BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

In the Matter of the Joint Notice and Application of Questar Gas Company and Dominion Resources, Inc. of Proposed Merger of Questar Corporation and Dominion Resources, Inc.	Docket No. 16-057-01
--	----------------------

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF CRAIG C. WAGSTAFF

FOR JOINT APPLICANTS

July 28, 2016

Joint Notice and Application Exhibit 2.0R

2.0R Rebuttal Testimony of Craig C. Wagstaff

DOCKET NO. 16-057-01 PAGE 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION
II.	CUSTOMER SERVICE STANDARDS

DOCKET NO. 16-057-01 PAGE 3

1		I. INTRODUCTION
2	Q.	Are you the same Craig C. Wagstaff that offered Direct Testimony in this matter?
3	A.	Yes.
4	Q.	What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?
5	A.	The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to support the approval of the proposed merger
6		("Merger") between Dominion Resources, Inc. ("Dominion") and Questar Corporation
7		("Questar Corp."), including Questar Gas Company ("Questar Gas"). After the Merger is
8		effective ("Effective Time"), Questar Corp. will become a wholly-owned subsidiary of
9		Dominion that will continue to exist as a separate legal entity (herein referred to as
10		"Dominion Questar"), and Questar Gas (herein referred to as "Dominion Questar Gas")
11		will remain a direct, wholly-owned subsidiary of Dominion Questar and will continue to
12		exist as a separate legal entity with its own complete set of books and records. Upon
13		approval of the Merger, I will be appointed as President of Dominion Questar.
14		I will address the proposals made by the Utah Office of Consumer Services ("Office") and
15		the Utah Division of Public Utilities ("Division") regarding the customer service standards
16		("CSS"). Specifically, I will address the recommendations related to service quality set
17		forth in the Direct Testimony of Richard A. Baudino in OCS-3D lines 302 - 420. I will
18		also discuss the proposals set forth in the Direct Testimony of Kathleen Kelly in DPU 3.4
19		DIR paragraphs 8 - 17.
20		II. CUSTOMER SERVICE STANDARDS

21

Q. Are you familiar with the customer service standard reports?

A. Yes. I participated in the task force that created these standards during the time the
 customer service area was within my area of responsibility. Customer service is a matter
 of high importance to Questar Gas and to me personally. As the leader of Dominion

DOCKET NO. 16-057-01 PAGE 4

Questar going forward, I can offer assurance that customer satisfaction will continue to bea top priority.

27 Q. Please summarize the proposals made by the other parties.

28 A. Mr. Baudino makes three recommendations. First, Mr. Baudino recommends that the Commission order Dominion to ensure that Dominion Questar Gas continues to comply 29 with the currently-effective CSS reporting requirements. 30 Second, Mr. Baudino recommends that the "Annual Goals" for each service criterion in the CSS report be 31 32 renamed "Minimum Service Metrics". Third, Mr. Baudino recommends that the Commission assess penalties against Dominion and Dominion Questar Gas if Dominion 33 34 Ouestar Gas fails to achieve the minimum service metrics. I will address each recommendation individually. 35

Q. Do you agree with Mr. Baudino's recommendation that the Commission order Dominion to continue Questar Gas' commitment to currently-effective CSS reporting requirements?

39 A Commission order is not necessary. Two years ago, in Docket 14-999-02, the Division A. recommended discontinuation of the requirement for Questar Gas to file quarterly CSS 40 41 reports. However, Questar Gas continues to provide the report on an annual basis because we believe that it was an important metric for the Commission, Division and Office to use 42 43 to measure service levels. Questar Gas also uses the report as an internal management tool to evaluate performance. Going forward, Dominion Ouestar Gas will commit to file the 44 45 CSS Report on a quarterly basis for three years following the Merger completion date, to ensure that the Division, the Office and the Commission can evaluate Dominion Questar 46 47 Gas' performance during the integration period. Additionally, Dominion Questar will continue to monitor its own performance, and to take steps to ensure that its customers 48 49 continue to enjoy the high level of customer service that they have come to expect.

50Q.Mr. Baudino recommends that the "Annual Goals" for each service criterion be51renamed "Minimum Service Metrics." How do you respond?

DOCKET NO. 16-057-01 PAGE 5

A. Changing the title of the report will not provide any additional public benefit. Questar Gas
is, and will continue to be, committed to high levels of customer service, regardless of how
the report is labeled. If the Commission finds this title change useful however, the Joint
Applicants do not oppose it.

Q. Mr. Baudino also recommends that the Commission assess penalties against Dominion Questar Gas if it fails to meet the minimum service standards. Do you think this is necessary or appropriate?

59 A. No. Questar Gas has a history of providing high levels of customer service. The objective of the goals is to give Questar Gas and other interested parties a certain level of comfort 60 and confidence that customers are served in a friendly, timely and effective manner. Mr. 61 Baudino's analysis shows only three occasions in six years when Ouestar Gas failed to 62 63 achieve even one of the goals. Questar Gas reports on 50 metrics each quarter. Over the referenced six-year period, there were 1,200 data points. Mr. Baudino's own analysis 64 shows that Questar Gas meets or exceeds its standards 99.8% of the time. The data shows 65 that Ouestar Gas strives for, and achieves a high level of customer service. A penalty does 66 not make sense for Questar Gas because it is not under-performing and there is no evidence 67 that this performance level will change after the Merger. If customer satisfaction is the 68 desired outcome, a better solution would be for the parties to collaboratively set goals and 69 review performance during the integration period. 70

Q. Mr. Baudino argues that customer service post-Merger could decline if Dominion
were to reduce staffing levels in an effort to cut its costs and pass the savings on to
shareholders. Would this be a good reason to institute the penalty proposal?

A. No. Mr. Baudino describes a potential parade of horribles, but fails to provide any evidence
supporting such fears. In fact, all of the evidence on the record suggests that both Questar
Gas and Dominion have, and will continue to provide very high levels of customer service.
Commitment "f" in the Joint Notice and Application in this docket states that "Dominion
intends to maintain Dominion Questar Gas' customer service at or better than current levels
and will strive for continued improvements thereto."

2.0R Rebuttal Testimony of Craig C. Wagstaff

DOCKET NO. 16-057-01 PAGE 6

80 Q. Is there any evidence that supports this commitment?

A. Yes. A comparison of customer satisfaction metrics of Questar Gas and Dominion
Resources' wholly-owned natural gas distribution company, The East Ohio Gas Company
("Dominion East Ohio"), are summarized in the table below:

2015 Performance Results				
Customer service standard	DEO	QGC		
Average speed of answer	34 seconds	29 seconds		
Appointments met within 4-hour window	99.3%	97%		
Gas service initiation within 5 days	100%	100%		
Emergency call response within 60 minutes	98%	98%		

As you can see, Dominion East Ohio and Questar Gas have very similar results when it comes to customer service metrics. The data suggests that customer satisfaction is as important to Dominion as it is to Questar Gas.

Therefore, I recommend that the Commission reject Mr. Baudino's proposal to impose penalties related to the customer service report.

Q. Mr. Baudino argues penalties of this nature have been assessed by the Commission in the past. Can you provide background on why those penalties were assessed?

A. A review of pages 1-5 of Exhibit RAB-5 indicates that penalties would be assessed against
Scottish Power because of network performance (Section I.A.) and customer service
guarantees (Section I.C.), if these standards were not achieved.

DOCKET NO. 16-057-01 PAGE 7

Q. In section I.B. of RAB-5 there are some customer service performance metrics that are similar to the metrics provided on the CSS. Were penalties assessed if these metrics were not met?

97 A. No.

98 Q. Why were there no penalties assessed on these metrics?

It may have to do with the high volume of customer contacts that occur in the customer 99 A. service area. At Questar Gas, our customer service representatives handle over 8,000 calls 100 101 per day. We also perform over 45,000 meter reads and send out over 45,000 bills per day. I also think that there is a big difference between a customer who is placed on hold for one 102 103 minute and a customer who loses power to their home for over 24 hours. The parties 104 seemed to take this into account as they outlined the penalties in the Scottish Power merger. 105 Most of the penalties were applied if, for whatever reason, a customer had no electricity at their home. 106

107 Q. Did Ms. Kelly offer similar recommendations?

A Yes. Ms. Kelly recommended reporting requirements with respect to the customer service standards in paragraphs 14-15 of DPU Exhibit 3.4 that were similar to Mr. Baudino's recommendations. Again, Dominion Questar Gas will have a continuing commitment to provide high levels of customer service. The commitment to file these reports quarterly will give the interested parties the necessary information to monitor customer service levels during the integration period.

Ms. Kelly also offered a number of recommendations in paragraphs 8-17 of DPU 3.4, including a variety of issues including gas leak reports, meter testing, customer-dispute resolution and outage reports. She did not offer testimony supporting any need for implementation of these recommendations nor did she take into account that Questar Gas already has reporting requirements and policies in place with the Commission for many of these issues. 2.0R Rebuttal Testimony of Craig C. Wagstaff

DOCKET NO. 16-057-01 PAGE 8

120 Q. Does Questar Gas agree with these other recommendations?

As I mentioned before, Questar Gas has a continuing commitment to provide high levels 121 A. of customer service in all of these areas, and will provide the Commission, the Division 122 and the Office with any information the Commission deems appropriate. However, much 123 of the information identified in paragraphs 8-17 of DPU 3.4 already appears in reports that 124 the Company files with the Commission and/or the Division. Many of these 125 126 recommendations are unnecessary and some seem more applicable in an electric utility context than a natural gas utility context (outage reporting, for example). Ms. Kelly did 127 not offer any testimony, evidence or other support for these recommendations. If the 128 Commission or the Division believes there is a deficiency in reporting. Questar Gas 129 130 submits that a more constructive approach would be to collaborate on additional reporting requirements outside of this proceeding. 131

132 **Q.** Does this conclude your testimony?

133 A. Yes.

State of Utah)) ss. County of Salt Lake)

I, Craig C. Wagstaff, being first duly sworn on oath, state that the answers in the foregoing written testimony are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO this __ day of July, 2016.

Notary Public