



STATE OF HAWAII | KA MOKU'ĀINA 'O HAWAII'
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS
KA 'OIHANA PILI KĀLEPA
335 MERCHANT STREET, ROOM 310
P.O. BOX 541
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96809
Phone Number: 1-844-808-DCCA (3222)
Fax Number: (808) 586-2856
cca.hawaii.gov

JOSH GREEN, M.D.
GOVERNOR | KE KIA'ĀINA

SYLVIA LUKE
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR | KA HOPE KIA'ĀINA

NADINE Y. ANDO
DIRECTOR | KA LUNA HO'OKELE

DEAN I. HAZAMA
DEPUTY DIRECTOR | KA HOPE LUNA HO'OKELE

Testimony of the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs

**Before the
Senate Committee on Ways and Means
Tuesday, March 3, 2026
10:17 a.m.
Via Videoconference**

WRITTEN TESTIMONY ONLY

**On the following measure:
S.B. 2487, S.D. 1, RELATING TO THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

Chair Dela Cruz and Members of the Committee:

My name is Michael Angelo, and I am the Executive Director of the Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs' (Department) Division of Consumer Advocacy. The Department offers comments on this bill.

The purpose of this bill is to: (1) clarify that, for electric utilities, "performance-based incentives" include revenue adjustment mechanisms, cost control mechanisms, rewards for superior performance, and penalties for subpar performance; (2) confirm that the Public Utilities Commission (Commission) may adopt alternative ratemaking procedures to establish electric utility rates and performance-based incentives; and require the Commission to apply a presumption in favor of considering historical cost trends and external indices that reflect incentives to control costs if the Commission resets an electric utility's allowed revenues based on consideration of the utility's costs.

The Department understands the intent of this bill given that the purpose of the original Ratepayer Protection Act¹ was to directly tie an electric utility's revenues to its achievement on performance metrics and break the direct link between allowed revenues and capital expenditures (i.e., to incentivize utilities to deliver outcomes rather than just build infrastructure). Upon passage of the initial act, much work has been done to develop the performance-based regulation (PBR) Framework in Docket No. 2018-0088, which the Hawaiian Electric Companies are currently operating under.

The Department notes that the Commission is in the middle of a comprehensive review of the PBR Framework, specifically the review of the performance incentive mechanisms (known as PIMs) and other mechanisms of the PBR Framework with stakeholder input. In addition, the issue of “rebasing” Hawaiian Electric Companies’ rates and how best to do so is being formulated and should be resolved in the next few months under the current laws and, thus, the changes to Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS) § 269-16.1, as contemplated by this bill, may unnecessarily complicate and even delay the ongoing proceedings.

The Department, through its Division of Consumer Advocacy (Consumer Advocate) is heavily involved in both aspects of Docket No. 2018-0088. The Consumer Advocate’s foremost object is to protect and represent the interest of all consumers, and to ensure that the public interest protections of HRS § 269-16, HRS § 269-12, and Hawaii Administrative Rules Chapter 16-601 regarding public hearings be applicable to any type of “rebasing” application that is requesting increased rates to help better ensure that the utility is undertaking necessary actions to better control and become more efficient in reducing costs.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this bill.

¹ Act 5 of the 2018 Regular Legislative Session is known as the Ratepayer Protection Act.

JOSH GREEN, M.D.
GOVERNOR

SYLVIA LUKE
LT. GOVERNOR



STATE OF HAWAII
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
465 S. KING STREET, #103
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

JON S. ITOMURA
CHAIR

NAOMI U. KUWAYE
COMMISSIONER

COLIN A. YOST
COMMISSIONER

Telephone: (808) 586-2020
Facsimile: (808) 586-2066

Website: puc.hawaii.gov
E-mail: puc@hawaii.gov

Testimony of the Public Utilities Commission

To the
Senate Committee on
Ways & Means

March 3, 2026
10:17 a.m.

Chair Dela Cruz, Vice Chair Moriwaki, and Members of the Committee:

Measure: S.B. No. 2487, S.D. 1
Title: RELATING TO THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION.

Position:

The Public Utilities Commission ("Commission") offers the following comments for consideration.

Comments:

The Commission supports the intent of this measure to clarify that electric utility regulation in Hawai'i should emphasize performance-based incentives, cost control, and ratepayer protections.

The Commission remains cognizant of its legislative mandate to break the link between an electric utility's revenues and its investment levels. The Commission must also operate within the constitutional constraints articulated by the United States Supreme Court in *Hope Natural Gas* and *Bluefield Water Works*. These decisions require that utility rates be just and reasonable and provide an opportunity for the utility to earn a fair return on its investment, while also protecting customers from excessive charges. The Commission is mindful that performance-based and alternative ratemaking mechanisms are designed to change how revenues are determined and adjusted rather than seeking to eliminate the public utility's entitlement to a reasonable opportunity to recover prudently incurred costs and earn a fair return. Accordingly, the Commission must balance policy goals such as cost control, efficiency, reliability, resiliency, and customer value with the fundamental requirement that rates, viewed as a whole, remain sufficient to maintain the utility's financial integrity and ability to attract capital, consistent with *Hope* and *Bluefield*.

To this end, the Commission is currently undertaking its comprehensive review of the Performance-Based Regulation Framework (“PBR Framework”) governing the Hawaiian Electric Companies in anticipation of the start of the Second Multi-Year Rate Period (“MRP2”). This comprehensive review is to occur over three different phases (Phases 5-7) and will involve the concurrent re-basing of the Hawaiian Electric Companies’ Target Revenues ahead of MRP2.

- Phase 5 utilized an informal collaborative process to identify which mechanisms within the PBR Framework may remain unmodified as the PBR Framework moves into MRP2, and which mechanisms should be examined for potential modification and/or elimination before commencing MRP2.
- Phase 6 would utilize a more formal proceeding to facilitate the examination of specific PBR mechanisms to determine what modifications, if any, should be adopted heading into MRP2.
- Phase 7 is reserved as a buffer period to address any issues with implementing any modifications to any mechanisms ahead of MRP2.

On February 27, 2025, the Commission issued Order No. 41575 in which the Commission determined that it would re-base the Hawaiian Electric Companies’ Target Revenues ahead of MRP2. The Commission concluded that general rate case-like proceeding would best achieve the following outcomes: (1) base rates designed for extended stay-out periods with no rate cases; (2) the assessment and capture of any operational efficiencies that have occurred during the First Multi-Year Rate Period; and (3) the resolution of legacy issues that are currently not addressed under the PBR Framework. The Commission also noted that a general rate case-like proceeding would best satisfy the many procedural and legal requirements that continue to govern the Commission, including those provided for in section 269-16, Hawaii Revised Statutes (“HRS”), and Chapter 16-601, Subchapter 8, Hawaii Administrative Rules (“HAR”).

On August 13, 2025, the Commission concluded Phase 5 with Order No. 41876. The Commission determined that it would focus Phase 6 on examining modifications to the I-Factor, Customer Dividend (“CD”), Earning Sharing Mechanism, X-Factor, the Exceptional Project Recovery Mechanism (“EPRM”) Guidelines, and the Performance Incentive Mechanism (“PIM”) Portfolio.

On September 29, 2025, the Commission issued Order No. 41963 in which the Commission granted Hawaiian Electric’s request to extend the time for Hawaiian Electric to file its application to re-base its Target Revenues. The Commission set a deadline of January 7, 2026, by which Hawaiian Electric and the other parties would attempt to develop an alternative rate-rebasing proposal that “could make the need for a general rate case application and process (and the associated time, cost and resources) unnecessary.” This deadline was subsequently extended to February 8, 2026.

On January 28, 2026, Hawaiian Electric made a request for a further ninety (90) day extension to finalize an alternative rate-rebasing proposal.

On February 24, 2026, the Commission issued Order No. 42351 in which the Commission denied HECO's 90-day extension request but accepted HECO's alternative request for a limited extension to March 6, 2026.

In reviewing and evaluating the alternative proposal that is expected to be filed on March 6, 2026, the Commission will take into consideration the concerns raised by this legislature regarding the perceived return to cost-of-service regulation in light of the Commission's recent actions in the PBR docket. The Commission remains committed to its statutory mandate to establish "incentives and penalty mechanisms that directly tie an electric [utility's] revenues to that utility's achievement on performance metrics" in order to "break the direct link between allowed revenues and investment levels."

Nevertheless, it is important to note that HAR § 16-601-87 and HAR § 16-601-88 presently require that all general rate increase applications by a public utility must utilize a forward-looking test year. However, when reviewing the reasonability of an application's forward-looking test year figures, the Commission does rely on historical cost data and trends to validate and judge the reasonability of the application's figures, but historical cost data and trends may not necessarily be dispositive in a vacuum.

The Commission believes that S.B. 2487 SD 1's requirement that the Commission apply a presumption in favor of considering historical cost trends and external cost-control indices when resetting utility revenues can be reconciled with the existing forward-looking test year requirements so long as it is a rebuttable legal presumption. Nevertheless, such a legal presumption may constrain the Commission's ability to effectively set starting base rates for MRP2. Under the PBR Framework, base rates are set at the beginning of the five-year Multi-Year Rate Period and are designed such that the electric utility has a reasonable opportunity to earn a return on its investments over the course of the entire five-year period. This includes all of the effects of the other PBR mechanisms, such as the CD, EPRM, and PIMs. Creating a legal presumption in favor of considering historical cost trends and external cost-control indices when resetting utility revenues may unintentionally create the need to alter the look and design of the other PBR mechanisms in Phase 6 to ensure that the PBR Framework as a whole satisfies *Hope* and *Bluefield*.

As the Commission continues its comprehensive review of the PBR Framework, the Commission remains committed to ensuring that the PBR Framework entering MRP2 retains and includes mechanisms that provide performance-based incentives, cost control, and ratepayer protections.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this measure.



Email: communications@ulupono.com

SENATE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS
Tuesday, March 3, 2026 — 10:17 a.m.

Ulupono Initiative strongly supports SB 2487 SD1, Relating to the Public Utilities Commission.

Dear Chair Dela Cruz and Members of the Committee:

My name is Micah Munekata, and I am the Vice President of Government Affairs at Ulupono Initiative. We are a Hawai'i-focused impact investment firm that strives to improve the quality of life throughout the islands by helping our communities become more resilient and self-sufficient through locally produced food, renewable energy, and clean transportation choices, and better management of freshwater resources.

Ulupono strongly supports SB 2487 SD1, which clarifies that, for electric utilities, “performance-based incentives” include revenue adjustment mechanisms, cost control mechanisms, rewards for superior performance, and penalties for subpar performance; confirms that the Public Utilities Commission may adopt alternative ratemaking procedures to establish electric utility rate and performance-based incentives; and requires the Commission to apply a presumption in favor of considering historical cost trends and external indices that reflect incentives to control costs if the Commission resets an electric utility’s allowed revenues based on consideration of the utility’s costs.

SB 2487 builds on the foundational Hawai'i Ratepayer Protection Act (Act 5, SLH 2018; codified as HRS § 269-16.1), by clarifying that, for purposes of utility regulation, “performance-based incentives” explicitly include cost control mechanisms, not just incentive metrics tied to reliability, customer service, or clean energy goals. The bill also affirms the Public Utilities Commission’s authority to adopt alternative ratemaking procedures that break the traditional direct linkage between utility profits and capital investment — a core misalignment of the traditional cost-of-service model that inherently rewards increased spending rather than efficiency and customer value.

Finally, SB 2487 requires the Commission to adopt a presumption in favor of using historic cost trends and external indices that reflect incentives to control costs when reviewing utility cost justifications, rather than returning to a forward test year cost-of-service framework that can incentivize “wish lists” of capital projects and upward pressure on rates.

These provisions are not simply technical adjustments or a restatement of existing policy — they are a necessary legislative correction to ensure that the original intent of Act 5, SLH

Investing in a Sustainable Hawai'i

2018, is preserved and fully implemented. In doing so, Hawai'i leads a pathway toward lasting regulatory reform centered on restraint, predictability, and efficiency.

The traditional cost-of-service regulatory structure, which bases utility revenues on recovering historic and projected costs plus a rate of return on capital investment, has long been understood nationally as misaligned with modern public policy and cost management goals. Under the model, utilities lack robust financial incentives to limit spending or advance cost-effective alternatives like accelerating adoption of utility-scale renewable energy and demand-side management or customer-owned distributed energy resources (DERs).

Performance-based regulation (PBR) represents an evolution in regulatory thinking: rather than paying utilities simply for their costs incurred, PBR seeks to tie a portion of utility revenue to performance on clear, measurable outcomes, including cost containment, reliability, integration of clean energy, and customer satisfaction. Prominent national organizations describing PBR note its potential to improve utility cost control over time while maintaining service quality — precisely the objective this bill reinforces.

A key focus of PBR — and of SB 2487 — is aligning utility performance incentives with customer and societal benefits rather than rewarding capital expenditures alone. As one national analysis explained it: “In all jurisdictions, utilities enable achievement of important societal goals. Performance-based regulation ... motivates [them] to deliver on public goals as well as internal and fiduciary goals.”¹

This encapsulates why SB 2487's emphasis on cost control mechanisms and its presumption in favor of historical cost indices are not just administratively sound, but fundamentally in the public interest: they structurally reorganize utility incentives toward efficiency and customer value.

SB 2487 affirms and strengthens Hawai'i's leadership in utility regulatory innovation by enshrining clearer legislative direction for performance-based regulation, emphasizing cost control, and preventing backsliding to a traditional, cost-of-service paradigm that could lead to higher rates and poor alignment with customer interests. This bill supports predictable rates, reinforces legislative intent, and mirrors thoughtful reforms underway in other states.

For these reasons, we respectfully urge the Committee to pass SB 2487.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Respectfully,

Micah Munekata
Vice President of Government Affairs

¹ <https://www.ncsl.org/energy/performance-based-regulation-harmonizing-electric-utility-priorities-and-state-policy>



**Hawaiian
Electric**

WRITTEN TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

**SB 2487, SD1
Relating to the Public Utilities Commission**

Tuesday, March 3, 2026
10:17 AM
State Capitol, Conference Room 211 & Videoconference

Dear Chair Dela Cruz, Vice Chair Moriwaki, and Members of the Committee,

Hawaiian Electric respectfully provides **comments** on SB 2487, SD1, Relating to the Public Utilities Commission.

Hawaiian Electric supports Performance Based Regulation (PBR). The bill seeks to clarify that the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) has certain authority with respect to implementing PBR. However, the bill is unnecessary.

In terms of clarifying that the PUC may adopt alternative ratemaking procedures to establish electric utility rates and performance-based incentives, the PUC, in Docket No. 2018-0088, has already approved Hawaiian Electric's and other stakeholders' request to pursue exactly this (an alternative process to consider rate rebasing and other PBR modifications). The process, which for the time being involves confidential discussions among the parties, has been constructive and is on-going.

The bill also proposes that the PUC apply a presumption in favor of considering historical cost trends and external indices that reflect incentives to control costs, rather than relying on a forward test period. Hawaiian Electric believes the PUC already has this discretion, especially if supported by parties to such a docket. As the preamble of the bill notes, any historical costs may be adjusted for known and measurable future changes.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide **comments** on SB 2487, SD1.



SENATE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Senator Donovan M. Dela Cruz, Chair
Senator Sharon Y. Moriwaki, Vice Chair

TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF SENATE BILL 2487 SD1

Tuesday, March 3, 2026, 10:17 a.m.
Conference Room 211 & Videoconference
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

Aloha Chair Dela Cruz, Vice-Chair Moriwaki, and Committee Members:

Earthjustice **supports Senate Bill 2487 SD1**, “Relating to the Public Utilities Commission,” which seeks to update and clarify the Ratepayer Protection Act, Act 5 of 2018 (codified in Hawai‘i Revised Statutes § 269-16.1) to reaffirm the principles and process for performance-based regulation (“PBR”) of Hawai‘i’s main electric utility, Hawaiian Electric Company. These amendments will help bolster the law’s purpose of protecting ratepayers and the public interest by controlling utility costs and electric rates and aligning the utility’s financial interests toward delivering performance on priorities such as enabling customers to save money by shifting from fossil fuels to clean energy.

Earthjustice has almost two decades of experience practicing before the Hawai‘i Public Utilities Commission. Throughout that span, we have engaged in the ongoing efforts over many years and numerous dockets to reform utility incentives and align utility interests with performance. This movement gained particular focus and momentum over 10 years ago, when the commission issued its landmark “Inclinations on the Future of Hawai‘i’s Utilities” document in 2014. It then came into fruition with the legislature’s passage of Act 5 and the commission’s opening of its comprehensive PBR proceeding, Docket No. 2018-0088. As SB 2487’s preamble recognizes, this historic process established the PBR framework in Hawai‘i, which has been recognized as a leading model for the necessary and beneficial transition from traditional cost-of-service regulation to modern PBR.

This progress, however, was cast into doubt when the commission under previous leadership departed from its historic direction and adopted HECO’s proposal to initiate a traditional general rate case to “re-base” (i.e., increase) the utilities revenues and rates. This switch in direction would backtrack on PBR, re-anchor utility rates and incentives in the outdated and inefficient cost-of-service model, and open the way to a historic rate hikes. These concerns were starkly highlighted in the public informational briefing that the Senate Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection held in June of last year.

SB 2487 would help reaffirm the basic principles of PBR, including the legal mandate to “break the direct link between allowed revenues and investment levels” under cost-of-service regulation. This is particularly necessary since, although Act 5 and HRS § 269-16.1 should be clear enough in enabling the commission to pursue a new course under PBR, the commission has signaled a perspective that existing law may tie its hands and require a return to a cost-of-service ratemaking process. The Consumer Advocate has taken an even harder line that existing legal provisions dictate a cost-of-service rate case.

SB 2487 thus provides the necessary clarification to uphold Act 5’s original mandate and principles. It should be emphasized that the bill simply reaffirms the PBR framework that the legislature and commission have established. Most of the amendments simply update terms and provide clarifications based on the progress since Act 5. The main amendments include:

- ▶ Updating terms by referring to “performance-based incentives” as a general encompassing term, which includes “revenue adjustment” and “cost control” mechanisms, as well as both reward and penalty mechanisms. These are terms and elements the commission has established in the PBR framework.
- ▶ Making clear that the commission may adopt alternative ratemaking procedures besides a traditional rate case to establish rates and performance-based incentives. The commission pursued such an alternative path in establishing the PBR framework and is currently considering such a process. This amendment would confirm that the commission has this discretion.
- ▶ Providing that, if the commission resets utility revenues based on the utility’s costs, it should apply a presumption in favor of considering historical cost trends and external indices that reflect incentives to control costs. This conforms with PBR by ensuring that ratemaking focuses on performance in controlling costs, rather than “wish lists” produced under a projected “forward test year” approach.

In sum, SB 2487 provides the commission constructive support—and ultimately, the *discretion*—to implement the PBR framework, rather than being bound to outdated and inefficient cost-based protocols. For these reasons, Earthjustice fully supports SB 2487 and recommends that it be passed.

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify. Please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions or for further information.

Isaac H. Moriwake, Esq.
Managing Attorney
Earthjustice, Mid-Pacific Office