## PROCEEDING

CMSR. HARRINGTON: We're here this morning on Docket DE 13-021, Electric Renewable Portfolio Standards. On January 18th, the Commission issued an order in this docket scheduling a prehearing conference for today for the purpose of hearing comments on whether it's appropriate for the Commission to adjust Class III renewable portfolio requirements.

The Commission has determined, in lieu of the prehearing conference, that we will hold a public hearing today for the purpose of receiving public comment regarding the appropriateness of the Commission to adjust Class III renewable portfolio requirements.

On January 31st, the Commission determined it is also necessary to address whether it is appropriate to accelerate or delay up to one year any given year's incremental increase in Class I renewable portfolio requirements pursuant to RSA 362-F:4, V, and to receive public comment on that issue.

We just wanted to make it clear that this, today's procedure, will be the hearing as required by statute for both of those. We're going to try to break this up into two separate subsets, if you will, just for the sake of continuity, to make it a little bit easier to
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follow. Because we're hoping that the -- addressing whether it was appropriate to delay up to one year any given year's incremental increase in Class 1 renewable portfolio standards will go a little faster, and we're going to start with that.

And, that basically evolves from SB 218, which providers of electricity would have to purchase 0.2 percent of the delivered electricity with useful thermal renewable energy certificates, or make a payment of $\$ 25$ per megawatt-hour in alternative compliance payments to the Renewable Energy Fund. The main reason for this is the Commission has determined that, due to technical challenges with thermal metering standards, the rulemaking required by the statute will not be completed in time to certify facilities to qualify for the production of useful thermal energy in 2013. As a result, providers of electricity will have to make alternative compliance payments to the Renewable Energy Fund to comply with the new requirement for 2013. The Commission is, therefore, expanding the public comment hearing scheduled for today as to whether it's reasonable to delay the implementation of the new useful thermal REC requirement for one year until 2014 to allow sufficient time to develop and implement rules.
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And, I guess, to start with, there were
a number of intervenors on this. I'm just going to go quickly through them. There was the New Hampshire Electric Co-op; Liberty Utilities; Robert Olson for various power companies; Public Service of New Hampshire; the Consumer Advocate; the Retail Energy Supply
Association. And, all intervenors will be granted.
And, this is also, as it is a public hearing, we will be taking statements from anybody in the public who would like to speak up as well. Just for the purpose, there's a couple of ground rules. We will be, obviously, taking verbal comments today on both subjects, but we will also be asking that, if anyone has written comments, that they provide those comments by a week from today, which would be the 21st of February.

And, just for how this will go, like I
said, we'll start with the issue of adjusting the Class I, i.e. the thermal requirement. And, we'll allow everybody that wants to speak a chance to speak, and then one chance to go around again, if someone wants to rebut or clarify what someone else has said. So, I'm not going to take appearances, because I think what we'll just do is allow people to identify themselves as it comes up. And, we're going to simply go around the room.
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since we're sticking with the Class I thing, we'll begin there. And, initially, we wanted to note a concern that PSNH has that, looking at 362-F:4, V, it reads: "For good cause, and after notice and a hearing, the Commission may accelerate or delay by up to one year, any given year's incremental increase in Class I or II renewable portfolio standard requirements under 362-F:3."

And, at least initially, it appears that
that, I'll call it, I guess, a "waiver" provision, though it's not really that, but just for ease, applies to Class I as a whole. And, since the thermal RECs are a subset of Class I, it appears that, to the extent the Commission would accelerate or delay under that provision, it would have to do so for the entirety of Class I, and not just for the thermal RECs, at least as we read the statute right now.

So, assuming that to be the case, then PSNH would not be in favor of delaying those, that REC requirement for a year, because it would affect the entirety of that class. There's a lot of things in that class, a lot of folks have made a lot of plans, including PSNH, based around what is in Class I. And, so, to that extent, we would not be in favor of that delay.

CMSR. SCOTT: Attorney Fossum, if indeed \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}

And, with that, Commissioner Scott, do you have anything you would like to add to start with? CMSR. SCOTT: No.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: So, why don't we start with the first gentleman here. Could you please identify yourself, and if you represent anybody. And, if you would like to speak, this is on, again, the issue of moving the Class I standards, i.e. the lack of rules to deal with the thermal renewable requirements. And, not speaking out does not mean you don't have a chance to speak on the other subjects, because we will do this twice.

MR. ORIO: Yes. Thank you. My name is
Martin Orio. And, I'm representing the New England Geothermal Professional Association. And, I'm just here more to listen, to see what the direction will be. Certainly interested as a stakeholder in the new thermal REC opportunity, and want to be sure that our interests are served. So, I'm here to listen. And, if I have a rebuttal, I'll certainly come back around.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Thank you.
MR. ORIO: Thank you.
MR. FOSSUM: Good morning. Matthew
Fossum, for Public Service Company of New Hampshire. And, \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
the interpretation, however, was that we were able to delay just that subset of Class $I$, is PSNH in favor of that, if that were the case?

MR. FOSSUM: It's my understanding that
PSNH doesn't have a strong -- if, in fact, the Commission can delay simply the thermal subset of Class I, PSNH doesn't have a strong feeling one way or the other about that. So, essentially, we have no position on the very limited issue of the Class I thermals.

CMSR. SCOTT: Thank you.
CMSR. HARRINGTON: Next who would like to comment on this?

MR. WARSHAW: John Warshaw, from Liberty
Utilities. And, Liberty Utilities is in favor of delaying the implementation of the thermal requirement for at least a year. And, on that subject, that's all I have.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Thank you. To the back of the room, I guess.

MR. NIEBLING: Thank you. Commissioner Harrington, Commissioner Scott, good morning. My name is Charles Niebling. I'm General Manager of New England Wood Pellet, Jaffrey, New Hampshire. We're a manufacturer of wood pellet fuels. Had a great deal to do over the years with the concept of addition of thermal to the RPS,
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starting with testimony back in 2006/2007 on the original
legislation. And, having worked six or seven years on it,
I'm certainly disappointed to see the proposal to delay the implementation of the administrative rulemaking to
effect the addition of thermal to the RPS Class I.
I'm respectful of the issues that
apparently have prompted the Commissioners to propose a delay, namely the technical issues around some of the unique complexities with metering thermal energy. I don't think they're -- I don't think it's rocket science. I think it can be overcome. I also think that, if the first effort at rulemaking to implement this provision isn't exactly perfect, rulemakings is a dynamic, ongoing process, the Commission can always revisit the rules at a point in the future.

I'm sensitive to the fact that there is concern, given the time necessary to do an appropriate job, that it may predispose the utilities to having to make ACP payments in year one. I certainly recognize, as I think everyone does, the sensitivity around that issue. I would remind the Commission that the thermal class was structured as a carve-out from the preexisting utility obligation in Class I set in the statute at a significantly lower ACP, and that was done intentionally, \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
stakeholder draft of rules on December 22nd. I think, had there been more of an effort on the part of the Staff, I think a lot more technical assistance would have been forthcoming. But, be that as it may, we're where we are.

And, I guess my main issue is that, if
you should decide to delay this, what happens to the two-tenths of one percent thermal allocation in 2013, which was explicitly identified and authorized in the statute, it's a reflection of legislative intent. If 362 -- if 362-F, IV -- I'm sorry, 4, V, gives you the authority to accelerate or delay, then I hope implicit in that authority is the ability to take that two cent --two-tenths and allocate it to the four-tenths, which is the allocation set forth in the statute for 2014. So, rather than dismiss it altogether and lose that, that modest -- modest allocation for 2013, I hope that it doesn't get lost and is added to 2014, or perhaps prorated over the first two years or something like that.

You know, the carve-out is a very small provision. It is, for all practical purposes, a pilot program. New Hampshire has shown significant leadership in its intention to incorporate a full thermal component on a parity basis with electricity in its RPS Program. And, for that, I commend the Legislature and the
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to enable the addition of thermal at a lower ratepayer cost. All else being equal, it would cost ratepayers less. It didn't add utility obligation to Class I, it simply took a small piece of the existing electric obligation and allocated it to thermal, at an ACP of \$25 a megawatt-hour versus 55, as was put in place with Senate Bill 218 for the electric component of Class I.

So, regardless of whether utilities pay
ACP in year one, it -- and I don't know what the market value of RECs are for electric currently in Class I or what they're anticipated to be, but it is intentionally at a significantly lower cost to the utilities, and ultimately to the ratepayers that foot the bill.

I think we're overall eager to move as expeditiously as we can. I hope that a delay of a year doesn't necessarily take a year, if that's the decision the Commission makes. I hope that the Staff will continue to move as efficiently as possible to develop the administrative rules. Certainly, there's a lot of interest and support and willingness to help.

And, I will just point out that that -that not a lot of assistance from the private sector was sought, beyond the stakeholder meeting in early August, and the issuance of the -- of the draft sort of
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## Commission.

I hope that -- I hope that you won't decide to delay this provision, but, if you do, I hope that you'll hold onto that two-tenths, and we won't lose that, that allocation, to the sands of time.

So, with that, thank you very much for the opportunity to offer these comments. If you have any questions, l'd be happy to answer them. Thank you.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Who's next please?
MR. STOCK: Good morning. For the record, my name is Jasen Stock. I'm with the New Hampshire Timberland Owners Association, and want to thank you for the opportunity to speak to this docket. For the sake of time, I'm not going to echo everything that Mr. Niebling had said, but I do concur with his thoughts and his comments, specifically regarding the concept of taking the two-tenths of a percent and rolling that -rolling that forward so that that capacity is not lost.

Again, as the organization that
represents the state's forest products industry and timberland owners, this -- we see this thermal -- the thermal carve-out is a fantastic opportunity to add diversity to the state's wood-using industries and renewable energy industry as well. And, again, I thank
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you for the opportunity to comment on this, and I'll be happy to try to answer any questions.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Commissioner Scott.
CMSR. SCOTT: Good morning, Mr. Stock.
I just wanted to make sure I understood your position.
So, is your position that we should not delay the percentage or we should delay?

MR. STOCK: Oh, yeah. My preference
would be not to. But, again, recognizing that, you know, that the technical hurdles that need to be overcome, we certainly can live with the delay, if that is, in fact, the case, take the two-tenths. But, obviously, we'd love to see the program up and running yesterday. But, again, given the situation that we're faced, we understand that the realities are what they are.

CMSR. SCOTT: Thank you.
CMSR. HARRINGTON: No comments? Okay.
And, the OCA's Office?
MR. ECKBERG: No comment. CMSR. HARRINGTON: Mr. Patch?
MR. PATCH: Doug Patch, from Orr \& Reno, on behalf of RESA. We appreciate the opportunity to submit written comments. And, therefore, don't have any oral comments we want to offer on either issue this \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
thermal RECs, into the rules.
Staff issued a preliminary draft of the rules on December 21st of 2012 and announced a second stakeholder meeting for January, and which was held on January 25th of 2013. So, there have been quite a great deal of outreach and integration of suggestions into the Staff's work product over the last several months.

After the stakeholder meeting, the Commission realized that the implementation of Class I thermal REC obligations should possibly be delayed for the following reasons: At the stakeholder meeting in January, many technical issues were raised concerning the preliminary draft rules. The Staff will need to hire a consultant to finalize the technical details of the rules, which are quite substantial. The rules will not be final until, at the earliest, October 2013. There is a concern that there might be a matter of administrative fairness, efficiency and transparency in implementing a REC requirement that does not have active final rules in place.

Without rules, thermal facilities cannot submit applications for RECs and become eligible for creating RECs, which has a chilling effect, as you might imagine, on the market. And, then, electricity providers \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
morning. Thank you.
CMSR. HARRINGTON: Thank you. Staff? MR. SPEIDEL: Good morning,

Commissioners. I'm Alexander Speidel. And, I'm here on behalf of the Staff of the Public Utilities Commission.

And, I have with me Liz Nixon and Jack Ruderman of the Sustainable Energy Division.

Staff believes that the requested delay
in the implementation of Class I thermal RECs is advisable for reasons of administrative effectiveness and fairness given the current circumstances. In general terms, the Staff has been actively involved in the development of these rules for quite some time and has reached out to stakeholder entities since at least last summer, the Summer of 2012. For instance, Liz Nixon began at the Commission in mid August as a new analyst in this area. And, on August the 3rd of 2012, the Commission held a stakeholder meeting and requested input on the present rulemaking.

For several months, Staff researched metering and verification of thermal RECs and received input from various entities. Staff drafted rule language related to the useful thermal energy provisions and also incorporated the other changes of SB 218, not related to
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would have to pay the ACP for 2013, since no RECs would be available in this subclass of Class I. The ACP impact is estimated to be about $\$ 550,000$ for 2013, which is substantial in a state of our size.

The Staff does not intend to stop the rulemaking process through the implementation of this administrative delay. Instead, it intends to be able to finalize and enhance the rulemaking process on an ongoing basis and protect utilities against unforeseen consequences of having no rules in place with a concurrent REC requirement.

Moreover, in response to the argument
raised by Mr. Fossum, on behalf of PSNH, Staff does not agree that there is necessarily a prohibition under the terms of the statute for the imposition of a stay in the incremental increase represented by thermal Class I. The language of the statute, and I believe the legislative intent of this statute, was to provide for a method by which the Commission could delay up to one year "any given year's incremental increase in Class I Renewable Portfolio Standards", meaning any subset of the incremental increase in the standards. In particular, this is a novel subset. It would be within the ambit of the legislative intent to have this suspended for a period of time to enable rules
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to be in place for the implementation of the program.
And, it does not necessarily imply that the entire class must be in abeyance for a given year, or that is for a
given year's scheduled increase, a subset of such an increase could be put in abeyance at the discretion of the Commission.

So, Staff thanks the Commission for its consideration and for the stakeholders for their appearance today. Thank you.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Commissioner Scott.
CMSR. SCOTT: Thank you, Attorney
Speidel. Do you have thoughts or does Staff have thoughts on the issue that Mr. Niebling raised, as far as, assuming that the delay in this subset were to happen, how do you catch up, if you will, for the following year?

MR. SPEIDEL: Commissioner, that's an
interesting question. It might require additional analysis to a certain extent. I think that's the safest course of action. I think, in discussion with the regulated utilities and affected entities, that would be advisable to develop a solution. I don't think the Staff's intent is to completely abandon the 2013 implementation. I think it's -- the rulemaking would allow for a smooth streamlining and implementation of \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
guess the easiest way, if someone has a comment on a comment, this is the -- is there anyone? Oh. Let's start over here then with --

MR. WARSHAW: John Warshaw, Liberty
Utilities. Liberty Utilities would not support
incrementally adding the 2013 thermal obligation to 2014
or 2015. Instead, we would see the -- use the intent that
was proposed, to have it as a slowly ramping up
obligation. And, if we increase it too much in the front-end, before we've had a chance for suppliers and developers to invest and find facilities and places where they can invest in these Class I resources, we could end up with, again, a shortage of RECs and possible, you know, ACP payments for no other reason than it just takes a while for facilities to get going.

So, we would not support the incremental increase of 2013 into 2014 and '15, but just keep the ramp rate as specified in the legislation, just everything slid out a year.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Okay. Thank you. A question? Commissioner Scott.

CMSR. SCOTT: Mr. Warshaw, could you help me a little bit then. So, I'm reading that statute where, again, it says "the Commission may accelerate or \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
this, of this increase, without disruption. But the question is "how to do it?" And, I think that would require additional technical analysis.

CMSR. SCOTT: Thank you.
CMSR. HARRINGTON: Just one other question. You know, there was, obviously, some, I guess, maybe slight disagreement on how much the Staff reached out to industry for technical support on this. But what is done in that case is done. My question has more to go with going forward. Do you see the possibility that a matter -- is a large amount of technical support from the industry over the next, say, month or two months, would that make -- would it be, at this point, still practical to get the rules out in time for the next year or would you still -- Staff thinks the delay will still be needed?

MR. SPEIDEL: I believe the Staff still
believes it's needed, because of the fact that we might have a good product developed through stakeholder and industry input at a fairly early stage, and also with the assistance of the consultant, of course. But the issue is, there are delays in JLCAR process that are just inherent, that it takes time for that to be finalized.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Okay. And, I said I'd give everybody another chance to go around. So, I
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delay for up to one year", wouldn't what you suggest be being more than delay, it sounds like it would be eliminating? And, I just want to make sure I follow the legal path where we'd be able to do what you suggest.

MR. WARSHAW: I'm not a lawyer. So, the only thing I can say is, if we're delaying the 2013 increase, I would see that it would be just delaying the entire increasing of the thermal until it reaches the max that is specified in the legislation.

CMSR. SCOTT: I appreciate that. And, if the utility is so inclined, perhaps some kind of a legal analysis showing us how we could do that would be helpful, if you're so inclined.

MR. WARSHAW: I could bring it back to my staff, to my organization.

CMSR. SCOTT: Thank you.
CMSR. HARRINGTON: Mr. Niebling.
MR. NIEBLING: Thank you, Commissioner. If I remember correctly, with the original House Bill 873, the Commission undertook what I believe was termed "emergency rulemaking", in order to produce rules to implement 362-F by the end of the -- prior to the effective date of the January 1, 2006 or '07. Bob, help me out?
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MR. OLSON: Seven.
MR. NIEBLING: 2007, when the law went
into effect and the obligation became effective. And,
subsequently, the PUC then pulled back, and they did a
much more thorough job, and they filled in some of the
holes. And, those rules, the final rules, Puc 2500, came out in the early fall/mid fall of 2007.

Is there not authority or a provision to
consider something similar for the addition of the thermal subclass? Can you issue call them "interim rules" or "emergency rules" under your existing 541-A authority? And, then, continue to work on the details around the edges and issue final amendments to Puc 2500 sometime later in 2013? I ask the question. I don't know the answer to that.

And, with respect to that two-tenths that may potentially be at risk here, should you decide to delay, it seems that there's fundamentally a legislative intent here to implement a thermal carve-out that ramps at two-tenths of a percent per year, up to 2.6 percent by 2025, which is when the statute -- the authority to have an RPS in New Hampshire goes away, at least under current statute.

To, by administrative directive, to
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artificially. So, there's a lot of work to be done. CMSR. HARRINGTON: Okay. MR. SPEIDEL: Thank you, Commissioners. CMSR. HARRINGTON: Thank you. Well, in
closing on this session, I guess there's just a couple of issues I'd like to comment on. There seems to be a few legal issues here. The one raised by Public Service, which is whether the delay has to be applied to the entirety of Class I or if it can be delayed -- applied only to a subsection of that. So, for those who chose to comment on that or requested they do so, it would be helpful to have different opinions on that.

The second one, which is also more of a legal issue, is where the carry-forward provision, l'll call it, which is people on both sides talk about whether that was required by the law that this would be delayed and carried forward, or it could simply not be implemented next year and then get picked up on the normal ramp-up schedule for the next year. Again, we'd appreciate people's comment on that.

And, kind of getting back to the meat of the argument or the meat of the problem here, which, to be quite honest with, I'm a little more comfortable with being an engineer than talking about all this legal stuff, \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
eliminate a portion of that mandate seems to me an abrogation of legislative intent. And, I think -- I don't think you can get rid of it. I'm not a lawyer. And, I'm probably not going to hire one to give you a legal opinion on this. But I was there every step of the way during the legislative process, and a lot of thought went into that carve-out. And, I would hope, respectfully, that the Commission not eliminate that small, little start-up provision, and find a way to embed it in subsequent years, so that the impact on the utilities is modest, so that we don't lose it altogether. And, I think that's consistent with legislative intent. Thank you.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Anybody else like to speak, as sort of rebuttal? Okay.

MR. SPEIDEL: Well, as far as emergency
rules go, the Staff believes that certain technical problems would still remain, in terms of crafting rules that made technical sense, and doing it in a hasty fashion wouldn't necessarily solve any problems.

The two-tenths, there is a potential for a solution that would integrate that in some way, and we don't know yet. It would require a lot of consensus. Obviously, there is disagreements on how to proceed. But the discussions must continue, they can't be cut off
but -- and that's the little word "can be metered", the word "metered" is what's causing the problem here, I think. People look at this, and we've had -- the Commissioners have had meetings with the Staff on this, and this can get very, very complicated very, very quickly, as to how much of a degree, how far do you want to go in that little word "can be metered", and to determine what's "useful thermal energy". There's a lot of different ways that can be looked at. And, you can, obviously, you can take some type of metering, and then use that to do a calculation to come with something else, how direct the metering has to be. There's a lot of options there.

So, whether we decide to delay the implementation of this or not, we're going to need the support of outside technical people on this. The Staff has limited engineering people. And, as you're aware, we were specifically prohibited by statute from hiring an engineer or anybody to help with this thing. So, any type of support, if somebody has a proposal that they put together, a written proposal that would work on these, we would certainly encourage people to send that in. Please be advised that one that may work for a thermal boiler may not necessarily work for a geothermal system. So, if you
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could be as generic as possible, or even look at what you consider the major things to be placed in here, I don't think, as Commissioner Scott has stated, the intent of the law was for someone to aggregate 500 wood-burning stoves in people's basements and then try to get thermal credits for that. So, --

> (Loud noise in the room.)

CMSR. HARRINGTON: I guess someone
didn't like that idea. But maybe that's possible as well.
So, if anything people can provide on a technical basis as to actually how to implement this would be truly helpful.

Commissioner Scott, did you have
anything else you wanted to add?
(No verbal response)
CMSR. HARRINGTON: Okay. So, now, we'll
move onto the second part, which was actually the first one noticed. Which, just so we make sure what we're talking about, this is the purpose for comment whether it's appropriate for the Commission to adjust the Class III renewable portfolio requirements. And, I've given the background on this. This is because, basically, we've had a very large increase in the alternative compliance payments, and we're trying to determine if it is advisable for the Commission to make an adjustment to those going \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}

2012 such that the requirements are equal to an amount between 85 percent and 95 percent of the reasonably expected potential annual output of available eligible sources after taking into account demand from similar programs in other states." Very straightforward and concise. The Legislature has really nailed it down for us again.

So, with that, I'Il start again with
people who might have comments.
MR. LABRECQUE: My name is Rick Labrecque, from PSNH. Just throw out that we -- PSNH has got a lot of experience in this market. We're here to help. We think this is a complicated issue that might require some types of technical sessions or something where interested parties can discuss the potential way to implement an adjustment, you know, maybe aside from the question of whether or not it's appropriate, just how would the mechanics be done.

I don't believe, at this time, PSNH has a position on the appropriateness of it. But, we, as a participant in the market, I will, you know, just throw out some facts as I see them. Is that it is difficult, if not impossible, to acquire these, either last year or this year. And, that kind of draws upon the statement
\{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
forward under --
CMSR. SCOTT: 362-F:4, Subsection VI. CMSR. HARRINGTON: As Commissioner Scott
just stated. So, we're going to basically do the same thing. We'll go around, give everybody a chance to comment, and then there will be a chance for rebuttal comment on that. Commissioner Scott.

CMSR. SCOTT: And, also, for any clarity
in our discussions, I'm sure you've all thought of this anyways, but that section of the statute is fairly explicit, as far as allowing the Commission to adjust to a certain percentage, but it's really we have to base that upon supply effectively in the region and demand effectively in the region. So, we would -- the Commission definitely needs some input and help on what are those things and how do we quantify those, should we go down this path. Thank you.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: And, maybe as a
starting point, we should read that part of the statute, just because it's not exactly straightforward. It says: "After notice and hearing," and, as we stated, this the hearing today, "the Commission may modify the Class III and Class IV renewable portfolio standard requirements under RSA 362-F:3 for calendar years beginning January 1,

$$
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regarding the demand from similar programs in other states. There -- I believe all of the eligible Class III resources that have gone through the eligibility, you know, application and approval here at the PUC, are also eligible in Connecticut and/or Massachusetts. And, those markets right now are higher valued than the New Hampshire Class III ACP. So, there's -- obviously, the sellers are selling into Connecticut, for example. So, it does leave, essentially, no RECs available for New Hampshire load-serving entities to meet their obligation. So, last year, as you know, it resulted in a large payment across the board by all the load servers into the Renewable Energy Fund through the ACP mechanism. We anticipate that to happen again, so that that fund could potentially, you know, double by this July. And, whether or not if you call that a "disfunctional market" or a "market where there's no supply", you know, you could label it as that. Whether that is appropriate to make an adjustment for the demand, because these extreme ACP payments are not appropriate. That's -- I don't think that's something I want to pass a judgment on. But I would say, what is done with the money that's placed into the Renewable Energy Fund is certainly an important factor in coming to a judgment on whether or not it's reasonable
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to continue with large, you know, perhaps $\$ 10$ million a year ACP payments. If the Renewable Energy Fund were being used in a manner consistent with the ideals of the RPS Program, that's one thing. If the money were somehow to be siphoned off for something completely unrelated to the RPS Program, that would, you know, that would probably be something that PSNH would not be in favor of, as, you know, just a impact on rates that is being used for let's just say a non-electrical or a non-renewable type of application.

So, I think that's about all I wanted to
say. But I would suggest that any methodology would require some technical sessions to discuss.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Did you have a question, Commissioner Scott? Just one question. You had mentioned that you thought that the Class III RECs supply in New Hampshire would be eligible in Connecticut or has been eligible in Connecticut and Massachusetts. And, I sort of got the implication that you thought that would be the case going forward.

But, with the new laws in Massachusetts for this year, I believe there has to be, I'm not actually sure what the word means, but that they use the term "sustainable" forestry has to be associated with the \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}

Utilities. We appreciate being able to comment here. As you know, load-serving entities in New Hampshire were unable to purchase sufficient Class III RECs to satisfy their requirements for 2011, and we expect that that will be the case for 2012, and possibly going forward. And, why is that? Well, of the 19 REC -- 19 units that have been approved as Class III RECs in New Hampshire, all of them are able to also -- were also approved as Class I RECs in Connecticut, ten are Mass. Class I RECs, and four are Rhode Island new renewable resources. And, those markets all played in -- you know, sell RECs in the mid 50s to mid 60s price range, mixed with the cap in New Hampshire of \$31 or so in 2012 and $\$ 31.50$ in 2013, it just goes -- just ends up having the owners of those resources making rational decisions and selling their RECs in the markets where they can make the most money that they can. And, I can't fault the owners of those resources for doing that. The trouble is, you end up in New Hampshire with significant ACP payments to the state, because those resources -- those RECs are not available to satisfy New Hampshire's requirements.

Some of the recommendations that we have, which would probably need more study, might be to harmonize New Hampshire's definition of "new" versus "old" \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
burning of that. And, I heard from numerous people that some of ours may be able to qualify, some may not, that applies to not only generating facilities in New Hampshire, but in the other New England states. So, are you saying that you believe all of them will continue to qualify in Massachusetts as we go forward?

MR. LABRECQUE: Well, landfill gas has a
big role to play here as well. And, I don't follow Massachusetts that closely. I don't know if there's any changes in the eligibility regarding an existing older vintage landfill gas. But --

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Excuse me. It just applies to the biomass plants.

MR. LABRECQUE: Okay. All right. So, most of the units, really, in this class are landfill gas, at least as of the last time I downloaded the list of facilities from the PUC website. And, most of them that are qualified in Mass. are also qualified in Connecticut. So, even if some subset were to lose eligibility for Massachusetts, they then have Connecticut as their backup, before New Hampshire as their next backup.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Okay. All right.
Thank you. Okay. Just going again around.
MR. WARSHAW: John Warshaw, Liberty
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resources, to roll it back from 2006 to 1997, and that would then make New Hampshire's RECs very similar to the other markets. The other recommendation might be rolling the Class III requirement down a couple of percentage points, until the market is able to catch up with the demand.

What we do not support, and I know I have heard some folks have suggested this, is raising the ACP payment for Class III RECs to a higher level than it is now. The only thing that that would do would be to increase the cost to our customers. And, at this time, we don't recommend increasing any costs to customers.

And, that's the end of what I have to
say.
CMSR. HARRINGTON: Commissioner Scott. CMSR. SCOTT: Thank you for your comments. I do want to remind you what venue you are in. So, many of the things you're talking about, you'd need to be at the Legislature, not at the Commission.

Having said that, what is before for topic here is should we adjust the percentage, and, if so, there's probably an easier said than done formula here in the statute, which is we need to base it on what the demand is and what the supply is in the region. So, would
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you be able to have -- do you have thoughts on that, how we would actually do that? How would we implement that change? It sounds like, if I'm correct, that you're supportive of a change, correct?

MR. WARSHAW: Yes. I am supportive of a change. Exactly how that would happen or what information we would need to make that decision, I have not gone much further than saying "yes, it needs further analysis."
And, like PSNH, I think that would require some working together with other folks to investigate that and to come up with a program that would be supportive and documentative.

CMSR. SCOTT: Thank you.
CMSR. HARRINGTON: And, just one
follow-up question, I just want to make sure I heard. You said that the RECs in other states were trading in the 50 to -- I didn't get the rest of it, 50 to 55 , I wasn't sure --

MR. WARSHAW: Yes. Connecticut Class 1 RECs are trading in the mid $\$ 50$ range; the Mass. Class 1 RECs are trading in the mid $\$ 60$ range; and the New Hampshire -- and the Rhode Island new RECs are trading in the mid 60s range.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: And, the issue here \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}

However, no matter how many bushes I
beat, and how many brokers I call, how many resources I call, there simply are not Class IIIs available. So, just in the pure language of this piece of the RSA that you read, if we're talking about " 85 to 95 percent of available", and "available" is the word I key into there, I think the number of "available" is zero, and 85 to 95 percent of zero is still zero. It's unfortunate, but it's the nature of a regional market with various definitions.

Also, I echo what Mr. Warshaw says, that we should not just simply increase the ACP in New Hampshire in order to try and make it line up with the Class Is in Connecticut and Rhode Island, as that will just increase costs to ratepayers. That paying the ACP already is producing that result of increasing costs to ratepayers, versus being able to buy RECs for something less than the ACP. I would hope we don't exacerbate that problem.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Thank you. Anybody else on this left side? Okay. So, back to --

MR. OLSON: Commissioner, both Mr. Stock and I have some comments. But Mr. Veilleux has a need to depart shortly. So, if he could go first, and then we'll pick up afterwards.
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is that the Class III RECs in New Hampshire all qualify for those Class I in the other states?

MR. WARSHAW: Correct. But the maximum that they would basically be sold to load-serving entities would be the ACP price, which is only 31.39 in 2012.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: So, as long as that disparity exists, what you're saying, to make sure I got this straight, that any company thinking correctly or at least economically is going to say "I will pay an ACP of 31 whatever, rather than buy a REC for 50 something"?

MR. WARSHAW: Right.
CMSR. HARRINGTON: Okay. Thank you.

## Miss? Ma'am?

MS. MANYPENNY: I'm Heather Manypenny, from New Hampshire Electric Cooperative.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: I'm sorry, from what one?

MS. MANYPENNY: New Hampshire Electric

## Cooperative.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Oh, I'm sorry. MS. MANYPENNY: We actually did not pay
the ACP in $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ for Class IIIs, basically because we had a contract that predated the REC price in Connecticut for Class 1 .
\{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}

Veilleux.
CMSR. HARRINGTON: Certainly. Mr.

MR. VEILLEUX: Thank you. Thank you.
For the record, my name is Henry Veilleux, V-e-i-I-I-e-u-x. And, I'm with the Sheehan Phinney Capitol Group, in Concord, and here this morning on behalf of Waste Management and Wheelabrator. And, we fully recognize why the Commission has opened this docket with the ACP payments going up substantially.

We would suggest, however, that the Commission postpone any action on this issue, or at least delay it. There is Senate Bill 148 that has been introduced in the New Hampshire Legislature, and will be coming up for a hearing sometime soon, but it is going to address this issue. The allocation of requirements for Class III are part of this legislation. And, additionally Senator Pierce is going to be presenting an amendment to look at adding waste-to-energy facilities to Class IIIs, that would be the incinerators, to Class III. It would be a 6-megawatt cap. And, then, additionally, there will be a look at the methane requirements and possibly putting a cap on that.

So, there's going to be activity in the Legislature on this issue coming up very soon. And, we
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would respectfully suggest that maybe the Commission Staff participate as stakeholders over at the Legislature, which a number of other stakeholders will be participating in the discussion on that legislation. There are a number of Senate co-sponsors and House co-sponsors.

So, we would just suggest that, we fully recognize why the Commission opened this docket, obviously, but acting soon on this issue may be premature, if, in fact, the Legislature, in June, enacts a statute that may not be consistent with what the Commission may do in this docket. So, we would just raise, you know, that concern.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Thank you.
Mr. Olson. Oh, I'm sorry. Do you have a question Commissioner Scott?

CMSR. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Veilleux.
So, I'm just trying to get my head around timing. That, presuming that the Legislature were to act in a fashion that's consistent with what we're talking about, which is, obviously, an assumption, that would -- I'm just trying to think through the timing for regulated entities. And, so, we're talking a calendar year for compliance obligations. So, if we were to, if I understood you right, basically to hold them in abeyance or just basically wait for the
\{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
that would take to iron out? And, the concern, I don't want to set regulated utilities, you know, load-serving entities up with something they can't do, obviously. So, I want to be fair with them. So, I was just curious how long you thought that process may take to iron that out?

MR. VEILLEUX: I'd defer to Mr. Olson, I
think he could probably answer that a little better.
CMSR. SCOTT: Okay. Then, I'll wait and
-- I'll be anticipating that response. So, thank you.
CMSR. HARRINGTON: Let's go right to
Mr. Olson then.
MR. OLSON: Thank you, Commissioners. I understand there will be an opportunity for written comments, so I'm not going to get as involved in my comments this morning, and will submit some written comments for some of the more detailed parts of the things I might say. So, I appreciate that opportunity.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Excuse me.
CMSR. SCOTT: Mr. Olson, just to
interrupt. So, just who are you representing?
MR. OLSON: Oh. I'm sorry. I filed an intervention petition, and I represent the six independent wood-fired power plants. And, that would be the Whitefield Power \& Light Company; Springfield --
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Legislature to see what happens, and then we take this issue up? Is that your thought?

MR. VEILLEUX: Yes. And, one of the
pieces in the legislation, I believe, takes a look at the 2012 payments that would be made into the fund, and I think it suggests rebating that to customers. So, I understand your concern, that waiting may, you know, allow the market to do something in 2012, we won't be able to have any impact on it, but the legislation does address that issue. So, again, I don't think there's a need for the Commission to act right away on this issue, because the Legislature I think is going to have a -- could potentially, you know, have a say on that. Obviously, it would have to be, if it's going to be enacted, it would have to be enacted sometime late May/early June. So, we may have a sense by then, when, you know, when the Legislature would have a say on this.

CMSR. SCOTT: Okay. Thank you. And, again, this question may be best for perhaps the person sitting next to you or somebody else here. But, obviously, it's already been intoned that trying to figure out this " 85 to 95 percent", based on demand and supply, is probably not as easy as may have occurred to the Legislature when they wrote this. How long do you think
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bills pertaining to RPS, and certainly other legislation, work with the stakeholder group in a collaborative fashion, much like you might end up having done here in
the docket anyway, but do it in the legislative process,
because that bill is looking at some of the purchase
percentage years and making downward adjustments in them.
And, so, I think that there's a way to get to I think where the Commission would like to go, recognizing its duty under RSA 362-F:4, VI, and what's happening in Senate Bill 148. So, I think we could work collaboratively on that. So, that's one point.

The second point is, that when you look
at Senate Bill 148, it's proposing adjustments in the years 2013 and 2014 only. And, I want to explain why those are the years. Mr. Veilleux is correct, in 2012, it considers 2012 to be a year where the transactions are closed. That is, the sales and the ACP payments will have been made by the time the Legislature concludes its activity. And, so, it looks at the year 2012 and says, "well, to the extent that monies have been paid into that fund above a certain number, we ought to find a way to rebate them to ratepayers, because we recognize that we could have not act in a timely fashion to adjust a 2012 percentage." So, it corrects it by setting up a mechanism
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"Class III" category. So, only two of them are presently qualified by the Commission as "Class III". There was a third, but it had difficulty with the particulate matter standard, and it's presently making a capital investment to correct that.

But, at least right now, of the 122, 40
are biomass. So, the real issue for scarcity in Class III right now is "where does all this methane go? Because people have qualifying methane generators, but, obviously, they go to other jurisdictions. And, that's where, you know, the issue of the other jurisdictions become significant. And, that's the disparity that I think the prior speakers referenced in the alternative compliance price.

And, here's where I want to clarify something I think Mr. Warshaw said. He referred to "RECs trading in $\$ 50, \$ 55$, and $\$ 60$ ranges." I want to clarify that there's a difference between where RECs trade and what ACP prices are. ACP prices are the ceiling price, obviously, that the provider of electricity under the statute pays, if it has come up short in the number of RECs it buys. When it buys RECs, it never pays the ACP price, because it would just pay into the fund at that level. So, it becomes a ceiling price, and REC prices are \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
to return monies, which is, in effect, a way of correcting the percentage after the fact. So, it corrects the percentages or it adjusts them, rather, in 2013 and 2014. And, the Legislature's proposed -- the proposal before the Legislature is to reduce them from six and a half percent in 2013, to five and a half percent in 2013, and from 7 percent in 2014, to five and a half percent in 2014. So, they make a downward adjustment. And, so, -- and, I can elaborate on that in a moment, and certainly in my written comments.

The third main point is, and I think both of the utilities speaking before me made this point, that is the bulk of the resource right now, when you look at the report of eligible facilities that the Commission maintains on its website, and the most recent one I believe is the October 8th, 2012 report. I know there have been some additions since then. But it lists about 122 megawatts of Class III facilities. Of that 122, I think roughly 40 megawatts are what are known as "Class III biomass", that is my clients. Because Class III is limited to biomass, it's -- I think it's 25 megawatts or less. So, it's a discrete set that you can identify looking around New England. And, of the six facilities I represent, you'll see that two much of them are in that
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below that.
So, when you look around the programs right now, Massachusetts, and I don't remember the exact number, but its ACP is probably in the neighborhood of $\$ 62$ for Class I. Okay? And, in Massachusetts, "Class I" means "new facilities". So, none of the existing New Hampshire biomass facilities, to my knowledge, are Class I. One might have tried, one may be in their as incremental. But the bulk of them I don't believe qualify in Class I. And, even the one that's in there as incremental, under these new Massachusetts rules, which I want to make reference to in a moment, would not remain there, even if it is there.

Massachusetts did, a few years ago, implement a Class II program. It would allow what I call "existing biomass" to qualify. But it set its ACP at a level so low, and set its purchase percentage at a level so low, and set its environmental emission standards equal to those that are required of new facilities, that the result is they got zero subscription into that program. So, it's a class that exists, but never got any subscription, and, basically, from a business standpoint, it really doesn't exist. And, in fact, Massachusetts has now suspended participation or suspended issuing what it \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
calls "statement of qualifications" into that class.

> So, really, for the purposes of Class

III New Hampshire, the Class III facilities don't really fit into New Hampshire, the Massachusetts Class I, if they are biomass. If they are methane, they can move into Class I, I assume.

With respect to Connecticut, the Connecticut Class I program only has an emission standard for oxides and nitrogen. And, it has the same standard that New Hampshire has, 0.075 pounds per MMBtu. The result is that, if you are a New Hampshire Class III eligible biomass facility, you would be meeting that NOx standard. And, you would also be capable of meeting the Connecticut standard. The New Hampshire Class III also has a particulate matter standard, but Connecticut Class I does not. So, the result is, all biomass facilities in New Hampshire qualify in Connecticut Class I. Not all New Hampshire biomass facilities are qualified in New Hampshire Class III, that's where you get the 40 megawatts out of 122 megawatts.

The New Hampshire ACP is in the $\$ 31$ range; the Connecticut Class I ACP is set by statute at \$55. And, obviously, RECs in Connecticut trade below that. So, they don't trade at 55, but the market is made \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
even further below the numbers in 148 is a valid discussion, because we don't know where that methane, which comprises the bulk of that, will go in '13 and '14. What we come to when we come to 2015 , we come to a lot of uncertainty in the market. And, this is where I made earlier mention of "Massachusetts Class I". And, I think, Commissioner Harrington, you made reference to some rule changes. And, what's happening in Massachusetts Class I is their regulatory agency, the Department of Energy Resources, or the DOER, has promulgated final rules last year that impose, for biomass facilities, a fuel-harvesting standard and a boiler efficiency standard. And, the main biomass facility, in Class I Massachusetts, is Schiller Station, at some 50 megawatts of nameplate capacity for biomass. Whether that facility can remain there, in 2015 and 2016, you know, that's something we could look to PSNH to answer. I can speculate that, in 2015, it will have to deal with fuel-harvesting standards, and that may affect some level of its REC sales into Mass., but PSNH would know that much better than I .

I know that, in 2016, there's a boiler efficiency standard that kicks in that, at least from my, and I stress this greatly, given my audience, my
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below that, depending upon supply and demand. So, that's the situation where, as the prior speakers have said, if you are making a business determination, you will go to the place where your REC has the highest value. And, right now, for a biomass, an existing biomass plant, that would be the Connecticut market.

So, why do I say "adjust 2013 and 2014"?
That's because those are the years that we can see, putting the word "see" in quotes, we can "see" that, in 2012, as the prior speakers indicated, there's not an expectation that they can procure RECs; Senate Bill 148 addresses that.

We also know that, from the biomass standpoint, that it is unlikely they will sell into the New Hampshire market in Class III, given that, one, there's only 40 megawatts of them. And, secondly, that the ACP differential in 2013 and 2014 remains. And, so, the business expectation is you would sell into that Connecticut market. So, with that expectation, we support the downward adjustment that you see in Senate Bill 148. We don't suggest adjusting years beyond 2013 and 2014, because there are a lot of unknowns in the marketplace. And, whether the 2013 and 2014 numbers could be adjusted \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
non-engineering background suggests that they can't meet that boiler efficiency standard in 2016, and therefore would be out of that program, and their markets would be Rhode Island, which is a small market, or Connecticut Class I, or New Hampshire Class I, because that's where they would fit statutorily.

So, there's a lot of other events occurring in 2015 that can affect supply and demand in the common markets between Class I in Mass. and Class I in Connecticut and Class I in New Hampshire, and, ultimately, that can affect the supply and demand into Class III in New Hampshire, because, if you're in Class I in Connecticut, you may move into Class III New Hampshire. But none of those pieces have sort of landed on the chessboard at this point. And, so, it's hard to see how a rational adjustment could be made in 2015, at least from my vantage point.
'13 and '14, you know, my view is, we do not see through a glass darkly, we have a much clearer picture of what we could expect in ' 13 and ' 14 , and, hence, adjustments can be made there.

And, again, I can, you know, put this down in a written comment, but let me stop there.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Commissioner Scott.
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CMSR. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Olson. So, starting with the original comment that you agreed with
starting with the original comment that you agreed with
Mr. Veilleux that we should hold this in abeyance, if I can paraphrase, while the Legislature acts. Let me ask the converse of that. What would be the harm, if we continued this process and adjusted, clearly, we'd be adjusting based on what current law is, not what, you know, at the time we issued an order. What would be the harm in that?

MR. OLSON: I don't think of it so much in terms of "harm", as in terms of comity with the legislative process. You're making adjustments in '13 and '14, presumably, that the Legislature is also making. So, you're expending your resources, and the Legislature is expending their resources. And, it would seem to me you don't want to end up with different results. And, so, I'm just looking for a way to bring the processes together, so that the result is a uniform one. And, it seemed to me that, if your Staff participated in what we euphemistically refer to as "stakeholder processes" over at the legislative process, we could have that collaborative discussion and work out a set of numbers. So, the Commission itself would not be uninvolved, it would be very much involved in the process. We'd just be \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
facilities will turn and say "I have a REC that can be sold to Connecticut, and I will sell it directly into the Connecticut market." And, it's turned in and stamped "done" in Connecticut, and, so, that REC is no longer tradeable. Other RECs are sold to brokers or other RECs are sold to buyers who operate in many jurisdictions, and will later decide, at the time of compliance, where they're going to use that REC. So, if you have a competitive seller who operates in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut, and they buy a REC from a Class III New Hampshire facility, but they also have a compliance obligation in Connecticut, well, they bought a Class III REC, but they may use it in Connecticut. Or, if it was a Class I Connecticut REC that they bought, they may use it in Massachusetts and use the Class III to cover Connecticut. So, it's very difficult to figure out where it all goes, because there's no -- there's no central clearing house where one can see that.

So, I think there are, you know, there are questions of, you know, how do you figure out what's going on in other states? How do you look at the bulk of the methane facilities, who apparently, I didn't hear anyone identify themselves, but I don't hear anyone here today from any one of the methane generators, and they \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
using Senate Bill 148 as the vehicle.
If 148 somehow stumbled and failed, you would still have all of that work that you could then come back, pick up your docket and use it. So, I am not suggesting the work stops, so much as we look at -- we change the vehicle by which we achieve the result.

CMSR. SCOTT: All right. Thank you for that. And, let's say for a moment we didn't wait for the Legislature and we were to press on with the current docket. Do you have thoughts on how we would arrive at 85 to 95 percent of available demand, take into account -the supply, rather, take into account the demand in the region?

MR. OLSON: That's something that would require a lot of thought, which I have not given it. I do want to say to you that my view is, that's very difficult statutory language. Because, as the representative from the Co-op pointed out, you could conclude that it means "zero", because, if you focus on the word "available", you know, that's the Co-op's position, apparently.

How one looks at the demand in other states, and figures out where RECs are going and where they will go over time, is not as easy as it sounds. Because, when you look at how RECs are sold, some
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comprise the bulk of the eligible facilities in Class III.
So, you know, if you're a New York methane generator, and you're qualified in this state, you know, part of the difficulty under the statute is, well, even if you had a long-term contract in New York, and you sold your methane RECs to that buyer, if that buyer looks out and says "well, gee, that REC also helps me in Connecticut." And, they use it in Connecticut, it's not going to come to New Hampshire.
So, it's a long way of saying "it's a complicated subject, and I don't know the answer to that." And, the statute gives you a very narrow window, putting aside its ambiguities, of saying "you've got to be in an 85 to 95 percent range", and putting aside the argument that it means zero if something is not available, it still leaves you in a position where you're setting the supply and demand such that demand is below supply. And, you know, if a \$31 ACP is allowing RECs to flow to Connecticut, and, by adjusting the purchase percentage, you can only set it so that it creates downward pressure on the Class III RECs, it seems that you end up pushing more RECs into Connecticut the further out in time you go. So, it's not a simple process, and I don't -- I'm not a fan of that provision in the statute. Because I don't
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think -- I don't think it gives you something that's very workable, as opposed to just saying "well, go out and figure out what the market looks like and adjust RECs so that you have a workable market, given the REC supply."

It doesn't tell you to produce a workable market necessarily.

CMSR. SCOTT: Well, on that front, the statute does seem to give us a little bit of a wiggle room, in that the 85 to 95 percent, they use the word of what would be the "reasonably expected potential". So that, to me, gives some leeway.

MR. OLSON: Sure.
CMSR. SCOTT: So, given that, and all the complexities, I understand it's not a simple solution here, but would not a solution be to have a ledger sheet, where we know all the eligible generators, and where they could potentially sell to, based on the different statutes for the RPSs in the different states on one side, and then we know the compliance obligations for generators -excuse me "generators", compliance entities in the states, and to take those two, and that's our delta, and then we take 85 to 95 percent of that. I understand we don't know where they're going to be sold to, but, to me, the word "reasonable" gives us, as long as we make reasonable \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
suggesting we look at ' 13 and ' 14 , but not beyond, correct?

MR. OLSON: Correct.
CMSR. SCOTT: Thank you.
CMSR. HARRINGTON: And, Mr. Olson, I
just have a very limited amount of questions. One thing I was trying to follow, you basically talked a lot about the vagaries of the market, once you get beyond 2014. And, you know, looking at that, I think we can look at the biomass side and have a pretty good idea of what the production is of an existing plant, and with known capacity factors. So, is it the methane production that becomes sort of fuzzy at that time? I'm not familiar with that technology. Since these -- so, that's a "yes" you're saying. You have to speak up, so Steve can write that down.

MR. OLSON: Okay. I think, from my vantage point, the methane production, in terms of where it goes, is fuzzy right now, and it doesn't get clarified for me out in 2015. And, the reason is, I don't really follow that type of generation. It's baseload generation, like any other natural gas type generation. So, I think of it as, you know, in the neighborhood of a 90 percent plant factor. But how much of it is out there at any time \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
assumptions, that works. Is that your correct -- is that your vision of that?

MR. OLSON: I'd have to think about the methodology you just laid out. But I agree with you that, you know, "reasonable" gives you the ability to make, you know, a range of assumptions that fall within the ambit of "reasonable". But, the methodology, I would have to think about it. I think a lot of it gets -- it becomes less significant, to my particular client group, if I -- say we're looking at the years 2013 and 2014, because there I have a good handle on, I think, what the business signals are, and, so, I know what will happen in those years. So, the adjustments in those years become less troubling.

When we get to a year like 2015, because there are so many variables in the marketplace, you know, it becomes much more problematic for me, if we were to implement the statute.

So, my recommendation is, if we focus on
'13 and '14, I'm okay with that in developing a process, subject to my earlier comment about working on Senate Bill 148 to achieve that result.

CMSR. SCOTT: Okay. Thank you. And, just to clarify. So, rather than just, if we were to go down this path, rather than to just look at '13, you're
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and how much of it would come into a particular market, I don't have a good view of. With --

CMSR. HARRINGTON: So -- excuse me, go
ahead.
MR. OLSON: With respect to my statement
about biomass, I think there's a lot of potential changes in the marketplace in the 2015 and beyond period. That, you know, the closer we get, maybe get clarified, I mentioned one, which is Schiller biomass. And, we know, we can look historically at Schiller and say, well, here's how many RECs it produces, whether it's 380,000, 400,000, we can get a handle on the amount of REC production. What we don't know, what I don't know is, where are the potential markets that it falls into? You know, another complicating factor is the wood facility in Berlin will certainly be operating by that time. And, my recollection, and this is a recollection, is that it has something like 400,000 RECs annually under its long-term contract that come into Class I. But I think it has, at least at one time I think it had at least another 100,000 RECs that it could produce. And, whether those go to Class I New Hampshire or Class I Connecticut is unclear. I assume they don't go to Class I Mass. for the same reason in 2016 Schiller wouldn't go to \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}

Class I Mass. And, then, we don't know what other biomass facilities in the region, you know, may come into the market. We do know that, you know, the facility in Vermont has been asked by its Board to present a proposal to put on pollution control equipment. So, there are a lot of variables beyond just saying "well, here's a biomass plant, and I know its capacity and I know its plant factor, and so I know how many RECs are there."

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Okay. So, basically, just looking out three years, it's just to far to make an accurate prediction basically?

MR. OLSON: That is my view, yes, Commissioner.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: All right. Thank
you. Just so we kind of keep with the pattern of going around, the gentleman that came in in the back, I'm not sure what your name is, did you want to speak on this issue?

MR. SALTSMAN: I do not. Mark Saltsman, with Concord Steam.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Okay. Mr. Patch.
MR. PATCH: I know I said I didn't want to provide any oral comments today, but just a couple of pieces of information I think might be useful to the \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
that the amount being put into the fund exceeds 6 million, that the Commission shall take such action as is necessary, excuse me, to refund that amount to the electricity providers on behalf of customers. And, again, obviously, that could change as it goes through the process.

But I just think it's important to note
some of those things for the record. Thank you.
CMSR. HARRINGTON: Thank you. Who would
be next, the OCA's Office?
MR. ECKBERG: Thank you, Commissioner.
The OCA has no specific comments to add to this very technical discussion. We are not experts in the economies or the marketplace for these RECs. We do appreciate everyone coming today who are experts in that market and trying to offer some comments. We would be glad to participate in any additional technical sessions that are held to discuss these matters. Clearly, our interest is the overarching impact on ratepayers, the costs to energy supply here in New Hampshire. Thank you very much.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: And, Staff.
MR. SPEIDEL: Thank you, Commissioners.
Staff has no comment at the present time. But we have very carefully listened to all of the comments made today, \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}

Commissioners and the parties involved.
In terms of Senate Bill 148, and I'm not taking a position on whether the Commission ought to suspend its consideration pending that, but I just noticed last night that a hearing has been scheduled next Wednesday, at 9:30 in the morning, you know, before the Senate Energy Committee on that bill. And, I think it's important to note, since l've heard a couple of comments this morning, at least from the load-serving entities, that they would not be in favor of an increase in the alternative compliance payment sort of floor, that Section 2 of that bill, beginning in 2015, would actually raise the Class III from 31.50 to $\$ 45$, and then it would be adjusted in 2016. And, so, I just think that's information that might be useful to the Commission and the parties.

That also contains -- Mr. Olson referred to a provision that would allow for essentially returning to ratepayers excess amounts that are collected into the fund. And, at least as currently written in the bill, and, obviously, it's subject to amendment as it goes through the process or it might never get through the process, it contains in Section 3 a provision that only applies to 2012, and basically says that, to the extent
\{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
and look forward to reviewing them in writing as they might come in or as they are presented in the transcript. Thank you.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Thank you. Okay. Once more we'll go around, and the gentleman from Public Service.

MR. LABRECQUE: Thank you. Yes. On the question of whether or not this process should be delayed in favor of Senate Bill 148 process, in my opinion, this is the forum where a lot -- it will be a lot easier to gather the right experts, the right information, to put together an informed review of this particular issue. That Senate Bill 148 has a lot of stuff in it. And, I just heard today that there's going to be an amendment regarding waste-to-energy, and may be adjusting the methane requirements. There's no way the Legislature, at a hearing on this bill, is going to be able to do justice to any one of the issues that are in that bill. I have much more confidence in the process that would take place in this room amongst the stakeholders.

Along the same lines, as I look at the language regarding the " 85 to 95 percent adjustment", it occurs to me, I wasn't part of the process where that language is developed, but this is -- Class III and Class
\{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}

IV relate to existing renewable assets. You know, Class I and Class II, different animal, you're setting criteria for new percentages that the Legislature deemed, you know, appropriate going forward for new development. I'm assuming, not being there, and there are people here in this room who were there, I'm sure, that there was some uncertainty as to what would shake out in Class III, for example. And, perhaps it was unknown how many of the six biomass units in New Hampshire would ultimately qualify. And, as it turned out, only two of them have. I'm sure it was also uncertain what would happen with methane, including now where a lot of methane units in New York State are qualified, and so there was a lot of uncertainty. And, given that, you might think that this language that's in the current statutes was designed to handle either an under supply or an over supply in the future. And, it was put in there presumably to allow the PUC to gather, and I read it to say you could make this adjustment annually, you could react to what's going on at the time, and have a process here by which the requirement is adjusted in response to all these market factors.

And, as we talked about over the last 30 or 40 minutes, it's very complicated. There's a lot going on. It changes constantly. There is no way Senate Bill \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
as opposed to having duplicative processes that, at the end of the day, may have different responses or have different outcomes, I should say, and then force another revisit by the PUC at a later date, to come back and yet again adjust the RPS percentages.

So, again, l'Il conclude my comments,
and would just say, like Mr. Olson and Mr. Veilleux,
Senate Bill 148 is the venue that we believe this discussion should occur.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Commissioner Scott. CMSR. SCOTT: Thank you. Thank you,
Mr. Stock. I was curious your reaction, like what I think I heard Mr. Labrecque saying, and hopefully he'll correct me if I'm wrong, is that perhaps this language should be used in a more dynamic basis, meaning, obviously, even as Mr. Olson has said, certainly going past 2014, the crystal ball is very foggy and don't know what's going to happen. Would not this -- utilizing this language in some kind of ongoing basis and having groups like this together be beneficial to everybody involved, as far as watching the market, supply and demand, and making sure there's no adverse impacts to the program itself?

MR. STOCK: Sure. Great question. And, I guess one of the things, my response to that is, one of \{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}

148, or any bill that's static in nature, is going to be able to handle the next ten years, the ups and downs of what might possibly go on in this market, whereas the language that brought us here today potentially could.

So, I guess I would just reiterate that
I believe this is the appropriate forum to address this issue.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Thank you. Anybody else on this side of the room would like to make an additional comment?
(No indication given.)
CMSR. HARRINGTON: The other side?
Just, as you haven't spoke before, please identify yourself, so Steve can make sure he knows who you are.

MR. STOCK: Jasen Stock, the New
Hampshire Timberland Owners Association. And, I guess I just -- I wanted to just go on the record as saying that, like Henry Veilleux and Mr. Olson's comments, we, the Timberland Owners Association, also believes that Senate Bill 148 embedded within that is the process to have this debate and this discussion. And that, instead of duplicating efforts, we feel it would be much more -- a much more efficient process to work through that legislative process and have the stakeholders work there,
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the elements of Senate Bill 148 is it does complicate that, looking beyond this 2015, what the bill does is it establishes a study commission to look at creating a mechanism, a self-adjusting mechanism. So that, as we -as this program moves forward, there is a mechanism established that contemplates these shifts in markets. And, I'll say these shifts can occur outside of Class III.
These shifts can occur in Class -- any of the renewable classes. So, Senate Bill -- again, coming back, there is a mechanism in there to bring a group, to establish a study commission, again, in which the stakeholders would be a part of that process, to look at this beyond just 2015, to ensure that, for the health of the program, that there is a process, kind of a self-correcting process, so that when we see these disruptions in the marketplace, the program can adjust and move with those. Thank you.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Does anyone care to comment?

## (No verbal response)

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Okay. Again, it seems as if there's a few particular issues here that have been brought up. And, one is the -- how to interpret or implement the formula that's given in the law, where it talks about the -- as we discussed today, the " 85 to 95
\{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
percent of the reasonably expected potential annual output of available eligible sources after taking into account demand from similar programs in other states."

Certainly, if anyone would like to give us some clarification on how they think that should be actually interpreted, that would be very helpful. There was the issue that's been brought up as whether the word "available" implies that, since there are no available RECs, that that would imply that there are no available eligible sources, as Mr. Olson, I believe had said, that could mean the percentage would be 85 percent of zero, which, of course, is zero. So, if any of the people would care to comment on that.

There was also the issue of whether we needed a technical session to try to jointly resolve what that paragraph in the law actually means. So, if people could also comment on that, we would find that very helpful. And, again, those comments, the written comments are due on the 21 st , which are a week from today. And, please, let's not forget the first part of this, which was the idea of the "thermal carve-out", as it's called, and we also prefer or would like written comments on those by the 21st as well.

So, does anyone have an additional
\{DE 13-021\} \{02-14-13\}
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## comment?

(No verbal response)
CMSR. HARRINGTON: Commissioner Scott? CMSR. SCOTT: No. All set.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: That will close this hearing on this docket for today. Thank you.
(Whereupon the hearing ended at 11:40
a.m.)
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designed [1] 61/15
detailed [1] 39/16
details [2] 15/14 21/12
determination [1] 46/4
determine [2] 24/8 25/23
determined [3] 3/9 3/15 4/12
develop [3] 4/23 10/18 17/21
developed [2] 18/18 60/24
developers [1] 19/11
developing [1] 54/19
development [2] 14/12 61/4
did [6] 21/4 25/12 29/14 34/21 44/14 57/17
didn't [6] 10/3 25/9 33/17 50/8 51/22
57/22
difference [1] 43/18
different [8] 23/12 24/9 49/16 53/17 53/18
61/2 63/2 63/3
differential [1] 46/18
difficult [3] 27/22 50/16 51/16
difficulty [2] 43/3 52/4
direct [1] 24/12
direction [1] 6/16
directive [1] 21/24
directly [1] $51 / 2$
disagreement [1] 18/7
disagreements [1] 22/23
disappointed [1] 9/3
discrete [1] 42/22
discretion [1] $17 / 5$
discuss [3] 27/15 29/13 59/18
discussed [1] 64/24
discussion [7] 17/19 37/4 47/2 49/22
59/13 62/21 63/9
discussions [2] 22/24 26/9
disfunctional [1] 28/16
dismiss [1] 11/15
disparity [2] 34/7 43/12
disruption [1] 18/1
disruptions [1] 64/15
diversity [1] 12/23
Division [1] 14/7
do [40] 5/22 6/1 6/11 7/14 8/23 9/17 12/3
do... [33] 12/15 17/12 17/14 18/2 18/10 20/4 20/12 23/11 24/6 24/11 26/4 26/16 32/7 32/10 32/17 33/1 33/2 37/10 37/14 38/8 38/24 39/3 41/4 46/8 48/18 50/10 50/15 51/20 51/21 57/3 57/19 59/14 60/17 docket [11] 3/3 3/5 12/13 36/8 37/7 37/11 40/23 41/4 50/4 50/10 66/6
documentative [1] 33/12
DOER [1] 47/10
does [16] 6/10 9/20 15/19 16/5 16/13 17/2
17/12 28/8 38/9 43/8 45/16 53/8 64/1 64/2 64/17 65/24
doesn't [7] 8/5 8/7 10/16 11/17 44/23 53/5 55/19
doing [2] 22/18 31/17
don't [41] 6/4 6/10 9/9 9/10 10/9 13/23
17/21 21/14 22/2 22/11 22/22 25/2 27/19
28/20 30/8 30/9 32/12 35/17 38/10 39/1
44/3 44/9 45/3 45/24 46/22 47/2 49/10
49/16 51/23 52/11 52/23 52/24 53/1 53/22
55/20 56/2 56/13 56/13 56/23 57/1 63/17
done [10] 9/24 18/9 18/9 23/1 27/18 28/22
32/22 40/24 41/3 51/4
double [1] 28/15
Doug [1] 13/21
down [6] 26/16 27/6 32/4 48/23 54/24
55/16
downloaded [1] 30/16
downs [1] 62/2
downward [4] 41/6 42/8 46/21 52/20
draft [4] 10/24 11/1 15/2 15/13
drafted [1] 14/22
draws [1] 27/24
due [2] 4/12 65/19
duplicating [1] 62/22
duplicative [1] 63/1
during [1] 22/5
duty [1] 41/9
dynamic [2] 9/13 63/15
E
eager [1] 10/14
earlier [2] 47/6 54/20
earliest [1] 15/16
early [4] 10/23 18/19 21/7 38/15
ease [1] 7/10
easier [3] 3/24 32/22 60/10
easiest [1] 19/1
easy [2] 38/23 50/23
echo [2] 12/14 35/10
Eckberg [1] 2/17
economically [1] 34/9
economies [1] 59/13
edges [1] 21/13
effect [4] 9/5 15/23 21/3 42/1
effective [2] 20/23 21/3
effectively [2] 26/13 26/14
effectiveness [1] 14/10
efficiency [4] 15/18 47/13 47/23 48/2
efficient [1] 62/23
efficiently [1] 10/18
effort [2] 9/12 11/2
efforts [1] 62/22
either [3] 13/24 27/23 61/16
elaborate [1] 42/9
electric [8] 1/7 3/3 5/4 10/4 10/7 10/10 34/15 34/18
electrical [1] 29/9
electricity [7] 4/7 4/8 4/17 11/23 15/24
43/20 59/4
elements [1] 64/1
eligibility [3] 28/3 30/10 30/19
eligible [12] 15/22 27/3 28/2 28/5 29/17

29/18 42/14 45/12 52/1 53/16 65/2 65/10
eliminate [2] 22/1 22/8
eliminating [1] 20/3
else [8] 5/21 10/2 22/13 24/11 25/13 35/20
38/20 62/9
embed [1] 22/9
embedded [1] 62/20
emergency [3] 20/21 21/11 22/15
emission [2] 44/18 45/8
enable [2] 10/1 16/24
enacted [2] 38/14 38/15
enacts [1] 37/9
encourage [1] 24/22
end [9] 19/10 19/12 20/22 31/18 32/13
41/3 49/16 52/21 63/2
ended [1] 66/7
ends [1] 31/14
energy [18] 4/9 4/11 4/16 4/18 5/6 9/9
12/24 14/7 14/23 24/8 28/13 28/23 29/2
36/18 47/10 58/7 59/19 60/15
engineer [2] 23/24 24/19
engineering [2] 24/17 48/1
England [4] 6/14 8/21 30/4 42/23
enhance [1] 16/8
ensure [1] 64/13
entire [2] 17/2 20/8
entirety [3] 7/14 7/20 23/9
entities [11] 14/14 14/22 17/20 28/10 31/2
34/4 37/21 39/3 40/12 53/20 58/9
environmental [1] 44/18
equal [3] 10/2 27/144/18
equipment [1] 57/5
essentially [3] 8/8 28/9 58/18
establish [1] 64/10
established [1] 64/6
establishes [1] 64/3
estimated [1] 16/3
euphemistically [1] 49/20
even [7] 25/1 30/19 44/10 44/13 47/1 52/4
63/15
events [1] 48/7
every [1] 22/5
everybody [4] 5/18 18/24 26/5 63/20
everyone [2] 9/20 59/15
everything [2] 12/14 19/18
evolves [1] 4/6
exacerbate [1] 35/17
exact [1] 44/3
exactly [3] 9/13 26/20 33/6
example [2] 28/8 61/8
exceeds [1] 59/1
excess [1] 58/19
excuse [5] 30/12 39/18 53/20 56/3 59/3
exist [1] 44/23
existing [8] 10/4 21/11 30/10 44/6 44/16
46/6 55/11 61/1
exists [2] 34/7 44/21
expanding [1] 4/20
expect [2] 31/4 48/20
expectation [3] 46/12 46/19 46/20
expected [3] 27/3 53/10 65/1
expeditiously [1] 10/15
expending [2] 49/14 49/15
experience [1] 27/12
experts [3] 59/13 59/15 60/11
explain [1] 41/14
explicit [1] 26/11
explicitly [1] 11/8
extent [5] 7/12 7/23 17/18 41/20 58/24
extreme [1] 28/19
F
F:3 [2] 7/7 26/24
F:4 [6] 1/7 2/12 3/18 7/3 26/2 41/9
faced [1] 13/14
facilities [22] 4/15 15/21 19/11 19/15 30/3
30/17 36/18 40/16 42/14 42/18 42/23 44/6 44/7 44/19 45/3 45/16 45/18 47/12 51/1
51/22 52/1 57/2
facility [6] 45/12 47/13 47/16 51/11 56/16 57/3
fact [7] 8/5 9/16 13/11 18/17 37/9 42/2
44/23
factor [4] 28/23 55/24 56/15 57/8
factors [2] 55/12 61/21
facts [1] 27/22
failed [1] 50/2
fair [1] 39/4
fairly [2] 18/19 26/10
fairness [2] 14/10 15/17
fall [3] 21/7 21/7 54/6
fall/mid [1] 21/7
falls [1] 56/14
familiar [1] 55/13
fan [1] 52/24
fantastic [1] 12/22
far [6] 17/13 22/15 24/6 26/11 57/10 63/20
fashion [4] 22/18 37/18 41/3 41/23
faster [1] 4/4
fault [1] 31/17
favor [7] 7/18 7/23 8/2 8/14 29/7 58/10
60/9
February [2] 1/4 5/15
feel [1] 62/22
feeling [1] 8/7
few [3] 23/6 44/14 64/21
figure [4] 38/21 51/16 51/20 53/3
figures [1] 50/22
figuring [1] 40/14
filed [1] 39/21
filled [1] 21/5
final [5] 15/15 15/19 21/6 21/13 47/11
finalize [2] 15/14 16/8
finalized [1] 18/22
find [4] 19/11 22/9 41/21 65/17
fired [1] 39/23
first [7] 6/5 9/11 11/18 25/16 35/23 40/20
65/20
fit [2] 45/4 48/6
five [2] 42/6 42/7
floor [1] 58/11
flow [1] 52/18
focus [2] 50/19 54/18
foggy [1] 63/17
folks [3] 7/21 32/8 33/10
follow [6] 4/1 20/3 30/8 33/15 55/7 55/21
follow-up [1] 33/15
following [2] 15/11 17/15
foot [1] 10/13
force [1] 63/3
forest [1] 12/20
forestry [1] 29/24
forget [1] 65/20
form [2] 40/8 40/21
formula [2] 32/22 64/23
forth [1] 11/14
forthcoming [1] 11/4
forum [2] 60/10 62/6
forward [11] 12/18 18/10 23/14 23/17 26/1
29/20 30/6 31/5 60/1 61/4 64/5
Fossum [4] 2/5 6/24 7/24 16/13
four [2] 11/13 31/9
four-tenths [1] 11/13
front [2] 19/10 53/7
front-end [1] 19/10
fuel [2] 47/12 47/19
fuel-harvesting [2] 47/12 47/19
fuels [1] $8 / 23$
full [1] 11/22
fully [2] 36/7 37/6

F
fund [11] 4/11 4/18 28/13 28/14 28/23
29/2 38/5 41/21 43/23 58/20 59/1
fundamentally [1] 21/18
further [4] 33/8 33/8 47/1 52/22
future [2] $9 / 15$ 61/17
fuzzy [2] 55/13 55/19
G
gas [4] 30/7 30/11 30/15 55/22
gather [2] 60/11 61/18
gee [1] 52/7
general [3] 8/21 14/11 40/17
generating [1] 30/3
generation [3] 55/21 55/21 55/22
generator [1] 52/2
generators [5] 43/9 51/24 53/16 53/19
53/20
generic [1] 25/1
gentleman [3] 6/5 57/16 60/5
geothermal [2] 6/15 24/24
get [19] 11/17 18/14 19/15 22/3 23/18 24/5 25/5 33/17 37/17 39/14 41/7 45/19 54/14
55/8 55/19 56/8 56/8 56/12 58/22
gets [1] 54/8
getting [1] 23/21
give [5] 18/24 22/4 26/5 53/8 65/4
given [18] 3/17 4/3 7/5 9/17 13/14 14/11
16/19 17/3 17/4 25/20 46/16 47/24 50/15
53/4 53/13 61/14 62/11 64/23
gives [6] 11/10 52/12 53/1 53/11 53/24
54/5
glad [1] 59/16
glass [1] 48/19
go [30] 4/4 5/2 5/16 5/20 5/24 18/9 18/24
22/16 24/7 26/5 26/16 30/6 35/23 39/10
41/8 43/8 43/10 46/4 47/3 50/23 52/22 53/2
54/23 56/3 56/22 56/23 56/24 60/5 62/3 62/17
goes [6] 21/22 31/14 51/17 55/19 58/21 59/5
going [37] 3/22 4/5 5/2 5/21 5/24 12/14
18/10 19/15 22/4 24/15 25/24 26/4 29/20
30/23 31/5 34/9 36/9 36/14 36/17 36/23
38/12 38/14 39/14 50/22 51/8 51/21 52/8
53/23 57/15 60/14 60/17 61/4 61/19 61/23
62/1 63/16 63/17
gone [2] 28/3 33/7
good [10] 6/23 7/3 8/20 12/10 13/4 14/3 18/18 54/11 55/10 56/2
got [6] 27/12 29/19 34/7 44/20 44/21 52/13
granted [1] 5/7
great [3] 8/23 15/5 63/23
greatly [1] 47/24
ground [1] 5/11
group [4] 36/6 41/2 54/9 64/10
groups [1] 63/19
guess [11] 5/1 7/9 8/18 11/5 18/6 19/1 23/5 25/8 62/5 62/16 63/24

## H

had [13] 8/23 11/1 12/15 19/10 24/3 24/4
25/21 29/15 34/22 43/3 52/4 56/21 65/10 half [3] 42/5 42/6 42/7
HAMPSHIRE [46] 1/1 1/4 5/3 5/5 6/24 8/22 11/21 12/12 21/22 28/6 28/9 29/17 30/4
30/21 31/2 31/7 31/13 31/18 33/22 34/1
34/15 34/18 35/12 36/13 44/7 45/3 45/4
45/10 45/11 45/14 45/17 45/18 45/19 45/21 46/16 48/5 48/10 48/12 48/13 51/10 51/11 52/9 56/22 59/20 61/9 62/16
Hampshire's [3] 31/21 31/24 32/2
handle [4] 54/11 56/12 61/16 62/2
happen [6] 17/14 28/14 33/6 54/12 61/12

63/17
happening [2] 41/9 47/8
happens [2] 11/6 38/1
happy [2] 12/8 13/2
hard [1] 48/15
harm [3] 49/5 49/9 49/11
harmonize [1] 31/24
Harrington [5] $\quad 1 / 10$ 2/10 2/20 8/20 47/7
harvesting [2] 47/12 47/19
has [43] 3/9 4/12 5/13 5/21 7/3 11/21
14/12 14/13 15/23 18/9 19/1 23/8 24/12
24/17 24/20 25/3 27/6 27/11 27/19 29/17
29/22 29/24 30/7 35/22 36/8 36/12 40/24
43/21 44/23 45/8 45/9 45/10 45/15 46/4
47/10 56/18 56/20 57/4 58/5 59/12 59/23
60/13 63/16
hasty [1] 22/18
have [87]
haven't [1] 62/13
having [8] 9/2 9/18 16/10 31/14 32/20 41/3
63/1 63/19
he [4] 35/23 39/7 43/16 62/14
he'll [1] 63/13
head [1] 37/17
health [1] 64/13
hear [2] 51/22 51/23
heard [6] 30/1 32/8 33/15 58/8 60/14
63/13
hearing [14] 1/9 3/6 3/11 3/21 4/20 5/9 7/4
26/21 26/22 36/14 58/5 60/17 66/6 66/7
Heather [1] 34/14
held [3] 14/17 15/4 59/18
help [6] 10/20 19/23 20/23 24/19 26/15
27/13
helpful [5] 20/13 23/12 25/11 65/6 65/18
helps [1] 52/7
hence [1] 48/21
Henry [2] 36/4 62/18
$\begin{array}{lllll} \\ \text { here }[30] & 3 / 2 & 6 / 5 & 6 / 15 & 6 / 19 \\ 14 / 4 & 19 / 3 & 21 / 17\end{array}$
21/19 23/7 23/22 24/2 25/2 27/12 28/4 30/8
31/1 32/21 32/22 33/24 36/6 38/20 40/11
41/3 51/23 53/15 59/20 61/6 61/20 62/4
64/21
here's [3] 43/15 56/10 57/6
higher [2] 28/6 32/9
highest [1] 46/5
hire [2] 15/13 22/4
hiring [1] 24/18
his [2] 12/15 12/16
historically [1] 56/10
hold [4] 3/10 12/4 37/24 49/3
3 holes [1] 21/6
honest [1] 23/23
hope [9] 10/15 10/17 11/11 11/16 12/2
12/2 12/3 22/7 35/17
hopefully [1] 63/13
hoping [1] $4 / 1$
hour [2] 4/10 10/6
house [3] 20/19 37/5 51/18
how [33] 5/16 17/14 18/2 18/7 20/12 22/23
24/6 24/6 24/12 25/11 26/16 27/17 33/1
33/2 33/6 35/1 35/2 35/2 38/24 39/4 48/15
50/10 50/21 50/24 51/20 51/21 55/24 56/1
56/11 57/8 61/9 64/22 65/5
however [3] 8/1 35/1 36/10
hurdles [1] 13/10
I
I'd [7] 12/8 18/24 23/6 39/6 40/7 40/13
54/3
I'Il [9] 6/20 7/9 13/1 23/14 27/8 39/8 39/9 63/6 64/7
I'm [41] 5/2 5/21 6/14 6/15 6/19 8/21 9/3
9/6 9/16 11/10 12/11 12/14 14/4 14/4 19/23
20/5 22/3 22/3 23/23 26/9 29/22 33/3 34/14

34/16 34/20 36/5 37/14 37/17 37/20 39/14
39/21 49/16 52/23 54/19 55/13 57/16 58/2 61/5 61/6 61/11 63/14
I've [2] $25 / 2058 / 8$
i.e [2] $5 / 186 / 8$
idea [3] 25/9 55/10 65/21
ideals [1] 29/3
identified [1] 11/8
identify [5] 5/23 6/6 42/22 51/23 62/13 if [72]
II [3] 7/6 44/15 61/2
III [40] 1/8 2/12 3/7 3/13 25/20 26/22 28/2
28/7 29/16 31/3 31/7 32/4 32/9 34/1 36/16
36/19 40/14 42/18 42/20 42/20 43/1 43/2
43/7 45/3 45/3 45/11 45/14 45/19 46/16
48/11 48/13 51/11 51/13 51/15 52/1 52/21
58/13 60/24 61/8 64/7
IIIs [3] 34/22 35/3 36/18
imagine [1] 15/24
impact [5] 16/2 22/10 29/8 38/9 59/19
impacts [1] 63/22
implement [10] 4/24 9/12 20/22 21/19
25/11 27/16 33/2 44/15 54/17 64/23
implementation [10] 4/21 8/15 9/4 14/9
15/9 16/6 17/1 17/23 17/24 24/15
implemented [1] 23/17
implementing [1] 15/18
implication [1] 29/19
implicit [1] 11/11
implies [1] 65/8
imply [2] 17/2 65/9
important [4] 28/23 40/15 58/8 59/7
impose [1] 47/11
imposition [1] 16/15
impossible [1] 27/23
in [289]
Inc [2] 40/4 40/5
incinerators [1] 36/19
inclined [2] 20/11 20/13
including [2] 7/21 61/12
incorporate [1] 11/22
incorporated [1] 14/24
increase [17] 3/17 4/3 7/6 16/16 16/20
16/21 17/4 17/5 18/1 19/9 19/17 20/7 25/22
32/11 35/11 35/14 58/10
increasing [3] 20/8 32/12 35/15
incremental [9] 3/17 4/3 7/6 16/16 16/20
16/21 19/16 44/9 44/11
incrementally [1] 19/6
Indeck [1] 40/4
Indeck-Alexandria [1] 40/4
indeed [1] 7/24
independent [1] 39/22
indicated [1] 46/11
indication [1] 62/11
industries [1] 12/23
industry [5] 12/20 12/24 18/8 18/12 18/19
information [4] 33/6 57/24 58/15 60/11
informed [1] 60/12
inherent [1] 18/22
initially [2] 7/2 7/8
input [4] 14/18 14/22 18/19 26/15
instance [1] 14/15
instead [3] 16/7 19/7 62/21
integrate [1] 22/21
integration [1] 15/6
intend [1] 16/5
intends [1] 16/7
intent [9] 11/9 16/18 16/23 17/22 19/7
21/19 22/2 22/12 25/3
intention [1] 11/22
intentionally [2] 9/24 10/11
interest [2] 10/20 59/18
interested [2] 6/17 27/15
interesting [1] 17/17

## ,

interests [1] 6/18
interim [1] 21/10
interpret [1] 64/22
interpretation [1] 8/1
interpreted [1] 65/6
interrupt [1] 39/20
interruption [1] 40/1
intervenors [2] 5/2 5/7
intervention [1] 39/22
into [34] 3/23 15/1 15/6 19/17 21/3 22/6
27/4 28/8 28/12 28/22 35/6 38/5 41/20
43/23 44/20 45/1 45/4 45/5 46/15 46/19
47/20 48/11 48/13 50/11 50/12 51/2 52/22
56/1 56/14 56/19 57/2 58/19 59/1 65/2
intoned [1] 38/21
introduced [1] 36/13
invest [2] 19/11 19/12
investigate [1] 33/10
investment [1] 43/4
involved [5] 14/12 39/14 49/24 58/1 63/20
iron [2] 39/1 39/5
is [174]
Island [4] 31/10 33/22 35/13 48/4
isn't [1] 9/12
issuance [1] 10/24
issue [30] 2/3 2/12 3/19 5/17 6/7 8/9 9/20
11/5 13/24 17/13 18/20 21/10 21/13 23/14
27/13 33/24 36/11 36/15 36/24 37/8 38/2
38/10 38/11 43/7 43/11 57/18 60/12 62/7
65/7 65/14
issued [3] 3/4 15/2 49/8
issues [7] 9/6 9/8 15/12 23/6 23/7 60/18
64/21
issuing [1] 44/24
it [158]
it's [40] 3/7 4/21 7/10 8/4 9/10 11/9 17/23
18/17 25/19 26/12 26/20 27/17 28/24 35/8
35/8 38/14 38/21 40/15 41/13 42/21 42/21
42/22 43/4 44/21 48/15 51/3 51/16 52/8
52/10 52/10 52/23 53/14 55/21 56/11 57/10
58/7 58/21 59/7 61/23 65/21
its [18] 11/22 11/23 17/7 40/23 41/8 41/18
42/15 44/4 44/16 44/17 44/18 47/20 52/13
56/19 57/4 57/7 57/7 58/4
itself [2] 49/23 63/22
IV [3] 11/10 26/23 61/1
J
Jack [1] 14/6
Jaffrey [1] 8/22
January [7] 3/4 3/14 15/4 15/5 15/11
20/23 26/24
January 1 [1] 20/23
January 18th [1] 3/4
January 25th [1] 15/5
Jasen [2] 12/11 62/15
JLCAR [1] 18/21
job [2] 9/18 21/5
John [4] 8/13 19/4 30/24 40/10
jointly [1] 65/15
judgment [2] 28/21 28/24
July [1] 28/15
June [2] 37/9 38/15
jurisdictions [3] 43/10 43/11 51/6
just [72]
justice [1] 60/17
K
keep [2] 19/17 57/15
key [1] 35/6
kicks [1] 47/23
kind [6] 20/11 23/21 27/24 57/15 63/18 64/14
know [68]
knowledge [1] 44/7
known [2] 42/19 55/11
knows [1] 62/14
L
label [1] 28/17
Labrecque [4] 2/14 27/11 40/9 63/13
lack [1] 6/8
laid [1] 54/4
landed [1] 48/14
landfill [3] 30/7 30/11 30/15
language [10] 14/22 16/17 35/4 50/17
60/22 60/24 61/15 62/4 63/14 63/18
large [4] 18/11 25/22 28/11 29/1
last [8] 14/14 15/7 27/23 28/10 30/16
47/11 58/5 61/22
late [1] 38/15
later [3] 21/14 51/7 63/4
law [6] 21/2 23/16 25/4 49/7 64/23 65/16
laws [1] 29/21
lawyer [2] 20/5 22/3
LCR [1] $1 / 23$
leadership [1] 11/21
least [15] 7/8 7/15 8/15 14/14 21/22 30/16
34/9 36/11 43/6 47/23 48/16 56/20 56/21
58/9 58/20
leave [1] 28/8
leaves [1] 52/16
ledger [1] 53/15
leeway [1] 53/11
left [1] $35 / 20$
legal [6] 20/4 20/12 22/4 23/7 23/14 23/24
legislation [8] 9/2 19/18 20/9 36/16 37/4
38/4 38/9 41/1
legislative [11] 11/9 16/17 16/23 21/18
22/2 22/6 22/12 41/4 49/12 49/21 62/24
Legislature [20] 11/24 27/6 32/19 36/13
36/24 37/2 37/9 37/18 38/1 38/12 38/17
38/24 41/18 42/5 49/4 49/13 49/14 50/9
60/16 61/3
Legislature's [1] 42/4
less [5] 10/3 35/17 42/22 54/8 54/13
let [2] 48/23 49/4
let's [5] 19/2 29/8 39/10 50/8 65/20
level [5] 32/9 43/24 44/17 44/17 47/19
Liberty [7] 5/4 8/13 8/14 19/4 19/5 30/24
40/10
lieu [1] 3/9
Light [2] 39/24 40/3
like [27] 5/10 5/16 6/2 6/7 8/11 11/18 20/2
22/13 23/6 25/9 33/3 33/9 40/7 40/13 41/3
41/8 53/3 54/14 55/22 56/18 62/9 62/18
63/7 63/12 63/19 65/4 65/22
limited [4] 8/9 24/17 42/21 55/6
line [1] 35/12
lines [1] 60/21
list [1] 30/16
listen [2] 6/16 6/19
listened [1] 59/24
lists [1] 42/17
little [9] 3/24 4/4 19/23 22/8 23/23 24/1
24/7 39/7 53/8
live [1] 13/11
Liz [2] 14/6 14/15
load [6] 28/10 28/12 31/2 34/4 39/2 58/9
load-serving [5] 28/10 31/2 34/4 39/2 58/9
long [7] 34/6 38/24 39/5 52/5 52/10 53/24
56/19
long-term [2] 52/5 56/19
longer [1] 51/4
look [20] 24/3 25/1 36/18 36/21 38/4 41/12
42/13 44/2 47/17 50/5 50/24 51/21 54/24
55/1 55/9 56/10 60/1 60/21 64/3 64/12
looked [1] 24/9
looking [8] 7/3 41/5 42/23 49/17 54/10
55/9 57/10 64/2
looks [4] 41/19 50/21 52/6 53/3
lose [4] 11/15 12/4 22/11 30/19
lost [2] 11/17 12/18
lot [26] 7/20 7/21 7/21 10/19 10/22 11/3
22/6 22/22 23/1 24/8 24/12 27/12 46/23
47/5 48/7 50/15 54/8 55/7 56/6 57/6 60/10
60/10 60/13 61/12 61/14 61/23
Loud [1] 25/7
love [1] 13/12
low [2] 44/17 44/18
lower [3] 9/24 10/1 10/12
LP [1] 40/5
M
Ma'am [1] 34/13
made [11] 7/21 22/18 38/5 41/18 42/12
45/24 47/6 47/7 48/16 48/21 59/24
main [6] 4/11 11/5 40/8 40/20 42/11 47/13
maintains [1] 42/15
major [1] 25/2
make [25] 3/20 3/24 4/9 4/17 9/19 13/5
18/13 20/3 25/17 25/24 28/18 31/16 32/2
33/7 33/15 34/7 35/12 42/8 44/12 53/24
54/5 57/10 61/18 62/9 62/14
makes [1] 10/17
making [8] 31/15 40/23 41/6 43/4 46/3
49/12 49/13 63/21
Management [1] 36/7
Manager [1] 8/21
mandate [1] 22/1
manner [1] 29/3
manufacturer [1] 8/22
many [10] 15/12 32/18 35/1 35/2 35/2 51/6
54/15 56/11 57/8 61/9
Manypenny [2] 2/15 34/14
Mark [1] 57/19
market [27] 10/9 15/24 27/12 27/21 28/16
28/16 32/5 35/9 38/8 40/12 45/24 46/7
46/16 46/20 47/5 48/4 51/3 53/3 53/4 53/5
55/8 56/1 57/3 59/15 61/21 62/3 63/21
marketplace [5] 46/23 54/15 56/7 59/14
64/15
markets [10] 28/6 31/11 31/16 32/3 40/12
40/15 48/3 48/9 56/14 64/6
Martin [1] 6/14
Mass [7] 30/18 31/9 33/20 47/20 48/9 56/24 57/1
Massachusetts [17] 28/5 29/18 29/21
30/6 30/9 30/20 44/3 44/5 44/11 44/14 44/23 45/4 47/6 47/9 47/14 51/9 51/15 matter [5] 15/17 18/11 35/1 43/3 45/15 matters [1] 59/18
Matthew [1] 6/23
$\max [1] 20 / 8$
maximum [1] 34/3
may [27] 7/4 9/18 11/4 19/24 21/17 24/23
24/23 26/22 30/2 30/2 37/8 37/10 37/10
38/7 38/15 38/16 38/19 38/23 39/5 44/8
47/19 48/13 51/13 51/15 57/2 60/15 63/2
May/early [1] 38/15
maybe [6] 18/7 25/9 26/18 27/16 37/1 56/8
me [21] 14/6 19/23 20/24 22/1 30/12 39/18
42/12 48/23 49/4 49/15 49/18 52/7 53/11
53/20 53/23 54/16 55/20 56/3 59/3 60/23
63/14
mean [2] 6/10 65/11
meaning [2] 16/21 63/15
means [5] 29/23 44/6 50/18 52/15 65/16 meat [2] 23/21 23/22
mechanics [1] 27/18
mechanism [6] 28/13 41/24 64/4 64/4 64/5 64/10
meet [2] 28/10 48/1
name [6] 6/13 8/20 12/11 27/10 36/4 57/17
namely [1] 9/8
nameplate [1] 47/15
narrow [1] 52/12
natural [1] 55/22
nature [3] 35/9 40/11 62/1
necessarily [6] 10/16 16/14 17/2 22/19
24/24 53/6
necessary [3] 3/15 9/17 59/3
need [10] 13/10 15/13 24/15 31/23 32/18
32/23 33/7 35/22 38/10 40/19
needed [3] 18/15 18/17 65/15
needs [2] 26/15 33/8
neighborhood [2] 44/4 55/23
never [3] 43/22 44/21 58/22
new [69]
next [11] 8/11 12/9 18/12 18/14 23/18
23/19 30/21 38/20 58/5 59/10 62/2
Niebling [5] 2/6 8/21 12/15 17/13 20/17
night [1] 58/5
nitrogen [1] 45/9
Nixon [2] 14/6 14/15
no [28] 1/15 1/23 2/2 6/3 8/8 13/17 13/19
16/1 16/10 19/14 25/14 28/9 28/17 35/1
51/4 51/17 51/17 59/12 59/23 60/16 61/24
62/11 63/21 64/19 65/8 65/9 66/2 66/4
noise [1] 25/7
non [3] 29/9 29/9 48/1
non-electrical [1] 29/9
non-engineering [1] 48/1
non-renewable [1] 29/9
none [2] 44/6 48/14
normal [1] 23/18
not [77]
note [3] 7/2 58/8 59/7
notice [2] 7/4 26/21
noticed [2] 25/17 58/4
novel [1] 16/22
now [12] 7/16 25/15 28/6 32/10 42/13 43/6
43/8 44/3 44/24 46/5 55/19 61/12
NOx [1] 45/12
nuances [1] 40/19
number [7] 5/2 35/7 37/3 37/4 41/21 43/21
44/4
numbers [3] 46/24 47/1 49/22
numerous [1] 30/1

## 0

obligation [8] 9/23 10/3 10/5 19/6 19/9 21/3 28/10 51/12
obligations [3] 15/10 37/22 53/19
obviously [17] 5/12 13/12 18/6 22/23
24/10 28/7 37/8 37/20 38/13 38/21 39/3 43/9 43/20 45/23 58/21 59/5 63/15
OCA [1] 59/12
OCA's [2] 13/18 59/10
occur [3] 63/9 64/7 64/8
occurred [1] 38/23
occurring [1] 48/8
occurs [1] 60/23
October [2] 15/16 42/16
October 8th [1] 42/16
off [2] 22/24 29/5
offer [3] 12/7 13/24 59/16
Office [2] 13/18 59/10
Oh [5] 13/8 19/2 34/20 37/14 39/21
okay [22] 13/17 18/23 19/20 22/14 23/2
25/15 30/14 30/22 30/23 34/12 35/20 38/18 39/8 40/2 44/5 54/19 54/22 55/17 57/9 57/21 60/4 64/20
old [1] 31/24
older [1] 30/10
Olson [12] 2/16 5/4 37/14 39/6 39/11
39/19 49/1 55/5 58/17 63/7 63/16 65/10
Olson's [1] 62/18
on [105]
once [2] 55/8 60/5
one [40] 3/16 4/2 4/22 5/19 7/5 8/7 9/19
10/9 11/7 16/19 18/5 20/1 22/4 23/7 23/13
24/23 25/17 29/4 29/15 33/14 34/17 38/3
41/11 42/15 44/8 44/8 44/10 46/16 49/18
50/21 51/18 51/24 53/18 55/6 56/9 56/20
60/18 63/24 63/24 64/22
one percent [1] 11/7
ongoing [3] 9/13 16/8 63/19
only [12] 20/6 23/10 30/3 32/10 34/5 41/14
43/1 45/8 46/17 52/20 58/23 61/10
onto [2] 12/4 25/16
op [2] 5/4 50/18
op's [1] 50/20
opened [2] 36/8 37/7
operate [1] 51/6
operates [1] 51/9
operating [1] 56/16
opinion [2] 22/4 60/9
opinions [1] 23/12
opportunity [8] 6/18 12/7 12/13 12/22
13/1 13/22 39/13 39/17
opposed [2] 53/2 63/1
options [1] 24/13
or [63] 3/16 4/9 5/20 7/5 7/6 7/13 8/7 9/2
10/10 11/11 11/17 11/18 13/7 17/3 17/12
18/12 18/14 19/7 19/24 20/23 21/8 21/10
23/9 23/11 23/17 23/22 24/15 24/19 25/1
27/14 27/17 27/23 28/5 28/15 28/16 28/24
29/9 29/17 31/13 33/6 34/8 36/11 37/24
38/20 42/3 42/21 44/24 47/10 48/4 48/5
51/5 51/13 56/22 58/22 59/14 60/2 60/8
61/16 61/23 62/1 63/2 64/22 65/22
oral [2] 13/24 57/23
order [4] 3/5 20/21 35/12 49/8
organization [2] 12/19 20/15
original [3] 9/1 20/19 49/2
Orio [2] 2/5 6/14
Orr [1] 13/21
other [26] 6/11 8/7 14/24 18/5 19/14 $27 / 5$
28/1 30/4 32/3 32/3 33/10 33/16 34/2 37/3
41/1 43/10 43/11 48/7 50/21 51/5 51/5
51/21 55/22 57/1 62/12 65/3
ought [2] 41/21 58/3
our [6] 6/18 16/4 26/9 32/11 53/21 59/18
ours [1] 30/2
out [38] 6/10 9/22 10/21 11/19 12/22 14/13 18/8 18/14 19/19 20/24 21/7 21/19 22/7
27/11 $27 / 22$ 38/22 39/1 39/5 40/13 40/14
45/20 48/3 49/22 50/18 50/22 51/16 51/20
52/6 52/22 53/2 53/3 54/4 55/20 55/24
57/10 61/7 61/10 65/21
outcomes [1] 63/3
output [2] 27/3 65/1
outreach [1] 15/6
outset [1] 40/7
outside [2] 24/16 64/7
over [10] 8/23 11/18 15/7 18/12 19/3 37/2
49/20 50/23 61/16 61/22
overall [1] 10/14
overarching [1] 59/19
overcome [2] 9/11 13/10
owners [6] 12/12 12/21 31/14 31/17 62/16
62/19
oxides [1] 45/9
$P$
PAGE [1] 2/2
paid [1] 41/20
paragraph [1] 65/16
paraphrase [1] 49/4
parity [1] 11/23
part [8] 11/2 25/16 26/19 36/16 52/3 60/23
64/12 65/20


solution [4] 17/21 22/21 53/14 53/15 solve [1] 22/19
some [35] 9/8 14/13 18/6 20/11 21/5 22/21
24/10 26/15 27/14 27/22 29/13 30/2 30/2
30/19 31/22 32/8 33/9 35/22 39/15 39/16
40/9 40/11 40/19 41/5 42/17 47/8 47/14 47/19 50/24 53/11 59/8 59/16 61/7 63/18 65/5
somebody [2] 24/20 38/20
somehow [2] 29/4 50/2
someone [5] 5/20 5/21 19/1 25/4 25/8
something [17] 11/18 21/9 24/11 27/14
28/21 29/5 29/7 34/10 35/16 38/8 39/3
43/16 47/17 50/14 52/15 53/1 56/18
sometime [3] 21/13 36/14 38/15
soon [3] 36/14 36/24 37/8
sorry [5] 11/10 34/16 34/20 37/14 39/21
sort [7] 10/24 22/14 29/19 40/13 48/14
55/13 58/11
sought [1] 10/23
sounds [3] 20/2 33/3 50/23
sources [3] 27/4 65/2 65/10
speak [9] 5/10 5/19 5/19 6/7 6/11 12/13
22/14 55/15 57/17
speakers [4] 40/17 43/13 46/3 46/11
speaking [2] 6/10 42/12
specific [1] 59/12
specifically [2] 12/16 24/18
specifics [1] 40/18
specified [2] 19/18 20/9
speculate [1] 47/18
Speidel [4] 2/8 2/17 14/4 17/12
spoke [2] 40/17 62/13
sponsors [2] 37/5 37/5
Springfield [2] 39/24 40/3
staff [26] 10/17 11/2 14/2 14/5 14/8 14/12
14/20 14/22 15/2 15/13 16/5 16/13 17/7
17/12 18/7 18/15 18/16 20/15 22/16 24/4
24/16 37/1 40/24 49/19 59/21 59/23
Staff's [2] 15/7 17/22
stage [1] 18/19
stakeholder [11] 6/17 10/23 11/1 14/14
14/18 15/4 15/8 15/11 18/18 41/2 49/20
stakeholders [6] 17/8 37/2 37/3 60/20
62/24 64/11
stamped [1] 51/3
standard [13] 1/7 7/7 26/23 43/4 45/8 45/9 45/13 45/14 45/15 47/12 47/13 47/23 48/2 standards [8] 3/4 4/4 4/13 6/8 16/21 16/22 44/18 47/19
standpoint [2] 44/22 46/15
start [8] 4/5 5/1 5/17 6/2 6/5 19/2 22/8
27/8
start-up [1] 22/8
starting [3] 9/1 26/19 49/2
state [5] 1/1 16/4 31/19 52/3 61/13
state's [2] 12/20 12/23
stated [3] 25/3 26/4 26/21
statement [4] 27/24 40/18 45/1 56/5
statements [3] 2/4 2/13 5/9
states [10] 27/5 28/2 30/4 33/16 34/2
50/22 51/21 53/18 53/20 65/3
static [1] 62/1
Station [1] 47/14
statute [24] 3/22 4/14 7/15 9/23 11/9
11/14 16/15 16/17 16/18 19/23 21/21 21/23
24/18 26/10 26/19 32/23 37/9 43/21 45/22
52/4 52/12 52/24 53/8 54/17
statutes [2] 53/17 61/15
statutorily [1] 48/6
statutory [1] 50/17
stay [1] 16/15

Steam [1] 57/20
step [1] 22/5
Steve [2] 55/15 62/14
Steven [1] 1/23
sticking [1] $7 / 1$
still [8] 18/13 18/15 18/15 18/16 22/17
35/8 50/3 52/15
Stock [7] 2/7 2/18 12/11 13/4 35/21 62/15 63/12
stop [2] 16/5 48/23
stops [1] 50/5
stoves [1] 25/4
straight [1] 34/8
straightforward [2] 26/20 27/5
streamlining [1] 17/24
stress [1] 47/24
strong [2] 8/5 8/7
structured [1] 9/22
study [3] 31/23 64/3 64/11
stuff [2] 23/24 60/13
stumbled [1] 50/2
subclass [2] 16/2 21/10
subject [4] 8/16 52/11 54/20 58/21
subjects [2] 5/12 6/11
submit [3] 13/23 15/22 39/15
subscription [2] 44/20 44/22
subsection [2] 23/10 26/2
subsequent [1] 22/9
subsequently [1] 21/4
subset [8] 7/11 8/2 8/6 16/21 16/22 17/4
17/14 30/19
subsets [1] 3/23
substantial [2] 15/15 16/4
substantially [1] 36/9
such [4] 17/4 27/1 52/17 59/2
sufficient [2] 4/23 31/3
suggest [7] 20/1 20/4 29/12 36/10 37/1
37/6 46/22
suggested [1] 32/8
suggesting [2] 50/5 55/1
suggestions [1] 15/6
suggests [2] 38/6 48/1
summary [2] 40/8 40/21
summer [2] 14/14 14/15
suppliers [1] 19/10
supply [17] 5/6 26/13 28/17 29/16 32/24
38/22 46/1 48/8 48/11 50/12 52/16 52/17
53/4 59/20 61/16 61/16 63/21
support [9] 10/20 18/8 18/11 19/5 19/16
24/16 24/20 32/7 46/20
supportive [3] 33/4 33/5 33/11
sure [16] 6/18 13/5 20/3 25/17 26/9 29/23
33/15 33/18 34/7 53/12 57/17 61/6 61/11
62/14 63/21 63/23
suspend [1] 58/4
suspended [3] 16/24 44/24 44/24
sustainable [2] 14/7 29/24
system [1] 24/24
T
take [14] 5/21 10/16 11/12 13/12 24/10
38/1 39/1 39/5 50/11 50/12 53/21 53/22
59/2 60/19
taken [1] 1/15
takes [3] 18/22 19/14 38/4
taking [6] 5/9 5/12 12/17 27/4 58/3 65/2
talk [1] 23/15
talked [2] 55/7 61/22
talking [6] 23/24 25/18 32/18 35/5 37/19 37/22
talks [1] 64/24
Tamworth [1] 40/5
technical [18] 4/12 9/8 11/3 13/10 15/12
15/14 18/3 18/8 18/11 22/16 22/18 24/16
25/10 27/14 29/13 59/13 59/17 65/15
technology [1] 55/14
tell [1] 53/5
ten [2] 31/9 62/2
tenths [9] 11/7 11/13 11/13 12/4 12/17
13/12 21/16 21/20 22/20
term [3] 29/23 52/5 56/19
termed [1] 20/20
terms [7] 14/11 16/15 22/17 49/11 49/11 55/18 58/2
testimony [1] 9/1
than [13] 11/15 19/14 20/2 23/24 28/6 32/9
32/22 33/8 34/10 35/17 47/21 54/23 54/24
thank [53] 6/13 6/21 6/22 8/10 8/17 8/19
12/6 12/8 12/12 12/24 13/16 14/1 14/2 17/9 17/11 18/4 19/20 20/16 20/18 22/12 23/3
23/4 26/17 30/23 32/16 33/13 34/12 35/19
36/3 36/3 37/13 37/16 38/18 39/9 39/12
49/1 50/7 54/22 55/4 57/14 59/8 59/9 59/11
59/20 59/22 60/3 60/4 60/7 62/8 63/11
63/11 64/16 66/6
thanks [1] 17/7
that [400]
that's [34] 8/16 10/16 17/16 17/18 22/11
24/1 25/9 28/20 28/21 28/22 29/4 29/11
32/13 37/19 41/11 43/10 43/12 44/10 45/19 46/2 46/9 47/17 48/5 50/14 50/16 50/20
53/1 53/21 55/14 58/14 61/15 62/1 64/23 65/7
their [10] 17/8 28/10 30/20 30/21 31/4
31/15 44/8 47/9 48/3 49/15
them [19] 5/3 12/8 21/10 27/22 30/5 30/17
31/8 37/24 39/4 41/6 41/22 42/3 42/5 42/24
43/1 44/9 46/17 60/1 61/11
themselves [2] 5/23 51/23
then [28] 5/19 7/17 11/11 15/24 19/3 19/23
21/4 21/12 23/18 24/10 25/5 26/6 30/20
32/2 35/23 36/20 38/1 38/16 39/8 39/11
40/8 42/17 50/3 53/18 53/21 57/1 58/13
63/3
there [60] 5/1 5/3 7/2 9/16 11/2 15/5 15/16
15/17 16/14 18/6 18/21 19/2 21/8 22/5
22/20 22/23 23/6 24/13 26/6 28/2 29/22
35/3 35/6 36/12 36/20 37/4 39/13 40/18
42/16 43/2 44/10 44/13 44/13 46/23 47/16
48/21 48/23 51/19 51/19 54/10 54/15 55/24
57/5 57/8 61/5 61/5 61/6 61/7 61/13 61/17
61/24 62/24 64/5 64/9 64/10 64/14 65/6

## 65/8 65/9 65/14

there's [29] 5/11 7/20 10/19 21/18 23/1
23/5 24/8 24/12 28/7 28/17 30/9 32/22
36/23 38/10 40/11 41/7 43/18 46/11 46/17
47/22 48/7 51/17 51/17 56/6 60/14 60/16
61/23 63/21 64/21
therefore [3] 4/19 13/23 48/2
thermal [36] 4/8 4/13 4/16 4/22 5/18 6/9
6/17 7/11 7/15 8/6 8/15 8/24 9/5 9/9 9/21
10/1 10/5 11/7 11/22 12/21 12/22 14/9
14/21 14/23 15/1 15/10 15/21 16/16 19/6
20/8 21/9 21/19 24/8 24/23 25/5 65/21
thermals [1] $8 / 9$
these [15] 12/7 14/13 19/12 24/21 27/23
28/19 44/11 55/14 59/14 59/18 61/21 64/6 64/7 64/8 64/15
they [43] 5/14 13/15 19/12 21/4 21/5 22/24
23/11 24/20 29/23 30/20 31/16 31/16 34/4
38/24 39/3 40/2 42/8 43/10 44/20 45/4 45/5 45/5 45/24 46/12 46/15 48/1 48/6 50/23
51/10 51/11 51/12 51/13 51/14 51/14 51/24
52/8 53/9 53/16 56/23 58/10 60/1 60/2 65/5
they're [4] 9/10 10/11 51/8 53/23
thing [7] 7/1 20/6 24/19 26/5 29/4 32/10 55/6
things [8] 7/20 25/2 26/16 32/18 39/16 40/9 59/8 63/24
think [64] 5/22 9/10 9/10 9/11 9/11 9/20
think... [58] 10/14 11/1 11/3 17/18 17/19 17/21 17/23 18/2 22/2 22/3 22/11 24/3 25/3 27/13 28/20 29/11 33/9 35/7 37/21 38/6 38/10 38/12 38/24 39/7 40/8 40/11 40/16 40/24 41/7 41/7 41/10 42/11 42/19 42/21 43/12 43/16 47/7 49/10 51/19 53/1 53/1 54/3 54/7 54/8 54/11 55/9 55/17 55/22 56/6 56/20 56/20 57/24 58/7 58/14 59/7 61/14 63/12 65/5
thinking [1] 34/8
thinks [1] 18/15
third [2] 42/11 43/3
this [116]
thorough [1] 21/5
those [27] 3/22 5/14 7/18 21/6 23/10 25/24
26/15 26/16 28/5 31/10 31/14 31/17 31/19
31/20 34/2 41/15 44/19 46/9 48/14 53/21
54/12 54/13 56/22 59/8 64/16 65/18 65/22
though [1] 7/9
thought [7] 22/6 26/9 29/16 29/19 38/2 39/5 50/15
thoughts [5] 12/15 17/12 17/12 33/1 50/10 three [1] 57/10
through [12] 5/3 16/6 18/18 28/3 28/13
37/21 40/23 48/19 58/22 58/22 59/5 62/23
throw [2] 27/11 27/21
timberland [4] 12/12 12/21 62/16 62/19
time [23] 4/14 4/23 9/17 12/5 12/14 14/13
16/24 18/14 18/22 27/19 30/16 32/11 41/18
49/8 50/23 51/7 52/22 55/13 55/24 56/17
56/20 59/23 61/20
timely [1] 41/23
timing [2] 37/17 37/21
today [16] 3/6 3/11 4/20 5/12 5/15 17/9
26/22 51/24 57/23 59/15 59/24 60/14 62/4
64/24 65/19 66/6
today's [1] 3/21
together [5] 24/21 33/10 49/17 60/12 63/19
too [1] 19/9
took [1] 10/4
topic [1] 32/21
trade [3] 43/18 45/23 45/24
tradeable [1] 51/5
trading [5] 33/16 33/20 33/21 33/22 43/17
transactions [1] 41/16
transcript [1] 60/2
transparency [1] 15/18
tried [1] 44/8
trouble [1] 31/18
troubling [1] 54/13
truly [1] 25/11
try [5] 3/22 13/2 25/5 35/12 65/15
trying [6] 25/23 37/17 37/20 38/21 55/7
59/16
turn [1] 51/1
turned [2] 51/3 61/10
twice [1] 6/12
two [17] 3/23 11/7 11/12 11/13 11/18 12/4
12/17 13/12 18/12 21/16 21/20 22/20 40/16
42/24 43/1 53/21 61/10
two-tenths [8] 11/7 11/13 12/4 12/17
13/12 21/16 21/20 22/20
type [5] 24/10 24/19 29/9 55/21 55/22
types [2] 27/14 40/16
U
ultimately [3] 10/13 48/10 61/10
unable [1] 31/3
uncertain [1] 61/11
uncertainty [3] 47/5 61/7 61/14
unclear [1] 56/23
under [13] 7/7 7/13 16/14 21/11 21/22

26/1 26/24 41/9 43/20 44/11 52/4 56/19
61/16
understand [6] 13/14 38/7 39/13 40/15 53/14 53/22
understanding [1] 8/4
understood [2] 13/5 37/23
undertook [1] 20/20
unforeseen [1] 16/9
unfortunate [1] 35/8
uniform [1] 49/18
uninvolved [1] 49/23
unique [1] $9 / 9$
units [4] 30/15 31/6 61/9 61/13
unknown [1] 61/8
unknowns [1] 46/23
unlikely [1] 46/15
unrelated [1] 29/5
until [4] 4/23 15/16 20/8 32/5
up [38] $3 / 16$ 3/23 4/2 5/10 5/23 7/5 13/13
16/19 17/15 19/8 19/13 20/1 21/20 22/8
23/18 23/18 31/14 31/18 32/5 33/11 33/15
35/12 35/24 36/9 36/14 36/24 38/2 39/3
40/9 41/3 41/24 43/21 49/16 50/4 52/21
55/15 64/22 65/7
upon [3] 26/13 27/24 46/1
ups [1] 62/2
us [6] 20/12 27/6 53/8 53/24 62/4 65/5
use [10] 19/7 24/11 29/23 50/4 51/8 51/13
51/15 51/15 52/8 53/9
used [3] 29/3 29/8 63/15
useful [7] 4/8 4/15 4/22 14/23 24/8 57/24
58/15
using [2] 12/23 50/1
utilities [16] 1/2 5/4 8/14 8/14 9/18 10/8
10/12 14/5 16/9 17/20 19/5 19/5 22/10 31/1
39/2 42/12
utility [3] 9/22 10/3 20/11
utilizing [1] 63/18
V
V-e-i-I-I-e-u-x [1] 36/5
vagaries [1] 55/8
valid [1] 47/1
value [2] 10/10 46/5
valued [1] 28/6
vantage [2] 48/17 55/18
variables [2] 54/15 57/6
various [3] 5/5 14/22 35/9
vehicle [2] 50/1 50/6
Veilleux [10] 2/15 35/22 36/2 36/4 37/16
40/21 41/15 49/3 62/18 63/7
venue [2] 32/17 63/8
verbal [4] 5/12 25/14 64/19 66/2
verification [1] 14/21
Vermont [1] 57/4
versus [3] 10/6 31/24 35/16
very [25] 8/8 11/19 12/6 24/5 24/5 24/5
24/5 25/22 27/5 32/2 36/24 40/17 49/24
50/16 51/16 52/12 53/1 55/6 59/12 59/20
59/24 61/23 63/17 65/6 65/17
VI [4] 1/7 2/12 26/2 41/9
view [4] 48/18 50/16 56/2 57/12
vintage [1] 30/11
vision [1] 54/2
W
wait [3] 37/24 39/8 50/8
waiting [1] 38/7
waiver [1] 7/9
want [18] 6/18 12/12 13/24 20/3 24/6
28/21 32/17 33/15 39/2 39/4 41/14 43/15 43/17 44/12 49/16 50/16 57/17 57/22
wanted [6] 3/20 7/2 13/5 25/13 29/11
62/17
wants [2] 5/19 5/20

Warshaw [9] 2/6 2/14 8/13 19/4 19/22
30/24 35/10 40/10 43/16
was [31] 4/2 5/3 8/1 9/21 9/24 10/6 10/22
11/8 15/4 16/18 18/6 19/8 20/20 22/5 23/16
25/4 25/16 39/4 43/2 51/14 55/7 61/7 61/8 61/11 61/13 61/15 61/17 63/12 65/7 65/14 65/20
wasn't [2] 33/17 60/23
waste [3] 36/7 36/18 60/15
waste-to-energy [2] 36/18 60/15
watching [1] 63/20
way [14] 8/7 19/1 22/5 22/9 22/21 27/15
40/23 41/7 41/21 42/1 49/17 52/10 60/16

## 61/24

ways [1] 24/9
we [131]
we'd [5] 13/12 20/4 23/19 49/6 49/24
we'll [8] 5/17 5/18 5/22 7/1 25/15 26/5 35/23 60/5
we're [20] 3/2 3/22 4/1 4/4 5/23 7/1 8/22
10/14 11/4 13/14 20/6 24/15 25/17 25/23
26/4 27/12 35/5 37/19 37/22 54/10
we've [3] 19/10 24/3 25/21
website [2] 30/17 42/15
Wednesday [1] 58/6
week [2] 5/14 65/19
well [17] 5/10 12/24 22/15 23/4 25/9 30/7
30/8 31/6 41/20 51/12 52/4 52/7 53/2 53/7
56/10 57/6 65/23
went [2] 21/2 22/6
were [18] 5/1 8/1 8/3 15/12 17/14 24/18 29/2 29/4 30/19 31/2 31/8 33/16 37/18 37/23 50/9 54/16 54/23 61/6
what [62] 5/21 5/22 6/16 7/22 10/9 10/11
11/6 13/15 18/8 20/1 20/4 20/20 25/1 25/17 26/15 28/22 29/23 32/7 32/13 32/17 32/20 32/23 32/24 33/6 34/7 34/16 35/10 37/10
37/19 38/1 40/8 40/12 40/12 40/14 40/15
40/16 42/19 43/19 44/15 44/24 47/4 48/20
49/5 49/7 49/7 49/8 49/19 53/3 53/10 54/11
54/12 55/10 56/12 56/13 57/1 57/17 61/7 61/11 62/3 63/12 64/2 65/15
what's [7] 24/2 24/8 41/9 47/8 51/20 61/19 63/17
whatever [1] 34/10
Wheelabrator [1] 36/7
when [15] 21/2 21/21 38/16 38/16 38/24
40/13 40/18 41/12 42/13 43/22 44/2 47/4 50/24 54/14 64/15
where [35] 11/4 19/11 19/24 20/4 23/14 27/15 28/16 31/16 41/8 41/16 43/8 43/10 43/15 43/18 45/19 46/2 46/4 47/2 47/6 48/5 50/22 50/22 51/7 51/16 51/18 52/16 53/16
53/16 53/23 55/18 56/13 60/10 60/23 61/12 64/23
whereas [1] 62/3
Whereupon [1] 66/7
whether [21] 3/6 3/15 4/2 4/21 10/8 23/8
23/15 24/14 25/18 27/17 28/15 28/18 28/24 46/24 47/15 56/11 56/22 58/3 60/8 65/7 65/14
which [34] 4/7 5/15 11/8 11/13 15/4 15/15
15/23 16/3 16/19 21/21 23/8 23/13 23/15
23/22 25/16 25/17 31/23 32/23 34/5 37/2
37/19 40/24 42/1 44/11 47/3 48/4 50/6
50/15 56/9 61/20 64/11 65/12 65/19 65/20
while [3] 19/15 40/23 49/4
Whitefield [2] 39/24 40/3
who [13] 5/10 8/11 23/10 27/9 39/20 40/12
51/6 51/9 51/22 59/9 59/15 61/6 62/14
Who's [1] 12/9
whole [1] 7/11
why [6] 6/4 31/6 36/8 37/7 41/14 46/8
wiggle [1] 53/8
will [43] 3/10 3/21 3/23 4/4 4/14 4/17 5/7


