

Interests Affected

I am a Vermont Gas Systems customer. My interest in seeking permissive intervention is to ensure that I will not have to pay extra because of rate increases resulting from a claimed benefit that does not actually exist. VGS makes the claim that “the Contract aligns with State ... climate goals in a cost-effective manner that benefits VGS customers”, a claim which I dispute. (Murray prefiled direct testimony, page 3, lines 16 & 17). I intend to show that the contract will provide no benefit to me as a VGS ratepayer and, furthermore, that it does not align with Vermont’s climate goals or allow VGS “to contribute to the State’s Global Warming Solutions Act requirements”. (Murray prefiled direct testimony, page 4, lines 15 and 16.)

Protecting my interests

There is no other way for me to protect my interests than to participate in this proceeding. Moreover, without the access to redacted documents, which VGS claims as protected, I will not be able to make my case that VGS’s claim of cost-effectiveness is incorrect. In its filing of July 5, “The Department recommends an investigation to carefully evaluate the Contract and ensure the benefits of VGS’s efforts are delivered to Vermont ratepayers in a least-cost manner, consistent with 30 V.S.A. § 218c.” (THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE’S RECOMMENDATION, page 3, concluding sentence.) This makes clear that the Department of Public Service’s overriding interest in this case is whether the contract under consideration is as fully consistent as possible with the statutory least-cost standard. The GHG emissions reduction benefits of the contract are assumed by the DPS. It is exactly this assumption and the issues related to it that I believe need to be aired and resolved. I do not see that any other party participating in this case is prepared to provide testimony on these issues.

Catherine Bock
175 A North Prospect St
Burlington, Vermont 05401