

RESPONSES FROM ATTENDEES AT
THE WASHINGTON CLEAN ENERGY LEADERSHIP COUNCIL INDUSTRY EVENT
IN THE TRI-CITIES ON OCTOBER 6TH, 2010

At the Washington Clean Energy Leadership Council (CELC) Industry Event held on Oct. 6, 2010 in Kennewick, WA, Council Co-Chair Marc Cummings presented the draft recommendations that Navigant Consulting prepared for the CELC. Participants were asked to provide responses to the following three questions:

- 1) **What is one thing from the recommendations presented you think MAKES SENSE? (10 responses)**
- 2) **What is one thing from the recommendations presented you think DOESN'T MAKE SENSE? (9 responses)**
- 3) **What is one thing that's MISSING from the recommendations presented? (15 responses)**

The responses listed below are copied exactly as written by participants at the Tri-Cities event. Please contact Brian Young (brian@elementstrategic.com, 206.437.2611) with questions or comments. A copy of the presentation given by Marc Cummings can be downloaded at: <http://washingtoncelc.org/documentarchive/>.

1) Responses to Question 1 - What MAKES SENSE

- The need for convergence between policy, capital and technology.
- Pass energy efficiency policy change to encourage utilities to promote efficiency and get credit for RPS standard.
- There is no doubt the state should have an economic development focus/strategy associated with the clean energy sector. A plan and organization that executes against that plan makes sense.
- For Washington State, build on our strengths:
 - Nuclear
 - IT expertise (smart grid)
 - Biomass/Agriculture
- Catalysis of market initiatives is important, but we need to incentivize co-location of a critical mass of clean technology developers, as well as manufacturers.
- Very good intentions but no solid plan to implement, I would recommend you fund a group to study how Germany, France, Italy and other countries have made clean energy policy work both as environmental improvement and stimulate economic growth. Germany very successful here.
- Focus on long lived jobs.
- Need for WA to be much more aggressive and focused – need for state to be able to participate in initiatives that require cost-sharing.
- Attacking market and policy together.

- Align administrative, regulatory and legislative.

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

- A system benefit charge for general R&D and consultants.
- Outcomes are right idea, but in this presentation they are too fuzzy and not compelling. The outcomes need to create a cause to rally around. It's the "vision thing".
- The idea that policy and state role aren't too important – they ARE!
- To say that because we don't use much energy in this state we should therefore not target the use of clean energy in the state. We need to implement our technology here as well as export it.
- Overall expecting Olympia to solve the problem.
- The last slide that talked about how 50,000 new jobs are created – doesn't make sense to me (disconnect?). Maybe the data is there – but it did not come through in the presentation. How/more details/what is the competitive advantage in the state?
- Continuing to manipulate the energy markets to promote the idea that renewable energy is low cost and reliable doesn't make sense. We have already seen unintended consequences, destabilization of the grid and increased costs that are not worth the jobs and visual pollution.
- There is not enough emphasis on building and manufacturing clean energy technology to reinforce WA state as the launching pad to meet world energy needs.
- \$5 million too little.

3) Responses to Question 3 – What's MISSING

- The role of the state as an energy consumer.
- The importance of defining the outcome from the initiatives.
- A stronger focus on nuclear, it is clean, it is jobs and there is a potential for manufacturing jobs.
- Not enough emphasis on cluster/ecosystem development. Projects aside, we want to create jobs via export and that includes consulting, engineering services, R&D, services, maintenance, manufacturing, etc.
- Communications outreach plan – how to make people, leaders in business and politics, etc., aware of how much energy costs. Will go up in future if we do nothing. People aren't being made aware – many people think things are just fine as is.
- Need to recommend specific policy examples to show the impact they would have on energy and jobs.
- Need more emphasis on energy in transportation, especially leveraging aerospace and trucking which are located here. There are a number of approaches where we can benefit.
- Specific tax incentives, plus regulatory specificity, will attract new green businesses.
- A plan of action for next steps.
- Lack of specificity re: how "leadership" goal translates to job creation, business-friendly policy, tax-payer income.

- Nuclear energy as a source of carbon neutral power.
- Attracting manufacturing and food production that wants access to our still inexpensive electricity and growing broadband infrastructure.
- Presentation moved quickly but did not emphasize what the recommendation might result in or be able to measure.
 - How much public discourse is encouraged to develop awareness of policy needs?
 - Need RECs to incentivize investment capital.
 - Need to capture a surcharge on exported energy to help fund innovative projects.
- Manufacturing incentives.
- Nuclear.