

- BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH -

In the Matter of the Formal Complaint of)
Steve Sorenson vs. Questar) DOCKET NO. 06-057-05
)
) ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR
) RECONSIDERATION
)

ISSUED: October 4, 2006

By The Commission:

On August 23, 2006, the Commission issued its Report and Order in this docket dismissing the complaint of Complainants Steve C. Sorenson and Darlene M. Sorenson based on our conclusion that Respondent Questar Gas Company (“Questar”) had violated no provision of statute, rule, or tariff in providing an estimated bill for the period during which Complainants’ gas meter had failed to properly register their actual gas usage.

On September 18, 2006, Complainants filed a Response to Decision of Hearing (“Response”) which we treat as a request for reconsideration. In their Response, Complainants: (1) assert they were not given the benefit of an independent, third-party inspection of their gas meter; (2) question whether there is any way a meter can over-charge or over-measure the amount of natural gas used; and (3) claim our Order does not address anything about the difference in electricity usage relative to the natural gas usage at their residence.

Having reviewed these claims, we are satisfied that the evidentiary record adequately addresses each of Complainants’ concerns¹ and that our Order based on that record

¹Specifically, the hearing transcript at page 41 makes clear that a representative of the Division of Public Utilities was present during the inspection of Complainants’ meter. In addition, at transcript pages 54-55, Questar presents unrefuted testimony that inspection of the meter disclosed no condition that would cause the meter to “over read”. Finally, regarding the claim that we did not consider Complainants’ evidence of reduced electricity usage, we point to our discussion and conclusion regarding this issue in our Order at pages 5-6 and 8.

DOCKET NO. 06-057-05

-2-

rightly concludes Questar's final adjustment to Complainants' bill is in accordance with all statutory, administrative, and tariff requirements for estimated billing adjustments resulting from a nonregistering meter.

We understand and accept Complainants' assertions that during the disputed period they took action to reduce natural gas usage at their residence. We commend and encourage such conservation efforts. However, absent any direct and reasonable evidence that would enable us to quantify the results of their conservation efforts, we must affirm our earlier conclusion that Questar's final billing adjustment of May 10, 2006, reasonably estimates Complainants' actual gas usage for the period in question. With respect to Complainants' responsibility to pay the \$141.54 billing adjustment, we simply note Commission Rule 746-320-8E requires Questar to permit Complainants to pay this amount over a period of time at least as long as the time period covered by the billing adjustment. We encourage Questar to work with Complainants to provide them a reasonable period of time not less than that noted above to pay this amount.

Wherefore, it is hereby ORDERED that the request for reconsideration filed on September 18, 2006, by Complainants Steve C. Sorenson and Darlene M. Sorenson is denied.

DOCKET NO. 06-057-05

-3-

DATED at Salt Lake City, Utah, this 4th day of October, 2006.

/s/ Ric Campbell, Chairman

/s/ Ted Boyer, Commissioner

/s/ Ron Allen, Commissioner

Attest:

/s/ Julie Orchard
Commission Secretary
G#50795