

UTAH DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Division of Public Utilities

MARGARET W. BUSSE Executive Director

CHRIS PARKER Division Director

Docket No. 22-057-03 - Dominion General Rate Case

Questions for the Revenue Requirement Technical Conference – June 1, 2022

Please provide a general overview of the GRC filing and include the following information as part of the overview.

LNG Facility

- 1. Please discuss the cost increase for the LNG facility.
- 2. Did the \$211,157,307 that was originally approved by the Commission include any allowance for cost overrun or contingency? If so, please identify the amount that was included.
- 3. The increase in the thermal expansion zone was identified in the 4th quarter of 2020. Please explain why the requirement change and the potential cost increase were not presented to the Commission until this filing.
- 4. Has there been any change in the estimated O & M expense for the LNG facility since the original approval? If there is a difference, please provide a comparison of the assumed O & M cost used in the initial approval compared to the current estimate.
- 5. Please discuss and identify the amount of O & M cost that would be removed from the GRC if the electricity cost for the LNG facility is approved to be included in the 191 filing.
- 6. Please describe how the LNG facility is anticipated to be used once completed? Is the anticipated usage of the LNG facility different than other storage resources?

Infrastructure Tracker

- 7. Please explain the relationship between Infrastructure Tracker Revenue recorded for 2019, 2020, and 2021; and the relationship with \$80.4 million allowed in base rates.
- 8. What causes the variation in the revenue numbers in 2019, 2020, and 2021?
- 9. What year does the \$80.4 Infrastructure allowance in base rates from the prior GRC relate to?
- 10. How is the \$80.4 million treated to prevent being charged inadvertently to ratepayers twice (ie included in base rates in the prior GRC and later included in the Tracker rate adjustment).
- 11. Please explain the \$77.4 million proposed as Exhibit 1.06

Other

12. Please discuss the impact the pandemic may have had on historical costs that will be included in historical averages or base year calculations.

- 13. Are there any pandemic-related costs that are included in the rate effective period?
- 14. Please explain the \$250,000 non-labor cost savings initiative for 2023. (Exhibit 3.09 Line 59)
- 15. Please discuss the \$272 million in actual capital spending in 2020 compared to the \$253 million amount authorized by the Commission in Docket No. 19-057-02.
- 16. Please discuss the significant changes in the lead-lag study
- 17. Please discuss any impact that the pandemic may have had on the calculation of the lead-lag study.