**A.14-11-003 and A.14-11-004 Sempra Utilities’ 2016 TY GRC**

**TURN Data Request**

**Data Request Number:** TURN-SCG-2 (Gas Distribution)

**Date Sent:** January 14, 2015

**Response Due:** January 29, 2015

Please provide an electronic response to the following questions. A hard copy response is unnecessary. The response should be provided on a CD sent by mail or as attachments sent by e-mail to the following:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Bob Finkelstein  The Utility Reform Network (TURN)  785 Market Street, Suite 1400  San Francisco, CA 94103  [bfinkelstein@turn.org](mailto:bfinkelstein@turn.org) | Garrick Jones  JBS Energy  311 D Street, Suite A  West Sacramento, CA 95605  [garrick@jbsenergy.com](mailto:garrick@jbsenergy.com) |  |

For each question, please provide the name of each person who materially contributed to the preparation of the response. If different, please also identify the Sempra Utilities witness who would be prepared to respond to cross-examination questions regarding the response.

For any questions requesting numerical recorded data, please provide all responses in working Excel spreadsheet format if so available, with cells and formulae functioning.

For any question requesting documents, please interpret the term broadly to include any and all hard copy or electronic documents or records in the possession of either of the Sempra Utilities.

These questions are associated with the testimony in SCG-4 (Gas Distribution) and the supporting workpapers.

1. In its forecast of Gas Distribution Capital Expenditures, SoCalGas proposes replacement of Leak Detection Equipment in Exhibit 4 CWP, pp. 224-227. The Business Justification statement on p. 224 states the lifespan of electrical and optical components in existing leak detection technology is 7 to 8 years.
   1. Regarding handheld leak detection equipment, discussed on p. 224 of Exh. 4 CWP,
      1. Please provide the age, or distribution of ages of the handheld leak detection equipment, or other existing leak detection equipment, which the handheld equipment would replace. Please identify and describe the number of units and the capabilities of the leak detection equipment being replaced.
      2. Please provide all analysis conducted by SoCalGas in determining the reduction in costs or increase in leak detection efficacy or efficiency due to purchase of the new handheld equipment.
      3. When would SoCalGas have the technology available to utilize the Bluetooth capability of the proposed new equipment? Please provide all analysis of the cost savings resulting from that capability and identify each location in this application of any additional costs related to implementing it.
   2. Regarding multi-gas detectors and support equipment discussed on p. 225 of Exh. 04 CWP,
      1. Please provide the number and age or distribution of ages of the leak detection equipment which the handheld equipment would replace.
      2. Please identify and explain the material differences in capabilities between the existing equipment being replaced and the proposed multi-gas replacement units.
      3. Please provide all analysis conducted by SoCalGas regarding cost savings resulting from replacing existing equipment with the multi-gas detectors.
      4. Please provide all analysis conducted by SoCalGas regarding the increase in leak detection efficacy or efficiency from replacement of the existing leak detectors with the multi-gas detectors.
   3. Regarding the GIS-Based Leak Survey Tracker, discussed on p. 227 of Exh. 04 CWP
      1. Please provide the results of all analysis conducted by SoCalGas regarding cost savings and safety improvement resulting from application of this equipment.
      2. Are there any other costs or forecasted expenditures related to implementation of this technology? If so, please indicate where each such expenditure is addressed or identified in this application, and the forecast cost of each such expenditure.
   4. Please describe and explain the conditions under which field personnel use a multi-gas detector, and the conditions under which those personnel use a leak detector.
2. Please provide two confidential documents provided to DRA in response to their DR 30:
   1. ORA-SCG-DR-030-DAO\_Q1\_CONFIDENTIAL.pdf
   2. ORA-SCG-DR-030-DAO\_Q4\_CONFIDENTIAL.pdf
3. Regarding Gas Distribution O&M expenses and the Field O&M – Leak Survey forecast on Exh. 04 WP, p. 15:
   1. Please provide the end-of-year leak survey footage on SoCalGas’ system for each year from 2008 through 2013.
   2. For the leak survey footage provided for each year in a. above, please provide the number of feet subject to a five-year survey cycle and the number of feet subject to a three-year survey cycle.
4. Regarding the Field O&M – Main Maintenance forecast on Exh. 04 WP p. 43:
   1. Please explain the “gas leak backlog” noted on p. 42 under “Forecast Explanations”, including –
      1. The number of located, unrepaired main leaks at the end of each year from 2009 through 2013.
      2. The number of located, unrepaired main leaks, by grade (1, 2 and 3) at the end of each year from 2009 through 2013.
      3. The forecast backlog of located, unrepaired main leaks at the end of each year from 2014 through 2018, assumed in SoCalGas funding proposal.
      4. The forecast number of new leaks found in each year from 2014 through 2018, by grade (1, 2 and 3).
5. Regarding the Field O&M – Service Maintenance forecast on Exh. 04 WP p. 53:
   1. Please explain the “gas leak backlog” noted on p. 53 under “Forecast Explanations”, including –
      1. The number of located, unrepaired service leaks at the end of each year from 2009 through 2013.
      2. The distribution of located, unrepaired service leaks, by grade (1, 2 and 3) at the end of each year from 2009 through 2013.
      3. The forecast backlog of located, unrepaired service leaks at the end of each year from 2014 through 2018, assumed in SoCalGas funding proposal.
      4. The forecast number of new service leaks found in each year from 2014 through 2018, by grade (1, 2 and 3).
6. Regarding the Field O&M – Field Support forecast on Exh. 04 WP p. 63: SoCalGas’ forecast of Field Support FTE in the 2012 GRC, Exh. 2 WP, p. 115 included 198 FTE in 2012, a figure that was 8 to 18 FTE over the FTE recorded figures for 2012 and 2013 as presented in the 2016 GRC. SoCalGas’ workpapers refer to “increased regulatory pressures” (2016 GRC Exh. 04 WP p. 62) occurring since the 2012 forecast was made.
   1. Please explain how SoCalGas completed the additional work outlined in its 2012 GRC workpapers (2012 GRC Exh. 02 WP p. 115) and absorbed the “increased regulatory pressures” noted in this filing with the lower staffing levels as compared to the 2012 GRC forecast.
   2. Please explain how SoCalGas incorporated these efficiencies into its current forecast of FTE required for these functions.