

Minneapolis Clean Energy Partnership
ENERGY VISION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minneapolis City Hall, Room 319

Tuesday, September 26, 2017

4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Q3 2017 Meeting Notes

Committee members present: Chairs: Abby Finis and Matt Kazinka. Members: Louis Alemayehu, Timothy DenHerder-Thomas, Trevor Drake, Patty O’Keefe, Rebecca Olson, Siri Simons, Jamez Staples, Shane Stennes, Billy Weber

Committee members excused: John Farrell, Timothy Gaetz, Kevin Lewis, Julia Silvis

Guests: Akisha Everette, Ellen Holman, Donna Olsen, Marcus Mills, Lee Samelson, Isaac Smith, Edward Sutton, Michelle Wenderlich

Planning Team/staff present: Sara Barrow, Carter Dedolph, Bridget Dockter, Patrick Hanlon, Luke Hollenkamp, Emma Ingebretsen, Louis Mondale, Kelly Muellman, Halston Sleets, Brady Steigauf, Al Swintek, and Marsha Wagner

1. Welcome and Introductions

Co-chair Abby Finis called the meeting of the Energy Vision Advisory Committee (EVAC) to order. Introductions were deferred until later in the meeting, waiting for the arrival of new EVAC member Siri Simons. Siri got interested in energy and climate issues working as a student with EVAC member Shane Stennes on a campaign to transition the University of Minnesota off of coal-fired power. She has continued to be involved in energy and climate issues from an educational and public perspective. She currently works at the Minnesota Department of Transportation on sustainability planning.

2. Review and Approval of Agenda and Q2 Minutes

There being no changes to the agenda or Q2 minutes, it was MOVED and SECONDED that the agenda for today’s meeting and minutes from July 11 (Q2 2017) be approved. Motion CARRIED.

3. Update on Work Plan Activity Criteria and Processes

Luke Hollenkamp reported that at the Q3 Clean Energy Partnership (CEP) Board meeting Council Member Glidden introduced the idea of developing criteria for amending the Work Plan to create a better process and provide better clarity. The other CEP Board members concurred, so best practices criteria were established for any new Work Plan activities. They should address the City’s climate and energy goals, be induced by the Partnership, state roles for the City and at least one utility, identify a lead that will be ultimately responsible, and, if it is a utility conservation program, consider the cost-effectiveness.

There is an understanding that in future Work Plans proposed items may not meet all of these criteria. In this case any individual Partner activities that clearly advance the City’s climate and

energy goals may become potential items of future collaboration. Work Plan amendments should be rare, and the substance of any amendments will be presented at an EVAC quarterly meeting for input prior to Board consideration. The process for Work Plan creation, which CEP will be starting to think about next summer, is that the City will bring forth its priorities, and each Partner will present a list of potential Work Plan activities. EVAC will have an opportunity to review and respond to these proposed items, and may also make recommendations to the Planning Team that meet Work Plan activity criteria. Billy Weber suggested that the Planning Team set a timeline beginning in Q4 2017 or Q1 2018 so everyone knows when there is an expectation of EVAC input and output, and which items are coming forward from the City and utilities as priorities so EVAC can respond in a timely manner.

Pertaining to the work of CEP and activities in the Work Plan, Louis Alemayehu said that he feels there are two issues that should be more clearly articulated. One is that fossil fuels have got to go, and the other is the development and distribution of energy must be totally and dramatically changed. He said we are working with a model that has been evolving over approximately two centuries, and everywhere on the planet we are at a major turning point. Louis added that this is a critical hour, so we have to be very serious and intentional about how we move forward.

4. Community Voices about Energy

At the Q2 EVAC meeting members agreed to add space in future agendas to allow for community voices to speak about anything related to energy, with a time limit of five minutes per person including Q&A. EVAC will do this for a couple of meetings, then determine if they want to continue it as a standard agenda item.

- Edward Sutton: Edward was born and raised in Minneapolis, moved away for a period, and returned to Minneapolis in January 2017. As a renter in the Powderhorn neighborhood he is concerned about his energy costs. Between himself as a tenant, the property owner and the property management company playing interference, it has been a struggle to get any kind of maintenance requests fulfilled, even urgent ones. Problems include shingles that are missing from the roof, resulting in water damage and critters running around his kitchen. When he moved into his rental unit in March 2017 there was wind coming out of his silverware drawers because the exterior walls are completely without insulation and there are holes in the walls. Edward hesitates to make requests for repairs to the management company and property owner because the property is in such a bad state he fears they would consider knocking down and replacing the building with something new at twice the rent, which would price him out of that location. He is bringing his concerns to EVAC because he recognizes they are seeking some kind of mechanism to make energy efficiency improvements available to everyone in a way that obviates concerns like profit motives of property owners and energy companies. He believes as a renter he has a right to affordable housing with affordable energy as a part of that, and he is not certain where he should turn for those sorts of solutions.

When asked what methods he has pursued besides going to the property manager, Edward said a city inspector stopped by a couple of weeks ago. Edward is hoping his neighbor calls for a city inspection as well because he has even more water damage and it is affecting the

health of his children. The inspector sent out two repair orders; one for the roof and one for broken windows. If the work is not completed in a timely manner fines will be assessed. As far as proactive energy efficiency improvements, Edward does not expect that to happen at all.

- Donna Olson: Donna has some similar concerns to Edward's regarding energy costs. Two and a half years ago, after living in her car for six weeks, Donna found permanent housing through a Veterans Administration program for homeless vets. She currently is in the Section 8 voucher program, as are most of the other residents in her Brooklyn Park apartment. In her unit, she can see cracks under the windows where enough air is coming in to move her window blinds. Past requests to have things repaired have been ignored. Donna has lived in two different apartments in the complex and both had the same problems, so she knows the general overall condition of the apartments is not good. As a church planter in an interfaith spiritual community, she is concerned because much of her outreach will be to people who have also experienced homelessness. In community meetings she has heard horror stories about landlords making upgrades to apartments, then either kicking the tenants out or raising the rent to such a level that they can no longer afford it. This causes a fear among people of being homeless or moving to substandard rental housing. Donna would like to see inclusive financing, which means that energy efficiency upgrades that need to be made as well as investing in renewable energies could be paid on their utility bills but not necessarily funded by utility companies. It could be a win-win for landlords as well as homeowners. People who have experienced homelessness often have poor credit histories, making it difficult for them to find funding on their own.

5. Community Engagement Pilot Projects Update: Presentation on Results and Recommendations – Neighborhood Hub

Akisha Everett, Executive Director of Neighborhood Hub (NH), said it is a nonprofit organization located in the Jordan neighborhood which serves as a focal point for residents in need of immediate information, resources, rapid response and assistance in navigating social service systems. NH has a collaborative partnership with the City, Xcel Energy and CenterPoint Energy to try to get community members in North Minneapolis access and resources to energy efficiency and cost-saving pilots. The mission of NH is to foster a healthy and vital North Minneapolis community through partnership and holistic services that respond to the needs of our neighbors. They accomplish this by connecting neighbors to resources in the community, filling gaps in services to individuals and families, advocating that community needs are met today and into the future, and engaging in partnerships that build a stronger, more vital, and prosperous North Minneapolis community. Residents in North Minneapolis face challenges similar to those expressed by Edward and Donna in the Community Voices segment of the meeting (i.e. concerns about the condition of housing stock and shortage of affordable housing).

NH was established in 2005 as a federally funded One-Stop Family Support Center, serving predominantly African American families and individuals. It was incorporated as a nonprofit in 2007. They have assisted thousands of residents with navigation services focused on getting people access to safe, affordable housing, and access to services providing basic needs. Some unrestricted funding comes from the faith-based community and Hennepin County also provides some funding. Beginning in 2010 NH added an additional focus on eliminating health disparities

in this population. Its research and work focus on social determinants of health such as employment and housing.

Akisha provided an overview of the Community Engagement Energy Efficiency Pilot. She said that NH is involved in work that evaluates how to increase engagement with underrepresented communities in North Minneapolis with regards to energy efficiency programs. Their goal was to increase the knowledge and equitable uptake of energy saving opportunities offered by Xcel Energy and CenterPoint Energy for underrepresented communities.

NH collaboratively created a survey tool and employed several strategies for connecting with its community to determine why they were not using energy efficiency tools. They tabled several community events as well as hosting some events of their own, like the Healthy Homes Resource Fair. Through its work with the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) around healthy housing assessments, NH conducted one-on-one healthy homes visits and surveyed participants on what barriers they found to using assistance programs. Radio interviews with a Q&A and call-in component were conducted with KMOJ, and an ad was placed in the local publication, *North News*. Partnering with the Volunteer Lawyers Network, NH presented some tenant-landlord workshops.

They found both staffing and programmatic barriers. The top programmatic barriers were that people were simply unaware of the programs, the marketing materials were too complex, or the materials lacked details about the specific programs. For instance, a flyer about Home Energy Squad visits said it cost \$99, but there was no information about low- or no-cost options. One of the staffing barriers was not having enough bilingual staff; only one of the four staff members working on this pilot was bilingual. With more staff they could have attended more outreach events.

The accomplishments of NH in this pilot include conducting 14 one-on-one Healthy Home assessments, engaging 11 navigation clients from their intake application, hosting an interactive Healthy Homes Resources Fair where 48 of the 500 people who attended completed surveys, facilitating 2 tenant-landlord workshops where 18 participants were surveyed, and educating the community on energy efficient products and referring them to energy efficient resources. One issue that continues to be a problem is lead, and high on NH's list of healthy homes initiatives is finding funding for lead abatement.

Following Akisha's presentation there were some questions, clarifications and discussion:

- The primary languages besides English in the community are Hmong, Somali and Spanish.
- If this pilot could be continued or expanded, next steps would include reviewing literature and marketing materials to suggest simplified language to better reach this community. Employing step-by-step instructions on how to participate in these resources would be helpful.
- Besides lead, other high-priority initiatives of the MDH-funded Healthy Homes Team are promoting environmentally-safe cleaning products, providing access to healthy food, and stabilizing housing needs.
- NH has not had much conversation about gentrification, but as they conducted their landlord-tenant workshops with the Volunteer Lawyers Network the topic arose that landlords were

possibly not renovating or improving their property because they were waiting for a rush of people to return to the neighborhood and renovate their homes.

- At the Zero Waste Summit a statistic was presented that lead levels of homes in North Minneapolis are higher than they are in Flint, Michigan.
- People in this community may be aware of or have heard about energy efficiency programs, but they lack details about how to access them, such as when and where do they apply. In addition to provide a resource it would be helpful if there was follow-up to make sure they actually got the service(s) for which they qualified.
- Through the work that has been done locally and nationally, people are interested in working on more effectively combining health and energy efficiency. If you look at a standard energy efficiency retrofit list it hits many of the same categories. As these initiatives move forward it would be more productive to send out one team, as the NH team has done, instead of employing two teams.
- Much of the funding for the energy efficiency programs offered by NH came from Xcel Energy and CenterPoint Energy for their specific programs. Some money is available but certainly more could be leveraged.
- Training provided by the utilities on their specific programs was helpful, but NH staff found they had specific questions and needed more information and had to dig deeper. The trainers erroneously assumed that the people they were training already knew about energy.

6. Residential Retrofit Discussion

Matt introduced this portion of the meeting as a presentation of some of the energy efficiency programs available which will help EVAC members have a better understanding of how they work. EVAC wants to give some guidance to the City and utilities around what CEP can do to address some of the issues around unmet needs.

a. Overview of Residential Energy Efficiency Programs

Rebecca Olson, Director of Residential Programs with the Center for Energy and Environment (CEE), has been working in residential energy efficiency for eleven years in Minnesota, working for the Sustainable Resources Center, the Low Income Weatherization Program, NEC and CEE delivering Xcel Energy and CenterPoint Energy programs. Rebecca focused on five programs either because of their breadth or depth, or the lack of knowledge by this group about these programs.

- Home Energy Squad (HES) – high volume, low to moderate savings: CEE partners with CenterPoint Energy and Xcel Energy to deliver this program. It is a direct install program, which means they go into homes and actually install energy saving measures like lighting, weather stripping, and thermostats. It is coupled primarily with energy audits, which involve determining what bigger projects could be done like insulating or replacing a furnace. CenterPoint Energy added a low-income offering (HES LI) in 2017 so Minneapolis residents can now access direct install and energy audit visits for free, and 1-4 unit and townhome style properties are now eligible regardless of whether they are renter- or owner-occupied. In addition to doing installs, HES makes recommendations and connects customers who receive visits with energy advising services. If they are a low-income customer they are referred to a low-income program. If it's a non-low-income customer but they need financing, they make that connection. They can also

connect customers with suitable contractors. Also as part of the assessment they include an insulation bid that they can schedule with CEE.

- **Rebate Programs: Insulation/Air Sealing/Heating System CIP CPE – moderate volume, high savings:** Although Xcel Energy has some rebate programs, the high-impact rebate programs are insulation based and come primarily through CenterPoint Energy. Rebate programs are primarily a contractor-led model. The customer hires an approved contractor to complete the work, and the contractor submits paperwork for a rebate to the utilities on behalf of the customer. (Rebate amounts were not provided due to time constraints.) This program mostly applies to single family homes and townhomes. Rental units are eligible if they have a residential gas meter present and have an applicable component, i.e. attic space in the upper half of a duplex. Several years ago CenterPoint Energy added a quality assurance (QA) program as part of its insulation/air sealing rebate, which CEE deems important in ensuring that the work is done correctly and helps ensure energy savings into the future. Because energy advisor services are available through HES to coach customers through the process, and CEE works with CenterPoint Energy to provide feedback on which customers actually complete the recommended projects, they have information about how effective they are in leading people from the visit to the actual work. Approximately 80 percent of customers in Minneapolis received larger scale recommendations that would be eligible for rebates, and of that about 15 to 20 percent of homes that were visited go through with the work. That equates to about 100 jobs per year.

Regarding quality assurance (QA), a question was asked about what happens if the work does not measure up or is not satisfactorily completed. Rebecca said that they work with the contractor to fix it. The contractors are bonded and agree to terms and conditions. The implementer and the utility will work out how to make the customer whole, and if the contractor is not part of the solution or does not meet standards they would be removed from the approved list or face some other repercussions.

- **Low Income Rental Efficiency Program (LIRE) –low volume, moderate to high savings:** This program is administered by the Energy Cents Coalition. It includes a free energy audit including full work orders that are directly given to contractors to complete the work, and this year they started a referral to HES LI. In this program the property owner does not pay anything for the direct install or assessment but pays 50 percent of the project cost if they want to do the larger projects, with CenterPoint Energy paying the other 50 percent. Measures include attic air sealing/insulation, wall insulation, heating system and water heater replacements, and health and safety measures. They are comprehensive and cost-effective improvements. Eligibility is based on the property being 1-4 rental unit properties and the tenant and/or landlord must be low-income eligible. Low income in all of these utility programs as well as the Weatherization Assistance Program is defined as 50 percent of area median income or 200 percent of poverty level, whichever is greater. Rebecca noted that a 1-4 unit rental property is likely a higher energy burden than 5-plus unit multifamily buildings because of the square footage. The goal is to serve 50 buildings per year service territory wide, not just in Minneapolis.

- DOE Low Income Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP) – low volume, high savings: The Sustainable Resources Center administers this program. It is completely free to customers, including audit, work orders directly to contractor, completed work and final inspection. In Minneapolis it is often combined with CenterPoint Energy’s low-income weatherization programs to leverage those dollars so they go further. All cost-effective measures in the WAP are required to be completed by SRC. Cost-effective is defined as a savings-to-investment ratio of one or above, which is different than utilities’ CIP program standards. Measures include attic air sealing/insulation, wall insulation, heating system replacements/tune-ups, lighting upgrades, and very comprehensive health and safety measures (i.e. indoor air quality, no combustion safety issues). In order to qualify for the program the occupant and/or landlord must be eligible for low-income heating energy assistance programs, which typically tend to serve single family owner occupied properties with some rental units. Many logistical barriers have been cited for the lack of rental/multifamily property inclusion. A very robust 100 percent-plus QA is included in this program.

Program metrics were provided [see powerpoint presentation for more details], the most relevant being participants per year and total kBtus per participant. Some of the challenges in low income programs are limited funding and limited service delivery models that would provide high savings measures, logistical and philosophical barriers to completing rental property work, historical lack of CIP programs aimed at multi-family properties, incomplete coordination with other implementers to combine a full suite of services, and some walk-away issues that cost more to resolve than program budgets allow (i.e., vermiculite, knob and tube, structure or moisture issues).

For non-low income programs, challenges include lack of knowledge on which measures are best for an individual home, lack of motivation to complete more expensive measures, confusion over contractor bids/trust in robustness of scope of work, lack of awareness or access to good financing to reduce upfront cost, and lack of trust in payback/return on investment and other benefits. HES participation is high and cost-effective, but many customers stop after that visit. Multifamily properties struggle with multiple decision makers; tenants are often motivated but landlords and property management companies are not. Multiple visits by different parties, i.e. auditor, contractor bids, etc., can be cumbersome for an individual.

Some of the program successes include:

- HES combining direct install with energy audit visits to help eliminate multiple visits for customers.
- Inclusion of insulation and air sealing quote as part of HES to help streamline the bid process. This is based on a Minneapolis pilot that CEE did a couple of years ago that had good success so it was incorporated into the program as a whole. CEE is delivering the bid as a neutral third party which instills trust.
- There has been a robust utility/CEE focus on HES customer recruitment as well as customer co-pay buy down, and increased funding from utilities to do direct outreach.
- Addition of LIRE program to address low-income 1-4 unit rental properties.

- Addition of multifamily building efficiency program to focus specifically on 5-plus multifamily properties including a low-income component.
- Low interest financing options are available and promoted by CEE and certain neighborhoods.
- Increased focus on house as a system approach (i.e. indoor air quality and other healthy housing issues).
- Asset rating added to HES service including voluntary certification program (Energy Fit Homes). This provides a way to make improvements transparent at the time of sale of the property, and lays out a clear path for how to complete energy performance measures.
- QA program added to CenterPoint Energy's insulation/air sealing rebate helps build confidence in the work that is done.

Current gaps include:

- There are either not enough financial resources or access to financial resources for low-income customers to complete high savings measures. WAP has fairly limited funding (it serves one percent of all low income heating energy assistance program eligible customers in the state). CIP funding is robust and they sometimes have a difficult time spending all the money available. We need to explore how these funds are being leveraged as well as get more funding.
- Access to energy efficiency programs by renters is a struggle. High savings measures need to be done by the property owner, and there is a lack of energy usage transparency at time of rental.
- Access to low interest financing, specifically for the low to moderate income (50-80 percent AMI) customers with bad credit. Customers are not eligible for low-income programs but still have difficulty securing upfront capital.
- Homebuyers' understanding of their new home's energy performance. Most home improvement projects are completed within the first five years of homeownership. We're missing the opportunity to let people know what the best path is to energy efficiency.
- Lower participation in the new multifamily programs. They have robust designs but they are new programs with modest market penetration currently. There is a very low conversion rate from visit to larger measure implementation. One-to-four unit rental is about 30 percent of the rental market in Minneapolis, but the dedicated program serves only about 0.1 percent of low-income units.
- There are policy and incentive gaps to encourage or require energy efficiency improvements. Without some policy requirements or increased incentives customers remain less motivated to complete projects.

b. How do we boost programs and focus on implementation?

Abby and Matt led a brainstorming session about how EVAC can move the conversation forward on what it would like to see from residential energy programs. There is an ambitious goal of doing energy efficiency retrofits in 75 percent of the multifamily and single family homes in Minneapolis. Currently there are approximately 190,000 homes in Minneapolis, and as Rebecca reported approximately 1,200 homes are involved in these programs every year. Participation in those programs must be increased to meet that goal. We should be thinking about what we can do or invest in, especially if we have additional resources available via a franchise fee increase in the residential sector.

Luke Hollenkamp challenged EVAC to think about this presentation as it applies directly to reducing energy costs (affordability) and greenhouse gas emissions. With electricity we have two tools in our bucket to reduce greenhouse gas emissions: conservation and renewable. With natural gas we currently only have conservation, so there is a lot of potential greenhouse gas savings in programs that really have a high benefit on the heating side and simultaneously reduce heating costs.

EVAC members had a discussion with the following points:

- HES is the first step in getting to a whole home energy retrofit, and if we find that 80 percent of those people get recommendations, in order to achieve our goals we essentially have to be thinking about how do we get near 100 percent of everyone in Minneapolis to go through HES or the equivalent multifamily programs and get 75 percent of them to move on to do the actual retrofits.
- A point of sale policy would require that every time a home changes hands or rental unit changes tenants there needs to be a check on the energy efficiency and improvements that need to be made to a minimum standard. This is not allowed by state law, but improvements can be incentivized and policies can make transparent what is needed so that somebody understands that they are buying a house that has no insulation or rent a house that has really high energy bills.
- CEE is able to fulfill all requests for HES visits and demand ebbs and flows throughout the year. There currently exist multiple financial mechanisms to incentivize people to participate in HES, but perhaps more money could go toward income-qualified buy-downs at different thresholds.
- Requirements for workforce development of people making the energy retrofits would address some of the inequities that have been discussed. That is important when considering how to broaden, deepen and make accessible energy retrofit programs and have equity infiltrated throughout.
- The hardest part for residential programs is getting projects actually installed and lowering costs of retrofits, not just increasing the initial visits. A lot of support work is needed to get people to follow through with improvements, like deeper, broader, culturally appropriate community engagement that is bilingual and supports the entire lifecycle of the process from the visit to the installation. Like in business programs, what is most successful is follow-through, not just a hand off.
- Including on-bill loan repayment that is tariff based and not loan based could change the game in terms of who has access and who would be incentivized. Also helpful would be a full suite of innovative financing that includes credit enhancements, loan loss reserve, and renovation interest buy-downs.
- It may be difficult to meet aggressive goals if there isn't a program that is set up to walk anybody through the retrofit process including a way to cover the full upfront cost through some kind of financing mechanism. It needs to be as simple as getting your connections set up for your utility service, streamlined like the steps that HES is taking to have the bid and be able to refer contractors, and modeled off some of the low-income programs that provide full funding. However, access to financing is a not panacea by itself.

- Energy disclosure is the first piece in many of the programs proposed and we have already started to do that with our commercial buildings in Minneapolis.
- It is important to recognize that there are a lot of existing programs and we do not want to recreate or create a new program necessarily when much could be learned or leveraged from existing programs.
- Knowledge, carrots, and sticks are all needed to increase program participation and for people to implement building energy efficiency projects.
- Luke Hollenkamp asked Isaac Smith what was successful on the City's 2016 interest rate buy-down program, buying the interest rate down to zero percent for air sealing and insulation projects. Isaac said many of the loans happened in December when the deadline was December 31, which shows it is helpful to have that stick or that deadline of "you have to act now." Some sort of deadline or tiered rebate approach or zero percent financing for a limited time will help spur that action as quickly as possible. If HES did a visit, recommended measures, and then said that zero percent financing is available for thirty or sixty days after your visit, that potentially could spur more action than just saying that it is indefinitely available or it is available to the end of the year. Similarly, city funding could tier (ratchet) down as more time elapses between a HES visit and project implementation.
- Pertaining to lead remediation and healthy homes model, is there something the City can do to combine either outreach programs or fix-up programs? Patrick Hanlon said that inspectors go in and work on replacing windows and doors as part of the recommendation for those high risk assessments. Oftentimes there are HUD dollars for weatherization available that are left on the table or not being used because it is not enough of an incentive to get people to act. In rental units, looking at return on investment is nearly irrelevant because you don't have the incentive to be looking at energy efficiency and getting the return on investment as much as you would if someone owns it. That incentive has got to be much higher and closer to the cost.
- What is needed is an approach that does not treat this as you, the individual, have to figure this out and decide that you want it. Instead it needs to be done on a massive citywide scale and figured out who the appropriate person to pay for it is and have an appropriate collection system in place that is based on who is the beneficiary of those savings. I don't see how we're ever going to get to 75 percent if the process is each individual has to say this is something I want. People don't adopt things at a 75 percent ratio unless it is socially and culturally cool or mandated or everyone needs it in order to live.

Matt Kazinka closed out the discussion by stating EVAC needs to keep on being in communication with the Partnership and the City to figure out how to take what was discussed today and make it useful when thinking about spending priorities for any franchise fee increase. A member suggested making a recommendation to the City to fund a consultant to create an implementation plan for what scaling up residential programs could look like. Luke Hollenkamp stated that ultimately the budget adopted by the City dictates some of the possibilities here and that there's a balance of planning and action because that it is imperative to begin work now while creating an iterative process of what is working, what isn't working, and how to change.

Abby Finis stated that if there's interest in carrying on this conversation we can see if it will fit on the next meeting's agenda. If there's interest in creating a work group, communicate with the rest of us through email and see if others want to participate in that. The next step for us is to summarize and synthesize this discussion and then figure out what the next steps are. Matt Kazinka said that it needs to be figured out how this group advises on how the City puts increased funding towards meeting these goals. This is a conversation that we will have a follow-up email about to see if there is a group that wants to get together in person or via email for any interesting conversations. We are not building an implementation plan today.

7. Work Group Updates

a. Multi-Family – Billy Weber

Interested in how this discussion intersects with multi-family and in the future would like to be brought into conversations about residential retrofit prior to the meeting. Looking at energy equity and energy burden; currently there are goals but no target in the Work Plan. At the next meeting they plan to have CPED staff present to discuss some of the ideas that have been generated that should be carried forward about multi-family finance options, using the City's trust fund and trying to figure out some of those things. A data request was made on the multi-family housing program; they received a response that the information will not be available until next year.

b. Workforce Development – Jamez Staples

Planning to have another meeting with Partners (including representation from the City) to review the information that they requested and received from Xcel Energy.

c. Small Business – Matt Kazinka

[No updates to report.]

8. Announcements

[There were no announcements.]

The meeting was adjourned at 6:01 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