1		STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
2		PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
3	To 1	
4	21 South Fru	024 - 9:03 a.m. it Street
5	Suite 10 Concord, NH	
6		
7	RE:	DW 24-069
8		MILL BROOK VILLAGE WATER SYSTEM, LLC, MARC LIECHTI, AND JUSTIN AHMANN:
9		Joint Petition for Approval to Change Ownership of Mill Brook Village Water
10		System. (Prehearing conference)
11		
12	PRESENT:	Cmsr. Carleton B. Simpson, Presiding
13		Ben Martin-McDonough, Esq./PUC
14		Legal Advisor
15		Tracey Russo, Clerk
16	APPEARANCES:	LLC, Marc Liechti, and Justin Ahmann:
17		Marcia A. Brown, Esq. <i>(NH Brown Law)</i> James Ingram, Owner
18		Reptg. New Hampshire Dept. of Energy:
19		Marie-Helene B. Bailinson, Esq. Jayson Laflamme, Director/Water Division
20		Robyn Descoteau, Water Division (Regulatory Support Division)
21		
22		
23	Court Rep	oorter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52
24		

		1
1		
2	INDEX	
3	1	PAGE NO.
4	SUMMARY OF THE DOCKET BY CMSR. SIMPSON	3
5	STATEMENT BY MS. BROWN (Re: Affidavit of Publication)	5
6		6
7	STATEMENT BY CMSR. SIMPSON ON THE PURPOSE OF A PREHEARING CONFERENCE	0
8		
9	OPENING STATEMENTS BY:	
10	Ms. Brown	7
11	Ms. Bailinson	13
12	OUESTION BY CMSR. SIMPSON TO DOE	16
13	(Re: Affidavit of Publication issue)	1 0
14	QUESTIONS BY CMSR. SIMPSON TO MR. INGRAM (Re: Affidavit of Publication issue)	16
1516	QUESTIONS BY CMSR. SIMPSON TO PETITIONERS (Re: Deadlines for the sale)	17
17	QUESTION BY CMSR. SIMPSON TO DOE (Re: Discovery)	17
18 19	QUESTION BY CMSR. SIMPSON TO DOE (Re: A need to schedule a hearing)	18
20	REQUEST BY CMSR. SIMPSON FOR A JOINT FILING BY THE PARTIES WITH REGARD TO VARIOUS ISSUES	19
21	QUESTION BY CMSR. SIMPSON TO ATTY. BROWN (Re: What was included in the filing made	20
23	today with the Clerks Office regarding the Affidavit of Publication)	
24		

1 PROCEEDING

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

CMSR. SIMPSON: On the record. Good morning, everyone. My name is Commissioner Carleton Simpson.

We are here today for a prehearing conference in Docket Number DW 24-069, in which the Commission docketed the Joint Petition to Transfer Ownership of Mill Brook Village Water System, LLC, from its current owner of James Ingram, to Marc Liechti and Justin Ahmann. This prehearing conference was noticed on June 4th, 2024. The Commission's jurisdiction over this docket comes from RSA 374:30, RSA 374:22, RSA 374:26, RSA 374:1, Section 2, 378:7, and RSA 369:1.

In addition to the Joint Petitioners, the New Hampshire Department of Energy is the only other party to have filed an appearance in this docket.

We'll start today by taking appearances, starting with the Joint Petitioners.

MS. BROWN: Good morning, Commissioner Simpson. Thank you for presiding today. I am Marcia Brown, with NH Brown Law, representing

1 Mill Brook Village Water District -- I'm sorry, 2. Water System. And with me today is its owner, 3 James Ingram. 4 Unable to physically be here are the 5 Buyers, Marc Liechti and Justin Ahmann. 6 will be virtually tied in for the tech session 7 that's following this. 8 And I do have a preliminary matter to 9 address, after taking appearances, relating to 10 the Affidavit of Publication. 11 Thank you. 12 CMSR. SIMPSON: Excellent. I had that 1.3 on my list to ask you. So, look forward to your 14 response. 15 New Hampshire Department of Energy. 16 MS. BAILINSON: Good morning, Mr. 17 Chair. My name is Marie-Helene Bailinson, and 18 I'm here representing the Department of Energy. 19 And with me is Jayson Laflamme, who is the 20 Director of the Department's Water Division; and 2.1 Robyn Descoteau, who is a Utility Analyst in the

CMSR. SIMPSON: Thank you. Good morning.

Water Division.

2.2

23

MS. BAILINSON: Good morning.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

CMSR. SIMPSON: I'll recognize Attorney
Brown, you can address the question about the
Affidavit of Publication.

MS. BROWN: Yes. As the Commission is well aware, that if an affidavit of publication -- or, if notice of the prehearing is not perfected, then the prehearing cannot be held.

CMSR. SIMPSON: Uh-huh.

MS. BROWN: But I need to take the fall on this, because I had everything to send to the Commission, the signed Affidavit of Publication, the list of everybody that it was signed — the notice was sent out to on June 7th. And that never happened. It happened to be during a major cyber attack that I had had for my law firm during that time. So, I just filed all of those documents this morning.

But I will represent today, and Mr.

Ingram can testify, that he did personally mail
out a copy of the order to all of his customers
on June 5th.

So, I just want to put that into the

record, and ask that the Commission entertain my motion for late acceptance of the Affidavit, proving that service occurred.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. Well, we'll proceed today. We'll consider that motion. And, in our prehearing order, we'll address the question as to process, and whether another prehearing conference will need be held in the future, or otherwise.

MS. BROWN: Uh-huh.

CMSR. SIMPSON: Thank you for that information, though.

We're going to allow opening statements. Before doing so, I want to lay out the purpose of a prehearing conference, and what information we need from the parties.

The purpose of this prehearing conference is to identify all issues in this docket, identify and resolve all initial administrative issues and pending motions, determine whether a procedural schedule and discovery are necessary, and agree to a schedule, and determine whether a hearing will be necessary, and, if so, when an appropriate time

for a hearing would be.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

In addition, the Commission would like to hear from the parties as to what they believe a likely timeframe for resolving this docket is, including if there are any external deadlines that the Commission should be aware of, particularly in light of the issue with respect to the Affidavit of Publication.

With these questions in mind, I'll turn to the parties to make opening statements, starting with the Joint Petitioners.

MS. BROWN: I forget that they just moved a shorter mike to this table.

Thank you very much. We have prepared remarks to read into the record.

For background, Mill Brook Village
Water System has been a regulated utility since
2014, that was ten years ago. However, Maranatha
Construction, which is Mr. Ingram's construction
company, built the water system back in 1988, and
began developing homes in 1989.

For a period of time, Mr. Ingram consulted the PUC Staff, when Staff was with the PUC. Through -- and it was thought at the time

that homeowners associations would be taking over ownership of the infrastructure, so that it would not constitute a "regulated public utility" situation.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

But, over the years, that, with the slow development of the three developments, the lack of homeowner association interest in acquiring the assets, it became clear that Mr.

Ingram was going to be a regulated utility. So, that's why it was such a delay, from 1988-1989 timeframe of starting the developments, to filing a rate case in 2014.

Mill Brook is a small system. It has about 44 customers, comprised of adjacent developments in Thornton. The first one is Mill Brook Village, which was constructed about 1989 and '90; Brookside Hollow had residences constructed in about 1991; The Falls at Mill Brook, which is where the bulk of the infrastructure resides, wasn't built until 2009. So, there was a very slow development of these 44 customers.

The customer class is predominantly -- or, is entirely residential, comprised of

condominiums and single-family homes. Customers pay about \$535 a year for their water, which is very cheap. The billing is done quarterly, so that \$535 equates to about \$133 per quarter per customer.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

Briefly, the infrastructure consists of two bedrock wells and a dug well. Those sources of supply are combined, and have a total yield of about 80 gallons per minute. There is a pump house that treats for particulates, iron, manganese, and pH, very simple systems. There are storage tanks. One is a 20,000 gallon steel storage tank, there is a 3,300 gallon steel storage tank, two booster pumps. The assets are about 35 years old, but have been lightly used, given the level of slow development. But they are very much within their useful lives.

Mr. Ingram would like to retire from the water business. Marc Liechti and Justin Ahmann are private investors from Montana, specializing in purchasing small systems, like Mill Brook. Marc Liechti serves as President and Chief of Operations of Alpine Pacific Utilities, which is Justin Ahmann's and Marc Liechti's

utility company. Justin Ahmann is a Licensed Water Operator and a Wastewater Operator in Montana. He's also a Licensed Professional Engineer in New Hampshire, Montana, Virgina, North Dakota, and Alberta, Canada.

2.

1.3

1 4

2.1

2.2

In the Petition, we noted the number of small systems that the Buyers own. And I would direct the Commission's attention to that. There is East Vassalboro Water Company, which has about 85 customers. That's in Maine. Then, there's a system in Pennsylvania called "Jefferson Estate Sewage Treatment". That has 92 customers. The rest are in Montana, and range from having 17 customers to 295 customers. So, clearly, the Buyers have a niche specialty in operating small water and wastewater utilities.

Because of this experience, we believe that the Buyers meet the requisite managerial, technical, financial, legal expertise to own and operate Mill Brook, to provide safe and adequate service under the Commission's statutes to the Mill Brook customers, and to maintain Mill Brook in compliance with all state and federal regulations.

Agreement, a purchase price has been agreed to at \$52,000. Just for comparison, the rate base in the 2014 test year was at 70,000. So, there's clearly no acquisition premium going on here. No financing is anticipated. And the proposed transaction is not anticipated to alter Mill Brook's corporate structure, any of its rate structure, rates or tariff, with the exception of some of the customer service improvements that the Buyers bring to the table.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

As Commissioner Simpson noted, this proceeding is governed by RSA 375:22, RSA 374:30, both of which have a "for public good" litmus test for approving transfers. And, so, the ask in this proceeding is going to be that the Commission find favorably that the purchase of Mill Brook is "for the public good", consistent with those two statutes.

Now, I briefly mentioned that the

Buyers will change some of the customer

interface, and that is described in the Testimony

of Mr. Ahmann. The Buyers propose to have a

website. They have an existing website for their

customers to pay their bills on, and they will bring that to the Mill Brook customers as well. In comparison, right now, the Mill Brook customers pay by physical checks.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

Now, Mr. Liechti and Ahmann are in Montana. And, so, that begs the question of "What's the local face of the Company?" That is yet to be decided upon. However, right now, Mill Brook uses Lakes Region Water Company to operate the system. And Mr. Liechti and Ahmann also have a humorously named "Hydro Hooligans" company over in Bennington, and Bennington is about an hour and 20 minutes away from Thornton.

So, as this proceeding progresses, if it looks like there's going to be Commission approval, then the Buyers will be making a decision on who's going to be their local presence.

Customers will still have the same -will still have contact information, either to
the local presence, or to Mr. Liechti and Mr.
Ahmann directly, similar to how the customers
have the contact information of Mr. Ingram. So,
the customers -- there's still going to be the

ability of customers to reach out to somebody if there is a problem.

We have mentioned earlier today a procedural -- or, I believe, or maybe not. I discussed with the Department of Energy proposing a procedural schedule. And we expect to finalize that during the tech session following this proceeding. And look forward to working with DOE on discovery.

And if, Commissioner Simpson, you have any questions, we're here to take any of your questions.

Thank you.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

CMSR. SIMPSON: Thank you. Recognize the New Hampshire Department of Energy, do you have any opening remarks you'd like to make at this time?

MS. BAILINSON: Thank you, Commissioner.

The Department of Energy is generally supportive of the idea of the transaction in this matter, so long as the discovery supports the prerequisite established by RSA 374:30, that the proposed transaction from Mill Brook, Mr. Ingram,

to the Buyers, Mr. Liechti and Mr. Ahmann, is in the public good. Including the need for a satisfactory investigation of other issues presented by the Commission in its Commencement of Adjudicative Proceedings.

2.

1.3

1 4

2.1

2.2

The Petition states that the Joint

Petitioners seek to each purchase 50 percent of

the stock in Mill Brook, and each have the

managerial, technical, and financial expertise to

own and operate Mill Brook.

The Department has some questions and need for clarification regarding the corporate structure of Mill Brook, before and after the transaction, which we will want to resolve during the discovery process.

And the Department understands,

pursuant to the Petition, and the -- I think the

Joint Petitioners' statement, that the proposed

Buyers will use the affiliated company, I had

"Hydro Hooligans", I think it's just Hydro

Hooligans, I am sort of unclear whether they

meant Alpine Pacific [sic] & Water, LLC, and

Hydro Hooligans. But, either way, if it's Hydro

Hooligans, and that's opened by Mr. Liechti, to

then perform the operations and maintenance on Mill Brook, the Department wishes to review the affiliate contracts, in accordance with RSA 366:3 and 366:5, which I think would also require that the Commission have access to those contracts.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

And we also want to dig into the corporate structure of the affiliates. And it appears, from the statement today, that those affiliates, that might not be a sure thing that it's Hydro Hooligans. We understood it was per the Petition. But it appears that, maybe during the discovery process, we'll find that it's another, another affiliate will be used.

In our preliminary statement, we discussed working with the Joint Petitioners on a procedural schedule. We have had some preliminary discussions about a procedural schedule, which we will jointly file after the prehearing conference.

Finally, well, and in connection to the procedural schedule, we thought, you know, because the Buyers are not here, available for questions today, that we would build a technical session and, you know, ask the Buyers to attend

1 sooner, rather than later, in the process. 2. then, we'll have some discussions with the Joint 3 Petitioners regarding this. 4 I don't think we have anything, any 5 other comments to make. Thank you, Mr. Chair. 6 CMSR. SIMPSON: Thank you very much. 7 So, I will start with a few questions, 8 just to ensure I understood what Attorney 9 Brown -- oh, sure. Did you have any comments on the Affidavit of Publication and the motion that 10 11 Attorney Brown made? 12 MS. BAILINSON: We have no objection to 1.3 Attorney Brown's proposal regarding this matter. 14 CMSR. SIMPSON: Perfect. Thank you. 15 And just to square my understanding. 16 Mr. Ingram, I think I understood that Mr. Brown 17 stated that you mailed the notice in June to 18 customers and to the parties outlined in the 19 Notice of Adjudicative Proceeding? 20 MR. INGRAM: That is correct. 2.1 CMSR. SIMPSON: So, you mailed, by June 2.2 17th, the approved notice to the Town of Thornton Board of Selectmen, the New Hampshire Department 23 24 of Environmental Services, and all Mill Brook

1	customers?
2	MR. INGRAM: Correct, on June 5th.
3	CMSR. SIMPSON: Thank you. Okay.
4	With respect to a timeframe for the
5	sale, Attorney Brown, are there any dates that
6	the Commission should be aware of?
7	MS. BROWN: In the Petition, we noted
8	"30 days after Commission approval", but that
9	technically is within the motion for rehearing
10	and appeal period. So, it would be sometime
11	after that 30-day when the Commission order
12	becomes final. But it is hoped, certainly, by
13	the end of this tax year, 2024.
14	CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. And any other
15	external deadlines or is that really the only
16	deadline that the Company has in mind for the
17	resolution of this proceeding?
18	MS. BROWN: Well, I'll note that
19	there's no financing that's needed to, and that
20	would be another external deadline.
21	Anything else?
22	MR. INGRAM: Yes. There are no other
23	external deadlines.
24	CMSR. SIMPSON: Thank you. We talked a

```
1
         little bit about discovery. I'll turn to the
 2.
         Department.
 3
                    Other than what you noted in your
 4
         opening remarks, do you have thoughts on rounds
 5
         of discovery, the timeline that will be needed,
 6
         and anything from the Commission?
 7
                    MS. BAILINSON: Thank you.
                    CMSR. SIMPSON: Yes.
 8
 9
                    [Atty. Bailinson and Dir. Laflamme
10
                    conferring. 1
11
                    MS. BAILINSON:
                                    Thank you for --
12
         appreciate it. Yes. In conferring with Director
1.3
         Laflamme, --
14
                    CMSR. SIMPSON: Uh-huh.
15
                    MS. BAILINSON: -- we're anticipating
16
         three rounds of discovery, and to file, you know,
17
         hoping to file a settlement by November 15th, or
18
         thereabouts.
19
                    CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. And do you have
20
         any thoughts at this time on whether the
2.1
         Commission should schedule a formal hearing or do
2.2
         you anticipate a settlement, with a
23
         recommendation to the Commission to resolve this
24
         matter via order nisi?
```

```
1
                    MS. BAILINSON: Let me confer, and I'll
 2.
         get right back to you.
 3
                    CMSR. SIMPSON:
                                    Sure. Take your time.
                    [Atty. Bailinson and Dir. Laflamme
 4
 5
                    conferring.]
                    MS. BAILINSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
 7
                    CMSR. SIMPSON: Uh-huh.
                    MS. BAILINSON: Our preference will be
 9
         to file a settlement, with an issuance of order
10
         nisi.
11
                    CMSR. SIMPSON:
                                    Okay. Thank you very
12
         much.
1.3
                    MS. BAILINSON: Uh-huh.
14
                    CMSR. SIMPSON: And, given that there's
15
         a technical session following this prehearing
16
         conference, I would request that, after that tech
17
         session, if the parties could submit a joint
18
         filing that lays out the issues presented; our
19
         legal authority, from your view, over the issue;
20
         the standard of review; and propose a procedural
21
         schedule, including whether or not a hearing is
2.2
         required, and hearing dates consistent with that.
23
                    Any objection to that request?
24
                    MS. BAILINSON: No objection, no.
```

```
1
                                None from the Company.
                    MS. BROWN:
 2.
         Department of Energy and Mill Brook have already
 3
         circulated a proposed procedural schedule.
         we would like to fine-tune that. We're
 4
 5
         generally -- my understanding is we're in general
 6
         agreement, and could certainly, pretty soon after
 7
         this prehearing conference, file a report with
 8
         the listed items.
 9
                    CMSR. SIMPSON: Would you -- do you
10
         think by the end of this week is too aggressive
11
         for that report?
12
                    MS. BAILINSON: We do not. Thank you.
                    MS. BROWN: We certainly can make a
1.3
14
         filing within this week.
15
                    CMSR. SIMPSON:
                                    Okav.
                                If it's joint, separately,
16
                    MS. BROWN:
17
         but likely joint, and within days.
18
                    CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. Very good.
                                                        So,
19
         we'll set the deadline of August 2nd for that.
20
                    And, as a final question, just so,
2.1
         again, to square my understanding on the
2.2
         Affidavit, Ms. Brown, what did you file with the
23
         Clerk's Office today?
24
                    Did you -- you've noted that you filed
```

1 something. I just want to understand I know 2. what's been provided to them at this point. 3 MS. BROWN: Sorry, I was just pulling 4 up the e-mail again. So, there's a cover letter. 5 There is the Affidavit of Mr. Ingram. 6 CMSR. SIMPSON: Uh-huh. 7 MS. BROWN: There is the letter that was sent to the Commission -- to the customers, 8 9 DES, and Town folks. And, then, there is the 10 list of everyone who received the mailing. 11 So, I thought that would be a complete 12 package. 1.3 CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. 14 MS. BROWN: So, you have, you know, 15 documentation of what actually went out, when it 16 went out, and Mr. Ingram's attestation that he 17 mailed them out personally. 18 CMSR. SIMPSON: Very good. Thank you. 19 All right. Well, I appreciate everyone 20 taking the time today to attend. 2.1 After we receive the joint filing and 2.2 the issues presented by the parties, we'll issue 23 a prehearing order that memorializes the discussion that we had today. 24

Before we adjourn, is there anything 1 else that we should consider? 2 3 MS. BAILINSON: Nothing further from 4 the Department, Mr. Chair. 5 MS. BROWN: I just want to make one 6 factual correction. When I mentioned the 7 simplicity of treatment from the pump station, 8 there is uranium now that is also being treated. 9 But, other than that, there are no 10 corrections and no further comments for the 11 prehearing. 12 Thank you. CMSR. SIMPSON: Okay. All right. 1.3 Thank you for everyone's time this morning. 14 15 are adjourned. (Whereupon the prehearing conference 16 17 was adjourned at 9:26 a.m., and a technical session was held thereafter.) 18 19 20 2.1 2.2 23 24