# On-screen notes from 2/28/2025 VA Dpt. Of Energy PBR Stakeholder Engagement Meeting

This document contains the on-screen notes taken during the February 28, 2025 stakeholder engagement meeting for the Virginia Department of Energy’s PBR process. The on-screen notes reflect participant report-outs to the whole group, following a small group discussion session during which participants responded to the following two questions:

1. What do you want to get out of the stakeholder process and what input do you want to provide?
2. What should be the top three goals for the output from the stakeholder process?
   1. Goals could be in terms of final report format, types of recommendations to the SCC, key subjects to address, etc.
   2. Reflect priorities for the group that can be reasonably addressed in the time we have

#### On-screen notes (documented by Aileen Cole, GPI)

* Looking at current PBR elements in code—evaluating efficacy
* Support for spreadsheet ideas across performance areas
* More comprehensive approach—seeing what VA would look like in the future if that was applied
* Needs a balanced approach across all metrics/needs. Need to progress in the right direction on everything.
* Want to focus on consensus
  + Areas of consensus should be areas with a heavy focus on additional research on implementation
  + Once there’s consensus, want to ID which PBR tools can be most successful in those areas
  + Mutual understanding among groups can be a form of consensus
  + Identify the stakeholder group’s top priority areas for SCC study, specific tools of interest, etc.
  + Identify different stakeholder perspectives that could be grouped together
* Affordability
  + Might need additional definition in report—can mean different things to different people
  + Systemwide affordability
  + Impacts on customer affordability (residential, industrial)
  + How PBR tools can help reach EE targets to support affordability
* Desire to learn, and better understand PBR mechanisms
  + Education to enable robust participation in this process
* Balanced presentation of benefits/drawbacks of alternative forms of regulatory ratemaking
  + The value of a tool is dependent on the goal for which it will be used, and that value must be balanced against its costs
* Need to clarify and prioritize Commonwealth’s clean energy goals (maybe beyond the scope of this process, but worth considering)
* Understand what we have now, do they work, and what are the specific problems we may want to address via alternative reg. mechanisms—what is the current landscape, and what do we want to change?
  + Understanding the pros/cons of current reg. framework—what works, what could be changed?
  + Clarity on problems we’re trying to solve before selecting tools to solve them
  + Understand the unintended consequences of certain mechanisms
* Reliability, resilience
* Lifecycle impacts and assessments—decommissioning, broader impacts of technologies, etc.
* All stakeholders have a good understanding of the process
* Ensuring consistency with public interest needs
* Longer term looks at energy system return on investment—any resulting framework should be able to look at the system more holistically, with an understanding of how the whole energy system works together (programs, technologies, etc.)