

RESPONSES FROM ATTENDEES AT  
THE WASHINGTON CLEAN ENERGY LEADERSHIP COUNCIL INDUSTRY  
EVENT  
IN SEATTLE ON OCTOBER 15TH, 2010

At the Washington Clean Energy Leadership Council (CELC) Industry Event held on Oct. 24<sup>th</sup>, in Seattle, 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? (21 responses)**
- 2) **What is one thing from the recommendations presented you think DOESN'T MAKE SENSE? (15 responses)**
- 3) **What is one thing that's MISSING from the recommendations presented? (22 responses)**

The responses listed below are copied exactly as written by participants at the Seattle event. Please contact Annika Barnes ([annika@elementstrategic.com](mailto: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://washingtongcelc.org/documentarchive/>.

- 1) **Responses to Question 1 - What MAKES SENSE (21 responses)**
  - SMART GRID innovation as it leverages our core skill sets. Coordination of agencies
  - Action is needed. We talk a lot and we must agree on a path forward.
  - Standardization of public/private partnerships. No agency chauvinism.
  - Capital, policy, technology trifecta.
  - Need to focus on engaging public/private partnerships around common goals. Need to decrease regulatory barriers to clean tech and provide incentives.
  - Market research and chosen focus areas. (ee, bioenergy, integration of renewables). Smart choices based on existing assets, market potential, etc.
  - Focusing on certain sectors. Focusing on need for \$. State getting its act together.
  - Goal. Increase public awareness – esp linkages to job creation/retention.
  - Recognition of findings to catalyze Market Initiatives.
  - Deep stakeholder participation. Push to create a streamlined offices to execute this, w/close ties in to the Gov's office. Focus on spring board-to-export concept.
  - Need state funds to be successful.
  - I like the acknowledgement that export is key – are there any specific policy recommendations around that? How do we both compete and cooperate with California, Oregon and BC?

- Smartgrid – could do for energy what the internet did for information.
- Focus. Execution imperative. High level facilitation.
- Focus on EE and green building. “Focus on strengths.”
- Energy efficiency decoupling for investor-owned utilities.
- Happy to see bioenergy figures prominently in state’s plans. DONE WELL.
- Public private partnership – needs open communication.
- A visible empowered public / private partnership / team
- Partnership of a consolidated policy team is great if you can make it work...but this is also a typical response to issues like this.
- Need to align policy execution w/technology and capitol investment.

## 2) Responses to Question 2 – What DOESN’T MAKE SENSE (15 responses)

- Focused effort on govt policy to streamline, invite, and promote success of new companies/start-ups.
- Too naïve about regulatory environment. It is institutional and wont change.
- Reliance on state funding.
- While biofuel/renewable fuel jobs doesn’t represent the largest potential job growth as other “green” positions, it still deserves as much political/private/public partnership support.
- Isn’t DOC our “Store Front? Why wouldn’t this be automatically housed out of commerce?
- What is the potential for job creation in the sectors that have been called out, vs. some of those (solar, EVs, wind) not? What is role of state gov’n’t as a market maker/reference customer?
- I don’t agree with the report’s trashing of mandates. “Mandates” like 937 could also be termed “the will of the people”. Business has the obligation of citizenship too, so gov’n’t should exercise its right to enforce the will of the people in RES mandates, low carbon fuel standards, etc. I sense that the CELC’s point is largely semantic – many of your wise recs are indeed mandates. But I think its disingenuous to dis “mandates” just to sell the plan. Thank you for hard work. This is exciting stuff.
- The sacrifice needed to disconnect the floundering economy from the advancement required in this touchy time.
- How will 50,000 jobs be created in 10 yrs? And would these jobs be limited to the determined green jobs sectors?
- DOE funding was mentioned, but what will state do to ensure funds come to WA? See Penn. Green building center. DO BETTER
- Assumption that funding/facilitating demo projects will help local companies scale up. Will help only be given when tech sourced from WA? Maybe some examples of specific companies who would be helped would improve clarity. Basically, would there be WA sourcing requirements for demo projects receiving assistance? (so not helping testing out-of-state company products?)
- All recommendations make sense. How do you determine priorities and most bang for the buck?
- Belief that we can guide economic development. That’s not what has created Microsoft, Amazon, Starbucks, etc.

- Where is your active political support?
- Lack of “our butt to kick – a thought leader.

### 3) Responses to Question 3 – What’s MISSING? (22 responses)

- Incentives for existing, capable non-clean businesses (how to convert to clean)
- Consider a serious partnership with the environmental NGO community around this agenda. I’m from that community and see a lot of opportunity.
- Miniscule state matching funds
- The workforces. How to train folks for the new jobs/educate our own students.
- Capture supply chains. Spending on fuel, wind turbines/towers. In state companies.
- Lets focus on preparing for this development through education of the future workforce. Support for groups such as STEM and higher ed push toward policy, science and technology.
- Marketing/branding strategy for WA cleantech.
- 1. Performance-based contracting (ESCOs) for conservation and renewables. 2. Piggyback on EV project!!
- What’s the strategy on transitioning TransAlta jobs to clean energy jobs? Is the CELC involved there? Interesting comment from Tibal Energy re – agreeing w/her that the CELC plan should deeply incorporate tribal challenges/opportunities, especially regarding regulatory alignment.
- Missed potential for wave and tidal energy – vast resources
- Focus on something other than specific technologies. Lets give some thought to new ownership models and structures, such as: fractional transportation ownership of projects; multi-building / district level finance and ownership of projects; getting up front investment based on a stream of future savings.
- Public / elected education. It’s problematic that the public and electeds think we are doing well in this arena. Neither will support change unless they feel we are behind the curve.
- Add recognition of linkages between innovation and the critical manufacturing jobs in the clean energy sector. We have a foundation in advanced manufacturing = jobs.
- Min focus on education, workforce development, too much on R&D and technology @ labs, UW, WSU...need education.
- Workforce development / suitability analysis. Software or IT developers.
- Tie in demand-driven workforce development - (assess market needs and develop workforce preparation plan for execution).
- Carbon price –plus- tax cuts on capital investment
- Incentives and OJT funding to manufacturers and start-ups in clean tech implementation
- Missing might be a proactive way to reduce pillaging or cherry picking by competitors at home for abroad. We can’t just wait or react to threats.
- How can local governments work together to encourage clean tech strategies that best coincide with localized strengths?

- Misses one of the primary economic partners in the state – include tribes – we have \$.
- Does Washington state government have plans to incentivize pulp and paper companies to develop biofuels/bioproducts facilities at their existing sites? NOT ON PAGE.