



## STATE OF MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Public Utilities Commission Docket 12-1344

### **CEUD Privacy Workgroup**

April 18, 2014

10:00 am – 12:00 (noon)

### **Meeting Minutes**

The working group convened on Friday, March 21, 2014 at 10:00 a.m. and covered the following topics as drawn from the agenda. Facilitator ALJ Tammy Pust opened the meeting and addressed administrative issues, moving on to public comment invitation.

#### **Public Comment**

None.

#### **Update on Commission Direction**

ALJ Pust informed the workgroup of the Commission's interest in the workgroup report being filed with the Commission by July. She provided a handout that answered other questions regarding the report and its timing.

#### **Report on Subgroup Discussion in Light of Direction**

Some workgroup members stated they were not part of the Risk Mitigation Study Scope document submitted by e-mail to the workgroup on 4/14/2014 and would not necessarily agree with all points.

#### **Review of Revised Use Case Matrix 4.9.14**

ALJ Pust explained the changes to the revised use case matrix; in particular, government agencies were listed together. She asked whether anyone had a concern with separating government and non-government requestors separately. Discussion followed on how different government agencies have different levels of authority; however, there was agreement that government requestors in general shared authority not available to non-government requestors. One member also raised the issue that some non-government requestors are contracted with a government agency; for example, they may receive a grant to perform research. The representative of the Department of Commerce noted that in the case of government grants, each contract varies and has different rules. In general, however, no workgroup member opposed putting government requestors into one category and non-government requestors into a separate

category. ALJ Pust again asked if anyone had any changes to the matrix aside from items 3-8 in column 1 being collapsed. No member had further changes.

### **Review Utility Information re Data Availability**

As to the second matrix which includes data availability from utilities, ALJ Pust asked for input. The City of Minneapolis representative questioned the portions of the matrix saying utilities could not provide city-wide data. Utilities responded that some of them can, depending on service area; however, the compilation is a manual process and continuously needs manual updating due to new construction and other changes. Other utilities noted that their records are maintained by meter; while each meter has an address associated with it, compiling the reverse (meters by address) is manual and takes time. The City representative noted that Xcel is working on a DOE project and supported additional investment in IT and infrastructure to make this data gathering an automated process.

### **Discussion of Mitigation Alternatives for 7 Non-Governmental Use Cases**

The City of Minneapolis representative provided a handout and suggested that the Census Bureau could be a good model for aggregation and other mitigation measures. According to the Minneapolis representative, following a discussion with staff at the Census Bureau's Center for Disclosure Avoidance Research, "...in most cases an aggregation threshold of three individuals, households or businesses provides a reasonable level of protection against re-identification." Therefore, the Minneapolis representative suggested an aggregation level of 4, with no single customer making up more than 80% of the data in that geographic area. The Minneapolis representative also suggested a document or form showing who the data requestor is, and that data would be released once a year, perhaps through a single database maintained by a state agency.

ALJ Pust requested input on the 3 proposals made thus far (Xcel's 15/15, the Large Power Intervenor's 5MW or opt out proposal, and the Minneapolis proposal):

- The Department of Commerce stated that whatever proposal was selected needed to be supportable.
- The OAG stated that a low aggregation level such as 4 then raises the issue of customer consent; it would not be an undue burden on a data requestor to gain consent of 4 customers.
- The two electric cooperatives preferred 15/15 but might be open to an aggregation level of 4 if customers received advance notice and the choice to opt out.
- The four representatives of third party organizations seeking customer data all supported an aggregation level of 4 but did not state whether they supported or opposed an opt out provision or customer consent.
- Xcel supported the 15/15 standard, stating it was the only standard of the 3 that was approved by a state commission. Xcel also stated that advance customer notice and opt out may be a challenge administratively and financially for a large utility.
- Minnesota Power stated it was not prepared to weigh in but cautioned it had questions about an aggregation level of 4.
- The Large Power Intervenor supported their own proposal of a 5 MW exemption or customer opt out for data requests.

(OTP and IPL have not provided input on these issues.)

Following the input by each workgroup member, there was discussion about who had the burden of proof to resolve the issue of risk (workgroup members representing customers, or those requesting data release), and whether kWh usage by itself could measure compliance toward state energy goals, particularly for business customers who might have various ways of increasing energy efficiency aside from simple kWh reductions.

### **Discussion of Cost Recovery and Reporting Considerations**

Deferred to May workgroup meeting.

### **Planning for Next Meeting**

ALJ Pust requested comments on issues raised in this meeting to be provided by May 5. Judge Pust also asked for questions or concerns on the process document provided regarding the timing and process of the workgroup report drafting. No one raised concerns or questions.

### **Workgroup members appearing in person at 4.18.2014 meeting:**

Drew Moratzka  
Jessica Burdette  
Steve Kismohr  
Ian Dobson  
Sheri Brezinka  
Alison Lindberg  
Ryan Hentges  
Brendon Slotterback  
Jody Londo  
Megan Hertzler  
Nick Mark  
Kevin Marquardt  
Jenna Warmuth  
Michael Hoy  
Bridget McLaughlin  
Vince Chavez  
Andrew Quirk  
Susan Medhaug  
Todd Ells

The meeting ended at noon.

**This document can be made available in alternative formats (e.g., large print or audio) by calling 651-296-0406 (voice). Persons with hearing loss or speech disabilities may call us through their preferred Telecommunications Relay Service.**