

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

July 11, 2023 - 9:04 a.m.
21 South Fruit Street
Suite 10
Concord, NH

RE: **DE 23-021**
PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW
HAMPSHIRE d/b/a EVERSOURCE ENERGY:
Petition to Approve 2023 Regulatory
Reconciliation Adjustment.

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

F. Anne Ross, 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. Residential Ratepayers:
Michael Crouse, Esq.
Office of Consumer Advocate

Reptg. New Hampshire Dept. of Energy:
Suzanne G. Amidon, Esq.
Stephen Eckberg, Energy Group
(Regulatory Support Division)

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

I N D E X

PAGE NO.

DISCUSSION OF PRELIMINARY MATTERS 5

**ISSUE RE: TECHNICAL STATEMENT OF
STEPHEN R. ECKBERG AS AN EXHIBIT** 5

STATEMENTS BY:

(Re: Rate Case Expense Amortization)

Mr. Wiesner		7
Chairman Goldner		7, 8
Ms. Amidon		8
Mr. Crouse		9

STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER RE: THE PETITION 9

FURTHER PRELIMINARY STATEMENTS BY:

Mr. Wiesner		10
-------------	--	----

WITNESS PANEL:

ROBERT D. ALLEN
RUSSEL D. JOHNSON
ELLI NTAKOU
BRYANT ROBINSON
SCOTT R. ANDERSON

Direct examination by Mr. Wiesner		13
Cross-examination by Ms. Amidon		27
Interrogatories by Cmsr. Simpson	34,	65
Interrogatories by Cmsr. Chattopadhyay	54, 62,	66
Interrogatories by Chairman Goldner		60

* * *

CLOSING STATEMENTS BY:

Mr. Crouse		67
Ms. Amidon		68
Mr. Wiesner		69

E X H I B I T S

EXHIBIT NO.	D E S C R I P T I O N	PAGE NO.
1	Testimony and Supporting Attachments of Robert D. Allen, Elli Ntakou, and Russel Johnson (03-01-23)	<i>premarked</i>
2	Testimony of Marisa B. Paruta and Scott R. Anderson (05-01-23)	<i>premarked</i>
3	Revised Attachment RDA/EN/RDJ-3 2022 Annual Reliability Report	<i>premarked</i>
4	Technical Statement of Stephen R. Eckberg (07-05-23)	12

P R O C E E D I N G

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Good morning, everyone. I'm Chairman Goldner. I'm joined today by Commissioner Chattopadhyay and Commissioner Simpson.

We're here this morning for a hearing in Docket Number DE 23-021. The authority to convene a hearing in this matter is provided by RSA 378:7 and 378:8. We are considering testimony and evidence concerning the request for an increase in the Regulatory Reconciliation Adjustment rate for effect on August 1st, 2023.

So, let's begin by taking appearances, beginning with the Company.

MR. WIESNER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. David Wiesner, representing Public Service Company of New Hampshire, doing business as Eversource Energy.

We have five witnesses this morning. And, because we have five, three of them are in the witness box, and two of them are to my immediate right.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay.

MR. WIESNER: To be introduced shortly.

1 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you, sir. And
2 the Office of the Consumer Advocate?

3 MR. CROUSE: Good morning,
4 Commissioners. My name is Michael Crouse. I am
5 the Staff Attorney to the Office of the Consumer
6 Advocate. Freshly returned from Oregon, and
7 fighting through jetlag.

8 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Very good. And the
9 New Hampshire Department of Energy?

10 MS. AMIDON: Thank you. And good
11 morning. Suzanne Amidon, on behalf of the
12 Department of Energy. And with me today is
13 Stephen Eckberg, who's an analyst in the Energy
14 Group.

15 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you.

16 Okay. So, I'll begin with some
17 preliminary matters.

18 Attorney Amidon, do you wish to enter
19 Mr. Eckberg's technical statement of July 5th
20 into evidence?

21 MS. AMIDON: No, I do not. He did not
22 file testimony in this matter. And my intention,
23 as you know from looking at the Witness List, was
24 not to have him testify in this matter.

1 So, I think that the Commission can
2 decide to do that, if they wish. I think the
3 facts sort of speak for themselves.

4 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Would you have any
5 objection to putting it into evidence, if the
6 Commission wanted to?

7 MS. AMIDON: No, I would not.

8 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.
9 Would the parties have any objection to putting
10 Mr. Eckberg's technical statement into evidence
11 as an exhibit?

12 MR. WIESNER: As a document stating
13 what it states, it's not testimony, and he's not
14 adopting it, and we're not requiring him to do
15 so. But, otherwise, no objection.

16 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.

17 MR. CROUSE: The OCA has no objections.

18 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.

19 Okay. So, next, I would like to hear
20 from the parties specifically on the rate case
21 expense amortization, which is not in the
22 Petition, and was therefore not noticed by the
23 Commission. So, I'd like to hear from everyone
24 on if that should be considered in today's

1 proceeding.

2 Mr. Wiesner, would you like to
3 contemplate that?

4 MR. WIESNER: Well, I mean, it is a
5 part of the Regulatory Reconciliation Adjustment
6 mechanism. And it was included in the
7 supplemental filing that was made on May 1st.
8 And I don't believe that any of the other parties
9 have an objection to it being considered as part
10 of the RRA.

11 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. We can check
12 on that. I'm looking at your Petition. And the
13 Petition lists five issues that you were
14 requesting the Commission to review. The sixth
15 issue, which was this rate case expense
16 amortization, was not listed in the Petition.
17 But it was -- it is included in testimony, deep
18 in the weeds of the testimony.

19 So, we're not sure what we're supposed
20 to do with something that is not in the Petition.

21 MR. WIESNER: I mean, we would ask that
22 the Commission consider it, as it has
23 traditionally -- well, since the rate case
24 settlement was approved a few years ago, it's

1 been included in the RRA mechanism. And I
2 believe it was included last year as well.

3 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: In our research this
4 morning, we couldn't find it. Perhaps, at a
5 break, the Company could help clarify for us.
6 But, on the prior two RRA adjustments, we
7 couldn't find any evidence of the rate case
8 amortization. So, we would request, I guess,
9 some clarification on that.

10 And I'll turn to the other parties to
11 see if there's any objection to including rate
12 case expense amortization, even if it wasn't in
13 the Petition?

14 MS. AMIDON: If I may offer information
15 that I am aware of?

16 And that is the rate case expense
17 related to the underlying rate case, Docket
18 19-057, was a litigated matter. I am not sure,
19 but I understand that that was resolved in an
20 order, maybe the order was issued last year.

21 However, I think the timing of the
22 resolution of that issue may have something to do
23 with whether it did not appear in last year's
24 reconciliation. But, again, this is by way of

1 information from the analyst that is sitting with
2 me.

3 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay.

4 MS. AMIDON: So, if that helps the
5 Company in answering your question, it may be of
6 some assistance.

7 But that's the best that I know at this
8 point. I just thought it might help.

9 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. That is.

10 MS. AMIDON: You're welcome.

11 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: That's helpful.

12 MR. CROUSE: The OCA does not have a
13 strong position. So, there are no objections if
14 it is included.

15 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.

16 So, next, I'll turn to the topic of
17 sort of an "in general", and this is directed at
18 the Company. So, the Eversource Petition, you
19 know, really should have the clarity of
20 Mr. Eckberg's technical statement, which was very
21 clear, i.e., "There are six RRA elements. Here
22 is the dollar recovery being sought for each
23 element. Here's the rate impact." In other
24 words, a clear ask.

1 To be even more specific, the Company,
2 you know, should have specified a dollar impact
3 for each of the six elements, and a total dollar
4 and rate impact in the petition. And the
5 Commission recommends a table for this in the
6 future, so we don't -- we don't have these issues
7 moving forward.

8 And I'll just say, ideally, as a
9 general matter, a petition would specify how much
10 of an increase or a decrease in rates, revenue
11 requirement, rate factors being sought, with page
12 cites to the relevant testimony.

13 And I'll just add that, in future
14 Eversource filings, the Company can expect
15 petitions to be reviewed more carefully by the
16 Commission, and potentially rejected, if the ask
17 is not clear, so that we know what your ask is.
18 And I'll cite Puc Rule 203.05 for reference.

19 Okay. Are there any other preliminary
20 matters or any comments so far, before we move to
21 exhibits?

22 MR. WIESNER: I'll just note that this
23 is a somewhat unusual filing process, because it
24 comes in two parts, if you will. You know, the

1 original Petition is filed at the time when the
2 initial testimony is submitted, regarding the
3 vegetation management plans and reliability
4 metrics. And then, it's on May 1st when the
5 actual, you know, if you will, all-in rate filing
6 is made.

7 But we will, you know, take that note
8 from the Chair, and try to be more specific and
9 more detailed, and perhaps even submit an amended
10 Petition, with respect to the May 1st filing.

11 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. Thank
12 you, Attorney Wiesner. That's very helpful, and
13 appreciated.

14 Okay. So, let's move to the premarked
15 exhibits. We've received an Exhibit List and a
16 Witness List. Are there any changes or
17 additions, before we begin, to the existing
18 Exhibits 1 through 3?

19 MR. WIESNER: No. No additional
20 exhibits.

21 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Attorney
22 Amidon, nothing? Everybody is okay here?

23 MS. AMIDON: Yes. Nothing further.

24 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Yes. And Exhibit 4,

1 yes. Exhibit 4, for the statement of Mr.
2 Eckberg.

3 MS. AMIDON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay.

5 (The document, as described, was
6 herewith marked as **Exhibit 4** for
7 identification.)

8 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Very good.

9 Do the parties wish to make an opening statement
10 today?

11 MR. WIESNER: We didn't intend to make
12 an opening statement, just go directly to direct
13 testimony of the witnesses.

14 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay.

15 MS. AMIDON: Same here. Thank you.

16 MR. CROUSE: Likewise.

17 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Very good.

18 So, let's go directly to the Company and the
19 witnesses.

20 And, Mr. Patnaude, if you could please,
21 please swear in the witnesses.

22 *(Whereupon **ROBERT D. ALLEN,***

23 **RUSSEL D. JOHNSON, ELLI NTAKOU, BRYANT**

24 **ROBINSON, and SCOTT R. ANDERSON** were

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 *duly sworn by the Court Reporter.)*

2 **ROBERT D. ALLEN, SWORN**

3 **RUSSEL D. JOHNSON, SWORN**

4 **ELLI NTAKOU, SWORN**

5 **BRYANT ROBINSON, SWORN**

6 **SCOTT R. ANDERSON, SWORN**

7 **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

8 BY MR. WIESNER:

9 Q So, I'll begin with Mr. Allen. And, Mr. Allen,
10 would you please state your name and title with
11 Eversource?

12 A (Allen) My name is Robert Allen. I'm the Manager
13 of Vegetation Management for Eversource-New
14 Hampshire.

15 Q And what are the responsibilities of your role
16 with the Company?

17 A (Allen) My responsibilities are to implement the
18 Vegetation Management Program annually, and to
19 manage the contractors that we hire to do that
20 work.

21 Q Have you previously testified before the
22 Commission?

23 A (Allen) Yes, I have.

24 Q And did you file joint testimony and

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 corresponding attachments as part of the
2 Company's initial filing on March 1st, marked as
3 "Exhibit 1" for hearing?

4 A (Allen) Yes, I did.

5 Q What parts of that joint testimony and supporting
6 materials are you responsible for?

7 A (Allen) Let me get there please. I am
8 responsible for Parts II, III, and IV of the
9 initial testimony, regarding the Company's
10 Vegetation Management Program, and the Company's
11 Vegetation Management Performance in 2022, the
12 Company's Vegetation Management Plan for 2023,
13 and the related attachments.

14 Q Were the testimony and supporting materials you
15 just described prepared by you or at your
16 direction?

17 A (Allen) Yes, they were.

18 Q Do you have any changes or updates to make at
19 that time?

20 A (Allen) No, I do not.

21 Q And do you adopt your testimony today as it was
22 written and filed?

23 A (Allen) Yes, I do.

24 Q I'll turn next to Mr. Johnson. And ask you, Mr.

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 Johnson, if you would state your name and title
2 with the Company?

3 A (Johnson) My name is Russel Johnson. And I am
4 the Director of Distribution Engineering for
5 Eversource.

6 Q And what are the responsibilities of your role?

7 A (Johnson) I'm responsible for optimizing the
8 performance of the distribution system in New
9 Hampshire, and also to ensure customer needs are
10 met in the areas of service and reliability.

11 Q Have you previously testified before this
12 Commission?

13 A (Johnson) Yes, I have.

14 Q And did you file joint testimony and
15 corresponding attachments as part of the
16 Company's initial filing on March 1st, marked as
17 "Exhibit 1"?

18 A (Johnson) Yes.

19 Q What parts of that joint testimony and supporting
20 materials are you responsible for?

21 A (Johnson) I'm responsible, in part, for Section V
22 of the testimony, which discusses the Company's
23 reliability performance in 2022, and the related
24 attachment.

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 Q Were the testimony you just described and
2 supporting materials prepared by you or at your
3 direction?

4 A (Johnson) Yes.

5 Q And do you have any changes or updates to make at
6 this time?

7 A (Johnson) Yes. Following the filing of the 2022
8 Annual Reliability Report, which is Attachment
9 RDA/EN/RDJ-3, I discovered that there were
10 certain corrections necessary regarding the
11 CTAIDI, which is the Customer Total Average Index
12 -- Interruption Duration Index, and CAIFI, the
13 Customer Average Interruption Frequency Index,
14 reliability metrics on Pages 5 and 8, and the
15 status of the White Lake Substation Project on
16 Page 37. Those corrections were made and are
17 reflected on those pages of the revised version
18 of the attachment marked as "Exhibit 3" for
19 hearing.

20 Q And, with those corrections as noted, do you
21 adopt your testimony today as it was written and
22 filed?

23 A (Johnson) Yes.

24 Q Thank you. Now, turning to Ms. Ntakou. Forgive

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 me for mispronouncing your name. Would you
2 please state your name and title with the
3 Company?

4 A (Ntakou) My name is Elli Ntakou. And I am the
5 Manager of System Resilience and Reliability
6 Planning.

7 Q And what are the responsibilities of that role
8 with the Company?

9 A (Ntakou) I'm responsible for Eversource's
10 reliability and resilience programs for its
11 electrical infrastructure. This includes efforts
12 focused on assessing a wide portfolio of
13 reliability and resilience solutions, and
14 prioritizing, optimizing and targeting those
15 solutions to transmission and distribution grid
16 needs based on historical data, data forecasts,
17 and engineering models.

18 Q Have you previously testified before the
19 Commission?

20 A (Ntakou) Yes, I have.

21 Q And did you file joint testimony and
22 corresponding attachments as part of the
23 Company's initial filing on March 1st?

24 A (Ntakou) Yes.

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 Q What parts of that joint testimony and supporting
2 materials are you responsible for?

3 A (Ntakou) I am responsible, in part, for Section V
4 of the testimony, which discusses the Company's
5 reliability performance in 2022, and the related
6 attachment.

7 Q And were the testimony and supporting materials
8 prepared by you or at your direction?

9 A (Ntakou) Yes.

10 Q Do you have any changes or updates to make at
11 this time, other than those previously described
12 by Mr. Johnson?

13 A (Ntakou) No, I do not.

14 Q And, with those corrections as noted by Mr.
15 Johnson, do you adopt your testimony today as it
16 was written and filed?

17 A (Ntakou) Yes, I do.

18 Q And I'll turn back to the witness box, and
19 Mr. Robinson. Would you please state your name
20 and title with Eversource?

21 A (Robinson) My name is Bryant Robinson. And I'm
22 Team Leader for the New Hampshire Revenue
23 Requirements Group, excuse me.

24 Q And what are the responsibilities of your role

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 with the Company?

2 A (Robinson) I'm responsible for helping to
3 coordinate and implement revenue requirements
4 calculations in regulatory filings, such as the
5 Regulatory Reconciliation Adjustment, Energy
6 Service, and other rates of the electric and gas
7 subsidiaries of Eversource Energy, including the
8 Company.

9 Q Have you previously testified before this
10 Commission?

11 A (Robinson) Yes, I have.

12 Q Now, did you assist Marisa Paruta in her
13 preparation of the joint testimony and supporting
14 attachments as part of the Company's filing on
15 May 1st, which has been marked as "Exhibit 2"?

16 A (Robinson) Yes, I did.

17 Q What parts of that joint testimony and the
18 supporting materials is Ms. Paruta responsible
19 for?

20 A (Robinson) She is responsible for the
21 calculation -- excuse me -- of the RRA components
22 that relate to the regulatory assessments, the
23 veg. management costs, the property tax expense
24 reconciliation, the storm cost amortization

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 reconciliation, and the rate case expense
2 amortization reconciliation, as well as the
3 related attachments. And I assisted her in
4 preparing those parts of the testimony.

5 Q And were those portions of the joint testimony
6 and supporting materials prepared by you and
7 Ms. Paruta, or at her and your direction?

8 A (Robinson) Yes. I assisted Ms. Paruta in
9 preparing those portions of the joint testimony
10 marked as "Exhibit 2".

11 Q Do you have any changes or updates to that joint
12 testimony at this time?

13 A (Robinson) No, I do not.

14 Q And do you adopt Ms. Paruta's testimony as your
15 own for the purposes of today's hearing as it was
16 written and filed?

17 A (Robinson) Yes, I do.

18 Q And, finally, I'll turn to Mr. Anderson. Would
19 you please state your name and title with
20 Eversource?

21 A (Anderson) My name is Scott Anderson. And I'm
22 the Manager of Rates for New Hampshire.

23 Q What are the responsibilities of that role with
24 the Company?

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 A (Anderson) I'm responsible for activities related
2 to rate design, cost of service, and rates
3 administration.

4 Q And have you previously testified before this
5 Commission?

6 A (Anderson) Yes. Most recently, in Docket DE
7 21-043 [23-043?], regarding the Company's Energy
8 Service rate.

9 Q Did you file joint testimony and individual
10 testimony, together with supporting attachments,
11 as part of the Company's filing on May 1st,
12 marked as "Exhibit 2"?

13 A (Anderson) Yes.

14 Q What parts of that testimony and the supporting
15 materials are you responsible for?

16 A (Anderson) I'm responsible for calculation of the
17 lost base revenue due to net energy metering
18 component of the proposed RRA rate that is
19 included in Exhibit 2, and related attachments.
20 I'm also responsible for application of the
21 various components of the RRA, to calculate the
22 overall RRA rate, and the calculations of
23 individual RRA rates by rate class, as well as
24 bill impacts and tariff changes.

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 Q Were those portions of the joint testimony and
2 your individual testimony and supporting
3 materials prepared by you or at your direction?

4 A (Anderson) Yes, they were.

5 Q Do you have any changes or updates at this time?

6 A (Anderson) I do not.

7 Q Do you adopt your testimony today as it was
8 written and filed?

9 A (Anderson) Yes.

10 Q Now, by way of a brief summary of the Company's
11 filing, I will turn back to Mr. Robinson, and ask
12 that you please provide a brief summary on the
13 Company's 2023 RRA filing?

14 A (Robinson) Yes. Eversource's Regulatory
15 Reconciliation Adjustment is an annually
16 reconciling rate adjustment mechanism, that
17 covers regulatory assessments, vegetation
18 management costs, property tax expense
19 reconciliation, storm cost amortization
20 reconciliation, rate case expense amortization,
21 and lost base revenue due to net energy metering.

22 The Company's calculation of this
23 Regulatory Reconciliation Adjustment revenue
24 requirement, for effect August 1st, 2023, is

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 \$2,593,483, representing a 0.5 percent increase
2 in the total RRA revenue requirement, when
3 compared to the prior year.

4 The proposed overall average rate is
5 largely driven by under-recoveries in DOE
6 regulatory assessment and consultant expenses,
7 property tax expense, lost base revenue due to
8 net energy metering, and rate case expense
9 amortization. Which is then partially offset by
10 over-recoveries of vegetation management expenses
11 and the storm cost amortization offset.

12 The overall average rate, RRA rate, is
13 based on the total over- and under-recoveries of
14 all RRA cost components through December 31st,
15 2022, in accordance with the Settlement Agreement
16 approved by the Commission in the Company's DE
17 19-057 rate case.

18 Consistent with the RRA filings in
19 prior years, the Company's -- the Company
20 proposes for recovery the overall average -- the
21 overall RRA revenue requirement with an average
22 RRA rate of \$0.00033 per kilowatt-hour.

23 Q And, in particular, could you please summarize
24 the Company's proposal to transfer and carry over

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 the underspent 2022 vegetation management amount
2 to the 2023 vegetation management activities as
3 an offset to the costs of those activities?

4 A (Robinson) Yes. Excuse me. As described in our
5 testimony, the Company has proposed to carry over
6 the actual 2022 over-recovery amount of
7 \$2,126,381 to serve as an offset to the 2023
8 Program Year of vegetation management activities,
9 consistent with the approved Settlement Agreement
10 in Docket Number DE 19-057.

11 If approved by the Commission, this
12 approach would allow the Company to perform
13 necessary vegetation management work in 2023 that
14 could not be performed during 2022, for reasons
15 outside the Company's control, as described by
16 Mr. Allen in the filed report and his testimony.

17 Accordingly, this approach would permit
18 the Company to continue to remain on track to
19 complete the 2023 Vegetation Management Plan by
20 spending the 2022 over-recovery funds in 2023, in
21 addition to the 2023 budgeted amount for the
22 current year. And that would essentially allow
23 the Company to shift those activities that could
24 not be performed in 2022 into the 2023 vegetation

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 management effort. In doing so, the Company
2 would effectively offset the 2023 vegetation
3 management costs with the 2022 over-recovery,
4 which would reduce the total actual 2023
5 vegetation management expenditures that will be
6 reported in the March 1st, 2024 filing by the
7 \$2,126,381 amount.

8 The proposed carryover of unspent
9 funds, therefore, will permit the Company to
10 catch up with the vegetation management work that
11 could not be completed in 2022, by transferring
12 the related funds to 2023 expenditures, in
13 addition to the 2023 vegetation management budget
14 amount.

15 Q Thank you. And I'll turn to Mr. Anderson now,
16 and ask if you can tell us what effect the
17 proposed RRA adjustment would have on customers'
18 bills?

19 A (Anderson) The bill impacts attributable to the
20 RRA are negligible, but are set forth in
21 Attachment MBP/SRA-8, at Bates Page 074 through
22 076. Due to rounding, a Residential Rate R 600
23 kilowatt-hour bill would have the same 28 cents
24 per month charge for the RRA, and, therefore,

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 would see no bill change.

2 Q And, finally, I'll turn back to Mr. Robinson, and
3 ask does the proposed RRA adjustment result in
4 rates that are just and reasonable?

5 A (Robinson) Yes, it does.

6 MR. WIESNER: I have no further
7 questions on direct examine for these witnesses,
8 and they're available for cross-examination.

9 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you, Attorney
10 Wiesner.

11 We'll move to the Office of the
12 Consumer Advocate. Do you wish to cross-examine
13 the Eversource witnesses?

14 MR. CROUSE: As fun as it would be to
15 cross-examine our great friends at Eversource,
16 the OCA believes they got this one right, and we
17 have no cross.

18 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you,
19 Attorney Crouse.

20 And we'll move to the DOE. You
21 mentioned that you wish to cross-examine the
22 Eversource witnesses today. Please proceed.

23 MS. AMIDON: Thank you very much.

24 **CROSS-EXAMINATION**

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 BY MS. AMIDON:

2 Q I wanted to start off with the rate calculation.
3 So, I believe that's Exhibit 2. In the filing,
4 Eversource calculated an average rate of the
5 costs of these collective amounts of money to be
6 0.0 -- well, 0.033 cents per kilowatt-hour. I
7 believe that's the average per kilowatt-hour
8 rate, is that correct?

9 A (Robinson) Yes.

10 Q Okay. But, as you know, the rate for residential
11 customers is 0.47 cents per kilowatt-hour. Could
12 you explain why that's the case please?

13 A (Anderson) Yes, I can explain that. The
14 denominator that derives the overall rate is
15 different in the two years. So, the actual RRA
16 rate for residential is going up from 0.00046, to
17 0.00047, due to the slight increase in the
18 revenue requirement.

19 Q And this is because certain costs are allocated
20 on the basis of class, correct?

21 A (Anderson) It's that, but it's also the fact that
22 the revenue requirement is an increase.

23 Q Okay. And, just for my information, what portion
24 of the RRA costs are borne by residential

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 customers, what percentage? Do you know that?

2 A (Anderson) Let me see if I can find that for you.

3 Q Well, subject to check, would you agree with me
4 it's about 56 percent?

5 A (Anderson) Yes, I would. I'm referring to
6 Attachment MBP/SRA-8, Page 3 of 8, which is Bates
7 Page 072. And I got "56.6 percent".

8 Q And this allocation was derived from the
9 Settlement Agreement in the underlying rate case,
10 is that right?

11 A (Anderson) Yes. We shared the RRA revenue
12 consistent with past practice, past settlement,
13 yes.

14 Q Okay. Thank you. That's what I wanted to get
15 at. Appreciate your patience. And all of these
16 costs here today are, and forgive me if I'm using
17 the wrong words, but they're incremental to the
18 revenue requirement that's already recovered in
19 rates, is that fair to say?

20 A (Robinson) Yes.

21 A (Anderson) Yes. It's an additional adjustment
22 charge that is charged to the customers.

23 Q Yes. So, for example, the base revenue
24 requirement for vegetation management in rates is

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 approximately \$27 million, more or less?

2 A (Robinson) Yes, \$27.1 million. Correct.

3 Q Thank you very much. So, the annual adjustment
4 is to take into account activities that are
5 planned for the future or have occurred -- well,
6 in this case, because it's a reconciliation, to
7 account for the activities that occurred in the
8 past year, and to allow the Company to recover
9 the additional costs, if there are any, for that
10 past year activity, is that right?

11 A (Robinson) Correct. The RRA mechanism is
12 designed for a look-back to the prior calendar
13 year.

14 Q Right. So, with respect to vegetation
15 management, what activities were delayed or
16 postponed, due -- you know, that resulted in this
17 proposed carryover of \$2.1 million?

18 A (Allen) So, we had approximately 10 miles that
19 weren't completed last year on our plan. But,
20 also, several thousand hazard trees that we were
21 not able to get to.

22 Q And what were the -- what was the cause of those
23 omissions?

24 A (Allen) Sure. So, we had storms at the end of

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 2021, which caused us to move into 2022 removing
2 a lot of hazard trees that had happened during
3 those storms. We put most of our crews on that
4 at the beginning of the year. That put us a
5 little bit off schedule for the miles. So, we
6 stopped doing hazard trees, and started doing the
7 miles to stay in compliance. As we continued to
8 do that throughout the year, our hazard tree list
9 grew. There's several insects that are affecting
10 trees in New Hampshire, and diseases, and there's
11 a lot of trees that are failing.

12 So, we continued to monitor the health
13 of those trees, and marked them up for removal.
14 But, while we were trying to stay in compliance
15 or continuing to stay in compliance with our
16 miles, we weren't able to get to those trees.

17 When December came, we had just about
18 completed our miles. And we planned on doing
19 about 90 crews every day on hazard trees. And we
20 got two major storms that hit in December. So,
21 we weren't able to complete the hazard tree plan.

22 Q Okay. And the money, this -- assuming that the
23 Commission authorizes the Company to carry over
24 this unspent budgeted amount from the prior year

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 into the current year plan, would that contribute
2 to the activities that are outlined and provided
3 in the Exhibit 1 of the filing here? I believe
4 it's Exhibit 1, and the hearing Bates Stamp
5 Page 067. And let me know when you get there.

6 A (Allen) I'm not sure that I have that, but I
7 can --

8 Q Well, let me get some help from my --

9 A (Allen) Okay.

10 Q Okay. Got it. You want to look for the updated,
11 the red Bates number. You found it?

12 A (Robinson) We're almost there.

13 Q Thank you. Yes. This is "Attachment
14 RDA/EN/RDJ" -- well, I probably got that twice,
15 "J-2" [RDA/EN/RDJ-2], "Page 2 of 15".

16 A (Allen) All right. I have it.

17 Q All right. So, that -- that graph or table
18 describes activities that are proposed for
19 2023 --

20 A (Allen) That's correct.

21 Q -- in planned vegetation management. And there
22 is a total calculated cost of what those programs
23 would entail, is that right?

24 A (Allen) That's correct.

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 Q Now, if the Commission approves the Petition, and
2 this is sort of consistent with the
3 Commissioner -- with the Chairman's opening
4 comments, if the Commission approves this
5 Petition, do you consider that approval for this
6 plan or do you consider approval for the budget?
7 Or, do you just provide this for information in
8 this docket, and for the -- so that the
9 Commission understands where the various
10 components of these costs are allocated?

11 A (Allen) Great question. This is a table that
12 shows our plan for 2023. Does not include the
13 \$2 million that we're asking for to carry over.
14 This is a breakdown of our major programs, and
15 within our Vegetation Management Program, and our
16 expectation of an investment strategy on them
17 this year.

18 However, if the carryover was approved,
19 we have identified trees from 2022 that were not
20 done. So, this is 2023 work. That carryover
21 dollars would allow us to do the 2022 work that
22 was not completed last year.

23 Q And I understood that. But what I asked is
24 whether, leaving aside the specific issue of the

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 carryforward, --

2 A (Allen) Yes.

3 Q -- but looking at this particular table and this
4 plan, and the budget, if the Commission approves
5 the Petition in this proceeding, --

6 A (Allen) Yes.

7 Q -- does the Company consider that approval of
8 this plan and the costs associated with it as
9 well? That's what I'm trying to figure out.

10 A (Allen) Yes.

11 Q Okay. I didn't understand that to be the case.
12 I thought it was just for information. So, --

13 A (Allen) Well, we provided this table to show what
14 our plan was, and that's a requirement for the
15 filing every year, what our plan is going to be
16 for that year. So, --

17 MS. AMIDON: Okay. All right. Thank
18 you for clarifying that for me.

19 That's all I have, Mr. Chairman. Thank
20 you very much.

21 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. We'll
22 move to Commissioner questions, beginning with
23 Commissioner Simpson.

24 CMSR. SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr.

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 Chairman.

2 BY CMSR. SIMPSON:

3 Q Why don't we stick with vegetation management
4 then for the time being. Thanks for being here,
5 Mr. Allen.

6 So, tell us about 2022 a little bit
7 more. I'm looking at Exhibit 1, Bates Page 027,
8 the "Summary of the '22 Planned versus Actuals".
9 Let me know when you get to that page please.

10 A (Allen) Yes. I'm there.

11 Q So, if you would just walk us through what your
12 2022 Plan for activities was, and then,
13 subsequently, the actuals that resulted, just to
14 explain some of the variances, to lead into a
15 discussion about the carryforward please?

16 A (Allen) Sure. So, starting with "Scheduled
17 Maintenance Trimming", Line 1, our gross cost,
18 \$21 million; the reimbursements are 4,232,880;
19 leaving us a net cost of 16,931,520.

20 Q And that was your plan?

21 A (Allen) That was our plan.

22 Q And the 4,000,000 was from the prior year, the
23 '21 year, correct, when you say "reimbursements"?

24 A (Allen) That was expected reimbursements.

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 Q Okay.

2 A (Allen) For the 2022 actual, we were at
3 \$14,956,053; our reimbursement was 2,501,172; for
4 a net cost of \$12,454,881.

5 Q So, that's all work that you plan throughout the
6 year, correct?

7 A (Allen) Yes.

8 Q And, for '22, you had some work planned that you
9 were able to -- most of the work you were able to
10 accomplish. And then, it sounds like some
11 circumstances from the end of 2021, due to
12 storms, that led to not being able to achieve
13 some of the overall goals that you had set in '21
14 for '22?

15 A (Allen) That's correct. So, very similar, we had
16 storms at the end of the year in '21, --

17 Q Uh-huh.

18 A (Allen) -- which left us with hazard tree
19 removals that we weren't able to get to. The
20 same thing happened again in 2022. So, we have a
21 backlog of trees standing there we've identified,
22 we have permission, and we weren't able to get to
23 them.

24 Q I think last year, when we were here, we talked a

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 little bit about crew availability. How are you
2 doing in that regards this year, and looking
3 forward?

4 A (Allen) It's always a struggle, as we've talked
5 about it every year.

6 Q Yes.

7 A (Allen) We do have approximately 100 crews right
8 now. We have brought in some extra crews --

9 Q Uh-huh.

10 A (Allen) -- from the Midwest, which was great.
11 One of our contractors that had won some work had
12 some crews available. So, we're meeting with
13 them on Wednesday, actually, to discuss bringing
14 more crews in.

15 So, the last few years have been
16 difficult to get crew resources. This year, it
17 seems like there's a chance we're going to get
18 some earlier in the year than we had thought we
19 would get them.

20 Q And, when you bring crews in from other parts of
21 the country, costwise, is it comparable? Is
22 there a greater expense to it? I mean, what do
23 you balance there?

24 A (Allen) So, the work that we are doing has a unit

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 price to it, our removals by size class, each one
2 has a unit price. And then, our miles that we do
3 on SMT is a cost per mile. So, that really
4 doesn't change. They come in, and they either
5 accept that work at that price or they don't.

6 There are some contractors that would
7 prefer to see a, you know, a mobilization cost
8 and a demobilization cost, and sometimes we do
9 that. But for the most part is they come in and
10 work at our unit prices.

11 Q Okay. And then, you don't need to walk through
12 the numbers, but just to explain, when you say
13 "mid cycle review", can you distinguish that for
14 us please?

15 A (Allen) Sure. We always have a budget line item
16 for "mid cycle", what we like to call "cycle
17 busters", trees that maybe failed or a circuit
18 that maybe had a windstorm, but the rest of the
19 state didn't receive that same type of particular
20 storm. So, we have a "mid cycle" line item that
21 we use to go out and address those things as they
22 come up, it's kind of an emergent plan.

23 Rarely do we spend that full amount,
24 because we're kind of stuck with not having

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 enough crews to get all the work done to begin
2 with, and then finding that extra work. So,
3 32,000 is about an average year, I would say, for
4 us on a mid cycle.

5 Q Okay. And then, "Customer Work", is that work
6 that exists purely on customers' properties?

7 A (Allen) Not purely. We consider "customer work"
8 to be a ticket that was called in from a
9 customer.

10 Q Uh-huh.

11 A (Allen) Oftentimes it is on their property. But,
12 also, there is a lot of people that see trees on
13 their commute to work and call us and say "Hey,
14 there's a tree that's failing over there." And
15 we go out and look at all of those. Oftentimes
16 they're something we will do; occasionally,
17 there's something we won't do. But we're happy
18 to have those other sets of eyes on the forest,
19 as we cannot always have enough people out there
20 to find those.

21 Q Okay. And then, "Flagging", there's an empty
22 field here.

23 A (Allen) Yes.

24 Q Can you just note that for us or explain that?

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 A (Allen) Sure. So, on both our mileage work, SMT,
2 and our unit price hazard tree removals, flagging
3 and police work is included in there. So, we put
4 \$100,000 aside in case there's a job that comes
5 up that was not expected, wasn't bid on, and --
6 or perhaps we're in a situation where we needed
7 two or three officers, on a particularly
8 dangerous intersection, we would then use that
9 funding, so it wasn't part of the bid. We didn't
10 have that situation occur last year.

11 Q And I know that this has been an area of interest
12 statewide for many years. Have you been using
13 generally law enforcement or do you predominantly
14 use flaggers? I know it varies by municipality.

15 A (Allen) Uh-huh.

16 Q What are you seeing right now, in terms of
17 options?

18 A (Allen) The options for flaggers, from a
19 municipality standpoint, is limited. It's almost
20 always they ask us to use an officer. And we
21 work with them wherever we can. We have several
22 times gone into towns and highlighted maps that
23 we thought we could use a flagger on, and
24 oftentimes the police chief will agree with us,

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 but sometimes they don't, and want an officer on
2 every road. So, the risk there is borne by the
3 contractor when they bid the work.

4 Q Okay. All right. Thank you. I want to move to
5 our reliability witnesses, Ms. Ntakou, Mr.
6 Johnson, and Mr. Allen.

7 So, I'm looking at Exhibit 3. And I'm
8 hoping, just in a general sense, that all of you
9 could walk through, not every graph, but identify
10 the most salient representative reliability
11 metrics here for our consideration, and note
12 where the Vegetation Management Programs have
13 demonstrated benefit?

14 A (Johnson) I will take a shot at that, and ask Ms.
15 Ntakou to add context, if needed.

16 I'll start on Bates, let's see here, I
17 guess, well, my Bates aren't showing up on this
18 version. Well, it's Page --

19 Q The *pdf* numbers, at least if you're looking at a
20 41-page *pdf*, align with our Bates pages.

21 A (Johnson) Okay. So, Page 7. I'll just run
22 through, you know, these are the typical metrics
23 which we primarily track.

24 The first is, in the top left, is

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 SAIFI, which is a frequency metric. And, as you
2 can see, we, you know, we continue to trend down.
3 You know, each of these, I'll start, are, you
4 know, the result of multiple efforts by the
5 Company. Obviously, when we get a little bit
6 later on and you see the causes of outages, it
7 becomes quite clear that veg. management has a
8 significant impact on these.

9 We also are doing significant
10 investments in pole-top automation, Tripsavers,
11 we are replacing fuses with devices that have
12 reclose capability, building circuit ties, all
13 kinds of things which have certain impacts.

14 So, you know, certainly, SAIFI, being
15 it's a event-driven metric, if you can reduce the
16 number of events, then it improves SAIFI. So,
17 clearly, any avoidance of trees and winds
18 impacting the lines has a benefit to SAIFI. As
19 do devices that reclose, or where we can do
20 automated switching in under five minutes, such
21 that they don't show up in these types of
22 statistics.

23 Moving to the right, "CAIDI" is a
24 duration metric. So, that's the average duration

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 of an event. And, you know, this one, I
2 wouldn't -- clearly, I would say, you know,
3 hazard trees have a significant impact on CAIDI.
4 In that, generally, if you lose a large tree, and
5 there's significant damage with broken poles,
6 you're talking about extended outages. And those
7 would drive the CAIDI metric up regardless.
8 Because, in fact, even with automation,
9 automation actually tends to push CAIDI up,
10 because we're able to restore so many customers
11 in under five minutes, that where we used to
12 restore customers in 20 minutes, and that would
13 actually lower the average duration. We no
14 longer have that. So, you're left with those
15 longer outages. But, clearly, you know, anything
16 that causes significant damage, and not -- and
17 requires significant effort to put back impacts
18 that CAIDI.

19 The lower left graph, "SAIDI", this is
20 really a combination of those two, frequency and
21 duration. So, it's an average number of minutes
22 out per customer. And, again, so, advantages,
23 any improvement on frequency or duration plays a
24 benefit on SAIDI.

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 And the lower right is CIII. This
2 would not be impacted by veg. management, because
3 it's really -- it's the average number of
4 customers impacted by each event. So, this is
5 really more about other reliability projects that
6 we do, adding, you know, reducing the size or the
7 number of customers impacted by an event through
8 the addition of automation and circuit ties, and
9 things like that.

10 Q Okay. Thank you. In terms of O&M, I know that
11 pole inspections is in here. My understanding is
12 that the Company recently picked up a few new
13 poles. So, tell us about this past year, and the
14 Company's ability to meet the number of poles
15 that you had hoped to inspect in 2022? And,
16 then, if you could give us a forward look, into
17 maybe the next couple of years, that would be
18 helpful as well?

19 A (Johnson) Okay. So, in 2022, with those poles
20 that were maintained within the Eversource
21 territory, we, and again, based on criteria, age
22 of the pole and the type of treatment depended on
23 the type of inspection that was done. If they
24 met certain criteria, you also would, you know,

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 would do a ground level inspection in order to
2 determine the condition of the pole.

3 So, you know, we clearly did all of
4 those inspections. And any reject poles, which
5 are generally classified amongst two different
6 groups, what we refer to as "C rejects", which
7 are, you know, a risk, a safety risk to the
8 public and to the system, in which case we have
9 to, you know, make them safe within ten days.
10 And we generally get them replaced within those
11 ten days. Or, "B rejects", which are, you know,
12 anything from, you know, chunks being knocked out
13 by plows, to insect damage, to rot, to other
14 things, where the pole is safe, but it needs to
15 be replaced within six months. So, those are the
16 two categories.

17 With respect to the poles that were in
18 another company's maintenance area, we would do a
19 visual inspection on the poles. So, we would
20 capture pole rot and things like mechanical
21 damage to the pole. And, so, likewise we would
22 clarify those as a "C reject" or a "B". And the
23 C rejects being the, you know, the danger to the
24 system and public, we would assure that they were

{DE 23-021} {07-11-23}

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 done, either by the joint owner of the pole, or,
2 if they were not able to do it in a timely
3 fashion, then we took care of those. And we're
4 not talking significant numbers there for that.
5 But, again, we're not doing a ground line
6 inspection for those.

7 Q Uh-huh.

8 A (Johnson) With the acquisition of the CCI pole
9 plant, we will be, you know, now adding those
10 poles to our, you know, ground line inspection.
11 And the way we're approaching those is there were
12 already a predefined number of zero-life poles
13 that are C rejects, that had been provided to us
14 through that -- through that process. And we've
15 gone out and we're inspecting those to, number
16 one, determine if they're still there. Because
17 some of these inspections that identified those
18 were ten years old. So, many of those poles have
19 been replaced for other reasons, whether it be a
20 third party surveyor work, you know, capital
21 project work, or anything.

22 So, we're down to around 460, I believe
23 it was, that we're going out physically
24 inspecting and writing up to get those replaced

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 immediately.

2 As far as the remainder of the poles,
3 we will have a, you know, an accelerated
4 inspection of those poles to be completed within
5 five years, with actually the majority of those
6 inspections completed before that.

7 So, you know, based on our inspection
8 results, you know, we'll find C rejects or B
9 rejects, and need to address those accordingly.

10 CMSR. SIMPSON: And maybe this is a
11 question for Attorney Wiesner. But how does the
12 Company anticipate communicating plans to the
13 Commission with respect to the CCI pole efforts?

14 You know, I know we're just looking at
15 2022 here. We have, from Attorney Amidon's
16 question, I think we've clearly identified that
17 we have a plan for vegetation management for '23.
18 I don't see that for poles here, correct?

19 MR. WIESNER: Correct.

20 WITNESS JOHNSON: This was -- I'm
21 sorry. This probably was done by March 1st.

22 CMSR. SIMPSON: Right.

23 WITNESS JOHNSON: And, of course, the
24 deal didn't close until May 1st on the

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 acquisition.

2 CMSR. SIMPSON: So, when would the
3 Company anticipate forthcoming with a plan or
4 information on more future poles? Just because
5 we'll be, you know, if we follow the same process
6 that we're following today, then we'd be
7 reconciling costs within this adjustment factor
8 in the future.

9 MR. WIESNER: Some of the related costs
10 will be run through the Pole Plant Adjustment
11 Mechanism that was approved at the time of the
12 CCI pole acquisition.

13 The Company is currently evaluating,
14 I'll just say, which costs go where, --

15 CMSR. SIMPSON: Uh-huh.

16 MR. WIESNER: -- and what that filing
17 will look like, and what plans and reports might
18 be included in that filing when it's made. Right
19 now, I can't tell you exactly when that's coming,
20 or what it will include.

21 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. But the PPAM
22 will have some. You would first see some of that
23 flowing over to the RRA. But we should be
24 anticipating, at some point in the future, more

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 detail on that?

2 MR. WIESNER: The PPAM will be the main
3 event, in terms of describing for the Commission
4 the impacts resulting from the CCI pole
5 acquisition.

6 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you. And,
7 so, it sounds like the Company is going to, in
8 the -- with their "best efforts", categorize what
9 was acquired through CCI in a separate factor?

10 MR. WIESNER: I think that's fair to
11 say. I think my understanding is that the CCI
12 records were not as detailed or comprehensive as
13 anyone might have wanted. And it may not be
14 possible to achieve the level of detailed
15 specificity that all would prefer, but that
16 effort is underway with respect to the PPAM.

17 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you.

18 BY CMSR. SIMPSON:

19 Q Okay. So, then, Exhibit 3, just a few more on
20 this, these Sections 2.1, 2.2, that provide a
21 summary of the program and the resulting costs.

22 So, 2.1, this is purely the inspection
23 effort. This is costs to roll a truck and
24 inspect poles, correct?

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 A (Johnson) That is correct. And it is actually,
2 it's contracted work, --

3 Q Yes.

4 A (Johnson) -- bid work, to a vendor. So, yes.

5 Q Okay. And, then, scrolling down to Bates 029,
6 so, the reject pole replacement, these are actual
7 costs incurred to replace infrastructure?

8 A (Johnson) As a result of --

9 Q Of the inspections.

10 A (Johnson) -- of the inspections specifically,
11 yes.

12 Q Okay. And the "Plan" versus the "Variance", I
13 mean, it's, what, 40 percent, that's good in many
14 ways. But are there other factors that led to
15 that variance?

16 A (Johnson) Yes. It was a combination of two
17 things, a lower failure rate than historical,
18 which is not surprising, as we've worked our way
19 through, we're in the second round now of
20 inspections of these poles. So, it's a reduction
21 in the failure rate that we saw, as well as we
22 did have some supply chain/availability issues,
23 pole availability issues, which did delay our
24 ability to complete some of that work, combined

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 with the storms that Mr. Allen discussed, delayed
2 some work at the end of the year.

3 Q Is that getting better?

4 A (Johnson) Yes. I think, yes, that the higher
5 class poles, you know, Class I poles, I would
6 say, are a challenge. Class II, from what I
7 understand, our needs are being able to be
8 supplied.

9 I will state, though, that we haven't
10 really challenged that, because of other material
11 issues are delaying many of our projects, our
12 ability to complete those projects.

13 But, in general, yes. I believe the
14 pole availability has gotten better.

15 Q Okay. Thank you so much. And, then, let's move
16 over to lost base revenue.

17 Mr. Anderson, hello. So, I believe the
18 last -- for the last year, this was a negative
19 figure, correct?

20 A (Anderson) I don't believe so. I think it was
21 about half the amount of the 900,000, roughly.

22 Q Okay. Could you point me to that summary table,
23 or information, if it's in your testimony?

24 A (Anderson) I'm not sure last year's figure is in

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 my testimony.

2 Q Okay.

3 A (Anderson) But, just reading last year's
4 transcript of the hearing, Mr. Davis testified,
5 and I have a figure in mind that's roughly half
6 of what we're seeking to recover in lost base
7 revenue this year.

8 Q And can you describe the trend that the Company
9 has seen from '22 to '23 -- or, from '21 to '22,
10 excuse me?

11 A (Anderson) Yes.

12 Q In terms of customer adoption, and how that
13 changed the recovery?

14 A (Anderson) Sure. Definitely continued interest
15 and implementation of solar net metering systems
16 continued in 2022. So, we saw an increase,
17 again, over 2021, lost base revenues almost
18 doubled revenue-wise.

19 Q Okay. And let's see. I'm looking at Exhibit 2,
20 Bates Page 013. I'll give you a moment.

21 A (Anderson) I'm sorry, Exhibit 2 is?

22 Q Your direct testimony, with Ms. Paruta.

23 A (Anderson) Thank you. Thirteen? Okay.

24 Q Uh-huh. So, there's the "RRA Rate (Average

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 dollars per kilowatt-hour)" table at the top of
2 the page. Do you see that?

3 A (Anderson) I do.

4 Q Okay. So, in the prior order, so, it's roughly
5 doubled, right, year over year, is that fair to
6 say?

7 A (Anderson) Yes.

8 Q Year over year?

9 A (Anderson) Thank you for pointing that out.
10 That's consistent with what I was saying with
11 respect to a revenue requirement dollar amount,
12 unitized, it's about doubled.

13 Q Okay. All right. I was thinking the negative on
14 the overall, my mistake originally. And do you
15 have any sense of the future, of what we can
16 expect for the '23 adjustment, just to
17 foreshadow?

18 A (Anderson) My judgment is that net metering
19 systems will continue to be adopted, and that
20 lost base revenues will increase on this pace.

21 Q Uh-huh. And, so, your test year for 19-057 was
22 2018, right?

23 A (Anderson) 2018.

24 Q So, this factor only impacts systems that were

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 put in service from '19, moving forward, correct?

2 A (Anderson) January 1st, 2019, going forward, yes.

3 Q Okay. So, in -- just explain to us how the

4 Company reconciled prior systems before

5 January 1st, 2019? Where did those costs go?

6 A (Anderson) I believe those were reflected in the

7 overall calculation of the base distribution

8 rates themselves.

9 Q Okay. And would you anticipate doing the same

10 thing in a future rate case for the systems that

11 have been placed into service from January 1st,

12 2019?

13 A (Anderson) I would expect, when a future rate

14 case occurs, that same method will be used, yes.

15 Q Okay.

16 A (Anderson) That is one method that may be used.

17 My understanding is that we also may introduce

18 some revenue decoupling mechanisms. And we've

19 not yet done so, obviously.

20 Q Uh-huh.

21 A (Anderson) But --

22 Q That was my next question for you.

23 A (Anderson) -- there would be -- there would be a

24 new calculation starting with a subsequent rate

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 case.

2 CMSR. SIMPSON: Very good. Okay.

3 Thank you.

4 I don't have any further questions for
5 these witnesses, Mr. Chairman.

6 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.

7 We'll move to Commissioner Chattopadhyay.

8 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Feel free to
9 respond based on who has the expertise. Whenever
10 there are more than three witnesses, I lose
11 track.

12 BY CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY:

13 Q So, I'm just going to go to the discussion about
14 SAIFI, CAIDI, and SAIDI. And, so, I think, Mr.
15 Johnson, it's your area. Do you -- do you track
16 some sort of a benchmark for those three metrics?

17 A (Johnson) We do. There are --

18 *[Court reporter interruption.]*

19 **CONTINUED BY THE WITNESS:**

20 A (Johnson) Yes, we do. There are IEEE benchmarks
21 for different size companies, different areas of
22 the country.

23 BY CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY:

24 Q Can you tell me how these numbers compare with

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 those benchmarks?

2 A (Johnson) I don't have them memorized. But I
3 believe there are, when you look at the IEEE
4 criteria, which means without exclusion events,
5 we perform quite well. If I recall, it's second
6 quartile on everything, with the exception of
7 CAIDI. I believe CAIDI, we're a little more
8 challenged. Again, a lot of that is due to
9 travel times and things like that that you
10 wouldn't have in a more densely populated area.

11 When we look at -- there are also
12 benchmarks for all-in, where you don't exclude
13 major events. And, looking at those metrics, we,
14 if I recall, we fall more into the third quartile
15 grouping.

16 Q What you're describing here, it's not part of the
17 testimony directly, the written testimony, right?

18 A (Johnson) It is not. And it's subject to check.
19 I would need to confirm that. We have --

20 Q Understood.

21 A (Johnson) Okay. Yes.

22 Q I think it would be helpful going forward to
23 also, when you have these measures, just give us
24 a sense of which quartiles, you know, those

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 metrics fall in. In some sense, the benchmarks
2 themselves are changing, but the approach that
3 IEEE uses helps us to have a good comparative
4 look. So, I would prod the Company to do that at
5 least next time around.

6 So, I'm going to go to the -- I think
7 this is Exhibit 2, I think I -- Commissioner
8 Simpson had already discussed a bit about the
9 LBR, and it's largely the increase in the rate.
10 And I'm going to go directly to the same page,
11 it's Bates Page 013. It's gone up from
12 "\$0.00007", to "\$0.00014". So, it has doubled.
13 And I think what I heard was, because of how the
14 net metering, you know, environment is, you
15 expect it to go -- that number go up in the
16 future?

17 A (Anderson) All else equal, --

18 Q All else --

19 A (Anderson) -- new systems coming along will drive
20 that number up, yes.

21 Q I did read the testimony about the consultant
22 costs, you know, DOE assessment, all of that.
23 But I'm still not 100 percent sure what's driving
24 the increase from, again, using that table, in

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 the prior docket, which was 22-010, the number
2 was "0.00007", that is in dollars. And it has
3 gone up, like, almost 350 percent, okay -- or,
4 yes, or gone up 250 percent, okay.

5 So, can you give me a sense of what's
6 going on? Is it mainly because there's some
7 costs that were part of the rate case that are
8 being recovered now? Or, I'm -- as I was reading
9 the testimony, it wasn't very clear to me. So,
10 can you just put some light on that?

11 A (Robinson) Yes, Commissioner. If we can step
12 back to last year's filing as a starting point,
13 for the regulatory assessments, the difference
14 between what we were -- what was expensed in
15 calendar year 2021, versus what was included in
16 base rates, we had just a slightly over \$400,000
17 difference. Whereas, for this current filing, in
18 Exhibit 2, and just bear with me, it's shown on
19 Bates Page 037 of Exhibit 2, at Line 4.

20 Q Can you just bear with me and let me go there?

21 A (Robinson) Sure. Of course.

22 Q You said "Bates Page 037, Line 4"?

23 A (Robinson) Page 37, yes.

24 Q Okay.

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 A (Robinson) On Line 4.

2 Q I'm there.

3 A (Robinson) So, for calendar year 2022, the
4 difference between what was actually assessed and
5 expensed in calendar year 2022, versus the amount
6 recovered in base rates, we're increasing that
7 from the \$400,000 in 2021, --

8 Q Yes.

9 A (Robinson) -- to \$1.6 million dollars in 2022.
10 And, again, for the -- for the assessments, if
11 we're talking about in total, you're talking
12 about a 1. -- you're talking about a \$1.2 million
13 increase in the assessments between calendar year
14 2021 and 2022.

15 Q Okay. So, that's really what's driving it?

16 A (Robinson) Yes. Consultant costs, again, in
17 calendar year 2021, last year's filing,
18 consultant costs, we had \$199,000 that we
19 included. This year, we're at \$293,000,
20 something like a \$100,000 increase in consultant
21 costs between calendar years 2021 and 2022.

22 Q And what is that increase attributed to? I mean,
23 I'm basically not asking, I know how it has gone
24 up. And the kind of work that the DOE and the

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 OCA, would you be able to just talk about it?

2 A (Robinson) I'm not familiar with the formula --

3 Q Yes.

4 A (Robinson) -- the DOE used in developing their
5 assessments.

6 Q Yes.

7 A (Robinson) So, I can't speak to that. You know,
8 what we see, at our end, in New Hampshire revenue
9 requirements, we see what we're invoiced for, and
10 we receive four installments each year, each
11 calendar year. And I don't know what the formula
12 is behind the calculation --

13 Q Okay.

14 A (Robinson) -- in the assessment we receive. I
15 apologize for that.

16 Q No, you don't have to. I'm just, you know, I was
17 hoping you might know. But, if you don't, that's
18 understandable. You know, and I'm also asking it
19 not knowing fully. So, I'm just curious what
20 drove that increase. And, so, what are the
21 factors behind it.

22 As for -- could go back to Bates
23 Page 013, this is -- whoops. I'm just trying to
24 make sure I get it right. The "Total Average

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 RRA" that is being shown there, you know,
2 "\$0.00033", that's weighted average, right?

3 A (Robinson) That's the average. That's the total
4 revenue requirement.

5 Q Yes. So, it has to be --

6 A (Robinson) Correct.

7 Q -- weighted? Yes.

8 A (Robinson) Correct.

9 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Okay. Thank you.
10 That's all I have.

11 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. I just have
12 one line of questioning, I think.

13 BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:

14 Q So, I'm on Exhibit 2, Bates Page 043. It's
15 relative to the vegetation management. And, so,
16 we know that, in the Settlement, there's a 27.1
17 million allowed, the Company spent 24.973, for
18 the delta that we've been talking about, I think,
19 of 2.1 million.

20 So, my question is, in the RRA
21 adjustment that's being requested here, is that
22 based on the 24.97 million number or the \$27.1
23 million number? What are you requesting, in
24 terms of relief?

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 A (Robinson) We're requesting that that
2 over-recovery, the "\$2.1 million" you mentioned,
3 Commissioner, --

4 Q Uh-huh.

5 A (Robinson) -- that that be carried forward into
6 calendar year 2023.

7 Q I understand on the spending plan for 2023. I
8 understand that, and that request. And that's,
9 as Mr. Eckberg pointed out, allowed per the
10 Settlement. So, no problem there.

11 What I'm really asking about is, in
12 this RRA request in this filing, in this docket,
13 are you -- is your request based on the 27.1 or
14 the 24.97?

15 A (Robinson) Per the request, and the condition
16 within the Settlement of requesting carryover,
17 that the request would be the \$24.7 million that
18 you mentioned.

19 Q Okay. So, in this filing, you're just filing for
20 your actual cost --

21 A (Robinson) Correct.

22 Q -- in the filing, and you're asking the
23 Commission to carry forward that 2.1, so you can
24 spend that in 2023?

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 A (Robinson) Correct.

2 Q So, we would expect to see that show up in your
3 2023 filing?

4 A (Robinson) Correct.

5 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.
6 Okay. That's all I have.

7 Anything else from the Commissioners,
8 any follow-up?

9 CMSR. SIMPSON: No thank you.

10 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Just one question
11 on, again, on the carryforward issue.

12 BY CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY:

13 Q So, because that's money that you've already
14 collected, are you going to --

15 A (Robinson) Excuse me. Sorry for interrupting,
16 Commissioner.

17 Q Yes.

18 A (Robinson) That's money where we propose to
19 collect. Since the rate has not been approved,
20 nothing's formal yet.

21 Q Okay. Let me rephrase. So, because you ended up
22 spending less than what was in the rates, do you
23 ultimately, even though you're going to now defer
24 it, use it for the next year, do the interest

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 rate issue -- do interest rates also matter,
2 meaning, for the customers, because they're sort
3 of providing you money beforehand?

4 A (Robinson) I mean, what's proposed right now, --

5 Q Yes.

6 A (Robinson) -- in our Exhibit 2, is the
7 reconciliation for the going-forward period,
8 August 2023 through July 2024, does not include
9 that, that credit over-recovery or credit of \$2.1
10 million.

11 Q Understood. But, okay. Typically, if you
12 were -- I shouldn't say "typically". If you were
13 not holding onto that, and you were returning it
14 to the customers, what would have happened?

15 A (Robinson) If you look on Bates Page --

16 Q And I'm assuming you're in Exhibit 2?

17 A (Robinson) Exhibit 2. We're still on Exhibit 2,
18 yes. And Bates Page 017.

19 Q One seven?

20 A (Robinson) Yes.

21 Q Yes. I'm there.

22 A (Robinson) And, if you look at the "Vegetation
23 Management Program" line, --

24 Q Yes.

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 A (Robinson) -- in the "Alternative Rate" column,
2 if we flowed that back to customers, rather than
3 carry that forward, we would end up with a lower
4 average RRA rate than what we're proposing.

5 Q Okay. By not doing so, are you -- is this kind
6 of a loan from the ratepayers to you? And let me
7 ask, and it's -- my question isn't very clear
8 because I'm still sort of struggling with it
9 myself.

10 A (Robinson) Understood. Yes, and I think I
11 understand the general concept that you're
12 talking about. It's that there will always be
13 some carrying charge impact, you know? And,
14 again, you look at the alternative rate, versus
15 what our proposed rate is, the fact is, the
16 monies in 2022 had already been spent. So,
17 that's cash out the door for the Company. And
18 benchmarking that against what was in base rates
19 ends up in an over-recovery. So, it works both
20 ways, because the Company -- that cash is out the
21 door, you know, and, because we couldn't get to
22 certain vegetation management activities in 2022.

23 But, again, just the way the
24 reconciliations work, and depending upon what

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 expense is included, you know, because, in the
2 Alternative Rate scenario, where we show that
3 credit going through, then that would carry
4 forward to the going-forward reconciliation, you
5 know, as well.

6 And, so, yes. There is a carrying
7 charge impact.

8 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Okay. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. We'll take
10 ten minutes, before we move to redirect, and
11 return at 10:30.

12 ***(Recess taken at 10:20 a.m., and the***
13 ***hearing resumed at 10:31 a.m.)***

14 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. We're back on
15 the record. And I'll -- there's a couple of
16 short follow-up questions, before we move to
17 redirect, from the Commissioners. So, I'll begin
18 with Commissioner Simpson.

19 BY CMSR. SIMPSON:

20 Q Just a question about the Enhanced Tree Trimming
21 element. Our understanding was that that program
22 had a sunset at some point. Could you explain
23 that for us?

24 A (Allen) Sure, Commissioner. Originally, when we

[WITNESSES: Allen|Johnson|Ntakou|Robinson|Anderson]

1 started that program, we said we would do all the
2 three-phase/backbone line, and the "backbone" was
3 described and defined as "from the source to the
4 first device." We thought we had approximately,
5 my memory, I'm not sure, approximately 1,500
6 miles, 1,600 miles of that. Currently, we're
7 over 1,200 miles completed. So, once that
8 additional work is done, we will sunset that
9 program.

10 Q And then, maintenance will just become part of
11 your normal VMP cycle?

12 A (Allen) Yes. We do METT currently, which is
13 maintenance on previously ETT work. So, we have
14 reclaimed the original clearance.

15 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you.

16 WITNESS ALLEN: You're welcome.

17 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: All right. We'll
18 move to Commissioner Chattopadhyay.

19 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: A very quick one.

20 BY CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY:

21 Q We were talking about "carrying charge". And,
22 so, I'm just curious whether -- what are the
23 carrying charges for over- and under-collection,
24 do you know?

1 A (Robinson) The carrying charge rate?

2 Q Yes.

3 A (Robinson) It's the prime rate.

4 Q For both sides?

5 A (Robinson) For both sides.

6 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Okay. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Very good.

8 We'll move to Attorney Wiesner, and redirect?

9 MR. WIESNER: I believe that the
10 questions and answers have sufficiently clarified
11 the record for purposes of the Commission's
12 consideration and approval of the proposed RRA
13 rate. So, I have no redirect.

14 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you,
15 Attorney Wiesner.

16 Let's move then to closing statements.
17 And we can begin with the Office of the Consumer
18 Advocate.

19 MR. CROUSE: Thank you.

20 After review and listening to the
21 cross-examination today, the OCA maintains its
22 stance that the RRA is resulting in a just and
23 reasonable rate, and has no objections to the
24 proposal of Eversource in this matter.

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. And
3 we'll move to the New Hampshire Department of
4 Energy.

5 MS. AMIDON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

6 Based on the Department's review and
7 analysis of the Company's filing, as provided in
8 the technical statement of Mr. Eckberg,
9 everything that's been presented today at the
10 hearing and in the exhibits appears to support
11 the calculation of the RRA as proposed in the
12 Company's filing. And it also is consistent with
13 the Settlement Agreement that was approved by the
14 Commission in Docket 19-057, which is the
15 Company's last rate case. Consequently, we think
16 the charges that they propose are in the public
17 interest and just and reasonable, within the
18 meaning of RSA 378.

19 Having said that, the Company does not
20 under -- understands this to be a request for a
21 rate adjustment to recover these reconciling
22 charges, and not for approval of the Vegetation
23 Management Plan for 2023 and the associated
24 budget. Our understanding was that was for

1 "information only" purposes, to illustrate what
2 they were proposing to do with the money. And I
3 am not convinced that the Commission has to
4 approve it at this point, but just considered it
5 to be for information.

6 Finally, I just wanted to say that, as
7 we were discussing the rate case expense issue,
8 we did find that the order approving the rate
9 case expense, Order 26,634, in Docket 19-057, was
10 approved May 27th, 2022.

11 Beyond that, the Department doesn't
12 have any specific knowledge of whether the
13 Company began recovery of those costs last year.
14 But we have no problem with those costs beginning
15 to be recovered this year as consistent with that
16 particular order.

17 Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.
19 And, finally, we'll move to Attorney Wiesner, and
20 Eversource.

21 MR. WIESNER: So, thank you, Mr.
22 Chairman. I will cover a couple of these points
23 before I get to the main body of my closing.

24 First of all, with respect to the rate

1 case expense amortization surcharge. It was
2 approved, as Attorney Amidon said, in late May of
3 last year. The Company made a filing, I believe,
4 June 16th, to adjust its schedules to account for
5 that surcharge inclusion in the RRA. And the
6 Commission ultimately approved the inclusion of
7 that additional rate component for the RRA, the
8 rate case expense surcharge, with the five-year
9 amortization schedule, beginning August 1st,
10 2022.

11 And it doesn't appear, from my review
12 of the virtual file room docket, that there was a
13 supplemental notice last year, a supplemental
14 order of notice or any type of additional notice
15 that was issued following the June filing by the
16 Company, prior to the approval in the
17 Commission's ultimate order.

18 So, I certainly heard loud and clear
19 the Commission's interest in having more
20 specificity in the petitions. And I understand
21 that applies to this docket, and other dockets as
22 well. And we will endeavor to do that going
23 forward. And, if I understand correctly, that
24 those beefed-up petitions, if you will, will

1 include specific dollar amounts, and perhaps rate
2 impacts, and references, page references to the
3 relevant testimony and schedules. And we will
4 make every effort to do that, it will make the
5 Commission's job easier, and, you know, possibly
6 make hearings quicker and more efficient for
7 everyone, which is certainly a benefit.

8 I think we would argue that, today, the
9 rate case expense amortization surcharge, as
10 approved for inclusion in the RRA by the
11 Commission last year, and based on the precedent
12 of last year, where it was approved for inclusion
13 in the RRA beginning August 1st of 2022, should
14 be followed this year for approval and inclusion
15 of that additional rate case component, as well
16 as the five others that were called out in the
17 original Settlement Agreement from 19-057 that
18 was previously approved.

19 I will also say that I believe that I
20 do agree with what Ms. Amidon said about the
21 Vegetation Management Plan, and it is provided
22 primarily for informational purposes. There are
23 underlying standards that apply to it, and
24 expectations as to what the Company will do with

1 it. But it really has relevance when it comes to
2 these annual rate filings, in terms of what the
3 Company is permitted to recover, and how that is
4 reconciled against the amount that's included in
5 base rates.

6 So, with those two issues covered, I'll
7 get back to my original statement. Which is that
8 the Company supports the Regulatory
9 Reconciliation Adjustment rate that's been
10 proposed. We believe the record demonstrates,
11 through the filings and live testimony this
12 morning, that the proposed RRA rate adjustment
13 has been calculated accurately, and
14 appropriately, to allow for approval by the
15 Commission.

16 In particular, and there was quite a
17 bit of discussion on this this morning, we ask
18 the Commission to approve the Company's proposal
19 to transfer carryover and apply the actual 2022
20 over-recovery, which represents an underspend
21 against the allowed amount for vegetation
22 management, in the amount of \$2,126,381 to serve
23 as an offset to the 2023 program year vegetation
24 management activity costs. That treatment is

1 consistent with the approved Settlement Agreement
2 in the Company's last general rate case, in DE
3 19-057.

4 That approach would permit the Company
5 to complete vegetation management work this year
6 that could not be completed last year, for the
7 reasons beyond the Company's control as described
8 by Mr. Allen, thereby enhancing system
9 reliability for the benefit of the Company's
10 customers.

11 And this is more in the nature of
12 cleanup. But we will also ask the Commission
13 specifically to note that the RRA adjustment will
14 apply to the Company's Rate EV-2, as it will to
15 other customer rates, assuming that the order
16 *nisi* issued in Docket DE 23-053 becomes effective
17 following the end of the *nisi* period, and I
18 believe that effective date is July 14th. That
19 cleanup effort should become final before the new
20 RRA rates are effective on August 1st. And, so,
21 the RRA should also apply to that Rate EV-2.

22 We appreciate the time and efforts of
23 the Commission, the Parties in this docket, in
24 particular, the DOE and its helpful analysis and

1 recommendation, to review the Company's filing
2 and the proposed RRA rate adjustments. We ask
3 that the Commission approve the rate adjustments
4 promptly, so that the new rates may become
5 effective on August 1st.

6 Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you, Attorney
8 Wiesner. And, in particular, appreciate the
9 Company's, you know, review of future petitions,
10 and the clarification of that, that would, I
11 think, be very helpful for all involved.

12 And you had mentioned, under
13 preliminary matters, that perhaps the Company
14 would consider a summary, a brief summary even
15 for this docket, to help the Commission. And
16 I'll just say it's very helpful in final orders
17 if we know precisely the Company's request, and
18 that can just be placed in the final order.
19 It's, I think, easier for everyone involved. So,
20 if the Company would consider that, the
21 Commission would appreciate that as well.

22 Okay. Without -- if there's no
23 objections, we'll strike ID on Exhibits 1 through
24 4, and submit them as full exhibits, no

1 objections?

2 [No verbal response.]

3 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. And, so,
4 we'll issue an order to address the rates
5 requested today on or before August 1st, as the
6 Company requests.

7 Is there anything else that we need to
8 cover today?

9 [Atty. Amidon indicating in the
10 negative.]

11 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. All right.
12 Seeing none. I'll thank everyone, and we are
13 adjourned.

14 **(Whereupon the hearing was adjourned**
15 **at 10:41 a.m.)**

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24