

IGP RFP Meeting (10/31/2023): Notes

Docket No. 2022-0250

- Welcome & moment of Aloha
- Intros and Ground Rules
 - Intros via chat & new folks introducing themselves
- Status of the Equity Docket:
 - September - order setting next steps to focus on community engagement & series of meetings on the IGP RFP
 - We are working on procurement of a local consultant to be on board in 2024
 - IGP RFP meetings - high-level overview
 - Meeting 1: focus on education & scoping
 - Meetings 2 & 3: focused on proposed solutions
 - Meeting 4: prioritizing/refining solutions and outputs
- Objectives for the meeting today:
 - Learning opportunities
 - Scoping this effort
- Learning opportunity: Hawaiian Electric's Request for Proposal ("RFP") Process
 - See slide deck & chat history
 - Questions:
 - Where is the equity? How can we incorporate community input before the RFP is formalized? How can areas without land contribute to carrying the load?
- Breakout room share out:
 - Community empowerment and safety are the major issues
 - Meaningful participation in the process; defining community & consensus better; nothing can replace thorough community engagement process; mentions of high cost of capital and improving energy democracy
 - Community benefits discussion of burdens - lack of community involvement and empowerment; need to have a group that could come together overall & be a one-stop shop.
 - Echo the community empowerment theme on CBPs, RFP inputs, EE, solar, etc.; should embed environmental justice into the bid and scoring process; could direct benefits to Hawaiian Homelands; talked about siting & places projects shouldn't go; lower barriers to community-based developers to level the playing field
- Next steps:
 - The Commission will synthesize the inputs on problem statements to support discussions in meetings 2 & 3 - these will be the basis for thinking about how the solutions support and address the root problem;
 - The Commission will share the chat/notes/recording/and problem statement share out

- Public comments are welcome at any time & participation is welcome both inside and outside of meetings
- Outputs may include staff recommendations, party proposals, etc.

Bike Rack:

- NEM should be brought back
- Consideration of PGV
- Training for communities on intervening/participation
- Molokai's procurement process & how to get involved

Breakout 1. Facilitator: Gennelle

Problem Statements

- Procurements are not oriented toward and do not center environmental justice and climate resilience
- Community benefits packages should be designed equitably instead of one-size fits all (i.e., why do we assume that \$3,000/MW is appropriate for all communities; higher rewards may be necessary for lower income communities)
- Existing infrastructure isn't considered when new developments are planned (and the amount of existing infrastructure should be, so that the same communities are selected to host over and over again)
- Geographic equity for new/old projects
- Opportunities for input for bidding in to RFP needs to be aligned with communities needs and strengths and constraints (i.e., the barriers for bidding is biased towards multinational firms, which makes it challenging for communities to self-bid)
- Metrics (or bid criteria) should (but do not) emphasize and center what the community wants
- Benefits need to be customizable for community needs

Commonalities/Themes:

- Customization of benefits for communities
- Equity in siting of infrastructure

Differences/Unique Elements:

-

Bike Rack:

- Efforts to lower the need for electricity, generally, so that fewer resources are needed to meet demand
- Teach reduction of electricity use/conservation, e.g., in schools

Breakout 2. Facilitator: Grace

Problem Statements

- “There is little citizen control delegated to communities regarding what types of energy infrastructure will be developed.” “RFP processes fail to nurture and encourage a democratic process that invites meaningful participation in planning and development”. “All of Hawaii’s communities experience...”
- Problem with the statement is that it is missing that the cost of capital for HECO just went up a lot. The cost of building out that infrastructure will cost much more due to HECO’s downgrade. We should look into other sources of capital. CBRE projects are judged on experience and access to capital - and now HECO is in the same situation.
- One element missing from the statement - how do we define who the community is?
- Recurring theme is/to add is around including community at the front end of discussions. Language could be changed to community concerns & interested. Improve energy democracy.
- Transparency of the scoring process is critical.
- How do you define consensus? Challenge of reaching full awareness/input.
- Having communities facilitate would help to reduce communities feeling they don’t have a say. Identifying communities that need assistance - can look into specific populations that need assistance.
- Establish an arbiter or venue for the community’s views to be conveyed more officially. (e.g. elected officials?)
- Participation of community members in dockets needs to be facilitated.

Commonalities/Themes:

- A more involved role of communities in all parts the process—including community interests toward the beginning of the process.
- How do we define key terms like community and consensus?
- Build out a broader energy democracy methodology with definitions and metrics and strategies for successful equitable energy planning and development***

Differences/Unique Elements:

- Meaningful participation & citizen control. Need less ambiguity.
- Sources of capital.
- How do we define the communities?
- Put communities at the front end.
- Define consensus. Utilize additional help. Look into specific populations that need assistance.
- Defining a problem statement isn’t effective.
- Nothing can replace community input.

Bike Rack:

-

Breakout 3. Facilitator: Eric

Problem Statements

- Community benefits package funded by ratepayers that will be distributed to small groups; HECO limited in funding these projects which ruins the cost savings that benefit communities
- Community benefits - why isn't burden shared among communities; shouldn't everyone contribute to that?
- Lack of partnering with comm orgs; did not hear about these issues during community conventions; lack of messaging to communities, how many projects going on at the same time? Can community get involved in portfolio level of projects? Is there outreach to groups on lands where siting occurs? Who is responsible? Lack of modeling framework for change overall. Is that something that was considered on a holistic level?
- Lacking community involvement process as community doesn't have power to drive these processes. Creating greater equity allows shifting involvement to communities. Community feels like they are getting "sloppy seconds".
- Upcoming IGP process; zones to RFPs; push by HECO/CA to develop projects in specific zones on the island to save \$\$ in distribution and transmission costs but deepens the problem for communities who don't want the projects next to them. Worried about how this process will look like and will be implemented.

Commonalities/Themes:

- Need comm group that others can come together with; collectively comm can get a better grasp of what is acceptable and negotiable with contractors as opposed to following individually; comm is fragmented but with an organized effort
- Allocation of funds to encourage developers to build long term relationships with comm rather than "buying them out"

Differences/Unique Elements:

-

Bike Rack:

-

Breakout 4. Facilitator: Ashley

Problem Statements

- Giving communities negotiating power - having a structure for community input. Communities need to be defined. Who will be the voice?
- Communities need to be part of the process, need to incorporate more community involvement
- Safety concerns – Safety has not been the prioritized criteria for RFPs (2) challenge: Prioritize safety in RFPs (3) specificity of impact communities' will be less likely to suffer man-made disasters
- Would like to see a metric for safety. What is the accepted OSHA
- Oahu's landfill - heavy metals from PV - the grid is changing to renewable. Lifecycle concerns. Requirements for material management plan.

Commonalities/Themes:

- Safety is a concern
- Community empowerment

Differences/Unique Elements:

- Lifetime of the project (requirements for material management)- thinking about the community impact holistically

Bike Rack:

-

Breakout 5. Facilitator: Mike

Problem Statements

- Keeping the cost of electricity down (i.e., the least-cost RFP approach) is not the only thing communities care about. Is there a way to shape the RFP that prioritizes other things communities care about (e.g., climate resiliency, local food production, sustainable building materials)?
- Elevate the communities' role from providing input to co-development, focusing on long-term equity in the development process. Existing policies/laws/definitions/limitations hinder the opportunity for community development (e.g., CBRE limited to solar). Community benefits are important, but community leadership and investment in development (rather than outside companies/injection) may be better.
- Current decision-making processes neglects and/or ignores traditionally disadvantaged communities (certainly Native Hawaiian communities, but not limited), manifesting in economic, environmental, historical, and cultural impacts and unequal access to clean energy resources despite these same communities bearing the vast majority of the burden created by utility-scale clean energy projects. Low-cost model with landowner power perpetuates inequity in the RFP process. Ideas: set standards for community meetings, advertisement guidelines for community meetings, local employment as a requirement—not a benefit, incorporate non-monetary benefits early.
- Every RFP needs to have health, safety and welfare of the community as top priority.
- The “how” of infrastructure development and renewable energy programs needs to be included in the problem statement. Energy planning and construction has mostly been siloed, should be more holistic. Steep learning curve for this work requires a mechanism for community reps to engage effectively.
- Community should be part of the decision making in how a facility is operated, what is prioritized.
- “However, community represents are underrepresented and solicited too late in the process.” Communities should be involved in development, not reaction. The CBPs are predicated on community agreement, and does not allow an opportunity for communities to reject projects.
- More than just checking a box that you have covered community engagement.

Commonalities/Themes:

- Low-cost approach is not necessarily the best option.
- Need for education for communities.
- Need earlier opportunities for involvement.
- RFP co-design with communities involved or leading.

Differences/Unique Elements:

-

Bike Rack:

- Perhaps a longer intro session for communities about RFPs.

Additional Problem Statements Submitted by Docket Participants

1. How do we get support from the community for projects?
2. How do we define community? What are the groups?
3. How do we know our community outreach and engagement were successful?
 - a. Success
 - b. Outcomes
4. How do we ensure community is aware of projects and the process?
5. How can the community be involved in the development of the project?
6. How do we increase community capacity so that community can meaningfully participate?
7. How could we better address community opposition?
8. How do we ensure that community is driving the process?
9. How do we avoid last-minute opposition to projects?
10. How do we build and maintain trust with the community?
11. What do communities want?
 - a. Rooftop solar
 - b. Lower bills
 - c. Good jobs
 - d. Money staying in community
12. How do we get community plans to include renewable energy?
13. How can we better site renewable energy projects so that we are not always in the same (already-burdened) areas?

1. Appears to be a lack of partnering with Community Organizations to amplify messages/outreach - Native Hawaiian Organizations list from Dept of Interior; Hawaiian Civic Clubs; OHA. US Department of Transportation held community listening sessions in May/June/July to obtain feedback from the community on how they wanted to be engaged for DOT projects that may impact the community – has anyone reached out to them to find out their lessons learned from the community outreach? Hawaiian Civic Clubs just held a convention in Waikiki in October – no messaging. Council for Native Hawaiian Advancement will hold their convention in Maui in November – is there an opportunity to get messaging out?

2. Appears to be a lack of WIIFM messaging to Community – What's In It For Me? Why should the community care and get involved? Is this a one-shot chance with different vendors for each RFP, or is this a true long term partnership being built? What is the process to engage the community at the entire project portfolio level and discuss holistic change versus single one-off projects/RFPs?

3. Appears to be a lack of proper definition of community – more than 50% of Native Hawaiians are forced to live away from our cultural home. This group of Native Hawaiians cares very deeply about what happens to the land and resources, and many intend to return home someday. Including this group will yield positive long-term results and broader acceptance of changes.

4. Appears to be lack of follow-up on what were great suggestions from July 20 meeting. Were action items assigned from this meeting? Were the action items

published? Who had responsibility to follow-up with community groups and what were results? Lack of follow-up creates lack of trust in the process.

5. Appears to be a lack of full model/framework for managing change (e.g. ADKAR)