

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

Docket No. DG 26-037

**Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp.
d/b/a Liberty**

Request for Change in Rates

Data Requests of Congresswoman Maggie Goodlander

Set 1

To: Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp. d/b/a Liberty

From: Congresswoman Maggie Goodlander (NH-02)

Date Served: October 16, 2026

Instructions:

1. These requests are served pursuant to N.H. Admin. R. Puc 204.03. Responses are requested in accordance with the procedural schedule approved in this docket.
2. Where a request seeks information or documentation that does not exist, please state that affirmatively and specifically, rather than omitting a response.
3. For any material that the Company intends to identify as confidential, clearly note the following;
 - a. The document or information withheld on grounds of confidentiality
 - b. The basis on which the document is to be treated as confidential
 - c. The relevant PUC rule or New Hampshire legal standard under which the information is proposed to be treated as confidential
4. For each interrogatory, please provide a response grouping the interrogatory and the Company's corresponding response together, using a separate sheet for each interrogatory number. Clearly identify the interrogatory number for each response, the name of the company, and the person responsible for the response.
5. "Document" is used in its broadest sense and includes correspondence, emails, memoranda, presentations, analyses, models, workpapers, calendar entries, and meeting notes, whether in draft or final form.

Unless otherwise specified, "the Company" and "Liberty" refer to Liberty Utilities (EnergyNorth Natural Gas) Corp. d/b/a Liberty; "Parent Company" refers to Algonquin Power & Utilities Corp. and any other direct or indirect parent of the Company; "the June 25 Response" refers to

the Company's letter to Congresswoman Goodlander dated June 25, 2026 and signed by Anthony Strabone; "the Lakes Region" refers to the communities of Northfield, Franklin, Tilton, Belmont, Sanbornton, Laconia, Canterbury, and Gilford, and any other area subject to the policy; and "the policy" refers to the Company's policy to reject requests for new natural gas service connections, reconnections, and increased gas usage within the Lakes Region, described in the June 25 Response as the "Lakes Region Moratorium" and first described by the Company in a communication to the New Hampshire Department of Energy and New Hampshire Office of the Consumer Advocate on July 15, 2024.

MG-001 (Nature and Scope of Policy) Provide the following information with respect to the policy:

- a. The nature and scope of the policy, including affected areas. Include a full list of the conditions under which the Company would reject a request to connect, to disconnect and reconnect from the Company's natural gas service, or to increase gas utilization at an existing service location. State whether the eight communities identified in the June 25 Response are the only areas affected.
- b. Discuss whether customers who are required to temporarily disconnect from Liberty's natural gas service will be allowed to reconnect, and if so, what factors are taken into consideration when determining whether a customer will be able to reconnect to Liberty's natural gas service.
- c. Include a map of the areas subject to the policy, with municipal boundaries and the boundary of Liberty's service area clearly indicated.
- d. A detailed description of the process by which a determination was made that the implementation of this policy was necessary. Include the names, titles, and company affiliation of all personnel involved in the decision-making process, along with a timeline, correspondence, and documentation relating to any meetings in which a potential policy to reject new natural gas connections or other potential solutions were discussed and finalized. Correspondence and documentation should include but not be limited to: calendar invitations and attendee lists for meetings, meeting agendas, meeting minutes, and relevant memos or emails. Specifically indicate whether and discuss the degree to which Parent Company personnel were involved in any decision-making steps.
- e. A detailed timeline regarding relevant dates, including the dates on which the policy was proposed, the date on which the policy was approved by Company leadership, the date on which the policy was reviewed, recommended, revised and/or approved by the Parent Company, and the date on which the policy was made effective.
- f. A discussion of the extent of involvement of any Parent Company in the decision-making process which resulted in the implementation of this policy. This discussion should specifically address the involvement of any Parent Company in the allocation of capital to operating subsidiaries such as the Company, which may have precipitated the conditions resulting in the policy's implementation.
- g. A copy of the July 15, 2024 communication to the New Hampshire Department of Energy and the New Hampshire Office of the Consumer Advocate, and all

subsequent correspondence between the Company and either agency regarding the policy.

- h. The June 25 Response states that “affordability ultimately drives decision-making from a regulatory and business perspective.” Explain whether cost, affordability, or capital availability considerations caused the Company or the Parent Company to defer the Concord-Tilton High Line Replacement Project, and provide all time- and date-stamped documents reflecting that decision.

MG-002 (Outreach Regarding Policy) Provide the following information as it applies to any customers currently affected, or projected to be affected by the policy:

- a. Detailed information regarding where and when information regarding the policy was made publicly available, including the entities or individuals that were notified of the Company's policy, and the dates on which any such information was subsequently materially altered.
- b. The June 25 Response describes a "targeted outreach approach" under which the Company alerted potential customers "as they requested service." Describe the proactive outreach that Liberty conducted regarding the policy, including relevant dates, and to what extent information about the policy has been made publicly available by Liberty.
- c. A detailed explanation of Liberty's plans to provide outreach about the policy moving forward, and to proactively notify potential and existing customers of the applicability of the policy to them.
- d. Provide copies of any materials used to notify customers about the policy and a log of the dates on which the materials were distributed.
- e. Discuss whether any municipalities or other non-profit entities were proactively notified of the policy (i.e., in advance of its imposition). If so, provide the date on which each municipality or entity was notified, the personnel title for the recipient of the notification, and a copy of the notification and any accompanying materials distributed by Liberty. If no municipality or other entity was proactively notified of the policy, please affirmatively state that.
- f. For customers in the area subject to the policy, provide any materials distributed from 2020 to the present to customers, municipalities, or other entities (government or otherwise) regarding the expansion of the natural gas infrastructure in their area and opportunities to connect or reconnect with higher projected load. This may include but is not limited to rebates or programs customers are eligible for to encourage the use of or transition to natural gas service.
- g. State the date on which information about the policy was first posted on the Company's website, and provide a time- and date-stamped copy of each version of that posting.
- h. Provide all materials presented or distributed at the December 2025 meetings with the Tilton Select Board and the Department of Energy, the May 2026 briefings of

the New Hampshire Congressional offices, and the June 10, 2026 meeting with the Department of Energy, each referenced in the June 25 Response.

MG-003 (Service Requests) Provide the following information as it applies to any customers currently affected or projected to be affected by the policy:

- a. Provide a list of all requests for service which were denied pursuant to the Company's policy. Include the address, customer class, requested load, date of request, and date on which the prospective customer was notified that their request was rejected. Clearly indicate whether each request was a request for new service, a request for reconnection, or a request for increased load at an existing service location. Clearly identify any duplicate requests from identical customers. If the Company asserts that customer addresses are confidential, provide the municipality and an anonymized identifier for each request in the public response.
 - i. Discuss the specific circumstances and justification for each of the denials to date.
- b. Discuss whether customers affected by the policy are being or will be compensated in any form, such as a reconnection fee waiver, and if so, whether the Company will commit to treating such remedies as below-the-line expenses not recoverable in rates.
- c. State the number of requests denied pursuant to the policy to date, and disclose how many requests for new connections, reconnections, or increased load are still pending within the area subject to the policy. Discuss whether this disclosure includes customers who disconnected for any reason (e.g., nonpayment, move-in/move-out, renovation, safety issue, etc.), and if not, supplement the response to include all denials for connection in the affected service area for which the policy is cited as a justification in full or in part.
- d. Provide a log of all customer inquiries and complaints received or routed to Liberty regarding the policy. Include information regarding the status and resolution of each entry.
- e. Discuss whether the NH PUC or New Hampshire courts have adjudicated a denial of service in which the tariff language which the Company relies on to implement the policy (see MG-010) was cited as the primary justification.

MG-004 (Methodology and System Characteristics) Provide the following information regarding the Company's implementation of the policy:

- a. A detailed description of the methodology used to identify the specific service area and associated customers subject to the policy.
- b. Discuss whether there is a targeted number of customers, supply, and/or capacity that Liberty is trying to achieve through the application of this policy.
- c. A complete explanation regarding the justification and rationale for imposing the policy. This should include but not be limited to information regarding the Company's design day specifications, current and prior (circa 2022 IRP) sales and use forecasts, and any on-site inspection summaries, specific to the affected service area. Provide the actual peak-day demand, the design-day demand, and the available capacity for the Lakes Region for each year from 2016 to the present, along with any hydraulic modeling supporting the statement in the June 25 Response that "downstream peak demand has reached the available supply under current conditions."
- d. A discussion of whether the Company is considering, or has identified other service areas for which the Company may implement a similar or identical policy to reject new natural gas connections.
- e. Provide data for the last five years regarding Liberty's lost and unaccounted for gas (LAUF gas). Data should be provided on both a calendar year basis and on a summer-to-summer period (ending August 31), if available, and include a breakdown by:
 - i. distribution system input (sendout);
 - ii. distribution system throughput;
 - iii. gross unaccounted for gas (i-ii) and as a percentage of sendout;
 - iv. adjustments to gross, by category (e.g., soft closes/theft); and
 - v. net unaccounted for gas (i – ii – iv) and as a percentage of sendout.Include a discussion of how this data compares to other company affiliates and other in-state local distribution companies.
- f. For each year from 2016 to the present, provide the number of new service connections added in each Lakes Region community, by customer class, and the associated incremental design-day load.
- g. Regarding the Tilton LNG peak shaving facility referenced in the June 25 Response, provide its vaporization and storage capacity, its current condition, and the number of days it operated in each of the last five winters.

MG-005 (Interim Solution) The June 25 Response states that “[o]ne such option under consideration is the use of portable LNG to supplement system supply,” and that the Company’s “goal is to have this solution deployed in late 2026, with a second portable LNG tank potentially added in 2027.” The June 25 Response further states that the solution is intended to provide “partial relief from the moratorium.” Provide the following information regarding this proposed interim solution:

- a. A detailed description of all potential interim solutions identified and considered by the Company, including those that may have been dismissed as viable alternatives. Specifically address whether the Company considered non-pipe alternatives such as targeted demand response, energy efficiency, or electrification.
- b. For any other interim solution considered by the Company, a detailed rationale as to why the Company declined to pursue that interim solution in favor of the LNG tank option.
- c. A detailed description of the methodology the Company will use, once the interim solution has been approved and is operational, to process pending requests for service.
- d. A detailed discussion of the Company’s expectations as to the extent that the proposed solution will, if approved and implemented, allow the Company to connect new customers. Provide the incremental capacity and the approximate number of customer connections that each portable LNG tank is expected to support, along with any hydraulic analysis supporting that estimate.
- e. Based on the list provided pursuant to MG-003 (a), an identification of which pending requests for service are expected to be accepted once the interim solution is in place.
- f. The estimated capital cost and annual operating cost of each portable LNG tank, the expected in-service date of each, and the Company’s proposed ratemaking treatment of those costs, including whether any such costs are included in the Company’s filing in this docket (and if so, the testimony, exhibit, and schedule reference).
- g. An itemization of each regulatory approval, permit, or other authorization required before the interim solution can be placed in service, and the current status of each.

- h. An identification of each instance in which the Company or an affiliate has deployed a similar portable LNG tank solution, as referenced in the June 25 Response, including the location, duration, capacity, cost, and ratemaking treatment.
- i. The current status of the interim solution, including whether the Company still expects the first portable LNG tank to be in service in late 2026.

MG-006 (Long-Term Remedy) Liberty Utilities' 2022/2023 Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) identifies the 12-inch 200 PSIG Concord-Tilton High Line Replacement Project (Replacement Project) as the proposed remedy to the current situation. Direct Testimony of Tracy A. Musto, Ian Crabtree, and Derek Tomka in this proceeding likewise identifies this project as the Company's expected long-term solution to lift the Policy. Regarding this project, provide the following information:

- a. Provide the date and other information associated with the initial determination by the Company that the Replacement Project would be necessary to meet growth in the service area.
- b. Provide the detailed expected timeline for the Replacement Project as it exists currently. If there have been material alterations to the timeline since the Replacement Project was first identified, provide earlier iterations of the timeline as well.
- c. The 2022/2023 IRP projected that the Replacement Project would be constructed in 2026-2027. The June 25 Response states that construction "would be undertaken in 2027-2029." Explain the reasons for this change in schedule, and identify the person(s) who approved the change and the date on which such decision was authorized.
- d. State whether the preliminary engineering studies that the June 25 Response states "will begin in 2026" have been initiated, and if not, why not, as well as the date by which it is expected to commence.
- e. Discuss the expected duration of the engineering study and permitting phases.
- f. Discuss the ways by which the project timeline could be reduced, including by identifying primary barriers to doing so.
- g. Identify whether additional upgrades beyond the Replacement Project are necessary in order to lift the policy. If so, please detail those upgrades, including affected areas, timeline, and projected cost.
- h. The June 25 Response describes the original 6-inch line as "thin-wall pipeline of 0.141 inches compared to the current standard of 0.280 inches." Regarding the 6-inch line expected to be replaced pursuant to the Concord-Tilton High Line project, discuss the Company's risk assessment, including whether the Company considers the pipe to be leak prone, under the Company's Distribution Integrity Management Program (DIMP).

- i. Discuss where the Concord-Tilton high line project sits, relative to all pipe replacement projects for which the Company is seeking recovery pursuant to this rate case, in terms of risk under the Company's DIMP.
- j. Discuss whether Liberty conducted a revised cost estimate for this project since the 2022 IRP, and, if so, provide all available information supporting the revised cost estimate. Any revision should be clearly delineated in terms of the underlying assumptions and cost drivers. State the Company's current cost estimate for the project.
- k. Indicate how much of the current estimated project cost has been invested. For any associated capital expenditures, provide a detailed breakdown by cost, category, and date incurred.
- l. Indicate whether the Company has previously sought or obtained rate recovery for any part of this project, including planning, design, permitting, or construction.
- m. Regarding the Company's identification of the project in the 2022/2023 Integrated Resource Plan (IRP), explain why the investment in this project was not made on the schedule indicated in the IRP.
- n. For each prior phase of the High Line replacement described in the June 25 Response (2003, 2004, and 2016), provide the mileage replaced, the total cost, and the docket in which the cost was recovered in rates. Explain why no further replacement work was undertaken after 2016.
- o. The Replacement Project is identified above as a 200 PSIG project, while the June 25 Response refers to a "300-psig maximum allowable operating pressure, once fully completed." State the design operating pressure of the Replacement Project and the resulting incremental capacity to the Lakes Region.
- p. The June 25 Response states that "the potential for federal funding for energy infrastructure projects" will be critical to the project. Identify any federal or state funding the Company has applied for or identified for the Replacement Project, and state whether the Company intends to proceed with the project if no such funding materializes.

MG-007 (Annual Report) Utilities operating in New Hampshire are required to file an annual report with the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission (NH PUC) by April 1 of each calendar year. At the time of writing, the Company's 2025 natural gas report has not been filed. With respect to this report, provide the following:

- a. An estimated date by which the report will be filed.
- b. An explanation as to why Liberty failed to file its report in a timely manner.
- c. A discussion as to whether the report will address in any way the ongoing policy to refuse new natural gas connections and/or the February 2026 natural gas explosion in Nashua.
- d. The Company's net income and earned return on equity for its natural gas division in 2025, including year-over-year changes from 2024.
- e. For each year from 2021 through 2025, the amount of all dividends, distributions, and other payments (including affiliate service charges and intercompany loan payments) made by the Company to any Parent Company or affiliate, identified by recipient and type of payment, and the amount of equity contributed to the Company by any Parent Company or affiliate in the same period.

MG-008 (Hurdle Rate) Provide the following information regarding the Company's hurdle rate or comparable methodology:

- a. Provide the Company's currently effective hurdle rate or comparable methodology, including information regarding the assumed payback period utilized to compare the revenue requirement of connecting new customers to the gas distribution system to determine the level of new business capital expenditures that will be recoverable through rates. Provide any marginal cost of service study on which the methodology relies or which the Company has filed in the docket.
- b. Provide the citation for the NH PUC order in which this methodology was most recently approved.

MG-009 (Rate Case) Regarding Liberty's most recently completed rate case proceeding and the Company's filings in this docket, provide the following information:

- a. Discuss whether any capital expenditures associated with service provided to the customers subject to the policy were proposed for inclusion in the rate base. If yes, provide a detailed summary by project as well as any applicable NH PUC determination on each request.
- b. Discuss, quantitatively and qualitatively, whether the Company's five-year capital plan was materially adjusted subsequent to the rate case final determination. If so, indicate the justification for this decision and whether this direction was provided or determined in consultation with any Parent Company.
- c. Regarding the Company's filing in this docket, identify whether any costs associated with the Replacement Project, the interim solution described in MG-005, or other capital expenditures serving the Lakes Region are included in the Test Year, rate base, or any proposed step adjustment, and provide the amounts and supporting schedule references.

MG-010 (Tariff) The June 25 Response cites “Tariff, Original Page 3, Section I, 6, B” as the Company’s authority to reject applications for service. For the tariff provisions relied on by the Company to implement the policy, provide the following:

- a. The complete text of the cited provision and for any other tariff provision on which the Company relies.
- b. A citation and date on which the NH PUC first, as well as most recently, authorized inclusion of this language in the applicable tariff.
- c. A discussion and supporting citations to any prior reliance by the Company on the same or similar tariff language to deny service to a customer.
- d. The basis for the Company’s position that a provision which the June 25 Response describes as a right to “reject any application for service” authorizes the Company to deny reconnection to, or increased usage by, an existing customer.

MG-011 (June 25 Response) Regarding the June 25 Response, provide the following:

- a. A copy of the June 25 Response and confirmation that the statements in it are true and accurate to the best of the Company's knowledge as of the date of this response. Identify any statement that the Company would now revise.
- b. The name and title of each person who prepared or contributed to the June 25 Response, and the witness in this docket who will sponsor it and respond to questions regarding its contents.