STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

BEFORE THE

NEW HAMPSHIRE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

PENNICHUCK EAST UTILITY, INC.

DW 13-126

NOTICE OF INTENT TO FILE RATE SCHEDULES

PRE-FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

JOHN L. PATENAUDE

MAY 2013

Q. What are your responsibilities as the Chief Executive Officer of Pennichuck?

from Bentley College.

23

24

25	A.	As the Chief Executive Officer, I am responsible for overall management of the
26		corporation, and I report to the Board of Directors. I work with the Chief Operating
27		Officer, the Chief Financial Officer, the Director of Human Resources and the Director
28		of Information Technology to implement short and long term strategies, insure funding

30 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

29

of debt and minimize water rate increases.

- A. The purpose of my testimony is to provide information relative to the Pennichuck

 Corporation merger, corporate governance after the transaction, the cost of the
- transaction, the interest rate on the City Acquisition Bonds and, compliance with the
- 34 terms of the Settlement Agreement approved by the Public Utilities Commission in
- Docket No. DW 11-026 (Settlement Agreement).

36 Q. Would you please identify the other witnesses in this case?

- 37 A. In addition to my testimony, the following witnesses will provide testimony. Donald
- Ware, the Chief Operating Officer, will provide testimony as to operations. Larry
- 39 Goodhue, the Chief Financial Officer, Controller and Treasurer, will provide testimony
- 40 relative to finances. John Boisvert, the Chief Engineer, will provide information
- 41 regarding capital expenditures.

42 The Merger Transaction

- 43 Q. When was the merger transaction completed?
- 44 A. The merger transaction was completed on January 25, 2012, when the City of Nashua
- 45 acquired the shares of Pennichuck Corporation.
- Q. The Settlement Agreement estimated the "Acquisition Cost" to be \$152,099,885.
- What was the actual acquisition cost?

48	A.	The actual acquisition cost was \$150,570,000. A comparison of the estimated cost
49		compared to the actual cost by category is attached as Exhibit JLP-1. Mr. Goodhue wil
50		discuss the major differences in his testimony.
51	Q.	A condition of the merger approval was that the true interest cost of the City
52		Acquisition Bonds would not exceed 6.50 percent per annum. What is the true
53		interest cost?
54	A.	The true interest cost on the City Acquisition Bonds is 4.09 percent per annum as
55		shown in Exhibit JLP-4.
56	Q.	Can you provide an update as to the governance of Pennichuck after the merger?
57	A.	After the acquisition, the Pennichuck Board of Directors was reconstituted with 10 new
58		members appointed by the Sole Shareholder, the City of Nashua. There were six
59		members from Nashua, including the Mayor; one member from Londonderry; one
60		member from North Conway; one member from Windham; and, one member from
61		Amherst. These individuals also serve as members of the boards of directors of
62		Pennichuck's utility subsidiaries.
63		As agreed to in the Settlement Agreement, the By-Laws of Pennichuck Corporation
64		require that one member of the Pennichuck Corporation Board of Directors be
65		nominated by the Merrimack Valley Regional Water District. The District has
56		nominated a member who is currently being considered by the Board of Directors. If
57		approved, the Pennichuck Board of Directors will recommend the nominee to the Sole
58		Shareholder for approval.
59		While the Pennichuck Board members are from different locations, they have a
70		fiduciary responsibility to care for the finances and legal requirements of the

71		corporation. They must act in good faith and with a reasonable degree of care. The
72		interests of the corporation must take precedence over personal interests of individual
73		Board members.
74	Q.	Has the change in ownership as a result of the acquisition impacted customers and
75		operations?
76	A.	The change in ownership at the Pennichuck Corporation level has been transparent to
77		both customers and operations. Management changes at the senior executive level have
78		not affected customer services or operations. Mr. Ware will address this issue in more
79		detail.
80	Ra	te Case
81	Q.	Why is the Company filing a rate case at this time?
82	A.	The Settlement Agreement requires the regulated companies owned by Pennichuck
83		Corporation to file full rate cases simultaneously by no later than June 1, 2013.
84	Q.	Please discuss the ratemaking structure utilized in this filing.
85	A.	The rate making structure utilized in this filing is set forth in the Settlement Agreement.
86		There are two elements to the structure. The first element provides for recovery of the
87		City Bond Fixed Revenue Requirement ("CBFRR"). The second element is akin to
88		traditional ratemaking and provides for recovery of operating expenses and equity. Mr.
89		Goodhue and Mr. Ware will provide more detailed information relative to the structure.
90	Q.	How was the CBFRR amount determined?
91	A.	The CBFRR amount was determined in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.
92		Under the approved formula, the CBFRR amount is based on the pro-rata share of the

City's Acquisition Debt obligation, which is calculated based on the Company's

94		percentage share to the total share of the three regulated utilities. Mr. Goodhue will
95		provide more detail as to the computation of the CBFRR amount in his testimony.
96	Q.	How was the Company's allowable rate of return determined?
97	A.	The Company utilized the formula agreed to in the Settlement Agreement. The formula
98		applies a cost of equity based on the average of interest rates on 30-year Treasury bonds
99		for the most recent 12 months plus 3.0 percentage points. Mr. Goodhue will provide
100		more detail in his testimony.
101	Q.	In your testimony in DW 11-026, you testified that the savings related to the
102		acquisition of Pennichuck Corporation by the City of Nashua would result in
103		operational savings of \$1.7 million. Were the savings achieved?
104	A.	Yes. As described in Mr. Goodhue's testimony, the anticipated savings of \$1.7 million
105		were achieved by reducing public company costs in Pennichuck Corporation and
106		eliminating certain executive management positions in Pennichuck Water Works, Inc.
107	Co	mpliance with Settlement Agreement
108	Q.	The Settlement Agreement provided for the establishment of a rate stabilization
 109		fund by Pennichuck Water Works. Has the fund been established?
110	A.	Yes. The City Acquisition Debt included \$5 million for the establishment of a rate
111		stabilization fund by Pennichuck Water Works, Inc. The \$5 million was contributed by
112		Pennichuck Corporation to Pennichuck Water Works, Inc. upon completion of the
113		acquisition. The PWW Rate Stabilization fund has been maintained in accordance with
114		the procedures set forth in the Settlement Agreement in DW 11-026. Mr. Goodhue will
115		discuss the rate stabilization fund in more detail in his testimony.

116	Q.	Has the MARA been recorded on the Company books and how was the MARA
117		treated for ratemaking purposes?
118	A.	As agreed to in the Settlement Agreement, the MARA was computed and recorded on
119		the books at the time of the City's acquisition of Pennichuck. The MARA was
120		removed from the traditional ratemaking process because it is only recoverable as part
121		of the CBFRR.
122	Q.	Did the Company declare and provide dividends or distributions to its parent,
123		Pennichuck Corporation?
124	A.	Yes. The Commission approved the payment of dividend and distributions from paid in
125		capital to the parent corporation, Pennichuck Corporation, for the purpose of enabling
126		the City to satisfy the City's obligations for the City Acquisition Bonds. On February
127		22, 2013, Pennichuck East Utility, Inc. recorded the following distribution of its parent
128		Pennichuck Corporation: a dividend in the amount of \$71,787 (from retained earnings)
129		and a distribution from paid in capital of \$752,171. The distribution reflected the
130		Company's share of the funding of the City acquisition debt for 2012.
131	Q.	Did the Company make any payments to the City in 2012 for its Eminent Domain
132		costs?
133	A.	The Company did not make any payments to the City in 2012 pursuant to Paragraph
134		III. D. 4. of the Settlement Agreement. As part of the discovery process in the rate
135		cases, it may be advisable for the parties to discuss the mechanism by which the
136		Commission will audit the final Eminent Domain Amount.
137 138	Ten	nporary Rates
139	Q.	Will the Company be seeking a temporary rate increase?

140 A. Under the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the Company is required to seek 141 temporary rates in accordance with RSA 378:27.

Communications

142

143

144

152

- Q. Please describe Pennichuck's efforts to communicate with the City of Nashua, other affected communities, and customers relative to the rate filing?
- 145 A. We have been communicating with Nashua and other communities with customers

 146 relative to rate information and the rate case process for some time. These constituents

 147 have been notified of the filing of the Notices of Intent to File Rate Schedules and the

 148 estimated rate increase. We will continue to keep them informed as the rate cases

 149 proceed. We have indicated to the communities that our staff is available to meet with

 150 each community as it desires. Customers will also be informed directly in accordance

 151 with Puc 1203.02.

Conclusion

- Q. How do the rates requested compare to the rates that would have been required had Pennichuck Corporation remained a publicly traded company?
- The requested increase in rates consists of a permanent rate increase of 9.97% and a 155 step increase of 2.25%. The combined rate increase is 12.21%. Under the prior 156 ownership structure, the requested increase, including the step increase, would have 157 approximated 21.98% as shown in Exhibit JLP-2. The higher rate assumes that the 158 public company cost savings and the savings associated with the management 159 restructuring are not achieved. The higher rate also assumes an overall rate of return of 160 5.96% on a higher rate basis. The annual impact on the average single family customer 161 162 would have been to increase monthly cost to \$11.52 versus the \$6.40 per month

- requested in the filing as shown in Exhibit JLP-3. I believe these results demonstrate
 the sound judgment of the City of Nashua in pursuing the acquisition of Pennichuck
 Corporation.

 Q. Does this complete your testimony?
- 167 A. Yes.