

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

July 6, 2010 - 10:08 a.m.  
Concord, New Hampshire

NHPUC JUL28'10 PM 2:52

RE: DE 10-172  
UNITIL ENERGY SYSTEMS, INC.:  
Annual Stranded Cost Recovery and  
External Delivery Charge Reconciliation  
and Rate Filing.

PRESENT: Chairman Thomas B. Getz, Presiding  
Commissioner Clifton C. Below  
Commissioner Amy L. Ignatius

Sandy Deno, Clerk

APPEARANCES: Reptg. Unitil Energy Systems, Inc.:  
Gary M. Epler, Esq.

Reptg. PUC Staff:  
Suzanne G. Amidon, Esq.

Court Reporter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52

ORIGINAL

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

I N D E X

PAGE NO.

WITNESS PANEL:           KAREN M. ASBURY  
                                  FRANCIS X. WELLS

Direct examination by Mr. Epler	6
Cross-examination by Ms. Amidon	13
Interrogatories by Cmsr. Ignatius	17
Interrogatories by Chairman Getz	21

\* \* \*

E X H I B I T S

EXHIBIT NO.	D E S C R I P T I O N	PAGE NO.
-------------	-----------------------	----------

1	UES, Inc. Annual Reconciliation and Rate Filing (06-17-10)	4
2	Revised schedules to the Testimony of Linda McNamara (18 pages)	5
3	Revised schedules to the Testimony of Francis X. Wells (5 pages)	6

\* \* \*

CLOSING STATEMENTS BY:	PAGE NO.
------------------------	----------

Ms. Amidon	22
Mr. Epler	23

1 P R O C E E D I N G

2 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Good morning,  
3 everyone. We'll open the hearing in Docket DE 10-172. On  
4 June 18, 2010, Unitil Energy Systems filed its annual  
5 reconciliation of its Stranded Cost Charge and External  
6 Delivery Charges for effect for service rendered on and  
7 after August 1. If approved, the effect of the changes  
8 would be a decrease in the average class bill of  
9 1.1 percent for Residential customers, 1.1 percent for G2  
10 customers, and 1.4 percent for Large General Service, or  
11 G1 customers. Order of notice was issued on June 22nd  
12 setting the hearing for today. I'll note for the record  
13 that the affidavit of publication has been filed.

14 Can we take appearances please.

15 MR. EPLER: Yes. Good morning, Mr.  
16 Chairman, Commissioners. Gary Epler, on behalf of Unitil  
17 Energy Systems, Inc. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Good morning.

19 MS. AMIDON: Good morning. Suzanne  
20 Amidon, for Commission Staff, and with me today is Al-Azad  
21 Iqbal, an Analyst with the Electric Division.

22 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Good morning. Are you  
23 ready to proceed, Mr. Epler?

24 MR. EPLER: Yes, I am, Mr. Chairman.

{DE 10-172} {07-06-10}

[WITNESS PANEL: Asbury~Wells]

1 Thank you. We have two witnesses this morning, Karen  
2 Asbury and Fran Wells. Could I have the witnesses sworn.

3 (Whereupon *Karen M. Asbury* and  
4 *Francis X. Wells* were duly sworn and  
5 cautioned by the Court Reporter.)

6 MR. EPLER: Okay. Mr. Chairman, before  
7 I proceed to the cross-examination of the witnesses, there  
8 are several documents, and I believe we've put copies in  
9 front of the Commission, if we can just have these  
10 premarked for identification. The first is the original  
11 filing, that's in a blue binder. And, those consist --  
12 that consists of a cover letter, petition, proposed  
13 tariffs, and the testimony and exhibits of the two  
14 witnesses. I'd also note for the record, and I know I'll  
15 walk this through with the witness, that the original  
16 witness that the Company proposed to appear this morning,  
17 Linda McNamara, is unavailable. Her direct supervisor,  
18 Karen Asbury, is here and will be adopting the testimony.

19 CHAIRMAN GETZ: All right. We'll mark  
20 for identification as "Exhibit Number 1" then the filing  
21 originally submitted to the Commission on June 17.

22 (The document, as described, was  
23 herewith marked as **Exhibit 1** for  
24 identification.)

{DE 10-172} {07-06-10}

[WITNESS PANEL: Asbury~Wells]

1 MR. EPLER: Thank you. And, then, there  
2 are two sets of additional documents. The first is,  
3 consists of 18 pages, and there are -- those are revised  
4 schedule sheets, and, again, I'll go into more detail,  
5 revised schedule sheets relating to the Testimony of Linda  
6 McNamara. So, if I can have this, these 18 pages,  
7 premarked as "Unitil Exhibit 2".

8 CHAIRMAN GETZ: And, these are -- is  
9 this the package that says "Calculation of the External  
10 Delivery Charge" on them?

11 MR. EPLER: Yes, that is.

12 CHAIRMAN GETZ: All right. So marked.

13 MR. EPLER: In landscape format.  
14 (The document, as described, was  
15 herewith marked as **Exhibit 2** for  
16 identification.)

17 MR. EPLER: And, then, there is a second  
18 packet of five pages, with a table at the front  
19 "Comparison of Revised Estimated Cost to Original Filed  
20 Estimated Cost". And, those are revised pages to the  
21 Testimony of Fran Wells.

22 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. That will be  
23 marked for identification as "Exhibit Number 3".

24 (The document, as described, was

{DE 10-172} {07-06-10}

[WITNESS PANEL: Asbury~Wells]

1 herewith marked as Exhibit 3 for  
2 identification.)

3 MR. EPLER: Okay. Thank you.

4 KAREN M. ASBURY, SWORN

5 FRANCIS X. WELLS, SWORN

6 DIRECT EXAMINATION

7 BY MR. EPLER:

8 Q. Ms. Asbury, could you please state your position with  
9 Unitil.

10 A. (Asbury) Yes. My name is Karen M. Asbury. And, I'm  
11 Director of Regulatory Services for Unitil Service  
12 Corp.

13 Q. Ms. Asbury, could you turn to what's been premarked as  
14 "Exhibit Number 1". And, in there, there are a number  
15 of tabs labeled "Exhibit LSM-1", and then Schedules  
16 "LSM-1" through "LSM-4". And, then, what has been --  
17 the 18 pages that's been premarked as "Unitil  
18 Exhibit 2", this material, particularly the material  
19 that's in Unitil Exhibit Number 1, that was originally  
20 prepared by Unitil employee Linda McNamara, is that  
21 correct?

22 A. (Asbury) Yes, that's correct.

23 Q. And, are you familiar with this material?

24 A. (Asbury) Yes, I am.

{DE 10-172} {07-06-10}

[WITNESS PANEL: Asbury~Wells]

1 Q. In both exhibits?

2 A. (Asbury) Uh-huh.

3 Q. And, do you adopt the testimony in Exhibit Number 1 and  
4 the schedules that appear in Exhibit Number 1 and  
5 Exhibit Number 2 as your own?

6 A. (Asbury) I do.

7 Q. Thank you. Mr. Wells, could you please turn to what's  
8 been premarked as "Exhibit Number 1".

9 A. (Wells) Yes.

10 Q. And, also what's been premarked, the five pages that  
11 were premarked as "Exhibit Number 3". And, turn to the  
12 tabs in Exhibit Number 1 that are marked "Exhibit  
13 FXW-1" and then "Schedules FXW-1" through "5". And,  
14 were these all prepared by you or under your direction?

15 A. (Wells) Yes.

16 Q. Mr. Wells, I'd like to have you walk through the five  
17 pages that have been premarked as "Unitil Exhibit  
18 Number 3" and explain the reason that these revised  
19 pages were filed and what they purport to show.

20 A. (Wells) Certainly. Beginning on Page 1 of Exhibit 3, I  
21 provide a comparison of the revised estimated cost to  
22 the original filed estimated cost for the line item in  
23 the filing in the estimated cost for the EDC cost  
24 projection. For the line item "Third Party

{DE 10-172} {07-06-10}

[WITNESS PANEL: Asbury~Wells]

1 Transmission Providers", I also refer to that in my  
2 testimony as "Northeast Utilities Network Integration  
3 Transmission Service", or "NU Network Service". And,  
4 in this table, I provide a revised estimate that was  
5 based upon billing information that was provided by  
6 Northeast Utilities after we had filed the original  
7 budget. And, then, a comparison of that to what we  
8 originally filed, and then a variance, indicating that,  
9 over the period May 2010 through July 2011, an  
10 approximate increase in the cost estimate of \$700,000.

11 Q. Okay. And, this information was provided to you by  
12 Northeast Utilities on this past Friday, is that  
13 correct?

14 A. (Wells) That's correct.

15 Q. And, did they provide any explanation for the change or  
16 do you have any understanding of the reason for the  
17 change?

18 A. (Wells) Yes. The increase beginning in 2011 is  
19 reflective of the expected transmission investment that  
20 will increase the amount that Northeast Utilities will  
21 recover through their NU Network Service effective  
22 January 1st, 2011. This is just reflective of  
23 transmission investment that Northeast Utilities has  
24 been making for several years now, and is just a

{DE 10-172} {07-06-10}

1 continuation of that trend.

2 Q. And, can you then turn to the next sheet and explain  
3 what that shows?

4 A. (Wells) Yes. The next sheet is a Revised Table 2,  
5 which appears in Exhibit FXW-1, my testimony. And,  
6 this provides projected costs for the August 2009  
7 through July 2010, what I refer to as the "Current EDC  
8 period", to the August 2010 through July 2011 estimated  
9 cost, what I refer to as the "Upcoming EDC rate period"  
10 in my testimony. Based on the new cost projections,  
11 based on the new estimate provided on Page 1, the  
12 projected cost through July 2010 is about 17.9 million,  
13 and the proposed budget is approximately 19.2 million,  
14 an increase year over year of about 1.2 million.

15 Q. Okay. And, that replaces the table found on Bates  
16 stamp 0055 of your testimony, Unitil Exhibit 1?

17 A. (Wells) Yes.

18 Q. Okay. And, turning to the next page in Exhibit Number  
19 3.

20 A. (Wells) Yes. This table compares the estimates that  
21 were provided in the last year's reconciliation filing,  
22 docketed DE 09-115, to the actual and projected costs  
23 for May 2009 through July 2010 period, which it  
24 comprises of 12 month actual costs and 3 months

[WITNESS PANEL: Asbury~Wells]

1 estimated costs. The costs were 22.1 million in the --  
2 estimated in DE 09-115, and approximately 21 --  
3 22.1 million in actual costs. The variance was about  
4 \$65,000. This replaces Table 3 in my testimony, which  
5 appears on Bates stamp 0060.

6 Q. Okay. And, finally, can you turn to the last two  
7 pages, Revised Pages 3 and Revised Pages 4 of Schedule  
8 FXW-2?

9 A. (Wells) Yes. These pages replaced Pages 3 and 4 of the  
10 original FXW-2. And, they are -- they reflect the  
11 updated third party transmission providers' estimate  
12 that I refer to on Page 1 of Exhibit 3.

13 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Mr. Epler, I think we're  
14 missing a page out of Exhibit 3.

15 MR. EPLER: Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Is there supposed to be  
17 five pages in Exhibits 3?

18 MR. EPLER: Yes. There should be, there  
19 should be two pages at the end, Revised Pages 3 and  
20 Revised Pages 4. And, I apologize if you don't have that.

21 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay.

22 MR. EPLER: You just have four?

23 CHAIRMAN GETZ: We have a fourth page,  
24 and it appears to be "Schedule FXW-2, Page 3 of 4".

{DE 10-172} {07-06-10}

[WITNESS PANEL: Asbury~Wells]

1 CMSR. IGNATIUS: I have Page 4 of 4.

2 CHAIRMAN GETZ: What do you have?

3 CMSR. BELOW: I have 3 of 4.

4 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. We need one "3 of  
5 4" and two "4 of 4"s. Steve, off the record.

6 (Brief off-the-record discussion  
7 ensued.)

8 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Back on the  
9 record.

10 BY MR. EPLER:

11 Q. Okay. I believe we had finished going through  
12 Exhibit 3, the revised pages?

13 A. (Wells) Yes.

14 Q. Ms. Asbury, can you please turn to what's been  
15 premarked as "Unitil Exhibit Number 2", which consists  
16 of 18 pages? And, could you walk through those pages  
17 and describe what's in them please.

18 A. (Asbury) Yes. Included in Exhibit Number 2 are revised  
19 exhibits, Schedule LSM-2, Schedule LSM-3, and Schedule  
20 LSM-4. I have revised the External Delivery Charge  
21 consistent with the revised estimates that Mr. Wells  
22 just described in Company Exhibit Number 3. As shown  
23 on the very first page, which is marked "Schedule LSM-2  
24 Revised Page 1 of 6", I have recalculated the External

{DE 10-172} {07-06-10}

[WITNESS PANEL: Asbury~Wells]

1 Delivery Charge. On Line 6, the proposed rate is  
2 "\$0.01688" per kilowatt-hour. The original proposed  
3 rate was "\$0.01630" per kilowatt-hour. This rate, as  
4 compared to the rate that we originally proposed, is an  
5 increase of \$0.00058 per kilowatt-hour. Which  
6 increases a residential 500 kilowatt-hour bill by 29  
7 cents per month. The first six pages, which are  
8 Schedule LSM-2, again, it's the revised calculation of  
9 the External Delivery Charge, incorporating the revised  
10 estimates described by Mr. Wells.

11 Schedule LSM-3 is a Revised Page 2 of 2,  
12 which is the redline of the tariff page calculation of  
13 the External Delivery Charge.

14 Schedule LSM-4, which is eleven pages,  
15 are the revised bill impacts that incorporate the new  
16 proposed External Delivery Charge. And, if I could  
17 just summarize the average class bill impacts, they are  
18 located on Schedule LSM-4, Revised Page 5 of 11. The  
19 average class bill impact for the Residential class is  
20 a decrease of 0.7 percent; for the General Service  
21 class, it is also a decrease of 0.7 percent; the Large  
22 General Service class is a decrease of 0.9 percent,  
23 also including the proposed or approved Default Service  
24 rate changes, also in effect for August 1, is a

{DE 10-172} {07-06-10}

[WITNESS PANEL: Asbury~Wells]

1 3.4 percent decrease, the net change is a 4.3 percent  
2 decrease. And, for Outdoor Lighting, it's a  
3 0.4 percent decrease. I would also like to note that  
4 all of these bill comparisons are compared to May 1,  
5 2010 rates, which, at the time of our filing, was our  
6 current rates. We have had a rate change that took  
7 place on July 1st, 2010, which was an increase  
8 associated with the Company's temporary rates in DE  
9 10-055, its rate case.

10 Q. Thank you. Do either of you have anything to add?

11 A. (Asbury) No.

12 A. (Wells) No.

13 MR. EPLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
14 tender the witnesses for cross-examination.

15 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Ms. Amidon.

16 MS. AMIDON: Thank you. Good morning.

17 WITNESS WELLS: Good morning.

18 CROSS-EXAMINATION

19 BY MS. AMIDON:

20 Q. Although there's an overall decrease associated with  
21 this filing, there are two components, the Stranded  
22 Cost Charge and the External Delivery Charge. Am I  
23 correct on that? And, anyone can answer.

24 A. (Wells) Yes, that's correct.

{DE 10-172} {07-06-10}

[WITNESS PANEL: Asbury~Wells]

1 Q. Now, the Stranded Cost Charge is decreasing, is that  
2 correct?

3 A. (Wells) That is correct.

4 Q. And, could you explain the principal reason for the  
5 decrease in the Stranded Cost Charge?

6 A. (Wells) The decrease in the Stranded Cost Charge  
7 reflects a decrease in the contract release payments  
8 that the Company will pay to Mirant. The final payment  
9 to Mirant will occur through -- in October 2010. And,  
10 thereafter, the contract with Mirant for -- that  
11 transfers Unitil Power Corp.'s -- the majority of their  
12 portfolio responsibilities to Mirant will have been  
13 completely -- will be completely terminated, and the  
14 obligations of all the parties will be satisfied.

15 Q. What will the Company continue to recover in the  
16 Stranded Cost Charge once the Mirant contract release  
17 payments end?

18 A. (Wells) After the Mirant contract release payments are  
19 complete, the Company will continue to recover its  
20 Hydro-Quebec obligations, offset by any revenue source,  
21 in the Stranded Cost Charge.

22 Q. How long will the Hydro-Quebec contract continue?

23 A. (Wells) Hydro-Quebec continues through October 2020.

24 Q. How does the Company reconcile the expenses and

{DE 10-172} {07-06-10}

[WITNESS PANEL: Asbury~Wells]

1 revenues associated with the Hydro-Quebec support  
2 contract?

3 A. (Wells) Both the revenues and the expenses are  
4 reconciled through the Stranded Cost Charge.

5 Q. All right. Now, the effect on the External Delivery  
6 Charge in this filing is an increase, is that correct?

7 A. (Wells) That is correct.

8 Q. And, while we got some associated rate impacts overall  
9 for these two elements, can you give me a relatively --  
10 a percentage increase in the External Delivery Charge  
11 over the current charge, which you said is May 2010?

12 A. (Asbury) Yes. If you turn to Exhibit Number 2, which  
13 are the revised schedules for Linda McNamara. If I  
14 just turn you to Schedule LSM-4, Revised Page 1 of 11,  
15 I'll use a residential 500 kilowatt-hour bill as an  
16 example. At the bottom shows the total bill impact,  
17 which includes both the External Delivery and Stranded  
18 Cost rate changes, which shows a 0.6 percent decrease.  
19 If you look up above, you can see the "External  
20 Delivery Charge" listed separately, which actually has  
21 an impact of a 1.8 percent increase on a 500  
22 kilowatt-hour bill. And, the Stranded Cost Charge is  
23 decreasing by 2.5 percent, for a net of 0.6 percent  
24 decrease.

{DE 10-172} {07-06-10}

[WITNESS PANEL: Asbury~Wells]

1 Q. Thank you. And, Mr. Wells, I know you don't have a  
2 crystal ball, but do you foresee that the transmission  
3 costs will be reducing over time or do you anticipate  
4 that we will continue to see this steady increase in  
5 the transmission costs?

6 A. (Wells) I have seen nothing to indicate that the  
7 current trend of transmission investment will end any  
8 time in the foreseeable future. I would only say that,  
9 before transmission costs begin to decline, the  
10 regional initiative towards transmission investment  
11 will have to, at some point, will -- will eventually  
12 stop, and that will be what eventually gets  
13 transmission rates to start going back down.

14 Q. Thank you. I have one final question for you, Mr.  
15 Wells. And, it relates to the recovery in -- I think  
16 it's the recovery of the Renewable Source Option  
17 Administrative Costs, if you look at your testimony,  
18 Bates stamp 58. Right up at Line 3, you indicate "The  
19 Commission approved the recovery of implementation and  
20 administrative costs associated with the [Company's]  
21 Renewable Source Option", and that the "First year  
22 administrative costs of the program [was] capped at  
23 \$50,000." Will this \$50,000 be -- is this a permanent  
24 annual expense or is this a start-up expense?

{DE 10-172} {07-06-10}

[WITNESS PANEL: Asbury-Wells]

1 A. (Wells) The \$50,000 includes both start-up costs and  
2 first year administrative costs. So, in subsequent  
3 years, the amount will be lower than 50,000.

4 MS. AMIDON: Thank you. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Commissioner Ignatius.

6 CMSR. IGNATIUS: Thank you.

7 BY CMSR. IGNATIUS:

8 Q. I have a question about the new information received  
9 from Northeast Utilities last week it sounds.

10 A. (Wells) Yes.

11 Q. And, how you're able to plan -- how much time you're  
12 given and is there any way to be able to anticipate  
13 better what's happening with some of these numbers? If  
14 your filing was made June 17th, I think, it was pretty  
15 up-to-date. There isn't a lot of time lag between the  
16 filing and today's hearing. And, yet, even then, huge  
17 changes have come in just in the last couple of days,  
18 which I sympathize with the Company having to adjust to  
19 some significant changes like that. Is there anything  
20 you can think of that would explain why there are such  
21 significant differences so quickly coming upon you in  
22 this hearing today?

23 A. (Wells) Well, in response to your question, the  
24 difficulty the Company has is that frequently Northeast

{DE 10-172} {07-06-10}

[WITNESS PANEL: Asbury~Wells]

1 Utilities itself doesn't have the billing information  
2 for us until, you know, as we stated on the record, we  
3 got this information on Friday, as far as what the rate  
4 trend will be effective January 1st, 2011. The only  
5 way I can see that we could provide a better initial  
6 estimate would be to get that information from  
7 Northeast Utilities earlier.

8 In the past, we have tried, you know,  
9 estimating rates, when we had -- when the rate  
10 reconciled from May through April. And, initially, we  
11 had some success with that, but, eventually, there's,  
12 because you're trying to estimate someone else's costs,  
13 you know, you're always going to miss something. So,  
14 you know, while our plan was to move it, and it worked  
15 -- it's worked in that the rate that we are proposing  
16 will capture all the costs that we know of when the  
17 rate goes into effect.

18 But I acknowledge that there is a  
19 challenge of the initial rate estimate often will  
20 change dramatically. I will note that the Northeast  
21 Utilities rate is the most difficult to estimate,  
22 because there are so many moving parts to it. What  
23 Northeast Utilities does is they estimate their entire  
24 revenue requirement, including both Pool transmission

{DE 10-172} {07-06-10}

[WITNESS PANEL: Asbury~Wells]

1 facilities and non-Pool transmission facilities. Then,  
2 they deduct from that whatever revenue credits they may  
3 estimate, the most significant source being the ISO,  
4 from the Regional Network Service revenue that they  
5 receive. And, so, for their part, knowing, you know,  
6 they need to estimate what their revenue requirement  
7 will be, which has a lot of moving parts, due to their  
8 increased transmission, you know, "what is their  
9 transmission investment going to be?" You know, "what  
10 their administrative costs and that type of thing  
11 were?" And, then, on top of that, they need to  
12 estimate what the revenue can be. And, the revenue --  
13 the revenue can be a difficult thing to estimate, is  
14 what I've learned from talking with Northeast Utilities  
15 staff.

16 And, so, I guess my answer is, I do not  
17 know of anyway that we can give you a better initial  
18 estimate, other than to move the filing up to, you  
19 know, to a different effective date.

20 Q. Well, is there anything about the schedule of billing  
21 or reporting that makes it any more difficult by having  
22 this as an August 1st new rate? Does the calendar have  
23 any impact here? Or, whenever you set the date, you'll  
24 have this problem of getting the most up-to-date

{DE 10-172} {07-06-10}

1 numbers?

2 A. (Wells) The one challenge I could see with that, you  
3 will always have some -- there's always a potential of  
4 some update. Because, if we move this from August 1st  
5 to September 1st, then we would just have more months  
6 that are -- the rates that I'm basing my estimate on  
7 are effective from June through May 2010. So, at this  
8 point, the estimate accounts for estimated rates for  
9 June 2011 -- excuse me, I think I said "May through" --  
10 I said "June -- "May 2010", I meant "May 2011". The  
11 rates -- let me start over again. I apologize.

12 The rates that I am basing my estimates  
13 off of are effective June through 2010 through May  
14 2011. So, I'm using estimated rates for June 2011 and  
15 July 2011. If we were to make the rate effective  
16 September 2000 -- or, September, rather than August, I  
17 would have the most current information when we make  
18 the initial filing. But I would be -- then I would  
19 have an extra month that's based on an estimated rate,  
20 rather than the actual rate. So, there's -- I think  
21 there's a give-and-take on the effective date. I think  
22 both, you know, from my perspective, both work.

23 And, I would certainly prefer not, the  
24 Friday before a hearing, to be preparing you revised

[WITNESS PANEL: Asbury~Wells]

1 cost schedules. But, as far as the overall sending the  
2 right price signal to the customer, either this or a  
3 different effective date would work. We're not, at  
4 this time, proposing to change the effective date of  
5 the rate.

6 CMSR. IGNATIUS: Okay. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Well, let me just follow  
8 up on that.

9 BY CHAIRMAN GETZ:

10 Q. Though, even if you had a different effective date,  
11 you're still going to be trying to incorporate NU  
12 numbers that are on their own cycle, is that correct?

13 A. (Wells) Well, NU has two important dates for them.  
14 During June, they true up the prior year costs. So,  
15 for this filing, June 2010, they billed us for a  
16 true-up of costs for 2009. So, that was -- that's one  
17 important date. Then, that revenue requirement they  
18 used for 2009 ended up being the basis for their  
19 estimate for 2010 and 2011 costs. Which they -- which  
20 they provide the 2010 estimated cost during June, and  
21 then we got the last part of it, the estimate for 2011,  
22 in early July. If we had a different effective date,  
23 presuming, you know, presuming they were always to be,  
24 you know, that first week of July, I think we would,

{DE 10-172} {07-06-10}

[WITNESS PANEL: Asbury~Wells]

1           you know, in the hypothetical, you know, we would be  
2           filing 45 days before the effective date, which I  
3           believe would be July 15th, instead of June 15th. And,  
4           so, we would have -- we would not be updating the rate  
5           after that, if it were -- if, in the hypothetical, if  
6           we had rates effective September 1, rather than  
7           August 1.

8                           CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Mr. Epler, any  
9           redirect?

10                          MR. EPLER: No, Mr. Chairman. Thank  
11           you.

12                          CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Then, the  
13           witnesses are excused. Thank you.

14                          Is there any objection to striking the  
15           identifications and admitting the exhibits into evidence?

16                          (No verbal response)

17                          CHAIRMAN GETZ: Hearing no objection,  
18           they will be admitted into evidence. Ms. Amidon, do you  
19           have anything before opportunity for closings?

20                          MS. AMIDON: No.

21                          CHAIRMAN GETZ: Then, Ms. Amidon.

22                          MS. AMIDON: Thank you. Staff has  
23           reviewed the filing. And, we do not oppose the  
24           implementation of these rates effective August 1, 2010.

{DE 10-172} {07-06-10}

1 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Thank you. Mr. Epler.

2 MR. EPLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3 Based on the evidence and testimony and exhibits we  
4 presented, we request approval as indicated in the  
5 Petition.

6 CHAIRMAN GETZ: Okay. Thank you. Then,  
7 we'll close the hearing and take the matter under  
8 advisement.

9 (Whereupon the hearing ended at 10:40  
10 a.m.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24