| | 5 | 1 | |
|------------|----|---|----|
| | 1 | STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE | |
| | 2 | PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION | |
| | 3 | | |
| | 4 | September 18, 2012 - 10:12 a.m. Concord, New Hampshire | |
| | 5 | | |
| | 6 | RE: DW 12-170 NHPUC OCT12'12 PM 3:35 | |
| | 7 | HAMPSTEAD AREA WATER COMPANY: Notice of Intent to File Rate Schedules. | |
| | 8 | (Prehearing conference) | |
| | 9 | | |
| | 10 | | |
| | 11 | PRESENT: Chairman Amy L. Ignatius, Presiding Commissioner Michael D. Harrington | ų, |
| 1 | 12 | | |
| \bigcirc | 13 | Sandy Deno, Clerk | |
| | 14 | | |
| | 15 | APPEARANCES: Reptg. Hampstead Area Water Company: Robert C. Levine, Esq. | |
| | 16 | | |
| | 17 | Reptg. PUC Staff: Marcia A. B. Thunberg, Esq. | |
| | 18 | Mark Naylor, Director/Gas & Water Division Jayson Laflamme, Gas & Water Division | |
| | 19 | James Lenihan, Gas & Water Division | |
| | 20 | | |
| | 21 | | |
| | 22 | | |
| | 23 | Court Reporter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52 | |
| | 24 | | |

ORIGINAL

| \sim |
|--------|
| 2 |
| ~ |

| 1 | | |
|----|--|----------|
| 2 | INDEX | |
| 3 | | PAGE NO. |
| 4 | STATEMENTS OF PRELIMINARY POSITION BY: | |
| 5 | Mr. Levine | 5 |
| б | Ms. Thunberg | 6, 13 |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | QUESTIONS BY: | |
| 9 | Chairman Ignatius | 10 |
| 10 | Commissioner Harrington | 10 |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| | {DW 12-170} {09-18-12} | |

| 1 | PROCEEDING |
|----|--|
| 2 | CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: I'd like to open the |
| 3 | hearing in Docket DW 12-170, Hampstead Area Water Company. |
| 4 | This is the Company's permanent rate request proceeding. |
| 5 | Hampstead provides water service to approximately 3,000 |
| 6 | customers in Atkinson, Chester, Danville, East Kingston, |
| 7 | Fremont, Hampstead, Kingston, Newton, Nottingham, |
| 8 | Plaistow, Salem, and Sandown, New Hampshire. And, it has |
| 9 | proposed a 6.99 percent increase to its annual revenue, |
| 10 | for effect July 1st, 2012, I believe. It proposes an |
| 11 | overall rate of return of 4.97 percent, based on a cost of |
| 12 | equity of 10.75 percent and a weighted average cost of |
| 13 | debt of 3.9 percent. And, by order of notice dated |
| 14 | August 21st, we noticed the hearing today, a prehearing |
| 15 | conference, to begin to assess the case and develop a |
| 16 | procedural schedule, and a technical session to follow. |
| 17 | So, let us begin with appearances |
| 18 | please. |
| 19 | MR. LEVINE: Good morning, |
| 20 | Commissioners. My name is Attorney Robert Levine, I'm |
| 21 | in-house counsel for Hampstead Area Water Company. With |
| 22 | me today is President Harold Morse; our Vice President, |
| 23 | Christine Lewis Morse; our Controller, John Sullivan; our |
| 24 | Engineering Department is represented by Charlie Langdon. |
| | {DW 12-170} {09-18-12} |

| 1 | And, we also have our consultant, Stephen St. Cyr, |
|----|---|
| 2 | accompanying us today. |
| 3 | CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Good morning. |
| 4 | MR. LEVINE: Good morning. |
| 5 | MS. THUNBERG: Good morning, Chairman |
| 6 | Ignatius, Commissioner Harrington. My name is Marcia |
| 7 | Thunberg representing Staff today. And, with me is Mark |
| 8 | Naylor, Jayson Laflamme, and Jim Lenihan. Staff is not |
| 9 | aware of any customers who have expressed an interest in |
| 10 | participating as of yet. We have been in contact with |
| 11 | OCA. We thought they might change their mind and file a |
| 12 | notice of participation. But, obviously, they're not here |
| 13 | today. Thank you. |
| 14 | CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. Thank |
| 15 | you. Good morning. And, we also hadn't seen any requests |
| 16 | for intervention. Has the required publication affidavit |
| 17 | been received? |
| 18 | MS. DENO: Yes. |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Yes, it looks like |
| 20 | it has, on the 14th. So, thank you for that. And, |
| 21 | Ms. Hollenberg, is the OCA participating in this |
| 22 | proceeding? |
| 23 | MS. HOLLENBERG: It's possible. I was |
| 24 | going to have a conversation with the parties after this |
| | {DW 12-170} {09-18-12} |

| 1 | prehearing conference and go from there. Thank you. |
|----|---|
| 2 | CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. Thank |
| 3 | you. So that, on board for this morning would be a |
| 4 | presentation of initial positions, a summary from the |
| 5 | Company of what the request is, an initial response from |
| 6 | the Staff. And, then, after that, it would be for the |
| 7 | parties to begin, in technical session, to engage in |
| 8 | discovery, map out a procedural plan, identify any other |
| 9 | issues that are expected to be likely to arise in the |
| 10 | docket. |
| 11 | So, Mr. Levine, would you present the |
| 12 | summary of the Company's petition. |
| 13 | MR. LEVINE: Thank you, Commissioner |
| 14 | Ignatius. The Company is requesting an increase of rates |
| 15 | by this petition. This increase is compromised of a |
| 16 | permanent rate increase request and a request for a step |
| 17 | increase. The general rate increase request is due to a |
| 18 | number of capital improvements that have been put into |
| 19 | service since the last rate case, as well as some |
| 20 | DES-mandated expenses regarding water loss. As the |
| 21 | Commission noted, the proposed rate of return on the rate |
| 22 | base for this investment is 4.97 percent. |
| 23 | The other component, the step |
| 24 | adjustment, is due to other investment in plant, for |
| | {DW 12-170} {09-18-12} |

1 service line replacement and other system improvements, which are to be constructed and anticipated to be 2 3 completed in the year 2012. This is from DES-funded borrowing through the SRF Loan Program, which had been 4 5 previously approved by the Commission for the Company. 6 The proposed rate of return for this investment is 7 4.55 percent. The permanent revenue increase and the 8 9 step increase would result in an increase to customers on 10 an average basis of \$33.48, or a 6.99 percent increase. 11 Lastly, the Company had requested that the existing rates be used for consideration for temporary 12 13 rates, noted in the petition, they're effective July 1, 14 2012. But, obviously, we're past that date. And, that's 15 the petition -- the position of the Company. 16 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. Thank 17 you. Ms. Thunberg. 18 MS. THUNBERG: Staff would be conducting 19 its usual review of this Company's rate case. As the 20 order of notice indicates, the rate increase sought is a 21 6.99 percent for the general customers, although the 22 overall increase is a 6.52 percent, which is good, 23 considering we've seen rate increases in double digits 24 proposed by other companies. Staff will be conducting

| 1 | discovery in this proceeding. There will be an audit of |
|----|--|
| 2 | the Company's books and records. |
| 3 | The Company has also requested temporary |
| 4 | rates effective July 1. And, it proposes as the rates to |
| 5 | be present rates as temporary rates. As Staff and the |
| 6 | Company work out a procedural schedule, we'll be building |
| 7 | in a temporary rate hearing proposal. And, Staff will put |
| 8 | its position, with respect to temporary rates, on the |
| 9 | record at that point. |
| 10 | The Company has not proposed to increase |
| 11 | its fire protection rates. Staff will be looking at |
| 12 | whether that is appropriate, and whether there should be |
| 13 | an across-the-board increase, just one of the issues that |
| 14 | we're flagging. Hampstead has made a number of pro forma |
| 15 | adjustments to its test year, which is not unusual, but it |
| 16 | has chosen to use a year-end rate base, rather than an |
| 17 | average rate base. And, Staff and the Commission usually |
| 18 | examine rate base with an average, rather than year-end. |
| 19 | So, we will be looking at that issue and discussing it |
| 20 | with the Company. |
| 21 | Staff will be looking at the proposed |
| 22 | the pro forma adjustments, to make sure that the test year |
| 23 | accurately reflects the Company's future financial |
| 24 | picture. |
| | |

1 As you heard, the Company is also 2 seeking a step increase. And, in the past, the Commission 3 has used step increases as a way to allow a company to 4 earn a rate of return after implementing large capital 5 projects that, if we did not consider them in the rate case, it may leave them in a earnings deficiency post rate 6 7 case. So, Staff will be looking at the improvements. Some have been approved through financing already by the 8 9 Commission, as far as the financing portion of these 10 capital improvements. But Staff will be looking to make 11 sure that they are used and useful. And, we'll file a recommendation on the step increase in the procedural 12 13 schedule. 14 With respect to the cost of equity that 15 the Company has proposed, they are proposing a cost of 16 equity of 10.75 percent. This proposed equity number is 17 higher than what the Commission has approved in the past. 18 It's higher than what Staff has been comfortable with in the past. If -- we also, in this proceeding, are lacking 19 a cost of equity study, a rate of return study. And, 20 21 there could be an argument of whether it's not appropriate or is appropriate for a company of this size. But it's 22 23 just an issue that Staff will be looking at in the 24 proceeding. And, I'm sure Staff will be offering its

{DW 12-170} {09-18-12}

| 1 | position on cost of equity and rate of return as the |
|----|--|
| 2 | proceeding progresses. |
| 3 | Of note, the Company's cost of debt is |
| 4 | very low. And, we would like to commend the Company |
| 5 | publicly for that. Low interest rates on debt is a |
| 6 | benefit to ratepayers. So, we just wanted to highlight |
| 7 | that. |
| 8 | As indicated in Mr. Morse's testimony, |
| 9 | Hampstead has done a number of or, has conducted a |
| 10 | number of improvements to deal with Department of |
| 11 | Environmental Services' compliance issues. And, Staff |
| 12 | will be looking at the compliance as going forward for the |
| 13 | Company, and making sure that it is in compliance with |
| 14 | future regulations, and that it has the rates necessary to |
| 15 | meet the regulation the compliance. |
| 16 | I don't believe the Company discussed |
| 17 | the proposal for WICA in its prehearing statement, but it |
| 18 | is a issue that was raised in testimony. So, I'm sure the |
| 19 | Company and Staff, and any other intervenors, or OCA, |
| 20 | whoever is participating, will discuss whether WICA is |
| 21 | appropriate going forward. |
| 22 | Other than that, Staff looks forward to |
| 23 | working with the Company, and any intervenors or the |
| 24 | Office of Consumer Advocate that may participate. If |
| | {DW 12-170} {09-18-12} |
| | |

there are late intervenors, Staff will offer assistance to 1 2 any late participants with understanding either the issues 3 or the process to participate. And, thank you very much. 4 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Thank you. I do 5 have a question. Mr. Levine, you had said the investments 6 that are contained in the step increase are due to be 7 completed by the end of the year, and the filing had said "projected September 30th". Are you still on track for 8 9 September 30th or has that --10 MR. LEVINE: Yes, we are. And, that's 11 particularly what I meant. 12 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: And, obviously, if 13 there were approval of those in a step, there would be no 14 effective date prior to the date that they become 15 operational, correct? 16 MR. LEVINE: Absolutely. They would 17 have to be used and useful. 18 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Any questions, 19 Commissioner Harrington? 20 CMSR. HARRINGTON: Just one, maybe a 21 comment, and don't necessarily expect an answer to it 22 right now. But there has been a couple of mentions of 23 this "DES compliance" in some of the testimony on 24 recommendations regarding water loss. And, how much of

 $\{DW \ 12-170\} \ \{09-18-12\}$

1 that is a recommendation and how much it's actually 2 achieving specific compliance? So, I guess, as we get 3 into the hearing, I'd be interested in a little bit of economic analysis on that. Are we simply saving water for 4 5 the sake of complying -- complying with some type of a 6 regulation? Or, is it accomplishing something as, in the 7 case down the road, will we see some savings from not losing that water that will manifest itself and put 8 9 downward pressure on rates? Or, is this simply something 10 that's going to cost the Company money, but the amount of 11 water loss -- or, amount of water savings is so small, it will have no affect on future revenues? 12 13 MR. LEVINE: No. There's been a pretty 14 directed program by DES to get the Company's water loss, I 15 believe they have a target of below 15 percent. And, 16 we've been working with them to try to achieve that, both 17 leak detection and repair. 18 CMSR. HARRINGTON: I guess my question is, the purpose of that then is strictly just to use less 19 20 water, but there is -- is there any economic side to that? 21 Does the Company see any benefit, because, if they reduce their water loss, let's say, from, I don't know what it 22 23 is, 20 percent to 15 percent, does that result in X amount of additional revenues -- or, non-losses for the Company? 24

| - | |
|----|--|
| 1 | Or, is it just simply complying with the DES regulation to |
| 2 | let less water leak back to where it came from? |
| 3 | MR. MORSE: There would definitely be a |
| 4 | savings. You wouldn't be |
| 5 | (Court reporter interruption.) |
| 6 | MR. MORSE: I'm sorry. Harold Morse. |
| 7 | MR. PATNAUDE: Okay. Start over please. |
| 8 | MR. MORSE: Okay. I'm Harold Morse, |
| 9 | President. There would be a savings. We'd be pumping |
| 10 | water less water, so you're saving on electricity, |
| 11 | saving on wear and tear of the pumps, chemicals used to |
| 12 | treat the water, etcetera. |
| 13 | CMSR. HARRINGTON: I just, I mean, like |
| 14 | I said, I don't expect an answer now, but maybe some type |
| 15 | of a balance between how much you're actually saving |
| 16 | versus how much it costs you, to see how economic this |
| 17 | pursuit of leak reduction really is. Okay. Thank you. |
| 18 | CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Okay. Ms. Thunberg? |
| 19 | MS. THUNBERG: I would like a word with |
| 20 | Attorney Levine for just a moment. |
| 21 | (Atty. Thunberg and Atty. Levine |
| 22 | conferring.) |
| 23 | MS. THUNBERG: Can I amend my prehearing |
| 24 | statement? |
| | |

1 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Sure. 2 MS. THUNBERG: Just briefly. On Page 3 3 of 6 of the Petition for Permanent Rates, there's a 4 discussion of a step increase -- step adjustment assets 5 that would be completed September 30th, that is 2012. It 6 is incorrectly stated in the Petition to be "2013". So, 7 it doesn't appear that Staff will be having a battle of what assets are includable in a step increase, because 8 9 usually we stick to 12 months. I guess, since that's 10 2012, and not 2013, we don't have an issue with that, or 11 won't have a battle on the step adjustment assets. 12 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. So that, 13 to be clear, our notice incorrectly stated "September 30, 14 2012", it should have been "September 30, 2013"? 15 MR. LEVINE: No, just the opposite, 16 Commissioner. 17 CMSR. HARRINGTON: Other way around. 18 MR. LEVINE: The order was correct, in 19 2012. 20 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: Okay. 21 MR. LEVINE: There was a typo in the 22 Petition of "2013". 23 CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: All right. Thank 24 Anything further? you.

| 1 | (No verbal response) |
|----|--|
| 2 | CHAIRMAN IGNATIUS: If not, then I'll |
| 3 | leave you to begin the discovery process and development |
| 4 | of a procedural schedule, and await a filing regarding the |
| 5 | schedule. Thank you. We stand adjourned. |
| 6 | (Whereupon the prehearing conference |
| 7 | ended at 10:27 a.m., and thereafter a |
| 8 | technical session was held.) |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| | $\{DW \ 12-170\} \ \{09-18-12\}$ |