1		STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
2		PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
3		
4	June 4, 2024 21 South Fru:	
5	Suite 10 Concord, NH	
6		
7	RE:	DG 23-067
8		LIBERTY UTILITIES (ENERGYNORTH NATURAL GAS) CORP. d/b/a LIBERTY UTILITIES:
9		Request for Change in Distribution Rates. (Status conference)
10	PRESENT:	•
11		Commissioner Pradip K. Chattopadhyay Commissioner Carleton B. Simpson
12		Alexander Speidel, Esq./PUC Legal Advisor
13		Doreen Borden, Clerk
14	APPEARANCES:	Reptg. Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp. d/b/a Liberty
15		Utilities:
16		Michael J. Sheehan, Esq. Jessica Buno Ralston, Esq. (Keegan)
17		Reptg. Residential Ratepayers:
18		Michael Crouse, Esq. Marc H. Vatter, Dir. of Econ./Finance
19		Office of Consumer Advocate
20		Reptg. New Hampshire Dept. of Energy: Paul B. Dexter, Esq.
21		Molly M. Lynch, Esq. Mary E. Schwarzer, Esq.
22		(Regulatory Support Division)
23	Court Rep	orter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52
24		

1		
2	INDEX	
3	PAGE	E NO.
4	SCOPE OF STATUS CONFERENCE BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER	3
5	QUESTIONS TO NH DOE BY:	
6	Chairman Goldner	5
7	QUESTIONS TO LIBERTY UTILITIES BY:	
8	Chairman Goldner	15
9	STATEMENT BY CMSR. SIMPSON	18
10	QUESTION BY CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY	19
11	QUESTIONS TO THE OCA BY:	
12	Chairman Goldner	19
13		
14	* * *	
15	REQUEST TO LIBERTY UTILITIES BY	23
16	CHAIRMAN GOLDNER TO FILE IN DG 23-067 AND DE 23-039 RELATIVE TO THE	2 3
17	SHAREHOLDER COST ISSUE REGARDING AUDITS	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

1 PROCEEDING

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

I'm Chairman Goldner. I'm joined today with Commissioner Simpson and Commissioner Chattopadhyay. This is the status conference for the Liberty-Gas rate case, Docket Number 23-067, scheduled for today's proceeding in the Commission's procedural order dated May 7th, 2024.

At the outset, this will be a

Commission-directed status conference given

developments in the Liberty's Electric rate case,

Docket Number DE 23-039, following the

Commission's issuance of Order Number 27,000 on

April 30th, 2024. Since April 30th, the

Commission has learned, in the Electric rate

case, that the New Hampshire Department of Energy

expects it will take until January 2026 for the

DOE-directed audit work approved by Order 27,000

to be completed.

This is relevant in this instant Gas docket because (1) the same relief was requested for the Gas case as for the Electric case, in that the same DOE letter was filed in both

dockets on April 18th, 2024; and (2) no update filing has been made by the DOE or the Company in this Gas docket after the DOE reveal of the Electric audit schedule in the DOE letter filed on May 20th, 2024, in Docket 23-039.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

Furthermore, the stay in this Gas rate case expires on June 7th. And the twelve-month processing period, pursuant to RSA 378:6, I(a), will expire on July 26th, 2024, as noted in the Commission's Commencement of Adjudicative Proceeding Order, Number 26,877, issued on August 25th, 2023, in this case.

After we take simple appearances from the parties, we'll probe these issues in preparation for the next phases of this proceeding.

We'll now take simple appearances, beginning with the Company.

MS. RALSTON: Jessica Ralston, from the law firm Keegan Werlin, on behalf of Liberty
Utilities. Joined by Michael Sheehan, in-house counsel for the Company.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Very good. The Office of the Consumer Advocate?

1 Good morning, MR. CROUSE: 2. Commissioners. My name is Michael Crouse, Staff Attorney for the OCA, representing residential 3 4 customers in this matter. Joining me today is 5 our Director of Economics and Finance, Marc 6 Vatter. 7 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Very good. And the New Hampshire Department of Energy? 8 9 MR. DEXTER: Good morning, Mr. 10 Chairman. Paul Dexter, joined by co-counsels 11 Molly Lynch and Mary Schwarzer, appearing on 12 behalf of the Department of Energy. 1.3 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Very good. Okay. 14 Thank you. The Commission will now address some 15 16 questions to the Department of Energy, the moving 17 party for the Audit Report-related relief 18 requested in the April 18th DOE letter. 19 So, we'll begin, Attorney Dexter, with 20 a question, does the DOE have the expectation 2.1 that the DOE-led audit process, of the type 2.2 approved in Order 27,000 for the Electric case, 23 would require until January 2026 for the Gas rate 24 case?

MR. DEXTER: Well, yes, I think it would actually require a little bit more time, because the schedules are a little bit staggered. But we don't see any reason -- we don't see any reason why, if we were to go down the same path for the Gas case that we've started on the Electric case, that the timeframes would be significantly different.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. And, relative to complexity, you know, are the billing determinants, O&M tracking, overall general ledger accounting issues conceptually or operationally simpler in the Gas rate case than the Electric case, or would you say that they're the same or --

MR. DEXTER: I think the Gas rate case is simpler, in that it has a single revenue requirement, it doesn't have a multiyear rate plan. But that really wasn't part of the scope of the audit at all. The audit is based on the test year, essentially, and the SAP conversion.

So, I don't see that the Gas case is any simpler or more complex than the Electric case, in terms of what would be looked at in an

1 audit.

2.

1.3

2.2

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.

Can you discuss the administrative process to enable the DOE to retain the needed experts, and if that process could be expedited? I'm thinking about both the Electric case and the Gas case.

So, maybe just walk the -- for the record, walk everyone please through the process of obtaining the schedule, and how long things take. And, then, if any comments on perhaps expediting the process.

MR. DEXTER: Yes. I just want to take a minute to find some notes I had made on this.

[Short pause.]

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: And just as a reference, Attorney Dexter, while you're looking, we're just trying to understand why, in sort of a conventional rate case, it would be, you know, eight, nine, ten months, and the audit would be available, and here it's actually longer. So, we were trying to understand the timing.

MR. DEXTER: Yes. Thanks. And I was just looking for a sheet that I had put together that sort of broke down in a little bit more

detail, you know, what was provided to you earlier in the case.

2.

1.3

1 4

2.1

2.2

We had seven months allocated for securing the audit, and that broke down into several different steps. One would be drafting and issuing the RFP. We had allowed two months for bidders to respond, this is rough terms, one month for bids to be scored, one month for contract preparation and finalization, and then an additional month for the approval of the Governor's [sic] and Council, with the understanding that, you know, we don't control those dates, and those dates -- meeting days haven't been set that far out into the future.

And, so, when we added all that up, that took us from -- we put this schedule together, well, the Commission's order was issued April 30th, and that totaled seven months, until December 1st. So, that's what it was broken down into.

And, yes, we did try to look at this schedule to see where we could expedite it. But, even if you were to save a week here and there, that was the conclusion that we came to.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: So, just using a real-life example, in the Eversource rate case, which is I think will be filed any day now, we have the twelve-month statutory, you know, time limit. The Department will, maybe even a month ago, embarked on the audit process, and getting everything ready for that. Why are you able to do all that in the Eversource rate case, for example, in a twelve- or thirteen-month period, but here it takes, you know, seven months plus, you know, roughly another year?

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

MR. DEXTER: Well, in a typical rate case, the Department looks for outside help in a number of areas. Cost of capital being one that I think is almost always contracted out, at least since the seven or eight years I've been working here.

We have looked for help in the revenue requirements calculation, modeling and calculation, again, in I think virtually every gas and electric rate case that I've been involved in since I got here.

And we have almost always, in electric cases, looked for help with things like rate

design and analyzing marginal and embedded cost studies.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

And, so, when a rate case notice of intent, or even a preliminary indication comes along, we are prepared for those types of, you know, for securing contractors for those types of services. And we have a pretty good history of doing that. And I don't want to say a "good history", what I'm trying to say is we have a lot of experience with that. So, we have some standard, you know, documents that we're working with.

That's not at all the case in this situation. We are not preparing to secure an outside auditor for the Eversource rate case, nor did we intend to secure an outside auditor for either of the Liberty-Electric [sic] rate cases. In fact, the way audits are handled from the Department of Energy is with our internal Audit Department.

And, again, in virtually every rate case that I'm aware of, certainly the gas and electric ones, since I've been working at the Department and the Commission, the internal Audit

Department of the Department of Energy, formerly the Commission Staff, conducts an in-depth audit, which is what happened in this case. The difference is that, in this case, it resulted in the Department filing the Motion to Dismiss, based on the results of that audit that's already been done.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

So, I'm not sure I'm answering your question. I don't want to get too far into the Eversource rate case, but we are in the process of securing the typical contractors that we do for the Eversource rate case. And auditing the test year is not something that we're in the process of looking for outside help with in that case.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. That's helpful.

Does the DOE have the same position regarding Liberty's shareholder financial responsibility for the DOE-led audit process in the Gas case, in this Gas case context, the same position that the Department took in the Electric case?

MR. DEXTER: Yes. And, in retrospect,

clearly that should have been included in my

April 18th letter, maybe it was assumed. But, in

looking at the order that came out in the

Electric case, it occurred to us that it was not

stated who would have paid for that audit. So,

we filed a Motion for Clarification, asking the

Commission to clarify that this audit would be

borne by shareholders.

2.

1.3

2.2

And, yes, that, if the Commission were to go down this road in the Gas case, that would be our recommendation.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. And can you just discuss for the record why you view the DOE-led audit process is a shareholder cost?

MR. DEXTER: Yes. Yes. So, as I said, the Department has done its typical due diligence in both cases with respect to auditing. And we have used our internal Audit Department to do an audit. And, in these instances, it resulted in Motions to Dismiss, rather than a simple -- I won't say "simple", but a typical audit report, with some issues that are handled back and forth by the parties. And, for the reasons that I went into in great detail back in March, we weren't --

didn't feel that was the appropriate case based on the audit that we had done.

2.

1.3

2.2

The work that is being directed by
the Commission in the Electric case, in Order
2,700 [27,000?], is to account for the fact or is
caused by the fact that the documents that we
received at the beginning of the rate case, in
the Electric side and in the Gas side, put us in
a position where we could not go forward with the
case, and instead we filed the Motion to Dismiss.

So, we believe those costs were caused, if you will, by the Company's bookkeeping situation in the test year. And I think we've determined that that was tied directly to the SAP conversion that occurred during the test year.

And, so, we believe that this is not something that is providing any benefit to ratepayers. It's a situation that was brought to us by Liberty Utilities. And this is, I guess, an attempt to, you know, to fix the test year, so that rates can be set on it. You know, it's correcting actions, and a situation that we're put in, you know, because of Liberty Utilities, not their customers.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

So, we feel very strongly that Liberty shareholders, as they offered to pay for their PwC report, they should be required to pay for the report that the Commission ordered.

And I will say, Commissioner, I'm happy to make the parallels between the two cases, but I'm very uncomfortable talking about the Electric case. There are five or six other parties in the Electric case that would have no reason to expect a need to be here today, and to expect that their case would be discussed. And I understand that there's parallels, and I'm fine with that. But I don't want to answer questions about, you know, where the Department stands in the Electric case or things like that.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Would the DOE support the Company filing with the Commission a waiver of the twelve-month processing period by the -- pardon me -- by the close of business tomorrow, June 5th?

MR. DEXTER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you.

Okay. I'll turn to my fellow

Commissioners to see if there's any additional

```
1
         questions for the Department, before I turn to
 2.
         the Company?
 3
                    [Cmsr. Simpson indicating in the
 4
                    negative.]
 5
                    CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY:
                                          I don't.
 6
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay.
 7
                    Okay. So, we'll turn now to the
 8
         Company.
 9
                    We note that the Company assented to
10
         the DOE proposed procedural schedule in DE
11
         23-039, which incorporated the DOE-led audit
12
         element, with a report coming out in January
         2026. Is it fair to say, in light of what the
1.3
14
         DOE has shared with us today, that the Company
15
         would have the same point of view regarding the
16
         process for this Gas case?
17
                    MS. RALSTON: Yes.
18
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. Second
19
         question is, can the Company file a written
20
         waiver for the twelve-month processing timeframe
2.1
         under RSA 378:6 by the close of business
2.2
         tomorrow, June 5th?
23
                    MS. RALSTON: We could. But we were
24
          just looking back, and we think we've already
```

```
1
         filed the waiver on March 8th.
 2.
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. I'll --
 3
         Attorney Speidel will look into that. Can you
 4
         perhaps provide us some more information on that
 5
         filing?
 6
                   MS. RALSTON:
                                  Sure. I'm looking at the
 7
         Commission's docket online. And, if you look at
 8
         March 8th of this year, --
 9
                   CMSR. SIMPSON: Tab 70.
10
                   MS. RALSTON: Number 70. And, like I
11
         said, we would be happy to file something again
         tomorrow, if there's something additional the
12
1.3
         Commission needs. I just didn't want to
14
         duplicate.
15
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: It looks like, I'll
16
         turn to Commissioner Simpson and Commissioner
17
         Chattopadhyay, it looks like it is filed.
18
         Attorney Speidel, do you see it?
19
                   MR. SPEIDEL: Yes, I see the document.
20
                    [Chairman Goldner and Atty. Speidel
2.1
                    conferring.]
2.2
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Yes.
                                             Attorney
23
         Speidel suggests if you, because that was filed
24
         before a lot of the litigation, so, if you could
```

```
1
         refile it tomorrow, that would be helpful, just
 2.
         so that everyone knows that this is fresh.
 3
                    MS. RALSTON: Of course. We'd be happy
 4
         to.
 5
                    MR. SPEIDEL:
                                  Thank you.
 6
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you.
 7
                    Okay. And, then, the final question I
 8
         have, at least for the Company, is, in DE 23-039,
 9
         we haven't seen any Company response to the DOE
         and OCA positions on shareholder responsibility
10
11
         come within the tenth day. Can the Company share
12
         its perspective on these matters in this Gas
1.3
         context?
14
                    MS. RALSTON: You're referring to the
         costs for the audits?
15
16
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:
                                      Yes.
17
                    MS. RALSTON: So, I think the Company
18
         didn't file a response, we don't object. We were
19
         just waiting for direction from the Commission.
20
         And I think we would take the same position here.
2.1
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: So, just to repeat
2.2
         back, to make sure I understand. You're saying
23
         the Company does not object to the DOE-led audit
24
         costs being a shareholder responsibility?
```

1 MS. RALSTON: That's correct. 2. CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you. 3 Okay. Any further questions for the 4 Company? 5 CMSR. SIMPSON: So, I'm encouraged by 6 what I've heard with the Company accepting 7 financial responsibility for the audit. I'm 8 encouraged, too, there was no motion for 9 rehearing on this process. 10 We're clearly motivated. We want to 11 ensure that the Company can operate as it needs 12 to, that the IT systems are functioning as they should, and do this in a collaborative means 1.3 14 through the OCA, DOE, the Company, and PUC. So, 15 I just am encouraged by the direction that we're 16 heading. I think that's very good. And I'm sure 17 that the Company is feeling, you know, tremendous 18 pressure in many ways. 19 So, you know, I think this is the right 20 process to follow. I'm encouraged by what I'm 2.1 hearing today, what I've heard from the 2.2 Department. Clearly, you've taken a leadership

So, I just wanted to say that, put that

role, and I'm grateful for that.

23

1 on the record, that I think this is going to be a 2. fruitful process, and that it will be -- it will 3 lead to the healthiest outcome for customers, for the Company, and for all of the partners in state 4 5 government as well. 6 That's really all I wanted to say. 7 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Any further 8 questions or comments for the Company, 9 Commissioner Chattopadhyay? CMSR. CHATTOPADHYAY: I know this 10 11 doesn't directly involve what we are talking 12 about, but I'll just let you know what I'm 1.3 already thinking about. What does this mean for 14 the test year, eventually? What test year? 15 So, that's just a question that I have. 16 Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. I'm going to turn to a question for the OCA, then we'll just take a quick break, and then we'll wrap up after the break.

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

So, we note that the OCA filed comments on the DOE audit issues and Company assented-to DOE scheduling proposal in the Electric case, in the OCA's 23-039 position statement filed on

May 17th.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

Does the OCA have any viewpoints it would like to share regarding this situation in the Gas rate case?

MR. CROUSE: Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

I would adopt the position of Donald Kreis, the Consumer Advocate, in the Electric case, as is here in the Gas case. We certainly agree that the proposed procedural schedule presented by the Department is reasonable, we understand how they got there.

But I agree with Donald Kreis that we are sort of entering into the realm of I'll say "uncharted waters", with the rate case taking 26 months, and the statutory period of twelve months being waived.

So, if there's an opportunity to expedite that or figure out a means to making this process more efficient, the OCA is open to that.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: But the OCA is otherwise in support of the process as proposed by the Department and the Company, in terms of

the timeline and procedural schedule and so forth?

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

MR. CROUSE: Well, I know Donald Kreis said that he couldn't concur with the procedural schedule itself. And I think that's our -- our current position is that we understand how it was reached, but will not be in support.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. And can you share the reason that the OCA does not support the current schedule?

MR. CROUSE: Yes. For many of the similar reasons that was filed in that position statement, it's just unclear to us that this is really what the Legislature had in mind for how this process would work. And, in my view, it's uncertain if the statute can be waived in and of itself for that twelve months.

So, I understand that we're going into uncharted waters. And, to the extent that the Commission were to go forward with the proposed procedural schedule, the OCA is happy to continue participating.

But the OCA is currently looking into what is the permissible -- or, the best way to

move forward, how to make things more efficient.

Thank you.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: And I just want to make sure I understand the objection. So, it's the length of the extension beyond twelve months? If it was one or two or three months, the OCA would be supportive. But, given the length of the delay, that's the OCA's concern, and I believe it has to do with the temporary rates?

MR. CROUSE: Yes. As the Consumer

Advocate stated in his position statement on the

Electric side, some of the concerns is how those

permanent rates get reconciled back to July 1st

of 2023, or October, or whenever we decide the

actual effective date is, based off of, you know,

everything that we've discussed up to this point.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Okay, thank you. The Commission will take a brief break. We'll return at 9:40, and wrap things up today. Off the record.

(Recess taken at 9:30 a.m., and the status conference reconvened at 9:46 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. So, just a

```
1
         request for the Company.
 2.
                    If the Company can file, in both
 3
         dockets, relative to the shareholder cost issue,
 4
         that would be very helpful for the Commission.
 5
                    And I'll just ask, how long would it
 6
         take to file such -- make such a filing?
 7
                    MS. RALSTON: You're asking for a
 8
         letter confirming that we agree to bear those
         costs, we can do that by close of business
 9
10
         tomorrow.
11
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Perfect. Thank you.
         Thank you. And, then, just a reminder to refile
12
         that written waiver for the twelve-month period
1.3
14
         tomorrow as well. Is that okay?
15
                   MS. RALSTON: Yes.
16
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.
17
                    MS. RALSTON: Yes, we anticipate doing
18
         that today.
19
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. Okay.
20
         Great.
2.1
                    So, I'll just ask if there's any other
2.2
         matters requiring our attention today?
23
                    MR. DEXTER: Nothing from the
24
         Department.
```

```
1
                    MR. CROUSE: Nothing from the OCA.
 2
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Anything from the
 3
         Company?
 4
                    MS. RALSTON: Sorry. No, nothing from
 5
         the Company.
 6
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:
                                        Thank you.
 7
                    Okay. The Commission will issue
 8
         further guidance via order after the filings from
         the Company are received.
 9
10
                    And this status conference is
11
         adjourned.
                      Thank you.
                    (Whereupon the status conference was
12
1.3
                    adjourned at 9:48 a.m.)
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```