



# City of Columbia, Missouri

## Meeting Minutes

### Integrated Electric Resource and Master Plan Task Force

---

Wednesday, November 13, 2019  
6:00 PM

Regular

701 E Broadway  
Mezzanine

---

#### I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hassani called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

Staff: Ryan Williams, Assistant City Utilities Director of Water & Light; Sarah Talbert, Utility Financial Manager; Christian Johanningmeier, Power Production Superintendent; Brandon Renaud, Utility Services Manager; Chris Kisch, Sr. Administrative Support Assistant

**Present:** 13 - Rachel Hassani, Thomas Jensen, Detelina Marinova, Kim Fallis, Scott Fines, Robert Hasheider, Robin Wenneker, Carly Dibben, Gregg Coffin, Nicholas Knoth, Lincoln Brown, Dick Parker and Alex Antal

**Absent:** 2 - Scott Bell and Philip Fracica

#### II. INTRODUCTIONS

There were no introductions made.

#### III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved as submitted with a motion by Mr. Dick Parker and a second by Mr. Scott Fines. Motion passed unanimously.

#### IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The October 24, 2019 meeting minutes were approved as submitted with a motion by Mr. Dick Parker and a second by Mr. Scott Fines. Motion passed unanimously.

**Attachments:** [Meeting Minutes Draft 10 24 19](#)

#### V. NEW BUSINESS

None

#### VI. OLD BUSINESS

##### a) Review and Develop Criteria for Scenarios (Slide 12)

Mr. Fines noted the task force was building the scenarios based on the columns on

page 12. He asked if the task force wanted to first discuss the scenarios or just proceed, noting the assumptions on page 13. Mr. Fines then asked if there were any questions. Mr. Coffin stated he felt this was a good start but there needed to be more. Mr. Parker advised he had concerns with four of the scenarios. He said the scenarios do nothing by 2030, saying the beginning base ignores the greenhouse gas emission reduction. Mr. Parker stated he felt the timeline should be 2030 and 2035 instead of 2050 and 2060. Mr. Jensen replied that allowed six years to accomplish 34 percent. Mr. Parker agreed. Mr. Fines asked what the dates were in the Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP). Mr. Hasheider replied the dates were 2035, 2050, and 2060. Mr. Parker said the ordinance stated 60 percent reduction by 2025. Mr. Hasheider stated he did not feel the utility would be at that point by that date. Mr. Brown advised there had been discussion at the last meeting on what the consultants needed. Mr. Williams suggested looking at the current saturations and trends and then continue along that line. Mr. Parker insisted the proposed timeline was ignoring the CAAP timeline. Mr. Antal disagreed, saying Council adopted the 2050 and 2060 goals and felt it was not the decision of the task force to discard those goals from the planning process. He suggested adding two additional goals. Mr. Brown agreed. Mr. Jensen noted he did not feel the task force should set aside what Council had set. He asked about data requests. Mr. Williams advised the data requests were complete and the consultants would be meeting with staff in the next week. Mr. Fines stated in order to get to 80 percent reduction, the utility would need to be at 100 percent. Mr. Jensen advised upgrades would be needed to achieve that. Mr. Parker pointed out the CAAP had an action for the utility to be at 100 percent by 2035. Mr. Coffin advised there was nothing saying the task force could not put a more aggressive date in the scenarios. Mr. Fines agreed, adding there should be discussion on the utilities responsibility not the community's responsibility. He then asked if the community needed to be at 80 percent what did the utility need to be at. Mr. Fines said another question to consider was were the target years adequate to give to the consultants. He asked if the base case was for the utility at 100 percent by 2050 then ask for the goal to be achieved by 2035 if that was agreeable. Mr. Coffin stated he felt that was achievable. Mr. Brown asked how the utility goals were addressed. Mr. Williams advised the goals given to the utility should be given with direction. The task force agreed to add a scenario element of:

- ✓ Electric Utility at 100 percent Renewable

With the scenarios:

- ✓ Mid Term Utility Renewable with the date of 2040
- ✓ Early Utility Renewable with the date of 2030
- ✓ High Seasonal Load
- ✓ Recession/Economy

Another scenario element added was the conversion of all gas heat to electric; no dates included at that time.

**Mr. Dick Parker made a motion to replace the assumed timeline of 2050**

and 2060 with 2030 and 2035 in all scenarios with a second by Mr. Scott Fines. Motion failed 8-1.

Mr. Alex Antal made a motion to adopt two additional scenarios, the first being 80 percent reduction by 2030 and 100 percent reduction by 2040, and the second being 80 percent reduction by 2040 and 100 percent reduction by 2050 with a second by Mr. Tom Jensen. Motion passed 5-2 with Ayes from Mr. Jensen, Mr. Fines, Ms. Marinova, Mr. Antal, and Ms. Wenneker, Nays from Mr. Parker and Mr. Hasheider, Ms. Fallis abstained.

**b) Review and Answer Task Force Questions (Slide 14)**

Mr. Fines noted question one he felt had been discussed. Mr. Antal felt there should be some resiliency and it should be clarified as an objective. Mr. Brown felt resiliency should also be in question five adding it was on slide six. The task force noted resiliency, local job creation, and affordability for question one. Question two the task force felt the concerns were substation loading and transmission line connection with additional staff recommendations. Question three the task force answer was staff recommendations. Mr. Coffin felt staff should be part of questions two and three. Mr. Williams advised this was for concerns of the task force. Mr. Hasheider said he felt there was a need for enhanced reliability. Mr. Jensen stated there had been five or six years spent studying that topic and that was a behind the meter issue and he did not feel it was unique. Mr. Fines advised reliability could be covered as an objective. Ms. Marinova replied it was. Mr. Jensen stated he felt the comment dealt with power quality. Question four the task force answer was “yes” there were concerns with the development of new transmission lines. Mr. Coffin stated he felt this was a nationwide issue, not just in Columbia. Question five the task force felt the assessment of resiliency was important and at a high level. The task force noted they would like to know how much was included and how much for the scope addition. The task force tabled question six to address at the next meeting. Mr. Hasheider made a request to provide a response to the task force regarding question six. Mr. Parker noted he would be emailing a suggestion to include capacity to the list. Mr. Fines stated he felt that would be addressed as it was a MISO requirement.

Attachments: [CWL IRP Task Force Meeting 10-24-2019 \(1\)](#)

**VII. CHAIRMAN'S REPORTS**

None

**VIII. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, MEMBERS AND STAFF**

None

**IX. NEXT MEETING DATE**

a) November 21, 2019

**X. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

Members of the public may attend any open meeting. For requests for accommodations related to disability, please call 573-874-CITY (573-874-2489) or email CITY@CoMo.gov. In order to assist staff in making the appropriate arrangements for your accommodation, please make your request as far in advance of the posted meeting date as possible.