

The Minneapolis Clean Energy Partnership offers a lot of lessons for us to learn from and was formed with two simultaneous agreements being signed. This MOU cannot create the partnership (because it will not involve other parties), therefore it should probably be negotiated at the same time as an agreement with others that does create a "Community Energy Partnership."

- Instruct the negotiating team to hold public hearings and meetings with stakeholders to gather input on what a Community Energy Partnership should look like.
  - This should occur before an MOU is signed.
- An agreement creating the Community Energy Partnership should involve multiple parties.
  - Dane County, Fitchburg and other cities served by MGE, as well as other stakeholders and citizens such as the UW, environmental groups, consumer groups, the water utility, the sewage utility, the school district, and maybe others.
- An MOU between MGE and the City of Madison should not be signed until a separate agreement, which would also include the city, is signed between MGE and these parties.

Here are why these actions would be beneficial to the city.

- From a reading of the EWP, it seems possible that an MOU could be signed without the concurrent development of a (strong) "Community Energy Partnership."
- The city would then have less leverage for a CEP negotiation.
- A bad outcome would be the development of a CEP with no real power to get things done or hold anyone accountable—window dressing—with the city's inadvertent blessing.