

Cully Energy Plan PAC Meeting #8
Meeting Objectives and Agenda
November 6th 2017

Please note meeting location, Hacienda CDC – Victor Merced Conference Room

Meeting Objectives:

- PAC provides feedback and recommendations on Energy Plan re-write
- PAC provides recommendations on LCCEP communications, evaluation, further pilot exploration and plan fundraising

Meeting Agenda:

- A. Welcome and check-in question
- B. LCCEP current status and steps to finalize plan
- C. LCCEP feedback discussion
- D. PAC guidance on next steps
 - Getting the word out about the LCCEP Plan
 - Missed projects to keep on the radar
 - Strategies for plan evaluation
 - Funding
- E. PAC closing and next steps
- F. Meeting Evaluation and Closing

Welcome/Bienvenidos

LCCEP #AC MEETING #8
NOVEMBER 6th 2017



	Name (First & Last)	Email or Phone Number	Are you a volunteer or want to be involved with Verde/Living Cully?
	Nombre y Apellido	Email o numero de telefono	Eres un voluntario o quiere involucrarse en Verde/Living Cully?
1	Taren Evans	taren@habitatportlandmetro.org	<input type="checkbox"/> yes/si
2	Maiyee Tuan	maiyeet@apano.org	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes/si
3	Holly Braun	holly.braun@natural.com	<input type="checkbox"/> yes/si
4	Cameron Herrington		<input type="checkbox"/> yes/si
5	Zach Sipel		<input type="checkbox"/> yes/si
6	ERON (NAYA)		<input type="checkbox"/> yes/si
7	ALAN (VERDE)		<input type="checkbox"/> yes/si
8			<input type="checkbox"/> yes/si
9			<input type="checkbox"/> yes/si
10			<input type="checkbox"/> yes/si
11			<input type="checkbox"/> yes/si
12			<input type="checkbox"/> yes/si
13			<input type="checkbox"/> yes/si
14			<input type="checkbox"/> yes/si
15			<input type="checkbox"/> yes/si

Cully Energy Plan PAC Meeting #8

Meeting Notes

November 6th, 2017

Present: Eron, Zack, Maiyee, Cameron, Holly, Taren, Carolina, Alan, Jess

Pre-Meeting Notes:

Taren: It's just NR, not NRI now. Something else about financing from Habitat for Humanity if St. Charles church owns the energy plan

Welcome & Check In: What's something you're looking forward to about the winter?

LCCEP Current Feedback Status

- A. Draft sent to:
 - a. PAC members,
 - i. Requested edits back by end of second week in Nov. (Week of Nov. 6)
 - b. Solar Plus Stakeholders
 - c. Verde Staff
- B. Community focus group in early December
 - a. Reaching out through Living Cully's membership
 - b. Get an opportunity to look at specific pilots
- C. Looking to contract out design of final plan (layout, editing, etc.)
- D. Timeline: we are on track! In feedback period, with goal to having the final plan published Dec. 15

LCEEP Feedback and Discussion

Please email comments and feedback to Carolina by end of the week!

- E. Structure of paper:
 - a. Holly: Before the section on LCCEP's relation to city and county plans, would be helpful to have groupings. (So having four sections: Introduction, Context and Background, Pilots, Appendices). This is about formatting, having a clear transition between sections
- F. Relationship to City and County Plans:
 - a. Eron: These sections seem to highlight things that are not the Cully plan. The deep dive on energy plans outside of the Cully energy plan (Climate Action Plan and 100% renewable) - in theory they shouldn't matter if we are doing the work that we want to do for this community.
 - i. Holly: to me, there's only one paragraph on each, so it helps me understand why the Living Cully Plan is what it is. It seems fitting.
 - ii. Eron: The full page for how it's connected to the city is too much
 - iii. Carolina: Maybe what's lost is, while we want to show the relationship, we want to influence those plans in the future, so we might need to call that out more specifically.
 - iv. Eron: Totally, and what my concern is that its giving the city too much credit, could be used against you that you're "already doing it" and then they won't give you any more funding. Also, you're definitely ahead of them on this plan.
- G. Relationship to Anti-Displacement

- a. Eron: on Anti-Displacement – move last paragraph to the beginning and take out some of it, because it seems like too much of a deep dive.
 - i. Holly: marked it as opposite. Felt like it was so helpful. People never talk about anti-displacement and environmental investments at the same time.
 - ii. Eron: I guess what I'm saying is be more blunt about it. Sometimes the really impactful stuff gets lost (like paragraph 3)
 - iii. Alan: I think there are some audiences that will go right to where you are [Eron], whereas some other people will say, oh, energy investments, let's get those in every neighborhood, without thinking about the consequences.
 - iv. Zach: I would second Eron's opinion, it felt a little long to me, even though I knew folks at ETO would feel like that build up was really powerful
- b. Zach: Put anti-displacement before City and County Plans (in terms of flow). City nicely transitions to the snapshot in terms of technical language.
- c. Maiyee: The anti-displacement and Cully neighborhood section could have a stronger emphasis on community engagement and organizing. Such as, "here are some things that are building action and connections with the community."
 - i. Zach: Maybe it would be helpful to have some of these things as sidebars. Would make it easier to read.
- d. Cameron: It's really important to have anti-displacement at the front of the report. I like that every pilot meets one of the anti-displacement strategies. I like that it is on par with energy efficiency goals.
- e. Zach: Early on, it would be nice to get to know Cully, some of the factual things, like that this is a high poverty but affordable city, diverse, highest energy use intensity, little to no investment in green infrastructure (parks, safe transit). That could go in the intro. We are engaging in this because we are an energy burdened community
- H. Energy Snapshot: Maybe take a closer look at this section. Carolina has had a hard time understanding this section. Did we actually say anything?
 - a. Zach: Some great charts, specifically on energy burden. I think the numbers are there, so don't lose faith.
 - b. Holly: Part of the data that isn't telling the story fully. There's confusion on what we are defining as energy burden. The way we are using it is referring just to electricity, which kind of muddies the water. Might be helpful to pull out houses that are heating with electricity rather than gas, because their electric burden is going to be much more.
 - i. Caro: what you're saying is that for the data that we have, the electricity cost is missing those who aren't using electricity for heating.
 - ii. Holly: I don't want to over complicate it, but it makes a difference if you're just powering lights, or heating your home. [If you calculating a percent electricity burden, and you have both gas and electric homes in there, the gas homes are going to bring your average burden down because they are not using electricity to heat their homes].
 - iii. Zach: This means we need to be clear about how we are defining energy burden – is it just electricity? Does Dat have data on the distribution of how people heat? Oil? Gas? Electric?
 - c. Alan: Title this Carolina's least favorite section
 - d. Holly: Data's not weather normalized. Project for PAC: have we captured the full message of what the data is saying? Is it too 2-D? Making sure the verbage and the number match.
 - e. Eron: Data is good for defending things

I. Pilot Projects: Criteria/Framing

- a. Holly: What's the criteria that made these projects come forward? (Concern about sexy solar: is it actually financially best, or is there a different value going on). Page 5 criteria, not super tight. You want to make sure that when people finish reading the plan, they feel like the projects you have chosen are the best projects.
 - i. Eron: One of the advantages of community solar vs. roof, is that costs come down, and it ends up being a bill credit.
 - ii. Cameron: None of the solar projects in this plan are for energy efficiency. These are projects going on new construction, or for the roof of the church, where the solar energy offers energy resiliency in times of natural disasters.
 - iii. Eron: Also, solar projects are economically worthwhile if somebody else is paying for them. If it's highly subsidized then it is beneficial for residents. So if solar is the sexy thing for the funders right now, then that's what we should go for. Best way to serve the client without them being financial impact
 - iv. Zach: Yeah, there's a lot of money for solar right now.
 - v. Alan: It's a framing issue: what do these projects lead to? Resiliency? Additional place based work at other MHP? It's also important to say why we didn't choose other projects.
 - vi. Cameron: That sounds like an articulation of why these are *pilot projects*. Maybe that is something that's missing: a framing of these projects as pilots of specific project categories, to implement these kinds of projects in other places.
 - vii. Alan: Helpful to think about how these projects lead to the next project
 - viii. Holly: Making the theme that we are doing this thing right now to open the door to a next project
 - ix. Carolina: Can somebody summarize what everybody is saying?
 - x. Holly: Part of it is articulating the criteria for how the pilots were selected.
 - xi. Alan: The other element is the narrative. When we are talking specifically about the mobile home parks, then you need to note that MHP big part of our anti-displacement. Oak Leaf, is the access point. Then this option is the most feasible, and can hopefully be replicated at other sites.
 - xii. Eron: Concerned with replicability.
 - xiii. Carolina: So it sounds like the *why* is missing in this document
 - xiv. Alan: Sure, and that framing can come after the pilots are presented. What does the efficacy of these pilots teach us about how we can meet community needs and continue forward on certain fronts.
 - xv. Eron: Could that be fleshed out in Appendix A?
 - xvi. Carolina: I don't think that's the right section for that.
 - xvii. Alan: from an implementation, viability perspective, there is a long-term strategy that we need to apply now. These pilots help us learn how to do that.
 - xviii. Maiyee: It sounds like this could be a reframing of replicability into a vision. Not just how can we do this again, but this is what we are working towards. For example, "We are working towards creating community purchasing power, hence we are doing this project..." or "We are working towards creating community resilience, hence..."
 - xix. Cameron: Sharing why this is the pilot for that category. We are not saying that this was the best in all categories, but it presented itself as a viable one.
 1. Alan: Projects build engagement, which build more projects. Not about having to identify THE BEST project

J. Pilot Projects: Ductless Heat Pumps:

- a. Cameron: Be more explicit about who we want to serve. Wanting to help MH residents reduce their expenses. Share why those people still need this. How will they still benefit from it? They are at an income level perhaps that is too high for receiving support from grant or government programs, but that doesn't mean they can afford to buy a heat pump on their own.
 - i. Eron: Agreeing, if they aren't qualifying for my program, they aren't qualifying for many programs. These are the people who are getting left out.
 - ii. Cameron: These are the ones who have high energy burdens
- b. Holly: If they have baseboard heating, then ductless heating makes sense, but if it is already ducted, it is cheaper to put in a regular heat pump.
 - i. Eron: so you're saying drop the duct
 - ii. Holly: if it's an unducted home, you use a ductless system. I'm not sure if DIY works for ducted systems
 - iii. Eron: I have a ducted home with a ductless pump. Because of code, the only place they could put a pump was below my window, and I didn't want that noise
- c. Cameron: since the heat pumps are a subsidized commodity for low-income folks, you might put in a story about how this is helping a specific family. What percentage of their income are they now saving? Could be a powerful way to share the project
 - i. Eron: for me it was about 50%
- d. Eron: Anti-Displacement strategy: one of the things we are finding is that for homes that have sold, we've invested enough in the house to make it unattractive to develop. Can't flip it, it makes it difficult to develop. Investing in current homes in the neighborhood makes it less attractive to developers
- e. Alan: Is there funding coming for those outside the co-op to buy the DHPs? There's a bit of confusion on where the money will come from. I think what we are actually wanting to say for funding is that it's a blended funding model, without outside funds and internal funds coming from the residents.
 - i. Cameron: Could be a mixed income, so that those with higher incomes help to subsidize those who can't afford it.
 - ii. Eron: I like the idea of having one project that's not dependent of outside funding or unsecure. One that is boxed up and ready to go.
 - iii. Holly: energy trust funding is pretty secure, so if you get outside funding for this project, it still might be able to be presented as stable
- f. Holly: Energy Ted?
 - i. Carolina: They are energy measuring devices you can hook up to measure your energy usage. Help to monitor the efficacy of the pilot.
 - ii. Cameron: That definitely needs to be explain.
- g. Cameron: target number of how many families: ANSWER: 25 minimum for coop
- h. Cameron: once these systems are installed, can the system be removed and salvaged?
 - i. Eron: yes.
 - ii. Carolina: you can take it with you
 - iii. Cameron: mention that. It's a safe investment because it can move beyond this project
- i. Holly: It's not more comfortable to have DHP. Baseboard blows off hot heat, DHP blows off cold heat (warmer than air, but cold to skin). I don't ever want to be by our vents.

K. Pilot Projects: Oak Leaf Mobile Home Park Solar:

- a. Eron: Replacing the whole thing is just about as much weatherizing you can do

- i. Carolina: looks like funding this project from Neighborhood Revitalization (NR) isn't possible. Might still just be solar on the community building
 - ii. Eron: you guys really got the ball rolling on NRI.
 - iii. Taren: funding more difficult from NR on MH because they have to be owned by the resident, which the Oak Leaf are owned by St. Vincent de Paul
 - b. Alan: Park missing in first sentence
 - c. Cameron: one of the goals is that it helps make the project more cost effective for the non-profit that owns it. Tests out model to make future affordable housing projects more financially feasible for non-profits or tenants to purchase.
 - i. Eron: brings overhead down
 - d. Holly: didn't feel right forgetting that the bulk of homes are in other parks.
 - i. Carolina: would it help to talk about the policy needs in order to make it possible to work at those parks? Would it be helpful to look into solar for resident-owned properties?
 - ii. Holly: yeah. Be clear about the replicability and the goals, and why this one is most feasible
 - iii. Cameron: we want to be prepared to purchase or have resident-owned projects and that takes policy, but this is developing a "plug and play" model that can happen when ownership changes
 - iv. Holly: good
 - v. Eron: I would say that rooftop would not be viable for MHPs
 - vi. Zach/Carolina: we're thinking about pole model
- L. Pilot Project: Living Cully Plaza Rebuild
 - a. Maiyee: There could be a lot of powerful verbiage about how this came together, not just through Cully and community organizing, but replicable details. How did you make this project happen. In order to serve as a model, those details need to be shared. Additionally, you could brag a little bit more about how that energy is going to be put to use.
 - b. Eron: move this to 2017, since it is ready to go. Moving this to the front and say that it's already going (in process)
 - c. Alan: think through how we are going to frame this one. I think it's okay for the plan to be forward thinking. However, at the same time that discussions started to take place on development, LCCEP was coming into focus, and we saw an opportunity to bring those two together. Highlighting the narrative of the pivot point or coming together of the two projects- the items that we are bringing to the project that wouldn't otherwise be there
- M. Energy Education Campaign:
 - a. Carolina giving context: We shouldn't be doing education that's already happening. ½ of the people at our focus group had gone through CEP. (This is building off something Eron shared at an earlier meeting)
 - b. Holly: Train people who have gotten homes weatherized and bill assistances, could you have them trained to become auditors and inspectors?
 - c. Alan: worth mentioning that each project has its own educational component

PAC Guidance on communications, evaluation, funding and other opportunities

- N. Carolina will follow up with an evaluation about the PAC. Additionally, please give feedback on our plans for communicating the plan

Closing and Evaluation