

September 9, 2014

Debra A. Howland
Executive Director
New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission
21 S. Fruit Street, Suite 10
Concord, NH 03301-2429

Re: DRM 13-311 Rulemaking PUC 902 & 909 Group Net Metering

Dear Ms. Howland:

I submit the following comments in response to the proposed rule issued by the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission ("PUC") in the above-cited rulemaking docket. Overall, the rule is fair and workable, and it will hopefully lead to a robust net metering program in New Hampshire that will both support local industry and bolster the local electric systems. I have two specific comments, both of which were discussed at the August 27th public hearing.

The actual wording used in the PUC's proposed definition for "facility" (PUC 902.09) appears to give a good amount of flexibility to develop projects in the most efficient way possible - both from a cost and land use perspective. At the public hearing, however, PUC staff indicated that it was not their intention that the definition would allow multiple facilities on a single parcel of land. First, I note that, if this is the PUC's intention, the wording in the definition does not reflect this intent. Instead, it only refers to the meter that is connected to the facility. Second, I strongly urge the PUC to not change the language in the definition, which provides necessary flexibility, but to make clear that in certain situations it is okay for two or more facilities to be located on the same parcel. To unilaterally state that only one facility can be located on a land parcel will prevent communities from determining where net metering projects should be developed in a smart and efficient manner. Oftentimes, there will be one central location that is appropriate for renewable energy development that could be used to serve many members of the community. As an example, an industrial park near existing large businesses and utility infrastructure might be the best place for multiple projects to serve a community.

Instead, an interpretation of the rule as discussed at the public hearing would force scattered development of projects in places that may not be the best for a community or landowners that are adjacent to a project. As a counter example, a project may be forced into a rural location that has both high aesthetic and agricultural value. This would create frustration and resentment of the net metering program, resulting in restrained growth in a program that will provide significant benefits to the state and its ratepayers. There is nothing in the statute that would require the interpretation discussed by the PUC staff and such an interpretation would result in inefficient development of group net metering projects. Similarly, the inclusion of "in the normal course of business" should not act as an excuse for a utility to unilaterally determine that a

centralized location should not be used for group net metering development when it otherwise would be the most appropriate location.

Finally, I agree with the PUC staff that the language added to the definition of “customer-generator” (PUC 902.03) is both consistent with the net metering statute and is necessary to promote the development of group net metering projects. The additional language merely clarifies the phrase “customer's own electricity requirements” from the definition of “eligible customer-generator” in RSA 362-A:1-a, II-b. It is not inconsistent with any part of the statute and the PUC is acting within its authority to provide this further clarification.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. With the exception of the concern about the interpretation of the definition of “facility” discussed above, the final rule looks to promote strong development of net metering projects in New Hampshire.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "E.D. Emerson", written in a cursive style.

Elijah D. Emerson