1	STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
2	BEFORE THE
4 5	PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	Re: Petition of Pennichuck East Utility, Inc. for Approval of Financing
13 14 15 16	Under the State Revolving Loan For Water Main Improvements in the Maple Hills Community Water System, the Litchfield Water System, and the Pennichuck East Utility and Pennichuck Water Works Interconnection Pipeline
17	
18	DW 17
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	DIRECT PREFILED TESTIMONY OF LARRY D. GOODHUE
24 25 26 27 28 29 30	April 3, 2017

1	Q.	What is your name and what is your position with Pennichuck East Utility, Inc.?
2	A.	My name is Larry D. Goodhue. I am the Chief Executive Officer of Pennichuck East
3		Utility, Inc. (the "Company" or "PEU"). I have been employed with the Company since
4		December, 2006. I also serve as Chief Executive Officer, Chief Financial Officer, and
5		Treasurer of the Company's parent, Pennichuck Corporation ("Pennichuck"). I am a
6		licensed Certified Public Accountant in New Hampshire; my license is currently in an
7		inactive status.
8	Q.	Please describe your educational background.
9	A.	I have a Bachelor in Science degree in Business Administration with a major in
0		Accounting from Merrimack College in North Andover, Massachusetts.
1	Q.	Please describe your professional background.
2	A.	Prior to joining the Company, I was the Vice President of Finance and Administration
3		and previously the Controller with METRObility Optical Systems, Inc. from September,
4		2000 to June 2006. In my more recent role with METRObility, I was responsible for all
15		financial, accounting, treasury and administration functions for a manufacturer of optical
16		networking hardware and software. Prior to joining METRObility, I held various senior
17		management and accounting positions in several companies.
18	Q.	What are your responsibilities as Chief Executive Officer of the Company, and
19		Chief Executive Officer, Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer of Pennichuck?
20	A.	In my roles, including my primary responsibilities as Chief Executive Officer, with
21		ultimate responsibility for all aspects of the Company, I am responsible for the overall
22		financial management of the Company including financing, accounting, compliance and
23		budgeting. My responsibilities include issuance and repayment of debt, as well as

- quarterly and annual financial and regulatory reporting and compliance. I work with the

 Chief Operating Officer and Chief Engineer of the Company to determine the lowest cost

 alternatives available to fund the capital requirements of the Company, which result from

 the Company's annual capital expenditures and its current debt maturities.
- Q. What financings are proposed by the Company in its petition in this proceeding (the
 "Proposed Financings").
- 7 A. The Company is proposing three new long term debt financings: (1) a \$570,000 long 8 term loan from the State Revolving Loan Fund ("SRF"), to provide funding to complete 9 the replacement of approximately 2,400 liner feet of water main on Brady Avenue in the Maple Hills Water System in Derry, NH, (2) a \$245,000 long term loan from the SRF, to 10 provide funding to complete the replacement of approximately 1,200 liner feet of water 11 main on Hillcrest Road in the Litchfield Water System in Derry, NH, and (3) a \$2.4 12 million long term loan from the SRF to provide funding to construct an interconnection 13 main, and pumping facility, between the core system of Pennichuck Water Works, Inc. 14 ("PWW") in Merrimack, NH and the Litchfield Water System owned by Pennichuck 15 East Utility, Inc. ("PEU") in Litchfield, NH. 16
- Q. Did you supervise the preparation of the Company's petition for authority to issuelong term debt?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. Does the Company have on file with the Commission a certification statement in its

 Annual Report with respect to its book, papers and records?
- 22 A. Yes.

- Q. Please provide an explanation of the purpose of the proposed financings through the
 SRF.
- 3 As more fully described in the prefiled testimony of John Boisvert, the purpose of the A. 4 financing from the SRF is to fund the cost of three projects: (1) to replace approximately 2,400 linear feet ("LF") of small diameter water main with 8" ductile iron water main on 5 Brady Avenue in the Maple Hills Water System in Derry, NH, in coordination with sewer 6 7 replacement being done by the town on that road (hereinafter referred to as "Brady Ave"); (2) to replace approximately 1,200 LF of significantly deteriorated 12" "pressure 8 class" ductile iron water main on Hillcrest Road in Litchfield (hereinafter referred to as 9 "Hillcrest Road") with 12" C-900 PVC and D-11 high density polyethylene; and (3) to 10 install an interconnection main between the PWW core system and the PEU Litchfield 11 Water system, with approximately 5,980 feet of 12" and 18" HDPE water main, plus a 12 1.5 million gallon per day pumping facility. As indicated above, the testimony of the 13 Company's Chief Engineer, John Boisvert, included with the Company's filing, provides 14 the details regarding the scope and need for the proposed Project. 15
- 16 Q. Please describe the overall financing plan with the SRF for the capital17 improvements.
- A. Substantially all of the funding for this Project is anticipated to be provided by the

 proceeds of loan funds issued by the New Hampshire Department of Environmental

 Services ("NHDES") through the Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund ("SRF").

 In the event that the loan amount authorized by NHDES is not sufficient to completely

 fund the cost of the Project, the balance, if any, will be funded from a mix of PEU's

 internal cash flow from operations and/or advances to PEU from Pennichuck

Corporation's short term line of credit. PEU seeks approval in this docket to borrow up to an aggregate principal amount of \$3,215,000 from the SRF in the form of three new SRF loans. The actual borrowing amounts will be based on the costs of construction that the Company incurs on each of the three projects. The use of the low cost funds available through the SRF will lower the overall cost of financing needed to complete the construction of the water main installation, when compared to other possible sources of financing for these projects, including usage of funds available as advances to PEU from Pennichuck's short term line of credit. Additionally, the Brady Ave project is eligible for 10% principal forgiveness and an extended repayment term of 30 years.

10 Q. Please describe the loan that will comprise the SRF financing for this Project.

A. The loan to finance the Brady Ave water main project will be in the principal amount of \$570,000; the loan to finance the Hillcrest Road water main project will be in the principal amount of \$245,000; and the loan to finance the River Interconnection Main project (hereinafter referred to as "River Crossing") will be in the principal amount of \$2.4 million. The loans will be evidenced by promissory notes.

Q. What are the terms of the proposed SRF financings?

A.

The SRF provides public and private water systems the opportunity to borrow funds to fund the construction of qualified projects at interest rates that are typically lower than market rates of commercial financing. The following terms will be available for these loans. Amounts advanced to PEU during construction will accrue interest at a rate of 1% per annum, and the total accrued interest will be due upon substantial completion of each of the projects. The terms of the SRF loans require repayment of the loan principal plus interest over a twenty-year period commencing six months after the project is

substantially complete, unless the project qualifies for principal forgiveness and an extended repayment term of 25 or 30 years. The current interest rate on SRF borrowings is 1.96% per annum, although the actual rates will be based on the current rates available at the time the loans are actually closed. The loans will be unsecured, and the Company's Parent company will provide an unsecured corporate guarantee for the repayment of the loans. Copies of the loan documents will be submitted to the Commission once they have been finalized and executed.

8 Q. What are the estimated issuance costs for this SRF loan?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

- The anticipated issuance costs total \$10,000 per loan, and relate primarily to legal costs 9 A. which will be incurred to (i) review and revise the necessary loan documentation 10 prepared by SRF, and (ii) obtain Commission approval of the loans. The issuance costs 11 will be amortized over the life of the SRF loans. The annual amortization expense of 12 \$500 for the Hillcrest Road and River Crossing loans, and \$333 for the Brady Ave loan, 13 associated with the issuance costs, has not been reflected in Schedules LDG-2 through 3 14 due to its immateriality with respect to the overall analysis and impact of these proposed 15 financings. 16
- Q. Please explain <u>Schedule LDG-1</u>, entitled "Balance Sheet for the Twelve Months

 Ended December 31, 2016".
- A. Schedule LDG-1, pages 1 and 2, presents the actual financial position of the Company as of December 31, 2016 and the pro forma financial position reflecting certain adjustments pertaining to the proposed SRF and CoBank financings.
- 22 Q. Please explain the pro forma adjustments on Schedule LDG-1.

1	A.	Schedule LDG-1, page 1, reflects the pro forma adjustments to record the net assets
2		related to the replacement or installation of the water mains, pump station and
3		connections in the amount of \$3,215,000 (identified to the aggregate SRF funding), and
4		to record a full year of depreciation and the adjustments required to reflect the Cost of
5		Removal, of \$81,500. Schedule LDG-1, page 2, establishes the aggregate total of the
6		SRF loans of \$3,215,000. This schedule also reflects the income impact on retained
7		earnings related to costs associated with the financings, as reflected on Schedule LDG-2.
8		Schedule LDG-1, page 2, also records the use of a small amount of intercompany funds
9		to support some of the related expenses.

- 10 Q. Mr. Goodhue, please explain <u>Schedule LDG-2</u> entitled "Operating Income

 Statement for the Twelve Months Ended December 31, 2016".
- 12 A. As indicated previously, the issuance costs associated with the financing are not expected
 13 to be significant and are not reflected in <u>Schedule LDG-2</u>, page 1. <u>Schedule LDG-2</u>,
 14 page 1, presents the pro forma impact of this financing on the Company's income
 15 statement for the twelve month period ended December 31, 2016.
- 16 Q. Please explain the pro forma adjustments on Schedule LDG-2.
- A. Schedule LDG-2, page 1, contains three adjustments. Adjustment one is to record the
 estimated increase in interest expense related to additional debt raised at interest rates of
 1.96% per annum. The second adjustment is to record the estimated depreciation and
 property taxes on the new assets. The third adjustment is to record the after-tax effect of
 the additional pro forma interest expense using an effective combined federal and state
 income tax rate of 39.61%. Schedule LDG-2, page 2, contains the supporting
 calculations for the pro forma adjustments.

1 Q. Please explain Schedule LDG-3 entitled "Pro Forma Capital Structure for 2 Ratemaking Purposes for the Twelve Months Ended December 31, 2016." 3 Schedule LDG-3 illustrates the Company's pro forma total capitalization as of December A. 4 31, 2016, which is comprised of common equity and long term debt including the 5 proposed SRF financing. 6 Q. Please explain the pro forma adjustments on Schedule LDG-3. Schedule LDG-3 contains two adjustments. The first adjustment reflects the elimination 7 A. of debt related to Capital Recovery Surcharge Assets per Order 25,051 in DW 08-052 8 and the second adjustment reflects the elimination of the Municipal Acquisition 9 Regulatory Asset ("MARA"), and the related equity as of the date of the Nashua 10 11 acquisition per Order 25,292 in DW 11-026. Mr. Goodhue, are there any covenants or restrictions contained in the Company's 12 Q. other bond and debt agreements which would be impacted by the issuance of debt 13 14 under this proposed financing? Yes. Section 6(c) of the Loan Agreement between Pennichuck and TD Bank, NA 15 A. A. (the "Bank") prohibits Pennichuck or its subsidiaries from incurring additional 16 17 indebtedness without the express prior written consent of the Bank, except for certain 18 allowed exceptions. One of the listed exceptions, in section 6(c)(vi), allows for borrowings under tax exempt bond financing or state revolving loans made available by 19

the State of New Hampshire, provided that in either instance the financing or loan is on

an unsecured basis and the Bank is given prior written notice of such financing. This

new loan with the SRF complies in all aspects to the exemption listed in 6(c)(vi) of the

Loan Agreement between Pennichuck and the Bank. As such, prior written notice has

20

21

22

23

1 been given to the Bank on April 3, 2017, and the receipt of this notice has been duly 2 noted and agreed upon. Accordingly, this requirement has been satisfied for the SRF 3 loans. 4 Q. What is the status of corporate approvals for the SRF Financings? 5 The SRF financings have been approved by the Company's and Pennichuck's Boards of A. Directors, as well as Pennichuck's sole shareholder, the City of Nashua. The Company 6 7 has not yet received the written verification of this approval voted upon by the City's Board of Alderman on March 21, 2017, and will supplement its Petition with that 8 documentation showing such shareholder approval promptly upon receipt thereof. 9 Do you believe that the SRF Financings will be consistent with the public good? 10 Q. Yes. The projects being financed through the proposed SRF loans will enable PEU to 11 A. continue to provide safe, adequate and reliable water service to PEU's customers. For the 12 reasons described in Mr. Boisvert's direct testimony, the projects and their proposed 13 financing through the SRF loans, will provide the most cost effective solutions, in 14 support of this overall benefit for PEU's customers. The terms of the financing through 15 the SRF loans are very favorable compared to other alternatives, and will result in lower 16 financing costs than would be available through all other current debt financing options. 17 Are there any special considerations that you need to address with respect to these 18 Q. 19 proposed financings? Yes. The exhibits attached in LDG-1 thru LDG-3 are proformed upon PEU's existing 20 A. rate structure. It is important to note that PWW, the sister subsidiary of PEU, is currently 21

promulgating a full rate case seeking modifications to its existing rate structure, which

includes a component of revenue tied to the actual annual debt service of the Company's

22

23

debt in the test year, and a step increase mechanism for future financings. If PWW's proposed modifications to its rate making methodology is approved by the Commission, PEU will be seeking a similar modified rate structure in its next full rate case filing, whereupon the debt repayment of these new loans would be included in the basis for that revenue component in its future rate and revenue structure.

Q. Is there anything else that you wish to add?

Yes. I respectfully ask the Commission to issue an Order in this docket as soon as reasonably possible since the NHDES and the Company seeks to close on this loan on or before May 31, 2017. Closing by this date will allow the Company to have these projects out to bid in early June, a contractor selected by mid-June, work started in the early summer, and completed by the late fall of 2017. This will allow these projects to be completed under favorable weather conditions, which should allow for favorable bid results. Additionally, the NHDES requests that these funds be accessed and used during 2017, related to the overall terms underlying this SRF loan, and the availability of these funds for these Projects.

16 Q. Mr. Goodhue, does this conclude your testimony?

17 A. Yes it does.

A.