

Commissioner Nielsen

Comfortable with direction in conjunction with reduction of regulated emissions

Ideal plan combines

- Economics
- Affordability
- Environment

Delay only 1-3 years

Conservation = cultural + individual

Peer review:

- Post design review
- Neutral party to select reviewers
- +/- 1 yr

"Not your grandmothers coal plant"

Biomass – 50%

Need comprehensive analysis of local supply including economic and environmental impacts

Use Green House Gas Fund to "seed" alternate energy technology, funding should be recurring

GRU to eliminate P.V. connection charges

1

Commissioner Bryant

Affordability
Conservation
Environment

Biomass – 30 MW too low
Goal: 50 MW

Supports independent peer review

Conservation - future needs cannot be met but we can do *more*
Encourage top 100 customers to conserve
Provide data and feedback to top 100

2

Commissioner Chestnut

Concerned about impacts on low income
Weatherization
Late bill fees

Low income federal assistance administered by Community Action Agency
Audit of project share

Rebates – Do they help low income homeowners?

How can we better assist low income customers?

*Most important – Can the least advantaged population afford utility bills?

Rental units + weatherization
Implement energy audits
\$6,500 on weatherization = 26 families

3

Commissioner Braddy

Chronology:
Consideration for over 1 year - not a hasty decision

Prior direction:
Rates affordable
Responsible stewards of environment
Healthy general fund transfer

Community meetings throughout Gainesville
Commission meeting with citizen input
Reports internal + external
Peer review of other cities/ utilities
C. Commission will adopt all conservation + renewables that meet R.I.M.

Biomass – flexibility

Renewable goal – highest in state

Move forward because:

Off ramps
New ideas can be added
(Waive P.V. hook up fees is a recommendation)
Independent peer review

4

Commissioner Domenech

GEAC advisory board recommendation for initiation 1/25/05 of plan

Potential off ramps

Facts / baseline data for commission agreement – workshop

GRU bond rating 9/2000 – top 99%

Impacts General Government bond rating

5

Commissioner Lowe

Conservation

More than plan rates vs. bill

RIM test may not be optimal

Increase rates reduce use with conservation

Fuel mix – over 90% coal with plan

Coal

Price

Regulations (future)

CO2

Transportation

Locally produced energy

Jobs / Economy

Coal mining

Gas wells

Forestry

Funding – external

D.O.E.

Conservation locally

-Local jobs

Solar / P.V. in long term

Green house gas fund vs. elimination of green house gases when generated

C.F. B. technology evaluation – alternatives

-need level 230 MW

Energy strategy + evaluation of community values

6

Mayor Hanrahan

Good plan
Reduces all but one pollutant
Keeps jobs local

Is there a better option?

Also – incentives impact new construction
Solar hot water heating
Change way financed

Alternatives
Fuel costs vs. capital costs. Fuel markets

Observations:

Current rate structures
Business partners discount – 10 yrs vs.
customers and impoverished citizens

Panel:
RFP, resumes
Pay for time and travel

(continued next page)

7

Mayor Hanrahan

(Continued)

Review of proposal
Suggest alternative
Compatible
Cost
Emissions
Truck Traffic

Biomass-
Carbon Neutral
Local economy
Transportation of wood with trucks

Natural Gas
Timing – 2-3 years to construct
Capacity – smaller

Stable solution

Prefers panel to review prior to design – cost
concern

Real experts with broad utility experience
3-5 members

8