



September 3, 2010

Debra Howland  
Executive Director  
NH Public Utilities Commission  
21 S. Fruit Street, Suite 10  
Concord, NH 03301

Re: DE-10-212 Commercial and Industrial Energy Rebate Program

Dear Ms. Howland:

NHSEA fully supports the proposed incentive program. The proposal for an initial rollout is limited to solar technologies – we understand that the PUC and the market both have experience working with these technologies and they will help the PUC develop the program and provide for a sound foundation. Once the initial rollout period has provided the clarity and support for the staff to refine the programs, we support the inclusion of other renewable technologies. Many of these technologies are provided by New Hampshire companies and are based on products and fuel sources and promote renewable energy to a wider user base.

We also support the position that broad rebates to many classes of renewable energy users is an important as part of a transformational effect on the market adoption of such technologies. As such, we support a limit on rebates in terms of amount, size, and participants. Rapid deployment in a limited number of projects does not insure a sustainable and market-based transition. As adoption increases and prices reduce, rebates can decline without having a start-stop program that lacks the necessary predictability necessary to support widespread adoption and access. Although it may be enticing to focus on quantity at this stage, we believe that the quality and diversity of access is as important. The proposed cap of \$50,000 per project is a reasonable roll out and we would suggest further limits on participants and installers having access to these rebates.

We fully support the opening of these rebates to non-profits and governments. Unlike tax-based programs, the PUC rebate is based on electricity usage and rates, which does not have change with your tax status. The funds should be open to all qualified customers in New Hampshire. Furthermore, we recommend that these rebate programs be available to third-party financial structures that are, for many, the only way to provide the initial capital to facilitate adoption. Concerns about exporting rebates could limit third-party access to New Hampshire companies serving end-use customers in New Hampshire. Unlike REC sales, this is a rate-payer based

incentive and should likewise be able to be limited to rate-payers for the benefit. It is not infected with the same Commerce Clause concerns raised in the recent Solar REC program in Massachusetts.

We do not recommend limitations on entities that must have been in operation/existence for a set amount of time. There is no data to suggest that an entity in existence for 2 years has any empirical reason to continue versus a new entity that is making initial investments in buildings, facilities, and other programs for its launch.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important program.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Clay", enclosed within a large, horizontal, oval-shaped flourish.

Clay Mitchell, Esq. PhD  
President NHSEA