

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

Tuesday, June 23, 2026 | 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Meeting materials

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

Meeting objectives

- Provide an overview of feedback from the May 28, 2026 RPAG meeting
- Continue discussion of the 2027 Integrated System Plan (ISP) reference case
- Discuss electric distribution system planning reference case
- Discuss electric transmission (regional and local) reference case
- Provide an opportunity for public comments

Introduction and agenda review

Follow along: This information is on slides [1-8](#) of the presentation and [4:41 – 11:18](#) in the meeting recording.

Presenter: Hilary Wilkinson, Facilitator, Maul Foster & Longi (MFA)

Recap and next steps

Follow along: This information is on slides [9-12](#) of the presentation and [11:19 - 22:17](#) in the meeting recording.

Presenter: Jennifer Coulson, Director, Resource Planning Analytics, PSE

Highlights:

- The AURORA model did not initially produce a feasible solution (reference case) based on inputs and assumptions developed through RPAG engagement and public participation.
- The model must meet effective peak capacity, CETA renewable and non-emitting resources, and energy demand to produce a solution.
- PSE determined that the main feasibility challenge was due to the projected 2045 peak need; to produce a solution, PSE removed the build limits for commercially available technology.
- Due to transmission constraints across the region the model maxed out wind and solar builds; this was not enough to create a solution, so PSE had to force in an unrealistic amount of 4-hour battery technology to produce a solution (Reference A).
- To produce a more realistic solution than Reference A, PSE allowed the model to select emerging technologies such as small nuclear reactors (SMR), advanced geothermal, mid- and long-duration energy storage, renewable peakers and offshore wind. This model produced a solution (Reference B).
- The reference case is the starting point for developing a preferred portfolio, and scenarios and sensitivities will allow PSE to examine the nuances of potential futures.

RPAG members provided the following questions and feedback:

- RPAG member: It was mentioned that there are differing opinions on what resources are commercially available, but there is an official definition for commercially available. This is a good working assumption as we develop a reference case, so I've included it in the chat. According to WAC 480-96-020 (5) "Commercially available" means that a resource is currently available for purchase, procurement, or installation, or is reasonably anticipated to be available within the integrated system plan's study period.
 - PSE response: Thank you. [Note: PSE used a narrow interpretation of this definition for Reference A but needed to use a more expansive interpretation of the definition in order for the model to solve (Reference B).]

Electric distribution system planning reference case

Follow along: This information is on slides [13-20](#) of the presentation and [22:18 – 1:02:12](#) in the meeting recording.

Presenter: David Landers, Director, Planning, PSE

Highlights:

- The electric distribution system reference case aligns with the load forecast for the 2027 ISP and PSE's 2026 General Rate Case (GRC).
- The reference case projects steady investment in the distribution system across the planning horizon.
- Investment spending in the reference case shifts from capacity additions (primarily substation upgrades) in the early years to incremental maintenance for a growing electric system.
- This case establishes a baseline for deeper analysis; future iterations will align this case with the gas electrification potential assessment and assess customer programs.

RPAG members provided the following questions and feedback:

- RPAG member: What range of non-wire alternatives are factored into the modeling?
 - PSE response: To avoid putting resources on the distribution system we look at resources that serve a local peak rather than a system peak at a specific substation. Implementation of a five-megawatt Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) is one of the most opportunistic ways to avoid adding a transformer bank or building a new substation.
- RPAG member: What percentile forecast are these loading levels based on?
 - PSE response: The reference case demand forecast uses P50.
- RPAG member: Does electric system growth shown on slides 18-19 include planned electrification programs on the gas side?
 - PSE response: No, it does not. We will discuss the gas reference case separately and how electrification of current gas loads may impact the electric system.
 - RPAG member: Will the natural gas reference case inform the electric reference case?
 - PSE response: Scenario analysis will show varying levels of electrification and how gas assumptions interplay with the electric system. Assumptions and inputs are aligned across both gas and electric systems.
- RPAG member: It would be helpful to break up substation capacity by winter or summer season.
 - PSE response: That is standard analysis in our planning. We can share that in the future.
- RPAG member: Can you share how you came up with the assumption about a 30% success rate for non-wire alternatives in the reference case? What do you consider success?

- PSE response: Success is the ability to implement a non-wire alternative at a substation and therefore defer a traditional substation capacity investment for a period of 10 to 15 years.
- RPAG member: Are the substation investments included in the model?
- PSE response: Yes, these costs are included in the model.
- RPAG member: Does your capacity data come from advanced metering infrastructure (AMI) or some other technology within the substation?
- PSE response: We use a power flow model tool which does analysis on all our circuits and substations.
- RPAG member: Were demand response and energy efficiency part of the reference case presented at the May RPAG meeting?
 - PSE response: Customer programs and their impacts on the load are elements of the reference case.
 - RPAG member: Are those distributed across the entire service territory equally?
 - PSE response: Yes, they are spread equally across the service territory (“peanut butter spread”).

Electric transmission reference case

Follow along: This information is on slides [21-34](#) of the presentation and [1:02:12 – 1:53:36](#) in the meeting recording.

Presenter: Shaun Foster, Director, Electric Transmission, PSE

Highlights:

Local transmission planning

- Recent resource planning exercises have identified a significant need for on-system resources to meet our clean energy goals.
- PSE’s local transmission system planning needs to consider both reliability and resource integration.
- Resource integration will likely drive transmission system improvements
- PSE is examining five different PSE service territory transmission options (referred to as scenarios in the meeting) to capture the uncertainty of future resource siting.

Regional transmission planning

- Cross-Cascades transmission is the keystone to accessing other clean energy zones

- PSE is evaluating options to increase capacity across the Cascades, which would require significant transmission investments.
- PSE is also exploring opportunities to reach clean energy zones via the North Plains Connector project.
- There is uncertainty in Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) transmission.
- The 2027 ISP will examine a number of transmission sensitivities to evaluate the impact of regional transmission.

RPAG members provided the following feedback:

- RPAG member: The ISP uses the PSE zones to balance resource needs after regional transmission capacity is fully utilized. Can you explain what you mean by balance?
 - PSE response: This is a complex problem to solve. We have very limited transmission; the model will optimize least-cost resources to meet requirements. Further into the planning horizon, we begin to exhaust transmission zones, which prompts the model to move to other zones. Once those are exhausted it may turn to PSE's zone to balance out the remaining resources, which may not be lowest cost, but meets planning margin and CETA requirements.
- RPAG member: On slide 24, some transmission scenarios and potential resource locations are based off analysis from the 2023 Electric Progress Report. How recently has this information been refreshed?
 - PSE response: We started with the 2023 Electric Progress Report to help provide scenarios for generation siting. Our current analysis looks at the new volume of resources within PSE's system as compared against our prior generation siting work.
- RPAG member: What can be done to overcome challenges with siting, transmission, and development?
 - PSE response: Cities, counties, and states have their own siting and zoning constraints. The answer isn't simple.
 - RPAG member: Is there a plan for a joint body to work through these issues over the next two decades?
 - PSE response: Whatever shape that may take, PSE is ready to collaborate to figure out how to solve these challenges.
- RPAG member: What's the earliest in-service date for the cross-Cascades expansion?
 - PSE response: If you could start building today, you could complete it in five years. However, the challenge lies in right-of-way acquisition, permitting, and concerns with how infrastructure affects people. A best-case scenario is 10 years from now.

- RPAG member: How is PSE taking action to move these transmission projects forward? Also, will the preferred portfolio select transmission options if the sensitivities show that they're lower cost or lower risk?
 - PSE response: An independent developer is managing the North Plains Connector project. PSE and other potential participants are collaborating with them to figure out the best way to move the project forward. We need to make sure it makes sense for our portfolio before making development decisions. Regarding the portfolio transmission options, we will use scenarios and sensitivities to inform an optimal decision about transmission projects.
- RPAG member: How is PSE building in or considering the Washington Electric Transmission Authority (WETA)?
 - PSE response: It's too early to tell how that will work or what that may look like.

Next steps and public comment opportunity

Follow along: This information is on slides [35-42](#) of the presentation and [1:53:37 – 2:03:00](#) in the meeting recording.

Presenter: Hilary Wilkinson, Facilitator, MFA

Highlights:

- June 30, 2026: Feedback form for the June 23, 2026 meeting closes
- July 28, 2026: RPAG meeting
- One member 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 | 4. Donald Williams | 7. John Ollis |
| 2. Callie Moriyasu | 5. Froylan Sifuentes | 8. JP Carvallo |
| 3. Dennis Suarez | 6. Jaime McGovern | 9. Katie Ware |

10. Megan Larkin

11. Quinn Weber

Presenters

1. David Landers, PSE

3. Shaun Foster, PSE

2. Jennifer Coulson, PSE

Support staff and facilitators

1. Ben Relampagos,
Triangle Associates

3. Kara Durbin, PSE

6. Sam Humphreys, MFA

4. Meredith Mathis, PSE

7. Stephen Collins, PSE

2. Hilary Wilkinson, Maul
Foster & Alongi (MFA)

5. Ray Outlaw, PSE

Members of the public

1. Aubrey Young

8. Jason Verduzco

15. Rachel Gates

2. David Stewart

9. Jon Lange

16. Rae Brigham

3. Don Marsh

10. Kelly Kozdras

17. Renchang Dai

4. Doug Howell

11. Kristine Rompa

18. Seth Baker

5. Ehsan Samani

12. Lian Arnst

19. Shirley Huang

6. Elliot Carleton

13. Paul G

20. Steve Perkins

7. Erik Olson

14. Phillip Popoff

21. Thom Fischer