Tacoma Power 2022 IRP/CEIP Public Workshop #1
Tuesday, August 17, 2021

PARTICIPANTS

Name	Representing	Name	Representing
Stephanie Leisle	Pierce County	Lisa Rennie	TPU
Pat Babbit	City of Tacoma	Christine Tembo	TPU
Andrew Strobel	Puyallup Tribe	Keil Drescher	TPU
Annabel Drayton	NW Energy Coalition	Logan Bahr	TPU
Rebecca Slinger	Tacoma Community College	Mia Navarro	TPU
David Slocomb	Linde	Michael Catsi	TPU
Elizabeth Osborne	NW Power & Conservation Council	Seema Ghosh	TPU
Bruce Martin	West Rock	Rachel Clark	TPU – Meeting Lead
Graham VanderSchelden	NW Seaport Alliance	Haley Saul	TPU – Facilitator
Jon Shields	US Oil & Refining	Ahlmahz Negash	TPU – Project Team
		Travis Metcalfe	TPU – Facilitator
		Danielle Szigeti	TPU – Project Team

NOTES

TIME	ITEM	LEAD
3:00 P.M.	**Welcome**	Rachel Clark
3:05 P.M.	**Introductions & Ice Breaker**	All

3:15 P.M.	**Agenda and Objective Review**
	
	2 Objectives:
	1. Introduce the CEIP
	   • What it is
	   • How it works together with the IRP
	2. Input on potential indicators
	   • Get feedback from attendees
		Haley Saul/
		Travis Metcalfe

3:20 P.M.	**Brief Overview of CEIP & CEIP Indicators** See attached PowerPoint presentation (Slides 5-8)	Rachel Clark
3:25 P.M.	**Tacoma Power's Draft Criteria** Measurable & Mappable: We have the data, can be measured using regionally accepted practices and can be disaggregated using the census Relevant: The indicator will be impacted by resource acquisition actions, utility expenditures, etc. Timely: The indicator will be impacted within the next four years. The data can measure change over the four years	Rachel Clark

Meaningful: Aligned with Tacoma Power's strategy and values and with TPU's Public Utility Board directives

3:30 P.M.	**Tacoma Power's Draft Indicators**	Rachel Clark

CATEGORY | Energy benefits

- INDICATOR | Number of customers benefitting from conservations programs
- INDICATOR | Megawatt hours energy saved

CATEGORY | Reduction of burdens

- INDICATOR | Energy burden
- INDICATOR | Assistance dollars spent
- INDICATOR | Conservation dollars spent

CATEGORY | Energy security

- INDICATOR | SAIDI, SAIFI
- INDICATOR | Number of customers impacted by outages

CATEGORY | Resiliency

- INDICATOR | MW demand response

QUESTION | Does energy burden include transportation related energy or only home/heating/cooling/domestic living expense? (Bruce Martin)

- Only home/heating/cooling/domestic living expenses
- There are other plans for transportation electrification with different restrictions (e.g. costs cannot result in more than a quarter of a percent of rate impact)
- Further detail from Commerce guidelines:
  - Energy burden for the purposes of 19.405.120 RCW can be calculated using the following formula:

  energy burden = annual home energy expenses + annual

  household income

  Energy burden is limited to expenses for residential or domestic purposes. This includes any fuel source for energy (i.e. electricity, natural gas, propane, heating oil, wood, etc.) and excludes non-energy utilities and transportation-related energy expenses. To the extent feasible, it excludes electricity expenses for electric vehicle charging, home businesses or shops, and agricultural or irrigation purposes.

QUESTION | Does the MW save metric include a timing component (i.e. diurnal and/or seasonal)? (Graham VanderSchelden)

- No, we are not envisioning that it will, primarily because it comes form our conservation programs. We consider shape, but focus on an annual MW basis.

- When we explore the MW saved metric, it may be better answered through MW of demand response as a final indicator.

COMMENT | Reliability indicators may be better classified as measures of resiliency rather than energy security. Customer disconnects would be a better measure of energy security. (Annabel Drayton)

3:35 P.M.	**Brainstorm Additional Indicators**	All

All participants were asked to think of one indicator, not already listed in the PowerPoint presentation by TPU, that they think TPU should include in the CEIP. TPU employees were asked not to participate in this exercise.

Participants were asked to submit their indicator via a Menti survey and these are the responses that were received:

- Rate impacts for both vulnerable communities and residential sector overall

- Energy security: reduction in number and percentage of residential customer disconnections by location (and demographic info) of residential customer disconnections (zip code/census tract; renter; known low-income; HICs; and BIPOC customers)

- % of customers benefitting from (1) conservation programs and (2) assistance programs that are BIPOC, low-income, disabled, etc.

- % of households that are energy burdened that are BIPOC, low-income, etc.

- # customers benefitting is equitable across racial demographics in our communities. (ie. We haven't inadvertently created something that leaves specific ethnic groups out.)

- # customers impacted by outages

- I don't have any additional indicators to add to the list.

- Though you talked about the equity lens and mapping, what is missing from the actual chart of indicators is the emphasis on low income diverse households like in "energy benefits" and the disparity between benefits given to homes owned vs.rented.

- As others have stated, being able to disaggregate the indicator(s) by race.

- # new electricity customers (net)
- Identifying specific geographies where system infrastructure may impact communities of color adversely.
- GHG emissions by Council district

QUESTION | Is it mostly electrification efforts that are considered in this particular exercise? (Graham VanderSchelden)

- At this moment, TPU is not in the position to engage in a lot of electrification efforts ourselves. We can provide support and welcome efforts, but we would need legislative changes in order to actually engage in electrification (with some exceptions in transportation)
- The impacts of electrification may be part of the energy burden metrics
  - Does not include transportation or gas
  - Whole energy burden is included in metric and relates to electrification

COMMENT | NWEC sees targeted reductions in pollution burden and pollution exposure as relevant (Annabel Drayton)

| 4:00 P.M. | **Prioritize Indicators** | All |

TPU's list of indicators and the participant's additional indicator ideas were combined. Then, participants were asked to rank which indicators they felt were most important to include in the CEIP. Here are the results:

MWh of energy saved	5.45
Number of Customers benefiting from conservation programs	9.09
Conservation $ spent	9.09
Assistance $ spent	3.64
Energy burden	4.55
SAIDI/SAFI	10.91
Number of customers impacted by outages	8.18
MWs of Demand Response	1.82
Rate impacts for vulnerable communities and residential	12.27
Disaggregate by race	4.09
% of households that are energy burdened that are BIPOC, low-income, etc	9.55
% of customers benefiting from conservation programs	2.73
% of customers benefiting from assistance programs that are BIPOC, low income, disabled, etc	3.64

Energy security reduction in # and % of residential customer disconnections by location and demographic info of residential customer disconnects	5.45	
# of customers benefiting is equitable across demographics	9.55	

4:20 P.M.	**Next Steps**	Rachel Clark

COMMENT | If we're talking about equity, we need to disaggregate the indicators by race (Rebecca Slinger)

COMMENT | I think it's really important to include energy security, number and percentage of disconnections, and measure the reduction of disconnections by demographic (Annabel Drayton)

COMMENT | It doesn't seem like there's a direction that the indicators are trying to demonstrate. Are we reducing something? Are we improving something? What is the goal? The indicator's context is lost without a target. (Annabel Drayton)

COMMENT | Observation – there is an emphasis on conservation dollars and we know that it's primarily homeowners who benefit from conservation. Are we hoping to measure the improvement of equity in conservation? There could be populations we miss only measuring conservation. (Mia Navarro)

Participants will be invited to engage in several more workshops with the next one related to the CEIP as well.

Participants were asked to provide feedback on the meeting. Here were their responses:

- Have short breaks

- I liked the effort to make it interactive – introductions, norms, questions-and-answer style to learning about the CEIP. Some hosts really helped keep the energy up – that's important.

- Just present the content and get the feedback. Give people their time back.

- The high level indicators are reliability and cost of carbon free energy. The next indicators would be specific to the programs being implemented to control cost or reliability. It's hard to pinpoint equity indicators until programs are outlined.

- When sharing documents make them larger so that ew can read the words!

- It's clear that some people weren't interested in participating but I appreciated the effort to make it interactive and a productive use of everyone's time! Thank you and looking forward to the next workshop!