- BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH -

Request of Dominion Energy Utah for Approval of a Voluntary Resource Decision to Construct a Liquefied Natural Gas Facility	DOCKET NO. 19-057-13 ORDER

ISSUED: October 25, 2019

The Public Service Commission (PSC) approves Dominion Energy Utah's (DEU) resource decision to construct a self-owned liquefied natural gas (LNG) facility.

1. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

This docket arises from DEU's Application for Voluntary Request for Approval of Resource Decision ("Application") filed with the PSC on April 30, 2019, pursuant to Utah Code Ann. § 54-17-401, *et seq*., and Utah Admin. Code R746-440-1, *et seq*. Concurrent with the Application, DEU filed a Petition for Highly Confidential Treatment and Additional Protective Measures under Utah Admin. Code R746-1-601(2)(a), which the PSC subsequently granted.[1] The Utah Association of Energy Users (UAE) and Magnum Energy Midstream Holdings, LLC ("Magnum") petitioned for and received leave to intervene in this docket.

On August 15, 2019, the Division of Public Utilities (DPU), the Office of Consumer Services (OCS), and Magnum filed direct testimony. On September 12, 2019, DEU, the OCS, and UAE filed rebuttal testimony. On September 23, 2019, DEU, the DPU, the OCS, and Magnum filed surrebuttal testimony.

On September 26 and 27, 2019, the PSC conducted a hearing on the merits of DEU's Application. DEU, the DPU, the OCS, UAE, and Magnum appeared and offered testimony.

[1] Order Regarding Petition for Highly Confidential Treatment and Additional Protective Measures Under Utah Administrative Code Rule R746-1-601(2)(a), issued May 17, 2019.

2. BACKGROUND

DEU seeks PSC approval to construct a self-owned, on-system LNG facility consisting of a 15-million gallon LNG storage tank, an amine gas-pretreatment process, a liquid nitrogen refrigeration cycle, gas vaporization facilities, and a 14-inch diameter high-pressure line. We refer to these components collectively as the "DEU-owned LNG facility" or simply "Facility." The Facility's proposed liquefaction rate is 8.2 MMcfd and the proposed vaporization rate is 150 MMcfd (or approximately 150,000 Dth/day). Application at 2. In its Application, DEU identifies the total cost of the Facility and proposes to have it in service in 2022, in time for the 2022-2023 winter heating season. Direct Testimony of Gill at 8:216-17. DEU proposes to allocate the cost and benefits of the LNG facility solely to its sales customers because it contends the Facility will be "built and used for [their] sole benefit." *See, e.g.,* Direct Testimony of Mendenhall at 18:449.

a. DEU Asserts a Significant Risk Exists that Customers Could Suffer a Service Outage as a Consequence of an Extreme Cold Weather Event or Other Unpredictable Disruption of Its Supply.

Based on historical and recent events occurring on its distribution system, and in other areas near its system, DEU contends a risk exists that a significant portion of DEU's gas supply may be disrupted during a severe cold weather event or other unpredictable event. Direct Testimony of Faust at 16:420-17:424. DEU further contends the ramifications of such a disruption could be enormous and models a scenario that would result in a loss of service to 650,000 customers. Direct Testimony of Platt at 7:170-77. DEU estimates restoring service to so many customers, under this scenario, may take as long as 51 days and cost DEU between \$10,450,000 and \$104,600,000. *Id.* at 8:210-11. The cost of such an outage to the public, measured in loss to its Gross State Product, would be far greater. Rebuttal Testimony of Platt at

2:28-30 (testifying "this loss of service would result in a negative monetary loss of between $1.4 and $2.4 billion on Gross State Product).

DEU has historically been able to manage supply disruptions on days that are not "Design Days"[2] by purchasing additional supplies and utilizing available storage. Direct Testimony of Faust at 7:161-62. However, on a Design Day, all storage resources will be fully utilized. *Id.* at 7:163. DEU concedes that "relying on purchasing additional supplies on short notice is theoretically viable for at least some supply disruptions" but contends "many of these supplies could also be disrupted, fail to materialize … and may not be available in the quantities needed, if at all, during a supply shortfall. *Id.* at 7:166-70. DEU believes an on-system storage facility will significantly improve its ability to respond to supply disruptions in the future. *Id.* at 8:178-79; *see also* Direct Testimony of Paskett at 16:321-23 (testifying that "on-system supply resources are not subject to the same threats and risks [as off-system resources] and, therefore, are a highly reliable supply resource").

b. Last Year, DEU Requested Approval to Construct a Similar Facility, and the PSC Denied the Request Largely Based on DEU's Failure to Conduct an RFP.

On April 30, 2018, DEU filed an application for approval to build a DEU-owned LNG facility, making substantially similar arguments to those it makes here. On October 22, 2018, the PSC issued an order (the "2018 Order"),[3] denying the application. In doing so, the PSC repeatedly emphasized "DEU could have followed standard industry practice by issuing a well-

---

[2] The Design Day is a day with a daily mean temperature of -5 degrees Fahrenheit or lower at the airport in Salt Lake City. Direct Testimony of Faust at 4, n.1. On a Design Day, DEU must rely on all of its current supply options to perform. *Id.* at 16:410-11.

[3] *Request of Dominion Energy Utah for Approval of a Voluntary Resource Decision to Construct a Liquefied Natural Gas Facility*, Docket No. 18-057-03 (Order issued Oct. 22, 2018).

defined RFP to identify the market options available to mitigate the specific risk DEU seeks to address in this docket."[4] The PSC ultimately found "that because DEU did not follow the common industry practice of requesting proposals from the market to address the risk it seeks to mitigate through the LNG Facility, it ha[d] not adequately supported its conclusion that its chosen solution [was] in the public interest." 2018 Order at 16.

c. To Support Its Application in this Docket, DEU Issued an RFP that It Designed with Parameters to Ameliorate Its Specific Concerns about Supply Reliability.

Mindful of the PSC's recommendation to conduct a targeted RFP,[5] DEU designed an RFP to solicit proposals to address its supply reliability issue, seeking and obtaining input from the DPU and the OCS, some of which DEU "incorporated into the final RFP." Direct Testimony of Mendenhall at 6:137-41. Ultimately, DEU determined, based on its historical experience, that the capability to replace supply at a central point ("Optimal Delivery Location")[6] in its demand center (the Wasatch Front), at a rate "up to 150,000 Dth/day … and a total annual supply availability of between 750,000-1,500,000 Dth" would be sufficient to address its concerns about a potential supply disruption.[7]

---

[4] 2018 Order at 13; *see also id.* at 15 (identifying "the weakness in DEU's evaluation process that failed to solicit proposals from the market to address DEU's specified need for additional supply reliability under weather conditions near or at design peak day parameters").

[5] Direct Testimony of Mendenhall at 5:122-28 (testifying DEU considered the PSC's observations about the failure to conduct a targeted RFP in the 2018 Order in its evaluation process).

[6] Direct Testimony of Platt at 12:292-95 (explaining "[i]n order to provide reliability for the most likely scenarios to occur, the selected resource must be capable of providing operational pressures for shortfalls at all the gate stations feeding the Wasatch Front" and "[d]elivery at the Optimal Delivery Location allows the gas to be delivered to the northern or southern extents of the connected system").

[7] Direct Testimony of Schwarzenbach at 4:88-96 (explaining that DEU has experienced a supply shortfall of over 100,000 Dth/day and that "[b]ecause DEU's system is growing, and because there is potential for weather to be much colder than it was [on the day of that incident], DEU [seeks] a higher level of supply to mitigate winter-time shortfalls").

On January 2, 2019, DEU issued an RFP utilizing these criteria. *See, e.g.,* Direct Testimony of Neale at 12:300. DEU contends the RFP, among other things, "explained in detail the purpose and scope of the RFP," "identified the requirements of a qualifying proposal," "explained the criteria that would be used for evaluation," and "noticed a planned respondent conference." Direct Testimony of Schwarzenbach at 2:51-3:60.

DEU represents it attempted to "cast a broad net" to identify all potential bidders by making the RFP publicly available on its website, directly sending the website link to all potential bidders of which it was aware, and advertising the RFP "for multiple days over a two-week period in the S&P Global Platts Gas Daily newsletter." Direct Testimony of Schwarzenbach at 3:63-71. DEU subsequently held a bidder's conference, on January 14, 2019, which more than a dozen people attended. DEU provided verbal responses to the bidder's questions at the conference and written responses "in a Question and Answer document that was posted and regularly updated on the RFP website." *Id.* at 4:81-86.

In response to the RFP, DEU received a total of six bids from three respondents. *Id.* at 5:124-27. Because the parties have designated and treated the contents of the bids as confidential, their specific contents are not discussed in this Order.

d. DEU Evaluated the RFP Results and Selected the Facility Because It Believed It to be the Optimal, Lowest Cost Solution to Its Supply Reliability Issue.

DEU represents it utilized the following price and non-price factors in evaluating all of the options, including the DEU-owned LNG facility: (1) "whether the proposal satisfies the Operational and In-Service Requirements contained in the RFP"; (2) "total annual customer cost of the proposal"; (3) "the long- and short-term impacts of the proposal, including any operational considerations"; (4) "technical, operational and financial viability of the proposal"; (5) "the impact of the proposed delivery location on DEU's system, including any resulting costs or benefits"; (6) "reliability of the proposal, including but not limited to, any operational reliability benefits and design redundancy"; (7) "the risks addressed and/or presented by the proposal"; (8) "the financial impact on DEU, if any, other than the total annual cost to customers"; (9) "other identified benefits or risks associated with the proposal"; and (10) "other factors that were determined to be relevant." Direct Testimony of Schwarzenbach at 5:110-20.

DEU presents a summary of the qualitative RFP evaluation in DEU Highly Confidential Exhibit 3.03. DEU also provides a summary of its quantitative RFP evaluation and a revenue requirement calculation for each of the proposed options, including its proposed LNG facility, in DEU Highly Confidential Exhibits 1.06 and 1.07, respectively.

DEU's quantitative evaluation includes the capital costs, contract costs, imputed debt, and credit support for the proposed projects. DEU's capital cost evaluation represents the capital investment inclusive of reinforcement costs, which DEU explains are any additional and necessary costs to the existing DEU system to ensure the proposal will provide delivery to the necessary location on DEU's system. Direct Testimony of Mendenhall at 7:171-75. Contract costs represent the annual contract costs that would be paid to the third-party provider. *Id.* at 7:179-80. DEU included an imputed debt adjustment with respect to certain bids involving lease costs, explaining these costs would be necessary for DEU to maintain its credit worthiness owing to the manner in which accounting rules require leases be treated. *Id.* at 13:311-12; *see also* Rebuttal Testimony of Mendenhall at 1:11-4:78.

DEU contends that "[a]fter a thorough review of the options proposed, [it] determined that its DEU-owned LNG facility is the most effective and lowest-reasonable cost solution for [DEU's] supply reliability needs." Direct Testimony of Gill at 15:403-05. DEU further contends the Facility offers "ancillary benefits," including (1) "allow[ing] [DEU] to provide service to certain remote communities at a greatly reduced cost when compared with the cost of traditional pipeline extensions";[8] and (2) the potential to "provide peak-hour system support and flexibility to offset purchases when supply is limited." Direct Testimony of Schwarzenbach at 28:704-05.

3. DISCUSSION, FINDINGS, AND CONCLUSIONS

The record in this docket is significant, containing voluminous testimony from a dozen witnesses and extensive exhibits. We find it impracticable and inefficient to attempt to summarize all the parties' positions or to discuss every point raised in support or in opposition to the Application. Instead, we address the evidence and points we find most salient and upon which we rely in making our findings and conclusions. The absence of discussion of any particular portion of testimony or evidence should not be construed as our declining or failing to consider it in reaching our determination.

a. Legal Standard

Chapter 17 of Title 54 (Utah Code) is titled "Energy Resource Procurement Act" (the "Act"), and governs the relief DEU seeks in this docket. The Act allows energy utilities, like DEU, to seek the PSC's approval for the acquisition of "resource decisions," broadly defined as the "acquisition, management, or operation of … a facility or process for the efficient, reliable, or safe provision of energy to retail customers." Utah Code Ann. § 54-17-401(b). Although the Act

---

[8] *Id.* at 12:318-24.

does not require the PSC approve these acquisitions, it incents utilities to seek approval by including statutory cost recovery mechanisms applicable to projects for which a utility has obtained approval. *See, e.g., id.* at § 54-17-403.

In ruling on a request for approval of a resource decision, the PSC must determine whether the decision is (a) reached in compliance with applicable statutes and administrative rules; and (b) in the public interest. *Id.* at § 54-17-402(3). In assessing whether the decision is in the public interest, the Act directs the PSC to consider: (i) "whether it will most likely result in the acquisition, production, and delivery of utility services at the lowest reasonable cost to the retail customers"; (ii) "long-term and short-term impacts"; (iii) risk; (iv) reliability; (v) financial impacts on the utility and (vi) "other factors determined by the [PSC] to be relevant." *Id.*

The PSC's order on a request for approval of a resource decision must include findings as to the approved projected costs of the resource decision and the basis upon which those findings are made. *Id.* at § 54-17-402(8).

b. DEU Complied with Applicable Statutes and Administrative Rules.

No party alleges DEU has failed to comply with the Act or Utah Admin. Code R746-440-1 or R746-440-2. Having reviewed the Application and other supporting documents in this matter, we find and conclude DEU has complied with all applicable statutes and regulations in seeking approval of its Facility.

c. We Find the Evidence Supports Our Finding that Approval of the Facility is in the Public Interest.

The PSC has previously interpreted, in Docket No. 17-035-40, how Utah Code Ann. § 54-17-402(3) applies to a resource decision.[9] In that order, we noted the statute does not dictate the weight we give to each factor in making our determination of the public interest. Rather, it enumerates factors for our consideration and allows us discretion, both to exercise our judgment in weighing them, and to consider other factors we deem relevant.

i. We find the evidence supports DEU's concerns related to supply reliability and that the cost, risk, and reliability considerations, on balance, favor approval of the Application.

Because the primary purpose for the resource decision at issue here is to address concerns about risk and reliability, these factors are intrinsically intertwined with the matter of cost. We therefore analyze these three factors together.

This matter arises out of DEU's assessment of and desire to mitigate gas supply disruption risks, beyond its control, that would prevent DEU from fully satisfying the requirements of its firm sales customers, *i.e.* would result in customers, including residential customers, losing service. DEU testified it "has experienced supply shortfalls in recent years due to unexpected weather events and other disruptions" and that "[i]f these events had occurred on colder days or been of longer duration, they would have threatened DEU's ability to provide safe and reliable service to all of its customers." Direct Testimony of Mendenhall at 2:25-34; *see also* DEU Exhibit 2.04 at 14. DEU testified the "probability of [a supply shortfall] occurring on a Design Day is 5% annually." Rebuttal Testimony of Platt at 1:17-18.

---

[9] *See Application of Rocky Mountain Power for Approval of a Significant Energy Resource Decision and Voluntary Request for Approval of Resource Decision*, Order at 16, issued June 22, 2018.

The ramifications of such an event could be catastrophic. DEU testified that a loss of 10% of supply on a "Design Day" could result in a loss of service to 650,000 customers, explaining the problem of a 10% loss may be compounded by a significant reduction in system pressure. Direct Testimony of Platt at 7:170-77. "When homes lose natural gas service they also lose their internal heat quickly" and "would reach freezing temperatures within hours" on a Design Day, according to DEU. *Id.* at 8:199-202. DEU further testified that restoring service to so many customers could take weeks (as long as 51 days) at cost estimates between $10,450,000 and $104,600,000. *Id.* at 8:210-11.

DEU asserted that such a loss of service would result "in a negative monetary loss of between $1.4 and $2.4 billion on Gross State Product." DEU represents, based on a 5% annual probability, the annual risk to the GSP is "between $70 million and $120 million." Rebuttal Testimony of Platt at 2:28-32.

Given that all of the resources in DEU's portfolio are spoken for on a Design Day and given that supply shortfalls owing to numerous causes (*e.g.,* well freeze-offs, natural disasters, human error, etc.) have occurred in the past and are highly likely to occur in the future, we find DEU's concerns about the risk attendant to disruption in its supply are legitimate and DEU should seek to implement reasonable efforts to mitigate such risk. *See, e.g.,* Direct Testimony of Paskett at 11:223-29 (testifying the "risks [DEU has identified] present legitimate threats to the safe and reliable delivery of natural gas to the DEU system").

While other parties contend DEU should "bolster its analysis" of these risks,[10] no party has disputed DEU's testimony regarding the severe consequences of a service outage stemming

[10] Direct Testimony of Wheelwright at 2:50-52.

from a supply disruption, including the time and resources necessary to restore service and the resulting public safety and health risks. As we concluded when DEU raised this issue last year, "[a] prudent utility should plan for such a low risk, but high consequence, event." 2018 Order at 12.

We must, therefore, weigh the cost and efficacy of DEU's proposed effort to ameliorate the risk of supply shortfall against the threat to reliability these risks pose and potential alternative solutions. Of course, we recognize that a sufficiently severe natural disaster or other unexpected scenario could disrupt DEU's supply or distribution to a degree for which no practical means exists to ensure continuity of service. Here, DEU has reasonably identified a real and credible risk to its supply reliability and crafted a solution to ameliorate, but of course not eliminate, that risk. *See, e.g.,* Direct Testimony of Schwarzenbach at 4:88-104 (explaining the basis of the design requirements of the RFP that DEU crafted to address the identified reliability issue).

In fact, last year, we declined to approve DEU's request largely because DEU had not conducted an RFP designed to consider alternative solutions to mitigate the identified supply reliability risk. 2018 Order at 16. The record here is altogether different.

The evidence shows DEU conducted a robust RFP targeted at addressing its supply reliability concerns, received six unique alternative bids, and DEU selected the Facility as the most cost-effective of these seven options. Indeed, while the DPU opposes approval of the Application, its outside expert, Allen Neale's, testimony is unequivocally supportive of DEU's RFP. Mr. Neale testified DEU:

(1) "Successfully issued an RFP that allowed for reliability resource bids to meet a technology-independent requirement evaluated on an objective set of performance requirements";

(2) "Conducted a robust RFP process that invited a comprehensive list of qualified bidders to participate in a fair and reasonable process, resulting in multiple qualified bids" that "allow[ed] bidders flexibility to propose alternate delivery point and volume, resulting in multiple cost-effective bids received";

(3) "Demonstrated that the proposed LNG facility appears to remain the most cost-effective option compared to the alternative bids received[.]"[11]

We find unpersuasive parties' criticism that the RFP was insufficiently broad or designed to "ensure that DEU's desired LNG facility would be the only resource that could meet DEU's newly described needs." Direct Testimony of Schultz at 7:135-36. We note the RFP resulted in multiple respondents proposing six alternative proposals, a fact that corroborates Mr. Neale's conclusion that the RFP was "robust" and allowed sufficient flexibility to ensure bidders had an opportunity to present genuine alternatives to the Facility.

Additionally, we find the evidence supports DEU's determination that the Facility offers a lower cost option than the six alternatives the RFP solicited. *See, e.g.,* Direct Testimony of Mendenhall at 18:463-19:466 (testifying the Facility will cost "about one million dollars per year less than the next lowest option). We acknowledge the bids do not provide "apples to apples" comparisons and that reasonable minds may disagree as to the appropriate manner to evaluate

---

[11] Direct Testimony of Neale at 5:125-38; *see also* Direct Testimony of Paskett at 8:153-56 (testifying "the process engaged in by DEU to assess reliability needs and identify reasonably available options to supplement [its] existing gas supply portfolio has been conducted in a reasonable manner consistent with prudent utility practices").

them – for example, the OCS's contention that the level of imputed debt in DEU's bid analysis is incorrect. However, we find the testimony of DEU and Mr. Neale demonstrate DEU reasonably concluded the Facility offered the lowest cost option.

In summary, we find DEU identified a genuine and legitimate risk to the reliability of its supply and designed an appropriate RFP to solicit multiple alternatives for addressing the risk. We further find the evidence shows the Facility will most likely result in accomplishing DEU's risk mitigation objectives at the lowest reasonable cost to its customers. Accordingly, we find the statutory considerations of risk, reliability, and cost favor our finding approval of the Facility is in the public interest.

ii. Consideration of the long- and short-term impacts support approval and no negative financial impacts on DEU have been alleged.

No party disputes DEU's showing that it has the financial capacity to construct the DEU-owned LNG facility without destabilizing its ability to raise capital and carry out its gas utility duties. We find the "financial impacts on the energy utility" consideration to be a neutral component of our analysis.

With respect to long- and short-term impacts, the DPU credibly testified that the proposed DEU-owned LNG facility will put upward pressure on retail rates. Direct Testimony of Wheelwright at 13:305-17 and 15:341-16:369. It is uncontroversial that a capital investment of the contemplated magnitude, with attendant operations and maintenance costs, will do so over the useful life of the asset and this is significant in both the short and long term. Against this upward pressure in rates over the short and long term, we measure the benefit to customers of increased reliability and the mitigation of the risk in supply disruption that underlies the request in the first instance. Having already found the risk, reliability, and cost factors support our finding approval is in the public interest, we find, on these facts, it follows that over the short and long term, the benefits of the project outweigh the costs. Therefore, we find this factor also favors approval.

iii. We deem certain ancillary benefits to the Facility support a finding it is in the public interest.

DEU testified that the DEU-owned LNG facility could be used to provide operational benefits, such as offsetting approximately 25,000 Dth/day of peak-hour service. Direct Testimony of Schwarzenbach at 26:642-43. In addition, DEU also provided high-level analysis of the opportunity to extend service to remote, currently unserved, locations at a lower cost than building pipeline facilities. Direct Testimony of Gill at 12:318-22. DEU identified three Utah communities it could serve using the DEU-owned LNG facility. DEU also provided a high-level comparison of the capital cost savings this would facilitate versus the extension of a pipeline for serving remote rural communities. *Id.* at 14:378. Finally, the DPU's witness, Mr. Neale, contends that, once constructed, the DEU-owned LNG facility might be used to accommodate major maintenance that requires shutting in a gate station for a short period of time. Direct Testimony of Neale at 19:459-62.

We conclude the ability of the DEU-owned LNG facility to offset peak-hour service pipeline contracts, accommodate major maintenance, and to possibly support extending service to remote communities are relevant factors under our analysis, and we find the record in this proceeding is sufficient to consider these factors that further support our finding approval is in the public interest.

In summary, having considered the statutory factors, we find approval of the Application is in the public interest.

d. Project Costs

Based on the results of the competitive RFP process, DEU's quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the RFP bids, and DEU's and the DPU's testimony and documentary evidence discussed in this Order and otherwise contained in the record, we find the amount presented in DEU Highly Confidential Exhibit 1.0 page 10, line 244 is the approved projected cost for DEU's self-owned LNG facility.[12] Any increase to this approved cost must be brought before the PSC in compliance with Utah Code Ann. § 54-17-404.

e. Allocation of Facility Costs

DEU's intention is to use the DEU-owned LNG facility to serve its firm sales customers. DEU believes potential transportation customer usage of the DEU-owned LNG facility can be managed through strict penalties. Rebuttal Testimony of Mendenhall at 6:116-18. The DPU's witness, Mr. Neale, recommends the PSC should require DEU to evaluate recovering an appropriate share of the costs of the DEU-owned LNG facility from transportation customers based on a future cost of service study to be conducted as part of the next rate case. UAE asserts transportation customers are responsible for their own gas supply and should not be allocated costs for a facility that is designed to mitigate supply shortfalls for DEU's firm sales customers.

---

[12] The specific cost for the DEU-owned LNG facility is in the record but is designated confidential. To preserve the confidentiality of the project-specific figures, we refer to the confidential portion of the record containing the approved projected costs.

We conclude Utah Code Ann. § 54-17-401, *et seq*., does not require a determination be made related to cost allocation and we find this is not the appropriate docket to make such a determination.

4. ORDER

Consistent with the foregoing, and based on the information included in the Application and parties' testimony:

1. We approve DEU's voluntary request for pre-construction approval of its resource decision to construct the DEU-owned LNG facility, and the project costs identified on page 10, line 244 of DEU Highly Confidential Exhibit 1.0.
2. The LNG Facility shall be designated a materially strategic resource under the provisions of the Merger Agreement approved in Docket No. 16-057-01.
3. Any increase to this approved cost must be brought before the PSC in compliance with Utah Code Ann. § 54-17-404.

DATED at Salt Lake City, Utah, October 25, 2019.

/s/ Thad LeVar, Chair

/s/ David R. Clark, Commissioner

/s/ Jordan A. White, Commissioner

Attest:

/s/ Gary L. Widerburg
PSC Secretary
DW#310496

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 20 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. §§ 63G4-401, 63G-4-403, and the Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I CERTIFY that on October 25, 2019, a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served upon the following as indicated below:

By Email:

Jenniffer Clark (jenniffer.clark@dominionenergy.com)
Dominion Energy Utah
Cameron L. Sabin (cameron.sabin@stoel.com)
Stoel Rives LLP
Counsel for Dominion Energy Utah

Phillip J. Russell (prussell@hjdlaw.com)
Hatch, James & Dodge, P.C.
Counsel for Magnum Energy Midstream Holdings, LLC

Phillip J. Russell (prussell@hjdlaw.com)
Hatch, James & Dodge, P.C.
Counsel for the Utah Association of Energy Users

Patricia Schmid (pschmid@agutah.gov)
Justin Jetter (jjetter@agutah.gov)
Robert Moore (rmoore@agutah.gov)
Steven Snarr (stevensnarr@agutah.gov)
Assistant Utah Attorneys General

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

Cheryl Murray (cmurray@utah.gov)
Office of Consumer Services

____
Administrative Assistant