

## STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

## PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

July 23, 2015 - 10:04 a.m.  
Concord, New Hampshire

NHPUC AUG06'15 AM 8:19

RE: DG 15-121  
NORTHERN UTILITIES, INC.:  
Request for Hearing on Notices of  
Violations PS1501NU and PS1502NU.  
(Prehearing conference)

PRESENT: Chairman Martin P. Honigberg, Presiding  
Commissioner Robert R. Scott

Sandy Deno, Clerk

APPEARANCES: Reptg. Northern Utilities, Inc.:  
William D. Hewitt, Esq. (Roach, Hewitt...)  
Christopher J. LeBlanc, Dir./Gas Operations

Reptg. PUC Staff:  
Michael J. Sheehan, Esq.  
Randall Knepper, Dir./Safety Division  
Joe Vercellotti, Safety Division

Court Reporter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52

ORIGINAL

## I N D E X

## PAGE NO.

## STATEMENTS BY:

Mr. Hewitt 4, 11, 13, 15, 18

Mr. Sheehan 8, 11, 13, 17, 19

## QUESTIONS BY:

## PAGE NO.

Chairman Honigberg 8, 11, 12, 14

Commissioner Scott 13

JAN 18 1990

1                                   P R O C E E D I N G

2                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We are here this  
3 morning in Docket DG 15-121, Northern Utilities' request  
4 for a hearing on Notices of Violations. Before we go any  
5 further, let's take appearances.

6                   MR. HEWITT: Good morning. Bill Hewitt,  
7 of the law firm Roach, Hewitt, Ruprecht, Sanchez &  
8 Bischoff, based in Portland, Maine. With me today, I have  
9 Chris LeBlanc, who is Director of Gas Operations for  
10 Northern Utilities.

11                  CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Good morning.

12                  MR. LeBLANC: Good morning.

13                  MR. SHEEHAN: Good morning,  
14 Commissioners. Mike Sheehan, for designated Commission  
15 Staff. And, present with me is Randall Knepper, Director  
16 of the Safety Division, and Joe Vercellotti of the Safety  
17 Division.

18                  CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: As you all know,  
19 there were two Notices of Violation issued by the Safety  
20 Division to Northern Utilities. Northern has, as is its  
21 right, requested a hearing. My understanding, and the  
22 Order of Notice is consistent with that happily, is that  
23 we're here to talk about the process that we're going to  
24 follow in the hearing. Northern wants some more process

1       than I think is typical for a Notice of Violation. The  
2       Staff, I'm sure, has some opinions on that. And, I  
3       believe there's a technical session scheduled after,  
4       correct?

5                   MR. SHEEHAN: Yes, sir.

6                   MR. HEWITT: That's correct.

7                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. I know  
8       that the Staff has the burden of proof, ultimately, in all  
9       of this. But, really, I think this is Northern's request  
10      for process. So, unless someone thinks that we should go  
11      otherwise, I'm interesting in hearing from Northern first,  
12      about why we should follow a different set of rules than  
13      we normally follow on a Notice of Violation.

14                  MR. HEWITT: Sure.

15                  CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So, Mr. Hewitt, go  
16      ahead.

17                  MR. HEWITT: Thank you, Chairman  
18      Honigberg. Chapter 500 allows the Company to request that  
19      this Commission hear the Company's defense to the Notices  
20      of Violation as an adjudicatory proceeding. And, this  
21      Commission -- and it specifically references this  
22      Commission's Chapter 200 rules. If you go into the -- to  
23      the Commission's Chapter 200 rules, the Company is merely  
24      seeking the types of process that are allowed and, in some

1 parts, mandated by the Commission's rules in Puc 203. So,  
2 really what we are doing is we are following the  
3 Commission's own procedures, I believe. And,  
4 specifically, 511.10, sub (b) states that "Hearing  
5 requests pursuant to 511.09 shall be treated as a request  
6 for an adjudicatory proceeding." And, then, if you go to  
7 Part 203 of your rules, there is an entire section that's  
8 entitled "Adjudicative Proceedings". And, even within the  
9 "adjudicative proceedings" portion of the rule, the  
10 Commission refers to "adjudicatory proceedings" and  
11 "adjudicative proceedings" as really being synonymous.

12 So, I think that the rule doesn't just  
13 contemplate a hearing, in the sense of "we gather in a  
14 room, witnesses are sworn, and the Commission takes  
15 evidence." I really think that the way the rule is  
16 established, this is supposed to be treated as an  
17 adjudicative process, and an adjudicative process within  
18 your rules. Which I do believe contemplates, typically,  
19 the filing of prefiled testimony, which, as the petitioner  
20 under your rules, you have really the right to do when you  
21 file your petition.

22 Now, admittedly, this case is a little  
23 bit different, because, as you noted, Mr. Chairman,  
24 although it's the Staff's allegations, it was the Company

1 who had to really come in and say "well, we want this  
2 additional process." So, I think the rules, in  
3 particular, 203.06(b), states that "If a petitioner wishes  
4 to submit testimony with a petition in the interest of  
5 expediting the proceedings, the Commission shall accept  
6 such testimony." And, that really is what we're talking  
7 about here, is trying to expedite the hearing on this  
8 matter.

9           The legal issues that are before the  
10 Commission involve interpretations of the federal Gas  
11 Safety Code. This Commission has, you know, very broad  
12 jurisdiction in terms of all the various issues that you  
13 folks have hearings on. It's my impression that you don't  
14 have hearings very frequently on the ins and outs, if you  
15 will, and the nuances of the federal Gas Safety Code. So,  
16 in order to allow the Commissioners to better understand  
17 how the various portions of the Code work, vis-a-vis the  
18 facts that are at issue in this proceeding, the Company  
19 believes that it's going to be much easier for the two or  
20 three of you, depending on the timing of this, to be able  
21 to look at the Staff's NOV, which I understand is  
22 basically their prefiled testimony, and to be able to  
23 consider the Company's prefiled testimony before you even  
24 walk into the hearing room. Otherwise, you're going to be

1       faced with having to understand all of these issues on the  
2       fly, if you will, during a live hearing. And, I think  
3       it's going to be, frankly, much simpler for you, and  
4       you'll be able to be better prepared, if you have that  
5       information before you even step foot into the hearing  
6       room.

7                       And, in fact, the Company has already  
8       prepared the prefilled testimony, and we're prepared to  
9       file it. And, so, it's not going to delay a hearing. A  
10      hearing is scheduled for this matter, I believe, on August  
11      the 19th, and we can have this testimony filed with you  
12      next week. And, so, from the Company's perspective, it's  
13      not going to harm anything, no one is going to be  
14      prejudiced by our filing of the testimony. We think it's  
15      only going to be helpful to you, because you'll be able to  
16      be better prepared.

17                     And, if you -- and, frankly, if you  
18      don't allow me to file it, what I'll do is just put my  
19      witnesses on walk them through the prefilled testimony that  
20      we've already prepared, more likely than not.

21                     CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. Maybe I'm  
22      going to need to hear from Mr. Sheehan before asking  
23      questions, but I do have some questions about what you  
24      just said.

1 Are you done? I didn't mean to  
2 interrupt you, but are you done?

3 MR. HEWITT: In terms of why we need  
4 prefiled testimony, that's the essence of the argument.

5 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, let me ask  
6 you, do you need our permission to file prefiled  
7 testimony?

8 MR. HEWITT: I think that I don't,  
9 although, as I read the -- as I read the Order of Notice,  
10 it suggests that there was going to be an argument as to  
11 whether prefiled testimony would be allowed. So, in my  
12 mind, there was some question as to whether you folks were  
13 going to say, you know, "we really don't want you to file  
14 it." And, when I appear before regulators, I don't like  
15 to file something, if there's a suggestion that I  
16 shouldn't be filing it.

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Understood.  
18 Mr. Sheehan.

19 MR. SHEEHAN: Certainly. The overview  
20 comment is, this proceeding is different, largely because  
21 the 500 rules delegate to the Safety Division many of the  
22 steps that normally would be involved in a rate case, for  
23 example. And, most of the time, the Safety Division acts  
24 as fact-finder and judge/jury/prosecutor, if you will.



1 And, so, when it does, and they do have a right to this  
2 hearing, but, when they do request it, it comes with a  
3 fairly different backdrop than the normal case.

4 That being said, our concern leading up  
5 to this was that the Safety Division is -- we did not want  
6 this kind of hearing to turn into a rate case. We wanted  
7 to keep it fairly straightforward, fairly direct, because  
8 a lot of the work has already been done. So, that was our  
9 overriding concern.

10 Based on what your question was, and  
11 Mr. Hewitt's presentation, if they want to file prefiled  
12 testimony, it's not going to hurt anybody, of course. We  
13 don't want the obligation to. We think our Notice of  
14 Violation is, in effect, our prefiled testimony. We've  
15 already answered data requests voluntarily to the Company  
16 earlier this week, and we expect to get some from them,  
17 once we give them the questions soon. So, there will be  
18 some brief discovery. But that's all that we anticipated.  
19 A quick exchange of discovery, you know what our case is  
20 based on the NOV's, and let's have a hearing.

21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Maybe I'm wrong,  
22 but I actually think everybody here is roughly on the same  
23 page. Mr. Hewitt, I think you said, and I think  
24 Mr. Sheehan agrees, that the Notice of Violation is

1 essentially their prefiled testimony, the Staff's prefiled  
2 testimony. If you want to file prefiled testimony, and as  
3 I understand 203.06, it's actually not a requirement that  
4 people file prefiled testimony, but it's a great idea.  
5 And, so, you can do that.

6 And, I'm not sure, am I wrong? Are we  
7 all now agreeing?

8 MR. HEWITT: I believe I'm -- I'm  
9 certainly in agreement with that.

10 MR. SHEEHAN: I'm not objecting.

11 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.  
12 Wonderful. Peace in our time. We've brought peace to the  
13 Kingdom.

14 For the record, I will note that, when  
15 we do get to hearing, barring some cataclysm, you will  
16 have Commissioner Bailey sitting to our right. She was  
17 confirmed yesterday by the Council, and all that's left is  
18 to have her sworn in, and move from one corner office to  
19 another corner office. And, she's in the back of the  
20 room.

21 MR. HEWITT: Terrific.

22 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So, I think all  
23 that, if you guys have a technical session to hash through  
24 timing, that's great. Is there anything else from the

1 Order of Notice that really needs to be locked down?

2 MR. HEWITT: The other issue that we had  
3 raised was a post-hearing briefing, and that was also  
4 raised in the notice. And, again, sort of similar to the  
5 prefiled testimony, there was just a question as to  
6 whether that would be -- whether that would be permitted.  
7 And, we certainly think it would be helpful to encapsulate  
8 and summarize "Here's what the testimony was, here's what  
9 we view the law to be, and this is how we apply these  
10 facts to this law."

11 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Sheehan.

12 MR. SHEEHAN: My response is similar. I  
13 don't think it's required. I think this case is much  
14 simpler than Mr. Hewitt is describing it to be. I think,  
15 at the end of the hearing, you will know exactly what the  
16 issues are and exactly where the point of conflict is.  
17 And, it's a interpretation of two rules that are fairly  
18 clear.

19 Again, if they want to file a brief, I  
20 can't stop them. We, again, are trying to keep, to the  
21 extent this process, we have not done one of these in a  
22 while, an NOV hearing, we don't want it to set a template  
23 that is more burdensome on Staff than it needs to be.

24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Understanding that

1 we do not want to set a precedent, is there time  
2 sensitivity to issuing an order on this Notice of  
3 Violation?

4 MR. SHEEHAN: No.

5 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So, if we were to  
6 allow post-hearing memos, brief post-hearing memos, as  
7 those who appear here a lot, at least since I've become  
8 the Chair, I am a believer in page limits, so, if the  
9 Parties wanted to file brief post-hearing memos, that  
10 wouldn't be a problem, from your perspective, Mr. Sheehan?

11 MR. SHEEHAN: Again, it's the same as  
12 before. We would not object to it. We can't stop -- I  
13 mean, I completely understand. If I were in Mr. Hewitt's  
14 shoes, I may be saying the same thing. So, I'm not going  
15 to object to it. And, in fact, if -- so, I'll leave it at  
16 that.

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. I think what  
18 we'll do, Mr. Hewitt, is, I think you should assume you're  
19 going to be allowed to file a post-hearing memo. It may  
20 be, by the time we get there, everyone agrees this is  
21 really pretty straightforward, and it's obvious that the  
22 Commissioners understand the relatively narrow issues and  
23 you don't need it. Or, you may conclude that you do, and  
24 we'll deal with it with a specific schedule, once we have

1 a sense of how long the transcripts are going to be and  
2 what you might need. Commissioner Scott.

3 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: I just wanted to  
4 ask the Company is, in the context of the Chair just  
5 mentioned that there's no particular urgency to get to a  
6 resolution of this, the urgency in my mind would be, if  
7 activity -- if there is really indeed a safety issue  
8 caused by overpressurization, are we assured that there's  
9 no -- that activity is not continuing while we figure all  
10 this out?

11 MR. HEWITT: We can certainly make that  
12 assurance. Our systems are safe, they are reliable.  
13 These particular NOV's do not address, in the Company's  
14 view, sort of long-standing issues. They were really,  
15 frankly, isolated incidents that the Company has taken  
16 measures to ensure that they will not occur again. And,  
17 in the Company's mind, we are very confident that any time  
18 to decision that is necessary in this docket will have  
19 really zero impact on the safety of the public of the  
20 people of the State of New Hampshire.

21 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Thank you.

22 MR. SHEEHAN: In response to that, the  
23 philosophical disagreement in this case is between one  
24 section of the Code that says "you shall not operate over

1 your maximum pressure", and another section of the Code  
2 that allows the design of the system to accommodate  
3 pressures above that maximum.

4 We believe the Company thinks it's okay  
5 to, on occasion, go into that 10 percent cushion above  
6 maximum pressure; we disagree vehemently. So, to the  
7 extent there may be overpressurization, as Commissioner  
8 Scott mentioned, we were concerned -- that would be our  
9 concern is that they are continuing to move into that  
10 10 percent window that we think is not permissive, and  
11 they think, at least it appears, there may be some belief  
12 that it is okay on occasion to go into that range.

13 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Hewitt, just,  
14 not necessarily addressing the second part of what  
15 Mr. Sheehan said, but the first part, in outlining the  
16 interplay between those two sections being the crux of the  
17 dispute, is that something you agree with?

18 MR. HEWITT: That is certainly one of  
19 the issues that is of significance in this, in this  
20 matter. That's correct.

21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Do you want to  
22 respond at all to the second thing Mr. Sheehan said?

23 MR. HEWITT: You're going to have to  
24 help me with the first and the second, because --

1 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The first was "we  
2 got a philosophical difference between one provision and  
3 another."

4 MR. HEWITT: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The second issue  
6 that Mr. Sheehan outlined was their concern that "the  
7 Company believes it's okay to operate in an area above  
8 what appears to be a limit."

9 MR. HEWITT: Sure. And, rather -- and,  
10 without arguing the case too much before the evidence is  
11 in, so, Mr. Sheehan is correct, the Company does believe  
12 that the system can be operated above MAOP. But let us be  
13 very clear. The Company takes that position that that --  
14 that the system MAOP can exceed -- or, that the pressure  
15 on the system can exceed MAOP, only during an emergency  
16 situation, such as when the primary means for regulating  
17 pressure on that system fails. And, so, you have a backup  
18 means for regulating the pressure on that system. It's  
19 called "overpressure protection". And, when you have to  
20 rely on that overpressure protection, because of a failure  
21 of your primary mode of pressure regulation, the Code  
22 provides, and PHMSA has confirmed, that you can then have  
23 the pressure on your system, temporarily, during this  
24 emergency situation, go into that 10 percent overage.

1           And, to provide you assurance that this  
2   is -- that this does not present a public safety hazard,  
3   these systems are designed purposefully, as you might  
4   expect, with a safety factor. So that, if you have what's  
5   called the "MAOP" on a system, okay, if you just go a  
6   little bit over that MAOP, there's not -- there's not a  
7   concern that pipes are going to start deforming or that  
8   you're going to have significant problems with the system.  
9   These systems are constructed with a safety factor built  
10   in. And, the 10 percent amount that the Staff is talking  
11   about is well within the safety factor that's already  
12   designed into the system.

13           So, I want to be very clear that the  
14   Company's position here is that, yes, the system can  
15   experience a pressure that exceeds MAOP, but only in very,  
16   very limited circumstances, that only arise if there is a  
17   failure of that system. Okay? And, it's temporary in  
18   nature.

19           So, when I said it's an isolated  
20   incident, it really is an isolated incident. It is an  
21   emergency type of situation when this is allowed.

22           CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. That's  
23   helpful from both of you to outline -- helpful from both  
24   of you to outline what the issues are, I think.



1                   Is there anything else, Mr. Sheehan,  
2                   that you want to add?

3                   MR. SHEEHAN: Other than vehemently  
4                   disagreeing.

5                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No, I understand.  
6                   You guys are going to disagree about how it all applies.  
7                   But, I mean, I appreciate you laying out where the -- the  
8                   nature of the disagreement, I think that's helpful.

9                   MR. SHEEHAN: And, Mr. Knepper reminded  
10                  me, to the extent there is a safety concern, the Staff  
11                  believes the MAOP is a bright line that shall never be  
12                  exceeded. And, we believe, at the end of this process,  
13                  there will be an order from the Commission reaffirming  
14                  that. So that, between now and that order, we would  
15                  appreciate a commitment from the Company that they won't  
16                  go above the MAOP, regardless of Mr. Hewitt's statements  
17                  that "the system can probably handle it." It's still, in  
18                  our view, not permissive. And, to the extent that  
19                  Commissioner Scott had a concern about what's happening  
20                  between now and decision time, that would be -- that would  
21                  satisfy Staff, is a commitment from the Company they won't  
22                  go there.

23                  CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: In large measure, I  
24                  think that's a situation that's probably outside the

1 Notice of Violation proceeding that's before us. I think  
2 that's really a matter for the Safety Division and the  
3 Company as to how they're operating today.

4 I mean, Mr. Hewitt, if you want to make  
5 such a representation, you can. I'm not going to require  
6 it as you sit there.

7 MR. HEWITT: Yes. I think what Staff's  
8 essentially asking for is some, you know, sort of  
9 prejudgment relief.

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, no, I  
11 wouldn't say that. I think what they're asking for is  
12 some interim commitment that, while this is uncertain at  
13 least legally while you are disagreeing about what's  
14 required, what they'd like you to do is commit to staying  
15 on the low -- staying below the line until there's an  
16 order.

17 MR. HEWITT: We operate, and I'm  
18 hesitant to start arguing -- really start arguing the  
19 merits of the case. But we operate these systems  
20 substantially below the MAOP. So that, if an emergency  
21 situation does occur, and our backup means for  
22 overpressure protection on these systems is required to  
23 kick in, the exceedance is for a very short period of time  
24 while that overpressure protection gains control of system

1 pressure.

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Don't -- yes, you  
3 don't need to do any more. We're not going to order the  
4 Company to do something that they don't believe the rules  
5 require them to do that you do, and that's the dispute  
6 that's in front of us. I think, if the Safety Division  
7 believes that some visit to the Company, some regular  
8 checking of their numbers is appropriate, I think you  
9 should do that. But I don't think that they need to make  
10 any further commitments than what they have made. And, if  
11 they turn out to be wrong, they're going to be wrong. But  
12 I understand where the nature of the dispute is.

13 I'm sorry, I cut you off. Was there  
14 something else you needed to say?

15 MR. HEWITT: No. You understood the  
16 point that I was making.

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.

18 MR. HEWITT: So, I appreciate that.

19 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Is there anything  
20 else we can do for you, before you do your technical  
21 session? Mr. Sheehan.

22 MR. SHEEHAN: The Order of Notice did  
23 say, at the prehearing conference, the parties would  
24 "state positions", which, in effect, we've already done,

1 and "to identify any facts detailed in the NOV's that are  
2 disputed". What we're going to do in the technical  
3 session is to try to work out an agreed statement of  
4 facts. So, I do believe that we will probably find out  
5 then what's disputed and what isn't.

6 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes. I don't think  
7 it's necessary to have -- to make Mr. Hewitt or his  
8 witness state in front of us what they disagree with. I  
9 think, if you can work out, to the greatest extent  
10 possible, an agreed statement of facts, it would certainly  
11 simplify everything for the hearing and crystallize what  
12 the nature of the dispute is. And, I think, in large  
13 measure, you'll probably be able to do that.

14 Is there anything else?

15 MR. SHEEHAN: That's all from Staff.  
16 Thank you.

17 MR. HEWITT: Nothing from the Company.  
18 Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Thank  
20 you very much. Good luck with your technical session.

21 MR. HEWITT: Thank you.

22 **(Whereupon the prehearing conference was**  
23 **adjourned at 10:26 a.m., and a technical**  
24 **session was held thereafter.)**