

RESPONSES FROM ATTENDEES AT
THE WASHINGTON CLEAN ENERGY LEADERSHIP COUNCIL INDUSTRY EVENT
IN VANCOUVER ON SEPTEMBER 30TH, 2010

At the Washington Clean Energy Leadership Council (CELC) Industry Event held on Sept. 30, 2010 in Vancouver, WA, Council Co-Chair Rogers Weed 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? (18 responses)**
- 2) **What is one thing from the recommendations presented you think DOESN'T MAKE SENSE? (11 responses)**
- 3) **What is one thing that's MISSING from the recommendations presented? (17 responses)**

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

1) Responses to Question 1 - What MAKES SENSE

- Focusing on MDIs
- Focus on integration of renewable resources into existing grid.
- I support putting technology solutions outside of gov't steering. MDI makes sense.
- When focusing on the grid, focus on better efficiency.
- The biojet fuel is very interesting for WA with Boeing as a resource. Realize a hurdle to alt. fuels in cars is the fueling station infrastructure. Changing this infrastructure for aviation is small and seems much more achievable.
- Sounds pretty good overall.
- The realization that this will require a balance between investment, tech. and policy execution.
- Thinking about energy in a portfolio view, not as energy consumers but also as suppliers to other areas.
- Nuclear energy expansion.
- Jobs – Partnerships – Energy/Weatherization. Sure bet – clean energy works -> PDX (Green Jobs).
- A business plan that anticipates and plans for green job growth.
- Using WA based expertise to export new software and aerospace biofuel.
- Focus on energy efficiency.
- Focus on low hanging fruit.
- None, this is a legislative idea looking for a reason to exist.

- EE/Green Building.
- Smaller scale projects.
- Yes, let's implement an Energy Trust of WA! (to fund tax incentives)

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

- More taxes and government programs targeted to move these initiatives forward. Just don't see it! I wonder if this had been done in a positive economic climate if the outcomes if the outcomes [would have] been the same.
- Why create a new agency? Why not flow funds and tax preferences into existing agencies?
- Nukes
- Smart grid is just a "buzz word" – have consumers been asked what it means to them in cost, reliability and security?
- I don't think all green jobs are equal – production creates multi-generational blue collar jobs, but technology development – storage, design leadership – are high-value, patentable jobs.
- Rather than another new group, this funding proposal should accompany accountability and move through existing economic development channels.
- If energy conservation is [the] goal – set EE code req. for building – this was recently postponed by gov. due to economy.
- Please no "public purpose charge" or system benefit charge. Too much of the ETO PPC goes to administration costs vs. actual energy efficiency projects.
- That we need a program to control GHG other than limiting foreign oil.
- Nuc
- Continuing to add wind and solar (intermittent) before the grid infrastructure can take full advantage of spikey loads and load centers separated by generation.

3) Responses to Question 3 – What's MISSING

- Specific proposals to ease or economically encourage business investment from the private sector (ie. get out of the way and let business work).
- The cost (high cost) of renewables and time future effects on rates.
- Scale – too modest!
- Political will or just barriers to this path in general.
- What will it cost (is never mentioned)? How will this affect our ability to compete globally?
- More emphasis on storage for variable energy sources.
- It would have helped to have microphones.
- Is clean energy worth the investment in a hydro rich state[?] This is an opportunity cost to capital and if GHG (down) is goal, capital should be directed to coal generating energy regions.
- Was hydropower mentioned?

- More investment in hi-tech nuclear generation. Innovation in nuclear energy can make it be truly green for the future.
- Do we have the technology and will to make safe nuclear power?
- Any acknowledgement that the assumptions concerning GHG are false.
- Actual numbers to back up findings.
- Action. Enough Talk. Is it 2010 in Olympia too!
- Conservation Education – apart from Energy Efficiency.
- Distributed Energy Projects.
- Too much info on the slides – bullets are better.