| 1 | | The current interconnection project will take advantage of the soon to be completed |
|----------------------|----|--|
| 2 | | Plaistow water system enabled by the establishment of the Southern NH Regional |
| 3 | | Water System. The Plaistow water distribution system, once completed and |
| 4 | | operational, is located within Sweet Hill Road adjacent to the Sweet Hill |
| 5 | | Development. The interconnection will offer a reliable supplemental and emergency |
| 6 | | source of water for the Sweet Hill CWS when capacity of the existing wells drops |
| 7 | | below acceptable levels to meet base demand, and/or in case of mechanical/pump |
| 8 | | failures. The interconnection may also allow for a reasonable amount (restricted) of |
| 9 | | outside water use during the summer months. |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | Q. | Please describe the basic components to each interconnection project. |
| 12 | A. | A more detailed description for each project will be provided late in this testimony. |
| 13 | | However, the basic components for each project are listed below. |
| 14 | | Twin Ridge |
| 15 | | |
| | | The components of the Twin Ridge Interconnection are depicted in Figure 1 attached |
| 16 | | The components of the Twin Ridge Interconnection are depicted in Figure 1 attached as Exhibit JJB-1. The Company will connect to the existing Town of Plaistow water |
| 16 17 | | |
| | | as Exhibit JJB-1. The Company will connect to the existing Town of Plaistow water |
| 17 | | as Exhibit JJB-1. The Company will connect to the existing Town of Plaistow water main at the intersection of Walton Road and Route 125. The interconnection will |
| 17 18 | | as Exhibit JJB-1. The Company will connect to the existing Town of Plaistow water main at the intersection of Walton Road and Route 125. The interconnection will include the following: |
| 17 18 19 | | as Exhibit JJB-1. The Company will connect to the existing Town of Plaistow water main at the intersection of Walton Road and Route 125. The interconnection will include the following: A tap/connection to the existing Plaistow water main on Route 125 |
| 17 18 19 20 | | as Exhibit JJB-1. The Company will connect to the existing Town of Plaistow water main at the intersection of Walton Road and Route 125. The interconnection will include the following: A tap/connection to the existing Plaistow water main on Route 125 Approximately 120 feet of 8-inch watermain will be added to the Company's |

| 1 | | followed by chlorination within the existing Sweet Hill station. |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | | Chloramine filtration will allow water produced by the well and that |
| 3 | | water purchased from Plaistow to receive the same type of |
| 4 | | disinfection. |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | Q. | What are the estimated construction costs for each project and the |
| 7 | | corresponding loan amounts and terms for the Twin Ridge and Sweet Hill |
| 8 | | projects? |
| 9 | A. | The estimated capital cost for the Twin Ridge interconnection is \$261,173 which will |
| 10 | | be covered by the SRF loan of \$300,000 with an interest rate of 1.256% for 20 years. |
| 11 | | The estimated capital cost for Sweet Hill is \$462,672 and will be covered in part by |
| 12 | | the available SRF loan of \$240,000 with an interest rate of 1.256% for 20 years. The |
| 13 | | remaining \$222,677 will be covered by bonds issued in 2023. |
| 14 | | As addressed in the testimony of Larry Goodhue in this docket, if the Order for this |
| 15 | | financing cannot be approved prior to the annual reset of the eligible interest rate for |
| 16 | | these loans at the end of July 2022, the stated interest rate on these loans will increase |
| 17 | | to a rate estimated to be 2.5%. Sensitivity for this impact on these projects is |
| 18 | | included later in this testimony, and in exhibits attached hereto. |
| 19 | Q. | Please provide addition detail/analysis that supports the Company's decision to |
| 20 | | discontinue the use of the Twin Ridge wells, treatment and storage facilities in |
| 21 | | favor of purchasing 100% of the Twin Ridge demand from Plaistow. |
| 22 | A. | The Company looked at three options to address the water supply needs of Twin |
| 23 | | Ridge, as follows: |

| Option | NPV in \$ (at 1.256% interest rate) | NPV in \$ (at 2.5% interest rate) |
|----------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Option 1 | (\$1,144,185.03) | (\$1,167,921.48) |
| Option 2 | (\$1,545,956.23) | (\$1,573,221.43) |
| Option 3 | (\$2,318,897.36) | (\$2,346,162.56) |

1

2 Option 1 represents the lowest NPV therefore in this case the most cost-effective
3 solution of the options available as evaluated as a long-term solution to the water
4 supply needs of Twin Ridge and the Company.

5

Q. Please provide addition detail/analysis that supports the Company's decision to
continue the use of the Sweet Hill wells, treatment and storage facilities with
Plaistow as a supplemental source rather than purchasing 100% of the Sweet
Hill demand from Plaistow.

- 10 A. The Company looked at two options to address the water supply needs of Sweet Hill11 as follows:
- <u>Option 1</u> Purchase 100% of the Twin Ridge demand from Plaistow while
 maintaining the Sweet Hill Station and booster pumps.

| 1 | Property tax implications | |
|----|--|--|
| 2 | • Current and future operation and maintenance | |
| 3 | Inflationary impacts | |
| 4 | • The Company did include replacement of the portion of the Sweet Hill | |
| 5 | station that houses the booster pumps. The replacement of the station | |
| 6 | structure was included in year 14 of the NPV analysis JJB-1 Page 11. In | |
| 7 | year 14 of the NPV analysis the station structure reaches the end of its | |
| 8 | useful life, when the station turns 40 years old, and as such, that is | |
| 9 | included in the overall planning horizon for this analysis. | |
| 10 | The NPV analysis used a 20-year planning horizon. The resulting NPV for each | |

11 option is depicted below and in Exhibit JJB-2, Page 6.

| Option | NPV in \$ (at 1.256% interest rate) | NPV in \$ (at 2.5% interest rate) |
|----------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Option 1 | (\$1,343,584.53) | (\$1,365,396.69) |
| Option 2 | (\$1,416,166.86) | (\$1,437,979.02) |

12

The NPV analysis of Option 1 and Option 2 are very close, unlike the differential in
the valuations for Twin Ridge. Since there are inherent assumptions (interest rates,

15 inflation, actual vs. estimated water demand, etc.) included in the NPV analysis, the