



City Light Review Panel Meeting Meeting Minutes

Date of Meeting: February 25, 2021 | 10:00 AM – 12:00PM

| Meeting held via Microsoft Teams “Final”

MEETING ATTENDANCE					
Panel Members:					
Names		Name		Name	
Gail Labanara	√	John Putz	√	Mikel Hansen	√
Sara Patton	√	Anne Ayre	√	Leon Garnett	√
Scott Haskins	√				
Staff and Others:					
Debra Smith		Jen Chan	√	Karen Reed (Consultant /RP Facilitator)	√
Kirsty Grainger	√	Mike Haynes		Tom DeBoer	
Jim Baggs	√	DaVonna Johnson	√	Craig Smith	√
Kalyana Kakani	√	Emeka Anyanwu	√	Michelle Vargo	√
Julie Moore	√	Chris Ruffini	√	Maura Brueger	
Greg Shiring	√	Carsten Croff	√	Leigh Barreca	√
Eric McConaghy	√	Toby Thaler	√	Angela Bertrand	√
Kathryn Aisenberg		Chris Tantoco	√	Colleen Lenahansen	√

Welcome\Introductions. Karen Reed called the meeting to order at 10:03 AM.

Public Comment. There was no public comment.

Standing Items:

Review Agenda. Karen Reed reviewed the agenda.

Approval of February 18, 2021 Meeting Minutes. Approved as submitted.

Chair’s Report. No report.

Communications to Panel. Leigh Barreca reported that we have received one application for the Residential panel position.

Panel Member Recruitment. Leigh provided an update on the recruitment efforts for three current (or upcoming) vacancies: Suburban Franchise City (Gail will be retiring in April), Economist, and a Residential representative. The paperwork for the Economist nominee has been sent to the Mayor’s office. Advertisements for the other two positions have been published via our Power Lines blog (one is in the meeting packet.) We are also working with the SCL franchise city liaison to get the word out to these targeted audiences.

General Manager’s update. Leigh shared that Debra Smith will not be able to attend the full meeting today. She is very sorry and will pop in if she has a break during her other meeting. Debra has been



City Light Review Panel Meeting Meeting Minutes

spending considerable time working with our internal team, the Mayor's office, stakeholders, and sovereigns on the Skagit relicensing project. In March she will share updates from Skagit relicensing and IBEW (International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers) labor negotiations.

Q: Debra last time talked about the TV coverage on the Skagit relicensing, which I watched. What was the reaction in City Light? Debra did a great job and seemed to walk a fine line and she seemed open to a joint study.

A: Julie Moore: We have been in communication with the reporter beginning two weeks ago. We were surprised when she stated that she had been working on this story for three months since she had not reached out to us earlier. This week's follow-up story should include additional information we provided about studies we plan to suggest.

2022 – 2026 Strategic Plan. Leigh presented an overview of the planning process, showing the draft business strategies, objectives, success criteria, and sample projects/initiatives/activities, and how they relate to one another in building the strategic business plan. [See presentation in meeting packets]

Comment: I love it. It is great – but when you look at the rest of the documentation, there is a large customer focus that is reflected throughout. That is impressive, but not reflected on the process chart.

Response: That is a good point. We will include our mission vision and values explicitly in future versions of this.

At this point, different SCL Officers took turns presenting an overview of the five proposed strategic objectives in the plan, and how the utility proposes to measure their success in advancing towards these objectives.

1. Improve the Customer Experience: *Kirsty Grainger presented*

Comment: When I read the statement under improve customer experience – it leads with employees. If I were a customer reading this, I would wonder why employees are emphasized rather than customers.

C: Thinking back to customer service, does this messaging about making it easier for customers to understand their bills and usage start here? How will you let customers know changes are ahead?

C: Items one and two deal with customer satisfaction and the associated metrics. Something related to service levels should be included--- Are we meeting expectations against targeted benchmarks?

C: Regarding surveys, I have heard different demographics respond differently to surveys. What mechanisms are in place to ensure diverse groups are participating?

2. Create our Energy Future: *DaVonna Johnson presented*

Q: Could you explain the automation on the grid? Also, in the past you have talked about developing a new training center and apprenticeship program. Do you have any updates on these?

A: [Emeka Anyanwu] In broad terms, automation is automated functioning devices on the grid that can



City Light Review Panel Meeting Meeting Minutes

sense grid conditions and respond to them with voltage regulators and switches. They matter because our energy future will be more dynamic – customers with different usages, building controls, and increased two-way interplay with our system. Our grid can no longer be a static. There are a lot of underlying technologies that need to be implemented to build the foundation to meet these needs.

Response: [DaVonna] We did shelve the training center project. The land that we owned is right up against the Duwamish and a lot of the things we would need to make that site suitable for use. This drove the price for building the center up. Since then we have started looking at other parcels we own to meet our training needs.

In the last two months or so we have begun working with Petelco (full service electrical contractor) to partner on our diversification initiatives. We are developing a regional approach which may include apprenticeship affinity groups or scholarships to attend lineman's college or building a utility pathway program paid for by City of Seattle education levy.

C: I am confused by the heading "create our energy future'. It seems too broad. The objective implies that it is all about the grid and making sure that it is equitably dealt used. There is nothing to guide the reader through how you will be doing it. The success criteria do not match what is stated in the objective.

C: It does not really deal with supply/demand in providing the energy future.

C: The whole electrification of transportation is not reflected in the objective text. Neither is reduction in carbon emissions.

C: Is SCL looking at impacts affecting communities and stakeholders outside SCL's service territory?

C: The whole discussion we had about innovation is not in this document.

R: Innovation is not an end in itself. We innovate to solve problems. We are not making innovation our outcome.

3. Develop Workforce & Organizational Agility: *Leigh presented*

Comment: I love this. Nice job. It captures a lot. Would like to see a mention of equity in the outcome/success measures.

C: Glad to see workforce development and culture under this one. I am concerned that the success criteria include retention but does not specify diversity within SCL.

C: I would like to see a mention of innovation here.

C: I would recommend having a recruitment metric in addition to retention and promotion.

Q: Do you have a measure for recruitment to see what are the outcomes of recruitment efforts and how that tied back into retention and promotion?



City Light Review Panel Meeting Meeting Minutes

A: [DaVonna] We maintain a lot of demographic data about our workforce. We will continue to that. We can do heroic efforts on recruitment, but if your culture is not inclusive and safe where people can come in and succeed, it does more harm and is all for naught. We are trying to move to the next level of how ensure that our workplace environment allows all employees to excel, regardless of identity.

C: I see employee culture survey shows positive responses for attitudes for change. The survey can identify where your gaps are.

Financial Health & Affordability: *Jen Chan presented*

Comment: I would appreciate something about your strategy around debt in the strategy statement as well as the success criteria.

C: I like the success criteria and businesses strategy.

C: I would recommend removing the item about manager accountability for their budgets.

C: I would recommend removing or clarifying the discussion about budget spending.

C: I am a little disappointed about the strategy around debt. It is still a gap.

R: We thought if we said 'sustainable affordable rates' it would be implied. You are correct that cannot do that without controlling debt. I understand we are not being explicit.

C: I am not familiar with when you last reviewed your financial policies such as 1.8 and 60% - especially in light of the changes of prior years. Maybe once you have a measure of sustainability you can review them. I know there are choices.

R: It is true our financial policies have been more or less unchanged for about a decade. That said, we should look at them. Given that we are currently in a recession it is a hard time to have a conversation about being financially policies. There is so much improvement we can make in how we manage our capital improvements. That is where we're focusing right now.

4. We Power Seattle: *Jim Baggs presented*

Comment: It does not deal with performance management overall. Would you want to cover that? I also don't see Capital Improvement Program here. The PIAs and dashboard related to accountability for that.

C: For Risk, I wonder about looking at risk as a part of each category instead of breaking it out. Risk categorically applies to all others.

C: I was thinking the same thing with risk. Then, the second one, you might add 'customer construction' permit levels or permit response so people know what that is. Is Market participation for wholesale market participation? I am confused about communication and community involvement? Is that every time you have a press release? We want to show that under DEI, but you should be communicating



City Light Review Panel Meeting Meeting Minutes

across the board for everything.

R: Good feedback. For Communications we look at what people are doing on the website and who is looking. This should provide pretty good feedback about who is accessing it.

Final Comments:

- Great start! Hitting all the important notes. One thing that is bothering me is #6 on Create Energy Future. Maybe drop race and broaden to just equity measures.
- Overall, it is great. I felt like there were gaps in very few areas. Maybe I missed this, but I felt one thing that did not come through to me on business strategy and objective side is something more explicit around Environment and Sustainability.
- Looks good. Everything looks good. Thanks for adding improvements to the billed services program. Also, we spent so much time on rate redesign and it is missing from this document.
- It is really good. How do you make sure everyone has fun doing this? Would like to know expectations for the advisory panel and our next steps.
- This is coming along very well. Good comments from the panel. One trap here is how you survey—is it really valid feedback, especially around workforce development. Need to pick measures really carefully here.
- Be clear that the goals highlighted aren't everything that SCL does.

In response to a Panel member question, Leigh outlined that the two meetings in March will include a review of the outreach plan and some of the specific Projects/Initiatives/Actions that will be included—this may also go into early April. An outline of the plan will be presented in March; the first draft will be available in Mid-April and the Panel can develop its comment letter at that point; the Draft Plan is to be submitted to the Mayor in mid-May.

Q: Will you be doing more scenario planning?

A: Not at this time.

Adjourn: The meeting adjourned at 12:01 PM.

Next meeting: March 11, 2021