1	STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE		
2		PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION	
3			
4	21 South Fru	<b>2023</b> - 1:02 p.m. it Street	
5	Suite 10 Concord, NH		
6			
7	RE:	DG 23-087	
8		NORTHERN UTILITIES, INC.: Petition for Expedited Approval	
9		of Empress Capacity Agreements. (Prehearing conference)	
10			
11	PRESENT:	Chairman Daniel C. Goldner, Presiding	
12		Alexander Speidel, Esq./PUC Legal Advisor	
13		Doreen Borden, Clerk	
14	APPEARANCES:	<u> </u>	
15		Patrick H. Taylor, Esq.	
16		Reptg. Residential Ratepayers: Michael J. Crouse, Esq.	
17		Marc H. Vatter, Dir./Economics & Finance Office of Consumer Advocate	
18		Reptg. New Hampshire Dept. of Energy:	
19		Mary E. Schwarzer, Esq. Paul B. Dexter, Esq./Legal Director	
20		Faisal Deen Arif, Dir./Gas Division Ashraful Alam, Gas Division	
21		(Regulatory Support Division)	
22			
23	Court Rep	porter: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52	
24			

1		
1		
2	INDEX	
3		PAGE NO.
4	SUMMARY OF THE DOCKET BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER	3
5		
6	STATEMENTS OF PRELIMINARY POSITION BY:	
7	Mr. Taylor	6
8	Mr. Crouse	9, 11
9	Ms. Schwarzer	11
10		
11	QUESTION BY CHAIRMAN GOLDNER	14
12	(Re: Current gas market conditions in Northern New England as it relates	
13	to the Empress Proposal)	
14	RESPONSES BY:	
15	Mr. Wells	15
16	DISCUSSION RE: PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE	17
	DISCUSSION RE. PROCEDURAL SCREDULE	1 /
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
-		

## PROCEEDING

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

afternoon. This is the prehearing conference for the Docket DG 23-087, the Commission review proceeding for the Northern Utilities' Petition for Approval of the Empress Capacity Agreements between the Company and the Portland and TransCanada Pipeline Systems, named after the Town of Empress, Alberta, Canada, in the western Canadian gas fields where the capacity path originates. Northern's Petition was filed on October 6, 2023.

I'm serving today as Presiding Officer, as you can see, by myself.

This prehearing conference is being held pursuant to the Order of Notice issued by the Commission on October 12th, 2023, and the hearing guidelines. The Office of the Consumer Advocate filed its Letter of Participation on October 9th. Northern filed its affidavit and publication on October 23rd. The New Hampshire Department of Energy filed a Technical Statement by Dr. Arif and Mr. Alam regarding the DOE's preliminary technical positions for this matter

on November 3rd.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

Before taking appearances, I'd like to offer the following framework for today's proceeding. I would invite the Company, the OCA, and the DOE to make opening statements. As a part of these opening statements, I would ask that the OCA and the DOE indicate their positions regarding the Company's Motion for Confidential Treatment, and invite the Company to advocate for approval of the same.

Also, it's the Commission's intent to have the parties' proposal for a procedural schedule no later than November 15th, in light of the Company's request for disposition of this Petition no later than January 26th, 2024.

Following the statements of position, I have some preliminary questions for the Company and other parties, or I may have.

And I'll just pause there and see if there are any objections to this approach?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: All good?

MR. TAYLOR: No objection.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. Okay.

{DG 23-087} [Prehearing conference]  $\{11-09-23\}$ 

1 In that case, let's proceed, starting with the 2. Company for appearances. 3 MR. TAYLOR: Good afternoon, 4 Commissioner. Patrick Taylor, on behalf of 5 Northern Utilities, Inc. 6 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you. And the 7 Office of the Consumer Advocate? MR. CROUSE: Good afternoon, Chairman 8 9 Goldner. My name is Michael Crouse, Staff Attorney, on behalf of the Office of the Consumer 10 11 Advocate. Joining me today is our Director of Economics, Marc Vatter. 12 1.3 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Very good. And the 14 New Hampshire Department of Energy? 15 MS. SCHWARZER: Good morning [sic], Mr. 16 Chairman. Mary Schwarzer, Staff Attorney for the 17 Department of Energy. With me as co-counsel is 18 Legal Director, Paul Dexter, also Gas Director, 19 Faisal Deen Arif, and Utility Analyst Ashraful 20 Alam. 2.1 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Excellent. Very 2.2 good. So, now, we can move to statements of 23 initial position, and remembering to talk about 24 the Motion for Confidential Treatment, beginning

1 with the Company.

MR. TAYLOR: Good afternoon,

3 Commissioner.

2.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

1 4

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

So, as explained in the Company's

Petition, Unitil is seeking approval to enter
into the capacity agreements that will provide

Northern the ability to add 12,500 decatherms per
day of incremental capacity to the Company's gas
supply portfolio beginning April 1st, 2024. And,
of course, the Company has a system that spans
both New Hampshire and Maine. So, when I talk
about Northern's portfolio, I do talk about the

Company as a whole, some of which will be
apportioned to New Hampshire. And, based upon
the current — the Company's current design year
forecast, approximately 5,007 decatherms per day
of the proposed capacity would be supported by

Northern's customers.

There are several contracts before the Commission when we talk about the Empress Capacity Agreements.

One is with PNGTS, that is a Firm

Transformation Agreement for service beginning

April 1st, 2024. And this agreement is subject

to what is sometimes referred to as a "regulatory out" provision, and, under that provision, Unitil can cancel, without penalty, if it does not obtain regulatory approval that's acceptable to the Company prior to February 1st, 2024.

2.

1.3

2.2

There are also agreements with

TransCanada Pipeline before the Commission.

There is a 2024 Precedent Agreement and Firm

Transformation Agreement before the Commission

for service beginning April 1st, 2024, through

November -- I'm sorry -- October 31st, 2027.

And, then, another Precedent Agreement and Firm

Transformation Agreement beginning November 1st,

2027, that would go through March 1st, 2054. I

know that's a very long time to look out. And,

cumulatively, those agreements are for a 30-year

term.

The request before the Commission today is similar to that brought forth by the Company in DG 19-116. There's also precedent for the Commission reviewing such agreements in DG 14-830, in which the Commission approved a long-term capacity contract proposed by Liberty Utilities.

And, so, even though the Company is mindful that there's no specific requirement in the rules or the governing legislation that the Company submit these agreements for approval by the Commission, there is precedent. And the Commission has found that it has the authority to review these agreements under RSA 374:1 and 374:2.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

And, so, you know, in this case, there are several factors that I think are similar, or I think that, as a general matter, these agreements are very similar to what we brought before the Commission in 2019, in that there is the PNGTS Agreement, a "regulatory out" provision. And, under the TCPL Agreements, there are certain pre-service costs. And we made a request for Commission approval to include those in the cost of gas, and that was also taken up by the Commission in 2019.

And, so, we do think that it's prudent to bring these agreements before the Commission, and that it's appropriate for the Commission to review them.

With respect to the Motion for

C

```
1
         Confidential Treatment, I won't get into each
 2.
         element that we have requested confidential
 3
         treatment for, other than to say that these are
 4
         commercial terms and financial terms that are
 5
         very commonly granted confidential treatment by
         the Commission. We have been, I think, quite --
 6
 7
         quite rigorous in our redaction of these terms.
 8
         And, if you look at the materials, you'll see
 9
         that we actually have redacted very little, and
10
         have really just tried to keep it to the pricing
11
         terms and analyses that would show our evaluation
12
         of commercial terms. And, so, we really just
1.3
         kept it to a minimum, and limited it to numbers
14
         and analyses that we are very confident are
15
         confidential and not in the public record, and
16
         would do harm both to the Company and to its
17
         counterparties if they were disclosed publicly.
18
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Anything else, Mr.
19
         Taylor?
20
                   MR. TAYLOR:
                                 That's it.
                                             Thank you.
2.1
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.
2.2
         Okay. Thank you. Let's move to the Office of
23
         the Consumer Advocate.
24
                   MR. CROUSE:
                                 Thank you, Commissioner.
```

Generally speaking, the Office of the Consumer Advocate is supportive of the Empress Capacity Agreements. We believe that there's a lot of potential that can be benefited both to New Hampshire and the residential ratepayers residing within.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

The only concern that the Office of the Consumer Advocate preliminarily takes is in regards to the TCPL PA, or TransCanada Pipeline Precedent Agreement. It just stated that, if it's canceled for any reason, TransCanada Pipeline has the right to recover pre-service and cancellation costs.

In our view, we kind of view that as anti-CWIP. And we would have some concerns that we'd want to talk with both the Department and the Commission -- the Company about.

But, other than that, we're just excited to review this and get an exact number of the benefits we're passing on to residential ratepayers.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you,
Attorney Crouse. And did you have any comments

```
1
         on confidential treatment, Attorney Crouse?
 2
                    MR. CROUSE: Yes. In regards to the
         confidential treatment, the OCA does not have any
 3
 4
         objections.
 5
                    And, regarding the procedural schedule,
 6
         I believe the Department will be addressing that
 7
         shortly.
 8
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:
                                       Okay.
 9
                    MR. CROUSE:
                                 Thank you.
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: And we'll turn now
10
11
         to the New Hampshire Department of Energy, and
12
         Attorney Schwarzer.
1.3
                    MS. SCHWARZER:
                                    Thank you, Mr.
14
         Chairman.
15
                    As an initial matter, the Department
16
         has no objection to Northern's request for
17
         confidential treatment, to get that out of the
18
         way.
19
                    We have spent some time with the
20
         parties to put together a proposed procedural
2.1
         schedule. And I do have hard copies to provide
2.2
         to the Commission at this time, with your
23
         permission? Other parties have them already.
24
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:
                                       Okay.
                                               Thank you.
```

1 You can approach.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

1 4

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

[Atty. Schwarzer distributing document to Chairman Goldner.]

MS. SCHWARZER: Overall, this schedule would propose a hearing on January 18th, understanding that Northern has asked for an order no later than January 26th. We have worked hard to get dates that will work for discovery. You'll see several rounds of discovery. And we are dealing with a initial period in January where our witness would not be available, which is why we've moved this forward.

We think this gives everybody an opportunity to conduct discovery, and to provide the Commission with the information it will need to make a decision.

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you.

MS. SCHWARZER: With regards to the Department's position, we have no position on the preliminary agreement, per se, at this time.

Although, we look forward to working with the parties to explore this complex matter at issue in this expedited docket.

We have identified several key issues

in this docket. Primarily, the termination costs, aka "cancellation fees", which are certainly sizable, and confidential. But were also addressed in Docket Number DG 19-116, or similar costs.

2.

1.3

2.1

2.2

This Agreement has a 30-year term, which is longer. And it has sort of a two-tiered nature, in that there's a PNGTS date of April '24 through March 2027, and a TCPL date from March 2027 to 2054.

We also have concerns and questions about the allocation for both gas and the risk of termination costs between New Hampshire and Maine. So, we look forward to exploring those. And we are interested in potential quantification of the qualitative benefits that Northern has identified in its Petition.

We certainly believe it's appropriate for the Commission to conduct this hearing, and to consider the efforts that Northern is making towards reliability and flexibility. There's precedents, as Northern has identified. And Northern has also shared with us that it has a current need for the gas that would be acquired.

1 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: And I just want to 2. make sure I understand, Attorney Schwarzer. 3 think you're saying you have no position now, 4 here, early on in the process. But you expect to 5 take a position before the end of the process? 6 MS. SCHWARZER: Yes. We will take a 7 position. We simply have no position at this time. 8 9 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: It is early. Okay. Very good. And I thank -- the Commission would 10 11 just like to thank Dr. Arif and Mr. Alam for 12 their very helpful technical statement filed last 1.3 Friday. So, we found those to be very helpful. 14 Does the OCA have anything further, based on DOE's comments? 15 16 MR. CROUSE: At this time, no further 17 comments. 18 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. And maybe 19 we'll just keep the questions kind of limited 20 today. 2.1 But would any of the parties care to 2.2 elaborate on the current gas market conditions in 23 northern New England, and as it relates to the

Empress proposal? Would anyone like to comment

1 on that?

1.3

2.1

2.2

MR. TAYLOR: I can tell you that I personally am not the person who is best equipped to give you that answer. I do have Francis Wells with me today. He is the witness who supported the analysis. And he could provide an answer to you.

I'm not sure if you're asking us, given this is a prehearing conference, we typically don't give witness testimony. So, we're happy to answer the question just from the table here.

But I don't know you would need him to be sworn in or not or if you're just seeking information?

CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: No, just seeking

information. That would be excellent. Thank you.

MR. WELLS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman.

Just in reference to your question

about, you know, a comment on the New England

gas -- the New England -- I like to think of it

as the "New England energy supply market",

because of that interconnection between the power

market and the gas market. And, of course,

Northern is a gas company. But the scarcity of supply, which sort of drives the New England region, is really driven by the combination of the need for natural gas supply of both the power and gas market combined.

2.

1.3

2.2

One of the challenges of the gas
market, I'd say in New England, is that there's
insufficient pipeline capacity to meet all of the
supply requirements of the region on the coldest
days of the year. And it is reliant on really
very low load factor utilization of some really
expensive, you know, LNG import facilities. And,
so, that provides -- that creates sort of a
commercial challenge for those entities, as well
as a high-price environment, especially in the
wintertime, for the New England -- the entire New
England market, whether it's the power side of
the market or the gas side of the market.

And, so, these are the -- you know, this is the sort of the environment that Northern is trying to operate in. And, you know, our purpose in acquiring the Empress capacity was more to be proactive in trying to manage the inherent risks due to the current environment.

```
1
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Thank you,
 2.
         Mr. Wells. Very helpful.
 3
                   Would the OCA or the DOE kind of care
 4
         to comment on the same question?
 5
                   MR. CROUSE: The OCA doesn't have any
 6
         further comments to add. Thank you.
 7
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Thank you,
         Attorney Crouse.
 9
                   MS. SCHWARZER: No thank you, Mr.
10
         Chairman.
11
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Very good.
                    I'll just turn my attention to the
12
1.3
         procedural schedule. And I'm looking at the
14
         proposal. Just a moment please.
15
                    [Short pause.]
16
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Just a moment, let
17
         me confer with Attorney Speidel.
18
                    [Chairman Goldner and Atty. Speidel
19
                    conferring.]
20
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. So, just
21
         checking quickly with the Office of the Consumer
2.2
         Advocate and the Company. Is this -- is this
23
         schedule acceptable to all the parties?
24
                   MR. TAYLOR: We're comfortable with it,
```

1 yes. 2 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. 3 MR. CROUSE: The OCA was also able to 4 accommodate it, thanks to the Department and the 5 Company's willingness to accommodate the week of 6 January 15th, due to our limited availability. 7 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Excellent. So, without my fellow Commissioners 8 9 here, it looks -- at the moment, the 18th looks open, but I need to check on Commissioner 10 11 availability. So, I can't rule on that from the 12 Bench. But we'll put something out shortly. It does leave a very limited time 1.3 14 between the hearing and the order. But I think we'll work to accommodate this schedule, assuming 15 16 the Commissioners are available on the 18th. 17 MR. CROUSE: Excuse me, Chairman Goldner? 18 19 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Yes. 20 MR. CROUSE: If it's helpful to the 2.1 Bench, Donald Kreis would be the only one from 2.2 the OCA available to meet that week. And the 23 19th is the only alternative we could offer. 24 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay.

```
1
                   MR. CROUSE:
                                 Thank you.
 2.
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: That's helpful,
 3
         Attorney Crouse. Thank you.
 4
                   All right. And the Department and the
 5
         Company would be available on the 19th, if that
 6
         came to pass?
 7
                   MS. SCHWARZER: We'd be happy to check
         our schedules right now, Your Honor.
 8
 9
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: I was going to start
10
         the hearing at 4:00 p.m., if that's okay? It's a
11
         Friday, you know. So, probably not.
12
                   MS. SCHWARZER: Sounds great.
1.3
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. It would
14
         be -- do the parties anticipate a full day or a
15
         half day for the proceeding?
16
                   MR. CROUSE: My impression was a half
17
         day. But we're willing to be accommodating to
18
         the other parties.
19
                   CHAIRMAN GOLDNER:
                                       Okay.
                   MS. SCHWARZER: We believe it would
20
2.1
         likely be half a day. But, perhaps, out of an
2.2
         abundance of caution, it could be the first half
23
         of the day?
24
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Oh, of course, yes.
```

1 For sure. 2 Attorney Taylor, a full day or half 3 day? 4 MR. TAYLOR: I agree that, and my hope 5 certainly is, this could be done in a half a day. 6 And I'm certainly open to the idea of it being 7 the first part of the day. And I just checked our calendars, and 8 we are available on the 19th, if necessary. 9 10 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: The 19th. Okay. 11 So, the Commission will work towards either the hearing at 9:00 a.m. on 18th or the 19th. 12 we'll perhaps block out the full day, and then --1.3 and perhaps anticipate a half day, but block out 14 15 the full day. 16 MS. SCHWARZER: And, Mr. Chairman, the 17 Department is available on the 18th or the 19th. 18 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Both, okay. Okay, 19 that's what I had understood. But thank you for 20 verifying. 2.1 All right. Very good. Okay. 2.2 there any concerns with filing the procedural 23 schedule by November 15th? I guess, this would

just be filed by then?

1 MS. SCHWARZER: Sure. We'll be happy 2. to file that for you. 3 Perhaps the Commission could let us 4 know or we can check with the Clerk's Office as 5 to which date, hearing date the Commission would 6 prefer, or we'll include both? 7 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. So, we --8 [Chairman Goldner and Atty. Speidel 9 conferring. 1 10 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Due to 11 Commissioner schedules, we're having some 12 scheduling challenges of our own here. But I 1.3 think, for the filing on the 15th, I think this 14 filing would work well. So, I would encourage 15 the filing as is. 16 MS. SCHWARZER: Certainly. I can 17 identify the other alternative date as well, if 18 that's helpful. 19 CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Oh, thank you. That 20 would be perfect. 2.1 And, then, because of some travel in 2.2 hard-to-reach places, it may be a few days after 23 that we can confirm everything. But we'll 24 certainly confirm as quickly as we can.

```
1
         either the 18th or 19th will work.
                    MS. SCHWARZER: Thank you, Mr.
 2.
 3
         Chairman.
 4
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: All right. Okay.
 5
         I'm just checking here. Is there anything else
 6
         that we need to cover today? I'll just offer
 7
         that we'll issue a prehearing order posthearing.
         And I just want to make sure that we've covered
 8
         everything before the parties will probably
 9
10
         meet -- well, you may be meeting to discuss or
11
         you may not be. But is there anything else that
         we need to cover here?
12
1.3
                    [Atty. Crouse indicating in the
14
                    negative.]
15
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: No?
16
                    MS. SCHWARZER: No thank you, Mr.
17
         Chairman.
18
                    CHAIRMAN GOLDNER: Okay. Well, thank
19
         you very much. If there's no further matters,
20
         I'll conclude the prehearing conference. And we
2.1
         are adjourned.
2.2
                    (Whereupon the prehearing conference
23
                    was adjourned at 1:22 p.m.)
24
```