

Scott J. Rubin

Attorney + Consultant

333 Oak Lane • Bloomsburg, PA 17815

Current Position

Public Utility Attorney and Consultant. 1994 to present. I provide legal, consulting, and expert witness services to various organizations interested in the regulation of public utilities.

Previous Positions

Lecturer in Computer Science, Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, PA. 1993 to 2000.

Senior Assistant Consumer Advocate, Office of Consumer Advocate, Harrisburg, PA. 1990 to 1994.

I supervised the administrative and technical staff and shared with one other senior attorney the supervision of a legal staff of 14 attorneys.

Assistant Consumer Advocate, Office of Consumer Advocate, Harrisburg, PA. 1983 to 1990.

Associate, Laws and Staruch, Harrisburg, PA. 1981 to 1983.

Law Clerk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC. 1980 to 1981.

Research Assistant, Rockville Consulting Group, Washington, DC. 1979.

Current Professional Activities

Member, American Bar Association, Public Utility Law Section.

Member, American Water Works Association.

Admitted to practice law before the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, the New York State Court of Appeals, the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and the Supreme Court of the United States.

Previous Professional Activities

Member, American Water Works Association, Rates and Charges Subcommittee, 1998-2001.

Member, Federal Advisory Committee on Disinfectants and Disinfection By-Products in Drinking Water, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC. 1992 to 1994.

Chair, Water Committee, National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, Washington, DC. 1990 to 1994; member of committee from 1988 to 1990.

Member, Board of Directors, Pennsylvania Energy Development Authority, Harrisburg, PA. 1990 to 1994.

Member, Small Water Systems Advisory Committee, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources, Harrisburg, PA. 1990 to 1992.

Member, Ad Hoc Committee on Emissions Control and Acid Rain Compliance, National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, 1991.

Member, Nitrogen Oxides Subcommittee of the Acid Rain Advisory Committee, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington DC. 1991.

Education

J.D. with Honors, George Washington University, Washington, DC. 1981.

B.A. with Distinction in Political Science, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA. 1978.

Publications and Presentations (* denotes peer-reviewed publications)

1. "Quality of Service Issues," a speech to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission Consumer Conference, State College, PA. 1988.
2. K.L. Pape and S.J. Rubin, "Current Developments in Water Utility Law," in *Pennsylvania Public Utility Law* (Pennsylvania Bar Institute). 1990.
3. Presentation on Water Utility Holding Companies to the Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, Orlando, FL. 1990.
4. "How the OCA Approaches Quality of Service Issues," a speech to the Pennsylvania Chapter of the National Association of Water Companies. 1991.
5. Presentation on the Safe Drinking Water Act to the Mid-Year Meeting of the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, Seattle, WA. 1991.
6. "A Consumer Advocate's View of Federal Pre-emption in Electric Utility Cases," a speech to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission Electricity Conference. 1991.
7. Workshop on Safe Drinking Water Act Compliance Issues at the Mid-Year Meeting of the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, Washington, DC. 1992.
8. Formal Discussant, Regional Acid Rain Workshop, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and National Regulatory Research Institute, Charlotte, NC. 1992.
9. S.J. Rubin and S.P. O'Neal, "A Quantitative Assessment of the Viability of Small Water Systems in Pennsylvania," *Proceedings of the Eighth NARUC Biennial Regulatory Information Conference*, National Regulatory Research Institute (Columbus, OH 1992), IV:79-97.
10. "The OCA's Concerns About Drinking Water," a speech to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission Water Conference. 1992.
11. Member, Technical Horizons Panel, Annual Meeting of the National Association of Water Companies, Hilton Head, SC. 1992.
12. M.D. Klein and S.J. Rubin, "Water and Sewer -- Update on Clean Streams, Safe Drinking Water, Waste Disposal and Pennvest," *Pennsylvania Public Utility Law Conference* (Pennsylvania Bar Institute). 1992.

13. Presentation on Small Water System Viability to the Technical Assistance Center for Small Water Companies, Pa. Department of Environmental Resources, Harrisburg, PA. 1993
14. "The Results Through a Public Service Commission Lens," speaker and participant in panel discussion at Symposium: "Impact of EPA's Allowance Auction," Washington, DC, sponsored by AER*X. 1993.
15. "The Hottest Legislative Issue of Today -- Reauthorization of the Safe Drinking Water Act," speaker and participant in panel discussion at the Annual Conference of the American Water Works Association, San Antonio, TX. 1993.
16. "Water Service in the Year 2000," a speech to the Conference: "Utilities and Public Policy III: The Challenges of Change," sponsored by the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission and the Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA. 1993.
17. "Government Regulation of the Drinking Water Supply: Is it Properly Focused?," speaker and participant in panel discussion at the National Consumers League's Forum on Drinking Water Safety and Quality, Washington, DC. 1993. Reprinted in *Rural Water*, Vol. 15 No. 1 (Spring 1994), pages 13-16.
18. "Telephone Penetration Rates for Renters in Pennsylvania," a study prepared for the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate. 1993.
19. "Zealous Advocacy, Ethical Limitations and Considerations," participant in panel discussion at "Continuing Legal Education in Ethics for Pennsylvania Lawyers," sponsored by the Office of General Counsel, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, State College, PA. 1993.
20. "Serving the Customer," participant in panel discussion at the Annual Conference of the National Association of Water Companies, Williamsburg, VA. 1993.
21. "A Simple, Inexpensive, Quantitative Method to Assess the Viability of Small Water Systems," a speech to the Water Supply Symposium, New York Section of the American Water Works Association, Syracuse, NY. 1993.
22. * S.J. Rubin, "Are Water Rates Becoming Unaffordable?," *Journal American Water Works Association*, Vol. 86, No. 2 (February 1994), pages 79-86.
23. "Why Water Rates Will Double (If We're Lucky): Federal Drinking Water Policy and Its Effect on New England," a briefing for the New England Conference of Public Utilities Commissioners, Andover, MA. 1994.
24. "Are Water Rates Becoming Unaffordable?," a speech to the Legislative and Regulatory Conference, Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies, Washington, DC. 1994.
25. "Relationships: Drinking Water, Health, Risk and Affordability," speaker and participant in panel discussion at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Association of Regulatory Commissioners, Charleston, SC. 1994.
26. "Small System Viability: Assessment Methods and Implementation Issues," speaker and participant in panel discussion at the Annual Conference of the American Water Works Association, New York, NY. 1994.

27. S.J. Rubin, "How much should we spend to save a life?," *Seattle Journal of Commerce*, August 18, 1994 (Protecting the Environment Supplement), pages B-4 to B-5.
28. S. Rubin, S. Bernow, M. Fulmer, J. Goldstein, and I. Peters, *An Evaluation of Kentucky-American Water Company's Long-Range Planning*, prepared for the Utility and Rate Intervention Division, Kentucky Office of the Attorney General (Tellus Institute 1994).
29. S.J. Rubin, "Small System Monitoring: What Does It Mean?," *Impacts of Monitoring for Phase II/V Drinking Water Regulations on Rural and Small Communities* (National Rural Water Association 1994), pages 6-12.
30. "Surviving the Safe Drinking Water Act," speaker at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, Reno, NV. 1994.
31. "Safe Drinking Water Act Compliance -- Ratemaking Implications," speaker at the National Conference of Regulatory Attorneys, Scottsdale, AZ. 1995. Reprinted in *Water*, Vol. 36, No. 2 (Summer 1995), pages 28-29.
32. S.J. Rubin, "Water: Why Isn't it Free? The Case of Small Utilities in Pennsylvania," *Utilities, Consumers & Public Policy: Issues of Quality, Affordability, and Competition, Proceedings of the Fourth Utilities, Consumers and Public Policy Conference* (Pennsylvania State University 1995), pages 177-183.
33. S.J. Rubin, "Water Rates: An Affordable Housing Issue?," *Home Energy*, Vol. 12 No. 4 (July/August 1995), page 37.
34. Speaker and participant in the Water Policy Forum, sponsored by the National Association of Water Companies, Naples, FL. 1995.
35. Participant in panel discussion on "The Efficient and Effective Maintenance and Delivery of Potable Water at Affordable Rates to the People of New Jersey," at The New Advocacy: Protecting Consumers in the Emerging Era of Utility Competition, a conference sponsored by the New Jersey Division of the Ratepayer Advocate, Newark, NJ. 1995.
36. J.E. Cromwell III, and S.J. Rubin, *Development of Benchmark Measures for Viability Assessment* (Pa. Department of Environmental Protection 1995).
37. S. Rubin, "A Nationwide Practice from a Small Town in Pa.," *Lawyers & the Internet -- a Supplement to the Legal Intelligencer and Pa. Law Weekly* (February 12, 1996), page S6.
38. "Changing Customers' Expectations in the Water Industry," speaker at the Mid-America Regulatory Commissioners Conference, Chicago, IL. 1996, reprinted in *Water* Vol. 37 No. 3 (Winter 1997), pages 12-14.
39. "Recent Federal Legislation Affecting Drinking Water Utilities," speaker at Pennsylvania Public Utility Law Conference, Pennsylvania Bar Institute, Hershey, PA. 1996.
40. "Clean Water at Affordable Rates: A Ratepayers Conference," moderator at symposium sponsored by the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate, Trenton, NJ. 1996.

41. "Water Workshop: How New Laws Will Affect the Economic Regulation of the Water Industry," speaker at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, San Francisco, CA. 1996.
42. * E.T. Castillo, S.J. Rubin, S.K. Keefe, and R.S. Raucher, "Restructuring Small Systems," *Journal American Water Works Association*, Vol. 89, No. 1 (January 1997), pages 65-74.
43. * J.E. Cromwell III, S.J. Rubin, F.C. Marrocco, and M.E. Leevan, "Business Planning for Small System Capacity Development," *Journal American Water Works Association*, Vol. 89, No. 1 (January 1997), pages 47-57.
44. "Capacity Development – More than Viability Under a New Name," speaker at National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners Winter Meetings, Washington, DC. 1997.
45. * E. Castillo, S.K. Keefe, R.S. Raucher, and S.J. Rubin, *Small System Restructuring to Facilitate SDWA Compliance: An Analysis of Potential Feasibility* (AWWA Research Foundation, 1997).
46. H. Himmelberger, *et al.*, *Capacity Development Strategy Report for the Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission* (Aug. 1997).
47. Briefing on Issues Affecting the Water Utility Industry, Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, Boston, MA. 1997.
48. "Capacity Development in the Water Industry," speaker at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, Boston, MA. 1997.
49. "The Ticking Bomb: Competitive Electric Metering, Billing, and Collection," speaker at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, Boston, MA. 1997.
50. Scott J. Rubin, "A Nationwide Look at the Affordability of Water Service," *Proceedings of the 1998 Annual Conference of the American Water Works Association*, Water Research, Vol. C, No. 3, pages 113-129 (American Water Works Association, 1998).
51. Scott J. Rubin, "30 Technology Tips in 30 Minutes," *Pennsylvania Public Utility Law Conference*, Vol. I, pages 101-110 (Pa. Bar Institute, 1998).
52. Scott J. Rubin, "Effects of Electric and Gas Deregulation on the Water Industry," *Pennsylvania Public Utility Law Conference*, Vol. I, pages 139-146 (Pa. Bar Institute, 1998).
53. Scott J. Rubin, *The Challenges and Changing Mission of Utility Consumer Advocates* (American Association of Retired Persons, 1999).
54. "Consumer Advocacy for the Future," speaker at the Age of Awareness Conference, Changes and Choices: Utilities in the New Millennium, Carlisle, PA. 1999.
55. Keynote Address, \$1 Energy Fund, Inc., Annual Membership Meeting, Monroeville, PA. 1999.
56. Scott J. Rubin, "Assessing the Effect of the Proposed Radon Rule on the Affordability of Water Service," prepared for the American Water Works Association. 1999.

57. Scott J. Rubin and Janice A. Beecher, The Impacts of Electric Restructuring on the Water and Wastewater Industry, *Proceedings of the Small Drinking Water and Wastewater Systems International Symposium and Technology Expo* (Phoenix, AZ 2000), pp. 66-75.
58. American Water Works Association, *Principles of Water Rates, Fees, and Charges, Manual M1 – Fifth Edition* (AWWA 2000), Member, Editorial Committee.
59. Janice A. Beecher and Scott J. Rubin, presentation on “Special Topics in Rate Design: Affordability” at the Annual Conference and Exhibition of the American Water Works Association, Denver, CO. 2000.
60. Scott J. Rubin, “The Future of Drinking Water Regulation,” a speech at the Annual Conference and Exhibition of the American Water Works Association, Denver, CO. 2000.
61. Janice A. Beecher and Scott J. Rubin, “Deregulation Impacts and Opportunities,” a presentation at the Annual Conference and Exhibition of the American Water Works Association, Denver, CO. 2000.
62. Scott J. Rubin, “Estimating the Effect of Different Arsenic Maximum Contaminant Levels on the Affordability of Water Service,” prepared for the American Water Works Association. 2000.
63. * Janice A. Beecher and Scott J. Rubin, *Deregulation! Impacts on the Water Industry*, American Water Works Association Research Foundation, Denver, CO. 2000.
64. Scott J. Rubin, Methods for Assessing, Evaluating, and Assisting Small Water Systems, NARUC Annual Regulatory Studies Program, East Lansing, MI. 2000.
65. Scott J. Rubin, Consumer Issues in the Water Industry, NARUC Annual Regulatory Studies Program, East Lansing, MI. 2000.
66. “Be Utility Wise in a Restructured Utility Industry,” Keynote Address at Be UtilityWise Conference, Pittsburgh, PA. 2000.
67. Scott J. Rubin, Jason D. Sharp, and Todd S. Stewart, “The Wired Administrative Lawyer,” *5th Annual Administrative Law Symposium*, Pennsylvania Bar Institute, Harrisburg, PA. 2000.
68. Scott J. Rubin, “Current Developments in the Water Industry,” *Pennsylvania Public Utility Law Conference*, Pennsylvania Bar Institute, Harrisburg, PA. 2000.
69. Scott J. Rubin, “Viewpoint: Change Sickening Attitudes,” *Engineering News-Record*, Dec. 18, 2000.
70. Janice A. Beecher and Scott J. Rubin, “Ten Practices of Highly Effective Water Utilities,” *Opflow*, April 2001, pp. 1, 6-7, 16; reprinted in *Water and Wastes Digest*, December 2004, pp. 22-25.
71. Scott J. Rubin, “Pennsylvania Utilities: How Are Consumers, Workers, and Corporations Faring in the Deregulated Electricity, Gas, and Telephone Industries?” Keystone Research Center. 2001.
72. Scott J. Rubin, “Guest Perspective: A First Look at the Impact of Electric Deregulation on Pennsylvania,” *LEAP Letter*, May-June 2001, pp. 2-3.

73. Scott J. Rubin, Consumer Protection in the Water Industry, NARUC Annual Regulatory Studies Program, East Lansing, MI. 2001.
74. Scott J. Rubin, Impacts of Deregulation on the Water Industry, NARUC Annual Regulatory Studies Program, East Lansing, MI. 2001.
75. Scott J. Rubin, "Economic Characteristics of Small Systems," *Critical Issues in Setting Regulatory Standards*, National Rural Water Association, 2001, pp. 7-22.
76. Scott J. Rubin, "Affordability of Water Service," *Critical Issues in Setting Regulatory Standards*, National Rural Water Association, 2001, pp. 23-42.
77. Scott J. Rubin, "Criteria to Assess the Affordability of Water Service," White Paper, National Rural Water Association, 2001.
78. Scott J. Rubin, Providing Affordable Water Service to Low-Income Families, presentation to Portland Water Bureau, Portland, OR. 2001.
79. Scott J. Rubin, Issues Relating to the Affordability and Sustainability of Rates for Water Service, presentation to the Water Utility Council of the American Water Works Association, New Orleans, LA. 2002.
80. Scott J. Rubin, The Utility Industries Compared – Water, NARUC Annual Regulatory Studies Program, East Lansing, MI. 2002.
81. Scott J. Rubin, Legal Perspective on Water Regulation, NARUC Annual Regulatory Studies Program, East Lansing, MI. 2002.
82. Scott J. Rubin, Regulatory Options for Water Utilities, NARUC Annual Regulatory Studies Program, East Lansing, MI. 2002.
83. Scott J. Rubin, Overview of Small Water System Consolidation, presentation to National Drinking Water Advisory Council Small Systems Affordability Working Group, Washington, DC. 2002.
84. Scott J. Rubin, Defining Affordability and Low-Income Household Tradeoffs, presentation to National Drinking Water Advisory Council Small Systems Affordability Working Group, Washington, DC. 2002.
85. Scott J. Rubin, "Thinking Outside the Hearing Room," *Pennsylvania Public Utility Law Conference*, Pennsylvania Bar Institute, Harrisburg, PA. 2002.
86. Scott J. Rubin, "Update of Affordability Database," White Paper, National Rural Water Association. 2003.
87. Scott J. Rubin, *Understanding Telephone Penetration in Pennsylvania*, Council on Utility Choice, Harrisburg, PA. 2003.
88. Scott J. Rubin, *The Cost of Water and Wastewater Service in the United States*, National Rural Water Association, 2003.

89. Scott J. Rubin, What Price Safer Water? Presentation at Annual Conference of National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, Atlanta, GA. 2003.
90. George M. Aman, III, Jeffrey P. Garton, Eric Petersen, and Scott J. Rubin, Challenges and Opportunities for Improving Water Supply Institutional Arrangements, *Water Law Conference*, Pennsylvania Bar Institute, Mechanicsburg, PA. 2004.
91. Scott J. Rubin, Serving Low-Income Water Customers. Presentation at American Water Works Association Annual Conference, Orlando, FL. 2004.
92. Scott J. Rubin, Thinking Outside the Bill: Serving Low-Income Water Customers. Presentation at National League of Cities Annual Congress of Cities, Indianapolis, IN. 2004.
93. Scott J. Rubin, Buying and Selling a Water System – Ratemaking Implications, *Pennsylvania Public Utility Law Conference*, Pennsylvania Bar Institute, Harrisburg, PA. 2005.
94. *Thinking Outside the Bill: A Utility Manager's Guide to Assisting Low-Income Water Customers*, American Water Works Association. 2005.
95. * Scott J. Rubin, "Census Data Shed Light on US Water and Wastewater Costs," *Journal American Water Works Association*, Vol. 97, No. 4 (April 2005), pages 99-110, reprinted in Maxwell, *The Business of Water: A Concise Overview of Challenges and Opportunities in the Water Market.*, American Water Works Association, Denver, CO. 2008.
96. Scott J. Rubin, Review of U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Notice Concerning Revision of National-Level Affordability Methodology, National Rural Water Association. 2006.
97. * Robert S. Raucher, et al., *Regional Solutions to Water Supply Provision*, American Water Works Association Research Foundation, Denver, CO. 2007.
98. Scott J. Rubin, Robert Raucher, and Megan Harrod, The Relationship Between Household Financial Distress and Health: Implications for Drinking Water Regulation, National Rural Water Association. 2007.
99. * John Cromwell and Scott Rubin, *Estimating Benefits of Regional Solutions for Water and Wastewater Service*, American Water Works Association Research Foundation, Denver, CO. 2008.
100. Scott J. Rubin, "Current State of the Water Industry and Stimulus Bill Overview," in *Pennsylvania Public Utility Law* (Pennsylvania Bar Institute). 2009.
101. Scott J. Rubin, Best Practice in Customer Payment Assistance Programs, webcast presentation sponsored by Water Research Foundation. 2009.
102. * Scott J. Rubin, How Should We Regulate Small Water Utilities?, National Regulatory Research Institute. 2009.
103. * John Cromwell III, et al., *Best Practices in Customer Payment Assistance Programs*, Water Research Foundation, Denver, CO. 2010.

104. * Scott J. Rubin, What Does Water Really Cost? Rate Design Principles for an Era of Supply Shortages, Infrastructure Upgrades, and Enhanced Water Conservation, , National Regulatory Research Institute. 2010.
105. Scott J. Rubin and Christopher P.N. Woodcock, Teleseminar: Water Rate Design, National Regulatory Research Institute. 2010.
106. David Monie and Scott J. Rubin, Cost of Service Studies and Water Rate Design: A Debate on the Utility and Regulatory Perspectives, Meeting of New England Chapter of National Association of Water Companies, Newport, RI. 2010.
107. * Scott J. Rubin, A Call for Water Utility Reliability Standards: Regulating Water Utilities' Infrastructure Programs to Achieve a Balance of Safety, Risk, and Cost, National Regulatory Research Institute. 2010.
108. * Raucher, Robert S.; Rubin, Scott J.; Crawford-Brown, Douglas; and Lawson, Megan M. "Benefit-Cost Analysis for Drinking Water Standards: Efficiency, Equity, and Affordability Considerations in Small Communities," *Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis*: Vol. 2: Issue 1, Article 4. 2011.
109. Scott J. Rubin, A Call for Reliability Standards, *Journal American Water Works Association*, Vol. 103, No. 1 (Jan. 2011), pp. 22-24.
110. Scott J. Rubin, Current Topics in Water: Rate Design and Reliability. Presentation to the Water Committee of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, Washington, DC. 2011.
111. Scott J. Rubin, Water Reliability and Resilience Standards, *Pennsylvania Public Utility Law Conference* (Pennsylvania Bar Institute). 2011.
112. Member of Expert Panel, Leadership Forum: Business Management for the Future, Annual Conference and Exposition of the American Water Works Association, Washington, DC. 2011.
113. Scott J. Rubin, Evaluating Community Affordability in Storm Water Control Plans, *Flowing into the Future: Evolving Water Issues* (Pennsylvania Bar Institute). 2011.
114. Invited Participant, Summit on Declining Water Demand and Revenues, sponsored by The Alliance for Water Efficiency, Racine, WI. 2012.
115. *Scott J. Rubin, Evaluating Violations of Drinking Water Regulations, *Journal American Water Works Association*, Vol. 105, No. 3 (Mar. 2013), pp. 51-52 (Expanded Summary) and E137-E147. Winner of the AWWA Small Systems Division Best Paper Award.
116. *Scott J. Rubin, Structural Changes in the Water Utility Industry During the 2000s, *Journal American Water Works Association*, Vol. 105, No. 3 (Mar. 2013), pp. 53-54 (Expanded Summary) and E148-E156.

Testimony as an Expert Witness

1. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Pennsylvania Gas and Water Co. - Water Division*, Pa. Public Utility Commission, Docket R-00922404. 1992. Concerning rate design, on behalf of the Pa. Office of Consumer Advocate.

2. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Shenango Valley Water Co.*, Pa. Public Utility Commission, Docket R-00922420. 1992. Concerning cost allocation, on behalf of the Pa. Office of Consumer Advocate
3. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Pennsylvania Gas and Water Co. - Water Division*, Pa. Public Utility Commission, Docket R-00922482. 1993. Concerning rate design, on behalf of the Pa. Office of Consumer Advocate
4. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Colony Water Co.*, Pa. Public Utility Commission, Docket R-00922375. 1993. Concerning rate design, on behalf of the Pa. Office of Consumer Advocate
5. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Dauphin Consolidated Water Supply Co. and General Waterworks of Pennsylvania, Inc.*, Pa. Public Utility Commission, Docket R-00932604. 1993. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Pa. Office of Consumer Advocate
6. *West Penn Power Co. v. State Tax Department of West Virginia*, Circuit Court of Kanawha County, West Virginia, Civil Action No. 89-C-3056. 1993. Concerning regulatory policy and the effects of a taxation statute on out-of-state utility ratepayers, on behalf of the Pa. Office of Consumer Advocate
7. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Pennsylvania Gas and Water Co. - Water Division*, Pa. Public Utility Commission, Docket R-00932667. 1993. Concerning rate design and affordability of service, on behalf of the Pa. Office of Consumer Advocate
8. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. National Utilities, Inc.*, Pa. Public Utility Commission, Docket R-00932828. 1994. Concerning rate design, on behalf of the Pa. Office of Consumer Advocate
9. *An Investigation of the Sources of Supply and Future Demand of Kentucky-American Water Company*, Ky. Public Service Commission, Case No. 93-434. 1994. Concerning supply and demand planning, on behalf of the Kentucky Office of Attorney General, Utility and Rate Intervention Division.
10. *The Petition on Behalf of Gordon's Corner Water Company for an Increase in Rates*, New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. WR94020037. 1994. Concerning revenue requirements and rate design, on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate.
11. *Re Consumers Maine Water Company Request for Approval of Contracts with Consumers Water Company and with Ohio Water Service Company*, Me. Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 94-352. 1994. Concerning affiliated interest agreements, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate.
12. *In the Matter of the Application of Potomac Electric Power Company for Approval of its Third Least-Cost Plan*, D.C. Public Service Commission, Formal Case No. 917, Phase II. 1995. Concerning Clean Air Act implementation and environmental externalities, on behalf of the District of Columbia Office of the People's Counsel.
13. *In the Matter of the Regulation of the Electric Fuel Component Contained within the Rate Schedules of the Dayton Power and Light Company and Related Matters*, Ohio Public Utilities Commission, Case No. 94-105-EL-EFC. 1995. Concerning Clean Air Act implementation (case settled before testimony was filed), on behalf of the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.

14. *Kennebec Water District Proposed Increase in Rates*, Maine Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 95-091. 1995. Concerning the reasonableness of planning decisions and the relationship between a publicly owned water district and a very large industrial customer, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate.
15. *Winter Harbor Water Company, Proposed Schedule Revisions to Introduce a Readiness-to-Serve Charge*, Maine Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 95-271. 1995 and 1996. Concerning standards for, and the reasonableness of, imposing a readiness to serve charge and/or exit fee on the customers of a small investor-owned water utility, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate.
16. *In the Matter of the 1995 Long-Term Electric Forecast Report of the Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 95-203-EL-FOR, and *In the Matter of the Two-Year Review of the Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company's Environmental Compliance Plan Pursuant to Section 4913.05, Revised Cost*, Case No. 95-747-EL-ECP. 1996. Concerning the reasonableness of the utility's long-range supply and demand-management plans, the reasonableness of its plan for complying with the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, and discussing methods to ensure the provision of utility service to low-income customers, on behalf of the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
17. *In the Matter of Notice of the Adjustment of the Rates of Kentucky-American Water Company*, Kentucky Public Service Commission, Case No. 95-554. 1996. Concerning rate design, cost of service, and sales forecast issues, on behalf of the Kentucky Office of Attorney General.
18. *In the Matter of the Application of Citizens Utilities Company for a Hearing to Determine the Fair Value of its Properties for Ratemaking Purposes, to Fix a Just and Reasonable Rate of Return Thereon, and to Approve Rate Schedules Designed to Provide such Rate of Return*, Arizona Corporation Commission, Docket Nos. E-1032-95-417, *et al.* 1996. Concerning rate design, cost of service, and the price elasticity of water demand, on behalf of the Arizona Residential Utility Consumer Office.
19. *Cochrane v. Bangor Hydro-Electric Company*, Maine Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 96-053. 1996. Concerning regulatory requirements for an electric utility to engage in unregulated business enterprises, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate.
20. *In the Matter of the Regulation of the Electric Fuel Component Contained within the Rate Schedules of Monongahela Power Company and Related Matters*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 96-106-EL-EFC. 1996. Concerning the costs and procedures associated with the implementation of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, on behalf of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
21. *In the Matter of the Regulation of the Electric Fuel Component Contained within the Rate Schedules of Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company and Toledo Edison Company and Related Matters*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case Nos. 96-107-EL-EFC and 96-108-EL-EFC. 1996. Concerning the costs and procedures associated with the implementation of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, on behalf of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
22. *In the Matter of the Regulation of the Electric Fuel Component Contained within the Rate Schedules of Ohio Power Company and Columbus Southern Power Company and Related Matters*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case Nos. 96-101-EL-EFC and 96-102-EL-EFC. 1997. Concerning the costs and procedures associated with the implementation of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, on behalf of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.

23. *An Investigation of the Sources of Supply and Future Demand of Kentucky-American Water Company (Phase II)*, Kentucky Public Service Commission, Docket No. 93-434. 1997. Concerning supply and demand planning, on behalf of the Kentucky Office of Attorney General, Public Service Litigation Branch.
24. *In the Matter of the Regulation of the Electric Fuel Component Contained within the Rate Schedules of Cincinnati Gas and Electric Co. and Related Matters*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 96-103-EL-EFC. 1997. Concerning the costs and procedures associated with the implementation of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, on behalf of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
25. *Bangor Hydro-Electric Company Petition for Temporary Rate Increase*, Maine Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 97-201. 1997. Concerning the reasonableness of granting an electric utility's request for emergency rate relief, and related issues, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate.
26. *Testimony concerning H.B. 1068 Relating to Restructuring of the Natural Gas Utility Industry*, Consumer Affairs Committee, Pennsylvania House of Representatives. 1997. Concerning the provisions of proposed legislation to restructure the natural gas utility industry in Pennsylvania, on behalf of the Pennsylvania AFL-CIO Gas Utility Caucus.
27. *In the Matter of the Regulation of the Electric Fuel Component Contained within the Rate Schedules of Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company and Toledo Edison Company and Related Matters*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case Nos. 97-107-EL-EFC and 97-108-EL-EFC. 1997. Concerning the costs and procedures associated with the implementation of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, on behalf of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
28. *In the Matter of the Petition of Valley Road Sewerage Company for a Revision in Rates and Charges for Water Service*, New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. WR92080846J. 1997. Concerning the revenue requirements and rate design for a wastewater treatment utility, on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate.
29. *Bangor Gas Company, L.L.C., Petition for Approval to Furnish Gas Service in the State of Maine*, Maine Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 97-795. 1998. Concerning the standards and public policy concerns involved in issuing a certificate of public convenience and necessity for a new natural gas utility, and related ratemaking issues, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate.
30. *In the Matter of the Investigation on Motion of the Commission into the Adequacy of the Public Utility Water Service Provided by Tidewater Utilities, Inc., in Areas in Southern New Castle County, Delaware*, Delaware Public Service Commission, Docket No. 309-97. 1998. Concerning the standards for the provision of efficient, sufficient, and adequate water service, and the application of those standards to a water utility, on behalf of the Delaware Division of the Public Advocate.
31. *In the Matter of the Regulation of the Electric Fuel Component Contained within the Rate Schedules of Cincinnati Gas and Electric Co. and Related Matters*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 97-103-EL-EFC. 1998. Concerning fuel-related transactions with affiliated companies and the appropriate ratemaking treatment and regulatory safeguards involving such transactions, on behalf of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
32. *Olde Port Mariner Fleet, Inc. Complaint Regarding Casco Bay Island Transit District's Tour and Charter Service*, Maine Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 98-161. 1998. Concerning the standards and

requirements for allocating costs and separating operations between regulated and unregulated operations of a transportation utility, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate and Olde Port Mariner Fleet, Inc.

33. *Central Maine Power Company Investigation of Stranded Costs, Transmission and Distribution Utility Revenue Requirements, and Rate Design*, Maine Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 97-580. 1998. Concerning the treatment of existing rate discounts when designing rates for a transmission and distribution electric utility, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate.
34. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Manufacturers Water Company*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-00984275. 1998. Concerning rate design on behalf of the Manufacturers Water Industrial Users.
35. *In the Matter of Petition of Pennsgrove Water Supply Company for an Increase in Rates for Water Service*, New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. WR98030147. 1998. Concerning the revenue requirements, level of affiliated charges, and rate design for a water utility, on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate.
36. *In the Matter of Petition of Seaview Water Company for an Increase in Rates for Water Service*, New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. WR98040193. 1999. Concerning the revenue requirements and rate design for a water utility, on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate.
37. *In the Matter of the Regulation of the Electric Fuel Component Contained within the Rate Schedules of Ohio Power Company and Columbus Southern Power Company and Related Matters*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case Nos. 98-101-EL-EFC and 98-102-EL-EFC. 1999. Concerning the costs and procedures associated with the implementation of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, on behalf of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
38. *In the Matter of the Regulation of the Electric Fuel Component Contained within the Rate Schedules of Dayton Power and Light Company and Related Matters*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 98-105-EL-EFC. 1999. Concerning the costs and procedures associated with the implementation of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, on behalf of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
39. *In the Matter of the Regulation of the Electric Fuel Component Contained within the Rate Schedules of Monongahela Power Company and Related Matters*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 99-106-EL-EFC. 1999. Concerning the costs and procedures associated with the implementation of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, on behalf of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
40. *County of Suffolk, et al. v. Long Island Lighting Company, et al.*, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York, Case No. 87-CV-0646. 2000. Submitted two affidavits concerning the calculation and collection of court-ordered refunds to utility customers, on behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs.
41. *Northern Utilities, Inc., Petition for Waivers from Chapter 820*, Maine Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 99-254. 2000. Concerning the standards and requirements for defining and separating a natural gas utility's core and non-core business functions, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate.
42. *Notice of Adjustment of the Rates of Kentucky-American Water Company*, Kentucky Public Service Commission, Case No. 2000-120. 2000. Concerning the appropriate methods for allocating costs and designing rates, on behalf of the Kentucky Office of Attorney General.

43. *In the Matter of the Petition of Gordon's Corner Water Company for an Increase in Rates and Charges for Water Service*, New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. WR00050304. 2000. Concerning the revenue requirements and rate design for a water utility, on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate.
44. *Testimony concerning Arsenic in Drinking Water: An Update on the Science, Benefits, and Costs*, Committee on Science, United States House of Representatives. 2001. Concerning the effects on low-income households and small communities from a more stringent regulation of arsenic in drinking water.
45. *In the Matter of the Application of The Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company for an Increase in Gas Rates in its Service Territory*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 01-1228-GA-AIR, *et al.* 2002. Concerning the need for and structure of a special rider and alternative form of regulation for an accelerated main replacement program, on behalf of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
46. *Pennsylvania State Treasurer's Hearing on Enron and Corporate Governance Issues*. 2002. Concerning Enron's role in Pennsylvania's electricity market and related issues, on behalf of the Pennsylvania AFL-CIO.
47. *An Investigation into the Feasibility and Advisability of Kentucky-American Water Company's Proposed Solution to its Water Supply Deficit*, Kentucky Public Service Commission, Case No. 2001-00117. 2002. Concerning water supply planning, regulatory oversight, and related issue, on behalf of the Kentucky Office of Attorney General.
48. *Joint Application of Pennsylvania-American Water Company and Thames Water Aqua Holdings GmbH*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket Nos. A-212285F0096 and A-230073F0004. 2002. Concerning the risks and benefits associated with the proposed acquisition of a water utility, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
49. *Application for Approval of the Transfer of Control of Kentucky-American Water Company to RWE AG and Thames Water Aqua Holdings GmbH*, Kentucky Public Service Commission, Case No. 2002-00018. 2002. Concerning the risks and benefits associated with the proposed acquisition of a water utility, on behalf of the Kentucky Office of Attorney General.
50. *Joint Petition for the Consent and Approval of the Acquisition of the Outstanding Common Stock of American Water Works Company, Inc., the Parent Company and Controlling Shareholder of West Virginia-American Water Company*, West Virginia Public Service Commission, Case No. 01-1691-W-PC. 2002. Concerning the risks and benefits associated with the proposed acquisition of a water utility, on behalf of the Consumer Advocate Division of the West Virginia Public Service Commission.
51. *Joint Petition of New Jersey-American Water Company, Inc. and Thames Water Aqua Holdings GmbH for Approval of Change in Control of New Jersey-American Water Company, Inc.*, New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. WM01120833. 2002. Concerning the risks and benefits associated with the proposed acquisition of a water utility, on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate.
52. *Illinois-American Water Company, Proposed General Increase in Water Rates*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 02-0690. 2003. Concerning rate design and cost of service issues, on behalf of the Illinois Office of the Attorney General.

53. *Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission v. Pennsylvania-American Water Company*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-00038304. 2003. Concerning rate design and cost of service issues, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
54. *West Virginia-American Water Company*, West Virginia Public Service Commission, Case No. 03-0353-W-42T. 2003. Concerning affordability, rate design, and cost of service issues, on behalf of the West Virginia Consumer Advocate Division.
55. *Petition of Seabrook Water Corp. for an Increase in Rates and Charges for Water Service*, New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. WR3010054. 2003. Concerning revenue requirements, rate design, prudence, and regulatory policy, on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate.
56. *Chesapeake Ranch Water Co. v. Board of Commissioners of Calvert County*, U.S. District Court for Southern District of Maryland, Civil Action No. 8:03-cv-02527-AW. 2004. Submitted expert report concerning the expected level of rates under various options for serving new commercial development, on behalf of the plaintiff.
57. *Testimony concerning Lead in Drinking Water*, Committee on Government Reform, United States House of Representatives. 2004. Concerning the trade-offs faced by low-income households when drinking water costs increase, including an analysis of H.R. 4268.
58. *West Virginia-American Water Company*, West Virginia Public Service Commission, Case No. 04-0373-W-42T. 2004. Concerning affordability and rate comparisons, on behalf of the West Virginia Consumer Advocate Division.
59. *West Virginia-American Water Company*, West Virginia Public Service Commission, Case No. 04-0358-W-PC. 2004. Concerning costs, benefits, and risks associated with a wholesale water sales contract, on behalf of the West Virginia Consumer Advocate Division.
60. *Kentucky-American Water Company*, Kentucky Public Service Commission, Case No. 2004-00103. 2004. Concerning rate design and tariff issues, on behalf of the Kentucky Office of Attorney General.
61. *New Landing Utility, Inc.*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 04-0610. 2005. Concerning the adequacy of service provided by, and standards of performance for, a water and wastewater utility, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
62. *People of the State of Illinois v. New Landing Utility, Inc.*, Circuit Court of the 15th Judicial District, Ogle County, Illinois, No. 00-CH-97. 2005. Concerning the standards of performance for a water and wastewater utility, including whether a receiver should be appointed to manage the utility's operations, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
63. *Hope Gas, Inc. d/b/a Dominion Hope*, West Virginia Public Service Commission, Case No. 05-0304-G-42T. 2005. Concerning the utility's relationships with affiliated companies, including an appropriate level of revenues and expenses associated with services provided to and received from affiliates, on behalf of the West Virginia Consumer Advocate Division.
64. *Monongahela Power Co. and The Potomac Edison Co.*, West Virginia Public Service Commission, Case Nos. 05-0402-E-CN and 05-0750-E-PC. 2005. Concerning review of a plan to finance the construction of pollution control facilities and related issues, on behalf of the West Virginia Consumer Advocate Division.

65. *Joint Application of Duke Energy Corp., et al., for Approval of a Transfer and Acquisition of Control*, Case Kentucky Public Service Commission, No. 2005-00228. 2005. Concerning the risks and benefits associated with the proposed acquisition of an energy utility, on behalf of the Kentucky Office of the Attorney General.
66. *Commonwealth Edison Company proposed general revision of rates, restructuring and price unbundling of bundled service rates, and revision of other terms and conditions of service*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 05-0597. 2005. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
67. *Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission v. Aqua Pennsylvania, Inc.*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-00051030. 2006. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
68. *Central Illinois Light Company d/b/a AmerenCILCO, Central Illinois Public Service Company d/b/a AmerenCIPS, and Illinois Power Company d/b/a AmerenIP, proposed general increases in rates for delivery service*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket Nos. 06-0070, et al. 2006. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
69. *Grens, et al., v. Illinois-American Water Co.*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket Nos. 5-0681, et al. 2006. Concerning utility billing, metering, meter reading, and customer service practices, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General and the Village of Homer Glen, Illinois.
70. *Commonwealth Edison Company Petition for Approval of Tariffs Implementing ComEd's Proposed Residential Rate Stabilization Program*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 06-0411. 2006. Concerning a utility's proposed purchased power phase-in proposal, in behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
71. *Illinois-American Water Company, Application for Approval of its Annual Reconciliation of Purchased Water and Purchased Sewage Treatment Surcharges Pursuant to 83 Ill. Adm. Code 655*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 06-0196. 2006. Concerning the reconciliation of purchased water and sewer charges, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General and the Village of Homer Glen, Illinois.
72. *Illinois-American Water Company, et al.*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 06-0336. 2006. Concerning the risks and benefits associated with the proposed divestiture of a water utility, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
73. *Joint Petition of Kentucky-American Water Company, et al.*, Kentucky Public Service Commission, Docket No. 2006-00197. 2006. Concerning the risks and benefits associated with the proposed divestiture of a water utility, on behalf of the Kentucky Office of Attorney General.
74. *Aqua Illinois, Inc. Proposed Increase in Water Rates for the Kankakee Division*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 06-0285. 2006. Concerning various revenue requirement, rate design, and tariff issues, on behalf of the County of Kankakee.
75. *Housing Authority for the City of Pottsville v. Schuylkill County Municipal Authority*, Court of Common Pleas of Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania, No. S-789-2000. 2006. Concerning the reasonableness and uniformity of rates charged by a municipal water authority, on behalf of the Pottsville Housing Authority.

76. *Application of Pennsylvania-American Water Company for Approval of a Change in Control*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. A-212285F0136. 2006. Concerning the risks and benefits associated with the proposed divestiture of a water utility, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
77. *Application of Artesian Water Company, Inc., for an Increase in Water Rates*, Delaware Public Service Commission, Docket No. 06-158. 2006. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Staff of the Delaware Public Service Commission.
78. *Central Illinois Light Company, Central Illinois Public Service Company, and Illinois Power Company: Petition Requesting Approval of Deferral and Securitization of Power Costs*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 06-0448. 2006. Concerning a utility's proposed purchased power phase-in proposal, in behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
79. *Petition of Pennsylvania-American Water Company for Approval to Implement a Tariff Supplement Revising the Distribution System Improvement Charge*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. P-00062241. 2007. Concerning the reasonableness of a water utility's proposal to increase the cap on a statutorily authorized distribution system surcharge, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
80. *Adjustment of the Rates of Kentucky-American Water Company*, Kentucky Public Service Commission, Case No. 2007-00143. 2007. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Kentucky Office of Attorney General.
81. *Application of Kentucky-American Water Company for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity Authorizing the Construction of Kentucky River Station II, Associated Facilities and Transmission Main*, Kentucky Public Service Commission, Case No. 2007-00134. 2007. Concerning the life-cycle costs of a planned water supply source and the imposition of conditions on the construction of that project, on behalf of the Kentucky Office of Attorney General.
82. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Pennsylvania-American Water Company*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-00072229. 2007. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
83. *Illinois-American Water Company Application for Approval of its Annual Reconciliation of Purchased Water and Purchased Sewage Treatment Surcharges*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 07-0195. 2007. Concerning the reconciliation of purchased water and sewer charges, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
84. *In the Matter of the Application of Aqua Ohio, Inc. to Increase Its Rates for Water Service Provided In the Lake Erie Division*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 07-0564-WW-AIR. 2007. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
85. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Aqua Pennsylvania Inc.*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-00072711. 2008. Concerning rate design, on behalf of the Masthope Property Owners Council.

86. *Illinois-American Water Company Proposed increase in water and sewer rates*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 07-0507. 2008. Concerning rate design and demand studies, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
87. *Central Illinois Light Company, d/b/a AmerenCILCO; Central Illinois Public Service Company, d/b/a AmerenCIPS; Illinois Power Company, d/b/a AmerenIP: Proposed general increase in rates for electric delivery service*, Illinois Commerce Commission Docket Nos. 07-0585, 07-0586, 07-0587. 2008. Concerning rate design and cost of service studies, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
88. *Commonwealth Edison Company: Proposed general increase in electric rates*, Illinois Commerce Commission Docket No. 07-0566. 2008. Concerning rate design and cost of service studies, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
89. *In the Matter of Application of Ohio American Water Co. to Increase Its Rates*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 07-1112-WS-AIR. 2008. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
90. *In the Matter of the Application of The East Ohio Gas Company d/b/a Dominion East Ohio for Authority to Increase Rates for its Gas Service*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case Nos. 07-829-GA-AIR, et al. 2008. Concerning the need for, and structure of, an accelerated infrastructure replacement program and rate surcharge, on behalf of the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
91. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Pennsylvania American Water Company*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-2008-2032689. 2008. Concerning rate design, cost of service study, and other tariff issues, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
92. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. York Water Company*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-2008-2023067. 2008. Concerning rate design, cost of service study, and other tariff issues, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
93. *Northern Illinois Gas Company d/b/a Nicor Gas Company*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 08-0363. 2008. Concerning rate design, cost of service, and automatic rate adjustments, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
94. *West Virginia American Water Company*, West Virginia Public Service Commission, Case No. 08-0900-W-42T. 2008. Concerning affiliated interest charges and relationships, on behalf of the Consumer Advocate Division of the Public Service Commission of West Virginia.
95. *Illinois-American Water Company Application for Approval of its Annual Reconciliation of Purchased Water and Purchased Sewage Treatment Surcharges*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 08-0218. 2008. Concerning the reconciliation of purchased water and sewer charges, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
96. *In the Matter of Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. for an Increase in Electric Rates*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 08-0709-EL-AIR. 2009. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
97. *The Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company and North Shore Gas Company Proposed General Increase in Rates for Gas Service*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket Nos. 09-0166 and 09-0167. 2009.

Concerning rate design and automatic rate adjustments on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General, Citizens Utility Board, and City of Chicago.

98. *Illinois-American Water Company Proposed Increase in Water and Sewer Rates*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 09-0319. 2009. Concerning rate design and cost of service on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General and Citizens Utility Board.
99. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Aqua Pennsylvania Inc.*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-2009-2132019. 2010. Concerning rate design, cost of service, and automatic adjustment tariffs, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
100. *Apple Canyon Utility Company and Lake Wildwood Utilities Corporation Proposed General Increases in Water Rates*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket Nos. 09-0548 and 09-0549. 2010. Concerning parent-company charges, quality of service, and other matters, on behalf of Apple Canyon Lake Property Owners' Association and Lake Wildwood Association, Inc.
101. *Application of Aquarion Water Company of Connecticut to Amend its Rate Schedules*, Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control, Docket No. 10-02-13. 2010. Concerning rate design, proof of revenues, and other tariff issues, on behalf of the Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel.
102. *Illinois-American Water Company Annual Reconciliation Of Purchased Water and Sewage Treatment Surcharges*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 09-0151. 2010. Concerning the reconciliation of purchased water and sewer charges, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
103. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Pennsylvania-American Water Co.*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket Nos. R-2010-2166212, et al. 2010. Concerning rate design and cost of service study for four wastewater utility districts, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
104. *Central Illinois Light Company d/b/a AmerenCILCO, Central Illinois Public Service Company d/b/a AmerenCIPS, Illinois Power Company d/b/a AmerenIP Petition for accounting order*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 10-0517. 2010. Concerning ratemaking procedures for a multi-district electric and natural gas utility, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
105. *Commonwealth Edison Company Petition for General Increase in Delivery Service Rates*, Illinois Commerce Commission Docket No. 10-0467. 2010. Concerning rate design and cost of service study, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
106. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. City of Lancaster Bureau of Water*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-2010-2179103. 2010. Concerning rate design, cost of service, and cost allocation, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
107. *Application of Yankee Gas Services Company for Amended Rate Schedules*, Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control, Docket No. 10-12-02. 2011. Concerning rate design and cost of service for a natural gas utility, on behalf of the Connecticut Office of Consumers' Counsel.
108. *California-American Water Company*, California Public Utilities Commission, Application 10-07-007. 2011. Concerning rate design and cost of service for multiple water-utility service areas, on behalf of The Utility Reform Network.

109. *Little Washington Wastewater Company, Inc., Masthope Wastewater Division*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission Docket No. R-2010-2207833. 2011. Concerning rate design and various revenue requirements issues, on behalf of the Masthope Property Owners Council.
110. *In the matter of Pittsfield Aqueduct Company, Inc.*, New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission Case No. DW 10-090. 2011. Concerning rate design and cost of service on behalf of the New Hampshire Office of the Consumer Advocate.
111. *In the matters of Pennichuck Water Works, Inc. Permanent Rate Case and Petition for Approval of Special Contract with Anheuser-Busch, Inc.*, New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission Case Nos. DW 10-091 and DW 11-014. 2011. Concerning rate design, cost of service, and contract interpretation on behalf of the New Hampshire Office of the Consumer Advocate.
112. *Artesian Water Co., Inc. v. Chester Water Authority*, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania Case No. 10-CV-07453-JP. 2011. Concerning cost of service, ratemaking methods, and contract interpretation on behalf of Chester Water Authority.
113. *North Shore Gas Company and The Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company Proposed General Increases in Rates for Gas Service*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket Nos. 11-0280 and 11-0281. 2011. Concerning rate design and cost of service on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General, the Citizens Utility Board, and the City of Chicago.
114. *Ameren Illinois Company: Proposed general increase in electric delivery service rates and gas delivery service rates*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket Nos. 11-0279 and 11-0282. 2011. Concerning rate design and cost of service for natural gas and electric distribution service, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General and the Citizens Utility Board.
115. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Pennsylvania-American Water Co.*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-2011-2232243. 2011. Concerning rate design, cost of service, sales forecast, and automatic rate adjustments on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
116. *Aqua Illinois, Inc. Proposed General Increase in Water and Sewer Rates*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 11-0436. 2011. Concerning rate design and cost of service on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
117. *City of Nashua Acquisition of Pennichuck Corporation*, New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. DW 11-026. 2011. Concerning the proposed acquisition of an investor-owned utility holding company by a municipality, including appropriate ratemaking methodologies, on behalf of the New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate.
118. *An Application by Heritage Gas Limited for the Approval of a Schedule of Rates, Tolls and Charges*, Nova Scotia Utility and Review Board, Case NSUARB-NG-HG-R-11. 2011. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate.
119. *An Application of Halifax Regional Water Commission for Approval of a Cost of Service and Rate Design Methodology*, Nova Scotia Utility and Review Board, Case NSUARB-W-HRWC-R-11. 2011. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate.

120. *National Grid USA and Liberty Energy Utilities Corp.*, New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. DG 11-040. 2011. Concerning the costs and benefits of a proposed merger and related conditions, on behalf of the New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate.
121. *Great Northern Utilities, Inc., et al.*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket Nos. 11-0059, et al. 2012. Concerning options for mitigating rate impacts and consolidating small water and wastewater utilities for ratemaking purposes, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
122. *Aqua Pennsylvania, Inc.*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-2011-2267958. 2012. Concerning rate design, cost of service, and automatic rate adjustment mechanisms, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
123. *Golden State Water Company*, California Public Utilities Commission, Application 11-07-017. 2012. Concerning rate design and quality of service, on behalf of The Utility Reform Network.
124. *Golden Heart Utilities, Inc. and College Utilities Corporation*, Regulatory Commission of Alaska, Case Nos. U-11-77 and U-11-78. 2012. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Alaska Office of the Attorney General.
125. *Illinois-American Water Company*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 11-0767. 2012. Concerning rate design, cost of service, and automatic rate adjustment mechanisms, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
126. *Application of Tidewater Utilities, Inc., for a General Rate Increase in Water Base Rates and Tariff Revisions*, Delaware Public Service Commission, Docket No. 11-397. 2012. Concerning rate design and cost of service study, on behalf of the Staff of the Delaware Public Service Commission.
127. *In the Matter of the Philadelphia Water Department's Proposed Increase in Rates for Water and Wastewater Utility Services*, Philadelphia Water Commissioner, FY 2013-2016. 2012. Concerning rate design and related issues for storm water service, on behalf of Citizens for Pennsylvania's Future.
128. *Corix Utilities (Illinois) LLC, Hydro Star LLC, and Utilities Inc. Joint Application for Approval of a Proposed Reorganization*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 12-0279. 2012. Concerning merger-related synergy savings and appropriate ratemaking treatment of the same, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
129. *North Shore Gas Company and The Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket Nos. 12-0511 and 12-0512. 2012. Concerning rate design, cost of service study, and automatic rate adjustment tariff on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
130. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. City of Lancaster Sewer Fund*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-2012-2310366. 2012. Concerning rate design, cost of service, and cost allocation, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
131. *Aquarion Water Company of New Hampshire*, New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. DW 12-085. 2013. Concerning tariff issues, including an automatic adjustment clause for infrastructure improvement, on behalf of the New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate.

132. *In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for an Increase in Electric Distribution Rates*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 12-1682-EL-AIR, et al. 2013. Concerning rate design and tariff issues, on behalf of the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
133. *In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., for an Increase in Natural Gas Distribution Rates*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 12-1685-GA-AIR, et al. 2013. Concerning cost-of-service study, rate design, and tariff issues, on behalf of the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
134. *In the Matter of the Application of The Dayton Power and Light Company to Establish a Standard Service Offer in the Form of an Electric Security Plan*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 12-426-EL-SSO, et al. 2013. Concerning rate design, on behalf of the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
135. *Application of the Halifax Regional Water Commission, for Approval of Amendments to its Schedule of Rates and Charges and Schedule of Rules and Regulations for the delivery of water, public and private fire protection, wastewater and stormwater services*, Nova Scotia Utility and Review Board, Matter No. M05463, 2013. Concerning rate design, cost-of-service study, and miscellaneous tariff provisions, on behalf of the Consumer Advocate of Nova Scotia.
136. *California Water Service Co. General Rate Case Application*, California Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. A.12-07-007. 2013. Concerning rate design, phase-in plans, low-income programs, and other tariff issues, on behalf of The Utility Reform Network.
137. *Application of The United Illuminating Company to Amend its Rate Schedules*, Connecticut Public Utility Regulatory Authority, Docket No. 13-01-19. 2013. Concerning sales forecast, rate design, and other tariff issues, on behalf of the Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel.
138. *Application of Aquarion Water Company of Connecticut to Amend its Rate Schedules*, Connecticut Public Utility Regulatory Authority, Docket No. 13-02-20. 2013. Concerning sales forecast and rate design on behalf of the Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel.
139. *Ameren Illinois Company, Proposed General Increase in Natural Gas Delivery Service Rates*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 13-0192. 2013. Concerning rate design and revenue allocation, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General and Citizens Utility Board.
140. *Commonwealth Edison Company, Tariff filing to present the Illinois Commerce Commission with an opportunity to consider revenue neutral tariff changes related to rate design*, Docket No. 13-0387. 2013. Concerning rate design and cost of service study issues, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
141. *In the Matter of the Potomac Electric Power Company for Authority to Increase Existing Retail Rates and Charges for Electric Distribution Service*, District of Columbia Public Service Commission, Formal Case No. 1103. 2013. Concern rate design, revenue allocation, and cost-of-service study issues, on behalf of the District of Columbia Office of Peoples' Counsel.
142. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Pennsylvania-American Water Co.*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-2013-2355276. 2013. Concerning rate design, revenue allocation, and regulatory policy, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.

143. *In the Matter of the Revenue Requirement and Transmission Tariff Designated as TA364-8 filed by Chugach Electric Association, Inc.*, Regulatory Commission of Alaska, U-13-007. 2013. Concerning rate design and cost-of-service study issues, on behalf of the Alaska Office of the Attorney General.
144. *Ameren Illinois Company: Tariff filing to present the Illinois Commerce Commission with an opportunity to consider revenue neutral tariff changes related to rate design*, Docket No. 13-0476. 2013. Concerning rate design and cost of service study issues, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
145. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. City of Bethlehem Bureau of Water*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-2013-2390244. 2014. Concerning rate design, cost of service study, and revenue allocation on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
146. *In the Matter of the Tariff Revision Designated as TA332-121 filed by the Municipality of Anchorage d/b/a Municipal Light and Power Department*, Regulatory Commission of Alaska, U-13-184. 2014. Concerning rate design and cost-of-service study issues, on behalf of the Alaska Office of the Attorney General.
147. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Pike County Light and Power Co. - Gas*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-2013-2397353. 2014. Concerning rate design and revenue allocation on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
148. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Pike County Light and Power Co. - Electric*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-2013-2397237. 2014. Concerning rate design, cost of service study, and revenue allocation on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
149. *Apple Valley Ranchos Water Company*, California Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. A.14-01-002. 2014. Concerning rate design and automatic rate adjustment mechanisms on behalf of the Town of Apple Valley.
150. *Application by Heritage Gas Limited for Approval to Amend its Franchise Area*, Nova Scotia Utility and Review Board, Matter No. M06271. 2014. Concerning criteria, terms, and conditions for expanding a utility's service area and using transported compressed natural gas to serve small retail customers, on behalf of the Nova Scotia Consumer Advocate.

Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp. d/b/a Liberty Utilities

DG 14-155

Joint Petition for Authority to Transfer Ownership of New Hampshire Gas Corporation
OCA Data Requests, Set 1

Date Request Received: 7/17/14
Request No. OCA 1-21

Date of Response: 8/8/14
Respondent: Richard H. Leehr

REQUEST:

Reference testimony of Leehr, p. 6 (Bates p. 150), lines 1-4. Please define the terms “acquisition premium” and “transaction costs” as used here.

RESPONSE:

Reference to an “acquisition premium” would be any amount paid to Iberdrola in excess of the net book value of the Company at the date of acquisition. The term “transaction costs” would be any incremental costs incurred by Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth) leading up to or closing the purchase and sale transaction. Examples of such incremental costs would be costs for outside counsel, filing fees, due diligence review expenses, etc.

Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp. d/b/a Liberty Utilities

DG 14-155

Joint Petition for Authority to Transfer Ownership of New Hampshire Gas Corporation to
Liberty Utilities
OCA Data Requests, Set 2

Date Request Received: 8/15/14
Request No. OCA 2-19

Date of Response: 8/29/14
Respondent: Stephen R. Hall

REQUEST:

Reference the response to Staff 1-4. Please confirm that ENGI will not attempt to recover any portion of the acquisition premium (or otherwise include it in rates) from customers of either ENGI or NHGC.

RESPONSE:

EnergyNorth will not seek recovery of any acquisition premium from customers.

Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp. d/b/a Liberty Utilities

DG 14-155

Liberty Acquisition of NHGC
Staff Data Requests - Set 2

Date Request Received: 8/15/14
Request No. Staff 2-2

Date of Response: 8/29/14
Respondent: Stephen R. Hall

REQUEST:

Ref. Staff DR 1-4. Will Liberty seek recovery of the acquisition premium its customers, and if so, from all customers (EnergyNorth and NHGC)?

RESPONSE:

No, recovery of an acquisition premium will not be sought.

Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp. d/b/a Liberty Utilities

DG 14-155

Acquisition of New Hampshire Gas Corp.
Staff Data Requests - Set 1

Date Request Received: 7/23/14
Request No. Staff 1-1

Date of Response: 8/8/14
Respondent: Stephen R. Hall

REQUEST:

Ref. LeeHR Testimony, Bates p. 150, lines 1-4. Please provide a cost breakdown of the individual components of the estimated a) transaction costs, b) financing costs, c) transition costs, and d) legal costs. For each cost category state whether Liberty will or will not seek rate recovery.

RESPONSE:

There will be no incremental transaction costs, as all of the work associated with the transaction will be performed by existing personnel. There will be no financing costs, since the transaction will be paid for from existing funds. There may be a small amount of transition costs to the extent that resources other than existing employees will be required to perform the transition. The amount of such costs is unknown. There may also be a small amount of legal costs to prepare or review documents necessary to effect the transaction, but the amount of those costs are not yet known. The Company will not be seeking recovery of these costs from customers.

Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp. d/b/a Liberty Utilities

DG 14-155

Liberty Acquisition of NHGC

Staff Data Requests, Set 1 – September 4, 2014, Technical Session

Date Request Received: 9/4/14
Request No. Tech 1-1

Date of Response: 9/11/14
Respondent: Stephen R. Hall

REQUEST:

(Liberty) Please review the filing and discovery responses and identify all incremental costs estimated to be incurred after the acquisition. For each incremental cost, please state whether the costs are transition costs and, if so, a) whether the costs will be charged to customers; and b) specify which customers (i.e., NHGC customers or all EN customers) would be charged those costs. Please also categorize the incremental costs as either capital costs or expenses.

RESPONSE:

Please see Attachment Tech 1-1 for a listing of the information regarding incremental costs estimated to be incurred after the acquisition. The definition of a transition cost used in the attached is a “temporary cost incurred to effect the transaction,” which was the same definition in the settlement agreement in Docket No. DG 11-040. As shown on the attachment, only one of the listed items is classified as a transition cost. While certain other costs may be incurred in “transitioning” customers to EnergyNorth’s systems and procedures, such costs are not necessary in order to effect the transaction. Rather, such costs would be incurred to improve service, reliability and/or efficiency and are discretionary in the timing of their incurrence.

<u>Cost Description</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Transition Cost</u>	<u>Estimated Amount</u>	<u>Classification</u>	<u>Cost Recovery</u>
Conversion to LNG or CNG	Staff 1-3, 1-13, 2-1	No	Unknown	Capital	NHGC customers
Acquisition premium	Staff 1-4	No	\$288,945	Capital	None
System change or enhancements	Staff 1-5	No	Unknown	Capital	NHGC customers
Dispatch & control center integration	Staff 1-20, OCA 2-24	No	\$20,000	Capital	All customers
GIS/Mapping expertise & associated systems	Staff 1-20, OCA 2-24	No	\$75,000 expense, \$48,000 capital	Both	All customers
Corrosion control engineering	Staff 1-20, OCA 2-24	No	\$1,000 expense, \$3,000 capital	Both	All customers
Internal training	Staff 1-20, OCA 2-24	No	\$5,000	Expense	All customers
Automated meter reading	Staff 1-22, 1-25, OCA 2-23, 2-25	No	\$4,300 expense, \$202,000 capital	Both	All customers
CIS integration	Staff 1-25, OCA 2-25	No	\$310,500	Capital	All customers
IVR system	Staff 1-25, OCA 2-25	No	\$65,000	Capital	All customers
Re-branding	Staff 1-25, OCA 2-25	Yes	\$16,000	Expense	None

Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp. d/b/a Liberty Utilities

DG 14-155

Joint Petition for Authority to Transfer Ownership of New Hampshire Gas Corporation to
Liberty Utilities
OCA Data Requests, Set 2

Date Request Received: 8/15/14
Request No. OCA 2-24

Date of Response: 8/29/14
Respondent: Stephen R. Hall

REQUEST:

Reference Staff I-23. Will the Company seek recovery of the costs associated with incorporating these services to NHGC customers into ENGI's operations? If so, from which customers will the Company seek to recovery these costs (e.g., just customers served by the NHGC system or all then-existing ENGI customers)?

RESPONSE:

Yes, in the future, the Company will seek recovery of these costs from all of its customers.

Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp. d/b/a Liberty Utilities

DG 14-155

Joint Petition for Authority to Transfer Ownership of New Hampshire Gas Corporation to
Liberty Utilities
OCA Data Requests, Set 2

Date Request Received: 8/15/14
Request No. OCA 2-23

Date of Response: 8/29/14
Respondent: Stephen R. Hall

REQUEST:

Reference Staff 1-22. Will the Company seek recovery of the costs associated with automated meter reading? If so, from which customers will the Company seek to recovery these costs (e.g., just customers served by the NHGC system or all then-existing ENGI customers)?

RESPONSE:

The costs associated with automated meter reading (both capital and annual O&M) would ultimately be included in EnergyNorth's costs in a test year of a future rate case and therefore recovered from all customers through distribution rates in the same manner as such costs for existing EnergyNorth customers are recovered.

Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp. d/b/a Liberty Utilities

DG 14-155

Joint Petition for Authority to Transfer Ownership of New Hampshire Gas Corporation to
Liberty Utilities
OCA Data Requests, Set 2

Date Request Received: 8/15/14
Request No. OCA 2-25

Date of Response: 8/29/14
Respondent: Stephen R. Hall

REQUEST:

Reference Staff 1-25. Will the Company seek recovery of the costs associated with incorporating these services to NHGC customers into ENGI's operations? If so, from which customers will the Company seek to recovery these costs (e.g., just customers served by the NHGC system or all then-existing ENGI customers)?

RESPONSE:

EnergyNorth would seek to recover these costs from all customers, not just from existing NHGC customers.

Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp. d/b/a Liberty Utilities

DG 14-155

Joint Petition for Authority to Transfer Ownership of New Hampshire Gas Corporation
OCA Data Requests, Set 1

Date Request Received: 7/17/14
Request No. OCA 1-11

Date of Response: 8/8/14
Respondent: Stephen R. Hall

REQUEST:

Reference Testimony of Stephen R. Hall, pp. 2-7 (Bates pp. 164-169).

- a. Is ENGI proposing its "rate plan" in this case? If so, please provide proposed tariff sheets, proof of revenue schedules, and all other documents that would be required for a filing that would increase the rates of ENGI customers and decrease the rates of NHGC customers.
- b. Is ENGI seeking approval in this case of an accounting mechanism that would allow for the accrual of the "rate shortfall" with carrying charges, as described on Bates p. 166? If so, please provide a workpaper that shows the estimate amount of such "shortfall" in each year and how it was calculated, along with the proposed carrying charge rate and how it was calculated?
- c. Please provide a workpaper showing the calculation of the revenue requirement that ENGI alleges NHGC is not recovering.
- d. Does the revenue requirement provided above reflect the fact that ENGI is proposing to acquire the property of NHGC for less than the book value of that property? If not, please explain why not.
- e. Hypothetically, if the Commission were to approve the transaction but were to make no ruling prior in this case on the reasonableness of the "rate plan" would ENGI consider that a failure to obtain governmental consent under sections 8.1(a) and 9.1 of the Stock Purchase Agreement (Bates pp. 35-37)? If so, please explain why.
- f. Hypothetically, if the Commission were to approve the transaction but were to make no ruling prior in this case on the reasonableness of the proposed deferral mechanism would ENGI consider that a failure to obtain governmental consent under sections 8.1(a) and 9.1 of the Stock Purchase Agreement (Bates pp. 35-37)? If so, please explain why.

RESPONSE:

- a. No, EnergyNorth is not proposing a rate plan at this time.
- b. No. Since a rate plan is not being proposed at this time, EnergyNorth is not seeking approval of an accounting mechanism for deferrals.
- c. Please see Attachment OCA 1-11.
- d. No. The calculation on the attachment is based upon NHGC's financial statements for 2013.
- e. No.
- f. No.

Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp. d/b/a Liberty Utilities

DG 14-155

Acquisition of New Hampshire Gas Corp.
Staff Data Requests - Set 1

Date Request Received: 7/23/14
Request No. Staff 1-23

Date of Response: 8/8/14
Respondent: Christian P. Brouillard

REQUEST:

Ref. Saad Testimony, Bates p. 189, lines 11-18. Please describe how each of the five processes is currently being conducted by NHGC. Please describe any situations over the past three years in which NHGC would have benefited from the safety enhancements and, in each instance, describe how and to what extent NHGC would have benefited.

RESPONSE:

1. Liberty Utilities Dispatch & Control Center, located in Londonderry, to monitor the Keene System and provide emergency resource coordination:

Currently after-hours coverage is provided by two separate providers. Iberdrola Dispatch in Binghamton, NY monitors Gas Plant operations only (24/7). Gas Plant related calls are directed to the NHGC "Distribution Tech" on call. Customer off-hours calls regarding odor complaints, appliance service calls and all other after-hour inquiries are handled by the Keene Answering Service which directs the inquiry to the "Service Tech" on call. Following the acquisition, the emergency response for the NHGC system will be integrated into the single Liberty Utilities gas dispatch and control center. The Liberty Utilities center is staffed 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. A full complement of qualified on-call operations and engineering resources are available to coordinate and support response to an event. The inclusion of the NHGC system in Liberty's gas dispatch and control center will represent an improvement over the current level of communications utilizing the Keene Answering Service.

2. Pressure regulator and instrumentation expertise:

Pressure monitoring at NHGC is provided by Iberdrola Dispatch in Binghamton, NY. Pressure regulation takes place at the Gas Plant with plant pressures and operating data monitored 24/7 remotely in NY and by chart recorders at the Gas Plant. Pressures in the distribution system are monitored on Chart Recorders at five separate locations; however,

these locations are not remotely monitored and the charts are changed on a weekly basis. Engineering and other support are provided as needed by Iberdrola staff in NY. Liberty Utilities is positioned to assign local expertise to support this function. Liberty has an experienced Instrumentation and Regulation supervisor and locally based staff to monitor and make corrections to the system during daily and seasonal operation. Over time, Liberty will determine what system regulation monitoring points will be made available to its control center. Liberty also employs a gas system planning engineer in Londonderry to provide delivery system modelling and analysis. Operations and Maintenance policies and procedures are in place to specify and ensure compliance with required regulatory tasks.

3. GIS/Mapping expertise and associated systems:

Gas system mapping requirements are met by NHGC by utilizing hand drawn maps and manual records. Currently, only two employees are familiar with the system. Although the use of this manual process has not caused any problems, there is a concern that the records could be susceptible to physical damage, misinterpretation and delays in producing the necessary documents in times of emergencies. Liberty plans to convert NHGC's maps to an industry leading ESRI ArcFM system during 2015. In addition to fundamental mapping functionality, the system also has the capability to capture Global Positioning System (GPS) points provided by hand held devices. Portions of the mapping and records system are made available to field personnel through an ArcView application on ruggedized mobile laptops mounted in company vehicles. The ruggedized laptops also provide for work and data management of daily and emergency activities, including damage prevention. Liberty's move to the Vero Track Leak Surveying and Application system will further enhance NHGC's leak management capabilities and these systems, including access to scanned field records, will be rolled out to NHGC.

4. Corrosion control engineering:

The NHGC corrosion control program and records are manual based. Testing and monitoring of the anode only system is conducted annually on mains and services. The total amount of coated steel mains and services has been decreasing over the years due to replacements with PE and some retirements. Liberty will be employing state of the art corrosion control techniques and programs to enhance NHGC's corrosion control on its coated steel mains and coated steel and wrought iron services. Liberty has a dedicated corrosion engineer, augmented by contracted and internal field staff expertise. Liberty is currently improving corrosion control on its own coated steel pipe through implementation of a program to install additional anodes and corrosion protections systems at selected locations. Liberty utilizes a software application to schedule and manage its corrosion control inspections of mains and services. Services are replaced as

needed based upon periodic inspection results. These programs and approaches would be extended to NHGC following the acquisition.

5. Dedicated internal training department:

Training at NHGC is completed on an as-needed basis, driven by regulatory requirements and the need to enhance employee skill sets. Training comes from a mix of local, Iberdrola-based, and outside resources. Outside resource training can be costly due to the small size and location of the company. Out of state training can at times be difficult to coordinate and attend due to the small size of the company and the number of employees that need to remain in Keene to maintain operations. Following the acquisition, the training of NHGC employees would be rolled in the comprehensive Liberty Utilities training regimen. Training would be conducted at the proposed Liberty Training Center in Concord, NH, scheduled to be in operation in 2015. Some training may take place in Keene as required, depending on the subject matter. The full time training staff of two employees, augmented by internal subject matter experts and outside resources, will be providing the training. Training materials, accessible in hard copy and electronically, will be made available to NHGC personnel.