

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY**  
**(DATA REQUEST CALADVOCATES-SC-SCG-2019-10)**  
**DATA RECEIVED: December 10, 2019**  
**DATE RESPONDED: December 23, 2019**  
**DATE SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE: January 13, 2019 2020**

---

**QUESTION 1:**

In 2017, as part of San Pedro Bay Ports' Clean Air Action Plan, the Port of Long Beach set a goal of transitioning all terminal equipment to zero emissions by 2030. At any time, has SoCalGas lobbied the Port of Long Beach regarding the proposed zero emissions transition?

**RESPONSE 1:**

Yes, SoCalGas participated in a discussion with Port of Long Beach officials regarding the Port of Long Beach's truck incentive program, renewable natural gas, the availability of near-zero and zero emissions heavy duty trucks that would assist the Port of Long Beach with meeting their climate change goals and suggesting that the Port of Long Beach take these into consideration in their updated Clean Air Action Plan.

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY**  
**(DATA REQUEST CALADVOCATES-SC-SCG-2019-10)**  
**DATA RECEIVED: December 10, 2019**  
**DATE RESPONDED: December 23, 2019**  
**DATE SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE: January 13, 2019 2020**

---

**QUESTION 2:**

In 2017, did SoCalGas employees appear at meetings of the Long Beach Harbor Commission to speak regarding the proposed transition to zero emissions equipment?

**RESPONSE 2:**

Yes. SoCalGas employees appeared at a September 21, 2017, meeting with Port of Long Beach officials.

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY**  
**(DATA REQUEST CALADVOCATES-SC-SCG-2019-10)**  
**DATA RECEIVED: December 10, 2019**  
**DATE RESPONDED: December 23, 2019**  
**DATE SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE: January 13, 2019 2020**

---

**QUESTION 3:**

If the answer to question 2 is yes:

- a. When did such lobbying occur?
- b. What were SoCalGas' recommendations to the Port of Long Beach regarding the proposed zero emissions transition?
- c. Who authorized such lobbying?
- d. Please provide the name and title of each SoCalGas employee who was involved in such lobbying.
- e. Did SoCalGas contract with any agent, consultant or firm to support its lobbying effort? If so, identify each such contractor/agent.
- f. State the total costs that SoCalGas has incurred associated with lobbying the Port of Long Beach regarding a transition to zero emissions equipment.

**RESPONSE 3:**

The response includes highlighted Confidential and Protected Material pursuant to PUC Section 583, GO 66-D, D.17-09-023, and the accompanying declaration.

- a. September 21, 2017.
- b. SoCalGas recommended that the Port of Long Beach consider including near zero heavy duty trucks into the clean truck program of the updated clean air action plan. The company discussed the benefits of Near Zero Trucks, Renewable Natural Gas (RNG) Background, RNG State Benefits, production capability of near zero emission engines and fueling infrastructure availability.
- c. George Minter, Regional Vice President of External Affairs
- d. George Minter, Regional Vice President of External Affairs [REDACTED], Environmental Policy Manager [REDACTED], Public Affairs Manager
- e. Yes. [REDACTED]
- f. **SoCalGas Original Response 01 Dated December 23, 2019**

SoCalGas objects to this question as overbroad and unduly burdensome. Subject to and without waiving its objection, SoCalGas responds as follows:

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY**

**(DATA REQUEST CALADVOCATES-SC-SCG-2019-10)**

**DATA RECEIVED: December 10, 2019**

**DATE RESPONDED: December 23, 2019**

**DATE SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE: January 13, 2019 2020**

---

SoCalGas has not attempted to calculate the costs associated with the company's discussions with the Port of Long Beach regarding the Port of Long Beach proposed zero emissions transition. The employees who communicated with the Port of Long Beach are all salaried employees and do not track their costs each day with the intent of reporting out a log of incremental costs associated with their daily employee activities.

**SoCalGas Supplemental Response 01 Dated January 13, 2020:**

On January 9, 2020, SoCalGas conferred with the Public Advocates Office and its counsel about clarifications to the scope of the data request. SoCalGas appreciates the courtesy afforded by the Public Advocates Office in clarifying the data request. In accordance with the Public Advocates Office email correspondence dated January 9, 2020, this data request response is supplemented based on the following clarifications:

"For all of the updated answers to DR 10, SoCalGas will provide not only an estimate of the costs, but the basis for the estimates so that the Public Advocates Office has an understanding of how SoCalGas reached the estimates." "If employees do not track their costs, as asserted in response to the DR, SoCalGas should at least be able to provide a reasonable estimate of the costs."

Based on the meet and confer with the Public Advocates Office on January 9, 2020, SoCalGas has calculated an estimate of total costs of \$ [REDACTED], which includes estimates for the following: \$ [REDACTED] of labor costs for three employees spending ½ hour of time at a meeting plus commute and minimal prep time, \$ [REDACTED] for one employee's mileage expense and \$ [REDACTED] as an estimated contractor expense. These costs are explained further in responses 4 and 5 below.

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY**  
**(DATA REQUEST CALADVOCATES-SC-SCG-2019-10)**  
**DATA RECEIVED: December 10, 2019**  
**DATE RESPONDED: December 23, 2019**  
**DATE SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE: January 13, 2019 2020**

---

**QUESTION 4:**

Please disaggregate the costs identified in question 3 into the following categories:

- a. Labor
- b. Travel, lodging, meals, and incidental travel expenses
- c. Consultant costs
- d. Other

**RESPONSE 4:**

The response includes highlighted Confidential and Protected Material pursuant to PUC Section 583, GO 66-D, D.17-09-023, and the accompanying declaration.

**SoCalGas Original Response 01 Dated December 23, 2019**

SoCalGas objects to this question as overbroad and unduly burdensome. Subject to and without waiving its objection, SoCalGas responds as follows:

SoCalGas has not attempted to calculate employee labor, travel, lodging, meals, travel expenses, consultant costs or other costs associated with the company's September 21, 2017, meeting with the Port of Long Beach regarding the Port of Long Beach proposed zero emissions transition. Accordingly, SoCalGas is unable to "disaggregate the total costs" for the categories listed in 4(a) – (d).

**SoCalGas Supplemental Response 01 Dated January 13, 2020:**

On January 9, 2020, SoCalGas conferred with the Public Advocates Office and its counsel about clarifications to the scope of the data request. SoCalGas appreciates the courtesy afforded by the Public Advocates Office in clarifying the data request. In accordance with the Public Advocates Office email correspondence dated January 9, 2020, this data request response is supplemented based on the following clarifications:

"SoCalGas agreed that it could provide an estimate of employee time spent on the activities in question and estimate the costs based on employee salaries. The Public Advocates Office stated that any time spent on these activities is responsive to the question, not just the time spent physically at the meeting on Sept. 21, 2017. SoCalGas said it would confer with the available employees involved in the subject activities and estimate any other time spent on these activities. SoCalGas also stated it would estimate any travel, lodging, or related expenses

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY**

**(DATA REQUEST CALADVOCATES-SC-SCG-2019-10)**

**DATA RECEIVED: December 10, 2019**

**DATE RESPONDED: December 23, 2019**

**DATE SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE: January 13, 2019 2020**

---

as requested in Question 4, although it asserted there were no expenses for some of these categories. SoCalGas also explained that it considered it difficult to estimate consultant costs because of the manner in which the consultant is paid and because the consultant does not track its time. The Public Advocates Office stated that SoCalGas should be able to provide an explanation of how the consultant is paid and a reasonable estimate of how much of these costs may be attributed to the activity in question. SoCalGas agreed to provide this information about consultant costs.”

Based on the meet and confer with the Public Advocates Office on January 9, 2020, SoCalGas supplements its response as follows:

a. Labor

SoCalGas estimates the labor costs by taking the 30 minutes spent at the meeting in addition to prep time the employees estimated and multiplying by the hourly salary cost of the employees who attended. The total labor costs include minimal to no preparation time as this meeting was essentially a meet and greet and the SoCalGas employees were already familiar with the RNG subject discussed at the meeting. Accordingly, there was little to no relevant preparation time for the meet and greet. The estimated total labor costs are as follows:

██████████ - \$ ██████ (1.05 hours)  
George Minter - \$ ██████ (1.5 hours)  
██████████ - \$ ██████ (3 hours)

b. Travel, lodging, meals, and incidental travel expenses

The September 21, 2017 meeting was 30 minutes and scheduled as a meet and greet. There are no lodging costs associated with the September 21, 2017 meeting as the meeting was local. ██████████ and ██████████ did not have mileage costs as their commute to the Long Beach meeting was shorter than their commute to SoCalGas’ office in downtown Los Angeles. George Minter incurred approximately \$ ██████ in mileage costs for his commute to Long Beach, which is based on 48 miles calculated at \$ ██████ cents per mile.

c. Consultant costs

██████████ received a \$ ██████ monthly retainer fee and provided an average of 15 hours of work per month for governmental affairs. For the January 21, 2017, meeting, ██████████ made a telephone call to the Port of Long Beach officials to schedule the meeting and another call to confirm the meeting, estimated at a total of 15 minutes. Based on this, SoCalGas estimates ██████████ incurred \$ ██████ in costs for arranging the meeting. This amount is calculated by dividing the \$ ██████ per month retainer fee by an average of 15 hours work per

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY**

**(DATA REQUEST CALADVOCATES-SC-SCG-2019-10)**

**DATA RECEIVED: December 10, 2019**

**DATE RESPONDED: December 23, 2019**

**DATE SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE: January 13, 2019 2020**

---

month for a \$ [REDACTED] per hour fee then dividing by 4 to obtain the 15 minutes spent arranging the meeting.

d. Other

SoCalGas did not identify any “other” costs associated with the September 21, 2017 meeting.

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY**  
**(DATA REQUEST CALADVOCATES-SC-SCG-2019-10)**  
**DATA RECEIVED: December 10, 2019**  
**DATE RESPONDED: December 23, 2019**  
**DATE SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE: January 13, 2019 2020**

---

**QUESTION 5:**

Please identify each account to which any portion of the costs identified in question 3 were charged.

- a. State the account name and cost center number.
- b. State whether the account is ratepayer funded.
- c. State how much was charged to the account.

**RESPONSE 5:**

The response includes highlighted Confidential and Protected Material pursuant to PUC Section 583, GO 66-D, D.17-09-023, and the accompanying declaration.

**SoCalGas Original Response 01 Dated December 23, 2019**

- a. [REDACTED] (Regional Public Affairs)  
Cost Center: 2200-0811  
IO Number: 9205702200

[REDACTED] (Environmental Policy)  
Cost Center: 2200-2396  
IO Number: 300645944

George Minter (External Affairs)  
Cost Center: 2200-2441  
IO Number: 9200002200

[REDACTED]  
Shared cost center: (External Affairs)  
Cost Center: 2200-2208  
IO Number: 9215702200  
Cost Center: 2200-2285  
IO Number: 9210002200

- b. The accounts are ratepayer funded.
- c. SoCalGas objects to this question as overbroad and unduly burdensome. Subject to and without waiving its objection, SoCalGas responds as follows:



**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY**

**(DATA REQUEST CALADVOCATES-SC-SCG-2019-10)**

**DATA RECEIVED: December 10, 2019**

**DATE RESPONDED: December 23, 2019**

**DATE SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE: January 13, 2019 2020**

---

SoCalGas has not attempted to calculate costs associated with the September 21, 2017 meeting. The employees who attended the meeting are all salaried employees and do not track their costs each day with the intent of reporting costs associated with specific meetings. The contractor, Ek, Sunkin & Bai, LLC is on retainer; therefore, there were no additional contractor costs associated with this meeting.

**SoCalGas Supplemental Response 01 Dated January 13, 2020:**

On January 9, 2020, SoCalGas conferred with the Public Advocates Office and its counsel about clarifications to the scope of the data request. SoCalGas appreciates the courtesy afforded by the Public Advocates Office in clarifying the data request. In accordance with the Public Advocates Office email correspondence dated January 9, 2020, this data request response is supplemented based on the following clarifications:

“For all of the updated answers to DR 10, SoCalGas will provide not only an estimate of the costs, but the basis for the estimates so that the Public Advocates Office has an understanding of how SoCalGas reached the estimates.” “If employees do not track their costs, as asserted in response to the DR, SoCalGas should at least be able to provide a reasonable estimate of the costs.”

Based on the meet and confer with the Public Advocates Office on January 9, 2020, SoCalGas supplements its response as follows:

- a. [REDACTED] (Regional Public Affairs)  
Cost Center: 2200-0811  
IO Number: 9205702200

Estimated Labor: \$ [REDACTED]

- [REDACTED] (Environmental Policy)  
Cost Center: 2200-2396  
IO Number: 300645944

Estimated Labor: \$ [REDACTED]

- George Minter (External Affairs)  
Cost Center: 2200-2441  
IO Number: 9200002200

Estimated Labor: \$ [REDACTED]

Travel: \$ [REDACTED]

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY**

**(DATA REQUEST CALADVOCATES-SC-SCG-2019-10)**

**DATA RECEIVED: December 10, 2019**

**DATE RESPONDED: December 23, 2019**

**DATE SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE: January 13, 2019 2020**

---

[REDACTED]  
Shared cost center: (External Affairs)

Cost Center: 2200-2208

IO Number: 9215702200

Cost Center: 2200-2285

IO Number: 9210002200

Estimated consultant costs: \$ [REDACTED]

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY**  
**(DATA REQUEST CALADVOCATES-SC-SCG-2019-10)**  
**DATA RECEIVED: December 10, 2019**  
**DATE RESPONDED: December 23, 2019**  
**DATE SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE: January 13, 2019 2020**

---

**QUESTION 6:**

State how SoCalGas determined the appropriate account(s) in which to record the costs identified in question 3.

**RESPONSE 6:**

SoCalGas objects to this question as overbroad and unduly burdensome. Subject to and without waiving its objection, SoCalGas responds as follows:

The employees who attended the September 21, 2017 meeting are all salaried employees and their labor costs and expenses are recorded to ratepayer funded cost centers. As noted in the TY2019 General Rate Case (GRC) workpapers, not all costs recorded to the cost centers are requested for recovery from ratepayers. During the development of the GRC forecasts, it is sometimes necessary to remove incurred costs to further ensure that ratepayers are not funding activities that should be borne by shareholders.