## STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Pennichuck Water Works, Inc.
Petition for Fifth Special Contract for Service to Anheuser-Busch, LLC.

DW 21-\_\_\_\_

**Direct Testimony of Donald L. Ware** 

1	Professional a	and Educa	ational Bac	kground
-				

2	Q.	What is your name	and what is your	position with	Pennichuck	Water V	Works
---	----	-------------------	------------------	---------------	------------	---------	-------

- 3 Inc.?
- 4 A. My name is Donald L. Ware. I am the Chief Operating Officer of the Pennichuck
- Water Works, Inc. ("PWW" or "Company"). I have worked for PWW since
- 6 1995. I am a licensed professional engineer in New Hampshire, Massachusetts,
- 7 and Maine.
- 8 Q. Please describe your educational background.
- 9 **A.** I have a bachelor's in science degree in Civil Engineering from Bucknell
- 10 University in Lewisburg, Pennsylvania and I completed all the required courses,
- with the exception of my thesis, for a master's degree in civil engineering from
- the same institution. I have a master's in business administration from the
- Whittemore Business School at the University of New Hampshire.
- 14 Q. Please describe your professional background.
- 15 A. Prior to joining the Company, I served as the General Manager of the Augusta
- Water District in Augusta, Maine from 1986 to 1995. I served as the District's
- engineer between 1982 and 1986. Prior to my engagement with the District, I
- served as a design engineer for the State of Maine Department of Transportation
- for six months and before that as a design engineer for Buchart-Horn Consulting
- 20 Engineers from 1979 to 1982.
- 21 Q. What are your responsibilities as Chief Operating Officer of the Company?
- 22 A. As Chief Operating Officer, I am responsible for PWW's overall operations,
- 23 including customer service, water supply, water supply and water sales contracts,
- distribution and engineering. I work closely with PWW's Chief Engineer and

other senior managers to help develop PWW's Annual and Three-Year Capital

Improvement Plans.

## Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

3

- A. The purpose of my testimony is to describe the Company's desire to enter into a

  Fifth contract with Anheuser-Busch, LLC ("AB"), and to summarize the terms

  and conditions of the proposed new contract, and to explain why the proposed

  contract is in the public interest and should be approved.
- 8 Q. Why is PWW seeking to enter into a Fifth special contract with AB?
- 9 A. The Fourth Special contract with AB, which was approved in DW10-091,
  10 terminates on June 30, 2021. PWW believes it is in the best interest of its
  11 customers and AB to develop and enter into a new long-term special contract that
  12 will provide the terms of service to AB beyond June 30, 2021.

## 13 Q. What is the basis for the proposed Fifth Special Contract?

14 A. The basic form and overall terms of the proposed Fifth Special Contract follows 15 the same form as the Fourth Special Contract: AB will pay an annual fixed fee to 16 provide for its share of the City Bond Fixed Revenue Requirement, the 1.0 Debt 17 Service Revenue Requirement and the 0.1 Debt Service Revenue Requirement. 18 AB will pay a Volumetric Rate that is based on it paying for the variable cost to 19 operate the Company's raw water facilities, its water treatment facilities, 20 distribution system maintenance, and administrative expenses. AB will pay a 21 monthly meter charge that reflects the cost of operating and maintaining the water 22 meters serving AB. Additionally, AB will guarantee a minimum annual water 23 purchase (Minimum Annual Usage) amount of 196.8 million gallons (263,101 24 CCF). AB will also limit their annual average daily usage to: (1) 0.9 Million

2 peak hour usage to 1.9 MGD. No changes to the above methodology are 3 proposed for the Fifth contract. 4 Q. What are the proposed rates in the Fifth contract and how do they compare 5 to AB's current rates (those approved in DW19-084)? 6 A. The Base Monthly Fixed Fee is proposed to be \$30,442. In comparison, the 7 current AB Monthly Fixed charge is \$30,953. The proposed AB Volumetric Rate 8 is \$1.2710 per 100 cubic feet (CCF) (This rate is inclusive of the 3.90% Qualified 9 Capital Project Adjustment Charge (QCPAC) for 2019 QCP's requested in DW 10 20-020 and the 1.52% QCPAC requested in DW 21-023). The current 11 Volumetric Rate, as approved in DW 19-084 for AB, is \$1.1700 per CCF. The 12 current DW 19-084 AB volumetric rate will change to \$1.2156 per CCF if the 13 requested 3.90% requested QCPAC sought in DW 20-020 is approved by the 14 Commission (recoupable back to April 30, 2020). The \$1.2156 per CCF will 15 change to \$1.2341 per CCF if the 1.52% QCPAC sought in DW 21-023 is 16 approved by the Commission (recoupable back top April 2, 2021). The \$1.2341 17 per CCF would change to the Fifth Contract rate of \$1.2710 per CCF on July 1, 18 2021 and the QCPAC's approved in DW 20-020 and DW 21-023 will not apply to 19 this new rate as they are included in the \$1.2710 rate per CCF. 20 The proposed monthly fee for the two AB six-inch meters will be the same as 21 approved for the PWW General metered customer in DW19-084 and will be 22 subject to any approved QCPAC's, including those being sought in DW 20-020 23 and DW 21-023.

Gallons per Day (MGD), (2) their maximum daily usage to 1.2 MGD and (3) their

1

24

1	Q.	Will the Volumetric Rate ever change other than to reflect the QCPAC
2		adjustments?
3	<b>A.</b>	Yes, the Volumetric Rate may only be adjusted by the same percentage and at the
4		same time as any future change in the Volumetric Rates for general metered
5		service, as adjudicated by the Commission, which PWW charges to its core
6		system customers in the City of Nashua and the Town of Merrimack. In the event
7		that PWW requests the Commission to increase or otherwise increases the
8		Volumetric Rate above \$2.10 per 100 cubic feet, AB shall have the right to
9		terminate the Fifth Contract as provided for in paragraph 6 of the Fifth Contract.
10	Q.	What is the basis of the rates proposed in the Fifth Special Contract?
11	A.	PWW had a Cost of Service Study (COSS) performed by Raftelis based on the
12		approved Revenue Requirements from the Company's last rate case, DW 19-084.
13		Additionally, the COSS included pro formas to account for major capital
14		improvements completed in 2019 and 2020, with regards to
15		additions/upgrades/replacements to PWW's raw water facilities and its Nashua
16		Water Treatment Plant. The COSS is included as Attachment DLW-1 to this
17		testimony.
18	Q.	What are the additions/upgrades/replacement that were added as pro forma
19		in the COSS?
20	A.	Since the completion of DW 19-084 PWW has invested \$8,664,836 in providing a
21		fully redundant raw water supply from the Merrimack River. AB's share of the
22		principal and interest times 1.1 associated with this investment is included in
23		AB's fixed monthly fee. The improvements listed below were completed in 2019
24		and 2020 and the principal and interest payments on these investments are

1		included in the QCPAC's requested in DW 20-020 and DW 21-023. The
2		improvements, which are essential to providing service to AB, which were
3		completed were:
4		1. The Construction of the Merrimack River Deep Intake was completed in
5		December 2019 at a cost of \$6,693,729.
6		2. The addition of a 3 <sup>rd</sup> raw water pump in the Merrimack River Raw Water
7		pump station along with Station improvements and rebuilds of the two original
8		raw water pumps at a cost of \$485,114.
9		3. The replacement of the Carbon media in the six filters in the Nashua Water
10		Treatment plant at a cost of \$1,485,993.
11	Q.	Are there other changes in PWW's operations since the Fourth Contract
12		went into effect in 2010 that had an impact on the formation of the proposed
13		Fifth Contract?
14	A.	The change that had the largest impact on the proposed rates charged to AB was
15		
16		the change in PWW from an investor-owned utility in 2010 with a rate making
		the change in PWW from an investor-owned utility in 2010 with a rate making methodology based on Return on Investment and depreciation expense being
17		
		methodology based on Return on Investment and depreciation expense being
17		methodology based on Return on Investment and depreciation expense being replaced with 1.1x (Principal and Interest) plus the payment of City Bond Fixed
17 18		methodology based on Return on Investment and depreciation expense being replaced with 1.1x (Principal and Interest) plus the payment of City Bond Fixed Revenue Requirement as the basis of determining AB's fixed monthly fee. In
17 18 19		methodology based on Return on Investment and depreciation expense being replaced with 1.1x (Principal and Interest) plus the payment of City Bond Fixed Revenue Requirement as the basis of determining AB's fixed monthly fee. In 2010 the pretax ROI on PWW's investment was 11.07% based on a mix of
17 18 19 20		methodology based on Return on Investment and depreciation expense being replaced with 1.1x (Principal and Interest) plus the payment of City Bond Fixed Revenue Requirement as the basis of determining AB's fixed monthly fee. In 2010 the pretax ROI on PWW's investment was 11.07% based on a mix of 50.33% debt at an average rate of 5.94% and 49.67% equity with a pretax return
17 18 19 20 21		methodology based on Return on Investment and depreciation expense being replaced with 1.1x (Principal and Interest) plus the payment of City Bond Fixed Revenue Requirement as the basis of determining AB's fixed monthly fee. In 2010 the pretax ROI on PWW's investment was 11.07% based on a mix of 50.33% debt at an average rate of 5.94% and 49.67% equity with a pretax return of 16.145%. Additionally, the blended depreciation rate for PWW assets (based

2 AB, at the end of 2020 of \$87,539,036, is almost double the 2009 NBV of PWW 3 plant providing service to AB of \$46,670,612; the substantially lower cost of 4 capital and its impact in PWW's current revenue requirement methodology almost 5 entirely offsets the increase in the NBV of the assets used to provide service to 6 AB that occurred between the end of 2009 and the end of 2020. 7 Q. Please summarize the key provisions of the Fifth Contract. 8 A. The key provisions of the Fifth Contract are as follows: 9 1. AB's contract requires PWW to provide up to an average annual flow of 0.9 10 MGD, a peak day flow of 1.2 MGD and a maximum hourly flow rate of 1.9 11 MGD. 12 2. AB will pay a monthly bill, in arrears, consisting of three parts, a monthly 13 meter charge, a monthly fixed charge and a monthly Volumetric Rate, which will 14 be based on the actual volume of water used during the billing month. 15 3. In the event that AB's annual usage averages less than 539,178 Gallons per 16 Day (GPD) then AB will be required to make a payment at the end of the contract 17 year known as the Annual Volume Shortfall charge. The Annual Volume 18 Shortfall charge will be calculated by taking the Volumetric Rate in effect for AB 19 at the end of the contract year times the difference between 539,178 GPD (72,100 20 cubic feet per day) times the number of days in the contract year less the actual 21 usage during the contract year. These similar provisions were in the Fourth 22 contract. 23

the Net Book Value (NBV) of the PWW plant in service used to deliver water to

1

24

Q. Please explain how each of the charges comport with the recommendations of the Cost of Service Study.

1

2

24

3 A. The charges match those detailed in the COSS based on the AB Contractual rates 4 of 0.9 MGD Average Day, 1.2 MGD Maximum Day and 1.9 MGD Maximum 5 Hour. See Attachment DLW-1, page 10, "Allocation Factors"... 6 The monthly meter charge provides PWW with the vehicle to collect the customer 7 related charges associated with the meter charge that are not collected elsewhere 8 in the AB charges. The costs associated with this charge are primarily variable 9 and as such this charge will increase at the same rate as the 6" meter charge for 10 PWW's General Metered customers in in this and future rate cases. The rate for a 11 6" meter approved in DW 19-184 is \$1,104.29 for a 6" water meter. This rate 12 will be subject to the QCPAC's being sought in DW 20-020 and DW 21-023. 13 The monthly fixed charge ensures that AB will pay its share of the expenses 14 associated with the water supply facilities that provide service to AB, as well as 15 AB's share of the CBFRR, regardless of its actual usage. This charge is fixed for 16 the length of the contract unless PWW is required to make an investment in the 17 water supply facilities required to service AB, in which case a new COSS will be 18 completed to determine the proper allocation of PWW's expenses and return on 19 the investment in its water supply facilities that would be allocable to AB. The 20 COSS set this rate at \$30,435.13 per month based on the allowed usage volumes 21 specified in the proposed Fifth Contract. This rate will not change during the 22 duration of the Fifth Contract unless PWW must make additional investment in 23 the water supply facilities that service AB, and a new COSS is completed that

establishes the appropriate sharing of the new investment that is approved by the

1		Commission. Finally, this rate is charged each month regardless of whether AB
2		uses any water or not.
3		The AB volumetric charge was determined in the COSS as the rate necessary to
4		pay for the variable costs associated with producing AB's water as well as
5		providing a prorated contribution from AB toward PWW's Administrative and
6		Management, Water supply and Distribution Administrative expenses. The
7		Volumetric Rate established for AB by the COSS was \$1.2710 per CCF. See
8		Attachment DLW-1, page 12. This rate is based on the DW 19-084 expenses and,
9		as explained on page 4 of this testimony, is not subject to the QCPAC's being
10		sought in DW 20-020 and DW 21-023. This rate is not subject to the proposed
11		QCPAC's sought in DW 20-020 and DW 21-023 because the property tax
12		expenses and operating expenses associated with the new Merrimack River Raw
13		Water facilities are included as pro forma to the 2018 expense. The pro forma are
14		calculated in the COSS on the schedule entitled Pro Form Operating Expense.
15		See Attachment DLW-1, page 23.
16		The Annual Minimum Annual Usage charge provides rate stability in the event
17		AB uses less water than the minimum amount.
18	Q.	What is the proposed term and effective date for the Fifth Contract?
19	A.	The term of the Fifth Contract is proposed to be ten years following its effective
20		date, which will be July 1, 2021. Because of the tight time frame for approval, the
21		Company and AB proposed that any difference in the final rates approved by the
22		Commission and the current rates in effect as of the date of Commission's
23		approval of the terms and conditions of the Fifth Contract shall be reconcilable
24		from the date of the Commission order approving the Fifth contract, back to July

1	1, 2021. The Company is filing a petition to specifically allow the continuation of
2	the Fourth contract until the Fifth contract is approved and allow the parties to
3	include the interim reconciliation feature.

Q. Why should AB have a special contract? Please explain how they are different from PWW's other customers.

4

5

6 A. As was the case when the Fourth Contract was approved by the Commission, AB 7 is far and away PWW's largest customer in terms of demand. During calendar 8 2020, AB used 265,881,088 gallons of PWW water, which amounts to an average 9 per day take of approximately 0.728 million gallons, or about 6.3% of PWW's 10 total average daily usage in 2020. By way of contrast, PWW's second largest 11 customer was the Town of Hudson who used 148,160,100 gallons of water in 12 2020, an average per day take of 405,918 gallons. It should be noted that PWW's 13 five largest volumetric users: AB, the Town of Hudson, the Town of 14 Tyngsborough, Pennichuck East Utility, and the Town of Milford are all PWW 15 special contract customers. 16 Besides being PWW's largest customer, AB also has on site storage which results 17 in AB's usage being relatively steady without troublesome hourly or daily peaks 18 during seasonal peaking periods. Additionally, AB paid for the entire cost of 19 constructing the water main that provides water service to them, directly from the 20 PWW's Nashua Water Treatment plant to the AB facilities. As noted above, the 21 AB Rate was arrived at using a cost of service approach and is appropriate under 22 the circumstances because it is more reflective of the actual cost to serve AB 23 based upon the facts detailed above, as opposed to the tariffed rate that would 24 otherwise apply (and not reflect AB's capital contributions), absent a special

1 contract. The variable cost of producing a CCF of water through the Nashua 2 Water Treatment plant in 2020 was about \$0.43 per CCF (based on a complete 3 carbon change out every three years, plus all chemicals and electricity for 100% 4 of water being pumped from the Merrimack River) versus the proposed AB 5 Volumetric Rate of \$1.2710 per CCF. The proposed AB Volumetric Rate ensures 6 that AB pays a ratable share of PWW's administrative and general expenses, 7 Water supply and Distribution administrative expenses per the COSS. Finally, 8 PWW is convinced that if it does not provide special contract rates to a large 9 water user such as AB, it will ultimately either obtain its water supply 10 independently from its own premises or simply leave the State of New 11 Hampshire. The loss of AB as a customer would result in its share of the fixed 12 costs associated with PWW's water supply facilities having to be paid for by the 13 general metered customers. Additionally, there are economic benefits to retaining 14 AB as an employer in the region. 15 O. What is the economic advantage of the proposed Fifth Contract to AB? 16 A. If AB were to be billed as a GM customer it would be billed a monthly meter 17 charge for two 6" water meters at a rate of \$1,104.29 per month and a volumetric 18 rate \$4.03 per CCF (based on the permanent rates established in DW 19-084) 19 which would result in annual bill to AB for 2020, based on 355,456 CCF of 20 usage, in the amount of \$1,459,991 Under the provisions of the proposed Fifth 21 Contract AB's annual bill for 2020 would have been \$843,503.62 22 Q. What are the termination provisions in the proposed Fifth Contract? 23 A. Like the expiring Fourth Contract with AB, they may terminate the Fifth Contract 24 in any of the following three ways:

- 1. Providing Two Years notice. Notice may be issued without cause.
- 2. If the Company requests that the Commission increase AB's volumetric rate
- 3 above \$2.10 per CCF, AB has the right to terminate the Fifth Contract if it notifies
- 4 PWW of its intent to terminate within 90 days of the PWW rate filing. The Fifth
- 5 Contract would terminate 1 year after the notification of termination. In the event
- AB terminates under this clause, it would allow PWW to make a pro forma
- 7 adjustment to its filed rate case reflecting the loss of AB as a customer.
- 8 3. If the Company requests that the Commission increase AB 6" meter rate above
- 9 \$2,000 per 6" meter, AB has the right to terminate the Fifth Contract if it notifies
- 10 PWW of its intent to terminate within 90 days of the PWW rate filing. The Fifth
- 11 Contract would terminate 1 year after the notification of termination. In the event
- AB terminates under this clause it would allow PWW to make a proforma
- adjustment to reflect the loss of AB as a customer.
- 14 Q. What is the purpose of the minimum payment obligation and early
- termination provisions of the Fifth Contract?
- 16 A. With these provisions, PWW is attempting to protect its financial integrity while
- 17 allowing some flexibility to AB to reduce its costs. In exchange for the
- 18 continuation of a special rate, AB is agreeing to accept the minimum payment
- provisions. Among other things, the two-year notice period would give PWW
- 20 time to file for a rate case to recover the portion of the AB revenues required to
- cover the fixed expenses associated with the water supply facilities that provide
- service to AB.
- 23 Q. Do you have anything else you would like to add?
- 24 A. Yes. PWW believes that the Fifth Contract is just and reasonable for both AB and

all of PWW's customers. The Fifth Contract results in AB paying its fair share of PWW's costs to serve it while allowing AB the benefit of further conservation efforts regarding its water usage. Retaining AB as a customer for the next 10 years provides PWW and its customers a guaranteed contribution to the fixed expenses associated with its water supply facilities as well as a contribution to PWW's general, administrative, water supply and distribution expense that will not change regardless of whether AB is a customer or not. The annual minimum usage requirement ensures that AB will pay its fair share of PWW's administrative and general expenses, WTP administrative and Distribution administrative expenses for the duration of the Contract. In sum, PWW believes that the Fifth Contract is just and consistent with the public interest.

## 12 Q. Does that complete your testimony?

13 A. Yes.