
A BILL FOR AN ACT

RELATING TO ENERGY.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF HAWAII:

1 SECTION 1. The legislature finds that Hawaii utility
2 ratepayers have been forced to pay escalating prices for
3 electricity under regulatory policies that financially
4 incentivize the investor-owned utility monopoly to increase
5 consumer costs. Under these conditions, in a competitive
6 market, new companies would emerge to better serve customers
7 with cheaper rates.

8 Over the last decade, energy efficiency, conservation, and
9 increasingly cheaper solar panels have contributed to declining
10 electricity consumption in Hawaii despite a growing population.
11 While electricity sales have fallen nearly twelve per cent from
12 one thousand twelve gigawatt-hours in 2006 to eight hundred
13 ninety-eight gigawatt hours in 2014, investor-owned utility
14 profits have escalated more than eighty-four per cent from
15 \$75,000,000 to over \$138,000,000 annually, raising public anger
16 reflected in news stories.



1 The growing contradiction between the investor-owned
2 utility's shrinking electricity sales and soaring profits has
3 left many customers wondering where their money is going. The
4 exception to this profit escalation is the non-profit Kauai
5 Island Utility Cooperative, which has been able to manage
6 utility operations over the last decade with far fewer, and
7 substantially less, base rate increases than each of the
8 Hawaiian Electric Industries' electric utility companies. The
9 public utilities commission has stated that investor-owned
10 utility rates have skyrocketed in part because the Hawaiian
11 Electric Industries' electric utility companies do not, by any
12 discernible indications, appear to feel financially compelled to
13 implement corresponding decreases in utility expenses to the
14 extent that would occur with declining net revenues.

15 The legislature further finds that even when consumers
16 attempt to save money by decreasing energy consumption, a policy
17 known as decoupling forces ratepayers to pay for the value of
18 electricity not consumed, among other things. A 2014
19 investigation by Honolulu Civil Beat found leaked documents from
20 the public utilities commission revealing that Oahu residents
21 are paying about an extra \$95 per year, Maui residents are



1 paying about an extra \$57 per year, Hawaii island residents are
2 paying about an extra \$26 more per year, and Molokai and Lanai
3 residents are paying about an extra \$38 per year because of
4 decoupling policies.

5 The legislature finds that current policies also allow
6 investor-owned utilities to profit from new infrastructure
7 spending while passing these costs to ratepayers. This serves
8 as an incentive to increase infrastructure spending to boost
9 profits, which further inflates ratepayer bills. The Wall
10 Street Journal found that "the more [utilities] spend, the more
11 profits they earn," and called it "a regulatory system that
12 turns corporate accounting on its head." Achieving the State's
13 one hundred per cent renewable portfolio standard requires grid
14 upgrades and investment. However, this necessity should not be
15 a blank check for utilities to justify massive new spending.
16 Regulatory policies must change to ensure utilities maximize
17 public benefit, reduce ratepayer risk, and meet Hawaii's energy
18 goals at the lowest cost to consumers.

19 While reviewing these policies, the public utilities
20 commission found that it is difficult to ascertain whether the
21 Hawaiian Electric Industries' electric utility companies'



1 increasing capital investments are strategic investments or
2 simply a series of unrelated capital projects that effectively
3 expand utility rate base and increase profits while appearing to
4 provide little or limited long-term customer value. With
5 investor-owned utilities passing on nearly all infrastructure
6 costs to ratepayers, the public utilities commission stated that
7 as risk is currently allocated, there does not appear to be an
8 effective incentive for the Hawaiian Electric Industries'
9 electric utility companies to control certain costs, including
10 baseline project costs.

11 On November 4, 2015, the public utilities commission, for a
12 second time, rejected the investor-owned utilities' plans for
13 future infrastructure spending because the commission is
14 concerned that the implicit deal in the Hawaiian Electric
15 Industries' electric utility companies' preferred plans appears
16 to favor the financial interests of the companies while
17 providing less prominent and less certain benefits for
18 customers. The commission explained that the Hawaiian Electric
19 Industries' electric utility companies appear to have included
20 resources with higher costs and uncertain feasibility at the



1 expense of other lower-cost renewable sources that could be
2 developed sooner and with lower development risk.

3 Finally, the public utilities commission concluded that the
4 Hawaiian Electric Industries' electric utility companies'
5 prominent claim that the power supply improvement plan would
6 result in twenty per cent residential bill reductions is a
7 selectively limited and potentially misleading characterization
8 of the supporting analyses. Closer examination indicates that
9 the power supply improvement plan costs and rates would increase
10 for Hawaiian Electric Company, and would not decrease
11 substantially for the Maui Electric Company and the Hawaii
12 Electric Light Company.

13 The legislature finds that investor-owned utilities in
14 Hawaii and around the nation have operated on largely the same
15 business model for over a century. However, that is rapidly
16 changing with the growth of alternative renewable energy
17 technology, spurring a paradigm shift in new competition and
18 energy economics. To satisfy shareholder expectations,
19 investor-owned utilities have been forced to make up for lost
20 revenue as a result of declining electricity sales by boosting
21 profits through increasing infrastructure spending and other



1 current policies that can needlessly inflate ratepayer costs.
2 The public utilities commission has stated that the Hawaiian
3 Electric Industries' electric utility companies appear not to be
4 moving toward the sustainable business model necessary to
5 address technological advancements and increasing customer
6 expectations, and that to date, the utility displays
7 insufficient urgency in addressing this rapidly changing
8 business environment.

9 The legislature finds that it has an obligation to place
10 the interests of the people first. Maximizing public benefit
11 likely means a transition to utility models that place the
12 interests of the people first. However, until a utility model
13 transformation takes place, it is imperative to align investor-
14 owned utility regulatory policies with customers' interests and
15 the State's public policy goals before billions of dollars in
16 additional costs are added to ratepayer electric bills.

17 The legislature finds the responsibility of aligning
18 investor-owned utility regulatory policies with customers'
19 interests and the State's public policy goals is not limited to
20 the public utilities commission, but more broadly rests with the
21 State and county governments that represent the public interest.



1 The regulatory framework under which utilities operate and the
2 scope of regulation by the public utilities commission are
3 established by the legislature, which holds the exclusive
4 authority to issue, amend, or revoke franchise rights which
5 permit utilities to operate in the State.

6 The purpose of this Act is to protect ratepayers from
7 potentially unnecessary additional costs by requiring that
8 electric utility rates are considered just and reasonable only
9 if the rates are derived from an earnings impact mechanism
10 developed by the public utilities commission.

11 SECTION 2. This Act shall be known as the Hawaii Ratepayer
12 Protection Act.

13 SECTION 3. Chapter 269, Hawaii Revised Statutes, is
14 amended by adding a new section to be appropriately designated
15 and to read as follows:

16 "§269- Performance incentive mechanisms. On or before
17 January 1, 2020, the public utilities commission shall establish
18 performance incentive mechanisms that directly tie electric
19 utility revenues to the utility's achievement on performance
20 metrics. In developing performance incentive mechanisms and
21 performance metrics, the public utilities commission's review of



1 electric utility performance may include but is not limited to
2 the following:

- 3 (1) Compliance with the State's renewable portfolio
- 4 standards;
- 5 (2) Electric rate affordability;
- 6 (3) Electric service reliability;
- 7 (4) Levels of customer service;
- 8 (5) Utility system information access, including but not
- 9 limited to public access to electric system planning
- 10 data and aggregated customer energy usage data;
- 11 (6) Integration of renewable energy sources, including
- 12 customer-sited generation; and
- 13 (7) Timely execution of competitive procurement
- 14 processes."

15 SECTION 4. New statutory material is underscored.

16 SECTION 5. This Act shall take effect upon its approval;
17 provided that the public utilities commission may delay the
18 implementation of the requirements of this Act until no later
19 than January 1, 2020.



Report Title:

Public Utilities Commission; Electric Utilities; Rates

Description:

Requires the PUC to establish performance incentive mechanisms that directly tie electric utility revenues to the utility's achievement on performance metrics. Effective upon approval, but allows PUC to delay implementation until no later than January 1, 2020. (HB2649 HD1)

The summary description of legislation appearing on this page is for informational purposes only and is not legislation or evidence of legislative intent.

