Docket A.20-04-023

CCSF CROSS EXAMINATION EXHIBIT

CCSF-7. PG&E Response to CCSF First Set of Data Requests (Revised) (dated October 5, 2020), Question 11

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY Securitization 2020 Application 20-04-023 Data Response

PG&E Data Request No.:	CCSF_001-Q01-12			
PG&E File Name:	Securitization2020_DR_CCSF_001-Q01-12Rev01			
Request Date:	August 31, 2020 Requester DR No.: 001			
Date Sent:	September 15, 2020 (Original) October 5, 2020 (Revised)	Requesting Party:	City and County of San Francisco	
PG&E Witness:	Q1: Various Q2-Q5: David Thomason Q6-Q7: Mari Becker Q8: David Thomason Q9: Greg Allen Q10-Q11: David Thomason Q12: Various	Requester:	Suzy Hong	

Pacific Gas and Electric Company ("PG&E") submits the following revised response to the City and County of San Francisco's ("CCSF") Question 11 of Data Request 1, served on August 31, 2020. This revised answer attaches an updated PDF that corrects an error in PG&E's 2011 state Consolidated Taxable Income (Loss), and this response supersedes the prior Answer 11.

All of PG&E's prior objections to this set of data requests, set forth in PG&E's Data Response served September 15, 2020, are incorporated herein by reference.

QUESTION 01

Please provide all workpapers and any related calculations and functioning spreadsheets supporting Tables 6-1, 6-2, 6-3, and Figure 6-1 of PG&E's Testimony.

ANSWER 01

PG&E refers CCSF to the working model 2020Securitization_DR_Misc_Chapters 3_6_7_UPDATED08-07-2020_Securitization Application Update Model_Final.xlsx.

QUESTION 02

Does PG&E plan to make the five-year financial projections in Exhibit 5.4 of its Testimony public? If so, when does PG&E plan to make available the unredacted five-year financial projections in Exhibit 5.4? If not, please provide the reason or basis for why the five-year financial projections in Exhibit 5.4 warrant confidential treatment when substantially similar information has been made public in the past. (See, for example, I.19 09 16, PG&E's Second Omnibus Supplemental Data Response,

Attachment 2 (PlanOfReorganizationOII-2019_DR_MISC_Atch02CPUC financial package 2.18.20_Updated_Redacted.xlsx), dated February 19.)

ANSWER 02

PG&E does not plan to make public the confidential Projected Financial Statements presented in Exhibit 5.4 to Chapter 5, Stress Test Methodology (D. Thomason; J. Sauvage), served August 7, 2020. PG&E previously provided detailed financial projections publicly in connection with the review and approval of PG&E's Plan of Reorganization. PG&E has not traditionally provided detailed financial projections publicly in applications for long-term debt authorization. Nor do publicly-traded companies typically provide detailed financial projections because that is considered material non-public and commercially sensitive financial information. PG&E does not intend to provide PG&E-unconsolidated financial projections. PG&E Corporation provides high-level projections to the public and investors on a quarterly basis and the latest projections can be found here:

http://s1.q4cdn.com/880135780/files/doc_financials/2020/q2/Q2'20-Earnings-Presentation_Final.pdf.

QUESTION 03

Please confirm that the five-year projections provided in Exhibit 5.4 of PG&E's Testimony, labeled as "Consolidated Utility" projections, are for PG&E's operations only (electric and gas services) (i.e., does not include PG&E Corp.), and include projections for PG&E's gas operations.

Answer 03

PG&E objects to this request as vague and ambiguous. Subject to its objections, PG&E responds as follows:

PG&E confirms that the confidential Projected Financial Statements presented in Exhibit 5.4, labeled "Condensed Utility," not "Consolidated Utility," include gas operations projections, but do not include financial projections for PG&E Corporation.

QUESTION 04

For the 5-year projections provided in Exhibit 5.4 of PG&E's Testimony, please provide, for each year of the forecast:

- a. Bundled retail sales in MWh, revenues in dollars, and average rate in \$/kWh.
- b. Community Choice Aggregation retail sales in MWh, revenues in dollars, and average rate in \$/kWh.
- c. Direct Access retail sales in MWh, revenues in dollars, and average rate in \$/kWh.
- d. Other retail sales (if any) in MWh, revenues in dollars, and average rate in \$/kWh.
- e. Wholesale sales in MWh, revenues in dollars, and average rate in \$/kWh.

- f. Revenues collected from all municipal departing load customers in \$/yr, together with the billing determinant(s) (e.g. load in MWh) used to estimate those revenues.
- g. Other electric revenues.
- h. Natural Gas sales in MMBtu and revenues in dollars.
- i. Other Natural Gas sales in dollars.
- i. Other revenues not included above.

ANSWER 04

PG&E objects to this request as beyond the scope of this proceeding. PG&E further objects to this request as unduly burdensome and not relevant. Subject to its objections, PG&E responds as follows:

PG&E did not prepare a detailed rate forecast in connection with the financial projections presented in connection with PG&E's Application and does not believe such a rate forecast is necessary for purposes of evaluating the Application or the proposed Securitization. PG&E will meet and confer with CCSF regarding the relevance of the requested information. PG&E submitted certain responsive load forecast information in Electricity Demand Forecast forms issued by the California Energy Commission (CEC) for the 2019 Integrated Energy Policy Report. The link to the public version of those forms (with confidential information redacted) is

https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/GetDocument.aspx?tn=227685&DocumentContentId=5895 6.

QUESTION 05

For the 5-year projections provided in Exhibit 5.4 of PG&E's Testimony, please provide, for each year of the forecast:

- a. Dividend payments from PG&E to PG&E Corp.
- b. Principal and interest payments made by PG&E Corp. on the \$4.75 billion in debt issued by PG&E Corp. as part of PG&E's exit from bankruptcy (as described in, for example,
 - http://www.pgecorp.com/news/press_releases/Release_Archive2020/200621press_release.shtml).

ANSWER 05

PG&E objects to this request as vague and ambiguous. PG&E further objects to this request as beyond the scope of this proceeding. Subject to its objections, PG&E responds as follows:

PG&E refers CCSF to the discussion of dividends in Chapter 5, Stress Test Methodology (D. Thomason; J. Sauvage), served August 7, 2020, at pages 5-54 to 5-55. PG&E can provide further detail regarding dividend payments included in the confidential Projected Financial Statements presented in Exhibit 5.4 upon execution by

CCSF of a Nondisclosure Agreement with PG&E and appropriate Nondisclosure Certificates. The confidential Projected Financial Statements presented in Exhibit 5.4 are Utility-only projections and do not include principal and interest payments made by PG&E Corporation on the debt issued by PG&E Corporation in connection with the exit financing.

QUESTION 06

What does PG&E expect will be the bond rating for the Securitized Bonds?

ANSWER 06

Based on historical precedents, PG&E anticipates that the Recovery Bonds will be rated AAA / Aaa / AAA. Of the \$56.7 billion of historical issuances in the utility securitization market, each issuance, except one, has obtained AAA ratings from the respective rating agencies retained to rate the issuance (some transactions have been rated by only two rating agencies). The sole exception is the Moody's rating for the \$99 million Entergy New Orleans issuance in 2015, which was rated AAA by S&P and Aa1 by Moody's. See Chapter 2, Background on Utility Securitization (S. Lunde), served August 7, 2020, at pages 2-5, 2-8 to 2-12.

QUESTION 07

Has PG&E had discussions with any of the rating agencies regarding the ratings the rating agencies are likely to assign to the Securitized Bonds? Please provide a brief description of these discussions (if any), approximately when they occurred, and the guidance provided the rating agencies.

ANSWER 07

No, PG&E anticipates engaging with the rating agencies closer to the timing of issuance of the proposed Recovery Bonds. PG&E anticipates that preliminary credit ratings would be provided during the few-months period leading up to the issuance, and final credit ratings and associated credit reports would be provided prior to the transaction closing.

QUESTION 08

Are the references throughout PG&E's Testimony to annual "taxable income" amounts (see, for example, Table 6-2, lines 3, 12) calculated on a GAAP book basis, ratemaking basis, or actual tax basis?

ANSWER 08

PG&E objects to this request as vague and ambiguous, and overbroad. Subject to its objections, PG&E responds as follows:

As described at page 6-11 of Chapter 6, Customer Credit Mechanism and Investment Returns (D. Thomason; G. Allen), served August 7, 2020, the annual "Consolidated Forecast Taxable Income" amounts referenced in Table 6-2, Lines 3 and 12 "show projected federal and state taxable income after the application of any current-year losses." In other words, the amounts represent the forecasted taxable income estimates that are anticipated to be reflected on PG&E's tax returns.

QUESTION 09

For the 2,000 scenarios described in PG&E Testimony, Chapter 6. C (Investment Returns, G. Allen)(see, 6-21, line 18):

- a. How do these scenarios capture the potential variability in investment returns (by asset class) year-over-year, particularly for the period during which (i) PG&E is utilizing Ratepayer NOLs, and/or (ii) PG&E is making Additional Shareholder Contributions?
- b. Please describe whether and to what extent these scenarios included variability in PG&E's projections of taxable income.

ANSWER 09

- a. The Monte Carlo simulation model simulates a series of 120 quarterly returns (30-years) for each asset class for each of the 2,000 trials. Each series of returns for each asset class (US stocks, non-US stocks, US bonds) reflects the quarter-to-quarter and year-to-year volatility (and correlations) from the capital assumptions shown in tables 6-4 and 6-5 of the testimony. For example, the central tendency across the 2,000 trials for US stock returns in the model is an annualized standard deviation of roughly 18.10% (standard deviation of quarterly returns of roughly 9.05%). Thus the model effectively captures the year-to-year variability of investment returns across the entire simulation for each trial, including the period when PG&E is utilizing Ratepayer NOLs and/or making Additional Shareholder Contributions.
- b. All of the 2,000 simulations referenced in Mr. Allen's testimony used the same schedule of Additional Shareholder Contributions shown in Table 6-2 and in Figure 6-1.

QUESTION 10

Over what time period is PG&E measuring "ratepayer neutrality," e.g. at (i) any instant in time at which the FRC in \$/kWh exceeds the Customer Credit in \$/kWh for any customer, (ii) over any billing cycle, (iii) over some longer period, but less than 30 years, (iv) only over the 30-year term of the Securitized Bonds, (v) some other period of time. If PG&E's time period for measuring "ratepayer neutrality" is longer than a billing cycle, what interest rate will PG&E use to compensate ratepayers for the higher bills that will result if the Customer Credit is less than the FRC.

ANSWER 10

PG&E objects to this request as vague and ambiguous. Subject to its objections, PG&E responds as follows:

PG&E has committed to a rate-neutral securitization and submits that its proposal meets, and in fact exceeds, its commitment. As PG&E stated in the Chapter 11 Cases: "The Securitization structure is anticipated to yield a full (nominal) offset each year to securitized charges." PG&E submits that this is the relevant standard for purposes of evaluating rate neutrality pursuant to the Plan of Reorganization OII Decision, D.20-05-053. PG&E proposes to provide shareholder contributions to fund the Customer Credits. These Customer Credits are expected to equal the Fixed Recovery Charges (FRCs) in each billing period. Moreover, the Customer Credit Trust is expected to generate a substantial surplus, which PG&E proposes to share with customers at the end of the life of the Trust, or sooner if the Commission so directs. The 25% sharing of surplus is proposed as compensation for the potential risk of loss to customers. As set forth in Chapter 1, Introduction (D. Thomason), served August 7, 2020, the customer expected value of the surplus sharing is \$990 million, with a present value of \$118 million. The Customer Credit will commence at the same time and in the same amount as the FRC, and PG&E anticipates that the Customer Credit will equal the FRC in each billing period such that the Customer Net Bill Impact each year is zero, as reflected in Table 6-3.

QUESTION 11

For the 25 years from 1995-2019, please provide PG&E's actual annual taxable income and marginal tax rates (federal and state), using the same methodology used to project PG&E's taxable income as shown on Table 6-2 of PG&E's Testimony.

ANSWER 11 REVISED 01

PG&E refers CCSF to Securitization 2020 DR CCSF 001-Q11Atch01-Rev01.pdf.

QUESTION 12

Please provide PG&E's previous responses to all data requests by other parties in this proceeding. On an ongoing basis, please provide PG&E's responses to all data requests by other parties in this proceeding.

ANSWER 12

PG&E objects to this request as overbroad and unduly burdensome. Subject to its objections, PG&E responds as follows:

The non-confidential data responses that PG&E has provided to date in this proceeding are available on the PG&E Regulatory Cases – Discovery Access website. The link for users to log in or register is https://pgera.azurewebsites.net/account/login.

PG&E Corporation & Subsidiaries Taxable Income/(Loss) before NOL carryover

Federal California

1995 2,553,103,523 35% 2,160,219,907 9.30% 1996 1,607,722,316 35% 1,482,058,363 9.30% 1997 1,615,113,562 35% 1,117,752,427 8.84% 1998 1,553,844,752 35% 831,133,722 8.84% 1999 2,064,319,166 35% 1,154,896,503 8.84% 2000 (3,095,563,610) 35% (1,878,493,901) 8.84% 2001 727,633,531 35% 252,976,249 8.84% 2002 2,217,461,068 35% 1,398,482,234 8.84% 2003 285,928,102 35% 745,979,522 8.84% 2004 460,944,733 35% 1,223,161,727 8.84% 2005 2,862,306,646 35% 2,521,374,037 8.84% 2006 2,305,567,492 35% 2,438,435,355 8.84% 2007 1,024,182,508 35% 1,23,461,020 8.84% 2008 (657,847,502) 35% 123,461,020 8.84% <th>Year</th> <th>Adjusted Taxable Income (Loss)</th> <th>Tax Rate</th> <th>Adjusted Taxable Income (Loss)</th> <th>Tax Rate</th>	Year	Adjusted Taxable Income (Loss)	Tax Rate	Adjusted Taxable Income (Loss)	Tax Rate
1997 1,615,113,562 35% 1,117,752,427 8.84% 1998 1,553,844,752 35% 831,133,722 8.84% 1999 2,064,319,166 35% 1,154,896,503 8.84% 2000 (3,095,563,610) 35% (1,878,493,901) 8.84% 2001 727,633,531 35% 252,976,249 8.84% 2002 2,217,461,068 35% 1,398,482,234 8.84% 2003 285,928,102 35% 745,979,522 8.84% 2004 460,944,733 35% 1,223,161,727 8.84% 2005 2,862,306,646 35% 2,521,374,037 8.84% 2006 2,305,567,492 35% 2,438,435,355 8.84% 2007 1,024,182,508 35% 1,123,027,834 8.84% 2008 (657,847,502) 35% 123,461,020 8.84% 2010 (476,346,505) 35% 1,309,015,741 8.84% 2011 (1,733,434,831) 35% 208,270,732 8.84% </td <td>1995</td> <td>2,553,103,523</td> <td>35%</td> <td>2,160,219,907</td> <td>9.30%</td>	1995	2,553,103,523	35%	2,160,219,907	9.30%
1998 1,553,844,752 35% 831,133,722 8.84% 1999 2,064,319,166 35% 1,154,896,503 8.84% 2000 (3,095,563,610) 35% (1,878,493,901) 8.84% 2001 727,633,531 35% 252,976,249 8.84% 2002 2,217,461,068 35% 1,398,482,234 8.84% 2003 285,928,102 35% 745,979,522 8.84% 2004 460,944,733 35% 1,223,161,727 8.84% 2005 2,862,306,646 35% 2,521,374,037 8.84% 2006 2,305,567,492 35% 2,438,435,355 8.84% 2007 1,024,182,508 35% 1,123,027,834 8.84% 2008 (657,847,502) 35% 123,461,020 8.84% 2009 (338,311,604) 35% 968,563,126 8.84% 2010 (476,346,505) 35% 1,309,015,741 8.84% 2011 (1,733,434,831) 35% 208,270,732 8.84% <td>1996</td> <td>1,607,722,316</td> <td>35%</td> <td>1,482,058,363</td> <td>9.30%</td>	1996	1,607,722,316	35%	1,482,058,363	9.30%
1999 2,064,319,166 35% 1,154,896,503 8.84% 2000 (3,095,563,610) 35% (1,878,493,901) 8.84% 2001 727,633,531 35% 252,976,249 8.84% 2002 2,217,461,068 35% 1,398,482,234 8.84% 2003 285,928,102 35% 745,979,522 8.84% 2004 460,944,733 35% 1,223,161,727 8.84% 2005 2,862,306,646 35% 2,521,374,037 8.84% 2006 2,305,567,492 35% 2,438,435,355 8.84% 2007 1,024,182,508 35% 1,123,027,834 8.84% 2008 (657,847,502) 35% 123,461,020 8.84% 2009 (338,311,604) 35% 968,563,126 8.84% 2010 (476,346,505) 35% 1,309,015,741 8.84% 2011 (1,733,434,831) 35% 208,270,732 8.84% 2012 (585,271,403) 35% (339,847,480) 8.84% 2013 (1,278,437,127) 35% (339,847,480) 8.84% <td>1997</td> <td>1,615,113,562</td> <td>35%</td> <td>1,117,752,427</td> <td>8.84%</td>	1997	1,615,113,562	35%	1,117,752,427	8.84%
2000 (3,095,563,610) 35% (1,878,493,901) 8.84% 2001 727,633,531 35% 252,976,249 8.84% 2002 2,217,461,068 35% 1,398,482,234 8.84% 2003 285,928,102 35% 745,979,522 8.84% 2004 460,944,733 35% 1,223,161,727 8.84% 2005 2,862,306,646 35% 2,521,374,037 8.84% 2006 2,305,567,492 35% 2,438,435,355 8.84% 2007 1,024,182,508 35% 1,123,027,834 8.84% 2008 (657,847,502) 35% 123,461,020 8.84% 2009 (338,311,604) 35% 968,563,126 8.84% 2010 (476,346,505) 35% 1,309,015,741 8.84% 2011 (1,733,434,831) 35% 318,818,059 8.84% 2012 (585,271,403) 35% 208,270,732 8.84% 2013 (1,278,437,127) 35% (339,847,480) 8.84% </td <td>1998</td> <td>1,553,844,752</td> <td>35%</td> <td>831,133,722</td> <td>8.84%</td>	1998	1,553,844,752	35%	831,133,722	8.84%
2001 727,633,531 35% 252,976,249 8.84% 2002 2,217,461,068 35% 1,398,482,234 8.84% 2003 285,928,102 35% 745,979,522 8.84% 2004 460,944,733 35% 1,223,161,727 8.84% 2005 2,862,306,646 35% 2,521,374,037 8.84% 2006 2,305,567,492 35% 2,438,435,355 8.84% 2007 1,024,182,508 35% 1,123,027,834 8.84% 2008 (657,847,502) 35% 123,461,020 8.84% 2009 (338,311,604) 35% 968,563,126 8.84% 2010 (476,346,505) 35% 1,309,015,741 8.84% 2011 (1,733,434,831) 35% 318,818,059 8.84% 2012 (585,271,403) 35% 208,270,732 8.84% 2013 (1,278,437,127) 35% (339,847,480) 8.84% 2014 (762,922,789) 35% (412,879,626) 8.84% 2015 (740,273,752) 35% 84,490,014 8.84% </td <td>1999</td> <td>2,064,319,166</td> <td>35%</td> <td>1,154,896,503</td> <td>8.84%</td>	1999	2,064,319,166	35%	1,154,896,503	8.84%
2002 2,217,461,068 35% 1,398,482,234 8.84% 2003 285,928,102 35% 745,979,522 8.84% 2004 460,944,733 35% 1,223,161,727 8.84% 2005 2,862,306,646 35% 2,521,374,037 8.84% 2006 2,305,567,492 35% 2,438,435,355 8.84% 2007 1,024,182,508 35% 1,123,027,834 8.84% 2008 (657,847,502) 35% 123,461,020 8.84% 2009 (338,311,604) 35% 968,563,126 8.84% 2010 (476,346,505) 35% 1,309,015,741 8.84% 2011 (1,733,434,831) 35% 318,818,059 8.84% 2012 (585,271,403) 35% 208,270,732 8.84% 2013 (1,278,437,127) 35% (339,847,480) 8.84% 2014 (762,922,789) 35% (412,879,626) 8.84% 2015 (740,273,752) 35% 84,490,014 8.84% 2016 (602,371,164) 35% 58,080,613 8.84% <	2000	(3,095,563,610)	35%	(1,878,493,901)	8.84%
2003 285,928,102 35% 745,979,522 8.84% 2004 460,944,733 35% 1,223,161,727 8.84% 2005 2,862,306,646 35% 2,521,374,037 8.84% 2006 2,305,567,492 35% 2,438,435,355 8.84% 2007 1,024,182,508 35% 1,123,027,834 8.84% 2008 (657,847,502) 35% 123,461,020 8.84% 2009 (338,311,604) 35% 968,563,126 8.84% 2010 (476,346,505) 35% 1,309,015,741 8.84% 2011 (1,733,434,831) 35% 318,818,059 8.84% 2012 (585,271,403) 35% 208,270,732 8.84% 2013 (1,278,437,127) 35% (339,847,480) 8.84% 2014 (762,922,789) 35% (412,879,626) 8.84% 2015 (740,273,752) 35% 84,490,014 8.84% 2016 (602,371,164) 35% 58,080,613 8.84% 2017 894,034,912 35% 763,201,102 8.84%	2001	727,633,531	35%	252,976,249	8.84%
2004 460,944,733 35% 1,223,161,727 8.84% 2005 2,862,306,646 35% 2,521,374,037 8.84% 2006 2,305,567,492 35% 2,438,435,355 8.84% 2007 1,024,182,508 35% 1,123,027,834 8.84% 2008 (657,847,502) 35% 123,461,020 8.84% 2009 (338,311,604) 35% 968,563,126 8.84% 2010 (476,346,505) 35% 1,309,015,741 8.84% 2011 (1,733,434,831) 35% 318,818,059 8.84% 2012 (585,271,403) 35% 208,270,732 8.84% 2013 (1,278,437,127) 35% (339,847,480) 8.84% 2014 (762,922,789) 35% (412,879,626) 8.84% 2015 (740,273,752) 35% 84,490,014 8.84% 2016 (602,371,164) 35% 58,080,613 8.84% 2017 894,034,912 35% 763,201,102 8.84%	2002	2,217,461,068	35%	1,398,482,234	8.84%
2005 2,862,306,646 35% 2,521,374,037 8.84% 2006 2,305,567,492 35% 2,438,435,355 8.84% 2007 1,024,182,508 35% 1,123,027,834 8.84% 2008 (657,847,502) 35% 123,461,020 8.84% 2009 (338,311,604) 35% 968,563,126 8.84% 2010 (476,346,505) 35% 1,309,015,741 8.84% 2011 (1,733,434,831) 35% 318,818,059 8.84% 2012 (585,271,403) 35% 208,270,732 8.84% 2013 (1,278,437,127) 35% (339,847,480) 8.84% 2014 (762,922,789) 35% (412,879,626) 8.84% 2015 (740,273,752) 35% 84,490,014 8.84% 2016 (602,371,164) 35% 58,080,613 8.84% 2017 894,034,912 35% 763,201,102 8.84%	2003	285,928,102	35%	745,979,522	8.84%
2006 2,305,567,492 35% 2,438,435,355 8.84% 2007 1,024,182,508 35% 1,123,027,834 8.84% 2008 (657,847,502) 35% 123,461,020 8.84% 2009 (338,311,604) 35% 968,563,126 8.84% 2010 (476,346,505) 35% 1,309,015,741 8.84% 2011 (1,733,434,831) 35% 318,818,059 8.84% 2012 (585,271,403) 35% 208,270,732 8.84% 2013 (1,278,437,127) 35% (339,847,480) 8.84% 2014 (762,922,789) 35% (412,879,626) 8.84% 2015 (740,273,752) 35% 84,490,014 8.84% 2016 (602,371,164) 35% 58,080,613 8.84% 2017 894,034,912 35% 763,201,102 8.84%	2004	460,944,733	35%	1,223,161,727	8.84%
2007 1,024,182,508 35% 1,123,027,834 8.84% 2008 (657,847,502) 35% 123,461,020 8.84% 2009 (338,311,604) 35% 968,563,126 8.84% 2010 (476,346,505) 35% 1,309,015,741 8.84% 2011 (1,733,434,831) 35% 318,818,059 8.84% 2012 (585,271,403) 35% 208,270,732 8.84% 2013 (1,278,437,127) 35% (339,847,480) 8.84% 2014 (762,922,789) 35% (412,879,626) 8.84% 2015 (740,273,752) 35% 84,490,014 8.84% 2016 (602,371,164) 35% 58,080,613 8.84% 2017 894,034,912 35% 763,201,102 8.84%	2005	2,862,306,646	35%	2,521,374,037	8.84%
2008 (657,847,502) 35% 123,461,020 8.84% 2009 (338,311,604) 35% 968,563,126 8.84% 2010 (476,346,505) 35% 1,309,015,741 8.84% 2011 (1,733,434,831) 35% 318,818,059 8.84% 2012 (585,271,403) 35% 208,270,732 8.84% 2013 (1,278,437,127) 35% (339,847,480) 8.84% 2014 (762,922,789) 35% (412,879,626) 8.84% 2015 (740,273,752) 35% 84,490,014 8.84% 2016 (602,371,164) 35% 58,080,613 8.84% 2017 894,034,912 35% 763,201,102 8.84%	2006	2,305,567,492	35%	2,438,435,355	8.84%
2009 (338,311,604) 35% 968,563,126 8.84% 2010 (476,346,505) 35% 1,309,015,741 8.84% 2011 (1,733,434,831) 35% 318,818,059 8.84% 2012 (585,271,403) 35% 208,270,732 8.84% 2013 (1,278,437,127) 35% (339,847,480) 8.84% 2014 (762,922,789) 35% (412,879,626) 8.84% 2015 (740,273,752) 35% 84,490,014 8.84% 2016 (602,371,164) 35% 58,080,613 8.84% 2017 894,034,912 35% 763,201,102 8.84%	2007	1,024,182,508	35%	1,123,027,834	8.84%
2010 (476,346,505) 35% 1,309,015,741 8.84% 2011 (1,733,434,831) 35% 318,818,059 8.84% 2012 (585,271,403) 35% 208,270,732 8.84% 2013 (1,278,437,127) 35% (339,847,480) 8.84% 2014 (762,922,789) 35% (412,879,626) 8.84% 2015 (740,273,752) 35% 84,490,014 8.84% 2016 (602,371,164) 35% 58,080,613 8.84% 2017 894,034,912 35% 763,201,102 8.84%	2008	(657,847,502)	35%	123,461,020	8.84%
2011 (1,733,434,831) 35% 318,818,059 8.84% 2012 (585,271,403) 35% 208,270,732 8.84% 2013 (1,278,437,127) 35% (339,847,480) 8.84% 2014 (762,922,789) 35% (412,879,626) 8.84% 2015 (740,273,752) 35% 84,490,014 8.84% 2016 (602,371,164) 35% 58,080,613 8.84% 2017 894,034,912 35% 763,201,102 8.84%	2009	(338,311,604)	35%	968,563,126	8.84%
2012 (585,271,403) 35% 208,270,732 8.84% 2013 (1,278,437,127) 35% (339,847,480) 8.84% 2014 (762,922,789) 35% (412,879,626) 8.84% 2015 (740,273,752) 35% 84,490,014 8.84% 2016 (602,371,164) 35% 58,080,613 8.84% 2017 894,034,912 35% 763,201,102 8.84%	2010	(476,346,505)	35%	1,309,015,741	8.84%
2013 (1,278,437,127) 35% (339,847,480) 8.84% 2014 (762,922,789) 35% (412,879,626) 8.84% 2015 (740,273,752) 35% 84,490,014 8.84% 2016 (602,371,164) 35% 58,080,613 8.84% 2017 894,034,912 35% 763,201,102 8.84%	2011	(1,733,434,831)	35%	318,818,059	8.84%
2014 (762,922,789) 35% (412,879,626) 8.84% 2015 (740,273,752) 35% 84,490,014 8.84% 2016 (602,371,164) 35% 58,080,613 8.84% 2017 894,034,912 35% 763,201,102 8.84%	2012	(585,271,403)	35%	208,270,732	8.84%
2015 (740,273,752) 35% 84,490,014 8.84% 2016 (602,371,164) 35% 58,080,613 8.84% 2017 894,034,912 35% 763,201,102 8.84%	2013	(1,278,437,127)	35%	(339,847,480)	8.84%
2016 (602,371,164) 35% 58,080,613 8.84% 2017 894,034,912 35% 763,201,102 8.84%	2014	(762,922,789)	35%	(412,879,626)	8.84%
2017 894,034,912 35% 763,201,102 8.84%	2015	(740,273,752)	35%	84,490,014	8.84%
	2016	(602,371,164)	35%	58,080,613	8.84%
2018 296,273,414 21% 7.418.237 8.84%	2017	894,034,912	35%	763,201,102	8.84%
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	2018	296,273,414	21%	7,418,237	8.84%
2019 (1,904,345,320) 21% Not yet filed 8.84%	2019	(1,904,345,320)	21%	Not yet filed	8.84%

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY Securitization 2020 Application 20-04-023 Data Response

PG&E Data Request No.:	CCSF_001-Q01-12			
PG&E File Name:	Securitization2020_DR_CCSF_001-Q01-12Rev01			
Request Date:	August 31, 2020 Requester DR No.: 001			
Date Sent:	September 15, 2020 (Original) October 5, 2020 (Revised)	Requesting Party:	City and County of San Francisco	
PG&E Witness:	Q1: Various Q2-Q5: David Thomason Q6-Q7: Mari Becker Q8: David Thomason Q9: Greg Allen Q10-Q11: David Thomason Q12: Various	Requester:	Suzy Hong	

Pacific Gas and Electric Company ("PG&E") submits the following revised response to the City and County of San Francisco's ("CCSF") Question 11 of Data Request 1, served on August 31, 2020. This revised answer attaches an updated PDF that corrects an error in PG&E's 2011 state Consolidated Taxable Income (Loss), and this response supersedes the prior Answer 11.

All of PG&E's prior objections to this set of data requests, set forth in PG&E's Data Response served September 15, 2020, are incorporated herein by reference.

QUESTION 01

Please provide all workpapers and any related calculations and functioning spreadsheets supporting Tables 6-1, 6-2, 6-3, and Figure 6-1 of PG&E's Testimony.

ANSWER 01

PG&E refers CCSF to the working model 2020Securitization_DR_Misc_Chapters 3_6_7_UPDATED08-07-2020_Securitization Application Update Model_Final.xlsx.

QUESTION 02

Does PG&E plan to make the five-year financial projections in Exhibit 5.4 of its Testimony public? If so, when does PG&E plan to make available the unredacted five-year financial projections in Exhibit 5.4? If not, please provide the reason or basis for why the five-year financial projections in Exhibit 5.4 warrant confidential treatment when substantially similar information has been made public in the past. (See, for example, I.19 09 16, PG&E's Second Omnibus Supplemental Data Response,

Attachment 2 (PlanOfReorganizationOII-2019_DR_MISC_Atch02CPUC financial package 2.18.20_Updated_Redacted.xlsx), dated February 19.)

ANSWER 02

PG&E does not plan to make public the confidential Projected Financial Statements presented in Exhibit 5.4 to Chapter 5, Stress Test Methodology (D. Thomason; J. Sauvage), served August 7, 2020. PG&E previously provided detailed financial projections publicly in connection with the review and approval of PG&E's Plan of Reorganization. PG&E has not traditionally provided detailed financial projections publicly in applications for long-term debt authorization. Nor do publicly-traded companies typically provide detailed financial projections because that is considered material non-public and commercially sensitive financial information. PG&E does not intend to provide PG&E-unconsolidated financial projections. PG&E Corporation provides high-level projections to the public and investors on a quarterly basis and the latest projections can be found here:

http://s1.q4cdn.com/880135780/files/doc_financials/2020/q2/Q2'20-Earnings-Presentation_Final.pdf.

QUESTION 03

Please confirm that the five-year projections provided in Exhibit 5.4 of PG&E's Testimony, labeled as "Consolidated Utility" projections, are for PG&E's operations only (electric and gas services) (i.e., does not include PG&E Corp.), and include projections for PG&E's gas operations.

Answer 03

PG&E objects to this request as vague and ambiguous. Subject to its objections, PG&E responds as follows:

PG&E confirms that the confidential Projected Financial Statements presented in Exhibit 5.4, labeled "Condensed Utility," not "Consolidated Utility," include gas operations projections, but do not include financial projections for PG&E Corporation.

QUESTION 04

For the 5-year projections provided in Exhibit 5.4 of PG&E's Testimony, please provide, for each year of the forecast:

- a. Bundled retail sales in MWh, revenues in dollars, and average rate in \$/kWh.
- b. Community Choice Aggregation retail sales in MWh, revenues in dollars, and average rate in \$/kWh.
- c. Direct Access retail sales in MWh, revenues in dollars, and average rate in \$/kWh.
- d. Other retail sales (if any) in MWh, revenues in dollars, and average rate in \$/kWh.
- e. Wholesale sales in MWh, revenues in dollars, and average rate in \$/kWh.

- f. Revenues collected from all municipal departing load customers in \$/yr, together with the billing determinant(s) (e.g. load in MWh) used to estimate those revenues.
- g. Other electric revenues.
- h. Natural Gas sales in MMBtu and revenues in dollars.
- i. Other Natural Gas sales in dollars.
- i. Other revenues not included above.

ANSWER 04

PG&E objects to this request as beyond the scope of this proceeding. PG&E further objects to this request as unduly burdensome and not relevant. Subject to its objections, PG&E responds as follows:

PG&E did not prepare a detailed rate forecast in connection with the financial projections presented in connection with PG&E's Application and does not believe such a rate forecast is necessary for purposes of evaluating the Application or the proposed Securitization. PG&E will meet and confer with CCSF regarding the relevance of the requested information. PG&E submitted certain responsive load forecast information in Electricity Demand Forecast forms issued by the California Energy Commission (CEC) for the 2019 Integrated Energy Policy Report. The link to the public version of those forms (with confidential information redacted) is

https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/GetDocument.aspx?tn=227685&DocumentContentId=5895 6.

QUESTION 05

For the 5-year projections provided in Exhibit 5.4 of PG&E's Testimony, please provide, for each year of the forecast:

- a. Dividend payments from PG&E to PG&E Corp.
- b. Principal and interest payments made by PG&E Corp. on the \$4.75 billion in debt issued by PG&E Corp. as part of PG&E's exit from bankruptcy (as described in, for example,
 - http://www.pgecorp.com/news/press_releases/Release_Archive2020/200621press_release.shtml).

ANSWER 05

PG&E objects to this request as vague and ambiguous. PG&E further objects to this request as beyond the scope of this proceeding. Subject to its objections, PG&E responds as follows:

PG&E refers CCSF to the discussion of dividends in Chapter 5, Stress Test Methodology (D. Thomason; J. Sauvage), served August 7, 2020, at pages 5-54 to 5-55. PG&E can provide further detail regarding dividend payments included in the confidential Projected Financial Statements presented in Exhibit 5.4 upon execution by

CCSF of a Nondisclosure Agreement with PG&E and appropriate Nondisclosure Certificates. The confidential Projected Financial Statements presented in Exhibit 5.4 are Utility-only projections and do not include principal and interest payments made by PG&E Corporation on the debt issued by PG&E Corporation in connection with the exit financing.

QUESTION 06

What does PG&E expect will be the bond rating for the Securitized Bonds?

ANSWER 06

Based on historical precedents, PG&E anticipates that the Recovery Bonds will be rated AAA / Aaa / AAA. Of the \$56.7 billion of historical issuances in the utility securitization market, each issuance, except one, has obtained AAA ratings from the respective rating agencies retained to rate the issuance (some transactions have been rated by only two rating agencies). The sole exception is the Moody's rating for the \$99 million Entergy New Orleans issuance in 2015, which was rated AAA by S&P and Aa1 by Moody's. See Chapter 2, Background on Utility Securitization (S. Lunde), served August 7, 2020, at pages 2-5, 2-8 to 2-12.

QUESTION 07

Has PG&E had discussions with any of the rating agencies regarding the ratings the rating agencies are likely to assign to the Securitized Bonds? Please provide a brief description of these discussions (if any), approximately when they occurred, and the guidance provided the rating agencies.

ANSWER 07

No, PG&E anticipates engaging with the rating agencies closer to the timing of issuance of the proposed Recovery Bonds. PG&E anticipates that preliminary credit ratings would be provided during the few-months period leading up to the issuance, and final credit ratings and associated credit reports would be provided prior to the transaction closing.

QUESTION 08

Are the references throughout PG&E's Testimony to annual "taxable income" amounts (see, for example, Table 6-2, lines 3, 12) calculated on a GAAP book basis, ratemaking basis, or actual tax basis?

ANSWER 08

PG&E objects to this request as vague and ambiguous, and overbroad. Subject to its objections, PG&E responds as follows:

As described at page 6-11 of Chapter 6, Customer Credit Mechanism and Investment Returns (D. Thomason; G. Allen), served August 7, 2020, the annual "Consolidated Forecast Taxable Income" amounts referenced in Table 6-2, Lines 3 and 12 "show projected federal and state taxable income after the application of any current-year losses." In other words, the amounts represent the forecasted taxable income estimates that are anticipated to be reflected on PG&E's tax returns.

QUESTION 09

For the 2,000 scenarios described in PG&E Testimony, Chapter 6. C (Investment Returns, G. Allen)(see, 6-21, line 18):

- a. How do these scenarios capture the potential variability in investment returns (by asset class) year-over-year, particularly for the period during which (i) PG&E is utilizing Ratepayer NOLs, and/or (ii) PG&E is making Additional Shareholder Contributions?
- b. Please describe whether and to what extent these scenarios included variability in PG&E's projections of taxable income.

ANSWER 09

- a. The Monte Carlo simulation model simulates a series of 120 quarterly returns (30-years) for each asset class for each of the 2,000 trials. Each series of returns for each asset class (US stocks, non-US stocks, US bonds) reflects the quarter-to-quarter and year-to-year volatility (and correlations) from the capital assumptions shown in tables 6-4 and 6-5 of the testimony. For example, the central tendency across the 2,000 trials for US stock returns in the model is an annualized standard deviation of roughly 18.10% (standard deviation of quarterly returns of roughly 9.05%). Thus the model effectively captures the year-to-year variability of investment returns across the entire simulation for each trial, including the period when PG&E is utilizing Ratepayer NOLs and/or making Additional Shareholder Contributions.
- b. All of the 2,000 simulations referenced in Mr. Allen's testimony used the same schedule of Additional Shareholder Contributions shown in Table 6-2 and in Figure 6-1.

QUESTION 10

Over what time period is PG&E measuring "ratepayer neutrality," e.g. at (i) any instant in time at which the FRC in \$/kWh exceeds the Customer Credit in \$/kWh for any customer, (ii) over any billing cycle, (iii) over some longer period, but less than 30 years, (iv) only over the 30-year term of the Securitized Bonds, (v) some other period of time. If PG&E's time period for measuring "ratepayer neutrality" is longer than a billing cycle, what interest rate will PG&E use to compensate ratepayers for the higher bills that will result if the Customer Credit is less than the FRC.

ANSWER 10

PG&E objects to this request as vague and ambiguous. Subject to its objections, PG&E responds as follows:

PG&E has committed to a rate-neutral securitization and submits that its proposal meets, and in fact exceeds, its commitment. As PG&E stated in the Chapter 11 Cases: "The Securitization structure is anticipated to yield a full (nominal) offset each year to securitized charges." PG&E submits that this is the relevant standard for purposes of evaluating rate neutrality pursuant to the Plan of Reorganization OII Decision, D.20-05-053. PG&E proposes to provide shareholder contributions to fund the Customer Credits. These Customer Credits are expected to equal the Fixed Recovery Charges (FRCs) in each billing period. Moreover, the Customer Credit Trust is expected to generate a substantial surplus, which PG&E proposes to share with customers at the end of the life of the Trust, or sooner if the Commission so directs. The 25% sharing of surplus is proposed as compensation for the potential risk of loss to customers. As set forth in Chapter 1, Introduction (D. Thomason), served August 7, 2020, the customer expected value of the surplus sharing is \$990 million, with a present value of \$118 million. The Customer Credit will commence at the same time and in the same amount as the FRC, and PG&E anticipates that the Customer Credit will equal the FRC in each billing period such that the Customer Net Bill Impact each year is zero, as reflected in Table 6-3.

QUESTION 11

For the 25 years from 1995-2019, please provide PG&E's actual annual taxable income and marginal tax rates (federal and state), using the same methodology used to project PG&E's taxable income as shown on Table 6-2 of PG&E's Testimony.

ANSWER 11 REVISED 01

PG&E refers CCSF to Securitization 2020 DR CCSF 001-Q11Atch01-Rev01.pdf.

QUESTION 12

Please provide PG&E's previous responses to all data requests by other parties in this proceeding. On an ongoing basis, please provide PG&E's responses to all data requests by other parties in this proceeding.

ANSWER 12

PG&E objects to this request as overbroad and unduly burdensome. Subject to its objections, PG&E responds as follows:

The non-confidential data responses that PG&E has provided to date in this proceeding are available on the PG&E Regulatory Cases – Discovery Access website. The link for users to log in or register is https://pgera.azurewebsites.net/account/login.

PG&E Corporation & Subsidiaries Taxable Income/(Loss) before NOL carryover

Federal California

Year	Adjusted Taxable Income (Loss)	Tax Rate	Adjusted Taxable Income (Loss)	Tax Rate
1995	2,553,103,523	35%	2,160,219,907	9.30%
1996	1,607,722,316	35%	1,482,058,363	9.30%
1997	1,615,113,562	35%	1,117,752,427	8.84%
1998	1,553,844,752	35%	831,133,722	8.84%
1999	2,064,319,166	35%	1,154,896,503	8.84%
2000	(3,095,563,610)	35%	(1,878,493,901)	8.84%
2001	727,633,531	35%	252,976,249	8.84%
2002	2,217,461,068	35%	1,398,482,234	8.84%
2003	285,928,102	35%	745,979,522	8.84%
2004	460,944,733	35%	1,223,161,727	8.84%
2005	2,862,306,646	35%	2,521,374,037	8.84%
2006	2,305,567,492	35%	2,438,435,355	8.84%
2007	1,024,182,508	35%	1,123,027,834	8.84%
2008	(657,847,502)	35%	123,461,020	8.84%
2009	(338,311,604)	35%	968,563,126	8.84%
2010	(476,346,505)	35%	1,309,015,741	8.84%
2011	(1,733,434,831)	35%	318,818,059	8.84%
2012	(585,271,403)	35%	208,270,732	8.84%
2013	(1,278,437,127)	35%	(339,847,480)	8.84%
2014	(762,922,789)	35%	(412,879,626)	8.84%
2015	(740,273,752)	35%	84,490,014	8.84%
2016	(602,371,164)	35%	58,080,613	8.84%
2017	894,034,912	35%	763,201,102	8.84%
2018	296,273,414	21%	7,418,237	8.84%
2019	(1,904,345,320)	21%	Not yet filed	8.84%