

Minneapolis Clean Energy Partnership
ENERGY VISION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minneapolis City Hall, Room 333

Tuesday, May 23, 2016

4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Q2 2016 Meeting Notes

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

Committee members excused: Chris Duffrin, Sydney Jordan, Julia Silvis

Guests: Timothy DeHerder-Thomas

Planning Team/staff present: Bridget Dockter, Nick Mark, Louis Mondale, Kelly Muellman, Gayle Prest, Katie Jones Schmitt, Al Swintek, Marsha Wagner

1. Welcome and Introductions

Co-Chair Jamez Staples called the meeting of the Energy Vision Advisory Committee (EVAC) to order.

Co-Chair Billy Weber reviewed the agenda, then invited EVAC members, staff and guests to introduce themselves.

2. Review and Approval of Agenda and Minutes

It was MOVED and SECONDED that the minutes from February 16 (Q1 2016) be approved. Motion CARRIED.

3. Annual Report Presentation and Discussion (Planning Team)

The Planning Team provided an overview of the draft Clean Energy Partnership (Partnership) Annual Report 2015 (Report). Gayle Prest introduced the report, stating that the work plan and metrics formed in conjunction with EVAC were used as the basis. Data, gathered by census tract which has never been done before, has not yet been evaluated and analyzed. The Planning Team recognizes that the Executive Summary is the weakest part of the Report; communications teams from the City and Xcel Energy will be providing additional input. They are looking for major questions from EVAC that could be considered for next year's annual report. Bridged added that major changes will not be made to Report 2015 because it is being emailed to the Partnership Board this week and formally presented to them on June 3, 2016. Nick Mark offered thanks to the people – shown on the acknowledgements page – who pulled the data and report together.

Returning to review of the Report, Gayle said that the Introduction is lengthy because the Planning Team thought it important to introduce the history and how the entities involved – City of Minneapolis, CenterPoint Energy and Xcel Energy – came together to form CEP. Following

introduction of the eight metrics the Report includes next steps, then appendices which provide historical documentation of steps taken throughout the first year, i.e. work plan, demographic maps, and additional resources.

- *Executive Summary.* It includes background and structure, first year highlights, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (through 2014 because data tends to lag a year behind), introduction and summary of the eight metrics, recognition received to date, and what is planned for 2016. (Two awards – EPA’s Climate Action and White House recognition for the Building Data Accelerator Project – were received in January 2016 and will be included in next year’s report.) In 2016 the Partnership will dive deeper into the data provided in the Report, using that data and funding by the Partnership to conduct one to three pilot projects on community engagement, seek applications (or reapplications) from the public to serve on EVAC, begin drafting the 2017-2018 Work Plan, and seek additional resources and strengthen relationships with other interested parties.
- *Introduction.* Covers the background and structure of the Partnership, and duties of the Board, EVAC and Planning Team. It includes Partnership work done in its first year (2015) and what will be done in the remainder of 2016. Metrics were established to measure and inform on progress toward achieving goals. In addition, Xcel Energy and CenterPoint rolled out a multi-family program in 2015, the City funded a buy down of Home Energy Squad (HES) visits to income-qualified households, and they all worked with the Center for Energy and Environment (CEE) to streamline the process for customers participating in HES. Much of the important foundational work during the first year was around establishing the structure, metrics and work plans. In the future more time will be spent analyzing data, evaluating programs and driving teams.
- *Metric 1: Citywide Greenhouse Gas Emissions.* GHG in 2014 (the most recent year available) were down 7.5% from 2006 levels. Emissions from electricity were 22.5% lower than in 2006 due to carbon intensity and declining use. Although the building stock in Minneapolis grew by almost 3000 buildings and 27 million square feet, electricity consumption continues to decline due to participation in utility energy efficiency programs. This reflects all new construction where utilities provided energy design assistance amongst other programs. It was noted that 2014 was an abnormally cold year while 2012 was an abnormally warm year, making the data even more significant.
- *Metric 2: Commercial Buildings.* Metric 2.0 measures energy use of commercial and industrial buildings; Metric 2.1 is for benchmarked buildings. The Energy Star score of 74 is better than the national median score of 50 and just one point shy of the score of 75 required for certification. The Energy Use Intensity (normalized energy per square foot) score is 99. Initiatives included the Minneapolis Building Energy Challenge with the goal of reducing GHG emissions 15% by 2020, which is in line with Climate Action Plan (CAP) goals of 20% reduction for commercial buildings by 2025. Xcel Energy launched a tool to assist and enable building owners to upload their energy usage data to the portfolio manager. [Metric 2.1 Map; lines on maps represent census tracts.]

Metric 2.2 shows Xcel Energy and CenterPoint program data on one sheet, but not combined. It includes program participation, initiatives, incentive dollars, and estimated energy and cost savings. In 2015 \$5 million went into incentive dollars to commercial businesses, reflecting a savings of almost \$6 million. Through their Energy Design Assistance (DEA) programs the utilities are working to coordinate with the City to identify those who might be missing from program participation: small entities that are likely not aware of them, or larger ones who might not want to deal with the paperwork or other reasons. It was noted that buildings near downtown on the NRG steam system are not eligible to participate in CenterPoint's programs because NRG has opted out of gas CIP they can still participate on the electric side. [Metric 2.2 Maps]

Q: With larger long-term goals about efficiency program participation, have you considered putting this into a percentage, i.e. x% cumulatively of commercial buildings have participated in these programs? It would show how it fits into the overall picture.

A: The Work Plan and Metrics will be updated; we will keep that in mind. Although that is already requested in the Work Plan, it is important and has been considered by the Planning Team but it is not easy to do.

- *Metric 3: Residential Buildings.* Residential gas use in Minneapolis has been flat for at least seven years despite the fact that 5000 residential customers have been added in that time. It is due to codes and standards, utility programs, and arguably could be due to climate change. Electric use is down slightly on the residential side. Data for 2015 is not available until late June or early July.
- *Metric 4: Locally or Directly Purchased Renewable Energy.* Metric 4.1: Windsource shows cumulative numbers from 2012-2015; annual numbers are currently not available. There were no community solar gardens (Metric 4.2) up and running in 2015 in or adjacent to Minneapolis. Metric 4.2: Rooftop new solar data includes Solar*Rewards® and Made in Minnesota Solar Incentive programs. In 2015 the city added almost a megawatt of rooftop solar interconnections. [Metric 4.1 and Metric 4.3 Maps]

Q: Are megawatt hour outputs measured or estimated?

A: Do not know. Will research.

Q: Did all of the rooftop solar interconnections take advantage of Solar*Rewards® or Made in Minnesota?

A: Most go through these programs. Tracking the RDF projects would be different because those are free, but they are still interconnections.

Q: Are you tracking megawatt hours from [inaudible] in past years?

A: Yes, we are tracking that. It is not reflected in the report, but it could be added next year if a cumulative tracking mechanism is added.

Metric 5: Home Energy Squad Participation. This is tracked by rental and owner-occupied, by unit. HES serviced approximately 1% of all eligible 1-to-4 unit residences in Minneapolis. Because of the City's loan buy-down program the loan count for insulating or heating

equipment increased from 11 in 2014 to 47 in 2015. The Map for Metric 5.0 shows the breakdown by rental and owner-occupied units. The downtown area does not have many 1-to-4 unit buildings but residents in large apartments and condos are eligible for program participation. Metric 5.1 show mostly 1-to-4 unit residences that qualified for HES. Metric 5.2 shows the count of energy efficiency loans by census tract, and the sum of loans awarded. [Metric 5.0, Metric 5.1 and Metric 5.2 Maps]

Q: What is going on in the Sheridan-Bottineau-Holland (Northeast) area where there is a lot of rental participation?

A: There are two large apartment buildings that were serviced. That is why there is a spike in that area.

- *Metric 6: Low-Income Program Participation.* Focused on energy efficiency programs aimed at low-income customers; bill-payment assistance programs are not included. In Minneapolis the utilities spent more than a million CIP low-income dollars on energy efficiency programs in 2015; over two million dollars were spent with Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP) funds added. There is some overlap in the utility and WAP home visits due to complexity of allocating funds and privacy issues, but no overlap in dollars spent. [Metric 6 Maps for CenterPoint and Xcel Energy]

Q: Why was the estimated cost savings so much lower than the CNP low-income dollars spent?

A: Cost savings is a function of the energy saved times the customer bill rate. The program pays for all of the energy efficiency upgrades performed in the home, where a rebate might give you a few hundred dollars on a new furnace. The program cost should not be thought of at the same time as the cost saving.

- *Metric 7: Air Sealing and Insulation Program Participation.* This program involves rebates for home insulation. CenterPoint launched a pilot in Minneapolis in early 2015 which is still ongoing through HES to drive customers to move forward with recommended improvements. A number of them took advantage of the City's loan buy-down program to move forward. The program has been successful, and CenterPoint and the Partnership can take some credit in that success. [Metric 7 Map]
- *Metric 7: Multi-Family Program Participation in CIP.* This includes many programs offered by CenterPoint and Xcel Energy but not the Multi-Family Building Efficiency Program, which is expected to bring an increase in 2016. [Note: Xcel Energy did not include MFBE, CenterPoint did; to be addressed in the next annual report.] [Metric 8 Maps for CenterPoint and Xcel Energy]
- *Next Steps:* In 2016 an RFP will be developed for the community engagement projects, EVAC applications will be sought (existing members can reapply), data will be used to inform the 2017-2018 Work Plan, and partnerships and relationships will be strengthened.

Billy thanked the Planning Team for their efforts in putting together the Annual Report, and invited EVAC members to make comments or ask questions.

Comment: It would be useful to see percentage numbers so we can relate the one-year numbers of the goals of the CAP.

Response: The Planning Team will have to figure out an appropriate year to start that, and there are system capabilities of each of the utilities when they can find appropriate tracking and extrapolate Minneapolis-specific data.

Comment: We should be really explicit and transparent about how household numbers are counted. Response: In the Annual Report 1-to-4 is under residential, 5+ is under commercial.

Comment: When you are counting household averages, how are you doing that? Is my property in here as one household, two households because I have two Xcel Energy bills or four households because I actually have four units? Is there a way to get that accurate, because I have one CenterPoint bill, two Xcel Energy bills? That sort of accuracy will matter in terms of getting to our 75% of households for whatever it is. If it is not possible it should be transparent where there is uncertainty in the numbers.

Response: We only know what our meter provides. We do not count households, we count customers. Generally in a residential situation a meter is a customer. How many households are behind that is unknown. If you have two meters and four households we don't know about the other two households, so we don't know if the other two are adding to our taking from.

Comment: The Annual Report should make it clear that there are cases where you do not know and give examples so it can be accurately understood, and when we are doing the transition to percentages that we are aware of the gap.

Response: Agreed. Katie added that for HES visits they are counted per unit, so there will be differences between program and consumption data.

Comment: Would it make sense to list the CAP goals with the metrics that relate to them so we know if we are on track to meet them?

Response : We have attached the Work Plan that does have the direct reference to the CAP goals. That would a great idea and maybe something that a PR department could figure out how to communicate. It could be included in the tables. It will not be possible to do in a day [or the 2015 Annual Report], but we can think about it for next year.

Comment: On the counts of participants, be specific so when someone is looking at them it is clear. All of the maps look roughly the same but they are counting different things and the legends mean different things. It would be helpful if the legend is specific.

Response: That is a good point. It probably cannot be done for this Report but when we do the legends make sure it reflects that we are counting meters, customers or households rather than participants, and what the base is. Bridget added that it was done this way because it is how the utilities report them to their regulators, and Billy said some of the CAP metrics are based on participation. The Planning Team will explore to determine if there's a way to make these changes to make the material more clear.

Comment: I find it difficult to distinguish which color was in which category. Is there a way for the maps to distinguish the color gradient a little more? The difference between some of the shades is difficult to tell, specifically between second, third, and fourth.

Comment: Is there a way to provide context about how Minneapolis compares to other areas, like energy use intensity of benchmark buildings? Could we add a statement like “nationally this is what the average use intensity is for commercial buildings of this same size”? Regarding the comment that natural gas usage is staying flat, was the context for CenterPoint’s service territory in Minnesota, and how does Minneapolis compare to that? One of our assumptions is that we are able to go farther and do better by having this kind of partnership.

Comment: On the Metric 8 Map the ranges jump from 9-32 to 81-110. Where are the numbers between that range?

Response: It should be sequential. Louie added that a couple of tracts were outliers with several having 1-3 or 1-4. It was a difficult map. This will be checked and if the numbers stay the same language will be added to make it clear this is not a typo.

At the conclusion of the discussion period, EVAC members with additional comments were invited to send them to the Planning Team. Billy added that this will be discussed again as planning for the next Work Plan gets underway, so more questions and requests for clarification will surface. The Annual Report will be presented to the CEP Board on June 3. Thanks were expressed; applause ensued.

- 4. Engagement Pilot Project Focus** (EVAC Outreach Team) [\[Handout\]](#) The community engagement pilot was presented to the CEP Board at its Q1 meeting. They were excited about and approved the proposed pilot in specific targeted communities in North and South Minneapolis. Each of the three partners allocated \$10,000 towards initial funding for the pilot projects. The Planning Team is also looking at other grant funds.

The Community Engagement subcommittee committee held three meetings in the last quarter. They identified what priorities to use in selecting pilot communities, selected the communities, and created guidelines for drafting an RFP that the Partnership can use to select organizations to implement the pilot projects.

The priorities agreed upon by EVAC include focusing on communities with specific need, from which the Partnership can learn the most, and that are not being reached by existing engagement methods. The committee identified additional priorities: focus primarily on communities of color, at least one pilot should be in a primarily non-English-speaking community, at least one in a residential rental housing community, and at least one should be in North Minneapolis. Depending on the level of funding it might not be possible to achieve all of these goals. Rather than selecting priority projects, the committee left that open for organizations to propose specific projects in the RFP process, factoring in requirements around geography; race, ethnicity and language; income (households below 80% of the Area Median Income); and housing type. Proposals that seek to engage renters will be given priority if they demonstrate a capacity and

willingness to additionally engage property owners of buildings occupied by targeted renters. The committee developed criteria by which proposals will be measured by the Partnership and Planning Team.

Comment: It would be helpful to define what you mean by engagement. It would be helpful to include a sentence or two providing context of what the overall city goal is, and frame it in reference to EVAC's goals for engaging traditionally under-enfranchised groups.

Response: The committee wrote some language but it is not going to the Board to be approved. The language will have to be crafted, but it is about seeking organizations that can do the work of helping the Partners understand the community, and make a plan for engaging that community in energy efficiency opportunities and implementing that plan. Bridget added that the cost-to-impact ratio of the proposed project in terms of dollars spent per resident engaged is an appropriate proposal criterion, but said it should be kept in mind that if this is a project that is being considered for replication – especially looking at leveraging funding dollars elsewhere – they have to be cost-effective from a per-unit perspective. Gayle thought that number could be determined after the fact, but it will not be built into the RFP. Having done a similar thing on the HES pilot, Nick agreed that with the right data collection it is something that can be done at the back end to determine if it was cost-effective and how replicable it is.

Comment: If generally cost-effective measures were effective in these processes we wouldn't be here working on it now. Part of the reason a pilot program is being developed for this concept is because generally cost-effective measures have been ineffective and we are trying to come up with a solution to make what is cost-effective capable of expanding out into areas that have not been served. The programs are cost-effective already but the engagement, marketing and processes that have already been engaged in have not been effective in getting them beyond places where people already have easy capital or time and attention to do that. Cost-effectiveness cannot be one of the major criteria for this process.

Response: From a utility standpoint, we have a regulatory requirement that these programs must be cost-effective. You are correct that investing money that will drive higher participation in a program that is cost-effective you might be able to generate cost-effective energy savings at a higher level than previously achieved. It is also possible to spend that money in a way that does not produce as much incremental participation. A pilot does not have to be cost-effective, but it has to be able to show that if replicated there is reason to believe it could be possible.

Comment: Is there any benefit in the fact that since the City and utilities are in partnership that this responsibility could be put on the City to balance out the efficacy?

Response: : That is an interesting question, and there is not a final answer now.

Comment: It would be great to identify what resources, in addition to the funding the Partners can provide to the effort, would be available.

Response: Bridget said that Xcel Energy contracts out its program evaluations, but the Partners can help pull the information and provide collateral, technical assistance, and assistance with program evaluation.

Comment: With the cost-effectiveness test, it is also a question of cost-effective for whose money, if there's money in here that is not utility funding. If we are paying extra to reach

customers that have not been reached, how much of that is utility funding that needs to meet a cost-effectiveness test? If the City is contributing money on top of that, it should not be included. Response: This is a regulatory discussion that would take a whole other docket. To clarify, Gayle said this is one to three projects, at \$10,000. This is a starting point so we have to be clear and not over-manage these contracts. For this investment we are probably not going to come up with a model that works; rather it will be what we learned and what is the next iteration of this project.

There being no further discussion on the proposed engagement plan to be presented to the CEP Board at its meeting on June 3, it was MOVED and SECONDED that the following Motion be approved as amended:

EVAC recommends that the CEP Board approve the language in Attachment #2 for inclusion in the Engagement Pilot Project RFP related to Targeted Populations and Proposal Criteria. Motion CARRIED.

5. 2017-2018 EVAC Application Process and Timeline (Planning Team)

Terms for the first two-year EVAC group expire at the end of 2016. It is hoped that everyone currently serving on EVAC who is interested in reapplying will do so as their terms are not automatically renewed. The Planning Team will ask the Board for authorization to release the application process August 1, and the application period will close on September 15. In October the Planning Team will submit their recommendations to the Board. Because it will take place between Q3 and Q4 Board meetings approval will take place via email. Any new EVAC members would be invited to attend the Q4 meeting to get acquainted with the work of EVAC and transition into the position.

Comment: Is there a plan for orientation for new people? As someone who joined in the middle it was difficult to catch up. A packet that contains the vision and work plan would be helpful.

Response: The Planning Team talked briefly about a social event for an informal orientation. Gayle said a three-ring notebook could be assembled and made available for new members, or perhaps establishment of mentor-mentee relationships for new member orientation. At its Q4 meeting the CEP Board will be approving the Work Plan for 2017-18 so that will be another good opportunity for new members to see what they will be working on.

6. 2017-2018 Work Plan Process (Weber/Staples)

The majority of the 2015-16 Work Plan is going to roll forward into the next two-year term. The process for the initial Work Plan was to generate one to three ideas to put forward and workshop at the 2015 Q3 meeting. Much of this was done through a large survey, with EVAC members pitching additional ideas to be added. In the time leading up to the 2016 Q3 meeting EVAC members have time to return to their constituencies and talk to people about what might be good programs to consider.

In the ensuing discussion about how to develop the 2017-18 Work Plan several ideas were put forward:

- It is helpful and most effective to use both: a survey to generate ideas and then a group discussion to make final selections.
- Not everyone on EVAC is able to participate in extra meetings that might be scheduled between now and the Q3 meeting.

- Review the ideas proposed for the last Work Plan, and take part in a prototyping activity.
- Consider hiring a consultant to run the Q3 meeting. If approved by the Board, the Partnership would provide funding for the consultant (estimated at \$1000 or more). Annie Levenson-Falk and Trevor Drake volunteered to research and identify suitable candidates; the City would take the lead on the minimal procurement process. Co-Chairs Jamez Staples and/or Billy Wilder would be involved in the planning process for that meeting.
- The bulk of the work will involve revisions to the current Work Plan, looking forward to see what should be added or dropped off, not starting from scratch.

7. Kirk Washington Recognition

Kirk Washington was on the initial EVAC Board, and served until his resignation in 2015. Louis Alemayehu spoke eloquently about Kirk's many contributions to the community, his diverse and deep family roots, and his incredible energy. Louis quoted Che Guevara in capturing Kirk's essence: "... the true revolutionary is guided by a great feeling of love." Although Kirk's life on earth ended in a tragic and untimely way – an automobile accident in early April – his energy was not destroyed but lives on in the many lives he touched.

8. Open Discussion and Announcements

- Minneapolis City Council approved moving forward with buying down HES and limiting zero percent financing for income-qualified. The contract is for \$60,000 versus \$40,000 last time.
- Annie Levenson-Falk is transitioning to a new role as executive director of a new consumer advocacy organization called Citizens Utility Board Minnesota.
- Cameran Bailey graduated with his masters degree and has accepted a position with a small solar development firm where he will be working on the Aurora Project. Kelly added that Cameran's masters capstone project – Minneapolis Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment – has been posted on the city's [website](#).
- Chris Duffrin has been named President at Center for Energy and Environment.
- Tim Gaetz is now Managing Director Facilities & Development at Minneapolis Public Housing Agency, following his predecessor's retirement about ten months ago.
- A request was made for a link/listserve on CEP's website for people who want to receive updates on meetings. Gayle said it is not part of the city's website but they will check into adding this.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:56 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