IN THE MATTER OF THE JOINT APPLICATION	)
FOR APPROVAL TO ACQUIRE	)
NEW MEXICO GAS COMPANY, INC.	)
BY SATURN UTILITIES HOLDCO, LLC.	) Docket No. 24-00266-UT
	)
JOINT APPLICANTS	)

### REVISED APPLICATION REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

**OF** 

KAREN E. HUTT

October 10, 2025

1	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS, AND POSITION.
2	A.	My name is Karen E. Hutt, and I am the Chief Strategy and Growth Officer of Emera Inc.
3		("Emera"). My business address is 5151 Terminal Road, Halifax, Nova Scotia, B3J 1A1.
4		
5	Q.	HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY FILED TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?
6	A.	Yes. I filed Direct Testimony in this case on October 28, 2024, Rebuttal Testimony on
7		May 16, 2025 and Revised Direct Testimony on July 3, 2025.
8		
9	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS TESTIMONY?
10	A.	In this Revised Application Rebuttal Testimony, I will respond to the testimony of various
11		intervenor witnesses in the areas covered by my Revised Direct Testimony in this case.
12		
13	Q	MR. WALTERS OPINES THAT DURING THE BIDDING PROCESS FOR THE
14		SALE OF NEW MEXICO GAS COMPANY ("NMGC"), EMERA DID NOT MAKE
15		OPERATIONAL EXPERIENCE A CRITERIA FOR SELECTING THE
16		PURCHASER. WALTERS P. 14, LN 8 THROUGH PAGE 15, LN 9. IS THIS TRUE?
17	A.	No. I explained in great detail in my Revised Application Direct Testimony the bidding
18		process that Emera engaged in. (Revised Application Direct Testimony pages 4-11). This
19		process was both competitive and exhaustive as we narrowed the bids down from an initial
20		pool of 45 to 1. Throughout this process, one factor that we understood was that the sale
21		required regulatory approval to close. Having owned NMGC for nine years, having been
22		through the acquisition process to acquire NMGC, having been through rate cases, a Storm

Uri fuel cost recovery case, energy efficiency cases, amongst other regulatory proceedings, the one thing we knew was that the New Mexico Public Regulation Commission ("NMPRC") is concerned about the utilities it regulates and that operational experience is always considered by the NMPRC as it regulates its utilities. So, while the words "operational experience" do not appear in the bidding documents, it is absurd to opine that Emera did not make operational experience a factor for selecting bidders to participate in the bidding process and in ultimately selecting the purchaser. As stated in the Round 1 Process Letter, JA Exhibit KEH-2, attached to my Revised Application Direct Testimony, participants in the bidding process were asked to include information relating to the bidder's operation and ownership of public utilities. Among the criteria identified in JA Exhibit KEH-2 (Revised Application), were the bidders' "management and employee plans", as well as the internal and external "approvals" that would be required to consummate the transaction. Both of these factors include consideration of the bidders' operational experience and plans. For example, Bernhard Capital Partners ("BCP") Management's appreciation of NMGC's senior management team as critical to the business' continued success and its commitment to maintain and support that team was a factor in Emera's evaluation.

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Q. MR. SANDBERG AND MR. WALTERS EACH OPINE THAT EMERA DID NOT CONSIDER THE INTERESTS OF CUSTOMERS DURING THE BIDDING PROCESS. IS THIS CORRECT?

1	<b>A.</b>	No. For all the reasons identified in the previous response, it is naïve to think that a
2		company entering into a \$1.25 billion transaction would not evaluate all aspects of the sale
3		including the sale's impact upon the customers of the company being sold. Emera is proud
4		of NMGC's strong track record of operational excellence, safety and customer focus while
5		under Emera ownership, and was interested in finding a buyer that would permit NMGC
6		to continue this standard of operations.
7		
8	Q.	MR. SANDBERG OPINES THAT CERTAIN REGULATORY COMMITMENTS IN
9		THE REVISED JOINT APPLICATION, INCLUDING THE RATE CREDIT AND
10		INVESTMENTS IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS DO NOT
11		DEPEND UPON THE PROPOSED TRANSACTION AND COULD BE
12		ACCOMPLISHED BY NMGC AND ITS CURRENT OWNERS, WITHOUT ANY
13		CHANGE IN OWNERSHIP. WOULD EMERA AGREE TO THESE THINGS IN
14		THE ABSENCE OF THE PROPOSED TRANSACTION?
15	<b>A.</b>	No. In the event that this Transaction is not approved and NMGC were to remain under
16		Emera's ownership, Emera would not agree to offer the regulatory commitments that are
17		incremental to the commitments that remain in effect from NMPRC Case No. 15-00327-
18		UT (for Emera's acquisition of NMGC) or are required for compliance with applicable law.
19		This includes, for example, the rate credits, investments in economic development
20		projects, or the proposed rate stay-out being offered in this Case. These incremental
21		benefits and protections offered by the BCP Applicants in the Revised Joint Application
22		would be lost if the Transaction were not to be approved.

1	Q.	DR. BLANK, IN RECOMMENDING CREATION OF A REGULATORY
2		LIABILITY "EQUAL IN VALUE TO THE GOODWILL PAID (LESS ANY
3		BENEFIT AMOUNTS DESIGNATED BY THE COMMISSION FOR SPECIFIC
4		PURPOSES IN THIS CASE)," STATES THAT HE "WOULD EXPECT THAT RE-
5		NEGOTIATION OF THE PURCHASE PRICE MAY BE NECESSARY FOR THIS
6		TRANSACTION TO SURVIVE." WOULD EMERA AGREE TO RENEGOTIATE
7		THE PURCHASE PRICE DOWNWARD TO ACCOUNT FOR DR. BLANK'S
8		PROPOSAL?
9	A.	No. Emera does not agree to adjust the purchase price to accommodate Dr. Blank's
10		recommendation. As discussed in detail in my Revised Application Direct pages 12-13,
11		and as discussed in the Revised Application Direct and Rebuttal Testimony of Joint
12		Applicant witnesses Quilici, Kelly and Talley, there is no sound basis for sharing with
13		customers, or creating a regulatory liability based upon, any acquisition premium or
14		goodwill that might result from this Transaction. The Joint Applicants have made a
15		commitment to not, directly or indirectly, seek to recover in any future rate case, any
16		increased goodwill resulting from this Transaction. Customers should therefore be
17		indifferent to any acquisition premium, as the decision to pay more than the depreciated
18		original cost of an asset has been borne by the investor, not customers. Moreover, the
19		Purchase and Sale Agreement was negotiated by the buyer and sellers and there is no basis
20		for ordering the reopening of negotiations on the contract.

1	Q.	MR. SANDBERG OPINES THAT EMERA DID NOT MENTION THE SIX
2		FACTOR TEST OR THE PUBLIC INTEREST STANDARD IN THE DOCUMENTS
3		PREPARED AND RELIED ON DURING THE BIDDING PROCESS. SANDBERG
4		P. 15, LNS 5-8. IS THIS CORRECT?
5	<b>A.</b>	Yes. The documents referenced by Mr. Sandberg at this place in his testimony are
6		documents that are passing back and forth between bidders to a financial transaction. The
7		ability for a buyer to get regulatory approval is always a consideration in M&A
8		transactions, references to a specific legal test for regulatory approval would have been out
9		of place in such documents as each party had recourse to counsel of their choosing who
10		would be better positioned to opine, if desired, on the standard for and likelihood of
11		approval. Frankly, there was no contemplation of putting a summary of the standards for
12		regulatory approval in these documents, and nothing should be implied from their absence.
13		
14	Q.	CERTAIN PARTIES HAVE PROMOTED THE NARRATIVE THAT EMERA
15		PROVIDES CRITICAL OPERATIONAL SUPPORT TO NMGC WHICH WILL BE
16		LOST IF THE TRANSACTION IS APPROVED. IS THIS A CORRECT
17		NARRATIVE?
18	<b>A.</b>	No. While I believe Emera has provided value to NMGC, including through the back
19		office and IT shared services functions that have been provided by Emera and TECO,
20		NMGC, led by its management team under the direction of Ryan Shell, is and has been
21		solely responsible for carrying out its day-to-day operations of providing safe and reliable
22		gas service to New Mexicans. This is similar to how the BCP Applicants have explained

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

they intend for NMGC to continue to operate if the Transaction closes. The Joint Applicants have committed to retain the current employees and management of NMGC, and as explained in the Revised Application Rebuttal Testimony of Mr. Baudier, are in agreement with Staff Witness Velasquez's recommendation to extend employee protections from 36 months to 60 months to further ensure the maintenance of safe and reliable gas operations. NMGC will also add approximately twenty new local jobs resulting in more New Mexicans providing services to New Mexico residents. While NMGC will largely continue to operate as a separate utility, it will still have the ability to share best practices and lessons learned with the other utilities that BCP Management managed funds have in their investment portfolios, much like existing practice with Emera. Q. HOW DO YOU RESPOND TO THE CLAIM BY WESTERN RESOURCE ADVOCATES ("WRA") WITNESS CEBULKO THAT NOW THAT EMERA HAS SOLD ONE OF ITS OTHER COMPANIES IT NO LONGER NEEDS TO SELL NMGC? A. WRA Witness Cebulko has misinterpreted Emera's statements regarding potential asset sales. Notwithstanding the prior sale of Emera's interest in the Labrador-Island Link, Emera remained interested in advancing the sale of NMGC and Emera reached an agreement with BCP to sell NMGC on commercial terms which were acceptable to Emera. If Emera had no desire to sell NMGC it simply could have closed the auction process.

1	Q.	DID EMERA OWN OR OPERATE ANY GAS LDC SYSTEMS AT THE TIME IT
2		ACQUIRED NMGC?
3	A.	No. It did not. Prior to its acquisition of TECO, which included NMGC and Peoples Gas
4		System in Florida, Emera had not previously owned or operated any gas LDCs.
5		
6	Q.	DOES EMERA BELIEVE THAT NMGC IS CAPABLE OF OPERATING
7		SUCCESSFULLY AS A STANDALONE UTILITY AT THIS TIME, PENDING THE
8		TRANSITION VIA THE TRANSITION SERVICES AGREEMENT AND THE BCP
9		APPLICANTS' PROPOSED IT SYSTEM UPGRADE?
10	A.	Yes. Emera believes that NMGC will operate successfully as a standalone utility. We
11		believe the Transition Services Agreement provides a clear path to NMGC standing up for
12		itself the incremental business elements that it will need to replace shared services presently
13		provided by Emera and TECO, and provides ample time for that to take place in an orderly
14		and economical manner.
15		
16	Q.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?
17	A.	Yes.

IN THE MATTER OF THE JOINT APPLICATION	)
FOR APPROVAL TO ACQUIRE	)
NEW MEXICO GAS COMPANY, INC.	)
BY SATURN UTILITIES HOLDCO, LLC.	)
	) Docket No. 24-00266-UT
	)
JOINT APPLICANTS	)
	)

#### ELECTRONICALLY SUBMITTED AFFIRMATION OF <u>KAREN HUTT</u>

In accordance with 1.2.2.35(A)(3) NMAC and Rule 1-011(B) NMRA, Karen Hutt, Chief Strategy and Growth Officer, for Emera Inc., affirms and states under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of New Mexico: I have read the foregoing Revised Application Rebuttal Testimony. I further affirmatively state that I know the contents of my Rebuttal Testimony and it is true and accurate based on my personal knowledge and belief.

<b>SIGNED</b> this 10 <sup>th</sup> day of October 2025.		
	/s/Karen Hutt	
	Karen Hutt	

IN THE MATTER OF THE JOINT	)
APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL TO	)
ACQUIRE NEW MEXICO GAS COMPANY,	)
INC. BY SATURN UTILITIES HOLDCO,	) Case No. 24-00266-UT
LLC.	)
JOINT APPLICANTS	)

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I CERTIFY that on this date I sent via email a true and correct copy of the *Revised*Application Rebuttal Testimony of Karen E. Hutt, to the people listed here.

	· • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
NM Gas Company	
Thomas M. Domme	TMD@jkwlawyers.com;
Brian J. Haverly	BJH@jkwlawyers.com;
NMGC Regulatory	NMGCRegulatory@nmgco.com;
BCP Applicants	
Dana S. Hardy	DHardy@hardymclean.com;
Timothy B. Rode	TRode@hardymclean.com;
William DuBois	WDubois@wbklaw.com;
Ed. Baker	Ebaker@scottmadden.com;
Raymond Gifford	RGifford@wbklaw.com;
Richard L Alvidrez	RAlvidrez@mstlaw.com
Coalition for Clean Affordable Energy	
Charles De Saillan	Desaillan.ccae@gmail.com;
Cara R. Lynch	Lynch.Cara.NM@gmail.com;
Don Hancock	Sricdon@earthlink.net;
Mark Ewen	Mewen@indecon.com;
Angela Vitulli	AVitulli@indecon.com;
Jason Price	<u>JPrice@indecon.com;</u>
Stefani Penn	Spenn@indecon.com;
Federal Executive Agencies	
Jelani Freeman	Jelani.Freeman@hq.doe.gov;
Emily Medlyn	Emily.Medlyn@hq.doe.gov;
Dwight Etheridge	DEtheridge@exeterassociates.com;
<b>Incorporated County of Los Alamos</b>	
Daniel A. Najjar	dnajjar@virtuelaw.com;
Philo Shelton	Philo.Shelton@lacnm.us;
Thomas L. Wyman	Thomas.Wyman@lacnm.us;

Revised Application Rebuttal Testimony of Karen E. Hutt

Case No. 24-00266-UT

New Mexico AREA	
Peter J. Gould	Peter@thegouldlawfirm.com;
Kelly Gould	Kelly@thegouldlawfirm.com;
Katrina Reid	office@thegouldlawfirm.com;
Joseph Yar	Joseph@yelardeyar.com;
Shawna Tillberg	Shawna@yelardeyar.com;
New Mexico Department of Justice	
Gideon Elliot	GElliot@nmdoj.gov;
Maria Oropeza	MOropeza@nmdoj.gov;
Nicole Teupell	Nteupell@nmdoj.gov;
New Energy Economy	
Mariel Nanasi	mnanasi@newenergyeconomy.org;
Christopher Sandberg	CKSandberg@me.com;
Collin Poirot	CPoirot@jd18.law.harvard.edu;
NMPRC – Utilities Staff	
Ryan Friedman	Ryan.Friedman@prc.nm.gov;
Nicholas Rossi	Nicholas.Rossi@prc.nm.gov;
Kaythee Hlaing	Kaythee.Hlaing@prc.nm.gov;
Naomi Velasquez	Naomi.Velasquez1@prc.nm.gov;
Bryce Zedalis	Bryce.Zedalis1@prc.nm.gov;
Jacqueline Ortiz	Jacqueline.Ortiz@prc.nm.gov;
Timothy Martinez	<u>Timothy.Martinez@prc.nm.gov;</u>
Daren Zigich	Daren.Zigich@prc.nm.gov;
Marc Tupler	Marc.Tupler@prc.nm.gov;
Larry Blank	LB@tahoeconomics.com;
Felicia Jojola	Felicia.Jojola@prc.nm.gov;
Agata Malek	Agata.Malek@prc.nm.gov;
Prosperity Works	
Cara R. Lynch	Lynch.Cara.nm@gmail.com;
Ona Porter	Ona@prosperityworks.net;
Western Resource Advocates	
Cydney Beadles	Cydney.Beadles@westernresources.org;
Anna Linden Weller	Annalinden.Weller@westernresources.org;
Caitlin Evans	<u>Caitlin.Evans@westernresources.org;</u>
Michael Kenney	Michael.Kenney@westernresources.org;
Bradley Cebulko	BCebulko@currentenergy.group;
Meera Fickling	MFickling@currentenergy.group;

Revised Application Rebuttal Testimony of Karen E. Hutt

Case No. 24-00266-UT

PRC General Counsel Division		
Scott Cameron	Scott.Cameron@prc.nm.gov;	
LaurieAnn Santillanes	Laurieann.Santillanes@prc.nm.gov;	
Alejandro Rettig y Martinez	Alejandro.Martinez@prc.nm.gov;	
Russell Fisk	Russell.Fisk@prc.nm.gov;	
Hearing Examiners Division		
Patrick Schaefer Co-Hearing Examiner	Patrick.Schaefer@prc.nm.gov;	
Ana C. Kippenbrock, Law Clerk	Ana.Kippenbrock@prc.nm.gov;	

**DATED** October 10, 2025

/s/Lisa Trujillo Lisa Trujillo Project Manager, Regulatory Affairs 505-697-3831 lisa.trujillo@nmgco.com