

In Re:
DE 10-188
2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

DAY 3
June 22, 2012

SUSAN J. ROBIDAS, LCR
(603) 622-0068 shortprtr@comcast.net

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

		Page 3
<p style="text-align: center;">STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION</p> <p>June 22, 2012 - 10:17 a.m. DAY 3 Concord, New Hampshire</p> <p>RE: DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS AND NATURAL GAS ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS: Energy Efficiency Programs</p> <p>PRESENT: Chairman Amy L. Ignatius, Presiding Commissioner Michael D. Harrington Commissioner Robert R. Scott Sandy Deno - Clerk</p> <p>APPEARANCES:</p> <p> Reptg. Public Service Co. of N.H.: Gerald M. Eaton, Esq.</p> <p> Reptg. Unitil Energy Systems and Northern Utilities: Rachel A. Goldwasser, Esq. (Orr & Reno)</p> <p> Reptg. Granite State Electric Co., D/b/a National Grid and EnergyNorth Natural Gas, d/b/a National Grid NH: Carol J. Holahan, Esq. (McLane, Graf)</p> <p>COURT REPORTER: SUSAN J. ROBIDAS, N.H. LCR NO. 44</p> <p style="text-align: center;">{DE 10-188} [DAY 3] {06-22-12}</p>		I N D E X
		1
		2
		3 WITNESS PANEL: JAMES J. CUNNINGHAM, JR.
		4 AL-AZAD IQBAL
		5
		6 INTERROGATORIES: PAGE
		7 By Cmsr. Harrington 8
		8 By Cmsr. Scott 32
		9 By Chairman Ignatius 50
		10
		11 EXAMINATION:
		12 Redirect Examination by Ms. Thunberg 67
		13
		14
		15
		16
		17
		18
		19
		20
		21
		22
		23
		24
		Page 4
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 2</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES (CONT'D)</p> <p>2 Reptg. The Way Home:</p> <p>3 Alan Linder, Esq. (N.H. Legal Assistance)</p> <p>4 Reptg. N.H. Community Action Association:</p> <p>5 Dana Nute, Director</p> <p>6 Reptg. Residential Ratepayers:</p> <p>7 Rorie E. P. Hollenberg, Esq.</p> <p>8 Stephen R. Eckberg</p> <p>9 Office of Consumer Advocate</p> <p>10 Reptg. NHPUC Staff:</p> <p>11 Marcia A.B. Thunberg, Esq.</p> <p>12 James J. Cunningham, Jr., Electric Div.</p> <p>13 Al-Azad Iqbal, Electric Division</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p>		P R O C E E D I N G S
		1
		2 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Welcome
		3 back everyone. I'd like to reopen the
		4 hearing in DE 10-188, which is the CORE
		5 Electric Programs, Natural Gas Efficiency
		6 Programs. We were not able to finish at our
		7 last hearing date and scheduled to return
		8 this morning for final examination of the
		9 witnesses on the stand -- thank you -- and
		10 then move to redirect and closing
		11 statements; is that correct?
		12 I think there was some
		13 question initially about whether we were
		14 going to do closings in writing or orally.
		15 Everyone seemed happy with orally, except
		16 for Mr. Steltzer, who wasn't able to be here
		17 today. Does anyone have a report on the
		18 status regarding closings?
		19 MS. HOLLENBERG: Yes. Good
		20 morning. Mr. Steltzer did ask us to relay
		21 his statements, and we have it in writing.
		22 I'm happy to provide it to the Commission
		23 and parties in writing, or I can read it
		24 into the record, whatever you'd prefer.

Page 5	Page 7
<p>1 CMSR. IGNATIUS: I guess it 2 depends on how long it is and if it's 3 lengthy -- 4 MS. HOLLENBERG: It's about 5 a page and a half. 6 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All 7 right. Have you read the record in, and 8 we'll give a copy to the stenographer, 9 'cause sometimes it's hard to transcribe 10 writings because people speak a lot faster. 11 There's no objection on doing it that way, I 12 take it? 13 MS. THUNBERG: None. 14 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: There is 15 one other matter I want to raise with you 16 and let people have a chance to think it 17 over and, if need be, take a break before 18 we're done to respond to it, and that is, we 19 noticed in going through the file this 20 morning that there's one matter that relates 21 to this docket and actually pretty close to 22 the issues under discussion here. And if we 23 could resolve it today and get everyone's 24 responses and not have to do anything</p>	<p>1 morning we have a chance for any oral 2 responses to the request for waiver so that 3 we know if there are any concerns that we 4 should consider, and then we can take the 5 matter under advisement and address in a 6 final order. So, if anyone doesn't have a 7 copy of that, please come get one from Ms. 8 Deno, who's got extras. 9 MR. EATON: On that issue, 10 we reviewed the letter before it was 11 submitted, and PSNH has a practice similar 12 to that which we'll comment on, you know, if 13 that's acceptable. And if you don't want 14 the attorney testifying on the record, we 15 could have Mr. Galineau explain what we do. 16 But we do similar things, and we'll comment 17 on why we think it's acceptable for Unitil 18 and PSNH. 19 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I think 20 your offer of proof is fine on those things. 21 But thank you. 22 All right. So, unless 23 there's anything further -- if anyone needs 24 a copy, please pick one up -- we can</p>
Page 6	Page 8
<p>1 further on paper, that would be a good 2 thing, and we could address it in the order. 3 It's a letter received here on June 15th 4 from Unitil and Northern, from Ms. 5 Goldwasser. It involves a request for a 6 waiver of certain standards for the Park 7 Place Home Performance with ENERGY STAR 8 project. And Park Place, if I could 9 summarize this -- I have copies of everyone 10 to take a look at if you don't have it in 11 your files -- is an electrically heated 12 96-unit rental community. It doesn't meet 13 the Home Heating Index criteria, but it does 14 meet other tests of cost efficiency. And 15 the Company makes out arguments on why it 16 would be appropriate to allow it to be done 17 in the HPwES program, exceed the cap number 18 of homes for this year, but not exceed the 19 budgetary limits for the program. If I got 20 any of those details wrong, I'm sorry. But 21 we've got copies of the letter that you can 22 come get from the clerk if you don't have 23 it. 24 My hope is at the end of the</p>	<p>1 dispense with that for a bit and go back to 2 witnesses, unless there's anything else we 3 need to take up first. 4 MS. THUNBERG: I just want 5 to clarify. Staff hasn't developed a 6 position on this yet. So we will have a 7 break to caucus first? 8 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: That'll 9 be fine. We'll take a break to make sure 10 everyone has a chance to look it over and 11 discuss it. I didn't mean to spring it. I 12 just thought we're so close to the comment 13 period, and we're here today, so if we could 14 do it all at once it would be more 15 efficient. 16 All right. Unless there's 17 anything further, the witnesses remain 18 sworn. And I think, if I've got it right, 19 we've been around the room for questioning, 20 and it's time for Commission questions. 21 Commissioner Harrington. 22 INTERROGATORIES BY CMSR. HARRINGTON: 23 Q. Good morning. Just a few questions. I want 24 to clarify some points in your testimony.</p>

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 9</p> <p>1 The presumption of this docket was that</p> <p>2 the legal basis for the fuel-neutral issue</p> <p>3 has already been established by previous</p> <p>4 Commission orders. So, is it therefore safe</p> <p>5 to say that what you're arguing today, or in</p> <p>6 this Commission docket, is the fairness</p> <p>7 issue and not the legal issue?</p> <p>8 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Yes, you are correct.</p> <p>9 Q. And following along with that, it appears</p> <p>10 the fuel-neutral barrier has already been</p> <p>11 breached, if you will, under two programs:</p> <p>12 The low-income program, which allows the</p> <p>13 system benefit charge money to go to</p> <p>14 weatherization and low-income housing, as</p> <p>15 well as the Home ENERGY STAR program, which</p> <p>16 allows the system benefit charge money to go</p> <p>17 to new home construction for things not just</p> <p>18 related to electrical energy efficiency, but</p> <p>19 also could be heat savings, which may not be</p> <p>20 electric heat savings; is that correct?</p> <p>21 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) That's correct. On that, in</p> <p>22 our testimony we explain that those are</p> <p>23 exceptions. The commission took exception</p> <p>24 of those, particularly for low-income group.</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 11</p> <p>1 without any bias that whether they will get</p> <p>2 equity based on their choice on the heating</p> <p>3 system. They don't have to be pushed</p> <p>4 towards electric heating or not.</p> <p>5 Q. So it sounds as if your concern, then, is</p> <p>6 not absolutely that no system benefit charge</p> <p>7 that's taken from the electric ratepayers</p> <p>8 should be used for anything but electric</p> <p>9 energy-efficiency savings, but to what</p> <p>10 degree that may be used in other programs.</p> <p>11 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) That is correct. Yeah.</p> <p>12 Q. Referring to your testimony on Exhibit 55,</p> <p>13 on Page 6 -- actually, tell you what. I'll</p> <p>14 ask you another question and come back to</p> <p>15 that one. No, let's do that one now. We'll</p> <p>16 take them in order of the pages. That would</p> <p>17 be easier.</p> <p>18 All right. What you stated here in the</p> <p>19 middle of Page 6 is that this results in</p> <p>20 PSNH's residential electric customer who</p> <p>21 heats with natural gas paying twice but</p> <p>22 benefiting only once, with the idea being</p> <p>23 that a residential electric customer will</p> <p>24 pay the system benefit charge, and they'll</p>
<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 10</p> <p>1 There are two exception. One is that first</p> <p>2 one. The other one is that is funded by</p> <p>3 both residential customers and C & I</p> <p>4 customers. And on the other hand, the other</p> <p>5 one, the ENERGY STAR Home, that is also an</p> <p>6 exception because it is a practical matter.</p> <p>7 Why? In our testimony, we explain that when</p> <p>8 somebody is building a house, the idea is</p> <p>9 that we want all these new houses to be</p> <p>10 energy-efficient. But when somebody is</p> <p>11 building the house without knowing which one</p> <p>12 is the best available energy-efficient</p> <p>13 measures, they cannot decide on that. So if</p> <p>14 that is not fuel blind, then we face a</p> <p>15 situation when the builder or the owner will</p> <p>16 be given all this information and said that,</p> <p>17 okay, these are the best option you have.</p> <p>18 And if the best option is not electric</p> <p>19 heating, then, okay, we cannot help you. In</p> <p>20 that situation, we are not -- we are not</p> <p>21 progressing to achieve that all these houses</p> <p>22 are most energy-efficient. So, by choice,</p> <p>23 it is giving them a choice based on all this</p> <p>24 information they are getting and then choose</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 12</p> <p>1 also pay the LDAC charge if they happen to</p> <p>2 be a natural gas customer as well.</p> <p>3 So, are you suggesting that there</p> <p>4 should be a change, such that a PSNH</p> <p>5 ratepayer who is also a natural gas customer</p> <p>6 not pay the LDAC, but only the system</p> <p>7 benefit charge?</p> <p>8 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) We are not proposing that,</p> <p>9 but we are saying that that would be a</p> <p>10 fair -- if the Commission wants to go that</p> <p>11 route, then that would be fair. But without</p> <p>12 going that route and opening this program up</p> <p>13 for everybody as proposed, that is creating</p> <p>14 the unfairness.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. So, kind of following up on what you</p> <p>16 just said, so I think we can say, if not</p> <p>17 absolute, just about a hundred percent of</p> <p>18 people who have natural gas also have</p> <p>19 electric service and they pay a system</p> <p>20 benefit charge. So, would you recommend</p> <p>21 that if the Commission were to accept this</p> <p>22 fuel-neutral charge that we're talking about</p> <p>23 here, that they have a program such that</p> <p>24 those customers would only pay the system</p>

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 13</p> <p>1 benefit charge and not the LDAC charge if 2 they were both electric and natural gas 3 customers? 4 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) That would be fair. 5 Q. Okay. 6 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) And on that point, I also -- 7 we also ought to point out that the electric 8 heat customers are also paying SBC for their 9 heating portions. So if we take care of the 10 gas customers, we have to take care of the 11 electric customers, too. 12 Q. Now, down on Page 7 of the same exhibit, in 13 the middle of the page you're talking about 14 how 98 percent of the savings are 15 transferred from residential customers who 16 heat with electricity to residents who heat 17 with natural gas, et cetera, et cetera. Are 18 you saying that under the proposed program, 19 that people who heat with electric -- use 20 electric heat are less likely to receive 21 weatherization subsidies if this HPwES 22 program is continued? 23 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Less likely because their 24 numbers are fewer. Because if we look at</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 15</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. I'll come back to that issue in just 2 a little bit. 3 Again, on Page 7, towards the bottom, 4 you talk about the two benefits: One is, of 5 course, to the customer who actually 6 participates in the program; and the other 7 is a lower cost for all ratepayers. And I 8 think in previous discussions and questions 9 that I've asked -- I've mentioned about how 10 the system benefit funds, where they result 11 in electric savings only can be used to 12 enter bids into the Forward Capacity Market, 13 which results in additional funding of load 14 reductions, which saves people money all 15 across the board, especially during peak 16 times, huge transmission costs due to 17 electric energy efficiency is also a 18 savings. Can you quantify any of those 19 savings? What are we talking about here? 20 If we take a dollar that would have gone to 21 electric energy efficiency and moved that 22 dollar and used -- allowed somebody to use 23 it to insulate their house when they're 24 heating by oil, what's it going to cost the</p>
<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 14</p> <p>1 the whole program, like we said in our 2 testimony, we found that 8 percent of the 3 electric customers are heating with 4 electricity. And if we don't do any -- we 5 don't -- just not putting any assumption on 6 that, if hundred people are participating in 7 HPwES, that is a possibility that only eight 8 people who will be in this program who will 9 be heating with electricity. So, yes, you 10 are right. That is a lower possibility that 11 electric customers will be participating 12 here because of the proportionality of whole 13 customer base. 14 Q. So you think that there will be a -- someone 15 who heats with electric heat will try to 16 participate in the program, and they'll be 17 told there just isn't enough funds because 18 the funding needs to be given to someone who 19 doesn't participate in -- who doesn't have 20 electric heat? 21 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Right now, it is first 22 come/first service. So that could be the 23 possibility not only for electric customers, 24 but for oil customers or gas customers, too.</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 16</p> <p>1 electric ratepayer? 2 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) On that point, I think we can 3 look at the predecessor HES program, that 4 how much we are saving -- how much the peak 5 load we are saving. And if you look at 6 that, right now we are spending \$1.6 million 7 for PSNH, and we are serving peak load 8 1.5-megawatt. 9 Q. I'm sorry. I didn't follow you. You're 10 spending 1.6 million -- 11 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Million, and we are -- on 12 peak load, we are saving only 1.5 megawatt. 13 But if you look at a similar program which 14 is not fuel blind, like Co-op or National 15 Grid, they are spending much less than that, 16 and they're saving more, almost 10 times, I 17 think -- you might have the numbers -- 18 almost 10 times more than that. So, on 19 the -- when you are talking indirect 20 benefit, those are the benefit we are 21 talking about. 22 Q. Again, can I just back you up here, because 23 I'm not really following you, what you're 24 saying.</p>

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 17</p> <p>1 You're saying under the existing</p> <p>2 program, which includes the pilot, Public</p> <p>3 Service spends 1.6 million, and that results</p> <p>4 of a peak shaving of 1.5 megawatts.</p> <p>5 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Or maybe I'm wrong. It's 15</p> <p>6 megawatts.</p> <p>7 Q. Fifteen megawatts?</p> <p>8 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay.</p> <p>10 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: And to</p> <p>11 clarify, are you talking about the HES</p> <p>12 program has those numbers, just what you</p> <p>13 said earlier, or are you saying it's the</p> <p>14 HPwES Program has those numbers?</p> <p>15 WITNESS IQBAL: HES Program.</p> <p>16 The budget number is almost similar.</p> <p>17 BY CMSR. HARRINGTON:</p> <p>18 Q. So it's the low-income program --</p> <p>19 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) No.</p> <p>20 Q. -- the Home ENERGY STAR Program --</p> <p>21 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. -- which also includes weatherization for</p> <p>23 people that could have oil heat as well.</p> <p>24 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Yes.</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 19</p> <p>1 everything is actual. How much peak savings</p> <p>2 they achieve in 2009, it shows 583</p> <p>3 kilowatts. And this planned one, planned</p> <p>4 HPwES, which is fuel blind, we are saving</p> <p>5 only 15-kilowatt. So the reduction is</p> <p>6 almost 97.4 percent.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. I'm having a little trouble. I</p> <p>8 understand the HES program, 1.6 million</p> <p>9 results in 15 megawatts of peak savings.</p> <p>10 And then, from there you're talking about</p> <p>11 some other program. What's the other</p> <p>12 program you're talking about?</p> <p>13 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) When it was not fuel blind,</p> <p>14 the same program would save 583 kilowatt.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. So you're not talking about HES,</p> <p>16 because that's always been fuel blind. So</p> <p>17 you're talking about the pre --</p> <p>18 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) HES was not fuel blind in</p> <p>19 2008.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. So back then it was not fuel blind.</p> <p>21 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) No.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. And during that time you spent how</p> <p>23 much money?</p> <p>24 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Around the same amount of</p>
<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 18</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. For that program only, it's 1.6</p> <p>2 million spent results in 15 megawatts of</p> <p>3 savings.</p> <p>4 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Yeah.</p> <p>5 Q. And then you were saying something about the</p> <p>6 Co-op?</p> <p>7 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Yeah. What I'm trying to</p> <p>8 say, first of all, that we can look at the</p> <p>9 HES program, that what is the peak load we</p> <p>10 are reducing with the same amount of money.</p> <p>11 In 2009, actual HES program peak load was</p> <p>12 saved was 583 kilowatts.</p> <p>13 Q. Excuse me. Are you reading from your</p> <p>14 testimony someplace, or is this someplace</p> <p>15 else? Do you have a document? It would be</p> <p>16 easier if we -- I'm not saying you have to</p> <p>17 put it in evidence. It's too late. But if</p> <p>18 it's already there, if you can tell us where</p> <p>19 it is, it would be helpful.</p> <p>20 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) This is on the docket book,</p> <p>21 but it is not a part of the evidence.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay.</p> <p>23 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) But it is from their filing,</p> <p>24 the performance incentive filing. But</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 20</p> <p>1 money. And peak saving was 583. In 2012,</p> <p>2 we are using the same amount of money, and</p> <p>3 we are -- peak savings is 15 kilowatt.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you have any similar analysis for -- I'm</p> <p>5 trying to get the overall savings. Now</p> <p>6 you're talking about peak savings. What</p> <p>7 about loss of funding for the FCA, loss of</p> <p>8 funding for energy -- electrical energy</p> <p>9 efficiency that will reduce transmission</p> <p>10 costs in the future? Do you have any</p> <p>11 estimate for -- I'm trying to get a handle</p> <p>12 on if we take a dollar of system benefit</p> <p>13 funds that -- well, if we didn't have a</p> <p>14 fuel-neutral program at all, pilot or</p> <p>15 otherwise, if we go to energy-efficiency --</p> <p>16 electrical energy efficiency, and we took</p> <p>17 that dollar and moved it over and used it in</p> <p>18 a fuel-blind program, where it went to</p> <p>19 insulating houses that are heated not with</p> <p>20 electricity, how much would it cost the</p> <p>21 electric ratepayers, approximately, in loss</p> <p>22 of savings from these various mechanisms I</p> <p>23 mentioned?</p> <p>24 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) We haven't done a full</p>

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 21</p> <p>1 analysis on that. But it is possible to do 2 an analysis on that, what is the actual 3 amount we are not saving. But we can have 4 an idea from utility filings, which is -- 5 while they're showing all these benefits, 6 electric benefits and non-electric benefits, 7 that will give us an idea that whether -- 8 how different those are. 9 Q. And going on this idea of savings, one of 10 the things that was brought up by the 11 utilities' testimony was ancillary savings. 12 And they mentioned things like lighting the 13 boiler less so that the pump would be less 14 and the fan would be less. But there was 15 also this discussion on -- appropriately 16 over the last couple days -- a better 17 insulated house uses less air conditioning. 18 And just about, I think it's fair to say, a 19 hundred percent of the air conditioning in 20 New Hampshire is charged by electricity. So 21 how much -- would you care to comment on how 22 much that would be? 23 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) It is reported that -- Cadmus 24 did this study for the HPwES program. And</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 23</p> <p>1 it's getting extremely difficult to find 2 enough people who are willing to go along 3 with the program. So their response is we 4 need to have weatherization, and that gets 5 us in the door, if you will, and then we can 6 work on some of the electrical savings as 7 well. Can you care to comment on that? 8 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) There are several layer of 9 that argument. First of all, why run this 10 energy-efficiency program? We don't want to 11 serve every household in this country 12 through this program. The idea is just form 13 the market, and market will take care of it. 14 What they are trying to say now, that 15 they already serve all these customers. 16 They already transformed the market and 17 serve all these customers. There's no more 18 customers, or very few customers. So then 19 the question is: Then why do we need this 20 program at all? 21 Q. Well, that may be a good question. But the 22 legislature has said you will take so much 23 from the system benefit fund, and you will 24 use it for energy-efficiency programs. That</p>
<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 22</p> <p>1 their finding, preliminary finding is it is 2 only 40 kilowatt hours per year. And their 3 overall savings, which is fuel-blind savings 4 we can say, are 22.3 MMBtu, which is almost 5 6,500 kilowatt hours. So, 40 out of 6,500. 6 So that's why we are saying that it is 7 insignificant. It is below, actually, 8 one-tenth of one percent. 9 Q. And in the discussion when we had the 10 utility witnesses up there, they talked 11 about, I guess for lack of a better term, 12 not being to get their foot in the door 13 without weatherization; by that, they sent 14 out mailers to identify customers who used 15 electric heat. And even with sending very 16 specific things saying here's a way you can 17 save a lot of money, we'll do all these 18 things for you, they still only got a 19 participation rate of around 4 percent. So, 20 it appears what they're saying is that, in 21 order to take the money that the legislature 22 says go out and use it for energy savings, 23 that they're getting to the point where it's 24 very -- especially on the residential side,</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 24</p> <p>1 may be a very valid question to give to the 2 Science and Tech Committee over at the 3 House, but that decision's already been made 4 for us. We have to figure out the best way 5 to spend it, not whether we spend it at all. 6 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) I think your comment is "best 7 way to spend it." So that ultimately means 8 that, okay, we already weatherized all these 9 electric-heated houses, so we have to 10 weatherize somebody else's house without 11 [sic] fuel oil and all these things, and 12 that makes sense. 13 That doesn't make sense, because all 14 this money is coming from electricity. If 15 we didn't have any opportunity on the 16 electricity savings, then I understand. 17 There is no legislative requirement that you 18 have to run a weatherization program. It 19 only says that we have to save 20 electricity -- or electric energy 21 efficiency. Weatherization program is not 22 required under any law. 23 So, by choosing that we do 24 weatherization, and showing that the</p>

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 25</p> <p>1 delivery costs of weatherization doesn't</p> <p>2 make it cost-effective, it's almost like</p> <p>3 saying the pizza guy who got a order from</p> <p>4 50 miles away, and he found that delivery of</p> <p>5 one pizza will not be cost-effective for</p> <p>6 him. So, best way to do it, he calculate it</p> <p>7 and find that we have to deliver 10 pizza to</p> <p>8 make this trip -- this delivery</p> <p>9 cost-effective. So the decision is, okay,</p> <p>10 let's give nine pizza to neighbors and</p> <p>11 charge him for 10 pizza and give him one</p> <p>12 pizza. That's what their solution is. That</p> <p>13 make delivery cost cost-effective, we have</p> <p>14 to deliver 10 pizza. But ultimately, that</p> <p>15 guy has to -- who is getting only one pizza</p> <p>16 but paying for all the other nine pizza.</p> <p>17 Q. Now, so your position is that there's plenty</p> <p>18 of opportunities there on the residential</p> <p>19 side for continued use of these funds</p> <p>20 exclusively on electrical energy savings.</p> <p>21 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Yeah, that's our position.</p> <p>22 And the GDS found that there are lots of</p> <p>23 energy-savings opportunity. And utility</p> <p>24 witness also agree with that, that they are</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 27</p> <p>1 to be able to spend the money to save</p> <p>2 electricity on? I mean, we have the ENERGY</p> <p>3 STAR program which affects if you buy light</p> <p>4 bulbs or certain appliances you can get</p> <p>5 rebates. But people don't -- you know,</p> <p>6 people can go a couple years or more without</p> <p>7 buying a major appliance.</p> <p>8 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) On that, I think one of the</p> <p>9 potential would be water heating. And it is</p> <p>10 almost 5 percent of the total potential of</p> <p>11 electric savings. And as long as I</p> <p>12 remember, PSNH, out of their thousand, more</p> <p>13 than thousand of their customer they serve,</p> <p>14 there is only one water-heating customer</p> <p>15 they serve. And if you look at the</p> <p>16 potential from water heating, and if you go</p> <p>17 back to PSNH --</p> <p>18 Q. Excuse me. When you say "water heating,"</p> <p>19 you're talking about replacing the standard</p> <p>20 35- to 50-gallon tank that's</p> <p>21 resistance-heated with something else. What</p> <p>22 would the something else be? Where are you</p> <p>23 getting the efficiency from?</p> <p>24 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) I think most of the water</p>
<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 26</p> <p>1 not saving almost two thirds of potential</p> <p>2 energy -- potential electric savings.</p> <p>3 Q. And where would these be in residential</p> <p>4 homes? Can you give us an example?</p> <p>5 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) GDS pointed out -- GDS did a</p> <p>6 very good job, thorough job. And if you</p> <p>7 look at the appendices, Appendix E, which</p> <p>8 actually point out what are the potential</p> <p>9 measures, and Appendix H, which talks about</p> <p>10 whether those measures are cost-effective,</p> <p>11 so if we combine these two, we can find lots</p> <p>12 of opportunity which are cost-effective and</p> <p>13 which could be run. And as overall savings</p> <p>14 potential-wise, they actually took</p> <p>15 consideration of both of those.</p> <p>16 Q. Well, could you give me a couple examples.</p> <p>17 Typical residential house, you're not going</p> <p>18 to do any weather stripping. So we've</p> <p>19 already tried to reach out for the people</p> <p>20 who have electric heat, and apparently, for</p> <p>21 whatever reason, a very low percentage of</p> <p>22 them want to participate in the program. So</p> <p>23 how do you deal with the other house? What</p> <p>24 is it you're selling them that they're going</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 28</p> <p>1 heaters are old water heaters. If you</p> <p>2 replace those -- and from the data, as long</p> <p>3 as I remember, the PSNH has 33,000 electric</p> <p>4 water-heating customers, and they serve</p> <p>5 only, last year, serve one of them. So...</p> <p>6 Q. But my question is, when you say "serve</p> <p>7 them," this typical customer has the 35-</p> <p>8 gallon hot water tank in their basement, and</p> <p>9 it's resistance-heated. So now you're going</p> <p>10 to come up with a new energy-efficiency way</p> <p>11 of providing them with hot water using</p> <p>12 electricity. What is that method? That's</p> <p>13 what I'm asking you. You say you're going</p> <p>14 to serve these customers. I'm trying to</p> <p>15 figure out what are you doing. Are you</p> <p>16 going to double-insulate their tank? Or is</p> <p>17 it a different technology that still uses</p> <p>18 electricity? Clearly, you're not going to</p> <p>19 be putting any gas to heat the</p> <p>20 electricity -- to heat the hot water.</p> <p>21 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) There are several measures</p> <p>22 GDS pointed out on that particular -- they</p> <p>23 also talk about alternative water heating</p> <p>24 system, like heat-pump water heater, solar</p>

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 29</p> <p>1 water heating, which reduce -- those are 2 very high-efficiency and low electric 3 consumption. So those are some of the ideas 4 they have provided. 5 But if you look, we go back to GDS and 6 look deeper into that, I am sure that we can 7 find lots of opportunities. 8 Q. All right. Well, just moving on to another 9 subject. Let's assume that what you're 10 saying is that, if I can scale it down to a 11 few words, that you believe there's plenty 12 of opportunities out there for spending 13 system benefit charge dollars to save 14 electric use without having to go to a 15 fuel-neutral program; is that correct? 16 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Exactly. 17 Q. Let's just say, though, we did go to a 18 fuel-neutral program. We've already got the 19 pilot program now. And, you know, of 20 course, one of the issues I think there 21 is -- and I think it's been brought up by 22 Commissioner Scott -- is we have a 23 weatherization funding. So, someone comes 24 in and we say we'll insulate your house for</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 31</p> <p>1 lighting and appliances in HPwES program. 2 But on the other hand, some of the 3 programs are -- they just do the audit and 4 prescribe the owner that these are the 5 potential savings you can have and these are 6 the cost-effectiveness and these are the 7 rebate for each of those. Then owner 8 actually choose and participate on those 9 stand-alone program. That's another one. 10 And so it's about design issue. 11 Q. Okay. 12 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) And we have a concern about 13 that, too, because if you look at the 14 electric service from HPwES, that two 15 percent we are talking about, most of those 16 are electrical lighting or the appliances. 17 So -- but we have a stand-alone lighting 18 program. So we are saying that, okay, you 19 are counting these savings under HPwES, but 20 those are really not HPwES savings. Those 21 are lighting savings, which we have another 22 program; and those are appliance savings, 23 which have another program. So if we were 24 to take those out, even the HPwES program is</p>
<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 30</p> <p>1 you and you'll see an instant savings next 2 winter of so-much money, but we also think 3 you should replace your refrigerator or your 4 hot-water heater or your light bulbs or 5 whatever. Should there be some type of a 6 tie between those programs; so if you want 7 the money for the insulation, then you also 8 have to take the money and spend your half 9 for the electric energy savings as well? Or 10 should they just be able to pick and choose 11 which of the savings they want? 12 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) On that, I think that it is 13 all about the program design, because we 14 already have an appliance program where they 15 can do that. We already have a lighting 16 program where they can do that. So, tying 17 into this program is a good idea, but -- 18 Q. You think it should be linked. 19 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Yes, linked. But that's one 20 of the program design issue. Because if you 21 look at the HPwES program all around the 22 country, there are several model of HPwES 23 program. One is the PSNH program design 24 which ties everything and which builds the</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 32</p> <p>1 not saving the 2 percent of the savings. 2 Q. So you're saying that when somebody comes in 3 and does a HPwES energy audit, that they 4 sort of lump the savings into the package, 5 and they include the captured electric 6 savings that goes along with the savings 7 from weatherization. And your point is that 8 those savings might have happened, anyways, 9 through the lighting and appliance program. 10 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Exactly. 11 Q. Thank you. 12 CMSR. HARRINGTON: That's 13 all the questions I have. 14 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank 15 you. 16 Commissioner Scott. 17 CMSR. SCOTT: Thank you. 18 Once again, Commissioner Harrington's been 19 so thorough, most of my questions have been 20 asked and answered. So mine will be pretty 21 quick. 22 INTERROGATORIES BY CMSR. SCOTT: 23 Q. As you're probably aware -- I assume you're 24 aware -- House Bill 1490 is going to change</p>

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 33	[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 35
<p>1 the way the original greenhouse gas</p> <p>2 emissions initiative program funds are</p> <p>3 treated; so in the future, those funds will</p> <p>4 also be required to be part of the CORE</p> <p>5 program. Once -- my word, not yours -- once</p> <p>6 those funds are "mixed," the systems benefit</p> <p>7 charge and the RGGI funds, do you have the</p> <p>8 same concerns once that happens?</p> <p>9 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) If you look at our options we</p> <p>10 put forward in our testimony, that our</p> <p>11 position is that legislature already decided</p> <p>12 that how RGGI money should be used. It is</p> <p>13 based on fuel bind because their focus is on</p> <p>14 saving tons of carbon emission. So it is</p> <p>15 not directly related to either electricity</p> <p>16 or fuel oil or anything. They are talking</p> <p>17 about carbon reduction.</p> <p>18 So when it comes into CORE Program, I</p> <p>19 think that idea will still prevail. Whether</p> <p>20 it is under CORE or not, we have to adhere</p> <p>21 to that idea.</p> <p>22 Q. Thank you. Also in your testimony, you talk</p> <p>23 a little bit about performance incentives.</p> <p>24 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Yes.</p>	<p>1 Is that fair?</p> <p>2 Second of all, that when we are talking</p> <p>3 about -- the utility witness talks about how</p> <p>4 difficult it is to find these electric</p> <p>5 customers. So when the customer base is</p> <p>6 then hundred percent of the whole</p> <p>7 customer -- of the statewide customers, so</p> <p>8 it is not that difficult to find customers</p> <p>9 anymore. So we are talking about one</p> <p>10 difficulty level to another difficulty</p> <p>11 level, which is much bigger customers. You</p> <p>12 don't really have to choose.</p> <p>13 Just like, for example: If we take a</p> <p>14 jar with let's say 8 red balls and 92 blue</p> <p>15 balls. And if you ask somebody to find red</p> <p>16 balls, it will be a little bit difficult,</p> <p>17 because out of 100, 8 are red balls. But if</p> <p>18 you ask somebody to choose only blue balls,</p> <p>19 it's so easy because 92 of them are blue</p> <p>20 balls. So, if to find the red ball requires</p> <p>21 low percent of the incentive, finding the</p> <p>22 blue balls should not be the same level</p> <p>23 because it's so easy.</p> <p>24 And the other aspect of this is, in our</p>
[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 34	[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 36
<p>1 Q. And if I remember correctly, I don't have it</p> <p>2 in front of me -- oh, yes, I do -- that you</p> <p>3 suggest that the performance incentive</p> <p>4 working group should reconvene and fully</p> <p>5 analyze? That's on Page 27 of your</p> <p>6 testimony.</p> <p>7 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Yes, that's our point, our</p> <p>8 position.</p> <p>9 Q. Can you elaborate a little bit more? Can</p> <p>10 you flush out a little bit of what you think</p> <p>11 they should look at?</p> <p>12 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) First of all, when we are</p> <p>13 doing -- when electric customers are paying</p> <p>14 for performance incentive, electric</p> <p>15 customers has to look into what they are</p> <p>16 getting out of it. If electric customers'</p> <p>17 benefit is only 2 percent of the whole</p> <p>18 benefit, so is it fair to ask them to pay</p> <p>19 the profit for the utilities hundred</p> <p>20 percent? So that's one perspective, that</p> <p>21 from electric customer perspective, okay, we</p> <p>22 are already paying for this program and then</p> <p>23 we have to pay for this profit that is</p> <p>24 performance incentive. How do we do that?</p>	<p>1 testimony we talked about high hanging fruit</p> <p>2 and low hanging fruit. That goes to that</p> <p>3 example, that when you are trying to find</p> <p>4 low hanging fruit, you have to work harder</p> <p>5 because those are -- high hanging fruit, you</p> <p>6 have to work harder. But when you have</p> <p>7 enormous opportunity to pick the low hanging</p> <p>8 fruit, then do we need the same level of</p> <p>9 incentive or not? That's another issue.</p> <p>10 The third issue is there's several</p> <p>11 model of performance incentive all around</p> <p>12 this region in particular. If we look at</p> <p>13 the bottom one, they are doing the same type</p> <p>14 of program with only 3 percent of</p> <p>15 performance incentive. If you look at the</p> <p>16 neighboring states, Massachusetts, their</p> <p>17 performance incentive before tax is around</p> <p>18 8 percent. So when we talk about</p> <p>19 performance incentive, we have to compare it</p> <p>20 with the peers: What is other people are</p> <p>21 doing? How much incentive they require to</p> <p>22 do this type of program.</p> <p>23 And that is also alluded in the VEIC</p> <p>24 report. They also talk about this. So we</p>

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 37</p> <p>1 are thinking that we are not taking any 2 position on all these issues, but we think 3 that we have to look into those issues. 4 Q. So if I could paraphrase it, if I remember 5 correctly, the OCA's recommendation on 6 performance incentives was that we look at 7 other programs in the country. So is it 8 safe to assume you agree with that? 9 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Yes. 10 Q. Thank you. 11 A. (By Mr. Cunningham) I'd also like to 12 mention, performance incentives, as they 13 currently are formulated by the Commission 14 in order -- approved in Order 23,574, had a 15 focus on electric savings. The HPwES 16 program is 98.5 non-electric savings. And I 17 would refer you to the New Hampshire Energy 18 Efficiency Working Group Report that's on 19 the Commission's Web site, Appendix 6, Page 20 A68. That shows the focus on kilowatt-hour 21 savings, not MMBtu savings. So the HPwES 22 program would better be limited to just the 23 cost to achieve electric savings, we 24 believe, than the cost to achieve electric</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 39</p> <p>1 decided, and it would be decided in time -- 2 in a timely way so that it could be 3 incorporated into the multi-year filing 4 which is due in August of this year. So I 5 think it would be very challenging, near 6 impossible, to examine and fully analyze all 7 the issues that we have before us with 8 respect to the performance incentive. 9 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) One more point, that when I 10 talk about the perspective of the electric 11 customers, if you look at the benefit of the 12 electric customers from this program, it is 13 two percent of the total savings if you 14 convert it in dollar. And if you convert 15 utility benefit -- utility performance 16 incentive, if it is 12 percent, those dollar 17 are almost equal. Almost equal. So we are 18 saying that, from electric customers' 19 perspective, that we are getting the benefit 20 investing in \$1.6 million, the same level of 21 benefit the utilities' shareholders get. Is 22 that fair? All investment is ours. But 23 benefit-wise, utility and we are the same 24 level. So that's another issue we have to</p>
<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 38</p> <p>1 and non-electric savings, which is what the 2 Company is proposing. 3 Further, in Commission Order 20,186 4 which we reference in our testimony, the 5 Commission has established that the 6 performance incentives rest, in part, on a 7 broad array of energy-efficiency programs. 8 With the proposal for the HPwES that we 9 have before us today, the residential sector 10 programs will become 70-percent fuel-blind 11 programs, up from 45 percent, without HPwES 12 programs. 13 Other issues that have to be analyzed 14 are included in the VEIC report -- a number 15 of issues, and I can't recite them all. But 16 one of them was different metrics perhaps 17 should be used in the establishment of a 18 performance incentive. 19 Finally, I just add that we need time 20 to fully flush out all these issues. I 21 think on the first day, the Chairman 22 mentioned that the game plan of this hearing 23 would be to determine whether full or 24 limited performance incentives would be</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 40</p> <p>1 look into. 2 A. (By Mr. Cunningham) Perhaps just to cap this 3 off, getting back to Commissioner 4 Harrington's questions with respect to peak 5 summer demand savings, the HPwES program 6 greatly diminishes the peak summer demand 7 savings, as Iqbal has pointed out. And I 8 just wanted to indicate that in my analysis 9 of drawing off some numbers for our 10 presentation this morning, we found that in 11 2009, the last year before HPwES went to the 12 pilot version, went from -- in 2009, it was 13 an electric program for half the year, 14 focusing on electric-only savings, and 15 halfway through the year it changed to a 16 fuel-blind program. During that year which 17 was half and half, which is the first year 18 we have these data, during that 2009 year, 19 the actual kilowatts saved by the HES 20 program was 583 kilowatts. The plan savings 21 that we have in the filing today for the 22 HPwES program, the fuel-blind program, is 23 only 15 kilowatts. That's a reduction of 24 568 kilowatts on this HPwES program. The</p>

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 41</p> <p>1 15 kilowatts, by way of reference, can be 2 found in Exhibit 23, Page 24. The reduction 3 in kilowatt savings in 2012 as proposed 4 versus the actual kilowatt savings in 2009 5 is a 568-kilowatts reduction, which 6 represents a 97.4-percent reduction in the 7 peak demand savings as a result of this 8 program being changed from fully electric to 9 full blind -- fuel-blind.</p> <p>10 Furthermore, with respect to peak 11 summer demand savings, we drew off some 12 numbers with respect to HPwES as it compares 13 to the lighting program, both in the year 14 2012. And on Exhibit 23, Hearing Exhibit 15 23, Page 24, you'll find that the lighting 16 program delivers peak summer demand savings 17 of 441 kilowatts and the HPwES program for 18 this year delivers 50 kilowatts; a 19 94.3 percent reduction, HPwES versus the 20 lighting program.</p> <p>21 Q. Back to my question on performance 22 incentives. If I understood correctly, 23 Staff's position is, once the RGGI funds are 24 introduced into the CORE program, then,</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 43</p> <p>1 have to investigate that, too.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>3 And finally, I just want to clarify.</p> <p>4 Regarding participation in the electric-only 5 program, again, the implication has been 6 that there's -- we're kind of getting away 7 from the low hanging fruit -- meaning, 8 there's -- the low hanging fruit's been 9 eaten and we're moving up the tree. I'm 10 almost getting a different impression, that 11 you feel there's still plenty of low hanging 12 fruit that people will participate.</p> <p>13 As a good example, you were questioning 14 the effectiveness of the HPwES program, if 15 through the HPwES program there was some 16 lighting changes, if I understood right, 17 because it's only a lighting program. But 18 that implies that independently that 19 lighting program would be tapped. And I'm 20 getting a different feel from the other 21 testimony. Can you comment on that?</p> <p>22 A. (By Mr. Cunningham) Well, I would like to 23 say that the other testimony that you might 24 be referring to is the utility testimony</p>
<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 42</p> <p>1 again, back to that position and the 2 performance incentives. Once that happens, 3 would it not be -- should this working group 4 also look at how that is integrated? Once 5 the RGGI funds happen, should that also be 6 re-looked at, as far as performance 7 incentives also?</p> <p>8 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) I think so, because if you 9 look at the RGGI fund and how it was spent, 10 then we have to work with sustainable energy 11 division because they're on this RGGI 12 program. And we have to look at their -- 13 how much performance incentive they 14 provided. But they're the same for the same 15 type of programs.</p> <p>16 And another concern is how much 17 administrative cost they provide. If you 18 look at our -- that's another concern.</p> <p>19 So, just focusing on performance 20 incentive -- forget about administrative 21 costs -- then we have to look on that model 22 running under SED, how much is spent on 23 performance incentive, should that not be 24 reflected when it is under CORE or not? We</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 44</p> <p>1 which had a fundamental misunderstanding of 2 Staff's testimony and presented the idea 3 that Staff was looking at a program that was 4 drawing down to the end of life in its 5 Option 1. And that was a significant, 6 fundamental misread of Staff's testimony.</p> <p>7 Staff is not recommending an Option 1 8 to focus on an electric-only program in the 9 context of the HES. Staff is focusing on 10 delivering service to electric customers as 11 they continue to show up; however, to focus 12 the balance of the budget towards electric 13 energy-efficiency programs, such as lighting 14 programs and appliance programs.</p> <p>15 So, Option 1 is not a program that's 16 very restrictive. It's a program that's 17 very active and alive and still dynamic. As 18 we talk about the GDS potential study, there 19 are plenty of additional opportunities to 20 pursue electric savings, and that's what our 21 Option 1 recommends.</p> <p>22 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) And just to clarify, are you 23 suggesting that if the HPwES program there 24 is not enough customers for HPwES program as</p>

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 45</p> <p>1 designed, then are you talking about the</p> <p>2 ancillary savings we talked about or -- I</p> <p>3 was not sure of your question.</p> <p>4 Q. Well, my question was -- I'll phrase it in a</p> <p>5 different way.</p> <p>6 In the discussion you had with</p> <p>7 Commissioner Harrington, you were talking</p> <p>8 about concern over double-counting, for</p> <p>9 instance, with the HPwES program. And the</p> <p>10 context was somebody has come into the HPwES</p> <p>11 program. Part of the audit said do your</p> <p>12 lights also. And even if they did do the</p> <p>13 lights, you were saying, well, that should</p> <p>14 have been counted, or would have been -- or</p> <p>15 the implication was it would have happened</p> <p>16 under the lighting program. And I'm</p> <p>17 questioning: Is that true, though? Would</p> <p>18 it necessarily have happened under the</p> <p>19 lighting program?</p> <p>20 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) No, we didn't imply that they</p> <p>21 were double-counting. We didn't. But the</p> <p>22 point we are trying to make, that when we</p> <p>23 are talking about saving electricity through</p> <p>24 this weatherization program because of</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 47</p> <p>1 70 percent of our total resources to get</p> <p>2 those same 14 percent of savings. And we</p> <p>3 all agree, and the utilities agree, that we</p> <p>4 don't have enough money to save electricity.</p> <p>5 So, when we don't have any money, enough</p> <p>6 money, almost one fifth, GDS pointed out</p> <p>7 that every year, to get those potential, we</p> <p>8 have to spend 38 million, and we have only</p> <p>9 7 million every year; and now we are saying,</p> <p>10 okay, let's focus on this 14 percent and</p> <p>11 invest all our money in there. That is --</p> <p>12 from my common sense, it says that is</p> <p>13 unreasonable.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>15 A. (By Mr. Cunningham) If I could just add?</p> <p>16 The point that my colleague is making about</p> <p>17 ancillary savings was a significant point</p> <p>18 that was used by the Commission -- in fact,</p> <p>19 called "significant." At least the</p> <p>20 Commission expected a "significant ancillary</p> <p>21 savings" from the fuel-blind program. The</p> <p>22 Company has said we disagree with the</p> <p>23 Commission. We don't disagree with the</p> <p>24 Commission. We want to clarify the record</p>
<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 46</p> <p>1 ancillary service, we are pointing out that</p> <p>2 if you take out this lighting program,</p> <p>3 because we have a separate -- several</p> <p>4 separate lighting program and appliance</p> <p>5 savings, there is not much ancillary</p> <p>6 service, because lighting should be done by</p> <p>7 lighting program, appliance could be done by</p> <p>8 the appliance program. So the point</p> <p>9 utilities are making, that to get all this</p> <p>10 service we have to do weatherization,</p> <p>11 otherwise we are keeping out a huge</p> <p>12 potential of electric savings, that is not</p> <p>13 true. Even GDS says that only 10 percent</p> <p>14 is -- 10-percent potential is coming from</p> <p>15 weatherization, which includes electric heat</p> <p>16 customer and all these other ancillary</p> <p>17 savings from weatherizing other heating fuel</p> <p>18 customers.</p> <p>19 So that's why we raise that issue, that</p> <p>20 we are already spending 43 percent of our</p> <p>21 total resources to get those ancillary</p> <p>22 savings, and those ancillary savings is only</p> <p>23 14 percent of the total potential. And now</p> <p>24 we are saying that we should invest</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 48</p> <p>1 on that. We believe the Company's proposal</p> <p>2 disagrees with the Commission's</p> <p>3 expectations. The Company's proposal</p> <p>4 includes zero ancillary savings. The</p> <p>5 Commission thought it could include</p> <p>6 "significant" electric savings.</p> <p>7 Furthermore -- and that can be found on the</p> <p>8 Company's testimony, Page 12, Line 22.</p> <p>9 Furthermore, the Cadmus report that the</p> <p>10 Commission asked the companies to pursue to</p> <p>11 evaluate the HPwES program identified zero</p> <p>12 ancillary savings, electric ancillary</p> <p>13 savings.</p> <p>14 Subsequent to our testimony, the</p> <p>15 companies went back to Cadmus to try to cull</p> <p>16 out of their report, "Aren't there any</p> <p>17 ancillary electric savings for this</p> <p>18 fuel-blind program?" And they found 43</p> <p>19 kilowatt hours of savings. Just to put that</p> <p>20 into perspective, there's maybe 28,000</p> <p>21 equivalent kilowatt hours of usage every</p> <p>22 year, and the ancillary savings that the</p> <p>23 Cadmus folks identified for the Company were</p> <p>24 43 out of 28,000 per year, or one-tenth of</p>

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 49</p> <p>1 1 percent of the savings. Thank you.</p> <p>2 CMSR. SCOTT: I'm all set.</p> <p>3 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank</p> <p>4 you. Yes, Mr. Iqbal.</p> <p>5 WITNESS IQBAL: Just one</p> <p>6 more clarification. When we talk about the</p> <p>7 38 million, I remember the utility witness</p> <p>8 talks about whether that includes customer</p> <p>9 cost or not. And there is that issue that</p> <p>10 38 million is a good number, but it might</p> <p>11 not reflect the whole cost. And I went back</p> <p>12 into that, and that 38 million include</p> <p>13 customer cost, but it doesn't include</p> <p>14 administrative cost and PI. And if you look</p> <p>15 at that, how much administrative costs are,</p> <p>16 it is -- administrative cost alone is</p> <p>17 24 percent, and customer cost is also</p> <p>18 23 percent. So it crosses out each other.</p> <p>19 So when we are talking about</p> <p>20 38 million, we are talking about without</p> <p>21 customer cost, because if you exclude</p> <p>22 customer cost and include administrative</p> <p>23 cost only, and if you add another</p> <p>24 12 percent, it will be more than that. So</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 51</p> <p>1 Yeah. See if I can find that piece of</p> <p>2 paper. The specific reference is from</p> <p>3 Public Service Company of New Hampshire's</p> <p>4 filing for performance incentive in Docket</p> <p>5 08-120, Attachment F, revised June 30th,</p> <p>6 2009, Page 1A of 4, column heading --</p> <p>7 exhibit title, "2009 Actual," column heading</p> <p>8 second from the right, quote, Summer</p> <p>9 Kilowatt Savings, 582.9.</p> <p>10 Q. Thank you.</p> <p>11 A. (By Mr. Cunningham) You're welcome. My</p> <p>12 pleasure.</p> <p>13 Q. And that document should be in the -- that's</p> <p>14 made available to all the parties as part of</p> <p>15 the performance incentive filings, or is</p> <p>16 that only part of --</p> <p>17 A. (By Mr. Cunningham) Yes. That's correct.</p> <p>18 Everybody would have that.</p> <p>19 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) It is available online.</p> <p>20 Q. Is the Staff's recommendation to continue</p> <p>21 HPwES as a pilot and continue to study it,</p> <p>22 or to abandon it as of this Commission</p> <p>23 order?</p> <p>24 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) I think we think that HPwES</p>
<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 50</p> <p>1 we need more than \$38 million from utility</p> <p>2 cost only, according to the GDS.</p> <p>3 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I have a</p> <p>4 few questions.</p> <p>5 INTERROGATORIES BY CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS:</p> <p>6 Q. Mr. Cunningham, you were given some figures</p> <p>7 from an exhibit, and I'm not -- from a</p> <p>8 document, and I'm not sure if it's an</p> <p>9 exhibit in the record or not. You said that</p> <p>10 you were reading from something to get that</p> <p>11 in the 2009 period, when HES had been</p> <p>12 electric-only program, it was achieving</p> <p>13 538 kilowatts of savings. What were you</p> <p>14 reading from?</p> <p>15 A. (By Mr. Cunningham) That is a filing that --</p> <p>16 that was the actual data for 2009 that the</p> <p>17 companies filed in their filing for</p> <p>18 performance incentives for the year 2009,</p> <p>19 and the docket number is 08-120.</p> <p>20 Q. And in the column heading that you're</p> <p>21 reading from that gets to the 583 kilowatts</p> <p>22 was that? I just want to make sure we're</p> <p>23 comparing apples to apples.</p> <p>24 A. (By Mr. Cunningham) Column heading, okay.</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 52</p> <p>1 program as filed should not continue. It</p> <p>2 should focus on electric customers only. If</p> <p>3 in the future HPwES program is saturated, or</p> <p>4 all electric customers have been served,</p> <p>5 then, just like any other program, when it</p> <p>6 is saturated, that means we achieved our</p> <p>7 goal. So we have to shift this money and</p> <p>8 get other electric opportunities. One</p> <p>9 question might be: Then how that is fair?</p> <p>10 That is fair because when we are saving</p> <p>11 electricity, everybody is benefiting from</p> <p>12 the secondary benefit. But when we are</p> <p>13 saving fuel, nobody -- electric system is</p> <p>14 not benefiting. So if your choice is to</p> <p>15 save oil or save electricity, we be</p> <p>16 overwhelmingly for electricity savings.</p> <p>17 And it is not that we have to run a</p> <p>18 HPwES program or weatherization program.</p> <p>19 The difference is whether the market is</p> <p>20 transformed or not, whether all the</p> <p>21 customers are served or not.</p> <p>22 Just like we see that when a program is</p> <p>23 mature and saturated, or market is</p> <p>24 transformed, the obvious path to take is</p>

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 53</p> <p>1 reduce this funding of this program to lower 2 and lower and lower and then get out of this 3 program. It is nowhere in any legislation 4 or any order or anywhere which says there 5 has to be a weatherization program. And on 6 that matter, we already have a 7 weatherization program, which is low-income 8 weatherization program. Even when this 9 weatherization program doesn't exist anymore 10 in the future, we still have a 11 weatherization program which will be 12 achieving the same 10-percent goal we are 13 talking about through that program. And we 14 are -- nobody is suggesting that that 15 program don't have to -- that program has to 16 be electric only, because those are special 17 program and a good exception for low-income 18 group. So, the notion that we have to have 19 a weatherization program for everybody is 20 false -- is not correct. 21 Q. Let me -- I still, though, am not sure of 22 your recommendation, because I'm trying to 23 ask you, is your recommendation that, as of 24 the new budget for the next two-year cycle,</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 55</p> <p>1 keep and find all those other 1500 customers 2 somehow, somewhere. So that raise another 3 issue. 4 So what we are saying, that serve these 5 customers, electric heat customers with 6 electric money. And if you think that this 7 budget is too high to serve those segment of 8 the customers, then shift this extra money 9 to some other program where we save 10 electricity. 11 Q. I know your concern is that it's a first 12 come/first serve program, and you had said 13 that that may result in some electric heat 14 customers not being served if they weren't 15 in the line at the right point and the caps 16 had been met before you get to them. Could 17 you solve that program by having a 18 requirement that any electric heat customer 19 be taken to the top of the list, and the 20 first come/first serve really apply only to 21 non-electric heat customers? 22 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) I think that would be tougher 23 to do, because if they commit to somebody, 24 and after that the electric heat customer</p>
<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 54</p> <p>1 there would be no fuel-blind HPwES program? 2 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Yes, that's our 3 recommendation. We say that we think that 4 there is enough electric heat customers, and 5 those customers have to be served if 6 required. Just like when Commission 7 approved this pilot program, they also 8 said -- the Commission also suggested that 9 they limit it to 200 customers for PSNH and 10 100 customers for UES. And another 11 suggestion in that order was that the extra 12 money could be used in other programs. And 13 unfortunately, or fortunately, it has chose 14 to keep it within that program and still 15 serving some of the electric measures for 16 lots of customers. 17 Like, if you look at 2009 -- I don't 18 remember exact number of how many customer 19 they serve -- their fuel blind was limited 20 to 100, 200 customers. And ultimately, end 21 of the year they serve almost 1700 22 customers. So that also says something 23 about that, that they can find customers. 24 But they don't shift the money either. They</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 56</p> <p>1 comes in, then what they do with that 2 customer who is not electric heat customer? 3 Should they kick them out? Or how they 4 accommodate that? So, if you change it to 5 from first come/first serve to something 6 that if you're electric heat customers you 7 are at the top of the list, it might create 8 another problem for the utilities: How do 9 you deal with those customers who are being 10 demoted from the list? 11 Q. Other than the administrative difficulties, 12 if there were a way the utilities felt they 13 could handle that, would you have an issue 14 with that approach? 15 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) We still have this fairness 16 issue. That may solve one problem, that now 17 we are prioritizing electric customers. But 18 fairness issue is not gone. Fairness issue 19 still there. 20 Q. And I know you explained to Mr. -- 21 Commissioner Harrington why the other 22 fuel-blind programs weren't -- didn't raise 23 the same fairness issues. And I just -- I 24 confess I don't understand why fairness</p>

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 57</p> <p>1 isn't a significant worry to you in the</p> <p>2 other programs, but it is in this program.</p> <p>3 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Particularly for low-income</p> <p>4 group, that is no-brainer, because they</p> <p>5 cannot afford it, afford the co-payment.</p> <p>6 And if you just select -- because of the</p> <p>7 Commission's decision to serve them and</p> <p>8 create an exception. So -- and the ENERGY</p> <p>9 STAR program is also an exception.</p> <p>10 Commission created that exception. Now we</p> <p>11 are seeing a trend using those exception and</p> <p>12 making that as a rule. Exception is</p> <p>13 exception. If we take exception and protect</p> <p>14 it in other field, then it would not be</p> <p>15 exception because it will be the rule. So</p> <p>16 that's the point we are in right now.</p> <p>17 And when we look at the budget level,</p> <p>18 43 percent of the budget; so, another</p> <p>19 57 percent of the budget is dedicated for</p> <p>20 electricity. So we can still say that this</p> <p>21 program is electric energy-efficiency</p> <p>22 program. But if it goes beyond</p> <p>23 50 percent -- or right now it's</p> <p>24 70 percent -- can it still call this a</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 59</p> <p>1 car insurance, your car is covered. And if</p> <p>2 you need your home covered, you have to pay</p> <p>3 something else, home insurance. But here we</p> <p>4 are trying to say that everybody who has car</p> <p>5 insurance, their houses should be -- their</p> <p>6 homes should be covered, too. That is the</p> <p>7 situation we are in. Then, that is okay</p> <p>8 until we ask some of the homeowners to pay</p> <p>9 for the home insurance. That is happening</p> <p>10 right now.</p> <p>11 So we are saying that everybody paying</p> <p>12 for lighting and appliances, they should get</p> <p>13 the benefit of lighting and appliance</p> <p>14 service. But those who are paying for</p> <p>15 heating, they should only get the heating.</p> <p>16 So, you get what you pay for. That is the</p> <p>17 basic idea of all the whole thing.</p> <p>18 Q. And you had said you thought it would be</p> <p>19 fair if your customer, who pays a SBC for</p> <p>20 electric power and light and paying an LDAC</p> <p>21 for gas heat, that it would be fair to drop</p> <p>22 the LDAC payment for those customers and</p> <p>23 only pay the SBC?</p> <p>24 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) In that situation, they will</p>
<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 58</p> <p>1 electric energy-efficiency program? It will</p> <p>2 be called by the fuel-blind program. And</p> <p>3 unfortunately, this fuel-blind program is</p> <p>4 funded by electric customers.</p> <p>5 Q. You had given an example, and I realize it</p> <p>6 was kind of off the cuff. But you had the</p> <p>7 pizza deliveryman making his trip efficient</p> <p>8 by charging 1 person for 10 pizzas and</p> <p>9 giving 9 of them away for free. It doesn't</p> <p>10 really fit our situation, does it, because</p> <p>11 the other nine who are receiving it for</p> <p>12 free, in this context, are people who have</p> <p>13 paid into the SBC every year; correct?</p> <p>14 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) That's correct. But I have</p> <p>15 concern of that, too, because then I have to</p> <p>16 use another analogy, that those customers</p> <p>17 who are paying into that for their lighting</p> <p>18 and appliances, they're getting their</p> <p>19 benefit from the lighting and appliances.</p> <p>20 We have program for those. So it doesn't</p> <p>21 mean that they have to get all this benefit</p> <p>22 from all other programs.</p> <p>23 It's almost like the insurance</p> <p>24 situation, that if we say that if you have</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 60</p> <p>1 be on the same playing field, yes. But</p> <p>2 still, electric proportion of electric</p> <p>3 customers will still be paying for the</p> <p>4 heating portion of the SBC portion.</p> <p>5 Q. So if I'm following you right, you're asking</p> <p>6 the Commission to roll back how many years</p> <p>7 we've had of gas energy-efficiency programs</p> <p>8 and no longer fund those?</p> <p>9 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) No. We are saying that that</p> <p>10 is perfect model. We should be doing that.</p> <p>11 And how we do that? We ask the oil</p> <p>12 customers to pay for their weatherization.</p> <p>13 Q. But you're not making that recommendation,</p> <p>14 that the oil customer -- that we create an</p> <p>15 SBC for oil I thought you said earlier.</p> <p>16 That's a theoretical possibility, but that</p> <p>17 wasn't your recommendation; right? Did I</p> <p>18 get that wrong?</p> <p>19 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) That's the fair way to deal</p> <p>20 with it. But whether practically we can do</p> <p>21 that or not, that's another issue.</p> <p>22 A. (By Mr. Cunningham) Just with respect to the</p> <p>23 point my colleague made about the heating</p> <p>24 customers: Oil-heating customers are not</p>

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 61</p> <p>1 paying an energy-efficiency surcharge but 2 are getting the weatherization program; is 3 that fair? The Commission has a long 4 history of determining what's fair, in terms 5 of allocating monies for programs, all the 6 way back to 98,174 and Commission Order 7 23,172 it talked about the importance of 8 allocating budgets/benefits based on 9 kilowatt-hour sales. And the Commission was 10 talking in that order about the equity of 11 allocating an energy-efficiency budget to 12 residential customers and C & I customers. 13 What we have before us today is a similar 14 kind of an equity issue. We are looking 15 within the residential customer class, and 16 we're identifying the usage, the sales 17 within that class, as the basis for 18 allocating the cost benefits of this 19 program. And that's a continuation of our 20 Schedule 1, is a replication of the 21 Commission's Order 23,172 with respect to 22 the equity of allocating energy-efficiency 23 monies to various customer groups. 24 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Just to add to that, Exhibit</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 63</p> <p>1 questioned it and noted that it hadn't been 2 verified by a third party, therefore somehow 3 suggesting it wasn't reliable. But you rely 4 on every other number that the utilities put 5 forward, so why is that a particular area 6 that you took such issue with? 7 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Main issue of that, that if 8 it is close to all of the DOE number -- we 9 understand that there is some discrepancy 10 because of sampling and all these other 11 things. But it is not even near that 12 number. And we know that DOE do a very 13 detailed and very particular question -- 14 they ask very particular question and very 15 detailed question, 46 pages of questions 16 about their energy use. So -- and it has 17 been done for years and years. And 18 everybody use that. So, when there is 19 another study which comes in and say that 20 that number doesn't match, then it is 21 their -- the burden of proof is on them, 22 that why there is a big difference. But we 23 didn't see any evidence from utilities which 24 actually, with valid data, justified the</p>
<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 62</p> <p>1 33, it talk about running this program like 2 HPwES program. And the last page of the... 3 No. 8 circle, the last sentence says -- 4 CMSR. HARRINGTON: What page 5 number? 6 WITNESS IQBAL: Circle Page 7 8 of evidence Exhibit 33. 8 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) The last sentence says that 9 recommended non-electric measures may be 10 installed at the customer expense. So when 11 Commission approved that, they -- the 12 Commission actually took the position that 13 when you are not paying into that, then all 14 those things should be paid by the 15 participant. So that's another way to go 16 there, that all electric measures could be 17 dependent -- or incentivized, but all other 18 measures has to be paid by the customers. 19 Q. In your testimony, prefiled and on the 20 stand, you took issue with the utilities' 21 numbers on the number of customers who heat 22 with electricity. And I don't want to get 23 into a debate about the numbers, but I do 24 want to ask you, 'cause you said that -- you</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 64</p> <p>1 difference. That's all. 2 Q. Is it your suspicion that the companies are 3 manipulating the data to get the result they 4 want? 5 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) I have not said that. It is 6 all about the methodology they might be 7 using, the data they might be using, the 8 sampling size they might be using. It could 9 be anything in their methodology and their 10 data. So our position is that we should be 11 looking -- when we are talking policy 12 decision in particular, that we should be 13 using reliable, reputable and available to 14 everybody, that type of data, not a very 15 specific data which is not reviewed, which 16 is not -- which is not tested, which 17 methodology is not tested, and we don't even 18 know the methodology and details. 19 Q. And are you suggesting that when the Company 20 testifies -- both companies testify they're 21 having a hard time locating willing electric 22 heat customers to come forward and 23 participate, that they're being dishonest 24 about that?</p>

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 65</p> <p>1 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) No, we are not saying that.</p> <p>2 Q. And if they say we are running out of people</p> <p>3 and measures to do on the electric-heat-only</p> <p>4 customers, what is it that gives you the</p> <p>5 comfort that there are sufficient programs</p> <p>6 and savings and customers out there to</p> <p>7 funnel efforts into if the utility says they</p> <p>8 just can't find very many of them?</p> <p>9 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Because we have several study</p> <p>10 which supports our position. We have the</p> <p>11 GDS study in 2008, and they found there are</p> <p>12 lots of opportunity. So if we took -- and</p> <p>13 which PSNH is taking a contradictory</p> <p>14 position. So when you take a contradictory</p> <p>15 position on a study, which PSNH was also</p> <p>16 part of it, then if they didn't raise that</p> <p>17 issue that your numbers are not correct,</p> <p>18 then they should have raised that, and GDS</p> <p>19 might look into that details. So when we</p> <p>20 have the study and we ignore that and take</p> <p>21 another study which is not verified, and</p> <p>22 take our policy decision on that, that might</p> <p>23 not be a good policy decision overall,</p> <p>24 because we didn't know how those numbers</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 67</p> <p>1 should continue to -- they should be paid</p> <p>2 only on the electric savings and not on</p> <p>3 anything further?</p> <p>4 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) That's correct.</p> <p>5 Q. And is that the same treatment given to the</p> <p>6 other fuel-blind programs for performance</p> <p>7 incentives?</p> <p>8 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) It depends on the analysis we</p> <p>9 are planning to do. And we find that that</p> <p>10 makes sense for other fuel-blind programs.</p> <p>11 I think should also apply to other programs</p> <p>12 as well.</p> <p>13 Q. But currently, they're not separated out.</p> <p>14 The other fuel-blind programs earn an</p> <p>15 incentive without separating gas -- excuse</p> <p>16 me -- electric from other savings.</p> <p>17 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Yes. That's correct.</p> <p>18 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All</p> <p>19 right. I think that concludes the questions</p> <p>20 from us.</p> <p>21 Is there any redirect, Ms.</p> <p>22 Thunberg?</p> <p>23 MS. THUNBERG: Yes.</p> <p>24 REDIRECT EXAMINATION</p>
<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 66</p> <p>1 came to be.</p> <p>2 On the other hand, the other</p> <p>3 documentation, like DOE number or GDS</p> <p>4 number, which is verified, which is done by</p> <p>5 third party, if the choice is my number or</p> <p>6 GDS number or DOE number, I will always take</p> <p>7 DOE number, because everybody agrees with</p> <p>8 that. Even if my analysis showed lower than</p> <p>9 that, then I have to justify or find reason</p> <p>10 why my numbers are lower and justify that;</p> <p>11 otherwise, I would not even use my number,</p> <p>12 let alone the utility number.</p> <p>13 Q. Let me ask about performance incentives.</p> <p>14 You had suggested that it would be</p> <p>15 appropriate to develop different kinds of</p> <p>16 incentives for the varying degree of</p> <p>17 difficulty in achieving savings; correct?</p> <p>18 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) That is -- those are some of</p> <p>19 the issues we should think about. But we</p> <p>20 are not -- as I said, we didn't take any</p> <p>21 position on those issues. But we are saying</p> <p>22 that we have to look into those issues.</p> <p>23 Q. But your position as to performance</p> <p>24 incentives right now in this case is that it</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 68</p> <p>1 BY MS. THUNBERG:</p> <p>2 Q. Can we pick up with the most recent issue?</p> <p>3 The Commissioner -- Chairman Ignatius was</p> <p>4 asking about the performance incentive on</p> <p>5 HPwES. Mr. Al-Azad, when you spoke that</p> <p>6 Staff would -- Staff's position is a</p> <p>7 performance incentive only on the electric</p> <p>8 savings, your response is only with respect</p> <p>9 to SBC funds; is that correct?</p> <p>10 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Right now, yes, that is</p> <p>11 correct. But if RGGI can come in, and after</p> <p>12 our evaluation or the subgroup comes up with</p> <p>13 some other ideas, we can include that, too.</p> <p>14 So, yes, right now what you said is correct.</p> <p>15 Q. Let me ask it another way, just to make sure</p> <p>16 we're clear. Staff's position is that it</p> <p>17 would not oppose full performance incentive</p> <p>18 if there were other sources out there after</p> <p>19 it had gone through a review; is that</p> <p>20 accurate?</p> <p>21 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) That's accurate. But when we</p> <p>22 are talking about full performance</p> <p>23 incentive, it depends on the outcome of this</p> <p>24 study group, what that full performance</p>

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 69</p> <p>1 incentive is. Right now it's 12 percent. 2 What it will be after that, we don't know. 3 We have to go through the whole process. 4 Q. Understood. I was just trying to exact our 5 present position on -- Staff's present 6 position on a full performance incentive on 7 HPwES or not. 8 Next question. You were asked 9 questions about why isn't Staff concerned 10 about fairness with low income. Are you 11 aware that the legislature has directed 12 spending on low income? Either one of you 13 can answer. 14 A. (By Mr. Cunningham) Yes, we're aware of the 15 separate fund for the low-income folks. 16 We're also aware of the low-income program 17 and the Commission orders that specified how 18 the low-income program is to be allocated -- 19 is to be determined each year in the context 20 of the energy-efficiency CORE filings. 21 Q. And has any legislative directive on how to 22 treat low income factored into your decision 23 on why the present low-income program would 24 be fair or not fair?</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 71</p> <p>1 Thunberg, that seems to me to be questions 2 that certainly could have been done in 3 direct. So let's be careful that you're 4 really raising things that relate to 5 cross-examination or questions from the 6 Bench. 7 MS. THUNBERG: This is 8 questioning from Commissioner Scott. 9 BY MS. THUNBERG: 10 Q. Is it Staff's position that HPwES could 11 be -- could continue if other sources of 12 funding, aside from the systems benefit 13 charge, were incorporated? 14 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) That's our position. We 15 think that SBC should be focusing on 16 electric savings. If there is some other 17 form, that could be used for this fuel-blind 18 program, given that the other fund is 19 fuel-blind as well. So, our position is 20 electric funds should be used for electric 21 savings, and fuel-blind funds should be used 22 for fuel-blind savings. 23 Q. On Day 2 of the hearing, we had a 24 bogged-down discussion about your direct</p>
<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 70</p> <p>1 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) When you define "low income," 2 I guess you're talking about low-income 3 energy-efficiency program. 4 Q. Yes. 5 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) On that, I don't remember 6 there is any incentive direction -- 7 directives on that. But we know that part 8 of this SBC money goes for Home Energy 9 Assistance Program, almost half, 1.5 million 10 of the 3.3 million. So if that is an 11 indication, that means that legislation want 12 us to treat low-income group as a special 13 group. 14 Q. Next question -- and I want to get at this 15 question or this issue. Aside from market 16 saturation issues, we're talking about the 17 progression of HPwES and it being a useful 18 program going forward. Presently, how many 19 sources of funding fund energy-efficiency 20 programs? 21 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) Mainly two source of fund: 22 One is SBC, and one is FCM, Forward Capacity 23 Market. 24 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: And Ms.</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 72</p> <p>1 testimony and Schedule 1. And that's 2 Exhibit 35. And I just have a couple of 3 highlight -- or high-level questions on this 4 schedule, if you have it in front of you. I 5 just want to ask, what is this schedule 6 intended to show? Briefly. 7 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: And 8 again, we're not rehashing all of this. So 9 can you tailor your question to what you 10 feel needs clarification? I think we've 11 been through what is this intended to show. 12 So, what is your specific question that 13 needs clarification now on redirect? 14 MS. THUNBERG: I thought it 15 got very confusing when I was listening to 16 the dialogue between the Bench and the 17 witnesses as to what this was to show. So I 18 wanted to just have him succinctly state it. 19 If the Commissioners feel that they have an 20 understanding, a high-level understanding of 21 what this schedule depicts, then that's 22 fine. I can move on. 23 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I think 24 we're okay as is.</p>

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 73	[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 75
<p>1 MS. THUNBERG: Okay.</p> <p>2 BY MS. THUNBERG:</p> <p>3 Q. And I just want to clarify, Mr. Iqbal. My</p> <p>4 last question here, there was a discussion</p> <p>5 about low hanging fruit and high hanging</p> <p>6 fruit, and I thought there was a</p> <p>7 misstatement. I believe you had stated that</p> <p>8 low hanging fruit is harder to get. Did you</p> <p>9 mean to say that low hanging fruit is easier</p> <p>10 to get and that high hanging fruit,</p> <p>11 therefore, would be a higher incentive -- or</p> <p>12 that the incentive would differ?</p> <p>13 A. (By Mr. Iqbal) I think I said that -- I</p> <p>14 corrected that in the next sentence, what I</p> <p>15 meant, yeah.</p> <p>16 Q. You did.</p> <p>17 MS. THUNBERG: That's all</p> <p>18 the questions I had on redirect. Thank you.</p> <p>19 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank</p> <p>20 you.</p> <p>21 All right. Then the</p> <p>22 witnesses are excused. Thank you.</p> <p>23 I think it would make sense</p> <p>24 to take a break and let people organize</p>	<p>1 see if there are any objections to any of</p> <p>2 the exhibits being -- that are marked for</p> <p>3 identification being made full exhibits.</p> <p>4 MS. THUNBERG: No.</p> <p>5 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I see no</p> <p>6 one rising to that one. So let's strike the</p> <p>7 identification and make all of the exhibits</p> <p>8 full exhibits. Thank you.</p> <p>9 Are there any other matters,</p> <p>10 other than closings and then the waiver</p> <p>11 issue, which we should take up?</p> <p>12 MS. THUNBERG: Can I just</p> <p>13 say that it's been a pleasure working with</p> <p>14 Attorney Eaton in his last docket, last</p> <p>15 hearing. And I think my colleagues and the</p> <p>16 rest of the parties in this room would also</p> <p>17 agree.</p> <p>18 (Audience applauding.)</p> <p>19 CMSR. HARRINGTON: You have</p> <p>20 to admit, we made you work until the last</p> <p>21 one.</p> <p>22 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Yes,</p> <p>23 thank you for saying that. Our theory was</p> <p>24 if we could keep extending this docket out</p>
[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 74	[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 76
<p>1 their thoughts about response to the request</p> <p>2 for waiver from Unitil Energy Systems and</p> <p>3 Northern Utilities and make some notes for</p> <p>4 oral closings. Why don't we take a break</p> <p>5 until 12:00. That gives us 15 minutes to</p> <p>6 get organized. That work for everyone?</p> <p>7 MS. THUNBERG: Sorry. Until</p> <p>8 what time?</p> <p>9 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Until</p> <p>10 12:00. I mean, an alternative is to take a</p> <p>11 lunch break and come back. But I'm hoping</p> <p>12 that's not necessary. We've got the</p> <p>13 afternoon already scheduled up. Can we do</p> <p>14 that, run through lunch and be done, you</p> <p>15 know, I would think by 1:00?</p> <p>16 (No verbal response)</p> <p>17 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All</p> <p>18 right. Then let's take a break until 12:00.</p> <p>19 Thank you.</p> <p>20 (WHEREUPON a brief recess was taken at</p> <p>21 11:45 a.m., and the hearing resumed at</p> <p>22 12:01 p.m.)</p> <p>23 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All</p> <p>24 right. Our first order of business is to</p>	<p>1 longer, you wouldn't retire. But even</p> <p>2 10-188's got to come to an end at some</p> <p>3 point. You have a couple days left and a</p> <p>4 party next week; correct?</p> <p>5 MR. EATON: Yup.</p> <p>6 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I hope</p> <p>7 people can get there and wish you well</p> <p>8 there. And we are going to make you work</p> <p>9 down to the very end. So, thank you for</p> <p>10 everything all these years.</p> <p>11 Do we want to go first to</p> <p>12 closings, or do people want to speak to the</p> <p>13 waiver? I don't know if you think they sort</p> <p>14 of cross back and forth and have a preferred</p> <p>15 order of doing it.</p> <p>16 MR. EATON: The utilities</p> <p>17 heard a great many factual misstatements in</p> <p>18 the testimony of Staff today, and we find</p> <p>19 that we must await a transcript and file</p> <p>20 written comments. They were -- apples and</p> <p>21 oranges doesn't begin to describe the</p> <p>22 testimony of Staff today. It's apples and</p> <p>23 kumquats. For instance: 42-kilowatt hours</p> <p>24 for ancillary savings is savings in a year,</p>

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 77	[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 79
<p>1 and it's compared to lifetime kilowatt-hour</p> <p>2 savings. And we need the time to look at</p> <p>3 the transcript and compare it to the rest of</p> <p>4 the record. So I'm afraid we're going to be</p> <p>5 asking for written closing statements of at</p> <p>6 least 15 pages to be filed after the</p> <p>7 transcript is available.</p> <p>8 But I do think we're all</p> <p>9 prepared to go ahead and speak to the Unitil</p> <p>10 and Northern request for Park Place Home</p> <p>11 Performance. I'm ready to do that today.</p> <p>12 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank</p> <p>13 you. Have you discussed this with others?</p> <p>14 Do others have a position on the written</p> <p>15 versus oral statements today? Is there</p> <p>16 anyone opposed to Mr. Eaton's suggestion</p> <p>17 that we not do oral statements and, instead,</p> <p>18 have a transcript and a written submissions?</p> <p>19 MS. THUNBERG: I guess Staff</p> <p>20 is commenting on an unknown, because, I</p> <p>21 mean, this is a hearing that has disputed</p> <p>22 issues, disputed issues of fact. And Staff</p> <p>23 has opinions of factual representations that</p> <p>24 were made with Company witnesses as well.</p>	<p>1 input on some of those pieces of information</p> <p>2 that were presented this morning. So we</p> <p>3 have no objection to the written closing</p> <p>4 request. We are aware that that will add</p> <p>5 additional work and perhaps cost to the</p> <p>6 overall proceeding. We're sensitive to</p> <p>7 that. But we feel that the parties need to</p> <p>8 have every opportunity to represent their</p> <p>9 position as appropriate.</p> <p>10 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Any</p> <p>11 other comments on the request to do written</p> <p>12 rather than oral closings? Mr. Linder?</p> <p>13 MR. LINDER: We do not</p> <p>14 object to having written closings.</p> <p>15 Just a clarification</p> <p>16 question. I assume there would be no</p> <p>17 response closings, that everybody would just</p> <p>18 submit their closing at one time and that</p> <p>19 would end it.</p> <p>20 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: That</p> <p>21 would be our expectation as well.</p> <p>22 Any other comments? I</p> <p>23 guess, most importantly, any objection to</p> <p>24 the request, other than Staff's preference?</p>
[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 78	[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 80
<p>1 But Staff would prefer to go forward with</p> <p>2 oral closings. If there are egregious</p> <p>3 facts, I mean, certainly, you know, Staff</p> <p>4 would welcome corrections of that record.</p> <p>5 But I'm just hesitant to agree to 15 pages</p> <p>6 of written closings without really knowing</p> <p>7 what facts. And I understand the position</p> <p>8 that PSNH is putting -- or is in, that it</p> <p>9 wants to see the transcript because it's</p> <p>10 perceiving that there are misstatements of</p> <p>11 fact.</p> <p>12 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Mr.</p> <p>13 Eckberg, did you have a comment?</p> <p>14 MR. ECKBERG: While I would</p> <p>15 certainly prefer that Attorney Hollenberg</p> <p>16 deliver the comments of the OCA, she</p> <p>17 unavoidably had to leave for a few minutes.</p> <p>18 We expect her back shortly. But we -- I do</p> <p>19 feel that I can represent that our office</p> <p>20 has no objection to the written closings.</p> <p>21 We were likewise surprised with many of the</p> <p>22 statements and new information that was</p> <p>23 provided this morning, and it may be very</p> <p>24 appropriate for us to comment or offer some</p>	<p>1 MS. THUNBERG: Can I modify</p> <p>2 the objection to can we do it in 10 pages</p> <p>3 instead of 15, if you have to have</p> <p>4 attachments to corroborate? I mean, I</p> <p>5 suppose that would be acceptable. But 15</p> <p>6 pages just seems an awful lot to make</p> <p>7 corrections to testimony.</p> <p>8 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Well,</p> <p>9 it's not just corrections. It's the closing</p> <p>10 positions on the policy issues; is it not?</p> <p>11 (Commissioners conferring off the record.)</p> <p>12 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All</p> <p>13 right. We will grant the request to go to</p> <p>14 written closings with a 15-page limit. That</p> <p>15 doesn't mean a minimum of 15. It means a</p> <p>16 maximum. So please don't go on longer than</p> <p>17 you need to. But that's fine.</p> <p>18 Can we set it -- we don't</p> <p>19 know the exact date of the transcript,</p> <p>20 although I understand we're pretty caught</p> <p>21 up, because Mr. Patnaude's heading out next</p> <p>22 week and so he's trying to get everything</p> <p>23 done in advance. So if we say two weeks</p> <p>24 after receipt of transcripts, which I think</p>

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 81</p> <p>1 will be fairly soon...</p> <p>2 MS. GOLDWASSER: Sorry,</p> <p>3 Chairman Ignatius. I would respectfully</p> <p>4 suggest that perhaps we could do it faster</p> <p>5 than that, I mean, given the schedule for</p> <p>6 filing the next year's programs. Just if we</p> <p>7 can buy the Commission another week, I know</p> <p>8 Unitil would be happy to do that. I know</p> <p>9 that Attorney Eaton is retiring before that</p> <p>10 two-week period will be up. I don't want to</p> <p>11 force any undue hardship on the other</p> <p>12 parties. But I would respectfully ask --</p> <p>13 and we haven't discussed it. But given the</p> <p>14 August 30th, I believe, deadline for the</p> <p>15 next year's filing, if we can buy the</p> <p>16 Commission a week, I'd be happy to do that.</p> <p>17 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Meaning?</p> <p>18 MS. GOLDWASSER: One week</p> <p>19 after the transcript, 'cause most of us can</p> <p>20 do most of our closings before we receive</p> <p>21 transcripts. It's only a question of these</p> <p>22 other factual questions that would have to</p> <p>23 be supplemented.</p> <p>24 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Any</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 83</p> <p>1 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All</p> <p>2 right. We can go around the room. I guess</p> <p>3 I'm -- if there's any -- maybe it's useful</p> <p>4 to know, just sort of a show of hands, are</p> <p>5 there people who are opposed to the request</p> <p>6 for a waiver? And if there are none, then</p> <p>7 we don't need to have people go through</p> <p>8 lengthy explanations of why they're not</p> <p>9 opposed. Ms. Hollenberg.</p> <p>10 MS. HOLLENBERG: Sure. I</p> <p>11 don't have to go out of turn, though. I was</p> <p>12 only going to say I wasn't prepared to</p> <p>13 respond to this today, and so I'm really</p> <p>14 feeling a little unprepared to do that. And</p> <p>15 I guess to the extent that -- I'm wondering</p> <p>16 if the Commission would consider the parties</p> <p>17 including comments in their briefs in this</p> <p>18 docket, you know, basically their position</p> <p>19 statements, they could respond in that way?</p> <p>20 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All</p> <p>21 right. That's fine. That's fine. We're</p> <p>22 cutting the 10-day response date by a few</p> <p>23 days. So I'm not trying to cut off</p> <p>24 anybody's rights. I just thought while we</p>
<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 82</p> <p>1 objection to that?</p> <p>2 (No verbal response)</p> <p>3 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All</p> <p>4 right. So one week after the transcript is</p> <p>5 received is fine with us.</p> <p>6 And then I guess the only</p> <p>7 other issue is responses to the waiver</p> <p>8 request from Northern and UES.</p> <p>9 Ms. Goldwasser, you</p> <p>10 submitted the request. And it's fairly</p> <p>11 detailed, so I don't know if there's</p> <p>12 anything you need to clarify or add to it,</p> <p>13 or whether the letter alone covers it.</p> <p>14 MS. GOLDWASSER: Chairman, I</p> <p>15 think the letter stands for itself, although</p> <p>16 we're happy to respond to any questions that</p> <p>17 either the Bench has or the other parties</p> <p>18 have. We haven't had a quarterly meeting</p> <p>19 since this letter was submitted. There have</p> <p>20 been telephone conversations between UES</p> <p>21 staff and Commission staff. But that said,</p> <p>22 we're happy to respond to any questions that</p> <p>23 either the Bench has or the parties have</p> <p>24 today.</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 84</p> <p>1 were all here. But if you'd rather roll</p> <p>2 that into the written submissions, which are</p> <p>3 not that far off, anyway, that's fine.</p> <p>4 MS. HOLLENBERG: I think it</p> <p>5 would be helpful, too, for us to have an</p> <p>6 opportunity to just have a conversation with</p> <p>7 the Company and clarify issues; that way,</p> <p>8 it's efficiently presented to the Commission</p> <p>9 as possible and we don't have to do that in</p> <p>10 the context of this hearing today.</p> <p>11 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Maybe</p> <p>12 then, after we're done here, people do that</p> <p>13 as a group in case -- because I know, Mr.</p> <p>14 Eaton, you said PSNH has its own similar</p> <p>15 analysis it does. Maybe share that with</p> <p>16 everyone.</p> <p>17 MR. EATON: I'd like to</p> <p>18 share it with the Commissioners, not to make</p> <p>19 this go any longer than it needs to.</p> <p>20 Yes, we do projects like</p> <p>21 this ourselves. And I asked some questions</p> <p>22 of Mr. Galineau about it. And the</p> <p>23 individual customers, the tenants that are</p> <p>24 electrically heated, do not apply for the</p>

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 85</p> <p>1 program. It's the landlord who applies for 2 the program. He provides the customer-side 3 money. And the reason the apartments often 4 don't qualify under the Home Heating Index 5 is because two walls, at least, are not 6 exposed to the outside, so they don't have 7 as much heat loss as a freestanding home. 8 The other thing that I think 9 is important is, at the same time, we also 10 do energy improvements to the common areas 11 as well by replacing lighting with more 12 efficient lighting. 13 So it doesn't really fit in 14 the commercial side because it's not a 15 master metered apartment. These are 16 individual customers. But the application 17 is really done by the landlord, and he 18 provides the matching funds to match the 19 rebates. 20 So it's -- the bottom line 21 is that we agree with the statements made in 22 the letter, that these are all 23 cost-effective, and they're all done within 24 the budget of a HPwES program, and ought to</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 87</p> <p>1 programs that we don't want to get bumped as 2 programs such as HPwES develop in areas that 3 we've discussed today. And also, this was 4 consistent with, I think, Option 1 that 5 Staff had suggested in its testimony. So 6 that was the only comment, that Staff is 7 very supportive of monies going to these 8 kind of programs. Thank you. 9 MS. GOLDWASSER: Can I? 10 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Sure. 11 MS. GOLDWASSER: I just have 12 a clarification. 13 As we state in our request, 14 we found that we wanted to bring this to the 15 Commission's attention with the interest of 16 shining a light on a really exciting 17 project, but also in the interest of shining 18 a light on a project we knew that Staff 19 would have an interest in, in the context of 20 this proceeding. 21 That said, when I reviewed 22 the filings regarding these programs and 23 discussed the rules with UES, it was unclear 24 to us whether we needed waivers for this</p>
<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 86</p> <p>1 continue to be done because -- and I don't 2 want to make a blanket statement -- but 3 perhaps apartment dwellers are perhaps not 4 more -- they need some help with their 5 electric bill as well, and their heating 6 bill, even if they're not qualified for home 7 energy assistance or other low-income 8 programs, that we should continue to do 9 this. And maybe we need to flush it out 10 more as to what the guidelines for this 11 ought to be in our next filing. But I think 12 it ought to be allowed, and we fully support 13 the request that Unitol made. 14 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank 15 you. Ms. Thunberg. 16 MS. THUNBERG: Staff would 17 just like to make a couple comments, because 18 when Staff reviewed these waiver requests, 19 it struck us that these would have been 20 covered under the old Home Energy Solutions 21 Program. And it's these kind of programs 22 that we just -- we're very supportive to get 23 funding, even if we have to do a waiver of 24 the program, because these are the kind of</p>	<p>[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM IQBAL] Page 88</p> <p>1 project. So we are seeking waivers to the 2 extent they are necessary. We wanted to 3 make sure this project happened, and 4 happened quickly. And so we ask the 5 Commission to rule, if necessary, and to let 6 us know what rule we should be following. 7 And, of course, should a fuel-blind program 8 go forward, we would like to seek means of 9 avoiding this in the future and also 10 creating a -- seek means of creating a 11 preference for a project like this one and 12 to make sure that they get done, because 13 they should be prioritized. 14 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: And that 15 sort of protocol for the future could be 16 developed as part of the next filing? 17 MS. GOLDWASSER: Yeah, the 18 '012, whatever it's going to be for the CORE 19 filing in August. 20 And then, I believe in the 21 last paragraph of the letter we say, you 22 know, we say that that's our position. We'd 23 like to find ways of doing this in the 24 future should the Home Performance Program</p>

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM|IQBAL]

Page 89

1 be approved.
2 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All
3 right. Anything further on the waiver
4 request?
5 (No verbal response)
6 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Then,
7 although it sounds like there's support for
8 it from most people, OCA still wants an
9 opportunity to go through it a little more
10 closely and submit something in writing. I
11 take it there's no -- waiting another week
12 doesn't throw off any ability to perform the
13 project?
14 MS. GOLDWASSER: No, it
15 won't impact the project. The project has
16 actually occurred. And that's indicated --
17 or it was in process when we realized, and
18 this is part of the timing situation. It
19 was in process when we realized that we had
20 this question regarding the rules associated
21 with it, and we expedited getting a letter
22 to you as soon as possible about it. But I
23 don't think that there's anything that's
24 going to change from one week to another.

[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM|IQBAL]

Page 90

1 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All
2 right. So feel free to make comments on
3 that, to the extent you haven't already, or
4 need to supplement. If you feel you've said
5 what you need to say, don't feel you need to
6 restate it in the brief, but you may do so
7 if you'd like.
8 Mr. Linder, yes.
9 MR. LINDER: Just for the
10 record, we support the request.
11 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank
12 you.
13 Unless there's anything
14 further, we will close this hearing, await
15 the written submissions a week from the date
16 the transcripts are received. And we
17 appreciate everyone's participation. We
18 regret that Mr. Eaton has to work down to
19 the absolute wire writing the closing. But
20 I wish you luck. And I thank everyone in
21 this case for all of your work.
22 (WHEREUPON the hearing was adjourned
23 at 12:18 p.m.)
24

[WITNESS PANEL: CUNNINGHAM|IQBAL]

Page 91

1 C E R T I F I C A T E
2 I, Susan J. Robidas, a Licensed Shorthand
3 Court Reporter and Notary Public of the State of
4 New Hampshire, do hereby certify that the
5 foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of my
6 stenographic notes of these proceedings taken at
7 the place and on the date hereinbefore set forth,
8 to the best of my skill and ability under the
9 conditions present at the time.
10 I further certify that I am neither attorney
11 or counsel for, nor related to or employed by any
12 of the parties to the action; and further, that I
13 am not a relative or employee of any attorney or
14 counsel employed in this case, nor am I
15 financially interested in this action.
16
17 _____
18 Susan J. Robidas, LCR/RPR
19 Licensed Shorthand Court Reporter
20 Registered Professional Reporter
21 N.H. LCR No. 44 (RSA 310-A:173)
22
23
24

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

	78:5;80:3,5,15	38 (5) 47:8;49:7,10,12,20	14:2;35:14,17;36:18; 62:3,7	26:8,14;31:8;62:12; 63:24;89:16
\$	1500 (1) 55:1			add (6) 38:19;47:15;49:23; 61:24;79:4;82:12
\$1.6 (2) 16:6;39:20	15-kilowatt (1) 19:5	4	9	additional (3) 15:13;44:19;79:5
\$38 (1) 50:1	15-page (1) 80:14	4 (2) 22:19;51:6	9 (1) 58:9	address (2) 6:2;7:5
[15th (1) 6:3	40 (2) 22:2,5	92 (2) 35:14,19	adhere (1) 33:20
[sic] (1) 24:11	1700 (1) 54:21	42-kilowatt (1) 76:23	94.3 (1) 41:19	adjourned (1) 90:22
0	1A (1) 51:6	43 (4) 46:20;48:18,24;57:18	96-unit (1) 6:12	administrative (7) 42:17,20;49:14,15,16, 22:56;11
	2	441 (1) 41:17	97.4 (1) 19:6	admit (1) 75:20
012 (1) 88:18		45 (1) 38:11	97.4-percent (1) 41:6	advance (1) 80:23
08-120 (2) 50:19;51:5	2 (3) 32:1;34:17;71:23	46 (1) 63:15	98 (1) 13:14	advisement (1) 7:5
1	20,186 (1) 38:3	5	98,174 (1) 61:6	affects (1) 27:3
	200 (2) 54:9,20		98.5 (1) 37:16	afford (2) 57:5,5
1 (9) 44:5,7,15,21;49:1; 58:8;61:20;72:1;87:4	2008 (2) 19:19;65:11	5 (1) 27:10		afraid (1) 77:4
1.5 (3) 16:12;17:4;70:9	2009 (12) 18:11;19:2;40:11,12, 18:41;4:50;11,16,18; 51:6,7;54:17	50 (3) 25:4;41:18;57:23	A	afternoon (1) 74:13
1.5-megawatt (1) 16:8	2012 (3) 20:1;41:3,14	50-gallon (1) 27:20	A68 (1) 37:20	Again (6) 15:3;16:22;32:18; 42:1;43:5;72:8
1.6 (4) 16:10;17:3;18:1;19:8	22 (1) 48:8	538 (1) 50:13	abandon (1) 51:22	agree (7) 25:24;37:8;47:3,3; 75:17;78:5;85:21
1:00 (1) 74:15	22.3 (1) 22:4	55 (1) 11:12	ability (1) 89:12	agrees (1) 66:7
10 (8) 16:16,18;25:7,11,14; 46:13;58:8;80:2	23 (4) 41:2,14,15;49:18	568 (1) 40:24	able (4) 4:6,16;27:1;30:10	ahead (1) 77:9
100 (3) 35:17;54:10,20	23,172 (2) 61:7,21	568-kilowatts (1) 41:5	absolute (2) 12:17;90:19	air (2) 21:17,19
10-188 (1) 4:4	23,574 (1) 37:14	57 (1) 57:19	absolutely (1) 11:6	Al-Azad (1) 68:5
10-188's (1) 76:2	24 (3) 41:2,15;49:17	582.9 (1) 51:9	accept (1) 12:21	alive (1) 44:17
10-day (1) 83:22	27 (1) 34:5	583 (6) 18:12;19:2,14;20:1; 40:20;50:21	acceptable (3) 7:13,17;80:5	allocated (1) 69:18
10-percent (2) 46:14;53:12	28,000 (2) 48:20,24	6	accommodate (1) 56:4	allocating (5) 61:5,8,11,18,22
11:45 (1) 74:21	3	6 (3) 11:13,19;37:19	according (1) 50:2	allow (1) 6:16
12 (4) 39:16;48:8;49:24;69:1	3 (1) 36:14	6,500 (2) 22:5,5	accurate (2) 68:20,21	allowed (2) 15:22;86:12
12:00 (3) 74:5,10,18	3.3 (1) 70:10	7	achieve (4) 10:21;19:2;37:23,24	allows (2) 9:12,16
12:01 (1) 74:22	30th (2) 51:5;81:14	7 (3) 13:12;15:3;47:9	achieved (1) 52:6	alluded (1) 36:23
12:18 (1) 90:23	33 (2) 62:1,7	70 (2) 47:1;57:24	achieving (3) 50:12;53:12;66:17	almost (15) 16:16,18;17:16;19:6; 22:4;25:2;26:1;27:10; 39:17,17;43:10;47:6; 54:21;58:23;70:9
14 (3) 46:23;47:2,10	33,000 (1) 28:3	70-percent (1) 38:10	across (1) 15:15	
1490 (1) 32:24	35 (1) 72:2	8	active (1) 44:17	
15 (12) 17:5;18:2;19:9;20:3; 40:23;41:1;74:5;77:6;	35- (2) 27:20;28:7	8 (6)	actual (7) 18:11;19:1;21:2; 40:19;41:4;50:16;51:7	
			actually (10) 5:21;11:13;15:5;22:7;	

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

alone (3) 49:16;66:12;82:13 along (3) 9:9;23:2;32:6 alternative (2) 28:23;74:10 although (3) 80:20;82:15;89:7 always (2) 19:16;66:6 amount (4) 18:10;19:24;20:2;21:3 analogy (1) 58:16 analysis (7) 20:4;21:1,2;40:8;66:8; 67:8;84:15 analyze (2) 34:5;39:6 analyzed (1) 38:13 ancillary (15) 21:11;45:2;46:1,5,16, 21,22;47:17,20;48:4,12, 12,17,22;76:24 answered (1) 32:20 anymore (2) 35:9;53:9 anyways (1) 32:8 apartment (2) 85:15;86:3 apartments (1) 85:3 apparently (1) 26:20 appears (2) 9:9;22:20 appendices (1) 26:7 Appendix (3) 26:7,9;37:19 applauding (1) 75:18 apples (4) 50:23,23;76:20,22 appliance (9) 27:7;30:14;31:22; 32:9;44:14;46:4,7,8; 59:13 appliances (6) 27:4;31:1,16;58:18, 19;59:12 application (1) 85:16 applies (1) 85:1 apply (3) 55:20;67:11;84:24 appreciate (1) 90:17 approach (1)	56:14 appropriate (4) 6:16;66:15;78:24;79:9 appropriately (1) 21:15 approved (4) 37:14;54:7;62:11;89:1 approximately (1) 20:21 area (1) 63:5 areas (2) 85:10;87:2 arguing (1) 9:5 argument (1) 23:9 arguments (1) 6:15 around (7) 8:19;19:24;22:19; 30:21;36:11,17;83:2 array (1) 38:7 Aside (2) 70:15;71:12 aspect (1) 35:24 Assistance (2) 70:9;86:7 associated (1) 89:20 assume (4) 29:9;32:23;37:8;79:16 assumption (1) 14:5 Attachment (1) 51:5 attachments (1) 80:4 attention (1) 87:15 attorney (4) 7:14;75:14;78:15;81:9 Audience (1) 75:18 audit (3) 31:3;32:3;45:11 August (3) 39:4;81:14;88:19 available (5) 10:12;51:14,19;64:13; 77:7 avoiding (1) 88:9 await (2) 76:19;90:14 aware (6) 32:23,24;69:11,14,16; 79:4 away (3) 25:4;43:6;58:9 awful (1)	80:6 <div style="text-align: center;">B</div> back (18) 4:3;8:1;11:14;15:1; 16:22;19:20;27:17;29:5; 40:3;41:21;42:1;48:15; 49:11;60:6;61:6;74:11; 76:14;78:18 balance (1) 44:12 ball (1) 35:20 balls (7) 35:14,15,16,17,18,20, 22 barrier (1) 9:10 base (2) 14:13;35:5 based (4) 10:23;11:2;33:13;61:8 basement (1) 28:8 basic (1) 59:17 basically (1) 83:18 basis (2) 9:2;61:17 become (1) 38:10 begin (1) 76:21 below (1) 22:7 Bench (4) 71:6;72:16;82:17,23 benefit (25) 9:13,16;11:6,24;12:7, 20;13:1;15:10;16:20,20; 20:12;23:23;29:13;33:6; 34:17,18;39:11,15,19, 21;52:12;58:19,21; 59:13;71:12 benefiting (3) 11:22;52:11,14 benefits (5) 15:4;21:5,6,6;61:18 benefit-wise (1) 39:23 best (6) 10:12,17,18;24:4,6; 25:6 better (3) 21:16;22:11;37:22 beyond (1) 57:22 bias (1) 11:1 bids (1) 15:12	big (1) 63:22 bigger (1) 35:11 Bill (3) 32:24;86:5,6 bind (1) 33:13 bit (6) 8:1;15:2;33:23;34:9, 10;35:16 blanket (1) 86:2 blind (9) 10:14;16:14;19:4,13, 16,18,20;41:9;54:19 blue (4) 35:14,18,19,22 board (1) 15:15 bogged-down (1) 71:24 boiler (1) 21:13 book (1) 18:20 both (5) 10:3;13:2;26:15; 41:13;64:20 bottom (3) 15:3;36:13;85:20 breached (1) 9:11 break (7) 5:17;8:7,9;73:24;74:4, 11,18 brief (2) 74:20;90:6 Briefly (1) 72:6 briefs (1) 83:17 bring (1) 87:14 broad (1) 38:7 brought (2) 21:10;29:21 budget (9) 17:16;44:12;53:24; 55:7;57:17,18,19;61:11; 85:24 budgetary (1) 6:19 budgets/benefits (1) 61:8 builder (1) 10:15 building (2) 10:8,11 builds (1) 30:24 bulbs (2)	27:4;30:4 bumped (1) 87:1 burden (1) 63:21 business (1) 74:24 buy (3) 27:3;81:7,15 buying (1) 27:7
				C
				Cadmus (4) 21:23;48:9,15,23 calculate (1) 25:6 call (1) 57:24 called (2) 47:19;58:2 came (1) 66:1 can (53) 4:23;6:21;7:4,24; 12:16;15:11,18;16:2,22; 18:8,18;21:3;22:4,16; 23:5,7;26:4,11;27:4,6; 29:6,10;30:15,16;31:5; 34:9,9;41:1;43:21;48:7; 51:1;54:23;57:20,24; 60:20;68:2,11,13;69:13; 72:9,22;74:13;75:12; 76:7;78:19;80:1,2,18; 81:7,15,19;83:2;87:9 cap (2) 6:17;40:2 Capacity (2) 15:12;70:22 caps (1) 55:15 captured (1) 32:5 car (3) 59:1,1,4 carbon (2) 33:14,17 care (5) 13:9,10;21:21;23:7,13 careful (1) 71:3 case (3) 66:24;84:13;90:21 caucus (1) 8:7 caught (1) 80:20 cause (3) 5:9;62:24;81:19 certain (2) 6:6;27:4 certainly (3)

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

71:2;78:3,15 cetera (2) 13:17,17 CHAIRMAN (44) 4:2;5:6,14;7:19;8:8; 17:10;32:14;38:21;49:3; 50:3,5;67:18;68:3; 70:24;72:7,23;73:19; 74:9,17,23;75:5,22;76:6; 77:12;78:12;79:10,20; 80:8,12;81:3,17,24;82:3; 14:83;1,20;84:11;86:14; 87:10;88:14;89:2,6; 90:1,11 challenging (1) 39:5 chance (3) 5:16;7:1,8;10 change (4) 12:4;32:24;56:4;89:24 changed (2) 40:15;41:8 changes (1) 43:16 charge (14) 9:13,16;11:6,24;12:1, 7,20,22;13:1,1,25;11; 29:13;33:7;71:13 charged (1) 21:20 charging (1) 58:8 choice (5) 10:22,23;11:2;52:14; 66:5 choose (5) 10:24;30:10;31:8; 35:12,18 choosing (1) 24:23 chose (1) 54:13 circle (2) 62:3,6 clarification (5) 49:6;72:10,13;79:15; 87:12 clarify (9) 8:5,24;17:11;43:3; 44:22;47:24;73:3;82:12; 84:7 class (2) 61:15,17 clear (1) 68:16 Clearly (1) 28:18 clerk (1) 6:22 close (4) 5:21;8:12;63:8;90:14 closely (1) 89:10	closing (6) 4:10;77:5;79:3,18; 80:9;90:19 closings (13) 4:14,18;74:4;75:10; 76:12;78:2,6,20;79:12, 14,17;80:14;81:20 CMSR (9) 5:1;8:22;17:17;32:12, 17,22;49:2;62:4;75:19 colleague (2) 47:16;60:23 colleagues (1) 75:15 column (4) 50:20,24;51:6,7 combine (1) 26:11 come/first (4) 14:22;55:12,20;56:5 comfort (1) 65:5 coming (2) 24:14;46:14 comment (10) 7:12,16;8:12;21:21; 23:7;24:6;43:21;78:13, 24;87:6 commenting (1) 77:20 comments (7) 76:20;78:16;79:11,22; 83:17;86:17;90:2 commercial (1) 85:14 Commission (33) 4:22;8:20;9:4,6,23; 12:10,21;37:13;38:3,5; 47:18,20,23,24;48:5,10; 51:22;54:6,8;57:10; 60:6;61:3,6,9;62:11,12; 69:17;81:7,16;82:21; 83:16;84:8;88:5 Commissioner (9) 8:21;29:22;32:16,18; 40:3;45:7;56:21;68:3; 71:8 Commissioners (3) 72:19;80:11;84:18 Commission's (5) 37:19;48:2;57:7; 61:21;87:15 commit (1) 55:23 Committee (1) 24:2 common (2) 47:12;85:10 community (1) 6:12 companies (5) 48:10,15;50:17;64:2, 20	Company (8) 6:15;38:2;47:22; 48:23;51:3;64:19;77:24; 84:7 Company's (3) 48:1,3,8 compare (2) 36:19;77:3 compared (1) 77:1 compares (1) 41:12 comparing (1) 50:23 concern (7) 11:5;31:12;42:16,18; 45:8;55:11;58:15 concerned (1) 69:9 concerns (2) 7:3;33:8 concludes (1) 67:19 conditioning (2) 21:17,19 conferring (1) 80:11 confess (1) 56:24 confusing (1) 72:15 consider (2) 7:4;83:16 consideration (1) 26:15 consistent (1) 87:4 construction (1) 9:17 consumption (1) 29:3 context (6) 44:9;45:10;58:12; 69:19;84:10;87:19 continuation (1) 61:19 continue (8) 44:11;51:20,21;52:1; 67:1;71:11;86:1,8 continued (2) 13:22;25:19 contradictory (2) 65:13,14 conversation (1) 84:6 conversations (1) 82:20 convert (2) 39:14,14 Co-op (2) 16:14;18:6 co-payment (1) 57:5	copies (2) 6:9,21 copy (3) 5:8;7:7,24 CORE (8) 4:4;33:4,18,20;41:24; 42:24;69:20;88:18 corrected (1) 73:14 corrections (3) 78:4;80:7,9 correctly (3) 34:1;37:5;41:22 corroborate (1) 80:4 cost (20) 6:14;15:7,24;20:20; 25:13;37:23,24;42:17; 49:9,11,13,14,16,17,21, 22,23;50:2;61:18;79:5 cost-effective (7) 25:2,5,9,13;26:10,12; 85:23 cost-effectiveness (1) 31:6 costs (5) 15:16;20:10;25:1; 42:21;49:15 counted (1) 45:14 counting (1) 31:19 country (3) 23:11;30:22;37:7 couple (6) 21:16;26:16;27:6; 72:2;76:3;86:17 course (3) 15:5;29:20;88:7 covered (4) 59:1,2,6;86:20 covers (1) 82:13 create (3) 56:7;57:8;60:14 created (1) 57:10 creating (3) 12:13;88:10,10 criteria (1) 6:13 cross (1) 76:14 crosses (1) 49:18 cross-examination (1) 71:5 cuff (1) 58:6 cull (1) 48:15 Cunningham (11) 37:11;40:2;43:22;	47:15;50:6,15,24;51:11, 17;60:22;69:14 currently (2) 37:13;67:13 customer (28) 11:20,23;12:2,5; 14:13;15:5;27:13,14; 28:7;34:21;35:5,7; 46:16;49:8,13,17,21,22; 54:18;55:18,24;56:2,2; 59:19;60:14;61:15,23; 62:10 customers (67) 10:3,4;12:24;13:3,8, 10,11,15;14:3,11,23,24, 24;22:14;23:15,17,18, 18;28:4,14;34:13,15; 35:5,7,8,11;39:11,12; 44:10,24;46:18;52:2,4, 21;54:4,5,9,10,16,20,22, 23;55:1,5,5,8,14,21; 56:6,9,17;58:4,16;59:22; 60:3,12,24,24;61:12,12; 62:18,21;64:22;65:4,6; 84:23;85:16 customers' (2) 34:16;39:18 customer-side (1) 85:2 cut (1) 83:23 cutting (1) 83:22 cycle (1) 53:24
D				
data (9) 28:2;40:18;50:16; 63:24;64:3,7,10,14,15 date (4) 4:7;80:19;83:22;90:15 day (2) 38:21;71:23 days (3) 21:16;76:3;83:23 DE (1) 4:4 deadline (1) 81:14 deal (3) 26:23;56:9;60:19 debate (1) 62:23 decide (1) 10:13 decided (3) 33:11;39:1,1 decision (6) 25:9;57:7;64:12; 65:22,23;69:22 decision's (1)				

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

24:3 dedicated (1) 57:19 deeper (1) 29:6 define (1) 70:1 degree (2) 11:10;66:16 deliver (3) 25:7,14;78:16 delivering (1) 44:10 delivers (2) 41:16,18 delivery (4) 25:1,4,8,13 deliveryman (1) 58:7 demand (5) 40:5,6;41:7,11,16 demoted (1) 56:10 Deno (1) 7:8 dependent (1) 62:17 depends (3) 5:2;67:8;68:23 depicts (1) 72:21 describe (1) 76:21 design (4) 30:13,20,23;31:10 designed (1) 45:1 detailed (3) 63:13,15;82:11 details (3) 6:20;64:18;65:19 determine (1) 38:23 determined (1) 69:19 determining (1) 61:4 develop (2) 66:15;87:2 developed (2) 8:5;88:16 dialogue (1) 72:16 differ (1) 73:12 difference (3) 52:19;63:22;64:1 different (7) 21:8;28:17;38:16; 43:10,20;45:5;66:15 difficult (4) 23:1;35:4,8,16 difficulties (1)	56:11 difficulty (3) 35:10,10;66:17 diminishes (1) 40:6 direct (2) 71:3,24 directed (1) 69:11 direction (1) 70:6 directive (1) 69:21 directives (1) 70:7 directly (1) 33:15 disagree (2) 47:22,23 disagrees (1) 48:2 discrepancy (1) 63:9 discuss (1) 8:11 discussed (4) 77:13;81:13;87:3,23 discussion (6) 5:22;21:15;22:9;45:6; 71:24;73:4 discussions (1) 15:8 dishonest (1) 64:23 dispense (1) 8:1 disputed (2) 77:21,22 division (1) 42:11 docket (9) 5:21;9:1,6;18:20; 50:19;51:4;75:14,24; 83:18 document (3) 18:15;50:8;51:13 documentation (1) 66:3 DOE (5) 63:8,12;66:3,6,7 dollar (6) 15:20,22;20:12,17; 39:14,16 dollars (1) 29:13 done (15) 5:18;6:16;20:24;46:6; 7:63;17:66;4:71:2; 74:14;80:23;84:12; 85:17,23;86:1;88:12 door (2) 22:12;23:5 double-counting (2)	45:8,21 double-insulate (1) 28:16 down (5) 13:12;29:10;44:4; 76:9;90:18 drawing (2) 40:9;44:4 drew (1) 41:11 drop (1) 59:21 due (2) 15:16;39:4 during (4) 15:15;19:22;40:16,18 dwellers (1) 86:3 dynamic (1) 44:17 E earlier (2) 17:13;60:15 earn (1) 67:14 easier (3) 11:17;18:16;73:9 easy (2) 35:19,23 eaten (1) 43:9 EATON (8) 7:9;75:14;76:5,16; 81:9;84:14,17;90:18 Eaton's (1) 77:16 Eckberg (2) 78:13,14 effectiveness (1) 43:14 Efficiency (10) 4:5;6:14;9:18;15:17, 21;20:9,16;24:21;27:23; 37:18 efficient (3) 8:15;58:7;85:12 efficiently (1) 84:8 efforts (1) 65:7 egregious (1) 78:2 eight (1) 14:7 either (5) 33:15;54:24;69:12; 82:17,23 elaborate (1) 34:9 Electric (87) 4:5;9:20;10:18;11:4,7,	8,20,23;12:19;13:2,7,11, 19,20;14:3,11,15,20,23; 15:11,17,21;16:1;20:21; 21:6;22:15;24:20;26:2, 20;27:11;28:3;29:2,14; 30:9;31:14;32:5;34:13, 14,16,21;35:4;37:15,23, 24;39:10,12,18;40:13; 41:8;44:10,12,20;46:12, 15;48:6,12,17;52:2,4,8, 13;53:16;54:4,15;55:5,6, 13,18,24;56:2,6,17; 57:21;58:1,4;59:20; 60:2,2;62:16;64:21; 67:2,16;68:7;71:16,20, 20;86:5 electrical (6) 9:18;20:8,16;23:6; 25:20;31:16 electrically (2) 6:11;84:24 electric-heated (1) 24:9 electric-heat-only (1) 65:3 electricity (21) 13:16;14:4,9;20:20; 21:20;24:14,16,20;27:2; 28:12,18,20;33:15; 45:23;47:4;52:11,15,16; 55:10;57:20;62:22 electric-only (4) 40:14;43:4;44:8;50:12 else (5) 8:2;18:15;27:21,22; 59:3 else's (1) 24:10 emission (1) 33:14 emissions (1) 33:2 end (6) 6:24;44:4;54:20;76:2, 9;79:19 ENERGY (26) 6:7;9:15,18;10:5; 15:17,21;17:20;20:8,8, 16;22:22;24:20;25:20; 26:2;27:2;30:9;32:3; 37:17;42:10;57:8;63:16; 70:8;74:2;85:10;86:7,20 energy-efficiency (16) 11:9;20:15;23:10,24; 28:10;38:7;44:13;57:21; 58:1;60:7;61:1,11,22; 69:20;70:3,19 energy-efficient (3) 10:10,12,22 energy-savings (1) 25:23 enormous (1) 36:7	enough (6) 14:17;23:2;44:24; 47:4,5;54:4 enter (1) 15:12 equal (2) 39:17,17 equity (4) 11:2;61:10,14,22 equivalent (1) 48:21 especially (2) 15:15;22:24 established (2) 9:3;38:5 establishment (1) 38:17 estimate (1) 20:11 et (2) 13:17,17 evaluate (1) 48:11 evaluation (1) 68:12 even (12) 22:15;31:24;45:12; 46:13;53:8;63:11;64:17; 66:8,11;76:1;86:6,23 everybody (10) 12:13;51:18;52:11; 53:19;59:4,11;63:18; 64:14;66:7;79:17 everyone (7) 4:3,15;6:9;8:10;74:6; 84:16;90:20 everyone's (2) 5:23;90:17 evidence (4) 18:17,21;62:7;63:23 exact (3) 54:18;69:4;80:19 Exactly (2) 29:16;32:10 examination (2) 4:8;67:24 examine (1) 39:6 example (5) 26:4;35:13;36:3; 43:13;58:5 examples (1) 26:16 exceed (2) 6:17,18 except (1) 4:15 exception (12) 9:23;10:1,6;53:17; 57:8,9,10,11,12,13,13,15 exceptions (1) 9:23 exciting (1)
--	--	--	---	---

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

87:16 exclude (1) 49:21 exclusively (1) 25:20 Excuse (3) 18:13;27:18;67:15 excused (1) 73:22 Exhibit (11) 11:12;13:12;41:2,14, 14:50;7:9;51:7;61:24; 62:7;72:2 exhibits (4) 75:2,3,7,8 exist (1) 53:9 existing (1) 17:1 expect (1) 78:18 expectation (1) 79:21 expectations (1) 48:3 expected (1) 47:20 expedited (1) 89:21 expense (1) 62:10 explain (3) 7:15;9:22;10:7 explained (1) 56:20 explanations (1) 83:8 exposed (1) 85:6 extending (1) 75:24 extent (3) 83:15;88:2;90:3 extra (2) 54:11;55:8 extras (1) 7:8 extremely (1) 23:1	12:10,11;13:4;21:18; 34:18;35:1;39:22;52:9, 10;59:19,21;60:19;61:3, 4;69:24,24 fairly (2) 81:1;82:10 fairness (7) 9:6;56:15,18,18,23,24; 69:10 false (1) 53:20 fan (1) 21:14 far (2) 42:6;84:3 faster (2) 5:10;81:4 FCA (1) 20:7 FCM (1) 70:22 feel (9) 43:11,20;72:10,19; 78:19;79:7;90:2,4,5 feeling (1) 83:14 felt (1) 56:12 few (6) 8:23;23:18;29:11; 50:4;78:17;83:22 fewer (1) 13:24 field (2) 57:14;60:1 Fifteen (1) 17:7 fifth (1) 47:6 figure (2) 24:4;28:15 figures (1) 50:6 file (2) 5:19;76:19 filed (3) 50:17;52:1;77:6 files (1) 6:11 filing (12) 18:23,24;39:3;40:21; 50:15,17;51:4;81:6,15; 86:11;88:16,19 filings (4) 21:4;51:15;69:20; 87:22 final (2) 4:8;7:6 Finally (2) 38:19;43:3 find (18) 23:1;25:7;26:11;29:7; 35:4,8,15,20;36:3;41:15;	51:1;54:23;55:1;65:8; 66:9;67:9;76:18;88:23 finding (3) 22:1,1;35:21 fine (8) 7:20;8:9;72:22;80:17; 82:5;83:21,21;84:3 finish (1) 4:6 first (14) 8:3,7;10:1;14:21;18:8; 23:9;34:12;38:21;40:17; 55:11,20;56:5;74:24; 76:11 fit (2) 58:10;85:13 flush (3) 34:10;38:20;86:9 focus (7) 33:13;37:15,20;44:8, 11;47:10;52:2 focusing (4) 40:14;42:19;44:9; 71:15 folks (2) 48:23;69:15 follow (1) 16:9 following (5) 9:9;12:15;16:23;60:5; 88:6 foot (1) 22:12 force (1) 81:11 forget (1) 42:20 form (2) 23:12;71:17 formulated (1) 37:13 forth (1) 76:14 fortunately (1) 54:13 Forward (8) 15:12;33:10;63:5; 64:22;70:18,22;78:1; 88:8 found (9) 14:2;25:4,22;40:10; 41:2;48:7,18;65:11; 87:14 free (3) 58:9,12;90:2 freestanding (1) 85:7 front (2) 34:2;72:4 fruit (12) 36:1,2,4,5,8;43:7,12; 73:5,6,8,9,10 fruit's (1)	43:8 fuel (13) 10:14;16:14;19:4,13, 16,18,20;24:11;33:13, 16;46:17;52:13;54:19 fuel-blind (20) 20:18;22:3;38:10; 40:16,22;41:9;47:21; 48:18;54:1;56:22;58:2, 3;67:6,10,14;71:17,19, 21,22;88:7 fuel-neutral (6) 9:2,10;12:22;20:14; 29:15,18 full (9) 20:24;38:23;41:9; 68:17,22,24;69:6;75:3,8 fully (5) 34:4;38:20;39:6;41:8; 86:12 fund (7) 23:23;42:9;60:8; 69:15;70:19,21;71:18 fundamental (2) 44:1,6 funded (2) 10:2;58:4 funding (9) 14:18;15:13;20:7,8; 29:23;53:1;70:19;71:12; 86:23 funds (14) 14:17;15:10;20:13; 25:19;33:2,3,6,7;41:23; 42:5;68:9;71:20,21; 85:18 funnel (1) 65:7 further (7) 6:1;7:23;8:17;38:3; 67:3;89:3;90:14 Furthermore (3) 41:10;48:7,9 future (7) 20:10;33:3;52:3; 53:10;88:9,15,24	gets (2) 23:4;50:21 given (8) 10:16;14:18;50:6; 58:5;67:5;71:18;81:5,13 gives (2) 65:4;74:5 giving (2) 10:23;58:9 goal (2) 52:7;53:12 goes (4) 32:6;36:2;57:22;70:8 Goldwasser (9) 6:5;81:2,18;82:9,14; 87:9,11;88:17;89:14 Good (10) 4:19;6:1;8:23;23:21; 26:6;30:17;43:13;49:10; 53:17;65:23 grant (1) 80:13 great (1) 76:17 greatly (1) 40:6 greenhouse (1) 33:1 Grid (1) 16:15 group (10) 9:24;34:4;37:18;42:3; 53:18;57:4;68:24;70:12, 13;84:13 groups (1) 61:23 guess (8) 5:1;22:11;70:2;77:19; 79:23;82:6;83:2,15 guidelines (1) 86:10 guy (2) 25:3,15
F			G	H
face (1) 10:14 fact (3) 47:18;77:22;78:11 factored (1) 69:22 facts (2) 78:3,7 factual (3) 76:17;77:23;81:22 fair (16)			Galineau (2) 7:15;84:22 gallon (1) 28:8 game (1) 38:22 Gas (14) 4:5;11:21;12:2,5,18; 13:2,10,17;14:24;28:19; 33:1;59:21;60:7;67:15 GDS (13) 25:22;26:5,5;28:22; 29:5;44:18;46:13;47:6; 50:2;65:11,18;66:3,6	half (6) 5:5;30:8;40:13,17,17; 70:9 halfway (1) 40:15 Hampshire (2) 21:20;37:17 Hampshire's (1) 51:3 hand (3) 10:4;31:2;66:2 handle (2) 20:11;56:13 hands (1) 83:4 hanging (13) 36:1,2,4,5,7;43:7,8,11;

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

73:5,5,8,9,10 happen (2) 12:1;42:5 happened (5) 32:8;45:15,18;88:3,4 happening (1) 59:9 happens (2) 33:8;42:2 happy (6) 4:15,22;81:8,16; 82:16,22 hard (2) 5:9;64:21 harder (3) 36:4,6;73:8 hardship (1) 81:11 Harrington (8) 8:21,22;17:17;32:12; 45:7;56:21;62:4;75:19 Harrington's (2) 32:18;40:4 heading (5) 50:20,24;51:6,7;80:21 heard (1) 76:17 hearing (11) 4:4,7;38:22;41:14; 71:23;74:21;75:15; 77:21;84:10;90:14,22 heat (27) 9:19,20;13:8,16,16,19, 20;14:15,20;17:23; 22:15;26:20;28:19,20; 46:15;54:4;55:5,13,18, 21,24;56:2,6;59:21; 62:21;64:22;85:7 heated (3) 6:11;20:19;84:24 heater (2) 28:24;30:4 heaters (2) 28:1,1 Heating (20) 6:13;10:19;11:2,4; 13:9;14:3,9;15:24;27:9, 16,18;28:23;29:1;46:17; 59:15,15;60:4,23;85:4; 86:5 heat-pump (1) 28:24 heats (2) 11:21;14:15 help (2) 10:19;86:4 helpful (2) 18:19;84:5 here's (1) 22:16 HES (11) 16:3;17:11,15;18:9, 11;19:8,15,18;40:19;	44:9;50:11 hesitant (1) 78:5 high (5) 36:1,5;55:7;73:5,10 high-efficiency (1) 29:2 higher (1) 73:11 high-level (2) 72:3,20 highlight (1) 72:3 history (1) 61:4 HOLLENBERG (6) 4:19;5:4;78:15;83:9, 10;84:4 Home (16) 6:7,13;9:15,17;10:5; 17:20;59:2,3,9;70:8; 77:10;85:4,7;86:6,20; 88:24 homeowners (1) 59:8 homes (3) 6:18;26:4;59:6 hope (2) 6:24;76:6 hoping (1) 74:11 hot (3) 28:8,11,20 hot-water (1) 30:4 hours (5) 22:2,5;48:19,21;76:23 house (10) 10:8,11;15:23;21:17; 24:3,10;26:17,23;29:24; 32:24 household (1) 23:11 houses (5) 10:9,21;20:19;24:9; 59:5 housing (1) 9:14 HPwES (44) 6:17;13:21;14:7; 17:14;19:4;21:24;30:21, 22;31:1,14,19,20,24; 32:3;37:15,21;38:8,11; 40:5,11,22,24;41:12,17, 19;43:14,15;44:23,24; 45:9,10;48:11;51:21,24; 52:3,18;54:1;62:2;68:5; 69:7;70:17;71:10;85:24; 87:2 huge (2) 15:16;46:11 hundred (5) 12:17;14:6;21:19;	34:19;35:6 I idea (11) 10:8;11:22;21:4,7,9; 23:12;30:17;33:19,21; 44:2;59:17 ideas (2) 29:3;68:13 identification (2) 75:3,7 identified (2) 48:11,23 identify (1) 22:14 identifying (1) 61:16 IGNATIUS (43) 4:2;5:1,6,14;7:19;8:8; 17:10;32:14;49:3;50:3, 5;67:18;68:3;70:24; 72:7,23;73:19;74:9,17, 23;75:5,22;76:6;77:12; 78:12;79:10,20;80:8,12; 81:3,17,24;82:3;83:1,20; 84:11;86:14;87:10; 88:14;89:2,6;90:1,11 ignore (1) 65:20 impact (1) 89:15 implication (2) 43:5;45:15 implies (1) 43:18 imply (1) 45:20 importance (1) 61:7 important (1) 85:9 importantly (1) 79:23 impossible (1) 39:6 impression (1) 43:10 improvements (1) 85:10 incentive (29) 18:24;34:3,14,24; 35:21;36:9,11,15,17,19, 21;38:18;39:8,16;42:13, 20,23;51:4,15;67:15; 68:4,7,17,23;69:1,6; 70:6;73:11,12 incentives (13) 33:23;37:6,12;38:6, 24;41:22;42:2,7;50:18; 66:13,16,24;67:7 incentivized (1) 62:17	include (6) 32:5;48:5;49:12,13, 22;68:13 included (1) 38:14 includes (5) 17:2,22;46:15;48:4; 49:8 including (1) 83:17 income (4) 69:10,12,22;70:1 incorporated (2) 39:3;71:13 independently (1) 43:18 Index (2) 6:13;85:4 indicate (1) 40:8 indicated (1) 89:16 indication (1) 70:11 indirect (1) 16:19 individual (2) 84:23;85:16 information (4) 10:16,24;78:22;79:1 initially (1) 4:13 initiative (1) 33:2 input (1) 79:1 insignificant (1) 22:7 installed (1) 62:10 instance (2) 45:9;76:23 instant (1) 30:1 instead (2) 77:17;80:3 insulate (2) 15:23;29:24 insulated (1) 21:17 insulating (1) 20:19 insulation (1) 30:7 insurance (5) 58:23;59:1,3,5,9 integrated (1) 42:4 intended (2) 72:6,11 interest (3) 87:15,17,19 INTERROGATORIES (3)	8:22;32:22;50:5 into (23) 4:24;15:12;29:6; 30:17;32:4;33:18;34:15; 37:3;39:3;40:1;41:24; 45:10;48:20;49:12; 58:13,17;62:13,23;65:7, 19;66:22;69:22;84:2 introduced (1) 41:24 invest (2) 46:24;47:11 investigate (1) 43:1 investing (1) 39:20 investment (1) 39:22 involves (1) 6:5 Iqbal (79) 9:8,21;11:11;12:8; 13:4,6,23;14:21;16:2,11; 17:5,8,15,19,21,24;18:4, 7,20,23;19:13,18,21,24; 20:24;21:23;23:8;24:6; 25:21;26:5;27:8,24; 28:21;29:16;30:12,19; 31:12;32:10;33:9,24; 34:7,12;37:9;39:9;40:7; 42:8;44:22;45:20;49:4, 5;51:19,24;54:2;55:22; 56:15;57:3;58:14;59:24; 60:9,19;61:24;62:6,8; 63:7;64:5;65:1,9;66:18; 67:4,8,17;68:10,21;70:1, 5,21;71:14;73:3,13 issue (27) 7:9;9:2,7,7;15:1; 30:20;31:10;36:9,10; 39:24;46:19;49:9;55:3; 56:13,16,18,18;60:21; 61:14;62:20;63:6,7; 65:17;68:2;70:15;75:11; 82:7 issues (17) 5:22;29:20;37:2,3; 38:13,15,20;39:7;56:23; 66:19,21,22;70:16; 77:22,22;80:10;84:7 it' (1) 43:17
J				
jar (1) 35:14 job (2) 26:6,6 June (2) 6:3;51:5 justified (1) 63:24				

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

justify (2) 66:9,10	22:21;23:22;33:11; 69:11	5,13;18:8;26:7;27:15; 29:5,6;30:21;31:13; 33:9;34:11,15;36:12,15; 37:3,6;39:11;40:1;42:4; 9,12,18,21;49:14;54:17; 57:17;65:19;66:22;77:2	match (2) 63:20;85:18	8;65:19,22
K	lengthy (2) 5:3;83:8		matching (1) 85:18	miles (1) 25:4
keep (3) 54:14;55:1;75:24	less (7) 13:20,23;16:15;21:13, 13,14,17	looking (3) 44:3;61:14;64:11	matter (5) 5:15,20;7:5;10:6;53:6	million (16) 16:6,10,11;17:3;18:2; 19:8;39:20;47:8,9;49:7, 10,12,20;50:1;70:9,10
keeping (1) 46:11	letter (9) 6:3,21;7:10;82:13,15, 19;85:22;88:21;89:21	loss (4) 20:7,7,21;85:7	matters (1) 75:9	mine (1) 32:20
kick (1) 56:3	level (7) 35:10,11,22;36:8; 39:20,24;57:17	lot (3) 5:10;22:17;80:6	mature (1) 52:23	minimum (1) 80:15
kilowatt (9) 19:14;20:3;22:2,5; 41:3,4;48:19,21;51:9	life (1) 44:4	lots (5) 25:22;26:11;29:7; 54:16;65:12	maximum (1) 80:16	minutes (2) 74:5;78:17
kilowatt-hour (3) 37:20;61:9;77:1	lifetime (1) 77:1	low (16) 26:21;29:2;35:21; 36:2,4,7;43:7,8,11; 69:10,12,22;70:1;73:5,8, 9	may (9) 9:19;11:10;23:21; 24:1;55:13;56:16;62:9; 78:23;90:6	misread (1) 44:6
kilowatts (11) 18:12;19:3;40:19,20, 23,24;41:1,17,18;50:13, 21	light (5) 27:3;30:4;59:20; 87:16,18	lower (7) 14:10;15:7;53:1,2,2; 66:8,10	maybe (6) 17:5;48:20;83:3; 84:11,15;86:9	misstatement (1) 73:7
kind (7) 12:15;43:6;58:6; 61:14;86:21,24;87:8	lighting (26) 21:12;30:15;31:1,16, 17,21;32:9;41:13,15,20; 43:16,17,19;44:13; 45:16,19;46:2,4,6,7; 58:17,19;59:12,13; 85:11,12	low-income (14) 9:12,14,24;17:18; 53:7,17;57:3;69:15,16, 18,23;70:2,12;86:7	mean (10) 8:11;27:2;58:21;73:9; 74:10;77:21;78:3;80:4, 15;81:5	misstatements (2) 76:17;78:10
kinds (1) 66:15	lights (2) 45:12,13	luck (1) 90:20	meaning (2) 43:7;81:17	misunderstanding (1) 44:1
knew (1) 87:18	likely (2) 13:20,23	lump (1) 32:4	means (6) 24:7;52:6;70:11; 80:15;88:8,10	mixed (1) 33:6
knowing (2) 10:11;78:6	likewise (1) 78:21	lunch (2) 74:11,14	meant (1) 73:15	MMBtu (2) 22:4;37:21
kumquats (1) 76:23	limit (2) 54:9;80:14	M	measures (9) 10:13;26:9,10;28:21; 54:15;62:9,16,18;65:3	model (4) 30:22;36:11;42:21; 60:10
L	limited (3) 37:22;38:24;54:19		mechanisms (1) 20:22	modify (1) 80:1
lack (1) 22:11	limits (1) 6:19	mailers (1) 22:14	meet (2) 6:12,14	money (26) 9:13,16;15:14;18:10; 19:23;20:1,2;22:17,21; 24:14;27:1;30:2,7,8; 33:12;47:4,5,6,11;52:7; 54:12,24;55:6,8;70:8; 85:3
landlord (2) 85:1,17	Linder (4) 79:12,13;90:8,9	Main (1) 63:7	meeting (1) 82:18	monies (3) 61:5,23;87:7
last (12) 4:7;21:16;28:5;40:11; 62:2,3,8;73:4;75:14,14, 20;88:21	Line (3) 48:8;55:15;85:20	Mainly (1) 70:21	megawatt (1) 16:12	more (15) 8:14;16:16,18;23:17; 27:6,12;34:9;39:9;49:6, 24;50:1;85:11;86:4,10; 89:9
late (1) 18:17	linked (2) 30:18,19	major (1) 27:7	megawatts (5) 17:4,6,7;18:2;19:9	morning (8) 4:8,20;5:20;7:1;8:23; 40:10;78:23;79:2
law (1) 24:22	list (3) 55:19;56:7,10	makes (3) 6:15;24:12;67:10	mention (1) 37:12	most (9) 10:22;27:24;31:15; 32:19;68:2;79:23;81:19, 20;89:8
layer (1) 23:8	listening (1) 72:15	making (5) 46:9;47:16;57:12; 58:7;60:13	mentioned (4) 15:9;20:23;21:12; 38:22	move (2) 4:10;72:22
LDAC (5) 12:1,6;13:1;59:20,22	little (8) 15:2;19:7;33:23;34:9, 10;35:16;83:14;89:9	manipulating (1) 64:3	met (1) 55:16	moved (2) 15:21;20:17
least (3) 47:19;77:6;85:5	load (6) 15:13;16:5,7,12;18:9, 11	many (6) 54:18;60:6;65:8; 70:18;76:17;78:21	metered (1) 85:15	moving (2) 29:8;43:9
leave (1) 78:17	locating (1) 64:21	marked (1) 75:2	method (1) 28:12	much (17) 16:4,4,15;19:1,23; 20:20;21:21,22;23:22; 35:11;36:21;42:13,16, 22;46:5;49:15;85:7
left (1) 76:3	long (4) 5:2;27:11;28:2;61:3	Market (8) 15:12;23:13,13,16; 52:19,23;70:15,23	methodology (4) 64:6,9,17,18	multi-year (1)
legal (2) 9:2,7	longer (4) 60:8;76:1;80:16;84:19	Massachusetts (1) 36:16	metrics (1) 38:16	
legislation (2) 53:3;70:11	look (33) 6:10;8:10;13:24;16:3,	master (1) 85:15	middle (2) 11:19;13:13	
legislative (2) 24:17;69:21			might (11) 16:17;32:8;43:23; 49:10;52:9;56:7;64:6,7,	
legislature (4)				

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

39:3 must (1) 76:19	6:17;17:16;38:14; 49:10;50:19;54:18;62:5, 21;63:4,8,12,20;66:3,4, 5,6,6,7,11,12 numbers (11) 13:24;16:17;17:12,14; 40:9;41:12;62:21,23; 65:17,24;66:10	23;15:11;16:12;18:1; 19:5;22:2,18;24:19; 25:15;27:14;28:5;34:17; 35:18;36:14;40:23; 43:17;46:13,22;47:8; 49:23;50:2;51:16;52:2; 53:16;55:20;59:15,23; 67:2;68:7,8;81:21;82:6; 83:12;87:6	34:10,16;35:17;38:20; 40:7;46:1,2,11;47:6; 48:16,24;49:18;53:2; 56:3;65:2,6;67:13; 68:18;75:24;80:21; 83:11;86:9	particularly (2) 9:24;57:3 parties (8) 4:23;51:14;75:16; 79:7;81:12;82:17,23; 83:16 party (3) 63:2;66:5;76:4 path (1) 52:24 Patnaude's (1) 80:21 pay (12) 11:24;12:1,6,19,24; 34:18,23;59:2,8,16,23; 60:12 paying (12) 11:21;13:8;25:16; 34:13,22;58:17;59:11, 14,20;60:3;61:1;62:13 payment (1) 59:22 pays (1) 59:19 peak (17) 15:15;16:4,7,12;17:4; 18:9,11;19:1,9;20:1,3,6; 40:4,6;41:7,10,16 peers (1) 36:20 people (23) 5:10,16;12:18;13:19; 14:6,8;15:14;17:23; 23:2;26:19;27:5,6; 36:20;43:12;58:12;65:2; 73:24;76:7,12;83:5,7; 84:12;89:8 per (2) 22:2;48:24 perceiving (1) 78:10 percent (35) 12:17;13:14;14:2; 19:6;21:19;22:8,19; 27:10;31:15;32:1;34:17, 20;35:6,21;36:14,18; 38:11;39:13,16;41:19; 46:13,20,23;47:1,2,10; 49:1,17,18,24;57:18,19, 23,24;69:1 percentage (1) 26:21 perfect (1) 60:10 perform (1) 89:12 Performance (37) 6:7;18:24;33:23;34:3, 14,24;36:11,15,17,19; 37:6,12;38:6,18,24;39:8, 15;41:21;42:2,6,13,19, 23;50:18;51:4,15;66:13, 23;67:6;68:4,7,17,22,24;	
N	O	opening (1) 12:12 opinions (1) 77:23 opportunities (5) 25:18;29:7,12;44:19; 52:8 opportunity (8) 24:15;25:23;26:12; 36:7;65:12;79:8;84:6; 89:9 oppose (1) 68:17 opposed (3) 77:16;83:5,9 option (7) 10:17,18;44:5,7,15,21; 87:4 options (1) 33:9 oral (6) 7:1;74:4;77:15,17; 78:2;79:12 orally (2) 4:14,15 oranges (1) 76:21 order (16) 6:2;7:6;11:16;22:21; 25:3;37:14,14;38:3; 51:23;53:4;54:11;61:6, 10,21;74:24;76:15 orders (2) 9:4;69:17 organize (1) 73:24 organized (1) 74:6 original (1) 33:1 others (2) 77:13,14 otherwise (3) 20:15;46:11;66:11 ought (4) 13:7;85:24;86:11,12 ours (1) 39:22 ourselves (1) 84:21 out (36) 6:15;13:7;22:5,14,22; 24:4;26:5,8,19;27:12; 28:15,22;29:12;31:24;	outcome (1) 68:23 outside (1) 85:6 over (6) 5:17;8:10;20:17; 21:16;24:2;45:8 overall (5) 20:5;22:3;26:13; 65:23;79:6 overwhelmingly (1) 52:16 own (1) 84:14 owner (3) 10:15;31:4,7	P	package (1) 32:4 page (15) 5:5;11:13,19;13:12, 13;15:3;34:5;37:19; 41:2,15;48:8;51:6;62:2, 4,6 pages (6) 11:16;63:15;77:6; 78:5;80:2,6 paid (4) 58:13;62:14,18;67:1 paper (2) 6:1;51:2 paragraph (1) 88:21 paraphrase (1) 37:4 Park (3) 6:6,8;77:10 part (10) 18:21;33:4;38:6; 45:11;51:14,16;65:16; 70:7;88:16;89:18 participant (1) 62:15 participate (6) 14:16,19;26:22;31:8; 43:12;64:23 participates (1) 15:6 participating (2) 14:6,11 participation (3) 22:19;43:4;90:17 particular (6) 28:22;36:12;63:5,13, 14;64:12
National (1) 16:14 Natural (7) 4:5;11:21;12:2,5,18; 13:2,17 near (2) 39:5;63:11 necessarily (1) 45:18 necessary (3) 74:12;88:2,5 need (18) 5:17;8:3;23:4,19;36:8; 38:19;50:1;59:2;77:2; 79:7;80:17;82:12;83:7; 86:4,9;90:4,5,5 needed (1) 87:24 needs (5) 7:23;14:18;72:10,13; 84:19 neighboring (1) 36:16 neighbors (1) 25:10 new (8) 9:17;10:9;21:20; 28:10;37:17;51:3;53:24; 78:22 next (11) 30:1;53:24;69:8; 70:14;73:14;76:4;80:21; 81:6,15;86:11;88:16 nine (3) 25:10,16;58:11 nobody (2) 52:13;53:14 no-brainer (1) 57:4 None (2) 5:13;83:6 non-electric (5) 21:6;37:16;38:1; 55:21;62:9 Northern (4) 6:4;74:3;77:10;82:8 noted (1) 63:1 notes (1) 74:3 noticed (1) 5:19 notion (1) 53:18 nowhere (1) 53:3 number (20)	object (1) 79:14 objection (6) 5:11;78:20;79:3,23; 80:2;82:1 objections (1) 75:1 obvious (1) 52:24 OCA (2) 78:16;89:8 OCA's (1) 37:5 occurred (1) 89:16 off (8) 40:3,9;41:11;58:6; 80:11;83:23;84:3;89:12 offer (2) 7:20;78:24 office (1) 78:19 often (1) 85:3 oil (9) 14:24;15:24;17:23; 24:11;33:16;52:15; 60:11,14,15 Oil-heating (1) 60:24 old (2) 28:1;86:20 once (9) 8:14;11:22;32:18; 33:5,5,8;41:23;42:2,4 one (45) 5:15,20;7:7,24;10:1,2, 2,5,11;11:15,15;15:4; 19:3;21:9;22:8;25:5,11, 15;27:8,14;28:5;29:20; 30:19,23;31:9;34:20; 35:9;36:13;38:16;39:9; 47:6;49:5;52:8;56:16; 69:12;70:22,22;75:6,6, 21;79:18;81:18;82:4; 88:11;89:24 one-tenth (2) 22:8;48:24 online (1) 51:19 only (38) 11:22;12:6,24;14:7,				

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

69:6;77:11;88:24 perhaps (6) 38:16;40:2;79:5;81:4; 86:3,3 period (3) 8:13;50:11;81:10 person (1) 58:8 perspective (5) 34:20,21;39:10,19; 48:20 phrase (1) 45:4 PI (1) 49:14 pick (4) 7:24;30:10;36:7;68:2 piece (1) 51:1 pieces (1) 79:1 pilot (6) 17:2;20:14;29:19; 40:12;51:21;54:7 pizza (10) 25:3,5,7,10,11,12,14, 15,16;58:7 pizzas (1) 58:8 Place (3) 6:7,8;77:10 plan (2) 38:22;40:20 planned (2) 19:3,3 planning (1) 67:9 playing (1) 60:1 please (3) 7:7,24;80:16 pleasure (2) 51:12;75:13 plenty (4) 25:17;29:11;43:11; 44:19 pm (2) 74:22;90:23 point (16) 13:6,7;16:2;22:23; 26:8;32:7;34:7;39:9; 45:22;46:8;47:16,17; 55:15;57:16;60:23;76:3 pointed (4) 26:5;28:22;40:7;47:6 pointing (1) 46:1 points (1) 8:24 policy (4) 64:11;65:22,23;80:10 portion (2) 60:4,4	portions (1) 13:9 position (27) 8:6;25:17,21;33:11; 34:8;37:2;41:23;42:1; 62:12;64:10;65:10,14, 15;66:21,23;68:6,16; 69:5,6;71:10,14,19; 77:14;78:7;79:9;83:18; 88:22 positions (1) 80:10 possibility (4) 14:7,10,23;60:16 possible (3) 21:1;84:9;89:22 potential (12) 26:1,2,8;27:9,10,16; 31:5;44:18;46:12,14,23; 47:7 potential-wise (1) 26:14 power (1) 59:20 practical (1) 10:6 practically (1) 60:20 practice (1) 7:11 pre (1) 19:17 predecessor (1) 16:3 prefer (3) 4:24;78:1,15 preference (2) 79:24;88:11 preferred (1) 76:14 prefiled (1) 62:19 preliminary (1) 22:1 prepared (2) 77:9;83:12 prescribe (1) 31:4 present (3) 69:5,5,23 presentation (1) 40:10 presented (3) 44:2;79:2;84:8 Presently (1) 70:18 presumption (1) 9:1 pretty (3) 5:21;32:20;80:20 prevail (1) 33:19 previous (2)	9:3;15:8 prioritized (1) 88:13 prioritizing (1) 56:17 probably (1) 32:23 problem (2) 56:8,16 proceeding (2) 79:6;87:20 process (3) 69:3;89:17,19 profit (2) 34:19,23 program (153) 6:17,19;9:12,15; 12:12,23;13:18,22;14:1, 8,16;15:6;16:3,13;17:2, 12,14,15,18,20;18:1,9, 11;19:8,11,12,14;20:14, 18;21:24;23:3,10,12,20; 24:18,21;26:22;27:3; 29:15,18,19;30:13,14, 16,17,20,21,23,23;31:1, 9,18,22,23,24;32:9;33:2, 5,18;34:22;36:14,22; 37:16,22;39:12;40:5,13, 16,20,22,22,24;41:8,13, 16,17,20,24;42:12;43:5, 14,15,17,19;44:3,8,15, 16,23,24;45:9,11,16,19, 24;46:2,4,7,8;47:21; 48:11,18;50:12;52:1,3,5, 18,18,22;53:1,3,5,7,8,9, 11,13,15,15,17,19;54:1, 7,14;55:9,12,17;57:2,9, 21,22;58:1,2,3,20;61:2, 19;62:1,2;69:16,18,23; 70:3,9,18;71:18;85:1,2, 24;86:21,24;88:7,24 Programs (35) 4:5,6;9:11;11:10; 23:24;30:6;31:3;37:7; 38:7,10,11,12;42:15; 44:13,14,14;54:12; 56:22;57:2;58:22;60:7; 61:5;65:5;67:6,10,11,14; 70:20;81:6;86:8,21; 87:1,2,8,22 progressing (1) 10:21 progression (1) 70:17 project (9) 6:8;87:17,18;88:1,3, 11;89:13,15,15 projects (1) 84:20 proof (2) 7:20;63:21 proportion (1) 60:2	proportionality (1) 14:12 proposal (3) 38:8;48:1,3 proposed (3) 12:13;13:18;41:3 proposing (2) 12:8;38:2 protect (1) 57:13 protocol (1) 88:15 provide (2) 4:22;42:17 provided (3) 29:4;42:14;78:23 provides (2) 85:2,18 providing (1) 28:11 PSNH (13) 7:11,18;12:4;16:7; 27:12,17;28:3;30:23; 54:9;65:13,15;78:8; 84:14 PSNH's (1) 11:20 Public (2) 17:2;51:3 pump (1) 21:13 pursue (2) 44:20;48:10 pushed (1) 11:3 put (4) 18:17;33:10;48:19; 63:4 putting (3) 14:5;28:19;78:8	raised (1) 65:18 raising (1) 71:4 rate (1) 22:19 ratepayer (2) 12:5;16:1 ratepayers (3) 11:7;15:7;20:21 rather (2) 79:12;84:1 reach (1) 26:19 read (2) 4:23;5:7 reading (4) 18:13;50:10,14,21 ready (1) 77:11 realize (1) 58:5 realized (2) 89:17,19 really (11) 16:23;31:20;35:12; 55:20;58:10;71:4;78:6; 83:13;85:13,17;87:16 reason (3) 26:21;66:9;85:3 rebate (1) 31:7 rebates (2) 27:5;85:19 receipt (1) 80:24 receive (2) 13:20;81:20 received (3) 6:3;82:5;90:16 receiving (1) 58:11 recent (1) 68:2 recess (1) 74:20 recite (1) 38:15 recommend (1) 12:20 recommendation (7) 37:5;51:20;53:22,23; 54:3;60:13,17 recommended (1) 62:9 recommending (1) 44:7 recommends (1) 44:21 reconvene (1) 34:4 record (9) 4:24;5:7;7:14;47:24;
Q				
qualified (1) 86:6 qualify (1) 85:4 quantify (1) 15:18 quarterly (1) 82:18 quick (1) 32:21 quickly (1) 88:4 quote (1) 51:8				
R				
raise (5) 5:15;46:19;55:2; 56:22;65:16				

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

50:9;77:4;78:4;80:11; 90:10 red (4) 35:14,15,17,20 redirect (5) 4:10;67:21,24;72:13; 73:18 reduce (3) 20:9;29:1;53:1 reducing (1) 18:10 reduction (7) 19:5;33:17;40:23; 41:2,5,6,19 reductions (1) 15:14 refer (1) 37:17 reference (3) 38:4;41:1;51:2 Referring (2) 11:12;43:24 reflect (1) 49:11 reflected (1) 42:24 refrigerator (1) 30:3 regarding (4) 4:18;43:4;87:22;89:20 region (1) 36:12 regret (1) 90:18 rehashing (1) 72:8 relate (1) 71:4 related (2) 9:18;33:15 relates (1) 5:20 relay (1) 4:20 reliable (2) 63:3;64:13 re-looked (1) 42:6 rely (1) 63:3 remain (1) 8:17 remember (7) 27:12;28:3;34:1;37:4; 49:7;54:18;70:5 rental (1) 6:12 reopen (1) 4:3 replace (2) 28:2;30:3 replacing (2) 27:19;85:11	replication (1) 61:20 report (6) 4:17;36:24;37:18; 38:14;48:9,16 reported (1) 21:23 represent (2) 78:19;79:8 representations (1) 77:23 represents (1) 41:6 reputable (1) 64:13 request (15) 6:5;7:2;74:1;77:10; 79:4,11,24;80:13;82:8; 10;83:5;86:13;87:13; 89:4;90:10 requests (1) 86:18 require (1) 36:21 required (3) 24:22;33:4;54:6 requirement (2) 24:17;55:18 requires (1) 35:20 residential (11) 10:3;11:20,23;13:15; 22:24;25:18;26:3,17; 38:9;61:12,15 residents (1) 13:16 resistance-heated (2) 27:21;28:9 resolve (1) 5:23 resources (2) 46:21;47:1 respect (7) 39:8;40:4;41:10,12; 60:22;61:21;68:8 respectfully (2) 81:3,12 respond (5) 5:18;82:16,22;83:13, 19 response (8) 23:3;68:8;74:1,16; 79:17;82:2;83:22;89:5 responses (3) 5:24;7:2;82:7 rest (3) 38:6;75:16;77:3 restate (1) 90:6 restrictive (1) 44:16 result (4) 15:10;41:7;55:13;64:3	results (5) 11:19;15:13;17:3; 18:2;19:9 resumed (1) 74:21 retire (1) 76:1 retiring (1) 81:9 return (1) 4:7 review (1) 68:19 reviewed (4) 7:10;64:15;86:18; 87:21 revised (1) 51:5 RGGI (7) 33:7,12;41:23;42:5,9, 11;68:11 right (31) 5:7;7:22;8:16,18; 11:18;14:10,21;16:6; 29:8;43:16;51:8;55:15; 57:16,23;59:10;60:5,17; 66:24;67:19;68:10,14; 69:1;73:21;74:18,24; 80:13;82:4;83:2,21; 89:3;90:2 rights (1) 83:24 rising (1) 75:6 roll (2) 60:6;84:1 room (3) 8:19;75:16;83:2 route (2) 12:11,12 rule (4) 57:12,15;88:5,6 rules (2) 87:23;89:20 run (5) 23:9;24:18;26:13; 52:17;74:14 running (3) 42:22;62:1;65:2	63:10;64:8 saturated (3) 52:3,6,23 saturation (1) 70:16 save (9) 19:14;22:17;24:19; 27:1;29:13;47:4;52:15, 15;55:9 saved (2) 18:12;40:19 saves (1) 15:14 saving (13) 16:4,5,12,16;19:4; 20:1;21:3;26:1;32:1; 33:14;45:23;52:10,13 savings (86) 9:19,20;11:9;13:14; 15:11,18,19;18:3;19:1,9; 20:3,5,6,22;21:9,11; 22:3,3,22;23:6;24:16; 25:20;26:2,13;27:11; 30:1,9,11;31:5,19,20,21, 22;32:1,4,6,6,8;37:15, 16,21,21,23;38:1;39:13; 40:5,7,14,20;41:3,4,7,11, 16;44:20;45:2;46:5,12, 17,22,22;47:2,17,21; 48:4,6,12,13,17,19,22; 49:1;50:13;51:9;52:16; 65:6;66:17;67:2,16; 68:8;71:16,21,22;76:24, 24;77:2 saying (24) 12:9;13:18;16:24; 17:1,13;18:5,16;22:6,16, 20;25:3;29:10;31:18; 32:2;39:18;45:13;46:24; 47:9;55:4;59:11;60:9; 65:1;66:21;75:23 SBC (10) 13:8;58:13;59:19,23; 60:4,15;68:9;70:8,22; 71:15 scale (1) 29:10 Schedule (6) 61:20;72:1,4,5,21; 81:5 scheduled (2) 4:7;74:13 Science (1) 24:2 Scott (6) 29:22;32:16,17,22; 49:2;71:8 Second (2) 35:2;51:8 secondary (1) 52:12 sector (1) 38:9	SED (1) 42:22 seeing (1) 57:11 seek (2) 88:8,10 seeking (1) 88:1 seemed (1) 4:15 seems (2) 71:1;80:6 segment (1) 55:7 select (1) 57:6 selling (1) 26:24 sending (1) 22:15 sense (5) 24:12,13;47:12;67:10; 73:23 sensitive (1) 79:6 sent (1) 22:13 sentence (3) 62:3,8;73:14 separate (3) 46:3,4;69:15 separated (1) 67:13 separating (1) 67:15 serve (17) 23:11,15,17;27:13,15; 28:4,5,6,14;54:19,21; 55:4,7,12,20;56:5;57:7 served (4) 52:4,21;54:5;55:14 service (10) 12:19;14:22;17:3; 31:14;44:10;46:1,6,10; 51:3;59:14 serving (2) 16:7;54:15 set (2) 49:2;80:18 several (6) 23:8;28:21;30:22; 36:10;46:3;65:9 share (2) 84:15,18 shareholders (1) 39:21 shaving (1) 17:4 shift (3) 52:7;54:24;55:8 shining (2) 87:16,17 shortly (1)
		S		
		safe (2) 9:4;37:8 sales (2) 61:9,16 same (19) 13:12;18:10;19:14,24; 20:2;33:8;35:22;36:8, 13;39:20,23;42:14,14; 47:2;53:12;56:23;60:1; 67:5;85:9 sampling (2)		

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

78:18 show (5) 44:11;72:6,11,17;83:4 showed (1) 66:8 showing (2) 21:5;24:24 shows (2) 19:2;37:20 side (3) 22:24;25:19;85:14 significant (6) 44:5;47:17,19,20; 48:6;57:1 similar (7) 7:11,16;16:13;17:16; 20:4;61:13;84:14 site (1) 37:19 situation (7) 10:15,20;58:10,24; 59:7,24;89:18 size (1) 64:8 solar (1) 28:24 solution (1) 25:12 Solutions (1) 86:20 solve (2) 55:17;56:16 somebody (9) 10:8,10;15:22;24:10; 32:2;35:15,18;45:10; 55:23 somehow (2) 55:2;63:2 someone (3) 14:14,18;29:23 someplace (2) 18:14,14 sometimes (1) 5:9 somewhere (1) 55:2 so-much (1) 30:2 soon (2) 81:1;89:22 sorry (4) 6:20;16:9;74:7;81:2 sort (4) 32:4;76:13;83:4;88:15 sounds (2) 11:5;89:7 source (1) 70:21 sources (3) 68:18;70:19;71:11 speak (3) 5:10;76:12;77:9 special (2)	53:16;70:12 specific (4) 22:16;51:2;64:15; 72:12 specified (1) 69:17 spend (6) 24:5,5,7;27:1;30:8; 47:8 spending (6) 16:6,10,15;29:12; 46:20;69:12 spends (1) 17:3 spent (4) 18:2;19:22;42:9,22 spoke (1) 68:5 spring (1) 8:11 Staff (19) 8:5;44:3,7,9;68:6; 69:9;76:18,22;77:19,22; 78:1,3;82:21,21;86:16, 18;87:5,6,18 Staff's (9) 41:23;44:2,6;51:20; 68:6,16;69:5;71:10; 79:24 stand (2) 4:9;62:20 stand-alone (2) 31:9,17 standard (1) 27:19 standards (1) 6:6 stands (1) 82:15 STAR (6) 6:7,9;15;10:5;17:20; 27:3;57:9 state (2) 72:18;87:13 stated (2) 11:18;73:7 statement (1) 86:2 statements (8) 4:11,21;77:5,15,17; 78:22;83:19;85:21 states (1) 36:16 statewide (1) 35:7 status (1) 4:18 Steltzer (2) 4:16,20 stenographer (1) 5:8 still (15) 22:18;28:17;33:19;	43:11;44:17;53:10,21; 54:14;56:15,19;57:20, 24;60:2,3;89:8 strike (1) 75:6 stripping (1) 26:18 struck (1) 86:19 study (10) 21:24;44:18;51:21; 63:19;65:9,11,15,20,21; 68:24 subgroup (1) 68:12 subject (1) 29:9 submissions (3) 77:18;84:2;90:15 submit (2) 79:18;89:10 submitted (3) 7:11;82:10,19 Subsequent (1) 48:14 subsidies (1) 13:21 succinctly (1) 72:18 sufficient (1) 65:5 suggest (2) 34:3;81:4 suggested (3) 54:8;66:14;87:5 suggesting (5) 12:3;44:23;53:14; 63:3;64:19 suggestion (2) 54:11;77:16 summarize (1) 6:9 summer (5) 40:5,6;41:11,16;51:8 supplement (1) 90:4 supplemented (1) 81:23 support (3) 86:12;89:7;90:10 supportive (2) 86:22;87:7 supports (1) 65:10 suppose (1) 80:5 surcharge (1) 61:1 sure (11) 8:9;29:6;45:3;50:8,22; 53:21;68:15;83:10; 87:10;88:3,12 surprised (1)	78:21 suspicion (1) 64:2 sustainable (1) 42:10 sworn (1) 8:18 system (14) 9:13,16;11:3,6,24; 12:6,19,24;15:10;20:12; 23:23;28:24;29:13; 52:13 systems (3) 33:6;71:12;74:2 T tailor (1) 72:9 talk (9) 15:4;28:23;33:22; 36:18,24;39:10;44:18; 49:6;62:1 talked (4) 22:10;36:1;45:2;61:7 talking (27) 12:22;13:13;15:19; 16:19,21;17:11;19:10; 12,15,17;20:6;27:19; 31:15;33:16;35:2,9; 45:1,7,23;49:19,20; 53:13;61:10;64:11; 68:22;70:2,16 talks (3) 26:9;35:3;49:8 tank (3) 27:20;28:8,16 tapped (1) 43:19 tax (1) 36:17 Tech (1) 24:2 technology (1) 28:17 telephone (1) 82:20 tenants (1) 84:23 term (1) 22:11 terms (1) 61:4 tested (2) 64:16,17 testifies (1) 64:20 testify (1) 64:20 testifying (1) 7:14 testimony (25) 8:24;9:22;10:7;11:12;	14:2;18:14;21:11;33:10, 22;34:6;36:1;38:4; 43:21,23,24;44:2,6;48:8, 14;62:19;72:1;76:18,22; 80:7;87:5 tests (1) 6:14 That'll (1) 8:8 theoretical (1) 60:16 theory (1) 75:23 therefore (3) 9:4;63:2;73:11 thinking (1) 37:1 third (3) 36:10;63:2;66:5 thirds (1) 26:1 thorough (2) 26:6;32:19 though (4) 29:17;45:17;53:21; 83:11 thought (7) 8:12;48:5;59:18; 60:15;72:14;73:6;83:24 thoughts (1) 74:1 thousand (2) 27:12,13 throw (1) 89:12 THUNBERG (19) 5:13;8:4;67:22,23; 68:1;71:1,7,9;72:14; 73:1,2,17;74:7;75:4,12; 77:19;80:1;86:15,16 tie (1) 30:6 ties (1) 30:24 timely (1) 39:2 times (3) 15:16;16:16,18 timing (1) 89:18 title (1) 51:7 today (15) 4:17;5:23;8:13;9:5; 38:9;40:21;61:13;76:18, 22;77:11,15;82:24; 83:13;84:10;87:3 told (1) 14:17 tons (1) 33:14 took (7) 9:23;20:16;26:14;
---	--	---	--	--

DAY 3 - June 22, 2012
DE 10-188 2011 CORE ELECTRIC PROGRAMS

62:12,20;63:6;65:12 top (2) 55:19;56:7 total (5) 27:10;39:13;46:21,23; 47:1 tougher (1) 55:22 towards (3) 11:4;15:3;44:12 transcribe (1) 5:9 transcript (8) 76:19;77:3,7,18;78:9; 80:19;81:19;82:4 transcripts (3) 80:24;81:21;90:16 transferred (1) 13:15 transformed (3) 23:16;52:20,24 transmission (2) 15:16;20:9 treat (2) 69:22;70:12 treated (1) 33:3 treatment (1) 67:5 tree (1) 43:9 trend (1) 57:11 tried (1) 26:19 trip (2) 25:8;58:7 trouble (1) 19:7 true (2) 45:17;46:13 try (2) 14:15;48:15 trying (12) 18:7;20:5,11;23:14; 28:14;36:3;45:22;53:22; 59:4;69:4;80:22;83:23 turn (1) 83:11 twice (1) 11:21 two (10) 9:11;10:1;15:4;26:1, 11:31;14:39;13;70:21; 80:23;85:5 two-week (1) 81:10 two-year (1) 53:24 tying (1) 30:16 type (5) 30:5;36:13,22;42:15;	64:14 Typical (2) 26:17;28:7 U UES (4) 54:10;82:8,20;87:23 ultimately (3) 24:7;25:14;54:20 unavoidably (1) 78:17 unclear (1) 87:23 under (14) 5:22;7:5;9:11;13:18; 17:1;24:22;31:19;33:20; 42:22,24;45:16,18;85:4; 86:20 understood (3) 41:22;43:16;69:4 undue (1) 81:11 unfairness (1) 12:14 unfortunately (2) 54:13;58:3 Until (6) 6:4;7:17;74:2;77:9; 81:8;86:13 unknown (1) 77:20 unless (4) 7:22;8:2,16;90:13 unprepared (1) 83:14 unreasonable (1) 47:13 up (18) 7:24;8:3;12:12,15; 16:22;21:10;22:10; 28:10;29:21;38:11;43:9; 44:11;68:2,12;74:13; 75:11;80:21;81:10 usage (2) 48:21;61:16 use (10) 13:19;15:22;22:22; 23:24;25:19;29:14; 58:16;63:16,18;66:11 used (13) 11:8,10;15:11,22; 20:17;22:14;33:12; 38:17;47:18;54:12; 71:17,20,21 useful (2) 70:17;83:3 uses (2) 21:17;28:17 using (7) 20:2;28:11;57:11; 64:7,7,8,13 utilities (9)	34:19;46:9;47:3;56:8, 12:63;4,23;74:3;76:16 utilities' (3) 21:11;39:21;62:20 utility (12) 21:4;22:10;25:23; 35:3;39:15,15,23;43:24; 49:7;50:1;65:7;66:12 V valid (2) 24:1;63:24 various (2) 20:22;61:23 varying (1) 66:16 VEIC (2) 36:23;38:14 verbal (3) 74:16;82:2;89:5 verified (3) 63:2;65:21;66:4 version (1) 40:12 versus (3) 41:4,19;77:15 W waiting (1) 89:11 waiver (10) 6:6;7:2;74:2;75:10; 76:13;82:7;83:6;86:18, 23;89:3 waivers (2) 87:24;88:1 walls (1) 85:5 wants (3) 12:10;78:9;89:8 water (11) 27:9,16,18,24;28:1,8, 11,20,23,24;29:1 water-heating (2) 27:14;28:4 way (17) 5:11;22:16;24:4,7; 25:6;28:10;33:1;39:2; 41:1;45:5;56:12;60:19; 61:6;62:15;68:15;83:19; 84:7 ways (1) 88:23 weather (1) 26:18 weatherization (23) 9:14;13:21;17:22; 22:13;23:4;24:18,21,24; 25:1;29:23;32:7;45:24; 46:10,15;52:18;53:5,7,8, 9,11,19;60:12;61:2	weatherize (1) 24:10 weatherized (1) 24:8 weatherizing (1) 46:17 Web (1) 37:19 week (9) 76:4;80:22;81:7,16, 18;82:4;89:11,24;90:15 weeks (1) 80:23 Welcome (3) 4:2;51:11;78:4 weren't (2) 55:14;56:22 what's (3) 15:24;19:11;61:4 WHEREUPON (2) 74:20;90:22 whole (7) 14:1,12;34:17;35:6; 49:11;59:17;69:3 who's (1) 7:8 willing (2) 23:2;64:21 winter (1) 30:2 wire (1) 90:19 wish (2) 76:7;90:20 within (4) 54:14;61:15,17;85:23 without (11) 10:11;11:1;12:11; 22:13;24:10;27:6;29:14; 38:11;49:20;67:15;78:6 WITNESS (6) 17:15;25:24;35:3; 49:5,7;62:6 witnesses (7) 4:9;8:2,17;22:10; 72:17;73:22;77:24 wondering (1) 83:15 word (1) 33:5 words (1) 29:11 work (10) 23:6;36:4,6;42:10; 74:6;75:20;76:8;79:5; 90:18,21 working (4) 34:4;37:18;42:3;75:13 worry (1) 57:1 writing (5) 4:14,21,23;89:10; 90:19	writings (1) 5:10 written (12) 76:20;77:5,14,18; 78:6,20;79:3,11,14; 80:14;84:2;90:15 wrong (3) 6:20;17:5;60:18 Y year (21) 6:18;22:2;28:5;39:4; 40:11,13,15,16,17,18; 41:13,18;47:7,9;48:22, 24;50:18;54:21;58:13; 69:19;76:24 years (5) 27:6;60:6;63:17,17; 76:10 year's (2) 81:6,15 Yup (1) 76:5 Z zero (2) 48:4,11
--	--	--	--	--