

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

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Identify
Disadvantaged Communities in the San Joaquin
Valley and Analyze Economically Feasible Options to
Increase Access to Affordable Energy in those
Disadvantaged Communities.

R.15-03-010
(Filed March 26, 2015)

**REVISED EXHIBIT 16 OF ATTACHMENT 4 OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS
COMPANY'S (U 904 G) REVISED PILOT PROPOSALS**

JOHNNY Q. TRAN

Attorney for:
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
555 West Fifth Street, Suite 1400, GT14E7
Los Angeles, California 90013
Telephone: (213) 244-2981
Facsimile: (213) 629-9620
E-Mail: JQTran@SempraUtilities.com

October 3, 2018

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Identify Disadvantaged Communities in the San Joaquin Valley and Analyze Economically Feasible Options to Increase Access to Affordable Energy in those Disadvantaged Communities.

R.15-03-010
(Filed March 26, 2015)

REVISED EXHIBIT 16 OF ATTACHMENT 4 OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY’S (U 904 G) REVISED PILOT PROPOSALS

On September 10, 2018, Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) filed its Revised Pilot Project Proposals for the communities of Allensworth, Alpaugh, California City, Ducor, Lanare, Seville, and West Goshen pursuant to Administrative Law Judges’ Ruling Requesting Parties’ Responses to Ruling Questions, Providing Guidance on Pilot Project Updates, Updating Proceeding Schedule, Entering Documents into the Record, and Providing Additional Guidance to Specific Parties issued on August 3, 2018 (ALJ’s Ruling). SoCalGas has discovered errors in its Exhibit 16 of Attachment 4. SoCalGas files this Revised Exhibit 16, Attachment 4 to correct and replace the version filed on September 10, 2018 in its entirety. The revisions are highlighted in blue cells in Exhibit 16 attached hereto and summarized as follows:

Table 1: Costs by Treatment Type

- All Communities
 - “Total NEW budget requested” – changed to be the sum of “households proposed for treatment” multiplied by “Total costs/hh.”
 - “Leveraged budget from ESA” – added \$721 per household estimated for weatherization.
 - “Total budget leveraged from existing ratepayer programs” – updated to include the added “Leveraged budget from ESA.”
 - “Total Budget Needed” – updated to incorporate the added “Leveraged budget from ESA.”

- California City, Ducor, Lanare
 - “BTM costs/hh” – Adjusted ratio of wall heaters and forced air furnaces by treatment type, overall BTM costs did not change.
- California City
 - “Leveraged budget from Solar Thermal Program” – added \$1,100 per household for estimated 112 households receiving solar thermal water heater.

Table 2: Summary of Community

- “Single Family (SF)” – revised to “Unk” as total number of single family homes is not known.
- “Estimated hh without gas” – revised to “Unk” as the number of households without gas instead of the number of households proposed in the pilot.
- “Percent hh without gas” – updated to new percentage of households without gas.

Table 3: Projected Changes in Participants’ Energy Costs

- Updated monthly values to annual totals to match revisions filed by other proposers.

Table 4: Total NEW Budget Requested

- “IFM Costs” and “Administrative” – moved “PMO Construction Management Labor” costs out of “IFM Costs” and into “Administrative” for Allensworth, California City, Ducor, Seville, and West Goshen. Alpaugh and Lanare do not have “PMO Construction Management Labor” costs. Total Cost did not change.
- “etc” – changed label to describe actual costs “Other (escalation, CWIP property tax, and AFUDC).”

Table 5: Projected Pilot Revenues (annual)

- “Increased gas sales” – updated estimated post-pilot revenue for Lanare. The estimated monthly bill amount for Ducor was inadvertently applied to Lanare.

Table 1: Costs by Treatment Type

Allensworth (SoCalGas)		Water Heater/Wall Furnace/Dryer/Range	Tankless Water Heater/Forced Air Furnace/Dryer/Range	All Treatments (Totals/Average)
General	Eligibility Requirements	ALL	ALL	
	Households proposed for treatment	53	53	106
	Minimum households to accomplish pilot objectives	53	53	106
Costs to Ratepayers	BTM costs/hh	\$ 5,275	\$ 9,112	\$ 7,194
	IFM costs/hh	\$ 42,055	\$ 42,055	\$ 42,055
	Other costs/hh	\$ 9,087	\$ 9,087	\$ 9,087
	contingency costs/hh	\$ 6,431	\$ 7,710	\$ 7,071
	Total costs/hh	\$ 62,849	\$ 67,964	\$ 65,407
Additional costs	Costs hh expected to pay, if any	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total NEW budget requested	\$ 3,330,990	\$ 3,602,110	\$ 6,933,100
Budget Requested	Leveraged budget from ESA	\$ 38,213	\$ 38,213	\$ 76,426
	Leveraged budget from ratepayer program B, etc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total budget leveraged from existing ratepayer programs	\$ 38,213	\$ 38,213	\$ 76,426
	Total Budget Needed	\$ 3,369,203	\$ 3,640,323	\$ 7,009,526

Table 1: Costs by Treatment Type

Alpaugh (SoCalGas)		Water Heater/Wall Furnace/Dryer/Range	Tankless Water Heater/Forced Air Furnace/Dryer/Range	All Treatments (Totals/Average)
General	Eligibility Requirements	ALL	ALL	
	Households proposed for treatment	3	3	6
	Minimum households to accomplish pilot objectives	3	3	6
Costs to Ratepayers	BTM costs/hh	\$ 5,271	\$ 9,104	\$ 7,188
	IFM costs/hh	\$ 8,970	\$ 8,970	\$ 8,970
	Other costs/hh	\$ 2,050	\$ 2,050	\$ 2,050
	contingency costs/hh	\$ 2,754	\$ 4,031	\$ 3,393
	Total costs/hh	\$ 19,044	\$ 24,156	\$ 21,600
Additional costs	Costs hh expected to pay, if any	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total NEW budget requested	\$ 57,133	\$ 72,467	\$ 129,600
Budget Requested	Leveraged budget from ESA	\$ 2,163	\$ 2,163	\$ 4,326
	Leveraged budget from ratepayer program B, etc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total budget leveraged from existing ratepayer programs	\$ 2,163	\$ 2,163	\$ 4,326
	Total Budget Needed	\$ 59,296	\$ 74,630	\$ 133,926

Table 1: Costs by Treatment Type

California City (SoCalGas)		Solar Thermal Water Heater/Forced Air Furnace/Dryer/Range	Tankless Water Heater/Forced Air Furnace/Dryer/Range	All Treatments (Totals/Average)
General	Eligibility Requirements	ALL	ALL	
	Households proposed for treatment	112	112	224
	Minimum households to accomplish pilot objectives	112	112	224
Costs to Ratepayers	BTM costs/hh	\$ 8,394	\$ 8,739	\$ 8,566
	IFM costs/hh	\$ 6,695	\$ 6,695	\$ 6,695
	Other costs/hh	\$ 3,536	\$ 3,536	\$ 3,536
	contingency costs/hh	\$ 3,542	\$ 3,657	\$ 3,599
	Total costs/hh	\$ 22,166	\$ 22,626	\$ 22,396
Additional costs	Costs hh expected to pay, if any	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total NEW budget requested	\$ 2,482,644	\$ 2,534,156	\$ 5,016,800
Budget Requested	Leveraged budget from ESA	\$ 80,752	\$ 80,752	\$ 161,504
	Leveraged budget from Solar Thermal program	\$ 123,200	\$ -	\$ 123,200
	Total budget leveraged from existing ratepayer programs	\$ 203,952	\$ 80,752	\$ 284,704
	Total Budget Needed	\$ 2,686,596	\$ 2,614,908	\$ 5,301,504

Table 1: Costs by Treatment Type

Ducor (SoCalGas)		Water Heater/Forced Air Furnace/Dryer/Range	Tankless Water Heater/Forced Air Furnace/Dryer/Range	All Treatments (Totals/Average)
General	Eligibility Requirements	ALL	ALL	
	Households proposed for treatment	101	100	201
	Minimum households to accomplish pilot objectives	101	100	201
Costs to Ratepayers	BTM costs/hh	\$ 7,229	\$ 8,862	\$ 8,046
	IFM costs/hh	\$ 37,113	\$ 37,113	\$ 37,113
	Other costs/hh	\$ 7,625	\$ 7,625	\$ 7,625
	contingency costs/hh	\$ 6,533	\$ 7,078	\$ 6,805
	Total costs/hh	\$ 58,500	\$ 60,677	\$ 59,589
Additional costs	Costs hh expected to pay, if any	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total NEW budget requested	\$ 5,879,278	\$ 6,098,022	\$ 11,977,300
Budget Requested	Leveraged budget from ESA	\$ 72,461	\$ 72,100	\$ 144,561
	Leveraged budget from ratepayer program B, etc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total budget leveraged from existing ratepayer programs	\$ 72,461	\$ 72,100	\$ 144,561
	Total Budget Needed	\$ 5,951,738	\$ 6,170,122	\$ 12,121,861

Table 1: Costs by Treatment Type

Lanare (SoCalGas)		Water Heater/Forced Air Furnace/Dryer/Range	Tankless Water Heater/Forced Air Furnace/Dryer/Range	All Treatments (Totals/Average)
General	Eligibility Requirements	ALL	ALL	
	Households proposed for treatment	4	4	8
	Minimum households to accomplish pilot objectives	4	4	8
Costs to Ratepayers	BTM costs/hh	\$ 7,228	\$ 8,860	\$ 8,044
	IFM costs/hh	\$ 8,156	\$ 8,156	\$ 8,156
	Other costs/hh	\$ 1,688	\$ 1,688	\$ 1,688
	contingency costs/hh	\$ 3,315	\$ 3,860	\$ 3,588
	Total costs/hh	\$ 20,387	\$ 22,563	\$ 21,475
Additional costs	Costs hh expected to pay, if any	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total NEW budget requested	\$ 81,548	\$ 90,252	\$ 171,800
Budget Requested	Leveraged budget from ESA	\$ 2,884	\$ 2,884	\$ 5,768
	Leveraged budget from ratepayer program B, etc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total budget leveraged from existing ratepayer programs	\$ 2,884	\$ 2,884	\$ 5,768
	Total Budget Needed	\$ 84,432	\$ 93,136	\$ 177,568

Table 1: Costs by Treatment Type

Seville (SoCalGas)		Water Heater/Wall Furnace/Dryer/Range	Tankless Water Heater/Forced Air Furnace/Dryer/Range	All Treatments (Totals/Average)
General	Eligibility Requirements	ALL	ALL	
	Households proposed for treatment	52	52	104
	Minimum households to accomplish pilot objectives	52	52	104
Costs to Ratepayers	BTM costs/hh	\$ 5,275	\$ 9,112	\$ 7,194
	IFM costs/hh	\$ 41,240	\$ 41,240	\$ 41,240
	Other costs/hh	\$ 9,922	\$ 9,922	\$ 9,922
	contingency costs/hh	\$ 6,341	\$ 7,620	\$ 6,980
	Total costs/hh	\$ 62,778	\$ 67,894	\$ 65,336
Additional costs	Costs hh expected to pay, if any	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total NEW budget requested	\$ 3,264,459	\$ 3,530,465	\$ 6,794,924
Budget Requested	Leveraged budget from ESA	\$ 37,492	\$ 37,492	\$ 74,984
	Leveraged budget from ratepayer program B, etc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total budget leveraged from existing ratepayer programs	\$ 37,492	\$ 37,492	\$ 74,984
	Total Budget Needed	\$ 3,301,951	\$ 3,567,957	\$ 6,869,908

Table 1: Costs by Treatment Type

West Goshen (SoCalGas)		Water Heater/Wall Furnace/Dryer/Range	Tankless Water Heater/Forced Air Furnace/Dryer/Range	All Treatments (Totals/Average)
General	Eligibility Requirements	ALL	ALL	
	Households proposed for treatment	75	75	150
	Minimum households to accomplish pilot objectives	75	75	150
Costs to Ratepayers	BTM costs/hh	\$ 5,275	\$ 9,112	\$ 7,194
	IFM costs/hh	\$ 29,065	\$ 29,065	\$ 29,065
	Other costs/hh	\$ 6,883	\$ 6,883	\$ 6,883
	contingency costs/hh	\$ 4,988	\$ 6,267	\$ 5,627
	Total costs/hh	\$ 46,211	\$ 51,326	\$ 48,769
Additional costs	Costs hh expected to pay, if any	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total NEW budget requested	\$ 3,465,823	\$ 3,849,477	\$ 7,315,300
Budget Requested	Leveraged budget from ESA	\$ 54,075	\$ 54,075	\$ 108,150
	Leveraged budget from ratepayer program B, etc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Total budget leveraged from existing ratepayer programs	\$ 54,075	\$ 54,075	\$ 108,150
	Total Budget Needed	\$ 3,519,898	\$ 3,903,552	\$ 7,423,450

Table 2. Summary of Community

Allensworth

Allensworth	number / percent
Population	561
Number of hh	136
Single Family (SF)	Unk
Multifamily (MF)	Unk
mobile homes	Unk
Estimated hh without gas	106
Percent hh without gas	77.9%
Number of CARE eligible	76
Percent of CARE eligible	72%
Average hh annual income	\$ 29,091
Primary source of employment [if known]	Farming, Fishing, Forestry

Table 2. Summary of Community

Alpaugh	number / percent
Population	1124
Number of hh	285
Single Family (SF)	Unk
Multifamily (MF)	Unk
mobile homes	Unk
Estimated hh without gas	46
Percent hh without gas	16.1%
Number of CARE eligible	31
Percent of CARE eligible	68%
Average hh annual income	\$ 38,750
Primary source of employment [if known]	Farming, Fishing, Forestry

Table 2. Summary of Community

California City	number / percent
Population	13360
Number of hh	5254
Single Family (SF)	Unk
Multifamily (MF)	Unk
mobile homes	Unk
Estimated hh without gas	1110
Percent hh without gas	21.1%
Number of CARE eligible	522
Percent of CARE eligible	47%
Average hh annual income	\$ 48,776
Primary source of employment [if known]	Administrative

Table 2. Summary of Community

Ducor	number / percent
Population	741
Number of hh	199
Single Family (SF)	Unk
Multifamily (MF)	Unk
mobile homes	Unk
Estimated hh without gas	201
Percent hh without gas	100%
Number of CARE eligible	103
Percent of CARE eligible	51%
Average hh annual income	\$ 30,288
Primary source of employment [if known]	Farming, Fishing, Forestry

Table 2. Summary of Community

Lanare	number / percent
Population	297
Number of hh	72
Single Family (SF)	Unk
Multifamily (MF)	Unk
mobile homes	Unk
Estimated hh without gas	15
Percent hh without gas	20.8%
Number of CARE eligible	6
Percent of CARE eligible	42%
Average hh annual income	\$ 37,001
Primary source of employment [if known]	Transportation

Table 2. Summary of Community

Seville	number / percent
Population	586
Number of hh	122
Single Family (SF)	Unk
Multifamily (MF)	Unk
mobile homes	Unk
Estimated hh without gas	104
Percent hh without gas	85.2%
Number of CARE eligible	47
Percent of CARE eligible	45%
Average hh annual income	\$ 23,000
Primary source of employment [if known]	Farming, Fishing, Forestry

Table 2. Summary of Community

West Goshen	number / percent
Population	580
Number of hh	148
Single Family (SF)	Unk
Multifamily (MF)	Unk
mobile homes	Unk
Estimated hh without gas	150
Percent hh without gas	100%
Number of CARE eligible	59
Percent of CARE eligible	39%
Average hh annual income	\$ 25,335
Primary source of employment [if known]	Farming, Fishing, Forestry

Table 3: Projected Changes in Participants' Energy Costs

	CARE	Non-CARE
Allensworth		
Pre-pilot estimated average energy costs for households in community	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500
Pre-pilot estimated average energy costs for participating households lacking access to natural gas	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500
Post-pilot estimated energy costs savings		
propane	\$ 1,176	\$ 1,092
wood	\$ -	\$ -
natural gas	\$ -	\$ -
electricity	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 1,176	\$ 1,092
Post-pilot estimated percent reduction in total energy costs	78.40%	72.80%

Table 3: Projected Changes in Participants' Energy Costs

	CARE	Non-CARE
Alpaugh		
Pre-pilot estimated average energy costs for households in community	\$ 1,356	\$ 1,356
Pre-pilot estimated average energy costs for participating households lacking access to natural gas	\$ 1,356	\$ 1,356
Post-pilot estimated energy costs savings		
propane	\$ 1,056	\$ 984
wood	\$ -	\$ -
natural gas	\$ -	\$ -
electricity	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 1,056	\$ 984
Post-pilot estimated percent reduction in total energy costs	77.88%	72.57%

Table 3: Projected Changes in Participants' Energy Costs

	CARE	Non-CARE
California City		
Pre-pilot estimated average energy costs for households in community	\$ 1,356	\$ 1,356
Pre-pilot estimated average energy costs for participating households lacking access to natural gas	\$ 1,356	\$ 1,356
Post-pilot estimated energy costs savings		
propane	\$ 1,104	\$ 1,032
wood	\$ -	\$ -
natural gas	\$ -	\$ -
electricity	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 1,104	\$ 1,032
Post-pilot estimated percent reduction in total energy costs	81.42%	76.11%

Table 3: Projected Changes in Participants' Energy Costs

	CARE	Non-CARE
Ducor		
Pre-pilot estimated average energy costs for households in community	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500
Pre-pilot estimated average energy costs for participating households lacking access to natural gas	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500
Post-pilot estimated energy costs savings		
propane	\$ 1,176	\$ 1,092
wood	\$ -	\$ -
natural gas	\$ -	\$ -
electricity	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 1,176	\$ 1,092
Post-pilot estimated percent reduction in total energy costs	78.40%	72.80%

Table 3: Projected Changes in Participants' Energy Costs

	CARE	Non-CARE
Lanare		
Pre-pilot estimated average energy costs for households in community	\$ 1,380	\$ 1,380
Pre-pilot estimated average energy costs for participating households lacking access to natural gas	\$ 1,380	\$ 1,380
Post-pilot estimated energy costs savings		
propane	\$ 1,080	\$ 1,008
wood	\$ -	\$ -
natural gas	\$ -	\$ -
electricity	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 1,080	\$ 1,008
Post-pilot estimated percent reduction in total energy costs	78.26%	73.04%

Table 3: Projected Changes in Participants' Energy Costs

	CARE	Non-CARE
Seville		
Pre-pilot estimated average energy costs for households in community	\$ 1,464	\$ 1,464
Pre-pilot estimated average energy costs for participating households lacking access to natural gas	\$ 1,464	\$ 1,464
Post-pilot estimated energy costs savings		
propane	\$ 1,140	\$ 1,056
wood	\$ -	\$ -
natural gas	\$ -	\$ -
electricity	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 1,140	\$ 1,056
Post-pilot estimated percent reduction in total energy costs	77.87%	72.13%

Table 3: Projected Changes in Participants' Energy Costs

	CARE	Non-CARE
West Goshen		
Pre-pilot estimated average energy costs for households in community	\$ 1,488	\$ 1,488
Pre-pilot estimated average energy costs for participating households lacking access to natural gas	\$ 1,488	\$ 1,488
Post-pilot estimated energy costs savings		
propane	\$ 1,164	\$ 1,080
wood	\$ -	\$ -
natural gas	\$ -	\$ -
electricity	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 1,164	\$ 1,080
Post-pilot estimated percent reduction in total energy costs	78.23%	72.58%

Table 4: Total NEW Budget Requested

Allensworth				
Cost Category	Year 1	Year 2	All Years	Percent of New Budget (All Years)
Administrative	\$ 359,523	\$ 359,523	\$ 719,047	10.4%
BTM Costs	\$ -	\$ 1,016,700	\$ 1,016,700	14.7%
IFM Costs	\$ 4,295,177	\$ 78,577	\$ 4,373,753	63.1%
Marketing & Outreach	\$ 170,200	\$ 170,200	\$ 340,400	4.9%
Workforce Development	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%
Other (escalation, CWIP property tax, and AFUDC)	\$ 362,800	\$ 120,400	\$ 483,200	7.0%
Total	\$ 5,187,700	\$ 1,745,400	\$ 6,933,100	100%

Table 4: Total NEW Budget Requested

Alpaugh				
Cost Category	Year 1	Year 2	All Years	Percent of New Budget (All Years)
Administrative	\$ 1,200	\$ 1,200	\$ 2,400	1.9%
BTM Costs	\$ -	\$ 57,500	\$ 57,500	44.4%
IFM Costs	\$ 59,800	\$ -	\$ 59,800	46.1%
Marketing & Outreach	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%
Workforce Development	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%
Other (escalation, CWIP property tax, and AFUDC)	\$ 5,800	\$ 4,100	\$ 9,900	7.6%
Total	\$ 66,800	\$ 62,800	\$ 129,600	100%

Table 4: Total NEW Budget Requested

California City				
Cost Category	Year 1	Year 2	All Years	Percent of New Budget (All Years)
Administrative	\$ 166,662	\$ 218,962	\$ 385,623	7.7%
BTM Costs	\$ -	\$ 2,558,400	\$ 2,558,400	51.0%
IFM Costs	\$ 281,938	\$ 1,094,738	\$ 1,376,677	27.4%
Marketing & Outreach	\$ 170,200	\$ 170,200	\$ 340,400	6.8%
Workforce Development	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%
Other (escalation, CWIP property tax, and AFUDC)	\$ 50,600	\$ 305,100	\$ 355,700	7.1%
Total	\$ 669,400	\$ 4,347,400	\$ 5,016,800	100%

Table 4: Total NEW Budget Requested

Ducor				
Cost Category	Year 1	Year 2	All Years	Percent of New Budget (All Years)
Administrative	\$ 375,023	\$ 375,023	\$ 750,047	6.3%
BTM Costs	\$ -	\$ 2,156,200	\$ 2,156,200	18.0%
IFM Costs	\$ 3,123,477	\$ 4,585,577	\$ 7,709,053	64.4%
Marketing & Outreach	\$ 170,200	\$ 170,200	\$ 340,400	2.8%
Workforce Development	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%
Other (escalation, CWIP property tax, and AFUDC)	\$ 364,100	\$ 657,500	\$ 1,021,600	8.5%
Total	\$ 4,032,800	\$ 7,944,500	\$ 11,977,300	100%

Table 4: Total NEW Budget Requested

Lanare				
Cost Category	Year 1	Year 2	All Years	Percent of New Budget (All Years)
Administrative	\$ 1,300	\$ 1,300	\$ 2,600	1.5%
BTM Costs	\$ -	\$ 85,800	\$ 85,800	49.9%
IFM Costs	\$ 72,500	\$ -	\$ 72,500	42.2%
Marketing & Outreach	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%
Workforce Development	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%
Other (escalation, CWIP property tax, and AFUDC)	\$ 4,800	\$ 6,100	\$ 10,900	6.3%
Total	\$ 78,600	\$ 93,200	\$ 171,800	100%

Table 4: Total NEW Budget Requested

Seville				
Cost Category	Year 1	Year 2	All Years	Percent of New Budget (All Years)
Administrative	\$ 359,223	\$ 359,223	\$ 718,447	10.6%
BTM Costs	\$ -	\$ 997,524	\$ 997,524	14.7%
IFM Costs	\$ 4,005,577	\$ 180,477	\$ 4,186,053	61.6%
Marketing & Outreach	\$ 170,200	\$ 170,200	\$ 340,400	5.0%
Workforce Development	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%
Other (escalation, CWIP property tax, and AFUDC)	\$ 424,500	\$ 128,000	\$ 552,500	8.1%
Total	\$ 4,959,500	\$ 1,835,424	\$ 6,794,924	100%

Table 4: Total NEW Budget Requested

West Goshen				
Cost Category	Year 1	Year 2	All Years	Percent of New Budget (All Years)
Administrative	\$ 366,823	\$ 366,823	\$ 733,647	10.0%
BTM Costs	\$ -	\$ 1,438,700	\$ 1,438,700	19.7%
IFM Costs	\$ 4,149,277	\$ 115,377	\$ 4,264,653	58.3%
Marketing & Outreach	\$ 170,200	\$ 170,200	\$ 340,400	4.7%
Workforce Development	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%
Other (escalation, CWIP property tax, and AFUDC)	\$ 384,300	\$ 153,600	\$ 537,900	7.4%
Total	\$ 5,070,600	\$ 2,244,700	\$ 7,315,300	100%

Table 5: Projected Pilot Revenues (annual)

Allensworth	Year 1	Year 2	All Years
Increased gas sales	\$ 34,344	\$ 34,344	\$ 68,688
Increased electricity sales	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CAISO market participation	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Tax credits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
etc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 34,344	\$ 34,344	\$ 68,688

Table 5: Projected Pilot Revenues (annual)

Alpaugh	Year 1	Year 2	All Years
Increased gas sales	\$ 1,800	\$ 1,800	\$ 3,600
Increased electricity sales	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CAISO market participation	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Tax credits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
etc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 1,800	\$ 1,800	\$ 3,600

Table 5: Projected Pilot Revenues (annual)

California City	Year 1	Year 2	All Years
Increased gas sales	\$ 83,328	\$ 83,328	\$ 166,656
Increased electricity sales	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CAISO market participation	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Tax credits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
etc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 83,328	\$ 83,328	\$ 166,656

Table 5: Projected Pilot Revenues (annual)

Ducor	Year 1	Year 2	All Years
Increased gas sales	\$ 82,008	\$ 82,008	\$ 164,016
Increased electricity sales	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CAISO market participation	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Tax credits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
etc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 82,008	\$ 82,008	\$ 164,016

Table 5: Projected Pilot Revenues (annual)

Lanare	Year 1	Year 2	All Years
Increased gas sales	\$ 2,976	\$ 2,976	\$ 5,952
Increased electricity sales	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CAISO market participation	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Tax credits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
etc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 2,976	\$ 2,976	\$ 5,952

Table 5: Projected Pilot Revenues (annual)

Seville	Year 1	Year 2	All Years
Increased gas sales	\$ 42,432	\$ 42,432	\$ 84,864
Increased electricity sales	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CAISO market participation	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Tax credits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
etc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 42,432	\$ 42,432	\$ 84,864

Table 5: Projected Pilot Revenues (annual)

West Goshen	Year 1	Year 2	All Years
Increased gas sales	\$ 61,200	\$ 61,200	\$ 122,400
Increased electricity sales	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CAISO market participation	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Tax credits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
etc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 61,200	\$ 61,200	\$ 122,400

Table 6: Non-Participant Bill Impacts

	Monthly bill impacts	Percent of average monthly bills	Annual bill impacts	Percentage of average annual bills
Allensworth				
Residential-CARE	\$0.00	0.02%	\$0.05	0.02%
Residential- Non-CARE	\$0.01	0.02%	\$0.08	0.02%
Non-Residential	\$0.05	0.02%	\$0.57	0.02%

Table 6: Non-Participant Bill Impacts

	Monthly bill impacts	Percent of average monthly bills	Annual bill impacts	Percentage of average annual bills
Alpaugh				
Residential-CARE	\$0.00	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%
Residential- Non-CARE	\$0.00	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%
Non-Residential	\$0.05	0.00%	\$0.01	0.00%

Table 6: Non-Participant Bill Impacts

	Monthly bill impacts	Percent of average monthly bills	Annual bill impacts	Percentage of average annual bills
California City				
Residential-CARE	\$0.00	0.01%	\$0.03	0.02%
Residential- Non-CARE	\$0.00	0.01%	\$0.05	0.02%
Non-Residential	\$0.03	0.01%	\$0.32	0.02%

Table 6: Non-Participant Bill Impacts

	Monthly bill impacts	Percent of average monthly bills	Annual bill impacts	Percentage of average annual bills
Ducor				
Residential-CARE	\$0.00	0.02%	\$0.05	0.02%
Residential- Non-CARE	\$0.01	0.02%	\$0.08	0.02%
Non-Residential	\$0.05	0.02%	\$0.57	0.02%

Table 6: Non-Participant Bill Impacts

	Monthly bill impacts	Percent of average monthly bills	Annual bill impacts	Percentage of average annual bills
Lanare				
Residential-CARE	\$0.00	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%
Residential- Non-CARE	\$0.00	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%
Non-Residential	\$0.05	0.00%	\$0.01	0.00%

Table 6: Non-Participant Bill Impacts

	Monthly bill impacts	Percent of average monthly bills	Annual bill impacts	Percentage of average annual bills
Seville				
Residential-CARE	\$0.00	0.02%	\$0.05	0.02%
Residential- Non-CARE	\$0.01	0.02%	\$0.07	0.02%
Non-Residential	\$0.04	0.01%	\$0.49	0.01%

Table 6: Non-Participant Bill Impacts

	Monthly bill impacts	Percent of average monthly bills	Annual bill impacts	Percentage of average annual bills
West Goshen				
Residential-CARE	\$0.00	0.02%	\$0.05	0.02%
Residential- Non-CARE	\$0.01	0.02%	\$0.08	0.02%
Non-Residential	\$0.05	0.02%	\$0.54	0.02%

Table 7: Summary of all Proposed Pilots' Non-Participant Annual Bill Impacts [annual]

SoCalGas	Allensworth	Alpaugh	California City	Ducor	Lanare	Seville	West Goshen	Total of all Proposed Pilot Project Bill
Residential-CARE	\$ 0.05	\$ -	\$ 0.03	\$ 0.05	\$ -	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.24
Residential- Non-CARE	\$ 0.08	\$ -	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.08	\$ -	\$ 0.07	\$ 0.08	\$ 0.37
Non-Residential	\$ 0.57	\$ 0.01	\$ 0.32	\$ 0.57	\$ 0.01	\$ 0.49	\$ 0.54	\$ 2.51

Table 8: Estimated GHG and Criteria Air Pollutant Benefits

SoCalGas	Allensworth	Alpaugh	California City	Ducor	Lanare	Seville	West Goshen
GHG Benefits (lbs/yr)							
CO2 reductions	117,786	6,267	367,411	223,348	8,422	114,051	165,632
CH4 reductions							
Criteria Air Pollution Benefits							
In-home [name]							
Outside of home [name]							
* Add additional rows as needed							

Table 9: Summary of Proposed Gas Pilot Projects

[Community Name]	Number of hh in community	Number of hh lacking gas access	Number of hh Converted (Gas)	Annual Savings (hh)(\$)(Gas)	Annual Savings (hh)(%)(Gas)	To the Meter Costs (Gas)	Total Cost Estimate (Gas)	Total NEW Budget Requested	Estimated Cost per Household (Gas)
Allensworth	136	106	106	\$ 1,092	72.80%	\$ 4,953,200	\$ 6,933,100	\$ 7,009,526	\$ 66,128
Alpaugh	285	46	6	\$ 984	72.57%	\$ 59,800	\$ 129,600	\$ 133,926	\$ 22,321
California City	5254	1110	224	\$ 1,032	76.11%	\$ 1,666,400	\$ 5,016,800	\$ 5,301,504	\$ 23,667
Ducor	199	201	201	\$ 1,092	72.80%	\$ 8,288,500	\$ 11,977,300	\$ 12,121,861	\$ 60,308
Lanare	72	15	8	\$ 1,008	73.04%	\$ 72,500	\$ 171,800	\$ 177,568	\$ 22,196
Seville	122	104	104	\$ 1,056	72.13%	\$ 4,765,500	\$ 6,794,924	\$ 6,869,908	\$ 66,057
West Goshen	148	150	150	\$ 1,080	72.58%	\$ 4,844,100	\$ 7,315,300	\$ 7,423,450	\$ 49,490

