



September 3, 2013

To: Pathways Team

From: Brian Ross, CR Planning, Inc.

Re: Summary of Vision Review with the Community Environmental Advisory Commission

On Wednesday, July 24th, we meet with CEAC members to review and get detailed comments on the draft energy vision. The draft energy vision had gone out to CEAC members the previous week for their review prior to the meeting. At the meeting we presented:

- The Pathways project background and scope
- The inventory process for developing the draft energy vision
- The three components of the draft energy vision (Statement, Conditions, Narrative), with a particular emphasis on the Conditions, which were the focus of the discussion exercise

CEAC members had a number of questions regarding the Conditions section. Most of the questions were definitional. We requested that they provide alternative definitions or clarifying language in their written comments.

Several questions focused on whether the outreach effort for the Pathways study assessed whether racial or cultural groups were represented equivalently to their representation in the population. We summarized the outreach effort and emphasized that the energy vision process relied heavily on existing policy and plans and the outreach efforts associated with those policies and plans (which varied considerably). The Comprehensive Plan had a deliberative process to engage neighborhoods, cultural groups, and stakeholder organizations. The 5-year Goals and Strategic directions did not include a public outreach process other than ad hoc efforts by council members. A public outreach summary for each plan or policy was included in inventory process.

Discussion Exercise

For most of the meeting, members participated in a discussion exercise that allowed them to discuss in detail the nuances of the Conditions portion of the Energy Vision (the most detailed part of the Vision). Members were asked to review the desired conditions in each of the four Conditions categories: Energy Supply; Distribution System and Infrastructure; Energy End Use; and Related Non-Energy Issues. Within each category, member were asked to:

- identify gaps (missing conditions),
- assign a priority to each condition,
- offer definitional or clarifying language associated with specific conditions.

To ensure that the process both included each member's perspective and allowed for interactive discussion, the members formed four small groups of three or four people. Each small group was asked to seek consensus, but that individual comments were encouraged if the group was not in consensus.

At the end of the discussion, each group offered a summary of the discussion to the entire CEAC. Members asked to see the next draft of the Energy Vision prior to the next CEAC meeting, in the event that CEAC wanted to recommend (as a Commission) actions or changes to the City Council.

Summary of CEAC Review of Draft Vision

Discussion Exercise Results

Each of the small groups had its own dynamic and approached the exercise in distinct ways. Some groups reached consensus on most items, while others chose to discuss then submit individual comments and feedback.

The consultant team assembled the priorities, gaps and edits offered by CEAC members. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Priorities

Almost none of the conditions were assigned a low (4 or 5) priority, and most of the conditions were given a high (1 or 2) priority (as reflected in the mode).

Six conditions were given the highest priority by almost all participants:

- **A.1. Low or no carbon** (mode – 1, Mean 1.09 on a 1-5 scale)
- **B.1 High level of reliability** (mode – 1, Mean 1.09)
- **B.3. Allows for consumer choice** (mode – 1, Mean 1.09)
- **C.1 Highest level of efficiency** (mode – 1, Mean 1.09)
- **C.3 Promotes a conservation mindset** (mode – 1, Mean 1.10)
- **D.2. Reduces health and economic disparities** (mode – 1, Mean 1.00)

The two lowest priorities were given to two conditions in the Distribution category:

- **B.4. Minimizes land use conflicts** (mode -3, Mean 3.09 on a 1-5 scale)
- **B.6. Minimizes duplication of infrastructure** (mode – 3, Mean 2.7 on a 1-5 scale)

The prioritization does seem to suggest that a few of the conditions could be merged in order to simplify the vision conditions. The full scoring of the prioritization effort is provided below.

Energy Supply	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Mode	Mean	Score	
1. Low or no Carbon	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.09	1
2. Clean	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1.27	1
3. Affordable	2	2	1	3	1	1	2	3	3	3	2.00	2
4. Reliable	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1.36	1
5. Predictable	2	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	2	2	1.91	2
6. Diversified	1	1	1	3	5	1	1	3	3	3	2.18	3
7. Local	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	2	2	2	1.64	2

Distribution System	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Mode	Mean	Score	
1. High level of reliability	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1.09	1
2. High level of safety	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	4	4	4	2.00	2
3. Allows for consumer choice	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.09	1
4. Minimizes land use conflicts	2	2	3	2	3	4	3	4	4	4	3.09	3
5. Minimizes natural resource conflicts	2	1	3	3	1	3	1	2	2	2	1.91	2
6. Minimizes duplication of infrastructure	1	2	3	3	3	3		3	3	3	2.70	3
7. 21st century distribution system	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1.18	2

Summary of CEAC Review of Draft Vision

Energy Use	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Mode	Mean	Score	
1. Highest level of efficiency	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1.09	1
2. Maximizes efficiency's societal benefits	1	1	1	1	1		2	2	2	1	1.33	1
3. Promotes a conservation mindset	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	2	1.10	1
4. Allows end-user self sufficiency	2	2	3	3	1	2	2	2	2	1	1.90	2
5. Promotes equity in rate structures	2	1	1	1	1		2	2	2	1	1.44	1

Non-Energy	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	Mode	Mean	Score	
1. Improves social equity	1	1		1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1.33	1
2. Reduces economic & health disparities	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.00	1
3. Improves participation	2	4	1	1	1	2	3	3	3	1	2.10	2
4. Expands economic development	1	5	3	1	1	1	1	1	1		1.67	2
5. Improves City's ability to meet goals	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1		1.33	1

Gaps

CEAC participants suggested 12 new conditions:

- Energy Supply – 3
- Distribution System – 2
- End Use – 3
- Non-Energy Related – 4

Some of these did overlap with each other, or were addressed in suggested edits to the condition description. Three new conditions are suggested from the gaps identification completed by CEAC members:

- Distribution System – New 8
 - **New Market Entrants** – Make the energy system accessible for independent and local energy producers to supply energy into the district energy system
- End Use – New 6
 - **Transparency** – Allow energy users access to their energy consumption data while ensuring privacy at the individual level.
- Non-Energy Issues – New 6
 - **Support current residents** – Energy system improvements benefit current (at the time of the improvement) residents and current residents are safeguarded from displacement.

Condition Comments and Edits

CEAC participants offered a number of edits to the condition descriptions and some comments suggesting modifications to the language. Most of the conditions were edited, although some of the edits were grammatical or usage suggestions, and most conditions only had a single suggested edit. Several conditions did have more than one person suggest an edit:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| A. 1. Low or no carbon | D. 1. Social equity |
| B. 2. High level of safety | D.4. Economic development |
| C. 1. Highest level of efficiency | |

Summary of CEAC Review of Draft Vision

The consultant team reviewed the edits, comments, and suggested gaps, and categorized them into eight themes in order to assess the general direction and priorities of the participants. The themes were used only to allow for a snapshot of the results. The 8 themes are:

1. Life cycle costs
2. Keep energy dollars local
3. Supporting renters
4. Social equity
5. Behavior change
6. Meaningful participation
7. Transparency
8. Avoiding displacement of residents, businesses

Gaps	Energy System Category				Total Mentions
	A	B	C	D	
Life cycle costs	5				5
Keep energy \$ local	2				2
Supporting renters			4		4
Social equity	3	3	1	2	9
Behavior change			3		3
Meaningful participation				7	7
Transparency		2	1		3
Avoid displacement				2	2

Of these themes, #4 – Social equity – was the most prominent comment theme, with suggested edits or comments in all four of the condition categories. The category with the most edits was Energy Supply, with eleven suggested changes, driven primarily by the five comments about making sure that energy supply was considered from a life cycle cost basis.

The suggested edits and changes to the descriptions of the conditions were incorporated, where the CEAC comments were internally consistent. Additional input from the stakeholder interview process will also be incorporated into the Energy Vision in order to arrive at the final draft.