

TURN/SCGC DATA REQUEST-02
SDG&E-SOCALGAS 2019 GRC – A.17-11-007/8
SDG&E_SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: FEBRUARY 21, 2018
DATE RESPONDED: MARCH 8, 2018
SUPPLEMENTAL DATE: MARCH 28, 2018

Exhibit Reference: Gas Transmission SCG-07
SCG Witness: Bermel
Subject: North / South

3. The testimony at page MAB-32, lines 3-4, states: “The Commission has permitted cost recovery of this type under similar circumstances under the abandoned project theory and when equity so requires.”

- a. Please identify each Commission decision that the witness is relying upon in support of this statement.
- b. Please explain in specific terms what type of cost recovery the witness is referring to in this statement.
- c. Please explain what circumstances the witness is referring to in this statement.
- d. What is “abandoned project theory”?

Supplemental Utility Response 03:

Pursuant to a telephonic meet-and-confer on March 19, 2018 with Hayley Goodson on behalf of TURN and SCGC, SoCalGas, TURN, and SCGC stipulate to delete the following sentence from SCG-07 (Bermel and Musich) at p. MAB-32: “The Commission has permitted cost recovery of this time under similar circumstances under the abandoned project theory and when equity so requires.”

The foregoing shall not affect SoCalGas’ ability to rely upon the abandoned project theory or any other legal or equitable theories in seeking the cost recovery discussed in SCG-07 (Bermel and Musich). The deletion shall be reflected in rebuttal testimony to be submitted by Mr. Bermel and Ms. Musich in this proceeding.

TURN/SCGC DATA REQUEST-02
SDG&E-SOCALGAS 2019 GRC – A.17-11-007/8
SDG&E_SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: FEBRUARY 21, 2018
DATE RESPONDED: MARCH 8, 2018
SUPPLEMENTAL DATE: MARCH 28, 2018

Original Utility Response 03:

- a. SoCalGas objects to this request on the grounds that it: (1) seeks information that is beyond the scope of permissible discovery contemplated by Rule 10.1 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the State of California Public Utilities Commission; (2) seeks legal conclusions rather than the production of evidence of a factual matter; and (3) requests SoCalGas to search for matters of public record in CPUC proceedings (decisions, orders, etc.), when such information is available equally to TURN/SCGC. SoCalGas further objects to the extent this request calls for the production of privileged communications, analyses or documents covered by the attorney-client communication privilege and/or attorney work product doctrine.
- b. SoCalGas objects to the phrase “type pf cost recovery” is vague and ambiguous. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing onjections, SoCalGas responds as follows:

SoCalGas interprets the phrase “type of cost recovery” as seeking a detailed breakdown of the costs sought in the application. The witnesses are referring to the recovery of reasonably incurred costs, as described in response 2.
- c. This passage refers to circumstances where a utility prudently selected or pursued a project, ultimately not constructed, and the Regulatory Agency determined cost recovery should be allowed for equitable reasons.
- d. SoCalGas objects to this request on the grounds that it: (1) seeks information that is beyond the scope of permissible discovery contemplated by Rule 10.1 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the State of California Public Utilities Commission; (2) seeks legal conclusions rather than the production of evidence of a factual matter; and (3) requests SoCalGas to search for matters of public record in CPUC proceedings (decisions, orders, etc.), when such information is available equally to TURN/SCGC. SoCalGas further objects to the extent this request calls for the production of privileged communications, analyses or documents covered by the attorney-client communication privilege and/or attorney work product doctrine.