

## Appendix 2

# PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Over the next ten years, City Light will make important resource choices. These choices commit hundreds of millions of dollars of customer funds and affect future operating costs, operating reliability, and the city's environmental footprint for decades to come. The Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) is a key forum for considering the options and consequences of these choices.

As a municipally owned utility, public input into the IRP is critical. Involving stakeholders in the development of the 2012 IRP made the plan more responsive and promoted understanding and support for the long-term resource plan. The public involvement program for City Light's 2012 IRP provided opportunities for participation by customers and representatives of groups that have expertise on various aspects of the regional electric power system.

Key objectives for public involvement in City Light's 2012 IRP process were:

- Involve customers, regional experts and other stakeholders during the entire IRP process;
- Integrate the public involvement program with analytical activities for the IRP, by including opportunities for stakeholders to review and comment on various inputs and analyses;
- Actively promote two-way communication, group learning and consensus building;
- Gather, balance and incorporate a broad spectrum of perspectives, ideas and suggestions; and
- Use multiple communication channels to provide several ways for members of the public to learn about City Light's 2012 IRP process and to provide input.

## OVERVIEW

This appendix summarizes how public input was gathered and used in developing City Light's 2012 IRP. Many methods were used to encourage City Light customers to understand and have an impact on the resource mix for the utility's future energy needs. During 2011 and 2012, input was gathered from the public, as well as City Light employees, using a variety of methods.

Activities included:

- Consultations with the Seattle City Council Energy and Technology Committee and Mayor's staff;
- Five stakeholder meetings (guests included);
- Email notification;
- Web site announcements;
- Three public meetings;
- Email notification of community groups;
- Stakeholder notification;
- Newspaper ads;
- Internal employee communications;
- Presentations to the City Council Energy and Environment Committee in public meetings and broadcast on the Seattle Channel;
- Bill insert mailed to all City Light customers;
- An IRP link from City Light's home page to keep people up-to-date and a specific email address so they could ask questions and/or make comments and suggestions;
- Email responses; and
- Telephone.

The purposes of public involvement were to:

- Gather input regarding long-term resource choices;
- Inform stakeholders of the IRP process and ask for input and guidance;
- Inform the general public about resource options and gather their comments and questions; and
- Raise awareness of the importance of long-term planning and City Light's need for additional resources and renewable energy credits beyond their current resource mix.

City Light's web page and public meeting schedules were advertised. PowerPoint presentations are available online at <http://www.seattle.gov/light/news/issues/irp>. Each of the major types of public involvement are described below.

## STAKEHOLDER GROUP

One of the primary vehicles to promote broad public involvement in City Light's 2012 IRP was working with an IRP stakeholder group. The IRP stakeholders are an advisory group. They have diverse backgrounds and the stakeholder meetings provided a forum for their participation throughout the IRP process.

The stakeholder group includes representatives of City Light's retail electric customers and other local stakeholders, along with experts drawn from several groups that are actively involved in regional energy issues.

Staff from the mayor's office and the city council were invited to attend and participate in the group meetings. All group meetings were open to the public.

The meetings were designed to enable City Light staff to work directly with the IRP stakeholder group. Each meeting typically began with presentations on one or more topics by City Light staff, followed by interactive group discussion.

While the IRP stakeholder group is a valuable source of ideas and suggestions, it does not have formal policy-making responsibilities.

### Stakeholders

Invited members and their affiliations are listed below:

- John Chapman, University of Washington
- Cameron Cossette, Nucor Steel Seattle
- Stuart Clarke, Bonneville Power Administration
- Kim Drury, Northwest Energy Coalition
- Tom Eckman, Northwest Power and Conservation Council
- Pam Jorgensen, Harborview Medical Center
- Steven LaFond, Boeing Company (past) and WECC Board of Directors
- Mike Locke, McKinstry
- Henry Louie, PhD, Seattle University
- Christy Nordstrom, Residential Customer
- Mike Ruby, Envirometrics
- Jennifer Sorensen, PhD, Seattle University
- Paul Zemtsov, Volunteer, Cascade Chapter, Sierra Club

Invited staff:

- Tony Kilduff, City Council
- Calvin Chow, City Budget Office

### Stakeholder Meetings

Five stakeholder meetings were held, usually from 4:00 PM to 6:30 PM. Dates and main topics are listed below. More detailed information, including presentation materials, is available online at <http://www.seattle.gov/light/news/issues/irp>.

| IRP Stakeholder Group Meeting Dates & Main Topics  |
|--|
| <p><i>June 9, 2011</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Role of Stakeholders</li> <li>• City Light Demand Outlook</li> <li>• Conservation Overview</li> <li>• New Resources to be Evaluated</li> <li>• Environmental Impacts Overview</li> </ul> |
| <p><i>September 29, 2011</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Method for Estimating Resource Needs</li> <li>• Waste Wood Biomass</li> <li>• Conservation Potential Assessment</li> <li>• Draft Portfolio Design Strategies</li> </ul>                |
| <p><i>February 2, 2012</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 Key Market Trends</li> <li>• Future Resource Needs</li> <li>• 8 Draft Resource Portfolios</li> <li>• Initial Portfolio Modeling Results</li> </ul>                                     |
| <p><i>May 10, 2012</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk Analysis for Top 3 Portfolios</li> <li>• Draft Action Plan</li> <li>• Next Steps for IRP</li> </ul>   |
| <p><i>June 5, 2012</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Near Term Comparison Top 3 Portfolios</li> <li>• Environmental Impacts Top 3 Portfolios</li> <li>• Issues Identified by Portfolio</li> </ul>   |

## PUBLIC MEETINGS

Three public meetings were held. The April 12 meeting was in the Bertha Knight Landes Room in City Hall. The April 17 meeting was in the Northgate Community Center, and the April 19 meeting was in the New Holly Community Center in South Seattle. The meetings were advertised in the newspaper, in emails to community groups, and online at the City of Seattle website. Below is a brief synopsis of the IRP public meetings.

| IRP Public Meeting Synopsis   |
|---|
| <p>The presentation began with an overview of the agenda and a discussion of why City Light customers might care about an IRP. This was followed by a description of what an IRP is and key objectives for the IRP.</p> <p>It was explained that although City Light has sufficient firm resources on an annual average basis, it faces risk from the combination of low hydro generation caused by little precipitation together with high winter demand caused by severe cold fronts. This risk is managed by having sufficient resources in reserve for the winter months. In addition, City Light must prepare to meet the requirements of I-937.</p> <p>The eight portfolios and the modeling of the portfolios were explained, along with the selection of the top three performing portfolios.</p> <p>Participants were asked their views on two key issues: 1) The types of new resources in the IRP; 2) Any preferences for a preferred portfolio out of the top three candidate portfolios.</p> <p>In general, there was strong support for conservation. Hydro efficiencies, wind, and utility-scale solar were also favored by public meeting attendees.</p> <p>There was much greater support for the renewable energy portfolios than for the natural gas portfolios.</p> <p>Support for electric vehicles and electric vehicle infrastructure was also identified.</p> |

## CONCLUSION

City Light received public input on the 2012 IRP from multiple sources including: three public meetings; a dedicated email address to receive public comment; an IRP website; five stakeholder meetings; phone calls; and the City Council Energy and Environment Committee meetings where the IRP was an agenda topic.

City Light did not recommend a resource portfolio until June of 2012. Options remained open through most of the integrated resource planning process, allowing public input to continue to have value in shaping analysis and recommendations. The final public involvement opportunity came at the City Council's Energy and Environment Committee meeting on July 24, 2012.