

Clean Energy Partnership - Meeting Notes

Minneapolis Energy Vision Advisory Council

2022 Q4 Meeting Notes

Microsoft Teams Virtual Meeting

November 30, 2022

4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Meeting attendees:

EVAC members present: Patty O’Keefe (Co-chair); Beth Tomlinson (Co-chair); Timothy DenHerder-Thomas; John Farrell; Mauricio Leon; Marcus Mills; Jamez Staples; Margaret Cherne-Hendrick; Elizabeth Turner; Ansha Zaman; Jon Kuskie; Katie Jones; Natalie Haberman; Leah Hiniker.

Staff/Guests present: Kim Havey, City of Minneapolis; Ly-Ly Vang-Yang, City of Minneapolis; Luke Hollenkamp, City of Minneapolis; Al Swintek, CenterPoint Energy; Kat Knudson, CenterPoint Energy; Dan King, Xcel Energy; Patrick Hanlon, City of Minneapolis.

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Meeting Protocol

Roll was called and meeting instructions for Microsoft Teams relayed.

2. Review and Approve Agenda and Q3 Meeting Notes

Beth Tomlinson noted one correction to the agenda that it should say “approve Q3 meeting notes” rather than “Q2 meeting notes”. With that correction, Beth asked for a motion to adopt the Q3 meeting minutes and the Q4 meeting agenda. Both were MOVED and both motions CARRIED.

3. 2022-2023 Work Plan

Luke Hollenkamp introduced this topic as an opportunity for staff and EVAC members who are involved in working groups organized around the three workplan themes to report back to the entire group.

Luke began by discussing Theme 1, which is focused on residential electrification. This working group has had two in-person meetings. The group has two purposes: 1) to inform the work of

the Clean Energy Partnership and 2) to provide recommendations for what can be put into the upcoming Climate Equity Plan. A series of three meetings is being facilitated by the Center for Energy and Environment (CEE). In the first two meetings CEE presented data on Minneapolis buildings and what types of equipment and services within a building are served by gas versus electricity. That gives us an idea of how far we have to go for full electrification of the building stock. One of things we've been looking at is what is the incremental cost over the next few decades of electrifying residential buildings knowing that there's a certain amount of cost that is already going to be borne by society by just replacing equipment as it fails.

Timothy DenHerder-Thomas then provided some thoughts as an EVAC member who has been participating in this working group. Timothy noted that the conversation has primarily been focused on one-to-four-unit buildings. It quickly boiled down to technology and economics. Most of the end uses that that we use for gas are pretty easy to replace. The one that's difficult and also the vast majority of the usage is space heating. The group really dug into what would it take and what are the impacts of trying to electrify space heating because a lot of the others are relatively straightforward, but they do have some cost. Timothy also discussed the importance of reducing demand across the board and specifically advanced load control to manage peak demand. The group has also discussed ground source and district energy systems as part of the solution.

Dan King then gave an update on Theme 2, which focuses on local solar energy. He first discussed the Resilient Minneapolis Project and the fact that the RFP to engineer and construct the microgrids has been released. He then gave an overview of the discussions of the in-boundary solar working group. The group has looked at some interconnection timeline data and what the existing incentive programs for rooftop solar are from Xcel Energy and the City. The group has discussed how to better utilize commercial rooftop space for solar and some opportunities for collaboration between Xcel Energy and the City for solar energy related to municipal operations.

Timothy DenHerder-Thomas then provided the perspective of an EVAC member who has participated in the working group meetings. He noted that the data and discussions have revealed and identified some different ways that we are looking at the experience of interconnection customers and how that looks different for small scale residential projects vs. larger projects. He also reiterated the interest in utilizing commercial rooftop space for solar. Timothy also noted that the group is interested in discussing how to create more community wide programs that are accessible and can benefit people, particularly renters and low-income communities and communities of color.

Kat Knudson then gave an update on Theme 3, which focuses on reductions in C&I buildings' gas use. She noted the regular meetings between CenterPoint and the City focused on the "New Normal" campaign. CenterPoint has also been meeting with vendors who would be implementing parts of the campaign. A courtesy notification was sent to the Department of Commerce to inform them of the initiative.

Leah Hiniker then gave an update on Theme 3 from the perspective of an EVAC member. Leah reminded the group of the City's and CenterPoint's natural gas emissions goals. She noted that the working group discussed strategies to meet these goals, including increased participation in CIP and decarbonizing district energy systems. Leah provided some more context on the New Normal campaign and the benefits of recommissioning. She noted that the group discussed district geothermal systems and a focus on equity when considering these strategies to reduce natural gas emissions.

Some general discussion followed regarding the working groups and making sure that they are complementary to and not redundant with the working groups informing the City's Climate Equity Plan. The group discussed this format for information sharing on the working groups at quarterly EVAC meetings. A suggestion was raised to distribute a short summary on the working group activities rather than providing updates in the meeting, then more meeting time can be for discussion. This could be done in writing or with a few slides. The group seemed to agree that this was a good idea and the planning team agreed that this could be done. There was also discussion of a shared online space for notes from the working group meetings. The IT challenges in doing so (with restrictions in access to collaboration spaces like Google Docs in place at many organizations) were noted, and the chairs and planning team indicated they could look into this more to see if there was something that could work. The group also discussed the importance of relationship building among EVAC members and several members expressed a desire to move back to in-person meetings, largely for that purpose.

4. Time of Rent Energy Disclosure Visualization

Luke provided a recap of the City's time of rent energy cost disclosure ordinance. One portion of that ordinance that took a longer time to implement was the tool for providing this information for 1–4-unit rentals. Recognizing data access and privacy policies, the City and utilities landed on using confidence intervals rather than actual customer energy usage data for the disclosure. Luke provided more details on the methodology and shared some possible visualizations of what the presentation of the data might look like.

EVAC members raised some questions about how the data are normalized (by number of bedrooms or per 100 sq. ft.). Some concern was expressed for customer/resident confusion if the data is not presented as for the entire property. Luke noted that the City is looking at this with an eye toward providing information that is useful while not being misleading (in terms of being able to be interpreted as a guarantee of costs).

Luke then asked some specific questions about the visuals and gathered feedback via the chat function of the meeting.

5. Partner Updates

a. Carbon-Free Future MN Coalition

Sara Barrow from Xcel Energy gave an overview of Carbon-Free Future MN. She noted that the goal is to make sure that Xcel Energy customers are well informed and have an opportunity to understand what Xcel Energy is doing in terms of resource planning. The group is not an entity that speaks with one voice. Members are informed about decisions being weighed in the legislature or at the PUC, and they can choose how and if to engage with the topic.

EVAC members then asked questions including asking if Carbon-Free Future MN is in conflict with the work of the Clean Energy Partnership and/or the Walz administration. Sara noted that the goals of Carbon-Free Future MN have been mischaracterized in some places. Xcel Energy is not opposed to the potential 2040 clean energy legislation. Sara noted that one of the main goals of the Coalition is to do outreach and education to audiences who are skeptical of the ability to reliably and affordably incorporate large amounts of renewable generation onto the system as quickly as we are. Sara offered to have follow up conversations with any EVAC members to discuss the Coalition further.

b. Minneapolis Climate Equity Plan

Luke provided a very brief update that the working groups would be completing their work in January. The process would then move to a steering committee with a draft in April.

c. Minneapolis and CenterPoint Energy Tariffed On Bill Pilot Proposal

Luke provided a brief update that the proposal was rejected by the PUC. There is not a clear alternate path forward, but conversations are underway about what comes next.

d. CenterPoint Energy 2024-2026 Triennial Plan – Ran out of time for an update. Relevant info may be shared via email.

e. CenterPoint Energy Innovation Plan – Ran out of time for an update. Relevant info may be shared via email.

A quick poll was taken on interest in meeting in-person. The idea of hybrid was raised, but the planning team noted that we don't really have the facilities to host a successful fully hybrid meeting. Several members expressed a strong preference to remain virtual, at least through Q1 2023. Consensus was

reached to continue virtually for Q1 2023. Beth and Patty would explore the idea of an in-person social gathering and we can revisit the idea of moving to in-person for Q2 2023.

Meeting Adjourned

DRAFT