

April 16, 2019

Docket No. 19-057-09

Reply - Formal Complaint of Brett Robinson and
Brad Crookston against Dominion Energy Utah

Public Service Commission,

We welcome the opportunity to present all of the facts of our complaint at a hearing. We understand that a scheduling conference may be required prior to the actual hearing. We respectfully request that the hearing and/or conference when possible be held in the Logan area. This may provide the opportunity for all of the parties including the Presiding Officer a chance to inspect the "Development" which may provide important insight.

We also wish to clarify a few points Dominion Energy provided in their response.

4 North Logan City did not require a "public road with a dead end at the east end for the purpose of future development of future properties". The road in fact stops roughly 163' short. There is a "Remainder Parcel" between the end of the road and the adjacent parcel. We agreed with North Logan City to leave a separate parcel left undeveloped so that a future road and infrastructure could potentially go there. In addition, none of the other Utility Companies required their infrastructure to go beyond the existing development through or around the "Remainder Parcel".

#15 and #16 To be clear, there would be no complaint if Dominion Energy did not "Propose" and ultimately has required that we pay for infrastructure unrelated to our development. Under Utah Code Ann. 54-3-1. The "service rendered" is not "just and reasonable".

#24 Whatever new development that may occur in the future will include the "Remainder Parcel – Parcel A" of the current development.

26 and # 28 Yes, had the gas line ended at the road the next developer would have to pick up the costs; however, in no way would that have been unfair to them. The next development will be roughly 7.75 acres. North Logan City will allow 8 lots. At a maximum the next development will require roughly 1,326 LF of gas line. That is 165 LF per lot. We have installed 900 LF and three lots or 300 LF per lot. Had we been required to install 450 LF instead of 900 the numbers would be roughly proportional to each other. There are no "sidewalks, driveways, curbs, landscaping etc." and there are no plans to install anything that would be significant. We would like to explore in the hearing how Dominion Energy is somehow interested in limiting the costs of a future development while maximizing the current costs.

29 and # 30 We recognize that there will be much construction and disturbance in the future. We do not know when this will occur. This may very well be many decades away? Adding the gas line at a later date would have been much preferable and insignificant to the overall future project.

#31 “The adjacent property had planted an orchard within the public utility easement, resulting in the Complainants requesting for the Company to select an alternate route to avoid disturbing the existing trees.” The sequence of events is opposite of this. The public utility easement was provided in 2018. The trees had been in place for 30 or 40 years. The gas line should have never been proposed in the public utility easement. In nearly all cases the Main Lines are within the public roadway easement. The modification of the route did not increase the length and we fail to see how it increased the costs for the main extension.

In no way is this small list all-inclusive. We are hopeful that many of these issues can be flushed out further at the time of the hearing. It is not reasonable that Section 11.1 of Dominion Energy’s Guideline would justify violating Utah State Code as spelled out in 54-3-1 and 54-3-2.

We are requesting the reimbursement of roughly half of the \$8,438 paid. Additionally, we are asking that the portions of the pipeline not relevant to the current development be uninstalled.

We appreciate the Mission of the Division of Public Utilities to “promote the public interest in utility regulation and works to assure that all utility customers have access to safe, reliable service at reasonable prices.”

Thank You,

Brett Robinson

Brad Crookston