



2010

Energy Independent Communities Grant Program Summary

February 17, 2011

Prepared For:

Wisconsin Office of Energy Independence
210 West Washington Avenue
Madison, Wisconsin 53703

Prepared By:

Local Government Institute of Wisconsin
999 Fourier Drive , Suite 201
Madison, Wisconsin 53717



Local
Government
Institute of Wisconsin
Bringing Local Governments Together to Serve

Table of Contents:

Introduction.....1

Section One: Grantee Community Characteristics.....6

Section Two: EIC Planning Process and Common Issues.....9

Section Three: Community Case Studies.....12

Section Four: Lessons Learned and Recommendations.....15

Section Five: Update and Insights from 2009 EI Communities.....18

Section Six: Guide to Getting Started in Energy Planning.....21

Grantee Program Background

In February 2010, similar to 2009, the Wisconsin Office of Energy Independence (WI OEI) announced \$500,000 would be distributed as part of 11 grant awards to a total of 24 different entities to pursue "25x25" energy independence planning efforts. The 2010 grant awards were used by the participating communities to prepare energy independence plans focused on energy and fuel usage in municipal buildings and fleets. Participants included counties, cities, villages, school districts, a first nation tribe, and multiple utilities. The goal of the planning process was to identify projects and implementation strategies needed to achieve the goal of generating 25 percent of a community's electricity and transportation fuel from renewable energy resources by the year 2025. The 2010 grant awards came from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act's Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant Program.

Concurrently with the grantees' planning process, the Wisconsin Local Government Institute (LGI) monitored communities' progress and collected data from participants via an online survey, an online collaborative group, and three meetings. Meetings were held April 7, 2010 in Eau Claire, August 4, 2010 in Kaukauna, and December 15, 2010 in Waukesha. LGI's goal was to identify lessons learned, common challenges, and barriers to creating effective and implementable energy independence plans. The summary of the LGI review is contained in this document.

2009 Energy Independent Communities Planning Program Lessons Learned

Ten planning grants were awarded to a total of 23 different communities as part of the 2009 energy independence planning grant program. The following are key lessons learned from the 2009 program:

- Energy independence planning efforts can serve as a catalyst for economic development.
- Most communities do not track their energy consumption or regularly observe consumption data. The need to collect, organize, and streamline energy data is essential for energy independence planning efforts.
- Collaboration between units of government when performing energy independence planning is important. This is especially true for smaller communities that face limitations when conducting energy independence planning.
- Having a thorough planning process with community support in place is important before setting forth on any energy independence goals or initiatives.

Importance of Energy Independence Planning

The following examples provide an overview of the potential impacts of an investment in energy independence planning.

Home-Grown Economic Development

Wisconsin has a unique and established foundation on which to generate economic development through energy planning and initiatives. Wisconsin, along with the State of Indiana, has a higher proportion of its total workforce in manufacturing jobs than any other state in the country, at 15% of its total workforce. The prevalence of manufacturing workers in the Wisconsin economy means there exists a set of technological, institutional, and other infrastructure components necessary to continue to produce quality manufactured products.

In conjunction with a strong manufacturing base, Wisconsin's workforce possesses a strong work ethic. Comprehensive technical colleges across the state provide graduates with the necessary skills and expertise to be valuable contributors to Wisconsin's economy. Nearly 9% of the Wisconsin workforce possess occupational or vocational degrees, compared to just 4.6% of the national workforce. All of these elements provide a unique set of conditions that will facilitate progress into new energy development areas and put Wisconsin in a favorable position for economic development built around energy initiatives¹.

As energy demands grow and fuel prices increase, a significant amount of government spending is going toward the purchase of fuel sources that are largely produced outside of Wisconsin. As a result, that portion of government spending is not helping to create local jobs or economic growth. The 25x25 plan and energy independence planning provides the opportunity to capture energy spending locally and help drive the Wisconsin economy.

The pursuit of renewable fuels and energy efficiency will require capital investment by local units of government. By engaging in an energy independent planning process, government officials will have the data necessary to make informed decisions about project costs and return on investment.

The issues addressed in the energy independence planning process are relevant to many other community planning issues. By making the results of the planning process available to other initiatives, future community plans and economic development strategies can be tailored toward achieving the 25x25 strategy.

Public Education and Outreach

Engaging the public in the energy independence planning process will educate people on the impacts of energy efficiency and renewable resources, and help to foster public support for ongoing energy initiatives. Additionally, involving the public will provide a source of lasting behavior among the public by, hopefully, giving them the knowledge and tools to practice energy efficiency in their own lives.

Assess Progress Towards Goals

As energy efficiency and renewable projects move forward, units of government will need baseline data to track their progress. The energy independence planning process provides the opportunity to develop that data.

Although all of the advantages of energy independence planning listed above are important incentives for engaging in the process, the most tangible benefit will be the creation of jobs and economic growth resulting from increased spending on fuel sources produced in Wisconsin. The following list summarizes and quantifies some potential impacts of investment in renewable energies:

- In 2008 Wisconsin energy users spent \$23.9 billion on energy consumption. If, as a result of meeting the 25x25 goal, 25 percent of those purchases shift to locally-produced renewable energy sources, there would be almost \$6 billion of new money entering the state economy.
- With a recession impacting the State of Wisconsin, in 2009 Wisconsin energy users spent \$18.7 billion on energy consumption. This was a decrease of 21.7% compared to 2008. Even in challenging economic times, 25% of investment in Wisconsin-based energy technologies would have equaled at least \$4.7 billion in home-grown energy opportunities.
- The Wisconsin Office of Energy Independence continues to pursue the goal of capturing 10 percent of the growing bio-industry and renewable energy market by 2030. According to a national leader in economic research, the nation as a whole is projected to see 3.4 million new "green" jobs by 2038¹. If successful in capturing 10 percent of that growing market, Wisconsin could see 340,000 new jobs. In order to capture those new jobs, local units of government may consider planning for the development of energy technologies.
- Many of the new "green" jobs will be in important existing industry sectors, e.g., sheet metal workers are needed for wind turbine production; roofers, contractors, etc. will undertake efficiency upgrades. Because these industries have long been important to the Wisconsin economy, investment in renewable energy and energy efficiency can help boost key sectors that have ripple effects through the rest of the State's economy¹.
- If municipal governments and regions choose to invest in renewable energy, they will be making long-term decisions that will positively impact their residents. Research has shown that investment in clean-energy technologies generates about three times more jobs than investment in fossil fuel technologies².

As local governments consider preparation of an energy independence plan, it is important to understand how the potential economic impacts could occur. The result of investment in renewable resources will include three tiers of impacts. These impacts will create positive results through the local and regional economy. Those tiers are defined as direct, indirect and induced impacts:

Direct Impact: The direct impact of investment in energy technologies is job creation and increased output resulting from greater efficiencies and additional energy production. For example, when a new bio-fuel plant is constructed by 50 employees, the direct impact is the creation of those 50 jobs.

Indirect Impact: All new facilities will have to purchase materials and supplies from other local businesses resulting in more money circulating through the economy. This also has an indirect impact upon job creation. For example, when a bio-fuel facility purchases fuel from local farmers, this also results in an indirect impact upon Wisconsin's agricultural sector.

Induced Impact: All employees needed to fill the new jobs created by the direct and indirect impacts will spend money at local establishments (grocery, auto-repair, etc.). That spending represents induced impact.

Evaluating the Energy Independent Communities Planning Grant Program

Building off of the momentum created by the 2009 participating communities, the 2010 communities and the Wisconsin Office of Energy Independence hoped to improve the process for 2010. This document provides an overview of the 2010 Energy Independent Communities (EIC) grant planning process and identifies results of evaluation, lessons learned, similarities and differences between the 2010 and 2009 programs, and recommendations.

This document is divided into four sections:

Section One: Grantee Community Characteristics:

The first section provides an overview of all the participating communities. The important aspect of this section will include the characteristics of the communities and how they compare to the average local unit of government in Wisconsin. The grantee communities' similarity to other Wisconsin units of government will dictate how readily the findings from this study can be applied to future energy independent communities.

Section Two: EIC Planning Process and Common Issues:

The second section will provide a summary of the planning process. It will highlight the communities' experiences and common issues across all of the grantees. As part of the process, LGI conducted a survey of the grantee communities. Results of this survey, as well as results of the discussions of the closing program meeting on December 15 in Waukesha, will be discussed in this section. The results of the survey can be used to determine whether the common experiences are applicable to other units of government.

Section Three: Community Case Studies

The third section presents several meaningful examples of innovative approaches and best practices in energy independence planning among the 2010 grantee communities. The case studies presented are focused on conducting the planning effort, forming partnerships, and engaging in outreach and education.

Introduction

Section Four: Lessons Learned and Recommendations

The fourth section synthesizes all of the information gathered during the evaluation process and presents lessons learned from this second energy independent communities program.



A team leader from the Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians energy team describes the team's process at the December 15, 2010 meeting in Waukesha.

Section One:

Grantee Community Characteristics

The energy independence planning grants were provided to 24 different entities that, via cooperative arrangements, comprised 11 grantees. The grantees are briefly profiled below:

Chippewa Valley Partnership: City of Eau Claire, Eau Claire County, and City of Altoona

The Chippewa Valley Partnership included the City of Eau Claire, Eau Claire County, and the neighboring City of Altoona in northwest Wisconsin, with a total 2010 estimated population of 170,229. The City of Eau Claire is home to the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire. With a student enrollment of over 10,000, the university is one of the largest in the University of Wisconsin system.

E3 Coalition: Vernon County, Crawford County, City of Viroqua, City of Prairie du Chien, Village of Fennimore, Village of Ferryville, Village of Viola, Village of La Farge, Village of Gays Mills, Village of Soldiers Grove

With ten different municipalities, including counties, cities, and villages involved, the E3 Coalition represents the most numerous and varied set of communities of any of the grantees, as well as the largest in total land area. This planning effort entails a large amount of collaboration between all of the local units of government involved, their sources of energy consumption, and desires for an energy independent future.

Green Lake County and Green Lake School District

Green Lake County is located in east-central Wisconsin, and has an estimated 2010 population of 19,772. The largest municipality in Green Lake County is the City of Berlin, with a 2010 population of approximately 5,222. The Green Lake School District is a joint participant in this project team, with the school district superintendent playing an active role.

City of Jefferson

The City of Jefferson is located in Jefferson County in southeastern Wisconsin, approximately 35 miles east of Madison. The City is at the junction of the Rock and Crawfish Rivers, and has an estimated 2010 population of 7,865. Jefferson is the site of a Renew Energy, LLC, a corn-fed ethanol plant located at the Cargill-owned Ladish Malting Company plant.

City of Kaukauna and Kaukauna Utilities

The City of Kaukauna is located in the Fox Valley south of Green Bay, and has an estimated 2010 population of 15,120. The City of Kaukauna is participating in the 2010 program with Kaukauna Utilities, which has been active in renewable energy work in the Kaukauna area, and continues its commitment by working with the City on this planning process.

Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians

Located in the rural north woods of Wisconsin, the Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians is the first tribal-only grantee to participate in the energy independent communities grant program. The area is rich with natural resources, and is a popular year-round recreation destination. Tribal liaisons with the University of Wisconsin-Extension led the effort for this grantee participant. The 2000 U.S. Census estimated the population of the tribe to be 2,995, making this grantee the smallest of all of the grantees in population size.

Section One:

Grantee Community Characteristics

City of Monona

The City of Monona is a community surrounded by the City of Madison and Lake Monona in Dane County with an estimated 2010 population of 8,214. The City is active in energy independence planning efforts, having secured an Energy Efficiency Community Block Grant (EECBG) in the spring of 2010 for the retrofit of systems on several municipal buildings.

Polk County

Polk County is a rural county located in northwest Wisconsin along the Mississippi River with an estimated 2010 population of 46,171. The City of Amery, with an estimated 2010 population of 2,895, is the largest municipality in the county. The County seat is the Village of Balsam Lake, just north of Wisconsin Highway 8, which travels horizontally across the state.

Shawano County

Located northwest of Green Bay, Shawano County has an estimated 2010 population of 42,752. Largely rural in nature, the largest municipality in the county is the City of Shawano with an estimated 2010 population of 8,298. The Stockbridge-Munsee Indian Reservation is located in the northwestern part of the County.

Waukesha County

With an estimated 2010 population of 360,767, this suburban county west of Milwaukee is the most populous grantee that has participated in the energy independent communities program to date. This makes Waukesha County an interesting case study for insight into the advantages and disadvantages of coordinating energy independence planning across such a highly populated area.

City of Whitewater

The City of Whitewater is located in Walworth and Jefferson Counties in southeastern Wisconsin, and has an estimated 2010 population of 14,454. The City is home to the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, one of the University of Wisconsin system campuses, with a total enrollment of over 11,000 students.

It is important to note that the collection of units of local government among the 2010 grantee communities does not reflect the actual distribution of municipality types across the state, as there are more towns than any other form of government among the nearly 2,000 different units of government in Wisconsin.

There were 24 different units of government and other entities represented by the 11 grant recipients for 2010. The following is the breakdown of the participants:

- Counties - 7
- Cities - 8
- Villages - 6 (part of the E3 Coalition)
- Other (school district, utility) - 2
- First Nation Tribes - 1

Section One: Grantee Community Characteristics

The collection of 2010 participants is a strong mix of entities with unique characteristics and a variety of geographic locations, making the results of the planning process more applicable to future communities.

Map 1 - 2010 Grantee Communities



Section Two:

EIC Planning Process and Common Issues

Similar to the 2009 program, the 2010 energy independence planning grant dictated a 12 month planning process that was segmented into different phases of activity. The pre-determined phases of the project which helped guide the grantees through the process were:

- Community Preparation, Data Collection and Analysis
- Identification of Opportunities and Strategies
- Evaluation and Selection of Strategies
- Plan Implementation

The Local Government Institute of Wisconsin planned and helped facilitate each of the three energy independence planning meetings held in 2010.

Summary of Program and Feedback Results

Overview

Over the course of the 2010 program, three meetings were held to gather all of the community participants, provide education on energy independence planning topics, and provide a forum for discussion of process. The three meetings were held on April 7, 2010 in Eau Claire, August 4, 2010 in Kaukauna, and December 15, 2010 in Waukesha.

The April meeting in Eau Claire focused on PACE (Property Assessed Clean Energy) financing and other local financing mechanisms used in promoting energy independence projects. Speakers included individuals from the U.S. Department of Energy, the River Falls Municipal Utility, and Midwest Region Renewable Funding, LLC, who have experience in local financing strategies used to promote energy independence.



Team leaders from Green Lake County describe their energy independence planning process and challenges at the final energy independent communities meeting on December 15, 2010 in Waukesha.

The August meeting in Kaukauna had energy independence and economic development as its focus, one that is particularly topical given the state of the economy in 2010. Speakers included individuals from the Waukesha Economic Development Corporation, Wisconsin Wind Works, Renewegy, Bassett Mechanical, and Thilmany. Discussions focused on the importance of energy independence initiatives for cost savings, as well as the importance of public-private partnerships to encourage sustainable economic development.

Between the second and third meetings, LGI conducted a survey of the grantees to assess their progress, determine the challenges that the communities faced, and offer recommendations

Section Two: EIC Planning Process and Common Issues

for future communities engaging in energy independence planning. The results of the survey are discussed in the next section. These items were incorporated into the discussions at the meeting in Waukesha on December 15.

The third and final meeting in Waukesha involved presentations from each of the participating communities detailing their experience with energy independence planning. The meeting included a discussion between communities regarding general themes, issues and challenges. Communities shared important lessons learned. In addition to these conversations, a presentation was given by Carla Wright of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. She provided information about the new Legacy Communities initiative that is connected to the Green Tier program. Finally, the 2009 EI Pilot Communities shared an update on how their energy independence efforts are going a year later. More information on the progress of 2009 energy independent communities can be found in Section Five.

Survey Summary

The Local Government Institute of Wisconsin conducted a survey of grantee communities between the second and third community meetings. The purpose of the survey was to learn about the experience of the 2010 grantees in the energy independence planning process. This included gaining information on the challenges and successes that the communities encountered and provides a tool to summarize the 2010 Energy Independent Communities program, compare the process with the program in 2009, and establish conclusions on methods and strategies for coordinating a successful energy planning effort.

Survey questions (and responses) are included in **Appendix A** for reference. Questions were intended to gather information on the following aspects of the planning process:

- Goals
- Expectations
- Benefits
- Obstacles
- Data sources and data collection process
- Analysis of baseline data
- Development of energy independence projects and measures
- Planning challenges and strategies for overcoming them
- Recommendations for other communities undertaking energy planning



Roundtable discussion between communities helped summarize key lessons learned from the energy planning process at the final meeting in Waukesha.

Section Two: EIC Planning Process and Common Issues

With regard to goals that led grantee communities to be interested in an energy planning process, most communities were interested in establishing energy efficiency measures to save energy and reduce municipal costs. A few of the communities mentioned the desire to be part of the “new economy” and brandish their sustainability credentials. Each community believed that it is possible for energy planning to assist in generating economic development — specifically by supporting the attraction of clean tech and energy sector jobs and businesses. Common throughout the responses was the theme of economics – reducing costs and generating economic growth through thoughtful energy planning.

Additionally, awareness and understanding of the level of energy use and methods for energy savings were listed as key benefits. Although some communities were met with supportive municipal officials, other communities noted that establishing support among key officials was an obstacle. Some communities experienced difficulty acquiring the necessary political and financial support. This was particularly challenging when energy saving measures were accompanied by monetary investments and payback periods with extended terms.

Obtaining political support and stakeholder buy-in was the most prominent obstacle to energy independence planning; this is consistent with the feelings of the 2009 grantee communities. Communities must continue to stress the financial, economic and job creation benefits of energy initiatives in order to gain support from community leaders.

The complete set of survey results can be found in Appendix A.

Section Three:

Community Case Studies

Community Case Studies

Several initiatives undertaken by 2010 grantee communities deserve acknowledgment for their illustration of best practices in energy planning, forming partnerships, and engaging in education and outreach. Of particular interest and focus in the 2010 program was outreach and education, something that was discussed and initiated more prominently in 2010 than in 2009.

E3 Coalition

The E3 Coalition consists of a partnership of the following ten entities engaging in a collective energy independence planning process: Vernon County, Crawford County, City of Viroqua, City of Prairie du Chien, Village of Fennimore, Village of Ferryville, Village of Viola, Village of La Farge, Village of Gays Mills, Village of Soldiers Grove. As part of its planning effort, the E3 Coalition team was able to test a community assessment toolkit under development by staff at the UW-Extension Environmental Resources Center. This toolkit offers a systematic way of assessing the economic, social, and environmental impacts of various potential energy initiatives including woody biomass, corn grain ethanol, wind energy, and anaerobic digestion. The target audience of the toolkit are: UW-Extension educators and community leaders/facilitators across the state. The E3 Coalition was used as a testing ground for the assessment toolkit as it undergoes continued development. The E3 Coalition plans to use the toolkit as part of its ongoing regional meetings with energy teams in 2011. Representatives from these local teams also serve on a joint regional collaborative energy team.

The E3 Coalition conducted two community energy meetings in October 2010 to gain feedback on pursuing different energy independence initiatives. The Coalition used the community assessment toolkit as a basis for discussion, which centered on the potential economic, social, and environmental effects of possible energy initiatives.

Furthermore, the Coalition will coordinate and conduct ongoing energy meetings in 2011 to maintain the involvement of the public and key stakeholders, and to help implement the goals that emerged from the energy planning process.

Green Lake County

Green Lake County conducted the 2010 energy independence planning process in close concert with the Green Lake School District. Both entities had previously signed commitments to pursue 25x25 energy reduction goals, and both are significant users of energy in Green Lake County. The Green Lake School District has long been interested in sustainability initiatives, having participated in the Earth Partnership for Schools, recognizing the relationship of people to the land. As a sign of the extent of the partnership, the energy independence planning committee for this grantee entity included the Superintendent of the Green Lake School District, the Vice President of the School Board, and the Building and Grounds Chairperson.

The School District and County have committed to exploring the creation of a joint fueling station with both E85 and biodiesel available, since the transportation fleet was found to be a significant user of energy. Various school energy efficiency retrofits are planned, including

Section Three: Community Case Studies

replacing the building boiler with a high efficiency version. Various policy changes are planned at the county and school levels to reduce energy use.

Community outreach and education will continue to be a high priority for Green Lake County and the School District. The goal is to promote awareness and acceptance of energy reduction policies and practices throughout the community. Outreach efforts will include: energy demonstration sites at schools, monthly educational forums, focus groups, and continuing the work with community partners and stakeholders.

Specifically, there will be several key events in 2011. "Energy Education Week" will be facilitated by the Green Lake County energy planning team. This will include a community job fair, career day, and a teacher workshop. This workshop is an effort to update teachers from across the county on energy education issues so that information can be shared with students.

City of Jefferson

As part of its energy planning process, the City of Jefferson has conducted a public energy planning kickoff meeting, and has a series of informational opportunities scheduled for the future. This is part of an ongoing campaign to keep the public and stakeholder groups involved in the process of implementing energy projects and recommendations. The kick-off meeting was held November 11, 2010. The goal of the meeting was to introduce the City's energy planning process, and lay the framework for ongoing public participation.

Several meetings and workshops are planned for 2011 to continue the community outreach process. The goal of the workshops is to educate and involve the public in energy projects, act as an example for other communities and bring new stakeholders into the process. The energy independence planning education series is an ideal way to empower different stakeholder groups, involve them in the planning process, and continue the momentum of the 2010 process.

Polk County

Polk County, as part of the 2010 energy planning effort, conducted its first annual Renewable Energy and Resource Fair on August 21 and 22 at the Polk County Fairgrounds in St. Croix Falls. The fair was well attended and included several speakers discussing the topics of local sustainability, state energy policy updates, energy technologies, and home energy use practices. Members of the Polk County energy independence planning team were also in attendance to discuss the County's energy planning efforts. Several exhibitors in the areas of electricity, renewable energy, recycling and waste, and sustainable living participated in the two day fair. In addition to the fair, Polk County conducted other educational events, surveys, and involved the public on their energy planning team. The energy fair will continue into the future, and is scheduled for August 19-20, 2011, at the County Fairgrounds.

Section Three: Community Case Studies

City of Whitewater

A partnership between the City of Whitewater Community Development Authority (CDA), the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, and the Whitewater University Technology Park has been developed to create a 125-acre technology park. This park has significant implications for the future energy use and future production of renewable energy and economic development in Whitewater. The \$5.4 million Whitewater Innovation Center is slated to open in 2011. It was an important consideration for the City of Whitewater in its 25x25 energy independence planning process.

The Whitewater Innovation Center will be managed by the City of Whitewater CDA and is expected to achieve Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold rating from the U.S. Green Building Council. Its features include a rooftop solar photovoltaic array, a geothermal heating and cooling system, and various water efficiency measures. The hope of the CDA is to lure "green" tech and renewable energy-type businesses to the technology park. The specific purpose of the Whitewater Innovation Center is to serve as an incubator for green energy businesses and a showcase for clean energy technology. The City of Whitewater has long been interested in the economic development potential of renewable energy and energy independence planning, a theme that was at the forefront of discussion in the 2010 energy independence planning process. The City of Whitewater feels that it must be proactive to create the necessary leverage for future economic development.

See Appendix B for a complete collection of all final energy independence 25x25 reports from the 2010 grantee communities.

Section Four: Lessons Learned & Recommendations

An important outcome of the 2010 energy independence planning process has been the ability to draw lessons from the grantees' experiences. Feedback from these communities can provide meaningful recommendations for other communities interested in energy independence planning.

The following are lessons learned and recommendations. The feedback was given to the Local Government Institute of Wisconsin in a survey administered in September 2010:

1. **Start planning as soon as possible. Collecting and tracking data is important.**

The grantee communities mentioned the importance of starting the energy planning process as soon as possible. The challenging task of collecting and tracking of energy data can require a significant amount of time. Many communities seeking to facilitate an energy planning process may already collect and track energy use data for municipal buildings, but many times this data is difficult to acquire and organize, and it may not be in the appropriate format to conduct planning and analysis.

Initiating an energy independence planning process requires the availability of organized and comprehensive data. Energy Independence Teams will need to work with appropriate facilities and fleet vehicle personnel as well as local utility staff to collect, organize, and track relevant energy use data from buildings and municipal vehicles. This is necessary to create a strong, data-driven process.

2. **The Energy Independence Team needs a strong leader, and multiple advocates.**

To maximize the ability of the team to garner and maintain support from key community stakeholders, it is essential that the energy team have knowledgeable, committed members. A strong leader is important to maintain the focus of the energy team throughout the planning process. Having multiple advocates on the team with the ability to support the leader and continue engagement with key stakeholders can make the process more productive. This is confirmed in the survey results from 2010 grantee communities. Energy teams often face various obstacles and can feel overwhelmed with the process. Strong leaders and advocates provide essential roles to address challenges and keep the team focused on achievable and measurable results.

3. **Education and outreach are necessary to inform the public and assist with gaining support..**

Community support was the most significant issue in the public process. Many planning teams faced challenges informing and educating community leaders about the merits of energy independence planning. Specific measures for plan implementation have direct impacts upon a community's financial situation. There are opportunities for commitments with both short and long-term payback periods. A thoughtful plan that includes public input, and integrates multiple viewpoints will help frame the context for each community. By respecting and listening to all points of view the process will become stronger. Including multiple perspectives that are unique to each community will highlight the knowledge of local residents. This ultimately creates a stronger plan.

Section Four: Lessons Learned & Recommendations

An emphasis was placed on involving the public in the 2010 energy independence planning process in a mix of education and feedback forums, Energy Fair events, workshops, and other public input strategies were employed. Many communities had the help of UW-Extension educators and coordinators to undertake public outreach efforts. After the culmination of the energy planning process, a plan should be in place to continue public involvement and momentum. This will help with the implementation of the projects, initiatives, and goals in the energy independence plan.



Brian Driscoll of the Wisconsin Office of Energy Independence and Carla Wright of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources lead a discussion with 2010 and 2009 energy teams and others at the December 15, 2010 meeting in Waukesha.

Section Four: Lessons Learned & Recommendations



2010 Energy Independent Communities Pilot Planning Grant team members pose for a group photo at the final meeting in Waukesha. Top Row (Left to Right): Brian Driscoll (Wisconsin Office of Energy Independence); Bryan Hoover (Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians); **Bruce Parker (Whitewater), (Polk County)**; Jerry Braatz (Waukesha County); Dave Walter (Chippewa Valley Partnership); Todd Osman (E3 Coalition); Ned Noel (Chippewa Valley Partnership); Jim Brown (Kaukauna Utilities); Tim Anderson (Polk County); Jay Moynihan (Shawano County); Daniel Priske (Green Lake County and Green Lake County School District); Jeff Forbes (Kaukauna Utilities); Heather Gates (Monona); Jim Olson (E3 Coalition); Jess Leinberger (E3 Coalition)

Bottom Row (Left to Right): Mary Nimm (Whitewater); Leslie Williams (Waukesha County); Alice Rasmussen (Kaukauna); **Linda Leef (Polk County)**; Patrick Marsh (Monona); Jill Weiss (City of Jefferson); Marge Bostelmann (Green Lake County and Green Lake School District); Ken Bates (Green Lake County and Green Lake School District)

Section Five: Update and Insights from 2009 EI Communities

Revisiting the progress of the 2009 grantee communities a year later is a useful exercise in determining what has been successful and what has not. It is important to share the insights gained and applied by other communities as they continue to work on their energy independence planning efforts. Representatives from three of the 2009 grantee communities were interviewed. Their experiences and insights are shared below.

Brown County

Brown County has been able to implement several measures presented in its 2009 plan. The County Executive established an Energy Oversight Committee to help guide its energy planning process. This committee has five sub-committees that deal with the following components of the comprehensive energy planning: administration (logistics and procedures), communications (education, outreach, etc.), buildings, vehicles, and large scale energy products. These committees are comprised of officials from various departments, including airport, highways, land conservation, sheriff, planning, and facilities. Sub-committees meet regularly, and report to the entire committee. This assists with regular updates and coordination. This has ensured a well organized and comprehensive process examining all facets of energy use and potential energy savings.

The County has completed several energy feasibility studies and energy audits. It also has many projects out for bid. Currently, photovoltaic systems are being installed at three parks and a library. Upgrades are being made to the electricity automation system in the courthouse, as well as the senior center facility. Staff has conducted research on potential projects and funding sources, which has aided the County's efforts. Mr. William Dowell, the Brown County Facility and Park Management Director, cited the importance of remaining flexible during the energy planning and implementation process to ensure success. For instance, Brown County believed the largest potential for energy projects is in the area of on-site renewable energy. After further evaluation the County has shifted attention to large-scale renewable energy production projects. The plan is oriented toward the long-term, and it includes a level of flexibility with projects and strategies for the future.

City of Evansville

The City of Evansville has been very successful in implementing initiatives discussed in its 2009 energy independence plan. The City will perform energy audits in two primary municipal buildings, the library and city hall. This will help with future energy saving measures, including timers on water coolers, and motion detectors for lights in bathrooms. The City also has access to funds from its municipal utility to implement many of the initiatives from the 2009 energy independence plan. It has acquired grant money from the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant program to modify street lights and install lighting upgrades that will increase energy efficiency. The City has also installed a wood burner in the public works facility and a 100 kilowatt wind turbine at the City's wastewater treatment site. These projects were supported by funds from Focus on Energy and WPPI Energy.

One of the key reasons for the City's success is the existence of a large and diverse group of leaders committed to energy independence planning. Mayor Sandy Decker is a strong leader and the main advocate. Mayor Decker has cited the team as an essential organization in both

Section Five: Update and Insights from 2009 EI Communities

preparing the plan and implementing several initiatives. The team has also helped to maintain and build support for future opportunities. The energy independence team has representatives from the chamber of commerce, school district, public works department, water and light, and the general public.

City of Oconomowoc

The City of Oconomowoc has found successes with several initiatives from its 2009 energy independence plan. These projects include motion sensors on lights, a new "green" fire station, reworking city building codes, development of new guidelines, and planning initiatives to incorporate future energy initiatives. A new community center is in development. The center will be built to follow existing green standards and will integrate other sustainability standards.

Lisa Geason-Bauer, a member of the 2009 Oconomowoc energy independence team was interviewed. She offered insights into Oconomowoc's successful implementation of energy saving measures. The City of Oconomowoc has a diverse energy independence team that includes City leaders that serve as advocates and have the political clout to affect change. Ms. Geason-Bauer stresses the importance of a cost/benefit analysis while trying to educate the City of Oconomowoc on future energy projects. City officials are interested in their return on investment, especially with respect to the proposed energy reduction, efficiency, and generation projects.

The City of Oconomowoc embodies the importance of ongoing education for a sustained process. Ms. Geason-Bauer added that lack of knowledge and understanding in the community-at-large can be a barrier when trying to involve others in the energy planning process. Education is vital to this effort, which is why the City of Oconomowoc has established a process of educating new elected public officials on energy planning initiatives. The City also operates outreach and education events in the community including open houses at the utilities and Public Power Week. The City uses the school district as its main conduit for these activities.

Oconomowoc understands the need to recognize the uniqueness of its community. This is essential to a successful energy planning process. Each community is faced with its individual set of demographics, cultural and political viewpoints, and economic and environmental challenges. The approach used by one community may not prove to be successful for another. In looking for precedents and examples of success, it is important to examine similarities and differences for a general source of guidance.

Village of Osceola

Robert Kazmierski, an agent with the University of Wisconsin Extension in Polk County, was interviewed about the experiences of the Village of Osceola. Mr. Kazmierski was involved in the 2009 program with the Village of Osceola and in the 2010 program with Polk County. He lauded the process for offering valuable information into the Village's energy use. It provided an important starting point with a baseline of energy data. The collection of data and the placement into one central location has facilitated understanding and analysis. It has increased the understanding of the community's use of energy, the costs associated with

Section Five: Update and Insights from 2009 EI Communities

energy, and provided insights on how to increase efficiency in the future. In short, the energy planning effort provided an important foundation for energy issues in municipal dialogue.

One aspect that surfaced during the 2010 program, and which was mentioned by Mr. Kazmierski, is the importance of having a template or precedent to follow when undertaking an energy planning process. Collaboration between communities who are participating or have participated in an energy planning process is an important factor in success. Several 2010 communities mentioned their desire and efforts to “set an example” for other communities interested in energy planning initiatives. Creating a resource network increases connections and the sharing of information. Communities new to the process can learn from the experiences of communities who have completed it. This has been viewed as an essential component to maintaining momentum for energy planning efforts across the State of Wisconsin.

Section Six:

Guide to Getting Started in Energy Planning

1. **Form a committed energy team with a strong leader**

This is the most important step in the energy independence planning effort. The team needs the time, human energy, and commitment to collect data, advocate for future goals, and help create the plan to achieve these goals. A strong leader is necessary to help keep the group focused, and act as a liaison between the group and key public officials and stakeholders.

2. **Collect energy data**

It is vital that any community interested in this process identify the data needed, select a format, and select key stakeholders to assist in collecting and organizing the necessary data for analysis. Establishing a process for data collection and organization early will facilitate analysis and planning throughout the process.

3. **Use Portfolio Manager**

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) has an online energy management tool called Energy Star Portfolio Manager, which allows for the tracking and assessing of energy consumption for municipal buildings. This tool helps to set energy priorities, identifies potential energy improvements, and determines which buildings are in need of improvement.

4. **Create a Plan**

Based on your community's unique resources and characteristics, develop an energy plan that outlines the energy goals of the community, the key stakeholders, the energy independence measures to pursue, and an implementation plan.

5. **Engage in Outreach and Education**

Early, often and constant education of decision-makers and citizens is necessary to implement the plan and guide and develop future opportunities for energy reduction and renewable energy production. Education and outreach are a vital part of the energy planning process, both to help individuals make more informed decisions, but also to gain the feedback on proposed energy measures and implementation strategies.

Others Examples and Resources:

US Conference of Mayors Climate Protection Agreement
<http://www.usmayors.org/climateprotection/agreement.htm>

National Association of Counties – Green Governments Initiative
<http://www.naco.org/programs/csd/pages/greengovernmentinitiative.aspx>

Eco-Municipalities based on the book, "The Natural Step"
<http://www.naturalstep.org>

Section Six: Guide to Getting Started in Energy Planning

Sustainability Planning – UW-Extension – Tool Kit

<http://www4.uwm.edu/shwec/publications/cabinet/reductionreuse/SustainabilityToolkit.pdf>

UW-Extension Municipal Energy Planning Workbook

<http://energyindependence.wi.gov/docview.asp?docid=17192&locid=160>

WAPA – Sustainability Planning Resources

<http://www.wisconsinplanners.org/eco-municipalities.html>

Appendix A

Appendix A: Survey Questions and Responses

Community	1. Please describe what community goals led you to want to take part in energy independence planning.
Joshua Clements (City of Whitewater)	Over the past few years, the City of Whitewater has viewed energy as a way to reduce municipal operating costs, as well as drive economic development in the clean tech and clean energy sectors. Whitewater has become a regional leader in supporting energy efficiency and water quality through municipal action. The City staff viewed EI Communities as a way to tap into state-wide momentum, resources, and expertise to address municipal energy use.
Jason Kauffeld (Green Lake County and Green Lake School District)	I was directed by the P&I Committee of the County Board to pursue any grants that would help the county save money on energy costs. Also, the County Board asked me to provide information on LEED certification and then voted to build a LEED certified Justice Center.
James J. Brown (City of Kaukauna and Kaukauna Utilities)	Kaukauna is a progressive community with a long history of renewable energy because of the existing hydro generation in the community. Kaukauna is known as the electric city. Kaukauna, because of its municipally owned electric and water utility, is in a unique position to be an example to other communities interested in the 25 by 25 concept.
Jerry Braatz (Waukesha County)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waukesha County established a multi-disciplinary team that included county departments in early 2008. This resulted in the development of a Sustainability Plan for Waukesha County. The plan contained the following elements: • Building Design • Facilities Management/Building Operations • Grounds and Site Management • Transportation • Land Use • Environment • Purchasing • Employees <p>The need to update the 2008 plan and a further analysis of energy use, projects implemented, and future projects were goals that led Waukesha County to take part in 25X25 Energy Independence Planning.</p>
Tim Anderson (Polk County)	Presence of a ad hoc renewable energy committee made of local elected officials. Energy sustainability element in the county comprehensive land use plan.
Susan McConnell (Green Lake County)	Putting as many energy efficient/cost saving/renewable/forward thinking elements into our new justice center that was being planned, as well as working to retrofit/renovate a 100+ year old current court house complex.
Jill Weiss (City of Jefferson)	Looking to acheive Energy Independence Green Economy may be the future and we want to be a leader We have been Looking for ways to save money
Jess Leinberger (E3 Coalition)	The desire to maximize energy efficiency as a responsible practice for the public good ; both cost savings and environment.
Ned Noel (City of Eau Claire - Chippewa Valley Partnership)	Each community formally adopted the 25% by 2025 goal. Each community is committed to energy effeciency and sustainability efforts.

Bryan Hoover (Lac du Flambeau Tribe of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians)	The Tribe recently adopted a Strategic Energy Plan that includes goals for energy efficiency and utilizing renewable energy, as well as a goal to develop a 25x25 plan for energy independence. The Strategic Energy Plan is what the Tribe uses to guide project development and further planning, so the EIC project fit well into the overall community goals for the Tribe.
Jay Moynihan (Shawano County)	Reduction of expenses Fuel/energy transition

Community	2. What were the benefits you expected to gain through the energy independence planning process? Are these consistent with what you have gained so far in your efforts?
Joshua Clements (City of Whitewater)	I cannot speak for all members of the energy team, but one item that has consistently arisen is to drive economic development in the community around energy. The team is encouraged by the news from the 2009 EI Communities concerning interest from developers as a result of their planning efforts. To date, I am unaware of increased interest in Whitewater as a consequence of the planning process, but it is early. The members of the team are excited and hopeful that Whitewater will become a target for both new and expanded businesses in the clean tech and energy sectors.
Jason Kauffeld (Green Lake County and Green Lake School District)	Long-term cost savings and stronger / more resilient local economy.
James J. Brown (City of Kaukauna and Kaukauna Utilities)	The benefits for the community is enhance energy awareness by the city and utility. The energy savings and uses of renewable energy will have a long term impact on the operating costs to the community. The awareness aspect of the exercise has already made had a positive impact.
Jerry Braatz (Waukesha County)	Energy use is a major cost each year in the County budget. This process helped us further analyze County natural gas, fuel, and electricity usage. The energy audits also helped us identify which projects might have a favorable rate of return within a reasonable pay-back period.
Tim Anderson (Polk County)	Better understanding of energy consumption and use. Identify area were energy use needs to be tracked better.
Susan McConnell (Green Lake County)	Savings in money, energy, and awareness in our community as to what was possible when these elements were included. Somewhat - new building has been operating for 2 months, nothing was done with the old building.
Jill Weiss (City of Jefferson)	Create a road map and develop a plan for energy conservation, energy independence and expending less money on energy. We are working toward gaining these in our efforts.
Jess Leinberger (E3 Coalition)	Among the benefits we expected to gain through the energy independence planning process was 1. Greater awareness of level of electric, gas, and fuel usage. 2. Increased forethought of how we can reduce usage and integrate efficiencies 3. Increased knowledge of and interest in energy conservation, efficiency, and renewable energy options for facilities. SO far (October) we can see some real gains in all areas except conservation. We need to see a bit more behavior change initiatives.
Ned Noel (City of Eau Claire - Chippewa Valley Partnership)	More knowledge on what real renewable energy projects we could implement. Better understanding of our baseline energy use.

Bryan Hoover (Lac du Flambeau Tribe of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians)	We expected the project to give us a chance to explore further into the details of the renewable energy projects that we have been considering. With the 25x25 plan in place, we hoped that it would provide the Tribe with a guide to follow each year in pursuing energy projects. So far in our efforts, this is not exactly what we have gained it has been realized that the execution of many of the planned projects will be dependent upon the availability of funding, and that the Tribe will be forced to maintain flexibility as it selects projects each year to pursue.
Jay Moynihan (Shawano County)	To have a picture of county energy usage and develop the beginning of a plan for cost reduction and reduction of fossil fuel use.

Community	3. Before beginning the planning process, what were the biggest obstacles you thought would come up in planning for energy independence? Are these obstacles consistent with what you have seen so far in your planning efforts?
Joshua Clements (City of Whitewater)	The biggest obstacle that I personally thought would arise in planning for energy independence was political will, with the second being budget. I know that municipalities can take huge strides in reducing energy consumption and increase renewables production, the major barriers being if the political will exists to undertake those projects and the second barrier being making the financing work. We are not far enough along in the planning process for me to have determined if those obstacles will remain. We have not yet determined, for example, what the expected payback will need to be in order for the municipality or school district to undertake the project. However, given what the City is undertaking presently in terms of efficiency upgrades, I am cautiously optimistic that the City will undertake all projects that have a reasonable payback period.
Jason Kauffeld (Green Lake County and Green Lake School District)	Local opposition. The anti-sustainability movement is actually stronger than I expected.
James J. Brown (City of Kaukauna and Kaukauna Utilities)	Planning for meeting the goal is easy. The biggest obstacle will be the presentation to the community leaders and getting their commitment to continue the process for at least the next 15 years and obtaining the necessary financial support to implement the plan.
Jerry Braatz (Waukesha County)	Identifying renewable energy projects that we could show were feasible to the point of receiving political support. At this time, these projects have a very long pay-back period. Without significant incentives, these projects are a very very tough sell, especially, with our current economy.
Tim Anderson (Polk County)	Buy-in
Susan McConnell (Green Lake County)	Buy-in by the committees & supervisors to allow the work to be approved. Yes.
Jill Weiss (City of Jefferson)	Doing all the research for our energy usage. This was not a major obstacle.
Jess Leinberger (E3 Coalition)	I thought municipal officials would fight these efforts and resist change. I was glad to find that most of our municipalities are very open to energy independence planning and setting a 15 year plan for their facilities and fleets.
Ned Noel (City of Eau Claire - Chippewa Valley Partnership)	Lack of industry knowledge / planning. Not having experts on staff or knowing who to talk to. Cost for renewable projects and unreliability in energy price fluctuations. The obstacles have been consistently experienced.

Bryan Hoover (Lac du Flambeau Tribe of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians)	We always have known that the biggest obstacle in planning for energy independence would be funding. This has proven to be consistent with what we expected. It has been difficult to formulate an attainable plan when it is not known where the money will come from to implement the plan.
Jay Moynihan (Shawano County)	Thought determining how to sub renewables would be difficult. That turned out not to be the case.
Bryan Hoover (Lac du Flambeau Tribe of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians)	We always have known that the biggest obstacle in planning for energy independence would be funding. This has proven to be consistent with what we expected. It has been difficult to formulate an attainable plan when it is not known where the money will come from to implement the plan.
Jay Moynihan (Shawano County)	Thought determining how to sub renewables would be difficult. That turned out not to be the case.

Community	4. Has the process matched the expectations you had before starting? Is it going the way you thought it would?
Joshua Clements (City of Whitewater)	The process has been slower than anticipated. It has gone slower because getting all of our members of the energy team to engage to the level of the leaders has been sporadic. Also, information from the Focus on Energy facility audits were not nearly as useful as we expected.
Jason Kauffeld (Green Lake County and Green Lake School District)	It is going more slowly than I expected.
James J. Brown (City of Kaukauna and Kaukauna Utilities)	The pprocess here in kasukauna is goig very well. We have an engaged and thoughtful commitee, who are willing to put in some extra effort to analysis certain technologies and see if they can be applied.
Jerry Braatz (Waukesha County)	<p>Many of the smaller communities have their own public utility which provides them with an advantage over other units of government. For example, County governments do not operate utilities. The data analysis has helped us better understand our energy situation and provided several tools for current and future analysis.</p> <p>Throughout this process, there has been a push to focus on renewables, yet Waukesha County has done a great job of focusing on energy conservation due to the fact that these projects are feasible with an acceptable pay-back period.</p>
Tim Anderson (Polk County)	Not really...the data collection and analysis was not seemless as we expected.

Susan McConnell (Green Lake County)	Yes. For the most part. Seems like there are some internal organizational problems with the overall project. It is large, and there are many varied participants.
Jill Weiss (City of Jefferson)	No. No.
Jess Leinberger (E3 Coalition)	Yes. I thought it would be a foreign process to most that would require innovation and LOTS of communication to move forward. This is certainly true. It has been hard to find the time to organize energy team meetings
Ned Noel (City of Eau Claire - Chippewa Valley Partnership)	Yes and no. There are too many unforeseen problems with the EPA Portfolio Manager- data glitches, lack of ratings for municipal building types, etc. This has resulted in more recent delays/extra work on data quality checks. It also took a lot more work than we thought to find everything in our jurisdictions that use some form of energy. We weren't pleased with the Focus building surveys- being they had token answers on renewable projects. We had to hire a consultant team with grant funds to figure this out for us.
Bryan Hoover (Lac du Flambeau Tribe of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians)	The data collection process took much longer for us than we expected. Otherwise, it seemed to go similar to how we expected.
Jay Moynihan (Shawano County)	No, and no.

Community	5. What data sources were most useful and accessible during your data gathering process? Please describe your data collection process. Did you find your local utility helpful? What were the challenges and successes?
Joshua Clements (City of Whitewater)	The baseline data is obviously useful. The utility, WE Energies, was able to pull most electric and natural gas data. Challenges still exist in terms of collecting transportation fuel data, as well as creating a process of submetering different uses within buildings.
Jason Kauffeld (Green Lake County and Green Lake School District)	We contracted with MSA to take care of this.
James J. Brown (City of Kaukauna and Kaukauna Utilities)	The city and the utility had good data. Vehicle data before 2008 was not good. because of new construction building data was not relevant before 2009. Therefore, our baseline is only one year (2009) and is not a 5 or 10 year average. Also predicting energy use growth is difficult.

<p>Jerry Braatz (Waukesha County)</p>	<p>We had been tracking some energy consumption data for our larger buildings in Portfolio Manager. As part of the 25 x 25 grant process, we requested energy consumption data from our utility provider, WE-Energies, for the rest of our buildings and signalized intersections. They were able to give us six years of data in Excel spreadsheets. It was not in a format that was easily transferrable to the Portfolio Manager multi-facility upload template. For instance, WE-Energies supplied the data by account number, not meter number. We are working with WE- Energies to provide their data in a format that is compatible with the upload template. Ultimately, we would like to have WE-Energies upload monthly energy consumption data to Portfolio Manager directly. For the present, we have developed an internal workflow plan to enter current data into Portfolio Manager.</p> <p>During the data collection process we also used WE-Energies Business Account Online web-based tool to fact check and fill in data gaps.</p> <p>Our Fleet Maintenance Division has been using an automated fuel management system that collects vehicle type, mileage and fuel consumption data since 2000. We were able to download monthly diesel and unleaded gasoline consumption data and costs from this system.</p>
<p>Tim Anderson (Polk County)</p>	<p>Internal records within each of the county departments. Some of the utilities were slow in getting the information.</p>
<p>Susan McConnell (Green Lake County)</p>	<p>I did not work directly with inputting the data. This process has seemed quite problematic. Our data was mostly collected prior to this years process beginning. Yes, our local utility has been good in helping. Challenges to get it all in place, and separate the two portions out from each other - School & County.</p>
<p>Jill Weiss (City of Jefferson)</p>	<p>Facilities data was generally very obtainable by working with the utilities. The fleet data was not kept really long and the format that it comes in was difficult to make it go easily into the template.</p>
<p>Jess Leinberger (E3 Coalition)</p>	<p>The municipal utilities were easiest to get accurate data from b/c we could call and check on numbers/meters, etc. For all other municipalities we went to the large utilities and in most cases found it fairly easy to collect the data in excel spreadsheet format which made entering the data fairly easy. The difficulty came when identifying building name to address to meters to account number to usage.</p>
<p>Ned Noel (City of Eau Claire - Chippewa Valley Partnership)</p>	<p>Getting five year building account histories was super. The local utility was pretty helpful. Getting the last remaining data was like pulling teeth though. We also ran into some internal problems with our fleet data after switching to a new software management system. We had unpaid interns do most of our data entry to free up staff to work on promoting 25x25 education, etc.</p>
<p>Bryan Hoover (Lac du Flambeau Tribe of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians)</p>	<p>The easiest way for us to collect our data was to obtain records from our electric utility, and our various fuel suppliers. This was due to the fact that our accounting office did not have the data available or centralized for ease in collection. Going through the Utility and the providers then proved to be challenging because of the wide variety of programs and businesses that our community had, we often came across missing data and had to correspond back and forth in order to get a complete set of data.</p>
<p>Jay Moynihan (Shawano County)</p>	<p>The final tool/spreadsheets. Data gathering involved all major departments, turned out to be more difficult that expected. We are developing a new scope plane for ungoing collection. Whether or not the utilities were helpful, depended on the utility. Challenges faced included difficulty in getting data, and our initial misunderstanding of the</p>

	grantor's roll/assistance levels in that.
--	---

Community	6. Was your community collecting and analyzing energy data prior to this effort? If yes, who was doing that?
Joshua Clements (City of Whitewater)	No, data was not collected for analyzed prior to this project.
Jason Kauffeld (Green Lake County and Green Lake School District)	Yes. Our local UWEX educator (which is me filling out the survey) collected and compiled the county's energy use for the year of 2008 and presented that to the County Board.
James J. Brown (City of Kaukauna and Kaukauna Utilities)	Data was available, was not gathered and looked at as a whole.
Jerry Braatz (Waukesha County)	Yes, The Department of Public Works collected both building energy usage and fleet fuel usage data.
Tim Anderson (Polk County)	The data was being collected but not analyzed to the degree of the OEI process.
Susan McConnell (Green Lake County)	Yes. We applied for the 2009 25x25 grant. Our local STEAM Team, formed to work collaboratively in 2008 to apply for the 2009 grant was active & participating on a local basis, monthly.
Jill Weiss (City of Jefferson)	No
Jess Leinberger (E3 Coalition)	Two of our 10 communities were tracking to some degree. In both cases it was the city clerk.
Ned Noel (City of Eau Claire - Chippewa Valley Partnership)	Yes, I was and a few other people in Parks and Public Work for the City of Eau Claire. Don't know about Altoona or the County of Eau Claire.
Bryan Hoover (Lac du Flambeau Tribe of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians)	No.
Jay Moynihan (Shawano County)	The county was not. Some private and non-profit entities in our county were.

Community	7. In retrospect, would your community have changed its strategy for gathering data? In what way?
Joshua Clements (City of Whitewater)	No, I do not think so. The utilities have been great in providing data for this project. In terms of what the City can do, it would have been useful to have been collecting transportation fuel consumption in an organized way in the past; and submetering of facilities that have a variety of uses and loads would have been useful in identifying both past waste and future efficiency gains.

Jason Kauffeld (Green Lake County and Green Lake School District)	Probably not, although we would have liked MSA to spend more time on the ground in our county getting a feel for it, rather than relying completely on Internet resources.
James J. Brown (City of Kaukauna and Kaukauna Utilities)	Some of the procedures have been changed to gather the data, especially with the vehicles. Better vehicle data is now being collected.
Jerry Braatz (Waukesha County)	No, but I think we now see the value in tracking this information for our smaller buildings and other kinds of energy-consuming facilities. We are planning to install sub-meters at larger buildings so that we can break out parking lot energy consumption. This will help us track the energy savings gained from planned lighting upgrades in these areas.
Tim Anderson (Polk County)	Perhaps at the beginning of collecting the data, I may have approached department with boarder questions about their energy usage.
Susan McConnell (Green Lake County)	I think we did this right. Only thing to have done differently, was the idea to bring in more partners - the towns, the four cities, and the school districts. This was recognized to be a very big challenge.
Jill Weiss (City of Jefferson)	Yes, the fleet data should be saved longer. We are also investing in a fuel software upgrade and are hopeful this provides a better format for our data.
Jess Leinberger (E3 Coalition)	With more time we could match meter number/account number/meter address before requesting the usage from utilities.
Ned Noel (City of Eau Claire - Chippewa Valley Partnership)	I think we did it mostly right but our Xcel energy accounts all had different names so some data was missing from the initial history. We are in the process of naming all our accounts starting with the "City of Eau Claire" for more consistency as we keep track in the future.
Bryan Hoover (Lac du Flambeau Tribe of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians)	I'm not sure that we would have any other option for collecting the data other than how we did. In retrospect though, it would have been nice if we kept our energy records more centralized and organized in order to be able to gather everything internally.
Jay Moynihan (Shawano County)	Yes. If more time had been available, we would have developed a more formalized approach, which we are doing now and will do post-grant period.

Community	8. Nearly all the pilot EIC communities started this process with an idea of the projects or measures they wanted to pursue. Please tell us how your projects have changed as you have gone through this process. Are they different? More refined?
------------------	--

Joshua Clements (City of Whitewater)	I do not know that they are much different - perhaps they are greater (broader). The City has been able to refine where efficiency gains are expected and where the renewables may come from, but the broad goals of improving efficiency and cost and meeting the 25x25 goal remains. I do not think the City had a detailed project list coming into this planning process. The City was already going through a water utility upgrade, and thus had an idea concerning some of the projects there; and had also conducted some audits for the EECBG that identified some projects that could be done but were not funded. This project will hopefully allow all municipal systems to be looked at with finer detail as to where efficiency gains can be made.
Jason Kauffeld (Green Lake County and Green Lake School District)	Wind Turbines, PV, bio-diesel, and conservation methods were all top of our list to start, and are still there.
James J. Brown (City of Kaukauna and Kaukauna Utilities)	Additional conservation project have been discovered and will be incorporated into the plan. Additional renewable technologies have been investigated and may be in the overall plan.
Jerry Braatz (Waukesha County)	Additional conservation project have been discovered and will be incorporated into the plan. Additional renewable technologies have been investigated and may be in the overall plan.
Tim Anderson (Polk County)	More refined but we had an idea of what projects seemed feasible.
Susan McConnell (Green Lake County)	We have only very recently received our baseline data. I think we realize that we can be more in control of 'community' type projects - solar, bike/walk trails, etc.
Jill Weiss (City of Jefferson)	Not too different at this point but they are more refined.
Jess Leinberger (E3 Coalition)	We have tried to capture a complete picture 15 years down the line of potential energy efficiency projects covering all municipal facilities. We are making progress .
Ned Noel (City of Eau Claire - Chippewa Valley Partnership)	The projects are getting more refined and advancing to site assessments and initial payback feasibility studies. I think the County and Altoona have better ideas of more projects now than before.
Bryan Hoover (Lac du Flambeau Tribe of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians)	The projects that we are looking to pursue have been more refined as we have gone through this process. We have selected specific measures to pursue during this year. Then we plan to evaluate the success of those projects in order to us prioritize future projects.
Jay Moynihan (Shawano County)	We initially thought of the priority would be facility projects. That changed.

Community	9. Please describe how the analysis of your baseline data impacted the projects you have decided to pursue. Did the analysis reinforce or alter your ideas about projects?
Joshua Clements (City of Whitewater)	We do not yet have precise enough project data to select which projects to pursue. There were problems with the Focus on Energy facility audits, specifically projects were attributed to the incorrect building, and significant differences in FoE audit and independent third-party audit.

Jason Kauffeld (Green Lake County and Green Lake School District)	I have no input on this, as the analysis is still incomplete / has bugs, to the best of my knowledge.
James J. Brown (City of Kaukauna and Kaukauna Utilities)	The analysis of the data placed a greater emphasis on vehicle energy use. Projects involving controlling vehicle energy use received higher priority.
Jerry Braatz (Waukesha County)	The analysis reinforced our ideas about projects. It also showed us that our energy conservation efforts are feasible projects.
Tim Anderson (Polk County)	Gave us direction on what projects to pursue..enable us to make better decisions.
Susan McConnell (Green Lake County)	We have not been able to review this yet as a group - the information just came to us this past two weeks, will review at our next meeting.
Jill Weiss (City of Jefferson)	We are still working through our baseline data so it is yet to be determined.
Jess Leinberger (E3 Coalition)	People have responded most quickly to the numbers provided by baseline. It seems to motivate our energy teams.
Ned Noel (City of Eau Claire - Chippewa Valley Partnership)	Our baseline has errors that the Energy Center of WI is helping us to figure out with EPA. I cannot trust the City's baseline at this point. Too many problems. I'm not sure about the County's and Altoona's?
Bryan Hoover (Lac du Flambeau Tribe of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians)	The analysis of our baseline help us to reinforce what we already suspected about our energy loads. We have some significant inefficiencies that cause large heating and electricity loads in some of our buildings, which was prevalent in the analysis of our baseline.
Jay Moynihan (Shawano County)	We realized that intital wins would be in changing things in our fleet.

Community	10. What process did you use to generate/refine your priorities (e.g. by committee, by individuals, collaborative, etc.)? Please describe the level of debate around the priorities and how you reached agreement.
Joshua Clements (City of Whitewater)	This process has not yet occurred for our team.
Jason Kauffeld (Green Lake County and Green Lake School District)	By committee. Not much debate, and two of the committee members wish we had never gotten this grant so that has been part of the opposition.
James J. Brown (City of Kaukauna and Kaukauna Utilities)	Projects are being prioritized by Payback analysis and Life cycle cost analysis. Periodically projects should be reevaluated because costs change and priorities may change.
Jerry Braatz (Waukesha County)	We are not quite there yet. Our guiding principle is selecting projects that are realistic. As mentioned previously, without aggressive financial incentives the majority of renewable projects are not feasible.
Tim Anderson (Polk County)	Group process that is still ongoing, so far, good consensus.
Susan McConnell (Green Lake County)	Using the County as the mentor/leader is was determined to start with the county buildings as these were areas that we could control and set a process, priorities. The Green Lake School district was a very local partner that we were already working with, and had leadership that was interested in participating with us, and had a need for large building updates/upgrades that were a good fit.

Jill Weiss (City of Jefferson)	We are still working on our priorities so it is yet to be determined.
Jess Leinberger (E3 Coalition)	Energy teams coordinated/met with facility managers, public works guys, etc. These staff were key to creating a realistic 15 year plan. Most were open to thinking ahead in this way.
Ned Noel (City of Eau Claire - Chippewa Valley Partnership)	Our own in-house energy teams helped to figure the list out. We also asked other key staff and our utility and Focus experts. We hired a consultant team to help us by November 12th refine our lists down to what projects are most feasible.
Bryan Hoover (Lac du Flambeau Tribe of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians)	The process we used to prioritize was very collaborative. Initial ideas were identified through Focus on Energy audits and prior renewable energy assessments. Specific projects were then proposed to EI Team members, and then Tribal Council members for discussion, alteration, then approval.
Jay Moynihan (Shawano County)	Used facilitated discussions. Some educational presentations. Fair amount of debate. Most of debate though revolved around the question of how to fund change.

Community	11. Did your team discuss specific criteria to evaluate priorities? For example, focusing on the biggest impacts for the least effort, or what the priorities mean for the community's image, or how the priority might leverage economic development opportunities.
Joshua Clements (City of Whitewater)	This process has not yet occurred for our team. Conversation has included payback as well as visibility of project. Conversation has also focused on driving economic development, but this is difficult to quantify.
Jason Kauffeld (Green Lake County and Green Lake School District)	We discussed impact in terms of ROI and marketing / outreach visibility.
James J. Brown (City of Kaukauna and Kaukauna Utilities)	Community image was discussed and is important. Life cycle costs and payback analysis will be the main tools to prioritize projects.
Jerry Braatz (Waukesha County)	Our projects are based upon the fact that they are realistic with an acceptable pay-back period and the necessary political support. We have an economic potential for the growth and enhancement of technologies in our region. Waukesha County has the 2nd highest number of residents with bachelors degrees and professional degrees in the State. Historically, our local manufacturing base has been technology oriented.
Tim Anderson (Polk County)	No quite there yet.
Susan McConnell (Green Lake County)	Yes. All three of these areas, and how a silver LEED certified building (the new justice center) could become a showpiece within the county to demonstrate these ideals.
Jill Weiss (City of Jefferson)	Our priorities are completely based on economics. This is critical to such a plan.

Jess Leinberger (E3 Coalition)	Yes. We discussed payback period, return on investment, positive public image regarding fiscal (cost savings) and environmental responsibility.
Ned Noel (City of Eau Claire - Chippewa Valley Partnership)	Yes, biggest bang for the buck, payback, projects that dovetail or expand existing projects, projects that could be used for educational purposes or showcasing. We thought about how it could help lure green manufacturing jobs to our area and how it might work with our local tech college to advance job training in the the biofuels, geothermal, digester, green building categories.
Bryan Hoover (Lac du Flambeau Tribe of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians)	All of these criteria were used to consider and prioritize projects. For the most part, we focused on what projects gave the biggest impacts for the least effort, but other criteria were also considered.
Jay Moynihan (Shawano County)	Priority was: Related reduction in operations costs Largest impact for least input.

Community	12. Have there been other community processes or projects going on at the same time that have impacted your analysis and identification of priorities – either positively by contributing to or reinforcing your efforts or negatively by competing for time and resources? If so, what were they and how did they affect your EI planning?
Joshua Clements (City of Whitewater)	The University of Wisconsin - Whitewater has a sustainability coordinator, has completed recent building retrofits and solar pv installation, and in the past few years had wind site assessments completed. UW-W is represented on our energy team, and they have been helpful in providing expertise and learning. This has been a big positive.
Jason Kauffeld (Green Lake County and Green Lake School District)	Moving to the new LEED building has taken an immense amount of time and effort.
James J. Brown (City of Kaukauna and Kaukauna Utilities)	There are some conservation projects and some renewable projects that are in the process or have been completed. These projects are part of the process and will positively impact the apth to the goal.
Jerry Braatz (Waukesha County)	No, not really.
Tim Anderson (Polk County)	Johnson Controls has a performance contract with Polk County. Information is similar and helps refine our list futhure so we do not duplicate efforts.
Susan McConnell (Green Lake County)	A Green Lake revitalization initiative being undertaken by the City of Green Lake residents and business people where our new and old (county)buildings are located. They have made us more aware of the need, and how we can work together to get this message of 'energy independence' out to citizens throughout the county.
Jill Weiss (City of Jefferson)	We have been doing upgrades particularly for interior lighting which is positively impacting our analysis.
Jess Leinberger (E3 Coalition)	Climate Change discussions, watershed alliance, Collaborating with prestigious local cooperative business that has major sustainability mission.

Ned Noel (City of Eau Claire - Chippewa Valley Partnership)	We have participated in Excel Energy's Executive Energy Forum to learn more about the price of energy and future markets of natural gas and their deployment of wind and other renewables. We work with the EC Chamber of Commerce to develop a Green Business Initiative to help other businesses in the Chippewa Valley promote sustainability, energy efficiency and renewables.
Bryan Hoover (Lac du Flambeau Tribe of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians)	Yes. New construction is often occurring on the reservation, which obviously affects the Tribe's energy loads. Our energy efforts and commitment to renewable energy have made us focus on making sure that the new construction is done in a manner consistent with our 25x25 goals.
Jay Moynihan (Shawano County)	Some private sector projects, including methane to market stuff, and some non-profits implementing geothermal and PV

Community	13. Please describe any efforts to involve the public in setting priorities, developing potential projects, or developing strategies.
Joshua Clements (City of Whitewater)	This process has not yet occurred in our planning effort.
Jason Kauffeld (Green Lake County and Green Lake School District)	They are invited to all committee meetings.
James J. Brown (City of Kaukauna and Kaukauna Utilities)	Our committee consists of community members. Nothing has been done to educate the general public although the committee has come up with some ideas about outreach to the general public. Some of these ideas will be in the plan. Community buy-in will be important, especially if it involves additional community funds to accomplish the goals.
Jerry Braatz (Waukesha County)	We had a sustainability forum on March in Waukesha County and 62 people attended. A follow-up to this forum is being held in Waukesha on October 6th. At this forum, we talked about priorities and strategies, however, these ideas focused more comprehensively on entire community (government, businesses, and residents).
Tim Anderson (Polk County)	Energy Fair, educational events, surveys and public participation on the OEI team.
Susan McConnell (Green Lake County)	Information booth at our county fair & Harvest Celebration, inviting John Ikerd to speak to citizens at a public venue, and plans to involve kiosks at our new justice center, and school building to teach/inform residents of the value.
Jill Weiss (City of Jefferson)	We have a team and a committee. The committee has community businesses and citizens.
Jess Leinberger (E3 Coalition)	We held two public outreach events organized with local extension community development agent and a scientist at the Environmental Resource Center at UW MADISON to discuss renewable energy opportunities for creating local energy and gather feedback from the public to inform our regional energy independence plan.

Ned Noel (City of Eau Claire - Chippewa Valley Partnership)	We did not engage the public so much only from the educational end. We felt we needed to understand what projects might be feasible first and their costs before bringing them to the public. Most renewable investments need to be scrutinized heavily first if the public are going to make the upfront costs.
Bryan Hoover (Lac du Flambeau Tribe of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians)	The Tribe always maintains many opportunities for Tribal member input on our community and project development strategies. We also organize focus groups during our planning processes which help us gain public input into our plans and ideas.
Jay Moynihan (Shawano County)	Our committee included community representatives.

Community	14. Please describe the biggest challenges to the energy independence planning work you have conducted up to this point as part of this grant, and how you worked to overcome them.
Joshua Clements (City of Whitewater)	Perhaps the biggest challenge is limited staff time, for staff that is already overworked. This has not been fully overcome, our process has moved more slowly than many on the team would like. A second challenge has been to get full engagement from energy team members, an issue which is ongoing. The differences between the Focus on Energy site visit and the audits conducted by third-party assessors make estimating cost and benefit difficult; another issue which has not been resolved.
Jason Kauffeld (Green Lake County and Green Lake School District)	Tight budgets. We are exploring other funding sources / grants.
James J. Brown (City of Kaukauna and Kaukauna Utilities)	The biggest challenge was data collection. getting good data to set a benchmark. As stated earlier some additional processes have been put in place to ensure future data is accurate.
Jerry Braatz (Waukesha County)	The substantial costs and very long pay-back periods for renewable projects. This is going to take some time as new technologies develop, and greater production and competition reduces cost, thus enhancing feasibility.
Tim Anderson (Polk County)	Data collection and analysis was tedious and frustrating.
Susan McConnell (Green Lake County)	Getting buy in from some county leaders on the importance of these initiatives. Some people are simply not interested, or feel they are being 'forced' to accept the ideas of the need for conservation, and a change over to alternative fuels, and changing our energy use priorities.

Jill Weiss (City of Jefferson)	Getting our baseline data. We provided our energy in April, when it was requested because the tasks to complete seemed like a lot to have done by the end of the year. We now have our baseline in September. We are now behind and our team has somewhat lost interest as we have waited for our baseline information.
Jess Leinberger (E3 Coalition)	Biggest challenges were getting the necessary people from each municipality together to consider each facility and fleet for energy efficiency and renewable energy projects. We did a large share of the recruiting of energy team members. Everyone had many time conflicts so we organized and lead meetings in a number of these municipalities on behalf of the energy team members as well. Otherwise, there would be very little progress.
Ned Noel (City of Eau Claire - Chippewa Valley Partnership)	Staff time invovled. It's been a lot of work and other job priorities have suffered, especially as being the Chippewa Valley Partnership coordinator. We have overcome by hiring renewable energy consultants and unpaid interns.
Bryan Hoover (Lac du Flambeau Tribe of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians)	Funding is definitely our biggest obstacle. Renewable energy systems are expensive, and the Tribe makes it a priority in planning to create plans that are attainable. So developing an attainable 25x25 plan has been the biggest challenge. The Tribe has overcome this challenge by making sure that plan is dynamic and flexible.
Jay Moynihan (Shawano County)	Data gathering. A number of staffer's pitched in and it was done.

Community	15. Are there particular techniques, methods, or models that have worked or not worked for your community throughout this process? What are they?
Joshua Clements (City of Whitewater)	
Jason Kauffeld (Green Lake County and Green Lake School District)	Not yet.
James J. Brown (City of Kaukauna and Kaukauna Utilities)	We have used basic cost analysis techniques and basic energy calculation to arrive ot the numbers. There is noting unique about the calculations.
Jerry Braatz (Waukesha County)	Enhanced utilization of portfolio manager. Use of the model developed by the Energy Center of Wisconsin for additional analysis.
Tim Anderson (Polk County)	No

Susan McConnell (Green Lake County)	Nothing is standing out to me at this time. I do see a growing awareness, and questions being asked of how these things work, and what steps can be taken to become more energy efficient. Our local group seems to be becoming a little more recognized. Newspaper articles written by one of our members appear to have been read & received, and commented on.
Jill Weiss (City of Jefferson)	None known.
Jess Leinberger (E3 Coalition)	Offering educational programs on energy efficiency and renewable energy seemed to prompt projects best.
Ned Noel (City of Eau Claire - Chippewa Valley Partnership)	We didn't really need the help of our local UW-Extension office. We didn't need to meet with our utility and Focus reps. as much as we first thought. The three governments all worked very well together and have gained greater relationships ties.
Bryan Hoover (Lac du Flambeau Tribe of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians)	The Tribe uses models for planning that have been successful in the past, and these models have continued to assist in this planning process.
Jay Moynihan (Shawano County)	We found all the "Provided" tools to be pretty bumpy for a county government.

Community	16. Has the Office of Energy Independence been helpful to you in your planning? What about the Energy Center of Wisconsin? Local Government Institute? Have they provided you with the necessary tools? Please suggest improvements as you see fit.
Joshua Clements (City of Whitewater)	The Office of Energy Independence has not been as responsive as we would have liked; but we understand there is one person that is working this program and this is likely not enough for this project to reach full potential. The Energy Center of Wisconsin's model has a reasonable learning curve, but the online learning sessions, including those created independent of the EIC program, have been helpful. Other than the quarterly meeting, our team has not seen any resources from the Local Government Institute. Having a more clear picture of how these three work together would be helpful.
Jason Kauffeld (Green Lake County and Green Lake School District)	Yes to OEI. No to ECWI. Neither here nor there with LGI.
James J. Brown (City of Kaukauna and Kaukauna Utilities)	Yes some of the tools have been helpful.
Jerry Braatz (Waukesha County)	The Office of Energy Independence clearly explained the guidelines of the project. The quarterly meetings were much better this year. Better presentations and more time for communities to talk to each other. The webinars that the Energy Center of Wisconsin hosted were helpful. Follow-up from the Energy Center of Wisconsin was slow, however, follow-up was a little better than last year.
Tim Anderson (Polk County)	Need to separate the question, if you want an evaluation of each entity. Otherwise, they were both helpful in the roles that they serve. If you want to expand your roles, there are additional services that you could provide.

Susan McConnell (Green Lake County)	Yes, I believe they have. There has been good interaction & sharing of resources available.
Jill Weiss (City of Jefferson)	The Office of Energy Independence has been very helpful.
Jess Leinberger (E3 Coalition)	It was difficult to glean from OEI what specific steps would be recommended to get to create a plan that has real teeth. If the pilot municipalities could formulate a simple step-by-step process to share with the public this would be helpful. We developed one ourselves. Energy Center of Wisconsin was nearly always available (by phone) for questions and comments. I appreciated their (Sean Weitner's) responsiveness to my phonecalls. Email was not so successful. I think the webinars worked well too! I didn't really interact with LGI except at meetings because I have no idea what services they offer to our planning process. I'm sure they would be great but we would need specifics about what they would do!?
Ned Noel (City of Eau Claire - Chippewa Valley Partnership)	OEI has been great. Brian Driscoll is excellent! ECW baseline tool is sophisticated and will help us keep track of our progress. I have found Sean Weitner has been very helpful even when we have had major data problems. LGI has set up good meetings. Kevin White has done a good job with getting information out. I really haven't used the base-camp much. Good idea though.
Bryan Hoover (Lac du Flambeau Tribe of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians)	The OEI has been helpful in providing contacts and facilitating correspondence with resources that have assisted in our planning process. The Energy Center obviously helped with our data compilation and analysis. The Local Government Institute also obviously help by organizing and facilitating the meetings and communication throughout the year.
Jay Moynihan (Shawano County)	Generally speaking, they have been helpful.

Community	17. Did you find the EIC meetings in Eau Claire and Kaukauna to be helpful and informative? Please suggest means of improvement as you see fit.
Joshua Clements (City of Whitewater)	The quarterly meetings have been very helpful in learning from other communities, learning how to use the ECW tool, as well as networking and energizing with other communities from across the State.
Jason Kauffeld (Green Lake County and Green Lake School District)	They are good, but please keep each community to 5 minutes or less when they share so we can have more discussion / Q&A time. DO NOT let ECWI present again, please. That material is better covered in a how to guide.
James J. Brown (City of Kaukauna and Kaukauna Utilities)	Yes! Somewhat helpful. It is interesting to see the how the other communities are approaching the problems.
Jerry Braatz (Waukesha County)	As stated previously, the meetings were better planned out and more informative. Also, the time for communities to interact together was very helpful.
Tim Anderson (Polk County)	More time for group processes. Maybe OIE can put together a 'fact sheet' of of FAQ's particularly which measures fit within efficiencies and which measures fit within renewables.

Susan McConnell (Green Lake County)	I think so, but I do not feel qualified to answer this in much depth. Our base-line info was very long in coming, and the time is passing by very quickly when our plan needs to be completed. Better time management from those in charge of getting this data out to the communities would be better.
Jill Weiss (City of Jefferson)	They were helpful and it was good to get the communities together.
Jess Leinberger (E3 Coalition)	The Kaukauna meeting was very useful b/c we heard from each muni. on what projects they were working on. We could have used more time at the Eau Claire meeting just with pilot (2009 and 2010)communities, Sean, and Brian (and LGI?) to ask about the practicalities and specifics of the planning process. Perhaps the communities could have this time first thing at the event (over breakfast) preceding the start of the greater meeting.
Ned Noel (City of Eau Claire - Chippewa Valley Partnership)	Both were good and informative- especially the PACe in EC, but rooms could have been bigger.
Bryan Hoover (Lac du Flambeau Tribe of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians)	I did feel that these two meetings were helpful and informative. I think that if there were monthly conference calls, some of the information that was presented at the meetings could have been provided over a conference call. Which would have then provided for more time for community discussion.
Jay Moynihan (Shawano County)	Yes. Much more discussion time by attendees, less presentations. Would also suggest switching to HS video /distance learning for these, for reasons that should be obvious, given the program's purpose. :)

Community	18. What recommendations would you have for other communities interested in doing energy independence planning?
Joshua Clements (City of Whitewater)	It may be too early to suggest recommendations, having not completed our public outreach, project selection, plan writing, or implementation stages. However, I would say that working with trusted third-party engineering firms in conducting audits is crucial to getting an accurate picture of costs and benefits of potential projects. Having an inclusive team of individuals that are committed to attending the meetings and working between meetings is essential. Having a leader(s) that is able to facilitate and bring the group together is necessary for a smooth process. More case studies are needed to provide some baseline of knowledge of what projects should be looked at (from Focus on Energy, ECW, EPA/DOE, etc). Including UW Extension in some way is helpful to bring in their resources and skills.
Jason Kauffeld (Green Lake County and Green Lake School District)	Expect opposition, and develop a plan ahead of time of how to deal with it.
James J. Brown (City of Kaukauna and Kaukauna Utilities)	We hope that the plan we come up with can be altered and modified to fit other communities.
Jerry Braatz (Waukesha County)	It is a lot easier for communities with their own power utility to do energy independence planning. It is a good process. Sustainability continues to grow as a science. Universities are offering degrees in sustainability. This is a 15-year plan. Hopefully, renewable technologies will become more financially feasible over the next 5 to 10 years.

Tim Anderson (Polk County)	Be prepared for struggle to get energy data. It is worth the effort, however.
Susan McConnell (Green Lake County)	Start now!
Jill Weiss (City of Jefferson)	Get your baseline data early.
Jess Leinberger (E3 Coalition)	Get a committed, energetic energy team established early on and integrate a facilities manager or the like as well as a local representative. Then proceed with energy use gathering. Get Focus on Energy to help as well as record ongoing usage on Portfolio Manager
Ned Noel (City of Eau Claire - Chippewa Valley Partnership)	Don't use EPA's Energy Star Portfolio Manager again for transmitting data to ECW. There are too many glitches and most importantly lack of building ratings.
Bryan Hoover (Lac du Flambeau Tribe of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians)	I would recommend that other communities work to develop a good process for tracking energy data. Compiling our data was the biggest challenge, and I feel that the project would have gone much smoother if we had a good process in place for tracking our energy data
Jay Moynihan (Shawano County)	Clearly understand the amount of assistance provided by the grantor and contractors before writing your application and jumping in. Also know, it will require significant staff time.