

City Light Review Panel Meeting Meeting Minutes

Date of Meeting: March 27, 2018

MEETING ATTENDAN Panel Members:	CE				
Names		Name		Name	
Gail Labanara	√	David Allen		John Putz	√
Sara Patton	√	Patrick Jablonski	√	Nina Sidneva	√
Thomas Buchanan	√	Leon Garnett		Cal Shirley	√
Staff and Others:					
Jim Baggs	√	Kathleen Wingers	√	Karen Reed (Consultant Contractor/RP Facilitator)	√
Calvin Goings		Kirsty Grainger	√	Leigh Barreca	√
Robert Cromwell	√	Mike Haynes		Jaya Bajpai	√
Paula Laschober	√	Tony Kilduff	√	Richard Cuthbert	√
Lynn Best		Calvin Chow		Monica Fontaine	√
Gregory Shiring	√	Darnell Cola	√	Carsten Croff	
Emeka Anyanwu	√	Amy Wheeless	√	Maura Brueger	√

<u>Introduction</u>: Gail Labanara welcomed the group and convened the meeting at 11:07 AM and led a round of introductions. Jim Baggs introduced the new officer of Engineering, Technology and Innovation, Emeka Anyanwu.

Panel Discussion: None

Review of Agenda: Karen Reed reviewed the agenda.

Meeting Minutes: The meeting summary for March 12th was approved as submitted.

Public Comment: None

<u>Chair's Report</u>: Gail noted she will join City Light for a presentation to the Council Health, Housing, Energy and Workers' Rights committee next week regarding strategic plan performance. She also shared that the committee to find a new general manager for the Utility has had its second meeting.

<u>Communications to Panel</u>: There were no communications to the panel.

<u>SCL in the news and other updates:</u> There were no further communications.

Panel Letter to Mayor re: 8th & Roy Property: The letter has been delivered; no response as of yet.

<u>Detailed Report on Results of Strategic Plan Outreach</u>: Leigh Barreca introduced the topic. Jenny

GIII)

City Light Review Panel Meeting Meeting Minutes

Levesque from SCL Communications gave a PowerPoint presentation summarizing results. Discussion points included:

- Did you share what you thought you heard with each group? A: Staff did ask for feedback on whether their views differed from the survey results.
- Concerned that the outreach was held without knowing the rate path. With this information known, feedback and concerns expressed could be very different. Will staff follow up to see what people think about the rate path? A: Yes.
- This was an impressive effort. Will there be more follow up with ethnic leaders? A: Yes, we are developing a process for this.
- What were the key learnings from staff? A: What we heard was pretty much as expected. It was interesting to see differences between groups. Some concerns from small businesses were new—noting how costly it is to do business in Seattle and concerned about anything that increases the cost of doing business.
- What information about load decline shared at these forums? A: We did note the revenue declines the Utility has experienced. We were more focused on sharing survey results and did not get much feedback on load decline.
- Do you think residential interest in reliability is a way of saying there are too many power outages? No. Just that reliability is a value.
- The overall themes heard from all groups were the desire for clean, reliable, affordable power.

<u>Draft Strategic Plan</u>: Jim Baggs introduced the document, noting that it is still a draft and the final will look quite different. He commended Leigh for her yeoman's work in pulling the document together thus far. The Panel took a break to read the document and then the group went through the document section by section. Discussion points included:

- Table of contents
 - o Add detail, not clear what is in each section from the "We Power" phrase.
 - List appendices
- CEO Letter
 - o Add date
 - o The plan is actually the 2nd plan. There were 2 biannual updates.
 - o "Unfortunately lower sales of electricity" sentence should be reworked.
 - o Add note for who to call/email for more information.
- Mission Vision Values
 - o In the future, may want to add something to mission statement regarding equity.
- Commitment to equity notes
 - Like the text boxes
- Panel description, members
 - o Add ordinance number
 - Note that panel met regularly over 2 years.
 - o Should we mention panel members who participated in this cycle but left?
 - o Other adjustments to Panel titles, experience

GIN

City Light Review Panel Meeting Meeting Minutes

Public Outreach

 Add summary detail on numbers of people who participate in outreach and the main themes heard

We Power Reliability

o Clarify up front what this section is about—context of where we are, where we've come from.

We Power Financial Stability

- Desire to revise caption. Should it say Affordability? Predictability? Accountability? All different concepts, all important.
- o Under-collection of revenue: re-phrase as over-forecast, revenue not coming in as expected due to declining retail sales of power.
- o Explain more about how and why demand is going down
- o Clarify the conclusion from the declining use from efficiency: more rate pressure.
- o Clarify what costs are going up more than inflation
- o Add national context?
- o More detail on why costs are going up and how power demand going down.
- o Add description of fixed v. variable
- o Add examples from commercial and industrial rate payers
- o Note that residential customers contribute to only about one-third of utility's retail revenue.

We Power Resiliency

- o Clarify up front that this section is about the challenges and risks going forward.
- Overall, most Panel members think this section should be deleted—content shifted elsewhere.
- o Add an executive summary highlighting challenges, context
- Should the action plans noted here be described in section called "Utility of the Future?"

• We Power Progress

- The "We Power" descriptors are problematic in terms of really helping explain what is being talked about. Perhaps use these captions in text boxes and have more descriptive section captions.
- o Unclear what are initiatives versus overall plan priorities.
- o Can the plan priorities be stated clearly somewhere?
- o Are there 4 or 5 pillars? Seems like affordability is a new pillar.

We Power Success

- Where metrics suggest weakening of goals, they should be adjusted.
- o Clarify when each metric is for—a year? 5 years?
- UDP seems to be a decreasing target—Mayor will define the new target.
- Streetlight repairs—is that still a relevant metric? Customers care a lot about streetlights being fixed, but now the repairs are costlier and time consuming with the



City Light Review Panel Meeting Meeting Minutes

shift to LEDs and the need to fix all adjacent sidewalks for accessibility every time SCL puts in a new pole/light (recent lawsuit requirement).

- o Clarify what "Rate Ranking" is.
- o Are the "Solar Installations" just those installed by SCL or total in place?
- Perhaps describe I-937 compliance as "Percentage of Power from Renewables" and footnote I-937 details

• We Power the Future

- o What will this section be? A conclusion or a description of the utility of the future?
- o Prefer to see a conclusion section

Other

- o The initial section needs to have more of a story about the forecast and the rate adjustments required as a result, and that after considering those adjustments, the cost increases are only around 3% a year
- o Each plan has talked about the need for a "one-time adjustment" so there might be pushback on that.
- o Risks the Utility faces should be presented up front and referred to throughout the document.

<u>Panel Letter Outline</u>: Karen noted what Panel letters have generally included in the past; the Panel can change that. The letter should outline the major points the Panel wants to express to the Mayor and Council. Karen encouraged members to read the outline before the next meeting and think about what is important to convey about the new strategic plan.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:03 PM.