

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

Regarding SCG-13 and SDG&E 19, OpEx 20/20

- 1) Please provide the latest (near the end of 2006 or 2007) business case studies and other documentation that Sempra (through the parent or the Utilities) or consultants produced to support the estimates of costs and benefits due to the Utility of the Future program, including each of its components. Please also provide any further documentation supplied to the Board of Directors in support of the Utility of the Future program.

SoCalGas Response:

Attached are the draft 2006 business cases.



Bus Case.zip

Attached are Management presentations provided to the Utility Board. The program name ultimately changed to “OpEx 20/20” from “Utility of the Future,” and reflects the Sempra utilities’ vision for “excellence through information”.



Board
Presentation.zip

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

Regarding SCG-13 and SDG&E 19, OpEx 20/20

- 2) Regarding SCG 13 and SDG&E 19, p. RP-2, Utility of the Future:
- a) Identify all expenditures, by line item (FERC account number or capital project number and description), made under the Utility of the Future Program in each year 2005 to the present. Identify whether they were capital or expense.
 - b) Identify any projects completed under Utility of the Future.

SoCalGas Response:

- (a) Please see attached for direct capital and O&M spend. The 2010 accounting data will not be available for release until such time the information has been subject to an audit by our independent auditors of the annual results and is publicly reported in early 2011.



Total OpEx O&M Cap
Labor and NL directs.

- (b) There were no projects completed under “Utility of the Future” (see response to Q3 of this data request for a description of the transition of Utility of the Future to OpEx 20/20). The following are the projects completed under OpEx 20/20: Asset Investment Support, Operational Insight Analytics, Customer Interactions Infrastructure, sub-phases of Single View of the Customer, sub-phases of ICE Self Service, Supervisor Enablement, Encryption and Authentication, Service Oriented Architecture, I3, Mobility, and sub-phases of Environments.

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

- 3) Please identify annual recorded O&M and capital benefits that ratepayers received as a result of the implementation of the Utility of the Future program, divided by SCG and/or SDG&E and/or Sempra Energy (and allocated to the Utilities), for each year since its inception. Please provide O&M benefit data by FERC account and subaccount and capital expenditure by capital budget account, divided between cost savings and cost avoidance.

SoCalGas Response:

Please note that the program name ultimately changed to “OpEx 20/20” from “Utility of the Future” and there is not significant distinction between the program efforts. The program name was changed to “OpEx 20/20” and reflects the Sempra utilities’ vision for “excellence through information”.

The Utility of the Future (“UoF”) program resulted in a comprehensive analysis and evaluation of the potential projects as *individual* projects. The OpEx 20/20 program was developed to fill the gap between the individual projects developed in the UoF program and the integrated, enterprise-wide technology and process improvement program required to meet operational objectives and achieve full benefits. While the UoF grouped projects within the three major workstreams to take advantage of project synergies, the most significant gap identified in the program was the lack of defined, overall management, not only within each workstream, but between workstreams and existing legacy systems and applications. The OpEx 20/20 program with its governance “umbrella” was established to develop to provide leadership and direction to the project teams in order to successfully implement and deploy the individual solutions *and* achieve program goals. OpEx 20/20 is still based on the 15 year electric and gas operations technology roadmap developed in the Utility of the Future (UoF) program.

As described in my testimony, the investments in the OpEx program are designed to produce overall long-term benefits for customers. O&M benefits do not exceed O&M costs until 2012 and those net benefits are being passed to customers in the form of lower requested revenue requirements for SoCalGas and SDG&E. In TY2012 we are also beginning to experience capital-related benefits but those benefits do not yet exceed the TY2012 capital expenditures.

OpEx benefits are a mix of cost avoidances and cost savings. These benefits cannot be tracked on a recorded basis as they become part of the overall cost structure of the utility and cannot be attributed to a specific program.

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

- 4) Regarding SCG 13 and SDG&E 19 p. 1, overall program costs across both utilities for OpEx 20/20 are projected to be \$545 million, and the NPV of benefit is \$251 million:
- a) Please provide the final business case studies and other documentation that Sempra (through the parent or the Utilities) or consultants produced to support the Operational Excellence 20/20 program. Please also provide any further documentation supplied to the Board of Directors in support of the Operational Excellence 20/20 program.
 - b) Provide underlying workpapers and studies to support the projection regarding benefits. Include line item expected benefits in each year (subdivided into costs saved and costs avoided), with descriptions and dollar values, for each project in Table RP-01. Subdivide by utility if possible (SCG and SDG&E).
 - c) Include all assumptions used in calculating the benefits, and provide a spreadsheet with working formulas that documents this calculation.
 - d) Include underlying workpapers and studies to document the projected costs of \$545 million, separated into capital and expense for each project in Table RP-01 and each utility. Include line item level expected costs in each year, 2007-2015.
 - e) Identify recorded costs already spent in past years, by line item and year, subdivided into utility if possible (SCG and SDG&E).

SoCalGas Response:

- a) The document attached provides business case information for each of the projects within OpEx 20/20 as of December 2009.



Q4a Updated Bus
Case.xls

The document attached below is a presentation to the Sempra Energy Board in February 2010. Please note that the attached document describes a program cost of \$540 million instead of the \$545 million in the TY 2012 GRC application. This is because the cost of the program increased by approximately \$5 million between the time of the presentation to the board and the development of the GRC testimony. This increase did not require a Board update. The total \$545 million in costs are estimated in fully loaded and escalated dollars, including labor loaders such as pension and benefits, vacation and sick time, payroll taxes and workers compensation, as well as inflation and growth factors on both labor and non-labor costs, and AFUDC. Although the attachment to this response is marked “confidential” SoCalGas no longer considers it to be so.



Q4a. SE Board
OpEx 20-20 Feb 20

Since the time our TY 2012 GRC applications were filed, SoCalGas senior management has approved changes to the OpEx program that resulted in certain project costs decreasing and certain project costs increasing with the result of an overall program cost increase from \$545

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

Response to Question 4 (Continued)

million to \$586 million. Estimated costs of projects change throughout a project's life as more information becomes known. The attached document provides the program updates presented to SoCalGas Board. Although the attachment above is marked confidential on some pages of the presentation, SoCalGas no longer considers it to be confidential.



4a. OpEx Program
Update to SCG Board

Also attached is the specific information provided to the SoCalGas Board related to the project areas where costs increased the most. The reasons for the cost increases are included in the attached. The benefits estimate did not change. Although the attachment below is marked confidential on some pages of the presentation, SoCalGas no longer considers it to be confidential.



4a. OpEx
Construction Program

Following is an updated table of OpEx projects with the current expected total project costs. As there are no provisions for updating our 2012 GRC forecasts, the SoCalGas and SDG&E requests related to OpEx remain unchanged from our December 15 GRC applications.

Initiative	2007-2015 (in Millions)	
	Total	Updated Total
Asset Investment Support (AIS)	\$8.8	8.3
Condition-Based Maintenance (CBM)	\$56.2	55.6
Geospatial Information System (GIS)	\$112.6	109.4
Outage/Distribution Management System (OMS/DMS)	\$45.3	43.8
Customer Interactions Infrastructure (CII)	\$9.8	10.2
Intelligent Customer Experience (ICE)	\$27.2	25.9
Operational Insight Analytics (OIA)	\$4.4	4.4
Single View of the Customer (SVOC)	\$5.4	4.3
Care Representative of the Future (Care Rep)	\$1.4	1.1
Supervisor Enablement (SE)	\$10.0	10.6
Maintenance & Inspection (M&I)	\$103.9	115.1
Construction	\$65.2	109.7
IT Infrastructure (ITI)	\$63.4	64.3
Education, Training and Communication (ETC)	\$9.8	3.2
Project Management Office (PMO)	\$21.7	19.6
Total (fully loaded nominal dollars)	\$545.1	585.5

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

Response to Question 4 (Continued)

b) Hard benefits are cost savings that will result in reduction in costs when compared to historical spend. Soft savings are avoided costs. They are not a reduction in the level of historical spending, but rather a reduction in what would have been requested had the OpEx projects not been implemented. For the 15 year view of total benefits, we do not have a break out of soft vs. hard benefits by utility. Attached is OpEx's forecasted soft vs. hard benefits projection.



Soft vs Hard
Benefits.Dec 09.xls

c) Included in the attached are the benefits assumptions and calculations.



Q4c. FF Benefits
Assumptions Rev1



Q4c. Customer
Benefit Assumptior



Q4c. AM Benefits
Assumptions.xls



Q4c. FF
benefits.ppt

d) Please see response to Question 4a. above for capital costs and expenses. The costs are not broken out by utility.

e) Please see the response to Question 2a.

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

- 5) Identify any costs from Utility of the Future or OpEx 20/20 that have already been placed in ratebase. Include project-by-project costs, year spent, date put into ratebase, and full description.

SoCalGas Response:

There were no projects placed in ratebase under Utility of the Future (see response to Q3 of this data request for a description of the transition of Utility of the Future to OpEx 20/20). Please see the attached document below for December 2009 OpEx SoCalGas ratebase and in-service dates. 2010 ratebase information is not available. The 2010 accounting data will not be available for release until such time the information has been subject to an audit by our independent auditors of the annual results and is publicly reported in early 2011.



Turn SCG Q5.xls

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

- 6) Please identify annual recorded O&M and capital benefits that ratepayers received as a result of the implementation of the Operational Excellence program, divided by SCG and/or SDG&E and/or Sempra Energy (and allocated to the Utilities), for each year since its inception, by each initiative in Table RP-01. Please provide O&M benefit data by FERC account and subaccount and capital expenditure by capital budget account, divided between cost savings and cost avoidance. Please identify the location in the application where savings were applied to reduce the amount requested for the FERC accounts and capital budgets.

SoCalGas Response:

Please see the response to Question 3, above.

**TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011**

7. Referencing p. RP-4, SDG&E states that all but two of the SDG&E-specific projects would be completed by 2012.
- a) Please identify the specific projects that will not be completed by 2012, the expected remaining O&M and capital expenditures for each year related to those incomplete projects, and the expected portion of the ratepayer benefits that will be accrued as those programs come on line on an annual basis through the end of their implementations.
 - b) For the projects that will be completed, provide the future O&M projection, by project, for each year 2013-2015, and a description of what is included in this projection.

SoCalGas Response:

(a)

Project O&M	2013	2014	2015	Total Costs
CBM	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
ICE SS	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total (in million)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Project Capital	2013	2014	2015	Total Costs
CBM	2.8	2.5	1.5	6.9
ICE SS	2.1	0.0	0.0	2.1
Total (in million)	4.9	2.5	1.5	9.0

Please see 4B regarding benefits.

- (b) The 2012 on-going support costs (tables SDG&E-RP-5 and SCG-RP-05) carry forward and remain the same in 2013, 2014 and 2015. These on-going costs are contained in the testimony of Mr. Edward Fong (Exhibit SDG&E-13), Mr. Scott P. Furgerson (Exhibit SDG&E-04), Ms. Gina Orozco-Mejia (Exhibit SDG&E-02) and Mr. Jeffrey C. Nichols (Exhibit SDG&E-18), Ms. Gina Orozco-Mejia (Exhibit SCG-02), Mr. Edward Fong (Exhibit SCG-07) and Mr. Raymond K. Stanford (Exhibit SCG-05).

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

- 8) Regarding ongoing O&M costs for components of the OpEx 20/20 project, identify whether the costs of each of the following were included in projections under question 7) above. If not included above, why not?
- a) Implementation of the mobile data terminals (SCG 02 WP p. 125) requires \$290,073 of wireless fees.
 - b) Six additional scheduling advisors required (WP to SCG 02 p. 126).
 - c) GIS training costs of \$2.7 million in (WP to SCG 02, p. 129).

SoCalGas Response:

- (a) Wireless fees for the mobile data terminals were included under the OpEx on-going support costs forecast.
- (b) The six additional scheduling advisors were also included under the OpEx on-going support costs forecast.
- (c) The GIS training costs are incremental to the on-going support forecast from OpEx. The training costs are for field employees in the use of new technology tools related to OpEx initiatives. These costs represents the time these employees are in training and thus unavailable to complete their regular field assignments. The regular work of those attending training is managed within the remaining employee base, and is in addition to their own work assignments. Please see Gina Orozco-Mejia's testimony (Exhibit SCG-02) for additional details.

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

- 9). Is the calculation of O&M benefits (SCG-13 p. RP-10) from OpEx 20/20 (Table SCG-RP-06) net of these additional costs in question 8) above)? Describe fully your reasoning.

SoCalGas Response:

The benefits were not reduced for the on-going costs. All costs were shown separately whether in this testimony or in the other witness' testimony. Similarly, benefits are shown separately in this testimony. This was done to provide clarity for both costs and benefits.

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

10) Regarding Workpapers to SCG-13, p. 8:

- a) Describe fully the \$495,000 in OpEx nonlabor hard savings. Which project is this attributable to? What type of nonlabor cost was involved?
- b) Describe fully the 136 FTE saved due to OpEx. Identify what project was involved, and the area of SCG in which these labor savings occurred.

SoCalGas Response:

- (a) These savings are GIS SCG nonlabor hard savings for Storage and Distribution. For storage, costs are optimized through more efficient operator control, reduced time for data collection and reporting, therefore the savings are from reduction of storage materials & supplies. For Distribution, the nonlabor savings are for the replacement of maintenance costs for existing ESRI and microstation.
- (b) The FTE savings are from efficiency gains through process improvement, better access to information, reduction of overtime and attrition. The benefits from the Customer workstream are attributed to deflection of answered calls by the customer representatives, therefore an increase to Self Service rates. The benefits gains for the field crews are the utilization of MDT's to automate paperwork, improve work routing and scheduling. For GIS, these savings are for productivity gains through automation of the mapping processes and more effective geospatial analytic tools.

These FTE savings are from the following projects: GIS, CII, ICE, OIA, SVOC, Care Rep, SE, M&I and Construction. The impacted organizations are Gas Distribution, Customer Services and Gas Engineering.

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

11) Regarding Workpapers to SCG 13, p. 20:

- a) Provide more description and detail on the SCG O&M labor and nonlabor hard savings for 2012.
- b) Identify the OpEx projects that these savings are attributable to.
- c) Identify the line items in this application where costs are lower by the amounts of these hard savings.

SoCalGas Response:

- (a) Please see response to Question 10a. and 10b.
- (b) Please see response to Question 10b. and 4b. Please note that 4b is represented in fully loaded nominal cumulative dollars.
- (c) Line item savings are shown in workpapers (SCG-13-WP) at pages 7-8. The overall SoCalGas revenue request in 2012 was reduced by the total amount (\$4.9M).

**TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011**

12) Regarding Table SCG RP-01 in SCG 13:

- a) Provide a correspondence between the OpEx 20/20 projects and capital costs listed in Table SCG RP-01 and those listed on FERC FORM 2 in SCG-26-WP p. GGY-WP-346.
- b) For each project where the discrepancy between the capital costs in Table SCG-RP-01 versus the sum of columns b and c on SCG-26-WP GGY-WP-346 exceed 5%, provide a full explanation for the difference.
- c) For any projects listed in Table SCG-RP-01 that do not appear in the FERC FORM 2, provide an explanation of the projected start date, or the actual completion date (if already completed).

SoCalGas Response:

a)

	SCG-RP-01	GGY-WP-346
Initiative	Capital	Total
Asset Investment Support (AIS)	\$6.2	**/****
Condition-Based Maintenance (CBM)	\$55.2	**
Geospatial Information System(GIS)	\$48.7	\$124.1
Outage/Distribution Management System (OMS/DMS)	\$41.2	**
Customer Interactions Infrastructure (CII)	\$7.9	\$8.2
Intelligent Customer Experience (ICE)	\$25.8	\$25.1
Operational Insight Analytics (OIA)	\$3.3	\$4.7
Single View of the Customer (SVOC)	\$4.3	*
Care Representative of the Future (Care Rep)	\$1.1	***
Supervisor Enablement (SE)	\$4.7	****
Maintenance & Inspection (M&I)	\$89.7	\$155.7
Construction	\$54.9	***
IT Infrastructure (ITI)	\$63.4	*/**/****/*****
Education, Training and Communication (ETC)	\$0.0	
Project Management Office (PMO)	\$13.8	*****
Total	\$420.3	

* part of line 40 Minor Projects .in GGY-WP-346

** SDGE projects

*** project not started as of Dec 2009

**** project completed before Dec 2009

***** program governance costs allocated to projects

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

Response to Question 12 (Continued)

- b) The capital estimates in table SCG -RP-01 reflects the capital forecast for the respective projects as of December 2009. In GGY-WP-346, Construction work in progress (column b) plus estimated additional costs of projects (column c) equals the 2007 SoCalGas approved Work Orders. These approved work orders are total project costs (O&M and capital).

- c) Please see the footnotes associated with the table provided in response to Question 12a, above. In addition, the Supervisor Enablement project had a completion date of May 2008.

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

- 13) Regarding Workpapers to SCG 26, p. GGY-WP-346:
- a) Provide a correspondence that links each OpEx 20/20 line item on p. GGY-WP-346 to individual OpEx 20/20 projects in GGY-WP-8 to 10. Include line numbers as well as full titles and descriptors.
 - b) Provide electronic workpapers to the OpEx 20/20 totals on GGY-WP-346 showing correspondence with account level details
 - c) Provide costs for years 2007-2009 for each project in a) above.
 - d) Identify which projects have been completed and are in ratebase.

SoCalGas Response:

- a) See attached file.



Microsoft Office
Excel Worksheet

Projects 338 – 455 were inadvertently omitted from pages GGY-WP-8-10 in the Application but will be added back in the ERRATA filing.



Adobe Acrobat
Document

- b) All costs are in FERC account 107 (Construction work in progress).

See attached work order settlement reports from SAP/Business Warehouse.



Microsoft Office
Excel Worksheet

- c) See response to b) above.
- d) None of the OpEx 20/20 projects in GGY-WP-346 were completed or in rate base as of 12/31/2009.

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

- 14) As of the end of 2009, FERC FORM 2 on SCG-26 WP GGY-WP-346 shows CWIP of \$35.364 million for line 1, GIS system. Reconcile this figure with data shown on SCG-13-CWP RDP-CWP-1. Identify and document previous expenditures on this project that are included in the FERC FORM 2.

SoCalGas Response:

Please see the attached file.



Microsoft Office
Excel Worksheet

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

- 15) As of the end of 2009, FERC FORM 2 on SCG-26 WP GGY-WP-346 shows CWIP of \$6.8 million on line 6, ICE Self-serve. Reconcile this figure with data shown on SCG-13-CWP RDP-CWP-5. Identify and document previous expenditures on this project that are included in the FERC FORM 2.

SoCalGas Response:

Please see the attached file.



Microsoft Office
Excel Worksheet

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

- 16) As of the end of 2009, FERC FORM 2 on SCG-26 WP GGY-WP-346 shows CWIP of \$8.097 million on line 5, ICE interactions infrastructure. Reconcile this figure with data shown on SCG-13-CWP RDP-CWP-15 and 16. Identify and document previous expenditures on this project that are included in the FERC FORM 2.

SoCalGas Response:

The project on pages RDP-CWP-15 and 16 is not the same as the ICE Interactions Infrastructure project on page GGY-WP-346, line 5. No capital forecast was provided for the ICE Interactions Infrastructure project in the GRC because the project was placed in service in January of 2010. Please see response to question 17 below for the detailed expenditures.

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

- 17) For each OpEx 20/20 project not separately identified in questions 14-16 above, reconcile the total CWIP in FERC FORM 2 with workpapers to SCG-13-CWP. Provide detail on expenditures in prior years, projects completed, and benefits received for each expenditure.

SoCalGas Response:

Please see the attached file.



Microsoft Office
Excel Worksheet

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

18) Referencing SCG-13 p. RP-3 at line 11, Sempra mentions “productivity targets.”

- a) Please identify the targets and their associated metrics for each year since the inception of Operational Excellence 20/20, and identify SDG&E’s and SCG’s annual recorded achievement with respect to the identified metrics.
- b) If the Utilities originally identified targets during the Utility of the Future program, please identify them and their corresponding metrics for both SDG&E and SCG, in addition to, SDG&E and SCG’s annual recorded achievement with respect to the identified metrics for the Utility of the Future program.
- c) For each productivity target, identify in which FERC account productivity enhancements would be reflected.

SoCalGas Response:

The productivity targets referenced in testimony refer to the productivity expectations built into past rates case decisions and expected to be built into this GRC decision. The statement in testimony is meant to refer to the type of productivity targets discussed by Witness Michael M. Schneider (A. 06-12-009 and A.06-12-010) in the last GRC and by Witness Herbert S. Emmrich (Exhibits SDG&E-46 and SCG-39) in these TY 2012 GRC proceedings.

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

- 19) Workpaper to SCG-13, WP p. 20, identifies SCG O&M hard savings from non-shared services in project OpEx 20/20 SCG. Provide a breakdown, in electronic form, of the substantiation and assumptions involved in calculating these savings. Identify the FERC accounts involved. Include a spreadsheet with working cells that substantiates this workpaper and a description of each entry.

SoCalGas Response:

Please see responses to Questions 4b. and 4c., above.

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

- 20) Workpaper to SDG&E-19, WP p. 22, identifies SDG&E O&M hard savings from non-shared services in project OpEx 20/20 SDGE. Provide a breakdown, in electronic form, of the substantiation and assumptions involved in calculating these savings. Identify the FERC accounts involved. Include a spreadsheet with working cells that substantiates this workpaper and a description of each entry.

SoCalGas Response:

Please see responses to Questions 4b. and 4c., above. Benefits were not mapped by FERC accounts.

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

21. Regarding the GIS program, supplemental Testimony of Hal Snyder in A.06-12-009 and 010, SDGE/SCG-100, p. HS-9 identified \$84.8 million in O&M to be spent in 2007-2021. In Table HS-2 this item was identified with an “x”, signifying that components of these projects are included in GRC testimony.
- a. Identify how much of the \$84.8 million in O&M was included in the prior GRC request?
 - b. Identify what was spent in O&M on the GIS project in each year from 2007-2010.
 - c. Explain fully any discrepancies between a) and b) above.

SoCalGas Response:

- a. For TY 2008, \$13.5M of O&M was identified for GIS. However, part of GIS is funded as a refundable program (annual spend: \$10 mm at SCG and \$4 mm at SDG&E) and is one-way balanced and subject to true-up in 2012 for any under spending.
- b. Below are the direct actual spend for GIS from 2007-2010. This included O&M and refundable costs.

(in millions)

2007	2008	2009	2010
1.3	4.4	7.1	14.3

-
-
- (c) Response: See answer 2B for actual O&M expenditures for GIS from 2007-2010. For 2A, the forecast are based in 2005 direct dollars. The response to 2B is direct nominal dollars.

The difference between the TY 2008 vs. actual spend is due to timing of the project schedule. TY 2008 assumed a six year data conversion schedule. Actual data conversion was four years. The reduction of costs is also due to lower vendor pricing. About \$1.6M of the \$13.5M was taken out of the GIS's project scope and performed under the "DIMP" project.

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011

22. Provide a correspondence between projects identified in Table HS-2 of Hal Snyder’s testimony (SDGE/SCG-100, p. HS-9) in A.06-12-009/06-12-010 and Table SCG-RP-01 in SCG-13 of this case.
- a. Clarify fully which projects in Table HS-2 have been combined to form single projects in Table SCG-RP-01.
 - b. Identify which projects in Table HS-2 have been rejected and do not form part of the current OpEx 20/20 project.
 - c. Identify any new projects in Table RP-01 that did not appear in Table HS-2.

SoCalGas Response:

- a. See below chart for project name comparison.

SDGE/SCG-100, p. HS-9 (Hal Snyder's Testimony)	SCG-RP-01 (Rick Phillip's Testimony)
Initiative	Initiative
Asset Investment Support (AIS)	Asset Investment Support (AIS)
Geospatial Information System(GIS)	Geographic Information System (GIS)
Care Rep of the Future	Care Representative of the Future (Care Rep)
ICE: Interactions Infrastructure	Customer Interactions Infrastructure (CII)
ICE: Self Service	Intelligent Customer Experience (ICE)
Real-Time Operational Analytics (RTOA)	Operational Insight Analytics (OIA)
Single View of the Customer	Single View of the Customer (SVOC)
Electronic Design	Construction
Dispatching and Mobile	M&I
Forecasting & Scheduling	M&I
Supervisor Enablement	Supervisor Enablement (SE)
Work Management	M&I
Outage/Distribution Management System (OMS/DMS)	Outage/Distribution Management System (OMS/DMS)
Condition-Based Maintenance (CBM)	Condition-Based Maintenance (CBM)
Identity and Access Management	N/A
Business Analytics	IT Infrastructure (ITI)
Encryption & Authentication	IT Infrastructure (ITI)
Service Oriented Architecture (SOA)	IT Infrastructure (ITI)
Mobility Network	IT Infrastructure (ITI)
Wide Area Network (WAN)	N/A
Project Integration (Enterprise PMO)	ETC and PMO

- b. Wide Area Network (WAN) and Identity and Access Management
- c. The current IT Infrastructure workstream includes IT Environments and I3, not previously identified in Table HS-2.

**TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-06
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: JANUARY 25, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: FEBRUARY 8, 2011**

23. According to Hal Snyder’s testimony in the prior GRC, over 90% of the O&M costs for potential UoF initiatives that may be underway in 2008 are contained in the GRC budgets. (SDGE/SCG 100, p. Hs-2.
- a. For each project with an “x” in Table HS-2, identify the O&M cost for the test year and each subsequent year that was contained in the GRC request.
 - b. Identify the authorized amount for each item in a) above implicit in the last GRC settlement.

SoCalGas Response:

- a) See below for projects with 2008 TY O&M funding request.

Project	2008 TY GRC Request
Geospatial Information System(GIS)	13.5
Forecasting & Scheduling	0.5
Work Management	0.9
OMS/DMS	1.8
Condition-Based Maintenance (CBM)	0.1
Total O&M (in millions)	16.9

For subsequent costs beyond 2008, please see response to 2A, above.

- b) The 2008 GRC Settlement Agreements (and accompanying Joint Settlement Comparison Exhibits) do not contain sufficient detail to determine an authorized funding level for these activities. However, part of GIS is funded as a DIMP refundable program (annual spend: \$10 mm at SCG and \$4 mm at SDG&E) and is one-way balanced and subject to true-up in 2012 for any under spending.