
This document was created from the closed caption transcript of the September 15, 2020 City Council Special meeting and has not been checked for completeness or accuracy of content.

A copy of the agenda for this meeting, including a summary of the action taken on each agenda item, is available online at:

<https://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/Assets/ScottsdaleAZ/Council/current-agendas-minutes/2020-agendas/09-15-20-special-agenda.pdf>

An unedited digital video recording of the meeting, which can be used in conjunction with the transcript, is available online at:

<http://www.Scottsdaleaz.gov/Scottsdale-video-network/Council-video-archives/2020-archives>

For ease of reference, included throughout the transcript are bracketed "time stamps" [Time: 00:00:00] that correspond to digital video recording time.

For more information about this transcript, please contact the City Clerk's Office at 480-312-2411.

CALL TO ORDER

[Time: 00:00:00]

Mayor Lane: Welcome, everyone to our council meet, it's approximately 4 p.m. and I would like to call to order you are September 15th, 2020, special city council meeting. I would ask the city clerk to please conduct a roll call.

ROLL CALL

[Time: 00:00:16]

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Thank you, Your Honor. Mayor Jim Lane.

Mayor Lane: Present.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Vice Mayor Solange Whitehead.

Vice Mayor Whitehead: Present.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Councilmembers Suzanne Klapp.

Councilmember Klapp: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Virginia Korte.

Councilmember Korte: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Kathy Littlefield.

Councilmember Littlefield: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Linda Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Guy Phillips.

Councilmember Phillips: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: City Manager Jim Thompson.

City Manager Jim Thompson: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: City Attorney Sherry Scott.

City Attorney Sherry Scott: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: City Treasurer Jeff Nichols.

City Treasurer Jeff Nichols: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: City Auditor Sharron Walker.

City Auditor Sharron Walker: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: And the Clerk is present.

ITEM 1 – ENERGY RULE AND ENERGY EFFICENCY STANDARD

[Time: 00:00:52]

Mayor Lane: Thank you. We have one item tonight, and it's item one and only one. Arizona Corporation Commission's energy rule and efficiency standard that we are considering weighing in on a three-year plan to be put in action after a couple of years of evaluation and

outreach and development of the clean energy rules we will have in place the next three years.

This issue -- we had a special meeting for it. I would like everyone to understand that this is important enough when we start talking about engaging with a quasi judicial body, such as the Arizona Corporation Commission on an issue like this, that there are particular procedures that need to be employed and how we go about it and our own procedures as to how we develop a consensus of opinion on it.

And since it has been underway for just a little while, as far as their overall program and then in recent weeks, it's been brought to our attention there was an issue that might change that we might want to consider whether we would like to have a change if we can have a say or at least a recommendation to a body, such as a -- the Arizona Corporation Commission.

The issue was brought to our attention by a member of our council to have the city council officially weigh in on the continuance of the energy efficiency rules. And these are specifically a number of items which have been supplied to you, and I think in our council packet, which include the resource planning procurement rules, requiring the energy utilities to file an integrated resource plan.

That is part of it, and that would simply remain the same as it is before and that -- that would be included -- and would remain the same and not sunsetted if, in fact, we go with one course of action here.

The other is a renewable energy standard and tariff rules which are essentially targets for renewable energy requirements, and those are set out in the agreement as well, but they are adjusted.

We are not asking for them to be continued in the same form that they are right now. The two elements that really are being talked about are the energy -- the energy -- the electric energy efficiency, the EEE rules requiring the cost effective energy efficiency and the gas energy efficiency rules.

Those are the two that we are considering here. We'll have a presentation by Dan Worth here in a moment on some of this, as to the particulars of it.

The final one that's included in this group is the energy portfolio standards which is subject to some consideration on the -- in the new plan that might be coming before the Arizona Corporation Commission soon.

So with that background on, it I just wanted to emphasize the fact that there was a call to make sure that our council was aware of exactly what was at stake, what is of interest to us and what may not be of interest to us, as a consensus and a vote of the body of our political council. So with that, I would ask Dan Worth, our public works director, if you could present -- give us a

presentation on the elements of which we are about to weigh in on, or may or may not weigh in on.

[Time: 00:04:35]

Public Works Director Dan Worth: Good afternoon, mayor, members of council. Hopefully you can see the slides that are showing on the screen now.

As the mayor mentioned, the action in front of us today is to decide if we wished to communicate with the Arizona Corporation Commission regarding a proposed new energy rule that's currently under consideration at the commission, and also specifically to decide if that communication will express support for including an energy efficiency standard in the new rule. Next slide, please.

Mayor just went through each of these in turn. This is the current situation. Over the last 15 plus years, the Corporation Commission has passed a number of rules regarding energy, and the regulated utilities that provide energy, and all of these rules are currently in effect and the Arizona administrative code. I'll address some key details of two of them in some additional slides. Next slide, please.

This is what the current effort is at the Arizona Corporation Commission. You have a before on the left side and after on the right side. The five rules that are currently in effect, what they are attempting to do is rescind all five of those rules and replace them with a new comprehensive energy rule. And the goals are multiple.

Obviously, this will achieve some simplification for the community, as well as for the customers that want to see what the requirements are. It is modernization. Some of these rules have targets that were established as long as 15 years ago. And technology is advanced.

Economies have advanced and more aggressive targets are achievable and so there's a need to modernize the targets in the rules and the extensions, some of these rules have provisions that expire in the near term, in mar the energy efficiency, the electric energy efficiency rule sets targets beginning in 2011 and running up through this year, but there's nothing beyond this year. So if the Corporation Commission intends to extend some of these provisions, they will need to take action. So that's intent. Replace the existing five rules with the new rules and achieve some of those goals. Next slide, please.

[Time: 00:07:06]

I will address some of them in some detail. The clean and renewable energy standard. This is what the mayor referred to as the renewable energy and standard, REST. They adopted standards that ultimately ended one a target or a mandated target for utilities to achieve 15% of energy sales for renewable sources by 2024, and obviously we are coming close to that and we

can do better. The new standard will go out further and impose a higher standard.

The new standard I'm showing you, by the way is from say staff proposal at the A.C.C. that was presented in July of this year. It was discussed a special open meeting at the Corporation Commission at the end of July. The commission did not take action on it. They have agendized another special meeting coming up very soon where they do intend to take action on it, but the numbers you see on the right-hand side of your screen are in that new proposed staff proposal. There are other competing plans that are still in play in the form of amendments. They differ in several areas but not very much in this area. The new standard is going to be something very close to this regardless of which amendments they go with.

And just to run through those, by 2035, 50% of retail electricity will come from renewable sources and of that, 10% will come from distributed renewable storage and then by 2050, 100% of retail sales of clean energy sources. Clean energy includes anything that is classified as renewable, plus what they referred to as demand side measures which is energy efficiency and it includes nuclear. So those are the targets in play in the new energy rule. Next slide, please.

The second major standard is the one we want to focus on a little bit. The energy efficiency standard. The current standard on the left-hand side, this started in 2011. In 2011, the utilities were required to achieve 1.25% of the previous year's revenue in efficiency savings. So they were required to get their customers to renew energy consumption by 1.25% of the previous year's sales. And then they do this through a number of means. Rebates is one program that -- that most regulated utilities use to achieve this.

[Time: 00:10:08]

They give customers rebates for installing energy efficient equipment that meets their targets and meet their goals and then they keep track of cumulatively from year-to-year, the new equipment and the new energy efficiency measures put in place on the customer side and the standard increases year after year.

So starting at 1.25% in 2011, the requirement has gone up about 2 to 2.5% every year, and it's now where you see it on the slide, they are required to achieve 22% cumulative, counting all of those improvements, 22% compared to the retail sales for last year and then it ends. There's no target beyond this year.

So that is one of those provisions that if we're going to continue to have an energy efficiency standard needs to be included in the new rule and needs to be extended. On the right-hand, the new standard big question mark and that's the subject of discussion. There's a couple of different options. Next slide, please.

One option and this is what that proposed staff plan that the Corporation Commission started considering in July, this is what the staff plan included. No energy efficiency mandate. The staff

proposal, without a mandate still allows for and encourages energy efficiency. It's just not mandating particular targets. Energy efficiency counts and clean energy and there is a clean energy goal and the energy efficiency is part of the integrated resource planning that the utilities are required to do. It's part of the annual planning reporting requirements. So the commission will watch it. They are not mandating it. That's under the staff proposal.

The alternative, and this is in several different proposed amendments that they are going to be considered by the Corporation Commission, but the alternative is to extend the current program with a biannual increase going from the 22% in 2020 up to 25%. You can see how it increases up through an end date of 2030, for the utilities who will be required to achieve 35% cumulative efficiency savings compared to the previous year's retail sales. So it builds on mandated reductions from the current standard. Next slide, please.

This is an undecided issue. There are arguments on each side of the issue, and I have listed some of the ones that have appeared in the docket that have been made by different people that have intervened in the Corporation Commission deliberations. Open the left, reasons to include a standard. On the right, reasons to not include a standard.

The first reason on the left, the one that you hear most often, it's cheaper for a utility to pay for energy reduction from its customers than it is to build new capacity. And that's been proven to be true in a number of cases. Just not going to be through all of these, but obviously, at the bottom, environmental benefits, energy efficiency is going to reduce those byproducts, greenhouse gas emissions, water use and other things detriment.

If you don't increase the traditional capacities, you are not increasing the environmental impacts. On the right-hand, reasons for no standard, really the one that you hear most often is that if efficiency measures are truly least cost, then they will be able to compete favorably with other resources in the resource all source RFP process that the utilities are required to use. They are supposed to compete gas, coal, nuclear, and hydro, solar, wind and all potential sources and procure the least cost sources and if energy sources are the least cost, that should compete well.

You see a comparable bullet on the left-hand side, it's hard to compete energy savings with all of those other sources. It just doesn't lend itself to an open bidding process. So you have theory and practice that are kind of conflicting with each other. Those are the arguments for standard on the left and arguments to maybe not include a specific standard open the right. Next slide, please.

[Time: 00:15:00]

The impact on city, the city operations, we get the vast majority of our power from APS, about 87% of our purchase power comes from APS. That is largely because most of the water plant activities, not all, but the water campus, the water treatment facilities and a lot of our pumping

infrastructure is in the northern part of the city, in the APS service area. SRP provides about 13% of our purchase power. SRP is not subject to ACC standards. They have their own elected board that provides regulatory oversight. They have their own rebate and demand management program in place. That will likely remain unchanged.

APS is a regulated utility. They do intend to maintain an efficiency incentive program. That's their corporation line. They -- and I have communicated with them this past week. They can't commit to what that efficiency program is going to look like. They would think that it would change potentially, if there's not a mandate, if there's not a standard in place, but they do intend to have a program and that's to some degree a reflection of the fact that it's cheaper for them to pay for energy efficiency than a new plant. So what type that program takes is uncertain.

What I can tell you is what we benefit for our participation in the current program. You see every year, APS comes and presents a big check to us, 100,000 plus dollars. That is a demand side management program, where our water department has agreed to put in place the capability to shift their load, to demand electricity at times when it's cheaper for APS to provide it, and we get a rebate for participating in that program.

We also get rebates for installing energy efficiency equipment as part of our capital construction program and as part of our facilities life cycle programs. The rebates vary depending on the type of equipment, but it applies to air conditioning equipment, and -- and some of our renewable energy equipment that we put in several of our buildings. And the benefit that we have achieved, it's a little complex.

We have gotten direct payment, as much as \$30,000 in a year. We have gotten indirect benefit, because we will bid out projects and the contractor will get the rebate and factor that into their bid. So we still benefit from that. And we do have plans and the bond projects for solar projects and we have plans to increase the installations.

So the number will go up and the it t hundred thousand dollars I show here, it's an -- \$200,000 I show here, it's an estimate. No guarantees it could be this high, but that gives you a range of the values we are looking at. Will these rebates disappear, the \$100,000 for water resources, the 30 to \$200,000 for the rebate program? Not likely. But they could change dramatically if there is no mandated program in the new energy rule. Next slide, please.

Management Assistant Megan Lynn: Mayor Lane. I'm sorry so sorry. Mayor Lane and Dan, we have a hand raised by Councilmember Klapp.

[Time: 00:18:58]

Councilmember Klapp: I have a question for Dan. And maybe you know this and maybe you don't know Dan. When we're looking at this slide that shows the percentage of electricity used

by -- you know, from APS versus SRP. Do you know the amount of electricity used from Scottsdale residents vs. SRP. I would think the percentage of Scottsdale residents that are affected here is much higher -- I would say is much less, because there's, you know, the whole southern part of the city, plus into downtown that's covered by SRP. Do you know what the percentage of residential use is?

Public Works Director Dan Worth: I agree that APS's percentage will be smaller if you are just looking at the developed areas of the city -- And the proportion that's in the APS service area and the SRP. I think it's close to two-thirds in the APS service area.

SRP has everything in the city south of the Arizona canal and APS has a carve out, a four-square mile carve out in the middle of the SRP area. They have a fairly good amount of high density developed area.

Councilmember Klapp: Much of this information you are presenting is obviously the impact on the city of Scottsdale and the kind of rebates that the city of Scottsdale gets and the participation and the usage of electricity from APS. Do you have an idea what our Scottsdale citizens receive in rebates from APS versus SRP? Do you have any information on that at all.

Public Works Director Dan Worth: Councilwoman Klapp, I don't have information open that. I can try to find that out from the companies. They report it to the Arizona Corporation Commission.

Councilmember Klapp: Okay. Thank you.

Mayor Lane: Could you go back to the current energy efficiency comparison. Yeah, that's the one. When we talk about mandate versus non-mandate, is there any kind of legal consequence to a quasi judicial body such as the Corporation Commission to the best of your knowledge whether it's a mandate or it is a voluntary or if it's non-mandated but a set standard, nevertheless?

Is there kind of legal issue that may be being involved here at all, or are we not aware of it?

Public Works Director Dan Worth: Mayor lane, to the best of my knowledge, there are no penalties in the existing rules and I don't believe there are penalties in the proposed new rule. It's not voluntary. It's mandated, but they don't spell out what actions the Corporation Commission can take, if the mandates aren't achieved.

Mayor Lane: But as far as the Corporation Commission is concerned -- and they are standing in setting rules and regulations, enforcing them, is really not a consideration because they don't have an enforcement mechanism and thus don't operate in the true judicial sense because they don't -- and I guess my next question, it really was my first question, my primary one. For the mandate and/or the standard, there is no penalty.

In other words, they don't have to gear down power in order to meet the reduced power level that would be seen by a 2%, 3%, whatever it might be in the standard energy reduction in energy, which would be measured as an energy efficiency.

[Time: 00:23:03]

Public Works Director Dan Worth: Mayor, that is correct. There's no -- mandatory reductions or scale downs. It's more carrot than stick. They don't comply with the standards, they have to go through the annual rate setting practice and comply with the Corporation Commission mandates in other areas, and if -- if they are failing to meet the standards, I would imagine that becomes a more difficult process for the utility.

Mayor Lane: I'm sorry to continue on this a little bit. Part of the costs associated with these efficiencies are borne by the taxpayer by buying newer and more efficient equipment and that can be substantial. The true costing of this is not really when you do a means testing on this, it's really not -- it's a difficult thing to really set. And I don't have the contact with how they calculate it or how they don't calculate it. I don't have anything other than a statement there. As far as the -- the idea that if we become more and more efficient, we meet the criteria we're also using less energy.

Is it judged that way because the supply and demand figure that we have talked about and that is illustrated here too doesn't necessarily mean that we use less energy.

Public Works Director Dan Worth: The intent is that the energy efficiency standard, it can still mean that they are providing more energy year over year, and that is why they tie it to the previous year's sales. They are not going all the way back to 2011. There's more demand because there's more development. There's more customers. There's more electric cars. There's more of many things that place a demand on the system.

So the aggregate amount of energy that the utility can provide is an increase, and generally does, but they have to demonstrate that they are causing that increase to be less than it otherwise would be through energy efficiency programs.

Mayor Lane: And would the renewable energy side of this have anything to do with the energy efficiency.

[Time: 00:25:38]

Public Works Director Dan Worth: The renewable energy targets, they don't conflict for the energy efficiency rules. They don't get credit by conserving energy. Renewable energy is defined and includes several things, biogas, solar, wind, some hydro, but it doesn't include energy efficiency other demand side measures. The clean energy goal does. So this helps them achieve

their clean energy goal.

Mayor Lane: So when you think about other alternatives, now you say there's no context. But if you think about other alternative energy development, renewable energy, if you are using less and less, let's just say by virtue of solar, wind, or any of those things you mentioned, you are producing your own energy. We are subject to this. So this weighs on us as a city and utility. But if we produce more of our own energy, we reduce our energy consumption, does that somehow have any effect on the energy?

Public Works Director Dan Worth: I see where you are going with this? If on the customer side, if we install a significant photovoltaic and generate a lot of electricity ourselves, that will count as a reduction for the utility. That can count as an efficiency measure. The renewable that they have to provide, and I believe that counts for their renewable, contributed renewables count.

So if we're generating power and connected to APS's grid, they get credit for that and is it counts as an efficiency because we are reducing our consumption.

Mayor Lane: If there was something that a consumer could use to produce energy, maybe something we haven't even considered right now, some innovation or otherwise and they remove themselves from the system, and thus APS produced less energy for their constituency -- well, their potential customers, does that have any effect?

Public Works Director Dan Worth: If the utility can capture that, I assume it would. They have to go through a pretty detailed process with the Corporation Commission every year. They have to commit a plan that includes every single demand side measure, all the different rebates and the classes of equipment they are looking at and it shows everything they intend to do for the following year to achieve the energy efficiency reduction and the Corporation Commission has to review that and determine whether they will allow a particular efficiency reduction. So that would have to be something they would take up with the commission.

Mayor Lane: Gotcha. Okay. Thank you. Do we have any other hands raised?

Management Assistant Megan Lynn: No other hands raised at this time.

Public Works Director Dan Worth: This is actually the last slide. The first bullet says special open meeting September 25th as of about two hours ago. The Corporation Commission published an agenda. They will have the special open meeting on September 24th, Thursday of next week. To continue their deliberations on the new energy rule.

If they elect to adopt a new energy rule, then they kick off the state rulemaking process, which follows with its additional possibilities for public input. So it's still not a done deal at that point although that becomes the proposed rule that goes out for public comment and review in the rulemaking process and then it will be some period of time following the completion of that

rulemaking process before it gets entered into the Arizona administrative code. And that is the last side.

I would be happy to attempt to answer any other questions.

Mayor Lane: Any other hands raised or any other questions?

Management Assistant Megan Lynn: Mayor, this is Megan. We have a hand raised by Councilmember Whitehead and Councilmember Klapp.

Mayor Lane: Okay. Councilwoman -- or rather vice mayor Whitehead, please, go ahead.

[Time: 00:30:10]

Vice Mayor Whitehead: Okay. Thank you. I have a few comments not necessarily any questions. Dan has certainly received enough questions from me on this. First of all, I want to thank staff. To the best of my knowledge and I looked at the docket, and I spoke to other cities, only our staff read the document.

They went beyond the city, and they reviewed the energy rule as proposed, identified the problem that this program that brings in revenue, today, right now, cash to the city, and it does help our -- the ratepayers that live within our city, was omitted from the new energy rule. And I want to liken it to fill a bucket. It's a lot easier to fill a bucket if the bucket doesn't have holes. There may be some point in time where our homes that can't be any more efficient. We're a long ways from there.

If you do have to spend new money on windows, the benefit is new windows are really nice. It's nice to have a home that's leaking cold air into our hot, already too hot outside. So this energy efficiency is exactly as staff put it. This is the cheapest and cleanest energy source available. And honestly, it's the best way to keep the bills of our residents lower too.

So back to staff and in alphabetical order, I wanted to thank Anthony Floyd, Lloyd Glover and Dan Worth for identifying the problem and then I want to thank city manager Jim Thompson for creating a culture where any staff person is encouraged to find a problem that could impact the city, and could cost us money and diminish our quality of life and bring it to the attention of everyone in the city, from the city council on down. So thank you for that.

The energy efficiency incentives and I have done some research. The states that have regulated energy efficiency. It doesn't really have a lobbying group. So the energy efficiency regulations in states that have them, those -- those ratepayers on average pay lower energy bills.

So that includes the city, but it also includes all the residents that have APS which is quite a few and it impacts the entire city. Energy generation is a big source of urban heat. We want people

to have their new windows and not put more hot air into our already hot environment. This is also not that theoretical. APS reports to shareholders. So if they are not required to give millions of dollars in energy efficiency incentives they likely won't do it.

And if you review a submission that APS has before the Arizona Corporation Commission to be considered on September 22nd, APS asks to decrease incentives upon providing 30-day notice. So it's very much on their agenda to reduce the efficiency incentives if allowed to do so. So I -- again, I just appreciate the staff bringing it to our attention.

I appreciate that Mayor Lane took the leadership in order to give us the opportunity to weigh in. We have the opportunity to influence the outcome, and you encourage everything to support what is best for our tax dollars, what is best for our quality of life and support option A.

MOTION – ITEM 1 – ENERGY RULE AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY STANDARD

[Time: 00:34:20]

With that, I would like to make a motion to approve item one, Arizona Corporation Commission energy rule and energy efficiency standard, option A. in to include the energy efficiency standard. Thank you.

Councilmember Milhaven: I will second that motion. This is Linda Milhaven.

Mayor Lane: Would you like to speak to your second?

[Time: 00:34:44]

Councilmember Milhaven: I would like to thank Vice Mayor Whitehead for all of her great work on this. It's certainly beyond my expertise to know what the standards are but I think providing incentives to encourage people to find more efficiencies certainly puts a lot of weight into those standards and helps us achieve those goals. So thank you, Vice Mayor Whitehead for taking the lead on that.

Mayor Lane: Now, Councilwoman Klapp. Hello?

Councilmember Klapp: I have not delved into this as deeply as Vice Mayor Whitehead has. That's why I have some questions. I'm questioning the process that has taken place at the Corporation Commission so I better understand it.

At the last meeting, am I correct that they discussed in a public meeting the energy rule, but there was no discussion with the public related to revised energy standards; is that correct? And is that what this next meeting is about is to have a public meeting to discuss energy standard?

Public Works Director Dan Worth: The commission has been discussing the proposed energy rule since sometime in 2018. That discussion has included several stakeholder meetings where the public was invited to come in and comment, including two earlier this year. The July 30th meeting where they considered the current staff proposal and several other amendments.

The meeting was about three and a half hours long and about three hours of that was public comment. Individual members of the public and many advocacy groups came and spoke and I think probably somewhere close to half of them spoke on the issue of energy efficiency standard.

Some had other issues but that was a popular topic of conversation. So they have heard a lot of public testimony about it. And the meeting that is scheduled now is to, again, consider the same staff proposed energy rule along with several amendments that have been proposed it's agendized as a special public meeting.

I believe they will allow public comment again and they are certainly allowing additional items which would include ours, depending on the action you stay. They are allowing additional items to be added to the docket. They are certainly giving a lot of input on proposed energy efficiency standard in their new energy rule.

Councilmember Klapp: Okay. Thank you for that explanation.

Mayor Lane: Do we have any further hands raised.

Management Assistant Megan Lynn: We have one additional hand raised by Councilmember Littlefield.

Mayor Lane: Okay. Councilwoman Littlefield, please go ahead.

[Time: 00:38:00]

Councilmember Littlefield: Thank you, mayor. I would like to echo Councilwoman Milhaven's thanks to Solange Whitehead for taking this up, and our staff in making this presentation for us and explaining it to us.

I do support option a, and basically, it comes down to some very simple reasons. Energy efficiency regulations are good for both the city and our residents and they reduce costs. They reduce greenhouse gas emissions into the environment, and all together they are a better solution, I think in the long term for our energy needs. So I would definitely support option a and I think the city should send a recommendation to that effect. Thank you.

Mayor Lane: Megan, do we have any further hands raised?

Management Assistant Megan Lynn: Not at this time.

Mayor Lane: I would like to thank everyone for getting us educated before taking April official position with the Arizona Corporation Commission for or against. I think is probably far more complicated than the fall than we may even imagine as we look at it right now.

One of my concerns is if someone over the last two years of negotiating this irrespective of any type of conspiracy or controversy that might arise from the players in the design, we want it to work together so a singular end and that is efficiency and just a cleaner environment for us all, all the way across the board and there's a lot of different ways that can happen.

I'm going to say, I'm going to support Option A, calling for the energy efficiency rules to remain and un sunsetted and remain in the new program, the clean energy program that goes for, but I'm hoping in their wisdom, the Corporation Commission will make sure this is a good fit all the way around if they decide to accept our recommendation but it's very good to have the education, Dan, certainly thank you very much for what you have done and I'm glad we were able to get past the idea of how it was being endorsed by the city without coming to the city council to make that judgment all. So I'm glad we have gotten to this.

ITEM 1 – ENERGY RULE AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY STANDARD – VOTE

[Time: 00:40:50]

Mayor Lane: So with that, we'll close out any other questions and we have the motion and a second on deck. So Ms. Jagger, I believe we are ready for a roll call vote on this.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Yes, thank you mayor. Mayor Lane?

Mayor Lane: Yes.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Vice Mayor Whitehead.

Vice Mayor Whitehead: Yes.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Council woman Klapp.

Councilmember Klapp: Yes.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Councilwoman Korte.

Councilmember Korte: Yes.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilmember Littlefield: Yes.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Councilwoman Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: Yes.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: And Councilman Phillips.

Councilmember Phillips: No.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: The motion passes 6-1. Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT

[Time: 00:41:41]

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Ms. Jagger. And that concludes our meeting, our agenda for this evening. So I would ask for a motion to adjourn.

Councilmember Klapp: I move to adjourn. This is Councilwoman Klapp.

Councilmember Korte: Second. This is Virginia Korte.

Mayor Lane: Just by voice vote, all those in favor of adjournment, please indicate by aye.

[Chorus of ayes]

Mayor Lane: We're adjourned. Thank you very much.

Vice Mayor Whitehead: Thank you, Mayor.