

Public Service Commissi

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: April 14, 1995

TO: Bruce Page, Esquire

Kenneth A. Hoffman, Esquire and William B. Willingham, Esquire

Wilton R. Miller, Esquire and Mark K. Logan, Esquire

Edward Tancer, Esquire

FROM: Beth Culpepper

RE:

Docket No. 950307-EU

VIA FACSIMILE

This is just to remind you that the PSC staff will be holding an Issue Identification meeting at 2:00 p.m., Thursday, April 20, 1995, in Conference Room 233 of the Fletcher Building. We will discuss the issues to be addressed in Docket No. 950307-EU. You are invited to attend this meeting.

ACK _

AFA _____ I have included a list of standard issues that will be covered at the meeting:

STAFF'S PRELIMINARY LIST OF ISSUES DOCKET NO. 950307-EU

CMU ____

CAF

What is the geographical description of the disputed area? CTR ISSUE 1:

LEG

What is the nature of the disputed area, including population, type of utilities seeking to serve it, degree of urbanization and proximity to other urban areas, and the present and reasonably foreseeable future requirements of the area LIN for other utility services?

What is the expected customer gas usage and population growth in the SEC disputed area?

WAS -

Does either utility presently have facilities for the distribution of natural gas OTH ISSUE 4: in the disputed area?

Which utility has historically served in the vicinity of the disputed area? ISSUE 5:

ISSUE 6:

What is the present location, purpose, type, and capacity of each utility's

existing facilities in or adjacent to the disputed area?

ISSUE 7:

Is each utility capable of providing adequate and reliable natural gas service

to the disputed area?

ISSUE 8: What additional facilities would each party have to construct to provide service to the disputed area?

Docket No. 950307-EU

Notice of Issue Identification Meeting
Page 2

- <u>ISSUE 9:</u> Does each party have arrangements in place for interstate pipeline capacity and gas supplies sufficient to enable it to provide the service proposed in the disputed area without detriment to its other ratepayers?
- <u>ISSUE 10:</u> What would be the cost to each utility to provide natural gas service to the disputed area?
- ISSUE 11: According to each party's plan for the expansion of its facilities, when would each phase of its expansion be completed?
- <u>ISSUE 12:</u> Are the parties' projections of new customers, and the revenue to be derived therefrom, reasonable?
- <u>ISSUE 13:</u> What would be the effect on each utility's ratepayers if it is awarded the disputed area?
- <u>ISSUE 14:</u> What would be the effect on each utility's ratepayers if it is not awarded the disputed area?
- **ISSUE 15:** What is the customer preference in the disputed area?
- ISSUE 16: Has unnecessary and uneconomic duplication of natural gas facilities occurred in the vicinity of the disputed area or in other areas served by the parties?
- <u>ISSUE 17:</u> Are there other areas of potential conflict between the parties?
- <u>ISSUE 18:</u> Are the parties bound by a territorial agreement?
- ISSUE 19: How does each party propose to expand the provision of natural gas service to new and existing (a) residential, (b) commercial, and (c) industrial customers in the disputed area?
- ISSUE 20: Which party should be awarded the disputed area?
- **ISSUE 21:** Should this docket be closed?