PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY General Rate Case 2011 Phase I Application 09-12-020 Data Response

PG&E Data Request No.:	DRA_272-01							
PG&E File Name:	GRC2011-Ph-I_DR_DRA_272-Q01							
Request Date:	June 10, 2010	Requester DR No.:	DRA-272-DAO					
Date Sent:	June 21, 2010	Requesting Party:	DRA					
PG&E Witness:	Robert Fassett	Requester:	Dao Phan					

EXHIBIT REFERENCE: PG&E-18, Volume 3B

SUBJECT: DIMP, GAS DISTRIBUTION O&M EXPENSES

QUESTION 1

On page 27-6 of the Rebuttal, PG&E states, "While PG&E agrees with the use of the PHMSA analysis as a matter of a general principle, the PHMSA cost-benefit analysis was a high level review of the potential costs of the new rule. It did not evaluate the circumstances of individual utilities. It also expressly did not take into consideration the complexity of PG&E's proposed DIMP plan relative to the model used, or the significant differences in wages, unit costs and other factors between PG&E's DIMP plan and the assumptions PHMSA used in its analysis."

- a. Please identify the "model" used in this statement and provide a copy of this model.
- b. Please provide a copy of the comparison used in this statement to conclude that there are significant differences in wages, unit costs and other factors between PG&E's DIMP and PHMSA assumptions.

Answer 1

(Question a.): The PHMSA study (Regulatory Impact Analysis: Final Rule), referenced by DRA incorrectly as a FERC estimate (DRA-7, p. 8, fn. 14: 74 Fed. Reg. 63932), is attached to GRC2011-Ph-I_DR_DRA_272-Q03. The model used by PHSMA is described in sections 7-1, 7-2, and 7-3 of this document.

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY General Rate Case 2011 Phase I Application 09-12-020 Data Response

(Question b.): Please see below:

Main Replacement C	osts	PHMSA Study	PG&E (2009)	Pre-1940 unit cost comparison (ratio of PG&E costs to PHMSA cost)	Post-1940 unit cost comparison (ratio of PG&E costs to PHMSA cost)	PHMSA Study Unit Cost x PG&E 2011 Units	PG&E Unit Cost x PG&E 2011 Units
Costs to replace cast iron (high density underground)	per foot	90		5	3	\$90/foot x 189,544 feet = \$17.1 million (capital)	
Costs to replace steel w/coated steel	per foot	77		5	3	(
Cost to replace w/plastic	per foot	25		16	10		
Costs to replace steel w/plastic (high density underground)	per foot	45		9	6		
PG&E Cost to replace cast iron and pre-1940 steel with plastic	per foot		407				GPRP: \$407/foot x 189,544 feet = \$77.1 million (capital)
PG&E Cost to replace post-1940 steel and plastic with plastic	per foot		260				

GRC2011-Ph-I_DR_DRA_272-Q01

Service Replacement		PHMSA Study	PG&E (2009)	Copper Service Replacement - PG&E cost/PHMSA cost	Other Service Replacement - PG&E cost/PHMSA cost	PHMSA Study Unit Cost x PG&E 2011 Units	PG&E Unit Cost x PG&E 2011 Units
Cost to replace service – high density underground	per service	2200		3	3	\$1,500 per service	
Cost to replace service – medium density underground	per service	1500		5	5	- \$10.9 million (Capital)	
Cost to replace service – low density underground	per service	1000		7	7		
PG&E Copper Service Replacement	per service		6,870				\$7000 per service x 7240 services = \$50.7 million (Capital)
PG&E Other Service Replacement	per service		7,231				
PSE&G Benchmarking - Range, Average	per service						

Excess Flow Valve (E Installation	EFV)	PHMSA Study	PG&E (2009)	EFV Installation PG&E cost/PHMSA Cost	PHMSA Study Unit Cost x PG&E 2011 Units	PG&E Unit Cost x PG&E 2011 Units
Cost of EFV installation on new or replacement services for large operators	per service	20		Not applicable	No unit/unit cost comparison available for this category of work	
Cost of EFV installation on new or replacement services for large operators	per service	30				

Labor Costs		PHMSA Study	PG&E (2009)	PG&E Labor Costs as a percentage of PHMSA labor costs		
Fully loaded cost of pipeline employees – Large and small operators	per hour	70	116	166%	No unit/unit cost comparison available for this category of work	

Leak Survey Costs	PHMSA Study	PG&E (2009)	Surve a perc	E Leak ey costs is a entage HMSA	PHMSA Study Unit Cost x PG&E 2011 Units	PG&E Unit Cost x PG&E 2009 Units
-------------------	-------------	-------------	--------------------	--	---	-------------------------------------

GRC2011-Ph-I_DR_DRA_272-Q01

Page 4

				leak Survey Costs		
Cost of leak survey on a main	per mile	175	481	275%	\$175 per mile x 28,992 miles = \$5,073,600 (expense)	\$481 per mile x 28,992 miles = \$13,945,152 (expense)
Cost of leak survey on a service	per service	2.25	11	489%		