

1

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

2

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

3

4

July 2, 2009 - 9:36 a.m.  
Concord, New Hampshire

5

6

RE: DE 09-114  
PUBLIC SERVICE CO. OF NEW HAMPSHIRE:  
Petition for Approval of Transmission  
Cost Adjustment Mechanism Rates.)

8

9

10

PRESENT: Chairman Thomas B. Getz, Presiding  
Commissioner Clifton C. Below

11

12

Jody Carmody, Clerk

13

14

APPEARANCES: Reptg. Public Service Co. of New Hampshire:  
Gerald M. Eaton, Esq.

15

16

Reptg. Residential Ratepayers:  
Meredith Hatfield, Esq., Consumer Advocate  
Office of Consumer Advocate

17

18

Reptg. PUC Staff:  
Suzanne G. Amidon, Esq.

19

20

21

22

23

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

24

## I N D E X

PAGE NO.

WITNESS PANEL: ROBERT A. BAUMANN  
STEPHEN R. HALL

Direct examination by Mr. Eaton 5

Cross-examination by Mr. Mullen 14

\* \* \*

## E X H I B I T S

EXHIBIT NO. DESCRIPTION PAGE NO.

1 Petition for Approval of 4  
Transmission Cost Adjustment  
Mechanism Rates (06-12-09)

2 Testimony of Robert A. Baumann, 6  
with attachments

3 Testimony of Stephen R. Hall, 7  
with attachments

4 Revised attachments to the 8  
Testimony of Stephen R. Hall  
(06-25-09)

5 Summary of proposed rate changes 10  
(5 pages)

\* \* \*

CLOSING STATEMENTS BY:

Ms. Hatfield 21

Ms. Amidon 21

Mr. Eaton 22

{DE 09-114} {07-02-09}

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Good morning. We'll  
3 open the hearing in docket DE 09-114. On June 12, 2009,  
4 Public Service Company of New Hampshire filed a petition  
5 requesting approval of its reconciliation of transmission  
6 costs and revenues for calendar year 2008, as well as  
7 approval of an annual forecasted retail transmission  
8 revenue requirement and related costs for the period  
9 August 1 through June 30, 2010. PSNH estimated that there  
10 will be an increase on August 1, 2009 in the average rate  
11 from the current 0.935 cents per kilowatt-hour to 1.195  
12 cents per kilowatt-hour. Order of notice was issued on  
13 June 18 setting the hearing for this morning. I'll note  
14 for the record that we have -- an affidavit of publication  
15 has been filed.

16 So, let's take appearances.

17 MR. EATON: For Public Service Company  
18 of New Hampshire, my name is Gerald M. Eaton. Good  
19 morning.

20 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Good morning.

21 MS. HATFIELD: Good morning, Mr.  
22 Chairman. Meredith Hatfield, for the Office of Consumer  
23 Advocate, on behalf of residential ratepayers.

24 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Good morning.

{DE 09-114} {07-02-09}

1 MS. AMIDON: Suzanne Amidon, for  
2 Commission Staff. And, with me today is Steve Mullen, who  
3 is the Assistant Director of the Electric Division.

4 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Good morning. Mr.  
5 Eaton.

6 MR. EATON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
7 I'd like to call to the stand Robert A. Baumann and  
8 Stephen R. Hall.

9 (Whereupon Robert A. Baumann and Stephen  
10 R. Hall was duly sworn and cautioned by  
11 the Court Reporter.)

12 MR. EATON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to  
13 begin by marking for identification the petition for  
14 approval of new TCAM Rate. That was filed on June 12th,  
15 2009. And, that would be "Exhibit 1", because this  
16 proceeding is just opening.

17 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. It's so marked.  
18 (The document, as described, was  
19 herewith marked as Exhibit 1 for  
20 identification.)

21 ROBERT A. BAUMANN, SWORN

22 STEPHEN R. HALL, SWORN

23 DIRECT EXAMINATION

24 BY MR. EATON:

{DE 09-114} {07-02-09}

[WITNESS PANEL: Baumann|Hall]

1 Q. Mr. Baumann, would you please state your name for this  
2 record.

3 A. (Baumann) My name is Robert Baumann. I'm the Director  
4 of Revenue Regulation and Load Resources for Northeast  
5 Utilities Service Company that provides administrative  
6 services to all of our operating subsidiaries,  
7 including Public Service Company of New Hampshire. My  
8 duties include responsibility for the calculation and  
9 preparation of all revenue requirement calculations  
10 related to the Energy Service Charge, the Stranded Cost  
11 Recovery Charge, and the Transmission Adjustment  
12 Mechanism, as well as revenue requirement calculations  
13 associated with distribution rate case requests.

14 Q. Mr. Baumann, did you prepare testimony for this  
15 proceeding?

16 A. (Baumann) Yes.

17 Q. Do you have that in front of you?

18 A. (Baumann) Yes, I do.

19 Q. What was the date that that was submitted?

20 A. (Baumann) That was submitted on June 12th, 2009.

21 Q. Do you have any corrections to make to that testimony?

22 A. (Baumann) No.

23 Q. Is it true and accurate to the best of your knowledge  
24 and belief?

{DE 09-114} {07-02-09}

[WITNESS PANEL: Baumann|Hall]

1 A. (Baumann) Yes.

2 MR. EATON: Could we have that marked as  
3 "Exhibit 2" for identification.

4 CHAIRMAN GETZ: So marked.

5 (The document, as described, was  
6 herewith marked as Exhibit 2 for  
7 identification.)

8 BY MR. EATON:

9 Q. Mr. Hall, would you please state your name for the  
10 record.

11 A. (Hall) My name is Stephen R. Hall.

12 Q. For whom are you employed and what is your position?

13 A. (Hall) I'm employed by Public Service of New Hampshire.  
14 I'm Rate and Regulatory Services Manager.

15 Q. What are your duties?

16 A. (Hall) I have responsibility for pricing, as well as  
17 PSNH's tariff and rate administration, and regulatory  
18 relations.

19 Q. Mr. Hall, did you prepare testimony for this  
20 proceeding?

21 A. (Hall) Yes, I did.

22 Q. And do you have that in front of you?

23 A. (Hall) Yes, I do.

24 Q. Is that testimony true and accurate to the best of your

{DE 09-114} {07-02-09}

[WITNESS PANEL: Baumann|Hall]

1 knowledge and belief?

2 A. (Hall) Yes, it is. My testimony is. The attachments  
3 were subsequently revised.

4 Q. Do you have any corrections to make to your testimony?

5 A. (Hall) No. No changes to the testimony.

6 MR. EATON: Could we have that marked as  
7 "Exhibit 3" for identification.

8 CHAIRMAN GETZ: So marked.

9 (The document, as described, was  
10 herewith marked as Exhibit 3 for  
11 identification.)

12 BY MR. EATON:

13 Q. Mr. Hall, when were your revisions to your attachments  
14 filed with the Commission?

15 A. (Hall) They were filed on June 25th, 2009, under a  
16 cover letter signed by me.

17 Q. And, those represent the calculation of what?

18 A. (Hall) The attachments show the calculation of the base  
19 component of the TCAM rate, and they also show  
20 individual transmission rates and charges by rate  
21 class.

22 Q. And, where would I find the actual rates and charges  
23 that PSNH is proposing to collect from each customer  
24 class?

{DE 09-114} {07-02-09}

[WITNESS PANEL: Baumann|Hall]

1 A. (Hall) On Attachment SRH-1, Column 2.

2 MR. EATON: Thank you, Mr. Hall. Could  
3 we have that marked as "Exhibit 4" for identification.

4 CHAIRMAN GETZ: So marked.

5 (The document, as described, was  
6 herewith marked as Exhibit 4 for  
7 identification.)

8 MR. EATON: Mr. Chairman, I think that  
9 concludes preliminary procedural matters, and the  
10 witnesses would summarize their testimony at this point.  
11 Oh, I'm sorry, I have one other thing.

12 BY MR. EATON:

13 Q. Mr. Hall, did you prepare a summary of the rate changes  
14 that are proposed for effect on August 1st?

15 A. (Hall) Yes, I did.

16 Q. And, do you have that in front of you?

17 A. (Hall) Yes, I do.

18 Q. Could you please describe that document.

19 A. (Hall) Sure. This is a five-page document that  
20 illustrates a comparison of rates and charges by  
21 customer class for Transmission, Stranded Cost Recovery  
22 Charge, and Energy Service, and shows the changes in  
23 rates both by customer class and component on a cents  
24 per kilowatt-hour and a percentage basis.

{DE 09-114} {07-02-09}



[WITNESS PANEL: Baumann|Hall]

1                   The first page is simply today's  
2                   currently effective rate level: Distribution,  
3                   Transmission, SCRC, System Benefits Charge, Consumption  
4                   Tax, and Energy Service rate, and the rows are each  
5                   class of service. So, that's today's rate level.

6                   The next page shows the proposed rate  
7                   level for August 1st, 2009 rates. And, what's changed  
8                   from the first page to the second page is that the  
9                   rates in the "Transmission", "SCRC" and the "Energy  
10                  Service" columns now contain the proposed rate level  
11                  for effect August 1, 2009.

12                  The third page shows the change in each  
13                  rate component on a cents per kilowatt-hour basis,  
14                  "Transmission", "SCRC", and "Energy Service", by rate  
15                  class and in total, for effect August 1, 2009.

16                  The fourth page shows the percentage  
17                  change, excuse me, by individual rate component, again,  
18                  for "Transmission", "SCRC", and "Energy Service", for  
19                  the proposed rates for effect August 1, 2009. And, the  
20                  percentages are the percent change in that individual  
21                  component of the customer's bill amount. In other  
22                  words, the Transmission rate change of approximately  
23                  26 percent for residential customers, what we mean by  
24                  that is that the transmission rate alone will change by

{DE 09-114} {07-02-09}

[WITNESS PANEL: Baumann|Hall]

1       26 percent on August 1st, 2008 [2009?]. Similarly,  
2       stranded costs would change by "15.87 percent" and the  
3       Energy Service rate would decrease by "8.97 percent".

4               The last page is similar to the fourth  
5       page, except that the percentage changes are expressed  
6       in terms of the percent change in total revenue for  
7       each rate class, rather than percent change in total  
8       bill component. So, what you'll see is that the  
9       percentage amounts in each column, "Transmission",  
10      "SCRC", and "Energy Service", are smaller than on Page  
11      4, because the denominator is different. The  
12      denominator is total revenue level. The final column,  
13      "Total Revenue", is identical on both Pages 4 and 5.

14              So, really, all we're attempting to show  
15      with this exhibit is a summary of what changes are  
16      being proposed and how much each change means, both on  
17      a cents per kilowatt-hour and percentage basis.

18              MR. EATON: Could we have this document  
19      marked as "Exhibit 5" for identification.

20              CHAIRMAN GETZ: So marked.

21              (The document, as described, was  
22      herewith marked as Exhibit 5 for  
23      identification.)

24              MR. EATON: Thank you. I think that's

{DE 09-114} {07-02-09}

[WITNESS PANEL: Baumann|Hall]

1 all we have before a summary of the witnesses' testimony.

2 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Thank you, Mr.

3 Eaton. Then, we'll take a recess at this time.

4 (Whereupon a recess was taken at 9:48

5 a.m. and the hearing reconvened at 11:59

6 a.m.)

7 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. We're back on the

8 record in docket DE 09-114. Mr. Eaton.

9 BY MR. EATON:

10 Q. Before the break, Mr. Baumann and Mr. Hall, you  
11 identified your testimony and the exhibits. Mr.  
12 Baumann, could you please summarize your testimony for  
13 the record.

14 A. (Baumann) Well, my testimony lays out the projected  
15 TCAM rate that we are proposing from August 2009  
16 through June 2010. This rate has actual data, general  
17 ledger data through May of 2009, and then projected  
18 data for the remainder of the period, using the  
19 recently changed RNS and LNS rates that are effective  
20 on June 1st, 2009. I also summarize, to some extent in  
21 my testimony, some of the other reliability charges  
22 that are also part of this filing.

23 Q. And, Mr. Hall, would you please summarize your  
24 testimony.

{DE 09-114} {07-02-09}

[WITNESS PANEL: Baumann|Hall]

1 A. (Hall) Certainly. My testimony talks about the design  
2 of transmission pricing, that's transmission rate  
3 design that's contained in my attachments. In  
4 particular, I talk about the way we allocated costs and  
5 calculated transmission prices for Backup Service, Rate  
6 B, the base components specifically for Backup Service,  
7 Rate B. That was done in accordance with the  
8 Settlement Agreement in PSNH's last rate case, docket  
9 number DE 06-028. And, the results of our rate design  
10 calculations are shown on my attachments.

11 Q. I guess following up on that, Mr. Hall, if you can, if  
12 you look at Exhibit 5, which was your current rates  
13 effective January 1st, 2009, it's the first page.

14 A. (Hall) Yes.

15 Q. And, could you look at Page 4 of 5.

16 A. (Hall) I'm there.

17 Q. And, could you explain to the Commission the  
18 transmission change in Rate B. That seems to be a  
19 little bit out of the ordinary compared to the others.

20 A. (Hall) That's because the way the costs are allocated  
21 to the base component of Rate B can result in  
22 significant changes on a percentage basis to the Rate B  
23 Transmission Demand Charge. To put it in perspective,  
24 one needs to look at Attachment SRH-1 in Exhibit 4. If

{DE 09-114} {07-02-09}

[WITNESS PANEL: Baumann|Hall]

1       you go down to Line 45, you can see that the Rate B  
2       Demand Charge is increasing from 25 cents per kW or kVA  
3       per month to 88 cents. So, while, on a percentage  
4       basis, it's a very high increase; on a dollars basis,  
5       we're not really talking about a large increase.

6   Q.   Is this allocation based upon the contribution of the  
7       different rate classes to a peak?

8   A.   (Hall) Yes, for Rate B, in particular. And, what we do  
9       is we allocate transmission costs to Rate B based on  
10      the Rate B class contribution to system peak. And, to  
11      the extent that the Rate B class contribution changes  
12      from one period to the next, there can be significant  
13      swings in the amount of costs that are allocated, and  
14      therefore the dollars per kW of the Demand Charge.

15  Q.   Is it accurate to say some Rate B customers are quite  
16       large and that could --

17  A.   (Hall) Yes.

18  Q.   -- contribute to the swing?

19  A.   (Hall) Yes.

20  Q.   Thank you. Do either of you have anything to add to  
21       your testimony?

22  A.   (Baumann) No.

23  A.   (Hall) No.

24                   MR. EATON: Thank you. The witnesses

{DE 09-114} {07-02-09}

[WITNESS PANEL: Baumann|Hall]

1 are available for cross-examination.

2 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Ms.

3 Hatfield.

4 MS. HATFIELD: Mr. Chairman, Staff has  
5 kindly agreed to ask its questions first. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Ms. Amidon.

7 MS. AMIDON: And, I'll defer the cross  
8 to Mr. Mullen.

9 MR. MULLEN: I guess it's "good  
10 afternoon" now.

11 WITNESS HALL: Good afternoon.

12 WITNESS BAUMANN: Good afternoon.

13 CROSS-EXAMINATION

14 BY MR. MULLEN:

15 Q. Mr. Baumann, if you could take a look at Exhibit 2, the  
16 schedules attached to your testimony. And, I'm looking  
17 specifically at Attachment RAB-1, Page 3. At the  
18 bottom of that page, starting on Line 42, there's a  
19 "Note 1", it talks about a "\$4.8 million true-up for  
20 fiscal year 2007" that was reflected in June 2008. Do  
21 you see that?

22 A. (Baumann) Yes.

23 Q. And, I believe in discovery we learned that the 4.8 was  
24 an estimated number, and the actual number was roughly

{DE 09-114} {07-02-09}

[WITNESS PANEL: Baumann|Hall]

1       \$6.4 million, does that sound right?

2     A.   (Baumann) Yes.

3     Q.   When a large true-up number like that comes, what type  
4       of review does that get, in terms of accuracy and that  
5       sort of thing?

6     A.   (Baumann) Well, any -- in this situation, it's an LNS  
7       true-up. LNS true-ups are, in part, impacted by RNS  
8       recoveries, and as well as -- as well as the  
9       projections that were made for the LNS rates. And, I  
10      know in this particular case there was a -- what they  
11      call a "rebill" or a true-up of 6.4 million. And, it  
12      really was -- it really related to the timing of  
13      in-service dates for a lot of transmission projects  
14      that were assumed in the projections. This was also  
15      impacted by the fact that, in actual, there were lower  
16      loads than in the projections as well. There wasn't  
17      one bullet, if you will, that explained this entire  
18      differential in the estimate to the actual. It was  
19      just a combination of, you know, different assumptions  
20      in the rates.

21    Q.   So, when I look at the supporting information that was  
22       supplied with that discovery response, the initial  
23       charges for fiscal year 2007 were based on billed  
24       revenue requirements of roughly \$28, \$29 million,

{DE 09-114} {07-02-09}

[WITNESS PANEL: Baumann|Hall]

1       however, the actual revenue requirements were just  
2       under \$59 million. So, when there's that big of a  
3       swing, you say there's a number of factors that go into  
4       that, that there's people at PSNH or NU that review all  
5       that to make sure that you're paying what you should be  
6       paying?

7       A.   (Baumann) Well, yeah. I would say that the majority of  
8       the review of those true-ups, as well as -- as well as  
9       all the rates, are done -- there are a couple of  
10      committees at ISO that have transmission owner  
11      participation. And, I know there's a -- I know there's  
12      a summary review I think probably in July or August,  
13      it's a combination of individuals from the Transmission  
14      Committee and the Reliability Committee, with  
15      transmission owner input, that sit together and review  
16      the 2009 forecast, in this situation, and, say, the  
17      2008 true-up, and they sign off on those true-ups in  
18      that fashion.

19                   It's difficult -- It's difficult to sign  
20      off on some of these true-ups without total  
21      participation, because what other companies submit in  
22      terms of RNS can impact recoveries of RNS, which can  
23      then impact the net amount of the LNS that is  
24      recovered. So, it's, you know, it's a process that the

{DE 09-114}   {07-02-09}



[WITNESS PANEL: Baumann|Hall]

1 participants, in effect, review, you know, throughout  
2 the year.

3 Q. Now, I think earlier you also mentioned something about  
4 "in-service dates".

5 A. (Baumann) Uh-huh.

6 Q. How does that impact something like this?

7 A. (Baumann) I'll give you an example. Our current LNS  
8 charge, which is now going down in our schedules, the  
9 charges in effect now, it was -- it began in June of  
10 '08. And, it, in effect, ends in May of '09 or ended.  
11 In that time period, Middletown to Norwalk was going to  
12 come on line, or it was projected to come on line in  
13 the first quarter of 2009. In actuality, it came on  
14 line early, under budget, for the record, and because  
15 of that, you know, from an LNS perspective, it was in  
16 the LNS rate at, in hindsight, a higher amount for LNS  
17 than it should have been or could have been if you had  
18 assumed a different in-service date. So, all these  
19 different projects -- and, then, just to finish that  
20 story, when the unit -- when the project did come on  
21 line, it's now an RNS project, but it's in an LNS  
22 charge until you change the RNS rate.

23 So, -- And, then, there are differences  
24 between the recoveries, levels of RNS and LNS for a

{DE 09-114} {07-02-09}

[WITNESS PANEL: Baumann|Hall]

1 particular project, because of, say, AFUDC values that  
2 are now in RNS that are not part of the CWIP in LNS.  
3 There's a host of different what I'll call "credits"  
4 running from the RNS into the LNS that could cause, you  
5 know, in this situation, an under recovery of LNS.

6 And, I know, I talk to our transmission  
7 people yesterday, in fact, and, you know, they told me,  
8 and I used that example, and they told me that they  
9 would -- they approach those calculations on a  
10 conservative basis. They were not going to, although  
11 there was good indication that that project was going  
12 to come on line earlier, they still used the in-service  
13 date of the first quarter of '08 -- of '09 to come up  
14 with what they could characterize as "conservative"  
15 dollar amounts put into the rates for the revenue  
16 requirements. So, it's a host of things working in  
17 tandem, if you will.

18 But, in this particular case, in the --  
19 I guess it was Data Request 2, it really was -- it  
20 really was a combination of in-service dates and lower  
21 load than actual -- in actual than in the original  
22 projection.

23 Q. Okay. And, I think this discussion leads me into my  
24 next question, which is, again, the schedules attached

{DE 09-114} {07-02-09}

[WITNESS PANEL: Baumann|Hall]

1 to your testimony, this is RAB-1, Page 5. Bottom of  
2 the page, on Line 45, there's a "Note 2, discussing  
3 about a "decrease in June 2009 LNS reflects regional  
4 projects now being billed through RNS." So, if I  
5 captured the -- your earlier discussion about  
6 in-service dates and that sort of thing, I mean, how  
7 common is it that you would see a large swing like this  
8 because of projects being shifted from LNS to RNS?

9 A. (Baumann) Well, I think, when you have major projects  
10 that switch, you're going to see what I'll call  
11 "significant changes", which this obviously is. I  
12 believe a large part of that change is again the  
13 Middletown to Norwalk switch. So, you know,  
14 referencing your question, "how often do you see it?"  
15 I really don't have, you know, a great historic answer  
16 to that, other than -- other than, when there are  
17 regionally significant projects, the FERC allows the  
18 recovery or the beginning of recovery of those projects  
19 through LNS, through CWIP. And, in effect, then the  
20 LNS charges, which are charged to PSNH, Western Mass.  
21 Electric, and CL&P, the transmission entity begins to  
22 recover those costs, rather than waiting for them to be  
23 in service and into RNS.

24 So, in effect, the certain parties, i.e.

{DE 09-114} {07-02-09}

[WITNESS PANEL: Baumann|Hall]

1 the LNS parties that, you know, customers that have to  
2 pay LNS begin getting charged earlier, because they're  
3 not in service yet, they're in CWIP. Once they go into  
4 RNS, you know, the AFUDC and the total cost is loaded  
5 into RNS and then recovered on a regional basis.  
6 Certainly, CL&P, PSNH, and Western Mass. don't pay any  
7 more than their fair share of a regional project on a  
8 regional basis. But it's really a timing of when the  
9 recoveries begin for all the entities, if you will.

10 Q. So, while you might see projects shifted from LNS  
11 recovery to RNS, you wouldn't see projects going the  
12 other way?

13 A. (Baumann) No, I don't think so. Because LNS really is  
14 local transmission, projects that aren't in service,  
15 that are in the "CWIP" category that could be regional  
16 projects or regionally significant projects that will  
17 ultimately get into RNS. And, then, you can have --  
18 you can have certain in-service regional projects in  
19 LNS, only because the timing of which we didn't, you  
20 know, they weren't included in RNS because of the  
21 cut-off as to when their in-service date was. So, you  
22 know, generally speaking, I don't know of any  
23 possibility that a project could go the other way.

24 MR. MULLEN: Thank you, I have nothing

{DE 09-114} {07-02-09}

[WITNESS PANEL: Baumann|Hall]

1 further.

2 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Ms. Hatfield?

3 MS. HATFIELD: Thank you. The OCA has  
4 no questions.

5 CHAIRMAN GETZ: All right. Nothing from  
6 the Bench. Is there anything further, Mr. Eaton?

7 MR. EATON: No thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Then, hearing  
9 nothing else for the witnesses, you're excused. Thank  
10 you, gentlemen.

11 Is there any objection to striking the  
12 identifications and admitting the exhibits into evidence?

13 (No verbal response)

14 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Hearing no objection,  
15 they will be admitted into evidence. Is there anything  
16 else we need to address before we provide an opportunity  
17 for closings?

18 (No verbal response)

19 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Hearing nothing, then,  
20 Ms. Hatfield.

21 MS. HATFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
22 The OCA has no objection to PSNH's request. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Ms. Amidon.

24 MS. AMIDON: Thank you. Staff has

{DE 09-114} {07-02-09}

1 reviewed the filing, and we recommend that the Commission  
2 approve the petition.

3 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Mr. Eaton.

4 MR. EATON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We  
5 request that the overall TCAM rate be approved, and the  
6 specific rates and charges that were included in Mr.  
7 Hall's testimony be approved for the individual rate  
8 classes.

9 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Then, we'll close  
10 this hearing and take the matter under advisement. Thank  
11 you, everyone.

12 (Whereupon the hearing ended at 12:17  
13 p.m.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

