1		STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
2		PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
3		
4	_	2010 - 2:28 p.m.
5	Concord, New	Hampshire
6		
7	RE:	DW 10-091
8		PENNICHUCK WATER WORKS, INC.: Notice of Intent to File Rate
9		Schedules. (Hearing regarding Temporary Rates)
10		
11	PRESENT:	
12		Commissioner Clifton C. Below Commissioner Amy L. Ignatius
13		Sandy Deno, Clerk
14	APPEARANCES:	Reptg. Pennichuck Water Works, Inc.: Sarah B. Knowlton, Esq. (McLane, Graf)
15 16		Reptg. Anheuser-Busch: John T. Alexander, Esq. (Ransmeier & Spellman)
17		Reptg. Residential Ratepayers: Rorie E.P. Hollenberg, Esq.
18		Kenneth E. Traum, Asst. Consumer Advocate Office of Consumer Advocate
19		Reptg. PUC Staff:
20		Marcia A.B. Thunberg, Esq. Mark A. Naylor, Director/Gas & Water Division
21		James L. Lenihan, Gas & Water Division Jayson P. LaFlamme, Gas & Water Division
22		dayson F. Hartanine, das & water Division
23	Cou	rt Reporter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52
24		

1		
2	INDEX	
3		PAGE NO.
4	WITNESS PANEL: BONALYN J. HARTLEY DONALD L. WARE	
5	MARK A. NAYLOR	
6	Direct examination by Ms. Knowlton	6
7	Direct examination by Ms. Thunberg	19
8	Cross-examination by Ms. Hollenberg	24
9	Interrogatories by Cmsr. Below	27, 33
10	Interrogatories by Cmsr. Ignatius	29
11		
12		
13	* * *	
14		
15	CLOSING STATEMENTS BY:	PAGE NO.
16	Mr. Alexander	35
17	Ms. Hollenberg	35
18	Ms. Thunberg	35
19	Ms. Knowlton	36
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

1			
2			
3		EXHIBITS	
4	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
5	1	Petition for Temporary Rates, including the Joint Testimony of	6
6		Donald L. Ware and Bonalyn J. Hartley and attachments	
7	0		_
8	2	Settlement Agreement - Temporary Rates (09-08-10)	6
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

1 PROCEEDING

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Good afternoon.

We'll open the hearing in Docket DW 10-091. On May 7,

2010, Pennichuck Water Works filed schedules and materials supporting a proposed rate increase and a Petition for Temporary Rates. We issued an order on June 4, 2010 suspending the proposed tariffs and scheduling a prehearing conference. A prehearing conference was held on July 14, and subsequently a secretarial letter was issued approving a procedural schedule, including a hearing on temporary rates for this afternoon. We received on September 8 a Settlement Agreement between Staff and Pennichuck Water Works that will be the subject of the hearing this afternoon.

Can we take appearances please.

MS. KNOWLTON: Good afternoon, Chairman and Commissioners. My name is Sarah Knowlton. I'm with the McLane law firm. And, I'm here today for Pennichuck Water Works, Inc. And, with me from the Company today is Bonalyn Hartley, Donald Ware, and Charles Hoepper.

CHAIRMAN GETZ: Good afternoon.

MR. ALEXANDER: Good afternoon. John

Alexander, with Ransmeier & Spellman, on behalf of Anheuser-Busch.

Τ	CHAIRMAN GETZ: Good afternoon.
2	MS. HOLLENBERG: Good afternoon. Rorie
3	Hollenberg, here for the Office of Consumer Advocate, and
4	with me today is Ken Traum.
5	CHAIRMAN GETZ: Good afternoon.
6	MS. THUNBERG: Good afternoon. Marcia
7	Thunberg, on behalf of Staff. With me today is Mark
8	Naylor, Jim Lenihan, and Jayson LaFlamme. And, today, the
9	Company and Staff would like to present a panel, the
10	witnesses comprised of Ms. Hartley, Mr. Ware, and Mr.
11	Naylor. And, we would ask that we be allowed to do our
12	direct and friendly cross, and then have the panel opened
13	up for cross by the other parties, just for efficiency for
14	today's hearing.
15	CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Thank you. Sir.
16	MR. MEIGHAN: I'm Patrick Meighan with
17	the <u>Nashua Telegraph</u> .
18	CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Thank you.
19	Ms. Knowlton, are you ready to proceed?
20	MS. KNOWLTON: I am. One procedural
21	matter. The Company would ask that the following
22	documents be marked for identification: Exhibit 1 would
23	be the Company's Petition for Temporary Rates, and the
24	Prefiled Direct Testimony of Mrs. Hartley and Mr. Ware in

```
1
       support of temporary rates; and then Exhibit 2 is the
       Settlement Agreement that's before the Commission today,
 2
 3
       dated September 8th, 2010.
 4
                         CHAIRMAN GETZ: They will be so marked.
                         (The documents, as described, were
 5
                         herewith marked as Exhibit 1 and
 6
 7
                         Exhibit 2, respectively, for
                         identification.)
 8
 9
                         MS. KNOWLTON: With that, the Company
10
       calls Donald Ware and Bonalyn Hartley.
11
                         (Whereupon Bonalyn J. Hartley, Donald L.
                         Ware, and Mark A. Naylor were duly sworn
12
13
                         and cautioned by the Court Reporter.)
14
                       BONALYN J. HARTLEY, SWORN
15
                         DONALD L. WARE, SWORN
16
                         MARK A. NAYLOR, SWORN
17
                           DIRECT EXAMINATION
18
     BY MS. KNOWLTON:
19
          Good afternoon, Mr. Ware. Would you please state your
     Q.
20
          full name for the record.
21
          (Ware) My name is Donald L. Ware.
22
          By whom are you employed?
23
          (Ware) I'm employed by Pennichuck Water Works.
24
          What is your position with the Company?
     Q.
```

[WITNESS PANEL: Hartley~Ware~Naylor]

- 1 A. (Ware) I am President of Pennichuck Water Works.
- 2 Q. How long have you been with the Company?
- 3 A. (Ware) I've been with the Company for 15 years.
- 4 Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Hartley.
- 5 A. (Hartley) Good afternoon.
- 6 Q. Would you please state your full name for the record.
- 7 A. (Hartley) Bonalyn J. Hartley.
- 8 Q. By whom are you employed?
- 9 A. (Hartley) Pennichuck Water Works.
- 10 Q. In what capacity?
- 11 A. (Hartley) Vice President of Administration and
- 12 Regulatory Affairs.
- 13 Q. How long have you worked for the Company?
- 14 A. (Hartley) Thirty-one years.
- 15 Q. Mr. Ware and Ms. Hartley, I'll start with you, if you
- 16 would look at the documents that have been marked as
- 17 Exhibit 1 today. Do you have those before you?
- 18 A. (Ware) Yes.
- 19 Q. I'll start with you, Mr. Ware. If you would look at
- 20 the Joint Prefiled Direct Testimony Regarding Temporary
- 21 Rates, that is sponsored by you and Mrs. Hartley, was
- 22 that testimony prepared by you or under your direction?
- 23 A. (Ware) Yes, it was.
- 24 Q. Is it true and correct to the best of your belief?

[WITNESS PANEL: Hartley~Ware~Naylor]

- 1 A. (Ware) Yes, it is.
- 2 Q. Do you have any corrections to that testimony?
- 3 A. (Ware) No.
- 4 Q. If I were to ask you the questions in your testimony
- 5 today, would the answers be the same?
- 6 A. (Ware) Yes.
- 7 Q. Mrs. Hartley, looking at that same testimony, was that
- 8 prepared by you or under your direction?
- 9 A. (Hartley) Yes, it was.
- 10 Q. And, to the best of knowledge, is it true and correct?
- 11 A. (Hartley) Yes.
- 12 Q. Do you have any corrections to make to your testimony?
- 13 A. (Hartley) No, I do not.
- 14 Q. If I were to ask you the questions in your testimony
- today, would the answers be the same?
- 16 A. (Hartley) Yes.
- 17 Q. Ms. Hartley, I'll start with you. Are you familiar
- with the Settlement Agreement that's been marked as
- 19 "Exhibit 2"?
- 20 A. (Hartley) I am.
- 21 Q. Was that Settlement Agreement -- the formulation of
- 22 that Settlement Agreement a process that you
- 23 participated in?
- 24 A. (Hartley) Yes, it was.

1 Q. And, Mr. Ware, is that the case for you as well?

- 2 A. (Ware) Yes.
- Q. Mrs. Hartley, was this Settlement the result of compromise between the Company and the Staff of the Commission?
- 6 A. (Hartley) It was.
- Q. If you would walk us through the Settlement Agreement, starting with Page 2, Section III, "Terms of Agreement".
- 10 A. (Hartley) The Settlement Agreement proposes a

 11 10.81 percent increase for purposes of temporary rate,

 12 resulting in a revenue requirement of \$2,604,524.
- Q. And, the \$2,604,524, those are the additional revenues that will be generated by the temporary rate increase?
- 15 A. (Hartley) That is correct.
- Q. Mr. Ware, what are the primary drivers behind that, that need for an increase?
- 18 A. (Ware) There are really three primary drivers. First

 19 is the Company's continued investment in both the

 20 completion of its upgrade to its water treatment plant,

 21 and also replacement of aging infrastructure. Since

 22 the last rate case, the Company has spent about 4.3

 23 million to complete the treatment plant, and an

 24 additional slightly over 6 million to replace aging

1 infrastructure.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q.

Α.

case.

Additionally, as mentioned in the PAC rate case, we've seen a reduction in overall consumption that's occurred, and this is what we call "base consumption", non-wintertime consumption, an overall decrease of 17 percent. But, to kind of put it into buckets, residential consumption over the last three years, during the winter months, so, in base consumption, is off by about 9.3 percent. Commercial consumption is off by about 7 percent over the same three-year period. And, industrial consumption, exclusive of Anheuser-Busch, is down over 34 percent. So, a large reduction in consumption. And, also, we've seen some increase in operating expenses, primarily, one of the biggest one is property taxes, which are up about \$410,000. If you would look at the last page of Exhibit 2, which is the rate schedule for non-metered customers. Does that rate schedule reflect anywhere that decrease in consumption that you were just describing? (Ware) Yes. If you look at the "Average Single Family Residential Usage", you know, it showed the "9.53"

hundred cubic feet per month, that was from the last

And, it's currently at "7.88" hundred cubic

1 feet.

- Q. Ms. Hartley, what does the Settlement Agreement provide
 with regard to the design of the rates for a temporary
 rate purpose?
- A. (Hartley) The Company has filed a cost of service study
 with the case. However, we've agreed to maintain its
 present rate design, and to recover the revenues on a
 pro rata basis from all customers.
- 9 Q. When would the temporary rates take effect, based on the Settlement Agreement?
- 11 A. (Hartley) June 16th, 2010.
- Q. Okay. And, if you would look at Paragraph III.C of the Settlement Agreement, which is on Page 3 of 5.
- 14 A. (Hartley) Yes.

22

23

- 15 Q. This language in Section III.C, as the agreement was
 16 filed with the Commission, provides for a recoupment of
 17 the difference should temporary rates be approved by
 18 the Commission from June 16th forward, to the date of
 19 the order putting rates into effect. Is that language
 20 that the Company has made any changes to since this
 21 document was filed?
 - A. (Hartley) Yes. In efforts to compromise, and in this incident, the Company has agreed that we will eliminate, and with Staff, to eliminate the language

- subsequent to where it says "rendered on and after

 June 16, 2010", we would put a period there, and we

 would propose to eliminate "and will be recouped from

 customers in equal installments over a five month

 period."
- Q. Are there any other changes to the Settlement Agreement that you're aware of?
- 8 A. (Hartley) No.

19

20

21

22

23

- 9 Q. And, is it your understanding that, with that language
 10 being struck from the Agreement, that the Company would
 11 recover those revenues from June 16th, 2010, between
 12 that date and the date of an order approving temporary
 13 rates, should the Commission issue such an order, that
 14 that would be recovered at the conclusion of the case,
 15 when permanent rates were put into effect?
- 16 A. (Hartley) Yes. It was my understanding that that would 17 be the process.
 - Q. Okay. The Settlement Agreement refers to an effective date as "service rendered on and after June 16, 2010."

 What is the basis for that date?
 - A. (Hartley) The customers in Pennichuck Water Works were noticed in four different methodologies. The first was on June 16th, 2010, which we processed a display ad, in concert with the Consumer Affairs Division here at the

1 PUC, and that was published in the Nashua Telegraph on June 16th. As well as the original order was published 2 3 in the Telegraph on June 16th. In addition to that, on June 16th, postmarked, I want to make sure that that's 4 5 clear, there was a mailing to every customer in Pennichuck Water Works, they got a copy of the original 6 7 order, and a cover letter went with that. In addition to that, subsequent to that, around the July time 8 9 frame, I believe it was around July 12th, the Company 10 has traditionally sent out newsletters to its 11 customers. And, as part of that, not that it's on file, but just to let you know that we also notified 12 13 customers about our request for the rate increase and 14 the amount and why, and the drivers for that increase. 15 So, the customers of Pennichuck Water Works really have 16 been noticed in four different methodologies.

- Q. If you would turn to the Report of Proposed Rate

 Changes, which is the page that follows Page 5 of 5 of
 the Settlement Agreement.
- 20 A. (Hartley) Yes.

17

18

- Q. Do you have that before you? What does this -- what does this report show?
- 23 A. (Hartley) Well, again, the Company is asking for an overall increase or proposing in the Settlement with

Staff an overall increase of 10.8 percent. And, this proposed -- this Report of Proposed Rate Changes shows the overall effect of the 10.8 percent. Certain contracts are not subject to increase, they're fixed, and, therefore, they do not show an increase here, which creates a slight variation for the increase to 10.85 percent. For example, the "General-Metered" customers, we're proposing rates at "\$21,191,255", an increase of "\$2,074,200", resulting in an effective increase of "10.85 percent".

And, then, similarly, as we go on down through, the "Private Fire Protection" would also receive an effective increase of "10.85 percent", or a \$92,483 increase. The Public Fire Hydrant accounts would receive a "10.85 percent" increase, or an effective increase of \$305,663. "Anheuser-Busch" would receive also a "10.85" effective increase, or a "\$93,532" increase. And, then, because there is no increase to the contracts, there would be no increase for the Milford contract, but there would be an increase for the component of the Milford contract for the Volumetric Charge, which would then also be an effective increase of "10.85 percent", or "\$9,527".

And, then, there's a component of the Hudson contract

that is not subject to the increase, because it is

fixed. But they also have a volumetric component,

which would also have an effective increase of

"10.85 percent", or "\$28,880". The total overall

increase is "\$2,604,285", and 10.81 percent, in this

case, there was some surrounding, I guess, so it shows

as "10.8".

Q. If you would turn to the next page, this appears to reflect a calculation of the rate impact on a typical residential customer. Can you walk us through that calculation?

A. (Hartley) Yes, I'd be glad to. Currently, the average residential customer, utilizing a 5/8ths meter, has a monthly charge of \$18.18. The 10.80 percent increase would result in "20.15 percent". And, the average consumption for the -- current average consumption for the Pennichuck Water Works residential customer is "7.88" hundred cubic feet. Utilizing that as a component for multiplying the volumetric rate at "\$3.21", this will result in a "\$25.29" increase, on an average, per month for the volumetric component. The total monthly bill will increase from "\$41.03", on an average, to "\$45.44". Annualized, that would result in an increase from "\$492.36" to "\$545.28". The

- incremental increase for the residential customers,
 single family in Pennichuck Water Works, is
 approximately "\$4.41" per month, and annualized
 "\$52.92".
 - Q. The pages that follow the proposed rate impact on residential customers, are these the tariff pages for Pennichuck Water Works' various customer classes?
 - A. (Hartley) Yes, it is.

6

7

8

24

- 9 Q. And, what do these tariff pages reflect?
- 10 Α. (Hartley) They reflect the proposed temporary increase 11 of 10.81 percent. And, the first -- the first page is the General-Metered rate. And, it shows the current 12 rate, plus the proposed temporary increase for each of 13 the meter sizes, as well as the Volumetric Charge of 14 15 "\$2.90", with an increase to "\$3.21" per hundred cubic 16 feet. And, then, on the next page, we have the 17 Municipal Rate [Fire?] Protection Service for fire 18 protection, and that shows the increases from -- for each hydrant connected to the distribution system, from 19 20 "17.16" per month to "19.02" per month. And, then, we charge for an inch-foot unit for the size pipes for the 21 Public Fire Protection. And, that increases from 22 23 "0.11828" per year to "0.13111" per year.

{DW 10-091} [RE: Temporary Rates] {09-15-10}

And, then, we also have a schedule

	showing the Private Fire Protection rates, and the
	increases for the three different components regarding
	Private Fire Protection: An increase to "61.74" for
	the four-inch; the six-inch increases to "103.60"; and
	the eight-inch increases to "152.53". And, then,
	finally, the page that we had referred to previously is
	a "temporary" well, it's a flat rate for services
	that temporarily are waiting to have meters set. And,
	it's based on, again, the average consumption that's
	used by a single family residential customer. And,
	that results in a proposed increase of to "45.44"
	per month, from "45.82". Oh, and the reason, this is
	an interesting schedule, because, in the current rate,
	if you see the "9.53" as Mr. Ware has demonstrated,
	actually, the flat rate's going to go down. I wanted
	to correct that. And, that's because the average
	single family residential customer usage has gone down
	to "7.88" hundred cubic feet per month. So, in our
	last case, we were experiencing "9.53" hundred cubic
	feet per month, and now we're experiencing "7.88"
	hundred cubic feet, actually results in a decrease for
	the flat charge.
Q.	Mrs. Hartley, if the Commission approves the Settlement
	Agreement that's before it and puts temporary rates

[WITNESS PANEL: Hartley~Ware~Naylor]

- into effect, at the conclusion of this case, when
- 2 permanent rates are put into effect, would there be a
- 3 reconciliation between those permanent and temporary
- 4 rates?
- 5 A. (Hartley) Yes.
- 6 Q. How does, in a general sense, can you describe how the
- 7 Company conducts that reconciliation?
- 8 A. (Hartley) Yes. The Company's computer system can
- 9 calculate on an individual basis, for each customer,
- 10 what that reconciliation would be. In some cases, some
- customers might get a refund and, in some cases, some
- customers may be extra charged. It's an extremely fair
- way of reconciling the differences between permanent
- 14 and temporary rates.
- 15 Q. Mrs. Hartley, in your opinion, is the Settlement
- 16 Agreement, as proposed, will it result in just and
- 17 reasonable rates?
- 18 A. (Hartley) Yes.
- 19 Q. And, Mr. Ware, do you have an opinion about that?
- 20 A. (Ware) Yes. I believe that it will result in just and
- 21 reasonable rates.
- 22 Q. And, Mr. Ware, do you believe that the Settlement
- 23 Agreement is in the public interest?
- 24 A. (Ware) Yes, I do.

1 Q. And, Mrs. Hartley, do you have an opinion about that?

- 2 A. (Hartley) Yes, I do.
- MS. KNOWLTON: I have no further
- 4 questions for the witnesses.
- 5 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you.
- 6 BY MS. THUNBERG:
- Q. Mr. Naylor, I'd like to get your name and responsibilities for the Commission on the record please.
- 10 A. (Naylor) Yes. My name is Mark Naylor. I'm the
 11 Director of the Gas and Water Division.
- Q. And, what are your responsibilities as Director of the Gas and Water Division? Could you explain please.
- 14 A. (Naylor) I'm responsible for all of the staff's work
 15 product and managing the Staff in that division.
- Q. Can you please describe your involvement with this docket?
- A. (Naylor) Yes. I've reviewed the Company's filing, both
 the permanent rate filing and the temporary rate
 filing, and all of the testimony and the schedules, and
- 21 participated in discovery.
- Q. Did you review what we consider the books and records on file with the Commission?
- 24 A. (Naylor) Yes. That would be the Company's 2009

operating results. And, I did review those results.

- Q. Did you participate in the preparation of a settlement agreement?
- 4 A. (Naylor) Yes.
- Q. And, we've had marked for identification as "Exhibit 2"
- a settlement agreement. Is that the document that you
- 7 participated in?
- 8 A. (Naylor) Yes.
- 9 Q. And, you're familiar with the terms of that document?
- 10 A. (Naylor) Yes, I am.
- 11 Q. Ms. -- actually, I don't know if it was Mrs. Hartley or
- 12 Mr. Ware that talked about a correction to the
- 13 Settlement Agreement. And, are you aware of that
- 14 correction?
- 15 A. (Naylor) Yes, I am. On Page 3, Paragraph C, Staff and
- the Company agreed to strike certain language.
- 17 Q. And, I'd like you to briefly state what is Staff's
- reasons for recommending the Commission approve a
- 19 temporary increase in the Company's revenue requirement
- and the resulting rates?
- 21 A. (Naylor) Well, from our review of the test year
- results, it is clear that, based on the reports on file
- with the Commission, the Company is experiencing a
- revenue deficiency. And, also, based on the Company's

- calculation of its request for permanent rate, we felt
 that the temporary rate the Company sought in its

 Temporary Rate Petition was reasonable. And, that's
 why we have entered into this Agreement, to recommend
 that rate to the Commission.
 - Q. Does Staff have any concerns that the temporary rate, if approved by the Commission, will put the Company in an over earnings situation?
- 9 A. (Naylor) No.

7

8

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. And, are there any benefits to the customers for having the temporary rate in place?
- 12 A. (Naylor) It's certainly going to help mitigate

 13 potential rate shock. As I indicated, based on the

 14 Company's permanent rate request, this temporary rate

 15 would help to step up rates during the period that we

 16 review the permanent request. So, it would certainly

 17 help to mitigate the potential rate shock.
 - Q. I'd like to move onto the effective date of temporary rates, and have you provide Staff's basis for agreeing to that date.
 - A. (Naylor) As Ms. Hartley had indicated earlier, that is the date that all of Pennichuck Water Works' customers were notified of the rate filing. And, that has certainly become practice in recent years with respect

- to the establishment of an effective date for temporary rates.
 - Q. With respect to the reconciliation or recoupment that's cited on Page 3 of the Agreement, can you please describe, from Staff's perspective, when that recoupment or reconciliation happens, what's the process?
 - A. (Naylor) Well, the Company would, upon receiving an order with respect to final rates, permanent rates, the Company would go through a process of comparing the revenues that it received during the period temporary rates were in effect, with the revenues that it would have received if permanent rates were in effect for that same period, calculate the difference. And, either refund dollars to customers or recoup dollars from customers over a reasonable period following the conclusion of the case.
 - Q. And, would the refund or recoupment require additional Commission approval?
- 20 A. (Naylor) Yes, it would.

Q. And, with respect to rate design, the Company and Staff
have agreed to not change the rate design. But, if
that -- if the rate design is changed for permanent
rates, will that be a problem in calculating the either

[WITNESS PANEL: Hartley~Ware~Naylor]

1 recoupment or refund?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- A. (Naylor) No, it should not be a problem. Depending on the Commission's order, and what the Commission says in that order, assuming that it adopts a different rate design from that which has been in effect until this case, the temporary rate reconciliation would be done under the rate design ultimately approved by the Commission.
- Q. And, the last question I have concerns the rates that are attached to the Agreement in the form of the tariff pages. Is Staff's position that these rates will be -- are just and reasonable?
- 13 A. (Naylor) Yes, it is.
- MS. THUNBERG: It appears that Staff and the Company are done with their direct and friendly cross.
- 16 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Mr.
- 17 Alexander, any questions for the witnesses?
- 18 MR. ALEXANDER: No questions. Thank
- 19 you.
- 20 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you.
- 21 Ms. Hollenberg.
- MS. HOLLENBERG: Thank you. Good
- 23 afternoon.
- 24 WITNESS HARTLEY: Good afternoon.

1 MS. HOLLENBERG: I just have a few

2 questions.

3 CROSS-EXAMINATION

- 4 BY MS. HOLLENBERG:
- 5 Q. Ms. Hartley, would it be correct to say that the
- 6 Company included certain pro forma adjustments to
- 7 revenues in its permanent rate filing?
- 8 A. (Hartley) That's correct.
- 9 Q. And, they're approximately a million -- \$1.15 million,
- 10 would you agree with that?
- 11 A. (Hartley) That's correct.
- 12 Q. And, would you also agree that those adjustments relate
- to the, in part, relate to the increase from the last
- 14 rate case, DW 08-073?
- 15 A. (Hartley) Correct.
- 16 Q. And, also, in part, related to the change to the
- 17 service fees that Pennichuck implemented across all its
- 18 affiliates?
- 19 A. (Hartley) That's correct.
- 20 Q. Thank you. And, would you agree that those revenue
- 21 adjustments are not included in the calculation of the
- temporary rate proposed today?
- 23 A. (Hartley) No, they're not. The temporary rates is
- 24 based on the test year.

- Q. Okay. Thank you. Ms. Hartley, are there any eminent domain costs included in the temporary rate proposed today?
- 4 A. (Hartley) No.
- Description of the service of the se
- 12 A. (Naylor) Yes, I do.
- Q. And, would it be fair to characterize that downside as being the likelihood that the rate increase would actually be greater than 10.8 percent for the first five months that those temporary rates were in effect, is that correct?
- 18 A. (Naylor) That is correct.
- Q. And, it's possible, would you agree, that, if the
 permanent rates were not established by the end of
 those five months, that the rates would go down at that
 point to 10.8 percent?
- A. (Naylor) Yes, that's correct. To a level 10.8 percent above the rates that are currently in effect.

[WITNESS PANEL: Hartley~Ware~Naylor]

- Q. And, then, it is further possible then that the rates, once the permanent rates, once they're approved, could go up again, if the Commission approved a higher permanent rate that was higher than 10.8 percent, is that correct?
- 6 A. (Naylor) That is correct.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. And, I direct this to any of the witnesses. Do you know if any of the tariff pages attached to the Settlement Agreement include the temporary rate recoupment that was stricken from the Settlement Agreement?
- 12 A. (Hartley) No, it does not include, it just shows what
 13 the rates would be, once temporary rates are awarded.
- Q. Thank you. I just wanted to clarify that. Thank you.

 Ms. Hartley, is it true that the Company is not seeking

 Commission approval of any recoupment process today?
- 17 A. (Hartley) Yes, that's true.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. And, Mr. Naylor, is that -- would you answer that question the same way?
- 20 A. (Naylor) Yes, I would.
- Q. Thank you. And, Mr. Naylor, you did touch upon the impact of a possible change in rate design for purposes of the permanent rates, and how that intersects with recoupment of the difference between temporary and

[WITNESS PANEL: Hartley~Ware~Naylor]

- 1 permanent rates in your direct. Is it possible, would
- 2 you agree, that the rate design would not be
- 3 implemented to recover the recoupment?
- 4 A. (Naylor) Well, it's certainly possible. It's subject
- 5 to whatever the Commission ultimately decides.
- 6 Q. Thank you.
- 7 A. (Naylor) Whether the Staff or any other party makes a
- 8 recommendation, it's ultimately the Commission's call
- 9 to decide how that should be done.
- 10 Q. Thank you. Thank you. You would agree, just to
- clarify that, it's an issue that's yet to be
- determined, and an issue that's not being decided
- 13 today?
- 14 A. (Naylor) That is correct.
- MS. HOLLENBERG: Okay. Thank you. One
- 16 moment please. Okay. No further questions.
- 17 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Commissioner Below.
- 18 CMSR. BELOW: Thank you.
- 19 BY CMSR. BELOW:
- 20 Q. Ms. Hartley, on the last page of Exhibit 2, the
- 21 Settlement Agreement, is the non-metered rate schedule
- 22 proposed.
- 23 A. (Hartley) Uh-huh.
- 24 Q. Approximately how many customers at any given time or

[WITNESS PANEL: Hartley~Ware~Naylor]

```
presently might be on a non-metered rate, which I think
you described as a "temporary" transitional rate till
meters get installed?
```

- A. (Hartley) Currently, in Pennichuck Water Works, I am aware of none right now. This, usually during periods of growth, and we're setting meters or we have acquired a system, and we need to set new meters, there's a period of time when we have to charge a flat rate. But I don't -- I don't know of any right now. And, I'll let Don address it, because he would know better about it.
- A. (Ware) That fee was implemented solely in the event of an acquisition of a non-meter area. And, the difficulty becomes often getting into people's homes to set meters. And, with no incentive, no rate, people tend to be very slow letting you into their house.

 And, so, a number of years ago, this was the solution.

 There are currently, and I'm very confident, there's no unmetered customers in Pennichuck Water Works.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. So, the average single family residential usage is based on all of your whole residential class, which typically doesn't include any unmetered customers?
- A. (Hartley) That's correct.

CMSR. BELOW: Okay. That's all. Thank
you.

3 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Commissioner Ignatius.

CMSR. IGNATIUS: Thank you.

BY CMSR. IGNATIUS:

- Q. Mr. Naylor, while we're looking at that final page, the "General Service non-metered" sheet, the last one in Exhibit 2, this is a question I want to ask you really to set up for the permanent rate proceeding, ask you to take a look at. When you see changes in the volumetric amount of usage by customers, do you -- does that have an impact on how you design rates and how you anticipate the revenue requirement being met?
- A. (Naylor) Well, I think an issue like this one highlights the importance of a test year, and using consistent methodology to evaluate a test year and to set rates going forward based on a reasonable test year. So, really, what this -- what this tells me is that, for various reasons, consumption, at least from the last time rates were set, which I believe would have been based on a 2007 test year, and this is a 2009 test year, so, the Company has experienced a fairly significant decline in average usage by residential customers. It will be an issue to discuss in reviewing

1 the permanent filing.

As the Commission knows, we have a fair amount of flexibility in reviewing filings and making recommendations for setting future rates. There may be other things we need to look at, maybe other trends we need to look at. My understanding, with this company, as a number of other utilities, not just in water, but in the other industries, there has been very little growth at all in new customers, no new meters being set. The economy is the prime reason for that. So, there's a number of things to look at. But it tells me — it tells me a number of things that are going on, and opens up areas that we should look at in reviewing the permanent rate.

Q. Thank you. One other clarification for the temporary rate issue is, in looking at Schedule 9, and I don't know, Mr. Ware, Ms. Hartley, whoever can better explain this, this is the first -- the first schedule attached to the Settlement Agreement. There are three contracts, two of them, Milford and Hudson, are broken out into different categories, "Contract Charges" and "Volumetric Charges". And, in each case, they both have increases in the Volumetric Charge, but none in the Contract Charge. Anheuser-Busch is listed as

1		simply "Contract" and "increase". Can you give a
2		little more explanation on why that appears differently
3		on this chart and how their contracts may be different?
4	A.	(Ware) Okay. We'll have to kind of handle them on a
5		contract-by-contract basis. All the contracts
6		typically refer to a base fee, because these are
7		typically take-or-pay contracts and then a Volumetric
8		Charge. And, for instance, in the case of Hudson, it
9		says, when that rate was established, I think in 2005,
10		the rate of \$32,800 per year was established. And,
11		then, the Volumetric rate was established at the time,
12		and the contract that was approved indicated that the
13		Volumetric rate would change by the same amount as the
14		rest of the the typical increase to the
15		General-Metered class. There is no there is a
16		vehicle relative to the fixed charge that's tied to
17		some capital work in that particular contract. So, if
18		certain capital work happened, then the fixed charge
19		could go up from the \$32,800. But, otherwise, absent
20		any work in a defined area, there would be no change in
21		the base.
22		Very similar with Milford. Milford's
23		actually has no opener on the base amount of 81,000, in
24		other words, that stays in effect during the duration

of I believe what's a 20 year contract. The Volumetric rate changes each time we have a rate case by the same amount as the General-Metered.

In the Anheuser-Busch contract,

Volumetric changes by the same amount, but the amount

of -- that they're paying is subject to cost of service

-- specific cost of service study relative to

Anheuser-Busch. And, so, again, if there's a specific

cost of service study that says the amount that we're

collecting, either in a fixed or Volumetric Charge,

should be different, because conditions have changed

since the contract was initiated, there's a potential

reopener in that contract.

But, for purposes of temporary rates, we're looking at, you know, again, what was there at the time, without reflection of the cost of service study. And, so, you look at the existing contracts in the context of the year. And, again, that would mean no change to any of the contract rates in the fixed area, but, in the volumetric area, there would be an increase.

Q. So, for Anheuser-Busch, there is also a fixed base amount that is not being increased today, it's not part of the proposal, it just doesn't appear on this sheet?

- 1 Α. (Ware) Well, actually, they are -- they have a 2 six-inch, their fixed charge currently is tied to a 3 six-inch meter charge. And, so, all the fixed charges, from 5/8th through six-inch meters are proposed to go 4 5 up 10.8 percent. And, so, that meter charge would go up from whatever it is for a six-inch meter per month 6 7 by 10.8 percent for Anheuser-Busch. CMSR. IGNATIUS: All right. 8 Thank you. 9 CMSR. BELOW: A follow-up on one of 10 Commissioner Ignatius's questions. 11 BY CMSR. BELOW:
 - Q. Mr. Naylor, in looking at the factors regarding usage by residential, perhaps some commercial customers, for purposes of setting rates going forward, is one of the factors that you look at the impacts of weather on the test year? For instance, if there's a wet, cool summer versus a hot, dry summer, would that impact -- potentially impact average usage for watering lawns and gardens and keeping pools filled, for instance?
 - A. (Naylor) Yes. Definitely.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

- Q. So, weather normalization might be something you would look at, whether that might be called for or not?
 - A. (Naylor) We do look at it. We are, I think, particularly sensitive to that issue now, given a

1	couple different things. The economy is one sort of
2	overlaid over all of this. And, the fact that this
3	company, in particular, and many others have
4	experienced no growth. And, we see this rather
5	dramatic decline in average consumption. Really, we
6	want to, for a lot of good reasons, stick to a
7	consistent methodology based on a test year.
8	But the overriding purpose is to set
9	correct rates going forward into the future. So, we do
10	need to look at those factors, and explore them and
11	understand them. And, if there's some things, after
12	that review, that we should take into account, then we
13	will do so, and make it a recommendation.
14	CMSR. BELOW: Okay. Thank you.
15	CHAIRMAN GETZ: Any redirect,
16	Ms. Thunberg or Ms. Knowlton?
17	MS. KNOWLTON: No thank you.
18	MS. THUNBERG: None. Thank you.
19	CHAIRMAN GETZ: If there's nothing
20	further for these witnesses, then you're excused. Thank
21	you, everyone.
22	Is there any objection to striking
23	identifications and admitting the exhibits into evidence?
24	MS. THUNBERG: No.

```
1
                         CHAIRMAN GETZ: Hearing no objection,
       they will be admitted into evidence. Is there anything
 2
 3
       else we need to address before opportunity for closings?
 4
                         (No verbal response)
 5
                         CHAIRMAN GETZ:
                                         Then, we will begin with
 6
       Mr. Alexander.
 7
                         MR. ALEXANDER:
                                         Anheuser-Busch has no
       position on the temporary rate issue.
 8
                                         Thank you.
 9
                         CHAIRMAN GETZ:
10
       Ms. Hollenberg.
11
                         MS. HOLLENBERG:
                                          Thank you. The Office
       of Consumer Advocate has no position on the amount of the
12
13
       temporary rate increase proposed by the Settlement
14
       Agreement. We do -- we would like to recognize and thank
15
       the Staff and the Company for deferring the issues of rate
16
       design until the permanent rate phase of this proceeding.
17
       And, we are -- we agree with the language being stricken
18
       from Paragraph III -- Page 3, I'm sorry, of the Settlement
19
       Agreement, as proposed today by the Staff and the Company.
20
       Thank you.
21
                         CHAIRMAN GETZ:
                                         Thank you.
22
       Ms. Thunberg.
23
                                        Staff respectfully
                         MS. THUNBERG:
24
       requests the Commission approve the Settlement Agreement
```

and the terms contained therein. Staff believes that the rate proposed in there and the revenue requirement will bring the Company closer to its last authorized rate of Also would like to note that these temporary rates are fully reconcilable when permanent rates are determined. Thank you for your consideration. CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Ms. Knowlton. MS. KNOWLTON: Thank you. Based on the testimony that was prefiled, as well as the oral testimony at the hearing today, there is a sufficient record to

testimony that was prefiled, as well as the oral testimony at the hearing today, there is a sufficient record to support a temporary rate increase. The Company has testified to the reasons for its under earning, and Mr. Naylor confirmed that the Staff reviewed the books and records on file with the Commission and was able to verify that, in fact, the Company is under earning. I believe that the Settlement Agreement that's before the Commission today is reasonable and in the public interest, and would ask that the Commission grant it.

I would conclude by indicating that the Company looks forward to working with all of the parties and the Staff through the rest of the course of this docket, through the audit of the Company's records, as well as continuing to work with parties on discovery and

```
other issues.
 1
                      Thank you.
                         CHAIRMAN GETZ: All right. With that,
 2
 3
       then we will close this hearing and take the matter under
 4
       advisement.
                    Thank you, everyone.
                         (Whereupon the hearing ended at 3:11
 5
 6
                         p.m.)
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```