Northern Indiana Public Service Company LLC
Integrated Resource Planning
Public Advisory Meeting #2b
DSM: MPS & IRP Inputs

SUMMARY

November 10, 2026

Welcome & Introduction
Abe Lang, Manager Strategy and Risk

Abe Lang provided introductory comments noting that this meeting is an extension of the second public stakeholder meeting that was held on October 20. It was the intent to discuss this topic at that meeting, but due to some schedule changes, we had to move the discussion regarding DSM, both demand response and energy efficiency. Abe also introduced our external partners on DSM, Jeffrey Huber, GDS Associates, and Jesse Smith, Demand Side Analytics.

DSM: MPS & IRP Inputs

Energy Efficiency
Jeffrey Huber, GDS Associates

Jeffrey Huber presented on energy efficiency, covering the topics of modeling approach, updated sales forecast, incentive and non-incentive costs per kWh comparison, IQW and IQ-HEAR, 2024 vs 2026 comparison (net cumulative annual savings, bundle costs, net T&D), levelized cost comparison (2024 vs 2026 RAP and 2026 RAP vs 2026 E-RAP).

Participants had the following questions and comments, with answers provided after:

- Dan Mellinger, Energy Futures Group on behalf of Citizens Action Coalition (CAC), asked: To reconcile the earlier comment that was made that data centers are excluded, but in the slide, we see that the forecast uses the same opt out rate as the 2024 MPS. If new data center loads are coming into the forecast, but you're applying the same opt out rate, that seems like a portion of the data center loads would be reflected here.
    - Jeffrey Huber responded: This is the NIPSCO forecast already excluding the data centers, which is same in 2024. So, it's the same, we're starting with the same point. This is the sales forecast, and it doesn't include the data center load already.
- Dan Mellinger, Energy Futures Group on behalf of CAC, followed up: So, it's almost like a two-step process. First, remove data centers from the forecast. Second, apply an opt-out rate to get to eligible sales.

    - Jeffrey Huber responded: Yes, and that first step was done by NIPSCO. The forecast that was provided to us already excluded that load. And as mentioned earlier and noted on the slide, it's the same opt out rate. The percentage of sales for commercial industrial that we assumed were opt out sales. We just kept constant with the percentage in 2024. We didn't get a full new database of customer accounts and sales and a flag for opt-outs to refresh that. That would be done in a full market potential study.
- Dan Mellinger, Energy Futures Group on behalf of CAC, asked: On slide 6, in selecting option 2 and not choosing option 3, did GDS evaluate the difference between the 2026 and 2027 levels at the bottom where you note option 2 increased from $0.10 per kWh to $0.14 per kWh across all sectors. What would option 3 have landed at?
    - Jeffrey Huber responded: I don't have the number, but it is higher. And they were also increasing 2027, 2028, and 2029. That led to the question of which one do we land on. So, we thought using the most current 2026 level was most consistent with what we would have done previously as well.
- Dan Mellinger, Energy Futures Group on behalf of CAC, followed up: At the 2026 levels, it could create a scenario where the incentives are losing ground relative to costs. Do you know if that is the case in the MPS?
    - Jeffrey Huber responded: We made an adjustment to the measure costs so that the incentives were generally covering the same percentage that incremental measure costs. In reality, yes, if costs continue to go up and we are keeping them at 2026 levels and flat, it may be true that in the future, those incentive levels do need to increase as well. We thought option 2 was the most consistent approach with 2024 and if there needs to be continued refinements to incentives and costs, that will happen in the full-scale update.
- Dan Mellinger, Energy Futures Group on behalf of CAC, followed up: Understanding that incentive levels held steady throughout the time frame, does that imply that incremental measure costs is also held steady so that the percentage remains the same?
    - Jeffrey Huber responded: It does.
- Dan Mellinger, Energy Futures Group on behalf of CAC, asked: On slide 7, non-incentive costs are growing faster under the IRP update. Is the assumed inflation different compared to the 2024 MPS?
    - Jeffrey Huber responded: I think it is a little bit different, but I think that is more driven by some changes to what is going on in the measure mix, as well as just a slightly higher starting point. It's not purely just inflation. It does look like a higher pace, but it has been driven more by the measure mix.
- Rebecca TeKolste, Hoosier Environmental Council, asked: Do you have a list of measures that can be shared, both IQ and not?
    - Jeffrey Huber responded: Yes, we can produce a list of the energy efficiency measures that were included in the bundles.
    - Abe Lang confirmed: Yes, you can share that.
- Dan Mellinger, Energy Futures Group on behalf of CAC, asked: Will the modeling files be made available for review?
    - Abe Land responded: We have shared our IRP modeling inputs with those that have signed non-disclosure agreements. If there is a separate set of inputs that are being requested here, let me know.
- Dan Mellinger, Energy Futures Group on behalf of CAC, asked: My question was about the actual MPS modeling files that would support the charts that Jeffrey is showing for the savings and the costs, and also those files are used to support the bundling, especially the breakpoint between residential low/medium and residential high.
    - Jeffrey Huber responded: I think the slides here do come from those other files that Abe was referring to, the DSM inputs, but I think you asked for just the updated MPS models, and I think we are comfortable with that.

Demand Response
Jesse Smith, Demand Side Analytics

Jesse Smith presented on program types considered in the 2026 input refresh for demand response, peak load forecast by season, avoided cost of generation capacity, 2027-2029 DSM plans incorporated into IRP inputs, seasonal peak load contributions, RAP, and MAP.

Participants had the following questions and comments, with answers provided after:

- Scott Reeves (did not identify affiliation) asked about PTR.
    - Jesse Smith responded: PTR shows up under rates. It is the default, and I think Jeffrey had it back in the beginning. The RAP scenario is a default PTR and MAP is a default TOU with an opt-in CPP.

Closing Comments / Stakeholder Questions
Abe Lang, Manager Strategy and Risk

Abe Lang concluded the meeting with closing comments and a final opportunity for stakeholder questions. There were no additional questions.