



THE ASSEMBLY
STATE OF NEW YORK
ALBANY

CHAIRMAN
Committee on Governmental Operations

COMMITTEES
Education
Energy
Higher Education
Rules

STEVEN ENGLEBRIGHT
4th Assembly District
Suffolk County

August 29, 2014

Hon. Kathleen H. Burgess
Secretary, Dept. of Public Service
3 Empire State Plaza
Albany, NY 12223

Ms. Julia Bovey
Director, Dept. of Public Service
125 East Bethpage Road
Plainview, NY 11803

Re: Matter Number 14-01299-PSEG Long Island's 2.0 Plan

Dear Hon. Burgess and Ms. Bovey:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Utility 2.0 Plan.

I would like to acknowledge and commend PSEG on its studied evaluation of Long Island's future energy needs and its determination that Caithness II would not be needed. Without that determination and the resultant shelving of the Caithness II proposal, any meaningful Utility 2.0 Long Range Plan for the Long Island region would have been deferred for decades. Now, our region will now have the opportunity to develop a cogent, cost-effective and transformational energy plan that will take us into a cleaner and better future that includes a substantial reliance on renewables and recycles our legacy plants.

I have been a member of the Assembly's Standing Committee on Energy for 20 years and am privileged to be one of the leading members of the Legislature working on the advancement of clean renewable energy generation through solar and wind energy net metering. My legislation, the Solar Choice Act of 1996 provided for New York its first residential solar net metering program and in 2008 legislation I sponsored expanded net-metering to all customer classes.

After more than two decades of helping to advance clean renewable energy, I am heartened that conservation and increased use of renewable energy production are now top priorities.

PSEG's draft Utility 2.0 plan, while a good start, needs to go further in its commitment to renewable energy. This plan should address how PSEG will align itself to meet NY State's renewable and energy efficiency goals, including reaching the 50% carbon emission reduction by 2030 and the 80% reduction by 2050. An outline of a broad vision should be provided as well as interim steps and targets for what it will achieve in terms of increasing renewable energy for Long Island.

I strongly oppose the idea PSEG floated on page 4-4 regarding tariffs on customers who have invested their own resources in net-metered renewables. Though solar net-metering in NY State is approaching its 20th year, these customers remain pioneers in clean, renewable distributed energy generation and are helping to transform our

energy system. Your suggestion that a tariff on net-metered customers might insure that all customers who benefit from utility service “pay their fair share of costs” neglects to factor into the equation the tremendous benefits these customers provide to the entire electric system as well as to the quality of our air and reduction of greenhouse gases. They should not be disadvantaged nor discouraged as a consequence of narrow thought policy.

I would also like to associate myself with a very important point made by Neal Lewis of The Sustainability Institute of Molloy College. In his comments dated August 25, 2014 Mr. Lewis said:

“Several individuals have commented that the strategy for PSEG to provide \$200 million dollars as a loan to fund the efficiency program expansion appears ill-considered. I will not belabor the point that charging interest when LIPA can get loans at lower interest rates does not make sense. I would like however, to identify an additional concern regarding this strategy for financing. The new contract for PSEG was crafted to achieve several goals with one of them being avoiding the problems with misaligned interests and incentives that existed in the old National Grid contract. It is important for the public’s interest in a well-run utility, and LIPA and PSEG’s interests to all be in alignment. That is why the contract provides a clear fee structure and additional incentives for PSEG doing a good job, as evidenced by such things as improving public satisfaction poll ratings for the utility’s performance. Proposing a method for PSEG to earn additional profit from an unnecessary loan will undermine that important goal.”

PSEG should utilize the confidence that recently has been given to them to treat Long Island ratepayers as valued customers deserving of fair and honorable service rather than repeat the way that other private electric supply companies have too often viewed us. The PSEG Long Island Utility 2.0 Long Range Plan is a potentially effective tool for enhancing a long-term relationship between the people of Long Island and PSEG. I urge PSEG as it finalizes this plan to sharpen its focus upon renewables and treat the Long Island customer base as a long-term investment built upon constructing now a foundation of trust.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on this proposal and look forward to working with the Department of Public Service, the Governor’s office, PSEG Long Island, and LIPA to develop a cogent, cost-effective and transformational energy plan that will take us into a cleaner and better future.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Steve Englebright". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large initial 'S'.

Steve Englebright