

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

Thursday, March 26, 2026 | 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Meeting materials

- [Presentation](#)
- [Meeting recording](#)
- [Meeting agenda](#)

Meeting objectives

- Continue the cost test discussion from the [February 26, 2026 RPAG meeting](#)
- Provide the updated demand forecast assumptions since the [July 29, 2025 RPAG meeting](#)
- Discuss ISP load scenario assumptions for large loads and electric vehicles
- Provide an opportunity for public comments

Introduction and agenda review

Follow along: This information is on [slides 1-8](#) of the presentation and [3:09 – 13:00 in the meeting recording](#).

Presenter: Annie Kilburg Smith, facilitator, Triangle Associates

Advancing definitions of societal impacts in the cost test

Follow along: This information is on [slides 9-17](#) of the presentation and [12:25 – 1:05:12](#) and [1:35:14 – 1:49:51](#) in the meeting recording.

Presenter: Kara Durbin, Director, Clean Energy Strategy, PSE and Brian Tyson, Manager, Clean Energy Planning and Implementation, PSE

Highlights:

- PSE used feedback from the February 26, 2026 RPAG meeting to refine the cost test approach discuss
- PSE is working with the Equity Advisory Group (EAG) and the Conservation Resource Advisory Group (CRAG) in March to discuss the cost test and solicit feedback on approaches
- Cost test risk reduction premium is specific to Climate Commitment Act (CCA) ceiling price. PSE will separately estimate this from the price in total dollars by portfolio.
- PSE proposes using the Job and Economic Development Impact (JEDI) model to quantify jobs by portfolio for the economic development portion of the cost test.
- PSE is still working to identify clear quantifiable metrics for reliability, resiliency, and security of supply not currently captured in the modeling process.

RPAG members provided the following questions and feedback:

- RPAG member: I'm hoping PSE can share more about who may incur impacts for the elements in the cost test
 - PSE response: We welcome feedback about which impacts would be most appropriate to consider at the portfolio level. We are still reflecting on feedback from the previous RPAG meeting.
- RPAG member: I'm not seeing all the components that go into the cost test on the agenda for this meeting, such as environmental impacts. Are those already finalized at this point or will we have time to weigh in on them later in the process?
 - PSE response: Today we will focus on updates we made based on feedback and have a more robust discussion around reliability, resiliency, and security of supply. We're happy to take feedback on other elements.
- RPAG member: Is PSE looking at bill impacts as an aspect of the cost test?
 - PSE response: We are absolutely considering bill impacts as part of the overall scenarios and portfolio for the ISP. Affordability is one of the main themes we've heard in EAG conversations and it's on our minds as we embark on this ISP.
- RPAG member: Where is the Climate Commitment Act (CCA) expected price coming from?
 - PSE response: PSE is developing a process to forecast what we think that price may be.
 - RPAG member: I'm interested in knowing more about how the price is derived. I'm also interested in how fuel prices and associated risk is being factored in.
 - PSE response: The CCA ceiling price is based on Department of Ecology guidance. The mid price is based on a recent forecast from the California Energy Commission.

- RPAG member: Is PSE considering modeling higher ceiling prices that align with the state emission targets?
 - PSE response: That is not our plan currently. We did reference the California ceiling price as well, and our ceiling price closely follows what California is doing.
 - RPAG member: Can you share more on how California's ceiling price compares to Washington's?
 - PSE response: They have very similar assumptions about inflation per year over time.
- RPAG member: The Job and Economic Development Impact (JEDI) model also includes other economic development impacts like local revenue and supply chain. It seems like you're myopically focusing on jobs and leave a lot of output on the table that you could potentially use.
 - PSE response: Thank you. It sounds like it may be helpful for RPAG members to see output beyond jobs if the model is able to produce that.
- RPAG member: How does output from the JEDI model inform decision making? Would a higher job count be selected over a lower cost portfolio for example?
 - PSE response: We are still discussing with the RPAG and other advisory groups how these different criteria really fit into the overall decision framework. We aren't sure quite yet; it's something we're still developing, and we want to focus on getting these specific elements and impacts defined. We will come back and have discussion on the larger decision framework.
- RPAG member: I'm curious if there are any other examples where resource planning has incorporated this type of econometric modeling. I'm encouraged that you are willing to look at this and consider how to use the JEDI model. It could yield some interesting information and inform how you develop the ISP.
 - PSE response: Thank you. We're open to any other models or sources that can help us better understand the economic development element.
- RPAG member: First, Wisconsin was looking at using similar metrics for their energy efficiency program, and perhaps it might be beneficial for PSE to take a look and see how it could potentially be applied in this context. Second, I'm curious how PSE might geographically scope economic development within the ISP. Will it be statewide or just limited to economic development with PSE's service territory?
 - PSE response: Are we thinking about impacts within our service territory or are we thinking about it broadly regardless of where the resources may go? The model does ask for a location and so we would have to think about what location we use based on our planning processes and assumptions. In regard to jobs, it's tough to say if tax revenue for example is going towards PSE service territory especially if the model is planning to build outside the region. The JEDI model is very location-based so it looks at local impact. We would look at this in totality, not just specific to PSE's service territory.

- RPAG member: It's a matter of how you would think about scoping; deciding on a scope is important.
- RPAG member: On the topic of geographical distribution, I think we would appreciate it if PSE considered other metrics too. For example, when we talk about the social cost of greenhouse gas (SCGHG) or the impact on frontline communities if a power plant is not in PSE's service territory. Are you considering the impact that building a plant can have on the air quality for a community outside your service territory?
 - PSE response: At the portfolio level we may not necessarily know the specific location of a build due to the generic nature of resources in the ISP.
- RPAG member: Do you have a specific methodology to measure and prioritize risk within the ISP model regarding reliability, resiliency, and security of supply?
 - PSE response: The model is set to make sure we serve all load and meet all the standards to lower the risk of outages or things like that. I don't think we have the level of detail you are thinking about in terms of a sensitivity around risk. If there's a specific risk you have in mind, we may be able to speak to it directly.
 - RPAG member: This is like a model we've used in the past for a security threat matrix or emergency management risk matrix. We look at the probability of risk and the probability of the severity of that incident; another dimension is the dependent variable sensitivity. When risk happens, how many other dependent variables get triggered in the system?
 - PSE response: The process we're using takes the scenarios and looks at different possibilities and feasibilities, so there's inherent risk in each bucket. But we understand that risk isn't just the risk itself, but the likelihood and severity of it; we will take that feedback into consideration as we look at each scenario.
- PSE: We want to provide additional context about the CCA ceiling prices. We are not looking at prices beyond the ceiling price because that's not required in the CCA. The Department of Ecology is required to provide allowances at the ceiling price. It makes sense for our ISP to use the ceiling price for our analysis because that might be what our customers have to pay.
- RPAG member: I think some clarity about what the applicable standards are would be helpful and then making sure we're quantifying the contribution of ALL resources (including customer-side resources) toward meeting those standards. And, then I think the RPAG would benefit from some comparative analysis between PSE's methods and other similarly situated utilities. For example, I think the E3 study might undervalue the reliability/resilience value of DR and DERs in PSE's service territory, which is transmission constrained.
- RPAG member: It would be great to try and capture the risk of extreme price volatility at natural gas hubs, on the scale of 3–5-day events.

- RPAG member: Can you speak more to “potential other factors” you’ve identified in the cost test framework?
 - PSE response: The cost test rules allow for flexibility, so if there are other factors that don’t fit within the cost test, we may want to measure them as part of the decision framework. We don’t have any other factors identified but we are leaving space for things that aren’t fully defined in the rules.
- RPAG member: How does the JEDI model connect to the EAG’s desire to see economic development in named communities and workforce development? Does it support that analysis or are there going to be two separate tracks of specific economic analysis and quantitative data; then the qualitative data would answer the question of how the benefits occur in named communities.
 - PSE response: We aren’t able to be granular in the JEDI model and in the ISP, so we aren’t able to distill the named communities impact necessarily. The understanding and evaluation of impact to named communities doesn’t stop in the ISP process. We have a request for proposal (RFP) process and acquisition process that helps us better understand details for the model.
- RPAG member: Could you speak to how the risk reduction premium will be weighted in the cost test, especially compared with the ceiling price of CCA allowances? In general, can you speak a bit to how these different impacts will be weighted? Is this something we’re going to figure out in a later RPAG meeting?
 - PSE response: Right now, we’re really trying to understand the elements of the cost test. The rules don’t indicate we should weight any of these elements, so we’re trying to understand the elements and how we can compare them across different scenarios. What are your thoughts on weighting? Is weighting critical to the decision framework process?
 - RPAG member: I’d have to think a bit more about that and submit comments later. I think the monetized and quantified elements are pretty easy to weigh against each other. It’s harder with the qualitative impacts.
 - PSE response: You’re right that the quantitative elements seem more straightforward; we want to continue to have discussions about the qualitative elements.
 - PSE response: To address your comment about CCA, we will have a sensitivity that looks at the mid price rather than the ceiling price so we will be able evaluate that to see the difference.
- RPAG member: I think I’ve seen some studies on the health benefits associated with the reduction of indoor air pollution from switching from cooking with gas to cooking with electric. I’d like to share those resources with PSE and RPAG members. Indoor air quality is something we could possibly leverage for this process. *RPAG member provided [this link in the chat](#).*

- PSE response: Thank you.
- RPAG member: I'll provide a caveat that the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Commission) staff's position is not necessarily the Commission's position. Staff has been thinking about how some of the metrics around health and safety were qualified as "meeting the standards", but I'd encourage you to go beyond that. If a portfolio meets the standards, what happens next? How do we look at what the impact of actually meeting standards and turn qualitative impacts into quantitative impacts? Staff is happy to share research as we find it.
 - PSE response: Thank you.
- RPAG member: EPA has done a lot of work towards quantifying and monetizing health and safety. There are two tools that they have: the [COBRA tool](#) and the [BenMAP tool](#). I encourage you to look at those.
 - PSE response: Thank you.
- RPAG member: When are we going to start looking at some of the delivery system pieces of this?
 - PSE response: In May we have the reference case RPAG meeting, so that will be all-encompassing for all the outputs across the ISP. We will talk about scenario results and sensitivities.

Demand forecast

Follow along: This information is on [slides 18-27](#) of the presentation and [1:05:13 – 1:34:47](#) in the meeting recording.

Presenter: Lorin Molander, Manager, Load Forecasting & Analysis, PSE and Stephanie Price, Lead – Electric, Load Forecasting & Analysis, PSE

Highlights:

- PSE presented the demand forecast to the RPAG in July 2025
- PSE has since updated assumptions about customer growth and electric vehicle (EV) adoption due to changing conditions, policies, and RPAG feedback
- Original customer growth assumptions expected gas growth; updated assumptions project no gas growth beyond 2026
- Original transportation electrification assumptions met state targets for light duty vehicles, but not medium/heavy duty vehicles; updated assumptions project not meeting state targets for light or medium/heavy duty vehicles.
- PSE updated scenarios to reflect large loads and EV adoption such as data centers

RPAG members provided the following questions and feedback:

- RPAG member: You're saying you predict an average amount of 20 MW of data center growth per year, but they don't come online 20 MW at a time. Are you able to smooth out data center growth and predict where you might see growth versus a more linear model.
 - PSE response: The model shown here isn't linear. On average growth is 20 MW a year; it starts lower and then grows over time. This number is consistent with reality. Specific ramp rates for individual projects is a detail that is beyond what we're trying to do in these scenarios for the ISP.
- RPAG member: To what extent is managed charging incorporated into this forecast?
 - PSE response: This forecast is before demand-side resources. Managed charging is modeled in two ways: time of use rates and event-based demand response. CADMUS Group provides our conservation potential assessment (CPA) which includes managed charging estimates. However, when we compare the previous forecast with the updated forecast, the participation rates in managed charging are not significant in comparison to the load forecasted.
- RPAG member: Are fuel prices factored into the averages for the low and base scenario? What is the time frame for the price averages? Will high fuel prices incentivize more EV adoption?
 - PSE response: Our average base price assumption for fuel prices are as of 2025 and adjusted for inflation. Fuel prices could influence people to adopt EVs faster, however Guidehouse generally believes that fuel price is a factor, but not in the short term. EV adoption is more influenced by incentives or tax credits.
- RPAG member: PNUCC is getting ready to publish the northwest regional forecast. If RPAG members are interested I'd like to offer to walk through the forecast to help put PSE's forecast in context with the rest of the region.
 - PSE response: Thank you, that is great. We will figure out if/when we can work that in.
- RPAG member: The Commission will have a new electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) policy statement at some point we would like to collaborate on. How much does this forecast consider the MSRP for used vehicles?
 - PSE response: We will need to take that question to Guidehouse.

Next steps and public comment opportunity

Follow along: This information is on [slides 28-35](#) of the presentation and [1:49:52 – 1:54:13](#) in the meeting recording.

Highlights:

- April 2, 2026: Feedback form for the March 26, 2026 meeting closes
- April 2026: No scheduled RPAG meeting
- No members of the public participated in the public comment opportunity
- Participants were invited to complete a post-meeting feedback poll to share their insights and help improve future sessions.

Attendees

Attendees are listed alphabetically by first name. This list does not include viewers on [PSE's YouTube channel](#).

RPAG members

- | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Aliza Seelig | 6. Froylan Sifuentes | 11. Megan Larkin |
| 2. Callie Moriyasu | 7. John Ollis | 12. Quinn Weber |
| 3. Dennis Suarez | 8. JP Carvallo | 13. Sommer Moser |
| 4. Donald Williams | 9. Katie Ware | 14. Wesley Franks |
| 5. Fred Heutte | 10. Lauren McCloy | |

Presenters

- | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Brian Tyson, PSE | 3. Lorin Molander, PSE |
| 2. Kara Durbin, PSE | 4. Stephanie Price, PSE |

Support staff and facilitators

- | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------------|
| 1. Annie Kilburg
Smith, Triangle
Associates | 5. Elizabeth Hossner,
PSE | 8. Jennifer Coulson,
PSE |
| 2. Ashley King, PSE | 6. Emma Taylor-
Chapman, PSE | 9. Kelly Xu, PSE |
| 3. Brian Tyson, PSE | 7. Jack Donahue,
Maul, Foster and
Alongi (MFA) | 10. Meredith Mathis,
PSE |
| 4. Chhandita Das,
PSE | | 11. Phillip Popoff, PSE |
| | | 12. Ray Outlaw, PSE |

Members of the public

1. Darren Gest
2. Denelle Peacey
3. Dorian Taylor
4. Ehsan Samani
5. Elliot Carleton
6. Jesse Scharf
7. Joshua Rubenstein
8. Matt Wills
9. Sheryl Mayo
10. Shirley Huang
11. Sophie Major
12. Steve Perkins
13. Willard Westre