

Company: Southern California Gas Company (U 904 G)
Proceeding: 2024 General Rate Case
Application: A.22-05-015/-016 (cons.)
Exhibit: SCG-240-[E](#)

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
OF KHAI NGUYEN
(POST-TEST YEAR RATEMAKING)**

[ERRATA](#)

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



May 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS..... 1

 A. SoCalGas’s Proposal..... 2

 B. CAL ADVOCATES ~~4~~4

 C. TURN/SCGC 4

III. REBUTTAL TO PARTIES’ PROPOSALS ~~5~~5

 A. O&M and Medical Cost Escalation ~~5~~5

 B. Capital Cost Escalation Revenue Requirement 6

 C. Other Proposals..... 11

IV. CONCLUSION..... 11

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A – GLOSSARY OF TERMS

APPENDIX B – DATA REQUEST RESPONSES

APPENDIX C – TURN-SCGC RESPONSE TO SCG-SDGE-TURN-SCGC-02

**ERRATA REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF
KHAI NGUYEN
(POST-TEST YEAR RATEMAKING)**

I. INTRODUCTION

This rebuttal testimony regarding Southern California Gas Company’s (SoCalGas) request for Post-Test Year (PTY) Ratemaking addresses the following testimony from other parties:

- The Public Advocates Office of the California Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) as submitted by Stacey Hunter (Ex. CA-20 (Hunter)), dated March 27, 2023.
- The Utility Reform Network (TURN) and Southern California Generation Coalition (SCGC), jointly, as submitted by Catherine E. Yap (Ex. TURN-SCGC-07 (Yap)), dated March 27, 2023.
- California Environmental Justice Alliance (CEJA) as submitted by Matthew Vespa, Sara Gersen, Sasan Saadat, and Rebecca Barker on behalf of California Environmental Justice Alliance (Ex. CEJA-01), dated March 27, 2023.¹
- The Protect Our Communities Foundation (PCF) as submitted by Bill Powers (Ex. PCF-01 (Powers)), dated March 27, 2023.²

As a preliminary matter, the absence of a response to any particular issue in this rebuttal testimony does not imply or constitute agreement by SoCalGas with the proposal or contention made by these or other parties. The forecasts contained in SoCalGas’s direct testimony, performed at the company and project levels, are based on sound estimates of its revenue requirements at the time of testimony preparation.

II. COMPARISON OF PROPOSALS

The following tables provide a summary comparison between SoCalGas and intervenors on key items of the PTY mechanism. Further details regarding SoCalGas’s and intervenors’

¹ Because CEJA offer no specific post-test year proposal or position to rebut, I do not include a separate section within my testimony responding to CEJA.

² Because PCF offer no specific post-test year proposal or position to rebut, I do not include a separate section within my testimony responding to PCF.

proposals are outlined below.

Table KN-1 – Comparison of Proposals

(\$ in millions) Revenue Requirement Increase	2025		2026		2027	
SoCalGas ³	6.7166%	\$295293	5.5644%	\$261255	7.6655%	\$379374
Cal Advocates ⁴	4.7%	\$188	5.1%	\$215	5.1%	\$225
TURN/SCGC ⁵	5.56%	\$244	4.34%	\$201	4.21%	\$204

Table KN-2 – Comparison of Proposals

Issue		SoCalGas	Cal Advocates	TURN/SCGC
General Rate Case (GRC) Term		4 years	4 years	Not addressed
Escalation Rates	O&M (excluding medical)	IHS Global Insight	3.0%	CPI-U or Alternative of CPI-U + up to 50 basis points
	O&M - Medical	Willis Towers Watson	3.0%	CPI-U or Alternative of CPI-U + up to 50 basis points
	Capital	IHS Global Insight	3.0%	CPI-U or Alternative of CPI-U + up to 50 basis points
Capital Additions Adjustment		5-year average (2020-2021 actual, 2022-2024 forecast)	None	7-year average (2015-2021 actual) No capital exceptions
Post-Test Year Capital Exceptions		Separate PTY revenue requirement	For IMPs*, establish a 2-way balancing account with costs, in excess of 110% of authorized subject to reasonableness review; exclude CIS* and HRCM*	
Z-factor mechanism		Test Year (TY) and PTYs with \$5 million deductible per event	TY and PTYs with \$5 million deductible per event	Not addressed

*Integrity Management Programs (IMPs), Customer Information System (CIS), Honor Rancho Compressor Modernization (HRCM)

A. SoCalGas’s Proposal

SoCalGas issued its second revised testimony on PTY ratemaking on November 21,

³ Ex. SCG-40-2R-E (Nguyen) at KN-ii. ~~In the course of responding to data request TURN-SCGC-023, Question 2, SoCalGas identified an error in the 2020-2021 capital additions. The historical data (2020-2021) should have included overheads but inadvertently excluded overhead loading. SoCalGas will update the post test year revenue requirement at the next available opportunity.~~

⁴ Ex. CA-20 (Hunter) at 2.

⁵ Ex. TURN-SCGC-07 (Yap) at 12.

2022. The following is a summary of SoCalGas’s request:⁶

- Continuation of 4-year General Rate Case (GRC) cycle term (2024-2027), with SoCalGas’s next test year in 2028;
- Using IHS Markit Global Insight’s (GI) utility cost escalation factors to determine PTY operations and maintenance (O&M) escalation (excluding medical expenses);
- Adopt Willis Towers Watson’s actuarial forecasts and escalations to determine PTY medical expenses;
- Calculate PTY capital-related revenue requirements using:
 - A 5-year average of capital additions (2020-2021 actual, 2022-2024 forecast) escalated using GI's utility cost escalation factors;
 - A forecast for the Honor Rancho Compressor Modernization (HRCM) capital additions;
 - A forecast for the Customer Information System (CIS) Replacement capital additions;
 - Forecasts for the Gas Integrity Management Program capital additions (Transmission Integrity Management Program (TIMP), Distribution Integrity Management Program (DIMP), Storage Integrity Management Program (SIMP), Facilities Integrity Management Program (FIMP), Gas Safety Enhancement Program (GSEP));
- Continuation of the currently authorized Z-Factor mechanism, with a \$5 million deductible per event;
- Continuation of updating the PTY revenue requirements through an annual advice letter process;
- Application of SoCalGas’s proposed PTY ratemaking mechanism would result in the following forecasted attrition year revenue requirement increases:

(\$ in millions)	2025		2026		2027	
Revenue Requirement Increase	6.7166%	\$295293	5.5644%	\$261255	7.6655%	\$379374

⁶ Ex. SCG-40-2R (Nguyen) at KN-1 – KN-2; and Ex. SCG-40-WP-2R.

1 **B. CAL ADVOCATES**

2 The following is a summary of Cal Advocates' positions:⁷

- 3 • Continuation of 4-year GRC cycle term (2024-2027);
- 4 • Adopt PTY revenue increases of 3.0% per year in 2025, 2026, and 2027;
- 5 Additional revenue requirement increases associated with certain capital-
- 6 related PTY exceptions;
- 7 • Continuation of two-way balancing for Gas Integrity Management
- 8 Programs with costs in excess of 110% of the authorized amount subject
- 9 to reasonable review;
- 10 • Oppose inclusion of CIS Replacement and HRCM for PTY recovery;
- 11 • Continuation of updating the PTY revenue requirements through an
- 12 annual advice letter process;
- 13 • Continuation of the existing Z-factor mechanism, with a \$5 million
- 14 deductible per event.

15 **C. TURN/SCGC**

16 The following is a summary of TURN/SCGC's positions:⁸

- 17 • Escalate O&M costs based on CPI-U or adjusted CPI-U plus maximum 50 bps;
- 18 • Use a 7-year (2015-2021) average of recorded capital additions to
- 19 determine post-test year capital additions with no exceptions being made;
- 20 • Exclude Gas Integrity Management Programs, HRCM, and CIS
- 21 Replacement as capital exceptions and include in 7-year average
- 22 calculation;
- 23 • Exclude any clean energy products and services from test year, precluding
- 24 any PTY increase in revenue requirement.

⁷ Ex. CA-20 (Hunter).

⁸ TURN-SCGC-07 (Yap).

1 **III. REBUTTAL TO PARTIES' PROPOSALS**

2 **A. O&M and Medical Cost Escalation**

3 Cal Advocates' proposal for post-test year increases of 3.0% per year for 2025, 2026, and
4 2027 is guided by a recent independent forecast of the annual percent change in Consumer Price
5 Index (CPI) for the post-test years.⁹ TURN/SCGC also recommends escalating PTY O&M
6 revenue increase using CPI-U or alternatively adjust CPI-U by an arbitrary maximum of 50 basis
7 points.¹⁰

8 Cal Advocates' and TURN/SCGC's proposals inappropriately utilize CPI as a basis for
9 forecasting utility-specific costs and are not supported by numerical analysis. Cal Advocates
10 notes that they are "well aware of the Utilities' opposition to the application of CPI to post-test
11 year revenue increases, but CPI reflects the level of general price increases ratepayers endure and
12 expect."¹¹ However, CPI is not intended to and does not gauge price changes of goods and
13 services purchased by businesses, or more specifically, utilities. CPI measures changes in the
14 price of a representative basket of goods and services purchased by a typical U.S. household
15 including food and beverages, housing, apparel, transportation, medical care, recreation,
16 education and communication and other goods and services (tobacco and smoking products,
17 haircuts and other personal services, funeral expenses).¹² Furthermore, TURN/SCGC's claim
18 that "[...] under SoCalGas' proposed mechanism, O&M cost escalation would be highly tailored
19 to SoCalGas' circumstances" is inaccurate.¹³ As stated in SoCalGas's Cost Escalation testimony
20 (Exhibit No: SCG-36-WP), Global Insight (GI) is weighted to incorporate "Utility Service
21 Works," "Managers and Administrators," and "Professional and Technical Workers" and is
22 therefore more appropriate as an industry-specific source for escalation.¹⁴ As stated in my
23 revised direct testimony, in multiple recent GRC decisions, the Commission concluded that CPI

⁹ Ex. CA-20 (Hunter) at 18.

¹⁰ Ex. TURN-SCGC-07 (Yap) at 7-8.

¹¹ Ex. CA-20 (Hunter) at 2, n. 8 (emphasis omitted).

¹² U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Handbook of Methods, Consumer Price Index: Concepts (as of April 6, 2023), available at <https://www.bls.gov/opub/hom/cpi/concepts.htm>.

¹³ Ex. TURN-SCGC-07 (Yap) at 6.

¹⁴ Ex. SCG-36 (Wilder, adopted by Martinez) at SRW-2.

1 does not reflect how utilities incur costs and has adopted Global Insight as the preferred index to
2 use in escalating attrition year revenue requirement.¹⁵

3 Furthermore, SoCalGas believes utilization of Willis Towers Watson’s medical
4 escalation rates is more appropriate for the post-test years. SoCalGas recommends using post-test
5 year escalation rates of 6.0% for 2025, 5.50% for 2026, and 5.0% for 2027 for medical expenses.
6 Neither Cal Advocates nor TURN/SCGC recommends a separate escalation rate for medical
7 expenses. Cal Advocates utilizes a flat 3.0% escalation in the post-test years.¹⁶ TURN/SCGC
8 utilizes a 2.2% rate for 2025 and 2.1% rate for 2026-27 based on CPI.¹⁷ The medical escalation
9 forecast prepared by Willis Towers Watson is more appropriate because it takes into account
10 demographic factors specific to SoCalGas. These demographic factors – location, workforce
11 demographics, and medical plan design – are key drivers of medical plan costs. When adopting
12 Southern California Edison Company’s (SCE) TY 2018 GRC decision, the Commission
13 emphasized their preference for using escalation rates based on SCE’s actual population
14 demographics. The Commission stated in its decision that they “deferred to SCE’s reliance on
15 medical program cost escalation rates provided by its plan administrators, rather than relying on
16 a broader public study as proposed by ORA.”¹⁸ The Commission also adopted a separate
17 medical cost escalation mechanism in SCE’s TY 2021 GRC.¹⁹ The actuarial forecast by Willis
18 Towers Watson, which is based on preliminary 2021 renewal rates, is more reflective of the cost
19 trends in Southern California. Additional information is provided in Debbie Robinson’s
20 compensation and benefits revised direct testimony.²⁰ Consistent with prior Commission
21 decisions, the medical escalation rates shown in Debbie Robinson’s chapter should be utilized
22 for the PTY methodology.

23 **B. Capital Cost Escalation Revenue Requirement**

24 Cal Advocates does not address the use of an escalated multi-year average of capital

15 Ex. SCG-40-2R (Nguyen) at KN-5.

16 Ex. CA-20 (Hunter) at 18.

17 Ex. TURN-SCGC-07 (Yap) Attachment B: Catherine E. Yap Workpapers--PTYR model.

18 D.19-05-020, Findings of Fact 138 and Conclusions of Law (COL) 114.

19 D.21-08-036 at 547-548 and COL 184.

20 Ex. SCG-25-R/SDG&E-29-R (Robinson).

1 additions as a proxy for post-test year capital additions, but instead escalates test year revenue
2 requirement using a 3% escalation rate based on CPI.²¹ Cal Advocates does not oppose
3 additional post-test year revenue requirement for certain Integrity Management programs;
4 however, opposes inclusion of the CIS Replacement and the HRCM project as capital
5 exceptions.²² TURN/SCGC proposes the use of a 7-year average (2015-2021) recorded capital
6 additions escalated using the CPI-U. TURN/SCGC also recommends no additional revenue
7 requirement related to post-test year capital exceptions stating, “The trended seven-year average
8 of capital additions will provide an increasing level of capital additions throughout the PTY
9 period, which will provide increased capital-related revenue requirement.”²³

10 As previously discussed, using CPI is not an appropriate basis for forecasting utility-
11 specific costs. TURN/SCGC appears to recognize the shortcomings of CPI as a basis for
12 escalating utility costs and proposes adding 50 basis point to CPI-U as an alternative. However,
13 adding an arbitrary 50 basis points (bps) to CPI-U does not make the index any more reflective
14 of utility costs. TURN/SCGC is also inconsistent with their use of escalation factors throughout
15 their post-test year calculations. For example, in TURN/SCGC’s post-test year model provided
16 in response to discovery request SCG-SDGE-TURN-SCGC-02, the historical recorded capital
17 additions and retirements are escalated to 2024 test year dollars using GI in its historical 7-year
18 average (2015-2021); however, TURN/SCGC then escalates the 7-year average in the post-test
19 years (2025-2027) using CPI.²⁴ Therefore, TURN/SCGC’s model appears to suggest that it is
20 appropriate to use GI to escalate the 2015-2021 recorded costs, but not post-test year forecasted
21 costs. TURN/SCGC’s inconsistent use of escalation indices in its modeling by using a
22 combination of GI and CPI rates²⁵ for the 7-year capital additions average and arbitrary proposal
23 of using CPI plus 50 bps for the PTY demonstrates its haphazard and fundamentally flawed
24 approach in its proposal. As such, TURN/SCGC’s proposal should not be adopted.

²¹ Ex. CA-20 (Hunter) at 18.

²² *Id.*

²³ Ex. TURN-SCGC-07 (Yap) at 11.

²⁴ TURN-SCGC Response to SCG-SDGE-TURN-SCGC-02; and Ex. TURN-SCGC-07 (Yap), Attachment B: TURN-SCGC-07 Yap Workpapers.xlsx.

²⁵ *See* Appendix C – TURN-SCGC Response to SCG-SDGE-TURN-SCGC-02.

1 Furthermore, an attrition adjustment based on CPI will not reflect the revenue requirement
2 increase from plant additions in excess of depreciation (rate base growth) and cost escalation
3 SoCalGas will face in the attrition years. Unlike expenses that can generally be escalated using
4 indices reflecting inflation, capital cost growth is much more complex and is driven by plant and
5 rate base growth, not just cost escalation. Changes in capital revenue requirement components
6 (authorized returns on rate base, depreciation expense, and taxes) are determined almost entirely
7 by the relationship between capital additions and depreciation. When capital additions exceed
8 depreciation, rate base increases and the related capital revenue requirement components
9 (depreciation, taxes, and return) also increase.

10 SoCalGas disagrees with Cal Advocates methodology of escalating test year revenue
11 requirement using CPI instead of using of an escalated multi-year average of capital additions as
12 a proxy for post-test year capital additions. Using a 5-year average (2020-2021 recorded and
13 2022-2024 forecasted) is more reliable than escalating the test year, as it takes into account a
14 broader range of data and can provide more accurate representation of historical and long-term
15 trends. Additionally, SoCalGas disagrees with TURN/SCGC's proposal to use a 7-year average
16 escalated using the CPI-U and exclude any capital related exceptions. Utilizing a 5-year average
17 (2020-2021 recorded and 2022-2024 forecasted) best captures the utility investment profile and
18 operating initiatives of the current utility environment, which has evolved in the past few years
19 with the risk-informed GRC framework and "SoCalGas's strong commitment to the State's
20 climate policy goals."²⁶ SoCalGas's capital program is continuing to evolve with a greater focus
21 on increasing investment in utility safety, reliability, and sustainability, which directly support
22 California's clean energy and environmental initiatives; and therefore, a 5-year average
23 mechanism should be adopted instead of the 7-year average.

24 To illustrate the recent changes in SoCalGas's capital program, the average escalated
25 capital additions in 2015 and 2016 was approximately \$1.221 billion compared to approximately
26 \$1.671 billion average in 2020 and 2021, which resulted in a compound annual growth rate of
27 ~8% over the four-years. By utilizing the 5-year average of capital additions (2020-2024),
28 SoCalGas is able to more appropriately capture the future environment of the utility through the
29 utilization of the most recent historical trends along with the forecasted capital spending that is

²⁶ See Ex. SCG-01-2R (Brown) at MSB-3.

1 approved through the test year 2024 GRC. This methodology captures a balance of current and
2 forward-looking spending which is more in line with the operational needs of the company and
3 more recent regulatory requirements.

4 The 7-year average methodology ignores present day trends and challenges and will
5 significantly underestimate SoCalGas's post-test year capital needs. This is demonstrated in
6 Table KN-3 below:

7 **Table KN-3**
8 **Capital Related Cost Attrition (\$ in millions)**

	2025	2026	2027
SoCalGas	\$24 5 ⁸	\$20 4 ⁹	\$31 9 ²⁴
TURN/SCGC	\$200	\$158	\$160
<i>Difference</i>	\$(45 ⁴⁸)	\$(46 ⁵¹)	\$(159 ⁶⁴)

9
10 The Integrity Management Programs, which comprises a significant part of SoCalGas's
11 post-test year capital related costs will be underfunded if escalated using TURN/SCGC's
12 proposed methodology. It is also not appropriate to use the historical average to determine the
13 future costs of the Integrity Management Programs since they are approved and balanced for
14 each GRC cycle only. As shown in Table KN-4, using the constant test year 2024 as the starting
15 point, calculating post-test year capital related costs using TURN/SCGC's proposed CPI
16 escalation rate for the Integrity Management Programs will result in a significant revenue
17 shortfall of \$185 million²⁷ because TURN/SCGC's proposal ignores the compounding effect of
18 capital related costs (return, depreciation expense, and taxes) as projects are placed into service
19 and become part of rate base. Because of the compounding effect on rate base, the growth and
20 accumulation of revenue requirement for the Integrity Management Programs over the GRC
21 cycle is significantly higher than the CPI average methodology. Therefore, a separate exception
22 adder is needed for the Integrity Management Programs rather than using a simple historical
23 average with CPI.
24
25

²⁷ \$47 million + \$67 million + \$71 million = \$185 million.

Table KN-4
Integrity Management Programs
Capital Related Cost Attrition (*\$ in millions*)

	2024	2025	2026	2027
SoCalGas	\$20	\$67	\$88	\$92
TURN/SCGC²⁸	\$20	\$20	\$21	\$21
Difference	\$-	\$(47)	\$(67)	\$(71)

Both Cal Advocates and TURN/SCGC oppose the inclusion of the Honor Rancho Compressor Modernization and Customer Information System as capital exceptions in the post-test year. The rebuttal to both parties’ proposal regarding the Customer Information System completion date is addressed in CIS Replacement Program rebuttal testimony (Ex. SCG-213 (Goldman)). Cal Advocates’ suggestions regarding the completion date and threshold requiring a separate application for the Honor Rancho Compressor Modernization is addressed in the Gas Storage Operations & Construction rebuttal testimony area (Ex. SCG-210 (Bittleston and Hruby)). TURN/SCGC’s suggestion that the capital related revenue requirement of the trended 7-year average will be sufficient to fund the two programs is grossly incorrect. Since the projects do not go into service by the test year, a separate capital adder is needed to account for these projects because of the magnitude of the revenue requirement associated with these projects compared to the overall request. Table KN-5 below shows the ratio of the two exceptions compared to the total capital related revenue requirement requested by SoCalGas. Without these exceptions, SoCalGas would be significantly underfunded in the 2024 GRC cycle for these programs and will be forgoing recovery of revenue requirement associated with these projects in 2026 and 2027 with the remaining revenue requirement to be collected in the 2028 GRC cycle. The exception adder mechanism is also consistent with what was approved in the last GRC for Pipeline Safety Enhancement Plan (PSEP) in the post-test year.²⁹

²⁸ Calculated by escalating SoCalGas’s proposed TY 2024 revenue requirement using TURN/SCGC’s proposed post-test year escalation rates of 2.2% (2025), 2.1% (2026,2027).

²⁹ D.19-09-051, Conclusions of Law 41, (“PSEP capital-related costs not fully reflected in the TY2019 revenue requirement should be included as part of the PTYs.”).

Table KN-5
HRCM & CIS
Capital Related Cost Attrition (\$ in millions)

	Total SoCalGas	HRCM	HRCM % of Total	CIS	CIS % of Total
2025	\$24 5 ⁸	\$ -	-	\$ -	-
2026	\$20 4 ⁹	\$ -	-	\$11	5%
2027	\$31 9 ²⁴	\$ 92	29 8 ⁸ %	\$29	9%

C. Other Proposals

Cal Advocates’ proposal to have a 110% threshold for all the Gas Integrity Management Programs is addressed in the rebuttal testimony of Rae Marie Yu (Ex. SCG-238 (Yu)). TURN/SCGC’s proposal for excluding SoCalGas’s projects related to clean energy innovations is addressed in the rebuttal testimony of Armando Infanzon (Ex. SCG-212 (Infanzon)). CEJA’s proposal to exclude TY 2024 line extension allowances in the post-test year is addressed in the rebuttal testimony of Shaena Walker and Cody Quezada (Ex. SCG-204 (Walker and Quezada)).

IV. CONCLUSION

To summarize, SoCalGas believes that a reasonable PTY mechanism should meet the following goals: (1) use O&M and medical cost escalation indices that are representative of SoCalGas actual cost drivers (GI and Willis Towers Watson) rather than general consumer goods drivers (CPI), (2) use capital additions cost escalation that balances the certainty of historical spending with the future needs of the company as adopted through this GRC, and (3) include a forecast for CIS, HRCM, and the Integrity Management Programs beyond the TY 2024. For the reasons discussed above, the proposals of Cal Advocates, TURN/SCGC, CEJA and Protect Our Communities fail to meet these goals.

SoCalGas’s proposal is a fair and reasonable mechanism to provide the level of funding necessary to support important safety, reliability, and sustainability projects in the post-test years. This proposal accounts for the major cost drivers that impact the Company, which allows SoCalGas to provide safe and reliable service to its customers, comply with regulations, and manage its operations as prudent financial stewards.

This concludes my prepared rebuttal testimony.

APPENDIX A GLOSSARY OF TERMS

ACRONYM	DEFINITION
Cal Advocates	California Public Advocates Office
CIS	Customer Information System
Commission	California Public Utilities Commission
CPI	Consumer Price Index
DIMP	Distribution Integrity Management Program
FIMP	Facilities Integrity Management Program
Global Insight or GI	IHS Markit Global Insight
GRC	General Rate Case
GSEP	Gas Safety Enhancement Program
HRCM	Honor Rancho Compressor Modernization
IMPs	Integrity Management Programs
O&M	Operations and Maintenance
PTY	Post-Test Year
SCGC	Southern California Generation Coalition
SDG&E	San Diego Gas & Electric Company
SIMP	Storage Integrity Management Program
SoCalGas	Southern California Gas Company
TIMP	Transmission Integrity Management Program
TURN	The Utility Reform Network
TY	Test Year

APPENDIX B

DATA REQUEST RESPONSES

SOCALGAS RESPONSE TO DATA REQUEST TURN-SCGC-023,

QUESTION 2, DATED 2/21/2023

Data Request Number: TURN-SCGC-023

Proceeding Name: A2205015_016 - SoCalGas and SDGE 2024 GRC

Publish To: Southern California Generation Coalition, The Utility Reform Network

Date Received: 2/7/2023

Date Responded: 2/21/2023

23.2 Regarding KS-21 in SCG-09, which presents the Gas Integrity Management Programs recorded capital expenditures for 2021 and forecast capital expenditures for years 2022-2024 by type of Integrity Management program. For each capital expenditure value in the table, please provide the corresponding capital addition amount.

SoCalGas Response 23.2:

Additions are calculated for the total of the Integrity Management Programs and are not readily available at the individual program level.

In addition, SoCalGas identified an inadvertent error in the 2020-2021 additions for the Gas Integrity Programs shown in Table 6, Line 8 of Exhibit SCG-40-WP-2R. This historical data used in the PTY mechanism excludes overhead loading while the 2022-2024 forecasted additions include overhead loading. The 2020-2021 data should include overheads. SoCalGas will update the 2020-2021 data to include overheads at the next available opportunity.

APPENDIX C

TURN-SCGC RESPONSE TO SCG-SDGE-TURN-SCGC-02

Table 10

Southern California Gas Company
2024 GRC
Calculation of Revenue Requirement Increase
(Thousands of Dollars)

		Section-1			
Line	Depreciation Expense	2024	2025	2026	2027
1	2024 Accrual	970,361			
2	/ 2024 Wtd Avg Plant in Service	24,808,770			
3	= System Average Depreciation Rate	3.91%	3.91%	3.91%	3.91%
4	x Plant in Service Weighted Average Increase		1,920,606	1,641,179	1,675,644
5	= Increase in Depreciation Expense		75,122	64,192	65,541
6	x Net-to-Gross Multiplier	1.3885726	1.3885726	1.3885726	1.3885726
7	= Increase in Revenue Requirements		104,312	89,136	91,008
<u>Ad Valorem Taxes</u>					
8	2024 Ad Valorem Taxes	166,144			
9	/ 2024 Plant in Service	26,024,428			
10	= System Average Ad Valorem Tax Rate	0.64%	0.64%	0.64%	0.64%
11	x Current Attrition Year Additions		1,626,376	1,660,529	1,695,401
12	= Increase Full Year Additions		10,383	10,601	10,824
13	x Franchise Fee and Uncollectible Factor	1	1	1	1
14	= Increase in Revenue Requirements		10,383	10,601	10,824
<u>Payroll Taxes</u>					
13	Prior Year Payroll Taxes		58,478	60,109	61,825
14	x Current Year Labor Escalation Rate	Global Insight	2.79%	2.85%	2.89%
15	= Increase in Full Year Additions		1,631	1,716	1,789
18	x Franchise Fee and Uncollectible Factor		1	1	1
19	= Increase in Revenue Requirements		1,631	1,716	1,789

Source: TURN-SCGC Response to SCG-SDGE-TURN-SCGC-02; Attachment TURN-SCGC-07 Yap Workpapers.xlsx

Global Insights used to escalate historical recorded costs (rows 10 & 11)

CPI used to escalate PTY forecasted costs.

SCG POST-TEST YEAR: Esh No: SCG-40-WP/Witness: KN'guyen
Table 6

Line No.	2024 RO Model				2025-2027 Attrition Year Calc				2027					
	2024	2025	2026	2027	2025	2026	2027	2027						
1	Plant In Service	WAVG	End of Year	WAVG Increase	End of Year	WAVG	WAVG Increase	End of Year	WAVG	WAVG Increase				
2	Beginning of the Year	23,878,718	26,024,428	26,024,428	2,145,710	27,650,803	1,626,376	29,311,333	29,311,333	1,660,300				
3	Net Additions	2,145,710	930,002	1,626,376	(221,104)	1,660,309	719,752	14,804	1,695,401	15,115				
4	Total Fixed capital	26,024,428	24,808,770	27,650,803	26,729,376	1,925,696	29,311,333	1,641,179	31,006,733	30,046,199				
5	Accum Depreciation	WAVG	End of Year	WAVG Increase	End of Year	WAVG	WAVG Increase	End of Year	WAVG	WAVG Increase				
6	Beginning of the Year	9,772,822	10,424,826	10,424,826	652,004	11,127,306	702,480	11,872,918	11,872,918	745,612				
7	Depreciation Reserve	652,004	356,320	702,480	383,905	27,585	745,612	407,477	23,572	789,650				
8	Total	10,424,826	10,129,142	11,127,306	10,808,731	679,389	11,872,918	11,334,783	12,662,548	11,304,462				
9	Capital Additions (exc for meter cart)	2015 (2015)	2016 (2016)	2017 (2017)	2018 (2018)	2019 (2019)	2020 (2020)	2021 (2021)	2022 (2022)	2023 (2023)	2024 (2024)	2025 (2025)	2026 (2026)	2027 (2027)
10	Adj. for Capital Exceptions	1,245,626	1,274,840	1,269,170	1,598,867	1,202,970	1,576,121	1,943,014	2,047,126	1,849,415	2,352,498	2,352,498	2,352,498	2,352,498
11	Total Capital Additions	1,245,626	1,274,840	1,269,170	1,598,867	1,202,970	1,576,121	1,943,014	2,047,126	1,849,415	2,352,498	2,352,498	2,352,498	2,352,498
12	Capital Additions (2021)	1,750,696	1,799,875	1,700,869	2,023,152	1,452,949	1,813,112	1,943,014	1,902,895	1,899,297	2,382,561	2,382,561	2,382,561	2,382,561
13	Capital Additions (2024)	1,728,606	1,771,644	1,679,408	1,997,624	1,434,616	1,790,234	1,918,497	1,878,885	1,786,468	2,352,498	2,352,498	2,352,498	2,352,498
14	Capital Additions 7-Year Average Recorded							1,760,878					1,799,618	1,837,410
15	Retirements	126,816	127,664	159,738	127,845	130,909	134,228	154,625	156,924	121,256	200,462	200,462	200,462	200,462
16	Adj. for Capital Exceptions	126,816	127,664	159,738	127,845	130,909	134,228	154,625	156,924	121,256	200,462	200,462	200,462	200,462
17	Total Retirements	126,816	127,664	159,738	127,845	130,909	134,228	154,625	156,924	121,256	200,462	200,462	200,462	200,462
18	Retirements (2021)	178,524	180,341	214,071	161,771	158,112	154,411	154,625	127,277	117,207	198,453	198,453	198,453	198,453
19	Retirements (2024)	178,271	177,967	211,370	159,730	156,117	152,462	152,674	125,671	116,025	195,949	195,949	195,949	195,949
20	Plant Additions for Ratebase							169,513					173,242	176,880
								1,660,376					1,660,376	1,695,401

Source: TURN-SCGC Response to SCG-SDGE-TURN-SCGC-02; Attachment TURN-SCGC-07 Yap Workpapers.xlsx KN-C-2