

PacifiCorp Equity Advisory Group (EAG)

Meeting #5 Notes

Wednesday September 15, 2021, 1-4pm Pacific Time

These notes were synthesized and summarized by RMI, PacifiCorp's meeting facilitation partner, without EAG member attribution.

Executive Summary

EAG Meeting #5 focused on customer benefit indicators (CBIs) and their metrics, utility planning, and utility actions. Approximately 40 people attended the virtual meeting on Zoom. Ten out of our 12 EAG members were able to attend, and the meeting had approximately 9 observers, which included members of the public and state regulatory staff. Throughout the meeting, PacifiCorp answered EAG member questions and solicited EAG feedback on processes and outputs.

At the beginning of the meeting, PacifiCorp shared the weighting of CBIs, allowing time for questions and reactions. PacifiCorp then reviewed the draft list of CBI metrics. EAG Members reflected on these metrics and provided additional ideas and reactions to PacifiCorp.

Following the presentations on CBIs, PacifiCorp described the utility planning process at PacifiCorp and presented utility actions in three categories: supply-side actions, demand-side actions, and other actions.

The final portion of the meeting included a public comment period and question and feedback session.

During the question and feedback session, the EAG voiced that they:

- Would like more details on the “other utility actions” and how those programs will be designed to benefit named communities.
- Think bikes and scooters should be included in an electric vehicle program.
- Want to better understand the evaluation of resource bids to be more inclusive, with the opportunity for siting in Washington.
- Think PacifiCorp’s actions should not seek to maximize a CBI if the outcomes have a negative impact to named communities.
- Want to know more about how PacifiCorp will measure the outcomes of various proposed programs.
- Are eager to provide feedback on actions as part of the Clean Energy Implementation Plan (CEIP) process.
- The meeting concluded with a review of next steps and description of the final two EAG meetings in 2021.

Responses to questions and comments that did not get addressed during Meeting #5 or where PacifiCorp felt that greater detail was needed are highlighted throughout the document in purple.

Session Objectives

- Reflect and give feedback on CBI weights and refined CBIs.
- Review a refined list of CBI metrics.
- Introduce the 2021 Integrated Resource Plan (IRP), CEIP, and utility actions.
- Provide an opportunity for the EAG to discuss topics of interest with PacifiCorp to ensure that EAG members have a full understanding of this process.

Slides available here: [English](#) [Español](#)

Opening (1:05pm)

RMI welcomed attendees and shared meeting objectives and the agenda. PacifiCorp provided updates since Meeting #4, which included highlighting a Meeting #4 make-up session and PacifiCorp’s first Public Meeting on the Clean Energy Transformation Act (CETA).

EAG Member Check-In (1:10pm)

Equity Advisory Group member	Organization
Angélica Reyes	La Casa Hogar
Erendira Cruz	Sustainable Living Center (SLC)
Jonathan Smith	Yakima County Development Association (YCDA)
Laura Armstrong	La Casa Hogar
Nathan Johnson	Yakima Health District (early departure)
Noemi Ortiz	Northwest Community Action Center (NCAC) (early departure)
Norman Thiel	SonBridge
Paul Tabayoyon	Asian Pacific Islander Coalition (APIC)
Raymond Wiseman	Yakama Power
Sylvia Schaefer	Blue Mountain Action Council (BMAC)
Not in attendance	
Isidra Sanchez	Opportunities Industrialization Center (OIC)
Kaila Lockbeam	Perry Technical Institute (Perry Tech)

All EAG members “checked-in” by sharing their favorite or lucky number and why it is significant. This activity introduced the EAG members to a meeting tool, Mural, which is an online whiteboard with sticky notes.

CBIs (1:20pm)

CBI Weighting

PacifiCorp shared the results of the CBI weighting analysis, which explored prioritization of CBIs based on input from the EAG, Public Survey, and other advisory groups. The final combined scores for each CBI and relative rankings of the CBI category were presented to the EAG. The EAG was then prompted with the following question: “Do these weights align with the equity priorities that are important to you and your community?” Reactions included:

- Energy resilience and risk reduction was ranked higher by the EAG than the public or other advisory groups. The EAG recognized that resiliency and risk reduction is part of the work that many of their organizations do.
- Low and middle-income members that don't have the ability to get loans, that rent housing, or that live in mobile or marginal homes cannot participate in many CBIs in the Energy Benefit category.
- The CBI weightings are difficult to think of as actionable.
- The CBI for culturally and linguistically appropriate outreach, which has a high weighting, will have a cascading effect into access that improves other CBIs, like participation in programs and energy benefits.
- Some CBIs may have incentives that encourage actions that may have subsequent or related negative implications. It will be important to ensure that CBIs have overall positive outcomes for named communities.

The EAG also asked questions for clarification that PacifiCorp responded to:

- Q: PacifiCorp's presence in Washington is largely transmission and distribution-based. How does local generation, such as solar, get developed? Can costs go down with local generation because of lower transmission costs?

- A: Any party interested in developing a renewable generator in PacifiCorp's Washington territory would need to obtain a site and complete an interconnection application with PacifiCorp in order to understand the feasibility, cost and timing of connecting the proposed generating resource to PacifiCorp's distribution or transmission grid. The interconnection process is regulated by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and the application process is laid out in PacifiCorp's Open Access Transmission Tariff (OATT) which can be found on PacifiCorp's Open Access Same-time Information System (OASIS) website.

More information can also be found here: [Transmission Services - PacifiCorp \(https://www.pacificorp.com/transmission/transmission-services.html\)](https://www.pacificorp.com/transmission/transmission-services.html)

After a party has established site control and conducted other project due diligence, they may participate in a PacifiCorp request for proposal (RFP) process and bid their project to the utility or they may request pricing and a contract as a qualified facility (QF) under the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act (PURPA) and Washington Chapter 480-106 WAC ELECTRIC COMPANIES—PURCHASES OF ELECTRICITY FROM QUALIFYING FACILITIES.

Costs are typically a function of the overall size of the project, the cost of equipment, the characteristics of the site, the cost of the engineering, labor and construction services, the cost of the interconnection and the required profit margin, and cost of capital required by the project developer and its investors. Costs of local generation may be greater than or less than resources that require transmission based on the items listed above as well as the quality of the solar resource as compared to those in other areas of PacifiCorp's territory.

It's important to understand that PacifiCorp's system benefit is not only a function of cost, but also a function renewable resource availability and the value a resource brings to PacifiCorp's system. Costs to develop a new renewable asset in Washington

versus other states serviced by PacifiCorp are reasonably close. The difference lies in the natural wind or solar resource available to a Washington site's asset. Therefore, given similar capital costs, new capital may be more likely to be proposed and selected in other states, such as Wyoming and Utah, where the same capital can yield a higher benefit to both the resource developer and PacifiCorp.

- Q: Why is there only 1 CBI selected for each CBI category?
 - A: We developed 22 draft CBIs. CETA requires at least 1 CBI per category, but 22 CBIs may be too ambitious for our first year. These CBIs are very interrelated. PacifiCorp recognizes that all of these CBIs are important, and even if they are not the selected with the final CBIs this year, we will still be considering them.
- Q: Some CBIs, such as the clean energy education, are not the highest-weighted in the category, but are weighted higher than those in other categories. Is there room to add some of these higher-rated CBIs for consideration?
 - A: CBIs are being considered primarily in the context of the CBI category. PacifiCorp is trying to manage this by developing actions that address some of these other CBIs even if they were not weighted highest in their category.
- Q: What is the plan now that the CBIs have been weighted? How will this be integrated with public participation?
 - A: It helps PacifiCorp identify what attributes of a given action are most important to the community. Actions have several attributes, such as a program that both reduces burdens and has an environmental benefit. PacifiCorp needs to begin tracking how well the company is meeting these objectives.

CBI Metrics

PacifiCorp provided an update to the EAG on potential metrics for each of the highest-weighted CBIs. In some cases, multiple metrics are under consideration based on data availability. The EAG asked a few questions about CBI metrics:

- Q: On non-energy benefits, the metric is the number of workshops. Could the metric focus on number of participants instead?
 - A: Yes, we will look at number of workshops and attendance.
- Q: The CBI metric for culturally and linguistically appropriate outreach only proposes language metrics. How is PacifiCorp going to measure culturally appropriate communications, such as with individuals on the Yakama Nation reservation?
 - A: PacifiCorp will primarily look at this through the program design to ensure that the company is listening and engaging well with people. We welcome suggestions for metrics that might be more appropriate.
- Q: I see a link between public health and energy security. For example, disconnecting electricity could create a health issue when customers instead heat their homes with wood. Who is tracking the data related to something like this?
 - A: We agree that there is a link between public health and energy security. There will very likely be multiple CBIs affiliated with specific actions. In this instance, if we implement a program/action intended to reduce disconnections, then that program/action would very likely have beneficial outcomes for public health—as they would have access to electricity that they would not have had if they had been

disconnected. This program/action would also likely have positive implications on the CBI of increased participation in company energy and efficiency programs. We are currently evaluating the CBIs affiliated with specific actions and intend to share our current thinking around the nexus between programs/actions and the CBIs in Meeting #6.

Break (2:10pm)

2021 IRP and Utility Actions (2:15pm)

PacifiCorp shared the process to create their 2021 IRP and summarized the supply-side and demand-side utility actions included in the plan. PacifiCorp also presented “other utility actions” that were influenced by the EAG and other advisory groups. All utility actions will be viewed and measured through the lens of the CBIs to account for equity considerations.

The EAG asked questions and gave comments throughout the presentation:

- Q: Does the supply-side include anything you’re picking up from Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act (PURPA), such as local solar projects in the Yakima Valley that might not make it into the request for proposal (RFP)?
 - A: The supply-side action item list does not include PURPA, but all Washington utilities are required to take outputs from these projects. The IRP planning process does assume known PURPA contracts; this list only reflects the results of the 2020 all-source RFP and so it not comprehensive of the entire system.
- Q: What about the cost of distribution for these remote generation facilities?
 - A: PacifiCorp’s system has the capability to select and transmit from remote wind and solar resources that are best suited to serve the company’s customers. Transmission and distribution costs are included in the IRP, as well the cost to acquire the resources.
- Q: Is there a list of Washington generation facilities? It seems like other states will see the benefit of these renewable energy generation facilities, but not Washington.
 - A: The RFP looked at Washington resources, but none of them met the threshold of least cost and least risk. The integrated nature of PacifiCorp’s system means that the company can select resources and optimize across the whole system, which lowers cost for all customers. Washington currently supplies approximately 300 MW of wind and 600 MW of hydro, and Oregon supplies approximately 1,000 MW of wind and solar. In the next RFP, PacifiCorp is hoping to solicit bids from a more diverse range of suppliers, including Washington-based suppliers. [Washington generation facilities can be found in CHAPTER 6 – LOAD AND RESOURCE BALANCE of the 2021 Integrated Resource Plan.](#) [Washington customers benefit from the lowest cost renewables, which PacifiCorp can import from competitively priced renewable resources in its six-state territory.](#) Likewise, customers in PacifiCorp’s other states may benefit from the low-cost hydro and wind resources that have previously been developed and constructed in Washington.
- Q: Are these numbers nameplate capacity?
 - A: Yes, all capacity numbers are nameplate capacity.
- Q: Renewables don’t always generate. How is PacifiCorp firming up its resource portfolio?

- A: PacifiCorp’s biennial resource planning process is designed to ensure that the company’s resource portfolio can generate and transport electricity to customers when and where they need it. While variable generating resources may not always generate, PacifiCorp serves multiple climate zones, is including energy storage co-located with new renewables, has access to multiple power markets, and includes margins in our planning process to ensure adequate supply during all hours of the year.
- Q: What are demand response resources?
 - A: These are actions that can be put into place where there are load constraints on the electricity system. For example, if it’s a warm day with lots of air conditioning use, demand response can incentivize customers to shift their air conditioning earlier in the day when power is more plentiful to ease demand on the grid, using thermostat programs for example.
- Q: What is the point of diminishing returns for energy efficiency programs?
 - A: The IRP selected significant energy efficiency resources throughout the planning period. Programs to deliver that resource will remain an important part of the Company’s clean energy transition. Certainly, some efficiency opportunities become less cost effective over time but at the same time new technology is evolving. Efficient light bulbs used to be an efficiency upgrade and are now the baseline for residential, but there are new energy efficiency opportunities such as more efficient heat pumps and more energy efficient windows. PacifiCorp updates its Conservation Potential Assessment study every two years to incorporate these types of changes. Outputs from this study are inputs to the next Integrated Resource Planning model.
- Q: As more homes become weatherized and higher building codes are passed, at what point do you stop investing in energy efficiency and have to account for demand growth instead?
 - A: PacifiCorp runs a planning process that models technology advances by sector for the IRP. We compare this model to external models to develop a menu of potential activities and costs. This menu then “competes” things like energy efficiency against supply-side resources to identify the lowest cost options. The planning process, conservation potential assessment, and the IRP energy efficiency selections indicate that energy efficiency remains a key resource for the foreseeable future.

Break (2:55pm)

Question and Feedback (3:00pm)

During this activity, the EAG used Mural to independently identify questions and feedback they wanted to discuss with PacifiCorp. These ideas were organized into themes, and the EAG was put in a Zoom breakout room to plan for the question and answer and feedback session. The questions or comments that were not addressed during the meeting are included in the following section with post-meeting responses from PacifiCorp in purple text.

Ideas and questions shared with PacifiCorp and PacifiCorp responses included:

- Concern about the differences in investment going to procuring new resources versus home improvement or demand-side programs. It is unclear if choosing “low-hanging fruit” options

that are cost-effective will serve the right communities. Typical programs target quick and easy participant recruitment rather than harder to reach rural communities, for example.

- How can local communities become more participatory in system-wide investments? Can civic organizations or community groups get involved? Do enough public organizations know about PacifiCorp's resource procurement process?
- Confusion and frustration with the current EAG process—the EAG is being asked to provide comment before plans are complete.
 - PacifiCorp response: The timeframe is compressed due to the November 1 CEIP filing deadline. [PacifiCorp plans to add another EAG meeting to the schedule in November to provide the EAG members with more opportunity for input.](#)
- Is this the last time we get to provide input on utility actions?
 - PacifiCorp response: Many of the actions come directly from the results of the IRP and PacifiCorp's Biennial Conservation Plan; CBIs will be applied to these actions. The third bucket of "other utility actions" stem directly from feedback provided by the EAG to allow for greater access to programs by Named Communities. EAG Meeting #6 in October will feature more input on actions and the CEIP.
- It seems like the focus on equity has gotten lost in some of the actions.
- CBIs, such as the one related to disconnections, could result in negative outcomes for some communities.
 - PacifiCorp response: To address disconnections, the company recognizes that the EAG is here to view the CEIP through an equity lens and addressing disconnections through actions that have a detrimental effect on the named communities is not equitable.
- All the CBIs need to be examined carefully about the impact it will have on named communities.
 - PacifiCorp response: PacifiCorp is looking at data to assist in measuring the outcomes as it relates to this challenge, especially for the CBIs identified specifically for named communities.
- Does PacifiCorp have metrics on the direct support the company has given to community actions where it is of no cost to the customer? This structure could be helpful for renters and low-income customers. Would that be a better metric for named communities? For example, the number of homes retrofitted, equipment installed, or dollars spent?
 - PacifiCorp response: [In a previous EAG meeting, PacifiCorp showed the data that tracks weatherization program participation. The company maintains data for location and account participation, so this can be analyzed.](#)
- Does PacifiCorp have the data for both utility and nonprofits that serve the area with energy efficiency programs?
 - PacifiCorp response: [PacifiCorp only presented data for utility programs to the EAG, but PacifiCorp's annual report includes data from nonprofit programs. The most recent annual report \(found at \[https://www.pacificorp.com/content/dam/pcorp/documents/en/pacificorp/environment/dsm/washington/2016-17_PacifiCorp_Low_Income_Weatherization_Report_WA_FINAL.pdf\]\(https://www.pacificorp.com/content/dam/pcorp/documents/en/pacificorp/environment/dsm/washington/2016-17_PacifiCorp_Low_Income_Weatherization_Report_WA_FINAL.pdf\) for program years 2016 –2017\) provides number of participants by weatherization implementation agency \(nonprofits\). Weatherization implementation agencies leverage Washington State Matchmaker funds with PacifiCorp funds to provide no cost weatherization services to](#)

program participants. PacifiCorp pays 50% of qualifying measures when Matchmaker funds are available, and 100% when Matchmaker funds are exhausted.

- Has PacifiCorp considered including alternative electric-powered transportation, like bicycles and scooters, to your EV program? These less expensive modes of travel can be great for named communities.
 - PacifiCorp response: The CBI is focused on electrification, not just vehicles and we agree that forms of transportation beyond light duty vehicles are important to consider as programs are designed.

Additional comments and questions from Mural

Some discussion points documented in Mural were not shared during the meeting with PacifiCorp. The EAG's additional input was organized into themes, which included:

- Outreach
 - What does the outreach strategy look like?
 - PacifiCorp response: The specific outreach strategy is in development; however, it will include expanded written and oral language services in Spanish.
 - How does PacifiCorp plan to differentiate between linguistically appropriate and culturally appropriate outreach?
 - PacifiCorp response: Culturally and linguistically appropriate outreach go hand-in-hand. Culturally appropriate outreach is communication that is equitable, respectful, and understanding of diverse cultural beliefs and needs. Linguistically appropriate outreach focuses on accessibility of culturally appropriate oral and written language.
 - How will PacifiCorp reach more participants for the next public meeting?
 - PacifiCorp response: PacifiCorp will conduct additional outreach for the next public meeting, including a customer bill insert, direct email, paid media ads, interactive voice response (IVR) recording on our customer care center phone lines, and text message notices to customers.
- Metrics
 - What kind of input can the EAG provide on metrics and when?
 - PacifiCorp Response: Metrics will be further discussed during EAG Meeting #6 that will include an opportunity for feedback.
- Programs
 - How does an EV rebate program work?
 - PacifiCorp response: This is a typical equipment rebate program. Customer would purchase a qualified EVSE product and submit documentation (proof of purchase, application, etc.) to Pacific Power. Pacific Power would approve the purchase and issue an incentive check to the customer. While this is one concept under consideration, the Company will consider program design details and other EV program concepts in the context of equitable access to these programs.

- How will you support the reduction of wood burning?
 - PacifiCorp response: We would like to increase incentives (Home Energy Savings program for all customers, it does not have an income qualification) for heat pumps starting in 2022. We have proposed 2022 changes to Schedule 114 (low-income weatherization) to increase funds available for repairs and permit installation of electric heating in cases where the home is being heated by space heaters.
- Will specific renter/owner programs be developed to serve the needs to tenants?
 - PacifiCorp response: We will continue the direct install of efficient lighting in multi-family units and increase incentives for multi-family window replacement beginning in 2022.
- Could batteries play a role in preventing the impacts of disconnection?
 - PacifiCorp response: If the disconnection is a reliability issue where the distribution line loses power then storage can help prevent individual customer impacts as the charge in the battery will delay the impacts of the power outage for those specific customers that have the storage facility. If the disconnection is related to nonpayment or something of that nature, then the battery will be able to delay the impacts of the disconnection for one cycle of the battery, but then will have no value as there are no means to replenish the power within the battery.
- Education
 - How is the progress of this work going to be shared?
 - PacifiCorp response: Educational materials and content will be available on Pacific Power's website. Updates will be shared during EAG meetings, as well as through direct outreach to customers, EAG members, advisory groups, and community agencies.
 - Who are the targets for educational programs?
 - PacifiCorp response: Targets for the educational content and materials are both adults and children. Materials will be available in English and Spanish.
 - Making a website for educational material has too many barriers for too many people for it to be broadly effective.
 - PacifiCorp response: While the content will be available on the Pacific Power website, materials will also be available to be printed and shipped to those that are interested.
 - Consider efforts and methods for children's education.
 - PacifiCorp response: Pacific Power offers a Wattsmart Schools education program in Washington through the National Energy Foundation. The program is designed to develop a culture of energy efficiency among teachers, students, and families. This program includes a presentation with educational video components as well as hands-on, group activities for 4th and 5th grade students. Students are also sent home with a Home Energy Worksheet in English and Spanish to explore energy use in their homes. In 2020 the program reached 3,399 students and was presented in 47 schools in Washington.

- Investments and planning
 - How are large industrial power users contributing to the solution?
 - PacifiCorp response: Industrial customer energy efficiency opportunities are included in Conservation Potential Assessment. They are eligible to participate in the Wattsmart Business energy efficiency program (and soon, Demand response programs). Large customers are major contributors to the system benefit charge that funds energy efficiency (and soon, DR) programs.
 - Will there be future investment maps available?
 - PacifiCorp response: With respect to planning, the biennial IRP selects an optimized mix of resource types and locations to serve our customers in the least cost and least risk way. No maps were developed in the recently completed 2021 IRP, but instead a table was developed showing the type and general location of proxy resources chosen for the preferred portfolio.
 - Where do direct efficiencies fall into the utility actions?
 - PacifiCorp response: Can you please provide more context for this question? We do not understand it enough to provide a response.
 - In the next RFP, consider local community benefits as criteria in evaluating bids.
 - PacifiCorp response: We will consider this for conservation and demand response resources. Washington CETA rules require PacifiCorp to evaluate all RFP bids based on the community benefit indicators develop in partnership with the EAG and reported in the CEIP.
- Community and equity
 - How will CETA directly affect my community?
 - PacifiCorp response: CETA requires utilities, stakeholders, and state agencies to work together. The objective of CETA is to ensure that all communities, primarily highly impacted communities and vulnerable populations, are equitably benefitting from the transformation to 100% clean energy through least cost resources, demand response, and other programs. Through PacifiCorp's newly formed EAG, public meetings and outreach, communities now have many opportunities and avenues to have a seat at the table and to have their voices heard as PacifiCorp develops its plan. PacifiCorp greatly welcomes this opportunity for our customers and communities to share their perspectives and new ideas for a cleaner energy future.
 - Will you create data for examining the difference between low income and other demand-side usage patterns geographically to ensure that you are serving the most needed areas first?
 - PacifiCorp response: Yes. PacifiCorp has accumulated participation data for low-income weatherization, low-income bill assistance, and demand-side programs. PacifiCorp has also developed its mapping capabilities to understand program participation within highly impacted communities.

Public Comment (3:20pm)

Two observers contributed to the public comment period.

- Q: Why doesn't the EAG get to listen to public comment?
 - A: We create public facing notes to capture the information shared, and the EAG has access to that. It's a function of time efficiency to use this time to engage with you while the EAG is in a breakout.
- Q: On slide 21, those resources will be considered part of the base, since they were in the 2020 RFP, correct? The incremental renewable energy to comply with CETA will derive from the 2022 RFP, correct?
 - A: The incremental resources will move us towards our future targets.
- Q: Would any of those resources from slide 21 been acquired without CETA?
 - A: Yes, they would have been acquired. They were the least cost resources. The preferred portfolio was developed with least cost, least risk. They were not evaluated by CETA, but we did an analysis afterwards to make sure that the preferred portfolio aligned with CETA. The portfolio was not designed for CETA targets, but it is aligned.
- Q: On slide 17, how much of the 550 MW of new DR are already committed, per footnote? Can you clarify the difference between slides 17 and 21 about how much DR is targeted for Washington—62MW versus 78MW?
 - A: The difference is a matter of timing. The action plan goes through 2024. 274 MW is the new DR coming online. That is in addition to get to the 550 MW.
- Q: Regarding slide 18, which shows emissions reductions, the statute requires that clean energy be used to serve retail load. Where is chart that shows increasing use of clean energy to meet 2030 and 2045 standards?
 - A: Executive summary and Chapter 9 in the IRP touch on this. The website has information on the Technical Workshops that we are holding, so it includes details of the assumptions made there. The IRP is only through 2040, but we are on track to meet 100% clean energy in 2045.
- Comment: For metrics, it seems like it would be valuable to track multiple values—both the percentage change and the total amount, for example.
- Comment: We don't think the metric about grants from the Pacific Power Foundation count as utility actions since they are from the foundation, not the utility.

Closeout and Next Steps (3:55pm)

EAG members were encouraged to reflect on something that surprised them during this meeting. Some surprises shared were:

- The action items presentation
- The wood burning as a high focus
- Community resiliency and power outages
- Difficulty of creating metrics

Attendees were reminded that meeting materials and notes are posted to the website and that Meeting #6 is on October 20. Feedback can be shared at ceip@pacificcorp.com and through [this survey](#), which is open to EAG members and the public.