

STATE OF VERMONT
PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD

Docket No. 7535

Investigation into: (1) petition of AARP, for the)
establishment of reduced rates for low-income)
consumers of Green Mountain Power Corporation and)
Central Vermont Public Service Corporation; and (2) as)
expanded to possibly include general applicability to all)
Vermont retail electric utilities (In Re: Phase 2))

Order entered: 7/17/2012

PROCEDURAL ORDER

On May 5, 2012, I issued a procedural Order (the "May 5th Procedural Order") in which I posed several questions to Green Mountain Power Corporation ("GMP") and Central Vermont Public Service Corporation ("CVPS," and, with GMP, the "Companies") regarding the proposed final compliance plans and supporting prefiled testimony and exhibits that were filed on February 1, 2012. In the May 5th Procedural Order, I also established a deadline of June 15, 2012, for the Vermont Department of Public Service ("Department"), AARP and IBM to file written objections, if any, to the admission into evidence of (1) the prefiled testimony and exhibits submitted by the Companies on February 1, 2012; and (2) the Companies' answers to the questions posed in the May 5th Procedural Order. To date, only the Department, GMP and CVPS have advised that they do not object to the admission of these materials into the record.¹

I have completed my review of the additional information provided by the Companies on June 1, 2012. Based on this supplemental information, as well as upon the supplemental direct testimony and exhibits filed by the Companies on February 1, 2012, I believe this matter is ready for decision. However, I have belatedly recognized that the May 5th Procedural Order omitted to

¹Neither AARP nor IBM elected to file any comments or evidentiary objection on June 15, 2012.

provide notice of my intent to make findings based on the supplemental testimony and exhibits filed on February 1st and the supplemental information filed on June 1st. Consequently, the May 5th Procedural Order also failed to address whether any party desires an opportunity to cross-examine the Companies' witnesses regarding the supplemental evidentiary materials. Therefore, I would ask the Companies, the Department, AARP and IBM to confirm **by July 27, 2012**, that no additional technical hearings are needed or desired before I issue a Proposal for Decision.

The Companies, the Department and AARP have variously suggested that it may be useful to convene a workshop to discuss the proposed final compliance plans. It is not clear whether the parties are requesting a workshop for their own benefit or are proposing a workshop for my benefit. Based on the existing evidentiary record — and assuming no technical hearing is requested — I perceive no need for a workshop to aid the drafting of a proposal for decision. However, I will convene a workshop if the parties request one for their own benefit. To this end, any party who wishes to request a workshop should do so **by July 27, 2012**.

SO ORDERED.

Dated at Montpelier, Vermont, this 17th day of July, 2012.

s/ June E. Tierney
June E. Tierney, Esq.
Hearing Officer

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

FILED: July 17, 2012

ATTEST: s/ Judith C. Whitney
Deputy Clerk of the Board

NOTICE TO READERS: This decision is subject to revision of technical errors. Readers are requested to notify the Clerk of the Board (by e-mail, telephone, or in writing) of any apparent errors, in order that any necessary corrections may be made. (E-mail address: psb.clerk@state.vt.us)