



UM 2225 Investigation Launch Workshop

Wednesday, February 9, 2022

9:30 a.m. (PT)

[Link to Zoom Meeting](#)

Call-In: 971-247-1195 - Meeting ID: 884 5548 2423 - Passcode: 4668815788

Meeting Objectives

The purpose of this workshop is to review the Oregon Public Utility Commission’s (OPUC) HB 2021 implementation strategy, refine and prioritize key issues for near-term Commission guidance relating to Clean Energy Plans, and receive input on the Clean Energy Plan investigation process and schedule.

Agenda

The first portion of this meeting is a Commission Workshop to share strategy and scoping research with the Commission and other participants. The second portion will not include Commission attendance.

1. Commission Workshop

9:30a – 11:00a

9:30a	Welcome <i>Commission remarks, introductions, agenda review, ground rules, meeting protocols.</i>
9:50a	HB 2021 overview and strategy <i>Key topics, timing, and how to engage</i>
10:00a	Scoping presentation <i>Findings and themes emerging from scoping questionnaire and other research</i>
10:40a	Closing discussion

2. Break

11:00a -12:00p

3. Staff Workshop

12:00p – 3:00p

12:00p	Small group discussion <i>Participants will self-select into break out groups to refine and prioritize within key scoping work streams – SEE ATTACHMENT A</i>
1:15p	Large group report out and synthesis <i>Discuss the findings of each breakout group and how they can inform how and when to address key issues throughout this docket</i>
2:15p	BREAK
2:30p	Process discussion <i>Questions and ideas for an accessible, meaningful investigation process and schedule.</i>
2:50	Closing discussion

Questions

If you have questions about the investigation, workshop, or questionnaire, please contact:

Caroline Moore, Strategy and Integration Division
caroline.f.moore@puc.oregon.gov
(503) 480-9427

Kim Herb, Utility Strategy & Planning Manager
kim.herb@puc.oregon.gov
(503) 428-3057

Attachment A – Work Streams for Small Break-out Group Exercise

The table below summarizes the major themes emerging from the PUC’s initial scoping research. Staff will use these work streams in an exercise to refine and prioritize the near-term issues within the UM 2225 scope. Participants will be asked to self-select into a break-out group focused on the issues in one work stream. Staff asks that organizations avoid multiple representatives per work streams. Contact Staff with concerns.

You are invited to indicate likely break out group participation from your organization [using this form](#).

Work streams	Scoping questions – these are *examples* from the survey and not Staff recommendations	
Integration	Relationship between CEP and IRP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the format of a CEP filed with the IRP e.g., separate chapter, addendum? • Will the CEP and the IRP focus on meeting different needs? If not, why file separately? • Where are resource activities acknowledged if the CEP and IRP are filed separately? • How to avoid locking in an action in one plan prior to seeing the impact on another plan? • How to maintain consistency in reviewing CEPs filed with-and-without the IRP? • When, if at all, should the Commission require the CEP to be filed with the IRP?
	CEPs for multi-state utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What will CEPs for multi-state utilities look like and how will they interact with the IRP? • How to adapt to multi-state cost allocation methodology updates e.g., PAC post-2024? • How to ensure transparency and understanding of the interaction between a CEP and a multi-state cost allocation methodology? • What would be relevant information for the Commission to consider in looking at whether a CEP is “based on or contained in other information developed consistent with a cost-allocation methodology approved by the commission (HB 2021 §4(3)(b))?”
	Relationship between CEP and DSP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the DSP (and IRP) roll into the CEP? • Will the CEP be a layer of the IRP that uses DER and resiliency analysis from the DSP? • How to consider the portfolio of decarbonization actions between CEP, DSP, IRP? • How to evaluate consistency between CEPs, IRPs, and DSPs?
Community Lens	Risk-based resiliency analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to define resiliency (system and community resiliency)? • Which resiliency actions are included e.g., generation, system hardening? • How is the resiliency analysis used in the CEP e.g., action plan? • How will the costs and benefits (value) of a qualifying action be measured? • What is the relationship between Wildfire Protection Plans and CEP’s?
	Offsetting fossil fuels with community-based generation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to define community-based generation, which actions are included in the scope? • How is the analysis used in the CEP e.g., action plan? • Which values will be considered e.g., economic benefits, environmental justice impacts, system benefits such as avoiding transmission? • How to establish a transparent cost-benefit analysis for community-based project assumptions (versus utility-scale supply side options)? • How to emphasize community input in this analysis?
	Health, economic, environmental, other benefits and costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which community benefits will be evaluated in the action plan? • How will health benefits be measured e.g., mental health, stress, pollution? • How will economic benefits be measured e.g., job creation? • Will costs and benefits be measured at a more granular geographic level? • How to result in accrual of broad benefits and wealth building for currently and historically marginalized communities?
Engagement	UCBIAG*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the role of the UCBIAG in the CEP? In the IRP? • Is the CEP where the Commission oversees the implementation of the UCBIAG? • Will the Commission time the UCBIAG biannual report with IRP/CEP?
	CEP and IRP engagement practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the expectations for accessible, meaningful CEP engagement prior to filing? • What are the expectation for accessible, meaningful CEP engagement at the OPUC? • How to create both technical and accessible spaces? • Will the CEP include a description of the engagement process and in what level of detail? • Will the Commission’s DEI Director be involved in this investigation and CEP processes? • How can the engagement remain accessible if CEPs and IRPs are filed separately?
	Disclosure and transparency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to promote data transparency and consistency across utilities? • How move toward common formats, inputs, assumptions, models, etc? • What are the utilities’ disclosure concerns and strategies to overcome? • Will the Commission use any independent analyses to reduce information asymmetry?

	Coordination of HB 2225 with related processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can UM 2225 participants remain aware of related HB 2021 implementation and other OPUC processes? • How can questions that come up in other dockets relating to environmental justice, or low-income protections, or community climate resilience be integrated into this process?
Roadmap	Annual actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will annual goals for actions be set and who will be involved? • What is the expectation for demonstrating continual progress? • What is the focus of the annual actions e.g., acquiring/retiring resource types, setting procurement targets (MW), opening a procurement, emissions reductions? • What annual actions will be included e.g., RFPs, community projects, voluntary products? • Will the procurement process allow for diverse ownership of renewable energy sources? • What information will send meaningful market signals?
	Supply side options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to consider long-lead time investments in near-term action plans e.g., transmission? • What transmission assumptions (costs, for firm or non-firm transmission) cost, and timelines and construction timelines will be included? • Will the Commission prioritize demand-side actions and calibrate efficiency measures to provide emissions reductions by specific years? • Will the plan consider other infrastructure to enable non-emitting resources? • What are the expectations to consider a range of actions and alternatives?
	Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the legal standard/what does acknowledgement signal? • What is the recourse for non-compliant plans, including “continual progress”? • Will stakeholders have the opportunity to engage with the DEQ verification? • Is the Commission considering whether to develop additional criteria to ensure that DEQ approved forecasts are consistent with targets?
Other Analyses	Evaluation of costs, risks, timing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to evaluate technical and economic feasibility? • How to evaluate if the utility is taking actions as soon as practicable? • How evaluate costs and will the 6% rate impact be incorporated? • How to minimize the likelihood of triggering off-ramps, slowing progress? • How to balance near and long term costs, prevent overbuild, consider market maturation? • What risks will be evaluated, is risk evolving beyond the current IRP approaches? • How to capture a high electrification future?
	State policy requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to incorporate community-wide green products, VRET, and other voluntary actions? • How to incorporate the RPS, RPIP, and small-scale renewable energy project carve out? • How to consider other state planning goals, such as resiliency and offshore wind goals?
	Markets and regional impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What assumptions should be used for reliability and regional availability e.g., how to consider UM 2143 and the Northwest Power Pool’s Western Resource Adequacy Program? • How to coordinate with regional and federal transmission planning, incentives, efforts? • How to incorporate regional markets into CEP analysis e.g., EIM, EDAM?

*UCBIAG = Utility Community Benefits and Impacts Advisory Group found in HB 2021 §6