1	STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE		
2		PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION	
3			
4	April 14, 20	21 - 1:37 p.m.	
5	[Rei	mote Hearing conducted via Webex]	
6	DE.	DE 20 124	
7	KE:	DE 20-124 VANGUARD GROUP, INC.:	
8		Request for a Limited Exemption from Approval Requirements of RSA Section 374:33.	
9		RDA DECUION 3/4:33.	
LO	PRESENT:	Chairwoman Dianne H. Martin, Presiding Commissioner Kathryn M. Bailey	
L1		Commissioner Rachryn M. Barrey	
L 2		Jody Carmody, Clerk Corrine Lemay, PUC Remote Hearing Host	
L 3		colline Lemay, For Remote hearing host	
L 4			
L 5	APPEARANCES:	Reptg. Vanguard Group, Inc.: William S. Harwood, Esq. (Verrill Law)	
L 6		Katherine M. McDonough, Esq. (Verrill)	
L 7		Reptg. PUC Staff: Brian D. Buckley, Esq.	
L 8		Jay Dudley, Electric Division	
L 9			
20			
21			
22			
23	Court Rep	orter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52	
2 4			

1			
2		INDEX	
3			PAGE NO.
4	WITNESS PANEL:	JUDY GAINES	
5		JANINE KORPICS	
6	Interrogatories by	Mr. Buckley	10
7	Interrogatories by	Cmsr. Bailey	11
8	Interrogatories by	Chairwoman Martin	12, 13
9			
10		* * *	
11			
12	CLOSING STATEMENTS	BY:	
13		Mr. Harwood	14
14		Mr. Buckley	15
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

1			
2		EXHIBITS	
3	EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
4	1	Vanguard Group, Inc., Request for Limited Exemption	premarked
5		from Approval Requirements of RSA 374:33 (07-31-20)	
6	2	Vanguard Group, Inc.,	premarked
7		Amended Petition $(11-02-20)$	
8	3	Staff Recommendation $(04-08-21)$	premarked
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

PROCEEDING

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. We're here this afternoon in Docket DE 20-124 for a hearing regarding the Amended Petition filed by the Vanguard Group, Incorporated.

I have to make the necessary findings for this remote hearing.

As Chairwoman of the Public Utilities

Commission, I find that due to the State of

Emergency declared by the Governor as a result of

the COVID-19 pandemic, and in accordance with the

Governor's Emergency Order Number 12, pursuant to

Executive Order 2020-04, this public body is

authorized to meet electronically. Please note

that there is no physical location to observe and

listen contemporaneously to this hearing, which

was authorized pursuant to the Governor's

Emergency Order. However, in accordance with the

Emergency Order, I am confirming that we are

utilizing Webex for this electronic hearing.

All members of the Commission have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during this hearing, and the public has access to contemporaneously listen and, if necessary,

participate. We previously gave notice to the public of the necessary information for accessing the hearing in the Order of Notice. If anyone has a problem during the hearing, please call (603)271-2431. In the event the public is unable to access the hearing, the hearing will be adjourned and rescheduled.

2.

1.3

2.2

Okay. We have to take a roll call attendance of the Commission. My name is Dianne Martin. I am the Chairwoman of the Public Utilities Commission. And I am alone.

Commissioner Bailey.

COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Kathryn Bailey, Commissioner at the Public Utilities Commission. And I am alone.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. And let's take appearances, starting with Mr. Harwood.

MR. HARWOOD: Thank you, Chairman

Martin and Commissioner Bailey. It's William

Harwood and Katherine McDonough, from Verrill, on

behalf of the Petitioners. And with us this

afternoon, from Vanguard, is Janine Korpics and

Judy Gaines.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

1 And Mr. Buckley.

2.

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

MR. BUCKLEY: Thank you, Madam Chair and Commissioner Bailey. My name is Brian D. Buckley, appearing on behalf of Commission Staff. And with me today, however in "attendee only" mode, is a analyst with the Electric Division, Jay Dudley.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

And, for preliminary matters, I have

Exhibits 1 through 3 prefiled and premarked for identification.

Is there anything else we need to go over before we have the witnesses sworn in?

MR. BUCKLEY: Madam Chair, there is also a request for confidential treatment and protective order relating to two discovery request responses provided to Staff during the proceeding.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Was there any objection to that from Staff?

MR. BUCKLEY: No objection. And, in fact, Staff is supportive of the request.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. And I know you were already all warned to treat anything

marked as "confidential" as confidential during 1 2 the hearing. So, the Commission will also treat 3 that as confidential during this hearing and issue an order on that motion in the order that 4 5 comes out of this hearing. 6 Anything else? 7 MR. BUCKLEY: Nothing else on Staff's side. 9 CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Seeing nothing. 10 Then, let's get the witnesses sworn in please, Mr. Patnaude. 11 (Whereupon Judy Gaines and 12 Janine Korpics were duly sworn by the 1.3 14 Court Reporter.) 15 CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Thank you. 16 Mr. Harwood. 17 MR. HARWOOD: Yes. Thank you again, 18 Chairman Martin. This is a bit of an unusual case. 19 20 There are no public utilities here in this 21 proceeding, this has been brought by Vanguard. 2.2 And it's further unusual in that we have a Staff 23 motion, proposal for resolution. So, there is no 24 issue. But I would just like to briefly state

2.

1.3

2.2

our position, and then allow for questioning of the witnesses, if the Staff or the Commissioners have any.

Vanguard has come forward. I think they have done the responsible thing and taken the initiative to reach out to New Hampshire PUC to seek clarification of how your rules govern investments by investors like the investment funds in New Hampshire utilities. There is a good bit of uncertainty about how RSA 374:33 should be interpreted. Vanguard has suggested several alternatives to resolve this. The Staff has selected one alternative, and Vanguard is in support of that proposal.

The Staff has identified that, as a matter of business model, the Vanguard funds are each separate funds for purposes of 374:33. They do not need — they should not be aggregated. Each fund is a separate investor for purposes of the 10 percent rule in 374:33. And the Staff has laid out an explanation for that.

The funds are not affiliated in the corporate sense. They don't have a parent company that owns their outstanding shares. Each

2.

1.3

2.2

fund is owned by the individual investors in that fund. The funds are passive investors, they are not investing for control of management, and therefore there is no need to aggregate.

And, finally, each decision -- each fund's investment decisions are not influenced by the investment decisions of the other funds.

Each fund makes its own investment decisions based on the criteria of that fund. There is no coordination.

So, the Staff's proposal, which we support, is that each fund is an investor and would be subject to the 10 percent threshold in 374:33. The Commission can make a finding that the funds are separate investors and should not be aggregated for purposes of determining whether the 10 percent has been reached.

I'm happy to stop there and take any questions, or have the witnesses answer any factual questions. I think the Staff has done an excellent job of laying out the case, the issues, and an acceptable resolution to the Petitioners.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Mr. Buckley, do you have questions for the witnesses?

```
1
                   MR. BUCKLEY:
                                  Just one question for the
 2
         witnesses.
                     And this is to whoever feels most
 3
         comfortable asking [sic].
 4
                       JUDY GAINES, SWORN
 5
                     JANINE KORPICS, SWORN
 6
    BY MR. BUCKLEY:
 7
         If you could please turn to Exhibit -- what has
         been premarked as "Exhibit 3", which is the Staff
 8
         Recommendation. And I believe it's at one, two,
 9
10
         three -- what is marked as Bates "005" of that
11
         Recommendation, there is a diagram that
12
         identifies what is essentially the relationship
13
         of the Vanguard Group to the various Vanguard
14
         investment companies. Is that correct?
15
         (Gaines) This is Judy Gaines. That's correct.
    Α
16
         Thank you. And was this diagram provided by you
17
         or somebody at your organization in response to
18
         discovery requests by the Staff?
19
         (Gaines) Yes, it was.
    Α
20
         And, to your knowledge, is this diagram accurate,
21
         as far as the corporate structure of Vanguard?
2.2
         (Gaines) Yes. It is accurate.
23
         And, so, is it accurate to say that this diagram
24
         shows that the Vanguard Group, who has brought
```

```
this Petition on behalf of the Vanguard various
 1
 2
         investment companies, is not actually an owner of
 3
         those investment companies, but rather a
 4
         subsidiary?
 5
         (Gaines) That is correct. The Vanquard Group,
 6
         Inc., is an investment advisory company that is a
 7
         subsidiary of the Vanquard Funds. The Vanquard
 8
         Group, Inc., does not own and is not a parent
 9
         company of the Vanguard Funds.
10
                   MR. BUCKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Ms.
11
         Gaines. No further questions from Staff.
12
                   CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Commissioner
13
         Bailey.
14
    BY COMMISSIONER BAILEY:
15
         Is the Vanquard Registered Investment Company a
16
         parent of each of the individual companies listed
17
         in the big block?
18
         (Gaines) No. Rather, each of the entities listed
    Α
19
         in the big block is one of the Vanguard
20
         registered investment companies. So, the
21
         "Vanguard Registered Investment Companies" is not
22
         an entity. It's a description, rather, of those
23
         bulleted entities in the box.
24
         So, would another way of depicting this be to
```

```
1
         just cut out the box that says "Vanguard
 2
         Registered Investment Companies", and make all of
 3
         those connections, "100 percent Ownership",
 4
         straight down to the big box?
 5
         (Gaines) Yes. That would be another way of doing
 6
              I believe the way that it's presented the
 7
         way it was was just for explanation purposes.
 8
         But it would be -- it would be equally accurate
 9
         to have the arrows going up and down from "The
         Vanguard Group, Inc," in the oval, to the large
10
         rectangle with the bulleted entities themselves.
11
12
                   CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Commissioner
13
         Bailey, can I jump in there, just to make sure
14
         I'm following that?
15
                   COMMISSIONER BAILEY: Please do.
16
    BY CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN:
17
         My recollection of the prehearing conference was
18
         that the Vanguard Group doesn't actually own any
19
         of those. That each of the individual funds in
20
         the box is independent and owned by the fund
21
         owners, whoever owns those individual funds.
22
                   And, so, when you say "the line from
23
         Vanguard Group, Incorporated, to the big
24
         rectangle is 100 percent ownership", that
```

```
1
         confuses me. Can you clarify?
 2
         (Gaines) Sure. The arrow would be going to "The
 3
         Vanguard Group, Inc.", to indicate that those
 4
         funds listed in the box own the Vanquard Group,
 5
         Inc. The arrow going down from "The Vanquard
 6
         Group, Inc." to the larger box would indicate
 7
         that the Vanguard Group, Inc., is providing the
         investment, advisory, and administrative
 8
 9
         services, but it wouldn't indicate ownership.
10
                   CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. That helps.
11
         Thank you.
12
                   WITNESS GAINES: Sure.
1.3
                   COMMISSIONER BAILEY: And that does
14
         help. Thank you. That's what I was trying to
15
         understand.
                   WITNESS GAINES: Sure.
16
17
                   COMMISSIONER BAILEY: I'm all set.
18
                   CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: I just have one
19
         more clarifying question for the record.
20
    BY CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN:
21
         So, if any one of these were to own up to the 10
2.2
         percent, they would each be independent, is your
23
         point?
24
         (Gaines) That's correct.
```

1	CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. I don't have
2	any other questions. Do you have any redirect,
3	Mr. Harwood?
4	I think you're on mute.
5	MR. HARWOOD: Oh, I muted. No. I
6	think I'm all set. Thank you. You did a nice
7	job of cleaning up the confusion there. And I
8	have no further questions.
9	CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. Thank
LO	you. Anything else from Staff?
L 1	MR. BUCKLEY: Nothing further from
L 2	Staff.
L 3	CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Okay. Then, we
L 4	will strike ID on the three exhibits and admit
L 5	those as full exhibits.
L 6	And did you plan to do closings?
L 7	MR. HARWOOD: I'm happy to make a brief
L 8	summary.
L 9	I think what you've heard is that this
20	is an unusual business structure. It is not what
21	we might think of as having one normal pyramid,
22	with one corporation at the top of the page, and
23	many corporations that are under it and a wholly
2 4	owned subsidiary. This is the opposite. These

individual thousands and thousands of investors own each of the funds that they invest in. And those funds are independent and separate. And they are not coordinated.

1.3

2.2

And therefore, the Staff's

Recommendation, that each fund should be dealt

with as a potentially independent holding

company, and only if each -- if any of the funds

reach the 10 percent would RSA 374:33 be

implicated. As long as each fund stays under the

10 percent, we do not need to concern ourselves

whether you might be able to add them together to

get more than 10 percent.

So, we support the Staff's proposed resolution of this. And hope that you will be able to write an order that would give Vanguard the comfort to be able to continue with its current business model, providing its services to those investors, without concern about violating RSA 374:33.

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Thank you, Mr.

Harwood. Mr. Buckley.

MR. BUCKLEY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Staff takes this opportunity to reiterate its recommendation that the Commission should find that the interests held at the individual fund level should not be aggregated for the purpose of determining whether Vanguard has reached the 10 percent threshold set forth in RSA 374:33.

Since Vanguard has no ownership interest in any of the Vanguard advised funds, and the Petition does not express an intent for any individual fund to acquire holdings in a New Hampshire public utility at the levels that would invoke the Commission's RSA 374:33 authority, Staff also recommends that the Commission: (1) grant the Petitioners' request for a declaratory ruling that the Petitioners are not entities subject to the approval requirements of RSA 374:33; and (2) deem the request for an RSA 374:33 public interest finding moot in light of the declaratory ruling.

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: Thank you, Mr.

Buckley.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

I do want to thank Vanguard for

bringing this to the Commission. I think that it was an admirable thing to do. So, thank you for doing that. MR. HARWOOD: Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN MARTIN: All right. With that, we will close the record and take this under advisement. Thank you, everyone. We are adjourned. (Whereupon the hearing was adjourned at 1:53 p.m.)