



## **TCAAP EIRF**

### **10-22-14 ERAB Meeting Minutes**

- I. Attendees
  - a. *Lyle Salmela – ERAB Chair*
  - b. *Kent Bencoter – ERAB*
  - c. *Jim Ostlund – ERAB*
  - d. *Andrew Holewa – ERAB*
  - e. *Kate Knuth – ERAB*
  - f. *Brenda Holden – JDA Liaison*
  - g. *David Grant – Mayor, City of Arden Hills*
  - h. *Ryan Streff – City of Arden Hills*
  - i. *Greg Mack – RC*
  - j. *Zack Hansen – RC*
  - k. *Mary Karcz – RC*
  - l. *Ken Smith – EGE*
  - m. *Anders Rydaker – EGE*
  - n. *Jenae Batt – EGE*
  - o. *Jenny Edwards – CEE*
  - p. *Megan Hoyer – CEE*
  - q. *Sarah Lynch – Fresh Energy*
  
- II. Meeting Minutes from the September 12th meeting were reviewed and approved
  
- III. White Paper Review and Comments
  - a. Comments about the need to intrigue the reader early on and put the narrative in the Executive Summary. Include more about the vision, possibilities, and unique opportunities for the site.
  - b. The question came up about EIRF next steps and what work will be done between now and March by consultants and others working on advancing TCAAP. Two items of note are that the TCAAP Master Planning process will be completed by the end of December, and in January the JDA will be introducing ordinances and regulations for TCAAP.
  - c. It was recommended that the White Paper should include more ordinances and regulations to implement on TCAAP In adding to this section, the request was

made to consider the JDA timeline for introducing TCAAP ordinances and regulations in January 2015. What are the “make or break” regulations that could either advance or hinder the recommendations in the White Paper?

- d. It was suggested that the energy identities be removed and included in the final EIRF document.
- e. Suggestion to clarify the reasons that the fiber network is important to utilities as well as business.
- f. Suggestion to shift the time lines so that the most immediate tasks are labeled “near-term.”
- g. It was suggested that there be a 4-page summary document to accompany the larger white paper.
- h. Request that a comparison of development standards for energy sustainability development and standard industry developments be included.
- i. There was a question about how the White Paper would shape the EIRF.
- j. Requested that there be more examples of building co-location included to understand relative costs.
- k. Question if more precedents for CHP could be included.
- l. There was a comment that the text for the technology application matrix was hard to read, and requested to be increased.
- m. There needs to be clarification whether water, air, and ground source heat pumps are the same.
- n. Comment that Microgrids between AHATS and TCAAP can complement one another.
- o. Resiliency needs to be defined.
- p. Employee discounts for renewable installations at home could be an option to provide benefit to the development land owners (e.g. 3M).
- q. There should be education for residents before they build to inform about the energy sustainability aspects of the development.
- r. The White Paper should highlight where PUD process could be used for building co-location and ESA opportunities.
- s. TCAAP does not have PUD process; however, variances are available within the established process.
- t. Federal funding opportunities should be investigated for the necessary requirements. There was a discussion about how grants and partnerships could help with some of the economics of the energy projects. Sarah noted that there are government agencies that currently have grant money, (but they may not have the same funds next year) that could possibly be used toward some of the energy work at TCAAP. In the conversation around who might write grant applications, Greg suggested that this is something that he might be able to do at the County with staff grant writers. The Mayor added that if the County applies for grants that the city can support the efforts.
- u. The opportunities for third party financing and impact investments should be more prominent in the recommendations. TIF funding is not an option.
- v. Funding for the energy initiatives needs to be figured out.
- w. The White Paper should list 3-5 things that make this site unique.
- x. May be helpful to have a matrix of the recommendations by implementation timeline and/or party responsible.
- y. Make location specific recommendations.
- z. There was a conversation around forming partnerships for specific projects like microgrids. Greg suggested that a partnership with AHATS could possibly garner congressional support or recognition.

- aa. There was a discussion about the practical details of how the energy priorities would become reality. Will the RFP process be the tool?
  - bb. The suggestion was made that as the TCAAP site is being marketed, that information about the energy vision and possibilities could be included in the marketing materials.
  - cc. The request was made to note that a future discussion about gray water should occur, although it is beyond the scope of the energy work.
  - dd. The suggestion was made that some of the MN clean tech companies might be enticed to locate their headquarters or industrial operations on the TCAAP site.
  - ee. The suggestion was made to utilize local experts to form a TCAAP energy committee that could include folks from U of M, Xcel, and other organizations.
- IV. White Paper will be revised based on the discussion and provided to the ERAB for review prior to presenting to the JDA and City Council
- V. JDA Meeting Overview
  - a. Greg Mack discussed the presentation content for the JDA and the City Council meetings
- VI. Schedule
  - a. JDA Meeting presentation – Monday, November 3, 5 pm
  - b. City Council Meeting presentation – Monday, November 10, 5 pm
  - c. The following meeting dates were determined for the monthly ERAB meeting:
    - i. Wednesday, December 10, 5:30 pm
    - ii. Wednesday, January 14, 5:30 pm
    - iii. Wednesday, February 11, 5:30 pm
    - iv. Wednesday, March 11, 5:30 pm
- VII. Other