

**UTILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
CITY HALL 8TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA 33301
MAY 26, 2009 – 6:30-9:00 P.M.**

Cumulative
January 2009 -
December 2009

<u>Committee Member</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Bunney Brennehan, Chair	P	5	0
L. Thomas Chancey	A	3	2
Chris Chiari	P	5	0
Robert Cole	A	3	2
Dr. William Goetz	P	5	0
Don Larson	P	5	0
Terri Murru	P	3	2
Raymond Parker	P	4	1
Frances Smoot	A	4	1
Fred Stresau, Vice Chair	A	4	1
Claire Vickery	A	1	4

Staff

Peter Partington, City Engineer and Staff Liaison
Robert Dunckel, Assistant City Attorney
Brigitte Chiappetta, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Guests

Lynn Shatas, FPL

Communications to City Commission

- **Motion** made by Ms. Murru, seconded by Mr. Chiari, to request that the City Commission expand the Utility Advisory Committee’s scope of responsibilities, similar to those expressed in the following mission statement, which was circulated at the May 26, 2009 UAC meeting:

“The Green Committee Mission: To identify and recommend affordable strategies and practices associated with conservation, renewable energy, and energy efficiency in order to establish the City of Fort Lauderdale as a leader in environmental sustainability.”

In a voice vote, the **motion** carried 6-0.

I. Call to Order

Chair Brenneman called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Roll was taken and it was confirmed a quorum was present.

III. Self-Introductions

Self-introductions were made by all members, Staff, and guests.

IV. Minutes of April 28, 2009

Ms. Shatas noted a correction to be made to the minutes: on p. 6, final paragraph, change “which reply” to “which required.”

Motion made by Ms. Murru, seconded by Mr. Parker, to approve the minutes of the April 28, 2009 meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** carried unanimously.

V. New Business

- **Discussion on City’s Green Committee**

Chair Brenneman advised that the City Commission had taken up this issue at their last two Conference Agendas as well as at their most recent business session. She recalled that the Mayor had concluded the Utility Advisory Committee did not wish to become a Green Committee.

The City’s Green Committee report was presented by Albert Carbon, Director of Public Services, and Kathleen Gunn, former Assistant City Manager. Chair Brenneman explained that this report described the City’s environmental initiatives over the past year and longer, and had little to do with a Green Committee as it was discussed at the City Commission meetings.

Mr. Partington clarified that the City’s Green Committee is a Staff committee, which has been in existence approximately six months. He also noted that the idea of a Green Committee has been left for Director Carbon, in conjunction with City Commissioner Romney Rogers, to formulate a proposal for the scope and constitution of such a committee, as well as a mission statement.

Motion made by Ms. Murru that the UAC should formally suggest that they are willing to accept the creation of a Green Subcommittee, which would take up the listed items as identified by Mr. Carbon and work with the Staff Green Committee, in lieu of the creation of a separate Committee at the City's expense.

Mr. Chiari seconded the **motion**, noting that the mission of the proposed new committee seems very specific, solely focused on renewable energy, efficiency, and energy conservation. He felt this was a misunderstanding of the original intent of the environmental community, who had intended to include land preservation, marine and land animal protection, and energy. He recalled that the UAC had felt they were the proper committee to deal with energy issues; this message, however, did not seem to be reflected in the prospective Green Committee's focus.

Ms. Murru related that she had received phone calls from concerned citizens who informed her that the City Commission had "already voted" to form a Green Committee. Due to the financial constraints currently faced by the City, she found this "deeply disturbing," and emailed all the City Commissioners to express her concerns with fiscal responsibility and "overlap." She felt the UAC should remain focused on energy issues, and that Parks and Recreation or the Marine Advisory Board, similarly, would deal with those aspects in which they had the most expertise. She concluded that, as the prospective Green Committee seemed to have a particular focus on energy, the City would be best served to designate them as a subcommittee of the UAC.

Mr. Chiari agreed that the creation of such a subcommittee would be "a step in the right direction," and asked if the Committee felt there was room for four more members to join and become the "body" of a Green Subcommittee.

Chair Brenneman pointed out that when the UAC was originally created, their Charter allowed for 15 members, so they had some room for expansion.

Mr. Parker asked if a separate Green Committee has already been established. Ms. Murru added that she did not entirely understand this either. Chair Brenneman explained her understanding was the City Commission had "voted to create one," but it had not yet been funded.

Mr. Partington did not believe there had been a definite vote to create such a committee, but had instead asked Commissioner Rogers and Director Carbon to bring a recommendation to them on this issue. He circulated a copy of the PowerPoint presentation shown at the most recent City Commission Conference Agenda by Director Carbon and Ms. Dunn.

Mr. Chiari asked Mr. Partington for his recommendation on how the UAC should proceed, and whether he felt there was a “natural fit” for some of the prospective Green Committee’s concerns as a subcommittee of the UAC.

Mr. Partington stated that he and Director Carbon planned to meet with City Commissioner Rogers to discuss how to proceed with the prospective committee – for instance, how to establish such a committee and what its structure would be. Once these had been determined, City Commissioner Rogers would carry this information and a recommendation back to the City Commission at large. He reminded the Committee, however, that they may communicate directly to the City Commission through the “Communications to City Commission” section on the first page of the meeting minutes.

Dr. Goetz felt the City would want a Green Committee to deal with the preservation of natural resources in addition to energy or, specifically, utilities. He agreed that the UAC deals with “90%” of the stated concerns of such a committee, but felt the scope of a Green Committee would reflect a “tremendous expansion” of the work done by the Utility Advisory Committee, and therefore a good deal more work.

Chair Brenneman pointed out that there had been a change from the original intent of the UAC, as created in 2000, and the 2003 purpose statement of this committee. She explained that the original statement specifically omitted the phrase “utilities other than water”; however, in 2003, this phrase was added to the statement.

Ms. Murru stated that the UAC is facing a rare opportunity to address the issue of whether or not FPL’s franchise agreement should be renewed, and time spent discussing other actions draws their focus away from this opportunity. She also did not feel it is fiscally responsible for a Green Committee to be developed at the City’s cost when the UAC can absorb most of its concerns into a subcommittee. She emphasized that she would like to “put this to rest” and move on to the UAC’s work on the issue of franchise renewal.

Dr. Goetz felt the City intends to address a wider scope of issues through the use of the term “conservation” than utilities alone; for example, he believed “water management” referred to considerations outside the scope of utilities alone. Ms. Murru expressed concern with this outlook, as she did not feel such concerns were “the job of government.”

Dr. Goetz continued that the UAC might rename itself, or change its scope, in order to make it more encompassing; this would prevent the necessity of creating a new committee, and would allow the City Commission to add new members who were more interested in conservation issues than utilities. This would, in

effect, expand the UAC into a Green Committee, and perhaps this body could have a Utility Subcommittee.

Ms. Murru felt the UAC has a wide selection of members who are knowledgeable about the content they discuss; all that would be needed were further “content people,” who have expertise in LEED certification, preservation, or other concerns. She felt the fact that the UAC has only 11 members when they may have 15 means they are “already positioned” to take on additional issues as an advisory body and still maintain a core focus on utilities.

Mr. Parker stated that he was opposed to expanding the Committee’s scope, at least until franchise renewal is behind them.

Ms. Murru noted that franchise renewal could be concluded within six months, although Assistant City Attorney Dunckel pointed out that it does not have to be completed within that time frame, as an existing franchise may be extended while the parties are still negotiating.

Mr. Chiari felt some of the alternative and/or renewable energy ideas could be left out of a franchise renewal discussion if the UAC does not take steps toward a Green Subcommittee. He was hopeful that the City’s residents could find a way to work with FPL so that utility could make a profit and please its shareholders, but still allow the City to become “the face of energy alternatives.” He felt Fort Lauderdale should not have another 30-year agreement that does not allow for flexibility toward renewable energy, and green initiatives in energy production should be on the table “immediately.”

Assistant City Attorney Dunckel clarified that while he had stated there is case law that allows a franchise agreement to continue while the parties negotiate, he did not wish this to be seen as any sort of signal that the City did not intend to complete negotiations within an appropriate time frame.

He added that there is no mandate stating that a franchise agreement must be set for 30 years, pointing out that while this is the maximum time allowed for a franchise agreement, periods less than 30 years are also allowed.

Chair Brenneman advised that she had sent an email to City Commissioners, suggesting that if a vote was held to make the UAC a Green Committee, they might consider changing the name to the Utility and Sustainability Advisory Committee. She also indicated that it could be unnecessary to add the further financial burden of a new committee to the City, as the UAC had held three Energy Round Tables and two Green Expos, and had a good deal of expertise in this area.

Mr. Parker reminded the Committee that they are under contract with Power Services to arrive at the answers for the franchise agreement, and they should not lose their focus as a committee or they would "be sorry for it."

Mr. Larson noted that he had not received any information from Power Services that they could be working on or going over regarding the franchise agreement. He expressed concern that bringing in the greater scope of work of a Green Committee would take the UAC further away from the major concerns of power, infrastructure, and new methods of energy.

Chair Brenneman reiterated that the Committee has held Energy Round Tables and Green Expos, and has gradually moved closer to green initiatives over time. Mr. Larson felt the Committee's focus is primarily on utilities and power lines, and if they moved into other areas, it would diffuse these points of interest. He advocated that a Green Committee should remain a separate body from the UAC.

Ms. Murru reminded the Committee that they are not charged with making a decision about the upcoming franchise renewal, but act in an advisory capacity only and "are not here to do the work of City employees." She felt the issue of renewal is at the core of everything the UAC does, although at times it does get "pushed to the back." She asserted that even if the UAC expanded to take on issues of sustainability, these would not become the focus of the Committee; a Green Subcommittee would report to the UAC at large, as the Tree Subcommittee does.

She added that if such a subcommittee is added but does not work, they can always ask that this charge be removed from the UAC.

Mr. Chiari asked when Power Services is expected to provide the Committee with their written report. Chair Brenneman replied that this is 120 days from the time that the report was presented to the Committee, which was in March.

Mr. Chiari asked if this provides sufficient time for the returned information to be "digested by elected officials," and felt after conversations were held with these officials regarding franchise renewal, the City would "see a new relationship" with FPL; in any case, he felt a renewal would most likely not be for more than 10-15 years. He felt the UAC could miss a chance to "re-shape" the City from a green perspective, and getting lost in other concerns would take away from that mission.

Ms. Murru reiterated that the Committee should not be making a decision about renewal until they have all the facts; their top priority is to make informed choices. She advised that they take on the Green Committee as a subcommittee, and if it does not work, they could ask the City Commission to "take it back."

Mr. Partington stated for clarification that the UAC is interested in considering green issues as they relate to utilities, and that a City Commissioner will be making a recommendation shortly regarding a Green Committee; with this in mind, he felt this is "an appropriate time" for the UAC to send a message, through Mr. Partington, to the City Commissioner and the individual Commissioner regarding how they see the role of the UAC as relates to green issues or a Green Committee.

Mr. Larson pointed out that in focusing on what the UAC is charged to do, there are two schools of thought: one interested in "taking over" the grid from FPL and one that feels this may not or should not happen. He felt the Committee has already shown that it is interested in working together with utility providers such as FPL. They are, therefore, in a position to be a strong Committee and "get...things done" should the City elect to keep the franchise. He felt they would need to "pick and choose" among all green issues, suggesting that should the FPL franchise be renewed, the UAC should look into how wind, solar, or other alternative forms of power would figure into the agreement. He did not feel the UAC should consider taking on too many of what he felt would be "minor [green] issues."

Chair Brenneman pointed out that the UAC has dealt with some of the minor issues in the past, with invited guests from Public Works and Public Services; they have also dealt with recycling and landfill concerns.

Ms. Murru reminded the Committee that even if the City opted to municipalize, the UAC itself would not be involved in where alternative energies are placed or what is done with them: that would be a "high-powered" committee all of its own. If the City does not choose to municipalize, the UAC will still not have a say in these issues, as FPL is a "for-profit entity" that makes decisions, while the Committee may make only recommendations.

She continued that she wished to send a "strong motion" back with Mr. Partington that the UAC is able to accept a Green Subcommittee, and reiterated that no one will be expected to take on new levels of expertise in order to support such a subcommittee. They will only be asked to make a "judgment decision" on a report by a Green Subcommittee.

Mr. Chiari asked if the UAC could define "green" as they had before: as concerning matters specific to energy production and conservation. He was not comfortable accepting the definition as stated in Director Carbon's report, as this includes mention of land conservation, recycling, and other non-energy-related issues that belong in "other existing committees."

It was also noted that water would be included in the UAC's purview, as it is considered a utility.

Mr. Parker asked if the City created a Green Committee, would the UAC still be interested in expanding its scope.

Mr. Partington pointed out that he was not sure the City has voted definitively in favor of a Green Committee, although they have "put the process in place" by asking an individual Commissioner to come back to them with recommendations on how to set up such a committee. He advised that if the UAC wishes to have a say in the final outcome of this process, they are having this debate at an appropriate time.

Dr. Goetz asked if reference to a subcommittee could be omitted from the original **motion**. Ms. Murru did not feel a unanimous vote would be possible if this was done; she added that she felt a unanimous vote by the UAC would make any message carried on their behalf by Mr. Partington a stronger one.

Dr. Goetz felt establishing a subcommittee only for green concerns would not be politically wise; he proposed taking this reference out and having the UAC take on the "conservation aspect," which he felt they could reasonably handle.

Mr. Chiari reiterated that he approves of a subcommittee as long as it is limited to utility-specific green initiatives. Mr. Partington noted, however, that imposing this condition on such a subcommittee will make it a less "all-encompassing" body than the City Commission wishes to see. Mr. Chiari stated again that he did not wish the UAC's focus to be diluted, but at the same time did not have issues with their taking on greater responsibility, as long as it fits into the Committee's mission.

Chair Brenneman pointed out that in the Committee's years of existence, when they have had "lighter" Agendas, issues have come along to focus them, and when they have been very busy, this seems to "even out." Ms. Murru noted that they are currently in a quieter period while waiting for Power Services to issue their report, and this allows them to spend time discussing issues such as the Green Committee or subcommittee.

Chair Brenneman stated that she wished the discussion to move forward, and felt the Committee should take the advice of its Liaison and send a message through him to the City Commission; she also felt they should accept his offer to carry forward their message to the meeting between Mr. Partington, Director Carbon, and Commissioner Rogers. She concluded that she wished the UAC to vote on the issue at hand.

Chair Brenneman added that she wished to send a strong statement “that is unambiguous.”

Mr. Partington advised that the previous vote was on taking on green issues as they relate to utilities; should this motion pass, he felt it would be a different message. He agreed with Ms. Murru’s wish to have as many Committee members as possible vote in favor of this motion.

Ms. Murru pointed out that she had felt last month’s vote had been clear: that the UAC would accept green issues as they relate to utilities. However, now that they can see the proposal of issues for a prospective Green Committee, she noted that energy efficiency and resource conservation clearly relate to work on utilities. Save the references to recycling and waste, she asserted, “everything” falls under the UAC’s purview.

Mr. Partington emphasized that this would need to be “clearly communicated” to the City Commission, and he would do his best. He clarified that a Green Subcommittee would take on the role of a Green Committee, and would consist of interested UAC members.

Ms. Murru agreed, and stated that she felt this would have the unanimous support of the City Commission, as it would mean they did not have to create a new committee.

Dr. Goetz did not believe the City Commission would like to see green issues “relegated to the level of a subcommittee.” He felt if the UAC created a Sustainability Action Plan from the prospective Green Committee’s mission statement, they could properly emphasize various environmental issues and create subcommittee(s) if necessary; in his opinion, this would be more likely to be approved by the City Commission than a subcommittee alone.

Mr. Chiari proposed that the UAC’s action would be preemptive: they would take on the role of a Green Committee, and then adopt some of its specifics into appropriate subcommittees.

Chair Brenneman noted that in the beginning, the UAC could send issues to the Infrastructure Subcommittee, such as substations, poles, wires, and others. This is a practice that has “worked out well,” she observed.

Assistant City Attorney Dunckel reminded the Committee that there is a new City Commission, and he felt that a subcommittee would not be received “with the same enthusiasm” as the prospective Green Committee. He pointed out that by nature, a subcommittee is subordinate to another advisory committee, and City Commissioners might not wish a larger committee to “filter” issues or information coming to them from a subcommittee.

He pointed out, however, that the UAC's taking on environmental issues would be "more palatable" to the City Commission, as it would leave open the possibility for later creation of a subcommittee to specialize in a particular area. He added that the UAC's primary responsibility at this time is the franchise agreement, and if the entire Committee takes on green issues, they still control their own agenda and may prioritize issues while the franchise agreement is still under discussion.

Mr. Larson recognized that there are two different ways the Committee may respond, and proposed to Mr. Partington that he choose one of the two options and take it to his meeting with Director Carbon and Commissioner Rogers for further discussion.

Mr. Chiari stated he felt the UAC should become the Green Committee, or the Utility and Sustainability Committee, and take on the responsibilities discussed in the mission statement. He emphasized that this was the intent of the previous month's vote, which was sent to the City Commission, and suggested that the UAC draft a new mission statement to reflect their absorption of green issues as part of their work.

Ms. Murru stated she would be "happy to change" her original motion to reflect this, but requested a point of clarification: she preferred that they become the Utility and Green Sustainability Advisory Committee, rather than become the "Green Committee."

The **motion** and **second** were withdrawn. Ms. Murru altered the wording of the original **motion** to include changing the UAC's name.

Mr. Partington pointed out that the amended **motion** "sounds very similar" to the motion made the previous month. If they wished to discourage the creation of a new committee, and to take on the majority of the issues a Green Committee might have, he recommended that the **motion** be further amended. The UAC discussed further revisions to the **motion**.

Assistant City Attorney Dunckel advised that the UAC does not have the authority to expand its scope: they are instead requesting that the City Commission make this expansion. He felt this request should be included in the motion.

Motion made by Ms. Murru, seconded by Mr. Chiari, to request that the City Commission expand the Utility Advisory Committee's scope of responsibilities, similar to those expressed in the following mission statement, which was circulated at the May 26, 2009 UAC meeting:

“The Green Committee Mission: To identify and recommend affordable strategies and practices associated with conservation, renewable energy, and energy efficiency in order to establish the City of Fort Lauderdale as a leader in environmental sustainability.”

In a voice vote, the **motion** carried 6-0.

Mr. Partington stated he would communicate this motion to Director Carbon and Commissioner Rogers; he added that it should also appear in “Communications to City Commission” at the beginning of the minutes. The Committee agreed by consensus to do this.

- **Agenda Discussion: Items Requested by Member**

- 1. Development and prioritizing of a list of questions from all committee members for consultants.**

Chair Brenneman noted that these Items were placed on the Agenda at the request of Dr. Goetz, who has also shared his thoughts on these issues with the Committee via email.

Dr. Goetz stated that he had looked at several studies, including previous information provided by Power Services and some presented by Public Works. He felt it would be helpful to consolidate all the information available in the various disparate documents, as it could be “vital” in the decision of whether or not to underground or municipalize, as well as whether or not to extend the franchise agreement with FPL.

He proposed that this could be done in a number of ways: a list of questions could be sent to Power Services from individual members, for example. Dr. Goetz emphasized that the point is to ensure that the UAC gets back explicit information that will be valuable to them.

Ms. Murru did not feel it would be appropriate to send questions from different people, and noted that many of the items on the prospective list had already been requested at an earlier time, and were actually part of the RFP. She added that the UAC would receive a detailed report as well as a shorter executive summary.

Chair Brenneman added that there had now been three RFPs. She continued that Dr. Goetz’s points about “expanding the scope” were well taken; however, the Committee had had as much input as possible, and the scope of work was still determined at the City Staff level.

Dr. Goetz was “not convinced” that sufficient information has been shared in the responses to questions. He suggested that the UAC present Power Services with their questions and ask them to expand upon their responses as part of their report.

Ms. Murru pointed out that a consultant would provide this information, but would most likely do so at an additional fee. Mr. Partington agreed that this would occur.

Mr. Partington noted that some of the questions Dr. Goetz had submitted to the consultants resulted in their supplying him with material. He asked how much more extensive Dr. Goetz felt the new questions would be, considering that he had been supplied with materials.

Dr. Goetz explained that he was unsure what information would be included in Power Services’ report that was relevant to the questions he had asked. In studying their prior reports, he felt most of these questions might be covered, but believed there were others that would help the Committee pinpoint items that could prove useful in negotiating with FPL, such as questions regarding the cost of outages.

Mr. Partington referred to the back of the Agenda package, which contains the scope of Power Services’ tasks. He observed that should any member wish to send him additional questions, he would pass these along to the consultants, but he cautioned that their response could state that some of the questions are beyond their scope of work.

Mr. Chiari stated that another important fact to keep in mind is that municipalization does not come up until the 3rd part of Power Services’ RFP. He felt it would be “questionable” whether they would be able to complete this phase of their report by October 31, 2009.

Mr. Partington pointed out that Power Services’ contract is only for Phase 1, which is comprised of recommendations on what the UAC should be looking for in a new franchise agreement. Phase 2 would contain strategies, not specifically related to the franchise agreement, to bring about undergrounding.

Mr. Chiari added that the goal of the study was to look into undergrounding and the best way to carry this out; municipalization, he asserted, was proposed as a means of getting to undergrounding. He noted as well that the City Commission had never requested a report on municipalization as an alternative to renewal of the franchise agreement, as only Phase 1 had been funded thus far.

Ms. Murru and Dr. Goetz disagreed. Ms. Murru felt the scope of work contains “precursors” to information on municipalization. Mr. Parker clarified that it

contains information that would bring the Committee to a decision as to whether or not they wish to consider municipalization; he confirmed as well that there is “a price” in going on to Phase 2.

Mr. Partington emphasized that the former City Commission, upon viewing the initial scope of work for the RFP, did specifically address municipalization, although they noted that this did not necessarily mean they would take that step. This is why the scope was changed.

Ms. Murru asserted that it is untrue that the City cannot seriously consider alternatives to renewing the franchise agreement. She stated that there are “creative” ways to finance municipalization that are being studied, although the City is currently in a budget crisis, and did not feel the Committee should let that misconception affect their decision on whether or not to renew the franchise agreement.

Dr. Goetz noted that there are City funds in reserve. He agreed with Ms. Murru that the present financial situation should not affect the Committee’s deliberations regarding franchise renewal.

Mr. Partington stated that what will happen is the City will negotiate with FPL; if they are not satisfied with the results of these negotiations, they will look into other possibilities that are open to them. Ms. Murru added that the factual information the Committee has requested will help them make a more informed decision.

Chair Brenneman directed the discussion to move on to Item 2.

2. Advising new commission to reorder scope of work of the consultants.

Dr. Goetz explained that he wished to ask questions that would encourage Power Services to include as much information as possible, or at least to respond to questions in a “brief statement.”

Mr. Parker commented that this Item is about “reordering” the scope of work, which he felt could not be done because it is “too late.”

Dr. Goetz disagreed, as he felt in order to answer the “final question of the franchise agreement,” Power Services should include responses to all his suggestions for reordering the scope of work.

Mr. Chiari pointed out, however, that it has not yet been proposed to the City Commission to fund the next Phase. He suggested the UAC ask itself “if this order was done on purpose,” which, he felt, might be worth consideration, as

some aspects could be considered “political football[s].” He added that outside the Committee, he had heard “no urgency” in the issue of franchise renewal, and moving on into Phase 2 remains contingent on the City Commission’s willingness to spend the funds.

Dr. Goetz felt they could not change the scope of work at this point; the important thing, he asserted, is that the consultant answer everything they need to know to reach a final decision. He added that he had assumed money would be put forward for the next phase.

Mr. Chiari believed the Committee should be prepared for the next phase to not be funded, and cautioned again that all signs from City staff seem to be pointing toward a renewal of the franchise agreement. He encouraged the UAC to “shift focus” on getting the best possible renewal contract rather than becoming distracted by municipalization.

Chair Brenneman stated that there are two budget hearings scheduled in the month of September 2009, as well as a vote by the City Commission on the final budget (also in September). Mr. Chiari noted that this is considerably less than 120 days before the renewal date; Chair Brenneman added that the City Commission does not meet in the month of October.

Dr. Goetz commented that he had attempted to phrase his questions regarding municipalization in such a way that Power Services would only include them in their report if they felt the questions raised viable alternatives.

Mr. Chiari noted that Power Services had not discussed municipalization outright at their presentation, but had raised other types of franchise agreements or stipulations that were included in them at other locations. He felt the information would, in the end, compare Fort Lauderdale to other cities, with suggestions on what they could do that may or may not include alternative distribution models.

Mr. Parker recommended continuing to send questions through Mr. Partington.

Mr. Partington stated he hoped Dr. Goetz would provide him with further questions, which he would submit to the consultant; Power Services then had the option of answering some, but not all, of the questions, should they feel some went beyond their scope of work.

Chair Brenneman moved the discussion on to Item 3.

- 3. Creation of subcommittee to research and advise UAC on spending relevant to the mission of the committee of stimulus money received by City, and to apply for stimulus money and other grants on behalf of the City to further that mission.**

Mr. Larson asked if City Staff has a Department that deals exclusively in seeking and writing grants for the City. Mr. Partington and Chair Brenneman confirmed this; Mr. Larson then asked if the UAC made a recommendation to the City Commission, the application for a grant would go to this Department.

Dr. Goetz expressed concern that, given the “competing demands” such a Department would face, they would address the grants the Committee felt were important on a timely basis.

He continued that the City has been allocated over \$2 million in recovery funds and grants, and the deadline for applying for these “as a lump sum” is coming up in June. After this time, there are 120 days in which to present specific programs the Committee would like to be funded.

Instead of creating a subcommittee, Dr. Goetz suggested one such study could focus on the use of solar or wind energy to power specific municipal buildings in times of outages. This proposal, if successful, could also be extended to include private homes and businesses, he stated.

Ms. Murru recalled a Federal regulation that states alternative energies may not be used to “protect” municipal outages; they may be a secondary source of power, but a generator must be available as the first emergency source. Ms. Shatas explained that this is because alternative energies provide an “intermittent source of power,” and 100% backup is required for these sites.

Dr. Goetz noted that this study had been conducted in Montana using fire stations, and the idea was positively received.

Ms. Murru pointed out that grant writing is an expensive process, and ideally the provider should be the entity that looks for alternative energy sources and cost efficiency. She continued that these alternative sources are often provided by a for-profit entity such as FPL, as it lowers fuel and other costs for them.

Chair Brenneman referred the Committee to a handout provided by Mr. Partington, which had been prepared by Director Carbon and Ms. Gunn. The last five pages, which comprised a section called “What’s Next,” addressed many of the items covered in Dr. Goetz’s third point. It also includes prospective actions for the Green Committee, which, Chair Brenneman reminded the Committee, they have already adopted per the earlier motion. These items for consideration include wind turbines, solar roof retrofits, and LED lighting in specific areas.

Dr. Goetz stated that these were only “recommended programs” and a number of the items to which he was referring were “much more specific.” Chair Brenneman agreed, as the list was only an overall list.

Dr. Goetz went on that it was not possible that stimulus funding could cover all the initiatives listed. He noted as well that economic incentives may be developed that would encourage the public, as well as businesses, to install programs of this nature.

Ms. Murru reiterated that there is a cost to be reckoned with when applying for grant money, which should be evaluated before the first RFP is written. Mr. Larson agreed, and added that at times a good deal of money is spent without receiving the grant.

Chair Brenneman also pointed out that many competitive grants require matching funds, which means the applicant must have a matching source lined up.

Dr. Goetz observed that the \$2 million available to the Committee is not a matching grant; should the UAC choose to go after it, specific proposals and grants must be written.

Mr. Partington advised that Ms. Gunn, who writes the City's grants, is already seeking "every possible opportunity" for these, particularly due to the current budget situation. Regarding Dr. Goetz's suggestion regarding funds the City has already been allocated, Mr. Partington read the Committee an email from member Bob Cole, at Mr. Cole's earlier request. Mr. Cole felt "the intent is good," but that a great deal of fact-finding needs to be done before attempting some of the proposed initiatives, such as the use of solar power, which, he explained, cannot be used without a backup source of power. He also stated that FPL has "the largest wind farm in the world" and suggested the Committee speak with their experts on the topic.

Mr. Larson added that there have been two cases before the Board of Adjustment regarding wind power, and pointed out that there are several questionable or negative factors involved, such as noise, birds flying into the turbines, and height.

Mr. Parker advised that there are similar considerations involving solar power, such as the fact that 500 sq. ft. of solar cells are required to create five kilowatts of power; the cost of such an installation is roughly \$40,000 although government initiatives lower this to \$8000. The savings are approximately \$100/month, which means 80 months would go by before these expenses break even.

Ms. Shatas offered to bring a representative from FPL to the Committee's June 2009 meeting to discuss alternative energy sources, including solar, wind, and tidal power, as well as net metering.

Mr. Parker departed the meeting at this time (8:41 p.m.).

Assistant City Attorney Dunckel noted that he and Vice Chair Stresau have invested a great deal of time in gathering information from various sources regarding wind power and wind turbines; Mr. Larson added that the neighborhoods in which the two cases he had mentioned were located had to be taken into consideration as well.

Mr. Chiari confirmed that a State law prohibits the restriction of wind turbines unless it specifically violates Code, such as with noise or height.

Chair Brenneman proposed a presentation on wind power in June or July 2009. Mr. Larson suggested that it might be sufficiently covered by FPL's presentation alone.

- **Other New Business**

Mr. Larson advised that he had attended a meeting regarding work on A1A from Oakland Park to Lauderdale By the Sea, which proposed to create two lanes only, north and south. He suggested that this might be an appropriate time to discuss undergrounding part of this stretch of roadway.

Mr. Partington pointed out that this is not a funded project, and it would most likely be 18 months to two years before the Committee needed to consider making such a recommendation.

VI. Unfinished Business

- **Update on Power Outage**

Ms. Shatas recalled that she had asked for addresses affected by the power outages discussed at the April 2009 meeting, but did not receive one address. From the information available, she noted that one major feeder had been out in the west side of town, as well as five laterals in some of the neighborhoods that had been reportedly affected. These were caused by an underground failure; a weather-related issue; and a palm tree.

She continued that on March 17 and 18, 2009, torrential rains had been reported, and the dust and salt spray that had settled on the lines during the previous dry spell had most likely caused the outages. She pointed out that transmission lines are regularly sprayed to prevent salt buildup.

She requested that if outages are experienced and the reason why is not known, members could contact her directly via email.

Mr. Chiari asked if more details were available regarding the underground failure at the Holy Cross substation. Ms. Shatas responded that it was a transformer issue; as the Holy Cross substation is located on the hospital grounds, and is hardened, she noted that the hospital is usually one of the first locations to regain power.

She recalled a mention of Broward General Hospital during the FPL presentation at the April 2009 meeting, and advised that this was because their facilities are underground. The last hospital remaining to be hardened is Kindred Hospital, she noted, which is scheduled to be done this year.

VII. Good of the Committee

It was reiterated that the motion on which the Committee had voted would be placed on the front page of the minutes, under "Communications to City Commission." It would also be sent to Mr. Partington via email to take to the City Commission, as well as to the meeting with Director Carbon and Commissioner Rogers.

VIII. Announcements

- Tree Subcommittee Meeting: Thursday, June 11, 2009, 3:00-4:00 p.m.
- UAC Next Regular Meeting: Tuesday, June 23, 2009, 6:30 p.m.

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

[Minutes prepared by K. McGuire, Prototype, Inc.]