Company: Southern California Gas Company (U 904 G)

Proceeding: 2024 General Rate Case – Track 3

Application: A.22-05-015/-016 (cons.)

Exhibit: SCG-T3-PSEP-05

PREPARED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF SAKIF WASIF (REVENUE REQUIREMENTS)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA



August 29, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION		
II.	REBUTTAL TO INDICATED SHIPPERS' PROPOSALS		
	A.	Amortization Period	1
	B.	Accrual of Regulatory Interest	3
	CONCLUSION		
APPEN	NDIX A	ΑΑ	\ -1

1 2 3

3

5

6

7

8

9

1112

13 14

15

16 17

18

1920

2122

23

24

2526

2728

-

PREPARED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF SAKIF WASIF (REVENUE REQUIREMENTS)

I. INTRODUCTION

This rebuttal testimony regarding SoCalGas's request for GRC Track 3 PSEP Reasonableness Review addresses the following testimony from other parties:

Indicated Shippers (IS) as submitted by Brian C. Collins (Exhibit IS-T3-PSEP-001), dated July 14, 2025.

Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) proposes to amortize operations and maintenance (O&M) and capital-related revenue requirements recorded in their respective Pipeline Safety Enhancement Plan (PSEP) regulatory accounts over 12 months upon approval of this application. IS claims that O&M expenses in this proceeding are not routine but are escalated to achieve certain milestones on the SoCalGas delivery system, and that SoCalGas should not be entitled to accrued interest. IS appears to misunderstand the standard methodology for recovery of capital and O&M revenue requirements. SoCalGas's recovery proposal is consistent with other proceedings and IS's testimony does not identify any new evidence supporting its arguments for different treatment.

II. REBUTTAL TO INDICATED SHIPPERS' PROPOSALS

A. Amortization Period

SoCalGas disagrees with IS's recommendation to recover O&M and capital-related costs over three years "[b]ecause these costs were incurred over a 5-year period." The O&M and capital costs presented were incurred under SoCalGas's PSEP project implementation to provide safe and reliable service to customers. It is not reasonable to further delay the recovery of costs that are deemed prudent and reasonable upon review in this proceeding.

The 12-month amortization period is consistent with the amortization of other regulatory accounts filed in connection with SoCalGas's annual regulatory account balance update filing. In addition, under fundamental accounting principles, the cost of an asset is depreciated over its useful life once placed in service. Therefore, the intent of IS's proposal is unclear, given that the

Direct Testimony of Brian C. Collins on behalf of Indicated Shippers (Exhibit (Ex.) IS-T3-PSEP-001) at 13.

² *Id.* at 14.

project costs are already being proposed for recovery over the asset's useful life, and SoCalGas is only requesting recovery of the capital-related costs, namely depreciation, return, and taxes, that have already been incurred, consistent with standard ratemaking and cost recovery practices. Adopting a 12-month amortization period for cost recovery also avoids needless compounding of regulatory account interest charged to customers. Furthermore, approximately 86%, or \$113 million, of the \$132 million revenue requirement requested in this application has already been recovered as part of the 50% interim cost recovery mechanism, subject to refund per Decision (D.) 16-08-003 until a Commission decision is rendered in this application. Consistent with the intent of D.16-08-003, the 50% interim cost recovery already mitigates the issue of rate shock for customers when these costs are finally reviewed for reasonableness and incorporated into rates.

IS also makes the passing assertion that the 12-month recovery proposal was not evident in SoCalGas's testimony.³ This is incorrect. Contrary to IS's claim, the 12-month amortization proposal is noted in the direct testimony of both Sakif Wasif⁴ and Michael Foster.⁵ IS's characterization of the record is misleading and does not reflect the content of the submitted testimonies.

Again, the 12-month amortization period is consistent with the amortization of other regulatory accounts filed in connection with SoCalGas's annual regulatory account balance update filing. It is also consistent with the recovery of capital-related costs previously approved by the Commission of SoCalGas's Tier 3 advice letter filings for its Transmission Integrity Management Program (TIMP), Distribution Integrity Management Program (DIMP),⁶ and SoCalGas's 2016 and 2018 PSEP reasonableness review applications.⁷ In response to a similar amortization proposal by IS in SoCalGas's 2018 PSEP reasonableness review application, the Commission in D.20-08-034 rejected IS's arguments, noting that IS did not cite any persuasive

Prepared Direct Testimony of Sakif Wasif on behalf of SoCalGas (Revenue Requirements) (Ex. SCG-T3-PSEP-02) at SW-7.

³ *Id.* at 11-12.

Prepared Direct Testimony of Michael Foster on behalf of SoCalGas and SDG&E (Rates) (Ex. SCG SDG&E-T3-PSEP-03) at MF-5.

SoCalGas TIMP Advice Letter Nos. 6325-G and 6493-G; SoCalGas DIMP Advice Letter No. 6224-G. SoCalGas advice letters are available at: https://tariffsprd.socalgas.com/scg/filings/content/?utilId=SCG&bookId=GAS&flngStatusCd=Approved.

⁷ Application (A.) 16-09-005, approved by D.19-02-004 and A.18-11-010, approved by D.20-08-034.

legal or decision authority in support of its arguments for extending the amortization timelines.⁸ The Commission further affirmed that the 50% interim cost recovery mitigates customer concerns regarding rate shock.⁹ Given this clear precedent and the lack of new justification, IS's proposal to extend the amortization period in this proceeding should be rejected.

B. Accrual of Regulatory Interest

As stated in the opening testimony of Sakif Wasif, the Preliminary Statements approved by the CPUC for SEEBA, SECCBA, PSEP-P2MA, and PSEPMA state that each account is interest-bearing, and SoCalGas will record an entry at the end of each month for interest. In case of an over-collection in any of these accounts, the balance would be subject to a refund with interest. Disallowing or suspending interest accrued on under-collected balances associated with reasonably incurred expenditures would contradict long-standing authorization by the CPUC. In addition, IS does not provide any substantive reason for not allowing recovery of interest beyond what the Commission has already stated. IS did not raise any issue with the PSEP showing in Track 1; IS essentially argues that alleged deficiencies in a record they did not comment on previously should result in a disallowance.

III.CONCLUSION

IS's recommendation to amortize capital-related costs and O&M expenses over a three-year period should be rejected. The majority of SoCalGas's request is already subject to a 50% interim cost recovery mechanism that already mitigates the issue of rate shock for customers. A twelve-month amortization period is appropriate and consistent with Commission precedent for similar regulatory accounts. It ensures the timely recovery of prudent and reasonable costs incurred under SoCalGas's Application. Additionally, IS's recommendation to disallow interest accrual on these costs is inconsistent with established regulatory practice and is not based on any new evidence or arguments from IS. The proposed twelve-month amortization with interest accrual remains the most reasonable and consistent approach.

This concludes my prepared rebuttal testimony.

⁸ D.20-08-034 at 23-24.

⁹ *Id*.

APPENDIX A

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Acronym	Definition
DIMP	Distribution Integrity Management Program
PSEP	Pipeline Safety Enhancement Plan
PSEPMA	Pipeline Safety Enhancement Plan Memorandum Account
PSEP-P2MA	Pipeline Safety Enhancement Plan Phase 2 Memorandum Account
SECCBA	Safety Enhancement Capital Cost Balancing Accounts
SEEBA	Safety Enhancement Expense Balancing Accounts
SoCalGas	Southern California Gas Company
TIMP	Transmission Integrity Management Program