

- Audit Finding #2 – Limited City Input on SDG&E Undergrounding Construction MSA
  - Since SDG&E disputes the issue, was this primarily based on staff input to the auditor regarding a lack of City involvement?
  - SDG&E asserted that they provided documentation to support their position and that the City ultimately signed off.
  - Can it be confirmed whether this was simply an initial difference of opinion that was later resolved, or is there a more substantive compliance issue still at play?
- Audit Finding #3 – Noncompliance with Section 6 of the Administrative MOU
  - During the presentation, it was noted that both parties agreed to an alternate solution. Was this alternative approach formally incorporated into a later version of the Administrative MOU? In other words, is SDG&E considered to be in compliance today?
- For each ECA initiative, what level of financial and resource investment is SDG&E committing?
- How does SDG&E distinguish between ratepayer-funded, grant-funded, and shareholder-funded investments?
- Can the FCRC see a breakdown so that we understand who is bearing the cost of each program?
- What mechanisms are in place to ensure unused funds (e.g., Solar Equity Program carry-over) are transparently reported and reapplied as promised?
- The presentation noted we are in year 3 of SDG&E's \$1,000,000 annual shareholder-funded solar equity program. I'd like to clarify:
  - The slide showed 74 projects completed. Does this total cover all three years since program inception, or just the current year?
  - The distribution of projects appears disproportionate by council district. What explains this imbalance, and what steps are being taken to ensure a more equitable distribution across the City?
  - Can the Committee receive a transparent report detailing how funds were spent, including distribution by district, number of homes served, and cost per project?