1 STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE 2 PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 3 October 8, 2015 - 10:07 a.m. Concord, New Hampshire 4 5 NHPUC OCT21'15 PM 3:31 RE: DE 15-303 6 VIVINT SOLAR, INC.: Petition for Declaratory Ruling 7 Regarding RSA 362:2, 362-A:2-a, and Rule Puc 2002.05. 8 (Prehearing conference) 9 PRESENT: Chairman Martin P. Honigberg, Presiding 10 Commissioner Robert R. Scott Commissioner Kathryn M. Bailey 11 12 Sandy Deno, Clerk 13 14 APPEARANCES: Reptg. Vivint Solar, Inc.: Todd G. Glass, Esq. (Wilson, Sonsini...) 15 Garner Meads, Esq. (Vivint Senior Counsel) Shawn Lindquist (Exec. Vice President/Vivint) 16 Sheridan Pauker, Esq. (Wilson, Sonsini...) 17 Reptg. Alliance for Solar Choice: Jason B. Keyes, Esq. (Keyes, Fox & Wiedman) 18 Reptg. Freedom Energy Logistics (FEL): 19 James T. Rodier, Esq. 20 Reptg. PUC Staff: David K. Wiesner, Esq. 21 Amanda O. Noonan, Dir./Consumer Affairs Div. Thomas C. Frantz, Director/Electric Division 22 Liz Nixon, Sustainable Energy Division 23 Court Reporter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52





1		
1		
2	INDEX	
3		PAGE NO.
4	STATEMENTS OF PRELIMINARY POSITION BY:	
5	Mr. Glass	5
6	Mr. Keyes	7
7	Mr. Rodier	8
8	Mr. Wiesner	9
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

1 PROCEEDING

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Good morning, everyone. We're here this morning in Docket DE 15-303, which is a Petition for Declaratory Rulemaking by Vivint Solar, Inc., essentially coming here to ask us to confirm that they are none of our business.

After the prehearing conference this morning, which we're really just going to be taking the Parties' initial positions, you guys are going to have a technical session where you're going to work out all your problems and scheduling and go from there.

So, before we do anything else, let's take appearances.

MR. GLASS: Good morning, Chairman

Honigberg, Commissioners. My name is Todd Glass, with the

law firm of Wilson, Sonsini, Goodrich & Rosati. And, with

me today from the Company is Garner Meads, the Senior

General -- Senior Counsel with Vivint Solar; to my right

and behind me is Shawn Lindquist, an Executive Vice

President from Vivint Solar; and my co-counsel, Sheridan

Pauker, also with Wilson, Sonsini, Goodrich & Rosati.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Welcome.

MR. RODIER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners. Jim Rodier, I don't have to spell it,

```
1
       I don't think. And, I'm here on behalf of Freedom Energy
       Logistics, FEL.
 2
 3
                         MR. KEYES: Jason Keyes, with Keyes, Fox
                   I'm here on behalf of the Alliance for Solar
 4
       & Wiedman.
 5
       Choice.
 6
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I thought you were
 7
       with Vivint. You were sitting at the Vivint table. I
       expected you to be introduced. But, welcome.
 8
 9
                         MR. KEYES: Thank you.
10
                         MR. WIESNER: And, Dave Wiesner,
11
       representing Commission Staff. With me at the table are
12
       Amanda Noonan, Director of the Consumer Affairs Division;
13
       Tom Frantz, Director of the Electric Division; and Liz
14
       Nixon of the Sustainable Energy Division.
15
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We have the
16
       petitions to intervene from Freedom Energy Logistics and
17
       from the Alliance for Solar Choice. I have not seen any
18
       objections to either of those petitions. Is there any
       objection?
19
20
                         MR. GLASS: None.
21
                         MR. WIESNER: I'm not aware of any
22
       objections, Mr. Chairman. And, Staff does not object.
23
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Those
```

petitions for intervention are both being granted.

I think the only thing for us to do now is to hear from you about your petition -- or, your positions generally in this matter. So, we're going to start with you Mr. Glass.

MR. GLASS: Thank you. As stated in our Petition for Declaratory Ruling, we're here because we need clarity on the question of "whether we would be regulated under three particular provisions?" Our position is is that we should not be regulated as a public utility under the New Hampshire Revised Statutes Section 362.2, as we are not providing service to the public. And, we can explain more either now or later.

Similarly, our position is that we should not be regulated as a competitive energy power supplier under the Administrative Code 2002.05, because we are, really, in reality, those regulations and the laws that were behind those regulations were never intended to regulate our type of service, behind the meter, on private property, in -- as a competitive energy supplier. And, as the regulations are currently written, there's no way for us to do so. Whether becoming a member of NEPOOL or buying our power from NEPOOL and any variety of other regulations. And, importantly, once again, we cannot provide -- we cannot provide our services to the public

broadly. We need to be able to discern and provide service only to customers that qualify, that have enough sun insulation hitting their roof, that the roof is angled the right away, that there's not too much foliage and other types of things, the roof is safe, and that the client is — or, the customer has credit and owns their home. All of these things are things that we need to, as a matter of our business model, to be able to discriminate. We cannot offer service to the broad public.

And, finally, we do not think that we should be regulated as a limited producer of electric energy. Under the PURPA concept of the statute, we cannot be limited or our business model cannot be limited to three end-users and the regulatory regime that's been constructed around limited producers of electric energy. And, we don't think that the intent of the regulation or of the statutes there require us to be regulated.

So, in summary, we seek clarity so that we can enter the state to provide our service to customers in the State of New Hampshire.

And, I would say that, to the extent that you want further information about Vivint, my client, Garner Meads, will be happy to describe what Vivint Solar

```
does and how, in particular, its business operates.
 1
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you. To
 2
 3
       avoid giving whiplash, I'll stay on the left side, on my
       left. Mr. Keyes.
 4
 5
                         MR. KEYES: Thank you. Members of the
 6
       Alliance for Solar Choice, SolarCity and Sunrun, --
 7
                         [Court reporter interruption.]
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Off the record.
 8
 9
                         MR. KEYES: Two members of the Alliance
10
       for Solar Choice, Sunrun and SolarCity, have customers in
11
       New Hampshire on the basis that they thought the rules
12
       were clear that they would not be regulated as a public
13
       utility and would not be regulated as a competitive energy
14
      power supplier, and not be regulated as a limited producer
15
       of electric energy.
16
                         So, we are supportive of Vivint's
17
       Petition. We hope that this can be quick.
18
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You're essentially
19
       here -- you want to make sure that Mr. Glass doesn't do
20
       anything wacky and get you covered, right?
21
                         MR. KEYES: I know Mr. Glass well.
22
       have complete confidence in him.
23
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
24
      Mr. Rodier, I'm actually not sure if you need a
```

microphone, but --

MR. RODIER: Mr. Chairman, FEL is fully supportive of the relief that Vivint has requested. And, frankly, the reason is that, you know, FEL has actual business interests and prospective business interests in the emerging facts and law that are involved here, and other cases that we've been involved in, like the LEEPA three customer law.

Very briefly, two other things. I put in some comments very recently on the grid modernization proceeding, asked for comments. And, my comments were pretty much restricted to distributed generation. I think I said, in some fashion, that we have to, in order to have distributed generation, we have to start working our way through issues like we have here today. You can't really have a microgrid if you, you know, you can't interconnect, and if you — somebody is going to say you need a CEPS license to sell to somebody down the street. So, that was an important issue.

And, then, finally, just as an example of my view of what's emerging, I got a call the other day from somebody inquiring about what the law is with regard to electric vehicle charging stations. They're in New Hampshire. Their utility had said "hey, our tariff

```
1
       prohibits resale of electricity." They didn't say "you
       need to be a public utility". They didn't say "you need a
 2
 3
       CEPS license." They just said "you are unlawfully
       reselling electricity."
 4
 5
                         So, that is really what our interest
 6
       here is, to be supportive of things that allow the
 7
       Commission to move ahead with grid modernization.
 8
       you.
 9
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG:
                                              Thank you,
10
       Mr. Rodier. Mr. Wiesner.
11
                         MR. WIESNER: Staff believes this is an
       important case to clarify the regulatory status of
12
13
       behind-the-meter generation in particular residential
14
       rooftop solar installations. That's a very significant
15
       and growing market in this state, probably as a result of
16
       state policies that are encouraging renewable energy, such
17
       as group net metering, plain old net metering, and the
18
       rebate programs that are funded by the Renewable Energy
19
       Fund.
20
                         We're sympathetic with Vivint's interest
21
       in clarifying that status in particular, so that there
22
       are -- there's an opportunity for new competitors to come
23
       in and do business here. And, particularly, in the
```

current environment, where there's an investment tax

credit at the federal level, which may not survive beyond next year, depending on what happens in Congress.

We don't have a fully developed position on the merits of this case. One of the things we're going to discuss with the Parties in technical session is the extent to which there may be discovery and document production necessary so that the Commission can be presented with a full record to inform its decision on these important issues, of what are essentially legal and regulatory interpretation. What do the statutes require? What do our rules mean? And, do they apply to this type of situation, the business model that Vivint and its competitors are following or proposing to follow in the state?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you. I don't think we have any questions for you at this time. I think we'll leave you to your technical session. I think there's some interesting issues you have to discuss. I know that Mr. Rodier's active mind will keep you all fully engaged, I'm sure.

And, we'll look forward to seeing what you guys come up with for a schedule and a plan for moving this docket along as quickly as reasonably possible.

So, with that, we'll leave you. Thank

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