1	STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
2	PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
3	entre in the second of the sec
4	October 23, 2013 - 10:08 a.m. NHPUC NOVO6'13 AM 9:53
5	Concord, New Hampshire
6	
7	RE: DW 13-126 PENNICHUCK EAST UTILITY, INC.:
8	Notice of Intent to File Rate Schedules. (Hearing regarding Temporary Rates)
9	
10′	PRESENT: Chairman Amy L. Ignatius, Presiding Commissioner Robert R. Scott
11	Sandy Deno, Clerk
12	
13	APPEARANCES: Reptg. Pennichuck East Utility, Inc.:
14	Thomas B. Getz, Esq. (Devine, Millimet)
15	Reptg. Residential Ratepayers: Rorie E. P. Hollenberg, Esq.
16	James Brennan Office of Consumer Advocate
17	Reptg. PUC Staff:
18	Marcia A. Brown, Esq. Michael Sheehan, Esq.
19	Mark Naylor, Director/Gas & Water Division Jayson Laflamme, Gas & Water Division
20	Robyn Descoteau, Gas & Water Division
21	
22	
23	Court Reporter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52
24	

1		
2	INDEX	
3		PAGE NO.
4	WITNESS PANEL: DONALD L. WARE JAYSON P. LAFLAMME	
5	UAISON F. LACHANNE	
6	Direct examination by Mr. Getz	6
7	Direct examination by Ms. Brown	10
8	Cross-examination by Ms. Hollenberg	19
9	Interrogatories by Cmsr. Scott	21
10	Interrogatories by Chairman Ignatius	22
11		
12	* * *	
13		
13 14	CLOSING STATEMENTS BY:	PAGE NO.
	CLOSING STATEMENTS BY:  Ms. Hollenberg	PAGE NO.
14		
14 15	Ms. Hollenberg	30
14 15 16	Ms. Hollenberg Ms. Brown	30 31
14 15 16 17	Ms. Hollenberg Ms. Brown	30 31
14 15 16 17	Ms. Hollenberg Ms. Brown	30 31
14 15 16 17 18	Ms. Hollenberg Ms. Brown	30 31
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Ms. Hollenberg Ms. Brown	30 31
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Ms. Hollenberg Ms. Brown	30 31

1			
2		EXHIBITS	
3	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
4	1	Pennichuck East Utility rate filing, including testimony,	6
5	sched	schedules, Petitions for Temporary and Permanent Rates, tariff	
6		pages, etc. (05-31-13)	
7	2	Settlement Agreement regarding Temporary Rates (10-09-13)	6
8		Temporary Naces (10 03 13)	
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

Τ	PROCEEDING
2	CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I'd like to open the
3	hearing in Docket DW 13-126. This is the case of
4	Pennichuck East Utility's request for permanent rates.
5	And, what we have before us today is the issue of
6	temporary rates.
7	So, let's begin first with appearances.
8	MR. GETZ: Good morning, Chairman
9	Ignatius, Commissioner Scott. I'm Tom Getz, from the law
10	firm of Devine, Millimet & Branch, on behalf of Pennichuck
11	East Utility, Inc. And, also here today are the Chief
12	Executive Officer of Pennichuck Corporation, John
13	Patenaude, and also Donald Ware, who's the Chief Operating
14	Officer.
15	CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Good morning.
16	Welcome.
17	MS. HOLLENBERG: Good morning. Rorie
18	Hollenberg and Jim Brennan here for the Office of Consumer
19	Advocate.
20	CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Good morning.
21	MS. BROWN: Good morning, Commissioners.
22	Marcia Brown, on behalf of Staff. And, with me today is
23	Mark Naylor, Attorney Mike Sheehan, and Robyn Descoteau.
24	I also have Jayson Laflamme already at the witness box.

As evidenced by Mr. Ware and Mr. Laflamme being in the
witness box, we intend to present a panel in support of
today's Stipulation Agreement. And, may I segue into
identification of exhibits that parties have agreed to?
Exhibit 1 we intend to mark the initial
rate filing. We have sequentially numbered the initial
filing. So, it will be marked as a separate exhibit,
rather than be transferred over in the Commission's
docketbook from Tab 5. It just has the Bates stamps on
it, but it is identical.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Great.
MS. BROWN: Just by way of
clarification, there was supplemental testimony at Tab 16
of John Boisvert. That is not included in the initial
filing. We just wanted to preserve the initial filing as
"Exhibit 1". And, since the supplemental testimony
pertains to the permanent rate issue, we felt it was
appropriate to mark it at the permanent rate phase, rather
than the temporary rate phase. And, as "Exhibit 2", we
propose the Settlement Agreement, which you should have
before you, which is identical to what is at Tab 19, filed
on October 9th, 2013. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you. We'll

mark both of those for identification; Exhibit 1 being the

1	full rate case filing and Exhibit 2 being the Settlement
2	Agreement proposed for temporary rates.
3	(The documents, as described, were
4	herewith marked as <b>Exhibit 1</b> and
5	Exhibit 2, respectively, for
6	identification.)
7	CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Anything else before
8	we swear the witnesses?
9	(No verbal response)
10	CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Seeing nothing,
11	then, Mr. Patnaude.
12	(Whereupon <b>Donald L. Ware</b> and
13	Jayson P. Laflamme were duly sworn by
14	the Court Reporter.)
15	DONALD L. WARE, SWORN
16	JAYSON P. LAFLAMME, SWORN
17	DIRECT EXAMINATION
18	BY MR. GETZ:
19	Q. Good morning, Mr. Ware. Would you please state your
20	name, employer, and business address for the record.
21	A. (Ware) Yes. My name is Donald Ware. I'm employed by
22	Pennichuck Corporation. And, the business address is
23	25 Manchester Street, in Merrimack, New Hampshire.
24	Q. And, what is your position with the Company and what

1 are your job responsibilities?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

A. (Ware) I am the Chief Operating Officer of Pennichuck
Corporation, and Pennichuck East Utility as well. And,
I'm responsible for the day-to-day operations and the
oversight of the Water Supply, Engineering,
Distribution, Meter, and Customer Service Departments.

- Q. Okay. Turning your attention to the rate case filing that's been marked for identification as "Exhibit 1", at Tab 5, or Bates stamp Page 15, is the "Direct Prefiled Testimony of Donald L. Ware in Support of Temporary Rates". Was this testimony prepared by you or under your supervision?
- 13 A. (Ware) Yes, it was.
- 14 Q. Do you have any changes or corrections?
- 15 A. (Ware) No, I do not.
- Q. If you were asked these questions today, would your answers be the same?
- 18 A. (Ware) Yes, they would be.
- 19 Q. Is the testimony true and correct to the best of your 20 knowledge and belief?
- 21 A. (Ware) Yes, it is.
- Q. Would you please give a brief overview of the request for permanent rates and also the request for temporary rates.

A. (Ware) Yes. In this case, Pennichuck East has
requested a permanent rate increase of 9.97 percent, or
\$591,485. Additionally, a step increase of
2.25 percent, with an additional revenue of \$133,431.
So, the permanent and step request together is a total
request of 12.21 percent, or \$724,916.
And, relative to the temporary rate

And, relative to the temporary rate request, the Company has requested a 7 percent temporary rate increase, or a total of \$415,437.

- Q. Now, also I have a question with respect to the mailing of customer notices. Could you please tell the Commission the steps that the Company took with respect to those notices.
- A. (Ware) Yes. First of all, we prepared the notices in concert with the Consumer Affairs Division of the Public Utilities Commission. We worked with Ms. Amanda Noonan, in order to work up both the notices that were mailed to our customers and the display ads that were put in the papers. The individual notices were mailed to our customers over a period of four weeks with their bills. They were mailed on June 6th, June 13th, June 20th, and June 27th. We also published the display ad of the proposed rate increase in the Manchester Union Leader and the Conway Daily Sun. And, those

1 publications were done on June 26th.

- Q. Okay. And, turning to Exhibit 2, the Settlement

  Agreement on Temporary Rates, did you participate in

  that process that resulted in the Settlement?
- 5 A. (Ware) Yes, I did.
- 6 Q. Would you please describe the terms of the Settlement.
- 7 (Ware) Yes. The terms of the Settlement were that we Α. 8 would be granted a 7 percent increase over existing 9 rates, or a total \$415,437. And, that we would --10 temporary rates would be based on a service rendered on 11 or after July 1st of 2013. And, as we discussed 12 yesterday, that those rates would -- initial recoupment 13 would begin at the date of the order, but the 14 recoupment of the temporary rates between July 1st and 15 the order would occur at the date of the permanent 16 order.
  - Q. And, in your opinion, does the Settlement Agreement provide for just and reasonable rates and is it in the public interest?
- 20 A. (Ware) Yes, it is.
- 21 MR. GETZ: I have nothing further for the witness.
- 23 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
- Ms. Brown.

17

18

10

1 MS. BROWN: Yes.

- 2 BY MS. BROWN:
- Q. Mr. Laflamme, if you could please state your name and position with the Commission for the record.
- A. (Laflamme) My name is Jayson Laflamme. I'm a Utility
  Analyst with the Public Utilities Commission, Gas and
  Water Division.
- 8 Q. And, can you please describe your area of expertise?
- 9 A. (Laflamme) Accounting and finance.
- Q. And, as a Utility Analyst with the Commission, do you practice within that area of expertise?
- 12 A. (Laflamme) Yes, I do.

23

- Q. Can you please describe your involvement with this docket?
- 15 Α. (Laflamme) My involvement with this docket included a 16 review of the filings that were submitted by Pennichuck 17 East. In conjunction with that, I reviewed the annual 18 reports that were on record here at the Commission. I 19 participated in the submission of data requests. 20 reviewed the data requests -- the data responses that 21 were submitted by the Company. And, I participated in 22 the formulation of this Settlement Agreement.
  - Q. Mr. Laflamme, do you have any changes or corrections to make to the Settlement Agreement?

```
1
    Α.
         (Laflamme) No, I don't.
```

- 2 Are you familiar with the term "books and records on Q. 3 file with the Commission"?
- 4 Α. (Laflamme) Yes.
- 5 Q. And, what do you deem to be the "books and records"?
- (Laflamme) Primarily, the annual reports that are 6 Α. 7 submitted by the Company. The Company also submits 8 monthly reports to the Commission as well. That's what I would primarily deem as the "books and records on 9 10 file at the Commission".
- 11 And, are those also items that you reviewed in Q. 12 connection with this docket?
- 13 (Laflamme) Yes, I did. Α.
- 14 Thank you. Mr. Laflamme, can you please explain the 15 reasons why Staff is supporting the 7 percent proposed 16 temporary rate increase that's contained in this 17 Settlement Agreement?
- 18 Α. (Laflamme) Yes. The Company has -- the last full rate 19 proceeding that Pennichuck East had before the 20 Commission was DW 07-032. And, rate -- permanent 21 rates, plus a step, were granted by two Commission 22 orders during the year 2008. Subsequent to that, in DW 23 09-051, there were assets for three -- three so-called 24 "North Country systems" transferred to Pennichuck East,

[WITNESS PANEL: Ware~Laflamme]

and that took place, I believe, in 2010. But the recovery for those North Country system assets was only in the form of the North Country Capital Recovery Surcharge. So, the Company hasn't experienced a full rate proceeding since the 07-032 docket.

Since that time, the Company, in addition to the North Country assets acquired in 2010, the Company has also placed into service roughly 5 to 6 million dollars of net plant in service that they're not earning recovery on. Also, as was indicated in the Company's testimony, that it has undergone or experienced substantial increases in certain operating expenses, namely, property taxes, insurance, etcetera.

As a result, during the last two years, 2011 and 2012, the company is earning less than half of the net operating income that was authorized in 07-032. And, consequently, the Company has also experienced substantial net operating losses during those two years. So, it would appear that the Company is substantially underearning. And, so, we look -- Staff looks at the imposition of temporary rates as a means to have the Company gain some such needed revenue, in light of the fact that it does appear to be substantially underearning.

1 Also, as Mr. Ware pointed out, the 2 Company is seeking roughly a 10 percent permanent rate 3 increase. And, in addition to that, the Company is 4 also seeking a two plus percent step increase. And, 5 while the merits of the step increase have not been 6 fully examined, and that step increase has not been 7 approved, customers potentially are looking at a 12 8 plus percent increase in rates as a result of this rate 9 proceeding. And, therefore, to diminish rate shock to 10 customers, Staff feels that it would be prudent to have 11 a 7 percent temporary rates in order to mitigate rate 12 shock. 13 Thank you for covering multiple questions in your Q. 14 response. Thank you very much. One thing I just want

- Q. Thank you for covering multiple questions in your response. Thank you very much. One thing I just want to cover expressly, does Staff have any concern that the Company is going to be overearning during this pendency of temporary rates?
- 18 A. (Laflamme) No.

15

16

- 19 Q. Thank you. Mr. Laflamme, do you have a copy of
  20 Exhibit 2, the Settlement Agreement, in front of you?
- 21 A. (Laflamme) Yes, I do.
- Q. I'd like to have you turn to Attachment A. And, can
  you just please identify the revenue requirement Staff
  and the Company are asking the Commission to approve

for temporary rates?

- A. (Laflamme) The revenue requirement that's being sought, and taking into account the Capital Recovery Surcharge, is \$6,650,608.
- Q. Thank you. Mr. Ware, I have a question for you on this
  Attachment A, if you have it in front of you?
  - A. (Ware) Yes.

2

3

4

7

- 9 Q. Mr. Laflamme just mentioned the "Capital Recovery
  Surcharge". Can you just please briefly explain what
  that charge is for?
- 11 (Ware) Yes. When the so-called "North Country systems" Α. 12 were acquired, and there were three of them, from 13 Integrated and Consolidated Water, there's a 14 substantial amount of capital work that needed to be 15 completed at each one of those utilities. And, in 16 looking at how to handle that cost, without creating an 17 undue subsidy by the other utilities that were part of, 18 in this case, Pennichuck East Utility, there was a 19 determination made that we should take those capital 20 costs and set up essentially a 30-year note with each 21 of the three utilities to reflect the abnormal amount 22 of capital that had to be invested to bring them up to 23 a certain standard of service. And, so, that was set 24 And, each one of these utilities -- each one of up.

- 1 these three water systems, excuse me, is paying for a
- 2 portion of that initial capital outlay that was
- necessary, again, to get these systems up and
- functional, because they were quite disfunctional when
- 5 we acquired them.
- 6 Q. Thank you for that historical background. And, am I
- 7 correct in reading in this attachment A, the Capital
- 8 Recovery Surcharge is not going to have a 7 percent
- 9 temporary increase in it?
- 10 A. (Ware) That is correct.
- 11 Q. Thank you. And, is it also correct that the 7 percent
- 12 temporary rate increase will not affect any of like the
- 13 utility service fees?
- 14 A. (Ware) That is correct.
- 15 Q. So, it's only for the customer classes?
- 16 A. (Ware) Yes.
- 17 Q. And, it's for the customer classes identified in the
- 18 tariff?
- 19 A. (Ware) That is correct.
- 20 Q. Yes. I just want to ask you one other question about
- 21 the -- Mr. Ware, about the rate classes that's on
- 22 Attachment A. It says "G-M", is that
- "General-Metered"?
- 24 A. (Ware) Yes.

- 1 Q. Is there a customer class for unmetered?
- 2 Α. (Ware) We have a class for unmetered, yes. I believe 3 there's a tariff sheet for that at present, yes.
- 4 And, do you have any customers in that class? Q.
- 5 (Ware) No.
- 6 Thank you. So, the "Private Fire Protection" and "FP", Q. 7 or "Fire Protection (Municipal)" and "Public Hydrants", did you take some of the tariff sheets and lump them 8
- 10 (Ware) Yes. And, you see --

into these categories?

11 (Court reporter interruption.)

#### 12 BY THE WITNESS:

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

- (Ware) Yes. They were consolidated. Public hydrants, you see the parens indicated "3", there are three tariff sheets in individual communities where there are public hydrants. And, so, the revenues from those three communities with public hydrants are -- they were consolidated to form that \$23,815 worth of revenues collected in 2012.
- 20 BY MS. BROWN:
- 21 Q. Thank you. Mr. Laflamme, I'd like to ask you a 22 question about reconciliation. Are you familiar with 23 the process Staff undertakes with reconciling temporary 24 and permanent rates?

[WITNESS PANEL: Ware~Laflamme]

1 A. (Laflamme) Yes.

- Q. And, can you please describe what Staff expects at the conclusion of permanent rates, in terms of a filing from the Company?
  - A. (Laflamme) We anticipate that we will receive a filing by the Company, which contains a proposal to recover the difference between temporary rates and the permanent rates that are ultimately approved by the Commission. Staff will examine that proposal, including the underlying calculations which support that, support that proposal. And, then, Staff will be making a recommendation to the Commission. And, then, the Commission will ultimately decide the appropriate level of temporary rate recoupment.
    - Q. Mr. Laflamme, have you been involved in a docket where you're reviewing a Company's proposed reconciliation between temporary and permanent rates, and that the rate classes have changed as a result of the cost of service study during that proceeding?
- 20 A. (Laflamme) Yes.
- Q. Is there any additional burden to Staff to reviewing such a reconciliation report?
- 23 A. (Laflamme) Not especially, no.
- 24 Q. Okay. Thank you. And, Mr. Ware, PEU has filed a cost

of service study in this docket, correct?

- 2 A. (Ware) That is correct.
- Q. And, is there any concern on the Company's side that,
- 4 should the cost of service study be -- or, the
- 5 recommendations in their for changes to rate design be
- 6 implemented, is there any difficulty in the Company
- 7 doing the temporary/permanent reconciliation report?
- 8 A. (Ware) No.
- 9 Q. Thank you. Mr. Laflamme, do you have an opinion as to
- 10 the just and reasonableness of the rates proposed in
- 11 the Settlement Agreement?
- 12 A. (Laflamme) Yes. Staff feels that, in light of the
- evidence, that the rates -- temporary rates proposed
- 14 are just and reasonable.
- MS. BROWN: It looks like Attorney Getz
- and Staff are finished with the direct at this point.
- 17 Thank you.
- 18 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
- 19 Ms. Hollenberg, questions?
- 20 MS. HOLLENBERG: Yes. Thank you. One
- 21 moment please.
- 22 (Short pause.)
- MS. HOLLENBERG: Having done this twice
- 24 before, I have kind words for my colleagues here who have

[WITNESS PANEL: Ware~Laflamme]

1 covered many of my questions that I would have had

2 otherwise.

5

7

8

9

10

11

3 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: It does have a

4 familiar ring to it, I have to say.

### CROSS-EXAMINATION

# 6 BY MS. HOLLENBERG:

- Q. Mr. Ware, just to make sure I have it, you testified earlier that the recoupment of the temporary rate increase for the July 1 through the effective date of the temporary rate order will be done when the permanent rates are approved, is that true?
- 12 A. (Ware) That is correct.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. Mr. Laflamme, you testified about
  the North Country Capital Recovery Surcharge and -earlier as covering only capital costs. Is it true
  that the customers of now PEU in those North Country
  systems also pay a minimum consumption charge as well
  as a result of that case?
- 19 A. (Laflamme) I believe that's correct.
- Q. And, would that cover non-capital costs for those customers or what -- do you know that question, Mr.
- Ware?
- 23 A. (Ware) Yes, I do.
- 24 Q. Okay. Could you answer that please.

[WITNESS PANEL: Ware~Laflamme]

- 1 A. (Ware) Yes. Those revenues are there to cover operating expenses.
- Q. Okay. Okay. So, there was a slight increase for those customers, those PEU customers, since the last rate case. But the majority of the PEU customers, you would agree, could have seen a rate increase earlier than now, correct?
- 8 A. (Ware) Is that a question for me?
- 9 Q. Yes.
- 10 A. (Ware) All right.
- 11 Q. Yes.
- 12 A. (Ware) So, the majority of the customers' last revenue 13 or rate increase occurred, as Mr. Laflamme 14 testified, --
- 15 Q. Uh-huh.
- A. (Ware) -- based on the 2007 rate case, and a 2008 decision.
- 18 Q. Uh-huh.
- A. (Ware) So, in 2008 was their last adjustment of rates.

  With the exception, as you indicated, that the North

  Country customers who, you know, had some change in

  rates that occurred in that 2010 timeframe.
- Q. Uh-huh. Yes. Thank you. In fact, would you agree with me that the Company actually affirmatively agreed

```
1
          in the acquisition docket to delay a rate case to the
 2
          present time, to the present case? That was one of the
 3
          terms of the Settlement Agreement?
 4
          (Ware) Yes.
     Α.
 5
                         MS. HOLLENBERG: Okay. I don't have
 6
       other questions.
                         Thank you.
 7
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
 8
       Commissioner Scott.
 9
                         CMSR. SCOTT: Thank you. And, good
10
       morning again.
11
                         WITNESS WARE:
                                        Good morning.
12
                                            Good morning.
                         WITNESS LAFLAMME:
13
     BY CMSR. SCOTT:
14
          Real -- just a quick question. Obviously, we just
15
          heard Mr. Laflamme discuss the 7 percent temporary rate
16
          as the benefit, obviously, would reduce rate shock
17
          should ultimately the permanent rate increase asked for
18
          be approved. Why is 7 percent the right -- is there
19
          other significance to 7 percent? Whoever would like to
20
          answer. Obviously, anything between the current rate
21
          and the proposed permanent rate would have that same
22
          impact also. So, is there other reasons why 7 percent?
23
          (Ware) Well, I guess going back to the question from
     Α.
24
          Commissioner Ignatius yesterday, we, actually, in this
```

[WITNESS PANEL: Ware~Laflamme]

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
case, did do an unproformed 2012 expenses. And, that
would have resulted in a 17 percent increase.
knowing that there were, as we discussed yesterday,
changes happening to the Company's structure, which, in
fact, are reflecting in the fact of the 9.97 percent,
we had to come up with a number. For ourselves, we
look back historically. And, we said, "okay,
historically, where have we been in previous cases,
temporary to permanent, based on the normal process of
looking at the unproformed test year?" We came up with
that number of about 70 percent, which, in this case,
70 percent of the 9.97 rounded to 7 percent.
               CMSR. SCOTT: Thank you.
                                        That's all I
```

have.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I have a couple of questions, not about the temporary rate proposal, because I think those have all been addressed. But, just a few things to ask you about or get you thinking about as you work your way through the rest of this case.

### BY CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS:

- Q. One is a question from a customer, and these are all in the docketbook, from a customer in Locke Lake, which is one of the PEU companies, yes?
- (Ware) Yes. Α.

- Q. And, she says that rates were increased not too long ago and they're still paying a rate case surcharge of \$17 extra per month.
- A. (Ware) I would have to go back and look. Because the surcharge for the rate case was spread over 24 months, there's a possibility, given, you know, when the case was finally decided and when the rates were finally put in effect, that they may be at the -- I think that's over now, but it's possible that it could have been there for up until just recently.
- Q. And, this was written in June. So, do you think it's unlikely that, when we get to a final order in this case, that the two surcharges would overlap, that, you know, this one, the first, the old one would be fully done?
- A. (Ware) Yes.

- MS. BROWN: Commissioner Ignatius, I

  have a copy of the tariff. And, I think, to aid in

  Mr. Ware's discussion, he might want to look at the tariff

  page which pertains to that --
- 21 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Or, if you know and
  22 want to just let me know that, you don't even need to put
  23 it before him.

(Atty. Brown handing document to

```
1
                         Witness Ware.)
 2
                         MR. GETZ: And, madam Chair, just if I
 3
       could?
 4
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Please.
 5
                         MR. GETZ: I'm not sure, Mr. Ware said
 6
       "yes", I'm not sure which question he was saying "yes" to,
 7
       because I took it there would not be an overlap.
 8
                         WITNESS WARE: Correct. That is correct
 9
       that there should not be. This was filed on February
10
       24th, 2010, and indicated that the rate case expense would
11
       be recovered, in the case of Locke Lake, over 24 equal
      monthly installments. Actually, excuse me, in Locke Lake,
12
13
       it was over 18. So, the surcharge will be billed in 18
14
       equal monthly installments for Locke Lake and Sunrise
15
       Estate customers; 24 months for the Birch Hill customers.
16
       And, the filing of this tariff for -- well, this was a
17
       rate recoupment, was February 24th. So, that was relative
18
       to rate case expense, is that correct? The question was
19
       or the letter was about "rate case expense"?
20
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: It referred to it as
21
       a "rate case surcharge".
22
                         WITNESS WARE: All right. So, if it's
23
       the recoupment, that should have been over in an 18-month
24
      period, in the case of Locke Lake sometime in middle to
```

1 late 2011. The last one should have been August 2011.

25

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Well, let me ask 2

3 that, we don't need to do this today, but ask your folks

4 to go back, take a look at this complaint. And, if

5 there's some follow-up with the customer that would help

6 clarify, I think that would be a good idea.

WITNESS WARE: Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: She thinks she's

9 still paying a \$17 per month surcharge.

10 WITNESS WARE: Yes. According to this,

11 Locke Lake, so, it is not the rate recoupment, because the

12 rate recoupment was \$3.47. So, the \$17.10, I will have to

go back and review the tariff to see. That sounds like it

14 would be the rate case expense surcharge.

#### 15 BY CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS:

7

- 16 Q. There were a couple of other letters I wanted to point
- 17 out to you. One was from someone in Raymond. Would
- 18 that be within this docket?
- 19 (Ware) Yes, it would. Α.
- 20 Q. And, the person says that "I understand Pennichuck buys
- 21 water from the Town of Raymond. If this is the case, I
- would like to know why Raymond residents should have to 22
- 23 pay for an increase for upgrades to Pennichuck's water
- 24 treatment system."

- A. (Ware) Well, so, in Raymond, we have three water systems. One of those water systems, Green Hills, we purchase water from the Raymond Water Department. And, as you're aware, you know, there is a consolidation of the expenses. And, consequently, you know, they're in with that group. One of the expenses that we have up there is a purchase water expense from the Town of Raymond.
  - Q. One of the customers in Windham says that "The water quality is poor and is very corrosive to plumbing." Do you have issues on water quality that you're working on?
  - A. (Ware) That is the W&E system. And, the water there was very problematic when we took it over. We invested a substantial amount of money to put in a treatment system to remove iron, to remove manganese. And, actually, because of the I-93 project, there are high levels of chlorides, and chlorides can be corrosive. And, we put in a special system to remove chlorides. And, then, actually, the backwash water from the system goes into a tank that we then haul off to a treatment plant, so that we don't we recontaminate the groundwater in the area. But, generally, we have extensive treatment in that area. We watch it very

1 closely.

And, you know, is it, at the end of the day, corrosive to piping? Yes. All water is. Is it more corrosive than other water? Possibly, at times. But, again, this is a complex treatment system. We watch it very, very closely, and have made adjustments to it over time, in order to maintain the highest quality water that we can under the circumstances.

- Q. There are a couple of letters that refer to people having "low usage", but what they consider to be "rates that are too high", and one refers to it as "an unfair penalty imposed on low-usage consumers". I guess I'm not asking you today to address that, but that's an issue that --
- A. (Ware) I can -- we can tell you where those are from as I looked at the letters. Those are in relation to the minimum usage charge. So, in the case of Locke Lake, it's -- you pay for 4 cubic feet of water, whether you use 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4. Obviously, if you use more, if you use 5, you use five. That's primarily, you know, a lot of summer community folks, seasonal folks. And, one of the biggest issues there is, is because, you know, you're recovering a lot of your costs from, you know, from the sales of your water, you got to collect

1 a certain amount. And, the fact is is that those 2 customers who show up on a weekend and create a peak 3 load, and then go away, are probably your most 4 expensive customers to serve. And, back in the rate 5 case where we had evaluated ways in order to 6 effectively and fairly collect rates, that, you know, 7 the Staff and ourselves and the Commission came up with this particular methodology, to ensure that the 8 9 seasonal folks paid their fair share of the cost of the 10 operation. 11 Does your cost of service study delve into that? Ο. 12 (Ware) I do not believe that he looked at all in the 13 cost of service study at that issue of that minimum 14 charge, because it only applied to those particular 15 locations. And, so, I think that he, in his 16 calculations, simply included that in the consumptive 17 usage, in order to figure out the rates that would be 18 in effect. But I do not believe he went back and 19 looked at, you know, the dollars that needed to be 20 recovered from each home in order to, again, fairly

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. Thank you very much for your information. Is there any redirect?

spread the cost of the operation over all users.

21

22

23

[WITNESS PANEL: Ware~Laflamme]

```
1
                         MR. GETZ: No, madam Chairman.
 2
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Any redirect,
       Ms. Brown?
 3
 4
                        MS. BROWN: Sorry. I just wanted to
 5
       confer with Mr. Naylor. We have no redirect. Thank you.
 6
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
 7
       the two of you are excused. Thank you.
 8
                         Is there any objection to striking the
       identification on Exhibits 1 and 2 and making them full
 9
10
       exhibits?
11
                         MR. GETZ: No objection.
12
                         MS. BROWN: No objection.
13
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Then, we'll do so.
14
       Anything else before closings?
15
                         (No verbal response)
16
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: If not, then closing
17
       comments. Ms. Hollenberg.
18
                         MS. HOLLENBERG: Thank you.
19
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Oh, before you --
20
       I'm sorry, one thing. The Town of Litchfield had
21
       intervened. They're not here today. Does anyone have any
22
       information on whether the Town has a position?
23
                         MR. GETZ: In a previous conversation
24
       with Ms. Spector, she indicated, and she may have -- it
```

```
1
       may have been on the record previously at the prehearing
       conference, but that the Town was not going to participate
 2
 3
       in the issue of temporary rates. And, then, it would be
 4
       participating later with respect to permanent rates.
 5
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS:
                                             Thank you.
 6
                         MS. BROWN: And, Staff had emailed or
 7
       had received word from Attorney Spector-Morgan that they
       did not object to the Settlement Agreement.
 8
 9
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right.
10
       you. Then, Ms. Hollenberg.
11
                         MS. HOLLENBERG:
                                          Thank you. Just to let
12
       you know, the OCA understood that the Town of Litchfield
13
       did not oppose the Settlement Agreement. And, that was
14
       based on conversations via e-mail, as well as the language
15
       of the Settlement Agreement in Section 2.
16
                         We appreciate the efforts of the parties
17
       to this point, and look forward to getting into the meat
18
       of the issues that will be present in this case, including
19
       cost of service. We're pleased that the cost of service
20
       changes are not going to be done on a temporary basis, and
21
       will be reserved for a decision later in the proceeding
       for purposes of permanent rates.
22
23
                         And, I appreciated the Staff's
24
       summarization of the basis for their supporting the
```

```
agreement. I think it's, in this instance, of all the
 1
       three utilities, PEU has been out the longest for rate
 2
 3
       relief. And, the temporary rates do not seem to be
 4
       overcompensatory. And, because of that, the Office of
 5
       Consumer Advocate would not oppose the Agreement that the
 6
       Staff and the Company have reached.
                                            Thank you.
 7
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
       Ms. Brown.
 8
                         MS. BROWN: Thank you again for your
 9
10
       time today. Staff respectfully requests that the
11
       Commission approve the Settlement Agreement and the
12
       7 percent temporary rate request, effective July 1.
13
       You've heard testimony today that the customers were
14
       notified prior to the July 1 effective date, so have had
15
       an opportunity to at least adjust their usage, if they
16
       desired.
17
                         You've heard today that a cost of
18
       service study is in the works. And, Staff will opine at a
19
       later date on that cost of service issue.
20
                         And, with respect to the 7 percent
21
       increase in the revenue requirement, Staff's position is
22
       that it's just and reasonable, and that the resulting
23
       rates to the customer classes increasing by 7 percent is
```

24

just and reasonable.

```
1
                         And, with that, thank you for your time.
 2
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS:
                                            Thank you.
 3
       Getz.
 4
                         MR. GETZ:
                                    Thank you, madam Chair.
                                                             Ιn
 5
       his testimony, Mr. Laflamme described extremely well the
 6
       Company's financial position and why the request for
 7
       temporary rates is reasonable. The Company doesn't have
 8
       anything to add to that and would ask that the Settlement
 9
       Agreement be approved.
10
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
11
       understand you want this for effect November 1st, and,
12
       actually, --
13
                         MS. BROWN: July 1st.
14
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: July 1st, that's
15
       right. Effective back to July 1st. That's this
16
       afternoon's hearing.
17
                         MS. HOLLENBERG: That's this afternoon.
18
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: And, so, we will
19
       take all of this under advisement. Thank you. We're
20
       adjourned.
21
                         (Whereupon the hearing ended at 10:49
22
                         a.m.)
23
24
```