- BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH -

Request of Dominion Energy Utah to Extend Natural Gas Service to Eureka, Utah	DOCKET NO. 19-057-31 ORDER

ISSUED: August 27, 2020

1. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

a. Docket No. 19-057-31

On November 21, 2019, pursuant to Utah Admin. Code R746-440-1(2)(a) and (2)(b), Dominion Energy Utah (DEU) filed a notice with the Public Service Commission (PSC) of its intent to file a voluntary request for approval of a resource decision under Utah Code Ann. § 54-17-401 *et seq.* ("Voluntary Resource Decision Act"), to expand its natural gas distribution system to the rural community of Eureka, Utah ("Eureka").

On December 3, 2019, DEU filed its application and supporting testimony and exhibits ("Application"). DEU seeks (a) approval of its decision to build high pressure and intermediate high pressure mains to extend service to Eureka ("Eureka Mains Project"); (b) approval of a rural expansion tracker mechanism to facilitate the recovery of the costs to build the project; and (c) a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity ("CPCN") under Utah Code Ann. § 54-4-25 to extend DEU's facilities to provide natural gas service in Eureka.

On December 17, 2019, the PSC issued a Scheduling Order, Notice of Technical Conference, Notice of Consolidated Hearing, and Order Suspending Tariff, in Docket Nos. 19-057-31 and 19-057-32 ("Original Scheduling Order"), consistent with the parties' request to litigate the companion dockets separately, but with concurrent testimony deadlines and hearings.[1]

On March 18, 2020, the Division of Public Utilities (DPU) and the Office of Consumer Services (OCS) filed the direct testimony of Eric Orton and Alex Ware, respectively. On April 2, 2020, Rocky Mountain Propane Association (RMPA) filed a consolidated petition to intervene in this Docket and in Docket No. 19-057-32, which the PSC granted April 24, 2020.

b. Docket No. 19-057-32

On December 3, 2019, concurrently with the filing of the Application in Docket No. 19-057-31, DEU filed an application and supporting testimony and exhibits in Docket No. 19-057-32, seeking approval of a new GSE rate to recover the costs from Eureka residents over time, to build service lines in Eureka ("Eureka Service Lines Project") ("GSE Rate Application").[2] DEU explained that if the PSC approves the related Eureka Mains Project in Docket No. 19-057-31, the costs would be borne by DEU's entire customer base, reducing the economic burden on Eureka residents.[3] DEU asserted that it had separately filed the GSE Rate Application because the cost-recovery treatment permitted for the Eureka Mains Project costs in Docket No. 19-057-31 was not likewise permitted for the Eureka Service Lines Project costs.[4]

On March 18, 2020, the DPU and OCS filed the direct testimony of Eric Orton and Cheryl Murray, respectively.

---

[1] The parties requested concurrent schedules during the joint telephonic scheduling conference held in this Docket and in Docket No. 19-057-32, December 12, 2019.

[2] *Application of Dominion Energy Utah for Approval to Implement a GSE Rate to Provide Service Lines to Customers in Eureka, Utah*, Docket No. 19-057-32, filed December 3, 2019.

[3] *Id.* at 2.

[4] *Id.*

On April 7, 2020, DEU filed a Motion for Leave to Withdraw the Application in Docket No. 19-057-32, to Amend the Application in Docket No. 19-057-31, and to Amend the Scheduling Order ("Motion to Withdraw 19-057-32 and Amend 19-057-31"). DEU explained that the 2020 Legislature approved House Bill 129 ("HB 129") which amended the definition of "rural gas infrastructure" in the Voluntary Resource Decision Act to include the "acquisition, planning, development, extension, expansion, and construction of natural gas **utility facilities** to serve previously unserved rural areas of the state."[5] (emphasis added). (Motion to Withdraw 19-057-32 and Amend 19-057-31.)[6] DEU indicated that the new definition is broader and includes service lines, making it possible to seek approval of the Eureka Service Lines Project and its costs, under the Voluntary Resource Decision Act.[7]

DEU then amended the Application in Docket No. 19-057-31 to add the Eureka Service Lines Project and its costs to their request.[8] We refer to the Eureka Service Lines Project, combined with the Eureka Mains Project hereafter as the "Eureka Rural Expansion Project".

On April 10, 2020, the PSC granted the Motion to Withdraw 19-057-32 and Amend 19-057-31, and set an amended schedule in Docket No. 19-057-31 ("Amended Scheduling Order").

---

[5] The Motion to Withdraw 19-057-32 and Amend 19-057-31 did not include page numbers thus no page numbers are cited.

[6] *Id.*

[7] *Id.*

[8] *Id.*

c. Amended Docket No. 19-057-31

On April 15, 2020, DEU filed an Amended Application for Approval of a Rural Gas Infrastructure Development Project to Extend Service to Eureka, Utah and supporting supplemental direct testimony and exhibits ("Amended Application").

On May 6, 2020, the Utah Association of Energy Users ("UAE") filed a petition to intervene which the PSC granted May 27, 2020. On the same day, the OCS and DPU filed the supplemental direct testimony of Alex Ware and Eric Orton, respectively.

On June 24, 2020, RMPA filed its Cost-Benefit Analysis of Expanding Natural Gas Pipeline Capacity to Eureka, Utah Area ("RMPA Cost Benefit Analysis"), and DEU filed the rebuttal testimony and exhibit of Austin C. Summers.

On June 29, 2020, DEU filed an expedited Motion for Commission Clarification Regarding Submission by Rocky Mountain Propane ("Motion for Clarification"), requesting clarification on the treatment the PSC would give the RMPA Cost Benefit Analysis since it was not part of pre-filed testimony and was not submitted under oath. (Motion for Clarification at 5.) On the same day, the PSC filed a Notice of Comment Period seeking comments regarding the Motion for Clarification, and none were filed.

On July 2, 2020, the PSC issued its Order Granting Clarification and Amending Scheduling Order, and Notice of Telephonic Hearing. We found that the RMPA Cost Benefit Analysis could not be considered as evidence on the record since it lacked proper foundation because it was not sponsored by rebuttal testimony, and that it was not filed consistent with our applicable rules. We ruled that we would consider it as public comments.[9] Finally, on July 8, 2020, DEU and the OCS filed the surrebuttal testimony of Austin C. Summers and Alex Ware, respectively.

The PSC heard the parties at the hearing held July 16, 2020, during which DEU, DPU, and OCS testified, and RMPA participated.

2. BACKGROUND

a. DEU's Application

In its original Application, DEU requested the PSC approve its decision, pursuant to the Voluntary Resource Decision Act, to build the Eureka Mains Project including (i) interconnect facilities with Dominion Energy Questar Pipeline Company (DEQP) at Goshen, Utah to be owned by DEU and with facilities to be owned and financed by DEQP; (ii) approximately 48,000 linear feet of high pressure main from the DEQP interconnect to Eureka; and, (iii) approximately 48,400 linear feet of intermediate high pressure natural gas main throughout Eureka and associated regulator stations. (Application at 2.) DEU also requested the PSC approve a rural expansion cost tracking mechanism ("RETM") to facilitate DEU's recovery of the Eureka Mains Project's costs and a CPCN to extend its facilities to and offer natural gas service in Eureka. (*Id*.)

In its Amended Application, DEU subsequently added its request for approval of the Eureka Service Lines Project including approximately 360 service lines to customer premises and customer meters and related costs, and the inclusion of such costs in the RETM. (*See* Amended

[9] Order Granting Clarification and Amending Scheduling Order, and Notice of Telephonic Hearing at 2.

Application at 2; April 15, 2020 supp. direct testimony of A. Summers at 1.) DEU explains that legislative amendments that were passed during the 2020 General Legislative Session broadened the category of costs that can be included for cost recovery under the Voluntary Resource Decision Act, to include costs related to service lines and customer meters such as the Eureka Service Lines Project's costs. (April 15, 2020 supp. direct testimony of A. Summers at 3.)

DEU explained that, in communications with Eureka residents, one of their biggest concerns was the costs of transitioning to natural gas service – a concern that was shared by both the DPU and OCS. (*Id.* at 2.) DEU asserted that combining the requests and seeking the same ratemaking treatment for the combined Eureka Rural Expansion Project costs will help remove the costs barrier for Eureka residents of transitioning to natural gas service, and will partly remove the costs concerns raised by the DPU and OCS in their testimony.[10] (*Id.* at 2-3.) DEU indicated that, other than adding the service line and related costs and their ratemaking treatment to the Amended Application, DEU was not proposing any other change to its original request in the Application. (*Id.* at 2.)

b. DEU's Proposed Ratemaking Treatment

To recover the Eureka Rural Expansion Project costs, DEU proposes the PSC approve a new RETM. DEU states the costs are significant and "is concerned about the regulatory lag that may occur if cost recovery is delayed." (Amended Application at 7.) DEU proposes to start construction of the Eureka Rural Expansion Project as soon as possible and recover the costs

[10] Both the DPU and OCS mentioned that DEU's original proposal to use a GSE rate to recover service lines costs over time with a pre-tax rate of return for interest, was too high and likely higher than any loan a Eureka customer might obtain. (April 15, 2020 supp. direct testimony of A. Summers at 3.)

through the RETM to avoid the regulatory lag related to delayed cost recovery.[11] DEU states that when it completes construction of the project, it will file an application requesting rate recovery of the investment.[12]

DEU explains that a tracker mechanism is appropriate for rural gas infrastructure developments since DEU plans to continue to explore additional developments, adding that the tracker will create a template for DEU to use for future projects.[13] In addition, DEU states that it anticipates completing the project by the end of 2021 and that without a tracker, DEU would have to wait three years before it is allowed cost recovery for the investment.[14] DEU claims that if the PSC declines to approve the inclusion of all Eureka Rural Expansion Project costs in the RETM, or if it declines to approve the RETM, DEU will likely delay construction of the project to complete it, and coincide with the filing of DEU's next general rate case in 2022.[15]

3. DISCUSSIONS, FINDINGS, AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

A. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS – APPROVAL OF THE EUREKA RURAL EXPANSION PROJECT

The Eureka Rural Expansion Project is the first rural gas infrastructure development that we consider for approval under the Voluntary Resource Decision Act since the Legislature passed House Bill 422 (HB 422), Natural Gas Infrastructure Amendments, in 2018, and the subsequent HB 129 which broadened the types of qualifying improvements by amending the definition of "rural gas infrastructure development."

---

[11] Amended Application at 7.
[12] *See* December 3, 2019 direct testimony of A. Summers at 9:249-250.
[13] *Id.* at 10:259-260.
[14] *Id.* at 10:264-266.
[15] *Id.* at 10:270-272.

DEU, DPU, and OCS participated in full in this docket, filing pre-filed testimony and attending the hearing. RMPA filed public comments and also participated in the hearing. UAE was granted intervenor status but neither filed pre-filed testimony, nor participated in the hearing. DPU and OCS largely support DEU's request.

DPU states that the project qualifies for consideration under the Voluntary Resource Decision Act, but initially raised concerns about some of the information submitted by DEU.[16] However, DPU states in its last round of pre-filed testimony, that DEU sufficiently addressed each of DPU's concerns in supplemental direct testimony.[17] DPU also supports the RETM, stating that it is an adequate way for DEU to recover the used and useful costs of the Eureka Rural Expansion Project.[18]

---

[16] March 18, 2020 direct testimony of E. Orton at 3. For example, DPU stated that there was insufficient support for DEU's selection process in choosing Eureka as the first rural natural gas infrastructure project, and that it was unclear whether Eureka residents were given complete information about the benefits and costs of obtaining natural gas service from DEU. (*Id.* at 4-5.) DPU asserted it was also possible DEU over-estimated the number of potential customers that showed interest in taking DEU service. (*Id.* at 7.) In addition, DPU stated there was limited information regarding DEU's messaging to potential customers about the risks of transitioning to natural gas service and about the proposed interconnection with DEQP. DPU questioned its impact on the overall costs of the Eureka Rural Expansion Project as compared to the bid from Kern River Natural Gas Transmission Company. (*Id.* at 8-9.)

[17] May 27, 2020 supp. direct testimony of E. Orton at 3:67-69 (citing April 15, 2020 supp. direct testimony of A. Summers). For example, DPU noted DEU's commitment to '"clearly identify and demonstrate why [a] community was chosen for expansion,"' (*Id.* at 4:75-76) and '"… [encouraging] customers to hire a contractor of their choice and to obtain an estimate based upon their own individual needs and preferences."' (*Id.* at 4:89-90.) DPU indicates that as to its concern that DEU may have overestimated the number of interested customers, Mr. Summers conceded that DEU did not really know what potential customers' preferences will be, but that he stated, "'whether 190 or 360 customers sign up, it will have minimal impact on the overall cost of the … project … .'" (*Id.* at 5:103-106.) DPU asserts that DEU, the Mayor of Eureka (Mayor Castleton), and the Eureka city inspector committed to inspect homes and businesses and give approval before DEU installs meters in order to address DPU's safety concerns, including DEU's commitment to include safety information in an insert to be mailed with customers' water bill. (*Id.* at 5:119.) DPU also affirms that DEU satisfactorily addressed the concern over the effect that DEQP's participation in the project might have on the project's costs, stating that the PSC could rely on "Mr. Gill's estimate for service line costs and, if [DEU] is in danger of materially exceeding that amount, it would seek [PSC] approval to do so." (*Id.* at 6:125-128.)

[18] March 18, 2020 direct testimony of E. Orton at 14:338-340.

At hearing, DPU reaffirmed its support for the Eureka Rural Expansion Project, recommending the PSC approve DEU's Amended Application.[19] DPU reiterated that DEU has the burden of proof "of just and reasonable rates based on the evidence." And further stated that since "this is the first time the [Voluntary Resource Decision Act] has been used, it should be reviewed by full information and all supported documentation and substantially testified assumptions."[20]

OCS states the Voluntary Resource Decision Act allows cost recovery of the Eureka Rural Expansion Project and gives the PSC the authority to spread the cost of rural expansion across DEU's entire customer base. (May 27, 2020 supp. direct testimony of A. Ware at 2:26-32.) OCS also confirms the costs related to the project meet the cost cap in the statute stating, "the application stays within the statutory cost requirements."[21]

Similar to DPU, OCS states it does not oppose the Eureka Rural Expansion Project.[22] OCS asserts, however, that DEU's proposal does not impose responsibility on Eureka customers for each of their service line installation costs.[23] OCS explains that a customer could express a desire for a service line (at the expense of DEU's customer base), but then "never install a natural gas appliance and become an actual ratepaying customer."[24] OCS acknowledges that the Voluntary Resource Decision Act allows service lines to be subsidized by all DEU customers, but states that the Act's intent was to facilitate actual new rural gas service.[25] As a remedy, OCS

---

[19] July 16, 2020 Hr'g Tr. at 123:21-25 and 124:1-7*; see also* May 27, 2020 supp. direct testimony of E. Orton at 7.
[20] Hr'g Tr. at 123:12-17.
[21] March 18, 2020 direct testimony of A. Ware at 4:67.
[22] *Id.* at 4:67-68.
[23] May 27, 2020 supp. direct testimony of A. Ware at 4:75-77.
[24] *Id.* at 4:79-80.
[25] *Id.* at 4:82-84.

proposes that potential customers who sign up for service, be required to begin taking service within a specified time after DEU installs their service lines.[26]

Since RMPA did not file testimony in the docket, we address the evidence and the points or concerns it raised at the hearing in our analysis supporting our findings and conclusions.

i. Legal Standards.

The central part of the Voluntary Resource Decision Act in Chapter 17, Title 54, that governs this Docket gives utility companies the opportunity to seek the PSC's approval of a "resource decision" to acquire a resource involved in energy production, transmission or distribution, including the distribution of a "rural gas infrastructure development." *Id.* at §§ 54-17-401(1)(b)(i)(C) and 54-17-401(1)(c). As the name reflects, the statute is a way for utility companies to voluntarily seek approval for qualifying acquisitions before investing in them, and provides certainty because it requires our approval of the state's share of the costs the utility company incurs to implement the approved resource decision. *See, e.g., id.* at § 54-17-403.

In evaluating whether to approve a resource decision, we must determine whether (i) the decision complies with applicable statutes and rules and (ii) is in the public interest. *Id*. at § 54-17-402(3). A utility company must provide, in its request for approval, a description of the proposed rural gas infrastructure development project; an explanation of projected benefits from the proposed project; the estimated costs of the proposed project; and any other information the PSC requires. *Id.* at § 54-17-402(2)(c).

---

[26] *Id.* at 4:86-5:89.

It must also submit testimony and exhibits that provide a description of the resource decision; information to show compliance with the applicable requirements of the Voluntary Resource Decision Act and rules; the purpose and reason for the resource decision; an analysis of the projected costs, including the engineering studies, data, information and models used in the analysis; descriptions and comparisons of other resources or alternatives evaluated, instead of the proposed resource decision; sufficient data, information, spreadsheets and models to permit an analysis and verification of the conclusions reached and models used by the utility; an analysis of the estimated effect of the resource decision on the utility's revenue requirement; financial information showing adequate financial capability to implement the resource decision; major contracts, if any, proposed for execution or use related to the resource decision; information showing that the utility has or will obtain any required authorizations from the appropriate governmental bodies for the resource decision; and, other information the PSC may require. *See* Utah Admin. Code R746-440-1(1)(a) – (k).

In deciding whether the acquisition of a rural gas infrastructure development is in the public interest, the Voluntary Resource Decision Act directs the PSC to consider the potential benefits to previously unserved rural areas; the potential number of new customers; natural gas consumption; and revenues, costs, and other factors determined by the PSC to be relevant. *See* Utah Code Ann. § 54-17-402(3)(b)(ii).

No party contests and we conclude that the Eureka Rural Infrastructure Project represents a resource decision to acquire a rural infrastructure development for which a utility may voluntarily seek PSC approval under the Voluntary Resource Decision Act. DPU testifies that "the extension of service to Eureka fits within the statutory definition of a rural gas infrastructure development." (*See* March 18, 2020 direct testimony of E. Orton at 3:70-71 and May 27, 2020 direct testimony of E. Orton at 8:178-180.) OCS agrees, stating that HB 129 of the 2020 General Legislative Session "amended the definition of rural gas infrastructure … to include a more general term 'utility facilities' … [and that it] now allow[s] the inclusion of the costs of customer service lines in the rural expansion funding mechanism that spreads the cost of rural expansion across DEU's entire customer base." (*See* May 27, 2020 supp. direct testimony of A. Ware at 2:26-32.)

a. DEU complied with applicable statutory and other requirements in our rules.

DEU testifies that it addressed all applicable legal requirements in DEU's Exhibit 1.02 which summarizes and "identifie[s] where in the [Amended] Application and accompanying testimony and exhibits [DEU] provide[s] evidence satisfying each requirement." (April 15, 2020 supp. direct testimony of A. Summers at 4:80-86.) DEU states that the Amended Application, along with the testimony of Austin Summers, Michael Gill, and Mayor Nick Castleton "provide[s] the evidence required to show that approval of a project to extend natural gas service to Eureka is just and reasonable and in the public interest." (December 3, 2019 direct testimony of A. Summers at 3:80-83.)

Neither DPU nor OCS contest DEU's claim that the required information was provided. At hearing, RMPA questioned the reliability of some of the information and inferred, through cross examination, that DEU failed to provide a cost benefit analysis which RMPA deems is required under applicable laws.

RMPA disputed, for example, the validity of DEU's estimated number (360) of potential customers.[27] DEU explained that its estimate was based not only on Eureka's representations that it had just replaced all of its water service lines and updated its mapping (which was provided to DEU's engineers),[28] but also on independent verification of the information that was provided by Eureka.[29] DEU testified that its engineers "… [surveyed] individual residences, counted [them,] and [calculated] its own estimates."[30]

RMPA also questioned the completeness of the estimated costs that were provided to potential customers in a survey and in a handout that was provided at the open houses held for the Eureka community October 21 and 23, 2019 ("Open Houses").[31] DEU testified that the costs in the handout originated from the Open House Display Boards, set forth in DEU Exhibit 1.05, and included the expected costs of natural gas, what a typical customer would pay for the service, and DEU's estimated cost of the project of approximately $20 million.[32]

RMPA then probed whether sufficient information had been provided to potential customers about their ability to convert their appliances to natural gas service and the related costs.[33] DEU testified that it deliberately avoided providing appliance conversion cost information since each home is different and the conversion costs will therefore not be the same. DEU explained that it did not want to mislead customers.[34] DEU indicated that instead, technical

---

[27] July 16, 2020 Hr'g Tr. at 20:6-25, 70:20-25, and 71-76.
[28] *Id.* at 21:1-3.
[29] *Id.* at 56:2-6.
[30] *Id.*
[31] *Id.* at 28:19-29:4.
[32] *Id.* at 29:8-25.
[33] *Id.* at 31:2-25 and 79:13-86:1-3.
[34] *Id.* at 33.

support employees who attended the open houses helped answer questions about appliance conversions.[35] Mayor Castleton corroborated DEU's testimony, stating "[DEU] held open houses that were very informative and that specifically discussed the fact that [up front] costs will have to be paid to convert the community to natural gas."[36]

Finally, RMPA challenged DEU's position that the Voluntary Resource Decision Act does not require a cost benefit analysis for a decision to acquire a rural gas infrastructure development.[37]

RMPA's challenges concerning the validity of some of DEU's information, as well as its inference that DEU failed to file a cost benefit analysis that RMPA deems is required, did not persuade us that DEU did not comply with our applicable rules and statutes. DEU provided persuasive responses to suggestions that some of the information is not reliable and that a cost benefit analysis was omitted from the filing.[38]

We do not interpret either Utah Code Ann. § 54-17-402(3)(b)(ii) or Utah Admin. Code R746-440-1 as requiring a cost benefit analysis in this Docket. While all other project acquisitions under the Voluntary Resource Decision Act must demonstrate that the acquisition will most likely result in the lowest reasonable cost project for customers as set forth in Utah Code Ann. § 54-17-402(3)(b)(i)(A), a rural infrastructure development is not subject to the same showing. The public interest inquiry for rural gas infrastructure developments is unique and

---

[35] *Id.*
[36] *Id.* at 68:11-15.
[37] *Id.* at 36:16-37:8; at 39:1-40:7; at 41:1-7; and at 44:2-6.
[38] The costs of the rural gas infrastructure development are limited to the costs that DEU will incur in acquiring the rural gas infrastructure development, and do not include customer-specific costs that customers incur on their side of the meter.

includes consideration of entirely different factors. Whereas we acknowledge that a cost benefit analysis would be useful in the public interest determination applicable to project acquisitions requiring a showing of "lowest reasonable costs," it is not as useful (nor is it required) for a rural gas infrastructure development like the Eureka Rural Expansion Project.[39]

Accordingly, we conclude DEU provided information that both is sufficiently reliable and appropriately satisfies the requirements in our applicable statutes and rules, as identified in updated DEU Exhibit 1.02.

b. The Eureka Rural Expansion Project is in the public interest.

Approval of the Eureka Rural Expansion Project under the Voluntary Resource Decision Act requires us to determine that it is in the public interest, considering potential benefits to previously unserved rural areas, the potential number of new customers, natural gas consumption, and revenues, costs and any other factor the PSC determines is relevant.

1. The Eureka Rural Expansion Project will result in potential benefits for Eureka and surrounding communities.

At hearing, Eureka's Mayor Castleton testified that "natural gas will bring cost savings, reliable energy[,] and long-term stability to the community." (Hr'g Tr. at 67:22-25.) Mayor Castleton testified that "[e]ven with conversion costs, over time, the switch to natural gas will save [the] community money and will offer commercial and industrial growth opportunities to potential businesses that need natural gas."[40]

---

[39] In contrast, our net metering statute in Utah Code Ann. § 54-15-105.1, which we acknowledge is unrelated to a resource acquisition, includes a legislative mandate requiring the PSC to perform a cost benefit analysis and states, in part: "The governing authority shall determine … whether the costs that the electrical corporation or other customers will incur from a net metering program will exceed the benefits of the net metering program, or whether the benefits of the net metering program will exceed the costs … .

[40] *Id.* at 69:12-15.

While RMPA challenged DEU's and Mayor Castleton's projections of residential, industrial, and commercial growth in Eureka in the coming years,[41] Mayor Castleton provided examples of business and residential growth opportunities such as the Trixie and Mammoth mines which are already operating on a limited basis and "should be in production within two or three years."[42] Mayor Castleton also mentioned a subdivision of approximately 80 new homes that is in the planning and permitting phase.[43] He testified that the developers expressed their desire to build the homes with natural gas capability "[s]o [they] don't have to put another heating source in a new home, and then convert it in six months or a year."[44]

The record supports our finding that the Eureka Rural Expansion Project will result in potential benefits to the community and surrounding areas. Mayor Castleton and DEU presented credible and persuasive evidence that the project will result in more choices to potential customers that may result in cost savings, more reliability and convenience, and will likely promote residential, commercial, and industrial growth in Eureka and surrounding communities. We find that the potential benefits of the Eureka Rural Expansion Project are in the public interest.

2. A majority of the 360 potential customers and Eureka residents express positive interest in natural gas service.

DEU testified that there are approximately 360 potential customers, including 340 residential and 20 commercial customers. (December 3, 2019 direct testimony of A. Summers at

---

[41] *Id.* at 26:1-13.
[42] *Id.* at 71:8-21.
[43] *Id.* at 92:5-7.
[44] *Id.* 92:20-22.

7:179-183.) DEU testified that its engineers independently verified these numbers by "[surveying] individual residences, count[ing] [them] and [calculating] its own estimates."[45]

DEU held Open Houses where it circulated a survey to interested customers to gather information and gauge the level of interest in expanding natural gas service to the community. (December 3, 2019 direct testimony of A. Summers at 7:194-8:198.) The survey was also made available online and was advertised through an insert in Eureka residents' water bills, as well as on Eureka's website. The survey produced 206 responses. DEU testifies that 92 percent of the 206 surveyed indicated an interest in signing up for service. (*Id.* at 8:215-216.) The respondents indicated they wanted natural gas service for a variety of reasons including (1) so that they do not have to worry about running out of propane, (2) because Eureka would become more appealing for new business opportunities, (3) because natural gas is less expensive, (4) because it is more efficient and environmentally friendly, and (5) because they desire one source of heat and energy instead of having four different sources. (*Id.* at 9:223-233.)

DEU indicated that technical support employees who attended the Open Houses helped answer questions about appliance conversions.[46] Mayor Castleton testified that "Dominion Energy held open houses that were very informative and that specifically discussed the fact that [up front] costs will have to be paid to convert the community to natural gas."[47]

There is ample evidence showing that many Eureka residents are interested in getting natural gas service for a variety of reasons, and support the Eureka Rural Expansion Project. In

---

[45] Hr'g Tr. at 56:4-6.
[46] Hr'g Tr. at 33.
[47] *Id.* at 68:11-15.

addition, a subdivision of 80 additional potential customers is currently in the permitting process and will likely include natural gas capability with approval of the Eureka Rural Expansion Project. Accordingly, we find that the number of potential customers (360), which will likely grow by 80 upon approval of the project, favors the public interest.

3. The increase in natural gas consumption and the corresponding decrease in the consumption of other heating sources will likely produce cost savings, expose customers to fewer price fluctuations, and improve customer convenience and reliability.

DEU forecasts that potential customers in Eureka will consume approximately 33,098 Dth of natural gas annually, based on the anticipated number of customers and appliances, as set forth in DEU Exhibits 2.05 and 2.14S. (April 15, 2020 supp. direct testimony of M. Gill, DEU Exhibits 2.05 and 2.14S.) DEU projects that the expected annual costs of natural gas service for a typical customer is $635.[48] Mayor Castleton testified that he personally uses firewood to heat his home, but that if he were to use propane, his costs would be $500-$700 per month in the winter months. (December 3, 2019 direct testimony of Nick Castleton at 3:62-66.) He further testified that the most popular reason mentioned in the DEU survey (attached as DEU Exhibit 1.04) for respondents' interest in natural gas service, was the "cost savings." (*Id.* at 3:66-68.)

Mayor Castleton also testified that the price of propane fluctuates during the year with supply and demand. (*Id.* at 3:70-71.) He explained that prices are lower during the summer when demand is low, but that prices could double or triple during the winter months. (*Id.* at 3: 71-74.) Mayor Castleton further testified that natural gas is more convenient and reliable than wood in that there is no need to cut wood, or propane in that for propane a customer must remove snow to

[48] *See* DEU Exhibit 1.05, p.6.

make a path to the propane tank when the propane is delivered. (*Id.* at 4:85-93.) He stated that with natural gas, customers can just set their thermostats and leave for work and their homes will be heated when they return. (*Id.*)

No party persuasively challenged Mayor Castleton's testimony regarding the expected cost savings and improved convenience and reliability of natural gas service as compared to existing alternatives in Eureka. We find that the increase in natural gas consumption and the corresponding decrease in other heating sources that will occur as a result of the Eureka Rural Expansion Project is in the public interest.

4. The revenues, costs, and other factors related to the Eureka Rural Expansion Project, together, favor the public interest.

We observe that the terms "revenues" and "costs" in Utah Code Ann. § 54-17-402(3)(b)(ii) are not specific to the utility company, its customer base, or the rural community's customers. We also observe that the statute does not list the terms separately, unlike the other individually listed factors. They are listed together, with "and other factors determined by the commission to be relevant," as one combined factor.

We infer that the Legislature was deliberate in its language to give us the latitude to interpret them as one combined factor. We discuss the estimated revenues that DEU will receive from potential Eureka customers from the Eureka Rural Expansion Project (for natural gas service), and the estimated costs to DEU and DEU's customer base to build the project. Our findings and conclusions approving the estimated costs, and our conclusions that spreading the costs among DEU's customer base is in the public interest, are set forth in Section 3.B. of our Order.

Revenues.

DEU expects total annual consumption of natural gas in Eureka of 33,098 Dth,[49] and monthly consumption as shown in DEU Exhibits 2.05 and 2.14S. (*Id.*) DEU also presents its DNG rates for summer months (April 1 through October 31) and winter months (November 1 through March 31) in DEU Exhibit 1.01R,[50] which were updated effective June 1, 2020. Based on these numbers and amounts, DEU can expect total revenues from Eureka customers of approximately $83,000.[51] Indeed, the total projected revenues that will be collected annually from up to 360 potential Eureka customers is minimal, and DEU acknowledged the revenues will be "small" during the hearing. (Hr'g Tr. at 50:1-2.) DEU explains that the Legislature recognized that the expense of a rural expansion project would likely surpass the resources of small, currently unserved communities, and that this was the reason why the Legislature allows the costs to be shared among DEU's customer base, upon PSC approval. (July 8, 2020 sur-rebuttal testimony of A. Summers at 1:25-2:27.)

Costs.

DEU testifies that the estimated costs of the Eureka Rural Expansion Project are "a little higher than [$20 million] … [after the] estimates were refined to the confidential numbers that

---

[49] *See* DEU Exhibits 2.05, attached to December 3, 2019 direct testimony of M. Gill and 2.14S, attached to April 15, 2020 supp. direct testimony of M. Gill.
[50] *See* June 24, 2020 rebuttal testimony of A. Summers, DEU Exhibit 1.01R.
[51] The amount is calculated by multiplying total Dth expected to be consumed by 360 customers during the winter months by the winter rate of approximately $2.67, and total Dth expected to be consumed during the winter months by the summer rate of approximately $1.97. The total calculated revenues also account for DEU's tax surcredit 3, and is only the basic revenue that is collected to pay for the Eureka Rural Expansion Project. Additional assumptions include: customers' primary use for natural gas will be space heat, no residential customers will reach the second block, and all customers are assumed to be GS customers.

were filed by Mr. Gill."[52] (Hr'g Tr. at 30:10-24.) The incremental impact to DEU's revenue requirement, calculated in DEU Confidential Exhibit 1.11S at 1, would result in an annual increase to DEU customers of $1.85, or 0.29 percent, assuming a typical DEU customer using 80 Dth of gas each year.[53] (April 15, 2020 supp. direct testimony of A. Summers at 9:217-219 and Hr'g Tr. at 51:12-13.)

In response to RMPA's cross examination implying that conversion costs should also be included in the cost calculations of the Eureka Rural Expansion Project, DEU testified that it is not required nor should it account for customer-specific conversion costs. DEU explained that § 54-17-402(4) states that "the [PSC] may determine that spreading all or a portion of the costs of the rural gas infrastructure development to the larger customer base" is limited to DEU's costs to build the project, and does not include costs to the community, including conversion costs. (Hr'g Tr. at 44:10-19.)

We acknowledge that the revenues that will be collected from 360 potential Eureka customers will be nominal. However, as we observed, "revenues" is one of three sub-factors that we consider in the "catch-all" combined factor of our public interest inquiry. We also consider other important factors, which all support the state's policy of encouraging the expansion of natural gas service to previously unserved rural areas. *See* §§ 54-17-401(1)(c), 54-17-402(3)(b)(ii), 54-17-402(4), and 54-17-403(1)(c).

---

[52] Mr. Gill's refined cost estimates are attached to his testimony as DEU Exhibit 2.10 and Confidential Exhibits 2.06 and 2.11S. The total projected costs are also included in DEU Confidential Exhibit 1.11S at 1 and include the net investment in both the mains and the service lines, in the revenue requirement calculations.

[53] This calculation is set forth in DEU Confidential Exhibit 1.11S at 4, which also includes the incremental revenue requirement impact (at 1), and how the costs are allocated to the different customer classes (at 2).

The costs to DEU of just over $20 million to build the Eureka Rural Expansion Project, which equates to an incremental cost of $1.85, or 0.29 percent annually, to a typical DEU residential customer fall within the statutory cap discussed in Section 3.B. of our Order, and will provide access to natural gas service to many customers and businesses in Eureka. Accordingly, we find the record and the evidence support our finding that the revenues, costs and other factors, together, favor the public interest.

Based on the credible evidence and documentation submitted, we find and conclude that the Eureka Rural Expansion Project is in the public interest, and we approve it. Additionally, we will hold DEU to its commitment to submit more information about its selection process including completed surveys (rather than the blank survey in DEU Exhibit 1.04), clear messaging to potential customers about the safety aspects of appliance conversions, and all other information that DEU committed to file in response to DPU's initial concerns.

c. We Adopt the OCS's Recommendation of a Must-Take Service Deadline, Decline OCS's Recommended One-Year Deadline, and Adopt DEU's Alternative.

The OCS asserts that DEU's proposal does not impose responsibility on Eureka customers for each of their service line installation costs. (May 27, 2020 supp. direct testimony of A. Ware at 4:75-77.) DEU acknowledged the OCS's concern that "some customers might indicate interest to get a no-cost service line, but then never sign up for service." (June 24, 2020 rebuttal testimony of A. Summers at 1:13-14.) The OCS recommends that customers who sign up for service be required to begin taking service within a specified time after DEU installs their service lines.[54] Thus customers who have service lines built to their home will be "treated comparably to a customer on other parts of DEU's system who are subject to section 9.04 of DEU's tariff (SERVICE LINE EXTENSIONS – COMPANY INSTALLED)."[55] The OCS states that requiring reimbursement of the service line costs if a residence does not begin taking service within a specified period, will prevent installation of service lines that will not get used.[56]

DEU testifies that it supports OCS's recommendation of requiring reimbursement from customers for their no-charge service lines if they wait too long to start using natural gas, or if they never take it. (June 24, 2020 rebuttal testimony of A. Summers at 1:18-19.) DEU states that it is concerned, however, that one year may not be long enough for customers to take natural gas service. (*Id.* at 1:21-22.) DEU explains that under the OCS's proposal, "the customer would have 12 months from the time they get the service line to become a customer before they would have to pay for the service line. A longer [period] would provide more customers with a chance to retrofit their homes and appliances for natural gas." (*Id.* at 1:24-2:27.)

As an alternative, DEU proposes a two-year window before a customer must reimburse DEU for the no-cost service line that he or she has failed to use. (*Id.* at 2:30.) DEU clarified that under its proposal, customers will have a two-year window (the "Sign-Up Period") starting when gas starts flowing to Eureka, to sign up for a no-charge service line, and that the Sign-Up Period is available to the entire community.[57] (*Id.* at 2:34-38.) DEU proposes that the second two-year

---

[54] May 27, 2020 supp. direct testimony of A. Ware at 5:102-105.
[55] *Id.* at 5:98-101.
[56] *Id.* at 5:101-102.
[57] DEU also indicated that even if customers miss the Sign-Up period, they would still be able to get natural gas service, but that they would have to pay the costs associated with their service lines. *Id.*

period (the "Grace Period") begins when a customer signs a service line agreement. (*Id.* at 2:39-43.) DEU explains that a customer who signs up for a no-charge service line has two years from the date he or she signs the agreement to take natural gas service. (*Id.* at 2:40-41.) Finally, DEU acknowledges that the Sign-Up Period and the Grace Period could overlap, and states that in that case a customer has until the later of the end of the Sign-Up Period or the end of the Grace Period to begin taking service before it must reimburse DEU for the service line. (*Id.* at 2:44-47.)

The Eureka Rural Expansion Project is the first project we approve under the rural gas infrastructure development part of the Voluntary Resource Decision Act. We intend to closely monitor the implementation of the project, including the time it takes for customers to take natural gas service, after no-cost service lines are built to their homes. Under these circumstances, we adopt the OCS's recommendation of a must-take service deadline, but decline OCS's proposed one-year deadline. Instead, we find it is reasonable to give potential customers the Sign-Up Period and the Grace Period to start taking service from DEU. If any potential customer fails to take service after the Sign-Up Period and after the Grace Period, he or she will be required to reimburse DEU for the no-charge service line. We agree with the OCS that notification of the cost requirements should be included as part of DEU's tariff. We find the OCS's proposal to use similar language as section 9.02 of DEU's tariff for service extension areas, to be reasonable.

B. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS - APPROVAL OF PROJECTED COSTS

i. Legal Standards.

The Voluntary Resource Decision Act requires our order on a request for approval of a resource decision to include findings as to the approved projected costs of the resource decision and the basis upon which we made those findings. Utah Code Ann. § 54-17-402(8).

In addition, the Act states that the PSC may authorize the inclusion of the costs of a rural infrastructure development in the utility company's base rates if (i) the costs will not increase the base distribution non-gas revenue requirement by more than two percent in any three-year period; (ii) the distribution non-gas revenue requirement increase related to the project costs does not exceed five percent in the aggregate; and (iii) the applicable distribution non-gas revenue requirement is the annual revenue requirement determined in the gas company's most recent rate case. *Id.* at § 54-17-403(1)(c).

Finally, the Act allows the PSC to authorize all or a portion of the costs of a proposed rural gas development project to be spread to the utility company's customer base if the PSC finds it in the public interest. Voluntary Resource Decision Act, § 54-17-402(4).

ii. Projected Costs.

DEU testifies that the estimated costs of the Eureka Rural Expansion Project including the Interconnect, the high pressure line extension, the gate, the regulator station, the intermediate high pressure mains and the service lines and meters will cost "a little bit higher" than $20 million. (Hr'g Tr. at 30:10-24.) The total actual projected costs, including their breakdown, are confidential and set forth in the April 15, 2020 confidential supplemental direct testimony of M. Gill at 7:168-171, and specifically detailed in DEU Confidential Exhibits 2.06, 2.10, and 2.11S.

DEU testifies that it evaluated three options to extend a high pressure gas main into Eureka, which are all illustrated on DEU Exhibit 2.03. (April 15, 2020 confidential direct testimony of M. Gill at 3:71-4:88.) DEU states that Option 1 (yellow route) "begins at the DEQP Goshen Interconnect and heads south following the KRGT pipeline corridor. At SR-6 the alignment heads west along the highway until it terminates at the proposed Eureka regulator station location site" (*Id.* at 3:73-75), and testifies that the estimated cost of Option 1 is in DEU Confidential Exhibit 2.06. (*Id.* at 3:75-77.) DEU states that Option 2 (blue route) "begins at the proposed KRGT Interconnection location and heads west along SR-6 until it terminates at the proposed Eureka regulator station site" (*Id.* at 3:78-80), and testifies that the estimated cost of Option 2 is in DEU Confidential Exhibit 2.07. (*Id.* at 3:81-82.) DEU then states that Option 3 (green route) "begins at the [proposed] DEQP Goshen Interconnect and heads west along an existing dirt road. The route follows the dirt road until it intersects with SR-6 … [where] the alignment turns west along SR-6 until it terminates at the proposed Eureka regulator station site" (*Id.* at 4:83-86), and testifies that the estimated cost of Option 3 is set forth in DEU Confidential Exhibit 2.08. (*Id.* at 4:87-88.) In subsequent testimony, DEU updated or corrected costs for all three options which resulted in slightly higher costs for Options 1 and 3 and a slightly lower cost for Option 2; however, the changes in the update did not make a difference in DEU's decision.[58]

[58] *See* April 15, 2020 supp. direct testimony of M. Gill at 4:83-86.

DEU testifies that it chose "Option 1" (*Id.* at 4:86), and acknowledges it is not the lowest-cost option. At hearing, RMPA questioned DEU's choice asking whether DEU had chosen Option 1 because it included DEQP's bid for the interconnect, rather than the non-affiliate KRGT bid. DEU testified that the option with the KRGT bid (Option 2) was significantly more expensive, "so much so that even with constructing the extra length of yellow line that … can [be seen] running north and south …, [the] DEQP option was still cheaper and preferred." (Hr'g Tr. at 109:12-18.) DEU testified that the chosen yellow route "positions [DEU] to take advantage of the line that would be constructed from the interconnect, south to Highway 6, and then extend east [to Elberta and Goshen]." (*Id.* at 106:17-20.) DEU discussed opportunities for additional rural gas expansions made possible as a result of the chosen yellow route option. (Hr'g Tr. at 105:11-24.)

We find and conclude that the projected costs of the Eureka Rural Gas Expansion were reasonably derived. The costs of the preferred Option 1 (which represent the bulk of the total costs of the project), were vetted and evaluated against two other alternatives, consistent with the requirements in our Utah Admin. Code R746-440-1(1)(e). We recognize that DEU did not choose the least expensive option (Option 3), but conclude that Option 1 is better overall for long-run opportunities including the continued expansion of additional rural gas infrastructure developments in the future, which may cost less to build as a result of the infrastructure included in Option 1. Based on the record, the testimony and all of the documentary evidence submitted, we approve:

1) The work and related materials that make up the Option 1 costs, including the Eureka 9.1 miles of 6” regulator station, meter, odorant, and controls, up to the amount shown in DEU Confidential Exhibit 2.06, next to “Total Project Cost.”

2) The Intermediate High Pressure Mains, up to the amount shown in DEU Confidential Exhibit 2.10 at page 1, next to “Total Estimated Project Cost.”

3) The Intermediate High Pressure Service Lines, up to the amount shown in DEU Confidential Exhibit 2.11S at page 1, next to “Total Estimated Project Cost.”

DEU must seek approval for any amounts incurred that are above the approved amounts we reference in 1), 2), and 3) above.

iii. The Eureka Rural Expansion Project qualifies for cost recovery.

DEU testifies that the costs of the Eureka Rural Expansion Project meet the cost caps in § 54-17-403(1)(c) of the Voluntary Resource Decision Act, and qualify for inclusion in DEU’s base rates. (April 15, 2020 supp. direct testimony of A. Summers at 10:234-254 and Hr’g Tr. at 62:6-11). The Act limits the inclusion of rural gas infrastructure development costs to no more than a two percent increase to a utility company’s base distribution non-gas revenue requirement in any three-year period.

DEU explains that “[t]he distribution non-gas revenue requirement approved in Docket No. 19-057-02 is $391,436,970. Two percent of this amount is $7,828,739, which is therefore the dollar limit of revenue requirement increase permitted in any three-year period.” (*Id.* at 10:247-249.) DEU’s capital investment in the project of just over $20 million only increases DEU’s revenue requirement by the confidential amount set forth in DEU Confidential Exhibit 1.11S at 1 and is under the $7,828,739 revenue requirement threshold, so long as DEU does not file another general rate case within that three-year period. If DEU were to file another general rate case within the next three years, and its distribution non-gas revenue requirement changes, the revenue requirement threshold would also change. DEU testified at hearing that it will provide "updated allowance[s], allowed spending limits so the [PSC] will always be aware of any ceiling and what the aggregate limit is … for any new case." (Hr'g Tr. at 62:6-21.)

DPU and OCS testify that the projected costs of the project qualify for cost recovery[59] and no other party contests this issue. We find and conclude that the costs of the Eureka Rural Expansion Project are under the cost caps and revenue requirement thresholds set forth in Utah Code Ann. § 54-17-403(1)(c) of the Voluntary Resource Decision and qualify for cost recovery.

iv. Spreading the costs of the Eureka Rural Expansion Project to DEU's customer base is in the public interest.

Based on the evidence, the documentation and the testimony at hearing, including our analysis and findings and conclusions that the Eureka Rural Expansion Project is in the public interest, our approval of the projected costs, and that the costs qualify for cost recovery, we find that spreading the costs of the Eureka Rural Expansion Project to DEU's customer base is in the public interest.

C. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS – APPROVAL OF THE RETM

DEU proposes to recover the costs of the Eureka Rural Expansion Project through a rural expansion tracker mechanism,[60] and no party contests the RETM. We find and conclude that the RETM will be useful to keep track of and recover the actual costs of the Eureka Rural Expansion Project, as well as serve as a gauge for evaluating future rural gas infrastructure developments.

---

[59] *See* March 18, 2020 direct testimony of E. Orton at 3, and May 27, 2020 supp. direct testimony of A. Ware at 2:25-32.

[60] *See* December 3, 2019 direct testimony of A. Summers at 9:247-248.

Based on the evidence presented, we approve DEU's request for the RETM, to operate as described in DEU's Amended Application and supporting testimony and exhibits.

D. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS – CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY

DEU seeks a CPCN to extend DEU's facilities through the Eureka Rural Expansion Project, as described in the confidential direct and supplemental direct testimonies of M. Gill, DEU Exhibits 2.0 and 2.0S, and accompanying exhibits, and to serve Eureka. DEU states that Eureka is located in the easternmost section of Juab County, immediately adjacent to Utah County and other communities that receive natural gas service from DEU. (Application at ¶ 8.) It explains that the best way to offer service to Eureka is from an interconnect with DEQP's interstate pipeline system. It claims that no other natural gas utilities operate in the area and, therefore, that "extending service to Eureka, as proposed, will not interfere with any line, plant[,] or system of any other public utility." (*Id.* at ¶ 9.) DEU further states that it is currently working with Mayor Castleton to obtain any required franchise agreement or other permits it will need to serve Eureka. (*Id.* at ¶ 10.)

No party contests DEU's request for a CPCN. Eureka is not presently served by, or certificated to, any natural gas utility. According to the testimony, sources of energy generally available to Eureka residents include electricity, propane, and wood. Mayor Castleton filed testimony supporting the Eureka Rural Expansion Project.

Based on the supporting testimony and exhibits, we find and conclude that Eureka residents desire natural gas service, and no other utility seeks authority to provide it. DEU has the ability to provide it and meets the requirements set forth in Utah Code Ann. § 54-4-25. We also find that the present or future convenience or necessity does, or will, require construction of the Eureka Rural Expansion Project. Accordingly, we grant the CPCN, subject to the conditions set forth in our ordering paragraph below.

4. ORDER

Consistent with and based on our discussions, findings, and conclusions set forth above, we order as follows:

A. We approve the Eureka Rural Expansion Project, for the total projected costs stated in our Order, Section 3.B.ii.

B. We approve DEU's request for a RETM, which will operate as described in DEU's Amended Application, and whose balance will be reset to $0 effective on the date we approve new base rates in DEU's next general rate case, which will incorporate the remaining balance of the Eureka Rural Expansion Project Costs, if any.

C. We grant Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity No. 2622, attached as Exhibit A, allowing DEU to serve Eureka, Utah and the surrounding areas and extend its facilities through construction of the Eureka Rural Expansion Project, as described in the confidential direct and confidential supplemental direct testimony of M. Gill, subject to DEU filing, as soon as practicable, documentation showing that it has obtained any consent, franchise agreement, or any other permit required by the city of Eureka, or any other local governmental entity having jurisdiction over the project.

DATED at Salt Lake City, Utah, August 27, 2020.

/s/ Thad LeVar, Chair

/s/ David R. Clark, Commissioner

/s/ Ron Allen, Commissioner

Attest:

/s/ Gary L. Widerburg
PSC Secretary
DW#315159

Notice of Opportunity for Agency Review or Rehearing

Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. §§ 63G-4-301 and 54-7-15, a party may seek agency review or rehearing of this written order by filing a request for review or rehearing with the PSC within 30 days after the issuance of the order. Responses to a request for agency review or rehearing must be filed within 15 days of the filing of the request for review or rehearing. If the PSC fails to grant a request for review or rehearing within 30 days after the filing of a request for review or rehearing, it is deemed denied. Judicial review of the PSC's final agency action may be obtained by filing a Petition for Review with the Utah Supreme Court within 30 days after final agency action. Any Petition for Review must comply with the requirements of Utah Code Ann. §§ 63G-4-401, 63G-4-403, and the Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure.

EXHIBIT A

- BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH -

Request of Dominion Energy Utah to Extend Natural Gas Service to Eureka, Utah	DOCKET NO. 19-057-31 CERTIFICATE 2622

ISSUED: August 27, 2020

The Public Service Commission of Utah, pursuant to Utah Code Ann. § 54-4-25, issues a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity authorizing Dominion Energy Utah to construct and operate the pipelines and other related facilities in Eureka, Utah and the surrounding areas as specifically described in the April 15, 2020 Amended Application and accompanying direct testimony in this docket to provide natural gas service to Eureka, Juab County, Utah and the surrounding areas.

DATED at Salt Lake City, Utah, August 27, 2020.

/s/ Thad LeVar, Chair

/s/ David R. Clark, Commissioner

/s/ Ron Allen, Commissioner

Attest:

/s/ Gary L. Widerburg
PSC Secretary

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I CERTIFY that on August 27, 2020, a true and correct copy of the foregoing was delivered upon the following as indicated below:

By Email:

Cameron L. Sabin (cameron.sabin@stoel.com)
Stoel Rives LLP

Kelly Mendenhall (kelly.mendenhall@dominionenergy.com)
Austin Summers (austin.summers@dominionenergy.com)
Jenniffer Nelson Clark (jenniffer.clark@dominionenergy.com)
Dominion Energy Utah

Zane S. Froerer (zane.froerer@froererlaw.com)
Froerer and Miles, P.C.

Phillip J. Russell (prussell@jdrslaw.com)
James Dodge Russell & Stephens P.C.

Patricia Schmid (pschmid@agutah.gov)
Justin Jetter (jjetter@agutah.gov)
Robert Moore (rmoore@agutah.gov)
Victor Copeland (vcopeland@agutah.gov)
Assistant Utah Attorneys General

Madison Galt (mgalt@utah.gov)
Division of Public Utilities

Alyson Anderson (akanderson@utah.gov)
Bela Vastag (bvastag@utah.gov)
Alex Ware (aware@utah.gov)
ocs@utah.gov
Office of Consumer Services

____
Administrative Assistant