1		STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
2		PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
3	October 3, 2006 - 10:03 a.m. Concord, New Hampshire	
4	concord, New	
5	RE:	DG 06-107 NATIONAL GRID USA AND KEYSPAN CORPORATION.
6		Approval of the Indirect Acquisition of EnergyNorth Natural Gas, Inc. by way of the
7		Merger of KeySpan Corporation with an Indirect Subsidiary of National Grid, PLC,
8		and Other Regulatory Approvals. (Prehearing conference)
9		
10	PRESENT:	Chairman Thomas B. Getz, Presiding Commissioner Graham J. Morrison
11		Commissioner Clifton C. Below
12		Diane Bateman, Clerk
13	APPEARANCES:	Reptg. National Grid USA: Alexandra E. Blackmore, Esq.
14		Thomas Robinson, Esq. Donald Pfundstein, Esq. (Gallagher)
15		Reptg. KeySpan Energy Delivery New England:
16		Steven V. Camerino, Esq. (McLane) Thomas P. O'Neill, Esq.
17		Reptg. the United Steel Workers of
18		America, Local 12012-3: Shawn Sullivan, Esq. (Cook)
19		Reptg. Residential Ratepayers:
20		Meredith Hatfield, Esq., Consumer Advocate Office of Consumer Advocate
21		Reptg. PUC Staff:
22		Edward N. Damon, Esq.
23 24	0.50	rt Donorton. Stores D. Dotres de COD
44	Lou	rt Reporter: Steven E. Patnaude, CCR

1		
2		
3	INDEX	
4		PAGE NO.
5	STATEMENTS OF PRELIMINARY POSITION BY:	
6	Ms. Blackmore	7
7	Mr. Camerino	9
8	Mr. Sullivan	9
9	Ms. Hatfield	9
10	Mr. Damon	10
11		
12		
13		ļ
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

PROCEEDINGS

We'll open the prehearing conference in docket DG 06-107.

On August 10, 2006, National Grid and KeySpan Energy filed jointly a petition seeking approval of a transaction that will result in KeySpan becoming a wholly owned subsidiary of National Grid. An order of notice was issued on September 12 setting the prehearing conference for this morning, and, among other things, setting forth a proposed procedural schedule, and indicating that we would be

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Good morning.

We also have a affidavit of publication of the order of notice was filed on September 25. We have the Office of Consumer Advocate's notice of participation. And, we have Petitions to Intervene from the United Steel Workers of America, Local 12012-3, and the Utility Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO's Petition to Intervene.

seeking comments on the schedule this morning.

Can we take appearances please.

MS. BLACKMORE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Alexandra Blackmore, and I'm here representing National Grid. And, with me today is Tom Robinson, Deputy General Counsel for National Grid, and Donald Pfundstein, of Gallagher, Callahan & Gartrell.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Good morning.

1.8

1	CMSR. MORRISON: Good morning.
2	CMSR. BELOW: Good morning.
3	MR. CAMERINO: Good morning,
4	Commissioners. Steve Camerino, from McLane, Graf,
5	Raulerson & Middleton, on behalf of KeySpan Energy
6	Delivery New England. And, also appearing with me this
7	morning is Tom O'Neil, Senior Counsel for KeySpan, and
8	Joseph Bodanza.
9	CHAIRMAN GETZ: Good morning.
10	CMSR. MORRISON: Good morning.
11	CMSR. BELOW: Good morning.
12	MR. SULLIVAN: Good morning. Shawn
13	Sullivan, from Cook & Molan. I'm here on behalf of Local
14	12012-3. And, with me here today is Kevin Spottiswood
15	from the Union.
16	CHAIRMAN GETZ: Good morning.
17	CMSR. MORRISON: Good morning.
18	CMSR. BELOW: Good morning.
19	MS. HATFIELD: Good morning,
20	Commissioners. Meredith Hatfield, from the Office of
21	Consumer Advocate. And, with me is Kenneth Traum,
22	Assistant Consumer Advocate.
23	CHAIRMAN GETZ: Good morning.
24	CMSR. MORRISON: Good morning.

5

1 CMSR. BELOW: Good morning. Good morning, Commissioners. MR. DAMON: 2 Edward Damon, for the Staff. And, with me this morning at 3 counsel table are Tom Frantz, Steve Frink, Randy Knepper, 4 sorry, and also Amanda Noonan and Bob Wyatt. 5 CMSR. MORRISON: Good morning. 6 7 CMSR. BELOW: Good morning. CHAIRMAN GETZ: Good morning. Well, 8 9 let's address the two motions to intervene first. 10 Mr. Sullivan, the Petition to Intervene on behalf of the 11 United Steel Workers I believe indicates that Staff and 12 National Grid and KeySpan do not object to the 13 intervention. Ms. Hatfield, does the OCA take a position on the intervention? 14 15 MS. HATFIELD: We don't object. 16 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Now, with 17 the Petition to Intervene from the Utility Workers Union 18 of America, it appears that there's -- counsel is not here 19 this morning representing the Utility Workers Union. 20 I do not see any representation about concurrence. Is 21 there any objection to the Petition to Intervene by the 22 Utility Workers Union? 2.3 MS. BLACKMORE: We're not objecting 24 completely to their Petition to Intervene. But we have

some concerns about their interest and participating fully, given that they don't actually have any employees of either National Grid or KeySpan, who are currently employed in New Hampshire. So, to the extent that they would participate, we would hope that it would be limited.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Mr. Camerino, do you have a position as well?

MR. CAMERINO: I think we would just join in Grid's statement that there's no apparent interest stated by the Union, and, therefore, we would hope that the intervention would be limited in nature.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, let's do this then. Let's -- We'll grant the Petition to Intervene of the United Steel Workers, recognizing that there are no objections and that they have demonstrated rights, duties, interests or privileges affected by this proceeding. And, we will defer any action with respect to the Petition to Intervene of the Utility Workers Union of America. And, I guess, Mr. Damon, I would just ask that you reach out to counsel for the Utility Workers Union and find out what their interests are and what their plan as next steps in this proceeding.

Are there any other procedural matters, before we give the opportunity for statements of positions

from the parties?

2 (No verbal response)

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Hearing nothing, then,

Ms. Blackmore.

MS. BLACKMORE: Thank you. As National Grid stated in our joint merger petition with KeySpan, we're seeking the Commission's approval of the proposed merger pursuant to Revised Statutes Annotated 369, Section 8, and Revised Statutes Annotated 374, Section 33. We're also seeking several other regulatory approvals necessary to effectuate the merger. We believe that the proposed merger meets the statutory requirements for the Commission's approval in that it will not have an adverse effect on the rates, terms, service or operation of EnergyNorth and Granite State in New Hampshire, and that the transaction is lawful, proper, and in the public interest.

We also believe that the merger will provide real benefits to customers of both National Grid and KeySpan. We expect the merger to produce synergy savings of approximately \$200 million per year across the combined system, with approximately \$12.8 million of savings allocated to EnergyNorth over the next ten years. We're proposing to share the net synergy savings resulting

from the merger equally with EnergyNorth's customers.

We're committing to freeze EnergyNorth's current delivery rates for at least twelve months following the closing of the merger, and to exclude any rate recovery of the acquisition premium associated with the merger. We expect the merger to create gas supply benefits that will be reflected in EnergyNorth's Cost of Gas Clause.

We're proposing to improve EnergyNorth's response to customer telephone calls by committing to update the service quality standards in place at the time of EnergyNorth's next deliver rate case. And, finally, the merger will avoid capital investments and costs associated with billing and information systems that would otherwise have to be incurred by the stand-alone companies.

National Grid views the merger as an opportunity to strengthen our business presence in New Hampshire and to increase the efficiency of our operations within the state. So, to that end, we respectfully request the Commission's approval of the merger petition. And, we look forward to working with the Commission, Staff, the Office of Consumer Advocate, and other interested parties in this proceeding. Thank you.

1	CHAIRMAN GETZ: Ms. Blackmore, with	
2	respect to the procedural schedule, is the plan to meet	
3	during the technical session to discuss that further or do	
4	you have something to add on the record with respect to	
5	the procedural schedule?	
6	MS. BLACKMORE: No, I believe we're	
7	planning to discuss those items further during the	
8	technical session.	
9	CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you.	
10	Mr. Camerino.	
11	MR. CAMERINO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.	
12	KeySpan concurs in the statement of position by Attorney	
13	Blackmore.	
14	CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you.	
15	Mr. Sullivan.	
16	MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you for granting	
17	the Petition to Intervene. And, we've got nothing at this	
18	point. Thank you.	
19	CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you.	
20	Ms. Hatfield.	
21	MS. HATFIELD: Thank you. Due to what	
22	the OCA believes are limitations in the merger statute, we	
23	will be focussing very closely on customer interests in	
24	this docket, including rates, customer service, quality of	

service, and also the issue of jobs remaining in the State of New Hampshire. We also wanted to thank National Grid for their willingness to answer our early data requests.

And, we appreciate their willingness to get the ball rolling quickly. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Mr. Damon.

MR. DAMON: Staff's positions are not fully developed yet. However, as a preliminary matter, Staff believes that the petition itself falls short of demonstrating on its face that the proposed merger will not have an adverse impact on rates, terms, service or operation of the New Hampshire utilities involved in the transaction. And, accordingly, further proceedings are appropriate pursuant to RSA 369:8, II(b).

And, Staff has reached an agreement with the Joint Petitioners relating to further proceedings in this docket. And, under this agreement, the issue of adverse impact within the meaning of RSA 369:8, II(b) would be deferred pending the Commission's ultimate resolution of all issues in the docket, notwithstanding any provisions — provisions entitling the Joint Petitioners to preliminary determinations under RSA 369:8, II(b).

Staff expects to conduct a thorough

1 review of the issues raised in the petition. And, it has 2 obtained certain of the discovery requested in the New 3 York proceeding, and hopes to use that in part in order to provide discovery of its own in this docket. 4 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. 5 One, I 6 guess, request I would make, I anticipate that there will 7 be some written proposal out of the technical session. That, if you could just, when that's filed, include a 8 9 status of proceedings in other states with respect to the -- where those states are in the -- or even if their 10 11 approvals are required, and, if they are, what the status 12 of the proceedings are would be helpful. 13 Is there anything else that we need to 14 address this morning? 15 (No verbal response) 16 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Hearing nothing, 17 then we will close the prehearing conference. Await for a 18 recommendation of the parties and take the matter under 19 advisement. Thank you. 20 (Whereupon the prehearing conference 21 ended at 10:13 a.m. and the parties 22 convened a technical session 23 thereafter.)

24