

IGP Stakeholder Council Meeting

Tuesday, April 27, 2021

12:30pm - 2:30pm

WebEx

Attendees

WebEx

Donalyn Dela Cruz, S360

Collin Au, HE

Robin Kaye

Jennifer Zelko-Schlueter, HE

Brian Lam, HE

Christopher Kinoshita, HE

Henry Curtis, Life of the Land

Colton Ching, HE

Earlynn Maile, HE

Greg Shimokawa, HE

Stephany Vaioleti

Audrey Newman

Marc Asano, HE

Scott Glenn, HSEO

Shelee Kimura, HE

Marisa Chun, HE

Yvette Maskrey, Honeywell

Barry Usagawa, Board of Water Supply

Kirsten Turner, HSEO

Melissa Miyashiro, Blue Planet

Riley Ceria, HE

David Parsons, HPUC

Kylie Wager Cruz, Earthjustice

Amanda Yano, HE

Wren Westcoatt, Progression HI Offshore

Wind

Noelani Kalipi, Progression HI Offshore

Wind

Jeremy Laundergan, EnerNex

Yoh Kawanami, HE

Keith Yamanaka, DoD

Murray Clay, Ulupono

Rocky Mould, HSEA

Richard Rocheleau, HNEI

Christin Chang, HE

Kurt Tsue, HE

Mahina Martin, HE

Rick Pinkerton, HE

Robert Harris, Sunrun

Robert Uyeunten, HE

Ken Aramaki, HE

Christopher Lau, HE

Sorapong Khongnawang, HE

Isaac Kawahara, HE

Discussion

- I. Steps to Issuance of an RFP
 - a. Stakeholder: It would be helpful to add timeframes to each step.
 - b. Stakeholder: There needs to be a more open way to notify people about opportunities, right now only people familiar with the PUC know about them.
 - c. Stakeholder: Where is public comment is solicited in the process?
 - i. HE: Notices are posted on the Company website.
 - d. Stakeholder: It's better to be more aggressive in outreach; local papers and community newsletters could also be utilized. If we're going to be serious about community engagement, step 5 needs to be beefed up.

- e. Stakeholder: The Commissioners believe community engagement is needed to reach the State’s goals and the Company’s efforts to add minimum requirements are helpful. The various opportunities and zoom calls are appreciated. It can be challenging for outsiders to understand the PUC’s processes. The Commission doesn’t want to see community engagement end when the project gets approved.
 - f. Stakeholder: What is the PUC’s process for engagement?
- II. RFP Requirements
- a. Stakeholder: The minimum requirements are good but more is needed for a project to be successful.
 - b. HE: The RFP requirements are meant to be the floor. Not all developers have equal access to a local consultant or knowledge of the community that they will be working with.
 - c. HE: While the process can be mandated, the content is still difficult. Sometimes the process and content are dependent on timing.
 - d. Stakeholder: I’ve seen marketing and public relations from developers, rather than education.
 - e. HE: More time would be needed in the process to move above the floor that is set by the RFP requirements.
- III. Community Outreach Plan
- a. Stakeholder: Community engagement needs to be done in the style that fits the community; you can’t just rely on public meetings. There needs to be sensitivity to community needs. In small communities, some people may not be comfortable speaking out in groups. Developers may say they spoke with 150 people at a community meeting when in reality, only 15 people spoke.
 - b. Stakeholder: Most conversations were in small groups and it’s hard to build trust through a brochure. Different communities will also have different specific needs, e.g. Mililani wanted more education opportunities, Kunia was concerned about agriculture.
 - c. Stakeholder: Customization needs to happen for the people and place involved.
 - d. Stakeholder: The concept of co-design is important with the community. There seems to be a firewall between the communities and the Company on which projects to choose. How does a community tell which developer is most trustworthy? Sometimes the communication loop doesn’t always close.
 - i. Stakeholder: Is this related to the CBRE effort?
 - ii. Stakeholder: Moloka’i doesn’t believe that a firewall exists between the utility teams for evaluation and project development where self-build is allowed. Separately, how can a community discuss a project without being able to discuss the numbers? It’s not clear how the community can influence the project or the decision/selection of a project or developer.
 - iii. Stakeholder: A non-bid criteria should be the number and type of other projects in the same area.
 - iv. HE: The role of the independent observer (“IO”) is to oversee the RFP bids, evaluation, and end to end process to ensure it is consistent with

the intent and rules of the RFP and that information can properly flow between the Company and bidders. In serving in that role, the IO does not get involved in the steps that are taken in an evaluation and is not a subject matter expert on those topics. The IO is heavily involved to ensure the process follows the RFP intent but it is a little different from what the teams do with the bids in evaluation.

- v. HE: The Company meets with the IO to review the scoring of each proposal and the subject matter experts participate in this meeting. The IO ensures that the Company evaluates everything it said it would and that each developer is treated the same way.
- vi. Stakeholder: The Commission does its own independent analysis of the reasonableness of the proposals, which are informed by the IO and comments from participants in the docket. The IO will report to the Commission on the conduct of the process from start to finish and alert the Commission if there are any violations. The IO monitors negotiations with developers and will conduct a final report for each one which is available to the public with redactions. It is intended to be a public accounting of the overall process.
- e. Stakeholder: The Company will oppose intervention in the docket since the project has met the floor.
- f. Stakeholder: Why do you have to wait so long in the process for community input? Would it be possible to try a pilot for the next RFP to have public participation from step 1. Are there legal barriers, Company policies?
 - i. HE: On Moloka'i, several meetings were conducted to see what technologies would be available. The Company asked in those meetings what technology the community would like to see where.
 - ii. HE: The ability to do that needs to work within the RFP process that the Company is required to follow. This means starting very early to fit it into the RFP process.
 - iii. Stakeholder: From an outsider perspective, only groups represented by attorneys are able to speak up in the RFP process. The PUC system of docketing is much less transparent.
 - iv. Stakeholder: The PUC has an important role to play in soliciting community input. It should make its processes more open and accessible to the public by providing public notice of dockets and holding more public meetings. The PUC should solicit input on RFPs to determine what technologies or locations might be off-limits for a particular island or community. The waiver projects provide even less opportunity for public input because there is no RFP process.

Summary and Next Steps

- Stakeholders may provide feedback on today's discussion to IGP@hawaiianelectric.com