

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
2011 General Rate Case
Application 09-12-020
Data Request**

Recipient:	Division of Ratepayer Advocates		
PG&E Data Request No.:	PGE_DRA022		
PG&E File Name:	GRC2011-Ph-I_DR_PGE_DRA022		
Request Date:	May 13, 2010	PG&E Witness:	Redacted
Due Date:	May 27, 2010	PG&E Witness Phone No.:	Redacted
Topic:	Electric Distribution Operations and Maintenance Expenses		

Subject: MWC BK, Maintenance of Other Equipment

Reference: Exhibit DRA-5

DRA Witness: Tamera Godfrey

- Q1: In DRA-5, pg. 13, lines 13-14, DRA recommends use of PG&E's 2008 recorded adjusted expenses as a reasonable test year estimate that should be sufficient for PG&E to address its work needs in the test year. Please provide all work, documentation, support, spreadsheets, tables, analyses, and other detail to support how DRA arrived at the figure, and if DRA does not have support, describe in detail DRA's process to determine this is the most appropriate method in determining the proper funding of this activity in 2011.
- Q2: In DRA-5, pg. 13, line 13, DRA recommends use of PG&E's 2008 recorded adjusted expenses as a reasonable test year estimate that should be sufficient for PG&E to address its work needs in the test year. DRA then states in DRA-5, pg. 15, line 1 that "PG&E's 2008 recorded adjusted expenses of \$1.785 million is a sufficient forecast for 2011 based on recent history." Yet the 2008 recorded adjusted expenses, as is stated in DRA-5, pg. 13 table 5-2, and PG&E maintains, is \$4.109 million. Should PG&E assume then that DRA's actual recommendation for MWC BK for 2011 is \$4.109 million escalated to 2011 levels?