**Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission Comments on Draft RTF 2020 Work Plan**

The Regional Technical Forum staff thank the WUTC for its thorough review and comments on the RTF’s draft 2020 Work Plan and Business Plan. Staff have addressed many of the editorial comments in the business plan document directly. Below are staff’s response to non-editorial comments.

**WUTC Comment:** Designated funding stream explanation (e.g., electric ratepayers solely support electric demand side managements programs, gas ratepayers support natural gas programs) is helpful. However, at 6/18 RTF meeting funding discussion acknowledged a slight overall decrease for electricity measures within 2020-24 work plan. For transparency, recommend calling out this overall electricity decrease due to electricity-natural gas 75 percent / 25 percent funding carve out supporting dual fuel measures. Please see suggested redlines within 2020 RTF Business Plan.

**Response:** Staff agrees that this is one of the drivers for a reduction in electric spending, relative to the previous funding period. Staff, however, does not plan to highlight this within the Business Plan itself.

**WUTC Comment:** Interplay between organization funding (i.e., Table 1, p. 3) and Council contribution is confusing. Is external organization annual funding goal $1.8M or $1.61 (i.e., $1.8M – 185,600)? If latter scenario is likely, would $185,600 of external org funding first go to broader NWPCC and then get allocated back to RTF? Or does $185,600 represent the value of the Council’s in-kind contribution (e.g., office space made available for RTF staff). Please reconcile / clarify.

**Response:** The RTF budget ($1.8 million plus 2.5% inflation annually) is fully supported by the funders. This includes all the RTF work and the RTF Manager. The discussion of the Council’s contribution is to be clear that in addition to the RTF budget, the RTF contributes staff time to the RTF. This is done through technical review, legal, and admin support. This staff time is estimated to be around $186,000 and does not include any Council contribution of office or meeting space.

**WUTC Comment:** Last sentence, first paragraph [of Existing Measures Maintenance section] claims number of measures “sunsetting or otherwise requiring review” annually during 2020-24 is commensurate with 2015-18 funding cycle, when 15 to 30 measures were considered annually. Does “considered” imply adequately considered / evaluated? Is anticipated funding level sufficient to support quality consideration / evaluation of said number of measures?

**Response:** Yes. The draft budget reflects what staff estimates to be a sufficient level of funding to support quality analysis. This is true for all budget categories.

**WUTC Comment:** With the exception of this Rural Utility Support line item, all other Measure Analysis sub-sections (e.g., Existing Measure Maintenance, New Measure Development) link directly to the 9 categories listed in the proposed 2020 budget (i.e., Table 4, p. 5). Rather than organized into a separate category, are Rural Utility Support activities allocated across the 9 proposed annual budget categories? Please clarify.

**Response:** The Small/Rural utility work is a portion of the New Measure Development category. This has been clarified in the Business Plan. The Business Plan specifically highlights this work, separate from other new measure analysis, due to the importance for some stakeholders.

**WUTC Comment:** Narrative indicates $50K budgeted annually to contract out Regional Conservation Progress (RCP) Report data collection and analysis. However, 2020 budget (i.e., Table 4, p. 5) lumps this $50K item with website support / maintenance. Furthermore, review of rows 60-62 in the “Category Detail (2020)” tab within the Draft2020RTFWorkPlan Excel workbook suggests RCP Report and RTF website collectively cost $80K. Council staff appears to contribute directly the $30K for website updates. Please clarify total cost of the Website and RCP category within the proposed 2020 budget (Table 4) (i.e., is the budgeted cost $50K or $80K?).

**Response:** For this and other categories of work, the Business Plan focuses on the budget as supported directly by the RTF funders (and does not include the estimated Council contribution of staff time). The proposed budget for the RCP is $50,000, as captured in Table 4, described in the Business Plan, and in row 62 of the “Category Detail (2020)” tab of the draft work plan. In addition to the $50,000, staff estimates that the Council contributes approximately $15,000 on the completion of the RCP. This estimate is also reflected in row 62 of the “Category Detail (2020)” tab of the draft work plan. At this time, staff is not proposing any direct RTF funder contribution to the website. Website development and management is currently supported through the Council. Staff estimates that the Council contributes approximately $30,000 of staff time through the RTF Assistant and others supporting website updates. This is reflected in row 61 of the “Category Detail (2020)” tab of the draft work plan.