

1
2
3
4
5 **STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**
6 **BEFORE THE**
7 **NEW HAMPSHIRE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**
8
9

10
11
12 **RE: PENNICHUCK EAST UTILITY, INC.**
13 **DW 22- ____**
14

15
16
17
18 **2022 QUALIFIED CAPITAL PROJECT ADJUSTMENT CHARGE FILING**
19
20
21

22
23 **DIRECT TESTIMONY**
24 **OF**
25 **John J. Boisvert**
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 **February 10, 2022**
40

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
20 budgeted/forecasted for 2022-2024 as part of the Company's 2022 Qualified
21 Capital Project Adjustment Charge ("QCPAC") filing. This testimony will also
22 present and describe the major QCPAC projects initiated and completed in 2021,
23 as well as the budgeted or proposed projects for 2022, 2023 and 2024. My

1 testimony supports, and is in addition to, testimony being provided by the
2 Company's Chief Operating Officer Donald L. Ware for this docket. Detailed
3 project listings mentioned in this testimony are detailed in Mr. Ware's testimony
4 (Exhibit DLW-1, Pages 1 – 6).

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

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

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17 properly maintain it (outdated/lack of repair parts, etc.)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

- Engineering studies and evaluations to assess infrastructure and system performance to aid in planning future capital investment needs.

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 its Geographical Information System (“GIS”) database. An initial condition assessment and a preliminary evaluation of the consequence of failure of certain water main assets has been completed. This application and effort has thus far served as an effective tool to determine which assets are most critical and should be evaluated in more detail for possible inclusion in the current 2022 – 2024 capital budgets/forecasts. During 2020 and 2021, upon the transition to a new Computerized Management and Maintenance software, the Asset Management Initiative has and is being 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), in order to facilitate more predictive guidance to plan for and implement future capital expenditures. This approach is ongoing and being refined or enhanced

1 as more data and information on the Company's assets become available. This
2 Asset Management approach considers the following for all assets including:

- 3 • Water main break/failure history;
- 4 • Water quality problems;
- 5 • Fire protection flows;
- 6 • The proximity of and support provided to key critical customers (public safety,
7 government, hospitals, etc.);
- 8 • Coordination with gas company (or other buried utility assets) replacement
9 projects;
- 10 • Geographic grouping of streets where mains are to be replaced/rehabilitated
11 for improved efficiency by aggregating main replacement work in close
12 proximity;
- 13 • The opportunity to take advantage of efficiencies gained from coordinating
14 with the paving, storm water and sewer projects of Cities and Towns served
15 by the Company, and in the replacement of water mains where substandard
16 plastic water pipes are present. There are cost savings in pavement repair
17 and traffic control costs associated with completing projects while the
18 municipality or other utility company is also working on a street.
- 19 • Industry guidelines of the American Water Works Association for the
20 replacement of water mains using an average life expectancy for water mains
21 of 100 years absent specific information on a particular asset. The Company
22 considers this rate to be reasonable until the Asset Management System
23 allows for a more system/asset specific assessment to be performed. While

1 all of the Company's water mains are less than 60 years old, a portion of
2 those water mains are substandard plastic water mains that were installed by
3 the original developer prior to the NHDES setting minimum standards on
4 water main materials. As such, those plastic water mains break or fail with
5 much greater frequency than water mains constructed with today's approved
6 materials such as ductile iron pipe. By example, the break per mile on
7 substandard plastic (Sch 40 PVC, 100 psi HDPE or PB – 496 breaks on
8 about 68 miles of substandard plastic over the past 24 years) is about 7.2
9 breaks per mile versus 0.16 breaks per mile on ductile iron pipe (51 breaks on
10 about 324 miles of DIPCL) between 1998 and 2021, or about 45 times greater
11 in frequency.

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

14
15 **Q. What were the major water main projects completed in 2021?**

16 A. The following projects were completed in 2020 with carry over expenditures into
17 2021:

18 Pelham Water Main Replacement – Monticello and Lane Area Phase 1 (W/O#
19 2105634, W/O# 2105635, & W/O# 2105636 at a cost of \$100,351)

20 The Company replaced several sections of small diameter substandard pipe in
21 the Williamsburg Community Water System in Pelham, NH. The 2021
22 expenditures were for final road reconstruction, landscaping (loam & seed), and
23 driveway restorations.

Locke Lake Source of Supply/Treatment Projects (W/O# 2101752 at a cost of \$252,821)

The 2021 expenditures represent carry over costs for the Peacham Road Treatment Facility and the Webster Stream Raw Water Intake that went into service in December 2020. These costs were for final site restorations, completion of incidental structure features (painting, finished carpentry, etc.), additional fine tuning of the SCADA system, fine tuning of the treatment process, and completion of the Webster Stream Source Water Protection Plan required by the NHDES.

Locke Lake Airstrip Station Decommissioning (W/O# 2101758 at a cost of \$77,613)

The need to maintain the use of the Airstrip Station was no longer necessary upon completion of the piping of the Airstrip Well directly to the Peacham Road Treatment Facility in 2020. The Airstrip building structure along with buried water storage tanks were demolished and the site was reestablished by filling, grading, and revegetation. In addition, two wells once associated with the Locke Lake CWS were abandoned in accordance with NHDES regulations. These wells were never active during the Company's ownership of the water system.

Q. Please identify and describe water main projects budgeted or planned for 2022, 2023, and 2024.

1 A. Budgeted (2022) or planned (2023-2024) water main replacements and additions
2 are listed below by year.

3 2022 Water Main Replacements/Additions

4 There are no currently budgeted distribution water main replacements in 2022.

5 The 2022 Capital expenditures are more focused upon the Londonderry Storage
6 tank and pumping/treatment station upgrades and replacement and the
7 interconnection of the W&E CWS to the Southern NH Regional Water System.

8 Those activities will be discussed later in this testimony.

9
10 2023 Water Main Replacements/Additions

11 There are no planned distribution water main improvements planned for 2023.

12 Major capital projects will be focused booster station and storage tank
13 replacement discussed later in this testimony.

14
15 2024 Water Main Replacements/Additions

16 There are no planned distribution water main improvements planned for 2024.

17 Major capital project will be focused booster station and storage tank
18 replacement discussed later in this testimony.

19
20 **Q. Your testimony states that water main replacement varies each year (2022-**
21 **2024) due to balancing the investment in water main replacements with**
22 **other major capital projects. What are those projects?**

1 A. These investments are associated with vertical assets, including storage tanks,
2 pumping stations, treatment facilities, source of supply and process related
3 improvements (SCADA, Asset Management, etc.). In some years there may be
4 more need for horizontal asset investment (main replacements) rather than
5 vertical assets. In other years the opposite may be true. The balancing of these
6 focused objectives is necessary to maintain a balance between timely
7 replacement of aging infrastructure, while also keeping water rates from
8 increasing too quickly, in order to fund those incurred costs. A large vertical
9 asset can consume most of the targeted annual PEU capital investment dollars
10 and result in the Company delaying a horizontal project for a number of years to
11 lessen rate impacts. These deferments are weighed and considered carefully,
12 such that the deferment is not an adverse decision as it relates to the ability to
13 meet the core objectives of delivering water to customers as needed.

14 2022 Vertical Projects

15 Londonderry Core, Londonderry, NH

16 The Company had planned to replace the Gilcrest Road Pressure Reducing
17 Valve (PRV) Pit in 2019. This pit is a converted below ground vault that was
18 installed in the late 1980's. The internal piping, which is painted steel, is
19 corroded, and multiple small pin hole leaks have been repaired over the past five
20 years. The PRV's in the pit reduce the pressure from the elevation 620-foot
21 pressure zone down to the 498-foot pressure zone, as they exist in the
22 Londonderry Core portion of the Company's distribution system in that
23 community. The addition of a second PRV vault, as part of the Woodmont

1 Commons development will replace the Gilcrest PRV pit. The change in how
2 water will be fed into the Londonderry system, as discussed below, provides
3 system redundancy and eliminates the need to rebuild the Gilcrest PRV pit.
4 The Company planned to design and permit a 1.25 million gallon water storage
5 tank to address water supply capacity shortfalls in the Londonderry Core system,
6 as documented by the NHDES in their Sanitary Survey dated January 9, 2018.
7 A Private Developer is prepared to contribute 51% of the cost of the tank.
8 Additionally, the construction of the tank will reduce the Company's purchased
9 cost of water from Manchester Water Works by about \$70,000 per year. The
10 Company sought and received, through its petition to the Commission (Docket
11 No. DW 18-101), an approval of a Special Contract with a private entity, Pillsbury
12 Realty Development, LLC ("Pillsbury") for Pillsbury to fund approximately 51% of
13 the project cost. Pillsbury's contribution is the result of their impact on the
14 Londonderry water system from a significant development (Woodmont
15 Commons) that Pillsbury is constructing. The elevated tank required a variance
16 due to its height at the location where it was to be constructed.
17 Unfortunately, the Londonderry Zoning Board of Adjustment denied the variance
18 in November 2019. Since the denial of the variance, PEU has engaged the
19 services of an engineering consultant to assess other water supply storage and
20 distribution options to achieve the objectives of the original elevated storage tank
21 project and assess the relative costs. During this evaluation process, PEU
22 engaged in discussions with Town of Londonderry staff, our consultants, and
23 NHDES to advise local officials of the need to make system improvements of

1 which the most technically feasible options include water storage to meet existing
2 water demand conditions regardless of Woodmont Commons. In addition, PEU
3 met with representatives of Pillsbury to present system improvement options that
4 achieve PEU's responsibilities as the public water utility and meet the needs of
5 the Woodmont Commons development consistent with the Special Contract
6 approved by the Commission in Docket No. 18-101 by Order 26,285 on August
7 9, 2019. During these discussions, a number of opportunities were discovered or
8 offered by Woodmont Commons that advanced technical alternatives previously
9 unavailable to PEU and would result in similar rate impact to the elevated tank
10 option (originally identified as the "least cost option"). PEU filed a petition
11 detailing this alternative (see DW 18-101) to present a new alternative consisting
12 of a ground level storage tank, transmission main, and water booster pumping
13 station. This alternative revised the project scope but is consistent with the cost
14 sharing arrangements with Pillsbury in the Special Contract approved by a
15 subsequent Order 26,473 on April 21, 2021.

16 The Company hopes to complete some the project (used and useful) in 2022
17 with the remainder to be completed in 2023. However, this all depends upon the
18 timing of the granting of local permits (Planning Board) and a re-approval of the
19 Special contract by the Commission. The project may take 12 to 18 months to
20 complete depending upon when construction can start, and as such, could be
21 delayed to the later part of 2022. The Company estimates its 49% share of the
22 total project expenditure to be \$1,600,000. The project will be financed through
23 drawdowns on the Company's FALOC with CoBank (to be subsequently

1 converted to long-term debt via the QCPAC process filing in 2023 and/or 2024).
2 Once the Project is completed, the Company projects its purchased water costs
3 from Manchester Water Works to the Londonderry Core to be about \$70,000 per
4 year less than before the tank was constructed. The components of the project
5 are in final design.

6
7 W&E Community Water System Interconnection to the Salem Water System
8 (W/O# 2004243 and W/O# 2101750)

9 The W&E interconnection was initiated in 2021. The project includes two major
10 components. The first is the addition of catalytic granular activated carbon to the
11 treatment process to remove chloramines from water purchased from the Town
12 of Salem in order to blend that water with groundwater disinfected with sodium
13 hypochlorite (free chlorine). This will allow for continued disinfection of finished
14 water with free chlorine. This treatment modification is necessary because if
15 water that is treated with free chlorine is mixed with water disinfected by
16 chloramines, taste and odor issues are likely to arise. The second part of the
17 project is the installation of an interconnecting pipeline on Range Road to the
18 W&E treatment station on West Side Road. As mentioned above, the project was
19 designed and bid in 2021. Construction began on the treatment system
20 upgrades in the late Fall of 2021 and will continue into the first quarter of 2022.
21 The pipeline portion of the project could not be initiated in 2021, because it was
22 too late in the construction season and due to recent supply chain issues

1 associated with procuring ductile iron water main. The pipeline work is expected
2 to be complete in the second quarter of 2022.

3 This project will allow the Company to purchase up to 30,000 gallons of water per
4 day from Salem. This purchase will allow the Company to cease its dependency
5 and usage of its existing Well 3. Water quality from Well 3 (elevated hardness,
6 manganese, and at times uranium) overwhelms the treatment capacity of the
7 existing treatment and residuals (filter and softener backwash) systems.

8 The estimated project cost is \$705,000. The Company recently received funding
9 approval from the New Hampshire Drinking Water and Groundwater Trust Fund
10 Commission. The funding will be made up of a \$211,500 grant and a \$493,500
11 loan. The Company is preparing a financing petition for approval by the
12 Commission. The Company expects to file that petition in February 2022.

13
14 2023 Vertical Projects

15 Sunrise Estates CWS Booster Station & Storage Tank Replacement

16 The Sunrise Estates CWS booster station structure and steel atmospheric and
17 hydropneumatic storage tanks are original to the water system and are beyond
18 their useful service life. The station is located partially below ground, with the
19 storage tanks being fully buried except for where they protrude through the
20 station wall. Where the tanks protrude through the wall, they are heavily
21 corroded. The design is underway to replace the station with a new above
22 ground building structure, new pumps, controls, electrical system and room for
23 additional treatment (primarily manganese filtration and disinfection) and a new

below ground concrete atmospheric storage tank. The estimated project cost is \$500,000.

2024 Vertical Projects

Atkinson CWS Station Reconstruction

The Company has planned an amount of \$800,000 to reconstruct an existing water pumping and storage facility that serves a limited area in the Town of Atkinson (Pioneer Park). The station pumping and piping equipment are beyond the design life and have deteriorated where replacement is necessary. The storage tanks are buried steel and show signs of significant corrosion. The tanks need to be replaced. Finally, the station is required to provide limited fire protection. Existing storage volumes and pumping equipment are not capable of providing the required fire protection flows.

Q. Are there other capital expenditures completed in 2021 and/or budgeted/proposed for 2022, 2023, and 2024 that the Company plans to complete?

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

- The Company carries budgeted amounts for well rehabilitation, pump replacements, SCADA improvements, security enhancements, along with

1 other treatment and pumping equipment. The Company also budgets a
2 number of hydrant, valve, and service (main to stop) replacements each year.

3 • The Company will continue the process of replacing customer Radio Meter
4 Interface Units (MIU) that are beyond their warranty period of 10 years and
5 approaching the end of their useful life (original Radio MIU's were installed in
6 2008). The project is targeted to replace all the radios over ten years
7 resulting in radios being replaced between years 13 and 23 of their lives. All
8 the Radio MIU's planned for replacement were installed in 2008. Annual
9 radio failure rate has increased from about 0.5% per year to just under 2%
10 per year. The plan is designed to avoid mass failure of the radios and to
11 spread the investment of the aggregate replacement over time. Replacing
12 radios at the time of failure results in an estimated meter read and a special
13 trip to the location of the failed radio to complete the radio replacement. On
14 average (based on system geography), the average time for a single radio
15 change out (inclusive of travel) in PEU is about 2 hours in remote systems, or
16 about \$230 per replacement. This is opposed to a dedicated, planned
17 replacement program where all radios in a remote area are replaced at once
18 with one trip versus individual trips where the time spent per radio
19 replacement is no more than 15 minutes per radio, resulting in a replacement
20 cost per unit of about \$125. Extending the replacement plan over 10 years
21 will allow the Company to view radio failure rates for radios between 13 and
22 23 years old and allow a better planned timing of the next set of radio
23 replacements, while further spreading the radio replacements out over a

1 longer period of time than the original single year implementation. The 2022
2 budget for this effort is \$91,000. This work will continue into and be further
3 budgeted in 2023 and 2024 at \$91,000 per year respectively.

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

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

6 A. Yes.