

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

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

May 16, 2006 - 10:05 a.m.
Concord, New Hampshire

NHPUC MAY31 2006 PM 3:54

RE: DE 06-061
INVESTIGATION OF IMPLEMENTATION
OF FEDERAL STANDARDS OF THE
DOMENICI-BARTON ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005.
(Prehearing conference)

PRESENT: Chairman Thomas B. Getz, Presiding
Commissioner Graham J. Morrison
Commissioner Clifton C. Below

Christine True, Clerk

APPEARANCES: Reptg. National Grid:
Alexandra Blackmore, Esq.

Reptg. Public Service Co. of New Hampshire:
Gerald M. Eaton, Esq.

Reptg. Unitil Energy Systems:
Meabh Purcell, Esq.

Reptg. New Hampshire Electric Cooperative:
Mark W. Dean, Esq.

COURT REPORTER: STEVEN E. PATNAUDE, CCR

ORIGINAL

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)

Pentti Aalto, *pro se*

Roy Morrison, *pro se*

Reptg. N.H. Office of Energy & Planning:

Amy L. Ignatius, Esq., Director

Reptg. Residential Ratepayers:

F. Anne Ross, Esq., Consumer Advocate
Office of Consumer Advocate

Reptg. PUC Staff:

Suzanne G. Amidon, Esq.

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

I N D E X

PAGE NO.

STATEMENTS OF PRELIMINARY POSITION BY:

Ms. Blackmore	6
Mr. Eaton	7
Ms. Purcell	9
Mr. Aalto	13
Mr. Dean	17
Mr. Morrison	20
Ms. Ross	22
Ms. Amidon	23
Ms. Ignatius	24

1 a final determination no later than August 8, 2007 with
2 respect to this standard. And, a fifth standard, under
3 Section 1254, concerns interconnection and has a similar
4 time line.

5 We are not, at this point, in this
6 investigation, in a formal adjudicative proceeding. So, I
7 think what we'll do today is just go around the room and
8 let individuals provide comments on how they recommend
9 that we proceed with our investigation of these five
10 standards. I expect that there will still be a chance
11 for, if not a technical session, at least for the parties
12 to speak among each other, among themselves, after the
13 prehearing conference, to make some written recommendation
14 on how to proceed.

15 I'd just like to make the observation
16 that, with respect to the smart metering standard, that
17 is, in some respects, a continuation of the investigation
18 that the Commission did in docket DE 03-013, and that is
19 an issue that is being reviewed in a number of different
20 forums, and is I think of special importance to the state
21 and to the customers of the various utilities.

22 So, with that, Ms. Blackmore, you are
23 the closest. Do you have a comment on behalf of National
24 Grid?

1 **MS. BLACKMORE:** While National Grid
2 understands the Commission has commenced the proceeding to
3 consider the five standards set forth in the Energy Policy
4 Act of 2005, the standards concerning net metering, fuel
5 sources, fossil fuel generation efficiency, time-based
6 metering and communications or "smart metering" and
7 interconnection of distributed resources.

8 New Hampshire should be commended for
9 having already considered several of these standards in
10 recent years. In particular, advanced metering, which is
11 addressed in Section 1252 of the Energy Policy Act, and
12 with a final -- which was addressed comprehensively by the
13 Commission in docket DE 03-013, with a final order issued
14 in January of 2004. National Grid also recently agreed to
15 study providing hourly pricing to certain of its G-1
16 customers as part of a settlement agreement approved by
17 the Commission in docket DE 05-126. And, in addition, net
18 metering, which is addressed in Section 1251 of the Energy
19 Policy Act, was addressed by the Legislature in RSA
20 362-A:9 and in the Commission's 900 rules.

21 So, in light of the Commission's and/or
22 the State Legislature's previous actions in addressing the
23 topic of advanced meter and net metering, we think a first
24 step might be to determine whether and to what extent

1 these issues should be reconsidered as part of this
2 proceeding. But, in any case, we're looking forward to
3 participating fully in this proceeding to assist the
4 Commission in considering the standards. Thank you.

5 **CHAIRMAN GETZ:** Mr. Eaton.

6 **MR. EATON:** Thank you. Good morning,
7 Mr. Chairman and Commissioners. My name is Gerald Eaton.
8 I'm Senior Counsel for Public Service Company of New
9 Hampshire. And, I actually participated in the first
10 PURPA hearings, after the -- not on behalf of PSNH, but
11 after the passage of the Regulatory Policy Act of 1978.
12 It's my understanding that the Commission needs to
13 consider each of these standards in the context of a
14 proceeding where a hearing takes place and there's a
15 written decision, and decide whether it's appropriate to
16 adopt the standards. And, the Commission need not adopt
17 the standards if it's already implemented a standard or a
18 comparable standard, and considered in a previous
19 proceeding whether to implement the standard or the State
20 Legislature has acted. And, I believe that the initial
21 conversations that the parties will have will explore the
22 recent history of what's been done with respect to the
23 these standards, such as net metering. There is a state
24 statute on net metering in Chapter 362-A and the

1 Commission's 900 rules on net metering.

2 There are a couple of standards that
3 appear to apply more to Public Service Company than the
4 other utilities that purchase their power, and that has to
5 do with fuel sources and fossil fuel generation
6 efficiency. But PSNH is ready to participate fully in
7 those, in those two areas of inquiry. As the Commission
8 mentioned, the time-based metering was explored, and there
9 was some determination of what all the utilities were
10 doing in that area in the docket number DE 03-013, and
11 utilities continue to report on the services that
12 customers are taking, using their advanced meters that
13 have been installed.

14 In the area of interconnection, that is
15 going to take a bit more investigation on our part,
16 because, although we've been -- we have been performing
17 interconnection studies for many, many years with small
18 power producers, the IEEE Standard Number 1547, we need to
19 make sure that that -- what that standard requires. And,
20 also, I think the standard also -- the interconnection
21 standard also talks of model codes adopted by state -- the
22 associations of state regulatory agencies, as far as
23 interconnection policies which favor distributed
24 generation. We'll have to see whether that combines with

1 what we're doing currently. And, also, I think we ought
2 to -- ought to explore what FERC is doing in this area as
3 well. I think FERC is exploring a general policy of
4 interconnections that would apply to even interconnections
5 with very small generators.

6 I think one thing that the Commission
7 and the parties also should understand is the context in
8 which Congress passed this legislation. The context is
9 that not all states are like New Hampshire or New England,
10 where many utilities, there's an open access transmission
11 tariff and there is a wholesale market, and I think we
12 ought to be considering, as part of this investigation,
13 the fact that there is a wholesale market and that the
14 market may provide some of the solutions for these
15 standards, and that the people that were writing the bill
16 may have been writing from a perspective of a majority of
17 jurisdictions still having pretty much the old standard of
18 vertically integrated utilities.

19 That's all we have.

20 **CHAIRMAN GETZ:** Thank you. Ms. Purcell.

21 **MS. PURCELL:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

22 My name is Meabh Purcell, and I am from the office of
23 LeBoeuf, Lamb, Greene & MacRae, in Boston, and I represent
24 Unitil Energy Systems. Unitil welcomes the opportunity to

1 participate in this proceeding and to assist the
2 Commission in its consideration of the new federal
3 standards that have been just enacted and have become part
4 of PURPA. Unitil believes that the New Hampshire
5 Commission, as Ms. Blackmore stated, is in the enviable
6 position of having already addressed many of these issues
7 in some form or another prior to their enactment, and
8 actually has been among the leaders in the nation in
9 addressing these areas.

10 With respect to net metering, under
11 Section 1251, in UES's view, the new standard on net
12 metering, as people who have spoken prior have already
13 mentioned, have already been addressed in -- both by the
14 Legislature, under RSA 362-A:9 and by the Commission in
15 DRM 99-068. And, therefore, it would probably fall under
16 the "prior state action" exemption provided by the federal
17 statute. Net metering for customer-owned renewable energy
18 generation resources of 25 kW or less, that was adopted in
19 Puc 900, is therefore now a New Hampshire standard that's
20 comparable to the new federal standard for net metering.

21 With respect to the fuel sources part of
22 that, of Section 1251, as a provider of default service,
23 UES's position is that the Commission should look at a
24 voluntary utility-sponsored green default service option

1 as a way of meeting the federal requirement to reduce
2 dependence on a single fuel source. UES's repetitive RFP
3 solicitation process helps to ensure a diverse range of
4 fuels in UES's portfolio, because there's an opportunity
5 to change the portfolio every few months.

6 Moving on to the smart metering, under
7 1252: As you know it's been already mentioned, and that
8 the Chairman himself mentioned, that advanced metering was
9 already considered in DE 03-013, which resulted in a
10 settlement for all utilities. And, hourly metering is
11 therefore already in place for UES's largest customers,
12 with the availability of enhanced metering, remote access
13 metering, an interval data service, and pulse output
14 service for all customers on a tariff basis.

15 And, as the Commission is aware, in
16 UES's ongoing rate proceeding, that UES is in the process
17 of implementing advanced metering infrastructure for all
18 of its customer classes, and will have the ability to
19 provide a time-based rate. And, the schedule for
20 implementing this is in the second quarter of 2007.

21 With respect to pricing, suppliers can
22 already offer hourly pricing to large customers as hourly
23 metering is already in place. A proceeding concerning the
24 pricing of default service for UES has been conducted in

1 05-064, and UES is required to investigate the costs of
2 acquiring the capability of providing hourly-based pricing
3 for its large G1 customers.

4 And, with respect to 1254, regarding
5 interconnection, interconnection was also considered under
6 Puc 900, but those rules were adopted prior to the IEEE
7 Standard 1547 referenced in Section 1254. Therefore, the
8 interconnection procedures would need to be reviewed in
9 the context of this proceeding. For other transactions
10 under the New Hampshire Commission's jurisdiction, UES has
11 interconnections procedures in place, but these would also
12 need to be reviewed to incorporate the IEEE Standard 1547.
13 And, for FERC jurisdictional transactions, UES complies
14 with FERC-established standards governing interconnection,
15 which incorporate the IEEE -- it's a very hard acronym to
16 say -- Standard 1547.

17 And, Unitil looks forward to submitting
18 its comments and participating in the tech sessions and in
19 the rest of this proceeding to explore all these issues
20 surrounding the new federal standards. Thank you.

21 **CHAIRMAN GETZ:** Thank you. Before I
22 turn to Mr. Aalto, I hope I haven't created a
23 misimpression. I'm certainly not taking the position that
24 the findings in 03-013 constituted prior state action that

1 exempts any further consideration of especially the smart
2 metering standard. And, in fact, given what we've seen
3 from the New England Independent System Operator, with
4 their concerns about improving demand response and
5 improving retail/wholesale linkages, that, at least for my
6 part, and I think I speak for the three of us, that these
7 are important issues that need to be looked into to find
8 out whether there's more that can be done, whether there
9 are better things that can be done, and taking a look at
10 just what actions have been taken and should greater
11 encouragement be given to C&I customers, and should this
12 be something that should reach down to residential
13 customers. I'd like to make that clear for the record.

14 Mr. Aalto.

15 **MR. AALTO:** Chairman, Commissioners
16 thank you very much for the opportunity to speak, and
17 thank you for the most recent comment, because that is
18 exactly what I'll be addressing.

19 Indeed, New Hampshire is ahead of many
20 in the area of -- in these particular areas. We do have a
21 net metering law. I believe it's not quite up to snuff,
22 but I believe it's a good beginning. As for
23 interconnection, a lot of activity has gone on in
24 neighboring states that we might learn from. It's not

1 simply the electrical part of interconnection, but the
2 process of getting the approvals that can be very
3 important. So, we probably should consider those issues.
4 I would recommend the activities at the Massachusetts
5 Technological Collaborative looking at distributed
6 generation interconnection issues.

7 The area that I'd like to put most of my
8 focus on is the area of smart metering. We have had what
9 I believe to be appropriate levels of metering
10 requirements on the utilities in the past couple of years.
11 We have also had very little response particularly from
12 small customers. And, I believe part of the problem is
13 that we haven't really known what to do with a smart meter
14 or a smart price or whatever. What we'd like to do, and
15 I'm speaking here with Roy Morrison --

16 **MR. MORRISON:** I have a proposal.
17 Should I give it to you now?

18 **MR. AALTO:** We can give you a copy of a
19 proposal that we have.

20 **CHAIRMAN GETZ:** Please.

21 **MR. AALTO:** Yes. To look at a more
22 advanced system that would be with the intent of coming up
23 with a system of spot pricing of electricity for small
24 customers that would be inexpensive enough so that maybe

1 even a homeowner could use it. The intent would be to use
2 five minute pricing derived from the ISO and transmitted
3 to customers. Their billing would be done on an ongoing
4 basis based on that five minute price. The reason for
5 going to a five minute price is that it provides more
6 control to the customer. It provides the ability to
7 actually respond in real-time. An hourly price usually
8 means that I know what I paid for what I bought last hour.
9 I didn't know what it was when I was buying it. If we can
10 shorten the time period, the customer knows more of what
11 they're doing and can control better.

12 Second aspects of that are that it
13 provides a better response for the ISO. Because, in a
14 five minute scheme, we can respond to the actual system
15 state. That is to say, if the ISO suddenly runs short, it
16 has about 10 to 20 minutes to catch up. If we have fast
17 response, my water heater can shut off very quickly, and
18 those types of possibilities are available. The
19 technologies we're looking at are relatively simple
20 technologies that are using existing networks for
21 communication. It's not to say that these are the optimum
22 or that they're best way to go. My sense is, any one of
23 the many metering companies can do similar types of
24 things, and probably would. The purpose of this proposal

1 is to test these concepts on a small level, to see if, in
2 fact, this more advanced kind of process can work.

3 I should point out that the idea of
4 residential load response is moving forward. We mention
5 briefly activity in Illinois with the Community Energy
6 Cooperative in the ComEd territory, has had a three-year
7 project with about 1,500 customers, with surveys
8 indicating very high levels of customer satisfaction.
9 And, this is with a voluntary program, with customers
10 having the ability to receive a critical pricing kind of
11 information, but also a fully operative variable price on
12 a day-ahead basis. And, the end result is that they have
13 been able to achieve, by manual actions, something on the
14 order of 15 percent peak reductions for that class of
15 customers that were involved, during the peak hours, and
16 also some energy savings in addition to that. It seems to
17 have worked well, the customers have liked it and felt
18 comfortable. A few of the components, one of the worries
19 with a variable price is that I might someday see that
20 \$1.00 kilowatt-hour. Well, they set a price cap as part
21 of it, which they purchased as a price cap purchase that
22 covered all of the customers, at very low cost, because it
23 was a very high level that kept the price from going nuts.

24 My sense is that we can, at very low

1 cost, test these concepts, and in a very open kind of way
2 so that they would be -- the results would be available in
3 any of the many metering systems that are out there to
4 adapt in ways that would work best for them, and also, of
5 course, with the utilities that would be using them.

6 And, I'd be glad to answer any questions
7 later, if it's appropriate. Thank you very much.

8 **CHAIRMAN GETZ:** Thank you. Mr. Dean.

9 **MR. DEAN:** Good morning. My name is
10 Mark Dean, from the law firm of Devine, Millimet & Branch,
11 on behalf of the New Hampshire Electric Cooperative. I
12 guess my comments this morning are mainly intended to
13 answer the question that's been asked of me by several
14 people in the room this morning, you know, why am I here?
15 And, for that, unfortunately, you need to get a modified
16 version of my oft repeated jurisdictional speech. Under
17 the --

18 **CHAIRMAN GETZ:** Is there a footnote you
19 can cite us to on this?

20 **MR. DEAN:** It will be modified and
21 hopefully shortened. Under the New Hampshire regulatory
22 scheme in which the Co-op is now a deregulated rural
23 electric cooperative, the Commission retains jurisdiction
24 over PURPA enforcement. That's just the beginning,

1 though, of the analysis, because, under the sections of
2 PURPA that these five standards, which were added under
3 the Energy Policy Act, fall, the Co-op would be an
4 unregulated utility. And, so, the Commission would not
5 have a directive or authority to evaluate these standards
6 and decide whether they should be implemented with regard
7 to the Cooperative, but the Cooperative would have its own
8 independent and parallel obligation to undertake an
9 evaluation and determination and a decision about
10 implementing these standards within its own service
11 territory. And, the statute -- the PURPA statute requires
12 that that involve hearings, notice, a written decision,
13 *etcetera*. Not necessarily all of the same procedural
14 requirements that would exist here at the PUC, but also
15 not simply a managerial decision at the Cooperative one
16 way or the other.

17 And, so, it is the Cooperative's hope
18 that it can work with the parties to find a way to
19 participate in this proceeding, so that it can both
20 hopefully contribute something constructive to the process
21 for all the parties, but also to be part of a process
22 which develops a record and takes into account issues
23 which the Cooperative itself might not specifically
24 consider, issues about statewide uniformity of practices,

1 etcetera. So that, at the end of the day, a decision on
2 adopting these standards will be under the law a
3 obligation of the Cooperative Board of Directors, but that
4 you can do that in a more fully informed context if the
5 Cooperative participates in this proceeding.

6 So, really, the Co-op's viewpoint here
7 is, I don't know exactly how we would structure it, but
8 that we work with the Staff and the other parties when a
9 scoping order, a procedural order is developed, to find a
10 way that the Co-op can participate in a way the parties
11 feel is useful to this process, and the Co-op at the same
12 time feels it's useful for its ends.

13 **CHAIRMAN GETZ:** Thank you.

14 **CMSR. BELOW:** I have a question for
15 Mr. Dean, if I may.

16 **MR. DEAN:** Yes.

17 **CMSR. BELOW:** I'm wondering if the Co-op
18 might be willing to share with the other parties some of
19 its experience with day-ahead pricing, real-time pricing
20 for some of its large commercial customers?

21 **MR. DEAN:** As part of this proceeding?

22 **CMSR. BELOW:** Yes, as part of this
23 proceeding.

24 **MR. DEAN:** I would assume so.

1 **CHAIRMAN GETZ:** Okay. Mr. Morrison.

2 **MR. MORRISON:** I'd just like to make a
3 couple of remarks to add to issues that weren't mentioned
4 in our proposal for a pilot. I think that one of the -- I
5 think I'll stand. I think one of the -- there's two major
6 experiences in attempted deregulation and attempt to have
7 retail competition is, one, that there's been little use
8 of modern information technology. That the utility
9 industry, you know, still is in the same position as it
10 was when Detroit Edison was sending radio signals to shut
11 off water heaters from central dispatch. And, we've not
12 utilized modern electronic two-way communication. You
13 know, which -- You know, so that we're all connected to
14 the internet, we're all in cellphone networks, we all have
15 pagers, Blackberries, you know, and yet we have, you know,
16 essentially a 1950s utility system, you know, which is
17 now, you know, moving to having communication -- some
18 communications for largest users. But, in fact, you know,
19 in the information age, that each of us, as consumers,
20 should have the opportunity to optimize the operation of
21 our equipment in our homes, and that technology is
22 available now, those networks existing to move that
23 information back and forth, and the ISO now has five
24 minute pricing available that we can use as a source for

1 that control information for those strategies. And, so,
2 the question is, "can this be done in a cost-effective
3 manner? And, I believe that will be true.

4 And, the second thing is, is that the
5 net effect of competition on small commercial and
6 residential customers has been negligible. You know, that
7 people have not been able to exercise any sort of
8 meaningful choice or participation in the pursuit of
9 savings, because, you know, individual customer
10 acquisition is too expensive. But what's been
11 demonstrated is that, by people volunteering for a load
12 response system that's automated, that, in fact, has been
13 demonstrated in Illinois that this system works, that
14 people can achieve real savings and participate in the
15 market. And, further, that the existence of such a market
16 would attract other competitors to provide financial cap
17 contracts or other things to shield people from higher
18 rates, you know, that would open up a new area of business
19 for competitors and encourage meter companies and other
20 kinds of equipment suppliers to develop new -- to develop
21 and implement new technologies.

22 So, I think that it's a good time for us
23 to open the door for the participation in modern electric
24 systems to residential and small commercial customers.

1 And, the proposal that we have on the table generically
2 discuss the establishment of a pilot that would enlist the
3 participation of all interested utilities, and that we
4 would recruit people in small numbers and learn, if we can
5 make this system work cost-effectively. And, I think it's
6 in all our collective interest. It helps the people who
7 participate, it helps all electric customers by reducing
8 the peak load, and, as we know, you know, as in times of
9 congestion, small reductions in demand can lead to big
10 reductions in price. And, further, you know, we're about
11 to swallow huge ICAP costs, and a substantial amount of
12 that might be reduced if we can, through load control,
13 reduce our peak. So, I think it's appropriate and in the
14 public interest to pursue such a pilot program, which
15 would be affordable and I believe effective. Thank you.

16 **CHAIRMAN GETZ:** Ms. Ross.

17 **MS. ROSS:** Yes. Thank you. I'll be
18 brief. The OCA welcomes this docket as an opportunity to
19 explore some options that are suggested or recommended
20 under the Energy Policy Act. And, we will be interested
21 in looking at where customers are on a class-by-class
22 basis with regard to the initiatives that this Commission
23 has already put in place concerning advanced metering and
24 net metering. And, we'll also be concerned about how any

1 programs or pilots are implemented, to make sure that they
2 are actually available to residential customers, so that
3 we can test the residential customer class's willingness
4 and ability to adopt more advanced approaches to procuring
5 electric power. Thank you.

6 **CHAIRMAN GETZ:** Thank you. Ms. Amidon.

7 **MS. AMIDON:** Thank you. Staff has not
8 formed any recommendations regarding any of the five
9 standards at this point. We think it's appropriate to use
10 the wealth of knowledge that's in this room and try to
11 develop what we can in examining the potential for
12 implementing these standards, and along with the costs and
13 the practicality. So, we have developed what we think is
14 a procedural schedule to try to elicit that knowledge from
15 the parties and to develop a report that addresses each of
16 the five issues.

17 On a procedural note, I received a phone
18 call this morning from Dan Delurey with DRAM, and he will
19 be participating in this docket. And, James Rodier, with
20 Freedom Energy, will also be participating in this docket.
21 They just couldn't be here today.

22 **CHAIRMAN GETZ:** Thank you. Is there
23 anyone else here who didn't sign up would like to make a
24 comment?

1 **MS. IGNATIUS:** Mr. Chairman, good
2 morning. Amy Ignatius, from the Office of Energy &
3 Planning. And, I apologize for missing the sign-in sheet
4 time. The Office of Energy & Planning has been a
5 consistent advocate of efficiency and fuel diversity and
6 new developments in metering technology, to give more
7 opportunities for demand respond and customer control over
8 their accounts, where it's practical and cost-effective.
9 So, we're very happy to participate in this docket to
10 build on the start that has already been made in other
11 dockets in all of these issues.

12 We are intrigued with the pilot program
13 that Mr. Morrison and Mr. Aalto are describing. Haven't
14 studied it, obviously, yet, but I would hope that,
15 although this was a docket on standards through the Energy
16 Policy Act, that something that might be a creative
17 response to experiment with that, whether it's that
18 proposal or any other, could be -- could grow from this
19 docket if it's a good proposal, and not simply be limited
20 to whether or not to adopt standards, to kind of take it
21 the next step and experiment with some practical ideas.
22 We've got a lot of good people at the table on these
23 issues, and anything we can do that really starts to put
24 some things out there in the field and experiment and

1 develop some data seems like a good idea.

2 I also would like to explore in our tech
3 session with everyone here, and encourage the Commission
4 to do the same in its context, to see what's being done on
5 a regional level among the other states. I can work with
6 my counterparts in similar offices in the New England
7 states, the PUCs, other utilities must know much of what
8 their states are doing. And, if there is a way that we
9 can do anything on a common basis throughout New England,
10 it seems to me that's helpful. We're all very separate in
11 our state borders, but, to the marketers, you know, this
12 is lot of little territories, and it would be nice to have
13 as common a structure as possible. It helps to bring more
14 interest and investment and marketing interest to New
15 England and to New Hampshire specifically.

16 So, I offer that from my office to do
17 anything I can to learn more about that or to enlist the
18 New England Governors Conference, if they would be
19 interested in looking at many of these issues as well.

20 And, I think that's the end of my
21 comments. I appreciate it. Thank you.

22 **CMSR. BELOW:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23 In the interest of full disclosure, I'll just mention to
24 the parties that I attended the ISO New England Demand

1 Response Summit, in which ISO-New England was I think
2 essentially advocating for states to look more
3 aggressively at demand response opportunities, in light of
4 a constraint on generation capacity and import capacity
5 that's fairly imminent in this year and coming summers.
6 And, it was at that summit that a customer of the New
7 Hampshire Electric Co-op, American Skiing, made a
8 presentation about their experience with day-ahead pricing
9 that was I thought quite interesting. So, I thought maybe
10 something like that might be interesting to all the
11 parties here.

12 So, I would urge the parties to think
13 creatively about this opportunity, in terms of
14 opportunities that could continue to put New Hampshire
15 perhaps ahead of the curve, in terms of taking advantage
16 of cost savings opportunities for customers and for the
17 state as a whole.

18 I would also mention, in the interest of
19 full disclosure, that when I was in the Legislature I was
20 the prime sponsor of the net metering legislation. And,
21 although it looks as though we were, you know, sort of
22 addressed that issue, I think this may be an opportunity
23 to review our experience to date and see whether there is
24 any corrections or updates that might be considered even

1 on net metering, where a lot of work has already been
2 done. So, I just wanted to share that. Thank you.

3 **CHAIRMAN GETZ:** Are there any other
4 comments that people would like to make this morning?

5 (No verbal response)

6 **CHAIRMAN GETZ:** Okay. Hearing nothing,
7 then we will close the prehearing conference and wait for
8 a recommendation from the parties on next steps in this
9 investigation. Thank you very much.

10 **(Whereupon the prehearing conference**
11 **ended at 10:40 a.m. and the parties**
12 **participated in a technical session**
13 **thereafter.)**

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24