

Binary & Technical Screening

DRAFT

Introduction	2
Initial Screening.....	3
Binary Screening based on the OEB Decision	3
Technical Evaluation Project Review	4
Initial Technical Evaluation	4
Customer Connections.....	5
Compressor Stations	5
Hydrogen Blending.....	5
Storage Pools & Wells.....	5
Project Status	5
Technical Evaluation	5
Distribution Station condition related, IRPA's not applicable	6
See investment description – IRPA's not applicable for CNG	6
See investment description, IRPAs not applicable.....	6
Downsized to NPS 2, cannot downsize further or retire	11
Potential to be downsized to NPS 2. Further assessment closer to ISD	11
Potential to reduce pipe size, but need to avoid bottlenecks	11
ETEE could reduce pipe size, but it is a trunk main	11
Timing – Market Based Supply Side not available	11
Summary	12

Introduction

The IRP Binary Screening and Technical Evaluation described in this paper are conducted using the direction and guiding principles provided by the Ontario Energy Board in the IRP Decision and Order (EB-2020-0091). The investments considered as part of this Binary Screening and Technical Evaluation process include investments within Enbridge's Asset Management Plan and are limited to regulated Enbridge Gas investments.

As Enbridge has worked through its first IRP Binary Screening and Technical Evaluation of the investments in the Asset Management Plan, certain learnings have been identified. These learnings have led to some investments being removed either ahead of the Binary Screening (this was identified as "Initial Screening") or in the process of completing the Technical Evaluation (this was identified as "Initial Technical Evaluation"). The rationale for the removal of these investments from further evaluation is outlined in this document. In future Asset Management Plan (AMP) investment evaluations, Enbridge Gas will systematically apply these learnings so that time can be focused on the geographical areas and investment types that are most likely to yield an IRP Plan that is both Technically and Economically Feasible.

Initial Screening

Ahead of the Binary Screening, investments in non-Gas Carrying assets were removed. These investments are in **Real Estate & Workplace Services, Fleet & Equipment, and Technology & Information Services.**

Binary Screening based on the OEB Decision

Based on Binary Screening criteria provided by the OEB, investments were removed from further evaluation.

Investments deemed Emergent Safety Issue

These investment dollars are not yet tied to specific investment projects. Most of the dollars budgeted within this category are what Enbridge Gas refers to as “programmatic spend”, which means that they are dollars budgeted to be spent on emergent safety issues when they arise. The programmatic dollars budgeted for Emergent Safety Issues are allocated by region and based on historical spend. Emergent safety issues that this budget would be spent on include replacing mains and services after a leak has occurred. Once an asset is leaking the issue must be addressed quickly for safety reasons and to avoid further GHG emissions. There is no time for an IRP Plan to be developed and implemented.

- ***Investments failing based on Timing***

These investment dollars are not yet tied to specific investment projects. Most of the dollars budgeted within this category are what Enbridge Gas refers to as “programmatic spend” and are to be spent on various Integrity Management Programs and Station Replacement projects as they arise. The programmatic dollars budgeted are based on historical spend and known drivers such as changes to codes and standards. Specific projects in this category include (1) Integrity Digs, (2) Integrity Retrofits, and (3) the replacement of bypassing valves at Storage Facilities. Although most projects that arise from the Integrity Management Program will not be suitable for IRPA’s (see below for a description of these investments and why the investment type and timing would not allow for an IRPA – see Table 1 below, specifically Rows 13, 14, and 27), **any pipeline replacements identified will be subject to the IRP Binary Screening and Technical Evaluation process.**

- ***Investments failing based on \$ Threshold***

As noted in the OEB Decision, “A minimum cost of the facility project that would be built to meet a system need (in the absence of IRP) is required to justify the time and effort to conduct an IRP evaluation and potentially develop an IRP Plan. Projects under \$2 million should be screened out unless the government makes regulatory changes establishing a \$10 million threshold for OEB Leave to Construct approvals, in which case, the criteria should use \$10 million to determine if an IRP evaluation is appropriate.”¹ Enbridge used a \$ value of \$2M to screen projects out at this stage. In addition, as part of this binary screen step, programmatic budgets that have an estimated annual spend of less than \$2M were screened out. Programmatic budgeted spend that was removed at this stage includes main replacement and main relocation programmatic spend. The annual main replacement programmatic spend budget is based on historical spend and allows Regions to respond to leaking mains and services. Note: moving forward, Enbridge Gas will remove all spend for leaking mains and services through the Emergent Safety Issue category as noted above. The Main Relocation programmatic spend budget is based on the capital expenditures required to replace or relocate segments of pipeline to accommodate municipal infrastructure work. Any specific Main Relocation investments that are identified will be subject to the IRP Binary Screening and Technical Evaluation Process. In addition to the main replacement and relocation programmatic spend removed at this stage, there are several other small programmatic budgets that were screened out. These other small programmatic budgets are designed to address specific issues that arise annually on Enbridge Gas’ facilities.

- ***Customer-Specific Build***

If an identified system constraint/need has been underpinned by a specific customer’s (or group of customers’) clear determination for a facility option and either the choice to pay a Contribution in Aid of Construction or to contract for

¹ EB-2020-0091 Decision and Order, Integrated Resource Planning Proposal, July 22, 2021, p. 49

long-term firm services delivered by such facilities (including new subdivision or small main extensions) then it is not appropriate to conduct IRP analysis for those projects.”² In this first IRP Binary Screen and Technical Evaluation, Enbridge Gas chose not to Binary Screen out (1) customer-specific build investment projects which includes the Customer Connections budget. The Customer Connections budget is informed by the anticipated number of customer additions and the historical cost to add customers to the system.

- **Community Expansion & Economic Development:**

“If a facility project has been driven by government legislation or policy with related funding explicitly aimed at delivering natural gas into communities, then an IRP evaluation is not required.”³ As noted in the Asset Management Plan⁴, Community Expansion and Economic Development projects are not included in the Asset Management Plan and there will be no IRP evaluation.

Technical Evaluation

Enbridge has been completing detailed Technical Evaluation project reviews of its investments to verify that the forecasted needs haven’t changed, the project costs are sufficient, and that the project drivers haven’t changed. While completing this detailed project review, Enbridge has identified certain trends and groupings of projects for which IRPA’s will not be effective. The rationale for this is described below and in Table 1. In the future, Enbridge will remove these investments systematically from IRP Technical Evaluation.

As the Technical Evaluation Project Reviews proceeded, the Enhanced Distribution Integrity Management Program (EDIMP) was being established and matured. As this program has clarified its scope, some of the planned replacement projects will be within that scope and there is a potential for their scope and timing to change (increase or decrease, sooner or later), as a result of the EDIMP findings. This could, in turn, affect their treatment in the IRP Binary Screen and Technical Evaluation Process.

Technical Evaluation Project Reviews will continue to be completed on the remaining investments. These continued detailed Technical Evaluation Project Reviews could identify additional categories of work for which there are no technically feasible IRPA’s. Any additional categories would be described in a future draft of Enbridge’s “Binary and Technical Evaluation Screening Process”.

Initial Technical Evaluation

As noted above, as projects moved through the Technical Evaluation Project Review, Enbridge Gas identified categories of investments that do not have a technically feasible IRP alternative (IRPA). The first five categories were identified, and their associated projects were removed from further Technical Evaluation, in what Enbridge Gas has labelled its “Initial Technical Evaluation”. Provided below are the categories of projects that, through this Initial Technical Evaluation, have been deemed not to have a technically feasible IRPA.

² EB-2020-0091 Integrated Resource Planning Proposal, Decision and Order July 21, 2021, p. 44.

³ EB-2020-0091 Integrated Resource Planning Proposal, Decision and Order July 21, 2021, p. 48.

⁴ EB-2022-0200 Exhibit 2, Tab 6, Schedule 2, p. 282

Customer Connections

Enbridge reviewed the investments in this category to see if IRPA's could be identified and, upon review, has confirmed that they should be screened out through the Binary Screening. In its Technical Evaluation, Enbridge Gas determined that implementing an IRPA could not reduce the size of the distribution mains, services or regulating equipment, as these cannot be downsized any further. In addition, there are no non-gas IRPAs available within the current IRP Framework that can be offered to avoid the customer connection service being requested. Note that any associated main reinforcement investments will go through the Binary Screening and Technical Evaluation process.

Compressor Stations

The investments in the Compression Stations Asset Class are related to the maintenance of the existing fleet of compressors and include the periodic OEM prescribed overhauls and replacement of components that are not performing as intended or are obsolete. Enbridge Gas expects that technically feasible IRPA's will only be identified for Compressor Station investments where growth is a driver.

Hydrogen Blending

There are investments in the AMP related to the use of hydrogen in the distribution system. Since these investments are focused on reducing the carbon footprint of the existing transmission and distribution system, they cannot be offset by IRPA's. Enbridge Gas will remove investments in the GTH – Hydrogen Blending Asset Class/Program from Technical Evaluation going forward.

- Expansion of the existing Low Carbon Energy Project (LCEP),
- A Hydrogen Grid Study to establish what would be required to prepare the natural gas distribution system for the introduction of more hydrogen,
- A study to establish how the company could use hydrogen to fuel compressors, and
- A study to establish how the company could use hydrogen to station heating.

Storage Pools & Wells

The investments in the Asset Management Plan for Wells and Pools relate to maintenance and compliance driven upgrades to allow for ongoing deliverability from the storage pools. Enbridge Gas will remove these investments from the IRP Technical Evaluation moving forward as the projects relate to drilling of an observation well for compliance reasons and work that arises annually from the Integrity Management Program.

Project Status

Through the Technical Evaluation Project Review, Enbridge Gas identified several investments that would not have an IRP Technical Evaluation completed due to their project status. Projects that fall within this category are those that are already under construction, already granted Leave to Construct by the Ontario Energy Board or are projects that have been cancelled.

Technical Evaluation

As Enbridge continued to complete its Technical Evaluation Project Review of each investment for the purpose of completing an IRP Technical Evaluation, further categories of spend were identified for which no technically feasible IRPA could be established. These categories are described below and in the analysis of future Asset Management Plans, these will be systematically removed (with noted

exceptions) so that better progress can be made on the areas for which a technically feasible IRP may exist.

[Distribution Station condition related, IRPA's not applicable](#)

Through the Technical Evaluation Project Review, the Distribution Station investments were assessed to confirm that the projects were driven by the condition and not by growth. These Distribution Station Condition related projects are prioritized based on inspections that evaluate the condition of various components (regulators, valves, piping, etc) and systems (heating, odourant, communications, etc) at the stations. Sometimes, the specific projects are time constrained and low in dollar value meaning that they fail at the binary screening stage. For larger projects, an understanding of the impact on upstream and downstream facilities is required and replacement size for size is usually preferable – particularly if a full station replacement is not being planned. As such, all condition related station rebuilds, and replacements will be excluded from IRP Technical Evaluation. **However, any station rebuilds that involve an element of growth will be included in IRP Evaluation.**

[See investment description – IRPA's not applicable for CNG](#)

Through the Technical Evaluation Project Review, these investments were assessed to confirm that they are related to the ongoing replacement and upgrade of CNG facilities to fuel Enbridge's natural gas vehicles. These needs cannot be replaced through IRPA's and these investments will not proceed through IRP Technical Evaluation going forward.

[See investment description, IRPAs not applicable](#)

Through the Technical Evaluation Project Review, it was established that there would not be a technically feasible IRPA for a set of investments. This set of investments are classified as **"See investment description, IRPAs not applicable"**. Investments in this category are described below along with the reasons that they will not yield a technically feasible IRPA. Where applicable, there are notes as to how these will be systematically removed prior to IRP Technical Evaluation in future.

Table 1 – Description of Investments Screened out of the Technical Evaluation Project Review

	Sub-category	Asset Class	Asset Program	Description
1	AMI Pilot	Utilization	UTIL-Monitoring Systems	The AMI Pilot will establish the technical and economic benefits related to the installation of AMI meters and associated infrastructure. No technically feasible IRPA's can replace this spend and the investment will be removed from further Technical Evaluation.
2	AMP Fitting	Distribution Pipe	DP-Service Relay	An AMP fitting is a mechanical fitting installed between 1969 and 1984, on below ground residential gas service lines, to transition from a plastic service line to a copper riser. Locations with an AMP Fitting are identified annually and prioritized based on risk. As such the investments should be excluded based on timing and the fact that individual service replacements cannot be offset by IRPA's.
3	Class Location	Distribution Pipe & Transmission Pipe & Underground Storage	DP-Class Location TPUS-Class Location	This is one of the Integrity Management Programs in which the spend is held in a Programmatic spend budget to cover specific projects that are identified each year. Class locations projects arise when a facility needs to be relocated because of increased development and associated population density around the facility. Going forward this programmatic spend budget will be removed from IRP Technical Evaluation, but any specific pipeline replacements will be included for IRP Evaluation
4	Compression Stations	Compression Stations	All	See section above on Compression Stations
5	Corrosion	Distribution Pipe	DP-Corrosion	This programmatic spend covers the replacement of depleted anodes, work arising from bridge crossing inspections, and repairs to rectifier beds. Once found, these problems must be addressed quickly to avoid degradation of the pipe and, as such, will be removed from IRP Evaluation based on timing.
6	Depth of Cover Program	Transmission Pipe & Underground Storage	TPUS-Integrity	This programmatic spend budget is for facilities that are identified each year as exposed or shallow leading to an increased risk of 3 rd party damage. Once identified the pipeline must be lowered, replaced, or otherwise protected to control risk. Going forward this programmatic budget spend will be excluded from IRP Technical Evaluation, but any resultant pipeline replacements be included for IRP Evaluation.
7	District Station	Distribution Stations	DS-Station Rebuilds & B & C Stations	These investments hold \$ for specific station rebuild investments that have been identified through annual inspections and that have been prioritized for rebuild based on condition. Currently there are 53 such investments, each of which failed the binary screen based on the \$ threshold and because the asset condition once identified, are planned for the following year. As such they will be excluded based on Timing going forward.

8	Farm Taps	Utilization	UTIL-Regulator Refit	This is programmatic spend that is budgeted to cover the costs of remediating situations in which there are problems with the first or second cut of the regulation at a customer's premise. These are repaired as they are found and should be eliminated based on timing.
9	Facilities Integrity Management Program (FIMP)	Distribution Stations	DS-Integrity	This is programmatic spend that is budgeted to cover the costs of large station inspections that must be completed annually to scope the extent of work that is required at each large station investment identified in the AMP. Going forward, all such Station programmatic spend that is driven by condition, end-of-life, and compliance will be removed from IRP Technical Evaluation.
10	Fire Suppression	Distribution Stations	DS-Gate, Feeder & A Stations	These investments relate to the installation of Fire Suppression at Distribution Stations with Odourant. 3 similar investments were eliminated at Binary Screening because of Timing, and another was eliminated at Binary Screening because of the \$ threshold. Going forward all such Station programs that are driven by condition, end-of-life, and compliance will be removed from IRP Technical Evaluation.
11	Geohazard	Distribution Pipe	DP-Integrity	This integrity management programmatic spend is budgeted to cover the costs related to identifying pipelines that must be replaced because of risks related to geohazards. This spend will be excluded from IRP Technical Evaluation going forward but any resultant replacement projects will be included in IRP Technical Evaluation.
12	Independent Asset Integrity Review (IAIR)	Distribution Pipe & Transmission Pipe & Underground Storage	DP-Integrity, TPUS-Integrity	This is programmatic spend that is budgeted for work that results from the Independent Asset Integrity Review. Although the programmatic spend budgeted here cannot be assessed for IRP Alternatives, any resultant pipeline replacements will be included in the IRP Technical Evaluation.
13	Integrity Digs	Distribution Pipe & Transmission Pipe & Underground Storage	DP-Integrity, TPUS-Integrity	This programmatic spend is budgeted to cover the costs related to repairs and replacements that are identified through in-line inspections. This programmatic budgeted spend will be excluded from future IRP Technical Evaluation but pipeline replacement projects found as a result of the integrity dig work will be included in the IRP Evaluation.
14	Integrity Retrofit	Distribution Pipe, Distribution Stations & Transmission Pipe & Underground Storage	DP-Integrity, DS-Integrity, TPUS-Integrity	This is programmatic spend that is budgeted for installing pig launchers and receivers, allowing annual in-line inspection to be accomplished more easily and the life of transmission pipelines to be potentially extended. This work takes place at stations and does not affect the distribution system itself. No technically feasible IRPA's exist for this type of work, and it will be removed from the Technical Evaluation going forward.

15	Inside Room Regulators (IRR)	Distribution Stations	DS-Inside Regulator & ERR Program	This is programmatic spend that is budgeted for remediation of inside regulation sets based on risk. There is no technically feasible IRPA that could address this need and they will be removed from the Technical Evaluation going forward.
16	Large stations	Distribution Stations	DS-Gate, Feeder & A Stations	These stations are identified through inspections and prioritized for rebuild based on condition. Each year, this programmatic spend is converted into specific projects. Any identified investments for which growth plays a role will be included in the IRP Evaluation. It should be noted that there is also the possibility that reduced load will drive some investment in stations.
17	Liquified Natural Gas (LNG)	LNG	All	These investments relate to the maintenance of the Hagar LNG facility that is used to peak shave the load in the Sudbury area. Unless driven by Growth, all investments at the Hagar facility will be excluded from the Technical Evaluation moving forward.
18	Low Pressure Delivery Meter Sets (LPDMS)	Utilization	UTIL-Remediation	This is programmatic spend budgeted to cover the inspection and remediation of Low-Pressure Delivery Meter sets, which are usually at commercial customer locations. Similar investments were excluded at binary screening based on the dollar threshold. Going forward, these investments will be removed from the Technical Evaluation.
19	Main & Service Repl - Leaking	Distribution Pipe	DP-Service Relay	Similar investments in the EGD Rate Zone were excluded at Binary Screening and going forward these too will be excluded at Binary Screening as Emergent Safety Issue. Aside from the safety concern, leaks must be addressed quickly to avoid GHG's.
20	Meter exchanges	Utilization	UTIL-Regulator Refit	This programmatic spend is budgeted to cover the costs of replacing meters through the Measurement Canada approved processes.
21	Maximum Operating Pressure (MOP) Verification	Distribution Pipe & Transmission Pipe & Underground Storage	DP-Replacement s, TPUS-Replacement s	This programmatic spend is budgeted to cover the replacement of pipelines where this may be required because of a review of records for pipeline systems operating above 30 per cent SMYS. Once the MOP has been identified and based on the associated risk, the pressure in these pipelines may need to be reduced until the pipeline can be replaced. The programmatic budgeted spend will be removed from Technical Evaluation going forward but specific pipeline replacement projects will be included in IRP Evaluation when they are identified.
22	Odourant Program	Distribution Stations	DS-Gate, Feeder & A Stations	These investments are for the upgrade of odourant systems at stations. Similar investments failed at binary screening because of timing and because of the dollar threshold. Going forward all such Station programs that are driven by condition, end-of-life, and compliance will be removed from IRP Technical Evaluation.

23	Pressure Factoring Metering (PFM) Program	Stations	DS-Station Rebuilds & B and C Stations	This programmatic spend is budgeted to cover the costs of PFM stations that require a bypass. There is no technically feasible IRPA to address this need and this programmatic budgeted spend will be removed from Technical Evaluation moving forward.
24	Re-class to CNG	Distribution Stations	DS-CNG	One investment relates to CNG and should have been allocated to the “See investment description – IRPA not applicable for CNG investments”.
25	Relocation Program	Distribution Pipe	DP-Relocations	This programmatic spend has been budgeted to cover the costs of projects that are identified annually in response to the requirements of municipalities and other agencies. This programmatic budgeted spend will be removed from Technical Evaluation moving forward but specific pipeline replacement projects will be included in IRP Evaluation.
26	Remote Terminal Units (RTU)	Distribution Stations	DS-Gate, Feeder & A Stations	These investments are for the replacement of Remote Terminal Units that are no longer supported by the manufacturer. Similar investments were eliminated at Binary Screening because of Timing. Going forward all such Station programs that are driven by condition, end-of-life, and compliance will be removed from IRP Technical Evaluation.
27	Storage Facility	Transmission Pipe & Underground Storage	TPUS-Improvements	As noted above, investments related to Storage Pools and Wells will be excluded from Technical Evaluation going forward unless they are driven by growth.
28	Telemetry	Distribution Stations	DS-Gate, Feeder & A Stations	These investments are for telemetry at distribution stations. Similar investments failed at binary screening because of the dollar threshold. Going forward all such Station programs that are driven by condition, end-of-life, and compliance will be eliminated from IRP Technical Evaluation.
29	Vintage Steel Main (VSM)	Distribution Pipe	DP-Replacement	There is a programmatic spend budgeted for Vintage Steel Main projects that have not yet been identified. Although this programmatic spend will not- be put through Technical Evaluation projects, once identified, will go through IRP Evaluation.
30	Well Laterals	Transmission Pipe & Underground Storage	TPUS-Integrity	As noted above, investments in Storage Pools & Wells, and their associated Integrity Management Programs will be similarly excluded from Technical Evaluation.

Scope is NPS 2, cannot downsize further or retire

The existing scope is already NPS and thus cannot be further downsized. These investments were then reviewed to determine whether they could be retired. These scopes had services coming off the pipe that needed to be maintained to serve those customers and thus cannot be retired. Since the pipe size can't be reduced beyond NPS 2 and the pipe couldn't be eliminated, IRP wouldn't impact the project scope, so these were failed.

Potential to be downsized to NPS 2. Further assessment closer to ISD

When completing Technical Evaluation, it was determined that the project scope could potentially be replaced with NPS 2 prior to any IRP assessment. If the pipe size can be reduced, then IRP will not be applicable to the project scope; the scope will be confirmed when the project enters the detailed design phase.

Potential to be downsized to NPS 2, but need to avoid bottlenecks and maintain system resiliency

A portion of the project scope could potentially be replaced with NPS 2 prior to any IRP assessment. It is recommended that pipe size is maintained for segments of trunk main and for system resiliency. Thus, IRP is not applicable to the project scope; the scope will be confirmed when the project enters the detailed design phase. These projects may benefit from having a broader assessment of the needs in the area and the potential for reductions via a geographically focused IRP Plan. This type of analysis was beyond the capacity of the team for this first pass through the IRP Technical Evaluation process but is an area that will be explored in the future.

ETEE could reduce pipe size, but it is a trunk main

There are investments for which ETEE could potentially reduce the pipe diameter, but this would introduce a bottleneck in a trunk main which is not desirable from a network operations perspective.

Timing – Market Based Supply Side not available

Some investments failed because they are required in the near term (1-3 years) and there is no technically feasible supply-side alternative that can meet the need.

Summary

Enbridge is reviewing 2023-2032 investments through a combination of both detailed project reviews and systematic methods through which groups of investments are prioritized for evaluation or eliminated. Through these evaluations, lessons have been learned, which are incorporated in this document to develop guidance for evaluations going forward. At this time (for the reasons discussed above), the following Asset Class/Asset Programs will be screened out systematically when future AMPs are reviewed:

- Compression Stations
- Customer Connections
- Distribution Pipe (Programmatic Spend)
 - Class Location
 - Corrosion
 - Integrity
 - Service Relay
- Distribution Stations (note that any Stations with an element of Growth will be moved to the Growth Asset Class)
- Growth
 - Hydrogen Blending
- LNG
- Transmission Pipe & Underground Storage (Programmatic Spend)
 - Class Location
 - Improvements
 - Integrity
 - Land/Structures – Improvements
- Utilization

As the remainder of the Technical Evaluations are completed as well as economic evaluation and pilots, it is expected that this document will be updated for use on subsequent cycles of investment evaluation.

Legend	
Mandatory Fill If Applicable	Do Not Fill

IRP TECHNICAL REVIEW (Distribution Pipe Reinforcement / Replacements Projects)			
C55 Investment #	30536	Asset Class	Growth
Project Name	SRP_Southeast_Cambridge_Guelph Ave_Reinforcement_NPS6_1000m_420kPa		
Operating Area (EGI)	Div_7 - Waterloo	In Service Date (ISD)	10/1/2026
City/Town	Cambridge	IRP Review Lead	HT
Coordinates	43.436754, -80.312030	DOE Review Lead	SE
DOE Supervisor Check	KL	Date of Review	2/9/2023
Scope Refinement			
Existing Scope (size for size replacements, or SRP reinforcement)			
1000m of NPS6 PE on Guelph Ave			
Modified Scope (Can scope be smaller or shorter for construction year / in-service prior to consideration of IRPAs)			
Due to system and demand changes, project timing can be deferred and/or shortened.			
IRP General Review			
Is this a replacement project?	No		
Is the majority of the project NPS 2?	No		
Are there services on this pipeline that cannot be served elsewhere?	No		
Are there external factors driving the project schedule?	No		
Comments	N/A		
Skip greyed out sections (If applicable)			
Supply Side - CNG			
Is the In Service Date (ISD) - Current day more than 3 Years	Yes		
Does system demand decline in 5 years from in-service date?	No		
Can CNG be leveraged to defer the project?	Yes		
If CNG is implemented for up to 5 years, is the following possible for the project scope?			
Elimination	No	Comments	
Reduction	Yes	Comments	Reduction is possible
Deferral	Yes	Comments	Deferral is possible
Potential Scope Changes			
Any scope reduction will depend on the efficiency/peak hour reduction of ETEE measures			