



# R.20-01-007 Track 2 Workshop 1: Gas Infrastructure

January 10, 2022 | 9:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. | Remote participation only

Remote Participation Link:

<https://cpuc.webex.com/cpuc/j.php?MTID=m253d3320c16536ce0c96d97512e1d2f0>

Toll Call-in: 1-415-655-0002

Meeting Access Code: 2480 535 4677 Event Password: GasPlanning2022

---

**Workshop Purpose:** This workshop covers Scoping Memo questions 2.1(a)-2.1(d) of the Assigned Commissioner’s Amended Scoping Memo and Ruling, issued on January 5, 2022.<sup>1</sup> This workshop seeks to provide stakeholders with a common understanding of the issues, gather information, and seek feedback. Additionally, workshop participants may begin to develop possible future scenarios and suggest potential solutions.

**Intended Outcome:** Participants and attendees will have a better understanding of the facts upon which testimony, hearings (if needed), and briefs (if needed) will proceed. Energy Division staff will publish a workshop report in February summarizing the presentations and various discussions.

## WORKSHOP AGENDA

**9:30 – 9:50**

**Welcome**

Commissioner Remarks

Energy Division Staff Workshop Logistics

**9:50 – 10:30**

**Scoping Memo Question a:** Should the Commission consider adopting a General Order (GO) analogous to GO 131-D for electric infrastructure projects, that would require site-specific approvals for gas infrastructure projects that exceed a certain size or cost?

**Mary Jo Borak and Jack Mulligan**, CPUC Energy and Legal Division Staff

**Jennifer Everett**, PG&E

**Albert Garcia**, SoCalGas

**Matt Vespa**, Earthjustice

**10:30 – 10:40**

**Q&A**

---

<sup>1</sup> The scope of Track 2 can be found in the Assigned Commissioner’s Amended Scoping Memo and Ruling here: <https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Efile/G000/M436/K692/436692151.PDF>

10:40 – 11:40

**Scoping Memo Question b:** What criteria should the Commission use to determine whether aging transmission infrastructure should be repaired or replaced when a gas utility requests ratepayer funds?

- i. Should the repair or replacement criteria be based on whether that piece of infrastructure is necessary to meet the utility's design standard as determined in Track 1?
- ii. What other criteria might be considered?
- iii. How should the cost to repair or replace the infrastructure be balanced against its reliability benefits?

**Bryon Winget**, PG&E

**Michael Colvin**, Environmental Defense Fund

**Catherine Yap**, Southern California Generation Coalition

**Mark Pocta**, Cal Advocates

11:40 – 12:00

**Panel Discussion and Q&A**

12:00 – 1:00

**Lunch Break**

1:00 – 1:45

**Scoping Memo Question c:** What criteria should be used to determine when declining demand can enable transmission lines to be de-rated or decommissioned without harming reliability?

- i. How should the Commission define a transmission pipeline vs. a distribution line?
- ii. What should the regulatory process be for de-rating a transmission pipeline to a distribution pipeline?

**Matt Epuna**, CPUC Safety and Enforcement Division

**Thomas Finch**, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration

**Jonathan Peress**, SoCalGas

1:45 – 2:05

**Panel Discussion and Q&A**

2:05 – 2:10

**Stretch Break**

2:10 – 3:10

**Scoping Memo Question d:** What criteria should the Commission use to determine whether aging distribution infrastructure should be repaired or replaced when a gas utility requests ratepayer funds?

- i. What pipeline-related characteristics should be considered when determining whether to replace distribution infrastructure (e.g., downstream impacts, pipeline's role in serving industrial (hard to electrify) load, type of customers served, customer density, age, safety condition, pipe material such as Aldyl-A, proximity to a source of renewable gas?)
- ii. What community characteristics such as designation as a disadvantaged community (DAC), should be considered?
- iii. What other criteria, if any, should be considered?

- iv. What goals should be considered when using these characteristics (e.g., cost savings, pipeline safety, net greenhouse gas reductions, environmental justice)?
- v. What non-pipeline alternatives should be considered?
- vi. How should the cost of non-pipeline alternatives be compared to the cost of gas pipeline replacement or repair? for example, are there avoided operations and maintenance (O&M) and infrastructure replacement costs for retiring distribution pipelines that could be estimated and incorporated into cost-effectiveness analysis?
- vii. If the Commission determines that a distribution pipeline should be decommissioned, what consideration should be given to customers who do not wish to stop their gas service?

**Samuel Grandlienard**, Southwest Gas  
**Abigail Solis**, Self Help Enterprises  
**Sam Wade**, Coalition for Renewable Natural Gas  
**Marcel Hawiger**, TURN  
**Claire Halbrook**, Gridworks

**3:10 – 3:30**

**Panel Discussion and Q&A**

**3:30 – 3:55**

**Final Comments and Q&A (Open to All)**

**3:55 – 4:00**

**Closing Remarks**  
 Energy Division Staff

**Note:** It is expected that one or more CPUC Commissioners may attend and participate in the workshop. One or more advisors to the CPUC Commissioners, as well as other decision-makers, may also be in attendance. The agenda will be publicly noticed on the CPUC’s Daily Calendar 10 days in advance, so statements made at the workshop will not constitute a reportable *ex parte* contact. The workshop will be recorded. This agenda is subject to change.