

**COMMUNITY ENERGY TASK FORCE**  
**2nd Regular Meeting**  
**Thursday, May 14, 2009**  
**Minutes prepared by Cathie Currie, Secretary**

The 2<sup>nd</sup> regular meeting of the Community Energy Task Force (“CETF”) was held on May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2009 in the Fellowship Hall of the Eagle Harbor Congregational Church, 105 Winslow Way West, Bainbridge Island, Washington, from 7:00 pm to 9:00 pm

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Vice-Chair **Joe Deets** welcomed the attendees and suggested that, since there were new participants in attendance, everyone introduce themselves.

**In Attendance:** Tom Balderston (*Conservation Services Group*), Susan Bisnett, Jim Brennan, Dylan Chalk (*Community Energy Solutions*), Cathie Currie, Joe Deets (*Community Energy Solutions*), Tammy Deets (*Community Energy Solutions*), Kelly Dickson (*City of Bainbridge Island*), Stephen Douglass (*Community Energy Solutions*), Fritz Feiten, Jessica Geenen (*Puget Sound Energy*), Charles Higgins (*Distributed Energy Management*), Gerlind Jenkner, David Johnson, Richard Karl, Matt Keller, Michael Lichtenberger (*Community Energy Solutions*), Bill Luria (*Housing Resources Board*), Eric Moe (*Community Energy Solutions*), Matt Olson, David Rapp (*Community Energy Solutions*), Douglas Rauh, Grant Ringel (*Puget Sound Energy*), Eric Schmidt, Jaco ten Hove (*Interfaith Council*), Herman Vroom, Barb Zimmer (*Transition Town*)

**2. Vision/Recap**

**Hilary Franz** overviewed the agenda. **Susan Bisnett** suggested that the group consider the siting of the substation as one of its areas of focus. **Hilary** responded that that would be an appropriate conversation to address in a separate, community-wide forum, with the schools, etc. There is a large group of citizens interested in the location issue, and Puget Sound Energy (PSE) will hold a separate set of public meetings to discuss this issue. **Hilary** then asked the PSE representatives present what kind of forum PSE typically provides for citizens to address siting issues. **Grant Ringel** suggested that PSE can provide additional access to the decision-making process on siting for interested citizens, but recommended that the CETF focus on its previously stated goals.

**Hilary** recapped the last meeting, reviewing the committees established and the group’s goals. She noted the importance of the reliability goal, which resonates significantly with the public and particularly with the business community.

**3. Sub-Committee Reports**

**Communications and Marketing Sub-Committee:**

**Eric Rehm** overviewed the Google Groups that he established, and provided everyone with a “cheat sheet”.

**Jim Brennan** reported on behalf of the Communications and Marketing group, and expressed appreciation to Chair **Chris McMasters** and Co-Chair **Andrew Hill** for holding a pre-meeting which helped frame the conversation for the full sub-committee.

The committee began with a general brainstorm and discussion, but narrowed in on specific areas of discussion:

Task Force’s Marketing & Communications Goals:

- Audiences identified as:
1. Government entities/tax districts
  2. Commercial businesses -- leased and/or occupied
  3. Residential, including both single-family and multi-unit dwellers

- Potential targets identified as:
1. Energy evangelists
  2. Those who already care and are likely to act
  3. Those who don't know but would care if they knew
  4. Those who don't care

The Committee determined that outreach should first target the evangelists – they care, they're aware, they're active in the community and will help spread the word. Second, it should target “Key Influencers” – community organizations, Island “celebrities,” those who are well-connected and active.

What actions do we want people to take:

- Energy reduction/conservation
- Reduce heat use
- Avoid peak load times
- Install low-energy lighting (CFLs and others)
- Encourage neighbors to participate

The Committee discussed that it is very important to be careful about potential landmines in messaging and outreach.

- The substation is an example; the impression that it is part of our agenda could make a significant impact on our ability to activate people.
- It is also important not to tie this issue to a no-growth agenda; that will cause us to lose people. We are not “no growth,” but “smart growth.”

The Committee requests input from the technical group. It needs:

- Input on what actions to encourage.
- More information about reliability – if this is a goal, what are we going to do to achieve it, and how will we message that?

Potential barriers identified:

- Nimby's
- Substation

Ideas and tools:

- Develop energy efficient “green label” and certification agreement for businesses
- Promote the energy challenge by viral marketing
- Develop placard for people to post on their properties, ala Shoreline Stewards
- Website
- Community renewable energy bond
- Incentives

Comments from those present:

**Herman Vroom** suggested that a school curriculum focusing on energy use would be good. **Jim** responded that that had been discussed as one potential tool. **Hilary** noted that we already have participation from the schools; **Glenn Tyrell** is representing the school district, and **Tucker Rogers** is representing the students. **Hilary** suggested that it would be helpful to look at the marketing plan done by Marshfield Energy Challenge group.

**Partnership Development Sub-Committee:**

**Joe Deets** reported on behalf of the Partnership Development Sub-Committee: **Joe, Glenn Tyrell, and Maradel Gale** had met on May 11th.

They determined that the role of the Partnership Development Sub-Committee is primarily two-fold. In order for this community effort to succeed, partners must not only provide their names in support of the *Bainbridge Island Energy Challenge*, but they also must commit to specific actions; such as implementing energy efficiency strategies, hiring workers to implement green strategies, marketing & outreach, etc.

The Sub-Committee is drafting descriptive lists of the kind of support that the *Challenge* will need, similar to what was done by the Sound Alliance. This will provide organizations with a menu of ideas/choices for the support that they could provide, which they will then commit to doing.

The Partnership Development Sub-Committee also brainstormed potential partner groups, which included faith-based organizations, government entities, schools, and business associations.

**Joe** emphasized that getting partnerships is incredibly important for federal funding, not to mention the success of the *Challenge* itself.

#### **Grants Sub-Committee:**

**Bill Luria** reported on behalf of the Grants group. He noted that group hasn't met yet. He also suggested that the Sub-Committee be renamed – there are a whole range of potential funding opportunities in addition to grants – including incentives, rebates and bonding opportunities.

He did some relatively quick research and came up with 75 funding opportunities for the Task Force to consider.

He noted that the Sub-Committees will focus their energies on what makes sense, what particular plans the Task Force develops, and what the opportunities are that we can pursue.

**Hilary** noted that **NEED NAME** has come out with funding options, and there are quite a few loan-oriented opportunities.

A decision was made to re-name the Sub-committee the **Funding Sub-Committee**, to address the broad source of potential funds.

#### **Technical Sub-Committee:**

**Eric Moe** reported on behalf of the Technical Sub-Committee. The Sub-Committee has mostly met on-line. They have determined that the first step is to identify where we are right now in relation to peak use, base load, carbon footprint, and reliability. Then, we need to adopt a strategy to address the changes we want to see.

In determining baselines, the group started with a carbon goal, and tied that in to the IPCC goal, 20% reduction relative to 1990 by 2020. Using the data they have, they estimated back to 1990 to get to a baseline figure. From there, they established where we should want to be by 2020. That allowed them to establish what our MWH consumption should be, what would be needed to make another substation unnecessary.

The group has gathered numbers for each of the four areas targeted for reduction. They have also started the process of developing a screen through which to review alternative measures. If you look at the Marshfield Energy Challenge project, they used dollar/megawatt to evaluate the effectiveness of potential measures, and discovered that investments averaged \$1.4 M/MW. The Committee recommends that we look at dollars per MW, MWH and metric ton reductions so that we can use our money well.

In looking at our target reduction numbers through 2020, the Sub-Committee noted that we appear to be looking at a value of approximately \$45 million dollars, or \$2,000 per resident.

**Stephen Douglass** noted that the team has identified about 30 possible actions so far -- a few examples are timers on water heaters which have them turn off at peak usage times, and replacement of bottom unit reducing wattage. The materials cost for this is about \$50 – 60 dollars per heater. If done in all the homes on the island, this could achieve a 30 MW volume usage.

**Charles Higgins** informed the CETF group that he met today with PSE staff involved in implementing the Demand Side Management program. There are a number of technologies under consideration. His firm, Distributed Energy Management (DEM), is talking with them about partnering on the project here on Bainbridge Island. PSE would require a minimum of 600 buildings to participate. They will install technology that will allow demand-side management. They anticipate the list of vendors and tools will be completed within the next week or so.

PSE is very interested in working with Bainbridge Island to pilot this program. Residential participants would receive a \$50 incentive. Commercial participants would receive up to \$8,000 as an incentive. PSE can't go much beyond the 600 participants due to the project budget. DEM would provide a web-based platform to maintain the relationship between PSE and the participants in the program, which would carry a profile of their commitments and track their usage. The suggestion was made that we do a friendly competition between participants in the program and those not in the program around energy reduction. PSE is looking at implementing this mid-summer.

**Charles Higgins** noted that using time of use rates seems to be off the table for the immediate future.

**Grant Ringle** of PSE noted that PSE has had a lot of experience with time of use rates and has the technology to implement them. However, he questioned whether that would be a good area for CETF to focus its energy, as there are regulatory hurdles that would need to be addressed in order to put that program in place again. He noted that the utility regulatory commission tends to resist location-specific rate setting. **David Johnson** noted that due to the regulatory process timeline, a request for a time of use approach could not be filed until mid 2010, and would not be in place until 2011.

**Grant** offered more information on the Demand Side program. He can see CETF being very involved in recruiting the 600 homes to participate. He noted that there will be 4 or 5 criteria which homes will need to meet in order to participate to allow the pilot to effectively test whether this technology works well. He will email these criteria. **Charles** noted that 600 participants would allow the Island to achieve the target 2 MW reduction to at least postpone the substation. **Hilary** noted that federal funding could provide matching funds for PSE's investment, allowing us to potentially double participation. She asked how much the program as planned would cost PSE for each home, and noted that she has heard numbers for a similar project of \$500 per house, \$5,000 per business. **Grant** said that that sounded about right. **Charles** noted that there is an open window, depending on what is learned from this pilot project, to adjust the criteria for participation for the future. **Grant** confirmed that if stimulus money were available to supplement PSE's project budget, it would be possible to increase participation. **Hilary** noted that BPA has put out a call for demand side projects.

#### 4. Target Benchmarks for Reduction

**Eric Moe** reviewed the numbers that the Technology Sub-Committee has developed for "Where we want to be":

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2020</u>
Peak demand:	80 MW	70 MW	41 MW
Energy consumption	240,000 MWH	218,000 Mwh	164,000 MWh
Carbon:	120,000 Metric tons	117,000 Mt's	65,000
Reliability:	OPM: 2/yr, Duration: 5.4	1.7 OPM, 5.1 Hrs	99.995
	99.88% available elect.	99.9% ae	

**Eric Rehm** noted that it's important for us to think about how we want to set our carbon reduction goals. There are several established models, such as the IPCC's, Washington State's goals, which are a little lower, and the Kyoto Protocol goals, which are still lower.

**Hilary** mentioned the state's Carbon Reduction group, which is looking at strategies for reducing impacts through SEPA, and offered to provide their analysis of reduction goals. These goals are tied to the Architecture 2030 Challenge. Their overall goal is to establish a 0 net energy built environment by 2030.

**Tom Balderston** asked whether the Technology Sub-Committee is looking at propane and oil as alternatives. **Eric Moe** replied that it has not yet, as we need to first acquire the data.

## 5. Brainstorm of Potential "Tools" for Energy Challenge Toolbox, and Criteria for Evaluating Them

**Hilary** asked the group to brainstorm measures which can help reach these goals. She noted that we are looking for a host of measures to achieve our goals. Then, we need to determine what criteria we will use to evaluate potential measures. **Hilary** recommended that, as a brainstorm, the group throw out all possible ideas, and then the technical team could take on developing a matrix to evaluate the ideas based on the criteria.

**Jaco ten Hove** suggested that the group move past the time of use issue, that we are not in a business as usual model here (need to clarify his comment, that he may have been expressing support for implementing time of use rates). **Stephen Douglass** noted that because of the way PSE manages its power usage, when they tried to manage load using financial incentives, they used coal as their base power source and then hydro power, which can come online quickly, as a source during peak load times. To really affect climate changes, we would need them to flip this approach.

**Doug Rauh** suggested that we shouldn't wait on the regulatory discussion, because it takes so long to be implemented.

**Eric Rehm** noted that it is important to look at both "carrots and sticks". The time of use rate is an effective "stick," and the experience of being "punished" by being charged higher rates, without understanding why, will not result in a change in behavior. Public education around peak load usage would support the effectiveness of time of use rate. We should look at complimentary combinations of carrots and sticks.

**Gerlind Jenkner** mentioned the book, "Nudge," in which the author uses behavioral psychology research to evaluate what changes behavior. She asked, "What do you think would get people to use less energy -- is it an appeal to their environmental ethic? Is it a monetary reward? The answer is neither. What really drives people to change behavior is conformity." This is where the Neighbor to Neighbor Challenge can play in.

**Dylan Chalk** noted that investing in a home's energy efficiency should be as good an investment as granite countertops.

**Hilary** noted that the regional group is looking at how better to "sell" and build awareness of the economics of carbon footprint reduction.

**Fritz** asked PSE if conservation voltage regulation is something that they have employed or would consider at island substations. Grant noted that they have piloted this; it'll work for 2 - 3. **2 - 3 WHATS?**

**Jessica Geenan** noted that there are 20 units of consumer owned generators on the Island.

**Hilary** asked for more input to the brainstorm.

### **Brainstorm of Options:**

- Energy Auditors Crawl space approach. Many homes have inadequate floor insulation.
- Aggressive audit program.
- Distributive generation and distributive storage. This is crucial to reach the 41 MW goal. Storage is crucial to address reliability.
- Replace streetlights with induction lights.
- Opt-in programs
- Island-wide real time energy meter. On line, at Ferry Terminal. **Joe Deets** noted that a Very similar request has been made to PSE by the community of Langelly on Whidbey Island (PSE is looking at this)
- Businesses report their energy star ratings to the City, and they are publicized, like the City of Seattle's program.
- Information using billing systems. Like company called Positive Energy. Receive a report six times a year that compares you to 100 neighbors around you. Can be very motivational. It's opt out.
- Contact Red Fin, see about adding power usage to closing information for home sales.
- Gadget that goes to a vista site that will pop up on people's web screen, provides dashboard showing their usage, island's usage.
- Device to go on plugs for hot tubs
- Designer clotheslines
- Water use reduction
- On demand water systems
- Discuss interruptible rates with facilities that have backup generators.
- Community Usage Manager
- Designer clothesline. And, City ordinance to prohibit neighborhood regulation of clotheslines.

Additional ideas were submitted, and have been combined with the criteria listed below into a spreadsheet. The full spreadsheet is attached.

**More ideas should be sent to Stephen** **Eric Moe** requested that, if possible, ideas are accompanied by some information about the potential cost to implement them.

**Eric made three requests for information to PSE:**

1. Cost of carbon projected to 2020, or further if available.
2. Metric ton per MWH
3. Basic costs of rates for commercial, industrial and residential.

### **Brainstorm of Criteria for Evaluating Options**

1. Life cycle cost of option.
2. Funding options
3. Jobs
4. Timeframe to implementation
5. Community acceptance
6. Feasibility of implementation
7. Buzz
8. Impact on reliability
9. \$/MW hour
10. Possible partnerships
11. Cost per square foot
12. Cost effectiveness (Grant noted that this is PSE's top screen, would drive funding. This includes environmental economics.)
13. Access and availability of products.
14. Local access to necessary professionals.
15. Job creation
16. Shovel ready
17. Desirable -- stimulates free market. "People are begging for it."

Hilary noted that she has drafted a timeline for Task Force actions; she will send this out for comment.

#### 6. Next Things:

The CETF needs some start-up funding. **Bill Luria** noted that he has identified three grants that have deadlines coming soon: Brainerd, Bullitt, and Patagonia Foundations.

#### Goals for Next meeting:

- Have criteria fleshed out in detail
- Set short, mid and long term goals

**Eric Moe** noted that the Technology Sub-Committee will need a lot of assistance from larger group in fleshing out ideas for screening by criteria.

The Technology team requests that, if someone is throwing out a proposal, they start applying some of the metrics that they know. Then perhaps the Tech Team can split this out, each take a few. PSE can help.

**Hilary** asked **Grant** and **Jessica** if there is anything they see that the CETF is missing. They replied that PSE is learning along with us. **Grant** strongly recommended that we adopt a strategy of moving forward with the things that we CAN move forward with ASAP. A community notification network could go in to place very quickly.

**Tammy Deets** informed the group that Community Energy Solutions has partnered with Tom Balderston's group, Conservation Services Group, to implement a Kitsap county-wide residential energy efficiency services program. CSG has been doing community energy efficiency projects since 1984; and is directly involved in the Marshfield Energy Challenge. Among other things, the partnership provides Community Energy Solutions with access to a library of community-based energy efficiency information. She added that on May 26th, a "New Energy for Kitsap Summit" event will be held in Silverdale for businesses, community and government leaders to discuss steps towards a Kitsap-centered energy efficiency economy.

**Debbi Lester** suggested that as we have community leaders here, that we step up to the plate, have the organizations we represent take the lead. **Jessica Geenan** mentioned that the Community Energy Association of Canada has good resources on its website. **Kat Gjovik** suggested that we "have fun," infuse this effort with fun and celebration as we move along. "Where is the fun committee?!"

Lastly, **Hilary Franz** announced that she is stepping down as Chair, and invited anyone interested in serving as Chair to step up.