# BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

In the Matter of	)		
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION	)	DOCKET NO.	2018-0165
Instituting a Proceeding To Investigate Integrated Grid Planning.	) )		
orra rranning.	)		

<u>ORDER</u> <u>NO</u>. \_\_\_37604

ESTABLISHING A PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE FOR THE FIRST REVIEW POINT

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

In the Matter of	<b></b> )	
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION	)	DOCKET NO. 2018-0165
Instituting a Proceeding To Investigate Integrated	) ) )	order no. <b>37604</b>
Grid Planning.	)	

#### ESTABLISHING A PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE FOR THE FIRST REVIEW POINT

By this Order, the Public Utilities Commission ("Commission") establishes a procedural schedule to review the first integrated grid planning ("IGP") review point filed by HAWAIIAN ELECTRIC COMPANY, INC., HAWAII ELECTRIC LIGHT COMPANY, INC., and MAUI ELECTRIC COMPANY, LIMITED (collectively "Hawaiian Electric").1

The Parties to this proceeding are Hawaiian Electric, the DIVISION OF CONSUMER ADVOCACY ("Consumer Advocate"), an ex officio party, and the Intervenors: (1) LIFE OF THE LAND; (2) ENERGY ISLAND; (3) COUNTY OF HAWAII; (4) HAWAII PV COALITION; (5) HAWAII SOLAR ENERGY ASSOCIATION; (6) PROGRESSION HAWAII OFFSHORE WIND, LLC; (7) ULUPONO INITIATIVE, LLC; and (8) BLUE PLANET FOUNDATION.

#### BACKGROUND

On July 12, 2018, the Commission opened this docket to investigate the IGP process.<sup>2</sup> On January 19, 2021, Hawaiian Electric filed its first IGP review point ("First Review Point").<sup>3</sup> The Commission sets the following procedural schedule to aid in its evaluation of the First Review Point.

II.
PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE

Procedural Step	Deadline Date
Consumer Advocate's and Intervenors' Comments on the First Review Point	February 25, 2021
Hawaiian Electric's Reply Comments	March 4, 2021

The Commission notes that this schedule contemplates a longer review period than Hawaiian Electric's request to receive Commission feedback on the First Review Point within 30 days, to allow Hawaiian Electric "to incorporate any feedback into the final IGP inputs and assumptions." However, the Commission has

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup><u>See</u> Order No. 35569, "Instituting a Proceeding to Investigate Integrated Grid Planning," filed on July 12, 2018.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>See "Hawaiian Electric Companies Updated IGP Workplan & Review Point," filed on January 19, 2021.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>First Review Point at 1.

already cautioned Hawaiian Electric that 30 days may not be sufficient time for meaningful review, and that the Commission may solicit feedback from the Parties to this docket. Based on the Commission's initial review of the First Review Point, the Commission believes that feedback from the Parties will significantly aid the Commission in its review. Therefore, the Commission establishes a procedural schedules that affords the Consumer Advocate and the Intervenors an opportunity to comment on Hawaiian Electric's First Review Point In doing so, the Commission asks the Consumer Advocate and Intervenors to answer the following questions as a part of their comments:

- 1. Reference: First Review Point, Exhibit A.1. Is the baseline set of forecasts and assumptions proposed in Exhibit A.1 of the First Review Point a reasonable starting point for IGP long-term planning? If so, why? If not, why not? If more information is necessary to answer this question, please explain.
- 2. Reference: First Review Point, Exhibit A.1.

  Does the First Review Point, Exhibit A.1 (i.e., the draft inputs and assumptions) sufficiently incorporate stakeholder feedback, or transparently explain why it did not, consistent with

2018-0165 3

 $<sup>^5\</sup>underline{See}$  Order No. 36725, "Providing Guidance," ("Order No. 36725") filed on November 4, 2019, at 13.

Commission guidance? If not, what stakeholder feedback should it incorporate, or explain the rejection of? Should Hawaiian Electric reconvene any Working Groups to further develop and incorporate stakeholder feedback?

- 3. Reference: First Review Point, Exhibit A.1. Please explain if the Commission should approve, reject, or modify the IGP inputs and assumptions presented in the First Review Point, Exhibit A1, and specifically identify any modifications that should be required before approval.
- 4. Reference: First Review Point at 5-6. Hawaiian Electric explains that the unmanaged electric vehicle charging assumption is incorporated into the baseline forecast and the outcomes from managed charging will then modify this forecast based on specific program provisions. Is this a reasonable way for Hawaiian Electric to treat electric vehicle charging? If so, why? If not, why not? If more information is necessary to answer this question, please explain.
- 5. Reference: First Review Point at 9. Hawaiian Electric proposes not to include energy efficiency, distributed energy resources, or electrification of transportation tariffs, and programs from ongoing Commission dockets in

2018-0165 4

 $<sup>^6\</sup>underline{\text{See}}$  Order No. 37419, "Providing Guidance," filed on November 5, 2020, at 13-14.

this first IGP cycle. Please explain if it is appropriate for Hawaiian Electric to wait until the next IGP cycle to include these tariffs and programs. If not, please propose a remedy. Please be as specific as possible.

- 6. Reference: First Review Point at 10, 30. The IGP Workplan proposed to consider programs concurrent with the request for information ("RFI") step within the competitive procurement process. The First Review Point includes a proposed updated sourcing process that appears to indicate that Hawaiian Electric will source solutions solely through procurement first. Then Hawaiian Electric would consider near term needs not met through procurement in a follow-on procurement and/or program or tariff. Is it appropriate for Hawaiian Electric to source solutions via procurements before considering pricing and programs? Should Hawaiian Electric compare solutions sourced through pricing, programs, and procurements simultaneously?
- 7. Reference: First Review Point at 12. Would retrospective evaluation of IGP deliverables by the newly

2018-0165 5

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>See "Planning Hawaii's Grid for Future Generations; Integrated Grid Planning Workplan, December 14, 2018" ("IGP Workplan" or "Workplan") filed on December 14, 2018, at 26 (stating "[t]he IGP process will use the full suite of options in sourcing resources (energy and capacity services), ancillary and T&D non-wires services, including RFI, RFP, programs and developing new tariffs.").

formed Stakeholder Technical Working Group provide benefits commensurate with the additional time spent?

8. Reference: First Review Point at 200-207. Is this response from the Technical Advisory Panel sufficient to provide independent review? If not, what additional independent review would be appropriate?

As noted above, this list of questions is not exclusive, and the Commission encourages the Parties to be more expansive in their comments, and address any aspect of the First Review Point. The Consumer Advocate and Intervenors may file comments on the First Review Point by February 25, 2021. Hawaiian Electric may file reply comments by March 4, 2021. In its reply comments, Hawaiian Electric may address these questions and any element of the Consumer Advocate's or Intervenors' comments.

6

2018-0165

<sup>\*</sup>See Order No. 36725 at 11-12 (stating "[f]or the stakeholder process outlined in the Workplan to effectively serve as a replacement for independent evaluation, the Technical Advisory Panel would have to take an active role in analyzing, evaluating, and providing public feedback on Working Group activities and Review Point filings . . . the [C]ommission expects [Hawaiian Electric] to use the Technical Advisory Panel to provide independent review of each Review Point filing[.]").

#### III.

#### ORDERS

#### THE COMMISSION ORDERS:

1. The foregoing procedural schedule shall govern the Commission's review of the First Review Point.

DONE at Honolulu, Hawaii \_\_\_\_\_FEBRUARY 4, 2021 \_\_\_\_

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

By Lames P. Griffin, Chair

//. - 1 IN IV

Jennifer M. Potter, Commissioner

Ву

Leodoloff R. Asuncion, Jr., Commissioner

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Mike S. Wallerstein Commission Counsel

2018-0165.ljk

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Order No. 37043, the foregoing Order was served on the date it was uploaded to the Public Utilities Commission's Document Management System and served through the Document Management System's electronic Distribution List.

## FILED

2021 Feb 04 PM 12:47

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

The foregoing document was electronically filed with the State of Hawaii Public Utilities Commission's Document Management System (DMS).