1		STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
2		PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
3	3 m m i 1 20 200	
4	21 South Fru: Suite 10	23 - 9:07 a.m. it Street
5	Concord, NH	
6		
7		
8	RE:	DG 20-105 LIBERTY UTILITIES (ENERGYNORTH
9		NATURAL GAS) CORP. d/b/a LIBERTY UTILITIES: Request for
10		Change in Rates. (Hearing regarding rate case expenses)
11		Tate case expenses,
12	PRESENT:	Chairman Daniel C. Goldner, Presiding Commissioner Carleton B. Simpson
13		Eric Wind, Esq./PUC Legal Advisor
14		Tracey Russo, Clerk
15 16	APPEARANCES:	Reptg. Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp. d/b/a Liberty
17		Utilities: Michael J. Sheehan, Esq.
18		Reptg. New Hampshire Dept. of Energy:
19		Paul B. Dexter, Esq. Karen Moran, Enforcement Div./Audit
20		(Regulatory Support Division)
21		
22		
23	Court Rep	orter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52
24		

1			
2		I N D E X	
3			PAGE NO.
4	WITNESS:	ERICA L. MENARD	
5	Direct examination	by Mr. Sheehan	7, 20
6	Cross-examination	by Mr. Dexter	16
7	Interrogatories by	Cmsr. Simpson	22
8	Interrogatories by	Chairman Goldner	29
9			
10		* * *	
11			
12	CLOSING STATEMENTS	BY:	
13		Mr. Dexter	31
14		Mr. Sheehan	33
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

1			
2		EXHIBITS	
3	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
4	61	New Hampshire Department of Energy Final Audit Report	premarked
5		filed 08-12-22	
6	62	New Hampshire Department of Energy Final Audit Report	premarked
7		filed 01-13-23	
8	63	Liberty Response to New Hampshire Department of	premarked
9		Energy Recommendation Regarding Rate Case Expenses	
10	6 4	RESERVED FOR UPDATED FILING	34
11		(RE: Updated Settlement Agreement, with attachments)	
12		[04-20-23]	
13 14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

PROCEEDING

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

1 4

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Good morning, everyone. I'm Commissioner Goldner, Presiding
Officer for today's hearing. I'm joined by
Commissioner Simpson.

We're here this morning in Docket DG 20-105, in which the Commission docketed Liberty Utilities' 2020 rate case. The subject of this hearing is whether certain costs are recoverable by Liberty as rate case expenses.

First, let's take appearances, beginning with the Company.

MR. SHEEHAN: Good morning,

Commissioners. Mike Sheehan, for Liberty

Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Very good. And the New Hampshire Department of Energy?

MR. DEXTER: Good morning. Paul

Dexter, on behalf of the Department of Energy.

I'm joined today by Karen Moran, from the

Department's Audit Division.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Very good. Okay.

Well, we received a late-filed

Settlement last night. Without having much time

to review, the Commission will allow the parties to present their Settlement, and why they believe the Settlement is just and reasonable and serves the public interest. We'd like the parties to walk us through the Settlement, how they arrived at the final figures, including the treatment of interest.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

Okay. So, next, I'll note that we've marked as -- premarked for identification

Exhibits 61, 62, and 63. Do the parties plan to introduce the Settlement and illustrative tariff pages as exhibits?

MR. SHEEHAN: The Settlement Agreement, with Attachment A, yes. Unfortunately, there's a small error on the tariff pages. So, we can discuss — it included a rate that had changed in a different docket. So, we can discuss it and file a replacement this afternoon.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Okay. And would you propose that those would be "Exhibits 64" and "65", admit them as a single exhibit?

How would you want to do that?

MR. SHEEHAN: It's your preference.

I'm happy to combine the redline and clean as a

```
1
         single document.
 2
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Okay. So,
 3
         just for clarity, I think then let's assign the
         Settlement as "64", and the illustrative tariff
 4
 5
         pages as "Exhibit 65".
 6
                    (Exhibit 64 and Exhibit 65 reserved.)
 7
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. A question
 8
         for you, Mr. Dexter.
 9
                    Will you want to have your witness on
10
         the stand today or were you planning on just
         having Liberty, with Ms. Menard as the witness?
11
12
                    MR. DEXTER: Yes. The Department is
1.3
         not planning on sponsoring any witnesses today.
14
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. So, it would
15
         just be Ms. Menard on the stand?
16
                    [Atty. Dexter indicating in the
17
                   positive.]
18
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:
                                      Okay.
19
                   MR. DEXTER: That's my understanding,
20
         yes.
2.1
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.
2.2
                    All right. Are there any other
23
         preliminary matters, before we swear in the
24
         witnesses -- or, witness? Anything else?
```

```
1
                    [No verbal response.]
 2
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Ms. Menard,
 3
         you're invited to take the stand. Thank you.
 4
                    And, Attorney Sheehan, when you're
 5
         ready.
 6
                    MR. SHEEHAN:
                                  Thank you.
 7
                    (Whereupon ERICA L. MENARD was duly
                    sworn by the Court Reporter.)
 8
 9
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you.
10
                     ERICA L. MENARD, SWORN
11
                       DIRECT EXAMINATION
12
    BY MR. SHEEHAN:
1.3
         Ms. Menard, please introduce yourself and give us
14
         your position with Liberty?
         My name is Erica Menard. And I am the Senior
15
    Α
16
         Director of Rates and Regulatory Affairs for
17
         Liberty Utilities. I'm employed by Liberty
18
         Utilities Service Company, providing service to
19
         EnergyNorth Natural Gas in this case.
20
         And, Ms. Menard, were you involved in the
21
         conversations over the last year or so relating
         to the rate case expense issue that brings us
22
23
         here today?
24
         Yes, I was.
```

```
1
         And those conversations resulted in a Settlement
    Q
 2.
         Agreement that we have presented to the
         Commission today for approval, is that correct?
 3
 4
         That's correct.
 5
         It appears that maybe the best way to present
 6
         this to the Commission is to turn to Bates, in
 7
         the Settlement Agreement attachments, Bates
 8
         Page 010, is that correct?
 9
         Yes. Sorry, I'm just trying to find the Bates
10
         page number. Yes, I think that's the right page.
11
         And at a high level, and we'll go through the
12
         details, this document, going left to right, is
1.3
         essentially a chronology of the various rate case
14
         items that were discussed, audited, disputed, and
15
         got resolved, is that fair?
16
         That is correct.
17
         Why don't you walk us through this document with
18
         that thought in mind, and give us the chronology
19
         of what brings us here today?
20
         Sure. On Bates Page 010, we tried to lay out the
21
         history of rate case expenses for this case.
2.2
         Back in August of 2021, the Fall of 2021, which
23
         was right at the end of the initial rate case,
         there was an audit conducted on rate case
24
```

2.

1.3

2.2

expenses. Column (a) show the expenses that were in effect at the time that were audited, and post that audit, there were some additional expenses that came in. Because, at the time of the audit, it was soon after the case, not all expenses had been received by the Company. So, there is an additional amount. You know, Column (a) was about \$742,000, there was an additional \$107,000 that came in after that initial audit. And, so, where we sit as of August 31st, 2022, was a total of about \$848,000 of rate case expense.

In between, there was an order that approved an amount for recovery of rate case expense, and that amount was \$681,000, as shown in Column (d), that addressed some, but not all, of the rate case expense. So, there were some that were considered "in dispute" at the time.

After that order, or sort of around that time, a second audit was conducted on the post -- post initial audit expenses. There was an amount agreed upon that the Company removed from the request for rate case expense, you see that in Column (e), a little under \$6,000 that was agreed upon.

1 And, so, then we get to Column (f), 2 which is what we're calling the "unresolved" or 3 the "disputed" amounts, which is about \$162,000. 4 The Company then engaged in some 5 discussion with the Department of Energy, and 6 came to an agreed upon amount to be recovered of 7 the \$162,000, and that amount is shown in Column 8 (g), which is roughly \$124,000. 9 Q Ms. Menard, part of the conversation, if you 10 will, was reduced to writing in a couple of 11 letters that DOE and the Company filed stating 12 our positions on those issues, is that correct? 13 That is correct, yes. 14 And, to the extent there were arguments for and 15 against each of these items, those were 16 articulated in those letters, and those are 17 essentially the talking points, if you will, of 18 our disagreement on those issues? 19 That is correct. Α 20 So, if the Commission wants some more detail on 21 why we thought one should be in and they thought 22 one should be out, it's in those filings? 23 Α Yes. 24 So, after agreeing to the number, that \$123,000

1 number, what's the next step that's being 2 proposed here today? 3 Α So, the next step is to propose a recovery 4 mechanism for the \$123,000. And the Company is 5 proposing to recover that through the LDAC 6 component. There is a component within -- sorry, 7 the LDAC rate. There's a component within the 8 LDAC, which is for rate case expense and 9 recoupment. 10 The LDAC is recovered over usually a 11 12-month period, beginning November 1st.

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

The LDAC is recovered over usually a 12-month period, beginning November 1st. The Company is proposing to recover this, the amount in Column (g), over -- between now and the end of the LDAC period. Which is not the full 12 months, but it's, you know, an abbreviated period to recover that over.

In addition, there was some discussion around interest expense on rate case expenses.

And I'm going to get the rule, I don't have the rule off the top of my head, but I'm sure

Mr. Sheehan can correct me. So, in the 1900 rules, there's a definition of what can and can't be recovered through rate case expense, and interest on rate case expense is not allowed.

And, so, the Company interprets that as the interest on expenses that are incurred.

2.

1.3

2.2

Once the amount is approved for recovery, so, you take the amount that's approved for recovery, you turn it into a rate, that rate goes into effect, and there could be some, because you forecast the rate out, there could be some differences in the forecasts, you get over-/under-recoveries of that rate.

So, in the Company's tariff, the rate, the LDAC rate, allows for interest to be calculated on the recovery mechanism. And that is because it could be over-or under-collected, and so you want to -- it's trying to account for carrying charges, either back to customers or to the Company, for the variance in the rate.

And, so, the Company's tariff defines that. And, so, that's how the interest was calculated on the LDAC component.

As part of the Settlement Agreement, the Company is agreeing to remove that calculation, and propose to make that in effect as of June the 1st, or when this rate goes into effect.

```
1
         And is there a calculation of the proposed rate
 2
         in the Settlement Agreement?
 3
    Α
         Yes, there is. However, -- I'll find it. On
 4
         Bates Page -- I don't have a Bates page on that.
 5
         Can you tell me what that is?
 6
         What schedule is it?
 7
    Α
         It is Attachment A, Page 1.
 8
         Attachment A., Page 1, is Bates 007.
 9
         Okay. On Bates 007, --
10
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: And I'm sorry,
11
         Ms. Menard, I must have a different version. Can
12
         you refer to the pages, on something on the upper
1.3
         right part? I don't have a Bates page on my
14
         marking.
15
                   WITNESS MENARD: Okay. I don't either.
16
         Attachment A --
17
                   MR. SHEEHAN: I'm sorry. It's the
18
         first page after the signature lines. So, it's
19
         the Page 8 of the pdf.
20
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay.
21
                   MR. SHEEHAN: Page 1 of 8.
2.2
                   WITNESS MENARD: Page 1 of 8.
23
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay.
24
    CONTINUED BY THE WITNESS:
```

1	А	This reflects this schedule right here
2		reflects the amount, on Line 6, the "Incremental
3		Rate Case Expense to Recover as of June 1st", the
4		\$123,000. What that does is it kind of layers it
5		into the current LDAC calculation for rate case
6		expense and recoupment. There's an amount, as of
7		May 31st, that is over-/under-collected, layer in
8		this additional incremental expense, "\$123,519",
9		projected. And, so, the sum of those two is the
10		"\$449,704", and recover that over the remaining
11		period, which is June 1st through October 31st of
12		2023. So, we have a forecasted throughput. And
13		we take the \$449,000 divided that throughput to
14		come up with the Rate Case Expense Factor, on
15		Line 11.
16	BY MR. SHEEHAN:	
17	Q	And I mentioned in the opening that the proposed
18		or illustrative tariff pages had a mistake on
19		them. Is the numbers you just are the numbers
20		you just read off correct?
21	А	So that the Rate Case Expense Factor that you see
22		there, the "\$0.0111" per therm is correct.
23		On the tariff pages, there was an
24		incorrect number for one of the other LDAC

```
1
         components, the Energy Efficiency component,
 2.
         which then calculated the entire LDAC rate
 3
         differently than what it should be. So, we will
         revise -- we will revise that -- we will revise
 4
 5
         the LDAC rate to be "0.1180 cents" per
 6
         kilowatt-hour, as shown on -- I'll just get to
 7
         the schedule. It's on schedule -- Attachment B.
 8
         The very last page?
 9
         Attachment B, Page 5. Or, you could --
10
         It appears in several places?
11
         Yes. But Attachment B, Page 5. Instead of --
12
         so, if we're looking at the Residential, the LDAC
13
         line in that first section, it says "0.1153"
14
         cents per therm; it would be "0.1180".
15
         And, Ms. Menard, if you scroll to the very bottom
    0
16
         of Attachment B, which is the redline of the same
17
         page, the mistake was to change the --
18
         The Energy Efficiency component?
19
         Correct.
    0
20
         Yes.
21
         That should not have been changed?
2.2
    Α
         Correct.
23
         That should have been left alone?
24
         Correct. Yes. So, it should only be the Rate
```

```
1
         Case Expense Factor that changes.
 2.
                    MR. SHEEHAN:
                                  Thank you. Those are the
 3
         questions I have.
 4
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.
 5
         Mr. Dexter.
 6
                    MR. DEXTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
 7
                    The Department does support the
         Settlement, and doesn't intend to cross-examine
 8
         Ms. Menard. But I have a few questions, I just
 9
10
         want to make sure that I understand what we're
11
         agreeing to, I'm pretty sure I do. But I just
         want to make sure I understand this.
12
1.3
                       CROSS-EXAMINATION
14
    BY MR. DEXTER:
15
         So, Ms. Menard, I'm looking at the sheet that you
16
         referenced early, and I don't have Bates numbers,
17
         I apologize. So, I'm going to refer to it as
18
         "Schedule 6, Page 1 of 4 Revised". Do you have
19
         that in front of you? And the title is "Recovery
20
         of Rate Case Expenses and Recoupment".
         Schedule 6, Page -- which one?
21
2.2
         Page 1 of 4.
23
    Α
         Yes.
24
         It's the schedule that you were talking about
```

```
1
         earlier that develops the proposed RCE Factor.
 2
         Yes.
 3
         Okay. Could you explain, at the top of page
 4
         there is mention of "recoupment", as well as
 5
         "rate case expenses"?
 6
                    Let me ask you one question first.
 7
         We're not dealing with recoupment here, we're not
 8
         dealing with any change to the recoupment
 9
         calculation in this phase of this docket, would
10
         you agree with that?
11
         Correct.
    Α
12
         Okay.
1.3
         That the component itself is called "Recoupment
14
         and Rate Case Expense Factor".
15
         And it was -- it's that way in your tariff, and
    0
16
         it's been combined for some time, is that right?
17
         Yes. Yes. The recoupment has been fully
18
         recovered at this point. So, this is really just
19
         a rate case expense at this point.
20
         Okay. Okay. So, Line 5 says "Remaining Balance
21
         Recoupment/Rate Case Expenses...as of May 31st,
22
         2023". There's a figure of $326,000 there, do
23
         you see that?
24
    Α
         Yes.
```

```
1
         If I go two pages forward, I get to a sheet that
 2.
         is called "Forecasted Recovery November 2022
         through October 2023", it's Page 3 of 4. Do you
 3
 4
         see that? Do you have that page?
 5
         Yes.
 6
         And, if I go to the line "May 2023", I see a
 7
         under-collection, in Column (d), of "323,829"?
 8
         Do you see that?
 9
    Α
         Correct.
10
         In order to get the number that we just talked
11
         about on the prior schedule, which is 326,000, I
12
         have to take that number and add the last
1.3
         interest amount over in Column (h), is that
14
         right?
15
         Correct.
    Α
16
         Okay. So, if I add those two together, that's
17
         how I get to the "326,184"?
18
         Yes.
    Α
19
         Okay. And, while we're on this schedule, which
20
         is Page 3 of 3, the fact that the interest
21
         amounts go to zero, from Line 10 through the end,
22
         that's reflective of the clause in the Settlement
23
         that says that the Company will no longer be
         collecting interest on over-/under-recovered
24
```

```
1
         balances for rate case expenses, right?
 2
         That's correct.
 3
         Okay. And, if I were to go above those zeroes,
 4
         and see those monthly figures, you know, they're
 5
         in the two to three to four thousand dollar range
 6
         on this page, and going back to 2021 and 2022,
 7
         they're in the one to two to three thousand
 8
         dollar ranges. Those are all positive numbers,
 9
         is that right?
10
         Yes.
11
         And, so, in fact, for this rate case, those
12
         collections have always been under-collected,
13
         and, therefore, subject to interest, right?
14
    Α
         Yes.
15
         Okay. And then, that will stop as of June 1st,
16
         if the Settlement and the tariff is approved?
17
    Α
         Correct.
18
         Okay. Thank you. The other thing I wanted to
    Q
19
         point out, I think you covered this with
20
         Mr. Sheehan, but I just want to make sure that
21
         it's absolutely clear. I'm looking at Settlement
22
         Attachment B, Page 11, this is the calculation of
         the LDAC. And, just looking at the top block,
23
24
         there's the "Residential Non-Heating". There's
```

```
1
         about nine elements to the LDAC, it looks like,
 2
         that are listed there, correct?
 3
    Α
         Correct.
 4
         Okay. The only one that we're dealing with in
 5
         this docket is the "Rate Case Expense Factor",
 6
         second one from the bottom, correct?
 7
    Α
         Yes.
 8
         Okay. And the fact that the "Energy Efficiency
 9
         Charge", up on the first line, change was an
10
         error, and that's going to be taken care of in
11
         your corrected filing later today?
12
         Yes.
1.3
                    MR. DEXTER: Okay. Thanks. That's all
14
         the questions I have.
15
                    MR. SHEEHAN: Mr. Chairman, there's one
16
         topic I didn't cover, and I thought it would be
17
         good to get it out before you started asking
18
         questions, if I may?
19
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Of course.
20
                    MR. SHEEHAN: And, certainly, Mr.
21
         Dexter can ask questions.
2.2
                 DIRECT EXAMINATION (resumed)
23
    BY MR. SHEEHAN:
24
         Ms. Menard, you referenced the rule that requires
```

```
1
         or allows for recovery of interest. In fact,
 2.
         it's a provision in our tariff that allows
 3
         interest on over- and under-collections within
         the LDAC, is that correct?
 4
 5
         That's correct.
 6
         And that's what the Company relied on to apply
 7
         the interest, because -- it's not because it's
 8
         rate case expenses, because it's an over/under as
 9
         part of the LDAC?
10
         That's correct.
11
         And, so, one of the requests we have today is, in
12
         the proposed tariff language, is to change our
1.3
         tariff, so that, going forward, that provision
14
         isn't there anymore?
15
         That's correct.
    Α
16
                    MR. SHEEHAN: Okay. Thank you.
17
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. Mr.
18
         Dexter, is there anything you'd like to --
19
                    MR. DEXTER: No. I was going to touch
20
         on that in closing, but I appreciate the
2.1
         clarification.
2.2
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.
23
         Okay. We'll move to Commissioner questions,
24
         beginning with Commissioner Simpson.
```

```
1
                    CMSR. SIMPSON:
                                    Thank you, Mr.
 2
         Chairman.
 3
                    I know there's often language about
 4
         "late-filed settlements". But I was pleased to
 5
         see this one today. Appreciate all the work that
 6
         you folks put in.
 7
                   MR. SHEEHAN: And apologies for it
 8
         being late. Just too many things on the pile.
    BY CMSR. SIMPSON:
 9
10
         So, with the Energy Efficiency Charge change, I
11
         was just a little bit confused about what you had
12
         done in error. Looking at Attachment B, Page 11,
13
         like, what did you change? What were you
14
         thinking when you made that change?
         So, I used the initial model for our LDAC, when I
15
    Α
16
         was calculating the rate case expense change.
17
         And there was a leftover, if you recall, back,
18
         when we initially filed the LDAC, there was some
19
         change in the Energy Efficiency rate. And, so, I
20
         had just picked up the old model, --
21
         Uh-huh.
    Q
2.2
         -- and it flowed through. And I shouldn't have
23
         done that.
24
         Okay. With respect to the interest expenses,
```

1 that was something that we were prepared to talk 2. about today. Appreciate the resolution that 3 you've proposed. 4 Looking at Attachment A, Page 4 of 8, 5 the summary table, did you consider including 6 that figure in this presentation, because it had 7 been something that was in dispute previously? 8 When we came in, we expected to talk 9 about the interest figure. And, so, it was 10 confusing when I looked at this page and there 11 was no mention of it, either in the unresolved 12 amount or the incremental expense being left out. 1.3 So, there's no interest in the disputed amount. Α 14 Uh-huh. 15 It's in the over/under rate calculation. So, 16 there's nothing to resolve in terms of the rate 17 case expenses themselves. 18 Uh-huh. Q 19 Those are purely what we've been invoiced and 20 what we've paid. So, there's not an additional 21 amount that we're recovering because we've been 22 carrying those expenses since 2019 or 2020. 23 Q Okay. 24 The interest is really the calculation of any

```
1
         over-/under-recovery of a rate that's put into
 2
         effect. So, there was nothing to address or
 3
         resolve on the schedule that listed out all of
 4
         the expenses. There's nothing to remove, nothing
 5
         to add there.
 6
         Uh-huh.
 7
         It's really in the reconciliation of the rate.
 8
         Okay. Thank you. And then, looking at Column
 9
         (g), you know, some of the figures, like,
10
         particularly "Legal Expenses", it was unclear
11
         what the overall figure would be. And did you
         just receive invoices over the last few months
12
1.3
         from Keegan Werlin, for example, and that's what
14
         you've presented here as the roughly 41,000?
15
         There were ongoing activities post -- post
    Α
16
         settled rate case. There were some, if I recall,
17
         there were disputes over step adjustments.
18
         Uh-huh.
    Q
19
         And there were things that lingered on beyond --
    Α
20
         Yes.
21
         -- the timing of when the rate case was actually
2.2
         settled. And it had, I think, to do largely with
23
         step adjustments that were part of that rate
24
         case. So, those expenses came in after the audit
```

```
1
         was done.
 2
         Okay.
 3
         And, so, that's largely what those were.
 4
         And all those invoices you've provided to the
 5
         Department, like they have seen the overall --
 6
         Yes.
 7
         -- evidence?
 8
         Yes.
 9
         Okay. Great. So, then, what the -- what you and
10
         the Department are proposing is the Concentric
11
         costs, from your decoupling mechanism review;
12
         Keegan Werlin, legal expenses; ScottMadden,
13
         testimony support, and you've agreed to remove
14
         the Management Applications Consulting costs?
15
    Α
         Yes.
16
                    CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. And I would just
17
         ask Mr. Dexter, you believe that all these would
18
         be just and reasonable, in the public interest?
19
                    MR. DEXTER: Yes. I think, as part of
20
         the Settlement, I do.
21
                    We laid out our reasons, as Mr. Sheehan
         pointed out, in several filings with the
22
23
         Department, why we were in a position to contest
24
         them.
                We've reread the Liberty's letters and
```

1 arguments on that, and came to this Settlement, 2. of which the interest calculation is an important 3 part. 4 And, on balance, yes. I believe that 5 what's presented here is just and reasonable. 6 CMSR. SIMPSON: Thank you. 7 And then, my final question, I was a little bit confused about whether the OCA signed 8 9 onto this. At the beginning of the Settlement, 10 it says that "the OCA" was a "Settling Party", 11 but then there's no signature on Page 6? MR. SHEEHAN: I can address that. 12 1.3 draft included them, and the OCA was copied on all the back-and-forth. 14 15 CMSR. SIMPSON: Yes. 16 MR. SHEEHAN: And we received a message 17 from Mr. Kreis last night saying "I'm not going 18 to appear at the hearing tomorrow." So, I 19 removed him from the signature line, forgot to 20 remove him from the top. So, that was just an 21 oversight.

In fairness, Mr. Kreis did not say "I support" or "I object to the Settlement". I asked him that late last night and never got an

2.2

23

24

1 answer. 2. CMSR. SIMPSON: Uh-huh. 3 MR. SHEEHAN: But I interpret his 4 absence here as not taking a position. So, 5 that's how I would characterize it. 6 CMSR. SIMPSON: But you included him on 7 all the discussions, and --8 MR. SHEEHAN: Yes. CMSR. SIMPSON: -- provided all the 9 10 evidence to his office? 11 MR. SHEEHAN: The discussions were a 12 DOE/Liberty only conversation. But, once the 1.3 drafts started going, he was copied on all of 14 that. 15 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. Thank you. 16 I don't have any further questions, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. 17 18 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Just for efficiency, 19 I'd like to, I know you're not on the stand, Mr. 20 Dexter, but just to ask you, if you're 2.1 comfortable sharing the Department's position 2.2 with regards to rate case expenses associated 23 with steps? Some of the prior filings indicated that the Department was uncomfortable with rate 24

2.

1.3

2.2

case expense recovery associated with steps. And I'd like to understand the Department's position on that.

MR. DEXTER: Yes. As a general rule, we believe that the 1900 rules cover the base case expenses, not step adjustments. Now, I understand there might be unusual circumstances perhaps in some water cases, where there might be warranted exceptions. But, generally speaking, that's how we interpret the 1900 rules, number one.

Number two, going way back to the beginning of this case, the Settlement in the underlying base rate case had an estimate of rate case expenses, which were for the base case.

There was no discussion, back when we settled this case, that the step adjustment-related rate case expenses would be recovered.

So, in this instance, there is two reasons why we objected to the Management Applications' study, which was tied to the second step adjustment.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.

And I'll just follow up with Ms. Menard.

BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:

1.3

2.2

- Is there anything in the Settlement, I'm looking at the spreadsheet on Attachment A, Page 4 of 8, or Schedule 6, 4 of 4, that big table, is there anything on this table that represents any expenses, rate case expenses, relative to steps?
- A The base case did include, as part of the -- the final number, it did roll in the -- I guess you could call it the "first step". But it's kind of resolving all issues to get to then the point where you set rates into effect.

So, these costs, I guess it depends on how you define "steps". This was a step adjustment as part of the base case. There are costs related to that.

The Management Application Consulting cost was post case step adjustment that was required as part of the Settlement Agreement to do a revision to the depreciation study. So, that's why that was initially included. We agreed to forgo that.

- Q Yes.
- A So, if you define "steps" as "post settled rate case", there are not costs associated with that.

1 But there is a step that is embedded in the base 2. case itself. 3 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Mr. Dexter, 4 I'd like to get your thoughts on that? 5 MR. DEXTER: Yes. Ms. Menard gave a 6 more complete answer than I did. I should -when I said "there was no rate case expenses in 7 8 the original settlement", that's actually not 9 correct. This case, I believe, concluded with a 10 step adjustment concurrent with the base case, 11 which included investments in the year 12 immediately following the test year, which was 1.3 fairly typical. And those would have been 1 4 included in the original estimate, and those 15 were -- the first step was presented as part of 16 the base rate case. So, we did not have an 17 objection to that first step. 18 So, I think Ms. Menard is making an 19 important distinction. 20 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Very good. 2.1 That was a helpful clarification from both. 2.2 Thank you. 23 Okay. That's all the questions I have 24 relative to this issue.

1	I would like to just ask both parties,
2	if you're understanding that this concludes all
3	of the issues for this docket?
4	MR. SHEEHAN: We actually discussed
5	that right before the hearing started. And I
6	think we agree that it does.
7	CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay.
8	MR. DEXTER: I believe we agree as
9	well.
10	CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Well, that is good
11	news. Welcome news.
12	Okay. That is everything I have.
13	Commissioner Simpson, anything to follow up on?
1 4	CMSR. SIMPSON: No. This has been a
15	great discussion. Thank you.
16	CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Yes. Thank you very
17	much.
18	Okay. Very good. The witness is
19	released. Thank you, Ms. Menard.
20	And, after Ms. Menard gets settled, we
21	can move to a closing. And I'll address the
22	exhibits after closings.
23	So, Mr. Dexter.
2 4	MR. DEXTER: Thank you. I sort of

jumped into my closing a little bit earlier in response to a question from Commissioner Simpson.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

But, basically, this Settlement contains two elements: One, it resolves the disputes regarding the remaining invoices. And I believe it reaches a reasonable compromise on those four remaining vendor costs. And, secondly, and as I said very importantly to the Department, it corrects what we saw as a conflict between Liberty's tariff and the rate case expense rules. So that now no longer will interest accrue on what's called the "over-/under-recovery of rate case expenses", but I think the way it's set up will always be an under-recovery, and therefore will always have interest expense, at least that's the way it looks from this case, because you're collecting those costs over, you know, a period of time. You're starting with a pot, and then collecting it over a period of time.

So, we are pleased that Liberty agreed to make this tariff change in this docket, and not wait until the next rate case. That would have delayed this discussion for, you know, a

number of months or, potentially, even years.

So, we believe that's an important part of the Settlement.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

And we urge the Commission to approve the Settlement as it was presented.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. And the Company.

MR. SHEEHAN: I can say the same thing. It was a conversation over disputed items. We reached a resolution that we also think is a fair way to solve these problems and close out this docket. And we ask -- so, the request is to approve the new LDAC factor, and approve the language change in the tariff going forward.

Stop. New paragraph. I'd like to have a conversation over exhibits, to make sure we get them right. And, so, my -- first is to clarify the numbering. And, second, I can offer to refile everything, properly numbered, remove the "OCA" from the opening paragraph of the Settlement Agreement, and fix the Exhibit B, the proposed tariff -- the illustrative tariff error.

And I can make that all one document. If you give me a number, I can make a single

34

```
1
         document, with Attachments A, B, and that will be
 2
         the Settlement Agreement, Exhibit X.
 3
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: We can do that.
                                                         Wе
         can make that "Exhibit 64".
 4
 5
                    (Revised exhibit numbering with
 6
                    regard to the Settlement Agreement
 7
                    and Attachments earlier noted as
                    "Exhibit 64" and "Exhibit 65", to now
 8
 9
                    be filed together as "Exhibit 64"
10
                    only.)
11
                    MR. SHEEHAN:
                                  Okay.
12
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Is that acceptable,
1.3
         Mr. Dexter?
14
                    MR. DEXTER:
                                 Yes.
15
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:
                                      Okay.
16
                    MR. SHEEHAN: Thank you. That's all we
17
         have.
18
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you.
19
                   Okay. So, we'll admit Exhibits 61, 62,
20
                  Attorney Sheehan, you'll file Exhibit 64
         and 63.
21
         later today? Tomorrow?
2.2
                    MR. SHEEHAN: Yes. Probably by close
23
         of business today.
24
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Close of business
```

1 today.

2.

1.3

2.2

And then, since there are some alterations, Attorney Dexter, would it be okay if the Commission -- or, if the Department, rather, filed any objections or concerns to that, would you want a day or two or three, if there are any concerns with the changes, because it won't be exactly what we've seen today?

MR. DEXTER: By Monday would be nice.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. By Monday,

okay.

Okay. So, we'll -- so, just to resummarize. The Company will file Exhibit 64, with everything we've viewed today, with the changes we've discussed, by close of business today. And then, the Department, and I suppose the OCA as well, if there's any objections to those changes, they will file by Monday, close of business on Monday.

Okay. Is there anything else that we need to cover today?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ DEXTER: Nothing from the Department.

MR. SHEEHAN: Nothing. Thank you.

```
CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Seeing none.
 1
          Thank you, everyone. I'll thank everyone for
 2
          their time today. And we are adjourned.
 3
                     (Whereupon the hearing was adjourned
 4
                    at 9:45 a.m.)
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```