

WAC 480-100-238 IRP Rulemaking UE-190698
Notice of Opportunity to File Written Comments on the First Discussion Draft
by December 20, 2019

Summary of Comments

Stakeholders

- Avista
- Pacific Power and Light (PP&L)
- Puget Sound Energy (PSE)
- Public Counsel (PC)
- Northwest Energy Coalition (NVEC)
- Renewable Northwest (RN)
- Front and Centered (F&C)
- Northwest and Intermountain Power Producers (NIPPC)
- Climate Solutions (CS)
- Washington Environmental Council (WEC)
- Vashon Climate Action Group (VCAG)
- King County-Cities Climate Collaboration (K4C)
- Sierra Club
- Invenenergy

The citations mentioned below refer to the initial IRP draft rules. Staff reorganized the new draft rules published on August 14, 2020 as follows:

Definitions: -6XX is now -605

Purpose of Integrated Resource Planning: -605 is now -615

Content of an Integrated Resource Plan: -610 is now -620

Integrated Resource Plan Timing: -615 is now -625

Public Participation in an Integrated Resource Plan: --620 is now -630

Contents

1a. Should the Commission only require a full IRP every four years, with a limited IRP progress report every two years? Why or why not?..... 3

1b. If the Commission were to require only a progress report every two years, filed two years after the full IRP, which components of an IRP do you think should be updated? Which components do you think only need to be updated every four years?..... 6

2. The discussion draft proposes that a utility must file a work plan at least fifteen months prior to the due date of its IRP, and a completed draft IRP four months prior to the due date. Does this proposed schedule allow sufficient time for a thorough IRP with robust public engagement? If not, please provide a preferred timeline..... 9

3a. Please describe: a) an ideal timelines on when a utility files and IRP and a CEIP; (b) the relationship between an IRP and a CEIP; (c) How the CEAP in the IRP will inform the CEIP..... 17

4a. Should the Commission move the public hearing to a date between the utility’s submission of its draft IRP and the final IRP? Is there any other point in time that public comment hearings are most beneficial to public engagement? 19

4b. Given the integration of the IRP, the CEAP, and the CEIP, is there any other point in time that public comment hearings are most beneficial to public engagement? 27

5. Draft WAC 480-100-615(2) states that a utility must file a draft of its integrated resource plan four months prior to the due date of the final plan. Are there requirements in WAC 480-100-610 that are not necessary or which reduce a utility’s flexibility in their preparation of a draft IRP?..... 31

6. Historically, the Commission has used an acknowledgment letter with comments to affirm that the utility has met the legal and regulatory requirements for filing an IRP. Given the advent of the CEIP, which is informed by the IRP and approved by the Commission, should the Commission consider a different type of response to an IRP, including but not necessarily limited to a compliance letter, an acknowledgment letter with comments, or Commission approval? Please explain your reasoning. 32

7. Should the requirements for assessments in RCW 19.280.030(1)(k) and the requirements to ensure all customers benefit in RCW 19.405.040(8) be connected in Commission rules? If so, how might this integration work? 35

8. What types of information should a utility provide in its IRP to document that the utility is ensuring all customers are benefitting from the transition to clean energy? 36

9a. How should the Commission guide the type of information included in the utility’s assessment (e.g. rule, policy statement, or some other method)? 39

10. RCW 19.280.030(9) prohibits using IRPs as a basis to bring legal action against electric utilities. That is, an IRP cannot be adjudicated before the Commission. Considering this statutory prohibition, where and when should a utility report compliance ensuring all customers are benefitting from the transitions to clean energy? 41

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

11. In the portfolio analysis and preferred portfolio section of draft WAC 480-100-610(11), should the Commission include criteria in the narrative explanation in addition to those listed in subsections (a) through (f)? 42

12. Should the Commission provide more specific guidance in these rules on how and where a utility incorporates the social cost of greenhouse gases? See draft WAC 480-100-610(6) and WAC 480-100-610(12)(j). Why or why not? 46

13a. Should the Commission address resource adequacy metrics in rule by identifying the scope of allowed metrics or identifying the specific metric utilities should use? Alternatively, should the Commission allow utilities the flexibility to change their resource adequacy requirement to meet current best practices without going through a rulemaking? Please explain why one method is preferred over the other..... 48

13b. If the Commission does not establish specific guidelines in rule, it is possible different utilities will use different resource adequacy metrics, which may make effective comparisons among utilities more difficult. If not by rule, should the Commission provide more specific guidelines through another process, such as a policy statement?..... 54

14. Should the Commission provide additional guidance regarding cost-effective demand response and load management? See WAC 480-100-610(2)(b) and (12)(e). 56

15. Draft WAC 480-100-610(12) includes a requirement for utilities to identify in the IRP the CEIP’s four-year energy efficiency, demand response, and renewable energy goals in the CEAP. This is the only listed requirement of a CEAP that is not in statute. Is it necessary and appropriate for the utility to identify proposed four-year CEIP targets in the CEAP? 57

Other Issues..... 59

1a. Should the Commission only require a full IRP every four years, with a limited IRP progress report every two years? Why or why not?

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
Avista	Supports 4-year IRP cycle because it aligns with CAP and eliminates unnecessary analysis and process.	Staff agrees.
PP&L	Does not oppose 4-year cycle so long as mechanisms are in place for a utility to seek acknowledgment should there be changes between 4-year cycles. Must manage a multi-jurisdictional planning process, which is biennial.	Staff believes that PP&L could continue to file every two years even under a 4-year IRP.
PSE	Supporting moving to 4-year cycle as it aligns with the cadence of CETA. Balances the need for stakeholder input and time for the utility to implement the law.	Staff agrees.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

PC	4 years is appropriate for fluidity and coordination between IRP, CEAP, and CEIP requirements.	Staff agrees.
NWEC	Maintain 2-year schedule. Waiting every four years will result in utility planning processes that lag behind best available technology and pricing. Consider staggering individual utility filings.	Staff disagrees that the UTC should maintain a two-year cycle. We believe it is appropriate to align the IRP and the CEIP schedules. However, Staff agrees that utilities should update both demand-side and supply-side resources in the IRP progress report.
RN	Does not have a firm position, but notes that there is rapid change and many inputs may become stale in four years.	Staff agrees that utilities should update supply-side resources after two years in the IRP progress report.
F&C	Maintain 2-year cycle. The IRP is an invaluable opportunity for public scrutiny.	Staff believes that the public will have ample opportunity to provide feedback to the utility through the development of the IRP and the two-year update.
NIPPC	Maintain 2-year cycle. More frequent IRPs are necessary to provide the most up to date information for procurement, RA, and avoided costs. The transition to move to renewable-based grid is happening too quickly to move to a four-year cycle. Four-year cycle will make avoided cost filings more complex and challenging.	Staff agrees that the utilities to update demand-side and supply-side resources every two years in the IRP and the IRP update.
CS	Maintain 2-year cycle as it provides a sufficient amount of time to complete an IRP, while also preventing information being grossly outdated and losing its value.	Staff disagrees that the UTC should maintain a two-year cycle. However, Staff agrees that utilities should update both demand-side and supply-side resources every two years.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

WEC	Maintain 2-year cycle with a continuous public process.	Staff believes that the public will have ample opportunity to provide feedback to the utility through the development of the IRP, the two-year update, and the development of the Clean Energy Implementation Plan (CEIP).
VCAG	No, maintain 2-year schedule. Need more frequent evaluation of IRPs during a time of accelerated change. Moving to four years depletes the regulatory oversight.	Staff disagrees that the UTC should maintain a two-year cycle. However, Staff agrees that utilities should update both demand-side and supply-side resources every two years.
K4C ¹	Supports 4-year IRP cycle.	Staff agrees.
Sierra Club	Maintain 2-year cycle. Advancements in technology and changing economics are happening too fast. There is a fundamental need for consistent oversight and IRP process is one of only venues for this critical role.	Staff disagrees that the UTC should maintain a two-year cycle. However, Staff agrees that utilities should update both demand-side and supply-side resources in the IRP progress report.
Invenergy	Maintain 2-year cycle. During period of stability then 4-year cycle makes sense. But the system is undergoing major transformation, technological changes, and regional energy market restructuring. Continue biennial process and allow utilities to file waivers if they can demonstrate that there are not major issues meriting a full IRP.	Staff believes aligning the IRP schedule with the Clean Energy Implementation Plan schedule will produce timely, well-developed resource plans and reduce administrative burden.

¹ Includes King County and partner cities of Burien, Kenmore, Kirkland, Mercer Island, Shoreline, and Snoqualmie.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

1b. If the Commission were to require only a progress report every two years, filed two years after the full IRP, which components of an IRP do you think should be updated? Which components do you think only need to be updated every four years?

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
Avista	<p>Limited in scope and process and limited to 10-year horizon.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update to the peak and energy load forecast • Updated current resources; • Update to the energy efficiency & demand response potential and price/availability changes for resource options; • The previously filed Preferred Resource Strategy (PRS) should be evaluated and a new PRS developed if there have been significant changes to the input data. • All other changes should be at the discretion of the utility if they are material. • Changes since the last filing and any action items for the next IRP. • The analysis should not be required to address scenarios unless pending market forces require it. • The utility should be required to have one technical meeting to discuss changes and a second to share results. The remaining public process should remain as with the other IRP rules. <p>The full IRP should address all of the items in the final rules.</p>	<p>Staff agrees that this is a comprehensive list, except Staff disagrees that the update should be limited to a 10-year horizon. The planning horizon should account for all known significant policy targets. Staff is generally more comfortable with a time horizon of approximately 20 years.</p>
PP&L	<p>The current proposed list is adequate as PP&L will continue to develop a full IRP every two years.</p>	<p>Staff is not proposing additional requirements that PP&L's full IRP would not already include.</p>

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

PSE	<p>The progress report should focus on how a utility is implementing its 4-year CEIP. Do not model a re-optimized portfolio as it raises the question of changing the 4-year CEIP targets. Include a CEIP progress report and an updated conservation potential assessment.</p>	<p>Staff recommends that the UTC adjust the utility’s CEIP energy efficiency target to align with the 2nd biennium’s biennial conservation target per RCW 19.285. To develop the conservation target, the utility must run its portfolio optimization program to develop the 10-year conservation potential. Therefore, the utility must re-optimize its portfolio.</p>
PC	<p>Progress reports should be substantive progress reports, and stakeholders should determine the process by which the UTC reviews and comments on progress reports. Looks to Colorado as an example. Progress reports must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DSR including conservation to align with BCP, • Load forecasts, • Resource adequacy, and • Progress on other components of 480-100-610. 	<p>Staff agrees with each of these inclusions; however, we recommend that the resource adequacy study should be only be required in the 4-year IRP. A 4-year requirement does not relieve the utility of its requirement to ensure that its supply meets its load.</p>
NWEC	<p>Does not support 4-year cycle, however, a two-year progress report must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DSM (including EE and DR), • Some aspects of distribution system planning, • Recent data and pricing for renewable energy, • Availability and pricing of emerging technology, • Comparison of load forecasts and actuals, and • Progress report on interim goals and targets 	<p>Staff recommends updates for DSM, supply-side resources, load forecasts, the preferred portfolio, and any other updates that are necessary due to changing regulatory policy, or significant economic or market changes.</p>
RN	<p>Resource inputs must be updated every two years.</p>	<p>Staff agrees and recommends updating both supply- and demand-side resources.</p>

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

K4C	Process and outcomes must be transparent, and utilities are held accountable to the goals of the CETA. Support a review of the major assumptions of the IRP, including projected demand, projected conservation, and resource costs.	Staff agrees with each recommendation.
F&C	Must include all assessments, forecasts and plans in RCW 19.280.030(1) including the equity assessment in 19.280.030(1)(k), the most important assessment in the IRP. All components of the IRP include an assessment of benefits and burdens to all customers with a focus on vulnerable populations and highly impacted communities.	The RCW 19.280.030(1)(k) assessment is included in the draft rules in WAC 480-100-610(8) and included in the “equitable distribution” definition, which Staff believes appropriately incorporates the requirements for utilities to plan for and acquire resources in an equitable manner with a focus on vulnerable populations and highly impacted communities.
VCAG	VCAG lists many contents, including a new CEAP, interim targets, T&D planning, DER forecasts, benefits and risks of new capital projects, and scenarios and sensitivities.	Staff recommends updates for DSM, supply-side resources, load forecasts, the preferred portfolio, and any other updates that are necessary due to changing regulatory policy, or significant economic or market changes.
WEC	Oppose 2-year cycle. But progress report must include changes in the costs and benefits of resources uncovered in intervening utility action, including the distribution of costs and benefits, demand-side resource assessments, actual load comparisons to forecasts, and overall progress toward interim targets and goals in the IRP.	Staff recommends updates for DSM, supply-side resources, load forecasts, the preferred portfolio, and any other updates that are necessary due to changing regulatory policy, or significant economic or market changes.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

Sierra Club	There are too many issues in the IRP to delineate for a progress report.	Staff disagrees and believes that the progress report should be more limited in scope but provide the essential information for a mid-period check in.
-------------	--	--

2. The discussion draft proposes that a utility must file a work plan at least fifteen months prior to the due date of its IRP, and a completed draft IRP four months prior to the due date. Does this proposed schedule allow sufficient time for a thorough IRP with robust public engagement? If not, please provide a preferred timeline.

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
Avista	Has no preference on specific timeline, but prefers time to allow a public draft of a work plan to get feedback from Technical Advisory Committee (TAC); Believes a 4-month window of public comment is too long; notes the company typically receives feedback on draft plans within first four to six weeks of comment process, leaving ample time to make minor additions or corrections to a final draft. Also notes that if the Commission expects companies to make substantial changes during public review of draft, then 4-month process is too short.	Staff believes a public hearing on the draft would take place approximately one month following the submission of a draft IRP to give stakeholders and commission staff time to review the draft. Following the hearing the company would then have approximately three months to incorporate any feedback that had not already been modeled and addressed through its planning process and communicate to stakeholders and the public where their concerns have been discussed.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

PP&L	<p>Supports keeping the 12-month requirement, as it is more than sufficient for PacifiCorp’s IRP public-input process, which typically spans nine months; To avoid the need to refile work plans when changes occur, PacifiCorp requests that the Commission allow utilities to include a link to the company’s website with up-to-date meeting information within the work plan; believes proposed requirement to file a draft IRP four months before the due date is not feasible and may diminish meaningful public input in IRP development; notes much of this input is front loaded (offers detailed information about company’s process); “once the preferred portfolio and report are at a point where a full draft is available, there is limited ability to incorporate feedback and comments from stakeholders without duplicating much of the work already performed throughout the stakeholder process”</p>	<p>Staff supports utilities maintaining an updated website, but utilities aren’t precluded from adding information to their website.</p> <p>See response to Avista for Staff’s proposed filing and hearing timeline.</p>
PSE	<p>Except for 2021 IRP, PSE is comfortable with this approach on a 4-year cycle. Recommends eliminating the draft IRP requirement and submitting a draft resource portfolio instead (offers suggested language); notes a several-hundred page draft IRP is time-consuming for company to prepare and stakeholders to review and analyze, notes much or all of public engagement should happen in formal and informal meetings before releasing a draft IRP. Suggests maintaining a public comment hearing on the final IRP.</p>	<p>Staff agrees that most public engagement should take place before releasing a draft IRP.</p> <p>See response to Avista for Staff’s proposed filing and hearing timeline.</p>
PC	<p>Believes proposed timeline is sufficient for public participation; believes filling a draft for comment with the Commission provides more transparency to the IRP process and utility changes based on public input; open to timeline extension if others believe it is necessary.</p>	<p>Staff is also open to timeline tweaks if needed, but requests specific proposals from utilities and stakeholders.</p>

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

<p>Sierra Club</p>	<p>Stakeholders should have opportunities to recommend issues before an IRP workplan is submitted to the Commission. Timing is an issue when utilities do not provide adequate inclusion and responsiveness to stakeholder recommendations; changing timing is less important than ensuring meaningful public process. Recommends requiring utilities to move from “inform/consult” to “involve/collaborate” on International Association’s Public Participation Spectrum.</p>	<p>Staff agrees that utilities and stakeholders should discuss the workplan before it is finalized.</p> <p>Staff agrees that utilities should be responsive to stakeholders during the planning process, but declines to use terminology defined by the IAP2 in this rule in order to maintain the flexible and plain-language use of these words; because the proposed draft rule language provides an explicit expectation of utility actions required for adequate stakeholder engagement; and because staff do not want to confine utilities to one model of public participation. We recommend the commission adopt a position where the words inform, consult, involve are generally understood to be plain language definitions and not the IAP2-specific definitions</p>
--------------------	--	--

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

<p>NWEC</p>	<p>Believes timeline is adequate but that rules should provide additional guidance to utilities for minimum requirements regarding public and stakeholder input during development of IRP; guidance should instruct utilities that the purpose of public involvement is more than presenting information and that it should be a sharing of analysis that incorporates public feedback; suggests using IAPP Public Participation Spectrum and process closer to involve/collaborate. Includes suggested language in draft rules.</p>	<p>Staff believes the second draft rule incorporates requests for additional guidance around expectations for public involvement.</p> <p>Staff agrees that utilities should be responsive to stakeholders during the planning process, but declines to use terminology defined by the IAP2 in this rule in order to maintain the flexible and plain-language use of these words; because the proposed draft rule language provides an explicit expectation of utility actions required for adequate stakeholder engagement; and because staff do not one want to confine utilities to one model of public participation.</p>
-------------	--	--

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

<p>F&C</p>	<p>Proposes the Commission develop a policy statement to guide multi-stage engagement along the timeline in order to support promotion, accessibility, and meaningful opportunities for participation. Encourages open record-keeping and follow up. Particularly encourages guidance for public participation for vulnerable populations and highly impact populations that face higher barriers to participation. Encourages linguistically and culturally sensitive public participation aligned with RCW 19.405.120(4)(ii); proposes changing “consults” to “includes” or a similarly robust form of engagement.</p>	<p>Staff anticipates developing a policy statement to supplement the expectations for involvement in the draft rules and particularly addressing involvement of vulnerable and highly impacted populations. Staff would appreciate specific suggestions for topics in this policy statement from stakeholders as stakeholders review the pieces that are included in the draft rules.</p> <p>Staff believes the addition of expected actions around public engagement in the draft rule language demonstrate the commission’s expectations for robust engagement.</p>
----------------	--	---

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

<p>VCAG</p>	<p>Recommends adding the proposed method the utility will use to evaluate advisory group technical inputs, including the approach used to achieve consensus on incorporation of advisory group technical inputs in the integrated resource plan analyses.</p> <p>Recommends adding new sub-section (4): “Not later than seventeen months prior to the due date of its integrated resource plan, the utility must invite advisory group members to identify significant topics that will be discussed during the integrated resource plan period.”</p>	<p>Staff proposes language indicating utilities should discuss IRP workplans with advisory groups before the plans are finalized. Staff also believes the utility may use multiple methods to consider stakeholder input, depending on the type and scope of input, and that this would be communicated to stakeholders as indicated in the draft rule language (how and where input was considered). Staff does not agree that the purpose of public engagement in IRPs is to achieve consensus on a utility’s plan or inputs.</p>
-------------	---	---

Docket UE-190698
Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

CS	<p>Proposes a two-year IRP cycle that accelerates a utility’s IRP workplan filing to 18 months prior to final plan submission, notes this plan would provide 6 months for utilities to develop a workplan and increase amount of time for hearings and public engagement. Recommends 4-month period between submissions of draft and final IRPs; suggests hearings on draft and final IRP. Suggests hearing on draft IRP should be held 4 weeks after filing. Suggests hearing date should be scheduled with enough time for utilities to “meaningfully” incorporate stakeholder feedback. Suggests a hearing on the final IRP would allow the public to voice remaining concerns before final Commission acknowledgement.</p>	<p>Staff recommends a 4-year cycle with a CEIP between IRPs, and updates for both plans. Current draft rules contemplate a 4-month time-period between a draft IRP and a final. A hearing on the draft would fall approximately one month after the draft is submitted, giving utilities three months to incorporate feedback. Staff believes a hearing on a final, in addition to a hearing at the draft, is unnecessary. The UTC will be able to determine where public concerns may have not been addressed following the submission of a final IRP and through public comments, which the commission accepts at any point.</p>
----	--	--

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

<p>WEC</p>	<p>Offers a suggested two IRP cycle timeline that includes public involvement meetings between issuing an IRP workplan and submitting a draft IRP, public hearing on draft IRP, after which IOUs accept and respond to public comments on CEIP work plan; also a public hearing on the draft CEIP; IOUs then solicit public input for next IRP progress report. After submission of progress report, IOUs solicit public input on IRP workplan and have public involvement meetings between issuing final workplan and submitting a draft IRP. Public hearing on draft IRP. Accept and responds to public comments on CEIP workplan, hearing on draft CEIP.</p>	<p>Staff believes a number of these elements with some revisions are detailed in the current combined draft IRP/CEIP rules. Staff does not believe the rules need to outline a specific timeline for input on a workplan, but the draft rules do propose stakeholder involvement on plans. Staff believes the additional timelines and meetings for public involvement in planning will be addressed through utility workplans and participation plans and not through rule. Staff does not anticipate a hearing on the draft CEIP, but draft rules propose the draft CEIP will be provided to advisory groups for input before utilities submit a final plan.</p>
------------	---	--

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

3a. Please describe: a) an ideal timelines on when a utility files and IRP and a CEIP; (b) the relationship between an IRP and a CEIP; (c) How the CEAP in the IRP will inform the CEIP.

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
Avista	(a) IRP should be filed no later than 8/1/21. CEIP filed on 1/1/2022 (b) CEIP should be a summary of specific actions as described in RCW 19.405.060. CEIP actions should be described in the IRP. (c) IRP and CEAP should be one filing. For multi-state utilities, the utility may choose the option to file its IRP as a system document, but the CEAP clarifies the specific analysis for WA customers only.	Staff generally agrees but believes that the IRP need not include any part of the CEIP.
PP&L	(a) CEIP should be filed as part of the IRP progress report every two years following a full IRP, as a policy-based supplement to the progress-report data. Allows for time to integrate Commission feedback into next IRP. (b) Welcome a workshop to discuss practical application of the timing. (c) The CEAP filed with the IRP, and setting RA and transmission requirements, is an upstream deliverable.	This timing is a different approach than Staff's recommendation. Staff welcomes additional conversation and consultation concerning timing.
PSE	(a) Question should be expanded to include consideration of demand- and supply-side acquisition process. See Attachment A. (b) IRP should maintain generic allocation of resources, transmission, and storage. CEIP should be a more detailed roadmap for complying with CETA. (c) CEAP will provide high-level guidance on the utility's baseline, progress, potential costs, actions, and risks. CEAP should also consider equity. CEIP is more granular.	Staff generally agrees. The timeline proposed for the IRP and CEIP are similar to Staff's recommendation and the RFP timing should be considered carefully.
PC	Does not currently have an ideal timeline, however, IRP and CEIP should occur at the same time.	Staff disagrees. Since the IRP informs the CEIP the processes should largely be sequential.
NWECC	(a) Draft CEIP filed one month after IRP acknowledgment, with a 3-month discovery and comment period. (b) CEIP is a specific plan for CETA compliance. The specific identification and determination of alternative compliance mechanism will be made in the CEIP and not the IRP. CEIP must contain full data on historic performance under median water conditions. (c) The CEIP may need to look 20 years or more into the future to fully inform cost and risk and, consequently, rely on the entire IRP and not just the CEAP.	Staff generally agrees.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
F&C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) See 3(b) and 3(c). (b) CEIP is a separate mechanism that details how a utility will comply with CETA. Both require an equity assessment, and the CEIP should include an evaluation of equity conditions and metrics to guide interim targets. (c) Maintain separation between IRP and CEIP. 	Staff agrees.
Sierra Club	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Draft CEIP should be filed as soon as possible after IRP acknowledgment. CEIP should include discovery and comment period. (b) CEIP is a specific plan for complying with CETA. CEIP is the right place for identifying if there is a need for a cost cap. Each utility must include full data on historic performance under median water conditions, which will need to be defined. (c) While the CEIP has 4-year targets, the CEIP has to be put into context of achieving the 10-year CEAP and 20-year IRP. For example, if PSE’s market purchases and current gas plant operations put it above the 2030 requirement, the CEIP must show near-term progress to be on the path to meet 2030 requirement. 	Staff generally agrees. Staff recommends the CEIP be filed soon after the utility receives feedback on the IRP, with enough time to allow recommendations to be incorporated.
VCAG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The IRP and the CEIP should be filed by 1/1/2021 and updated every two years thereafter. The UTC should strive to have the CEIP released shortly after the IRP hearing as possible, not to exceed two months. (b) The IRP should inform the CEIP including; the interim targets, the schedule to achieve GHG neutrality, and the cost of compliance analysis. (c) Ten-year potential for DR, conservation potential, and load management programs, T&D system, and renewable acquisitions create an acquisition and design. The RA requirement should be a consideration. The CEAP informs how much DR and RE to procure in the CEIP. 	Staff generally agrees. Staff recommends the CEIP be filed soon after the utility receives feedback on the IRP, with enough time to allow recommendations be incorporated.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

4a. Should the Commission move the public hearing to a date between the utility’s submission of its draft IRP and the final IRP? Is there any other point in time that public comment hearings are most beneficial to public engagement?

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
Avista	Requests clarification on Commission’s expectation for responding to public process and incorporating feedback; notes 4 months between a draft and a final is not enough time for substantial changes; believes the best time to incorporate major IRP feedback is in the TAC process.	Staff agrees the best time to incorporate major IRP feedback is during the advisory group process. If that input is incorporated satisfactorily, the hearing on the draft IRP would uncover few substantial changes. Staff believes a hearing on a draft IRP would take place one month after submission, leaving approximately three months for utilities to incorporate feedback for a final IRP. Staff believes this is an appropriate amount of time but is open to timeline changes.
PP&L	Believes the Commission should not hold a public hearing for review of a draft IRP; notes that filing a draft IRP multiple months in advance is not feasible for PacifiCorp, and could greatly reduce the amount of public participation and engagement in the IRP process. States the company’s robust stakeholder input process provides multiple opportunities for comment and input on each iteration (or “draft”) of the company’s final, preferred portfolio and to inform inputs, assumptions, and methodologies applied throughout the IRP development process.	Staff disagrees. Filing a final IRP after hearing input on a full draft allows additional stakeholder feedback to be considered and incorporated.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
PSE	Concerned that a hearing on a draft IRP will signal a different expectation or role for the Commission than what is outlined in the IRP statute. Notes that under statute and the current IRP rules, the Commission does not direct the utility to modify a draft resource portfolio, nor does it approve the utility’s IRP; the Commission reviews and acknowledges the IRP. Notes that this limited role did not change with the passage of CETA. As such, the public hearing should still occur as part of the Commission’s review of a utility’s final IRP.	RCW 19.280.040(1) requires the commission to establish by rule the requirements for preparation and submission of integrated resource plans. Commission practice has been to hold a public comment hearing on integrated resource plans. Staff believes moving the hearing to a draft filing would make better use of that public comment period for utilities and the public. The commission’s role is to determine that utility IRPs meet requirements of the law.
PC	The Commission should hold a public hearing on the draft IRP.	Staff agrees.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
NWEC	<p>Believes extensive public participation in IRP process is critical. Offers detailed suggestions for public engagement across 3 stages of planning: IRP development (proposes 15 month timeframe, proposes that rules should clearly state expectations for company engagement with an IRP advisory group); IRP drafting (proposes 3 month timeframe, believes public hearing and comment at draft and before final is important, proposes public comment period should be held enough in advance to provide utilities time to incorporate changes into final filing, notes that advanced public process in development will make drafting process less burdensome, proposes rules should provide flexibility for Commission to require more engagement processes); IRP final filing (proposes 2 week timeframe, proposes Commission should require a hearing after final filing and that company or UTC staff should summarize input so that public opinion is clear before the Commission makes a determination on the IRP). Offers line edits to draft rules discussing the above.</p>	<p>Staff believes the draft rules clearly state expectations for company engagement with advisory groups and believes the commission will issue additional flexible guidance at a later date. Staff anticipates a public comment hearing on a draft IRP would take place approximately one month following submission of the draft, giving utilities three months to incorporate any feedback. Staff believes the commission will have a clear understanding of public opinion following the draft hearing and will have the opportunity to examine where public feedback has been addressed in the final plan. Staff believes a hearing on the final IRP, in addition to the draft IRP, is unnecessary. The proposed draft rules include a public comment summary.</p>

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
F&C	<p>Recommends a public hearing on draft following submission. Recommends soliciting, compiling, and addressing public comments by or shortly after the hearing. Recommends a hearing following submission of the final draft to review changes incorporated during previous participation opportunities.</p>	<p>Staff believes a public comment hearing on a draft IRP would take place approximately one month following submission of the draft. Companies would then have three months to incorporate any changes and submit a final draft. A summary of public comments is required with the filing, according to the current draft rules. Staff does not believe a second public comment hearing on the final IRP is necessary as the commission will be able to determine the extent to which public input from the draft hearing was incorporate in the final plan.</p>

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
WEC	<p>Recommends a public hearing on the draft IRP. Recommends the companies should document and respond to the public comments following the hearings. Proposes IOUs should “involve” rather than “consult” the public.</p>	<p>The draft rules propose a public hearing on the draft IRP as well as outline expectations for engagement and response to stakeholders. Staff has removed the definition of “consult” from the draft rules and replaced the definition with more specific expectations of actions for engagement from a utility. Staff believes the draft rules now clearly outline the expectations for companies to engage in a meaningful participatory process with stakeholders and the public</p>

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
VCAG	<p>Recommends the Commission conduct a hearing on the draft IRP and the final IRP, noting the draft IRP hearing will provide important feedback that will encourage utilities to steer the last four months of IRP analysis to better align with consumer and government needs and objectives and the final IRP hearing will help the utility create an adequate CEIP.</p> <p>Notes that if the UTC is unable to conduct a final IRP hearing, the UTC should require utilities to accept and respond to, on the utility website, public inputs and advisory group technical inputs on the final IRP, fully explaining any rationale the utility used in the event any of these inputs are not included in the final IRP analyses or document. Offers language.</p>	<p>Staff believes a public comment hearing on a draft IRP would take place approximately one month following submission of the draft. Companies would then have three months to incorporate any changes and submit a final draft. A summary of public comments is required with the filing. Staff does not believe a second public comment hearing on the final IRP is necessary as the commission will be able to determine the extent to which public input from the draft hearing was incorporate in the final plan. Expanded expectations for public participation and utility responsiveness are provided in the draft rules.</p>

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
Sierra Club	<p>Recommends public comment hearings on both the draft and the final IRP. A comment hearing on the draft IRP should be placed with sufficient time for utilities to make substantive edits to the draft. Reiterates recommendation that public input should be addressed at the IRP workplan stage before the workplan is submitted to the Commission.</p>	<p>Staff believes a public comment hearing on a draft IRP would take place approximately one month following submission of the draft. Companies would then have three months to incorporate any changes and submit a final draft. The draft rules expand on expectations for public engagement, including a Staff proposal for utilities to engage stakeholders in the development of workplans.</p>
Invenergy	<p>Invenergy supports changing the rules to require a public hearing on utility draft IRPs, rather than their final IRPs. This will allow more meaningful public engagement in the IRP process, including an opportunity to make specific revisions if needed. To enable meaningful public input, the draft IRPs should meet all requirements for a completed IRP.</p>	<p>Staff agrees.</p>

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
The Energy Project	IRP process provides opportunities for meaningful engagement of low-income and vulnerable customers and broad consideration of programs and practices in the context of resource planning. Has some concerns about holding a hearing only on the draft IRP and not the final filing and generally favors more opportunities for stakeholder input.	Staff agrees that the IRP provides opportunities for meaningful engagement with low-income and vulnerable customers. Staff believes this input would be more useful on a draft plan because utilities would be able to incorporate that input into a final plan. Staff does not believe a second public comment hearing on the final IRP is necessary as the commission will be able to determine the extent to which public input from the draft hearing was incorporate in the final plan. The draft rules expand on expectations for stakeholder input and utility responsiveness in developing the IRP.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

4b. Given the integration of the IRP, the CEAP, and the CEIP, is there any other point in time that public comment hearings are most beneficial to public engagement?

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
Avista	Indifferent to placement of hearings, but believes public hearings are duplicative since the public is invited to all TAC meetings for both draft and final plans.	Public hearings offer customers who are not able to attend advisory group meetings an opportunity to comment on a plan and give the commission an opportunity to hear from utility customers about a plan.
PSE	Proposes opportunity for public comment on the CEIP. Suggests CEIP's should be heard at an open meeting. Notes that public comment processes should be separate and staggered (offers timeline graphic) because the IRP and CEIP serve different purposes and because the CEIP is approved by the Commission, which seems to indicate a different level of review and consideration by the Commission than "review."	Staff generally agrees and believes this comment is addressed in the combined second draft rules.
PC	Does not currently have an opinion on timing of coincidental hearings for CEAP or CEIP; Proposes that one hearing could address multiple plans but requests further discussion as rules are developed.	The commission held a workshop on public participation on May 5, 2020. Staff envisions a separate process for the IRP and the CEIP. The second round of draft rules compile draft expectations for both plans. Staff looks forward to stakeholder discussion on the combined rules.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

NVEC	Proposes a focused public comment period on the CEIP.	Staff generally agrees and believes this comment is addressed in the combined second draft rules, which include extensive public involvement during CEIP development and an opportunity for public comment when the plan is under commission review.
F&C	Believes comment hearings are most beneficial when they allow adequate time for plans to be shaped by comments. Suggests comment opportunities run concurrently with hearings so that public may submit comments in advance or during hearing. Suggests process should allow commenters to receive acknowledgement and direct responses to concerns as well as time for additional comment and changes to final IRP.	Staff agrees and notes that commission comment opportunities do run concurrently with hearings. The commission accepts comments online and via phone, email, and mail. Staff anticipates a comment hearing on a draft IRP would fall approximately one month following submission, giving utilities three months to incorporate any needed changes. Additional details for public engagement as well as comment summaries are provided in the draft rules.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

<p>VCAG</p>	<p>Recommends that CEIP is released and reviewed no later than two months following receipt of final IRP public inputs and technical advisory group technical inputs.</p> <p>The Commission should conduct a hearing any time the utility seeks to initiate a significant capital project that has not been specifically analyzed as an IRP scenario reviewed at an IRP Hearing. “Significant” should be determined through rulemaking, but any project that generates or transports more than 2% of the utilities total generation capacity should be considered significant. Rationale: The current approach to regulation of utility planning and resource acquisition practices allows capital project investment recovery because regulators are unwilling to test the financial community’s response to total utility plant investment disallowance. Utility projects should never be allowed to proceed to such a point of financial brinksmanship in the absence of a UTC hearing.</p>	<p>The IRP is the utility’s plan and, although informative for rate recovery, is not a rate recovery process. Staff recommends that the Commission continue its practice of reviewing the utility’s actions for prudent decision-making in other, more appropriate adjudicative proceedings. Staff questions if the Commission should begin considering a utility’s business case review of its capital projects in the CEIP.</p>
<p>Sierra Club</p>	<p>Recommends strong public involvement from beginning to end, including hearings on drafts and final plans, disclosure of data files to create CEIP with non-disclosure agreements employed as needed. Evidentiary hearings with discovery are also needed.</p>	<p>Staff proposes expanded expectations for public involvement in the draft rules, including a comment hearing on a draft IRP and expectations for data disclosure. Evidentiary hearings on these plans would be limited to the CEIP because IRPs cannot be litigated.</p>
<p>Invenenergy</p>	<p>The Commission’s IRP rulemaking process should explore potential changes to improve the functioning of the stakeholder involvement process for IRPs. This includes providing meaningful mechanisms to encourage more open and active collaboration between utilities and stakeholders.</p>	<p>Staff believes the current draft rules expand on expectations for utilities’ public involvement and would request stakeholders provide specific comments or suggestions regarding additional changes.</p>

Docket UE-190698
Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

WEC	Recommends a public hearing on the draft IRP and on the draft CEIP. Recommends the companies should document and respond to the public comments following the hearings. Proposes IOUs should “involve” rather than “consult” the public.	The draft rules propose a public hearing on the draft IRP as well as outline expectations for engagement and response to stakeholders. Staff has removed the definition of “consult” from the draft rules and replaced the definition with more specific expectations of actions for engagement from a utility. Staff believes the draft rules now clearly outline the expectations for companies to engage in a meaningful participatory process with stakeholders and the public. Given the expansive requirements for public participation in the CEIP, Staff believes a hearing on the final CEIP via open meeting or adjudication would be more appropriate than a hearing on the draft plan.
-----	--	--

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

5. Draft WAC 480-100-615(2) states that a utility must file a draft of its integrated resource plan four months prior to the due date of the final plan. Are there requirements in WAC 480-100-610 that are not necessary or which reduce a utility’s flexibility in their preparation of a draft IRP?

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
Avista	Section 16: requiring the company to summarize and respond to comments is unnecessary. Believes public comments do not always address concerns or benefits of all customers, and instead are special interest groups. States goal of public participation is to provide Avista insight into planning concepts the utility may have missed or make it easier for public to understand utility’s plan, understand specific public concerns. Proposes Avista should not be required to address each concern.	Staff believes a summary will be helpful for stakeholders and the agency in determining how public input has been considered. Staff believes that one goal of public participation is to provide utilities with insights they may have missed. Staff believes it would be beneficial to a utility to address the concerns and needs of its customers and stakeholders.
PP&L	It is not necessary to include comment summaries in the draft as PP&L already invites public feedback and provides responses on its website.	Staff recommends public feedback and responses be included in the filing and preserved for the record.
PSE	Recommends eliminating requirement for filing draft IRP and therefore none of the requirements are necessary. Consultation should occur throughout the development of the IRP.	Staff agrees that public engagement should occur throughout the development of the IRP. Staff believes filing a draft plan will be beneficial for utilities and the public by creating time for utilities to consider and incorporate any final feedback from stakeholders and the public into the plan before it is finalized.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

PC	Supports requirement that utilities file drafts four months in advance. The requirements in 610 are not unduly prescriptive. Need clarification on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redlined edits to DER planning. • 610(7) is duplicative with (8) and should be deleted. • 610(10) create definitions for cases, scenarios, portfolio, preferred portfolio, and sensitivities. • 610(12) makes redlined edits. 	See reorganized DER section See combined Resource Adequacy section Staff disagrees that it is necessary
NWEC	No.	No Staff response necessary.
VCAG	No. All elements of the final IRP should be included in the draft IRP to assure adequate public review. Rules should seek to resolve all action items before the draft IRP hearing.	No Staff response necessary.
CS	Maintain the four months between the submission of the draft and final IRP.	Staff agrees but is open to additional timeline suggestions.
WEC	610 requirements mirror statute. Establishing a cycle for planning, public comment, decision making in a transparent way, and reporting will help refine these requirements.	Staff agrees that refinement of process will be iterative.
Sierra Club	No.	No Staff response necessary.

6. Historically, the Commission has used an acknowledgment letter with comments to affirm that the utility has met the legal and regulatory requirements for filing an IRP. Given the advent of the CEIP, which is informed by the IRP and approved by the Commission, should the Commission consider a different type of response to an IRP, including but not necessarily limited to a compliance letter, an acknowledgment letter with comments, or Commission approval? Please explain your reasoning.

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
Avista	Commission staff should provide written comments after the draft IRP, and the Commission should provide a compliance letter with specific comments regarding its expectations or change for the upcoming CEIP, as well as the next IRP.	Staff agrees on all points. Staff recommends that Staff continue to provide written comments, the Commission continue to acknowledge the IRP, and provide written feedback in time for the utility to incorporate feedback into its CEIP.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

PP&L	Continue to provide acknowledgment letter. Re-emphasizes its approach to stagger the CEIP with the IRP to provide sufficient review to incorporate into the next IRP and CEIP.	Staff recommends that Staff continue to provide written comments, the Commission continue to acknowledge the IRP, and provide written feedback in time for the utility to incorporate feedback into its CEIP.
PSE	Issue a compliance letter for the IRP and an acknowledgment of the CEAP. An IRP is a planning document and the Commission will engage more directly on the CEIP. An acknowledgment letter for the CEAP would be informative to subsequent CEIP.	Staff proposes draft rules that would incorporate the CEAP into the IRP and both would be acknowledged by the Commission in a letter. The IRP and CEAP should inform the CEIP.
PC	Supports continuing acknowledgment with letters. Strongly cautions against Commission approval of IRPs as it equates approval with pre-approval for resource acquisition and capital investments.	Staff agrees.
F&C	Commission should respond to an IRP with a comment letter highlighting key actions areas where the utility may strengthen their path. The commission should predicate their response on the correct preparation and submission process.	Staff agrees.
NWEC	Maintain current acknowledgment process. The accompanying letter from the Commission should be useful for the utilities in drafting the CEIP.	Staff agrees.
RN	Consider adding more substance to the acknowledgment letter.	During the Commission's review of the IRP, Staff encourages parties to ask the Commission to opine on specifics of a utility's IRP in its comments.
CS	Maintain acknowledgment process.	Staff agrees.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

VCAG	<p>Consider revisions to the process. The CEIP should not relieve the Commission responsibility to review and take action on the IRP. Since CEIP is informed by the CEAP, Commission action on IRP is an important quality check on the process. If Commission asks a question in an IRP and the Company does not respond in next IRP, next IRP should not be acknowledged. UTC should conduct a hearing anytime a utility initiates a significant (2% or more of total generation capacity) capital project. The current approach allows project investment recovery because regulators are unwilling to test the financial community's response to total utility plant investment allowance.</p>	<p>By law, the IRP cannot be adjudicated. Therefore, the Commission should not take any steps beyond acknowledging a utility's IRP.</p>
WEC	<p>Support an acknowledgment letter with comments.</p>	<p>Staff agrees.</p>
Sierra Club	<p>Maintain same process with only the exceptions stated previously in comments. Data files need to be made available.</p>	<p>Staff agrees and recommends that the Commission mandate the utility to provide data input files used in the development of the IRP. Staff also encourages utilities to use non-disclosure agreements for confidential material.</p>
NIPPC	<p>Commission should approve IRPs. IRPs are increasingly important. Formal approval will increase the quality of participation and comments.</p>	<p>Staff disagrees as IRPs cannot be adjudicated.</p>

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

7. Should the requirements for assessments in RCW 19.280.030(1)(k) and the requirements to ensure all customers benefit in RCW 19.405.040(8) be connected in Commission rules? If so, how might this integration work?

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
PP&L	Open to rules, though there will need to be flexibility built into any requirement.	Staff proposes the draft rules include elements associated with RCW 19.280.030(1)(k) and RCW 19.405.040(8).
PSE	No, the two requirements should not be connected. RCW 19.280.030(1)(k) is specific to the IRP and more narrow than the language in RCW 19.405.040(8). Additionally, the introduction phrase of “must ensure that all customers benefit from the transition to clean energy” in RCW 19.405.040(8) modifies how the specified elements should be interpreted and applied, and therefore they two sections should be treated as separate requirements.	Staff does not recommend collapsing the two requirements, but rather ensure that the two provisions are harmoniously included in rule.
PC	Do not believe that integration would need to occur.	Staff does not recommend collapsing the two requirements, but rather ensure that the two provisions are harmoniously included in rule.
NWEC	Utilities should analyze and demonstrate how customer subsets are benefiting from utility programs, including, in particular, vulnerable populations and highly impacted communities. This should occur in the CEIP, but NWEC is open to other implementation pathways.	Staff believes that customer benefits should be evaluated in the IRP and CEIP as RCW 19.280.030(1)(k) is an amendment to the IRP statute and RCW 19.405.040(8) is broadly applicable throughout CETA.
	Recommends a process-oriented approach that recognizes the unique situation of each utility and the needs of its customers.	Staff agrees that rules should focus on process.
WEC	RCW 19.280.030(1)(k) is one requirement designed to help ensure IOUs meet the requirement of 19.405.040(8).	No Staff response necessary.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

CS	Statute requires an assessment of benefits and burdens and their distributional impacts. This is a separate and distinct requirements from considering a broad range of benefits for all customers.	Staff does not recommend collapsing the two requirements, but rather ensure that the two provisions are harmoniously included in rule.
The Energy Project (TEP)	The draft rules already connect the two comments since they are both listed as required content of an IRP. The utility’s preferred portfolio and narrative regarding benefit will build on the assessment. It is not clear that further connection is required.	No Staff response necessary.
F&C	Sections should not be integrated in rule.	Staff does not recommend collapsing the two requirements, but rather ensure that the two provisions are harmoniously included in rule.

8. What types of information should a utility provide in its IRP to document that the utility is ensuring all customers are benefitting from the transition to clean energy?

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
Avista	All customers benefit from a utility plan that ensures reliability at the lowest reasonable cost. A plan meeting either the clean requirements or the cost cap ensures that all customers are benefitting from the transition.	Staff believes that RCW 19.405.040(8) establishes an affirmative mandate that is separate and distinct requirement from the renewable energy requirements and cost cap provisions.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

PP&L	The IRP does not represent actual procurement decisions nor acquisitions and, as such, is not the appropriate place to incorporate or comment on the equitable distribution of benefits. The IRP is also not a ratemaking plan nor does it contemplate impacts on specific customer rates.	RCW 19.280.030(1)(1) requires the companies to address Section 4(8) in the CEAP, which is part of the IRP. Additionally, Staff expects companies to consider, at a high level, different bundles of procurement that have different equity-related characteristics in the IRP to ensure least cost planning.
PSE	The CEIP is the appropriate vehicle to document outcomes, though equity considerations are important and will be considered in the IRP process, as well as influence the development of the CEAP.	RCW 19.280.030(1)(1) requires the companies to address Section 4(8) in the CEAP, which is part of the IRP.
	To the extent the IRP results are adjusted to better address the analysis in the assessment, the rationale for those adjustments should be explained.	Staff agrees. The IRP rules should require utilities to provide a narrative related to RCW 19.405.040(8).
PC	Geographic information system (GIS) data should be included with descriptions of what investments have and will be made.	Staff agrees that locational information should be included.
WEC	One general principle is that data should capture the distribution of impacts, costs, and benefits across populations and geographies.	Staff agrees.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

TEP	The draft rules appropriately include several provisions related to the equitable distribution of benefits, including 1) An assessment of DER programs identified under 19.405.120(4)(b); 2) a comparative evaluation that includes benefits that accrue to the utility, its customers, and program participants; 3) the assessment required by RCW 19.280.030(1)(k); 4) a portfolio analysis and a preferred portfolio, with a narrative explanation of how its IRP ensures all customers are benefitting and assesses the environmental health impacts in highly impact communities; a CEAP which must demonstrate that all customers are benefitting from the transition; 5) an avoided cost analysis with, for listed NEBs, should specify to whom they accrue; and 6) inclusion of cases, scenarios, and sensitivities, including those that were informed by the public participation process.	No Staff response necessary.
F&C	Equity posture of the utility and equity conditions related to the direct and indirect impact of utility activities.	Staff agrees.
	All components of the IRP (including load forecasting, demand-side resources, DER, supply-side resources, regional generation and transmission, resource evaluation, resource adequacy, and cases and scenarios) should include an assessment of benefits and burdens to all customers, with an emphasis on benefits and burdens to vulnerable populations and highly impacted communities.	Staff is unclear how all elements (e.g., load forecasting) would explicitly consider equitable distribution of benefits but agrees that the IRP should comprehensively integrate RCW 19.405.040(8) where appropriate.
	Clear and complete record of how utility’s equity assessment ties into strategy development, decision-making process, and resulting implementation. Assessment should include qualitative information and quantitative information, such as a description of developing the equity assessment and how utility culture and practices align with equity principles as well as targets and metrics. Information could include social responsibility business standards; community engagement metrics; diversity, equity, and inclusion protocols; change in energy burden over time; state of resiliency; health data; economic opportunities and outcomes; and environmental conditions.	Staff agrees that utilities should include an explanation of how RCW 19.405.040(8), including both qualitative and quantitative information as applicable. The scope of RCW 19.4050.040(8) does not include all utility actions, such as internal business standards.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

9a. How should the Commission guide the type of information included in the utility’s assessment (e.g. rule, policy statement, or some other method)?

9b. How should the Commission guide how utilities incorporate the assessment into the IRP (e.g., rule, policy statement, or some other method)?

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
Avista	(a)/(b) Policy Statement. Absent direction, it will be difficult to determine if an IRP has met the law.	The current draft rules include language regarding the assessment described in RCW 19.280.030(1)(k). Additional guidance may be provided in a future policy statement.
PP&L	(a)/(b) Recommends a workshop to discuss potential guidance regarding information potentially included in utility assessments.	Staff held a workshop on May 22, 2020, that included information related to utility assessments.
PSE	(a)/(b) Seeking broad and flexible guidance on the assessment and analysis in the IRP. At least for the first IRP cycle, incorporating the assessment could be left to the discretion of each utility. The UTC could initiate a rulemaking in Phase 2 if the UTC wants uniformity.	The current draft rules include language regarding the assessment described in RCW 19.280.030(1)(k). Additional guidance may be provided in a future policy statement.
PC	(a)/(b) Recommends more in-depth discussion before draft rules are proposed. Currently recommends a policy statement as components of the assessment may be fluid and amendable.	The current draft rules include language regarding the assessment described in RCW 19.280.030(1)(k). Additional guidance may be provided in a future policy statement. The Commission had a workshop on May 22, 2020, that included information related to utility assessments.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

NWEC	<p>(a) Minimum approach in rules, plus potentially a policy statement on equity metrics on regulatory reform and performance-based regulation.</p> <p>(b) Rule, with potential policy statement with greater detail.</p>	<p>The current draft rules include language regarding the assessment described in RCW 19.280.030(1)(k). Additional guidance may be provided in a future policy statement.</p>
WEC	<p>(a)/(b) The UTC should establish rules for the requirements of the assessments and achievement of the equitable distribution of benefits.</p>	<p>The current draft rules include language regarding the assessment described in RCW 19.280.030(1)(k) and the requirements in RCW 19.405.040(8) related to the equitable distribution of benefits.</p>
CS	<p>(a) Rule should identify and define the range of benefits to be included as required by statute.</p> <p>(b) Once benefits have been defined, a policy statement should provide guidance on how utilities incorporate the benefits into planning and procurement processes.</p>	<p>The current draft rules outline the process for utilities to develop, propose, and update indicators that are associated with resource benefits. Additional guidance may be provided in a future policy statement.</p>
TEP	<p>(a)/(b) Rule, to ensure that it has the force of law. The initial rules should be more general in nature, supplemented by policy statements. With more experience, additional detail can be added to the rules, as needed.</p>	<p>The current draft rules include language regarding the assessment described in RCW 19.280.030(1)(k). Additional guidance may be provided in a future policy statement.</p>

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

F&C	(a)/(b) Rule with required information and policy statement for prioritizing metrics and setting qualitative and quantitative objectives. Policy statement should evolve into rules as processes and information matures.	The current draft rules outline the process for utilities to develop, propose, and update indicators and weighting factors related to qualitative and quantitative objectives. Staff expects the prioritization to be proposed and reviewed during the CEIP process. Additional guidance may be provided in a future policy statement. Staff expects that rules will be updated as the processes and information mature.
-----	---	--

10. RCW 19.280.030(9) prohibits using IRPs as a basis to bring legal action against electric utilities. That is, an IRP cannot be adjudicated before the Commission. Considering this statutory prohibition, where and when should a utility report compliance ensuring all customers are benefitting from the transitions to clean energy?

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
Avista	Appropriate place might be the CEIP.	The current draft rules require reporting in CEIPs and compliance reports.
PP&L	Recommends a workshop to discuss this further. The CEIP might be an appropriate process.	Staff held workshops on February 5, 2020, and May 22, 2020.
PSE	The CEIP and any reporting on CEIP progress could serve as the primary vehicle.	The current draft rules require reporting in CEIPs and compliance reports.
PC	Compliance should occur outside the IRP. CEIPs may be more appropriate.	The current draft rules require reporting in CEIPs and compliance reports.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

NWEC	In the CEIP.	The current draft rules require reporting in CEIPs and compliance reports.
TEP	The IRP acknowledgement process, though not legal action, has provided a forum for detailed oversight and influence by the Commission and other stakeholders. This process should continue and be made more robust. The requirements for a CEAP and a CEIP provide enforcement opportunities beyond the IRP acknowledgement process.	The CEAP is part of the IRP, so it is unclear what additional enforcement opportunities the CEAP presents beyond the IRP more generally.
F&C	IRP will have the equity assessment. The Commission should respond to IRP with a comment letter highlighting key actions to put utilities on a path towards compliance. CEIP should evaluate equity conditions and metrics to guide the plan's interim targets. Compliance review of CEIP should ensure equity baselines, targets, and measurable progress have occurred.	The current draft rules require reporting in CEIPs and compliance reports. The current draft rules also require the interim targets to be consistent with the requirements related to RCW 19.405.040(8).

11. In the portfolio analysis and preferred portfolio section of draft WAC 480-100-610(11), should the Commission include criteria in the narrative explanation in addition to those listed in subsections (a) through (f)?

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
Avista	Section (e) and (f) need <i>more elaboration</i> . In terms of more elaboration, Jennifer Smith indicated in a follow-up phone call that more information regarding non-energy benefits would be helpful in this IRP rule.	Staff agrees that clarity is needed. Additional clarity is included in relevant portions of the IRP rules, as well as an updated definition of “indicator” that is related to the non-energy impacts of resources. Additionally, process for indicator development is included in the CEIP portions of the rule.
PP&L	No comments at this time.	No Staff response necessary.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

<p>PSE</p>	<p>To minimize confusion between the assessment and the equitable distribution standard, PSE suggests that the rule language in Section (e) mirrors RCW 19.280.030(1)(k) as closely as possible.</p> <p>Subsection (f) appears redundant and could be deleted from the rule.</p> <p>PSE recommends that the phrase “preferred portfolio” be replaced with the phrase “resource portfolio” in the header for WAC 480-100-610(11), as well as the reference contained in WAC 480-100-615(3).</p>	<p>Staff proposes revisions to Section (e) that are intended to incorporate the considerations associated with 19.405.040(8) mentioned in the response to question 8.</p> <p>Staff is rater indifferent to the terminology, but prefers the term ‘preferred portfolio’ as we do not want to unnecessarily limit projects. This alternative term also broadens the definition of “other resources” within the company’s service territory, such as direct ownership of DERs to reduce energy burden, see RCW 19.405.020(15)(b).</p>
<p>PC</p>	<p>Section (f) should include vulnerable populations for consistency. RCW 19.405.060(1)(c)(iii)</p>	<p>Staff agrees.</p>

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

<p>Invenergy</p>	<p>WAC 480-100-610(11)(a) does not give adequate priority to risk as a key criterion. Invenergy suggests that risk be included as a distinct criterion and be specified to include both management of reliability risks and cost risks to utility customers. The evaluation of new resource alternatives should also apply on the same basis to repowering and major refurbishments of existing resources, which will ensure that electric utility planning that significantly affects the useful life is done on a consistent basis with new resources.</p> <p>The IRP rules should be clarified to specify that firm transmission rights alone are not a resource capable of serving consumers’ needs for firm electricity. When evaluating resources, utilities should be required to identify the specific types of resources being considered. An exception to this may be short-term purchases from the wholesale power market. Before including short-term market power purchases in its long-term resource strategy, a utility should be required to carefully assess the extent it can prudently rely on purchases, and identify the resource adequacy, cost, and risk implications to its customers.</p>	<p>Staff agrees risk is a key criterion and utilities and required to consider a variety of risk as part of the definition of lowest reasonable cost. Staff disagrees that the rules need additional language on this issue. Staff believes that the utilities will need to consider the risk of relying on firm transmission rights without specific resource contracts as part of their resource adequacy evaluation.</p>
<p>RN</p>	<p>The proposed rules do not mention storage as a resource. It needs to be identified, explicitly, beyond the definition of distributed energy resource. It should also be included in the definition of IRP. It needs to be listed separately as a resource to capture its many value streams. Consider as an amendment to proposed WAC 480-100-610(12)(f), to expressly including storage and non-traditional resources to this section would add particular value given that the CEAP is intended to inform the CEIP.</p>	<p>Staff agrees that storage should be recognized and recommends calling it out specifically in several areas of the rule. However, Staff does not recommend the Commission adopt language on how to incorporate storage, at this time. Staff believes that the Commission needs to engage in a more thorough investigation through future workshops and develop additional rule language in the future. Staff recommends the Commission initiate storage workshops in 2021.</p>

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

<p>NWEC</p>	<p>NWEC suggests including a summary of data sources, assumptions, and calculations. NWEC also suggests additional analysis including calling-out: 1) Market analysis – including price forecasts and the relationship between market purchases and resource acquisition are an important component of the IRP analysis. We recommend adding this into the IRP content section in a way that reflects best practices for utility planning. 2) Energy storage – integrating energy storage as a more prominent resource, distinct from distributed energy resource and generating resource. While some storage may belong in the distributed energy resource category, other storage resources, such as pumped storage, do not fit in that definition. 3) NWEC recommends the SCGHG be explicitly required as part of the avoided cost calculations.</p> <p>Alternative Language: WAC 480-100-610(13) Avoided cost. Staff agrees with NWEC’s redline “The avoided cost must incorporate the social cost of greenhouse gas emissions.” This could be construed as an additional adder beyond capacity and energy avoided cost considerations. Instead, staff proposes the following sentence in 610(13): <i>Utilities must demonstrate how the social cost of greenhouse gas is included in the avoided cost calculations.</i></p>	<p>Staff agrees that a market analysis that examines the relationship and trade-offs of relying on the markets v. resource acquisition is a critical component of an IRP and a resource adequacy assessment.</p> <p>Staff agrees energy storage must be evaluated in all IRPs but declines to recommend a methodology for evaluation in rule.</p> <p>Staff believes that the SCGHG <i>must</i> be included when calculating the avoided cost of conservation per RCW 19.280.030(3)(a), but it is not necessarily desirable or possible to break-out every component of the avoided cost.</p>
<p>CS</p>	<p>In 480-100-610 (11)(c), the language should be changed to the following to align with the statute: “Considers acquisition of existing renewable resources and relies on renewable resources and energy storage in the acquisition of existing renewable new resources constructed after May 7 2019, insofar as doing so is at the lowest reasonable cost, considering risks.”</p>	<p>Staff agrees with the edits.</p>
<p>Sierra Club</p>	<p>Sierra Club’s comments are the same as NWEC’s, above.</p>	<p>See Staff’s comments to NWEC, above.</p>

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

12. Should the Commission provide more specific guidance in these rules on how and where a utility incorporates the social cost of greenhouse gases? See draft WAC 480-100-610(6) and WAC 480-100-610(12)(j). Why or why not?

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
Avista	No, recommend giving the utility discretion. The Commission should determine whether or not the utility met legislative intent; if changes should be made, the advisory group and utility should determine the utility’s methodology and reach consensus.	Staff recommends that the social cost of greenhouse gases (SCGHG) is modeled as a cost, or planning, adder. If each utility is given discretion, there is a risk of inconsistent results across utility IRP modeling and potentially utility resource preference.
PP&L	No, retain flexibility how the social cost of carbon is treated in resource portfolio modeling due to multi-state considerations with differing regulatory requirements. The company will continue to address the social cost of greenhouse gas emissions as a sensitivity it applies to top portfolios, not as a built in cost that would not be consistent across states. The social cost of greenhouse gas emissions will be applied to “top portfolios” and the “preferred portfolio,” which will inform the CEAP.	Staff recommends modeling the SCGHG as a cost adder; PacifiCorp should continue to address SCGHGs as it applies to its top portfolios and may continue to use scenarios and sensitivities, as appropriate.
PSE	Yes, make the distinction more clear in rules that the social cost of greenhouse gases is a “planning adder,” not an input that affects economic dispatch of plants. PSE recommends language be added to subsection “(j) Incorporate the social cost of greenhouse gas emissions as a cost adder as specified in RCW 19.280.030.”	Staff agrees and recommends modeling the SCGHG as a cost adder.
PC	Yes, more specificity would be beneficial and will provide more consistent portfolio results across the state. The Commission should continue to engage stakeholders to determine the most effective ways to account for these costs in modeling.	Staff agrees and recommends the SCGHG be modeled as a cost adder.
NVEC	NVEC provides redlines for SCGHG and also recommends the social cost of greenhouse gas emission be explicitly required as part of the avoided cost calculations.	RCW 19.280.030 (3)(a) requires the SCGHGs must be incorporated when calculating the avoided cost.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

CS	<p>Utilities must incorporate the SCGHG in a consistent manner or the differing assumptions will distort resource procurement across Washington. The rule should apply the SCGHG to all WECC resources that flow through the utility’s system, is delivered to Washington customers, the utility’s existing resources, new resources being considered to serve the utility’s load, and market purchases, regardless of geographic location. Applying the cost adder post-economic dispatch may better reflect reality, but modeling results should ensure that this does not underestimate the per-MWh cost of various portfolios. The utilities should also model a future carbon tax as a risk scenario.</p>	<p>Staff agrees that if utilities are not incorporating the SCGHG in a consistent way, there is a risk of differing utility assumptions potentially distorting resource procurement and availability in Washington and across the WECC. It is not clear the IRP model can apply SCGHG to flows in practice. Staff recommends modeling the SCGHG as a cost adder. Staff declines to recommend requiring the utilities model a carbon tax as a future scenario but believe it may be appropriate for the utility to include in its IRP.</p>
VCAG	<p>Yes, the Commission should provide explicit guidelines for utility incorporation of the social cost of greenhouse gases in IRP analysis. To address costs and risk, recommend including it as a cost adder to IRP analyses that support utility facility acquisition or de-commission decisions and analyses associated with electricity dispatch modeling. Also recommend instructing utilities to conduct additional analysis of a “high impact” social cost of greenhouse gas costs sensitivity, which may necessitate a new definition for: high impact social cost of greenhouse gas emissions.</p>	<p>Utilities may choose to include a high impact social cost of GHG sensitivity as part of its IRP risk analysis. Staff disagrees that it should direct or require utilities to perform the “high impact” analysis beyond the specific SCC values set forth in statute.</p>
WEC	<p>Yes, the Commission should provide more guidance to ensure that the social cost of greenhouse gas emissions is applied to resource evaluation, planning, and acquisition in a way that promotes the timely transition off of fossil fuels.</p>	<p>Staff recommends applying the SCGHG as a cost adder.</p>

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

Sierra Club	Social cost of greenhouse gases needs to be applied broadly. At a minimum, the social cost of GHGs should be applied to all modeling for planning and acquisition, and to short-term acquisitions. This cost should be rigorously applied not just to the IRP, but to the CEIP and CEAP as well.	Staff agrees that SCGHG should be applied to IRP modeling. Staff recommends including it as a cost adder.
RN	No position at this time.	No Staff response necessary.

13a. Should the Commission address resource adequacy metrics in rule by identifying the scope of allowed metrics or identifying the specific metric utilities should use? Alternatively, should the Commission allow utilities the flexibility to change their resource adequacy requirement to meet current best practices without going through a rulemaking? Please explain why one method is preferred over the other.

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
Avista	Do not adopt metrics in rule. Maintain flexibility for utilities (within standard utility practices) until a regional or legislative mandate is created. Without flexibility best methodologies cannot be adopted.	Staff agrees that at this time the Commission should not mandate specific metrics in rule, but rather that a utility must consider more than one metric. The Commission should wait for regional collaboratives to continue to develop, provided they do so on a timely basis.
PP&L	No. Do not make rules on resource adequacy metrics. Wait for the regional resource adequacy program to develop.	Staff agrees that at this time the Commission should not mandate which specific metrics in rule must be considered but rather that a utility must consider more than one metric. The Commission should wait for regional collaboratives to continue to develop, provided they do so on a timely basis.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

sPSE	<p>The rules should not define specific metrics at this time. Rules could impair changing the resource adequacy approach as the energy supply portfolio changes.</p> <p>The Commission should hold a utility accountable for achieving the reliability metrics the utility adopts. CETA provides the Commission with more authority over resource adequacy. The Commission can intervene in a utility’s CEIP process if the Commission is concerned the proposed CEIP does not properly incorporate resource adequacy.</p>	<p>Staff agrees that the Commission should not mandate the metrics in rule at this time. The Commission should wait for regional collaboratives to develop, provided they do so on a timely basis.</p>
PC	<p>Do not dictate a single, specific metric to use but instead, highlight various resource adequacy metrics that utilities can choose to include in their IRPs. This is best approach due to changing energy policy landscape and technologies in the Western Interconnect.</p>	<p>Staff believes that the utilities must consider multiple metrics as part of its assessment but does not recommend specific metric requirements in rule or a methodology for weighting the metrics.</p>
CS	<p>The rules should provide guidance for utilities to measure resource adequacy and to identify transmission availability in a consistent manner across utilities. The Commission should issue a policy statement to provide guidance that can be updated over time as resource adequacy metrics evolve. Resource adequacy should consider solutions on a Western Interconnection basis.</p>	<p>Staff believes a policy statement may be appropriate in the future but recommends waiting for the regional collaboration to develop, provided they do so on a timely basis.</p>
Energy Storage Solutions, LLC	<p>Incorporate system flexibility needs into reliability metrics to better account for the characteristics of the future supply mix.</p>	<p>This is a standard practice in resource adequacy modeling but methods for inter-hour modeling are not well enough established to prescribe in rule.</p>

Docket UE-190698
Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

Invenergy, LLC	Before including short-term market power purchases in its long-term resource strategy, a utility should be required to carefully assess the extent to which it can prudently rely on such purchases, and identify the resource adequacy, cost and risk implications to its customers. The IRP rules should be clarified to specify that firm transmission rights alone are not a resource capable of serving consumers' needs for firm electricity	The resource adequacy model only answers the physical question of the sufficiency of generation and transmission system's capability to meet load. If a utility's resource sufficiency is dependent on market purchases, the IRP must explicitly measure and incorporate that risk and cost into its portfolio.
----------------	--	---

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

<p>NIPPC</p>	<p>A common resource adequacy standard should be established in rule for determining renewable resource contributions to capacity. Effective load carrying capability or a capacity factor approximation could be use (see stipulation in OPUC docket). The IRP work plan should include proposed due dates and schedule for performing an appropriate capacity contribution study.</p>	<p>NIPPC provides a link to Oregon PUC’s renewable generator’s contribution to capacity investigation. Standard business practices for resource adequacy studies include the determination of a generator’s capacity. The best specific modeling method for calculating the capacity contribution of renewable resources has not been determined so incorporating a specific method in rule at this time is premature. The IRP rules require the utility to examine methods for determining the capacity contribution of renewable resources and a work plan with specificity that allows stakeholders to examine and comment on the approaches the utility is considering using.</p>
--------------	---	---

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

<p>NWEC</p>	<p>Establish resource adequacy standards in rule to ensure consistency across the regulated utilities and, due to changes in the industry, issue a more detailed policy statement. Resource adequacy standards in rule should use effective load carrying capacity to model renewables and should account for the value of diverse resource portfolios that include distributed energy resources and flexible demand approaches.</p>	<p>Each utility is responsible for determining its resource adequacy standard and that standard may vary with its resource mix. A policy statement or Commission order in a specific docket is the best method for considering a standard. While staff agrees that effective load carrying capacity is a good approach, choosing one approach in rule may exclude modifications or other improvements to modeling that would improve accuracy. Staff believes the rules as written require the determination of the value of diversity in a resource portfolio, include consideration of distributed energy resources and flexible demand approaches.</p>
-------------	--	---

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

Renewables Northwest	Establish consistent standards for resource adequacy in rule that are applied to all utilities' resource planning and that use effective load carrying capacity to capture the full capacity value of renewable resources. Due to the combination of capacity needs and the move to meet capacity needs with variable energy resources, a uniform standard is needed. Rules need to be flexible enough to allow the use of innovative resources or resource portfolios with a diversity of resource to meet resource-adequacy needs.	Each utility is responsible for determining its resource adequacy standard and that standard may vary with its resource mix. A policy statement or Commission order in a specific docket is the best method for considering a standard. While staff agrees that effective load carrying capacity is a good approach, choosing one approach in rule may exclude modifications or other advancements to modeling that would improve accuracy.
Sierra Club	The UTC should provide a uniform approach for all utilities that includes an assessment of energy efficiency, demand response, grid integration, storage, benefits from transitioning away from utility-based Balancing Authorities and rigorous assessment of renewables contribution to peak demand. All data used in the resource adequacy analysis should be disclosed with the use of non-disclosure agreements where necessary.	Staff does not believe a uniform approach can be adopted at this time as improvements in modeling methods are expected.
Swan Lake North Hydro, LLC, PUD #1 of Klickitat County, and Renewable Hydrogen Alliance	The 2019 Washington Legislature enacted RCW 19.405 ("CETA") and changes to RCW 19.280, which both directly and indirectly require addressing resource adequacy. The IRP rules must address the coming capacity deficit. The region does not have market or regulatory mechanisms that providing compliance mechanisms for capacity.	Staff believes the draft rules require sufficient analysis to identify a capacity deficit.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

Washington Environmental Council	In order to establish a shared understanding of resource adequacy across the state, the Commission should identify metrics in the rule.	Staff does not believe that at this time the Commission should mandate which specific metrics in rule must be considered but rather that a utility must consider more than one metric. The Commission should wait for regional collaboratives to continue to develop, provided they do so on a timely basis.
----------------------------------	---	--

13b. If the Commission does not establish specific guidelines in rule, it is possible different utilities will use different resource adequacy metrics, which may make effective comparisons among utilities more difficult. If not by rule, should the Commission provide more specific guidelines through another process, such as a policy statement?

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
Avista	Commission should not create rules on a resource adequacy standard until the region acts: but should determine and rule on whether a utility is in compliance with its own resource adequacy standard.	Each utility is responsible for determining its resource adequacy standard and that standard may vary with its resource mix. A policy statement or Commission order in a specific docket is the best method for considering a standard.
CS	See question 13(a).	See response in 13(a)
Energy Storage Solutions, LLC	See question 13(a).	See response in 13(a)

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

Invenergy, LLC	The IRP rules should be clarified to specify that firm transmission rights alone are not a resource capable of serving consumers' needs for firm electricity. See also question 13(a).	A utility's resource adequacy studies must demonstrate that there is sufficient generation to meet all load, including any of its load obligation that is not served by generation resources in its portfolio.
NIPPC		
NWECC	A policy statement that can be updated over time will provide the best means to ensure utilities are utilizing common adequacy metrics that reflect current best practices. See also question 13a	Staff agrees that a policy statement may be a useful tool in the future as resource adequacy methodologies and standards develop in the industry.
PP&L	See question 13(a).	
PC	PC agrees with the need for consistency between utilities but, considering the relatively inflexible nature of rules, the Commission should provide guidance in a policy statement. This approach provides clear guidance but also affords the flexibility.	Staff agrees that a policy statement may be a useful tool in the future as resource adequacy methodologies and standards develop in the industry.
PSE	The Northwest Power Pool members are designing a resource adequacy program that includes allocation and procurement of the region's capacity needs. Once design and implementation is further along, the Commission could revisit whether a policy statement or additional rules are necessary.	Staff does not consider it realistic to expect the 25+ NWPP resource adequacy program members to change their decision after they have designed and begun implementation of their resource adequacy program due to a non-binding policy statement from a single state Commission.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

Renewables Northwest	See question 13(a).	See response in question 13(a)
Sierra Club	Sierra Club is not sure that it is appropriate for different utilities to use different metrics.	Staff believes if differences arise the utility will need to demonstrate why it choose its approach.
Swan Lake North Hydro, LLC, PUD #1 of Klickitat County, and Renewable Hydrogen Alliance	N/A or see response to 13a.	See response to 13(a).
Washington Environmental Council	See question 13(a).	See question 13(a).

14. Should the Commission provide additional guidance regarding cost-effective demand response and load management? See WAC 480-100-610(2)(b) and (12)(e).

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
Avista	No, current DR potential analysis in the IRP is already robust for each IOU.	Staff disagrees that the current process is adequate and recommends additional guidance in a policy statement.
PC	The Commission should issue a demand response policy statement addressing programmatic guidance, direction in determining cost effectiveness, funding mechanisms, customer privacy and data security concerns.	Staff agrees a policy statement is warranted to address issues.
NWEC	Yes, current efforts in DR are concerning. Possibly start with guidance on how to evaluate cost-effectiveness. Rules for DR need to ensure total transparency in data, methods, assumptions, RFPs, etc. to ensure outcomes can be audited.	Staff agrees.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

PP&L	No new guidance on DR is necessary. The IRP process compares resources and selects all cost-effective DR. Additional specificity may have unintended consequences.	Staff disagrees that the current process is adequate and recommends additional guidance in a policy statement.
CS	Strongly suggests guidance in rules to ensure consistent methodologies for target development, both specific and interim.	Staff disagrees and believes additional guidance in a policy statement is warranted at this time.
PSE	No guidance is needed at this time.	Staff disagrees that the current process is adequate and recommends additional guidance in a policy statement.
Sierra Club	Yes, guidance is necessary because the utilities have a poor track record of DR compared with many other places around the country. Utilities must ensure transparency in calculations.	Staff agrees.

15. Draft WAC 480-100-610(12) includes a requirement for utilities to identify in the IRP the CEIP’s four-year energy efficiency, demand response, and renewable energy goals in the CEAP. This is the only listed requirement of a CEAP that is not in statute. Is it necessary and appropriate for the utility to identify proposed four-year CEIP targets in the CEAP?

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
VCAG	It is appropriate to establish the CETA baseline/plan against which 4-year targets will be determined. Suggests language addition to 610(2)(b) “including aggregated demand response resources.”	Staff agrees the CEAP goals will establish a baseline for the specific target in the CEIP. Staff disagrees that additional language citing aggregated DR resources is necessary.
Avista	Recommends a draft CEIP and opportunity to change between IRP and CEIP as data gets stale.	Staff disagrees that a draft CEIP should be included in the IRP, although a utility would be allowed to include additional information that will inform the CEIP process.
PC	It is appropriate but not necessary	Staff agrees.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

NWEC	Yes, goals in the CEAP should inform and be consistent with four-year CEIP targets.	Staff agrees but recommends that additional information about specific actions should modify the specific target in the CEIP.
RN	Yes, explicitly incorporating goals into the IRP is appropriate.	Staff agrees but recommends that additional information about specific actions should modify the specific target in the CEIP.
PP&L	Requests clarification and a workshop around the requirements and timing of the CEIP and CEAP, including how the plans relate to one another.	Staff believes that the CEAP is an Action Plan within the IRP, and both the IRP and CEAP inform the CEIP.
CS	Supports the inclusion of specific targets in the CEAP once every four years.	Staff agrees but recommends that additional information about specific actions should modify the specific target in the CEIP.
PSE	It is not necessary to identify proposed 4-year CEIP targets in the CEAP. The CEAP should be a starting point to build specific targets but should not contain binding targets. Adjustments may be necessary during an iterative implementation planning process.	Staff agrees that any goals identified in the CEAP must be allowed to be modified in order to produce CEIP compliance targets.
Sierra Club	Yes.	Staff agrees but recommends that additional information about specific actions should modify the specific target in the CEIP.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

Other Issues

Party	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
Avista	Section 13 and 14: it is premature to codify avoided cost rules in IRP given the outstanding PURPA issues. Limit the description of information required by striking sections 13 and 14.	Staff disagrees and continues to recommend the inclusion of those sections. The IRP is the primary model that produces avoided costs and is the appropriate place for disclosing this information.
PAC	It is important to <i>not</i> incorporate a penalty for failure to meet the aspirational targets contained in any assessment.	Staff recommends the Commission maintain its discretion to enforce targets identified in a plan it approves, such as a CEIP.
K4C	Emphasizes interests in increasing transparency, accountability, and stakeholder involvement in the planning process. Strongly supports public participation in the IRP process and encourages developing guidance to ensure a robust and constructive dialog during IRP development, encourages adequate time for stakeholder input and utility response to input/incorporation into plan.	Staff recommends the draft IRP rules include enhanced public participation and has included proposals.
	Seek clear reporting from utilities regarding decision making in concert with highly impacted communities.	Staff believes this recommendation has been included in the draft rules and welcomes feedback on the next issued draft.
	Would like to better understand barriers to equitable and accelerated implementation of clean energy resources.	The UTC and Commerce held a joint workshop on February 5, 2020, and the UTC held a workshop on May 22, 2020.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

PC	Amend WAC 480-100-610(12)(c) to “Demonstrate that all customers are benefiting from the transition to clean energy <u>through the equitable distribution of benefits, consistent with RCW 19.405.060(1)(c)(iii).</u> ”	RCW 19.405.040(8) includes three distinct categories of benefits that must accrue to customers through the transition. Therefore, Staff does not support this edit as it enumerates only one of the benefit categories.
	Understanding the terms “vulnerable populations” and “highly impacted communities” with further discussion and data is a critical before draft rules are proposed.	The UTC held a workshop on May 22, 2020, that included discussion of vulnerable populations and highly impacted communities.
	PC supports inclusion of Section 16 but notes proposed rule should clarify whether the requirement includes comments offered orally at a hearing or advisory group meeting or if it refers to written comments.	Staff views the public comment summary as inclusive of advisory group meeting and oral and written comments but would not expect a comment summary to include detailed summaries of comments offered orally at a hearing.
NWECC	Supports incorporating the definition of “energy assistance” and “energy burden” in WAC 480-100-600, but recommends more deliberative process.	The UTC and Commerce held a joint workshop on energy assistance on January 28, 2020, that included discussion of “energy assistance” and “energy burden.”
	Equity could be addressed through the specific targets (<i>i.e.</i> , energy efficiency, renewable energy, and demand response) in the CEIP.	Compliance with RCW 19.405.040(8) should be evaluated on a portfolio basis, which is not consistent with the specific targets.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

	Equity metrics are directly relevant to the performance-based incentive mechanisms in ratemaking.	Performance based ratemaking is outside the scope of this rulemaking.
WEC	Compliance should not be <i>granted</i> at a certain point in time, but met by <i>maintaining the cycle</i> of planning, incorporating public input, making decisions in a transparent way, and reporting on actions as planning begins anew.	CETA establishes four-year compliance periods. Staff recommends the draft rules include language regarding planning, public input, reporting, and adaptive management to support appropriate engagement.
	Recommend amending the definition of “lowest reasonable costs” to capture the distribution of costs, risks, and benefits over geographies and populations.	Staff agrees.
	Recommends moving the assessment pursuant to RCW 19.280.030(1)(k) from WAC 480-100-610(9) to the resource evaluation section [WAC 480-100-610(6)].	Staff disagrees. The assessment described in RCW 19.280.030(1)(k) should inform resource selection, but the assessment is an input to the IRP and should therefore be included in the current location in rule.
CS	Recommend updating the definition of “lowest reasonable costs” to include long- and short-term public health, economic, and environmental benefits.	Staff agrees that the lowest reasonable cost should explicitly incorporate new public policy objectives in CETA.
	Recommend in-depth utility conversation with vulnerable community members to collaborate on developing metrics.	Staff agrees. Rule language requires utilities to engage with highly impacted communities and vulnerable populations when developing indicators.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

	Utility planning should consider health impacts of indoor air pollutants from non-electricity fuels.	Utility planning will continue to consider indoor air pollutants from non-electricity fuels in cost-effectiveness tests, but it is unclear what additional consideration of indoor air impacts should be considered pursuant to CETA.
	Notes that decisions made in planning process will directly impact all utility customers and public, stakeholders, experts, etc. should be able to provide meaningful input into the decision-making process. Notes, the law requires utilities to ensure an equitable distribution of benefits in the clean energy transition, so engagement with highly impacted communities is critically important.	Staff agrees. Staff recommends that the rules include enhanced public engagement.
	Recommends amending definition of “consult” to go beyond listening and acknowledging feedback.	Staff recommends removing the definition of “consult” from the draft rules and replacing the definition with more specific expectations of actions for engagement from a utility. Staff believes the draft rules should clearly outline the expectations for companies to engage in a meaningful participatory process with stakeholders and the public.
TEP	The IRP process provides an opportunity for each of the three foundational components of an equitable transition: 1) details data collection and analysis; 2) meaningful engaging of low-income and vulnerable customers; and 3) broad consideration of programs and practices in the context of resource planning.	Staff agrees.
	The word “through” in RCW 19.405.040(8) has the effect of identifying relevant information for ensuring all customers are benefitting.	Staff agrees.
	The UTC and stakeholder will be considering how to move to more fully recognize and incorporate NEBs into resource planning analysis.	No Staff response required.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

	Utilities should ensure the equitable sharing of energy efficiency savings by providing documentation regarding how savings are distributed within the residential class and how barriers such as rental status or upfront costs of measures are addressed.	Staff believes companies should evaluate ways to equitably distribute benefits at the program level to ensure they are meeting 4(8) in a cost-effective manner.
	Utilities can address the reduction of burden via energy efficiency by providing information such as 1) identification of vulnerable populations and highly impacted communities and analytical tools used for that identification; 2) which supply- and demand-side programs impact vulnerable communities; 3) current and projected participation levels in energy efficiency and DER programs and accessibility; 4) comparative participation levels; 5) analysis of potential impacts of preferred portfolio on vulnerable populations and highly impacted communities and any mitigation of negative effects; and 6) proposed metrics.	Staff agrees.
	It is important to retain consistent definitions across the IRP rulemaking and EIA rulemaking. Additionally, a definition of “low-income” should be added to the IRP rules.	The definitions associated with energy assistance should be consistent across the EIA and IRP rules. The term “low-income” is not currently included in the rule so the definition is not included at this time.
	Supports strengthening the rule regarding public participation and providing more specific provisions for ensuring that venerable communities, highly impacted communities, and low-income customers are included in resource planning.	No Staff response necessary.
F&C	Commission guidance on CEIPs should include the following process for utility planning and decision-making practices and metrics: 1) identify clean energy transition needs qualitatively and quantitatively; 2) determine options to meet those needs; 3) evaluate the impacts associated with each option, drawing from local assessments; 4) identify who is impacted and how, including historical conditions related to disparate distribution of benefits and harms; and 5) elect actions that: a) direct impacts to create benefits and reduce burdens on vulnerable and highly impacted communities and b) have the lowest risk profile for causing harm to the public broadly and vulnerable populations in particular.	Staff agrees in general and believes many of these elements are explicitly included in the draft rules. The “equitable distribution” definition has been updated to clarify that current conditions include legacy and cumulative conditions.

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

	<p>“Equitable distribution” should be defined in the draft rule to mean “The distribution of energy and non-energy benefits and reduction of burdens to vulnerable populations and highly impacted communities.”</p>	<p>This definition is duplicative with language in the draft bill in 11(e). The rules include an alternative definition of “equitable distribution.”</p>
	<p>“Lowest reasonable cost” should consider the equitable distribution and the long-term and short-term public health and environmental benefits, costs, and risks; and energy security risk requirements.</p>	<p>Staff agrees.</p>
VCAG	<p>Recommends requiring utilities to solicit IRP topics to be considered in the IRP workplan from members of the advisory group two months before the utility proposes their IRP work plan. (offers language)</p>	<p>Staff agrees that utilities should discuss the contents of workplans with advisory group members in advance of submitting the workplans. Staff does not believe a specific timeline for this is necessary in draft rules.</p>
	<p>Recommends changing the level of public participation from “consult” to “involve” (offers language)</p>	<p>Staff recommends removing the definition of “consult” from the draft rules and replacing the definition with a more specific expectations of actions for engagement from a utility. Staff believes the draft rules should clearly outline the expectations for companies to engage in a meaningful participatory process with stakeholders and the public</p>

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

	<p>Requests more transparency/oversight over conservation potential assessment from Public Counsel (PC). “increase public participation and transparency by adding a provision to proposed WAC 480-600 et seq. requiring PC to provide oversight of the contractor bidding process for conservation potential assessments.”</p>	<p>Staff does not recommend the UTC attempt to put requirements on Public Counsel. Staff has recommended, and the UTC has approved by order, conditions that allow significant opportunity for energy efficiency advisory group members, including PC, to participate in the development of the conservation potential assessment.</p>
<p>NIPCC</p>	<p>The utilities should be required to provide access to their market forecast methodologies and underlying inputs in the pre-filing IRP stakeholder advisory process</p> <p>NIPCC also recommends an addition to discussion draft rule WAC 480-100-620(1) that would require that the utility IRP website also include a list of methodologies and underlying data or inputs that are available in native file format upon request, including the market price forecast methodology and all inputs</p>	<p>Suggested redlines based on current draft rule language would be helpful to Staff’s understanding of where the draft rules do not address this ask.</p>

Docket UE-190698
 Integrated Resource Plan Rulemaking
 Summary of Comments on 1st Discussion Draft

James Adcock	<p>Generally notes concerns with PSE’s IRP public involvement process; suggests requiring audio recording of IRP meetings for future fact-checking; suggestions requiring PSE to record and post publicly ALL questions that are asked and their answers from IRP meetings; suggests setting an expectation for public participation in PSE’s advisory group meetings that require PSE to set aside time for stakeholder comments; have rules and penalties for audio/visual equipment use; require a certain percentage of IRP meetings to take place as scheduled (notes difficulties with changing schedules and times/locations); create a check process so that stakeholders can formally alert Commission of issues with IRP stakeholder involvement and so that the Commission can address the issue; have staff facilitate and mediate IRP meetings, esp rules of the road checks; limit the ability of utilities to redact or otherwise make confidential certain planning materials.</p>	<p>The draft rules require utilities to record or summarize and respond to questions and advice from advisory group members as well as add some guiding language around sharing confidential information with stakeholders. Staff does not believe rules and penalties for audio/visual equipment use or requirements for percentages of on-time, as-scheduled meetings, a formal alert process, and staff-facilitated meetings are needed at this time, however the commission and staff are planning additional flexible guidance around public participation best practices for utilities and stakeholders.</p>
--------------	--	--