

Webinar #10: Clean Energy Action Plan and Clean Energy Implementation Plan, Economic, Health and Environmental Benefits Assessment of Current Conditions and delivery system and grid modernization needs

11/17/2020

Overview

On November 16, 2020 Puget Sound Energy hosted an online meeting with stakeholders to discuss the Clean Energy Action Plan and Clean Energy Implementation Plan, Economic, Health and Environmental Benefits Assessment of Current Conditions and delivery system and grid modernization needs. Additionally, participants were able to ask questions and make comments using a chat box provided by the Go2Meeting platform.

Below is a report of the questions submitted to the chat box. Answers to the questions were provided verbally by IRP staff during the webinar. Please note that questions were answered in order of relevance to the topic currently being discussed. Questions regarding other topics were answered at the end of the webinar session.

To view a recording of the webinar and to hear responses from staff, please visit the project website at pse-irp.participate.online.

Attendees

A total of 75 stakeholders and PSE staff attended the webinar, plus another 6 attendees who called into the meeting and did not identify themselves (81 people total).

Attendees included: Allison Jacobs, Andrew Wood, Anne Newcomb, Anthony O'Rourke, Ben Farrow, Bill Pascoe, Bill Westre, Bob Stolaski, Brett Rendina, Brian Tyson, Brian Grunkemeyer, Chad Ihrig, Charlie Black, Charlie Inman, Cindy Song, Colin Crowley, Cress Wakefield, Cuong Nguyen, David Meyer, Diann Strom, Don Marsh, Doug Howell, Elaine Markham, Elyette Weinstein, Eric Kang, Fred Heutte, Gurvinder Singh, James Adcock, Jennifer Snyder, Jens Nedrud, Jon Piliaris, Joni Bosh, Kara Durbin, Kathi Scanlan, Katie Ware, Kendra White, Kevin Jones, Kristina Kelly, Kyle Frankiewicz, Leslie Almond, Lori Elworth, Marcus Sellers-Vaughn, Mariel Thuraingham, Norm Hansen, Warren Halverson, Peter Brown, Rahul Venkatesh, Scott Williams, Shay Bauman, Sheri Maynard, Stephanie Chase, Ted Drennan, Thad Curtz, Therese Miranda-Blackney, Tom Eckman, Tyler Tobin, Vlad Gutman-Britten, Virginia Lohr, Wendy Gerlitz, and Wiemin Dang.

Questions Received

Questions from attendees are posted in the order in which they were received. The webinar began at 1:00 PM PDT and ended at 3:48 PM PDT.

Name	Time Sent	Comment
James Adcock	1:11 PM	Comment: I express concerns about the big elements which will not be ready in time for the Draft IRP, which I believe will keep participants from commenting in an informed manner on that Draft.
Don Marsh	1:13 PM	The Draft IRP should contain all the parts that stakeholders would want to participate and comment on. If the analysis is not available, the Draft IRP should be delayed until they are.
Kevin Jones	1:14 PM	The current CETA Rules call for UTC review only of DRAFT IRP's, which PSE is now telling us will be incomplete on their filing date. Will PSE be addressing this issue with the UTC so that a complete PSE DRAFT IRP will be available for review?
Kevin Jones	1:17 PM	James - I believe you filed a technical input (vice a comment)...
Doug Howell	1:26 PM	Raised hand. slide 19
Brian Grunkemeyer	1:29 PM	I strongly encourage PSE to invite land use planners throughout your service area to participate in the IRP Advisory Group.
Brian Grunkemeyer	1:30 PM	we have data on WA avoided tailpipe emissions from some EV's.
Don Marsh	1:32 PM	Are there any situations where a person would be excluded from the IRP Advisory Group? I ask because PSE once told me that I did not meet the qualifications for participating in the Technical Advisory Group. I hope that isn't happening any more.
Doug Howell	1:33 PM	Raised hand, follow up question on Slide 19?
Don Marsh	1:34 PM	Thanks for the answer, Irena. I am encouraged by PSE's increasing openness in that regard.
Elise Johnson	1:42 PM	A reminder to please mute your phone or computer mic to prevent feedback when speakers are presenting.
Michele Kvam	1:43 PM	Caller 04, please mute. Thank you.
Thad Curtz via Alexandra Streamer	1:47 PM	Reposting a question Thad Curtz posed to Organizers: Re Slide 22 - Is your view that any action which doesn't meet all of these criteria should be excluded from the plan, or is it that the suite of actions as a whole should meet these criteria?
James Adcock	1:49 PM	Slide 26: How do you want us to best send you our inputs requested on this slide?
Kyle Frankiewich	1:54 PM	Q on slide 29
James Adcock	1:58 PM	Comment: I would ask that for all PSE beneficially programs, such as weatherization, energy efficiency, etc. that PSE report on these programs divided into two groups -- the first section being ratepayers in the group "highly impacted communities and vulnerable populations" vs. the second group being ratepayers not in that group, and report actual financial spending normalized on a per ratepayer basis for the 1st group vs. the 2nd group -- such that we can see overall which PSE beneficially programs are equitably meeting the actual needs of each set of groups -- or not. For example I would be concerned that many PSE beneficially programs might be in practice inaccessible by the 1st group, either due to lack of funds, or because of the "split incentives" problem -- i.e. landlords vs. renters, or even just from a lack of understanding. If PSE beneficially programs for whatever reason are not reaching the 1st group, then that is an equity problem which needs to be actually fixed.

Don Marsh	2:01 PM	The Health Disparities Map is a very useful place to start. It shows that the census tract nearest PSE's Tacoma LNG facility is very highly impacted, vulnerable, and has a high percentage of residents from tribes. It would be useful to understand how PSE would change its approach under this policy. Would you find a better place for the plant? Would you seek higher participation from residents who have many difficult challenges they are facing? How are these policies implemented in practice?
Joni Bosh	2:02 PM	Will you be capturing downwind impacts in any of these initial metrics? Or just generation point impacts?
Michele Kvam	2:03 PM	Warren HALVERSON has some questions submitted in the IRP mailbox; he is on the phone
Fred Huette	2:04 PM	Has PSE reviewed the Avista assessment of Vulnerable Populations & Highly Impacted Communities? While this is an initial effort and can be enhanced and improved, this shows the promise of combining disparate data sources to provide important insights relevant to CETA and other planning contexts, and we recommend PSE and stakeholders take a look. Here's the most recent presentation (starting on slide 85): https://www.myavista.com/-/media/myavista/content-documents/about-us/our-company/irp-documents/2021-irp-tac-2-presentations.pdf?la=en
James Adcock	2:05 PM	Comment re slide 35 "Environmental Impacts." I am concerned that PSE has not been responsive to date to the issue of the environmental impact of new Transmission Lines, and how needless oppressive to the perceived environmental quality of the communities where a new transmission line is pushed through. For example PSE just cut down a huge number of beautiful trees along 148th in Bellevue, replacing those trees with gigantic creosote glue-lam poles -- some about 6 feet wide, and placed in the business property of a minority owner. PSE needs to honestly consider all the environmental impacts of their new transmission lines and make meaningful design choices to minimize the needless and excessive environmental damages and environmental ugliness of those transmission lines. Rather than just doing what is quickest and cheapest.
Bill Westre	2:09 PM	Raise Hand
Bill Westre	2:09 PM	James, that is a very good point. Transmission lines are often placed in impacted communities, because they are not seen as desirable in nicer parts of our community or business districts.
Warren Halverson via Michele Kvam	2:09 PM	From Warren Halverson: How does PSE map communities and/or customers to DOH maps? If the community can be defined down to the customer level, are you concerned at privacy issues?
Brian Grunkemeyer	2:09 PM	Raise hand
Charlie Black	2:10 PM	Kyle Frankiewich had a question on Slide 29 - has that been addressed?
Fred Huette	2:12 PM	raise hand for a follow-up
Joni Bosh	2:14 PM	Agree with Kyle's interpretation of slide 29

James Adcock	2:16 PM	Comment: The Slide 24 RCW quote makes it clear for the purposes of this section of environmental impact we are only considering the impacts on Washington State residents.
James Adcock	2:18 PM	Comment: +1 Brian -- avoided tailpipe emissions -- or the lack of avoided tailpipe emissions (where PSE's EV programs "fail") should be part of the consideration and evaluation.
James Adcock	2:19 PM	Comment: For example PSE support of electric busses might be a way to extend tailpipe reduction efforts to more communities.
Brian Grunkemeyer	2:26 PM	Great idea, Jim. Another idea would be looking at the Mileage Purchase Agreement as a financing mechanism to make EV's more affordable. This works out well for high-mileage drivers, including potentially transportation network company drivers. Adrian at Flux Auto is commercializing the MPA idea. https://www.fluxauto.co/
Brian Grunkemeyer	2:29 PM	(Sorry, it's Andrew, not Adrian)
James Adcock	2:32 PM	Slide 41: Does "Lowest reasonable cost" as related to "delivery system infrastructure" mean that PSE needs to implement transmission lines in a way that leads to needless and excess local environmental destruction?
Kevin Jones	2:34 PM	Slide 41: Given the new rules inclusion of electricity delivery systems in power planning, does PSE believe this applies to ALL transmission systems even if they were proposed prior to these new rules?
James Adcock	2:38 PM	Thank you I think you just did so.
Doug Howell	2:38 PM	Is PSE now assuming its full transmission capacity on the Colstrip Transmission System?
James Adcock	2:39 PM	Slide 44: How many times a year does my Bellevue neighborhood have to lose power before PSE considers that they are NOT delivering power "safely and reliably?"
Kevin Jones	2:49 PM	Follow-up to my earlier question: Does PSE believe that ALL transmission projects will be discussed in IRP and CEIP planning meetings even if those projects were proposed prior to these new rules?
Doug Howell	2:49 PM	Okay. Thank you
James Adcock	2:51 PM	Follow-up: We lose power all the time. Meanwhile PSE is arguing how many peakers do they need to avoid a system-wide outage every 20 years, or every 40 years, and "reach back in time" 100 years to find weather conditions which can no longer possibly exist -- and while ignoring that in practice our neighborhood loses it's power All The Time, because tree maintenance is not being done.
Charlie Black	2:53 PM	Regarding previously-planned transmission projects, can you clarify what 'included' means? Does that mean those projects will be evaluated, or will they be assumed to be built?
James Adcock	3:00 PM	Slide 48: Question: What does it take to actually get neighborhood tree maintenance so that we can actually experience the kind of safety and reliability which PSE claims it is designing it's power system to? We lose power all the time. Multiple times a year. Meanwhile PSE is arguing how many peakers do they need to avoid a system-wide outage every 20 years, or every 40 years, and is "reaching back in time" 100 years to find weather conditions which can no longer possibly exist -- and while ignoring that in practice our neighborhood loses it's power All The Time, because tree maintenance is not being done. What does it take so that we can actually in practice experience safe and reliable power delivery?

Charlie Black	3:00 PM	I do not see Energy Eastside listed on Slide 49. Does that imply the delivery system plan is assuming it will be built and therefore not evaluated in the delivery system plan?
Kevin Jones	3:00 PM	Slide 49: Which of these projects are associated with Energize Eastside?
Kyle Frankiewich	3:01 PM	Q on slide 43: Does PSE propose a threshold for what kinds or sizes of delivery system projects will be "included in the IRP"?
Warren Halverson via Michele Kvam	3:04 PM	<p>Questions from the IRP mailbox from Warren:</p> <p>Two questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is item 7 the Richards Road substation? 2. PSE did not submit a formal IRP this last year and, in fact, abruptly canceled a long awaited discussion of transmission and distribution activities. Now, with some details about CETA we can understand why 😊 <p>2. Please provide the current status and update where PSE is concerning Energize Eastside?</p> <p>Include, does PSE stand by their forecast of 2.4 per cent peak growth? If not what is the current peak demand forecast for the Eastside?</p> <p>Finally, Energize Eastside forecasts that took place 5-7 years ago showed we would basically be in deep trouble in 2019. That has not happened either winter or summer. We request you provide a 10 year Update to that forecast?</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Warren Halverson</p>
Kyle Frankiewich	3:04 PM	Q on slide 49: I see that these 11 projects are "in planning phase". Can PSE describe the various phases of the delivery system planning and implementation process, and detail how the handoff occurs from planning to implementation?
Joni Bosh	3:07 PM	Slide 49 - it looks like all of these projects would be pursued even if CETA didn't exist, correct?
Joni Bosh	3:11 PM	Thanks
Bill Westre	3:16 PM	When will DERMS and TOU be ready?
James Adcock	3:18 PM	<p>Slide 51: In regards to "Enhanced Meter Data Visibility" will customers have the same access to their meter data that PSE has? If not why not -- why shouldn't we be allowed to have the same access to our own usage data as PSE has?</p> <p>Continued: For example is PSE has access to hourly meter data, can the customer have access to hourly meter data? If not why not?</p>

Tom Eckman	3:22 PM	Slide 51 - Does PSE anticipate that it will ultimately have DER potential assessments by feeder (or substation) that is linked to its load forecast for that feeder/substation? Does PSE anticipate including DERs as resource options in its capacity expansion modeling? If so, does PSE anticipate initiating DER acquisition programs, similar to its EE programs, in addition to providing TOU or other rate design signals for DER development?
Lori Elworth	3:23 PM	Transmission line planning data should be updated prior to building if the data is not current. Customers are paying a huge price for old technology of Energize Eastside. There are better solutions today. Can this be addressed? Warren had some good questions that were not answered.
Joni Bosh	3:23 PM	Do you have an existing analysis/report on what PSE needs/is evaluating for Grid modernization? Slide 51, I think? My mistake, might be slide 52?
James Adcock	3:30 PM	Comment: Just to give one "Reality check point" I just checked what is available to me in terms of meter data, and I can still only access meter data on a daily-cumulative basis, not on an hourly basis. Having access to hourly-usage data would allow customers to begin to understand where their electrical and/or natural gas usage is going to - allow them to actually target conservation and efficiency efforts.
Joni Bosh	3:31 PM	Thanks
James Adcock	3:39 PM	Raise hand
Cress Wakefield	3:39 PM	How are you currently working with commercial customers and large companies that are driving net positive energy goals on their sites?
Kyle Frankiewicz	3:41 PM	Q on Jens's response: what litigation is pending regarding Energize Eastside, and why would that prevent conversation in the context of this public meeting?
Anne Newcomb	3:43 PM	Is PSE considering burying wires? If not why? With all of the trees and wind in this area I have always thought it makes sense.
Kyle Frankiewicz	3:45 PM	follow-up: I can understand that there might be some hesitance to discuss issues under litigation right now. Could you provide more background for the legal dispute or a reference to it?
Bill Westre	3:45 PM	Thanks to all the presenters
Anne Newcomb	3:46 PM	Thanks!
Kyle Frankiewicz	3:47 PM	Thank you for offering stakeholders additional time!