1	STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE		
2	PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION		
3	October 5, 2021 - 9:07 a.m. 21 South Fruit Street Suite 10 Concord, NH		
4			
5			
6	[Hearing also conducted via Webex]		
7			
8			
9	RE:	DE 21-041	
LO		UNITIL ENERGY SYSTEMS, INC.: 2021 Default Service.	
L1		(Hearing regarding the six-month period beginning December 1, 2021)	
L2			
L3	PRESENT:	Chairwoman Dianne H. Martin, Presiding Commissioner Daniel C. Goldner	
L 4 L 5		Doreen Borden, Clerk Corrine Lemay, PUC Hybrid Hearing Host	
L 6	APPEARANCES:	Reptg. Unitil Energy Systems, Inc.: Gary Epler, Esq.	
L 7		Reptg. Residential Ratepayers:	
L 8		Donald M. Kreis, Esq., Consumer Adv. Office of Consumer Advocate	
L 9		Reptg. New Hampshire Dept. of Energy:	
20		Suzanne G. Amidon, Esq. Stephen Eckberg, Analyst	
21		(Regulatory Support Division)	
22			
23	Court Rep	orter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52	
2 4			

1		
2	I N D E X	
3		PAGE NO.
4	WITNESS PANEL: JEFFREY M. PENTZ LINDA S. McNAMARA	
5	MARK LAMBERT TODD DIGGINS	
6	1022 21001115	
7	Direct examination by Mr. Epler	9
8	Cross-examination by Mr. Kreis	13
9	Cross-examination by Ms. Amidon	33
10	Interrogatories by Commissioner Goldner	39
11	Interrogatories by Chairwoman Martin	53
12	Redirect examination by Mr. Epler	55
13		
14	* * *	
15		
16	CLOSING ARGUMENTS BY:	
17	Mr. Kreis	60
18	Ms. Amidon	69
19	Mr. Epler	72
20	QUESTIONS BY:	
21	Chairwoman Martin	66, 68
22		
23		
24		

1		
2		EXHIBITS
3	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION PAGE NO.
4	3	Testimony of Jeffrey M. Pentz, premarked with attachments, and the
5		Testimony of Linda S. McNamara, with attachments
6		[REDACTED - For PUBLIC Use]
7	4	Default Service RFP Bid premarked
8	1	Evaluation Report {CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY}
9	5	Chart entitled "Itemized premarked
10	9	costs for Non-G1 Class Default Service Charge Report
11		{CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY}
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

PROCEEDING

1.3

2.2

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Good morning,
everyone. We're here this morning in Docket DE
21-041, which is Unitil Energy Systems,
Incorporated, Default Energy Service rate
proceeding for the period beginning December 1,
2021.

Let's take appearances, starting with Mr. Epler please. You're on mute.

MR. EPLER: Sorry. Good morning,

Chairwoman -- excuse me -- good morning,

Chairwoman Martin, Commissioner Goldner. My name
is Gary Epler. I am the Chief Regulatory Counsel
for Unitil Service Corp. And I'm appearing on
behalf of Unitil Energy Systems.

And with me this morning are two panelists who provided prefiled testimony, Linda S. McNamara, who is a Senior Regulatory Analyst with Unitil Service Corp., and Jeffrey Pentz, who is a Senior Energy Analyst with Unitil Service Corp.

Also with me this morning are two additional members of Unitil Service Corp., who I have asked to attend in case there are additional

questions from the Commission or the parties.

And those two panelists are Mark Lambert, who is the Vice President of Customer Operations, and Todd Diggins, who is the Treasurer and Director of Finance with Unitil Service Corp.

Thank you very much.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Epler. And Mr. Kreis.

MR. KREIS: Good morning, Chairwoman Martin, Commissioner Goldner, fellow utility enthusiasts. I am Donald Kreis, the Consumer Advocate, here on behalf of residential ratepayers.

I would like to apologize for sometimes having a squinty expression on my face. I just came back from my annual eye exam, and so my pupils are dilated. So, hopefully, I will still be able to see everything.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. Thank you. And Ms. Amidon.

MS. AMIDON: Good morning, Chairwoman

Martin and Commissioner Goldner. My name is

Suzanne Amidon. I am representing the Department

of Energy. And with me today is Steve Eckberg,

who is an analyst in the Regulatory Support
Division of the Department of Energy.

1.3

2.2

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. Thank you, everyone.

And, for preliminary matters, I have exhibits filed that have been prefiled and premarked for identification as "Exhibits 1" through "3". However, I note we have previously admitted Exhibits 1 and 2 in this docket for the past hearing. And, so, I would suggest that we re-mark the exhibits filed for today as "Exhibits 3", "4", and "5".

Mr. Epler, do you have any issue with that?

MR. EPLER: Yes. When I marked those and sent them out last night, I had forgotten that this is actually a continuation in the same docket, in a previous hearing we had two exhibits.

So, you are correct. They should be marked -- 1, 2, and 3 that I marked should be, as you indicate, "Exhibits 3", "4", and "5". I will provide revised copies to the Clerk after the hearing so that the docket is correct.

1 CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Excellent. 2 you very much. 3 Any other preliminary issues we need to 4 cover? 5 MR. EPLER: Only that, in referring to 6 the exhibits, there is one non-confidential 7 exhibit, that's the large file that has the testimonies and the schedules and various attachments, and then there are two confidential 9 exhibits. The confidential exhibits, the Bates 10 11 page markings on them correspond to the redacted 12 pages in Exhibit 3. So, they are identical, 1.3 except they're confidential, they reveal the confidential material that is redacted in 14 Exhibit 3. 15 16 CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. And just for 17 clarity, given our prior conversation, what is now Exhibit 3 is not confidential. 18 19 MR. EPLER: Correct. 20 CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: And Exhibits 4 and 21 5 are confidential. Do I have that right? 2.2 MR. EPLER: Yes. That's correct. 23 Thank you. 24 CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

1 And also, for clarity, if MR. EPLER: 2 all the witnesses can refer to the Bates page 3 numbering, which is on the lower right-hand 4 corner of the pages, if you're referring to a 5 page, so that all in the hearing can follow that 6 correctly. 7 CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: And that will help us keep the record straight as well. So, yes, please, if you could do that, it would be 9 10 helpful. 11 All right. Anything else from anyone 12 else? 1.3 MS. AMIDON: Nothing from me. 14 CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Then, why 15 don't we have the witnesses sworn in please, 16 Mr. Patnaude. 17 (Whereupon Jeffrey M. Pentz, 18 Linda S. McNamara, Mark A. Lambert, 19 and Todd R. Diggins were duly sworn by 20 the Court Reporter.) 21 CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Mr. Epler. 2.2 MR. EPLER: Okay. I will go through each witness one at a time, but I will start with 23 24 the two witnesses who did not provide prefiled

```
1
         testimony, just to move things along.
 2
                    JEFFREY M. PENTZ, SWORN
 3
                    LINDA S. McNAMARA, SWORN
 4
                     MARK A. LAMBERT, SWORN
 5
                     TODD R. DIGGINS, SWORN
 6
                       DIRECT EXAMINATION
 7
    BY MR. EPLER:
         Mr. Lambert, can you please state your full name,
 8
 9
         your position with the Company?
10
         (Lambert) Yes. Good morning. Mark Lambert, Vice
11
         President of Customer Operations with Unitil.
12
         Thank you. Mr. Diggins, same question please?
13
         (Diggins) Todd Richard Diggins, Director of
    Α
14
         Finance with Unitil.
15
         Thank you. And is it correct that neither of you
    0
16
         have filed any prefiled testimony or exhibits in
17
         this case? Is that correct?
18
         (Diggins) That is correct.
19
         (Lambert) That's correct.
    Α
20
         Thank you. Mr. Pentz, please state your full
21
         name and your position with the Company?
22
    Α
         (Pentz) Jeffrey Pentz, Senior Energy Analyst at
23
         Unitil.
         Thank you. And, Mr. Pentz, drawing your
24
```

```
attention to what has been premarked as "Exhibit
 1
 2
         Number 3". And, if you can turn to that exhibit,
 3
         and look at the Bates Pages numbers 1 through
 4
         44 -- 1 through 144. And does this consist of
 5
         your prefiled testimony and schedules?
 6
         (Pentz) Yes.
 7
         And do you have any changes or corrections to
         this material?
 8
 9
         (Pentz) So, I do have one cosmetic change, which
    Α
10
         is on Bates Page 012. On Line 2 there, --
11
    Q
         Wait for folks to turn to that page please.
12
         (Pentz) Yes.
13
         Okay.
    Q
14
         (Pentz) Where it says "New Hampshire Renewable
15
         Portfolio Standards: 2020", the year is
16
         incorrect. It should be "2021 and 2022".
17
    Q
         Okay. That's the title of that, the heading of
18
         that chart?
19
         (Pentz) That's correct.
    Α
20
         Thank you. And do you have any other changes or
    0
21
         corrections?
22
    Α
         (Pentz) No.
23
         And do you adopt this prefiled testimony and
24
         schedules as your testimony in this proceeding?
```

```
1
          (Pentz) Yes.
 2
         Thank you very much. Ms. McNamara, can you
 3
         please state your full name and position with the
 4
         Company?
 5
          (McNamara) My name is Linda McNamara. I am a
 6
         Senior Regulatory Analyst.
 7
         And can you please turn to what's been premarked
    Q
 8
         as "Exhibit Number 3", and to Pages 145 through
 9
         185. And were these prepared by you or under
10
         your direction?
11
    Α
         (McNamara) Yes.
12
         And do you have any changes or corrections?
13
         (McNamara) No.
    Α
14
         And do adopt these as your testimony in this
    Q
15
         proceeding?
16
         (McNamara) Yes.
17
    Q
         And can you also turn to what's been premarked as
18
         confidential "Exhibit Number 5".
19
         (Witness McNamara nodding in the affirmative).
    Α
20
         Which is a single page, Bates Page 166. And was
    0
21
         this prepared by you or under your direction?
22
    Α
         (McNamara) Yes.
23
         And do you adopt it as part of your testimony in
24
         this case?
```

```
1
          (McNamara) I do.
 2
         And, Mr. Pentz, I had forgotten to direct you to
 3
         the confidential exhibit. Can you turn to
         confidential Exhibit Number 4?
 4
 5
         (Pentz) Okay.
 6
         Which is Bates Page marked 019 through 081. And
 7
         was this prepared by you or under your direction?
 8
         (Pentz) Yes.
 9
         And do you have any changes or corrections here?
    Q
10
         (Pentz) No.
11
         And do adopt this as part of your testimony in
12
         this proceeding?
1.3
         (Pentz) I do.
    Α
14
                    MR. EPLER: Okay. Thank you very much.
15
                    With that, Madam Chair -- excuse me,
16
         Chairwoman Martin and Commissioner Goldner, the
17
         witnesses are available for cross-examination.
18
                    CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. Thank
19
         you, Mr. Epler. Mr. Kreis.
20
                   MR. KREIS: Thank you, Chairwoman
21
         Martin. I just have a few questions.
22
                    I don't really care which of the Unitil
23
         witnesses answer my questions, although I think
24
         the appropriate witness will be really obvious.
```

Most of my questions relate to Exhibit 4, that is 1 2 a confidential exhibit, but I do not intend to 3 put any confidential information on the record. 4 CROSS-EXAMINATION 5 BY MR. KREIS: 6 Turning to Exhibit 4, Bates Page 021, I think 7 this might be a question for Mr. Pentz. 8 Mr. Pentz, would it be fair to say that the three and a third lines there that have been marked as 9 "confidential" describe the number of bids that 10 11 the Company received by this solicitation? 12 (Pentz) I'm sorry. I'm having a little trouble 13 hearing. What lines were those again? 14 There aren't any line numbers, but there are about three and a third lines of text on Bates 15 16 Page 021 that have been designated as 17 "confidential". And my question about those 18 three and a third lines is, do they describe the 19 number of indicative and final bids that the 20 Company received in response to its solicitation? 21 (Pentz) Yes. Those lines do refer to the number Α 22 of indicative and final bids received. 23 Why is that information considered "competitively 24 sensitive" so as to warrant confidential

1 treatment? 2 (Pentz) Well, I think it's, you know, from a 3 competitive standpoint, when we have our 4 suppliers bid, I think it's important to keep 5 this confidential, because, in future 6 solicitations, you know, they could potentially 7 look at, you know, how competitive our solicitations are or how uncompetitive they could 8 be, and that could affect the pricing that they 9 10 could submit in future solicitations. So, I 11 think it's important to keep this confidential. 12 So, yes. 13 Turning your attention to Bates Page 025 of that Q 14 same exhibit, Exhibit 4. And, on that page, 15 there are one, two, three -- four lines that are, 16 in whole or in part, marked as "confidential". 17 And I guess my question about that information, 18 without really referring to it, is the same. Why 19 is that information in those four lines 20 competitively sensitive? 21 (Pentz) We have always treated this as Α 22 confidential in Tab A(2). You know, in looking 23 at it, you know, for payments due, and, you know, 24 timelines there, that's something we could look

1 into. 2 But, just for purposes of why we've 3 redacted, we've done it in previous 4 solicitations. You know, as long as -- so, when 5 we look at this, it's referring to, you know, 6 pricing exhibits where these terms are used. 7 So, I'm not necessarily sure that these 8 would have to remain redacted necessarily. 9 Q Okay. Now, moving along to Bates Page 033 of 10 Exhibit 4, and most of that page is not 11 confidential, and it's a discussion entitled 12 "Comparisons to NYMEX Futures". Mr. Pentz, could 13 you briefly summarize the significance of the 14 comparison that the Company has undertaken to conduct and then describe to NYMEX futures for 15 16 the present proceeding? 17 Α (Pentz) The comparison to NYMEX futures is fairly 18 important in this particular solicitation. So, 19 just in context, you know, as you look through 20 the filing, you know, the pricing is 21 significantly higher than it has been in previous 22 solicitations. And, as a background to that, 23 that is driven primarily by natural gas prices. 24 Most of the electricity generated in New England

is generated from natural gas-fired power plants. So, this is a good metric to gauge natural gas prices, and see how they affect the resulting power prices.

And to do that, if you follow in the next four pages there, Bates 034 to 037, there are four exhibits which what they do is it creates a benchmark. And you want to look at natural gas futures and power futures and see what the ratio is to the actual bid prices that we receive from these suppliers. It kind of gives us a good gauge, to make sure, you know, suppliers are giving us a rational bid, something that seems in line with the current market.

And most of the data and the pricing on Bates 034 through 037 is confidential, because these are the bid prices that the bidders have submitted. So, it's important to keep that confidential.

So, it's -- what, you know, what these exhibits do is they create a benchmark to make sure the pricing that we receive is in line with the forward market pricing.

Q Did you have any concerns with respect to whether

```
the bids were in line with those forward market
 1
 2
         prices for natural gas?
 3
    Α
         (Pentz) I did not have any concerns. As you can
 4
         see, in particular, on Page -- let's see here.
 5
         If we go on Bates Page 034, we can do a winter to
 6
         winter comparison, which makes more sense,
 7
         because, in New England, there are fluctuations
 8
         in power prices between seasons. So, normally,
 9
         summer power prices are significantly lower than
10
         winter power prices. So, I would just focus on
11
         looking at the same period last year, which would
12
         be Bates 034. And you can look at the ratio of
13
         the final bid to the NYMEX ISO. And you can see
14
         that they're fairly in line, without revealing
15
         any confidential numbers here, I don't want to
16
         get into that. I didn't have any concerns here
17
         with these numbers.
18
         Those ratios, though, vary, wouldn't you agree?
    Q
19
         Is there a reason why that ratio might change
20
         from month to month?
21
         (Pentz) The ratio, it could change based on --
    Α
22
         let's see. So, if we look at a particular month
23
         here, you know, the ratios could change, in the
24
         summer, for example, the ratios might be a little
```

lower, because -- oh, I'm sorry, they could be a 1 2 little higher, because, in the summer, they 3 represent -- I'm sorry, let me restate this. 4 So, the NYMEX ISO quotes only quote 5 energy. They don't quote the other components of 6 the bid price. And, in the summer, you may have 7 more of those components in there, which may 8 change the ratios. Mr. Pentz, earlier, in response to I think my 9 Q 10 previous question, you mentioned that the bids 11 that the Company received in this solicitation 12 are significantly higher than most of the previous bids. Would it be fair to say that the 13 14 bids that drove the price in this solicitation 15 were actually the highest that the Company has 16 ever received, or in the history of default 17 energy service? 18 (Pentz) Looking back at the history of the Α 19 wholesale power price component, the prices 20 received were the highest in recent memory. 21 looking back to, you know, even 2013 and 2014, 22 during the winter price spikes, it's coming in a 23 little bit higher than that year. 24 And this -- this is a global phenomenon

right here, what we're talking about with these power prices. Like I had said, in the New England energy markets, more than 50 percent of the energy is generated by natural gas. Natural gas prices are going higher. The future prices, the forward NYMEX prices are going higher. Why is this? Well, it's because there was a hurricane, Hurricane Ida, you know, took out a lot of the natural gas rigs in the Gulf of Mexico, and they still haven't started up yet.

In Europe, natural gas prices are four to five times what they were last year at this

In Europe, natural gas prices are four to five times what they were last year at this time. So, what's happening right now is, a lot of U.S. domestic production is moving over to Europe, in the form of LNG. So, that's taking away from even more natural gas supplies, which is causing prices to go up even further.

- Q And, by "LNG", you mean "liquified natural gas"?
- A (Pentz) Liquified natural gas, yes. Uh-huh.

20 Storage levels are, storage levels, in terms of

21 how much underground storage there is for natural

gas, usually at this time of year you want to

build up a good amount of storage for the winter.

Those storage levels are not what they used to be

```
1
         at this time. They were lower than in past
 2
         years, because of the liquified natural gas
 3
         exports. And that's causing a lot of fear in the
 4
         natural gas market. And natural gas is directly
 5
         correlated to power prices, and that's what's
 6
         causing these high bid numbers that were received
 7
         from our bidders.
         You mentioned -- I'm sorry, I didn't mean to
 8
 9
         interruptor cut off the rest of your answer.
10
         (Pentz) Yes. And just to say, you know, this is
11
         not just happening in the energy landscape.
12
         is happening for commodities all over the world.
13
         Inflation is taking a hold. And it's not just,
14
         you know, relegated to natural gas.
15
         So, you mentioned that the current price spike
    0
16
         that we're dealing with right now is higher than
17
         the price spike that occurred, I think, in 2013
18
         and 2014 because of the polar vortex. Do you
19
         have a theory about why this spike is even worse
20
         than that previous spike?
21
         (Pentz) I think, when we look at comparing the
    Α
22
         prices received to the most recent prices, let's
23
         say, right after, you know, the Coronavirus took
24
         hold, in March 2020, you know, what you saw in
```

the economy was much lower demand, and that actually caused natural gas prices to go down significantly. We had some of the lowest power prices we've ever procured right after the Coronavirus hit, in early 2020.

So, when you look at a basis for comparison, we're starting very low to begin with. So, when I say in my testimony "rates have risen", you know, I think it was "172 percent since the previous period", well, we're starting from a very low period of energy prices, I think the lowest period that I've seen, I think, in the history of default service, and that was because of low demand.

Now that the economy is picking up, there's much more demand and not enough gas supply. You know, this is a principle of economics, if there's not enough supply, the price is going to go up, and that's what we're seeing here.

Would it be fair to say or is it your opinion that, as the market price of electricity goes up, the bidders incorporate a larger risk premium in the bids that they submit to you and other

1 utilities?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

- (Pentz) In a time where there is, you know, extreme fluctuation in the market, there could be a strategy that bidders take where they would incorporate a risk premium into those bids. I didn't necessarily see any significant risk premium in these bids. But it's -- the bids that we received is -- it's a full requirements bid, right? So, it includes energy, capacity, and ancillary services. There is no way you can see under the hood how much, if anything, you know, they would incorporate into a risk premium. it's very difficult to discern if any risk premium was priced in here. What you can do is look at these NYMEX exhibits and benchmark these ratios to see if the bids were in line with ISO futures.
- Q Thank you. Very interesting. Turning now to

 Page -- Bates Page 074 of Exhibit Number 4, just

 get to that.
- 21 A (Pentz) I'm sorry, was that Bates Page 074?
 - Q Yes. Okay. That page is almost entirely redacted. And I guess my question to you, without even mentioning what that information is,

what is competitively sensitive about the information on Bates Page 074?

1.3

Α

(Pentz) There are contact names from the companies that we have reached out to, that should remain confidential. There are a number of suppliers on here. There is a section at the top which contains the number of suppliers that we've sent this RFP out to. And this kind of gets back to the, you know, how many bids we have received, and keeping that confidential, due to competitive issues.

And I think that keeping, you know, this information confidential would make sense, because it could lead to some issues down the road in future solicitations, if they see the number of suppliers we've sent this to, and they're wondering "Oh, they have only sent it to this" or "Oh, they have sent it to this many", that may, you know, that may provoke more questions on their end. And, you know, there's a section on here that says "Expectations" of these bidders that I've reached out to. And there's comments in this section that say whether I've spoken to these bidders, and what their plans

That should be kept confidential. 1 2 There is an observation somewhere in your 3 testimony, I forget where, that you send the 4 RFP -- that you sent this RFP, and have sent 5 previous RFPs, to the entire Participants Committee at NEPOOL. So, isn't it fair to say 6 7 that all of the potential suppliers in the 8 universe are receiving your RFP? And so, the 9 list of specific companies that are on your 10 contacts list, that's -- it's just not -- the 11 mere fact that a company is on your list doesn't 12 seem to be a very significant piece of 13 information for competitive or any other 14 purposes, really. What am I missing? 15 (Pentz) The companies on this exhibit are the Α 16 companies that I have directly sent this RFP out 17 to. I also, as you had mentioned, I send out the 18 RFP to a contact at ISO New England, and I 19 request that this RFP be sent out to the entire 20 Markets Committee for wide distribution. 21 are over -- there are over 100 different entities 22 in the Markets Committee, most of whom are not 23 interested in bidding on default service. So, I 24 do not list those companies on this particular

1 exhibit. 2 But that, you know, I could make 3 changes to this exhibit and make a note that, you 4 know, this is sent to the Markets Committee for 5 widespread distribution, which is -- it's 6 mentioned in my testimony, too, that it is sent 7 to the Markets Committee for distribution. If I told you that the Office of the Consumer 8 9 Advocate were a member of those NEPOOL 10 Committees, would it be fair to say that you are 11 not expecting us to submit a bid to you to supply default service? 12 13 (Pentz) That is correct. 14 I think my next question might be for Ms. 15 McNamara. But, again, I don't really care which 16 Company witness answers it. 17 I think it would be helpful if the 18 Company -- well, with respect to residential 19 customers, it is true, is it not, that a 20 residential customer who wishes to obtain default 21 energy service from Unitil has an opportunity to 22 either pay a fixed price or a variable price? 23 That's a correct statement, is it not? 24 (McNamara) That is correct.

1 So, under what circumstances are variable prices 2 available to residential customers? 3 Α (McNamara) Well, in accordance with our Default 4 Service Tariff, Non-G1 customers, that would be 5 the Residential, the G2, and the Outdoor 6 Lighting, are automatically placed on the fixed 7 option, unless they opt for the variable option 8 at the beginning of when, you know, as they 9 become a new customer or when a new six-month 10 period starts, so that would be, in this case, 11 December 1, 2021. The other time that a customer would be 12 1.3 placed on variable service would be if they 14 returned to Unitil from having a competitive 15 supplier in between six-month periods. 16 generally speaking, most customers, Non-G1 17 customers, are on the fixed option. 18 With respect to that option to choose variable Q 19 service, does the Company undertake any efforts 20 to inform its residential customers that they 21 have that opportunity to choose variable Default 22 Energy Service? 23 (McNamara) Oh, I'm not aware of any direct 24 information packets or, you know, data that's out

there that specifically informs customers that 1 2 there are two options. The information is 3 definitely posted on the Company's website. 4 believe there are, when the mailing is done with 5 our rates, which I think is required once a year, 6 I could be wrong about that, there are bullets in 7 there that describe that there are variable 8 options. When we put out our customer bill 9 messages, it's also mentioned in there. So, 10 customers are made aware that it is an option. 11 Do you know what percentage of your residential 12 Default Energy Service customers end up or are on 13 variable, as opposed to fixed, rates at present? 14 (McNamara) Under 10 percent for the Residential 15 class, I believe the number is closer to 16 somewhere maybe around 10, maybe up to 15 percent 17 for the G2/Outdoor Lighting class. But the 18 Residential -- the Residential class is 19 definitely in the -- somewhere between the, say, 20 5 to 8 percent mark. 21 And just to refresh the recollection of people 22 who might remember, I don't remember, because I 23 wasn't here when this decision was made, but what 24 is the reason why, if you migrate out to

competitive energy supply, and then you come back to default energy service, you are automatically and irrevocably placed on variable, as opposed to fixed, prices?

- A (McNamara) That is so that customers can't game the system. It is, I guess, for lack of a better term, a fairness issue.
- O Sure.

A (McNamara) There was a point in time where customers actually, way back, I don't know how many years it's been now, if a customer left in the middle of a six-month period, and they had been on the fixed service, they were required to have their bill recalculated and pay the difference for what it would have been under the variable. And I guess, in some circumstances, that could have been a credit.

But that has been removed. And now, if you are on the fixed option, and you move to a competitive supplier, you just move. You don't have your bill recalculated. It's only when you return that you're placed on the variable option, until the start of the next six-month period, then you can certainly be placed on the fixed

1 option.

Q Thank you. I think my last question or two might be for Mr. Lambert. But, again, anybody from the Company who wants to answer my question can certainly do so.

Would it be fair to say that, given that Default Energy Service prices, assuming the Commission approves the request that's now pending, are going to be higher than they have ever been, would the Company expect that development to increase the degree of interest among its residential customers in exploring the possibility of competitive energy supply?

- A (Lambert) Yes, Mr. Kreis. This is Mark Lambert.

 If I understood the question correctly, I was just having a little hard time hearing, is your question whether we would further promote competitive suppliers with our Residential class customers?
- No. My question was simply, do you expect more interest among residential customers in at least considering migrating out to competitive supply, at a time when your Default Energy Service price is or will be at its highest level ever?

```
1
          (Lambert) Yes. Thank you for the clarification.
 2
         Yes, absolutely we do. We saw the migration to
 3
         competitive energy suppliers back when prices
 4
         spiked in 2014 and '15 from the polar vortex.
 5
         saw interest in competitive suppliers increase.
 6
         And what we plan to do through communications to
 7
         proactively inform customers is to further
 8
         promote where this information is on our website,
 9
         and then also where it is on the Department of
10
         Energy and PUC's website as well. So, customers
11
         have an opportunity to compare rates, to compare
12
         competitive suppliers that do business in our
13
         service territory.
14
                    So, we anticipate it, but we also look
15
         for opportunities to promote that, especially
16
         with these high rates as we can see.
17
    Q
         You just said "we look for opportunities to
18
         promote that". What specifically are you
19
         promoting?
20
         (Lambert) We will proactively communicate through
21
         bill messages, bill inserts, newsletters to
22
         customers throughout this period. And we're
         putting those communications together now.
23
24
         will also reactively, as customers talk to our
```

```
1
         customer service representatives, this will be a
 2
         point of interest and a point of training for our
 3
         CSRs, to encourage customers that they do have
 4
         this option. So, we'll do it two different ways;
 5
         I think proactively, through messaging, and
 6
         reactively, as customer service representatives
 7
         are talking to customers.
         So, you actually -- you expect that you will --
 8
 9
         Unitil will actually promote to residential
10
         customers, and perhaps other customers as well,
11
         the fact that they have the right to choose
12
         competitive supply, as opposed to default energy
13
         service?
14
         (Lambert) I'm sorry, Don. I missed that last
15
         part.
16
         Sorry. I just wanted to make sure I understand
17
         what it is that the Company is promoting. And I
18
         think you said that what you intend to promote is
19
         simply the fact that every customer has the
20
         opportunity, if she, he or it wants to, to choose
21
         a competitive supplier?
22
    Α
         (Lambert) Yes. Yes, that's correct. And what
23
         we'll do, too, is to point customers to
         information. So, perhaps "promote" may have been
24
```

```
the wrong way to describe that, but what we'll do
 1
         is provide as much education as we can to
 2
 3
         customers about what their options, about what
 4
         they should be careful of for suppliers, you
 5
         know, how they should go about to be best
 6
         informed to make these decisions. So, those are
 7
         the things we'll do. And I think maybe
         "education" is probably the better way to
 9
         describe it.
10
         Right. So, it sounds to me, if I'm understanding
11
         your testimony correctly, that you aren't putting
12
         the Company's thumb on the scale of either
13
         choosing a competitive supplier or sticking with
14
         default service, you are simply proactively
15
         educating customers about the fact that they can
16
         make that choice, and it's up to them?
17
    Α
         (McNamara) Yes. That's correct.
18
                   MR. KREIS: Thank you, Madam
19
         Chairwoman. Those are all the questions I have
20
         at this time for these distinguished witnesses.
21
                   CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you,
22
         Mr. Kreis. Ms. Amidon.
23
                   MS. AMIDON: Thank you. I would first
24
         ask the witnesses to please let me know if you
```

need me to repeat a question or if you can't hear 1 2 I haven't used this system before, and I 3 understand there could be some issues. So, let 4 me know. 5 BY MS. AMIDON: 6 My first question I believe is for Mr. Pentz. 7 I understand your testimony, this solicitation 8 was conducted pursuant to the terms of the 9 Settlement Agreement which set this process up, 10 and is consistent with prior Unitil solicitations 11 for Default Energy Service. Is that right? 12 (Pentz) That's correct. 13 And, similarly, the bid evaluation process that 14 you conducted considered all the factors that 15 have previously been considered in the selection 16 of a winning bidder, consistent again with that 17 Settlement Agreement that established this 18 procurement in the competitive market. Is that 19 right? 20 (Pentz) That's right. 21 Did the Company make any revisions to the Master 22 Power Agreement with the winning bidder that 23 would shift any costs to customers? 24 (Pentz) No. There were no revisions to the Power Α

```
1
         Supply Agreement.
 2
         And, similarly, were there any changes to the
 3
         financial security requirements from prior bids
 4
         and prior agreements?
 5
         (Pentz) There were no changes to any financial
 6
         security requirements.
 7
    Q
         Thank you. And, Mr. Pentz, if you would please
 8
         go to Page 32 of I guess I'm going to look at
         Exhibit 4, which is the confidential filing. And
 9
10
         let me know when you're there?
11
         (Pentz) I'm there.
    Α
         I understand that this page is confidential.
12
13
         I want to find out how the Company sees the Class
14
         III market operating this year, as opposed to
15
         prior years. And my understanding is that the
16
         Class III market is existing biomass and in
17
         addition some methane producers, is that right?
18
         (Pentz) That's correct. For the New Hampshire
    Α
19
         Class III market, for compliance year 2020, we
20
         issued an RFP for New Hampshire Class III RECs.
21
         We did not receive any offers at all. We looked
22
         on the market for a little bit shortly
23
         thereafter, and we were unable to contract for
24
         any Class III RECs. And, so, the Company paid
```

alternative compliance payments in 2020 to comply with that.

Looking at 2020, the compliance percentage was 8 percent, which means, you know, if you're a competitive supplier, or if you're a utility that supplies energy, you have to purchase 8 percent -- 8 percent worth of your sales with those RECs. And it was later reduced to 2 percent, in I believe it was the fourth trading -- the fourth quarter trading period. That presents a risk, because, if you buy 100 percent of your RECs, and then the compliance percentage is reduced to 2 percent, what do you do with those leftover RECs? You know, you may not -- you may not be able to bank all of those RECs.

So, the New Hampshire Class III, it's a very risky market, from a compliance perspective, because there's a lot of uncertainty as to if the compliance percentage will be changed, you know, in the fourth quarter trading period.

So, my view on this class, I like to take a very conservative approach here. We're going to issue an RFP this month likely for 2021

```
1
                And I'm not sure that it's in our best
 2
         interest to procure New Hampshire Class III RECs
 3
         because of that risk. The percentage is -- it
 4
         remains at 8 percent right now. But, if it's
 5
         reduced to 2 percent, what do we do with all
 6
         those extra RECs, if we are able to purchase
 7
         them?
 8
                   So, I'm unsure as to the outlook of the
 9
         market. But it's risky.
10
         Thank you. And, just for the record, your
11
         understanding is that the statutory alternative
12
         compliance payment is the cap for which the
13
         Company is responsible for the RPS requirement,
14
         is that correct?
15
         (Pentz) That is correct.
    Α
16
         Thank you. Okay. I believe this is for Ms.
17
         McNamara. I wanted to ask you to turn to I
18
         believe it's Bates 160, which is the calculation
19
         of the Default Service Charge.
20
         (McNamara) Okay.
    Α
21
         Let me know when you're there?
22
    Α
         (McNamara) I am there.
23
         Okay. So, you recall that previously Attorney
24
         Kreis was having a conversation regarding the
```

```
1
         fixed and variable rates. Do you recall that?
 2
         (McNamara) Yes.
 3
         And could you show -- could you tell us where on
 4
         this exhibit we might see the fixed rate versus
 5
         the variable rate?
 6
         (McNamara) Yes.
 7
         So, let's go for the Non-G1 class, which is the
 8
         subject at the top of the page, right?
 9
         (McNamara) Correct. This particular page is the
10
         redline version of the Company's tariff for the
11
         calculation of total default service for the
12
         Non-G1 class. And the first several lines, Lines
13
         1 through 8, calculate the power supply charge
14
         for the Residential class; Lines 9 through 16
15
         calculate the power supply charge for the G2 and
16
         Outdoor Lighting class; and then the last box --
17
         or, not really the "last box", or the last
18
         calculation, is Lines 17 through 24 is the RPS
19
         charge for the Non-G1 class. It's the same for
20
         the Residential, G2, and Outdoor Lighting.
21
                    So, the very bottom section is where
22
         that's all summed together. On Line 25, you see
23
         the Residential Variable rate; on Line 26, you
24
         would see the Fixed rate for the Residential
```

```
1
         class; and then similar, on Lines 27 and 28, the
 2
         Variable and Fixed charges for the G2 and Outdoor
 3
         Lighting classes.
 4
         So, just to be clear, the variable rate is where
 5
         the cost per kilowatt-hour vary from month to
 6
         month, is that right?
 7
    Α
         (McNamara) That is correct.
 8
         And tell me how you calculate the fixed rate?
 9
         (McNamara) The fixed rate is simply based on the
10
         sum of the six-month period.
11
         So, it's a simple matter of dividing the costs
    Q
12
         equally over six months, is that fair to say?
13
         (McNamara) It's divided equally over the
    Α
14
         purchased -- purchased kilowatt-hour, you know,
15
         increased using a loss factor.
16
         Thank you. And about the loss factor, has the
17
         Company done any recent recalculation or
18
         evaluation of the loss factor?
19
         (McNamara) It has not.
    Α
20
         And would that perhaps be conducted in the
21
         context of a rate case?
22
    Α
         (McNamara) Yes, it would. My understanding is
23
         that, with the Company's current rate case, one
24
         was not prepared. But that, with the next rate
```

```
case, which I don't know when that would be, the
 1
 2
         Company is prepared to file one.
 3
                   MS. AMIDON: Okay. Thank you. One
 4
         moment please.
 5
                    (Atty. Amidon conferring with
 6
                   Mr. Eckberg.)
 7
                   MS. AMIDON: Thank you. That's all
 8
         that the Department of Energy has for these
 9
         witnesses. Thank you.
10
                   CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. Thank
11
         you, Ms. Amidon. Commissioner Goldner.
12
                   COMMISSIONER GOLDNER: Yes. Thank you.
13
         I just wanted to follow up actually on the last
14
         series of questions on Bates 160.
    BY COMMISSIONER GOLDNER:
15
16
         If it's a simple -- if there's a simple average,
17
         this Line 25 that we were talking about a
18
         variable rate, wouldn't it be a weighted average
19
         with usage?
20
         (McNamara) Yes. It is a weighted average. It's
21
         based on the summation for the whole period,
22
         divided by the kilowatt-hours for the period.
23
         Okay. Let me -- I'm new to this, so bear with
24
         me. So, if I look at each time period, that
```

```
1
         corresponds to -- there's a rate, and there's a
 2
         usage in each period, so, X number of
 3
         kilowatt-hours. And I would assume that it --
 4
         you have less energy consumed in the springtime
 5
         and in the fall than in the winter, is that
 6
         right?
 7
    Α
         (McNamara) Could you repeat that?
 8
         I'm just wondering if your usage in each of those
 9
         time periods of the kilowatt-hours is the same or
10
         if it's different?
11
    Α
         (McNamara) The kilowatt-hours per period or per
12
         month?
13
         Yes. So, on the chart, on Page 160, you have
14
         December '21 through May of '22. And is your --
15
         is the kilowatt-hours that you would expect to
16
         sell in December '21 greater or less than in May
17
         of '22?
18
         (McNamara) Oh. The kilowatt-hours are higher in
    Α
19
         December 2021 versus May of 2022. If you were to
20
         look at the page, Bates Page 160, and, for
21
         example, look at Line 4, that shows kilowatt-hour
22
         purchases, which, with applying the loss factor,
23
         the Company estimates the sales for each of those
24
         months. In your example, looking at December,
```

```
1
         just over 43 million kilowatt-hours, and moving
 2
         over to May, just over 31 million kilowatt-hours.
 3
    Q
         Perfect. Perfect. And, when you calculate that
 4
         fixed rate of about 17 and a half cents, that's
 5
         the weighted average of Line 25 and Line 4,
 6
         correct? Or, is it the simple average?
 7
    Α
         (McNamara) It is not a simple average. It is
 8
         taking what is on Line 8, for example, that we
         would look at Line 8, which is the Fixed
 9
10
         Residential power supply charge, which is
11
         calculated based on the amounts that are in the
12
         column directly above it, on Lines 1, 2, 3, 4, 5,
13
         you know, which is the sum from the period.
14
         then, it adds in what is on Line 24, the
15
         Renewable Portfolio Standard Charge for the
16
         period, the fixed charge.
17
    Q
         Okay. Okay.
18
         (McNamara) So, I quess I'll just rephrase.
19
         cannot take the variable charges shown on Line
20
         25, sum them and divide by 6.
21
         Correct. Because it's weighted.
22
    Α
         (McNamara) That would be a simple average.
                                                       The
23
         17 cents proposed fixed rate is a weighted
24
         average.
```

```
1
                   Okay. Thank you. Yes.
         Correct.
                                             That's what I
 2
         was checking. Very good. Very good.
 3
                   So, to follow up on that, and maybe you
 4
         can help me with percentages, because this is
 5
         hard to do in my head. If you look at the
 6
         Renewable Portfolio Standard charges of it looks
 7
         like seven-hundredths of a dollar, and you take
         that as a ratio of the overall retail rate on
 8
 9
         Line 7, is that -- what percentage does the
10
         ratepayer pay for the renewable -- the RPS?
11
         (McNamara) I could do that math.
    Α
12
         I'll see if I get the same number here.
1.3
         (McNamara) Sorry.
    Α
14
         0.007, 7 divided by 0.167 --
15
         (McNamara) Four percent.
    Α
16
         So, it looks like, and correct me if I'm wrong,
17
         I'm getting about 4 and a half percent. So,
18
         there's an adder due to RPS of about 4 and a half
19
         percent?
20
         (McNamara) Correct. I had 4.4 percent of the
    Α
21
         total fixed Residential Default Service Charge is
22
         made up of the RPS component.
         Okay. So, if a residential ratepayer were to ask
23
24
         "hey, what am I paying for RPS?" The answer, at
```

```
1
         least in this time period, would be about roughly
 2
         4 and a half percent?
 3
    Α
         (McNamara) Of their rates, correct, but not
 4
         necessarily of their bill.
 5
         Understand. Okay. Very good. And I am
 6
         interested, it was interesting when you landed on
 7
         Page 160, because I'm very interested in the
 8
         market price and the price that ratepayers end up
 9
         paying due to cost burdens being added by, let's
10
         say, the state. So, we have the Renewable
11
         Portfolio Standard, we just talked about that,
12
         that's about 4 and a half percent; no problem.
13
         Also in the filing, it was Page 1 of what I have
14
         from Mr. Hevert, there's also a lot of
15
         documentation on the cost of the low-income, for
16
         the low-income piece of it. Can you share that
17
         same percentage for low-income, what is the
18
         contribution of the ratepayers to that fund?
19
         (McNamara) I'm not sure I understand the
    Α
20
         question.
21
         There is a low-income fund, right? And, so, it's
22
         the same question. So, we know how much, because
23
         we have it on Page 160, how much the ratepayer
24
         contributes to the RPS. And, so, my question is
```

```
1
         the same for low-income, how much does the
 2
         ratepayer contribute in this regard?
 3
    Α
         (McNamara) Customers are not funding, for default
 4
         service, a low-income rate. Low-income customers
 5
         receive a discount through the low-income
 6
         discount tiers. That's actually shown in the
 7
         filing on Bates Page 164.
 8
         Let me get to that in a second. So, yes.
    Q
 9
         the money comes from --
10
         (McNamara) That's the redline.
11
         The money comes from somewhere, right? So, some
12
         ratepayers pay in, some ratepayers take out. So,
13
         I'm trying to understand, the ratepayers that are
14
         paying in, how much are they paying?
15
         (McNamara) The discount is not collected as part
    Α
16
         of default service.
17
    Α
         (Lambert) Yes. Commissioner, this is Mark
18
         Lambert from Unitil.
19
                   Although I don't have the numbers in
20
         front of me to answer directly your question, you
21
         may be referring to what's not included into this
22
         default service filing, which is the funding of
23
         the System Benefit Charge. And the System
24
         Benefit Charge really funds two things: It
```

funds, as you stated correctly, the low-income 1 2 attribute or low-income discounts to customers 3 who qualify, and then also the energy efficiency 4 initiatives that have also been approved. 5 that charge funds both of those programs. 6 And I don't have the numbers in front 7 of me. Certainly, we could get those for you. 8 MR. KREIS: Madam Chairwoman, I realize 9 that I object to questions posed by commissioners 10 at my peril. But I would like to point out that the effect of the System Benefits Charge on rates 11 12 or bills is not germane to the matter that is 13 presently pending before the Commission, which is 14 the Company's Default Energy Service rates. 15 COMMISSIONER GOLDNER: So, what I'm 16 trying to understand is --CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Just one second, 17 18 Commissioner Goldner. Is that an objection or is 19 that a comment to note for the record? 20 MR. KREIS: Well, again, if another 21 party were to ask questions like that, I would 22 object on the ground that that line of inquiry is 23 not relevant. I don't even know whether it's 24 appropriate for me to object to a question asked

at a hearing by a commissioner. 1 2 CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Well, let's hear what Commissioner Goldner had to say, and 3 4 then we can go from there. 5 BY COMMISSIONER GOLDNER: 6 Yes. All I'm trying to understand is, on Page 7 164, if I could direct to a particular page, we 8 have a lot of numbers relative to a summary of 9 Low-Income Electric Assistance Program discounts 10 in this filing, and I'm trying to understand how 11 that relates to what ratepayers pay? 12 (McNamara) For default service, it has no 13 relation to what, and if I -- correct me if I'm 14 wrong, that I'm understanding your question 15 correctly, are you looking to understand if other 16 customers, not low-income customers, other 17 customers are paying a increased price to collect 18 the discount associated with providing energy to 19 low-income customers? Through default service, 20 the answer is "no". 21 I see. So, --Q 22 (McNamara) That discount is collected elsewhere. 23 Yes. And I appreciate the full disclosure by 24 Unitil in terms of helping to display as much

```
1
         information as possible. I'm just trying to
 2
         understand the meaning of Page 164 and what I
 3
         should take away from this page?
 4
         (McNamara) Page 164 is -- the specific Page 164
 5
         is the redline version of the Company's tariff.
 6
         But, as I mentioned, this is a tariff page. So,
 7
         this provides the low-income customers for their
 8
         delivery discounts by tier. The middle column
 9
         provides, if they were to take fixed default
10
         service, the discount they would receive. And
11
         the final columns provide the variable energy, if
12
         they were to take variable default service, the
13
         discounts that they would receive by month, --
14
         Okay. Very good.
15
         (McNamara) -- by tier.
    Α
16
         Yes. And is there a dollar amount that
17
         correlates to these rates?
18
         (McNamara) Well, there is. There is, the
    Α
19
         customer would receive a discount.
20
         Uh-huh.
21
         (McNamara) And, you know, that would be part of
    Α
22
         their bill. And then, that would get, you know,
23
         all these low-income customers' discounts would
24
         get summed up, and that amount, as Mr. Lambert
```

1 pointed out, would be collected as part of the 2 SBC. 3 Yes. And I'm just trying to understand what all 4 this adds up to. I see the rates. I see the 5 categories. I'm just trying to understand what 6 it all adds up to, that's all? 7 (McNamara) Are you looking for a specific dollar Α 8 amount? 9 Q Yes. Yes. 10 (McNamara) That amount would vary every month. 11 It would be part of the billing system. 12 Understand. Understand. But, in this filing, 13 we're talking about the next six months. So, I'm 14 just looking to understand just what that dollar amount would be that correlates to these 15 16 percentages. That all I'm trying to understand 17 here. 18 (McNamara) I would not be able to answer that Α 19 question. It would be a matter of how many 20 low-income customers there are, how much energy 21 they used, because these rates are per 22 kilowatt-hour, and how many customers remain on 23 default service. 24 CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Mr. Epler.

MR. EPLER: Yes. Just for clarification, perhaps I could direct Commissioner Goldner to where he might find some of this information.

And, if you look in Docket DE 21-121, which was the Unitil Energy Systems' most recent reconciliation filing, that's where you could see the breakdown of the components that are in the -- what we call the "EDC", the External Delivery Charge. And that's where a number of different rate components are compiled and charged, and then reconciled once a year.

So, in that docket, there is a chart in one of the schedules that was part of

Ms. McNamara's testimony in that case, that shows the breakdown. It shows the Customer Charge, the Distribution Charge, the External Delivery

Charge, Stranded Cost Charge, Storm Recovery

Charge, Systems Benefits Charge, Default Service

Charge, and you see each component broken down there. So, for example, I am looking at Bates

Page 043 of her Schedule -- Ms. McNamara's

Schedule LSM-4 in that docket.

So, I provide this not to include it as

evidence in this docket, only for a reference. 1 2 COMMISSIONER GOLDNER: Yes. Thank you, 3 Mr. Epler. That's exactly what I was looking 4 Thank you. I will reference that offline. 5 CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Ms. Amidon. 6 MS. AMIDON: If I may, there are bill 7 impact statements or comparisons in this docket, 8 and if you -- in this filing. If you go to Bates 9 175, for example, and this is to assist 10 Commissioner Goldner, there is "Typical Bill 11 Impact by Rate Component" for each customer, for residential customers who use 650 kilowatt-hours 12 13 a month. And this is something that the Company 14 typically prepares with these filings to show 15 what bill impacts there will be. And there you 16 will find, for this particular customer, the 17 categories of Distribution, External Delivery 18 Charge, Stranded Cost, Storm Recovery, System 19 Benefits Charge, and then the Default Service 20 Charge, and with a dollar value for each. And it 21 shows clearly that the only increase affected by 22 this filing is in the Default Service Charge. 23 So, that may be of some assistance to I don't -- I'm not sure if this is what 24 you.

```
1
         you're asking for, but I thought this would be
         helpful.
 2
 3
                   CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: What was the Bates
 4
         page? I apologize, Commissioner.
 5
                   COMMISSIONER GOLDNER: 175, yes.
 6
                   CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: 175?
 7
                   COMMISSIONER GOLDNER: Yes. Excellent.
 8
         Thank you. That is -- that is exactly right, or
 9
         exactly what I was looking for.
10
    BY COMMISSIONER GOLDNER:
11
         So, if I look at that Page 175, and I look at the
12
         Default Service Charge, as revised, in Column 3,
         12/1/21, it shows the Default Service Charge of
13
14
         the 17 and a half cents, which I recognize, and
15
         total kilowatt charges of about 25 cents. Am I
16
         reading that right?
17
    Α
         (McNamara) That is correct.
18
         Excellent. Excellent. And, so, I'm just going
    Q
19
         to do some simple math. I'm going to take 0.175
20
         divided by 0.252. And I'm going to say that the
21
         Default Service Charge is about 70 percent of the
22
         ratepayer's bill for this scenario, 650
23
         kilowatt-hours in this particular scenario.
24
         Understanding that scenarios can change, but the
```

```
one provided from the Company for a typical
 1
 2
         ratepayer would be in this first section. Is
 3
         that -- am I doing the math correctly and am I
 4
         summarizing that correctly?
 5
         (McNamara) Your math might be a little -- well, I
         know you're doing a back-of-the-envelope.
 6
 7
         column that is the far column to the right,
         "% Difference to Total Bill", --
 8
 9
         Uh-huh.
    Q
10
         (McNamara) -- that would be the amount I believe
11
         that you were just looking for. So, in this
12
         particular case, a 650 kilowatt-hour residential
13
         customer, who stays on fixed default service,
14
         would see a "60.3 percent" increase, which is
15
         shown on the line that is on Default Service, as
16
         well as total bill. The 60.3 is a percent of
17
         total bill.
                   COMMISSIONER GOLDNER: Got you. Okay.
18
19
         Okay. Thank you. That was very helpful.
                                                     That
20
         was what I was looking to understand. That's all
21
         the questions I have, Chairwoman.
22
                   CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.
23
         I just want to go back to Page 164, just to
24
         clarify, since we had so much discussion there
```

that I'm understanding that right. 1 2 BY CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: 3 What I understood from the testimony was that 4 that is simply a reflection of the Default 5 Service rate, less the discount, and that that 6 discount is not funded as part of this. It is 7 coming from the SBC. Do I have that right? 8 (McNamara) Yes. 9 All right. Thank you. Going back to the number 10 of bids that we saw, the number of bids received, 11 which I won't state, is that the same or similar 12 to the number of bids received in other years 13 over the past five years? 14 (Pentz) Yes. It is a similar amount of bids. Α 15 There was a slight, very slight reduction in the 16 number of bids due to, like I was mentioning 17 earlier, market conditions for power in New 18 England these days. But, for the most part, they 19 were consistent with past. And I would consider 20 this a very competitive solicitation. 21 Okay. Thank you. And you mentioned that the Q 22 list that we saw, I believe it was Bates Page 23 074, represents those suppliers that you sent the 24 RFP to directly, or that you reached out and

1 contacted directly. How do you decide which 2 suppliers you'll reach out to, versus I think we 3 heard about the Markets Committee and a number of 4 other suppliers? How do you make that 5 distinction? 6 (Pentz) Some of these suppliers have been on our 7 distribution list for over ten years. As a 8 practice, we do reach out to most of these suppliers on this list. Most of them are not 9 10 involved in wholesale power trading as of today. 11 So, you know, this is why there is, you know, the 12 pool of suppliers that we have today. I have done some maintenance on this 1.3 14 list, and, in particular, for this auction. 15 However, like I had mentioned before, you know, 16 the RFP is sent to the Markets Committee for

Now, you know, our most active communications really are directed at participants who have participated in previous solicitations. These are what I would like to call "active suppliers", because we worked with them before in the past. So, you know, the communication is robust. It involves a phone

widespread distribution.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
call, follow-up emails.
 1
 2
         When you say you did "some maintenance", what
 3
         does that entail?
 4
         (Pentz) I removed older suppliers that, you know,
 5
         have never responded to our RFP.
 6
         Did you add any suppliers?
 7
    Α
         (Pentz) Yes.
 8
                    CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.
 9
         I have no other questions.
10
                    Mr. Epler, do you have any redirect?
11
                   MR. EPLER: Yes.
12
                      REDIRECT EXAMINATION
13
    BY MR. EPLER:
14
         Mr. Pentz, if you could look at Bates Page 074,
15
         in confidential Exhibit 5 [4?]. Are you there?
16
         (Pentz) Yes.
17
         Okay. So, I just want to make sure it's clear
18
         what this page represents. So, looking at the
19
         list of companies, these are companies that have,
20
         at some time or another, expressed a level of
21
         interest in this solicitation at some point in
22
         time?
23
         (Pentz) That's correct.
    Α
24
         Okay. They may or may not be -- reflect recent
```

```
activity, but, certainly, at some point they have
 1
 2
         indicated an interest and either submitted a bid
 3
         or perhaps an indicative bid. Is that correct?
 4
         (Pentz) That's correct. Some of these suppliers
 5
         at some point have responded to our initial
 6
         solicitation notification for additional
 7
         information, to only find out that they're not
 8
         interested in bidding. Some of them are
 9
         interested in bidding. Some of these companies
10
         we have entered into contracts with. So, it's a
11
         widespread pool of participants that we tend to
12
         think are the most active. So, we put these
13
         suppliers in this list to directly send them the
14
         solicitation. So, yes.
15
         Okay. And then, obviously, the contact name is
16
         the specific contact person that you're aware of
17
         at these -- at these companies?
18
         (Pentz) Yes. That's correct. And, when I
    Α
19
         referred to "maintenance", maintenance also
20
         involves, you know, assigning a new contact to a
21
         company, if someone retires. So, that would be
22
         involved in the maintenance part.
23
         Okay. Now, on the column labeled
24
         "Communication", it appears that some -- some of
```

```
these have an indication of the kind of
 1
 2
         communication and others are blank. What does it
 3
         mean if it's blank? Does that --
 4
         (Pentz) If it is blank, then these are suppliers
 5
         that I have not heard back from in quite a while.
 6
         So, these are suppliers that generally are not
 7
         interested in bidding on default service.
 8
         And then, that's -- and then, for those who there
 9
         is a communication indicated, you then indicate
10
         further, in the last column, "Initial
11
         Expectation", what your expectation is, as to
12
         whether or not those that you had direct contact
13
         with will be bidding, is that correct?
14
         (Pentz) That's correct. Yes.
15
         So, in terms of the value of this information, if
16
         you were someone who was either active or
17
         considering whether to be active, if you -- let
18
         me clarify that. If you were a potential entity
19
         that wanted to bid, and you had access to this
20
         information, you could then glean from this which
21
         entities are active and which are not? Is that
22
         correct?
23
         (Pentz) Yes. That's correct.
    Α
24
         And could you also then gain an understanding of
```

```
which the Company has actively contacted?
 1
 2
         (Pentz) Yes, as stated in the exhibit.
 3
         And, if you could turn to Page -- in this same
         exhibit, --
 4
 5
         (Pentz) I apologize, what Bates page was that?
 6
         Yes, I'm trying to make sure I -- I want to turn
 7
         to it first to make sure I have the right one
         before I tell you. Bates Page 025, in this same
 9
         exhibit, confidential Exhibit 5 [4?].
10
         (Pentz) Okay.
11
         And do you see the four lines that are shaded
12
         gray?
13
         (Pentz) Yes.
    Α
14
         And so, that indicates lines that the Company, at
15
         least in this exhibit, has marked as
16
         "confidential". Is it your testimony that, in
17
         reconsidering these four lines, the Company could
18
         withdraw its request to keep these four lines
19
         confidential? That this is just a general
20
         statement and not specific?
21
         (Pentz) I would agree. This is a general
    Α
22
         statement regarding payment terms, but it's not
23
         assigned to any particular bidder. So, I agree
24
         this could be definitely public.
```

```
MR. EPLER: Madam Chair, the Company is
 1
 2
         willing to withdraw its request to have the lines
 3
         on this page confidential. And, when I refile
 4
         the exhibits to indicate the proper numbering, as
 5
         I indicated at the beginning of the hearing, I
 6
         will amend the exhibit so that the lines on this
 7
         page are not -- are not shaded and not requested
         to be confidential.
 9
                   CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right.
10
               And can you please note that in your cover
         you.
11
         letter when you submit those?
12
                   MR. EPLER: Okay. Thank you.
1.3
                   CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Thank you. Any
         further redirect?
14
15
                   MR. EPLER: No, I don't believe so.
16
         Thank you very much.
17
                    (Brief off-the-record discussion
18
                   between the court reporter and
19
                    Chairwoman Martin.)
20
                   CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Mr. Patnaude has
21
         questioned whether Mr. Lambert and Mr. Diggins,
2.2
         when he swore in the witnesses, raised their hand
         and were sworn in. Can you, the both of you
23
24
         please confirm that, and/or we'll need to do that
```

```
1
         and have you --
 2
                   WITNESS DIGGINS: Yes. This is Todd
         Diggins. I did answer. I did swear in.
 3
 4
                   CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay.
 5
                   MR. PATNAUDE: Okay.
                   CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Mr. Lambert?
 7
                   WITNESS LAMBERT: Yes. I swore in as
         well. But, certainly, I do.
                   CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you
 9
10
         for the clarification.
11
                   MR. PATNAUDE: Thank you.
12
                   CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Any other lingering
13
         concerns from anyone?
14
                    [No verbal response.]
15
                   CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Commissioner
16
         Goldner, any other questions?
17
                   COMMISSIONER GOLDNER: No.
18
                   CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. Then,
19
         we will strike ID on what are now going to be
         identified as "Exhibits 3", "4", and "5" and
20
21
         admit those as full exhibits.
22
                   And we will take closings, starting
23
         with Mr. Kreis.
24
                   MR. KREIS: Thank you, Madam
```

Chairwoman.

2.

1.3

2.2

These are the largest Default Energy
Service prices ever presented to this Commission
for approval in the history of electric
restructuring. And it's obvious, from the
evidence adduced by the Company, that that
development is not the Company's fault. It is a
result of some unfortunate and unhappy conditions
in the world market for natural gas, and the
effects that that world market for natural gas
have had on wholesale electricity prices. And I
think the Company has done a very good job of
making that clear here.

The reason that I raised the issue of the redactions in the public version of the Company's exhibits and its filing is I hope pretty obvious. There will be and there should be heightened public interest in a Default Energy Service proceeding that proposes the kind of ultra high prices that the Company, again, through no fault of its own, is proposing.

And, in that context, because RSA 91-A calls on instrumentalities of government, and ultimately the courts, to apply a balancing test,

it seems to me that the public's interest in disclosure is heightened, not because the public has an interest in scrutinizing the Company, but because the public has an interest in scrutinizing the Commission and, to some extent, even the Office of the Consumer Advocate, so that the public has confidence that we, meaning the PUC and the Office of the Consumer Advocate, and the Department of Energy, are doing everything that we can to make sure that the public is well served by electric restructuring, and is not being taken advantage of in any way at a time when default energy services are at their height.

1.3

2.2

Now, unfortunately from my perspective, what utilities get to do in the context of these default energy service proceedings is rely on Rule Puc 201.06 and Rule Puc 201.07, to essentially gain automatic confidential treatment of certain aspects of their filings. That is a problem, because it largely circumvents the balancing test, and those rules even give the Company an opportunity to seek nondisclosure of certain information should there be a request from the public for access to this information.

And let me be clear, I don't think I have standing to make such a request, for the simple reason that the Office of the Consumer Advocate has full access to all the confidential information. So, you won't see me making a request like that. But I do have concerns about the two rules provisions that I just quoted, for the simple reason that RSA 91-A, the Right-to-Know law, is a disclosure statute. It is not a confidentiality statute. And outside parties, including utilities, that prefer to see certain information treated as confidential, because its ultimate source is their files, don't have standing under the statute to attempt to vindicate their alleged confidentiality interest.

1.3

2.2

The question of whether anything in the Commission's files is confidential or not confidential is a matter of discretion to the agency. And, in these circumstances, I would urge the Commission to exercise its discretion by urging this Company, and other companies, to re-examine, refine, and get less sloppy about their assertions of what are entitled or what is entitled to confidential treatment in a docket

like this.

1.3

2.2

It's laudable that Mr. Epler, at least in one instance, said "well, it turns out that something we designated as confidential really doesn't need to be confidential. So, we'll fix that when we fix the exhibit numbers and submit new -- newly renumbered exhibits to you so that the record is accurate."

But I don't think that's good enough.

I think the Commission really ought to re-examine and clamp down on the extent to which utilities are allowed to make cursory, conclusory, and sloppy confidentiality designations. And that's especially important now, because the public is and has a right to be very concerned about the kind of energy prices that they will be confronting when the Commission, as it should, approves this Default Energy Service filing.

With respect to the questions about the effect of the low-income program on people's electricity bills, I would just point out two things. (1) RSA 374-F, Section 4, Paragraph VIII, Subparagraph (a) [Sub. (c)?] says that the low-income portion of the System Benefits Charge

is, by statute, fixed at a maximum of "1.5 mills per kilowatt-hour". To my knowledge, this, and every other electric utility in the state, charges that full 1.5 mills per kilowatt-hour to fund the Low-Income Energy Assistance Program.

That is a tiny fraction of people's electricity bills, especially with the Default Energy Service price going up to the level that it is going to go up to.

1.3

2.2

There is a separate proceeding that the Commission has recently opened to consider the budgets for the Electric Assistance Program, and that is where any concerns about what all ratepayers are contributing to the welfare of the fraction of ratepayers who are low-income customers. That's where that question gets resolved. It's not germane to this case.

And the other observation I would make is that the Commission has long assumed, without really examining it, that 650 kilowatt-hours per month is a typical residential energy bill.

Thanks to things like energy efficiency, I believe that the typical residential bill is now considerably less than 650 kilowatt-hours per

month. So, to the extent its relevant, as the Commission considers "what effect does all of this have on the typical residential energy bill?", I don't think that that exhibit that tells you what the effect on a 650 kilowatt-hour bill really tells you what you would like to know.

1.3

2.2

Subject to all of those concerns, I would like to thank the Company for its help in allowing us and the Department of Energy to understand its filing, and for the good job it, and in particular its witnesses, did today in presenting the results of its latest solicitation to you.

These are very troubling developments, but I nevertheless, with great reluctance, urge the Commission to approve the results of this solicitation and the resulting Default Energy Service bills. Perhaps, though, instructing the Company to be more proactive in making sure that customers know that they do have the right to choose a variable, rather than a fixed rate.

That's all I have to say.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Mr. Kreis, I just

have a question, based on your 91-A comments.

1.3

2.2

Do you have -- are you suggesting that the pricing in this docket should -- we should consider disclosing pricing? Or is there some other information that is covered by the rule that you think would give greater insight to the public in understanding why the prices are higher?

MR. KREIS: Frankly, Madam Chairwoman,
I would urge public disclosure of everything in
this file. I really think the public's interest
in disclosure, given the extremely high rate that
the Company is about to start charging, warrants
total disclosure of certain information that, in
more routine times, would potentially be
competitively sensitive, and therefore worthy of
nondisclosure under the balancing test.

But, beyond that, I'm simply urging the Commission to ask the Company, this company and other utilities, to be more discerning in what they designate as punitively confidential under Rule 201.06 of the PUC's procedural rules.

I hope that's responsive to your question?

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: It is. As a follow-up, do you disagree that disclosing the pricing may inhibit the competitive nature of future bids?

1.3

2.2

MR. KREIS: I think the evidence of that is -- I really have no way of answering that question. I think that claim has been made time and again on a conclusory basis.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. And I'd like to, Mr. Epler, go back to your witness, just to get, if it's available, a response to Mr. Kreis's argument related to the average residential customer bill.

Do you have a more accurate number? Is the "650" an assumption? Is it close? Can you give us some information on that, Mr. Epler?

MR. EPLER: Yes. Actually, if you look at -- if you go to Exhibit Number 3, and you go to Bates Page 179, we provide a much more granular breakdown of usage, total bill, under current rates, the new rates, the difference, and the percentage difference.

And Ms. McNamara may want to clarify that point it looks like.

WITNESS McNAMARA: I would actually like to turn you to Bates Page 177. Sometime ago this question was posed, this particular page has been included with default service filings, as well as our annual reconciliation filing that recovers the EDC and SCC. This page provides a box where we show the residential mean, the average, as well as the residential median. And, as footnoted, that was based on the last calendar year. We update this once a year. So, this looked at actual billings for the period January through December 2020.

1.3

2.2

And, coincidentally, it's not always that way, but the mean use for calendar year 2020, for a residential customer, was 650 kilowatt-hours. Typically hovers right around that number.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

All right. Ms. Amidon.

MS. AMIDON: Thank you. Staff, the
Department of Energy, has reviewed the filing,
and we believe that the Company conducted the bid
solicitation, the bid evaluation, and the final

selection process according to the process approved by the Commission in Order Number 24,511, as amended, and consistent with other Commission rulings.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

In particular, we find that the bids were competitive -- that the solicitation was competitively bid. That the selection was appropriate, and that the resulting rates are indeed market-based.

So, consistent with the Commission settlement -- the settlement agreement I previously referenced, the Commission should approve the filing, and along the lines requested by the Company, which I believe is by the end of the week they would expect an order.

I am concerned that any, other than what Attorney Epler proposed in terms of a redaction from the confidential request, at this time. I think that Attorney Kreis has some merit in asking for maybe a generic process for all utilities to conform with those, with certain new requirements, if they are indeed sloppy in their request for redaction. But my concern is related to issues of volatility in the market, and the

fact is that the number of competitive suppliers, for example, is confidential is it does send a signal to the market. I am not a market expert. But, in developing the process used here by the Commission, I did work with someone who was familiar with the markets, and that utility analyst, George McCluskey, agreed that you don't want to send signals to the market that would create instability in the market, that would discourage competitive suppliers from -- well, that would discourage energy suppliers from responding to these bids, or encourage energy suppliers to bid higher prices.

1.3

2.2

So, in that sense, given the nature of these increases, I would think this would not be an appropriate time to consider releasing the bid numbers that was received by the Company from these suppliers.

As to the future, I think it has to be done with some deliberation and caution. And I'm also mindful, I believe there is a FERC rule which holds wholesale prices confidential for I believe at least one quarter. Attorney Epler may be able to clarify anything I said that's

incorrect with respect to these FERC rules. But that you will note, if you look at the filing, that after a period of time the wholesale prices can be disclosed.

So, having said that, I request the Commission to approve the filing as -- and the rates that result from this filing. But to be cautious in taking any action, other than what Attorney Epler suggested, with respect to the confidential treatment of the financial information in this filing.

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Thank you,

Ms. Amidon. Mr. Epler.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

MR. EPLER: Thank you, Chairwoman Martin, Commissioner Goldner.

Perhaps one of the benefits, or maybe a detriment, of occupying the chair that I've sit in for so long is that I've gone through a number of iterations in a number of dockets dealing with the solicitations for default service. And, so, there's a history that I may remember that others may not. But it may be instructive to just review a little bit of that in talking about some

of these issues.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

First, in terms, just to give some perspectives, so the Commission understands, it was actually at the request of an earlier Consumer Advocate that the Company provides the typical bill showing the median and the mean usage, as well as what I pointed out to be on Bates Page 179, which is a more granular breakdown, showing the usage at various levels. So, we were -- this actually evolved and we were instructed by the Commission to provide this information on this more granular level. Because there was an argument that either a 600 or 650 kilowatt-hour usage that we were using was not really indicative to those customers, as Mr. Kreis has pointed out, tried to take advantage of energy efficiency measures and so on and try to reduce their usage. So, that's why that's provided there.

In terms of the confidentiality, it was previously the case a number of years ago that, when we made our filing, we actually accompanied it with a motion for confidential treatment, and there was a more upfront analysis of

confidentiality on the record as part of these proceedings. And, after some time, I think perhaps from the Commission's perspective, these became routine. And, so, the provisions that Mr. Kreis pointed to in Rule 200 were incorporated into that rule, so that we would not — there wasn't a need to rehash those arguments in each one of these default service hearings. Perhaps there's a benefit of doing that, perhaps there's a detriment in doing that. But, in any event, that's the derivation of why that's in the Commission's rule, at least according to my memory.

2.

1.3

2.2

Certainly, at the time, again, thinking about the evolution of the confidentiality here, the intent initially was to protect the competitive supplier market and to nurture it, and to allow it to develop, so that, when we went out for -- when the Company would go out for a default service solicitation, it would -- it could be assured that there were as many participants as possible, and that you would get an actual competitive solicitation and a competitive result.

1 So, there was clearly an intent to try 2 to protect information that, perhaps not at first 3 glance, but from somebody who is a sophisticated 4 player in the market, could be used to try to 5 game the solicitation and gain some kind of 6 advantage, by knowing who are at least 7 participating in the markets; whether they 8 participate in other markets; whether they are an active bidder here, or maybe they're not, and 9 maybe they're going to be an active bidder 10 11 somewhere else; if they bid recently, if they're 12 not, what kind of terms that they're proposing, 1.3 are they requesting payment monthly, more 14 frequently, less frequently; are there other 15 kinds of financial arrangements they want. 16 there was a desire to protect as much of that 17 information as possible to protect the 18 competitive market and keep it active. 19 So, it is very possible that over time 20 that, because we no longer, on an active basis,

So, it is very possible that over time that, because we no longer, on an active basis, look at some of this information and rely on the rule, that we have become perhaps a little less precise in what we're seeking confidential treatment for. But the desire is to protect

21

2.2

23

24

that, our solicitations from gaming, to try to solicit as many participants as possible, so that we have a result that we can rely on, and that we can present to you and to the other parties, is an active market, and we believe that we have achieved an accurate price that is reflective of the market.

1.3

2.2

So, with that, I would just -- I would caution the Commission in taking what I would consider a drastic step and seeking to have all this information made public. I think that there is a strong basis for wanting to protect a lot of the information, or perhaps all of it that we've marked. And, if there is a desire to look at this, to do -- is to proceed along the lines that Attorney Amidon has suggested, that would be some kind of more generic or inclusive docket, where other participants could look at the kind of information that we're seeking to protect, and the benefits and costs of either disclosing or keeping it confidential.

But we will, for this particular proceeding, as I re-mark the exhibits, as I indicated at the beginning of the hearing, we

will carefully go through what we've requested confidential treatment for. And, if we have not been precise in our request, we will amend that request, and you will see that in the filing.

And we will endeavor to do that as quickly as possible, knowing that we are requesting an order by the end of the week. So, we'll try to get that to you quickly.

With that, I think that really covers the points that I wanted to make. I think, otherwise, I think the witnesses and the evidence has shown that the solicitation occurred in accordance with prior Commission orders and precedent, and that the results are accurate, and the tariffs that we're requesting should be approved.

Thank you.

2.

1.3

2.2

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Thank you,
Mr. Epler. And I appreciate your reviewing what
has been marked "confidential" and your
willingness to do that very much.

Commissioner Goldner, did you have any follow-up?

COMMISSIONER GOLDNER: No follow-up.

1	CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. Thank
2	you, everyone.
3	With that, we'll close the hearing and
4	take this matter under advisement, and we will
5	issue an order promptly as requested. The
6	hearing is adjourned.
7	(Whereupon the hearing was adjourned
8	at 10:51 a.m.)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
2 4	