1	STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE				
2			PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION		
3		0.00			
4	21 South Fru		3 - 9:04 a.m. it Street		
5	Suite 10 Concord,	NH			
6					
7		RE:	DW 23-016		
8			CITY OF LACONIA: Petition to Extend Water and Sewer		
9			Service Areas in Belmont. (Prehearing conference)		
10					
11	PRESENT	r:	Chairman Daniel C. Goldner, Presiding		
12			Lynn Fabrizio, Esq./PUC Legal Advisor		
13					
14			Tracey Russo, Clerk		
15	APPEARANO	CES:			
16			Joseph H. Driscoll, IV, Esq. (Mitchell Municipal Group, P.A.)		
17			Reptg. Mountain Lake Village, LLC:		
18			Philip A. Brouillard, Esq. (Brouillard & Brouillard, PLLC)		
19			Reptg. New Hampshire Dept. of Energy:		
20			Suzanne G. Amidon, Esq. Jayson Laflamme, Dir./Water Group		
21			Robyn Descoteau, Water Group (Regulatory Support Division)		
22					
23	Court	Rep	oorter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52		
24					

1		
2	INDEX	
3		PAGE NO.
3	ISSUE RE: PETITION FOR INTERVENTION	PAGE NO.
5	ISSUE RE: PETITION FOR INTERVENTION	4
	CENTENENES OF DDELINING DV DOCUMENT DV.	
6	STATEMENTS OF PRELIMINARY POSITION BY:	_
7	Mr. Driscoll	5
8	Ms. Amidon	6
9	Mr. Brouillard	7
10		
11	QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER	9
12		
13	FURTHER STATEMENTS BY:	
14	Mr. Driscoll	13
15	Ms. Amidon	15
16	Mr. Brouillard	16
17		
18	ISSUE RE: PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE	13
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

PROCEEDING

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Good morning, everyone. I'm Chairman Goldner, Presiding
Officer for the prehearing conference today,
pursuant to RSA 363:16. We're here this morning
in Docket 23-016 regarding a Petition filed by
the City of Laconia on February 17th, 2023, for
approval to extend the City's water and sewer
service in the Town of Belmont, to serve 18 lots
within the Mountain Lake Village development.

Let's begin by taking appearances, beginning with the City of Laconia.

MR. DRISCOLL: Good morning Chairman.

Joe Driscoll, from the Mitchell Municipal Group,
and we represent the City of Laconia. With me
today is the Director of Public Works, Wes

Anderson, he has a injury, so forgive him for not
standing; and Ben Crawford, the Superintendent of
Water Works.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. Thank you. And no need to stand today, but unless you wish. So, --

MR. BROUILLARD: I'm Attorney Philip Brouillard, representing Mountain Lake Village.

```
1
         And this is Jon Rokeh, the engineer.
 2.
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:
                                       Thank you.
 3
               And we -- so, for Mountain Lake Village.
         vou.
 4
         And how do you pronounce your name, sir?
 5
                   MR. BROUILLARD: Brouillard, "brew
 6
         yard".
 7
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. And the
 8
         New Hampshire Department of Energy?
 9
                   MS. AMIDON: Good morning. Suzanne
10
         Amidon, for the Department. And with me is
11
         Jayson Laflamme, who is the Director of the Water
12
         Group in the Department of Energy; and Robyn
1.3
         Descoteau, who is an Analyst in that division.
14
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Very good.
15
                   Okay. Mountain Lake Village submitted
16
         a timely Petition to Intervene, which has not
17
         been objected to. Does anyone have anything
18
         further to say with respect to the Petition to
19
         Intervene?
20
                   MS. AMIDON: We do not have anything at
2.1
         the Department. Thank you.
2.2
                   MR. DRISCOLL: We do not object.
23
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.
24
                   Okay. Seeing none, I've reviewed and
```

determined that the Mountain Lake Village intervention would be in the interest of justice, and would not impair the orderly and prompt conduct of the proceeding, and therefore grant intervention pursuant to Puc 203.17 and RSA 541-A:32 II.

2.

1.3

1 4

2.1

2.2

Okay. I'd like to start today's proceeding with taking preliminary positions, and beginning with the City of Laconia.

MR. DRISCOLL: Good morning, Chair.

[Court reporter interruption regarding the use of the microphone.]

MR. DRISCOLL: As has been noted, we filed this Petition to service 18 residential lots. This is the product of a intermunicipal subdivision that's been created, approximately 52 lots. I'll let the intervenor speak more on the details of that. They are the developer of the property. The intent here is to get the services necessary, both water and sewer, from the City of Laconia, that would branch off into the development starting in the City of Laconia, and this, as you can see from our plans, if you'd like to see, kind of needs to wiggle across the

line in a couple different ways. The stricter compliance is in the City of Laconia, as opposed to the Town of Belmont. That will be followed, as opposed to any sort of transition to the Belmont's standards of things.

Outside of that, you know, it's -frankly, it's something that the City supports.

It is something that the services can handle.

And, you know, I have the gentlemen here that can speak to that, if there's any further questions on it.

Thank you.

2.

1.3

1 4

2.1

2.2

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you, sir. And let's move to the New Hampshire Department of Energy.

MS. AMIDON: Thank you.

The Department has already commenced one set of discovery on this. And, from what we can ascertain, Laconia intends to charge no more than 15 percent over the rate that it charges for its municipal customers to those Belmont customers, which is consistent with the requirements of the statute. In addition, we've been able to determine that the sewage rates are

going to be the same as those in Laconia. So, that also satisfies the statute.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

However, we're missing a couple of things. One of them is the Department of Environmental Services' letter attesting to the availability of the water. And we requested that in a data request. And, initially, we were going get that, I think, on the 18th or the 19th, but there's another date that has been set at this point. So, we're looking forward to getting that. And, based on the fact that we haven't gotten that letter yet, we're going to have an additional set of discovery, or at least allow for an additional set, so we can make sure that we have everything we need to complete our review of the docket.

Thank you. And you have any questions, please let me know.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you,
Attorney Amidon. And let's move to Mountain Lake
Village, and Mr. Brouillard.

MR. BROUILLARD: Well, I'm usually -[Court reporter interruption regarding
the use of the microphone.]

MR. BROUILLARD: Sorry. I'm usually accused of saying too much. But I do subscribe to the adage of "A picture is worth a thousand words." And I don't know if you've seen this particular plan.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: I have. It's in the filing.

MR. BROUILLARD: Okay. Great. And, as you can see, the town line sort of bisects the property. And the Town of Belmont regulations say that, if you have a cluster subdivision, you need water and sewer. And, also, this was 107 acres, and part of the development and the approvals is we had to give a conservation easement on 50 acres to the Town of Belmont and actually deed it to them, which we have done.

So, we've got -- the other thing is, if you look at the subdivision, all the lots back up to the common area. It's a very nice subdivision. You know, water and sewer are very nice amenities, and it's good for the environment, treated water and everything.

So, you know, basically, we would like to have the Department of Energy complete their

review and have the Board look favorably upon it.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. And I'll just maybe some -- a couple of follow-up questions.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

What I take from the opening statements is that all of the parties to the proceeding are in agreement with the costs, with the setup, with the implementation. The only concern at this point is from the -- the approval from the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services. Is that a fair summary?

MS. AMIDON: Yes. But one thing I did want to emphasis is that the Department is reviewing it for purposes of determining whether they're acting as a municipal utility, not subject to the Commission's jurisdiction, and the rates that they are assessing the Belmont residents of this proposed subdivision. So, that's really what we're looking at.

One of those factors, obviously, also that we are required to look at is the availability of water. So, we are looking for that letter, and assume that that will be forthcoming at some point.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Does the Department have any concern with the rates, the 15 and zero percent? Those are the maxes allowed by statute. Does the Department accept the proposal from the Petitioner? Or, are you doing some analysis to determine some different numbers?

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

MS. AMIDON: We have that information. And, in order to avoid being a public utility, the municipal water utility can charge no greater than 15 percent over the municipal water tariff itself for their residents. And that is the case in this case. They are within — I think they are charging the 15 percent in excess of the Laconia municipal water rate. But that's consistent with the statute, to avoid being under the jurisdiction of the Commission. And the same with the sewer rates being the same as the rates that are charged the Laconia municipal residents under that tariff. That is also consistent with being able to be a municipal utility not subject to the full regulation of the Commission.

So, those are the two aspects that we're looking at. We also looked at the managerial, financial, and technical abilities of

```
1
         the Town [sic] to be able to serve these
 2.
         additional customers, and that appears to be
 3
         adequate as well. But we need just one more set
 4
         of discovery to complete our review.
 5
                   And I would say -- I wouldn't say that
 6
         we agree that the Petition is in the best -- is
 7
         in the public interest, the Petition satisfies
 8
         the requirements of the statute.
 9
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Any comments
10
         from the City of Laconia?
11
                   MR. DRISCOLL: Is there any way I could
12
         speak with my client briefly on a certain point?
1.3
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Of course. Yes,
14
         please.
15
                   MR. DRISCOLL: Is it -- can we do it in
16
         the hallway or something?
17
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: That would be fine.
18
         We can stay here, yes. If nobody objects, that's
19
         fine with me.
20
                   And I don't want to rush you. If you
2.1
         need 15 or 20 minutes, we can take a break.
2.2
         it's just going to be a few minutes, we can just
23
         stay. Do you have a preference?
24
                   MR. DRISCOLL: About 10 minutes is kind
```

```
1
         of the preference.
 2.
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:
                                      Okay.
 3
                    MR. DRISCOLL: So, I leave that to the
 4
         Board, however you would like to handle that.
 5
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Is everyone okay
 6
         staying or would you like to adjourn for the 10
 7
         or 15 minutes?
                    MS. AMIDON: We'll probably stay here.
 8
 9
         Thank you.
10
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Mr.
11
         Brouillard, are you okay just to stay, while they
         take a break?
12
1.3
                   MR. BROUILLARD: I am. But I may go to
14
         the men's room.
15
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay.
16
                    MR. BROUILLARD: Yes.
17
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. So, let's --
18
         I'll stay here. But let's reassemble at 9:25.
                    MR. BROUILLARD: Thank you.
19
20
                    (Recess taken at 9:14 a.m., and the
2.1
                    prehearing conference resumed at
2.2
                    9:22 a.m.)
23
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. We'll go back
24
         on the record. City of Laconia.
```

MR. DRISCOLL: Just wanted to raise a couple kind of quick points.

2.

1.3

1 4

2.1

2.2

As to the discovery, that's completely understood. We know that information that the Department needs is -- it's coming to us from DES. I think -- April 20th I think was discussed as probably the timeline for that to come in. So, obviously, that comes in, we get that over, and any further discovery requests, obviously, will be accommodated.

I don't believe -- is there any other questions that I should be addressing at this time?

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: No. I just wanted to make sure you had an opportunity to comment after the Department.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}\ \operatorname{DRISCOLL}\colon$\operatorname{No.}\ \operatorname{Appreciate}$ that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Sure. Maybe a question for the Department.

I know that you're awaiting the report from Environmental Services. Can you maybe lay out, Attorney Amidon, your thoughts on a procedural schedule or how you see this docket

rolling out?

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

MS. AMIDON: I have Mr. Laflamme next to me. I guess what I would suggest is that maybe we will be looking at doing a technical statement or something of that nature. But I'm going to let him look at the calendar and inform me of what is an appropriate time for that, because the calendar is pretty busy right now.

MR. LAFLAMME: Yes. What we were -what we were going to propose, we haven't
discussed this with the City of Laconia yet or
the other intervenor, but what we were going to
propose is that, anticipating that the last
discovery response would be on the 20th, we were
going to propose a follow-up round of discovery
going out on April 27th, with responses due on
May 11th. And then, our report from the -- on
our analysis of this proceeding would be by
June -- by June 8th.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Laflamme. That's very helpful.

I'll turn to the City and Mountain Lake Village. Is that procedural schedule fast enough for your needs?

1 MR. DRISCOLL: We are fine with that. 2. Again, I believe on the 20th is when we're anticipating getting that information, and that 3 4 seems to expedite it. But I'll let the 5 intervenor speak on that issue. 6 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. 7 Brouillard. MR. BROUILLARD: Mountain Lake thinks 8 that's fine. 9 10 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. 11 MR. BROUILLARD: Thank you, Chairman. 12 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Any other 1.3 concerns, Attorney Amidon, from your perspective? 14 MS. AMIDON: There is no other 15 concerns, just one comment. We have that set 16 aside, that discovery is on a sort of like "as 17 needed" basis. So, we may or may not use those 18 times. But that's what we're planning at this 19 point. 20 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Yes. 2.1 interest was just in making sure that -- is that 2.2 the issue is resolved in a timely fashion for 23 everyone. And it sounds like the procedural 24 schedule meets everyone's needs.

1 Is there anything else that we need to 2. discuss today? I think -- I think we have a 3 clear understanding of scope, I think we have a 4 clear understanding of timeline. And I just want 5 to make sure that everyone is comfortable, before 6 you go off to subsequent sessions? 7 MR. DRISCOLL: No. MS. AMIDON: Yes. The Department is 8 9 happy that the City agrees with our proposed 10 procedural schedule. And, so, we'll -- I don't 11 know what we have to discuss more this morning, 12 but we're certainly available for a technical 1.3 session following this. 14 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. City of 15 Laconia, anything to add? 16 MR. DRISCOLL: Nothing to add. 17 you for your time. 18 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you. 19 Mr. Brouillard, Attorney Brouillard? 20 MR. BROUILLARD: I would just say that, 2.1 this has nothing to do with what you've just been 2.2 talking about, but it's something I neglected to

About 15 or 20 years ago, this project

say that my engineer pointed out to me.

23

```
1
         was approved for 77 lots. There was another 31
 2.
         lots in Laconia. And I'm not -- and it's still
         at the same 18 lots in Belmont. And there were
 3
 4
         no, you know, issues about capacity back then.
 5
         But, of course, that was 15 years ago or so. And
 6
         I don't -- I don't recall the PUC or the
 7
         Department of Energy being involved back then.
 8
         But I just want you to know, this is actually
 9
         about 31 lots less than it was before.
10
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay.
11
                   MR. BROUILLARD: That's all I wanted to
12
         say.
1.3
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. No, thank
14
               That will be recorded by the court
         you.
15
         reporter. So, it's in the record.
16
                   Okay. Let's see. Is there anything
17
         else that we need to cover today?
18
                   MR. DRISCOLL: Nothing for our
19
         purposes.
20
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.
2.1
         Just a moment, let me check with Attorney
2.2
         Fabrizio. Just a moment please.
23
                    [Chairman Goldner and Atty. Fabrizio
24
                    conferring.]
```

```
1
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. So, seeing
 2
          that there's nothing else to cover, the
 3
          Commission will issue a short procedural order
 4
          just summarizing this session so it's in the
 5
          docket.
 6
                    And I'll thank everyone for their time
 7
          today, and we are adjourned.
                    (Whereupon the prehearing conference
 8
                    was adjourned at 9:28 a.m.)
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```