# PG&E RSAR 2020 Data Request 22-05-23

For each data request, please provide any relevant documentation including:

* Internet address to the document(s)
* Citation including applicable page numbers, tables, charts, heading.
* Screen shots as applicable

## Gas Distribution Expense

1. **Table 2-3, Line 5, p. 2-14 Answer Received**
   1. An accounting change recorded response times differently.
      1. Provide documentation about why the the accounting change increased actual costs by almost 50%?
      2. Did the MATs that previously contained these charges see a decrease in actual costs?
      3. What was the effect on other related MATs?
2. **Table 2-3, Line 23, p.2-15 Answer Received**
   1. Provide documentation about why the anticipated efficiencies and cost reductions from the Picarro leak survey technology were not realized.

## Gas Distribution Capital

1. **Table 2-4, Line 8, p. 2-21 Answer Received**
   1. Provide documentation about why the capital conversation rate was lower.
      1. Were there less customer requests for inspections?
      2. Did inspections reveal that a greater number of meter locations meet conformity than anticipated?
      3. Were there other reasons?
2. **Table 2-4, Line 63, p. 2-24**
   1. Why was this work converted to contractors if it resulted in higher costs? Provide documentation.
   2. Is the requirement for contractors to hold a California drilling license responsible for the cost overrun?
      1. Are PG&E workers also required to hold a California drilling license? If so, elaborate on why the Cost Variance Explanation points out that California contractors must hold a drilling license.

## Electric Distribution Expense

1. **Table 3-3, Line 20, p. 3-5**
   1. What was the reason for the switch from the Customer Care Category to the Electric Distribution Category?
   2. Why does the actual cost in the Customer Care Category show a negative amount?
   3. Was this program overspent? The dollar amount spent between the two categories does not add up to the 2021 Imputed Adopted Cost in the program. If it was overspent, what was the reason for the overspend?
2. **Table 3-3, Line 22, p. 3-5**
   1. Provide documentation for the reason for the increased compliance workload.
   2. Provide documentation the reason for the increased system hardening work.
   3. Provide documentation the reason for the other new business work.
   4. Provide documentation the reason for the increased wildfire mitigation work in support of EPSS.
3. **Table 3-3, Line 40, p. 3-6**
   1. Provide documentation of the reasons for the increased contractor spend and increased support costs.
      1. Why were contractors used instead of PG&E employees?
4. **Table 3-3, Line 82, p. 3-8 Answer Received**
   1. Cite any regulation or driver that caused the change.
   2. Provide documentation as to why was there an expansion of vegetation management over what was previously planned?
5. **Table 3-3, Line 136, p. 3-12**
   1. Provide documentation as to why UG preventative maintenance exceed forecasted workload.
      1. Did priorities change?
      2. Where did the excess funds come from?

## Electric Distribution Capital

1. **Table 3-4, Line 22, p. 3-14**
   1. The 2021 imputed adopted cost is $0. Why did PG&E decide to undertake this work? Provide documentation.
2. **Table 3-4, Line 27, p. 3-14**
   1. The unit variance explanation says, *"Actual units were lower than imputed regulatory units due to supporting higher risk and higher priority work such as System Hardening, WSIP tags, pole replacement, and PSPS that shifted out conductor replacements."* However, it seems reasonable that replacement of deteriorated conductors is a logical result of a Wildfire Safety Inspection Program (WSIP) and a critical component of system hardening and wildfire resiliency.
      1. Provide a listing of work that was a listing of the work that was placed at higher risk and higher priority than replacement of deteriorated conductors.
      2. What PSPS activities rose above replacing damaged conductors?
      3. How does this affect risk reduction mitigation in the RAMP?
      4. Where was the unused 44% of funding spent? Please provide documentation of all programs and work types.
3. **Table 3-4, Line 30, p. 3-14**
   1. Provide documentation of changes resulting from the improved modeling tool.
      1. For example, location, type of work performed, improved inspections, improved data collection, etc.
   2. It is understood that the miles targeted in 2021 from the improved model result in greater risk reduction in previously planned work. Even so, PG&E equipment still pose a fire risk beyond the 2021 targets.
      1. Why was the unused 61% of funding not used to further reduce fire risk from PG&E equipment beyond the 2021 target?
      2. How does this affect the risk reduction mitigation in the RAMP?
      3. Provide documentation showing where was the remaining 61% of funding was used.
4. **Table 3-4, Line 60, p. 3-16**
   1. Higher volume of work completed than anticipated and the need for more contractors appears contradictory.
      1. Please elaborate on what is meant in this Cost Variance Explanation.
      2. Explain reason for additional work and additional contractors.
      3. How does this work fit with the underexpenditure in 08W, MAT Name: System Hardening Wildfire Resiliency projects and 08J, MAT Name: Repl Deteriorated OH Conductor?
5. **Table 3-4, Line 66, p. 3-17**
   1. Did the actual preventative maintenance work volume exceed forecasted workload?
      1. If not, why was the need for greater use of contractors not accounted for in the imputed adopted costs?
   2. Provide documentation as to where the excess funds came from.
6. **Table 3-4, Line 94, p. 3-18**
   1. Cite the regulatory driver or processes.
   2. Describe these technology investments and how they will more efficiently support wildfire mitigation efforts.
7. **Table 3-4, Line 97, p. 3-18**
   1. Provide documentation about cancellation of the Llagas Energy Storage Project, including project phase and any capital and non-capital expenditures incurred prior to and during Project cancellation.
   2. Provide a brief summary as to the reason for the cancellation of the Llagas Energy Storage Project.
   3. Provide documentation as to where and how was the unspent 70% of funding was used. Include all programs and work types.
8. **Table 3-4, Line 111, p. 3-19**
   1. What was the purpose for the higher volume of line reclosers and automatic switch purchases?
   2. Was this equipment actually needed and was it installed?
   3. Was there also a higher amount of work done in repairing and replacing line reclosers and automatic switches?
9. **Table 3-4, Line 139, p. 3-21**
   1. Explain what an in-flight transformer replacement is.
   2. Why was the decision made to continue in-flight transformer replacements even though this activity is not included in the GRC?