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

**TURN Data Request**

**Data Request Number:** TURN-SCG-14 (TIMP-DIMP and Gas Dist)

**Date Sent:** April 21, 2015

**Response Due:** May 5, 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.

1. Regarding SoCalGas Exhibit 8-CWP, in response to TURN DR 7-1c, SoCalGas states that “The DREAMS algorithm… is only capable of calculating a relative risk score.” In response to question 1.b., SoCalGas states that “As a starting point to establishing a 10 year plan of top priority pipe segments to replace the listing encompassed… steel with a risk score of 75 or greater and … plastic segments with a risk score of 45 or greater.”

Is the relative risk of a steel pipe segment with a risk of “75” equivalent in DREAMS to a plastic segment with a risk score of “45”?

* 1. In either event, please explain how those risk scores were chosen as the minimum for replacing pipe segments
  2. If the relative risk between the two scores is not equivalent, please explain the decision to use different minimum risk scores for selecting replacements.
  3. Given the variation in DREAMS marginal risk scores from 2013 to 2014, as discussed in response to question 7-4.d, have the minimum scores for replacement of gas and plastic pipe changed? If so, please provide the minimum DREAMS scores for steel replacement and plastic replacement, by year, since SoCalGas began using DREAMS scores through 2014.

1. In response to TURN DR 7-4a, SoCalGas states, “since the ratio for the steel leak population is twice as large as the plastic leak population the replacement ratio is 2:1.” In the response to DR 7-1c, SoCalGas mentions that the “failure modes” for steel and plastic pipe are different, with steel pipe having “pending leaks”, while plastic pipe has “repaired leaks”.
   1. Please confirm that the decision of which steel pipe to replace is based on a different criterion or different criteria than the decision of which plastic pipe segments to replace.
   2. Please identify and briefly describe each criterion used in making the decision of which steel pipe to replace.
   3. Please identify and briefly describe each criterion used in making the decision of which plastic pipe segments to replace.
   4. Please explain how SoCalGas applies the different steel and plastic replacement criteria discussed in its response to question 7-1.c. to achieve the 2:1 replacement ratio discussed in response to question 7.4.a.
2. In response to TURN DR 7-4.d and e. SoCalGas states that the DREAMS estimated marginal risk for steel pipe increased by a factor of nearly 200 between 2013 and 2014, while the marginal risk of plastic pipe declined by 40 percent.
   1. Please explain SoCalGas’s definition and use of the term “marginal risk” in this response.
   2. Is more than one steel pipe segment posing a risk of over 40,000 in 2014?
   3. Please provide a distribution of risks, by pipe segment, developed through DREAMS, for steel pipe and for plastic pipe for 2014, in EXCEL format and in graphical form where possible.
   4. Please provide available information on the distribution on risks, by pipe segment, developed through DREAMS, for steel pipe and for plastic pipe for 2013, in EXCEL format and in graphical form where possible
3. Regarding SoCalGas’s response to TURN DR 7-14, Cathodic Protection Package remediation, please provide the backlog of packages requiring remediation at the end of 2014.
4. Regarding Workpaper SCG- 04-CWP, pp. 109-114, Cathodic Protection capital spending, given that 2014 adjusted-recorded capital spending for account 001730 was 54% of the 2014 forecast:
   1. What planned or forecasted work did SoCalGas include in the 2014 forecast but did not undertake during 2014?
   2. In SoCalGas’s judgment, did the failure to spend the forecasted amount in 2014 undermine in any way the utility’s ability to operate its gas system in a safe and reliable manner? If the response is anything other than an unqualified “no,” please explain the response in detail.
   3. Please break out 2014 recorded capital expenditures in account 1730 between accounts 1730.001 and 1730.002.