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\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}

PROCEEDING
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I'd like to open the hearing in Docket DE 11-105, which involves Unitil's Petition for Approval of Adjustment to Certain Account Balances, all growing from a billing issue at Riverwoods, is it "Exeter"? "Exeter at Riverwoods"? I always get it backwards. One of the two. We have noticed for hearing today consideration of a Settlement Agreement that was filed in this case between Unitil, the Office of Consumer Advocate, and the Commission Staff.

So, let's begin with appearances please.
Mr. Epler.
MR. EPLER: Thank you. Good morning.
My name is Gary Epler, appearing on behalf of Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Good morning.
MS. HOLLENBERG: Good morning. Rorie Hollenberg and Donna McFarland, here for the Office of Consumer Advocate.

MR. SPEIDEL: Alexander Speidel, representing Commission Staff. And, I have with me Grant Siwinski and Steve Mullen of the Electric Division.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Good morning.
Welcome. And, I see the witnesses are already assembled,
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
which is good. Are there any matters to begin with, before we take testimony?

MR. EPLER: Just to advise the Commission that we'll have two exhibits. The first is a joint exhibit, which is the Settlement Agreement that was filed on October 4th, 2012. I propose to mark that for identification purposes as "Exhibit Number 1". And, the second is the Amended Petition and Amended Joint Testimony of the Company that was filed on September 30th, 2011, and propose to mark that for identification purposes as "Exhibit Number 2".

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: So, do we not have
exhibits already in the docket?
MS. CARMODY: No.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. I mean,
certainly, we have things that have been filed in the docket and are in the official docketbook.

MS. CARMODY: I found nothing previously
filed.
MR. SPEIDEL: Well, that would not be
the case, so --
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: No, we've been here in the hearing room on this before, but maybe nothing has ever been marked.
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
marked as an exhibit?
MR. EPLER: I would have no objections
to that. If I can point out to the Commission, the filing on September 30th, 2011, included a motion to amend the Petition, an Amended Petition, and amended testimony. And, I think, by going through all those papers, there is a clear road map as to what has happened. Essentially, the initial Petition was filed at a time when there was an outstanding dispute with Riverwoods. Subsequent to that, subsequent to the prehearing conference, there was a settlement with Riverwoods. And, the motion to amend the Petition, Amended Petition accounts for that, and the amended testimony picks up on that.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: And, that
September 30, 2011 packet is what you're proposing to mark as "Exhibit 2"?

MR. EPLER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. I think
you're -- that's fine. We don't need to go back to the initial one. It's in the record, if anybody's ever --
it's in the docketbook, if anyone ever needs it. I'm okay with that.
(The documents, as described, were
herewith marked as Exhibit 1 and \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}

MR. EPLER: There was -- Chairman Ignatius, there was -- you're correct, there was a prehearing conference, and there was extended argument during that, a number of motions, and I guess cross motions at the time. But I don't believe that at that time that anything was entered into the record.

MR. SPEIDEL: That would be correct, counsel. As I recall, and if it would have been entered, it would have been, let's see, we have an OCA exhibit marked "OCA-1", from July 18th, 2011. Now, these are the original filing materials, not this updated filing. The updated filing, Commissioners, came in after that prehearing conference. So, this is fresh. But it would be as part of the docket file.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: I'm sorry, what's the date of that again?

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: There are too many at once. Good ahead.

MS. CARMODY: If you're looking to me for an answer, it could have been part of the docket file, but it is not an exhibit. We do not have anything marked.

MR. SPEIDEL: Correct. Correct.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. So, I think it sounds like, should not the original Petition be \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}

Exhibit 2, respectively, for identification.) CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. And, the OCA document, is that something that, Ms. Hollenberg, should be admitted? And, it may be that you're not even aware of what it is at this point.

MS. HOLLENBERG: I was going to say, you're catching me at a little bit of a disadvantage, only because this wasn't my case until March of this year. But --

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: How about, before we're done, take a chance to look at that. And, we can consider putting in an additional document in the record, if you think it's appropriate.

MS. HOLLENBERG: Okay. Okay. Thank
you. I will.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Do we also have an outstanding motion for confidentiality? I know one was filed in March of 2011, March 11, the Company testimony.

MR. SPEIDEL: Yes. As I recall,
Commissioners, that related to the identify of the customer in this case, Riverwoods. Which part of the reason that Staff agrees with the Company that filing the original Petition and testimony as part of this proceeding
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{11}\)
as a hearing exhibit is a little unnecessary or
obsolescent, is because, in the original Petition, they could not mention the name "Riverwoods". But, in this revised testimony, they are able to mention that, since they had essentially come to an understanding with the customer as of that date. So, maybe counsel for the Company could confirm as to whether that was the issue?

MR. EPLER: Yes, if I could expand on
that. It was not just the name, it was also the usage information of the customer. My recollection is also at the prehearing conference that the customer waived confidentiality as to that. But, at the time we filed, we didn't want to reveal the name or the usage -- the usage history.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: So, there's -MR. EPLER: So, I think --
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: It really can be
withdrawn?
MR. EPLER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right.
CMSR. HARRINGTON: So, this, what is
confidential, is no longer confidential?
(Chairman Ignatius nodding in the affirmative.)
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{10}\)
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. Anything
further, before we swear the witnesses?
(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Seeing nothing, then
Mr. Patnaude.
(Whereupon Mark H. Collin,
Karen M. Asbury, Justin C. Eisfeller, and Robert S. Furino were duly sworn by the Court Reporter.) CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Go ahead. MR. EPLER: Okay.
MARK H. COLLIN, SWORN
KAREN M. ASBURY, SWORN
JUSTIN C. EISFELLER, SWORN
ROBERT S. FURINO, SWORN DIRECT EXAMINATION

\section*{BY MR. EPLER:}
Q. Starting with Mr. Collin, if each of the witnesses could state your full name and your occupation please.
A. (Collin) Yes. Good morning, Commissioners, Chairman. My name is Mark Collin. I'm the Treasurer of Unitil Energy. I am also the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer for Unitil Energy's parent company, Unitil Corporation. My business address is 6 Liberty
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{12}\)
Q. And, do any of you have any changes or corrections to this testimony at this time?
A. (Asbury) I do not.
A. (Furino) I do not.
A. (Eisfeller) I do not.
Q. And, do each of you adopt this testimony and the attached exhibits as your testimony in this proceeding?
A. (Asbury) I do.
A. (Furino) Yes, I do.
A. (Eisfeller) Yes, I do.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Collin, could you please provide a brief summary of the genesis of this proceeding.
A. (Collin) Yes. The Company had been working with the Riverwoods Company of Exeter to identify ways of reducing their energy consumption at three of their continuing care retirement facilities located in Exeter, New Hampshire. During this process, in February 2011, the Company learned that the electricity consumption at the Riverwoods -- at one of the Riverwoods' facility, one of the facilities known as "The Ridge", had been incorrectly billed since September 2004. September 2004 was the time when electric service was initially established at that facility. It was a new facility that was provided \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury \(\sim\) Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{13}\)
electric service starting in September 2004. And, at
that time, there was an installation of a current transformer to provide service that was erroneously labeled and had caused the Company to overcharge Riverwoods over this period. The amount of the overcharge, since September 2004 until the time the Company discovered it and corrected the billing problem, was \(\$ 1,801,504\). And, those bills were issued in a period from October 2004 through January of 2011. The overcharge consisted of several different billing components, including the distribution rates, the Default Service energy rates, the stranded cost rates, System Benefits Charges, and several other reconciling rates that the Company billed over this time period. All of which were a function of the amount of metered kilowatt-hours at the facility.
Q. What did the Company do once it discovered the error?
A. (Collin) Once the Company discovered the billing error in early 2011, the Company took immediate steps to correct the problem, and to correctly begin billing the customer. We also took additional steps to investigate all the facilities owned by the customer, to ensure that there was no other similar problems on their other two facilities that they have there. They have, in \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin \(\sim\) Asbury \(\sim\) Eisfeller \(\sim\) Furino] \({ }^{15}\)
Company's continued consideration of the facts and circumstances of the overcharge, as well as, and importantly, the Company's desire to achieve a fair and equitable resolution of this issue without lengthy and costly litigation, as well as to maintain a relationship with an important customer to the Company. We subsequently paid an additional amount to Riverwoods of \(\$ 1,459,721\). That brought the total refund that we paid to Riverwoods to \(\$ 2,071,420\), and essentially made Riverwoods whole for any overcharges that occurred over the entire period, with interest.

As a result of that final settlement and payment to Riverwoods, they subsequently filed a letter with the Commission stating that all claims between the Company and Riverwoods had been settled, and that it was withdrawing from any further administrative proceedings before this Commission on this issue.
Q. Mr. Collin, did the Company amend its Petition and provide additional supporting testimony following this additional refund to Riverwoods?
A. (Collin) Yes. I think, as consistent with the discussion of some of the preliminary matters here today, in September 2011, the Company filed a motion to amend its Petition, accompanied by an Amended Petition
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
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total, three facilities. And, then, we implemented new processes, new controls and procedures to ensure that this problem would never happen again. And, we also entered procedures -- began procedures to investigate all of the current transformers on the system, to ensure that we did not have this problem with any other customers. And, we have completed that review, and determined that there are no other current transformers that are causing this billing problem for the Company. We initially then refunded Riverwoods
\(\$ 611,699\) in May 2011. That represented two years of billing, plus interest, that was overcharged to Riverwoods. Concurrent with that payment to Riverwoods, we filed the Petition and supporting testimony here with the Commission seeking, among other things, a ruling as to the time period to be used in calculating the refund for the customer, and approval to adjust rate account balances in order to correct for a portion of the collection that was due to reconciling overcharges on reconciling rates.
Q. And, could you please explain the status of the refund made by the Company to Riverwoods at this time?
A. (Collin) Yes. Subsequent to our filing in 2011, based on the procedural course of this docket, and the
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{16}\)
and supporting testimony. During the latter half of 2011 and through the better part of this year, and up and to the filing of the Settlement -- the filing of this Settlement, the Company responded to formal discovery of the Staff and of the OCA, and the parties participated in several technical sessions and settlement discussions, which ultimately led to the Settlement discussion that you have today before you.
Q. Okay. Mr. Collin, can you please turn to the document that's been marked as "Exhibit Number 1", the Settlement Agreement? And, can you please provide an overview of that Agreement?
A. (Collin) Yes. There are essentially two major components of the Settlement Agreement. And, these two components are laid out in Section 2, which begins on Page 3 of the Settlement Agreement. The first component is an agreement on what amount of overcharges are appropriately recovered through adjustments to rate reconciliation mechanisms. These adjustments recognize that other customers' bills, those -- not Riverwoods', but our other customers, were artificially lower than they would have been had the overbilling to Riverwoods not occurred. That is, some of our other customers actually benefited because of our overbilling to
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
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[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{19}\)

Riverwoods through the way the reconciliation rate mechanisms work.

The second component is in Section --
begins in Section 2.7, and this section is an agreement on the amount of overcharges the Company would not be allowed to recover. What the Company is required to essentially write off or take a charge against income for as a result of the billing error.
Q. Could you explain these in reverse order. Please describe the amount of the overcharges refunded to Riverwoods.
A. (Collin) Yes. Let me, you know, take the amount, essentially, the second component first, and that's the amount that the Company will take a charge against earnings. And, that's in Section 2.7 of the Settlement Agreement. So, as shown here, the first line is the distribution revenue. In addition to not recovering \$185,663 of distribution base revenue the Company received as a result of this billing error, the Settlement would result in the Company not recovering several additional charges that are typically reconciling in nature, including \(\$ 163,597\) associated with additional supply costs that were refunded to Riverwoods, but are over and above what the Company's \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}

There's an adjustment to the Non-G1 Default Service in the amount of \(\$ 1,152,493\), an adjustment to the External Delivery Charge in the amount of \(\$ 137,970\), an adjustment to the Stranded Cost Charge in the amount of \(\$ 103,557\). Each of these adjustments is listed in Paragraphs 2.2 through 2.4 of the Settlement Agreement. Due to the reconciling nature of these three rate mechanisms, while the Company collected additional revenues from Riverwoods through these rate mechanisms as a result of the overbilling, it did not retain these additional revenues for its own benefit, but rather flowed them back to other customers through the workings of each reconciling rate mechanism.
Accordingly, an adjustment to these rate reconciling mechanisms is appropriate to bring them to a level they would have been at but for the overcollection from Riverwoods, and to permit the recovery from other customers the amount they benefited from as a result of this overcollection.
Q. And, over what period will the amounts be recovered?
A. (Collin) These, as discussed again in Section 2, these amounts will be recovered over a period of about three years, with interest, at the customer deposit rate.
Q. Are there any other provisions in the Settlement you'd
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{18}\) other customers would have paid for the same supply. An additional \$269,916 of interest paid by the Company to Riverwoods, as well as \(\mathbf{\$ 5 0 , 9 2 2}\), which is a total of the rest of the items listed here, associated with several other reconciling rate components.

In total, under the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the Company has been required to write off \(\$ 670,098\), or about a third of the total amount of overcharges that have been refunded to Riverwoods, and more than three and a half times the additional base distribution revenue, or what might be called the "benefit" the Company received from Riverwoods over the entire seven-year billing period that the error occurred.
Q. Could you now please describe the second major component of the Settlement, the amount of the overcharges that the Company would be allowed to recover through the adjustments.
A. (Collin) Yes. In Sections 2.1 through 2.6, there are several items discussed here relative to the recovery of items that the Company would be allowed to recover through reconciling rate mechanisms. Essentially, the first, there are three mechanisms that the Company will be able to receive recovery of -- through recovery of.
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{20}\) like to discuss at this time?
A. (Collin) Yes. As described in Section 2.8 of the Settlement, which is on Page 4, at the top of Page 4, in addition to these two major components of the Settlement, the Company has also agreed to pursue remedies as it may have from the vendor or manufacturer of the mislabeled CT equipment, or the current transformer equipment. The Company will advise Staff as to the status of these efforts. And, if, after six months, the Company has not been successful in obtaining remedies, it will not engage in further purchase from the vendor or manufacturer.
Q. And, Mr. Collin, based on your review of the Settlement Agreement and your participation in the negotiations, do you believe that the Settlement Agreement is a just and reasonable resolution of this matter, and appropriately balances the interest of customers and the Company?
A. (Collin) Yes, I do.
Q. Do you have anything further to add?
A. (Collin) Not at this time.
Q. Okay. Mr. Eisfeller, Mr. Collin already alluded to this, but I just wanted to verify with you. If you could turn to the Joint Testimony, at Page 10. And, \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
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there, in the middle of the page, there's a discussion
of the status of inspection of all the instrumented installations, the CTs, and I guess what you call the
"PTs", "potential transformers". And, could you advise the Commission the status of that review?
A. (Eisfeller) So, we completed our testing of all installations at Unitil, including in New Hampshire and Massachusetts, this year, and found no other mislabeled current transformers.
Q. Okay. Thank you. And, is it -- is it also correct that this testing procedure is now part of the protocol, ongoing protocol for the Company?
A. (Eisfeller) That is correct.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Ms. Asbury, could you please provide an estimate of the bill impacts of the Settlement Agreement on a typical residential customer.
A. (Asbury) Yes. First, I've estimated the Default

Service rate impact for Non-G1 customers to be \(\mathbf{\$ 0 . 0 0 0 6 0}\) per kilowatt-hour; for the External Delivery Charge, which applies to all customers, I've estimated a rate impact of \(\$ 0.00005\) per kilowatt-hour; and, for the Stranded Cost Charge, which also applies to all customers, I've estimated a rate impact of \(\mathbf{\$ 0 . 0 0 0 0 4} \mathbf{~ p e r}\) kilowatt-hour. Adding those all together, I get a rate \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{23}\)
first day of the month after Commission approval, if it's approved, a similar sort of provision for External Delivery and Stranded Cost?

WITNESS ASBURY: Yes. Let me try to clarify. If the Settlement was approved, let's say, in the month of November, December 1st would be, you know, the first day following approval. So, what we would do in December is we would actually begin to charge our mechanisms for Default Service, External Delivery Charge, and Stranded Cost Charge, to reflect the Settlement, but we do not anticipate having a rate change on December 1st. So, those mechanisms would begin to get charged, but what we would do is the rate would actually change on the next normal rate change. And, the reason for that is simply because the rate impacts are fairly small. So, we felt that waiting until the next normal rate change would be reasonable.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: So, the charge would be in effect, and the amounts that should be collected under it would be accruing as an undercollection, but the rate that the customer would see wouldn't be altered until the next regularly scheduled change?

WITNESS ASBURY: That's correct.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
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impact of \(\$ 0.00069\) per kilowatt-hour. For a residential customer, using 600 kilowatt-hours per month, that would be 41 cents on their monthly bill, or just under a half a percent on a bill impact.

And, I would also like to note that, if the Settlement is approved, these rate impacts would take effect at the Company's next normal -- normally scheduled rate change, which, for Default Service, for the Non-G1 class, would be June 1, 2013. And, for the External Delivery Charge and Stranded Cost Charge, it would be August 1st, 2013.

MR. EPLER: Okay. Thank you. Chairman Ignatius, I've completed my direct examination. The witnesses are available for cross-examination.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.
Ms. Hollenberg, questions?
MS. HOLLENBERG: Yes, please. Thank you. One moment.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Before you begin,
maybe just take another moment to look at your notes. Let me just clarify one thing. Ms. McNamara [Asbury?], you just said that the rates would be in effect for the next scheduled rate changes for each of the components. But doesn't the Settlement Agreement say that Non-G1 is the
\[
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CMSR. HARRINGTON: If I can follow up on that? So, you would, let's say it took a few months, or whatever, you would simply charge that amount and roll it up, and then would it come in and be all collected in the first month or would it have to be distributed over the entire period?

WITNESS ASBURY: It would be distributed over the entire period.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Okay. And, just while we're on this subject, you talk about the "first month immediately following the Commission's approval", which may or may not happen, depending on it, but you have a fixed date at the end. So, I'm assuming if the approval date is a little bit later, rather than earlier, if there is an approval, then these numbers that you gave us would be adjusted upward accordingly to account for the shorter period of time or you extend out the date after November 30th, 2015?

WITNESS ASBURY: The end dates coincide with the end dates of our normally scheduled rate changes. So, assuming we were still able to implement our rate changes for Default Service on -- implement these changes pursuant to the Settlement on June 1st, and the other charges August 1st, would not impact those figures.
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
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CMSR. HARRINGTON: I'm confused a little
bit then. If you start accruing the change, let's just say January 1st, instead of December 1st, then you're going to have to, if it's a fixed end date, you'll have to charge more per month than you would if it started December 1st, isn't that correct? You have a variable starting date and a fixed end date. So, I would assume that the -- the figures you gave us are based on starting accruing the charges on what date?

WITNESS ASBURY: The figures are based upon the amounts that we've agreed to pursuant to the Settlement, but recovered starting -- beginning June 1st. So, as long as I continue on that same path, you know, for Default Service on June 1st, for the other charges on August 1, those estimated bill impacts should not change.

The only thing that would change those
bill impacts would be, let's say the Settlement was delayed beyond those timeframes and we actually delayed implementing the rate change.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Okay. I guess you've completely confused me, which probably isn't too hard to do, but --

MR. EPLER: If I --
CMSR. HARRINGTON: Just my question is, \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{27}\)
won't change at all. And, part of that is due, there's another feature of the Settlement that establishes a fixed interest period relative to the collection of these costs, and that we have agreed that, starting at June, June?

WITNESS ASBURY: Yes.
WITNESS COLLIN: June 1st of 2012, we
will begin accruing interest on these payments that were made to Riverwoods. That day doesn't change. So, interest is calculated from June 1st, 2012, no matter when this gets accounted for. The accounting starts one month after the Commission approval of the Settlement, and the rate change takes place on the normal anniversary dates. And, so, as long as all that schedule holds together, the interest won't change, because that's locked in from June 1st. The amount to be put in place during the normal rate changes won't change, because, again, the interest has been determined, the principal is known, and Karen has calculated as if all that occurs during the normal anniversary date.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: So, on June 1st, you will adjust the rates to collect the total amount that you want to collect, and that will be done between June 1st and November 30th, regardless of whether you start accruing it on December 1st or April 1st or May 1st,
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino \({ }^{26}\) in reading this, it says you're going to "begin to recover over a period beginning the first day of the month immediately following Commission approval", which to me seems like a variable date. And, now, you're telling me that you're "beginning on June 1st". So, is it the first day -- it appears to be "beginning the first day of the month immediately following Commission approval" or is it June 1st?

WITNESS COLLIN: Let me try to give you some clarification to it.

\section*{CMSR. HARRINGTON: Okay.} WITNESS COLLIN: Because the Company has not received approval from the Commission for the recovery of these costs, we are unable to account for them as a recoverable cost through these mechanisms. So, once we, assuming we receive approval, then we can begin accounting for them through those mechanisms. We will not change the rate, however, until their normal change period. So, we'll begin accruing them and accounting for them the first day of the month after we receive approval. That's just an accounting convention. We need that approval in order to do that accounting.

So, as long as we receive approval
before the normal change date, then Karen's estimates
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
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whatever, is that what you're saying?
WITNESS COLLIN: Yes.
CMSR. HARRINGTON: Okay. But that's not
clear from reading the Settlement, but at least clear to me. Thank you. That helps.

WITNESS COLLIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right.

\section*{Ms. Hollenberg.}

\section*{CROSS-EXAMINATION}

BY MS. HOLLENBERG:
Q. And, just to be clear, this -- it isn't in the Settlement Agreement, the discussion that you're talking about, in terms of the way that the recovery will be flowed back. We're talking about it now, we talked about it before the hearing. Is that something that you would agree with?
A. (Collin) Well, as Commissioner Harrington has pointed out, it's not clear in the Settlement Agreement. I think that, when we look at the best way to implement a rate change relative to this recovery, --
Q. Uh-huh.
A. (Collin) -- that the most efficient and least confusing way for customers and to do this is to simply begin the accounting or which would be consistent with the word \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury Eisfeller~Furino \({ }^{29}\)
"recovery" --
Q. Uh-huh.
A. (Collin) -- of the costs one month after the -- the first day of the month after the approval, and then actually do the mechanical rate change on the anniversary dates of those mechanisms.
Q. All right. And, I understand that. And, I guess I'm not trying to cast any kind of critical judgment, but it is something that was just newly discussed this morning, in terms of the fact that the actual collection from customers was not going to begin until June, is that correct?
A. (Collin) Yes. We came in, and I think we had a sidebar with the Staff and you to try to explain this procedure as being the most efficient and best for customers, in terms of making rate changes, and that it doesn't change the economics at all --
Q. Uh-huh.
A. (Collin) -- in any way, in terms of the transaction.

MS. HOLLENBERG: And, to assure you, my
question is not intended to say that we disagree with it.
I just wanted to make that clear to you and to the Commission, that the reason it's not in the Agreement is that it really is something that's just come up, but it's \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{31}\)
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{30}\) not really something that the OCA has a disagreement with.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: So, I'm not as confused as I thought I was.

MS. HOLLENBERG: No. Never.
BY MS. HOLLENBERG:
Q. May I just clarify a couple of things. Mr. Collin, if you could, I'm just going to talk about some of the numbers in the Settlement Agreement. So, the total amount that UES paid to Riverwoods was just over \(\$ 2\) million in September 2011, is that correct?
A. (Collin) Yes. And, we had previously made an initial payment of a little over \(\$ 600,000\), and then made a second payment of almost 1.5 million. So, the total is --
Q. As of September 2011 was about \(\$ 2\) million?
A. (Collin) Yes. Correct.
Q. Okay. And, if you look at Page 3, in the Paragraph 2.5, as I think you pointed out in your direct testimony, the interest that is applied to the amount you're recovering from retail customers is applied starting June 1st, 2012, is that correct?
A. (Collin) That's correct.
Q. And, if you look in 2.7, in the chart there, the third line down, it says "Interest Paid to Customer". And, \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
the customer referred there is Riverwoods, is that correct?
A. (Collin) That's correct.
Q. And, that is the interest that you paid or the Company paid to Riverwoods for the period of September 2004 through September 2010, is that correct?
A. (Collin) Eleven.
Q. Or '11, sorry.
A. (Collin) September 2011, yes. That's correct.
Q. So, in the amount, in the \(\mathbf{2}\) million or so amount that UES paid to Riverwoods, there was this portion \$269,916 that related to interest, the value of the money that was overcollected from Riverwoods during that period of time, correct?
A. (Collin) Yes.
Q. And, there also is the -- given the fact that 2.5 has the interest collected from customers beginning in June 1, 2012, there is then a difference between the time that you paid the money to Riverwoods and the time that you're beginning to collect interest from your retail customers on the overbilling, is that correct?
A. (Collin) Yes. There's about a ten-month lag.
Q. And, would you agree that, subject to check, that amount, which -- would you agree, firstly, that that \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{32}\) amount is not reflected in the \(\$ 296,000\) [ \(\$ 269,000\) ?] that's in the chart in 2.7?
A. (Collin) Yes.
Q. Okay. And, then, would you agree, subject to check, that that amount for the ten months between the September 2012 through May 2000 -- I'm sorry, September 2011 through May 2012 is approximately \$35,000?
A. (Collin) Yes.
Q. Subject to check?
A. (Collin) Yes.
Q. Okay. And, so, in actuality, the Company is not recovering from ratepayers the interest amount reflected in 2.7, in addition to this other 35 or so thousand dollars that relates to that time period between the payment to Riverwoods and the beginning of collection of interest from customers?
A. (Collin) Yes. The Company is foregoing any interest accrual from the payment date to Riverwoods in September, all the way till June.
Q. Okay.
A. (Collin) That was negotiated as part of the Settlement.
Q. Okay. Great. Thank you. Ms. Asbury, you were talking about, in direct, about the proposal to not begin the
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
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```

collections of the amount from customers until June or August of 2013, depending on what charge it's recovered through. And, does the -- although you're going to start recording that those costs are incurred as of the month after the Commission approves the recovery, is that correct?
A. (Asbury) That's correct.
Q. And, is there -- do you have a sense in your mind, I realize that these are very -- these are small amounts, in terms of the recovery. And, which is one of the reasons that Unitil is suggesting that you wait to actually make the rate change until the next official rate change for the Company. Is there an interest amount or an amount of money that the customers are going to pay? How significant is that? Do you have a sense of that, for waiting to actually start -- for you to start receiving the money, as opposed to booking it?
A. (Asbury) I don't have an exact figure.
Q. Yes.
A. (Asbury) But I would estimate that it's a pretty small amount. You're talking about the difference between making a rate adjustment now, --
Q. Uh-huh.
A. (Asbury) -- versus June 1st or August 1st.
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
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A. (Eisfeller) yes.
Q. And, how often are you checking those customers' CT transformers?
A. (Eisfeller) The minimum requirement for checking those CTs is every four years.
Q. Uh-huh.
A. (Eisfeller) And, so, as part of our four-year test, that is part of our normal procedures now.
Q. Okay.
A. (Eisfeller) I should state "also upon installation".
Q. Uh-huh. So, when you install it, you're checking to make sure that it's appropriately calibrated, it doesn't have the same problem that it had with the Riverwoods customer?
A. (Eisfeller) When we install it and the customer has load on those CTs. So, we cannot verify that ratio unless there is load.
Q. Uh-huh.
A. (Eisfeller) So, we install it, the customer starts up, within a month or so we would be out to test that on load.

MS. HOLLENBERG: I have no other
questions. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you. Attorney
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
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Q. Uh-huh. So, very minimal, you would think?
A. (Asbury) Yes.
Q. Okay. And, at this point, and I apologize if this is something that you talked about in your presentation earlier, how many customers have CT transformers for the Company?
A. (Collin) Rorie, I think Justin would probably be the best to answer that.
A. (Eisfeller) So, when we filed our testimony in May, there was 791.
Q. Uh-huh.
A. (Eisfeller) And, that's an approximate number. I have not looked at, you know, looked at that number since, and that was in UES territory, New Hampshire territory.
Q. And, you know, I know, from having -- looking at the history of this case, that the Company attempted on a number of occasions to try and determine what was going on with this particular customer before it was realized that it was the CT transformer. What steps has Unitil taken with its practices to -- are you checking the CT transformers that are currently in the field with a way that would have detected the problem with the Riverwoods Company CT transformer? Are you doing those kinds of screenings now?
\[
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MR. SPEIDEL: Thank you very much,
Chairman.
BY MR. SPEIDEL:
Q. I would like to direct this to the panel. And, specifically, the panel of witnesses that provided the testimony in Exhibit 2, but also Mr. Collin as appropriate. And, within Exhibit 2, there is some discussion, on Pages 13 through 17 of the testimony, of how the overbilling of Riverwoods interrelated with the nature of the physical infrastructure and metering infrastructure, in particular, of the Unitil system, and also the accounting procedures of the Unitil system, to produce the, for lack of a better term, undercollection of the various classes of customers that are going to be paying an additional rate as part of this Settlement, is that correct? Would you agree that that provides a general overview of how the mechanism of the error led to the need to recover from those customers, is that right.
A. (Asbury) Yes.
Q. Okay. I'm just offering that for the record, just to direct people to that background information, just to know where it is.
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
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The next question I would have would
relate to the Settlement in Exhibit 1. As part of 2.8, there is a provision that requires Unitil to pursue remedies with the vendor of the equipment, also the manufacturer of the equipment. Could you provide a summary of past efforts, dating from October 4th, the date of this Settlement, and also future efforts that the Company plans to engage in to seek such remedies?

MR. EPLER: Madam Chairman, since this
is perhaps a legal question, it may be best if I could address this, if there's no objections, because it does involve discussions the Company has had with its outside counsel and so on. And, I would also request if we can mark this part of the transcript as confidential, because it does involve legal activities of the Company.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Well, I think it's
fine, unless there's any objection anyone has to Mr. Epler describing some of the efforts that have been made to do so. I think, any issue with that?

MR. SPEIDEL: I think it can be of informational purposes, yes.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I'm sorry, say that --

MR. SPEIDEL: It could be for \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
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recommend how we pursue this matter. We have issued demand letters to both the vendor and the manufacturer and are pursuing those.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you. Attorney
Speidel, did you want more detailed information, in which case we may need to go to a confidential record?

MR. SPEIDEL: I think, unless my
colleagues from the Staff would disagree, one way that we might go is to have a compliance filing filed as part of this docket, just an informational summary, that would be provided to Staff and OCA, under confidential treatment, perhaps, in writing, just to provide a little more detail, but so as to not burden the hearing. That might be workable.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Commissioner Scott. CMSR. SCOTT: While we're on the topic,
I was just hoping to get some clarification. So, to the extent you are able to get some remedies from the manufacturer, to where do those remedies go? Towards the 670 that the Company is not seeking reimbursement for or towards the change to the rate base?

MR. EPLER: If we were to, whatever extent we're successful, we will credit the amount to customers, minus expenses and costs to the Company of
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{38}\) informational purposes or of informational use.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Yes. I think that's
fine. I think, as to confidentiality, let's do as much publicly as you can, because I think that is important to the public's understanding.

MR. EPLER: Sure.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: If there's something
that begins to cross into things that really should be protected, let's be clear to stop and see if we need to go further.

MR. EPLER: Okay. I'll try to give a -CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: But why don't you, right now, explain where we are --

MR. EPLER: -- a general overview.
Basically, coinciding with the time frame that the error was discovered, and we were able to trace it to the -- to either the manufacturer or the distributor of the product, the Company retained counsel to review the matter, review its options. And, actually, in the course of this, retained a second outside counsel to also look into the matter and to advise us as to our options. And, for various reasons, we're advised that we have limited options to pursue remedies. We are taking the advice of counsel and are acting fully in concert with what they
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CMSR. SCOTT: Okay. Thank you.
(Chairman and Commissioners conferring.) CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I think the suggestion of a document filed after the hearing, in a compliance filing that would come in under confidential protection, with more detail on the efforts to reach a resolution with the vendor and manufacturer is a good idea. I don't think we need to do more on the record today.

MR. EPLER: Okay. Madam Chair, could we go off the record just for a moment please?

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right.
(Brief off-the-record discussion
ensued.)
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. Back on
the record. Thank you. We're back on the record. And, we've been -- left off talking about the request for more information about Settlement -- excuse me, efforts with the vendor and manufacturer of some sort of recovery. Attorney Speidel, do you have anything further on that?

MR. SPEIDEL: Yes. In light of some informal discussion with the Company, we think that it
\[
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would be advisable that the Company provide us an oral briefing regarding the status of these efforts, together with the Office of Consumer Advocate as a participant, and we would proceed on that basis.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. And, that's consistent with the language of the Settlement Agreement at \(\mathbf{2 . 8}\) ?

MR. SPEIDEL: Yes, I think so. Ideally, we would have some written record. But, if an oral briefing is the most advisable at the present time, we're willing to accede to that.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you. Did we have -- l've lost track. Did you have any other questions?

MR. SPEIDEL: Well, those were -- I
believe those were my cross-examination questions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. MR. SPEIDEL: Thank you, Chairman. CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Before we begin questions from the Bench, I want to apologize, Ms. Asbury, I called you "Ms. McNamara", and you were too polite to correct me. I'm getting my witnesses and cases blurred. So, sorry about that.
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
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[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{42}\) WITNESS ASBURY: Thank you. CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Questions?

\section*{Commissioner Harrington.}

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Just a couple.
BY CMSR. HARRINGTON:
Q. Just to clarify the process. I believe it was stated, and I'll just address these to the panel and whoever is appropriate, that some of the other customers were billed less as a result of the overbilling of Riverwoods, or something to that effect. Could you just tell -- walk me through the process. I mean, I understand that the CT was labeled incorrectly. So, when you calculated the bill at Riverwoods, it came out twice as high as it really was. How does that result in other people getting a lower electric bill, in light of the fact that my meter, if I was one of the other customers, wouldn't spin backwards because of that. So, I'm just -- how does it result in someone else getting a lower bill?
A. (Collin) Yes. I think, as a general matter, what happens is that there's a total cost that needs to be allocated across all customers. So, if you're allocating those costs on a kilowatt-hour basis, the more you allocate to one customer, the less other
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
customers are going to get allocated. So, that's -this is, you know, simply how the reconciliation works.
Q. Maybe I don't -- well, just a second, excuse me, maybe I can make this quite short then.
A. (Collin) Yes.
Q. What you're saying is, you know the total charge, and then you know how many kilowatt-hours. So, you simply would adjust the kilowatt-hours downward for the non-Riverwoods customers, so they would -- the kilowatt-hours they used wouldn't change, but the rate would change slightly downward?
A. (Collin) Well, in this case, what would happen is, is more of the costs should have gone to other customers, so the rate would actually go up to recover more of the costs.
Q. No, I don't mean to recover, but while -- while they were reaping the benefits of this, they were charged a lower kilowatt per hour rate than they should have been?
A. (Collin) Yes.
Q. Okay. And, that gets me -- that's the part I'm trying to figure out. So, when you come in, you came in as a rate case here, and you said that "we should charge a different rate for" -- is Riverwoods a -- what's their
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A. (Collin) They're a G1 customer, a large customer. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, you would say then "our Non-G1 customers should have a lower kilowatt per hour rate", and that's what you filed with this Commission?
A. (Collin) In a sense, that's where it ends up. We would come in and say "they have less costs --
Q. Right.
A. (Collin) -- allocated to them." And, therefore, because their costs are less, their kilowatt-hours, as you pointed out, are measured and fixed, --
Q. Yes.
A. (Collin) -- the rate would go down in order to collect those costs.
Q. And, what about other G1 customers, like Riverwoods, what would be the effect on them?
A. (Collin) Because of the way, and this is where we can get into more of the details, and Rob can get into that, because of the way we allocate, the other larger G1 customers are specifically measured. And, therefore, their usage is known and fixed. The Non-G1 is an allocated amount, because of the numbers of them and the nature of the Non-G1. So, the G1 do not get impacted by changes in another G1 customer, because we
\[
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know their amounts are specifically measured and metered and their load curve assigned. The Non-G1 is the residual, if you will. After you know all the G1 customers, the Non-G1 gets assigned the residual. So, they essentially make up for any errors or changes in the G1.
Q. Okay. I guess that brings me to what I'm trying to get to.
A. (Collin) Yes.
Q. And that, if you do this, and you come out, and let's just make up a number here, and you say that, based on the measurements that you do on all the G1 customers, and the amount of electricity that you flowed, there is 100 kilowatt-hours that need to be made up for by the -- all the Non-G1 customers. So, at the end of the month, you say "we have to allocate 100 kilowatt-hours to them." Then, you go out and you look at their meters, and all their meters add up to something other than \(\mathbf{1 0 0}\) kilowatt-hours. How come someone didn't notice we have a problem here?
A. (Collin) There's a lot of different things in that. But one is is that the metered kilowatt-hours that you have for the Non-G1 are not -- they're read over billing cycles that are not a calendar month.
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{47}\)
A. (Eisfeller) They're responsible for the testing. We receive these --
Q. They're responsible for the testing, okay.
A. (Eisfeller) -- CTs pretested.
Q. Then, that gets me to my next question then. When you receive these, I assume there's some paperwork, and the paperwork says that "certified test report" or something to that effect, --
A. (Eisfeller) correct.
Q. -- saying that this was tested and the taps are accurately labeled?
A. (Eisfeller) The testing uses a standardized ANSI test that measures the performance of the CT at various load levels for each of the ratios, in this case, there was a dual ratio of the transformer, and it certifies that it's accurate at those ratios. It does not certify the labeling.
Q. Okay. I'm trying to figure that out, how they would do that, if it was off by a factor of two, without noticing something in the testing, though, it seems a little off. But, okay. And, you also mentioned about, you do it upon installation, and then what it receives load, which, obviously, makes sense, to verify that they, in fact, were labeled correctly, the taps. But
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Q. Okay.
A. (Collin) And, so, it's difficult to compare directly meters that are read over a non-calendar month with a total kilowatt-hour amount relative to what you know for the system. And, the difference is assigned to either metering lag or losses on the system.

When you look at the quantity here of a single customer, like Riverwoods, and the number of kilowatt-hours, the amount of kilowatt-hours just get lost in all that reconciliation.
Q. Okay.
A. (Collin) It's just a very small amount.
Q. That's fine. That gets me to what I was looking for. Thank you. There was another question on the miss -you said these things were "mislabeled by either the manufacturer or the supplier". So, is it such that these things could come out of the manufacturer's facility unlabeled, and then the vendors, who actually sells them, labels the taps on it? It seems kind of odd to think the manufacturer would do that.
A. (Eisfeller) That's incorrectly stated. They're labeled by the manufacturer. The vendor who sold us the product also has some liability.
Q. Okay.
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[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{48}\) then you said something about "rechecking every four years", I'm a little confused. What will you recheck? To see that no one moved the labels?
A. (Eisfeller) We have a requirement under Puc Rule 300, the 300 rules, to verify every installation of instrumented transformer installation and test the meter at those locations every four years. So, it's a requirement for us to do that. We have a procedure for that testing process. And, we have, you know, modified that procedure to include this additional test.
Q. Okay. So, you're going to add this onto what you already do?
A. (Eisfeller) Correct.
Q. Okay. I guess my question is, is that test necessary, in that, I can see doing a functional test, to make sure that it's still performing correctly, in that it hasn't deteriorated through time or it doesn't have an internal short or something like that.

But, as far as the ratio goes, is that going to change with -- does that change with time? Or, is it just a matter of, if you're checking for mislabeling, and as long as the labels aren't moved, what more is there to check?
A. (Eisfeller) You check that the installation is
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installed correctly, for one. That you have not had any deterioration of the connections or the wire as part of the connections. You also recheck all the calculations for the billing multipliers that are used. And, so, there's this constant checking and verifying that's done every four years, to make sure that no mistakes were made, for one, and that you don't have any deterioration at the site. And, these CTs can be installed in environments that are subject to dirt and dust, and maybe movement of those wires perhaps. And, you verify that the installation is still working as planned.
Q. But I'm assuming that's, though, what -- everything you described would appear to be in your pre this problem testing mechanism. So, what are you doing differently every four years? Or, is it simply a matter of just verifying that the labels haven't been moved, in addition to what you would have done anyways? That's what I'm trying to get at.
A. (Eisfeller) Okay. We go out with a separate CT and do a field check under load, and verify that our ratio is -- expected ratio is very similar to what we see this meter or the CT is labeled. And, it's a quick check. It's not an exacting check. It's a variance check. If \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
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A. (Eisfeller) It's a good argument not to continue testing it. But we are going to continue to test it.
Q. Well, it just strikes me that maybe it's a waste of money, I guess. I'm wondering what the rationale is to --
A. (Eisfeller) It's a very -- it's not a lengthy procedure to do that check. And, I think we'd rather be certain.
Q. And, how many, again, was the number of these that you're going to be checking every four years?
A. (Eisfeller) Oh, I'm glad you asked that, because I have a correction to make. I think I stated "710" of these installations. We have 910.
Q. Okay.
A. (Eisfeller) And, so, I misstated that number. And, so, every four years we will verify these.
Q. I'd be interested in what the cost of that was.
A. (Collin) And, important, I mean, you talk about that, I worry about costs a lot, too. But one of the things that Justin is explaining is that this procedure has been added to a test procedure that we do anyway. We're at the site. In other words, getting to the site, investigating the meter, checking all the connections, and checking for dirt, checking for deterioration. All that stuff is being done regardless \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
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it varies more than \(\mathbf{2 0}\) percent, we would pull the CT and have it tested in the lab. It's very difficult to get a field test done that is, you know, half a percent accurate. So, it's a rough field check that's done. And, given the field conditions, it's difficult to do a laboratory test. So, it's a rough check. If it's within a bandwidth of operation of expected values, we assume -- we label it as "verified".
Q. I understand what you're saying. But you didn't do this particular check in the past --
A. (Eisfeller) Correct.
Q. -- or you would have caught the problem. Okay. So, what -- there's -- the mechanism for fault here appears to be mislabeling. So, you're going to go out and check for deterioration of the transformer in a way you didn't do it before, because you didn't think it was necessary. But, now, because of mislabeling, you think it is. How is this going -- I mean, if you check it initially and find out "this is labeled correctly" by your installation field check, when it's under load, why do you need to continue to check for mislabeling, because the only way it could get mislabeled is if someone was to have changed the labels around? I mean, is that --
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In terms of, you know, addressing your issue, "once you know the label is right, why do you need to keep checking it?" And, I think, you know, from -- just from this experience, you know, the belt and suspenders is, obviously, there. But it's also, oftentimes equipment does get changed, meters get changed, customers change their requirements, and we have different installations going on. And, rather than making sure that all that's been lined up and you're always, you know, sure that the equipment is staying appropriate for the customer's usage, I think, when we discussed it, it was just a good procedure to add in and make sure that all customers' installations are always fully appropriate.
Q. And, do you anticipate buying new spare CTs to doing this testing or are these spares you already have in stock?
A. (Eisfeller) I'm sorry, I missed the question.
Q. Well, you're going to bring out a separate CT to use as a test in the field. So, you have to acquire one of \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
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entory or would you be buying new ones?
A. (Eisfeller) We bought some new ones. And, they're different than -- they're a different type of CT than what's installed there, a CT that can open up, so you can get around the wires. The permanent installed units are not, are solid and are not able to open up. Hence, they're only installed when the customer is running wires. So, it's a different type of CT.
They're not that expensive. You know, they're in the range of a thousand dollars apiece.
Q. And, how many different types do you need?
A. (Eisfeller) You buy one that has a range of capabilities. Since we're not looking for an exact number, we're looking for something that is a quick check. And, I should state that, if we do this quick check and we something that's outside our range, we will pull the CT out and send it away to be tested. And, that's where the bigger expense is. And, that's the labor associated with that, pulling the CT out that looks suspicious, and then the testing of that CT at a lab would be a higher expense than this quick check that we do.
Q. So, I guess my concern there was, and seemingly \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] 5 that into how much we collect. And, that really doesn't make any difference the day we start recovering is the part that becomes superfluous". That is correct in saying that?
A. (Collin) Yes.
Q. Okay. Well, that means, if we approve this, approving the Settlement Agreement is going to be very difficult as written, and then we have this condition, you can make any changes whatsoever, and the -- any change or condition or "the Commission makes any findings that go beyond the scope of the Settlement Agreement, if any of the Settling Parties are unable to agree with the changes" then the Settlement Agreement becomes void. And, right now, I kind of look as though we have to make some adjustment to this, because, in reading it in plain English, it tells me, if this order was approved next week, that you'd start beginning to recover on December 1st. And, maybe it's the definition of "beginning to recover", but it appears to me you're not going to begin to recover, I used to take that as "collecting money", until June 1st. So, does this create a legal issue?

MS. HOLLENBERG: May I ask a question that I think might get to the point?
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] 54 addressed, but that you have one CT for about a thousand dollars that you use and you can test all 910 or do you have --
A. (Eisfeller) We have three sets of these for each of our operating centers.
Q. Okay. So, it's three, but not 900 spares?
A. (Eisfeller) Correct.
Q. Okay. That's what I was trying to get to. Thank you. Getting off of that, we've buried that, on the Settlement Agreement itself, getting back to that whole deal about the dates, on section 2.2, you know, when I read this, it says "allowed to recover over a period beginning the first day of the month immediately following Commission approval". Let's just, for the sake of argument, assume that the Commission approval came effective would be the first day of the month after would be January 1st. Then, you would say, "okay, January 1st to November 30th, that's X amount of months, we have so much money to collect, let's divide it, and then we'll figure out how much we're going to charge people per month extra." Now, what you're saying is that you're actually going to start on June 1st and say "we have \(X\)-- \(Y\) amount of months from June 1st to November 30th, and we're going to divide \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{56}\) CMSR. HARRINGTON: Absolutely.

\section*{BY MS. HOLLENBERG:}
Q. Isn't it true that the amount that, when you're calculating the amount that you'll recover beginning on June 1, you would include in that amount the amount you would have recovered between the first day of the month following the Commission's order and that date? It would be part of the reconciliation. You're basically booking those costs or you're accruing those costs starting the first day of the month after the Commission approval, but you're not beginning to collect them from customers until you roll that amount into the amounts to be collected starting June \(1 ?\)
A. (Collin) Yes.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Okay. Then, I guess my question would be, everything you just said, if it were to appear in an order, would that constitute a problem due to Section 3.1 of the Settlement Agreement?

WITNESS COLLIN: And, it may. You know, and I think it's a good point. And, I can speak for the Company that we would waive any objection to clarification or correction of that issue relative to the Settlement Agreement in the Commission's order.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Excuse me, just one
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
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MR. SPEIDEL: Yes. I concur with this, definitely. Could I ask a question as well of the Company?

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Hold on one second
please.
(Chairman and Commissioners conferring.)
CMSR. HARRINGTON: Excuse me. Is Staff
and the OCA also of that same position?
MR. SPEIDEL: Well, no, not exactly,
Commissioner. In that, I would like to ask a little bit
of clarifying -- a line of questioning that would clarify
this issue a little bit. I think we've kind of fallen a
little bit down the path of failing to recognize that some of these terms have understood meanings among the parties, and for the purposes of Commission practice and procedure.
BY MR. SPEIDEL:
Q. So, let's start with Section 2.2. And, there is a reference --

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Excuse me, are we in the Settlement Agreement?

MR. SPEIDEL: Yes. In the Settlement
Agreement, correct. That would be Page 3, Commissioner.
BY MR. SPEIDEL:
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A. (Collin) Yes.

MR. SPEIDEL: So, I think it's not as
much of an ambiguity in the view of Staff as you might expect. Because, without approval by the Commission, they wouldn't have approval to recover these amounts through this recovery mechanism or this accounting feature, this accounting box, and so on through the remaining segments of the Settlement.

So, I think the Company may have elucidated as to when they would like to actually start charging customers. And, they have essentially told us that they would feel that it's most efficient and most reasonable to do it as of June the 1st of next year. That's kind of at their own election, and we would support that. But we think the Settlement stands on its own terms. And, that these references all have specific meanings.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Well, let me just follow up, especially with your very last statement about "specific meanings". I mean, maybe I just don't understand the concept. But it would appear to be that the statement they "be allowed to recover beginning the first day of the month immediately following Commission approval", based on what was said today, would -- the \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{58}\)
Q. And, there is a description of the recovery mechanism here. "UES shall be allowed to recover over a period beginning the first day of the month immediately following Commission approval of this Agreement through November 30th, 2015, as an adjustment to its Non-G1 Default Service recovery mechanism, the amount of \$1 million, etcetera, plus interest." So, there was a common understanding I believe that, among the Company, the OCA, and the Staff, that, for the purposes of Section 2.2 onward, through 2.4, "recover" means when the amounts are first added to the reconciliation accounts, because the "Non-G1 Default Service recovery mechanism" is an accounting feature. So, these funds would be added into that accounting feature, and they would be collected upon whenever the Company would elect to integrate it into its rates. Is that correct, in general terms?
A. (Collin) Yes.
Q. And, that addition to the accounting feature would be done as a lump sum of this Settlement amount. Therefore, when it would be recovered upon would not really be germane, except for the small amount of customer account interest that would accrue. Is that correct?
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[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{60}\) effect would be no different if it said "based on the beginning of the first day of the third month following Commission approval", as long as that third month's approval was prior to June 1st, is that correct?

MR. SPEIDEL: In theory, yes.
CMSR. HARRINGTON: Okay. So, then, we
have a statement that is meaningless, as long as it's before June 1st. And, I kind of look at that and say "that's troubling, to approve a meaningless statement as part of the Settlement Agreement, without some clarification." That, regardless of when the recover starts, and I guess there's some confusion between "recovery" and "collecting", I assumed "recovery" meant -and "collecting" were one in the same, but you're saying it's booking, rather than actually collecting from the customers. That, if we were to say "they'll recover beginning that, but the actual collection from customers will not start until June 1st", would that constitute a variation from the Settlement Agreement that the parties would consider voiding it? And, what the Company has said is they would not, and I'm trying to find out what the other parties would say?

MR. SPEIDEL: No, no. Because, Commissioner, it is up to the Company to collect that \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{61}\) figure before November 30th of 2015. If they fall asleep on the job and they don't bother to set it into their rate structure, and, of course, we're filling in through oral record a few of the interstices of this agreement. But it doesn't void it, it doesn't change it to the effect that "no, we don't have an agreement of the parties." And, certainly, OCA can speak to this. But, in our view, I think the Company was trying to figure out the timing of approval to a certain extent of this Settlement Agreement.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: I understand why they're picking the June 1st date.

MR. SPEIDEL: Right.
CMSR. HARRINGTON: But, based on what
you just said, they could pick November of 2015 and charge the whole amount in one month's bill, because you said it just allows them to recover it sometime prior to that. And, certainly, I don't think we want to have people's bills hit with the total amount in one month.

MR. SPEIDEL: Yes. And, certainly,
we --
MS. HOLLENBERG: That's not my understanding of how -- I mean, we wouldn't be comfortable with that, if that were to happen. Could I just make a comment, though, because there's a lot of discussion? I \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{63}\) we're talking about "booking" it and we're talking about "collecting" it. And, the word "recovery" here is used to mean "booking" in the way the Settlement Agreement is written, and you just used "recovery" in the sense of "collecting" the funds in the rate adjustment. So, --

MR. SPEIDEL: Well, yes. There's
multiple uses of the same word. "Recovery" here is, within the Settlement Agreement, refers to "booking" it for accounting purposes. And, then, the integration into rates is presumed as following that integration into the accounting feature that the Company has for each element.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Mr. Epler, do you have anything to add to the discussion?

MR. SPEIDEL: A clarification.
MS. HOLLENBERG: I would like to make a comment.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Just a moment. MR. EPLER: Why don't you go ahead. CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Okay. All right.
Ms. Hollenberg.
MS. HOLLENBERG: Well, I guess I would clarify just that I, personally, and it could be my totally my fault, was not aware of what we discussed this morning, which was that we wouldn't actually start
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can wait, though. I'm happy to wait. Everyone else has been able to weigh in on this issue. And, I thought that you were looking for the OCA's feedback, but l'm -CMSR. HARRINGTON: And, I am. MR. SPEIDEL: I don't know what's just been said, though. Could you repeat that. MS. HOLLENBERG: We wouldn't be comfortable with the Company waiting until October 2015 to start recovery.

MR. SPEIDEL: No, of course not. I understand. I was assuming arguendo. Assuming arguendo was what I was trying driving at. It's not a matter of comfort, it's just what we're trying to get at is that, if we have a clarification in our order on the basis of the record today, that says that the Company has agreed that it would begin recovery starting in June of next year, from the rates, they would integrate the rate increase starting in June of next year. And, the accounting recovery would begin in the month after approval is issued by the Commission through the accounting feature, and that Staff and OCA accede to that, I think that would be the basis for action that would be acceptable.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I think, but using
the word "recovery" may be a mistake. It sounds like
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[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{64}\) recovering from customers until June. But l'm not opposed to that, because it seems to make sense to not change the rates again, and to do it when all the other rates are, especially in light of the Company's assurance that there is a minimal impact, in terms of interest.

I guess I am thinking that, if I understand you correctly, Commissioner Harrington, I am starting to question why there is the need for that booking date, per se, if we have the date of interest beginning of June 1, 2012 already fixed. But I am not opposed to the methodology that's been discussed this morning, nor am I opposed to the Commission clarifying that methodology in its order.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Thank you. I think we probably need the date just for the purposes of starting the date for collecting interest. But, if nothing else today, we've come up with a new word we're not supposed to say anymore. So, we can't say the "R-word" anymore. Let's use "billing" or "collecting"; no "R-word" please.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Mr. Epler, do you have anything further to add?

MR. EPLER: Well, I just wanted, first, to apologize, if this caused some confusion. Just the \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
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intent was a couple of things. One is, if you recall, we've had a couple of Default Service proceedings where we had, when we made the initial filing, we actually included some recovery. And, what happened, without disclosing anything that occurred, during the Settlement Agreement, there were a couple of glitches, and we couldn't get the Settlement finalized as quickly as we initially thought. And, because of that, we then did not want to push the Commission into saying "you've got to decide this on \(X\) date, in order so that we could make the adjustment at the time -- for these adjustments at the time we normally make our adjustments." So, that's why we included the language that said "on the first day of the month following approval", that's when it would be implemented. To basically give discretion to the Commission to deliberate this and decide it in the fashion that it chose.

What we wanted to preserve and what we attempted to do with this language is just preserve an end date that "let's get some certainty, as we're going to recover this by X date", and that's the important point. So, then, and the reason this did not come up in discussions was actually, quite frankly, the Company was looking at, well, looking at when we can anticipate a date from a Commission order, and when is our next changes, \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{67}\) testimony. Thank you.

\section*{BY CMSR. HARRINGTON:}
Q. This is a totally different question and subject. Nothing to do with the "R-word", I hope. Though, it's in this sentence as well, I'm sorry. 2.6 talks about adjustments to the Consumption Tax. Can you just kind of, someone, walk through what's causing the need for a credit on the Consumption Tax?
A. (Collin) Essentially, the Consumption Tax, under the New Hampshire statutes, is billed on all energy usage of the customer. To the extent the energy usage didn't really exist, because it was overmetered, then you can credit the Consumption Tax for what was not used.
Q. But wasn't somebody else, let's -- forgetting about the Company is willing to write off part of this, but I thought, for every megawatt that you overbilled, you underbilled somebody else, because the total amount of power consumed was the same, so why wouldn't the total tax be the same?
A. (Collin) We billed the correct kilowatt-hours, we were allocating the wrong cost. So, the consumption cost is based on the kilowatt-hours. So, there hasn't been an issue relative to that.
Q. I'm sorry, you said "consumption cost", do you mean \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{66}\) wouldn't it be simpler to just have the rate change occur the next time we do it, as opposed to changing rates or December 1 or January 1 again, after we just changed them based on our last Default Service change. And, so, we just thought, among ourselves, that that would be the simplest thing to do, to just wait for the next period, given the size of the change we're looking at.

And, given that these are reconciling adjustments, and that there are other things that go on in the reconciling period up and down, we thought that it would be the simplest thing to do was to wait for June 1st for the Default Service change and August 1st for the other changes that normally occur when we make the reconciling adjustments.

Given that, I think that there's no
harmful effects to customers. I think it still keeps the reasonable -- the reasonableness of the charge to customers. I think it's the simplest thing. It doesn't have a second time that you're changing rates for customers. And, I think the parties' intent to have an end date for collection is preserved as well.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Thank you. CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: We're well into our closing arguments here, but let's finish up with
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\section*{"Consumption Tax"?}
A. (Collin) Consumption Tax.
Q. So, it's based on per kilowatt-hour?
A. (Collin) Yes.
Q. And, the per kilowatt-hours were overcharged to Riverwoods, but undercharged to the Non-G1. And, didn't they come out to be correct or what am I getting mixed up there?
A. (Collin) Yes. The Non-G1 kilowatt-hours were correct.

The cost spread across those kilowatt-hours was wrong.
Q. Okay.
A. (Collin) So, the kilowatt-hours was correct, the Consumption Tax was correct, because it was based on kilowatt-hours.
Q. Okay.
A. (Collin) But the cost, which was a responsibility of the Non-G1, was lower than it should have been, because Riverwoods was paying more of the total costs.
Q. Right. And, I understand that. But you just said the "Consumption Tax was correct". So, why do you need a credit to the Consumption Tax?
A. (Furino) If I can just, maybe --
A. (Collin) Well, let me get to the Consumption Tax, and then I'm going to let you dive in, because he's the
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expert on it. But the Consumption Tax on G1 was
correct; the Consumption Tax on Riverwoods was incorrect. And, that's what we're correcting here.
Q. Okay. So, let me, maybe we can simplify this. You base the Consumption Tax on the actual meter reading, and, since the actual meter reader's reading on the Non-G1 is what it was, so their tax is correct. But, on the Riverwoods, it was higher than it was supposed to be, so you paid more tax. And, then, that cost differential that gets sorted out and, you know, you talked about the different billing cycles and kind of the noise, that just doesn't affect it. So, I think I understand it exactly.
A. (Collin) That's correct.

CMSR. HARRINGTON: Okay. Thank you.
And, I'm sure everyone will be happy to hear that was my last question.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Commissioner Scott.
BY CMSR. SCOTT:
Q. With some trepidation, I'm going to ask this question just to clarify. So, with Commissioner Harrington, you first laid out the -- I'll call it the "laws of conservation", you're buying \(X\) amount of power to come into the UES system. People have meters. We
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{1}\) Charge, Stranded Cost, the end dates, which we've discussed, I was just curious why some are "July 31st" and why some are "November 30th"? What was the rationale?
A. (Asbury) The Default Service charges are just -they're on a different schedule. The Non-G1 rates are set -- reset semi-annually, and they're done on June 1st and December 1st.
Q. Okay.
A. (Asbury) And, the other two reconciling clauses for External Delivery and Stranded Cost are reset annually. And, the annual anniversary date is August 1st for those changes.

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

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you.

\section*{BY CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS:}
Q. In testimony today, the Company said that it intends to first change the rate and begin the actual collection from customers with the next scheduled rate changes. But it isn't a stated term in the Settlement Agreement, it's just an allowance that you can begin it, begin booking it, and then there's the end date. So, can we be certain there's a commitment on the part of the
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{0}\) understand the CT issue in this particular application. And, if what I heard correctly was, you have some metering lag going on and some losses on the system, my words, but sounds like. So, and this is, in a broad scheme of things for your whole system, these are small amount -- this is a small amount of loss, if you will. So, my question is, is do you do -- I assume you do some kind of system loss analysis? Do you do like metering reconciliation? Again, it's easier -- it's easy for me to say, you know, you have \(X\) amount in, there should be X amount out, and, in a perfect world, you should know if the two don't jibe. But is there a value to that type of analysis? Do you do that type of analysis?
A. (Collin) We do measure our losses on a regular basis and evaluate those. And, I mean, there should be losses on the system. That's the nature of electricity and running it across lines and such. But we do measure that and look for anomalies or any kind of issues of that nature. Yes. Something like this just would not be measurable in that spectrum, yes.
Q. Okay. All right. That's helpful. Very minor question. So, back to the Settlement Agreement, I was just curious, for the Default Service, the Delivery
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Company to make those changes as of the next scheduled rate changes, make those adjustments?
A. (Collin) Yes.
Q. So that we don't have the possible scenario of, you know, a year from now, two years from now, needing to collect a bigger lump sum then. The amount that needs to be adjusted took, it looks like, seven to eight years to accrue, is that right? Beginning in 2004?
A. (Collin) Yes. About that time.
Q. The period of time to make all of the corrections is quite a bit shorter, it's over a three-year period. And, why is that?
A. (Collin) There's a lot of different economics going on here. One of the -- and, again, I can give you from the Company's perspective, everybody settles for a different reason in coming up with an agreement. Essentially, when the Company refunded the amount to Riverwoods, it paid Riverwoods that full interest for that period, and has agreed that other customers would not pay that interest. That that would be absorbed by the Company. However, if you look at the economics during that period, where customers were paying less than the actual cost, they theoretically were saving that, you know, that interest, there's an argument to
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
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be made that that interest should be allocated to them, because they got to pay for their energy less than what was the actual cost. So, taking that into account, the Company has already taken -- absorbed the cost of the interest for that seven-year period. In addition, as pointed out in cross with the OCA, we've agreed to absorb interest that we theoretically have been incurring since we made the payment from September through June. So, those kind of tradeoffs resulted in us wanting -- being able to agree on a three-year recovery period, which extended this out over a period of time. And, lastly, basically prevented, assuming an interest would accrue on that, the three-year recovery period prevents interest from continuing to accrue if you take this out longer. It just, the customer would continue to essentially be burdened by additional interest charges on this.

So, all those things taken into account, we thought that a three-year balanced, you know, smoothed out this recovery, didn't have a large rate impact, and balanced out some of these economic concessions and tradeoffs that took place.
Q. Of the little over \(\$ 2\) million that's at stake, the Settlement has a split of about 1.4 million being \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
[WITNESS PANEL: Collin~Asbury~Eisfeller~Furino] \({ }^{5}\) Hampshire?
A. (Collin) It's a practice -- again, it's a practice that's used in other billing adjustments that have taken place.
Q. Even going back as far as 2004?
A. (Collin) I would say that would be a rare -- I'm not aware of ever having to go back that far or that -that length of an adjustment. In terms of the type -the amount of Consumption Tax we pay, this is, again, a very minor, small, small piece of that. I don't expect any issue for this with the State.
Q. Looking at your 2.7, the little block that breaks out the different charges that the Company is agreeing not to seek recovery of, I want to clarify a couple of things. The "System Benefits Account-Energy Efficiency" is about \(\$ \mathbf{2 3 , 0 0 0}\). From year to year, some utilities end up not expending their entire energy efficiency amounts, and they roll that forward into the next year's budgets. In this case, if you had unpaid -- unexpended energy efficiency monies at the end of the year, in an amount of 23,000 or more, would you consider that to be the way that would -- would the amount that you are absorbing under this Settlement be taken out of the unpaid energy efficiency fund,
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recovered over a three-year period, and 670,000 being absorbed by the Company. Is that simply a negotiated settlement amount or is there something in the accounting or requirements that you have to do that led you to that split?
A. (Collin) It's a negotiated amount, yes.
Q. Another question about the Consumption Tax provision, 2.6. I think I got lost at the last minute. I was following Commissioner Harrington's question. But am I correct that the amount of Consumption Tax paid for Riverwoods was higher than it should have been because the CT was showing higher than it should have?
A. (Collin) Yes.
Q. So, at this point, aren't you looking at a refund to -I'm sorry, that you've overpaid the State, how does a credit to the State -- I'm not following the language of 2.6. What happens next?
A. (Collin) Essentially, when we calculate our Consumption Tax in the next period, we will credit this overpayment against that. So, we will pay less Consumption Tax. We won't collect any more, we won't collect any less, but we'll just -- we just owe the State less tax, because this an overpayment of an earlier tax.
Q. And, have you discussed this with the State of New
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A. (Collin) If we weren't absorbing it, if the Company was not absorbing it, we would adjust the account balance in the energy efficiency fund by that amount. But, because we're absorbing it, we're leaving the account balance untouched.
Q. All right. So, even if you have money left at the end of the year for energy efficiency, that would still roll forward into the next year's fund. It wouldn't be used to -- in any way to absorb some of the amount you've agreed not to recover?
A. (Collin) That's correct.
Q. All right. And, the same thing for the Low Income Account?
A. (Collin) That's correct.
Q. We have a customer letter that's in the docketbook, and I won't read it all, but I just -- I think we've been through all of the details here, but I want to give you a few of the sentences that this customer provided to us, and hear your responses to it. He says that he's opposed to seeking the recovery, and says "the Company capitalized off of the mistake and now wants to make the rest of us, who had nothing to do with it, pay it back." Is there any way that Unitil has capitalized \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
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off of the mistake with the CTs?
A. (Collin) With the implementation of the Settlement, certainly not. There was -- is an argument that, had we collected dollars relative to our distribution service over a period of time, and retained those, and not somehow refunded those or given those back, with interest, that would have been the benefit. So, if you look at the total overcharge of a little over \(\$ 1.8\) million, only about \(\mathbf{2 0 0}, 000\) is related to base distribution revenues, which is the -- in a sense, is the benefit retained by the Company. That's the earnings before tax, the revenues, earnings that the Company would retain. And, just, as you're familiar, the electric bill is -- the majority of the electric bill is energy charges and other System Benefits Charges and other charges that are reconciling, are not retained by the Company, do not flow to the bottom line, but are essentially reconciled on a cost basis. So, only that \(\mathbf{2 0 0 , 0 0 0}\) was, in a sense, a benefit received over the period. We have now refunded all of that, and we've refunded all of that with interest to the customer. So, everybody is made whole in that process.

In addition to that, much -- a little
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\section*{BY CMSR. SCOTT:}
Q. Just a follow-up, and perhaps you don't have that kind of information on your fingertips. I was just curious the amount of staff hours you spent on this issue?
A. (Collin) Don't have an exact amount, but this has been going on, as you know, since the beginning of 2011. So, it's been, you know, a lengthy period. And, we've taken it very seriously. It's a very serious thing. You can only imagine what it means to our reputation, our integrity, the trust our customers put in us. And, I think we've done everything we can to try to correct the problem with the customer we had, but also with our other customers, to make sure that there are no other problems of this nature. And, we feel this Settlement is a very fair and equitable solution to this, and we're glad to move on from it, and get onto providing our customers with top quality service that they can trust in and count on.

CMSR. SCOTT: A good closing. CMSR. HARRINGTON: One final -CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Commissioner Harrington, another question. CMSR. HARRINGTON: Just a really quick one.
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more esoteric, is, when we did our rate case recently for UES, we had these revenues, it's 185,000 , or I guess the test year portion of that amount, in our revenues. And, so, the rate case, basically, arguably, we got less rate relief because of these revenues were counted in in our rates. And, that's built in. So, year after year, it's as if we were getting these revenues, even though, following the rate case, we discovered this error and are no longer getting these revenues.

So, I think there's lots of reasons to say that the Company hasn't capitalized on it. In fact, the Company has paid a significant penalty financially, the over \(\$ 600,000\) write-off we've had to take, on an item where we earned less than \(\$ 200,000\) over that whole period. So, the Company has tried to make good on this in a number of ways. And, this is certainly not something that we feel we've capitalized on or benefited from at all.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you. I have no other questions. Is there any redirect?

MR. EPLER: No thank you.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. I'm
sorry, Commissioner Scott, another question.
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\section*{BY CMSR. HARRINGTON:}
Q. How do you intend to inform the customers of this? Or, is it just going to be, they will get a new rate, and it will be a little, slightly higher than it would have been without this Settlement, if you get approval?
A. (Collin) Yes, I think, other than the normal, you know, coverage that the press may pick up or something on this issue, I don't think we were seeing making a specific notification on this issue. It will fall in with the rest of the rate adjustments. It's an adjustment to a reconciling balance that we do, you know, every period when we make the rate adjustments. CMSR. HARRINGTON: Thank you. CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: No redirect? MR. EPLER: No thank you. CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. Then, you're excused. Thank you. Although, why don't you stay put.

Any objection to striking the identification and making the two exhibits full exhibits?

MS. HOLLENBERG: No thank you. CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. Seeing none, we'll do so. And, I take it OCA does not have a request to put anything further in the record?
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}

MS. HOLLENBERG: No, ma'am. I looked back at the docketbook, and having not been involved in the case at the time, I wasn't really able to find a hearing at which would have occurred after the July date that those data responses are dated, at which it would have been used at a hearing or as an exhibit in that hearing. So, I would not ask that it be specifically included for the record at this point in time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. Then, unless there's anything else to attend to, administrative matters?
(No verbal response)
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Then, opportunity
for closings. Ms. Hollenberg.
MS. HOLLENBERG: Thank you. The Office
of Consumer Advocate supports the Settlement it reached with the Staff and Unitil. We appreciate very much everyone's efforts in this docket. And, we're glad to put
this case -- to put some sort of closure at this point in time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Mr. Speidel.
MR. SPEIDEL: Yes. Thank you, Chairman.
This Settlement Agreement is a compromise resolution of all the issues in this proceeding. It is not an admission \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
patience today. And, we thank the Office of the Consumer Advocate and the Company for its collaboration and its consultation with Staff over this period. And, we ask that the Agreement do receive consideration and approval. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you. Attorney
Epler.
MR. EPLER: Yes, Chairman Ignatius,
Commissioners. Just to reiterate, the Company appreciates
the active participation and engagement of the Staff and the OCA in the Settlement process. We believe it was a thorough process, that this matter was investigated thoroughly. And, we believe that the Settlement Agreement, for all the reasons that you've heard today from the panel, is a just and reasonable resolution of this matter, and ask for your consideration and approval. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you. We will take all of this under advisement. And, I do want to mention one other thing before we close. And, that's, Mr. Epler, if you will, convey back to the Company, that the activity of last week, with the storm, Hurricane sandy, was pretty intense for a lot of people. And, the responsiveness of people from Unitil to all of our
\{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
by Staff, Company or the Office of the Consumer Advocate that any allegation or contention in this proceeding by any other party is true or valid, nor does this Settlement Agreement govern future adjudication of these matters by the Commission or the positions of Staff in a future adjudication of such matters.

That said, Staff believes that this Agreement does provide a just and reasonable solution to an issue that took place between Unitil and one of its customers. It protects customers from costs that Staff believes should be borne by the utility in this instance. But, at the same time that it protects customers from unnecessary costs, it also provides for the collection of energy charges from the customers who consumed the power.

We also note that the Settlement calls
for the integration of certain amounts into various accounting features of the Company. And, that the Company, the Staff, and the Office of the Consumer Advocate today have come to an agreement that the integration of those figures into rate recovery would take place next summer. So, we would ask that the Commission, as part of its approval of the Settlement Agreement, if it so elects, would make note of that fact.

So, we do thank the Commission for its \{DE 11-105\} \{11-08-12\}
questions was just extremely helpful, prompt and thorough, and made it easier for us to get a handle on what was going on and to keep track of changes out in the field, and be able to convey information to municipalities, to the Governor's office, and the various people who were turning to us. So, we really appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. EPLER: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: And, with that, we

\section*{are adjourned.}
(Whereupon the hearing ended at 11:51 a.m.)
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energy [20] \(1 / 7\) 1/15 4/15 10/22 11/7
11/11 12/15 13/12 67/10 67/11 73/2 75/15
75/17 75/20 75/24 76/1 76/4 76/8 77/15
82/14
Energy's [1] 10/23
engage [2] 20/11 37/8
engagement [1] 83/10
English [1] 55/16
ensued [1] 40/16
ensure [3] 13/22 14/2 14/6
entered [3] 6/6 6/8 14/4
entire [5] 15/11 18/13 24/6 24/8 75/17
environments [1] 49/9
Epler [10] 1/15 2/7 2/20 4/12 4/14 37/17
63/12 64/21 83/7 83/21
equipment [6] 20/7 20/8 37/4 37/5 52/10

\section*{52/14}
equitable [2] 15/4 79/15
erroneously [1] 13/3
error [8] 13/17 13/18 17/8 17/19 18/14
36/19 38/15 78/9
errors [1] 45/5
esoteric [1] 78/1
especially [2] 59/19 64/4
Esq [3] 1/15 1/17 1/19
essentially [14] 7/7 9/5 15/9 16/13 17/7
17/13 18/22 45/5 59/11 67/9 72/17 73/16 74/18 77/18
established [1] 12/23
establishes [1] 27/2
estimate [2] 21/15 33/20
estimated [4] 21/17 21/20 21/23 25/15
estimates [1] 26/24
etcetera [1] 58/7
evaluate [1] 70/16
even [4] 8/5 75/5 76/7 78/8
ever [4] 5/24 7/20 7/21 75/7
every [10] 35/5 48/1 48/5 48/7 49/6 49/16
51/9 51/15 67/16 80/12
everybody [2] 72/15 77/22
everyone [2] 62/1 69/16
everyone's [1] 81/18
everything [3] 49/13 56/16 79/11
exact [3] 33/18 53/14 79/5
exacting [1] 49/24
exactly [2] 57/10 69/13
examination [8] 2/7 2/10 2/11 10/16 22/13
22/14 28/9 41/16
except [1] 58/22
excuse [5] 40/20 43/3 56/24 57/8 57/20
excused [1] 80/17
Exeter [4] 4/6 4/6 12/14 12/17
exhibit [17] 3/3 5/5 5/7 5/11 6/9 6/21 7/1
7/16 7/24 8/1 9/1 11/17 16/10 36/7 36/8

\section*{37/2 81/6}

Exhibit 2 [2] 36/7 36/8
exhibits [5] 5/4 5/13 12/7 80/20 80/20
exist [1] 67/12
expand [1] 9/8
expect [2] 59/4 75/10
expected [2] 49/22 50/7
expending [1] 75/17
expense [2] 53/19 53/22
expenses [1] 39/24
expensive [1] 53/10
experience [1] 52/8
expert [1] 69/1
explain [4] 14/21 17/9 29/14 38/13
explaining [1] 51/19
extend [1] 24/17
extended [2] 6/3 73/11
extent [4] 39/18 39/23 61/9 67/11
External [6] 19/2 21/19 22/10 23/2 23/9
71/11
extra [1] 54/21
extremely [1] 84/1
F
facilities [5] 12/16 12/20 13/22 13/24 14/1
facility [6] 12/20 12/24 12/24 13/16 46/18
52/2
fact [6] 29/10 31/16 42/16 47/24 78/13
82/23
factor [1] 47/19
facts [1] 15/1
failing [1] 57/14
fair [2] 15/3 79/15
fairly [1] 23/15
fall [2] 61/1 80/9
fallen [1] 57/13
familiar [1] 77/13
far [3] 48/19 75/5 75/7
fashion [1] 65/16
fault [2] 50/13 63/23
feature [7] 27/2 58/13 58/14 58/19 59/6
62/20 63/11
features [1] 82/17
February [1] 12/18
February 2011 [1] 12/18
feedback [1] 62/3
feel [3] 59/12 78/18 79/14
felt [1] 23/15
few [3] 24/2 61/4 76/19
field [8] 34/21 49/21 50/3 50/4 50/5 50/20

\section*{52/24 84/3}
figure [6] 33/18 43/22 47/18 54/20 61/1

\section*{61/8}
figures [4] 24/24 25/8 25/10 82/20
file [2] 6/14 6/20
filed [15] 4/9 5/6 5/9 5/16 5/19 7/8 8/19
9/12 14/14 15/13 15/23 34/9 39/9 40/6 44/5
filing [11] 6/11 6/11 6/12 7/3 8/23 14/23
16/3 16/3 39/9 40/7 65/3
filling [1] 61/3
final [2] 15/12 79/20
finalized [1] 65/7
Financial [1] 10/23
financially [1] 78/14
find [3] 50/19 60/21 81/3
findings [1] 55/10
fine [4] 7/19 37/17 38/3 46/13
fingertips [1] 79/3
finish [1] 66/24
first [27] 5/4 16/16 17/13 17/16 18/23
21/17 23/1 23/7 24/5 24/10 26/2 26/5 26/6
26/20 29/4 54/13 54/16 56/6 56/10 58/3
58/11 59/23 60/2 64/23 65/13 69/22 71/19
firstly [1] 31/24
fixed [7] 24/13 25/4 25/7 27/2 44/11 44/21
64/10
flow [1] 77/17
flowed [3] 19/12 28/14 45/13
follow [3] 24/1 59/19 79/2
follow-up [1] 79/2
following [15] 15/19 23/7 24/11 26/3 26/7
54/14 56/7 58/4 59/23 60/2 63/10 65/13
74/9 74/16 78/8
foregoing [1] 32/18
forgetting [1] 67/14
formal [1] 16/4
forward [2] 75/18 76/9
found [2] 5/18 21/8
four [8] 35/5 35/7 48/1 48/7 49/6 49/16
51/9 51/15
four-year [1] 35/7
frame [1] 38/15
frankly [1] 65/22
fresh [1] 6/13
full [3] 10/19 72/18 80/20
fully [2] 38/24 52/18
function [1] 13/15
functional [1] 48/15
fund [4] 75/24 76/1 76/4 76/9
funds [2] 58/13 63/5
FURINO [10] \(2 / 5\) 10/8 10/15 11/6 11/7
11/20 11/24 12/4 12/9 68/22
further [8] 10/2 15/16 20/11 20/20 38/10 40/22 64/22 80/24
future [3] 37/7 82/4 82/5
\(G\)
G1 [27] 19/1 21/18 22/9 22/24 44/2 44/3
44/15 44/20 44/21 44/23 44/23 44/24 45/2
45/3 45/4 45/6 45/12 45/15 45/23 58/5
58/12 68/6 68/9 68/17 69/1 69/7 71/6
Gary [2] 1/15 4/14
gave [2] 24/15 25/8
general [4] 36/18 38/14 42/20 58/17
genesis [1] 12/12
germane [1] 58/22
get [27] 4/6 21/24 23/12 39/17 39/18 43/1
44/18 44/18 44/23 45/7 46/9 49/19 50/3
50/22 52/10 52/10 53/6 54/8 55/24 62/13
65/6 65/19 68/23 79/16 80/3 80/5 84/2
gets [6] 27/10 43/21 45/4 46/13 47/5 69/10
getting [9] 41/23 42/15 42/19 51/21 54/9
54/10 68/7 78/7 78/9
give [5] 26/9 38/11 65/15 72/14 76/18
given [6] 31/16 50/5 66/7 66/8 66/15 77/6
glad [3] 51/10 79/16 81/18
glitches [1] 65/6
go [16] 7/19 10/10 38/9 39/6 39/9 39/19
40/13 43/14 44/13 45/17 49/20 50/14 55/10
63/18 66/9 75/7
goes [1] 48/19
going [33] 7/6 8/7 25/4 26/1 29/11 30/7
33/3 33/15 34/17 36/16 43/1 48/11 48/20
50/14 50/18 51/2 51/9 52/12 52/23 54/20
54/22 54/24 55/7 55/20 65/19 68/24 69/20
70/3 72/13 75/5 79/6 80/3 84/3
gone [1] 43/13
good [16] 4/13 4/16 4/17 4/23 5/1 6/18
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline G & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 35 / 635 / 1135 / 18 \\
& \text { Hurricane [1] 83/22 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
|intended [1] 29/21 \\
intends [1] 71/18
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{10}{*}{\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline good...[10] 10/20 11/2 11/6 11/10 40/9 \\
\(51 / 152 / 16 ~ 56 / 20 ~ 78 / 17 ~ 79 / 19 ~\) \\
got [4] 65/9 73/2 74/8 78/5 \\
govern [1] 82/4 \\
Governor's [1] 84/5 \\
Grant [2] 1/20 4/21 \\
Great [1] 32/23 \\
growing [1] 4/5 \\
guess [13] 6/4 21/3 25/20 29/7 45/7 48/14 \\
51/4 53/24 56/15 60/12 63/21 64/6 78/3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}} & & intense [1] 83/23 \\
\hline & & intent [2] 65/1 66/20 \\
\hline & I'd [2] 4/2 51/16 & interest [36] 14/12 15/11 18/2 19/23 20/17 \\
\hline & I'Il [4] 11/14 38/11 42/7 69/22 & 27/3 27/7 27/9 27/14 27/16 30/19 30/24 \\
\hline & I'm [37] 6/15 7/21 10/21 11/3 11/11 24/13 & 31/4 31/12 31/17 31/20 32/13 32/17 32/18 \\
\hline & 25/1 29/7 30/2 30/7 32/6 36/22 37/22 41/23 & 33/13 58/7 58/23 64/5 64/9 64/16 72/18 \\
\hline & 42/18 43/21 45/7 47/18 48/2 49/13 49/19 & 72/20 72/24 73/1 73/5 73/7 73/13 73/14 \\
\hline & 51/4 51/10 52/22 60/21 62/1 62/3 64/1 67/5 & 73/17 77/7 77/21 \\
\hline & 67/24 68/24 69/16 69/20 74/15 74/16 75/6 & interested [1] 51/16 \\
\hline & 78/23 & internal [1] 48/18 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{H} & I've [5] 21/17 21/20 21/23 22/13 41/13 & interrelated [1] 36/10 \\
\hline & idea [1] 40/10 & Interrogatories [3] 2/8 2/9 2/12 \\
\hline had [20] 9/5 12/13 12/21 13/4 15/15 16/22 & Ideally [1] 41/8 & interstices [1] 61/4 \\
\hline 29/13 30/11 35/13 37/12 49/1 65/2 65/3 & identification [4] 5/7 5/10 8/2 80/20 & into [21] 6/6 38/8 38/20 44/18 44/18 55/1 \\
\hline 71/15 75/19 76/23 77/3 78/2 78/14 79/12 & identify [2] 8/21 12/14 & 56/13 58/14 58/16 61/2 63/9 63/10 65/9 \\
\hline half [4] 16/1 18/10 22/4 50/3 & if [72] 6/8 6/19 7/3 7/20 7/21 8/14 9/8 & 66/23 69/24 73/3 73/18 75/18 76/9 82/16 \\
\hline HAMPSHIRE [11] 1/1 1/4 11/1 11/5 11/9 & 10/18 20/9 20/23 22/5 23/1 23/5 24/1 24/13 & 82/20 \\
\hline 11/13 12/17 21/7 34/14 67/10 75/1 & 24/14 25/2 25/4 25/5 25/23 27/18 30/6 & inventory [1] 53/2 \\
\hline Hampton [3] 11/1 11/4 11/9 & 30/17 30/23 34/3 37/10 37/11 37/13 38/7 & investigate [2] 13/21 14/4 \\
\hline handle [1] 84/2 & 38/9 39/22 41/9 42/16 42/22 45/3 45/10 & investigated [1] 83/12 \\
\hline happen [4] 14/3 24/12 43/12 61/23 & 47/19 48/21 49/24 50/6 50/18 50/22 53/16 & investigating [1] 51/22 \\
\hline happened [2] 7/7 65/4 & 55/6 55/11 55/16 56/16 60/1 60/16 61/1 & involve [2] 37/12 37/15 \\
\hline happens [2] 42/21 74/17 & 61/23 62/13 64/6 64/9 64/16 64/24 65/1 & involved [1] 81/2 \\
\hline happy [2] 62/1 69/16 & 68/22 70/2 70/6 70/12 72/21 73/14 75/19 & involves [1] 4/3 \\
\hline hard [1] 25/21 & 76/2 76/2 76/7 77/7 78/7 80/5 82/22 83/21 & is [207] \\
\hline harmful [1] 66/16 & Ignatius [6] 1/10 2/8 6/2 9/23 22/13 83/8 & isn't [5] 25/6 25/21 28/11 56/3 71/21 \\
\hline Harrington [7] 1/11 2/9 28/17 42/3 64/7 & imagine [1] 79/9 & issue [18] 4/5 9/7 15/4 15/17 37/19 52/1 \\
\hline 69/21 79/22 & immediate [1] 13/19 & 52/6 55/22 56/22 57/13 62/2 67/23 70/1 \\
\hline Harrington's [1] 74/9 & immediately [6] 24/11 26/3 26/7 54/13 & 75/11 79/4 80/8 80/9 82/9 \\
\hline has [30] 5/23 7/7 11/16 18/7 20/5 20/10 & 58/3 59/23 & issued [3] 13/8 39/1 62/19 \\
\hline 26/12 27/17 27/17 28/17 30/1 31/16 34/19 & impact [8] 21/18 21/21 21/23 22/1 22/4 & issues [2] 70/20 81/24 \\
\hline 35/15 37/12 37/17 46/23 51/19 53/13 60/20 & 24/24 64/5 73/21 & it [183] \\
\hline 62/1 62/15 63/11 72/19 73/4 73/24 76/24 & impacted [1] 44/24 & it's [56] 7/20 7/21 8/14 23/1 25/4 28/18 \\
\hline 78/13 78/16 79/5 & impacts [5] 21/15 22/6 23/15 25/15 25/17 & 29/23 29/24 33/2 33/20 35/12 37/16 46/2 \\
\hline hasn't [3] 48/17 67/22 78/12 & implement [3] 24/21 24/22 28/19 & 46/12 47/16 48/7 48/16 49/23 49/24 49/24 \\
\hline have [118] & implementation [1] 77/2 & 50/2 50/4 50/5 50/6 50/6 50/20 51/1 51/3 \\
\hline haven't [1] 49/17 & implemented [2] 14/1 65/14 & 51/6 51/6 52/9 53/9 54/6 55/18 56/20 59/2 \\
\hline having [4] 23/11 34/15 75/7 81/2 & implementing [1] 25/19 & 59/12 60/7 60/15 62/12 62/13 66/18 67/4 \\
\hline He [1] 76/20 & important [4] 15/6 38/4 51/17 65/20 & 68/3 70/9 70/9 71/22 72/11 74/6 75/2 75/2 \\
\hline he's [2] 68/24 76/20 & importantly [1] 15/3 & 78/2 78/7 79/7 79/8 80/10 \\
\hline hear [2] 69/16 76/20 & in [218] & item [1] 78/15 \\
\hline heard [2] 70/2 83/14 & INC [3] 1/7 1/15 4/15 & items [3] 18/4 18/20 18/21 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{hearing [11] \(4 / 34 / 7\) 5/23 9/1 28/15 39/13
heli
\(40 / 681 / 481 / 681 / 784 / 10\)} & include [2] 48/10 56/5 & its [15] 15/18 15/24 19/11 34/20 37/12 \\
\hline & included [4] 7/4 65/3 65/12 81/8 & 38/19 58/5 58/16 59/15 64/13 82/9 82/22 \\
\hline helpful [2] 70/22 84/1 & including [4] 3/5 13/11 17/22 21/7 & 82/24 83/2 83/2 \\
\hline helps [1] 28/5 & income [2] 17/7 76/13 & itself [1] 54/10 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Hence [1] 53/8
here [19] 4/18 5/22 14/15 15/22 17/16 18/4} & incorrect [1] 69/3 & J \\
\hline & incorrectly [3] 12/21 42/12 46/21 & J \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{here [19] 4/18 5/22 14/15 15/22 17/16 18/4 18/20 43/23 45/11 45/20 46/7 50/13 58/2 63/2 63/7 66/24 69/3 72/14 76/18} & increase [1] 62/17 & January [5] 13/9 25/3 54/17 54/18 66/3 \\
\hline & incurred [1] 33/4 & January 1 [1] 66/3 \\
\hline herewith [1] 7/24 & incurring [1] 73/8 & January 1st [2] 54/17 54/18 \\
\hline high [1] 42/14 & inform [1] 80/2 & jibe [1] 70/12 \\
\hline higher [5] 53/22 69/8 74/11 74/12 80/4 & informal [1] 40/24 & job [1] 61/2 \\
\hline history [2] 9/14 34/16 & information [6] 9/10 36/23 39/5 40/20 & Jody [1] 1/13 \\
\hline hit [1] 61/18 & 79/3 84/4 & joint [7] 3/5 3/6 5/5 5/8 11/15 11/18 20/24 \\
\hline Hold [1] 57/5 & informational [4] 37/21 38/1 38/1 39/10 & judgment [1] 29/8 \\
\hline holds [1] 27/13 & infrastructure [2] 36/11 36/12 & July [3] 6/10 71/2 81/4 \\
\hline Hollenberg [9] 1/17 2/10 2/18 4/18 8/4 & initial [4] 7/8 7/20 30/11 65/3 & July 18th [1] 6/10 \\
\hline 22/16 28/8 63/20 81/14 & initially [4] 12/23 14/10 50/19 65/7 & July 31st [1] 71/2 \\
\hline hope [1] 67/4 & inspection [1] 21/2 & June [36] 22/9 24/23 25/12 25/14 26/5 \\
\hline hoping [1] 39/17 & install [3] 35/11 35/15 35/19 & 26/8 27/4 27/4 27/6 27/9 27/15 27/20 27/22 \\
\hline hour [9] 21/19 21/21 21/24 22/1 42/23 & installation [8] 13/2 35/10 47/22 48/5 48/6 & 29/12 30/21 31/18 32/20 33/1 33/24 54/23 \\
\hline 43/18 44/4 46/4 68/3 & 48/24 49/11 50/20 & 54/24 55/21 56/5 56/13 59/13 60/4 60/8 \\
\hline hours [20] 13/16 22/2 43/7 43/8 43/10 & installations [5] 21/3 21/7 51/12 52/12 & 60/18 61/11 62/16 62/18 64/1 64/10 66/11 \\
\hline 44/10 45/14 45/16 45/19 45/22 46/9 46/9 & 52/17 & 71/8 73/9 \\
\hline 67/20 67/22 68/5 68/9 68/10 68/12 68/14 & installed [5] 49/1 49/9 53/5 53/6 53/8 & June 1 [5] 22/9 31/18 56/5 56/13 64/10 \\
\hline 79/4 & instance [1] 82/11 & June 1st [19] 24/23 25/12 25/14 26/5 26/8 \\
\hline how [21] 8/11 33/15 34/5 35/2 36/10 36/18 & instead [1] 25/3 & 27/6 27/15 27/20 27/22 30/21 33/24 54/23 \\
\hline 39/1 42/14 42/18 43/2 43/7 45/19 47/18 & instrumented [2] 21/2 48/6 & 54/24 60/4 60/8 60/18 61/11 66/11 71/8 \\
\hline 50/18 51/8 53/12 54/20 55/1 61/22 74/15 & integrate [2] 58/16 62/17 & just [84] 5/3 9/9 20/15 20/23 22/4 22/20 \\
\hline 80/2 & integration [4] 63/9 63/10 82/16 82/20 & 22/21 22/22 24/9 25/2 25/24 26/21 28/11 \\
\hline however [2] 26/18 72/21 & integrity [1] 79/10 & 29/9 29/22 29/24 30/6 30/7 30/9 36/22 \\
\hline huh [9] 28/21 29/2 29/18 33/23 34/1 34/11 & intend [1] 80/2 & 36/22 36/23 39/10 39/12 39/17 40/13 42/4 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \(J\) & let's [16] 4/11 6/9 23/5 24/2 25/2 25/17 & 7/24 \\
\hline just... [57] 42/6 42/7 42/11 42/18 43/3 & 65/19 66/24 67/14 & 59/9 62/24 80/7 \\
\hline 45/11 46/9 46/12 48/21 49/16 51/3 52/8 & letter [2] 15/13 76/16 & May 2011 [1] 14/11 \\
\hline 52/16 54/14 56/16 56/24 59/18 59/20 61/14 & letters [1] 39/2 & maybe [11] 5/23 9/6 22/20 43/3 43/3 49/10 \\
\hline 61/16 61/23 62/5 62/13 63/4 63/17 63/22 & level [1] 19/15 & 51/3 55/18 59/20 68/22 69/4 \\
\hline 64/15 64/23 64/24 65/18 66/1 66/3 66/5 & levels [1] 47/14 & McFarland [2] 1/17 4/18 \\
\hline 66/6 67/6 68/19 68/22 69/12 69/21 70/20 & liability [1] 46/23 & McNamara [2] 22/21 41/22 \\
\hline 70/24 71/2 71/5 71/22 73/15 74/22 74/22 & Liberty [3] 10/24 11/4 11/9 & me [29] 4/21 6/19 8/8 17/12 22/21 23/4 \\
\hline 76/17 77/13 79/2 79/3 79/23 80/3 82/8 83/9 & light [3] 40/23 42/15 64/4 & 25/21 26/3 26/4 26/9 28/5 40/20 41/23 \\
\hline 83/15 84/1 & like [17] 4/2 6/24 20/1 22/5 26/4 36/5 & 42/11 43/3 43/21 45/7 46/13 47/5 51/3 \\
\hline  & 44/15 46/8 48/18 57/11 59/10 62/24 63/15 & 55/16 55/19 56/24 57/8 57/20 59/18 68/23 \\
\hline & & \\
\hline K & limited [1] 38 & [11] 5/15 42/ \\
\hline KAREN[6] 2/4 10/7 10/13 11/2 11/19 & lined [1] 52/13 & meaningless [2] 60/7 60/9 \\
\hline 27/17 & lines [1] 70/18 & meanings [3] 57/15 59/17 59/20 \\
\hline Karen's [1] 26/24 & listed [2] 18/4 19/5 & means [3] 55/6 58/10 79/9 \\
\hline keep [2] 52/7 84/3 & litigation [1] 15/5 & meant [1] 60/13 \\
\hline keeps [1] 66/16 & little [16] 8/8 9/1 24/14 25/1 30/12 39/12 & measurable [1] 70/21 \\
\hline kilowatt [28] 13/16 21/19 21/21 21/24 22/1 & 47/21 48/2 57/11 57/13 57/14 73/23 75/12 & measure [2] 70/15 70/19 \\
\hline 22/2 42/23 43/7 43/8 43/10 43/18 44/4 & 77/8 77/24 80/4 & measured [3] 44/11 44/20 45/1 \\
\hline 44/10 45/14 45/16 45/19 45/22 46/4 46/9 & load [8] 35/16 35/17 35/21 45/2 47/13 & Measurement [1] 11/11 \\
\hline 46/9 67/20 67/22 68/3 68/5 68/9 68/10 & 47/23 49/21 50/20 & measurements [1] 45/12 \\
\hline 68/12 68/14 & located [1] 12/16 & measures [1] 47/13 \\
\hline kilowatt-hour [7] 21/19 21/21 21/24 22/1 & locations [1] 48/7 & mechanical [1] 29/5 \\
\hline 42/23 46/4 68/3 & locked [1] 27/14 & mechanism [8] 19/13 36/19 49/15 50/13 \\
\hline kilowatt-hours [19] 13/16 22/2 43/7 43/8 & long [6] 25/13 26/23 27/13 48/22 60/3 60/7 & 58/1 58/6 58/13 59/6 \\
\hline 43/10 44/10 45/14 45/16 45/19 45/22 46/9 & longer [3] 9/22 73/15 78/9 & mechanisms [12] 16/19 17/2 18/22 18/23 \\
\hline 46/9 67/20 67/22 68/5 68/9 68/10 68/12 & look [13] 8/12 22/20 28/19 30/17 30/23 & 19/8 19/9 19/15 23/9 23/12 26/15 26/17 \\
\hline 68/14 & 38/20 45/17 46/7 55/14 60/8 70/19 72/21 & 29/6 \\
\hline kind [12] 29/8 46/19 55/14 57/13 59/14 & 77/8 & megawatt [1] 67/16 \\
\hline 60/8 67/6 69/11 70/8 70/19 73/9 79/2 & looked [3] 34/13 34/13 81/1 & mention [3] 9/3 9/4 83/20 \\
\hline kinds [1] 34/24 & looking [11] 6/19 34/15 46/13 53/14 53/15 & mentioned [1] 47/21 \\
\hline know [35] 8/18 17/12 23/6 25/13 34/13 & 62/3 65/23 65/23 66/7 74/14 75/12 & meter [6] 42/16 48/7 49/23 51/22 69/5 \\
\hline 34/15 34/15 36/24 43/2 43/6 43/7 45/1 45/3 & looks [2] 53/21 72/7 & 69/6 \\
\hline 46/4 48/9 50/3 52/5 52/6 52/7 52/8 52/14 & loss [2] 70/6 70/8 & metered [3] 13/15 45/2 45/22 \\
\hline 53/10 54/11 56/19 62/5 69/10 70/10 70/12 & losses [4] 46/6 70/3 70/15 70/17 & metering [4] 36/11 46/6 70/3 70/9 \\
\hline 72/5 72/24 73/19 79/6 79/7 80/6 80/12 & lost [3] 41/13 46/10 74/8 & meters [5] 45/18 45/18 46/3 52/10 69/24 \\
\hline known [3] 12/20 27/17 44/21 & Iot [5] 45/21 51/18 61/24 72/13 83/23 & methodology [2] 64/11 64/13 \\
\hline L & lots [1] 78/11 & Michael [1] 1/11 \\
\hline & Low [1] 76/13 & middle [1] 21/1 \\
\hline lab [2] 50/2 53/22 & lower [6] 16/21 42/15 42/19 43/18 44/4 & might [5] 18/11 39/9 39/13 55/24 59/3 \\
\hline label [2] 50/8 52/6 & 68/17 & million [8] 30/10 30/13 30/15 31/10 58/7 \\
\hline labeled [7] 13/4 42/12 46/21 47/11 47/24 & lump [2] 58/20 72/6 & 73/23 73/24 77/9 \\
\hline /23 50/19 & M & mind [1] 33/8 \\
\hline labeling [1] 47/17 & N & minimal [2] 34/1 64/5 \\
\hline labels [5] 46/19 48/3 48/22 49/17 50/23 & ma'am [1] 81/1 & minimum [1] 35/4 \\
\hline labor [1] 53/20 & Madam [2] 37/9 40/12 & minor [2] 70/22 75/10 \\
\hline laboratory [1] 50/6 & made [13] 14/22 15/9 27/8 30/11 30/12 & minus [1] 39/24 \\
\hline lack [1] 36/14 & 37/18 45/14 49/7 65/3 73/1 73/8 77/22 84/2 & minute [1] 74/8 \\
\hline \(\operatorname{lag}\) [3] 31/22 46/6 70/3 & maintain [1] 15/5 & mislabeled [4] 20/7 21/8 46/15 50/22 \\
\hline laid [2] 16/15 69/22 & major [3] 16/13 18/15 20/4 & mislabeling [4] 48/22 50/14 50/17 50/21 \\
\hline Lane [3] 11/1 11/4 11/9 & majority [1] 77/14 & miss [1] 46/14 \\
\hline language [4] 41/6 65/12 65/18 74/16 & make [27] 29/22 33/12 35/12 43/4 45/5 & missed [1] 52/22 \\
\hline large [2] 44/2 73/20 & 45/11 48/15 49/6 51/11 52/17 55/2 55/9 & misstated [1] 51/14 \\
\hline larger [1] 44/19 & 55/15 61/23 63/15 64/2 65/10 65/11 66/13 & mistake [3] 62/24 76/22 77/1 \\
\hline last [5] 59/19 66/4 69/17 74/8 83/22 & 72/1 72/2 72/10 76/22 78/17 79/13 80/12 & mistakes [1] 49/7 \\
\hline lastly [1] 73/12 & 82/23 & mixed [1] 68/8 \\
\hline later [1] 24/14 & makes [2] 47/23 55/10 & modified [1] 48/9 \\
\hline latter [1] 16/1 & making [5] 29/16 33/22 52/13 80/8 80/20 & moment [4] 22/18 22/20 40/13 63/17 \\
\hline laws [1] 69/22 & manufacturer [11] 20/6 20/12 37/5 38/17 & money [8] 31/12 31/19 33/14 33/17 51/4 \\
\hline LCR [1] 1/23 & 39/2 39/19 40/9 40/21 46/16 46/20 46/22 & 54/19 55/21 76/7 \\
\hline learned [1] 12/18 & manufacturer's [1] 46/17 & monies [1] 75/20 \\
\hline least [2] 28/4 28/22 & many [5] 6/17 34/5 43/7 51/8 53/12 & month [29] 22/3 23/1 23/6 24/5 24/11 25/5 \\
\hline leaving [1] 76/5 & map [1] 7/7 & 26/2 26/7 26/20 27/10 29/3 29/4 31/22 33/5 \\
\hline led [3] 16/7 36/19 74/4 & March [3] 8/9 8/19 8/19 & 35/20 45/16 45/24 46/3 54/13 54/16 54/21 \\
\hline left [2] 40/19 76/7 & mark [8] 2/4 5/6 5/10 7/15 10/6 10/12 & 56/6 56/10 58/3 59/23 60/2 61/18 62/19 \\
\hline legal [3] 37/10 37/15 55/22 & 10/21 37/14 & 65/13 \\
\hline length [1] 75/8 & marked [6] 5/24 6/10 6/21 7/1 7/24 16/10 & month's [2] 60/3 61/15 \\
\hline lengthy [3] 15/4 51/6 79/7 & Massachusetts [1] 21/8 & monthly [1] 22/3 \\
\hline less [11] 42/9 42/24 44/7 44/10 72/22 73/2 74/20 74/21 74/22 78/5 78/15 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { materials [1] 6/11 } \\
& \text { matter [11] 20/16 27/9 38/18 38/21 39/1 }
\end{aligned}
\] & months [5] 20/10 24/2 32/5 54/19 54/23 more [19] 11/17 18/10 25/5 39/5 39/12 \\
\hline let [8] 17/12 22/20 23/4 26/9 59/18 68/23 68/24 69/4 & 42/20 48/21 49/16 62/12 83/12 83/16 matters [5] 5/1 15/22 81/11 82/4 82/6 & 40/8 40/10 40/19 42/24 43/13 43/14 44/18 48/23 50/1 68/18 69/9 74/21 75/21 78/1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
morning [11] 4/13 4/16 4/17 4/23 10/20 11/2 11/6 11/10 29/10 63/24 64/12
most [5] 28/22 29/15 41/10 59/12 59/12
motion [4] 7/4 7/11 8/18 15/23
motions [2] 6/4 6/5
move [1] 79/16
moved [3] 48/3 48/22 49/17
movement [1] 49/10
\(\mathrm{Mr}[13]\) 2/7 2/11 2/19 2/20 10/5 10/18
12/11 15/18 16/9 20/22 20/22 30/6 36/7
Mr. [7] 4/12 20/13 37/17 63/12 64/21 81/21

\section*{83/21}

Mr. Collin [1] 20/13
Mr. Epler [5] 4/12 37/17 63/12 64/21 83/21
Mr. Speidel [1] 81/21
Ms [3] 2/10 2/18 41/21
Ms. [9] 8/4 21/14 22/16 22/21 28/8 32/23
41/22 63/20 81/14
Ms. Asbury [2] 21/14 32/23
Ms. Hollenberg [5] 8/4 22/16 28/8 63/20
81/14
Ms. McNamara [2] 22/21 41/22
much [8] 36/2 38/3 54/19 54/20 55/1 59/3 77/24 81/17
Mullen [2] 1/20 4/22
multiple [1] 63/7
multipliers [1] 49/4
municipalities [1] 84/4
my [28] 4/14 8/9 9/10 10/21 10/24 11/2
11/4 11/6 11/8 11/10 11/12 22/13 25/24
29/20 39/7 41/16 41/23 42/16 47/5 48/14
53/24 56/16 61/21 63/22 63/23 69/16 70/3 70/7

\section*{N}
name [9] 4/14 9/3 9/9 9/13 10/19 10/21 11/2 11/6 11/10
nature [7] 17/22 19/7 36/11 44/23 70/17 70/20 79/14
necessary [2] 48/14 50/17
need [14] 7/19 26/21 36/19 38/9 39/6
40/10 45/14 50/21 52/7 53/12 64/8 64/15
67/7 68/20
needing [1] 72/5
needs [3] 7/21 42/21 72/6
negotiated [3] 32/22 74/2 74/6
negotiations [1] 20/14
never [2] 14/3 30/4
new [19] 1/1 1/4 11/1 11/5 11/9 11/13
12/17 12/24 14/1 14/2 21/7 34/14 52/19
53/2 53/3 64/17 67/10 74/24 80/3
newly [1] 29/9
next [22] 22/7 22/22 23/13 23/16 23/22
33/12 37/1 47/5 55/17 59/13 62/16 62/18
65/24 66/2 66/6 71/20 72/1 74/17 74/19
75/19 76/9 82/21
no [37] 1/23 2/3 2/17 3/3 3/3 5/14 5/22 7/2
9/22 10/3 13/23 14/8 21/8 27/9 30/4 35/22 37/11 43/16 48/3 49/6 57/10 60/1 60/23
60/23 61/6 62/10 64/19 66/15 78/9 78/21
78/22 79/13 80/14 80/15 80/21 81/1 81/12
nodding [1] 9/23
noise [1] 69/12
non [20] 19/1 21/18 22/9 22/24 43/9 44/3
44/21 44/23 45/2 45/4 45/15 45/23 46/3
58/5 58/12 68/6 68/9 68/17 69/7 71/6 non-calendar [1] 46/3
Non-G1 [18] 19/1 21/18 22/9 22/24 44/3
44/21 44/23 45/2 45/4 45/15 45/23 58/5
58/12 68/6 68/9 68/17 69/7 71/6
non-Riverwoods [1] 43/9
none [1] 80/23
nor [2] 64/12 82/3
normal [10] 22/7 23/14 23/16 26/18 26/24
27/12 27/15 27/18 35/8 80/6
normally [4] 22/7 24/20 65/11 66/13
not [90]
note [3] 22/5 82/15 82/23
notes [1] 22/20
nothing [6] 5/18 5/23 10/4 64/17 67/4
76/23
notice [1] 45/20
noticed [1] 4/7
noticing [1] 47/20
notification [1] 80/9
November [10] 1/4 23/6 24/18 27/23 54/18
54/24 58/5 61/1 61/14 71/3
November 30th [6] 24/18 27/23 54/18
54/24 58/5 61/1
now [16] 6/10 18/15 21/11 26/4 28/14 33/22 34/24 35/8 38/13 50/17 54/21 55/14 72/5 72/5 76/22 77/20
number [14] 5/7 5/11 6/4 11/17 16/10
34/12 34/13 34/17 45/11 46/8 51/8 51/14 53/15 78/17
numbers [3] 24/15 30/8 44/22
0
objection [3] 37/17 56/21 80/19
objections [2] 7/2 37/11
obsolescent [1] 9/2
obtaining [1] 20/11
obviously [2] 47/23 52/9
OCA [13] 6/9 6/10 8/4 16/5 30/1 39/11
57/9 58/9 61/7 62/21 73/6 80/23 83/11
OCA's [1] 62/3
OCA-1 [1] 6/10
occasions [1] 34/17
occupation [1] 10/19
occur [2] 66/1 66/13
occurred [5] 15/10 16/23 18/14 65/5 81/4
occurs [1] 27/18
October [4] 5/6 13/9 37/6 62/8
October 2004 [1] 13/9
October 2015 [1] 62/8
October 4th [1] 37/6
odd [1] 46/20
off [12] 17/7 18/8 40/13 40/15 40/19 47/19
47/21 54/9 67/15 76/22 77/1 78/14
off-the-record [1] 40/15
offering [1] 36/22
office [9] 1/18 4/9 4/18 41/3 81/15 82/1
82/18 83/1 84/5
Officer [1] 10/23
official [2] 5/17 33/12
often [1] 35/2
oftentimes [1] 52/10
Oh [1] 51/10
okay [53] 7/21 8/15 8/15 10/11 11/14 16/9 20/22 21/10 21/14 22/12 24/9 25/20 26/11 28/3 30/17 32/4 32/12 32/21 32/23 34/3
35/9 36/22 38/11 40/3 40/12 43/21 44/3
45/7 46/1 46/11 46/24 47/3 47/18 47/21
48/11 48/14 49/20 50/12 51/13 54/6 54/8
54/18 55/6 56/15 60/6 63/19 68/11 68/15
69/4 69/15 70/22 71/9 71/14
on [117]
once[5] 6/18 13/17 13/18 26/15 52/6
one [32] 4/7 7/20 8/18 12/19 12/20 22/18
22/21 27/10 29/3 33/10 39/8 42/16 42/24
45/22 48/3 49/1 49/7 51/18 52/24 53/13
54/1 56/24 57/5 60/14 61/15 61/18 65/1
72/14 79/20 79/24 82/9 83/20
ones [3] 53/1 53/2 53/3
ongoing [1] 21/12
only [8] 8/8 25/16 50/22 52/1 53/8 77/9
77/19 79/9
onto [2] 48/11 79/16
onward [1] 58/10
open [3] 4/2 53/5 53/7
operating [1] 54/5
operation [1] 50/7
opportunity [1] 81/13
opposed [6] 33/17 64/1 64/11 64/12 66/2 76/21
options [3] 38/19 38/21 38/23
or [69] 9/1 9/13 11/21 12/1 17/7 18/8 18/11
20/6 20/7 20/12 22/3 24/2 24/5 24/12 24/17 26/7 27/24 27/24 28/24 31/4 31/8 31/10
32/14 33/1 33/14 33/24 35/20 38/1 38/17
39/20 42/10 45/5 46/6 46/16 47/7 48/17
48/18 48/21 49/2 49/16 49/23 50/12 52/20 53/2 54/3 55/9 55/10 56/9 56/22 59/6 64/19 66/2 66/3 68/7 70/19 74/3 74/4 75/7 75/21 77/6 78/2 78/19 80/2 80/7 81/6 82/1 82/2 82/3 82/5
oral [3] 41/1 41/9 61/3
order [12] 14/18 17/9 26/22 44/13 55/16
56/7 56/17 56/23 62/14 64/13 65/10 65/24 original [4] 6/11 6/24 8/24 9/2
other [44] 13/13 13/23 13/23 14/6 14/8
14/15 16/20 16/21 16/23 18/1 18/5 19/12
19/17 19/24 21/8 24/23 25/14 32/14 35/22
41/13 42/8 42/15 42/16 42/24 43/13 44/15 44/19 45/18 51/21 60/22 64/3 66/9 66/13
71/10 72/19 75/3 77/15 77/16 78/21 79/13

\section*{79/13 80/6 82/3 83/20}
otherwise [1] 40/1
our [34] 14/23 16/21 16/23 16/24 21/6 23/8 24/20 24/21 34/9 35/7 35/8 38/21 44/3 49/21 53/17 54/4 61/7 62/14 65/12 65/24 66/4 66/23 70/15 74/18 77/4 78/1 78/3 78/6 79/9 79/10 79/10 79/12 79/17 83/24 ourselves [1] 66/5
out [34] 7/3 16/15 24/17 28/18 30/18 35/20 42/13 43/22 44/11 45/10 45/17 46/17 47/18 49/20 50/14 50/19 52/23 53/18 53/20 54/20 60/21 61/8 68/7 69/10 69/22 70/11 73/6
73/11 73/15 73/20 73/21 75/12 75/24 84/3
outside [3] 37/12 38/20 53/17
outstanding [2] 7/9 8/18
over [26] 13/5 13/14 15/10 17/24 18/13
19/20 19/22 24/5 24/8 26/2 30/9 30/12
45/23 46/3 54/12 58/2 72/11 73/11 73/23
74/1 77/5 77/8 77/20 78/14 78/16 83/3
overbilled [1] 67/16
overbilling [6] 16/22 16/24 19/10 31/21 36/10 42/9
overcharge [5] 13/4 13/6 13/10 15/2 77/8
overcharged [2] 14/12 68/5
overcharges [7] 14/20 15/10 16/17 17/5
17/10 18/9 18/17
overcollected [1] 31/13
overcollection [2] 19/16 19/19
overmetered [1] 67/12
overpaid [1] 74/15
overpayment [2] 74/19 74/23
overview [3] 16/12 36/18 38/14
owe [1] 74/22
own [3] 19/11 59/14 59/15
owned [1] 13/22
P
packet [2] 7/15 11/18
page [10] \(2 / 3\) 2/17 3/3 16/16 20/3 20/3
20/24 21/1 30/17 57/23
Page 4 [1] 20/3
Pages [1] 36/9
paid [14] 15/7 15/9 18/1 18/2 30/9 30/24
31/4 31/5 31/11 31/19 69/9 72/18 74/10 78/13
panel [6] 2/4 11/15 36/5 36/6 42/7 83/15
papers [1] 7/6


\(\frac{\mathrm{S}}{\text { small... [4] } 70.570675 / 1075 / 10}\)
smoothed [1] 73/20
so [127]
sold [1] 46/22
solid [1] 53/7
solution [2] 79/15 82/8
some [32] 15/22 16/23 26/10 30/7 36/8
37/18 39/17 39/18 40/21 40/23 41/9 42/8 46/23 47/6 53/3 55/15 57/14 60/10 60/12
64/24 65/4 65/19 69/20 70/2 70/3 70/8 71/2
71/3 73/21 75/16 76/10 81/19
somebody [2] 67/14 67/17
somehow [1] 77/6
someone [4] 42/18 45/19 50/23 67/7
something [19] 8/4 28/15 29/9 29/24 30/1
34/4 38/7 \(42 / 10\) 45/18 47/8 47/20 48/1
48/18 53/15 53/17 70/20 74/3 78/18 80/7
sometime [1] 61/16
sorry [10] \(6 / 15\) 31/8 32/6 37/22 41/24
52/22 67/5 67/24 74/15 78/24
sort [3] 23/2 40/21 81/19
sorted [1] 69/10
sounds [3] 6/24 62/24 70/4
spare [1] 52/19
spares [2] 52/20 54/6
speak [2] 56/20 61/7
specific [3] 59/16 59/20 80/9
specifically [5] 11/18 36/6 44/20 45/1 81/7 spectrum [1] 70/21
Speidel [8] 1/19 2/11 2/19 4/20 36/1 39/5
40/22 81/21
spent [1] 79/4
spin [1] 42/17
split [2] 73/24 74/5
spread [1] 68/10
staff [22] \(1 / 19\) 4/10 4/21 8/23 16/5 20/8
29/14 39/8 39/11 57/8 58/9 59/3 62/21 79/4
81/17 82/1 82/5 82/7 82/10 82/18 83/3
83/10
stake [1] 73/23
standardized [1] 47/12
stands [1] 59/15
start [13] 25/2 27/23 33/4 33/16 33/17
54/22 55/2 55/17 57/18 59/10 60/18 62/9 63/24
started [1] 25/5
starting [13] 10/18 13/1 25/7 25/8 25/12 27/4 30/21 56/10 56/13 62/16 62/18 64/8 64/16
starts [3] 27/10 35/19 60/12
state [9] 1/1 10/19 35/10 53/16 74/15
74/16 74/22 74/24 75/11
stated [4] 42/6 46/21 51/11 71/21
statement [4] 59/19 59/22 60/7 60/9
STATEMENTS [1] 2/17
stating [1] 15/14
status [5] 14/21 20/9 21/2 21/5 41/2
statutes [1] 67/10
stay [1] 80/17
staying [1] 52/15
steps [3] 13/19 13/21 34/19
Steve [1] 4/22
Steven [2] \(1 / 201 / 23\)
still [5] 24/21 48/16 49/11 66/16 76/8
stock [1] 52/21
stop [1] 38/9
storm [1] 83/22
stranded [8] 13/12 19/4 21/22 22/10 23/3
23/10 71/1 71/11
strikes [1] 51/3
striking [1] 80/19
structure [1] 61/3
stuff [1] 51/24
subject [6] 24/10 31/23 32/4 32/10 49/9

67/3
subsequent [3] 7/9 7/10 14/23
subsequently [2] 15/7 15/13
successful [2] 20/10 39/23
such [4] 37/8 46/16 70/18 82/6
suggesting [1] 33/11
suggestion [1] 40/6
sum [2] 58/20 72/6
summary [3] 12/12 37/6 39/10
summer [1] 82/21
superfluous [1] 55/3
supplier [1] 46/16
supply [2] 17/23 18/1
support [1] 59/14
supporting [3] 14/14 15/19 16/1
supports [1] 81/16
supposed [2] 64/18 69/8
sure [9] 35/12 38/6 48/16 49/6 52/13 52/14
52/17 69/16 79/13
suspenders [1] 52/9
suspicious [1] 53/21
swear [1] 10/2
sworn [5] 10/8 10/12 10/13 10/14 10/15
system [13] 13/13 14/5 36/12 36/14 46/5
46/6 69/24 70/3 70/5 70/8 70/17 75/15
77/15
SYSTEMS [3] 1/7 1/15 4/15
T
take[13] 5/2 8/12 17/7 17/12 17/14 22/7
22/20 55/20 73/15 78/15 80/23 82/20 83/19
taken [6] 34/20 73/4 73/18 75/4 75/24 79/8
takes [1] 27/12
taking [2] 38/23 73/3
talk [3] 24/10 30/7 51/17
talked [3] 28/15 34/4 69/11
talking[7] 28/13 28/14 32/23 33/21 40/19 63/1 63/1
talks [1] 67/5
taps [3] 46/19 47/10 47/24
\(\operatorname{tax}[24]\) 67/6 67/8 67/9 67/13 67/19 68/1
68/2 68/13 68/20 68/21 68/23 69/1 69/2
69/5 69/7 69/9 74/7 74/10 74/19 74/20
74/22 74/23 75/9 77/12
technical [1] 16/6
tell [1] 42/11
telling [1] 26/4
tells [1] 55/16
ten [2] 31/22 32/5
ten-month [1] 31/22
term [2] 36/14 71/21
terms [12] 18/6 28/13 29/10 29/16 29/19
33/10 52/5 57/15 58/17 59/16 64/5 75/8
territory [2] 34/14 34/14
test [17] 35/7 35/20 47/7 47/12 48/6 48/10 48/14 48/15 50/3 50/6 51/2 51/20 52/2 52/4 52/24 54/2 78/3
tested [3] 47/10 50/2 53/18
testimony [24] 3/5 3/6 5/2 5/8 7/5 7/13
8/19 8/24 9/4 11/16 11/19 12/2 12/6 12/7
14/15 15/19 16/1 20/24 30/19 34/9 36/7
36/9 67/1 71/18
testing [11] 21/6 21/11 47/1 47/3 47/12
47/20 48/9 49/15 51/2 52/20 53/21
than [21] 16/21 18/10 24/14 25/5 43/18
45/19 50/1 52/13 53/4 53/4 53/22 60/15
68/17 69/8 72/23 73/2 74/11 74/12 78/15 80/4 80/6
thank [48] 4/13 4/15 8/15 12/11 21/10
21/14 22/12 22/15 22/17 23/24 28/5 32/23
35/23 35/24 36/2 39/4 40/3 40/18 41/12
41/16 41/19 42/1 46/14 54/8 64/14 66/22
67/1 69/15 71/14 71/16 78/20 78/22 80/13
80/15 80/17 80/21 81/8 81/15 81/20 81/22
| 82/24 83/1 83/5 83/6 83/17 83/18 84/6 84/7| that [470]
that's [53] 7/19 16/10 17/13 17/15 23/23
26/20 27/14 28/3 29/24 30/22 31/3 31/9
32/2 33/7 34/12 38/2 41/6 43/1 43/21 44/4 44/6 46/13 46/21 49/6 49/13 49/18 50/4 52/13 53/17 53/19 53/19 54/8 54/18 59/14 60/9 61/21 64/11 65/12 65/14 65/20 69/3 69/14 70/17 70/22 71/14 73/23 75/3 76/12 76/15 76/16 77/11 78/6 83/20
their [19] 12/15 12/15 13/23 22/3 26/18
43/24 44/10 44/10 44/21 45/1 45/2 45/17
45/18 52/11 59/14 61/2 69/7 73/2 75/17
them [15] 19/12 19/15 26/14 26/17 26/19
26/19 44/9 44/16 44/22 45/17 46/19 56/12 61/16 66/3 73/1
then [40] 10/4 14/1 14/10 24/4 24/15 25/2 25/3 26/16 26/24 29/4 30/12 31/18 32/4
43/4 43/7 44/3 45/17 46/18 47/5 47/5 47/22 48/1 53/21 54/17 54/20 55/8 55/13 56/15 60/6 63/9 65/8 65/21 67/12 68/24 69/9
71/23 72/6 80/16 81/9 81/13
theoretically [2] 72/23 73/7
theory [1] 60/5
there [55] 5/1 6/1 6/2 6/2 6/3 6/17 7/6 7/8 7/10 11/18 13/2 13/23 13/24 14/8 16/13 18/19 18/23 19/24 21/1 24/14 30/23 31/1 31/11 31/16 31/18 33/8 33/13 34/10 35/17 36/8 37/3 45/13 46/14 47/14 48/23 52/9
53/5 53/24 57/18 58/1 58/7 64/4 64/8 65/6
66/9 67/22 68/8 70/11 70/12 70/16 74/3
76/24 77/3 78/21 79/13
there's [23] 9/15 19/1 21/1 27/1 31/22
37/11 37/17 38/7 42/21 45/21 47/6 49/5
50/13 60/12 61/24 63/6 66/15 71/23 71/24
72/13 72/24 78/11 81/10
therefore [3] 44/9 44/21 58/21
these [48] 6/10 16/14 16/19 17/9 19/5 19/7 19/9 19/10 19/14 19/21 19/21 20/4 20/9
22/6 24/15 24/22 26/14 26/15 27/3 27/7
33/9 33/9 41/2 42/7 46/15 46/17 47/2 47/6 49/8 51/8 51/11 51/15 52/20 53/1 54/4 57/15 58/13 59/5 59/16 65/11 66/8 70/5 73/21 78/2 78/5 78/7 78/9 82/4
they [36] 9/2 9/4 9/5 13/24 13/24 15/13
16/22 19/15 19/18 38/24 43/9 43/10 43/16 43/17 43/18 44/7 45/5 47/18 47/24 58/14
59/4 59/10 59/11 59/12 59/22 60/21 61/1 61/2 61/14 62/17 68/7 72/23 73/2 75/18 79/17 80/3
they'Il [1] 60/16
they're [13] 44/2 45/23 46/21 47/1 47/3 53/3 53/4 53/8 53/10 53/10 61/11 71/6 71/7 thing [9] 22/21 25/16 52/1 66/6 66/11 66/18 76/13 79/8 83/20
things [13] 5/16 14/16 30/6 38/8 45/21
46/15 46/17 51/18 65/1 66/9 70/5 73/18 75/15
think [52] 6/24 7/6 7/18 8/14 9/16 15/21
28/19 29/13 30/18 34/1 34/7 37/16 37/19
37/20 38/2 38/3 38/4 39/7 40/5 40/10 40/24 41/8 42/20 46/20 50/16 50/17 51/7 51/11 52/7 52/15 55/24 56/20 57/13 59/2 59/9
59/15 61/8 61/17 62/21 62/23 64/14 66/15
66/16 66/18 66/20 69/12 74/8 76/17 78/11
79/11 80/6 80/8
thinking [1] 64/6
third [4] 18/8 30/23 60/2 60/3
this [160]
thorough [2] 83/12 84/1
thoroughly [1] 83/13
those [41] 7/6 13/8 16/20 21/24 23/12
24/24 25/15 25/16 25/18 26/17 29/6 33/4
34/23 35/2 35/4 35/16 36/20 39/3 39/19
41/15 41/16 42/23 44/14 47/16 48/7 49/10

\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline W \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
will [28] 8/16 17/14 18/23 19/20 19/22 \\
20/8 20/11 26/17 27/7 27/21 27/22 28/14 \\
39/23 40/1 45/3 48/2 51/15 53/18 60/18 \\
69/16 70/6 74/19 74/20 80/3 80/4 80/9 \\
83/18 83/21 \\
willing [2] 41/11 67/15 \\
wire [1] 49/2 \\
wires [3] 49/10 53/6 53/9 \\
withdrawing [1] 15/16 \\
withdrawn [1] 9/18 \\
within [4] 35/20 36/8 50/7 63/8 \\
without [6] 15/4 47/19 59/4 60/10 65/4 \\
80/5 \\
WITNESS [1] 2/4 \\
witnesses [7] 4/24 10/2 10/18 11/15 22/14 36/6 41/23 \\
won't [6] 27/1 27/14 27/16 74/21 74/21 76/17 \\
wondering [1] 51/4 \\
word [8] 28/24 62/24 63/2 63/7 64/17 \\
64/19 64/20 67/4 \\
words [2] 51/21 70/4 \\
work [1] 17/2 \\
workable [1] 39/14 \\
working [2] 12/13 49/11 \\
workings [1] 19/13 \\
works [1] 43/2 \\
world [1] 70/11 \\
worry [1] 51/18 \\
would [139] \\
wouldn't [10] 23/21 42/17 43/10 59/5 \\
61/22 62/7 63/24 66/1 67/18 76/9 \\
write [4] 17/7 18/8 67/15 78/14 \\
write-off [1] 78/14 \\
writing [1] 39/12 \\
written [3] 41/9 55/8 63/4 \\
wrong [2] 67/21 68/10
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Y \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
year [22] 8/9 16/2 18/13 21/8 35/7 59/13 62/16 62/18 72/5 72/11 73/5 73/10 73/13 73/19 74/1 75/16 75/16 75/21 76/8 78/3 78/7 78/7 \\
year's [2] 75/19 76/9 \\
years [11] 14/11 19/23 35/5 48/2 48/7 49/6 49/16 51/9 51/15 72/5 72/8 yes [68] 7/17 8/20 9/8 9/19 10/20 11/22 11/23 11/24 12/9 12/10 12/13 14/23 15/21 16/13 17/12 18/19 20/2 20/19 21/17 22/17 23/4 27/5 28/2 28/6 29/13 30/11 30/16 31/9 31/15 31/22 32/3 32/9 32/11 32/18 33/19 34/2 35/1 36/21 37/21 38/2 40/23 41/8 42/20 43/5 43/20 44/2 44/12 45/9 55/5 56/14 57/2 57/22 58/18 59/1 60/5 61/19 63/6 68/4 68/9 70/20 70/21 72/3 72/9 74/6 74/13 80/6 81/22 83/8 you [263] \\
you'd [2] 19/24 55/17 \\
you'll [2] 25/4 56/4 \\
you're [38] 6/2 6/19 7/15 7/19 8/5 8/8 25/3 26/1 26/4 26/5 28/1 28/12 30/20 31/20 33/3 33/21 35/11 42/22 43/6 48/11 48/21 50/9 50/14 51/9 52/14 52/23 54/21 54/22 55/19 56/3 56/8 56/9 56/11 60/14 66/19 69/23 77/13 80/17 \\
you've [5] 25/20 65/9 74/15 76/11 83/14 your [21] 10/19 10/19 11/21 12/7 20/13 20/14 22/20 30/18 31/20 33/8 34/4 49/14 50/20 52/5 53/1 59/19 70/5 75/12 76/20 79/3 83/16
\end{tabular} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}```

