1		STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
2		PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
3	3	
4	21 South Fru	3 - 9:04 a.m. it Street
5	Suite 10 Concord, NH	
6		
7		
8	RE:	DW 22-085
9		PENNICHUCK WATER WORKS, INC.: Petition for Approval of Special
10		Contract with Merrimack Village District. (Prehearing conference)
11		
12	PRESENT:	Cmsr. Pradip K. Chattopadhyay, Presiding
13		Lynn Fabrizio, Esq./PUC Legal Advisor
14		Tracey Russo, Clerk
15	ADDEADANGEG	Doube Doubishash Makes Masks Too
16	APPEARANCES:	Reptg. Pennichuck Water Works, Inc.: Marcia A. Brown, Esq. (NH Brown Law)
17		Reptg. New Hampshire Dept. of Energy:
18		Suzanne G. Amidon, Esq. Jayson Laflamme, Dir./Water Group
19		David Goyette, Water Group (Regulatory Support Division)
20		
21		
22		
23	Court Rep	oorter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52
2 4		

1		
2	INDEX	
3	PAGE NO.	
4	SUMMARY OF THE DOCKET BY CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY 5	
5		
6	ISSUE RE: MOTION FOR CONFIDENTIAL TREATMENT 6	
7	ISSUE RE: PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE 7	
8		
9	STATEMENTS OF PRELIMINARY POSITION BY:	
10	Ms. Brown 8	
11	Ms. Amidon 14	
12		
13	QUESTIONS BY CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY 16	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

PROCEEDING

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Good morning, everyone. I'm Commissioner Pradip Chattopadhyay, in the presiding role today for this prehearing conference, pursuant to RSA 363:16.

We are here this morning in Docket

22-085, regarding the Petition filed by

Pennichuck Water Works, Inc., on December 16th,

2022, for approval of a special contract with the

Merrimack Village District for the wholesale

supply of water. The Notice of Adjudicative

Proceeding issued on February 13, 2023 noted the

issues raised by the Petition, including whether

special circumstances exist to support Commission

approval of the proposed special contract between

PWW and Merrimack Village District, as just and

consistent with the public interest, as required

by RSA 378:18.

Today's prehearing conference is intended to help to move matters forward, particularly with respect to the settlement agreement of the special circumstances and need for a special contract, and any additional issues that may arise in the review of the Company's

filing.

2.

1.3

2.2

So, let's begin with the appearances.

So, I recognize Attorney Brown, for Pennichuck

Water Works, Inc.

MS. BROWN: Good morning, Commissioner Chattopadhyay. Thank you very much for the Commission's time today. My name is Marcia Brown, and I'm with NH Brown Law, and representing Pennichuck Water Works in this matter. And with me, to my right, is Larry Goodhue, who is the Chief Executive Officer of Pennichuck; to his right is Donald Ware, who is the Chief Operating Officer; and immediately behind me is Jay Kerrigan, who is the Manager of Regulatory Affairs; and then, to his right, is George Torres, who is the Chief Financial Officer.

And I would also just note for the record that, on February 14th, the Company filed its affidavit of publication for the prehearing that was as required by the order on February 13.

Thank you.

CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Thank you. Let's go to Attorney Amidon.

1 MS. AMIDON: Good morning. Suzanne 2. Amidon, for the Department of Energy Water Group. 3 And with me today is Jayson Laflamme, who is the Director of that Water Group; and an analyst from 4 5 that division, David Goyette. 6 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Thank you. 7 I don't see Office of Consumer 8 Advocate, I don't think they are participating in the docket. Do you have anything to add? 9 MS. BROWN: Yes. Commissioner 10 11 Chattopadhyay, my apologies. I forgot to 12 introduce that Merrimack Village District is also 1.3 in attendance today. And two seats behind me is 14 Jill Lavoie, and to her right is Ron Miner. 15 I just wanted to introduce those folks 16 from Merrimack Village District. And my 17 apologies for overlooking them. 18 Thank you. 19 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: And they're 20 certainly at least arm's length away from you, so 2.1 that's good. No, just kidding. 2.2 So, I'll just, for the context here, 23 I'll briefly talk about the Petition, as we 24 understand it. The Petition seeks approval of a

new special contract for wholesale water supply between Pennichuck Water Works, Inc., and Merrimack Village District, pursuant to RSA 378:18. The new contract is intended to more accurately reflect the costs for PWW to provide water to MVD. That's the understanding. And the contract would have an initial three-year term beginning on September 1st, 2023, and ending on August 30th, 2026. Or is it "August 31st"? I'm not sure. Okay. With three automatic one-year extensions after that date, until August 30th -- actually, 31st, 2029. PWW seeks approval of the new contract by June 1st, 2023, in order to meet MVD's summer demand requirements.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

So, let's go to preliminary matters. I think we -- Attorney Brown, you already talked about the affidavit of publication. So, I won't go there. I know that it was taken care of.

There was a Motion for Confidential

Treatment. On December 21st, 2022, PWW filed a

live cost of service study in support of its

Petition, with a motion pursuant to Puc 203.08

for protective order and confidential treatment

of certain confidential commercial information

1 and work product contained in that study. 2 I want to make sure I will have the 3 DOE's position on it, if you have anything to 4 share? 5 MS. AMIDON: Regarding the Petition? 6 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Regarding the 7 confidential treatment, you know, motion? 8 MS. AMIDON: We have no objection to 9 that. Thank you. 10 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Thank you. we will issue an order on that motion in the very 11 12 near future, okay? I will have to meet with the 1.3 Commissioners, the other Commissioners. 14 The procedural schedule was approved on February 13th, 2023, and modified on February 15 16 16th, to reschedule today's -- to basically have 17 the prehearing conference today. 18 Do the parties anticipate any further 19 changes to the approved schedule? 20 MS. BROWN: None from the Company. 2.1 MS. AMIDON: No, we do not. As you 2.2 probably know, from looking at the schedule, 23 we're well on our way to developing a settlement

agreement at this point. But I'll go into that

24

{

1 in more detail later. Because, if you look at 2. the procedural schedule, that final filing in the 3 docket is April 27th. 4 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Yes. Noted. 5 Are there any other preliminary matters 6 to be addressed at this time? 7 [Atty. Brown and Atty. Amidon both indicating in the negative.] 8 9 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: No. Okav. 10 So, let's take preliminary positions of 11 the parties, beginning with Pennichuck Water 12 Works. 1.3 MS. BROWN: Good morning again. Thank 14 you for the opportunity for this prehearing to 15 represent our position. 16 As the Commissioner's remarks just 17 stated, this proceeding involves approval of a 18 special contract, and the governing statute for that is RSA 378:18. And the test is whether 19 20 special circumstances exist that warrant a 2.1 departure from Pennichuck's general schedules, 2.2 just and consistent with the public interest.

And with the filing that was put forth with

accompanying schedules, prefiled testimony of

23

24

Mr. Donald Ware and Mr. Ron Minor, as well as the proposed contract, the Company does maintain that there is sufficient evidence for the Commission to make a finding that special circumstances warrant a departure from the general tariff rate schedules.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

Having said that, and as you just noted, the Company and Merrimack Village District have participated in discovery already, because of the approved procedural schedule. The parties have conducted three rounds of discovery. And, within that discovery, there were some errors, corrections — or, clarifications that need to be made to the prefiled testimony, Petition, and proposed contract. So, those will be forthcoming to this Commission likely today. So, I wanted to at least put that on the record.

We are cognizant that there is a April 27th filing deadline for the settlement agreement, and the parties are actively working toward meeting that, that deadline.

This is not the first special contract in the past year that has come before the Commission. And, in some of those past special

contract reviews, the Commission has offered two improvements of note. And one of the improvements concerned when the demand charge could be adjusted; the second involved when the volumetric charge could be adjusted.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

And, as the Commission would know from the record, the proposed contract includes those improvements, so that the demand charge can be allowed to be adjusted when there is a material investment in plant required to serve Merrimack Village District that is necessary to be made to comply with U.S. EPA and New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services' regulations.

With respect to the volumetric adjustment, the contract includes expressly that the QCPAC Program, which is the "Qualified Capital Project Adjustment Charge" Program, can also effectuate a change on that volumetric charge.

So, we thank the Commission for those improvements. And those have indeed been included in the instant contract.

Now, as I alluded to, there are changes that will be coming, likely today, with respect

to the Petition, prefiled testimony of Mr. Ware, and the proposed contract. Briefly, those are to correct the dates, as you just mentioned, the "August 30th" date should be "August 31st" date for the stub year. So, that has been corrected in the documents.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

And, also, a correction regarding the stub year, and whether that qualifies or is included in the usage calculation in Subsection 6(b). That correction is that "a stub year will be included", not that "it will not be included." So, although that is a material change, it does represent and it is more consistent with the Parties' understanding, and we apologize for that, any confusion that original error caused, but those changes will be coming today.

You will note that there is a provision in the proposed contract concerning "wheeling".

And that is, if you -- if the Commission were to recall, in Docket 21-134, which involved the Pennichuck Water Works/Merrimack Village District Emergency Special Contract, we put into the record that there were three subdivisions that Pennichuck purchases water from Merrimack Village

District to serve. And these subdivisions are in Bedford. They involve Cabot Preserve, Greenfield Farms, Parker Ridge, but not all three of those were expressly identified in the pleadings. In this docket, we have now made that clarification, so that the Commission is fully aware that the wheeling provision concerns those, not necessarily stranded, but those Pennichuck systems in Bedford for which it normally purchases water from Merrimack Village District to serve.

2.

1.3

1 4

2.1

2.2

You've already mentioned that there is a pending Motion for Protective Treatment. There being no objection from DOE, I can imagine putting that provision in a settlement agreement, so that the Commission has just one order, where it's dealing with the Motion for Protective Treatment and the Settlement Agreement. But, if the Commission deems it preferable to issue an order separate, I just wanted to set that out there, maybe that we can put it in a settlement agreement, so it will be more efficient having the Commission issue one order than two orders.

There is a pending rate case for

Pennichuck Water Works right now, that docket is DW 22-032. And I mention that, because we have some settlement filing deadlines. We have a filing deadline of a settlement in that rate case of April 19th. We have the filing of a settlement here, in this docket, on April 27th. And there is no hearing scheduled for this particular docket. However, there is a hearing scheduled on May 17th in the rate case docket. And I mention those because, yes, the Commission is going to look at the requested approvals in this particular docket. However, there is that companion rate case docket that, if there are any questions at the hearing, the Commission can ask any questions.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

We think that, in total, issuing an order for a potential June 1st start date is doable, because there is ample review time, given that the settlements for both of those dockets and the hearing are going to be before the Commission well before a June 1st -- or, well before, you know, at least two weeks before the June 1st start date. And the June 1st is requested, because, if Merrimack Village District

needs water over the summer, they will have it.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

And I just want to clarify that the contract years start September 1 and end August 31st, each contract year. The initial term is three years, and then there's an automatic renewal of one-year terms, and there are three of those. So, in total, it could be a six-year special contract. But the stub year is intended to address, should Merrimack Village District need water over the summer, that the rate will be available to it.

So, in closing, the Company and Merrimack Village District are here to answer any questions the Commission has.

CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Thank you.

Before I go to DOE, I just wanted to make sure to convey that, you know, the Motion on the Confidential Treatment, we will decide. But, until that happens, we will treat it as the information is confidential. So, just to make sure that that's understood.

So, let's go to DOE.

MS. AMIDON: Thank you. I have allergies, so please forgive me. I sound a

little croaky today.

2.

1.3

1 4

2.1

2.2

The Staff, as you probably know, has conducted the discovery on this matter already. We agree, in the first instance, we agree that special conditions exist to warrant a special contract. And, based on that conclusion, we have gone through with the discovery.

And, in the course of that discovery, as Attorney Brown mentioned, which copies of the testimony, contract, and Petition were revised.

We received a redline version of this in discovery that was submitted to us on March 30th. As Attorney Brown noted, there are additional changes she needs to make to those documents. But we have requested, and she has agreed, to file those with the Commission, so that you will be dealing with the correct documents, and we don't have to go through that recitation in the Settlement Agreement about how those documents were altered.

Having said that, we are prepared to work on the Settlement Agreement with the Company. And we had preliminary discussions about the timing of receiving the draft this

morning, and expect to be able to make the April 27th deadline.

If you have any questions, please let me know. But we are well on our way to concluding the work that needs to be done on this particular docket.

Thank you.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Thank you. So, let's go to the Commissioner questions here.

I think one of them was about what you just talked about, which is that, you know, it sprung up because I heard what Attorney Brown mentioned. So, clearly, you are all working on it.

And, so, one of the questions that I had was, will anything, with the changes, you know, with the prehearing conference being today, does the settlement date of April 27th still work? Clearly, it does. So, I'm not going to go there.

I have just maybe two or three questions.

So, you know, clearly, and you can correct me if my understanding is wrong, but the

cost of service study was done in DW 19-084, 2. right? And that study is now maybe at least 3 three years old.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

And, so, one question that I have is, does PWW have any concerns that the rates and charges established pursuant to that cost of service study will be outdated by the time the new contract with MVD will take effect on September 1st this year?

And, also, before you respond, also opine on not only that, but also what might be the situation end of six years of the contract term?

So, go ahead.

MR. WARE: So, Commissioner, two things.

There was a separate cost of service study done for this particular special contract. So, the cost of service study you referred to in DW 19-084 was to divide the costs amongst our various customer classes, Private Fire, Public/ Municipal Fire, the General Metered customers. And then, part of that was the inclusion of any special contract customers that were there at

that time. But -- and that was based on the test year 2018 operating expenses.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

The results of that was the fact that the Municipal Fire was being undercharged at the time. And laid out in the final order in DW 19-084 was a slow transition of bringing Municipal Fire rates up at a rate of three percent a year, and then reducing General Metered volumetric and meter rates by, you know, just a little over half a percent a year.

And it was agreed that we would go through a six-year period to transition, and then in part of the next PWW rate filing, you know, and not the next, the one we're in right now, 22-032, but the one that would happen with a 2024 test year, to be filed in '25, would be a full cost of service study.

In the interim, the cost of service studies that has been -- that were performed, again, are specific to each unique wholesale customer, and they are built upon the rates that were approved in DW 19-084. So, they reflect that cost of service study. They also are adjusted, because the rates to the volumetric and

the meter charges are adjusted every year as a result of that. So, these special contracts, there's an adjustment there.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

So, I believe that, you know, that we perform these cost of service studies with the most recent and current information, and in accordance with the agreement between DOE, that were approved by the Commissioners. And that, again, this will all be wrapped together, relative to a whole new cost of service study associated with a 2024 test year.

CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: So, with respect to the special contract, if I understood you, you did some additional study?

MR. WARE: Yes.

CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: But you still relied on the base study, which is the one that came from 19-084.

And, so, really, what I'm trying to understand is, as you keep going every year, will you be tracking the information to allow you to infer things appropriately, or the way this is structured, you know, basically, at least for a while, you will be using, and I'm hesitant to use

the word, you know, "stale", but sort of information that is not current?

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

MR. WARE: Right.

CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: And, so, just give me a sense of that.

MR. WARE: So, again, to address that, these unique cost of service studies are specific to the cost to the particular wholesale customer. They get built on the plant and equipment, one side of the equation, and the operating expenses the other. Those are what they are.

The cost of service study broadly done in 19-084 divides those costs amongst customer classes. So, that happened back here, in DW 19-084. The unique cost of service study isn't looking at how costs are divided between General Metered and, you know, Municipal Fire, Private Fire. It's looking at what share of the expenses that exist, and the plant and property equipment that exist, that that unique wholesale customer is going to utilize.

And, so, they're really two -- you know, that special contract is -- cost of service study is not built upon the cost of service study

1 done in 19-084. 2. CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Thank you for 3 explanation. I think I get it. So, it's -- I'm 4 just going to make sure that I understood it, and 5 you can respond. 6 So, basically, the unique realities of 7 the special, you know, customers, that is being 8 addressed. And, yes, the cost of service study that was done previously, which was more about 9 10 cost allocation, as far as the SC, the special, 11 you know, customer contract are concerned, those 12 costs are sort of being determined independently, 1.3 and you're making sure they're being recovered appropriately. That's what you're saying? 14 15 MR. WARE: That is correct. 16 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Okay. So, one 17 question I have, just out of curiosity, what is the status of the contamination issue with MVD's 18 19 wells right now? 20 MR. GOODHUE: Do you want MVD to 2.1 respond? 2.2 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Yes. I mean, 23 they can certainly --Yes. Merrimack Village 24 MS. BROWN:

1 District is able to respond to that. Thank you. 2 MR. MINER: So, we just had our last treatment plant on line, put on line the 20th of 3 4 March, thank you, want to get the month right. 5 So, all of our treatment plants are 6 operational [?]. We're still waiting for one 7 well to come on line, which should be within the 8 next two weeks or so. It's going to be treated 9 by that last plant that came on line. 10 CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Okay. Thank you. 11 Again, give me a summary on, and, again, this is 12 just for my understanding, and I know you are 1.3 going to be filing something new, you know, 14 supplemental, all of that. But, very briefly, 15 tell me what are the key drivers for the proposed 16 new contract terms? 17 MS. BROWN: I'm just going to find 18 They are listed either in the Petition or them. 19 the testimony. 20 [Short pause.] 21 MS. BROWN: Okay. All right. Donald 2.2 Ware is going to help me here. 23 MR. WARE: So, relative to the key 24 drivers, Commissioner, you're looking at the

2.

1.3

2.2

various demands that the Merrimack Village

District is going to place upon the PWW system.

So, the way the cost of service studies are done for a wholesale contract, there are four different capacity numbers that are looked at.

There is the guarantied minimum purchase amount, which is viewed over a period of a year. And, in this case, the Merrimack Village District is guaranteeing that they will purchase at least 250,000 gallons per day of water over the course of a contract year. If they do not purchase that amount of water, they still pay for that amount of water.

Secondarily, they are reserving, so to speak, the ability of Pennichuck's water treatment plant to produce a half a million gallons a day under all conditions, other than a true emergency. So that, you know, they don't call up and say or they go to start their pumping station, and we say "Sorry, we don't have enough water for you today. We're, you know, busy keeping the lawns in Nashua green."

Thirdly, they're limiting their peak hour demand -- or, their peak day demand to half

2.4

a million gallons a day.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

And, lastly, their peak hour demand flow rate is also half a million gallons a day. So, they're a very nice customer that, normally, if you look at a typical customer pattern, there's times that, you know, they're using a little water, and then, you know, later in the day a lot of water, and there's a lot of cycling back and forth. But, because they have storage and their own supply, you know, they're looking to put a steady drawl on our system that at any hour in any day is not going to exceed half a million gallons a day, which is roughly 347 gallons per minute. They're going to limit their maximum day to half a million gallons a day. And then, again, they're going to guarantee the purchase of a quarter of a million gallons a day over a period of 365 days a year.

Those are the drivers and the metrics used to shape their share of both our fixed and variable costs.

CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Thank you.

Is there anything else that we need to cover?

```
MS. AMIDON: Not for the Department.
 1
 2
          Thank you.
 3
                    CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Thank you.
                    MS. BROWN: Nothing from the Company.
 4
                    CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: Okay. So, thank
 5
         you, everyone. We are adjourned.
 6
 7
                    (Whereupon the prehearing conference
                    was adjourned at 9:34 a.m.)
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```