

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**March 21, 2023** - 1:42 p.m.  
21 South Fruit Street  
Suite 10  
Concord, NH

RE: **DE 23-004**  
**PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW**  
**HAMPSHIRE d/b/a EVERSOURCE ENERGY:**  
Proposed Purchase of Receivables  
Program. (*Prehearing conference*)

**PRESENT:** Chairman Daniel C. Goldner, Presiding  
Commissioner Pradip K. Chattopadhyay  
Commissioner Carleton B. Simpson

Eric Wind , Esq./PUC Legal Advisor

Tracey Russo, Clerk

**APPEARANCES:** **Reptg. Public Service Company of**  
**New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource Energy:**  
David K. Wiesner, Esq.

**Reptg. Community Power Coalition of**  
**New Hampshire:**  
Clifton Below, Chair

**Reptg. New Hampshire Dept. of Energy:**  
Matthew C. Young, Esq.  
Alexandra K. Ladwig, Esq.  
Amanda Noonan, Dir./Consumer Division  
Elizabeth Nixon, Dir./Electric Division  
(Regulatory Support Division)

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

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

**I N D E X**

**PAGE NO.**

**STATEMENTS OF PRELIMINARY POSITION BY:**

Mr. Wiesner	6
Mr. Young	9
Mr. Below	10

**QUESTIONS/STATEMENTS BY:**

Cmsr. Simpson	11
Cmsr. Chattopadhyay	18
Chairman Goldner	23

<b>DISCUSSION RE: PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE</b>	<b>25</b>
---	-----------

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

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

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. We are here this afternoon in Docket DE 23-004, in which the Commission has docketed Public Service Company of New Hampshire, doing business as Eversource, Proposed Purchase of Receivables Program, a component facilitating retail electric service sales, required by RSA 53-E:9 and Administrative Rule Puc 2205.16.

We will hear preliminary positions from the parties on Eversource's Proposal, as well as address the development of a procedural schedule today.

First, let's take appearances, beginning with Eversource.

MR. WIESNER: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. I'm David Wiesner, representing Public Service Company of New Hampshire, doing business as Eversource Energy. And, yes, you heard that correctly.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Welcome back, Mr. Wiesner.

MR. WIESNER: Thank you. It's good to be back.

1 CMSR. SIMPSON: Nice to see you.

2 MR. WIESNER: With me today is a team  
3 of our experts, although not perhaps the full  
4 complement that we might have brought: Our  
5 witness, Brendan O'Brien, of the Accounting  
6 Department; Daryush Donyavi, of the -- who works  
7 with suppliers for the Company; Sandra Gagnon, of  
8 Regulatory Affairs; and Helen Gagnon, of our IT  
9 Department.

10 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Very good. Very  
11 good. And the Department of Energy?

12 MR. YOUNG: Good afternoon,  
13 Commissioners. This is Matthew Young, appearing  
14 on behalf of the Department of Energy. And with  
15 me today is Alexandra Ladwig, who's serving as  
16 co-counsel. With us today is also Amanda Noonan,  
17 who is the Director of Consumer Services; and Liz  
18 Nixon, who is the Director of the Electric  
19 Division.

20 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Very good. And the  
21 Community Power Coalition of New Hampshire?

22 MR. BELOW: Good afternoon,  
23 Commissioners. Clifton Below, on behalf of the  
24 Coalition.

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. At the  
3 outset, the Community Power Coalition of New  
4 Hampshire and the NRG Retail Companies submitted  
5 a timely Petition to Intervene, neither of which  
6 were objected to.

7 Does anyone have anything further to  
8 say with respect to either of these Petitions to  
9 Intervene?

10 MR. WIESNER: We have no objection to  
11 either intervention, Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. So, we  
13 have reviewed and determined that the Community  
14 Power Coalition of New Hampshire and the NRG  
15 Retail Companies' intervention would be in the  
16 interest of justice, and would not impair the  
17 orderly and prompt conduct of the proceedings,  
18 and therefore grant intervention pursuant to Puc  
19 203.17 and RSA 541-A:32, II.

20 Are there any other matters that need  
21 to be raised before we take preliminary  
22 positions?

23 *[No verbal response.]*

24 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Seeing none.

1           Let's turn to the Proposal. We'll plan to hear  
2           positions on Eversource's Purchase of Receivables  
3           Program, and the Commission may have some  
4           follow-up questions. And we'll begin with  
5           Eversource.

6                       MR. WIESNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
7           I was going to reference "Ground Hog Day", but  
8           you beat me to it.

9                       So, in this docket, Eversource has  
10          proposed a Purchase of Receivables Program in  
11          compliance with RSA 53-E:9 and the Commission's  
12          rules at Puc 2205.16(e).

13                      The Company's POR Program leverages our  
14          experience with affiliates in Massachusetts and  
15          Connecticut, and will apply to all competitive  
16          suppliers using consolidated billing services,  
17          including those not serving community power  
18          aggregations, and, as well, the aggregations  
19          themselves, when they are acting as load-serving  
20          entities.

21                      Consistent with current practices in  
22          Connecticut and Western Massachusetts, payments  
23          will be made to suppliers on a monthly basis,  
24          with the payment amount calculated with reference

1 to the supplier's portion of accounts receivable  
2 and the applicable discount rate.

3 The proposed discount rate of 1.066  
4 percent is based on an Uncollectible Expense  
5 Factor and a three-year amortization of the  
6 estimated incremental costs associated with POR  
7 Program implementation in New Hampshire. At this  
8 time, the Company anticipates it will not incur  
9 incremental costs to administer collection  
10 efforts under the POR Program, and, therefore, no  
11 related administrative costs have been included  
12 in the proposed discount rate. The discount rate  
13 will be recalculated on an annual basis, subject  
14 to Commission approval.

15 Now, Eversource is proposing to use a  
16 single discount rate for all supplier accounts  
17 receivable regardless of the customer rate class.  
18 The Company did not consider proposing discount  
19 rates that differed by class, because that would  
20 require significant modifications to its two very  
21 different legacy billing systems.

22 Due to the need to accommodate those  
23 two different systems, the Company determined  
24 that the potential benefits would be outweighed

1 by the additional costs associated with system  
2 upgrades required to facilitate multiple discount  
3 rates.

4 It's currently estimated that an  
5 eight-month development and transition period  
6 will be required to implement the proposed POR  
7 Program in the state, and that the related system  
8 upgrade costs will total approximately \$1.9  
9 million.

10 Importantly, Eversource proposes to  
11 extend the POR Program to cover suppliers'  
12 existing receivables as of the time of Program  
13 implementation, as well as their receivables  
14 going forward, with the existing receivables  
15 purchased subject to an appropriate discount  
16 rate.

17 Finally, certain details related to the  
18 POR Program will be covered in revised tariff  
19 provisions that will be submitted as part of a  
20 compliance filing following Commission approval,  
21 if granted.

22 We look forward to working with the DOE  
23 and other parties to clarify and further develop,  
24 if necessary, the record in this proceeding to



1 support Commission approval of the Company's POR  
2 Program.

3 To that end, we've circulated a  
4 proposed procedural schedule, which we expect  
5 will be discussed during the technical session to  
6 follow. That draft procedural schedule proposes  
7 that a hearing would be held in mid-June,  
8 although it seems that there may be interest in  
9 postponing that until the following month.

10 So, that concludes my initial comments.  
11 And we would be happy to address any clarifying  
12 questions at this time.

13 Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. Let's  
15 move to the Department of Energy.

16 MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

17 At this stage, the Department has  
18 reviewed the filing. And we look forward to  
19 working with the Company and to address relevant  
20 questions and clarify the factual context for the  
21 record.

22 We do appreciate the Company proposing  
23 a procedural schedule. However, we do have some  
24 concerns that we will endeavor to iron out in the

1 technical session to follow.

2 Thanks.

3 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. And the  
4 Community Power Coalition of New Hampshire.

5 MR. BELOW: Thank you.

6 Obviously, the same concern, although I  
7 think I heard Attorney Wiesner just address that,  
8 by indicating they would be proposing agreements,  
9 appropriate agreements and/or tariffs appropriate  
10 to both community power aggregation serving as an  
11 LSE, as well as for competitive electric power  
12 suppliers.

13 The other sort of elephant in the room  
14 is the 1.9 million estimated cost, it's four  
15 times Liberty, 340 times Unitil, even though  
16 Eversource already operates a POR on its other  
17 systems. And one has to start to wonder at what  
18 point very large expenditures for pretty simple  
19 math calculations, I mean, they presented  
20 illustrated math calculations on a single sheet  
21 of paper, why that costs so much money?

22 And you have to wonder if legacy  
23 systems that are, as I understand it, perhaps 30  
24 years old or more, it wouldn't be more prudent to

1 update to a 21st century billing system that  
2 could be modified at a more reasonable cost?

3 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you, Mr.  
4 Below. I think their quote on a new system was  
5 "100 million". So, I'm not sure that's the  
6 answer we're looking for. But that is a good  
7 point, and one that we'd like to probe on  
8 further.

9 Let's move to Commissioner questions,  
10 and beginning with Commissioner Simpson.

11 CMSR. SIMPSON: Thank you.

12 And I'll continue on that topic,  
13 because it appears that the Company's affiliate  
14 has a system that is capable of offering POR.  
15 So, I'm curious to understand, and to confirm,  
16 first off, is the Company using a different  
17 billing/customer management system in  
18 Massachusetts and Connecticut than they are in  
19 New Hampshire?

20 MR. WIESNER: There are, this is my  
21 understanding, there are different systems in  
22 place for different utilities in different parts  
23 of the Company. And, in particular, in New  
24 Hampshire, there is the quite old Large Power

1 Billing system that is still in use. And, as a  
2 result, there are two billing systems that need  
3 to be modified in order to accommodate POR in New  
4 Hampshire. And at least my understanding is  
5 that's not the case in Massachusetts or  
6 Connecticut.

7 CMSR. SIMPSON: And can anybody just  
8 elaborate on a higher level strategy to integrate  
9 these operating companies on single IT systems?

10 MR. WIESNER: There is an initiative  
11 that is heading in that direction. It is several  
12 years away. And I'm not really in a position  
13 today to speak more definitively toward that  
14 initiative or its timing or potential cost.

15 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. I mean, I would  
16 say, as a general matter, it seems like we hear a  
17 similar issue arise in other proceedings with  
18 respect to other initiatives that are  
19 data-driven. And I'm eager to hear from the  
20 Company on a corporatewide strategy to update  
21 customer-facing and customer systems that  
22 integrate with metering, integrate with EDI,  
23 integrate with, you know, demand-side systems.

24 So, it certainly is a concern of mine

1 to see the estimated cost just to update a legacy  
2 system for this Proposal. So, as we continue on  
3 in this proceeding, I'll look forward to hearing  
4 more about that strategy. And I expect to hear  
5 more from the Company as we continue in this  
6 docket. And I encourage the Company to weave  
7 those concepts into our dockets before the  
8 Commission moving forward.

9 MR. WIESNER: We do understand the  
10 concern. Thank you.

11 CMSR. SIMPSON: Thank you.

12 I asked Liberty a question about "How  
13 the Company will interface with customers served  
14 by competitive electricity suppliers and  
15 aggregators?" Will that -- are you aware of how  
16 customers will be paid? Will it be through EDI?  
17 Will it be through the billing system? Something  
18 else?

19 MR. WIESNER: When we say "customers",  
20 I think you mean "suppliers", Commissioner  
21 Simpson, is that right?

22 CMSR. SIMPSON: Yes. How will the  
23 payments to suppliers and aggregators be  
24 facilitated?

1 MR. DONYAVI: This is Daryush, --

2 CMSR. SIMPSON: Thank you.

3 MR. DONYAVI: -- with Supply Services.

4 Is this on?

5 CMSR. SIMPSON: Yes, it is.

6 MR. DONYAVI: So, in the Proposal that  
7 we have, suppliers would get 810 transactions,  
8 they would get --

9 *[Court reporter interruption.]*

10 MR. DONYAVI: -- EDI 810 transactions.  
11 So, they would be able to -- they would be able  
12 to see what the usage is and what the  
13 kilowatt-hours are, so they'd be able to shadow  
14 bill. And then, when we make the payment, they  
15 would get a payment detail, similar to what we do  
16 in Connecticut and Massachusetts -- and Western  
17 Massachusetts, that would tie back the payment to  
18 each account with the usage, allowing them to tie  
19 back the payment.

20 CMSR. SIMPSON: So, you mentioned  
21 "Western Massachusetts", so, former "WMECo", it  
22 sounds like they have a system that you're  
23 leveraging for part of this process?

24 MR. DONYAVI: Connecticut and Western

1 Massachusetts is similar, yes.

2 CMSR. SIMPSON: And elaborate a bit  
3 more on that for us. Just help us understand  
4 what that system is, how you're leveraging it,  
5 within the context of this Proposal for New  
6 Hampshire? And then, what do you need to do to  
7 tie that output to your New Hampshire system?

8 MR. DONYAVI: I can't speak to the  
9 actual, like, CIS systems. But, from the EDI 810  
10 that goes out to the suppliers, it's similar in  
11 Western Massachusetts and in Connecticut. The  
12 suppliers would get the 810 transactions, but  
13 their payment would be a wire once a month, and  
14 they would also get, when they request it from  
15 us, their payment detail from my team, which  
16 would tie back that payment to each account, with  
17 the usage, *et cetera*, *et cetera*. And we propose  
18 to do a similar method here in New Hampshire.

19 But, as far as the actual CIS system, I  
20 can't speak to that, unfortunately.

21 I know, in New Hampshire, as Attorney  
22 Wiesner said, we have two systems. We have an  
23 LPB system, which is only in New Hampshire, and  
24 then there's also a C2 system, so the similar

1 system to the other two states. But there's a  
2 stand-alone, complete separate system in New  
3 Hampshire, as Dave mentioned.

4 CMSR. SIMPSON: And what part of your  
5 customer base does that stand-alone system serve?

6 MR. DONYAVI: That I don't know.

7 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Do any of the  
8 witnesses here today have any insight into that?

9 MR. O'BRIEN: Yes. This is Brendan  
10 O'Brien. That system, Large Power Billing,  
11 usually serves -- primarily serves the larger  
12 commercial/industrial-type customers.

13 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. So, your large  
14 C&I customers in New Hampshire, they have a  
15 unique system. And then, your residential  
16 customers, they're in an enterprisewide system?

17 MR. O'BRIEN: "Enterprisewide", meaning  
18 "serving multiple utilities in different  
19 jurisdictions"?

20 CMSR. SIMPSON: Yes.

21 MR. O'BRIEN: Yes. Yes. So, that the  
22 C2 system is serving other jurisdictions as well,  
23 and primarily oversees the residential customers.

24 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. And what is



1 driving the cost estimate? What are the key  
2 system or systems challenges that you face that  
3 are so costly?

4 MS. H. GAGNON: Hi. I'm Helen Gagnon.

5 CMSR. SIMPSON: Hello.

6 MS. H. GAGNON: I'm from IT. So, for  
7 New Hampshire, as he explained, there are  
8 separate stand-alone billing systems. The older  
9 one, it's called "New Hampshire LPB", was written  
10 about 1980ish. It's about 38 years old. And  
11 then, the other one, the C2 system, is used by  
12 other operating companies, but they're completely  
13 stand-alone and separate. So, it's double the  
14 programming, and the platforms are completely  
15 different.

16 The older one is a very old mainframe  
17 system, requiring a special skillset to do that  
18 programming. And we can't leverage anything in  
19 that older system. But we can leverage some  
20 processing in the 15ish year-old system from  
21 WMECo and CL&P.

22 So, I don't know if that helps?

23 CMSR. SIMPSON: Yes, that's helpful.

24 Okay. I don't think I have anything

1 further at this time. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Commissioner  
3 Chattopadhyay.

4 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: So, before I lose  
5 track, I will stick with what we were talking  
6 about just now.

7 And I'll use the terms "old system" and  
8 the "new system". So, please confirm my  
9 understanding that, when you talk about the new  
10 system, that system is more about the residential  
11 customers, right?

12 MR. WIESNER: The C2 system serves  
13 residential customers. "New" is a relative term,  
14 but it is certainly newer.

15 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Let's say 15  
16 years is long enough that I consider that to be  
17 "new". Just kidding.

18 *[Laughter.]*

19 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: So, this cost  
20 estimate you have, can you confirm that that's  
21 largely driven by the replacement of the old  
22 system?

23 MR. WIESNER: This is not a replacement  
24 of either system. These are modifications to the

1 two existing systems. And I, personally, don't  
2 have the details on what all is involved, or how  
3 the costs align with the two different systems.

4 Ms. Gagnon may have more information  
5 for you.

6 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Please.

7 MS. H. GAGNON: So, the cost estimate  
8 was developed as a project cost estimate. So,  
9 it's a high-level order of magnitude estimate,  
10 with those separate efforts, separate technical  
11 skills, to deliver the Purchase of Receivables.

12 And, of course, again, New Hampshire  
13 Large Power Billing system, this skillset is a  
14 little more involved, because it's very old  
15 technologies.

16 And also, as far as the estimate being  
17 the high-level order of magnitude, it's managed  
18 as a project. So, you know, there is incremental  
19 resources, like a project manager, with a life  
20 cycle of the project, that eight-month time  
21 period, in addition to contingency. So, again,  
22 the estimate is a high-level order of magnitude  
23 capital project estimate for two separate  
24 systems.

1 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Understood. But  
2 what I'm trying to get at is, again, sticking to  
3 that earlier classification, "old system" versus  
4 "new system", the old system is the one where you  
5 have to make more changes?

6 MS. H. GAGNON: Right. It's brand-new  
7 code. There's nothing we can leverage. We do  
8 not have a Purchase of Receivables.

9 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: And that is  
10 exclusively non-residential?

11 MS. H. GAGNON: Yes. Basically, it's  
12 the commercial and industrial, but also municipal  
13 streetlights are in that older 38 year-old  
14 system.

15 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Okay.  
16 The overall discount, can you confirm,  
17 if I -- I think it was mentioned it's "1.066  
18 percent", illustratively?

19 *[Mr. O'Brien indicating in the*  
20 *affirmative.]*

21 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Is that correct?

22 MR. O'BRIEN: Sorry. Yes, that's  
23 correct.

24 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: But you wouldn't

1 know right now, given the prior discussion I'm  
2 having about how this is driven by perhaps  
3 largely improving the old system to accommodate  
4 PORs, the percentage here may be actually very  
5 different for different classes, if you were  
6 applying, you know, a class-based allocation?

7 MR. O'BRIEN: In terms of the C2 newer  
8 system being where the residential customers lie,  
9 there are also commercial and industrial  
10 customers that are included in that system as  
11 well. But it's not all of them. They're,  
12 obviously, split between the two. So, it's not a  
13 complete distinction system-by-system, by class  
14 of customers.

15 But, from a residential perspective, if  
16 I'm interpreting the question right, it's  
17 exclusively in the C2 system to evaluate that  
18 cost difference.

19 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Can you -- of  
20 course, this is all illustrative. Can you give  
21 me a sense of, if you were able to do it, if you  
22 had the discounts being different for commercial  
23 customers and residential customers, can you tell  
24 me what that would be for the residential

1 customers, relative to the commercial customers?  
2 Would it be significantly lower?

3 MR. O'BRIEN: In terms of in totality?

4 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Yes.

5 MR. O'BRIEN: Or specific to the cost  
6 of the system upgrades?

7 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: No. Since you've  
8 translated that, and you've looked at the  
9 discount rate as well, I'm just -- I'm more  
10 focused on the discount rate.

11 MR. O'BRIEN: Sure. So, one of the  
12 complications, and probably the key complication  
13 in breaking that down, is from an uncollectible  
14 expense perspective. We do not currently have  
15 the data broken down at that level by individual  
16 customer class. And, also, as mentioned in the  
17 initial filing, there is also a complication --  
18 just there would be additional costs, in terms of  
19 the older system, to break that data down in a  
20 more fine level of detail to be able to  
21 distinguish discount rates at that individual  
22 level. And we felt that the benefits outweigh  
23 the costs of incurring that, to break that data  
24 down to split by class.

1 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Do you have PORs  
2 in other jurisdictions, non-New Hampshire?

3 MR. O'BRIEN: Yes. We do.

4 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Do you track the  
5 uncollectible percentage differently for  
6 different classes in the other states?

7 MR. O'BRIEN: I'd have to confirm. I'm  
8 not exactly sure if we do, off the top of my  
9 head. But we could confirm with our Regulatory  
10 team, I'm sure, unless someone else on the panel  
11 would know that answer.

12 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Okay. I think  
13 that's all I have for now.

14 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: My question is  
15 actually for Mr. Below.

16 You've heard a lot today. And I'm just  
17 a little baffled, I know you have a lot of  
18 experience in this area. On the one hand, we  
19 have answers that are "\$5,000, and we need to do  
20 some testing, and don't worry." And then,  
21 there's another answer that says "It's \$1.9  
22 million, and we have to adjust all these things,  
23 and EDI systems, and billing systems, and all  
24 these things."

1           And I just thought it might be helpful  
2           to get your perspective?

3           MR. BELOW:   Okay.  I guess I'm just  
4           somewhat also baffled by that cost estimate.  And  
5           do wonder, like Commissioner Chattopadhyay, how  
6           that splits between the two systems?  And, if  
7           it's predominantly for this much older system  
8           that is -- if that happens to be the case, then  
9           it sort of makes me wonder if, for those larger  
10          C&I accounts, if the whole thing is worth it?  
11          Maybe it makes sense just to do it for the  
12          residential and whatever small commercial  
13          customers are in the C2 system.

14                 But I thought I would perhaps explore  
15                 that through discovery questions with the  
16                 utility.  I think that's one thought I had.

17                 I mean, obviously, Eversource has a  
18                 much larger customer base to spread these costs  
19                 over.  So, in their illustrative example, the  
20                 ACP, the Administrative Cost Percentage, is  
21                 roughly half of the uncollectibles, unlike  
22                 Liberty, where it's much more.

23                 I do know that, obviously, we have  
24                 factored into our own financial projections a



1           loss rate. But the advantage of POR is that it  
2           provides predictability to that revenue stream,  
3           knowing -- although, you know, just on an annual  
4           basis, but that's certainly reasonable for it to  
5           reconcile itself.

6                        So, I guess those are some preliminary  
7           thoughts on your question. Thank you.

8                        CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you.  
9           Commissioners, any other questions?

10                       [Cmsr. Simpson and Cmsr. Chattopadhyay  
11                        indicating in the negative.]

12                       CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay.

13                       Okay. Lastly, on the topic of the  
14           procedural schedule, I'll start again by  
15           commenting that, although three PHCs are being  
16           held in sequence, we don't anticipate each  
17           procedural schedule necessarily being identical,  
18           and that any necessary hearings will be  
19           individually scheduled. With that said, we  
20           brought all three electric utilities in at the  
21           same time, so that the Commission and parties  
22           could effectively use their time to develop  
23           procedural schedules that can complement each  
24           other to the extent possible.

1           Do the parties have any comments for  
2           the Commission on establishing a procedural  
3           schedule to govern the remainder of this  
4           proceeding?

5           Or is it acceptable to discuss this in  
6           technical session following these PHCs and get  
7           back to the commission with a proposal?

8           MR. WIESNER: I think it's our  
9           preference to discuss it with the parties during  
10          the technical session, and then propose a  
11          procedural schedule for the Commission's  
12          approval.

13          CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. I'll note for  
14          the record Attorney Young shook his head in the  
15          vertical direction. So, I think that is a "yes".  
16          And Mr. Below didn't shake his head "no", so that  
17          all seems promising.

18          Okay. Is there anything else that we  
19          need to cover today?

20                    *[No verbal response.]*

21          CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: All right. Very  
22          good.

23                    This prehearing conference in Docket DE  
24          23-004 is concluded. We are adjourned. Thank

1           you.

2                           *(Whereupon this prehearing conference*  
3                           *in DE 23-004 was adjourned at*  
4                           *2:09 p.m., and a technical session was*  
5                           *held thereafter.)*

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24