

Meeting Summary and Feedback Report

Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update Webinar

Meeting details

- Monday, October 16, 2023, 1:00 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.
- Virtual webinar hosted by PSE and facilitated by Triangle Associates
- Links to:
 - [Presentation](#)
 - [Meeting recording](#)

Meeting summary

Agenda Topic	Summary
2021 CEIP status update Kara Durbin, Director, Clean Energy Strategy, PSE	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explained the goals of the WA Clean Energy Transformation Act (CETA).• Shared PSE’s electric resource planning process.• Described PSE’s 1st Clean Energy Implementation Plan (CEIP) as well as its goals & targets, customer benefits, and 2025 clean resources.• Shared the timeline of the CEIP, which was first submitted in November 2021 along with its current status.

Agenda Topic	Summary
<p>2023 Biennial CEIP Update overview</p> <p>Brian Tyson, Manager, Clean Energy Planning and Implementation, PSE</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared details on the 2023 Biennial CEIP Update (Biennial Update) that refines how PSE is delivering clean energy through 2025 and responds to the Commission decision issued June 6, 2023. • Described how PSE is integrating the 4 tenants of energy justice (recognition, procedural, distributive, and restorative). • Provided insights on how PSE will ensure equitable distribution of benefits to named communities • Described a proposed new definition of named communities in response conditions in the Commission decision. • Defined deepest need per conditions in the Commission decision and through collaboration with PSE’s advisory bodies. • Updated annual goals in the Biennial Update along with specific targets. • Described new clean, utility-scale resources acquired since 2022.
<p>Specific actions in the Biennial Update</p> <p>Brian Tyson, Manager, Clean Energy Planning and Implementation, PSE</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Described sample energy efficiency programs targeting named communities, which make up 30% across all programs. • Described new demand programs including flex rewards, flex smart, flex events, and flex rewards-business demand response. • Described distributed energy resources programs and products for solar and storage. • Outlined other specific actions, including a time varying rates pilot, grid modernization, and virtual power plant.
<p>Public engagement overview and next steps</p> <p>Ray Outlaw, Manager, Communication Initiatives, Clean Energy, PSE</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared a summary of public engagement activities completed across multiple groups and organizations in support of Biennial Update. • Described lessons learned from past public engagement.
<p>Next steps</p> <p>Sophie Glass, Facilitator, Triangle Associates</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted Biennial Update will be filed on November 1, 2023 with a formal Commission approval process to follow. • Shared next steps beyond the Biennial Update, including how PSE will continue to address Commission conditions, clean energy resource acquisition, refine existing and develop new programs, and advance equity efforts along with developing the 2025 CEIP.

Feedback report

The following table records participant questions and PSE responses from the Engagement Plan Webinar Q&A segment, public comment period, and comments submitted via online [feedback form](#) or irp@pse.com. Meeting materials are available on the project [website](#).

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
1	10/16/23	Virginia Lohr	Q&A	Just curious. Why are we not able to see who else is listening to this webinar?	PSE is utilizing the Zoom webinar format for public meetings where there is potential for a large volume of participants. In this format participants are not able to see other participants on the webinar, with the exception of facilitators and PSE staff. PSE is working to expand engagement and encourage broader and more diverse participation. The webinar format is widely accepted as a more effective tool as we expand our audience.
2	10/16/23	Don Marsh	Q&A	How many people are online today?	We have 37 total participants on the webinar today. <i>A full list of participants is included at the end of this document.</i>
3	10/16/23	Lukas Tejada	Q&A	What energy resources are considered carbon neutral and clean electricity? What is the difference between the 2?	Washington’s clean energy law defines “carbon neutral” as providing at least 80% renewable or <u>non-emitting</u> electric resources. The remaining (up to) 20% can be met through acquiring Renewable Energy Credits (RECs). The energy resources considered clean resources are renewable resources (like wind, solar and hydropower) and non-emitting resources (such as nuclear power). PSE’s primary clean resources in its electric portfolio today are resources are wind, solar, and hydroelectric power. Hydropower has been part of our plan for some time, and we were an early leader with our Wild Horse wind facility. We are also

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
					increasingly seeing our customers participate in our net metering program with rooftop solar.
4	10/16/23	James Adcock	Q&A	Slide 8 -- CETA law also requires that utilities be 80% carbon free by 2030. Is Puget also committing to be 80% carbon free by 2030 -- i.e. 80% of customer load being served by renewables and non-emitting sources of electricity?	Yes. Our commitment to meeting the 80% standard has not changed. It remains a key part of PSE's 2022-2025 Clean Energy Implementation Plan (CEIP)
5	10/16/23	Jaime Agredano	Q&A	Will the slides be posted? If so, could you please share the link?	Yes, the slides are on the IRP website under the October 16 section. https://www.pse.com/en/IRP/Get-involved
6	10/16/23	Virginia Lohr	Q&A	Slide 11 shows increasing clean electricity from 35% to 63% by 2025. What year was it 35% and what is the % in 2023?	We were at about 34-35% when we developed the CEIP in 2021 based on 2020 data. In 2023 we are projected to be at 53%. When we file our annual progress report in 2024, we project to be around 59%.
7	10/16/23	Don Marsh	Q&A	Can you repeat the answer to Virginia Lohr's question? I missed the details of the years and percentages. If you answered in detail, I can watch the recording later.	We will pause to answer questions at the end of this section.
8	10/16/23	Don Marsh	Q&A	I appreciate being able to see other people's questions. If this is one of the things you fixed from the last webinar, thank you.	Thank you for your feedback.
9	10/16/23	Don Marsh	Q&A	I am interested in seeing the "deepest need" map in greater detail. I want to zoom in to some of the EB customer areas. Where can I get a copy?	We do not have this available in an interactive format at this time. This is still a work in progress as we work towards the November 1 filing date. It is included in the presentation in PDF format. Post-meeting note: PSE is not able to share the interactive version of this map publicly because revealing energy burden information at specific customer locations would

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
					<i>violate customer privacy. Following submittal of the Biennial Update we will evaluate what information can be shared and how do so.</i>
10	10/16/23	Don Marsh	Q&A	Could I ask about specific Census Blocks to get an EB score? Who would I ask?	Thank you for your question. <i>Please see the post-meeting note from question 9 above.</i>
11	10/16/23	Don Marsh	Q&A	When Kara says the load has increased significantly, is this average load or peak demand?	This is average load. CETA requirements use the average annual load.
12	10/16/23	Virginia Lohr	Q&A	Why didn't PSE anticipate the increased load when the world was saying we need to electrify everything?	Both average load and peak load have increased since the 2021 IRP. This is driven by 1) increased load from newly enacted electric vehicle policies after we submitted the 2021 CEIP, 2) the effects of updated climate change analysis, and 3) improved economic outlook as we recovered from COVID-19. You can read more about our demand forecast in Chapter Six: Demand Forecast of the 2023 Electric Progress Report.
13	10/16/23	Don Marsh	Q&A	I didn't hear the answer. Could she repeat the answer? I'm guessing if she was referring to peak demand, she means peak demand in the summer. This matters, because it is easier to address with solar in the summer.	We were specifically addressing average load, not peak demand. Please see our answer to question 12.
14	10/16/23	Jennifer Keller	Q&A	In the CEIP, you are struggling to meet the 63% clean-energy target you originally outlined for 2025, and some of the factors you listed seem like they are completely predictable. The slide mentions "short-term hydroelectric contracts... ending in 2024" (you already knew these contracts were ending, didn't you?) and the effects on short-term contracts related to "growing demand for CETA qualifying resources" (seems like you would know this would happen, and could have made conservative	This is our first CEIP and Biennial Update. We are learning what to plan for and how to plan for our targets and actions we set forth in the CEIP. Some of these factors will play a bigger role in our estimating and planning going forward. We are getting accustomed to a percentage of load standard, which means that

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
				estimates accordingly). What are you doing to be sure to take these into account in the future, rather than setting goals that don't reflect realities that you can see ahead of time?	as loads grow our obligations grow. We remain on track to meet our 2030 and 2045 goals and this will inform future target setting.
15	10/16/23	Virginia Lohr	Q&A	Thanks for explaining why we are seeing that a question has been answered when it hasn't. Also thanks making it so we can see the questions being asked.	Thank you for your feedback.
16	10/16/23	James Adcock	Q&A	Are the "Flex" programs available to all customers in 2023, or are these only limited participation "test programs" ?	There are several PSE Flex programs open to any residential PSE electric customer in addition to pilot programs in select communities. You can learn more about Flex programs on our website .
17	10/16/23	Don Marsh	Q&A	I'm very interested in residential battery owners having incentives to participate in load shifting in a Time Varying Rates program. The last I heard, there were obstacles. Any news?	<p>PSE's pilot design intended to include customers with solar and/or battery storage systems, but due to billing system constraints and regulatory hurdles we are unable to offer time-of-use (TOU) rate options to existing and prospective net energy metering (NEM) customers at this time. Our goal is to develop the necessary capabilities in order to extend TOU rate options to existing net metering customers by 2025 upon completing of the 2-year pilot.</p> <p>Residential customers will be incentivized to utilize energy storage by charging during off-peak hours when the cost of electricity is lower and utilizing their lower-cost stored energy during on-peak hours to avoid higher on-peak energy costs. This incentive for battery owners could shorten the amount of time before they are able to recoup their investment in energy storage. At the</p>

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
					same time, their load shifting serves to reduce system costs for everyone in the long term.
18	10/16/23	Virginia Lohr	Q&A	Slide 27 doesn't help me understand what PSE is actually planning and what is changing. What is happening with net metering, for example.	<p>There is a certain threshold PSE believes it will meet for net metering; once we meet that threshold we can establish a new program. We are thinking of what an expanded net metering program will mean.</p> <p>There will be more information forthcoming in the Biennial Update about some of the newer programs listed on slide 27.</p>
19	10/16/23	Jaime Agredano	Q&A	With growing load, growing share of renewables (intermittent) in the energy mix and decreasing use of thermal generation, is there a plan to incorporate utility scale capacity resources (e.g., battery storage)?	We modeled several utility-scale storage resources in the 2023 Electric Progress Report , including batteries and pumped hydroelectric storage (PHES). You can read more about these storage resources in Chapter Three: Resource Plan , Chapter Seven: Resource Adequacy Analysis , and Chapter Eight: Electric Analysis .
20	10/16/23	Mark Sincell	Q&A	Could you elaborate on the actual/potential conflicts between meeting basic needs and engaging with clean energy for named communities?	Some of the community based organizations (CBOs) we talked to were food banks; we asked what deepest need looked like to them. They generally felt customers on the edge of homelessness meet that definition for deepest need. Conversations on clean energy like solar or batteries, are tied to additional challenges. We will continue to address those challenges as we engage those customers.

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
21	10/16/23	James Adcock	irp@pse.com	<p>I continue to express concerns that Puget is actively discouraging public participation, sending out emails to everyone saying: "You will not be allowed to participate." Some traditional stakeholders have invested more than a decade of their time and energy into the Puget IRP / CEIP Process etc., and now Puget is basically freezing those stakeholders out completely. The IRP law states that "public participation is essential" not optional. I believe the meaning of a "public meeting" is clear: Those who are interested show up, listen, AND ask questions. When Puget chooses who is allowed to participate in Puget IRP and CEIP meetings, that is no longer "public participation" but rather is a "private meeting" which Puget has set up with Puget's invited attendees. I disagree with these Puget Actions -- Puget must allow the Public to ask real, hard, "Vetting" questions about how Puget intends to spend about a billion dollars of ratepayer money on the CETA and CPP related items, rather than preventing ratepayers from having any real participation in how that money is being spent.</p>	<p>This characterization of our communication regarding public participation is inaccurate. We welcome participation and have and will continue to provide more and better opportunities than in the previous cycle. We understand this approach feels different for those have been regularly involved but we are working to create spaces that are welcoming for all.</p> <p>We believe that the engagement approach we are modeling for the 2025 IRP will be effective in bringing more, diverse voices to our resource planning process. By having a public webinar track as well as our Resource Planning Advisory Group (RPAG) we are creating opportunities for voices to be heard at both tables. This is not a process that will exclude voices, but rather bring a greater diversity of voices to PSE's resource planning.</p> <p>Members of the public are encouraged to observe RPAG meetings, give public comment at meetings during a designated time, and may submit questions and feedback to PSE via email at irp@pse.com or through the online feedback form.</p>
22	10/16/23	Don Marsh	irp@pse.com	<p>There was some good summary information provided in this webinar, but there is no doubt that public participation was restricted. Any request for detailed information (like a more detailed map of Severely Energy Burdened communities) was not shared with other participants, and I was told maybe there will be an answer in the Feedback</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback. Please see responses 9 and 10 for responses to your questions about energy burden. Please see our answer to question 21.</p>

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
				Report, but I'm worried it won't be. In the end, participants were only allowed to make one 2-minute comment at the end. If we wanted to talk about more than one or two slides, we wouldn't be able to do that. The right answer should probably be, "You can attend the Resource Planning Advisory Group, where more detail is offered, but many people don't have time for a 4-hour meeting, so this webinar is just a quick overview of what PSE is doing." That would be a good answer, but PSE is not allowing anyone except a few hand-picked "resource planners" to participate in that group. Many environmental organizations, some of which have participated in many previous IRP advisory groups, have now been rejected from participating in the advisory group. This is a huge backwards step for public participation in the IRP process. PSE should fix the situation as soon as possible.	

Attendees (alphabetical by first name)

- | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Adrian Falla | 15. Jim Schretter | 29. Michael Corrigan |
| 2. Amreen Papar | 16. John Robbins | 30. Rachel Clark |
| 3. Charlee Thompson | 17. Katie Chamberlain | 31. Randy Hardy |
| 4. Chris Goelz | 18. Jon Lange | 32. Robert Healy |
| 5. Chris Searcy | 19. Kelima Yakupova | 33. Robin Park |
| 6. Corey Dahl | 20. Kelly Scott | 34. Rosemary Moore |
| 7. Don Marsh | 21. Kelly Xu | 35. Ryan Robertson |
| 8. Ellyn Murphy | 22. Kurt Waldner | 36. Sarah Buck |
| 9. Virginia Lohr | 23. Leslie Almond | 37. Sophie Janeway |
| 10. Elyse Hammerly | 24. Lukas Tejada | 38. Stephanie Price |
| 11. Jack Wellman | 25. Marietta Cole | 39. Stuart Schare |
| 12. Jaime Agredano | 26. Mark Sincell | 40. Susan Christensen Wimer |
| 13. James Adcock | 27. Matt Larson | 41. Uche Nwude |
| 14. Jesse Durst | 28. Megan Larkin | |

Presenters (alphabetical by first name)

1. Brian Tyson, PSE
2. Kara Durbin, PSE
3. Meredith Mathis, PSE
4. Ray Outlaw, PSE

Consultant staff (alphabetical by first name)

1. Emilie Pilchowski, Triangle Associates
2. Jack Donahue, Maul, Foster, and Alongi (MFA)
3. Kim Zamora Delgado, Triangle Associates
4. Pauline Mogilevsky, Triangle Associates
5. Seth Baker, MFA
6. Sophie Glass, Triangle Associates