(A.18-07-024)

(DATA REQUEST TURN-SEU-07)

DATA RECEIVED: 3-7-19
DATE RESPONDED: 3-22-19

QUESTION 1:

Please provide the same data provided in response to Data Request TURN-SEU-04, Question 1 (all subparts except h) for the historical period April 1, 2012 through March 31, 2016.

RESPONSE 1:

Sent via Electronic Data Transfer on March 22, 2019.

(A.18-07-024)

(DATA REQUEST TURN-SEU-07)

DATA RECEIVED: 3-7-19
DATE RESPONDED: 3-22-19

QUESTION 2:

For each of the last ten winters, please provide the highest daily storage withdrawal volume for the core market. If possible, please also separate between figures for scheduled core withdrawals and any additional withdrawals required to balance flowing core supplies and scheduled core withdrawals with daily core demand.

RESPONSE 2:

Please see attachment "TURN-07-Q2 Total Core Withdrawal Winters.xlsx."

Applicants cannot separate figures for scheduled core withdrawal and load balancing withdrawal.

(A.18-07-024)

(DATA REQUEST TURN-SEU-07)

DATA RECEIVED: 3-7-19
DATE RESPONDED: 3-22-19

QUESTION 3:

Have any of the highest daily withdrawal volumes provided in response to Question 2 above exceeded the core allocation of withdrawal capacity in effect at the time?

RESPONSE 3:

No, firm withdrawal volumes are governed by contractual quantities, and that information is an input in the customer contract computer system. This information limits the transaction quantities of these customers through our gas scheduling system, ENVOY.

(A.18-07-024)

(DATA REQUEST TURN-SEU-07)

DATA RECEIVED: 3-7-19
DATE RESPONDED: 3-22-19

QUESTION 4:

Regarding the response to Data Request TURN-SEU-04, Question 9: Before proposing to increase the core's summer injection capacity allocation from 388 MMcf/d to 433 MMcf/d, did the Sempra Utilities conduct any analysis to determine whether the increased cost of the higher core summer injection allocation would be offset by reduced gas commodity costs as a result of having "more flexibility to inject gas at the most beneficial times throughout the summer injection season"? If so, please provide that analysis.

RESPONSE 4:

No such analysis was performed.

(A.18-07-024)

(DATA REQUEST TURN-SEU-07)

DATA RECEIVED: 3-7-19
DATE RESPONDED: 3-22-19

QUESTION 5:

Regarding the response to Data Request TURN-SEU-04, Question 11: Please reconcile the gas base margin of \$2,225,608 shown in this response with the Total Allocated Base Margin of \$2,246,492 shown in Table 4 on page 26 of Witness Schmidt-Pines' testimony. Please describe all adjustments made to reach the figure shown in the testimony.

RESPONSE 5:

Below shows the Base Margin and the adjustments to equal to the \$2,246,492 (in \$000). This is shown in the previously-provided workpaper (excel version), "2020 TCAP SCG RD Model.xls", tab: Revenue Check.

			(\$000)
Base Margin			\$2,225,608
Adjustments to Base Margin			
AB32 Fees	(\$4,536)	101.74%	(\$4,615)
Brokerage Fee			(\$7,927)
			\$2,213,066
			\$0
Alice Canyon			
Aliso Canyon	#00.050	404 740/	COO 400
Turbine Replacement	\$32,856	101.74%	\$33,426
Base Margin in Transportation Rates			
(w/FFU; Pre SI/BTS)			\$2,246,492

AB32 Fees (after applying FF&U factor) are removed from Base Margin and allocated by Equal Cents Per Therm (ECPT) for AB32 Fee Non-Exempt, shown in the workpaper, "2020 TCAP SCG RD Model.xls", tab: Cost Alloc, line 27. Brokerage Fee is part of the Core Procurement. Aliso Canyon Turbine Replacement is added as explained in Chapter 8 (Fung), pp. 17-18.