



Midwest Renewable Energy Tracking System, Inc.  
1885 University Avenue West, Suite 315, Saint Paul, MN 55104  
P 651 789 3338 F 651 645 1262  
mrets.org

## Meeting Minutes

Monday, September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2012  
1:30 P.M. Central  
Via GoToMeeting Webconference

### Board Members

#### Present:

- (1) Deborah Erwin, **WI-PSC**, *President*
- (2) Pat Keily, **We-Energies**, *Vice President*
- (3) Brian Rounds, **SDPUC**, *Secretary*
- (4) Susan Mackenzie, **MNPUC**
- (5) Janet McGurk, **IUB**
- (6) Larry Johnston, **SMMPA**
- (7) Ron Franz, **Dairyland Power Cooperative**
- (8) Illona Jeffcoat-Sacco, **NDPSC** (on phone only)
- (9) Jeffery Cottes, **Manitoba Province Energy Division** (arrived during item 4)

#### Absent:

- (1) Eric Jensen, **IWLA**

#### Others Present:

- (1) Amy Fredregill, **M-RETS, Inc.**, *Executive Director*
- (2) Eric Schroeder, **GPI**, *M-RETS Treasurer*
- (3) Jamie Niccolls, **Alliant Energy**

### Proceedings

Deb called the meeting to order at 1:37 PM.

1. Approval of Agenda
  - a. No edits were proposed
  - b. MOTION by Susan to approve the agenda as posted – 2<sup>nd</sup> by Janet
  - c. Motion passed on a voice vote.
2. Survey Recipient Overview
  - a. Amy gave an overview of who received the survey and how the responses were tracked
  - b. All responses were anonymous, but we did have a breakout of the top 10 fee-paying account holders – known as “Key Stakeholders”. These stakeholders were notified that they would be tracked as a group prior to their response.
3. Survey Design & Interpretation Questions
  - a. Discussion regarding the survey interest in tracking carbon and energy efficiency (EE) and wanting to know more if it is a reflection that respondents believe carbon and EE will be required in the future or reflection of their company strategy to track and trade these in the future? May be more an issue as to how the questions were designed. We will investigate further via future subscriber engagement.

- b. Amy reports that Rosanna suggests being cautious putting a lot of weight on the responses, given a low response rate. Our response rate of 1/3 of survey respondents is at the low end of a reliable range of results.
  - c. Suggestion that the survey probably does provide a lot of good information, just that we should be careful about making major decisions without confirming survey results we might be relying on.
  - d. Discussion about types of questions that had good response rates.
4. Key Question Review
- a. Each board member was asked in advance of the meeting to add their comments/takeaways to a spreadsheet tool on Central Desktop
  - b. Ron and Larry provided an overview of the key question feedback. Overall, M-RETS is doing good/adequate, but not “great.” Substantive performance of the system could be improved. A goal could be to raise the bar; discussion regarding whether adequate is good enough? Depends on cost effectiveness of addressing concerns and requests.
  - c. Directors expressed an interested in opportunities to leverage M-RETS, Inc. to provide more value for stakeholders
  - d. Question of how M-RETS compares to other tracking systems would be a good one to ask in the future.
  - e. Regulators seemed to feel the need for additional improvements; the Enhancement Committee efforts should address many concerns.
  - f. The survey provide a lot of good suggestions to improve the system
  - g. Discussion regarding survey results on the value M-RETS provides. Would perceptions change if fees were lowered?
  - h. M-RETS seems to be used primarily for compliance. However, one of the key stakeholders seems to be largely using the system for voluntary purposes, so compliance-focused responses could be a result of a low overall response rate. Discussion of how pro-active M-RETS should be in the voluntary area; this can be a strategic planning session discussion topic.
  - i. Administrator received good remarks, but interaction with Board did not do as well. Subscribers work much more closely with Administrator on a daily basis than with the Board, and the topics the Board deals with are more controversial. Again, how can M-RETS, Inc. add value?
  - j. High scores for the Enhancement Committee may be a result of key stakeholders being involved and familiar with the committee’s work.
  - k. Surprise that there was a strong apparent interest in using tracking for products other than RECs (carbon, nuclear, EE) if M-RETS were to track those. Question about how much true interest there is to start tracking other products and what type of obligation M-RETS has to pursue those, given nonprofit status and public good purpose in bylaws.
  - l. Discussion regarding survey feedback on public data, and the role the Miners Team played in reviewing our current public reports.
  - m. Strong interest for import/export compatibility with MIRECS and an enhanced and expanded Bulletin Board (BB). Bryan Gower has mentioned an increasing number of requests from REC owners looking for buyers. Discussion of why current BB is not being used much, could be a result of website organization. Amy forwarded this idea to Enhancement Committee previously.
  - n. Deb walked through each question placed on the spreadsheet tool, and the Board discussed to the extent the topic had not previously been discussed. Some suggestions related to ideas written into the original grant proposal that MRETS received at the time

- of its founding. Additional conversation regarding ongoing effort to improve performance in meeting the needs of regulators.
5. Survey Output/Purview Follow-up
    - a. Discussion of how best to share the results from the survey with those outside the Board. Operational items are being addressed by staff. Enhancement ideas are being forwarded to Enhancement Committee.
    - b. Other ideas will be discussed with Subscriber Group; directors will explain at the Oct. 16 meeting how survey ideas are being investigated and incorporated to the extent possible, practical and cost-effective. A website demo will be incorporated in the meeting to address survey responses indicating users are unsure where info is located on website.
    - c. Call for suggestions and further review of survey as groundwork and background to inform the strategic planning session in October.
    - d. Call for ideas for future surveys – send to Amy.
  6. Adjourn
    - a. MOTION by Deb to adjourn – 2<sup>nd</sup> by Pat
    - b. Motion passed on a voice vote.

*The meeting was adjourned at 3:37 PM  
Minutes submitted by Brian Rounds*