, but
22 particularly with the intent to provide more
23 understanding, and assuming we're going to want
24 to be able to bring more of this to hearing.

1 I think it would helpful just to
2 understand your earlier question, your beginning
3 question about how we got to where we are. So,
4 if you had monthly net metering for the Small
5 Customer Group, if you will, largely residential
6 customers, and we had banking of kilowatt-hours,
7 you know, the whole paradigm was really
8 installing solar locally at a customer site,
9 netting against their load, and doing that each
10 month. If there's excess, it gets banked and
11 rolled forward.

12 The current version -- so, that's the
13 "legacy" kind of group of customers. The current
14 version, we actually monetize that each month.
15 So, now, if you think about, well, there's a
16 generator there, so think of it, whether it's
17 merchant or not, there's a production going on
18 there, and the same netting occurs for that
19 customer, but there's maybe excess in a given
20 month. There's pricing that applies to that.
21 So, we're monetizing it at that point.

22 But the model, the net metering model,
23 it really comes from way back in PURPA days, you
24 know, and it pretty much has been translated to

1 the alternate net metering we have today for that
2 Small Group. We have monthly metering. So, it's
3 really just kilowatt-hours over the month,
4 everything is kilowatt-hour based.

5 That's different than the Large Group,
6 where we have probably more like stand-alone
7 generators, or very large generators, that maybe
8 have little or no load there, and you're
9 literally producing and delivering most of that
10 power to the grid, you have hourly metering.

11 But what I think is sort of a common
12 denominator, is what's the appropriate pricing
13 for the types of customers who are connected and
14 taking that net metering service. Small
15 customers are typically at secondary service.
16 So, there's a form of locational pricing with
17 regard to service level, if we price energy
18 delivered from the market to residential
19 customers in a different manner. It's still
20 default service, but it's different than we do
21 for larger customers, which is monthly.

22 So, you have a sort of system level,
23 locational kind of dimension there. But, more
24 importantly, the Large Group has maintained

1 exports that are largely production, almost all
2 delivered to the grid, and they could be group
3 hosts, where you allocate the costs, whatever.

4 But, at the end of the day, you're
5 pricing it at default service for that type of
6 service. You have interval metering. And you
7 have the ability to look at hourly or more
8 granular, you know, production profiles and
9 things like that.

10 But it's just really the evolution of
11 where we got to. And, then, the implications of
12 where we may want to go in the future. You know,
13 things like a value of DER study, you know, look
14 at the basis of the study, and what it's
15 measuring, and how does that compare to the form
16 of net metering that we have today. I think, so,
17 in terms of providing that understanding, I think
18 it's important to recognize how we got there.

19 And that small net metering model is
20 very common, most -- across the country, that's
21 where most small net metering started. And, now,
22 we're looking at something more granular. You
23 might have AMI metering to be able to look at the
24 data. We know this, as Ms. Chiavara said

1 earlier, and we have some limited amount of
2 interval data. We don't have production data,
3 typically, unless you're a large customer and you
4 see what's happening at the grid, at the grid
5 level.

6 So, I just thought it would be
7 important to provide that context and insight to
8 help provide a better understanding as you're
9 framing these questions. So, I just had to speak
10 up.

11 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: No, thank you. That
12 is --

13 MR. DAVIS: Taking the bait.

14 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: And it's a
15 complicated issue. If you have a house in an
16 area that where additional electrons would be
17 helpful, and you put solar on the house, there's
18 probably a lot of value in that. But, if
19 everybody in the neighborhood put solar on their
20 house, maybe it creates a burden for the utility
21 having to handle that additional load.

22 So, you know, it's a complicated issue
23 for sure. Okay. Thank you.

24 And, if you can't answer this question,

1 Mr. Sheehan, I'll understand, relative to the
2 settlement. But are TOU rates involved in this
3 discussion at all? Or, how is the rate structure
4 involved in this docket?

5 MR. SHEEHAN: To be a little flip, with
6 Mr. Below involved, TOU is always in the
7 discussion.

8 *[Laughter.]*

9 MR. SHEEHAN: So, yes, we talk about
10 it. I can't really speak to what's going to be
11 in the settlement. And it mostly comes down to a
12 metering issue. Some of us simply can't do it
13 yet.

14 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.

15 Okay. At the risk of stirring folks
16 up, I just have a couple other questions.

17 But, in the VDER Study, it indicates,
18 at least the way I read it, that solar is the
19 cheapest source for a new build, in fact, 30
20 percent cheaper than gas at the moment, \$49 a
21 megawatt-hour. So, it sort of begs the question,
22 again, this is probably one for hearing, but why
23 is a subsidy needed, if we already have the
24 cheapest source?

1 So, no need to answer that today. But
2 the Commission would be interested in knowing, if
3 we've already identified the cheapest source of
4 energy for New Hampshire, and it's \$49 a
5 megawatt-hour, and it's the cheapest source for a
6 new build, then maybe a subsidy would not be
7 appropriate. So, I'll just throw that one out
8 there for discussion at the hearing.

9 And this is a question relative to the
10 filings, maybe I'll look to Attorney Dexter on
11 this. Is there any place that we can see in the
12 Dunsky Study, or otherwise, an NPV or rate of
13 return for the generator, and also for
14 participants and nonparticipants?

15 So, we're trying to understand the
16 generator's point of view, and how it looked, in
17 terms of their NPV, and we didn't -- at least I
18 didn't see anything in the filing. So, if
19 somebody can point us to that, that would be
20 helpful. And, if it's not, it would be something
21 we'd be interested in hearing more about at
22 hearing.

23 Yes, sir.

24 MR. AALTO: I think the argument was

1 that -- excuse me -- that the generator, in a
2 competitive environment, has to take care of its
3 own costs, and displaying those costs isn't
4 necessarily something that is appropriate for a
5 person entering a competitive market.

6 As a generator feeding into the grid,
7 the price I see is the price that I would expect
8 to get. If I go to the farmer's market with
9 tomatoes either to buy or sell, the price in that
10 market is what I see for either buying or
11 selling. I don't care what the wholesale price
12 is of tomatoes in Mexico.

13 So, if the market is working, if I have
14 a cheaper source, I will tend to grow, and I will
15 reduce the cost to everybody by putting in the
16 cheaper sources.

17 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.

18 And another question for understanding,
19 we use the word "net metering" in this docket,
20 that's the title of the docket, I think. Has
21 there been any discussion about "net billing"
22 versus "net metering"? Is that something that
23 the parties are discussing at all? Or, is that
24 something that's off the table, or not being

1 discussed?

2 "Net billing", meaning "wholesale
3 rates", as opposed to retail rates with net
4 metering.

5 MS. CHIAVARA: I'm sorry, at the end,
6 you said "Net billing, at wholesale rates", as
7 opposed to using the retail rate for net metering
8 compensation?

9 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Yes. My definition,
10 which might be different than your definition, is
11 that net billing involves wholesale rates, net
12 metering involves retail rates, for the energy.
13 And, so, I'm just trying to understand if that's
14 been part of the discussions so far, or if that's
15 not --

16 MS. CHIAVARA: I haven't read that in
17 any of the testimony filed in this docket. So, I
18 don't believe it's been an issue.

19 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Okay.

20 MR. EVANS BROWN: So, the only net
21 energy -- the only state that I am aware of,
22 personally, that refers to its program as "net
23 energy billing" is Maine, which is a very
24 different structure, and which, in fact, looks a

1 lot more like what you might call a "feed-in
2 tariff" than New Hampshire's program.

3 And, so, I -- using that nomenclature
4 as a way to refer to "wholesale pricing of
5 exports" is not something I am personally
6 familiar with in the Maine instance.

7 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.

8 MR. DAVIS: And, Chairman, I want to
9 note that, as a rates person, I actually refer to
10 "net metering", as you referred to it as also
11 "net energy billing", meaning on the customer's
12 retail bill.

13 So, thank you for the clarification,
14 because you threw me, for the term "net billing"
15 is not something I've seen. I don't think we've
16 talked about it at all among the group here.

17 MS. MINEAU: Yes. I was going to add,
18 it's called "net energy billing" in Maine, and
19 the credit there, for larger projects, is
20 actually quite a bit more generous than New
21 Hampshire's. It is default service, and a
22 transmission credit and a distribution credit.

23 So, yes. And I think we want to be
24 clear about what it is we're talking about.

1 Because net energy billing in Maine, that's what
2 it's referred to as, and it is a much more
3 generous credit than we have here in New
4 Hampshire, at least for the larger projects.

5 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.
6 Pentti Aalto.

7 MR. AALTO: Thank you again.

8 The use of the wholesale price is
9 appropriate in the situation where the customer
10 sees that wholesale price in real-time. So, a
11 customer in Chicago, for example, on the hourly
12 real-time price, that would be a proper net
13 metering credit for the energy component. Now,
14 even in their system, they still have fixed
15 non-variant pricing for transmission and
16 distribution, which ultimately needs to get
17 adjusted to a variable rate also, in my mind.

18 But, under those conditions, if I, as a
19 customer, see 2 cents as the rate for power that
20 I -- the energy component, then that's the rate
21 that I would expect to get paid, instead of the
22 20 cents.

23 But, however, we are not on that type
24 of pricing structure. It is a long way from the

1 2 cents to the 20 cents that I pay, and I argue
2 20 cents is what it's worth in my neighborhood.

3 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. Thank
4 you. That's an inexpensive tomato.

5 Anything else on this topic?

6 *[No verbal response.]*

7 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: All right. Thank
8 you.

9 So, I think Mr. Dexter mentioned the
10 NPV for the generator, the participant and the
11 nonparticipants, we can just save that for the
12 hearing. But just understanding that those
13 perspectives would be helpful for the Commission.

14 A question that I sort of alluded to
15 earlier, but maybe I'll put a finer point on it.
16 From the position of the parties in the room,
17 would any cross-subsidization between
18 participants and nonparticipants be acceptable?

19 And, if that's a legal white paper, we
20 can defer it to the hearing. But I just wanted
21 to, if there was a perspective on that, I think
22 it helps the Commission going into the hearings.

23 MS. CHIAVARA: I think that is a
24 position that probably goes to the heart of the

1 settlement discussions. So, while I do
2 apparently have a subject matter expert here
3 today, apologies, I wasn't trying to hide
4 Mr. Davis, I think that we would probably refrain
5 from speaking on that at this time. But would be
6 fully prepared to speak to it at the hearing.

7 And I think legal briefs could be
8 relevant as it goes to a matter of policy, state
9 policy.

10 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.

11 MR. KREIS: Mr. Chairman, I would just
12 point out that the statute, I brought my book,
13 but I can't quite get to the --

14 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: I was pretty sure
15 you were going to answer this question. But,
16 when I looked down, and I thought "Mr. Kreis has
17 not answered it yet", I was shocked.

18 MR. KREIS: Well, I just want to make
19 clear that the statute talks about
20 "cross-subsidization", but it talks about "no
21 undue or unreasonable cross-subsidization".

22 So, you know, the point is that we're
23 all subsidizing each other all the time, right?
24 Our utilities do not design a unique tariff for

1 every customer that accounts for the costs that
2 each of us uniquely imposes on the system and
3 then bill us accordingly.

4 So, you know, the same people who
5 criticize cross-subsidization in net metering are
6 often the sort of people who live at the end of a
7 five-mile dirt road in a McMansion. And I
8 guarantee you that the people in inner-city
9 Manchester are subsidizing the cost of providing
10 electric service to those people in their
11 McMansions on Lake Sunapee. But is that fair and
12 reasonable? Well, probably, it is, because, you
13 know, we don't set unique tariffs for everybody.

14 So, I guess it really does come back
15 around to the points others have made, that it's
16 a policy choice about the extent to which we're
17 willing to suffer some amount of
18 cross-subsidization.

19 I think we've heard from the
20 Legislature that some cross-subsidization is, if
21 not desirable, then at least inevitable.

22 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: So, let me expand on
23 that a little bit. And it makes sense that all
24 1.4 million, you know, or maybe 600,000 New

1 Hampshire households, you know, can't have a
2 unique subsidy. But, here, we're really talking
3 about large groupings, you know, participants,
4 nonparticipants, for example. So, we're not --
5 we're just trying to create large enough buckets
6 so that the analysis becomes reasonable.

7 Can you comment on that perspective?

8 MR. KREIS: I agree with it.

9 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: I'll accept that,
10 and quickly move along.

11 So, just a couple more questions, and
12 I'll wrap up. Yes?

13 MR. BELOW: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to
14 speak to your last question?

15 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Oh, please, Mr.
16 Below. Thank you.

17 MR. BELOW: Thank you. Our testimony,
18 my testimony, does focus, in particular, on
19 opportunities for reducing cross-subsidization,
20 especially going forward with new net metering
21 tariffs. Some of it's locked in, in terms of the
22 historical, the two existing ones, because of
23 either statutory or prior Commission order on
24 grandfathering.

1 But a major emphasis on our testimony
2 is trying to move towards a market -- more
3 market-based structure, with compensation more in
4 line with actual benefits, so as to minimize
5 cross-subsidization.

6 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you,
7 Mr. Below.

8 So, just a couple more. And, then,
9 we'll just take a quick break, so that the
10 parties and the Commissioners can quickly caucus.
11 It will just be, you know, ten minutes, and then
12 we'll wrap things up today. Just let me check my
13 notes.

14 *[Short pause.]*

15 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: No, I think we've
16 covered it. So, let's just take a quick break,
17 returning at 10:35, and we'll wrap things up
18 then. Off the record.

19 *(Recess taken at 10:27 a.m., and the*
20 *prehearing conference reconvened at*
21 *10:46 a.m.)*

22 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. So, just
23 wrapping up. I think the one thing that
24 Commissioners are -- need more clarification on

1 is the money flow in a community aggregation
2 scenario. We're a little unclear on how
3 everything works in a net metering community
4 aggregation/utility transaction.

5 So, you know, at hearing, or if there's
6 a separate filing that could be made, the three
7 Commissioners would appreciate, you know,
8 clarification in that money flow transaction.
9 And that's why we were late returning, as we're
10 still trying to completely figure that out.

11 Okay. So, before we wrap up, I'll just
12 ask if there is anything else that we need to
13 cover today, or anything else that anyone else
14 would like to say, before we wrap things up
15 today?

16 Mr. Pentti Aalto.

17 MR. AALTO: Thank you.

18 For personal reasons, I have not been
19 able to attend the previous -- this docket in the
20 past. I don't know if it's appropriate to ask
21 for intervention status at this point. I'm not
22 sure that other people would agree at this point
23 that that would be useful.

24 I would like to request that, if it's

1 possible. I understand a lot of work as gone in
2 the past. But I believe that I have some things
3 that I may be able to offer that would be of use
4 here.

5 And, as for status, I am an Eversource
6 customer, if that's necessary at this point.

7 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Would the parties
8 like to weigh in on the request at this point?
9 We won't rule from the Bench, we'll just take
10 input before we break.

11 MS. CHIAVARA: I would say, as a
12 general matter, and speaking no ill will of
13 any -- of Mr. Aalto at all, the parties are quite
14 far along in the docket now. We are really, you
15 know, rounded home plate at this point.

16 So, with settlement negotiations
17 largely buttoned up, except for details, I would
18 say that it is -- it is past due for any
19 interventions at this point.

20 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.
21 Would any of the other parties like to comment?

22 MR. KREIS: I think I generally agree
23 with that perspective. I think, you know, we're
24 so late in the docket at this point that adding

1 new parties is really not in the best interest of
2 getting this docket to its reasonable conclusion.

3 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay.

4 MR. EVANS BROWN: I would also just
5 quickly state that I think it's probably
6 reasonable, given the amount of interest in this
7 docket, to reserve time for public comment at the
8 end of each hearing. So, it might be something
9 to plan for.

10 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.

11 Okay. Thank you. And I'll just ask if
12 there's anything else that anyone would like to
13 comment on or anything else that we need to cover
14 today?

15 Mr. Krakoff. Attorney Krakoff.

16 MR. KRAKOFF: Yes. Thank you.

17 Yes, I appreciate all the questions the
18 Commission has asked today. And I was just
19 wonder if you could provide a little more
20 clarity. Are you going to submit record requests
21 to the parties? Are you going to ask for
22 comments? Or, are these matters that we should
23 address at hearing?

24 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: So, when issue the

1 post PHC order, and it will be issued fairly
2 quickly, in the next week or so, I think, right?
3 So, we'll issue it pretty quickly. The idea is
4 to just highlight what we talked about today, in
5 terms of topics that we're interested in
6 covering.

7 We'll meet afterwards, and see if the
8 Commissioners would like to issue any kind of
9 record requests to prepare for the hearing. So,
10 I can't answer that before we confer. But that
11 would be the idea, is to provide clarity, in
12 terms of what we're looking for at hearing.

13 MS. CHIAVARA: I have what's hopefully
14 a non-confrontational, logistical matter to
15 raise.

16 The parties discussed at some length,
17 prior to today's convening, that this docket's
18 gone on considerably longer than we had
19 anticipated. And several of the parties have had
20 to employ consultants pretty extensively for this
21 docket, and that's incurred quite a bit of
22 expense.

23 So, when it comes time for the
24 hearings, if -- I know the Commission likes

1 having everybody in the room, and there's
2 certainly advantages to that. But I think all
3 the parties are in agreement that remote
4 participation would be particularly beneficial
5 for those who have had to hire consultants for
6 this proceeding.

7 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. And a lot of
8 times it's locational when we look at it. So,
9 for example, Toronto would be a place where, you
10 know, having somebody remote would make perfect
11 sense. If somebody is in, you know, Boston, or
12 something like, then we tend to look at that a
13 little bit differently. It's not that far.

14 So, we try to apply some balance, in
15 terms of folks being here or not being here.

16 So, is there -- where else would
17 consultants be coming from, other than Toronto?

18 MR. EVANS BROWN: So, Clean Energy New
19 Hampshire has two consultants. One based in
20 Portland, Maine, and I think it's reasonable to
21 expect that he could attend in person. The
22 second is on the West Coast, and we would prefer
23 if we do not have to fly him out here and get him
24 a hotel room. But it is, of course, up to the

1 Commissioners.

2 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: And that makes
3 perfect sense.

4 So, I will say that, just from a
5 personal point of view, that in-person is much
6 more effective. It's just easier to understand
7 what the person is saying and see how it's being
8 communicated.

9 But we're certainly respectful of the
10 cost issue, and we're certainly respectful of the
11 time issue. And we'll make sure we take care of
12 the requests expeditiously. So, no problem.

13 Mr. Dexter.

14 MR. DEXTER: Yes. Would there be an
15 opportunity to weigh in on the specific hearing
16 dates before they're set in stone? When I heard
17 "July and August", the scheduling side of me
18 shuddered a little bit, given the likelihood that
19 some people will have prescheduled vacations,
20 and, by "some people", I mean myself.

21 *[Laughter.]*

22 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: We had originally
23 planned on the 3rd, 4th, and 5th of July, would
24 that be a problem?

1 *[Laughter.]*

2 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: No, that's fine. I
3 have got my calendar in front of me here. If
4 there's preferred dates, we can certainly talk
5 about that.

6 I'm looking now at July 30th, the week
7 of July 30th is open on the Commissioner calendar
8 right now and available, all three Commissioners
9 are available on those dates, I believe.
10 Commissioners, please comment if you see it
11 differently. So, that week would be a good week
12 for us.

13 The following week would also be fine.
14 And, look at that, the following week is fine,
15 too.

16 So, really, I think it's for any time
17 from the last week in July through mid-August
18 would be fine. We do want to wrap this up as
19 soon as possible. We also see this docket as
20 having taken a lot of time, and wish to wrap it
21 up as soon as we can.

22 But the dates on those three weeks
23 would be fine. Attorney Dexter, would there be
24 something you would like to throw out there as a

1 proposal?

2 MR. DEXTER: No, that helps. But I'm
3 just certain that there are going to be a lot of
4 conflicts. And my particular conflict is the
5 week of July 29th. But it's good to have dates
6 that we can -- so, that's the three-week
7 timeframe you're looking at, the week starting
8 July 29th, the week starting August 5th, and the
9 week starting August 12th?

10 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Yes. And I'm
11 showing, I'm going to look real quick here, I'm
12 actually showing -- August is pretty much wide
13 open at the moment. It tends to book up quickly.
14 So, we'd prefer to get the dates that would work
15 for folks as quickly as possible. But August, at
16 the moment, is wide open.

17 So, we don't need to schedule the last
18 week of July, Mr. Dexter. So, enjoy your
19 vacation.

20 And, maybe in the settlement, and
21 linking up the folks that aren't engaged in the
22 settlement, maybe if you could just let us know
23 what would work, I think we can accommodate that.

24 Would you want to have three days in a

1 row? That's, I don't know about the parties, but
2 that becomes challenging, particularly the older
3 you get. So, I don't know if you'd want to do
4 two in one week and one in another, and maybe we
5 can wrap it up in two days, something like that.
6 I know, if people are traveling here, that
7 becomes less convenient. I know it's a balance.

8 MS. CHIAVARA: I think we had -- I
9 think the last place we had settled was on two
10 days. And whether those are together or not, I
11 think probably in the same week would make the
12 most sense.

13 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Yes.

14 MS. CHIAVARA: And, if you'd like the
15 parties to file something along the lines of what
16 we filed a couple weeks ago for weeks of July
17 29th, or maybe not, because of Attorney Dexter,
18 but the weeks of August 5th and August 12th, as
19 far as our availability for that week, we'd be
20 happy to file something?

21 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Perfect. Yes. I
22 think, if -- I think, if we could do it
23 Tuesday/Thursday, pick a week, a Tuesday and
24 Thursday would be helpful for us. From a

1 Commissioner perspective, it's nice to have a day
2 to process the information, maybe the parties
3 appreciate that, too. I know, for the witnesses,
4 that's an extra day. But that would be helpful
5 for us to have a Tuesday and Thursday, and we
6 could wrap it up that way.

7 All right. Is there anything else that
8 we need to cover today?

9 *[No verbal response.]*

10 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: All right. Seeing
11 none.

12 Thank you for your participation.
13 We'll issue a prehearing order in due course. In
14 the prehearing order, we will include the
15 questions and the data that we're interested in
16 as we talked about before. And we are adjourned.
17 Thank you.

18 ***(Whereupon the prehearing conference***
19 ***was adjourned at 10:54 a.m.)***