1		STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
2		PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
3	Turne 15 202) 1.21 m m
4	21 South Fru: Suite 10	2 – 1:31 p.m. it Street
5	Concord, NH	
6		
7		
8	RE:	DW 22-006 Pennichuck water works, inc.:
9		Petition for Approval of the 2022 Qualified Capital Project Adjustment
10		Charge (QCPAC). (Prehearing conference)
11		(,
12	PRESENT:	Chairman Daniel C. Goldner, Presiding Commissioner Carleton B. Simpson
13		Tracey Russo, Clerk
14		
15	APPEARANCES:	Reptg. Pennichuck Water Works, Inc.: James J. Steinkrauss, Esq.
16		(Rath, Young & Pignatelli)
17		Reptg. New Hampshire Dept. of Energy: Suzanne G. Amidon, Esq.
18		Jayson Laflamme, Director/Water Group (Regulatory Support Division)
19		
20		
21		
22		
23	Court Rep	orter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52
24		

1 2 INDEX 3 PAGE NO. STATEMENTS OF PRELIMINARY POSITION BY: 4 5 5 Ms. Amidon 6 Mr. Steinkrauss 11 7 QUESTIONS BY: 8 8 Cmsr. Simpson 9 FURTHER STATEMENTS BY: 10 Mr. Goodhue 10 11 12 APPROVAL OF PROPOSED PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE 8 13 APPROVED PROPOSED PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE 14 First Set Data Requests to PWW June 8, 2022 15 PWW Responses to First Set June 22, 2022 of Data Requests 16 Second Set Data Requests to PWW July 6, 2022 17 PWW Responses to Second Set July 20, 2022 18 of Data Requests 19 Technical Session at 10:00 a.m. August 10, 2022 20 PWW Responses to Technical August 17, 2022 Session Data Requests 21 File Settlement to be filed September 14, 2022 2.2 23 24

1	PROCEEDING
2	CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Good
3	afternoon, everyone. I'm Chairman Goldner. I'm
4	joined today by Commissioner Simpson.
5	We're here this afternoon in Docket
6	22-006 for a prehearing conference regarding the
7	Pennichuck Water Works' Petition for the 2022
8	Qualified Capital Project Adjustment Charge.
9	Let's take appearances, beginning with
10	Pennichuck.
11	MR. STEINKRAUSS: Good afternoon,
12	Commissioners and Staff. My name is Jim
13	Steinkrauss. I represent Pennichuck Water Works
14	for its 2022 QCPAC Petition.
15	I'm joined today by Mr. Larry Goodhue,
16	Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial
17	Officer; Donald Ware, Chief Operating Officer;
18	Mr. John Boisvert, Chief Engineer. And Mr. Ware
19	and Mr. Boisvert both filed written testimony
20	with the Company's Petition.
21	Mr. George Torres, Corporate Controller
22	and Treasurer; as well as Mr. Jay Kerrigan,
23	Senior Financial Analyst, who are also attending,
24	but won't be participating.
l	

1 All these individuals are employees of 2 Pennichuck Water Works, but are also employees of 3 the subsidiaries, Pennichuck East and the parent, 4 PennCorp. 5 Thank you. 6 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Very good. 7 And New Hampshire Department of Energy? MS. AMIDON: Good afternoon. 8 I'm Suzanne Amidon. I am here on behalf of the 9 10 Department of Energy, Division of Regulatory 11 Services. 12 And with me today is Jayson Laflamme, 13 who is the Director of the Water Group; and 14 Anthony Leone, who is an Analyst in that group. 15 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Very good. 16 Just one preliminary issue from the Commission, 17 before we hear initial positions. 18 For QCPAC hearings moving forward, 19 including this one, we anticipate resolving via 20 nisi orders, without a hearing. We found that 21 DOE's substantive analysis to be very helpful in 2.2 the past, and would welcome its continued input 23 in this docket. In the absence of such input or 24 a settlement between the parties, we would

1 anticipate a hearing in this matter to ensure a 2 complete record. 3 Is there anything else the parties wish 4 to include in today's prehearing conference, 5 outside of initial positions? 6 MR. STEINKRAUSS: That's great. 7 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Very good. All right. Well, let's begin with the New 8 9 Hampshire Department of Energy. 10 MS. AMIDON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 11 Staff is doing its customary process, 12 which is we're evaluating the filing, in terms of the calculations. We're looking at the audit. 13 14 And the audit, by the way, has been completed. 15 There were some minor findings in that, but we're 16 working through those issues with the Company. 17 And we're going to be doing an engineering 18 review, to make sure all the plant is in service 19 and used and useful. 20 This is on a little bit of a more 21 accelerated schedule than some of our other --2.2 than our other docket, the PEU docket, which we 23 were talking about yesterday. But we do expect to be able to resolve it without having a 24

1 hearing.

2	And I guess, if the preference is a
3	settlement agreement, we can shoot for that as a
4	goal. You know, we're amenable to either
5	providing a recommendation, with backup, or
6	having a settlement agreement. So, if the
7	Commissioners have any particular, you know,
8	favor amongst between those two, we're fine to
9	accommodate that.
10	And we appreciate also that the
11	Commissioners are welcome, you know, are
12	welcoming to issuing an order nisi, as opposed to
13	going through a hearing.
14	We do have a pending procedural
15	schedule, a Motion for a Procedural Schedule.
16	And we've already commenced discovery. So, we're
17	going to be continuing to follow that, unless
18	otherwise ordered by the Commission.
19	[Chairman Goldner and Cmsr. Simpson
20	conferring.]
21	CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Ms. Amidon, yes,
22	just to move things along. If you want, if you
23	can verbalize the procedural schedule, we can
24	just make sure everybody is aligned right here,

1 and then we'll be finished. If that's okay? 2 MS. AMIDON: Yes. Yes, I filed that on 3 April 12th. And it's assented to by PWW. 4 So, we commenced discovery on June 8th; 5 the responses are due to that first set on June 6 22nd. We'll issue a second set to PWW on 7 July 6th, with those responses due July 20th. We've scheduled a technical session, which we'll 8 conduct over Teams, on August 10th. And any 9 10 questions that need responses will be provided by 11 PWW on August 17th. 12 And the proposal, when this was 13 developed, was to file a settlement, and we have 14 the target date for that September 14th. 15 And, as I said, this is an assented-to Motion for a Procedural Schedule. 16 17 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. So, if 18 Pennichuck could just, Mr. Steinkrauss, if you'd 19 just like to verbally confirm that you agree with 20 that schedule? 21 MR. STEINKRAUSS: Pennichuck Water 2.2 Works absolutely agrees with that, and has no 23 objection. Thank you. 24 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.

{DW 22-006} [Prehearing conference] {06-15-22}

7

1 So, I think we can rule from the Bench and just 2 approve the procedural schedule here today, and we're all set. So, thank you. 3 4 CMSR. SIMPSON: Agreed. 5 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Yes. Thank 6 you. 7 CMSR. SIMPSON: One question for you, Ms. Amidon. 8 You had articulated the difference 9 10 between a recommendation moving forward, compared 11 to a settlement agreement. Historically, from 12 your experience, with how the PUC was structured 13 in the past, or historical practice within the 14 Department of Energy, do you have a preference or 15 could you provide some context into the approach 16 historically? 17 MS. AMIDON: Well, let me see what Mr. 18 Laflamme has to say. 19 CMSR. SIMPSON: Please. 20 [Atty. Amidon and Mr. Laflamme 21 conferring.] 2.2 [Chairman Goldner and Cmsr. Simpson also conferring.] 23 24 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: I'm sorry, Ms.

1 Amidon. Go ahead. Please proceed. 2 MS. AMIDON: No, that's fine. 3 I just discussed it with Mr. Laflamme. 4 And he said that, in the past, when it was --5 when the PUC was a unified whole, the Staff would 6 file a recommendation, and an order nisi would 7 issue. But, given the fact that the PUC is now 8 9 bifurcated or we're separate entities, and there 10 is some fluid nature to this filing as it goes 11 through the analysis, and the calculations may 12 change, you know, as we move forward, it's 13 probably better to go as a settlement agreement, 14 because then we can explain and add, and include 15 the data responses, which show why some 16 calculations may have changed. 17 So, probably be a better way to go with 18 a settlement agreement, as we originally 19 proposed. 20 CMSR. SIMPSON: Great. I appreciate 21 And that sounds reasonable to me. that. 2.2 MS. AMIDON: Thank you. 23 CMSR. SIMPSON: Thank you. 24 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay.

{DW 22-006} [Prehearing conference] {06-15-22}

9

1 MR. STEINKRAUSS: Yes. We'd absolutely 2 agree with that, and do the settlement approach. 3 Thank you. 4 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. 5 MR. STEINKRAUSS: With an order nisi as 6 approval? 7 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Yes. CMSR. SIMPSON: And the Company would 8 9 work in collaboration with the Department of 10 Energy in order to reach settlement in the 11 future, should we work towards that process. 12 MR. GOODHUE: Sure. This is Larry 13 Goodhue, the CEO of Pennichuck. We absolutely 14 agree. The advantages to a settlement agreement 15 is it allows us and the other parties to the case 16 to definitively, you know, lock down what the 17 facts are that we wish the Commissioners to opine 18 on in an order *nisi*. And, so, that's a very 19 positive step in the whole process. Absolutely. 20 CMSR. SIMPSON: Thank you. 21 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Very good. Ms. 2.2 Amidon, anything else from the Department of 23 Energy? 24 MS. AMIDON: Are you asking for a

1 position on the docket? 2 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Well, yes. Ιf you -- I think, yes, is there anything else that 3 4 you'd like to add, before I move to Pennichuck? 5 MS. AMIDON: I think -- I think I'm 6 done. Thank you very much. 7 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Steinkrauss? 8 Thank you, Chairman. 9 MR. STEINKRAUSS: 10 The Petition asks for -- Pennichuck's 11 Petition asked for three things. First, final 12 approval of the QCPAC surcharge, based on the 13 eligible capital projects that were completed, 14 used and useful by the end of December 2021; 15 second, preliminary approval of the capital 16 budget for 2022; and also provide the Commission 17 with information regarding the Company's 18 forecasted budgets, and that's for 2023 and 2024. 19 The Company's Petition states that the 20 capital projects in the Petition were eligible, 21 meaning they were completed, used and useful by 2.2 the end of December 31st, 2021. They were 23 financed by debt that was previously approved by 24 the Commission. And the projects are associated

with budgets that were previously submitted and preliminarily approved by the Commission by Order 26,598, which was issued on March 29th, 2022, as amended by Order 26,605, on April 8th, 2022, in Docket DW 21-023, and that one approved a settlement in that prior QCPAC.

1

2

3

4

5

6

24

7 The Company estimates that the QCPAC 8 surcharge for 2022 is 1.75 percent, or 97 cents, 9 when added to the rates granted in the rate case 10 docket, 19-084, that was approved in Order 11 26,435, on November 24th, 2020, and the rates in 12 the 2020 QCPAC, which was 3.9 percent, granted in 2020-020 [20-020?], and the 2021 QCPAC of 1.56 13 14 percent, granted in DW 21-023; resulting in a 15 cumulative QCPAC charge of \$4.01 per month, 16 resulting in an average single-family bill of 17 \$59.66, or a cumulative increase of about 7.21 18 percent.

And, finally, the Company requests that the 1.75 percent QCPAC surcharge will be recouped on a services rendered basis back to April 26, 2022, which is the date that the Company closed its most recent bond sale.

The Company asks that the Commission

1 find the 2022 surcharge is prudent, and based on 2 used and useful projects completed in 2021, and 3 ask that the Commission approve the current year 4 budget as appropriate and reasonable, and provide 5 preliminary approval for the forecasted budgets 6 for 2023 and 2024. 7 I have nothing more. Thank you. 8 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. Are 9 there any additional matters that we need to 10 cover today? All set, Commissioner Simpson? 11 CMSR. SIMPSON: Nothing from me. Thank 12 you. 13 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Anything else, Ms. Amidon? 14 15 MS. AMIDON: Nothing from the 16 Department. Thank you. 17 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: And Pennichuck is 18 ready to go. Okay. 19 Well, thank you everyone, we are 20 adjourned today. Thank you very much. 21 (Whereupon the prehearing conference 2.2 was adjourned at 1:42 p.m., and a 23 technical session was held thereafter.) 24