

# Feedback Report

RPAG Kickoff Webinar

## Meeting details

- Monday, October 30, 2023 2:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
- Virtual webinar hosted by PSE and facilitated by Triangle Associates
- Links to:
  - [Presentation](#)
  - [Meeting recording](#)
  - [Draft RPAG Charter](#)

## Feedback report

The following table records participant questions and PSE responses from the webinar Q&A function during the meeting, public comment opportunity, and comments submitted via online [feedback form](#) or [irp@pse.com](mailto:irp@pse.com). Meeting materials are available on the IRP [website](#).

Note: PSE aims to provide clarity in responses but subsequent follow-up may be required at times. Please direct any follow-up clarifications to [irp@pse.com](mailto:irp@pse.com).

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
1	10/25/23	James Adcock	irp@pse.com	For the record, I want to make it clear that I do not agree to my exclusion from full participation in the RPAG group, as (effectively) I have been able to do the last dozen+ years. I believe my exclusion is clearly based of my criticisms of PSE's previous IRP modeling efforts. And my previous criticisms have led to some PSE improvements, such as PSE no longer using 80 year old data in their climate modeling. James Adcock, Electrical	PSE undertook a thorough, impartial, and transparent process to select RPAG members <a href="#">as described in Triangle's RPAG selection memo</a> .

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
				Engineer, MIT, spent my entire career doing statistical modeling for Fortune 500 companies	
2	10/30/23	Don Marsh	Public comment	<p>Thanks for hearing my comment. My name is Don Marsh. I'm the chair of the Washington Clean Energy Coalition and member of 3 previous IRP advisory groups. My organization is concerned that PSE is restricting public participation, using the mechanisms you claim will enhance it. Our first concern is the siloing of resource planning and equity advocates. On slide 20, PSE says it need to continue improving how we embed equity into resource planning. The best way to do that is to have equity advocates as members of the RPAG. That way, everyone can benefit from the concerns and diverse perspectives these folks bring to the table. The wrong way to do it is to have a completely separate table like the EAG and little cross communication between the groups. We also take issue with the 2 track strategy that PSE has proposed. We support PSE's commitment to have public webinars that are more accessible to the general public. But that is not where members of my group belong. We have been attending IRP advisory groups for many years, but now we are excluded from the discussion and shoved into a two-minute comment at the end. When others might be tuning out at the end of a two and a half hour meeting, that isn't enough time to have a conversation or ask a question about a relevant slide. There are many other things that we could have contributed to today's discussion, but I am already running out of time. This is not the kind of public participation we feel was envisioned in the Washington Administrative Code, which says consultations with commission staff and public participation are essential to the development of an effective plan. PSE is effectively sidelining the Washington Clean Energy Coalition, which is comprised of dedicated and well-informed individuals, whose purpose is to represent the public in IRP meetings. Thank you very much.</p>	Thank you for your feedback. Please see our answer to question #5.

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
3	10/30/23	James Adcock	Public comment	James Adcock, Electrical Engineer, MIT. I'm a dozen year member of the IRP stakeholders group, which Puget is now killing. IRP law say explicitly public participation is essential. Public means public. It does not mean those organizations which Puget specifically chooses to be acceptable to Puget's liking. To be allowed to participate because a small handful of organizations is not the public. Puget proposes to spend about a billion dollars of ratepayer money over the next decade and to do so without meaningful reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Or if it's all just spent on wasteful regulatory game playing. The public deserves to have a real meaningful voice and how these 1 billion dollars are spent. Not just Puget breakout sessions, with Puget representatives carefully coach. To record only the answers which Puget wants to hear. Not multiple choice surveys, where one of the choices isn't "we want Puget to greatly reduce greenhouse gas emissions and we want Puget to do that now, not waste another 10 or 20 years in regulatory game playing." Recently, Puget has been generating tons of electricity from natural gas turbines. Almost 1,000 megawatts of power, not just during peak hours, but 24/7/365. This is crazy. This has got to change or not only will we lose the natural environment of Washington state, all our famous flora and fauna, but in addition we will lose the human race.	<p>We agree public participation is essential to the IRP process. Our goal with the 2025 IRP is to create more and diverse opportunities for public participation. As previously described, during this cycle all members of the public may submit comments or questions in writing as well as ask questions during public webinars. The public may also provide comments during designated periods of both public webinars and RPAG meetings. Consistent with previous IRPs, all feedback and questions will be catalogued and addressed in a timely manner. There will also be a public comment period on the draft IRP.</p> <p>We share your concerns for the environment and remain committed to our clean energy goals of delivering 80 percent clean energy by 2030 and 100 percent by 2045.</p>
4	10/30/23	James Adcock	irp@pse.com	Crazy that Puget only allowed a total of four minutes of public comment. This is not appropriate when Puget will be spending a billion dollars of the public's money. Crazy that this was supposedly a technical meeting of technical experts, with the public "Frozen Out" because supposedly they are not "technical enough" but basically not one minute of the meeting was spent on "technical topics" but rather just a continual dummy-down of Puget technical content from years-gone-by when we had actual real Public IPR Meetings, the people who actually cared showed up, and we had real, honest-to-dickens	<p>We invite all interested parties to provide public comment during designated opportunities at all of our RPAG and public meetings. PSE did not limit comments to four minutes during this meeting; only two individuals elected to provide comments.</p> <p>As this was a kickoff meeting of our first Resource Planning Advisory</p>

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
				technical discussions -- yes including arguments! -- among those members of the Public who actually cared enough to show up! Sign me bitterly disappointed. This is all just a billion-dollar Ratepayer Rip-off! Begs the question why Public Counsel and UTC bless the charade with their presence!	Group (RPAG) we designed an agenda focused on member introductions and the projected work plan for the 2025 IRP cycle. Subsequent meeting discussions will focus on resource planning topics as described in our <a href="#">workplan filed with the Commission</a> on September 29, 2023.
5	10/30/23	Don Marsh	irp@pse.com	<p>After attending the first meeting of PSE's 2025 RPAG this afternoon, the Washington Clean Energy Coalition has two requests detailed in the attached document. We hope these requests will be considered to increase public participation in the IRP process.</p> <p>(UTC records, please include this document in the electric IRP docket UE-230806 and the gas IRP docket UG-230807.)</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Don Marsh Chair, Washington Clean Energy Coalition</p> <p><i>Attachment:</i></p> <p>October 30, 2023 Dear PSE IRP Team, The Washington Clean Energy Coalition (WCEC) has two concerns regarding opportunities for public participation in PSE's 2025 IRP Resource Planning Advisory Group (RPAG).</p> <p>First, we are concerned that there are no members focused on equity issues in the group. We understand</p>	<p><i>PSE responded to this query via email on November 9, 2023.</i></p> <p>Dear Don Marsh, Lauren McCloy, Jim Dennison, and Kelly Hall,</p> <p>In response to your letter dated Oct. 30, 2023, PSE will not be making changes to the RPAG roster at this time.</p> <p>As described in the RPAG selection memo (see attached), PSE undertook an intentional and thorough process to solicit applicants and engaged independent third parties to partner in reviewing applications in the interest of fairness and equity. We selected three established environmental organizations with demonstrated expertise in resource planning, each of whom provided highly qualified and experienced representatives. We acknowledge Mr. Marsh's ongoing interest and welcome his</p>

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
				<p>that there is a separate Equity Advisory Group, but by siloing these discussions, PSE impedes opportunities for communication and education across these disciplines. We believe that PSE employees, RPAG members, and EAG members would benefit from a more integrated discussion that includes resource planners and equity advocates. One mitigation would be to allow members of the EAG to fully participate in RPAG meetings whenever they would like to attend.</p> <p>Second, we are troubled by the exclusion of the WCEC from RPAG discussions. The WCEC offers unique strengths that will enhance the diversity and effectiveness of the RPAG:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. History. Although the WCEC is only three years old, individual members have participated in at least three previous IRP Advisory Groups. The collective experience of our members helps us understand the technical details of IRPs and suggest relevant and feasible improvements.</li> <li>2. Grassroots. The WCEC is an all-volunteer organization. We dedicate our time and energy to this work not because we are getting paid, but because the Commission has told us that engaging with the IRP process is the best way to benefit our communities, vulnerable populations, ratepayers, the environment, and future generations.</li> <li>3. Public participation. An organization with our grassroots connections closely aligns with the Washington Administrative Code, which states that public participation is essential to the IRP process. The WCEC brings the public's perspective to the table. We also help the public understand the decisions that underlie the final IRP document.</li> </ol>	<p>participation in the numerous formats available to all members of the public.</p> <p>As a reminder, during this cycle all members of the public may submit comments or questions in writing as well as ask questions during webinars. The public may also provide comments during designated periods of both public webinars and RPAG meetings. Consistent with previous IRPs, all feedback and questions will be catalogued and addressed in a timely manner. There will also be a public comment period on the draft IRP.</p> <p>The RPAG is not intended to be the only forum for feedback on resource planning. We are committed to identifying creative and collaborative opportunities going forward to ensure equity is addressed in resource planning. This work is ongoing. Thank you for acknowledging this important role and offering suggestions to address equity in this process.</p> <p>Thank you for your continued participation.</p>

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
				<p>4. Focus. The WCEC supports the other statewide environmental and clean energy organizations that have been seated on the RPAG. The WCEC adds value through our intense focus on PSE's IRP and CEIP, as exemplified in our comments submitted in the UTC's docket for PSE's 2023 Gas IRP. Many of the public's comments were based on our research and comment letters.</p> <p>If the WCEC is admitted into the RPAG, the coalition will be represented by Don Marsh, who has participated in IRP Advisory Groups for over 8 years. With decades of experience as a software architect and founder of three software startup companies and two nonprofit organizations, Don offers a diversity of experience to represent concerned customers throughout PSE's service territory.</p> <p>Sincerely,  Don Marsh, Chair, Washington Clean Energy Coalition  Lauren McCloy, Policy Director, Northwest Energy Coalition  Jim Dennison, Staff Attorney, Sierra Club  Kelly Hall, Washington Director, Climate Solutions</p>	
6	11/3/23	Jim Dennison, Sierra Club	irp@pse.com	<p>Thank you for PSE and Triangle Associates' work preparing and facilitating the October 30 RPAG kickoff webinar. The webinar was a good opportunity to meet RPAG members and learn about the process and high-level topics PSE intends to address with the RPAG. We are encouraged by several of the ways PSE plans to integrate feedback on its 2023 IRP into the 2025 IRP cycle. We especially appreciate PSE's commitment to publishing and responding to the input it receives from RPAG members and the public.</p> <p>Below are some suggestions and feedback from the first RPAG meeting:</p>	<p><b>RPAG Composition and Public Participation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Thank you for acknowledging this important role and offering suggestions to address equity in this process. We are committed to identifying creative and collaborative opportunities going forward to ensure equity is addressed in resource planning. This work is ongoing and we will provide updates at future RPAG meetings.</li> </ul>

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
				<p><b>RPAG Composition and Public Participation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Sierra Club strongly supports the suggestions of Fred Heutte/NWEC and Don Marsh/WCEC to facilitate RPAG participation by environmental justice, equity, and social justice organizations however possible. We appreciate PSE’s outreach to some of these organizations, and understand that competing demands on these groups’ capacity may affect their ability to join the RPAG. Nevertheless, we strongly encourage PSE to be flexible and make any accommodations that could allow equity organizations to participate at whatever level fits their interests and capacity. This could include, for example, inviting members of PSE’s Equity Advisory Group (and any other equity organizations PSE contacted about joining the RPAG) to join individual RPAG meetings as full participants, without requiring the full two-year commitment. If PSE or RPAG members determine that an upcoming RPAG meeting may have a heavy focus on topics that may be of interest to equity organizations, PSE should invite these groups with as much notice as possible, and work with RPAG members to make any scheduling adjustments or accommodations that may facilitate their participation. PSE should take these steps even if it decides not to allow these groups to participate in individual meetings on an equal footing as RPAG members.</li> <li>(b) Sierra Club supports WCEC’s request to be added to the RPAG. While we recognize PSE’s desire to keep the RPAG to a manageable size, Don Marsh’s October 30 letter to PSE And Fred Heutte’s comments at the RPAG kickoff demonstrate why WCEC’s contributions would justify adding one more member. WCEC offers a uniquely Washington-focused perspective that is not currently represented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(b) PSE responded to the membership change request via email on November 9, 2023. Please see our answer to question #5.</li> <li>(c) Thank you for this feedback and your suggestions. We will provide a response after considering all feedback from RPAG members providing during 1:1 interviews with the RPAG facilitator.</li> </ul> <p><b>Material Availability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(d) We endeavor to post meeting presentations and agendas at <a href="https://www.pse.com/en/IRP/Get-involved">https://www.pse.com/en/IRP/Get-involved</a> one calendar week prior to, and no fewer than three business days in advance of meetings. Materials for this meeting were posted on October 25, 2023.</li> <li>(e) Thank you for your suggestion regarding feedback form links; PSE will implement this update in the near future.</li> </ul> <p><b>Topics to Cover in RPAG Meetings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(f) We agree that the Mentimeter poll utilized to capture feedback in the RPAG meeting regarding RPAG discussion topics will not be our sole guide for future engagement. Our projected 2024 topics are based on PSE’s needs for the 2025 IRP, meeting</li> </ul>

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
				<p>in the RPAG, and Mr. Marsh's experience participating in multiple PSE IRPs over 8 years will enable him to provide valuable expertise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(c) We encourage PSE to continue adjusting its RPAG meeting format to facilitate robust public participation. In particular, when time permits, PSE should be willing and prepared to engage in a flexible, back-and-forth dialogue with members of the public who comment at RPAG meetings. In his oral comments, Don Marsh expressed interest in being able to ask clarifying questions, refer to presentation slides, and have more extended back-and-forth discussion. The meeting facilitator did not allow such an exchange in this initial meeting (even though there was additional time after all interested commenters had spoken for the 2 minutes allocated to them), but committed to coming back to this suggestion for future meetings. PSE staff have also previously stated that they were willing to stay beyond the allocated RPAG meeting time if additional members of the public are interested in comment and discussion. Another way PSE could facilitate public participation is to keep the meeting chat or Q&amp;A open during the presentation, at least between public observers and a designated facilitator, so that questions and feedback may be captured in real-time without interrupting the meeting flow and addressed at the end of the presentation. We look forward to the responses and adjustments PSE makes based on this feedback, and will offer additional suggestions for robust public participation going forward. <p><b>Material Availability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(d) The presentation slides and <a href="#">kickoff webinar recording</a> do not yet appear to be available on PSE's</li> </ul> </li></ul>	<p>regulatory and general rate case (GRC) requirements, as well as feedback we received from Commission staff and interested parties during the 2023 IRP. We are allowing the opportunity to expand on those topics while still meeting our key IRP engagement priorities.</p> <p><b>Suggestions on Draft RPAG Charter</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(g) Thank you for your suggested clarifications and additions to the draft RPAG Charter. We will provide additional responses to suggested charter edits after Dec. 1 when all RPAG members have been given an opportunity to provide feedback on the charter.</li> </ul>

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
				<p><a href="#">IRP webpage</a>. We recommend posting these materials to the webpage as soon as they are available, so that members of the public may consult them in preparing written feedback.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (e) It may also help to post a link to the “<a href="#">give feedback</a>” page under the entries for meetings while feedback on those meetings is being accepted. Although this link is available in the top right of the IRP webpage, linking it to the specific meetings for which feedback is being sought could make it easier to navigate the site and provide timely feedback.</li> </ul> <p><b>(f) Topics to Cover in RPAG meetings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The kickoff meeting featured a brief discussion of high-level topics that may be covered in RPAG meetings. While we appreciate this start to the conversation, we share the view of PSE and RPAG members that the topics of interest will evolve as the RPAG digs in substantively. PSE should not be tied to emphasizing or de-emphasizing any particular topics based on the results of its brief, initial Menti poll.</li> </ul> <p><b>(g) Suggestions on Draft RPAG Charter</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On page 1 under “Purpose,” the fourth bullet could specify “Meeting Clean Energy Transformation Act (CETA) and Climate Commitment Act (CCA) obligations and requirements, <u>including applicable equity requirements</u>” This could be one way of effectuating Fred Heutte’s recommendation to address these equity issues in the charter (with the important caveat that the RPAG process alone will not be adequate to fully explore these issues, especially if environmental and social justice organizations are not able to participate).</li> </ul>	

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On page 2 under “PSE Commitments,” the first bullet could read “Be accountable to RPAG members and members of the public by sharing how RPAG <u>and public</u> feedback and recommendations are used or not used in accordance with WAC 480-100-625.” This would clarify the charter’s alignment with PSE’s existing commitment to publish and respond to all RPAG and public feedback.</li> <li>On page 2 under “RPAG Commitments,” the second bullet could read “Contribute their technical expertise to <u>help enable</u> PSE to effectively meet its legally mandated obligations under WAC 480-100-625, WAC 480-90-238, and RCW 19.405.” This would recognize that the RPAG process alone will not fill the “essential” role of public participation in “the development of an effective plan.” WAC 480-90-238(5).</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for considering these comments, and we look forward to the next RPAG meeting.</p>	