

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
BEFORE THE
NEW HAMPSHIRE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**RE: PENNICHUCK EAST UTILITY, INC.
DW 21- ____**

2021 QUALIFIED CAPITAL PROJECT ADJUSTMENT CHARGE FILING

**DIRECT TESTIMONY
OF
John J. Boisvert**

February 11, 2021

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Professional and Educational Background

Q. What is your name and what is your position with Pennichuck Water Works, Inc.?

A. My name is John J. Boisvert. I am the Chief Engineer of Pennichuck Water Works, Inc. (“PWW”), which provides services to Pennichuck East Utility, Inc. (“PEU” or the “Company”) pursuant to a management allocation agreement. I have worked for PWW since February 1, 2006. I am a licensed professional engineer in New Hampshire and Maine.

Q. Please describe your educational background.

A. I have a Bachelor of Science degree and a Master of Science degree in Civil Engineering from the University of New Hampshire in Durham, New Hampshire. I also have a Master’s degree in Environmental Law and Policy from Vermont Law School in South Royalton, Vermont.

Q. Please describe your professional background.

A. Prior to joining the Company, I served as a Team Leader for Weston & Sampson Engineers of Portsmouth, New Hampshire in their Water Practices Group from 2000 to 2006. Prior to Weston & Sampson I was employed by the Layne Christensen Company of Shawnee Mission, Kansas as Regional Manager for their Geosciences Division in Dracut, Massachusetts from 1994 to 2000. I completed graduate school in 1992 and was employed by Hoyle, Tanner, &

1 Associates of Manchester, New Hampshire as a Project Engineer from 1992 to
2 1994. Prior to entering full time graduate programs at the University of New
3 Hampshire and Vermont Law School, I was employed by Civil Consultants of
4 South Berwick, Maine as a Project Engineer from 1986 to 1989 and by
5 Underwood Engineers of Portsmouth, New Hampshire as a project Engineer
6 from 1985 to 1986.

7
8 **Q. What are your responsibilities as Chief Engineer of the Company?**

9 A. As Chief Engineer, I manage and oversee the Company's Engineering
10 Department. I lead the Company's Asset Management program. I, as head of
11 the Engineering Department, am responsible for the planning, design, permitting,
12 construction, and startup of major capital projects, including pipelines,
13 reservoirs/dams, building structures, pumping facilities, treatment facilities, and
14 groundwater supplies. The Engineering Department staff provides regular
15 technical assistance to the Company's Water Supply Department, Distribution
16 Department, Customer Service Department, and Senior Management.

17
18 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

19 A. I will be providing details of the major capital projects planned and budgeted for
20 2021-2023 as part of the Company's 2021 Qualified Capital Project Adjustment
21 Charge ("QCPAC") filing. This testimony will also present the major QCPAC
22 projects initiated and completed in 2020, as well as proposed projects for 2021,
23 2022 and 2023. My testimony supports, and is in addition to, testimony being

1 provided by the Company's Chief Operating Officer Donald L. Ware for this
2 docket. Detailed project listings mentioned in this testimony are detailed in Mr.
3 Ware's testimony (Exhibit DLW-1 Pages 1 – 5).

4
5 **Q. What types of projects can be described as “major capital projects”?**

6 A. Major capital projects require significant capital investment and are approved
7 annually in the Company's capital budget by the Company's Board of Directors.
8 Projects are associated with treatment facilities, pumping facilities, storage tanks,
9 water main replacements, valve and hydrant replacements, building facility
10 improvements and refurbishments, equipment purchases as well as non-
11 structural efforts to improve Company performance, such as engineering studies.

12 These generally include:

- 13 • The replacement of infrastructure that has reached the end of its useful
14 life, does not achieve the level of service required of it (water quality,
15 capacity, and efficiency), or the Company's ability to properly maintain it
16 (outdated/lack of repair parts, etc.) is either impractical or more costly
17 than replacing it.
- 18 • Infrastructure upgrades to improve system performance.
- 19 • Investments to ensure compliance with the primary and secondary Safe
20 Drinking Water Act standards.
- 21 • Replacement of meter reading radios.
- 22 • Engineering studies and evaluations to assess infrastructure and system
23 performance to aid in planning future capital investment needs.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Q. What is the process that the Company employs and what are the factors the Company considers when developing the capital budget for water main replacements?

A. The Company considers a number of factors in developing a capital budget for water main rehabilitation, replacement, and/or new construction. The Company has completed the first phase of its Asset Management Initiative. The Company has inventoried its pipeline assets and documented them within the GIS system. An initial condition assessment and a preliminary evaluation of the consequence of failure of certain water main assets has been completed. The effort thus far is serving as an effective tool to determine which assets are most critical and should be evaluated in more detail for possible inclusion in the current 2020 – 2022 capital budget. During 2020 and 2021, upon the transition to a new Computerized Management and Maintenance software, the Asset Management Initiative will be expanded to look more closely at specific assets to identify the risk of failure, whether there is a structural failure (break) or the asset is not attaining the required level of service (water quality, flow, or pressure) to guide future capital expenditures. The Asset Management approach considers the following for all assets including:

- Water main break/failure history;
- Water quality problems;
- Fire protection flows;

- 1 • The proximity of and support provided to key critical customers (public safety,
2 government, hospitals, etc.);
- 3 • Coordination with gas company replacement projects;
- 4 • Geographic grouping of streets where mains are to be replaced/rehabilitated
5 for improved efficiency by keeping work in close proximity;
- 6 • The opportunity to take advantage of efficiencies gained from coordinating
7 with the paving, storm water and sewer projects of Cities and Towns served
8 by the Company, to replace water main where substandard plastic water
9 pipes are present. There are cost savings in pavement repair and traffic
10 control associated with completing projects while the municipality or other
11 utility company is working on a street.
- 12 • Industry guidelines of the American Water Works Association for the
13 replacement of water main using an average life expectancy for water mains
14 of 100 years absent specific information on a particular asset. The Company
15 considers this rate to be reasonable until the Asset Management System
16 allows for a more system/asset specific assessment to be performed. While
17 all of the Company's water mains are less than 60 years old, a portion of
18 those water mains are substandard plastic water mains that were installed by
19 the original developer prior to the NHDES setting minimum standards on
20 water main materials. As such those plastic water mains break with much
21 greater frequency than water mains constructed of today's approved
22 materials. By example, the break per mile on substandard plastic (Sch 40
23 PVC, 100 psi HDPE or PB – 496 breaks on about 68 miles of substandard

1 plastic over the past 23 years) is about 7.2 per mile versus 0.16 breaks per
2 mile on ductile iron pipe (51 breaks on about 324 miles of DIPCL) over the
3 past 23 years, or about 45 times greater in frequency.

4 Replacement of aging and substandard infrastructure will continue to be a major
5 driver of the Company's water main replacement for the foreseeable future.

6

7 **Q. What were the major water main projects completed in 2020?**

8 A. The following projects were completed in 2020:

9 Rolling Hills CWS – Plaistow

10 The Company replaced an estimated 755 LF of substandard 2-inch plastic pipe
11 with 794 LF of 6-inch DICLP. The original 2-inch pipe (constructed in the 1970's
12 long before PEU ownership) ran through private property and under a deck and
13 other out structures of the property owner. The original pipe leaked and could
14 not be readily repaired due to the proximity of the private structures. The
15 Company constructed the new water main within the public roadway and
16 reconnected house services to the new water main. The original 2-inch pipe was
17 retired from service. The project costs in 2019 were approximately \$188,000.

18 An additional \$27,400 was spent in 2020 on site restoration and pavement repair.

19 Locke Lake CWS (\$1,328,000)

20 The Company completed final site restorations for water main replacements on
21 the following locations:

- 22 - Georgetown Drive: Replaced 4600 LF of 4-inch schedule 40 PVC with
23 6-inch C900 PVC

- 1 - Bradford Lane: Replaced 1825 LF of 4-inch schedule 40 PVC with 6-
2 inch C900 PVC.

3 The Georgetown Drive watermain was used and useful in 2019 and initially
4 recovery of the P&I associate with the invested capital was sought in DW20-019,
5 but later withdrawn from the Docket as the NHDES SRF funding will not convert
6 from short term to long term financing until June of 2021.

7 Additional water main construction was completed at the following locations:

- 8 - North Barnstead Road: Added 680 LF of 4-inch C-900 PVC to
9 eliminate dead end and replaced 275 LF of 4-inch sch 40 PVC with 6-
10 inch C900 PVC
11 - Belmont Drive: Replaced 500 LF of 4-inch schedule 40 PVC with 6-
12 inch C900 PVC.
13 - Route 28: Replaced 720 LF of 2-inch PE with 720 LF of 4-inch C-900
14 PVC

15 The Belmont Drive and North Barnstead Road watermain were used and useful
16 in 2019 and initially recovery of the P&I associate with the invested capital was
17 sought in DW20-019, but later withdrawn from the Docket as the NHDES SRF
18 funding will not convert from short term to long term financing until June of 2021.

19 Pelham Water Main Replacement – Monticello and Lane Area Phase 1
20 (\$595,046)

21 The Company replaced several sections of small diameter substandard pipe in
22 the Williamsburg Community Water System in Pelham, NH. The replacement
23 was in response to mains lacking capacity, to correct a system lacking

1 distribution valves such that emergency or planned shutdown impacted a
2 significant area of the water system, well above normal break history (9.9 breaks
3 per mile of water main; 105 breaks since 1998), replacement of a direct buried
4 pressure reducing valve that was unable to be services and lacked sufficient
5 capacity, and to increase the capacity of the piping ahead of the future Phase 2
6 water main replacement in 2023. The specific Phase 1 work completed is as
7 follows:

- 8 - Monticello Road: Replaced 1600 LF of 3-inch PE with 12-inch C-900.
- 9 - Lane Road: Replaced 1000 LF of 3-inch PE with 12-inch C-900.
- 10 - Simpson Road: Relocated an existing hydrant and added 70 LF of 12-
11 inch C-900.
- 12 - Andrea Lane: Added 60 LF of 12-inch C-900.
- 13 - Mount Vernon Drive: Replaced 140 LF of 3-inch PE with 12-inch C-
14 900 and replaced undersized 2-inch pressure reducing valve with an
15 appropriately sized 8-inch and 2-inch valves inside a service access
16 vault.

17
18 Locke Lake Source of Supply/Treatment Projects

19 The Company broke ground on upgrades and additions to the water supply and
20 treatment capacity of the Locke Lake Community Water System (Locke Lake). In
21 2020, the Company completed the design and permitting of a new surface water
22 source of supply (Webster Stream) and treatment system at the existing
23 Peacham Road Treatment Facility. This project is the result of investigations and

1 analysis over a two-year period in response to a significant deficiency identified
2 by the NHDES. The existing Locke Lake well capacity could not keep up with
3 existing customer demands even with full outside water use restrictions. The
4 new surface water source will operate from October through June of each year,
5 as authorized by the Water Quality Certificate issued by the NHDES. The
6 surface water source will supply water when stream flows are generally plentiful
7 during the winter and spring. This will allow the existing wells to rest and
8 groundwater levels to replenish ahead of summertime demand when
9 groundwater recharge is not occurring. This project went used and useful in
10 December 2020; however, project close out items such as painting, structural
11 finish work and site restoration will carry over into 2021. The project included
12 three distinct but related projects and were competitively bid in that fashion. The
13 three parts of the project were the following:

- 14 - The raw water infiltration gallery (intake) in Webster Stream, the raw water
15 pumping station, and the raw water transmission pipeline to the Peacham
16 Road Treatment Facility. (\$268,920)
- 17 - The expansion of the Peacham Road Treatment Facility to house
18 chemical storage/feed system including containment, ventilation to code,
19 and required worker safety provision. This project also included a new
20 residuals settling basin and infiltration lagoon for the new surface water
21 treatment system. (\$200,527)
- 22 - The addition of a new 150 gallon per minute ultra-filtration membrane
23 system to treat the raw water from Webster Stream along with other

1 supporting components including equalization tanks, residuals handling
2 equipment, chemical feed equipment, water quality monitoring equipment,
3 electrical system upgrades, SCADA system upgrades and expansion, as
4 well as structural improvements to accommodate the new treatment
5 process. (\$1,743,647)
6

7 The Company completed another source water related project in 2020
8 associated with the Locke Lake Airstrip Well. The Airstrip Well operated as an
9 independent source separate from the wells that feed into the Peacham Road
10 Treatment Facility. The Airstrip Well had its own arsenic treatment system using
11 adsorptive media as opposed to the Coprecipitation process used at the
12 Peacham Road Treatment Facility. The use of Coprecipitation to remove the
13 arsenic will save about \$28,000 in treatment costs from the 2020 expenses
14 associated with arsenic removal via adsorptive media. With the change in the
15 arsenic standard from 10 ppt to 5 ppt, the cost of the adsorptive media treatment
16 would almost double from about \$40,000 to \$80,000 per year resulting in
17 additional long-term savings. The analysis showed that the Company could
18 reconfigure the Airstrip Well to pump to the Peacham Road Treatment Facility via
19 a new pipeline directionally drilled under Locke Lake. The Company sought and
20 the Commission approved a license to allow the crossing under Locke Lake (see
21 DW 19-198). This project was completed in the first half of 2020 but had to wait
22 until December for improvements to be complete at the Peacham Road
23 Treatment Facility before it could go into service. (\$618,531)

1 One final project was completed at Locke Lake in 2020. The existing iron,
2 manganese, and arsenic filters suffered a significant failure of the internal
3 screens and supports that contain the filter media. The failure was not
4 repairable, and the filters were no longer functional. The Company initiated the
5 installation of a temporary arsenic filtration unit, as well as it continued to truck
6 water into the system to minimize the impact of arsenic going into the distribution
7 system to maintain compliance with the arsenic standard. The existing filters
8 were removed, and the Company purchased new filters and installed them with
9 the assistance of the Contractor that was installing the new membrane system.
10 The replacement groundwater filters were placed into service on or about
11 December 24, 2020. The NHDES authorized use of already approved SRF
12 funds to pay for some of the cost and the balance was paid for with CoBank
13 financing. (\$140,348)

14

15 **Q. Please identify and describe water main projects planned for 2021, 2022,**
16 **and 2023.**

17 A. Planned water main replacements and additions are listed below by year.

18 2021 Water Main Replacements/Additions

19 There are no planned distribution water main replacements in 2021. The 2021
20 Capital expenditures are more focused upon the Londonderry Storage tank and
21 pumping/treatment station upgrades and replacement. Those activities will be
22 discussed later in this testimony.

23

1 2022 Water Main Replacements/Additions

2 Gage Hill CWS

3 The Gage Hill water system in Pelham, NH is another system the Company
4 acquired with substandard small diameter plastic pipe. The system has
5 experienced 35 breaks over the past 5 years (43 breaks per mile of watermain).
6 Those leaks have impacted service to the customer and present risk of
7 contamination due to depressurization. The project will replace mains at the
8 following locations.

- 9 - Wellesley Drive: Replace 1760 LF of 2-inch PE with 1760 LF of 4-inch
10 C900 PVC
- 11 - Radcliffe Drive: Replace 720 LF of 1.5-inch PE with 720 LF of 4- inch
12 C900 PVC
- 13 - Vassar Drive: Replace 1740 LF of - inch PE with 1740 LF of 4-inch
14 C900 PVC

15 The estimated budget for this project is approximately \$590,000.

16 2023 Water Main Replacements/Additions

17 Pelham Main Replacement - Monticello & Lane Area Phase 2 (\$900,000)

- 18 - Lane Road: Replace 2,900 LF of 3-inch PE pipe with 3,600 LF of 6-
19 inch C-900 PVC that will eliminate dead end mains and cross-country
20 main running behind private homes.
- 21 - Monticello Drive: 1,960 LF of 3-inch PE pipe with 6-inch C-900 PVC.
22 This work will also enable the elimination of existing pipe that runs
23 cross-country behind private residences.

- 1 - Mammoth Road: Replace 1,660 LF of 3-inch PE pipe with 12-inch C-
2 900 and add 510 LF of 12-inch C-900 to eliminate dead ends on Lane
3 Road and facilitate the elimination of existing pipe that runs cross-
4 country behind private residences.

5 The Company will be applying to the NH SRF for loans and the NH DWGTF for
6 loans and grants to fund water main projects once the application process opens
7 each year (May and June) for projects planned in 2022 and 2023.

8

9 **Q. Your testimony states that water main replacement varies each year (2021-**
10 **2023) due to balancing the investment in water main replacements with**
11 **other major capital projects. What are those projects?**

12 A. These investments are associated with vertical assets, including storage tanks,
13 pumping stations, treatment facilities, source of supply and process related
14 improvements (SCADA, Asset Management, etc.). In some years there may be
15 more need for horizontal asset investment rather than vertical assets. In other
16 years the opposite may be true. The balancing is necessary to keep rates from
17 going up too quickly. A large vertical asset can consume most of the targeted
18 PEU capital investment dollars and result in the Company delaying a horizontal
19 project for a number of years to lessen rate impacts.

20 2021 Vertical Projects

21 Atkinson CWS Station Reconstruction

22 The Company has budgeted \$630,000 (budget has \$30,000 for design in 2021
23 and \$600,000 for Station rebuild in 2022) to reconstruct an existing water

1 pumping and storage facility that serves a limited area in the Town of Atkinson.
2 The station pumping and piping equipment are beyond the design life and have
3 deteriorated where replacement is necessary. The storage tanks are buried steel
4 and show signs of significant corrosion. The tanks need to be replaced. Finally,
5 the station is required to provide limited fire protection. Existing storage volumes
6 and pumping equipment are not capable of providing the required fire protection
7 flows.

8 Londonderry Core, Londonderry, NH

9 The Company had planned to replace Gilcrest Road Pressure Reducing Valve
10 (PRV) Pit in 2019. The pit is a converted below ground vault that was installed in
11 the late 1980's. The internal piping is corroded, and several leaks have been
12 repaired. The PRV's in the pit reduce the pressure from the elevation 620 foot
13 pressure zone down to the 498 foot pressure zone in the Londonderry Core. The
14 addition of a second PRV vault, as part of the Woodmont Commons
15 development will replace the Gilcrest PRV pit. The change in how water will be
16 fed into the Londonderry system, as discussed below, provides system
17 redundancy and eliminates the need to rebuild the Gilcrest PRV pit.

18 The Company planned to design and permit a 1.25 million gallon water storage
19 tank to address water supply capacity shortfalls in the Londonderry Core system,
20 as documented by the NHDES in their Sanitary Survey dated January 9, 2018.
21 The private development is prepared to contribute 51% of the cost of the tank.
22 Additionally, the construction of the tank will reduce the Company's purchased
23 cost of water from Manchester Water Works by about \$70,000 per year. The

1 Company sought and received, through its petition to the Commission (DW 18-
2 101), an approval of a Special Contract with a private entity, Pillsbury Realty
3 Development, LLC (“Pillsbury”) for Pillsbury to fund approximately 51% of the
4 project cost. Pillsbury’s contribution is the result of their impact on the
5 Londonderry water system from a significant development (Woodmont
6 Commons) that Pillsbury is constructing. The elevated tank required a variance
7 due to its height at the location where it was to be constructed.

8 Unfortunately, the Londonderry Zoning Board of Adjustment denied the variance
9 in November 2019. Since the denial of the variance, PEU has engaged the
10 services of an engineering consultant to assess other water supply storage and
11 distribution options to achieve the objectives of the original elevated storage tank
12 project and assess the relative costs. During this evaluation process, PEU
13 engaged in discussions with Town of Londonderry staff, our consultants, and
14 NHDES to advise local officials of the need to make system improvements of
15 which the most technically feasible options include water storage to meet existing
16 water demand conditions regardless of Woodmont Commons. In addition, PEU
17 met with representatives of Pillsbury to present system improvement options that
18 achieve PEU’s responsibilities as the public water utility and meet the needs of
19 the Woodmont Commons development consistent with the Special Contract
20 approved by the Commission in Order 26,285. During these discussions, a
21 number of opportunities were discovered or offered by Woodmont Commons that
22 advanced technical alternatives previously unavailable to PEU and would result
23 in similar rate impact to the elevated tank option (originally identified as the “least

1 cost option"). PEU filed a petition detailing this alternative (see DW 18-101) to
2 present a new alternative consisting of a ground level storage tank, transmission
3 main, and water booster pumping station. This alternative revised the project
4 scope but is consistent with the cost sharing arrangements with Pillsbury in the
5 Special Contract approved in Order No. 26,285.

6 The Company hopes to complete the project (used and useful) in 2021.

7 However, depending upon the timing of local permits (Planning Board) and re-
8 approval of the Special contract by the Commission. The project may take 12 to
9 18 months to complete depending upon when construction can start and could
10 be delayed to 2022. The Company estimates its total project expenditure to be
11 \$1,600,000. The project will be financed through CoBank. Once the Project is
12 completed, the Company projects its purchased water costs from Manchester
13 Water Works to the Londonderry Core to be about \$70,000 per year less than
14 before the tank was constructed.

15
16 2022 Vertical Projects

17 Atkinson CWS Station Reconstruction

18 The Company has budgeted \$630,000 (budget has \$30,000 for design and
19 \$600,000 for Station rebuild) to reconstruct and existing water pumping and
20 storage facility that serves a limited area in the Town of Atkinson. The reasons
21 for the station replacement were detailed earlier in this testimony.

1 2023 Vertical Projects

2 There are no major vertical capital projects planned for 2023 at this time.

3

4 **Q. Are there other capital expenditures completed in 2020 and/or proposed for**
5 **2021, 2022, and 2023 that the Company plans to complete?**

6 A. Yes. The Company has a number of routine capital activities that are not
7 classified as “major” but are necessary to operate the business and serve our
8 customers. Some examples are as follows:

- 9 • The Company carried budgets for well rehabilitation, pump replacements,
10 SCADA improvements, security enhancements, along with other treatment
11 and pumping equipment. The Company also budgets a number of hydrant,
12 valve, and service (main to stop) replacements each year.
- 13 • The Company will begin the process of replacing customer meter radios that
14 are approaching the end of their useful life. The project is anticipated to take
15 seven years complete resulting in radios being replaced between year 15 and
16 21 of their lives. All the radios in question were installed in 2007 and are
17 warrantied for 10 years. Annual radio failure rate has increased from about
18 0.5% per year to just under 2% per year. The plan is designed to avoid mass
19 failure of the radios. Replacing radios at the time of failure results in an
20 estimated meter read and a special trip to the location of the failed radio to
21 complete the radio replacement. On average (based on system geography),
22 the average time for a single radio change out (inclusive of travel) in PEU is
23 about 2 hours in remote systems, or about \$230 per replacement. This is

1 opposed to a dedicated, planned replacement program where all radios in a
2 remote area are replaced at once with one trip versus individual trips where
3 the time spent per radio replacement is no more than 15 minutes per radio,
4 resulting in a replacement cost of about \$125. Extending the replacement
5 plan over 7 years will allow the Company to view radio failure rates for radios
6 between 15 and 22 years old and allow a better timing of the next set of radio
7 replacements, while further spreading the radio replacements out over a
8 longer period of time than the original single year implementation. The 2021
9 budget for this effort is \$130,000. This work will continue into and be further
10 budgeted in 2022 and 2023 at \$130,000 per year.

11 These Capital expenditures will be funded through a loan from CoBank.

12 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

13 **A. Yes.**