

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

September 14, 2011 - 1:35 p.m.
Concord, New Hampshire

NHPUC DEC14'11 AM11:01

RE: DE 11-028
UNITIL ENERGY SYSTEMS, INC.:
*Default Service for the period
November 1, 2011 through
January 31, 2012 for the Large
Customer (G1) requirements, and
November 1, 2011 through
October 31, 2013 for the Small
Customer (Non-G1) requirements.*

PRESENT: Chairman Thomas B. Getz, Presiding
Commissioner Clifton C. Below
Commissioner Amy L. Ignatius

Sandy Deno, Clerk

APPEARANCES: Reptg. Unitil Energy Systems, Inc.:
Gary M. Epler, Esq.

Reptg. Residential Ratepayers:
Meredith Hatfield, Esq., Consumer Advocate
Donna McFarland
Office of Consumer Advocate

Reptg. PUC Staff:
Suzanne G. Amidon, Esq.
Grant Siwinski, Electric Division

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

ORIGINAL

I N D E X

PAGE NO.

WITNESS PANEL: LINDA S. McNAMARA
ROBERT S. FURINO

Direct examination by Mr. Epler 6
Cross-examination by Ms. Hatfield 13
Cross-examination by Ms. Amidon 17

* * *

CLOSING STATEMENTS BY:

PAGE NO.

Ms. Hatfield 21
Ms. Amidon 23
Mr. Epler 24

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

E X H I B I T S

EXHIBIT NO.	D E S C R I P T I O N	PAGE NO.
5	UES Petition for Approval of Default Service Solicitation and Proposed Default Service Tariffs (09-09-11)	5
6	UES Default Service RFP Bid Evaluation Report, Tab A Confidential Attachment (09-09-11) <i>{CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY}</i>	5

P R O C E E D I N G

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Good afternoon, everyone. We'll open the hearing in Docket DE 11-028. On September 9, Unitil filed a petition for approval of its Default Service Solicitation and Proposed Default Service Tariff for the three month period beginning November 1, 2011, for 100 percent of its Default Service for its G1 customers, and for 25 percent of the Non-G1 customers for the period November 1, 2011 through October 31, 2013. And, a secretarial letter was issued on September 12 setting the hearing for this afternoon.

So, let's take appearances.

MR. EPLER: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Gary Epler, on behalf of Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. And, with me is Todd Bohan, a Senior Analyst with the Energy Contracts Division, and on the witness stand are Linda S. McNamara and Robert S. Furino. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Good afternoon.

MS. HATFIELD: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Meredith Hatfield, for the Office of Consumer Advocate, on behalf of residential ratepayers. And, with me for the office is Donna McFarland.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Good afternoon.

1 MS. AMIDON: Good afternoon. Suzanne
2 Amidon, for Commission Staff. With me today is Grant
3 Siwinski, an analyst in the Electric Division.

4 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Good afternoon.
5 Mr. Epler.

6 MR. EPLER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Just a
7 couple of preliminary matters. There are two items I'd
8 like premarked. I believe we're up to Unitil Exhibit
9 Number 5 in this docket. So, I'd like the binder and the
10 material in the binder, the green binder, marked as "UES
11 Exhibit Number 5". And, then, the confidential material,
12 which was filed in a separately marked envelope, premarked
13 as "Unitil Exhibit Number 6".

14 CHAIRMAN GETZ: So marked.
15 (The documents, as described, were
16 herewith marked as **Exhibit 5** and
17 **Exhibit 6**, respectively, for
18 identification.)

19 MR. EPLER: And, then, I do have a minor
20 matter to report to the Commission. If you note, in the
21 prefiled testimony of Linda McNamara, at Page -- I believe
22 it's Page 4 of 12, which is stamped page "090", there's a
23 reference to recovery of the Smart Grid Pilot Program
24 costs. And, we have filed -- the Company has filed a

[WITNESS PANEL: McNamara|Furino]

1 report detailing those costs in Docket DE 09-137, and that
2 was filed on September 9th. So, the detail and the
3 invoices and so on have been filed in that docket. And,
4 we have had an initial conversation with the Staff analyst
5 on reviewing that, and the analyst had about half a dozen
6 questions, which the Company will respond to in writing
7 and file it as part of that docket, so all parties have an
8 opportunity to see those questions. And, we're hoping to
9 arrive at a joint recommendation on recovery of those
10 costs. But I just wanted to indicate that the backup for
11 that has been filed in a separate docket.

12 CHAIRMAN GETZ: All right. Thank you.

13 (Whereupon **Linda S. McNamara** and
14 **Robert S. Furino** were duly sworn and
15 cautioned by the Court Reporter.)

16 **LINDA S. McNAMARA, SWORN**

17 **ROBERT S. FURINO, SWORN**

18 **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

19 BY MR. EPLER:

20 Q. Okay. Mr. Furino, just drawing your attention to
21 what's been marked as "Unitil Exhibit 5" and "Unitil
22 Exhibit Number 6", and can you turn to the tabs that
23 are marked "Exhibit RSF-1" and tabs "Schedule RSF-1"
24 through "RSF-7"?

[WITNESS PANEL: McNamara|Furino]

1 A. (Furino) Yes.

2 Q. And, were those prepared by you or under your
3 direction?

4 A. (Furino) Yes, they were.

5 Q. Okay. And, do you have any changes or corrections to
6 those at this time?

7 A. (Furino) I do not.

8 Q. And, Ms. McNamara, can you turn to -- oh. And, then,
9 in Unitil Exhibit Number 6, the stamped pages "001"
10 through "097", was that prepared also by you or under
11 your direction?

12 A. (Furino) Yes, it was.

13 Q. Any changes or corrections to that?

14 A. (Furino) No changes.

15 Q. And, Ms. McNamara, could you turn to what's been marked
16 as "Unitil Exhibit Number 5", and the tabs "Exhibit
17 LSM-1" and tabs "Schedule LSM-1" through "7". And,
18 were those prepared by you or under your direction?

19 A. (McNamara) They were.

20 Q. And, do you have any changes or corrections to those at
21 this time?

22 A. (McNamara) No.

23 Q. And, can you turn to what's been premarked as "Unitil
24 Exhibit 6", and the last page, it's stamped "098". Was

1 that prepared by you?

2 A. (McNamara) Yes.

3 Q. And, do you have any changes or corrections to that?

4 A. (McNamara) No.

5 Q. Okay. Ms. McNamara, can I turn your attention to
6 Page 6 of 12 of your testimony, which is stamped page
7 "092". And, on the bottom of that page, there's a
8 question and answer. You indicate that this filing has
9 an update of the "internal company administrative costs
10 associated with providing default service", is that
11 correct?

12 A. (McNamara) Yes.

13 Q. And, that's a filing that we make on an annual basis,
14 the update of those costs, is that correct?

15 A. (McNamara) Yes.

16 Q. Okay. And, the changes this year, reading your
17 testimony, it appears that there is approximately a
18 \$2,300 increase in those costs?

19 A. (McNamara) I believe that's about right.

20 Q. And, about 800 -- it looks like about \$850 or so are an
21 increase to Non-G1 costs, and the remaining, about
22 \$1,450, an increase to G1 costs, is that correct?

23 A. (McNamara) Yes.

24 Q. Okay. And, then, if you can turn in your testimony to

[WITNESS PANEL: McNamara|Furino]

1 an earlier page, Page 4 of 12, stamped page "090".

2 And, it's on that page -- on that page, do you have a
3 short reference to recovery of the time of use Pilot
4 Program costs?

5 A. (McNamara) Yes.

6 Q. And, what is included for recovery in this filing for
7 those costs?

8 A. (McNamara) As noted in the footnote on that page,
9 approximately half of the currently incurred costs are
10 included for recovery in this filing. And, that amount
11 I believe is not listed on that page. However, it is
12 listed on Bates stamp page "103". The dollar amount
13 included in this filing is "\$166,206".

14 Q. And, that's at the bottom of that page, Roman Numeral
15 ix, "Smart Grid amount", is that correct?

16 A. (McNamara) Yes.

17 Q. Okay. And, could you now turn to stamped page "117",
18 and that's Schedules LSM-7, Page 5 of 11. Do you have
19 that?

20 A. (McNamara) Yes, I do.

21 Q. Okay. Prior to the hearing, there were a couple of
22 questions raised about this page. And, perhaps, if you
23 could just review, the title of one of the columns may
24 have caused some confusion. If you look at Column B,

[WITNESS PANEL: McNamara|Furino]

1 where it says "Number of Customers", is that correct?
2 Is it the number of customers that's listed there in
3 that column or is something else?

4 A. (McNamara) It does represent customers. However, it's
5 annualized. So, everything is multiplied by 12. And,
6 "Outdoor Lighting Customers", the number represents
7 luminaires, as opposed to actual outdoor lighting
8 customers.

9 Q. Okay. So, the number of customers first was taken from
10 the most recent rate case filing, is that correct?

11 A. (McNamara) Yes.

12 Q. DE 10-055?

13 A. (McNamara) Correct.

14 Q. And, then, that's multiplied by 12. So, for
15 "Residential", that represents the number of customers
16 in the rate case multiplied by 12?

17 A. (McNamara) I believe the number itself, the "763,694",
18 is a number that's shown actually in a schedule filed
19 in the rate case. It wasn't something that had to be,
20 you know, multiplied out by 12. But, in essence, yes.
21 It would be, if you divided that number by 12, you
22 would have, on average, the number of customers Unitil
23 has, residential customers, by month.

24 Q. Okay. And, that would be then the same calculation for

[WITNESS PANEL: McNamara|Furino]

1 "General Service" and "Large General Service"?

2 A. (McNamara) Correct.

3 Q. And, "Outdoor Lighting", that represent actual lighting
4 fixtures?

5 A. (McNamara) The lighting fixtures, yes.

6 Q. Times 12?

7 A. (McNamara) Yes. It's the annual amount of fixtures.

8 Q. Okay. Thank you. That's all I have for you,
9 Ms. McNamara. Mr. Furino, if you can turn to your
10 prefiled testimony, at Page 12 of 14, which is stamped
11 page "012". And, on that page, you describe the update
12 to the Renewable Source Option, is that correct?

13 A. (Furino) Yes, that's correct.

14 Q. And, has Unitil recently made a filing with respect to
15 providing the Renewable Source Option?

16 A. (Furino) Yes. First off, in the filing, at Schedule
17 RSF-6, we provide the quarterly update that we've been
18 providing during the past year. That's updated to show
19 the number of customers and associated kilowatt-hours
20 of revenues of participation. And, then, also in the
21 filing, Schedule RSF-7 shows a calculation of the
22 revised RSO Charge rate. Essentially, the RSO provides
23 for Class I RECs and Class II RECs. The Class I market
24 price has gone up. So, we're reflecting that in an

[WITNESS PANEL: McNamara|Furino]

1 updated RSO Charge rate, and that calculation is shown
2 in Schedule 7. And, in addition, what you're likely
3 referring to is, also on Friday, September 9, the
4 Company filed its annual review of the RSO Program in
5 DE 09-244 -- 244, excuse me.

6 MR. EPLER: Mr. Chairman, I actually --
7 I have a copy of that filing here. I don't have any
8 questions to ask the witness relating to that. But, if
9 the Commission or any of the parties would like to have
10 that entered in this docket, I do have copies that I can
11 provide. It's --

12 WITNESS FURINO: I could give a brief
13 overview of that filing as well, if that would be helpful?

14 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, Ms. Hatfield or
15 Ms. Amidon, do you have questions about that or --

16 MS. HATFIELD: Mr. Chairman, because we
17 did just receive that report on Friday, it's our intention
18 to work with the Company and Staff to discuss it at a
19 future date.

20 MR. EPLER: That's fine.

21 MS. AMIDON: And, Staff agrees. I mean,
22 we just got the first 12-month report from this company, I
23 believe National Grid and PSNH. And, I think the OCA and
24 Staff's intention was to review those reports, and then

[WITNESS PANEL: McNamara|Furino]

1 sit down with the Company to make recommendations of
2 program design and marketing or things of that nature,
3 looking at the participation in each of those programs.
4 So, it doesn't need to be part of this proceeding.

5 MR. EPLER: That's fine.

6 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you.

7 MR. EPLER: Okay. I have no further
8 questions.

9 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Ms. Hatfield.

10 MS. HATFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11 **CROSS-EXAMINATION**

12 BY MS. HATFIELD:

13 Q. Ms. McNamara, could you please turn to Bates Page 113.
14 Is this chart showing the typical impacts for
15 residential customers?

16 A. (McNamara) It is. It's the impact to a 500
17 kilowatt-hour bill for a residential customer, under
18 the proposed rates and the current rates.

19 Q. And, what is the proposed Default Service rate for the
20 upcoming period?

21 A. (McNamara) The proposed rate is shown under the Default
22 Service Charge line, under the second column, dated
23 11/1/2011. The fixed proposed rate, which this
24 particular bill uses, is \$0.08026 per kilowatt-hour.

[WITNESS PANEL: McNamara|Furino]

1 Q. So, that's just over 8 cents per kilowatt-hour?

2 A. (McNamara) Yes.

3 Q. Okay. And, that's a slight increase from the current
4 rate of just over 7.2 cents?

5 A. (McNamara) Correct.

6 Q. Do you know why the rate is increasing?

7 A. (McNamara) The increase from the current rate is due to
8 the supplier charges.

9 Q. And, Mr. Furino, do you think that the length of the
10 term of the contract that Unitil seeks in these
11 proceedings has an impact on that rate increase?

12 A. (Furino) Well, certainly, we are looking at the
13 contracts that have been purchased over a period of
14 time. And, the contract that the Company seeks
15 approval of today, in this docket, is -- represents
16 25 percent of the costs that are currently embedded in
17 this rate. But the Company, and I believe we have -- I
18 have stated in prior proceedings that there is some
19 cost associated with fixing a price over a longer
20 period of time. So, yes, there is likely to be, you
21 know, had the Company sought a six-month price, it's
22 likely that the Company would have gotten a lower rate
23 for that six-month period. But, again, and if you were
24 to turn to the confidential section, Bates stamped

[WITNESS PANEL: McNamara|Furino]

1 "011", here we see, for Non-G1 customers, our
2 comparison of historical pricing. And, we list, in the
3 first set of blocks, if you will, the suppliers of the
4 various we'll call them "tranches" or "blocks". And,
5 you see the Dominion contract is in here listed as
6 "Block A". One thing that we see is, also, as you work
7 your way over, you can see the contributing prices over
8 the six-month period. And, if you focus on the period
9 that begins November 2011 and ends April 2012, we did
10 include the later future months that we currently have
11 under contract, just to have them in here. And, if we
12 work our way over, you can see, if you go to the third
13 set of blocks for Non-G1 pricing, what the monthly
14 average prices are, and that combines all four
15 contracts, and what the weighted average price is. So,
16 we have "\$70.74", that's dollars per megawatt, would be
17 a little over 7 cents. And, we're showing that as a
18 10 percent increase over the prior period, which is --
19 we're essentially going from a summer period to a
20 winter period. And, it's also showing a 1.5 percent
21 reduction from the prior year. So, the pricing that we
22 received is relatively consistent with prior pricing.
23 And, there is a seasonal pattern associated with it.
24 Q. Do you think it would be worthwhile for the parties to

[WITNESS PANEL: McNamara|Furino]

1 consider changing the length of the contracts that you
2 enter into or do you think that the current length is
3 sufficient?

4 A. (Furino) Well, currently, the Company is utilizing a
5 combination of 12-month and 24-month contracts for its
6 Non-G1 procurement. And, the Company is exploring
7 alternatives to the pricing for Non-G1 service
8 customers. And, currently, it's not ready to bring a
9 proposal to the parties, but it intends to do so.

10 Q. And, the number of responses you received here to your
11 RFP are confidential, is that correct?

12 A. (Furino) Yes.

13 Q. But, I believe, in your testimony, you did state that
14 you felt as though the response was robust, is that
15 right?

16 A. (Furino) Yes.

17 Q. And, by that, did you mean that, in your view, a
18 sufficient number of responses were received by the
19 Company?

20 A. (Furino) Yes.

21 MS. HATFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
22 I have nothing further.

23 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Ms. Amidon.

24 MS. AMIDON: Thank you.

1 BY MS. AMIDON:

2 Q. And, looking at Page 010 of Exhibit 6, which is the
3 confidential piece, Mr. Furino, if you look at Page
4 010, that's a similar table that shows for G1 customers
5 the change in costs of power from the prior period, is
6 that correct?

7 A. (Furino) Yes, that's correct.

8 Q. And, it actually is a sequential table, much as appears
9 on Page 011, that begins "November 2009", and goes down
10 to "January 2012"?

11 A. (Furino) Yes. Providing us a two-year history, yes.

12 Q. And, could you explain why the rate impact -- the bill
13 impact for the Large Customer Group is somewhat less
14 than the wholesale price increase? It may be something
15 that's obvious to you, and I just need an explanation.
16 Because, if you look at LSM-7, for the Large Customer
17 Group, rate impacts are increases in the neighborhood
18 of 9.8 percent, while the increase in the wholesale
19 power costs were somewhat different.

20 A. (Furino) Well, I'm not -- I'm not aware of the
21 reconciliation, any prior reconciliation impact that
22 might be impacting the comparison.

23 Q. Okay.

24 A. (Furino) I do expect there is a modest increase in RPS

1 costs, which could impact this a little bit.

2 Ms. McNamara.

3 A. (McNamara) I'm going to say that, without reading
4 through the numbers here, Schedule LSM-7, Page 3, which
5 is showing the 9.8 percent increase on a typical bill,
6 I guess one could say, and general speaking, energy is
7 about half of a bill. So, if we -- and this is a
8 percentage, the 9.8 is a percentage of total bill. So,
9 Default Service is making up, you know, 50-60 percent
10 of a bill, just generally, whereas the percentage that
11 Mr. Furino is showing on Page 010 of the confidential
12 data is a straight impact of the Default Service
13 wholesale rate, the purchase rate.

14 Q. Well, while we're at your Schedule LSM-7, Page 3,
15 that's Bates stamp "115", if you look at the Default
16 Service Charge alone going across, is that correct that
17 the increase is 9.8 percent or is it only the total
18 bill that the increase is 9.8 percent?

19 A. (McNamara) I'm sorry. Would you remind repeating your
20 question.

21 Q. Well, if you look at the lower, the table on Page Bates
22 stamp 115, and it's the table -- there are two tables
23 there. There is one that appears at the top of the
24 page and one that appears on the bottom of the page.

[WITNESS PANEL: McNamara|Furino]

1 I'm looking at the one at the bottom of the page. And,
2 that's the one that indicates the total bill impact for
3 Large General G1 customers to be an increase of
4 approximately 9.8 percent. Is it true that the Default
5 Service Charge is increasing at 9.8 percent or is it
6 increasing at some other rate, because I'm trying to
7 understand how the power costs factor in? And, if the
8 only change in this whole document is the Default
9 Service Charge, I don't understand why it's not higher?

10 A. (McNamara) The 9.8 percent is a percent -- it's the
11 \$2,000 change in the previous column, the \$2,134
12 change, as a percent of the total bill.

13 Q. So, it's not a percent of the \$16,472?

14 A. (McNamara) Correct.

15 Q. All right. That was my confusion.

16 A. (McNamara) Yes.

17 A. (Furino) And, just -- if I could just interject. I was
18 calculating on the side as this discussion has been
19 going on. The new rate, divided by the old rate, gives
20 us a 14.8 percent increase, which is consistent with
21 the 14.3 percent wholesale Default Service cost
22 increase, particularly when you consider the increase
23 in RPS costs. So, that hopefully helps reconcile.
24 And, could have presented a different, you know, set of

1 information if we were to provide it that way.

2 Q. Okay. Thank you. I look at these filings on a
3 quarterly basis, and I always find something that is
4 different. Regarding the administrative cost, in
5 LSM-6, this exhibit, if I understand it correctly, just
6 presents the revised administrative costs. And, I'm
7 correct that it doesn't show where the incremental
8 increase has occurred in these costs. So, generally,
9 could you describe what the cost causers were that
10 resulted in this modest increase in the administrative
11 costs incurred by the Company?

12 A. (McNamara) Based on my recollection of putting this
13 schedule together, I believe the overhead, there's only
14 two pieces that changed, that only change ever when we
15 make this update, it's the average cost of labor, which
16 is provided on Bates stamp page 112, and the overhead
17 rates. I believe, in the settlement in DE 05-064,
18 those pieces were something that were the components
19 that were allowed to change as result of this. The
20 hours listed do not change.

21 Q. Okay. So, the hours are pretty much the same.

22 A. (McNamara) They are identical.

23 Q. It's just an incremental increase in overhead and an
24 incremental increase in hourly wages, too?

[WITNESS PANEL: McNamara|Furino]

1 A. (McNamara) Correct. And, I believe, in this
2 circumstance, as I said, based on my recollection, the
3 overhead rates decreased slightly. I believe the
4 current rate includes the overhead rate of 95 percent.
5 So, the average hourly rate would be the reason for the
6 increase.

7 MS. AMIDON: Thank you. I have no
8 further questions.

9 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Any redirect, Mr. Epler?

10 MR. EPLER: No, Mr. Chairman.

11 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Then, the
12 witnesses are excused. Thank you very much.

13 Is there an objection to striking the
14 identifications and admitting the exhibits into evidence?

15 (No verbal response)

16 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Hearing no objection,
17 they will be admitted into evidence. Anything before
18 opportunities for closings?

19 (No verbal response)

20 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Hearing nothing, then
21 Ms. Hatfield.

22 MS. HATFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23 The OCA has no objection to Unitil's request for its new
24 Default Service rates. We appreciate the Company's

1 willingness to work with the OCA and Staff to review the
2 costs related to the Smart Grid Pilot that was discussed
3 today, and also to work with the OCA and Staff to review
4 the Company's report on its Renewable Energy Source Option
5 that was also discussed previously.

6 One issue that we did want to mention is
7 that, in the March filing, at the beginning of this
8 docket, the Company filed a Lead/Lag Study. And, at that
9 time, the parties stated that they had not had time yet to
10 review the study. And, while I don't believe the OCA has
11 an objection to it, I did just want to raise that with the
12 Commission that it has not been addressed since March.
13 So, it's something that we should take care of at some
14 point in this docket. So, I did want to just raise that.
15 I don't think it impacts the Commission issuing this order
16 in a timely manner, but I did just want to raise it.

17 And, then, finally, it's my
18 understanding that this is Commissioner Below's last
19 hearing. And, so, I want to just thank him very much for
20 his service to the state and to the ratepayers of the
21 state.

22 And, I especially wanted to thank him
23 for his ability to always ask a better question than me.
24 And, in fact, to follow up to my questions in a way that

1 made me wish that I had thought of the questions before
2 him. So, thank you very much.

3 CMSR. BELOW: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Ms. Amidon.

5 MS. AMIDON: Thank you. Staff reviewed
6 the Petition, and has determined that Unitil has complied
7 with the Settlement Agreement approved by the Commission
8 in Order Number 24,511, in conducting the bid solicitation
9 process, evaluating the bids, and selecting the final
10 bidder for these two solicitations. And, we believe the
11 resulting rates are market-based, and recommend that the
12 Commission approve the Petition.

13 We do not have any objection to the
14 increase in the RSO rate for the options that the Company
15 offers. And, as previously noted, we intend to sit down
16 with the OCA and the companies to review their annual
17 reports on the Renewable Service Option Program, to see if
18 there are any improvements we can make in the design or
19 marketing.

20 And, as Attorney Epler said, the Staff
21 has commenced review of the costs associated with what
22 they're now calling the "Smart Grid Pilot Program". And,
23 for purposes of beginning recovery of costs, we recommend
24 that Unitil be allowed to recover the costs at a level of

1 \$166,206 for the period beginning November 1, as they
2 request in their Petition. We could have recommended an
3 adjustment to the total costs, based on Staff's ongoing
4 review of the September 7th report. But we understand
5 that these costs only go up to those incurred I think it's
6 as of July 1, 2011. And, we understand that additional
7 costs will be trickling in. So, therefore, we believe
8 that, before the Company asks for recovery of the
9 remainder of the costs, that they file a complete report
10 with all the final information, and allow Staff and the
11 OCA to review it and make any recommendations that they
12 want, that we think is appropriate, in light of the
13 settlement agreement we had on the pilot project.

14 And, finally, I also want to say, for
15 me, it's my last hearing with Commissioner Below as a
16 member of this Commission. And, for the record, I want to
17 thank him for his public service. It's been a pleasure
18 working with you. And, your attention to detail and your
19 hard work is greatly appreciated. And, I wish you the
20 best in your future endeavors.

21 CMSR. BELOW: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Mr. Epler.

23 MR. EPLER: Yes. Thank you, Mr.
24 Chairman. The relief requested is outlined in the

1 Petition, and I don't think there's a need to repeat going
2 through that, and appreciate the opportunity to work with
3 Staff and OCA on reviewing of this.

4 I do note, and I confess I'm not quite
5 sure if I did the correct thing in including a Motion for
6 Confidential Treatment. I guess it's not clear to me,
7 under the new rules, the interim rules, whether or not I
8 need to include one. So, maybe it was just suspenders and
9 belt in putting one in. But I'll pay attention to those
10 rules in the future. And, if I can avoid filing
11 something, then I will.

12 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay.

13 MR. EPLER: And, also, I was not aware
14 that today is Commissioner Below's last day. And, so, the
15 sentiments that have been expressed by the OCA and the
16 Staff certainly go the same for the Company. And, on
17 behalf of the Company, wish you well in everything after
18 this.

19 CMSR. BELOW: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. We will reserve
21 our remarks. I don't think I've gotten teary-eyed on the
22 record yet.

23 (Laughter.)

24 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Just in this room. But

1 I don't think there's anything further, so we will close
2 the hearing and take the matter under advisement. Thank
3 you, everyone.

4 (Whereupon the hearing ended at 2:07
5 p.m.)
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24