















































- Current status of the 2018 double pole backlog, including the number of double pole removals for the period (by service territory);
- Current status of preventive double poles in the field, including the number of double pole removals for the period (by service territory);
- Updates regarding implementation of the Stipulated Plan (by process change, as applicable);
- Any challenges regarding the implementation of the Stipulated Plan and resolutions of them, if any;
- Additional process changes that the Parties are working to develop; and
- Any other matters of concern related to double poles.<sup>58</sup>

The Consumer Advocate's second recommendation is that the Commission should allow the "[Stakeholders to] develop targets regarding preventive double poles in the field after implementation of the [Stipulated Plan] for at least a year," and that any such "targets regarding the preventive double poles should be submitted in the [semi-annual report], starting from the

---

<sup>58</sup>See CA SOP at 19.



report on its public engagement efforts, which can be filed with the submittal of the first Double Pole Report.”<sup>62</sup>

The Consumer Advocate’s sixth recommendation is that “the Commission [should . . .] consider establishing a [Performance Based Ratemaking Performance Incentive Metric],” around the topic of double poles.<sup>63</sup>

The Consumer Advocate provides additional comments for consideration consistent with other participating Stakeholders including related to “vegetation management” and “development of a statewide One Touch program,” but the Consumer Advocate “does not currently recommend that the Commission take further steps in this docket.”<sup>64</sup>

Overall, the Consumer Advocate states that “the Commission should consider refraining from imposing additional regulatory requirements aside from those discussed in or related to subsections 1-5, above at this time.”<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup>See CA SOP at 26.

<sup>63</sup>See CA SOP at 28.

<sup>64</sup>See CA SOP at 29, 30, and 31.

<sup>65</sup>See CA SOP at 32.



III.

DISCUSSION

A.

Approving the Stipulated Comprehensive Double Pole Remedy Plan

Prior to the Application being filed, the Commission encouraged Hawaiian Electric and the Stakeholders to work together to identify a path forward that would result in a more manageable, efficient, and robust plan to reduce the double pole backlog. The Commission recognizes that the Applicants and the Consumer Advocate have proceeded diligently on the Stipulated Plan, providing innovative elements through collaboration. The Commission will not address the various points in the Stipulated Plan as the Commission understands that it is a "snapshot-in-time," and the Commission believes that the plan has resulted in a commitment and strategy by Hawaiian Electric, Stakeholders, and the Consumer Advocate to work collaboratively to address the identified issues, and thus the Commission does not see a need to explicitly manage implementation of the Stipulated Plan.

However, in line with the Consumer Advocate's request, the Commission addresses the Consumer Advocate's first through fifth recommendations, below.<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup>See CA SOP at 32.



























