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Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI)


Sources and Notes [B]–[D] states that the percent of residential customers participating was provided by Puget Sound Energy for 2021, with an assumed escalation rate of one percent.

a. Is the customer participation rate based on actual participation rates for 2021? If not, please provide the basis for the customer participation rate.
   i. If the answer to subpart a. is yes, please explain why the 2021 participation estimate differs for the low, base, and high cases.

b. Please provide the basis and assumptions used to calculate a one percent escalation rate.

Response:

a. No, it is not. The customer participation rate assumptions are based on current website logins.

b. This is a conservative growth assumption made by the Brattle team. See Puget Sound Energy’s Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 322 for how the team has further adjusted down the participation rates for “active” participation in the usage presentment program.