

RESPONSES FROM ATTENDEES AT
THE WASHINGTON CLEAN ENERGY LEADERSHIP COUNCIL INDUSTRY EVENT
IN SPOKANE ON SEPTEMBER 24TH, 2010

At the Washington Clean Energy Leadership Council (CELC) Industry Event held on Sept. 24, 2010 in Spokane, WA, after the presentation by Council Co-Chair Marc Cummings on the draft recommendations that Navigant Consulting prepared for the Council, participants were asked to write their responses to the following three questions:

- 1) **What is one thing from the recommendations presented you think MAKES SENSE? (32 responses)**
- 2) **What is one thing from the recommendations presented you think DOESN'T MAKE SENSE? (18 responses)**
- 3) **What is one thing that's MISSING from the recommendations presented? (32 responses)**

The responses listed below are copied exactly as written by participants at the Spokane event. Please contact Annika Barnes (annika@elementstrategic.com, 206.265.2757) with questions or comments. A copy of the presentation given by Marc Cummings, Co-Chair of the CELC can be downloaded at: <http://washingtancelc.org/documentarchive/>.

1) Responses to Question 1 - What MAKES SENSE

- Bringing clean industries to Washington State (jobs) and exporting produced goods.
- Maximize innovation and the export across Washington State, the nation, globally
- Understanding that we need to focus on export of product / research to markets like CA
- State and other government entities need to be committed partners with \$\$
- Recognition of need for funding (system benefit charge). The dog food industry spends more on R&D than utilities.
- \$0.20 residential tax to finance fund
- Dedicated funding from the State
- The creation of 50,000 jobs is huge for WA, and to position ourselves as a leader in this market. The architecture of the plan looks good (small group).
- Need a hub – with public and private partners – to convene the discussion and implement strategy / projects
- Single small coordinating council
- Small staff to align the initiatives
- Public private partnerships – collaboration among competitors
- Bring utilities together to establish pilot projects that can be used to prop up solutions for the export market.
- Small group of experts
- Focus groups like CELC to study this and take point position to lead initiatives

- Collaborative approach to organizing this STATE initiative
- Create small advocacy group to catalyze new efforts.
- Large scale demos of new tech
- The division of sectors that came out on top
- Well-balanced approach tackling multiple areas at once (a hedging of bets if you will).
- Revise regulation and policy
- Regulatory and policy alignment
- Alignment
- Regulatory / policy alignment
- Policy clarity. Constant policy requirements.
- Focus on innovation projects
- Focus! Do top 3 things mentioned. Don't allow group to go away / off mission. Don't try to be end-all of everything in clean energy.
- Does this make sense? Yes – I like the focus on renewable and smart grid to “balance” load.
- Focus on renewables integration is essential
- State regs and policy are harming biofuels industry – this has to change
- Smart grid to capture line loss. Some mechanism for utility recapture of investment.
- Use of biomass waste to energy

2) Responses to Question 2 – What DOESN'T MAKE SENSE

- Not integrating big picture - look at energy sources and need for delivery relative to need of developing new energy sources
- Cannot legislate where competition occurs. Be realistic.
- Letting size of market restrict what we look at
- Washington doing poorly on biofuels and not having \$20 million to fund it all
- Washington utilities with goals to export energy
- Investment in the council and in possible authority for them. Risk is it could send mixed policy message to capital markets as alluded to earlier?
- \$20 million is not enough to move the needle
- More explanation on how incentive –vs- state restrictions on “gifting” would work
- Transition to renewable / clean technology may add to cost. Consider policy support for those in need (low income).
- It all makes sense!
- Importing one-time tech (wind, for ex.) instead of growing state enterprises around in-state efficiency industry
- Need stronger strategy to influence regulatory environment
- Another separate organization wastes resources and creates lack of focus for 4 to 6 people (FTEs). That's a lot of work, but all of this would be in forming vs. accomplishing the 3 objectives.
- Not utilizing what we have. Efficiency upgrades.
- Fear GHG may not be adequately addressed

- What “out of state” renewables are you referring to – Oregon wind? I feel like we do have sig. in-state renewables too, and are exporting them.
- Which recommendations are critical / vital, which are useful, which are nice to have?
- Funding...

2) Responses to Question 3 – What’s MISSING

- Regional strengths in specific sectors – how/when to concentrate
- One thing that was missing – attract energy intensive companies
- Urban / rural interface
- Culture of partnership? How to advance
- Local level implementation strategy
- How does this effort plan for the changes coming @ the federal level?
- What needs to change in State regulations?
- An action plan to make it happen, e.g. legislation for a system benefit charge or changing historic test year rate making
- Integration mechanism to speed / simplify regulation approval
- In depth look at current regulatory environment for new energy production
- Regulatory reform through UTC to allow more flex in new facilities coming on-line
- Transitional pain in increased rates because it will exist
- How private investment becomes reality?
- Funding for bricks and mortar construction
- How private sector financing will be mobilized
- Missing for my company: if these policies are implemented and FUNDED this will work for many companies – needs more funding 2x
- Translate investment into this and resulting jobs into payback + ROI through additional tax revenue. Covered jobs, not ROI.
- This approach will create how many jobs using how much money over how long? Job creation is the goal. Quantify it and cost.
- What will be given up in order to do what state needs to do? How to answer the “stop doing this _____ so we can focus on this stuff.”
- Public communication of the issues
- Well-defined marketing plan.
- Suggested ways to proceed --- Actual strategies to go forward
- How our research institutions / universities need to refocus or realign programs to make this work
- What’s the min. we can do?
- Solutions to renewable integration need to include hydro as non-emitting resource. More pumped storage, auxiliary services market development / incentives.

- Export clean energy balanced with State's own needs (people and business) to meet certifiable goals
- New ideas for small biz development and dissemination routes
- Real priority reality more kwh's
- Why isn't water-gen of burning waste – gen a renewable resource?
- Why not nuclear now?
- WTE is a renewable resource