



**City Light Review Panel Meeting  
Meeting Minutes**

**Date of Meeting: March 31, 2020 | 11:00AM – 12:00PM | Meeting held via Skype “Final”**

<b>MEETING ATTENDANCE</b>					
<b>Panel Members:</b>					
<b>Names</b>		<b>Name</b>		<b>Name</b>	
Gail Labanara	√	John Putz		Mikel Hansen	√
Sara Patton	√	Patrick Jablonski	√	Leon Garnett	√
Thomas Buchanan	√	Chris Mefford	√		
<b>Staff and Others:</b>					
Debra Smith		Jen Chan		Karen Reed (Consultant /RP Facilitator)	√
Kirsty Grainger	√	Mike Haynes		Emeka Anyanwu	
Jim Baggs		DaVonna Johnson		Tom DeBoer	
Julie Moore		Chris Ruffini		Maura Brueger	
Saroja Reddy		Carsten Croff	√	Leigh Barreca	√
Eric McConaghy	√	Alex Pedersen		Kathryn Aisenberg	
Craig Smith		Toby Thaler	√	Angela Bertrand	√
Kathleen Wingers	√	Vanessa Lund		Chris Tantoco	

**Welcome\Introductions.** Karen Reed, Panel Facilitator, called the meeting to order at 11:08 AM.

**Public Comment.** There was no public comment.

**Review of Agenda** Karen reviewed the agenda.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes.** The meeting notes were approved as presented.

**Chair’s Report.** Gail Labanara had no report.

**Communications to Panel.** Leigh Barreca shared three items:

- Nominee for the panel vacancy is being identified by Councilmember Pederson’s office. The candidates may be invited to listen to panel meetings in April.
- COVID – General Manager (GM) Debra Smith is working with Mami Hara, Director of SPU, for a collaborative approach for including COVID Impact in the department’s respective strategic plans, both of which will be submitted to Mayor and Council this spring. A sidebar will likely be included in report that describes City Light’s efforts in response to crisis (Utility Discount Program, no shut offs.) Final decision on how the utilities will address this is pending further discussion with the GM.
- Another draft Plan will be available to the Panel to review before next meeting on April 14<sup>th</sup>.



## City Light Review Panel Meeting Meeting Minutes

**SCL in the News/Updates.** There were no news updates.

**Updates to the Roadmap.** There were no roadmap updates.

**General Managers/CEO's Report.** There were no updates.

### **Strategic Plan Initiatives**

Karen noted that based on responses gathered to date, most Panel members expressed concerns on measuring success, and the feasibility/advisability of expenditures in light of COVID 19, but generally support direction of the initiatives.

Leigh noted that City Light staff is currently working with program leads for detailed measurements. Operational Change Management lead hiring is on hold which will mean a new timeline for the project will be defined.

Karen asked the Panel members to identify as a top-line matter whether they have any "show-stopper" concerns with any of the initiatives. Responses included:

- No showstoppers. My concern is about prioritization in light of budget cuts.
- Customer experience road map concerns—timing, value at this point
- No show stoppers.
- Grid improvements – too expensive. Is it worth switching this out for other things right now?
  - City Light response – This is one initiative with an associated big spend. It will likely be supported with stimulus funds. Use of external funding will be a primary driver. This program will be hard to fund without external support.
- Generally curious at how the initiatives will be prioritized and how they will be impacted by budget cuts
- Rate Path – we need to carefully discuss
- Would prefer fewer initiatives with more clarity. They all need clear metrics and careful prioritization. Cyber Security is extremely critical
- Agree. The first 2 seem pretty process heavy, not a lot of new stuff here. But no show stoppers. Critical is rightsizing of the CIP. I also support the rate path.

Initiative detail discussion:

### **Organizational Change Management:**

- Concept good. Measurement is weak.
  - SCL comment: timeline is being pushed due to hiring freeze. Please note that this is a 6-year plan.
- There's no measurement currently identified to measure success on this. Not clear it is a priority at this time. Suggestion to combine this with another initiative.



## City Light Review Panel Meeting Meeting Minutes

- Combine with Future of Work.
- Combine, find measures.
- How interlinked is this with other initiatives?
- Dissenting opinion: It's great and speaks to leadership and adapting teams in these uncertain times.

Karen noted that on balance most favor this being combined with another initiative, but there is not a consensus to remove the initiative.

### **Continuous Improvement Program:**

Leigh noted this is a Continuation of Business Process Improvement initiative in current plan.

Panel comments included:

- Get things moving towards being LEAN

Panel consensus is to support this, keep it as a separate initiative, seek clarification.

### **Grid Modernization in Support of Electrification:**

Kirsty noted that investment in this is likely to be capped by the availability of federal stimulus funds.

Additional comments:

- Concern about cost of this in this environment.
- Concern is finances and overall undertaking. It's a long process. Hopefully stimulus funds also go to cyber security.
- Need discussion in the write-up around anticipated risks, and how to balance need for beneficial electrification vs energy efficiency.
- Link to cyber security.
- We have to think long term, the capital expenditure is very large so the Utility will need to take it on in phases.
- Would like to see this include an assurance that investments will result in a positive impact on rates and how a positive return on the investment when deciding on how to phase this.

Panel consensus is to support this, keep it as a separate initiative and clarify. Add stimulus funds as funding source and discussion on return on investment in times of austerity, as well as link to energy efficiency.

### **Regional Energy Leadership and Collaboration:**

Comments:

- We're already doing this; merge it into 'keep lights on.'
- Talk specifically about electrification vs. Energy Efficiency—need to balance these two goals.
- Talk more about salmon recovery.
- Important to think regionally and broadcast that to other utilities.



## City Light Review Panel Meeting Meeting Minutes

- Feels business as usual. Not a bad idea but detracts from the new and different ideas.
- Include national/global leadership not just regional.

Panel consensus is to support as a standalone initiative and clarify.

### **Future of Work:**

Comments:

- Will have union issues. But like to support employee survey work.
- Like, but concerns about unions. Sounds like there's a plan for that
- Text needs to reference the goal improving diversity and equity in the workforce.
- This work is important for Debra's goals.
- I like it; it is flexible. It seems to overlap with initiative 2 (Continuous Improvement).

Panel consensus to support as stand-alone initiative and clarify.

### **Rate Path at or Below Inflation:**

Comments:

- Support but wonder if it is achievable.
- No metrics tie back to reimbursement by customers for work performed by utility for the specific benefit. Why has the utility not been fully reimbursed for work, and will there be a metric?
  - (SCL) We're not sure. We perform a lot of customer-requested work on an at-cost basis. We're not a profit making organization; we charge what it costs. Time and materials costs need to be updated to make sure we are capturing costs comprehensively. Our financial systems weren't set up to ensure we make that recovery. This is related to the existing cost of growth initiative. This is especially important as it relates to our work with telecommunications firms accessing our light poles. We will track work such as this as a separate line of business to make sure we're recouping all of our costs.
- It's fine.
- Emphasize receivables and expenses.
- I love this one.

Panel consensus to support as stand-alone initiative and clarify.

### **Customer Experience Roadmap:**

Comments:

- Concerns with cost and if other things need to be moved up/delayed in the face of COVID. In general support of this initiative but it may be a lower priority now



## City Light Review Panel Meeting Meeting Minutes

- Like the spirit. Want to see more about incorporating customer feedback and reaching out to customers more.
- I like it because it will result in more energy efficiency.
- Concerned with the costs and software. Keep the work in-house.
- Feels like this has a residential focus– don't lose sight of bigger customers.
- Budget feels large given what we're already doing in this area, although I can support the idea of it.
- I like it, but reference smart grid/grid modernization and leveraging the data driven decisions the grid modernization supports
- Speak more to commercial/industrial customers.
- Amend to more clearly address non-residential customers.

Panel consensus to support as stand-alone initiative and clarify.

At this point, the time for the meeting had nearly expired and several Panel members had other meetings.

***Karen will send a short matrix seeking any additional input on the four initiatives we did not get to discuss.***

Closing comments from the group:

- Well run, efficient meeting.
- When is the next meeting? A: April 14<sup>th</sup>, 11:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.
- Leigh thanked the Panel for their time and input through the homework.

The meeting adjourned at 12:02 PM