

STATE OF NEW YORK
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Proceeding on Motion of the Commission as to the Rates,
Charges, Rules and Regulations of KeySpan Gas East
Corp. dba Brooklyn Union of L.I. for Gas Service.

Case 16-G-0058

Proceeding on Motion of the Commission as to the Rates,
Charges, Rules and Regulations of The Brooklyn Union
Gas Company dba National Grid NY for Gas Service.

Case 16-G-0059

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

GREGG C. COLLAR

Dated: June 10, 2016
Albany, New York

UTILITY INTERVENTION UNIT
DIVISION OF CONSUMER PROTECTION
NYS DEPARTMENT OF STATE
99 WASHINGTON AVENUE
SUITE 640
ALBANY, NY 12231-0001
www.dos.ny.gov

1 Q. Mr. Collar, did you file direct testimony in this case?

2 A. Yes.

3

4 Q. What is the purpose of this rebuttal testimony?

5 A. The purpose of this testimony is to respond to the Public Service Commission's
6 Order Adopting Low Income Program Modifications and Directing Utility Filings
7 ("Low Income Order") that was issued May 20, 2016 in Case 14-M-0565.

8

9 Q. Please discuss this Low Income Order.

10 A. The Order establishes a unified statewide approach to utility low income
11 programs, and prescribes several changes to utilities' current programs. The
12 Order is far-reaching and comprehensive, and will require significant efforts on
13 the part of utilities to review, consider, and implement its requirements. The
14 Order directs the Companies to file a document within 90 days (on or about
15 August 19, 2016) describing how the Companies intend to achieve
16 implementation of the framework outlined in the Order. The filing deadline for
17 this implementation plan will likely precede the conclusion of these rate
18 proceedings.

19 As I noted in my initial testimony, the Order declines to resolve all matters
20 related to the utilities' low income programs. Instead, several low income-related
21 matters are left to be determined in rate proceedings, including identifying eligible
22 customers, discount design details, cost allocation, the specific method of cost
23 recovery, cost allocation, and whether and how to implement arrearage

1 forgiveness and/or reconnection fees.

2 However, it is not clear whether these requirements of the Order apply to
3 rate cases that were initiated prior to the Order's issuance. For example,
4 Ordering Clause 2 requires the Companies to "utilize their existing low income
5 program cost recovery methods, to the extent practicable, and estimate the cost
6 allocation among the classes resulting from such an approach." (Low Income
7 Order at 47.) The Order does not specify, however, whether such estimated cost
8 allocation should then be adopted in a currently-pending rate proceeding. It is
9 possible that issues such as these might be addressed by the "inter-agency task
10 force" that Department of Public Service Staff is instructed to establish under
11 Ordering Clause 9. (Low Income Order at 48.)

12

13 Q. What is UIU's reaction to the Companies' implementation of the Low Income
14 Order?

15 A. UIU cannot evaluate the Companies' implementation of the Low Income Order
16 until we have had a chance to review their implementation plan, which as noted
17 above, is not due until mid-August. The burden rests on the Companies to
18 develop a strategy for implementing the Order. It would therefore be speculative
19 and premature to offer comments at this time.

20 Intervenor parties such as UIU will comment on the Companies'
21 implementation plan once it has been submitted. UIU expects that a vigorous
22 discussion among the parties will occur and will be critical to ensuring a
23 successful implementation of the Low Income Order.

1 Furthermore, UIU is willing to discuss the Low Income Order with the
2 Companies in advance of the implementation plan due date. If discussions
3 among the parties to the current rate proceedings can help guide the Companies
4 in complying with the Low Income Order, then UIU supports such a process.

5

6 Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?

7 A. Yes.