**QUESTION 7.1:**

Please provide a map of SoCalGas and SDG&E transmission facilities that also clearly delineates the boundaries of the ten proposed local service zones that are shown in Figure 3 of Mr. Bisi’s testimony. Please label each of the local service zones on this map or use translucent colors that do not mask the location of the transmission facilities to denote each of the local service zones.

**RESPONSE 7.1:**



**QUESTION 7.2:**

If the circumstances that were in effect on July 1, 2015, were hypothetically to reoccur and SoCalGas’ proposed curtailment procedures were in place at that time, please answer the following questions. For ease of reference, we have provided the following synopsis of events that occurred during July 1, 2015:

According to SoCalGas Advice Letter 4831, the July 1, 2015 curtailment was caused by two factors, that is, “high demand created from hot weather conditions” and “required compliance testing and replacement on one of SoCalGas’ natural gas pipelines” which resulted in “reduced natural gas capacity to meet increased demand.” Notices posted on Envoy indicate there were actually three reductions in capacity on the SoCalGas transmission system on July 1, 2015. First, there was a 540 MMcf capacity reduction in the “Needles/Topock Area Zone” that commenced on June 3, 2015, and was described on Envoy as “Planned – Line 4000 pipeline remediation between Newberry Compressor Station and Cajon.” Second, there was a 200 MMcf capacity reduction in the “Needles/Topock Area Zone” that commenced on June 12, 2015 and was described on Envoy as “Planned – Line 235 decrease of maximum operating pressure between Newberry Compressor Station and Quigley.” Third, there was a capacity reduction of 150 MMcf at “KR/MO – Kramer Junction” which commenced on June 14, 2015 and was described on Envoy as “Planned – Line 235 decrease of maximum operating pressure between Newberry Compressor Station and Quigley. Reduction required due to ongoing pipeline outages.” According to SoCalGas’ response to SCGC-24 in A.13-12-013, the facilities reductions reduced the receipt point capacity of the Northern Zone from 1590 MMcf/d to 1000 MMcf/d.

7.2.1. Were the facilities that experienced a capacity reduction all located in the Northern System local service zone?

7.2.2. If the answer to the previous question is “no,” please identify the local service zone within which each of the facilities were located.

7.2.3. Are the customers served in the Northern System local service zone provided any gas supply from Lines 2000 or 2001?

7.2.4. Are the customers served in the Northern System local service zone provided any gas supply from Wheeler Ridge, the Coastal system, or SoCalGas storage fields?

7.2.5. Under SoCalGas’ proposed curtailment procedure, would the July 1 circumstances have resulted in a curtailment in the Northern System local service zone?

7.2.6. Please explain how SoCalGas would have determined whether the curtailment was necessary given the sharp reduction in available capacity from the Northern Zone that provided supply for that local service zone.

7.2.7. Which local service zones directly receive supplies delivered from (or through) the Northern System local service zone? (Directly means that the service zones share some common border and gas flows from the Northern System local service zone to facilities in the service zone of question.)

7.2.8. Considering each of these local service zones separately, would the July 1 circumstances have resulted in a curtailment in the local service zone? Please make the answer specific to each local service zone.

7.2.9. Please explain how SoCalGas would have determined whether the curtailment was necessary in each of the local service zones considered in the previous question.

7.2.10. Are there any local service zones that indirectly receive supplies delivered from the Northern System local service zone? (Indirectly means that the service zone shares a common border with at least one of the service zones identified in the response to Q.7.2.7 and gas flows from at least that service zone into the indirectly served local service zone.)

7.2.11. If the answer to the previous question is “yes,” please identify these local service zones.

7.2.12. Considering each of these local service zones separately, would the July 1 circumstances have resulted in a curtailment in the local service zone?

7.2.13. Please explain how SoCalGas would have determined whether the curtailment was necessary in each of the local service zones considered in the previous question.

7.2.14. Comparing the local service zone and customer class associated with the customers who were actually curtailed on July 1, 2015, with the local service zone and customer class associated with the customers who would be curtailed in the hypothetical situation described above:

7.2.14.1. Would the customer locations in terms of service zones be different?

7.2.14.2. If the answer to the previous question is “yes,” please describe the local service zones that actually had some curtailment on July 1, 2015, and compare those service zones with the service zones that would receive curtailment under the hypothetical situation described above.

7.2.14.3. Would the customer classes involved in the curtailment be different?

7.2.14.4. If the answer to the previous question is “yes,” please describe the differences between those customer classes that actually experienced some curtailment on July 1, 2015, and compare those customer classes with the customer classes that would receive curtailment under the hypothetical situation described above.

7.2.14.5. Under the hypothetical situation described above, would gas be injected to any storage fields located within a local service area that would be subject to curtailment?

7.2.14.6. Please explain why or why not.

7.2.14.7. Under the hypothetical situation described above, would gas be injected to any storage fields located in a local service area that has at least a portion of its gas supply delivered from a local service area that would be subject to curtailment?

7.2.14.8. Please explain why or why not.

**RESPONSE 7.2:**

7.2. There would still have been curtailments under the proposed new curtailment rules, but the South LA Basin would have been clearly defined for all customers, and the implementation of the curtailment would have been simpler.

The combination of high sendout and low deliverability in the South LA Basin required a curtailment in the South LA Basin. The amount of EG volume reduction in the South LA Basin was less than 60%. CAISO was able to move some EG demand out of the South LA Basin into other zones that were not affected by the constraint. This resulted in the curtailment to be limited locally to the South LA Basin, and other zones were not affected.

7.2.1. Yes

7.2.2. N/A

7.2.3. No

7.2.4. Yes, the Northern System can receive limited supplies from Wheeler Ridge and Honor Rancho storage.

7.2.5. No

7.2.6. Please refer to response 7.2.

7.2.7. Southern System – West of Moreno, Southern System – East of Moreno, South LA Basin, North LA Basin, Valley System

7.2.8. The curtailment would have been for the South LA Basin only

7.2.9. Please refer to response 7.2.

7.2.10. Yes

7.2.11. Southern System – South of Moreno, Coastal System, North Coastal System, North Valley System

7.2.12. Please refer to response 7.2.

7.2.13. Please refer to response 7.2.

7.2.14.1. No

7.2.14.2. N/A

7.2.14.3. No

7.2.14.4. N/A

7.2.14.5. Please refer to SCGC DR-05 Response 3.

7.2.14.6. Please refer to SCGC DR-05 Response 3.

7.2.14.7. Please refer to SCGC DR-05 Response 3.

7.2.14.8. Please refer to SCGC DR-05 Response 3.

**QUESTION 7.3:**

On page 8 of Mr. Watson’s testimony, he states: “If a constraint does arise during the summer, it is unlikely that SoCalGas and SDG&E would need a more than 30% cut in EG demand to maintain gas service to all other customers.” Please explain in detail the basis for this statement identifying the assumptions made and the sources of data that are relied upon.

**RESPONSE 7.3:**

Systemwide EG demands during July-September are 1.5 to 2 times higher than they are in the December-February period. Therefore, a 30% cut in summer demand provides as much volumes to the System Operator as a 45-60% cut during the winter.