

1	STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE		
2	PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION		
3	180		
4		2016 - 10:04 a.m.	REDACTED
5	Concord, New 1	Hampshire	(for Public Use)
6		TD 16 000	HPUC MARO4'16 PM12:09
7	KE:	IR 16-202 CONCORD STEAM CORPORATION:	
8		Investigation into Steam P and General Operational St	
9	A Total Control of the Control of th	(Status conference)	
10			
11	PRESENT:	Chairman Martin P. Honigb	
12	,	Commissioner Robert R. Sc Commissioner Kathryn M. B	
13		Adele Leighton, Clerk	
14	APPEARANCES:	Reptg. Concord Steam Corp	
15	7.7	Susan S. Geiger, Esq. (Or Peter Bloomfield, Preside	nt
16		Mark Saltsman, Vice Presi	
17		Reptg. State Fire Marshal District Chief Danielle C	ole
18		Section Chief Ronald Anst	
19		Reptg. Office of Administ Michael Connor, Deputy Co	
20		Reptg. PUC Staff:	
21		Alexander F. Speidel, Esq Randall S. Knepper, Direc	tor/Safety Division
22		Robert Wyatt, Asst. Dir./ Stephen P. Frink, Asst. D	Safety Division ir./Gas & Water Div.
23	Court Reporter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52		
21	* * ₽ ₽ ₽	ACTED - for Bub	



1	
2	INDEX
3	PAGE NO.
4	STATEMENTS BY:
5	Mr. Speidel 8, 17, 34, 38, 42, 118
6	Ms. Geiger 11, 18, 35, 105, 119
7	Mr. Connor 15
8	District Chief Cole 25
9	Mr. Knepper 39, 67, 69
10	Mr. Frink 42
11	Section Chief Anstey 68
12	Mr. Saltsman 70
13	
14	Status Report by Concord Steam Corp. 51
15	
16	QUESTIONS BY:
17	Commissioner Bailey 20, 48, 95, 108
18	Mr. Speidel 23, 106
19	Ms. Geiger 28
20	Commissioner Scott 32, 45, 73, 114
21	Chairman Honigberg 105
22	
23	
24	

{IR 16-202} [Status Conference] {02-10-16}

1 PROCEEDING

everyone. We're here this morning in Docket IR 16-202, an investigation into steam plant safety and general operational status of Concord Steam Corporation. We initiated this proceeding pursuant to an order of notice, which cited a slew of statutes, directing Staff to investigate ongoing safety and -- sorry, ongoing violations of fire and life safety codes at the Concord Steam central plant as communicated by the Fire Marshal's Office to Concord Steam during 2015, and as reported in the press in late December.

We've examined -- we have directed the Staff to examine these matters carefully and recommend any appropriate remedies. The investigation shall include, at a minimum, review of the Company's compliance with applicable state and federal regulations, including, but not limited to, safety regulations, review of the Company's financial status and accounting, financial planning, continuity planning, contingency planning, and any other financial, operational, or managerial issues that Staff deems necessary.

We're here this morning for a status

1 conference. At this status conference, pursuant to our order of notice, we've directed Concord Steam to detail 2 3 the actions the Company has completed for each item 4 mentioned in all State Fire Marshal reports issued on 5 or prior to the date of this status conference, 6 describe potential effects on Concord Steam's 7 operational capabilities, provide information as 8 requested by Staff prior to the status conference, and 9 explain any omission of the State Fire Marshal's 10 adverse inspection reports and related developments 11 from its 2015 status reports as required by Order 12 Number 25,278, statute or rule. 13 Before we go any further, let's take 14 appearances. 15 MS. GEIGER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman 16 and Commissioners Scott and Bailey. I'm Susan Geiger, 17 with the law firm of Orr & Reno. And, I represent 18 Concord Steam Corporation. With me today at counsel table are the President of Concord Steam, Peter 19 20 Bloomfield, and Concord Steam's Vice President, Mark 21 Saltsman. 22 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Anybody else? 23 MR. SPEIDEL: Well, Commissioners, this

is Alexander Speidel, Staff attorney representing

24

Staff. And, I have with me several members of the Commission Staff. I have Assistant Director Stephen Frink of the Gas and Water Division; Assistant Director Robert Wyatt of the safety direction; Director Randall Knepper of the Safety Division; and also Safety Division personnel David Burnell and Joseph Vercellotti.

If I may have leave to make an opening statement at the opening of the status conference, that would be greatly appreciated. And, in doing so, I'll also invite other members and attendees here today to make statements, if they so desire, or to identify themselves for the Commission's consideration. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Before you do that,
Mr. Speidel, let's talk for a minute about that
schedule. It makes eminent sense to me for you to
start. I know we have representatives of other parts
of state government here. I don't know who else might
be here. I will note that we do have a sign-in sheet
at the back of the room -- excuse me -- if there are
people who wish to make public comments to the
Commission.

I know that the Department of

Administrative Services is here. I believe the State Fire Marshal's Office is here. So, I think we'll want to hear from anyone who wants to speak to us. But I know that Administrative Services and the Fire Marshal have a significant role to play.

Mr. Speidel, in addition to you offering your comments at the beginning, how do you propose that we hear from others?

MR. SPEIDEL: Well, I would invite them, the sign-up sheet is a good tool, and I welcome anyone signing in using that vehicle for identifying themselves. But, I think, given that this is a relatively informal proceeding, it wouldn't be a bad idea for everyone just to identify themselves orally before the Commission today, and just say "I am such-and-such from so-and-so." And, "I do wish to speak" or "I do not wish to speak", just so that we have it on the record for Mr. Patnaude's availability.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: That's not a bad idea. I recognize all of the people who work for the Commission. So, those people don't have to identify themselves. But I also see Mr. Connor back there from Department of Administrative Services. So, Mr. Connor, I assume you want to say something today?

```
1
                         MR. CONNOR: Yes, sir. That would be
 2
          great.
                 Thank you.
 3
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
 4
          State Fire Marshal's Office is probably behind you,
 5
          Mr. Speidel?
 6
                         MR. SPEIDEL: Yes, I believe so.
 7
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And, who do we have
          here?
 8
 9
                         DISTRICT CHIEF COLE: Danielle Cole,
10
          District Chief for the State Fire Marshal.
11
                         SECTION CHIEF ANSTEY: Ron Anstey,
12
          Section Chief for Engineering and Plans Review.
13
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
14
          Welcome. Who else is here who doesn't work for the
15
          Public Utilities Commission?
16
                         MR. WALTERS: Good morning. Aaron
17
          Walters, from Green City Power.
18
                         MR. O'BRIEN: Tom O'Brien, from Green
19
          City Power.
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: What's the first
20
21
          word of the name of your company?
22
                         MR. O'BRIEN: Green City Power.
23
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Green City.
24
                         MR. O'BRIEN: We're looking at acquiring
```

```
1
          Concord Steam.
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you.
 2
 3
                         MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you.
 4
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Everybody else
 5
          works here. All right. Thank you all. Mr. Speidel,
 6
          why don't you proceed.
 7
                         MR. SPEIDEL: Mr. Patnaude, did you get
          all those names, do you think, to your satisfaction?
 8
 9
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We'll do that off
10
          the record.
11
                         MR. SPEIDEL: Okay. I'm sorry.
12
          Ultimately, I would like to begin by thanking the
          Commission for its consideration of Staff's
13
14
          recommendation that had been made at the beginning of
15
          this year in its letter of January the 7th. And, I
16
          will not parse the various responses that came into
17
          that letter, beyond just simply mentioning the fact
18
          that in the October 24th -- I'm sorry, in the
19
          October 28th, 2014 Order Number 25,728, in Docket
20
          Number DG 14-233, within the 2014-2015 Cost of Energy
21
          Adjustment proceeding, the Commission stated the
22
          following on Page 7 of its order: "We agree with Staff
23
          that quarterly reporting by Concord Steam regarding its
24
          new plant proposal and its financing, current
```

operations, and future business plans is warranted and advisable, and we order such reporting pursuant to our duty to keep informed under RSA 374:4. We will require the first such quarterly report to be filed on January 9th, 2015. Concord Steam shall also file interim reports, in addition to its regular quarterly reports, upon the occurrence of significant developments regarding the new plant proposal, financing changes, current operations, or future business plans."

In so ordering at the recommendation of Staff, Staff was operating under the presumption that the Commission desired and required real-time information regarding not only the future business prospects of Concord Steam, but also the current operations of its physical plant. This message, Staff believed, had been reinforced through numerous informal interactions over the year 2015, in which we encouraged Concord Steam to provide Staff with real-time information regarding such developments.

If there had been any ambiguity regarding Staff's desire for such information, I think it's been dispelled. I think we've received quite a bit of information in recent weeks, since the filing of the Staff letter of January the 7th, that has provided

useful information to the Commission and to Staff, and indicates a greater responsiveness on the part of Concord Steam to the need for information, real-time information, by the Commission, by Staff, to be able to do its job as a regulator of this utility. That is the philosophy behind the January 7th letter, the need to have real-time information finally without ambiguity provided. And, I think we've gotten to that place. That is satisfactory to Staff, and we're appreciative of that.

However, as the Commission indicated in its order of notice opening this investigation, there's a good deal of work to be done. I think now we've gotten behind the hurdle of not having adequate information regarding some of the interactions of the Company with entities such as Department of Administrative Services, the Fire Marshal's Office.

So, we're getting the information. But the information we're getting indicates that there are some outstanding issues that need to be resolved. And, there needs to be some exploration of the current business status of Concord Steam.

So, what we're doing today is, I think we're going to go into some informal discussion on the

1 part of responsible Staff, to try to illuminate for the 2 Commission some of the aspects that we're concerned 3 about and what needs to be done in the coming weeks and months related to this Company. 4 5 And, again, we thank the Company for its 6 timeliness in filing its updated and interim status 7 reports over the last several weeks, we're appreciative of that. And, we look forward to continuing to work 8 9 with the Company, and also our sister agencies in state 10 government, to ensure that those that need the 11 information have it in a timely fashion. Thank you. 12 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you, 13 Mr. Speidel. Ms. Geiger, I know you want to provide 14 certainly an overview of what's going on here as well. 15 And, I'm going to give you an opportunity to do that in 16 just a second. 17 Mr. Connor, am I correct that you have a 18 time constraint this morning? 19 MR. CONNOR: Yes, sir. I do. 20 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Then, Ms. Geiger, 21 why don't you do a brief overview, and then we'll let 22 Mr. Connor do what we needs to do, so he can leave. 23 Thank you very much, Mr. MS. GEIGER: 24 Concord Steam Corporation's President, Peter Chairman.

Bloomfield, and Vice President, Mark Saltsman, appear today in response of Commission's order of notice issued January 28th, 2016. Quite frankly, we took the order of notice information literally and thought that we would be the only people here making a statement. We were not aware that the State Fire Marshal's Office or Mr. Connor would be here making a statement. But, be that as it may, we have no problem with that.

The order of notice references a Staff letter dated January 7th, 2016, which alleges that Concord Steam neglected to make a proper report of certain violations of the fire and life safety codes noted by the State Fire Marshal in inspection reports. Concord Steam immediately responded to Staff's letter that same day, on January 7th. And, they indicated in a letter to Executive Director Howland its basic — the Company's basic response to the January 7th letter from the Staff.

At the outset, Concord Steam would note its strong disagreement with some of the characterizations in that January 7th letter from Staff. The first area of disagreement is with Staff's characterization of the issues in the State Fire Marshal's inspection report as being "critical"

operational information or critical operational issues or an operational failure at Concord Steam". Concord Steam wishes to emphasize that the issues noted by the State Fire Marshal, many of which have been addressed or are in the process of being addressed, and which the Company takes quite seriously, have at no time impacted Concord Steam's ability to provide safe and reliable service to its customers.

The secondary area of disagreement is with Staff's allegation that Concord Steam's failure to report the State Fire Marshal's inspection reports as violating Concord Steam's reporting obligations under Order Number 25,278, issued October 28th of 2014. That order requires Concord Steam to file quarterly reports on the status of its new plant proposal, current operations, and future business plans.

The transcript of the hearing in DG

14-233 that gave rise to the order I just mentioned

clearly reveals, on Page 15, that Mr. Bloomfield was

asked if the Company was open to filing with the

Commission and Staff quarterly updates on the status of

the new plant proposal, air permitting, the lease

agreement with the State, along with other changes in

current operations and business plans. Mr. Bloomfield

responded "yes" at that hearing. And, the Company has filed eight status reports, seven of which are captioned as relating to the "status of repowering Concord Steam'. The last and eighth report that was filed on January 20th is captioned a "Supplement to Concord Steam Status Report".

Simply put, Concord Steam believed, as indicated in the hearing transcript and in the reports that it filed, that its reporting obligations under the October 24th -- October 28th, 2014 order was to report on the status of its repowering plans and any changes in current operations and business plans. Not day-to-day issues or operations related to fire and life safety code. That is an issue that the Company believes is separate and distinct from the issues that it was asked to report on.

As I've indicated, the Company takes fire and life safety code issues extremely seriously, and it also has a very good operational track record.

At the appropriate time, what we'd like to do is have Mr. Bloomfield and Mr. Saltsberg -Saltsman take the witness stand, or answer questions from the Bench from their bench, their counsel table, if the Commission deems it appropriate. Because this

is a status conference, and not a hearing, we're not sure what the Commission's preference is. But we're happy to accommodate however you want procedurally to get the information that the Commission is looking for in this proceeding. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you, Ms. Geiger. Mr. Connor, why don't we let you do what you need to do. You're going to need to get to a microphone, so Mr. Patnaude can get what you're saying. And, off the record. [Brief off-the-record discussion ensued. 1

MR. CONNOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. For the record, my name is Michael Connor. And, I am from the Department of Administrative Services, where I serve as the Deputy Commissioner. I appreciate you taking the time today in light of my tight schedule today.

I just want to reiterate our concerns over the lack of proper response regarding the life safety issues at the plant and the conditions of the plant. I'd sort of like to remind the Commission that the first letter from the Fire Marshal's Office was sent almost a year ago, in February of 2015. And, a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

lot of those issues were not addressed when we went through a tour, I don't know, probably a month ago with the Fire Marshal. Their total disregard for a lot of life safety issues that were present there, and also a follow-up letter that I sent in June and July to the representatives from Concord Steam requesting that they take appropriate action.

16

I am also here to express our concerns over the conditions of the plant. And, my concerns over the proper continuity of operations plan, if we had a catastrophic event. And, we did have a significant fire that took the plant down for a while, it became very evident to us of the exposure to the State of New Hampshire. We have 24 facilities that currently purchase steam from Concord Steam. Approximately 1.1 million square feet of office space, that would affect 2,738 employees, should we have a catastrophic event. So, we're very concerned about that, and the lack of a proper continuity of operations plan. When we did meet them, they reported that they could have the plant back up and running in a couple hours, which is really an unbelievable event. And, they also stated that they didn't have an MOA in place to actually acquire that boiler, if there actually is

one big enough to do that.

So, those are, in a nutshell, those are my concerns. There are representatives here from the Fire Marshal to get into more specific details of what they found to talk about that. I'd be glad to answer any questions that you may have.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Before we go any further, let me talk or have you all talk for a minute about what might we need to do in a confidential part of this process. Because there are going to be discussions that I think we have a fair number of red folders up here with confidential filings and confidential material. What of what we may get into going forward do the parties think or does the Staff and the Company think needs to be done behind closed doors? Mr. Speidel.

MR. SPEIDEL: Well, just for starters, I think that what we have here today are the Company themselves, they're within their own circle of confidentiality. There is an informal indication that the two gentlemen from Green City Power were also within their circle of confidentiality, because they have a reciprocal confidentiality agreement. And, I will let the Company speak to that directly.

We have sister state agencies, the

Department of Administrative Services and the Fire

Marshal's Office, which I presume, and I don't want to

make a presumption that's incorrect, would also be

within the circle of confidentiality. And, we have a

group of New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission

personnel.

So, I think it's up to the Company to protect its confidences, and certainly the Staff is going to indicate, if anything, matters that require confidential treatment, and then there could be entry into a confidential segment of this proceeding.

But I don't think, at present, that we require anyone to leave the room. And, perhaps we could double-check that with the Company. But I don't think we have to go through the exercise of excusing people from the room. But, certainly, we can begin a confidential transcript segment.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Geiger, do you need a minute?

MS. GEIGER: I may, Mr. Chairman. We have been provided with some data requests from Staff, and they were all labeled "confidential". And, in communication with Attorney Speidel, my understanding

was that, because this is an investigation, that at least responses to those data requests would be held confidential. And, I know that — I note that one of the items on the order of notice is to have the Company personnel provide information as requested by Staff prior to the status conference. So, I think, at the very least, you know, those, to the extent that those data responses come in today, that those should be maintained confidential.

I don't agree that the sister state agencies enjoy the same status as Commission Staff for purposes of maintaining the confidentiality of this record. So, I would object, to the extent that we get into conversations that border on confidential information, that either the State Fire Marshal's Office or Administrative Services should be privy to those conversations.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. I don't think we need to necessarily decide that this second, because I think there's some other things we can do.

How do people want to proceed with respect to the Fire Marshal's reports? I don't know, Ms. Cole, do you have -- do you want to say something up front or do you just want to participate in the

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

discussion, to the extent there is a discussion of the 2 things that you've provided?

> DISTRICT CHIEF COLE: I could just be --I can just be available to answer questions, unless I'm asked to give a brief overview of how we became involved.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think we'd probably like to get that brief overview. Before you do that, I understand that Commissioner Bailey has a question for Mr. Connor.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Good morning, Mr. Thank you for coming. Can you tell me, in the information that I've reviewed from the Company, a lot of their plans rely on a decision by the State as to whether they're going to continue with steam and enter into a new long-term contract, and I know you're probably not prepared to tell me the answer to that. But could you give me an indication of when we would likely know what the state's plans are with respect to the steam contract or another option?

MR. CONNOR: Yes. I would say, within the next month, we'll be prepared to move forward with a guaranteed energy savings contract. I don't know if you're aware, but we went out for proposals for a

1 quaranteed energy savings contract for 28 facilities, all of which are included that currently have Concord 2 3 Steam for purchasing steam. And, so, we're reviewing 4 those proposals. And, we're hopeful, within the next months, to be able to move forward with the detailed 5 6 feasibility study, which is a detailed audit, which 7 will take probably about five months. So, it's a two-phased approach. If, in fact, that's approved by 8 Governor and Council, we would go through and select a 9 10 vendor and do a detailed audit to confirm their energy 11 saving numbers that they're proposing. 12 And, then, at the end of that, if things 13 are still feasible, we would go forward with a 14 contract, with an energy performance contract, to make 15 those improvements. And, I anticipate that that would 16 probably be September or October of this year. So, 17 that's the timing. 18 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Thank you. 19 your selection or your preliminary selection would be 20 sometime in the next month? 21 MR. CONNOR: Yes. COMMISSIONER BAILEY: And, then you have 22 23 the audit of that one vendor whom you've selected? 24

Yes.

MR. CONNOR:

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: And, if all goes well, then you enter into the contract in the fall?

MR. CONNOR: Correct.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: And, if all doesn't go well, what happens? Are you back at square one?

MR. CONNOR: I wouldn't say "square one", because part of this process is to obtain a lot of energy saving ideas. Actually, at the end of the detailed feasibility study, we could -- we can say to the vendor "Thank you very much for all your ideas." Pay them a fee for completing that audit that we would agree to. And, we could actually take any and all of those measures ourselves.

So, it's hard to say at this point what measures we might take. But we're paying a premium right now, somewhere around \$1.8 million a year to be good neighbors. We're concerned about increases in costs. Are they even going to go above and beyond their most recent tariff that that — that doesn't include. We're also aware that the City of Concord is preparing to move in a different direction. That's no secret. They have that budgeted. We heard from the Merrimack County last week that they intend to move

```
away from Concord Steam, as well as the YMCA, who
 1
          called me last week.
 2
 3
                         So, we're very concerned about the
 4
          sustainability of any type of long-term contract.
                                                             And,
 5
          so, we're -- and, we're going to be moving to do
 6
          something different, given the expense that we're
 7
          paying to stay with Concord Steam.
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: So, the $1.8
 8
 9
          million premium, can you explain that a little bit?
10
                         MR. CONNOR: Basically, that $47 per M
11
          pound, I'm paying about three and three-quarters times
12
          what I would pay at my other facilities that have
13
          natural gas or other fuels.
14
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: So, are you
          prepared to say that you are not going to proceed with
15
16
          a long-term contract with Concord Steam --
                         MR. CONNOR: We have no --
17
18
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: -- or you haven't
19
          decided that?
20
                         MR. CONNOR: We have no intention of
          entering into a long-term contract.
21
22
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay. Thank you.
23
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Speidel.
24
                         MR. SPEIDEL: Yes.
                                             I have a follow-on
```

1	question for Mr. Connor, in light of his statement.
2	Mr. Connor, Staff noticed that the lease
3	agreement with the Department of Administrative
4	Services that Concord Steam has has an expiration date
5	of August the 31st of this year, 2016. Could you shed
6	any light in terms of what the Department's plans are
7	related to the renewal of that lease?
8	MR. CONNOR: Our intention is to renew
9	that. Obviously, we're a major customer of Concord
10	Steam. So, we have no intention to not renew that.
11	There's been discussion of many several different other
12	plans, as you may have known. There was going to be
13	another plant. So, we'll be glad to extend that for
14	whatever duration we need to to continue the current
15	operations.
16	MR. SPEIDEL: And, so, your duration has
17	not yet been fixed, in terms of time?
18	MR. CONNOR: No. We would have some
19	discussions with Concord Steam to see what extension
20	they would be looking for.
21	MR. SPEIDEL: Thank you, Mr. Connor. I
22	appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
24	Ms. Cole, why don't you give us a brief overview of how

you became involved in this.

DISTRICT CHIEF COLE: Sure. So, in late 2014 and early 2015, from October to January, there were three building fires or fires at the facility. As a State building, the Fire Marshal's is notified when Concord Fire responds to that facility. And, we began just talking with Concord Fire about why we were having three fires in such a short timeframe at the facility, and also looking at the last time anyone had been in to do a life safety inspection.

So, I reached out to Administrative

Services and Concord Steam and sat down with them in a meeting in February of 2015 to talk about the status of the plants, what was going on, and maybe potentially why we were having these fires go on.

So, during that time, Vice President
Saltsman was there, and he indicated that they had been
planning to do either some new projects or new
construction at the facility. And, we communicated to
them that, you know, we would be the office that would
be reviewing and approving those projects, should they
come forward, and that those are going to take time, I
guess, come at a later date, and then that day we also
did a -- conducted a limited visual inspection of the

facility. Based on what was seen during that inspection, an inspection report was generated and sent out to Concord Steam, giving them a timeframe to be able to respond back to the violations that were noted, and what their plan of action was going to be in response to those violations.

They did respond back in August of 2015.

And, when I kind of corresponded back and forth with

Mark Saltsman, in questioning about these projects or

this new developments that were going to take place at

this facility, if any of these projects would, I guess,

be able to mitigate some of the hazards that we had

seen there or to be able to improve, you know, the life

safety, we were told or actually it's mentioned in one

of their letters that the decision to move forward with

these projects wouldn't be made until October of 2015.

And, then, that got pushed back until December.

So, I guess not knowing what was going to be going on with the facility, and not knowing how things were going to move forward with these new projects, I asked to meet with them again, as well as State Administrative Services, to kind of get another status and to find out where they saw the facility moving forward, if these projects were going to take

place, and during which timeframe, and also to conduct a more comprehensive inspection at the facility, given its size and type of operations that happen there.

We did conduct an inspection, I guess a more comprehensive inspection, in early October. And, during that time had the opportunity to walk through with some personnel from our office, Plans Review, and I guess more of a technical expertise team to be able to come in and document some of what was going on. And, based on what we saw during that inspection, another inspection letter was generated and sent out, identifying some of the violations and hazards that we saw as an imminent danger to life safety. And, those were kind of marked out and described in the letter as being something that needed to be taken care of immediately.

We again went back with another team from the Fire Marshal's Office, as well as Administrative Services, in late December, and were available and to walk through the whole facility again, just because of the size and the complexity of what's taking place there, to be able to see more extensively what was going on, what would be needed, and to be able to identify, maybe through engineers, structural, fire

protection, and electrical engineers, more specific to those kind of operations than what we had seen during the inspections, to be able to come up with comprehensive reviews of what was, I guess, there at the facility at that time, and what would, if anything, be needed moving forward to be able to address some of the concerns that we saw.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you. Not certain what the next thing people want to talk about is. Attorney Geiger.

MS. GEIGER: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I could just obtain some clarification from Ms. Cole on the date of the inspection that she referenced? That I believe she said there was an inspection that occurred in October of 2015, is that correct?

DISTRICT CHIEF COLE: No. That was what was referenced in the response back from Concord Steam. Was that, in a letter from their company on August 5th, "the upgrade to the facility is dependent on whether the State continues to use steam as a heat source, and that decision will not be made until October at the earliest." So, that was just correspondence between our office and Concord Steam as to status of any

projects or repairs at the facility.

MS. GEIGER: I mean, I just wanted to clarify for the record that I believe the date of the comprehensive inspection was December 11th of 2015. I believe Ms. Cole had said or at least my notes indicated she had indicated "October".

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: My note was -- I had the same note. So, I think, thank you for clarifying that.

DISTRICT CHIEF COLE: Yes. December 11th and also December 30th were the two inspections.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. I want to address a couple of things Attorney Geiger said earlier. One about whether there would be others here, I recognize the order of notice didn't specifically note that others would be here. I think, from our perspective, we need more information than we had. And, it was coming in fairly slowly to the entire Commission. And, it had — it seemed obvious to us that we needed as many people here as possible to get as much information as possible.

And, I'll address another thing you said, and I understand how you can carefully read the transcript and the order that followed that transcript

to perhaps provide a technical limitation on what was provided in that order. I understand that.

I find it difficult to believe that someone could read the larger picture of what was going on with the Company, and its relationship with the Commission, and the Commission's need to oversee one of its regulated utilities, that issues like any Fire Marshal's report that had anything that had the word "life safety" in it would not be something that would be disclosed to the Commission. That seems very difficult for us to believe.

And, the fact that information wasn't provided I think is what you saw in Staff's letter to us. And, their reaction was not too different from the reaction, at least speaking only for myself, that I had. And, I'm also familiar with most of the interactions that we've had in this room with the Company over the last few years. I did happen to miss a fairly significant one last summer, because I had to go to a Governor and Council meeting. And, I'm aware of the exchange that took place that day, and the immediate follow-up correction that needed to be made following that hearing.

So, I will be candid with you,

Ms. Geiger. We're beginning to be concerned that, unless we ask a very specific question worded exactly right, that we're not going to get the information that we need from your client. I know you're knew to this particular representation, at least at this point. But that's a big concern that we have up here. And, if we need to use magic words in order to get accurate information, that's going to be a real problem. You understand?

MS. GEIGER: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Speidel, what's your -- let me also address, I'm sorry, the confidentiality. Having not discussed it, except very briefly with Commissioner Scott, and maybe Commissioner Bailey has a different view, I think Attorney Geiger has probably the better view of who should be in the room, if we do need to talk about something that's confidential. My sense is that it would probably be better if Mr. Connor and the Fire Marshal's Office were not here, if we're going to discuss things that are reasonably viewed potentially later down the line as being confidential through the regular processes.

{IR 16-202} [Status Conference] {02-10-16}

I don't think that's going to prevent us

1 from doing what we need to do today, because I think a lot of the discussion is going to be about what 2 happened with the Fire Marshal. You know, obviously, 3 4 these other agencies might be able to enter into an 5 agreement with the Company about confidential 6 information, but that's not happening in this, in the 7 next 15 minutes. 8 So, if we get to what would need to be a 9 confidential portion of the record, we're probably 10 going to ask Mr. Connor and the Fire Marshal's Office 11 to leave for that portion of the proceeding. 12 All right. Commissioner Scott. 13 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Thank you. 14 couple follow-up questions for Ms. Cole, if I could. And, you may have mentioned it, and maybe I missed it. 15 16 So, I apologize in advance. There's been an 17 implication, and maybe I've read too deeply into 18 things, that is there -- that perhaps there's some 19 structural issues with the facility itself, the 20 building itself. Is that a correct concern? 21 SECTION CHIEF ANSTEY: If I could, 22 Commissioner. We observed several areas of the 23 building where we had -- there had been structural

alterations or, in some cases, just lack of maintenance

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

33

that have created some structural difficulties. Mainly in one area where there's a conveyor that goes through the building that feeds the hoppers outside. There was a cut made in a concrete wall. In that wall, there was nothing to carry the load from the wall down to where usually you would put in a lintel or something to carry that load. Nothing was installed there, which is a concern. Another cut was made, there's a passthrough door, where you can actually see the concrete blocks failing, because nothing was put in to carry that load either. And, two places, one in the area where there's a wooden roof, a lot of the wood is rotted, we have photos where it's actually fallen down. In another area, it's a concrete roof that has cracks of sufficient size that actually rain water and snowmelt are leaking through the cracks. Those are cause for concern structurally. It's the reason that we asked for a structural engineer to be secured to do an evaluation of the building to make sure that it doesn't have a potential to collapse. COMMISSIONER SCOTT: And, my follow-up I think is to Mr. Connor. So, correct me if I'm wrong,

the facility itself, the structure itself, is owned by the State, is that correct?

1 MR. CONNOR: Yes, it is. But we have a 2 lease with Concord Steam that basically says they're 3 responsible for all maintenance at that facility and 4 all operations. 5 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Thank you. 6 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Speidel, 7 Ms. Geiger, how would you like to proceed next? 8 MR. SPEIDEL: Well, Mr. Chairman, Staff 9 would like to invite some unsworn discussion by Randy 10 Knepper and Steve Frink regarding the physical plant 11 and financial aspects of Concord Steam's current 12 status. Following that, we would invite Concord Steam 13 to make the responses they see fit. 14 There is one little wrinkle, and this 15 would pertain to Mr. Frink's discussion. Ms. Geiger 16 was correct in saying that we have characterized, 17 during the pendency of this investigation, all of the 18 questions and all the responses for data requests as 19 There is a summary schedule that has confidential. 20 quite a bit of interesting information from the response to Staff 1-2 that just came in yesterday. 21 22 And, Mr. Frink, this morning, advised me that it would 23 be perhaps helpful for the Commissioners to follow

along that schedule. This is a little bit new, insofar

24

as what can be offered as a "exhibit" at a status conference. I don't necessarily think that it has to be a formal exhibit. It may be a useful informational tool.

Mr. Frink has advised me that there may be some minor technical errors in the schedule that was produced. So, it's not necessarily a final document, but it could be a useful tool for the Commission's consideration of Mr. Frink's discussion. So, I just want to put that on the table, while you're hearing Mr. Knepper's discussion, that, when we get to Mr. Frink's discussion, whether we want to involve ourselves in such an exercise or not.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Geiger.

MS. GEIGER: Mr. Chairman, I'm a bit concerned with having the Company put on the spot today to respond directly to information that we don't quite frankly know what the Staff is going to say. Our understanding, from reading the order of notice, was that, in the first ordered paragraph, that Concord Steam personnel were supposed to appear to detail four things. They're suppose to detail their actions in response to the State Fire Marshal's inspection reports, which we're prepared to do. We have a written

response that was prepared, and we can submit as an exhibit. And, we can also have Mr. Bloomfield and Mr. Saltsman walk you through those detailed steps, responses to the most comprehensive report that we believe the Fire Marshal says supersedes all prior reports, indicate what they're doing or what they have done to correct the outstanding issues, and what they're doing currently to address ongoing issues.

And, then describe — the second thing in the order of notice is to describe the potential effects on operational capabilities, provide factual information, etcetera.

So, we were -- we were going by what was in the order of notice. I'm not -- I don't know if the Company is going to be prepared to respond to anything that Mr. Frink or others may say. We're happy to try. But, you know, we simply weren't expecting that to occur today.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I understand what you're saying. I think that -- I'm not sure how to deal with the document that Mr. Speidel described. It's not a document we have. So, we don't exactly know what we're talking about there.

But, other than that, I think we would

1 like to hear from Mr. Knepper and Mr. Frink. 2 extent that they raise issues that you feel comfortable 3 responding to, that's fine. If they have raised issues 4 that you're not prepared to respond to at this minute, 5 I think we wouldn't expect you to do that on the fly. 6 It's what you're comfortable doing with respect to new 7 things. And, I gather, given the way that 8 9 exchange just took place, that you have responded to 10 that first set of data requests generally? 11 MS. GEIGER: We were asked to respond to 12 three -- we just got those on February 5th. And, so, 13 we provided responses that Staff asked for by today. 14 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. 15 MS. GEIGER: We provided those 16 yesterday. And, then, I think we have until the 15th 17 to respond to the rest of the questions. And, so, --18 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes. As those who aren't familiar with the processes up here, we only get 19 20 data requests and responses when someone needs to show 21 them to us. So, we don't know what you have already 22 done and what agreements you made there on what timing 23 is. 24 So, I think, if Mr. Frink is in a

position to discuss one of the things you've already provided to him, I will leave it to you to sort out whether that's a document that we should see at this point, whether Mr. Frink can do it without us seeing it, or what.

And, I agree with you, Ms. Geiger, we do want to hear from you and your client regarding the Fire Marshal's report and the response thereto.

So, Mr. Speidel, I guess you're going to have Mr. Knepper go first. And, then maybe you and Mr. Frink can figure out how best to present the information that he wants to provide.

MR. SPEIDEL: Yes. Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. I think you hit the high notes, definitely
on the philosophy behind the status conference, is to
provide raw information to the Commission. There's not
going to be final dispositive order issued directly
after this. This is sort of an interim picture in time
regarding what's going on with Concord Steam as of
February. And, I think the reasoning behind that is
because the Commission was very much concerned about
some of the implications of what the Department of
Administrative Services was talking about in some of
its communications with Concord Steam, regarding the

need to maintain compliance with leasing terms, and also what the Fire Marshal's Office was talking about in terms of violations.

So, I think Mr. Knepper and Mr. Frink are going to give a snapshot. It's not a final picture. And, we appreciate the opportunity to do so.

So, I would invite Mr. Knepper to make a statement at the present time. Thank you.

DIRECTOR KNEPPER: Thank you. Sorry, I have a cold. So, if you can't understand me or I'm a little raspy, you're going to have to bear with me.

The Safety Division, in this order of notice, was asked to look at, there was, in my reading the order of notice, I saw that there were six areas that the Commission had concerns with. One was safety regulations. I believe, in reading that order of notice, that you're talking about these life safety codes, which is primarily the Fire Marshal's Office is very familiar with that code of regulations, and, so, we're going to lean very heavily on the reports and the correspondence that goes on regards to that. Another area that was listed was "continuity planning". And, I believe the Safety Division is going to be looking at the continuity plans of the Company. And, then, the

fourth one would be "contingency planning". And, so, I think both the Safety Division and the Gas and Water Division together are going to have to look at the contingency plans. Those are the three areas that we will be focusing on.

I will leave the financial and accounting and the financial planning and the other to basically the Gas and Water Division.

So, under that tact, you know, we need to make sure that we're all talking about what a "continuity of operations plan" is, so that the Company and the Safety Division have a full -- both a clear understanding of what our expectations is and they have an understanding, and what a "contingency plan" is.

And, so, we have not issued any discovery questions on those things yet, at this point in time. We will plan on doing that. But we're going to have to first just make sure that we are all talking the same language. Because some of this is contained in "repowering" status plans, and some of their other documentation that they have, which may or may not be what we consider "continuity of operations plans".

And, so, those are going to be the three areas that we will be focusing on as a Safety Division.

The Safety Division does not have the expertise that the Fire Marshals have on the life safety codes. We're somewhat familiar with them, but we're clearly not trained and have the expertise to do that. So, it makes sense for us to rely on some of that information coming from one of our sister agencies. We will review it and give our comments on it for the Commission, to let — they have those things.

How we first got involved in this was we did attend a December 30th inspection, I believe the end of December, of Concord Steam. And, that was done with the Fire Marshal's Office and Department of Administrative Services. Prior to that, we had not been through the plant, had not looked at it in extensive any detail. And, so, some of this, for us, is getting us up to speed and knowing some of the intricacies of their operations.

And, so, as we become more and more involved in it, look at some of the information that's come in through past dockets, past discovery, and having more conversations with the Company, we'll be able to give a better assessment at that time.

MR. SPEIDEL: Thank you, Mr. Knepper. Would it be a good moment to invite the Commissioners,

```
1
          and then perhaps Concord Steam, to make statements or
          follow-up questions, Mr. Chairman, do you think?
 2
 3
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Does anyone have
 4
          questions for Mr. Knepper?
 5
                         [No verbal response]
 6
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Seems like no one
 7
          wants to engage Mr. Knepper right now.
                         MR. SPEIDEL: Okie-dokie. Well, then, I
 8
 9
          would ask that Mr. Frink be given leave to make a
10
          statement as well of this type.
11
                         And, after further deliberations, we've
12
          decided not to involve Staff 1-2. It's probably
13
          premature to do that and get into that level of
14
          granularity.
15
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
16
                         MR. SPEIDEL: So, thank you.
17
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
                                                           {\tt Mr.}
18
          Frink.
19
                         MR. FRINK: I would just like to say
20
          I've been working with Concord Steam for probably close
21
          to twenty years, and they have always been a pleasure
22
          to work with. In all that time, they have had a good
23
          history of providing safe and reliable service.
24
          think they provide outstanding customer service.
```

But one issue they have always had is that their rates have always been higher than the alternative energy sources. And, I've been involved in a lot of rate cases, and it's in a lot of those orders that, in every instance I believe, they have come in for rates less than they're entitled to under traditional ratemaking, because, really, it's the market that's setting their rates. They're trying to hold onto their customer base, and planning to build a new plant that would give them rates that would be competitive.

So, this is an ongoing issue, because they get rates lower than what they might be entitled to, cash flows are an issue. Their business is, you know, it's a heating service. So, summers are, you know, there's not a lot of revenue. So, there have always been issues with earning a reasonable return or, in some cases, even breaking even.

And, they have been planning on a new plant. The first time it came up was in 2007, and they had hoped to have it in service in the Summer of 2010. In 2011, they entered steam purchase agreements with the City and the State. Their plans had advanced to that point. But there was an out for both the City and

the State that, if the plants didn't get built by a date certain that, you know, the contract — they could exit the contract, which is what happened.

I looked at what steam sales were for 2000 -- for November 2002 through October 2003, their normalized steam sales in their cost of energy was 220,000 M pounds for the year. This year's cost of energy, the normalized sales are 128,000. So, as you can see, their customer base and their sales have -- they have lost customers throughout the years. There's been conservation efforts, there's been all sorts of reasons.

But, with declining sales, and I think what really cause the greatest problems was when the natural gas market underwent a fundamental change, and their rates dropped drastically and make that a much more attractive alternative to steam.

So, it's been a struggle for Concord

Steam. And, if there's continued declining sales and a new plant isn't built, there's a real concern about their ability to continue into the long term.

And, the reason I had suggested entering that one data response, Staff 1-2, was, basically, it shows their sales and which customers are under special

1 contract and the volumes. And, that's, you know, informationally, there's a lot of good information on 2 3 It hasn't been vetted. But it's something we ask 4 for commonly, and it does provide a lot of information, 5 as to, you know, what the State's getting, what the 6 schools are getting, who's under special -- how many 7 are under special contract, that sort of thing. So, I thought it might be helpful and 8 9 generate some questions from the Commission. It's not 10 necessary to get into those details. But, for my 11 purposes, again, Staff's concern is Concord Steam's 12 feasibility going forward. 13 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Does anyone have 14 questions for Mr. Frink? Looks like Commissioner Scott 15 does. 16 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Thank you. Good 17 morning. You heard Deputy Commissioner Connor state, I 18 think I'm quoting him, that he has no intention of 19 entering into a long-term contract with Concord Steam. 20 Did you hear him say that? MR. FRINK: Yes, I did. 21 22 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Much of the -- and 23 I'll ask Concord Steam something similar, when it's 24 their turn, so don't feel neglected. Much of the

1 correspondence from Concord Steam would imply that the future progress, as far as facility upgrades and other 2 3 work to be done, is contingent on that. Did I also hear him say that, this is Deputy Commissioner Connor, 4 5 I think I also heard him suggest that the City, the 6 YMCA, and the County were of a similar mind. Is that 7 your understanding? I heard that, yes. 8 MR. FRINK: 9 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: So, I think that 10 leaves some smaller customers, and the school district 11 is probably the next largest customer, is that correct? 12 MR. FRINK: That's correct. COMMISSIONER SCOTT: And, they have a 13 14 special contract on file? 15 MR. FRINK: They have a special contract 16 that they filed with the Commission for approval. And, 17 it's actually two contracts: One's a three-year 18 contract with the high school, which currently isn't 19 under special contract rates. And, then, the remaining 20 schools that are under special -- do have rates under special contract. And, so, there's a three-year term 21 22 for the high school, and then a ten-year term for the 23 high school and the other schools all under that,

basically, a new contract, that was intended to take

24

effect at the time the new plant comes into service.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: And, the special contract that's been filed before us, can you give me the status on where that is?

MR. FRINK: Staff is reviewing the contract, and expects to have discovery requests out likely this week, next week at the latest. We don't -- often times we don't have a prehearing conference.

We've done special contracts through nisi orders and that sort of thing in the past. But we haven't had a prehearing conference, and whether we will or not remains to be seen. In this case, it probably makes sense.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: And, Staff -- has Staff taken a position on that contract at this point?

MR. FRINK: Staff has some concerns regarding the contracts. For instance, the Concord Steam rate is a discounted rate. And, as we know, the Company just filed an intent for a rate case. And, there's a need for a rate increase. There's always cash flow issues. And, to give a discount to a major customer, and refund back to 2014, obviously, puts more financial stress on the Company. And, the need to make that up from other customers is, obviously, a concern.

1 So, Staff has concerns regarding that. 2 The ten-year contract, that we have 3 concerns with that. And, that -- it's a rate that's set and subject to annual increases that would limit 4 5 the risk to the schools. But, again, if you do that sort of thing, then that can burn the non-special 6 7 contract customers. So, it's -- if we have a prehearing 8 9 conference, those would basically be Staff's initial 10 position that, you know, these are areas of concern. 11 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Thank you. 12 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Commissioner 13 Bailey. 14 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Mr. Frink, did I 15 read somewhere in the record that the contract with the 16 school system is also contingent on Concord Steam's 17 ability to get a long-term contract with the State, and 18 that they can opt out if the State contract doesn't materialize? 19

MR. FRINK: There are some outs in the special contract that -- I don't know that is tied specifically to the State. I think it's more, right now, they constitute a percentage of the load. And, if their percentage of the total load increases to a

{IR 16-202} [Status Conference] {02-10-16}

20

21

22

23

24

certain point, then they would have -- one of the conditions is they could opt out of the contract. So, if the State were to leave, there's no question Concord Steam would exceed that limit.

But it could be, you know, the conservation measures or non-special contract customers leaving or anything else. Again, it's a level that, if they become that much of Concord Steam's load, they can opt out. And, there's some other -- a few other opt outs as well, but --

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: But I think we know, from Mr. Connor, that the State is going to leave. Is that right? I mean, so, --

MR. FRINK: Mr. Connor has stated that the State has no intention of signing a long-term contract. I don't know if it's his position -- as a Staff member here, we don't have final say on certain things. And, I don't know how it is at Administrative Services, if he has final say on that matter or not.

But, yes, that is what he said. And, if that's the case, then that's going to be a major problem for Concord Steam.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Can you go back over your remarks about the declining sales? You said

```
at one point the sales level was "285"?
 1
                         MR. FRINK: 220,000.
 2
 3
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: 220,000 what?
 4
                         MR. FRINK: 220,000 M pounds in a year.
 5
          That was the weather-normalized forecasted sales for
          November 2002 through October 2003, that's their year
 6
 7
          for the cost of energy. And, then, in this cost of
          energy, it was -- weather-normalized sales is 128,000.
 8
 9
          Again, that's M pounds annual sales.
10
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Thank you.
11
          the point is that, in the last 12 to 15 years, they
12
          have lost half their sales?
13
                         MR. FRINK: Approximately.
14
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: And, you think
15
          it's because of things like the gas market and the
16
          price that isn't sustainable the way it is?
17
                         MR. FRINK: Yes. And, that is something
18
          that the Company is on record, they have said that in
19
          hearings, and that's why they have worked so diligently
20
          in getting a new plant built, to get rates down to
21
          where they would be competitive. But that, in coming
          forward with new plant plans, typically, they -- it's
22
23
          on record many times, you know, "our hope is" -- or,
24
          "our plan is to get our rates" -- "lower our rates by
```

1 30 to 40 percent, and at that level it will be 2 competitive." 3 So, based on those representations, it's safe to say they're probably 30 to 40 percent higher 4 5 than what energy costs -- what their current energy 6 costs are, compared to alternative natural gas. 7 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. 8 9 Ms. Geiger, after sitting through a little over an hour 10 of things you weren't expecting to do, we'll let you do 11 what I think you were expecting to do. 12 MS. GEIGER: All right. Thank you, Mr. 13 I think at this point, it probably makes 14 sense to turn it over directly to Mr. Bloomfield and Mr. Saltsman, to, at the outset, provide you with the 15 16 information you've requested in the order of notice, 17 especially insofar as you've asked for detailed --18 detailed actions that the Company has completed for 19 each item mentioned on the Fire Marshal's report. 20 So, if that's okay? And, given that the 21 other folks who have provided comments thus far have done so from their seats, is it the Commission's 22 23 pleasure that these gentlemen do the same here, or

would you prefer that they be sworn as witnesses and

24

1 testify under oath?
2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think we're okay
3 with them where they are.

MS. GEIGER: Thank you. Okay. As I said, Mr. Chairman, I'll just turn it over -- I'll turn it over to both Mr. Bloomfield and Mr. Saltsman. And, would ask that they provide you with information that actually is documented in a report back to Ms. Cole at the State Fire Marshal's Office. This was provided yesterday in writing. And, it responds to the State Fire Marshal's report of December 30th, which Concord Steam just received via e-mail on February 4th. So, within, you know, five days of receiving this report, even though it's dated -- the inspection is December 30th, they have responded in writing, with photographs.

And, I don't know if you have copies of it at the Bench? I can give you -- do you have it?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I do. I think

Commissioner Scott does. And, we all have it, yes.

MS. GEIGER: And, you have all the photographs and everything that have been -- okay.

Great. And, would you like color copies? Because I do think that there's a couple, I will tell you from

```
1
          personal experience, there are a couple where color
          matters, because they will actually show you --
 2
 3
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG:
                                              Sure.
 4
                         MS. GEIGER: -- show you things that I
 5
          couldn't see in black and white. So, --
 6
                         (Atty. Geiger distributing documents.)
 7
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Off the record.
                         [Brief off-the-record discussion
 8
 9
                         ensued. 1
10
                         MS. GEIGER: Thank you.
11
                         MR. SALTSMAN:
                                        Thank you, Mr. Chairman
12
          and Commissioners. Appreciate the opportunity to go
13
          through this report with you.
14
                         First, let me start off by saying that
15
          we do take life safety issues seriously. There's never
16
          been an intent to intentionally not report this to the
17
          Commission. We honestly did not think that that was
18
          part of that quarterly report requirement. And,
19
          therefore, our omission of that was not anything that
20
          we did in an attempt to hide issues that were ongoing
21
          at the plant.
22
                         We certainly realize that the plant that
23
          we have right now poses many challenges. And, we are
24
          doing our best to mitigate those challenges. Part of
```

the original mitigation, as you all are aware,
especially Commissioner Scott, as he's been here for a
while, was to build a new facility. And, that would
have completed mitigated all the issues at this plant.
But, unfortunately, we were unable to complete that.

So, as time goes on, as we came under
the realization that we were not going to be able to
leave that facility, we've steadily made improvements
to that facility. Most recently, we worked with our
insurance provider, Chubb, their inspectors, they have
inspectors at several levels. You know, they have a
fire protection engineer that's on staff. They also
have a boiler inspector that is on staff that is —
that routinely inspects our boiler equipment, not just
only the boilers, but all the associated equipment, any

pressure vessels that we have. All of that is routinely inspected. Through those routine inspections, when they identify issues that we have, and I pre-identified ourselves, they identify those, we must fix those in order to renew our policy with them.

21 So, they're addressed immediately.

Most recently, they identified our -[Court reporter interruption.]

MR. SALTSMAN: Deaerating feed tank,

{IR 16-202} [Status Conference] {02-10-16}

which is a large vessel, where all of the feedwater
goes to before it goes to the boiler, to get scrubbed
for oxygen and non-condensible gases, and be preheated
before it goes into the boiler. That tank, they
identified that tank to have some issues that concerned
them, and they saw it as a life safety issue. They
pointed it out to us, and provided reports to us to
read, that showed that tanks of that nature that showed
that kind of wear failed, and had caused serious damage
and/or a loss of life in the facilities that they
happened. We immediately replaced that vessel. That
vessel was replaced within the next year. A large
undertaking, not an inexpensive thing to do. It
required disassembly of the building, cranes on-site,
and a very costly piece of equipment, and the
installation was very costly. We did not avoid that.
We took it seriously. You know, we changed it.
So, just to make it clear, Concord Steam
does take life safety issues very seriously. And, we
take the report that came out from the Fire Marshal's
Office just as seriously. And, we're slowly working
through all of the issues that they put before us.
You'll see here in this report that

we've responded to many of those. I would not contend

that we have resolved every issue that the Fire Marshal could find on the facility. We've noted, as we expect, every time there is an inspection, something always comes up. We try to be perfect, but we realize that that's often a difficult thing to achieve. But our intention to do our very best to get to perfection, as they would expect it.

If you look at Page -- Item Number 1, just there's -- the way we listed that is what they had put in their report as an issue, and then we put our response in there. And, you'll note that Item 1 had -- was concerning "installing and repairing illuminated exit signage". We've had many signs throughout the facility already. The main issue with several of them was that their batteries had run low. And, so, when we tested those, there was a few that didn't work.

And, there were some in places where there shouldn't have been some, and there were some missing in places where there should have been some. So, we tried to correct that.

And, the various photos that you'll see there are just an indication that we've done that, that we've been working on it. I tried to put them in. The inspector, Ron Anstey, and I'm hoping I'm not

butchering your name too much, Ron, he was very specific, very helpful in pointing out where we should take care of those, those issues. And, so, I tried to do that as much as possible.

I think we got most of them covered. Hopefully, we got them all covered. But, you know, I'm not 100 percent certain, because the report wasn't exactly specific. And, I had to rely on my memory and my note-taking of the walk-through. And, I think we did a pretty good job on getting those in every place that they needed to be.

MR. BLOOMFIELD: And, this is Peter.

And, one point is that we started making these corrections immediately after the visit was made. We didn't wait till the report was received. You know, the visit, you know, the inspection visit was the 30th, and we have been doing this over the whole month of January, we've been making these changes.

MR. SALTSMAN: Yes. I had personnel, on that afternoon, begin to work on some of the issues that they pointed out. We have — there were some electrical issues that were pointed out that we had — we have a contractor, Doherty Electric, who provides us with electricians, licensed electricians. We had them

come in immediately and cover up junction boxes that were identified as potential hazards.

Also, there was rubber cords that were being used for some of the lighting that the Fire Marshal's Office felt were inappropriate. Rather than to try to figure out exactly which ones met code, I just had them go through and replace all of those rubber cords, so the facility is essentially free of those, for the most part, at least the ones that we were able to identify readily. That was all done within the first week of the inspection. That was prior to receiving the report as indicated.

You'll also see, in Items 2 and 3, there were the issues of exit access. I need to have a conversation with Chief Cole and her staff to be able to identify exactly what we were talking about there. I didn't remember, from our conversation in the walk-through or my notes, exactly where they were talking about getting access. So, I need to -- I need to get with them and find out where they feel those are at resolve that issue. But we're work on that as well.

Fire extinguishers: We have contracted with Hampshire Fire Protection for as long as I can remember. So, it's at least 20 years we've had them or

somebody like them come into the facility to do the annual inspections of our fire extinguishers, in addition, to do a fire extinguisher replacement whenever one has been exercised. They're responsible to us for taking care of all those fire extinguishers.

I think we do a really good job of keeping good working-order fire extinguishers throughput the plant. My safety officer is going through the plant right now to make -- to ensure that we have the right number of fire extinguishers distance-wise from one another. It refers in the report later about those fire extinguishers not being "more than 50 feet apart". We think we're covered on that. Although, we did identify one -- a couple various as questionable whether the fire extinguishers are adequately placed. And, so, we're just going to add a couple more just to make sure.

But, again, for as long as I can remember, we've made sure that we had workable fire extinguishers. One of the — one of the issues was some of the cards that were put on by Hampshire Fire Protection didn't allow for putting in the monthly inspection that our safety officer does on those. And, quite honestly, he was doing the monthly inspection, he

just -- there wasn't a place on the card that was on the fire extinguisher to fill it out, so, he didn't do it. So, we've since had Hampshire Fire Protection replace all those cards with the right one, so that it can be adequately recorded.

Moving on, there is just -- you'll see some photos again of the fire extinguishers. And, that's typical throughout the facility.

The next item, Item 4, is "Illumination of Means of Egress". Again, we've had Doherty Electric going through the plant. They have added some — they have added some emergency lighting and exit signs with lamps, to make sure that that is being done. They are continuing to do that. I think they're pretty close to being done on that.

And, Number 5, again, it's "Emergency Lighting". That goes a along with the same statement I just made. We have Doherty Electric working on and ensuring we have an adequate number of lights. And, you'll see some of that that were just pointed out that were recently added. If you'll notice, that photo that's just below Item Number 5, you'll see there's a little yellow label on that lamp. That is our -- one of the things that we're trying to be more proactive on

is having a PM program as recommended or requested by the Fire Marshal's Office, to have a -- basically, an Excel spreadsheet type program that allows us to record that we've done monthly and quarterly and annual checks on these, on these lights. So, that's -- I'm just pointing out that yellow sticker, that's one of the things that we're doing.

MR. BLOOMFIELD: One of the -- one of the issues with emergency lighting is, we don't necessarily feel that we're working with fire protection engineers and stuff. But, since we have an emergency generator that comes on within five seconds of loss of power that feeds the whole facility, we're not absolutely certain that we actually needed to put all these lights in. But we went and put them in anyway as just a belts-and-suspenders. It's what the Fire Marshal recommended, so, we went and put them in.

MR. SALTSMAN: Item 6 is "Fire
Reporting". At the time, and there's a note in there,
and you'll see it in italics there, "at the time of the
inspection, an active fire was discovered." Concord
Steam argued that that was a active fire, it was some
sawdust that was on a duct coming from our Number 6
boiler that was smoking, it wasn't actively on fire.

And, we don't want to parse words over that, but it is bothersome that it was characterized as an "active fire". I was up there with the inspector, and I didn't see any fire. I did see some smoldering wood dust. It comes off of a beater bar that we have that clears dust off of a belt. And, it had gotten --some of it had gotten on that hot duct. And, essentially, it was like ash in an ashtray, it was smoldering. But not we -- not that I -- I'm not trying to make light of it, I just -- it wasn't an active fire. So, I just wanted to point that out. And, we do report fires. When we have a fire, we report it to the Concord Fire Department.

"Damp and Wet Locations", that's Item

Number 7. We would -- well, I'm not going to go into

the detail, because that -- part of the discussion, and

I think it's going to be taken care of when we have the

fire protection engineer go through the facility and

the electrical engineer go through the facility, to

really identify whether one of the areas that was

pointed out was a serious issue or not.

But there was a drain from a steam turbine generator that was open because we were draining that particular turbine down, it was -- there

was steam that was wisping up, a cloud vapor of steam that was going over by switchgear. Inspectors pointed out that they saw that as an issue. And, I understand, I understand their concern. We just — that's kind of normal in these kind of facilities. And, in a power plant, you're going to see the turbine drains open around electrical switchgear and equipment all the time.

But, so, what we did, we've rerouted that. Just to try to mitigate any issues, we've rerouted that drainage so that it's going into a different part of the building, where there's a penthouse and a vent fan that pulls it out of the facility and vents it outside. So, that's -- we've done that.

There was also noted some water on an electrical cabinet. We've taken care to make sure that that's protected from that.

Number 8, "Personnel Doors", it talks about "where electrical equipment rated at 1,200 amps or more that contains overcurrent devices, switching devices, or control devices installed, and there's a personnel door intended for entrance or egress from the working space shall be equipped with a panic bar".

And, then, there was -- you see that big set of wooden doors there? That has a big deadbolt across it. And, which, if it was meant to be a means of egress, it should not have, absolutely. And, we realize that. What I -- what didn't -- what always got by me, and I'm not quite sure why it did, is that there was an exit sign above that door. That door was never intended as an exit. We don't use it as an exit. People don't use it as a personnel door. It's used as a service door, when we need to take large pieces of equipment in and out of the generator room, we use that door for that access only. And, so, what we did was just took the exit sign down. And, the door is a service door, not an exit door.

And, how we satisfied the requirement for personnel, Mr. Anstey recommended that we put exit lamp and a crash bar on the door that leads in through the Plant Manager's office, and then there's a door right there, and it goes directly outside. So, you see that photo there, that shows the crash bar that was added to the door and the exit lamp that was put up above it, illuminated exit — exit sign.

And, then, we also put an illuminated exit sign over the double doors on the other side of

the generator room that leads into the boiler plant, to take care of -- so that there's more than one means of egress out of that, out of that room.

Number 9 was to "Clear Working Space

Around Electrical Switch Gear and Panelboards" -
"Disconnect, and Panelboards". Rightly pointed out by
the inspectors, our Chemistry -- our Water Chemistry
work station was in front of the panels that you'll see
on the next picture. We've since moved that work
station, so that you have access to those panels. We
moved those panels -- the work station over to a
different part of the plant.

It's not that we didn't have preventive maintenance on our electrical equipment to begin with. But we concur with the inspection team that we should have a more specific EPM, instead of just a regular PM program for that, that electrical switchgear. And, typically, in the past, it's been done by in-plant electrician, by our own staff. But we're going out-of-house for that to get that done. And, again, we're working with Doherty Electric to complete that. And, that will take some time. That's no small task.

Item Number 11, just in general, to make

sure there's no deadbolts on the bars -- or, on the doors or bars on the doors. And, I've directed plant staff to remove all of the deadbolts that we could identify that were egress issue doors. So, I believe that's completed.

Items 12, 13, 14, and 15 are relative to what kind of fire protection should be in the facility. And, we are working with Nick Cricenti, from SFC Engineering. He's our fire protection expert. And, he was at the facility yesterday doing his initial investigation and a walk-through. He's going to help us identify exactly how we deal with these issues.

We're not -- we don't have the expertise to know exactly how we should address each one of these. And, he's going to give us guidance on that, and he's going to work with the Fire Marshal's Office to make sure that, where there's issues, that we take care of them, and, where we need to seek waivers, we get waivers.

Item 16, again, I mentioned that earlier, that talks about the fire extinguishers being within 50 feet of one another.

And, then, 17, 18, and 19 requested us to do a series of inspections. And, we have -- we have

contracted with folks already to start that process.

As I said, SFC has already been on site. Bob Mohlin, with Mohlin & Company, a structural engineer, has been contacted. He is going to put us on his schedule as soon as possible, to come over and take a look at the areas that were identified as structural concerns.

And, then, Doherty Electric is, who has a master electrician on staff, is going to do a review of the electrical equipment in the plant, and make recommendations to us and to the Fire Marshal's Office of what should be addressed.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Geiger.

MS. GEIGER: Mr. Chairman, I guess I would make Mr. Saltsman and Mr. Bloomfield available for questioning by the Commission, if they have any questions, or other parties.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Speidel, do you or other members of Staff have questions for the Concord Steam people at this point?

DIRECTOR KNEPPER: Yes. I hope Concord Steam keeps us abreast, because some of these items are long term, you know, development of plans, you have to have people come in and inspect them. I hope that they will share that with us going forward. And, I guess

1	that's all I have right now.
2	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Cole,
3	Mr. Anstey, anything that the Company said that you
4	want to follow up with them on or comment on at this
5	moment, at this point?
6	SECTION CHIEF ANSTEY: Thank you, Mr.
7	Chairman. We've only we only got actually saw
8	this this morning. So,
9	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And, do you have
10	the lovely color version?
11	SECTION CHIEF ANSTEY: We do. We do.
12	And, we are very happy to see that several of the
13	housekeeping issues have been taken care of. It's a
14	great first step.
15	I have questions on a couple of things.
16	I'm not going to get into the definition of "fire" or
17	pyrolysis and other things. We obviously can prove
18	that, when there's smoke and char, that there's active
19	fire, even if you don't see a flame. We can deal with
20	that.
21	As far as reporting, they cited an OSHA
22	requirement not requiring them to report. The
23	statutory requirements do require it. And, I think
24	that's something we can work out with Concord Fire. as

1 to, they call and say "Listen, I've got something this size." Then, if Concord Fire wants to respond or not, 2 3 that would be up to them as to how they want to deal with that response. 4 5 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It sounds to me 6 like you have lots to talk about with the Company with 7 respect to this? SECTION CHIEF ANSTEY: We have some. 8 9 didn't test their generator. It didn't seem like the 10 prudent thing to do in the middle of December, to shut 11 the power off. So, you know, it's something we would 12 like to probably do. They cited in their response 13 "we'd like to do that in the summer, when it's a better 14 timeframe." 15 But it's nice to see the response. We 16 await -- our letters gave them 30 days to get the 17 proper people in place. A lot of what we do is going 18 to be subject to the reports coming in from those 19 engineering professionals, showing where the deficiency 20 are and recommendations that they make, and then the 21 plan of correction in there. 22 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Knepper? 23 DIRECTOR KNEPPER: Yes. I have one 24 On Item Number 10, the EPM, you know, it comment.

lists the four requirements. I mean, one of the things at Concord Steam is they have a lot of equipment that was used at one time or electrically was used at one time. I just want to make sure that it gets included in there the stuff that's no longer — the electric — there's a lot of electric stuff that, when you walk through, you can't tell whether its live or dead. I want to make sure that that plan necessarily identifies that.

It would be very helpful, when it does that, so that this just kind of lists, you know, get a "listing of all electrical equipment and systems", the ones that are most critical. But the ones that are no longer used or out-of-service, that would also be very helpful.

MR. SALTSMAN: If I can respond?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes.

MR. SALTSMAN: Okay. The equipment that Mr. Knepper is referring to is the State-owned equipment that's been in the facility since we've been there. We've always deemed it not our right to remove that, nor our responsibility to remove that, because we don't know — some of that stuff was active in the plant for a good number of years while we were there,

and the State retired it from service, as they no longer needed it for their purposes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And, so, we -- we would certainly be willing to mark it "out-of-service". But that's going to take some -- that's going to take some cooperation with the State folks over there at the facility, to let us know what is and what is not of their electrical panels of over there that are not out-of-service.

Unfortunately, it's -- our lease with them is not quite as clean-cut as you would normally anticipate, because, originally, when it was entered into, there was quite a bit of equipment in that facility that the State still relied on, (a) to either power their equipment, actually, directly, originally, when we first took over that facility, that whole generating room, they still ran that, and they used the power from that generating room for their own facility. We used to sell them steam for their steam turbine generators that were in that room, and then they subsequently made power and powered their whole facility. And, then, as they went on grid, so to speak, they began to retire some of that. We bought some of the generating assets. Some of those, some of the switchgears, some of those panels in there, we did

not, because they still needed them for their purposes.

So, there's a little bit of a -- there's a little bit of uncertainty on our part on exactly what is in service and what is not in service that they own over there. So, it just --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think it's fair to say that you can work with Mr. Knepper and your landlord to identify clearly what is and isn't part of what you do. And, if it's State of New Hampshire surplus, maybe we'll find it over at White Farm one day. But it can certainly be -- you can figure it -- you can work out with Mr. Knepper --

MR. SALTSMAN: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: -- how it needs to be marked, or Mr. Anstey or whomever, after you've conferred with your landlord as to what is and isn't something that they want or need or need to have preserved. It doesn't seem like an unreasonable request.

MR. SALTSMAN: No. No. Certainly not a -- no. No, I didn't mean to indicate that I saw it as an unreasonable -- it's just, I was just trying to make the point, it's more complicated than just us identifying, us having an electrician come in or an

```
1
          electrical engineer come in and identify that.
                                                          It's
 2
          not quite that easy.
 3
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Understood.
 4
          Commissioner Scott.
 5
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Thank you.
                                                          And,
 6
          thank you for coming to talk to us. Different
 7
          questions, but why don't we start with the report,
          on -- I don't remember which item it is, but the
 8
          structural analysis that you contracted for or are
 9
10
          contracting for, I think that's -- I guess that's 18, I
11
          think, right? Does that sound right?
12
                         MR. SALTSMAN: Yes.
13
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Can you give me an
14
          idea of the timing for that? When will you know the
15
          analysis says "you need to do X"?
16
                         MR. SALTSMAN:
                                        Two things on that.
17
          We're trying to get Bob Mohlin in here, or somebody
18
          from his engineering firm, to look at that as quickly
19
          as possible. And, I would think that that's going to
20
          be in the next week or two. The report shouldn't take
21
          a lot of time.
22
                         Just to point out, though, when that
23
          hole was originally cut for the conveyors, Mohlin &
24
          Company reviewed that at that time, and told us that
```

```
1
          they didn't see it being an issue.
 2
                         But we don't have -- we can't dig up a
 3
          report on that. So, --
 4
                         MR. BLOOMFIELD: It was 35 years ago.
 5
                         MR. SALTSMAN: Yes, it was 35 -- 35
 6
          years ago. So, we're going to have them look at it
 7
          again and give us a report. And, we'll also have them
          look at that doorway and the other areas that were of
 8
 9
          concern. And, if there's things that need to be done,
10
          we'll certainly do them. But we'll have it done as
11
          soon as possible, within a couple weeks, hopefully, at
12
          least the initial inspection. Now, how long it takes
13
          them to generate a report, hopefully, they can get that
14
          out in a few days.
15
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: And, you may have
16
          heard me question Deputy Commissioner Connor on whose
17
          responsibility, ultimately, what I was getting at,
          for the facility, and he suggested "that's in your
18
19
          lease, --
20
                         MR. SALTSMAN: Yes.
21
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: -- so, it's your
22
          responsibility"?
23
                         MR. SALTSMAN:
                                        Yes.
                                              Yes.
24
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Even though it's a
```

```
1
          State-owned property, it's --
                         MR. SALTSMAN: Yes.
 2
 3
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: All right. This is
 4
          in no particular order, so, you have to excuse my
 5
          notes. So, the Chair mentioned an exchange in our cost
 6
          of -- your cost of energy hearing this -- in October,
 7
          and you corrected some testimony that was given. I'd
          like to follow up on that. So, I had asked about
 8
 9
          emission fees for environmental permitting, that's --
10
          my understanding is that's been paid, is that
11
          correct, --
12
                                        Yes. That's correct.
                         MR. SALTSMAN:
13
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: -- subsequently?
14
          The NOx RACT testing has now been completed, is that
15
          correct?
16
                         MR. SALTSMAN:
                                        Yes, sir.
17
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Do you, and I
18
          understand it takes a while to go through the analysis
19
          and all that, so, you may not know the answer to this,
20
          I understand. Do you know if facilities passed?
21
                         MR. SALTSMAN: Yes. I believe they all
22
                   In addition, we do have low NOx burners on.
          passed.
23
          So that we meet the requirement either way, whether
24
          they pass by actual emissions or pass because of
```

```
1
          technology. In either case, we're, as they say, "good
          to go". But I believe they all passed emissions on an
 2
 3
          emissions basis as well.
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Excellent. That's
 4
 5
          good to hear. And, my understanding, am I correct, you
 6
          probably passed the Continuous Emission Monitors
 7
          Relative Accuracy tests?
                         MR. SALTSMAN: Yes, we did.
 8
 9
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Or, audits, rather?
10
                         MR. SALTSMAN: Yes. We have a
11
          relatively new system on, so -- and it's been working
12
          pretty good for us.
13
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Excellent.
14
          Excellent.
15
                         (Mr. Saltsman and Mr. Bloomfield
16
                         conferring.)
17
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Do you want to
18
          amend that or --
19
                         MR. BLOOMFIELD: Not at all. I was just
20
          saying that we had a critical piece fail last year that
21
          we had to replace. So, it took us -- we were a few
22
          weeks with determining what the problem was, and then,
23
          of course, we wanted the new equipment, and it took
24
          another few weeks. So, there was some period of time
```

```
1
          last year where we were not -- our system wasn't in
          full service.
 2
 3
                         MR. SALTSMAN: Not in compliance.
                         MR. BLOOMFIELD: But now it's in good
 4
 5
          shape.
 6
                         MR. SALTSMAN: But to answer your
 7
          question, yes, we passed the RATA. I understood that
          to be your question.
 8
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Good. You've been
 9
10
          talking life safety issues. Obviously, the Fire
          Marshal's Office we understand has been in. Have you
11
12
          had an OSHA inspection in recent --
13
                         MR. SALTSMAN: Not recently, no.
14
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Can you give a
15
          timeframe when -- have they been there before?
16
                         MR. SALTSMAN:
                                        They were there several
17
          years ago, maybe six years ago, something like that.
18
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Did that result in
19
          fines?
                         MR. SALTSMAN: Yes, it did.
20
21
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: And, are those
22
          issues still in compliance?
23
                         MR. SALTSMAN:
                                        Those issues are in
24
          compliance. We had subsequent inspections from the
```

original one, where they reinspected. We provided -we provided a report very similar to this, to them, to
show that we had taken care of their concerns.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Okay. And, let me ask one of those "magic word" questions that I think the Chair was referencing.

So, one of the things we're generally concerned about, obviously, is the wellbeing for the utility and, therefore, the customers, the ability for the utility to be managed, and, in that guise, and if there's anything that puts it at risk. So, I'll ask you a global question. Is there any compliance issue that would put the utility at risk, whether it's financially or otherwise, that you're aware of?

MR. SALTSMAN: Let me answer that in a long way. First of all, we weren't trying to parse words with the report. We really did not understand that, that that's -- some of these kinds of things were what you were expecting to see in that quarterly report. Our mindset was really towards what operationally, as far as providing service to the customers, and losing customers, gaining customers, and the repowering project, were our primary focus, when we thought of what needed to be required in the quarterly

reports, and the intermediate reports, when required.

And, the only -- the only issue that we have that's outstanding right now that we need to take care of is our tank closures. We do have two tank closures, Number 6 oil tanks, that we have to complete, our plan is to complete those this summer. Just to make you aware of those.

And, there's also an issue before Weighs and Measures, that is our scale. Our scale is — it's a scale, that we've used this scale for forever, and it was recently identified a number, well, a few years ago that it really wasn't a certified scale, even though we had it routinely tested and certified by test companies. So, that's an issue. We've dealt with that. We've made the Weighs and Measures reasonably comfortable that what we're doing there is adequate. But they would like to see that replaced, and our plan would be to replace that, if we did the repowering project, would be to replace that scale.

So, those are some issues that it seems that, hearing the tone today, that you probably want to hear about those. So, I'm putting those on the table.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: The oil tanks you mentioned, are those -- the closures that need to be

1 done, are those aboveground or --MR. BLOOMFIELD: Both. 2 3 MR. SALTSMAN: They're unique. Part of 4 them is underground and part of them is aboveground. 5 So, they're kind of a different animal for the State to 6 deal with. And, --7 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Is there leakage associated? 8 9 MR. SALTSMAN: No. MR. BLOOMFIELD: These were heavy oil 10 11 tanks that the State had converted part of the old coal bunker into, they basically walled it up, and gunited 12 13 the inside, and just filled it with oil. And, so, they 14 did that in the 19 -- early 1950s. So, it's been --15 always been just heavy oil. Since then, we have 16 stopped using it. 17 As we understand it, there's no concern 18 about the leakage. We do -- we were doing regular 19 groundwater sampling right near it with no indication. 20 But, in order to meet the requirements of the UST 21 folks, we're going to go through a closure. It was --22 what it is is, as I say, it's two sides are buried, on 23 the high side, and two sides are open and exposed. So, 24 it's half buried and half aboveground.

{IR 16-202} [Status Conference] {02-10-16}

```
1
                         MR. SALTSMAN: Because it is heavy oil,
          Number 6 oil, it's virtually impossible for it to leak,
 2
 3
          because it can't. It's like tar. So, it has a -- it
          doesn't want to go anywhere once it hits anything
 4
 5
          that's very cool. It actually has to be heated in
 6
          order to pump it.
 7
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Of course, when the
          Commission is aware of --
 8
 9
                         [Court reporter interruption.]
10
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Please be aware,
          the Commission is aware of a tar remediation that's
11
          going on with some of our utilities.
12
13
                         MR. SALTSMAN: Okay.
14
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: So, it's a
15
          sensitive topic, obviously.
16
                         And, similarly, it sounds like, again,
17
          it's a State-owned facility, but this is under your
18
          purview per the lease, is that correct?
19
                         MR. SALTSMAN: One could argue one --
20
          that, but we're going to take care of it.
21
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: I do have more
22
          questions. I had asked Mr. Frink a question about
23
          Deputy Connor's -- Deputy Commissioner Connor made a
24
          statement about the intention -- his intention for the
```

```
1
          State not to sign a long-term contract. He had also
          implied that the YMCA, that the County were of a like
 2
 3
          mind. Is that news to you all?
 4
                         MR. BLOOMFIELD: Yes.
 5
                         MR. SALTSMAN: Yes. I'll defer to Mr.
          Bloomfield.
 6
 7
                         MR. BLOOMFIELD: We had communications
          from the City maybe two weeks ago, that they got a
 8
 9
          report back from their consultant that recommended that
10
          they continue with Concord Steam. I had a conversation
11
          with Jim Doremus, who runs the YMCA, maybe a month ago,
12
          that he said he wanted to renew his contract.
13
          County, I'm not really familiar with that.
14
                         MR. SALTSMAN: Yes. I was aware with
15
          the County, because the County is -- they're planning
16
          on moving from that facility. So, we assumed that,
17
          when that changed hands, it would -- they would do
18
          something different.
19
                         MR. BLOOMFIELD: And, his --
20
          Mr. Connor's statement of -- a flat statement of them
21
          "not intending to sign any long-term steam contract" is
22
          news to us. We've been waiting, without getting any
23
          response, no matter how many times we ask them. So,
24
          this is the first time we've heard that response.
```

```
1
          So, --
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: And, understanding
 2
 3
          it's the first time you've heard it, so, I understand
          you may want to dwell on this, do you have a reaction
 4
          to that?
 6
                         MR. BLOOMFIELD: I would refer to
 7
          Mr. Frink's comment about "it may be Mr. Connor's
          position, but it may not be his boss's position."
 8
                                                             So,
 9
          we're going to talk to his bosses.
10
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: The other thing I
11
          think I heard, that statement aside, I think I heard
          the Deputy Commissioner mention is he hoped, within a
12
13
          month, to have -- be in a position where they would do
14
          the second stage of the analysis. And, I think I heard
15
          him suggest that his hope was then by October of 2016,
16
          this October, they would have a final result of what
17
          would happen. Is that news to you?
18
                         MR. SALTSMAN: Yes.
19
                         MR. BLOOMFIELD: I think that we knew
20
          what their general -- what their --
21
                         MR. SALTSMAN: Process.
22
                         MR. BLOOMFIELD: -- what their general
23
          intent was, what their process was. But we didn't have
24
          those specific dates yet. Those were new.
```

1	COMMISSIONER SCOTT: And, again, I'll
2	ask an unfair question, since you just heard it. Does
3	that change your how does that bear upon your future
4	plans?
5	MR. BLOOMFIELD: It, obviously, has a
6	significant effect. What we need to do is talk to his
7	bosses, and the and some of the people in the
8	political hierarchy. And, if that's the case, then,
9	yes. It would absolutely change our what we're
10	planning to do.
11	COMMISSIONER SCOTT: So, Mr. Saltsman
12	just mentioned he was aware the YMCA would be moving
13	anyways.
14	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No, no. The
15	County.
16	COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Excuse me. I'm
17	sorry, the County. I apologize. I was curious about
18	any other customer migration that you're aware of,
19	either, you know, the past year people have left or
20	announced they are intending to leave?
21	MR. SALTSMAN: We did I think we, in
22	our last COE report, we reported all the ones that we
23	are aware of. Just there was a couple of smaller
24	commercial buildings that moved away. One in

particular I can think about is the Latchis Building that's down on Theatre Street, they converted over to natural gas.

MR. BLOOMFIELD: And, the Historical Society redid one of its buildings and converted it from steam to gas.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Okay. So,

Mr. Knepper mentioned that he'd be talking to you more
about continuity of operations and contingency plans.

I have similar concerns at that end, too. And, I'll
caution your counsel, you know, if we need to go to a
confidential session, you know, I'll rely on her to
tell us this.

So, one of the concerns I have is, and I'll ask you straight out, I mean, you have a -- you know, it's relatively small facility. I know you've been at this for quite a while. Should the Commission be assured that, if, you know, heaven forbid, something happened to one of you two, that the facility still operates? I mean, you know, how unique is the facility? And, do we have others that can step in? Again, I hope nothing does, I don't mean to suggest that it will.

MR. SALTSMAN: It could. I mean, we're

all here -- we're all here temporarily. I believe that the staff, one of the things that I've tried to do -- and I'm answering this, because I'm primarily responsible for the day-to-day operations and all the operational and distribution service personnel. One of the things I've always prided myself on is having people underneath me that are very adequately trained and capable to do things in my absence.

So, I believe that, while it may be painful, if one of the two of us were not here, I can't honestly answer that question with absolute certainty, but I believe we would — Concord Steam will continue to operate quite well. But it's — you know, every time you lose somebody that's a key person within the staff, and, you know, there's other key personnel there, other than just myself and Mr. Bloomfield, when we lose a key person it's, you know, it's a difficult transition, until you get somebody else that's able to step in and take over that position.

But we've always been able to do that. We've lost a number of key personnel over the last 24 years that I've been part of the facility, and we've always been able to fill the shoes. And, sometimes a more -- with somebody that's more competent than the

last person, and sometimes somebody that needs a little time to come, you know, up to speed. You know, but we've always been able to do that.

Now, Concord Steam is very proud of its operational record. We have been able to weather many storms, literally, quite literally and figuratively speaking as well. We've had the rare instances where our customer base has — have been without steam. I would say that our record far exceeds any of the electric utilities that are in this state for operational reliability, as far as making sure that our product was delivered to the customer's doorstep as required. We've done quite — we've done quite well with that. And, I'm really proud of it. It's not been an easy task. As you can see, and you're hearing through testimony, the facility has got some challenges. But we've always been able to overcome any challenge that we've ever had there.

In the 2006 Mother Day floods, we were flooded, that facility was flooded. And, we were able to dewater it, make the necessary repairs and have that facility back on line before anybody even realized that there was an outage with service. That was an undertaking.

But what we do there is we have a number of outside contractors that we rely on, because we're, obviously, a small staff. We don't have the luxury of the bigger utilities to overstaff ourselves with technical personnel to address all these issues. What we do is we make sure that we have reliable contractors that will respond immediately, and they always have. If they don't, we get somebody else. And, so, that's how we deal with most of the operational issues that we have, when we have a major failure. If we have a boiler tube leak, we have at least three different contractors that we can get ahold of and have them on site within a matter of hours, usually less than a hour, to deal with those kinds of issues.

So, we have contingency plans and continuity of operation plans. And, I think we just need to work with the Staff to make them understand how we do things. It was mentioned that we don't have an MOU. We have always, almost on an annual basis, contacted local boiler rental companies, to make sure that there's availability for what we would need. Remembering that the Company already maintains three boilers that any which one can go off line, and we've got another one that can act as backup. We don't

need -- typically, we only need one boiler. So, essentially, we have two backups. There is times where one of those boilers has to act as a peak shaver. But, generally speaking, we have a number of backups.

Also, all of our auxiliary equipment, every piece of equipment that we have, whether it be a feed pump, a fan, all of those have redundancy, multiple redundancy. We have one boiler that has three feed pumps. Our high pressure boiler, it's a critical boiler, it's the one that does the most work for us, we have three feed pumps for that boiler. So -- and any one of those feed pumps can feed that boiler by itself. So, we have three of them to make sure that we always have water -- you know, lifeblood for a boiler is water. So, we make sure that we have an adequate feedwater supply.

The same thing with the low pressure boilers. There's -- I think there's three feed pumps, yes, there's three feed pumps for those as well. And, we have an emergency backup generator that's capable of providing backup power, black power, to the black start capabilities to the plant. That thing's been exercised once a week, starts every week. If it doesn't start, we figure out why it's not starting. And, before the

day's end, it's working again, because we realize it's critical to our operation to be able to have backup power.

Additionally, because we have those steam turbine generators in the facility, if push came to shove, we can also, just in-house, produce power through our steam turbine generators as well. So, we have multiple power sources, the grid, a backup generator, a steam turbine generator, to provide power.

And, staffwise, you know, I try to keep -- we got to be doing something right there, because we've had -- our staff has been with us for a long time, most of them. We have some highly trained, competent operators that know what they're doing. We have an operation supervisor that lives very close by, so, when there's an issue, he can be on-site to help -- help walk them through whatever casualty they may have.

Additionally, I live in town. So, when it's something major, that my phone always rings, and I'm always there at the facility to also help walk them through any major issues. And, Mr. Bloomfield, as well, lives reasonably close, he's just in Bow. So, we have personnel that can respond for additional help with all of us within, generally speaking, fifteen

minutes of the facility.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Along those lines, and I appreciate your response, it sounds like it's a fairly unique facility. Any facility that old is going to have unique quirks, I suspect, that somebody, you know, a trained boiler operator won't necessarily have experienced before, is that fair?

MR. SALTSMAN: That's a fair statement. It takes training. No matter what your experience is in the boiler operating field, and it doesn't matter whether it's our facility or you're going to another one, a new facility to you as a — in particular, as a mechanic, not so much. I mean, you know, that kind of work is that kind of work.

As a boiler operator, there's always uniqueness to every facility. And, it takes a period of time to be trained in that. And, that would extend to the Plant Manager Operations Supervisor, and, Lord forbid, something would happen to me, it would take the General Manager some time to familiarize themselves.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: So, to the extent there may be unique knowledge to one or two individuals, do you document that, so, you know, in a worst case, that it's -- at least somebody can pick up

the ball and --

MR. SALTSMAN: We do have a training — we have a training manual that has all the systems in it. So, anybody could pick that up, and, if they know what they're looking at, they could figure things out.

But, essentially, what I know, my Plant Manager knows, as far as plant operations. What my Plant Manager knows, my Operations Supervisor knows. So, there's a chain of personnel that are pretty familiar with the facility. And, then, the operators themselves are all — they have all been around long enough that they could, if all three of us weren't around, they could probably do quite well on their own.

It's just, it's more the business decision, "who would we call?" You know, "who do we call in this case?" "Who do we call in that case?" You know, I have preferences. And, so, those are things that are done on a higher level that may not necessarily be known by personnel underneath me.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: So, that answers a lot of my "continuity of operations" concerns. And, again, I hope you'll have more dialogue, I trust you'll have more dialogue, I would like you to have more dialogue with the Staff.

{IR 16-202} [Status Conference] {02-10-16}

1 MR. SALTSMAN: Absolutely.

2 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Contingency plans.

So, we just discussed, you've got new information today, at least notionally, directionally, it sounds like, you certainly know the Deputy Commissioner for Administrative Services' desires. He implied some information, as we mentioned, about the YMCA, etcetera. So, there's new information for you. So, I assume, you know, that your contingency plans moving forward will -- you'll be revising those to reflect, "okay, now what do we do in these circumstances?" Is that fair?

MR. BLOOMFIELD: Well, our contingency plans we see as what we need to do to maintain steam operations and steam going to our customers. Those issues of how many customers we serve, really, I don't see how that would affect into the contingency operational issues. Yes, I mean, it makes an effect on how much steam we have to put out. But none of those customers are significantly large ones that would have any, really, effect on our steam capacity requirements.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Okay. So, you have submitted in the past, not this -- this docket, other dockets, you have submitted, you know, "if the State says "no", we're out of here." That's a final -- if

```
that's a final decision, you'll take certain actions.
 1
          You know, that would drive a lot -- a shutdown plan
 2
 3
          would drive a lot of detail that we need to see.
 4
                         MR. BLOOMFIELD: Absolutely. Right.
 5
          No, that's a whole nother -- whole nother thing that
          we're trying to work out, actually. Is that, as we're
 6
 7
          looking at trying to go forward with this upcoming rate
          filing, I'm thinking in terms of making a couple of
 8
          different filings; one is if we go forward and one is
 9
10
          if we close, and how that rate structure would be put
11
          together and those kinds of things. So, that's
12
          certainly something that's got our attention.
13
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Obviously, with --
14
          it's of great interest to us, because keeping your
15
          customers in a position where they can do what they
16
          need to do, and give them enough time to cross over, if
17
          that ends up happening, is of great concern to us.
                                                               So,
18
          that would definitely something we'd like to see
19
          fleshed out.
20
                         MR. BLOOMFIELD: Uh-huh.
21
                         COMMISSIONER SCOTT: All right.
                                                          I think
22
          that's all I have for now.
23
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Commissioner
24
          Bailey.
```

```
1
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY:
                                               Thank you.
                                                           Can I
          ask the Fire Marshal's Office a few questions before I
 2
 3
          begin?
 4
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I expect so.
 5
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: All right.
                                                           Thank
 6
          you.
 7
                         MR. SPEIDEL: And, Commissioners, just
          one quick thing. When we will offer Mr. Patnaude a
 8
          break?
 9
10
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Off the record.
11
                         [Brief off-the-record discussion
12
                         ensued.]
13
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
14
          don't we take a couple of minute break, say, a little
15
          over five minutes. And, the Fire Marshal can be on the
16
          edge of her seat waiting to know what's going to be
17
          asked.
18
                         All right. We'll be back in about five
19
          minutes.
20
                         (Recess taken at 12:05 p.m. and the
21
                         status conference resumed at 12:18 p.m.)
22
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Commissioner
23
          Bailey.
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY:
24
                                               Thank you.
```

Ms. Cole, on the response that the Company gave you, I understand that you haven't had a chance to review it very carefully, but some of the things that they talked about they referred to as "housekeeping issues". And, I took that to mean that there were some things that they could do quickly, and other things that needed to be done that would take a longer amount of time. Is that true, do you think?

DISTRICT CHIEF COLE: So, yes. Some of the things would be, you know, "clear an area around" -- one of them was "in front of the shut-offs for the electrical switchgear". So, there was kind of just general storage all in front of that switchgear. You know, it takes a short amount of time to be able to move that away. So, this "housekeeping", I guess, would refer to an inexpensive things that can be done to mitigate that hazard quickly.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: So, the things
that they showed us, like fixing the doors and putting
the exit signs up, and making sure the lighting is in
place, would you characterize all those things as
"housekeeping" or did they go a little bit further
already than that?

DISTRICT CHIEF COLE: So, I guess, when

1 it was brought up about the illumination of the exit signs on the doors, I wouldn't say that those were 2 3 "housekeeping issues", but those were brought up in the original inspection letter of February of last year. 4 5 So, you know, those had been kind of in queue for the 6 last three inspection letters. But, as far as 7 maintaining the distances around the electrical gear for maintenance, clearing out the obstructions for the 8 9 exit pathways, and to be able to provide access to fire 10 extinguishers, those would be, I guess, what I would 11 consider the "housekeeping issues" that were taken care 12 of. 13 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay. 14 think that they have a lot left to do to comply with 15 your letter? 16 DISTRICT CHIEF COLE: Yes. 17 COMMISSIONER BAILEY: The majority is 18 still remaining, would you say? The majority of the 19 work? 20 DISTRICT CHIEF COLE: Yes. So, it's 21 great that the initial, like you said, "housekeeping 22 issues" were taken care of. But a lot of them are 23 going to require these experts to come in and to give a

finding or give a recommendation for, I guess, a larger

```
1
          picture overview of what needs to take place there.
 2
          So, it's going to be more -- more costly and more time,
 3
          yes.
 4
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay. All right.
 5
          One more question. On Item 19, it says that you would
 6
          like them to "secure a New Hampshire licensed
 7
          electrical engineer to perform a comprehensive
          evaluation of the electrical systems". Is there a
 8
          difference between a "master electrician who's
 9
10
          licensed" and a "licensed electrical engineer"?
11
                         DISTRICT CHIEF COLE:
                                               There is, yes.
12
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY:
                                               Are you talking
13
          about a "Professional Engineer"?
14
                         DISTRICT CHIEF COLE:
                                               Yes.
15
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay. Thank you.
16
                         All right, Mr. Saltsman. You said that
17
          you were going to hire a master electrician to take
18
          care of that. Do you -- do you understand that that's
19
          not going to work?
20
                         MR. SALTSMAN: We understand that the
          Fire Marshal's Office would like a Professional
21
22
          Engineer. We'd like to have a discussion with them,
23
          what would be better suited to accomplish their goal.
24
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay. So, more to
```

```
come on that. So, then, you don't have the expert
 1
          required under number 19 secured at this point?
 2
 3
                         MR. SALTSMAN:
                                        That is correct. From
 4
          what we're hearing today.
 5
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay. And, then,
 6
          just a follow-up on the structural engineer, Bob
 7
          Mohlin, you said. You said that you "contacted him",
          and something was going to happen in the next week or
 8
 9
          two. What was that that was going to happen? He was
10
          going to come in and look at it or you were going to
11
          get in touch with him and hire him?
12
                         MR. SALTSMAN:
                                        That's correct.
                                                         I'll let
13
          Mr. Bloomfield, because he actually made the contact,
14
          I'll let him answer that question.
15
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY:
                                              Okay.
16
                         MR. BLOOMFIELD: No, we've contracted
17
          with him. He will come and make the investigation and
18
          analyze the situation.
19
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: In the next couple
20
          of weeks?
21
                         MR. BLOOMFIELD: Yes.
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: And, then how long
22
23
          do you think it would be until he issues a report?
24
                         MR. BLOOMFIELD: Oh, he -- he can give
```

```
1
          us a preliminary answer within a week of when he gets
 2
          here, I would think. And, his official report may take
 3
          a little longer, but we can get a fairly quick read
          from him.
 4
 5
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY:
                                              Do you plan to
 6
          file that official report with us?
 7
                         MR. BLOOMFIELD: Yes.
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay. And, the
 8
 9
          fire protection engineer, have you hired somebody to do
10
          that yet?
11
                         MR. SALTSMAN: Yes, we have.
                                                       That's
12
          Nick Cricenti, with SFC Engineering.
13
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay. And, Item
14
          15 on the list is the Fire Marshal's Office recommended
15
          that you "install an approved, supervised automatic
16
          extinguishing system". So, will that fire protection
17
          engineer help you design and install that or will you
18
          expect that you might ask for a variance on that or --
19
                         MR. SALTSMAN: Yes and yes. The fire
20
          protection engineer will help us identify what should
21
          be required. And, then, if what is required, for one
22
          reason or another, we feel like it's not something that
23
          we're capable of doing, not for whatever reason, I
24
          can't tell you what that would be, I don't know.
                                                            But
```

```
1
          then we would ask the Fire Marshal Office for a waiver
 2
          of that requirement.
 3
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay. In your
          January 8th, 2015 status report, you indicated that you
 4
 5
          were going to be installing new pollution control
 6
          equipment, the electrostatic precipitator, and a
 7
          catalyst to reduce CO emissions, and an SCR, I assume
          that's a scrubber?
 8
 9
                         MR. SALTSMAN:
                                        Uh-huh. Yes.
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: And, then, in the
10
11
          next report you said you were going to do that, and
12
          then it drops off, no mention of it in the last two
13
          that we've had that I noticed. What's the status on
14
          that?
15
                         MR. BLOOMFIELD: That would be done with
16
          the repowering of the facility.
17
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay.
18
                         MR. BLOOMFIELD: That's about a
19
          $4 million expense, 4 or $5 million.
20
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay. And, have
21
          you finalized the details of the PPA with the Co-op?
22
                         MR. BLOOMFIELD: No, we have not.
23
          going back and forth on a couple of issues on it. And,
24
          before we spend a lot of their time and our attorneys'
```

time, the State is still the key player. If the State's not going to be committing to buy steam, then we're not going to be able to finance the project.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So, before we spend everyone's time thrashing out some relatively minor details on the power contract, we're waiting to hear something more specific from the State.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay.

MR. SALTSMAN: If I may, we just recently met yesterday with the Co-op, just to go over things and status and where everything was at. And, their indication is that they're ready to finish it up as soon as we're ready with, and we're not -- we can't be ready, we can't in good -- we can't finalize that in good faith without knowing that we have something that works with the State so that the whole project would go forward. Because it's not fair to them to have a contract in hand that they're presenting to their board to get approval, and they have indicated that they're confident they can get approval. But we don't want them to go to their board with something that we can't deliver. It would not look good on them or wouldn't look good on us.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: All right. Thank

```
1
                In the September 25th report -- oh, your Green
 2
          Power people, they're gone?
 3
                         MR. SALTSMAN: Yes.
                                              They had to fly
 4
          out.
 5
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Oh, okay. All
 6
                 So, then, I can probably ask these questions
 7
          without worrying about it. But, in the September 25th
 8
          report, you said that one of your contingencies was "to
          sell to Liberty". Can you give me an update on what
 9
10
          the status of that idea is?
11
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Just a minute,
12
          Mr. Saltsman.
13
                         MS. GEIGER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
14
          believe we're going to start getting into some
15
          confidential information. And, so, I would
16
          respectfully ask that the parties aren't here with the
17
          Company or with Staff, that they be excused from the
18
          room.
19
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes. Let's see if
20
          we can get through everything that's not confidential,
21
          and then we can circle back to this.
22
                         MR. BLOOMFIELD: I will say that, I
23
          believe, in the follow-up report, whether it was the
24
          January one, we responded on our discussions with -- on
```

```
1
          that situation.
 2
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay. I'll take a
 3
          look at that again then.
                         I think that most of the rest of my
 4
 5
          questions -- well, I have a couple more, have to do
 6
          with something that may be confidential from the most
 7
          recent report. So, I'll hold those for a minute.
                         You talked about "black start" testing
 8
          on your generator, you do that weekly?
 9
10
                         MR. SALTSMAN: Yes, ma'am.
11
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Have you ever
12
          performed that -- do you perform that under the full
13
          load of the plant?
14
                         MR. SALTSMAN: Yes.
15
                         COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Okay. All right.
16
          I think the rest of my questions are going to be
17
          confidential.
18
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I have no other
19
          questions.
20
                         So, is there anything else we want to
21
          deal with in the open part of the proceeding?
22
                         MR. SPEIDEL: I think we're all set, Mr.
23
          Chairman.
24
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
```

Ms. Geiger, yes.

MS. GEIGER: Just one minor clarifying point for the record. I believe Ms. Cole, in her most recent remarks, referred to a Fire Marshal's Office inspection that occurred February 17th of 2015. And, although we do have a report of that inspection, we did not receive that inspection report I believe until June of 2015. So, I didn't want the record to reflect inaction on the part of Concord Steam since February of last year. It was only in June that it received documentation.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So, Ms. Cole, is the general way these things work is that you do an inspection, and then prepare a report, and there's a lag between the actual inspection and the report that gets generated?

DISTRICT CHIEF COLE: There is. It's the research that's done in between time. And, obviously, it's -- in the Investigations Bureau, we're also investigating fires, as well as conducting inspections and writing reports. So, there is a lag time in between when a report would be generated from the inspection date.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.

1	MR. SPEIDEL: If I may cut in?
2	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes, Mr. Speidel.
3	MR. SPEIDEL: So, for Ms. Cole, I'm
4	reading a Department of Administrative Services letter
5	dated June 3rd, 2015, referring to "receiving and
6	having reviewed the results of the fire and life safety
7	inspection conducted on February 17th, 2015". And, so,
8	there's a subject line that reads there "Fire and Life
9	Safety Inspection Report of February 17, 2015". Do you
10	happen to know the specific date it was sent to Concord
11	Steam, Ms. Cole?
12	DISTRICT CHIEF COLE: I don't have that
13	at this time. We usually give like anywhere from a 30
14	to 90 day response time. So, I'm guessing I would
15	be guessing. So, the end of May, early June.
16	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Is that something
17	you might be able to get an answer to Mr. Speidel?
18	DISTRICT CHIEF COLE: Yes.
19	MR. SPEIDEL: Yes. I'd greatly
20	appreciate that. Thank you.
21	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Is
22	there anything else we want to do on the open record?
23	[No verbal response]
24	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Let's

```
1
          go off the record for a second.
                          (Brief off-the-record discussion
 2
 3
                          ensued.)
                          (Whereupon the status conference
 4
                          continues under a confidential record so
 5
                          designated, and Pages 108 through 117
 6
 7
                          are contained in a separate transcript
                          designated as "Confidential &
 8
 9
                          Proprietary".)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
                [REDACTED AS CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY]
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

{IR 16-202} [Status Conference] {02-10-16}

```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
                [REDACTED AS CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY]
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

{IR 16-202} [Status Conference] {02-10-16}

```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
                [REDACTED AS CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY]
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

{IR 16-202} [Status Conference] {02-10-16}

```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
                [REDACTED AS CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY]
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

{IR 16-202} [Status Conference] {02-10-16}

```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
                [REDACTED AS CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY]
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

{IR 16-202} [Status Conference] {02-10-16}

```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
                [REDACTED AS CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY]
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

{IR 16-202} [Status Conference] {02-10-16}

```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
                [REDACTED AS CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY]
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

{IR 16-202} [Status Conference] {02-10-16}

```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
                [REDACTED AS CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY]
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

{IR 16-202} [Status Conference] {02-10-16}

```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
                [REDACTED AS CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY]
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

{IR 16-202} [Status Conference] {02-10-16}

```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
                [REDACTED AS CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY]
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

{IR 16-202} [Status Conference] {02-10-16}

(Status conference continues on the public portion of the transcript.)

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you. Thank you for your patience. Is there anything else that the Company or Staff or the Fire Marshal's Office feels that we need to know at this point, before this proceeding goes on its own course? Mr. Speidel.

MR. SPEIDEL: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

There's been sort of a slew of these status reports coming in through the door. And, as indicated in my January 7th letter, I need to carefully examine all of the requests for confidential treatment and the redactions presented therein. And, I think the best way to handle that would be a brief recommendation filed with the Commission supporting or requesting pare-backs for the motion for confidential treatment. I would imagine that it would generally be supportive at this point, given what I've seen thus far.

But I have to do the grunt work of actually examining all these materials carefully, before I make a final recommendation.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. So, that makes sense to us. So, you'll be reviewing the request for confidential treatment and providing us with a

1	written recommendation?
2	MR. SPEIDEL: Yes. Thank you.
3	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. Anything
4	else we need to take up or hear about this morning?
5	Ms. Geiger.
6	MS. GEIGER: Yes. Thank you, Mr.
7	Chairman. On behalf of Concord Steam, we appreciate
8	the opportunity to appear before you this morning to
9	answer your questions and those of other parties. We
10	think this has been a helpful session and we appreciate
11	the opportunity.
12	One thing that the Company would greatly
13	appreciate, though, so that there is no
14	misunderstanding going forward, as Mr. Speidel said,
15	there is a slew of information the Company is providing
16	to Staff. And, it could be very helpful, to avoid any
17	problems in the future, to know exactly what Staff and
18	the Commission is looking for, in terms of the
19	reporting under the October 2014 order, and then any
20	subsequent reports that you want as a result of today's
21	session.
22	Again, we don't want to inundate the
23	Commission with day-to-day memos that may be of no
24	consequence. But, by the same token, we don't want to

overlook anything either. So, any guidance that you or Staff can give us, we can do it offline with Attorney Speidel, but we would --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think it would probably be best to work with Attorney Speidel and Mr. Frink as to what their expectations are. I think our expectations generally are that, if, as it's happening, or the next day, Mr. Frink's or Mr. Speidel's name enter your mind, you would be calling them. I think, because if it's the kind of thing that might be of significance to them, you would be letting them know about it, even just on a -- on an informal basis.

I mean, we have an understanding, perhaps not totally accurate, but just an understanding, that there has long been regular communication between the Company and Staff. I think Mr. Frink indicated that in his statement. And, the kind of relationship that has been built up over the years, I think I sense from Mr. Frink, an expectation that information would flow freely.

Because Staff's not interested in either putting a company out of business or making their lives more difficult. We know how difficult it can be to make a living. We know how difficult it can be for a

```
1
          company, like Concord Steam, in an era where gas prices
 2
          are low, and there are options for customers and
 3
          difficulty to even get and maintain a customer base.
          So, I think everybody here is sensitive to that.
 4
 5
                         But I think we feel it's very important
 6
          that the information be shared. As I said, if
 7
          Mr. Frink's or Mr. Speidel's name, or Mr. Knepper's
          name for that matter, enters their heads in connection
 8
 9
          with an event, it probably makes sense to let them
10
          know.
11
                         MS. GEIGER:
                                      Thank you. Obviously, the
12
          Company will continue to work very closely with Staff
13
          and the State Fire Marshal's Office and the Office of
14
          Administrative Service to address all of the issues
15
          that we talked about this morning.
16
                         CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And, I will say, we
17
          appreciate the Fire Marshal's participation in this, we
18
          appreciate the Department of Administrative Services,
19
          and we certainly appreciate your -- the information you
20
          all have prepared and provided, and the work that
21
          you've obviously been doing, in response to what the
          Fire Marshal has laid on you over the last 12 months.
22
23
                         So, if there's nothing else, I think we
24
          are ready to adjourn?
```

1	[No verbal response]
2	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It looks like we
3	are. So, thank you all. And, we look forward to
4	working through this over the next few months.
5	(Whereupon the status conference was
6	adjourned at 12:49 p.m.)
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	