1	STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE		
2	F	PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION	
3			
4	July 6, 2017		
5	Concord, New	nampsnire	
6	D.T.	DG 17 070	
7		DG 17-070 NORTHERN UTILITIES, INC.:	
8		Request for Change in Rates. (Prehearing conference)	
9			
10			
11	PRESENT:	Chairman Martin P. Honigberg, Presiding	
12			
13		Sandy Deno, Clerk	
14			
15	APPEARANCES:	Reptg. Northern Utilities, Inc.: Gary Epler, Esq.	
16		Patrick Taylor, Esq.	
17		Reptg. Residential Ratepayers: D. Maurice Kreis, Esq., Consumer Adv.	
18		Brian D. Buckley, Esq. Pradip Chattopadhyay, Asst. Cons. Adv.	
19		James Brennan, Finance Director Office of Consumer Advocate	
20		Reptg. PUC Staff:	
21		Paul B. Dexter, Esq. Stephen Frink, Asst. Dir./Gas & Water	
22		Comment of the state of the sta	
23	Court Repor	cter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52	
24			

1		
1		
2	INDEX	
3		PAGE NO.
4	STATEMENTS OF PRELIMINARY POSITION BY:	
5	Mr. Epler	5
6	Mr. Kreis	9
7	Mr. Dexter	13
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

## PROCEEDING

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We're here this morning in Docket 17-070, which is Northern Utilities, a request for changes in rates.

There's also a request for temporary rates, and a hearing has already been scheduled for that.

We have a prehearing conference this morning that will be followed by a technical session.

Before we do anything else, let's take appearances.

MR. EPLER: Good morning, Mr.

Chairman. Gary Epler, attorney for Northern

Utilities, just make sure I've got the right

company here. And with me as co-counsel in

this case is Patrick Taylor, sitting to my

right, one row back. Also this morning

accompanying me is, immediately to my right,

David Chong, Director of Finance; Dan

Nawazelski, who is an Analyst in the Finance

Division; behind me is Kevin Sprague, who is

Director of Engineering; next to him, to his

right, is George Simmons, who's Manager of the

Regulatory Division. Thank you.

{DG 17-070} [Prehearing conference] {07-06-17}

MR. KREIS:

I guess that means it's

1 my turn. I'm D. Maurice Kreis, the Consumer Advocate, here on behalf of the residential 2 3 customers of the subject utilities. And I have my whole team with me here 4 5 To my immediate left is Pradip 6 Chattopadhyay, the Assistant Consumer Advocate; 7 to his left is Brian Buckley, our Staff Attorney; and to his left is Jim Brennan, our 8 Director of Finance. 9 10 MR. DEXTER: Good morning, Mr. 11 Chairman. Paul Dexter, from the Commission 12 Staff. 13 With me today is Stephen Frink, 14 Assistant Director of the Gas and Water 15 Division. 16 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I am aware of no 17 intervenor requests. Anybody aware of anyone 18 who's interested in intervening in this? 19 MR. DEXTER: Staff's not aware of 20 any. 21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Silence is 22 deafening on that one. Anything else we need 23 to do before the Parties state their positions? 24 I know we have some pending motions for

```
1
         confidential treatment, and no objections have
         been filed.
 2
 3
                    I assume the OCA and Staff are okay
         with those two motions?
 4
 5
                   MR. KREIS: We are.
                   MR. DEXTER: Staff has no objection.
 6
 7
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes. I expect
         they will be granted. Although, since I'm the
 8
9
         only one here, that won't happen today.
10
                   Anything else we can deal with,
11
         before hearing from the Parties on their
12
         preliminary positions and identification of
13
         what they think might be interesting in this
14
         case?
15
                         [No verbal response.]
16
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
17
         Mr. Epler, why don't you go first.
18
                   MR. EPLER: Yes.
                                      Thank you, Mr.
19
         Chairman. I do have a prepared statement, if I
20
         may.
21
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And, when you
22
         have a microphone on and in front of you, it
23
         will be great.
24
                                Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
                   MR. EPLER:
```

1 On June 5th, Northern Utilities filed with the 2 Commission its proposal for an increase in 3 permanent rates of 4.7 million for gas service 4 rendered on and after July 5th, 2017. As 5 stated in the Report of Proposed Rate Changes 6 submitted with the filing, this represents an 7 increase of 7.3 percent over total revenues under present rates. Northern is also seeking 8 9 to institute temporary rates effective for 10 service rendered on and after August 1st, 2017, and until the final order is issued on 11 12 permanent rates. The requested temporary rate 13 increase is slightly under \$2 million, or a 14 3.1 percent over total revenue under present 15 rates, and is proposed to be recovered on a 16 uniform 0.0285 cents [\$0.0285?] per therm basis 17 from all rate classes. 18 Northern's last base rate case, which 19 was Docket DG 13-086, was filed in March 2013,

Northern's last base rate case, which was Docket DG 13-086, was filed in March 2013, and decided by the Commission in April 2014 with the approval of a comprehensive Settlement Agreement. Under that Settlement, the Company was allowed two step adjustments, in 2014 and 2015. The last time the Company had a base

20

21

22

23

24

rate adjustment was in May 2015 for plant placed into service in calendar year 2014.

Therefore, the Company has not recovered its utility plant additions and increases in operating expenses since 2014. Since that time, the Company's operating expenses and rate base have grown significantly. From January 20 — January 1st, 2015 through December 31, 2016, Northern's investment in rate base has grown by approximately 16 percent.

The step increases under the previously approved Settlement Agreement occurred on the date of the initial increase and one year thereafter. The step increases were to recover the revenue requirement associated with the Company's investments in its Gas Mains Extensions, New Hampshire Main Replacement Program, and State and City Gas Highway Projects.

In this case, the Company proposes a new rate plan, with distinct step adjustments to distribution base rates occurring on July 1 of 2018, 2019, and 2020, for calendar years 2017, 2018, and 2019, respectively. Similar to

the previous step increases under the last

Settlement Agreement, these step adjustments

would allow for recovery of Mains Replacement

Program, Gas Main Extensions and Gas Highway

Projects, as well as Farm Tap Replacements,

Excess Flow Valve Installations, and Rochester

Reinforcement Projects. The Company estimates

that the annual revenue requirement for the

three annual step increases in 2018, 2019, and

2020 will be approximately 2.3 million,

2.2 million, and 1.9 million, respectively.

The proposed rate plan includes customer benefits and protections: An ROE collar, which would allow the Company to file a base rate case before 2020 only if the ROE is under 7 percent, but provides for equal earnings sharing between the distribution customers and the Company if the ROE is greater than 11 percent; and a general rate case filing stay-out provision through the term of the rate plan.

In rate design, the Company proposes to continue on the path to recover a greater portion of predominantly fixed costs associated

with the provision of service through the fixed customer charge, consistent with the goal of establishing cost-based rates.

The Company is prepared to work with the Commission Staff, Consumer Advocate, and any other interested party intervenor in technical sessions and through discovery to answer any questions they may have about the filing. And I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have, or if you prefer, you may certainly ask direct questions to any of my co-employees here. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you, Mr. Epler. Mr. Kreis.

MR. KREIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Office of the Consumer Advocate has a reasonably high degree of optimism that this particular rate case can be resolved, both in its temporary and permanent phases, in an amicable and negotiated fashion.

That said, I thought that the

Chairman's suggestion that we mention what's

interesting about this case was a suitable

query, and there are numerous interesting

things about this particular rate case. And here are the ones I would like to highlight.

The OCA is always concerned about rate cases that seek to increase rates and invoke a lavish return on equity, in this case, 10.3 percent, while at the same time assigning additional risk away from shareholders and onto customers. And that is what this particular rate case does through its step adjustment plan and various proposals contained in the rate case.

I have to say that I'm concerned generally about a paradigm that seems to be proliferating here, not just at this utility, but at utilities generally here, that certain capital expenditures are defined as so-called "nonrevenue-producing capital expenditures".

In the view of the OCA, all capital expenditures are revenue-producing, because they're all expenditures made by the utility in order to allow the utility to keep faith with its obligation to provide safe and reliable service for its customers pursuant to its tariff.

So, the idea that there are certain capital expenditures that deserve different regulatory treatment because they are so-called "nonrevenue-producing capital expenditures" is something of a nonstarter from our standpoint.

We are concerned about the inflation allowance for residual O&M expense. It's a small item of \$137,000. But we believe that's a bit of an anathema to cost of service ratemaking.

The proposed increases of \$880,000 in revenue requirement to reflect changes in depreciation are concerning for the OCA.

And we are concerned about the rate design trend that this utility continues to manifest in connection with its rate case.

That means more of the utility's revenue requirement would be produced through fixed charges, rather than volumetric charges. That, in our view, operates as a disincentive to consumers to do all of the things that we think consumers should be doing in order to -- in order to be good utility customers.

{DG 17-070} [Prehearing conference] {07-06-17}

We are concerned about the inequities

in the way that the revenue requirement is assigned to various rate classes, such that, in a rate case that proposes a 6.2 percent overall rate increase, at least one of the residential classes would see bills go up by 13.1 percent, where commercial and industrial customers only see a rate increase of 4.1 percent.

And I guess those are the only highlights that I'd like to draw the Commission's attention to. Now, again, in the context of having a fair degree of optimism that we can work through this rate case with the Company and with the Staff and reach agreement about all outstanding issues.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you for closing with the optimism again. I was feeling a little down there in the middle of the concerns.

MR. KREIS: I learned to deliver compliment sandwiches from some consultant somewhere. So, start with something nice, load all your complaints on, and then close the sandwich with another compliment.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And it's part of

every coaching seminar, too, for young players 1 2 in particular. 3 Mr. Dexter. 4 MR. EPLER: I thought I heard some 5 baloney in there. 6 [Laughter.] 7 MR. DEXTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, Staff has done a preliminary review of the 8 case and identified several issues that we will 9 10 investigate. We will investigate all the 11 issues. The traditional issues in the rate 12 case that are present here are rates to recover 13 increases in payroll, pensions, property taxes, 14 uncollectible expense, working capital, 15 prepayments, inflation, depreciation, return on 16 equity, class allocation, rate design. It's 17 all in the package. So, it's a complete rate 18 case. 19 At this stage, there are several 20 areas that sort of jump out that will require 21 additional investigation which raise concerns 22 for Staff. 23 First, the payroll adjustment that is

{DG 17-070} [Prehearing conference] {07-06-17}

proposed requests rate recovery for increases

24

measurable".

that occurred during the test year or one year after the test year, and then some that occur one year beyond, beyond one year after the test year. We will look at those to see if those are too remote to be considered "known and

Like the OCA, we have a concern about the inflation adjustment, which applies an inflation factor to a host of expenses, including things like gasoline and natural gas, which recent history would show are volatile, it can go up, it can go down, and don't necessarily move with the rate of inflation.

Staff has concerns with the length of the rate plan. In the Settlement last time, there was two step adjustments. The Company has proposed three in this case. And we also want to look closely at the three categories of expanded expenditures that are proposed to be included in the step adjustment.

Staff has concerns with the tripling and the quadrupling of the turn-on fees that we noticed. The Company has proposed to significantly increase those fees. And we

haven't found any sort of corresponding proforma adjustment on the revenue side that might reflect some of those increased fees, if they were approved.

And, finally, the Company for a long time has implemented a Residential Low Income Assistance Program, consistent with Commission precedent. And Staff will be looking at proposing an adjustment to that, to keep it in line with the original parameters of the program. Where the price of gas has dropped since that program was implemented, the percent of the discount on the total bill has gotten higher than the original parameters called for. And Staff will be looking at that and likely proposing an adjustment for that.

So, substantively, those are the issues that we plan to look at.

I just wanted to note on the record that Staff and the OCA and the Company had a brief discussion about discovery service in this case. And the Company indicated that they will be filing discovery via email in all cases, except where the content is such that

email is not practical. And, in those cases, they will be providing answers on either disks or memory sticks, which is a slight variation from the discovery rules, but I wanted to indicate that all Parties are in agreement with that.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. On that very last point, disks and sticks, I guess I would just caution everyone to make sure that you go through all of the required procedures from the Department of Information Technology regarding importing any data that originates outside the State. They have been pretty strict, in terms of making sure that media like that are fully cleaned and reviewed before they get put onto any State system.

Mr. Epler, in light of what Mr. Kreis and Mr. Dexter have talked about, anything you want to add to what you said before?

MR. EPLER: No, Mr. Chairman. I think that the issues that were raised are all appropriate for review in the rate case, and the Company is certainly prepared to address them. And, in the spirit that was raised by

```
1
         the Consumer Advocate, we're certainly open to
 2
         compromise and wanting to get this case
 3
         underway and resolved as quickly as possible.
 4
         So, I appreciate that.
 5
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: In terms of how
         long "as quickly as possible" would mean, when
 6
 7
         do we think this case would be ready to go to a
         hearing on the merits?
 8
                   MR. DEXTER: Well, we have a -- I
9
10
         have circulated a proposed procedural schedule
11
         to the Parties, which we're going to talk about
12
         at the tech session. But, if you give me a
13
         moment, I can pull that out and --
14
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sure. I'm just
15
         trying to get a sense. Is this a four-month
16
         case?
                An eight-month case?
17
                   MR. DEXTER: Well, the schedule has
18
         it as a twelve-month case.
19
                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: There we go.
20
                   MR. DEXTER: Which is what the
21
         suspension period in the statute allows for.
22
         And we tentatively have hearings set up for
23
         April of 2018.
24
                                      And, as with other
                   MR. EPLER:
                                Yes.
```

1 cases, certainly, if we could resolve it sooner, we would try to schedule the hearing 2 3 sooner on it. 4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I mean, it's 5 nice to hear optimism. I mean, Mr. Kreis's 6 optimism was encouraging there. And, no, I 7 understand. I mean, there's a lot of issues. As Mr. Dexter, this is a complete rate case, 8 9 and the filing is substantial. I can see it on 10 some of the tables, and I was looking at it 11 upstairs. So, we know how much there is to do. 12 I was just really just trying to get 13 a sense whether there was something you had 14 seen that indicated we were going to get this 15 one early in 2018. But April was kind of what 16 I expected, the 12 months. We'll go from 17 there. 18 You guys will have your technical session, work out the specifics of the schedule 19 20 and file something with us, and we'll deal with 21 it as quickly as we can. 22 Anything else before we adjourn? 23 [No verbal response.] 24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.

```
Thank you all.
 1
                          (Whereupon the prehearing
 2
                          conference was adjourned at
 3
                          10:19 a.m., and a technical
 4
 5
                          session was held thereafter.)
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```