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PROCEEDINGS
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right.
Let's go on the record. We're here this afternoon in Docket DE 19-064 to hear closing arguments regarding the Liberty Utilities Corporation step adjustment. We have previously made the necessary findings related to this hearing. Being a remote hearing, $I$ will reiterate, though, that if anybody has a problem during the hearing, please call (603)271-2431. And as always, if the public is unable to access this hearing, the hearing will be adjourned and rescheduled. All right.

I'm not going to go through the ground rules, but $I$ know you all know them. Let's start by taking attendance of the Commissioners.

When you state your presence, please also state where you're located. And if anyone is with you, please identify them. My name is Dianne Martin. I'm the Chairwoman of the Public Utilities Commission. I'm located at my home in -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}

Deerfield, New Hampshire, and no one is with me.

Commissioner Bailey.
COMMISSIONER BAILEY: I'm
Commissioner Kathryn Bailey. I'm located at my home, and no one is in the room with me.

COMMISSIONER GIAIMO: Good afternoon. Michael Giaimo. I'm at the PUC offices in Concord, and I am by myself.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right.
Thank you. Let's take appearances again.
Mr. Sheehan.
MR. SHEEHAN: Good afternoon. Mike Sheehan for Liberty Utilities (Granite State Electric Corp.)

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Thank you.
Mr. Dexter.
MR. DEXTER: Good afternoon,
Commissioners. Paul Dexter, on behalf of the Commission Staff. And Attorney Buckley will not be able to join us today due to a scheduling conflict.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank
you. Anything else we need to address before -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
we go to the closing arguments?
[No verbal response]
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Seeing none, Mr. Dexter.

MR. DEXTER: Thank you, Chairwoman Martin and Commissioners. First, let me express my appreciation for you allowing me some time after the end of the long hearing on Monday to prepare closing arguments. We used the time fruitfully to review the record and to discuss various positions amongst the witnesses in the case and the Electric Division. So I believe it was time well spent.

I'm going to address several topics today, and I'd like to start with the step adjustment process itself.

There was an argument made on Monday that the review of the projects at issue in this docket should be somehow limited in scope with respect to prudence; specifically, that the projects should be reviewed for the prudent execution of the projects, but not necessarily the selection -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
of the projects as prudent investments. And I addressed that Monday when we spoke, but I wanted to reiterate some key points on that process, on that topic, because it's extremely important to Staff.

First of all, as I pointed out on Monday, the investments that are at issue in step adjustments are all post-test year. Staff believes that they can't be reasonably expected, and other intervenors can't be reasonably expected, to conduct prudence reviews on an entire test-year basis and then also on projects that came in after the test year, after the case was filed, that weren't completed when the case was filed in many cases, and in some instances may not have even been started when the case was filed. Typically rate cases are filed in April. The projects at issue in the step adjustment went into service throughout 2019.

Mr. Dudley's testimony in the main case discusses in detail how Staff believed that the existing procedure afforded for step adjustments was inadequate. And on that -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
basis, Mr. Dudley recommended no step adjustments in this case. And through the settlement process, Staff agreed to two or three step adjustments, depending on circumstances. But part and parcel to that agreement was an expansion of the review process for the step adjustments. We built into the settlement a 90-day review process and required the Company to provide substantial materials up front to save on discovery. With those changes, Staff believed that an adequate review process could take place. But it was never our intention that that review process be limited in scope. The Commission only gets one chance to review investments before they go in rate base. And once they go in rate base, they're in forever until they're fully depreciated. And we don't believe that that scope of review should be limited in the step adjustment process. If we're wrong and the Commission decides that the selection of projects is not appropriate for review in the step adjustment phase, Staff will take a long -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
and hard look at its position in future cases before agreeing or supporting step adjustments.

As I said on Monday, they're
post-test-year investments. It is an extraordinary rate recovery mechanism designed to offset regulatory lag for the Company. But it was in no way intended, we believe, to circumvent a full prudence review of investments. Having said that about process, I'd like to focus my comments today on three or four of the topics that we went into in depth on Monday.

First, regarding the
pre-capitalization of meters and
transformers. Having looked at this issue, it's now Staff's understanding that since New Hampshire uses the test year-end rate base, there would probably be no substantial difference in rates if these assets are pre-capitalized, as Liberty does, or if they were installed throughout the year. The key question I think is what Commissioner Bailey asked, which was how could we be sure that
-064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20\}
all these assets were placed in service after they were pre-capitalized. If in fact they were, because materials -- under traditional accounting, these assets would have been placed in inventory, included as materials and supplies. And materials and supplies are generally added into rate base. So that's why we don't think there's a ratemaking -- a real significant ratemaking distinction between inventory and pre-capitalization. But as we said, Commissioner Bailey asked the appropriate question to make sure that these things are actually in service. We understand that the Commission's Audit Department is looking into this issue. We understand that they're on track to issue their final audit report in three to four weeks, and we won't make any additional recommendations at this time. We'll defer to the conclusions that we find in the final audit report on the issue of pre-capitalization of meters and transformers.

Next issue I want to talk about is -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
the walk-up payment center in Salem. Staff has looked at this project thoroughly, and we're going to recommend to the Commission that the Commission allow only about half of this investment to be recovered from customers through rate base inclusion, and we recommend that the remainder of the cost be borne by Liberty's shareholders. Staff came to this conclusion using an analysis that -parallelled the analysis that it used and the Commission used in reviewing Liberty Utilities' training center in the gas rate case, DG 17-048, a couple years ago. And it has to do with the robustness of the analysis of the decision to build the walk-in center and then the actions that were taken after that decision was made. And I'll go into that in some detail in just a moment.

First, in Exhibit 60, you'll see that the Company states they did not do a benefit cost analysis for this project.

Instead, they decided that they needed space in Salem due to recent employee shifts from Londonderry, which they state is full, and -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
they made the decision to relocate the walk-in center to separate customers from employees and employee equipment for safety reasons. These were non-cost considerations.

Next, the Company budgeted $\$ 300,000$
for the project to renovate a building they didn't own, that they leased. And if you look at Exhibit 41, you'll see that the costs are broken down: \$295,000 for contractors, and 5,000 is actually undefined at one page of Exhibit 41, for a total of 300,000. If you go to Bates 62 of that same exhibit, you'll see that the cost breakdown is $\$ 20,000$ for engineering and \$275,000 for construction. This budget was contained in a business case that was dated January 9th, 2019. It was signed by the vice-president of operations on March 6th and the vice-president of finance on April 2nd. The schedule of work says that it will locate a leased location between March 20th and April 20th. And that's at Bates 58. So Exhibit 41 tells us that the Company made this decision in early 2019, that they -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
indicated that it would cost roughly $\$ 300,000$. And the reasons for the project were as stated, customer safety and more space. And it was signed by two vice-presidents. This project would provide working space for about six employees, three of them in customer service and three of them in other areas.

What this business case didn't include was the fact that the Company is going to lease -- needed to go out and lease a building, as the business case stated. There's no recognition in the cost analysis or the cost budget of the lease costs, which turned out to be $\$ 4100$ per month. We'll get to that a little bit later. The substantial cost we assume -- we don't have the lease. I guess we could have asked for it, but we didn't. We don't have the lease, but we assume there will be utilities on top of that $\$ 4100$ a month and some operation and maintenance.

So the project went forward, and the final cost of the project was $\$ 568,000$. -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}

We will learn from the record requests that the Commission asked for that the 568,000 was broken down basically into three categories: Contractor cost of $\$ 364,000$, burdens of $\$ 180,000$, and internal labor of $\$ 24,000$.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: I'm sorry, Mr.
Dexter. What was the second category?
MR. DEXTER: Burdens of $\$ 180,000$,
which as we discussed on Monday, are the in-house overhead that gets added to every capital and operating project that the Company does. We've learned that they're unavoidable and that they vary project to project based on the amount of activity that the Company is doing in a given year. In other words, the cost of the burdens, the pool is always there, and it's just a question where they get allocated. So just to recap: $\$ 364,000$ in contractor costs, \$180,000 in burdens, $\$ 24,000$ in labor. Now, this is the final project cost.

We've also learned that the final
project cost included roughly $\$ 100,000$
renovation at Lowell Road, which is the area
-064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES]
from where the employees were moving to get down to Main Street. There was computer costs included in that. There were internal computer costs, as well as equipment computer costs, and internal labor. And Mr. Sheehan, I believe, will be filing that record request today. Liberty was kind enough to provide us sort of an advance notice of what was in it.

Now, major project changes,
according to the Company's capital
expenditure project, are recorded in what are called change-order forms. And there was a change-order form filed in this case, and it took the project from the $\$ 300,000$ when the decision was made to the $\$ 567,000$, which was the final cost. And this was signed by a regional president, Mr. Sweeney, who is one step above the New Hampshire president, who we spoke to yesterday, I believe. But this change-order report was not helpful in the decision-making process, because the change-order report was filed in March of 2020. The project was completed in the fall of 2019. And the change-order report
indicates that the major changes were for addition of a conference room at 130 Main Street, addition of conference room furniture, the addition of a handicapped bathroom, some bullet-proof glass, and the addition of audiovisual equipment. All of those changes, if you look at the details that Mr. Sheehan will be providing, come to about $\$ 19,000$. They weren't a significant factor in the project going from $\$ 300,000$ to $\$ 567,000$. It appears to Staff that the primary factor for the increase were burdens, \$180,000. These were not mentioned at the outset of the project and were not considered; therefore, we believe when the management made the decision to pursue this project. Heather Tebbetts testified that she believed that the burdens were accounted for in the original $\$ 300,000$, but review of the record doesn't seem to support that. There were contractor costs of $\$ 275,000$ originally estimated in engineering and designing. Now, her testimony was that the form didn't allow for burdens. And that may be. But even if
-064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES]
they were accounted for, there's not much room in that original budget of 300,000 for any substantial amount of burdens. When the contract came in in March to do the work at 130 Main Street, it was for $\$ 249,000$, and when it was done, it was around $\$ 269,000$ because of the conference room and other items. So all along, the actual renovation work at Main Street was going to cost somewhere between $\$ 275-$ and $\$ 300,000$. So just to sum up -- I'm throwing a lot of numbers around. But just to sum up, we have a decision made to pursue a project at $\$ 300,000$, that the documents indicate was based on contractor costs and design. What wasn't included in that analysis was burdens, was computer costs. And also what was not included was the renovation that was going to be needed to -- the renovation undertaken back at Lowell Road. Now, it's true that the conference room and the bathroom and the air conditioning were taken care of in the -mentioned in the change-order report also were also not accounted for in the original -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
estimate, but those turned out to be minor items.

So what we're looking at, we believe, is a decision that was made without a proper cost analysis. Now, we understand the Company was not predicting any benefits. These were non-cost safety and space benefits, and we understand that. But in our view, that makes the analysis of the cost even more important because this is all going to be money going out and being borne by customers, and no real tangible savings are coming in.

So in an instance like this, it's Staff's position that focus on cost analysis and budgeting and control are even more important in a situation than what we had with the training center, where the training center did have a cost benefit analysis because it was going to be designed to save outside training costs. Turned out that wasn't the case, but you see the point I'm making.

As we learned from the Commission's -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
decision in 17-048, and from long lines of precedence, the question of prudence comes down to what a reasonable utility manager would have done when faced with the decision. In this case, Liberty Utilities was faced with two problems: A space problem and a perceived safety problem. And I will note the witnesses indicated there actually haven't been any safety issues down at this facility, but there could be. And, you know, that's fine.

We think, first, before deciding to go out and look for additional space, that Liberty should have looked at the space that they have and see if they could have addressed the safety issue, do some reconfiguring of the lot. The witness testified that there were two ways in and out -- two means of access. I guess one's a one-way and one's a two-way. But there are two curb cuts, essentially. And from what we've seen in the record, we didn't see any evidence that the Company spent any time looking at reconfiguring how that building -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
could have been re-accessed, re-landscaped for ingress and egress, to somehow separate customers from the employees. And as the witness testified on Monday, there's a gate where all the equipment is housed behind. And even under the current consideration, customers aren't going behind the gate. Secondly, we think a reasonable manager might have done a space analysis of the existing facility before deciding to contract to lease additional space and do substantial renovations to the leased space. We have not seen any evidence that that was done. We've just seen a conclusion that there was no space. And again, we're talking about six employees, not a overwhelming number. It's fairly small, a small number of employees where additional space was needed. We also don't believe that the Company considered consolidating the walk-in function up in Londonderry, where the witness testified on Monday they have over 30 customer service reps already working and a customer walk-up center already in place.

Now, the evidence does indicate that the Salem walk-in center is more popular, I guess, more useful than the Londonderry center. And so we understand that there was a desire to keep the walk-in center in Salem. But when faced with over half a million dollars of cost, it would seem reasonable that consolidation up in Londonderry could have been considered.

So in summary, we looked at -- we tried to look at what the total cost of this project was on an annual basis. And we took the $\$ 567,000$ that was spent, plugged it into the revenue requirement model that's on the first page of the attachments of Ms. Tebbetts' and Mr. Strabone's testimony, and come up with an annual revenue requirement of $\$ 88,000$ for these investments. When we add to that the $\$ 50,000$ for the lease cost and some operation and maintenance expenses, we come up with an estimate of about $\$ 140$ - to $\$ 150,000$ per year to house six employees and a conference room. That strikes us as an extraordinarily high burden for customers to -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20\}
bear for the addition of this space. We recognize that the building's in place and it's been built, like the training center was, and therefore is used and useful. But on the question of prudence, we don't believe that the record supports that the Company acted prudently in making this decision because it failed to recognize the cost that they knew it would have to incur, including burdens, computer costs and internal labor costs. The change-order report was of no help because it was done after the fact. It was done after the project was done. So it could not have factored into the decision-making process. The decision was made on the basis of the original business case back in January which said $\$ 300,000$. Now, if you were to plug $\$ 300,000$ into the revenue requirement model, you get something like $\$ 10,000$ a year. But that's because you're not looking at the lease cost. We could very easily see that a manager might sit back and say, for $\$ 10,000$ a year I could get myself space for six employees. That
makes perfect sense. I may have that number wrong. Let me just think for a second.

If we were to plug the $\$ 300,000$
into the revenue requirement model, we would get a number of about $\$ 50,000$, I'm sorry, not $\$ 10,000$. Ten thousand dollars per customer. And that might be a reasonable conclusion. But it was not a robust analysis. It didn't include all the costs, and it didn't include all the alternatives.

And for those reasons, Staff's recommendation is that the Commission take an approach like they did in the training center and find that a portion of the costs that might have been considered prudent had it been executed could be recovered, and in this case we recommend the original budget of $\$ 300,000$.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Sheehan, I think it might make sense to break right now, if you don't have an objection, rather than having you start and break in the middle.
-064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20\}

MR. DEXTER: Oh, I haven't finished yet. I'm sorry. I was changing topics -CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Sorry. MR. DEXTER: -- and taking a glass of water. But I'd be happy to break now. I probably have about ten more minutes on the Salem assets.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Well, what's your preference? I can wait ten more minutes.

MR. DEXTER: I will continue to speak, and then if you stop me, $I$ will stop. How's that?

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Great. Thank you.

MR. DEXTER: No, sorry for that pause. I just wanted to take a sip of water.

The rest of my comments deal with the Salem area assets. And in this case, there are four Golden Rock projects that we discussed in detail on Monday which total about $\$ 3.1$ million. And they consist, for the most part, of work done in the substation, in the Golden Rock substation, -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
and on the lines to connect that substation to the system. And if you look back at the list of projects, there's four of them. They all have "Golden Rock" in their title.

Liberty stated on Monday that these assets were made to address two concerns: One was the condition of existing assets, specifically the substations at Baron Ave. and Salem Depot; and secondly, to address load growth that is happening mostly in the Tuscan Village development in Salem.

Staff's position is that in this step adjustment filing, the Company has failed to present a complete record to allow the Commission to adequately judge whether or not these investments were prudent. Based on the current state of the record, the Company has failed, in Staff's view, to prove that the replacement assets have deteriorated to a point where retirement and replacement is the least cost option, and we believe they have failed to support the load projection for the larger side of the Tuscan Village development, the south side. Thus, having -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
failed to provide adequate information on both of those factors, we don't believe the Commission can make a decision on these as the record stands.

First turning to asset condition. The Company produced many reports from various vendors that evaluated the various equipment at the substation going back to 2016. They testified in many instances that pieces of equipment were found to be acceptable by those contractors. And in the few instances where equipment was not found to be acceptable, repairs were made. And the repairs were not substantial. I recall one repair costing $\$ 100,000$, and all the rest of them were treated as maintenance costs. Importantly, no assets were retired as a result of these reports. You can look to Exhibit 53 for confirmation of that. That's response to Staff Step Adjustment 2-4. One set of reports that we went into in detail did evaluate the transformers at the substation, and it concluded that the transformers were deteriorated and needed to
be tested quarterly. Liberty did not provide any of the subsequent quarterly tests that were recommended, so the Commission can't evaluate whether these transformers have deteriorated further. Liberty stated that none have failed to date -- and it's been three years since the last report was submitted -- and if a transformer had failed, replacement would run in the range of \$1 million. Liberty also stated -CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Mr. Dexter, can I interrupt you? I apologize. I can't see anybody other than you and Mr. Wind. Can everyone else see --

MR. DEXTER: I can see everyone. CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: So it must be mine. I'm fine with proceeding so long as I can hear.

MR. DEXTER: Are the other Commissioners able to hear me? I see nodding. And Mr. Sheehan's nodding. How about our court reporter?

COURT REPORTER: I can see you.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. We can
-064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
proceed. If I end up not hearing, I'll let Mr. Wind know, or one of the Commissioners. MR. DEXTER: I was just noting that Liberty did state that there was a concern regarding space and availability of spare parts concerning the repair or expansion of the existing substation. And again, all of these transformers placed on quarterly watch are still in service. That was confirmed on Monday.

Concerning load growth, Staff's position is that Liberty has failed to provide detailed support of load forecast for the larger Tuscan parcel, despite it seems having had that detailed information in its possession. Liberty testified that it had customer-by-customer analysis of load requests for the southern parcel like it provided the for northern parcel in the Confidential Exhibit 51. Liberty stated that the information on the southern parcel wasn't provided because they somehow concluded that the information was never requested from Staff, a claim which Staff vigorously -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
contests. We've been asking questions about the forecasted load from the outset of this case. And if our questions weren't worded properly, we find it curious that we were able to get with the same question when we asked for updates what happened in connection with this project, we were able to get a detailed customer-by-customer projection of the smaller parcel, but not the larger parcel. I understood the witnesses's testimony on Monday to say that they have a similar analysis. Understanding that those customers are not as far along in their development stage and that the information might not look exactly like the information we got for the smaller parcel, but it certainly would be more detailed than what was provided in the main part of the case, which was essentially just a conclusion that the load would be somewhere in the 14 to 17 megawatts.

Staff reviewed the data request that the witness mentioned on the stand on Monday and maintains that the current state -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
of the record is void of any meaningful, detailed load projections for the larger Tuscan parcel which is under development. The Company has mentioned several times that a lot of that information is confidential. But the Commission has processes and procedures in place to receive confidential information, and we do it all the time. We don't believe that's an adequate reason for not providing the information.

So in conclusion, we don't believe the record supports the Golden Rock investments. But I'm harkening back to Mr . Sheehan's comment last week about the role of lawyer versus the role of problem solver. And rather than recommend disallowance of these assets, Staff would like to recommend a different course at this time.

Liberty testified that it has performed the updated testing on the assets at Baron Ave. and Salem Depot, and it plans to provide those reports in a month or so, along with the updated Salem Area Study. Despite having been requested to provide them -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
in the step phase, they did not. Liberty has also stated that it's nearing completion of its re-study of the Salem area concerning how to serve the projected load in light of recent events and in light of the new planning criteria that Liberty's agreed to in the settlements in the main part of this case. If you go to Exhibit 50, Staff Response 2-2, Liberty indicates that that study is in the final stages. If that information were provided, the Commission would have additional information on which to judge these assets. But there would still be a key piece missing, because Heather Tebbetts testified that the Salem Area Study does not contain any additional detail about the projected load at Tuscan Village. If the Commission were to require Liberty to file a detailed load projection, in whatever form it has, in the highest level of detail it has and in the greatest clarity that it has, then the Commission would have, along with the other two reports, the Commission would have three -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
pieces of information in front of it which it currently does not have. It would have updated asset reports on the Baron Ave. and Salem Depot substation; it would have Liberty's current thinking on how they were going to serve this load through the updated Salem Area Study; and they would have an adequate basis for the load, or at least they would have the basis with Liberty.

So given all this, Staff recommends that the Commission reserve judgment at this time on the Golden Rock assets until all this information has been provided in the docket that's been subject to discovery, and Staff has had an opportunity to provide rebuttal testimony if it so chooses; then the Commission could hold a hearing on these matters and issue an order. If the information is filed by July 31st and is complete, Staff believes a final issue could be -- a final order could be issued by October 31st, and it would allow for discovery, rebuttal testimony, and then the Commission could make its decision on the -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
most complete information available.
So in summary, Staff again thanks you for the opportunity to make this closing. We reaffirm our view that the step adjustments must be robust -- the review of the step adjustments must be robust and not be limited in any way. We defer to the Commission's Audit Staff on the questions of pre-capitalization of meters and transformers. We recommend a partial disallowance of the walk-in center based on a prudence analysis that was similar to what the Commission did with the Company's training center in the gas case. And we recommend that final judgment on the Golden Rock projects be deferred pending the information that $I$ just outlined.

That concludes our recommendations in this phase. Thank you for the opportunity.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right.
Thank you, Mr. Dexter.
Mr. Sheehan, I would like to take that break now, okay. Great. Why don't we -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
take our break until 2:00 and return.
Mr. Wind, we'll go off the record now.
(Brief recess was taken at 1:43 p.m., and the hearing resumed at 2:10 p.m.) CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. On the record.

Mr. Sheehan, you want to make your closing arguments?

MR. SHEEHAN: Thank you very much.
I hope you don't regret your decision to allow us to have this later closing. It obviously gave Staff time to prepare more thoroughly, as well as I did it, too. But I hope you find Staff's argument helpful to resolve the issues here.

First, I want to address Staff's comments about the Company not providing information. That's simply not true. There's no reason we would withhold any information, and especially of the type discussed here. As you heard in testimony, we did update the Salem study. It's almost finalized. And it shows -- it reaffirms the -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
prior study. It only helps our case in the long run. And similarly, the load information that we are getting every day continues to increase the total load at Salem, so there's no reason for us to withhold that. The reason that -- the caveat on that statement, however, is that that information really isn't relevant to today's conversation. And I'll get to that in a minute. But $I$ wanted to get to that early, that there's no incentive whatsoever for us to withhold information. Tuscan's very fluid. It changes often. And Staff hears about it formally and informally. On the issues in front of you today, there was some discussion about burdens at the hearing. That is reviewed extensively by the Audit Staff often in various cases. And the practice that the Company uses for burdens is a little bit complicated, but it has been reviewed and approved many times over.

Second, pre-capitalization. Staff
suggested we defer that to the Audit
-064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}

Division. I agree. The Audit Division, in the last rate case, 16-383, discussed the pre-capitalization at some length and found it to be appropriate. We just received the draft audit in this docket yesterday. It similarly has no problems with the pre-capitalization process. I understand that Staff and Commissioners have not seen that yet, but it is not an issue in this case that needs to be worried about, if you will.

And the other issue that was raised was on the record request that we will provide later today. One was on the capital costs of the walk-in center, and we'll provide that information. And the other was the backup for that one particular data response.

So let's get to the major issues. Staff did not raise issues with any of the other projects on the step adjustment list; it's the Golden Rock projects and the walk-in center. Staff arbitrarily recommends a 50 percent disallowance of the walk-in center. Respectfully there are no facts in -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
the record to support that disallowance. To the contrary, the undisputed facts support full recovery.

Recall that the walk-in center is required by Commission order. It was in the settlement agreement at the acquisition. The Commission approved the settlement agreement, finding that having walk-in centers is in the public interest. It wasn't a clear suggestion that they're unnecessary, but any suggestion so is simply wrong.

Recall that the Salem walk-in center receives more than 10,000 visits per year, close to 50 a day, and $\$ 2$ million a year comes in through those doors.

Recall the types of service the walk-in center provides, largely to lower income customers, those facing disconnects, those who needs to pay today or they'll lose their service. That's a valuable service. Salem isn't exactly an inner city, but it has some poor areas of people who can't hop in their car and drive to Londonderry to make a payment. Salem is a critical piece of the -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
walk-in center network. These facilities provide an essential service for our customers.

Recall the physical limitations of 9 Lowell Road. Ms. Tebbetts testified that the entire electrical engineering department was moved from Londonderry to Salem because of space issues in Londonderry. She testified that people didn't have desks. Imagine going to work as an office worker and not having a desk because there's no room. None of that was disputed. So the need for the move of the walk-in center is clear: The safety issue, the space issue.

The other piece of it obviously is the financial part. But the record shows that the project was budgeted for $\$ 300,000$. Those budgets were approved in the fall the year before. So this is a 2018 budget approval for $\$ 300,000$. At that time it was not an identified location. In 2019, the Company looks for a location. Ms. Tebbetts testified that it was an extensive look. We looked at many places, and recently there -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
wasn't anything suitably available, or not much suitably available. There was a search. There was an analysis. And we found the Main Street property. Work starts in the spring of 2019. If you look at the close-out form for 2019, which is Bates -- I'll find the number in a minute -- Bates 65, I believe, of the Company's filing of Exhibit 41, it shows that in the fall, in August of 2019, the budget for that project was increased from $\$ 300-$ to $\$ 500,000$, an internally funded project it's called. So that was due to the work that was being done on the quotation and changes that were necessary. The close-out form, which is dated early 2019, reflects that higher budget and discusses the difference between the $\$ 500,000$ budget and the $\$ 567,000$ total. Note that ownership, if we had bought a property as Staff suggested, has its costs. There's a recovery of the purchase price; there's a recovery of a return; there's the cost of property taxes, utilities, et cetera. So simply choosing a lease over ownership doesn't on its own
-064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
indicate prudence or not.
Staff suggested that we should have Considered reconfiguring the Salem site to avoid the safety issue. There was testimony, undisputed testimony, that that wouldn't work, given the ins and outs of the lot, given the size of the parking lots, given the need of the trucks to come and go. It simply would not work. There is no contrary testimony.

Staff suggested that we should have done a space analysis. If you have office people who don't have a desk in an office that's full of cubes and a few offices, you don't need to do a space analysis to know you need more room. Certainly it would be unreasonable to have spent thousands of dollars to tell people we need more room to have desks.

Staff suggested we should have consolidated Salem with Londonderry. Referring to the lower income customers, driving to Londonderry might as well, for some of them, mean driving to New York City. -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}

It would simply make that service unavailable to them. Plus, Londonderry is not equipped to handle quite as many. Parking is full of office people, et cetera. It's simply not a feasible option. And Staff didn't present any evidence that it was, other than to suggest we should have considered it.

Last, Staff's analogy of this project to the training center from the last rate case simply is an inappropriate analogy. The training center was a very difficult project for the Company. Those involved in this case remember it well. Maybe not fondly, but well. The training center problems included an insufficient business case. The business case said $\$ 1$ million. The final cost was closer to $\$ 4$ million. The business case did not include a number of costs: AFUDC, architectural fees, civil engineering, burdens, security, environmental. Paperwork in that case was not good. There were not appropriate signatures for approvals. And the Commission did not agree with some of the analysis of -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
our cost savings of training in-house versus out-of-house. That whole package resulted in a partial disallowance.

The walk-in center situation is very different. And as I mentioned, the paperwork is good, the costs were reasonable, and they were tracked properly. So we ask that you approve the walk-in center project in full.

The other bucket of investments that are at issue are the Golden Rock investments. Staff's position is that there is insufficient record evidence to date to support those investments, so Staff recommends further procedure to collect more information. I'll address some of those topics in order.

First, as for the claim of an insufficient record of evidence, with respect to that it ignores the evidence that was presented, recall that the Golden Rock projects include work within the Golden Rock substation to allow it to have some distribution feeders. There's testimony that -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}

Golden Rock has generally served as a conduit for the transmission lines coming from National Grid to Golden Rock, stepping down to the sort of Liberty transmission voltage, and it sends the lines to the other substations. There weren't any distribution feeders out of Golden. For the reasons that were discussed at length, the projects here were to get distribution feeders out of Golden Rock to support the failing substations at Barron Ave. and Salem Depot. The work on the dollar side, and there was no testimony really, no questions really from Staff about the dollars. The projects were competitively bid. All the supporting documents are in order. And all of those projects were under budget. As for the reasons for the projects, the two engineers, Company engineers involved in the project -- Joe Rivera, who's the design engineer who filed testimony in the underlying case, and Anthony Strabone, who testified in writing and orally in this case -- are both professional
-064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
engineers. Combined, they testified in support of the Salem Area Study. And the Salem Area Study highlights the deficiencies of the older substations. You heard direct testimony from Mr. Strabone about how old they were; how old the transformers were; about how the spare parts are not available; about if there's a failure, there's not an easy way to fix them, so there would be an extended outage. And to the reports that Staff criticized, recall that the reports clearly said those transformers were on a path to failure. Anthony testified clearly that what you're seeing within those reports, those gases and the other indicators of failure do not fix themselves; they just keep getting worse. So if there are any, quote, missing reports for a couple years, all they're going to show is the continued slow deterioration. I respectfully suggest that in light of those reports, if we had not done the Golden Rock work, sending the feeders to the substations to back them up, the Commission would have -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
found it's highly imprudent if there had been a failure and a severe outage.

So the reasons for the Golden Rock investments were to serve the current and impending load and to address those asset conditions. Recall that the load in 2019 and 2020 is already significant. There's testimony about the detailed load increases on the north parcel and all of the work that is coming on service now through the balance of 2019 and 2020. Without the Golden Rock projects, we would not be able to serve the load today. We'd be severely stressed to serve that today.

Staff mentioned that the purpose of the Golden Rock projects at issue here, which should retire and then replace those substations. That's not true. We certainly have plans to retire and replace those substations. That's part of the larger Rockingham project. But the projects here were simply to back them up and be able to serve the extra load that's coming on now. So Staff has suggested a process -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
where they're looking for more information before they can determine whether the Golden Rock investments at issue here were prudent. Look at what Staff is looking for, for information: They're looking for the final Salem study report. They called it the prudence review that you must engage in and ask what did management know at the time the decision was made to do the investment. So the decision to do the investments that went into service in 2019 happened in 2018 and into 2019. The current Salem study is being drafted in the summer of 2020. Obviously it was not available to management in 2019, so it would have no relevance to your decision as to whether the 2019 investments were prudent.

They're looking for the updated asset condition reports from recent months or year. Same comment. Those were not available to management in 2019 when the investments were made. What was available to them then in the asset reports that you saw that we provided indicated these transformers -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
were failing.
Staff wants the final audit report.
Again, that relates to the other issues.
Staff wants a detailed load
forecast with the balance of the Tuscan project, primarily the southern piece. Recall that the total Tuscan project, the numbers that we've been discussing, is 14 to 17 megawatts, or 15 to 19 megawatts. That's the build-out over several more years. That's the load forecast on which we are basing other projects, the so-called Rockingham projects. Those projects have not been built. They are not in service. They are not before you. So, yes, we will give Staff all of this information, but it will not help you decide the question today as to whether the Golden Rock investments to support current load and the old substations is prudent.

So there are two other -- a couple other points that $I$ wanted to illustrate. The process that Staff lays out is obviously contrary to what is in the settlement -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
agreement. As counsel stated, they were -Staff was concerned about the time it needed to do a review of a step adjustment, and the information it needed. So they negotiated for the language in the settlement agreement that provides a longer period of time to review. It required us to make a more thorough filing at the outset. And Staff agreed to all that. Mr. Dudley, Mr. Demmer, even counsel in his closing argument, all said this process is exactly what we need, and we think it will allow us to do what we need to do. Now they're asking for more process, yet they don't explain why they weren't able to accomplish what they needed to accomplish with the existing process. They've only pointed to the need for this future information, information that was not available to the Company when it made its decisions here. So it's really, in our view, an indication that there is no information that Staff has or will find in the future that undermines the core support for the Golden Rock projects: Again, the need for -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
current load and the need to back up these failing substations.

The issue of whether the
Commission, under the settlement agreement, can review the full prudence of the projects versus whether Staff agreed to the selection of the projects through the settlement agreement, that was the issue $I$ raised at the outset. I still think our interpretation is correct. But given the volume of evidence that shows the prudence of selecting those projects, as we just discussed today and at length Monday, it's really a moot point here.

And certainly going forward, we understand Staff's position of future step increases, and we will make sure that our filings similarly demonstrate both that the choice of the projects were prudent and that their execution was as well.

Just going through my notes. So in conclusion, Staff has presented no evidence supporting their contention that these projects were somehow imprudent. They've expressed the need for more information, that -064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}
we think is irrelevant to the current inquiry. Staff could have certainly presented evidence or made statements or offered testimony that undermines the Company evidence. There's experts on Staff's side that could have offered opinions as to the need for the projects and how they were carried out. They chose not to do any of that, and they chose to rely on existing records, which is the Company's filing and the Company's testimony, all of which completely supports the Golden Rock investments. So I might suggest that the Commission has more than ample evidence to find those investments prudent and to grant the request for a step increase as filed. I do have to, as a lawyer, make the caveat: Should the Commission consider finding them imprudent, as Staff suggests, given some alleged lack of evidence, we would certainly prefer the more extended process than to a finding of imprudence. So that would be obviously not a great scenario for us. It's more work for everyone. And we
think it's unnecessary. But of course, a finding of imprudence is not something we would want either. So again, I don't think we need to get there. I think there's more than enough to find prudence based on the current record of the assets to approve the filing as filed and the rates as requested. Very last note. As I indicated, we got a draft of the audit report yesterday. There was a single finding that we miscounted $\$ 23,000$ in CIAC, and that result would be a reduction in our requested revenue requirement by about $\$ 3,000$. So it's really an immaterial change that will work its way through the audit process, and an appropriate adjustment would be made down the road -(Court Reporter interrupts.) MR. SHEEHAN: -- if the Commission were to otherwise grant the requested relief. Thank you. That's all I have. CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. Thank you, both of you, for doing those excellent closing arguments. I frankly enjoyed them.
-064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES] \{06-25-20 \}

I think that's everything we need to cover. Anything else that remains?
[No verbal response] CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. Then we'll close the record and issue an order.

Go ahead.
MR. SHEEHAN: We do have the record request coming in later today.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Oh, that's
right. You haven't filed them yet. So we'll
leave it open for any remaining record
requests that need to be filed today. Other than that, we are adjourned.

MR. SHEEHAN: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Thank you.
(Whereupon the hearing was adjourned at 2:32 p.m.)
-064\} [CLOSING STATEMENTS BY THE PARTIES]
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| 10:22 | judge (2) | Liberty (21) | lower (2) | 19:9;21:22;22:7, |
| insufficient (3) | $24: 15 ; 30: 13$ | $3: 5 ; 4: 14 ; 8: 21$ | 36:17;39:22 | $15,21 ; 28: 15 ; 39: 23$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 40:15;41:13,19 } \\ & \text { intended (1) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r} \text { judgment (2) } \\ 31: 11 ; 32: 15 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:11;14:7;18:5,14; } \\ & 24: 5 ; 26: 1,5,10 ; 27: 4, \end{aligned}$ | M | 49:13 <br> Mike (1) |
| 8:8 | July (1) | 12,16,20;29:19;30:1, |  | 4:13 |
| intention (1) | 31:19 | 9,19;31:9;42:4 | main (8) | million (6) |
| $7: 14$ |  | Liberty's (3) | $6: 21 ; 14: 2 ; 15: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 7 ; 23: 22 ; 26: 10 \\ & 36 \cdot 14 \cdot 40 \cdot 1617 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { interest (1) } \\ 36: 9 \end{gathered}$ | K | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:8;30:6;31:5 } \\ & \text { light (3) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:5,9;28:18;30:7; } \\ & 38: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 14 ; 40: 16,17 \\ & \text { mine (1) } \end{aligned}$ |
| internal (4) | Kathryn (1) | 30:4,5;43:21 | maintains (1) | 26:17 |
| 13:5;14:3,5;21:10 | 4:5 | limitations (1) | 28:24 | minor (1) |
| internally (1) | keep (2) | 37:4 | maintenance (3) | 17:1 |
| 38:11 | 20:5;43:17 | limited (4) | 12:22;20:20;25:16 | minute (2) |
| interpretation (1) | key (3) | 5:21;7:14,20;32:7 | major (3) | 34:10;38:7 |
| $48: 9$ | 6:3;8:22;30:14 | lines (4) | 14:9;15:1;35:18 | minutes (2) |
| interrupt (1) | kind (1) | 18:1;24:1;42:2,5 | makes (2) | 23:6,10 |
| 26:12 | 14:7 | list (2) | 17:9;22:1 | miscounted (1) |
| interrupts (1) | knew (1) | 24:3;35:20 | making (2) | 50:10 |
| 50:17 | 21:9 | little (2) | 17:23;21:7 | missing (2) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { intervenors (1) } \\ & 6: 10 \end{aligned}$ | L | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 16 ; 34: 20 \\ & \text { load }(24) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { management (4) } \\ 15: 16 ; 45: 8,14,2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \quad 30: 14 ; 43: 18 \\ & \text { model (3) } \end{aligned}$ |
| into (14) |  | 24:10,22;27:11,13, | manager (3) | 20:14;21:19;22:4 |
| 6:20;7:8;8:13;9:7, | labor (4) | 17;28:2,20;29:2; | 18:3;19:9;21:22 | moment (1) |
| 15;10:17;13:3;20:13; | 13:5,20;14:5;21:10 | 30:4,17,19;31:6,8; | many (6) | 10:18 |
| 21:14,18;22:4;25:22; | lack (1) | 34:2,4;44:5,6,8,13, | 6:15;25:6,9;34:22; | Monday (15) |
| 45:11,12 | 49:20 | 23;46:4,11,19;48:1 | 37:24;40:3 | 5:9,19;6:2,7;8:4, |
| inventory (2) | $\operatorname{lag}(1)$ | locate (1) | March (4) | $13 ; 13: 9 ; 19: 4,22$ |
| 9:5,10 | $8: 7$ | 11:20 | $11: 18,21 ; 14: 22$ | $23: 21 ; 24: 5 ; 27: 10$ |
| investment (2) | language (1) | located (3) | $16: 4$ | $28: 11,24 ; 48: 13$ |
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| money (1) | 9:24;11:5 | 47:17 | 40:21;41:6 | 30:6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17:11 | nodding (2) | open (1) | parallelled (1) | plans (2) |
| month (3) | 26:21,21 | 51:12 | 10:10 | 29:21;44:19 |
| 12:15,21;29:22 | non-cost (2) | operating (1) | parcel (10) | please (3) |
| months (1) | 11:4;17:7 | 13:11 | 7:5;27:14,18,19, | 3:11,20,21 |
| 45:19 | none (3) | operation (2) | 21;28:9,10,16;29:3; | plug (2) |
| moot (1) | 5:4;26:6;37:12 | 12:21;20:20 | 44:9 | 21:18;22:3 |
| 48:13 | north (1) | operations (1) | parking (2) | plugged (1) |
| more (22) | 44:9 | 11:18 | 39:7;40:3 | 20:13 |
| 12:3;17:10,16; | northern (1) | opinions (1) | part (6) | Plus (1) |
| 20:2,3;23:6,9;28:17; | 27:19 | 49:6 | 7:5;23:23;28:18; | 40:2 |
| 33:13;36:13;39:16, | note (3) | opportunity (3) | 30:7;37:16;44:20 | pm (3) |
| 18;41:15;45:1;46:10; | 18:7;38:18;50:8 | 31:15;32:3,20 | partial (2) | 33:4,5;51:18 |
| 47:7,13;48:24;49:14, | notes (1) | option (2) | 32:10;41:3 | point (3) |
| $21,24 ; 50: 4$ | 48:20 | $24: 21 ; 40: 5$ | particular (1) | $17: 22 ; 24: 20 ; 48: 13$ |
| most (2) | notice (1) | orally (1) | 35:16 | pointed (2) |
| 23:23;32:1 | 14:8 | 42:23 | parts (2) | 6:6;47:17 |
| mostly (1) | noting (1) | order (6) | 27:6;43:7 | points (2) |
| 24:10 | 27:3 | 31:18,21;36:5; | path (1) | 6:3;46:22 |
| move (1) | number (6) | 41:17;42:16;51:6 | 43:13 | pool (1) |
| 37:13 | 19:17,17;22:1,5; | original (5) | Paul (1) | 13:17 |
| moved (1) | 38:7;40:18 | 15:19;16:2,24; | 4:19 | poor (1) |
| 37:7 | numbers (2) | 21:16;22:17 | pause (1) | 36:22 |
| moving (1) | 16:12;46:8 | originally (1) | 23:17 | popular (1) |
| $\begin{gathered} 14: 1 \\ \text { much (3) } \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 15:21 otherwise (1) | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline \text { pay (1) } \\ 36: 19 \end{array}$ | 20:3 |
| $16: 1 ; 33: 10 ; 38: 2$ | O | otherwise | payment (2) | $22: 14$ |
| must (4) | objection (1) | out (12) | 10:1;36:24 | position (6) |
| 26:16;32:5,6;45:7 | 22:23 | 6:6;12:11,15;17:1, | pending (1) | 8:1;17:15;24:12; |
| myself (2) | obviously (5) | 11,21;18:13,19;42:7, | 32:16 | 27:12;41:12;48:15 |
| 4:9;21:24 | 33:13;37:15;45:13; | 9;46:23;49:8 | people (5) | positions (1) |
| N | 46:23;49:23 October (1) | outage (2) $43: 10 ; 44: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 22 ; 37: 9 ; 39: 13, \\ & 18 ; 40: 4 \end{aligned}$ | possession (1) |
|  | 31:22 | outlined (1) | per (4) | 27:16 |
| name (1) | off (1) | 32:17 | 12:15;20:22;22:6; | post-test (1) |
| 3:22 | 33:2 | out-of-house (1) | 36:13 | 6:8 |
| National (1) | offered (2) | $41: 2$ | perceived (1) | post-test-year (1) |
| $42: 3$ | $49: 4,6$ | outs (1) | $18: 7$ | 8:5 |
| nearing (1) | office (4) | 39:6 | percent (1) | practice (1) |
| $30: 2$ | 37:10;39:12,13; | outset (4) | 35:23 | 34:19 |
| necessarily (1) | $40: 4$ | 15:14;28:2;47:8; | perfect (1) | pre-capitalization (7) |
| 5:24 | offices (2) | 48:9 | 22:1 | 8:15;9:10,22;32:9; |
| necessary (2) | 4:9;39:14 | outside (1) | performed (1) | 34:23;35:3,7 |
| 3:7;38:14 | offset (1) | 17:21 | 29:20 | pre-capitalized (2) |
| need (16) | 8:7 | over (5) | period (1) | 8:21;9:2 |
| 4:24;37:12;39:8, | often (2) | 19:22;20:6;34:22; | 47:6 | precedence (1) |
| 15,16,18;47:11,13, | 34:13,18 | 38:24;46:10 | phase (3) ${ }^{\text {(3) }}$ | 18:2 |
| 17,24;48:1,24;49:7; | old (3) | overhead (1) | 7:24;30:1;32:19 | predicting (1) |
| 50:4;51:1,13 | 43:5,6;46:19 | 13:10 | physical (1) | 17:6 |
| needed (8) | older (1) | overwhelming (1) | 37:4 | prefer (1) |
| 10:22;12:11;16:19; | 43:4 | 19:16 | piece (4) | 49:21 |
| 19:18;25:24;47:2,4, | once (1) | own (2) | 30:14;36:24;37:15; | preference (1) |
| 15 | 7:17 | 11:7;38:24 | 46:6 | 23:9 |
| needs (2) | one (11) | ownership (2) | pieces (2) | prepare (2) |
| 35:10;36:19 | 4:1,6;7:15;11:10; | 38:18,24 | 25:10;31:1 | 5:9;33:13 |
| negotiated (1) | 14:17;24:7;25:14,21; |  | place (4) | presence (1) |
| 47:4 | 27:2;35:13,16 | $\mathbf{P}$ | 7:13;19:24;21:2; | 3:19 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { network (1) } \\ 37: 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { one's (2) } \\ 18: 19,20 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 29: 7 \\ \text { placed (3) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { present (2) } \\ 24: 14: 40: 5 \end{gathered}$ |
| New (5) | one-way (1) | $41: 2$ | 91aced (3) | presented (3) |
| 4:1;8:17;14:18; | 18:20 | page (2) | places (1) | 41:21;48:21;49:3 |
| 30:5;39:24 | only (4) | $11: 10 ; 20: 15$ | 37:24 | president (2) |
| Next (2) | $7: 15 ; 10: 4 ; 34: 1$ | Paperwork (2) | planning (1) | 14:17,18 |
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| previously (1) | property (3) | rates (2) | 3:3;5:10;13:1; | repair (2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3:7 | 38:4,19,22 | 8:20;50:7 | 14:6;15:20;18:22; | 25:15;27:6 |
| price (1) | prove (1) | rather (2) | 21:6;24:14,17;25:4; | repairs (2) |
| 38:21 | 24:18 | 22:23;29:16 | 29:1,12;33:2,7; | 25:13,14 |
| primarily (1) | provide (12) | re-accessed (1) | 35:12;36:1;37:16; | replace (2) |
| 46:6 | 7:9;12:5;14:7; | 19:1 | 41:13,19;50:6;51:5,8, | 44:17,19 |
| primary (1) | 25:1;26:1;27:13; | reaffirm (1) | 12 | replacement (3) |
| 15:12 | 29:22,24;31:15; | 32:4 | recorded (1) | 24:19,20;26:9 |
| prior (1) | 35:13,15;37:2 | reaffirms (1) | 14:11 | report (11) |
| 34:1 | provided (6) | 33:24 | records (1) | 9:17,21;14:20,22, |
| probably (2) | 27:19,22;28:18; | real (2) | 49:10 | 24;16:23;21:11;26:7; |
| 8:19;23:6 | 30:11;31:13;45:24 | 9:9;17:12 | recovered (2) | 45:6;46:2;50:9 |
| problem (4) | provides (2) | really (6) | 10:5;22:16 | reporter (3) |
| 3:10;18:6,7;29:15 | 36:17;47:6 | 34:8;42:13,14; | recovery (4) | 26:22,23;50:17 |
| problems (3) | providing (3) | 47:20;48:13;50:13 | 8:6;36:3;38:20,21 | reports (13) |
| 18:6;35:6;40:15 | 15:8;29:10;33:18 | reason (4) | reduction (1) | 25:6,18,21;29:22; |
| procedure (2) | prudence (11) | 29:9;33:20;34:5,6 | 50:12 | 30:24;31:3;43:11,12, |
| 6:23;41:15 | 5:21;6:11;8:9; | reasonable (5) | Referring (1) | 15,19,22;45:19,23 |
| procedures (1) | 18:2;21:5;32:12; | 18:3;19:8;20:8; | 39:22 | reps (1) |
| 29:7 | 39:1;45:7;48:5,11; | 22:7;41:6 | reflects (1) | 19:23 |
| proceed (1) | 50:5 | reasonably (2) | 38:15 | request (5) |
| $27: 1$ | prudent (9) | 6:9,11 | regarding (3) | 14:6;28:22;35:12; |
| proceeding (1) | 5:23;6:1;22:15; | reasons (6) | 3:5;8:14;27:5 | 49:16;51:9 |
| 26:17 | 24:16;45:3,17;46:20; | 11:4;12:2;22:11; | regional (1) | requested (5) |
| process (19) | 48:18;49:15 | 42:7,18;44:3 | 14:17 | 27:23;29:24;50:7, |
| 5:17;6:4;7:3,7,8, | prudently (1) | rebuttal (2) | regret (1) | $12,19$ |
| 12,14,21;8:11;14:21; | 21:7 | 31:15,23 | 33:11 | requests (3) |
| 21:15;35:7;44:24; | public (3) | recall (9) | regulatory (1) | 13:1;27:18;51:13 |
| 46:23;47:11,14,16; | 3:12,23;36:9 | 25:14;36:4,12,16; | 8:7 | require (1) |
| 49:21;50:15 | PUC (1) | 37:4;41:21;43:12; | reiterate (2) | 30:19 |
| processes (1) | 4:8 | 44:6;46:7 | 3:9;6:3 | required (3) |
| 29:6 | purchase (1) | recap (1) | re-landscaped (1) | 7:9;36:5;47:7 |
| produced (1) | $38: 21$ | 13:19 | 19:1 | requirement (5) |
| 25:6 | purpose (1) | receive (1) | related (1) | 20:14,17;21:19; |
| professional (1) | 44:15 | 29:7 | 3:8 | 22:4;50:13 |
| 42:24 | pursue (2) | received (1) | relates (1) | rescheduled (1) |
| project (33) | 15:16;16:13 | 35:4 | 46:3 | 3:14 |
| 10:2,21;11:6;12:2, |  | receives (1) | relevance (1) | reserve (1) |
| 5,23,24;13:11,13,14, | Q | 36:13 | 45:15 | 31:11 |
| 21,23;14:9,11,14,23; |  | recent (3) | relevant (1) | resolve (1) |
| 15:10,14,17;16:13; | quarterly (3) | 10:23;30:5;45:19 | 34:8 | $33: 16$ |
| 20:12;21:13;28:7; | 26:1,2;27:8 | recently (1) | relief (1) | respect (2) |
| 37:17;38:10,12;40:9, | quite (1) | 37:24 | 50:19 | $5: 21 ; 41: 19$ |
| 12;41:8;42:20;44:21; | $40: 3$ | recess (1) | relocate (1) | Respectfully (2) |
| 46:6,7 | quotation (1) | 33:4 | 11:1 | 35:24;43:21 |
| projected (2) | 38:13 | recognition (1) | rely (1) | response (3) |
| 30:4,17 | quote (1) | 12:13 | 49:9 | 25:20;30:9;35:17 |
| projection (3) | 43:18 | recognize (2) | remainder (1) | response] (2) |
| $24: 22 ; 28: 8 ; 30: 20$ <br> projections (1) | $\mathbf{R}$ | $21: 2,8$ <br> recommend | 10:7 <br> remaining (1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 5:2;51:3 } \\ & \text { rest (2) } \end{aligned}$ |
| $29: 2$ | R | 10:3,7;22:17; | $51: 12$ | 23:18;25:15 |
| projects (30) | raise (1) | 29:16,17;32:10,15 | remains (1) | re-study (1) |
| 5:19,22,24;6:1,13, | 35:19 | recommendation (1) | 51:2 | 30:3 |
| 19;7:23;23:20;24:3; | raised (2) | 22:12 | remember (1) | result (2) |
| $32: 16 ; 35: 20,21$ | 35:11;48:8 | recommendations (2) | $40: 13$ | 25:18;50:11 |
| 41:22;42:8,15,17,19; | range (1) | $9: 19 ; 32: 18$ | remote (1) | resulted (1) |
| 44:12,16,21;46:12, | 26:9 | recommended (2) | 3:8 | 41:2 |
| 13,13;47:24;48:5,7, | $\text { rate }(10)$ | 7:1;26:3 | renovate (1) | resumed (1) |
| 12,18,23;49:7 | 6:18;7:17,17;8:6, | recommends (3) | 11:6 | 33:5 |
| proper (1) | 18;9:7;10:6,12;35:2; | 31:10;35:22;41:15 | renovation (4) | retire (2) |
| $17: 5$ | 40:10 | reconfiguring (3) | 13:24;16:8,18,19 | 44:17,19 |
| properly (2) | ratemaking (2) | 18:17,24;39:3 | renovations (1) | retired (1) |
| 28:4;41:7 | $9: 8,9$ | record (23) | 19:12 | 25:17 |
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| retirement (1) | 31:4,7;33:23;34:5; | several (3) | somehow (4) | starts (1) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24:20 | 36:12,21,24;37:7; | 5:15;29:4;46:10 | 5:20;19:2;27:22; | 38:4 |
| return (2) | 39:3,21;42:11;43:2, | severe (1) | 48:23 | state (7) |
| 33:1;38:22 | 3;45:6,12 | 44:2 | somewhere (2) | 3:19,20;4:14; |
| revenue (5) | same (3) | severely (1) | 16:10;28:20 | 10:24;24:17;27:4; |
| 20:14,17;21:19; | 11:12;28:5;45:20 | 44:13 | sorry (5) | 28:24 |
| 22:4;50:12 | save (2) | shareholders (1) | 13:6;22:5;23:2,3, | stated (8) |
| review (16) | 7:10;17:20 | 10:8 | 16 | 12:3,12;24:5;26:5, |
| 5:10,19;7:6,8,12, | savings (2) | Sheehan (12) | sort (2) | 10;27:20;30:2;47:1 |
| 14,16,20,23;8:9; | 17:12;41:1 | 4:12,13,14;14:5; | 14:8;42:4 | statement (1) |
| 15:19;32:5;45:7; | saw (1) | 15:8;22:21;32:23; | south (1) | 34:7 |
| 47:3,7;48:5 | 45:23 | 33:8,10;50:18;51:8, | 24:24 | statements (1) |
| reviewed (4) | scenario (1) | 15 | southern (3) | 49:3 |
| 5:23;28:22;34:17, | 49:23 | Sheehan's (2) | 27:18,21;46:6 | states (1) |
| 21 | schedule (1) | 26:21;29:14 | space (19) | 10:20 |
| reviewing (1) | 11:20 | shifts (1) | 10:22;12:4,6;17:7; | step (21) |
| 10:11 | scheduling (1) | 10:23 | 18:6,13,14;19:9,11, | 3:6;5:16;6:8,19,23; |
| reviews (1) | 4:22 | show (1) | 12,15,18;21:1,24; | 7:1,4,7,20,24;8:2; |
| 6:12 | scope (3) | 43:20 | 27:5;37:8,14;39:12, | 14:18;24:13;25:20; |
| right (10) | 5:21;7:15,20 | shows (4) | 15 | 30:1;32:4,6;35:20; |
| 3:2,14;4:10;22:19, | search (1) | 33:24;37:16;38:8; | spare (2) | 47:3;48:15;49:16 |
| 22;32:21;33:6;50:21; | 38:2 | 48:11 | 27:5;43:7 | stepping (1) |
| 51:4,11 | second (3) | side (4) | speak (1) | 42:3 |
| Rivera (1) | 13:7;22:2;34:23 | 24:23,24;42:12; | 23:12 | still (3) |
| 42:21 | Secondly (2) | 49:5 | specifically (2) | 27:9;30:14;48:9 |
| Road (4) | 19:8;24:9 | signatures (1) | 5:22;24:8 | stop (2) |
| 13:24;16:20;37:5; | security (1) | 40:23 | spent (4) | $23: 12,12$ |
| 50:16 | $40: 20$ | signed (3) | 5:14;18:23;20:13; | Strabone (2) |
| robust (3) | Seeing (2) | 11:17;12:4;14:16 | 39:17 | 42:23;43:5 |
| 22:8;32:5,6 | 5:3;43:15 | significant (3) | spoke (2) | Strabone's (1) |
| robustness (1) | seem (2) | 9:9;15:9;44:7 | 6:2;14:19 | 20:16 |
| 10:14 | 15:20;20:7 | similar (2) | spring (1) | Street (5) |
| Rock (21) | seems (1) | 28:12;32:12 | 38:4 | 14:2;15:3;16:5,9; |
| $23: 20,24 ; 24: 4$ | 27:14 | similarly (3) | Staff (50) | 38:4 |
| $29: 12 ; 31: 12 ; 32: 16$ | selecting (1) | 34:2;35:6;48:17 | 4:20;6:5,9,22;7:3, | stressed (1) |
| 35:21;41:11,21,22; | 48:11 | simply (8) | 11,24;10:1,8;15:11; | 44:13 |
| 42:1,3,10;43:22;44:3, | selection (3) | 33:19;36:11;38:23; | 25:20;27:24,24; | strikes (1) |
| 11,16;45:3;46:18; | 5:24;7:22;48:6 | 39:8;40:1,4,10;44:22 | 28:22;29:17;30:8; | 20:23 |
| 47:24;49:12 | sending (1) | single (1) | 31:10,14,20;32:2,8; | Study (10) |
| Rockingham (2) | 43:23 | 50:10 | 33:13;34:13,18,23; | 29:23;30:10,16; |
| 44:21;46:13 | sends (1) | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { s i p }}$ (1) | 35:8,19,22;38:19; | 31:7;33:23;34:1; |
| role (2) | 42:5 | 23:17 | 39:2,11,20;40:5; | 43:2,3;45:6,12 |
| 29:14,15 | sense (2) | sit (1) | 41:14;42:14;43:11; | subject (1) |
| room (10) | 22:1,22 | 21:23 | 44:15,24;45:4;46:2,4, | 31:14 |
| 4:6;15:2,3;16:2,7, | separate (2) | site (1) | 16,23;47:2,8,22;48:6, | submitted (1) |
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