1		STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
2		PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
3	- 1-1	
4		- 10:11 a.m. NHPUC GJUN 19449:29
5	Concord, New	Hampsnire
6		40 OFF
7	KE:	DE 19-057 EVERSOURCE ENERGY:
8		Notice of Intent to File Rate Schedules. (Prehearing conference)
9		
10	PRESENT:	Chairman Martin P. Honigberg, Presiding
11		Commissioner Kathryn M. Bailey Commissioner Michael S. Giaimo
12	,	
13		Sandy Deno, Clerk
14		
15	APPEARANCES:	. 3
16		Matthew J. Fossum, Esq. Daniel Venora, Esq. <i>(Keegan Werlin)</i>
17		Reptg. Clean Energy New Hampshire:
18		Elijah D. Emerson, Esq.
19		Reptg. The Way Home: Raymond Burke, Esq. (N.H. Legal Asst.)
20		
21		
22		
23	Court Repo	rter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52
24		



1		
2	APPEARANCES:	(Continued)
3		Reptg. Residential Ratepayers: D. Maurice Kreis, Esq., Consumer Adv.
4		Brian D. Buckley, Esq. James Brennan, Finance Director
5		Office of Consumer Advocate
6		Reptg. PUC Staff: Suzanne G. Amidon, Esq. Thomas Frantz, Dir./Electric Division Richard Chagnon, Electric Division Jay Dudley, Electric Division Kurt Demmer, Electric Division
7		
8		
9		
L 0		
L1		
L 2		
L3		
L 4		
L 5		
L 6		
L 7		
L 8 L 9		
20		
21		
22		
23		
2.0		

1	
2	INDEX
3	PAGE NO.
4	DISCUSSION RE: PETITIONS TO INTERVENE 5
5	
6	STATEMENTS OF PRELIMINARY POSITION BY:
7	Mr. Fossum 6, 16
8	Mr. Emerson 10
9	Mr. Burke 10
10	Mr. Kreis 12
11	Ms. Amidon 14
12	
13	QUESTIONS BY:
14	Chairman Honigberg 7, 9, 15
15	Cmsr. Bailey 9
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

## PROCEEDING 1 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We are here this 2 3 morning in Docket DE 19-057, which is a rate case for Public Service Company of New 4 Hampshire, which it does business as Eversource 6 Energy. We have a prehearing conference, which 7 will be followed by a technical session. 8 don't think I'll say anything more. Before we do anything else, let's 9 10 take appearances. 11 MR. FOSSUM: Good morning, 12 Commissioners. Matthew Fossum, here for Public 13 Service Company of New Hampshire, doing 14 business as Eversource Energy. With me this 15 morning at the front table is Dan Venora, of 16 the law firm Keegan Werlin, who is assisting 17 the Company with this proceeding. 18 Thank you. 19 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Who else needs 20 to enter an appearance?

MR. EMERSON: Eli Emerson, on

22 behalf -- or, of Primmer, Piper, Eggleston &

Cramer, on behalf of Clean Energy New

Hampshire.

```
1
                   MR. BURKE: Good morning,
 2
         Commissioners. Raymond Burke, from New
 3
         Hampshire Legal Assistance, here representing
 4
         The Way Home.
 5
                   MR. KREIS: Good morning,
 6
         Commissioners. I am D. Maurice Kreis,
 7
         sometimes known as Don Kreis. I am the
 8
         Consumer Advocate. I represent the interests
9
         of residential utility customers pursuant to
10
         RSA 328 -- excuse me -- 365:28.
11
                   MS. AMIDON: Good morning, Suzanne
12
         Amidon, for Commission Staff.
13
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
14
         have two petitions to intervene, both of them
15
         have entered appearances. Any position on the
16
         interventions, Mr. Fossum?
17
                   MR. FOSSUM: We have no position.
18
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. Anybody
               Mr. Kreis? Ms. Amidon?
19
         else?
20
                   MR. KREIS: We love these intervenors
21
         and think that you should admit them into the
22
         case.
23
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Don't know
24
         that's the standard, but --
```

1 [Laughter.] MS. AMIDON: And Staff has no 2 3 objections to the motions to intervene. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. 4 5 We'll grant both petitions to intervene. The primary piece of business for the 6 7 prehearing conference for us is to hear the preliminary positions of the parties. Is there 8 9 anything we need to deal with before we do 10 that? 11 [No verbal response.] 12 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. 13 Mr. Fossum, why don't you start us off. 14 MR. FOSSUM: Thank you. And good 15 morning. We're here this morning to offer our 16 initial position on the Company's temporary 17 rate request as we begin this rate filing. 18 In general, the position of PSNH --19 and I will clarify this very quickly. 20 filing does refer to the Company as "PSNH", rather than "Eversource". The underlying 21 22 reason for that is there are various layers of 23 the Eversource organization involved in this 24 filing. PSNH, at the operating company level,

1 a number of employees at the service company level, and some issues relative to the parent 2 3 company, we believed it was easier to use 4 "PSNH". So, just wanted to get that out there 5 for clarity. 6 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, from a 7 legal perspective, the corporation's name that is the utility in New Hampshire is "Public 8 Service Company of New Hampshire d/b/a", right? 9 10 MR. FOSSUM: Correct. That is 11 correct. Nothing has changed about that. I 12 just wanted to note that the designation we are 13 using in this Company -- or, in this filing is 14 that, when referring to the operating 15 distribution company, we will be using "PSNH", 16 rather than "Eversource". 17 So, with that little bit out of the 18 way, our general position is as set out in our

filing. But I'll just highlight a couple of things.

19

20

21

22

23

24

The current deficiency that we're looking to address through this case is driven in large part by the substantial investments in the system that the Company has made over the

last ten years since our prior case.

In addressing our temporary rate request, we've made some straightforward adjustments to allow the Company a reasonable opportunity to earn a reasonable return while the full permanent request is pending. As has been described in our filing, those adjustments were to address the operating deficiency; to deal with the reclassification of vegetation management costs coming out of Docket DE 18-177, in Order 26,206 last year; and to begin addressing a significant under recovery of storm costs.

All of those items are offset to a degree by an adjustment to the tax savings as was contemplated in Docket DE 18-049, in Order 26,177.

We believe this temporary request is reasonable, reflects some basic changes, and should be approved as leading to just and reasonable rates.

That said, we look forward to working with the other parties. We hope to reach a good resolution on temporary rates, so that we

```
1
         may all move on to looking at the real issues
 2
         in depth that will be part of the permanent
 3
         filing to be submitted next week.
 4
                   Thank you.
 5
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Do you expect
 6
         that we'll be having another prehearing
 7
         conference when the permanent rate filing is
         made?
 8
 9
                   MR. FOSSUM: I anticipate we will,
10
         yes.
11
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.
12
                   CMSR. BAILEY: Mr. Fossum, you're
13
         requesting $33 million in temporary rates,
14
         correct?
15
                   MR. FOSSUM: Correct.
16
                   CMSR. BAILEY: And the permanent rate
17
         increase is about 70 million?
18
                   MR. FOSSUM: Also correct.
19
                   CMSR. BAILEY: And you said that the
20
         $33 million in temporary rates has been offset
21
         by the tax savings. How much were the tax
22
         savings that are included in that?
23
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It's about $12
24
         million in tax savings. So, there's a chart, I
```

```
1
         believe, in Mr. Quinlan's testimony. There is
         also a chart in the testimony of Mr. Chung and
 2
 3
         Mr. Dixon that shows the breakdown of the
         revenue deficiency, the storm costs, the
 4
 5
         vegetation management costs, and the
 6
         approximately $12 million in tax savings that
 7
         all added up equal approximately $33 million
         that we're requesting.
 8
                   CMSR. BAILEY: So, you're asking for
 9
10
         45 out of the 70 million?
11
                   MR. FOSSUM: Well, it all depends
12
         on -- I guess it depends on how you're doing
13
         the math. I guess, if we removed, and I'm
14
         probably going to get kicked from the revenue
15
         requirement side, but if we removed the tax
16
         issue entirely, then, yes, we would rise by
17
         $12 million. The total request on both sides
         would rise.
18
19
                   CMSR. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you.
20
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Emerson.
21
                   MR. EMERSON: CENH does not take a
         position at this point.
22
23
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Burke.
24
                                Thank you, Mr. Chairman
                   MR. BURKE:
```

and Commissioners.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The Way Home just wanted to take a brief opportunity to highlight something that it mentioned in its petition to intervene. that's that it petitioned to get involved in this docket because it's concerned about the impact that increases to temporary rates will have on the low income clients that it serves. As the Company noted in its testimony, low-use residential customers will experience a higher percentage rate increase under the Company's proposal for temporary rate adjustments than non -- than higher-use customers. And The Way Home is concerned about this, because low income customers tend to use less energy than non-low income customers. And it will be much more difficult for those low income customers to absorb any increases, because these are households that already struggle to afford their utility bills under the current rates. And the high energy burden that low income customers face can result in families having to make difficult choices, between paying their utility bills and affording other basic

1 necessities.

The Way Home, our client, also raised some concerns, highlighted some concerns briefly in its petition that I won't get into here, but that it anticipates will be further explored after the -- once the Company files its petition for permanent rates.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Kreis.

MR. KREIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The statute that governs the filing of rate cases with the Commission contemplates that utilities will file a request for a permanent rate increase, and accompany that request with a request for temporary rate relief. The purpose of which is to basically smooth the rate path and avoid excessive reconciliations back to the date of the initial filing of the rate case, when the rate case is finally concluded, often a full year later.

Eversource or Public Service Company of New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource has chosen not to handle it that way. They have not filed their full permanent rate request yet. I've

looked into the legality of that, and concluded that it is perfectly legal for Eversource to handle it that way. But that does contemplate the review of the Company's rate request in a way that I don't think is terribly helpful from anybody's standpoint, particularly that of residential utility customers.

That said, in our opinion, the request for temporary rates is excessive. It is not appropriate to include in temporary rates the Company's positions with respect to the Major Storm Cost Reserve and the reclassification of vegetation management from capital to O&M. Those are issues for resolution in the full rate case.

I do believe that the Company should honor the commitment that the Commission enshrined in a previous order, that customers receive the full benefit of the Tax Reform Act with respect to rates that are effective on July 1st of this year.

And we would be willing to agree to the per book revenue deficiency that the Company has alleged is necessary in order to

get them back up to their previously approved weighted average cost of capital of 7.08 percent. But I do not believe that the Commission should go any further than that at the temporary rate stage, particularly without anybody having the benefit of the full rate case filing at present.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you, Mr. Kreis. Ms. Amidon.

MS. AMIDON: Thank you. Staff has already commenced discovery on this, and we've issued our second set of discovery requests yesterday.

Having said that, we understand and share some of the concerns that were expressed by the Consumer Advocate. Particularly, we're concerned that the proposal to recover the entirety of the deficit in Storm Fund over a five-year period through something similar to the Storm Adjustment Recovery Factor is not an appropriate use of the Storm Recovery Adjustment Factor, which was intended to recover the costs of infrequent storms of unusual magnitude.

We continue our review. We haven't gotten -- we hope to discuss the first set of discovery in the technical session that follows this. We have a proposal on how to schedule discovery, tech session, settlement, and the filing of the settlement agreement in this docket, and hope that we can reach a settlement with the Company. But, as it stands, we still -- our investigation has just begun.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Any sense, understanding that there are issues that are contested, of your timeline, what you expect it will take to get to a resolution of the temporary rates issues?

MS. AMIDON: I believe that the
Company is acting in good faith and will be
reasonable. We have a proposed settlement
discussion on June 5th. And I expect by that
point we'll have, the Staff at least, and
hopefully the OCA and the other parties who
received discovery responses, will have
adequate information to determine how a
settlement should be proposed. And I believe
the Company, as I said, would be interested in

```
1
         resolving it at the temporary rate level with a
 2
         settlement.
                   And that, if Mr. Fossum would like to
 3
         speak for the Company, I certainly would defer
 4
         to him.
 5
 6
                    Thank you.
 7
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Fossum.
 8
                   MR. FOSSUM: Well, I guess, since
         I've been invited.
9
10
                   Yes. I mean, the Company would be
11
         certainly interested in and is interested in
12
         settling and, you know, reaching a reasonable
13
         settlement on temporary rates. I don't think
14
         it serves anyone's best interest to make
15
         temporary rates contested. There's going to be
16
         plenty else to talk about in the case.
17
                   So, yes. If we can reach a
18
         resolution, we agree that would be the best
19
         outcome.
20
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Anything else
21
         anyone needs to share with us?
22
                         [No verbal response.]
23
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
24
         Then, we will adjourn the prehearing conference
```

```
1
          and leave you to your technical session.
                                                        Thank
 2
          you all.
                           (Whereupon the prehearing
 3
                          conference was adjourned at
 4
                          10:24 a.m., and a technical
 5
                          session was held thereafter.)
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```