1. One question I have for WLAB -- Can they elaborate more on the parts of the TEA report that point to a challenge in meeting the 100% renewable goal? I was under the impression that the TEA report was commissioned to identify the pathways to 100% renewable energy, not to assess its feasibility.

2. Why add recommendation 1.C. "Give recognition for executed contracts of renewable energy which are delayed outside the control of the City Utility, such as: market conditions, regulatory actions, material delays, force majeure, etc."? This is potentially a slippery slope if Columbia commits to a number of unreasonable/unrealistic renewable contracts which never materialize and could reduce the quality of the contracts the city pursues.

3. Recommendation 3)b.iii. "Issue an RFP for additional renewable energy within the next few years as necessary to reach the FY2035 renewable energy goal." Has an ambiguous completion date "next few years" why was a specific date not included in this recommendation? I might recommend by the end of fiscal year 2028 or some other specific date that provides reasonable time to build additional renewables to meet the 2035 target.)

4. Recommendation 6)e. Is there an existing set of evaluation metrics for bidding non-renewable energy to build on to?

5. Recommendation 7)b. I understand new businesses coming to Columbia is great for the city and we should welcome it but I don't think reassessment is sensible. If a spike in energy demand were to occur in Columbia shouldn't that trigger increased investment toward renewables to meet the increased demand? The alternative to increased investment toward renewables, is an investment in fossil fuels which this reassessment could allow for by loosening the goal. Is this the intention of recommendation 7b)?

6. Overall the notes do not mention any reference to the CAAP. Some items are mentioned as proposals but lack of citing the CAAP could undermine any proposal. Examples:
   - ★ Discussion on removing the 3% cap E-1.3.1
   - ★ Codify the 100% renewable goal for the utility under E-1.3.2

With those citations items omitted, what empirical evidence do they have that doesn't support achieving any of these said goals or any other goals under the Energy sector of the CAAP which this recommendation is basically ignoring? Why are they not wanting to consider energy credits (RECs) as a way to meet these goals? Also, why wait 5 years for the next review. This should be done annually and was mentioned at our last CEC meeting.