

070896

Williams, Sharon D.

From: Andrew, Devonia L.
Sent: Tuesday, February 05, 2008 8:50 AM
To: Lannon, Kurt M.
Cc: Williams, Sharon D.; Braddy, Edward B.
Subject: FW: Council prepared comments before the City Commission of Gainesville

Good Morning,

This is the back-up from Mr. Cunilio.

Thank you.

Devonia

From: tom cunilio [mailto:t.cosaf@cox.net]
Sent: Monday, February 04, 2008 5:29 PM
To: Andrew, Devonia L.
Cc: don post; john chamberlain; chris etherton; Conrad Craig (Conrad Tree Service); Gaston Levin (Wood Resource Recovery); Terry Zinn
Subject: Council prepared comments before the City Commission of Gainesville

Ms. Andrew - I am glad that Commissioner Braddy will schedule a brief presentation that I will make on behalf of the FL Renewable RC&D Council at the next City Commission Meeting on Feb 11th in the evening session.

My prepared comments will consist of the following historical/policy observations:

1. The RC&D Council thanks the City Commission for the recent Letter of Support in its Application for Recognition to the USDA to represent the five counties. Our Mission Statement is "We represent the practical solutions to serve the clean water and renewable energy needs of our fellow citizens through conservation and alternatives to fossil fuels in balancing creation's care."

Solar Energy in the form of highly photosynthetically active plant species is only one form of energy this City needs. There is a kind of spiritual energy inherent in our form of government and which respects the will of the majority. This City Commission has become a strong advocate for woody biomass renewable energy as witnessed in the recent RFPs from our utility staff and we applaud especially the two commissioners who will be leaving for learning as much as they have. We applaud only half-heartedly the staff's recent work with the scoring of proposals but must fault the political process for putting staff on the line to perform.

2. In 2003, when staff began its Strategic Planning Process, our Chairman, Don Post led an effort to quickly inventory the waste wood within a 25-mile radius of Deerhaven. This expert work was not done with GPS tools, USDA inventories or a large budget. The results that Don Post produced in his "Biomass Options for GRU - Part II" report were that there was and certainly still is enough waste-wood alone to power a 60 MW plant sustainably. Dr. Matthew Langholtz, PI of the recent 2007 School study, has stated that the Post numbers are essentially valid and unchanged after more than 4 years.

3. The RC&D Council has been organizing a woody biomass supply group since 2004 to assist the City-owned utility. We offered GRU in a Letter of Interest in Dec. 2006 over 800,000 tons of mainly waste wood from 20 potential suppliers.

3. Our assumption has been that the residents of the City and the CC believe that waste wood from urban forestry and from logging residues can easily compete with coal and if harvested responsibly and followed by replanting

2/5/2008

will even reduce the cost of electricity from fossil fuels in the future. Adding value in this way to pulp-wood production has the potential to keep forestry activities sustainable for the next 100 years or more.

4. It is not evident that all the CC members understand this historical record.

5. It is the Council's position that all Commissioners can and should attempt to understand the following essential points in this discussion:

a. The Council has no favorite responder in the RFP process although it did submit a Letter of Support to Mr. Lanier Edwards of Timberland Harvester based on

two visits made by TH to meet Council members. We understand the TH has filed a protest to the City Utility. The CC should be aware of this protest.

b. In that Letter of Support, TH agreed to accept the very foundational assumptions the CC has been listening to for 3 years from us on this subject which were:

i. The woody biomass will be purchased on a MMBtu basis. This is a position acknowledged as acceptable by Strategic Planning's Ed Regan.

ii. A CHP design using waste heat must be given serious consideration.

iii. The wood ash will be returned to the forested land from which it came in order to recycle nutrients.

iv. A minimum of 25% of the processed fuel wood can be sent by rail by the supply group.

It is our position also that a pure woody biomass plant is the only way to achieve point "iii" above. As well, there are negative costs for commercial timber growers involved in recovering a site after pulpwood harvest.

It is also our position that the drier the wood coming into the plant the higher the heating value the plant will contain and the lower the quantity of water transported.

Finally, to accomplish what we have assumed to be the unstated policy the present CC has taken toward woody biomass, we are engaging the world's largest manufacturer of forestry biomass to demo a piece of equipment which bundles the logging debris left after harvest, dries it on site before transportation to a processing site. Logging residues and urban tree debris represent 75% of the woody biomass supply described by the School.

These comments are being reviewed by the Executive Committee of the Council for approval before the Feb. 11th CC meeting. Changes may be suggested by these individuals in which case a postponement would be in order.

Sincerely,
Tom Cunilio, Coordinator
FL renewable RC&D Council
386-418-0381