

## 1 STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

## 2 PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

3  
4 **August 6, 2015** - 10:02 a.m.  
Concord, New Hampshire

5 NHPUC AUG20'15 PM 2:43

6  
7 RE: **DE 15-248**  
8 **PUBLIC SERVICE CO. OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**  
9 **d/b/a EVERSOURCE ENERGY:**  
10 **2015 Least Cost Integrated Resource Plan.**  
11 **(Prehearing conference)**12  
13 **PRESENT:** Michael J. Sheehan, Esq.  
14 (Presiding as Hearings Examiner)

15 Sandy Deno, Clerk

16  
17 **APPEARANCES:** **Reptg. Public Service Co. of New Hampshire**  
18 **d/b/a Eversource Energy:**  
19 Matthew J. Fossum, Esq.20  
21 **Reptg. Office of Energy & Planning:**  
22 Meredith A. Hatfield, Esq., Director23  
24 **Reptg. PUC Staff:**  
Suzanne G. Amidon, Esq.  
Richard Chagnon, Electric Division

Court Reporter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52

ORIGINAL

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**I N D E X**

**PAGE NO.**

**STATEMENTS OF PRELIMINARY POSITION BY:**

Mr. Fossum	4
Mr. Hatfield	5
Ms. Amidon	7

**P R O C E E D I N G**

1  
2 HEARINGS EXAMINER SHEEHAN: Good  
3 morning. My name is Mike Sheehan. I'll be the Hearings  
4 Examiner this morning. This is docket DE 248 [15-248?]  
5 Eversource Energy's Least Cost Integrated Resource Plan  
6 prehearing conference. Eversource filed a petition on  
7 June 19th with its proposed Plan. We issued an order of  
8 notice on July 14th scheduling today's conference and  
9 technical session.

10 We'll start with appearances.

11 Mr. Fossum.

12 MR. FOSSUM: Good morning. Matthew  
13 Fossum, for Public Service Company of New Hampshire doing  
14 business as Eversource Energy.

15 MS. HATFIELD: Good morning. Meredith  
16 Hatfield, for the Office of Energy & Planning.

17 HEARINGS EXAMINER SHEEHAN: Good  
18 morning.

19 MS. AMIDON: Good morning. Suzanne  
20 Amidon, for Commission Staff. And, with me today is Rich  
21 Chagnon, who is an Analyst in the Electric Division.

22 HEARINGS EXAMINER SHEEHAN: Thank you.  
23 I understand we have a Petition to Intervene from OEP. Is  
24 there any objection to that Petition?

1 MR. FOSSUM: No objection.

2 MS. AMIDON: No.

3 HEARINGS EXAMINER SHEEHAN: I see none.  
4 I'll recommend that the Commission approve that. Is there  
5 anyone else here seeking intervention?

6 FROM THE FLOOR: I'm just listening.

7 HEARINGS EXAMINER SHEEHAN: Thank you.  
8 So, why don't we go then to the statement of positions.  
9 Mr. Fossum.

10 MR. FOSSUM: Thank you. And, I'll be  
11 very brief this morning.

12 As you've already noted, back on June  
13 19th of this year, Eversource filed its 2015 Least Cost  
14 Integrated Resource Plan. Along with that Plan was a  
15 petition requesting it be reviewed and approved. And, the  
16 Plan was drafted up in line with the Settlement Agreement  
17 that we have had on our prior plan, as well as the orders  
18 that followed on that Agreement, and with the intent of  
19 incorporating some of the changes that were made to the  
20 IRP statutes in 2014.

21 We're looking forward to working with  
22 the other parties. Also, I'll make a note. I think, by  
23 "other parties", I believe the OCA has filed its letter of  
24 participation, --

1 HEARINGS EXAMINER SHEEHAN: That's  
2 right.

3 MR. FOSSUM: -- but is not here. And,  
4 we will certainly work with them throughout this docket to  
5 address our request on the Plan, any issues that are  
6 identified. And, we look forward to working with them and  
7 presenting at a final hearing to the Commissioners of  
8 their approval as soon as we can.

9 HEARINGS EXAMINER SHEEHAN: Thank you.  
10 I will note that the OCA has filed its letter of  
11 participation. My guess is, they're next door in the  
12 other hearing and don't have a body to spare.

13 Ms. Hatfield.

14 MS. HATFIELD: Thank you. The OCA's --  
15 excuse me -- the OEP's focus in this case is going to be  
16 looking at whether the 2015 Least Cost Integrated Resource  
17 Plan filed by the Company meets the new requirements of  
18 RSA 378:38, that, as I believe you know, were put into  
19 effect just a year ago now, back in August of 2014.

20 The Legislature that made the changes to  
21 the law I think really shows the Legislature's intent to  
22 direct utilities to focus on energy efficiency as a first  
23 order resource. And, if you look at that legislation,  
24 examples of where I think this is clear is that, in the

1 state's Energy Policy, in 378:37, they added language "to  
2 maximize the use of cost-effective energy efficiency and  
3 other demand-side resources". And, then, throughout the  
4 Section 378:38, regarding what should be in plans  
5 submitted to the Commission, you can also see several  
6 references where I think the Legislature was sort of  
7 emphasizing what had already been in the law, but really  
8 making clear that they wanted utilities to look first at  
9 energy efficiency.

10 We have reviewed the Company's filing,  
11 and we don't think that it meets the requirements of the  
12 law. The law does call for an "assessment" of demand-side  
13 energy programs. And, I think the Company has provided a  
14 nice review of the CORE Programs and some history of the  
15 CORE Programs, but it really doesn't do any kind of  
16 forward-looking assessment.

17 And, I think the Commission probably  
18 recalls back in 2010, the Company did a very thorough  
19 review of the potential for energy efficiency, using the  
20 Commission's 2009 study of energy efficiency potential in  
21 the state. And, we were really hoping that the Company  
22 would take that kind of a deep look again at the  
23 possibility for additional cost-effective energy  
24 efficiency.

1                   In addition, in Section 378:38, VII, the  
2                   statute requires "An assessment of plan integration and  
3                   consistency with the state energy strategy under  
4                   RSA 4-E:1." That's the state energy strategy that OEP  
5                   released last September. And, I'd be happy to be  
6                   corrected, but I don't believe that the Company has  
7                   included that in the filing.

8                   So, those are the things we'll be  
9                   focusing on primarily, in addition to looking at whether  
10                  they appropriately covered an assessment of the benefits  
11                  and costs of Smart Grid technologies, and whether they  
12                  fully assessed renewable energy and distributed energy  
13                  resources.

14                  And, we look forward to working with the  
15                  Company and the Staff and the other parties in this  
16                  docket. Thank you.

17                  HEARINGS EXAMINER SHEEHAN: Thank you.  
18                  Ms. Amidon.

19                  MS. AMIDON: Thank you. Staff has only  
20                  begun to review the Plan. One of our concerns will be  
21                  whether the Company complied with the Settlement  
22                  Agreement, and to the extent that it required an updated  
23                  assessment of demand-side energy management programs,  
24                  including conservation, efficiency, and load management

1 programs.

2 And, I share the views of the OEP,  
3 concerning whether or not the Plan adequately addresses  
4 the issues that are in the statute.

5 But, other than that, we have -- we have  
6 discussed a proposed procedural schedule. And, I think  
7 we're prepared to at least enter a high-level discussion  
8 after the end of this prehearing conference. And, I'll  
9 report back to the Commission.

10 HEARINGS EXAMINER SHEEHAN: All right.  
11 Thank you.

12 Anything else we need to cover this  
13 morning while on the record?

14 (No verbal response)

15 HEARINGS EXAMINER SHEEHAN: Seeing  
16 nothing, I will leave you to your tech session. Thank you  
17 very much.

18 **(Whereupon the prehearing conference was**  
19 **adjourned at 10:09 a.m., and a technical**  
20 **session was held thereafter.)**

21

22

23

24