

Witness: David L. Bickford
Request from: New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission Staff

Question:

Provide an estimate of the number of pole attachment applications that you received from Jan 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012:

- a. In total.
- b. Of under 200 poles.
- c. Over 200 poles that you rejected.
- d. Over 200 poles that you accepted.

Response:

Based on an estimate of the number of pole attachment applications that PSNH received from Jan 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012, the Company provides the following responses:

- a. In total: PSNH accepted 728 applications (40,316 attachments).
- b. Of under 200 poles: PSNH accepted 662 applications (27,116 attachments).
- c. Over 200 poles that you rejected: PSNH did not reject any applications with more than 200 poles.
- d. Over 200 poles that you accepted: PSNH accepted 66 applications (13,200 attachments) with 200 poles.

Public Service Company of New Hampshire
Docket No. DT 12-107

Data Request STAFF-01
Dated: 09/07/2012
Q-STAFF-003
Page 1 of 1

Witness: David L. Bickford
Request from: New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission Staff

Question:

Provide an estimate of the highest number of poles with applications pending (from all parties) but not yet approved at any one time during this period.

Response:

Based on the current application tracking process, PSNH is not able to provide an estimate of the highest number of pending applications at any one time during the period between January 1, 2011, through June 30, 2012.

As of September 10, 2012, the estimated number of applications pending and not yet approved is 203 applications (21,877 attachments).

Public Service Company of New Hampshire
Docket No. DT 12-107

Data Request STAFF-01
Dated: 09/07/2012
Q-STAFF-004
Page 1 of 1

Witness: David L. Bickford
Request from: New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission Staff

Question:

Provide an estimate of the highest number of poles with applications pending (from any single CLEC) but not yet approved at any one time during this period.

Response:

Based on the current application tracking process, PSNH is not able to provide an estimate of the highest number of applications pending at any one time during the period between January 1, 2011, through June 30, 2012.

As of September 10, 2012, Comcast had an estimated 98 applications (14,443 attachments) pending and not yet approved.

Public Service Company of New Hampshire
Docket No. DT 12-107

Data Request STAFF-01
Dated: 09/07/2012
Q-STAFF-005
Page 1 of 1

Witness: David L. Bickford
Request from: New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission Staff

Question:

During this period, did you exercise your option to limit applications pending approval by a licensor, to no more than 2,000 poles within a Planning Manager's Area at one time?

Response:

During the time period January 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012, PSNH did not limit the number of applications pending approval by any licensee. Instead, PSNH worked closely with the applicants and joint owners to establish a priority order in which the licensee's applications would be processed so as to meet their particular construction schedule.

Witness: David L. Bickford
Request from: New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission Staff

Question:

In deciding whether to invoke the 2,000 pole limit, do you consider:

- a. The work involved in modifying your own facilities,
- b. The work required of other attachers to modify their own facilities;
- c. Other factors (identify)

Response:

Please see PSNH response to Data Request STAFF-01, Q-STAFF-005.

Witness: David L. Bickford
Request from: New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission Staff

Question:

After a new licensee pays for make-ready work if applicable, when do you issue written notice to existing licensees that they must move their facilities? Is written notice always issued?

Response:

PSNH utilizes a web-based system called NJUNS, (National Joint Utility Notification System) to notify Joint Owners and other parties attached to poles in the PSNH maintenance area of their need to transfer their facilities to a newly set pole. A written notice to transfer facilities is delivered by the NJUNS System to all parties in the form of a "ticket" for each pole requiring transfer as soon as PSNH sets, transfers and processes the job package associated with that particular pole.

Witness: David L. Bickford
Request from: New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission Staff

Question:

If no make-ready work is required by the pole owner, but existing licensee attachments must be moved to accommodate a new licensee, how is notice provided to existing licensees?

Response:

In the event that no make ready work is identified as being required by the pole owner, PSNH will provide the "new" attaching party all information regarding current parties attached to the poles surveyed on the application. PSNH understands that the prevailing historical and current practice has been for the new attaching party to then contact all parties requiring rearrangement and work out a schedule or negotiate arrangements to move all facilities during the project . As required in most pole attachment agreements, the make ready survey is performed by PSNH, the Joint Owner and the new attaching party together to ensure that all parties understand the work that will be required at each pole location included on the application.

Public Service Company of New Hampshire
Docket No. DT 12-107

Data Request STAFF-01
Dated: 09/07/2012
Q-STAFF-009
Page 1 of 1

Witness: David L. Bickford
Request from: New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission Staff

Question:

In its notice to existing licensees, does the pole owner specify a date by which the facilities must be moved?

Response:

In all notices to transfer sent by PSNH utilizing the NJUNS System, PSNH specifies a date by which the party is required to move, pursuant to the time frame outlined in their specific pole attachment agreement.

Public Service Company of New Hampshire
Docket No. DT 12-107

Data Request STAFF-01
Dated: 09/07/2012
Q-STAFF-010
Page 1 of 1

Witness: David L. Bickford
Request from: New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission Staff

Question:
Estimate how often, between Jan. 1, 2011 and June 30, 2012, you issued such notices.

Response:
Between January 1, 2011 and June 30, 2012, PSNH initiated 3,290 tickets to 55 unique member codes in the NJUNS System.

Public Service Company of New Hampshire
Docket No. DT 12-107

Data Request STAFF-01
Dated: 09/07/2012
Q-STAFF-011
Page 1 of 1

Witness: David L. Bickford
Request from: New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission Staff

Question:
Estimate how often, between Jan. 1, 2011 and June 30, 2012, notice to existing licensees included instructions that facilities were required to be moved in 15 days.

Response:
Please see PSNH response to STAFF-01, Q-STAFF-009.

Witness: David L. Bickford
Request from: New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission Staff

Question:
Estimate how often, between Jan. 1, 2011 and June 30, 2012 you were notified by the new licensee or the existing licensee that the existing licensee would not complete its make ready work within the 15 day period.

Response:
PSNH currently utilizes the NJUNS System to notify parties of pending transfer requests and monitor aging history with regards to all pole transfers only. PSNH could not find an instance where a new or existing licensee notified PSNH through the NJUNS System that they are unable to meet the 15 day transfer period.

Public Service Company of New Hampshire
Docket No. DT 12-107

Data Request STAFF-01
Dated: 09/07/2012
Q-STAFF-013
Page 1 of 1

Witness: David L. Bickford
Request from: New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission Staff

Question:
Estimate how often, between Jan. 1, 2011 and June 30, 2012, you invoked your option to move an existing licensee's facilities.

Response:
Between January 1, 2011 and June 30, 2012, PSNH did not move any existing licensee's facilities unless required to do so in the case of an emergency or storm restoration work where the safety of the general public and/or the integrity of the PSNH electrical system would be compromised.

Witness: David L. Bickford
Request from: New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission Staff

Question:
What factors do you weigh in determining whether to invoke this option to move?

Response:

As noted in the Company's response to STAFF-01, Q-STAFF-013, PSNH has not relocated another parties' facilities except in the unusual case of emergency or storm restoration work where safety and service restoration may be overriding factors. PSNH has not in the past, and does not currently, engage in the practice of moving or modifying a third party attacher's facilities for any reason, including for the accommodation of a new third party attachment. The primary factor in this determination is that these facilities are not owned or maintained by PSNH, and are, in fact the responsibility of the third party owner, not PSNH. Furthermore, under its pole attachment agreements, PSNH does not have any legal obligation to take such action, only the right to do so, which right may freely choose not to exercise or invoke. Other significant factors which in PSNH's determination not to perform or have performed such work include but are not limited to the following: lack of available time and personnel resources required to dedicate to such work, or in the management and supervision of contractors required to perform such work; cost and issues of cost recovery from third parties; exposure to liability claims for property damage or loss of customers or business revenues in the event of accidental damage or failure of the third party facilities; lack of adequate training or experience in handling third party cable or telecommunications facilities, and in the applicable codes or standards; unwillingness to take on the burden of managing the communications space on the pole, involving potentially multiple pole attacher's, and fact finder or mediator roles; and, not directly related or beneficial to the PSNH core electric service business.