

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

September 14, 2023 - 1:04 p.m.  
21 South Fruit Street  
Suite 10  
Concord, NH

RE: DE 23-075  
PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW  
HAMPSHIRE d/b/a EVERSOURCE ENERGY:  
Petition to Approve Pole Plant  
Adjustment Mechanism Rates.

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

Sarah Fuller, Esq./PUC Legal Advisor

Tracey Russo, Clerk

**APPEARANCES:** Reptg. Public Service Company of  
New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource Energy:  
Jessica A. Ralston, Esq. (*Keegan Werlin*)

Reptg. New Hampshire Dept. of Energy:  
Alexandra K. Ladwig, Esq.  
Elizabeth Nixon, Dir./Electric Div.  
(*Regulatory Support Division*)

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

**I N D E X****PAGE NO.**

**WITNESS PANEL:**            **SCOTT R. ANDERSON**  
                                 **MARISA B. PARUTA**

Direct examination by Ms. Ralston	7
Cross-examination by Ms. Ladwig	15
Interrogatories by Cmsr. Simpson	28
Interrogatories by Cmsr. Chattopadhyay	35
Interrogatories by Chairman Goldner	44
<i>Administrative notice taken of Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2 from Docket DE 23-021</i>	44

**CLOSING STATEMENTS BY:**

Ms. Ladwig	47
Ms. Ralston	47

**E X H I B I T S**

<b>EXHIBIT NO.</b>	<b>D E S C R I P T I O N</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
1	Eversource Energy Joint Testimony of Marisa B. Paruta and Scott R. Anderson (August 2, 2023)	<i>premarked</i>
2	Eversource Energy Filing with Revised Attachments MBP/SRA-1 through MBP/SRA-4 (September 5, 2023)	<i>premarked</i>
3	Eversource Energy Response to Data Request DOE 1-1	<i>premarked</i>
4	Updated Attachment MBP/SRA-3, workpaper page 5 "Comparison of Rates Effective August 1, 2023 and Proposed Rates for Effect October 1, 2023 for Residential Service Rate R" to provide for Illustrative Purposes Calculation of October 1, 2023 rates if proposed PPAM and proposed TCAM Rates are approved	<i>premarked</i>
5	Chart entitled "Summary of Eversource's 2022 Actual Vegetation Management Program Costs	<i>premarked</i>
6	New Hampshire Dept. of Energy Technical Statement of Elizabeth R. Nixon and Stephen R. Eckberg (09-07-23)	6
7	<b>RESERVED FOR RECORD REQUEST</b> (Estimate of next year's costs for (a), (b), and (c) as described on Pages 1 and 2 of Exhibit 6	(39), 48

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

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

We're here this afternoon for a hearing in Docket Number DE 23-075. The authority to convene a hearing in this matter is provided in RSA Chapter 541-A, RSAs 374:2, 378:5, 378:7 -- and 378:7. We are considering testimony and evidence concerning the proposed PPAM rates for effect October 1st, 2023. We intend to issue an order on or before September 30th, 2023.

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

MS. RALSTON: Good afternoon. Jessica Ralston, from the law firm of Keegan Werlin, on behalf of Public Service Company of New Hampshire, doing business as Eversource Energy.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you. And the New Hampshire Department of Energy?

MS. LADWIG: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Alexandra Ladwig, appearing on behalf of the Department of Energy. And, then,

1 with me today is Elizabeth Nixon, who is the  
2 Electric Director for the Department.

3 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Very good.  
4 Are there any preliminary issues that the parties  
5 wish to raise before we get started?

6 *[No verbal response.]*

7 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Nothing. Would the  
8 parties like to make any kind of opening  
9 statement?

10 *[No verbal response.]*

11 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: All right. I'm  
12 O for two. Okay.

13 So, just one question before we get  
14 started. I just want to clarify, Attorney  
15 Ralston, just to clarify the Company's request, I  
16 think today you're seeking recovery of \$14.983  
17 million from ratepayers, and that's the item at  
18 issue today, is that correct?

19 MS. RALSTON: I'll defer to the witness  
20 on the exact number. But that sounds right.

21 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Can I get a  
22 nod from the witnesses? Is that -- is that why  
23 we're here today?

24 MS. PARUTA: That's correct.

1 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.  
2 Okay. That makes sense.

3 The parties have premarked and numbered  
4 the exhibits for the hearing today. Are there  
5 any additional exhibits the parties wish to  
6 submit at this time?

7 MS. RALSTON: No. I just note that we  
8 did add an exhibit yesterday that I assume the  
9 Commission has.

10 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Exhibit 5, correct?

11 MS. RALSTON: Yes. That's correct.

12 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Would the  
13 Department of Energy have any objection to making  
14 "Exhibit 6" out of the letter from September 7th?

15 MS. LADWIG: No objection to that.

16 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.  
17 So, we'll make that Exhibit 6.

18 (The document, as described, was  
19 herewith marked as **Exhibit 6** for  
20 identification.)

21 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Seeing that  
22 we've concluded all the preliminary matters,  
23 let's move to the swearing in of the witnesses.  
24 Mr. Patnaude, would you please swear in the

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 witnesses.

2 (Whereupon **SCOTT R. ANDERSON** and  
3 **MARISA B. PARUTA** were duly sworn by the  
4 Court Reporter.)

5 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: All right. Please  
6 proceed, Attorney Ralston.

7 MS. RALSTON: Thank you.

8 **SCOTT R. ANDERSON, SWORN**

9 **MARISA B. PARUTA, SWORN**

10 **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

11 BY MS. RALSTON:

12 Q I'll begin with Mr. Anderson. Mr. Anderson,  
13 would you please state your full name, company  
14 position, and responsibilities?

15 A (Anderson) My name is Scott Anderson. I'm the  
16 Manager of Rates for Public Service of New  
17 Hampshire. My responsibilities include cost of  
18 service, rate design, and tariff and rate  
19 administration for the Company.

20 Q Are you familiar with the exhibits that have been  
21 marked as "Exhibit 1" through "5", which support  
22 the Company's request for approval of the Pole  
23 Plant Adjustment Mechanism rates for effect  
24 October 1st?

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 A (Anderson) Yes, I am.

2 Q And do you have any corrections or amendments to  
3 Exhibits 1 through 5?

4 A (Anderson) Yes. I have one non-substantive  
5 correction for clarity. Exhibit 2 provides  
6 Attachments MBP/SRA-1 through 4, as revised on  
7 September 5th, 2023. The original header  
8 embedded in Attachment MBP/SRA-3 has two  
9 "Page 6 of 8"s and is missing "Page 5 of 8".  
10 Bates Page 012 should have been labeled, in the  
11 upper right-hand corner, as "Page 5 of 8".

12 Q Thank you. And, then, can I refer you to Exhibit  
13 4? This exhibit was not previously included in  
14 the docket, it wasn't included in the initial  
15 filing, correct?

16 A (Anderson) That's correct.

17 Q So, can you just briefly explain what Exhibit 4  
18 shows, and why the Company has included it as a  
19 hearing exhibit?

20 A (Anderson) Sure. Exhibit 4 is a revised version  
21 of Page 5 of Attachment MBP/SRA-3. Exhibit 4 has  
22 been revised to reflect the proposed Transmission  
23 Cost Adjustment Mechanism, or TCAM rate, that the  
24 Company has requested approval of in Docket DE

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1           23-070. If the proposed TCAM rate is approved in  
2           Docket DE 23-070, it would become effective on  
3           October 1st, 2023.

4                   Bates Page 012 of Exhibit 2 provides  
5           the same calculation as Exhibit 4, but reflects  
6           the current approved TCAM rate. Exhibit 4 was  
7           provided based on discussions with the Department  
8           of Energy. During those discussions, the  
9           Department of Energy suggested that it would be  
10          helpful to review the combined impact of the  
11          Company's request in this docket and in Docket  
12          DE 23-070 to October 1st, 2023 distribution  
13          rates.

14                   It's provided for illustrative purposes  
15          only, and does not change the Company's request  
16          in this proceeding or the DE 23-070.

17   Q       Thank you. Are you adopting those portions of  
18           Exhibits 1 through 5 that you have sponsored as  
19           part of your sworn testimony today?

20   A       (Anderson) Yes, I am.

21   Q       Thank you. I'll move on to Ms. Paruta. Can you  
22           please state your name, Company position, and  
23           responsibilities?

24   A       (Paruta) Yes. My name is Marisa Paruta. And I

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 am the Director of Revenue Requirements for  
2 Eversource Energy, overseeing the New Hampshire  
3 and Connecticut electric and natural gas utility  
4 companies.

5 Q And are you familiar with the exhibits marked as  
6 "Exhibit 1" through "5" that support the  
7 Company's request today?

8 A (Paruta) Yes, I am.

9 Q And do you have any corrections or amendments to  
10 Exhibits 1 through 5?

11 A (Paruta) No, I do not.

12 Q Can you provide a brief summary of the Company's  
13 request in this proceeding?

14 A (Paruta) Yes. So, in Docket DE 21-020, the  
15 Commission had authorized the Company to purchase  
16 certain pole plant assets from Consolidated  
17 Communications of Northern New England, LLC,  
18 which I will refer to as "CCI" in this hearing.  
19 The Commission also approved recovery of certain  
20 costs associated with the transaction through the  
21 Pole Plant Adjustment Mechanism, that I will  
22 refer to as the "PPAM rate" today.

23 The Company is authorized to recover  
24 three categories of costs through the PPAM rate.

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 And those costs are the costs and expenses  
2 associated with operation and maintenance of the  
3 transferred poles, pole replacement and  
4 inspection costs, and the vegetation management  
5 costs associated with those poles.

6 These costs are offset by the  
7 incremental pole attachment revenue that the  
8 Company will be receiving as a result of the  
9 acquisition and the sole ownership of these poles  
10 from the acquired assets.

11 The Company closed on the transaction  
12 with CCI on May 1 of 2023. Therefore, the  
13 Company has now made its first petition with the  
14 Commissioners to request to implement the PPAM  
15 rate as of October 1, 2023.

16 The Company proposed the PPAM rate for  
17 October 1, 2023, is going to recover the  
18 vegetation management expenses incurred starting  
19 with February 10, 2021, and through December 31,  
20 2022. The Company is not including any other  
21 categories of cost recovery based on the timing  
22 of the transaction, given that we closed on it on  
23 May 1, 2023, for the period of February 10, 2021,  
24 through December 31 of 2022. There were no other

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1       allowed costs, in accordance with the  
2       Commission's order, that were incurred during  
3       that period of time that would qualify for  
4       recovery today.

5   Q    You just mentioned that the PPAM authorizes the  
6       Company to recover vegetation management costs,  
7       correct?

8   A    (Paruta) That is correct.

9   Q    But the Company also recovers costs associated  
10      with its Vegetation Management Program through  
11      base distribution rates and the Regulatory  
12      Reconciliation Adjustment Mechanism, is that  
13      correct?

14   A    (Paruta) That's correct.

15   Q    And, so, did the Company confirm, as part of its  
16      preparation of its filing, that it's not  
17      recovering the same vegetation management costs  
18      through these different cost recovery mechanisms?

19   A    (Paruta) We did. We certainly did. And, during  
20      our tech session with the Department of Energy,  
21      we actually received the same question last week.  
22      And one of the requests from the Department of  
23      Energy was really to provide evidence and proof  
24      that that was performed. And, so, what the

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 Company did is we created what we ultimately  
2 filed as "Exhibit 5". And that Excel spreadsheet  
3 shows the vegetation management costs incurred  
4 over that period of time, and the totals that  
5 were required -- recovered, excuse me, through  
6 each rate recovery mechanism, including base  
7 rates. The summary was shared with the  
8 Department of Energy, and -- before we submitted  
9 it. And, then, we ultimately made the decision  
10 to submit it as "Exhibit 5" for the  
11 Commissioners' use as well.

12 Q Thank you. And just to clarify, Exhibit 5 shows  
13 2022 costs, correct?

14 A (Paruta) That is correct, yes. We used 2022 as  
15 the sample year to sort of show that work  
16 performed.

17 Q And, then, can you just briefly summarize what  
18 the Company is asking the Commission to approve  
19 in this proceeding?

20 A (Paruta) Sure. Yes. So, the Company is  
21 requesting approval to implement the PPAM rate  
22 for effect on October 1, 2023. And, as shown in  
23 our Exhibit 2, the proposed average PPAM rate is  
24 "0.194 cents per kilowatt-hour". The proposed

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 PPAM rates by rate class are shown in Exhibit 2,  
2 at Bates Page 008.

3 Q And what is the bill impact for an average  
4 residential customer associated with this rate  
5 proposal?

6 A (Anderson) Sure, I can take that. A 600  
7 kilowatt-hour customer will see a bill impact of  
8 \$1.62 per month.

9 Q And does approval of the PPAM rate result in  
10 rates that are just and reasonable?

11 A (Paruta) Yes, it does.

12 A (Anderson) Yes.

13 Q Thank you. And, Ms. Paruta, are you adopting  
14 those portions of Exhibits 1 and through 5 that  
15 you have sponsored as part of your sworn  
16 testimony today?

17 A (Paruta) Yes.

18 MS. RALSTON: Thank you. The witnesses  
19 are available for cross-examination.

20 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. Let's  
21 move to New Hampshire Department of Energy for  
22 any cross-examination.

23 MS. LADWIG: Thank you.

24 **CROSS-EXAMINATION**

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 BY MS. LADWIG:

2 Q So, as Ms. Paruta explained on direct, there are  
3 four components associated with the PPAM. And  
4 the components eligible for cost recovery are the  
5 pole replacement O&M transfer costs, annual  
6 inspection costs, and vegetation management  
7 expenses, and, then, there is also the pole  
8 attachment revenue component, which would be  
9 incremental revenues, correct?

10 A (Paruta) That is correct.

11 Q Okay. And, then, can you clarify when Eversource  
12 would start incurring costs associated with these  
13 components or when it did start incurring costs?

14 A (Paruta) It would have been effective with the  
15 close of the acquisition, so, post May 1, 2023.

16 Q Okay. And when would those costs be factored  
17 into the PPAM?

18 A (Paruta) It would be factored into our PPAM rate  
19 reconciliation mechanism that would be filed in  
20 2024, and that would include the period of  
21 January 1, 2023, through December 31 of 2023.  
22 So, the full calendar year of 2023 and the costs  
23 incurred in that period of time.

24 Q Thank you. I had a couple more questions about

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 the pole attachment revenue specifically. So,  
2 those -- you mentioned those revenues will be  
3 used to offset the pole replacement O&M transfer  
4 costs and the annual inspection costs. I think  
5 the tariff says it doesn't include that they will  
6 be used as an offset to the vegetation management  
7 expense portion of the PPAM. Do you know why  
8 that is or could you explain?

9 A (Paruta) I will say this: The PPAM rate will  
10 include all of the costs. And, then, we will  
11 have the incremental revenue as an offset in  
12 totality.

13 So, I'm not familiar -- closely  
14 familiar with the tariff language. I'm going to  
15 hand it over to Mr. Anderson.

16 A (Anderson) It certainly was not the intention to  
17 separate that out like that. It's just the pole  
18 attachment revenue would be a credit.

19 Q Okay. Thank you. That helps. And, then, did  
20 Eversource start collecting those revenues or  
21 would they have started collecting those revenues  
22 on May 1st, 2023, when the acquisition closed  
23 also?

24 A (Paruta) That is correct.

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 Q Okay. And the following questions, I'm just  
2 moving now to the vegetation management expense  
3 portion of the PPAM, which is the only component  
4 in this year's PPAM. Briefly, I want to take a  
5 look at Exhibit 2, on Bates Page 004. That  
6 should be "Attachment MBP/SRA-1", "Page 1 of 2".  
7 So, at the bottom of the page, the last  
8 paragraph, it's referring to or it's quoting part  
9 of the order that approved the PPAM in Docket  
10 DE 21-020. And the second line down mentions  
11 "February 10th, 2022", and, then, in bolded  
12 parentheses, it says "**(should be 2021)**". And  
13 that's reflecting that that portion of the quoted  
14 order said "2022", but the rest of the order said  
15 "2021". And the understanding of everyone, and  
16 the parties and the Commission, was it should be  
17 "February 10th, 2021", correct?

18 A (Paruta) That is correct, yes. The Company did  
19 note that in the review of the decision. We also  
20 noted that throughout the decision there were  
21 nine instances -- excuse me -- eight instances  
22 where it stated "February 10, 2021", and only one  
23 instance where it stated "February 10, 2022".  
24 So, we came to the conclusion it was just an

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 oversight human error, and felt that the decision  
2 had enough evidence to show that we could begin  
3 with the February 10, 2021, which was the  
4 Commission's intention.

5 Q Thank you. I just wanted to confirm that we all  
6 had the same understanding of the order language.

7 And, then, in that same exhibit, that  
8 same page, going up to Line 1, where it says  
9 "PPAM (Over)/Under Recovery", and then dollar  
10 amount, that's a zero amount. And that's because  
11 this is the first year the PPAM would be in  
12 effect, so, there's no prior PPAM to reconcile  
13 any over- or under-recovery, correct?

14 A (Paruta) That is correct.

15 Q Okay. And, then, the next line, Line 2, where it  
16 says "Recoverable PPAM Costs", it has a number  
17 that's "14,433,000", and that 14.4 million  
18 number, that shows all of the costs billed to CCI  
19 from Eversource for vegetation management from  
20 the February 10th, 2021, through December 2022?

21 A (Paruta) Correct.

22 Q Okay. And, if the Company's request is approved,  
23 that number, the 14.4 million will be recovered  
24 in rates through this next year's PPAM, going

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1           into effect October 1st, 2023, and through  
2           September 2024?

3   A       (Paruta) That is correct.

4   Q       Okay. How did Eversource get to that number or  
5           calculate that that's the amount that should be  
6           included in the PPAM?

7   A       (Paruta) Yes. If we go to Bates Page 005 in the  
8           same exhibit, Exhibit 2, you will see that we  
9           have our -- oh, no. Sorry. Hang on. If we go  
10          to Bates Page 006, you'll see that we have our  
11          total 2022 calculation that shows all of the CCI  
12          billed reimbursables for the amounts that the  
13          Company -- the Vegetation Management Program  
14          costs for services performed by Eversource on  
15          jointly-owned poles. And this is the portion  
16          that Eversource ultimately billed to CCI for the  
17          year 2022.

18                 Once we completed the transaction and  
19                 closed on the acquisition, that's when all those  
20                 costs essentially were compiled and included in  
21                 this PPAM filing for 2022.

22                 We did that same exercise for 2021, and  
23                 that's on Bates Page 007 in the same exhibit,  
24                 except that -- with the only exception in 2021,

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 given that it was not a full calendar year, we  
2 took February 2021 through December 31 of 2021,  
3 with the month of the February, where we had to  
4 calculate the amount to ascribe to the period  
5 February 10th through February 28th of 2021, and  
6 we did that below, where we created a *pro rata*  
7 approach for that month on what ultimately was  
8 determined to be collectible in the PPAM rate.

9 Q Okay. And those numbers -- or, I guess the basis  
10 for those numbers can be found in what was  
11 provided as a discovery response to DOE 1-1, that  
12 would be "Exhibit 3", includes invoices for each  
13 of those months that were prepared and would have  
14 been billed to Consolidated, right?

15 A (Paruta) That is correct.

16 Q Okay. And did CCI pay any of those invoices or  
17 billed amounts during that time?

18 A (Paruta) No, they did not.

19 Q Okay. And is there any interest applied to those  
20 amounts?

21 A (Paruta) No, there is not. But I did just want  
22 to point quickly to the Exhibit 2, Bates  
23 Page 005, which was the "Attachment MBP/SRA-1",  
24 "Page 2 of 2". If you look at Line 2, you will

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1       see that, if approved, the 14,433,000 would  
2       essentially enter the rate reconciliation  
3       mechanism on October 1, 2023. And the rate  
4       reconciliation mechanism itself has a carrying  
5       charge factor, similar to all of our other rate  
6       reconciliation factors, and that is on Line 6, 7,  
7       and 8, the calculation itself.

8               So, we do not have any carrying charges  
9       on the cumulative balance, until approved and  
10      placed into rates, at which point it then has a  
11      carrying charge associated with it.

12   Q   Right. Thank you. I want to go into a little  
13       more detail into Exhibit 5. That's the one the  
14       Company prepared that shows the 3 different  
15       places where the Company recovers vegetation  
16       management costs through rates.

17               So, looking at Exhibit 5, if we go  
18       first to the base rates number, which is on  
19       Line 2, it says "Base Distribution Rate - 2022  
20       VMP Cost Recovery", and, then, you go all the way  
21       to the right, in the "Total" column, it's "\$27.1  
22       million". And that 27.1 million is what the  
23       Company is authorized to recover through base  
24       rates every year, and that comes from the

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 Company's last rate case, correct?

2 A (Paruta) That is correct.

3 Q Okay. And, then, the RRA number, which is the  
4 next component, that represents a reconciliation  
5 that Eversource does every year for the over- or  
6 under-collection of vegetation management costs  
7 associated with base rates, right?

8 I might not have phrased that the best.

9 A (Paruta) I'll say "over-collection". Any  
10 under-collections is just -- we don't seek  
11 recovery yet.

12 Q Okay.

13 A (Paruta) Yes. Sorry.

14 Q Thank you for clarifying. And, so, in this  
15 year's RRA filing, in it would have been Docket  
16 DE 23-021, that showed that Eversource  
17 over-collected veg. management expenses by about  
18 2.1 million in 2022, correct?

19 A (Paruta) That is correct.

20 Q Okay. And that number would be Line 6, again,  
21 all the way to the right, in the "Total" column,  
22 the 2.1 million, right?

23 A (Paruta) That is correct.

24 Q And Eversource isn't currently collecting or

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1        refunding that amount, because they're going to  
2        carry it forward into next year's Vegetation  
3        Management Plan, right?

4    A     (Paruta) That is correct.

5    Q     Okay. And, then, the amount of vegetation  
6        management costs that's included in the base  
7        rates, and would be reconciled through the RRA,  
8        that does not include reimbursable amounts that  
9        are owed to the Company from telecommunications  
10       companies, correct?

11   A     (Paruta) Correct. Yes. Other telecommunication  
12        companies, correct.

13   Q     Okay. And those, the reimbursable amounts, those  
14        are amounts that are billed and collected from  
15        the telecom companies?

16   A     (Paruta) Correct.

17   Q     And, so, if you go to Line 5, all the way on the  
18        right, there's an "\$8,116,914" amount. That 8.1  
19        million, that would be the reimbursable amounts  
20        for 2022, correct?

21   A     (Paruta) As described in Docket Number DE 23-021,  
22        correct.

23   Q     Right, from the RRA. And, then, the PPAM costs,  
24        or the costs for 2022, that would have been

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 billed to CCI, those can be found on Line 3, all  
2 the way to the right, it's the "7,899,397",  
3 correct?

4 A (Paruta) Correct.

5 Q Okay. And that the 7.9 million for PPAM, that  
6 would have been billed to Consolidated, that's  
7 all included in the 8.1 million number, correct?

8 A (Paruta) Yes.

9 Q Okay. And, then, the rest of that 8.1 million  
10 number, other than the 7.9 that would be  
11 reimbursable amounts from other telecom  
12 companies, right?

13 A (Paruta) Correct.

14 Q Okay. But, then, as you've mentioned, and as  
15 we've discussed, that 7.9 million reimbursable  
16 number, that was never actually collected from  
17 Consolidated?

18 A (Paruta) Correct.

19 Q And that is part of what Eversource is seeking to  
20 recover in this year's PPAM, and then the other  
21 amount would come from or you could find it in  
22 the 2021 RRA filing as part of the reimbursable  
23 amount?

24 A (Paruta) Correct.

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 Q Okay. And, so, the total amount of vegetation  
2 management expenses that would be included in  
3 rates as of October 1st, 2023, if the PPAM is  
4 approved, that would be the 27.1 million that's  
5 already in base rates, plus the 14.4 million, or  
6 I guess it will be 14.9 million, billed to CCI  
7 from February 10th, 2021, through December 2022?

8 A (Paruta) I'm sorry, could you repeat it?

9 Q Yes.

10 A (Paruta) I just want to make sure I answer.

11 Q So, the total amount that would be included for  
12 vegetation management expenses in rates, as of  
13 October 1st, would be the amount in base rates,  
14 plus the amount through the PPAM?

15 A (Paruta) Yes. I'm sorry I missed that. Yes.

16 Q Okay.

17 A (Paruta) Perfect.

18 Q Yes. And, as you explained on the direct, to  
19 confirm, there is no place that these costs  
20 overlap, none of these rates recover vegetation  
21 management costs that are already recovered  
22 through another rate or through reimbursements  
23 from telecom companies?

24 A (Paruta) That is correct.

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 Q Okay. I want to go just briefly to Exhibit 2,  
2 Bates Page 010. It would actually be "Attachment  
3 MBP/SRA-3". And, then, at the top, where it  
4 says, Line 11, "Current Rate Distribution  
5 Revenue", and, then, Line 15 shows the "Proposed  
6 Distribution Revenue", with the PPAM Adjustment  
7 included, which would be an average rate change  
8 of "3.51 percent", could you explain how you got  
9 to that number?

10 A (Anderson) Sure. The Line 11, the "Current Rate  
11 Distribution Revenue", is the most recent  
12 distribution revenue reflective of the Step 3  
13 being a full twelve-month recovery period. We  
14 added the PPAM Adjustment to that to come up  
15 with a proposed combined amount, distribution  
16 revenue, plus PPAM. Row -- Line 15, divided by  
17 Line 11, develops a percentage change of "3.51  
18 percent".

19 Q Thank you. I want to finish by talking a bit  
20 about the estimated bill impacts from the  
21 proposed PPAM rate. Going to -- I think it would  
22 be also included in Exhibit 2, on Bates Page 012,  
23 and that shows the bill impacts from just the  
24 PPAM. And going down to the 600-kilowatt monthly

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 bill by rate component for the average  
2 residential customer, going all the way to the  
3 right, where it says "Change as a % of Total  
4 Bill", that shows that the PPAM, as proposed,  
5 would result in a "1.2 percent" increase to that  
6 customer's total bill, right?

7 A (Anderson) That is correct.

8 Q Okay. And, then, again, you kind of went through  
9 on direct Exhibit 4, which is just an  
10 illustrative example that shows what the  
11 estimated bill impacts would be of the TCAM and  
12 the PPAM combined, if they're both approved on  
13 October 1st. So, I want to go quickly to that  
14 exhibit.

15 And I'm again going to the average  
16 residential customer using 600 kilowatts per  
17 month. If you go all the way to the right, it  
18 estimates that the impact of the TCAM and the  
19 PPAM would be about "\$5.25" total, or a "3.6  
20 percent" increase in the total bill, right?

21 A (Anderson) That's correct. The combined impact  
22 is about 3.6 percent --

23 Q Okay.

24 A (Anderson) -- for October.

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 MS. LADWIG: Thank you. That's all I  
2 had. Thank you very much.

3 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. Let's  
4 move to Commissioner questions, beginning with  
5 Commissioner Simpson.

6 CMSR. SIMPSON: Thank you.

7 BY CMSR. SIMPSON:

8 Q Are both of you familiar with the DOE's technical  
9 statement? There are a couple of tables there  
10 that I think nicely summarize 2021. And I  
11 appreciate the technical statement that was  
12 submitted by the DOE. It's nice to have the  
13 answer in the back of the book.

14 Are you familiar with that, Ms.  
15 Paruta?

16 A (Paruta) I did read it. I'm going to pull it up.

17 Q Okay. And it looks like it references a table  
18 from another proceeding. It's noted as "22-010"?

19 A (Paruta) That is correct. Yes. It would have  
20 been our RRA rate proceeding from the year 2022,  
21 for calendar year 2021.

22 Q Okay. Thank you. And I'm mostly curious about  
23 the "Hazard Tree Removal", which is noted as  
24 "Line 11". Take your time.

{DE 23-075} {09-14-23}

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 A (Paruta) Yes.

2 Q Can you describe those costs for us?

3 A (Paruta) Did you say "Line 11"?

4 Q Yes.

5 A (Paruta) I'm not the tree expert. We usually  
6 have Mr. Allen testify to these. So, it's  
7 certainly not an area of expertise for me. I  
8 would probably botch it, to be honest.

9 But, based on my understanding, you  
10 know, for the Veg. Management Program, these are  
11 the costs that him and his team, on an annual  
12 basis, they have their program established where  
13 they determine, you know, as they're evaluating  
14 the hazard tree removal across the entirety of  
15 all five regions in the State of New Hampshire.

16 Q Uh-huh.

17 A (Paruta) And every region has the evaluation to  
18 go through the certain areas where the hazard  
19 tree removal -- or, excuse me, hazard trees have  
20 already been determined, and they have a certain  
21 amount, I believe, subject to check, every year  
22 that they have to meet the requirements for.

23 So, this would be the entirety of the  
24 program for New Hampshire --

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 Q Uh-huh.

2 A (Paruta) -- for the year 2021 on the hazard tree  
3 removal.

4 Q Okay. And would you be able to point us to just  
5 the CCI-related 2021 costs for hazard tree  
6 removal?

7 A (Paruta) I don't think -- I don't know that 2021  
8 we broke it out that way anywhere. I would have  
9 to check in our records. We do have it.

10 Q Uh-huh.

11 A (Paruta) I just don't know if it's in any of the  
12 exhibits.

13 Q Okay.

14 A (Paruta) I would have to flip through the detail  
15 one to confirm.

16 Q Because I'm mainly interested in just  
17 understanding those cost drivers for hazard tree  
18 removal and the increase that we saw for 2022,  
19 and if you were able to describe the factors that  
20 led to that increase for hazard trees  
21 specifically?

22 A (Paruta) So, I would not be able to answer that,  
23 unfortunately. But I do have it in one of our  
24 exhibits, it's on Bates Page 004 of Exhibit 3 for

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 the CCI sundry billed amount on the hazard tree  
2 removal, and that is on Line 2. So, --

3 Q Uh-huh.

4 A (Paruta) But, unfortunately, I would not be able  
5 to answer the question.

6 Q Okay. So, then, let's just start generally.  
7 You've consummated the acquisition of these poles  
8 with Consolidated at this point. I know we're  
9 just seeking costs that were incurred prior to  
10 that acquisition. How are things going?

11 A (Paruta) Based on -- so, we have monthly meetings  
12 with the Ops Team to check in and determine, you  
13 know, how things are going, in terms of the costs  
14 related to the PPAM rate. So, based on those  
15 meetings, things are going well. There really  
16 isn't anything surprising, which is good news.

17 Q Uh-huh.

18 A (Paruta) The joint pole owner -- formerly joint  
19 pole owner revenues that were collected are  
20 starting to come in, which is good news. The  
21 inspection program itself, the solicitation has  
22 been prepared. So, as I understand it, the Ops  
23 Team has started that process. And I believe, at  
24 least based on what I have heard, it is good news

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 all around, and the Company is very satisfied  
2 with this ownership.

3 Q Okay. That's good. And I'll note, I took a look  
4 at our order from 21-020, Order Number 26,729.  
5 And I see, on Page 17, in the section regarding  
6 the "Pole Plant Mechanism", a reference to  
7 "February 10, 2022". And I will represent that  
8 that does appear to be a mistake. That it should  
9 have been "February, 10, 2021".

10 Okay. So, then, on Exhibit 2, Bates  
11 Page 012, there are no changes noted expected to  
12 the transmission rates. But, on Exhibit 4, Bates  
13 Page 001, there's a change to the transmission  
14 rate and an impact for customers. Would you be  
15 able to explain that for us, perhaps what we  
16 might be misinterpreting?

17 A (Anderson) Sure. That's -- we provided Exhibit 4  
18 at the request of the Department of Energy --

19 Q Uh-huh.

20 A (Anderson) -- to reflect, if the Commission  
21 approves the TCAM rate that is before the  
22 Commission now, the effect of the combined PPAM  
23 and TCAM would be shown in Exhibit 4. Exhibit 2  
24 did not reflect that TCAM change. It reflected

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 the current TCAM rate that is in effect right  
2 now. So, basically, it did not presume that the  
3 Commission had already approved that TCAM rate  
4 for October 1, 2023.

5 Q Okay. Okay. Thank you. That's helpful. And,  
6 then, with the respect to the PPAM mechanism  
7 generally, I can't recall from a prior  
8 proceeding, is there an end date to the PPAM,  
9 once you've paid for these costs and the pole  
10 acquisition? Is there a date certain where you  
11 would foresee no longer recovering costs under  
12 this unique mechanism?

13 A (Paruta) That's actually a great question, and  
14 one that we were deliberating about off the  
15 record with the Department of Energy. So, the  
16 PPAM rate was put in place, indicating that it  
17 would be part of the next base distribution rate  
18 case for evaluation, and whether or not it would  
19 essentially go away, because the costs would be  
20 folded into base distribution rates that became  
21 effective at some point on a date uncertain in  
22 the future.

23 So, from the Company's perspective, the  
24 PPAM rate, we believe, would have to continue in

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 order for us to appropriately recover these costs  
2 that are allowed in the PPAM rate, until the  
3 point in time in the future when we are able to  
4 reflect these costs in base distribution rates.

5 So, we're not entirely certain when it  
6 will end, but it certainly will end, we believe,  
7 when base distribution rates reflect these costs.

8 Q So, you might foresee that being an issue in a  
9 future rate proceeding?

10 A (Paruta) That is correct, yes. It will certainly  
11 be discussed, I would say, within our next rate  
12 case.

13 Q Okay. Thank you. And, then, just generally,  
14 while you're here, how you guys doing with  
15 Hurricane Lee? It's all in the news.

16 A (Paruta) Preparing. Hoping it misses New  
17 Hampshire. We have enough storm cost recovery in  
18 the pipeline.

19 Q Well, I hope it misses our colleagues in  
20 Massachusetts and Connecticut, too.

21 A (Paruta) Yes. Let's hope so. Thank you.

22 CMSR. SIMPSON: All right. I don't  
23 have any further questions. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: All right. We'll

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 move to Commissioner Chattopadhyay.

2 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Good afternoon.

3 BY CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY:

4 Q So, if you look at the -- I think it was  
5 Exhibit 6, New Hampshire DOE's recommendation,  
6 I'm just using it to frame the question. And  
7 Bates Pages 001 and 002 talk about different cost  
8 elements. And, so, in this filing, you are  
9 simply trying to recover something that is only  
10 related to vegetation management expense. You  
11 had mentioned that, going forward, the other  
12 three, if you look at the listing there, (a),  
13 (b), (c), they will also be part of the cost.

14 Have you tried to, now that the  
15 acquisition is all set, have you tried to get an  
16 estimate of what that would do next time around?

17 If not, just let me know if you didn't.  
18 But I'm curious.

19 A (Paruta) That is a great question. We do not  
20 have an estimate. I think, as part of the  
21 proceeding, we did provide estimates on these  
22 costs, that they were, as of a certain point in  
23 time, reasonable estimates.

24 I know that, from a veg. management

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1       standpoint, I know that, talking with the Veg.  
2       Management Team, they do have expectations that  
3       the -- what we're calling them is the "CCI  
4       portion", the CCI reimbursables, even though  
5       they're not, they are now the CCI reimbursables  
6       that are in the PPAM rate. They continue to  
7       believe that will be right around the 7 to \$8  
8       million mark annually, subject to any concerns  
9       about increasing rates or changes in contracts  
10      with the contractors and the vendors.

11               Insofar as the other costs, there has  
12      not been a final determination on what the  
13      expectation is for 2023 and 2024, for example.

14   Q       So, it would be difficult for the Company to  
15       predict as to what share the other elements, (a),  
16       (b), and (c), would be contributing to the costs?  
17       So, you don't have a sense of that right now?

18   A       (Paruta) I do not have them at the ready.

19   Q       Okay.

20   A       (Paruta) But I'm certain that, if requested, we  
21       can certainly pull together a reasonable estimate  
22       based on what we know today. Because we had --  
23       we had prepared and included a revenue  
24       requirement calculation as part of Docket Number

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 DE 21-020, during the request to approve the  
2 acquisition. So, there already was a calculation  
3 pulled together at that point in time, based on  
4 the cost estimates as of that point in time,  
5 which, of course, are now stale.

6 Q So, to just make sure I'm following you, you're  
7 talking about (a), (b), and (c)?

8 A (Paruta) That is correct.

9 Q Exhibit 6?

10 A (Paruta) Yes.

11 Q Okay. Thank you. I think this could be an RR,  
12 or an exhibit. So, yes. It would be helpful if  
13 you can just give us an estimate of what you  
14 expect next time around, the Pole Replacement O&M  
15 Transfer Costs, Annual Inspection Costs, and Pole  
16 Attachment Revenue, you know, altogether, would  
17 be in terms of percentage, the total, just to get  
18 a sense? And this is all an estimate for the  
19 next time around.

20 A (Paruta) Yes. With the caveat that it will be  
21 based on estimates with information that is  
22 available to us today. And, just to clarify, are  
23 you looking for, like, a 2023 calendar year or  
24 are you looking --

{DE 23-075} {09-14-23}

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 Q Right now, those rates are not going to be in the  
2 rates. So, yes, 2023.

3 A (Paruta) Okay.

4 Q Because, if I understood you, you were saying  
5 those costs will be from sometime May through end  
6 of December?

7 A (Paruta) That is correct.

8 Q Is that correct? Yes. So, just to get a sense.

9 A (Paruta) Sure. Yes. So, we will provide you a  
10 January 1, '23, through April 30th, '23, for the  
11 veg. management.

12 Q Yes.

13 A (Paruta) And, then, May 1, '23 through December  
14 31, '23 --

15 Q For all of that.

16 A (Paruta) -- for these. Okay. And, again, just  
17 to clarify, are you not requesting the offsetting  
18 revenue?

19 Q I am.

20 A (Paruta) You are. Okay.

21 Q I'm sorry.

22 A (Paruta) Okay. Understood. Thank you.

23 Q Yes.

24 A (Paruta) Yes, Section (c). Sorry.

{DE 23-075} {09-14-23}

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1                   ***[Record request noted above.]***

2                   CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Just give me a  
3                   few seconds. I'm trying to see which one that I  
4                   opened is the one that relates to the next round  
5                   of questions. So, bear with me.

6                   *[Short pause.]*

7 BY CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY:

8 Q       So, again, it's just, I mean, I'm sure it's there  
9       somewhere else, too, but the -- look at  
10       Exhibit 6. And, if you go to Bates Page 004, if  
11       you go to Line 11, which Commissioner Simpson was  
12       asking about, there's -- are you there?

13 A       (Paruta) Yes.

14 Q       Okay. So, and the column says "Work Order". So,  
15       you have "NHRMV006", right? When -- it's just,  
16       I'm just very curious, that thing also appeared  
17       in the Docket 23-021, right?

18 A       (Paruta) Correct.

19 Q       And try to explain, you know, the number there  
20       was roughly \$11 million, and now it's a different  
21       number. So, I'm just trying to understand what's  
22       going on. Can you explain?

23 A       (Paruta) Sure. So, the work order itself is  
24       the -- excuse me. The work order itself is the

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 accounting identifier within our systems that  
2 allows all of the different departments within  
3 the organization to be able to track the costs  
4 associated with whatever activities it is that  
5 they are working on.

6 So, in this case, when you're looking  
7 specifically at that work -- and, I apologize, I  
8 can't see it anymore, that work order, that is  
9 specific to the Hazard Tree Removal. And, any  
10 time they work on Hazard Tree Removal, the  
11 contractors/vendors are provided that work order  
12 from the Veg. Management Team, and they record it  
13 to that specific work order. The way it's  
14 determined by calendar year is when the service  
15 is performed. So, the work order carries into  
16 every year, except kind of your lines of  
17 demarcation are starting January 1 through  
18 December 31, when those costs are incurred within  
19 that specific calendar year.

20 So, although the work order may sound  
21 to be the same, it's different costs based on the  
22 year of the Vegetation Management Program.

23 I hope that answers your question.

24 Q Okay. So, the difference is then, to summarize

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1       you, it's what was reported in Docket 23-021 was  
2       a different year, and the one that is showing up  
3       here is, obviously, you know, some other year?  
4       That's conceptually?

5   A     (Paruta) Correct.

6   Q     Okay.

7   A     (Paruta) Yes.

8   Q     Can you just briefly explain, you had made a  
9       revision, like there was some sort of an error  
10      identified initially that the PPAM rate actually  
11      increased by \$.0.00004? Just give me a sense  
12      what happened?

13   A     (Paruta) Sure. The initial filing that we had  
14      was based on information that included monthly  
15      reports for the veg. management costs that  
16      unfortunately truncated the sum of all the town  
17      costs, with starting with Line 9 or Line 10 on  
18      the Excel workbook. So, originally, it was  
19      missing the first eight, nine, or ten line  
20      items. We did not catch that actually until  
21      after the filing. And, as a result of that, we  
22      revised it and corrected it, and included in the  
23      PPAM rate.

24               However, we had caught that as part of

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 the RRA filing. And, so, our RRA filing was  
2 appropriately reflecting the truncated, but,  
3 unfortunately, when it came time for the PPAM  
4 rate, and, again, human error, my team, I take  
5 full responsibility for it, when we pulled in the  
6 two files, we pulled in the old file without  
7 realizing it. And, because it's not a  
8 dollar-for-dollar match, we didn't catch that.  
9 We pulled in the old file that was wrong, when we  
10 had actually saved down the right file for the  
11 RRA filing.

12 Q Okay. It's sort of a similar question to what  
13 Commissioner Simpson had asked previously. But I  
14 just, you know, now that, with the transfer of  
15 the assets from Consolidated, is there a material  
16 difference in how you have to deal with the  
17 poles, because it used to be telecom, and now,  
18 you know, I'm just trying to understand? Do  
19 you -- is it in any way very different from the  
20 poles that you, yourself, at the Company owns  
21 100 percent?

22 A (Paruta) Absolutely. I mean, there is a  
23 difference. If you think about it, any activity  
24 that happens on the pole, whether it be a pole

{DE 23-075} {09-14-23}

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1       attacher request, whether it be veg. management  
2       activities, whether it be storm response, any  
3       activity related to the pole, in the past, would  
4       have required some CCI involvement. Today, it  
5       does not. So, it really creates significant  
6       efficiencies for operating -- Operations Team,  
7       excuse me.

8               And, again, I know, with talking to  
9       them on our monthly calls, they are very  
10      satisfied that now they really have full control  
11      of these poles, along with our wires. And, you  
12      know, they need to get their work done, go out  
13      there, get to work, whatever it may be, pole  
14      attacher request, or inspection, or the veg.  
15      management work, it is much more effective and  
16      efficient today.

17   Q       So, due to those efficiencies, you should expect  
18       lower costs being incurred, relative to what it  
19       would have been if it was part of Consolidated,  
20       right?

21   A       (Paruta) I would expect that, on certain types of  
22       jobs, yes. Things like capital projects, for  
23       example. As you know, the longer a capital  
24       project remains open, the more costs it incurs.

{DE 23-075}   {09-14-23}

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1       So, if we're not sitting there waiting for a  
2       joint pole owner to react, but we have full  
3       control of the capital project, in this case,  
4       pole replacements, for sure, yes.

5               CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Okay. Thank you.  
6       That's all I have.

7               CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. First, let me  
8       take care of an administrative issue. Would the  
9       parties have any objections to the Commission  
10      taking administrative notice of Exhibits 1 and 2  
11      from Docket DE 23-021?

12              MS. RALSTON: None from the Company.

13              MS. LADWIG: No objection here.

14              CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Okay, then,  
15      the Commission then takes notice, administrative  
16      notice of Exhibits 1 and 2 from Docket DE 23-021.

17                      *[Administrative notice taken.]*

18              CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Just moving to maybe  
19      a brief question or two.

20      BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:

21      Q       I'm looking at Exhibit 2, Bates Page 005. And I  
22              just want to make sure I understand this monthly  
23              carrying charge of 550K.

24                      I believe that rate is set at the prime

[WITNESS PANEL: Anderson|Paruta]

1 rate as of July 27th, 2023. I'm assuming that  
2 prime rate fluctuates on a monthly basis, and you  
3 make that adjustment, and then that's a fully  
4 reconcilable rate?

5 A (Paruta) That is correct.

6 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Okay, that's  
7 all I have.

8 Let's do this. Let's take a short  
9 ten-minute break, so Attorney Ralston can confer  
10 with the witnesses, if there's any discussion  
11 that would be helpful there. Also, this will  
12 allow the Commission to confer. And we'll return  
13 at 2:10 to wrap up the hearing. Thank you.

14 *(Recess taken at 2:00 p.m., and the*  
15 *hearing resumed at 2:10 p.m.)*

16 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. The  
17 Commissioners have no further questions. We can  
18 move to redirect.

19 MS. RALSTON: The Company has no  
20 redirect. But we do have a question about the  
21 record request and the timing.

22 We spoke during the break, and it would  
23 require coordination with several groups within  
24 the Company, so it may take a little bit of time

1 to pull together, especially in light of the  
2 pending storm. We estimate that we could  
3 probably get it in within two weeks. I know  
4 that's close to the order deadline. But we also,  
5 because it's an estimate of next year's costs, we  
6 were hoping it wouldn't be essential to getting  
7 the order out as requested.

8 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: I think it's -- I  
9 think I would agree it's not essential. And we  
10 would like to see it before we issue the order.  
11 So, if we could target the 28th, that would be  
12 helpful. That way, you know, everything is  
13 closed off and when the docket is complete. So,  
14 9/28 I think would be fine, if that's okay with  
15 the Company?

16 MS. RALSTON: Yes. Certainly. And  
17 we'll get it in sooner if we can, especially if  
18 the hurricane veers out to the ocean, that will  
19 help us. And, yes, we'll target the 28th.

20 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Commissioner  
21 Chattopadhyay will be closely tracking the  
22 hurricane.

23 All right. So, very good. So, we can  
24 move to closing, beginning with the DOE, if any.

1 MS. LADWIG: Not much. We would just  
2 say that, based on everything that was presented  
3 today, and everything that we reviewed as part of  
4 the Company's filing, the Department would  
5 recommend the Commission approve the PPAM rates  
6 requested by the Company as filed.

7 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.  
8 And Eversource.

9 MS. RALSTON: And I will also keep it  
10 brief.

11 We would just want to thank the  
12 Department of Energy for their support for the  
13 filing, and for engaging with us in a technical  
14 session. We had some really great, productive  
15 discussions over the last week. And, then, also  
16 just to thank the Commission for their thoughtful  
17 questions this afternoon.

18 And to request approval of the rate as  
19 filed.

20 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. Okay.  
21 As stated earlier, we'll issue an order to  
22 address the issues raised today on or before  
23 September 30th, 2023.

24 Are there any objection to striking

1 identification on the Exhibits 1 through 6, and  
2 reserving Exhibit 7, as submitted, and striking  
3 them into evidence as full exhibits?

4 MS. RALSTON: None from the Company.

5 MS. LADWIG: No objection from the  
6 Department.

7 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. We'll strike  
8 ID and enter 1 through 6 as exhibits, and reserve  
9 Exhibit 7. Thank you.

10 *(Exhibit 7 reserved for record*  
11 *request.)*

12 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: The witnesses are  
13 released, in case that wasn't clear. Thank you.

14 And I'll ask if there's anything else  
15 that we need to cover today?

16 *[No verbal response.]*

17 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: All right. Seeing  
18 none, I'll thank everyone. And we are adjourned.  
19 Thank you.

20 *(Whereupon the hearing was adjourned*  
21 *at 2:13 p.m.)*