



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Meeting Minutes - Approved SUSTAINABLE MADISON COMMITTEE

Monday, February 16, 2015

4:30 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room 300 (Madison Municipal Building)

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

The Meeting was called to order following verification by the Secretary that the Meeting was properly noticed and a quorum was present.

Present: 14 - David Ahrens; Rajan V. Shukla; John M. Robinson; Lance E. Green; Sam J. Breidenbach; Richard J. Pearson; Jesse J. Shields; Zachary T. Schuster; Anya M. Firszt; Jeannette E. LeZaks; Chelsea Chandler; Richard A. Heinemann; Michael J. Vickerman and Sophia S. Rogers

Excused: 4 - Hans J. Hinke; John M. Conowall; David P. Rhode and Bradley Campbell

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Firszt, seconded by Shields, to Approve the Minutes. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ron Wolfe, 506 Dahmer Dr. Waunakee spoke on the need for more rail transportation, particularly using existing rail lines that could be activated quickly—i.e., rail line to Portage from Madison. He also spoke to use of alternative fuels, such as fuel cells/batteries for transportation.

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

Motion by Robinson and second by Rogers to change order of the agenda to allow staff and Capstone students to speak first. (Items 2 & 3 on publically noticed agenda)

1. [36998](#) To develop an Energy Work Plan, investigate options and provide recommendations to the Common Council on how to implement the Energy Work Plan.

As part of this semesters Capstone project, five UW students from the LaFollette School will be working on updating the Carbon Inventory for City facilities. They will use ICLEI software (Clearware) to calculate the City's footprint and will create a list of metric criteria and do a best practices comparison as a benchmark. This is the 4th time LaFollette has helped with the carbon inventory. Another group of LaFollette students will calculate a community-wide carbon footprint. The Students will report their findings to SMC on May 18th.

2. [37270](#) La Follete Capstone Project - Student's Introduction and Project Overview.

Presentation by Planning Division on Comprehensive Plan
Rick Roll and Brian Grady of the Planning Division reviewed the purpose of the Comprehensive Plan and the process the City will use to update it in 2016-2017. A Comprehensive Plan is required by State statutes as part of 'smart growth' legislation enacted and updated during the past decade. Our last rewrite of the Plan was in 2006, and we are required to update it every ten years. The Plan is the overall umbrella plan for development within the City and all other plans, like the Sustainability Plan, the Master Transportation Plan and neighborhood plans are amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan provides the framework on which growth and infill development occurs—it reinforces appropriate land use, mix-use development, walkability, neighborhood services and a full range of other programs.

Green asked about the power of the Plan to drive action.
Roll responded that the Plan is taken seriously and that various land use, zoning code and planning requirements are all formulated by the Plan. It is the umbrella document.

Green—How do neighborhood plans get updated? His neighborhood (NH) plan is several years old and he wondered how it could be updated.

Roll—Various things drive updates of the NH Plans. Often it is the alder who can get a NH Plan review and update arranged. Issues with neighborhoods—developments, other plans, demographic changes, land use changes and being out of date can also drive the plan review and update. Two people are assigned in Planning to assist in this Plan update.

Updating the Comprehensive Plan is part of Planning's strategic plan. It is being targeted to be completely updated by 2016. SMC will have a chance to comment on the updated Plan as part of the approval process which is driven by the Plan Commission and adopted by the Common Council.

3. [37033](#) Presentation by Planning Division on Comprehensive Plan.

Public comment:

Annette Miller MG&E (133 Blair St. Madison, WI 53788). Ms. Miller spoke as the project manager for the public outreach process that MG&E is crafting for the Energy Work Plan. She requested that the Committee postpone its vote for 30 days until MG&E could roll out their public forum process. The company has been working on the process for the past several months and will have a third-party facilitator lead the sessions. They will follow through on this promise to deliver and update on their process within 30 days.

Don Ferber: 4700 Allis Ave. Madison WI, 53716. He supports the Energy Work Plan and wants a strong one for the community so that it can move forward. He feels the State is hostile to renewables and that they are ignoring climate change and the equity impacts on lower income people. Feels the new MG&E rate case adversely impacts lower and middle income people as well. He wants the rate case to be friendlier to new start-ups, smaller companies and that it should link to transportation, housing and business climate improvements. He feels that using fossil fuels sends money out of the state and that renewable and building upgrades will keep money in the local economy.

Don Wichert: 1810 Keyes Ave, Madison WI 53711, spoke neither wishing to oppose or support the item. He is a renewable energy consultant and shareholder in MG&E and was more concerned that the Sustainability Plan goal should be consistent with the renewable energy target (25% renewable sources by 2025 not 15%.) He is glad MG&E and the City will work together on the Energy Plan.

Don Miner: 655 Crandall St. Madison, WI 53711. He supports the Energy Work Plan and focusing on action to reduce climate change. He is one of the 200 MG&E customers who have a solar installation and he totally supports renewable energy. He felt MG&E needs to have a plan that meets both MG&E needs as well as those of the city. Along with ensuring the grid works, he feels MG&E should support individual solar installations.

Mitchell Brey: 1105 Droster Rd. Madison WI 53716. He supports the Energy Work Plan and feels we should target 25% renewable by 2025 and 80% renewables by 2050. He pointed out that we should also be taking Alliant Energy into account as they have the grid for some parts of Madison. He was happy to hear that MG&E was responding to pressure from the public to hold public listening sessions. He stated that he and others had requested these meetings 113 days ago. He felt there was no public rate case discussion prior to its submission to the PSC and that its new rate case was very regressive. He wants MG&E to listen to the community.

Edward Kuharski: 405 Sidney St. Madison, WI 53703. He commented that the City should revise the 3-minute rule for an informational hearing. He felt MG&E's rate plan would drive people out of their homes and that it was set up to only give them and their shareholders economic advantage. He felt the economic balance of payments—he stated that \$16B goes out the state to pay for fossil fuels—is out of whack and that we should invest that money in the State of Wisconsin. He wanted local economic independence.

John Becker: PO 3292, Madison, WI 53704. President of CRANES (Capital Region Advocacy Network for Environmental Sustainability) and feels all communities should have a climate action plan. Asked if Committee knew that Dane County had a climate change plan and that it has a target for Net Zero energy use by 2050. MG&E expands beyond the city limits and we should be thinking more broadly. Reinforced that CRANES can help and that the current TIGER grant was part of their effort to support climate change action.

Harry Bennett: 632 Glenway St. Madison, WI 53711. Supports the plan and feels we need a plan to help future generations meet their needs and that the plan has to happen in order to have a sustainable future. He felt the German model of 29% renewable energy was good to emulate. (Sometimes 50% renewable energy depending on the day) He also stated that Costa Rica is currently 90% carbon neutral. He felt Madison and the US needed to change policies, that we shouldn't kill the environment for our grandchildren by going for cheap non-renewable energy prices now.

Kevin McGettigan: 1825 Bled St. Madison, WI 53711. In support of the Energy Work Plan and that we should not wait for MG&E to take action because they had a lot of coal to burn and did not want to move quickly on this. Feels we need to cut down on particulates—get rid of coal and listen to the people's wishes and not maintain the status quo. He felt the current rate structure benefits the privileged and that it is not helping individuals with things like renewable set-ups. He felt Madison should act more aggressively and not be baked out like the rest of the country.

Paul Schechter: No address given. MG&E has green sentiments but that their infrastructure and current organizational model does not allow it to change.. They need to stop the tug-of-war between money and being green. Rate structure should not negatively impact solar as it has little cost to the grid. He felt the rate structure was purely a way for MG&E to make more profits.

Karen Kenrick-Hands: 404 S. Blount. #101 Madison, WI 53703. Supported Energy Work Plan because it would help get carbon price established and promote saving energy in the long run. She felt that fossil fuel dependence was not a resilient way to operate. Madison needs to be proactive in leading on carbon pricing.

Two registrants in Support but did not wish to comment. Victor Castro: 8001 Ritz dr. #408 Madison, WI 53719 and Kate Schulte: 429 Engelhart Dr. Madison, WI

Close of public comment

Discussion of Energy Work Plan by SMC members.

Rogers moved that the resolution should be changed to read 25% by 2025. Seconded by Vickerman. Voice vote agreement to change wording.

Shields moved to postpone the vote on the Energy Work Plan resolution for 30 days. Heinemann seconded.

Discussion on motion.

Green stated that the city and MG&E listening process should not be in conflict.

Shields felt that the timing was going to cause a conflict if the City acted now.

Green felt that the scope of the MG&E process was unclear.

Rogers understands about acting now, but will if impact city and MG&E relationship.

Vickerman sees a value in seeing the MG&E proposal even though he disagrees with their stand on renewable. He felt that MG&E has to help chart the energy future and that the City needs to work to make that happen. He felt that reviewing the MG&E proposal was a good thing to do and if SMC didn't like it they could offer alternatives.

Rogers stated the next meeting date was March 16th, 28 days and not 30 days. She suggested a friendly amendment to the motion of 28 days vs. 30 days. Vickerman seconded. Member approved change.

Heinemann asked about format of MG&E plan. Did it have a work plan on energy and 1-2 public outreach sessions. Miller said that the plan does have both, but she didn't want to share details until it is fully finalized and the third-party facilitator can speak to the process they will use.

Heinemann feels the City needs to engage with MG&E in a meaningful way.

Green asked if SMC could see the language of the MG&E plan and suggest modifications during the 28 day period. MG&E would not do that, but would come to SMC meeting in March and give full process update. Some documentation in hands of committee prior to meeting is possible, but full update will come at meeting.

Schuster. Will the plan have hard dates?

Rogers what will public forums look like? Can the City help facilitate?

Heinemann—MG&E would have third-party facilitate meetings and we need to wait for their plan to see what the details will be.

Schuster. There is ill will towards MG&E in the community and we should help bridge that gap.

Shields. MG&E will be open to issues raised by the community.

Schuster. SMC should build any plans it has off the framework of the MG&E plan and community input.

Breidenbach. How realistic is it that we will have plan in 28 days.

Shields. We will have outline to present here in 28 days. Miller said it will be a process update and discuss how the public meetings will roll out.

Rogers. How do you think it will impact the Energy Work Plan?

Heinemann. We'll need to see it first. Green—it may have different needs.

Robinson. Called the question. Let's vote on 28 day postponement.

Voice vote to wait 28 days to review process update from MG&E and vote on the Energy Work Plan. All in favor.

A motion was made by Robinson, seconded by Heinemann, to Refer to the SUSTAINABLE MADISON COMMITTEE. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

4. [37271](#)

Items that need to appear on the next SMC agenda that require a vote.

Items that need to appear on the next SMC agenda that require a vote.
Other than process update from MG&E none were recommended.

5. [37272](#)

Update on Ad Hoc Benchmarking Collaboration committee.

Shukla, Ahrens, LeZaks and Susan Schmitz of DMI provided update. Have had six meetings with area businesses and property owners to craft ordinance language and discuss issues around benchmarking. Discussions have been productive and committee is learning range of activities that property owners and managers can and cannot do.

Green. Do we have a timeline for completion of work?

Schmitz. Working on all the details first. No set date for completion, but want it done by end of year.

Shields. Are there additional resources we can provide to property owners to help?

LeZaks. Technical help is one area. Some need more assistance than others with software and retrofit technologies.

Breidenbach. Any incentive for building improvements being discussed?

Shukla. Not at that level. Benchmarking will help with targeting where to intervene, but targets and incentives need to be highlighted first.

LeZaks—business owners would like help and knowledge on what they can do to make building and system improvements.

All items are still under discussion by ad hoc committee.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Vickerman—mentioned that Middleton and MG&E are having discussions around community solar and passed out some information.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by LeZaks, seconded by Ahrens, to Adjourn at 6:30 PM. The motion passed by voice vote/other.