

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

Tuesday, January 27, 2026 | 1:00 – 4:00 p.m.

## Meeting objectives

- Provide an update about the recently filed Work Plan for the 2027 Integrated System Plan (ISP)
- Discuss the final scenarios and get RPAG feedback on potential sensitivities for the 2027 ISP
- Provide overview of “maximum customer benefit scenario” and gain RPAG feedback on PSE’s recommended approach
- Provide an opportunity for public comment

Time	Agenda Item	Presenter
1:00 p.m. – 1:05 p.m. <i>5 min</i>	<b>Welcome and introductions</b>	<b>Annie Kilburg Smith</b> , Facilitator, Triangle Associates
1:05 p.m. – 1:15 p.m. <i>10 min</i>	<b>Work Plan updates</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work Plan highlights</li> <li>• Anticipated future engagement timeline</li> <li>• Updated ISP schedule by planning area</li> </ul>	<b>Kara Durbin</b> , Director, Clean Energy Strategy, PSE <b>Jennifer Coulson</b> , Manager, Operations and Gas Analysis, PSE
1:15 p.m. – 2: 25 p.m. <i>70 min</i>	<b>Final scenarios and sensitivity discussion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final scenarios for the 2027 ISP</li> <li>• Potential sensitivities</li> <li>• Feedback and discussion</li> </ul>	<b>Jennifer Coulson</b> , Manager, Operations and Gas Analysis, PSE <b>Elizabeth Hossner</b> , Manager, Resource Planning and Analysis, PSE
2:25 p.m. – 2:35 p.m. <i>10 min</i>	<b>Break</b>	
2:35 p.m. – 3:45 p.m. <i>70 min</i>	<b>“Maximum customer benefit scenario” definition and discussion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regulatory requirements</li> <li>• Context and history</li> <li>• Recommended approach</li> <li>• Feedback and discussion</li> </ul>	<b>Brian Tyson</b> , Manager Clean Energy Planning & Implementation, PSE <b>Alexandra Karpoff</b> , Senior Energy Resource Planning Acquisition Analyst
3:45 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.	<b>Next steps and public comment opportunity</b>	<b>Annie Kilburg Smith</b> , Facilitator, Triangle Associates

Time	Agenda Item	Presenter
4:00 p.m.	<b>Adjourn</b>	<b>All</b>

The full meeting materials, including the agenda, and presentation are available online under the Jan. 27, 2026 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.

## Work Plan updates

Annie introduced Kara Durbin, Director, Clean Energy Strategy, PSE. Kara provided an overview of updates to the 2027 ISP work plan and upcoming topics in the engagement timeline.

## Final scenarios and sensitivity discussion

Annie introduced Jennifer Coulson, Manager, Operations and Gas Analysis, PSE and Elizabeth Hossner, Manager, Resource Planning and Analysis, PSE. Jennifer and Elizabeth provided an overview of PSE’s final scenarios and sensitivities in PSE’s resource planning and modeling analysis. Jennifer reviewed the 2027 ISP sensitivity process and the final 2027 ISP scenarios. Jennifer defined scenarios as the set of planning assumptions that inform PSE’s resource planning, modeling and analysis.

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

- RPAG member: How are large loads from data centers reflected in the scenarios?
  - PSE response: PSE will add different levels of load to the electric demand based on the probability of projects moving forward.
- RPAG member: The handling of transportation electrification is a little unclear. The building electrification is clear, but I’d like to know more about the assumptions and numbers associated with PSE’s electric vehicle (EV) forecasts. I suggest creating a separate table on how PSE handles transportation and electrification in separate scenarios.
  - PSE response: Thank you for the input.
- RPAG member: What pilots are in the targeted electrification scenarios?

- PSE response: The targeted electrification scenarios include PSE’s existing targeted electrification programs. PSE also plans to propose extensions to its existing targeted electrification programs.
- RPAG member: How much data center growth is PSE expecting?
  - PSE response: The reference case forecast is considered conservative. If there is uncertainty, then it won’t be included. The forecast won’t include speculative loads.
- RPAG member: Are data center adoption in these models aligned with changes in regulatory proceedings or structure regarding data center interconnection? I would like to see variables regarding data centers and large loads reflected in the scenarios such as greenhouse gas reduction specifically tied to load growth.
  - PSE response: Thank you. PSE will use this feedback to inform the March RPAG meeting topic on how PSE looks at large loads and follow-up on proposed regulatory legislative changes on data center interconnection.
- RPAG member: Within the House Bill 1589 scenario, Customer Programs references 2% conservation and 10% demand response (DR). Is 2% conservation a maximum for all scenarios?
  - PSE response: Two percent is not a maximum. PSE’s conservation team continues to work with the biennial conservation planning process. Two percent conservation appears to be very difficult to achieve if not impossible at this time. The conservation team has continued to hold conversations with the Conservation Resource Advisory Group (CRAG). The conservation team presented at a previous meeting and we can send that material to you.

Jennifer provided an overview of PSE’s gas sensitivities and reference portfolio assumptions, which include current laws and requirements to help solve the least cost set of resources to meet PSE’s assumptions. Jennifer reintroduced Elizabeth to provide an overview of PSE’s electric sensitivities.

- RPAG member: Why do we need a sensitivity for removing the Climate Commitment Act (CCA)?
  - PSE response: In the meeting, PSE characterized the no CCA sensitivity as being required by rule; this was incorrect. However, much like the Clean Energy Transformation Act (CETA) requirements, PSE sees value in understanding the impact that the CCA has on the portfolio selection. This was indicated as an area of interest from other RPAG members as well.
- RPAG member: Do the CCA sensitivities have impacts from Washington State Department of Ecology adjusting credit allowances? Will there be effects from linkage with California or Montreal?

- PSE response: PSE is still waiting for outcomes from the adjustments. The current analysis assumes linkage. The ceiling price is above linkage, the mid scenario (Scenario 1) includes linkage and exceeding prices above linkage.
- RPAG member: Are opportunities for thermal district heating systems captured in the sensitivities?
  - PSE response: PSE has discussed network geothermal, but the resources are not widely available. Network geothermal is also site-specific and not generalizable. At this time there is not enough data to understand what it would cost to conduct a sensitivity.
- RPAG member: Are you going to model the high price gas scenario with events like the Ukraine war where there is a big spike?
  - PSE response: Long-term high fuel price forecasts generally consider potential constraints or disruptions in the supply chain that mimic real-world historical conditions, such as the impact of the war in Ukraine on gas prices. We purchase our long-term gas and electric price forecasts from Wood Mackenzie. These forecasts consider long-term trends that could influence demand and supply in the North American markets, including seasonality and long-term climate forecasts, legislation and policy outlooks, and international political and trade conditions.

Annie invited all RPAG members to provide comments, questions and feedback on PSE’s gas utility sensitivities. Members provided the following feedback:

- RPAG member: Does PSE not plan to do all these sensitivities? Why tell PSE our priorities?
  - PSE response: This is PSE’s first ISP and we may not be able to run all sensitivities listed, so we want input on how to best prioritize the list.
- RPAG member: There are no missing critical sensitivity themes. My priorities in order would be policy changes and analysis; requirements by the Washington Administrative Code (WAC); and emerging technology. I also think that it is important to include a time component to the analysis. As time goes on, the emerging technology sensitivity might become priority number one.
- RPAG member: I was pleased to see transmission availability as a priority. My priorities would have been transmission availability, emerging technology and resource adequacy. I have been involved in the data center discussion from a Tribal and non-Tribal lens and both at a national and regional level. Western Energy Coordination Council’s (WEC) large load forecast for 2023, Confederate Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) and Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission (CRITFC) conducted a large load data center study in our region.
- RPAG member: I am interested in the impact of including the changes to the Climate Commitment Act (CCA). I’d like to understand the pushback on removing the CCA from a

researcher's perspective. I am also interested in the billing impacts for customers and exploring a sensitivity analysis for customers who are more sensitive to rising bills.

- RPAG member: I would like to see policy changes and analysis, and areas the utility has a control over, broken into categories of endogenous and exogenous to the utility.
- RPAG member: The top three for me are natural gas prices, customer heating system switch and systemwide/geographical electrification.
- RPAG member: I am interested in what strategies PSE can use to meet existing policy requirements in the lowest reasonable cost. I am most interested in the topics that are in the delivery system planning bucket. Since this is long-term planning, gas prices are one of the biggest factors in what drives the cost of gas for customers. It would make sense to look at a high natural gas price sensitivity.
- RPAG member: I am interested in requirements by WAC with respect to both the no CCA factor and the benchmarking conservation; delivery system planning; and clarity on customer programs for gas. I am also interested in how gas price sensitivities and scenarios will be consistent with electrification sensitivities and scenarios.
- RPAG member: I am interested in delivery system planning, specifically full system versus geographic electrification. I am interested in how utility provides customer programs to those who wish to electrify, and how utility providers are thinking about strategically pruning the system geographically. I also have questions about the assumptions around partial versus full electrification, and how PSE measures the customer sensitivity on rising energy bills?
- RPAG member: Commission staff is interested in rising bill impacts. We are also interested in who is impacted by the shift of the delivery systems. Electrifying buildings is a big concern for us and we think that system-wide and geographic electrification is a priority.

Elizabeth provided an overview on ISP sensitivity themes on electric utilities.

- RPAG member: Does that include transmission upgrades as well as build-outs?
  - PSE response: Yes, PSE's reference case includes upgrades happening through the 2023 cluster study. The section labeled 'additional transmission available' will fully explore all the upgrade options.
- RPAG member: We would like to see sensitivities around resource adequacy. The study is important and presents useful information, but I don't think we can view this as the 100% exact outcome. I'd also like to know how PSE is thinking about CETA sensitivities.
  - PSE response: Regarding CETA, PSE's reference case will hit the minimum 80% requirement. It might hit more than 80%, but 80% is the floor. If it's cost-effective, it can go beyond 80% and the model will optimize the right amount.

Annie invited all RPAG members to provide comments, questions and feedback on PSE's electric utility sensitivities. Members provided the following feedback:

- RPAG member: The Commission would like to see resource adequacy, Distributed Energy Resource (DER) scenarios, and transmission or alternative compliance prioritized.
- RPAG member: I am interested in resource adequacy, customer programs, conservation bundled by capacity, and what assumptions exist for the investment tax credit (ITC) and production tax credit (PTC) sensitivities.
- RPAG member: In addition to Commission requirements, I would like to see a limited transmission availability, not necessarily no new transmission. I would like to see PSE's strategy on what the utility can realistically control; this includes local resources, utility scale or otherwise. I am unclear on demand response and customer programs; is it programmatic as well as price-based demand response? Berkley Lab wrote a paper on price-based demand response. No utility is doing a great job on time-varying pricing. Resource adequacy is also critically important.
- RPAG member: I am interested in the availability of natural gas. I would like to see PSE explore the types of natural gas resources available that would both meet the PSE's needs and comply with state law.
- RPAG member: I agree with previous members' priorities. Toggling the availability of transmission is important. There should be a limited transmission scenario instead of a no-new transmission scenario. It would be helpful to look to West Tech's study about the expansion of transmission that will be released on February 4, 2026. I would prioritize the ITC and PTC availability. I also agree with previous members that PSE should expand on the availability of natural gas sensitivity. We've been advocating for a reflection of the rising costs and constrained supply of gas turbines. PSE's estimates were lower than expected. It would be good to include increasing gas costs, and gas turbine costs in the availability scenario. I would also include resource adequacy as a priority. I suggest that PSE conduct a large load flexibility sensitivity within the resource adequacy sensitivity. Sylvan Analytics has a study that indicates large load flexibility as an option for the region to reduce peak loads.
- RPAG member: It might be worth looking into cases where the utility has less control or influence. I suggest prioritizing changes by the utility or engagements at the legislative and regulatory level. There are also limitations about the amount of money, amount of time and technology. With an infinite supply of resources, a lot of technology could be purchased. When PSE looks into rate cases to fund technology, access to capital comes into question.
- RPAG member: I am interested in understanding more from the WAC on its requirement on maximizing customer benefit and including this in the modeling. I also agree with the availability of capital and the probability that transmission will be really high capital intensive.
- RPAG member: I would prioritize resource adequacy to ensure we are hitting or moving toward the correct targets. I also prioritize transmission and emerging technology.

# “Maximum customer benefit scenario” definition and discussion

Annie introduced Brian Tyson, Manager Clean Energy Planning & Implementation, PSE Alexandra Karpoff, Senior Energy Resource Planning Acquisition Analyst, PSE. Brian and Alexandra provided an overview PSE’s proposed approach to analyzing the maximum customer benefit scenario/sensitivity.

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

- RPAG member: How did PSE maximize customer benefit indicators (CBI) for this approach?
  - PSE response: These scenarios are directly related to CBIs. There is one related to participation. Some indicators are related to environmental impacts.
- RPAG member: Are there CBIs outside of those listed on slide 34? Are you going on what’s considered a viable portfolio?
  - PSE response: PSE gives the portfolio various constraints. PSE must meet these requirements in order to solve the model. The margin is set during the resource adequacy planning period. PSE must meet those requirements for the model to solve. We let the model optimize and sometimes this goes over baseline requirements.

Annie posed the following question to RPAG members: Does this approach seem reasonable? RPAG members added their responses to the chat:

- RPAG member: Please include this study in the feedback:  
[https://static1.squarespace.com/static/6845e0b28d4b961235e936aa/t/696505de2177f361c8dc9143/1768228319023/NW\\_RA\\_Study\\_Review\\_Final.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/6845e0b28d4b961235e936aa/t/696505de2177f361c8dc9143/1768228319023/NW_RA_Study_Review_Final.pdf)
- RPAG member: “All scenarios and sensitivities must meet reliability requirements to be considered a viable portfolio.” Is that a requirement for all of them? How does resilience fit into these sensitivities especially given the context of extreme weather events and wildfires?
  - PSE response: Yes, that is correct. Slide 34 illustrates customer priorities that PSE gathered in outreach and surveys. Reliability is not a sensitivity, but rather a concern of PSE’s customers. Regarding resilience, from a resource planning perspective, PSE can influence the specific resource that is added to the model. In these models PSE is not looking at the transmission and distribution, we are only looking at the sensitivity and how that will impact the outcome. What PSE can influence in terms of resilience, can translate into how we can think of adding more distributed resources. When you think of resiliency what are the factors PSE can influence that could fluctuate or alter the resiliency of a particular portfolio?

- RPAG member: Researchers at Berkley Lab are attempting to understand and adapt what reliability metrics are used for major event days. Reliability is more of a continuum. Reliability cannot be entirely separated from resilience and a lot of metrics for resilience take reliability metrics. It would be important to include resilience metrics and reliability metrics. We include various tables for attribute and performance metrics for resilience to extreme weather in Bridging the Gap on Data, Metrics, and Analyses for Grid Resilience to Weather Events: <https://emp.lbl.gov/publications/bridging-gap-data-metrics-and>. The following project involved surveying ComEd customers to understand how they might respond when confronted with a WLD power interruption. The research team used the survey responses to calibrate a state-of-the-art regional economic model (“POET”) to estimate economic impacts to households and 38 industry sectors across 17 impacted micro-regions (individual counties or aggregations of counties) within ComEd’s service territory and beyond. We ran one-day, three-day, and 14-day interruption duration scenarios each with varying geographic extents as well as estimated the benefits of deploying additional backup generation across the service territory. The results were then compared to a “business as usual” scenario if no interruption occurred. <https://emp.lbl.gov/publications/power-outage-economics-tool-prototype>
- RPAG member: What are the associated metrics of the indicators? When PSE runs these models, what are the units of measurement? What is PSE using as a metric? PSE should make sure that the output and whatever the unit of measurement of CBIs are clear.
  - PSE response: PSE has not shown indicators yet, but we can provide those indicators.
  - RPAG member: I am imagining only two axes of CBIs. One for number of participants in DR projects and one for reduced CO2 emissions. It would be helpful for the output to fall on a two-dimensional space.
- RPAG member: We include various tables for attribute and performance metrics for resilience to extreme weather in Bridging the Gap on Data, Metrics, and Analyses for Grid Resilience to Weather Events. You’d want to select metrics that are relevant to generation (including DERs) and transmission.
- RPAG member: We tried to go back and see what the Commission originally thought about this approach. The Commission adoption order does not talk about lowest reasonable cost to customers in the sensitivities. It’s more about figuring out the greatest value to customers. For example, PSE can use extreme DER inputs which would increase costs for everyone and emissions. The Commission is looking to get this type of information out of this planning exercise.
  - PSE response: We appreciate you sharing this. PSE wants to be creative with a sensitivity that maximizes the value to customers. There are two challenges which are: what is the value and which customers are included? Different customers have different values.

- RPAG member: There is a world where reliability is a huge benefit and there are a lot of emerging resources. Having good metrics for reliability is important.
- RPAG member: One possible metric could be using an equity lens and bringing burdened customers above the 6% threshold. Also elevating the population of deepest need.
  - PSE response: Thank you for your feedback.
- RPAG member: This proposal seems reasonable. There are inherent trade-offs, for example, affordability versus reducing greenhouse gas emissions versus reliability.
  - PSE response: Thank you for your input.
- RPAG member: The work in defining CBIs is important and we appreciate all the time that folks have put on it. And now that we have them, it would be great to see how trying to compare/maximize the value (or volume) of these CBIs looks like for PSE. There is no solution that solves all the problems that we are tracking with CBIs, but I am particularly interested in seeing how the levers affect this final/total value to customers. Understanding how this space changes with our decisions across the multi-dimensional CBI levers/metrics is probably the most important here.
  - PSE response: Thank you for your feedback.

## Next steps

Annie previewed upcoming activities.

- February 4, 2026: Feedback form from January 27, 2026 meeting closes
- February 26, 2026: RPAG meeting
- March 26, 2026: RPAG meeting

Annie invited comments and questions from public attendees. Please visit PSE's [recording of the January 27 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

There were no public comments during the meeting. PSE's feedback report for this meeting is available on PSE's [clean energy planning website](#).

## Attendees

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

## RPAG members

1. Dennis Suarez
2. Donald Williams
3. Fred Heutte
4. Froylan Sifuentes
5. Jaime McGovern
6. John Ollis
7. Katie Chamberlain
8. Megan Larkin
9. Lauren McCloy
10. Quinn Weber

## Presenters

1. Alexandra Karpoff, PSE
2. Brian Tyson, PSE
3. Elizabeth Hossner, PSE
4. Jennifer Coulson, PSE
5. Kara Durbin, PSE

## Support staff

1. Eleanor Ewry, PSE
2. Lorin Molander, PSE
3. Meredith Mathis, PSE
4. Stephen Collins, PSE
5. Phillip Popoff, PSE
6. 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. Amir Valibeygi
2. April Montgomery
3. Denelle Peacey
4. Ehsan Samani
5. Elliot Carleton
6. Francisco Humaran
7. Lily Mwalenga
8. Matt Wills
9. Neelesh Pandey
10. Shirley Huang
11. Sophie Major
12. Teun Deuling
13. Tracey Eixenberger
14. Wesley Franks