1		STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
2		PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
3	yes moduli nou u	
4	February 13,	2014 - 10:06 a.m.
5	Concord, New	Hampshire NHPIC FEB18'14 PM12:48
6		WITTU FLULU I'M COLUMN
7	RE:	
		NEW HAMPSHIRE GAS CORPORATION: Winter 2013-2014 Cost of Gas.
8		(Hearing on the Petition to Increase the Non-FPO Rate)
9	, D. C.	
10	222022	gentine with the same to the first
11	PRESENT:	Chairman Amy L. Ignatius, Presiding Commissioner Robert R. Scott
12		Commissioner Martin P. Honigberg
13	tone brown prod	
		Sandy Deno, Clerk
14	We are seen Mr. O. Mr. O.	
15	APPEARANCES:	Reptg. New Hampshire Gas Corporation:
16		Brian R. Maloney (appearing via video conference)
17		produktest end prikarioni. Kanikarakkangi union 1999 beron stons
18		Reptg. PUC Staff: Alexander F. Speidel, Esq.
19		rickander r. Sperder, Esq.
20		
21		
22		lecteque, re
23	Cour	t Reporter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52
24		

1		
2	INDEX	
3		PAGE NO.
4	WITNESS: BRIAN R. MALONEY	
5	Direct examination by Mr. Speidel (to	assist NHGC) 6
6	Cross-examination by Mr. Speidel	9, 16
7	Interrogatories by Cmsr. Scott	20
8	Interrogatories by Cmsr. Honigberg	23
9	Interrogatories by Chairman Ignatius	14, 24
10		
11	* * *	
12		
13	EXHIBIT	3
14	EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTI	
14 15	2 Petition to Increase N	ON PAGE NO.
	2 Petition to Increase Nof Gas Rate above the Currently Approved by	ON PAGE NO. Yon-FPO Cost 8 Maximum Rate the Commission,
15	2 Petition to Increase Note of Gas Rate above the	ON PAGE NO. Son-FPO Cost 8 Maximum Rate the Commission, by of Brian R.
15 16	2 Petition to Increase Notes of Gas Rate above the Currently Approved by including the Testimon	ON PAGE NO. Son-FPO Cost 8 Maximum Rate the Commission, by of Brian R.
15 16 17	2 Petition to Increase Notes of Gas Rate above the Currently Approved by including the Testimon	ON PAGE NO. Son-FPO Cost 8 Maximum Rate the Commission, by of Brian R.
15 16 17 18	Petition to Increase Nof Gas Rate above the Currently Approved by including the Testimon Maloney, with attachme	ON PAGE NO. Son-FPO Cost 8 Maximum Rate the Commission, by of Brian R.
15 16 17 18 19	Petition to Increase Nof Gas Rate above the Currently Approved by including the Testimon Maloney, with attachme	ON PAGE NO. Son-FPO Cost 8 Maximum Rate the Commission, by of Brian R.
15 16 17 18 19 20	Petition to Increase Nof Gas Rate above the Currently Approved by including the Testimon Maloney, with attachment	ON PAGE NO. Son-FPO Cost 8 Maximum Rate the Commission, by of Brian R. ents (01-27-14)
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Petition to Increase Nof Gas Rate above the Currently Approved by including the Testimon Maloney, with attachment * * * * CLOSING STATEMENTS BY:	ON PAGE NO. Yon-FPO Cost 8 Maximum Rate the Commission, y of Brian R. Ents (01-27-14) PAGE NO.

{DG 13-261} {02-13-14}

1	PROCEEDING
2	CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Good morning. And,
3	good morning out in the Internet land. I'd like to open
4	the hearing in Docket DG 13-261. And, before I say
5	another word, can you hear me, Mr. Maloney?
6	MR. MALONEY: Yes, I can. Very well.
7	CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Good. Thank you.
8	And, we can hear you.
9	(Brief off-the-record discussion with
10	getting Mr. Maloney's voice to come
11	through the speakers.)
12	CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: This is a hearing
13	for New Hampshire Gas Corporation. It's related to its
14	Winter 2013-2014 cost of gas rates, which were previously
15	set by Commission order. But a request was received from
16	New Hampshire Gas Corporation to increase the rate beyond
17	the amount that's allowed under the provisions for
18	increases through the course of the cost of gas period
19	beyond that bandwidth level. And, so, the request is to
20	increase the rate for the period of March 1, 2014 through
21	April 30, 2014 beyond the approved maximum cost of gas
22	rate.
23	We issued an order of notice on

January 28th, 2014 that set forth the request from the

Company, allowed for additional interventions, and scheduled a hearing on the merits for this morning.

Let's, I know that -- Mr. Speidel, are you aware of anyone who's seeking intervention?

MR. SPEIDEL: No, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. We don't see anything in the file either. Why don't we begin, I guess, with appearances first. Mr. Speidel.

MR. SPEIDEL: Yes. Thank you, Chairman.

Alexander Speidel, for the Staff of the New Hampshire

Public Utilities Commission. And, I have with me

Assistant Director Steve Frink of the Gas and Water

Division.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Good morning.

MR. SPEIDEL: Just as a preliminary, we are making use of a new technology for video conferencing with Mr. Maloney, who is over in Rochester. And, as part of my responsibilities for the hearing today, I am going to facilitate some of Mr. Maloney's participation in this hearing. The reason this is doable, as Mr. Maloney is prose at this time, is because Staff does not contest the Company's Petition. So, therefore, we have conferred regarding an acceptable methodology for keeping this hearing moving. And, so, I will be interacting with Mr.

```
1
       Maloney in an unusual way, as he is not represented by his
 2
       own counsel.
 3
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Okay. Thank you for
 4
       helping out in that. And, Mr. Maloney, just an appearance
 5
       on the record please.
 6
                         MR. MALONEY: It's Brian Maloney --
 7
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Your name and
       Company.
 8
 9
                         MR. MALONEY: My name is Brian Maloney.
10
       And, I am a Lead Analyst in the Rates and Regulatory
11
       Economics Department at Rochester Gas & Electric
12
       Corporation. RG&E provides affiliate services to New
13
       Hampshire Gas Corporation.
14
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
15
       why don't we begin. And, however you've worked out best
16
       to assist both, because, Mr. Maloney, you're here pro se,
17
       and that's perfectly fine, and also you're appearing
18
       through a camera and Internet hook-up, which is a good
19
       experiment for us.
20
                         So, Mr. Speidel, why don't I hand it to
21
       for the best way to coordinate.
22
                         MR. SPEIDEL: Yes. Thank you, Chairman.
23
       I would suggest that Staff call Mr. Maloney virtually to
24
       testify by video conference, under oath, of course.
                                                            And,
```

1	after a series of brief establishing questions and	
2	adoption questions for the Petition's marking as an	
3	exhibit, Staff would engage in some cross-examination	
4	questions. And, then, we would suggest that the	
5	Commissioners engage in their Bench questioning. And, if	
6	Mr. Maloney has any further statements that he would like	
7	to make under oath, in a clarification context, something	
8	like a redirect, but self-directed redirect, we would be	
9	supportive of that.	
LO	CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. That's	
L1	fine. Why don't you go ahead.	
L2	MR. SPEIDEL: Thank you. Mr. Maloney,	
L3	would you please take the stand, and would the court	
L 4	reporter please swear the witness.	
L5	(Whereupon Brian R. Maloney was duly	
L6	sworn by the Court Reporter.)	
L7	BRIAN R. MALONEY, SWORN	
L8	DIRECT EXAMINATION	
L9	BY MR. SPEIDEL:	
20	Q. Okay. Mr. Maloney, just once more, could you please	
21	state for the record your full name and your position.	
22	A. My name is Brian Maloney. And, I'm a Lead Analyst in	
23	the Rates and Regulatory Economics Department at	
24	Rochester Gas & Electric RG&E provides affiliate	

1 services to New Hampshire Gas Corporation.

- Q. Okay. Do you have in your possession a document with a cover letter dated January the 27th of 2014, that is
- 4 signed by you?
- 5 A. Yes. I do.
- 6 Q. Could you just briefly describe what this document is.
- 7 A. This document is a Petition to request an increase in
 8 the March and April Non-FPO cost of gas rate to a level
 9 above the maximum rate currently approved by the
 10 Commission Order Number 25,588.
- 11 Q. Now, Mr. Maloney, did you prepare certain schedules and 12 testimony within this document?
- 13 A. I did.

- Q. And, were these schedules and testimony prepared as
 part of your responsibilities at New Hampshire -- I'm
 sorry, New York [Rochester?] Gas & Electric?
 - A. Yes, they were.
- MR. SPEIDEL: I would ask that this

 document, which has been prefiled into the record, be

 marked as Hearing Exhibit 2, as Hearing Exhibit 1 in this

 docket was the original Cost of Gas Petition filed on

 October the 21st of 2013.
- 23 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you. So 24 marked.

1 (The document, as described, was herewith marked as **Exhibit 2** for 2 3 identification.) 4 MR. SPEIDEL: Thank you. BY MR. SPEIDEL: 5 Mr. Maloney, would you care to summarize, in general 6 Q. 7 terms, the circumstances and positions taken by you in your testimony and in your Company's Petition, marked 8 as "Hearing Exhibit 2". 9 10 The Company is requesting this increase because there's 11 been a dramatic increase in spot market propane prices 12 in the Northeast and Midwest states due to shortages, 13 basically, due to problems in getting enough propane 14 transported up into these market regions. Therefore, 15 we would like to increase the cost of gas rate for 16 Non-FPO customers beyond the rate that's currently 17 approved, in an effort to minimize the undercollection 18 that would otherwise occur over this winter period. 19 Is that all? Q. 20 Α. Yes. 21 MR. SPEIDEL: Okay. Now, if it is all 22 right with the Commissioners, and with you, I would like 23 to begin my cross-examination? 24 WITNESS MALONEY: That's fine.

1 MR. SPEIDEL: Okay.

2 BY MR. SPEIDEL:

- Q. On Page 3, Lines 11 to 15 of your testimony, you state that the price forecasts are "highly uncertain" for the commodity used by the Company. How do the current February, March, and April price forecasts compare with those used in the filing?
- A. Well, that filing is about two weeks old. But, based on a conversation with our supplier recently, we believe that our February and March estimates for spot purchase prices are still reasonable, but uncertain.

 Our April forecast for spot purchases is currently about six cents lower than what was used in the Petition. But this is based on a futures price that changes daily.
- Q. Is it fair to say that using the current forecast, the projected under recovery, assuming the proposed rate increase is approved for March and April, would be similar to that described in the filing of Exhibit 2?
- A. Yes, it's fair to say that. I think, if we re-ran the numbers today, it would be no more than \$5,000 less of an undercollection.
- Q. Thank you. Does New Hampshire Gas Corp. have adequate propane supplies for the remainder of the winter?

- A. Well, having made it through to mid-January, in one of the toughest markets in memory, that gives us high confidence for the remainder of the winter, in terms of supply.
- Q. Where are those supplies located and how are they accessed by the Company?

- A. We have our hedged purchase commitments under the Pre-Purchase Program. And, we've got about 40,000 gallons left in storage in Amherst. And, our supplier has reliably been able to obtain spot loads for us from Selkirk, the Providence port, SEA-3 in Portsmouth, and even a few terminals in Canada.
- Q. Thank you. Mr. Maloney, on Page 3, Lines 24 through 31, of your testimony, you calculate the rate impacts on a typical residential customer, comparing this winter to last winter. Can you tell us the rate impact comparing the approved 2013-14 winter rate and the actual and proposed rates?
- A. Okay. The impact for the full winter period, comparing bills at the originally approved rate of \$1.68, to bills at the actual and proposed rates, is \$236 for the period.
- Q. Would you be able to tell us how much a typical residential customer will be paying over the last two

months of this winter period if the proposed rate

increase is not approved, and compare that to the cost

if the rate is approved?

- A. The difference over those two months would be \$83 for a typical residential customer.
- Q. Thank you. On Page 2, Lines 20 through 29, of your testimony, again, in Exhibit 2, you state that carrying over a large under recovery will put your company at a competitive disadvantage, and that Keene area propane dealers raise prices to fully recover their costs at this time. Could you give us some examples of how much area propane dealers' prices have increased?
- A. Well, there was one significant there is one significant propane retailer in the Keene area that raised its prices to residential customers by \$1.50, up to \$4.49 a gallon, at the start of the market disruption. And, we know of another retailer that recently raised its price by about 95 cents, to \$4.19, and that was over just a two-week period.
- Q. Under normal circumstances, how do New Hampshire Gas Corp.'s rates compare to these competitors?
- A. I would say that, in general, we are in the middle of the competitive range for residential customers. And, for large users, our price -- our all-in price tends to

1 be on the high end.

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

- Q. Thank you. The propane supply and price situation,
 which is sometimes described as a "shortage" or a

 "crisis", has gotten a fair amount of coverage in the
 national media recently. Are you aware of any coverage
 on this issue in the local New Hampshire media,
 especially in southwestern New Hampshire?
 - A. We are only aware that there's been some coverage on the local news on Channel 9, out of Manchester.
- 10 Q. What steps have you taken to inform your customers of the situation?
 - A. We placed a display ad in the Keene Sentinel on February 1st. And, all of the February bills, which have already gone out, have contained a bill insert explaining the situation.
 - Q. Has there been much, if any, customer response to the display ad and bill insert on the proposed rate increase?
- A. We have received probably one to two dozen inquiries, on the bill insert, in particular, out of about 1,200 customers.
- Q. And, do you believe that the Company was able to provide useful information to those customers?
- 24 A. Yes. I believe our Staff in Keene is very capable of

1 responding to those customers' concerns.

- Q. Thank you. Mr. Maloney, have you seep the e-mail to the Commission from Ms. Kalich, Judy Kalich and her husband, regarding the proposed rate increase?
- A. I have seen that e-mail, yes.

- Q. How would you respond to her concerns?
- A. Well, I can understand her concern regarding price increases on an essential service, such as heat.

 Unfortunately, the propane market volatility, and the harsh winter, have impacted many consumers throughout the Northeast and the Midwest.

I also believe that her characterization of "monopoly pricing" is not really at play here. We have several competitors in the Keene market providing propane service. And, in addition, the commodity portion of our service is strictly based on competitive market prices, with no mark-up.

- Q. Thank you. In your filing, you've used actual costs for prior months and forecasted costs for February through April of 2014. What changes have you made to the February through April cost forecasts provided in your initial forecast, which was part of Exhibit 1, the initial cost of gas filing for those months?
- A. The only material change that impacts the forecast is a

big increase in our estimates for spot market purchase prices in February, up \$1.26 in March, up 81 cents over the initial filing.

- Q. Thank you. Now, on Page 3, in Lines 11 through 22, of your testimony, you request that the Company be allowed to adjust the proposed cost of gas rate up or down, after approval, within certain parameters. Would you please define the parameters being requested.
- A. When making this request in the Petition, we envisioned a band of possibly 5 percent on the upside, and then unlimited amount on the downside. We thought that an adjustment provision would increase the likelihood of hitting the collection target. If such an adjustment is impractical for the March 1st rate, this request would apply to the April 1st rate.
- Q. So, the 5 percent upside adjustment, would you consider that to be a floor or a ceiling on the adjustment?
- A. I would consider that to be a ceiling on the adjustment, and the floor would be unlimited.
- 20 Q. Thank you.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Can I, before we go
22 on, can I just ask you to clarify? In using real numbers,
23 what it is that you're requesting for March, and what
24 could happen during March, if this were all approved?

1	What the request is for March, and what further
2	adjustments could take place during March under your
3	proposal?
4	WITNESS MALONEY: The March 1st rate
5	calculated in the Petition is \$2.5355. What we were
6	thinking was that, in an effort to get the undercollection
7	as close as possible to the target, given the extreme
8	volatility in the market, we may want to think about
9	modifying that Petition rate as we get closer to the end
LO	of March.
L1	Now, if that's really not practical at
L2	this point, I think we are just requesting some capability
L3	to more or less fine-tune the rate for April 1st, in an
L 4	effort to get close to the collection target. Given that
L5	these forecasts for spot purchase prices are so uncertain
L6	at this point.
L 7	CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: So, if I, just to be
L8	clear, your proposal is that the 2.5355 could go up
L9	another 5 percent or could drop in an unlimited amount?
20	WITNESS MALONEY: That's correct. In an
21	effort to achieve the undercollection target that has been
22	built into the Petition.
23	CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
24	MR. SPEIDEL: Just one moment, Chairman.

1 (Atty. Speidel conferring with 2 Mr. Frink.)

BY MR. SPEIDEL:

- Q. Mr. Maloney, thank you for your patience. Is it fair to say that this adjustment mechanism would be targeted so that a \$60,000 undercollection level for the month of March is maintained or is that not really the goal? It's more of a response mechanism, upward up to 5 percent, and downward to no floor, in response to changes in market prices, given the volatility of the current propane picture?
- A. The thought would be to have the winter period ending undercollection remain at \$60,000, given the possibility that our forecasts for spot purchase prices in February and March could change material that the actual prices could change materially from what we have forecasted. So, it's simply a fine-tuning mechanism suggested to potentially and, hopefully, achieve that \$60,000 undercollection target at the end of the winter period. It's certainly in no means a key part of our Petition.
- Q. So, you envision that the adjustment filing would be provided, given that we're roughly in the middle of February, what is your vision for the timing of these

adjustment filings, which would be akin a little bit to a reconciliation filing made -- a monthly cost of gas trigger sheet made in an ordinary course monthly filing, how do you expect that the Company will inform the Commission of the expected adjustments?

- A. My thought was that we would inform the Commission of the adjustments much like you've just suggested, through the monthly reconciliations that occur on a regular basis and rate updates, which are required to be filed five business days before the start of the subsequent month.
- Q. So, in this instance, you will have to give me some assistance, I don't have a calendar in front of me, but, for the March 1st adjustment, you would expect that the Company would have the requisite schedules in place, February is a month with 28 days, as early as five or six days from now?
- A. That is correct. Now, when this Petition was filed, at the end of January, we thought that would be a good feature to at least suggest in the Petition. I know, at this point, there have been bill inserts and display ads that have pointed out that the rate is going to be set on March 1st at 2.5355. So, I just wanted to point that out to -- and ask for the Commission's discretion

on how to best meet our undercollection target, but
also take into account the display ad and bill insert.

Okay. What we'll do is we'll continue with our line o

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

- Q. Okay. What we'll do is we'll continue with our line of questioning in a different direction. And, let's start with, would you please tell us how many customers enrolled in the Winter FPO, or Fixed Price Option Program, and what percent of your load that represents?
- A. We have 176 customers, or 15 percent, enrolled in the FPO Program. And, they represent approximately 19 percent of forecasted therms.
- 11 Q. How are prior period over or under recoveries typically
 12 treated when calculating the FPO?
 - A. For the seasonal filings, the Non-FPO rate is calculated first, taking into account a forecasted level of FPO participation. And, then, the FPO rate is simply set at a rate two cents higher.
 - Q. How will carrying forward the projected undercollection impact the FPO rate for next winter?
- A. If the targeted undercollection of about \$60,000 is

 achieved and carried over until next winter, it would

 increase both the FPO and Non-FPO rates by

 approximately six cents per therm.
- Q. Would you briefly describe New Hampshire Gas Corp.'s
 Propane Purchase Stabilization Program or Plan in place

1	for this winter, and to what extent that has served to
2	mitigate this winter's cost of gas?
3	A. Okay. We pre-purchased 700,000 gallons of propane
4	under the Hedging Program, in the months of April
5	through September. And, based on our forecast of spot
6	prices, this program will save about \$700,000 in
7	propane purchase costs for this winter, or about
8	43 percent.
9	MR. SPEIDEL: Thank you. Now,
LO	Commissioners, I could invite you to begin your Bench
L1	questioning now, or would you prefer that Mr. Maloney make
L2	a general statement, in the form of quasi-redirect, before
L3	your Bench questioning, or would you prefer that he does
L 4	it after?
L5	CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Well, I guess, Mr.
L6	Maloney, if there's anything else that you wanted to
L7	present to us in your Petition that hasn't been picked up,
L8	why don't you go ahead right now. And, then, we'll give
L9	you a chance to come back, if there's anything further you
20	need to add.

WITNESS MALONEY: Thank you. There is nothing in the -- that I want to bring up that was not presented in the Petition.

21

22

23

24

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you. Then,

```
1
       are there questions from the Commissioners? Commissioner
 2
       Scott.
 3
                         CMSR. SCOTT:
                                       Thank you. And, good
 4
       morning, Mr. Maloney.
 5
                         WITNESS MALONEY: Good morning.
 6
                         CMSR. SCOTT: Let me start with, I'm
 7
       pleased you don't have to make the journey in the bad
       weather. So, hopefully, this works out well in the future
 8
 9
       also, our new technology here.
10
     BY CMSR. SCOTT:
11
          I was curious, given the unanticipated price impact to
12
          your customers, is the Company placing any additional
13
          emphasis on their programs, looking at your customers
14
          with financial issues, as far as payment plans, or is
15
          there any activity on that end, to try and help
16
          mitigate some of this price shock?
17
          Yes, there is. Just in the regular course of business,
     Α.
18
          we are always working with customers that are
19
          experiencing financial difficulties. And, this winter
          will be no different. There's already been a handful
20
21
          of inquiries. And, we are working with those customers
22
          in our normal manner, to help their affordability.
23
          And, is your understanding that, particularly, I
     Q.
```

assume, really the issue is the Non-FPO customers,

obviously, at this juncture. So, they have a -generally, the customers have a good understanding of
what's available to them along those lines?

- A. I believe, given that the customers that appear to be experiencing financial difficulties are calling our Keene office, I believe that there is a general understanding in the community that we are receptive to working with customers in these types of situations.
- Q. Thank you for that. So, am I correct in the understanding is, is at this point there's no anticipation of a reoccurrence of this type of problem for next year, as far as availability, transportation of propane, is that a correct statement?
- A. I believe that's a correct statement. This winter, a handful of unusual circumstances occurred all at the same time, sometimes referred to as a "perfect storm".

 And, I think a lot of lessons have been learned this winter, in terms of propane storage, propane supplies needed up in the Midwest and Northeast. So, I would expect that this problem would happen rarely in the future, if ever.
- Q. And, to the extent you have -- your ratepayers are paying attention this winter, I would assume that you'd see perhaps more people doing the Fixed Price Option

next year. Do you think that may be the case?

- A. I think that's very likely. We've been stuck around
 20 percent participation or so, in terms of therms, for
 the last handful of years. And, I would not be at all
 surprised to see that go up substantially next winter.
- Q. And, as far as your storage and hedging programs, do you anticipate any changes to that? Or, do you -- you mentioned, you know, you've had some good cost savings from that. Do you think that's, I know you don't have a crystal ball for the future for any reoccurrence of these shortages, but do you feel that was -- what you've done is about right or do you think that needs to be adjusted?
- A. We think it's about right. We would like to find possibly a little more storage up here, near Keene, to have a little more supply on hand. At this point, that has proven difficult to find. But we're still looking.
- Q. And, my final question has to do with the -- again, if I understand it right, your idea would be your Non-FPO charge for March 1st would go into effect, with this ability to vary. So, am I correct then, so, it would probably likely be, depending on the commodity price, it may be a different charge 1 April? You may adjust it 1 April?

```
A. That's, I think, the best course of action at this
point. Stick with the March 1st rate as filed, and
have a band available to adjust the April 1st rate,
much like we do on a normal monthly basis, to achieve
the targeted undercollection.
```

CMSR. SCOTT: Thank you. That's all I

23

8 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.

9 Commissioner Honigberg.

10 CMSR. HONIGBERG: Good morning, Mr.

11 Maloney. I just want to touch on a couple of things.

12 BY CMSR. HONIGBERG:

have.

6

7

- Q. Following up on one of the questions that Mr. Speidel
 asked you, about what a typical customer would pay.
 That information is on Schedule F of your filing, is it
 not?
- 17 A. Excuse me?
- Q. If I wanted to know what a typical customer paid last year and would be expected to pay this year, that's on Schedule F of what you filed, is it not?
- 21 A. It is.
- Q. And, so, the numbers there, where it says "Total Bill", would give us an indication of what a typical user might be expected to pay, if this proposal is approved?

{DG 13-261} {02-13-14}

- 1 Α. That's correct.
- On the "5 percent" issue, 5 percent of what? You'd be 2 Q. 3 looking to increase 5 percent of 2.5355? Or, is it 4 5 percent of the increase that got us to that, so I 5 understand what the request is?
- 6 It's 5 percent of the 2.5355. Much like we have a 7 25 percent increase threshold on the initial cost of gas rate. 8
- That's what I thought. And, again, this is mostly a 9 Q. 10 terminology thing, or a positive and negative question. 11 What you're look -- you have about \$180,000 projected 12 under recovery, you're looking to recover about 120,000 13 of it this year, and trying to recover -- hoping to 14 recover the remaining 60 next year. Is that -- I have 15 that right?
 - Α. You have that exactly right.
- 17 CMSR. HONIGBERG: All right. I have Thank you. 18 nothing further.
- 19 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you. A couple 20 more questions.
- 21 BY CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS:

16

22 I noticed, I think yesterday or the day before, there 23 was a press release from the Federal Energy Regulatory 24 Commission about some emergency provisions that were in

> {DG 13-261} $\{02-13-14\}$

25

[WITNESS: Maloney]

place or may be extended to address propane shortages
in the Midwest. Do you know what they -- I don't
remember the details. Do you know what they announced
and whether that's going to be something that will
provide relief to you?

- A. It is expected to provide relief. FERC ordered the Enterprise Pipeline Company to prioritize propane shipments, rather than other products, up into the Midwest and Northeast. That started on February 7th, and it was initially for a seven-day period, and it was extended for another seven days. So, it will be going through February 24th.
- 13 Q. Do you have access to any of that supply?
- 14 A. Yes, we do, because the Selkirk terminal is on that pipeline.
- Q. So, some of your spot market purchases will be through
 Selkirk, and, hopefully, that will -- some of that
 supply can then be available to you?
- 19 A. That's correct.

6

7

8

9

10

11

- Q. You also said that you were obtaining some supply from
 the SEA-3 terminal in New Hampshire. I had thought
 that that was closed. So, that's good to hear. I must
 have misunderstood what was going on with SEA-3.
- 24 A. Hmm. All I can say is that, just yesterday, I was

1 informed by our General Manager that at least one 2 shipment came from the SEA-3 port. Maybe, it's 3 possible, that he misunderstood the supplier invoice or 4 his discussions with the supplier. But I'm --5 Q. Well, it's more likely that I had it wrong, not you. 6 I'll check with our gas folks. But that would be a 7 good thing, if SEA-3 is operational. And, you had said, Mr. Maloney, that you 8 9 would have another set of reports on actual costs 10 coming in within the next five days or so, is that

correct?

The spot market moves every day, and it moves Α. more than ever at this point. It's still a very volatile market. So, yes. Every day we can obtain a different spot price from our supplier.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. Well, the more you can keep in touch with our Staff, when you have that information, the better, obviously. And, I know you're trying to manage a volatile market, we also need to be sure that we're finding a way that's appropriate under the standards for the pass-through of your costs, but also being mindful of the impact on customers, which is very significant.

Are there any other questions from the

```
Bench?
 1
 2
                         (No verbal response)
 3
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Nothing. Any
 4
       further questioning from Mr. Speidel?
 5
                         MR. SPEIDEL: No further questions.
 6
       Thank you, Chairman.
 7
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. Anything
       else, Mr. Maloney, you wanted to mention, having responded
 8
       to those questions?
 9
10
                         WITNESS MALONEY: No. Nothing else.
11
                         CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. Then,
12
       we'll -- I assume there's no objection to striking the
13
       identification on Exhibit 2, making that a full exhibit.
14
                         And, then, the only thing left, I think,
15
       is for some brief closing statements. I want to, after --
16
       echo Commissioner Scott's comments about using this
17
       technology, it's been a good trial run for us. We're
18
       going to get better and better at it. And, maybe after
19
       this hearing is over, you could take a few minutes, stay
       online once we're closed, and talk about what seemed to
20
21
       work and what didn't work well.
22
                         So, why don't we begin, first,
23
      Mr. Speidel, with any closing comments from the Staff.
24
                         MR. SPEIDEL: Thank you, Chairman.
```

Staff supports the New Hampshire Gas Corporation's proposed rate increase to take effect on a bills rendered basis on March the 1st. Due to market forces beyond New Hampshire Gas Corp.'s control, propane prices have surged. And, although the Company has made monthly adjustments to recover its propane costs in a timely fashion, the cap on cumulative increases has limited the Company's ability to fully respond, and now there are only two months left in the winter heating season to recover this winter's costs without deferring some to next winter. Although the proposed rate increase is substantial, Staff believes the proposed increase fairly balances the customer bill impact with New Hampshire Gas Corp.'s need to remain competitive with area propane dealers.

Regarding the Company's request for a 5 percent upward and unlimited downward adjustment collar, Staff believes that this would be impractical for the month of March, but does support the introduction of such a mechanism for the month of April, with the proviso that the Company should not necessarily a \$60,000 undercollection, but, rather, reduce the undercollection further in April via rates at its own discretion, subject to the 5 percent cap. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you. Mr.

1	Maloney.
2	MR. MALONEY: Thank you. New Hampshire
3	Gas would like to thank the Commission Staff for its time
4	and effort in reviewing the Company's Petition. I'd also
5	like to express my personal appreciation for being able to
6	conduct my testimony by video conference. We respectfully
7	request Commission approval of our filed Petition by
8	March 1st. Thank you.
9	CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you. Then, we
10	will take this under advisement. We understand this needs
11	to move quickly. And, we'll work to make sure that we
12	have an order issued promptly. With that, the hearing is
13	adjourned.
14	(Whereupon the hearing was adjourned at
15	10:49 a.m.)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	