

**Minneapolis Clean Energy Partnership
ENERGY VISION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Minneapolis City Hall, Room 319

Tuesday, February 16, 2016

6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

Q1 2016 Meeting Notes

Committee members present: Chairs: Jamez Staples, Billy Weber. Members: Cameran Bailey, Trevor Drake, Chris Duffrin, Timothy Gaetz, John Farrell, Janne Flisrand, Matt Kazinka, Annie Levenson-Falk, Kevin Lewis, Marcus Mills sitting in for Louis Alemayehu, Lee Samelson sitting in for Karen Monahan, Julia Silvis

Committee members excused: Sydney Jordan

Guests: Timothy DeHerder-Thomas, Eric Immler, Holly Lahd, Isaac Smith

Planning Team/staff present: Carter Dedolph, Bridget Dockter, Peter Ebnet, Nick Mark, Louie Mondale, Kelly Muellman, Gayle Prest, Siri Simons, Al Swintek, Marsha Wagner, Stephanie Zawistowski

1. Welcome and Introductions

Co-Chair Billy Weber called the meeting of the Energy Vision Advisory Committee (EVAC) to order at 6:04 p.m.

Billy welcomed new EVAC member Julia Silvis who replaced Ross Abbey, and substitutes Marcus Mills and Lee Samelson, and invited them to tell a little bit about their background. He then asked EVAC members and staff to introduce themselves.

2. Review and Approval of Agenda and Minutes

On the agenda, Billy noted that Item #7 – Photograph for annual report – would be moved up in the agenda. Billy allowed a moment for review of the minutes from November 10 (Q4 2015), then asked for a motion to approve them. It was **MOVED** and **SECONDED** that the minutes be approved. Motion **CARRIED**.

3. Update on Recent Activities

Peter Ebnet, acknowledging that EVAC members have requested being informed of Planning Team and CEP activities outside of meetings, introduced a recap of things that are taking place in and around the Partnership. Bridget Dockter referenced some of the handouts that would not be reviewed in the meeting but offer information on CenterPoint's rate case, open dockets currently at the PUC (customer energy usage data and LED streetlights), data privacy dockets, and integrated resource plan.

- *CEP Board's Approval of Metrics.* Bridget said that the metrics which were approved by EVAC in November had only one addition by the CEP Board: they added subpoint 4.3. Rooftop Solar under "Local or directly purchase renewable energy." EVAC had forwarded

specific measures that are not included in this graph, but they are on the website, i.e. tracking by kW, by dekatherm, greenhouse gas emissions and other specific programs are citywide and will be tracked by census track.

- *Annual Report Preparations.* The Planning Team is in the process of gathering data for the first report which will be presented at the Q2 CEP Board meeting. The City and utilities are each gathering certain information on the approved metrics. State weatherization will be included, and CEE will provide information on Home Energy Squad visits. The annual report will include a “scorecard” showing raw numbers for all of the approved metrics, and there will be a narrative associated with each metric that will include historical data, how the information was gathered and additional detail about the numbers on the scorecard. The goal is to create a simple way to show this information at a glance, and to have an easily accessible CEP web page where people can access the scorecard. A draft report will be submitted to EVAC for feedback before being presented to the CEP Board.
- *City of Minneapolis Residential Energy Efficiency Work.* Kelly Muellman said that for the past few months the City has been researching some residential energy efficiency policy options, which was part of the two year work plan approved by EVAC and the CEP Board. Four potential policy options were presented where the City has levers to require or incentivize energy efficiency in the residential sector:
 - Energy audit requirements for new or renewal rental license
 - Energy disclosure through Truth in Sale of Housing
 - Expanding Commercial Building Energy Benchmarking to include multifamily
 - Adopt a sustainable building policy (for new constructions or major rehabs with City financing)

Drafts of white papers are being completed and will be reviewed by a larger staff group. These proposals will be presented without recommendation to certain subcommittees of the City Council and eventually the full City Council. The City Council will consider the options and determine which ones should be developed with external stakeholders (EVAC and other interested parties), creating a staff direction that currently does not exist. There will be no opportunity for outside input on these proposals prior to being presented to the City Council. Janne Flisrand said she is working with national experts on these issues and offered to make a connection between those experts and City staff. EVAC members requested an update and notification when this is going before the City Council.

- *City of Minneapolis Community Solar Garden Update.* Gayle Prest talked about the City’s participation in community solar gardens, and announced that the City joined the Met Council RFP, which was focused mainly on price, and requested 12 million kW hours annually. The City will be entering into agreements with four developers, totaling 7.5 million kW hours annually. The savings are expected to be approximately \$23,000 annually; a little more than seven percent of the City’s annual electricity usage. The City is also working with Property Services to develop an RFP that would be let by the City which will have more attributes, i.e. pollinators and low income participation. They anticipate the RFP going out in April, and hope that other, smaller cities will be able to use it in the future.

Gayle thanked Trevor Drake of MN CERTs and Holly Lahd of Fresh Energy for their assistance with the RFP, and said the two of them would be leading a two-hour workshop, “Community Solar Garden Speed Dating,” at the [Communities Connection Conference](#) on Saturday, April 2, at the Minneapolis Convention Center. This is a free event, and EVAC members and guests are encouraged and invited to attend.

- *Multi-Family Energy Efficiency Program Update.* Carter Dedolph, Senior Energy Program Administrator at CenterPoint Energy, said that at the time of the November meeting they had just rolled out the program and presented the design and attributes. They have received good response to date on the program, which has been promoted through the Multifamily Housing Association conference last Fall and the monthly Advocate magazine which contains a half page ad. Approximately three inquiries per week have been coming in about the program.

Showing a slide [[PPT-Website](#)] that indicated participation from October 2015 through mid February 2016, Carter explained that the number of Inquiries—33 buildings (2,420 units) in Minneapolis, and 83 buildings (5,614 units) in other cities—represents the number of people who have shown interest and approached the program vendor for more information. In the initial planning they had estimated it to be about 20 units per building; the actual number is closer to 70 units per building. The slide also showed the number of buildings that have completed the screening process; the number of projects that have not received a direct install (DI) visit or an audit visit; the number of buildings that will have an audit accomplished within the next week or so; and the number of buildings that have completed audit analysis. Three reports have gone out to date. Seventy percent of the qualified buildings are in Minneapolis, and the other thirty percent are in other cities that are participating in the program.

A subset of the previous chart showed low income participation. Percentages are about the same as the whole group, which includes market rate and low income. Carter also presented a map showing the distribution of qualified buildings in the City, which includes market rate and low income properties. The ratio of low income to market rate properties is about one-third. There was concern that the map showing distribution across the City indicates that word-of-mouth outreach is not reaching all parts of the city equitably. Carter explained that once the present backlog diminishes they will look at other outreach strategies, but they do not want to promote the program too widely until they have more capacity.

Janne Flisrand reported that subsequent to the November meeting she contacted someone at the City and learned that in Minneapolis there are 2,817 five-plus unit buildings with 89,177 units that are technically eligible for this program. The average building size is 32 units per building. She raised another concern that word-of-mouth is not reaching all building owners and types equitably, and especially smaller buildings tend to be less energy efficient and have fewer staff available to support that. If the CEP goal is to reach 75 percent of properties in the multi family sector, and achieve 15 percent savings by 2025, there is a long way to go. Carter said they have considered but have not yet strategized the next steps after the initial rush.

[Brief break for group photo for annual report.]

4. CEP Roles and Collaboration

Peter Ebnet explained that there has been an ongoing discussion outside of EVAC meetings among Planning Team members about how the Partnership works with the City and utilities, how all of the different interconnected parts work, and ultimately how EVAC, the Planning Team and CEP Board can function together. One of the big issues is funding, and the Planning Team has been working together to search out funding opportunities. Metrics is an important part of this work as well, but certain levers, i.e. energy efficiency goals, are outside of the Partnership's role but can be supported by it. The reality is that this is an ongoing process and as discussions continue it will develop and evolve over time.

Billy countered with his belief that work done through the City's policy levers is inside the Partnership because it allows the utilities to go further and for EVAC to think about different levers in different ways, working toward Partnership goals. Nick added that preliminary conversations have been had on these topics, like the City asking for numbers from the utilities in developing their white papers, but the City is not yet at the place where they are ready for stakeholder involvement. Throughout the Partnership all parties are still feeling their way, and good models do not exist to lead the way. Bridget pointed out that at this point the role of the utilities has been to provide different data sources. Each of them holds different data points—not all of which can be shared—but that are helpful to the City in developing policy.

Janne, acknowledging comments made by Planning Team members that this Partnership is doing something that has never been done before and that they are making it up as they go along, suggested doing something bigger and more ambitious. Annie Levenson-Falk suggested that they embrace the idea of “failing quickly,” coming back frequently to reevaluate and adjust. Billy reminded the group that the Partnership has been in existence less than a year, and EVAC will continue to push for more conversations and allow time for same within its meeting agendas.

Peter returned to the previous agenda item to briefly review 2017-2018 Work Plan development. This year in Q2 they will review the current work plan and generate ideas. In Q3 the Planning Team will produce a draft for review by EVAC of the 2017-2018 Work Plan, with recommended changes. In Q4 EVAC will adopt the 2017-2018 Work Plan. Bridget added that the intent of introducing this schedule now is so that EVAC members can start thinking about ideas and concepts that could be incorporated in the draft Work Plan and rolled into future meetings.

5. EVAC Outreach Subgroup Presentation

Jamez Staples reported that the EVAC Community Engagement Task Force has held several meetings and conversations to discuss the Proposed Engagement Plan, presented by Annie Levenson-Falk and Matt Kazinka. Annie introduced the topics to be covered: assumptions and goals, approach, proposed engagement process, questions for discussion/priorities for focus, and proposed next steps. This will be presented to the CEP Board at its next meeting on March 4.

The goals identified by CEP to be achieved by 2025 are:

- 75% participation in efficiency retrofit programs by residential properties, including rental property, with equitable distribution
- 15% increase in energy efficiency in residential properties; 20% in commercial/industrial buildings
- 10% local or directly purchased renewable energy

Making the assumption that the current program participants tend to be white, middle- or upper-class and more homeowners than renters, the group determined that engagement should be focused on people who are not being reached or engaged.

The purpose of engagement is to help get to the stated goals, and it will be necessary to learn what kinds of approaches will work to achieve them. Typical utility engagement is a marketing or outreach approach, but engagement must go deeper. Recognizing that the city consists of people who live in different communities and that no single approach will be effective in all of them, the proposed engagement plan consists of a template to guide effective engagement in any community. The intent is to use the template this year to pilot community engagement activities in two to four targeted communities, focusing on those that are not currently being served well. They will develop an RFP that will help find those who could do effective community engagement.

Matt described the types of communities to target as those where the Partnership can have the biggest impact, assist the most vulnerable people, and/or where we can learn the most about where the City needs to go. The template process as introduced and described in Appendix A [[Attachment 3](#)] consists of the following steps to be done with members of the community that is being engaged:

- Before beginning, prepare by reviewing existing resources, research and data
- Learn what defines the community: its structure, challenges and resources
- Plan the project, defining goals and objectives and creating engagement strategies
- Implement
- Evaluate

The idea of the RFP process came about with the realization by the Outreach Subgroup that EVAC was not positioned well enough to create and develop these plans. The City and utilities might be able to do this in the future, but currently they do not have staff or resources available. If budget allocations, grants or other funding sources can be made available one or more contractors who have expertise in community engagement and connections within specific communities could be hired to do the pilot projects. Bridget said that the utilities can provide training to the RFP recipients/contractor(s) to help them understand the existing programs that are available. There is also an opportunity for the Partnership to engage and find out more about a specific community to determine the programs needed that do not currently exist. Gayle added that by Q2 metrics by census tract will be available and can be tied into the pilots.

The Outreach Subgroup did not identify the communities that could be focused on because they thought it would be helpful to get feedback from EVAC before proceeding. Before asking for a show of hands indicating support by EVAC members for which communities they wanted to

focus on, Matt provided some additional details about the types of communities to consider where EVAC can:

- a. Have a big impact on energy and climate emissions in the near term using existing tools and resources (i.e., get the most energy savings for the money spent for the pilot); and/or
- b. Serve the greatest unmet needs of residents (including social or economic needs) who will benefit from energy efficiency or clean energy opportunities; and/or
- c. Learn the most about community engagement, filling in knowledge gaps that currently exist about populations that are not currently being reached

After additional discussion about some of the specific criteria (i.e., diversity includes residential and business/commercial; residential includes single family homes as well as multi-family), the presenters asked for a show of hands indicating which pilots they wanted to focus on. EVAC members were invited to vote one or two times, for options a., b., c., and following that an option d.-all of the above provided funding was available. Items b. and c. received the most votes.

Referencing Appendix B, Proposed Timeline for Community Engagement Planning Process [[Attachment 4](#)], Matt laid out the vision going forward. During Q2 the pilot communities will be selected and they will start to look at funding for the RFP process. It will be presented to the CEP Board for approval. In Q3 the RFP will be done and a contractor or contractors will be selected and begin developing plans in partnership with the Planning Team in Q4 2016 and in Q1 2017. By Q1 contractor(s) should have plans in place and have gone through the first steps of understanding the community and designing strategies that will work in that community. By Q2 and Q3 2017 they will be doing implementation, then reporting to the CEP Board so that by Q4 2017 they will have learned some things from the pilots that can be used to develop future plans.

In response to a question about the possibility of timing the outreach and implementation to include seasonal work (i.e. insulation or weatherization), Matt replied that with this schedule and the number of formal processes to undergo it is not feasible to begin that phase before winter. Annie added that funding is a big question; there is currently no budget for RFPs so that will factor into the timeline as well. A budget for community engagement has not yet been established as it depends on the scope of the pilot. It has not yet been determined who will be letting the RFP.

Between now and the Q2 EVAC meeting the Outreach Subgroup will be looking at data and relevant opportunities to define and select the two to four proposed pilot communities. They will also begin working on the specifics of the RFP, budget, etc. The group will likely meet three times before the Q2 EVAC meeting. Matt said that some of the Outreach Subgroup members would continue, but he extended an invitation to other EVAC members to join them in developing this further and sent around a sign-up sheet.

Annie concluded this discussion by adding that the Outreach Subgroup identified additional metrics needed to meet equity goals. They suggest that these be added to next year's work plan:

- ____% conversion from direct install to adoption
- ____% residents engaged (number that have participated or been involved in some kind of program)

- ____% households are energy-cost burdened

Billy explained that these metrics were included in earlier versions of the work plan and were omitted because this is already being collected. This information might already be available.

There being no further discussion on the proposed engagement plan to be presented to the CEP Board at its meeting on March 4, it was **MOVED** and **SECONDED** that the following Motion be approved:

EVAC forwards the community engagement planning process for adoption by the Clean Energy Partnership Board. Additionally EVAC recommends that the Board invest time, energy and money in developing the pilot engagement plans outlined in the process documents in 2016 and direct the Planning Team to use the process as a framework for future engagement projects.

Motion **CARRIED**.

Comments expressed by several members of EVAC throughout this discussion were that the work of the Outreach Subgroup, with assistance from others who are not on EVAC, represents an impressive body of work and a tangible approach for community engagement. The Outreach Subgroup members were thanked for their efforts by a hearty round of applause.

6. Open Discussion and Announcements

- Janne Flisrand said that in her work she is connected with Marti Frank, Evaluation + Strategy for Social Innovation, who has done research on community engagement with those not currently being reached. Ms. Frank is coming to the Twin Cities in a couple of months, and Janne offered to make a connection for anyone wanting to meet with her to learn about who is/is not engaging, what research exists, who do we know and how do we figure out more. Almost everyone present was interested in such a meeting, so Janne will make meeting arrangements and communicate the specifics (date, time, location).
- John Farrell invited anyone interested in learning more or working on the issue of on-bill repayment, a tool that would allow Xcel or CenterPoint customers to finance energy efficiency and renewable energy through their utility bill, to contact him: jfarrell@ilsr.org.
- Trevor Drake announced that Great Plains Institute's Metro CERT program has a clean energy accelerator that gives communities an opportunity to apply for assistance with clean energy goals or projects. A number of priorities in the current round might be interesting to folks in Minneapolis, i.e. projects that benefit underserved communities, help them understand and utilize renewable energy, and community solar. The City of Minneapolis is already being assisted by this program, but if EVAC members have other ideas about communities within Minneapolis that are working on clean energy projects they are asked to apply. The deadline is March 24 for the deep assistance track which involves Metro CERT making a long-term commitment to assist in whatever way they can. There is also a rapid assistance track for express assistance. For further information you can email Trevor at tdrake@gpisd.net or the website is: www.cleanenergyresourceteams.org/accelerator.

7. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

*This constitutes my understanding of items discussed and decisions reached.
If there are any omissions or discrepancies, please notify the author in writing.*

Submitted by:

Marsha Wagner, CastleVisions

marsha@castlevisions.com