

Wendy Bredhold
Sierra Club
wendy.bredhold@sierraclub.org

VIA EMAIL

Dear Ms. Bredhold:

I am replying in response to the letter of September 8, 2021, signed by you, Amanda Shephard, Dr. Indra Frank, Shannon Anderson, Barry Kastner, John Blair and Leslie Webb.

We understand the concerns that you have expressed, and we agree that transparency and engagement associated with the IRP are critical. We are working hard to achieve those objectives, along with the other objectives of discussing the IRP analysis and our rationale in ways that is accessible to a wide range of participants.

There are a number of points in your letter that I believe require clarification.

1. The access to public being more limited since COVID is factually incorrect. The number of participants in the daylong IRP meetings is several times larger we had previously experienced with in person meetings, even though the in-person meetings allowed for remote access. We are seeing more people participate in the meetings and with a far wider range of views and perspectives. The pre-COVID meetings were largely attended by a consistent group of stakeholders and their technical experts. In the current arrangement we are seeing many more stakeholders, as well as individual customers not affiliated with an interest group. In addition, I am pleased that we have added meetings in the evenings to allow people who work during the day to attend. These meetings have been geared towards stakeholders and customers that are less familiar with the IRP process and how it works. These have been well attended and have generated a high degree of engagement.
2. With respect to the change in format for the most recent meetings, it is correct that we have shifted the format from a very large zoom meeting to a webinar format.
 - a. We did this because we found that the previous format was limiting the ability for all stakeholders to engage effectively.
 - b. We found that a number of stakeholders did not have the opportunity to pose their questions and that the conversations, and questions and answers, were being dominated by a more vocal subset of the attendees to the meetings, limiting access to all stakeholder to get their questions out and answered.
 - c. The shift allows all stakeholders to pose questions through the Q&A box, and these questions and corresponding answers are ALL visible to ALL attendees.

We know this to be true because in many cases stakeholder attendees are voting up questions with the “thumbs up” feature and they are often answering each others’ questions via the Q&A function. The value of the having the questions posed in this manner is that it allows the Duke Energy experts, who are supporting the IRP process, to answer the questions in writing in real time for those that pose the questions. The question and answer log is then added as part of the record of the meeting. Using this process we find that we are able to address several times more questions that we were even asked in the previous format. We have also noted that the number of people asking questions is far greater in this format than the previous format.

- d. All written questions and all written answers, from anyone attending the IRP meeting webinar, are visible to all other attendees in real time. These are also all included in the meeting summaries provided after the meeting.
 - e. There are some questions that are read out to the group and responded to by the presenter. This is only about 20% or less of all questions asked. These questions are selected by the facilitators or by Duke Energy personnel as questions that they believe would be useful in providing greater clarification or helping to increase the understanding of the points being made.
3. The public is not shut out. In fact, there is a far greater number of people engaged in this process and the shift to the current format has more than tripled the number of questions that are asked and answered as compared to the previous format where all questions were asked in voice. The data clearly indicates that there is much greater customer and stakeholder input and feedback coming through the current process than from any method we have used previously. The polling we did at the end of the last meeting indicated high degrees of satisfaction with the overall meeting.

We have considered your first set of requests and have provided our initial feedback below:

1. View the participants list within the online platform;
 - a. This is a limitation of the platform we are using for the meeting. We will investigate what is possible here within the limits of individual privacy rights.
2. See all comments and questions in the chat feature;
 - a. Participants already can see all questions asked, and who has asked them. All participants can already see all the answers to the questions, including who has answered, even when they are answered by other participants.
3. Have the option to be seen on camera;
 - a. This is currently a limitation of the platform that we are using. We will investigate what we can do to make this possible.
4. Ask questions aloud if they so choose.
 - a. This has been done in the past when requested by a stakeholder or when Duke Energy needed additional clarity on a question asked. Stakeholders can raise their hand or ask to speak on a written question. We will work with the facilitation team to ensure that they have good protocols in place so that asking questions aloud does not limit the ability of the Duke Energy team to cover the material within the timeframes and that it does not result in the shutting down or limiting the input and questions of the full body of stakeholders attending.

Duke has not ignored the IRP rules, and to assert that we are simply ignoring them is not accurate. We have worked hard to keep within them and have explained to the stakeholders, throughout the process, the challenges that exist in trying to simultaneously meet these requirements while also expanding the range of analysis to meet specific requests of stakeholders, and stay on the original schedule that we had committed to. We have sought and thought we had received concurrence from the stakeholders that it was a higher priority to include more analysis, as requested by stakeholders, and that it was acceptable that there would be compression on the schedule and the ability to provide materials in advance. In this IRP process we are undertaking far more analysis than had been done in the past, in part because of the growing number and availability of resource types, in part because of a widening range of possible futures that need to be modeled and in large part because of Duke Energy's commitment to model scenarios and portfolios that are specifically requested by stakeholders. We will redouble our efforts to meet those requirements, although this could result in a need for us to revisit our ability to model and analyze portfolios requested by stakeholders. This represents a significant amount of work that is complicated by the needs to assess what else will be changing in a highly fluid market. This is easily the most complex IRP environment that Duke Energy Indiana has had the opportunity to study.

With respect to your final set of requests, we offer the following responses:

- **Access:** Meetings should be scheduled at times when everyday Hoosier customers can access them, and accommodations should be made for people of all abilities.
 - We have done this. We have scheduled meetings at multiple times in the day to accommodate the need to have stakeholders, commission staff and other interested stakeholders attend. This includes both meetings during the day and meetings in the evenings. We note that the daytime meetings, held virtually have generally resulted larger numbers of attendees 70-100+, while the evening meetings have generally been significantly smaller in number.
 - The meetings are specifically designed to address a wide range of technical understanding and technological ability.
- **Engagement:** Meetings should allow plenty of time for stakeholders and customers to ask questions, aloud if they so choose, and receive meaningful answers.
 - The meetings are currently designed to ensure that there is time to allow all attendees to ask questions and to have their questions answered in a manner that is not rushed and is responsive.
 - As we committed to above, we will continue to allow people to ask questions aloud and to ensure that this does not diminish the ability of every stakeholder to ask their questions and have their questions answered.
- **Transparency:** Meetings should be announced at least a month in advance so people can have adequate notice and time to prepare. Agendas and materials should be posted at least seven days in advance in line with the IRP rule.

There is limited time between now and the November 1 filing deadline. We will present tentative dates for the remainder of the meetings tomorrow. We will endeavor to provide the slides 7 days in advance but ask for understanding in the event that we cannot accomplish that goal along with ensuring that the analysis we present is comprehensive and has been subjected to quality control.

I have asked the facilitator team to connect with you and your colleagues to ensure that you all have visibility to the full set of questions, answers and conversations among the stakeholders and between stakeholders and Duke Energy Indiana personnel in the webinar scheduled for tomorrow.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Stan Pinegar". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Stan Pinegar
President, Duke Energy Indiana