State of New Hampshire
Public Utilities Commission

Docket No. DT 12-107
New Hampshire Optical Systems, Inc.

NH PUC Information Requests to Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. – Set 1

Received: September 6, 2012 | Date of Response: September 28, 2012
Request No. NHPUC 1-1 | Witness: Raymond A. Letourneau, Jr.

For all answers, provide information regarding only New Hampshire projects and attachments.

Request:

Provide copies of the PAA's you have in place with the following attachers: NHOS, segTEL, MetroCast, and BayRing.

Response:

Please see attached Pole Attachment Agreements.

State of New Hampshire
Public Utilities Commission

Docket No. DT 12-107
New Hampshire Optical Systems, Inc.

NH PUC Information Requests to Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. – Set 1

Received: September 6, 2012 | Date of Response: September 28, 2012
Request No. NHPUC 1-2 | Witness: Raymond A. Letourneau, Jr.

For all answers, provide information regarding only New Hampshire projects and attachments.

Request

Provide an estimate of the number of pole attachment applications that you received from Jan 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012:

a. In total:
b. Of under 200 poles
c. Over 200 poles that you rejected
d. Over 200 poles that you accepted

Response:

a. In total: **55**
b. Of under 200 poles: **54**
c. Over 200 poles that you rejected: **0**
d. Over 200 poles that you accepted: **1** (this one particular application had a total of 201 poles).

State of New Hampshire
Public Utilities Commission

Docket No. DT 12-107
New Hampshire Optical Systems, Inc.

NH PUC Information Requests to Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. – Set 1

Received: September 6, 2012 Date of Response: September 28, 2012
Request No. NHPUC 1-3 Witness: Raymond A. Letourneau, Jr.

For all answers, provide information regarding only New Hampshire projects and attachments.

Request

Provide an estimate of the highest number of poles with applications pending (from all parties) but not yet approved at any one time during this period.

Response:

Unitil does not track historical information that would provide the highest number of poles with applications pending at any one particular time. However the table below represents Unitil's current pending applications, the associated number of poles per application and their pending status as of September 10, 2012.

Company	Application Pending	Number of Poles on Application	Pending Status
NHOS	NHOS-P18-HAM-16	53	Make-ready work in progress
NHOS	NHOS-P18-PLA-08(B)	7	Fairpoint, pending
NHOS	NHOS-P18-KIN-09	117	Make-ready work in progress
NHOS	NHOS-P18-HAF-15	73	Make ready work in progress
NHOS	NHOS-P18-PLA-08	7	Fairpoint, pending
NHOS	NHOS-P18-SEA-13	199	Fairpoint, pending

State of New Hampshire
Public Utilities Commission

Docket No. DT 12-107
New Hampshire Optical Systems, Inc.

NH PUC Information Requests to Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. – Set 1

Received: September 6, 2012 Date of Response: September 28, 2012
Request No. NHPUC 1-3 Witness: Raymond A. Letourneau, Jr.

NHOS	NHOS-P14-CON-01	171	Make-ready work in progress
NHOS	NHOS-P3-CON-08	173	Make-Ready work sent to bid
NHOS	NHOS-P15-CON-31	200	Make-ready estimate sent for original application, NHOS reviewing other options
NHOS	NHOS-P14-CON-01-(B)	107	Make-ready work in progress
NHOS	NHOS-P14-EPS-04	118	Make-ready work package sent to contractors for bid
SEGTEL	A00	93	Waiting for make-ready payment
SEGTEL	A00-12-4024	101	Waiting for make-ready payment
SEGTEL	CONCORD-AO5	87	Make-ready work in progress
SEGTEL	PEMBROKE-A02	8	Make-ready work in progress
SEGTEL	CONCORD-A06	47	SEGTEL adjusting

			application
SEGTEL	EPSOM-A00	9	Survey Complete, preparing Estimate
BAY RING	FRCCON11	23	Make-Ready Scheduled

State of New Hampshire
Public Utilities Commission

Docket No. DT 12-107
New Hampshire Optical Systems, Inc.

NH PUC Information Requests to Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. – Set 1

Received: September 6, 2012 | Date of Response: September 28, 2012
Request No. NHPUC 1-4 | Witness: Raymond A. Letourneau, Jr.

For all answers, provide information regarding only New Hampshire projects and attachments.

Request:

Provide an estimate of the highest number of poles with applications pending (from any single CLEC) but not yet approved at any one time during this period.

Response:

Please see the Company's response to Request No. NHPUC 1-3.

State of New Hampshire
Public Utilities Commission

Docket No. DT 12-107
New Hampshire Optical Systems, Inc.

NH PUC Information Requests to Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. – Set 1

Received: September 6, 2012
Request No. NHPUC 1-5

Date of Response: September 28, 2012
Witness: Raymond A. Letourneau, Jr.

For all answers, provide information regarding only New Hampshire projects and attachments.

Request

During this period, did you exercise your option to limit applications pending approval by a licensor, to no more than 2,000 poles within a Planning Manager's Area at one time?

Response:

UES did not have reason to exercise this option as it did not have applications totaling more than 2,000 poles from any one applicant or licensor at any one time.

State of New Hampshire
Public Utilities Commission

Docket No. DT 12-107
New Hampshire Optical Systems, Inc.

NH PUC Information Requests to Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. – Set 1

Received: September 6, 2012
Request No. NHPUC 1-6

Date of Response: September 28, 2012
Witness: Raymond A. Letourneau, Jr.

For all answers, provide information regarding only New Hampshire projects and attachments.

Request:

In deciding whether to invoke the 2,000 pole limit, do you consider:

a. The work involved in modifying your own facilities,
b. The work required of other attachers to modify their own facilities;
c. Other factors (identify)

Response:

Not applicable. Please see the response to Request 1-6.

State of New Hampshire
Public Utilities Commission

Docket No. DT 12-107
New Hampshire Optical Systems, Inc.

NH PUC Information Requests to Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. – Set 1

Received: September 6, 2012 Date of Response: September 28, 2012
Request No. NHPUC 1-7 Witness: Raymond A. Letourneau, Jr.

For all answers, provide information regarding only New Hampshire projects and attachments.

Request

After a new licensee pays for make-ready work if applicable, when do you issue written notice to existing licensees that they must move their facilities? Is written notice always issued?

Response:

UES will issue a written notice to existing Licensees to move their facilities only if the make ready work involves a new pole set. In such a case, existing licensees on the pole would be notified through the receipt of a Form 57 (Notice to Transfer) after the pole is set and the pole owner's facilities have been transferred. If the make ready work does not involve a new pole set, the procedure in place is that the applying licensee notifies the existing licensee of proposed make ready work and the need to move their facilities.

State of New Hampshire
Public Utilities Commission

Docket No. DT 12-107
New Hampshire Optical Systems, Inc.

NH PUC Information Requests to Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. – Set 1

Received: September 6, 2012 Date of Response: September 28, 2012
Request No. NHPUC 1-8 Witness: Raymond A. Letourneau, Jr.

For all answers, provide information regarding only New Hampshire projects and attachments.

Request:

If no make-ready work is required by the pole owner, but existing licensee attachments must be moved to accommodate a new licensee, how is notice provided to existing licensees?

Response:

If no make ready work is required of the pole owner, the applying licensee, rather than UES, provides the existing licensee(s) notice of the proposed make ready work and the need to move their facilities in order to accommodate the new attachment(s).

State of New Hampshire
Public Utilities Commission

Docket No. DT 12-107
New Hampshire Optical Systems, Inc.

NH PUC Information Requests to Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. – Set 1

Received: September 6, 2012 | Date of Response: September 28, 2012
Request No. NHPUC 1-9 | Witness: Raymond A. Letourneau, Jr.

For all answers, provide information regarding only New Hampshire projects and attachments.

Request:

In its notice to existing licensees, does the pole owner specify a date by which the facilities must be moved?

Response:

UES does not specify the date in which the facilities must be transferred. The Company relies on the conditions and time frames set forth in the Pole Attachment Agreement.

State of New Hampshire
Public Utilities Commission

Docket No. DT 12-107
New Hampshire Optical Systems, Inc.

NH PUC Information Requests to Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. – Set 1

Received: September 6, 2012 Date of Response: September 28, 2012
Request No. NHPUC 1-10 Witness: Raymond A. Letourneau, Jr.

For all answers, provide information regarding only New Hampshire projects and attachments.

Request:

Estimate how often, between Jan. 1, 2011 and June 30, 2012, you issued such notices.

Response:

UES is unable to answer this request as data regarding the issuance of written notices to existing licensees is not maintained by UES in a manner that would allow it to readily distinguish the purpose for which such a notice was issued. As discussed above in the response to Request No. NHPUC 1-7, UES will issue a written notice to existing licensees to move their facilities only if the make ready work involves a new pole set. However, a new pole may be set for reasons other than the need to accommodate a new licensee, such as the need to replace a defective pole, the result of a town or state road project, or the need to accommodate changes to a pole owner's or an existing licensee's facilities. Also, as stated in the response to Request No. NHPUC 1-9, when a written notice is issued, UES does not specify the date by which the facilities must be moved.

State of New Hampshire
Public Utilities Commission

Docket No. DT 12-107
New Hampshire Optical Systems, Inc.

NH PUC Information Requests to Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. – Set 1

Received: September 6, 2012 Date of Response: September 28, 2012
Request No. NHPUC 1-11 Witness: Raymond A. Letourneau, Jr.

For all answers, provide information regarding only New Hampshire projects and attachments.

Request:

Estimate how often, between Jan. 1, 2011 and June 30, 2012, notice to existing licensees included instructions that facilities were required to be moved in 15 days.

Response:

UES did not issue or include such instructions during the referenced time period.

State of New Hampshire
Public Utilities Commission

Docket No. DT 12-107
New Hampshire Optical Systems, Inc.

NH PUC Information Requests to Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. – Set 1

Received: September 6, 2012 Date of Response: September 28, 2012
Request No. NHPUC 1-12 Witness: Raymond A. Letourneau, Jr.

For all answers, provide information regarding only New Hampshire projects and attachments.

Request:

Estimate how often, between Jan. 1, 2011 and June 30, 2012 you were notified by the new licensee or the existing licensee that the existing licensee would not complete its make ready work within the 15 day period.

Response:

Please see the Company's responses to Request Nos. NHPUC 1-9 through 1-11. UES did not receive any such notifications during the referenced period as it did not issue any such requests.

State of New Hampshire
Public Utilities Commission

Docket No. DT 12-107
New Hampshire Optical Systems, Inc.

NH PUC Information Requests to Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. – Set 1

Received: September 6, 2012
Request No. NHPUC 1-13

Date of Response: September 28, 2012
Witness: Raymond A. Letourneau, Jr.

For all answers, provide information regarding only New Hampshire projects and attachments.

Request:

Estimate how often, between Jan. 1, 2011 and June 30, 2012, you invoked your option to move an existing licensee's facilities.

Response:

UES did not invoke this option during the referenced period.

State of New Hampshire
Public Utilities Commission

Docket No. DT 12-107
New Hampshire Optical Systems, Inc.

NH PUC Information Requests to Unitil Energy Systems, Inc. – Set 1

Received: September 6, 2012 | Date of Response: September 28, 2012
Request No. NHPUC 1-14 | Witness: Raymond A. Letourneau, Jr.

For all answers, provide information regarding only New Hampshire projects and attachments.

Request

What factors do you weigh in determining whether to invoke this option to move?

Response:

As discussed during the technical session in docket DT 12-246 held at the offices of the Commission on August 29, 2012, there are at least three major factors that would need to be considered by a pole owner in determining whether to invoke the option to move another licensee's facilities:

1. The potential liability for any damage to the rearranged facilities or services of the licensee;
2. The risk of being unable to recover the costs incurred for the move or becoming involved in a protracted dispute if the licensee challenges or protests the move; and
3. The difficulty of determining whether the facts support issuing a requirement that the existing licensee move or rearrange its facilities within 15 days. A pole owner is generally not in a position to be a fact finder or arbiter of disputes between or among licensees.