Docket No. DE 19-057 Exhibit No. 21 Clean Energy NH Testimony of M. Mineau with Attachments Page 1 of 11

## STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

## **BEFORE THE**

# PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Docket No. DE 19-057

Public Service Company of New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource Energy

**TESTIMONY OF** 

# MADELEINE MINEAU

**On behalf of Clean Energy NH** 

December 20, 2019

## STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

### BEFORE THE NEW HAMPSHIRE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

# DIRECT TESTIMONY OF MADELEINE MINEAU

### PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE D/B/A EVERSOURCE ENERGY

December 20, 2019

**Docket No. DE 19-057** 

1	Q.	Please state your name, the organization you work for, your position and business	
2		address.	
3	А.	Madeleine Mineau. I am the Executive Director of Clean Energy NH ("CENH"), which	
4		is located at 14 Dixon Avenue, Suite 202, Concord, NH 03301.	
5			
6	Q.	Please describe your qualifications.	
7	A.	I am currently the Executive Director of CENH where, in addition to managing the	
8		administration of the organization and supervising staff, I am the lead on regulatory and	
9		policy issues. I have a BA in Biology and Environmental Policy and a PhD in Ecology. I	
10		have been in my current position for 1.5 years and have prior experience working in	
11		energy policy as co-president of Granite State Hydropower Association and as	

1		Waterways Manager for the City of Nashua where I managed two hydropower generation
2		projects. My resume is included as Exhibit CENH-MM- 1.
3		
4	Q.	Have you testified previously before the New Hampshire Public Utilities
5		Commission or other regulatory bodies?
6	Α.	I have testified before the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission (the
7		"Commission" or "PUC") in Docket No. DE 17-136 2019 regarding an update to the
8		statewide energy efficiency plan and in Docket No. DE 17-189 where I adopted the
9		testimony of my predecessor, Kate Bashford Epsen. In addition, I participated in Docket
10		No. DE 16-576 on behalf of the City of Nashua and Granite State Hydropower
11		Association. I am currently representing CENH in several dockets including IR 15-296,
12		DE 17-136, DE 19-064, DE 19-104, DE 19-133, DRM 18-158, and the planning process
13		for the next EERS plan.
14		
15	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony?
16	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to provide CENH's position with regard to Eversource's
17		proposal for its Grid Transformation and Enablement Program ("GTEP") and how the
18		cost of that program is recovered through a Distribution Rate Adjustment Mechanism
19		("DRAM"). CENH is also jointly filing the testimony of Kevin Miller from ChargePoint
20		regarding electric vehicle charging stations and the rates that would be applicable to those
21		stations.
22		

1 Q.

### Q. Please explain CENH's interest in the GTEP.

2 A. As part of our work as advocates for clean energy, the efficient use of energy, and accelerating the NH's transition to a clean energy economy, CENH recognizes the need 3 for investments to facilitate the integration of distributed energy resources in the 4 5 distribution system. However, Eversource's proposed GTEP would not address the most imminent and important needs to achieve this end. Furthermore, there seems to be 6 considerable overlap between the scope of the proposed GTEP and the likely scope more 7 broadly undertaken in the statewide grid modernization efforts. New Hampshire's grid 8 9 modernization process is being addressed in Docket No. IR 15-296, which is currently ongoing and encompasses several unresolved important issues that include how utilities 10 would be allowed to recover the costs of investments made associated with grid 11 modernization. 12

13

----

### 14 Q. What are your concerns about Eversource's GTEP proposal?

A. Although Eversource claims that all proposed GTEP investments aim to address the twin
goal of increased resilience and to facilitate the integration of advanced energy solutions,
as proposed the GTEP investments appear heavily weighted towards a focus on
bolstering system resilience. For example, accelerating pole replacement would provide
no tangible benefit to the integration of clean energy in the distribution system. This is
especially true following the removal from this docket of the Westmoreland Clean
Innovation Project and the Oyster River Clean Innovation Project and their associated

1	testimony. Eversource's proposal now lacks specifics as it pertains to what types of
2	"advanced energy solutions" would be enabled by GTEP and how and when these
3	solutions would be achieved. The only detail is in regard to providing distribution system
4	resiliency; CENH acknowledges that system resilience is an important goal of a
5	distribution but there is nothing new about this goal such that the Commission should
6	view it in any unique way or provide special rate treatment.

7

8

### Q. Please provide more detail on your concerns.

When asked in discovery to identify locations where distributed generation hosting 9 A. capacity is already constrained. Eversource first acknowledged that hosting capacity has 10 not been comprehensively evaluated within its system. A comprehensive hosting 11 12 capacity analysis would be necessary to identify priority locations where system upgrades are needed to enable the integration of additional distributed energy resources. CENH has 13 been advocating that such an analysis be conducted and that the communication of the 14 results to stakeholders be a priority under grid modernization. Further, of the locations 15 identified by Eversource as already constrained, two of the substations are planned for 16 upgrades as part of its base capital program. It is unclear to me if proposed GTEP 17 18 investments would alleviate hosting constraints in part or not at all at the other six locations identified. Eversource is already able to address some needed system upgrades 19 as part of its base capital program and without a better understanding of distributed 20

005

1		energy resources hosting constraints on the system, proposed GTEP investments may be
2		misdirected.
3		
4	Q.	Do you have any concerns with timing?
5	A.	While New Hampshire currently has very low penetration of distributed generation, I
6		think it is very important to plan now and begin the work needed for the integration of
7		distributed energy resources. This work, however, can be best undertaken in the grid
8		modernization docket where a unified framework can be developed for all regulated
9		utilities in New Hampshire rather than in individual utility rate cases.
10		
11	Q.	Please discuss your concerns with GTEP and how it relates to the Distribution Rate
12		Adjustment Mechanism.
13	A.	GTEP is proposing to accelerate distribution system upgrades that, if deemed necessary
14		and prudent, should be recovered through a regular distribution charge. Maintaining the
15		
16		distribution system is the responsibility of the distribution utility and proper maintenance
-0		distribution system is the responsibility of the distribution utility and proper maintenance includes upgrading equipment and infrastructure to current standards and good industry
17		distribution system is the responsibility of the distribution utility and proper maintenance includes upgrading equipment and infrastructure to current standards and good industry practice. The proposal to create a new Distribution Recovery Adjustment Mechanism
17 18		distribution system is the responsibility of the distribution utility and proper maintenance includes upgrading equipment and infrastructure to current standards and good industry practice. The proposal to create a new Distribution Recovery Adjustment Mechanism seems unjustified to recover GTEP costs even if they were approved as necessary and
17 18 19		distribution system is the responsibility of the distribution utility and proper maintenance includes upgrading equipment and infrastructure to current standards and good industry practice. The proposal to create a new Distribution Recovery Adjustment Mechanism seems unjustified to recover GTEP costs even if they were approved as necessary and prudent. As proposed, the GTEP is either a distribution system cost that should be

1		start on grid modernization before the resolution of the grid modernization docket. The
2		issue of how utilities should be able to recover costs associated with grid modernization
3		investments is one of the unresolved issues in the grid modernization docket. Approving
4		the DRAM in this case, without the context of and perspectives in the grid modernization
5		docket, would lead to a poorly-considered decision in this docket, constrain the
6		Commission's decision-making in the grid modernization docket and possibly lead to
7		conflicting decisions.
8		
9	0.	Please summarize your concerns with the GTEP proposal.
	×.	
10	A.	CENH's main concerns with the GTEP proposal are twofold. First, it does not contain
10 11	A.	CENH's main concerns with the GTEP proposal are twofold. First, it does not contain actual grid-transformational projects. Rather, the proposals are aimed at system
10 11 12	A.	CENH's main concerns with the GTEP proposal are twofold. First, it does not contain actual grid-transformational projects. Rather, the proposals are aimed at system resiliency and reliability, very traditional and standard goals of a distribution utility.
10 11 12 13	A.	CENH's main concerns with the GTEP proposal are twofold. First, it does not contain actual grid-transformational projects. Rather, the proposals are aimed at system resiliency and reliability, very traditional and standard goals of a distribution utility. These are not unique and should not be the subject of special rate recovery mechanism
10 11 12 13 14	A.	CENH's main concerns with the GTEP proposal are twofold. First, it does not contain actual grid-transformational projects. Rather, the proposals are aimed at system resiliency and reliability, very traditional and standard goals of a distribution utility. These are not unique and should not be the subject of special rate recovery mechanism like the DRAM. Second, to the degree there are any projects aimed at facilitating the
10 11 12 13 14 15	A.	CENH's main concerns with the GTEP proposal are twofold. First, it does not contain actual grid-transformational projects. Rather, the proposals are aimed at system resiliency and reliability, very traditional and standard goals of a distribution utility. These are not unique and should not be the subject of special rate recovery mechanism like the DRAM. Second, to the degree there are any projects aimed at facilitating the integration of advanced energy solutions, the planning, implementation and funding of
10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Α.	CENH's main concerns with the GTEP proposal are twofold. First, it does not contain actual grid-transformational projects. Rather, the proposals are aimed at system resiliency and reliability, very traditional and standard goals of a distribution utility. These are not unique and should not be the subject of special rate recovery mechanism like the DRAM. Second, to the degree there are any projects aimed at facilitating the integration of advanced energy solutions, the planning, implementation and funding of those projects should be addressed in Docket No. IR 15-296. To do otherwise would
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A.	CENH's main concerns with the GTEP proposal are twofold. First, it does not contain actual grid-transformational projects. Rather, the proposals are aimed at system resiliency and reliability, very traditional and standard goals of a distribution utility. These are not unique and should not be the subject of special rate recovery mechanism like the DRAM. Second, to the degree there are any projects aimed at facilitating the integration of advanced energy solutions, the planning, implementation and funding of those projects should be addressed in Docket No. IR 15-296. To do otherwise would undercut the hard work of the parties in that docket, especially when you consider that
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A.	CENH's main concerns with the GTEP proposal are twofold. First, it does not contain actual grid-transformational projects. Rather, the proposals are aimed at system resiliency and reliability, very traditional and standard goals of a distribution utility. These are not unique and should not be the subject of special rate recovery mechanism like the DRAM. Second, to the degree there are any projects aimed at facilitating the integration of advanced energy solutions, the planning, implementation and funding of those projects should be addressed in Docket No. IR 15-296. To do otherwise would undercut the hard work of the parties in that docket, especially when you consider that Eversource is by far the largest utility in New Hampshire.

19

# 20 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

Docket No. DE 19-057 Exhibit No. 21 Clean Energy NH Testimony of M. Mineau with Attachments Page 8 of 11

1 A. Yes.

# <u>Exhibit List</u>

CENH-MM-1

Resume of M. Mineau

# Dr. Madeleine M. Mineau

### Education

Ph.D.	Department of Biological Sciences, Idaho State University Research emphasis: Aquatic ecology Coursework emphasis: Biological Education Advisor: Dr. Colden V. Baxter	2010
B.A.	Colby College, Waterville, ME Majors: Biology and Environmental Policy Minor: Art Honors: Cum Laude	2003

### Certifications

Certified Floodplain Manager (since 2016)

### **Professional Experience**

### Executive Director, Clean Energy NH

August 2018 - Present

Skills and responsibilities: Administration and management of the organization, budget/financial management; development and fundraising; grant writing and management, staff supervision, human resources management; public presentations and education; legislative advocacy and lobbying; manage regulatory affairs at the Public Utilities Commission;

### Waterways Manager, City of Nashua

November 2015 – July 2018

Skills and responsibilities: Project management and planning; act as resident expert on waterways, environmental, and energy matters and policies; staff supervision; communicate effectively with diverse audiences; grant writing, budget/financial management; environmental regulatory compliance and reporting; environmental and energy policy advocacy; public outreach.

Research assistant professor, Earth Systems Research Center. University of New Hampshire, August 2014 – November 2015

Skills and responsibilities: Project leadership, organization, and planning; supervision/mentoring; collaboration/networking; grant writing; computer programming (C and unix shell); field work; laboratory work; data analysis; public presentations; technical writing (peer reviewed journal publications); budget/financial accounting; public outreach.

Research scientist II, Earth Systems Research Center, University of New Hampshire, October 2012 – August 2014

Skills and responsibilities: Project leadership, organization, and planning; supervision/mentoring; collaboration/networking; grant writing; computer

programming (C and unix shell); field work; laboratory work; data analysis; public presentations; technical writing (peer reviewed journal publications); budget/financial accounting; public outreach.

Assistant research professor, Plant, Soil, and Environmental Sciences, University of Maine. January 2012 – September 2012 Skills and responsibilities: Project leadership, organization, and planning; staff supervision; undergraduate and graduate student mentoring; collaboration/networking; grant writing; field work; laboratory work; data analysis;

public presentations; technical writing (peer reviewed journal publications); budget/financial accounting; public outreach.

Postdoctoral research associate, School of Biology and Ecology, University of Maine. Interactive effects of chronic N deposition, acidification, and phosphorus limitation on coupled elemental cycling in streams.

January 2011-December 2011.

Skills and responsibilities: Project leadership, organization, and planning; staff supervision; undergraduate and graduate student mentoring;

collaboration/networking; grant writing; field work; laboratory work; data analysis; public presentations; technical writing (peer reviewed journal publications); public outreach.

### Peer-reviewed publication

I can provide a list of 16 peer reviewed scientific publication upon request. H-index = 12 (H-index is a measure of citation impact) Journals include: Ecology, Ecosystems, Geophysical Research Letters, Biogeochemistry, Freshwater Biology, and Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment

### **Professional Service**

Energy Efficiency and Sustainable Energy Board, Vice-Chair 2019

Granite State Hydropower Association, Co-President, 2016 – 2018 Granite State Hydropower Association, Board member 2016 - Present

Chair, Nashua Regional Stormwater Coalition, 2018

Nashua Environment and Energy Committee, Vice-chair, 2017 - 2018

Advisory Board member, NHTI Environmental Science Program 2015 - 2018

Technical Reviewer, Buffers for the Bay Project 2016-2017

Representative Upper Merrimack River Local Advisory Committee, 2012 - 2015