1	STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE		
2		PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION	
3			
4	October 24, 2012 - 1:37 p.m. Concord, New Hampshire		
5	Concord, New II	NHPUC NOVO5'12 PM 2:48	
6	RE:	DE 12-262	
7	KE.	2013-2014 CORE New Hampshire	
	ME LES CORSOLS	Electric and Gas Energy Efficiency	
8		Programs. (Prehearing conference)	
9	stansia a yete	na tro en til til jerig jage smil	
10			
11	PRESENT:	F. Anne Ross, General Counsel	
12		(Presiding as Hearings Examiner)	
13		Sandy Deno, Clerk	
14	an organistics		
15	APPEARANCES: Reptg. Public Service of New Hampshire: Matthew J. Fossum, Esq.		
16		Reptg. Granite State Electric Co. and	
17		EnergyNorth Natural Gas, Inc., d/b/a Liberty Utilities:	
18		Sarah B. Knowlton, Esq.	
19		Reptg. Unitil Energy Systems and Northern Utilities, Inc.:	
20	Section Act	Rachel A. Goldwasser, Esq. (Orr & Reno)	
21		Reptg. New Hampshire Electric Cooperative: Mark W. Dean, Esq.	
22		mark w. Dean, 134.	
23	Court R	eporter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52	
24		D 2	

1		
2	APPEARANCES:	(Continued)
3		Reptg. the Jordan Institute: Dana Nute
4		Reptg. TRC Energy Services:
5		Tom Rooney
6		Reptg. The Way Home: Alan Linder, Esq. (N.H. Legal Assistance)
7		Reptg. the Dept. of Environmental Services:
8		Rebecca Ohler
9		Reptg. the Office of Energy & Planning: Brandy Chambers
10		Reptg. Residential Ratepayers:
11		Susan W. Chamberlin, Esq., Consumer Advocate Stephen Eckberg
12		Office of Consumer Advocate
13		Reptg. PUC Staff: Marcia A. B. Thunberg, Esq., Esq.
14		James J. Cunningham, Jr., Electric Division Al-Azad Iqbal, Electric Division
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

1		
2	INDEX	
3		PAGE NO.
4	STATEMENTS OF PRELIMINARY POSITION BY:	
5	Mr. Fossum	6
6	Ms. Knowlton	8
7	Ms. Goldwasser	9
8	Mr. Dean	10
9	Ms. Chambers	10
10	Ms. Ohler	11
11	Mr. Nute	11
12	Mr. Linder	11
13	Ms. Chamberlin	12
14	Ms. Thunberg	13
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

{DE 12-262} [Prehearing conference] {10-24-12}

1 PROCEEDING

MS. ROSS: Okay. We are here this afternoon in Docket DE 12-262, which is the 2013-2014 CORE New Hampshire Electric and Gas Efficiency Programs. My name is Anne Ross. I will be serving as Hearings Examiner today. And, I will report back to the Commissioners with recommendations.

On September 17th, 2012, Granite State
Electric Company, doing business as Liberty Utilities, New
Hampshire Electric Cooperative, Inc., Public Service
Company of New Hampshire, Unitil Energy Systems,
EnergyNorth Natural Gas, doing business as Liberty
Utilities, and Northern Utilities, doing business as
Unitil, jointly filed with the Commission a proposal for
the 2013-2014 CORE New Hampshire Energy Efficiency
Programs of the electric utilities and the energy
efficiency plan of the gas utilities for the period
January 1st, 2013 through December 31st, 2014.

Let me begin by checking with Public

Service Company of New Hampshire for an affidavit of

publication of the order of notice? Is that available?

MR. FOSSUM: That was filed a few days
ago, yes.

MS. ROSS: Okay. Do you have it? Thank

{DE 12-262} [Prehearing conference] {10-24-12}

```
1
       you. For interventions, what I have a record of are the
 2
       following: New Hampshire Community Action Association,
 3
       Jordan Institute, The Way Home, the Office of Energy &
       Planning, TRC, and the Department of Energy Services.
 4
                                                              Are
 5
       there any other intervenors -- oh, and the Office of
 6
       Consumer Advocate through a letter of participation.
 7
       there any other intervenors that I don't have a record of
      here today?
 8
 9
                         MS. OHLER: Just to correct, that last
10
       one I think is "Environmental Services"?
11
                         MS. ROSS:
                                    I'm sorry, what did I say?
                         MS. OHLER:
12
                                     "Energy".
13
                         MS. ROSS:
                                    I apologize, yes. Department
14
       of Environmental Services.
15
                         MS. OHLER: Thank you.
16
                         MS. ROSS:
                                    I was just trying to get you
17
       guys more in the energy realm. All right. Are there any
18
       procedural issues that we need to address this morning,
19
      before dealing with opening statements from the parties?
20
                         MS. THUNBERG:
                                        I'll take this
21
       opportunity to deal with an administrative matter.
       trying to make sure that the service list in this docket
22
23
       is complete. And, I have handed out a list of -- a copy
24
       of the service list to the people in this room today for
```

```
1
       any corrections or additions that the Commission may have
 2
       as an oversight. So, I just wanted to let folks know that
 3
       the Clerk can take a copy -- or, take the service list
       edits that you have at the end of the prehearing, and
 4
 5
       we'll make sure that we have the service list correct, to
 6
       include the people who have intervened and are parties to
 7
       this docket.
                     Thank you.
                         MS. ROSS: Thank you. Are there any
 8
 9
       other matters that we need to deal with?
10
                         (No verbal response)
11
                         MS. ROSS: All right. In that case, I
       think we'll begin with just brief statements for purposes
12
13
       of the record, preliminary statements of position in the
14
       docket. And, we'll begin with the lead Petitioner, which
15
       would be Public Service.
16
                         MR. FOSSUM: Just to clarify, due you
       wish to take appearances and statement?
17
18
                         MS. ROSS: As you give your statement,
19
       yes, please.
20
                         MR. FOSSUM: Okay. In that case,
21
       Matthew Fossum, on behalf of Public Service Company of New
       Hampshire. To lead off then, for our statement, PSNH,
22
23
       along with the other utilities in this state have worked
24
      hard to prepare this filing on the CORE Programs, and have
```

done so in a manner consistent with the prior orders and agreements for the CORE Programs. These are certainly important programs that have led to substantial benefits for consumers in New Hampshire.

And, as to this particular program, I wanted to highlight just a few things. First, this is the second time that the programs are being proposed to run for a two-year period. So, they would be for 2013 and 2014. In addition, this is the first time that all of the gas and electric programs are included together, making this a somewhat more comprehensive filing than it had been in the past.

In the body of this proposal, the utilities have presented various fuel neutral programs, as anticipated by the Commission's latest orders. And, we also wanted to highlight that the proposal here incorporates the use of the RGGI funds, as had been anticipated both by the Commission and by the Legislature in advance of this filing.

We are certainly prepared to work with the other parties to this docket, and as collaboratively a manner as possible, to discuss this proposal, and to move it forward.

In the tech session to follow, we intend

1 to work on a procedural schedule and any other matters, and hope that we can reach a resolution on at least the 2 3 schedule that would accommodate the needs and concerns of everybody, and, in particular, the utilities need to vet 4 5 these programs fully, and yet still have them in place and 6 ready to go for January 2013. Thank you. 7 MS. ROSS: Could I ask a question on clarification, and any of the Petitioners can answer. 8 9 quickly looking at your filing, it appears that what is 10 done in this initial filing is to simply include the 11 additional funds that are coming through RGGI, but to basically fund the normal course suite with those funds. 12 13 I did not notice new programs. Did I miss something or is 14 that the initial position of the filing parties? 15 MR. FOSSUM: It's my understanding there 16 are some new programs with the RGGI funds. 17 MS. ROSS: Okay. Thank you. 18 Appearances from the other parties who joined in that Petition? 19 20 MS. KNOWLTON: Thank you, Hearing 21 Officer. Good afternoon. My name is Sarah Knowlton. 22 here today on behalf of Granite State Electric Company and 23 EnergyNorth Natural Gas, both doing business as Liberty

Utilities. We're pleased today to be jointly proposing

these programs for both gas and electric utilities for the programs year 2013 and 2014. We have a truncated period of time to do a lot of hard work in this docket. So, we do look forward to working in the most efficient manner with the Staff and the OCA and all of the parties to this docket. Otherwise, I would echo and join in the opening comments offered by Attorney Fossum.

MS. GOLDWASSER: Good afternoon. My name is Rachel Goldwasser, from the law firm of Orr & Reno, here in Concord, here on behalf of Unitil Energy Systems and Northern Utilities. With me is Tom Palma. Unitil and Northern concur with the statements made by Attorneys Fossum and Knowlton in support of the filing that's been made regarding the CORE Energy Efficiency Programs.

The Company looks forward to working with the other parties to this docket and Commission Staff in the tech sessions in the coming weeks ahead, to bring this matter before the Commission so soon in December. We would ask the Commission review the programs filed on September 17th and approve them, so they can continue as of January 1st, 2013.

For the record, I would like to note that Page 3 of the order of notice indicates, and I'll

```
1
       quote, that "The Electric and Gas Utilities state that
       they will not include the non-electric energy savings
 2
 3
       associated with the HPwES program in compliance with Order
      Number 25,402, in Docket Number DE 10-188." And, for the
 4
 5
       purpose of clarification, the gas utilities would seek a
 6
       performance incentive associated with non-electric energy
 7
       savings on the gas HPwES programs.
                                   Thank you.
 8
                         MS. ROSS:
 9
                         MR. DEAN:
                                   Good afternoon.
                                                     Mark Dean,
10
       on behalf of the New Hampshire Electric Cooperative.
11
       Since I think the hallmark of this proceeding is going to
       be a tightened schedule, I'll be brief and simply
12
13
       reiterate what those other utilities have said before now.
14
       Thank you.
15
                         MS. ROSS:
                                    Thank you.
16
                         MS. CHAMBERS: Brandy Chambers, New
17
       Hampshire OEP. We don't have any position at this time.
18
       But we look forward to participating in this docket.
                         MS. ROSS:
19
                                    Thank you.
20
                         MS. OHLER: Are we all --
21
                         MS. ROSS: Yes.
                                          I'm sorry. We're just
22
       asking for appearances. If you don't have a position,
23
       just give your appearance and we'll move on.
24
                         MS. OHLER:
                                     Okay. Rebecca Ohler,
```

1 Department of Environmental Services. And, we have no position at this time. 2 3 MS. ROSS: Okay. 4 MR. NUTE: Yes. Dana Nute, on behalf of 5 the Jordan Institute. I'll be intervening here. And, I believe a letter, I just want to speak up, was presented 6 7 from the Community Action Agency that Ryan Clouthier was not going to be able to be here today. 8 9 MS. ROSS: Yes, we received that. 10 Okay. Thank you. MR. NUTE: 11 Tom Rooney, with TRC Energy MR. ROONEY: Services. 12 13 MR. LINDER: Good afternoon. 14 Linder, from New Hampshire Legal Assistance, and we 15 represent The Way Home. We have filed to intervene in 16 this proceeding, and we have reviewed most of the filing, 17 and are generally supportive of it, particularly the low 18 income section. We do have some questions that need a little clarification, and we sent out our questions about 19 three weeks ago. And, I guess, really the main concern is 20 21 the rather tight timeframe for this proceeding. And, now, 22 whether an order can be issued so that the programs can

get off the ground running January 1st of 2013, the --

like to do our best to try to avoid disruptions in the

23

program delivery. Although, if the CAP representative was 1 here, they would probably say that the worst thing that 2 3 could happen would be to disrupt the program, because 4 contractors have been -- and employees have been laid off during the year, they're in the process of rehiring. 6 Stopping again would be a real concern. So, thank you 7 very much. 8

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Thank you. MS. ROSS:

MS. CHAMBERLIN: Susan Chamberlin, Consumer Advocate for the residential ratepayers. With me today is Steve Eckberg. We are delighted to be working with Staff and the parties on these programs. We are interested in continuing the move toward uniformity throughout the state of the programs, and to increase opportunities for residential participation.

In light of the compressed procedural schedule, we understand that Staff has been doing an audit of the programs. And, we were hoping that the results of the audit could be given to all the parties before our testimony is due, so that, if there are changes, if the audit comes up with things that need to be addressed, then we'll be able to incorporate them into the programs.

> Thank you. MS. ROSS: Staff?

MS. THUNBERG: Good afternoon. Hearings

{DE 12-262} [Prehearing conference] {10-24-12}

Examiner Ross. Staff has no objection to the interventions that have been filed in this docket. We don't need to reiterate too much, that we are under a compressed time schedule with the late start of this docket, and bumping up against a December 31st deadline for Commission approval.

Staff, with the press of other business, has not been able to start a thorough review of the filing yet. We know that OCA and The Way Home are ahead of us, and we're going to be reviewing their discovery requests so that we're not duplicating in our efforts.

With the compressed schedule, Staff and the parties are working on a proposed procedural schedule. We hope to discuss this at the tech session. And, hopefully, in a matter of days, we'll be filing that with the Commission for approval.

Staff has gone ahead and grabbed -- put a hold on December 21st as a hearing date. There was a lot of activity going on, and that was the -- one of the only dates that we could grab to secure for a hearing for today -- or, not for today, but for this docket.

With the fact that the schedule is compressed, we're having some disagreement over discovery deadlines. And, Staff would just like to state at the

```
beginning, even -- whatever date we pick for discovery
 1
       responses to be due, we understand that there may be some
 2
 3
       responses that are late. And, we'll just try to work with
       that.
             But, also, I guess Staff is signaling to the
 4
 5
       Commissioners that, with discovery being more fluid in
       this particular proceeding, because of the compressed
 6
 7
       time, that there may be some late filings, corrections to
       testimony, etcetera. But we will do our best, Staff,
 8
 9
       working with the parties, to make an efficient streamlined
10
      presentation at the hearing.
11
                         So, with that, Staff looks forward to
       working with the parties in the tech session and the
12
      proceeding.
13
                    Thank you.
14
                         MS. ROSS:
                                    Thank you. Are there any
15
       objections to any of the interventions that are proposed
16
       at this time?
17
                         (No verbal response)
18
                         MS. ROSS: Okay. Seeing none, I'll
19
       assume that everyone's intervention requests are
20
       unopposed.
21
                         I think, at this point, the prehearing
       conference, the items that needed to be completed at the
22
23
       prehearing conference are done. I have one question.
24
       did hear a party, now I can't recall who, mentioned
```

```
1
       "December 1st" as a deadline in this docket, and then I
      heard Staff proposing a hearing date of "December 21st".
 2
       I hope the parties can work in the technical session to
 3
       come up with a Commission schedule for this proceeding
 4
 5
       that gets us to the end line as soon as possible.
       date that you need an order is December 31st, you have
 6
 7
       left the Commission ten days to deliberate and decide and
       to draft an order approving the program.
 8
 9
                         So, I'd urge you to keep that in mind.
10
       And, also, please, if you can, use this tech session not
11
       only to come up with a procedural schedule, but to
       actually make some progress on outstanding discovery
12
13
       issues. And, if there are parties who wish to suggest
14
       alternative programming that you get it on the table
15
       early, because the -- this schedule is compressed.
16
                         Are there any other items that we need
       to cover before I close the hearing? Does anyone got any
17
18
       other concerns?
19
                         (No verbal response)
20
                         MS. ROSS: Okay. Thank you.
21
       case, the prehearing conference is closed. And, I will
22
       make a recommendation on the interventions. Thank you.
23
                         (The prehearing conference ended at 1:54
24
                         p.m., and a technical session followed)
```