1	STATE OF	NEW HAMPSHIRE
2	SITE EVALU	ATION COMMITTEE
3		
4	January 12, 2017 - 11:00	
5	Public Utilities Commission 21 South Fruit Street	
6	Concord, New Hampshire	
7	RSA 162-H:8-a,III,	APPLICATION AND FILING FEES
8	PUBLIC HEARING	
9		
10	PRESENT FOR SUBCOMMITTEE:	SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE:
11	Chmn. Martin Honinberg	Public Utilities Commission
12	Cmsr. Robert R. Scott	Public Utilities Commission
13	Cmsr. Kathryn M. Bailey	Public Utilities Commission
14	Cmsr. Jeffrey Rose	Dept. of Resources &
15	Dir. Elizabeth Muzzey	Economic Development Dept. of Cultural Resources,
16	Act'g Cmsr. Clark Freise	Div. of Hist. Resources Dept. of Environmental Services
17	Charles III at and a Charles	
18		Department of Transportation Public Member
19	Also Decemb for the CEC	
20	Also Present for the SEC:	
21	Michael J. Iacopino, Esq. (Brennan Pamela G. Monroe, SEC Administrator	
22	COURT DEDODEED. Combbio	Eagton ICD No. 014
23	COURT REPORTER: Cynthia	FUSCEI, LCK NO. UI4
24		

{RSA 162-H:8-a, III } [Application and Filing Fees]  $\{01-12-17\}$ 

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Good morning,
everyone. I am convening a meeting of the Site
Evaluation Committee, January 12th, 2016. We
have two specific items on our agenda to deal
with. The first is to review the Application
Filing Fees as we are required to do under RSA

162-H:8-a, III. We'll do that first.

The second item on the agenda is Docket number 2016-03, a Petition for Declaratory Ruling. The plan is for us to take a break between those two agenda items to allow us to confer with counsel and in all likelihood for people to grab something to eat. So that's the expectation on that. We'll go off the record for just a second.

(Discussion off the record)

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: With respect to agenda item 1, the fees, I'm going to ask our Administrator -- before I do that, people should probably identify themselves. I know we have nametags in front of us, but there are some new faces here at the Committee. We have 8 members of the Committee present. The plan was to have our second public member who is our alternative

1	public member, Rachel Whitaker, participate by	
2	telephone, but for reasons I don't quite	
3	understand, there's a technological problem, and	
4	we do not have Rachel on the line. So let's	
5	have people identify themselves so everybody	
6	knows who's here.	
7	COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Bob Scott with the New	
8	Hampshire Public Utilities Commission.	
9	PRESIDING OFFICER HONINBERG: Martin	
10	Honinberg with the New Hampshire Public	
11	Utilities Commission.	
12	DIRECTOR MUZZEY: Elizabeth Muzzey.	
13	Department of Cultural Resources.	
14	COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Kathryn Bailey.	
15	Public Utilities Commission.	
16	PATRICIA WEATHERSBY: Good morning.	
17	Patricia Weathersby, Public Member.	
18	COMMISSIONER SHEEHAN: Victoria Sheehan.	
19	Department of Transportation.	
20	ACTING CMSR. CLARK FREISE: Clark Freise.	
21	Department of Environmental Services.	
22	COMMISSIONER ROSE: Good morning. Jeff	
23	Rose, Department of Resources and Economic	
24	Development.	

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. would like the SEC's Administrator, Pam Monroe, to lead us through a discussion of the fee situation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. RSA 162-H:8-a, III requires the Site Evaluation Committee to review and evaluate the application and filing fees at least once each year. The statute gives the Committee the authority to increase or decrease any amount in the fee schedule by up to 20 percent with prior approval of the Fiscal Committee of the General Court, providing that any such increase or decrease shall occur not more frequently than once during any 12-month period.

I had distributed to you, and I've got copies up there for anybody who would like them, an analysis, I guess you could call it that, of the application filing fees that we've received to date as well as the total charges billed for those.

I do have one change from what I sent all of you. On page 4, thank you to Ms. Weathersby for her eagle eyes catching this, it's under

item 7, SEC Docket No. 2016-02, the total charges that appear on page 4 should be an amount of 503, not, I believe it was 202.

I can take you, whatever your pleasure is.

I can take you through each of the dockets with

a brief summary if you'd like or --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I have a question before you do that. What's the compliance rate for state agencies to submit requests for reimbursement? I will confess that I have a listing of dates and times from the beginning of this fiscal year that is safe on my desk but not in your hands.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: That has been part of the issue, and I would like to take today to redistribute -- one of the things that I was required to do when I first came into this position was develop a record keeping system and accounting and payment procedures for the agencies as well as the public members. Public members have been great and timely with their filing, but I haven't always received all the Agency reporting so I'd like to distribute that.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Ms. Monroe, when you

get back to the microphone could you let us know what we're supposed to do with them when they're filled out because I filled mine out, too, but I didn't know what to do with it, and I apologize for that.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Well, I did ask today, and I should have introduced her, in the audience here to my right is Eunice Landry.

She's the business administrator for the Public Utilities Commission. The Site Evaluation

Committee is administratively attached to the PUC, and Eunice has been helping me with all of this accounting. So if you send them to me, I will send them to Eunice, and I will work with her. If you could submit the appropriate docket because that's how I'm trying to track those, I will take care of it.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: How often do you want us to submit them? Monthly? Quarterly? When the page is full?

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Quarterly would be the preferred time frame, which I believe is in the procedure.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. So with

that out of the way, why don't you summarize where we are, understanding I suspect is true that we're probably understating the obligation with the numbers that are in your report because there are some outstanding reimbursement requests that haven't come in.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Right. So I believe for the first Docket is 2015-05. That was the Joint Application of New England Power and PSNH regarding what's known as the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project. I believe we probably have most of the charges to date.

The big one that we just completed was the Antrim Wind which was Docket No. 2015-02. I did provide an estimate here because I did receive an estimate from Commissioner Rose's office and I've also developed working with Eunice an average cost per day per agency number. So I tried to extrapolate that given that we had 13 days of hearings and three days of deliberations to try and come up with a number, assuming all the charges get submitted. So the Application fee was 78,800, and I believe if my estimates are close, the total charges will be about

\$102,500 for that docket.

The fees come in when the Application is submitted, and then, as you know, we have a year to make our final decision so there's a lot of things that go on. We have the public hearings up front, but then there's a lag time between that and actually the hearing. So the money sits in the account, and we're not really drawing down until we have those hearings.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Monroe, I think Commissioner Scott has a question.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: I wanted to clarify a statement you made. You either said or implied that Antrim was finished. We still have to go through the process of getting a written order out. There will be some time. There's a potential for requests for reconsideration or appeal so the financial clock has not run out on that project yet; is that correct?

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: That's correct. I believe my estimate was just based on time to date which is the hearing and the deliberations on that project. Good point.

We also had, I'd just point out at number 4

as well that these are in the order of the Applications as they came in. That's the way they're sequenced. We did have two Petitions this year to transfer membership interests in two of the combined cycle power plants in the We convened a three-member Subcommittee State. in that, and Ms. Weathersby was kind enough to be the Presiding Officer in those proceedings and we had two agency members. So the second one went much guicker than the first. So that's represented here. We had the same Subcommittee do both in order to be more efficient with our time.

MR. ROTH: Mr. Chairman, I know this may seem out of order, but my office always bills for these reimbursements so I quess the question I would ask is if the Committee is aware whether the Attorney General's Office in billing for time for Counsel for the Public is up to date as well.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: I would say you're not up to date. Probably as far as the agencies go, probably the most complete is from the Attorney General's Office, but there are

23 24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

definitely pending charges in the Northern Pass docket.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Director Muzzey?

DIRECTOR MUZZEY: I would like to go back to Antrim just for a moment. Could you clarify, we also had a jurisdictional hearing on Antrim prior to this hearing, a certificate of site, was that prior to when agencies began this reimbursement process?

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: I believe the law provided that the agencies could be reimbursed, but there weren't any fees, and some of the monies came out and Eunice could maybe speak to this, the Renewable Energy Fund, when there was some money that was put into the --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm not sure that's right. I thought that the Antrim Wind jurisdictional proceeding occurred before the new law was effective.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: There was a provision. Do you have the spreadsheet, Eunice? Thanks, Eunice.

I could go back and I researched this when we received the charges because we did, it was

2014-05 was the docket number and as well as the C-3 proceeding. There was a provision in the law that, I believe in the 2014 changes that said in the event there's funding that falls in 2015, that any of these open dockets were subject to be reimbursed, and I researched that issue so we did reimburse DOJ in that docket.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The Antrim Wind jurisdictional proceeding?

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Correct, as well as the C-3, there was a public member, PUC and DES were members of that Subcommittee.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.

DIRECTOR MUZZEY: Thank you.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: The Tennessee Gas
Pipeline which was Docket No. 2015-08, the way
the system that we've set up works is, well, and
under the statute, any Applicant has to have a
pre-Application meeting out in each county where
the project is supposed to be sited. So when we
received a notice from Tennessee Gas that they
were planning on having those pre-Application
meetings, we actually opened a docket.

And there was various charges against that

including a meeting of the Subcommittee that was put in place for that particular docket to review the statutory requirement that they consider intervening in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission proceeding. So there were some charges there as well as charges from the public member for that, but we never received any fees because they withdrew their filing and said in the event the project came back, they would open a new docket. So there were \$2935 of charges to the fund, if you will, that we never received any fees.

Then we have SEC Docket No. 2016-01 was a rule making docket. The statute required the Committee to adopt rules relative to the citing of high pressure gas pipelines and gave the Committee one year to do that. In order to meet the statutory time frame, it was necessary to hire a contractor to work with me to develop those draft rules, and, essentially, we submitted the proposal to the Joint Legislative Committee before the statutory deadline, and the rules were actually adopted in August of 2016. So, again, that was \$12,267 charged to the SEC

fund. Again, there's no Application because it was general rule making.

I went through number 7 which was the, that was the transfer of ownership in the Newington Power combined cycle dual fuel facility in Newington.

And then the most recent Application submitted was in 2015-04. That's Application of Public Service of New Hampshire Company for a new 115 kV transmission line. That's also known and referred to in some places as the Seacoast Reliability Project. We've had public information sessions and our public hearings. We also did a site visit with the Committee in that docket, and currently the adjudicative hearings are scheduled for five days in May.

I think I skipped over the smallest project which was the Joint Application of Northern Pass and Public Service. That's number 3 on my list. Total Application fees that we received in that docket was \$626,000. We've got charges against it, 70,913 to date. Most of those were DOJ, DES, DOT, and the public members. And we have the adjudicative hearings currently scheduled in

that matter over a 29-day period starting in
April of this year.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, to be precise, it's 29 days over a much longer period than that.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: April, May, June and July.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Correct. So of the proceedings that have gone through a significant portion, if not all, of their adjudication, the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project, the Antrim Wind, the two ownership transfers, we're over sometimes and we're under sometimes.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And it's early days in terms of charges for a few of the others.

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Correct. I mean, I think probably next year will be a much more meaningful review. We'll have, hopefully, we'll get the agencies reporting in a more timely fashion and reporting all their hours, and we'll have a much better feel for whether or not the fees are in line with what was estimated and what's in the statute.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Do you feel like there's any reason to adjust the fees at this point based on what we have seen and what we have experienced?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

In my opinion, I ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: think it's too soon. Certainly, I mean we've got, as Commissioner Scott pointed out, the Antrim Wind is over. I mean, I don't know if it was because that project had a number of different proceedings. You know, I don't know if other wind projects would have the same number of days of hearings. Those were pretty long days. The Committee covered a lot of ground. So I guess it's at the pleasure of Committee, but certainly that's something that could be looked at.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Anyone have any questions for Ms. Monroe or any comments they want to offer on the situation as we see it today? Commissioner Scott?

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: So again, so the statute, 162-H:8-a tells us to meet once a year and review whether we should make adjustments to the fee schedule, correct?

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Correct.

also support waiting. I think there are a lot of projects still not finished. There are a lot of projects in the cue, and I think we'll learn a lot more. I don't see any reason that would drive me to want to change these at this point given where we are right now in the scheme of implementing this.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Other comments or questions? Ms. Weathersby?

MS. WEATHERSBY: If I could just ask a question so I understand the process. The fee is paid at the time of the Application, correct?

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Correct.

MS. WEATHERSBY: Is there any mechanism that if the charges to the fund for that Application are going over that more money is assessed or, conversely, if there's a big balance at the end, then that gets refunded?

PRESIDING OFFICER HONIGNBERG: The fee is the fee. You don't get a refund if the charges are lower, but you don't have to pay more if the charges are higher, and that was a very

significant issue for a lot of the people who were involved in the negotiation surrounding setting the fee schedule or agreeing to a fee schedule, that you'd know what it was.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And the one thing I think everyone accepts is that although there was work done in analysis of historical dockets at the SEC, I think there's a knowledge that every single one of these Application fees is going to be wrong. The question is whether they're radically wrong all the time in the same direction, and as long as they are generally circling around the right levels, we're probably in the right place. I mean, I think I agree with Commissioner Scott and Administrator Monroe, based on what we've seen, we're over sometimes and we're under sometimes, and the ones that are, the few that have gone far enough, I think it's too early to tell whether any changes are needed. Commissioner Bailey.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: I also agree.

22 think we don't have enough data yet, but out of 23 curiosity, Ms. Monroe, did you add up all of the 24 Application fees that were received and all of

the charges that were paid out so that we see in total what the difference is?

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: I did not. Did you do that, Eunice? No, I didn't. I could easily do it.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: If you're going to include Northern Pass and Seacoast Reliability where the money has just come in and almost nothing has gone out, I'm not sure what that's going to tell you.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: I don't think we have enough data so I support not making any changes as well.

Director Muzzey?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG:

DIRECTOR MUZZEY: Thank you. Although I am concerned it appears that the Antrim proceeding may go over, could you confirm, we don't currently have another wind farm in the docket?

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: No, we do not.

DIRECTOR MUZZEY: So I would agree with others here that waiting another year and getting a more complete look at how these numbers are going through time would be most useful.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: I could just want to add that there were 12 intervening groups in the Antrim Wind matter, and there was one in the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Although, I mean, I agree with the implication of what Director Muzzey said that Antrim Wind was not an enormous project either. I mean, it was essentially one town with nine turbines. It was below the jurisdictional threshold set in the statute, and that earlier proceeding was to determine whether the SEC should take jurisdiction over the project and so another wind project which crosses the borders, maybe goes into two counties, could add levels of complication and cost so it's certainly appropriate to watch out for that.

At the same time, maybe the Merrimack Valley Reliability Project which came in under, maybe there's a lesson that could be learned for the next Reliability Project or something like that. But sample sizes of one I don't think give us enough information to do anything about it.

1 All right. Is there action that needs to 2 be taken if we are not making a change? 3 procedurally like doing nothing is a possible answer here. 4 5 ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: I believe so. Τ 6 don't think it specifies. Just requires you to meet. Meet and review it. 7 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think the record 8 9 will reflect that we met and reviewed and took 10 no action to adjust the fees in light of the 11 experience that we've had to date. Is that fair 12 to say? 13 ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Yes. 14 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Is there 15 anything else we need to do with respect to 16 fees? I know Commissioner Scott needs to be 17 recognized to say something about the next 18 matter, but is there anything else we need to do 19 with respect to fees? 20 ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: No. I think you 21 covered all the ground that you need to. 22 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. 23 Commissioner Scott.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT:

Thank you. Regarding

1 the next matter, I just want to be on record. 2 As Commissioner with the Public Utilities Commission, I've recused myself from matters 3 with the Commission having to do with Northern 4 5 I am doing so for this Declaratory Ruling 6 also for the Site Evaluation Committee, and Staff Attorney Paul Dexter has been designated 7 in my place for that proceeding. 8 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: 9 To be clear, Attorney 10 Dexter works here at the PUC. So that's within 11 the agency. 12 Is there any other business we need to 13 transact with respect to that before we take our 14 break to eat and confer with counsel? 15 ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: No. 16 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. We will 17 look to reconvene in an hour at 12:30. 18 19 20 21 22 23 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

## CERTIFICATE

I, Cynthia Foster, Registered Professional Reporter and Licensed Court Reporter, duly authorized to practice Shorthand Court Reporting in the State of New Hampshire, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes of the hearing for use in the matter indicated on the title sheet, as to which a transcript was duly ordered;

I further certify that I am neither attorney nor counsel for, nor related to or employed by any of the parties to the action in which this transcript was produced, and further that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed in this case, nor am I financially interested in this action.

Dated at West Lebanon, New Hampshire, this 15th day of January, 2017.

Cynthia Foster, LCR

[Application and Filing Fees] {RSA 162-H:8-a, III }