

Documents provided by Richard Lauckhart for the record in PSE IRP Docket No. UE-160918
[Related to the need for Energize Eastside (EE)]

| <u>Date document filed</u> | <u>Comment Description.....</u> |
|----------------------------|---|
| July 25, 2017 | Several documents filed as follows: 1-Lauckhart_Schiffman Load Flow study showing EE is not needed (includes my resume) 2- Rebuttal to PSE criticisms of Lauckhart-Schiffman including Q's and challenges to PSE 3-Part 3: Email demonstrating that there is no Firm Requirement to deliver Canadian Entitlement Power to the Canadian Border 4-Copy of "Agreement on Disposals of the Canadian Entitlement within the United States" covering the years 1998-2024 referred to in the email above 5-Blowing the Whistle Slide show questioning PSE's motive and proof of the need for EE 6-Backstory on PSE's motive to build EE 7-Setting the record straight on EE Technical Facts |
| July 31, 2017 | Comments I made to ColumbiaGrid pointing out the error in their System Assessment write-up regarding the need to deliver 1,350 MW of Treaty power to the Canadian border |
| August 2, 2017 | Evidence that ColumbiaGrid had no substantive role in determining the need for EE |
| August 14, 2017 | Email describing alternatives that would be better than EE if in the future there is a need for reliability improvements on the Eastside Comments demonstrating that the Seattle City Light line is a legitimate and better alternative to EE if there is a need and PSE chooses to use the FERC Open Access Transmission Tariff (OATT) rules available to them in order to enable this option to happen |
| August 21, 2017 | Document describing the "fatal flaws" in the load flow studies PSE ran in an attempt to justify EE. Documents filed this day also include the documents that PSE has alleged show the need for EE because these documents are referenced in the "fatal flaws" write-up |
| August 22, 2017 | Document providing further evidence that the ColumbiaGrid System Assessment write-up stating there exists a Firm Commitment to deliver 1,350 MW of Treaty Power to the Canadian Border is not correct. Includes an email from ColumbiaGrid stating that BPA was the one that told them that such a Firm Commitment exists [even though BPA responded in a Public Record Act request that no such Firm Commitment exists]. ColumbiaGrid explains that it makes no check on what BPA tells them when they write their System Assessment document. They just include the BPA un-validated allegation in their System Assessment |

write-up. This allegation has subsequently been refuted by BPA in their response to the Public Records Act request

- Sept 12, 2017 Questions regarding EE for PSE to respond to at their October 5 IRP Advisory Group meeting
- Sept 14, 2017 One further question for PSE to respond to at their October 5, IRP Advisory Group meeting, i.e. Why has PSE chosen not to re-run their flawed EE load flow studies to fix the flaws?
- October 1, 2017 Document explaining the difference between (1) a WECC Path Rating and (b) a Firm Commitment for transmission delivery. Explains that PSE is erroneously treating the WECC Path Rating for the Northwest to Canada path as if it were a "Firm Commitment" in its load flow studies allegedly showing the need for EE. This treatment of WECC Path Ratings is wrong. PSE needs to re-run their load flow studies allegedly showing the need for EE to eliminate these non-required inter-regional flows.
- October 6, 2017 Comments Lauckhart made at the October 5, 2017 PSE IRP Advisory Group meeting
- List of documents that I placed on the record in UE-160918 that lead me to conclude that Energize Eastside is not needed now or any time soon.