From: Kahlon, Gurbux

Sent: 2/20/2014 1:37:37 PM

To: Doll, Laura (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=LRDD)

Cc: Myers, Richard A. (richard.myers@cpuc.ca.gov)

Bcc:

Subject: RE: gas pipeline extensions to rural communities

Laura, got your phone message. We totally understand that the estimates cannot be precise at this time. But PG&E laying out steps that these communities could take and what their options are would be helpful. Proximity to an existing gas line is one thing that could affect costs. We were specifically asked about how on-bill financing could be used for this. If you can provide information along these lines that would be helpful.

Gurbux Kahlon

Manager, Market Structure, Costs and Natural Gas

Energy Division

California Public Utilities Commission

505 Van Ness Ave, San Francisco Ca 94102

Tel: 415-703-1775

E-mail: gkk@cpuc.ca.gov

From: Doll, Laura [mailto:LRDD@pge.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2014 5:17 PM

To: Myers, Richard A.; Prusnek, Brian C (BPrusnek@semprautilities.com); Salazar, Jeff

(JLSalazar@semprautilities.com)

Cc: Kahlon, Gurbux

Subject: RE: gas pipeline extensions to rural communities

Richard and Gurbux

I know we are getting close to completing a response, and still expect to get it to you by COB next Monday. Have added this to the request.

Thanks

Laura

From: Myers, Richard A. [mailto:richard.myers@cpuc.ca.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2014 4:25 PM

To: Prusnek, Brian C (BPrusnek@semprautilities.com); Doll, Laura; Salazar, Jeff

(JLSalazar@semprautilities.com)

Cc: Kahlon, Gurbux

Subject: FW: gas pipeline extensions to rural communities

Hi Brian, Jeff & Laura: Gurbux would also like to know how close the communities noted in the attached document are to existing utility gas pipelines.

That is, Allensworth, Ducor, Lindcove, Seville, West Goshen, La Vina, and Le Grand.

Richard

From: Myers, Richard A.

Sent: Friday, February 07, 2014 3:17 PM

To: Prusnek, Brian C (BPrusnek@semprautilities.com); Irdd@pge.com

Cc: Kahlon, Gurbux

Subject: gas pipeline extensions to rural communities

Hi Brian and Laura: I was involved in a phone call with legislative staff person (Sue Kately) on Wednesday. She's interested in investigating whether natural gas pipelines and service lines could be built to smaller rural communities who currently don't have natural gas service but may be fairly near utility natural gas pipelines. She prepared the attached document. She asked that the Energy Division look into the viability of having residents and businesses in these communities pay for the required facilities through a special on-bill charge. According to Ms Kately, these residents would really want natural gas service, and aren't looking for a subsidy from other utility ratepayers.

Please prepare responses to the following questions:

1) If an entire existing community or town wanted to receive natural gas from SoCalGas/PG&E, please describe the process that the community and the utility would or

should undertake.
2) What would your preferred approach be $-i.e.$ should the town government officially approach the utility? Or, would it be acceptable for a grouping of residents and businesses to make their request?
3) If approached by a town or grouping of residents, could the utility prepare a "ballpark" estimate of the costs so that the town or residents could consider whether they want to move forward?
4) Could the town or grouping of residents prepare their own design for the required facilities? (I doubt if this would be their preferred approach but I thought I'd ask.)
5) Assuming that a utility transmission or distribution pipeline is near a town, would the utility first need to assess whether there is adequate capacity on the line to serve the town?
6) I understand basically how the distribution main and service line extension process typically works. In the circumstance where an entire existing town or large group of residents approached the utility with a request for natural gas service would that same basic process still apply? That is, would "allowances" be provided, and the applicants then be required to pay for the excess (above the allowance) up to the estimated costs of the facility?
7) Could the applicant/town use the 50% nonrefundable option?
8) Assuming that the estimated cost of the required facilities exceeded the allowances, would there be any significant problems with recovering those excess amounts from residents or businesses through some type of special on-bill charge? Please describe any issues you see with such an approach.

If a special on-bill charge could be made, could it made over a long period of time, e.g.

9)

several years? Please indicate your opinion of the period of time over which the charge should be assessed. If you have any particular line of reasoning for the length of time, please explain.
10) Would it be necessary to also assess a cost-of-ownership charge at some point in time if the refundable option was chosen?
11) If you care to describe any other issues or provide any other comments on this approach, please do so.
Thanks for your response. If possible, please get back to me in about 10 business days, say by Feb 24th. Please let me know if that's a problem.
Richard
PS: Laura, I spoke with PG&E's Redacted a couple times recently about gas main and service line extensions and he was very helpful. Thanks for putting me in touch with him.
PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy. To learn more, please visit http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/