SCL Review Panel Feedback on Draft Initiatives from March 24, 2020 Meeting.

Responses from Panel members are inserted below; rows line up for each respondent across the last two columns, font changes between regular *and then italics* for each successive respondent.

Name of Initiative *(presented in order they appear in the 3/24 meeting packet)*	Questions / Comments / Concerns	My position on this initiative: Support / Oppose / Need more Info (pls. specify info needed in column 2)
Organizational Change Management	• No comments or questions • *This initiative makes sense but is very tough to measure. How do you make it a more measurable? Are the different bargaining units going to involved?* • If SCL feels that this is critical, I can support it. I am, however, concerned that this initiative will create another plan that is filed and not embraced and utilized by the utility. My preference would be to see a plan for specific organizational changes on the horizon and not a general process. • *Too broad...needed at this time? $100k* • sounds good but very fuzzy to me what is actually involved. Would help to have a clearer view of some specific things that would be done	• Support • -- • Can support, but have some concerns that it turns into actual change • *Support, but may be pushed to back burner*
Continuous Improvement Program	• No comments or questions • -- • Same general comment as above. Although, I can fully support the spirit of this initiative, my preference would be to see specific projects listed and mindful of using strategic planning process to create other processes without clearly operational deliverables. • *LEAN? No $* • Similar to above. Sounds like great objectives but would be helpful to have some specific examples. Wouldn't want it to become mired in bureaucracy	• Support • *Fine* • Can support, but have some concerns that it turns into actual change • *Support*

Name of Initiative *(presented in order they appear in the 3/24 meeting packet)*	Questions / Comments / Concerns	My position on this initiative: **Support / Oppose / Need more Info** (pls. specify info needed in column 2)
Grid Modernization in Support of Electrification.	• No comments or questions • *Fine, capital availability will be the biggest constraint. We need to be realistic* • Budget and how it affects rate path – Would like to see some form of estimate on revenue increase as a result of this – Return? • *$10-20M, $3-7M to begin…WOW* • I like it. Seems like it will depend on returning to something akin to the world prior to corona. That may not be the case. Generally, next several years might be more focused on getting back to normal than initiating new projects - but too early to know at this point. (i.e. could find ourselves with much lower demand, but inability to significantly raise rates, leading to higher debt ratios and less ability to do new investments).	• Support • *Fine* • Can support with additional info • *Great, but the $*
Regional Energy Leadership and Collaboration	• No comment or questions • *Lots of undefined acronyms. Please scrub all initiatives to define acronym the first time it is used.* • I can support, but I was under the impression that this falls more into the "keeping the lights on" or business as usual category. • *Yes!* • Seems like what SCL's already been doing, but seems good to highlight it and hopefully see specific new concrete actions that follow from this. •	• Support • -- • Support • *Support*
Future of Work	• No comments or questions • -- • -	• Support • *Fine* • Support

Name of Initiative *(presented in order they appear in the 3/24 meeting packet)*	Questions / Comments / Concerns	My position on this initiative: **Support / Oppose / Need more Info** (pls. specify info needed in column 2)
	• *Will have Union issues, No $. Need to do something considering the employee survey –* • Again, sounds good but seems kind of squishy. Would like to see more well defined actions & metrics.	• *Support*
Rate Path at or Below Inflation	• I can't remember if we discussed this previously, but why hasn't the utility been fully paid for reimbursable work? Which process measure relates back to this element of the initiative? • *I would like to see emphasis on receivables as well as expenses* • Amen. Long overdue, maybe even too late. Wondering how is this defined – is it /bill or /kW (Do have some concerns about the ability to be fair across rate classes). • *Is this possible with revenue requirements? I think we should message this to make rates not political, so Mayor and Council have less say* • Rate Path - I like it (of course) but I'd caveat it that we shouldn't sacrifice needed investment to this rate path. Also, think there's reasonable chance that post-corona world will make this difficult	• Support • -- • Support • *Support*
Customer Experience Roadmap	• No comments or questions • *This initiative feels very "residential" in nature. As a corporate customer and building developer we have very different needs and think different rate classes should be recognized in the directive.* • I think this is necessary. I'd like to see where the staff resource budget comes from – Don't we have a lot of the data already? • *Staff $600k, outsource $550k, software $1m...* • Customer Experience - seems fine	• Support • -- • Support, but would like additional info • *Not at this time*

Name of Initiative *(presented in order they appear in the 3/24 meeting packet)*	Questions / Comments / Concerns	My position on this initiative: **Support / Oppose /** **Need more Info** (pls. specify info needed in column 2)
Pricing Services for the Future	• No comments or questions • *OK, a very challenging initiative. We need to be realistic on timeline here* • Most of this is long overdue. However, I have some concerns about commercial rate class standardization and becoming even more un-competitive in high demand general rates than we already are. • *Yes, Yes, Yes.* • Pricing for the Future - good	• Support • *OK* • Maybe support with more info. • *Support*
Expand Customer Program Options	• No comments or questions • -- • $15-20M over 5 years is significant enough for SCL to think about a return. • *This is great and goes with SCL leadership role but $15-20M* • New Products - good. I like the specificity	• Support • *OK* • Support if we can see an estimated return • *Not at this time* • Good
Information & Operational Technology for Cyber Security	• No comments or questions • *Process measures should be identified now. The Anticipated Risks -says none. They are huge if this plan is not executed on now. Government agencies are a prime target for cyber attacks* • Critical • *Great, yes, but no finances...need more info* • Cyber security - seems important	• Support • -- • Support • *Yes, need more info* •
Right-Size the Capital Program	• No comments or questions • -- • Critical • *Yes, Yes, Yes...and no $ listed, even better* • Rightsizing CIP - woohoo!	• Support • *OK* • Support • *Yes*