| 1 | | |
|----|--------------|---|
| 1 | ' | STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE |
| 2 | | PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | 6 - 2:07 p.m. |
| 5 | Concord, New | MHPUC JUL20'16 Ph 1:01 |
| 6 | 5.5 | 77 16 040 |
| 7 | RE | DE 16-249 LIBERTY UTILITIES (GRANITE STATE |
| 8 | | ELECTRIC) CORP. d/b/a LIBERTY UTILITIES: Default Service for |
| 9 | | the Period August 1, 2016 to January 31, 2017. |
| 10 | 2224 | Chairman Mantin D. Haniahan Danaidin |
| 11 | PRESENT: | Chairman Martin P. Honigberg, Presiding Commissioner Kathryn M. Bailey |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | Sandy Deno, Clerk |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | APPEARANCES: | |
| 16 | | State Electric) Corp.: Michael J. Sheehan, Esq. |
| 17 | | Reptg. Residential Ratepayers: |
| 18 | | Donald M. Kreis, Esq., Consumer Adv. Office of Consumer Advocate |
| 19 | | Reptg. PUC Staff: |
| 20 | | Suzanne G. Amidon, Esq. |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | Court Repo | rter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52 |
| 24 | - | |



| 1 | | |
|--|--|--------------------|
| 2 | INDEX | |
| 3 | | PAGE NO. |
| 4 | WITNESS PANEL: JOHN D. WARSHAW HEATHER M. TEBBETTS | |
| 5 | HEATHER M. TEBBETTS | |
| 6 | Direct examination by Mr. Sheehan | 8 |
| 7 | Cross-examination by Mr. Kreis | 12 |
| 8 | Cross-examination by Ms. Amidon | 17 |
| 9 | Interrogatories by Chairman Honigberg | 22 |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | * * * | |
| 12 | | |
| | | |
| 13 | CLOSING STATEMENTS BY: | PAGE NO. |
| | CLOSING STATEMENTS BY: Mr. Kreis | PAGE NO. 25 |
| 14 | | |
| 14 15 | Mr. Kreis | 25 |
| 14 15 16 | Mr. Kreis Ms. Amidon | 25 25 |
| 14 15 16 17 | Mr. Kreis Ms. Amidon | 25 25 |
| 14 15 16 17 | Mr. Kreis Ms. Amidon | 25 25 |
| 14 15 16 17 18 | Mr. Kreis Ms. Amidon | 25 25 |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Mr. Kreis Ms. Amidon | 25 25 |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Mr. Kreis Ms. Amidon | 25 25 |
| 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Mr. Kreis Ms. Amidon | 25 25 |

{DE 16-249} {06-23-16}

| 1 | | | |
|----|-------------|--|-----|
| 2 | | EXHIBITS | |
| 3 | EXHIBIT NO. | DESCRIPTION PAGE | NO. |
| 4 | 1 | Testimony of Heather M. Tebbetts, including | 5 |
| 5 | | attachments, regarding reconciliation (05-23-16) | |
| 6 | 2 | Filing consisting of the | 5 |
| 7 | | Testimony of John D. Warshaw, including attachments, and the | |
| 8 | | Technical Statement of Heather M. Tebbetts, including | |
| 9 | | attachments (06-21-16) [CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY] | |
| 10 | 3 | | 5 |
| 11 |) | Testimony of John D. Warshaw, including attachments, and the | |
| 12 | | Technical Statement of | |
| 13 | | Heather M. Tebbetts, including attachments (06-21-16) | |
| 14 | | (REDACTED - for public use) | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |

PROCEEDING

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We're here this afternoon in Docket DE 16-249, which is Liberty Utilities (Granite State Electric) Corp.'s 2016 Default Service Solicitation docket. This is, I believe, the first one under the new six-month period that will start August 1st, with the Company having transitioned to this schedule in its last round.

I'll note for the record that

Commissioner Scott is not in attendance at the hearing. He may read the transcript and the exhibits, if necessary. But you do have

Commissioner Bailey and myself here.

Before we go any further, let's take appearances.

MR. SHEEHAN: Good afternoon,

Commissioners. Mike Sheehan, for Liberty

Utilities (Granite State Electric) Corp. Thank
you.

MR. KREIS: Good afternoon. I am

Consumer Advocate Donald Kreis, here on behalf

of residential utility customers.

MS. AMIDON: Good afternoon. Suzanne

{DE 16-249} {06-23-16}

1 Amidon, for Commission Staff. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. 2 3 What, if anything, do we need to do in the way 4 of preliminary matters? 5 MR. SHEEHAN: I have two things, Mr. 6 Chairman. First, is to mark exhibits. And I 7 propose marking, as "Exhibit 1", Ms. Tebbetts' reconciliation testimony filed May 23, with 8 9 attachments; as "Exhibit 2", the confidential 10 version of our June 21 filing, which consists 11 of Mr. Warshaw's testimony and exhibits and Ms. Tebbetts' technical statement, updating her 12 13 prior testimony and giving rate impacts; and 14 "Exhibit 3" would be the redacted version of 15 Exhibit 2. 16 (The documents, as described, 17 were herewith marked as Exhibit 1, Exhibit 2, and 18 19 Exhibit 3, respectively, for 20 identification.) 21 MR. SHEEHAN: The other matter I have 22 is we've requested confidential treatment for 23 certain information in Mr. Warshaw's test --24 not in his testimony, but in his attachments,

| 1 | and some of that information is picked up in |
|----|---|
| 2 | Ms. Tebbetts' attachments to her technical |
| 3 | statement. And that is information protected |
| 4 | under the rules or presumed confidential under |
| 5 | the rules, such as contract prices, bids, the |
| 6 | number of bidders, the ID of the bidders, |
| 7 | etcetera. And these are all matters that have |
| 8 | been granted confidential treatment in past |
| 9 | hearings. |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Kreis? |
| 11 | Ms. Amidon? |
| 12 | MR. KREIS: No objection. |
| 13 | MS. AMIDON: Yes. The material that |
| 14 | for which they requested confidential treatment |
| 15 | is similar to the material that's been granted |
| 16 | confidential treatment in the past and is |
| 17 | consistent with the Commission rules. |
| 18 | CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Under those |
| 19 | rules, is an order required from us on this |
| 20 | motion? I had an understanding, at least for |
| 21 | some filings, that they're sort of |
| 22 | self-executing confidential. |
| 23 | MS. AMIDON: I think it's important |
| 24 | to identify them as comporting with the rules, |

| 1 | and, hence, they are confidential. |
|----|---|
| 2 | CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. |
| 3 | (Chairman Honigberg and |
| 4 | Commissioner Bailey conferring.) |
| 5 | COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Is the |
| 6 | confidential information included in the filing |
| 7 | considered routine filing confidential |
| 8 | information of routine filings? |
| 9 | MR. SHEEHAN: Yes. The provisions of |
| 10 | the 200 rules that we cited are those |
| 11 | provisions. You know, the following items are |
| 12 | routine filings |
| 13 | COMMISSIONER BAILEY: And they're not |
| 14 | automatically considered confidential, under |
| 15 | the rules? |
| 16 | MR. SHEEHAN: My understanding of the |
| 17 | process is they are, until somebody asks for |
| 18 | them. And, then, when someone asks for them, |
| 19 | it triggers the review and a determination of |
| 20 | whether, in fact, they are confidential or |
| 21 | should be released. |
| 22 | CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: That's my |
| 23 | understanding as well. So, understanding that |
| 24 | the filing is consistent with the rules, they |

| 1 | are the information will be treated as |
|----|---|
| 2 | confidential, as I think consistent with what |
| 3 | Mr. Sheehan just said. |
| 4 | Does that work for you, Ms. Amidon? |
| 5 | MS. AMIDON: Yes. |
| 6 | CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. Anything |
| 7 | else, Mr. Sheehan, before |
| 8 | MR. SHEEHAN: That's all I have. And |
| 9 | the witnesses are ready when we take care of |
| 10 | any other preliminary matters. |
| 11 | CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I saw that the |
| 12 | witnesses were prepositioned on this one. |
| 13 | Mr. Patnaude. |
| 14 | (Whereupon John D. Warshaw and |
| 15 | Heather M. Tebbetts were duly |
| 16 | sworn by the Court Reporter.) |
| 17 | JOHN D. WARSHAW, SWORN |
| 18 | HEATHER M. TEBBETTS, SWORN |
| 19 | DIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 20 | BY MR. SHEEHAN: |
| 21 | Q. Mr. Warshaw, your name and your position with |
| 22 | the Company please. |
| 23 | A. (Warshaw) My name is John D. Warshaw. And I am |
| 24 | the Manager of Electric Supply for Liberty |

(

- 1 Utilities Service Corp.
- 2 Q. And did you file testimony in this docket?
- 3 A. (Warshaw) Yes, I did.
- Q. And, in a sentence, what's the nature of your testimony? What topics do you cover?
- A. (Warshaw) And, in my testimony, I cover the
 procurement of supply of Energy Service for the
 period August 1st, 2016 through the end of
 January 31st, 2017. I also address the issue
 of Renewable Portfolio Standard.
- 11 Q. Do you have any corrections to your testimony?
- 12 A. (Warshaw) Yes, I do. If you turn to Page 8,
- Bates stamp Page 008, it's the same on both
- exhibits, Line 4, instead of saying:
- "January 31st, 2017", it should say
- 16 "January 31st, 2016".
- 17 Q. Any others?
- 18 A. (Warshaw) Those are all the corrections that I
 19 know of.
- 20 Q. With that correction, if I were to ask you the
- 21 questions in your prefiled testimony today,
- 22 would your answers be the same?
- 23 A. (Warshaw) Yes, they would.
- 24 Q. And do adopt your testimony here today?

- 1 A. (Warshaw) Yes, I do.
- Q. Ms. Tebbetts, your name and your position with the Company.
- 4 A. (Tebbetts) Yes. My name is Heather Tebbetts.
- I am employed by Liberty Utilities Service
- 6 Corporation. I'm an Analyst in our Rates and
- 7 Regulatory Group. And I'm responsible for
- 8 rate-related services for Granite State
- 9 Electric.
- 10 Q. And did you file testimony in this docket?
- 11 A. (Tebbetts) Yes, I did.
- 12 Q. And that is marked as "Exhibit 1", the
- reconciliation testimony?
- 14 A. (Tebbetts) Yes.
- 15 Q. And, again, briefly, that testimony does what?
- 16 A. (Tebbetts) That testimony provides a
- 17 reconciliation for the prior period, going back
- to 2015. And it also includes information
- about forward-looking rates for the
- 20 reconciliation period for 2016 into '17.
- 21 Q. And you also filed a technical statement, which
- is the latter half of Exhibit 2. And what is
- 23 the topic covered in that technical statement?
- 24 A. (Tebbetts) The information in the technical

```
[WITNESS PANEL: Warshaw~Tebbetts]
 1
         statement updates the attachments that I filed
 2
         on May 20th for the reconciliation. And it
 3
         also provides the calculated rates going
 4
         forward for August 1st, 2016 through
 5
         January 31, 2017.
 6
         Do you have any corrections to your testimony
    Q.
 7
         or technical statement?
         (Tebbetts) I have one correction to my
 8
    Α.
         testimony, which is Exhibit 1. That correction
9
10
         is on Bates Page 013, Line 8. And the sentence
11
         reads "The RPS Obligation Expense for 2015 is
12
         presented on Page 3", and that should read
         "Page 2".
13
14
         Any other corrections?
```

- 15 (Tebbetts) No. Α.
- 16 If I were to ask you the questions in your Q. 17 prefiled testimony today, would your answers be 18 the same?
- 19 Α. (Tebbetts) Yes.
- 20 And do you adopt your testimony today? Q.
- 21 (Tebbetts) Yes.
- 22 MR. SHEEHAN: Chairman, they're 23 available for cross-examination.
- CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Kreis. 24

1 MR. KREIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'll try to get as close as I can to the microphone without swallowing it. I just have a couple of questions, and I think they're all for Mr. Warshaw.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. KREIS:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- Q. Mr. Warshaw, at Page 5 of your testimony, which is Bates Page 007, Exhibit No. 2, you said "A similar number of bidders provided final prices as in the last solicitation." First of all, I assume that the vague the vague characterization of the number of bidders is a function of the fact that you consider the precise number of bidders to be confidential information?
- 17 A. (Warshaw) That is correct.
- 18 Q. Why is that number competitively sensitive?
- A. (Warshaw) It's considered competitively
 sensitive, because if, for some reason, the
 suppliers out there find out that we have an
 RFP where, instead of, you know, a good number,
 we have a small number, you know, they then say
 "Oh, well, the next time we bid, we don't have

 $\{DE\ 16-249\}\ \{06-23-16\}$

to cut our calculation as tight", because it's less competitive than if there is a large number of bidders involved.

The more number of bidders, the more competitive the solicitation is. And you don't want that information out there that one solicitation is less competitive than another solicitation.

- Q. So, even the answer to the question "was there a good number in this -- in this solicitation?", that's competitively sensitive?
- 12 A. (Warshaw) I would say it was an adequate
 13 number.
 - Q. Is there a trend that you could talk about? Is the number getting -- are the number of solicitations continuing to be healthy? Are they declining over time?
 - A. (Warshaw) It is continuing to be healthy. We did have some issues when the winter prices were extremely volatile, and the suppliers were reacting to that.

But, since then, they seem to have mostly calmed down and are still willing to participate in these RF -- in these types of

1 solicitations.

- Q. On the next page of that exhibit, which is

 Bates Page 008, you said, at Lines 8 through

 10, "Liberty Utilities evaluated the bids

 received and selected the two suppliers that:

 (i) provided a bid that was conforming to the

 RFP, (ii) had the lowest price, (iii) met the

 credit requirements described in the RFP, and

 (iv) passed our qualitative evaluation."

 What's the "qualitative evaluation"?
- A. (Warshaw) These suppliers have all participated in previous RFPs. And they -- and the winning bidders have all served our default service customers in previous solicitations.
- Q. What would happen if a bidder popped up that didn't meet that description of previous experience with you?
- A. (Warshaw) We would evaluate that bidder. We would talk to references that the bidder has to find out if there's been any problems with that bidder in serving load in another utility's territory.
- Q. Did you screen out any bids on that basis in this solicitation?

- 1 A. (Warshaw) No, we did not.
- 2 Q. In that case, it's a nonissue, right?
- 3 A. (Warshaw) Yes.

- Q. I have to beg your indulgence, because this is my first opportunity to participate in this particular kind of docket with Liberty. And, so, I am probably the only person in the room who is confused about how the -- how you dealt with the RPS compliance adder after asking for bids with an RPS compliance adder. So, could you maybe give me the elevator speech version of how that works?
- A. (Warshaw) Yes. We ask all bidders to -- we request all bidders provide a simple dollar per megawatt-hour adder to be added to their bids, if they're willing to take on the RPS obligation along with the load obligation. We then compare that adder, if a supplier has provided that, to both the value against making an ACP for all of the obligation, and also a estimate of what the market value is of that adder at that time. Most of the bidders in solicitations do not provide RPS adders.
- Q. So, since most of the bidders don't propose a

```
1
         RPS compliance adder, and since you did not
 2
         select one of those compliance adders, based on
 3
         Lines 19 and 20 of Bates Page 010, how does the
 4
         Company meet its RPS obligation?
 5
         (Warshaw) The Company will meet its RPS
 6
         obligations a number of ways. One, we issue
 7
         RFPs for our obligation twice a year. We also
         entertain unsolicited offers of sales of RPS
 8
9
         RECs. And, then, the third way is, if, at the
10
         end of a obligation year and the end of the
11
         trading period, we are still short come towards
12
         the end of June, we end up making an ACP for
13
         the shortage in the obligation.
14
         So, basically, you're staying in the RPS
15
         market, rather than locking yourself into
16
         something through one of these solicitations?
17
    Α.
         (Warshaw) Yes.
18
                   MR. KREIS: Okay. Mr. Chairman,
19
         those are all the questions I have.
20
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Amidon.
21
                   MS. AMIDON: Thank you. Good
22
         afternoon.
23
                   WITNESS WARSHAW: Good afternoon.
24
    BY MS. AMIDON:
```

- Q. So, I think this question is really for

 Ms. Tebbetts. As you know, in January, the

 Class -- you calculate an RPS adder, is that

 correct? Do you calculate it or does --
- 5 A. (Tebbetts) I do not calculate the RPS adder.
 6 Mr. Warshaw calculates that.
- Q. Okay. And, Mr. Warshaw, then maybe this
 question if for you. So, you calculate that
 adder based on a number of factors, and I think
 you have an exhibit that has that calculation.
 I think that is in Exhibit 2, on Page 102. Let
 me know when you're there.
- 13 A. (Warshaw) I'm there.
- Q. Okay. And, just to be clear, the shaded information is the information that is confidential, is that correct?
- 17 A. (Warshaw) Correct.
- Q. All right. So, for -- as noted in your testimony, for Class III, the RPS obligation goes to 8 percent as of January 2017, is that right?
- 22 A. (Warshaw) That's my understanding, yes.
- Q. Okay. So, how -- can you show me where that is shown in rates? I believe I saw an exhibit

- that Ms. Tebbetts had that shows the increase
 in that RPS adder for the month of January.
 - A. (Tebbetts) Yes. If you go to Exhibit 2, Bates
 Page 121, and it's Line 16. But, as I look at
 my printed page, I'm not positive if you have
 hash tags on your numbers? I do. So, --
- 7 Q. I do, too.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

- A. (Tebbetts) Okay. I apologize. It's the

 "Renewable Portfolio Standard Adder (dollars

 per kilowatt-hour)". That's the line you're

 looking at, and it's Line 16.
- 12 Q. I see that, because it's grouped by six months,

 13 and there are six columns, and then there is a

 14 line that -- it's above the line that demarks

 15 the "Total", is that fair to say?
 - A. (Tebbetts) Yes. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. So, -- and this is for the Large
 Customer Group. Is it the same for all
 customers, the RPS adder?
- 20 A. (Tebbetts) Yes. It's exactly the same. And we
 21 can look at HMT-2 to confirm that. If you look
 22 at the months of August through December,
 23 you'll see it is "0.407 cents" per
 24 kilowatt-hour --

1 Q. Yes.

- A. (Tebbetts) -- for those months. And, then,

 January reflects the increase to the 8 percent,

 for "0.778 cents" per kilowatt-hour.
- 5 Q. Yes.
- A. (Tebbetts) And, on Bates Page 122, Line 16, you will see those same numbers for the Small Customer Group.
- 9 Q. Thank you. That's what I was looking for. Mr.

 10 Warshaw, are there any changes in either of the

 11 contracts or confirmation transactions with the

 12 two selected companies that differ from the

 13 form contract used by the Company in its RFP?
- 14 A. (Warshaw) No, there is not.
- Q. Okay. And, then, the Consumer Advocate was asking about the number of bidders. And, if I go to Exhibit 2, Page 89, there is shaded information. Let me know when you're there.
- 19 A. (Warshaw) I'm there.
- Q. Okay. So, there's shaded information under the paragraph that's identified as paragraph "4", which shows the number, that is shaded because it is confidential?
- 24 A. (Warshaw) Correct.

- Q. Okay. Thank you. And, if we turn to the next page, we see that the same number of bidders provided final bids. That first number I referred to being indicative bids, is that right?
- 6 A. (Warshaw) Correct.
- 7 Q. Okay. Thank you. And, just finally, I wanted
 8 to, and, Ms. Tebbetts, this is for you,
 9 Page 148 of Exhibit 2, there's nothing shaded
 10 on here. Let me know when you're there.
- 11 A. (Tebbetts) I am there. Just you're referring
 12 to Schedule HMT-10?
- Q. Correct. Thank you for identifying that. This
 is the reflection of a reduction in a
 residential customer bill based on usage of 650
 kilowatt-hours a month for those customers who
 take service from Liberty, is that right?
- 18 A. (Tebbetts) Yes. This is for customers who take
 19 Energy Service from Liberty.
- Q. So, their bills will be reducing by \$15.29, or by approximately 14 percent?
- 22 A. (Tebbetts) Yes. That's correct.
- 23 Q. And do you have any similar calculation for
 24 Large customers or can -- I know that they have

```
rates that vary monthly. So, it might be more difficult to calculate that. Or, perhaps, Mr.

Warshaw, did you do a calculation comparing costs for different periods? I think I saw something in your testimony. It's on Page Bates 013.
```

- A. (Tebbetts) Ms. Amidon, we -- or, I calculate a bill calculation on a residential bill, for those customers, primarily because their rate is a weighted average rate for the six-month period.
- 12 Q. Uh-huh.

- A. (Tebbetts) And, so, their rate does not change.

 With regards to Large customers, they have a

 monthly rate. And, so, to calculate a bill

 impact for a Large customer is possible, but it

 would be a different bill impact for each month

 of the period.
- Q. Well, I'm thinking that the information provided in your testimony on Page 013 at least gives us a comparison, is that right, at Line 5?
- A. (Warshaw) Yes. At 5, it gives you a comparison as the cents per kilowatt-hour basis, but it

[WITNESS PANEL: Warshaw~Tebbetts]

```
doesn't bring it up to a total estimate of what someone's bill will change.
```

- Q. Right. But it just gives the load-weighted average of the power supply costs and just compares the new period with the one that is just ending. Is that fair to say?
- 7 A. (Warshaw) That's correct.
- 8 Q. Or the one that will be ending?
- 9 A. (Warshaw) Yes. It doesn't include any of the
 10 adjustments that Ms. Tebbetts has calculated --
- 11 Q. Right.

3

4

5

6

- 12 A. (Warshaw) -- that goes along with the Energy
 13 Service bill.
- 14 Q. But it does show us the general reduction in the power costs?
- 16 A. (Warshaw) Correct.
- MS. AMIDON: Okay. Thank you.
- 18 That's all I have. Thank you.
- 19 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Commissioner
- Bailey.
- 21 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: I have no
- 22 questions. Thank you.
- 23 BY CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG:
- 24 Q. Mr. Warshaw, this is the first time for the new

{DE 16-249} {06-23-16}

schedule. Did you see any difference in how
things went, compared to the last few
solicitations you've done?

- A. (Warshaw) The only difference is one of the bidders, for reasons that they did not disclose, who have bid in the past and have served load in the past, decided to not participate in this RFP. And, one of the reasons is that they are still shy about the winter prices. And, if I can if I would speculate, it's probably because they may have been hurt when the winter prices were extremely volatile, and are now very shy about participating in load in the December through February period.
- Q. But, taking a step back and looking at the process generally, are you satisfied that it went well?
- A. (Warshaw) Yes. We had a good turnout. We weren't stepping on any other RFPs that were also that were also done at the same time. So, we were able to get the attention of the bidders, and felt that this was a reasonable, robust solicitation, similar to what we've seen

```
1
         in the past.
 2
         You were asked some questions about the RPS
    Q.
 3
         adder. While we're on the subject of that
         obligation and the ACPs, we're coming up on the
 4
 5
         end of the period for payments. And do you
 6
         have any sense of what your alternative
 7
         compliance payments are going to be when they
 8
         come in at the end of this month?
         (Warshaw) I'm going to be -- we will be making
9
10
         a ACP of about $70,000.
11
         Do you know how that compares to last year,
    0.
12
         roughly?
         (Warshaw) I think last year was maybe -- I
13
14
         mean, a little over $100,000.
15
         So, less, but not way less?
    Q.
16
    Α.
         (Warshaw) No. But nowhere near a million
17
         dollars, as we paid in other dates.
18
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. I
19
         think that's all I have.
20
                   Mr. Sheehan, do you have any further
21
         questions for your witnesses?
22
                   MR. SHEEHAN: I do not. Thank you.
```

 $\{DE\ 16-249\}\ \{06-23-16\}$

assuming there's no objection to striking the

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. I'm

23

ID on Exhibits 1, 2, and 3? 1 2 [No verbal response.] 3 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. The ID is struck. Those are full exhibits. 4 5 I think the only thing we need to do 6 is allow the Parties to sum up. Mr. Kreis. 7 MR. KREIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree with the Company that the proposed 8 9 Energy Service rates are consistent with RSA 10 374-F, Section 3, Paragraph V(c), and are in 11 the public interest, as reflective of 12 competitive market prices pursuant to RSA 13 374-F:3, V(c). 14 Therefore, I believe that it is 15 appropriate for the Commission to approve the 16 Company's requested rates. 17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Amidon. 18 MS. AMIDON: Thank you. Staff 19 reviewed the filing and concluded that the 20 Company complied with the bid solicitation, 21 evaluation, and selection process approved by 22 the Commission in various orders regarding 23 Liberty's procurement of default service, and 24 have determined that the resulting rates are

| 1 | market-based. |
|----|--|
| 2 | And, on that basis, we believe the |
| 3 | Commission should grant approval of this for |
| 4 | rates effective August 1. |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Sheehan. |
| 6 | MR. SHEEHAN: I don't think I could |
| 7 | say it better than the two of them. So, we ask |
| 8 | that you approve the rates as we requested. |
| 9 | The order we respectfully request be issued by |
| 10 | July by June 27 for the contract reasons for |
| 11 | rates effective August 1. |
| 12 | Thank you very much. |
| 13 | CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you all. |
| 14 | We'll take this under advisement and issue an |
| 15 | order as quickly as we can. |
| 16 | (Whereupon the hearing was |
| 17 | adjourned at 2:32 p.m.) |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |