

Meeting Summary and Feedback Report

Equity in Delivery System Planning public webinar

Meeting details

- Monday, November 6, 2023, 1:00 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.
- Virtual webinar hosted by PSE and facilitated by Triangle Associates
- Links to:
 - Presentation
 - [Meeting recording](#)
- Participants: 38 via Zoom, 47 YouTube views as of November 21, 2023

Meeting summary

Agenda Topic	Summary
Overview of Delivery System Planning (DSP) David Landers, Director, System Planning, PSE	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Distributed energy resources (DER) are transforming the delivery system by putting customer generated energy back into the system to power the community• PSE is upgrading and automating the electric delivery system to increase reliability and advance equity by prioritizing areas serving vulnerable populations and highly impacted communities• Gas supply is less complicated than electricity; it is less complex to compress and store for meeting peak demand• Investments in the delivery system are made using a complex planning process to advance our clean energy future and meet customer demand

Agenda Topic	Summary
<p>Delivery System Planning and the Integrated Resource Plan (IRP)</p> <p>Ryan Lambert, Manager, Electric System Planning, PSE</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What used to be a one-way electric delivery system has now evolved to be a two-way system • DSP and IRP processes are closely linked as we transform from a one-way delivery system into an integrated system planning approach • Delivery system analysis considers wire and non-wire options, which feeds into the IRP
<p>Enabling Tools</p> <p>David Landers, Director, System Planning, PSE</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advanced upgrades allow PSE to see what's happening in the delivery system at any given time • Equity advancement, local community needs, and benefit-cost analysis are all key considerations in energy delivery system project portfolio optimization • With input from the Equity Advisory Group, in 2023 PSE enhanced the DSP planning process to include equity target parameters
<p>Additional Considerations</p> <p>David Landers, Director, System Planning, PSE</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PSE expanded DSP engagement in 2023 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Received input regarding equity and equitable distribution of benefits and incorporated this into the planning process ○ Developed an initial equity integration approach for the DSP iDOT and utilized it for optimizing 2025 and 2026 project portfolios ○ Piloted local community engagement for delivery system planning work • PSE will continue to expand engagement in delivery system planning in 2024 and 2025
<p>Poll and Q&A</p> <p>Sophie Glass, Facilitator, Triangle Associates</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PSE shared a poll to get feedback on how benefits should be prioritized when integrating distributed energy resources into the energy delivery system • PSE asked for feedback on what other things we should be thinking about as we work to embed equity into delivery system planning

Feedback report

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

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
1	11/6/23	Virginia Lohr	Q&A	The Oct. webinar was not satisfactory for listeners. Listeners asked for a change in the format. It doesn't appear that there are too many people to hold this as a regular zoom meeting, as you did last year with many people attending successfully. As a listener, I can't help but feel that this new format seems to be a way to keep us uniformed, not to facilitate our experience.	Thanks for your feedback. Consistent with our current work plan, PSE intends to continue using the webinar format for the remaining public webinars in 2023. PSE will continue to consider feedback on the meeting format as we develop our plan for engagement in 2024.
2	11/6/23	Don Marsh	Q&A	Are we able to see questions that are asked? I logged in a little late and I don't see any questions yet.	We have received one question previous to yours. You should be able to view it in the "answered" tab in the Q&A section. Please let me know if you aren't able to see Virginia's comment and PSE's response.
3	11/6/23	Don Marsh	Q&A	I only see "All questions" and "My questions" tabs. I don't see the "answered" tab or Virginia's comment.	Virginia commented: The Oct. webinar was not satisfactory for listeners. Listeners asked for a change in the format. It doesn't appear that there are too many people to hold this as a regular zoom meeting, as you did last year with many people attending successfully. As a listener, I can't help but feel that this new format seems to be a way to keep us uniformed, not to facilitate our experience. PSE responded: Thanks for your feedback. Consistent with our current work plan, PSE intends to continue using the webinar format

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
					for the remaining public webinars in 2023. PSE will continue to consider feedback on the meeting format as we develop our plan for engagement in 2024.
4	11/6/23	Don Marsh	Q&A	Could it depend on when I logged in?	Following the meeting PSE confirmed participants can only see questions that occur while they are in the meeting. Participants cannot see questions in the meeting that were asked before they joined. This feedback report, however, includes all questions asked during the meeting.
5	11/6/23	Don Marsh	Q&A	How many participants are here today?	There are currently 25 participants in this webinar, not including our YouTube livestream. <i>Post-meeting follow-up: A total of 37 individuals participated via Zoom.</i>
6	11/6/23	Don Marsh	Q&A	I feel somewhat blind using this webinar format. I can't see who is here or what their questions are. That is really useful in my thought process and formulating my own questions. I'm very disappointed that PSE is not acting on our concerns. For many stakeholders, this is our only chance to engage on these topics, since PSE is restricting public participation in the RPAG.	Consistent with our current work plan, PSE intends to continue using the webinar format for the remaining public webinars in 2023 (3 including this DSP webinar). PSE will continue to consider feedback on the meeting format as we develop our plan for engagement in 2024.
7	11/6/23	Don Marsh	Q&A	On slide 13, we applaud the transformation to a more integrated grid, and we support coalescing IRP and DSP into a single process. Has the public been able to participate in Delivery System Planning in the past? In	<i>Answered live at 32:51:</i> Historically a lot of participation has been related to project permitting and requirements. Moving forward, the

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
				the future, is the only way to participate through the IRP process? How does the public do that?	<p>most exciting area where we're going to be able to make some headway in is as we start to bring our Integrated Resource Planning and Delivery System Planning together, is focusing on where Distributed Energy Resources can bring the greatest benefit on our system. This includes meeting needs, enhancing carrying capacity of the system and optimizing investments we need to make in the system, as well as supporting the advancement of energy equity in our communities. Our first plan on engagement related to coordination of our resource planning and delivery system planning is as we go into our next IRP planning cycle and look for Requests for Proposals to bring DERs onto the system, it's our intent to share the location we think would be the greatest benefit to us as well as the community equity parameter information and seek input through our listening channels through the Integrated Resource Planning Process as to where we should place the greatest emphasis on requesting Distributed Energy Resources to come onto our system.</p>

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
					Another area that we are having local communities involved in Delivery System Planning is that we are hosting a pilot project for community engagement around a reliability need in King County. This is the first time we've done this; engaging the community on the needs, soliciting information on the needs we should be considering and developing it into a portfolio. It's our intent to move forward with that pilot as we move into next year and do a local community engagement pilot "2.0" as we get into 2024 and get greater experience about what's going to work best for us in coordinating with our communities and Delivery System Planning activities.
8	11/6/23	Don Marsh	Q&A	On slide 16, Ryan glossed over any detail regarding a "Virtual Power Plant." PSE has been working on this for at least a couple of years, but we don't know what the company's plans are or what the current status is. There are no details in PSE's 2023 Electric Progress Report. I have two batteries with a 27 kWh capacity, in addition to my EV with an 80 kWh battery. That's 100 kWh of capacity, enough to power an average home for at least a few days. When will I be able to contribute these resources to a Virtual Power Plant, and when will PSE compensate me for that?	<i>Answered live at 36:40. Please see our answer to question 16 for additional information on VPPs: If you look at our 2023 Electric Progress Report, our Demand Response programs are doing very well, and we have an increased target in that. VPP is a dispatchable demand response event that's viewed as a resource. If you look at our adjustments and targets you see that we are being very successful rolling this out. As far as ability for</i>

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
					specific customers to participate, we're working with our vendors and suppliers of the system, and as we get that up and functional there will be greater activities toward recruitment and invitations for others to participate in the program.
9	11/6/23	Joel Nightingale	Q&A	On slide 16, who is the audience for the "hosting capacity map" and what resources is it used for? It seems to me that the calculus for hosting a distributed battery would be pretty different than for a distributed solar system or EVSE, for example.	<p><i>Answered live at 39:42. Please see our answer to question 15 for additional information.</i> The hosting capacity map is available for customers and developers wanting to add distributed energy resources in our service territory. What the map does is provide value to the applicants because it helps avoid loss of time and application fees for planned projects by being able to see where we have capacity available for those resources. In order to access the map there's a link you can send an email and gain access to. The idea is to be more transparent around where we have carrying capacity available.</p> <p>https://www.pse.com/en/pages/grid-modernization/hosting-capacity-analysis</p>
10	11/6/23	Don Marsh	Q&A	On slide 17, I would like more detail on the "Equity Advancement" section. Specifically, I would like to have a list of Census Block Groups that qualify as "highly impacted communities". PSE already refused this	You can access information about Highly Impacted Communities, as that data is public through the Washington State Department of

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
				request, saying that it would violate customer privacy. A Census Block Group contains hundreds of homes and would not violate privacy of individual customers.	<p>Health here: https://doh.wa.gov/data-statistical-reports/washington-tracking-network-wtn/climate-projections/clean-energy-transformation-act/ceta-utility-instructions.</p> <p>Data related to “deepest need” is based on individual customer data and must be safeguarded appropriately in order to protect individual customer privacy. We are determining which data related to vulnerable communities and deepest need can be shared publicly.</p>
11	11/6/23	Virginia Lohr	Q&A	I'm glad to learn that you are considering a more integrated system, and I hope it will be very robust and resilient with appropriate use of local resources. Members of the public have been asking for this for some time. Please explain more about what has contributed to this new emphasis.	<i>Answered live at 40:50.</i> As we're looking at our system planning and the forecast of load growth associated with the clean energy transformation and the transformation to electric vehicles we are recognizing the need to update our planning approach. This applies to both utility owned as well as community and customer-owned resources. The important thing we recognize is that we have a lot of investment that is needed in a very short window of time to hit our state's Clean Energy Transformation Act renewable energy goals. To get there, we need to deploy all of our

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
					<p>resources, and to do that effectively and to maintain a reliable system for our customers we have to coordinate this investment and coordinate the utilization of these resources. That's why we have this "new and heightened" element of focus in making this a success.</p> <p>We're using the highly impacted community information and vulnerable population information to figure out where we should be targeting distribution system improvements. We're using it for the needs identification step and are currently in the midst of doing some community outreach where we're piloting going out to a community to get their feedback around what we should be doing in that particular area and we expect to a little bit more there.</p> <p>When we do the optimization process itself we're looking at it through an equity lens to see that at least a minimum percentage of our investments are going to those highly impacted communities.</p> <p>As we're actually delivering on the projects and making sure we have</p>

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
					that in mind as far as the areas that they're impacting to help prioritize that.
12	11/6/23	Joel Nightingale	Q&A	On slide 17, I see "customer impact" as part of the BCA analysis. BCA analysis isn't typically designed to handle ensuring "distributional" benefits. How does PSE consider distributional equity into its DSP process in tandem with its BCA analysis?	<i>Answered live at 44:45.</i> BCA is Benefit Cost Analysis, and we do keep it separate; we do a separate analysis for the project so it comes out with a ratio of 1.5. Then, based on the projects we have we look at what percentage are going to highly impacted communities and using it separately to figure out what projects we want to move forward with. It's a separate lens and a separate view.
13	11/6/23	Don Marsh	Q&A	Thanks for the link. This is exactly the data that PSE is using?	We will follow up with your question regarding data further in our feedback report. <i>Post-meeting follow-up:</i> Please see response 10, the link provided is specific to "highly impacted communities" and represents some of the data PSE is using.
14	11/6/23	Virginia Lohr	Q&A	In June of this year, Sightline Institute reported on transitioning off of gas and ways to prune the gas system: https://www.sightline.org/2023/06/07/its-time-for-cascadia-to-start-pruning-the-gas-system-and-electrifying-whole-neighborhoods/ . PSE must plan to decommission its gas distribution system by pruning entire parts of the system at a time, not by simply allowing those with the means and opportunity to electrify voluntarily on a case by case basis. This is essential to reduce overall leakage and not burden vulnerable	Thanks for your question. We will add this to our feedback report for additional follow-up. <i>Post-meeting follow-up:</i> In accordance with RCW 80.28.010 PSE is legally obligated to provide customers with "safe, adequate, and sufficient" gas and related services."

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
				populations. Has PSE begun this planning? When do you estimate beginning such a decommissioning and how long do you anticipate the decommissioning to take?	We modeled electrifying gas demand in our 2023 Gas Utility IRP, and this was not shown to be a cost-effective option. Additionally, PSE's electrification analysis did not include the additional costs of decommissioning. You can read more about PSE's electrification study in the Gas Utility IRP Chapter Two: Resource Plan Decisions on our past IRP website .
15	11/6/23	Joel Nightingale, UTC	Q&A	I don't think my question on slide 16 about different resource types and the Hosting Capacity map was fully answered. I would think a very different map would result depending on whether the analysis was based on hosting distributed solar, EVSE, batteries, etc. For what resource type(s) does the current Hosting Capacity Map show PSE's hosting capacity? (If there isn't time left today, please respond via the feedback form or via email)	We will follow-up with you in the feedback report. <i>Post meeting follow-up:</i> PSE's public Hosting Capacity Map currently has values based on the distribution system's ability to host Photovoltaic (PV) or Solar distributed resources. You are correct that an EV or Energy Storage Hosting Capacity Analysis would have different parameters and assumptions, which would lead to different results. Therefore, our next iteration of the HCA Map will include an enhancement that can take into consideration newly proposed customer load, including EV infrastructure. Our HCA project will also build better interfaces between our Map and Customer Portal, as well as provide more information to customers and PSE employees to

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
					help provide an overall better customer experience. We are aware that other utilities are developing their own Energy Storage Hosting Capacity Maps and PSE is currently evaluating the technical requirements to provide accurate results for this particular use case.
16	11/9/23	Don Marsh	Feedback form	<p>During my comment at the end of the webinar, I questioned PSE's use of the term "Virtual Power Plant," which presenters defined as something having to do with thermostats, demand response, and communications protocols. I observed that this is not the usual definition of a VPP used by the rest of the industry. For example, check out this page from Portland General Electric: https://investors.portlandgeneral.com/news-releases/news-release-details/pge-program-will-transform-hundreds-homes-virtual-power-plant In that article, PGE describes "525 residential energy storage batteries that PGE will dispatch, contributing up to four megawatts of energy to PGE's grid. The distributed assets will create a virtual power plant made up of small units that can be operated individually or combined to serve the grid, adding flexibility that supports PGE's transition to a clean energy future." A battery-based VPP appears not to be what PSE is thinking of when it uses the term "Virtual Power Plant." To avoid confusion, we would like PSE to specifically describe what resources are included in its VPP, when the first VPP will be implemented, and what plans PSE has for deploying other VPPs throughout its service territory. If PSE can't provide a reasonable response, the company should stop using the term which is creating some confusion for</p>	<p>PSE described its Virtual Power Plant (VPP) in UTC Docket UE-200413 regarding PSE Petition filed 03/15/2021 to Amend Order 04 to extend the date for filing its demand response request for proposal as follows:</p> <p>"A VPP aggregates different types of distributed energy resources in order to coordinate dispatch to meet system resource needs. A VPP aggregates distributed energy resources, including demand response, electric vehicle charging management, combined heat and power, solar photovoltaic generators (smart inverters) and distributed storage. Some VPPs can also manage alternative pricing programs, such as peak time rebates."</p> <p>Portland General Electric's new release as you reference recognizes distributed storage aggregation in a</p>

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
				stakeholders who believe VPPs would be a good investment on our way to achieving a clean energy future.	VPP, which is included in PSE's VPP roadmap. On a journey to a full suite of different types of resources aggregated through its VPP, the first aggregation for PSE was in November 2022 to support Bainbridge Island Targeted Demand Side Management Pilot. Since then PSE has expanded to aggregate behavior based demand response, which included thermostat and water heater programs across our entire service area and later this year will deploy a battery pilot. Residential Battery, Electric Vehicle and Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment programs and additional Stand Alone Battery sites are slated for 2024. PSE will advance its VPP further with integration in the PSE's Advance Distribution Management System.

Attendees (alphabetical by first name)

- | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Justin Nnoli | 7. Katie Chamberlain | 13. Stephanie Chase |
| 2. Cathy Koch | 8. Larry Becker | 14. Susan Christensen Wimer |
| 3. Chris Searcy | 9. Marcus Sellers-Vaughn | 15. Taylor Nickel |
| 4. Don Marsh | 10. Mark Klein | 16. Thomas Kraemer |
| 5. Joel Nightingale | 11. Pat Goodale | 17. Virginia Lohr |
| 6. Kathi Scanlan | 12. Rosemary Moore | |

PSE presenters (alphabetical by first name)

1. David Landers, PSE
2. Meredith Mathis, PSE
3. Ray Outlaw, PSE
4. Ryan Lambert, PSE

Other PSE staff

- | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Carryn Vande Griend | 4. Jens Nedrud | 7. Leslie Almond |
| 2. Corey Corbett | 5. Kara Durbin | 8. Niece Weatherby |
| 3. Jack Wellman | 6. Kelima Yakupova | 9. Tyler Tobin |

Consultant staff (alphabetical by first name)

- | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Claire Moerder, Maul, Foster, and Alongi (MFA) | 4. Kim Zamora Delgado, Triangle Associates | 7. Sophie Glass, Triangle Associates |
| 2. Emilie Pilchowski, Triangle Associates | 5. Pauline Mogilevsky, Triangle Associates | 8. Zak Ott, Triangle Associates |
| 3. Jack Donahue, MFA | 6. Seth Baker, MFA | |