

## Equity Considerations for the IGP RFP Meeting #5

February 21, 2024

9-11am

### Notes

- Presentation from Ulopono on on-bill/off-bill community benefits structure proposal (which is already in place in places in the mainland)
  - Sunny, Kahuku: Did you visit the impacted communities? How do you determine the impacted community? (E.g., zip code) & accountability for these
  - Tyler: Condo associations could be an input; learn from existing projects
  - Doesn't change existing CBPs; doesn't change utility's economics
  - Dennis: How to ensure equity across different community negotiations in impacts achieved?
  - Michael: formulaic through Commission rules/process
  - Henry: need to level the playing field
  - Ryan: still need to have community consent; this can't be a mechanism to force a project on a community
- [Draft staff report](#) presentation
  - Henry: REZs and urban-rural; REZs only exist in rural areas. As long as community can't see wizard behind curtain/HECO's black box process then defining inputs that are considered are largely meaningless. Failure to address community intervention can result in long litigation that will delay anything
  - Ryan: **How will these recs be used?** Even the Hui has "virtually no community involvement"
  - One stakeholder (I missed who): We're talking a lot about community but statistically it's still the same traditional stakeholders in the room

### Breakout Room 1 Notes

- Participant liked the recommendations in the report
  - Notes that UH has a department of urban planning with folks on expertise on community planning and other relevant topics
- Threshold criteria – safety manuals need to be made public as a requirement
  - Likes the idea of a standard legally binding CBP framework that reduces the need for lawyers
- Recommendations were consistent with what was expected (i.e. near-term process improvements), but would like to see a commitment to implementing the longer-term solutions with a schedule of how to get there
- Question about what kind of community outreach needs to be done to communities that do not host projects & will see higher rates due to CBPs
- Need to continue to look at non-financial benefits (e.g. Kupuna are interested in meeting with the Board of Directors) and things like inclusion in co-design of projects and how to value the non-financial benefits
- Participant is interested in training opportunities mentioned in the staff report

## Breakout Room 1 Notes

- UH has a department that works on urban planning—there are huge academic resources nearby that can assist with the intricacies.
- Interested in how training sessions would be formatted, who would be doing it, etc. What does the PUC intend for the training sessions to cover.
- It would be helpful if the PUC addressed boundaries for (short-term and long-term) process changes before the next meeting.
- Help define community benefits to accommodate all types of community members.
- We don't do any outreach to the communities that don't have the projects, but they still are affected by the rates. "The poorer community would be paying the cost."

## Breakout Room 2 Notes

- Do these recommendations capture the feedback and input you were expecting to see based on your participation so far?
  - Yes
  - Recommendations reflect feedback provided
  - Feel "seen" and the recommendations resonated
  - Medium – feels like it has fallen short of a truly community centered approach
  - Yes – lots of community engagement
- Are there additional short-term recommendations that could be implemented?
  - Challenges in defining host community (and a standardized way)
  - Feel like there is an immediate need for making a pathway a community-led energy planning and development
- Do the recommendations, as they stand, address equity in the IGP-RFP process?
  - It's a good start
  - Never a perfect set of recommendations
  - Will always be some members who will never be satisfied
  - It improves it – true equity requires engagement
- Which recommendations would you like to talk about in more detail?
  - What should be discussing further and why
    - Community ownership models
    - Defining the community
    - Interested in learning more about Ulupono
    - How developers will engage the community
    - If we ask the community to do participatory budgeting is a BIG LIFT, should dedicate funding
    - Evaluation criteria
    - Community co-design
    - How much bonus points to developers for doing upfront costs
- A question verbally asked by an attendee:
  - Where are we in the EE & Justice Docket? After today's 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, what's next?
    - Procuring a local consultant (to increase community engagement)

## Group 3 Notes

- What oversight would a community energy board have?
- We should design community benefits packages so that they are simple to understand. No jargon like “co-creation”
- We need to discuss how we define a community
- How can we increase community involvement?
- Breakout Discussion question: **How can we increase community involvement?**
- The Commission needs to go out to communities.
- A low cost commercial is a PUC youtube video for people to hear the presentation, and have a menti poll open so people can see and share. This could be shared by people in many ways.
- Community members that have participated in this docket could share with others. PUC could focus its outreach on communities that have already said that they feel left out.
- The PUC should do outreach at rotary clubs, and neighborhood boards, work with other organizations (like the Equity Hui, the Sierra Club, the Consumer Advocate).
- PUC needs a social media presence!
- Perhaps a bill insert to tell folks about the equity docket?
- PUC needs to go out to communities. No replacement for that.
- Word of mouth is the best advertisement. No need to create a special event. Hop onto other events (Farmer’s Market popup?)
- Have commissioners go on a listening tour. Ramp it up. Don’t have it be a one-time thing. Go to neighborhood boards. Do that first before the listening tour. Escalate the outreach.

Menti Breakout Room Results

| <b>Question 1: Do these recommendations capture the feedback and input you were expecting to see based on your participation so far?</b> |
|--|
| <b>Responses</b>   |
| Yes  |
| Not really.  |
| To a minimal degree.   |
| Yes  |
| yes, but seems like more work to do  |
| I think the recommendations reflect the feedback provided.   |
| Yes! Lots of focus on community engagement and valuing input   |
| Yes. Thank you for great synthesis and integration. “i feel seen” and your recs resonated. Thank you                                     |
| Medium. It still feels like it has fallen short of a truly community-centered approach.  |
| yes  |
| In general, yes. But expected to see more input on defining or setting the parameters for “community”                                    |

|  |
|--|
| I liked the recommendation ideas you all shared for improving upcoming IGP RFP   |
| Yes. I think they include reasonable short term recommendations that would be implementable in a short term while allowing further discussion on ideas that will take longer to implement.               |
|  |
| <b>Question 2: Are there additional short-term recommendations that could be implemented?</b>  |
| <b>Responses</b>   |
| None that I can think of   |
| once the local consultant is brought on board, will be good to have a kick-off with all stakeholders to help inform next steps   |
| I feel like there is an immediate need for making a pathway for community-led energy planning and development. Perhaps some thought around the competitive bidding framework & waivers.                  |
| Would be helpful to define host community sooner than later  |
| Look at standardizing evaluation criteria  |
| Providing definitions of community engagement to developers  |
| I don't understand why enabling community ownership models is placed in long-term process changes. This discussion and solutions around it seem ready for immediate implementation if not just as pilot. |
| Yes this is a good start so far!   |
| community benefits package: should be designed so that community members can fully understand the bargain that is on the table; I also suggest the avoidance of jargon such as "co-creation"             |
|  |
| <b>Question 3: Do the recommendations, as they stand, address equity in the IGP-RFP process?</b>   |
| <b>Responses</b>   |
| Yes. I feel they greatly improve equity considerations   |
| I think it is a good start to begin the shift in approach, value and thinking  |
| Largely! Addressing pre-existing projects as a good-will gesture between community and developer is important, too   |
| Non-price criteria additions   |
| On the basis of distributive and procedural justice, I don't believe so. The recommendations don't seem to address root-causes of energy injustice.  |
| Good start. More can be done as part of the process  |
| Yes this is a good start so far!   |

|  |
|--|
| The recommendations help to further more equity. There will never be a “perfect” set of recs and there will always be some community members who will never be satisfied. But this is good step forward.   |
| I appreciate the consideration for community participatory-budgeting   |
| It improves it. True equity requires meaningful, inclusive discussion, all of which take tons of time  |
| Good start. More work needed. Need backend process to ensure equity.   |
|  |
| <b>Question 4: Which recommendation(s) would you like to talk about in more detail? Why?</b>   |
| <b>Responses</b>   |
| Publicize threshold criteria (such as safety and community outreach requirements) and the scoring rubrics for evaluation criteria.   |
| Many of these recommendations can be expanded on by UHM's DURP Department that many professors whose work directly applies to defining community boundaries, community co-development and resilience.      |
| I believe a minimum amount of community member *attendance* as a non-price criteria would be an important detail -- currently it's just that developers offer a meeting with community.                    |
| b) publicize threshold criteria (like safety) -- who is connecting those dots at the lexical level of the community?   |
| Pricing criteria is something I'm unfamiliar with. I understand the concept and suggestions of changing the percentages but is there a visual or more elaborate lay out of what this looks like an ex      |
| Participatory budgeting so I can understand more   |
| defining a community, since the definition is not clear yet  |
| Interested in learning more about Uluono's proposal and hearing from communities that will end up paying more due to where they live   |
| would like more detail on the RFP Advisory Council concept   |
| How developers will engage the community. Also, any backend process to make sure there is equity between projects.   |
| Community ownership models. Both in its complete and hybrid forms. As well as a version of a CBA.  |
| I have two comments about today's report presentation. 1) inviting community based orgs to do the lift of working with community to do participatory budgeting is a BIG LIFT. Must dedicate funding to CBO |
| Evaluation criteria. While the equity and community aspects are important, we cannot lose sight that the projects selected need to be “good” projects that will be completed and provide benefits.         |

Community co-design. There is active work on what this looks like for grid-wide planning and project development. The recommendations around this seem shallow. ID challenges and short term solutions.

2) how much bonus points going to developer for doing upfront creation? Enough to tip scales? Was curious

I would be curious if the PUC could provide a meta explanation for why they compartmentalized recommendations in to near and far term. I don't want to criticize based on limited perspective.

CBP definition (pg 11, 'a'). I think \$3000/MW is critically too low. CBP's need to provide real benefit community (even if it is not fully proportional to burden - although ideally we achieve that).

I would like to better understand the RFP advisory group.

The level of oversight that a community energy board would have over the resource procurement process

The definition of community because that is the keystone to this whole undertaking.

In speaking of community involvement, discussing that which can increase the amount of community involvement