OCS Exhibit No. 2.1 - REDACTED

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

IN THE MATTER OF THE REQUEST OF DOMINION ENERGY UTAH FOR APPROVAL OF A VOLUNTARY RESOURCE DECISION TO CONSTRUCT AN LNG FACILITY	: : : : :	Docket No. 18-057-03

Office of Consumer Services (OCS) Exhibit No. 2.1 - REDACTED

As referenced in OCS – 2D Mierzwa

August 16, 2018

Table of Contents

P.S.C.U. Docket No. 18-057-03
DPU Data Request No. 1.12
Requested by Division of Public Utilities
Date of DEU Response 6/22/2018

DPU 1.12: Regarding Mr. Platt's testimony beginning on line 223, please provide every instance similar to the Coalville incident that the Company has had in the last 20 years and the cost to the Company for each.

Answer: The table below shows the requested data in the Company's possession. The incidents prior to 2013 are estimated. Where data is omitted, the Company does not have the requested information.

Date	Location	Approximate Number of Customers	Approximate Cost to Restore Service
1/6/2017	Coalville	600	$100,000
10/31/2013	Monticello	730	-
~8/8/2011	Glendale		
~12/15/2010	Saratoga		
2008	Ogden Valley		

Prepared by: Matthew Bartol, GM Engineering & Project Management
Mike Platt, Manager, Engineering

FDR 1.02: Please provide the reasons why the lesser cost options were not chosen.

Answer: Option 1 – Utilize existing resources (Reserve Aquifer Storage and Purchase Incremental Supplies)

- This option is off-system and far from the demand center
- Increased risk of supply shortfalls due to earthquakes, landslides, third party damage and tearouts, equipment failure, power outages, human error and cyberattacks
- Reserving the Aquifer storage for supply reliability would require replacing the Aquifer supply with another supply resource
- Risk of no supply purchase availability on cold days or times when the market isn't trading, if gas is available, it could be extremely expensive
- DEU would secure some additional supply (as insurance) with peaking contracts and high penalties for failure to deliver
- Suppliers may be reluctant to enter into agreements with high penalties for nonperformance
- Gas could be very expensive as the commodity would be priced on a daily index
- Much more gas would be purchased every day if Aquifers are kept in reserve, this results in unnecessary incremental gas costs and inefficient use of all storage assets as injections would need to be made daily to absorb the excess gas
- If supply is not nominated it may not be delivered in time due to NAESB cycle constraints
- Facilities owned and operated by outside entities are more vulnerable to upstream facility design inadequacies and maintenance risk

Option 2A – Demand Response (Large Customers)

- DEU contacted 17 of the largest customers and there was very little interest
- DEU contacted Pacificorp and did not receive a response
- Concerns that customer may not have supply available for use (for example, manufacturers unable to stop mid-process, no gas is scheduled for them on the day, or customer's gas is curtailed by same circumstance curtailing company's gas)
- Lack of available supply from customer renders this option ineffective
- Safety concerns for customers with reduced/curtailed service

- Requires installation of remote control valves will cost $100K - $120K per customer
- Costs associated with purchasing customer's gas are unknown

Option 2B – Demand Response (Sales Customers)

- It is impossible to predict the amount of demand reduction
- Participation is expected to be low
- Risk that not enough demand will be reduced in time to offset supply shortfalls is high
- Shortfalls occur overnight and the peak-demand time is early morning, and messaging requests would occur while customers are sleeping
- DEU has an obligation to provide firm reliable service to firm customers who pay for and expect firm reliable service

Magnum Storage 3D (Third party Off-System Storage Services and Transportation to Bluffdale)

- This option is off-system and far from the demand center
- Increased risk of supply shortfalls due to earthquakes, landslides, third party damage and tearouts, equipment failure, power outages, human error and cyberattacks
- Unknown reliability and risk because Magnum is not currently serving customers
- Project is in preliminary stages, and no engineering design or risk analysis has been provided
- Facilities owned and operated by outside entity
- Concerns over viability of project at the proposed pricing
- Experience with Ryckman Creek shows how unreliable new third party storage can be
- Facilities owned and operated by outside entities are more vulnerable to upstream facility design inadequacies and maintenance risk

Option 7A – Aquifer Storage at Coalville and Chalk Creek (Third-Party Off-System Storage Services and Transportation to the DEU City Gate)
Option 7B – Aquifer Storage at Coalville and Chalk Creek (Third-Party Off-System Storage Services and Transportation to the DEU City Gate)

- This option is off-system and far from the demand center
- Increased risk of supply shortfalls due to earthquakes, landslides, third party damage and tearouts, equipment failure, power outages, human error and cyberattacks
- Requires acquisition and use of incremental upstream transportation capacity
- Facilities owned and operated by outside entities are more vulnerable to upstream facility design inadequacies and maintenance risk
- Option provides considerably less supply than the other alternatives and much less than the need that has been identified

- Unknown if expansion is feasible
- Availability pending evaluation, execution and results of expansion FEED study at unknown cost to Company
- If supply is not nominated it may not be delivered in time due to NAESB cycle constraints

Prepared by: Kelly Mendenhall, Director, Regulatory and Rates

P.S.C.U. Docket No. 18-057-03
OCS Data Request No. 1.02
Requested by Division of Public Utilities
Date of DEU Response 6/28/2018

OCS 1.02: Please provide two copies of large-scale maps identifying each the following:

a. Dominion Energy Utah's major transmission and distribution mains;
b. The location of the proposed LNG facilities;
c. The transmission and storage facilities of Dominion Energy Questar Pipeline ("DEQP") and Kern River Gas Transmission Company; and
d. The pipeline and storage facilities associated with each of the alternative options examined in the evaluation process which lead the Company to propose the construction of an LNG facility.

Answer: Please see OCS 1.02 Highly Confidential Attachment.

Prepared by: Mike Gill, Manager-Engineering

Docket No. 18-057-03

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION – SUBJECT TO COMMISSION RULES 746-1-602 AND 603

OCS Data Request No. 1.02

Highly Confidential Attachment Map

P.S.C.U. Docket No. 18-057-03
OCS Data Request No. 1.03
Requested by Division of Public Utilities
Date of DEU Response 6/28/2018

OCS 1.03: Please provide the projected design day demands of sales customers for the next five winter seasons.

Answer: The firm sales Design Peak Day demand projection is summarized in the following table:

HEATING SEASON	FIRM DESIGN-DAY SALES DEMAND (Dth)
2018-2019	1,330,170
2019-2020	1,330,227
2020-2021	1,331,973
2021-2022	1,339,230
2022-2023	1,353,028

Prepared by: David Landward, Regulatory Analyst III, State Regulatory Affairs

Docket No. 18-057-03

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION – SUBJECT TO COMMISSION RULES 746-1-602 AND 603

OCS Data Request No. 1.05

Highly Confidential Response

P.S.C.U. Docket No. 18-057-03
OCS Data Request No. 2.01
Requested by Division of Public Utilities
Date of DEU Response July 31, 2018

OCS 2.01: Please provide a monthly summary of the Company's gas supply purchases for the winter of 2017-18 by receipt point and pipeline. Identify the Inside FERC and Gas Daily index trading location applicable for each receipt point.

Answer: A monthly summary of the Company's gas supply purchases is included as OCS 2.01 attachment 1. However, it is important to note that the index is determined for each deal based on negotiations with the counterparty. The location of the gas does not determine the index that is used for the deal.

Prepared by: Will Schwarzenbach III, Manager, Gas Supply

Pipeline	Location/Index	November-17	December-17	January-17	February-17	March-17	Grand Total
DEQP	Altamont MM	0	91,450	91,450	82,600	0	**265,500**
	Gas Daily Kern River Opal Midpoint	0	91,450	91,450	82,600	0	**265,500**
DEQP	Blue Forest Tap	485,000	909,000	712,000	502,000	116,000	**2,811,000**
	Gas Daily NW Wyo. Pool Midpoint	485,000	909,000	440,000	502,000	116,000	**2,539,000**
	Multiple Index Formula	0	0	272,000	0	0	**272,000**
DEQP	Clay Basin	9,000	1,010,000	80,000	0	0	**1,099,000**
	Gas Daily Kern River Opal Midpoint	0	1,010,000	80,000	0	0	**1,090,000**
	Gas Daily NW Wyo. Pool Midpoint	9,000	0	0	0	0	**9,000**
DEQP	CO2 Plant Outlet	652,335	465,000	465,000	420,000	60,000	**2,062,335**
	Gas Daily Kern River Opal Midpoint	202,335	0	0	0	0	**202,335**
	Inside FERC NW Rockies	450,000	465,000	465,000	420,000	60,000	**1,860,000**
DEQP	ET Outlet	0	0	0	1,300	0	**1,300**
	Gas Daily NW Wyo. Pool Midpoint	0	0	0	1,300	0	**1,300**
KRGT	FT Muddy Creek Pool	110,000	1,823,150	1,590,000	927,000	355,000	**4,805,150**
	Gas Daily Kern River Opal Midpoint	110,000	1,793,150	1,575,000	817,000	355,000	**4,650,150**
	Fixed Price	0	30,000	15,000	110,000	0	**155,000**
KRGT	FT Painter Pool	0	3,850	0	5,000	0	**8,850**
	Gas Daily Kern River Opal Midpoint	0	3,850	0	5,000	0	**8,850**
KRGT	Goshen	900,000	930,000	930,000	840,000	930,000	**4,530,000**
	Multiple Index Formula	900,000	930,000	930,000	840,000	930,000	**4,530,000**
DEQP	Kanda Coleman CIG	76,000	1,115,000	115,000	607,000	264,000	**2,177,000**
	Gas Daily CIG Rockies Midpoint	76,000	1,055,000	115,000	546,000	264,000	**2,056,000**
	Fixed Price	0	60,000	0	61,000	0	**121,000**
KRGT	Opal Plant	124,000	500,000	30,000	230,000	120,000	**1,004,000**
	Gas Daily Kern River Opal Midpoint	124,000	500,000	30,000	230,000	120,000	**1,004,000**
DEQP	Overthrust JL 36 MS	434,000	633,000	265,000	707,000	235,000	**2,274,000**
	Gas Daily Kern River Opal Midpoint	434,000	603,000	265,000	707,000	235,000	**2,244,000**
	Fixed Price	0	30,000	0	0	0	**30,000**
DEQP	Red Wash - Fidlar	0	945,000	937,500	840,000	0	**2,722,500**
	Gas Daily Kern River Opal Midpoint	0	15,000	7,500	0	0	**22,500**
	Inside FERC NW Rockies	0	930,000	930,000	840,000	0	**2,700,000**
KRGT	Riverton	0	0	0	10,000	0	**10,000**
	Fixed Price	0	0	0	10,000	0	**10,000**
DEQP	Shute Creek MM	636,000	661,100	651,000	348,700	341,000	**2,637,800**
	Gas Daily Kern River Opal Midpoint	270,000	620,000	651,000	206,000	120,000	**1,867,000**
	Gas Daily NW Wyo. Pool Midpoint	366,000	41,100	0	136,700	221,000	**764,800**
	Fixed Price	0	0	0	6,000	0	**6,000**
DEQP	Vermillion Creek Plant Outlet	15,900	0	0	0	0	**15,900**
	Gas Daily Kern River Opal Midpoint	15,900	0	0	0	0	**15,900**
DEQP	White River Hub	860,000	1,339,000	1,249,700	984,800	652,400	**5,085,900**
	Gas Daily White River Hub Midpoint	860,000	1,314,000	1,249,700	984,800	652,400	**5,060,900**
	Fixed Price	0	25,000	0	0	0	**25,000**
DEQP	Wildcat Tap C4	45,900	0	0	0	0	**45,900**
	Gas Daily Kern River Opal Midpoint	45,900	0	0	0	0	**45,900**
DEQP	XO-16 - NWP to QPC	0	160,000	140,000	234,000	55,000	**589,000**
	Gas Daily Kern River Opal Midpoint	0	150,000	140,000	135,000	55,000	**480,000**
	Fixed Price	0	10,000	0	99,000	0	**109,000**
	Grand Total	**4,348,135**	**10,585,550**	**7,256,650**	**6,739,400**	**3,128,400**	**32,145,135**

P.S.C.U. Docket No. 18-057-03
OCS Data Request No. 2.02
Requested by Division of Public Utilities
Date of DEU Response July 31, 2018

OCS 2.02: Please provide a monthly summary or estimate for the winter of 2017-18 identifying the quantity of gas purchased by the Company that flowed through a processing facility.

Answer: Some of the requested information is confidential and will be provided to those partries who agree in writing to comply with Utah Admin. Code R746-1-602 and 603. The Company does not know where the gas comes from prior to the point of purchase. However, if gas is purchased at the outlet of a plant, it can be assumed that the gas has been processed at the plant. OCS 2.02 Confidential Attachment 1 shows the gas that has been purchased at plants shown in red.

It is also important to note that most of the Company's cost-of-service gas supply is processed through processing plants.

Prepared by: Will Schwarzenbach III, PE, Manager, Gas Supply

Pipeline	Location/Index	November-17	December-17
[redacted]			

Fixed Price			[redacted]
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	

January-17	February-17	March-17	Grand Total
[redacted]			

P.S.C.U. Docket No. 18-057-03
OCS Data Request No. 2.03
Requested by Division of Public Utilities
Date of DEU Response July 31, 2018

OCS 2.03: Please identify for the last ten years, all instances where the Company requested an out of-cycle nomination change with Kern River or DEQP for flowing supplies or gas being withdrawn from storage. Describe the request in detail, the reason for the request, and identify whether the request was granted.

Answer: The Company has no way to request out-of-cycle nominations changes. There have been times when the Company makes a change for a later cycle and DEU Gas Control works with the upstream pipeline delivering the supply to allow that gas to flow early. These instances are not formalized in any way, they are just done when operationally available, and so there is no record to draw upon for detail.

Prepared by: Will Schwarzenbach III, PE, Manager, Gas Supply

P.S.C.U. Docket No. 18-057-03
OCS Data Request No. 2.06
Requested by Division of Public Utilities
Date of DEU Response July 31, 2018

OCS 2.06: Please identify each interstate pipeline on which DEQP is interconnected. Please explain whether DEQP receives or delivers gas to each interstate pipeline during the winter season.

Answer:

Interconnect	**Direction of flow**
COLORADO INTERSTATE GAS CO. LLC	receives and delivers
DOMINION ENERGY OVERTHRUST PIPELINE, LLC	receives and delivers
KERN RIVER GAS TRANSMISSION CO.	receives and delivers
NORTHWEST PIPELINE LLC	receives
SOUTHERN STAR CENTRAL GAS PIPELINE	receives and delivers
TRANSCOLORADO GAS TRANSMISSION CO	delivers
WHITE RIVER HUB, LLC	receives and delivers
WYOMING INTERSTATE COMPANY LLC	delivers

Prepared by: L. Bradley Burton, Director, Regulatory DES

OCS 2.10: Please explain how DEQP no-notice service operates. Does it provide DEU with the ability to take the delivery of gas supplies in excess of DEU's daily nominations up to the no-notice contract MDQ? That is, does it allow DEU to take delivery of up to 203,542 Dth on a particular day in excess of its total DEQP Rate Schedule T-1 MDQ?

Answer: Under the NNT rate schedule, the Company may nominate T-1 transportation capacity the day before the gas flows to reserve sufficient capacity and provide adequate variable sources of supply to match any change in demand. Nominations are confirmed by the pipeline and interconnect operators and the final quantity used for flowing gas is the daily scheduled quantity. NNT allows for daily scheduled quantity adjustments to reflect a difference between forecasted and actual daily demand.

Yes, NNT provides DEU the ability to take delivery of gas supplies in excess of daily nominations up to the no-notice contract quantity as described in the DEQP FERC Gas Tariff, Part 1, Rate Schedule NNT Section 3(c):

> Shipper will receive NNT service on demand up to shipper's level of NNT service specified in its service agreement irrespective of shipper's scheduled daily nomination.

Given the following limitations outlined in DEQP FERC Gas Tariff, Part 1, Rate Schedule NNT Section 2.1(c):

> May apply to any firm transportation service agreement executed by shipper so long as the total NNT service nominated on any day does not exceed (1) the level of service specified in the NNT service agreement or (2) the level of firm transportation service specified in the transportation service agreement to which the NNT service is nominated;

Yes, NNT allows DEU to take delivery of up to 203,542 Dth on a particular day in excess of its total DEQP Rate Schedule T-1 contract quantity as described in the DEQP FERC Gas Tariff, Part 1, Rate Schedule NNT Section 3(i):

> Upon the request of shipper, if capacity is available and if system integrity is not jeopardized, Questar will receive from or deliver to a shipper a quantity of gas in excess of the RDC specified in the shipper's service agreement, subject to the terms of §§ 9 and 11 of the General Terms and Conditions of Part 1. The service (i) shall be available only to the extent it does not impair Questar's ability to provide service under any other rate schedule (including service up to shipper's RDC under this rate schedule),

(ii) is interruptible, and (iii) is subject to the authorized overrun charge.

Prepared by: Lori Creer, Director, Engineering & Gas Control, Dominion Energy Questar Pipeline

OCS 2.12: Reference OCS Exhibit 1.04a Attachment. Please identify the extent to which the identified storage contracts are delivered under DEU's DEQP T-1 contracts.

Answer: The gas from the six storage contacts with DEQP and the Spire (Ryckman Creek) storage contract are all delivered to the DEU city gate on DEQP T-1 contracts. Each of the storage facilities are primary receipt points on a DEQP T-1 contract. The firm path MDQ for each of the storage facilities is as follows:

As of July 1, 2018

MAP	Storage Facility	Total Capacity	MAP 164 WF	MAP 334 Vernal	MAP 166 Indianola
66	Clay Basin QPC WD	216,887	181,887	5,000	30,000
82	Leroy Storage WD	55,128	55,128	-	
420	Ryckman Storage Withdrawal	16,600	16,600	-	
97	Chalk Creek Storage	14,700	14,700	-	
98	Coalville Storage WD	62,500	62,500	-	

The primary delivery point for the majority of the storage contracts is MAP 164 WF (Wasatch Front). The Clay Basin capacity exceeds the anticipated withdrawal capacity on the Clay Basin contracts on a peak day. This capacity is planned to be amended to other supply points based on the availability of withdrawals on any given day.

Prepared by: Will Schwarzenbach III, PE, Manager, Gas Supply

P.S.C.U. Docket No. 18-057-03
OCS Data Request No. 2.13
Requested by Division of Public Utilities
Date of DEU Response July 31, 2018

OCS 2.13: Reference OCS Exhibit 1.04b Attachment and the DEQP system map found in its FERC-approved tariff.

a. Please explain why 1.04b identifies DEU delivery points 164, 163, 177, 162, 168, 169, 166, and 336, but the system map identifies 164 as the only DEU delivery point; and

b. Please identify where the remaining delivery points can be found on the system map.

Answer:

a. The system map was created by DEQ, and was created for use by all DEQP customers not just for DEU. MAP 164 is the primary delivery point used by third party markets and agents.

b. The attached OCS 2.13 Attachment 1 is an updated version of the DEQP system map which labels all of the DEQP delivery points to the DEUWI system.

Prepared by: Will Schwarzenbach III, PE, Manager, Gas Supply

Dominion Energy Questar Pipeline System Map

- Reciept Point
- Delivery Point
- Compressor Station
- Underground Storage Basin
- Dominion Energy Questar Pipeline
- Dominion Energy Overthrust Pipeline
- White River Hub

*MAP locations can be found on Questar's informational postings website at http://www.questarpipeline.com/OracleReports/2FrameQPCReceipt.html

DEOP Ruby KRGT Interconnect
DEOP NWP Interconnect
DEOP CIG WIC Interconnect
REX WIC Interconnect
KRGT Ryckman Storage Interconnect
DEOP Interconnect
NWP Interconnect
Southern Star Interconnect
KRGT Interconnect
WRH REX TransColorado Interconnect
PSCO RMNG Interconnect

DEU Interconnect
DEW Interconnect

JL079 ML060 ML048 ML003 ML016 ML002 ML014 JTL076 JL032 JL049 JL056 JL064 JL036 JL057 JL053 JL055 JL081 JL081EXT JL054 JL051 JL036-1 TL112 ML013 ML001 SML073 JL084 JTL095 JL074 JTL075 JL069 JL012 ML015 JL097 JTL136 JL114 JTL093 JTL092 JTL106 JL131 JTL004 JL130 JL085 JL025 JL025EXT JTL091 JTL077 JL005 JL028 ML101 ML058 ML022 SML070 JL107 JL009 ML086 JL065 ML026 ML023 ML027 ML080 ML103 JL137 JL138 JTL078 ML040 ML104EXP ML104 JTL042 ML041 JTL113 JTL120 JTL083 JTL082 JL118 JL102 JL111 JL102EXT JL096EXT JL096 JL119 JL109 JTL117 JL044 JL046 JL045 JL047 ML068 JL142 JL141 JTL140 JTL143 JTL129 JL128 ML087 JL100

Chalk Creek
CoalVille
Roberson
Leroy
Eakin
Rock Springs
Kanda
Nightingale
Coleman
Simon
Skull Creek
Clay Basin
Fidlar
Blind Canyon
Oak Spring
Greasewood

Dominion Energy
DOMINION ENERGY QUESTAR PIPELINE, LLC
SYSTEM MAP - COLORADO, UTAH, & WYOMING
0 5 10 20 Miles
Rev. 4/9/2018

OCS 2.17: With respect to the outages identified in response to DPU data request number 1.12, please provide:

a. the specific location of the problem or issue that caused the outage,
b. a description of the geographic location and extent of the outage experienced,
c. the duration of any outage,
d. a description of how the outage was resolved in order to return service to customers, and
e. whether the Company's proposed LNG plant would have prevented the outage. Please explain why or why not.

Answer:

1. Coalville:

   a. The town of Coalville is primarily fed off of a tap from Questar Pipeline's Main Line 3 (CV0001). This tap included a rotary meter for measurement. Foreign material, possibly weld slag, became lodged in the meter and caused it to bind up. This effectively shut off gas to the town.
   b. Almost the entire town of Coalville.
   c. One day to relight customers.
   d. The bound-up meter was removed and replaced. Once replaced, gas flow and service was returned to the town.
   e. The proposed LNG plant in Magna would not have prevented these outages, many of which were on small isolated systems. The LNG plant is designed and located to prevent large scale outages from a supply shortfall along the Wasatch Front.

2. Monticello:

   a. The town of Monticello is fed off of a single tap from Williams Pipeline. During routine maintenance Williams Pipeline inadvertently left one of its valves partially closed. This restricted gas flow to Dominion Energy's

Feeder Line 98 and the town of Monticello. When weather turned cold, demand exceeded upstream supply (due to the closed valve) and the town was lost.

b. The entire town of Monticello.
c. Two days to relight customers.
d. Williams Pipeline opened the closed valve. Once opened, gas flow and service was returned to the town.
e. The proposed LNG plant in Magna would not have prevented these outages, many of which were on small isolated systems. The LNG plant is designed and located to prevent large scale outages from a supply shortfall along the Wasatch Front.

3. Glendale:
    a. When Dominion Energy's Feeder Line 12 was commissioned, the line was not properly purged. This resulted in nitrogen entering the distribution system. While nitrogen is inert, it displaced enough natural gas to cause outages for customers in the area.
    b. A small portion of the Glendale neighborhood in SLC.
    c. Less than one day to relight customers.
    d. The nitrogen was then purged from the system and some blended out. Customers within the affected area were relit.

    The proposed LNG plant in Magna would not have prevented these outages, many of which were on small isolated systems. The LNG plant is designed and located to prevent large scale outages from a supply shortfall along the Wasatch Front.

4. Saratoga:
    a. At the time, the town of Saratoga was primarily fed off of a single regulator station (TG0001). This station included a rotary meter to measure gas off of Dominion Energy's Feeder Line 85 which serves the Lakeside Power Plant. Inline with this meter was an orifice plate to limit

gas flow and protect the meter from damage. On a particularly cold day, downstream demand exceeded the orifice plate's capacity and gas flow was choked off. This caused downstream pressures to drop to the point that customers were lost.

b. A portion of Saratoga Springs.
c. Less than one day to relight customers.
d. The meter was temporarily bypassed and ultimately replaced with one that had additional capacity. Once bypassed, pressures were adequate and service was restored to customers.
e. The proposed LNG plant in Magna would not have prevented these outages, many of which were on small isolated systems. The LNG plant is designed and located to prevent large scale outages from a supply shortfall along the Wasatch Front.

5. Ogden Valley:
    a. Ogden Valley is fed off of a single tap from DEQP Main Line 3 (QPC0024 in Mtn. Green) via Dominion Energy's Feeder Line 83. Gas is delivered into Feeder Line 83 through a control valve with a pressure set point. Due to a control system failure, the set point dropped below the minimum needed to maintain service to all customers in Ogden Valley.
    b. Portions of Ogden Valley.
    c. One day to relight customers.
    d. The control valve was reset. Once reset, Feeder Line 83 was packed with gas and service restored to customers.
    e. The proposed LNG plant in Magna would not have prevented these outages, many of which were on small isolated systems. The LNG plant is designed and located to prevent large scale outages from a supply shortfall along the Wasatch Front.

Prepared by: Matt Bartol, General Manager of Operations

OCS 2.18: With respect to Slide 12 of DEU's June 19, 2018 tech conference slide presentation, please provide the following information relative to any Wexpro wells that are relied upon by DEU to provide gas service to customers living along the Wasatch Front:

a. the field and gas producing basins where such wells are located,
b. any gas processing plants that are used to process gas produced from such wells,
c. any interstate pipelines through which the gas flows prior to entering the DEU distribution system,
d. the city gate interconnection through which the flows from such wells must use in order to reach the DEU distribution system.

Answer:

a. Dominion Energy Wexpro cost-of-service production comes from wells in the following fields in the Green River and Uinta Basins:
   a. Ace
   b. Big Horse
   c. Birch Creek
   d. Brady
   e. Bruff
   f. Butcherknife
   g. Canyon Creek
   h. Church Buttes
   i. Copper Ridge
   j. Creston
   k. Dry Piney
   l. Emigrant Springs
   m. Five Mile
   n. Fogarty
   o. Granger
   p. Hiawatha
   q. Horseshoe
   r. Jackknife Springs
   s. Johnson Ridge
   t. Kinney
   u. Leucite Hills
   v. Mesa
   w. North Copper Ridge

x. PPMU
y. Shute Creek
z. South Baxter
aa. Tierney
bb. Trail
cc. Wamsutter
dd. Whiskey Buttes
ee. Whiskey Canyon
ff. Powder Wash
gg. Rabbit Mountain
hh. South Baxter

b. Dominion Energy Wexpro cost-of-service production may be processed in the following facilities:
   a. Blacks Fork Plant
   b. Emigrant Trails (ET) Plant
   c. Vermillion Plant
   d. Skull Creek Plant
   e. Opal Plant
   f. Pioneer Plant

c. Dominion Energy Wexpro cost-of-service production is transported on the following pipelines:
   a. Dominion Energy Questar Pipeline
   b. Kern River Gas Transmission
   c. Northwest Pipeline
   d. Colorado Interstate Gas

d. Dominion Energy Wexpro cost-of-service production may flow through the following gate stations to the DEUWI system:
   a. Hyrum Gate Station (DEQP)
   b. Sunset Gate Station (DEQP)
   c. Little Mtn Gate Station (DEQP)
   d. Payson Gate Station (DEQP)
   e. Porter's Lane Gate Station (DEQP)
   f. Hunter Park Gate Station (Kern River)
   g. Riverton Gate Station (Kern River)
   h. Wecco Gate Station (Kern River)
   i. Central Gate Station (Kern River)
   j. Numerous smaller stations and farm taps

Prepared by: Will Schwarzenbach III, PE, Manager, Gas Supply

OCS 2.23: DEU witness Michael Platt states in his direct testimony at lines 124 to 125: "Using a 2017-2018 Design Peak Day model, I calculated that the Company would lose service to up to 650,000 customers if a supply shortfall of 150,000 Dth/day occurred."

a. If the Company lost service to 650,000 customers as described in Mr. Platt's testimony, would transportation customers located among these 650,000 customers also lose service? Please explain why or why not.
b. If the Company's proposed LNG plant prevented the loss of service to 650,000 customers as described by Mr. Platt, would the LNG plant also prevent a loss of service to any transportation customers located among these 650,000 customers? Please explain why or why not.

Answer:
a. Yes. All firm customers in the affected areas will experience outages.
b. Yes. The LNG plant would replace the shortfall amount, which would negate any effects on the system. This means that firm Transportation customers would not experience negative impacts since all impacts will be mitigated with LNG. Interruptible customers would most likely interrupted in such an event.

Prepared by: Mike Platt, Manager Engineering