

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
(DATA REQUEST CALADVOCATES-SC-SCG-2019-10)

DATA RECEIVED: December 10, 2019
DATE RESPONDED: December 23, 2019

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**

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

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.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
(DATA REQUEST CALADVOCATES-SC-SCG-2019-10)

DATA RECEIVED: December 10, 2019
DATE RESPONDED: December 23, 2019

RESPONSE 3:

- 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, Vice President of External Affairs
- d. George Minter, Vice President of External Affairs
Kevin Maggay, Environmental Policy Manager
Faviola Ochoa, Public Affairs Manager
- e. Yes. Ek, Sunkin & Bai, LLC
- f. 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 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.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
(DATA REQUEST CALADVOCATES-SC-SCG-2019-10)

DATA RECEIVED: December 10, 2019
DATE RESPONDED: December 23, 2019

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:

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).

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
(DATA REQUEST CALADVOCATES-SC-SCG-2019-10)

DATA RECEIVED: December 10, 2019
DATE RESPONDED: December 23, 2019

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:

- a. Faviola Ochoa (Regional Public Affairs)
Cost Center: 2200-0811
IO Number: 9205702200

Kevin Maggay (Environmental Policy)
Cost Center: 2200-2396
IO Number: 300645944

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

Ek, Sunkin & Bai, LLC
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:

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.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
(DATA REQUEST CALADVOCATES-SC-SCG-2019-10)

DATA RECEIVED: December 10, 2019
DATE RESPONDED: December 23, 2019

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.