



City Light Review Panel Meeting Meeting Minutes

Date of Meeting: September 25, 2018

MEETING ATTENDANCE					
Panel Members:					
Names		Name		Name	
Gail Labanara	√	David Allen	√	John Putz	x
Sara Patton	√	Patrick Jablonski	√		
Thomas Buchanan	<i>On phone</i>	Leon Garnett	√		
Staff and Others:					
Jim Baggs	√	Greg Shiring	√	Karen Reed (Consultant Contractor/RP Facilitator)	√
Leigh Barreca	√	Calvin Chow	x	Richard Cuthbert	√
Robert Cromwell	√	Eric McConaghy	√	Jenny Levesque	√
Paula Laschober	√	Michael Maddox	√	Josh Czebotar	√
Maura Brueger	√	Kiersten Grove	√	Joni Bosh	√
Kirsty Grainger	√			Alex Tsimerman	√
Kim Kinney	√			Michael Kars	√
				Marguerite Richard	√

Welcome Introductions. Patrick Jablonski convened the meeting at 11:05 AM. Attendees introduced themselves.

Review of Agenda. Karen Reed reviewed the agenda.

Approval of September 11 meeting minutes. The minutes were approved as submitted. Later in the meeting, an amendment to the meeting summary was approved: under the Chair's Report, add a sentence that Gail Labanara shared that Debra Smith had been nominated for the General Manager position by Mayor Durkan.

Public Comment. 3 individuals spoke to the Panel:

Alex Tsimerman said that he wants to see something in black and white to respond to in which all City Light customers will have money returned to them, given the problems with the billing system.

Joni Bosh noted that she had submitted comments yesterday on the stakeholder materials discussed at the last Panel meeting.

Marguerite Richard said she is concerned about the Utility's billing process failures. She stated she is being subject to retribution and atrocities.

Communications to Panel. Joni Bosh's comments on the rate design materials prepared for the stakeholder meetings were shared with the Panel. There were no other communications to the Panel.

SCL in the news and other updates. The last confirmation hearing on Debra Smith's nomination will be held October 1. Full council consideration will likely be scheduled for October 15. Michael Maddux noted she will be looking to develop stakeholder engagement plans.

Leigh Barreca shared the RSVP's to date for the upcoming stakeholder meetings. Karen asked whether Panel members have other people they would like to hear from. Leon Garnett said he would reach out to the low-income groups. Patrick shared that Dave Gering from Manufacturing Industrial Council is planning to participate in the October 23 meeting. Robert Cromwell confirmed that he will make some calls to connect with other major



City Light Review Panel Meeting Meeting Minutes

stakeholders from the strategic planning process from whom we have not yet heard.

Draft Situation Assessment for Stakeholder Meetings. The group reviewed the revised situation assessment document. Comments and suggestions included:

- Put a scale on the electricity consumption chart.
- In the second bulled on page one, say "highest demand" rather than "most stressed"
- Date the document
- Add a pie chart showing the amount of power consumption by customer class
- Identify the year for each pie chart.
- Move distribution and energy bullets to the left hand side under the cost of service bar chart.

With these suggestions being addressed, the Panel approved the draft situation assessment for use in the stakeholder meetings.

Framework for Rate Design Principles. Kirsty Grainger presented. Comments and suggestions on the revised document included:

- Revise preamble to take out "get" and add "for rate design" at end.
- Provide a glossary, and / or electronic link to a glossary on technical terms in the document, such as energy charges. Simplify the language wherever possible.
- Under "Fairly apportion cost of service":
 - The first sentence should note that the benefit of conservation "may be" less than it was. The sentence on the value of efficiency should be expanded upon.
 - Remove reference to solar net metering.
 - Note bi-monthly customer charges and rates.
 - Add that there is no fixed "per customer charge" for non-residential customers.
 - Note that single family and multi-family differential costs are not acknowledged in current rate structure.
 - Reference to rate policy should be section 3.B, rather than 3.A
- Under "social justice" the discussion of the Utility Discount Program should note what the current eligibility threshold is and include a link to a further explanation of the program.
- Under "environmental stewardship" note the larger policy programs here—short bulleted list.
- The Panel agreed with separating social justice and environmental stewardship into two separate principles rather than a general "equity" principle.

With these suggestions being addressed, the Panel approved the draft framework for rate design principles to be shared with stakeholders.

Questions for Stakeholders. The Panel reviewed the four proposed questions for stakeholders. Direction included:

- Put the second question first on the list.
- The fourth question should include reference to decoupling and higher fixed charges.
- The panel considered but decided against a separate question on decoupling.

With these changes, the questions list was approved.

David Allen mentioned he had an interesting article "How Big is the Energy Efficiency Resource" from the Rocky Mountain Institute. **He will email it to Kim Kinney who will distribute it to the Panel.**



City Light Review Panel Meeting Meeting Minutes

Scope of Comparative Utilities Study. Richard Cuthbert presented. He developed a list of utilities that he would propose surveying – 5 large municipal utilities, nationwide; 6 hydro-based utilities in the Pacific Northwest; and 5 utilities known for innovative rate design. The Panel agreed with his recommendation. In terms of what will be studied from amongst this group of utilities, the Panel asked that in addition to items proposed, that the study include a look at:

- Interruptible rates
- Demand response
- Decoupling

In terms of other rate structures to be highlighted, Mr. Cuthbert noted that “philosophy” and “value” questions probably cannot be ascertained. The Panel asked that “premium green power rates” be added to the list of other rate structures examined. The focus on the other rate structures will be around the following questions:

- Why was this innovation implemented? What problem was the Utility trying to solve?
- What did they do?
- How was it implemented?
- Observations about the innovation.

The Panel approved the comparative utilities study scope as discussed. They asked to be able to review a draft of the report in November.

Letter to Council and Mayor Re: Sales of Utility Property at Below Fair Market Value in Support of Affordable Housing. The Panel agreed to several edits to the letter:

- removing the third paragraph completely,
- in the fourth paragraph, first line, adding a reference to “housing affordability;” removing the fourth sentence.

As revised, the Panel agreed to submit the letter. ***Karen will finalize and share with Patrick and Gail Labanara before submitting the letter.***

Kiersten Grove asked for an explanation of what actions the City should take to be more transparent on these issues.

Rate Design Research Summary. Jenny Levesque presented. The slide deck shared data from earlier polls of SCL residential customers, together with results of a national qualitative/focus group type survey of 60 customers.

The top themes from SCL residential customers were cost concerns, alternative energy and infrastructure improvements. Customers want to understand what they are being billed for (kWh information is too hard to understand) – they want simplified language and messaging.

Jenny advised that the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) rate design results should be available in the next couple of months.

The national E Source Research Study presented a number of ideas for rate design, including redesigning how rate bills are presented, expanding customer choice, offering rewards for engagement of customers, offering community rewards, and viewing energy as a service.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:50 PM.