



Filing Receipt

Filing Date - 2025-04-24 01:43:37 PM

Control Number - 57579

Item Number - 198

PUC DOCKET NO. 57579
SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-25-11558

APPLICATION OF CENTERPOINT	§	BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE
ENERGY HOUSTON ELECTRIC, LLC	§	
FOR APPROVAL OF ITS 2026-2028	§	OF
TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION	§	
SYSTEM RESILIENCY PLAN	§	ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

HOUSTON COALITION OF CITIES' RESPONSE TO CENTERPOINT ENERGY
HOUSTON ELECTRIC, LLC'S FIRST REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

In connection with the Application of CenterPoint Energy Houston Electric, LLC ("the Company") for Approval of its 2026-2028 Transmission and Distribution System Resiliency Plan, Houston Coalition of Cities ("HCC") responds to CenterPoint Energy Houston Electric, LLC's First Request for Information.

Respectfully submitted,
Arturo G. Michel
City Attorney
YuShan Chang
State Bar No. 24040670
Senior Assistant City Attorney
900 Bagby, 4th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002
(832) 393-6442
(832) 393-6259 Facsimile
yushan.chang@houstontx.gov

CITY OF HOUSTON

-and-

Alton J. Hall, Jr.
State Bar No.: 08743740
Anam Fazli
State Bar No.: 24108599
Steven T. Moritz
State Bar No.: 24138686
ADAMS AND REESE LLP
LyondellBasell Tower

1221 McKinney St., Suite 4400
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 308-0106
(713) 308-4032 (Fax)
Alton.Hall@arlaw.com
Anam.Fazli@arlaw.com
Steven.Moritz@arlaw.com

By: /s/ Alton J. Hall, Jr.
Alton J. Hall, Jr.

COUNSEL FOR CITY OF HOUSTON

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 24th day of April 2025, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served upon on all parties of record by email, facsimile and/or First Class Mail.

/s/ Alton J. Hall, Jr.
Alton J. Hall, Jr.

REQUEST NO. CEHE-HCC-1-1

QUESTION:

For each witness that will provide testimony for Houston Coalition of Cities in this case, please provide, for the period since January 1, 2020, a complete copy of all prior testimonies submitted or testified to at hearing by the witness relating to the topic(s) the witness will address in this docket. For testimony that is available from the Commission docket, simply list the docket number, and for documents that are otherwise publicly available online, a link to access the online document may be provided instead of a copy.

ANSWER:

Michael Ivey

- PUCT Docket 56548
- PUCT Docket 57271

Kevin Mara

- PUCT
 - Docket 53442
- Florida Public Service Commission
 - <https://www.psc.state.fl.us/dockets>
 - Review of 2020-2029 Storm Protection Plans
 - Docket No. 20200071-EI Florida Power & Light
 - Docket No. 20200070-EI Gulf Power Company
 - Review of 2023-2032 Storm Protection Plans
 - Docket No. 20220051-EI Florida Power & Light
 - Docket No. 20220050-EI Duke Energy Florida
- Florida Public Service Commission - 2022 Storm Protection Plans
 - <https://www.psc.state.fl.us/dockets>
 - Technical assistance and pre-filed Direct Testimony on behalf of The State of Florida Public Counsel for Review of Storm Protection Plans pursuant to Rule 25-6.030, F.A.C., all testimony filed May 31, 2022
 - Docket No. 20220048-EI Tampa Electric Company
 - Docket No. 20220049-EI Florida Public Utilities Company
 - Review of 2026-2035 Storm Protection Plans
 - Docket No. 20250014-EI Florida Power & Light
 - Docket No. 20250015-EI Duke Energy Florida
 - Docket No. 20250016-EI Tampa Electric Company
 - Docket No. 20250017-EI Florida Public Utilities Company
 - Docket No. 20220050-EI Duke Energy Florida
 - Docket No. 20220051-EI Florida Power & Light
 - Technical assistance and pre-filed Direct Testimony on behalf of The State of Florida Public Counsel for Review of Storm Protection Plan Cost Recovery Clause, Testimony, filed September 2, 2022
 - Docket No. 20220010-EI

- Vermont Public Utility Commission
 - <https://puc.vermont.gov/epuc-information/case-and-document-search>
 - Prefiled Direct Testimony on behalf of the Vermont Department of Public Service in a case before the State of Vermont Public Utility Commission, Petition of Green Mountain Power for approval of its zero outages initiative as a strategic opportunity pursuant to 30 V.S.A. § 218d and GMP's multi-year rate plan. Direct Testimony Filed March 15, 2021.
 - Case No. 23-3501-PET

Steven Hunt

- PUCT
 - Docket 51445
 - Docket 53601
 - Docket 54825
 - Docket 55190
 - Docket 55525
 - Docket 54830
 - Docket 55993
 - Docket 55867
 - Docket 56165
 - Docket 56306
 - Docket 56211
 - Docket 57385
 - Docket 57775
- Railroad Commission of Texas
 - Case No. OS-23-00015513
 - Case No. OS-24-00018066
 - Case No. OS-24-00019196
- Public Service Commission of Maryland
 - <https://www.psc.state.md.us/search-case-files/>
 - Case No. 9695
- Vermont Public Utility Commission
 - <https://puc.vermont.gov/epuc-information/case-and-document-search>
 - Case No. 21-0898-TF
 - Case No. 22-0175-INV
 - Case No. 23-0561-TF
- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)
 - <https://elibrary.ferc.gov/eLibrary/search>
 - Docket No. EL22-7-000
 - Docket No. ER17-405-000
 - Docket No. ER17-406-000
 - Docket No. EL23-51
 - Docket Nos. ER21-915-001

SPONSOR:

Kevin Mara
Michael Ivey
Steven Hunt

RESPONSIVE DOCUMENTS:

None.

REQUEST NO. CEHE-HCC-1-2

QUESTION:

Pursuant to 16 TAC § 22.103(b), and to the extent not already identified in previous pleadings, please provide a list identifying each member of Houston Coalition of Cities that is represented by Houston Coalition of Cities in these proceedings. For each such member, please provide the basis for that member's interest in the outcome of this proceeding.

ANSWER:

Please refer to the Houston Coalition of Cities' Motion to Intervene filed in this proceeding for a list of each member of Houston Coalition of Cities.

SPONSOR:

Alton J. Hall, Jr.

RESPONSIVE DOCUMENTS:

None.

REQUEST NO. CEHE-HCC-1-3

QUESTION:

Admit or deny that under 16 TAC § 25.62, the Commission may approve an electric utility's system resiliency plan (SRP) that includes measures that are similar to the electric utility's existing programs or measures. If your answer is anything other than an unqualified "admit," please explain the basis for your response, identify which section(s) of 16 TAC § 25.62 prohibit this, and provide all documents supporting your response.

ANSWER:

Admit that the Commission may approve an SRP with measures similar to existing measures as long as the SRP measures meet all the requirements of 16 TAC § 25.62. Some of an electric utility's measures that are similar to the electric utility's existing programs or measures may not meet all the requirements of 16 TAC § 25.62. Failure to meet all the requirements would be a reason to not approve the measure.

Per 16 TAC §25.62(c) the Resiliency plan needs to (with emphasis added): "prevent, withstand, mitigate, or more promptly recover from the risks posed by resiliency events to its transmission and distribution systems."

Normal maintenance measures are not focused on resiliency and are needed to maintain expected system reliability. From 16 TAC §25.62(b)(3)ded: "Resiliency event -- an event involving extreme weather conditions, wildfires, cybersecurity threats, or physical security threats that poses a material risk to the safe and reliable operation of an electric utility's transmission and distribution systems. A resiliency event is not primarily associated with resource adequacy or an electric utility's ability to deliver power to load under normal operating conditions.

As required by 16 TAC § 25.62, in addition to not addressing risks associated with normal operations, SRP measures are restricted to certain methods:

The measures must use the methods listed in 16 TAC §25.62(c)(1). A method similar to existing programs or measures but that is not in the listed methods does not meet the requirements of the statute. The statute does not say using a listed method excludes the other requirements of 16 TAC §25.62 because the plan must meet ALL the requirements of the statute. A listed method may be similar to a program primarily associated with delivering power under normal operations, but a resiliency use of a similar method must address a resiliency specific event risk, not something primarily associated with normal operations.

16 TAC §25.62(c)(1) states a resiliency plan is comprised of one or more measures designed to prevent, withstand, mitigate, or more promptly recover from resiliency events. The rule says each measure must utilize one or more of the following methods:

- (A) hardening electric transmission and distribution facilities;
- (B) modernizing electric transmission and distribution facilities;

- (C) undergrounding certain electric distribution lines;
- (D) lightning mitigation measures;
- (E) flood mitigation measures;
- (F) information technology;
- (G) cybersecurity measures;
- (H) physical security measures;
- (I) vegetation management; or
- (J) wildfire mitigation and response.

As required by 16 TAC § 25.62, in addition to not addressing risks associated with normal operations, and the SRP measures being restricted to certain methods, the SRP must also be in the public interest:

Measures similar to existing programs or measures but are not in the public interest do not meet the requirements of 16 TAC § 25.62. In meeting the public interest, some of the considerations include that the measures should be expected to address resiliency risks (and resiliency is not primarily associated with normal operations), be reasonable in cost, prioritize areas of low performance and critical loads, is the best method, etc. In addition to these considerations, the plan must meet ALL the requirements of the statute.

16 TAC §25.62(d)(4) states in reviewing a Resiliency Plan, the Commission will consider:

- (A) the extent to which the plan is expected to enhance system resiliency, including whether the plan prioritizes areas of lower performance;
- (B) the estimated costs of implementing the measures proposed in the plan; and
- (C) whether the plan is in the public interest. The commission will not approve a plan that is not in the public interest. In evaluating the public interest, the commission may consider:

- (i) the extent to which the plan is expected to enhance system resiliency, including:
 - (I) the verifiability and severity of the resiliency risks posed by the resiliency events the resiliency plan is designed to address;
 - (II) the extent to which the plan will enhance resiliency of the electric utility's system, mitigate system restoration costs, reduce the frequency or duration of outages, or improve overall service reliability for customers during and following a resiliency event;
 - (III) the extent to which the resiliency plan prioritizes areas of lower performance;
 - (IV) the extent to which the resiliency plan prioritizes critical load as defined in §25.52 of this title (relating to Reliability and Continuity of Service);
- (ii) the estimated time and costs of implementing the measures proposed in the resiliency plan;

(iii) whether there are more efficient, cost-effective, or otherwise superior means of preventing, withstanding, mitigating, or more promptly recovering from the risks posed by the resiliency events addressed by the resiliency plan; or
(iv) other factors deemed relevant by the commission.

SPONSOR:

Kevin Mara
Michael Ivey

RESPONSIVE DOCUMENTS:

None

REQUEST NO. CEHE-HCC-1-4

QUESTION:

Admit or deny that a measure can provide both resiliency and reliability benefits. If your answer is anything other than an unqualified "admit," please explain the basis for your response, and provide all documents supporting your response.

ANSWER:

Admit. A measure can provide both resiliency and reliability benefits. However, to be an SRP measure, it must meet the requirements under 16 TAC § 25.62 and PURA § 38.078. The measure, as such, is not an SRP measure simply because it provides resiliency benefits. If the measure is used primarily for normal operations, but also has some resiliency benefits, it remains a reliability measure and does not qualify under the rule and statute as an SROP measure. See also response to CEHE HCC 1-3.

SPONSOR:

Kevin Mara
Michael Ivey

RESPONSIVE DOCUMENTS:

None

REQUEST NO. CEHE-HCC-1-5

QUESTION:

Admit or deny that under 16 TAC § 25.62, the Commission may approve an electric utility's system resiliency plan measure that provides both resiliency and reliability benefits. If your answer is anything other than an unqualified "admit," please explain the basis for your response, identify which section(s) of 16 TAC § 25.62 prohibit this, and provide all documents supporting your response.

ANSWER:

Admit. The Commission may approve measures that meet the requirements of 16 TAC §25.62. These measures must provide reliability benefits and resiliency benefits. The Commission must also consider the requirements of PURA § 38.078. See also responses to CEHE HCC 1-3 and CEHE HCC 1-4.

SPONSOR:

Kevin Mara
Michael Ivey

RESPONSIVE DOCUMENTS:

None

REQUEST NO. CEHE-HCC-1-7

QUESTION:

With reference to the direct testimony of Mr. Ivey and Mr. Mara, please identify each city official and any personnel from a city's office of emergency management or similar body (other than outside counsel representing a city) with whom Mr. Ivey and/or Mr. Mara personally met, spoke, or otherwise communicated to discuss that city's views on CenterPoint Houston's SRP or appropriate resiliency measures for that city and provide the date of each such meeting, conversation, or communication.

ANSWER:

Subject to and without waiving the objections filed on 4/21/25, Mr. Mara and Mr. Ivey had no direct communications with the city's office of emergency management or similar body.

SPONSOR:

Kevin Mara
Michael Ivey

RESPONSIVE DOCUMENTS:

None

REQUEST NO. CEHE-HCC-1-8

QUESTION:

With reference to the direct testimony of Mr. Ivey and Mr. Mara in this docket, please state whether Mr. Ivey and Mr. Mara reviewed, prior to filing his testimony, the SRP of any other Texas electric utility that had been previously approved by the Public Utility Commission of Texas and, if so, which electric utilities' approved SRPs he reviewed.

ANSWER:

Mr. Ivey reviewed the filed plans of TNMP and had discussions with Mr. Mara regarding SRPs of other Texas electric utilities such as Entergy, AEP, and Oncor.

Mr. Mara reviewed the filed plans of TNMP, Entergy, AEP, and Oncor.

SPONSOR:

Kevin Mara
Michael Ivey

RESPONSIVE DOCUMENTS:

None

REQUEST NO. CEHE-HCC-1-9

QUESTION:

With reference to the direct testimony of Mr. Ivey, please explain how Mr. Ivey 1-9 distinguishes between "updating obsolete ... equipment" (see page 15, lines 15-18 for example) and "modernizing electric transmission and distribution facilities" as permitted under 16 Tex. Admin. Code § 25.62(c)(1)(B).

ANSWER:

Under reliability planning for normal operations, if a component is obsolete or at end of life, then it would be replaced under normal operations. Any old piece of equipment will naturally be replaced with modern technology that has more features and capabilities than yesterday's technology, just like we see with cars, cellphones, and appliances. As the utility system continues to age and get renewed under normal operations and maintenance, we use these new features as part of our day-to-day operations, maintenance, and planning. This natural modernization of the system happens whether we plan for resiliency or not because the system has a perpetual life and is constantly being renewed.

However, if the component is still providing good functionality for the modern reliable system under normal operations but is inadequate for resiliency events, then it would be replaced or upgraded as a resiliency measure and can have a resiliency cost under the modernizing method.

Using a method under 16 TAC §25.62(c)(1)(B) does not mean the SRP no longer has to meet the other requirements of 16 TAC §25.62. See the response to CEHE HCC 1-3.

SPONSOR:

Michael Ivey

RESPONSIVE DOCUMENTS:

None