1		STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
2		PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
3		
4	21 South Fru:	2023 - 1:34 p.m. it Street
5	Suite 10 Concord, NH	
6		
7	[Hearing also conducted via Webex]	
8		
9	RE:	DE 17-189 LIBERTY UTILITIES (GRANITE STATE
L 0		ELECTRIC) CORP. d/b/a LIBERTY UTILITIES: Petition to Approve Battery Storage
L1		Pilot Program. (Final Hearing regarding Phase 1 of
L 2		the Pilot Program)
L 3	PRESENT:	Chairman Daniel C. Goldner, Presiding
L 4		Commissioner Carleton B. Simpson
L 5		Eric Wind, Esq./PUC Legal Advisor
L 6		Doreen Borden, <i>Clerk</i> Tracey Russo, <i>PUC Hybrid Hearing Host</i>
L 7		
L 8	APPEARANCES:	Reptg. Liberty Utilities (Granite State
L 9		Electric) Corp. d/b/a Liberty Utilities: Michael J. Sheehan, Esq.
20		Reptg. Conservation Law Foundation:
		Nicholas Krakoff, Esq.
21		
23	Court Repo	orter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52
2 4		

1		
2	APPEARANCES:	(Continued)
3		Reptg. Residential Ratepayers: Donald M. Kreis, Esq., Consumer Advocate
4		Michael J. Crouse, Esq. Office of Consumer Advocate
5		Reptg. New Hampshire Dept. of Energy:
6		Paul B. Dexter, Esq. Alexandra Ladwig, Esq.
7		Elizabeth Nixon, Dir./Electric Group Mark Toscano, Electric Group
8		(Regulatory Support Division)
9		
10 11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
2 4		

		i
1		
2	INDEX	
3		PAGE NO.
4	DISCUSSION RE: SCOPE OF THE HEARING BY:	
5	Chairman Goldner Mr. Sheehan	7 8
6		
7	QUESTION BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER TO LIBERTY RE: PHASE 2	9
8	Response by Mr. Sheehan re: Phase 2	9
9		
10	PRELIMINARY COMMENTS BY:	
10	Mr. Kreis	11
11		
12	DISCUSSION RE: PROCESS FOR THE HEARING	11
12		
13	WITNESS PANEL: SAMUEL CRAWFORD	
14	KEVIN JOYCE HEATHER M. TEBBETTS	
TI	KAJAL GAUR	
15		
16	Direct examination by Mr. Sheehan Cross-examination by Mr. Kreis	12 19
10	Cross-examination by Mr. Krakoff	29
17	Cross-examination by Mr. Dexter	31
18	Interrogatories by Cmsr. Simpson 34, 76, Interrogatories by Chairman Goldner 65,	78, 90
19	Redirect examination by Mr. Sheehan	85
20	QUESTIONS FROM CMSR. SIMPSON	5 9
21	(to DOE/Mr. Dexter)	
22	QUESTIONS FROM CMSR. SIMPSON (to OCA/Mr. Kreis)	61
८ ८	(LO OCA/MI. RIEIS)	
23	QUESTIONS BY CMSR. SIMPSON	62
24	(to Liberty Utilities/Mr. Sheehan)	

1	
2	I N D E X (continued)
3	PAGE NO.
4	STATEMENT BY CMSR. SIMPSON 92
5	STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER 94
6 7	QUESTION/STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER 95, 98 (RE: Customers with Powerwalls and rooftop solar charging from the grid)
8	RESPONSES BY:
9	Mr. Sheehan 96 Mr. Dexter 98, 99, 103 Mr. Kreis 99, 104
11 12	REQUEST BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER FOR 101 A PROPOSAL FROM LIBERTY UTILITIES OF NEXT STEPS RE: PHASE 2 TO BE PROVIDED MAY 30, 2023
13 14	DISCUSSION RE: ADMITTING THE RECORD 105 REQUEST RESPONSES INTO THE RECORD
15	CLOSING ARGUMENTS BY:
16 17	Mr. Kreis 107 Mr. Krakoff 111 Mr. Dexter 115
18	Mr. Sheehan 118
19	* * *
20	EXHIBITS
21	EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION PAGE NO.
22	22 Battery Storage Pilot Program <i>premarked</i>
23	Interim Evaluation Report by Guidehouse <i>(November 2022)</i>
24	

1 PROCEEDING 2 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Good 3 afternoon. I'm Commissioner Goldner. I'm joined 4 today by Commissioner Simpson. We're here in 5 Docket DE 17-189, a docket on Granite State 6 Electric's Battery Storage Pilot Program. 7 Let's start by taking appearances, 8 beginning with the Company. MR. SHEEHAN: Good afternoon, 9 10 Commissioners. Mike Sheehan, for Liberty 11 Utilities (Granite State Electric) Corp. 12 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. Just a 1.3 moment. 14 [Short pause.] 15 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you. 16 Let's move to the Office of the Consumer 17 Advocate. 18 MR. KREIS: Good morning, Chairman 19 Goldner, Commissioner Simpson. I'm Donald Kreis, 20 the Consumer Advocate, here on behalf of 2.1 residential customers. With me today is our 2.2 Staff Attorney, Michael Crouse. 23 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. And I

don't see the City of Lebanon. Do I?

```
1
                    [No indication given.]
 2
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: On the screen?
 3
         Okay. Is ReVision Energy here?
 4
                    [No indication given.]
 5
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: No. Conservation
 6
         Law Foundation?
 7
                    MR. KRAKOFF: Good afternoon, Chairman
         Goldner and Commissioner Simpson. Nick Krakoff,
 8
 9
         with the Conservation Law Foundation.
10
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. Is the
11
         Acadia Center here?
                    [No indication given.]
12
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Is Sunrun here?
1.3
                    [No indication given.]
14
15
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Clean Energy New
16
         Hampshire?
17
                    [No indication given.]
18
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: The New Hampshire
19
         Sustainable Energy Association?
20
                    [No verbal response.]
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Mr. Emerson?
2.1
2.2
                    [No indication given.]
23
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: And the New
24
         Hampshire Department of Energy?
```

1 MR. DEXTER: Good afternoon, Mr. 2. Chairman, Commissioner. My name is Paul Dexter. 3 I'm representing the Department of Energy. 4 joined today by Attorney Alexandra Ladwig, and 5 Liz Nixon and Mark Toscano, from the Department's 6 Regulatory Division. 7 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. And did 8 I miss anyone? 9 MR. SHEEHAN: Mr. Chairman, on the 10 screen are Kevin Joyce, who's the Tesla 11 representative, and Kajal Gaur, who is with 12 Guidehouse, along with Mr. Crawford, who is here 1.3 in the courtroom. 14 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you, 15 sir. 16 Okay. Very good. All right. So, 17 various interim and final hearings on Phase 1 of 18 this Pilot were scheduled and rescheduled. 19 as a first order of business, I would like to 20 discuss the scope of this hearing before we dive 2.1 into the Phase 1 Report. 2.2 Looking at the procedural order dated 23 September 26th, 2022, this hearing is a final

hearing on Phase 1 of the Pilot. And Liberty has

not yet requested authorization to continue to a potential Phase 2 of this Pilot. The procedural order of September 26th also states that a hearing regarding Phase 2 will be scheduled, if Liberty decides to seek approval of Phase 2.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

Does anyone have a different impression of why we're here today?

MR. SHEEHAN: No, that's consistent.

There are a couple other loose ends that I think

can help wrap up Phase 1 that I would like to

raise.

One is, the order approving the Pilot called for a working group to develop a Bring Your Own Device component. That never got off the ground, largely because the proponents of it basically stopped participating. So, it was a requirement -- actually, it was a requirement that "the Commission shall begin a stakeholder group." So, we would like, as part of today's hearing, is a resolution to that.

Our proposal is simply to eliminate that requirement in this docket. The Bring Your Own Device programs are alive and well, and can probably be addressed in some of the other

investigations the Commission has ongoing.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

And the other is, we filed a request, almost two years ago now, to confirm a component of the program that is affecting our small solar customers, and I'll have Ms. Tebbetts address that on the stand, but is simply a statement from the Commission that we can do what we'd like to do with those customers in the Phase 1.

So, those are the three goals we hope to get out of today's hearing.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Sheehan.

Does Liberty have a position at this time as to whether it will seek Commission approval on Phase 2 of the Pilot?

MR. SHEEHAN: At this time, we have not decided whether to do that. Our thinking is severalfold. First is, it would be good to continue Phase 1, continue collecting the data. Although we have plenty of data, that's still relatively new. Second, is to see what comes of some of the other things rolling here in the Commission, some of the other demand response programs, et cetera, there may be an opportunity

to use -- to do something there, rather than here.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

But, at this point, we do not plan to do so. We have not erased it forever. But we don't have a current expectation to do it in the near term.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay, thank you.

I'll ask at this time if there's any other preliminary matters that we need -- that need to be raised or discussed, before we dive into the results of Phase 1?

And, Mr. Sheehan, you anticipated my next comment, which is, this is the Commission's oldest open docket. So, if there are any requests for Commission action that remain relevant and pending, please bring those to our attention now.

So, Mr. Sheehan, I've heard Liberty.

Do the other parties have anything that they would like to bring to the Commission's attention?

MR. DEXTER: Nothing from the Department of Energy.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

MR. KREIS: I don't think the

Commission should close this docket. The idea

that the Company should just be allowed to walk

away from Phase 2 is, I think, something that the

Commission shouldn't simply assume is okay.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Yes, Mr. Kreis. I think, to answer your question, if that was a question, is that we have no plans to close the docket. We're just trying to sort out the status of the docket at this time.

Okay. So, maybe the next question I'll direct to Mr. Sheehan, in terms of how you would like to proceed? Would it be with the panel of witnesses, and does the Company have anything that they would like to present or show first?

Or, would you like to dive directly into cross-examination and Commissioner questions?

MR. SHEEHAN: Aside from that one issue related to the solar customers that I'd like to have a brief direct with Ms. Tebbetts on, otherwise we are here at the Commission's request, brought the parties you wanted to speak to to answer questions.

```
1
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. And we
 2
         appreciate that.
 3
                    So, let's swear in the witness panel,
 4
         and then begin with direct examination.
 5
                    (Whereupon Samuel Crawford,
 6
                    Kevin Joyce, Heather M. Tebbetts, and
 7
                    Kajal Gaur were duly sworn by the Court
 8
                    Reporter.)
                    MR. SHEEHAN: I will have each of them
 9
10
          just introduce themselves, just so you can hear
11
         from them before we dive in, and then I'll have
12
         my questions for Ms. Tebbetts.
1.3
                     SAMUEL CRAWFORD, SWORN
                       KEVIN JOYCE, SWORN
14
                   HEATHER M. TEBBETTS, SWORN
15
16
                       KAJAL GAUR, SWORN
17
                       DIRECT EXAMINATION
18
    BY MR. SHEEHAN:
19
         Mr. Crawford, could you please introduce
20
         yourself?
21
         (Crawford) Hi. Sam Crawford, here with
22
         Guidehouse Consulting. I've been leading the
23
         evaluation effort for this Pilot, along with
24
         Kajal Gaur, who is on the line remotely.
```

```
1
         Thank you. And, Mr. Joyce, please introduce
 2
         yourself?
 3
    Α
         (Joyce) Hello. My name is Kevin Joyce. I'm with
 4
         Tesla, the Energy Division of Tesla. I am global
 5
         head for what we call our "Aggregation Programs",
 6
         that is virtual power plants and other advanced
 7
         applications of our behind-the-meter energy
 8
         products.
         Thank you. Mr. Joyce, you're coming across a
 9
10
         little garbled. So, if you just speak slowly, I
11
         think we'll be fine.
12
                   Ms. Tebbetts, please introduce
13
         yourself?
14
         (Tebbetts) Yes. Heather Tebbetts, with Liberty
         Utilities. I'm the Director of Business
15
16
         Development.
17
    Q
         And, Ms. Tebbetts, you were involved considerably
18
         in the underlying docket in this -- in this
19
         underlying docket from the beginning, is that
20
         fair?
21
         (Tebbetts) Yes.
    Α
22
    Q
         The one question I wanted to discuss with you
23
         relates to a technical statement you filed in
24
         January of '21. Can you please explain the issue
```

that gave rise to filing that technical statement?

1.3

(Tebbetts) Sure. So, we had customers who have solar participate in this project. And come to find out, when winter came, their solar systems were too small to be able to power the home, charge the batteries. And, so, the batteries are not being charged in the wintertime. There's just not enough daylight to allow that solar to power the home and then charge the batteries.

And, because of that, these customers actually are not -- two things. One, they're not getting the benefits of the program where they can use the batteries to offset their load during those critical peak hours, as we provided for in their contract. Then, two, we're unable to actually call on these batteries, because they're not charged during those peak events.

So, I'm not sure how many customers we have, call it between five and ten, since then, that have this issue. But, given that each customer has, you know, 10 kW in the house, that could be, you know, 100 kW we can't call on during that period.

```
1
         So, the non-solar customers don't have this
 2
         issue, because their batteries are charged from
 3
         the grid, and drawn back to the grid as needed
 4
         for these events, is that correct?
 5
         (Tebbetts) Yes. So, customers who don't have
 6
         solar, the way their batteries are charged is,
 7
         they charge overnight in the off-peak hours.
 8
         And, so, they're ready for the next day to be
 9
         used at the critical peak hours, and also to be
10
         called on for peak events. In the event that we
11
         call on a peak event, it will automatically
12
         charge after, in the off-peak hours.
13
                   For customers with solar, they don't
14
         have that opportunity. So, if we call on an
15
         event, and it didn't -- the batteries didn't
16
         charge with their solar, which is the only way
17
         they can charge them, then we can't use these
18
         batteries, and neither can the customers.
19
         And the difference between the two customers is
    Q
20
         the non-solar customers are not net-metered
21
         customers, but the solar are. And it's the fact
22
         that they are net-metered that, arguably, places
23
         some restrictions on their ability to charge the
24
         battery. Is that correct?
```

```
1
          (Tebbetts) That's correct. I think there was --
 2
         there was a lot of discussion at this time, in
 3
         2021, whether or not the batteries would just
 4
         export power, even though they weren't called
 5
         upon for a peak event. And that was a concern
 6
         with our net metering rules and the statutes in
 7
         New Hampshire on net metering.
 8
         For the reason that you wouldn't want a customer
 9
         to get net-metering credit for exporting battery
10
         power that was actually charged from the grid?
11
         (Tebbetts) Yes. That's correct.
12
         Because we want net-metered power to be solar or
13
         some other renewable?
14
         (Tebbetts) Yes.
15
         So, what is it -- so, with that problem, what is
16
         the solution that the Company proposed in your
17
         technical statement?
18
         (Tebbetts) So, the proposal was to allow
    Α
19
         customers with solar to charge from the grid only
20
         if their solar was -- well, there was a couple
21
         things in there. One we thought about, if the
2.2
         customer's solar was too small to be able to
23
         charge those batteries and their home -- and
24
         power their home.
                             There was also the issue of,
```

2.2

in the wintertime, you know, allowing customers with solar to charge from the grid.

And the issue of the export isn't an issue, because those batteries will never charge — those batteries will never export to the grid, except during peak events, as required. And Mr. Joyce can explain that further. But I think that was the biggest issue, is "Will these charge and then export to the grid?" No, they won't.

- At the beginning of this docket, the expectation of these batteries is that the customers would have control, and could have exported battery power to the grid, is that correct?
- A (Tebbetts) That's correct. And the programming with Tesla has provided that the customers don't have access to be able to just export to the grid.

MR. SHEEHAN: Okay. Thank you. And, in closing, I will refer to the language in the Settlement Agreement that we think is consistent with that. And what we'll be asking for is a statement from the Commission that allowing the customers with solar to be charged from the grid

1 in advance of an event is okay. 2. BY MR. SHEEHAN: 3 And, Mr. Joyce, just to close that loop, can you 4 confirm that the way the batteries are 5 programmed, these customers cannot export battery 6 power to the grid absent a called event? 7 (Joyce) That's right. The batteries, under Α 8 normal operation, will not export to the grid, 9 because it is not, you know, the way it is 10 programmed, the systems do not see it as a 11 benefit to do so. But, when commanded to for a 12 grid event, they are able to export. 1.3 MR. SHEEHAN: Thank you. I have no 14 further questions. 15 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you, Attorney 16 Sheehan. We'll move to the Office of the 17 Consumer Advocate for any cross-examination? 18 MR. KREIS: Just, I think, a few brief 19 questions, Mr. Chairman. 20 I think that my questions are really 21 for Ms. Tebbetts. And what I'd like to do, I'm 2.2 quite aware of the fact that the two 23 Commissioners sitting up on the Bench were 24 nowhere near the Walker Building, at least

nowhere near this docket, when it was first opened quite a number of years ago. I was interested in the fact that the Chairman mentioned that this is the "oldest open docket" that the Commission has. I didn't realize that, but it did open in late 2017. So, I guess that means it's now in first or second grade.

And, so, I just want to get these Commissioners back up to the speed.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. KREIS:

2.

1.3

2.2

- Ms. Tebbetts, if the Commissioners were to look back at Exhibit 1, which is the testimony that you filed with the Commission way back in 2017, they would discover, would they not, that the proposal that Liberty Utilities initially made back in 2017 is considerably smaller than what actually occurred or is occurring pursuant to Phase 1 of the Pilot, yes?

 A (Tebbetts) Well, what resulted is considerably
- smaller. We proposed a thousand batteries initially, and then we ended up with 200 batteries in this case.
- 24 Q Considerably smaller then?

```
1
          (Tebbetts) Yes. So, the result of the docket is
         that we have considerably less batteries
 2
 3
         installed. Yes.
 4
         And, when you made your initial proposal, as
 5
         reflected in Exhibit 1, the pilot was not
 6
         intended to proceed in two phases. You wanted to
 7
         do the whole pilot, everything, everywhere all at
         once?
 8
 9
         (Tebbetts) So, we had proposed a non-wires
10
         solution as part of it that targeted one of our
11
         heavily high usage/high load circuits in the
12
         Lebanon area, and that was part of the project,
13
         and that's why we proposed so many. But, yes, we
14
         did not propose two phases, we only proposed one
15
         single pilot.
16
         How did this thing morph into two phases then?
17
         (Tebbetts) Oh, now you're going to make me go
18
         back into my brain in 2018. So, at the time, I
19
         think folks were uncomfortable with the large
20
         request of batteries. And also, at the time,
21
         when we had first proposed this with Tesla, they
22
         only required one Powerwall in the home. And
23
         then, that changed during the docket as well,
24
         they now require, I don't know if it's still the
```

same, but, at the time, it was now two

Powerwalls. And, so, right off the bat, that

changed the project from a thousand Powerwalls to

500.

I think 500 was still a lot for folks at the time, because the technology, while I won't say was "new", it was new to the New Hampshire area. And, so, through, you know, settlement and negotiations, we decided that we'd do it in two phases. And we would do 100 customers, or 200 batteries, in Phase 1, and that remainder of 300 batteries in Phase 2.

- Q Could you briefly summarize the role that the
 Office of the Consumer Advocate has played over
 the years, in helping Liberty Utilities develop
 the Pilot Program we're talking about in this
 docket?
- A (Tebbetts) Sure. So, what I'll say is, what we proposed initially was good, but we had a really great opportunity to work with parties. And I think it's one of the first times, at least in my long regulatory career, I've had folks from all sides of the table come together. And the OCA was definitely a big part of that. To come

1.3

together and say "This is a good thing. We want to go forward with this. We want to learn more about battery storage in New Hampshire."

And we were lucky enough to have Lon Huber, who worked with the OCA as a consultant, to come in and really help us, as a company, and I think all the parties, come up with something that was viable, that we believed would benefit New Hampshire and the Liberty customers. And also provide good data-gathering, so that we could make future decisions on demand response, potentially non-wires solutions, and just, you know, getting behind the customer's meter. Is this something we want to go into? Is this something that's important to us? Or, is it something that we're going to try and see where it goes?

So, I would say that the OCA, obviously, played a large part in this. And I think that the parties worked really well together to come with something that really is a great project.

And just to clarify the role that Mr. Huber played, at the time he was employed as a

```
1
         consultant to the Office of the Consumer
 2
         Advocate, he got down and dirty into the details
 3
         of designing this program, so that it was a
 4
         viable pilot that was reasonably calculated to
 5
         prove or -- yes, "prove" the hypotheses that the
 6
         Company was bringing to the program, yes?
 7
         (Tebbetts) He did. And I still talk to him this
    Α
 8
         day, and sometimes we talk about this project,
 9
         sometimes other things. But it's definitely
10
         something that I think shaped his working with
11
         the New Hampshire folks and all of us.
12
         And would it be fair to say that, at some point,
1.3
         Mr. Huber became so involved in the Pilot that he
14
         actually migrated from being an employee or a
15
         consultant under contract to my office, to
16
         actually being a consultant under contract to
17
         your company, yes?
18
         (Tebbetts) Yes. Yes, he did, for a little while,
    Α
19
         while we were trying to figure out how we were
20
         going to, you know, implement the things that we
21
         had in the Settlement Agreement as smoothly as
22
         possible, because all these things were knew to
23
         us and our customers.
24
         And just to alleviate any mystery, because I
```

```
1
         personally would be deleted if Mr. Huber were
 2
         still involved in the work of our office and your
         utility, could you tell the Commission where he
 3
 4
         is now?
 5
         (Tebbetts) Yes. He's the Vice President of
 6
         Regulatory of Duke Energy. So, he's moved up
 7
         pretty fast, and done very well for himself. But
 8
         this was a great opportunity for all of us to
 9
         work with him.
10
         It was. And the reason I'm belaboring that is, I
11
         just would like the Commission to know that,
12
         consistent with what you just described, Ms.
1.3
         Tebbetts, you know, our office was, and other
14
         parties, were deeply involved in collaborating
15
         with this utility on developing this Pilot
16
         Program. So, this is, I guess, it's a little
17
         different than the traditional divide between
18
         utilities and people who kind of hover around
19
         utilities, usually criticizing what they do.
20
                   And, so, when the Pilot got divided
21
         into two phases, what part of the Pilot was
22
         consigned to Phase 2?
23
         (Tebbetts) So, I think the idea -- well, I don't
         "think", the idea behind a Phase 2 was to see,
24
```

```
1
         first of all, could we even do what we set out to
 2
         do in Phase 1, which was, there was four items
 3
         there, and can we do it? And, if we did it,
 4
         then, "Hey, let's see if we can get to Phase 2."
 5
         And Phase 2 could be designed differently, or the
 6
         same, we had to come up with a proposal. And it
 7
         was really just a continuation of what we wanted
 8
         to do in Phase 1.
         Well, doesn't Phase 2 provide for a Bring Your
 9
    Q
10
         Own Device component to the program?
11
         (Tebbetts) And Phase 1 did as well.
12
         difference was Phase 1, if an aggregator wanted
13
         to do a Bring Your Own Device, then they would
14
         have to predict the peaks. And Phase 2 provided
15
         that they would, if an aggregator came in with a
16
         Bring Your Own Device Program, then the
17
         Liberty -- Liberty would predict the peak.
18
         And did that happen in Phase 1?
19
         (Tebbetts) That did not happen in Phase 1.
20
         believe it started, and then I think it kind of
21
         just fell off, people just fell off somehow, some
22
         way, I don't remember really. But it didn't get
23
         off the ground in Phase 1, no.
24
         Presumably, you've read the Guidehouse Report
```

```
1
         that is entered -- at least marked for
 2
         identification as "Exhibit 22", I believe?
 3
    Α
         (Tebbetts) Yes.
 4
         Would you say, in general, that the Guidehouse
 5
         Report concludes that Phase 1 of the Pilot was a
 6
         success?
 7
         (Tebbetts) Overall, I would say yes.
    Α
 8
         And, so, therefore, I listened to Mr. Sheehan
 9
         say, in response to the Commission's question,
10
         about whether there will be a Phase 2, he
11
         basically said "There won't be a Phase 2".
12
         he actually said was "At this point, we do not
1.3
         have a plan to do so."
14
                    And, so, my question to you is, why is
15
         this Company walking away from Phase 2 of this
16
         Pilot Program?
17
    Α
         (Tebbetts) So, we're not walking away from
18
         Phase 2. To be clear, we just don't have a
19
         proposal today. To be honest, I sat here last
20
         week, and we talked about demand response
21
         opportunities in another docket. And the Company
2.2
         is seeing this kind of docket and other things
23
         come about. We don't think it makes sense at
24
         this time to just come up and now propose a
```

1.3

Phase 2, when the Commission and other parties are actually looking at potential demand response programs.

So, what we'd like to do is understand better what the Commission wants, understand what parties want. You know, we're talking five years after we made a filing, and see how have things changed. Do the things that we set out to do in Phase 1 still apply to a Phase 2? And, if they do, let's do them. And, if they don't, what does apply now? How have things in the world, and in New Hampshire, since we actually proposed this?

We want to, if we're going to put a Phase 2 out there, we want to make sure that we are looking at current issues in New Hampshire, and not looking back at 2017 and 2018 issues and now pushing that forward.

- Q And, finally, the service territory of your Company, in its western zone, abuts the service territory of Green Mountain Power, over in Vermont, does it not?
- A (Tebbetts) Yes, it does.
- Q And are you familiar with what Green Mountain
 Power is doing with Tesla Powerwalls?

```
1
          (Tebbetts) Well, I was familiar with their
 2
         program that they had. If that's changed in the
 3
         past year or two, then I am not familiar.
 4
    0
         Would it be fair to say that Liberty, through
 5
         this Pilot, sort of the leapfrogged over what you
 6
         understood Green Mountain Power to be doing?
 7
         (Tebbetts) We absolutely stole their program, and
    Α
 8
         I told them that when I worked with them.
 9
         just made it better, because we added time-of-use
10
         rates to it.
11
         That's a big deal, though, right? I mean, Green
    Q
12
         Mountain Power, like Liberty, was basically
13
         partnering with customers to install Tesla
14
         Powerwalls, they're helpful during outages, are
15
         they not?
16
         (Tebbetts) Yeah, you're right. We did exactly
17
         that, yes.
18
         But, then, you went one better than your friends
    Q
19
         in Vermont, by saying "Let's try some TOU
20
         arbitrage with these batteries and see how that
21
         goes", right?
22
    Α
         (Tebbetts) Yes.
23
         And, so, if you live or work in the Upper Valley,
24
         and you're trying to undermine the idea that
```

```
1
         Vermont is more evolved, in terms of its
 2
         electricity service than New Hampshire is, would
 3
         there be a better example than what Liberty has
 4
         done with Tesla Powerwalls, versus what Green
 5
         Mountain Power has done?
 6
    Α
         (Tebbetts) No.
 7
                    MR. KREIS: Those are all the questions
         I have for the Liberty witnesses at this time.
 8
 9
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.
10
         We'll move to Mr. Krakoff.
11
                    MR. KRAKOFF: Yes, I have a few
12
         questions.
1.3
    BY MR. KRAKOFF:
14
         Ms. Tebbetts, or the folks from Guidehouse, could
15
         you please just explain what the purpose of the
16
         Guidehouse Report was?
17
    Α
         (Tebbetts) Yes. Sure. So, as part of the
18
         Settlement Agreement, we said we would have a
19
         third party evaluate Phase 1, and it would look
20
         at about 18 months of data, to figure out, you
21
         know, "Did we meet what was set out to be met in
2.2
         the Settlement Agreement?" And one of those
23
         things was to get, you know, to predict the peak
24
         at least 75 percent of the time; we looked at
```

```
1
         cost-benefit analysis; customer engagement.
 2
                    And, so, we agreed that we would have a
 3
         third party come and take a look at all of the
 4
         data and make those determinations for us.
 5
         Okay. And, when you said that they would look at
 6
         whether you met all the criteria they set out to
 7
         do in the Settlement Agreement, I mean, would you
 8
         agree that the Guidehouse Report largely finds
 9
         that you did meet those criteria?
10
         (Tebbetts) Yes.
11
         Okay. And, so, one of those criteria you just
12
         mentioned was reducing peak demand with an
13
         accuracy of 75 percent or greater. So, that
14
         criterion was met here?
15
         (Tebbetts) Yes.
    Α
16
         Okay. And I guess one of the considerations in
17
         this hearing today is whether to continue Phase 1
18
         of the program, correct?
19
         (Tebbetts) Well, I think Phase 1 is going to
    Α
20
         continue through the ten years.
21
    Q
         Okay.
2.2
         (Tebbetts) As we have customer contracts saying
23
         that we will continue this. I think my opinion,
24
         and how I read the scope of this is, "Do we go to
```

```
1
         Phase 2? And, if so, have we met the
 2
         requirements to go to Phase 2?"
 3
    Q
         Okay. So, your intention is to continue with
 4
         Phase 1 for the entire ten years of the program?
 5
         (Tebbetts) Yes.
 6
                    MR. KRAKOFF: Okay. And I have no
 7
         further questions at this time. Thanks.
 8
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you,
 9
         Mr. Krakoff. We'll move to Department of Energy,
10
         and Mr. Dexter.
11
                    MR. DEXTER: Thank you.
12
    BY MR. DEXTER:
         I'd like to follow up on the issue that was
1.3
         raised earlier about the customers that have
14
         batteries that are also solar customers.
15
16
                    And, Ms. Tebbetts, you had identified
17
         an issue that you said was of concern back in the
18
         early parts of this program that concerned
19
         whether or not a customer with solar would ever
20
         export power to the grid, except when an event
21
         was called. And you sort of answered your own --
2.2
         you identified the issue, and then answered the
23
         question by saying "that would never happen."
24
         Did I understand that right?
```

```
1
          (Tebbetts) Yes. So, the batteries won't -- the
 2
         only time the batteries will ever export to the
 3
         grid is when they're called upon for a peak
 4
         event. And I think Mr. Joyce, from Tesla,
 5
         confirmed that they will not export power, except
 6
         in those instances.
 7
    Q
         Right. And Mr. Joyce, if I understood his
 8
         answer, said that that was "done through
 9
         programming", and I'm simplifying, but that's
10
         what I understood.
11
                   And I wonder if Mr. Joyce would explain
12
         in more detail how everyone can be sure that
13
         that's, in fact, what happens or what doesn't
14
         happen?
         (Joyce) The batteries are indeed controlled by a
15
16
         local computer running control software that
17
         includes an economic optimization for the sites.
18
         And we have configured the economics of these
19
         sites, as configured on the battery, so that it
20
         never sees a financial benefit to exporting the
21
         solar. And, so, it will use that energy to power
2.2
         the loads in the house.
23
                   When we send a direct command, however,
24
         it will obey that direct command, and that is how
```

```
1
         we are able to see the extra benefit from
 2
         exporting during a grid event. When we don't
 3
         send that event command, the system will only
 4
         serve on-site load.
 5
         So, do I understand then that this solar system
 6
         would bypass the battery when a customer's solar
 7
         system exports to the grid?
 8
         (Joyce) That's right. We don't block that.
 9
         only are concerned with whether or not the
10
         battery causes export to the grid.
11
         And you can -- and how can you tell whether or
12
         not an export from a battery is used by the
13
         homeowner or it goes to the grid?
14
         (Joyce) Every installation has metering at three
15
         different points in the home. Both a meter at
16
         the site that is collocated with the service
17
         meter, one at the battery, so that we know what
18
         the battery is doing, and one at any solar
19
         generation. So, using that data, we're able to
20
         track the energy flows. And we can tell if
21
         export to the grid is exceeding the amount of
2.2
         solar generation. We can monitor that point, and
23
         we can know that the battery is never causing
24
         there to be more export to the grid than there is
```

```
1
         solar generation.
 2
                   MR. DEXTER: That's all the questions I
 3
         have. Thanks.
 4
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you,
 5
         Mr. Dexter. We'll move to Commissioner questions
 6
         now, beginning with Commissioner Simpson.
 7
                   CMSR. SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr.
 8
         Chairman.
                   Okay. So, I'll start with a few
 9
10
         questions for the Company, and then I have some
11
         questions for Tesla. Nice to see you both again.
12
    BY CMSR. SIMPSON:
13
         So, just as of today, how many installations are
14
         out there? How many customers?
         (Tebbetts) We have 98 customers. We have two
15
    Α
16
         customers still awaiting their installations,
17
         because a couple of customers actually dropped
18
         out right before their batteries were installed.
19
         And, so, we've replaced them. We have a long
20
         waiting list. So, we've replaced those two, and
21
         those two are waiting to get their batteries
22
         installed.
23
         What's driving the waiting list?
    Q
24
          (Tebbetts) Oh, customers really want batteries.
```

```
1
         And they're just not available?
 2
         (Tebbetts) Well, we only have 100 allowed
 3
         participants. So, they're just waiting for maybe
 4
         Phase 2.
 5
         Okay. And can you point me to what you've spent
 6
         so far on those customers who are interconnected
 7
         today?
 8
         (Tebbetts) Yes. I think it's in the Report. I
 9
         thought it was in the Report, the total.
10
         Take your time.
11
         (Tebbetts) Yes. If it wasn't in the report, give
12
         one second.
13
                    I have a number, let me just get into
14
         it. Nope, shoot.
15
                    [Short pause.]
    CONTINUED BY THE WITNESS:
16
17
         (Tebbetts) Okay. Okay. So, the total -- total
18
         spent on Phase 1 was -- okay, well, that's not
19
         right.
20
                    Jeez, I thought I had it really in
21
         front of me, and I -- hold on. It's about two
22
         and a half, 2.6 million.
23
    BY CMSR. SIMPSON:
24
         Okay.
```

```
1
          (Tebbetts) Approximately.
 2
         Okay. Where are you reading that from? Is that
 3
         in the record?
 4
         (Tebbetts) You know, I'd have to look and see if
 5
         we -- did we file the cost-benefit analysis as
 6
         part of this? That's a good question. I just
 7
         can't remember what we did.
 8
         I can make it a record request, and then you can
    Q
 9
         go back and --
10
         (Tebbetts) Sure.
11
         If you can? So, that would be just, as of today,
12
         what have been the program expenditures?
13
         (Tebbetts) Yes, yes, yes. That's not a problem.
    Α
14
         Thank you.
15
         (Tebbetts) We can get you that.
    Α
16
         With respect to the "100 customer limit" that you
17
         just spoke to, there's, I think as some of the
18
         participants have articulated, that this Pilot
19
         has evolved quite a bit over time, it's deferred
20
         from what you initially proposed.
21
                    At some point, there was a distinction
22
         between "at least 100 customers and less than
23
         200", do you recall that?
         (Tebbetts) "At least 100 customers"?
24
```

```
1
         In Phase 1, you had to get at least 100
 2
         customers, but not more than 200.
 3
    Α
         (Tebbetts) So, it was -- it ended up being
 4
         batteries, because Tesla then required two
 5
         batteries per customer.
 6
         Okay. Okay.
 7
         (Tebbetts) So, I think it evolved into "no less
 8
         than 50 customers, no more than 100", because of
 9
         that issue.
10
         Okay. That's a helpful distinction. Thank you
11
         for that.
12
                   Can you explain how customers are using
1.3
         your time-of-use rate for charging, and
14
         discharging, if they can use it? It sounds like
15
         they're not using the TOU rate for discharging.
16
         But, please, if you could explain it for me, that
17
         would be helpful.
18
         (Tebbetts) Yes. Sure. So, the way the
    Α
19
         time-of-use rates work is that, well, customers
20
         have three periods during the week and two
21
         periods on the weekends.
22
                    So, we'll talk about customers who
23
         don't have solar. Customers who don't have
24
         solar, their batteries will operate in their home
```

```
1
         from -- during the critical peak hours, and they
 2
         will offset the load at the home, up to whatever
 3
         it is, until the batteries have 20 percent left.
 4
         In the event that a customer then uses more,
 5
         maybe they're running their air conditioning, --
 6
         Uh-huh.
 7
          (Tebbetts) -- a hot day, they will then draw from
 8
         the grid at the time-of-use rate.
 9
         Uh-huh.
10
          (Tebbetts) And then, as far as the solar
11
         customers go, same thing, but they will use their
12
         solar, and then use their battery during those
13
         periods.
14
         Uh-huh.
15
          (Tebbetts) And then, if all of that's gone, then
16
         they're going to draw from the grid. So, the
17
         benefit is that, during those high-price periods,
18
         customers have the opportunity to use the battery
19
         to offset the imports of kilowatt-hours at the
20
         very high prices.
21
         Uh-huh.
    Q
22
         (Tebbetts) And we found in -- well, the
23
         Guidehouse found, by doing some analysis, that
24
         those customers actually saved money on their
```

```
1
         bills, simply because they were using that price
 2
         arbitrage to benefit themselves.
 3
    Q
         The customers that just had the battery, with no
 4
         rooftop solar, or no solar, I should say?
 5
         that what you're distinguishing?
 6
    Α
          (Tebbetts) No. All customers who have batteries
 7
         had an opportunity to reduce their bills.
 8
    0
         Okay.
 9
          (Tebbetts) Maybe customers with solar had, you
10
         know, depending on how their solar worked, could
11
         have reduced it higher, but they all had an
12
         opportunity to reduce their bills.
13
         So, customers use the time-of-use rate just to
    Q
14
         charge the batteries, and then they offset their
15
         own load during the peak period of the rate
16
         design.
                  Is that a correct characterization of
17
         what you just said?
18
          (Tebbetts) Yes. So, the batteries for non-solar
    Α
19
         customers charge overnight, --
20
         Yes.
          (Tebbetts) -- in the off-peak hours, which start
21
22
         at 8:00 p.m. and go until 8:00 a.m., on the
23
         off-peak rate.
24
         Okay.
```

```
1
         (Tebbetts) And then use it in the critical peak
 2
         hours, 3:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., to offset that
 3
         high rate, so they're not importing. So, they
 4
         get that price arbitrage when they're buying
 5
         power really cheap, using it at the high price
 6
         periods.
 7
         Okay. And then, I read your filing with respect
    Q
 8
         to the solar customers. And my takeaway was that
         they're customers that have rooftop solar, and
 9
10
         there are times then they're not able to charge
11
         their battery. Their battery has a very low
12
         state of charge, because they can't charge it
13
         from the grid. Is that correct?
14
         (Tebbetts) Yes.
15
         And, seemingly, that would impact the life of the
16
         battery, sitting at a very, very low state of
17
         charge. Is that a fair assessment?
18
         (Tebbetts) I believe that's correct. But Mr.
    Α
19
         Joyce, from Tesla, would have to confirm that.
20
         But I do believe that I did hear that information
21
         when we brought this up to Tesla a few years ago.
22
    Q
         And, if there were a rate design that we looked
23
         at, let's say your time-of-use rate, and were to
24
         develop within those periods a charging and a
```

```
1
         grid discharging rate, could that be an option
 2
         for those customers? To have the solar charge
 3
         their battery, and then have a separate rate
 4
         design for the export?
 5
         (Tebbetts) Well, the batteries don't -- you mean
 6
         the batteries export or the solar export?
 7
         Because the batteries won't export at all, --
 8
         Uh-huh.
    0
 9
         (Tebbetts) -- except when we call on them.
10
         the issue is, we'd like to be able to charge
11
         those batteries -- we'd like to make sure that
12
         those batteries are ready for a peak event. And,
1.3
         so, in the event that Tesla predicts a peak event
14
         today, this morning we want to be able to send a
15
         signal to it right away to be able to charge it,
16
         regardless of the price.
17
         Uh-huh. Right. So, I read what the
18
         Department -- or, I guess PUC Staff at the time
19
         had filed with respect to a concern around net
20
         metering, and that that would violate the net
21
         metering statute. Is that your understanding of
22
         their concerns as well?
23
    Α
         (Tebbetts) Yes.
24
         So, what I'm asking is, if there's no netting, if
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

we have a rate design, time-of-use rate design, that has both import and export rates, and that we have the technology, because I believe Mr. Joyce said that there are meters or measurement devices at the service point for the solar, and for the battery, so, there should be no netting that would be necessary, could we enable those customers to gain the full benefits of these installations and actually export during time-of-use periods onto the grid? Could that be an option for future application within this program? (Tebbetts) I mean, anything is an option, I guess, as long as we're not -- well, put it this way. Let's forget the statutes for net metering and everything else. Yes, if we actually wanted those systems to export everything to the grid, as a benefit to the grid, as a benefit to the customer, call it whatever you want, we could do that. Obviously, we'd have to program the batteries, et cetera, and our billing. But, all things being equal, it's not impossible. CMSR. SIMPSON: Uh-huh. I don't know if maybe the Department might want to address

1 that, that point at some point, you don't have to 2 do it right now, but the question of net metering, and your concerns with respect to 3 violation of the statute. 4 5 BY CMSR. SIMPSON: 6 So, when does Liberty have control over these 7 batteries? 8 (Tebbetts) All the time. Well, what I'll say is, 9 Liberty, ourselves, we don't have actual access, 10 or control. Tesla has control of those 11 batteries. But through, with that, we do, all 12 the time. The customer has no access to their 1.3 battery. They can look at the battery through 14 their phone app. 15 0 Uh-huh. 16 (Tebbetts) But my understanding is they have no 17 access to do anything with the batteries. So, 18 even though the Settlement Agreement says "when 19 Liberty has control", the Settlement was written 20 while we were working through the control. And 21 it turned out that the customer never has 22 control. 23 And is that a positive or is that a negative, in 24 your view?

```
1
          (Tebbetts) I think it's a positive, because we
 2
         set out to the customers, in their contract, how
 3
         this program is going to work. If they were to
 4
         fuss with the batteries and the programming, no
 5
         longer are those batteries going to operate in
 6
         the manner that we set forth, and also that we
 7
         agreed with parties and the Commission on how we
 8
         would operate them.
         And is that just underlying in the contractual
 9
    Q
10
         agreement or is there anything in your tariff
11
         about that?
         (Tebbetts) I don't know if there's anything in
12
1.3
         the tariff. I'd have to go back in the tariff
14
         and look. But I think it's spelled out in the
15
         contract, and I think some of the contract is in
16
         the tariff. But, I think, for the most part,
17
         it's the time-of-use periods really that are in
18
         the tariff, not what's in the contract and how
19
         the batteries will be used.
20
         So, the only time that these batteries export
21
         energy to the grid is when Liberty calls upon
22
         them to do that, correct?
23
    Α
         (Tebbetts) That's correct.
24
         And can you explain how the customer is
```

```
1
         compensated during those times?
 2
         (Tebbetts) Sure. Through net metering, same idea
 3
         as net metering credits. So, any kilowatt-hour
 4
         that goes back to the grid, the customer
 5
         receives, you know, we net it at the month -- at
         the end of the month, just like if it was solar.
 6
 7
    Q
         Uh-huh.
 8
         (Tebbetts) So, any exports that go back to the
 9
         grid, they get a monetary compensation. They're
10
         not in the grandfathered program for net
11
         metering, they are in the tariff approved on
12
         September 1st -- for effect September 1st, 2017.
13
         Uh-huh.
    Q
14
         (Tebbetts) So, they get only a monetary credit
15
         for 100 percent energy service, 100 percent
16
         transmission, 25 percent distribution.
17
    Q
         As applied to the relevant time period in the TOU
18
         rate?
19
         (Tebbetts) That's correct. So, if, let's say, we
    Α
20
         called on them and told them to, at 2:00, they
21
         had to export, they would get whatever prevailing
22
         rate that is. If it was at 5:00, they would get
23
         that prevailing rate.
24
         Okay. All right. Thank you.
```

1 I have a few questions for Mr. Joyce. 2 How are you today, sir? 3 Α (Joyce) I'm doing well. Thank you. 4 I know that some of the participants here today 5 noted that we have some other ongoing focus areas 6 in the demand response. Are you aware of an 7 investigation that we have into demand response 8 technology? (Joyce) Only insofar as it was mentioned to me 9 10 that it exists. 11 Okay. And, just for the record, that's IR 22 - 076. 12 1.3 And I ask, because I don't want to 14 stand in the way of progress. But we do have a 15 balance, of course, in terms of what we're trying 16 to investigate and understand more broadly, with 17 respect to demand response, and any applications 18 of that technology that might help to enable the 19 energy statutes and policies here in New 20 Hampshire. 21 Which is really what I wanted to talk 22 to you about. I'm really curious to understand, 23 what's Tesla's vision for a retail electricity 24 market? How can state regulation enable that?

```
1
          (Joyce) Well, thank you.
 2
         That's an easy one.
 3
         (Joyce) that's a very broad question. I'd say,
 4
         we do --
 5
         Just stage-setting.
 6
         (Joyce) Yes. Thank you. We do have some visions
 7
         for different models for how all this can work.
         What we have done in New Hampshire, with Liberty,
 8
         is one model, with the utility ownership of
 9
10
         the -- of the batteries themselves, you know,
11
         providing benefits to the utility, you know,
12
         therefore, lowering the barriers to various
13
         customers adopting the technology, so that they
14
         can get backup. And also, as was shown in this
15
         Pilot, the benefit of managing their own energy
16
         costs.
17
                    There are, you know, other approaches
18
         that we've taken in other markets, more around
19
         customer ownership of the batteries themselves.
20
         And, in that case, it's really very similar in
21
         the overall outcomes, but it is a -- sort of a
22
         stack of allowing customers to manage their own
23
         energy costs and achieve a certain amount of
```

systemic load shift through time-of-use rates.

24

1 And layering on top of that various programs to 2 address peak and address other grid needs, like 3 ancillary services, by having a virtual power 4 plant offering on top of that, which also 5 generates value to the customer that can help 6 benefit them financially. And, you know, also, 7 to a certain degree, pay for the investments that 8 they have made into solar and storage at their 9 home. 10 Would you characterize this program as a "virtual 11 power plant"? 12 (Joyce) I would characterize this program as a 13 "virtual power plant", yes. 14 What do you think New Hampshire is missing, in Q 15 terms of enabling these technologies more 16 broadly? 17 Α (Joyce) I think, probably, it would be from here, 18 you know, I think a lot of the basic pieces are 19 in place. You know, the -- you have the net 20 metering policy that allows customers to export and realize value. That's a very key component, 21 22 that exports be valued. You are exploring, and 23 have explored through this program, time-varying 24 energy rates, which is another key component.

1.3

2.2

And I think, beyond that, it is finding ways to attach value to other services that these flexible resources can provide. Here, we've talked about various capacity services, the RNS and FCM values. And we've shown that we can unlock those, and make that value -- pass that value along to customers through various mechanisms.

Those are the pieces. And I -- and I 've seen them all, you know, in place or under development in New Hampshire.

- And did you understand or do you understand the concern that Liberty has raised, with respect to customers that have distributed generation, in addition to batteries, within this program, and the inability, at least as understood by the Company, of those customers to charge their batteries from the grid?
- A (Joyce) Yes, I am familiar with that issue. It is one that has existed as long as we have had batteries in cold climates, as you have in New England. So, yes. We have been dealing with it for a while.
- Q In other states as well?

```
1
          (Joyce) In other states as well, to a degree.
 2
         But a lot of places we have been able to -- to
 3
         get to resolution to have the appropriate parties
 4
         agree that, as long as there is a control to
 5
         minimize or eliminate the export outside of when
 6
         it is needed as part of the program, that the --
 7
         that the challenge to existing policies is
         non-existent or minimal.
 8
 9
    Q
         Do you think there are rate design options that
10
         could mitigate that issue? I mean, it seems to
11
         revolve around the core concept of "netting".
12
         And it seems as if these customers within the
13
         Pilot, that they have multiple measurement nodes
14
         that I would presume have telemetry, and fairly
         close to real-time information.
15
16
                   Can you explain the granularity of
17
         information that Tesla can see, in terms of how
18
         energy is flowing within these systems?
19
         (Joyce) Sure. In terms of the way they are
    Α
20
         controlled, as I mentioned, they are controlled
21
         locally. And, so, honestly, we don't need to see
22
         all this data in order to maintain all the
23
         control. And, of course, that local controller
24
         has, you know, extremely granular and extremely
```

fast ability to access this information and act on that information.

In terms of what we, Tesla, can see, in terms of telemetry that comes back to us, we do sample all those measurement points that I mentioned earlier, that is the premise, the battery, and on-site generation, such as solar. And we pull that data back to us regularly, at five-minute intervals, and, when needed, at up to every few seconds.

- Q Okay. So, at a minimum, you have five-minute interval information for all of those nodes, and you can access data per five-second intervals, it sounds like, down to that level?
- A (Joyce) That's right. When the customer -- when needed, for example, when the customer opens their app, and is watching their system in real-time, we're able to pull the data in near real-time in order to support that.
- Q Have you, in other jurisdictions, participated in programs or pilots that led to the formation of dynamic rates, for both importing and exporting energy?
- 24 A (Joyce) We have not participated in any pilots of

```
1
         dynamic rates to date. But I am familiar -- or,
 2
         I am aware, I should say, of some such pilots
 3
         that are under development.
 4
         Do you have any thoughts on value of these
 5
         systems that isn't being realized by the
 6
         inability of customers to export energy back onto
 7
         the grid, at times other than when Liberty calls
 8
         upon it?
         (Joyce) There are definitely -- yes. There are
 9
10
         definitely values to be had there. A lot of
11
         those values can still be accessed through the
12
         kinds of virtual power plant dispatches that
13
         we're talking about. But dynamic rates is
14
         another strategy that's being pursued.
15
         Does Tesla have a preference, in terms of
    0
16
         regulatory constructs, that you're pursuing?
17
         mean, we're at this pivotal junction in this case
18
         where we've deployed a couple hundred batteries
19
         that are, --
20
         (Joyce) Uh-huh.
21
         -- arguably, the most advanced, and seemingly
22
         there is some regulatory hurdles that are in
23
         place that limit the value that these resources
24
         could provide to the system and to New Hampshire
```

ratepayers. We're in a pilot.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

What recommendations might you offer to fully realize or to more fully realize the potential that these resources could provide? (Joyce) Right. I think, at this point, so, when we talk with people about creating programs and unlocking value for customers, and for the grid and all ratepayers, I think what we -- a lot of what we focus on these days is achieving more scale, honestly. That a lot of the pieces, a lot of the technical proofs of concept have been done with various pilots and programs, such as the one we're talking about here. We're very interested at this point, around the world, at finding structures that can appeal to lots of consumers, and, therefore, drive adoption, and, through adoption, create more value, and, through creating more value, making the proposition more attractive to customers, and to get the -- grow the resource that's available, as sort of a way to accelerate what we're doing here.

To that end, I think we're very excited about programs that are simple and transparent, and exciting to customers. And, to that end, and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that's why we're pursuing in many places the kind of framework that I described when you asked the first question, which is, you know, some simple concepts, simple for those of us who live in the utility space for our professional lives, like time-varying energy rates, TOU rates, like virtual power plants, that have discrete and understandable responses, things like that. that we can get customers excited, and that we can improve adoption, and so that we can start to educate customers as to how these systems can be extremely valuable as a foundation to build on. At which point, maybe some of the more sophisticated concepts can be brought in, once that understanding and trust has been built. I mean, I look at New Hampshire, and I see that we have multiple utilities that have time-of-use rates for a variety of customer types. We are on our way with respect to advanced metering for those utilities. I guess, what should we do next? do you recommend that we do next, in order to enable broader adoption and to realize benefits?

We're in this pilot environment where we can test

1 things out. 2 (Joyce) I think that continuing, you know, I 3 think that the idea of developing a BYOD-style 4 program, in order to mobilize the kind of VPP 5 value that we mobilized here in different ways for more customers, is one thing that could be 6 7 done, in order to -- in order to more realize the vision that I've been describing and to move 8 9 things forward. 10 And would that have, ideally, a broader customer 11 control component, in addition to a centralized 12 dispatch of these batteries in aggregate? 1.3 (Joyce) In general, yes, it would. If we're --14 if we were to go the Bring Your Own Device route, 15 and not a utility-owned route, generally 16 speaking, that comes with more customer controls, 17 so that customers can realize value from things 18 like the TOU rates as they elect. And there's no 19 necessarily -- it's not necessarily a 20 representation of the value from the utility that 21 we have to stand behind. 22 Q Okay. Just over two years ago, we received a

letter in this proceeding from Sunrun. I'm not

sure if you're familiar with that. If not, it's

23

24

```
1
         okay. I can give you a summary of my
 2
         perspective. Are you familiar with that letter?
 3
    Α
         (Joyce) No, not the content of it. But, now that
 4
         you mention it, I do recall something like this
 5
         being part of the conversation a few years ago.
 6
    Q
         So, in my reading, the essence of this letter was
 7
         that, if this Pilot were continued into a second
 8
         phase, that the utility would not control the
                     That another DER provider would
 9
         batteries.
10
         control the operation of these batteries.
11
                    So, first off, can you explain, from
12
         your understanding, who's really controlling the
13
         batteries? Who's doing that economic dispatch
14
         activity right now?
15
         (Joyce) The way this Pilot is put together, that
16
         is us, Tesla, as a service to the utility.
17
         are predicting ISO-New England peaks, --
18
         Uh-huh.
    Q
19
         (Joyce) -- and dispatching the VPP accordingly.
    Α
20
         Okay. And that's the Company's understanding as
21
         well? You're not in software, discharging
22
         batteries, you defer to Tesla on this?
23
    Α
         (Tebbetts) Yes. That's correct.
24
         So, are you familiar with the letter, Ms.
```

Tebbetts?

1.3

- A (Tebbetts) Yes, I am.
- Q How do characterize your operation of these batteries today? Do you feel that Liberty is really calling on these batteries or is somebody else? A partner?
- A (Tebbetts) Yes, a partner is. You know, that's part of the partnership with Tesla. If we had this kind of software, and we had someone sitting in a room every day making that determination, we wouldn't need Tesla, I guess.
- Q Uh-huh.
 - A (Tebbetts) But Tesla has the -- Tesla has the

 EPI. Tesla has the algorithms already programmed

 into it. They're already looking at the ISO-New

 England data. And, so, we'd be reinventing the

 wheel, if we did it for ourselves for a small

 pilot like this. And, so, we have worked with

 Tesla for the past few years to dispatch and

 monitor the batteries. They have a really great

 EPI, I can tell you, I use it all the time. And

 a couple of us at the Company use it, we can look

 at what the batteries are doing for any customer,

 or, in aggregate, what those customers are doing,

1 and are able to answer customer questions and 2 things like that. 3 So, we are not controlling those 4 batteries; Tesla is. And we're doing it in a 5 partnership. 6 So, when I look at the Sunrun's letter, 7 insert here, right, the company that's doing it 8 It's Tesla today. If Tesla wasn't here, tomorrow we'd find someone else to do it. 9 10 But, yes, it's a partnership. And we 11 don't control the batteries ourselves. We do it 12 through Tesla. 1.3 Okay. So, then, Mr. Joyce, can you explain to me 14 what software the Company uses in order to gauge 15 opportunities within the regional electricity 16 market, ISO-New England, as well as controlling 17 the batteries? 18 (Joyce) Sure. You know, Tesla, what we have are Α 19 Autobidder software, which is an 20 algorithmic-based bidding strategy software that 21 we use for in-front-of-the-meter batteries, as 2.2 well as behind-the-meter virtual power plants, 23 such as this one. 24 In terms of how this particular system

1 is -- this particular VPP is being dispatched, it 2 is a very, frankly, basic implementation. We do 3 have the data feeds that flow into our software, 4 but the dispatch for this program is a pretty 5 manual process on our side, with a human in the 6 loop that helps us monitor this on a day-to-day 7 basis and make the dispatch decisions. 8 And then, in some of the record request 9 responses, there's a mention of a tool called 10 "Powerhub". Can you explain that please? 11 (Joyce) That is the portal that was just 12 described earlier, that allows you to see the 13 behavior of the VPP in aggregate, as well as the 14 behavior of the individual sites. Liberty has 15 access to that. We, internally, also have access 16 to that for this fleet, and it also includes the 17 ability to schedule dispatch commands manually 18 within it. 19 We, Tesla, have that capability, but 20 Liberty does not have that capability, because of 21 the arrangement, the dispatch arrangement that we 22 have with them. They could have that capability. 23 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. So, I'll return 24 to the Department, if you have anything you want

to add on the "net metering" question? You don't 1 2. have to, if you don't want to. I just want to 3 give you that opportunity. 4 MR. DEXTER: Well, I think we explored 5 the concern that was raised several years ago. 6 And I think we heard the explanation from Liberty 7 and from Tesla on how the concern has been addressed. And I think we're satisfied with 8 9 that. So, I don't have anything else to add. 10 We don't have a comment at this time on 11 your proposal to do this without netting. We'd have to think about that a little bit. 12 1.3 CMSR. SIMPSON: So, with respect to 14 resolution, you're -- it sounds like the Company 15 hasn't resolved this question yet. They still 16 have it pending for us? 17 MR. DEXTER: Well, Mr. Sheehan started 18 with this as a pending -- as a request. 19 CMSR. SIMPSON: Yes. 20 MR. DEXTER: What I'm saying is, I 21 think, based on what we've heard today, we 2.2 wouldn't have any objection to the Commission 23 granting Liberty's request. CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. To enable their 24

1 customers with rooftop solar to charge their 2. batteries from the grid? 3 MR. DEXTER: Correct. 4 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. 5 MR. DEXTER: Yes. Because, based on 6 what we heard today, it sounds like they would 7 not be in violation of the net metering statute 8 requirements. 9 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you. 10 And, as somebody that's been involved 11 from the beginning, I would ask the Consumer 12 Advocate, do you have any thoughts on dynamic 1.3 rate evolution? 14 Because, frankly, it's surprising that we have hundreds of batteries that customers 15 16 themselves can't control and export to the grid 17 at their own discretion. So, I wonder "what 18 could be a next step?" "What could be a regulatory paradigm that would enable them to 19 20 monetize, realize value that meets their needs?" 21 Any thoughts? 2.2 MR. KREIS: That's a terrific question, Commissioner Simpson. I think I'd like to take 23 24 that one home and ponder it, though. I've had a

1 long day.
2 CMSR. SIMPSON: No problem. That's
3 fine.

1.3

2.2

And then, I guess, moving forward, it still seems like there's a lack of acquiescence around a strategy to move forward. So, what does the Company want from the Commission in order to "complete Phase 1"? And do you have an appetite to move to Phase 2?

It seems like there's a lot of opportunity here, now that there are almost 200 batteries that are possibly controlled by Tesla in the Granite State.

MR. SHEEHAN: Sure. As I said, one question is this net metering issue. And, based on DOE's position, we hope the Commission will solve that in a way that allows those customers to charge from the grid, because they can't export.

Our goal, our request is, frankly, to let this program run. You know, it's only been 18 months. We've had a couple of wacky years with COVID. So, with that, we have -- it's going to have an asterisk next to it.

1.3

So, there's a lot of value to be gained by not tinkering with it too much. Just let it run, let's collect the info. And, as Mr. Joyce said, it can be a foundation for maybe tweaking this program, maybe Phase 2, or maybe a totally different application we haven't thought of yet.

So, you know, it's always inviting to want to keep tweaking and manipulating it, and I think we should resist to a degree.

So, back to your question, we ask for a nod on that issue, that it's okay to do that.

More for administrative reasons, it would be nice to hear from the Commission that Phase 1, other than letting it run out, is done. You know, there's no more -- we don't have to show anything more. You know, we had to show so many batteries in operation by certain deadlines, and that we've essentially met all those. And costs going forward are minimal. We're not spending too much money to run it. So, it's an expense of just to let it run and collect the data.

Again, as to Phase 2, we have not closed the doors. It's, as Ms. Tebbetts said, that the parties that pushed for the BYOD kind of

1.3

2.2

went silent on it. So, we should reengage with them, or give them the opportunity to reengage, because it's going to be them that's going to be bringing their devices. So, it's -- we can't force them to the table.

And, so, we hope that, through the success of this program, through the other investigations you have, is that maybe it does become a Phase 2 here, or maybe it becomes something else.

CMSR. SIMPSON: So, I'm not sensing a real appetite to increase customer count and Liberty's ownership of more batteries?

MR. SHEEHAN: Correct.

CMSR. SIMPSON: You don't want to do that at this time?

MR. SHEEHAN: Not at this time. You know, I can't speak for the whole corporate hierarchy, but there's, you know, as a utility, we're a wires and poles company, and owning assets behind meters is not the core of our business. You know, we're doing it here for all the right reasons. We're not sure that that's where we want to expand.

```
1
                    CMSR. SIMPSON: Wow.
                                          Okay.
                    MR. SHEEHAN: I mean, it's not that
 2
 3
         we're not.
 4
                    CMSR. SIMPSON: Uh-huh.
 5
                    MR. SHEEHAN: I'm just saying it's not
 6
         resolved one way or the other.
 7
                    CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. All right.
         don't have any further questions. Thank you.
 8
 9
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Mr. Patnaude, are
10
         you okay to continue?
11
                    (Mr. Patnaude indicating in the
                    affirmative.)
12
1.3
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. So, I'll
14
         start with maybe some Guidehouse questions. I
         don't want you to feel left out. You've had a
15
16
         long day of sitting, sir, and ma'am, on the
17
         screen.
18
    BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:
19
         So, at the Settlement, Page 6, says that the goal
20
         of Phase 1 was to "test of program concept and
21
         execution, benefit-cost analysis parameter
22
         assumptions, and incurred actual costs, as well
23
         as customer acceptance and engagement."
24
                    And the Guidehouse Report, which is
```

1 very thorough, you have some comments in various 2. areas, including the customer acceptance and 3 engagement. Could you maybe comment on your 4 assessment of customer acceptance and engagement? 5 (Crawford) So, we had gauged customer acceptance 6 and engagement through a series of two different 7 surveys. One for the customers after 8 installation had occurred, and then, two, at the 9 end of the Pilot. And, overall, the level of 10 satisfaction, I have to look this up, overall, 11 the level of satisfaction was rated as a 4.25 out 12 of 5. And I believe those that would recommend 1.3 it to a friend was -- I want to say around 80 14 percent, but I have to confirm that. 15 Yes, 79 percent of customers said they 16 would recommend it to a friend. 17 Very good. And do you -- does Guidehouse have 18 experience doing these kinds of studies with 19 other customers or is this a unique study for 20 you? 21 (Crawford) We do have this experience. I will 22 say I am not a process evaluation expert. But 23 yes, Guidehouse has certainly expertise in this 24 area.

```
1
         And, really, my only question is, is how does
 2
         this compare to other Guidehouse studies?
         this good customer acceptance and engagement,
 3
 4
         relative to your other studies? Or, maybe you
 5
         don't know the answer, but --
 6
         (Crawford) I am sorry, I do not know how this
 7
         stacks up to typical responses to a program like
 8
         this.
 9
         And, so, in isolation, just knowing what you see
    Q
10
         in the Report, would you say these numbers are
11
         good or, you know, poor? How would you
12
         characterize the numbers in the study?
13
         (Crawford) I would say it seems to be -- it would
14
         certainly not be poor. And also -- I would
15
         overall say that there's a reasonable degree of
16
         satisfaction, certainly not poor.
17
    Q
         You would be the highest-rated barbecue place in
18
         New Hampshire, 4.25. So, that seems --
19
         (Crawford) That would be excellent.
    Α
20
         That would be excellent. So, I thought "4.25"
21
         was pretty good. So, that was just me.
22
                   Okay. Let's see. Let me move to the
23
         B-to-C ratio, and, again, a question for
24
         Guidehouse. But, if Guidehouse is uncomfortable,
```

```
1
         I'm sure Ms. Tebbetts can take this one.
 2
                    But it shows in the Report a B-to-C
 3
         ratio for 1 plus 2 combined, Phases 1 plus 2
 4
         combined, at about 1.00, 0.99, let's just round
 5
         that to 1.00.
 6
         (Crawford) Yes.
 7
         I believe that we had a record request for
 8
         Phase 1, and the B-to-C there is 0.87.
 9
         that -- can you confirm that number? Or, Ms.
10
         Tebbetts, please feel free, whoever can answer
11
         the question.
12
         (Crawford) I am not sure about the assessment of
13
         Phase 1 alone.
14
         It was -- Ms. Tebbetts, it was in our Record
    Q
15
         Request Number 2.
16
         (Tebbetts) Yes.
17
         So, I just want to confirm it on the record.
18
         I think the issues are, as Commissioner Simpson
19
         was highlighting, and really Mr. Sheehan and the
20
         other parties highlighted, some of the pitfalls
21
         in the current implementation, things that can be
22
         remedied, improved, fixed, right? But where we
23
         are right now is we're under 1.00, right?
24
          (Tebbetts) Yes. Right now, that is correct.
```

1 have a benefit-cost ratio of 0.87. 2 Very good. Thank you for confirming that. 3 then, we were confused, or at least I was 4 confused on the average life of the batteries. 5 Is it a 10-year battery life that was used in the 6 analysis? And maybe this is a question for 7 Guidehouse. Or, is it 15 years? And, on the 8 Report, Page 31, there's a discussion on a 9 "nameplate lifetime of 10 years". But then it 10 talks about using the batteries all for 10 years 11 in the assumptions, then degrading them at, I think, "2 percent a year" or something for the 12 13 next five years. So, we couldn't quite figure 14 out what the useful life of the battery was. 15 Α (Crawford) Yes. So, the battery life is -- it's 16 a challenging topic, because there's different 17 ways to look at it. There's the warranty period. 18 There's the time in which it degrades to 80 19 percent, which may or may not be exactly the 20 timeframe that you predict. There's a lot of 21 sort of different metrics that are you used for 22 sort of end-of-life. But, in this analysis, I believe all 23 24 the batteries were assumed to last at least 10

```
1
                 But, then, it was assumed that some would
         years.
 2
         be able -- the loop [sic] would be taken out of
 3
         service, you know, between 10 to 15 years.
         Okay. And then, they're all out of service at 15
 4
 5
         years?
 6
         (Crawford) I do not believe it's necessarily
         assumed that they are all out of service. But
 7
 8
         the analysis does not assume any additional
 9
         benefit is received after 15 years.
10
         Okay.
11
         (Crawford) And, Ms. Tebbetts, correct me if I'm
12
         wrong?
1.3
         (Tebbetts) That's correct.
14
         Okay. Okay. And a question for Ms. Tebbetts,
15
         has the Company had to replace any batteries
16
         until now or have all the batteries that have
17
         gone in, understanding that customers come and
18
         go, but have there been any need, has any
19
         batteries failed or was there a need to replace
20
         any batteries for any reason?
21
         (Tebbetts) Nope. Not yet. No, not at all.
    Α
22
         Knock on this [indicating].
23
         Very good. Excellent. And, if you were
24
         replacing a battery today or putting in a new
```

1 battery today, what would the cost of that 2 battery be? And how does that compare to the 3 battery that you might have bought a few years 4 ago, when you started to implement the program? 5 (Tebbetts) I actually don't know. We have a 6 contract with Tesla, and that price was set in 7 the contract. I have not looked at Tesla's 8 website to see what the battery prices are. 9 Maybe Mr. Joyce has an idea of what 10 those cost today, I don't know. 11 (Joyce) To answer your question about "What it would cost to replace the battery?" These 12 13 batteries are still all under their 10-year 14 warranty. And, so, the replacement cost for one 15 that would fail to Liberty would actually be 16 zero, as far as that goes. 17 In terms of, if we were to buy a 18 battery today, versus the contract price from 19 when this agreement was signed, I don't have the 20 exact numbers in front of me. But I can tell you 21 that the selling price for Powerwall 2s have 22 increased during that time. 23 Okay. And can you give us any, you know, 24 ballpark estimate? The question was asked to Ms.

```
1
         Tebbetts before, in terms of what the battery
 2
         installation cost, I show 1.7 million, for 100
 3
         installations.
 4
         (Tebbetts) Oh.
 5
         I think Ms. Tebbetts might have suggested "2.6
 6
         million". But let's just call it roughly 20K per
 7
         installation for the batteries. Is that -- would
         that be a low number in today's market or would
 8
 9
         that be about right?
10
         (Joyce) I would characterize that as "about
11
         right". You might see some two Powerwall
12
         stand-alone installations higher than that, by
13
         maybe 10 percent.
14
         Okay. Thank you.
15
         (Tebbetts) And if I may correct myself. When I
16
         did the math, I subtracted -- I added in the
17
         CIAC, instead of subtracting it. And, so, the
18
         total cost for Phase 1 was about 1.7 million.
19
         And that is in your Record Request 2, on the --
20
         within the battery revenue requirement.
21
         So, now, it's my turn to struggle with the math.
    Q
2.2
         (Tebbetts) Sure.
23
         So, it's 1.7 million, is that for -- that's for
24
         200 batteries?
```

```
1
         (Tebbetts) That is, yes, for 200 batteries.
 2
         Two hundred (200) batteries. So, we're talking
 3
         about 8, 9K a battery. And I think, Mr. Joyce, I
 4
         don't want to put words in your mouth, but I
 5
         think you're saying that 8, 9K a battery might be
 6
         10 percent low in today's environment?
 7
         (Joyce) Yes, maybe even a bit lower than that.
    Α
 8
         Okay. Meaning it's more or less --
 9
         (Joyce) Meaning that it is more than 10 percent
10
         more expensive than that these days.
11
         Okay. I see. Thank you. That's helpful.
    Q
12
         question for Ms. Tebbetts. Has there been --
13
         there's talk I think in the Settlement about
14
         "adverse changes in costs", I think Mr. Joyce
15
         just talked about a modest cost increase, if it's
16
         10 or 15 percent or something. Is there anything
17
         else that you discovered in this Pilot that was
18
         an adverse cost, it was something you didn't
19
         expect?
20
         (Tebbetts) Not with regards to cost, because we
21
         had a contract. So, we have not been subject to
22
         those price increases.
23
    Q
         So, meters, everything, came in as -- well, I
24
         guess it was per contract. So, you're saying it
```

didn't -- the contract didn't change?

A (Tebbetts) The contract did not change. The meters, we had installed in 2020, luckily, before all the supply chain issues happened with COVID. Because, right now, I can tell you, we use the same meters for our EV charging, and we can't get them. It's almost impossible.

Q Okay.

1.3

A (Tebbetts) We've been requesting them for like a year, and we've ordered a lot of them, like a hundred at least. And it's impossible to get.

So, it's a good thing that we had the meters installed first.

Other things that we found here is, time-of-use rates are really hard for customers to understand, because they have not been exposed to it. While we think they're really great, it does take a lot of education. And, so, for customers, if they didn't have the batteries, and they went on time-of-use rates, I'm not even sure they would be able to go a few months, in my own opinion, based on my discussions with customers. They're very difficult to manage, if you don't have that backstop.

1.3

innovative.

But there are customers out there who do watch their energy. And they know the things to do, and they know the things to change in their lifestyle, so that they can take advantage of those time-of-use rates. That's one of the things we notice the most, is just understanding time-of-use rates, for the most part.

Other than that, customers seem really

happy with the program. And the power outages that we've had, we've gotten some feedback that customers didn't even notice. So, that was nice. Well, my compliments on offering time-of-use rates. There's at least one utility in New Hampshire that is struggling in that area. And, so, what you guys are doing here is very

You know, and I used to live in Oslo,
Norway. And there was -- we had device that sat
on our kitchen counter that told us red, yellow,
green, in terms of when -- when it would be a
good time to give power to the grid or take power
back. And, so, that was 15 years ago. So, I
think the technology is probably still there.

And I think, you know, my input would

```
1
         be, in the future, if this were to, you know,
 2
         continue is, there are easy ways to make it for
 3
         people to understand. You know, like giving them
 4
         a spreadsheet probably isn't too helpful. But,
 5
         if you have something that people can see and
 6
         visualize, it helps a lot.
 7
                   And it was just a simple wireless
         communication between the meter and the device in
 8
         the kitchen. So, it wasn't rocket science.
 9
10
                   CMSR. SIMPSON: Can I ask a follow-up?
11
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Please.
12
                   CMSR. SIMPSON: A question for Mr.
13
         Joyce on that.
14
    BY CMSR. SIMPSON:
15
         Are you able to provide push notifications to
16
         customers that are Powerwall customers of when
17
         you want to dispatch or when rate situations
18
         change?
19
         (Joyce) We are capable of providing push
    Α
20
         notifications from our app, and we do that from
21
         time to time. We have never used it for
22
         signaling time-of-use rates for Powerwall
23
         customers, primarily because the Powerwall, of
24
         course, is an excellent tool for doing that for
```

```
1
         you.
 2
         Uh-huh.
 3
         (Joyce) And the idea would be to keep things as
 4
         simple and seamless as possible for customers.
 5
         But, if, let's say, a customer's load were to
 6
         dramatically increase during a period of higher
 7
         electricity prices, and you're able to model
 8
         that, the state of charge and the battery is not
         going to last until the end of that period, would
 9
10
         you be able to provide that analysis -- or, that
11
         information to a customer, in some form or
12
         another, to encourage conservation?
1.3
         (Joyce) Yes. Yes, that is the kind of thing that
14
         our technology is able to do. We also do have
15
         the ability for customers to input their utility
16
         rates into our system so that we have that
17
         visibility.
18
         And are you doing that type of real-time customer
    Q
19
         engagement in other jurisdictions?
20
         (Joyce) In terms, like I said, we aren't.
21
         doing pieces of that. We're certainly taking
22
         information about energy rates, and optimizing
23
         the behavior of our system to those rates, very
24
         similar to how we are with Liberty in this
```

```
1
         program.
 2
         Uh-huh.
 3
         (Joyce) But, based on customer inputs in those
 4
         other -- as opposed to prescribed rates in those
 5
         other -- in those other markets, we do have push
 6
         notifications for things like notifying customers
 7
         if backup duration is not adequate, things like
 8
         that. But we have never used a push notification
         to try to change customer's behavior for TOU
 9
10
         rates, for the reason I mentioned earlier, is
11
         that our focus is more on making sure that our
12
         products do the most that they can to assist.
1.3
                    CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you, Mr.
14
         Chairman.
15
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: A follow-up
16
         question, Mr. Joyce.
17
    BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:
18
         If a customer in New Hampshire, or really
19
         anywhere, wants to buy Powerwalls today, does
20
         Tesla require solar arrays to be included or will
21
         Tesla sell just the Powerwalls?
2.2
    Α
         (Joyce) I don't specifically know the answer to
23
         that question today. I do know that we do sell
24
         Powerwall with solar in more markets than we do
```

```
1
         sell Powerwall just by itself. And that's a
 2
         combination of managing the supply, and also
 3
         because, when Powerwall is paired with solar, it
 4
         is more full-featured and aligned with our
 5
         mission of accelerating to sustainable energy.
 6
         And I understand if my next question is
 7
         proprietary, but if you can share it, it would be
 8
         helpful for us to get a scale of the Tesla
 9
         Powerwall implementations in the U.S. last year,
10
         you know, with and without solar? Is that
11
         publicly available? Can you share the rough
12
         implementation size or quantity that Tesla
13
         installed last year?
14
         (Joyce) I don't, at my fingertips, have the
15
         number of Powerwalls that we installed last year.
16
         If it's of interest, I can share public available
17
         information to that end after the -- after the
18
         hearing.
19
                    In rough numbers, though, this product
20
         has been in the market since approximately 2017,
21
         and we have more than 800,000 units installed
22
         worldwide.
23
         Thank you, Mr. Joyce. No need for -- that was
24
         what I needed.
                          Thank you.
```

1.3

2.2

And I'm just curious, I know that GE, for example, for wind turbines, has like a central control center. You know, it's like War Games. You know, they have got screens, and they can monitor what's going on in all their turbines across the world -- at least the U.S., if not the world.

Does Tesla have a similar control center? You know, again, if you can share that or not share that, I'm just very interested in how you monitor this massive volume of data?

(Joyce) We don't have anything quite that showy, but, yes. All Tesla products are network-connected, and we do have access to the telemetry that allows us to monitor the behavior and health of the systems within appropriate privacy concerns.

And, so, yes, we are monitoring the systems, you know, for our customer support. And we do a certain amount of proactive monitoring and service as well.

Q Very good. And is it a large organization monitoring this or is it like the Wizard of Oz, with a guy behind the curtain?

1 Is there -- can you share any scale for 2 what, you know, how you monitor this massive 3 amount of data? 4 (Joyce) I don't, I don't know specifically how 5 many people are on our service team. I would 6 characterize it as "dozens", not hundreds. A lot 7 of the work that we do is more automated 8 monitoring. 9 And I'm tempted to use a buzz word like 10 "machine learning" and "artificial intelligence", 11 but I'll stop short of there. 12 No problem. Thank you. That's very helpful. 1.3 There was a criticism in the Guidehouse 14 Report relative to Tesla's communication and 15 customer service to participants. So, I'd like 16 to give you an opportunity to respond to that. 17 And maybe I'll also follow up with, do you have 18 any metrics that sort of measure your customer 19 service and communication? 20 (Joyce) I do acknowledge that that is an area 21 that we can -- that we can improve. I think 2.2 Guidehouse's observation was specifically around 23 customer communication and touch points, as it applied to the installation of the batteries. 24

And that is an area that we are working to improve.

1.3

I think one contributing factor here is that the utility-owned model that we are -- that we are installing here is, of course, not our standard offer, and, therefore, does not benefit from the same online communication and support infrastructure that an individual buying the system would benefit from.

- Very good. And really, my last question is, you know, in this "Bring Your Own Device" concept, if somebody in the Liberty zone today wanted to bring their own device, you know, could they do that with Tesla, and could they bring it online with Liberty? Or, how would that how would that work or not work in today's environment?

 A (Joyce) Today, there would not be an option for a "bring your own virtual power plant" in New
 - (Joyce) Today, there would not be an option for "bring your own virtual power plant" in New Hampshire, to my knowledge, that would be available to Tesla customers. We do have this Pilot. For a short while, there was some opportunity in New Hampshire for a Connected Solutions demand response participation with batteries. That is no longer available.

```
1
                    So, I think, while people in New
 2
         Hampshire can certainly purchase Powerwall
 3
         systems for their own purposes for backup, and,
 4
         you know, for what we call "self-supply", that is
 5
         to say to, you know, consume as much solar
 6
         on-site as possible, and to manage TOU rates
 7
         where available, there aren't additional virtual
 8
         power plants that we could plug into today to
         make it available. That would be something that
 9
10
         we would need to -- need to be supported with a
11
         utility program, or we would, you know, if there
         is work being done for potentially accessing
12
         products with the ISO in the utility markets.
1.3
14
         But that is not something that we have available
15
         in New Hampshire yet today.
16
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you,
17
         Mr. Joyce. You've been very helpful today.
18
                   Commissioner Simpson, do you have any
19
         follow-up questions for anyone?
20
    BY CMSR. SIMPSON:
21
         I guess I would ask, is that something you're
22
         interested in pursuing?
23
         (Joyce) I think we're always interested in
24
         programs, like I said, to increase the
```

```
1
         availability of this kind of value, so we can
 2
         take advantage of that virtuous cycle and get
         more behind-the-meter resources providing value
 3
 4
         to the grid.
 5
                    CMSR. SIMPSON: Thank you.
 6
                    [Brief off-the-record discussion
 7
                    ensued between Chairman Goldner and
 8
                    Mr. Patnaudel
 9
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. The
10
         stenographer needs a break. So, let's take --
11
         let's just take -- would five minutes be okay,
12
         Steve?
1.3
                    [Mr. Patnaude indicating in the
14
                    affirmative. 1
15
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Let's take
         five minutes and return at 3:20.
16
17
                    (Recess taken at 3:15 p.m., and the
18
                    hearing resumed at 3:25 p.m.)
19
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Commissioner
20
         Simpson, any additional questions from the
21
         Commissioners?
2.2
                    [Cmsr. Simpson indicating in the
23
                    negative.]
24
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. I think
```

```
1
         that's all from the Commissioners.
 2
                    We'll give the Company an opportunity
 3
         for redirect.
 4
                    MR. SHEEHAN: I simply have one
 5
         question.
 6
                    In my response to one of your
 7
         questions, I characterized the Company's interest
 8
         or lack of interest in future programs. And I
         thought I should give the Company witness the
 9
10
         opportunity to say what the Company's position
11
         is.
12
                      REDIRECT EXAMINATION
1.3
    BY MR. SHEEHAN:
         So, Ms. Tebbetts, could you express your
14
         understanding of the Company's desire for future
15
16
         programs here?
17
          (Tebbetts) Sure. So, I think there's a lot --
18
         there's a lot to be said about this project. I
19
         think customers are happy with it, the Company is
20
         happy with it, we heard from other parties today
21
         that they are happy with it.
2.2
                    I will also add that moving forward
23
         with a Phase 2 comes with uncertainty, from folks
         in this room, whether it be the Commission itself
24
```

1.3

or the other parties here. And I say that because this is a very small project, and it does take capital. But it also takes us having the understanding, and also knowing that, for example, the Commission would want us to move forward with something else like this.

what we heard today was really good. I enjoyed the questions that we received, and I was happy to see everyone engaged. But there is hesitation when you move forward with a pilot, because (a) it's 2023, and we're just having this hearing now. So, four and a half years later, we're finally getting through this.

So, to go to a Phase 2, how long is that going to take? Five more years? That's a long time when we're talking about, you know, technology.

The other thing that we talk about, you know, when we thought about Phase 2, is "what does the Commission want from us?" I'm not sure, and good, bad, indifferent, I'm not sure that we have, as a company, received the -- I'm not sure that we have seen from the Commission that this program is a good idea, and that we should move

forward with a Phase 2, or something like it.

And I'm not saying that we've asked for it either.

But, certainly, the dockets that have come up, that are coming up, if these are the kinds of programs that the Commission wants us to embark on, we want to hear that. We also want to know that, when we're looking to embark on these projects, the Commission is supportive of the capital that it takes, and the staff that it takes.

This is a small pilot. And, quite honestly, even though I've left regulatory, and I'm doing something different within the Company, I'm still running it, and happy to, because I love this project. But, you know, it takes staff. And, so, we're in the process of trying to hire staff to try to get somebody to do this, because it can be a lot of work, working with the customers and working with Tesla, and internally, with billing, et cetera.

And, so, I think Mr. Sheehan was trying to characterize that we're not -- we don't want to say "no" to another behind-the-meter or

```
1
         additional behind-the-meter project. We just
 2.
         need to be able to feel that we have support from
 3
         the Commission, and support from other parties,
 4
         that these projects are a good idea for our
 5
         company, our customers, and New Hampshire, in
 6
         general. And, if we feel that the parties feel
 7
         that way, we want to move forward. But I think
 8
         that we need to have -- we need to have that
 9
         reassurance somehow, some way, that these things
10
         are a good idea.
11
                    Thanks.
12
                    MR. SHEEHAN: Nothing further.
1.3
         you.
14
                    CMSR. SIMPSON: Can I ask a question?
15
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Sure.
16
    BY CMSR. SIMPSON:
17
         So, what's missing, in terms of reassurance from
18
         the Commission?
19
                    You received approval for this program.
20
         You've brought it to a certain point today.
21
         What's missing, for direction, from the
2.2
         Commission?
23
          (Tebbetts) So, --
    Α
24
         You don't have to answer it here, but --
```

A (Tebbetts) Yes. No, I'm happy to.

So, right now, I don't know that there's anything missing, in the sense that we are looking, like, we're asking for and we have not received. I will say I was very happy to see the engagement last week in the IR 22-076 docket with regards to demand response. I think there's a lot of opportunity in that docket to move forward with a project like this.

But where I do get concerned is, when the costs associated with a project like this, I will say that I feel, as someone representing the Company, that there is hesitation due to costs associated with projects like this, from the Commission's part, simply because it is a balance. There are customers who pay and customers — they will benefit, but it's in a longer period, versus the customers who have the battery and receive that benefit right away. And I understand and the Company understands there's a balance with regards to rates and cost recovery.

So, I'm not going to say that the Commission or others are lacking in providing us

direction. But I'm also going to -- I'm going to say I have not seen anything proactive, to say "We want this." Maybe that's coming, and we haven't seen it yet. But we'd love to see it, if it's out there.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: And let me maybe jump in with a question.

And that is, since Mr. Sheehan is not allowed to give testimony, I'll give the witness an opportunity.

BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:

1.3

- What Mr. Sheehan suggested earlier, and I want to give the witness a chance to weigh in, is that "this is not in the core competency of the Company." And, so, there was something that "the Company is trying to stick to its core competency." Would you care to address that topic?
- A (Tebbetts) Yes. I mean, I think -- I think that, so, we are a poles and wires company. That's certainly our core. But, with modernization of the grid, we recognize there are other areas we can serve our customers well. This is one area. We offer a service or a product that provides

1.3

them value. And it's new to the utility world, at least in New England -- maybe not in New England, but certainly in New Hampshire, as, you know, we're the only utility that has something like this here.

And, so, as I mentioned, we want -- we want to feel the way we felt when we went in with this docket, where all parties were excited about it, and parties wanted to make our proposal better, instead of shooting it down, as Mr. Kreis said. And I think that we can sell that up the chain, again, if we find that parties are still very interested in it.

If we find that parties are not interested or they find ways to shoot -- I don't want to say "shoot holes in it" in a bad way, but really just don't want projects like this moving forward in New Hampshire, then it's very hard to sell that up the chain that what we have is a great idea.

And, so, that's where I think

Mr. Sheehan was trying to convey that we want

support from the parties to do these kinds of

projects, and give our customers, and other

customers in New Hampshire, maybe other utilities will adopt stuff like this, too.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Anything else, Mr. Simpson?

"How can I, as a regulator in New Hampshire, innovate? How can I foster a more innovative regulatory environment?" And that's really why I was asking Mr. Joyce's questions about "What's Tesla's vision for a retail electricity market?" And I'm genuinely interested in that.

This is a very interesting proceeding, because of the partner that you have. You have a very engaged and innovative partner in this proceeding. And I'm curious to see what are models that have been successful in other jurisdictions. What could we enable further in New Hampshire that can realize the value that's often attributed and forecasted from these types of technologies?

So, you now have a dataset. You have a group of customers who have adopted this technology through the Pilot. I don't think either of us on the Bench today are going to tell

1.3

you what we want you to do. But we're certainly open to proposals for moving forward. And that's something that the Chairman is going to address before closing today, that we expect to see something further, based on what's gone -- what's been implemented, what's been built.

And I would encourage Liberty to work with Tesla, and to understand real applications for this technology at the edge. How do we demonstrate that New Hampshire wants to be the most innovative state within the electricity market? I think that we led the way in the '90s, and there's a lot of opportunity to move forward.

So, speaking on my own behalf, I offer that to the Company.

WITNESS TEBBETTS: If I may respond?

That's exciting to hear. And, as someone who has sat up here for, like, 12 years, I'm not sure

I've heard that before. So, that's exciting for us. And that's something for us to bring back, because that's what we want to do.

And, in my new role, actually, that's my opportunity to provide to you and others those projects to come forward with. And, so, thank

you.

We want to be cutting-edge, we want to be leading. We want to bring these things to our customers. And, so, those are the kinds of things we want to hear, and we want opportunities to present to you and the others in this room.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: If I could just jump in and say, I, too, am a big fan of innovation.

I love tidal power and nuclear power, if anybody cares, as things that I'm very interested in from a technology perspective. And I think I might be the only person in the room with a U.S. patent.

So, I get credit for innovation in a few different areas.

of augment what Commissioner Simpson said.

There's a lot of cool technology out there, a lot of interesting things. Ultimately, it has to be cost-effective. Ultimately, you know, you can't for it more than it benefits you.

And I'll just, you know, I'll just sort

And, ultimately, that's what we, in the Commission, are looking for. And it's something that I would always emphasize at every opportunity, you know, cost -- technology is

```
1
         cool, I love technology, Commissioner Simpson
 2
         loves technology. But, ultimately, we're tasked
 3
         with making sure things are cost-effective.
 4
                   So, I don't mean to pop any balloons,
 5
         but that's the way that I would phrase it.
 6
                   Okay. Is there anything else that the
 7
         Company would like to add?
                   MR. SHEEHAN: No. I think I'm all set.
 8
 9
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.
10
                   So, let me go here, before we go to
11
         closing, so that the parties have an opportunity
12
         to comment, if they wish.
13
                   So, I'll put it in the form of a
14
         question. Would the parties object to rooftop
15
         solar being able to -- being able to charge from
16
         the grid? Would any party object to that?
17
                   If the Commission issued an order that
18
         said "If you have rooftop solar, you can now
19
         charge from the grid", would any party object?
20
                   MR. DEXTER: Would you mind repeating
21
         that one more time?
22
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Sure.
                                              Sure.
                                                     Today,
         our understanding from the testimony was that --
23
24
         that customers with Powerwalls and rooftop solar
```

```
1
         are not allowed to charge from the grid. So,
 2
         they can't receive power from the grid to charge
 3
         up their batteries so that it can be used at peak
 4
         mode.
 5
                   And, so, our question for the parties
 6
         is, would the parties object if the Commission
 7
         issued an order that said "Never mind, you can
 8
         now charge from the grid"?
 9
                   MR. SHEEHAN: If I may interject?
                   MR. DEXTER: "You can now charge from
10
11
         the grid"?
12
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Pardon me? Sorry.
1.3
                   MR. DEXTER: "You can now charge from
         the grid."
14
15
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: You may, yes.
16
                   MR. DEXTER: Not "you cannot charge
17
         from the grid."
18
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Sorry. "Now", yes.
19
                   MR. DEXTER: No, I think that's what
20
         you said. I just wanted to make sure, "you can
21
         now charge from the grid"?
2.2
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Yes, sir.
23
                   MR. SHEEHAN: And I was just going to
24
         maybe make it easier. The Settlement Agreement
```

1 has the following language: "Net-metered 2. customers shall not be permitted to charge their 3 batteries from the grid, except when the 4 batteries are under Liberty's control." 5 And, so, you could make a finding that, 6 "under the facts presented, we understand the 7 batteries are always under Liberty's control, 8 therefore, they can charge from the grid." 9 So, if we can put some parameters around it, which I'm hearing from the whisperers 10 11 next door, they're worried that your statement 12 might be a little bit too broad and run afoul of 1.3 the statute. 14 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Yes. Because T 15 think we just heard that Tesla is kind of 16 controlling it, so --17 MR. SHEEHAN: Well, Tesla is working on 18 behalf of Liberty. 19 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: On Liberty, yes. 20 Yes, we'll give the parties a chance to 2.1 comment? 2.2 [Short pause.] 23 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: We always accept 24 briefs, if this is -- if we want to go down that

path. But take your time.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

MR. DEXTER: So, yes. We would be okay with an order like that. The issue is really that the battery not discharge to the grid.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: "Not discharge to the grid." And why not?

MR. DEXTER: Because, if the battery was -- except during an event, except when controlled by Liberty, or another way of saying that is "during an event", because of the net metering requirement that net-metered customers be renewable. So, if the battery were being charged with energy from the grid, that's not a renewable energy, and, therefore, would violate the net metering statute.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: It might be. We just don't know, electrons --

MR. DEXTER: Well, what we heard today is that it won't, based on the programming that's built into the system.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Well, if you're -not to enter into a spirited debate, but, if
you're discharging into the grid at peak, then
you're ostensibly saving power plants from

turning on, that are typically, you know, probably coal and natural gas.

2.

1.3

2.2

Going the other direction, you're taking energy from disparate sources, natural gas, nuclear, water, what have you, turbines, lots of different sources. So, in the net of things, you're probably benefiting yourself by taking that approach.

MR. DEXTER: Well, I think we might have to take this as a record request. Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. I should -- I want to get the answer right.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Of course.

Yes. Thank you. Yes, that would be great. We would be happy to have a record request.

Mr. Kreis?

MR. KREIS: Well, first of all, I don't think I have any objection to the proposition that you offered, Mr. Chairman.

But, you know, the phrase "record request" is just bandied around the Walker Building now with abandon. And I'm get more concerned by the minute.

I mean, you're basically extending the

hearing, giving the Department of Energy time to provide you with more evidence, and then just admitting it into the record. What you have to do, and this also relates to the two record requests — the two record request responses that the Company filed with the Commission, I think, back in January, if I'm remembering correctly, I mean, I don't have any objection to those being part of the record. But just filing documents with the Commission into a docket doesn't automatically make those exhibits part of the record, even if someone attaches, in a fascial way, the label "record request" to them.

2.

1.3

2.2

What I'm really suggesting here is that the Commission needs to be disciplined, we all need to be disciplined, about — this is an adjudicative proceeding. And it needs to be very clear what is in the record and what is not in the record. And, if this issue is going to require further litigation, then just saying "Oh, we'll let the Department file a record request, and then you'll make a decision based on it", that's not okay. Then, you really are talking about holding another hearing, and having the

```
1
         Department testify, and giving other parties the
 2.
         opportunity to cross-examine their witness.
 3
         mean, --
 4
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: This is why I was
 5
         hoping for all three "yeses", and that would have
 6
         made life so much simpler.
                   MR. KREIS: Yes. Well, I said "yes".
 7
 8
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: So, I've got, I
 9
         think, two "yeses", and one "maybe". So, I
10
         think, Mr. Kreis, if the Department agrees, there
11
         would be no problem. If the Department
12
         disagrees, then we have an issue. Would that be
1.3
         a fair summary?
14
                   MR. KREIS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
15
         would be a fair summary.
16
                   MR. DEXTER: Maybe we could avoid a
17
         record request with a short five-minute
18
         conference amongst ourselves at the Department of
19
         Energy, to make sure that we understand?
20
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:
                                       That would be --
21
         that would be fantastic. Maybe I'll mention part
2.2
         two of my --
23
                   MR. DEXTER: Okay.
24
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: -- of my preamble,
```

before we moved over to close, just so we have all the information. And then, we can part ways for a few minutes.

2.

1.3

2.2

So, the next concept is for the Company to propose next steps, whether it's -- I heard the Company say earlier they're continuing Phase 1, makes a lot of sense. But the Company is not excited about daily reports or monthly reports or quarterly reports, or what have you. So, the Company would propose to continue with Phase 1, but without continued reporting.

And then, there's this question of "Is there a Phase 2? And, if so, what form does it take?" Is it Bring Your Own Device? Is it, you know, more Tesla Powerwalls? Is it solar? What is it, if anything?

And, so, what the Commission would say about that is that we would request, by May 30th, the Company's proposal, and, hopefully, a collaborative proposal, on what, if anything, comes next. So, that just completes the picture.

And then, Mr. Dexter, if you'd like to take, however long you need would be fine? Would you like fifteen, or ten, five?

1 MR. DEXTER: I think ten minutes would 2. be plenty. 3 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Let's return 4 at five of, then. Thank you. 5 MR. DEXTER: Thanks. (Recess taken at 3:46 p.m., and the 6 7 hearing resumed at 3:58 p.m.) 8 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: All right. We'll 9 move to Mr. Dexter. 10 MR. DEXTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, 11 for that break. The Department of Energy would not 12 object to including a directive in the order that 1.3 14 it would be okay for these solar battery 15 customers to charge their battery from the grid. 16 And I could just stop there, but that 17 actually wasn't the concern that we were raising 18 earlier. It's related. Our concern, and we 19 would object to the solar battery customers 20 discharging to the grid during a non-event. 2.1 We heard testimony from Tesla that that 2.2 will never happen, based on the programming. 23 it's not really a concern anymore because of the 24 testimony of what we heard today. But we thought

```
1
         it might be useful for the Department to include
 2.
         that language in the order as well, and then --
 3
         and that would be a more complete description of
         the situation.
 4
 5
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you for
 6
         that.
 7
                   MR. DEXTER: And the reason we don't
         object to it, it's really not up to us. It's, if
 8
 9
         the order were phrased that way, in our view,
10
         that would not violate the net metering statute
11
         requirements.
12
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.
1.3
         That's our understanding as well.
14
                   MR. DEXTER: Sure. And sorry it took
15
         so long to get there.
16
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: No, no, no. It's
17
         time well invested.
18
                   Does the OCA or Liberty have any
19
         additional comments on this topic or can we run
         with "yes"?
20
2.1
                   MR. KREIS: We can run with the "yes"
2.2
         that Mr. Dexter just offered to you.
23
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Excellent.
24
         Excellent. No briefs or reply briefs today.
```

1 All right. 2. CMSR. SIMPSON: And, presumably, no 3 objection from the Company? MR. SHEEHAN: Correct. 4 5 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you. 6 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: All right. Very 7 Well, let us -- find the right page. good. So, let's strike identification on 8 Okay. Exhibit 22 and admit it into evidence. 9 10 Let's see. Commissioner Simpson, you 11 had a record request earlier relative to some 12 revenue questions. Do you want to -- do you want 1.3 to keep that record request or would you --14 CMSR. SIMPSON: No, I'd remove it. 15 Because I feel that Ms. Tebbetts adequately 16 addressed the question that I had. She was able 17 to speak to it later in testimony. 18 So, I don't have any record requests. 19 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Very good. 20 Then, it's just Exhibit 22 that we'll admit into 2.1 evidence. 2.2 And we can move to closing, beginning 23 with the OCA. 24 MR. KREIS: Before I offer a closing, I do suggest, I mean, it's up to you, but you talked about those two record request responses that the Company filed, I think in January. And they seem germane. You were asking about them. I would feel more comfortable if you admitted those into the record as well, even though I know they're labeled "record requests". But I guess that's up to you.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

That would be my humble suggestion to you.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Just to follow up on that. Mr. Kreis, would you recommend those and, in the future, making those exhibits? Or how would you recommend putting them into the record?

MR. KREIS: Well, I guess I would continue, until you change them, to abide by the rules. So, under the rules, I can't quote chapter and verse from the procedural rules, but the way they're -- the phrase "record request" doesn't actually appear in the rules. What the rules allow for is late-filed exhibits. So, at the close of a hearing, you could say, as I think maybe you are, or as you always did, but Commissioner Simpson said it wasn't necessary,

you can reserve an exhibit number for some late-filed exhibit that's responsive to some question that was asked at hearing that a witness said "Gosh, I'd like some more time to send you a written reply." That is -- that's appropriate.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

Then, there are those -- there are things that parties file before a hearing that you then want to put into the record. And I guess I would reserve exhibit numbers for them.

So, it's up to you in the way you want to manage your record. But I would feel more comfortable if you took those two documents that the Company filed and gave them exhibit numbers. And, therefore, it would be clear, as you go back to write your order, that that's part of the record you can take into account, if you want to, and make findings about it or talk about it to your heart's content in your order.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you, Mr.

Kreis. That is very helpful. And if you would like to proceed with closing, that would be fantastic.

MR. KREIS: Well, this was sort of a cranky afternoon, followed by -- following a

cranky morning for me. But I think, in the end, all's well that ends well, relatively speaking. In that, I liked the idea, from the perspective of the OCA, of asking the Company to, as sort of a next step, cogitate on the question of "What happens next?" You gave them, if I am understanding you correctly, you gave them a long time to figure that out, all the way to May 30th. That's probably appropriate. I mean, May 30th seems like a futurous date, but I suppose it will be here before we know it.

1.3

2.2

And the Company has given slightly differing answers to the question "Well, is there going to be a Phase 2?" I mean, depending on how you look at it, they have either said "no", or "maybe", or "we don't know." I guess I'll prefer to stick with "we don't know." And I will deem it reasonable for the Commission and the Company to say "Hey, we need some more time to think about where we go from here next", beyond continuing -- allowing Phase 1 to continue to operate and reach its logical conclusion, if that's the way you want to think about it.

 $\hbox{Commissioner Simpson asked me a}\\$

question that I would like the opportunity to answer. It was a really good question, and it sort of nested within the bigger question that he asked, which is "How do we demonstrate that New Hampshire wants to be the most innovative state when it comes to electricity?" I'm really glad to hear a member of the PUC ask that question, and make that assumption, that, after all of this time, we still would like to be an innovative state, when it comes to how we do electricity in this state.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

And, I guess, I hope this docket stays open as a way of figuring that out. I am glad there's at least one other investigative proceeding where that question can be addressed. And the OCA hopes to be part of addressing it.

We, just to muse about something Ms.

Tebbetts said, as I -- as was reflected in my colloquy with her, we did play a super active role in helping the Company develop this Pilot Program. And we're very proud of the results of that collaboration.

For whatever reason, maybe it's my personal affiliation with Vermont Law School, I

I'm really proud of the fact that we actually have a better approach to what to do with customer-side batteries of roughly the size of a Powerwall than they have over in Vermont.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

I was a little disappointed to hear Tesla equivocate on the subject of whether it is okay to -- or, whether they're willing to sell people Tesla Powerwalls that aren't paired with solar PV systems. I only know enough about antitrust law to be dangerous, having taken a course on antitrust law in law school. But, you know, there is a thing called "illegal tying" under federal antitrust law. And, so, I really hope that you don't have to have a bunch of solar panels on your roof, or plans to install solar panels on your roof, in order to be able to buy a Tesla Powerwall. I really hope that they proliferate here in New Hampshire, both among people who do net meter and those who do not net meter.

So, at the risk of rambling further, I just would like to say that I'm looking forward to working with Liberty Utilities on figuring out

what next steps they might propose on the timeline that the Commission has proposed for them to do that.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you, Mr. Kreis. Mr. Krakoff.

MR. KRAKOFF: Yes. Thank you.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

The Guidehouse Report really demonstrates that Phase 1 of the Liberty Battery Storage Pilot Program has been successful. And, so, there's no reason to not continue the Pilot Program, as Liberty has requested.

Particularly, it's met the criteria set out in RSA 374-G:5, Subsection II, which is outlined in the Settlement Agreement. And, you know, really, it met all those criteria under Phase 1, particularly with respect to demonstrating reliability benefits, in decreasing Liberty's customers' exposure to regional system risks, and other benefits there.

And I think that the Guidehouse Report provides strong evidence to show of the success of the Phase 1 of the program. And, you know, there's no reason to not continue that program here.

Briefly, I'd like to address something raised by Commissioner Goldner. He correctly noted that, you know, the cost-benefit analysis showed a value of less than one for Phase 1. You know, if you look back at what was filed with the proposal originally, that's very, very close to what was expected for the cost-benefit ratio back then. And, in fact, the actual savings from Phase 1 have exceeded the projected savings from Phase 1. So, there's no question that the savings have been on target or have been higher than expected.

2.

1.3

2.2

And, finally, with respect to Phase 1, I'd like to read from Page 20 of the Settlement Agreement, in which "The Parties stipulated and agreed that, although the benefit-cost analyses reflect only a minimally positive net present value for Phases 1 and 2 considered together, the program offers value and warrants deployment due to the qualitative benefits it will provide by informing future battery storage or TOU proposals brought before the Commission. The Settling Parties further stipulate and agree that a finding of positive net present value is not a

prerequisite to Commission approval under RSA 374-G:5 for a pilot program."

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

So, you know, again, looking at that, the Commission recognized then that, you know, a positive net present value wasn't a prerequisite under Phase 1. And then, and now, the Company's own analyses demonstrate that, you know, there is a net, you know, present value of one for the two phases considered together.

Also like to address something that

Commissioner Simpson said with becoming "a very
innovative state" and really "making New

Hampshire a most innovative state." I fully
support that idea. And, you know, and I think
one way to try to become that is to look at the

Commission's order back in Order Number 26,575,
which that ruled on Eversource's motion for
clarification in the grid mod. docket. And there
the Commission said that it would open, at some
point in the future, you know, an adjudication
docket to look at grid mod. again.

And I think grid mod. really provides a lot of opportunities to make us more innovative to look at some of these ideas that Commissioner

Simpson and Chairman Goldner have been discussing. And that order suggested that you would open an adjudication docket at some time in the future. It's been a -- it was February 3rd, 2022. So, it's been a year. But I think the Commission should consider opening that docket at some point.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

Finally, briefly, I'd like to address Phase 2. The Settlement Agreement provides that Liberty could request permission to commence Phase 2 of the Pilot. And, if you look at the Guidehouse Report and the Settlement Agreement, there are certain criteria under which Liberty could commence Phase 2. And these are outlined on Page 9 of the Settlement Agreement. But, basically, if Liberty is able to "dispatch Phase 1 batteries coincident with the monthly ISO-New England system coincident peak on average with an accuracy of seventy seven percent of at least 70 [75?] percent or greater determined with reference to expected peak hour kWH reduction"; if there's "realized RNS and LNS and FCM cost savings during Phase 1 that are not less than projected in the submitted benefit-cost

1 analyses"; "it demonstrates...that the 2. investments and costs necessary to implement 3 Phase 2, when considered in conjunction with 4 those incurred...have a forecasted net present 5 value"; and "there have been no material adverse 6 changes in any relevant circumstances or 7 criteria." I think the Guidehouse Report really 8 demonstrates that these four criteria have all 9 10 been met or are present. So, as the Commission 11 has indicated, they're considering a possible Phase 2. 12 1.3 So, I would encourage the Commission to 14 direct Liberty to at least contemplate proposals 15 for Phase 2, and, to, if necessary, work with 16 stakeholders in developing that proposal for 17 Phase 2. 18 And thank you for your time. 19 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you, 20 Mr. Krakoff. Mr. Dexter. 2.1 MR. DEXTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, 2.2 Commissioner Simpson. 23 So, the Department of Energy's position 24 is that Phase 1 has -- was a success. It is

finished, in the sense that its enrollment was essentially met. We are in favor of that phase continuing the way Ms. Tebbetts testified, in other words, these devices are going to be out in the field for a number of years. We believe that's appropriate that that be continued.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

We are satisfied that the information provided in the Guidehouse Report provided the information that the Department of Energy, then the Commission Staff, expected the program to produce. In other words, it was a pilot program set out to learn things, and we believe that the information that was received in Phase 1 is useful and sufficient.

We would not be, at this time, in favor of a Phase 2 that looked just like Phase 1. We think the Commission's approach of giving the Company three or four months to consider what Phase 2 might look like is a good idea.

Ms. Tebbetts testified that these programs come with significant capital costs, and we appreciate the Company's recognition of that, and we share the concerns. The idea of, you know, doubling or tripling Phase 1 and just

getting the same results is not something, sitting here, that the Department of Energy would be in favor of.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

You know, that being said, we're very interested in seeing what the Company comes up with with Phase 2. We would encourage that it be different. We're very interested in hearing about a "Bring Your Own Device" proposal from the Company. We view that as a way to spread costs away from all customers, and more towards the participants, which we think is appropriate in a case like this. So, we are very interested in working with the Company and the parties on a Phase 2 approach.

We -- I'm not sure I heard the Company say that they were interested in "stopping the reporting requirements of Phase 1". But I think I heard the Commissioners say that they thought "Liberty was interested in stopping the reporting requirements from Phase 1." So, I'm not sure where we stand on that.

The Department of Energy has found the reports on Phase 1 useful, would like them to continue, but believe that we could work with the

Company to come up with a more simplified form.

And maybe it would be monthly, but it wouldn't have to be a seven- or eight-page narrative. We would like the opportunity to discuss that with the Company, to develop some sort of a standardized, just a results-oriented report for Phase 1, at least for a couple more years, to see how this goes.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

So, with that, we thank you for your time today.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you, Mr.

Dexter. And thank you for the clarification on the reporting. I was going to ask you about that, but that's very much in line with our thinking. So, thank you.

Mr. Sheehan.

MR. SHEEHAN: Thank you.

I started today by having three things that we would ask for, and I think we've addressed them all.

First was to indicate that the requirements of Phase 1 have been met. Although, as we all have discussed, the batteries will remain in service for a number of years, and we

fully intend to continue that. The alternative would be to go and take them out at great cost, which makes no sense. The second was to address the solar issue, which we have. And the third is, as I said in the beginning of the hearing, was to clarify the BYOD component of the Settlement.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

Your suggestion of giving us a couple months to decide next steps makes sense to us.

And we would accept that as a resolution of the BYOD component.

I encourage the folks in the room to knock our door. "BYOD" is, by definition, not a Liberty program. It's what others want to do that we can facilitate. So, we can't do it by ourself, we need people coming to us to say "We want to do that." So, I know I have a lot of ears in the room that have connections with those people. So, we would like to reengage with those that were so active in the original docket to see where that stands now. Because, of course, it would make no sense to pursue a BYOD device, if no one was there to B-Y their Ds.

But, as Ms. Tebbetts says, we

absolutely want to explore these things. And we will assess over the next couple months how best to encourage that participation. So, that's, I quess, all I have to say.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

Oh, I guess the last issue was reporting. Obviously, we're collecting a lot of data. That's an important part. It is a cost, too. So, I think we just have to find a line between what reporting is simple and cost-effective to produce, and not.

I am comfortable if the Commission would simply indicate some -- propose some reporting, and maybe we and the DOE and the OCA can maybe submit a proposal of what reporting we would provide over the coming years.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Yes. I like Mr.

Dexter's proposal of, you know, simplifying,
getting it down to the critical essence, and then
would request that the parties would propose
something, so that we can all be aligned and
bless that off. That would be a very effective
model, I think.

Okay. Very good. Is there anything else that we should discuss today?

1	[No verbal response.]
2	CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: No? Well, I'll
3	thank the witnesses. Very much appreciate the
4	time and the support today. I felt the
5	Commissioner Simpson and I, I think, both feel
6	that the answers were excellent, and the
7	witnesses are much appreciated today. So, thank
8	you.
9	So, we'll take the matter under
10	advisement. And the hearing is adjourned.
11	(Whereupon the hearing was adjourned
12	at 4:19 p.m.)
13	
10	
14	
14	
14 15	
14 15 16	
14 15 16 17	
14 15 16 17	
14 15 16 17 18	
14 15 16 17 18 19	
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	