THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

BEFORE THE NEW HAMPSHIRE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

PREPARED TESTIMONY OF CHRISTOPHER J. GOULDING

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE d/b/a EVERSOURCE ENERGY

2018 RELIABILITY ENHANCMENT PROGRAM RECONCILIATION AND REQUEST FOR PROGRAM CONTINUATION

Docket No. DE 17-XXX

1	Q.	Please state your name, business address and position.
2	A.	My name is Christopher J. Goulding. My business address is 780 North Commercial
3		Street, Manchester, NH. I am employed by Eversource Energy Service Company as the
4		Manager of New Hampshire Revenue Requirements and in that position I provide service
5		to Public Service Company of New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource Energy ("Eversource"
6		or the "Company").
7	Q.	Have you previously testified before the Commission?
8	A.	Yes, I have.
9	Q.	What are your current responsibilities?
10	A.	I am responsible for the coordination and implementation of all Distribution revenue
11		requirements calculations for Eversource, as well as the filings associated with
12		Eversource's Energy Service ("ES") rate, Stranded Cost Recovery Charge ("SCRC"),
13		Transmission Cost Adjustment Mechanism ("TCAM"), and Alternate Default Energy
14		("ADE") rate.
15	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony?
16	A.	The purpose of my testimony is: (1) to provide a detailed reconciliation of capital and
17		O&M expenses currently included in rates for the actual and forecasted Reliability
18		Enhancement Program ("REP") investments for the timeframe of April 1, 2017 through

1		December 31, 2017; and (2) to seek approval of a 12-month continuation of the REP
2		covering the period from January 1, 2018 to December 31, 2018.
3	Q.	What is the overall average customer distribution rate change necessary to continue
4		delivering the benefits of the investments provided under the REP to Eversource's
5		customers?
6	A.	Under the proposal set forth by the Company in this filing to reconcile the current REP
7		investments, and the investments over the 12 months ending December 31, 2018,
8		Eversource is requesting an increase of \$0.021 cents/kWh to the current Distribution rates
9		for effect from February 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018 attributable to the REP
10		continuation.
11	Q.	What are the benefits that customers have been realizing due to the REP?
12	A.	The REP was initially developed as part of the settlement in the PSNH rate case in DE
13		06-028. Please refer to the testimony of Lee Lajoie and Brian Dickie for a detailed
14		description of the benefits that customers are realizing as a result of the REP.
15	Q.	Please describe the detailed support for the reconciliation of the REP investments
16		for actual and forecasted investments through December 31, 2017 and the revenue
17		requirement associated with the proposed investments for the 12 months ending
18		December 31, 2018.
19	A.	Submitted with my testimony are a series of attachments explaining the revenues and
20		expenses. Attachment CJG-1, page 1, provides a summary of the forecasted revenue
21		requirements associated with the January 1, 2018 to December 31, 2018 period, along
22		with the forecasted December 31, 2017 carryover amounts. The forecasted revenue
23		requirements include the operations and maintenance spending which includes funding
24		for the Troubleshooter organization and the Operations and Maintenance ("O&M")
25		portion of the REP capital investments, the depreciation expense and the return
26		associated with the actual and forecasted REP investments from January 1, 2018 through
27		December 31, 2018. Pages 2 and 3 provide a breakdown of the REP capital additions for

2017 and 2018 by month, as well as the associated accumulated depreciation, and accumulated deferred income taxes, along with the return. Pages 4 and 5 provide the calculation of the book depreciation for the REP capital additions taking into account the month the additions were placed in service. Pages 7 through 11 calculate the tax depreciation by investment year and incorporate the impact of bonus depreciation on the respective year.

Page 12 provides the calculation for the accumulated deferred income taxes ("ADIT") due to the timing issue of the recognition of book depreciation versus tax depreciation. The ADIT is used to reduce the rate base shown on pages 2 and 3 of Attachment CJG-1. Page 13 provides the rate of return based on the Company's current capital structure and weighted average cost of debt, along with the allowed ROE per the Company's last rate case. Pages 14 and 15 provide the reconciliation of actual operations and maintenance spending, depreciation expense, return associated with the actual REP investments for the period July 2016 to June 2017 as and the actual and forecasted period of July 2017 to December 2017 with the revenue level included in rates for the REP during those time periods.

Q. Please describe how the forecasted O&M expense and Capital investment have been included in Attachment CJG-1.

A. The O&M expense of \$2.350 million annually for January through December 2018 has been included as part of the revenue requirement calculation on Page 1 of Attachment CJG-1. The budgeted capital spending of \$9.0 million for January through December 2018 has been included in the calculations on Page 3 of Attachment CJG-1. The level of O&M funding and capital investment resulted from discussions with the Staff and OCA prior to this filing being made, consistent with the Order No. 26,034 issued in Docket No. DE 17-076 on June 28, 2017.

1	Q.	Please describe what is presented in Attachment CJG-2.
2	A.	Page 1 and Page 2 of Attachment CJG-2 provides the REP investments placed in service
3		by program for the period July 2016 through June 2017 and July 2017 to October 2017
4		respectively. Additionally, detail on the accounts that the investments are charged to has
5		been identified under each program. Page 3 of Attachment CJG-2 provides the proposed
6		2018 REP budget for calendar year 2018 as well as a high-level description of the capital
7		program along with the funding request for the O&M portion of capital and the
8		Troubleshooter organization.
9	Q.	Has the Company provided additional information on the benefits of the
10		Troubleshooter organization in this filing?
11	A.	Yes. Additional information on the benefits for reliability of the Troubleshooter
12		organization has been provided in the testimony of Lee Lajoie and Brian Dickie.
13	Q.	Has the Company continued to include the Enhanced Tree Trimming ("ETT") and
	Ų.	mas the Company continued to include the Emianced Tree Trimming (ETT) and
14	Q.	Hazard Tree Removal program as a capital investment in the REP?
	Q. A.	2 0
14		Hazard Tree Removal program as a capital investment in the REP?
14 15		Hazard Tree Removal program as a capital investment in the REP? Yes, for now. ETT has been a capital expense of the company in New Hampshire for
14 15 16		Hazard Tree Removal program as a capital investment in the REP? Yes, for now. ETT has been a capital expense of the company in New Hampshire for nearly 20 years, and for about as long in Massachusetts and Connecticut. ETT both
14151617		Hazard Tree Removal program as a capital investment in the REP? Yes, for now. ETT has been a capital expense of the company in New Hampshire for nearly 20 years, and for about as long in Massachusetts and Connecticut. ETT both extends the life of the conductors and improves their performance and is therefore
14 15 16 17 18		Hazard Tree Removal program as a capital investment in the REP? Yes, for now. ETT has been a capital expense of the company in New Hampshire for nearly 20 years, and for about as long in Massachusetts and Connecticut. ETT both extends the life of the conductors and improves their performance and is therefore appropriately treated as a capital expense. Furthermore, a review of the general
14 15 16 17 18 19		Hazard Tree Removal program as a capital investment in the REP? Yes, for now. ETT has been a capital expense of the company in New Hampshire for nearly 20 years, and for about as long in Massachusetts and Connecticut. ETT both extends the life of the conductors and improves their performance and is therefore appropriately treated as a capital expense. Furthermore, a review of the general accounting standards around similar activities, such as initial clearing to a right-of-way
14 15 16 17 18 19		Hazard Tree Removal program as a capital investment in the REP? Yes, for now. ETT has been a capital expense of the company in New Hampshire for nearly 20 years, and for about as long in Massachusetts and Connecticut. ETT both extends the life of the conductors and improves their performance and is therefore appropriately treated as a capital expense. Furthermore, a review of the general accounting standards around similar activities, such as initial clearing to a right-of-way border and related clearing of hazard/danger trees outside the border, supports treatment
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		Hazard Tree Removal program as a capital investment in the REP? Yes, for now. ETT has been a capital expense of the company in New Hampshire for nearly 20 years, and for about as long in Massachusetts and Connecticut. ETT both extends the life of the conductors and improves their performance and is therefore appropriately treated as a capital expense. Furthermore, a review of the general accounting standards around similar activities, such as initial clearing to a right-of-way border and related clearing of hazard/danger trees outside the border, supports treatment of ETT as a capital expense item
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		Hazard Tree Removal program as a capital investment in the REP? Yes, for now. ETT has been a capital expense of the company in New Hampshire for nearly 20 years, and for about as long in Massachusetts and Connecticut. ETT both extends the life of the conductors and improves their performance and is therefore appropriately treated as a capital expense. Furthermore, a review of the general accounting standards around similar activities, such as initial clearing to a right-of-way border and related clearing of hazard/danger trees outside the border, supports treatment of ETT as a capital expense item Relative to REP, in 2006 when the initial REP was established for PSNH, it included

In Docket No. DE 13-127, and following inquiry by Commission Staff in particular, the 1 2 Commission approved the reclassification of hazard tree removal from O&M to capital 3 along with the ETT in Order No. 25,534 (June 27, 2013) for essentially the same reasons ETT is capitalized. Accordingly, ETT and hazard tree removal are included as capital 4 expenses for calendar year 2018. 5 Q. Please explain Attachment CJG-3? 6 7 A. Attachment CJG-3 shows, for each distribution rate charge in the Company's tariff, the 8 adjustment for the recovery requested in Docket No. DE 17-160 along with this proposed 9 REP adjustment and the impact on distribution rates. 10 Q. Could you please explain how this proposal differs from the current program and whv? 11 12 A. Yes. As noted previously, prior to making this filing, the Company engaged in discussions with Staff and OCA over a period of months. As a result of those 13 discussions, the Company's 2018 proposal presents a "scaled back" program as compared 14 to the current REP. That is, the REP proposal has been refined to only a few categories 15 16 of capital and O&M items. 17 Also, the Company is proposing other changes that will impact the REP in the future. Specifically, following on the discussions with the Staff and OCA, the Company is 18 proposing that that the capitalization of ETT and Hazard Tree Removal costs will cease 19 after 2018. While these costs may appropriately be treated as capital expenses for the 20 21reasons stated above, Eversource understands that the treatment of similar costs by other New Hampshire utilities is to include them as O&M expenses, rather than capital 22 expenses. Accordingly, Eversource is proposing that for 2018 ETT and Hazard Tree 23 24 Removal will remain as capital expenditures, but shall be moved to O&M expenditures 25 beginning in 2019. Calendar year 2018 will act as an accounting transition year for ETT 26 and Hazard Tree Removal vegetation management activities.

Also, based upon the discussions with the Staff and OCA, the Company is proposing 1 2 changes to the funding and accounting for Troubleshooters. As described in the 3 testimony of Lee Lajoie and Brian Dickie, the Company is proposing that in 2018 some costs of the Troubleshooters will be assigned out of REP, and that funding for 4 Troubleshooters would no longer be included as part of the REP at all beyond December 5 31, 2018. With the adjustments to the scope of activities, the overall level of 6 7 investments, the changes in accounting for vegetation management and the end of the 8 inclusion of the Troubleshooters, Eversource understands that the proposed program is 9 one the Staff and OCA agree should be implemented in 2018.

10 Q. Does Eversource require Commission approval of this proposal by a specific date?

- 11 A. No. However, Eversource requests approval of the proposed continuation of the REP and associated funding as soon as reasonably possible.
- 13 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 14 A. Yes, it does.