

**EXH. PJP-1T
DOCKET UE-210795
PSE'S CEIP
WITNESS: PHILLIP J. POPOFF**

**BEFORE THE
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

In the Matter of

PUGET SOUND ENERGY

**Clean Energy Implementation Plan
Pursuant to WAC 480-100-640**

Docket UE-210795

PREFILED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY (NONCONFIDENTIAL) OF

PHILIP J. POPOFF

ON BEHALF OF PUGET SOUND ENERGY

DECEMBER 12, 2022

PUGET SOUND ENERGY

PREFILED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY (NONCONFIDENTIAL) OF

PHILLIP J. POPOFF

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. PSE’S APPROACH TO SOCIAL COST OF GREENHOUSE GAS
MODELING IS REASONABLE2

III. SUMMARY RESULTS OF PERFORMING DR. HART’S
RECOMMENDED ANALYSIS6

IV. PSE’S APPROACH TO MODELING AND ANALYZING ENERGY
STORAGE EFFECTIVE LOAD CARRYING CAPABILITY IS
REASONABLE12

V. CONCLUSION.....15

PUGET SOUND ENERGY

**PREFILED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY (NONCONFIDENTIAL) OF
PHILLIP J. POPOFF**

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exh. PJP-2: Professional Qualifications of Phillip J. Popoff

1 **PUGET SOUND ENERGY**

2 **PREFILED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY (NONCONFIDENTIAL) OF**

3 **PHILLIP J. POPOFF**

4 **I. INTRODUCTION**

5 **Q. Please state your name, business address, and position with Puget Sound**
6 **Energy.**

7 A. My name is Phillip J. Popoff, and my business address is Puget Sound Energy,
8 P.O. Box 97034, Bellevue, Washington 98009-9734. I am employed by Puget
9 Sound Energy (“PSE” or “Company”) as Director, Resource Planning Analytics.

10 **Q. Please describe your background and professional qualifications.**

11 A. I have worked in the energy utility sector for 30 years. I worked at the Virginia
12 State Corporation Commission for two years, the Washington Utilities and
13 Transportation Commission for three years, and at PSE for 25 years. Currently, I
14 lead PSE’s Integrated Resource Planning (“IRP”) and Load Forecasting teams.
15 An exhibit detailing my professional qualifications is provided as Exhibit PJP-2.

16 **Q. What is the purpose of your prefiled rebuttal testimony?**

17 A. My testimony addresses questions that arose in response testimony regarding
18 modeling in PSE’s Clean Energy Implementation Plan (“CEIP”). Specifically, my
19 testimony addresses the methodology that PSE used to model the social cost of
20 greenhouse gases in the CEIP Preferred Portfolio and the No-CETA Portfolio.

1 My testimony rebuts relevant portions of the prefiled response testimony of
2 Elaine K. Hart, Exh. EKH-1T, submitted on behalf of NW Energy Coalition and
3 Front and Centered (“NWEC and Front and Centered”) relating to treatment of
4 social cost of greenhouse gases and effective load carrying capability of energy
5 storage in long-term capacity expansion planning optimization.

6 **Q. Please summarize your prefiled rebuttal testimony.**

7 A. My testimony explains why PSE’s approach to social cost of greenhouse gases
8 modeling and effective load carrying capability of energy storage is reasonable
9 and preferable to the recommendations and requests from NWEC and Front and
10 Centered in this case. I will explain the technical aspects of (i) PSE’s approach to
11 modeling the social cost of greenhouse gases in its 2021 CEIP, and (ii) PSE’s
12 approach to analyzing effective load carrying capability of energy storage in its
13 2021 CEIP.

14 **II. PSE’S APPROACH TO SOCIAL COST OF GREENHOUSE GAS**
15 **MODELING IS REASONABLE**

16 **Q. Please describe PSE’s overall approach and strategy for its social cost of**
17 **greenhouse gas modeling decisions.**

18 A. PSE incorporates social cost of greenhouse gases in its modeling as an externality
19 cost (or adder). This methodology is reasonable because it accurately reflects how
20 power plants are expected to operate. As described in PSE’s CEIP (Table 5-2),
21 total costs = direct costs + externality (or pollution) costs. Direct costs are those
22 that PSE must pay to other parties, which become part of the Company’s costs to

1 customers. Direct costs include fixed cost items such as capital and fixed
2 operations and maintenance, along with variable costs that are affected by
3 dispatch, including fuel and variable operations and maintenance costs.
4 Externality costs associated with greenhouse gas emissions are real costs to
5 society but are not internalized into market mechanisms or operation decisions
6 and are therefore called “externalities.”

7 **Q. Can you summarize how PSE reflects the social cost of greenhouse gases in**
8 **its analytical process?**

9 A. PSE uses Aurora to incorporate analysis of the social cost of greenhouse gas
10 emissions. As explained more thoroughly in PSE’s CEIP, Aurora is an electric
11 modeling forecasting and analysis software that uses the western power market to
12 produce hourly electricity price forecasts and it also identifies hypothetical
13 portfolios of resources.

14 Typically, in Aurora, there are two model runs, which together reflect PSE’s
15 analysis of the social cost of greenhouse gas emissions. First is the long-term
16 capacity expansion model. This analysis is based on hourly sampling to develop
17 portfolios and determine the lowest cost mix of resources through the entire
18 planning horizon. This sampling approach is important to manage the run-time
19 needed to solve the cost minimization of resource additions given so much data
20 and so many constraints. Once that long-term capacity expansion is determined,
21 there is a full hourly run. The full hourly run takes the resources from the long-
22 term capacity expansion, along with PSE’s existing resources, and dispatches

1 them using hourly data for the entire planning horizon to better refine operation
2 and cost forecasts.

3 To model social cost of greenhouse gases as an externality cost, PSE first runs the
4 long-term capacity expansion and the full hourly model without a carbon cost,
5 then uses operational data of the hourly dispatch to estimate the amount of
6 greenhouse gas, by resource, by year. Then, PSE takes the tons of greenhouse gas
7 pollution, by source, and multiplies it by the social cost of greenhouse gas
8 emissions. That cost represents the estimated pollution cost by resource by year.
9 The estimated pollution cost by year is then put back into the long-term capacity
10 expansion model onto each resource as a fixed cost (*i.e.*, an adder) that does not
11 affect dispatch decisions. The next long-term capacity expansion run reflects the
12 social cost of greenhouse gases of emitting resources in a way that does not affect
13 economic dispatch. Once the long-term capacity expansion run is completed, an
14 hourly dispatch is run for the entire planning horizon to refine operations and
15 costs, as noted above.

1 **Q. NWECC and Front and Centered submitted testimony asserting that PSE does**
2 **not incorporate the social cost of greenhouse gases as a direct cost that affects**
3 **economic dispatch of PSE's fossil fuel plants.¹ Is that correct?**

4 A. Yes, PSE's planning models treat social cost of greenhouse gases as an externality
5 cost, not a direct cost that will impact economic dispatch of resources, based on
6 requirements of CETA.

7 **Q. Does CETA require utilities to incorporate consideration of the social cost of**
8 **greenhouse gas emissions when making economic dispatch decisions in its**
9 **modeling?**

10 A. No. CETA requires utilities to consider the social cost of greenhouse gases when
11 making intermediate to long-term decisions, but CETA does not require utilities
12 to apply this analysis when making economic dispatch decisions.² The rules in the
13 Commission's General Order R-601 in Dockets UE-191023 and UE-190698
14 (consolidated) do not prescribe a specific methodology for incorporating the
15 social cost of greenhouse gases into portfolio optimization, and allow the social
16 cost of greenhouse gases to be applied as a planning adder or as a dispatch cost.
17 PSE applied it as a planning adder, or externality cost. PSE has never
18 incorporated the social cost of greenhouse gas emissions as an adder when
19 making economic dispatch decisions. In PSE's current general rate case filing,
20 Docket UE-220066, PSE did not include the social cost of greenhouse gas

¹ See Hart, Exh. EKH-1T at 10:15-11:3.

² RCW Section 19.280.030(3)(a)

1 emissions as a dispatch cost in power costs and no party to that proceeding
2 (including NWECA and Front and Centered) recommended that PSE do so.

3 **Q. Why has PSE chosen to model social cost of greenhouse gas emissions as an**
4 **externality in the long-term model run instead of a dispatch cost?**

5 A. Because in operations, the social cost of greenhouse gases will not be treated as a
6 dispatch cost, as described above. PSE has two choices: (1) model social cost of
7 greenhouse gases as an externality that will not affect dispatch, or (2) model it as
8 a dispatch cost. PSE's choice to treat social cost of greenhouse gases as an
9 externality cost is reasonable because it is consistent with how the system will
10 operate.

11 **III. SUMMARY RESULTS OF PERFORMING DR. HART'S**
12 **RECOMMENDED ANALYSIS**

13 **Q. Dr. Hart recommended the Commission require PSE analyze the social cost**
14 **of greenhouse gas emissions as a dispatch cost? Did PSE perform this**
15 **analysis?**

16 A. Yes. In response to NWECA and Front and Centered's response testimony, PSE
17 developed a CETA and a "No-CETA" portfolio using the social cost of
18 greenhouse gases as a dispatch cost, rather than an externality, as recommended
19 by Dr. Hart.³ With those results, my testimony below illustrates the impact on
20 incremental costs using Dr. Hart's methodology.

³ See Hart, Exh. EKH-1T at 3:15-4:2.

1 **Q. Can you please describe how PSE incorporated the social cost of greenhouse**
2 **gases as a dispatch cost for PSE’s fossil fuel plants in the long-term capacity**
3 **expansion run?**

4 A. Yes. To implement Dr. Hart’s methodology, the social cost of greenhouse gases
5 was applied to all of PSE’s existing fossil fuel plants as a dispatch cost in the
6 long-term capacity expansion run. The social cost of greenhouse gases was also
7 applied as a variable cost on market imports to PSE’s system, to ensure consistent
8 treatment of greenhouse gas pollution associated with market purchases. This was
9 accomplished by using the emission rate for unspecified market purchases as
10 provided in RCW 19.405.070(2), which sets the rate at 0.437 metric tons of
11 carbon dioxide per megawatt-hour (MWh) of electricity, unless otherwise
12 determined by the Department of Ecology. This emission rate was then multiplied
13 by the social cost of greenhouse gases (\$/metric ton of carbon dioxide) to get a
14 \$/MWh charge by year. The charge was then applied as a variable transmission
15 cost for market purchases. This means the social cost of greenhouse gases was
16 incorporated as dispatch cost for both fossil fuel plant operation and market
17 purchases in deriving the least cost portfolio from the long-term capacity
18 expansion run.

19 **Q. How did PSE apply the social cost of greenhouse gases in the hourly dispatch**
20 **run to implement Dr. Hart’s methodology?**

21 A. In the hourly dispatch run, PSE started with the least cost plan from the long-term
22 capacity expansion model, as described above. In the hourly model dispatch run,

1 the social cost of greenhouse gases was not included in the economic dispatch,
 2 which is consistent with Dr. Hart’s methodology.

3 **Q. How did treating the social cost of greenhouse gases as a direct dispatch cost**
 4 **in the long-term capacity expansion run impact results of the CETA case,**
 5 **relative to treating social cost of greenhouse gases as an externality cost?**

6 A. Overall, incorporating the social cost of greenhouse gases as a direct dispatch cost
 7 had very little impact on the CETA case during the CEIP period. Table 1 CETA
 8 Case Comparisons, below, compares resource builds, cumulative direct costs, and
 9 emissions. This table illustrates that treating the social cost of greenhouse gases as
 10 a dispatch cost did not materially affect resource additions. This table also
 11 illustrates that differences in total direct costs and emissions are immaterial in this
 12 CEIP cycle (2022-2025).

13 Table 1 CETA Case Comparison (2022-2025)

CETA Case		Existing Resources	New Emitting	Market Purchase	Market Sales	New Non-emitting	Total
Resource Builds (nameplate MW)	SCGHG as Externality Cost	-	-	NA	NA	559	559
	SCGHG in Dispatch	-	-	NA	NA	559	559
Cumulative Direct Cost (\$000)	SCGHG as Externality Cost	2,238,899	-	197,638	(216,316)	552,360	2,772,582
	SCGHG in Dispatch	2,239,019	-	197,582	(216,359)	552,260	2,772,502
Emission (short ton)	SCGHG as Externality Cost	26,341,962	-	4,142,427	-	-	30,484,388
	SCGHG in Dispatch	26,344,304	-	4,140,207	-	-	30,484,511

1 **Q. Can you summarize how treating social cost of greenhouse gases as a**
 2 **dispatch cost in the long-term capacity expansion for the No-CETA case**
 3 **affects results?**

4 A. Yes. Treating the social cost of greenhouse gases as a dispatch cost in the long-
 5 term capacity expansion model for the No-CETA case adds 200 MW of
 6 Washington Wind in 2025, relative to treating social cost of greenhouse gases as
 7 an externality cost. This increases the total cost of the No-CETA case by \$50.6
 8 million over the four-year CEIP period (2022-2025). Emissions are approximately
 9 0.68 percent lower when the social cost of greenhouse gases is applied as a
 10 dispatch cost over the period, but given complexity of this analysis, this is not a
 11 material difference. The new resource builds, CEIP period costs, and emission
 12 summary are shown in Table 2 below.

13 Table 2 No-CETA Case Comparison (2022-2025)

No-CETA Case (Portfolio S Bundle 11)		Existing Resources	New Emitting	Market Purchase	Market Sales	New Non-emitting	Total
Resource Builds (nameplate MW)	SCGHG as Externality Cost	-	-	NA	NA	445	445
	SCGHG in Dispatch	-	-	NA	NA	645	645
Cumulative Direct Cost (\$000)	SCGHG as Externality Cost	2,244,384	-	229,768	(183,435)	564,420	2,855,136
	SCGHG in Dispatch	2,242,975	-	222,336	(189,526)	629,908	2,905,694
Emission (short ton)	SCGHG as Externality Cost	26,466,486	-	5,008,725	-	-	31,475,211
	SCGHG in Dispatch	26,434,426	-	4,827,238	-	-	31,261,664

1 **Q. Is the 200 MW of additional wind in the No-CETA case being added during**
 2 **the CEIP period to meet resource adequacy needs during the CEIP period?**

3 A. No. The No-CETA portfolio has adequate capacity to meet resource adequacy
 4 targets during the CEIP period without adding 200 MW of wind in 2025. Table 3
 5 illustrates the annual net capacity need prior to 2030 from the No-CETA case
 6 where social cost of greenhouse gases is treated as a dispatch cost. “Net capacity
 7 need” means the effective capacity of the portfolio minus the capacity needed to
 8 maintain a five percent “loss-of-load probability” resource adequacy target.⁴
 9 Table 3 illustrates the additional 200 MW of wind is not needed until 2027, which
 10 is after the CEIP window. However, the underlying economics, such as
 11 diminishing tax incentives, makes it more cost effective to accelerate acquisition
 12 of that 200 MW wind into the CEIP period to reduce the long-term net present
 13 value cost of the portfolio.

14 Table 3 Peak Capacity in MW (2022-2030)

Table for Peak Capacity		2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Peak Capacity Needs		5,656	5,706	5,792	5,845	5,906	5,972	6,054	6,103	6,182
SCGHG in Dispatch with the 200MW Wind	Peak Capacity	5,886	6,059	6,104	6,144	6,063	5,988	6,062	6,137	6,210
	Surplus/(Deficit)	231	352	312	299	157	16	8	33	28
SCGHG in Dispatch after Removing 200MW Wind	Peak Capacity	5,886	6,059	6,104	6,114	6,032	5,958	6,031	6,106	6,180
	Surplus/(Deficit)	231	352	312	269	127	(14)	(23)	3	(2)

⁴ “PSE uses a loss of load probability consistent with the Northwest Power and Conservation Council to determine the peak capacity need for its service territory.” CEIP Chapter 2, pg. 31.

1 **Q. How did Dr. Hart’s methodology to incorporate the social cost of greenhouse**
2 **gas emissions as a dispatch cost in the long-term capacity expansion affect**
3 **the incremental cost analysis?**

4 A. As shown in Table 2 above, Dr. Hart’s recommendation to include the social cost
5 of greenhouse gas emissions as a dispatch cost⁵ adds an additional 200 MW of
6 wind, resulting in an additional \$50.6 million in the difference between the CETA
7 and No-CETA case. Using Dr. Hart’s methodology indicates PSE could spend an
8 additional \$50.6 million during the CEIP period to acquire renewable resources
9 before hitting the two percent incremental cost threshold established in CETA.⁶

10 **Q. Based on results of this analysis, do you believe PSE’s approach of using the**
11 **social cost of greenhouse gas emissions as an externality cost in the long-term**
12 **capacity expansion in this CEIP filing, rather than as a dispatch cost, is**
13 **reasonable?**

14 A. Yes, PSE’s approach of applying the social cost of greenhouse gases as an
15 externality cost in the long-term capacity expansion model is reasonable.
16 Applying the social cost of greenhouse gases as an externality cost is more
17 consistent with economic price signals that will drive dispatch decisions.
18 Therefore, PSE’s methodology was reasonable.

⁵ See Hart, Exh. EKH-1T at 10:15-11:3.

⁶ See RCW 19.405.060.

1 **IV. PSE'S APPROACH TO MODELING AND ANALYZING ENERGY**
2 **STORAGE EFFECTIVE LOAD CARRYING CAPABILITY IS REASONABLE**

3 **Q. What is the effective load carrying capability of a resource?**

4 A. The effective load carrying capability of a resource measures the resource's
5 ability to produce energy when the system is experiencing electricity shortfalls;
6 that is, the peak capacity value of a resource. Effective load carrying capability
7 provides a way to assess the capacity value of a resource to meet a reliability
8 standard; PSE uses a five percent loss-of-load probability standard to determine
9 the peak capacity needed for its service territory.

10 **Q. Why is effective load carrying capability a critical metric in portfolio**
11 **optimization?**

12 A. In the IRP and CEIP portfolio optimization model, peak demand is a constraint in
13 the capacity optimization problem. Peak demand needs are met by the summation
14 of all available resources' effective load carrying capability adjusted capacity in
15 each year across the study horizon. Different effective load carrying capabilities
16 can result in different portfolios. Effective load carrying capability estimation is
17 performed by resource adequacy analysis, which is critical to the resource
18 planning process. The peak capacity constraint is one of the constraints in the
19 portfolio optimization model. Other constraints include CETA renewable and
20 non-emitting energy requirement and PSE's hourly loads. The modeling is
21 complicated, and a change in the effective load carrying capability value of a
22 resource may or may not affect the results of the optimization model.

1 **Q. Did you review Dr. Hart’s recommendation that the Company update the**
2 **2021 CEIP analysis with effective load carrying capabilities for storage**
3 **resources from the draft 2023 Electric IRP Progress Report?**

4 A. Yes. Dr. Hart recommended the Commission require PSE to update both the
5 CETA and No-CETA cases described above using effective load carrying
6 capabilities for storage developed for the draft 2023 Electric IRP Progress
7 Report.⁷

8 **Q. Did PSE re-run the portfolio analysis with updated effective load carrying**
9 **capabilities being developed for the 2023 Electric IRP Progress Report?**

10 A. No, PSE did not perform this analysis.

11 **Q. Why not?**

12 A. Dr. Hart’s recommendation would require comprehensive changes to the
13 underlying models used for the 2021 CEIP. When PSE updated its load forecast
14 and resource adequacy modeling (including planning reserve margins and
15 effective load carrying capabilities) to include climate change for the 2023 IRP
16 Progress Report, the planning reserve margin and effective load carrying
17 capabilities were differentiated seasonally. That is, PSE developed different
18 planning reserve margins and effective load carrying capabilities for winter and
19 summer seasons. However, the 2021 CEIP followed the 2021 IRP, which had
20 only annual planning reserve margins and annual effective load carrying

⁷ See Hart, Exh. EKH-1T at 4:5-7.

1 capabilities. The Aurora model used to develop the CEIP is not able to
2 accommodate seasonal resource adequacy metrics. Further, PSE is still working
3 on the draft 2023 Electric IRP Progress Report.

4 **Q. Aside from not being able to modify the 2021 IRP/CEIP models to**
5 **incorporate seasonal effective load carrying capabilities, do you have other**
6 **concerns with Dr. Hart’s recommendation to rerun the analysis with storage**
7 **effective load carrying capabilities from the draft 2023 Electric IRP Progress**
8 **Report?⁸**

9 A. Yes. Temperatures underlying the load forecasts between the 2021 IRP/CEIP and
10 the draft 2023 Electric IRP Progress Report are different, as are hydro generation
11 conditions. So, adopting Dr. Hart’s recommendation would result in using
12 effective load carrying capabilities for energy storage that are inconsistent with
13 effective load carrying capabilities for all other resources in the CEIP. It would
14 also be inconsistent with load shapes in the demand forecast and inconsistent with
15 hydro generation. For these additional reasons, updating just the storage effective
16 load carrying capabilities in the modeling for the 2021 CEIP would not be
17 reasonable.

18 **Q. Should the Commission adopt Dr. Hart’s recommendation to require PSE to**
19 **rerun the CETA and No-CETA cases using storage effective load carrying**
20 **capabilities from the draft 2023 IRP Progress Report?⁹**

⁸ See Hart, Exh. EKH-1T at 4:5-7.

⁹ See Hart, Exh. EKH-1T at 4:5-7. 38:11-14.

1 A. No. Such analysis is not as simple as updating assumptions, it would require
2 material changes to the underlying models. Additionally, updating just the
3 storage effective load carrying capabilities without updating effective load
4 carrying capabilities for any other resources or other data creates considerable
5 inconsistencies in assumptions that are inter-related.
6 PSE's 2023 Electric IRP Progress Report will be filed by March 31, 2023, and it
7 will include a complete, consistent update of all these changes. As outlined in the
8 commitments in Chapter 8 of the CEIP, changes to PSE's resource adequacy
9 modeling (which includes updates to effective load carrying capabilities) will be
10 included in the 2023 Biennial CEIP Update.

11 **V. CONCLUSION**

12 **Q. Does that conclude your prefiled rebuttal testimony?**

13 A. Yes, it does.