

From: Stephen Andrews [<mailto:andrews.stephen.m@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2017 3:19 PM
To: customer-service@pennichuck.com; PUC:
Subject: Pennichuck East Rate Increase

Firstly, it is unreasonable to schedule a public hearing for rate increases exactly 3 business days prior to Christmas when nearly everyone is pre-occupied with the holiday. This is clearly intentional.

As for the rate increases, I have no doubt that Pennichuck will present data showing that the cost to operate Pennichuck East has grown. Prior to Pennichuck owning the system known as Pennichuck East, the system was in poor repair. The prior operator cut corners, failed to properly manage the system and suffered from poor, corroding supply lines - All of which was a self-created condition.

Now that Pennichuck is running the system, no one would be surprised that they have had to invest in the system and continue to be plagued by prior mismanagement.

However, what is missing from this equation is the discussion that residents on this system already pay the highest rates in New Hampshire. The published increase for my system in Windham is to \$53.09/\$55.51 per 100 cubic feet. - The rates for Salem NH next door are a mere \$3.45 per 100 cubic feet -- nearly just 6%! of Pennichuck rates.

There is no doubt Pennichuck will demonstrate high costs, but what obligation do they have to contain costs when rates are established by cost + methods. Further, what obligation does a consumer have to compensate a utility for a poor investment. Current Pennichuck ownership purchased the water systems. Under what formula was the value established for purchasing failing infrastructure? Why is this simply a pass through? Shouldn't Pennichuck shareholders and bondholders bear the cost of over-valuing the private systems?