

Application: A.25-06-XXX
Exhibit No.: _____
Witness: Vijai Atavane

**PREPARED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF
VIJAI ATAVANE
ON BEHALF OF
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY

(CHAPTER 3 – MARKET ASSESSMENT STUDIES)**

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

June 12, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	PURPOSE AND OVERVIEW OF TESTIMONY.....	1
II.	COST COMPONENTS FOR MARKET ASSESSMENT STUDIES	3
III.	COMPLIANCE WITH PHASE 1 DECISION AND DESCRIPTION OF MARKET ASSESSMENT STUDIES.....	3
	A. Demand Study.....	5
	B. Production Planning and Assessment	5
	C. Project Options and Alternatives	6
	D. High-Level Economic Analysis and Cost Effectiveness Study	6
IV.	MANAGEMENT AND OVERSIGHT OF MARKET ASSESSMENT STUDIES	6
	A. Demand Study.....	8
	1. Initiation – Scope of Work.....	8
	2. Planning – Technical Approach.....	9
	3. Execution	10
	B. Production Planning and Assessment	11
	1. Initiation – Scope of Work.....	12
	2. Planning – Technical Approach.....	13
	3. Execution	13
	C. Project Options and Alternatives	15
	1. Initiation – Scope of Work.....	15
	2. Planning – Technical Approach.....	16
	3. Execution	17
	D. High Level Economic Analysis and Cost Effectiveness.....	17
	1. Initiation – Scope of Work.....	18
	2. Planning – Technical Approach.....	18
	3. Execution	19
V.	CONCLUSION.....	20
VI.	WITNESS QUALIFICATIONS.....	21

1 interest benefits to ratepayers and the broader community.⁷ These activities were planned and
2 executed in a manner that considered affordability and safety, integrated stakeholder input, and
3 complied with the Phase 1 Decision.

4 My testimony describes the activities associated with the Market Assessment Studies
5 conducted during Phase 1 to assess Angeles Link’s viability. The costs associated with the
6 Market Assessment Studies collectively amount to approximately \$9 million in operating and
7 maintenance (O&M) expenditures and support the \$24.3 million recorded to the ALMA.⁸ The
8 Market Assessment Studies include:

- 9 • Demand Study (Demand Study)
- 10 • Production Planning & Assessment (Production Study)
- 11 • Project Options and Alternatives (Alternatives Study)
- 12 • High-level Economic Analysis and Cost Effectiveness (Cost-Effectiveness Study)

13 My testimony provides the description and cost components for each of the Market
14 Assessment Studies, explains how the Market Assessment Studies were executed in compliance
15 and accordance with the Phase 1 Decision,⁹ and demonstrates how the studies were prudently
16 managed to control costs and achieve the deliverables outlined in the Phase 1 Decision while
17 engaging with key stakeholders throughout the process.

18 As demonstrated in my testimony and workpapers, these costs were prudently and
19 reasonably incurred, and the associated revenue requirement is justified for rate recovery. To
20 facilitate the review process and for ease of reference, additional information regarding the

⁷ In compliance with the Phase 1 Decision, SoCalGas made reports of the results and data of the Phase 1 Studies available to the public. The Decision recognized that sharing this information “should be beneficial to the development of the clean renewable hydrogen industry and thus serve the public interest.” (Phase 1 Decision at 62). The Phase 1 reports are available at: <https://www.socalgas.com/regulatory/angeleslink>.

⁸ Expenditures for these activities were incurred from January 2023 through December 2024, with some discrete trailing charges in 2025. See Chapter 6 (Direct Testimony of Jenny Chhuor and Michael W. Foster) for details on the ALMA balance and associated revenue requirement requested for rate recovery in this Application.

⁹ See Phase 1 Decision at 73-77 (OP 3(a), 3(c), 3(e), 3(h), 5(a), 5(c)-(d), 5(e), 7). The studies were scoped and conducted in compliance with the Phase 1 Decision in its entirety, which includes broader requirements than those required for cost recovery, including OP 6(a), 6(b), 6(c), 6(d), and 6(j) (*id.* at 75-77). Phase 1 Decision OP 6 requirements to advance to Phase 2 are being addressed in A.24-12-011.

1 Market Assessment Studies is included in my supporting workpapers. The information in this
2 testimony provides a summary of the activities and associated costs.

3 **II. COST COMPONENTS FOR MARKET ASSESSMENT STUDIES**

4 Table 1 below provides a summary of the fully loaded costs incurred by SoCalGas to
5 support the Market Assessment Studies, totaling approximately \$9 million. A combination of
6 internal and external resources were utilized to effectively complete these activities. Direct costs
7 reflect labor and non-labor costs. Labor costs include SoCalGas personnel who managed Phase
8 1 activities. Non-labor costs include third-party contractor costs incurred in the process of the
9 development of the studies, as well as other miscellaneous costs.¹⁰ Indirect costs reflect costs for
10 overhead loaders.¹¹ As described in Chapter 6 (Direct Testimony of Jenny Chhuor and Michael
11 W. Foster), the total ALMA balance of \$24.3 million is the basis for the requested revenue
12 requirement for cost recovery.

13 **Table 1: Chapter 3 Total Costs (in millions)**

Market Assessment Studies				
Study	Labor	Non-Labor	Overheads	Total Loaded Costs
Demand Study	\$0.4	\$2.4	\$0.4	\$3.2
Production Study	\$0.2	\$1.7	\$0.2	\$2.1
Alternatives Study	\$0.2	\$1.2	\$0.2	\$1.6
Cost-Effectiveness Study	\$0.2	\$1.7	\$0.2	\$2.1
Total Costs	\$1.0	\$7.0	\$1.0	\$9.0

14 **III. COMPLIANCE WITH PHASE 1 DECISION AND DESCRIPTION OF MARKET**
15 **ASSESSMENT STUDIES**

16 In the Phase 1 Decision, the Commission provided that SoCalGas may seek recovery of
17 Phase 1 costs if it satisfies conditions set forth in OP 3 and demonstrates how the recorded costs

¹⁰ See Chapter 1 (Direct Testimony of Shirley Arazi and Amy Kitson) for additional details.

¹¹ See Chapter 6 (Direct Testimony of Jenny Chhuor and Michael W. Foster) for additional details on the ALMA balance.

1 and activities meet the project-specific standards identified in OP 5. The Market Assessment
2 Studies demonstrate compliance with the following requirements in OP 3 and OP 5:

- 3 • 3(a): Feasibility studies for the Angeles Link Project shall be restricted to the
4 service of clean renewable hydrogen that is produced with a carbon intensity
5 equal to or less than four kilograms of carbon dioxide-equivalent produced on a
6 lifecycle basis per kilogram and does not use any fossil fuel in its production
7 process.
- 8 • 3(c): SoCalGas shall study a localized hydrogen hub solution, under the
9 specifications required to be eligible for federal funding provided through the
10 Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, as part of Phase One.
- 11 • 3(e): SoCalGas shall conduct quarterly stakeholder engagement meetings,
12 including quarterly meetings with Planning Advisory Group members. SoCalGas
13 shall also identify and invite participation from community-based organizations
14 that may potentially be impacted by the Project, including disadvantage
15 communities and environmental social justice groups, in either the quarterly
16 Planning Advisory Group meetings or some other stakeholder engagement
17 process.
- 18 • 3(h): SoCalGas shall submit to the Commission’s Deputy Executive Director for
19 Energy and Climate Policy quarterly reports to provide an update of the Angeles
20 Link Project and the feasibility studies, and to report on any preliminary results
21 and findings. The reports shall not include any redacted data or finding unless
22 SoCalGas is granted confidentiality of the data in accordance with General Order
23 66-D. The reports shall be made available to the public. SoCalGas shall solicit
24 feedback from parties and the Planning Advisory Group members and include this
25 feedback in the reports. SoCalGas shall serve these reports on the service list of
26 this proceeding.
- 27 • 5(a): How did the planning process address affordability concerns in the
28 development of the Project?
- 29 • 5(c): How did the planning process consider California environmental law and
30 public policies in the development of the Project?
- 31 • 5(d): How did the planning process gather and address stakeholder concerns?

- 5(e): How did the planning process consider and evaluate Project alternatives, including a localized hydrogen hub or other decarbonization options such as electrification, their costs, and their environmental impacts?

The description of each study and how it complies with the Phase 1 Decision are provided below in Section III A. through D. Moreover, the Market Assessment Studies considered clean renewable hydrogen as required by OP 3(a) and, in accordance with OP 3(e), 3(h), and 5(d), stakeholder feedback was gathered and incorporated where appropriate in the planning and execution of the studies.

A. Demand Study

In accordance with the Phase 1 Decision,¹² the Demand Study assessed potential hydrogen demand, end-uses, and end-users (including current natural gas customers and future customers) of Angeles Link. This study evaluated potential demand for clean renewable hydrogen across the mobility, power generation, and industrial sectors within SoCalGas’s service territory through 2045, and projected various demand trajectories to be served by Angeles Link over time.

B. Production Planning and Assessment

In accordance with the Phase 1 Decision,¹³ the Production Study assessed potential third-party sources of clean renewable hydrogen production¹⁴ from renewable sources (such as solar and wind) to serve the projected demand over time. Three primary production areas were identified within SoCalGas’s service territory (San Joaquin Valley, Lancaster area, and Blythe area) that could alone, or in some combination, meet the projected Angeles Link throughput range. The Production Study also highlighted specific production methods and assessed land availability.

¹² Phase 1 Decision 73-75 (OP 3(a), 3(c), 3(e), 3(h), 5(a), 3(c)-(e), 6(a), 6(c)).

¹³ *Id.* at 73-77 (OP 3(a), 3(e), 3(h), 5(a), 5(c), 5(d), 6(b), 6(j)).

¹⁴ The Phase 1 Decision restricts the hydrogen transported via Angeles Link to “clean renewable hydrogen that is produced with a carbon intensity equal to or less than four kilograms of carbon dioxide-equivalent produced on a lifecycles basis per kilogram and does not use any fossil fuel in its production processes.” (*Id.* at 73 (OP 3(a))).

1 **C. Project Options and Alternatives**

2 In accordance with the Phase 1 Decision ¹⁵ the Alternatives Study identified hydrogen
3 delivery alternatives and non-hydrogen delivery alternatives based on the requirements of the
4 Phase 1 Decision, alignment with Angeles Link’s purpose and objectives, and for the hydrogen
5 delivery options, geographic alignment with the Alliance for Renewable Clean Hydrogen Energy
6 Systems (ARCHES) vision for clean renewable hydrogen in California. These alternatives
7 (including a localized hydrogen hub in accordance with OP 3(c) and OP 5(e)) were compared for
8 scalability, transport distances across Central and Southern California, and overall cost
9 effectiveness. The Alternatives Study advanced hydrogen delivery alternatives and non-
10 hydrogen delivery alternatives that met the selected criteria to be evaluated for cost effectiveness
11 and potential environmental impacts appropriate at a feasibility stage. Information from the Cost
12 Effectiveness Study and the Environmental Analysis¹⁶ was incorporated into the Alternatives
13 Study.

14 **D. High-Level Economic Analysis and Cost Effectiveness Study**

15 In accordance with the Phase 1 Decision,¹⁷ the Cost Effectiveness Study evaluated
16 alternatives identified in the Alternatives Study and developed a methodology for measuring the
17 cost-effectiveness of Angeles Link (e.g. delivery of clean renewable hydrogen via pipeline)
18 compared to those alternatives based on available information. The analysis specifically
19 examined various hydrogen delivery (e.g., trucking, liquid hydrogen shipping, power
20 transmission and distribution (T&D) with in-basin production, and localized hydrogen hub) and
21 non-hydrogen delivery alternatives (e.g., electrification, carbon capture and sequestration).

22 **IV. MANAGEMENT AND OVERSIGHT OF MARKET ASSESSMENT STUDIES**

23 SoCalGas reasonably and prudently managed the Market Assessment Studies by
24 leveraging resources, maintaining financial oversight, and controlling costs. As contemplated in

¹⁵ *Id.* at 73-77 (OP 3(a), 3(c), 3(e), 3(h), 5(a), 5(c)-(e), 6(d)).

¹⁶ *See* Chapter 4 (Direct Testimony of Jessica Kinnahan Foley) for details regarding the Environmental Analysis.

¹⁷ Phase 1 Decision at 73-77 (OP 3(a), 3(c), 3(e), 3(h), 5(a), 5(c)-(e), 6(d)).

1 the Phase 1 Decision, SoCalGas began conducting the feasibility studies immediately.¹⁸ To
2 facilitate a quick ramp up in selecting vendors, SoCalGas utilized existing Master Service
3 Agreements (MSA), based on market rates stemming from previous competitive solicitations, as
4 well as standalone agreements. These MSAs provide pre-negotiated terms, including market-
5 based billing rates which offer cost predictability and typically do not escalate over the contract
6 term. Additionally, the MSAs enabled SoCalGas to have greater certainty about the firm's
7 capabilities, safety record, dedicated staff and staffing levels, insurance requirements, and
8 commitment to engaging with diverse businesses. When SoCalGas did not have an existing
9 MSA, SoCalGas solicited bids to engage selected contractors best suited to evaluate a particular
10 topic area based on a set of assessment criteria.

11 As explained in Chapter 2 (Direct Testimony of Frank Lopez), throughout the
12 development of the studies, in accordance with OP 3(e) and 5(d), SoCalGas presented
13 opportunities for stakeholders to provide feedback at four key milestones while conducting each
14 study: (1) initial description of the scope of work, (2) technical approach, (3) preliminary data
15 and findings, and (4) draft study.¹⁹ These milestones were selected because they represented
16 critical points at which relevant feedback could meaningfully influence the Phase 1 Studies.
17 SoCalGas considered stakeholder feedback and incorporated it where appropriate. Responses to
18 stakeholder feedback were also provided in quarterly reports in accordance with OP 3(h) and
19 5(d).²⁰ Throughout the development of the studies, changes to scope, schedule, and/or cost
20 resulted from stakeholder feedback, study development, as well as interdependencies with other
21 Phase 1 studies.²¹

¹⁸ *Id.* at 63 (FOF 13) (“Given the confluence of current events, including recent federal statutes, regional initiatives, and local interest, public interest is served if SoCalGas begins conducting feasibility studies of the Angeles Link Project immediately.”).

¹⁹ *See* Chapter 2 (Direct Testimony of Frank Lopez) for further details regarding the stakeholder engagement process.

²⁰ The quarterly reports provided status updates on the feasibility studies during Phase 1, identified and responded to stakeholder feedback, and attached transcripts of PAG and CBOSG meetings and materials presented at these meeting held during that quarter. The quarterly reports were submitted to the California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) and are published on SoCalGas's website, available at: <https://www.socalgas.com/regulatory/angeleslink>.

²¹ *See* Sections IV.A. through IV.D. describing the interdependencies for the Demand Study, Production Study, Alternatives Study, and Cost Effectiveness Study.

1 The following sections describe the reasonable and prudent management of the Market
2 Assessment Studies.

3 **A. Demand Study**

4 As described in Section III.A., in accordance with the Phase 1 Decision, SoCalGas
5 developed the Demand Study to evaluate potential clean renewable hydrogen demand across the
6 mobility, power generation, and industrial sectors within SoCalGas’s service territory through
7 2045 and to identify the ratepayers who would potentially be end-users, including current natural
8 gas customers and future customers.²² This study was foundational to Phase 1, providing
9 throughput demand volumes as inputs to the Cost Effectiveness Study, Alternatives Study,
10 Production Study, Preliminary Routing/ Configuration Analysis (Routing Analysis), Greenhouse
11 Gas (GHG) Emissions Evaluation (GHG Study), Nitrogen Oxide (NOx) and other Air Emissions
12 Assessment (NOx Study), Hydrogen Leakage Assessment (Leakage Study), Pipeline Sizing &
13 Design Criteria (Design Study), and Water Resources Evaluation. The scope and activities of the
14 Demand Study evolved over time, informed by stakeholder feedback and in alignment with the
15 Phase 1 Decision. The O&M costs incurred to develop the Demand Study total \$3.2 million and
16 include labor and non-labor costs.²³

17 The following sections describe the activities undertaken throughout the development of
18 the Demand Study—from the initial contracting stage, to the integration of stakeholder feedback
19 at four key milestones (scope, technical approach, preliminary findings, and draft study), to
20 completion of the final study.

21 **1. Initiation – Scope of Work**

22 The Demand Study scope of work was developed to guide the structure, content, and
23 execution of the Demand Study, confirming alignment with the Phase 1 Decision, incorporating

²² The Demand Study identified both existing and future SoCalGas ratepayers who would be potential end-users of Angeles Link in the three sectors analyzed. Existing ratepayers include mobility customers such as bus fleet and other heavy-duty vehicle operators, power generation facilities, and industrial customers such as metal fabrication shops, food and beverage manufacturing/processing facilities, stone/glass/cement facilities, pulp and paper, chemicals, and refineries, among others. Future potential ratepayers, who are not currently served by SoCalGas but could be end users of Angeles Link include non-utility served heavy-duty vehicle operators, commercial harbor craft operators, ocean-going vessel operators, and locomotive operators. The study was limited to identification of certain, but not all potential end uses that may drive potential demand for clean renewable hydrogen, which is expected to occur in future phases.

²³ Refer to my accompanying Chapter 3 Workpapers for additional cost information.

1 other Phase 1 Studies, and considering stakeholder feedback pursuant to OP 5(d). The scope of
2 work was developed by SoCalGas personnel with technical and project management expertise, in
3 collaboration with internal SMEs (e.g., gas demand forecasting, customer services), as needed.
4 The Demand Study was scoped in compliance with the Phase 1 Decision including identification
5 of hydrogen demand, end uses, and potential end-users in accordance with the broader
6 requirements in OP 6(a) and OP 6(c).

7 Following development of the initial scope of work, SoCalGas initiated a competitive bid
8 process involving third-party contractors with existing MSAs. Through a request for proposal
9 (RFP) process, SoCalGas received bids from several third-party contractors and ultimately
10 selected Accenture International Limited (Accenture) and Electrical Power Research Institute
11 (EPRI) based on their expertise, experience, and cost-effectiveness. Both contractors were able
12 to begin work promptly, supporting timely delivery of demand forecasts to inform other Phase 1
13 Studies.

14 To align the contractors' efforts with Phase 1 objectives, SoCalGas initiated an
15 onboarding process. This included developing a study plan with defined milestones and task
16 assignments, recurring coordination meetings, and confirmation of data needs, key assumptions,
17 and interdependencies with other Phase 1 Studies.

18 In accordance with OP 3(e) and OP 5(d), the draft scope of work was shared with
19 stakeholders in July 2023. Stakeholders provided feedback on the criteria used to determine
20 demand, demand locations or regions, and expected hydrogen demand over time. SoCalGas
21 considered the largest potential users of hydrogen across three main sectors—mobility, power
22 generation, and industrial—and various subsectors within each. The Demand Study used four
23 main factors—technology feasibility, commercial feasibility, business readiness, and policy &
24 legislation—to determine expected demand. The output of the study also included locational and
25 timing aspects. Responses to stakeholder comments were provided in the quarterly report(s),
26 consistent with OP 3(h) and OP 5(d).²⁴

27 **2. Planning – Technical Approach**

28 The technical approach—jointly developed by SoCalGas, Accenture, and EPRI—
29 established the analytical framework and methodologies for assessing hydrogen demand across

²⁴ See Q3 2023 Angeles Link Phase 1 Quarterly Report Appendices at 3-68.

1 sectors and scenarios. This included identifying relevant demand sub-sectors, defining adoption
2 rate assumptions, and outlining the range of demand scenarios to be analyzed.

3 In alignment with OP 3(e) and OP 5(d), the draft technical approach was shared with
4 stakeholders in August 2023. Because the Demand Study served as a foundational input to many
5 Phase 1 Studies, SoCalGas prioritized its timing early in the process. This sequencing allowed
6 for alignment with the overall Phase 1 schedule while still allowing for stakeholder input on
7 scope, technical approach, and findings. Stakeholders provided feedback on the technical
8 approach, which was incorporated where appropriate—for example, by including a non-
9 exhaustive list of interviewees and developing a Technical Appendix that detailed key
10 assumptions, data sources, methodologies, and calculations. Responses to stakeholder feedback
11 were provided in the quarterly report in accordance with OP 3(h) and OP 5(d).²⁵

12 **3. Execution**

13 **a. Preliminary Findings**

14 The preliminary findings reflected the initial outputs of the Demand Study, including
15 preliminary demand estimates across multiple sectors and scenarios. These findings were
16 developed through an iterative process involving demand modeling, alignment with the study’s
17 scope and technical approach, and incorporation of stakeholder feedback. Ongoing coordination
18 with Accenture and EPRI included regular working sessions to analyze the mobility, power
19 generation and industrial sectors. These meetings helped refine modeling assumptions, test
20 scenarios, and integrate available market data. In addition, interviews and peer reviews with
21 subject matter experts from industry, academia, and government agencies provided valuable
22 insights to inform preliminary findings.

23 Consistent with OP 3(e) and OP 5(d), SoCalGas shared the preliminary findings,
24 including scenario-based demand projections and sector adoption trends, with the PAG and
25 CBOG in August 2023. Stakeholders provided feedback, which was incorporated into the
26 study where appropriate—for example, in response to comments on demand study estimates,
27 SoCalGas compiled and presented third-party demand projections from various agencies to
28 demonstrate that the Demand Study’s forecasts were within the range of hydrogen demand

²⁵ See Q3 2023 Angeles Link Phase 1 Quarterly Report Appendices at 3-68; *see also* Q4 2023 Angeles Link Phase 1 Quarterly Report Appendices at 167-211.

1 projections for California. Responses to stakeholder feedback were provided in the quarterly
2 report in alignment with OP 3(h) and OP 5(d).²⁶

3 **b. Draft and Final Study**

4 The draft study compiled analyses and research, expanded on the preliminary findings,
5 and incorporated stakeholder feedback where appropriate. To support stakeholder
6 understanding, SoCalGas presented key findings from the draft study to the PAG and CBOSG in
7 December 2023. In accordance with OP 3(e) and OP 5(d), the draft study was shared with
8 stakeholders in January 2024. The Demand Study was the first of the draft studies to be
9 published for stakeholder input considering the foundational elements to the other studies.
10 Stakeholders provided feedback, which was incorporated into the study where appropriate—for
11 example, in response to comments, the draft added a comparative analysis of SoCalGas’s
12 demand forecasts with projections from agencies including the California Resources Board
13 (CARB), the California Energy Commission (CEC), Alliance for Renewable Clean Hydrogen
14 Energy Systems (ARCHES), and the National Petroleum Council (NPC)). Responses to
15 stakeholder comments were provided in the quarterly report in alignment with OP 3(h) and OP
16 5(d).²⁷ The final study was published in December 2024 in accordance with the Phase 1
17 Decision.

18 **B. Production Planning and Assessment**

19 As described in Section III.B, in accordance with the Phase 1 Decision, SoCalGas
20 developed the Production Study to evaluate potential primary sources of clean renewable
21 hydrogen production within SoCalGas’s service territory. The Production Study received
22 information from the Demand Study (e.g., volumetric requirements for production), the Water
23 Resource Evaluation (Water Evaluation) (e.g., expectations of water availability), and the
24 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Evaluation (GHG Study) (e.g., carbon intensity information on
25 different production pathways). The Production Study provided information to the Pipeline
26 Sizing & Design Criteria (Design Study) (e.g., potential locations and volumes of hydrogen),
27 Preliminary Routing/Configuration Analysis (Routing Analysis) (e.g., preliminary routing and

²⁶ See Q3 2023 Angeles Link Phase 1 Quarterly Report Appendices at 3-68; *see also* Q4 2023 Angeles Link Phase 1 Quarterly Report Appendices at 167-211.

²⁷ See Q1 2024 Angeles Link Phase 1 Quarterly Report Appendices at 327-418.

1 configuration across potential directional routes), GHG Study (e.g., potential production
2 pathways), and the Cost Effectiveness Study (e.g., production cost inputs to calculate the
3 levelized cost of hydrogen). The scope and activities of the Production Study evolved over time,
4 informed by stakeholder feedback and in alignment with the Phase 1 Decision. The O&M costs
5 incurred to prepare the Production Study totaled \$2.1 million and include labor and non-labor
6 costs.²⁸

7 The following sections describe the activities undertaken throughout the development of
8 the Production Study—from the initial contracting stage to integration of stakeholder input at
9 four key milestones (scope, technical approach, preliminary findings, and draft study), to
10 completion of the final study.

11 **1. Initiation – Scope of Work**

12 In accordance with OP 3(a), the Production Study evaluated potential primary sources of
13 clean renewable hydrogen production. The Production Study scope of work was developed to
14 guide the structure, content, and execution of the Production Study, confirming alignment with
15 the Phase 1 Decision, incorporating other Phase 1 Studies, and considering stakeholder feedback
16 pursuant to OP 5(d). The scope of work was developed by SoCalGas personnel with technical
17 and project management expertise, in collaboration with internal SMEs. The Production Study
18 was scoped in compliance with the Phase 1 Decision including identification of potential sources
19 of clean renewable hydrogen production in accordance with the broader requirements in OP 6(b)
20 and OP 6(j).

21 Following the development of the initial scope of work, SoCalGas initiated a competitive
22 bid process involving third-party contractors with existing MSAs. Through a request for
23 proposal process (RFP), SoCalGas received bids from several third-party contractors and
24 ultimately selected Burns and McDonnell (BMcD) based on their expertise and experience.
25 Given the interdependencies between the Production Study and certain other Phase 1 Studies
26 (e.g., the Design Study and Routing Analysis were informed by potential production locations

²⁸ Refer to my accompanying Chapter 3 Workpapers for additional cost information.

1 and volumes in the Production Study), SoCalGas consolidated certain Phase 1 Studies under a
2 single contract to support coordination, data sharing, and efficiency.²⁹

3 Following contractor selection, SoCalGas initiated the feasibility work in alignment with
4 the Phase 1 Decision, study deliverables, and timelines. Key activities included establishing a
5 study plan with defined milestones and task assignments, recurring coordination meetings,
6 confirmation of data needs, key assumptions, and interdependencies with other Phase 1 Studies.
7 In accordance with OP 3(e) and OP 5(d), the draft scope of work was shared with stakeholders in
8 July 2023. In accordance with OP 3(h) and OP 5(d), responses to stakeholder feedback were
9 documented in the quarterly report.³⁰

10 **2. Planning – Technical Approach**

11 The technical approach established the analytical framework and methodology for
12 evaluating potential sources of clean renewable hydrogen that could be transported via Angeles
13 Link. Developed jointly with BMcD, the technical approach integrated literature reviews,
14 internal data, and market assessments to build a data-driven foundation for evaluating production
15 feasibility, volumes, locations, costs, and interdependencies with other Phase 1 Studies.

16 In accordance with OP 3(e) and OP 5(d), the draft Technical Approach was presented to
17 stakeholders in October 2023. Stakeholders provided feedback, which was incorporated where
18 appropriate—for example, in response to stakeholder feedback, SoCalGas assumed that
19 renewable power requirements would be met with incremental power generation that is not
20 connected to the grid (i.e., not tied into high-voltage transmission lines). Responses to
21 stakeholder input were provided in quarterly reports in alignment with OP 3(h) and OP 5(d).³¹

22 **3. Execution**

23 **a. Preliminary Findings**

24 The preliminary findings reflected the initial outputs of the Production Study, providing
25 insight into the technologies, scale, and siting of clean renewable hydrogen production. These
26 findings identified primary production areas within SoCalGas’s service territory that could

²⁹ The BMcD agreement also included the Engineering & Design Studies. *See* Chapter 5 (Direct Testimony of Katrina Reagan) for further details.

³⁰ *See* Q3 2023 Angeles Link Phase 1 Quarterly Report Appendices at 3-68.

³¹ *See* Q3 2023 Angeles Link Phase 1 Quarterly Report Appendices at 3-68; *see also* Q4 2023 Angeles Link Phase 1 Quarterly Report Appendices at 167-211.

1 potentially produce clean renewable hydrogen at scale by 2045. The analysis incorporated
2 assessments of various renewable power sources, hydrogen production technologies, land
3 availability, and the role of storage in balancing supply and demand. To validate feasibility
4 assumptions, such as costs and economics of pairing electrolyzers with behind-the-meter solar,
5 SoCalGas also conducted interviews with third-party market participants.

6 Consistent with OP 3(e) and OP 5(d), the preliminary findings were shared with
7 stakeholders in April 2024. Stakeholders provided feedback, which was incorporated into the
8 study where appropriate—for example, in response to stakeholder feedback to clearly describe
9 and analyze the role of curtailed grid generation that could support hydrogen production, the
10 study was updated to expand on potential curtailments. Responses to stakeholder feedback were
11 provided in the quarterly report in accordance with OP 3(h) and OP 5(d).³²

12 **b. Draft and Final Study**

13 The draft study compiled analyses and research, expanded on preliminary findings, and
14 incorporated stakeholder feedback where appropriate—for example, by refining cost
15 assumptions, land availability analysis, and technology comparisons. SoCalGas collaborated
16 with BMcD and internal SMEs involved in interdependent studies to confirm consistency and
17 integration across studies. The draft study was structured to clearly present the purpose,
18 objectives, assumptions, and results. Supporting appendices included detail of renewable energy
19 feedstock assessments, the role and types of hydrogen storage, and various technical maps and
20 data tables.

21 In accordance with OP 3(e) and OP 5(d), the draft study was shared with stakeholders in
22 July 2024, followed by a presentation to the PAG and CBOSG. Stakeholders provided feedback
23 regarding design assumptions and land availability, which was incorporated into the final study
24 as appropriate—for example, in response to comments, SoCalGas expanded the discussion of
25 land use constraints using data from the CEC. Responses to stakeholder feedback were provided
26 in the quarterly report in alignment with OP 3(h) and OP 5(d).³³ The final study was published in
27 December 2024 in accordance with the Phase 1 Decision.

³² See Q2 2024 Angeles Link Phase 1 Quarterly Report Appendices at 396-556.

³³ See Q3 2024 Angeles Link Phase 1 Quarterly Report Appendix 3: SoCalGas Response to Comments.

1 **C. Project Options and Alternatives**

2 As described in Section III.C, in accordance with the Phase 1 Decision, SoCalGas
3 prepared the Alternatives Study to evaluate project alternatives to Angeles Link, including
4 hydrogen delivery and non-hydrogen alternatives such as localized hydrogen hub and
5 electrification.. The scope and activities of the Alternatives Study evolved over time, informed
6 by stakeholder feedback and in alignment with the Phase 1 Decision. The O&M costs incurred
7 to prepare the Alternatives Study total \$1.6 million and include labor and non-labor costs.³⁴
8 SoCalGas implemented financial oversight during the study development aligning payments with
9 the work performed.

10 The following sections describe the activities undertaken throughout the development of
11 the Alternatives Study—from the initial contracting stage to integration of stakeholder input at
12 four key milestones (scope, technical approach, preliminary findings, and draft study), to
13 completion of the final study.

14 **1. Initiation – Scope of Work**

15 The Alternatives Study scope of work was developed to guide the structure, content, and
16 execution of the Alternatives Study, confirming alignment with the Phase 1 Decision,
17 incorporating other Phase 1 Studies, and considering stakeholder feedback pursuant to OP 5(d).
18 The scope of work was developed by SoCalGas personnel with technical and project
19 management expertise, in collaboration with internal SMEs.

20 In accordance with stakeholder feedback and OP 3(c), OP 5(c), and OP 5(e), and the
21 broader requirements in OP 6(d), the scope of work defined and included a localized hub and
22 other decarbonization alternatives (e.g., in-basin production with power transmission and
23 distribution and electrification alternatives). The Alternatives and Cost Effectiveness Studies
24 were closely coordinated to confirm alignment on key assumptions and alternatives evaluated in
25 Phase 1.

26 Following development of the initial scope of work, to support both the Alternatives
27 Study and Cost Effectiveness Study, SoCalGas solicited bids from third-party contractors based
28 on the scope of work and expertise needed. SoCalGas selected Wood Mackenzie through a
29 stand-alone agreement based on its qualifications, experience, and cost effectiveness.

³⁴ Refer to my accompanying Chapter 3 Workpapers for additional cost information.

1 To align the contractor’s efforts with Phase 1 objectives, SoCalGas initiated an
2 onboarding process which included developing a study plan with defined milestones and task
3 assignments, recurring coordination meetings, and confirmation of data needs, key assumptions,
4 and interdependencies with other Phase 1 studies. In accordance with OP 3(e) and OP 5(d), the
5 draft scope of work was shared with stakeholders in July 2023. Responses to stakeholder
6 comments were provided in the quarterly report in alignment with OP 3(h) and OP 5(d).³⁵

7 **2. Planning – Technical Approach**

8 In accordance with OP 3(c), OP 5(c), and OP 5(e), the technical approach established a
9 consistent and transparent framework for identifying, screening, and evaluating alternatives to
10 Angeles Link. The technical approach included the following assessment criteria for comparing
11 alternatives: state policy, technological maturity, range of deliverability (distance), reliability and
12 resiliency, ease of implementation, end-user requirements, and scalability.

13 The technical approach was developed collaboratively by SoCalGas and Wood
14 Mackenzie, using a structured six-step evaluation process supported by a rubric-based scoring
15 framework to assess alternatives in a systematic and transparent manner. To confirm consistency
16 across the Phase 1 Studies, data inputs from the Demand Study, Production Study, Design Study,
17 and the Environmental Analysis were reviewed to align assumptions where applicable. For
18 example, the Alternatives Study and Environmental Analysis aligned on air quality and
19 biological resource assessment criteria.

20 In accordance with OP 3(e) and OP 5(d), the draft technical approach was presented to
21 stakeholders in September 2023. Stakeholder feedback was incorporated into the study where
22 appropriate—for example, the study expanded its discussion around the selection and assessment
23 criteria. Responses to stakeholder comments were provided in the quarterly report, consistent
24 with OP 3(h) and OP 5(d).³⁶

³⁵ See Q3 2023 Angeles Link Phase 1 Quarterly Report Appendices at 3-68.

³⁶ See Q3 2023 Angeles Link Phase 1 Quarterly Report Appendices at 3-68; *see also* Q4 2023 Angeles Link Phase 1 Quarterly Report Appendices at 167-211.

1 **3. Execution**

2 **a. Preliminary Findings**

3 The preliminary findings presented the initial results of the Alternatives Study, providing
4 insights into the hydrogen and non-hydrogen delivery alternatives. In accordance with OP 3(e)
5 and OP 5(d), the preliminary findings were shared with stakeholders in May 2024. Stakeholders
6 requested additional detail on alternatives that were screened out and not carried forward for
7 further analysis. For example, nuclear power generation was not carried forward based on
8 evaluation criteria such as state policy. Accordingly, SoCalGas included further clarification of
9 the potential alternatives that were initially identified but not carried forward for further analysis.
10 Responses to stakeholder feedback were provided in the quarterly report pursuant to OP 3(h) and
11 OP 5(d).³⁷

12 **b. Draft and Final Study**

13 The draft study compiled analyses and research, validated preliminary findings, and
14 incorporated stakeholder feedback where appropriate. SoCalGas worked closely with Wood
15 Mackenzie to organize the study in a way that clearly presented the purpose, objectives,
16 assumptions, and results. In accordance with OP 3(e) and OP 5(d), the draft study was presented
17 to the PAG and CBOSG stakeholders in June 2024 and released in July 2024. The final Study
18 was published in December 2024, consistent with the Phase 1 Decision.

19 **D. High Level Economic Analysis and Cost Effectiveness**

20 As described in Section III.D., in accordance with the Phase 1 Decision, SoCalGas
21 developed the Cost Effectiveness Study to evaluate the cost effectiveness of Angeles Link
22 against alternatives, including a localized hydrogen hub or electrification option. The Cost
23 Effectiveness Study was interdependent with other Phase 1 studies, drawing on Demand Study
24 (e.g., volumetric demand requirements), Production Study (e.g., production and storage costs),
25 the Design Study (e.g., routing, sizing and design assumptions), Water Evaluation (e.g., costs
26 related to water supplies), and Alternatives Study (e.g., selected alternatives carried forward for
27 further analysis). The scope and activities of the Cost Effectiveness Study evolved over time,
28 informed by stakeholder feedback and in alignment with the Phase 1 Decision. The O&M costs
29 incurred to prepare the Cost Effectiveness Study totaled \$2.1 million and include labor and non-

³⁷ See Q2 2024 Angeles Link Phase 1 Quarterly Report Appendices at 396-556.

1 labor costs.³⁸ The following sections describe the activities undertaken throughout the
2 development of the Cost Effectiveness Study—from the initial contracting stage, to integration
3 of stakeholder input at four key milestones (i.e., scope, technical approach, preliminary findings
4 and draft study), to completion of the final study.

5 **1. Initiation – Scope of Work**

6 The Cost Effectiveness Study scope of work was developed to guide the structure,
7 content, and execution of the Cost Effectiveness Study, confirming alignment with the Phase 1
8 Decision, incorporating other Phase 1 Studies, and considering stakeholder feedback pursuant to
9 OP 5(d). The scope of work was developed by SoCalGas personnel with technical and project
10 management expertise, in collaboration with internal SMEs.

11 In accordance with OP 3(c), OP 5(c), and OP 5(e), and the broader requirements in OP
12 6(d), the scope of work was designed to provide a consistent framework for evaluating cost
13 effectiveness of Angeles Link and alternatives using standardized cost metrics, uniform
14 assumptions, defined study objectives, evaluation metrics, and the levelized cost assessment
15 methodology. The Cost Effectiveness Study and Alternatives Study were closely coordinated to
16 confirm alignment on key assumptions and shared inputs, such as which alternatives would be
17 carried forward for further analysis. As previously noted, Wood Mackenzie was selected to
18 support both the Cost Effectiveness Study and Alternatives Study.

19 Following contractor selection, SoCalGas initiated the feasibility work by aligning with
20 Wood Mackenzie on objectives, deliverables, and timelines. Key activities included developing
21 a study plan with defined milestones and task assignments, recurring coordination meetings, and
22 confirmation of data needs, key assumptions, interdependencies with other Phase 1 Studies. In
23 accordance with OP 3(e) and OP 5(d), the draft scope of work was shared with stakeholders in
24 July 2023. Responses to stakeholder feedback were provided in the quarterly report in alignment
25 with OP 3(h) and OP 5(d).³⁹

26 **2. Planning – Technical Approach**

27 The technical approach was designed to enable transparent, like-for-like comparison of
28 hydrogen and non-hydrogen alternatives using industry standard cost metrics. Developed in

³⁸ Refer to my accompanying Chapter 3 Workpapers for additional information.

³⁹ See Q3 2023 Angeles Link Phase 1 Quarterly Report Appendices at 3-68.

1 collaboration between SoCalGas and Wood Mackenzie, the approach provided a consistent
2 structure for assessing levelized costs, applying common inputs across technologies, and
3 tailoring the analysis to key end-use sectors. The Cost Effectiveness Study also integrated inputs
4 from other Phase 1 Studies including the Water Evaluation, Project Options & Alternatives,
5 Production Study, Demand Study, and Pipeline Sizing & Design Criteria. For example,
6 throughput volumes from the Demand Study and production costs from the Production Study
7 were inputs to the Cost-Effectiveness Study.

8 The study adopted a cost evaluation process to systematically assess the cost
9 effectiveness of Angeles Link vis-a-vis the selected alternatives. In accordance with OP 3(e) and
10 OP 5(d), the draft technical approach was presented to stakeholders in September 2023.
11 Responses to stakeholder feedback was provided in the quarterly report in alignment with OP
12 3(h) and OP 5(d).⁴⁰

13 **3. Execution**

14 **a. Preliminary Findings**

15 The preliminary findings presented initial cost effectiveness results across the alternatives
16 and provided an early opportunity to assess key assumptions, incorporate stakeholder feedback,
17 and refine the analysis. These findings were developed through an iterative, evaluation process
18 and regular coordination meetings between SoCalGas and Wood Mackenzie. In accordance with
19 OP 3(e) and OP 5(d), the preliminary findings were shared with PAG and CBOSG in May 2024.
20 Stakeholders provided feedback, which was incorporated into the study where appropriate—for
21 example, in response to stakeholder feedback, the study expanded on the levelized cost of
22 hydrogen and levelized cost of electricity comparison metrics. Responses to stakeholder
23 feedback was provided in the quarterly report pursuant to OP 3(h) and OP 5(d).⁴¹

24 **b. Draft and Final Study**

25 The draft study compiled analyses and research, validated the preliminary findings, and
26 incorporated stakeholder feedback where appropriate. SoCalGas and Wood Mackenzie worked
27 collaboratively to organize the study in a manner that clearly presented the purpose, objectives,
28 assumptions, and results. In accordance with OP 3(e) and 5(d), the draft study was presented to

⁴⁰ *Id.*; see also Q4 2023 Angeles Link Phase 1 Quarterly Report Appendices at 167-206.

⁴¹ See Q2 2024 Angeles Link Phase 1 Quarterly Report Appendices at 396-556.

1 the PAG and CBOSG stakeholders in June 2024 and was released in July 2024. Stakeholders
2 provided feedback, which was incorporated into the study where appropriate. For example,
3 stakeholders commented on assessing alternative modes of power transmission systems such as
4 High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) transmission systems. In response to stakeholder
5 feedback, an Appendix was added to the study discussing the HVDC electric transmission
6 systems. Responses were provided in the quarterly report in accordance with OP 3(h) and OP
7 5(d).⁴² The final study was published in December 2024 in accordance with the Phase 1
8 Decision.

9 **V. CONCLUSION**

10 SoCalGas prudently executed the Market Assessment Studies in compliance with the
11 Phase 1 Decision. The costs presented in my testimony were reasonably incurred to complete
12 these Studies, reflect the incorporation of stakeholder feedback, and are supported by the
13 accompanying workpapers. Accordingly, based on my testimony and workpapers, the
14 Commission should find the Phase 1 Market Assessment Studies costs to be reasonable.

15 This concludes my prepared direct testimony.

⁴² See Q3 2024 Angeles Link Phase 1 Quarterly Report Appendix 3: SoCalGas Response to Comments.

1 **VI. WITNESS QUALIFICATIONS**

2 My name is Vijai Atavane. My business address is 555 West 5th Street, Los Angeles,
3 CA 90013. My title is Clean Energy and Strategic Partnerships Manager for SoCalGas. My role
4 at SoCalGas involves leading initiatives in market assessments such as hydrogen technologies
5 and infrastructure solutions. With more than twenty-four years of experience in the energy,
6 business consulting, and utility sectors, I am responsible for developing strategies to promote
7 innovations in clean energy and fostering collaborative partnerships for SoCalGas.

8 I have been employed by SoCalGas since 2016. I hold an MBA and an MS in Industrial
9 Engineering from Arizona State University (Tempe, AZ), as well as a BS in Mechanical
10 Engineering from Bangalore Institute of Technology (Bangalore, India).

11 I have not previously testified before the Commission.