



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Water and Light Advisory Board

Wednesday, January 14, 2026
8:00 AM

Regular

Conference Room
1A/1B
701 E Broadway
Columbia, MO

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mrs. Jennifer Coleman called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

Staff: Erin Keys, Utilities Director; Dawn Jennings, Assistant Director Utilities-Rates and Fiscal Planning; Gwen Corches, Assistant Director Utilities-Electric; Allison Anderson, Assistant Director Utilities-Water; Maggie Jones, Engineering Supervisor-Water; Ron Wyble, Power Supply Manager; David Storvick, Engineering Manager-Electric; Eric Worts, Engineering Supervisor-Electric; Todd McVicker, Utility Services Manager; Jason West, Communication and Outreach Supervisor; Matt Nestor, Public Information Specialist; Paige Adams, Public Information Specialist; Earl Kraus, Assistant City Counselor; Leslie Nguyen, Fellow from Federal Department of Energy; Christina Weaver, Administrative Technician II

Mike Murphy, CoMo Buzz; Jim Windsor, Public

Present: 4 - Thomas Jensen, David Switzer, Jennifer Coleman and Ryan Westwood

Absent: 1 - Philip Fracica

II. INTRODUCTIONS

A round robin was done for introductions.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mrs. Jennifer Coleman made a motion to approve the agenda with the amendment to discuss the Chairman's Report first with a second by Mr. Ryan Westwood. Motion passed unanimously.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The December 16, 2025 Basic COS minutes will be discussed at the next meeting.

The December 10, 2025 meeting minutes were approved as submitted with a motion by Mr. David Switzer and a second by Mr. Ryan Westwood. Motion passed unanimously.

Attachments: [Meeting Minutes Draft 12 10 25](#)
[Meeting Minutes Draft 12 16 25 Basic COS](#)

V. DIRECTOR'S REPORTS**a) FY 2027 Budget Discussion**

Mrs. Erin Keys presented the budget detail by boards and commissions. The Water and Light Advisory Board's budget for FY 26 is \$5,000.

Attachments: [fy26-final-adopted-budget-book - boards and commissions](#)

b) Transmission Project Example Slides

The Chapel Hill and Vawter School Routes' Alignments were mapped and provided to the board. Mr. Eric Worts stated that the difference between the two routes that they're trying to illustrate with the slides is that the Chapel Hill Route follows an existing transmission line. Additional information on the routes, including cost, will be presented at the City Council Work Session on February 9.

Attachments: [Transmission WLAB Meeting](#)

c) Purchase Power Proposal Metric Scoring

Mr. Todd McVicker presented the Renewable Energy PPA Evaluations. With the potential removal of the 3% cap on renewable energy impact on rates due to the revision of the renewable energy ordinance, a method to evaluate the feasibility and impact of renewable energy purchase power agreements (PPA) is needed. An evaluation rubric for method of performance and an evaluation metric for cost have been drafted to evaluate renewable energy purchase power agreements (PPA) in order to help the utility determine whether a PPA is reasonable and actionable. The rubric is broken into 4 sections, with Sections 3 (Existing Resource) and 4 (Proposed Resource) only being available as either/or. Scoring is therefore done in 3 categories for each PPA, with each section taking approximately 1/3 of the score. This rubric does not consider the costs of the PPA, as that is evaluated separately in the PPA Metric for Cost Evaluation.

Section 1 is Proposed Resource in which preference in scoring is given to larger systems and how soon the power will be available. Large systems are preferred as it requires less overhead and increases operational efficiency. Grainbelt delays prompted the preference for the timeframe of power availability, as having contracts without receiving power adds to uncertainty.

Mr. Todd McVicker requested feedback from the board on each section. He asked the board if we should be giving preference to systems that can provide power sooner or should we prioritize PPAs that provide power closer to expiration of existing contracts? Mrs. Jennifer Coleman inquired as to why it can't be both since they're both important, and Mr. Todd McVicker clarified that it's about which one is prioritized and gets more points. The board agrees that bigger is better and sooner is better than further out.

Section 2 is Location Preference in which not all available power will be in MISO Zone 5 or directly interconnected. However, there can be advantages to having the PPAs in Zone 5 or directly interconnected. Therefore, preference is given to PPAs located in Zone 5 and/or directly interconnected. Some additional consideration is

given to those systems that include battery storage at the generating facility. Although batteries are preferred, they are not currently given as much weight as a system being located in Zone 5 or directly interconnected.

Mr. Todd McVicker asked if the board agrees that Zone 5 and/or directly interconnected is preferred, and is there a preference between Zone 5 vs directly interconnected PPAs? Mr. Thomas Jensen said yes to the first part. Since interconnected is going to be extremely rare, he wouldn't decide that we have to have an RFP and only go for interconnected; he would be more focused on trying to stay in Zone 5 and not bypass an opportunity for Zone 5 because we're holding out for interconnected. Mr. Todd McVicker stated that it is an option for there to be no preference and Zone 5 or interconnected can score the same points. Mr. Thomas Jensen stated he would give more points to interconnected, especially if we don't have to build the transmission for it.

Section 3 is Existing Resource, which is for existing generating facilities. PPAs can score only in this category or only in Section 4 (Planned Resource), but cannot score in both. Power is already being produced or construction is nearing completion, so there is a value to eliminating the risk where the system is not yet constructed or might get delayed. Wind is given a slight preference over solar, due to the expected reduction in capacity credits for solar. Other renewable option sources will also be considered, but since wind and solar are the most mature technologies, both of them would receive higher scores. Given current market trends, it is expected that most new contracts will be solar, but there is still the potential for the renewal of existing wind contracts.

Mr. Todd McVicker requested feedback on the following: does the board agree with preference given to wind if we were to receive PPAs from both wind and solar facilities? Mr. David Switzer stated that ultimately it's not about solar vs wind, but it's more about the capacity credit and what we get in terms of capacity from the contract; in general, that is going to favor wind over solar. Mrs. Jennifer Coleman asked how do you give greater weight to those things that are listed, and if they're further along in the interconnection queue, do they get more points under that section and how do you determine the number of points? Mr. Todd McVicker responded that there's a scored rubric with where it's at in the process and where it's actually located at in the interconnection process. It's weighted so that the further along in the interconnection process the more points that vendor would receive compared to another one also going through the interconnection process.

Section 4 is Planned Resource, which is for generating facilities that are not yet producing power or construction is not yet nearing completion. Preference is given to systems that are further along in the RTO interconnection queue or are able to bypass the queue altogether. This is to help reduce the likelihood of a delay in construction or project cancellation. Additional preference is given to systems being developed by companies that have a successful track record in developing, constructing, and providing power from the particular generation type. While this is not a preference, additional consideration is given to systems with a focus on a sustainable built

environment, such as being pollinator friendly or using agrivoltaics.

Mr. Todd McVicker requested feedback on the following: the scoring is minimal with the built environment evaluation, so should this section be given more of a preference, and does the board agree with these preferences or should additional preferences be included? Mrs. Jennifer Coleman stated that she doesn't have any feedback for the first point as it's more technical so the City can decide on that; for the second point, an area that could be considered is environmental permitting because if you're in an area that the planned resource requires significant permitting hurdles then that could lower your score, so it's worth looking at where they are at in the permitting process. Mr. Ryan Westwood stated that the built environment should only be a consideration if we're considering direct interconnection.

Cost is a very important part of the PPA evaluation process. Therefore, the utility is looking at multiple factors to try and have an "apples to apples" cost comparison of PPAs, which can vary widely in offerings. In most cases a PPA will have multiple associated costs and factors: cost for energy, cost for capacity, node cost differences, contract length, and cost escalators. To compare these costs, the system is modeled to provide the estimated energy, seasonal capacity (as currently rated by MISO), and the node cost difference; to provide a cumulative estimated cost of the PPA in Year 1 and through the life of the contract. For the life of the contract, cost escalators and deemed system degradation are modeled. This is then compared to the total operating expenses for the electric utility to see what the PPA impact would potentially have on annual operating expenses. This modeling also provides an estimated cost per MWH for the deemed energy, capacity and node difference, to compare to other energy sources from the utility and as a baseline to compare future PPAs.

Mr. Todd McVicker asked if the board has additional considerations on PPA cost that staff should use for cost evaluation? Mr. Thomas Jensen inquired about whether they've considered building into the RFP to ask them to do the heavy lifting with projecting what they think our cost will be and make them do the research and then make them commit to those warranties to lift the burden from the utility. Mr. Todd McVicker stated that it hasn't been considered yet but they can look into it.

Attachments: [Renewable PPA Eval Process Memo](#)

d) Annual Engineering Fiscal Reports

Mr. David Storvick presented the Fiscal Electric Report, which is an overview of the distribution between October 1, 2024 and September 30, 2025. Mrs. Erin Keys suggested that how much line they're replacing needs to be added to the report since a lot of money has been spent replacing transmission lines.

Mrs. Maggie Jones presented the Fiscal Water Report, which is a recap of the total department work between October 1, 2024 and September 30, 2025. There were no loop closures. There were 39 new fire hydrants added, 0 hydrants were removed, 4 hydrants were replaced, and there are 6,464 total fire hydrants in the system at the end of FY25. Mrs. Jennifer Coleman inquired about how the fire hydrants are maintained, and Mrs. Maggie Jones let her know that the City has a unidirectional flushing program and all mains 8+ inches are flushed roughly every 4 years. There

were 1,000 water meters that were changed or replaced, 523 new meters added, and 58 meters were removed. At the end of FY25, there were 47,530 residential meters, 4,846 commercial meters, and 52,376 total meters in the system. The total footage of distribution system as of September 30, 2025 is 3,775,320 feet (715 miles).

=

Attachments: [2025 ELECTRIC FISCAL REPORT](#)
[FY25 Water](#)

e) Monthly Power Cost Adjustment (PCA) Report

Mr. Gwen Corches presented the Power Cost Adjustment Report for November 2025. Staff prepared the forecasted FY 2026 PCA and is forecasting a total increase of \$4.4 million over the forecasted FY25 level due to higher purchase power costs. Additionally, the final true-up amount from FY 2025 of \$10,871,288 will be recouped throughout FY 2026. Staff determined the FY 2026 forecasted energy sold (kWh) based on the MISO load forecast information that The Energy Authority (TEA) prepared. The energy sold forecast takes into account the base without the energy efficiency programs, electric vehicles, and behind the meter generation. Currently, with the final true-up amount from FY 2025, it's anticipated that the City will have to recover \$21,819,217 over the course of the fiscal year. The calculated PCA for November 2025 is \$0.013605, and it will result in a bill charge of \$10.88 for the average residential customer.

Attachments: [PCA Board Report - November 2025](#)

f) Council Item Update

Mrs. Erin Keys provided the council item updates. At the council meeting on December 1, Council Bill 321-25 was introduced. At the council meeting on December 15, Council Bill 321-25, Council Resolution 169-25, and Council Resolution 170-25 were approved. At the council meeting on January 5, 2026, Council Bill 9-26 was introduced. Report 2-26 was presented. The Integrated Resource Plan Public Meeting is January 28 and the Transmission Project Council Work Session is on February 9.

Attachments: [Council Item Updates - January 2026](#)

VI. CHAIRMAN'S REPORTS

a) Public Comment Response Process

The board discussed how they would like to respond to public comments. They are going to treat public comments when voting like City Council, and individuals will have 3 minutes to speak prior to the board's vote. Emails will be handled on a case by case basis. If a response is necessary, how the board responds will be determined by whether the individual is present at the next meeting. If the individual is at the next board meeting then the board will respond in person; if the individual is not at the next board meeting then a written response will be sent if necessary.

b) Rolling Calendar

Mr. Gwen Corches presented the rolling calendar. Some changes were made as the finance reports will not be available until March, and a discussion regarding transmission has been added to February.

Attachments: [WL Rolling Agenda January](#)

VII. PUBLIC EMAIL COMMENTS

a) Public Email Comments

The board reviewed and discussed Mr. Jim Windsor's email regarding the CIP, and no electronic response will be sent as he was present at the board meeting. Mr. David Switzer stated that the Warehouse & Enclosed Equipment Parking project is no longer part of the CIP. Mrs. Erin Keys explained that each year they've been refining the list of CIP projects and now specifically identify projects instead of generally categorizing them. She informed the board that the proposed CIP for the budget will be presented to the board in April then it will be presented to City Council around June.

Attachments: [WLABPublic_Prepare For FY27 CIP - Windsor Example](#)
[WLABPublic_Prepare For FY27 CIP - Windsor](#)

VIII. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, MEMBERS AND STAFF

Mr. Jim Windsor commented on the transmission issue. He stated that the customer survey said that 98.2% of residents responded that reliability is very important and 100% of the commercial responses said it was very important. It's important to include because rolling blackouts are not acceptable as a transmission. To reference a comment from CoMo Buzz, "The building hasn't caught on fire so we don't need sprinklers." You can create a long list of things that haven't happened that you can prepare for. Citizens expect the utility to be prepared; we don't expect to have to live with outages. The other thing is the redundancy issue by putting two transmission lines on one route. He stated that it doesn't make any sense to him as a citizen. In the original proposal, there was \$5 million for underground distribution lines in the transmission path; he stated that as a rate-payer, sorry but you should have to deal with the visual impairment if it develops down Nifong. There is an existing distribution line on Chapel Hill in addition to the transmission line; logically, you will have to do something with that before anything can be done to the transmission line, and he has heard no discussions about this. That seems like a much more important issue and more of a reason not to use Chapel Hill.

Mrs. Erin Keys stated that it is an overbuild so both lines would be on the same pole. Mrs. Jennifer Coleman suggested adding this to reference for Council and including on the slides that there may be more prolonged outages, which is a helpful fact from a decision-making standpoint.

Mr. Jim Windsor also commented on the PPA. On the PPA this year, he doesn't understand why they're talking about putting out renewable PPAs. Ameren recently announced they're building a transmission line to connect with Grainbelt so they obviously believe it's going to happen. When it's completed, you're going to get 150

thousand megawatt hours at least. I think you tell Council that we're covered right now and don't make rate payers pay more just for something we don't really need. Maybe put it up for 3 years until we hopefully have a better administration that understands needing to look at all sources and spend our money on things that benefit and reduce carbon in Columbia. Smart meters are an effective way because you can target rates to encourage people to be more efficient.

Mrs. Jennifer Coleman informed him that the City created the metric because the board asked them to, and, at that time, the board recommended Council not to move forward with those PPAs that were previously discussed. There aren't any current RFPs out; this was just something for in the event that they get those, there's a process to evaluate them.

Mr. Jim Windsor stated that on capacity there are two issues; there's the short-term issue of the 45 megawatt capacity contract expiring after this summer. How short are you going to be in 2027 if that 45 is gone? The second issue is Sikeston and what's going to happen with that. The IRP is slow and, in his opinion, should have already been addressed.

Mr. David Switzer informed him that we've seen slides related to his question with plans and has the next few years of capacity; this isn't something that staff or the board is unaware of.

Mr. Jim Windsor inquired about the status of smart meters. Mrs. Jennifer Coleman informed him that a cost of service hasn't been done yet, and Mrs. Erin Keys said they're working with a consultant on that.

Mrs. Erin Keys introduced Dawn Jennings, the new Assistant Director for Rates and Fiscal Planning. All of the Assistant Director positions are filled now.

Mr. Thomas Jensen stated the public comment section is not designed to be what it has devolved into; it's supposed to be brief, 30 seconds to 1 minute, so longer public comments and discussions should be put on the agenda. The email comment process was created to help avoid long comments during meetings.

Mr. David Switzer is in favor of mirroring City Council, so individuals have 3-5 minute to speak prior to a board vote; for general comments, individuals have 3 minutes to speak uninterrupted and individuals speaking on behalf of a group have 5 minutes to speak. If there's something specific that they want to discuss then they can submit to get on the agenda prior to the meeting.

IX. NEXT MEETING DATE

February 11, 2026

X. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:02 a.m. on a motion by Mrs. Jennifer Coleman and a second by Mr. David Switzer. Motion passed unanimously.

To submit questions or comments to the Water & Light Advisory Board, please email wlabpublic@como.gov

All media inquiries should be submitted to Matt Nestor at Matthew.Nestor@como.gov or Jason West at Jason.West@como.gov

Members of the public may attend any open meeting. For requests for accommodations related to disability, please call 573.874.CITY (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.

USB DRIVES PROHIBITED: A speaker who desires to display a presentation must upload the presentation, in advance, to the city network using an upload portal. To upload your files and learn more, visit CoMo.gov/upload.