1	1 CENTE OF WELL HAVEGUE	TDE		
Τ.	STATE OF NEW HAMPSH	STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE		
2	2 PUBLIC UTILITIES COMM	ISSION		
3	3			
4	4 June 20, 2016 - 10:05 a.m.	C JUL05'16 PH12:18		
5		C 1000 TO HATE AN		
6				
7	RE: DE 16-384 UNITIL ENERGY SYSTEMS Request for Change in			
8				
9				
10	PRESENT: Chairman Martin P. Ho Commissioner Robert F Commissioner Kathryn	. Scott		
11		M. Dailey		
12	Sandy Deno, Clerk			
13	13			
14	APPEARANCES: Reptg. Unitil Energy Gary Epler, Esq.	Systems, Inc.:		
15	15			
16	Reptg. Residential R Nicholas Cicale, Esc Pradip Chattopadhyay	[•		
17		ce Director		
18	18			
19		Reptg. PUC Staff: Suzanne G. Amidon, Esq.		
20	Thomas C. Frantz, Di	Thomas C. Frantz, Dir./Electric Div.		
21		Richard Chagnon, Electric Division Jay Dudley, Electric Division		
22	22			
23	Court Reporter: Steven E. Pat	naude, LCR No. 52		
24	2 4			



1			
2		INDEX	
3			PAGE NO.
4	STATEMENTS BY:		
5		Mr. Epler	4, 10, 11
6		Ms. Amidon	7, 8, 12
7		Mr. Cicale	9, 12
8			
9			
10	QUESTIONS BY:		
11		Chairman Honigberg	6, 8
12		Cmsr. Scott	10
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

1 PROCEEDING

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We're here this morning in Docket DE 16-384, which is Unitil's rate filing. We have a temporary rate hearing. We have a Settlement that was filed a few days ago.

And, before we do anything else, let's take appearances.

MR. EPLER: Good morning, Mr.

Chairman, Commissioners. My name is Gary

Epler, the Chief Regulatory Counsel for Unitil.

And with me this morning is Mark Collin, the

Chief Financial Officer and Senior Vice

President for Unitil; David Chong, Director of

Finance; immediately behind me is George

Simmons, Manager of Regulatory Affairs; and

next to him is Doug Debski, who's a Senior

Regulatory Analyst. Thank you.

MR. CICALE: Good morning, Chairman and Commissioners. Nicholas Cicale, here with the Office of Consumer Advocate, on behalf of residential ratepayers. To my left is Pradip Chattopadhyay, Assistant Consumer Advocate; and the Director of Finance, Jim Brennan.

```
1
                   MS. AMIDON: Good morning.
                                                Suzanne
         Amidon, for Commission Staff. Rich Chagnon, an
 2
 3
         Analyst with the Electric Division, is to my
         left; Tom Frantz, to his left, he's the
 4
         Director of the Electric Division; and
         Co-Counsel Paul Dexter, to Tom's left; and
 6
 7
         behind Paul is Mr. Jay Dudley, who is also
         working on this case.
 8
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
9
                                                     Are
10
         there any preliminary matters before you
11
         present the Settlement?
12
                         [No verbal response.]
13
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Didn't think so.
14
         All right. Are we going to have a panel of
15
         witnesses on the Settlement?
16
                   MR. EPLER: Mr. Chairman,
17
         Commissioners, I've had discussions with
18
         representatives of the Staff and the Consumer
19
         Advocate. And I'm prepared to present the
20
         Settlement on behalf of the Settling Parties.
21
                   We are not proposing to present a
22
                 Although, there are witnesses in the
         panel.
23
         room available to answer any questions that the
24
         Commission may have.
```

1 The Settlement Agreement before you 2 is a product of negotiations. The Parties met 3 in two technical sessions, one right after the 4 first prehearing conference and the second a 5 week ago, on June 13th. There were also two 6 rounds of data requests, one from the Staff to 7 the Company and from the OCA to the Company. 8 And, last week, we then engaged in settlement 9 negotiations. And we basically arrived at a 10 number that the Parties thought that, on the 11 basis of the Company's filing and the 12 presentation in the filing and on the data 13 requests, that it was a reasonable settlement 14 There's no particular methodology to 15 that amount. You know, it took into 16 consideration what the Company proposed, and we negotiated the amount. 17 18 So, it's kind of a black box, which 19 is why we're not presenting a witness to 20 describe it. The Parties understand that it 21 sets no precedent. That it's fully 22 reconcilable, once permanent rates are set.

{DE 16-384} [Re: Temporary Rates] {06-20-16}

consideration. And, again, we have witnesses

And, so, we offer it for your

23

24

```
1
         available, if you have any questions.
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you, Mr.
 2
 3
         Epler. I guess I would ask both -- all three
 4
         of you -- wait a minute, Mr. Cicale, you're on
 5
         the Settlement, too, right?
                   CMSR. BAILEY: Yes.
 6
 7
                   MR. CICALE: That's right.
 8
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I quess I would
9
         ask all three of you to confirm that, in your
10
         view, this is a reasonable result? And there's
11
         nothing else we've got, and can you --
12
                         (Short pause)
13
                   MS. AMIDON: Shall one of us proceed
14
         or --
15
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So, under
16
         378:27, we're supposed to be willing to fix
17
         temporary rates that are "sufficient to yield
18
         not less than a reasonable return of the cost
19
         of the property of the utility used and useful
20
         in the public service less accrued
         depreciation, as shown in the reports of the
21
22
         utility filed with the Commission, unless there
23
         appears to be reasonable ground for questioning
24
         the figures in such reports", and the rates
```

```
1
         have to be "reasonable temporary rates".
                   How are we to know if these are
 2
 3
         reasonable temporary rates?
                   Ms. Amidon.
 4
                   MS. AMIDON: Well, from Staff's
 5
 6
         perspective, we reviewed the filing, the books
 7
         and records of the Company on file with the
         Commission, and determined that the amount
 8
9
         that -- of revenue increase that is in the
10
         Settlement Agreement does reflect the --
11
         fairly, to both the utility shareholders and to
12
         customers. I believe that the increase is on
13
         the attachment to the Settlement Agreement on
14
         the last page. I believe, if I recall
15
         correctly, it was in the neighborhood of a
16
         dollar -- what is -- I'm sorry, Gary --
17
         Mr. Epler, do you have that provision?
18
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It's in the
19
         Settlement. It's the last page, as you said.
20
         It's a temporary rate increase to recover
         revenue of 2.4 million, and the impact on the
21
22
         average residential bill, 600 kilowatts, is
23
         $1.19.
24
                   MS. AMIDON:
                                 Right. I was thinking
```

it was \$1.19 per month. And I thought that that was reasonable, and we know that it's temporary.

To be quite honest, Staff's main issue with this is the permanent rate case. The filing came in on April 29th, we have to complete our work within a year of that date. And we wanted to move forward with the permanent rate case, while recognizing that there was support for temporary rate relief for the Company in the interim.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Although neither of you has used the phrase "offer of proof". I feel like what you're doing is making offers of proof that, if your witnesses were put under oath and called to testify, they would testify that this is a reasonable result and produces a reasonable temporary rate. Am I correct?

MS. AMIDON: That is correct. If we put the -- and Mr. Chagnon is available to -- on the stand, if you wish to ask him directly. But we do believe that the Settlement Agreement is a just and reasonable resolution of the issues. It's supported by the Company's

filing, and it results in reasonable rates to the customers, pending the resolution of the permanent rate case. The rates are reconciling.

And one of the concerns Staff had was, with respect to this filing, was to avoid rate shock at the end of the permanent rate case. I mean, that assumes, of course, that the Commission might grant an increase to the Company. But we prefer phasing in a rate for the customers to avoid that rate shock.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Understood.

And, Mr. Epler, you look like you were ready to confirm that you were essentially making an offer of proof along the lines of what I said?

MR. EPLER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Cicale?

MR. CICALE: The main crux for the

Consumer Advocate agreeing to the Settlement

was the Company came forth with a full

disclosure of their capital projects and the

investments made pertaining to those capital

projects. And a lot of the Company's revenue

requirement in this case hinges on those

capital investments.

The temporary rate increase that is reflected here is a fair one to the Company, it's fair to the consumers. It makes the Company temporarily whole for their current investment in those projects. And it also is not overly harmful for the residential customers. We find it to be just and reasonable. So, the overall cost of equity is low with this Settlement. And, so, we fully support it.

CMSR. SCOTT: Thank you. Mr. Epler, can you remind me the outreach to ratepayers for this temporary rate, the bill inserts, etcetera?

MR. EPLER: Yes. This was part of the notice that the Company was required to publish after the order of notice was issued by the Commission. And the description of the Company's rate request and the details of it has been part of a bill insert.

CMSR. SCOTT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. One other topic. I don't think there's any other

```
1
         questions on the Settlement, is there?
                         [No verbal response.]
 2
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We did receive a
 3
 4
         motion from one of the prospective intervenors
         seeking clarification, that's the phrase they
 6
         used, although it looked like perhaps a motion
 7
         for reconsideration. Are you going to be
         responding to that, Mr. Epler?
 8
9
                   MR. EPLER: Yes, I am.
10
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
11
         there anything else we need to do before we
12
         adjourn and take this under advisement?
13
                   MR. EPLER:
                                There was one minor
14
         matter outstanding --
15
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Uh-huh.
16
                   MR. EPLER: -- before the Commission,
17
         and that was a waiver of the -- I think it's
18
         the bill insert requirement.
19
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Uh-huh.
20
                   MR. EPLER: Because of the timing of
21
         when we filed and when we received approval
22
         from the Consumer Division of our bill insert,
23
         we didn't quite get everyone within the rules
24
         requirement, and we required an additional
```

1	period of I think one week, but certainly no
2	more than two weeks for people to receive
3	notice. I can report to you that people have
4	received notice now, but we did ask for a
5	waiver of that provision.
6	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Did either the
7	OCA or Staff have a position on the motion?
8	MS. AMIDON: We didn't file an
9	objection to the motion. We take no position
10	on it. It seemed a reasonable request.
11	MR. CICALE: The OCA shares Staff's
12	sentiment in that regard.
13	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: That motion is
14	granted.
15	Anything else we need to do?
16	MR. EPLER: No. No, Mr. Chairman.
17	CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
18	Thank you all. We will adjourn.
19	(Whereupon the hearing was
20	adjourned at 10:16 a.m.)
21	
22	
23	
24	