

# Meeting Summary and Feedback Report

Engagement Plan Public Webinar

## Meeting details

- Wednesday, September 20, 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
<p><b>Integrated Resource Planning Overview</b> Kara Durbin, Director, Clean Energy Strategy, PSE</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• An Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) is a 20-year view of what resources appear to be cost-effective while maximizing benefits and minimizing burdens. It does not make resource or program implementation decisions.</li><li>• PSE is exploring an integrated system planning approach to better integrate distribution and transmission system planning, the resource acquisition (RFP) process, traditional IRP modeling, and Clean Energy Implementation Plan processes.</li><li>• PSE is preparing its required work plan for the 2025 IRP for regulatory filing on Oct. 1, 2023. The work plan will include details about planned meetings and engagement opportunities.</li></ul>

Agenda Topic	Summary
<b>Engagement Approach</b> Ray Outlaw, Manager, Communication Initiatives, Clean Energy, PSE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PSE updated its engagement approach in response to feedback from IRP interested parties to evaluate and improve outreach efforts, grow the number and diversity of attendees, and make a concerted effort to solicit meaningful feedback throughout – especially from groups who have not historically engaged in resource planning processes.</li> <li>• The engagement will have a two-track approach including (1) public webinars designed to engage broader audiences and (2) formal Resource Planning Advisory Group (RPAG) consisting of regional experts in a range of resource planning related topics. Members must have organizational affiliation and approval for representation in the RPAG.</li> <li>• The public can participate in IRP development through attending public webinars, observing RPAG meetings and providing verbal public comments during comment opportunities, and submitting written comments on meeting agenda topics one week prior to and one week after each public webinar; the feedback report from public meetings will be shared with the RPAG.</li> </ul>
<b>Next Steps</b> Sophie Glass, Facilitator, Triangle Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• September 27, 2023 – Applications for Resource Planning Advisory Group (RPAG) due for priority consideration; online feedback form closes</li> <li>• October 1, 2023 – PSE files 2025 IRP Work Plan with Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission</li> <li>• October 9, 2023 (estimated) - PSE notifies RPAG members of selection and other applicants of non-selection.</li> <li>• October 16, 2023 – Biennial Clean Energy Implementation Plan Update Public Webinar</li> <li>• October 26 – RPAG kickoff meeting</li> </ul>

## 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	9/1/23	James Adcock, Sierra Club	irp@pse.com	I see, once again, PSE has resurrected the idea of PSE being allowed to "pick and choose" which members of the public are allowed to engage with PSE on issues of "Resource Planning" -- which is in fact the entirety of what "IRP" is about. Further, once again, PSE defining "membership requirements" in a way which exclude my participation -- even though I have been involved in the IRP process as much as anyone has been involved, and for as long as anyone has been involved. I am a	Please see our answer to question number 9, below.

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
				<p>"professional" in that I am an MIT trained electrical engineer, who spent his entire career involved in statistical modeling.</p> <p>Please note my disagreement, again, with this latest "go-around" of PSE's plan to "pick and choose" who can actually participate in the IRP process, as required by law. This is simply PSE's actions, again, to silence people who disagree with what PSE has done, and will be doing.</p> <p>Please note my dissent</p>	
2	9/20/23	James Adcock, Sierra Club	Q&A	Point of Order: Why can we not all see all the question?	The Zoom webinar format is a new tool Puget Sound Energy is utilizing for public meetings where there is a large volume of participants. Participants may use the Q&A tool to ask questions and PSE will answer the questions for all participants to view or live in the meeting. We acknowledge that some participants favor being able to see other participants and utilize the chat function freely. We will take feedback into consideration for future public meetings.
3	9/20/23	Don Marsh, Washington Clean Energy Coalition	Q&A	We can't see other participant names? I think that is actually useful in previous meetings.	Thank you for that feedback. We will post a full list of this meeting's attendees after the meeting at <a href="https://pse.com/irp">pse.com/irp</a> . <i>Final participant lists are at the end of this document.</i>
4	9/20/23	James Adcock, Sierra Club	Q&A	James Adcock is representing Sierra Club.	Noted, thank you.
5	9/20/23	Don Marsh, Washington Clean Energy Coalition	Q&A	I suppose I understand lack of visibility in a webinar, but I hope the regular meeting format is maintained for the RPAG.	Thank you for your feedback. We will use standard Zoom platform (not webinar format) for our RPAG meetings. <b>Post meeting correction:</b> <i>We are looking into using the standard Zoom meeting format for</i>

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
					<i>our RPAG meetings based on feedback received from interested parties during this meeting.</i>
6	9/20/23	Don Marsh, Washington Clean Energy Coalition	Q&A	How many people are online today?	We have 49 participants, 9 of which are PSE IRP or Triangle Associates staff. <i>Final participant lists are at the end of this document.</i>
7	9/20/23	Joel Nightingale, UTC	Q&A	FYI, I'm not seeing a link to the feedback form in the chat. All that is there so far is the agenda and the slides for today's meeting.	You can find the feedback form at <a href="https://www.pse.com/en/IRP/Get-involved/Give-feedback">https://www.pse.com/en/IRP/Get-involved/Give-feedback</a>
8	9/20/23	Kate Brouns, Renewable Northwest	Q&A	Would the integrated approach also explore combining gas and electric IRP processes? Thanks!	Thank you for your question. That is another aspect an Integrated System Plan (ISP) could explore. For the 2023 Electric Progress Report and Gas Utility IRP PSE modeled more interplay between gas and electric, and that is something we could potentially look at further for 2025. There appears to be even greater opportunity for integration in the 2029 resource planning cycle. We are interested in discussing more what that may look like.
9	9/20/23	James Adcock, Sierra Club	Q&A	Sierra Club: Once before PSE tried to "pick and choose" which members of the public -- including organizations -- were fully allowed to participate in the technical meetings -- include asking technical questions and getting real, open, truthful, and meaningful answers, and UTC told PSE then that there was no basis in law for Puget to "pick and choose" who could participate in a full manner. Why does Puget think they can try this again now.	We believe this process is consistent with the legal requirements we need to meet. We think that by having a public webinar track as well as our Resource Planning Advisory Group (RPAG) that 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.

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
					Additionally, members of the public are welcome to give public comment at RPAG meetings during a designated time and may submit technical questions to PSE via email at <a href="mailto:irp@pse.com">irp@pse.com</a> or through the online feedback form
10	9/20/23	Don Marsh, Washington Clean Energy Coalition	Q&A	Monitoring both the Q&A and the Chat windows is a bit much and can lead to duplication. It would be better to have just the chat. Also, we see some duplication of questions since we can't see what someone else has asked.	Thank you for your feedback; we will take it into consideration for future public meetings.
11	9/20/23	Jennifer Keller	Q&A	Among the time options for the meeting, why is "evening" not offered?	Thank you; we will send out this poll to our IRP newsletter subscribers and can add an "evening" option.
12	9/20/23	Froylan Sifuentes	Q&A	What are the main benefits of following a more integrated approach to the IRP process?	Over time an Integrated System Plan (ISP) may create more efficiency in our resource planning processes. Integration in this manner may help us support more specific actions in our clean energy transition.
13	9/20/23	Joel Nightingale, UTC	Q&A	How can participants expect their feedback/issues raised in IRP webinars to inform the IRP process?	We plan to share all public comments with the RPAG and consider how and where we may address those comments in the IRP. PSE will also respond to comments received via online feedback form, email at <a href="mailto:irp@pse.com">irp@pse.com</a> , and during webinars.
14	9/20/23	James Adcock, Sierra Club	Q&A	My understanding is that members of the general public who are not allowed in the RPAG will not be allowed to ask clarifying technical questions of the RPAG process. Is this correct?	Members of the public who are not RPAG members are welcome to give public comment at RPAG meetings during a designated time and may submit technical questions

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
					to PSE via email at <a href="mailto:irp@pse.com">irp@pse.com</a> or through the online feedback form.
15	9/20/23	Don Marsh, Washington Clean Energy Coalition	Q&A	Can the public listen to an RPAG meeting, even if they aren't allowed to contribute?	PSE will live stream all RPAG meetings via YouTube for members of the public, or they may join the Zoom webinar platform as an observer during those meetings. Members of the public are welcome to give public comment during RPAG meetings at designated times.
16	9/20/23	James Adcock, Sierra Club	Public comment	I want to clarify I'm representing Sierra Club. Sierra Club objects to the new format, which in practice we believe freezes out public participation, including myself who has been involved in the IRP process – including all the technical aspects – for 15 years now. I have been effective in public participation, for example, after a decade of work forcing Puget to update their weather data, which was 80 years out of date, to somewhat better climate modeling data, but that data is still flawed and we would like to get Puget to fix that. Also, we for example, caught Puget claiming in documents to the UTC three times the energy output from their renewable additions as will actually be generated. It is because the public has been involved that we are able to discover these problems and ask these changes in Puget behavior. I've been an electrical engineer, graduate of MIT. I spent my entire career doing statistical modeling of systems. I have patents in those areas. Sierra Club wants to see the CVs of anyone else Puget claims is better qualified for the proposed RPAG, which we believe should be open to the public anyway. WAC 40-90-238 section 5: public participation is essential to the development of an effective plan. Puget over the last few years has consistently moved away from that direction, refusing to answer questions in an open truthful manner, refusing to allow public participation and allowing less and less time over time for the meetings. Meetings where just Sophie	Thank you for your feedback.

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
				and Puget talks and the public is not allowed to ask technical questions or allowed to comment on the whole process. We think this is terrible and I will leave it at that. I refer people to The Mortality of the Cost of Carbon paper by R. Daniel Bressler, which explains how many people die from emissions and why we want Puget to get things cleaned up sooner rather than later.	
17	9/20/23	Don Marsh, Washington Clean Energy Coalition	Public comment	I'm Don Marsh representing Washington Clean Energy Coalition. I also have some of these same concerns. I have been involved in IRPs now for close to a decade. I think the first one I participated in was the 2015 one. At that time I had no particular qualifications to participate, and yet because PSE allowed members of the public to participate in the IRP advisory groups, which was the only meeting format at that time, I was able to learn a lot about this process and now I think I'm fully qualified not to be a Resource Planning Advisor. But if I had been excluded back then I don't know how I would have gained the knowledge and experience I have today that enables me to participate. So, I think I agree with Jim that just allowing people to watch quietly or just be in this public webinar...I'm not sure that a concern that somebody has within this webinar would be properly promoted to the RPAG, especially if they're not able to voice that concern in that forum. Of course, here there's probably not enough technical depth to really make a big difference. So, I do see that it feels like this is actually an impediment to future public participation and will gradually diminish the public's ability to engage the way I have. Thank you very much.	Thank you for your feedback.
18	9/20/23	Jennifer Keller	Q&A	What does Jim Adcock want to say? I am very interested in that. And there's plenty of time.	Mr. Adcock was not requesting to speak a second time.
19	9/20/23	James Adcock, Sierra Club	Q&A	Sorry -- I'm just having trouble your new (to me) zoom webinar thing.	Thank you for clarifying.
20	9/20/23	James Adcock, Sierra Club	Q&A	How do you sign up for the email mailing list?	You can register to receive IRP email updates on our IRP website

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
					<a href="https://www.pse.com/en/IRP/Get-email-updates">https://www.pse.com/en/IRP/Get-email-updates</a>
21	9/20/23	Joel Nightingale, UTC	Q&A	How does PSE plan to evaluate this new public participation format to understand if it is working as intended (i.e. facilitating more, and meaningful, participation and more diverse representation)?	We will evaluate in real time the effectiveness of our updated engagement approach. We want to evaluate the diversity of voices participating in our meetings and whether or not we are obtaining feedback that is ultimately contributing meaningfully to how we conduct our resource planning processes.
22	9/20/23	Don Marsh, Washington Clean Energy Coalition	Q&A	We would appreciate transparency in the RPAG member selection process. For anyone who is denied, we would like to know who they are and why they were rejected. This will help us understand PSE's criteria, motivation, and the final representation in the RPAG.	Thank you for your feedback.
23	9/20/23	James Adcock, Sierra Club	Q&A	We have had very real, substantial participation from many voices in years past when Puget had real in-person IRP meetings.	Thank you for your feedback.
24	9/20/23	Christine Bunch	Q&A	Can you post the link for the RPAG application?	The RPAG application is located on our IRP website <a href="#">here</a> ; or you can use this direct <a href="#">link</a> to the application.
25	9/20/23	James Adcock, Sierra Club	Feedback form	Comments as Sierra Club representative: Sierra Club opposes PSE planned changes in format, including creating a new restrictive membership RPAG Group. We believe that PSE has no basis in law to prohibit public participation in any part of the process, including being able to ask real, meaningful technical questions in the RPAG forum, and getting real, meaningful, open, and honest answers to those questions from PSE. UTC has told PSE once before that they cannot prevent full public participation in all mtgs.	Thank you for your feedback. Please see our answer to question number 9 above.

No.	Date	Interested party	Submitted via	Question or comment	PSE response
26	9/20/23	Don Marsh, Washington Clean Energy Coalition	Feedback form	I appreciate PSE's effort to engage a wider and possibly less technical audience with these shorter public webinars. I hope they are successful in reaching more members of our community and helping to educate the public on the resource planning process. However, as I expressed in the meeting, I am worried that PSE is becoming the gatekeeper and an obstacle for greater public involvement. I have more to say on this, but this form only accepts a few sentences before cutting off further comment, which is u	Thank you for your comment. PSE has updated the online feedback form to accommodate a greater amount of characters for written feedback.

## Attendees (alphabetical by first name)

- |                          |                       |                           |                        |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Alexandra Karpoff     | 19. Diana Aguilar     | 37. John Ollis            | 55. Maxwell Judd       |
| 2. Alicia Robinson       | 20. Elizabeth Hossner | 38. Justin Kotwicki       | 56. Megan Larkin       |
| 3. Allison Jacobs        | 21. Froylan Sifuentes | 39. Kasey Curtis          | 57. Michah Engum       |
| 4. Aliza Seelig          | 22. Gurvinder Singh   | 40. Kate Brouns           | 58. Michelle Wildie    |
| 5. Amy Berg              | 23. Heather Mulligan  | 41. Kathi Scanlan         | 59. Mona Davis         |
| 6. Audrey Neubauer       | 24. Heather Pierce    | 42. Katie Chamberlain     | 60. Nancy Shimeall     |
| 7. Austin Nnoli          | 25. Jack Wellman      | 43. Kelima Yakupova       | 61. Nathan Critchfield |
| 8. Ayla Pavelka          | 26. James Adcock      | 44. Kelly Xu              | 62. Nelli Doroshkin    |
| 9. Benjamin Zwirek       | 27. Jennifer Coulson  | 45. Ken Pratt             | 63. Pete Stoppani      |
| 10. Brian Robertson      | 28. Jennifer Keller   | 46. Larry Becker          | 64. Peter Newcomb      |
| 11. Byron Harmon         | 29. Jennifer Snyder   | 47. Leslie Almond         | 65. Peter Werner       |
| 12. Cathy Koch           | 30. Jessi Durst       | 48. Linda Golley          | 66. Phillip Popoff     |
| 13. Carryn Van De Griend | 31. Jim Dennison      | 49. Lisa Anderson         | 67. Rachel Clark       |
| 14. Christine Bunch      | 32. Jim Schretter     | 50. Lorin Mollander       | 68. Randy Hardy        |
| 15. Christopher Beasley  | 33. Jisong Wu         | 51. Luka Tejada           | 69. Rosemary Moore     |
| 16. Cindy Vu             | 34. Joel Nightingale  | 52. Marcus Sellers-Vaughn | 70. Sachi Begur        |
| 17. Corey Corbett        | 35. John Deese        | 53. Mark Klein            | 71. Sarah Buck         |
| 18. Dale Porter          | 36. John Robbins      | 54. Matt Larson           | 72. Scott Broten       |

73. Sheri Maynard  
74. Stephanie Chase

75. Susan Miller  
76. Taylor Nickel

77. Tyler Tobin  
78. Vincent Su

79. Wendy Gerlitz  
80. Willard Westre

## Presenters (alphabetical by first name)

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

## Consultant staff (alphabetical by first name)

1. Claire Moerder, Maul Foster Alongi (MFA)
2. Kim Zamora Delgado, Triangle Associates
3. Pauline Mogilevsky, Triangle Associates
4. Seth Baker, MFA
5. Sophie Glass, Triangle Associates
6. Zak Ott, Triangle Associates