

Minneapolis Clean Energy Partnership
ENERGY VISION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minneapolis Central Library, Doty Board Room
Wednesday, May 6, 2015
6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

Meeting Notes

Committee members present: Louis Alemayehu, Cameran Bailey, Trevor Drake, Chris Duffrin, John Farrell, Janne Flisrand, Timothy Gaetz, Sydney Jordan, Matt Kazinka, Kevin Lewis, Karen Monahan, Jamez Staples, Kirk Washington, William Weber

Committee members excused: Ross Abbey

Guests: Timothy DeHerder-Thomas, Elizabeth Dickinson, Eric Immler, Annie Levenson-Falk, Marcus Mills, Lee Samelson

Planning Team/staff present: Bridget Dockter, Peter Ebnet, Robin Garwood, Nick Mark, Shannon McDonough, Gayle Prest, Brendon Slotterback, Marsha Wagner

1. Welcome

Brendon Slotterback, Sustainability Program Coordinator for the City of Minneapolis, called the meeting of the Energy Vision Advisory Committee (EVAC) to order at 6:08 p.m. He welcomed and thanked those present, noting that with all but one EVAC member present there was a quorum. He then turned the meeting over to Billy Weber, the Board-appointed co-chair.

2. Review and Approval of Agenda and Minutes

Billy began by inviting EVAC members to introduce themselves. He mentioned that per discussions with the Planning Team, Roberts Rules would only be used in EVAC meetings when formal adoption was required. After reviewing the agenda, he asked for a motion for approval. It was MOVED and SECONDED that the agenda be approved. Motion CARRIED. He allowed a moment for review of the minutes, then asked for a motion to approve the minutes. It was MOVED and SECONDED that the minutes be approved. Motion CARRIED.

3. Co-Chair Election

Following the first EVAC meeting a survey was sent out seeking nominations for the EVAC-appointed co-chair. Three people were nominated: Karen Monahan, who declined her nomination and withdrew from the field; and John Farrell and Tim Gaetz, who accepted their nominations. After discussion about some of the responsibilities and scope of duties of the co-chair position, including rotation as chair at EVAC meetings, Jamez Staples received and accepted a nomination from the floor. All three candidates were invited to make a brief statement giving their perspective on EVAC and why they are willing and interested in being co-chair.

- John Farrell: His willingness to serve as co-chair is related to the advocacy and policy work he does with the Institute for Local Self-Reliance. As Board Chair of Community Power he has become familiar with many energy options.

- Tim Gaetz: In his work with the Minneapolis Housing Authority (MHA) he has focused on serving the underserved: economically disadvantaged; wide variety of age groups, physical disabilities and countries of origin. MHA has 3 million square feet of space. Tim's job is to take care of high rise buildings, and he overlooks a \$33 million energy performance contract involving equipment upgrades, initiating recycling programs, and engaging residents in community-building. Tim is a consensus-builder and a good listener.
- Jamez Staples: As the owner of Renewable NRG Partners the focus of his work is to assist more people of color by closing the gap in economic disparities. Energy efficiency and renewable energy are passions of his. He believes one issue is that pathways or opportunities don't exist to connect with people of color, to give them a voice. He considers himself an urban environmentalist, advocating for a group that is most underrepresented. While acknowledging that Minneapolis is a leader in many areas and a great place to live, he promotes and wants to see "One Minneapolis."

Following statements by the nominees ballots were distributed. Jamez Staples was elected as EVAC co-chair.

4. Results from EVAC feedback on Potential Work Plan Items

Brendon began by explaining how the list of work plan items being considered by EVAC was developed. He cited the City's Climate Action Plan process, strategies and goals; energy pathways analysis; discussions around the City's franchise renewals and subsequent memorandums of understanding on clean energy partnership with Xcel Energy and CenterPoint Energy; all leading to eventual formation of the Clean Energy Partnership. [These documents have been posted on the project [website](#).]

Before continuing with survey results from EVAC members, Brendon asked if there were questions about the process of coming up with the work plan items. A question was asked about the items shown in the presentation that did not make it into the work plan, and the thought process behind those decisions. Brendon responded that in some cases it was a matter of timing; they selected items that were most ripe for action. Other items were selected because of their importance to the utilities and what they and the city could accomplish working together. He added that any of the items not on the current work plan list could be considered in future work plans.

Brendon then addressed the work plan survey, acknowledging the significant amount of time it took EVAC members to complete it and expressing appreciation on behalf of the Planning Team. He added that the survey is not the end of the feedback, but the Planning Team will continue to seek clarification and engage the EVAC members in more robust discussions at future meetings.

Regarding the survey results, he said the data was reviewed to identify key themes drawn from the responses to open-ended questions on each work plan item. He referenced a bar chart showing prioritization results, with rankings from 1 to 4, where average scores were reflected. The top three items were multi-family energy efficiency, infrastructure planning and expanded community engagement.

The point was made by an EVAC member that the work plan items were ranked individually, not listed vertically and ranked against each other. A comment was made about the difficulty of completing the survey with insufficient information, followed by a question on how the results would be used (primarily drafting the document that goes to the CEP Board, then as a starting place to be used in future meetings for developing items). A question was also asked about how the items interrelate and integrate with each other. Planning Team members clarified that it is the intention of the CEP to have staff from the city and utilities make decisions in a coordinated way. They will bear in mind that there is synergy between and among some of the items, and the community engagement piece will tie everything together.

After considerable discussion about these questions, it was determined that an additional brief survey with a forced ranking of the work plan items would be useful. The list will contain the items on the original survey, and include any new items that will be added during the course of this meeting. At the suggestion of some EVAC members, there will also be an opportunity on the survey to indicate what should be included in the work plan no matter how low the item(s) might be ranked. Billy pointed out that EVAC members will see the outcome of the survey but there will not be another opportunity to come together to review and discuss the results.

5. Discussion: Prioritization & Clarification of New Items

Moving on to ideas for new programs or concepts that were not included in the Potential Work Plan Items adopted by the CEP Board, Billy explained that following input by members of the Planning Team, EVAC members will divide into several small groups to further develop these concepts, define the role of CEP for implementation, and determine the intended outcomes, other impacts and metrics. The top two or three recommendations will move forward as recommendations of EVAC to be included in the plan.

The new items to be considered for inclusion as a new program or concept were:

1. Electric vehicle adoption and charging infrastructure
2. Small Commercial Energy Efficiency program, possibly modeled on Lake Street Coaching Program
3. Pass-through tariff for municipal electricity purchases & RFP for projects if necessary
4. District energy program for large redevelopment/infill – consider using Prospect North redevelopment as a pilot
5. Capturing more energy through small hydro on the Mississippi
6. Thermal imaging flyover of the city to aid targeting of community organizing
7. Residential asset rating/benchmarking score made available to buyers at time of sale

Before considering these new programs/concepts, Brendon referenced survey responses dealing with items that were related to how the Partnership works and metrics to measure progress. This list, along with items that were deemed to be beyond the scope of the Partnership, can be found on pages 7-8 of the Feedback document.

Referencing Item No. 2 in the list above, Bridget McLaughlin Dockter, Manager of Policy & Outreach with Xcel Energy, said her organization is interested in targeting small and medium businesses, who face challenges with financing and capital budgets. Nick Mark, Manager of Conservation and Renewable Energy with CenterPoint Energy, said his organization is

particularly interested in Items No. 2 and 4. One EVAC member added that some of these proposed new items are larger than others, and suggested that research on those larger items might be a feasible goal in a two year plan where others could be completed within two years. Bridget reiterated that if some of these new items don't move forward now, they could continue and be considered in a future work plan.

The people who submitted each new program or concept were invited to spend a minute or two describing their idea. After hearing these brief presentations, EVAC members were invited to physically walk over to the person whose idea they liked best and wanted most to see included in the Work Plan. Each group was required to have at least four members to be viable. With some negotiating and merging of topics, three groups were eventually formed:

Group #1: Small Business Energy Efficiency Program

Leader: Matt Kazinka; Jamez Staples, Sidney Jordan, Trevor Drake

Group #2: Multi-Family/Single Family Housing Energy Transparency

Leaders: Chris Duffrin & Janne Flisrand; Louis Alemayehu, Tim Gaetz, Cameran Bailey

Group #3: Thermal Imaging Flyover

Leader: John Farrell; Kirk Washington Jr., Kevin Lewis, Karen Monahan

At the conclusion of the small group exercise, group leaders reported back to the group, and submitted their summary sheets to the Planning Team. (These summaries/reports are contained in a separate document labeled "Appendix A.") Each member of the EVAC received two adhesive dots which they were instructed to place on the initiative(s) they most wanted to see included in the Work Plan. After completing the "dotmocracy" voting the dots were counted, and there was essentially a three-way tie: Group 1=10, Group 2=9, Group 3=9. All three initiatives will be forwarded to the Partnership.

6. Process for Developing a Final Work Plan & Next Steps

Brendon stated that this will be the last meeting of EVAC before the next CEP Board meeting. At that Board meeting the Planning Team will report on the work plan that should be considered for the remainder of 2015 and 2016. The Planning Team will initiate the brief survey, with a short deadline for completion, allowing EVAC members to rank items against each other. EVAC members will receive final results of this survey by email.

The City and utilities have work to do internally regarding time lines, i.e. how long each item would take, and regulatory implications. Internal stakeholders (other departments in the City or with the utilities) will be consulted for their input. The Planning Team will consider this feedback, and review and summarize all of the survey data and comments including the new items, in creating the Final Work Plan. The CEP Board will also receive all of the data that has been collected through surveys and at EVAC meetings.

The CEP Board meeting is scheduled for Friday, May 29, from 9:00 to 11:00 am in the Doty Board Room, Minneapolis Central Library. All EVAC members are invited and encouraged to attend.

Subsequent to that meeting, the Planning Team will engage in discussions with the co-chairs about future meeting agendas, determining the most effective use of EVAC in its remaining two meetings in 2015 as they begin thinking about metrics and the next work plan process.

7. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 8:12 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