STATE OF ALASKA

THE REGULATORY COMMISSION OF ALASKA

3 Before Commissioners: Robert M. Pickett, Chairman 4 Stephen McAlpine 5 Rebecca L. Pauli Norman Rokeberg 6 Janis W. Wilson 7 In the Matter of the Tariff Revision Designated) as TA285-4 Filed by ENSTAR NATURAL GAS) 8 U-16-066 COMPANY, A DIVISION OF SEMCO) 9 ENERGY, INC. 10

ENSTAR NATURAL GAS COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO THE OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S FIRST SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS ON ENSTAR'S REPLY TESTIMONY (AG-ENSTAR-R1)

Pursuant to 3 AAC 48.155 and 3 AAC 48.141-145, ENSTAR Natural Gas Company ("ENSTAR") hereby provides its response to the Attorney General's First Set of Discovery Requests on ENSTAR's Reply Testimony ("AG-ENSTAR-R1"), as follows:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Discovery in this docket is not complete. As discovery proceeds, facts, information, evidence, documents, and other matters may be discovered which are not set forth in these responses, but which may be responsive to these discovery requests. The following responses are complete based on ENSTAR's current knowledge, information, and belief. Furthermore, these responses were prepared based on

U-16-066 - ENSTAR's Response to AG's First Discovery Requests on ENSTAR's Reply Testimony

May 8, 2017 Page 1 of 96

Date: 8 June 17 Exh # # 27
Regulatory Commission of Alaska
By: 1 U-16-066

Northern Lights Realtime & Reporting, Inc. (907) 337-2221

2526

1

2

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

ENSTAR's good faith interpretation of the discovery requests and are subject to correction for inadvertent errors or omissions, if any.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

- 1. ENSTAR objects to requests for documents relating to confidential settlement negotiations. Any and all answers ENSTAR provides in response to these data requests will be provided subject to, and without waiving, this objection.
- 2. ENSTAR objects to the production of documents, calculations, and analyses that do not exist. A document is not within a party's "possession, custody, or control" if it does not exist.
- 3. ENSTAR objects to each and every data request insofar as they are vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, or use terms that are subject to multiple interpretations but are not properly defined or explained for purposes of these data requests. Any and all answers ENSTAR provides in response to these data requests will be provided subject to, and without waiving, this objection.
- 4. ENSTAR objects to each and every data request insofar as it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and is not relevant to the subject matter of this proceeding.
- 5. ENSTAR objects to providing information to the extent such information is already a matter of public record. The requesting party is not entitled to require other parties to gather information that is equally available and accessible to it.

U-16-066 – ENSTAR's Response to AG's First Discovery Requests on ENSTAR's Reply Testimony May 8, 2017
Page 2 of 96

6. ENSTAR objects to each and every data request insofar as it seeks documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege or the work product privilege. Nothing contained in these responses is intended as, or shall in any way be deemed, a waiver of any such privilege or protection, or any other applicable privilege or doctrine.

7. ENSTAR objects to the instructions contained in AG-ENSTAR-R-1. In responding to the requests, ENSTAR will abide by the Regulatory Commission of Alaska's ("RCA") discovery regulations and where applicable, Alaska Rules of Civil Procedure.

DISCOVERY RESPONSES

AG-ENSTAR-R1-1. Refer to the attached document titled "AltaGas; AltaGas to acquire WGL Holdings, Enhancing a leading, North American diversified energy infrastructure company, dated January 25, 2017 (computer file named 2017-01-25 – Pr Blue Jay Rollout deck (1PM MT) – Final_rfs.pdf).

- (a) Admit that the document is a true and accurate copy.
- (b) If the response to subpart (a) is anything other than an unqualified admission of the truth of the matter asserted, provide a true and accurate copy of the document.
 - (c) Admit that this document is a presentation to AltaGas shareholders.

U-16-066 – ENSTAR's Response to AG's First Discovery Requests on ENSTAR's Reply Testimony May 8, 2017
Page 3 of 96

(b) See the response to subpart (a) above.

Person(s) Supplying Information: Daniel Dieckgraeff.

AG-ENSTAR-R1-25. Refer to the Prefiled Reply Testimony of Daniel M. Dieckgraeff at 59 referencing meals disallowed by RAPA. Refer to Exhibit DMD-14 (Attachment 1b), Miscellaneous Expense Items Disallowed by RAPA as Local Food/Snacks, second line, G/L Date 6/18/2015, "Pizza for Bike Safety Lunch."

- (a) Explain what this is and explain how bike safety is part of the provisioning of gas utility service to ENSTAR ratepayers.
- (b) Refer to DMD-14 (Attachment 1c) Miscellaneous Expense Items Disallowed by RAPA as Local Food/Snacks, the last entry dated 12/30/2015, for Johansen, "lunch during RCA hearing." Admit that the RCA online calendar for that date does not show a hearing for ENSTAR or any other utility.
- (c) If the response to subpart (b) is anything other than an unqualified admission of the truth of the matter asserted, state what ENSTAR believes the truth of the matter to be.
- (d) Refer to DMD-14 (Attachment le) Miscellaneous Expense Items Disallowed by RAPA as Local Food/Snacks, entry dated 8/31/2015, "golf for Mr. Sims." Explain how golf for Mr. Sims is part of the provisioning of gas utility service to ENSTAR ratepayers.

Response:

U-16-066 – ENSTAR's Response to AG's First Discovery Requests on ENSTAR's Reply Testimony May 8, 2017
Page 46 of 96

- (a) ENSTAR employees drive well over a million miles a year in the course of their duties (1.5 million in 2015 and 1.4 million in 2016, for example). They share the road with bikes and encouraging bike safety awareness with riders that share the streets with our employees helps to make the streets safer and reduce potential bike/vehicle accidents. Further, as part of its wellness and safety programs, ENSTAR supports bike safety awareness for its employees. Keeping employees safe both on and off the job helps keep ENSTAR's medical insurance costs lower, resulting in lower rates for customers.
- (b) Admit, but the general ledger date of that entry is not the same as the date of the activity. The actual meal charge was on September 2, 2015 which was a day when there was a public hearing at the RCA. See the attached document labeled ENS07900-07901, with redactions applied to portions of the document that are irrelevant to this response.
- (c) See response to subpart (b) above.
- (d) The activity in question was a golf outing with the President and Vice-President of ENSTAR and Mr. Kirk Gibson of Hilcorp, a third party who is instrumental to ENSTAR's ability to obtain gas for its customers. ENSTAR included this charge in meal charges because the receipt shows beverage charges. For purposes of rebutting RAPA's proposed disallowance, ENSTAR identified it as "incidental," but it could very appropriately be charged to business meetings. As is the case in any business, not all meetings take place in the office. See the

U-16-066 - ENSTAR's Response to AG's First Discovery Requests on ENSTAR's Reply Testimony May 8, 2017
Page 47 of 96

attached document labeled ENS07902-07903, with redactions applied to portions of the documents that are irrelevant to this response.

Person(s) Supplying Information: Daniel Dieckgraeff; John Sims.

AG-ENSTAR-R1-26. Refer to the Prefiled Reply Testimony of Daniel M. Dieckgraeff at 74 that refers to normalizing consumption of customers for weather, and that also states in part: "Second, in ENSTAR's last rate case, U-14-111, it proposed a 'normalized use per customer' adjustment that generated significant disagreement between ENSTAR and RAPA, with a significant amount of discovery, testimony, and resources for both parties consumed by the subject."

- (a) Admit that the disputed issue in U-14-111 was declining use per customer, not weather normalization.
- (b) If the response to subpart (a) is anything other than an unqualified admission of the truth of the matter asserted, state what ENSTAR believes the truth of the matter to be.

Response:

- (a) Admit that declining use per customer was a disputed issue in that case, not weather normalization per se; however, RAPA witness Lance Kaufman spent several pages of his testimony criticizing ENSTAR's weather normalization model.
- (b) See the response to subpart (a) above.

U-16-066 – ENSTAR's Response to AG's First Discovery Requests on ENSTAR's Reply Testimony May 8, 2017
Page 48 of 96