



Nancy Korda, Co-Chair
RePower Madison
222 S Hamilton St – Suite 14
Madison, WI 53703

Jeffery Keebler
President and Chief Executive Officer
Madison Gas and Electric Co and MGE Energy Inc.
133 Blair Street
Madison, Wisconsin, 53701

Re: RePower Madison Analysis of MGE Outreach Efforts

April 19, 2017

Dear Mr. Keebler,

It has been one year since MGE's Community Workshop. This letter is to explain the attached documents (an analysis of MGE customer input during the Community Energy Conversations and the Community Energy Workshop), and to convey my hopes/concerns about MGE's future. MGE's Middleton Community Solar project and the announced 66 MW wind farm are great first steps toward the 2030 Framework. But, MGE needs to move 'further faster'; the analyses show that it is what your customers want.

I have been an MGE ratepayer since 1966 when I moved to Madison. Beginning in the early 1970s I participated in local conservation and renewable resource activities. Later, I worked at the Public Service Commission (PSC) for almost 20 years, during which I developed estimates of the conservation and renewable resource potential for Wisconsin, reviewed and approved conservation programs, managed the statewide electric planning process (Advanced Plan), and did environmental analysis of proposed transmission line and power plant sites. After retiring from the PSC, I was on the BOD of Wisconsin Energy Conservation Corp. (9 years, two years as President). I have done volunteer work for Renew Wisconsin and am now volunteering at RePower Madison. I was a full party to the most recent MGE rate case.

Almost 15 years ago, I participated in one of a series of open public meetings that were held prior to the development of MGE's first Energy Plan. That plan removed coal from Blount Street and produced the "Green Power for Tomorrow" program. More recently, in the summer of 2015, MGE began a very ambitious process to again reach out to its customers to develop a new Community Energy plan (which became the 2030 Framework). I participated in the first round of outreach, the Community Energy Conversations, and appreciated that it allowed any interested person to participate and that the conversations came to my neighborhood. MGE prepared all the introductory materials (Unfortunately, many participants, including me, found the materials leading and slanted).

The published Community Energy Conversations Phase II report (December 23, 2015) did not include a thorough analysis of the public comments. There was a very good summary of 'themes' but no indication of priority. Because we wished to discover the priorities of the public, a colleague (Julie Foertsch, a professional statistician) and I coded all the comments (see Attachment A). We presented our data at a Forum hosted by RePower Madison and published the report on the RePower Madison website. Our analysis was submitted, with my testimony, in the most recent MGE rate case but MGE had it stricken from the record.

Soon after the Community Energy Conversations were held (but before the Community Energy Conversations report was published and long before the planned Community Workshop and formation of the proposed Community Energy Partnership) MGE released its 2030 Framework (November 18, 2015). This seemed premature given that it was supposed to be developed based on customer input.

The second round of community outreach, the Community Energy Workshop, was held in April 2016. It was held downtown at Monona Terrace with tight security, attendance was by invitation only. Again, MGE developed all the participant materials and did not allow the distribution of anything else. Seven months later, the summaries of the Workshop on the MGE website, had no statistical analysis of the participant's comments. Once the data became publicly available, it was coded and analyzed (Attachment B).

The multi-phased 2015 and 2016 public outreach process was very time consuming and expensive for MGE. Its warrants thorough analysis. It takes statistical analysis to know the public's priorities. The fully analyzed information from the Community Conversations could have informed your Community Workshop process, as was described in the Community Energy Conversation Phase II report. As it turned out, the Workshop could not cover any new ground since MGE did not use the outcome of the Conversations. Both the attached analyses show a strong desire from your customers for more interaction and raises some questions. Where is MGE headed with its public outreach efforts and why has it been a whole year since there was any public outreach? What happened to the proposed Community Energy Partnership?

In summary, based on the data collected by MGE, its customers want an enhanced and more forward thinking 2030 Framework. They want MGE to explain what it plans to do and when; they want MGE to report results and explain when efforts have not measured up. Especially, they want to know how they can contribute to future success. MGE's customers want to 'move further faster' and have shown that they are willing to help by investing in more renewable generation, more community solar (Middleton solar sold out within a few months), and more rate-based renewable generation like the announced 66 MW wind farm. Based on recent distributed generation proposals and formal governing resolutions acted on in Middleton, Monona, Fitchburg and Madison, your customers and their elected community leaders want more renewable generation, conservation and cleaner air. MGE believes its 2030 Framework is 'in line' with local goals but the line is constantly moving. If MGE is not part of the fast approaching and desired new world, it could be left in the dust. As customers have more choice about how to get their power they will turn away from the provider that is not listening to them, contributing to the feared 'utility death spiral'.

I understand that part of the difficulty in moving forward with a cleaner renewable future stems from action and inaction (perceived and real opposition – messages and decisions) on the part of the PSC. However, the Commission's decisions have been influenced by public reaction in the past. Those of us also concerned about past PSC actions will continue to make the Commissioners aware of the desires of the majority of MGE's ratepayers.

This letter and the results of the analysis of both outreach venues is being sent to MGE's Board of Directors, other MGE staff, and will be shared with the public on the RePower Madison website. It will also be given to the PSC and public interest groups that are usually interested in MGE legal proceedings.

I would be very willing to discuss any of these materials or concerns with you, or anyone else at MGE.

Thank you for your attention,

Nancy Korda