

## STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

## PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

July 22, 2015 - 2:31 p.m.  
Concord, New Hampshire

DAY 2

{REDACTED - for public use}

NHPUC JUL30'15 PM 1:09

RE: DG 14-380

LIBERTY UTILITIES (ENERGYNORTH NATURAL  
GAS) CORP. d/b/a LIBERTY UTILITIES:*Petition for Approval of a Firm  
Transportation Agreement with the  
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC.*

**PRESENT:** Chairman Martin P. Honigberg, Presiding  
Commissioner Robert R. Scott

Sandy Deno, Clerk (until 4:03 p.m.)

Clare Howard-Pike, Clerk (after 4:03 p.m.)

**APPEARANCES:** Reptg. Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth  
Natural Gas) Corp. d/b/a Liberty Utilities:  
Sarah B. Knowlton, Esq. (Rath, Young...)

Reptg. the Pipe Line Awareness Network  
for the Northeast, Inc. (PLAN):

Richard A. Kanoff, Esq. (Burns &amp; Levinson)

Zachary R. Gates, Esq. (Burns &amp; Levinson)

Reptg. Residential Ratepayers:

Susan Chamberlin, Esq., Consumer Advocate

Dr. Pradip Chattopadhyay, Asst. Cons. Adv.

Office of Consumer Advocate

Reptg. PUC Staff:

Rorie E. Patterson, Esq.

Stephen P. Frink, Asst. Dir./Gas &amp; Water Div.

Al-Azad Iqbal, Gas &amp; Water Division

Melissa Whitten (LaCapra Associates)

Court Reporter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52

ORIGINAL

**I N D E X****PAGE NO.**

**WITNESS PANEL:**        **FRANCISCO C. DaFONTE**  
                              **WILLIAM J. CLARK**  
                              **MELISSA WHITTEN**

Cross-examination resumed by Mr. Kanoff	8, 98
Interrogatories by Commissioner Scott	70, 98
Interrogatories by Chairman Honigberg	88
Redirect examination by Ms. Knowlton	109

**E X H I B I T S**

<b>EXHIBIT NO.</b>	<b>D E S C R I P T I O N</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
34	Liberty/EnergyNorth Response to Data Request PLAN 4-18 <b>(CONFIDENTIAL)</b>	premarked
35	Liberty/EnergyNorth Response to Data Request PLAN 4-18 <i>(Redacted)</i>	premarked
36	Liberty/EnergyNorth Response to Data Request Staff 1-19	premarked
37	Liberty/EnergyNorth Response to Data Request PLAN 2-8 Supplemental	premarked
38	Algonquin Power & Utilities Corp. Q1 2015	premarked
39	Liberty/EnergyNorth Response to Data Request PLAN 1-16	premarked
40	Liberty/EnergyNorth Response to Data Request PLAN 2-38	premarked
41	Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC Docket No. PF14-22-000 Supplemental Filing (12-08-14)	premarked
42	Liberty/EnergyNorth Response to Data Request PLAN 2-27 Supplemental	premarked
43	<u>Boston Globe</u> article - West Roxbury pipeline approved by federal regulators	premarked
44	Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct Project report	premarked

**E X H I B I T S (continued)**

<b>EXHIBIT NO.</b>	<b>D E S C R I P T I O N</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
45	Liberty/EnergyNorth Response to Data Request PLAN 1-7	premarked
46	Liberty/EnergyNorth Response to Data Request PLAN 1-25	premarked
47	Liberty/EnergyNorth Response to Data Request Staff 2-1 <b>(CONFIDENTIAL)</b>	premarked
48	Liberty/EnergyNorth Response to Data Request Staff 2-1 <i>(Redacted)</i>	premarked
49	Liberty/EnergyNorth Response to Data Request Staff Tech-17	premarked
50	Liberty/EnergyNorth Response to Data Request PLAN 2-23	premarked
51	Liberty/EnergyNorth Response to Data Request PLAN 1-4	premarked
52	Liberty Utilities Northeast LNG Project report	premarked
53	Page 45 of 56 to the Rebuttal Testimony of Francisco C. DaFonte, identified with Bates No. "047R2" <b>(CONFIDENTIAL)</b>	106
54	Page 45 of 56 to the Rebuttal Testimony of Francisco C. DaFonte, identified with Bates No. "047R2" <i>(Redacted)</i>	106
55	Liberty/EnergyNorth Response to Data Request Staff Tech-46 <b>(CONFIDENTIAL)</b>	108

**P R O C E E D I N G**

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Good afternoon. We're going to continue the hearing in DG 14-380. Mr. Kanoff, you will have the floor momentarily. We have a whole slew of exhibits that looks like were premarked. We're going to go as long as we can here today and hope we can finish. As we get to the end of the day, we'll see what needs to be done.

Is there anything we need to do before we start?

MS. KNOWLTON: I wanted to let the Commissioners know that the Company does have a revised version of Exhibit 10, which is Page 47R of Mr. DaFonte's testimony. We can do that at any time, but we do have it with us, and wanted to let you know that.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. We can deal with that, really, anytime. Because all you're doing is changing some numbers in the text to match up with what is in the table, is that right?

MS. KNOWLTON: That's right. We also lifted the "confidential" designation on some parts of the table, so there's more information now that would be public. So, those are the nature of the two changes.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Thank

1       you. Anything else?

2                       (No verbal response)

3                       CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Kanoff, you may  
4       proceed.

5                       MR. KANOFF: Thank you. I want to just  
6       distribute the exhibits that got premarked to the rest of  
7       the group.

8                       CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think they will  
9       be thrilled to receive them.

10                      MR. KANOFF: I'm sure they will.

11                      (Atty. Kanoff distributing documents.)

12                      MR. KANOFF: As Exhibit for  
13       identification, we have the data request response to PLAN  
14       4-18, that's been marked as "34". And, that's the  
15       confidential version. I'll distribute it to counsel.

16                      As "Exhibit 35", we've marked for  
17       identification the redacted version of that same data  
18       request. I'll distribute that as well.

19                      As "Exhibit 36", we have the -- for  
20       identification, we have the Data Request Staff 1-19.

21                      CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Kanoff, there  
22       are something like 19 exhibits that were premarked before  
23       we came in. Are you going to be doing each one of them  
24       individually? Is there any way you could have your

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 associate do that while we get started with questioning?

2 MR. KANOFF: Yes, there is. And, I was  
3 just thinking, as you asked that, at some point the  
4 questioning will catch up to the exhibits, but not right  
5 away. Let me just distribute a couple more?

6 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.

7 MR. KANOFF: And, then, I think that's  
8 it. I agree, that's a great way to do it. We tried to  
9 get started as quickly as possible with this, but it is  
10 what it is.

11 And, as exhibit for identification "37",  
12 we have data request response to PLAN 2-28.

13 MS. PATTERSON: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: While Mr. Kanoff is  
15 doing that, I will note that we received some more public  
16 comment, in the form of a few letters and e-mails. So,  
17 the pile continues to grow.

18 MR. KANOFF: And, as "Exhibit 38", for  
19 identification, we have Algonquin Power Utilities Corp.  
20 Quarter 1 2015, specific pages to that, marked for  
21 identification.

22 MS. PATTERSON: Thank you.

23 MR. KANOFF: Mr. Chairman?

24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes.

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 MR. KANOFF: If you give me one more  
2 moment, I'll coordinate now with my colleague, and then  
3 we'll have that happening as questions go on.

4 (Atty. Kanoff conferring with Atty.  
5 Gates.)

6 MR. KANOFF: We are ready to proceed  
7 here, and having those additional exhibits collated. Good  
8 morning -- or, good afternoon.

9 WITNESS DaFONTE: Good afternoon.

10 WITNESS CLARK: Good afternoon.

11 **FRANCISCO C. DaFONTE, previously sworn**

12 **WILLIAM J. CLARK, previously sworn**

13 **MELISSA WHITTEN, previously sworn**

14 **CROSS-EXAMINATION (continued)**

15 BY MR. KANOFF:

16 Q. I just wanted to follow up on one question that we  
17 discussed yesterday. And, this has to do with the  
18 Concord Lateral expansion cost estimates. And, I just  
19 wanted to clarify that the original cost estimate for  
20 expansion of the Concord Lateral was for expansion from  
21 Nashua, is that right?

22 A. (DaFonte) Yes. It was just an expansion to the  
23 existing Nashua gate station.

24 Q. And, that number has not changed, is that correct?



[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 A. (DaFonte) No. That estimate is still the same.

2 Q. Okay. And, then, you also provided another estimate of  
3 expansion of the Concord Lateral from -- to, excuse me,  
4 to Nashua, but also split to Manchester and Concord, is  
5 that right?

6 A. (DaFonte) That's correct.

7 Q. Okay. And, those are different estimates based upon  
8 different assumptions, is that right?

9 A. (DaFonte) Yes. There is different estimates based on  
10 where the gas is ultimately to be delivered.

11 Q. Thank you.

12 MR. KANOFF: Apologies for the delay.

13 We just got out of sequence here. We're ready.

14 BY MR. KANOFF:

15 Q. The questions I want to ask you now have a little bit  
16 to do with Algonquin Power. That's your parent  
17 company, is it not?

18 A. (DaFonte) That's the parent company of Liberty  
19 Utilities Co., yes.

20 Q. And, you listed the entities involved in the  
21 relationship between parent companies and Liberty  
22 Utilities in what's been marked now as "Exhibit 36" for  
23 identification, is that correct?

24 A. (DaFonte) Yes.

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 Q. And, if I'm reading that correctly, is EnergyNorth is a  
2 wholly owned sub of Algonquin Power, is that correct?

3 A. (DaFonte) Can you repeat the question? And, where are  
4 you looking on the exhibit? What page?

5 Q. I was looking on the exhibit two things. I was looking  
6 at Chart A, going into Chart B. And, then, I was also  
7 basing perhaps some of the question on, not only the  
8 charts, but your information about the relationship  
9 between EnergyNorth, the utility, and Algonquin Power.  
10 So, the question was, EnergyNorth is a wholly owned sub  
11 of Algonquin Power, is that right?

12 A. (DaFonte) I'm not -- I didn't put the information  
13 together. So, I'm not sure if it -- where it lies, in  
14 terms of "wholly owned". But it is certainly a  
15 subsidiary of Algonquin Power & Utilities Corp.

16 Q. Is there any reason or would you just subject to check  
17 that it's a wholly owned sub of Algonquin?

18 A. (DaFonte) Sure.

19 Q. Okay. So, Algonquin is a 4.5 billion company, based in  
20 Canada, with diversified assets all over North America?  
21 Is that your understanding of the parent, more or less?

22 A. (DaFonte) More or less, yes.

23 Q. It's big. And, Algonquin Power is also the parent to  
24 Liberty Utilities and Liberty Utility (Pipeline &

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 Transmission) Company, is that right? It's also in  
2 Exhibit 36?

3 A. (DaFonte) Yes.

4 Q. And, APUC, or Algonquin Power, is an investor-owner, is  
5 it not, on the Kinder Morgan Pipeline, through its  
6 affiliate Pipeline & Transmission Corp. --

7 (Court reporter interruption.)

8 BY MR. KANOFF:

9 Q. -- Utilities (Pipeline & Transmission) Corp.

10 A. (DaFonte) I'm sorry. The question again?

11 Q. Algonquin Power is an investor-owner in the Kinder  
12 Morgan Pipeline through its affiliate Liberty Utilities  
13 (Pipeline & Transmission) Corp., is that right?

14 A. (DaFonte) I guess I'd ask for a clarification on  
15 what -- which Kinder Morgan Pipeline?

16 Q. The NED project that's at issue here. And, the --  
17 well, let's start with that. It's part owner of the  
18 NED project that's at issue here, is it not?

19 A. (DaFonte) I'm not familiar with how it's all  
20 constructed. But the NED -- the NED Pipeline project  
21 is a Tennessee-sponsored project.

22 Q. Is what, sorry?

23 A. (DaFonte) It's a Tennessee Gas Pipeline-sponsored  
24 project. So, our PA is with Tennessee Gas Pipeline,

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1       which is the sponsor of the Northeast Energy Direct  
2       project.

3   Q.   I was just trying to establish it, and look at  
4       Exhibit 38. This isn't a trick question. I was just  
5       trying to establish the reality that APUC, in some form  
6       or another, I believe it is through the Pipeline &  
7       Transmission Corp., is, in fact, an owner of -- in  
8       partnership with Kinder Morgan in the development of  
9       the project at issue here today, among other projects.  
10      It might be slip as well.

11               CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Kanoff, are you  
12      looking at Exhibit 36?

13               MR. KANOFF: I'm looking at Exhibit  
14      36 -- I'm looking at exhibit now, just to get to the nub  
15      of this --

16               CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It's 36. And, it's  
17      the multipage corporate organization chart that you're  
18      trying to refer to, isn't it?

19               MR. KANOFF: Well, it's 38 as well. I  
20      had referred to -- I had referred to Exhibit for  
21      identification --

22               CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes, I missed the  
23      transition to 38. Mr. DaFonte, are you familiar with the  
24      corporate structure and the family relationships of

{DG 14-380} [REDACTED - for public use] {07-22-15/Day 2}

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 Algonquin and Liberty and NED and Tennessee? Is that  
2 something you're familiar with?

3 WITNESS DaFONTE: Only with respect to  
4 how it appears here on this form.

5 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Knowlton, can  
6 you help us out and maybe streamline this somewhat?  
7 Because I don't think this is controversial, I just want  
8 to make sure that he's asking a witness who knows.

9 MS. KNOWLTON: Yes. I think, without  
10 becoming a testifying witness myself, I think Mr. DaFonte  
11 can speak to the structure of the contracts that are on  
12 Page 4 of 4 of Staff 1-19, which depicts the entity that  
13 owns the pipeline, the lessor of the rights on the  
14 pipeline, and those relationships. I mean, subject to,  
15 obviously, his testimony, I believe that he could answer  
16 those questions.

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It's just I know  
18 that he's not the witness who responded on -- to that data  
19 request. And, so, I'm concerned that he's not really  
20 familiar with that structure. But I see -- I'm a lawyer.

21 MS. KNOWLTON: Right.

22 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I can see what this  
23 structure looks like, and I know what Mr. Kanoff wants to  
24 do. This shouldn't be as complicated --

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 MS. KNOWLTON: Right.

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: -- as I'm fearing  
3 that it's going to be.

4 MS. KNOWLTON: Agreed. And, Mr. DaFonte  
5 can, you know, take a stab at answering the questions.

6 MR. KANOFF: Well, I have a suggestion?

7 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Go ahead.

8 MR. KANOFF: Yes.

9 MS. KNOWLTON: I mean, we can also  
10 stipulate. I mean, I'll stipulate. Why don't we do that.  
11 I'll stipulate, now we're talking, I'll stipulate to --  
12 or, the Company will stipulate to the fact that an  
13 Algonquin subsidiary is -- has a membership interest in  
14 Northeast Expansion, LLC. How that's?

15 MR. KANOFF: Well, why don't you just  
16 stipulate that the answers, in what's been marked for  
17 identification "Exhibit 36", on Page 1, is correct?

18 MS. KNOWLTON: Because I don't remember  
19 what the question is. I'm sorry.

20 (Laughter.)

21 MR. KANOFF: Well, I just gave you the  
22 answer.

23 MS. KNOWLTON: I know you did. But I'm  
24 telling you what I'm willing to stipulate to, which I

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 think moves it along pretty quickly. What else do you  
2 want to stipulate to? We can make this real quick today.

3 MR. KANOFF: Sure. I want to stimulate  
4 that APUC is an investor-owner --

5 (Court reporter interruption.)

6 MR. KANOFF: I want to stipulate that  
7 APUC is an investor-owner in the Kinder Morgan Pipeline  
8 through one of its affiliates, Liberty Utilities (Pipeline  
9 & Transmission) Corp. And, basically, to stipulate also,  
10 as part of that, the answer on Page 1 of Exhibit for  
11 identification 36 is correct.

12 MS. KNOWLTON: Take the first piece, and  
13 I want to be accurate, and not use the term "Kinder Morgan  
14 Pipeline". So, as depicted on Page 4 of 4, Chart C, Staff  
15 1-19, that's been marked for identification as "Exhibit  
16 36", the owner of the pipeline in question is Northeast  
17 Expansion, LLC, which is partly owned by Kinder Morgan  
18 Operating, LP "A" and Liberty Utilities (Pipeline &  
19 Transmission) Corp. Liberty Utilities (Pipeline &  
20 Transmission) Corp. is an affiliate of Liberty Utilities  
21 (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp., which is the Petitioner  
22 in this proceeding.

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Do they -- is the  
24 Petitioner in this proceeding and Liberty Utilities

{DG 14-380} [REDACTED - for public use] {07-22-15/Day 2}

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 "Pipeline & Transmission" Corp., they share a common  
2 owner?

3 MS. KNOWLTON: Correct.

4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Is the ownership  
5 throughout this chart 100 percent --

6 MS. KNOWLTON: Well, are held by -- they  
7 have a common holding company.

8 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. Is the  
9 holding basically 100 percent throughout this  
10 organizational chart?

11 MS. KNOWLTON: Yes. So, if you go back  
12 and you look at, and, again, I'll stipulate to this, if  
13 you go a page, both Liberty Utilities (Pipeline &  
14 Transmission) Corp. and Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth  
15 Natural Gas) Corp. share a common parent of Liberty  
16 Utilities Co. There's an intervening parent for Liberty  
17 Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp., which is  
18 Liberty Energy Utilities (New Hampshire) Corp. But they  
19 both are ultimately owned by Liberty Utilities Co.

20 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Kanoff, that's  
21 what you need, right? For the first step of what you're  
22 trying to do, correct?

23 MR. KANOFF: That's right.

24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Good. All right.



[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 MR. KANOFF: Thanks.

2 BY MR. KANOFF:

3 Q. And, then, Liberty Utilities Co. is, in fact, owned by  
4 Algonquin, is that correct?

5 MS. KNOWLTON: I'll stipulate to that as  
6 well. How's that?

7 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you. Off the  
8 record.

9 (Brief off-the-record discussion  
10 ensued.)

11 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Go  
12 ahead.

13 BY MR. KANOFF:

14 Q. And, isn't -- if you take a look at Exhibit for  
15 identification 38, Page 20.

16 MR. KANOFF: I first want to just -- if  
17 I could approach the witness?

18 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Go ahead.

19 MR. KANOFF: I just first want to show  
20 counsel. I'm just going to have him --

21 (Atty. Kanoff showing a document to  
22 Witness DaFonte.)

23 BY MR. KANOFF:

24 Q. Take a look at this. Is this a familiar document to

{DG 14-380} [REDACTED - for public use] {07-22-15/Day 2}

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1           you? It's Algonquin's Quarterly Report?

2   A.     (DaFonte) I have not read it.

3   Q.     Have you seen it?

4   A.     (DaFonte) Just now, yes.

5   Q.     Is it something that Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth)  
6           contributes to?

7   A.     (DaFonte) I believe so. But I am not an individual  
8           contributor to that.

9   Q.     Would you have any reason to believe that information  
10          in here is not correct?

11   A.     (DaFonte) I do not have any reason to believe that it's  
12          not correct.

13   Q.     I want to refer you to Page 20. And, it talks about  
14          the Transmission Business Group.

15   A.     (DaFonte) Okay.

16   Q.     And, I believe we talked about this group. So, this  
17          group is, according to that paragraph, has a  
18          partnership with Kinder Morgan, is that correct?

19   A.     (DaFonte) I think counsel for EnergyNorth has already  
20          stipulated that the agreement is -- or, with a  
21          partnership with Kinder Morgan, Northeast Expansion  
22          LLC. And, that's what it says on Page 20 of  
23          Exhibit 38.

24   Q.     Okay. And, the interest that, according to this, that

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 the Transmission Group, which is part of Algonquin, has  
2 is as stated here, "2.5 percent", do you see that?

3 A. (DaFonte) Yes. I see that, yes.

4 Q. And, the investment can increase up to "10 percent".  
5 Do you see that?

6 A. (DaFonte) Yes.

7 Q. And, the value of that investment for APUC, doesn't say  
8 for "Transmission Group" or "Northeast Expansion LLC",  
9 it says for "APUC", does it not, to be up to  
10 400 million?

11 A. (DaFonte) That's what it says here, yes.

12 Q. Okay. Thank you. Now, it says -- I'm sorry, we talked  
13 yesterday about shareholders. Does EnergyNorth have  
14 any shareholders?

15 A. (DaFonte) I don't know.

16 Q. Is that something that you can answer subject to check,  
17 and perhaps confirm one way or another during a break?  
18 And, the subject to check would be, subject to check,  
19 EnergyNorth itself does not have any shareholders?

20 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Why don't you ask  
21 him to assume that that's true, because I don't know that  
22 he knows what the structure is. And, unless you want to,  
23 again, stipulate with counsel something you may well be  
24 able to stipulate, and perhaps could have stipulated

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 before we entered the room today, about the structure --  
2 actually, why don't I stop right here.

3 Why don't you give us a preview of what  
4 it is you want to establish. Not necessarily an offer of  
5 proof, but maybe, I mean, I have a sense of where you're  
6 going with this. And, it may -- I suspect the first 19  
7 steps of it are probably not that controversial.

8 MR. KANOFF: That's what I was thinking.

9 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So, why don't we --  
10 why don't you --

11 MR. KANOFF: And, I'm surprised that  
12 we're even stuck on this level. But here we are.

13 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think the problem  
14 is that you have a witness -- the only witness you have  
15 available to you doesn't actually know the answers to some  
16 of the questions you're asking. And, you know, that's  
17 kind of what discovery is for, and you've got a whole  
18 bunch of answers that the Company signed off on, that I  
19 don't think they're going to be able to walk away from if  
20 you assert them as facts.

21 And, so, I think counsel knows how to  
22 object, if she thinks you're doing something that's  
23 unfair. But you're asking this witness questions it is  
24 apparent that he doesn't know the answer to.

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 MR. KANOFF: One of the reasons, just to  
2 clarify, about the, for example, the shareholder question,  
3 they talked about shareholders yesterday, and EnergyNorth  
4 shareholders. But, to answer your question specifically  
5 about where this is going, it's essentially establishing,  
6 and we'll establish fairly quickly, the link between  
7 EnergyNorth utility and APUC as owner, the interest that  
8 APUC has in NED independent from the interests that  
9 EnergyNorth has, the common link of the owners and  
10 directors and so forth. And, just the opportunity in that  
11 relationship and those interactions, especially at the  
12 board and officer level, for bias.

13 And, it's really quick. It doesn't take  
14 a lot. The information is right here in the information  
15 request responses. And, if we could just get through some  
16 of the preliminaries, we'll be there.

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And, "this is a  
18 response that the Company submitted. And, this is right,  
19 isn't it?" "Yup, that one's right." And, then, you can  
20 argue whatever you want off of that document, right?

21 MR. KANOFF: I'm there.

22 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Go. Go for it.

23 MR. KANOFF: Okay. Let's do it.

24 BY MR. KANOFF:

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 Q. I want to refer you to Exhibit for identification 37.

2 MR. KANOFF: Mr. Chairman, just one  
3 moment. There seems to just be, in my copy, a page  
4 missing. And, I just need to reference that really  
5 quickly with my colleague.

6 (Atty. Kanoff conferring with Atty.  
7 Gates.)

8 BY MR. KANOFF:

9 Q. Take a look at Exhibit 37.

10 A. (DaFonte) I have it.

11 Q. Okay. And, this lists the management and Board of  
12 Directors, does it not -- management and Board of  
13 Directors, does it not, for Liberty's Utility and  
14 Transmission Company?

15 A. (DaFonte) Yes. I see that.

16 Q. You see that?

17 A. (DaFonte) I do.

18 Q. Okay. And, for -- if we go through that list for  
19 Algonquin Power, we have Ian Robertson is CEO and on  
20 the Board of Directors, is that right?

21 A. (DaFonte) Correct.

22 Q. And, for Liberty Utilities (Pipeline & Transmission),  
23 we have Ian Robertson is on the Board of Directors,  
24 Greg Sorenson is on the Board of Directors, and Richard

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1       Leehr is President, is that right?

2   A.   (DaFonte) Correct.

3   Q.   And, for EnergyNorth, your company, we have Greg  
4       Sorenson, Board of Directors; Ian Robertson, Board of  
5       Directors; and Richard Leehr, Board of Directors, is  
6       that right?

7   A.   (DaFonte) That's correct.

8   Q.   And, Richard Leehr is the individual who submitted that  
9       information request response we talked about a few  
10      minutes ago, is that correct?

11  A.   (DaFonte) Yes.

12  Q.   He's the President. Okay. Sorry, he's Board of  
13      Directors. So, wouldn't you agree, as a general  
14      proposition, that the Board of Director -- well, as a  
15      general proposition, Board of Directors are charged  
16      with setting goals and direction of the company, and  
17      the officers are charged with carrying out those goals?  
18      Is that generally right?

19  A.   (DaFonte) I can't attest to that in all cases.

20  Q.   Okay. All right. But, basically, we have the same  
21      individuals as both members of the Board of Liberty as  
22      utility and shipper, and as officers and Board members  
23      of the Pipeline & Transmission Company, is that right?

24  A.   (DaFonte) Yes.

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 Q. The same folks? Yes?

2 A. (DaFonte) Yes.

3 Q. And, we already talked about the investment involved  
4 here for APUC is up to \$400 million. Do you recollect  
5 that?

6 A. (DaFonte) Yes, I do.

7 Q. So, that would be a significant investment, would it  
8 not?

9 A. (DaFonte) I don't know. I don't get involved in the  
10 investment side of the business. I got involved in  
11 negotiating the PA. If you want to ask me about the  
12 PA, I think I could do a better job answering the  
13 questions.

14 Q. That's fine. Do you know how much at all, were you  
15 involved at the time that Algonquin Power purchased  
16 Liberty Utilities?

17 A. (DaFonte) I wasn't involved at the time of the  
18 purchase. I was hired after the purchase.

19 Q. Is it your understanding that -- strike that. Was the  
20 Liberty Utilities' Board of Directors aware of the  
21 filings and activities that were made with respect to  
22 the Kinder Morgan investment?

23 MS. KNOWLTON: I'd ask that, to the  
24 extent Mr. Kanoff refers to Liberty Utilities, that you



1 clarify which entity you're referring to.

2 BY MR. KANOFF:

3 Q. We talked about it yesterday. There was discussions  
4 between EnergyNorth management and its Board in this  
5 proceeding. I believe you mentioned at some point that  
6 the Board was taking a look and did evaluate the  
7 transaction, Market Path transaction, before the  
8 Precedent Agreement was signed, as one example of that,  
9 is that correct?

10 A. (DaFonte) I don't recall any statement to the effect  
11 that "the Board evaluated the Market Path commitment".

12 Q. It did evaluate whether you should sign and did provide  
13 guidance, did it not, on whether you should sign the  
14 Precedent Agreement?

15 A. (DaFonte) I'm only aware that the Board took a vote to  
16 grant the President of EnergyNorth the signature  
17 authority for the Precedent Agreement, which he then  
18 signed.

19 Q. So, they did take a look at that? The Board took a  
20 look at whether you should sign the Precedent  
21 Agreement?

22 A. (DaFonte) Well, I can't say exactly what the Board did.  
23 They gave authorization to the President of EnergyNorth  
24 to sign the Agreement.

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 Q. So, do you know whether the Board of Directors was  
2 aware of any of the filings that were related to the  
3 Precedent Agreement?

4 MS. KNOWLTON: Objection. The question  
5 is vague. It doesn't specify which filings counsel's  
6 referring to.

7 BY MR. KANOFF:

8 Q. Filings in this case?

9 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So, the question  
10 is, "is the Board of Directors of the Company that made  
11 these filings in this case, this docket, aware of the  
12 filings that were made in this docket?"

13 MR. KANOFF: That is correct.

14 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.

15 **BY THE WITNESS:**

16 A. (DaFonte) My understanding is that the Board of  
17 Directors was aware of the Precedent Agreement,  
18 because, clearly, they had to grant signature authority  
19 to the president. As to their awareness of any filings  
20 in the case, I can't say that they were aware of that  
21 at all.

22 BY MR. KANOFF:

23 Q. Are they aware that this proceeding is ongoing here  
24 today -- not "here today", but are they aware that you

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 filed for approval of this application with this  
2 Commission, the Board of Directors of EnergyNorth?

3 A. (DaFonte) I would assume that some of them are.

4 Q. Is Richard Leeher aware of it? He filed an information  
5 request response.

6 A. (DaFonte) He would have to be, yes.

7 Q. Correct. And, he's on the Board of Directors, is he  
8 not?

9 A. (DaFonte) Correct.

10 Q. So, at least one member of the Board of Directors is  
11 aware of it?

12 A. (DaFonte) Correct.

13 Q. And, would Richard Leeher be aware that, as part of  
14 that, that Liberty North was requesting approval for  
15 115,000 Dekatherms a day?

16 A. (DaFonte) I think you meant "EnergyNorth"?

17 Q. EnergyNorth, yes.

18 A. (DaFonte) Yes. He would have been part of the Board  
19 that gave the approval for signature authority.

20 Q. And, it's possible some of the other Board members  
21 would know as well?

22 A. (DaFonte) Yes, I would think so.

23 Q. And, similarly, is Richard Leeher and the other Board  
24 members, would they be aware of your proposal to have

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 the Settlement Agreement approved?

2 A. (DaFonte) Not that I'm aware of, no.

3 Q. So, Richard Leehr does not know, as a Board -- he knows  
4 everything else we just talked about, but he doesn't  
5 know that you requested this matter be settled?

6 A. (DaFonte) He would only know based on public  
7 information that's available.

8 Q. Well, who's going to -- who's going to sign the  
9 Settlement Agreement for the Company? Is he going to  
10 then -- is he going to be surprised when you go and say  
11 "hey, we got this approval"? I don't understand this.

12 A. (DaFonte) Well, he doesn't sign -- he would not sign  
13 the Agreement.

14 Q. But he would have to approve it as one member of the  
15 Board, would he not?

16 A. (DaFonte) I'm not sure that he -- well, I don't know if  
17 he would need Board approval to sign the Settlement  
18 Agreement. I just know that the authorization to sign  
19 the Precedent Agreement was required, Board approval  
20 was required for that. As to the Settlement Agreement,  
21 I'm not sure how that process would work.

22 Q. Would Board approval then be --

23 MS. KNOWLTON: I think that, for the  
24 record, it's clear who signed the Settlement Agreement in

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1       this case, which was me. Counsel for the Company signed  
2       the Settlement Agreement, as did counsel for Staff.

3 BY MR. KANOFF:

4 Q.     The question has to do with what the management knows  
5       about the Settlement Agreement as -- and, I think the  
6       question has to do with the information at the Board  
7       level for the Settlement Agreement. There's a draft  
8       modification Amendment to the Precedent Agreement  
9       submitted as part of the Settlement, is that right?

10 A.    (DaFonte) Yes.

11 Q.    And, wouldn't the Company, as part of the execution of  
12       that document, need Board approval?

13 A.    (DaFonte) I'm not sure. It's a draft at this point in  
14       time.

15 Q.    If it were to be approved, if it were to be granted by  
16       this Commission, would the Board have to approve it?

17 A.    (DaFonte) I don't know. I can't really answer that.

18 Q.    Do you know whether the Board of Directors had any  
19       discussion with management, that would be anybody in  
20       your management group, about how much capacity  
21       EnergyNorth should contract for in the NED project?

22 A.    (DaFonte) No. The negotiations were conducted by  
23       myself, solely.

24 Q.    Did you ever make any presentations or provide any

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 information to anyone in your management structure, who  
2 would then forward that information to the Board of  
3 Directors of EnergyNorth?

4 A. (DaFonte) I don't believe so, in terms of directly to  
5 the Board.

6 Q. So, what I'm struggling with is, and I'll try to make  
7 this a question, but what I'm struggling with is the  
8 idea that a significant investment of \$400 million here  
9 to APUC, with -- through a sub that has members of the  
10 Board of Directors that are of the same -- the same  
11 folks at EnergyNorth, and that there's no  
12 communication, according to your testimony, between  
13 EnergyNorth management and the Board about this case,  
14 which involves that significant investment. Is that  
15 your testimony?

16 MS. KNOWLTON: I'm going to object to  
17 the form of the question, because I think Mr. DaFonte has  
18 already testified that he does not know whether or not  
19 there were communications among Board members of  
20 EnergyNorth. All he knows about, which he's testified to  
21 repeatedly, is that the Board took a vote authorizing the  
22 Company to enter into the Precedent Agreement that's  
23 before the Commission today.

24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. DaFonte, is it

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 your position that entering into the Settlement Agreement,  
2 that the Company is entering into the Settlement  
3 Agreement, is already within the authority that the  
4 Company had been given by the Board? That you didn't need  
5 to go back to the Board for further authority?

6 WITNESS DaFONTE: I believe so, because  
7 we -- I did not go back to the Board.

8 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Kanoff, the  
9 broad theory here is that you've got one, essentially, one  
10 board making decisions for both companies. And, then,  
11 it's in the broad corporate interests of the parent to  
12 have the sub subscribe, and I think, under your theory,  
13 oversubscribe, to this other investment they have. That's  
14 the theory, right?

15 MR. KANOFF: Yes. That's correct. Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And, I think you  
17 are asking this witness obliquely for evidence that they  
18 were communicating about it. How much more do you want to  
19 get from him that he doesn't know? And, do you have any  
20 other -- any other way of establishing that they were  
21 directing the activities of all of them, clearly, the  
22 Board of Directors, we got that. I mean, that's pretty  
23 good for you. You like that.

24 So, the notion of "bias", which is the

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 word you used before, is an interesting one, because, of  
2 course, they're biased. They want to make money. And,  
3 they want all of their corporate family to make money.  
4 That's their bias. So, they're going to do what they  
5 believe is in their financial best interest. We're all  
6 with you on that one.

7 This becomes a problem for them, if the  
8 management of EnergyNorth is doing things that are not in  
9 EnergyNorth's best interests, right?

10 MR. KANOFF: That's correct. Right.

11 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. What have  
12 you got, besides the general structure, and that  
13 circumstance that may well get you all that you need, but  
14 do you have anything? Because I know we had a discovery  
15 dispute about this, so --

16 MR. KANOFF: We did. We did,  
17 Commissioner -- Chairman. And, the fact that there was a  
18 discovery dispute stopped a lot of the information about  
19 this. It was delayed for a little bit. And, the  
20 communication that was asked for in one of the discovery  
21 responses that had to do with in a -- not necessarily this  
22 part, but communication among the Board, was not -- there  
23 wasn't any communication. What would be -- so, short  
24 answer, there's nothing we've been able to get from the

{DG 14-380} [REDACTED - for public use] {07-22-15/Day 2}



[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 Company, other than the reality, as you are correct with,  
2 is that APUC is incentivized to go with the biggest number  
3 it can get, because it's going to make the biggest amount  
4 of money. It's incentivized to go with having this  
5 project succeed. The building blocks to get there had to  
6 start with "what's the communication back and forth from  
7 the Board?" We weren't able to get that. And, if we  
8 could ask for a record request to confirm.

9 MS. KNOWLTON: We answered this  
10 question. So, this was a subject of a Motion to Compel.  
11 It was the Motion to Compel on PLAN 2-28, among other  
12 questions. And, if I recall, in the Commission's order on  
13 the Motion to Compel, the Company was required to answer  
14 the question to the extent that it -- the question sought  
15 documents, to the extent that it had any documents between  
16 EnergyNorth and the various entities that were named in  
17 PLAN 2-28(c) regarding the Precedent Agreement, and the  
18 terms and conditions of the Precedent Agreement. And, the  
19 Company answered in a supplemental data response on  
20 June 9th, 2015 that it had no documents memorializing one  
21 or more obligations of EnergyNorth to any of the entities  
22 in PLAN 2-28 concerning the Precedent Agreement. So, in  
23 essence, there were no documents between EnergyNorth and  
24 its affiliates regarding the Precedent Agreement. So,

{DG 14-380} [REDACTED - for public use] {07-22-15/Day 2}

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 we've answered that.

2 There was another round of discovery  
3 that came in on June the 10th, 2015. We didn't receive  
4 any further questions on this subject matter. So, I'm not  
5 sure what there's left to inquire on.

6 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: What is there  
7 left -- what is there left to inquire on then?

8 MR. KANOFF: In the absence, you know,  
9 I'll answer the question directly, in the absence of any  
10 confirmation from the Company that, in fact, there were  
11 discussions between EnergyNorth's management and  
12 EnergyNorth's Board back and forth as to this project,  
13 and, therefore, between -- possibly between EnergyNorth's  
14 Board and Transmission Company Board, because they're the  
15 same people, it's almost, you know, as a factual problem,  
16 it's a factual barrier to try to make a link. And, I get  
17 that.

18 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: But, ultimately --  
19 but, ultimately, if the amount -- if the level of  
20 subscription that EnergyNorth has bought -- has signed on  
21 to here is reasonable, then it really doesn't matter.

22 MR. KANOFF: Well, that's --

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And, if it's  
24 unreasonable, it's got a separate problem, a problem

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 separate and apart from why it's unreasonable. The "why"  
2 may help explain what happened, but it doesn't establish  
3 in and of itself that it's unreasonable. A fair amount of  
4 the questioning yesterday directed at the witnesses who  
5 were up there tried to get at whether this was a  
6 reasonable amount.

7 Isn't that ultimately more significant  
8 than the "whys" of how they did it? Because, if it's  
9 unreasonable, it's reasonable, and we shouldn't approve  
10 it. If it's reasonable, even it was done for some really  
11 ugly, unpleasant, internal corporate reasons, we should  
12 approve it.

13 MR. KANOFF: Well, I think -- I think  
14 that, whether it's reasonable or not is sometimes a  
15 function of the back-and-forth that occurred by management  
16 and the Board. But I get your point. I do. And, I  
17 think, as far as this hearing is concerned right now, I'm  
18 just going to wrap it one with maybe three questions, then  
19 we can move onto another area.

20 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.

21 MR. KANOFF: I don't know, given the  
22 testimony and the witness and so forth, other than going  
23 through another round of record requests, how we get to  
24 that. And, if, in fact, the trier of fact is looking at

{DG 14-380} [REDACTED - for public use] {07-22-15/Day 2}

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 this the way you just described, that it's either  
2 unreasonable or it's not, and bias is something that is  
3 not essential to that determination, we're good with that.

4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Well, I mean,  
5 understand that, if they have done something for -- to  
6 benefit an entity other than the one we regulate, if  
7 they're -- I think this is apparent from our order on the  
8 discovery dispute. If there's evidence that someone up  
9 the corporate chain is directing the regulated subsidiary,  
10 the one we can -- we have control over, to do something  
11 that's not in its best interest or its ratepayers best  
12 interests, we want to know about that.

13 MR. KANOFF: And, I think, you know, I  
14 think we're right at that line, and we can't get an  
15 answer. Because it could will be, and I'm just going to  
16 give a hypothetical, it could well be that up the food  
17 chain, at APUC, a \$4.5 billion company, they're investing  
18 in this pipeline, and they're, and we don't have this,  
19 it's behind the curtain, but they're, in some ways,  
20 directing, and it may not be overt, but they're directing  
21 this Company to take as big a chunk as it can that it  
22 thinks it can get approved.

23 And, that is really an explanation  
24 that's as plausible as any other explanation, if you

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 believe that they're oversubscribed here. So, --

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And, underlying  
3 that is the essential question, "what's a reasonable  
4 amount for this Company to subscribe to?"

5 And, Ms. Knowlton, do you want to say  
6 something? You look like you wanted to say something.

7 MS. KNOWLTON: Yes, I do. I mean, --

8 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And, understand,  
9 all Mr. Kanoff was doing was spinning out a hypothetical  
10 theory. He was not making any accusations.

11 MR. KANOFF: And, I'm not a witness.

12 MS. KNOWLTON: Correct. And, I'm not a  
13 witness either, but Mr. DaFonte is. And, Mr. DaFonte has  
14 testified that he solely negotiated this Agreement on  
15 behalf of EnergyNorth. That his negotiations, I believe  
16 he testified to this yesterday, that his negotiations on  
17 this agreement started I think at least a year in advance  
18 of the existence of Liberty Utilities (Pipeline &  
19 Transmission) Corp. That the Company has responded to a  
20 discovery request that it has no documents between  
21 EnergyNorth and any of the affiliate entities regarding  
22 this Agreement. So, again, people can spin theories, but  
23 I don't really know what there is here. Other than the  
24 fact that Algonquin has an investment interest in the

{DG 14-380} [REDACTED - for public use] {07-22-15/Day 2}

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1       entity that owns the pipeline, you know, that Tennessee is  
2       the lessor of, which we stipulated to, I believe, or, if  
3       not, I'll stipulate to that. That's not in question here.

4               So, as to this issue of "bias", and, you  
5       know, Mr. DaFonte can testify further about the timing of  
6       things. But I think it is clear that the negotiation of  
7       this was by him alone, and well prior to any investment or  
8       an entity -- the existence of an entity that made an  
9       investment.

10               CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I understand where  
11       you are, Ms. Knowlton.

12               Mr. Kanoff, I understand you have a few  
13       more questions you want to ask, and then we're going to  
14       move onto another topic.

15               MR. KANOFF: Yes.

16               CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So, why don't you  
17       give that a whirl.

18               MR. KANOFF: That's correct.

19       BY MR. KANOFF:

20       Q.     Would you, just for the record, tell us who your boss  
21               is. Who do you report to?

22       A.     (DaFonte) I currently report to David Pasieka.

23       Q.     And, who does he report to?

24       A.     (DaFonte) David reports to Ian Robertson.

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 Q. And, Ian Robertson is, as we discussed, is CEO of APUC?

2 A. (DaFonte) Correct.

3 Q. If Liberty were to withdraw, as a hypothetical, from  
4 their Consortium, or not have this contract approved,  
5 or it were to reduce its obligation under the Precedent  
6 Agreement, would that have a impact on the chances of  
7 success of this project?

8 A. (DaFonte) You mean EnergyNorth?

9 Q. Yes.

10 A. (DaFonte) The Precedent Agreement stipulates that the  
11 volume that is, you know, at issue here is 115,000  
12 Dekatherms. That, with Commission order, can be  
13 reduced to 100,000 Dekatherms. That was in the filing.  
14 Any deviation from that essentially requires a  
15 renegotiation of all terms and conditions with  
16 Tennessee Gas Pipeline. That's essentially what would  
17 have to happen. There are no provisions for a volume  
18 less than 100,000 Dekatherms.

19 Q. And, is it your understanding that reducing then the  
20 level and having additional negotiations with Tennessee  
21 Gas Pipeline would diminish the chances of success of  
22 this project?

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: What is "this  
24 project"? Because I'm not sure he has the same notion of

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1       what "this project" is, the last two words of your  
2       question.

3       BY MR. KANOFF:

4       Q.     It would be the NED project.

5       A.     (DaFonte) I can't speak for the business plan and the  
6             strategy associated with Kinder Morgan's decisions with  
7             regard to the Tennessee project.

8       Q.     You suggest -- just four more questions here and we'll  
9             be done. You suggest that the Pipeline is in the best  
10            interest of customers and represents the least-cost or  
11            the best-cost option, is that right?

12      A.     (DaFonte) Absolutely.

13      Q.     Okay. Is it also in APUC's interest to have this  
14             Pipeline be approved and built? They have a  
15             \$400 million investment?

16      A.     (DaFonte) I would assume it would be good for the  
17             Company.

18      Q.     Good for APUC?

19      A.     (DaFonte) Good for APUC.

20      Q.     And, isn't it in APUC's interest to have Liberty invest  
21             in its Pipeline, as compared to other alternatives?

22      A.     (DaFonte) It may be for them. But, again, I only know  
23             what I know through the negotiation of the PA. I don't  
24             know what they're doing at the corporate level with



[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1       regard to their investments.

2   Q.   And, you don't know any -- the conversations between  
3       Mr. Ianson [sic] and Mr. Pareck -- Parecki [sic], is  
4       that your boss?

5   A.   (DaFonte) Ian Robertson is the CEO, and David Pasieka.

6   Q.   "Pasieka".

7   A.   (DaFonte) Right.

8   Q.   You don't have any information about their  
9       conversations?

10   A.   (DaFonte) No. I don't.

11   Q.   And, isn't it in APUC's interest, given those -- given  
12       that relationship, that EnergyNorth do everything it  
13       can, from a commercial and regulatory perspective, to  
14       ensure that -- to ensure the success of the NED  
15       project?

16   A.   (DaFonte) I don't know what kind of influence they have  
17       over the NED project. And, I just note, they have a  
18       2.5 percent interest in a LLC that is leasing capacity  
19       to Tennessee Gas Pipeline. I'm not sure, you know,  
20       what kind of control they have, in terms of their  
21       directing the strategy with regard to NED.

22   Q.   But are you -- strike that.

23                   MR. KANOFF: I'm going to move onto  
24       another area.

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.

2 (Atty. Kanoff conferring with Atty.

3 Gates.)

4 BY MR. KANOFF:

5 Q. I want to refer you to Exhibit 39 for identification  
6 and Exhibit 40 for identification. And, also note your  
7 testimony that this Pipeline, the NED Pipeline, will  
8 transverse existing rights-of-way through southern New  
9 Hampshire, is that correct?

10 A. (DaFonte) What's your reference? You said  
11 "Exhibit 39"?

12 Q. Thirty-nine (39), which is PLAN 1-16, and 40, which  
13 is --

14 A. (DaFonte) I don't believe you gave those to me.

15 Q. -- PLAN 2-38.

16 A. (DaFonte) I have 39 in front of me.

17 Q. And 40?

18 A. (DaFonte) I do not have 40.

19 Q. We're getting -- we're getting it to you. Sorry.

20 (Atty. Gates handing document to Witness  
21 DaFonte.)

22 BY MR. KANOFF:

23 Q. Now, is it fair to say that, based upon these exhibits  
24 and your testimony, that the Pipeline will traverse

1 through southern New Hampshire?

2 A. (DaFonte) That's my understanding of the route at this  
3 particular time.

4 Q. And, is it your understanding that that is going to be  
5 part of a existing right-of-way in some fashion?

6 A. (DaFonte) I mean, I'm not familiar with the  
7 right-of-way and any kind of negotiations --

8 Q. But -- and that's what it says in, I believe,  
9 Exhibit 39, that you're not aware of whether NED  
10 requested route has been approved with respect to  
11 right-of-way access. And, my question to you is, did  
12 you ask NED about that? In 1-16(d), you said "the  
13 Company is not involved". When you got this data  
14 request, did you reach out to Kinder Morgan/Tennessee  
15 Gas Pipeline and ask them for any additional  
16 information about the status of this right-of-way  
17 access?

18 A. (DaFonte) No, we did not. I think I testified  
19 yesterday, our negotiations with Tennessee center on  
20 various terms and conditions related to getting gas  
21 from Point A, in this case, Wright, New York, to our  
22 citygates. The actual path of the pipeline is really  
23 nothing that we can control or have any influence over.

24 Q. But you are involved in taking advantage of the

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 commercial opportunities that may be presented to the  
2 Company, given its route. We talked about that  
3 yesterday, isn't that correct?

4 A. (DaFonte) Correct. But, as I said, we have no  
5 influence over the pipeline route. My testimony  
6 yesterday was stating that, based on the current route,  
7 there are commercial opportunities that we would take  
8 advantage of, in order to utilize as much of that  
9 pipeline capacity as quickly as possible.

10 Q. So, you're paying attention somewhat to the route,  
11 because of the possible opportunities it presents from  
12 a commercial perspective, but you're not necessarily  
13 paying attention, getting information about the way  
14 that route is going to use rights-of-way?

15 A. (DaFonte) That's correct.

16 Q. You could have asked about that information, though, is  
17 that right?

18 A. (DaFonte) I suppose so. But that wasn't something that  
19 was part of the PA.

20 Q. You chose to -- do you know whether this project will  
21 traverse, and I suspect -- I just need to ask this, so  
22 bear with me, do you know whether this project will  
23 traverse or be parallel to an existing right-of-way or  
24 not?

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 A. (DaFonte) It's a long project. I'm not sure which  
2 particular portion you're talking about. I am familiar  
3 somewhat with the fact that the pipeline will run  
4 through some existing right-of-way. It will traverse  
5 probably some right-of-way. I don't know the exact  
6 details of where it's going to traverse, whether it's  
7 going to be in the right-of-way, outside of the  
8 right-of-way. I don't know those details behind the  
9 project.

10 Q. So, in making a judgment about whether this is a good  
11 project for ratepayers, at least-cost or best-cost, you  
12 did not factor in at all the impact of the Pipeline  
13 with respect to how it was going to be placed and any  
14 effects it might have on communities along the way?

15 A. (DaFonte) That is not what my job is as the Vice  
16 President of Energy Procurement.

17 Q. So, you did not, is that correct?

18 A. (DaFonte) Correct.

19 Q. Are you aware, in December, that Kinder Morgan moved  
20 this pipeline from Massachusetts to New Hampshire, so  
21 it could use the existing utility corridors? Is any of  
22 that familiar to you?

23 A. (DaFonte) I believe that there was some public  
24 information with regard to that, yes.

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 Q. And, if you want to look at Exhibit 41.

2 A. (DaFonte) Which I don't have.

3 (Atty. Gates handing documents to

4 Witness DaFonte.)

5 WITNESS DaFONTE: Okay. I have 41 here.

6 BY MR. KANOFF:

7 Q. Okay. And, have you seen this letter before? It's a  
8 letter from Kinder Morgan, dated December 8th, 2014, to  
9 FERC, with respect to the change in route from  
10 Massachusetts to New Hampshire?

11 A. (DaFonte) I may have seen it.

12 Q. Okay. And, on the top of Page 2 and 3, it basically  
13 explains one of the reasons for that change in route.  
14 And, it says that a change, and I'm paraphrasing here,  
15 you can look at the bottom of Page 2, the change in  
16 route "will enable a very substantial portion of the  
17 proposed new pipeline construction to be located  
18 adjacent to, and parallel with, existing corridors in  
19 the states of New York, New Hampshire," -- sorry, "New  
20 York, Massachusetts and New Hampshire." Do you see  
21 that?

22 A. (DaFonte) Yes.

23 Q. Okay. And, so, would you agree that, at least as far  
24 as this letter is concerned, one of the reasons

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 Tennessee Gas Pipeline moved this to New Hampshire was  
2 to use existing utility corridors?

3 A. (DaFonte) It would appear that way.

4 Q. And, you haven't done -- as you said, you haven't done  
5 any analysis of environmental impacts and associated  
6 costs and risks of those impacts to this project, have  
7 you?

8 A. (DaFonte) No. I'm not constructing the Pipeline. I'm  
9 just signing up for capacity.

10 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Along those lines,  
11 Mr. Kanoff, where are we going with this?

12 BY MR. KANOFF:

13 Q. Well, the next question was, you are aware that  
14 environmental costs are included as part of the  
15 Precedent Agreement pricing?

16 A. (DaFonte) I don't have any information with regard to  
17 the individual costs associated with the construction  
18 of the Pipeline. All I do have is the rate that we  
19 were able to negotiate on behalf of EnergyNorth  
20 customers with Tennessee Gas Pipeline. Their costs are  
21 their costs. And, I don't know what role they play in  
22 the rate that was negotiated.

23 Q. Would you take subject to check that some measure of  
24 environmental impacts may be included in the costs that

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1           you ultimately would pay?

2                       MS. KNOWLTON:  Objection.  The witness  
3       has stated that he doesn't have any knowledge as to the  
4       costs with regard to the construction of the Pipeline.

5                       CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG:  Mr. Kanoff, you  
6       want to know -- he negotiated the Agreement.  The  
7       Agreement contains some provisions that are relevant to  
8       where you're going.  That's what you want to ask him  
9       about, right?

10                      MR. KANOFF:  Right.

11                      CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG:  The provisions that  
12       are in the contract that he negotiated.

13                      MR. KANOFF:  That's right.  And, so, the  
14       question had to do with, is he -- I was just trying to get  
15       at --

16                      CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG:  No, I think you're  
17       good.  Go ahead.

18                      MR. KANOFF:  Okay.  Fine.

19       BY MR. KANOFF:

20       Q.   And, if I could refer you to Bates 098.

21                      CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG:  Of what?

22                      MR. KANOFF:  The DaFonte testimony.

23                      WITNESS DaFONTE:  May I just mention  
24       that that's all confidential.



[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 MR. KANOFF: Right. And, I think I may  
2 have taken it as far as I can take it. But I want to at  
3 least reference that's the link.

4 **BY THE WITNESS:**

5 A. (DaFonte) Okay. But I don't know the specific costs  
6 associated with any of those items listed there.

7 BY MR. KANOFF:

8 Q. I want you to look at Exhibit 42. And, take a look at  
9 Exhibit for identification 42, 43, and 44. And,  
10 cutting to the chase here, in response to the  
11 Supplemental Exhibit 42 response, you submitted what is  
12 marked for identification "43" and "44", is that right?

13 A. (DaFonte) Correct.

14 Q. And, first question, with respect to Exhibit 43, do you  
15 know anything more about the project, the "AIM project"  
16 reference in this document and what is referenced in  
17 the exhibit? Do you have any information beyond what's  
18 here?

19 A. (DaFonte) I do not.

20 Q. Okay. And, look at Exhibit 44. Do you recognize this  
21 document?

22 A. (DaFonte) I do.

23 Q. And, this was a response that you provided to us as  
24 part of an information request response, is that right?

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 It's a NESCOE presentation, the New England States  
2 Committee on Energy, if I got that right, by Kinder  
3 Morgan, in December 2014, is that right?

4 A. (DaFonte) Correct. We provided the link to the  
5 document.

6 Q. Right. And, this is the document.

7 A. (DaFonte) Correct.

8 Q. From that link. And, this is the same time when Kinder  
9 Morgan decided, Tennessee Gas decided to move this  
10 project from Mass. to New Hampshire, is that right?

11 A. (DaFonte) Approximately.

12 Q. Yes. And, this is one of the first presentations they  
13 made, at least publicly, announcing that decision?

14 A. (DaFonte) I can't confirm that.

15 Q. It would seem about the same timeline, given December  
16 8th?

17 A. (DaFonte) I said it's "approximately", yes.

18 Q. Okay. Fine. And, if you look on Page 3, this  
19 referenced some of the reasons why at least Kinder  
20 Morgan believes that the NED project makes sense for  
21 New England. You talked about some of these in the  
22 statements you made yesterday in support of the  
23 Settlement, although you said, as part of that, after  
24 making the statements, they're not part of the case. I

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 just want to, with my questions, say, are you aware  
2 that there's other pipelines, Spectra, Access  
3 Northeast, Portland Natural Gas Transmission pipelines,  
4 that will do the same things as some of the elements  
5 listed on this page, to "provide direct access to  
6 Marcellus", isn't that correct?

7 A. (DaFonte) I believe, as part of my testimony and the  
8 analysis that I conducted in this case, I've identified  
9 the available alternatives at the time that we were  
10 analyzing the benefits of the NED project. So, I have  
11 listed -- we have conducted analysis on the PNGTS/C2C  
12 project, as well as the Spectra/Atlantic Bridge  
13 project. Which, at this point, I might as well add  
14 that those two projects now have run their course, in  
15 terms of their Open Seasons, and are fully subscribed.

16 Q. I'll talk about alternatives later. That's the last  
17 element I have. We don't have to get into it now then.  
18 Let's look at Page 7. And, that shows a map of the  
19 change in route from Massachusetts to New Hampshire,  
20 does it not?

21 A. (DaFonte) Yes. That's correct.

22 Q. And, on Page 7, it also says, as a comment, "we  
23 listened". Do you see that?

24 A. (DaFonte) I do see that. Yes.

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Where are we going,  
2 Mr. Kanoff? We're talking right now about the pipeline  
3 route and the change. So, tell me where we're going.

4 MR. KANOFF: What I want to show is  
5 that, at the time that the route changed, which was just  
6 about the time that the Precedent Agreement was executed,  
7 December and December, and after the time that the  
8 Precedent Agreement had been approved and signed off by  
9 the Liberty Board, that the assumptions with respect to  
10 Liberty were all Massachusetts-based. So, by that, I mean  
11 there was no -- at that point, there was no opportunity --  
12 this wasn't going through the areas of southern New  
13 Hampshire, it wasn't going to provide for the kind of  
14 growth that they state now exists from the changed route.  
15 And, therefore, all those additional after-the-fact  
16 justifications for why they need the 115,000 Dekatherms a  
17 day did not exist at the time that this was originally  
18 proposed.

19 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Do you want him to  
20 testify that "it's even better than he thought it was"?

21 MR. KANOFF: Well, it depends where we  
22 stop the clock, Chairman. You know, there's always  
23 opportunities to grow after the fact. It depends how  
24 we're going to look at ratemaking, I guess, or how we're

{DG 14-380} [REDACTED - for public use] {07-22-15/Day 2}

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 going to look at gas supply.

2 So, at some point you say, they made a  
3 bet, and the bet was "it's 115, based on these facts."  
4 And, now, we're allowing in other information about why  
5 it's better or it may be further justification for the  
6 facts originally assumed. But we could add other facts,  
7 just as hypothetically, other pipelines, other realities,  
8 that make it less economic than they have assumed. At  
9 some point, we have to just say "they made a bet at this  
10 point in time", and we have to understand that and stick  
11 with it.

12 WITNESS DaFONTE: I don't mind  
13 answering, --

14 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Go ahead.

15 WITNESS DaFONTE: -- if you --

16 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Go ahead.

17 **BY THE WITNESS:**

18 A. (DaFonte) Sure. The original testimony, and the  
19 analysis that was conducted, did not include any growth  
20 with regard to the changed pipeline route. It had no  
21 Keene in there. There was no load associated with any  
22 potential communities along the new pipeline route.  
23 There wasn't even any more than about a thousand or so  
24 dekatherms associated with returning capacity-exempt

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 customers. So, the Company, when it filed for the  
2 115,000, that 115,000 was supported by the original  
3 route and the market activity at the time, again,  
4 mentioning the capacity-exempt customers. And, by the  
5 way, those customers, once they do return, they stay  
6 with us for good. That means they have to pay for that  
7 capacity long-term. So, those now have to be factored  
8 into our future planning. And, as I testified  
9 yesterday, those have increased to approximately 3,600  
10 Dekatherms per day.

11 So, the change in the route, that really  
12 has led to an even greater need for capacity. And, I  
13 think, as part of the Settlement, you know, that  
14 Settlement kind of takes that into consideration, and  
15 says "okay, sure, you know, 115, but you got to meet  
16 some of these targets that were negotiated. And, if  
17 you don't, then it goes down to 100. And, oh, by the  
18 way, whether it's 115 or 100, you got to hit certain  
19 growth targets, or else there is a disallowance of  
20 costs through the cost of gas."

21 So, I don't know if that's where you're  
22 going. But the initial filing was premised on the  
23 route at the time, and no additional growth was  
24 factored in.

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 Q. And the route at the time essentially was as filed, and  
2 the reaction of three experts in this case to that  
3 filing was that the Company did not undertake adequate  
4 analysis of that route at that amount. Isn't that  
5 right?

6 A. (DaFonte) I don't believe so, no. In my opinion?

7 MS. PATTERSON: And, actually, at this  
8 point, I would just object and say that the testimony  
9 speaks for itself, as far as the Staff testimony goes.

10 BY MR. KANOFF:

11 Q. And, to the extent that the testimony does speak for  
12 itself, and does suggest in some way that the Company's  
13 analysis, as filed, was deficient, then wouldn't it be  
14 a logical link to suggest that adding on additional  
15 possibilities to that foundation is even more  
16 speculative, more problematic than the original filing?

17 MS. KNOWLTON: Objection. I'd ask that  
18 the witness be shown particular portions of specific  
19 testimony, if he's going to be asked a question based on  
20 that testimony.

21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Kanoff.

22 MR. KANOFF: We'll let the testimony  
23 speak for itself at this point. I think that the question  
24 can be answered with another question, I'd just as soon go

{DG 14-380} [REDACTED - for public use] {07-22-15/Day 2}

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 in that direction.

2 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.

3 MR. KANOFF: All right.

4 BY MR. KANOFF:

5 Q. The question is, in December of 2014, and as part of  
6 your submittal in this case, you undertook an analysis  
7 that was based upon and presented analysis that was  
8 based primarily or almost totally on a Massachusetts  
9 route, is that right?

10 A. (DaFonte) The analysis was not based on the route  
11 itself. The analysis was based on the terms of the  
12 Agreement, and specifically the negotiated rate in the  
13 Agreement, as it related to the alternatives that were  
14 available at that time.

15 Q. And, the amount of alternatives that you relied on at  
16 that time were based upon a Massachusetts route that  
17 would serve EnergyNorth by a little spur called the  
18 "West Nashua Lateral", isn't that right?

19 A. (DaFonte) I believe that it was a lateral that would be  
20 coming from Massachusetts, but the terms and conditions  
21 were the same. And, I keep going back to this, but  
22 what I'm negotiating is a rate that our customers will  
23 ultimately pay, and the benefits associated with the  
24 contract that will accrue to our customers as well.



[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 The route is not in our control. And, as I've just  
2 said a little while ago, to the extent that that route  
3 changed and it provided other commercial opportunities  
4 to bring natural gas service to other communities,  
5 then, of course, we would want to take advantage of  
6 that.

7 Q. Let me ask two questions on this, and then I'll move  
8 on. Is the way a company looks at analysis that it  
9 establishes a -- based upon what the amount of  
10 customers are, how much gas it needs, or does it  
11 determine that it has a certain amount of gas and then  
12 evaluates how much customer it needs? Which is the  
13 best approach?

14 A. (DaFonte) Well, the Company first conducts a demand  
15 forecast, based on assumed growth and, you know, market  
16 trends. And, then, it compares that demand forecast to  
17 its available resources. And, any deficiency in those  
18 resources would have to be addressed through a capacity  
19 or supply procurement.

20 Q. And, is that what this is? Is this -- is the NED  
21 project, the Precedent Agreement, is that a capacity or  
22 supply procurement, as you just described?

23 A. (DaFonte) Yes. It's a capacity contract.

24 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Are we at a

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 breaking point, because I know Mr. Patnaude is going to  
2 need a break?

3 MR. KANOFF: This would be a great place  
4 to break.

5 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. We'll break  
6 for ten minutes, come back at quarter after four.

7 (Recess taken at 4:03 p.m. and the  
8 hearing resumed at 4:20 p.m.)

9 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Kanoff.

10 MR. KANOFF: Thank you. I have to turn  
11 it on.

12 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes, it helps if  
13 it's on.

14 MR. KANOFF: Okay.

15 BY MR. KANOFF:

16 Q. Mr. DaFonte, is it still possible that the route for  
17 the NED project will change?

18 MS. KNOWLTON: Objection as to the  
19 relevance of the question.

20 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sustained.

21 BY MR. KANOFF:

22 Q. I want to refer you to exhibits for identification 45,  
23 46, 47 confidential, 48 redacted, 49, 50, 51, and 52.

24 Do you have those in front of you?

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 A. (DaFonte) I have all of them, yes.

2 Q. Now, you referenced in your testimony, and also  
3 referenced in some of those information request  
4 responses that are now exhibits for identification,  
5 that you looked at Atlantic Bridge and C2C, is that  
6 right?

7 A. (DaFonte) That's correct.

8 Q. And, for each option, for those two projects, you  
9 assumed 115,000 Dekatherms a day long-haul  
10 transportation, from either Wright or Ramapo, New York  
11 beginning in 2018, is that right?

12 A. (DaFonte) That's correct.

13 Q. And, did you take any negotiation -- do you undertake  
14 any negotiations with Atlantic Bridge or C2C for any  
15 amounts less than 115,000 Dekatherms a day?

16 A. (DaFonte) No, we did not. It was on an  
17 apples-to-apples basis, based on the needs that the  
18 Company identified in its filing.

19 Q. And, did you assess either one of those alternatives at  
20 any other timetable, other than the timetable that you  
21 used for NED and which would be service beginning  
22 November 2018?

23 A. (DaFonte) No. We evaluated the project on a long-term  
24 cost analysis basis.

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 Q. And, to be clear, both those facilities go to Dracut,  
2 is that right? Let me say it a different way. Both  
3 those possible options, they both go to Dracut?

4 A. (DaFonte) Well, the PNGTS project would go to Dracut,  
5 because it has existing capacity to Dracut. The  
6 Atlantic Bridge project is not proposed to go to Dracut  
7 specifically.

8 Q. If the Precedent Agreement or the Settlement is not  
9 approved for any reason, what would EnergyNorth propose  
10 to do?

11 A. (DaFonte) Well, EnergyNorth would immediately begin  
12 exploring other alternatives that are out there. There  
13 are other projects that are being proposed that would  
14 be considered. It would certainly have to look at an  
15 expansion of the Concord Lateral, as probably the first  
16 order of business.

17 Q. Is it a fair -- is it a fair statement that other  
18 options are emerging beyond the two options that you  
19 looked at as part of your proposal in this case?

20 A. (DaFonte) I'm only aware of one other pipeline option  
21 that has been announced at this point in time.

22 Q. Which one would that be?

23 A. (DaFonte) It would be the Access Northeast project.

24 Q. Are you aware of any opportunities with respect to the

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 PNGTS system/TransCanada connections that would also  
2 provide availability to Dracut?

3 A. (DaFonte) I have not seen any announcements with regard  
4 to PNGTS, other than what was provided in the C2C Open  
5 Season.

6 Q. Are you familiar at all with the filing that PNGTS made  
7 in the regulatory proceedings with respect to LDCs in  
8 the Consortium, regarding its ability to serve and  
9 provide gas to Dracut from Marcellus/Utica?

10 A. (DaFonte) No, I'm not familiar with that.

11 Q. And, as a hypothetical, just one last question on this,  
12 the options available, if for some reason the Precedent  
13 Agreement was not approved or the project was not  
14 built. Is Spectra/Access Northeast, the Access  
15 Northeast project, would that be an option for the  
16 Company? Would you look at that?

17 A. (DaFonte) The Company would have to look into the  
18 project. What I know of it is it's a project that's  
19 been at least marketed to electric distribution  
20 companies. In fact, electric distribution companies  
21 are partial owners of the project.

22 Q. Are you also aware that LDCs are signing up for that as  
23 well?

24 A. (DaFonte) I am not aware of that, no.

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 Q. Now, you did not consider LNG as part of your  
2 assessment of NED, is that right? Expansion of LNG  
3 peaking?

4 A. (DaFonte) Yes. The Company did not consider the  
5 expansion of its existing LNG peaking facilities,  
6 because it does not have the ability under federal  
7 regulation to expand those facilities.

8 Q. Can you enlight us as to what that federal regulation  
9 that you're referring to is?

10 A. (DaFonte) Sure. It's NFPA 59A, "NFPA" being the  
11 National Fire Prevention Association. And, in that  
12 rule, NFPA 59A --

13 Q. I'm sorry. I'm sorry to interrupt you. Could you say  
14 that again? I didn't get the entire reference. It's  
15 "NFPA 59" --

16 A. (DaFonte) A. And, it's -- "NFPA" stands for the  
17 "National Fire Protection Association". And, that  
18 basically has specific requirements around vapor  
19 dispersion of LNG facilities and thermal radiation  
20 zones. The existing facilities, LNG facilities of the  
21 company, are in, for the most part, densely populated  
22 areas, and are grandfathered because of the fact that  
23 they're, you know, 30-40 years old. Any expansion  
24 would bring them under the new regulations, which

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 clearly would not allow the plants to function even as  
2 they function today.

3 Q. And, those regulations, I believe in one of your  
4 information responses, were enacted this year, is that  
5 your testimony?

6 A. (DaFonte) No. I don't believe they were enacted this  
7 year. They have been around for awhile now.

8 Q. Do you know when they went into effect?

9 A. (DaFonte) I do not.

10 Q. In 2007, as part of the Company's testimony in seeking  
11 approval of the Concord Lateral, it proposed to expand  
12 its existing propane facilities significantly. It was  
13 a alternative to expanding the Concord Lateral. And,  
14 so, the question is, really, what changed from 2007,  
15 from a regulatory perspective, that would make that  
16 option not available now as it was then?

17 A. (DaFonte) I wasn't with the Company at that time.  
18 Liberty Utilities did not own EnergyNorth at that time.

19 Q. I understand.

20 A. (DaFonte) So, I don't know.

21 Q. But I guess the confusion is, I'm trying to get a  
22 timeline on this reg., and I believe one of my  
23 colleagues is looking it up as we speak, but, if the  
24 regulation would not have prevented Grid from

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 expanding, in fact, they made a proposal here to do  
2 that, then the question is, how it would prohibit you  
3 from doing the same thing?

4 A. (DaFonte) You're making an assumption that I can't  
5 answer.

6 Q. Now, with respect to the expansion of LNG, you say two  
7 things. One was that there was a regulation that was  
8 challenging, and you just referenced that regulation.  
9 You also indicate that, with respect to LNG, that  
10 you're not aware of any new sites that would work.  
11 Could you talk about that a little bit.

12 A. (DaFonte) Can you point me to the data request or the  
13 exhibit that you're referencing?

14 Q. Sure. It's in Exhibit 49(b), last sentence. "The  
15 Company is not aware of any potential LNG sites that  
16 would be able to comply with all federal codes." So,  
17 you talked about "current facilities", and you also  
18 talked about "potential LNG sites". So, I'm asking now  
19 about potential LNG sites?

20 A. (DaFonte) My answer would be the same.

21 Q. So, are you -- is your testimony then, with potential  
22 sites, that there are no sites that would meet the --  
23 satisfy the prohibitions or the regulations of NFPA 59A  
24 anywhere in New Hampshire? I'm just trying to



[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 understand the context, your response that there's "no  
2 sites".

3 A. (DaFonte) No, I'm just suggesting -- I'm saying that  
4 we're not aware of sites within the Company's service  
5 territory that would be able to provide that level of  
6 service and satisfy the NFPA 59A requirements.

7 Q. So, it's just within your service territory?

8 A. (DaFonte) Yes. That's the only way we could get  
9 service.

10 Q. And, so, there's no -- strike that. So, what have you  
11 done to actually evaluate possible sites? I mean, how  
12 do you know that there's no sites? Your service  
13 territory encompasses a large area, presumably, and a  
14 lot of it is not as urban as your existing sites. What  
15 have you done to evaluate that there's no sites  
16 available in your service territory?

17 A. (DaFonte) Well, the site has to be somewhere near where  
18 the Company's largest consuming part of its service  
19 territory is, because there has to be takeaway  
20 capacity, in a sense. So, for example, you couldn't  
21 put it on the extremities of the distribution system,  
22 because there would be no demand out in those  
23 locations. So, it has to be closer to the urban, if  
24 you will, urban setting. And, it would certainly have

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 to be a large facility or multiple facilities to  
2 provide the same 115,000 Dekatherms per day of  
3 capacity.

4 Q. Well, it doesn't have to provide 115,000 Dekatherms a  
5 day, does it? It just has to provide some measure of  
6 peak demand.

7 A. (DaFonte) Well, to satisfy the long-term requirements,  
8 that's what we --

9 Q. Well, the LNG would not be a long-term requirement  
10 option, but it would be a peaking solution?

11 A. (DaFonte) Yes. But it would be a solution to satisfy  
12 our long-term design day requirements.

13 Q. It would reduce your design day long-term requirements,  
14 would it not, if it was available to you? That's what  
15 Grid said.

16 MS. KNOWLTON: Objection. I would ask,  
17 to the extent that Mr. Kanoff is referring to what Grid  
18 said, to show Mr. DaFonte National Grid's testimony, so he  
19 could review that, that specific reference to that  
20 testimony page, etcetera.

21 BY MR. KANOFF:

22 Q. Well, why don't I just modify the question and say,  
23 would not LNG, if it were employed, available,  
24 constructed by the Company, reduce peak -- I mean, be a

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 capacity source to serve peak demand, and wouldn't that  
2 reduce the amount of supply necessary otherwise under  
3 long-haul transportation?

4 A. (DaFonte) Yes. I believe that's what I was saying.  
5 It's a supply-side resource. So, if that were the  
6 solution, and, again, comparing apples to apples, we  
7 would be looking at 115,000 a day, which is what we're  
8 looking at for -- what we've put forth in our testimony  
9 as being the appropriate amount of capacity required to  
10 satisfy long-term customer demand.

11 Q. Just a few more questions. Are you aware that Northern  
12 Utilities is considering at least one site in New  
13 Hampshire for an LNG facility?

14 A. (DaFonte) Well, I probably would turn to Mr. Clark with  
15 regard to anything related to any LNG facilities to  
16 serve customers elsewhere. I'm assuming it's Keene  
17 or --

18 Q. I don't know. I'm asking you.

19 A. (DaFonte) That's the only one I'm aware of that there's  
20 been discussion of being able to provide service to --

21 MS. KNOWLTON: Mr. Kanoff can --  
22 objection. I believe the question was as to "Northern  
23 Utilities".

24 MR. KANOFF: And, I believe they're

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1       answering the question.

2                       WITNESS DaFONTE: Oh, I'm sorry. I  
3       misunderstood. I didn't realize it was Northern, Northern  
4       Utilities. So, I apologize for that.

5                       CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. Let's start  
6       again.

7                       MR. KANOFF: Start again. Question.

8       BY MR. KANOFF:

9       Q. Are you aware that Northern Utilities is considering at  
10       least one site in New Hampshire for an LNG peaking  
11       facility?

12      A. (DaFonte) No, I'm not.

13      Q. And, I just want to refer you to Exhibit 48. And,  
14       Liberty itself -- do you have that in front of you?

15      A. (DaFonte) Yes. I have 48.

16      Q. And, Liberty itself has established a joint venture to  
17       develop LNG liquification and storage to support LNG  
18       peaking use --

19                       (Court reporter interruption.)

20      **BY THE WITNESS:**

21      A. (DaFonte) I'm confused. It's not 48, right?

22      BY MR. KANOFF:

23      Q. Sorry. Fifty-two, 52 is the exhibit number for  
24       identification.

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 A. (DaFonte) Okay. I have that in front of me.

2 Q. Okay. And, Liberty established a joint venture to  
3 develop LNG liquification and storage to support LNG  
4 peaking use in the region, is that correct?

5 A. (DaFonte) Yes. I'm aware of that.

6 Q. Okay. Is any of that going to be available to Liberty  
7 (EnergyNorth)?

8 A. (DaFonte) Yes. It could be, in the form of liquid, to  
9 replenish the existing LNG facilities that we have.

10 Q. And, would you agree that LNG is a significant and  
11 important resource available to gas companies/LDCs  
12 generally to support your peaking requirements?

13 A. (DaFonte) Yes. That's why it's part of our diversified  
14 portfolio.

15 Q. And, that's why you're really looking to build that  
16 business through the joint venture, is that right?

17 A. (DaFonte) I don't know about the business venture. But  
18 I just know from the contracting side, and exploring  
19 all alternatives for LNG in liquid form, as we do every  
20 year, to replenish our facility storage.

21 MR. KANOFF: Mr. Chairman, that's  
22 really, that's all I have. I just want to note that, from  
23 yesterday, there was one confidential area. So, if we go  
24 into a confidential section -- discussion at any point,

{DG 14-380} [REDACTED - for public use] {07-22-15/Day 2}

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1       there's really one question possible, and I'll relook at  
2       that to see if it's even necessary.

3                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG:   Okay.   Then, we'll  
4       circle back to you after you've had a chance to do that.

5                   Commissioner Scott, do you have  
6       questions for the witnesses?

7                   COMMISSIONER SCOTT:   I do.   Thank you.  
8       And, good afternoon.

9                   WITNESS DaFONTE:   Good afternoon.

10                  WITNESS CLARK:   Good afternoon.

11   BY COMMISSIONER SCOTT:

12   Q.   Let me start with the Settlement.   I just want to  
13       understand a little bit better.   So, as I read it, it's  
14       conditional.   And, when I look on Page 3, and you  
15       probably don't need to go there, because I know you  
16       know the Settlement pretty well anyways.   But I just  
17       want to make sure I understand some of the dynamics  
18       here.   So, if it ends up that more than 10,000  
19       Dekatherms a day are needed for expansion, if you will,  
20       then the trigger is the amount of pipeline  
21       transportation purchase stays at 115, correct?

22   A.   (DaFonte) That's correct.

23   Q.   But if it's 9,999, it reverts to 100, correct?

24   A.   (DaFonte) That's correct.

1 Q. Right. So, that increment there, is there something  
2 special with that increment? Help me out how that  
3 happens. I'm just trying to understand the mechanics  
4 again.

5 A. (DaFonte) Yes. So, it's based on, essentially, three  
6 factors. The design day requirements of iNATGAS, which  
7 is the CNG facility being built in Concord. It's the  
8 design day capacity of any existing capacity-exempt  
9 customers. And, those are the customers that have  
10 their own capacity, essentially, upstream to supply  
11 themselves through a marketer. And, as those customers  
12 come back, they, as I mentioned earlier, they are  
13 entitled to our capacity, and then must pay for that  
14 capacity in perpetuity. But they are allowed to go  
15 back to transportation service. So, essentially, they  
16 take the capacity on a *pro rata* share. So, their *pro*  
17 *rata* share of all of our resources. And, they can  
18 assign those to their marketer, and then their marketer  
19 goes out and procures supply accordingly. And, so,  
20 they can continue to be a transportation customer. It  
21 does not prohibit them from going back. But they do  
22 have to pay 100 percent of the fixed costs associated  
23 with all of our resources. So, that's the second  
24 piece. The other one is, which is more recent, is the

1 fact that the Company has been talking to customers of  
2 Concord Steam who wish to switch to natural gas direct  
3 service from EnergyNorth.

4 Q. So, am I correct to paraphrase, you know, I was making  
5 it extreme, 9,999 you don't need that extra increment,  
6 that one more you do. But it's really directional, am  
7 I correct? Meaning, if you're able to demonstrate that  
8 these are needed, then there's a good understanding  
9 that you'd need the full 115. Is that kind of the  
10 thinking? Is that correct?

11 A. (DaFonte) Yes. Yes, exactly right.

12 Q. Did I hear correctly, so, if that is triggered, so  
13 it's -- the purchase amount is 100,000, not 115, that  
14 you do not require to renegotiate the Precedent  
15 Agreement? Did I hear that correctly?

16 A. (DaFonte) That's correct. The Tennessee has agreed  
17 that, under the terms of the PA, which essentially  
18 established a 100 or 115 type threshold, that this  
19 still falls within that threshold. So, they are  
20 amenable to an amendment.

21 Q. And, the pricing would be the same regardless?

22 A. (DaFonte) Right. And, as I had stated, that's really  
23 one of the benefits that comes out of the Settlement.  
24 That is that it is, essentially, a no-cost option to be



1       able to lower the commitment on the NED project.

2   Q.   Okay.  Thank you.  Is there -- obviously, you've, as  
3       you stated in your testimony, you've worked with a  
4       consortium.  And, my understanding is that is to kind  
5       of leverage buying power, is that correct?

6   A.   (DaFonte) Yes.  Absolutely.  And, as part of that, all  
7       the Consortium members receive the same benefits, if  
8       you will.

9   Q.   So, what I'm interested in is that, that increment.  
10       So, is there a magic number related to the Precedent  
11       Agreement with the 100,000, is that -- do you have to  
12       buy in lots, if you will, or chunks?  Or is that -- is  
13       there a number that you need to do in order to be part  
14       of this, I guess?

15   A.   (DaFonte) Well, the number is, you know, the number is  
16       really based on what our requirements were.  And, you  
17       know, each utility within the Consortium has their own  
18       specific requirements.  So, because it's a 20-year  
19       contract, we looked out 20 years to see what our demand  
20       would look like.  And, based off of that, that 115  
21       number was appropriate, given that we have decisions to  
22       make within that time period on the retirement of our  
23       propane facilities.  So, the planning horizon really  
24       isn't 20 years, it's more in the five to ten year

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 range, because of the 34,600 of propane capacity that  
2 we have on the system that would -- we would expect  
3 would eventually go away. So that was the basis for  
4 our commitment, and then each LDC had their own basis  
5 for commitment of a particular volume.

6 Q. So, if I understood you right, you didn't have a  
7 particular amount you had to purchase in order for this  
8 to go forward. Is it not correct, though, that the  
9 pipeline developer, in general, needs a certain  
10 critical mass before they move forward or nobody gets  
11 anything?

12 A. (DaFonte) Right. Exactly. And, that's, as part of the  
13 Consortium, because we were able to, you know, look at  
14 our individual needs, pool them together, and go to the  
15 pipeline, we were able to go to them with a particular  
16 volume. And, the pipeline agreed that, under, you  
17 know, with that volume in mind, we would provide you  
18 with a certain rate under those conditions. And, then,  
19 they would make a determination, that being, you know,  
20 Tennessee Gas Pipeline, would make a determination  
21 based on the additional participants in the project  
22 whether they would go forward with it. And, as I  
23 mentioned, they did announce, on July 16th, that they  
24 would go forward with the current volumes, if, in fact,

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1       they're approved by their representative state  
2       commissions.

3   Q.   So, you mentioned the price.  When does that actually  
4       get locked in?  When do you have a firm price?

5   A.   (DaFonte) Well, the negotiated rate gets locked in  
6       immediately, once -- upon approval of the Precedent  
7       Agreement, that gets locked in.  And, then, there are  
8       adjustments that I believe are confidential in nature,  
9       but there are some adjustments that could -- that could  
10      cause the price to go up and adjustments that could  
11      cause the price to go down as well.

12   Q.   And, you went to my next question.  So, to the extent  
13      there are cost overruns, how is that handled?  We're  
14      being asked to approve a certain thing.  Would the  
15      utility come back to us?  Or, what's the -- what are  
16      you envisioning if there's cost overruns?

17   A.   (DaFonte) Well, the PA includes provisions associated  
18      with the cost overrun, as well as the cost underrun.  
19      So that there's a -- well, it's confidential.  But we  
20      can -- the provisions are in the PA, but they are  
21      confidential.  And, so, I don't want to divulge those  
22      at this point in time.

23                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG:  So, Commissioner  
24   Scott, do you want to finish other aspects of your

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1       questioning, then circle back to that issue, and then, at  
2       that point, maybe Mr. Kanoff will also be able to ask his  
3       questions?

4                       COMMISSIONER SCOTT: That would be fine.

5 BY COMMISSIONER SCOTT:

6 Q.   And, what I'm really trying to ask, I don't know if you  
7       need to go into the confidential side, is, to the  
8       extent there are cost overruns triggered in the PA, is  
9       it your assumption that those will be absorbed, if we  
10      approve the Precedent Agreement, are we also approving  
11      to that limit of whatever the cost overruns are?

12 A.   (DaFonte) Yes. Yes.

13 Q.   Okay.

14                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Let me ask you  
15      this, Mr. DaFonte. Do you want to circle back to the  
16      confidential information and providing an answer to the  
17      question Commissioner Scott asked you just before that  
18      last one?

19                   WITNESS DaFONTE: If it's helpful, I  
20      would, yes. I would do that.

21                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. So,  
22      when Commissioner Scott is done, and maybe when I'm done,  
23      we'll circle back to that question, and that will also be  
24      Mr. Kanoff's opportunity to do what he needs to do, before

{DG 14-380} [REDACTED - for public use] {07-22-15/Day 2}

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 we then bring back everybody else and let Ms. Knowlton  
2 redirect. So, that's how we're going to go.

3 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Thank you.

4 BY COMMISSIONER SCOTT:

5 Q. So, moving, in my view anyways, to the other end of the  
6 equation, my view is a lot of your cost/benefit  
7 analysis assumes a certain liquidity at Wright, is that  
8 correct?

9 A. (DaFonte) Yes.

10 Q. And, if I think I heard yesterday in your testimony,  
11 there was some talk about, if certain conditions aren't  
12 met, the Precedent Agreement wouldn't take into effect.  
13 Is liquidity one of those?

14 A. (DaFonte) You know, again, that's a -- that's another  
15 confidential issue that we could certainly discuss.  
16 But there are provisions in the PA that would, in a  
17 sense, ensure that there is some liquidity there at  
18 Wright.

19 Q. Sounds like I'm developing a list of confidential  
20 items.

21 MS. KNOWLTON: If I may interject? I  
22 mean, Mr. DaFonte, on the public record, could point the  
23 Commissioners to the particular page of the PA in  
24 question, and at least provide some information that way

{DG 14-380} [REDACTED - for public use] {07-22-15/Day 2}

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 now, if that's helpful. And, then, if there's a need to  
2 get into the particulars, could do that on the  
3 confidential record.

4 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Fine. I'll do  
5 that. But, if you think it's more helpful to talk in the  
6 confidential side anyways, I'm fine with waiting till  
7 then, too.

8 WITNESS DaFONTE: Sure. I can do that.

9 **BY THE WITNESS:**

10 A. (DaFonte) I can elaborate a little bit with respect to  
11 liquidity, and the way in which we try to determine  
12 what the costs will be at Wright. But, essentially,  
13 our approach we used was sort of a "wellhead plus"  
14 approach. What that means is that we looked at the  
15 project that we know has been approved by the FERC,  
16 which is the Constitution Pipeline project, which is  
17 designed to go from, essentially, Marcellus to Wright.  
18 It's designed to bring about 650,000 Dekatherms a day  
19 to Wright. And, so, we looked at the rate associated  
20 with that project, which, at the time when we looked at  
21 it, we assumed a 75 cent rate. And, in actuality, it's  
22 about a 65 cent rate.

23 But our assumption was that the  
24 shippers, which are two producers, on that project

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 would want to recover those demand charges, those fixed  
2 costs, in the winter period, when there's typically  
3 more demand. So, we took the 365 days of demand  
4 charges, and assumed that they would all be recovered  
5 in the winter period. And, then, what we did is we  
6 took that demand charge and sculpted it based on the  
7 months with the highest demand, and that became the  
8 basis for Wright. And, so, that's how we developed  
9 that, that pricing assumption.

10 And, with respect to that liquidity, in  
11 addition to Constitution, I think I mentioned that  
12 Dominion has a project that is being built to  
13 interconnect with Iroquois Gas Transmission, which is  
14 where Wright is located, right off of Iroquois. In  
15 addition, I mentioned as well, that we are in  
16 negotiations with Tennessee Supply Path, which would  
17 bring another Bcf or so of supply to Wright. And, so,  
18 that's really the liquidity piece that we would be  
19 looking for. And, not just at Wright, but then  
20 diversifying, going all the way back to Marcellus as  
21 well through that Supply Path piece.

22 BY COMMISSIONER SCOTT:

23 Q. So, when we go to the confidential side, if it is  
24 needed, what I'm interested in is where are the

1 bookends for liquidity that we're approving, that,  
2 again, you did some analysis with what you understand  
3 is going to happen at Wright, I believe. All of that  
4 is somewhat -- and, I agree, the Constitution has been  
5 approved by FERC, but, you know, they're somewhat  
6 speculative, it's not there right now. So, where are  
7 the bookends of what we're being asked to approve,  
8 vis-a-vis how liquid it -- obviously, if Wright becomes  
9 less liquid, then, we have -- you know, it's a whole  
10 nother calculation, correct?

11 A. (DaFonte) Right. Agreed. And, that's why we're in  
12 negotiations with Tennessee as well, to make sure that  
13 we are looking at a fully diversified portfolio. But,  
14 as I said, with regard to Wright, there are projects  
15 that are being proposed to be built there, and that  
16 there are some protections, if certain things don't  
17 happen.

18 Q. And, those protections are what I would like to  
19 discuss.

20 A. (DaFonte) Exactly.

21 Q. Or, I'm not saying we'd do this, but, with those  
22 protections, would we do a conditional approval, where,  
23 assuming these things happen, this is how the approval  
24 is, that type of thing.



[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1                   Okay. Moving on for me, on the  
2           Settlement, the growth incentives. So, again, if  
3           certain triggers, my word, aren't used -- aren't met,  
4           the cost of gas reconciliation are reduced by certain  
5           amounts, correct?

6   A.   (Clark) Correct.

7   Q.   So, who bears those costs, if you will, or that lack of  
8           recovery, who bears that?

9   A.   (Clark) That would be shareholders.

10   Q.   Okay. So, help me out. An earlier discussion was that  
11           "EnergyNorth had no stakeholders", did I hear that  
12           correctly?

13   A.   (DaFonte) Yes, the shareholder issue?

14   Q.   Yes, "shareholders".

15   A.   (DaFonte) I mean, ultimately, it's the parent that  
16           bears the cost, which is APUC.

17   Q.   Okay. And, in no case would it be the ratepayers,  
18           correct?

19   A.   (DaFonte) No, absolutely not. They would actually be,  
20           you know, paying less.

21   Q.   Okay.

22                   MS. KNOWLTON: If I might, maybe one  
23           more thing I'll stipulate to, so there's no question.  
24           EnergyNorth does have a shareholder. It's wholly owned by

{DG 14-380} [REDACTED - for public use] {07-22-15/Day 2}

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 Liberty Energy Utilities (New Hampshire) Corp., which is  
2 then wholly owned by the next entity up the chain. So,  
3 there is a shareholder involved.

4 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: A more general or  
5 generic way of talking about this is that the owners of  
6 the Company bear the risk when in a circumstance where  
7 it's not able to recover costs. That's -- whoever owns  
8 it. Whether that's called "shareholders", "investors",  
9 "partners", whatever, it's the owners who bear that risk,  
10 right?

11 WITNESS CLARK: Correct.

12 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.

13 WITNESS DaFONTE: Yes.

14 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Thank you.

15 BY COMMISSIONER SCOTT:

16 Q. Again, the prior questioning went down the line of  
17 ownership, ownership change, if you will, for  
18 Algonquin. And, I guess I'd like to ask the question  
19 directly. Mr. DaFonte, you obviously negotiated the  
20 Precedent Agreement. Were you pressured by anybody  
21 above you in your chain of command, if you will, for a  
22 particular outcome for that negotiations?

23 A. (DaFonte) No, I was not.

24 Q. Okay. Also, on the discussion for LNG, liquified

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 natural gas, storage, I understood your comments about  
2 within your service territory. Did you look at --  
3 well, let me back up. For one of your -- one of your  
4 rationale, if I understood right, for not using --  
5 pulling gas from Dracut in the future, if this is  
6 approved, is that the cost -- the price point at  
7 Dracut?

8 A. (DaFonte) That's correct. There is declining supply in  
9 Atlantic Canada. There's been quite a few articles out  
10 there and statements from one of the producers that the  
11 proven reserves have decreased by 50 percent. And, so,  
12 some of that, whether directly or indirectly, makes its  
13 way to Dracut or is consumed up in the, you know, the  
14 Atlantic provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and  
15 so forth. And, so, as that supply begins to  
16 essentially shut down, those LDCs up there are going to  
17 require capacity. And, I believe some have already  
18 signed up for capacity on some of the new projects.

19 Q. So, on that end, have you -- did you look at use of  
20 other LNG facilities, Distrigas, Canaport, as a --  
21 maybe a way to right size the amount of pipeline  
22 capacity you need?

23 A. (DaFonte) Certainly, we looked at alternatives that  
24 would get the gas to us directly. So, you know, the

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 comparable projects, being the PNGTS/C2C project and  
2 the Spectra/Atlantic Bridge project, could get gas to  
3 Dracut. But none of those projects, nor any LNG  
4 option, from Repsol or from GDF Suez, could get that  
5 gas from Dracut, up to us on the Concord Lateral. So,  
6 you would still need a Concord Lateral expansion. And,  
7 that's an expensive proposition. As we mentioned, the  
8 initial estimate was what it was. It's confidential.  
9 But it was rather, you know, it's rather high. With  
10 the updated cost estimate, that would bring gas to all  
11 of our citygates, not just Nashua, that price now  
12 begins to dwarf the NED project, which goes all the way  
13 back to Marcellus. So, you're essentially, you know,  
14 paying more for transportation from Dracut to your  
15 citygates, than you would be by going all the way back  
16 to Marcellus.

17 Q. Thank you. And, along the lines of ownership, just to  
18 clarify, Attorney Kanoff brought up Exhibit 43, which  
19 talked about the AIM project, Algonquin Incremental  
20 Market project. Am I correct, that has no relationship  
21 to the Algonquin that's in your ownership chain, is  
22 that correct?

23 A. (DaFonte) That's correct.

24 Q. Despite the name?

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 A. (DaFonte) Yes. Exactly.

2 Q. And, before we go to confidential, so, obviously, we've  
3 heard a lot from the public on the route to be taken.  
4 Have you got any feedback from your customers on the  
5 project?

6 A. (DaFonte) I haven't specifically.

7 Q. Or are you aware of any?

8 A. (DaFonte) I mean, there's -- we've had, I mean, letters  
9 have been sent in --

10 A. (Clark) Right.

11 A. (DaFonte) -- that I know of from customers that would  
12 like to see the project built. That these are large --  
13 some of the largest employers and energy users in the  
14 state, and they have had to deal with very volatile  
15 pricing and very high pricing over the last couple  
16 years. And, so, as it relates to their business and  
17 their ability to compete in their specific marketplace,  
18 they have certainly sent letters of encouragement to  
19 the Commission to approve the contract.

20 And, of course, as I mentioned, we've  
21 had capacity-exempt customers that are coming back to  
22 our system. So, they're looking for price stability  
23 and supply security by getting our capacity. And, so,  
24 that is akin to, you know, adding new customers to the

1 system.

2 And, you know, again, more recently, the  
3 fact that the Concord Steam customers are looking at  
4 taking gas directly from EnergyNorth, it's just another  
5 indicator of what some of these larger consumers are  
6 looking for, and which is the low-cost natural gas  
7 option.

8 Q. And, Mr. Clark, I didn't mean to cut you off. Did  
9 you --

10 A. (Clark) No. I'm aware of the letters that were sent in  
11 in support from some of our larger industrial  
12 customers, as well as some labor and trades groups.

13 Q. And, probably for Mr. Clark. So, is it your  
14 understanding that, for the existing customers, if this  
15 project were to go through and be approved as  
16 envisioned, that's a benefit?

17 A. (Clark) I do agree.

18 Q. For Ms. Whitten, you haven't got a lot of questions, I  
19 don't want to miss you. In your experience with  
20 utilities or LDCs, related to the amount of reserve  
21 capacity being projected for this project for this LDC,  
22 how does that compare with other similarly situated  
23 LDCs that you're aware of? Is this a lot more or  
24 similar? Or, is it just not comparable?

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 A. Are you referring to the 15,000 [sic]? I'm aware of  
2 the Precedent Agreement -- the petitions to approve  
3 precedent agreements for NED in Massachusetts. And,  
4 all three of those Massachusetts LDCs have requested a  
5 similar, I believe Witness DaFonte referred to it as a  
6 "regulatory out" that would allow them to reduce their  
7 volumes without paying a penalty.

8 The magnitude actually is higher for two  
9 of them, because they're larger utilities, and about  
10 the same for the smallest utility, Berkshire. And,  
11 that's as much as I can say without going into a  
12 confidential session. But I'd be happy to talk more  
13 about it confidentially.

14 Q. Thank you. And, I think my final non-confidential  
15 question is regarding the Consortium. The Consortium  
16 members, are they also subsidiaries of your parent?

17 A. (DaFonte) No. None of them are.

18 Q. And, obviously, they're moving ahead also in other  
19 jurisdictions to have a precedent agreement approved,  
20 is that correct?

21 A. (DaFonte) Yes. As Ms. Whitten just mentioned, the  
22 three in Massachusetts, and I believe there's another  
23 one in Connecticut.

24 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Thank you.

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I don't think I'm  
2 going to be doing anything that requires confidential. I  
3 may change my mind in the middle, but I'm not planning on  
4 it.

5 BY CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG:

6 Q. Mr. DaFonte, I want to find out a little bit more from  
7 you about how you do what you do, and how you get  
8 authority to do what you do, and how -- what happens  
9 when you feel like you're on the edge of the authority  
10 you've been given by your superiors. Talk to me a  
11 little bit about how that works for you.

12 A. (DaFonte) Well, basically, you know, my responsibility  
13 is to all of the gas and electric utilities that are  
14 under the purview of APUC. So, all the regulated  
15 utilities. So, I provide these same services to our  
16 utilities in Massachusetts, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa,  
17 Missouri, and California. And, basically, we determine  
18 needs, we make purchases to satisfy those needs. We  
19 look out long term, based on each individual state's  
20 requirements. In New Hampshire, we have a five-year  
21 Least Cost Integrated Resource Plan which we file. In  
22 Massachusetts, we have a similar plan, but they call it  
23 a "Forecast and Supply Plan". Most of the other  
24 jurisdictions are essentially year-to-year. But it's



[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1       those longer term plans where we really look at our  
2       long-term requirements of our customers.

3               And, so, as the Company looked into --  
4       or, put together its 2013 IRP, at that time it started  
5       to identify the need for an incremental resource beyond  
6       even the five years. And, so, that's when we first  
7       began to look at what at that time was the Northeast  
8       Expansion project, or an opportunity to contract for  
9       that.

10              So, once that was identified as a need,  
11       then we would begin to look at alternatives that were  
12       out there, refine the forecast, get the most recent  
13       demand, actual usage by our customers and so forth, and  
14       then explore alternatives as they came up.

15              And, so, once we've done that, I look at  
16       the contract. I compare it to other alternatives. I  
17       make a determination as to what's the, you know, the  
18       best-cost alternative. And, when it comes time for  
19       signing off, I basically provide a summary of the  
20       agreement to corporate and ask for their approval of  
21       the agreement. And, so, that's pretty much how it  
22       works. They don't get involved in day-to-day  
23       transactions, even smaller transactions, such as  
24       contract renewals that come up almost on an annual

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 basis. They -- I have complete authority to renew  
2 those contracts.

3 Q. But this is a larger deal than one of those?

4 A. (DaFonte) Exactly. So, something of this magnitude,  
5 that's where I have to put together, you know, some  
6 summary to my boss, for example. And, then, that gets,  
7 you know, passed on up the, you know, the hierarchy in  
8 the organization. But I basically bring it to my boss  
9 with a summary of the terms and conditions of the  
10 agreement.

11 Q. How many of that type, the larger type, of transactions  
12 you think you negotiate in a year?

13 A. (DaFonte) Not many. There aren't a lot of  
14 opportunities that come up. You know, the last  
15 greenfield pipeline, essentially, that was built here  
16 in New England was in 2000 -- or, 1999 really. And,  
17 so, those opportunities don't come up very often. But,  
18 as a result, certainly, of the high energy prices that  
19 customers have experienced over the last couple winters  
20 in particular, that has certainly encouraged the  
21 development of new projects, given, you know, what most  
22 people would recognize as a lack of sufficient pipeline  
23 infrastructure into the region. So, that sort of  
24 kicked it off, and that's why there are alternatives

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 out there. And, that's why we identified those as  
2 competing projects.

3 Q. And, so, the Agreement was signed roughly December, I  
4 think, is what we --

5 A. (DaFonte) It was October.

6 Q. It was October? Okay. Maybe it was filed in December,  
7 I don't remember the details. But, if it was finalized  
8 in roughly October, at what point did you bring the  
9 people above you into the loop and let them know "this  
10 is what we have in mind here"?

11 A. (DaFonte) Well, you know, when we file the Integrated  
12 Resource Plan, that is, you know, for me, it's one of  
13 my key goals, and when we do make that filing, I  
14 generally communicate, you know, sort of the results of  
15 that filing and what it is that we're sort of  
16 providing. And, at that time, you know, there was  
17 that, the commencement of a discussion with Tennessee  
18 on the Northeast Expansion project.

19 Q. And when was that IRP?

20 A. (DaFonte) That was in 2013.

21 Q. Okay. All right. Thank you. Ms. Whitten, I haven't  
22 forgotten you either. Your testimony, do you have  
23 that?

24 A. (Whitten) Yes, I do.

1 Q. At the end, and I think Ms. Patterson probably did some  
2 of this with you, but it really was a long time ago and  
3 I have forgotten. On Page 56, you talk somewhat about  
4 what your recommendation to the Commission is. And, it  
5 was essentially to deny or require changes?

6 A. (Whitten) Correct.

7 Q. How much of what you put on Page 56 is reflected in the  
8 Settlement Agreement, in your view?

9 A. (Whitten) Well, all of it, basically, because it's  
10 embedded in the Settlement Agreement. What we were  
11 looking for, based on our review of the filing as  
12 originally filed, was not just a trend assumption for  
13 growth, but the backup that shows the cost/benefit of  
14 the assumed growth. And, in addition to that, you  
15 know, we wanted to see a little more discussion of the  
16 alternatives. But the primary concern was the growth  
17 assumption, that was based on a trend analysis, rather  
18 than the normal -- the typical econometric-driven  
19 analysis type of equations that would forecast growth.

20 And, in addition, we were concerned  
21 about the fact that, as originally filed, after 20  
22 years, the Company would have at least 2,000 a day, by  
23 its own admission, of excess capacity. And, it seemed  
24 as though, after 20 years, with an assumption of

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 growth, there shouldn't be that much excess capacity.  
2 I'm sure Witness DaFonte would disagree with me,  
3 because he refers to that as "necessary reserve". But  
4 I think of it as, over time, that much time, it  
5 shouldn't be there. So, we --

6 Q. He says "Precedent" [sic], you say "Precedent". You  
7 decide.

8 A. (Whitten) And, the other thing we were concerned about  
9 was the assumption that -- the apparent assumption that  
10 they would retain the propane/air plants. Now, I  
11 realize that in Witness DaFonte's -- and I recognize  
12 that in Witness DaFonte's testimony, he said that the  
13 Company would "look at that". But, from my  
14 perspective, "looking at it" is not the same thing as  
15 agreeing to evaluate it and present the evidence that  
16 shows that they should be retained or not. And, so --  
17 but what I wanted to do with this set of  
18 recommendations was to lay down a marker to the Company  
19 that they needed to -- that they had deficiencies in  
20 their original filing, and that they needed to address  
21 those deficiencies.

22 Q. Is it -- I'm not sure I had really understood this  
23 before, but is it fair to say that your original  
24 position on the application or on the Petition wasn't

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1           that "this couldn't be a good deal", but that "the  
2           Company hadn't demonstrated that it was a good deal"?

3   A.   (Whitten) Essentially, yes. Yes. I mean, as filed,  
4           with no changes, you have to have a position on that,  
5           assuming they refused to make any changes. But, in  
6           fact, they did come forth with responses through  
7           rebuttal and through other venues, technical sessions  
8           and discovery, with additional information.

9   Q.   You probably don't know this, but this pile of public  
10          comments that we've had printed out, I'm guessing  
11          there's somewhere between 80 and 100 public comments,  
12          all but a handful are negative. And, all but a handful  
13          of those negative ones quote you. They quote your  
14          testimony.

15   A.   (Whitten) They do, yes.

16   Q.   They quoted -- many of them quote the same passages.  
17          But I think that, well, I guess I would say, what would  
18          you say to the people who looked at your original  
19          testimony and said "she thinks this a bad idea." How  
20          would you respond to them today?

21   A.   (Whitten) I would say that the recommendations that I  
22          made were conditional on the opportunity for the  
23          Company to improve their filing. That they were tied  
24          specifically to the assumptions for growth. I've had

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 some experience running a LDC portfolio, a supply and  
2 transportation and capacity portfolio. And, I was not  
3 in a position to overbuy capacity or supply either.  
4 Our approach was to grow responsibly. So, we couldn't  
5 go out and sign on customers that weren't  
6 cost-effective for us to serve.

7 So, my metric in analyzing this filing  
8 was a cost-based filing. It was not related to any  
9 other issues that might be associated with other  
10 potential customers for this project. It was strictly  
11 this filing. And, we do a data-driven type of  
12 analysis, where we start with the demand forecast, as  
13 Witness DaFonte said they start with, and we found  
14 concerns with that. Now, I could imagine that they  
15 were addressable, if the Company wanted to come forward  
16 with more information. So, I embedded that in my  
17 recommendations.

18 I think what the -- with respect, I  
19 understand that these people who have filed comments  
20 are entitled to file those comments, and they do have  
21 their concerns, but they quoted one part of my  
22 testimony and not all of it.

23 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you very  
24 much. I think that's all I have. I know that

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 Commissioner Scott wants to do confidential, I know Mr.  
2 Kanoff may. Do you, by the way, Mr. Kanoff?

3 MR. KANOFF: If we're going to go to --  
4 if we're going to go to a confidential session, I will ask  
5 a question. I would not necessarily compel that.

6 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Commissioner Scott  
7 wants to. So, you're going to get --

8 MR. KANOFF: Then, I will ask --

9 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You're going to get  
10 a chance.

11 MR. KANOFF: I will ask a question.

12 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So, here's what --  
13 let's go off the record.

14 (Brief off-the-record discussion  
15 ensued.)

16 ***(Public portion of the record suspended)***

17 ***(Pages 97 through 108*** of the hearing  
18 transcript is contained under separate  
19 cover designated as "**Confidential &**  
20 **Proprietary**". Accordingly, *Pages 97*  
21 *through 108* herein have been  
22 intentionally left blank.)

23

24



[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**[REDACTED - THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]**

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**[REDACTED - THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]**

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**[REDACTED - THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]**

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**[REDACTED - THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]**

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**[REDACTED - THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]**

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**[REDACTED - THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]**

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**[REDACTED - THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]**

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**[REDACTED - THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]**



[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**[REDACTED - THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]**

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**[REDACTED - THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]**

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**[REDACTED - THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]**

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**[REDACTED - THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]**

{DG 14-380} [REDACTED - for public use] {07-22-15/Day 2}

1                   **(The Public Portion of the record**  
2                   **resumes.)**

3                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Knowlton, do  
4                   you have redirect for these witnesses?

5                   MS. KNOWLTON: Very limited.

6                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I should have asked  
7                   Ms. Patterson. Do you have any redirect for your witness?

8                   MS. PATTERSON: No thank you.

9                   CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. Why don't  
10                  you go ahead, Ms. Knowlton.

11                  **REDIRECT EXAMINATION**

12                  BY MS. KNOWLTON:

13                  Q. Mr. Clark, on cross-examination you were asked about  
14                  the number of customers served by the Company's system  
15                  in Keene, and you answered that there were "about 1,250  
16                  customers" in Keene. If there were natural gas in  
17                  Keene, would there be opportunities to serve more than  
18                  1,250 customers?

19                  A. (Clark) Yes, there would. Keene is a very unique  
20                  system. It's a low-pressure propane/air system. We've  
21                  identified four or five very large commercial  
22                  customers, that would require 5 to 15 pounds of  
23                  operating pressure, which that system can't supply.  
24                  So, by converting it to natural gas, and extending the

[WITNESS PANEL: DaFonte~Clark~Whitten]

1 gas lines to those larger commercial customers, we  
2 would also be going through some residential  
3 neighborhoods to offer service to those customers at  
4 well -- as well.

5 Those four customers that we've  
6 identified would more than triple the throughput of the  
7 existing system. So, significant.

8 Q. Mr. DaFonte, if additional capacity was brought into  
9 the Company's distribution system in West Nashua, would  
10 there be opportunities to ultimately tie together the  
11 Company's Nashua system into its Manchester system from  
12 Bedford?

13 A. (DaFonte) Yes. There are a couple opportunities.  
14 There's about one mile that could be built to connect  
15 the Manchester and Nashua systems in Merrimack. That  
16 would just be a -- excuse me -- that would just be a  
17 simple laying of new pipe. Alternatively, as the  
18 Company continues to grow that portion of its service  
19 territory, it could eventually grow that out so that it  
20 goes through several towns and connects up through,  
21 that we talked about the Bedford expansion already, and  
22 we would continue with that expansion, moving onto  
23 Amherst and the Milford area, and to provide sort of  
24 organic growth, you could also tie in the two systems.

1 MS. KNOWLTON: I have nothing further  
2 for the Company witnesses.

3 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. I think  
4 we are done with these witnesses. Been a long slog. You  
5 can return to your seats.

6 MS. PATTERSON: May I ask a question?  
7 May Ms. Whitten be excused from participating, if we do  
8 have to go on longer than today?

9 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I don't see why  
10 not.

11 MS. PATTERSON: Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: She's there mainly  
13 as your witness. So, if you feel like you don't need her  
14 to be there with you any further, then it's certainly up  
15 to you.

16 MS. PATTERSON: Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: It's quarter to  
18 six. Let's go off the record for a minute and talk about  
19 what we can do.

20 (Off-the-record discussion ensued.)

21 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. So,  
22 we're going to go back on the record. We've had a  
23 discussion off the record about scheduling and how we're  
24 going to wrap this proceeding up. The plan is that we

1 will return on Thursday, August 6, in the morning. We  
2 will probably be looking to start at 9:00, and try to  
3 finish. I'm optimistic that we will.

4 The Parties would like an opportunity to  
5 submit post hearing memoranda. There will be a 20-page  
6 page limit, and those will be due close of business  
7 Friday, the 7th.

8 Is there any other business we need to  
9 transact?

10 (No verbal response)

11 CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Good. Thank you  
12 all very much. We will see you in a couple of weeks.

13 **(Whereupon the hearing was adjourned at**  
14 **6:02 p.m. The hearing is scheduled to**  
15 **resume on August 6, 2015, commencing at**  
16 **9:00 a.m.)**