

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S

HEARING OFFICER: JORDAN A. WHITE
FOR DIVISION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES:
PATRICIA E. SCHMID, ESQ.,
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
160 East 300 South, Fifth Floor
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

FOR OFFICE OF CONSUMER SERVICES:
BRENT COLEMAN, ESQ.,
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
160 East 300 South, Second Floor
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

FOR QUESTAR GAS COMPANY:
JENNIFFER NELSON CLARK, ESQ.,
QUESTAR GAS COMPANY
333 South State Street
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

* * *

1	I N D E X	
2	WITNESS	Page
3	KELLY MENDENHALL	
4	EXAMINATION	5
	BY MS. CLARK	
5		
	CAROLYN ROLL	
6		
	EXAMINATION	8
7	BY MS. SCHMID	
8	DAN MARTINEZ	
9	EXAMINATION	11
	BY MR. COLEMAN	
10		
	KELLY MENDENHALL	
11		
	EXAMINATION	19
12	BY MS. CLARK	
13	CAROLYN ROLL	
14	EXAMINATION	23
	BY MS. SCHMID	
15	EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)	27
	BY MS. SCHMID	

* * *

E X H I B I T S

18	No.	Page Received
19		
20	QGC 1	7
21	DPU 1	9
22	QGC 2	21
23		
24		
25		

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead and go on the
3 record. Anyone else we're waiting for or are we--okay.

4 Good morning. This is the time and the place for
5 the duly noticed hearing in the following dockets: Docket
6 No. 13-057-16, In the Matter of the Application of Questar
7 Company--Questar Gas Company to amortize the Conservation
8 Enabling Tariff Balancing Account; and Docket No. 13-057-17,
9 In the Matter of Application of Questar Gas Company to
10 Change the Infrastructure Rate Adjustment.

11 My name is Jordan White. The Commission has asked
12 me to act as a presiding officer for these hearings. I want
13 to inform the parties I have a recording, along with the
14 court reporter who is here today also.

15 Let's go ahead and--go ahead and take appearances.
16 We'll start over here with Questar.

17 MS. CLARK: Thank you. Jenniffer Nelson Clark
18 appearing on behalf of Questar Gas Company. And I have with
19 me Kelly Mendenhall.

20 MS. SCHMID: Patricia E. Schmid with the attorney
21 general's office representing the Division of Public
22 Utilities. And with me is Carolyn Roll.

23 And Hearing Officer White, I have a hard time
24 hearing you. Is your microphone on?

25 THE HEARING OFFICER: Is it on? Can you hear me?

1 MS. SCHMID: Thank you.

2 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thanks for pointing that
3 out.

4 MR. COLEMAN: Brent Coleman with the attorney
5 general's office on behalf of the Office of Consumer
6 Services. And with me I have Danny Martinez.

7 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.

8 Okay. Why don't we go ahead and start with the 16
9 docket, which is the CET docket. This is Questar's
10 application, so Ms. Clark, why don't you go ahead and
11 proceed if that's okay.

12 MS. CLARK: Thank you. I have Kelly Mendenhall
13 with me to testify on behalf of the Company. Don't know if
14 you want to swear him.

15 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah, that'd be great.

16 Why don't you go ahead and raise your right hand.
17 Do you solemnly swear to tell the whole truth and nothing
18 but the truth?

19 MR. MENDENHALL: Yes.

20 KELLY MENDENHALL,
21 being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as
22 follows:

23 EXAMINATION

24 BY MS. CLARK:

25 Q Could you please state your full name and your

1 business address for the record?

2 A Sure. My name is Kelly Mendenhall. I'm the
3 director of regulatory affairs for Questar Gas. And my
4 address is 333 South State, Salt Lake City, Utah.

5 Q And what position do you hold at Questar Gas?

6 A Director of regulatory affairs.

7 Q Thank you. In that capacity, did you oversee and
8 participate in the preparation of the application and
9 exhibits submitted in this docket?

10 A Yes, I did.

11 Q And were you also able to review the action
12 request response submitted by the Division of Public
13 Utilities on November 18th, 2013?

14 A Yes, I did.

15 Q And did you also review the memorandum submitted
16 by the Office of Consumer Services dated November 22nd,
17 2013?

18 A Yes, I did.

19 Q Do you adopt the application and its exhibits as
20 your testimony today?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Can you please summarize the relief the Company
23 has requested and also provide any response to comments set
24 forth in the two memorandums referenced?

25 A Sure. In Docket No. 13-057-16, the application of

1 Questar Gas Company to amortize the conservation enabling
2 tariff balancing account, the Company proposes to amortize
3 the September 2013 undercollected balance of \$1.4 million.

4 This undercollection amounts to about a \$1.3 million
5 increase in the amount that is currently being collected
6 through the conservation enabling tariff. And this change
7 in the rate will result in a \$1.20, or about 0.17 percent,
8 annual increase to the typical general service customer's
9 bill.

10 On November 22nd, the Office of Consumer Services
11 filed a memo that raised some concerns regarding how the CET
12 mechanism was working. The Company's had the opportunity to
13 meet with both the Division and the Office and--to explain
14 that the CET mechanism is working as it was designed and
15 intended.

16 The Company is requesting that the proposed
17 changes be made effective December 1st, 2013.

18 That concludes my summary.

19 MS. CLARK: The Company would move for the
20 admission of its application and the attached exhibits as
21 Questar--or let's call it QGC Exhibit 1.

22 THE HEARING OFFICER: Any objections?

23 It's received.

24 MS. CLARK: Thank you.

25 THE HEARING OFFICER: Do we have--

1 MS. CLARK: Mr. Mendenhall is available for
2 questions.

3 THE HEARING OFFICER: Ms. Schmid?

4 MS. SCHMID: No questions.

5 MR. COLEMAN: The Office has nothing.

6 THE HEARING OFFICER: Ms. Schmid?

7 MS. SCHMID: Thank you. The Division would like
8 to call Ms. Carolyn Roll as its witness. Could Ms. Roll
9 please be sworn?

10 THE HEARING OFFICER: Raise your right hand. Do
11 you solemnly swear to tell the whole truth and nothing but
12 the truth?

13 MS. ROLL: Yes.

14 CAROLYN ROLL,
15 being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as
16 follows:

17 EXAMINATION

18 BY MS. SCHMID:

19 Q Good morning.

20 A Good morning.

21 Q Could you please state by whom you are employed,
22 your position, and your business address?

23 A Yes. My name is Carolyn Roll, R-o-l-l. And I am
24 a utility analyst with the Division of Public Utilities. My
25 business address is 160 East 300 South in Salt Lake City,

1 Utah.

2 Q Thank you. On behalf of the Division, have you
3 participated in this docket, Docket No. 13-057-16?

4 A Yes, I did.

5 Q Did you participate in the preparation and filing
6 of the Division's memorandum dated November 18th, 2013, that
7 covered both Docket No. 13-057-16 and 13-057-17?

8 A Yes, I did.

9 Q Do you have any changes or corrections to that
10 memorandum?

11 A I do not.

12 Q Do you adopt that memorandum as your testimony in
13 this 16 docket?

14 A Yes, I do.

15 MS. SCHMID: The Division would like to request
16 the admission of what the Division would call DPU Hearing
17 Exhibit 1. And that would be the November 18th memorandum
18 that covers both Docket 16 and Docket 17.

19 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
20 Any objections to receipt of that evidence?

21 MS. CLARK: No.

22 THE HEARING OFFICER: It's received.

23 MS. SCHMID: Thank you.

24 BY MS. SCHMID:

25 Q Do you have a summary to prepare--to give today?

1 A Yes, I do.

2 Q Please proceed.

3 A Thank you. Docket No. 13-057-16, known as the
4 CET, or conservation enabling tariff, asks for the
5 Commission approval to amortize the September 2013
6 undercollected balance of 1,443,547. The Division has
7 reviewed--reviewed and supports the application and the
8 calculations as submitted by the Company. And if this
9 docket is approved as submitted, a typical--excuse me--GS
10 customer will realize an increase of--in their annual bill
11 of \$1.20.

12 In response to the--the memo from the Office, the
13 Division had agreed that we should evaluate the concerns
14 that the--the Office brought up. And we did meet with the
15 Company, as Mr. Mendenhall stated, and we are in agreement
16 that the CET is operating as intended.

17 That concludes my summary.

18 Q Ms. Roll, is it the Division's testimony and
19 position that the CET numbers be adopted on an interim basis
20 in this docket?

21 A Yes. Those numbers will be reviewed when the
22 audit is completed by the Division, and at that time we will
23 request that they become permanent.

24 Q Thank you.

25 Ms. Roll is now available for questions.

1 THE HEARING OFFICER: Ms. Clark?

2 MS. CLARK: I have no questions. Thank you.

3 THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Coleman?

4 MR. COLEMAN: Nothing from the Office.

5 THE HEARING OFFICER: And I will probably have
6 questions for--along with Mr. Mendenhall after--after we get
7 through with the Office.

8 Okay. Mr. Coleman?

9 MR. COLEMAN: The Office would call Mr. Martinez.

10 THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead and raise your
11 right hand. Do you solemnly swear to tell the whole truth
12 and nothing but the truth?

13 MR. MARTINEZ: Yes.

14 DAN MARTINEZ,

15 being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as
16 follows:

17 EXAMINATION

18 BY MR. COLEMAN:

19 Q Would you state your name and business address for
20 the record, please?

21 A My name is Dan Martinez. I am a utility analyst
22 with the Office of Consumer Services.

23 Q Business address?

24 A My business address is 160 East 300 South in Salt
25 Lake City, Utah.

1 Q Did you prepare the memorandum submitted November
2 22nd, 2013, in Docket 13-057-16 on behalf of the Office?

3 A I did.

4 Q Can you summarize the Office's position with
5 respect to this docket?

6 A Yes. The Office had concerns for potential
7 unintended consequences due to migration of customers from
8 the GS class to the TS class. We have met with the Company
9 and at this time do not oppose the application of the
10 Company. And they have explained circumstances around
11 this--these concerns.

12 Q Do you have any changes to the memorandum dated
13 November 22nd, 2013?

14 A No.

15 Q Do you have any--anything further to summarize the
16 Office's position?

17 A No.

18 MR. COLEMAN: At this time the Office would move
19 for admission of the November 22nd, 2013--

20 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. Didn't hear.

21 MR. COLEMAN: --would move admission of the
22 November 22nd, 2013, memo into the record.

23 THE HEARING OFFICER: Any objections?

24 MS. CLARK: No.

25 THE HEARING OFFICER: Hearing none, it's received.

1 Why don't we go ahead just--everyone's calling it, I guess,
2 Office Hearing Exhibit 1.

3 MR. COLEMAN: Sure.

4 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Great.

5 Any cross, Ms. Clark?

6 MS. CLARK: No, thank you.

7 THE HEARING OFFICER: Ms. Schmid?

8 MS. SCHMID: None.

9 THE HEARING OFFICER: I do have a couple of
10 questions. I'll just go ahead and start off with the
11 Division, Ms. Roll. The concerns outlined in the
12 Office--Office's memorandum, how--what is the--I guess the
13 Division's plan to address those? I mean, I know there's
14 going to be an audit, and from my understanding, there has
15 not been an audit yet on the CET. Is it the Division's
16 intention that there would be an audit on the accounting
17 along with an actual evaluation of the design of the
18 mechanism?

19 MS. ROLL: Well, the audit of the CET is verifying
20 the number of customers that are in the GS class, because at
21 the time of the last rate case, the Commission ordered the
22 level of revenue that was collected per customer was set in
23 that order. So that does not change, and it hasn't changed,
24 and that's what's been verified.

25 So as far as any additional--I mean . . .

1 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah, I guess what I'm
2 asking is--I mean, I agree that--I mean, the tariff is what
3 it is, and--you know, that's, you know, essentially what
4 you're verifying is, you know, the accounting number of
5 customers, I guess, basically the delta between what's
6 allowed and what was--you know, etc.

7 I guess I just am wondering: In looking at the
8 Office's memorandum, they talk about these concerns, and it
9 says, "The Division agrees that these topics warrant
10 additional evaluation and has represented to the
11 Office . . . it will address our concerns in its ongoing
12 investigation." Is "the investigation" meaning the audit
13 that would address the concerns, which in my mind, I
14 guess--I see them as design issues. Is that . . .

15 MS. ROLL: From the Division's perspective, our
16 investigation was meeting with the Company--

17 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

18 MS. ROLL: --to go through and verify that it is
19 working as--as ordered.

20 THE HEARING OFFICER: So those have been
21 addressed, then, meaning the concerns that--those have been
22 addressed by meeting with the Company and--okay.

23 MS. ROLL: From the Division's perspective, yes.

24 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Is that also,
25 Mr. Martinez, the Office's perspective, that those have been

1 addressed, the concerns?

2 MR. MARTINEZ: Yes. I think that the Office's
3 meeting with the Company yesterday addressed the concerns
4 that we had with respect to this matter.

5 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Do you mind if I ask
6 what--how those were addressed, I guess? I mean, the
7 concerns are out there, but how--

8 MR. MARTINEZ: Sure.

9 THE HEARING OFFICER: --other than just meeting?

10 MR. MARTINEZ: Absolutely. There were two things
11 that I think that were--I think there was an understanding
12 by myself personally that the CET was to only--the
13 decoupling mechanism within the CET was to pick up DSM
14 savings only. The Company explained that that was not the
15 case, there was full decoupling mechanism--

16 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. There was a what
17 mechanism?

18 MR. MARTINEZ: I'm sorry.

19 THE REPORTER: Slow down a little bit.

20 MR. MARTINEZ: There was a decoupling mechanism, a
21 full decoupling mechanism in place which recovers other
22 revenues besides DSM savings-derived revenues.

23 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

24 MR. MARTINEZ: And so that was cleared up.

25 And then the second point of the--the Company

1 explained the CET mechanism, the accounting, which gave us a
2 better understanding of how the CET was collecting, and then
3 how they were booking the revenues within the GS class,
4 which also helped us to understand how the mechanism was
5 working. We did not oppose the way the accounting was
6 working. We just needed to understand how those savings and
7 revenues were derived.

8 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Thank you.

9 Is there anything additional you want to add,
10 Mr. Mendenhall, or--

11 MR. MENDENHALL: I would love to, if I could just
12 maybe explain--

13 THE HEARING OFFICER: Sure.

14 MR. MENDENHALL: --maybe give you a quick synopsis
15 of what we talked to the Division and Office about.

16 So as Mr. Martinez said, and Ms. Roll, back in
17 2009, when we set the allowed revenue per customer, that's--
18 that's based on kind of a snapshot in time and--and it's
19 based on an average amount of revenue per customer. But as
20 time goes on, your customer mix is going to change. You
21 know, every time you add a customer, a customer leaves, that
22 customer mix is going to change.

23 And as was mentioned, it is a full decoupling
24 mechanism, so it's designed to capture changes in--in usage
25 up or down from a variety of factors. And so from that

1 standpoint, we feel like it's doing what it's supposed to
2 do.

3 In terms of, you know, what happens when some
4 large customers leave, that definitely will impact the
5 average usage, but we don't believe that that is the driver
6 of--of the increase we're asking for today. It has a small
7 part to do with it, but the main driver is the decrease in
8 usage of all the residential customers. That--that--that
9 dwarfs the change in usage from--we had about 200 customers
10 switch to TS class. Of those 200, you're probably looking
11 at about a hundred that left from the GS class. So
12 definitely has an impact but is not the main driver in the
13 request we're asking for today. So I'd make those points.

14 And then the other thing that we discussed is, you
15 know, the Commission kind of has some safeguards in place
16 with this mechanism to keep things from going out of
17 control. One is, you know, right now we're kind of on a
18 three-year cycle, so every three years we come in and we--we
19 evaluate the allowed revenue per customer. We reset it
20 based on the new customer mix. So every three years, we're
21 able to evaluate it. And that--that is one safeguard in
22 place.

23 The other is that when we--when the CET was
24 originally filed, we had a cap, so the Company's not allowed
25 to accrue more than 5 percent of--of distribution non-gas

1 revenue in that account. So that's another kind of
2 safeguard the Commission has put in place to keep--keep this
3 mechanism from going out of control.

4 So we think--because it is a full decoupling
5 mechanism, it was contemplated that any usage would be
6 captured. And we think that combined with the safeguards in
7 place, we feel comfortable with the way the mechanism's
8 working. You know, the entries on a month-by-month basis
9 are small, which is what we had always anticipated when we
10 set out with the mechanism. So from that standpoint, we're
11 comfortable with where we're at now.

12 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. That's very
13 helpful.

14 While I have--I did have one question with respect
15 to applications as Exhibit 1.2. On the second row down, you
16 know, you have the--you know, there's the CET amortization
17 amounts, the revenue, and then the decatherm. I guess that
18 column with the decatherms, those are projected. And where
19 was--where does that projection come--is that tied to the
20 IRP, or where do those actual decatherms--

21 MR. MENDENHALL: Yes. Yeah, typically it comes
22 from the IRP. So these would be the same volumes that we
23 would use if we were to file a pass-through.

24 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

25 MR. MENDENHALL: So yeah, it's usually the IRP

1 projected volumes that we use.

2 THE HEARING OFFICER: All right. Thank you.
3 That's all--is there anything else on respect to the CET
4 docket before we move on to the next docket? Anything else
5 to address?

6 MS. CLARK: No.

7 MS. SCHMID: Nothing more from the Division.

8 MR. COLEMAN: No.

9 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Thank you. Let's go
10 ahead and move on to Docket 13-035-17 [sic], which is the--
11 Questar's infrastructure rate adjustment.

12 Ms. Clark?

13 MS. CLARK: Thank you.

14 KELLY MENDENHALL,
15 being previously duly sworn, was examined and testified as
16 follows:

17 EXAMINATION

18 BY MS. CLARK:

19 Q Mr. Mendenhall, in your capacity as an employee of
20 Questar Gas, did you oversee the preparation of the
21 application and attached exhibits in Docket No. 13-057-17?

22 A Yes, I did.

23 Q And you testified earlier that you had reviewed
24 respective memorandum from the Division of Public Utilities
25 and the Office of Consumer Services that addressed the

1 docket we just completed talking about and this 17 docket.

2 Did you review those with regard to the comments in this
3 docket as well?

4 A Yes, I did.

5 Q Do you adopt the contents of Questar Gas Company's
6 application and the attached exhibits in this docket as your
7 testimony as well?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Can you please summarize the relief the Company is
10 requesting?

11 A Sure. In Docket No. 13-057-17, the application of
12 Questar Gas Company to change the infrastructure rate
13 adjustment, the Company is proposing to adjust the
14 infrastructure rate to include investment related to high-
15 pressure infrastructure replacement projects that occurred
16 since August of 2013. The majority of this investment comes
17 from three projects: Feeder Line 8 in Midvale, Feeder Line
18 14 in Tooele, and Feeder Line 20 in South Weber. The
19 Company is requesting a \$2.8 million increase in annual
20 revenue. And if approved, this would increase the typical
21 GS customer's annual bill by \$2.33 per year, or 0.33
22 percent. And the Company's requesting that all the proposed
23 changes be made effective December 1st, 2013.

24 MS. CLARK: I would move at this time for the
25 admission of Questar Gas Company's application in this

1 docket and the accompanying exhibits as Questar Gas--or QGC
2 Exhibit 2. Excuse me.

3 THE HEARING OFFICER: Any objection?

4 BY MS. CLARK:

5 Q Mr. Mendenhall, one more--I'm sorry.

6 THE HEARING OFFICER: I hear no objections. It's
7 received.

8 MS. CLARK: Thank you.

9 BY MS. CLARK:

10 Q Mr. Mendenhall, one more question: Can you speak
11 briefly to the combined effect if the two dockets discussed
12 today were both granted?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Thank you.

15 A So the impact of both dockets results in an
16 overall increase to the typical general service customer of
17 about \$3.53 a year, or about half a percent. And in its
18 applications, the Company has prepared combined tariff
19 sheets to show the impact that both of these requests would
20 have on the general service class. The combined GS tariff
21 sheet is provided in Exhibit 1.5 of Docket 13-057-16. And
22 it's also provided in Exhibit 1.6 of Docket 13-057-17. The
23 tariff sheets for the other classes have been provided in
24 Exhibit 1.5 of 13-057-17. Because the other classes aren't
25 affected by the CET, there's no need to do a combined tariff

1 sheet for those, so . . .

2 That's it.

3 MS. CLARK: Thank you.

4 Mr. Mendenhall is available for further questions.

5 THE HEARING OFFICER: Ms. Schmid?

6 MS. SCHMID: No questions.

7 THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Coleman?

8 MR. COLEMAN: Nothing from the Office.

9 THE HEARING OFFICER: I have no further questions.

10 Why don't we go ahead and take a short recess.

11 I'm sorry. Yes.

12 MS. SCHMID: The Division's--

13 THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh.

14 MS. SCHMID: --memorandum also covered Docket 17.

15 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. I apologize.

16 MS. SCHMID: I'd like to address that, if I may.

17 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah. Thanks for the

18 reminder. Yeah, why don't we go ahead and do that,

19 Ms. Schmid.

20 MS. SCHMID: Thank you.

21 And a procedural question: As the two dockets
22 appear to have been combined for hearing but not for
23 decision, does Ms. Roll need to be sworn in again or does
24 her previous swearing in still apply?

25 THE HEARING OFFICER: I think she's still under

1 oath, so I think it's . . .

2 MS. SCHMID: Perfect. Thank you.

3 CAROLYN ROLL,

4 being previously duly sworn, was examined and testified as

5 follows:

6 EXAMINATION

7 BY MS. SCHMID:

8 Q Ms. Roll, did you participate on behalf of the
9 Division in Docket No. 13-057-17, which is the
10 infrastructure rate adjustment docket?

11 A Yes, I did.

12 Q Did you prepare and cause to be filed the
13 Division's memorandum filed November 18th?

14 A Yes, I did.

15 MS. SCHMID: This has previously been admitted for
16 the 16 docket as DPU Exhibit 1, and I would like to request
17 that it be admitted for the 17 docket as DPU Hearing
18 Exhibit 1 as well, please.

19 THE HEARING OFFICER: Any objections?

20 MS. CLARK: No.

21 THE HEARING OFFICER: It's received.

22 BY MS. SCHMID:

23 Q Ms. Roll, do you adopt the November 18th
24 memorandum, insofar as it addresses Docket 17, as your
25 testimony?

1 A Yes, I do.

2 Q Any changes or corrections?

3 A No.

4 Q Do you have a summary to give?

5 A A very brief summary.

6 Q Please proceed.

7 A Docket No. 13-057-17 is a request to increase the
8 infrastructure rate component of the DNG rates for all
9 customers. The Division has not reviewed the detailed
10 invoices used by the Company in deriving the dollar amounts
11 that are included in this filing and therefore recommends
12 that these rates be approved on an interim basis.

13 The effect of the proposed rates on a typical GS
14 residential customer will be an increase in their annual
15 bill of \$2.33 per year. At the time that the Division
16 completes the audit of the Infrastructure Tracker, then we
17 will submit a request to have those rates be permanent.

18 MS. SCHMID: Thank you.

19 Ms. Roll is now available for questions.

20 THE HEARING OFFICER: Ms. Schmid?

21 MS. CLARK: No.

22 THE HEARING OFFICER: I'm sorry. Ms. Clark.

23 MS. CLARK: No, thank you.

24 THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Coleman?

25 MR. COLEMAN: Nothing from the Office.

1 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Now, I know that the
2 Office had not submitted comments on the infrastructure
3 docket. Is there anything you'd like to address with
4 respect to those?

5 MR. COLEMAN: No, the Office has nothing further
6 on the infrastructure docket.

7 THE HEARING OFFICER: The witnesses are excused.
8 Why don't we go ahead now and take a brief recess
9 and come back momentarily.

10 (Recess taken, 10:23-10:29 a.m.)

11 THE HEARING OFFICER: Let's go ahead and go back
12 on the record.

13 One kind of administrative question, I guess--and
14 this--I know you're still not sworn. I excused you, but I
15 don't know if it's necessary to swear you back in. The
16 question I have is: Is it--is it Questar's intention that
17 they are offering this--the tariff sheets you mentioned
18 earlier for approval?

19 MR. MENDENHALL: Yes.

20 THE HEARING OFFICER: Would you mind, just for the
21 record, identifying those specifically just so we can have
22 that, if that's okay?

23 MR. MENDENHALL: I might need a moment.

24 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Do you want to go off
25 the record just for a minute?

1 MS. CLARK: Do you mind?

2 (A discussion was held off the record.)

3 THE HEARING OFFICER: Let's go ahead and go back
4 on the record.

5 MR. MENDENHALL: So yes, the Company would like to
6 submit those tariff sheets for final approval. So the--
7 there's a combined general service tariff sheet that takes
8 both dockets into account, and that's shown in Exhibit 1.5
9 of Docket 13-057-16 and Exhibit 1.6 of Docket 13-057-17.

10 THE HEARING OFFICER: But also--are those numbered
11 or is there a sheet number? Or what is the actual . . .

12 MR. MENDENHALL: You mean the tariff sheet?

13 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah.

14 MR. MENDENHALL: Yeah. So it would be--there's no
15 page number right now, but it would be Section 2.02.

16 And then for the other rate classes, those would
17 be found in--hold on a sec.

18 THE HEARING OFFICER: Why don't we just go off the
19 record just for a minute. That's fine.

20 (A discussion was held off the record.)

21 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Good. Why don't we
22 go ahead and go back on the record.

23 As we left, Mr. Mendenhall was going to identify
24 the specific tariff sheets that Questar was speaking
25 approval for in this proceeding.

1 MR. MENDENHALL: Okay. So it's probably easiest
2 just to go to Docket 13-057-17.

3 MS. CLARK: Yeah.

4 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

5 MR. MENDENHALL: So the GS combined tariff sheets
6 are shown in Exhibit 1.6. And then the tariff sheets for
7 the FS class, that would be Section 2.03. For the NGV
8 class, that would be Section 2.04. For the--is that all we
9 have?

10 MS. SCHMID: Huh-uh (Negative).

11 MR. MENDENHALL: TS as well?

12 MS. SCHMID: Don't you have . . .

13 MR. MENDENHALL: Section 4.02 would be the IS rate
14 schedule. Section 5.05 would be the firm transportation, or
15 FT-1 rate schedule. And Section 5.06 would be the MT rate
16 schedule. And Section 5.07 would be the TS rate schedule.
17 And I believe that would be it.

18 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.

19 Ms. Schmid, does the Division have a comment on
20 that?

21 MS. SCHMID: Yes.

22 EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)

23 BY MS. SCHMID:

24 Q Ms. Roll, did you examine the filed tariff sheets
25 on behalf of the Division?

1 A Yes, I did.

2 Q And does the Division have a recommendation
3 regarding the approval of the aforementioned tariff sheets?

4 A Yes. We believe that the tariff sheets as filed
5 are correct.

6 Q So do we recommend approval?

7 A Yes, we do, on an interim basis.

8 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. And so those
9 tariff sheets cover both--okay. Great.

10 Okay. Is there anything else? The Office,
11 comments or--

12 MR. COLEMAN: Nothing from the Office.

13 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Appreciate everyone's
14 participation today. Having considered Questar's
15 applications, the comments filed in these dockets, the
16 testimony presented today, and the fact that the
17 applications are unopposed, the Commission approves the
18 applications in Dockets No. 13-057-16 and 13-057-17
19 effective December 12th, 2013, on an interim basis until
20 such time as the Division completes the audit of the entries
21 in the respective accounts. The tariff sheets are approved
22 as filed, as described by Mr. Mendenhall.

23 After the completion of such audits, the
24 Commission directs the Division to issue memos to the
25 Commission--

1 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. There was a little
2 bit--

3 THE HEARING OFFICER: Sorry about that.

4 THE REPORTER: "The Commission directs the
5 Division to issue . . ."

6 THE HEARING OFFICER: --memos to the Commission
7 with recommendations regarding making the requested rate
8 changes in these dockets permanent.

9 MS. SCHMID: I have just one question.

10 THE HEARING OFFICER: Sure.

11 MS. SCHMID: The effective date is to be?

12 THE HEARING OFFICER: Yeah. Didn't I say December
13 1st, 2013?

14 MS. SCHMID: Thank you.

15 THE HEARING OFFICER: No problem. Sorry about
16 that.

17 MR. COLEMAN: You said the 12th, just--I think--

18 THE HEARING OFFICER: Oh, did I really? I
19 apologize. December 1st, 2013. Good correction.

20 MS. SCHMID: Thank you.

21 THE HEARING OFFICER: So we have the applications
22 approved, the tariff sheets approved.

23 With that, the Commission will issue written
24 orders memorializing these bench orders in due course. And
25 before we adjourn, is there anything additional that needs

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

to be addressed?
Appreciate everyone, and have a happy
Thanksgiving. Thank you. We're adjourned.
(Proceedings concluded at 10:37 a.m.)



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, SCOTT M. KNIGHT, a Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Utah, residing at South Jordan, Utah;

That the proceedings were reported by me in stenotype and thereafter caused by me to be transcribed into typewriting, and that a full, true, and correct transcription of said proceedings so taken and transcribed is set forth in the foregoing pages, inclusive.

I further certify that I am not of kin or otherwise associated with any of the parties to said cause of action, and that I am not interested in the event thereof.

Scott M. Knight, RPR
Utah License No. 110171-7801

