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| 1 | LACEY, WASHINGTON; JANUARY 31, 2023 | 1 | and Centered and the Northwest Energy Collision and |
| 2 | 9:30 A.M. | 2 | my colleague Molly Tack-Hooper is here as well. |
| 3 | --000-- | 3 | JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Thank you. |
| 4 | PROCEEDINGS | 4 | And just to confirm, NWEC and Front and |
| 5 |  | 5 | Centered will be -- will the two parties be presenting |
| 6 | JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the record. | 6 | jointly today consistent with the testimony filed |
| 7 | Good morning. It is Tuesday, January 31st, | 7 | earlier? |
| 8 | and the time is 9:32 a.m. My name is Michael Howard. | 8 | MS. GOODIN: Yes. Correct. |
| 9 | I'm an Administrative Law Judge with the Commission. | 9 | THE COURT: Okay. And could we have an |
| 10 | And I see I need to turn my video on. | 10 | appearance for The Energy Project? |
| 11 | And I am presiding in this matter, along | 11 | MR. FFITCH: Good morning. Simon ffitch |
| 12 | with the Commissioners who will join us shortly. | 12 | appearing on behalf of the Energy Project. |
| 13 | We're here today for an evidentiary hearing | 13 | JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. |
| 14 | in Docket UE-210795. | 14 | And do we have anyone from Renewable |
| 15 | This case is captioned in the matter Puget | 15 | Northwest appearing today? All right. Hearing none. |
| 16 | Sound Energy's Clean Energy Implementation Plans | 16 | So next I want to give a brief roadmap for |
| 17 | pursuant to WAC 480-100-640. | 17 | our plans for the hearing today. We'll begin in a |
| 18 | Let's started by taking appearances, | 18 | moment with admitting evidence and addressing any |
| 19 | beginning with the company. | 19 | objections to the evidence. |
| 20 | MS. BARNETT: Good morning, Your Honor. | 20 | After the Commissioners join us at about |
| 21 | Donna Barnett with Perkins Coie on behalf of Puget Sound | 21 | 9:45 a.m., we will then allow the parties to provide |
| 22 | energy. | 22 | brief opening statements limited to ten minutes each. |
| 23 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 23 | We'll then turn to the cross-examination of witnesses |
| 24 | And l'm not sure if it's just on my end. | 24 | following the order of presentation that I circulated to |
| 25 | But l'm not seeing the video feed from your conference | 25 | the parties earlier. |
|  | Page 107 |  | Page 109 |
| 1 | room at the moment. | 1 | And I wanted to note for the parties that in |
| 2 | MS. BARNETT: That is intended if that's | 2 | addition to, likely, bench questions for company |
| 3 | okay. We have every -- all the witnesses and attorney | 3 | witnesses, we have, likely, bench questions for |
| 4 | and me on our laptop videos, but the audio is going | 4 | witnesses: McCloy, Colton, Tam, and Snyder. |
| 5 | through the conference room. So that's why you see the | 5 | And I also wanted to remind the parties that |
| 6 | conference room but no video. | 6 | if you do plan to -- to raise specifically -- specific |
| 7 | JUDGE HOWARD: That's perfectly fine, then. | 7 | information has been marked confidential in your |
| 8 | Could we have an appearance from staff. | 8 | cross-examination of a witness, please give me a |
| 9 | MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. | 9 | heads-up either in advance or when you're beginning your |
| 10 | Assistant Attorney General Nash Callahan here on behalf | 10 | cross-examination so we can ensure the hearing room is |
| 11 | of commission staff. With me today is Jennifer Snyder | 11 | limited only to individuals who have signed the |
| 12 | and Joel Nightingale. | 12 | protective order/confidentiality agreements. |
| 13 | JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. | 13 | So the parties estimate that there will be |
| 14 | Do we have an appearance for Public Counsel. | 14 | approximately three hours of cross-examination today. |
| 15 | MS. SUETAKE: Good morning. This is Nina | 15 | If we account for opening statements, a brief |
| 16 | Suetake. Here on behalf of Public Counsel Unit. | 16 | mid-morning break and a lunch break, it is likely that |
| 17 | JUDGE HOWARD: And could we hear from AWEC? | 17 | our hearing will end by early afternoon. |
| 18 | MS. MOSER: Good morning, Your Honor. | 18 | And if you are observing, you might want to |
| 19 | Sommer Moser with Davison Van Cleve on behalf of the | 19 | make sure that your line is muted if you're not |
| 20 | Alliance of Western Energy Consumers. | 20 | intending to speak. |
| 21 | JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. | 21 | I also want to remind the parties again -- I |
| 22 | Could we have an appearance for NWEC and | 22 | was actually just about to say this -- to keep your |
| 23 | Front and Centered? | 23 | microphones muted unless they are speaking and also only |
| 24 | MS. GOODIN: Good morning, Your Honor. | 24 | to use video for those portions of the hearing when they |
| 25 | Amanda Goodin with Earthjustice here on behalf of Front | 25 | have a speaking role. |


|  | Page 110 |  | Page 112 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | If you are having a technical issue or you | 1 | the inclusion of them in the public comment exhibit |
| 2 | observe that someone has dropped off the call, please | 2 | alone be enough as sort of a -- to prove that they have |
| 3 | raise that issue in chat here in the Zoom conference. | 3 | been sent in, if you know what I'm -- l'm -- I'm trying |
| 4 | The Zoom chat should be reserved for such technical | 4 | to -- I'm being a little confusing, but I'm not quite |
| 5 | issues and requests for breaks and similar matters. | 5 | sure how that -- we would authenticate those, really. |
| 6 | Are there any questions, concerns, or | 6 | JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. I -- I -- I mean, as -- |
| 7 | housekeeping matters before we move on to exhibits? | 7 | in a way, you are asking whether we would need to take |
| 8 | MR. CALLAGHAN: Judge Howard, I do have a | 8 | additional steps or just posting them to the docket or |
| 9 | brief preliminary matter. | 9 | something of that nature? |
| 10 | So earlier in this proceeding you sent the | 10 | MS. SUETAKE: Yes. |
| 11 | parties an email related to the public comments summary. | 11 | JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. I don't expect that |
| 12 | And staff is working with Public Counsel on that. But | 12 | that would be necessary. I -- I would just encourage |
| 13 | we just want to know whether the Commission wants that | 13 | Public Counsel to follow its -- its normal practice and |
| 14 | summary to include comments that were filed before the | 14 | judgment working with the company on that. And |
| 15 | adjudication began in this case or not? And we're ready | 15 | including them -- from my perspective, including them in |
| 16 | to accommodate either. | 16 | the public comment exhibit would be sufficient. |
| 17 | JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. | 17 | MS. SUETAKE: Okay. Thank you. |
| 18 | That is a good question. | 18 | JUDGE HOWARD: With that, let's turn to the |
| 19 | My directions on that are going to depend on | 19 | admissibility of the pre-filed testimony and exhibits. |
| 20 | how the exhibits are admitted. If there's objections to | 20 | In my email to the parties last week, I circulated my |
| 21 | incorporating earlier written comments, then that's | 21 | exhibit list. That included PSE's Clean Energy |
| 22 | going to affect my directions on that issue. | 22 | Implementation Plan, CEIP, with attachments and all the |
| 23 | But I do appreciate Staff and Public Counsel | 23 | pre-filed exhibits and testimony up to and including |
| 24 | working together on that. I recognize that there are a | 24 | cross-exhibits filed on January 24th. And there are |
| 25 | large number of comments in the docket. It may take | 25 | also errata to cross-exhibits filed by NWEC and Front |
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| 1 | additional time and I do want to revisit that issue, at | 1 | and Centered after that date that I have since reflected |
| 2 | the very least, at the end of the hearing today. | 2 | in the exhibit list. |
| 3 | MR. CALLAGHAN: That's all I had. Thank | 3 | I've requested the parties provide any |
| 4 | you. | 4 | evidentiary objections in writing by 5:00 p.m. on Friday |
| 5 | MS. BARNETT: Before we move off that | 5 | the 27th. I have not received any objections at this |
| 6 | subject, I wanted to add that Puget Sound Energy has | 6 | point -- although there was an issue raised about |
| 7 | received comments from customers that they not | 7 | potential duplication and that was addressed. |
| 8 | necessarily be in the -- in the docket. | 8 | Do the parties at this point stipulate to |
| 9 | I'm happy to work with Public Counsel | 9 | the admissibility of all the pre-filed exhibits and |
| 10 | separately on getting those in the record if they are | 10 | testimony? I would turn first to the company. |
| 11 | intended to be so, but some of them came directly to | 11 | MS. BARNETT: Thank you, Your Honor. |
| 12 | PSE. So I wanted to make sure that we got those in the | 12 | We, PSE -- I apologize for not filing a |
| 13 | record, if appropriate. | 13 | written objection earlier, but we we're still reviewing |
| 14 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 14 | the cross-exam exhibits. |
| 15 | And just because l'm not seeing the name of | 15 | So Puget Sound Energy will stipulate to all |
| 16 | the speaker, could you identify yourself? | 16 | of the exhibits except for two. And that is Exhibit |
| 17 | MS. BARNETT: Sorry. This is Donna Barnett. | 17 | KKD-10X and KKD-44X. |
| 18 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 18 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. So that was |
| 19 | I thought so. I just want to confirm -- if | 19 | KKD-10X and KKD-44X? |
| 20 | the company could work with Public Counsel and staff on | 20 | MS. BARNETT: That's right. |
| 21 | that, that -- that would be appropriate. Thank you. | 21 | JUDGE HOWARD: Let's give everyone just a |
| 22 | MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, this is Nina | 22 | moment to -- to look through these. |
| 23 | Suetake from Public Counsel. Quick question about that. | 23 | So it looks like KKD-10X is cross exhibits |
| 24 | If the comments were sent to PSE directly | 24 | submitted by Public Counsel. And 44X was submitted by |
| 25 | and were not also filed as comments with the UTC, would | 25 | Front and Centered and NWEC. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MS. BARNETT: That's right. KKD-10X is | 1 | cost-effective demand response and that their target is |
| 2 | PSE's "2023 Distributed Solar and Storage Resources, | 2 | out of alignment with the realities driving the need for |
| 3 | Request for Proposals. | 3 | demand response. |
| 4 | And KKD-44X, that NWEC sponsored is the | 4 | The -- PSE hired E3 to, among other things, |
| 5 | electric draft portfolio results. That's Attachment A | 5 | update the ELCC values to reflect the demand response |
| 6 | to the data request response. | 6 | contribution to summer and winter peak and the |
| 7 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. And what is the | 7 | attachment shows that in 2029, PSE will be able to meet |
| 8 | basis for your objections? | 8 | seven percent of winter peak with demand response and |
| 9 | MS. BARNETT: They are both foundation and | 9 | nine percent of summer peak, numbers that are about 8 to |
| 10 | relevance for both. | 10 | 10 times higher than PSE's proposed target for this |
| 11 | Regarding KKD-10X, the -- the Distributed | 11 | four-year period. |
| 12 | Solar and Storage Resources was not -- not introduced by | 12 | We believe that the Commission can take -- |
| 13 | any party at PSE. It is -- was just, I think, finished | 13 | you know, can give it the weight it warrants, given that |
| 14 | or created a month ago or so. | 14 | it's a draft. And as for foundation, we would be happy |
| 15 | There's no foundation established and -- and | 15 | to put either Kara Durbin or Popoff on the stand to lay |
| 16 | relevance for the -- I'm not sure how it's intended to | 16 | the foundation. |
| 17 | be used, but since it was just finished, it's not | 17 | It's not clear to me who PSE thinks is the |
| 18 | relevant to the issues of whether the CEIP that was | 18 | more appropriate witness, if necessary. But bottom |
| 19 | written in 2021 meets CETA or should be approved. | 19 | line, we think this is an important piece of evidence |
| 20 | And the same with -- I don't know if you | 20 | that underscores our arguments. |
| 21 | want to take that separately, but I can elaborate on my | 21 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. |
| 22 | objections to KKD-44X. | 22 | I'm going to reserve a ruling on KKD-44X. |
| 23 | JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed with that and | 23 | When it is time for NWEC and Front and |
| 24 | then we will hear from both of the parties. | 24 | Centered to cross Witness Durbin, I will allow you to |
| 25 | MS. BARNETT: Thank you. | 25 | explore the issue of the witness' familiarity and the |
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| 1 | It is the same objections, foundation and | 1 | issue of foundation. And then I will rule on any |
| 2 | relevance, for electric draft portfolio results. The | 2 | objection at that time. |
| 3 | Attachment A to the data request response was -- first | 3 | So otherwise, was that -- Ms. Barnett, was |
| 4 | of all, the witness identified as knowledgeable was not | 4 | that the end of the company's objections to the |
| 5 | the witness it was directed to. So there's a lack of | 5 | evidence? |
| 6 | foundation for the witness. But also this is a draft | 6 | MS. BARNETT: Yes, we have no other |
| 7 | document that is not finished, it's not been vetted. | 7 | objections. Thank you. |
| 8 | It's still in process of being created and -- and again, | 8 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right, then. Thank you. |
| 9 | this is the same relevance argument that has limited | 9 | Could I turn next to Staff? |
| 10 | relevance, if any at all, to the issues in this case | 10 | MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. |
| 11 | that is the 2021 CEIP and whether that meets CETA and | 11 | Staff has no objection and stipulates to the |
| 12 | should be approved. | 12 | admission of all proposed exhibits. |
| 13 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 13 | JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. |
| 14 | Could I hear from Public Counsel, their | 14 | Could I hear from Public Counsel? |
| 15 | response on KKD-10X? | 15 | MS. SUETAKE: Yes. Public Counsel has no |
| 16 | MS. SUETAKE: Yes. Thank you. | 16 | objections and stipulated to the admission of all |
| 17 | On further discussion with my witnesses, I | 17 | exhibits. |
| 18 | think we are fine with removing that exhibit from the | 18 | JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. |
| 19 | list of exhibits. | 19 | Could I hear from AWEC? |
| 20 | JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Thank you. | 20 | MS. MOSER: Thank you, Your Honor. |
| 21 | Can I hear from NWEC and Front and Centered | 21 | AWEC has no objections and stipulates to the |
| 22 | on KKD-44X? | 22 | admission of all exhibits. |
| 23 | MS. GOODIN: Yes, Your Honor. This exhibit | 23 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. You cut out just |
| 24 | underscores Front and Centered and NWEC's argument that | 24 | briefly, but I caught that AWEC stipulates to the |
| 25 | PSE has not satisfied its obligation to pursue all | 25 | admissibility of the exhibits? |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MS. MOSER: Yes, I apologize. | 1 | Energy. |
| 2 | Are you all having a hard time hearing me? | 2 | JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Could we hear |
| 3 | JUDGE HOWARD: No. It was just for a | 3 | from Staff? |
| 4 | moment. | 4 | MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. |
| 5 | MS. MOSER: Okay. | 5 | Nash Callaghan, Assistant Attorney General |
| 6 | JUDGE HOWARD: I wanted to be sure that if a | 6 | on behalf of Commission Staff. |
| 7 | party was saying that they stipulated to something that | 7 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Can we have |
| 8 | I was very clear that I heard them correctly. | 8 | appearance from Public Counsel? |
| 9 | MS. MOSER: Great. Thank you. | 9 | MS. SUETAKE: Thank you. |
| 10 | JUDGE HOWARD: Could I hear from NWEC and | 10 | This is Nina Suetake on behalf of Public |
| 11 | Front and Centered? | 11 | Counsel. |
| 12 | MS. GOODWIN: NWEC and Front and Centered | 12 | JUDGE HOWARD: Could we have an appearance |
| 13 | have no objection to any exhibit and stipulate to the | 13 | from AWEC? |
| 14 | admissibility of all of them. | 14 | MS. MOSER: This is Sommer Moser on behalf |
| 15 | JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. | 15 | of AWEC. |
| 16 | Could I hear from The Energy Project? | 16 | JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. |
| 17 | MR. FFITCH: Thank you, Your Honor. | 17 | Could we have an appearance from NWEC and |
| 18 | The Energy Project has no objection to any | 18 | Front and Centered? |
| 19 | of the exhibits and we stipulate to their admission. | 19 | MS. GOODIN: Thank you, Your Honor. |
| 20 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 20 | Amanda Goodwin with Earthjustice on behalf |
| 21 | And as I observed earlier, Renewable | 21 | of Front and Centered and the Energy Coalition. And my |
| 22 | Northwest is not present today, so I'm not hearing any | 22 | colleague Molly Tack-Hooper is with me. |
| 23 | objections from them. | 23 | THE COURT: Thank you. |
| 24 | In that case, I am going to deem -- I'm | 24 | Do we have an appearance from The Energy |
| 25 | going to find and deem that all of the pre-filed | 25 | Project? |
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| 1 | testimony and exhibits are admitted with the exception | 1 | MR. FFITCH: Morning. Simon ffitch |
| 2 | of KKD-10X, which has been withdrawn by Public Counsel | 2 | appearing on behalf of The Energy Project. |
| 3 | and KKD-44X on which I am reserving my ruling until the | 3 | JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. |
| 4 | cross. | 4 | And I have observed that, although Renewable |
| 5 | I will provide a copy of this exhibit list | 5 | Northwest has been granted intervener status, they are |
| 6 | to the court reporter so it will be made part of this | 6 | not present at the hearing today and have not filed any |
| 7 | record after this hearing. | 7 | testimony. |
| 8 | So with that, we are at 9:49 a.m. I would | 8 | So with that, let's turn to opening |
| 9 | like to confirm that we have the Commissioners with us. | 9 | statements. As I indicated in my earlier email to the |
| 10 | Chair Danner, Commissioner Rendahl, and | 10 | parties, we will allow each party the opportunity for a |
| 11 | Commissioner Doumit, can you hear me? | 11 | brief opening statement limited to ten minutes, |
| 12 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I can. This is | 12 | preferably. Let's allow PSE to proceed -- proceed first |
| 13 | Commissioner Rendahl. | 13 | with that, if they wish. |
| 14 | JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. | 14 | MS. BARNETT: Thank you. |
| 15 | COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I can hear you, Your | 15 | Thank you, Judge Howard. And good morning, |
| 16 | Honor. Can you hear you? | 16 | Chair Danner, Commissioners Rendahl and Doumit and |
| 17 | JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. | 17 | everyone participating today. |
| 18 | CHAIR DANNER: I can hear you, too, Your | 18 | Just over three years ago, the Commission |
| 19 | Honor. | 19 | adopted rules implementing Washington's Clean Energy |
| 20 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 20 | Transformation Act or "CETA." In the order adopting |
| 21 | Could we have brief appearances from the | 21 | those rules, the Commission reflected on CETA, calling |
| 22 | parties now that the Commissioners are on the line. I | 22 | it a "novel and complex statute." |
| 23 | would turn, first, to the company. | 23 | The Commission stated in that order that the |
| 24 | MS. BARNETT: Yes, Your Honor. Donna | 24 | process of implementing CETA is an iterative process and |
| 25 | Barnett with Perkins Coie on behalf of Puget Sound | 25 | the rules adopted that day represented just the first |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | step in implementing the statutory requirements of CETA. | 1 | initiated, PSE has already gained experience that will |
| 2 | The Commission said it expects additional | 2 | inform the next generation of the CETA process, this |
| 3 | rule-makings to implement the law, modifications, and | 3 | year's biennial update. |
| 4 | refinements of those rules, and overall improvements in | 4 | For example, as explained in the rebuttal |
| 5 | the process as all stakeholders gain experience and | 5 | testimony of PSE witness Kara Durbin, the results from |
| 6 | understanding of the law. | 6 | PSE's recent targeted distributed energy resources |
| 7 | One year after the Commission adopted its | 7 | request for proposals indicate that PSE will be able to |
| 8 | rules, PSE submitted its first Clean Energy | 8 | increase the demand response target to at least |
| 9 | Implementation Plan. That CEIP presented in this | 9 | 60 megawatts, which is more than double the 23.7 |
| 10 | proceeding is PSE's first step in its clean energy | 10 | megawatts proposed in the 2021 CEIP. |
| 11 | transformation under CETA. The CEIP represents years of | 11 | Also, PSE committed in the CEIP to make |
| 12 | preparation; however, it grew out of PSE's Clean Energy | 12 | progress in specific areas where it wanted to do more |
| 13 | Action Plan which was part of PSE's 2021 Integrated | 13 | but could not in this first CEIP because the data simply |
| 14 | Resource Plan. | 14 | was not there. |
| 15 | The Integrated Resource Plan, itself, is | 15 | One example is incorporating the effect of |
| 16 | informed by extensive public input, but the CEIP | 16 | climate change in the modeling, something PSE is already |
| 17 | involved a whole new level of engagement, collaboration, | 17 | incorporating into its work. This type -- is the type |
| 18 | and dialogue with interested parties. | 18 | of iterative process we believe the Commission and the |
| 19 | Throughout the development process, PSE | 19 | legislature had in mind. Using the best data from |
| 20 | convened and consulted with the new Equity Advisory | 20 | reliable sources to establish ambitious targets then |
| 21 | Group in addition to PSE's other advisory groups. PSE | 21 | building on them in each step and incorporating the |
| 22 | also held numerous meetings with community-based | 22 | lessons learned along the way. |
| 23 | organizations, including one specifically for | 23 | PSE has already learned a great deal in this |
| 24 | Spanish-speaking customers. | 24 | process. Although we are not presenting a unified |
| 25 | PSE conducted a survey of residential and | 25 | settlement for your consideration, we are presenting a |
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| 1 | business customers and community members, held an open | 1 | Final CEIP that reflects the comments and concerns of |
| 2 | house, and reviewed hundreds of comments that helped | 2 | hundreds of interested parties and customers. This has |
| 3 | shape the final CEIP. PSE undertook all these | 3 | not been an adversarial process. It has been truly |
| 4 | activities to ensure that this CEIP meets the | 4 | collaborative. And with that in mind, PSE looks forward |
| 5 | requirements of CETA and lays out a path towards an | 5 | to answering your questions today and receiving your |
| 6 | equitable distribution of energy -- of clean energy | 6 | approval on the Final CEIP so we can quickly move |
| 7 | benefits. The plan is ambitious but achievable. | 7 | forward on the work that has already begun. |
| 8 | One important area of focus in the | 8 | Thank you. |
| 9 | development of the CEIP is the purposeful integration of | 9 | JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Ms. Barnett. |
| 10 | equity. PSE began building key new processes designed | 10 | Would staff like to provide a brief opening |
| 11 | to help place substantive emphasis on key areas where it | 11 | statement? |
| 12 | can improve equitable energy outcomes. These include | 12 | MR. CALLAGHAN: I would, Your Honor. |
| 13 | identifying vulnerable populations and highly impacted | 13 | Good morning, Commissioners. Good morning, |
| 14 | communities, developing customer benefits indicators and | 14 | Your Honor. |
| 15 | associated metrics, applying benefits and burdens | 15 | This is the Commission's first contested |
| 16 | considerations to elements of the CEIP, and others. | 16 | CEIP. In light of that, I think it's important to |
| 17 | Improving equitable energy outcomes is a process and the | 17 | reflect on what the legislature hoped to achieve with |
| 18 | work represented in the first CEIP is a starting point | 18 | CETA. |
| 19 | that the company plans to continue building upon. | 19 | If CETA's one and only goal were to change |
| 20 | This CEIP was developed using the best and | 20 | the utilities resource mix, the law could have been |
| 21 | most up-to-date information at the time it was created. | 21 | written quite simply. Get out of coal by 2026, be |
| 22 | In fact, PSE made a significant change to its resource | 22 | greenhouse gas neutral by 2030, and be a hundred percent |
| 23 | costs between the Draft and Final CEIP in response to | 23 | renewable or non-emitting by 2045. |
| 24 | feedback from some of the parties in this proceeding. | 24 | But as the Commission is well aware, those |
| 25 | And in the time since the CEIP was | 25 | are not CETA's only goals. The law also requires that |

utilities achieve this transition equitably and at lowest reasonable cost to ratepayers. Those requirements are the heart of what remains contested in this case.

Commission Staff is not challenging PSE's proposed interim or specific targets, but does raise some significant concerns about the plan and recommends approving the CEIP with conditions, which are listed in Exhibit JES-3. The contested issues before the Commission today are essentially over what conditions the Commission should place on approval of the CEIP and when those conditions should be met.

With that in mind, Commissioners, Judge Howard, as you are making your decision in this case, I want to ask -- I want you to ask yourselves three questions.

First, do I have enough information to decide; do I have enough information to decide whether or not the actions PSE proposes will result in a lowest reasonable cost portfolio; do I have enough information to decide whether this plan meets CETA's equity requirements?

Second, what additional information do I need to decide; what additional information would make me confident that PSE's proposals will lead to a lowest
proposal in those terms, the company is planning to achieve about 45 percent of its transition by the end of this first compliance period.

I want to be clear that Staff is not opposing that interim target. However, if a significant portion of the clean energy transition is occurring within this four-year period, that places an even greater emphasis on the need to ensure that this plan complies with CETA's equity and lowest reasonable cost requirements.

If almost half of the transition is happening by 2025, the Commission should get the information it needs now or as soon as humanly possible, not in October 2025. That is why Staff asked the Commission to approve the CEIP but with the proposed conditions outlined in Exhibit JES-3. The conditions Staff recommends are reasonable, achievable, and necessary.

Thank you.
JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
Could we hear from Public Counsel?
MS. SUETAKE: I'm sorry. I think I just froze. Can you all hear me?

JUDGE HOWARD: I can hear you, but it does look like your video is frozen.
reasonable cost portfolio; what additional information would give me confidence that this plan meets CETA's equity requirements?

Third, when do I need this information; how long can or should I wait for the information that we need; can this wait until October 1, 2025?

That last question is really the core of the contested issues before you today.

PSE, in its rebuttal testimony, asks that besides the commitments it made in chapter eight of the CEIP and a few others, any other condition that the Commission adds should apply only to the 2025 CEIP.

So the question is are you comfortable waiting that long?

This is where it's important to step back and look at the big picture.

PSE reported its 2020 baseline that it was serving retail load with 33 percent renewable and non-emitting resources. The company is asking the Commission to approve an interim target of 63 percent in 2025.

Now, a simplified way to look at the clean energy transition is to consider it in terms of getting from where a utility is now to a hundred percent renewable and non-emitting. When you think about PSE's

> MS. SUETAKE: Okay. How is that? Sorry. I apologize. It looks like Zoom just restarted on me.
> JUDGE HOWARD: I think it's working now.
> MS. SUETAKE: Okay. Thank you.
> I apologize.
> Good morning, Chair Danner, Commissioners
> Rendahl and Doumit, and ALJ Howard.
> Public Counsel recognizes that the CEIP process will be iterative and evolving. That being said, the utilities plans must still meet the statutory requirement of the Clean Energy Transformation Act and Commission Rules.
> Public Counsel supports PSE's proposed interim target of 63 percent renewable electricity by 2025 but has concerns with other aspects of the plan.
> In keeping with the iterative nature of this planning process, Public Counsel has made a number of recommendations and proposed conditions to align the current CEIP, the 2023 biennial update and the 2025 CEIP with statutory requirements.
> Public Counsel included a full list of conditions with its filed testimony, so I will only touch on a few of the primary conditions.
> First, Public Counsel recommends that the UTC require PSE to include customer benefit indicators
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | and metrics that measure customer energy burden, | 1 | Judge Howard. |
| 2 | arrearages, and disconnections in this current CEIP. | 2 | Good morning, Chair Danner, Commissioners |
| 3 | Public Counsel also recommends that PSE | 3 | Rendahl and Doumit. |
| 4 | include an updated set of CBls and metrics in its 2023 | 4 | Sommer Moser on behalf of AWEC, and I have |
| 5 | biennial update and also create a publically accessible | 5 | just a few brief opening comments to make for you today. |
| 6 | and comprehensive report card on all metrics PSE reports | 6 | Consistent with the position set forth in |
| 7 | to the UTC. | 7 | AWEC's testimony, AWEC remains concerned that |
| 8 | Second, Public Counsel recommends that the | 8 | PSE's renewable energy targets and renewable energy |
| 9 | UTC require PSE do additional distributional equity | 9 | acquisitions deviate from the least costly expressed |
| 10 | analysis to ensure the equitable distribution of | 10 | plan identified in its IRP and therefore do not |
| 11 | customer benefits, include its findings in the 2023 | 11 | represent a cost-effective strategy for achieving CETA |
| 12 | biennial update, and incorporate this analysis into its | 12 | compliance. |
| 13 | 2023 CEIP. | 13 | AWEC's analysis is that this changes -- the |
| 14 | Third, Public Counsel recommends that the | 14 | changes to the renewable energy targets and resource |
| 15 | Commission require PSE to remove its discussion of the | 15 | acquisitions result in an excess cost to customers of |
| 16 | proposed -- of its included distributed energy resource | 16 | \$500 million. This issue, coupled with PSE's treatment |
| 17 | selection process from the current CEIP. | 17 | of the cost cap as a spending target raises concerns |
| 18 | PSE's process improperly uses CBIs and | 18 | that customers are facing higher costs than are |
| 19 | metrics in a manner that results in a portfolio of | 19 | necessary to achieve CETA compliance in this compliance |
| 20 | costly projects that do not clearly provide benefits to | 20 | period. |
| 21 | vulnerable and highly impacted communities. | 21 | As Mr. Callaghan just pointed out, PSE is |
| 22 | Although PSE has indicated in testimony that | 22 | using this initial compliance period to achieve a |
| 23 | the resource selection process is illustrative, the bulk | 23 | significant amount of its compliance requirements. |
| 24 | of the discussion of the CEIP does not make this clear. | 24 | As justification for this plan, PSE offers |
| 25 | Public Counsel recommends that the | 25 | that its drivers for deviating from the IRP are related |
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| 1 | Commission require PSE to remove the distributed energy | 1 | to stakeholder requests. As set forth in AWEC's |
| 2 | resource selection process section from the CEIP as well | 2 | testimony, that rationale is not sufficient |
| 3 | as the related appendices. | 3 | justification for increased cost to customers who are |
| 4 | Finally, PSE's descriptions of the specific | 4 | already facing significant cost increases from PSE's |
| 5 | actions it intends to meet -- take to meet its proposed | 5 | general rate cases, other dockets, and other policies. |
| 6 | targets fail to adequately identify how each specific | 6 | Therefore, AWEC continues to recommend that PSE utilize |
| 7 | action would demonstrate progress towards the target at | 7 | linear glide path with resources identified in its 2021 |
| 8 | the lowest reasonable cost, equitably distribute | 8 | IRP to meet renewable energy targets because that is the |
| 9 | customer benefits and burdens, and mitigate risks to | 9 | most cost effective compliance strategy for meeting CETA |
| 10 | vulnerable communities as required by statute. | 10 | requirements. |
| 11 | Public Counsel, therefore, recommends the | 11 | PSE is also asking for guidance on the |
| 12 | Commission require PSE to update the narrative | 12 | incremental cost cap in two circumstances. |
| 13 | description of each specific action to include this | 13 | First, on how to proceed if compliance with |
| 14 | information in the 2023 biennial update. | 14 | its CEIP would cause it to exceed the two percent |
| 15 | It is important to note that Public Counsel | 15 | incremental cost cap. |
| 16 | would not oppose a faster timeline for any of these | 16 | And then, second, if PSE's costs are less |
| 17 | conditions. And that's all my comments for now. | 17 | than the two percent, whether it should continue to |
| 18 | JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. | 18 | pursue additional resources through its RFP to spend up |
| 19 | Would AWEC like to provide an opening | 19 | to the two percent so, essentially, treating the two |
| 20 | statement? | 20 | percent as a cost target. |
| 21 | MS. MOSER: Thank you, Your Honor. | 21 | As set forth in AWEC's testimony, I have |
| 22 | Can everyone hear me okay? I switched | 22 | strong concerns with PSE's requests for guidance at this |
| 23 | headsets. | 23 | juncture and how this may effect cost recovery and |
| 24 | JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. | 24 | future proceedings. |
| 25 | MS. MOSER: Okay. Great. Yes. Thank you, | 25 | Fundamentally, AWEC continues to find that |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | PSE remains responsible for making prudent business | 1 | The evidence will show that PSE's plan does |
| 2 | decisions in achieving CETA compliance and should not be | 2 | not include any concrete commitments to progress on |
| 3 | insulated from this obligation by any guidance that the | 3 | equity for named communities. |
| 4 | Commission could provide in response to its request in | 4 | And remarkably, there is almost no factual |
| 5 | this docket. | 5 | dispute about this. PSE has agreed with many of our |
| 6 | AWEC, therefore, requests that the | 6 | recommendations and testimony. They have even conceded |
| 7 | Commission make clear to PSE that if it deviates from | 7 | that they should be held to a higher standard for the |
| 8 | its approved CEIP based on its calculation of | 8 | equity provisions in their next plan. But a promise to |
| 9 | incremental cost, it does so at its own risk. | 9 | do better next time is not enough to fix this plan. |
| 10 | AWEC also continues to recommend that the | 10 | PSE has framed this plan as a first step. |
| 11 | Commission direct PSE to refrain from further | 11 | But even the first step has to be a meaningful step |
| 12 | accelerating renewable energy targets in the event that | 12 | forward. Without equity commitments, PSE's plan looks |
| 13 | costs are less than planned and that PSE refrain from | 13 | like marching in place. |
| 14 | pursuing its approved targets in the event that doing so | 14 | Now, in this docket the question the |
| 15 | would require PSE to exceed the two percent incremental | 15 | Commission has to decide is whether a plan that lacks |
| 16 | cost cap. | 16 | concrete commitments to progress on equity complies with |
| 17 | Thank you. | 17 | CETA. |
| 18 | JUDGE HOWARD: Turn next to NWEC and Front | 18 | In short, it doesn't. The process of |
| 19 | and Centered. | 19 | implementing CETA may be iterative, but that process |
| 20 | MS. GOODIN: Thank you, Your Honor. | 20 | still must start with progress. |
| 21 | Good morning, Commissioners. | 21 | You've already heard from Commission Staff |
| 22 | My name is Amanda Goodin, and I'm | 22 | this morning that a significant portion of the clean |
| 23 | represented Front and Centered and the Northwest Energy | 23 | energy transition will happen in these next four years. |
| 24 | Collision. | 24 | We can't afford to miss this window to make concrete |
| 25 | Front and Centered advocates for frontline, | 25 | progress on equity. |
|  | Page 135 |  | Page 137 |
| 1 | low income and black, brown, and indigenous and other | 1 | We need an order from the Commission that |
| 2 | communities of color working to achieve a just and | 2 | makes it crystal clear that these plans have to commit |
| 3 | equitable transition to a clean energy future in | 3 | to real progress on equity. |
| 4 | Washington. | 4 | And we need an order from the Commission |
| 5 | The Northwest Energy Collision is a longtime | 5 | that includes conditions of approval adding equity |
| 6 | advocate for an energy future that is clean, reliable, | 6 | commitments to this plan. |
| 7 | affordable, and equitable. | 7 | We have mandatory equity language in CETA. |
| 8 | Commissioners, this is the first Clean | 8 | We have mandatory language in the Commissions rules, and |
| 9 | Energy Implementation Plan to come before you for | 9 | we have recent orders from the Commission in other |
| 10 | adjudication under Washington's Clean Energy | 10 | proceedings that underscore the importance of centering |
| 11 | Transformation Act, or "CETA" for short. | 11 | equity in the clean energy transition. But all of this |
| 12 | CETA requires utilities to transform our | 12 | mandatory language may not mean much on the ground |
| 13 | state's electric supply to be a hundred percent clean | 13 | unless the Commission requires utilities to include |
| 14 | and to ensure that all customers benefit from this | 14 | concrete commitments to progress in their implementation |
| 15 | transition. | 15 | plans. |
| 16 | The PSE plan that's before you today commits | 16 | I'd like to highlight a few of the ways that |
| 17 | to real progress on clean energy, though there are some | 17 | PSE's plan falls short on equity commitments. And, |
| 18 | problems that l'll turn to later. But it's the equity | 18 | again, there's virtually no factual dispute about any of |
| 19 | provisions of PSE's plan that really fall short. And | 19 | these. In fact, some of these issues may not even come |
| 20 | I'll address those shortcomings. | 20 | up today because the record is already so clear. |
| 21 | CETA requires utilities to ensure that | 21 | For one example, PSE's plan uses customer |
| 22 | customers benefit from the clean energy transition; that | 22 | benefit indicators to measure the impact of PSE's |
| 23 | includes ensuring benefits flow to highly impacted | 23 | actions on its customers. These indicators have to |
| 24 | communities and vulnerable populations, which together | 24 | include impacts like public health benefits, energy |
| 25 | are named communities. | 25 | security, and the equitable distribution of energy and |

overarching document where PSE compares customer disparities with actions that reduce those disparities. It's where PSE should lay out its commitments in one place so the communities can provide input on PSE's goals and hold PSE accountable to the progress it promises. A piecemeal analysis across dockets, across years, and hidden behind confidential designations can't provide the same vehicle for public input and accountability.

PSE needs to commit to progress on equity and those commitments need to be in this plan.

I'd like to turn briefly to the clean energy provisions of PSE's plan. Here PSE's plan does have important commitments to progress. The evidence shows, for example, that PSE's interim renewable energy target and its DER subtarget are well-founded. But the clean energy provisions also fall short in several important ways.

First, PSE's demand response target is far too low. Demand response is a priority resource under CETA and the evidence shows that PSE should have adopted a much higher target than this plan.

Second, PSE's incremental cost calculation is flawed. The evidence shows that PSE attributed cost to CETA that PSE would have incurred anyways. This
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both because PSE hasn't picked the actions yet and because the bidder analysis is confidential.

The hypothetical actions PSE did include in the plan also fall short and not just because they are only hypothetical. The evidence shows that PSE ignored some of the most important impacts that its actions can have on its customers, like the decision to disconnect customers from their essential electric service. The result is a portfolio that is too short on benefits for named communities.

Again, there's no real factual dispute about what the plan includes.

PSE agrees that its plan doesn't commit to targets for its customer benefit indicators. PSE agrees it doesn't commit to minimum designations for named communities for its distributed resources. And PSE agrees that its plan doesn't commit to the actual resource actions it will take in the next 40 years.

But PSE promises that all of these pieces will be included somewhere else at some other time, in future plans or in updates or in other planning processes.

But the Clean Energy Implementation Plan itself is where PSE needs to lay out its equity plan and commitment to progress. This plan is supposed to be the
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evidence is unrebutted. PSE's only response is that these costs are reasonable. But reasonableness is not the test for whether costs are incremental to CETA compliance.

Finally, PSE relied on a flawed methodology to incorporate the social cost of greenhouse gas emissions into its portfolio models. PSE's flawed methodology overvalues its own fossil fuel resources and led PSE to select a baseline portfolio that was not actually least cost. This flawed methodology didn't affect PSE's interim targets or its CETA portfolio in this plan, but going forward there is a real risk that this flawed methodology will delay the clean energy transition.

Commissioners, this is the first Clean Energy Implementation Plan that has come before you for adjudication. And it will set an important precedent for how utilities approach these plans going forward.

The evidence shows that with a robust set of additional conditions, this plan can set a strong precedent that PSE and other utilities should follow. We've laid out the conditions that the Commission should adopt in Exhibit LCM-8.

The evidence also shows that without these conditions this plan, as currently written, fails to
meet CETA's minimum requirements. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Would The Energy Project like to provide an opening statement?

MR. FFITCH: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor. And good morning, Chair Danner and Commissioner Rendahl and Doumit.

I'm Simon ffitch, attorney with The Energy Project, and I would like to add a few brief comments to those you've already heard this morning. I'm really going to echo the opening statements of Staff, Public Counsel and NWEC and Front and Centered. And l'll try to abbreviate a little bit to not be redundant. But I do want to underline some of the points that have already been made.

CETA implementation under -- under this CEIP will certainly have a major impact on hundreds of thousands of low income customers, vulnerable populations, and highly impacted communities. And that's why a central goal of CETA, in addition to planning for clean resources is to ensure an equitable transition.

We have been actively involved in the CEIP dockets for all three IOUs, and our focus has been on the development of specific CBI and metrics that are
including the low income advisory group and the CRAG and also Front and Centered as a member of the equity advisory group.

Since then, Energy Project and other party recommendations have been brought forward in multiple rounds of comments and in testimony in this case. But unfortunately, Puget has not been open to adopting any condition or modification to the CEIP since it was filed in December of 2021.

And their recommendation in this case, as was repeated in their rebuttal testimony, is simply for the Commission to approve the CEIP as filed over a year ago in December 2021.

I'd like to just touch on one final point that has been raised eloquently by Mr. Callaghan and other counsel this morning. Time is a critical element for the Commission to consider in this case. There's real urgency here.

CETA was enacted in 2019, now nearly three and a half years ago. Puget's final CEIP was filed over one year ago, and since then no progress has been made on incorporating any of the reasonable recommendations of stakeholders and Commission Staff. And Puget's now arguing that it's too late to incorporate any of these new ideas into the current CEIP and that any action on
tied to the equity goals and the statutory elements of CETA, such as energy security, cost reduction, and reduction of burdens.

Our -- our recommended CBIs including, for example, tracking arrearages and disconnection, are designed to measure the tangible reality of customer household experience during the transition to a clean energy environment. And to track whether those customer households are experiencing benefits from the transition.

The testimony of Lorena Shah, for The Energy Project, lists the specific CBIs and metrics that we're recommending and provides details supporting discussion to explain the basis for the proposals and also to address Puget's own proposals and how they match up or don't match up. Her testimony provides tables that allow you to have a side-by-side comparison of the different proposals and how they also fit into the framework of the statutory elements. And Ms. Shah is in attendance at the hearing today.

Energy Project's proposals were first recommended as a part of a package of a joint advocate proposals presented to the company in July 2021. The -the authors of the initial set of proposals were all members of important commission advisory groups,
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new CBIs or metrics will have to wait another two years until the 2025 CEIP. That 2025 CEIP cycle is the final CEIP cycle before the 2030 deadline.

By then, over half of the available time for action between enactment of CETA and the 2030 deadline will have passed. And while all the parties understand -- and we've heard it again this morning -that this is an iterative process, that's not a justification for failure to act now in the current CEIP when there are reasonable and feasible CBls and metrics with available data that can be adopted now. Climate change is not on hold. The effects of climate change on customers is not on hold. It's important to make this CEIP the best possible initial plan for the company and its customers.

So we respectfully request that the Commission condition approval of the 2021 CEIP upon adoption of The Energy Project's recommendations for CBls and metrics. Thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you to all the counsel for the parties, that would conclude our opening statements.

And now we are going to turn to cross-examination of witnesses. And on the order of presentation I circulated earlier, that means our first
witness is PSE witness, Durbin.
Witness Durbin, can you turn on your video
feed? Your camera? And can you hear me?
THE WITNESS: Yes, I can hear you.
Can you see me?
JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. I am just flipping back and forth here on my Zoom screen to get the right icons to pop-up.

Can you please raise your right hand? And I
will swear you in.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
HOWARD JUDGE: Do you swear or affirm the testimony you will give today is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
Ms. Barnett, could you please introduce the witness and tender the witness for cross-examination.

MS. BARNETT: Certainly.
KARA DURBIN, witness herein, having been first duly sworn on oath, was examined and testified as follows:
//
//
Q. Yes. Could you start with your rebuttal testimony? If you could, turn to page 3 and let me know when you're there.
A. I will. Thank you.

Could you repeat the page number, please?
Q. Page 3.
A. I'm there.
Q. On lines 5 through 9 , you state that, quote:

PSE does not suggest in this rebuttal filing that the Commission should wholesale reject all of the conditions offered by the other parties to this proceeding, but rather be judicious about what conditions apply in the near term; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. All right. So to clarify, PSE is not asking the Commission to limit the conditions of approval to just the commitments that the company made in Chapter 8 of the CEIP; is it?
A. That's correct. We've -- in my rebuttal testimony, we've indicated a few areas where the conditions that have been proposed are reasonable and acceptable to the company.
Q. All right. And, in fact, in your rebuttal -- in your rebuttal testimony, you identify some of Staff's proposed conditions that the company either completely

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. BARNETT:
Q. Ms. Durbin, please state your name and spell your name for the court reporter?
A. Yes, Kara Durbin. D-u-r-b-i-n.
Q. What is your role at PSE?
A. I'm the Director of Clean Energy Strategy.
Q. Thank you.

MS. BARNETT: And given that the pre-filed exhibits and testimony have already been admitted, Your Honor, PSE presents Kara Durbin for cross-examination.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
And Staff indicated cross for this witness.
Mr. Callaghan, you may proceed.
MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. CALLAGHAN:
Q. Good morning, Ms. Durbin.
A. Good morning.
Q. Do you have a copy of your rebuttal testimony, Exhibit KKD-60, a copy of the revised CEIP, and Exhibit JES-3 with you?
A. I do. They might be across a couple different binders, so if you let me know which one you would like to start with, that would be great.
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|  | Page 150 |  | Page 152 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q. Okay. So you've answered my next question. |  | Q. Okay. So there are some conditions that apply |
| 2 | So Staff Conditions 14 through 31 are basically | 2 | to the 2025 CEIP that PSE does not support; correct? |
| 3 | restatements of the commitments PSE made to -- in | 3 | A. In -- are you speaking specifically to Staff's? |
| 4 | Chapter 8 ? | 4 | Q. No, just to any of them. |
| 5 | A. That's correct. | 5 | A. They are certainly across the record -- across |
| 6 | Q. And you state that in your rebuttal testimony | 6 | the parties, there are conditions proposed for the 2025 |
| 7 | that PSE supports including those commitments as a | 7 | CEIP that we, at least, have concerns with the -- what |
| 8 | condition of approval; is that right? | 8 | the condition means or how we would be able to |
| 9 | A. Yes. | 9 | accomplish it. |
| 10 | Q. All right. So given that Staff Conditions 14 | 10 | Q. Okay. Thank you. |
| 11 | through 31 are just restatements of those commitments, | 11 | And Conditions 9 through 13, again, they apply |
| 12 | does PSE support Staff Conditions 14 through 31? | 12 | to the 2025 CEIP; correct? |
| 13 | A. Yes, PSE does. | 13 | A. That's correct. |
| 14 | Q. All right. So if the Commission were to order | 14 | Q. What is PSE's position on Staff Condition 9? |
| 15 | PSE to fulfill Staff Conditions 14 through 31, the | 15 | A. On Staff Condition 9, which -- which is |
| 16 | company could do that? | 16 | requiring us to file a Draft CEIP for the 2025 on a |
| 17 | A. Yes. All of those conditions are for the | 17 | timeline that the company deems sufficient, we're |
| 18 | biennial that we made in Chapter 8. And, yes, we could | 18 | supportive of that condition. And we're also |
| 19 | do that. | 19 | anticipating for the biennial that we would also produce |
| 20 | Q. Thank you. | 20 | a draft. We think the public engagement step is |
| 21 | Could you please turn to the bottom of page 1, | 21 | important. Hearing that feedback and being able to |
| 22 | and the top of page 2 in JES-3 and review Conditions 9 | 22 | reflect on it for the final was something we benefitted |
| 23 | through 13, and let me know when you're done. | 23 | from in the 2021 CEIP while the timeline was short. And |
| 24 | A. Certainly. | 24 | we think -- we think that condition is reasonable. |
| 25 | (Reviews document.) | 25 | Q. Okay. What about PSE's position on Staff |
|  | Page 151 |  | Page 153 |
| 1 | Okay. I'm ready. Thank you. | 1 | condition 10? |
| 2 | Q. In your rebuttal testimony, you state that, | 2 | A. On Condition 10, we -- we agree, generally, with |
| 3 | quote: For any conditions the Commission might add as a | 3 | this condition and certainly, as evidenced in my |
| 4 | condition of approval beyond the commitments in | 4 | testimony, believe that there could be some improvements |
| 5 | Chapter 8 of the CEIP, PSE urges that the Commission | 5 | made to align planning and procurement processees. And |
| 6 | make those conditions as forward-looking requirements | 6 | we agree with the recommendation made by Staff that we |
| 7 | for the 2025 CEIP; is that correct? | 7 | would appreciate Commission guidance on the proper |
| 8 | A. As a general premise, yes. | 8 | timing of IRP, RFP, CEIP, and also let's add the |
| 9 | Q. Okay. But to clarify, you aren't stating here | 9 | multi-year rate plan in a future rulemaking or policy |
| 10 | that PSE is comfortable with all of the proposed | 10 | statement. I believe that was in Ms. Snyder's |
| 11 | conditions that apply to the 2025 CEIP, are you? | 11 | testimony, and we agree that when time allows, that |
| 12 | A. I'm sorry. Could you restate that question? I | 12 | would be a good conversation to have. |
| 13 | got a little lost. Apologies. | 13 | Q. Okay. Thank you. |
| 14 | Q. The quote that I just stated from your rebuttal | 14 | What about PSE's position on Staff Condition 11? |
| 15 | testimony, you're not saying there that PSE is | 15 | A. So on Staff Condition 11, we're reluctant to |
| 16 | supportive of any of the proposed conditions as long as | 16 | agree to this condition to not use the two percent as a |
| 17 | they apply to the 2025 CEIP; correct? | 17 | planning constraint or use it as a spending guideline in |
| 18 | A. What I was stating in my testimony is, generally | 18 | developing our targets. |
| 19 | speaking, we prefer forward-looking conditions for the | 19 | And the reason for that is we really are |
| 20 | 2025 CEIP to ensure we have enough time to execute upon | 20 | reluctant to agree to that condition without receiving |
| 21 | those conditions. | 21 | some guidance or direction from the Commission on how we |
| 22 | However, there are a few instances in which we | 22 | should go about proposing targets under CETA that |
| 23 | have signaled for the biennial update that there are | 23 | demonstrate progress towards the 2030 and 2045 standards |
| 24 | actions we can take. And some of them are in the | 24 | that incorporate the equity and the CBIs and balance |
| 25 | condition list that Staff provided in this exhibit. | 25 | costs. |

So, in other words, we just -- we have conditions with this -- we have concerns with this condition if it's added without some other direction on how we should go about this work differently in determining a lowest reasonable cost portfolio that demonstrates progress towards the targets. As we set our own targets, we would be looking for some -- some different direction on that.
Q. All right. And if the Commission were to provide additional guidance on the incremental cost calculation and how it should be used, would PSE be supportive of Condition 11?
A. I think it would be hard to -- to state right now, not knowing what that guidance looks like. So appreciate the question, but I'm not sure I can answer that in hypothetical.
Q. Okay. So what is PSE's position on Staff Condition No. 12?
A. So, Condition 12 is really similar to Condition, I believe, it's five. And we thought about -Condition 5 just applying to the biennial here shortly in 2023. We're certainly -- I guess this -- this condition is written rather generally and it's a little bit vague as to what refining methods is intended to mean.
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So I think PSE's position here is we think the overall methodology that we've used to identify vulnerable populations is -- is reasonable.

So if this is looking to have us change that methodology, we might have concerns, but we're certainly open to refining our data and how we sort of think about that work as well as continue to have conversations with our Equity Advisory Group and others on, you know, other -- other ways that we might identify factors of vulnerability that perhaps we didn't consider in this first CEIP.

So I think, generally speaking, refining -- we are refining and thinking about our method now, and we will continue as part of this iterative process.

So generally supportive but also a little bit not sure what -- what's intended by Condition 12.
Q. Okay. So if the Commission does agree with the concerns that Staff has raised regarding the methods to identify vulnerable populations that Staff has included in its testimony, under that circumstance, hypothetically, would PSE support Condition 12?
A. Yeah, if -- if the Commission agrees with -agrees with Staff's position and recommendation that there need to be changes to the methodology for identifying vulnerable populations, if that's where the
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And then on Condition 7, we've already agreed to do this and have been providing the license to Staff throughout the CEIP process, which has been going on for a while now, and we're happy to continue that practice going forward. So no concerns with Condition 7.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Now, could you review Staff Conditions 1, 2, and 5 on page JES-3? I'm going to be asking other witnesses about Conditions 3 and 4.
A. Yes. You said 1, 2, and 5?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, l've reviewed them. Thank you.
Q. All right. So with respect to Condition 5, we discussed this already.

Do you have the same position on Condition 5 as you did with the previous condition?
A. I do. We would be willing to continue to refine methods as I described for the biennial update and provided some narrative on that work in the biennial, but just note that that's just a few months away now.
Q. All right. And based on your rebuttal testimony, does PSE anticipate fulfilling Staff Condition No. 2?
A. I'm sorry. Could you repeat the opening of that question about Condition 2?
Q. Yeah. Based on your rebuttal testimony, on page 10, lines 17 and 18, does PSE anticipate fulfilling Staff Condition No. 2?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Finally, does PSE oppose the Commission adding Staff's Condition 1 as a condition of approval?
A. No, we do not oppose it.
Q. You don't propose -- you don't oppose Condition No. 1?
A. No, we do not oppose Condition No. 1.
Q. All right.

So I just have a few more questions for you.
Could you turn to page 31 of your rebuttal
testimony? And let me know when you're there.
A. Thirty-one of KKD-60.

Is that my rebuttal?
Q. Yes.
A. Correct?
Q. That's right.
A. I'm there. Thank you.
Q. All right. Thank you.

On lines 17 and 18 you state, quote: Instead,
PSE views the incremental cost as an approximate spending guide that the company used to inform the development of its interim target, end quote.
further questions.
A. Thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Do we have any redirect from the company, following Staff's cross?

MS. BARNETT: No, Your Honor.
JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. In that case, let's take our brief mid-morning break at this point. Since it's 10:43, let's -- let's just come back on the record at 11 , if that works for everyone.

Actually, I -- yeah. Let's just stick with 11. I'm not going to be more precise and, potentially, annoying than that. So we will return at 11 . We will take a brief mid-morning break. Thank you, all. We are off the record for a moment.
(A break was taken from
10:44 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.)
JUDGE HOWARD: All right.
We're returning after our midmorning break. I see we have Witness Durbin and we have Public Counsel, and l'm seeing -- if anyone believes someone is missing from the call at this point, please feel free to note that in the chat.

Our next -- our next cross-examination would be from Public Counsel for Witness Durbin.

Ms. Suetake, you may proceed.

Is PSE's view consistent with the guidance that the Commission has provided on incremental costs in the adoption order of the CEIP rules?
A. I -- I believe that it is. Although I will add that the Commission certainly signaled that it's neither a floor or a cap. And we did take that under advisement as we were thinking about the two percent. And as I stated in my rebuttal testimony, we -- we viewed it as a spending guideline in forming how we might establish our targets.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Finally, could you turn to page 26 of your rebuttal testimony?
A. I'm there.
Q. All right. So on line 16 through 18, you state that PSE agrees with eliminating the climate change CBI for the 2025 CEIP.

Does that mean that PSE opposes eliminating that CBI now?
A. Oh. PSE would be open to removing it for the biennial update, if that was the Commission's desire.

I -- I did write this specific to the 2025 CEIP, but that -- but we should not infer that that means we oppose it for the biennial.
Q. All right. Thank you, Ms. Durbin. I have no
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MS. SUETAKE: Thank you.
I seem to be having a little bit of Zoom
issues. So please let me know if l'm not coming in clearly.

JUDGE HOWARD: I did hear you break up a little bit in the audio there. Maybe let's -- let's see how it goes for a minute and then, if necessary, you can perhaps, call in on a cell phone.

MS. SUETAKE: Okay. Apologies. I'm not sure what the problem is today.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. SUETAKE:
Q. Good morning. My name is Nina Suetake and I'm here on behalf of Public Counsel Unit.

Do you have a copy of your rebuttal testimony in front of you?
A. Yes,I do.
Q. Could you please turn to page 14 of your rebuttal testimony?
A. Yes, I'm there.
Q. And then, is it correct -- I'm looking at line 9.

Is it correct that PSE generally supports Public Counsel's condition regarding PSE to clarify that the DER portfolio would be determined after finalizing its
assessment of the DER RFP proposals in the 2023 biennial update?
A. Yes, we generally agree with that.
Q. And is it correct that PSE's DER portfolio selection process included in the current CEIP is illustrative and not definitive?
A. Yes, that's correct. And also stated in my testimony.
Q. If you can turn to -- do you have a copy of the corrected CEIP in front of you?
A. Yes. Let me just turn to it. Give me a moment. I believe -- is there a particular section you would like me to turn to?
Q. Yes. If you can go to Chapter 2, page 32.
A. And just to confirm, you're in the corrected version that was published in -- say on February 2nd, on the front.
Q. Okay.
A. Page 32. I'm there.
Q. Now, is it correct that PSE's DER portfolio selection process is described, essentially, on pages 32 through about 42 and Appendix $D$ of this document?
A. I'm just flipping through to confirm, but that seems correct. The other -- the other appendices you mentioned was Appendix --
portfolio that is stated and included in this chapter actually a proposal by PSE?
A. You really have to read both the first sentence that you quoted and the next sentence that goes on to note that the -- all-source and targeted DERs will provide data on available resources in the program.

So this was our proposed DER preferred portfolio. It was more meant to be illustrative than definitive on the programs that we would pursue. And those updates, as reflected in our commitment in Chapter 8, will be done for the biennial.
Q. Okay. Is there -- can you point to anywhere in this chapter in these ten pages where PSE actually states that this selection process is merely illustrative?
A. If you'll give me a moment. I don't know specifically this moment whether the word "illustrative," if I did a word search, comes up. But I am looking.

I do think there's also some discussion in Chapter 4 that makes this point more clear in the specific actions.

The word "illustrative" may not be in Chapter 2. I don't know if you want me to take the time to read through it fully. But I do believe that is communicated
Q. Appendix D --
A. -- D.
Q. -- as in "dog"?
A. Yes. That's correct.
Q. And then -- so, to be clear, PSE -- is it
correct that PSE considers these ten pages describing its portfolio selection process as well as Appendix $D$, subparts 1 through 5, to be merely illustrative?
A. Yes, we do. These pages really gave it an indication of what we believed our DER portfolio could look like and to give some context for that. And as stated in the CEIP, we intended to update the DER specific to the results of the targeted DER RFP.
Q. Thank you.

If you could turn to page $\mathbf{4 2}$ of the CEIP?
A. Yes.
Q. And if you can turn -- look at that first full paragraph.

And is it -- where it says "PSE's proposed DER preferred portfolio is our initial path to meet CEIP targets."

Do you see that?
A. Ido.
Q. So when it says the "preferred" -- "proposed preferred portfolio," is it correct, then, that the
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in Chapter 4 as we discussed the specific DER actions we may take.
Q. Okay. Well, that's fine for now then. We don't have to actually search exactly for the word, then.

I guess, then -- could you clarify -- you've clarified that the process and the portfolio will be informed by the all-source and targeted DER RFPs; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Going forward, is PSE using the methodology of resource selection that it outlines in this CEIP?
A. If PSE uses a similar selection process for the 2025 CEIP, we will certainly make adjustments and improvements to the process.

But, right now, it is a little hard for me to speculate exactly what the process will be for the 2025, but would note that we would certainly want to make improvements. We did receive a lot of comments and critiques of the selection process that we used.
Q. So between now -- or between the time this was filed and the 2025 CEIP, what process is PSE using to craft its DER portfolio?
A. That -- if -- to speak more specifically to those plans, you may want to ask that question of Witness Will Einstein. I can speak generally, but we
have plans to do community engagement this year to inform out the specific programs that we will be pursuing through the remainder of the implementation period, informed by the DER RFP results.
Q. So when PSE says that this portfolio is illustrative, do you mean the results are illustrative or the methodology used is illustrative?
A. The methodology that we used in -- that's described in Chapter 2 and the -- and the programs we provided as -- as illustrative examples of the types of programs we would pursue to fill the 80 megawatt subtarget, that's what I'm referring to.
Q. So both the methodology and the results are illustrative and can change; is that correct?
A. I wouldn't really characterize what's in Chapter 2 as results. I would think of the results, when we use the word "results," as being the results from the RFP. But the proposed types of programs is certainly more illustrative. And the illustrative work does, just to clarify, show up on page 115, footnote 54 in talking about at least some of the time I used pilot programs. But that's not in Chapter 2.
Q. So one more time, just to clarify.

In the 2023 and 2025 -- well, CEIP -- in the update and in the 2025 plan, will PSE continue to update
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its portfolio selection process as well as the actual portfolio?
A. I'm hesitating on the term "selection process," but we will certainly update our -- our methods. We will update our cost estimates that we use. We will be talking to the community about the kinds of programs they want to see and all of that will inform the programs you ultimately see in the biennial and in the next CEIP. Whether we call it selection process or not, we are certainly going to make improvements in all of those areas.
Q. And will PSE modify how it uses the CBIs to select resources or is PSE planning on updates to how it uses CBIs?
A. I think it is reasonable to assume that we will also seek to make improvements in how we think about and apply CBIs for the biennial and even more so for the 2025 CEIP.
Q. Is it correct that the updates that your -- to the preferred portfolio will be -- the first updates will be based on the 2022 DER, RFP DER and DR RFP?
A. It's true that the DER DR RFP will be very informative to how we ultimately update the biennial. It will also be informed by the electric progress report results, which will be finalized in April. So that's
just another important input.
Q. Will the 2020 -- will that progress report be incorporated into the biennial update or just the 2025 CEIP?
A. It will be incorporated in the biennial and that's reflected in our commitments in Chapter 8.
Q. Okay. And do you anticipate a significant change in the expected programs in the -- in the DER portfolio based on the results of the RFP?
A. It is still a bit too early for me to opine on that. With respect to demand response, which witness Archuleta can look to. We're certainly looking at demand response programs that are -- that touch on additional customer classes beyond what we saw in the proposed CEIP. So we're looking at various programs. And on this distributed energy resource program, we're also looking at -- we're looking at the concepts that were proposed in the CEIP, but we're also really going to be talking to the community and seeing what's feasible and what's coming out of the DER RFP that we can move forward with.
Q. So going forward from CEIP to CEIP, will the process of resource selection be more driven by the RFPs than -- a theoretical selection process?
A. That's our expectation; is that we certainly
will have the benefit of those plans being more directly informed by the RFP process.

I think as indicated, briefly in my rebuttal testimony, we have a timing issue with the rule-required IRP RFP just because that is triggered by an IRP that concludes in April and a CEIP that's due under the rules in final form in October. So RFP results are going to need to come in earlier in order to really be able to inform some of our work and -- so that's what I would offer.
Q. Would PSE object to a condition that would require the company to explain in its 2023 biennial update how it intends to use the RFP results to craft a portfolio?
A. Can you elaborate on what that condition would look like? Do you mean for how it would use the results for the 2025 CEIP or --
Q. For -- so let me give a little background to my question. You have -- it's correct that you've stated that the DER RFPs will inform your process going forward; is that correct?
A. Certainly, this DER RFP is going to inform our biennial update. I'm just a little hesitant to project out to the future exactly how all of that will work, but yes.
Q. So right now in your current CEIP, you have a portfolio selection process that's illustrative; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. But that isn't necessarily the process that will be used going forward; right?
A. Correct.
Q. So at what point -- will it be possible in the 2023 biennial update to provide the Commission and parties an update to how PSE is selecting its resources?
A. I would expect in the biennial update we'll be explaining the engagement activities we're doing this year, the review we've done of costs and a justification for why the programs we've included we're pursuing and to have that -- that explanation in the biennial.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

I think that is all of my questions for now. Thank you.
A. Thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect
following Public Counsel's cross?
MS. MOSER: No, Your Honor.
JUDGE HOWARD: Okay.
NWEC and Front and Centered also indicated cross for this witness.
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You may proceed.
MS. GOODIN: Thank you, Your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. GOODIN:
Q. Good morning, Ms. Durbin.
A. Good morning.
Q. I have heard you say that you have your rebuttal testimony available. Could we go ahead and turn to page 25 for me, please?

Let me know when you're there.
A. You said page 25?
Q. Page 25. Correct.
A. Yes, I'm there.
Q. Great. You've testified that PSE plans to assess current disparities and burdens faced by named communities during the implementation period for this CEIP; is that correct?

I'm sorry. It's lines 13 through 19, if you're having trouble finding it.
A. On lines 13 or 19 , in a question that was talking about the developing of goals for CBIs; yes, we noted the importance of deeply understanding the disparities and burdens faced by our customers to ensure that we have a baseline to work from for our metrics.
Q. Could you go ahead and turn to Exhibit KKD-39X

```
                                    Page 173
```

A. Yes. Sorry. I see that in the response to subpart $B$, yes.
Q. Thanks.

And I heard you mention earlier that you do have the CEIP available.

Could you go ahead and turn to page 64?
A. Yes, just a moment. Multiple binders.

All right. I'm there. Thank you.
Q. All right. Could you go ahead and read the first bullet along with the sentence immediately before it?
A. Yeah. So the sentence in the CEIP reads: This CEIP will use the highly impacted community's designation and vulnerable population factors to ensure the equitable distribution of benefits by, bullet one, identifying the existing disparities and benefits and burdens between customers; and the second bullet, tracking and measuring process and addressing these disparities over time.
Q. Thanks.

So that first bullet, "identifying existing disparities," you'd agree that that's the same as -- or similar to assessing current disparities that you mentioned in your testimony; is that right?
A. Yes.
is in the request. It includes the information that you are asking for.

But the information that is project specific, that would be in those bidder responses that are not public; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And PSE is not planning to make those bidder analyses public even after the conclusion of the RFP process; is that correct?
A. I actually can't speak to what our plans will be once the process is concluded. We're not at that stage yet. I would just reiterate that while the process is still underway, we would be held to that confidentiality agreement. We would have to give more thought to what steps we might take at the conclusion. That is not customary for us to do, though. We usually put forward a summary report at the conclusion and that's -- that is the information we generally make public.

MS. GOODIN: Thank you.
Your Honor, I think the only issue we have left is the contested exhibit, and I would like to turn it over to my colleague, Ms. Tack-Hooper for that, if that's all right?

JUDGE HOWARD: Is there any objection from PSE to that?
A. That's correct.
Q. And the first two sentences of PSE's response say, "Puget Sound Energy recently engaged E3 as part of its 2023 IRP electric progress report to develop updated effective load carrying capacity values (ELCC), including demand response, resource contribution to peak capacity reduction; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Then it says, "This work was presented to stakeholders as part of the August 24, 2022, IRP resource adequacy information session. Materials may be downloaded from PSE's IRP website"; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I think we can now look at KKD-44X. Let me know when you've got that one?
A. I'm there.
Q. Okay. So the first part of the exhibit is PSE's response to our data request 218. And at the bottom it says, "Person who prepared the response: Kara Durbin and Phillip Popoff"; is that correct?
A. That's correct. I worked with Mr. Popoff on this response. He is listed as the witness knowledgeable, however.
Q. Right. And this is a true and correct copy of PSE's response to the data request?

MS. BARNETT: No, Your Honor.
JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
Please proceed.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. TACK-HOOPER:
Q. Okay. Hi, I'm Molly Tack-Hooper. I work at Earthjustice. We represent Front and Centered and NWEC in this proceeding.

I have just a few questions that are relevant to that contested exhibit, KKD-44X. I would actually like to start by asking you to look at KKD-25X is already in the record.

This is -- should be PSE's response to our Data Request 155.
A. Yes, I'm there. Thank you.
Q. Okay. It says at the bottom, "Witness knowledgeable about the response, Kara Durbin"; is that correct?
A. Yes, I do have some familiarity with this response.
Q. Okay. So the second sentence of the request says, "Please describe any additional analysis PSE has done to evaluate its summer peak needs and the potential for demand response programs to reduce summer peak; is that correct?
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A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. Okay. And what it says is: "Please provide the presentation from December 12th, 2022, Electric IRP progress report meeting. Please identify the amount of winter and summer peak need that PSE estimates will be met with demand response in 2029 on pages 32 and 33 of the presentation." And then there's a URL.

Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes, you did.
Q. And PSE's response is attached as Attachment A to PSE Response, et cetera. Please find the presentation from the December 12, 2022, electric Integrated Resource Plan Progress Report Meeting. The winter peak need that PSE estimates will be met with demand response in 2029 is 185 megawatts. The summer peak need that PSE estimates will be met with demand response in 2029 is 249 megawatts; correct?
A. Correct. That is our response.
Q. Okay. And the attachment appears to be a presentation titled Electric Draft Portfolio Results 2023, Electric Progress Report dated December 12th.

Is this a true and correct copy of the presentation from the December 12th Electric Integrated Resource Plan Progress Report Meeting?
A. Yes. These were the draft portfolio results
presented to stakeholders on December 12th.
Q. And are you familiar with this document?
A. I am generally familiar. Although, I did not conduct the analysis provided.

## Q. Fair enough.

Can you confirm that the slide deck shows the results of analysis performed after updates made by PSE and E3, including updated ELCC values for ER to reflect DR contribution and peak capacity reduction?
A. That is probably as far as my expertise can go, so I wouldn't encourage you to ask me questions about the numbers in here because I didn't perform the analysis.

But, yes, this looks like the presentation that was provided then.

MS. TACK-HOOPER: Okay. Your Honor, may I
have just one moment to confer with a colleague?
JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead.
MS. TACK-HOOPER: Thank you.
Okay. We have no other questions for Witness Durbin about this exhibit.

At this time we would like to move for its admission. We think we've laid a sufficient foundation and the parties can argue in post-hearing briefing about what weight it should be afforded.

Is there any redirect following this cross?
MS. BARNETT: Yes, just one question.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BYMS. BARNETT:
Q. Ms. Durbin, Ms. Goodin asked you in regard to page 64 of the corrected CEIP, when you were discussing disparities related to vulnerable populations and highly impacted communities.

You stated that PSE did not set specific goals related to those named communities in the CEIP.

Could you explain why PSE did not set specific goals related to highly impacted communities and vulnerable populations?
A. Yes. We felt that -- that the assessment of the existing disparities and really understanding the -- our named communities better and the barriers they may face to participating in programs was a really important and meaningful first step to inform us in how we might move forward in establishing any goals.

So I believe that demonstrating progress is important, and we're committed to doing that. And we'd really just like to have a better foundation for the existing disparities our customers face and we have that work ongoing now in looking at our existing programs and challenging where looking at participation rates and
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JUDGE HOWARD: Is there any objection from PSE?

MS. BARNETT: Yes, Your Honor. I don't believe the -- the foundation was laid that Ms. Durbin has anything more than knowledge on this. That was, that it was attached to a data request response and that it was what it said on the cover of the page. And that is much more tenuous than I think Ms. Tack-Hooper was -we need for foundation.

As you know, the standard for responding to a discovery request is different and much lower than the standard for admissibility of an exhibit.

And I, again, renew my objection. I don't believe that has been met here.

JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to deem this exhibit admitted into the record.

I, of course, would be mindful of any further questioning that would -- that would appear to go beyond the scope of this particular witness' knowledge. But it -- that is not my primary concern at this point. I'm deeming it admitted, and I believe a sufficient foundation and relevance has been laid.

MS. TACK-HOOPER: Great. Thank you, Your Honor. We don't have anything else for Ms. Durbin.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
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looking at how we've defined vulnerable populations and highly impacted communities and really trying to better understand that as a -- foundational steps. Then being able to say, okay, this is where we're at, what would be -- what should the goal look like for -- for moving forward? And baseline -- capturing baseline data is important part of that too.

MS. BARNETT: I have no further questions,
Your Honor.
JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
The Energy Project indicated it may cross this witness.

MR. FFITCH: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
Just a few -- just a few questions.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. FFITCH:
Q. Good morning. Good morning, Ms. Durbin.
A. Good morning.
Q. I -- I expect you still have in front of you
your rebuttal testimony; correct?
A. Yes, I do. I'm just flipping to it now.
Q. Great. Could you turn to page 22 of your testimony, please?

I'd like to come back to this question about
CBIs related to arrearages and disconnections and energy
matters.
Do we have that -- do you have that page?
COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Mr. ffitch, what page
and exhibit are we on?
MR. FFITCH: We are on Exhibit KKD-60,
Ms. Durbin's rebuttal testimony, on page 22 beginning at
line 8. I apologize for not setting that up better.
COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Nope. Thank you.
BY MR. FFITCH:
Q. Are you there, Ms. Durbin?
A. Iam.
Q. And here you are addressing the recommendations in this case from several parties regarding energy-assistance topics, including CBls for arrearages and disconnections; is that correct?
A. I don't see that discussion on page 23. I do
see some on page 22. Just making sure I'm in the right place.
Q. Yes. Page 23 is what I'm intending to refer to.
A. Page 22?
Q. Page 22 with question at line 8.
A. Okay. Page 22, line 8. I'm there. Okay.

Sorry, I was on page 23.
Q. Okay. So, again, this is where you're addressing the recommendations by multiple parties, in
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this case, Staff --
A. Yes.
Q. -- Energy Project, Public Counsel, Northwest Energy Coalition, and Front and Centered for CBIs related to arrearages, disconnections, and other energy assistance topics; correct?
A. Yes. That's -- we addressed some of those issues in this question.
Q. Okay. And it's -- it's Puget Sound Energy's position, as you state here, that CBIs in this area don't really belong in a CEIP because they're not resource related and the CEIP is a resource planning document.

That's your position; correct?
A. That is certainly our position with respect to metrics around disconnections and arrearages, that those are better handled in a different proceeding and many of those are tracked, for example, in our general rate case.
Q. Okay. But you've already testified earlier this morning that there's no prohibition in rule or order or otherwise for the Commission to adopt those metrics for arrearages and disconnections in a CBI in a CEIP; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. I want to explore this just a little bit more.

In that same answer you acknowledge in your
testimony that Puget has proposed a CBI regarding improved affordability; is that -- is that a correct statement?
A. Yes, that's one of -- that's one of the categories for CBIs and we do have a CBI metric in our CEIP.
Q. Okay. And the metric that you've proposed for that is improved -- excuse me, a median electric -- a median -- reduction in median electric bill as a percentage of household income?
A. Correct. That's the customer benefit indicator we proposed. And I believe we have ten metrics associated with that CBI that we'll be tracking.
Q. Okay. That -- you say that that relates to the CETA statutory elements, the cost reduction, and burden reduction; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. But you would agree, would you not, that a customer's unpaid balance or her arrearage is also a reflection of the affordability of energy, would you not?
A. It's -- it's -- it's an input for consideration,
yes.
Q. Okay. And wouldn't you also agree that the level of disconnection or the fact of disconnection for a customer household is a reflection of the affordability of that energy that it's purchasing?
A. That may be one element that -- of influence, yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Could you please turn to page 20 of your rebuttal testimony? And that's lines 1 and 2.
A. Yes.
Q. In there you state that in proposing CBls and establishing metrics, Puget sought metrics it could reasonably track given the data available; correct?
A. Yes, that's a general premise that -- that still remains true.
Q. And wouldn't you agree that Puget is currently tracking data with regard to arrearages and disconnections and reporting that to the Commission at the present time?
A. Yes. It has not been part of a Clean Energy Implementation Plan, but we are tracking that information in other proceedings, appropriately so, and having conversations with our low income advisory group about -- about those metrics.
Q. Okay. So this criterion is met for arrearages

|  | Page 190 |  | Page 192 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | and disconnection data, is it not? That data is clearly | 1 | So, you know, at this time we are still -- we're |
| 2 | available to the company right now? | 2 | still evaluating the proposals and the targeted DER and |
| 3 | A. Yes. That's correct. | 3 | DER RFP, so we could certainly, in a compliance filing, |
| 4 | Q. Is -- is it Puget's position that if data is | 4 | make an update to, at least, the 60 megawatts that I |
| 5 | available and reported already to the Commission, | 5 | signaled in my rebuttal testimony and we'd be happy to |
| 6 | perhaps in another docket or another -- another type of | 6 | do that if that's necessary. So that is something that |
| 7 | context or proceeding, that it's -- cannot be included | 7 | we -- we could do. But I would also note that we are |
| 8 | in the CEIP or should not be included in the CEIP | 8 | still working on our evaluation of the demand response |
| 9 | metrics? | 9 | proposals, and so I'm a little concerned about the |
| 10 | A. No, that -- that's not our position. Our | 10 | timing of what information we could share in that |
| 11 | position is that the CEIP should have a manageable | 11 | compliance filing, because we haven't secured those |
| 12 | number of customer benefit indicators that it tracks | 12 | contracts so we wouldn't really have -- I'm a little |
| 13 | over time and ones that are meaningful that we can -- | 13 | concerned we might not have the kind of meaningful |
| 14 | that we can influence. That's our goal. We understand | 14 | information you'd want to see in that compliance filing. |
| 15 | that these metrics certainly are informative to our work | 15 | I'm really hopeful that by the fall and |
| 16 | as a company. | 16 | certainly by November 1st when we file our biennial |
| 17 | Q. Okay. Thank you, Ms. Durbin. | 17 | update that we will have all that information. |
| 18 | MR. FFITCH: Your Honor, that's all the | 18 | So that's the only hesitancy I have is I'm |
| 19 | questioning I have for this witness. | 19 | thinking on my feet on what you would want to see in |
| 20 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 20 | that compliance filing, and we may not be able to |
| 21 | Do we have any redirect. | 21 | have -- we may not have all the data available to make |
| 22 | MS. BARNETT: No, Your Honor. | 22 | that a meaningful one. |
| 23 | JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from | 23 | Q. But it's something you are now keeping in mind; |
| 24 | the bench for Witness Durbin? | 24 | correct? |
| 25 | COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I have a few questions | 25 | A. Sorry? |
|  | Page 191 |  | Page 193 |
| 1 | if I might, please. | 1 | Q. It's something you'll now keep in mind; correct? |
| 2 | JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed. | 2 | A. Yes. Absolutely. |
| 3 | EXAMINATION | 3 | Q. Let's go to DER targets now, please. |
| 4 | BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: | 4 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Mr. Doumit? |
| 5 | Q. Ms. Durbin, good morning. | 5 | COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes. |
| 6 | A. Good morning. | 6 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have a follow-up, |
| 7 | Q. So first I want to talk about demand response | 7 | and that is also based on some of the questioning from |
| 8 | targets. I'm looking at your rebuttal testimony at | 8 | some of the other parties. |
| 9 | page 10 and -- page 11. Specifically, page -- page 11, | 9 | EXAMINATION |
| 10 | line 7. | 10 | BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: |
| 11 | And -- are you there? | 11 | Q. So once you have reviewed the RFP, at what point |
| 12 | A. Yes, l am. | 12 | in that process are the proposals made public or do they |
| 13 | Q. Okay. You state in response to public counsels | 13 | continue to be confidential even after contracts have |
| 14 | recommendation that PSE should update the demand | 14 | been awarded? |
| 15 | response targets in the 2023 biennial CEIP update. | 15 | A. That's -- that's a great question. |
| 16 | And then in response to NWEC in Front and | 16 | I really might need to direct that to one of my |
| 17 | Centered's recommendation you could update the targets | 17 | fellow witnesses that's managing that RFP process and |
| 18 | for both summer and winter peaking also in the biennial | 18 | how they plan to handle that, either Witness Archuleta |
| 19 | CEIP update; is that correct? | 19 | or Witness Einstein. |
| 20 | A. That's correct. | 20 | Typically, that information has been kept |
| 21 | Q. Okay. Please explain whether the company could | 21 | confidential until the process is included and we're not |
| 22 | update this information in a compliance filing following | 22 | there yet. But -- |
| 23 | a Commission order in this proceeding, and if not, why | 23 | Q. No, I understand that. I'm just trying to |
| 24 | not? | 24 | determine if the information is ever made public. And |
| 25 | A. Great question. | 25 | it sounds like I can confirm this with the other |


|  | Page 194 |  | Page 196 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | witnesses about at what point it is made publicly | 1 | to talk to them -- both raised their awareness of their |
| 2 | available? | 2 | familiarity with our existing programs, like community |
| 3 | A. Yes, I believe so. | 3 | solar. And sort of laid some foundation for them to |
| 4 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. Go ahead, | 4 | understand the kinds of programs we were considering |
| 5 | Doumit. | 5 | pursuing and really team them up to the next more -- |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thanks. Thank you, | 6 | even more in-depth conversation and bringing them |
| 7 | Commissioner. | 7 | proposals and being able to discuss trade-offs and what |
| 8 | EXAMINATION | 8 | customer benefits we thought we might see and what we |
| 9 | BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: | 9 | heard from the community around barriers and the kinds |
| 10 | Q. So DER targets -- so l'm looking at page 17 of | 10 | of benefits that they'd like to see from these programs. |
| 11 | your direct testimony, KKD-1T at lines 10 to 12. | 11 | So that's some of the work that we began with |
| 12 | A. Sorry. That's going to take me a moment. | 12 | our Equity Advisory Group and we will continue this |
| 13 | Q. No worries. No worries. | 13 | spring in addition to that direct community engagement |
| 14 | A. I'll need to pull that. Just one moment. | 14 | to hear, really, what benefits those customers and named |
| 15 | I think my paralegal may be saving me. I do | 15 | communities and elsewhere want to see from the |
| 1 | have it, but -- | 16 | transition. And what barriers do they see today from |
| 17 | Q. Take your time. That's okay. | 17 | them participating? We think that's an important part. |
| 18 | A. Thank you. | 18 | Q. Okay. I'm going to paraphrase some of the |
| 19 | All right. Could you please repeat the page | 19 | testimony in the docket here from others. And because |
| 20 | numbers for me? | 20 | we read over and over again that the way the company |
| 21 | Q. Yeah. And by the way, this is ground you've | 21 | engages the advisory groups -- and I'm paraphrasing |
| 22 | covered with Public Counsel, but I'm just going in, | 22 | here -- is "to be selective with information, strategic |
| 23 | maybe a slightly different question. | 23 | with the timing of information, and gives very little |
| 24 | Yes, at page 17 of your direct testimony, at | 24 | time for responsive feedback or even conversation." |
| 25 | lines 10 to 12. | 25 | What's your perspective on how this is working |
|  | Page 195 |  | Page 197 |
| 1 | A. Okay. | 1 | and how are you planning to change this? |
| 2 | Q. You state that the specific details of the DER | 2 | A. I -- I wouldn't -- particularly, when it comes |
| 3 | subtarget will be provided in the 2023 CEIP update | 3 | to our Equity Advisory Group, I really wouldn't agree |
| 4 | because these details depend on the outcome of the | 4 | with that characterization. |
| 5 | DER -- DER FP. | 5 | We've been very thoughtful and deliberate in |
| 6 | And then going to page 20, starting at line 5, | 6 | setting up our Equity Advisory Group and in how we share |
| 7 | you state that PSE will engage with advisory groups and | 7 | information with them in advance for meetings, how we |
| 8 | interested persons about specific product development | 8 | bring them a topic and then come back later and bring it |
| 9 | and tariff design for DER products as well as | 9 | back to them again for input. |
| 10 | refinements to CBls in this process? | 10 | I really think it's been a thoughtful process |
| 11 | A. Yes. | 11 | and a rich process for us in learning from them and them |
| 12 | Q. As we're already in 2023, what has PSE done so | 12 | challenging us honestly on some of the -- some of the |
| 13 | far on engagement and discussion with the advisory | 13 | hard questions that we need to think about and the ways |
| 14 | groups and interested persons on these topics? And if | 14 | that we need to approach our work from an equity lens |
| 15 | the company hasn't engaged, why not? | 15 | that we may not have previously been thinking from that |
| 16 | A. We have been in the engagement process. I can | 16 | perspective. We've really benefitted from that. |
| 17 | speak to it a little bit, and then I might encourage you | 17 | We're also -- we've made improvements with our |
| 18 | to ask Witness Will Einstein because he's overseeing | 18 | akeholder process for the Integrated Resource Plan |
| 19 | that work and will be able to give you more details. | 19 | this cycle. I'm not going to characterize it as a |
| 20 | But we began that engagement process in | 20 | erfect process, but we've made strides to really not |
| 21 | communities and following the model that PSE has | 21 | just share information in advance but spend time in |
| 22 | followed for our transportation electrification plan and | 22 | meetings and after meetings in really sharing with that |
| 23 | in terms of engagement with our equity advisory group as | 23 | group. Here's what we heard from you. Here are the |
| 24 | an example, the DER team came -- okay. We are in | 24 | changes we're making in our process based on your |
| 25 | January -- last fall in the Equity Advisory Group to -- | 25 | feedback. And keeping that feedback loop going. |


|  | Page 198 |  | Page 200 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | And we've also benefitted from strong | 1 | improvements. |
| 2 | facilitation support in those meetings and really trying | 2 | Are you -- are you asking people how it is |
| 3 | to promote dialogue between questions that, you know, | 3 | working -- I mean, is this -- is this a continual back |
| 4 | interested parties have about -- about our work and us | 4 | and forth because we're not getting the sense in |
| 5 | being able to respond. | 5 | communications with us that things are improving? |
| 6 | So I think we are really -- we've made a lot of | 6 | So I'm trying to figure out what is wrong and |
| 7 | improvements in this space. And It think we have more | 7 | what can work better because it -- I mean, as she says, |
| 8 | improvements that we can make to make our processees | 8 | there's a selected and curated nature of how information |
| 9 | more inclusive and transparent. But I think we've made | 9 | is shared and that's frustrating to a well-informed |
| 10 | some good strides over the last couple of years. | 10 | dialogue. And what we're trying to achieve here is a |
| 11 | Q. Okay. Thank you. Just one more question. | 11 | well-informed dialogue. |
| 12 | CHAIR DANNER: Commissioner, can I break in | 12 | A. And I would offer, Chair Danner, so are we. We |
| 13 | and ask a follow-up to that? | 13 | want that dialogue. We just recently engaged in |
| 14 | EXAMINATION | 14 | one-on-one conversations with all of our Equity Advisory |
| 15 | BY CHAIR DANNER: | 15 | Group members. We do it at the end of each year, or we |
| 16 | Q. First of all, did I hear you say that you are | 16 | have. We've only had a couple of years now. But we -- |
| 17 | not providing information in advance or that you are | 17 | we did at the end of 2021, at the end of 2022, to really |
| 18 | providing information in advance? | 18 | ask the question of how's it going? Is this the right |
| 19 | A. Oh, no. I'm sorry. Absolutely. We are | 19 | level of information that we're giving you? Are there |
| 20 | providing information in advance. That's very | 20 | ways we can do -- we can support you better? Are |
| 21 | important. | 21 | there -- and we really haven't been receiving the kind |
| 22 | Q. Okay. All right. I mean -- I refer you -- for | 22 | of critique that Ms. -- that Mariel suggested in her |
| 23 | example, Mariel Thuraisingham's testimony, MFT-1 at | 23 | pre-filed testimony. |
| 24 | page 14, and she says that there's a selected and | 24 | So I -- we definitely have our ears open to |
| 25 | curated nature of how information is shared. It's | 25 | concerns that are -- that are raised and are always |
|  | Page 199 |  | Page 201 |
| 1 | frustrating for well-informed dialogue. | 1 | thinking about how can we make this a better process. |
| 2 | I mean, are you -- it seems -- again, this is -- | 2 | Public engagement -- meaningful public engagement is |
| 3 | this is a theme that we hear over and over again. We | 3 | important to us and it informs our work. |
| 4 | hear about it in IRPs. We are hearing about it in the | 4 | So I just -- I don't -- I have not experienced, |
| 5 | CEIPs. We -- it appears to me that something is not | 5 | personally, the same critiques that you saw in that |
| 6 | working. You're saying you're doing back and forth with | 6 | testimony expressed by the equity advisor groups when we |
| 7 | them, but are -- are they expressing to you satisfaction | 7 | have asked them directly ourselves over the last couple |
| 8 | in the way this is working or are you still hearing a | 8 | of months. So I am hopeful that they are having a more |
| 9 | lack -- or are you hearing that there is a lack of | 9 | positive experience than what was suggested there. |
| 10 | satisfaction in how this is working? | 10 | Q. Well, I am too. I mean, I can't think of |
| 11 | A. We have heard -- we have heard comments from | 11 | anything more important than when you are reaching out |
| 12 | some of the interested parties that have been along on | 12 | to advocates for vulnerable populations that, you |
| 13 | the IRP stakeholder process journey for quite some time; | 13 | know -- or historically under-represented communities |
| 14 | that they have seen improvements in how our meetings | 14 | that we're actually hearing their voices, because |
| 15 | have been run and are willing -- and how Puget has been | 5 | otherwise we go forward in an uninformed way. |
| 16 | engaging with -- with stakeholders or interested parties | 16 | So I ask you to continue that, but we are also |
| 17 | that is during those meetings. | 17 | going to continue to monitor the information that comes |
| 18 | We've also heard critiques on how that process | 18 | to us and we want to make sure that that is an inclusive |
| 19 | has worked. And so we really are considering strongly | 19 | conversation, so thank you. |
| 20 | for the next IRP process some changes to how we | 20 | THE WITNESS: Absolutely. |
| 21 | structure our advisory group process and -- in the hopes | 21 | CHAIR DANNER: Commissioner Doumit, back to |
| 22 | that we can make further improvements. | 22 | you. |
| 23 | Q. Well, the testimony I referred to in -- from | 23 | COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you for that |
| 24 | Mariel Thuraisingham and at page 14 had to do with the | 24 | follow-up, Chair Danner. |
| 25 | CEIP. And -- and you've expressed that there have been | 25 | And, you know, I have one more question for |

Ms. Durbin, but the other Commissioners may have questions as well.

EXAMINATION
BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT:
Q. This refers to specific actions, and I'm referring to your rebuttal testimony at page 36, please. And I'm looking at lines 5 through 11, essentially. And this talks about expectation for future CEIPs, not for this CEIP. I think elsewhere in your testimony you may have said that you -- you will provide more detailed specific actions in the update, 2023 biennial update in the IRP process.

But what really concerns me about this statement is that you said even future CEIPs may fall short, given the timing of procurement processes in conjunction with CEIP timelines.

And those are PSE procurement processes you are talking about; right?
A. Correct.
Q. So what -- let me ask, generally.

Why is it that PSE feels it's unable to meet the regulatory requirements of CETA in this regard?
A. I wouldn't -- I wouldn't characterize it that
way. But I -- what I was trying to express in my
rebuttal testimony is that -- a concern that the
by the Commission, informed by all the parties during the -- the lightning-fast rulemaking that we were a part of in 2020. I felt at the time the thought was that that IRP-triggered RFP was going to inform the CEIP development. And we expressed concerns in the rulemaking at the time that we don't see that working. That doesn't seem like enough time and also concerns about how an RFP process that takes several months and involves confidential information, how can that information really be used transparently in the CEIP that's filed.

So it's one -- one of the areas that we just have questions about is it seems like the parties have differing expectations on how specific a CEIP should be, particularly with respect to the large scale resources.

And we're not opposed to providing more information when we have it and we can share it. It's more about what's a practical way for us to navigate some of these RFP processees and how detailed is the CEIP filed with the Commission intended to be? And -what does approval mean for that process?

And those are just policy questions that we're encountering with this first plan that -- that come to mind for us.

COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: All right. Nothing
processees and timelines that we have in place now, if the expectation is that an RFP that is triggered by an IRP that's filed in April is going to inform the actions, the costs, the development of what we proposed in our plan that's filed in October, that just simply doesn't work. We can certainly rely on voluntary IRP. That's another avenue in the Commission's rules, so we can start earlier with the IRP process to inform the CEIP. And that's certainly a tool we think we are going to need to pursue, because we have a lot of renewable resources to apply over the next several years. And so we anticipate that we will be doing that for some time.

I don't know if I fully addressed your question --
Q. Yeah. The concern is -- the concern is -- the question is, in the testimony it seems like -- it appears like the law, CETA, should follow PSE's processes rather than the other way.

How do you respond to that?
A. Well, I -- we certainly need to follow the law and we're committed to doing so, so I just feel the need to start there.

But the -- the question that I am more concerned that I am raising in my rebuttal testimony is that the timelines that we developed -- that were developed by --
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further from me, Your Honor.
Thank you, Ms. Durbin.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: So I guess it's now
almost afternoon, so I guess I'll check with Judge
Howard if we -- if you want to keep moving and go through Witness Durbin's testimony, take a break. But I have a few questions.

JUDGE HOWARD: Commissioner Rendahl, I believe if -- if the Commissioners are amenable, perhaps we would finish the bench questions for this witness and then break for lunch.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: That sounds good to me.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right.
EXAMINATION
BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:
Q. Ms. Durbin, I'm going to focus on the CBI development. And so if you look at your rebuttal testimony, I'm going to be focusing on page 24 of 40.

And so let me know when you're there.
A. I'm there. Thanks.
Q. Okay. So in responding to the other parties' request for conditions on the CBIs, you're basically stating that changes shouldn't be made in the 2020 --
certain changes shouldn't be made in the 2023 biennial update, but in the 2025 CEIP, identifying the potential for inconsistencies with the IRP electric progress report and the need for meaningful dialogue and to be truly inclusive of new voices.

And we've just been talking about that a bit in response to Commissioner Doumit's questions, but is it PSE's position that CBIs and other elements in the IRP and the CEIP need to be identical with no changes, even though the company has said in the opening that this process is iterative and builds from one to the next?

Do you understand what l'm getting at here?
A. I -- I'm not quite sure that I am.

Were you asking if they need to be identical between an IRP and a CEIP?
Q. Yes.
A. Or the customer benefit indicators in particular?
Q. Yes.
A. It's PSE's position that we think that consistency is -- is important. I don't know that the -- the law and the rules requires that it be. But since the IRP is the foundation -- foundational analysis and that Clean Energy Action Plan then flows to the CEIP that we see a lot of benefit from them being consistent.
thinking, okay, if we're going to make changes to CBIs and we want to be inclusive and bring those voices together, that's at least two meetings with our Equity Advisory Group, maybe three.

And how do we then have the time to refine to make sure we have the data to support a new CBI. So I think we're willing to begin those conversations around improvements to CBIs during this year. I'm just reluctant to commit to having substantive changes or new CBls for the biennial, just knowing that's a very aggressive timeline.
Q. Okay. Well, the company has received comments and suggestions on the CBI's during development of the Draft CEIP and afterwards. And then again after the Final CEIP was filed but has not made many of those suggested changes to the CBls.

So I guess this is the frustration, is -- is how will the process differ going forward or work differently from the process of developing the current CEIP if you -- you say you're open, but I'm not seeing any change -- you know, many changes.

And so -- given the short time frames, how -how can we be sure that there's going to be a different outcome going forward than this one?
A. I hear you, Commissioner Rendahl. And at the

## Page 207

## Q. Okay. But as you said, it's an iterative

 process --A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. -- and given the short time frames that we have, how do you move from one process to the next if you're not being iterative even in the CBI process?
A. Well, I think we are being iterative in the CBI process. So when I suggest that -- that changes for CBIs shouldn't be made until the 2025 CEIP, I'm not suggesting that PSE sit back and wait until 2024 to pick up the baton with CBIs. We've already made improvements in the electric progress report, which is still in draft form and still underway.

But we made some improvements over the past year in how we consider customer benefits in our portfolio analysis, an improvement from the 2021 IRP, so we are being iterative.

And, likewise, we're open to having conversations with the parties around ways we can improve upon the CBIs that we filed. I think my primary concern is that by the time we likely have a decision in this proceeding, it's the spring. We would really like to put out a draft biennial update, whether the Commission requires us to or not, in August.

So l'm just keenly aware of the calendar and
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same time, I would offer that, you know, the reasonableness of the CBls we proposed have been in an adjudicative state for the past year.

So we've been in an awkward position, at best, of we've got a plan; we've proposed CBls that we believe are reasonable; we've continued to have conversations with the parties to understand their ideas and suggestions for CBI work in the future. We -- we're -but at the same time, this year hasn't felt -- sorry, 2022 didn't feel like the time to continue to try to change the CBls that we had proposed in our plan that hadn't -- that we hadn't gotten any signal or direction from the Commission on. It's an awkward place to be. We want to improve. But we also think the CBIs we proposed are good ones, and we think a reasonable number of them in a plan is appropriate.

We have 11, and there are -- and we're open to changing them. We're open to potentially adding some, but we want to do that work thoughtfully.

And I just think that last year we -- we tried to focus in on a number of -- number of other areas for our work, including how we better use customer benefit indicators in our IRP process. And that's -- so that's been a focus area for us to make -- to be on a path to improving our use of CBIs.

## 31 (Pages 206 to 209)
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## Q. No problem. I understand.

A. I'm sorry. Could you please repeat the question? I want to make sure I answer it correctly.
Q. So he's -- he says there that you're not looking at non-wires alternatives because of CETA, and he quotes you there. And I just want to ask if that is accurate, and if it is, why does -- what is it in CETA that is precluding you from looking at non-wires alternatives?
A. Yeah. I'd like to just clarify that -- what that statement was suggesting, I believe -- I'd have to go pull it directly, but -- but that was more in reference to discussions around incremental cost and thinking about, sort of, what actions are directly related to CETA and ones may not.

We did include some discussion of non-wires alternatives in our Clean Energy Implementation Plan. We do believe that it's -- it's relevant. And so we were just -- we're just suggesting that, you know, non-wires alternatives is not a new thing because of CETA that we're implementing directly because CETA requires us to, but it's certainly an important part of our clean energy plan.
Q. Okay. Then a larger question, when you mention about incremental costs, in your own testimony, in 60 -at page 31.
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be an important tool for us. We'll have to see how things go.

But the fact remains that we assumed a two percent level of inflation and that is definitely not what we experienced in 2022. When we rolled the plan in 2021, we used a two percent rate of inflation, and that was typical and traditional. And just in light of where we've seen inflation rates go, wanted to make a cautionary note in my testimony mainly to make the point that we built all these estimates with that level of inflation assumed and, you know, we will need to make updates to our cost estimates in the future with better information. But the world has changed a bit even since we filed our plan in December of 2021.
Q. And so would we be starting to see that reassessment in the biennial update?
A. Yes, I would expect so. Or certainly -- we'll certainly be working on that.
Q. Okay. My -- my last question has to do with your testimony at page 13.

I think it's your response testimony.
When -- let me see if I can find it, just a moment.

I'm sorry. It's page 9 of your rebuttal testimony.

|  | Page 214 |  | Page 216 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Basically, when you're talking about the demand | 1 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. In that case, I |
| 2 | responses part of it, you say that you're going to use a | 2 | would like to thank Kara Durbin for her testimony today. |
| 3 | winter planning reserve margin to meet annual peak | 3 | And we will break for lunch. And Witness Durbin is |
| 4 | capacity needs and you say this is because PSE is a | 4 | excused from the proceeding. |
| 5 | winter peaking utility. | 5 | So we are going to take a 45-minute lunch |
| 6 | And so that's what you're going to use when | 6 | break. We'll return at one o'clock. And we are off the |
| 7 | you're studying to meet annual reliability standards. | 7 | record. Thank you, all. |
| 8 | Have you -- is -- is it your position that Puget | 8 | (A luncheon recess was taken |
| 9 | will always be a winter peaking utility as we're seeing | 9 | from 12:16 p.m. to 12:59 p.m.) |
| 10 | more extreme heat in the summertime, more AC use, | 10 | JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. |
| 11 | air-conditioning use, can you assume that you are going | 11 | It is 1:01 p.m.; Returning from lunch. |
| 12 | to be a winter peaking facility for the foreseeable | 12 | Our next witness in the order of |
| 13 | future or is that -- is that a question? | 13 | presentation would be PSE witness Gilbert Archuleta. |
| 14 | A. I -- I'm not the right person to make | 14 | Mr. Archuleta, could you turn on your video |
| 15 | assumptions around what -- what sort of peaking utility | 15 | feed and l'll swear you in. |
| 16 | will be in the future. | 16 | THE WITNESS: Yep. I'm here. |
| 17 | I certainly can -- just with respect to that | 17 | JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Could you please |
| 18 | portion of my testimony, you know, I was explaining the | 18 | raise your right hand? |
| 19 | standard that we used in the 2021 IRP and the 2023 | 19 | Do you swear or affirm that the testimony |
| 20 | electronic progress report, which is still, again, in | 20 | you will give today is the truth, the whole truth, and |
| 21 | draft form and won't be complete until April. | 21 | nothing but the truth? |
| 22 | But it does reflect the impacts of climate | 22 | THE WITNESS: I do. |
| 23 | change. It does look at a summer and winter peak and | 23 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. |
| 24 | all that information analysis, including how demand | 24 | Ms. Barnett, could you please introduce the |
| 25 | responds contributes will be incorporated in our | 25 | witness and tender him for examination. |
|  | Page 215 |  | Page 217 |
| 1 | biennial update. | 1 | MS. BARNETT: Yes. |
| 2 | Q. Okay. So this is not just, sort of, a stedfast | 2 |  |
| 3 | position that -- that Puget is taking, but you are | 3 | GILBERT ARCHULETA, witness herein, having been first |
| 4 | re-assessing this and you are re-assessing it currently? | 4 | duly sworn on oath, was examined |
| 5 | A. Yes; that's correct. | 5 | and testified as follows: |
| 6 | Q. All right. | 6 |  |
| 7 | A. And, no, it's not, to your question before that. | 7 | DIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 8 | Q. I'm sorry. I already forgot the question before | 8 | BY MS. BARNETT: |
| 9 | that. | 9 | Q. Mr. Archuleta, could you please state your full |
| 10 | A. I think you said -- I'm sorry. I thought there | 10 | name and spell your name for the court reporter? |
| 11 | were two questions. And I just wanted to be clear that | 11 | A. Gilbert Archuleta, A-r-c-h-u-l-e-t-a. |
| 12 | it's -- I think that it's not our position that it will | 12 | Q. And what's your role at Puget Sound Energy? |
| 13 | always be a winter -- | 13 | A. I am the Director of Customer Energy Management. |
| 14 | Q. Okay. | 14 | MS. BARNETT: Thank you. |
| 15 | A. I think that was your question. So just to | 15 | And PSE tenders Gilbert Archuleta for |
| 16 | clarify. | 16 | cross-examination. |
| 17 | Q. No. Thank you for reminding me. All right. | 17 | THE COURT: All right. Thank you. |
| 18 | A. Maybe more for the record. | 18 | I see that Staff indicated cross. |
| 19 | Q. Very good. | 19 | MR. CALLAGHAN: I did, Your Honor. Should I |
| 20 | CHAIR DANNER: Thank you. That is -- that | 20 | proceed? |
| 21 | is all I have, Your Honor. | 21 | JUDGE HOWARD: Please proceed. |
| 22 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Any further | 22 | MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you. |
| 23 | questions from the bench for Kara Durbin? | 23 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 24 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No, Your Honor. | 24 | BY MR. CALLAGHAN: |
| 25 | COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No, Your Honor. | 25 | Q. Mr. Archuleta, good afternoon. |

A. Good afternoon.
Q. So, Mr. Archuleta, based on Ms. Durbin's testimony today, I actually only have a few clarifying questions for you, so this should be fairly brief.

Do you have a copy of your rebuttal testimony, Exhibit GA-1T with you?
A. I do.
Q. And do you have a copy of Joel Nightingale's response testimony, which is Exhibit JBN-1T?
A. Let me get that one. I have that in front of me.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

So let's start with your rebuttal testimony. Could you turn to page $\mathbf{2 6}$ for me?
A. All right. I am there.
Q. Thank you.

So on lines 12 and 13, you state, quote: Additionally, Staff wants PSE to update the demand response target in the biennial conservation plan and PSE intends to do just that.

Just to clarify there, did you mean the biennial CEIP update, not the biennial conservation plan?
A. I meant the biennial conservation plan, but we will also update the biennial CEIP.
Q. Okay. So just to be clear, PSE's position is

Mr. Nightingale's testimony state that the demand response target should include the critical peak pricing and time of use programs in this CEIP?
A. It does not.
Q. Okay. So clarify, does Mr. Nightingale's response indicate that Staff, in fact, does not object to excluding those programs from the DR target at this time?
A. I believe so.
Q. Okay.

MR. CALLAGHAN: No further questions. JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect? MS. BARNETT: Not at this time. No, thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. Yes, and I was just asking for that particular party's cross. All right. NWEC and Front and Centered indicated cross for this witness as well. You may proceed. MS. GOODIN: Thank you, Your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. GOODIN:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Archuleta. I have just a couple questions for you today. I think you mentioned you had your testimony available.
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that it will update in the biennial CEIP update?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. All right. If you could turn now to your rebuttal testimony on page 21 for me, and let me know when you're there.
A. All right. I'm there.
Q. Okay. On lines 14 and 25 , you state: Staff argues that the demand response target of $\mathbf{2 3 . 7}$ megawatts should include critical peak pricing and time-of-use programs; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. Could you turn -- well, sorry.

In support of that statement, in footnote 17 on
that same page, you cite Staff witness Nightingale's testimony on page 9 , lines 10 and 11 ; is that correct?
A. Ido.
Q. All right. Could you turn to Staff witness

Nightingale's testimony at page 9 for me? And let me know when you're there.
A. I'm there.
Q. All right. Could you review the question and answer that starts on page 9 , line 14, and let me know when you're finished.
A. All right. I've reviewed it.
Q. All right. Does that portion of

$$
\text { Page } 221
$$

Could you go ahead and turn to page 23?
A. All right. I'm there.
Q. Thanks. And at 23 -- page 23 from line 16 going through page 24, line 7 , you've listed a few specific demand response programs that PSE might target to named communities beginning in 2023; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. The programs you listed included providing smart thermostats and water heater modules to named community customers, rolling out a behavioral demand response specifically to named communities, and co-deployment of demand response with PSE's home weatherization assistance and efficiency boost programs; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. But none of these demand response programs for named communities are discussed in the CEIP; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And PSE has not put into the record for this proceeding any analysis of how these specific demand response programs would impact named communities; is that correct?
A. That is correct.

MS. GOODIN: Thank you. I have no further questions, Your Honor.

JUDGE HOWARD: Any redirect following this cross?

MS. BARNETT: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. The Energy Project also noted it may cross this witness.

MR. FFITCH: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. FFITCH:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Archuleta.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. My name is Simon ffitch, and I'm the lawyer for The Energy Project in this case. And I'm also going to direct you to your rebuttal testimony, which is Exhibit GA-1T. So if you have that handy.

And, actually, start out with your conclusion, page 27 -- that -- the first $Q$ and $A$ there, starting at line 2.

Well, just a general question. Would you agree that as a general proposition, energy efficiency is a resource-related consideration that should be taken into account in a resource planning process?
A. I'm sorry. You cut out with part of that. So could you restate that question, please?
Q. Sure. You would agree, would you not, that as a general proposition, energy efficiency is a resource-
related -- or is resource related and should be considered in a resource planning process?
A. Generally, yes.
Q. And that would also apply to low income energy efficiency and programs, such as weatherization; correct?
A. Again, generally, yes.
Q. PSE is not arguing in this case that CBIs and metrics related to energy efficiency or low income energy efficiency are beyond the scope of the CEIP on the basis that they're not resource related. You're not making that argument with regard to energy efficiency; correct?
A. No.
Q. Your position, if I can just characterize it generally, is that -- and I think this is reflected on page 27, is that those are better addressed in the BCT process and not in the CEIP?
A. Correct.
Q. Is that a correct summary?

Okay. But let's look at page 8 for my next question, rebuttal Exhibit GA-1T, starting at line 5.

And there you say that -- and this is kind of, again, restating your position that these issues should be addressed in the BCP process, biennial conservation
planning process and then you say at line 8, that's simply reflected in the CEIP.

And so my question is, so -- Puget does not object to and is comfortable with bringing in material from the BCP process into the CEIP; is that a fair understanding?
A. Well, I would clarify by saying that the intention of -- of that comment was really to demonstrate that there are two distinct processees at play here. And so that the energy efficiency targets and the planning around programs to support those targets are already encompassed in our biennial conservation planning and it's already a regulatory process.

So anything reflected in the CEIP related to energy efficiency then should be pulled from the already-established process and reflected in the CEIP.
Q. Okay. I understand that -- that's what I was trying to get at, that the CEIP does pull important information from the BCP process. And Puget is not objecting to reaching out into that other process to bring in, you know, the products of the BCP process into the CEIP; isn't that correct?
A. I would say that would be generally correct, other than I wouldn't blur the processees; right?
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The framework by which we go through to establish conservation targets and the planning for programs is one process; the CEIP is another process.

And so if you're stating that when we reflect to the BCP in the CEIP where it's appropriate, I would agree with that, as long as you are not making decisions around what happens in the BCP through the CEIP process, because you would then blur the two -- two frame works.
Q. Okay. And you mention here in this testimony that the -- this process involves working with the Conservation Resource Advisory Group, CRAG; is that right?
A. Ido.
Q. Isn't it -- isn't it true that the company does also work with the CRAG on the CEIP process, including CBIs and metrics and is actually supposed to and is required to do that kind of work in coordination with CRAG under the Commission's rule? Under the Commission's CETA rules.
A. I -- I don't believe that is true. It is not my understanding that -- the Conservation Resource Advisory Group was really, a part of how we were responding to our energy efficiency responsibilities from a regulatory perspective, and so they advise on those things related to conservation and energy efficiency.
I would need you to point to where you would see 226
that required in the CEIP. We have an Equity Advisory
Group that -- that supports the CEIP process. But I --
I don't know where you might be referring to as it
refers to the CRAG.
Q. Okay. So you're not aware that the company is
under any obligation to work with its -- any of its
advisory groups other than the Equity Advisory Group on
low income energy efficiency issues?
A. I wouldn't say that.
$\quad$ What l'm saying is that, uh, based on -- on the
question, as I heard it, I don't know that there's any
expectation in the CEIP that we're working with the
CRAG.
What I would offer, however, is that we
generally are looking at all of our advisory groups to
advise us in making the appropriate and prudent
decisions in all the varying processees that we have to
go through.
So there would be some engagement from that
perspective, but I'm unaware of a requirement for that.
Q. Okay. Now the biennial conversation process is
generally conducted under the Energy Independence Act;
is that right?
A. Correct.
Page 22
Q. Does Puget have any obligations under the energy -- under CETA that are not, uh, reflected in the Energy Independence Act?
A. I'm not -- can you restate that question, please?
Q. Does Puget have any obligations under the -under CETA that are different than the Energy Independence Act?

Or, actually, the way I asked it the first time was any obligations that are not reflected in the Energy Independence Act.
A. Well, I would offer, again, that these are two distinct obligations and processees.

So what I would offer is that the independence act really provides regulation around how we look at and determine our conservation energy efficiency processees and targets. And those -- the results of that process can be reflected in the CEIP, but not decided through the CEIP process. They are decided through the -- the biennial conservation planning process.
Q. Okay. Well, I'll ask my question again.

Isn't it the case that CETA has other -- or additional obligations for Puget beyond what are in the Energy Independence Act?
A. I would say that CETA added additional
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responsibilities to PSE to comply with the law, yes. If that's what your question is?
Q. Yes, that's my question. And, as an example, adoption of customer benefit indicators is a new requirement under CETA that's not found in the Energy Independence Act?
A. Correct. I agree.
Q. Okay. And the biennial conservation process does not involve establishment or adoption of any customer benefit indicators or metrics; does it?
A. It does not.

MR. FFITCH: Thank you, Mr. Archuleta.
Those are all my questions, Your Honor.
JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
Do we have any redirect?
MS. BARNETT: Just one.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. BARNETT:
Q. Mr. Ffitch -- Mr. Archuleta, Mr. Ffitch was
asking you about a requirement in CETA to engage with the CRAG.

Do you recall those questionings?
A. Ido.
Q. Do you -- are you aware whether or not PSE engages with CRAG as part of its engagement with all
advisory groups on the CEIP?
A. Yes. PSE engages across advisory groups as we look at the CEIP and its inputs.
Q. Does that include CRAG?
A. It does.

MS. BARNETT: Thank you. No further questions.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Thank you.
Are there any questions from the bench for
Mr. Archuleta? COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, Your Honor. I have a few questions for Mr. Archuleta. JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:
Q. Mr. Archuleta, you have your rebuttal testimony in front of you?
A. Ido.
Q. And in that testimony you reference a number -that a number of other parties' proposals are more appropriately addressed in the next biennial conservation plan.

And I just want to clarify that when you're referring to the, quote/unquote, "next plan," you're
referring to the 2024/2025 biennial conservation plan that the company is due to file in November 2023; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So you're not referring to some other plan? I just needed to clarify that.
A. No, that is the plan I'm referring to.
Q. Excellent. Thank you.

Okay. So in the same testimony, if you could
turn to page 22 of your testimony. I'll turn to it as well.

All right. On that page -- are you at page 22?
A. I am. Thank you.
Q. Okay. So starting at line 8 and then continuing
on to the next page, 23 , up to line 13, it appears that PSE has been further developing its demand response programs in preparation for the biennial conservation plan; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And in response to the questions from

Mr. ffitch and -- and your counsel, it's correct that
PSE is engaging with the Conservation Resource Advisory Council in developing these programs, both in the CEIP and in the biennial conservation plan?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. If you look at the last page of your testimony, you are recommending that the Commission approve the energy efficiency and demand response targets in the CEIP even though you're stating that those would be the subject of review in the biennial conservation plan; correct?
A. I would like to clarify that response. Part of this is timing. So when the current biennial conservation plan was already in planning and ready for filing when the CEIP planning was happening, so those numbers reflected or pointed to from the currently filed CEIP are reflective of the current BCP. And so what I was trying to demonstrate is that we have the targets currently in the CEIP were a result of the analysis in the current BCP. And those will evolve as we work on the next BCP. Sorry for so many acronyms. But that was my intention.
Q. No. That is the world we live in. So I guess the question is, is it more appropriate to request that the Commission approve the targets subject to these being updated in the biennial conservation plan, as opposed to approving them and then approving the biennial conservation plan.
A. Well, I-- I-- my recommendation is really meant to demonstrate that if we're looking at the 2021
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A. We do have information regarding customers who have smart devices. I wouldn't say it's exhaustive, but we do have information and would work together more information so that we could effectively roll out these programs and impact the largest amount of customers as we can.
Q. Okay. And then how about the number of customers that will need to be provided smart devices as a part of co-deployment of demand response in energy efficiency programs?

Is that more subject to the biennial conservation plan development or is that part of the RFP results or both, and if you could explain?
A. I would say it's both -- so we're still in the -- the final stages of executing contracts for our demand response programs and engagements. And so dependent on the successful execution of those contracts, we plan to develop programs to reach as many people as possible.

So at that time or as a part of that planning process, we would identify any data needs or gaps that we have to make sure we have a wholistic view of our customer base so we can effectively do education outreach and enroll as many people as possible.

So it would be part of -- it's contingent on

1 execution of the RFP process, and then it will be 2 planned for in this planning process for the next PCP.
Q. And you may or may not be able to answer this, but as you're working on -- working with these vendors through the RFP, are you incorporating the learning that you might have gathered through this process and the CEIP about the needs and requests of vulnerable populations and highly impacted communities and how better to serve those through a demand response, or is that something that's going to have to be done iteratively after you let the contracts for demand response?
A. We've actually already started some of that work. Recognizing that equity and affordability is really one of our cornerstones and one of our focus areas; so we're already working toward that end.

So I wouldn't say it has to happen or be iterative. I think it's happening concurrently to everything else that's going on. We want to make sure that we have the right kind of information and data and inputs, so as we devise and design our next BCP programs that we have all of this fully in focus and were able to reach the right amount of people and the most amount of people, specifically in those low income and vulnerable communities.
would be Phillip Popoff.
And if I recall correctly, NWEC and Front and Centered indicated that they may need to cross the witness but they may not.

So I would like to check in with the party on that.

MS. TACK-HOOPER: Your Honor, we do not need to question Witnesses Popoff or Phillips; that time was just to deal with any evidentiary issues, but since all the exhibits have been moved in, we're good.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Are there any questions from the bench for this witness, Phillip Popoff?

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I have none, Your Honor.

CHAIR DANNER: No, Your Honor.
COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: None from me, Your Honor.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. We'll move on to the next witness, William Einstein.

Could you please turn on your camera feed?
And l'll swear you in.
MS. BARNETT: Your Honor, we are just getting settled here, transitioning chairs.

JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.
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Q. All right. And you will be discussing with your various advisory groups how you include that information with rolling out the products, or is that more of a question for Mr. Einstein?
A. We both, probably, answer that question, but I would say that we will be leveraging the CRAG for our energy -- energy efficiency specific programs. And then we also have a coordination with our Equity Advisory Group, just as a checks-and-balances kind of process, to make sure the advisory groups are understanding our progress and are able to provide the right kind of input so we're making the right decisions in regards to these communities.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, I have no further questions.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Are there any
further questions from the bench for this witness?
CHAIR DANNER: Not from me, your Honor.
COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No, Your Honor.
JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I'd like to thank
Mr. Archuleta for your testimony today.
You are excused from the remainder of the hearing.

Our next witness, taking them in order,
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All right. Mr. Einstein, can you hear me and see me all right?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I can.
JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great. Could you please raise your right hand? And l'll swear you in.

Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you will give today is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

THE WITNESS: I do.
JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
Ms. Barnett, could you please introduce the witness?

MS. BARNETT: Thank you.
WILLIAM T. EINSTEIN, witness herein, having been first duly sworn on oath, was examined and testified as follows:

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

## BY MS. BARNETT:

Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Einstein.

Could you please state your name and spell your name for the court reporter?
A. William T. Einstein. Last name is E-i-n-s-t-e-i-n.
Q. And what's your role at PSE?
A. I'm the Director of Product Development and Growth.
Q. Thank you.

MS. BARNETT: PSE now tenders Mr. Einstein for cross-examination.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
Mr. Callaghan, you may go ahead.
MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. CALLAGHAN:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Einstein.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Do you have a copy of your rebuttal testimony, Exhibit WTE-1T with you?
A. Ido.
Q. Your rebuttal testimony describes PSE's product development process; correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And you state that PSE began using this product development process in 2019; is that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. On page 4 of your rebuttal testimony, in Figure 1, you give a range for the timing of each phase in the product development process; is that right?
rebuttal testimony, you state that the average product development process, as a whole, can take anywhere from 12 to 18 months; correct?
A. That's what the beginning of that sentence says.

It also says, depending upon the complexity of the product, the readiness, and the duration of our regulatory review.
Q. Okay. And according to your testimony, on pages 6 and 7, the design phase includes activities such as the development of a formal business plan and initial cost estimates; is that right?
A. Yes, that's what it says.
Q. All right. And the development phase is when PSE would be making a tariff filing with the Commission for approval; is that right?
A. Yes, that's where we typically do the development -- what we typically do in the development phase, yes.
Q. All right. And is it safe to assume that a filing before the Commission for approval would occur relatively early on in the development phase?
A. Not necessarily. Usually, it can occur as we get closer to the end of the development phase. Because usually the development phase we're working on final -final design and understanding of that.
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A. That is correct.
Q. And this range, is this an average for how long each phase takes? Is this a maximum or minimum?
A. It's a range based upon experience that we've had. Each product takes a -- can take a different amount of time in each of the phases, depending upon the maturity of our thought work, but each of those phases as we get to them.
Q. Okay. Is it fair to say that for most product development processees each phase typically falls into this range that you provided in Figure 1?
A. It can, but that's not an exclusive.
Q. Okay. And does Figure 1 state that the ideation phase takes usually between one to three months?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. And the design phase takes between three and six months?
A. That's what the figure says, yes.
Q. All right. And so together those phases would usually take, at most, nine months; would that be fair to say?
A. That would be the average for the chart for a
prototypical example. That's not the case for every product we've designed.
Q. Okay. On page 6, lines 6 through 9 of your
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And then as we work through the development phase, that's where we head towards Commission and corporate approval.
Q. Okay. But your testimony states that the development phase includes the filing and the approval of the -- before the Commission; correct?
A. Right. You asked me if it occurred at the beginning, typically. And I said, no, it usually -- it can occur at any point in that process, but...
Q. Okay. So under this product development process, on average, a product should be ready for a filing at the Commission at some point in the development phase; is that correct?
A. That would be -- as the example you laid out, yes. It's not the case with every product; but yes.
Q. Okay. So could you turn to page 26 of your rebuttal testimony?

Let me know when you are there?
A. I am there.
Q. All right. On page 26 , line 23 , and continuing on to page 27 to line 14 of your rebuttal testimony, in response to Staff's proposed condition on the approval of the 80-megawatt DER subtarget, you state that PSE agrees with Staff's recommendation of engaging with the EAG and other advisory groups in the review of DER
product concepts.
But you go on to state that requiring this by the 2021 -- and that this condition should apply to the 2025 CEIP instead; is that accurate?
A. Can you repeat the second half of that question? Because the internet connection kind of garbled most of what you were saying in the second half.
Q. Yes.

So in response to Staff's proposed condition on the approval of the 80 -megawatt DER subtarget, could you state -- and this is, again, on page 26 , starting at line 23 and then going on to page 27, line 14.

You state that PSE agrees with Staff's recommendation of engaging with the EAG and other advisory groups in the review of DER product concepts, but you go on to state that requiring this by the 2023 CEIP update is unnecessarily aggressive and that this condition should apply to the 2025 CEIP instead; is that accurate?
A. Yes. That is what it says.
Q. All right. On page 10, lines 5 through 9 of your testimony, you state that PSE intends to file tariff provisions this year on these DER product offerings; is that right?
A. Sorry, I'm going to page 10.
Q. All right. So based on your explanation of PSE's product development process earlier in your testimony, do I understand correctly that PSE expects to reach the development phase for these DER products sometime this year after it has consulted with named communities on those potential products?
A. That would be correct.
Q. All right. So if that's the case, could you clarify for me why you believe Staff's condition to consult advisory groups on the DER selection process is unnecessarily aggressive?
A. Well, the -- the work to do the development of the products and tariffs, as we've discussed here, takes several months. We've also discussed, and it was discussed by Witness Durbin, that the information that led into the development of the preferred portfolio is several years old. We started that process almost a year before we started the -- submitted the CEIP and now we're more than a year into the -- the review of the CEIP. So we need to go through a process of re-evaluating the preferred portfolio.

We need to update the cost and the estimates associated with that, and then we need to also complete the work that we've already started to engage with named communities and customers in vulnerable populations and
Q. Okay. Take your time.
A. What line did you say that was?
Q. Lines 5 through 9 .
A. And so your question, again, please?
Q. Yeah. You state that PSE intends to file tariff revisions this year on these DER product offerings; is that right?
A. Not tariff revisions. They would be in nearly every case with the exception of our community solar product, it would be a new tariff for consideration by the Commission.
Q. Okay. So you plan to make tariff filings related to these DER product offerings, though; correct?
A. We do intend to make tariff filings, and we would do that for any product that requires engagement for customers. And that process would begin in '23. It wouldn't necessarily be complete in '23.
Q. Thank you.

And you also state in that same answer that PSE intends to share greater detail about the potential product offerings as it consults with highly impacted communities, vulnerable populations, and other customers prior to filing.

Is that PSE's -- is that still PSE's intention?
A. Yes.
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collect that data before we can finalize the development process.

So while you were asking me about where we are at in the product development process, it's not the same for every product that we're considering for DERs. It's also not the same for the maturity of where we're at.

In some cases, we're going to probably actually have to go backwards a bit into the design phase to better understand how this works, depending upon the feedback we get from the -- from the customers and communities that we're consulting with in our process right now.

So our intention is to begin the process of filing tariffs with the Commission over the course of this year. They would be for products that are much more close to the completion of their maturity. But there probably will be some products that are more complex, need further review, further design, and further consultation with parties before we would feel comfortable filing them. And that would take place probably after '23.
Q. All right. So just to clarify, in your testimony you state that PSE generally supports the concept of engaging with the EAG and other advisory groups to review the product concepts. And you're just

## challenging the timing.

So you're saying that the 2023 biennial update is too soon and you're asking that this condition be applied to the 2025 CEIP; correct?
A. My biggest concern in this whole process is just the timing and the collision of various schedules to try and get these things done. And we intend to engage with groups. We intend to engage with all the interested parties who are participating in this proceeding, and we intend to incorporate the feedback that we hear, along with updated costs and estimates.

That will take us some time. We are happy to provide a progress update as part of the '23 update on the work that we've done, but l'm very reluctant to commit to having all of that work completed by August or September of this year when we have to circulate a draft. I mean, that's a mere four months after we received the order from this process and there's still a great deal of engagement to do with various parties and discussion with the conservation resource advisory group as to whether they are even interested in taking over advice related to DERs.
Q. Mr. Einstein, did you read the Commission Staff comments on PSE's Final CEIP that were filed in March 2022?
isn't that right?
A. I'm saying there's not enough time from following receipt of the order and relative to this proceeding.
Q. Right. But if PSE received this as part of their comments in March '22, and they agreed with this recommendation, why hasn't the company begun to implement it?
A. I guess my -- my response would be, I didn't review those comments at that point in time. And at that point in time, the products that we had put into the portfolio relative to the CEIP, we had not received the parties' response testimony, which is very informative and provided feedback relative to where the parties were at on the preferred portfolio for DERs and that's the information I responded to in preparing my rebuttal testimony.

This proceeding has gone on for a very long period of time. But it's also created a great deal of uncertainty about where we should be at. And there are other products we're bringing to our customers at this time that are -- we focused our efforts on.
Q. All right. If the Commission were to order PSE today to meet Staff's recommended condition as soon as possible, approximately how long do you think that would
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A. I don't believe I did, no.
Q. Is it safe to assume that someone at PSE read
Staff's comments filed in March of last year?
A. I'm guessing, yes, they probably did.
Q. All right. So, hypothetically, if Staff made the recommendation to consult with advisory groups on the development of DER programs in its March '22 comments, and this recommendation was made back then, could PSE have engaged in that process throughout 2022?
A. I think it was Witness Durbin explained in her responses around this issue, there was a lot that happened in the space of 2022 relative to this proceeding that impacts -- and the outcomes of this conversation will impact the decisions in the design sweep we employ for products that we intend to offer, particularly for DERs.

So while we begin the process of engaging with customers in our communities to understand where their interests are very late in 2022, we did not revisit and re-evaluate all of the products yet because that work is pending the outcome of this proceeding.
Q. Well, I'm confused by that, Mr. Einstein, because this is a condition that, according to your testimony, PSE agrees with.

You're just saying that there's not enough time;
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## take the company?

A. Well, as I mentioned, we intend to bucket the development of the DER products into two buckets similar to how we developed our transportation electrification programs. And the first bucket of those will be the products that we believe are mature and ready for the Commission to approve in sort of a first phase; and then the second phase will be ones that take a longer period of time.

I can't commit to when we will finish the development and submission phase for the -- for the second batch of products. Our hope is that we will be able to get the first set of tariffs submitted to the Commission during 2023.

MR. CALLAGHAN: No further questions. Thank you, Your Honor. THE WITNESS: Some of those will largely depend upon the -MR. CALLAGHAN: Sorry. Mr. Einstein, I have no further questions. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Any redirect following that cross? MS. BARNETT: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Public Counsel also noted some time for this witness. You may proceed.

## MS. SUETAKE: Thank you.

 CROSS-EXAMINATIONBY MS. SUETAKE:
Q. Good afternoon. My name is Nina Suetake, and I'm here on behalf of Public Counsel Unit.

Do you have your rebuttal testimony in front of you?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Could you please turn to page 4 of your rebuttal testimony with that product development process, Figure 1?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, does this -- and I know we discussed this a little with -- with Staff's counsel, but is this process intended to develop product once that product has been chosen?
A. "Once that product has been chosen," I don't understand what you mean by "chosen."
Q. I'm trying to understand how this one and this process interacts with a larger portfolio selection process.

## At what point does defined strategy to, you

 know, "go to market" fit in a process of developing your portfolio?A. So in the -- in the -- the best example I can
rest of this process to develop that brought those to the Commission for their approval last spring.

And then we began the process of ideation -final ideation and design for the second phase, which will go to the Commission later this spring.

So assuming that this entire process is indicative of something that's extremely linear, isn't always the case.

Sometimes we do parts of this in order to build a portfolio of thoughts around what a product -- suite of products would look like, and then we pick that process back up again in order to complete its readiness for approval and submission to the Commission, if necessary.
Q. So is your testimony replacing pages 32 through 42 of the -- Chapter 2 of the CEIP, because it --
A. I don't know what "replacing" means.

We -- both of -- we submitted a plan to the Commission in the CEIP of the things we thought at that point were concepts that we could implement in the space of distributed energy resources. And my testimony talks about how we will pick that work up and continue forward with that work based upon the time that is elapsed, which is nearly two years since we developed that
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use is in the case where transportation electrification plans.

We did -- in the development of that plan, we prepared and looked at a variety of product concepts that we might be able to develop in order to execute the plan.

That product process involved some ideation and some initial design and concept building around what the products look like in order to assemble them, essentially, into a portfolio that we could then present to the Commission for its acknowledgement and created essentially a five-year view of the products we would then finalize and bring to the Commission to serve our electric transportation customers.

So that process in the case of that work, we did some ideation and design initially to develop that portfolio, but then we picked this process up again after the acknowledgement of that plan because that gives us indication from the parties as well as from the Commission about any concerns or issues or modifications we need to make and we did receive a great deal of feedback through that process. We incorporated that feedback and then we developed -- we broke the products that we were going to bring to market into two different phases. And we developed phase one and went through the
initial suite of products.
Q. So when you say "pick it up," do you mean you take -- going forward, do you have products in mind and then you'll start another round of ideation with those projects in mind?
A. We're going take the list of the product concepts that we submitted as part of the CEIP and re-evaluate them and analyze them both for costs as well as the feedback and the approval -- I mean, not the approval, the feedback and the input that we receive from parties along the way and determine at that point which products we believe could be most ready to come back to the Commission for their review and approval and discussion with the various parties participating in this proceeding before we do that.

And so we're -- we're -- when I say we're picking it up, we're going to take what's there, the feedback we've received. We're going to then re-analyze, update costs, engage our customers and communities, which we're already doing, converse with the appropriate advisory groups and then seek final input and feedback, and then we will bring that back to the Commission for its approval.

And that will happen for every product that we intend to offer for customer use as part of our DER

CEIP or not.
In the case of the CEIP, we put together some initial product concepts in the suite of -- initial suite of product concepts that we intended to suggest for their approval.

We did some initial scoring relative to CBIs, which is something we've never done before. And so we made an attempt at how we might go about doing that.

And then, over the last year, we received the feedback and input from the various parties about what that looks like. We will now take that all again, after we receive the order in this process and finish the process of -- of preparing each individual product for its review consideration approval by the parties, as well as the Commission and our customers.
Q. So from your viewpoint, has the -- has the methodology and process the company has been using to sort of develop the suite of programs to get to this product development process, has that methodology changed over the years? Last year and a half, I guess.
A. Well, we've only done it once. And we did it to prepare this initial Clean Energy Implementation Plan. It was a new way of doing it. It incorporated -- we made an attempt at incorporating and scoring relative to CBIs, but it's -- it's -- it is what it was at the time
we did it for the -- for the presentation of this initial plan, which is our first attempt at figuring this out.
Q. And since then, up until now, has PSE had discussions about how to modify that suite selection process, the sort of portfolio selection process?
A. We received a lot of feedback through this process about it, and we're going to take that feedback and we will re-evaluate the product process based upon what we think can and should be improved.
Q. But there -- but there hasn't been any changes as of yet; is that what I'm hearing?
A. Not in the suite selection process, because we haven't received the final disposition of this case.
Q. So if I'm understanding it correctly, PSE has said that that process was illustrative to begin with and that there has been no work on the suite and portfolio selection process since then; is that correct?
A. No work to revise it or change it, no.

MS. SUETAKE: Okay. Thank you. That is all my questions.

JUDGE HOWARD: Any redirect following that
cross?
MS. BARNETT: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Thank you.

NWEC and Front and Centered noted cross for this witness as well.

MS. TACK-HOOPER: Yes. Thank you, Your
Honor.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BYMS. TACK-HOOPER:
Q. Hi, Mr. Einstein. I represent Front and Centered and the Northwest Energy Coalition in this proceeding.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. As PSE's Director of Product Development and Growth, you are responsible for the development and marketing of new products for the utility; correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. You're not testifying in this proceeding as an expert on equity; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. You'd agree that your background doesn't qualify you as an expert on whether PSE's community engagement process and DER products are or are not equitable; correct?
A. I guess I would say, yes, that's correct.
Q. I have just a few questions about your testimony regarding Front and Centered and NWEC's requested condition that the CEIP designate a minimum percentage
of the energy benefits of PSE's DER programs for highly impacted communities and vulnerable populations.

In your testimony, you noted that PSE's
Transportation Electrification Plan includes a commitment to target 30 percent of spending within each transportation electrification integrated product and service to support equity-focused customers; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you've noted that PSE would consider similar spending designations for the 2023 biennial update to the CEIP; correct?
A. Yes, we're in the process of and will review what spending designations we can make relative to DER products.
Q. Okay. But the CEIP that's being adjudicated today does not designate a specific percentage of spending for each DER product to support named communities; correct?
A. I don't know that I know the answer to that.
Q. Okay. And do you know whether there are any megawatts of DER that are explicitly allocated for named communities in the CEIP?
A. I know that we laid out in some of the product concepts some minimum amounts. But again, that's not work that I prepared.
this engagement with the named communities about these products?
A. It could take anywhere from three to five months. It kind of depends upon when we start, how quickly we get an uptake, and then how long it takes to prepare the final report.

MS. BARNETT: I don't think I have anything
further. Thank you.
JUDGE HOWARD: The Energy Project also
noted possible cross for Mr. Einstein.
Mr. ffitch, do you wish to proceed?
MR. FFITCH: Yes, really one or two questions.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. FFITCH:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Einstein. I'm Simon ffitch representing The Energy Project. I just wanted to follow-up on your last interchange with your counsel.

Does Puget Sound Energy plan to interact with its low income advisory group or its Conservation Resource Advisory Group on this topic you were just discussing?
A. We plan to engage with the conservation resource advisory group as well as the Equity Advisory Group throughout this process. Part of the work we need to do
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further for Mr. Einstein.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
Any redirect?
MS. BARNETT: Yes, Your Honor. REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. BARNETT:
Q. Mr. Einstein, how do you anticipate named communities -- or how might engagement with named communities inform what products PSE presents to the Commission?
A. So we're in the process right now of -- of convening a partnership with our consultant who supports the Equity Advisory Group, a process that we used in the transportation electrification work of engaging with communities and customers about the -- about the types of products and barriers and solutions to products that they may be interested in and could support as part of our DER product suite. And so right now we've begun that process. That work is underway and we will finish later this spring. And out of that, we hope to get feedback around named communities and how funding communities about how the products that we would bring forward in the DER space could best serve them.
Q. And how long does it typically take to conduct
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at the Conservation Resource Advisory Group is meet with them to discuss whether and how they might take DERs into the umbrella of advice that they provide to the company and to the Commission. We haven't had that conversation with the members of that committee yet, but we intend to do so.
Q. And have you had that conversation with members of the low income advisory group?
A. No, we have not.
Q. And does Puget intend to have that conversation going forward on the DER programs?
A. We would be happy to brief the low income advisory group about the DER programs. My personal concern is I -- I have some concern that we might have -- because DERs do not currently have an assigned, essentially, advisory group that we might end up having too many advisory groups to effectively manage, given the time constraints we have. But we are certainly always happy to talk to any of the advisory groups to present information about the work that we're doing.

At this point, I think we believe the conversation resource advisory group from an expertise standpoint is probably the most appropriate to provide input on the design of the programs.

MR. FFITCH: No further questions. Thank
you.
JUDGE HOWARD: Any redirect?
MS. BARNETT: No, thank you.
JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any questions from the bench for Mr. Einstein?

COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, Your Honor. Thanks.

## EXAMINATION

BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT:
Q. Mr. Einstein, you and Mr. Archuleta talked a lot about interested party involvement in the processes, but I want to get some specific, sort of, answers, you know, as to when that occurs. So I'm going to ask you some questions to -- for the record.

And I want you to go, please, to your rebuttal testimony, page 4, in that flow chart.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Tell me when you're there.
A. Yes, I have it.
Q. Okay. And the very first stage labeled "define strategy," it references "collaboration with leadership and internal stakeholders."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. At this point -- or before this point, do
what would we engage the public about because we don't -- we don't know yet. We're still conversing. lt's pre-ideation.
Q. Okay. So that -- so next box, ideation is where -- that's when your -- initially your first customer engagement occurs; correct?
A. Yes. We do some customer engagement as part of ideation and, essentially, brainstorming and understanding how -- how and what a product could entail and look like.
Q. Does the customer engagement you do at that time, is that with your advisory group participants? Your equity -- Equity Advisory Group-named communities or is it -- is it different kinds of focus groups or what -- what does it look like, that customer --
A. It really can -- it can involve any of those things at that point in the process. There are industry stakeholders we talk to to get best practices from other utilities who have, maybe, launched a product similar to what we have before that.

A good example of that is community solar. We did a lot of work understanding various community solar products around the country before we started landing on a design element for where we were at. But we do -ideation can involve quick conversations to customers,
you ever discuss these ideas or proposals with external entities or engage with your advisory group participants?
A. Not usually at the define strategy phase, I would say.
Q. Why not? If it's not, why not?
A. The define strategy phase is really pre-ideation and really around -- I'm trying to think of a good example to share with you about what that would look like.

I mean, I guess I would say, sort of -- the best example I can give is after transportation electrification, after -- after we were given permission by the legislature, submitted a transportation electrification plan, we spent some time after receiving that legislation that I would categorize as being appropriate inside a defining strategy about what we're going to do, how we're going to do it; that is really the point at which I would say it is an internal conversation around how we gather our thoughts and plans for how we're going to approach a specific product.

It's not meant to -- you know, if your question is whether we're -- why we're not engaging the external public at that point, it's not a question of whether we're going to engage the public; it's a question of
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you know, as well as more elaborate one-off conversations with various stakeholders.
Q. So -- so it may or may not include involvement with named communities, et cetera.

In fact, as I'm looking at the chart, those --
those groups are not included, at least, you know, by name in the chart that --
A. I think it's important to point out,

Commissioner, that the engagement with named communities is a relatively new piece of the product development process.

And so this process was developed -- I mean, while we simply put it into place in 2019, we spent two and a half previous years working on refining -building and refining this process. It's pre-CETA. So a lot of the elements on the chart you're seeing here have not been adopted since the development and adoption of CETA.

So when would we appropriately engage with named communities?

I would say that the current practice we have right now really, sort of, occurs in the space of the ideation and the design phase of a particular product or a set of products and concepts, similar to what we are doing right now through the work with our consultant to

|  | Page 266 |  | Page 268 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | engage those named communities and customers through | 1 | CHAIR DANNER: No, Your Honor. |
| 2 | surveys, focus groups, one-off conversations with | 2 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. |
| 3 | individuals. We compensate people for participating in | 3 | Our next witness would be Austin Phillips. |
| 4 | those things, that all happens in the midst of that | 4 | And NWEC and Front and Centered have |
| 5 | ideation design phase. | 5 | initially indicated that they may need to cross Austin |
| 6 | Q. Okay. So just to be clear, again, for the | 6 | Phillips. And that is not the case now, as I |
| 7 | record, then, those -- it's a function of this being | 7 | understand? |
| 8 | sort of in -- an out-of-date chart is the reason we're | 8 | MS. TACK-HOOPER: That's correct, Your |
| 9 | not seeing the community groups involved in discussion | 9 | Honor. |
| 10 | at the ideation stage; is that -- is that correct, then? | 10 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any |
| 11 | A. Well, you would see -- and I guess I would say | 11 | questions from the bench for Austin Phillips? |
| 12 | the words "named communities" are not on this chart. | 12 | All right. Hearing none, feel free to |
| 13 | But as you would see at the top of the call | 13 | correct me if I'm jumping ahead too quickly. |
| 14 | under "design," it says "customer outreach and testing." | 14 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, does |
| 15 | That is the space in which, you know, it's sort | 15 | Staff have questions for Witness Phillips or have they |
| 16 | of formally listed and called out. But that's trying to | 16 | waived cross? |
| 17 | pinpoint something on a specific chart. It really | 17 | JUDGE HOWARD: Staff has waived cross for |
| 18 | happens throughout that process. | 18 | Austin Phillips, I believe. |
| 19 | Q. So CRAG, Low Income Advisory Group, Equity | 19 | Mr. Callaghan, is that right? |
| 20 | Advisory Group, that's where those groups would be -- | 20 | MR. CALLAGHAN: That's correct, Your Honor. |
| 21 | have access to the process? | 21 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. |
| 22 | A. If we were -- for -- in the case of DERs, if we | 22 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, I may |
| 23 | were to get into an ongoing conversation with the | 23 | have a question or two for -- for Phillips. |
| 24 | Conservation Resource Advisory Group, I would say | 24 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Could -- could |
| 25 | that -- similar to the way in which the -- the company | 25 | Mr. Phillips turn on his video feed and -- and prepare. |
|  | Page 267 |  | Page 269 |
| 1 | engages with that group around energy efficiency | 1 | THE WITNESS: Yes. Just one moment, please. |
| 2 | products, it becomes, sort of, an ongoing cycle of | 2 | Thank you. |
| 3 | dialog with those advisory groups. | 3 | JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. |
| 4 | And so a new product, in theory, would be | 4 | THE WITNESS: Good afternoon. |
| 5 | engaging with those advisory groups during those phases. | 5 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Good afternoon, |
| 6 | But in the case of our transportation | 6 | Mr. Phillips. |
| 7 | electrification work, you know, as we move from design | 7 | Could you please raise your right hand? And |
| 8 | and into development is when we really do sit down with | 8 | I will swear you in. |
| 9 | individuals from each of the interested parties involved | 9 | And you may need to unmute yourself so we |
| 10 | in this case, et cetera, to present the tariffs. | 10 | can hear you affirm in response. |
| 11 | We meet with the Transportation Electrification | 11 | Do you swear or affirm that the testimony |
| 12 | Advisory Group that all three utilities share in common, | 12 | you will give today is the truth, the whole truth, and |
| 13 | as suggested by the Commission. We meet with them and | 13 | nothing but the truth? |
| 14 | we provide those tariffs to those entities 60 days | 14 | THE WITNESS: I do. |
| 15 | before we file. | 15 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. |
| 16 | So there's a whole formal dialogue process as | 16 | Ms. Barnett, could you please introduce the |
| 17 | we're wrapping up the design phase, moving into the | 17 | witness? |
| 18 | development phase, and then the final submittal to the | 18 | MS. BARNETT: Yes. Thank you. |
| 19 | Commission. | 19 | AUSTIN PHILLIPS, witness herein, having been first |
| 20 | COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you, Your Honor, | 20 | duly sworn on oath, was examined |
| 21 | I have nothing further. | 21 | and testified as follows: |
| 22 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 22 | DIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 23 | Any further questions from the bench for | 23 | BY MS. BARNETT: |
| 24 | this witness? | 24 | Q. Dr. Phillips, could you please state your name |
| 25 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No, Your Honor. | 25 | and spell your name for the record? |

A. Yes, my name is Austin Phillips. My last name is spelled $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{h}-\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{II-i}-\mathrm{p}-\mathrm{s}$.
Q. What is your role at Puget?
A. I manage the Strategic Customer Insights Team.
Q. Thank you.

MS. BARNETT: With that, PSE tenders
Dr. Phillips for questions.
JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
And apologies for missing your title in
my -- my initial introduction to you, Dr. Phillips.
THE WITNESS: That's all right.
JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any questions from the bench for Dr. Phillips?

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Yes, Your Honor. I just have a few.

EXAMINATION
BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Phillips.
A. Good afternoon, Commissioner.
Q. So do you have your rebuttal testimony, AJP-1T, in front of you?
A. Not currently, but let me take one moment to get that ready.
Q. Okay. So, yes, if you get your rebuttal testimony, then we can get ready to roll.
some point in your testimony, it might be here, you talk about... oh, it's line 19 through 22.

You discuss the company's capable of re-expanding the data on vulnerability to make strategic decisions.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. So what does that mean? How -- can you describe what that means to re-expand the data to make strategic decisions?
A. I might need to -- to make that clarification. I understand it's somewhat of a vague sentence.

What I meant by that, when I wrote it, is that we compressed the set of total vulnerability factors by each census block group into a single total vulnerability score in order to be able to assess which communities faced a higher or a lower cumulative impact from those factors. So that allows us a way of triaging and prioritizing areas of higher vulnerability.

But the second half to that is that -- and this is what it speaks to in the testimony -- when we're seeking to take a particular action or decide on a plan within a particular community, we may be interested in knowing which particular vulnerability factors were most prominent in that community and lead to a higher
A. Okay. I have it in front of me now.
Q. Okay. If you would turn to page 17, please.
A. I'm there.
Q. Okay. And on page 17, lines 18 to 19, you
state: PSE is open to guidance on incorporating a well-rounded set of vulnerability factors that account for multiple dimensions of risk.

Do you see that?
A. Yes, Ido.
Q. Has company been thinking about what it envisions as a well-rounded set of vulnerability factors beyond what it's put together so far?
A. PSE does feel that the set of vulnerability factors we identified encapsulates a variety of different types of vulnerabilities.

So when I wrote that, my intention was to state that while we do feel confident that what we factored into our assessments captures a variety of different dimensions, we're open to further guidance from the Equity Advisory Group, from other interested parties and stakeholders on refining that set of factors over time.
Q. Okay. And then if you could look at your testimony on page 24, at lines 11 to 22.
A. Okay. I'm there.
Q. Okay. You -- I believe it's at this point -- at
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## vulnerability score.

And at that point, we're able to look for a particular community, not just at the singular value of its total vulnerability score, but to expand the whole set of vulnerability factors that could have contributed to its having a high score. And in virtue of that, addressing those particular needs in the community, whether those higher scoring factors were limited English or high rate of unemployment, what have you, we can tailor the response based on those specific factors.
Q. Okay. But you're still -- the company is still planning at this point to prioritize the initial focus on those census tracts with the highest cumulative vulnerability factors, correct, not making a decision based on the re-expanded list of all the census tracts; correct?
A. You're correct that the total vulnerability score will be a primary tool in determining which communities or which census block groups make most sense to consider for projects, programs, and engagement in virtue of having a higher cumulative effect of vulnerability.

So -- so, yes, we -- I do want to clarify,
though, that we will not make those decisions on locations or which communities to include, only based on

1 census block groups that have a high vulnerability 2 score.

We still consider all of our communities as potential for action and as opportunities to increase equity, but the continuous value or the spectrum where a particular community sits is -- is one factor that we'll consider.
Q. Okay. So if we could look at the next page of your testimony, page 25. The last page, actually, and at lines 6 to 14, you refer to the company constructing several internal dashboards and performing analysis related to equity.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. So can you describe whether and how this -- these new dashboards are helping the managers consider data?

What are these dashboards doing differently than the work that you already described about the different assigning values and then combining them into cumulative?

How are these dashboards doing something different or supporting that?
A. That's an excellent question. And I'm happy to report that one way we're using the information we glean
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from our vulnerability assessment and combining it with program data and PSE is in looking at particular programs and types of programs, including energy efficiency, renewable energy programs, and others.

And what this enables us to do through the dashboards is to look at the heterogeneity in vulnerability score over our service area and understand whether census block groups or communities that we have designated as higher vulnerability have historically seen less enrollment or less engagement in those particular programs over time or at the present.

And so that's already enabling managers and program administrators to look at specific communities where there is an indication of higher level of vulnerability, and at the same time, there is a lower-than-expected level in enrollment in particular programs.

And that indicates that there's a quantitative, quantifiable opportunity to increase equity in that particular community. That information can then be conveyed to folks who interact with the community and try to increase enrollment, again, based on an expansive look at the particular barriers that might be at play and may have contributed to the inequity previous.
Q. Okay. Have you -- has the company reviewed this
dashboard or shared it with its equity advisory committee yet?
A. We've had many internal conversations about the dashboards and other tools. To my understanding and my best knowledge, we haven't shared these tools with the Equity Advisory Group at this time.
Q. Okay. Do you know if it's the company's plan to do so?
A. To my best knowledge, it is.
Q. Okay. One last question.

Have you done --
CHAIR DANNER: Commissioner? Commissioner, can I just follow-up?

EXAMINATION

## BY CHAIR DANNER:

Q. And, Mr. Phillips, when would that be? When would you engage them on this?
A. I would have to consult with those who are planning conversations with the Equity Advisory Group. I would frame it as -- as soon as possible.

We did want to have the opportunity to go through this hearing process to understand whether there's any feedback from the Commission or other parties on elements that we may need to change in terms of our vulnerable population methodology before
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circulating it too widely with community members as to what the results of that analysis have shown.
Q. Okay. So they haven't seen it yet. And right now, there's no schedule for getting it in front of them?
A. They have not seen it and I cannot say one way
or the other whether there's a specific schedule, as that's not the team in the set of relationship that I particularly manage.

CHAIR DANNER: All right. All right. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: You're welcome.
CHAIR DANNER: I'm sorry to interrupt, Commissioner. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No, not at all.
And I have one more question, but you may have others after this.

EXAMINATION
BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL:
Q. So, Mr. Phillips, have you -- in the process of preparing for this hearing, have you reviewed the testimony and exhibits of staff witness Jennifer Snyder?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Okay. So, then, are you familiar with the equity -- the Energy Equity Project report that's
included as Exhibit JES-4 to Jennifer Snyder's testimony?
A. I'd like to pull up that document so that I can have it for reference. If you will give me --
Q. Sure.
A. All right. I'm there. Thank you.
Q. Okay. Great. Are you familiar with this document? Have you seen it before?
A. Could you cite a particular page number?

Are you referring to a -- a set of testimony in particular?

I just want to make sure I'm understanding the correct document.
Q. Do you have a copy of Exhibit -- do you have a copy of the Energy Equity Project report that was Exhibit JES-4 to Jennifer Snyder's testimony?

Do you have that in front of you?
A. Yes, I do have Exhibit JES-4 in front of me.
Q. Okay. Did you review that as a part of your review for the hearing?
A. I did not personally review this document.
Q. Okay. And you haven't reviewed it before in your work in developing the various metrics or methods for measuring vulnerable communities?
A. To my best knowledge, that is correct.
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## Q. Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, I have no
further questions.
JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions from
the bench for Dr. Phillips?
COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No, Your Honor.
CHAIR DANNER: No, Your Honor.
JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I would like to
thank Dr. Phillips for his testimony today. He's excused.

We did have a request in the chat for a
short break following this witness.
So let's go ahead and take a ten-minute
break, if that's agreeable to the Commissioners.
Let's return at 2:35.
COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you.
JUDGE HOWARD: And we are off the record.
(A break was taken from
2:25 p.m. to 2:37 p.m.)
JUDGE HOWARD: I'm just going to confirm --
ask one more time for Staff Witness Synder.
Can you hear me? Can I hear you? Do we
need a little more time?
THE WITNESS: I can hear you.
Can you hear me yet?

THE COURT: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Okay. Yay.
JUDGE HOWARD: All right.
So we have -- at this point in the hearing, we have completed the witnesses from PSE.

We're going to be turning to the non-company witnesses. And no party has indicated cross for any of the non-company witnesses. But we are going to be going through and seeing if there are any bench questions
for -- for these witnesses. We're going to start with Staff.

As I understand, there are questions from the bench for Staff witness, Jennifer Snyder.

Could you please raise your right hand? And I'll swear you in.

Do you swear or affirm the testimony you will give today is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

THE WITNESS: I do.
JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
Mr. Callaghan, could you introduce the witness?

MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor?
I/I
III

JENNIFER SNYDER, witness herein, having been first duly sworn on oath, was examined and testified as follows:

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. CALLAGHAN:
Q. Ms. Snyder, could you state your name and spell your last name for the record?
A. Jennifer Snyder. S-n-y-d-e-r.
Q. And, Ms. Snyder, you submitted Exhibits JES-1T through JES-6 in this record; is that correct?
A. That is correct.

MR. CALLAGHAN: Your Honor, Staff offers
Staff Witness Snyder for examination.
Thank you.
JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
Are there any questions from the bench for Snyder?

CHAIR DANNER: Yes. Thank you. EXAMINATION
BY CHAIR DANNER:
Q. Good afternoon, Jennifer Snyder. I have a clarifying question for you. This regards your testimony at JES-1T at page 45 and 46. And it has to do with the recommendation that the Commission approve

|  | Page 282 |  | Page 284 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | PSE's CEIP with a condition that a license is obtained | 1 | JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly, I -- I would -- |
| 2 | for Staff to use the Aurora and PLEXOS models within | 2 | perhaps we will call Aaron Tam first and then we will |
| 3 | 60 days of our final order. | 3 | turn to NWEC witnesses after that, if that works for |
| 4 | Does Staff have license for either one of | 4 | you. |
| 5 | these -- either Aurora or the PLEXOS software currently? | 5 | Is -- Aaron Tam, are you able to hear and |
| 6 | A. So, currently, my understanding is that Staff | 6 | see me all right? |
| 7 | has a license for the Aurora model. It is an intervener | 7 | THE WITNESS: Yes. Can you hear me? |
| 8 | license and it is only good for one year. This is | 8 | JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. Would you please raise |
| 9 | normally how we -- we get licenses to these models. | 9 | your right hand? And l'll swear you in. |
| 10 | They come and go. And so we're -- we're constantly | 10 | Do you swear or affirm that the testimony |
| 11 | having to reinstall/retrain. And what we're looking for | 11 | you will give today is the truth, the whole truth, and |
| 12 | is continuous access. | 12 | nothing but the truth? |
| 13 | Q. Okay. We currently -- the Commission does not | 13 | THE WITNESS: I do. |
| 14 | have a -- a license for the PLEXOS model? | 14 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. |
| 15 | A. Not that I am aware of. | 15 | Ms. Suetake, could you please introduce the |
| 16 | Q. Okay. Are you requesting -- is staff requesting | 16 | witness. |
| 17 | that the company obtain and cover the costs of the | 17 | MS. SUETAKE: Yes. Thank you. |
| 18 | license or is it for the Commission to cover the cost of | 18 |  |
| 19 | license? | 19 | AARON TAM, witness herein, having been first |
| 20 | A. Staff is requesting that the -- the company | 20 | duly sworn on oath, was examined |
| 21 | cover the cost of the license. | 21 | and testified as follows: |
| 22 | Q. Okay. That is my -- those are my only | 22 |  |
| 23 | questions. Thank you very much. | 23 | DIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 24 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 24 | BY MS. SUETAKE: |
| 25 | Any further questions? | 25 | Q. Could you please state and spell your name for |
|  | Page 283 |  | Page 285 |
| 1 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. Thank you, Your | 1 | the court reporter? |
| 2 | Honor. | 2 | A. My first name is Aaron, A-a-r-o-n. Last name |
| 3 | COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No, Your Honor. | 3 | Tam, T-a-m. |
| 4 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Jennifer Snyder, | 4 | Q. And on whose behalf are you appearing today? |
| 5 | thank you for your testimony today. | 5 | A. The Public Counsel Unit of the Attorney |
| 6 | The next Staff witness would be Joel | 6 | General's Office. |
| 7 | Nightingale. | 7 | Q. And did you file testimony -- or jointly |
| 8 | Are there any questions from the bench for | 8 | file testimony in Exhibits CDAT-1 through 5 on behalf of |
| 9 | Joel Nightingale? | 9 | Public Counsel? |
| 10 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No, Your Honor. | 10 | A. Yes. |
| 11 | COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: I have no questions. | 11 | MS. SUETAKE: Your Honor, the witness is |
| 12 | Thank you, Your Honor. | 12 | available for cross-examination. |
| 13 | CHAIR DANNER: No questions. | 13 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. |
| 14 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Hearing none. | 14 | Commissioner Rendahl, please proceed. |
| 15 | And then we have the Public Counsel | 15 | EXAMINATION |
| 16 | witnesses: Corey Dahl and Aaron Tam. | 16 | BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: |
| 17 | Are there any questions from the bench for | 17 | Q. Thank you. Good afternoon. |
| 18 | either of these witnesses? | 18 | On the -- I just want to confirm that as a part |
| 19 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Your Honor, I have a | 19 | of the joint testimony, you were sponsoring testimony on |
| 20 | clarifying question for Witness Tam, but also NWEC and | 20 | the customer benefit indicators; correct? |
| 21 | Front and Centered Witness McCloy on a subject that both | 21 | A. Correct. |
| 22 | of them address. And so I don't know the best way to | 22 | Q. Okay. So in reference to the -- that responsive |
| 23 | handle this. We could take up Witness Tam first and | 23 | testimony, CDAT-1T, do you have a copy of that in front |
| 24 | then Witness McCloy. But I just want to highlight | 24 | of you? |
| 25 | that -- that issue. | 25 | A. Yes. |

Q. Okay. And if you could turn to what is identified as page 36 of 40 , I believe. I'm sorry -- 33 of 40.
A. Okay.
Q. I believe this is -- going to line 21. No. I
have the wrong -- I have too many page numbers referenced here. I think this is the problem. Well, I don't have the page number but maybe you will remember.

In your testimony you mention at one point that you have concerns with the -- oh, here it is. It is on page 33 of 40 on line 9 , starting on line 9.

Do you see that?
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. You mentioned that -- starting on line 11 that Public Counsel believes that the metrics used in the 2021 CEIP should similarly not indicate any directionality or desired target; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, are you aware of testimony by Lauren McCloy for NWEC and Front and Centered in which she indicates that directionality should be added?

Are you familiar with that?
A. I've reviewed her testimony, yes.
Q. Okay. So can you explain, is there a difference in what you are both recommending and why -- can you
try and delineate it more clearly and consistently with the alternative rate-making docket.
Q. Okay. So in looking at the -- the recommendation that's in the bulleted point on line 16 through 21 of page 33. So you would like PSE to remove the directionality from the language of the metric, but separately identify it for each metric?

So keep the directionality language out of the metric language but identify some kind of a target that is directional, related to the metric?
A. Correct.

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Okay. All right. I think that helps me understand Public Counsel's position on this point.

So thank you. I don't have any other
questions for Witness Tam.
But I think it would be helpful to have some questions about this with Witness McCloy.

So thank you.
JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions for Witness Tam?

COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Hearing none, we will turn to NWEC and Front and Centered witness, Lauren McCloy, here shortly.
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explain why you think directionality should be omitted and -- I will ask her why she thinks it should be included.
A. Right. Let me just refresh my memory a bit on this point.
Q. And if you would like, I can give you a reference to her testimony as well.
A. Okay.
Q. Let me know if you would like me to give you that.
A. So Public Counsel here recommends that the metrics themselves do not indicate a directionality or desired target.

Here we just want to make sure there's consistency between how metrics are defined in this docket as well as the alternative rate-making docket that I referred to.

I don't -- I don't believe that we -- Public Counsel and the Northwest Energy Coalition have strong conflict in our views. We believe that we -- we just -we are fine with directionality being in the goals. And so we -- we just try and add a little more clarification in terms of how we would like that distinguished.

But we're not opposed to Puget Sound Energy establishing goals or having directionality. We just
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I just wanted to proceed down the order of presentation and note that The Energy Project witness, Lorena Shah has been excused.

We also have AWEC's witness, Lance Kaufman.
Are there any questions from the bench for Lance Kaufman?

COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No, Your Honor.
JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Hearing none.
We then have the five witnesses -- I'm sorry?

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No. Nothing.
THE COURT: All right. That we then have the five witnesses from NWEC and Front and Centered. These include Elaine Hart, Mariel Thuraisingham, Lauren McCloy, Roger Colton, and Scott Reeves.

Because Commissioner Rendahl has already indicated she has a question for Lauren McCloy, I would ask McCloy to turn on her video feed, and l'll swear you in.

Could you please raise your right hand?
Well, first of all, can you hear and see me all right?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Great.
Do you swear or affirm that the testimony

|  | Page 290 |  | Page 292 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | you will give today is the truth, the whole truth, and | 1 | Witness Tam? |
| 2 | nothing but the truth? | 2 | A. Yes. |
| 3 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. | 3 | Q. Okay. And so, I guess, my question to you is, |
| 4 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 4 | is there any difference of understanding or -- or |
| 5 | Ms. Goodin, could you please introduce the | 5 | recommendation between Public Counsel and Northwest |
| 6 | witness? | 6 | Energy Coalition and Front and Centered on |
| 7 | MS. GOODIN: Yes. | 7 | directionality and how the Commission should consider |
| 8 |  | 8 | that in the recommendations between the two parties? |
| 9 | LAUREN MCCLOY, witness herein, having been first | 9 | A. I don't think there is. I agree with Witness |
| 10 | duly sworn on oath, was examined | 10 | Tam's statement that there isn't necessarily a conflict |
| 11 | and testified as follows: | 11 | between our testimony. |
| 12 |  | 12 | I think the intent is the same regardless of |
| 13 | DIRECT EXAMINATION | 13 | whether the directionality is in the metric itself or in |
| 14 | BY MS. GOODIN: | 14 | an associated target or goal. I think we -- the outcome |
| 15 | Q. Ms. McCloy, could you please state and spell | 15 | would be the same. |
| 16 | your name for the record? | 16 | So -- so we would, you know, I think, support a |
| 17 | A. Lauren McCloy. L-a-u-r-e-n. M-c-C-I-o-y. | 17 | recommendation or support a -- sort of tweak to our |
| 18 | Q. Thank you. | 18 | recommendation that when we talk about directionality, |
| 19 | And you have submitted pre-filed testimony in | 19 | we're fine if that directionality is in sort of a |
| 20 | this docket; correct? | 20 | separate target associated with the metric and the |
| 21 | A. Correct. | 21 | metric itself is just a clean metric for reporting |
| 22 | MS. GOODIN: Your Honor, I offer the witness | 22 | purposes. |
| 23 | for questioning. | 23 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you. That's |
| 24 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 24 | really helpful. I appreciate it. |
| 25 | Commissioner Randall, please go ahead. | 25 | That's the only question I have for Witness |
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| 1 | EXAMINATION | 1 | McCloy, but there may be others. |
| 2 | BY COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: | 2 | CHAIR DANNER: Yes, Your Honor. I have a |
| 3 | Q. Good afternoon, Lauren McCloy. It's good to see | 3 | question as well. |
| 4 | you. | 4 | JUDGE HOWARD: Please go ahead. |
| 5 | A. Youtoo. | 5 | CHAIR DANNER: All right. |
| 6 | Q. And I just have a brief question following along | 6 | EXAMINATION |
| 7 | a question I asked of witness Tam for Public Counsel. | 7 | BY CHAIR DANNER: |
| 8 | And do you have your -- your response testimony | 8 | Q. Good afternoon, Lauren McCloy. |
| 9 | in front of you? | 9 | A. Good afternoon. |
| 10 | A. Ido. | 10 | Q. I have a question, basically, dealing with |
| 11 | Q. Okay. If you would turn to what is identified | 11 | customer benefit indicators. |
| 12 | as page 17 of 55. | 12 | In Kara Durbin's testimony in Exhibit 60 at |
| 13 | A. All right. I'm there. | 13 | page 21, she discusses the customer benefit indicators |
| 14 | Q. Okay. Starting at line 20 and then ending on | 14 | and says that it's not practical or it's practically |
| 15 | page 18 of 55 at line 2, you state that "adding the | 15 | infeasible for Puget to track certain data inside |
| 16 | metrics agreed to in the revenue requirement settlements | 16 | customers' homes because that information can greatly -- |
| 17 | in the recent PSE rate case would help fill the gaps | 17 | or could vary greatly due to a number of associations, |
| 18 | with customer benefit indicators or (CBIs) in PSE's | 18 | such as home insulation, airflow, number of open |
| 19 | CEIP, but that directionality should be added." | 19 | windows, and further regarding extreme heat impacts, it |
| 20 | Is that a correct summary of that portion of | 20 | is not clear to Puget whether data correlating illness, |
| 21 | your testimony? | 21 | hospitalization, or death attributes to extreme heat |
| 22 | A. Yes. This is specific to the recommendation on | 22 | events is even publically available or can be tracked. |
| 23 | adding the CBIs from the settlement stipulation in the | 23 | And she raises some other concerns. |
| 24 | general rate case. | 24 | How does -- how does NWEC or Front and Centered |
| 25 | Q. Okay. And you heard the questions I had for | 25 | respond to the PSE witness' -- Durbin's concern that |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | some of the CBls proposed by the parties require | 1 | DIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 2 | customer data that's just not feasible to obtain or is | 2 | BY MS. GOODIN: |
| 3 | not publically available? | 3 | Q. Mr. Colton, could you spell your name for the |
| 4 | A. So I will take my best crack at that. | 4 | court reporter, please? |
| 5 | I do believe that this portion of Ms. Durbin's | 5 | A. My name is Roger, R-o-g-e-r, Colton, |
| 6 | testimony was addressing the testimony of Roger Colton, | 6 | C-o-l-t-o-n. |
| 7 | who is also here today and might be able to answer this | 7 | Q. And could you describe your role in this |
| 8 | with more specificity. | 8 | proceeding? |
| 9 | I -- I would say that the metrics that we have | 9 | A. I am a witness for Front and Centered and for |
| 10 | proposed are very focused on using data that -- that we | 10 | the Northwest Energy Coalition. |
| 11 | believe the company has access to right now. | 11 | MS. BARNETT: I present Mr. Colton for |
| 12 | So the -- the CBIs that we -- the additional | 12 | questioning. |
| 13 | CBIs and additional metrics that we proposed, we do | 13 | JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any bench |
| 14 | believe that the company has the data that it needs in | 14 | questions for Mr. Colton? |
| 15 | order to put these metrics forward. | 15 | CHAIR DANNER: Yes, I'll start. |
| 16 | And in the case of this example, which I believe | 16 | EXAMINATION |
| 17 | is about indoor air quality, I would probably need to | 17 | BY CHAIR DANNER: |
| 18 | defer to our expert witness, Mr. Colton, on that. | 18 | Q. Mr. Colton, you heard my question to Lauren |
| 19 | Q. Okay. But, as a general matter, you believe | 19 | McCloy which she referred to you. |
| 20 | that your metrics are focused on information that is | 20 | I wondered if you wanted to comment on the |
| 21 | readily available, either collected by the company or | 21 | metrics and the -- whether you see those metrics as |
| 22 | publically available? | 22 | requiring something other than publically available |
| 23 | A. Or publically available, yes. | 23 | information. |
| 24 | COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Thank you. | 24 | A. Well, there -- let me address the two metrics |
| 25 | That's all the questions I have for you. | 25 | separately starting with the -- the heat information. |
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| 1 | JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions for | 1 | There are a variety of publically available |
| 2 | Lauren McCloy? | 2 | datasets that would allow someone, including PSE to |
| 3 | CHAIR DANNER: No, Your Honor. | 3 | track heat and heat health statistics. There is the |
| 4 | JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. | 4 | National Center for Health Statistics which has, through |
| 5 | Thank you for your testimony, Lauren McCloy. | 5 | the CDC -- the Centers for Disease Control -- has what |
| 6 | I am also informed there may be questions | 6 | it calls its "Heat and Health Tracker System" and the |
| 7 | for Roger Colton. | 7 | "National Syndrome Surveillance System," so that is |
| 8 | Could -- Mr. Colton, could you please turn | 8 | publically available information. |
| 9 | on your video feed? | 9 | But more than that, there are two different |
| 10 | Thank you. | 10 | entities that are interested in climate change, health, |
| 11 | Can you hear and see me all right? | 11 | and equity. |
| 12 | THE WITNESS: I can. | 12 | There is the National Association of Public |
| 13 | JUDGE HOWARD: Great. Can you please raise | 13 | Health Officials. They have what's called their |
| 14 | your right hand? And I will swear you in. | 14 | public -- their Climate Change, Health, and Equity |
| 15 | Do you swear or affirm that the testimony | 15 | Project. And the National Association of Public Health |
| 16 | you will give today is the truth, the whole truth, and | 16 | Officials has published a guide, if you will, 400 -- |
| 17 | nothing but the truth? | 17 | 400 pages, 390 pages, that it calls its "Climate Health |
| 18 | THE WITNESS: I do. | 18 | and Equity Vulnerability Assessment." |
| 19 | JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. | 19 | In addition, the Center for Disease Control has |
| 20 | Could you please introduce the witness? | 20 | its Climate Change, Health, and Equity Project. And it, |
| 21 | MS. GOODIN: Certainly, Your Honor. | 21 | too, has published a guide on how to track health |
| 22 |  | 22 | statistics. How to track heat statistics. |
| 23 | ROGER COLTON, witness herein, having been first | 23 | And that is publically available. The Center |
| 24 | duly sworn on oath, was examined | 24 | for Disease Control has its National Integrated Heat |
| 25 | and testified as follows: | 25 | Health Information System. All of those databases are |

[^0]1 publically available, including available to someone 2 like -- or an entity such as PSE.

The second question is -- has to do with indoor air quality, I believe.

Indoor air quality is closely related to housing quality. And tracking indoor air quality really isn't -- and tracking housing quality really isn't -isn't a new concept. There are four jurisdictions that receive federal funds. Those jurisdictions prepare what are called "Consolidated Plans" and update those consolidated plans periodically. And they also prepare what are called "Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing."

And the indoor air quality and the housing quality really through -- whether through the CHAS database, HUD's comprehensive housing affordability strategy database or through HUD's American Housing Survey, tracks information that can be viewed on a geographic basis, not on an individual household basis, but on a geographic basis down to the census track basis. They divide it -- well, I divide it. They have a whole list of -- of metrics which they -- they track.

But I would divide it into three or four different types. They will track the quality of systems in a house, including the quality of the HVAC system.
not clear how PSE would use that data in its CEIP.
Have you had any ideas about how Puget Sound Energy would use that data in its CEIP?
A. Sure. Let's consider the overlap of different metrics. Let's consider indoor air quality and let's consider the health impacts. Some of the health impacts that are routinely tracked include respiratory problems, asthma, both triggering asthma and the incidents of asthma, the uses of healthcare facilities for asthma; all of that data is routinely tracked and it is tracked based on different population attributes.

You compare that to indoor air quality, which would include heat and you would compare that to housing quality which would include the availability of cooling. And you combine that with energy burdens and you might very well find that one of your vulnerable populations are elderly people who have respiratory issues who lack air conditioning and who have high energy burdens that would impede their ability to use their air-conditioning even if they had their air-conditioning.

So the vulnerable population would be that group of people -- it would be population based. And it wouldn't make any difference whether that population -where that population is -- but the vulnerable population would be the combination of indoor air

They track the availability of heating. They track the availability of cooling. They track the physical quality of the house.

So I believe that the PSE rebuttal testimony, responsive testimony is simply in error. There -- there is ample opportunity -- if they were to talk to the correct people to find that information.
Q. Okay. So I just want to be specific here. In the -- in -- in Kara Durbin's testimony, it says, "Additionally, Mr. Colton appears to underestimate significant limitations inherent in tracking and measuring certain metrics."

For example, you insist that PSE add certain metrics that track indoor residential data.

Are you asking for metrics that track residential indoor data?
A. I am asking for metric -- or asking -- I'm recommending that metrics on indoor data be -- be tracked. I'm not recommending or not suggesting that it be done on a household-by-household basis. It can be done on a population basis. And it not only can be done, it's routinely done by other entities.
Q. Okay. Second part of what she says is even if he -- meaning you -- even if you were to point to a readily available and verifiable source of data, it is
quality, housing quality, energy burdens, and perhaps age.

And PSE doesn't -- or hasn't created the metrics that would allow that population to be defined and identified.
Q. It looks to me like one of the concerns they had was they didn't want to be gathering data that would be viewed as intrusive. But it sounds like there is readily available sources that would not be intrusive.
A. Yes. And I think the misunderstanding was -- or the portrayal by PSE was that information would need to be done on an -- for an individual.

So they would need to know Roger Colton and what the indoor air quality is in Roger Colton's home and what the housing quality Roger Colton's home is. And what my testimony talked about was -- was the need to have it be population-based rather than geographic based.

So rather than knowing my individual home, they simply need to know that -- not that I'm going to confess to being elderly here, but they would need to know that there are older folks who have respiratory issues who have high energy burdens.

And you have a vulnerable population without needing to know any intrusive information about
individual customers.
Q. Okay. And it tracks geographically? It has the -- it is -- it is not too general to be useful?
A. Most of the information that l've talked about is tracked to the census tract basis. It is not tracked to the census block group basis, which is a smaller geographic area than the census tract.

But l've never worked with anybody in either the housing industry or the utility industry, if you will, electricity and natural gas industries that they have said that information isn't useful unless it's obtained at the census block group basis.

And if you're identifying a vulnerable population, you want to know the population attributes. Whether or not you know precisely what the geography of those populations are.

CHAIR DANNER: All right. Thank you very much. Those are all of my questions, Your Honor. I -I think my colleagues may have more.

JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions for Mr. Colton?

COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Yes, Your Honor. I have a question. I think this is for Mr. Colton. EXAMINATION
BY COMMISSIONER DOUMIT:
actions that flow from the -- the identification of disparities.

And there's also a clear requirement that those specific actions be associated with -- and be explained as to how they will reduce -- address and reduce the disparities.

And as my testimony points out, the PSE CEIP doesn't identify the specific actions in coordinating with weatherization and -- is one of those specific actions. And it certainly doesn't lay out the -- those of us who do evaluations refer to as logic models. So if you do this, then you accomplish that. That is completely absent in the CEIP.

So saying that it -- having this testimony say that it should be in another proceeding, simply to me is saying that the requirements for -- with respect to specific actions and the requirements that those specific actions be intentionally and explicitly related to the accomplishment of CEIP goals, they're writing that out of the rules and they are writing that out of the statute.
Q. And so the legal aside, really, there's no practical reason why demand response and -- and low income weatherization programs should not be addressed at the same time?
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Q. And if you decide on hearing it that maybe another witness might be better, Mr. Colton, you can so state. But I'm referring you to company witness Archuleta's rebuttal testimony, which is GA-1T at page 14, and I'm looking at lines 9 through 17, which I can also read here.
A. If you could give me two seconds, I can --
Q. Yes. No. Sure thing.
A. Page 14 starting at line 9 with, "Yes. PSE has considered"?
Q. That's right. "Considered significant synergies if energy efficiency and demand response measures are coordinated in some way with low income weatherization programs, but that determining this specific energy efficiency or demand reduction measures how they are best coordinated with low income weatherization programs are best addressed outside of this proceeding and the development of the next biennial conservation plan."

I'm wondering how NWEC and Front and Centered respond to that.

What do you think of that plan?
A. Well, part of the response to that will need to
be argued in legal brief. But I can tell you my response as a witness; and that is, that there is a clear requirement that the CEIP identifies specific
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A. That -- that's correct. My -- yes -- yes, I
agree with what you just said.
COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: Okay. Thank you. Nothing further from me.

Thank you, Mr. Colton.
JUDGE HOWARD: Any further questions for Mr. Colton?

COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No, Your Honor.
CHAIR DANNER: No, Your Honor.
JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Colton, for your testimony today.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
JUDGE HOWARD: The remaining witnesses from NWEC and Front and Centered are Thuraisingham, Hart, and Reeves.

Just to check one more time, do we have any questions from the bench for those three witnesses? Any of those three?

CHAIR DANNER: No, Your Honor.
COMMISSIONER DOUMIT: No, Your Honor. COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. That concludes our examination of witnesses at the hearing today. I have a few details before we adjourn.

As Mr. Callaghan raised earlier today, we
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | have the issue of the public comment exhibit, and there | 1 | interested participants that are not parties to the |
| 2 | are a large number of comments in the docket. | 2 | proceedings, so I just want to make sure. |
| 3 | And, earlier in December of last year, I | 3 | JUDGE HOWARD: You know -- yes, actually |
| 4 | emailed Public Counsel and the other parties to discuss | 4 | you -- you are making me rethink this a little bit. |
| 5 | preparation of this public comment exhibit. And it was | 5 | I think, actually, what would be more |
| 6 | indicated that Public Counsel and -- and it appears now | 6 | appropriate and comprehensive to do would be to only |
| 7 | Staff can collaborate, as I understand, in preparing | 7 | omit comments filed earlier that are incorporated in the |
| 8 | this exhibit might take longer than the normal seven | 8 | testimony, perhaps, and then otherwise include all the |
| 9 | days, though. We also discussed whether the summary | 9 | comments submitted in the docket in this -- in this |
| 10 | should include comments submitted before the initiation | 10 | public comment exhibit, if that's clear. |
| 11 | of this adjudication. | 11 | MS. SUETAKE: Yes, Your Honor. It might |
| 12 | And because we have today admitted the | 12 | take us a little while to make sure, to verify that. |
| 13 | pre-filed testimony as filed without any objection to | 13 | Particularly because I don't know if all parties who |
| 14 | it, incorporating earlier written comments on the | 14 | filed testimony included their previous comments as |
| 15 | docket, I find it unnecessary for the summary of these | 15 | attachments. So it will take us a little while to |
| 16 | comments to include comments submitted before the | 16 | confirm all of that. |
| 17 | April 19th, 2022, notice of prehearing conference that | 17 | THE COURT: All right. I see Commissioner |
| 18 | initiate this adjudication. | 18 | Rendahl has raised her hand. |
| 19 | So, hopefully, that's helpful guidance for | 19 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: Thank you, Judge |
| 20 | Staff and Public Counsel in preparing that. | 20 | Howard. |
| 21 | I then turn to Ms. Suetake and Mr. Callaghan | 21 | I was just wondering, are we focusing on the |
| 22 | and ask how long it may take, reasonably, to prepare | 22 | comments filed after the final version of the CEIP was |
| 23 | this public comment exhibit? | 23 | filed, not the Draft CEIP comments, or is it only the |
| 24 | MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. | 24 | final comments? |
| 25 | Based on my conversations with Staff, they | 25 | JUDGE HOWARD: Well, I believe, my -- my |
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| 1 | are ready to -- they will be ready to send it to Public | 1 | intent, in my guidance to the parties, was to have a |
| 2 | Counsel within a few days. But I would leave it to | 2 | relatively comprehensive public comment exhibit. |
| 3 | Ms. Suetake to say how long Public Counsel will need to | 3 | But to hopefully ameliorate some of the work |
| 4 | file it. | 4 | by not requiring Public Counsel and Staff to summarize |
| 5 | MS. SUETAKE: One point of clarification, | 5 | comments that were expressly adopted in testimony. |
| 6 | before I get into that, Judge Howard, you had said that | 6 | That might not be the best solution. |
| 7 | we need to compile the existing comments in the docket | 7 | COMMISSIONER RENDAHL: I defer to Public |
| 8 | as part of the comment hearing -- or exhibit. | 8 | Counsel and Staff on this. |
| 9 | JUDGE HOWARD: Your question was breaking up | 9 | MS. SUETAKE: As much as I don't |
| 10 | a little bit. But if I understood correctly, no, I-- I | 10 | particularly want to ask my team to have more work, I do |
| 11 | believe it is unnecessary to -- to include comments that | 11 | think it would be valuable to ensure that all public |
| 12 | were filed to the docket before the initiation of the | 12 | comments are included in the record of this proceeding. |
| 13 | adjudication. | 13 | Because this became litigation at a, sort |
| 14 | MS. SUETAKE: Is it my understanding that | 14 | of, midpoint in this, after the initial comments were |
| 15 | those -- the comments that are already in the docket are | 15 | filed, I am just a little bit confused about when we |
| 16 | still considered part of the record or not? | 16 | start the public comment exhibit. We are open to |
| 17 | JUDGE HOWARD: Yes. I -- I believe they | 17 | including all of them, because they are all public |
| 18 | would still be considered part of the record. | 18 | comments related to this plan, but l-- I'm not sure |
| 19 | MS. SUETAKE: Okay. I just wanted -- | 19 | what the Commission's preference is. |
| 20 | JUDGE HOWARD: You're unfortunately breaking | 20 | JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. I think -- for -- for |
| 21 | up a little bit. | 21 | the moment, let's take a more comprehensive approach to |
| 22 | MS. SUETAKE: Apologies. I'm still having | 22 | the public comment exhibit, including all the comments |
| 23 | technical difficulties. | 23 | except those specifically adopted in testimony. |
| 24 | Yeah. I just wanted to clarify that because | 24 | How about two weeks? Would that work? Or |
| 25 | I know there were comments by parties -- or by | 25 | three weeks? |
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