

Charter of the Missouri Energy Efficiency Advisory Collaborative

Charter Organization: Missouri Energy Efficiency Advisory Collaborative (“MEEAC”)

Charter Date: month day, 2017

Authorization: 4 CSR 240-20.094(9)(B) Renew – authority is to make trusted recommendations. Although voluntary needs balance. Provide forum to discuss and a process to make decisions.

Mission Statement: The mission of MEEAC is to strengthen and supplement existing policies and practices through collaboration of Missouri’s electric utilities and their stakeholders by providing an environment for constructive contributions which enable utilities to deliver all cost-effective OPC – all cost effective and constructive contributions means different things to different groups demand-side savings opportunities under the Missouri Energy Efficiency Investment Act (MEEIA). Renew – Reduce amount of contested issues OPC – ideally a unified mission statement is important and believes it is strong. There are a lot of complex issues that require intense effort. KCP&L – need to address difference in oversight and collaborative. DE – believes mission statement makes sense because of statutory authority. Brubaker & Associates – There has to be some process to decide what collaborative decision is.

Guidelines for the Operation of MEEAC:

1. File No. EW-2013-0519 is the Working Docket for the State-Wide Advisory Collaborative to Address the Requirements of Commission Rule 4 CSR 240-20.094(9)(B).¹
2. The state-wide advisory collaborative shall:
 - a. Develop state-wide protocols for evaluation, measurement and verification of energy efficiency savings, no later than December 31, 2018, and update those protocols annually thereafter; DE - would like to build on this and guidebook could lead to workgroup.
 - b. Establish individual working groups to address the creation of the specific deliverables of the collaborative; KCP&L – Which groups could be involved? How the working groups will work/protocol/how will it get us where we need to be? Hoping groups can be sustainable/can solve/broader so groups do not dissolve. NHT – supports KCP&L ideas and questions about broad enough topics and frequency. As long as working groups are meeting frequently helps foster a result. Generalize discussion on all issues and develop recommendations/process and approach can be trustworthy for the Commission. Most interested in formulating this for the group. Not as concerned about who is involved but the purpose. OPC – Would like to see annual report or similar/ clear deliverable to the Commission.
 - c. Discuss and resolve state-wide policy issues, wherein utilities share lessons learned from demand-side program planning and implementation, and wherein stakeholders provide input on how to implement the recommendations of the individual working groups; and Renew – would like to see language included for recommending to the Commission. Good to have a member to help keep moving from topic to topic.

¹ The Commission’s MEEIA rules include 4 CSR 240-20.092, 4 CSR 240-20.093 and 4 CSR 240-20.094 which have an effective date of October 30, 2017.

Charter of the Missouri Energy Efficiency Advisory Collaborative

Already working in the groups/have EM&V-low-income etc. trying to formalize their roles. Should include language that anyone can join groups in addition to the ones listed below. OPC – need to figure out how to engage groups. Need to keep in mind moving forward on programs for next cycle trying to agree to avoid future litigation. Lessons learned/narrowing issues to look at that are worthwhile. NHT – Should have approach from collaborative to the Commission. Staff – in the rules/approach to the Commission must be delivered by December 2017. Staff – Collaborative making recommendations must keep due process in mind and not exclude other groups. Do decisions made during the collaborative have impact on other contested issues? Renew – it is advisory and it is based on buy-in of all parties. If participating in advisory group you adherently agree with Charter. DE – Collaborative more defined set of stakeholders. Forum open opportunity for discussion/working groups is also beneficial.

- d. Explore other opportunities.
3. MEEAC consist of the following organizations and organization groups (“members”): OPC -Should we have more members? What role would Staff have? It is concerning/dynamic environment and what makes sense today might not in future. NHT – concern about the members and who might be impacted. Wants membership defined. DE - Wants process to add members/categorize and select representative. Wants industrial member that is not MEEIA Opt-Out – small businesses/trade allies are not represented here. Brubaker & Associates – Define the members.
 - a. Ameren Missouri;
 - b. KCPL/GMO;
 - c. Empire District Electric;
 - d. Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission;
 - e. Office of the Public Council;
 - f. Department of Economic Development’s Division of Energy; DE- clarification on why department is listed/who this means
 - g. Low-Income Customers’ Group;²
 - h. Industrial Customers’ Group;³ and
 - i. Environmental Group.⁴
 - j. EE Industry – DE/Renew
 - k. Low-Income Renters – OPC
 - l. Small business - OPC
4. The MEEAC will meet at least semi-annually. Additional MEEAC meetings (in person meetings or conference calls) will be scheduled if a majority of voting members support the additional meetings. OPC – Lot of time spend on DSM/quarterly meetings/studies etc. for the large utilities and now statewide collaborative. Seems redundant information. Wants transparency – make meeting minutes public either through the Commission’s website or IL comes to mind large repository goes back several years able to maintain. Looking at all

² Low-Income Customers’ Group consists of, but is not limited to: National Housing Trust and Tower Grove Neighborhoods Community Development Corporation.

³ Industrial Customers’ Group consists of, but is not limited to: Missouri Industrial Energy Consumers; Midwest Energy Consumers Group; Wal-Mart Stores; and Barnes-Jewish Hospital.

⁴ Environmental Group consists of, but is not limited to: Renew Missouri; Missouri Department of Natural Resources; Natural Resources Defense Council; Sierra Club; and Missouri Coalition for the Environmental Industrial Consumers.

Charter of the Missouri Energy Efficiency Advisory Collaborative

the meetings and came up with over 40 meetings related to various components of MEEIA/DSM need to try and cut out some of the meetings or find a way to combine. DE - Would like to see quarterly or monthly – 4 a year minimum - prefers meetings in person. NHT – involved in another collaborative meets monthly but input is very limited/pp presentations only.

5. Staff will provide notice of each MEEAC meeting in File No. EO-2013-0519.
6. Interested persons may attend MEEAC meetings.
7. Members will determine through a majority vote of those members present the following aspects of each MEEAC meeting: a) date and location, b) agenda, c) and facilitator(s).

KCP&L – Wants clarification on how meetings are run and when do they present the information. Value in roles – leading/rotating/working through agenda and process/how formal it would be/approval of minutes DE – wants this process to be collaborative and hopeful the working groups will accomplish this. Would like clarification on which votes/how the voting is determined. Focus on consensus based decision making works around concerns. Brubaker & Associates – how do you vote- is it weighted? Needs structure - wants consensus and minority points of view make it to the Commission if 75% vote or agree to do A – wants Commission to know the full perspective of those involved not in agreement. Does not want any group dominating for voting purposes. Feels the utility group Staff OPC would likely have voting ability but wants more structured and more representative points of views on the subjects. DE – Favor of just consensus reporting. Renew– add more steps for consensus to address the concerns of minority. Consensus should carry more weight than a more divided opinion. Each utility get one vote? Would only utilities with programs get a vote or would they get one and with programs more votes? See both sides – maybe try membership vote on only utilities with MEEIA programs. Voting concern is only to try to make decisions and implement actionable items. Should be developing recommendations – should go to Commission in some report form. Empire is not in favor of votes only to utilities with MEEIA programs and wants to keep a seat at the table. KCP&L also feels Empire has the right to vote. Renew clarified they were not suggesting to cut Empire out of a vote but is trying to find a fair way so there is not a dominant voting privilege. MEEA – Especially with Staff if voting it must be stated it is not the final position. Are there common intervenors not on the list? AARP etc. Local governments, EE Industry – implementers would have difficulty voicing opinion. NRDC. - Staff having voting members is an issue – participated in IL no voting consensus only. Groups not having a vote are a concern. Language about webinars/calls if not able to attend in person and agendas in advance etc. needs to be included. Ygrene –Worth discussing municipalities being members – Clean Energy Development Boards – adding political subdivisions. If work product is advisory only is it report to be filed or where does the work product go? NHT – would like to see consensus outside of dockets to avoid litigation. Does not see language around this would like to see this added. Process should be consensus based. Defines consensus - * Six steps involved.
8. Meeting Minutes.
 - a. One of the member utilities will record MEEAC minutes of each MEEAC meeting including:
 - Presentations made during meeting;
 - Action items as a result of the meeting;
 - Date and location of the next meeting;

Charter of the Missouri Energy Efficiency Advisory Collaborative

- Member responsible for organizing the next meeting; and
 - Facilitator(s) for the next meeting. Brubaker & Associates – facilitator can be valuable however in the beginning no 3rd party unless issues unable to resolve. If this is the preferred path how will funding work? Could be part of administering program assessment. NHT – Could benefit from someone that organizes/agenda topics and someone tasked with follow-up. More valuable if we have someone dedicated to follow-up. Funding – agrees with assessment to fund facilitator. Renew – agrees with follow-up and NHT on benefits but also with Brubaker. Identifying action items is helpful. MO distinct so could be beneficial. Funding – utility assessment/current plans seems to make most sense. \$50-\$100k seems reasonable. Mosaves.com is website Renew created good place for finding annual reports/EM&V/public documents. Could be an avenue for follow-up and central location for information. OPC – In favor of RFP for 3rd party - could look to other states/value from seeing who is out there. If path taken would like to see facilitators engage with all the groups. Funding agree with assessment. Facilitator could also be responsible for the reporting/website of outcome. DE – favor of 3rd party – hard to be involved and facilitate. Funding – agrees with assessment. KCP&L- in favor of 3rd party. Agrees with assessment. Ameren – In favor of collaborative approach to identify EE. Could possibly provide RFP information but learned facilitators are expensive and additional costs to customers. If agree it is cost effective the consensus is best. Renew- how expensive? Ameren– approximately 100's of thousands. Identified opportunities used TRC/rating and having group input and how and when to pursue. Empire – all about saving customers money – is Staff thinking of being a facilitator? Staff – no but Staff's opinion is facilitator can be recovered in MEEIA charge.
- b. The member utility recording minutes will circulate meeting minutes, in draft form, to members within ten (10) business days of each meeting. The member utility recording minutes will file the draft meeting minutes in File No. EW-2013-0519 within twenty (20) business days of each meeting. KCP&L– facilitator could handle this role – utility not opposed but if roles defined either are ok. Staff – because of advisory language in statute is reason utility member is included. Changes to draft minutes will be circulated via email to the MEEAC at least 7 days prior to the next meeting. NHT – suggested advising not only utilities but also Commission.
- c. Meeting minutes will be approved through majority vote of members present at the next MEEAC meeting and filed in File No. EW-2013-0519 within five (5) business days of being approved.

*Six steps of consensus defined by NHT

1) Introduce the issue

2) Clarify the issue

3) Look for emerging proposals

4) Discuss clarify and amend proposal

5) Test for agreement

6) Implement

Charter of the Missouri Energy Efficiency Advisory Collaborative

Next Steps

NHT – Offered to suggest language/should do so in docket.

DE – Docket is helpful and everyone can view – offered to start the process.

Staff – First step needs to be creating small group work on next draft – who is in the group and establish deadline for the next draft.

DE – wants clarification when comments should be submitted in the docket and offered to set up conference call/bridge -likes the benefit of everyone being included.

DE will organize this meeting to work on next set of comments/draft charter. Relying on Staff to submit the comments and the sign in sheets that includes all the information needed to move forward.

OPC – Brought up the point that the TRM issue needs to be addressed/ who is the author/state agency/3rd party? Needs these questions answered maybe not in charter but this needs to be looked at.