

**UTILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE  
CITY HALL 8<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM  
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE  
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA 33301  
JULY 28, 2009 – 6:30 P.M.**

Cumulative  
January 2009 -  
December 2009

<b><u>Committee Member</u></b>	<b><u>Attendance</u></b>	<b><u>Present</u></b>	<b><u>Absent</u></b>
Bunney Brenneman, Chair	P	7	0
Maria Canady	P	1	0
L. Thomas Chancey	P	5	2
Chris Chiari	P	7	0
Robert Cole	P	5	2
Dr. William Goetz	P	7	0
Don Larson	P	7	0
Dr. Magdalene Lewis	A	0	2
Terri Murru	P	5	2
Raymond Parker [8:47 p.m. departed]	P	6	1
Frances Smoot	P	6	1
Fred Stresau, Vice Chair	P	5	2
Claire Vickery [7:20 p.m. arrived]	P	3	4
Jay Weiss [9:06 p.m. departed]	P	2	0

**Staff**

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

**Guests**

Lynn Shatas, FPL  
Buck Martinez, FPL

**Communications to City Commission**

None at this time.

**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 June 23, 2009 Meeting**

**Motion** made by Mr. Chiari, seconded by Ms. Murru, to approve the minutes of the June 23, 2009 meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** carried unanimously.

## **V. New Business**

- **Update on Sustainability “Green” Committee**

Mr. Partington explained that it is his understanding that the City Commission decided to put in place a stand-alone Green Committee. This was done in principle at the first Commission meeting in July. Mr. Partington does not believe any members have been appointed to that Committee, nor is he aware of the appointment of any staff liaison to that Committee.

Mr. Chiari asked Mr. Partington how the Commission would like the UAC to address the “green” issues currently handled by this Committee, and whether it was decided when this Committee should stop working on its “green” issues. Mr. Partington said that he did not believe the Commission formulated any such advice at this time; however, they were aware of this Committee’s desire with regard to the Green Committee. They did not give any definitive advice or where to draw a separating line.

Dr. Goetz advised that there will be 11 members on the Green Committee, two appointed by each Commissioner and the Mayor, and one by consensus. These individuals would include one environmental attorney, one environmental educator, one environmental scientist/engineer/architect, one professional environmental business practices, and one member from the marine industry.

Chair Brenneman expressed thanks to Vice Chair for this information that the Commission meeting is now available on streaming video online at the City’s website as well as archived for viewing on the City’s website.

Vice Chair Stresau asked if the Commission said anything about a person being appointed to the Committee that was LEED certified. Dr. Goetz said that one member would need to have the equivalent of LEED certification.

Vice Chair Stresau said that it is important that a member have LEED certification and not just the equivalent.

- **Update from the Tree Subcommittee Meeting**

Vice Chair Stresau announced that the December 4, 2008 Minutes and June 11, 2009 Minutes had been approved at the last Tree Subcommittee Meeting. There were two topics of discussion:

- 1) Development of Tree Planting Display Boards. Vice Chair Stresau stated that the Subcommittee was having a difficult time making progress on these boards.
- 2) Review of the Methods of Enforcing Tree Planting and Trimming. Mr. Chancey, Chair Brenneman and Mr. Stresau joined FPL's Vegetation Manager, who has raised the issue of being alerted when trees on a particular property are being cared for by a professional arborist, and to determine how they are to convey such information to the clearing crews. There was also discussion as to recognizing that FPL is having a difficult time having trees trimmed on private property that are interfering with the overhead power lines. Currently, the only trees and/or vegetation that FPL can clear legally are the ones that are in the right-of-way or in a utility easement. It has been suggested that this be discussed with the Building Department, Landscaping Department and Code Enforcement, as it may be a health-safety issue which would give the City some authority to enforce individual property owners maintaining their trees that FPL was unable to reach. Vice Chair Stresau said that this would be the main topic of discussion at the next Subcommittee meeting on Thursday, August 13, 2009. Vice Chair Stresau is hopeful that this will help resolve the issue surrounding trees on private property.

Mr. Chancey related a case where the individuals would not allow FPL to go through their property to reach the rear yard. In that case, Mr. Chancey went there and directed their work. This worked to the satisfaction of both FPL and the homeowner. He explained that there are cases where FPL cannot physically reach the easement. Mr. Dunckel stated that the law implies an easement of necessity to get to such an easement. While it may be pragmatically difficult and it may not be the politically correct thing to do, Mr. Dunckel voiced that FPL

would have the lawful authority to do so. Mr. Chancey is hopeful that there can be cooperation among people in order to get things done.

Vice Chair Stresau asked Lynn Shatas of FPL to check with Mr. Jollimore to determine how often the line clearing crews and vegetation management actually run into difficulties with homeowners where they cannot access the trees that need to be trimmed. He questioned whether it would be worthwhile to put more "teeth" in the ordinance. Ms. Shatas said that she would get this information to Mr. Dunckel, so that he can address this at the August 13, 2009 Tree Subcommittee Meeting.

Vice Chair Stresau said there were some 200 homeowners in the City of Fort Lauderdale that were having their trees professionally trimmed. Mr. Jollimore of FPL is developing some language that would be submitted to the individual property owner to fill out, which would explain their responsibilities and, in actuality their liability, if they do not continue to maintain the trees within the parameters set by FPL and OSHA.

Vice Chair Stresau noted that there was an interesting discussion two meetings ago about FPL developing a GIS system. FPL is supposed to be meeting with Mr. Partington, his Liaison and the City's GIS Department to go over the maps that would indicate where these properties are actually located. These maps would then be reviewed with the City's Tree Trimming crews to make sure that everyone had the same understanding. Vice Chair Stresau believes the maps that GIS has been using are more detailed than those of Ms. Shatas.

For the benefit of the newest UAC members, Mr. Chancey explained the impetus for the initial formation of the Utility Advisory Committee. He stated that this Committee is trying to accomplish the City having natural trees controlled in a manner of arboricultural research that shows appreciation for tree biology, so trees can be kept away from power lines for safety and power control, but not look like a hurricane just came through the neighborhood and visually ruined the trees.

Chair Brenneman added that the previous City Commission gave the Tree Subcommittee the mission of increasing the tree canopy of the City of Fort Lauderdale. A report was presented by Mr. Dempsey and Mr. Thornburg which indicated that the tree canopy had gone from 50-something% to 14% following Hurricane Wilma. Thereafter, the Tree Subcommittee was charged with educating residents and increasing the tree canopy in the City of Fort Lauderdale.

Chair Brenneman stated that the Tree Subcommittee produced a brochure called "Homeowners and Trees" which is specific to those species recommended for our City. In addition, this Subcommittee has worked with the City's Urban Forrester, Gene Dempsey, as part of a tree giveaway program. Previously, in order to receive a free tree, a resident had to show identification and promise to plant it in their right-of-way. Now, it is permitted to plant the tree anywhere on the homeowner's property.

- **Meeting Future Energy Needs in Florida Presentation**

Chair Brenneman introduced Buck Martinez from FPL, who advised that he is in the renewable energy business for FPL in the State of Florida. Mr. Martinez stated that FPL is really two companies: (1) the largest utility in the State of Florida, with 4-1/2 million customers; and (2) Nexterra, who was formerly FPL Energy, has more than 16,000 megawatts in operation outside of the State of Florida in 26 states and in Canada. In comparison, FPL has approximately 22,000 megawatts in Florida and is one of the largest in the country, which includes the nuclear plants, gas plants, oil plants, etc.

Mr. Martinez advised that Nexterra is the largest renewable energy company in the United States, having invested \$10 Billion in wind in addition to solar, gas and hydro.

Thereupon, Mr. Martinez gave a PowerPoint Presentation.

Mr. Chiari asked what percentage of Nexterra's 16,000 megawatts were from renewable energy, and Mr. Martinez estimated it at about 70%, consisting mostly of solar and wind energy. The renewable energy includes their investment of approximately \$10 Billion in wind; they own the largest solar project in the world at 310 megawatts located in the Mojave Desert; gas operations in California, Texas, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey and Pennsylvania; along with a number of hydro stations in Maine.

Mr. Martinez continued with the PowerPoint Presentation.

Mr. Martinez advised that FPL is building the largest solar photovoltaic project in the nation, consisting of 25 megawatts, in Desoto, Florida. The first field will be energized in September. These projects require no cooling water, produce no emissions and require no air currents. In addition, this project has employed 400 people.

Another project in the Space Coast, Mr. Martinez explained, consists of 10 megawatts, which will be connected to the FPL grid. FPL is building NASA their own one megawatt facility behind the Kennedy Space Center which will be net

metered into NASA's grid. It is believed this will be up and running in the first quarter of 2010.

Mr. Martinez advised that at the State level, FPL does not have permission to go forward with any solar projects. The Governor of the State of Florida is pushing to have 20% of all the energy coming from FPL to be renewable by 2020.

Mr. Martinez explained that the Governor encouraged FPL to put a wind project in Florida. There is not a lot of wind resource in Florida, one of only two potential locations being St. Lucie. However, the local commission rejected this proposal for public lands. It is proposed that this project will be built solely on FPL property.

[Claire Vickery arrived at 7:20 p.m.]

Dr. Goetz asked whether liquid natural gas and nuclear energy are considered renewable resources, and Mr. Martinez advised that they are not. Mr. Martinez stated that the Public Service Commission hired a company called Navigan to perform a resource assessment on how many renewable energy sources existed. It was determined that solar is really the issue in Florida. A tremendous resource, Mr. Martinez said, is ocean currents and FAU is working on that. FPL is very optimistic, as ocean currents would not be an intermittent source, as is solar and wind.

Mr. Martinez advised that until the university systems find a way to store wind and solar power, there is a real challenge trying to provide everyone with firm capacity. The firm capacity comes from the nuclear, coal, fossil, and hopefully one day ocean.

Mr. Martinez stated that FPL just submitted its 10-year plan, and there are no plans to build any additional fossil fuel plants in the State of Florida.

Mr. Chiari asked if FPL has maintained and continually been able to add capacity to Turkey Point. Mr. Martinez responded that only as to the upgrade and that there will be two new generation facilities going in. To keep this in perspective, said Mr. Martinez, China is putting in one coal plant a week into operation, basically putting in one nuclear a year into China. The French have 70 to 80% of their total country in nuclear, and Spain and Germany are also very nuclear. Mr. Martinez stated that the United States have been lagging in this area. The industry has done a poor job of dealing with storage, in that there really is no place to store nuclear waste. Mr. Martinez explained that the waste is being stored on-site in containers underground.

Mr. Martinez said that FPL uses a company called Wind Logics that tracks all the wind for every City, County and State, whose records go back 100 years. FPL is trying to figure out better ways to use the land so that retention ponds will be used at 7%, rather than at 30%.

Once completed, Ms. Vickery asked, how would FPL distribute solar to the less populous areas? Mr. Martinez responded that it would go right into the FPL grid and the electrons go wherever they need to go. He explained that the issue with solar is not the capital up-front cost, it is that you are paying a tremendous amount of cost and only getting 20% of the power.

Mr. Chancey asked for a comparison of the technology being used in China with that used here. Mr. Martinez responded that we are getting the most output of anyone right now by using sun power for our modules which are tracker systems, which track the sun all day. Therefore, we are getting a 24% capacity factor versus that of China, which is 18%. Mr. Martinez explained that while China may corner the market, they do not have any regulation for disposal and the product is very toxic.

Mr. Martinez advised that there are a number of companies today that are eager to put their manufacturing here in Florida, which will bring jobs, economic development for research and development. FPL has been speaking with every university within the State of Florida, and they have indicated that they would put an applied learning facility in each facility. Currently, everyone is waiting to see what happens with legislation.

Mr. Chiari asked if FPL has incorporated parallel inverters within the solar panels, or is all the power coming through one centralized inverter. Mr. Martinez said that the inverters used for the most part are 250 kilowatts, so that every field is isolated to 5 megawatts. Since FPL started this 9 months ago, Sadcom, a leader in inverter companies, has already introduced a 1 megawatt inverter.

Vice Chair Stresau asked what water retention has to do in the process. Mr. Martinez explained that because South Florida Water Management District basically controls water run-off, FPL must prepare for the storm of the century. Therefore, those ponds are for water run-off. Mr. Martinez advised that there is no water storage capacity underneath the cells, responding to Vice Chair Stresau.

Mr. Martinez continued to present the PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Chiari asked if conservation was in the purview of FPL. Mr. Martinez responded that FPL is the leader in energy conservation. The challenge of FPL

to be the preferred utility provider, he said, is to make sure that the same certainty that exists today, exists in the future with intermittent power. He went on to state various ways in which FPL is involved with wildlife conservation within the State.

Mr. Martinez expressed that FPL needs everyone in the State of Florida to push for renewable energy.

Mr. Chiari asked as the three major solar projects currently under production in Florida are a direct result of legislative action, what percentage of the 110 megawatts being built is being financed by public dollars versus dollars contributed by the State. Mr. Martinez responded that there are no funds being contributed by the State. FPL's mission is to keep these costs as low as possible. Therefore, for every dollar that was spent, Mr. Martinez has to testify that it was the best option and FPL must ensure the viability of the product. He explained that everything has to be bid out.

Mr. Martinez stated that one of the issues that differentiate Florida from California is that California's energy is very expensive at about 28 to 29 cents, with Florida at 12 cents. California introduced solar at over 30 cents. When Florida introduced solar energy, it was at about 19 cents. While 19 cents is still very low compared with everywhere else in the country, it is still 7 cents more than what is being paid today for energy in Florida. FPL's challenge will be to drive solar energy to 12 cents.

Dr. Goetz inquired whether the Martin County plant going to be photovoltaic, solar thermal or thermal. Mr. Martinez responded that it is all solar thermal. Dr. Goetz asked if renewable energy is 2% of the output, how FPL will reach 20%, and what could be built to generate that much. Mr. Martinez said that FPL is ready to build three 200 megawatt facilities.

Mr. Partington asked Mr. Martinez if FPL has an understanding of the relative economics of solar thermal against photovoltaic. Mr. Martinez replied that they do, but not in Florida. Mr. Partington then asked if they were still experimenting. Mr. Martinez advised that the largest utility scale project in the United States is at the Nellis Air Force base, being 13 megawatts of photovoltaic. However, the largest solar thermal is 310 megawatts which is in the desert.

Mr. Chiari asked when Mr. Martinez' team was formed and how big it is. Mr. Martinez explained that they have a very small team of five people which was formed about 1-1/2 years ago. One of the five people is focused solely on nuclear energy.

Mr. Chiari asked what FPL and Nexterra each own. Mr. Martinez explained that Nexterra cannot conduct business in Florida. Florida Power and Light cannot conduct business outside of the State of Florida. Mr. Martinez advised that the RPS is a State RPS and that FPL does not get cost recovery out of the State of Florida. He went on to clarify that outside of the State of Florida, Nexterra owns about \$10 million of renewable energy. FPL owns zero renewable energy, but buys 2% from the waste burners. If the legislation goes forward, the utility would have to generate 20% of all 22,000 megawatts or more from renewable energy.

Mr. Chiari then asked about carbon sequestering using biological catalysts for the production of fuel, and whether FPL was exploring that at all. Mr. Martinez said that FPL was not looking into this. He further explained that it his obligation to the Commission that he be cognizant of every other technology before he can recommend a project to them.

Mr. Weiss asked why natural gas was not the solution, as it appeared to be very prevalent and very clean. Mr. Martinez claimed that the perception is that it will run out, and that it did not seem prudent to have all their "eggs" in one technology. He then asked why perhaps coal was not the answer, as it seems to be the most plentiful fossil fuel. Mr. Martinez said that the government is not encouraging new clean coal technology to be put into service. He suggested that unless you allow the new technology to replace the old technology, you will never get clean coal.

Mr. Martinez advised that there are 26 states now that have a renewable portfolio standard, whereby there are 26 totally different strategies, but yet only one U.S. grid where all the power is being transmitted. Therefore, there is state-by-state definition of renewable portfolios and energy policies with one common carrier, which is the U.S. Government. Mr. Martinez suggested that the costs that are paid by the consumer in Florida are very, very cheap, so why mess with something that works.

Ms. Vickery asked if there would be a slight decrease in energy costs from FPL in the next three years. Mr. Martinez said that FPL's O and M has not increased since 1985. FPL must keep the cost down. The frustration is when a hurricane such as Wilma or Jean hit, the entire system had to be reconstructed, which costs money. He suggested taking a look at FPL's energy price versus health care versus automotive versus legal fees. The best plan is fuel diversity.

Ms. Vickery asked if FPL is successful and they get all these projects built and they are successful plans, can rates actually decrease? Mr. Martinez said it

depends, because FPL has no control over the price of commodities, which have all been outsourced to China, India and Pakistan.

Dr. Goetz asked if FPL has a policy as to buying back energy from consumers who install solar panels. Mr. Martinez said there were State policies, not FPL policies, whereby the consumer can put up to 2 megawatts net metered and FPL would have to buy back the differential between your usage and the 2 megawatts. Mr. Stresau said that this seemed simple, if you could get people to install solar panels, FPL would buy them, and the percentage would go up and FPL wouldn't have any investment.

Mr. Martinez assured the Committee that every possible question will be asked by the Public Service Commission, which consists of five Commissioners and hundreds of staffers.

Ms. Shatas stated that there are already more than 400 customers that are on net metering. Anyone interested in looking into doing net metering can go to [www.fpl.com/netmetering](http://www.fpl.com/netmetering) to get information.

Chair Brenneman thanked Mr. Martinez for his presentation, stating that this Committee had been seeking this information for months. She also expressed that in seven years of presentations, this was the best to have come before this Committee.

- **Other New Business**

None.

## **VI. Unfinished Business**

Ms. Shatas recounted that she had been asked to find out the cost of the storm damage when FPL in 2006 went to the Public Service Commission for the storm securitization request. She advised that FPL requested \$1.7 Billion, but only received \$1.1 Billion. This was based on bonds to recover the costs from the storm damage and for storm reserve.

Ms. Shatas further advised that the storm damage for the 2005 hurricanes was \$736 Million, and the amount requested for the 2004 storms was \$199 Million. FPL asked for \$650 Million for storm reserves, but only received \$200 Million.

Ms. Shatas recalled that Dr. Goetz mentioned Florida as having the third largest number of outages in the country. She explained that utilities report outages differently. She referenced "SAIDI," an acronym for System Average Interruption

Duration Index. For 2008, the average length of outages for the year was 126 minutes for the nation; for FPL service territory, it was 67 minutes; and for Fort Lauderdale it was 64 minutes. Therefore, FPL did better than the national average by 47%.

In responding to Dr. Goetz' inquiries, Ms. Shatas explained that she was not able to get all the information in great detail because not everyone reports in the same way.

Dr. Goetz expressed that it was the number of outages per 100,000 miles of lines. Ms. Shatas said that she was not able to get that information as it was based on Florida and not everyone reports it the same way. Dr. Goetz asked how far back the data is kept, and Ms. Shatas indicated that she did not know.

Mr. Chiari recalled that he had also asked Ms. Shatas to find out the amount of FPL's recoveries in the hurricane years from their insurance claims. He felt it seemed that FPL received close to 60% or better in each of the years by passing the costs onto the consumers to recover the damage on a system that should have been hard. Ms. Shatas answered that it is basically storm reserve, which is recoverable from the customers. FPL is self-insured as they cannot get insurance.

Dr. Goetz asked what percentage FPL passes onto the consumer for storm restoration costs. Ms. Shatas advised that she does not know the percentage, but that the amount recovered was the approved amount, plus \$736 Million toward the 2005 damage, \$199 Million for the 2004 damage. That averages out in the customer's bills just under \$2.00.

Dr. Goetz inquired as to the total storm restoration costs. Ms. Shatas responded that FPL requested \$1.7 Billion, which included the additional request for the storm reserve. For 2005, FPL received \$736 Million; in 2004, FPL received \$199 Million; and for storm reserves, FPL received \$200 Million. Mr. Martinez stated that the difference was made up by a reduction in O and M expenses of the utility.

Mr. Stresau asked of the \$1.7 Billion requested by FPL, how much was upgrades and how much would be just replacing what was blown down. Ms. Shatas recalled that in 2006, FPL went to the Public Service Commission to request the Storm Secure to look at hardening the facility. This involved checking all of the poles in the service territory, which was 1.1 million poles. This also included checking AT&T's poles as well. This was done over an eight year period. The feeders are trimmed every three years and the laterals trimmed every six years. All of this had to go before the Public Service Commission.

Dr. Goetz asked if FPL reports financials like FPL group does. He also inquired as to the net income of FPL Florida. Mr. Martinez responded that they were down \$4 Million. He also stated that approximately 27% of customers are delinquent on their payment schedules.

Chair Brenneman indicated that she did attend on the Committee's behalf both the Fort Lauderdale and Plantation FPL rate increase hearings.

Chair Brenneman explained that the Power Services report came out after the UAC's Agenda was prepared.

Mr. Chiari recalled that one of the biggest parts of the discussion of the request for a rate increase had to do with the percentage rate of return on the capital investment of FPL. He asked Ms. Shatas how firm the number was that was used to value FPL's capital assets. He explained that in this Committee's discussions over the years in determining whether municipalization was an option, the range for the value of the infrastructure in Fort Lauderdale seemed to have had a \$50 Million to \$100 Million swing. Because this is such a large range, Mr. Chiari asked Ms. Shatas which number FPL uses when looking for the rate of return as a percentage basis, and how fixed is that number.

Mr. Martinez stated that if one looked at the annual reports in the utility reports, FPL's greater average cost and that it is a firm price.

Mr. Chiari asked if it were possible to create a weight average cost of capital for the infrastructure in the City of Fort Lauderdale, and that it probably has never been divided because it has never been asked, to which Mr. Martinez agreed. Mr. Chiari asked to know that number, relative to the City of Fort Lauderdale as a separate entity. Mr. Martinez expressed that he did not know if this could be done, as it is done as a consolidated average capital, since FPL does not finance by city or county, but as an entity.

Mr. Partington asked Mr. Martinez to define the term "weighted average cost of capital." Mr. Martinez explained that it is FPL's capital cost of finance. For example, when getting a loan, it is the amount of money that an individual would pay; FPL would have to do it through a number of different financing throughout the term of the year.

Mr. Partington asked how this would affect the range and the value of the infrastructure. Mr. Martinez responded that there are two issues: (1) the amount of money that FPL is allowed to earn under capital costs and (2) the amount of FPL's discount rate -- the amount of money that FPL spends to finance its

projects. He felt that the issue before the public is how much money should FPL be allowed to earn on its investment. In essence, Mr. Martinez said, it is the amount of money that FPL feels it needs to have people invest in the utility as a solid stock.

Mr. Larson passed out copies of the Galt Mile newsletter, which contained an article by Eric Berkowitz, for review of the Committee.

Referring to Power Service's report, Dr. Goetz commented that Power Services estimated the cost to underground the remaining lines in Fort Lauderdale to be somewhere in excess of \$300 Million. This comes out to be approximately a \$4,600 cost to each customer. He noted that the report states the cost per person to the economy for outages is \$112 per person, per day, which was estimated by the Department of Homeland Security. Dr. Goetz expressed that this cost is the hidden cost which does not include restoration costs. Therefore, by dividing the \$112 per day into the \$4,600, the consumer would recover that cost in about 40 days without electricity.

Also in the report, Dr. Goetz stated, FPL suggests that the average customer would recoup their money within 4 years. By multiplying the amount of customers by the number of days without electricity, times \$112, the result is in the area of \$30 Billion in hidden costs from the outages over 10 years. This is in FPL's entire area, not exclusive to Fort Lauderdale. Mr. Dunckel stated that he did not believe the City of Fort Lauderdale has seen anything that approaches that.

[Mr. Parker departed at 8:47 p.m.]

Mr. Partington expressed that he did not believe all the facts and figures as reported by Dr. Goetz were easily apparent from the Power Services report. As such, there was a supplemental question and answer between Dr. Goetz and Power Services. Mr. Partington stated that the undergrounding cost would be \$4,563, when divided by all customers would be \$6,913 per customer, actually converted. Mr. Partington explained that Power Services is saying in their report that the hidden costs of outages quickly defrayed both of those numbers.

Vice Chair Stresau asked if Power Services make a point to suggest that there will always be power if you have undergrounding? Mr. Partington responded that they did not specifically make that point, but they did not claim it was 100% robust.

Dr. Goetz stated that the \$112 did not include restoration costs or anything the customers pay in taxes, which also has to get passed through. He asserted that

it is not known what percentage of outages would be prevented by undergrounding. He said that the addition of the hidden costs drastically changes the economics of undergrounding, and, to his knowledge, these hidden costs have never been used in analysis before. Dr. Goetz feels this is something for the Committee to consider in that it dramatically exceeds the actual monetary cost of undergrounding.

Mr. Cole stated that he did not see in the report the cost for easements, which will be necessary for transformers, switch gears, etc. Mr. Dunckel offered that they may have been placed in the rights-of-way and not in easements.

Chair Brenneman voiced that overall the selection committee in the City that selected the responder and did the ranking for the RFP in this first phase did a sensational job. Chair Brenneman advised that she was very pleased with the report and believed it was an excellent job.

Dr. Goetz asked if the Commission approved the next phases, and Mr. Partington explained that staff has informed the Commission by memo as to the cost of the subsequent phases. Thus far, Mr. Partington noted that he has had no feedback from any of the Commissioners on how they are viewing that. Mr. Partington advised that the cost is in the area of \$150,000 to \$200,000.

Mr. Stresau suggested that the Commission should establish a reasonable percentage of the City's new Green Committee to be LEED certified. It is Mr. Stresau's suggestion that it be 30%. Chair Brenneman noted that for this to be included in "Communications to the Commission," it must be in the form of a motion and the majority of this Committee would need to be in favor of such motion.

Mr. Partington voiced that LEED certification is a relatively new qualification. For example, his own staff has only been taking the test for the last few months. He believed there may be no more than 30 people within the City that are LEED certified. Therefore, it may be overly optimistic to expect to get 30% on the first round of committee members. Mr. Stresau suggested that the people that are certified should be "chomping at the bit" to be on that Committee.

**Motion** by Mr. Stresau, seconded by Ms. Smoot, to recommend that the Commission strive to achieve 30% of the panel of the Green Committee be LEED certified.

Mr. Cole stated that he feels this to be too high and he himself is not LEED certified. He opined that one LEED certified person on the Committee should be sufficient.

Mr. Chiari suggested that Mr. Stresau amend his motion to recommend to the Commission that the goal would be to have at least one person with LEED certification, as he would support such a motion.

**Amended Motion** by Mr. Stresau to recommend that the Commission appoint at least one member, with a goal to have 30% of its members, be LEED certified on the Green Committee.

Chair Brenneman notes that the amended motion dies for lack of a second.

Dr. Goetz said that he believes 30% to be too high and that until the real scope of the Committee is known and how important LEED certification would be to the Committee, it would be inappropriate for this Committee to suggest that.

Mr. Cole maintained that he believed 30% to be excessive, but one person to be LEED certified would be appropriate.

[Mr. Weiss departed 9:06 p.m.]

Vice Chair Stresau asked if the Commission must appoint residents of the City of Fort Lauderdale to the Green Committee, since he just read as to the Budget Advisory Committee that it does not require being a resident to be appointed. Chair Brenneman stated that some of the resolutions of Boards and Committees specify that you must be a resident and some do not. Mr. Chiari recalls reading that it is a requirement of the Green Committee that the members be residents of the City of Fort Lauderdale.

Vice Chair Stresau indicated that he brings this up because the Commission could appoint someone qualified to the Green Committee that is not a resident, as there are a lot of people that are qualified which can be pulled in as outside experts. In addition, he advised that he is serving his 28<sup>th</sup> year on the Planning and Zoning Board and had requested the new Commissioners appoint an architect to the Planning and Zoning Board. As to the three positions that had become available, Vice Chair Stresau said, the Commission ignored his request and there currently is not an architect on that Board. He claimed to be the only person on that Board that is remotely qualified to read plans, which is upsetting to him, especially since the Charter required an architect serve on the Board. Vice Chair Stresau expressed concern that the Green Committee will be a political appointment wherein people that are not qualified to make decisions appropriate to that Committee will become appointed. As such, he felt there should be a certain percentage of that Committee that should be LEED certified.

Dr. Goetz confirmed that it does state that one must be a citizen of the City of Fort Lauderdale to serve on the Green Committee. Vice Chair Stresau expressed concern that the Committee will consist of a group of lay people that are “do-gooders” as opposed to people that are highly qualified in this area.

Mr. Chiari read that “one member shall be a professional in the environmental business practice, such as construction and product development, and has certification equivalent to LEED.” He said that he could be very supportive of a motion if this Committee asked that at least one member in addition to the requirement that someone in the industry who has the equivalent to, and one member that absolutely has LEED certification.

Chair Brenneman asked that the original **Motion** by Vice Chair Stresau and seconded by Ms. Smoot be called. The Motion is stated here again in its entirety as follows:

**Motion** by Mr. Stresau, seconded by Ms. Smoot, to recommend that the Commission strive to achieve 30% of the panel of the Green Committee be LEED certified. Upon voice vote the motion was denied (3-8). [Brenneman, Canady, Chiari, Cole, Goetz, Larson, Murru, Vickery dissenting]

Chair Brenneman announced that the motion fails.

## **VII. Communications to the Commission**

None.

## **VIII. Good of the Committee**

Mr. Chiari expressed that he has had the privilege of serving in several levels in government in Broward County. It is his intention of attending one more meeting of the Utility Advisory Committee, however, he will be submitting a letter of resignation in the very near future. Unfortunately, Mr. Chiari explained, there are circumstances causing him to leave the City of Fort Lauderdale and he will be splitting his time between here and Philadelphia while caring for his 92-year old grandmother. In addition, it is his intention to seek a political opportunity in another city in Broward County. Mr. Chiari explained that it was with a heavy heart that he will tender his letter of resignation.

Dr. Goetz requested that there be a formal discussion on Power Services report at the next scheduled UAC meeting. Chair Brenneman advised that this would, in fact, be on the next Agenda.

**IX. Announcements**

- o Tree Subcommittee Meeting, Thursday, August 13, 2009, 3:30-4:30 p.m.
- o UAC Next Regular Meeting, Tuesday, August 25, 2009 at 6:30 p.m.

**X. Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 9:14 p.m.

[Minutes prepared by B. Chiappetta, Prototype, Inc.]