

**Aliso Canyon OII I. 17-02-002**

**Stakeholder Questions from Phase 3 Workshop #2 held March 30, 2021**

**April 16, 2021**

1. [Tyson Siegele, Protect Our Communities] Where any of the post-blowout Aliso Canyon mitigation measures assumed to be utilized during the peak hour of gas demand? If so, please provide a link to the document and provide the page of the specific mitigation measures that FTI used.

[Matthew DeCoursey, FTI] No.

2. [Tyson Siegele, Protect Our Communities] What Minimum Local Generation ("MLG") did FTI assume for the Aliso Canyon service area?

[Matthew DeCoursey, FTI] FTI and GSC did not make an assumption regarding Minimum Local Generation. During Workstream #1, we ran an electric simulation model to determine the gas burn from the generation required to serve load. We then analyzed deliverability using a gas simulation model to determine the shortfall. This is a different approach than the one used by the Energy Division in its Phase 2 study. Additional details are provided in the materials from the workshop we conducted in November 2020.

3. [Tyson Siegele, Protect Our Communities] In reviewing the materials, it appears that 4,768 MW is a conversion of the 32.6 MMcf "shortfall" for the peak 2027 gas demand hour. Please confirm.

[Matthew DeCoursey, FTI] Confirmed. Note that the total is subject to change based on updates to the assumptions that were discussed during the most recent workshops.

4. [Tyson Siegele, Protect Our Communities] Does FTI's "shortfall" calculation assume the 4,768 MW resides in an electric system load pocket and thus the 4,768 MW cuts into the MLG requirement? If so, please provide the MW shortfall by load pocket and please provide MLG for each load pocket.

[Matthew DeCoursey, FTI] See response to #2.

5. [Tyson Siegele, Protect Our Communities] Please provide the assumed peak electricity demand in the area served by Aliso Canyon during the peak gas demand "shortfall" hour.

[Matthew DeCoursey, FTI] Data from the electricity model used for Workstream #1, including hourly demand inputs, were posted after the workshop held in November 2020 on November 25<sup>th</sup>. See the "Load Modifying Demand Forecasts" and "Base Load Forecasts" worksheets of the "FTI Electricity Model Information" workbook here: <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/AlisoOII/>

6. [Tyson Siegele, Protect Our Communities] Please provide the assumed peak electricity demand assumed for the CAISO in the Aliso Canyon service territory plus the LADWP peak electricity demand during the peak gas demand "shortfall" hour.

**Aliso Canyon OII I. 17-02-002**

**Stakeholder Questions from Phase 3 Workshop #2 held March 30, 2021**

**April 16, 2021**

[Matthew DeCoursey, FTI] [See response to #5.](#)

7. [Tyson Siegele, Protect Our Communities] Assuming the 4,768 MW is the shortfall in electricity generation by gas-fired generators served by Aliso Canyon, please provide the MW of assumed non-gas-fired generation within the Aliso Canyon service area.

[Matthew DeCoursey, FTI] [Data from the electricity model used for Workstream #1, including inputs regarding generators, were posted after the workshop held in November 2020 on November 25<sup>th</sup>. See the “Hourly Generation 2027” and “Hourly Generation 2035” worksheets of the “FTI Electricity Model Information” workbook here: <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/AlisoOII/>](#)

8. [Tyson Siegele, Protect Our Communities] What assumptions did FTI use for growth in behind the meter generation?

[Matthew DeCoursey, FTI] [Assumptions for behind the meter generation capacity align with those used by the Energy Division for its Phase 2 study. Because different years were modeled in Phase 2 and Phase 3, in some cases growth assumptions were developed by interpolating or extrapolating the Phase 2 results. A reconciliation between the model inputs used in Phase 2 and the ones the Project utilized in Workstream #1 was presented at the workshop held in 2020 and is available in the materials distributed for that event. See <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/AlisoOII/>](#)

9. [Tyson Siegele, Protect Our Communities] Did FTI assume any or all of the 7,500 MW electrical generation NQC proposed in the February 22, 2021 IRP proceeding ruling? If so, how much was assumed to be built within the Aliso Canyon service territory?

[Matthew DeCoursey, FTI] [No. The ruling was not available at the time the modeling for Workstream #1 was developed. The Project Team will incorporate new resources to which commitments have been made during Workstream #2. Detailed descriptions of changes to the resource mix over time and reconciliation with the resource assumptions used during the Phase 2 analysis will be included in the draft report we expect to publish later in 2021.](#)

10. [Tyson Siegele, Protect Our Communities] Did FTI include any of the 3,300 MW of system RA capacity ordered in D.19-11-016 (with contracts subsequently approved)? If so, which of the contracts were included?

[Matthew DeCoursey, FTI] [No. Information regarding the contracts was not available at the time the modeling for Workstream #1 was developed. The Project Team will incorporate new resources to which commitments have been made during Workstream #2. Detailed descriptions of changes to the resource mix over time and reconciliation with the resource assumptions used during the Phase 2 analysis will be included in the draft report we expect to publish later in 2021.](#)

**Aliso Canyon OII I. 17-02-002**

**Stakeholder Questions from Phase 3 Workshop #2 held March 30, 2021**

**April 16, 2021**

11. [Tyson Siegele, Protect Our Communities] Were the existing electricity transmission pathways to Southern California assumed to be fully utilized in FTI’s “shortfall” assumption?

[Matthew DeCoursey, FTI] Utilization of transmission infrastructure is a result of the simulation model that was conducted during Workstream #1, not an assumption. Transmission capacity was assumed to be fully available. Data from the electricity model used for Workstream #1, including transmission line flows, were posted after the workshop held in November 2020 on November 25<sup>th</sup>. See the “Line Flows 2027” and “Line Flows 2035” worksheets of the “FTI Electricity Model Information” workbook here: <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/AlisoOII/>

12. [Tyson Siegele, Protect Our Communities] Please provide FTI’s transmission pathway MW capacity assumptions. Please provide the capacity ratings by path number.

[Matthew DeCoursey, FTI] Data from the electricity model used for Workstream #1, including transmission line capacity inputs, were posted shortly after the workshop held in November 2020 on November 25<sup>th</sup>. See the “Transmission” worksheet of the “FTI Electricity Model Information” workbook here: <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/AlisoOII/>

13. [Sara Gersen, Earthjustice] What depreciation period, if any, will be used to conduct the cost-benefit analysis of the portfolio of gas transmission investments planned for Workstream #2.

[Matthew DeCoursey, FTI] The Project Team has not yet finalized the inputs to the financial analysis that will be used during Workstream #2, including depreciation. We expect to utilize financial assumptions approved by the CPUC for ratemaking purposes as a starting point, subject to adjustment as necessary. Details descriptions of the financial assumptions used for Workstream #2 and our rationale for each will be included in the draft report we expect to publish later in 2021.