



NextGrid: Utility of the Future Study
Working Group 4: Customer and Community Participation
Meeting No. 5

Date: August 6, 2018

Time: 1:00 pm- 3:30pm pm

Location: ICC Main Hearing Room, 160 North LaSalle, Suite C-800
Chicago Illinois 60601

WebEx Information:

www.webex.com or 1-415-655-0002

Meeting number (access code): 800 864 511

Meeting password: TyKCaF37

Meeting Summary

[Note: descriptions of comments and discussion are condensed summaries and paraphrases]

Attendee List

NextGrid Project Team:

In Person:

- Marty Cohen, Working Group Leader

WebEx:

- Lynnea Johnson, University of Illinois, NextGrid Lead Facilitator

Working Group Members:

In Person:

- Karen Lusson, *Illinois Attorney General's Office*
- Kristin Munsch, *Citizen's Utility Board*
- Bill Malcolm, *AARP Illinois*
- Julie Vahling, *AARP Illinois*
- Ryan Ellen, *Ameren Illinois Company*
- Sarah Reynolds, *Ameren Illinois*
- Tucker Kennedy, *Ameren Illinois*
- Chris Foley, *Commonwealth Edison*
- *Chris Brinkonan, Commonwealth Edison*
- James Mazurek, *Accenture Strategy*
- Kate Buczek, *Cook County*
- Katie Stonewater, *Illinois Chamber of Commerce*
- *Illinois Institute of Technology*
- Kevin Dick, *Delta Institute*
- *Little Village Environmental Justice Organization*



- *Anne Mckibbin, Elevate Energy*
- *Jeff Orcutt, Chapman Energy Strategies*
- *Andrew Barbeau, The Accelerate Group*
- *Chris Townsend, NextGrid Coalition*

WebEx

- *Gerard Fox, Retail Energy Supply Association*
- *Anne Arquit, Enervee*

Absent:

- *Chicago Transit Authority*
- *Tesla*
- *Oracle Utilities (Opower)*
- *Illinois Municipal League*
- *City of Chicago*
- *Environmental Defense Fund*
- *Sierra Club Illinois*
- *Natural Resources Defense Council*
- *BOMA/Chicago*
- *IGS Energy*
- *Faith Place*
- *National Latino Education Institute*
- *RCHemphill Solutions LLC*
- *West Monroe Partners Energy & Utilities Practice*

Members of the public and Non-Working Group members:

In Person:

- *Nancy Goverhave, Bronzville Urban Development, IIT*

WebEx:

- *Gwenda Johnson*
- *Layton Olson*

Agenda Item I: Welcome and Introductions:

Marty Cohen, Working Group Leader, opens the meeting under the Open Meetings Act, encourages public participation and comments, and reviews the meeting agenda. Opportunities for public comment will also be available at the appropriate time on the meeting agenda. The public is invited to observe and record the meeting. Minutes are being taken but there will be no verbatim transcript. Roll call is conducted with request individuals indicate their name and organization starting with people present in the room, then on WebEx and finally by telephone. See attendee list above.



Agenda Item II: Discussion of WG4 3Ps:

Agenda Item III: Discussion of Working Group 4 Draft Chapter:

Marty Cohen, Working Group Leader (WGL), provides an overview and discusses Working Group(WG) 4 Draft Chapter.

- Draft: 29 pages
- Source: based on a range of information, presentations, comments, 3ps exercises, library of reference materials posted to the share drive. Tried to draft to represent all the perspectives that WGL heard. Today will discuss and prepare draft for a submission to University of Illinois.
- Difficult to write by committee. Written comments are due by the end of this week. WGL has received a few comments already. WGL requests specific comments. If comments are of general nature, it makes it more difficult to incorporate.
- Text: wrote and numbered the paragraphs so hopefully we can discuss them as need be by staring at the beginning and review section by section.

Discussion:

- **Comment 1-** We support the idea of transparent docketing. We would not like this process to be repeated. We support putting comments on the NextGrid website. We are members of two of the seven work groups. It is impossible for us to see those discussions much without using the normal processes that the Commission uses. Thank you.
 - WGL- Thank you. There is opportunity for everyone to see the drafts as its developed at different points in the process.
- **Comment 2-** In terms of the process, is there an opportunity to revisits the way this report was put together? General comments to WG 4 draft- does not seem to track various presentations that were given and has broader conclusions that does not track what we discussed. How do you suggest those types of overarching issues be addresses? One issue is how should different proposals be evaluated? Proposals should have a cost benefit analysis with them. Does not exists as a comment as part of the Charter Dura Bar presentation or broader comment as Working group process. To exclude that decision-making paradigm puts us at a disadvantage trying to evaluate all the different components of the report.
- **Comment 3-** Agree with comment to some extent, some things were mentioned in the report that were not mentioned. Are there ways to reference ideas sources? Need to think about ways to identify when ideas were mentioned and were they came from.
- **Comment 4-** Comments appear to suggest agreement by all Working Group members.
 - WGL - not my intention to portray full agreement by all the members of the parties. I understand that there is very little that members agree on. We can write a statement to make it clearer, it's the view of some stakeholders.
 - WGL – As to ways to reference where information came from and where it was discussed. I have no idea how to do that. To who would that be useful?
- **Comment 5-** First time I am seeing this draft is right now. To the extent that the whole process is set up so that we are all working through this together, I think the ICC would want it to be viewed as everyone had ample time.

- WGL- an outline was circulated for the sub-structure of this draft. A general topic outline was here. It covers everything that we talked about. What about things that we did not talk about? Every topic in here was mentioned a. Started with four meetings, there was never going to be time for the group to focus on everything. Meetings had subjects and various points of views. Information from all presentations is included in general way. 1st meeting captured everyone's initial points of views and forecasts. All those ideas were written down, taken to heart, and then there were materials from the refence library that I include. All that material was out there. WGL read a lot of reference pieces. Maybe too broad of material that I covered. Some presentations were scheduled based on who was available, some presentations we never had. We relied on reference material and group discussions as well.
- **Comment 6** - Thank you for the tremendous work you did to bring the draft report to this point. To the value piece- I think there is a proportional value piece to this. This is a very collaborative effort. I think it is valuable for a reader, whether a law maker, policy maker or member of the public. I think it is important to reference a topic that was talked about a lot, it is valuable to the reader.
- **Comment 7** - We appreciate the work that you have done. You have been reaching out to folks to get various input from multiple perspectives. To the extent you felt it necessary to fill in holes that were out there, I think the reader would benefit to understand what the holes are. If there is only a google doc that addresses a particular topic. If there is a presentation etc. I think the whole document would benefit with sources to help put it into context.
- **Comment 8** - You have been given a Herculean task, made more difficult by the NextGrid process itself. I agree, the reader would have a better understanding of the process. Policy was that no attribution would be assigned to any comments. Reader need to understand that we had four meetings. Your attempt to join in the holes for the 4-meeting process, it is not giving a clear picture of what this working group did. Needs to be more citation to points made. I see in some spots you left open areas of agreement/ disagreement and conclusions. I do not know how conclusions can be made unless they are very broad conclusions, for example "information of consumers is good". No opportunity to challenge or cross examine some of information presented. For example, what is the "NextGrid Era"? Are we talking next 10, 20, 30 years? It is important for policy makers reading the report, not just true of this chapter, its true of every working group chapter. There are broad generalizations made. As a participant in one of those working groups, I know some topics were not discussed in that working group. There are holes in report filled in by the WGL understandably because want to have a complete report.
- **Comment 9** - Appreciate all the work you have done in a short period of time. I would expect in the report to see more footnotes with attribution to things. There was no consensus on anything except for some general concepts. Recommendations- I do not see any area where we can make any recommendations.
 - WGL - There was no formal attempt to make any recommendations and repot should not include those.
- **Comment 10** - Agree with documentation of structure of workshops and discussion of 3Ps. Suggest we all agree to the 3ps but suggest adding all working group members were invited to submit 3Ps.
- **Comment 11** – WGL, received one comment via email- suggestion sections 1-4 would be more appropriately included in the introduction of the entire report.
- **Comment 12** - The draft of Introductory report is posted online. Can you talk about how that was put together?

- WGL - The entire report needs an introduction, in Illinois context, history, law and the process. Introductory chapter is trying to sum all of that up before going into working group information. The process for writing the introductory chapter is not a process undertaken by the working groups. Those of us in leadership of the process wrote the introductory draft chapter and the draft is posted and subject to comment in a transparent way. The general scope of the draft introductory chapter is Illinois specific history and over all view of what we're doing, why and where we start?
- **Comment 13** - Were other working group leaders involved? The Introductory chapter is an important step. It will set the tone. It might make sense to have a conversation with University of Illinois. The draft introductory chapter does include baseline information that has been discussed.
 - WGL- The Introductory chapter was drafted by University of Illinois, Senior Study Consultants and Commission staff. That is my understanding of where this information came from. It did not come from the WGLs.
- **Comment 14** - Suggests that the introductory chapter is worthy of some process.
 - ICC Staff - The draft Introductory chapter was part of the last Stakeholder Advisory Council meeting. We invite comments to make it better.
- **Comment 15** - Question- Can we agree on some consensus statement. In section 1.2., the 2nd paragraph of the introduction. Trying to see if there was anything we would agree to. Wanted to draft by committee a sentence, not sure that makes sense.
 - WGL- yes, the entire draft chapter is subject to comment and review today. 1.2 statement "Key word in customer community participation is the last one, Illinois should ... affordable electric service for all. Useful to have something that we could agree on.
- **Comment 16** - Does not have an objection.
- **Comment 17** - The sentence gives the reader an understanding of what this entire group discussed. I suggest a word change- from "maintaining" to "ensuring" because cost of electricity is not affordable for all.
- **Comment 18** - WGL, add reliable. Encourage you to add additional edits to the sentence in your written comments. When you make comments and editorial suggestions if they are self-serving they are not going to be included. This is a document that needs to reflect all views.
- **Comment 19** - Good sentence to start, one of the issues raised in discussion is a better understanding of the definition of how the utilities role change over the next couple of years? How are utilities currently set up? Issues are not front and center.
- **Comment 20** - WGL, specific suggestions will be appreciated. Is it worth everyone's time to go through now, section 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10, 11and 12? A Lot of people have not had a lot of time to take a close look at this. I am willing to go through section by section now.
- **Comment 21** - Most beneficial next steps would be understanding where the various statements came from. For us to comment, it is important to understand where you are coming from with background. A lot of feedback will be unclear where this statement came from. Here is a counter point that should be considered.
 - WGL - If there are counter points that should be included please send in written counter points. This is not a legal document. Section 4, "Statutory Policy Objections" - why is that included? Because three different times people cited "Statutory Policy Objections" separately. Included the law and included the substance of our discussions. Another example is section 4.3, "Questions for Policy Consideration," is my interpretation of

questions that people were raising. May be other questions. This was a summary. The summary needs to be reflective to all the views. Not important to reader who said what when.

- **Comment 22** – I do think it is important for the reader to know if a subject was part of discussion vs. Google doc.
 - WGL- Ground rules, were not going to have attribution.
- **Comment 23** - Working group participants would benefit from sources as we are developing responses. Don't want to suggest as a consensus item.
- **Comment 24** – Had a process that some things are presented, we also agreed that things that could be submitted to the folder, there was ample time to review something that was submitted and review.
- **Comment 25** -The stuff that I reviewed in the report, I was ok from where it came from.
- **Comment 26** - WGL, I am happy to go through section by section of where information came from. We can go through it.
- **Comment 27** - Citations do not have to be super specific. I see a value to have some reference of where material came from. Important for elected officials to have an understanding, even a generic description. I put more weight into working group sessions than the shared documents on Google drive. Did not have time to get into the weeds of some of those topics, the google drive allowed for a deeper dive.
- **Comment 28** - Cite facts could be a compromise and then refer to appendices for additional information.
 - WGL- cited to sources that were used.
- **Comment 29** - Things I provided as part of report, all presentations will be a part of appendix. We need to know where all this information came from.
- **Comment 30** - I think the most important thing for the document is to define the process. If written by workshop process or if things that come out of left field, people can address that and such. The data access section. How much of this will stay in this chapter? We discussed customer segmentation and customer needs, since we are the customer working group to try to look at things through their needs.
 - WGL – Discussion of segmentation in section 5. Also discussed Education and empowerment. Had a presentation from Ameren about customer segmentation. Briefly encapsulated in 5.5 on pg. 8. It is a lot of information captured in 2 paragraphs.
- **Comment 31** - WG is about how data is processed and how easily is data accessed?
- **Comment 32** – Ameren's customer segmentation is evolving even more. If it gets too detailed may be irrelevant.
- **Comment 33** - Talking about cost benefit analysis, customers' needs and wants, have good pricing programs, data access, missing piece of looking at what drives customers and what is going to motivate them to do good things for the system. Get the main focus by looking at the next generation of serving these customers so they are at the center.
- **Comment 34** – In section 2.4, is there anything else we should put in here about different types of customers and loads?

- WGL –All places are left open for additional information, I want you to add missing perspectives or additional information. Not suggesting that every edit/comment will be used. You have my good faith effort to reflect all views.
- **Comment 35** - Regarding the section of “Open Questions, L-Z,” questions like these are critical.
- **Comment 36** - These questions are critical and should be considered by all chapters in report as well as introductory chapter.
- **Comment 37** – WGL, there are other places where there are holes, the way we were asked to format reports including for each topic, sub topic such as areas of agreement and disagreement, issues for further study. Issues, challenges and opportunities, that is what this is all about.
- **Comment 38** - Where are suggestions of policies recommendations?
 - WGL- policy recommendations are not items of consensus, many of those came from 3Ps. Some came from proposals made in discussions or presentations. 3P exercise was very useful and surfaced a lot of specific ideas. There a dozen or more specific recommendations made under each of these subjects and some have little or no policy recommendations.
- **Comment 39** – A statement should make clear that proposals are not consensus proposals from all stakeholders.
- **Comment 40** – It is important to have description of the process, how the report was put together, made available for folks to read, list of references, list of presentations.
 - 1. General points.
 - 2. Process- what we talked about as a group. What we were not able to talk about as a group.
- **Comment 41** - Definition of value is important. Will send comments.
- **Comment 42** - Need to think about how products or services are presented to the consumer. Idea is a more wholistic approach. Possibly need to be upfront a bit more.
- **Comment 43** - Explain more on process part, if people have comments on 3Ps exercise.
 - WGL - Please respond to polices in your comments. These recommendations are a little bit out of context because not fully discussed. Will make clear that these are individual stakeholder recommendations. Idea behind 3ps is these recommendations are for consideration by policy makers so if there are other considerations make them.
- **Comment 44** - How voluminous is the final product going to be?
 - WGL - We don’t know, University of Illinois will be in charge of compiling and writing the final study. Could mean reducing repetition. For example, transportation electrification is discussed in groups 1,2, 4,6 and 7. There are areas of overlap. Left open as to whether there will be reorganization. Content should not be changed in fundamental way.
- **Comment 45** - This is our recommendations going to the University of Illinois and University of Illinois has flexibility to put into the final report.
- **Comment 46** – WGL, whatever is produced will be subject to comment. There is a commitment to preserve the content.
- **Comment 47** -- Urge final report highlights some of the innovative programs targeting moderate, low income and community energy planning- getting communities energized, would make report more interesting. They are new, something different. State is already leader in smart meters, formula rates and FEJA, much of which is still being implemented. It does not appear Illinois is not a leader. Can we finish smart meters and formula rates before we go onto the next thing?



- **Comment 48** - If we do this right, purpose of this approach is to try to make the eco system necessary to allow originations and people to do collaborate for changes ahead. What are barriers to making that eco system?
- **Comment 49** - Is there an opportunity to extend the conversation further within this context. More concrete, maybe as an addendum somewhere. Good next step. Recommends delegating to other bodies before a final report is submitted. Conversation about some of specific ideas.
- **Comment 50** - What should next steps of the process should be. To continue the conversation. There are a lot of different questions, not all that have been answered. Next step could be evaluating programs, policies or pilots. Could be a section of comments.
 - WGL, in general outline that University of Illinois proposed was questions for further study. Seems entirety of content is subject for further study.
- **Comment 51** - Should you have a subsection on equity? One issues that we find ourselves frustrated with, Utility comes in and says customers want this. Evidence is presented, for example, a survey was taken in Arizona, then told this is service customers would want. We would like to see language that points to and assessment of is this truly what customers want or is this part of motivations by the utility to increase rate base. Particularly if electricity usage is flat or declining. Or, customers because of new devices are increasing electric usage. There is tension, need to be reflected when policy makers are trying to decide what it is that customers want.
- **Comment 52**- 3Ps points presented as first impressions, not always clear what roles utilities will play as well as suppliers, hospitals etc.
- **Comment 53** - Cost question, various submission, were not details on what cost would be for implementing program or pilot or how costs would be recovered?
- **Comment 54** - Other cost questions are what are infrastructure costs required by utility that might to make it possible for some programs to be available or done by third parties.

Agenda Item IV: Public Comment:

Marty Cohen, Working Group Leader opens floor for public comment. No public comments received.

Group Discussion Continued Summary:

- Spell out process and include limitations of the process in statements or disclaimer.
- Liken this process to planting a garden, trying to make the soil as good as we possibly can. Look at fundamentally what we are trying to set up here is important for the report.

Agenda Item V: Next Steps:

Marty Cohen, Working Group Leader conclusory remarks. Thank you everyone who participated. This is the last meeting of WG 4. We are still in the middle of the drafting process. What we are attempting to do in Illinois is very different than what other states have done. They are some challenges to doing this in a collaborative effort. We have made a lot of progress in the spirit of collaboration. The report will be very useful for individuals who want to learn from these issues. Five years from now things will be different and 20 years from now maybe unrecognizable. It was an arduous process and the main effort was to be forward looking. Thank you again everyone for participating.

Meeting Adjourned.