

Application No.: A.08-09-  
Exhibit No.: SCG – 1  
Date: September 29, 2008  
Witness: Michelle M. Mueller

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY  
ADVANCED METERING INFRASTRUCTURE**

**CHAPTER I  
SOCALGAS AMI VISION AND POLICY**

**Prepared Direct Testimony  
of  
Michelle M. Mueller**

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**September 29, 2008**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>2</b>
A.	Energy Action Plan .....	2
B.	Commission’s Policy on Advanced Metering Infrastructure .....	3
<b>III.</b>	<b>SOCALGAS GAS AMI VISION AND POLICY.....</b>	<b>4</b>
A.	SoCalGas’ AMI Proposal is Supportive of the State’s Energy Policy .....	5
B.	SoCalGas AMI Provides Substantial Operating Benefits .....	6
C.	SoCalGas AMI Provides Other Societal Benefits .....	6
D.	SoCalGas AMI System Will Be Capable of Integrating Water Meters .....	7
<b>IV.</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF SOCALGAS AMI DEPLOYMENT PLAN.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>VI.</b>	<b>WITNESS QUALIFICATIONS.....</b>	<b>9</b>

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 This chapter presents: (i) the Southern California Gas Company’s (“SoCalGas”) vision  
3 for enabling its customers to better manage their natural gas consumption through the use of  
4 advanced metering infrastructure (“AMI”) technology; and, (ii) an overview of SoCalGas’  
5 proposed strategy for deploying AMI.

6 There are four compelling reasons for the California Public Utilities Commission  
7 (“Commission” or “CPUC”) to adopt SoCalGas’ proposed gas AMI system. First, the proposal  
8 is consistent with and supportive of the State’s Energy Action Plan’s (“EAP”) endorsement of  
9 energy conservation. SoCalGas’ AMI system will provide individual customers with access to  
10 energy usage and cost information to manage their energy bills by changing their energy  
11 consumption behavior. The demand side conservation is described in the testimony of Mr. J.C.  
12 Martin in Chapter VI. Second, the proposal provides substantial operational efficiencies that will  
13 benefit SoCalGas customers. SoCalGas witness Mr. Edward Fong presents the economic  
14 justification for pursuing AMI deployment for 6 million SoCalGas meters in Chapter II. The  
15 testimony of Mr. Mark Serrano in Chapter III describes the operational benefits that would  
16 accrue to SoCalGas customers. These operational benefits offset approximately 84.5% of the  
17 cost of the AMI system. Together with the reasonable demand side conservation benefits  
18 described by Mr. Martin, the proposal is cost-effective for SoCalGas’ customers. Third, the  
19 proposal provides significant environmental benefits, as identified in Mr. Martin’s testimony in  
20 Chapter VI. And finally, the proposal offers the potential for a communications network capable  
21 of being used by water companies to promote water conservation and better water management.

22 For these reasons, SoCalGas requests Commission authorization to proceed with an  
23 investment of \$1.09 billion to implement a gas AMI system in its service territory during the  
24 2009 – 2015 period including installation of AMI technology on 6 million gas meters.

25 Specifically, SoCalGas requests the following:  
26  
27  
28

- 1 • Expedited approval of initial funding of \$12.4 million for program management set-up  
2 activities and to initiate pre-deployment information systems work as is described in  
3 more detail in the testimony of Mr. Serrano in Chapter III and Mr. Christopher Olmsted  
4 in Chapter IV, respectively.<sup>1</sup>
- 5 • Approval for the installation of natural gas AMI modules and meters, an AMI  
6 communications network and implementation of information technology systems  
7 beginning in 2011 as is described in more detail in the testimonies of Mr. Serrano in  
8 Chapter III and Mr. Olmsted in Chapter IV.
- 9 • Authority to establish a balancing account to record the difference between the authorized  
10 revenue requirement and actual operations and maintenance (“O&M”) and capital-related  
11 costs associated with an investment of \$1.09 billion for full deployment of the proposed  
12 SoCalGas AMI as is described in more detail in the testimony of Ms. Allison Smith in  
13 Chapter VIII.

## 15 **II. BACKGROUND**

### 16 **A. Energy Action Plan**

17 The State has demonstrated that it is committed to pursuing various policy objectives to  
18 determine the right blend of conservation and infrastructure investments that meet California’s  
19 needs. The State’s Energy Action Plan (“EAP”), which was adopted in 2003, states the  
20 following about natural gas usage:

21  
22 “California’s demand for natural gas also is increasing. Currently the state uses 2  
23 trillion cubic feet of natural gas per year. Historically, the primary use of this fuel  
24 was for space heating in homes and businesses. ...Overall, natural gas use is

---

25  
26 <sup>1</sup> Pre-deployment funding identified in Mr. Serrano and Mr. Olmsted’s testimonies are in direct cost dollars (Mr.  
27 Serrano: O&M=\$1.0 million, capital=\$0.6 million; Mr. Olmsted: O&M=\$0.1, capital=\$7.3 million; Mr. Martin:  
28 O&M=\$0.1; contingency = \$1.1 million and Overheads, escalation, taxes= \$2.1 million. Total = \$12.4 million. A  
detailed table is included in Mr. Fong’s testimony.

1 growing by 1.6 percent per year. Eighty-five percent of natural gas consumed in  
2 California is supplied by pipelines from sources outside the state.”<sup>2</sup>

3 Furthermore, the EAP states the following:  
4

5 “In implementing this plan, the agencies are mindful that energy services – both  
6 natural gas and electric – are essential to every Californian’s general welfare and  
7 to the health of California’s economy. As actions to improve the reliability of  
8 these services are considered, the agencies will each take into account the effect  
9 the action will have on energy expenditures, the environment and climate change,  
10 and the overall economy. Alternatives to proposed actions will be evaluated in an  
11 integrated fashion, consider the cost of action or inaction, and consider the  
12 equitable distribution of costs among customer classes and groups.”<sup>3</sup>  
13

#### 14 **B. Commission’s Policy on Advanced Metering Infrastructure**

15 The CPUC and the California Energy Commission (“CEC”) conducted a four year  
16 investigative study and rulemaking proceeding on “Advanced Metering, Demand Response and  
17 Dynamic Pricing”, R.02-06-001. In this rulemaking, the three major electric utilities under  
18 Commission jurisdiction were directed to file applications to deploy AMI systems. Additionally,  
19 the State’s Energy Action Plan (EAP I & II) clearly established that demand side management  
20 (conservation, energy efficiency and demand response) is the preferred or first option that must  
21 be considered in the “loading order” when attempting to balance future energy needs.

22 As a result, the Commission has authorized funding for AMI deployment for Pacific Gas  
23 & Electric (“PG&E”) in Decision (D.) 06-07-027 and San Diego Gas & Electric (“SDG&E”) in  
24 D.07-04-043. PG&E and SDG&E are combined gas and electric utilities and funding for their  
25 AMI projects includes installation of gas communication modules (gas modules) on gas meters  
26

---

27 <sup>2</sup> State of California Energy Action Plan, Adopted May 8, 2003 by the CPUC, pp. 4.

28 <sup>3</sup> IBID, pp. 8

1 to provide daily meter reads. PG&E received authorized funding of approximately \$1.7 billion  
2 to install AMI on 5.1 million electric meters and 4.2 million gas meters.<sup>4</sup> SDG&E received  
3 authorized funding of approximately \$570 million to install AMI on 1.4 million electric meters  
4 and 900,000 gas meters. Most recently, the Commission adopted a settlement agreement  
5 between Southern California Edison Company (“SCE”) and the Division of Ratepayer  
6 Advocates (“DRA”) in D.08-09-039 that will allow \$1.63 billion in ratepayer funding for SCE’s  
7 proposed AMI project to install approximately 5.3 million AMI electric meters.

### 9 **III. SOCALGAS GAS AMI VISION AND POLICY**

10 SoCalGas proposes to join the other major California natural gas investor owned utilities  
11 (“IOU”) by deploying a gas AMI system in its service territory during the 2009 – 2015 period to  
12 enable its customers to better control and manage their energy bills with access to timely natural  
13 gas usage information and to realize the substantial operational and environmental benefits  
14 associated with a gas AMI system. The operating benefits will cover approximately 84.5% of  
15 the AMI project life cycle costs, higher than any of the other AMI applications thus far.

16 SoCalGas believes customers will utilize the information provided by the AMI system to lower  
17 their gas usage. Along with the reduced cost of operations, should residential customers reduce  
18 natural gas consumption by 1%, installation of the network will more than pay for itself. In  
19 addition, deployment of a SoCalGas gas AMI system will eliminate over 6.3 million vehicle  
20 miles each year as manual meter reading is eliminated, thus reducing greenhouse gas emissions  
21 by over 3,000 tons of CO<sub>2</sub> per year upon completion of the full deployment. These climate  
22 impacts are societal benefits in excess of the customer savings that will be realized.

23 SoCalGas’ proposed gas AMI will collect hourly gas meter reads and transmit 2-3 times  
24 per day back to utility data servers. This timely gas usage data can be used to project the  
25 customer’s monthly gas bill and as a result, SoCalGas can proactively provide this information to

26 <sup>4</sup> PG&E has requested an additional \$623 million of funding to upgrade the PG&E AMI electric meter to solid state  
27 technology with integrated AMI communications in application, A.07-12-009. PG&E later revised the upgrade  
costs to \$572 million.

1 customers to alert them to increased gas usage, out-of-pattern usage and potentially significantly  
2 higher bills if the customer does not take some action to reduce gas usage.

### 3 4 **A. SoCalGas' AMI Proposal is Supportive of the State's Energy Policy**

5 The State's EAP and EAP II have clearly articulated sets of actions of critical importance  
6 that need to be undertaken immediately. The first priority is to meet California's energy growth  
7 needs while optimizing energy conservation and resource efficiency.<sup>5</sup> Energy conservation  
8 applies to natural gas as well as electric usage. As with electricity, current gas customers receive  
9 a monthly bill showing monthly usage (consumption). The monthly consumption information  
10 displayed on the customer's bill is an "after the fact" statement, sometimes as much as 30-34  
11 days after the actual customer behavior or action that may have caused an increase in their gas  
12 usage. PG&E and SDG&E's AMI deployment will allow their respective customers to have  
13 access to timely electric as well as gas energy usage information. In both cases, customers will  
14 have greater capabilities to manage their gas and electric energy usage with information tools  
15 and automated controls.

16 With the State's commitment to gas AMI in the PG&E and SDG&E service territories,  
17 almost 5.1 million of the State's gas meters will be on a gas AMI system by the time SoCalGas  
18 begins deployment in 2011. SoCalGas customers should have the same opportunity as other  
19 customers to benefit from energy management and savings opportunities that may result from the  
20 availability of timely customer gas usage information.

21 A clear void will occur if SoCalGas' customers are not able to access the same  
22 information on daily and hourly gas usage as PG&E and SDG&E gas customers. This lost  
23 opportunity will therefore have adverse impacts on the following goals stated in the EAP:

- 24 • Encouraging and promoting energy conservation and efficiency as the first priority<sup>6</sup>

25  
26 <sup>5</sup> Energy Action Plan II, Implementation Roadmap for Energy Policies, September 21, 2005, State of California,  
California Public Utilities Commission and Energy Commission, pp.3

27 <sup>6</sup> IBID, pp. 5

- 1 • Providing alternative solutions in the face of anticipated rising natural gas prices<sup>7</sup>
- 2 • Reducing greenhouse gas emissions.<sup>8</sup>

### 3

#### 4 **B. SoCalGas AMI Provides Substantial Operating Benefits**

5 Relative to the other California IOUs that have already received Commission approval to  
6 implement an AMI solution, SoCalGas has the highest portion of AMI costs covered through  
7 tangible operating benefits. Specifically, over the project life cycle, approximately 84.5% of the  
8 costs are covered by operating benefits. This level of operating benefits is substantially greater  
9 than the AMI business cases put forth by PG&E, SCE and SDG&E. These operating benefits are  
10 returned to SoCalGas customers in future years and represent decreases in future utility revenue  
11 requirements.

#### 12

#### 13 **C. SoCalGas AMI Provides Other Societal Benefits**

14 In September, 2006, Governor Schwarzenegger signed Assembly Bill (“AB”) 32, which  
15 establishes the State’s leadership role in the effort to reduce GHG emissions.<sup>9</sup> The bill sets the  
16 ambitious goal of reducing statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Over 6.3 million  
17 vehicle miles and over 3,000 tons of carbon dioxide emissions (CO<sub>2</sub>) will be eliminated annually  
18 upon full deployment of the SoCalGas AMI. Although these benefits are societal in nature and  
19 difficult to quantify, SoCalGas notes these benefits support high-priority State policies, and a  
20 range for the value of the estimated CO<sub>2</sub> reductions is calculated in Mr. Martin’s testimony  
21 (Chapter VI).

22

---

23 <sup>7</sup> Energy Action Plan II, Implementation Roadmap for Energy Policies, September 21, 2005, State of California,  
24 California Public Utilities Commission and Energy Commission, pp. 10, “Because natural gas is becoming more  
25 expensive, and because much of electricity demand growth is expected to be met by increases in natural gas-fired  
26 generation, reducing consumption of electricity and diversifying electricity generation resources are significant  
27 elements of plans to reduce natural gas demand and lower consumers’ bills. California must also promote  
28 infrastructure enhancements, such as additional pipeline and storage capacity, and diversify supply sources to  
include liquefied natural gas (LNG).

<sup>8</sup> IBID, pp. 2. “In addition, EAP II highlights the importance of taking actions in the near term to mitigate  
California’s contributions to climate change from the electricity, natural gas and transportation sectors.”

<sup>9</sup> Assembly Bill (AB) 32 (Stats. 2006, Ch. 488).



1  
2 **D. SoCalGas AMI System Will Be Capable of Integrating Water Meters**

3 SoCalGas recognizes the State's priority and urgency in encouraging and enabling water  
4 conservation.<sup>10</sup> SoCalGas' request for proposal included a requirement for an AMI technology  
5 capable of reading water meters. The State's aggressive water conservation goal of 20%  
6 reduction in per capita water consumption by 2020<sup>11</sup> is providing impetus for many water  
7 agencies to evaluate AMI systems for water meters. AMI technology would allow for the  
8 identification of leaks and speed their repair, resulting in potentially significant water savings.

9 SoCalGas has actively communicated its interest in working with the major Southern  
10 California water agencies as the SoCalGas' AMI system is deployed. Many of the technical  
11 challenges faced by gas AMI are similar to those of water AMI. Specifically, gas and water  
12 communication modules require a battery power source. SoCalGas has approximately 200,000  
13 meters located in underground (curb) vaults, similar to many water meters. Although water AMI  
14 has not been identified as a cost or a benefit in SoCalGas' AMI business case, the capability to  
15 extend the SoCalGas AMI system to water meters has the potential to provide significant  
16 operational benefits to water agencies and their customers in the SoCalGas service territory.

17  
18 **IV. SUMMARY OF SOCALGAS AMI DEPLOYMENT PLAN**

19 SoCalGas urges the Commission to approve its request for expedited pre-deployment  
20 funding of \$12.4 million so that project planning, vendor selection and initial critical path IT  
21 activities can proceed without delay. SoCalGas' proposed deployment will start in 2009 (or as  
22 soon as the Commission authorizes) with the initial 18-24 months required for AMI software  
23 development and SoCalGas information systems integration. Mass deployment of AMI gas  
24 modules will begin in 2011. SoCalGas plans to install approximately 6.0 million gas modules  
25 and replace almost 1.1 million AMI incremental gas meters by year-end 2015.

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>10</sup> CPUC Water Action Plan, December 15, 2005, pp. 7-11.

28 <sup>11</sup> Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, February 28, 2008, Letter to State Senate

1  
2 **V. CONCLUSION**

3 SoCalGas requests that the Commission authorize and approve the SoCalGas AMI  
4 proposal. SoCalGas' proposal supports and is consistent with Commission direction for  
5 integrated electric, gas and water management. Specifically, the SoCalGas AMI system will  
6 complete the deployment of AMI for the major California IOUs. The deployment of SoCalGas'  
7 AMI is cost effective for ratepayers and provides additional societal benefits. Leveraging  
8 effective use of technology to enable the State's policies regarding electric, gas and water end-  
9 use management with customers, major utilities and municipalities will not be possible if AMI is  
10 not deployed with the base of almost 6.0 million meters in SoCalGas' service territory.

1 **VI. WITNESS QUALIFICATIONS**

2 My name is Michelle M. Mueller. My business address is 555 West Fifth Street, Los  
3 Angeles, California 90013-1011.

4 I am employed by the utilities as the Vice President of Customer Operations in the  
5 Customer Services Department for SoCalGas and SDG&E. I hold a Bachelor of Arts degree in  
6 Communications from Eastern Michigan University. I have a Master of Arts degree in Mass  
7 Communications from Morehead State University in Kentucky. I have a Masters of Business  
8 Administration from Syracuse University.

9 I have been employed by the utilities since 1999, and have held positions of increasing  
10 responsibilities in the customer service departments. I have been in my current role as Vice  
11 President of Customer Operations since January of 2008. In my current position, I am  
12 responsible for meter reading, billing, credit and collections, remittance processing and related  
13 groups for both utilities.

14 Prior to working for the utilities I held positions in management and technical services for  
15 QUALCOMM, The Titan Corporation, Linkabit and other technical firms.

16 I have not previously testified before the Commission.

17  
18 This concludes my prepared direct testimony.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28