

Webinar #8: Natural Gas IRP

10/15/2020

Overview

On October 14, 2020 Puget Sound Energy hosted an online meeting with stakeholders to discuss the Natural Gas IRP. Additionally, participants were able to ask questions and make comments using a chat box provided by the Go2Meeting platform.

Below is a report of the questions submitted to the chat box. Answers to the questions were provided verbally by IRP staff during the webinar. Please note that questions were answered in order of relevance to the topic currently being discussed. Questions regarding other topics were answered at the end of the webinar session.

To view a recording of the webinar and to hear responses from staff, please visit the project website at pse-irp.participate.online. The recording for this webinar has been uploaded as two separate files. On the day of the webinar, the start of the meeting through Slide 20 was not initially recorded. To correct this error, PSE and EnviroIssues re-recorded this section on October 15, asked and answered all the questions asked from stakeholders the day before.

Attendees

A total of 48 stakeholders and PSE staff attended the webinar, plus another 3 attendees who called into the meeting and did not identify themselves (51 people total).

Attendees included: Allison Jacobs, Anne Newcomb, Ben Farrow, Bob Stolaski, Brian Grunkemeyer, Charlie Inman, Christine Bunch, Cody Duncan, Court Olson, Dan Kirschner, David Perk, David Tomlinson, Deborah Reynolds, Don Marsh, Elyette Weinstein, Fred Heutte, James Adcock, Josh Rubenstein, Kara Durbin, Kassie Markos, Kathi Scanlan, Larry Becker, Leanne Guier, Marty Saldivar, Matthew Doyle, Peter Moulton, Rachel Brombaugh, Robert Briggs, Shay Bauman, Srirup Kumar, Stephanie Chase, Ted Drennan, Virginia Lohr, and Willard Westre.

Questions Received

Questions from attendees are posted in the order in which they were received. The webinar began at 1:00 PM PDT and ended at 4:35 PM PDT.

Name	Time Sent	Comment
James Adcock	1:05 PM	Here we go again.
James Adcock	1:09 PM	That's fine -- let's get on with it.
Don Marsh	1:21 PM	I forgot... did customers lose gas service after the Enbridge incident? Or was PSE able to maintain service?
Bill Donahue	1:22 PM	PSE customers did not lose service
Don Marsh	1:22 PM	Thanks for the answer, Bill.
Court Olson	1:39 PM	Does Scenario #5 assume short term or long term gas shut down?
James Adcock	1:39 PM	On a "peak coldest winter day" what percent of Puget's supplied natural gas is going to Puget's NG electric generators?
Don Marsh	1:40 PM	Slide 16: was this forecast updated for the economic impacts of COVID?
Court Olson	1:40 PM	When is PSE going to realize that Gas demand will soon be declining as customers switch to clean electricity for heating space and water?
James Adcock	1:42 PM	What has been your Peak Day condition in terms of actual MDth/day, in the last 10 years?
Fred Huetten	1:44 PM	also have a question Slide 16
Stephanie Chase	1:46 PM	Could you discuss the status of the Tacoma LNG project and when it is anticipated to be online?
Josh Rubenstein	1:48 PM	What carbon emissions reductions efforts are calculated into the resource forecast in slide 16?
Don Marsh	1:52 PM	Is the Tacoma LNG facility used for electric generation as well, or does it only supply PSE's gas customers?
Don Marsh	2:01 PM	Slide 17: question
Court Olson	2:08 PM	Your statement on the McKinsie analysis predicting a fall of gas demand after 2030 seems to be in conflict with PSE's gas demand forecast curve. How do you resolve that conflict?
Fred Huetten	2:09 PM	Is PSE considering the updated peer-reviewed study results concerning upstream emissions from BC and Alberta gas production and transportation? We submitted extensive detail in the electric IRP process.
Fred Huetten	2:11 PM	slide 19: what is involved in upgrading from 50% to 100% firm for Station 2->Sumas? To your knowledge is Enbridge willing to offer that service?
Fred Huetten	2:12 PM	slide 19: the cross-BC upgrades (it's Fortis most of the way as I recall, with about 250 mmcf/d of current capacity) has been in discussion for many years. What is the current status?
Fred Huetten	2:17 PM	slide 19: Williams/NW Pipeline declared a Deficiency Period starting Sep. 25 which is continuing and will result in "anomaly repairs" next week resulting in zero flow for several days. While this is a short term issue, to what degree is PSE including this kind of reliability risk in long term planning? http://northwest.williams.com/NWP_Portal/operations.action
Court Olson	2:18 PM	How does PSE intend to promote and implement gas conservation?
Anne Newcomb	2:18 PM	This looks like a lot of new NG capacity coming online. Are you expecting a spike in demand for existing customers and or new customers?
Court Olson	2:21 PM	Your slide 21 shows DSR impacts from mandated energy code standards. How do you reconcile this with the steadily increasing demand projection by PSE well into the future?

David Perk	2:22 PM	Thank you Don for raising this essential point.
James Adcock	2:22 PM	Comment: Puget by itself consumed the sustainable carbon footprint of one million human beings.
Josh Rubenstein	2:22 PM	Slide 20: How does the conservation cost bundling data incorporate the social cost of greenhouse gas emissions referenced in an earlier slide?
Virginia Lohr	2:24 PM	Slide 21: Are you assuming there will be no new codes or standards, such as those in Seattle, developed in future years?
Fred Huette	2:29 PM	In response to the facilitator: I'm happy to wait until after others who haven't asked questions, but we are asked to provide questions in this format and having done so, would like to hear at least initial responses.
James Adcock	2:31 PM	I think the "live" conversations are good, and again I would encourage PSE to start planning appropriate amounts of time in their IRP meetings, including time for more technical questions like Fred wants to ask. IRPs are supposed to be -- according to law -- about "Public Participation" NOT JUST PSE "Presentations" !
Fred Huette	2:34 PM	Also to note that I have to leave at 3 for an Oregon Department of Energy workshop. I will submit any questions not resolved in writing, but encourage PSE and the facilitation team to determine if this process is as efficient as it could be.
Court Olson	2:36 PM	You have collectively just admitted that gas demand will be falling off after 2030 due to utilities usage impacted by CETA rules. Surely the utilities get their gas from the same pipelines that you have shown us. So why is it that PSE is promoting increasing gas pipelines and gas storage facilities in Washington, when total gas demand (including from utilities) will surely be dropping after 2030?
Don Marsh	2:38 PM	PSE is not projecting increasing demand after DSR, so the "Resource Alternatives" will probably not be needed on slide 19.
Court Olson	2:44 PM	Energy code tightening every 3 years is required by existing Washington law. Every three years to 2031, the new building energy efficiency must tighten by about 9% on the afterage. Is this being included in your modeling?
Anne Newcomb	2:55 PM	Great question Court!
Srirup Kumar	2:56 PM	Would modular anaerobic digesters be eligible for conservation incentives offered to industrial, institutional and commercial clients?
Court Olson	3:02 PM	So glad to hear that there is no new gas resource need on the horizon!
Don Marsh	3:02 PM	25-26: question
Court Olson	3:04 PM	Whoops. Slide 26 still projects a net demand increase if I read it right. How do you reconcile the chart with what you just said that there is no demand increase seen on the horizon?

Virginia Lohr	3:09 PM	Slide 26. On March 19, 2020, the Governor signed HB 2311 - 2019-20, Amending state greenhouse gas emission limits for consistency with the most recent assessment of climate change science. It became effective on June 11, 2020. It states: "Based on the current science and emissions trends, as reported by the department of ecology and the climate impacts group at the University of Washington, the legislature finds that avoiding global warming of at least one and one-half degrees Celsius is possible only if global greenhouse gas emissions start to decline precipitously, and as soon as possible." Many of your responses to questions seem to assume we are in the same position climatically that we have been in for the past 50years, but we are not. Is PSE aware of this recent legislation and what are you doing to look not just at meeting your optimistic gas growth projection, but to reduce it?
James Adcock	3:16 PM	Comment: NG companies can and do make huge mistakes -- huge failures -- such as the California Aliso Canyon gas leak. I would hate to have a similar, or larger, failure at Tacoma LNG, which among other things would "take out" 30-40 schools.
Virginia Lohr	3:23 PM	Slide 30. You selected the IAP2 level of "Inform," the lowest level of public input, for the portion of this webinar on draft natural gas portfolio results. This level seems appropriate to me for simply presenting or informing us of the results of work you have done. You have also selected to use the IAP2 level of "inform" for a large portion of this webinar for: gas portfolio model, resource need, levelized gas prices, resource alternatives, and natural gas peak day planning standard. None of these topics involve just telling us results, but telling us how you plan to proceed. Why is this an appropriate level for an IRP meeting with many highly educated people volunteering their time to give useful and meaningful input for PSE to consider incorporating in your 20-year planning?
Don Marsh	3:24 PM	The Tacoma LNG facility is a big safety concern. If it is not absolutely essential (see slide 26), it is unethical to ask nearby residents to live with a potentially fatal risk of accident. PSE's website says "Our ethics: Doing the right thing." We expect PSE to follow its own ethics or take the words off its website.
James Adcock	3:26 PM	Slide 32 -- what additional "planning margin" in percentage -- if any -- does PSE build into their NG systems in addition to this 52 HDD planning standard?
Alison Peters	3:28 PM	Virginia, to your question about the inform level. This is the level where a sponsor such as PSE provides the public with the information needed to understand PSE's decision making process, including their forecasts. PSE welcomes questions about these topics before the webinar (in a Feedback Form) and we stop for clarifying questions frequently during this section. The Involve level for today will begin in just a minute - the next section.
James Adcock	3:29 PM	Slide 33 -- what additional planning margin, in percentage, is PSE building into their Natural Gas systems in response to PSE customer surveys that show that those customers put high value in keeping their gas on?
James Adcock	3:32 PM	Slide 35 Raise Hand.
Don Marsh	3:33 PM	Is slide 35 showing us 2005 data? Is it possible that things might have changed in the last 15 years?

Court Olson	3:34 PM	Slide 35 benefits do not apparently include the benefit of reduced GHG emissions, so this study needs to be replaced with a modern one that includes the social cost of carbon benefit.
Don Marsh	3:34 PM	Slide 36: question
Court Olson	3:37 PM	On Slide 37, has PSE studied the trend in changing cold peaks due to climate change in recent years? Doesn't that affect consumption and demand
James Adcock	3:53 PM	Puget is freezing me out because they know that 1950s weather data is no longer relevant re natural gas planning, as coldest winter days back then were 18 or more degrees colder than they are nowadays, due to large change in climate in PNW coastal weather -- PSE's region. As such, PSE's slide presented today -- which are based on 1950's weather data, are complete nonsense.
David Perk	3:53 PM	https://oohpseirp.blob.core.windows.net/media/Default/2021/meetings/Oct_20_webinar/Webinar%209:%20Updated%20sensitivities%20list .
Deborah Reynolds	3:54 PM	I agree that the peak day planning standards study should be fully described - what was provided in the slides today was a solid overview but not very detailed. The study should either be updated for 2020's customers and statutes, or supported as still accurate and useful.
Don Marsh	3:56 PM	How many portfolios can you study?
Court Olson	3:56 PM	I wonder how we can prioritize portfolio sensitivities? If we had to rank them, it might suggest that lower ranking sensitivities can be discarded, when that may not be the intent. Please give us guidance and the link to the place where we offer comments.
Virginia Lohr	3:56 PM	Please read my question I posted at 3:09. It addresses Elizabeth's question.
Don Marsh	3:57 PM	Raise hand
Don Marsh	3:59 PM	When I try to open the spreadsheet, it says "Can't open in protected view." I can't see it.
Brian Grunkemeyer	4:00 PM	I have the same spreadsheet problem as Don.
Deborah Reynolds	4:01 PM	I'm able to open the file in my native Excel desktop program. We've had some problems with this file when using it in Office 365 and Sharepoint Online.
Don Marsh	4:01 PM	I have Office 365. Hmm.
Alison Peters	4:02 PM	Don, I'm able to open it as well. For everyone else, it is linked to the meeting materials for 10/20.
Brian Grunkemeyer	4:03 PM	Got it. As Deborah hinted.. Run Excel. File -> Open -> Browse, then paste in the URL
Don Marsh	4:04 PM	Got it off the IRP website. Thanks.
Brian Grunkemeyer	4:06 PM	There is a colon ':' in the file name. That doesn't work well on Windows for reasons (NTFS streams). PSE, please consider not using ':'s in file names in the future.
Don Marsh	4:08 PM	Good debugging, Brian! You must have worked at Microsoft once upon a time! :)
Brian Grunkemeyer	4:09 PM	I wrote .NET's FileStream class. You learn some things.
Court Olson	4:09 PM	Slide 46 & 47. How does PSE plan to produce Hydrogen? From methane or by electrolysis?
Alison Peters	4:09 PM	Thank you, Brian. We can upload it again without the :

Srirup Kumar	4:12 PM	Slide 47: Does the 3-5% RNG estimate include the distributed RNG resources embedded in food, bev & ag waste?
Don Marsh	4:19 PM	Slide 52: question
Brian Grunkemeyer	4:22 PM	Bill, I'd like your gut feeling on this. What if you are only allowed to put carbon-neutral gas in the pipeline? Can your customers cover the fixed costs for the pipeline system at an acceptable cost?
Srirup Kumar	4:22 PM	Thank you. Following-on, would modular anaerobic digesters be eligible for conservation incentives offered to industrial, institutional and commercial clients?
James Adcock	4:24 PM	Why would you turn "Excess Electricity" into Hydrogen as opposed to Battery Storage or Pumped Hydro, or sell it to BPA for long term storage behind their dams as stored potential energy?
Peter Moulton	4:24 PM	WSU/Commerce assessment of RNG potential did take food/ag wastes into consideration, along with biomass gasification pathways. Conclusion was closer to 10% displacement potential if all pathways are taken into consideration...
Srirup Kumar	4:22 PM	Thank you.
Brian Grunkemeyer	4:24 PM	Thanks Bill. Just food for thought - please consider some policy goal like RNG-only by 2035. IE, say the Legislature incentivizes fuel switching, etc. It would be useful for PSE to have an answer to whether this might be an obtainable policy goal to set.
Peter Moulton	4:28 PM	I wouldn't characterize the ~10% estimate as "very optimistic," it's a realistic assessment of potential. Cost is different question...
Alexandra Streamer	4:32 PM	Link to Feedback Forms: https://pse-irp.participate.online/feedback-form
Srirup Kumar	4:32 PM	Note: a recent study by the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories found that converting organic waste to clean fuels like renewable natural gas (RNG) holds the greatest potential for negative emissions at the lowest cost https://www-gs.llnl.gov/content/assets/docs/energy/Getting_to_Neutral.pdf
Srirup Kumar	4:36 PM	Thank you!

*Note: PSE changed the Updated Sensitivity Fist file name based on stakeholder feedback concerning ease of opening the file. New link:
https://oohpseirp.blob.core.windows.net/media/Default/2021/meetings/Oct_20_webinar/Webinar%209%20Updated%20sensitivities%20list.xlsx