

# Puget Sound Energy Resource Planning Advisory Group (RPAG) meeting summary

Tuesday, October 28, 2025 | 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

## Meeting objectives

- Provide a history of equity considerations and engagement in PSE's system planning
- Discuss equity considerations in resource planning and modeling for the 2027 ISP
- Reflect on EAG feedback from October 20 meeting
- Provide an opportunity for public comment

Time	Agenda Item	Presenter
1:00 p.m. – 1:10 p.m. <i>5 min</i>	<b>Introduction and agenda review</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Safety moment</li><li>• Introductions</li><li>• Agenda</li></ul>	<b>Annie Kilburg Smith</b> , Facilitator, Triangle Associates
1:10 p.m. – 1:45 p.m. <i>35 min</i>	<b>History of equity in system planning</b>	<b>Brian Tyson</b> , Manager Clean Energy Planning & Implementation, PSE  <b>Uche Nwude</b> , PSE, Energy Equity Initiatives Manager, PSE
1:45 p.m. – 1:50 p.m. <i>5 min</i>	<b>Break</b>	
1:50 p.m. – 2:40 p.m. <i>50 minutes</i>	<b>Equity considerations in resource planning modeling and analysis</b>	<b>Brian Tyson</b> , Manager Clean Energy Planning & Implementation, PSE
2:40 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.	<b>Next steps and public comment opportunity*</b>	<b>Annie Kilburg Smith</b> , Facilitator, Triangle Associates
3:00 p.m.	<b>Adjourn</b>	<b>All</b>

The full meeting materials, including the agenda, and presentation are available online under the Oct 28, 2025 meeting heading on the [ISP website](#).

# Introduction and agenda review

Annie Kilburg Smith, facilitator, provided an overview of the meeting agenda and welcomed RPAG members. See [RPAG members in attendance](#) at the end of this document for a list of RPAG members who joined the meeting.

## History of equity in system planning

Annie introduced Brian Tyson, Manager Clean Energy Planning & Implementation, and Uche Nwude, Energy Equity Initiatives Manager, PSE. Brian and Uche provided an overview of PSE's history of equity in system planning.

RPAG members asked questions and comments as follows:

- RPAG member: How does PSE plan to implement the customer preference survey into its equity framework?
  - PSE response: PSE is considering how to use the insights from the survey and how to integrate that into the ISP.
- RPAG member: Will equity updates only be annual? Will the next one occur one year from now in Q3 2026?
  - PSE response: No, the equity checkpoints are not the only instances when equity will be discussed.
- RPAG member: The EAG discussed and looked at the modeling analysis to find opportunities in the equity evaluation that aligns with the decision-making framework. The model will help assess programs, policies and actions.
  - PSE response: Thank you for your insight.
- RPAG member: The 2025 IRP had its own equity framework, is that carried over into the 2027 ISP?
  - PSE response: Certain aspects of that model are important, but PSE wants to be specific on which models provide the best information. There are multiple layers of equity considerations.
- RPAG member: The EAG looked at a dynamic model based on the types of information that are present. It's designed for its consistency and to provide opportunities for changes during ISP process. The analysis is both qualitative and quantitative.
- RPAG member: Is there explicit naming of energy programming regarding energy burden, or costs in the ISP modelling and analysis? How does this model consider air quality, and other factors? How does PSE put the funding to work with the best outcome possible?

- PSE response: During the decision framework phase, PSE will take a broad look at the results, impacts and scenario analysis on a portfolio level. Understanding the potential incentives will help clarify both the cost impacts and what it could mean for customer bills.
- RPAG member: What are the metrics of interest during the decision-making framework phase?
  - PSE response: PSE wants to prepare for future scenarios. Some examples of metrics of interest include incentives and the types of incentives customers might receive. This type of data will be helpful when thinking about bill impacts.
- RPAG member: Has PSE considered policy guidance from the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC)?
  - PSE response: PSE has an energy equity team that is up to date with the UTC policies. PSE is waiting for information provided in the UTC docket and the updated policy statement before considering how to integrate its policies.
- RPAG member: Economists look at cost responsibility versus benefits; PSE customers may receive varying levels of benefits with particular investments and programs, but affordability should always be considered. Even if customers benefit from an investment, we should also look at the investment through a lens of affordability. This is on many customers' minds.
  - PSE response: Affordability is one of the major concerns that PSE has heard in surveys and through direct engagement.

RPAG member: Brian invited Dennis Suarez, a member of both the Resource Planning Advisory Group (RPAG) and PSE's Equity Advisory Group (EAG), to share additional context on how the EAG is approaching energy equity. Dennis explained that the EAG discussion identified equity, accessibility, accountability, and advocacy as key metrics for named communities. These metrics are being used to help determine which communities prioritize these values and where they are geographically located.

- RPAG member: More sophisticated customers, such as larger corporations with advanced computerized equipment, can benefit from more sophisticated meters such as smart meters and advanced metering infrastructure (AMI), but this may be theoretical across customer groups. These investments have benefits but also bring costs onto the system. There might be benefits to all customer groups, but some benefits might not be necessary to some of these customer groups.
  - PSE response: This is a challenge for us; to understand who benefits and to what magnitude. It will be important to consider how different investments provide different benefits to different customers during planning and development.
- RPAG member: Can PSE provide a transcript of the EAG transcript from the meeting?

- PSE response: Per the operating guidelines established with the EAG, transcripts or recordings of EAG dialogue are not available. PSE documents the discussions in a [meeting summary](#).

## Equity considerations in resource planning modeling and analysis

Brian continued and provided an overview of PSE's considerations of equity in resource planning and modeling analysis.

RPAG members asked questions and provided feedback throughout this section as outlined below.

- RPAG member: Are the emissions impacts localized?
  - PSE response: The emissions impacts are evaluated at the full portfolio level.
- RPAG member: Are non-energy impacts (NEIs) going to be used for more than just conservation?
  - PSE response: NEIs are used in more than just conservation, especially if you count the social cost of greenhouse gas as an NEI, as many jurisdictions do. The social cost of greenhouse gas emissions is embedded in our cost models, so it's used in all aspects of resource planning and optimization. Many of the NEIs we use in conservation; however, some NEIs such as O&M (operations and maintenance) savings and thermal comfort aren't found in other areas.
- RPAG member: Will PSE do an equity portfolio analysis on DERs?
  - PSE response: Long-standing programs provide a stronger basis for analyzing distributional impacts than a portfolio of newer or shorter-term programs. PSE is considering how to integrate the data and insights from the distributional equity analysis (DEA) pilot analysis into future modeling of equity considerations.
- RPAG member: How are non-energy impacts determined or calculated?
  - RPAG member response: PSE invested in a study that looked across multiple jurisdictions across the U.S. to determine what utilities were used for NEIs and existing studies and research on NEIs. These studies were adopted into the conservation portfolio.
- RPAG member: How is the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 80.86, energy efficiency and demand response, integrated into PSE's equity analysis? What stage will these be developed?
  - PSE response: Before the focus was CETA requirements and the electric supply side and some demand side resources. Now PSE is bringing together gas, electric,

distribution and transmission into the focus of the planning process. From there, PSE will have to look at equity considerations in each of these different buckets.

## Next steps

Annie previewed upcoming activities.

- November 6, 2025: Feedback form from October 28, 2025 meeting closes
- November 13, 2025: RPAG meeting
- November 18, 2025: Public webinars
- December 2025: No RPAG meeting

Annie invited comments and questions from public attendees. Please visit PSE's [recording of the October 28 meeting](#). At the conclusion of the meeting, participants were invited to complete a post-meeting feedback poll to share their insights and help improve future sessions.

## Public comment opportunity

All public comments and PSE's responses are located in the feedback report for this meeting on PSE's [clean energy planning website](#).

Don Marsh, representing the Sierra Club Washington State Energy Committee and the Washington Clean Energy Coalition, referenced slide 14 and commented that there are more equity concerns to consider in addition to the demand forecast. He noted that demand from data centers and building electrification were almost non-existent in previous PSE provided forecasts. He expressed concern that underestimating these sources could have major impacts both on distributional and restorative justice for named communities. He noted that new demands from data centers have shown increased costs, increased air and noise pollution and reduced reliability. He noted that customers affected by these impacts are not the same customers who benefit from data center services.

He suggested that incentives for solar panels, batteries and heat pumps could help named communities reduce their energy costs, improve reliability and free up resources for use by data centers. He suggested that PSE could play an active role in the process of supporting electrification for named communities.

He noted that PSE prioritizes restoration of power to critical services areas, but named community restoration occurs later. He suggested that equity in emergency response should be taken into consideration.

## Attendees

Attendees are listed alphabetically by first name. These numbers do not include viewers on [PSE's YouTube channel](#).

## RPAG members

- |                      |                       |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Aliza Seelig      | 8. Jaime McGovern     |
| 2. Callie Moriyasu   | 9. John Ollis         |
| 3. Dan Kirschner     | 10. Katie Chamberlain |
| 4. Dennis Suarez     | 11. Kelly Fukai       |
| 5. Donald Williams   | 12. Megan Larkin      |
| 6. Fred Heutte       | 13. Lauren McCloy     |
| 7. Froylan Sifuentes | 14. Quinn Weber       |

## Presenters

1. Brian Tyson, PSE
2. Uche Nwude, PSE

## Support staff

- |                           |                          |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Algie Au, PSE          | 8. Lorin Molander, PSE   |
| 2. Ario Salazar, PSE      | 9. Meredith Mathis, PSE  |
| 3. Eleanor Ewry, PSE      | 10. Niece Weatherby, PSE |
| 4. Elizabeth Hossner, PSE | 11. Stephen Collins, PSE |
| 5. Jennifer Coulson, PSE  | 12. Troy Hutson, PSE     |
| 6. Kara Durbin, PSE       | 13. Phillip Popoff, PSE  |
| 7. Kasey Curtis, PSE      | 14. Ray Outlaw, PSE      |

## Facilitation staff

1. Annie Kilburg Smith, Triangle Associates
2. Ben Relampagos, Triangle Associates
3. Jack Donahue, MFA

## Members of the public

1. Britney  
Blankenship
2. Carol Loughlin
3. Chris Goelz
4. Denelle Peacey
5. Don Marsh
6. Gabriel Clark
7. Gordon Parke

8. Ian McGetrick
9. Jim Perich-  
Anderson
10. Kathi Scanlan
11. Lorna Anderson
12. Marie Stanley
13. Matt Larson
14. Megan Lacy

15. Nancy Nuche
16. Rosemary J Moore
17. Sophie Major
18. Taylor Nickel
19. Thom Fischer
20. Tobyn Smith
21. Wesley Franks