BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Investigation pursuant to Senate Bill 380 to determine the feasibility of minimizing or eliminating the use of the Aliso Canyon natural gas storage facility located in the County of Los Angeles while still maintaining energy and electric reliability for the region.

Investigation 17-02-002 (Filed December 4, 2020)

INFORMAL COMMENTS OF ISSAM NAJM ON WORKSHOP 1 OF PHASE 3 CONDUCTED ON NOVEMBER 17, 2020

On November 17, 2020, Workshop 1 of Phase 3 of I.17.02.002 proceeding was conducted during which the work to be completed in Phase 3 of the proceeding was presented. This Phase of the proceeding will determine the changes that would need to be made to the gas system to allow for the permanent closure of the Aliso Canyon gas facility (Aliso) owned and operated by SoCalGas by 2027 or 2035. Assigned Administrative Law Judge Zhang noted that the parties to the proceeding may submit informal comments on the presented material and provide input to the contractor to include in their analysis. This document includes my comments and input.

Comment 1 – Hydraulic modeling conducted by CPUC ED staff and presented in previous workshops determined that a hydraulic bottleneck exists between Honor Rancho and the LA Basin that prevents the simultaneous use of the full capacity of the northern pipelines and Honor Rancho. Removal of this bottleneck should be included in the analysis.

Comment 2 – SoCalGas has only recently completed the installation of electric compressors at Aliso. When Aliso is closed, there is a quantifiable residual value to these compressors and other assets at the facility that needs to be accounted for in the economic analysis. If they are going to be considered stranded assets, their residual value must be removed from the rates paid by customers, and this rate reduction will need to be accounted for in the economic analysis. Either way, the economic analysis is incomplete without accounting for the residual value of these assets.

Comment 3 – The reason behind SB380 and all the ensuing activities, including this proceeding, is the protection of public health and safety caused by the continued operation of Aliso and the potential repeat of the blowout of October 23, 2015. There is a clear risk to public health that will be removed once the facility is closed. The monetary value of this reduction in public health risk must be included in the overall economic impact of closing the facility. This value can be determined using USEPA's BenMAP model, which is a free software available from the USEPA.¹ The USEPA has used this model to quantify the benefits of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) and provided a detailed description of its use in a 2011 report.² Several researchers have used the BenMAP model to quantify the economic benefits of risk reduction at localized areas resulting from priority pollutants reduction or reduction in GHG emissions.^{3,4} In another example, one that is more aligned with the Phase 3 analysis, the USEPA used BenMAP to estimate the benefit per ton of reducing PM2.5 precurors.⁵ There is no reason this model cannot be used to quantify the economic benefit of eliminating the existing risk from continued operation of Aliso. The model requires input data that are readily available. For example, the quantity of priority pollutants and methane released by the facility each year are well documented by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and others. The facility's current permit makes no changes to the operation of the facility aimed at reducing those emissions. Moreover, in its decision to allow the resumption of gas injection into the facility, the Department of Gas and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR), which is currently CalGEM, noted that initial flyovers would be required to confirm that the facility does not release more than 250 kg/hr of methane,⁶ suggesting that this is an "acceptable" release from the facility at any time. Either this value, or that reported by other reputable and independent scientific sources can be used for methane release values.

Comment 4 – On slide 70 of the FTI Research Presentation, Question 3 asks: "*Is our* selection of 2027 and 2035 as they years to analyze reasonable? If not, is there a preferred option?". My answer to the first question is "No". Two California Governors, Brown and

¹ <u>https://www.epa.gov/benmap</u>

² <u>https://www.epa.gov/clean-air-act-overview/benefits-and-costs-clean-air-act-1990-2020-report-documents-and-graphics</u>

³ https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1309104215305365

⁴ <u>https://www.pnas.org/content/106/6/2077.short</u>

⁵ <u>https://www.epa.gov/benmap/estimating-benefit-ton-reducing-pm25-precursors-17-sectors</u>

⁶ <u>https://www.conservation.ca.gov/calgem/Documents/Aliso/OrderfromStateOilandGasSupervisor.pdf</u>

Newsom, have now asked for the closure of the facility <u>no later than 2027</u>. Therefore, using 2027 as the short term and 2035 as the long(er) term is not reasonable. My preferred option is a timeline that considers a phased closure plan that has two milestones: The first is the termination of any new injection by December 2023 while allowing only withdrawals if needed as a last-resort through December 2025 at which time all oil and gas operation at the facility will be terminated.

Comment 5 – In response to Question 7 on Slide 70 of the FTI Research Presentation, I believe that the assumed 85% pipeline utilization in the Northern and Southern zones (Slide 43) is unreasonable under the high-demand scenario. While I understand that this is a level that CPUC has selected for its work under Phase 2, I ask that Phase 3 analysis be conducted at 85%, 90%, and 95% utilization rates in order to provide the Parties with an understanding of the significance of this assumption on the outcome of the analysis.

Comment 6 – Also in response to Question 7, the total pipeline capacity of 3.115 Bcfd stated on Slide 43 is inappropriate. The total pipeline capacity prior to the explosion of L235 was 3.4 Bcfd, and that is the physical capacity of the pipelines. While SoCalGas choses to operate them at reduced pressure resulting in an artificially lower transmission rate is not relevant to this part of the proceeding. These pipelines have been paid for by the ratepayers and need to be assumed at their proper capacity. At a minimum, I ask that a parallel analysis be conducted assuming the full pipeline capacity prior to the failure of L235.

I appreciate the opportunity to submit these comments, and I would be glad to provide any additional input and/or clarification regarding any of them.

Dated: December 4, 2020, at Porter Ranch, California.

/s/ ISSAM NAJM Issam Najm, Resident Porter Ranch, California c/o WQTS, Inc. 21018 Osborne Street, Suite 1 Canoga Park, California 91304 Ph. (818) 366-8340 issam.najm@WQTS.com