1	STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE		
2	PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION		
3		NHPUC MAR21'13 PM 3:41	
4	February 20, Concord, New	2013 - 10:06 a.m. Hampshire	
5	l comocia, new	Trainpoint to	
6			
7	RE:	PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE:	
8		Petition for Renewable Default Energy Service Rate. (Prehearing conference)	
9			
10			
11	PRESENT:	Commissioner Michael D. Harrington, presiding Commissioner Robert R. Scott	
12		Commissioner Robert R. Scott	
13		Sandy Deno, Clerk	
14			
15	APPEARANCES:	Reptg. Public Service Co. of New Hampshire: Matthew J. Fossum, Esg.	
16		,	
17		Reptg. Residential Ratepayers: Rorie E. P. Hollenberg, Esq.	
18		Stephen R. Eckberg Office of Consumer Advocate	
19		Reptg. PUC Staff:	
20	Alexander F. Speidel, Esq. Steven E. Mullen, Director/Electric Divisi		
21			
22			
23	Cou	rt Reporter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52	
24			

1		
2	INDEX	
3		PAGE NO.
4	STATEMENTS OF PRELIMINARY POSITION BY:	
5	Mr. Fossum	4
6	Ms. Hollenberg	8
7	Mr. Speidel	9
8		
9	QUESTIONS BY:	
10	Cmsr. Scott	7
11	Cmsr. Harrington	8
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

PROCEEDING

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Good morning. morning we're here for the prehearing conference on Docket DE 12-358, Public Service Company of New Hampshire, Petition to Adjust Renewable Energy Service Rates. December 19th, 2012, the Public Service Company of New Hampshire filed a petition to adjust its Renewable Default Service Energy rate with supporting testimony and related attachments. In its petition, PSNH requested that the Commission increase its RDES rate to 5.558 cents per kilowatt-hour for customers electing the 100 percent; to 2.779 cents per kilowatt-hour for customers electing the 50 percent option; and 1.395 cents per kilowatt-hour for customers electing the 25 percent option. In addition, the Company now seeks to establish a minimum of customers required to continue the RDES Program rate.

We have had the public notice filing was published in the <u>Union Leader</u> on February 7th. So, that's been covered. And, we've also had a application from the OCA to join the hearing, which they will.

And, other than that, I guess we'll start with appearances.

MR. FOSSUM: Good morning,

Commissioners. Matthew Fossum, for Public Service Company

```
1
       of New Hampshire.
 2
                         MS. HOLLENBERG:
                                          Good morning. Rorie
 3
       Hollenberg and Stephen Eckberg here for the Office of
 4
       Consumer Advocate.
 5
                         MR. SPEIDEL: Good morning. Alexander
 6
       Speidel, Staff Counsel, substituting for Staff Counsel
 7
       Suzanne Amidon. And, I have with me Steve Mullen of the
 8
       Electric Division.
 9
                         CMSR. HARRINGTON:
                                            Okay.
10
                         MR. SPEIDEL: Thank you.
11
                         CMSR. HARRINGTON: Because I've been
12
       known to do this, are there any administrative issues that
13
       I might have missed?
14
                         (No verbal response)
15
                         CMSR. HARRINGTON:
                                            Hearing none, I quess
       we'll start with the positions of the parties, starting
16
17
       with Public Service.
18
                         MR. FOSSUM: Thank you, Commissioner.
19
       As you have essentially just stated, the Company, by its
20
       filing, is requesting effectively two things. First, PSNH
21
       is looking for Commission approval to change the RDES rate
22
       last set in Order Number 25,324, on January 31, 2012.
23
                         One thing I did want to bring up is
24
       that, at the time of the Company's filing, the proposed
```

rate for the 100 percent option was as you had stated,
5.558 cents per kilowatt-hour, for the 100 percent option.
The proposed rate was based upon the anticipated
Alternative Compliance Payment level for Class I and II
RECs. Since that time, the actual level has been set at a
level slightly below that. So, the Company's proposal,
the rate amount would change from "5.558" to "5.5", for
the 100 percent option. It would change from "2.779" to
"2.75", for the 50 percent option. And, from "1.3895" to
"1.375", for the 25 percent option. And, we just wanted
to make the Commission aware of that. We would certainly
update our filing as this case progresses through
discovery and at -- or, well before any hearing that would
be held on the case.

I also wanted to mention that, as to the rate change, we would like to mention that this request is in conformity with PSNH's most recently filed and approved IRP from Docket DE 10-261, which was very recently approved by the Commission. That IRP does make specific reference to this rate and its availability. And, the underlying purpose of the rate is to permit customers to choose to contribute to the cost of retiring RECs and the purchase and retirement of the RECs conforms with PSNH's plans for compliance with its RPS requirements, which is

discussed in Section 10 of PSNH's IRP.

In addition to the change in the rate,

PSNH is requesting, as you had mentioned, consistent with

RSA 374-F:3, V(f)(10), that the Commission establish a

minimum number of customers to continue offering the rate.

As is described in Mr. Branch's testimony accompanying

PSNH's Petition, the current enrollment rate is very low,

and it does not justify the cost of continuing to maintain
the rate.

And, in addition, as noted in the testimony, there are third party services that essentially do the very same thing and don't involve the utility participation at all. PSNH believes, for reasons set out in its filing, that 1 percent of eligible customers is a reasonable threshold. And, at present, that would mean about 4,400 customers would choose the rate. And, I would note that, from information I was given this morning, that we have approximately 169 customers on the rate, which is actually down a few from when the filing was made.

And, so -- Oh. And, to the extent -- so, PSNH would ask then that the Commission establish this minimum number of customers to continue offering the rate, and would set essentially six months out from the date of a rate change as the deadline for meeting that minimum

7

```
1
                If the minimum number isn't met at six months out
       number.
 2
       from the rate change, then PSNH would discontinue the
 3
       rate, and any over- or undercollection, which would be
 4
       quite small, could and would be reconciled through the ES
 5
       rate.
 6
                         And, so, with that, PSNH would ask for
 7
       approval of both the rate change, as updated, and for the
       Commission to establish a minimum number of customers to
 8
 9
       continue offering the rate. Thank you.
10
                         CMSR. HARRINGTON:
                                            Thank you.
                                                         Ms.
11
       Hollenberg.
12
                         CMSR. SCOTT:
                                       I have a question.
13
                         CMSR. HARRINGTON: Oh, excuse me.
       Commissioner.
14
15
                         CMSR. SCOTT: Sorry, Ms. Hollenberg.
16
       Just to help your discussion a little bit, for Attorney
17
       Fossum, how do current customers know of the availability
18
       and how do they have access to that, to the RDES
19
       currently? How do they know it exists? How is it
20
       advertised?
21
                         MR. FOSSUM:
                                     I'm not certain exactly how
22
       it's advertised. I know that there is a dedicated portion
       of the PSNH website that speaks to the RDES rate. But, as
23
24
       for the particulars on how it's advertised -- oh, I quess
```

```
1
       I'm also being told that apparently we have it as part of
 2
       our -- as a part of our billing insert. So, that, on
 3
       occasion, that's distributed to customers with the billing
 4
       inserts that they receive.
 5
                         CMSR. SCOTT: Do you have an idea how
 6
       often that is done?
 7
                         MR. FOSSUM:
                                      Yes.
                                            Twice a year.
 8
                         CMSR. SCOTT:
                                       Thank you.
 9
                         CMSR. HARRINGTON: Just a follow-up
10
       question to that. If this was granted, would the Company
11
       be proposing to put out a billing insert notifying people
12
       of the six -- of the six-month timeframe that the rate
13
       would be going away?
14
                         MR. FOSSUM: Yes.
                                            There would be an
15
       effort to let customers know of our intention, by a
16
       billing insert, by changes to the website, that there
17
       would be -- that the rate would discontinue at a certain
18
       period, if the enrollment threshold is not met.
19
                         CMSR. HARRINGTON: Yes.
                                                  Thank you.
20
      Anything else?
21
                         CMSR. SCOTT: No, that's okay.
22
                         CMSR. HARRINGTON: Ms. Hollenberg.
23
                         MS. HOLLENBERG: Thank you.
                                                      At this
24
       time, the OCA does not have a position on the Petition.
```

guess one question that comes to my mind today is, once the rate is closed, but still exists as a statutorily authorized option for customers, how does it ever reopen again? And, that's just something that's crossing my mind now.

But we look forward to speaking with the Company and Staff about its idea. It does seem to make sense that, if it's not -- if the costs of the program are not outweighed by the benefits enjoyed by the customers, that it seems to make sense that something different needs to be done.

So, thank you for your time this morning.

MR. SPEIDEL: Yes, Commissioners.

Commission Staff would like to engage in discovery regarding the Company's Petition going forward, together with the OCA. That said, Staff is generally supportive of the Company's proposal to establish a minimum threshold for participation by customers. Given the fact that the program costs are borne, that is the administrative costs are borne by general Default Service customers. And, it is important to keep in mind a relationship between costs expended and benefits received by customers as part of participation. And, if there aren't very many

10

1 participants, there isn't much benefit. 2 However, we do believe that an 3 alternative approach, such as that used by the Granite 4 State Electric utility, in which customers that are 5 interested in acquiring alternative forms of electricity 6 through the PSNH platform could do so through a referral 7 service. That could be an advisable approach that we 8 would explore with the Company. 9 Following this session, I think we'll 10 have some basic discussions about a procedural schedule, 11 nothing definitive will be established today. We will 12 probably establish the possibility of some initial 13 discovery. And, after certain Staff members have 14 returned, we'll have a more formal schedule set up. Thank 15 you. 16 CMSR. HARRINGTON: Any other issues that 17 need to be brought forward today? 18 (No verbal response) 19 CMSR. HARRINGTON: If not, we'll close 20 the prehearing conference on DE 12-358. And, we 21 understand there will be a technical conference by the 22 parties to follow. Thank you very much. Have a good day. 23 (Whereupon the prehearing conference 24 ended at 10:17 a.m.)