

**Correspondence from the public to City Council and Energy Future project staff since April 17, 2013**

---

**From:** David W. Smith [<mailto:dwsonlee@yahoo.com>]

**Sent:** Thursday, August 01, 2013 12:41 PM

**To:** Council

**Subject:** Municipalization

I am disgusted by the arrogance and duplicity of the Council in voting to force Boulder County customers to convert to your incompetent municipal proposal.

If this proceeds, I promise to contribute to the opponents of any member who votes for this when they next stand for election.

Unlike the Boulder Council. I KEEP MY PROMISES!

David W. Smith [dwsonlee@yahoo.com](mailto:dwsonlee@yahoo.com)

Boulder CO 80301-3633

If the message subject includes DWS, it is intended to help assure you the message is really from me and is not spam.

---

**From:** Karey Christ-Janer [<mailto:karey@boulder.net>]

**Sent:** Thursday, August 01, 2013 11:04 AM

**To:** [karey@boulder.net](mailto:karey@boulder.net)

**Cc:** Council; Koehn, Jonathan; Brautigam, Jane; Bailey, Heather; Carr, Thomas; Gehr, David; Kalish, Debra; Driskell, David; Gichon, Yael; Mertz, Kara; Crandall, Kelly; Eichem, Bob; Huntley, Sarah; Haddock, Kathy; Barth, Andrew; Davis, Jerome E; [Craig.L.Eicher@XcelEnergy.com](mailto:Craig.L.Eicher@XcelEnergy.com); Mudd, Steve

**Subject:** Re: Why Xcel's "balancing area" is key

*(Resending without the typo in the first sentence...apologies for my terrible typing--hopefully that was the only one.)*

cc: Jerome Davis, Craig Eicher and Steve Mudd (WindSource director), all of Xcel Energy

Dear Boulder folks (et al)---

I have often mentioned in front of Council that what is truly "key" in renewable energy advancement is **progress at the "balancing area,"** and I wanted to further explain, here.

**First, it should be said that Xcel is the only balancing authority in our neck of the woods.**

As such, they function as the "cutting floor" of what energy gets dispatched for use at any given time. They handle the balancing for areas outside their territory, including other local municipal utilities, and overall, this is quite a "constrained" area, meaning that there are limited opportunities to trade energy both in and out of our balancing area landscape.

For one small municipal utility to add larger quantities of renewable energy than most is great, on the face of it. But what effect would this have, even if emulated widely by other munis? Even assuming the renewable energy added was truly new (not likely to be built out anyway), **as you add more and more, say, solar to the local grid/balancing area, Xcel---as a balancing authority---will have to deal with steeper and deeper "swings." So, at higher levels of intermittent RE, there are more "ups and downs," like a roller coaster, in electricity load/production continuum.**

The main way, traditionally speaking, to deal with the need for energy sources that can ramp up quickly to fill a need, has been thought of as combined-cycle natural gas. This is straightforward, and you all know this. Further, there is the prospect of having, say, TOO much solar generation in a particular area, and this can mean that measures must be taken to be able to "dump" that extra energy.

**But taking the long view, the goal is not to simply use more and more fuel-intensive start-ups of these sort of natural gas plants, right? AND--to actually utilize all of the precious renewable energy that is generated, too, rather than dumping it.**

This becomes more and more problematic as you get over-and-above 30% renewable energy in the balancing area. And, who are the lucky ones who get to "use" that 30% green energy, and who are the unlucky remaining ones who are relegated to using "brown" energy, to keep the grid stable? **Is there a better, more "democratic" solution?**

In order to avoid simply needing massive amounts of flexible gas gen as back-up and to avert dumping green energy, California regulators are looking at a coordinated system of programs---**yes, as product offerings by the utilities**---like demand response, permanent load shifting, distributed storage (as it becomes more financially viable), along with isolated solar curtailment (as rarely as possible) as needed. This could truly make transformative advances.

**In order to do this, you need expert coordination---also AMONG utilities in the same balancing area (in our case, within Xcel's balancing area), so that these new-fangled flexible resources can made available in such a fashion that the grid is stable enough to add more and more intermittent renewable resources.**

I don't mean to underestimate any small, nearby existing muni utility. **But it's far more evident that most Front Range municipal utilities---even those who might be interested in innovating---are struggling just to get to their mandated 10% renewable energy, and trying to balance this with how to adapt to higher rates due to their coal contracts, and further, reeling from how they will deal with coming EPA regs.** I'd love to see all the small munis get on board with such programs, but unfortunately,

I'm not holding my breath---even if Boulder became a shining example. And the large utilities like Xcel could create change--quickly--once they are ready. **I believe this is happening now, due to the coming regulations.**

**But, how can we be sure XCEL will advance, hopefully including some additional early retirements of coal plants, and truly create such "flexible resource" programs?**

**The sort of programs that Xcel is proposing with its "Options" are several steps in the right direction.** What I have not heard them address---but what is rather obvious---is that if enough cities or communities decide to utilize their new Options programs, soon enough there will be offset "brown" energy, and use of those resources could be stepped back in an organized fashion, and there would be need or cost recovery very similar to stranded costs.

People like to complain that we don't want to have to pay for these investments that so many see as mistakes. But the fact is that the industry has been changing so incredibly quickly, that no particular set of regulators, nor one company, can be blamed too much for past decision. **We need to move forward to solutions---solutions like what CA is (and I am) talking about.**

**Xcel's evident willingness to explore this somewhat uncharted territory is extraordinary. Please don't underestimate this.**

If Xcel creates these programs into what I believe they could be (though yes, they need to be made whole, and new rate structures developed so that they are not shooting themselves in the foot), this could set the pace for other states and regions of the U.S....especially in highly coal-dependent ones like here in Colorado, which is largely due to the highly coal-dependent municipal utilities.

**In other words....no utility is an "island," and we need to move the whole "continent" forward---UNLESS you like the idea on large amount of additional natural gas generation.**

Even in CA, where a whole lot is happening and I tracking developments carefully, we are not yet seeing programs which are "integrated" in the way I have been advocating for. **Please keep an open mind as you move forward on the "parallel" track.**

Thanks for the opportunity to explain (and Xcel folks, feel free to clarify if there is anything that you do not feel is accurate in my representations, here).

Karey C-J

---

<http://www.ideapete.com/fdr.html>

( : ( : pete

--

-----

Pete Baston

IDEAS. *id est*: People <> Processes <> Technology

Pursuit of Excellence

[www.ideapete.com](http://www.ideapete.com)

<http://bonaqualitatis.blogspot.com/>

Tell: 303-578-0886

Mailto:[pete@ideapete.com](mailto:pete@ideapete.com)

---

I am writing urging you to reconsider the takeover over of the generation and distribution of electricity for the the city. while I share your concerns about global warning and the increasing carbon in our atmosphere; I believe this step is misguided and a humongous financial mistake. The goals are laudable but not achievable by the pie in the sky advocates. Their rosy predictions and self serving assumptions are guaranteed to fail to meet the goals and increase Boulder city electricity rates to unbearable levels only to be met with general tax increases to to cover their folly.

Much can and should be done to address global warning but but his fiasco turn more people against those more reasoned efforts and be a repeat of the corn/alcohol/gasoline failure; which can not be turned off. Government hand outs to those miscreants will continue ad nauseam. Excel is doing a reasonable job restructuring their power generation to meet carbon goals and in the process has made a far greater impact on the planet than Boulder could even dream of.

The money wasted already by Boulder could have been spent more wisely on local issues of transportation, subsidizing solar utilization, working with surrounding communities on these issues that would have produced greater and far reaching benefits to our planet. Therefore I respectfully request that you vote not on the proposition.

Respectfully

Don Cote

1135 Hancock Dr

Boulder, Co 80303

---

Hope you all saw this important piece the NYT today:

[http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/29/opinion/gangplank-to-a-warm-future.html?hp&\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/29/opinion/gangplank-to-a-warm-future.html?hp&_r=0)

Additionally, as you consider the merits of entering the dying retail electric business, it would be nice to know how you reconcile the disconnect between selling electricity to cover bond payments while

encouraging real mitigation of use? If more and more of us limit our demand, go off grid, rates can only go up.

Investing in the retail electric business in 2017 is like getting into the land line telephone business in 1996.

The smart money is on a combination of wind, solar, geothermal, storage technologies and micro-generation. Spending so much money and not owning 1kWh of local, renewable energy is pure folly.

Kind regards,

Mark Gelband  
303-522-1192  
505 College Ave, 80302

---

**From:** Karey Christ-Janer [<mailto:karey@boulder.net>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 30, 2013 12:53 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Cc:** [openforum@dailycamera.com](mailto:openforum@dailycamera.com); Mark Gelband  
**Subject:** Real vs. "symbolic" carbon mitigation

All---

Many thanks to Mark Gelband for pointing out this scary NYT piece. Some of us, including some on Council, have had their eyes on the methane leakage issue, **but this adds to the concern exponentially.**

**And the article aptly points out that we have about 20 years to figure this stuff out (and act), basically, to avoid drastic effects.** A municipal utility "try" will likely spend **half or all** of that time either in litigation on MULTIPLE fronts with Xcel, or starting up saddled with debt and with PPAs that are either long or, alternately, more expensive (take your pick). And further, this path is **highly unlikely** to be seen as a palatably emulable path for other cities. **More likely, the city will eventually give up, due to the hornets nest of legal issues.** Even the independent evaluator had this concern.

**We need to change---along with Xcel, who truly COULD create an emulable model, far and wide, with their Options. (If we really care about climate change.)**

**The reason I focus on Boulder so much is that I think if everyone "got on the same page," the most progress in Colorado for a truly emulable program could take be created.**

Last thing---as an aside you have to admit, Mark Gelband has a way with words. I hope he writes a piece for the DC on these issues, since I'm guessing not too many people check the public record every day.

Karey

cc: Mark Gelband, Open Forum at the Daily Camera

Dear Council---

There are some very important points in Mark's proposed LTE for the Camera, but in my view **none greater nor more relevant to tonight's discussion about near-carbon-neutrality than the sentence I've called-out below.**

**Moving Xcel forward would have far-reaching effects, and could even possibly be a model for other utilities around the country. There is no question in my mind that if this happens, it would not be a mere "symbolic" statement---it would be true, meaningful GHG mitigation.**

(Last thing....Mark, be sure that the Camera has your full name, address and phone or they may not print your letter, since I believe these are some of their requirements.)

Karey

On 7/30/13 10:46 AM, mark gelband wrote:

The city's plan for mitigating stranded costs is purchasing power from Xcel for up to a decade. How does this get us any closer to a net-zero city, to 1 kWh more of local, renewable generation? It doesn't.

---

**From:** Laura Lewis [<mailto:lauralewismail@netscape.net>]

**Sent:** Sunday, July 28, 2013 8:11 PM

**To:** Council

**Cc:** [commissioners@bouldercounty.org](mailto:commissioners@bouldercounty.org)

**Subject:** City owned utility

We are not in favor of a city-owned utility and think that this council is setting up Boulder to be a very undesirable place to live - people will prefer any surrounding area to living in Boulder.

You have already wasted a lot of Boulder taxpayers money - please do not waste more.

Laura and Jim Lewis

5335 Holmes Place

Boulder CO 80303  
303 938 1864

---

Is the city planning to be a renewable energy producer or a PPA holder. I'm curious to understand, because the cost of scheduling in the Day Ahead MISO market carries significant risk if the commitments aren't met in the real-time market? If you are the PPA holder, how will the municipal utility monitor these risk with variable generation from wind, solar, hydro and I assume some fossil fuels?

mark flolid  
1600 Mariposa Ave.  
720.352.7808  
[flolid@gmail.com](mailto:flolid@gmail.com)

---

Dear City Council Members,

As county residents, we are very disturbed by the idea of being added to the city of Boulder's grand plan to create a energy municipality without having been allowed to vote on the proposal. Our house does not want to be a part of Boulder's electric service area. Here are a few reasons why:

- 1) We do not want to be responsible for having to pay back the bond (millions of dollars) to purchase Xcel's infrastructure. That money could be much better spent encouraging residents to reduce their electricity usage (or at least carbon generating ones), not lining the pockets of banks.
- 2) We truly do not believe that the city of Boulder can provide better service than Xcel, particularly when it comes to restoring power after outages caused by natural (or unnatural) causes. The city just does not have the resources and contracting for those resources does not feel efficient.
- 3) The city is proposing to solicit various power providers to get the "green" energy it wants. As a small energy provider, it cannot get the pricing breaks that Xcel can as it purchases power in much larger quantities.
- 4) The process has felt very deceptive in that the tagline of "in the long term" regarding energy costs has been quite downplayed, meaning that it has been made to sound like the energy will be cheaper and green immediately, which is obviously not true.
- 5) The modeling that the city did made at least one glaringly obvious mistake in assuming that Xcel would not also be trying to lower their costs for greener energy. To assume that Xcel would stand still for the next 10-20 years and not search for cheaper, more efficient and greener ways to generate energy is naive. Of course Xcel is going to do so.

As a county resident, we strongly encourage the city of Boulder to work with Xcel. They are not the devil that the city makes them out to be.

Sincerely,

Lane & Cathy Lee – [leecn1@comcast.net](mailto:leecn1@comcast.net)

---

Tuesday, July 23, 2013  
Members of City Council  
Boulder Colorado

The subject of energy has geographical distinctions and levels of importance.

Laws have changed predominantly in the mid-Atlantic corridor educating rate payers about choosing, their energy supplier, type of energy preference and fixed or variable rate budget plan.

You can expect deregulation to become effective in all 50 states in the next 'few' years. TBA.

I read an article today in the Denver Business Journal about your energy program considerations and the enormous plan of action you will undergo to reduce energy expenses.

I am sending your organization information about our energy supply procurement process so when Colorado is deregulated you'll give us a shot to help you shop for a supplier.

Please keep in touch with me for this option because our company is closing contracts of millions of kwh(s), expanding our own ESCO and increasing the number of suppliers we negotiate with nationally on your behalf!

[Lastly, here's an article on a new capacity charge effective June 2013.](#)

Thank you,

**Denise E. Curtain 6838 Rodney Street Philadelphia, PA 19138-2640 [DeniseECurtain@yahoo.com](mailto:DeniseECurtain@yahoo.com)**

**Phone number (215) 438-3029, 215 276 0727 Cell**

**Executive Director**

[Decision Marketing](#)

---

Hello City Council Members,

Regarding Items 2A & 2B, it's too bad Xcel was able to get their delay tactics for City of Boulder's muni on the ballot. However, the original vote was close due to Xcel's dollar input to distort facts – so I'm looking forward to voting NO to their measure when it comes to the public for a vote.

Thank you!

Elizabeth Allen

---

Because I can't be there this week for your discussions and vote, I would just like, on behalf of my family, to express my gratitude for your work on municipalization.

Despite the incredible array, the threats of sticks and promise of carrots, you have persevered. We can do it; we have faith in you.

Thanks very much.

Best,

Cheryl Stevenson

---

Boulder City Council:

I urge you to vote AGAINST the formation of a Boulder city electric utility, and ENCOURAGE you to collaborate with Xcel Energy to achieve common goals for increasing the use of renewable energy sources.

Regards,

Brian Hooker  
39 year Boulder city resident

---

DATE: July 21, 2013

TO: Boulder City Council, City Attorney Tom Carr, City Manager Jane Brautigam

FROM: Gunbarrel Energy Future (GEF) Citizens' Group

RE: Explanation and ramifications of the "Voter Approval of Debt Limits" petition that the City is considering for ballot placement

The Gunbarrel Energy Future (GEF) Citizens' Group is an active group of Gunbarrel city residents, unincorporated county residents and local business owners, who are concerned about water and air quality, climate change, future fossil fuel rates and the impacts our children will inherit from the energy choices we make now. We recognize that the Boulder voters approved the municipalization study. We appreciate the work the City has done to model and explain the range of energy options and potential outcomes. We support the city's effort to complete this study and to investigate all viable energy options.

During our last steering group meeting, we read and discussed the language of the proposed charter amendment submitted by the Voter Approval of Debt Limits Group. We have also consulted others with experience in the municipalization process. Following discussion, the GEF remains confused about what the charter ballot language actually says and exactly what it

means for Boulder and for the municipalization process. The proposed ballot initiative is not simple, a single subject or clear.

We are **DEEPLY** concerned that the proposed initiative may not comport with state law and that passage will commit us to years of expensive legal proceedings.

We are **DEEPLY** concerned that City Council may be compelled to put this apparent citizen initiative on the ballot without fully understanding all of the ramifications if it passes.

We are **DEEPLY** concerned that City Council would choose to put **ANY** proposed charter amendment on the ballot without adequately and definitively explaining it to the community.

As you are already aware, some unincorporated county residents in Gunbarrel, that could be included in the municipal utility service boundaries, are unhappy that they did not get a chance to vote on the municipalization issue. Ostensibly, the charter amendment language appears to give them that chance; but it is unclear whether the ballot language actually accomplishes that objective or that it is legally possible to provide them with that vote. We wonder whether the charter amendment is just a very expensive but uncertain effort to provide them with a false sense of hope for a vote.

WE ASK THAT THE CITY **NOT** PLACE the proposed charter amendment submitted by the Voter Approval of Debt Limits Group on the ballot **PRIOR** to a ruling by the Courts, State Legislature, County, Secretary of State, and any other entity that would need to be consulted to:

- clearly and publicly explain what the Voter of Approval Debt Limits' charter amendment says and means
- determine if all pieces of the charter amendment are legal
- determine whether any pieces cause any jurisdictional confusion

We **STRONGLY REQUEST** that you do this **BEFORE** you make a final decision on August 20th about whether to include the charter amendment on the November ballot.

Signed,

*The GEF Core Committee:*

Kathy Ramirez-Aguilar  
City resident in Gunbarrel and co-chair of GEF  
5868 S. Orchard Creek Circle

Manohar Croke  
County resident in Gunbarrel and co-chair of GEF  
Resides on White Rock Circle

Sky Canyon  
City resident in Gunbarrel  
5851 S. Orchard Creek Circle

## Denise Clark, ND

Business Owner in Gunbarrel  
Colorado Therapies and Aquatic Center  
5412 Idylwild Trail

Susan Riederer  
County resident in Gunbarrel  
4830 Tanglewood Trail

Bill Roettker  
City resident in Gunbarrel  
4507 Mulberry Court

Donna Rush  
County resident in Gunbarrel  
6256 Willow Lane

*For:* The Gunbarrel Energy Future Citizens' Group ([gunbarrelenergyfuture@gmail.com](mailto:gunbarrelenergyfuture@gmail.com))

---

I have been studying meth addiction ever since it hit East Boulder County, downwind of the Xcel coal-fired electric utility and the CEMEX cement plant, about Y2000. It turned out that mercury is the toxin that is causing it. Mercury is a three-way toxin, but the most destructive is it's effects on the mitochondria, which are responsible for giving us energy and vitality. It mutates these cells, which is the cause of the addicts lack of energy and of aging, internally and externally. See the summary of a Swedish Institute article, found in Discover, January 2005, page 58, titled "Cell Mutations Spark Aging" and included in Mercury Update. A number of ways of eliminating mercury are detailed. The best ways are by chelation, which AMA doctors in Colorado refuse to do. Labs routinely don't test for mercury.

See "Merchants of Meth", Mother Jones, July/August 2013. I saw the Faces of Meth. which should have given any honest doctor a clue. I also noted the efforts of Big Pharma to try to kill any attempts to reduce the meth problems, which is disabling a huge segment of our population. Over the past 15 years, I have been investigating Public Health which was corrupted by mining interests in the 1800s. It continues today by the transfer of old mining money to state and county medical and psychiatric societies *via* Colorado Trust. Boulder County Public Health tries to block me when I try to bring this to public attention. Not this time!

Mercury is also in coalbed methane. To begin to slow the degradation of our genome, I have invented a process to store wind energy, titled "Standalone Distributed Power Generation" that cities/states may be interested in and is detailed in the pdf.

Stay Upwind and Upstream,  
Rich Rebman  
Environmental Health Specialist  
Renegade Research

3380 Moorhead Ave.  
Boulder, CO 80305  
tel [720-217-1926](tel:720-217-1926)  
fax [303-499-1642](tel:303-499-1642)  
[rich.rebman@gmail.com](mailto:rich.rebman@gmail.com)

---

Ed Sztukowski  
email: [edsztukowski@gmail.com](mailto:edsztukowski@gmail.com)

I've been trying to decide whether or not to install solar panels, so have been doing as much research as possible to learn more. The list of resources you provide here ([http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=14226&Itemid=4943#WEBS](http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=14226&Itemid=4943#WEBS)) has provided some nice info, but I found another website I noticed was missing from your list.

The site is <http://www.colorado-solar.org/why-solar-power-in-colorado.php>

These guys seem to offer a lot of great information on how solar panels work, environmental benefits, and they also keep a pretty decent blog. I've found it to be instrumental in gaining a better perspective about solar in particular, and think your other visitors would also find it beneficial.

Thanks again for a great resource, and I hope the site I showed you is a good addition to your list.

---

**From:** Howard C Klemme [<mailto:Klemme@Colorado.EDU>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 27, 2013 5:45 PM  
**To:** Appelbaum, Matt; Council  
**Subject:** PUC's probable lack of constitutional authority to interfere with Boulder's constitutional Home Rule Powers to acquire and operate Xcel's relevant electric distribution facilities w/i and w/o Boulder'

Dear Matt and fellow council members:

As the title of this e-mail indicates, I have grave doubts that the PUC has any constitutional authority to do what it may think it has over matters relating to Boulder's possible acquisition of Xcel's electric distribution system, both within and without the city's geographic limits. The reasons for those doubts are:

- A. Colo. Const. Art. XX, Sec.s 1 and 6, and as well Art. XXV, the last sentence of which reads: "and provided further, that nothing herein shall be construed to apply to municipally owned facilities."
- B. Colorado's leading Supreme Court decision on such matters is City of Thornton, v. P.U.C., 157 Colo, 188, 402 P.2d 194 (1965). This case was an original proceeding in the Colorado Supreme Court for a writ of prohibition which I had suggested to Thornton's City Attorneys to bring to prevent comparable, inappropriate actions by the P.U.C., and in which the City of Thornton prevailed.

May I also offer a few other observations and suggestions (although, as you may know, I work in Boulder, but now reside in Louisville)?

Both the University and the City now own and operate electric generating facilities, and both operations would doubtlessly provide some indication of their capacities to operate *any* connected distribution system at least as (if not more) efficiently and safely than Xcel is able to do - which of course the University has done for many years.

What Xcel really does not want is to lose its monopoly on the electricity it produces and sells to its present Boulder customers and to customers in closely connected surrounding areas and be forced to compete with other wholesale electric producers. Such completion, would in turn be much more likely to lower, not raise, current present Xcel customers' electric rates.

I would suggest that the City might well commit itself, however, to having no differential rates or facilities, etc. between classes of customers (other than those categories that are usually recognized by the PUC and/or other municipalities, like Colorado Springs, etc.) whether a customer in any of those categories is physically within or without the City's limits. Surely, too, just as a matter of common sense and fairness, any outside-of-the-City customers should be able to expect the same standards of treatment and service as customers within the City's limits would expect to receive. In any event, all customers would have a far greater say about such matters than they now have with the PUC.

Contrary to reported claims of Xcel, from my 50+ years of work in the areas of the law of compensable takings, I do not believe Xcel can point to any Colorado or U.S. appellate decisions that would allow compensation for their so-called "stranded costs." Both the Colorado and U.S. Supreme Courts both require compensation be only for the private property "actually taken." See authorities cited in Colorado Civil Jury Instructions, 4th ed., v. 2, chapter 36. The reason, of course, is that Xcel will continue to use the facilities they have already built with those "would-be stranded costs" to provide services to other customers, both old and new, and thus will necessarily have lower future construction costs for future improvements they would otherwise be obligated to spend.

Finally, as Longmont is now doing, Boulder could possibly use its ownership of street light poles and other distribution facilities to make most, if not all of Boulder a free or decided lower cost WIFI city.

Thanks Matt (and your colleagues too) for all your conscientious, hardworking efforts to help keep Boulder and Boulder County among the most remarkable places one could live.

Warmst regards,  
Howard Klemme  
Office: 303.492.7171

---

name: Mary C. Howe  
email: mairch@aol.com  
topic: Other  
other\_topic: Municipal utilities  
comments: Would someone please address the issue of natural gas and where we will get it after you dump Xcel???! We won't be favorable customers of theirs at that point I am certain. This seems to be one of the best kept secrets in this pursuit of municipal electricity. Does anyone have the courage to answer this concern?

---

name: Jim Elkins  
email: [jelkinsii@comcast.net](mailto:jelkinsii@comcast.net)  
zipcode: 80301  
own-home-in-boulder:  
rent-home-in-boulder:  
work-in-boulder: yes  
outside-boulder: yes  
comments: Dear Madam/Sir

Subject: Electricity service annexation in Gunbarrel and non-city residents.

I'm an Xcel user in Gunbarrel not living in the city. We were not allowed to vote in a Boulder City ballot issue that affects us. I have a couple of questions that will affect a number of us in this debate.

I installed solar panels on my house with the financial help of Xcel in paying 66% of the costs of the installation. I have a contract with Xcel to provide electricity to the grid for a total of twenty years. I still have remaining years on the contract. If our electricity is annexed by the city of Boulder, then

- (1). don't I have to pay Xcel back for the loan for unfilled part of the contract?  
and
- (2). doesn't the City of Boulder have an obligation to refund me the amount back?

Is the city of Boulder aware of these costs and that some of us will sue the City if they try to not to compensate us for our lost of money?

What happens to good citizens that wanted to reduce their demand on fossil fuels that cause global warming?

Jim

---

name: Brian Nichols  
email: [benichols@mac.com](mailto:benichols@mac.com)  
zipcode: 80303  
own-home-in-boulder:  
rent-home-in-boulder:  
work-in-boulder: yes  
outside-boulder: yes  
comments: I have a solar PV array on my roof. As such, I receive renewable energy credits from Xcel energy (20 year contract). If you municipalize, obviously Xcel will stop paying these credits. Will the city of Boulder honor those contracts for renewable energy credit from Xcel so that forward thinking citizens won't be penalized for municipalization?

---

name: David Johnson  
email: [4xdjohnson@gmail.com](mailto:4xdjohnson@gmail.com)  
zipcode: 80303  
own-home-in-boulder: yes

rent-home-in-boulder:  
work-in-boulder: yes  
outside-boulder:

comments: My wife and I are in the process of having photovoltaic solar panels installed on our house in South Boulder. Under "municipalization" will the existing "Solar Rewards" program be continued, with the Xcel commitment to recently installed systems being picked up by Boulder?

---

name: Dr. R. Paul Williamson  
email: [sustainablessystemsofcolorado@gmail.com](mailto:sustainablessystemsofcolorado@gmail.com)  
zipcode: 80020  
own-home-in-boulder:  
rent-home-in-boulder:  
work-in-boulder: yes  
outside-boulder:

comments: I am in the process of moving forward to install an elevated guideway system between Boulder and Longmont. With this system we could, at the same time, install a solar generation system of several megawatts. Would Boulder Energy be interested in a power purchase agreement?

---

name: Doug Schuler  
email: [boulderbikes@gmail.com](mailto:boulderbikes@gmail.com)  
zipcode: 80303  
own-home-in-boulder: yes  
rent-home-in-boulder:  
work-in-boulder: yes  
outside-boulder:

comments: I'm curious why the 3rd party proposal to review Boulder's analysis is to assume that the values to acquire the grid and stranded costs are correct? Since these are the largest costs of creating a muni, it seems a bit backwards to prevent the 3rd party from evaluating them.

Please advise what will happen if the assumptions are wrong, and the costs are much higher than the city has estimated. Since we just went thru this exact same thing with FastTraks, I'd hate to see it happen again so soon.

Sincerely,

Doug Schuler  
Boulder, CO

---

name: Michael Roach  
email: [michael@microgridhorizons.com](mailto:michael@microgridhorizons.com)  
zipcode: 10280  
own-home-in-boulder:  
rent-home-in-boulder:  
work-in-boulder:  
outside-boulder:

comments: Please sign me up for the newsletter. We are a microgrid development and finance company based in New York City. Our web site is [www.microgridhorizons.com](http://www.microgridhorizons.com)

Thank you.

---

name: James Pequette  
email: [jcp\\_kala@comcast.net](mailto:jcp_kala@comcast.net)  
zipcode: 80120  
own-home-in-boulder:  
rent-home-in-boulder:  
work-in-boulder:  
outside-boulder:

comments: I support your efforts to force Xcel to provide clean energy. I am part of a group (Fossil Fuel Free Denver) that is working with Denver to move in the same direction. In fact, we would like to see a coalition of Front Range communities join the effort.

James C. Pequette, Ph.D  
Managing Partner  
KALA Consulting, LLC  
720-371-4360

---

name: Jill Hammel  
email: [hammeljill@aol.com](mailto:hammeljill@aol.com)  
zipcode: 80301  
own-home-in-boulder:  
rent-home-in-boulder:  
work-in-boulder:  
outside-boulder: yes  
comments: There is a meeting on June 27th 7 - 9 PM

East Boulder Senior  
Center address and phone is:

Address: 5660 Sioux Dr, Boulder, CO 80303  
Phone:(303) 441-4150

Xcel Energy reps. will give their presentation and then take questions from the community. Hope to see any and all members from the City and Staff in attendance.

Thanks.

---

name: Douglas Johnson  
email: [drjohn@colorado.edi](mailto:drjohn@colorado.edi)  
zipcode: 80301  
own-home-in-boulder:  
rent-home-in-boulder:  
work-in-boulder:  
outside-boulder: yes  
comments:

Greetings,

I arrived a little late to the GnuBarrel community meeting. I was astonished by the hostility of the residents. I for one, am not concerned about annexation nor electrical rates. I would gladly pay higher rates for responsibly produced electrical power especially when the profits will go to city and/or county community projects; under-grounding wires, community based broad band, etc.

Since I arrived a little late, I must have missed the part about how it actually gets decided whether unincorporated Boulder county is included in the plan or not. I want it included. If this was discussed in the opening slides, can you either send me a copy of the presentation or let me know when they are posted on your site.

Thank you for the work you are doing. I pray that this is a success and that the folks in unincorporated Boulder County are visionary enough to participate. I would much prefer to buy my power from a public entity than a private corporation.

I would also like to add that the true cost of power is not what appears on your utility bill anymore than the true cost of a gallon of gas in the cost at the pump. There are some many hidden costs that people are completely unaware of. To be fair, renewable energy sources are not free once the equipment are paid for. There are hidden costs here as well. In addition, clean energy is probably not as clean as most people would like to believe; hydro-electric causes environmental damage to water ways and aquatic life, wind turbines use rare earth metals that have a large environmental impact to produce, the semi-conductor industry used to produce photovoltaic cells is water intensive and rather dirty. All that said, these are all probably better than coal burning power plants. The only truism that I really know is that all resource extraction (power production) will damage the earth. The goal is to minimize that impact. The best way to minimize that impact is to reduce consumption. Good luck selling that idea. Jim Carter probably lost that 1980 election simply because he told people or put on a sweater and turn down the thermostat

Finally, people in unincorporated might want to be annexed so that they can benefit from the Boulder City moratorium on fracking, and oil and gas production. I fear county residents are in danger of becoming another Weld or Garfield county. I wonder how many people at the meeting understand that?

Thank you,  
Douglas Johnson  
4596 Starboard Dr  
Boulder, CO 80301  
Resident for > 22 years

---

name: John Knapp  
email: [jjknapp\\_5@msn.com](mailto:jjknapp_5@msn.com)  
zipcode: 80301  
own-home-in-boulder:  
rent-home-in-boulder:  
work-in-boulder:  
outside-boulder: yes

comments: Will the City annex the powerline on 75th street?

---

name: Jan DeCourtney  
email: [coloradojan97@yahoo.com](mailto:coloradojan97@yahoo.com)  
zipcode: 80301  
own-home-in-boulder:  
rent-home-in-boulder:  
work-in-boulder:  
outside-boulder: yes  
comments: I have a Boulder address but am considered in Boulder County in  
Gunbarrel. I hope we are included in this municipal electric utility. I would  
really like to be a part of it.

---

**From:** Karey Christ-Janer [<mailto:karey@boulder.net>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 30, 2013 8:57 AM  
**To:** [karey@boulder.net](mailto:karey@boulder.net)  
**Cc:** Council; Brautigam, Jane; Bailey, Heather; Carr, Thomas; Gehr, David; Kalish, Debra; Driskell, David; Gichon, Yael; Koehn, Jonathan; Mertz, Kara; Crandall, Kelly; Eichem, Bob; Huntley, Sarah; Haddock, Kathy; Barth, Andrew; Davis, Jerome E; [Craig.L.Eicher@XcelEnergy.com](mailto:Craig.L.Eicher@XcelEnergy.com)  
**Subject:** Corporate support; David Miller

Dear Boulder, et al---

First, just a heads up that **to my knowledge, David Miller never actually lied during the 2011 campaign about being paid** as Ken Regelson's recent Letter to the Editor claimed, outright. I just felt I had to say so somewhere, and publicly. I have been thinking of writing an LTE explaining this, but honestly, I'm not sure that I even feel comfortable taking on that task...the tomatoes are flying high and hard on this issue, and because of state-wide efforts I'm pursuing, I really don't like the idea of becoming a "target" again even to this very modest degree. But I did want to say this to you all, in this way.

Next, I read with great interest the article about Macon's proposal for campaign disclosure. I think there are a lot of questions around this, and rather than write them in a different way, I'll just copy below what I wrote in the Camera blog today, as some issues to think about for Tuesday:

***"This article brings up a host of issues. It will be an interesting analysis to watch unfold, especially since what Cowles is proposing does seem to conflict with the Supreme Court decision re: corporations, potentially.***

***Further, if Xcel were to challenge this but the city succeeded, where would this "stop," as a possible precedent? Could shareholders then rise up and try to prevent companies from other marketing decisions normally in its purview now, like forcing approval of a corporate slogan, or non-political ad campaigns, etc.? Seems questionable, but really--where would the line be drawn?***

***As for the smaller local groups, what would Cowles propose with regard to spending monies from donations already receipted for by these groups? Do these groups then also need to go back to those***

**donors and ask them if it's OK to use their donations for political ads, etc.? What if some of their donations actually came from corporations....say, a local solar company? Do they need to then go to their CEO/leadership and ask if they can give approval to the small local group to use their funds? Also confusing to think about.**

**And if it's possibly only FUTURE donations that these smaller local groups must receive permission to use for political purposes, then would it also be true that, say, Xcel can also use present monies, but only FUTURE revenue earned from the day this might be enacted, forward, would be subject to approval by shareholders? (?)**

**And, what about businesses that may not be corporations? What about say, a local realtor, "incorporated" or not, or a partnership---what is the actual threshold?**

**Again...this seems to bring up more questions than you can shake a stick at."**

Karey C-J

---

name: M Adaline Jyurovat

email: [adalinej@gmail.com](mailto:adalinej@gmail.com)

zipcode: 8302

own-home-in-boulder: yes

rent-home-in-boulder:

work-in-boulder:

outside-boulder:

comments: Electric power went off in my area at 4:15AM, on at 9:20, off again 2 more times so far today. First call to Xcel responder was in Wisconsin. Second call was answered in Texas. I could not get much info because all they knew was a switch malfunctioned, and it could take until 9:45 for service to return.

So: If energy project goes through, will Boulder buy/inherit this old/malfunctioning equipment? \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$

(Why would it take 5+ hours to repair a switch, and how often does this happen?) This has been a problem where I live for decades. There were a few remarkable/no power failure years ca. 2008-2010.

We know enormous amounts of energy are lost in transmission lines. How can Boulder address that? \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$ It should have been fixed/redone years ago.

---

name: Jen

email: [jklafin@gmail.com](mailto:jklafin@gmail.com)

zipcode: 80301

own-home-in-boulder: yes

rent-home-in-boulder: yes

work-in-boulder: yes  
outside-boulder: yes  
comments: forwarded message below

name: Jennifer Klafin  
email: [jlklafin@gmail.com](mailto:jlklafin@gmail.com)  
topic: Planning  
other\_topic: Energy  
comments: Hi City of Boulder-

I'm writing with regards to the City of Boulder's plans to take over providing energy to Boulder residents from Excel. Please direct my email to the proper team or agency.

In 2011 when I purchased my condo, the City of Boulder map showed my property within city limits which is one of the main reasons I chose it. At the end of 2012 when I refinanced the map showed that it was no longer in city limits.

I encourage the City of Boulder to consider including all of Gunbarrel in the Boulder city limits which would add 10,000 more residents to support the energy localization.

Appreciate your time and consideration!

Thank you, ~Jen

Jennifer Klafin  
4757 White Rock Cir, Unit B  
Boulder, CO 80301  
415 710 7092

---

name: Robert Beckman  
email: [Baratus1@gmail.com](mailto:Baratus1@gmail.com)  
zipcode: 80219  
own-home-in-boulder:  
rent-home-in-boulder:  
work-in-boulder:  
outside-boulder:  
comments: I'm simply interested in supporting this initiative...all cities can use Bolder as an example

---

name: Steve Gabel  
email: [sggski@msn.com](mailto:sggski@msn.com)  
zipcode: 80302  
own-home-in-boulder: yes  
rent-home-in-boulder:  
work-in-boulder:  
outside-boulder:  
comments: What discussion/provision/solution has been included in the municipalization project w/ incentivizing solar pv on residential and commercial roofs? Currently Xcel has the SolarRewards Program. Thanks.

---

**From:** "Kaboth, Linda" <[lkaboth@sugf.com](mailto:lkaboth@sugf.com)>

**Date:** May 15, 2013, 1:58:29 PM MDT

**To:** "[council@bouldercolorado.gov](mailto:council@bouldercolorado.gov)" <[council@bouldercolorado.gov](mailto:council@bouldercolorado.gov)>

**Subject:** Boulder municipalization plan

Dear Councilmembers: My husband and I live in Boulder County on the border of the City of Boulder and Boulder County. (Cherryvale abuts our property). We are extremely concerned about your ability to make governmental decisions that affect our home and life without our approval (either directly or through a vote). We do not live in the City of Boulder. We are opposed to the municipalization of our utility service. Even the term municipalization has the word City (municipal) as it's root word – not County. We live in the County. We never thought that the City could make decisions that would affect our home and life – except if it related to something across the street. This is fundamentally wrong – as I am sure you agree. We were not allowed to vote in any City elections – but we now must adhere to your laws. This is wrong and against our basic rights. Please provide me with the argument that supports your taking of our utility infrastructure and forcing us to purchase utility service from the City of Boulder. The argument cannot be that you need it to further your plans. That is unacceptable to those of us that have taken a basic civics course. Please reconsider your plans. Thank you. Linda and Dennis Kaboth 1229 Mallard Court, Boulder Colorado 80303

Linda P. Kaboth

Vice President, National Division

GF Real Estate Group

355 South Teller Street, Suite 210

Lakewood, Colorado 80226

[lkaboth@sugf.com](mailto:lkaboth@sugf.com)

970-764-6460 (Office)

970-759-0237 (Cell)

---

**From:** Eric Olson [<mailto:eolson@stoller.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 14, 2013 5:40 PM

**To:** Council

**Cc:** [commissioners@bouldercounty.org](mailto:commissioners@bouldercounty.org)

**Subject:** Proposed Boulder Municipalization (County Resident View) Attn: Ms. Alisa Lewis

Dear Ms. Lewis,

I was out of town and did not get to comment of the proposed finalists for the third party independent review. I do have a comment on one of the firms, the combination of Downes and Assoc. and Strategic Utility Management.

Mr. Ed Regan "retired" from GRU (Gainesville FL Regional Utilities) last year. Prior to that, he was the one person responsible for GRU's rapidly escalating rates. He single-handedly implemented the program that has paid hundreds of dollars per MWh for PV solar and he is the one responsible for the biomass plant that will cost over \$130/MWh in a state where the marketplace is less than half of that. The rates in the city of Gainesville are certainly non-competitive at this point and the ratepayers are very upset (to the extent that they recently voted out the more liberal mayor and replaced him with one who promised more fiscal control). If Boulder wants a perfunctory confirmation of its green intentions, Mr. Regan is a good choice. If you want a truly independent review, he is not the one. He will come with a very strong bias.

Sincerely,

Eric Olson

4408 Wellington Road

Boulder, CO 80301

[eolson@stoller.com](mailto:eolson@stoller.com)

---

On May 10, 2013, at 7:46 AM, Karey Christ-Janer <[karey@boulder.net](mailto:karey@boulder.net)> wrote:

Dear Boulder, et al---

Folks, feel I should tell you that I believe Xcel is highly, highly confident that their position is correct on the PUC/county customers issue---that is, about actually who gets to actually serve, and collect revenue, from those customers.

I have tried to alert or warn you as to what I am seeing as a now-ever-weakening position that the city has with regard to "leverage," and hints from this side of things are that this is truly at an all-time-LOW.

This does not help with any prospects for ANY positive outcome. What we are likely to see now is a negative campaign with strong push-back from muni advocates which escalates and galvanizes both sides. I want to say: I did not wake up celebrating, therefore.

I am holding out some hope for the Working Group process, but, how do we all think the community will be prepared to get behind an Xcel option, in the full swing of all this? To be clear...I think there may truly be good options. To be clearer, I think the community---not Xcel---may at that point simply be waiting with a mud-pie to throw in its face.

I hope I'm wrong about that last bit.

And I'm sure I am being redundant, but the risks are just so huge. SO huge....

Sorry for (another, if familiar) sobering note.

Karey

--

Sent from my Android phone with K-9 Mail. Please excuse my brevity (or lack thereof).

, Karey Christ-Janer <[karey@boulder.net](mailto:karey@boulder.net)> wrote:

Folks---First a reminder to Macon that I am an Xcel customer in Boulder and would ask for the same rights as others who express themselves, and I always try to be respectful, and ask for the same courtesy in return, which did not seem forthcoming today. Onward....

This morning I was in a CPUC workshop re: "operational flexibility" which is new terminology relating to renewable integration. SCE (Edison) and balancing area CAISO are going to use stochastic modeling to determine system constraints and there is talk of "bundled resource" procurement down the road, which is very exciting, and it is THIS that I advocate for....both here and in Colorado.

This is a "new" resource capability that the utilities will hopefully be developing to avoid, for example, new natural gas generation. There is hope that if San Onofre nuclear plant is decommissioned, bundled resources (which can include DSM) may be able to pick up where that load left off, so to speak.

If anyone on Council is interested, ask Carl Castillo or Deb K. or Jonathan K. What I am hoping to promote along with others, including the city....just very recently. It is not CCA but an alternate like what is contained in the city's Legislative Priorities, largely (or, similar). It is, basically, supporting "bundled resources," but now I'm going over familiar territory.

But what's NEW is that in CA, this sort of thing seems to be becoming reality, and quickly....and the IOUs really seem to be "getting it." Bigtime. I hope this can be adopted in CO instead of a massive, ugly fight at the legislature.

Last thing...to clarify the opening of this a.m.'s email, here is what I wrote on the DC site just now about the County customers, and this may help clarify what I meant:

"...I think you misunderstood what I meant. I was not talking about extending city areas through adding annexed land and/or extending infrastructure when there are AGREEMENTS in place. This happens all the time, and the example I've heard cited was when Loveland muni condemned property up the Thompson where their generating station was going to be.

However, the Boulder situation involves not only condemnation outside city borders, but the assumption that the city has the right to take customers---basically, by force. Where would be the line that would go too far? The edge of the state? Seriously. What Xcel seems to be saying is: condemning property is one thing.....and assuming the city has the RIGHT to SERVE that load is quite another...."

I again ask to be treated with respect, and if you choose to listen or read, that would be good, too. There

is a LOT to share out here.

Have a good weekend, all.

--Karey

---

name: Puneet Pasrich

email: [pasrich@buckyballsystems.com](mailto:pasrich@buckyballsystems.com)

zipcode: 80303

own-home-in-boulder: yes

rent-home-in-boulder:

work-in-boulder: yes

outside-boulder:

comments: Though PowerServices has quite a strong consulting background and expertise, they are very much a traditional consulting company. While conversing with their President, I learned that the numbers he uses for fossil fuels are vastly lower than today's costs and, conversely, financial and operational numbers from the 2005-2008 time frame for renewable generation. That is, his bias is highly towards fossil fuel generators. For example, he quoted wind farms having a 13% capacity factor "as the industry standard", while CO & WY wind farms are \*showing\* 30%+ capacity factors. In effect, this devalues the operational contribution of wind by a factor of 2.5.

Strategic Utility Management and Downes Associates Inc. comments:

I very much like the use of a probabilistic Monte Carlo simulation.

I am more confident of their work and strength of their experience.

They have also been involved in the evaluation of several other utility acquisitions.

I had the impression they have a greater understanding of Boulder, it's values and goals, as well as the work that the City has already completed in the last year.

In short, Strategic Utility Management did their homework and came prepared to answer Boulder's questions. I believe they would be the better candidate to evaluate the viability of Boulder's municipalization effort.

Regards,

Puneet Pasrich

PS. At the top of

[http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=17967&Itemid=4636](http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=17967&Itemid=4636) , "Video of finalist presentations on May 8" should point to <http://vimeo.com/65831567> . The current link results in an error.

---

name: Eric Thayer

email: [ericthayer@yahoo.com](mailto:ericthayer@yahoo.com)

zipcode: 80015

own-home-in-boulder:  
rent-home-in-boulder:  
work-in-boulder: yes  
outside-boulder:

comments: I have 20 years experience in corporate restructuring, corporate finance, and strategy primarily in the energy industry. I have completed numerous M&A transactions as large as \$5.9 billion. I have had budgetary and direct report responsibility in both large corporate and small company environments. I have managed commodity transaction budgets as large as \$4 billion.

I would like to be involved in your efforts to become an independent municipal utility. I could do this on a contract or full-time basis.

Please contact me to discuss.

Sincerely,

Eric Thayer  
(970) 466-2854

---

**From:** Michael Greene [<mailto:greenemp@onebox.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 08, 2013 2:49 PM

**To:** Council

**Subject:** Boulder researchers team with Xcel Energy to fine-tune renewable energy forecasts - Boulder Daily Camera

So for all of this money we want to spend can we really do better than this?

In the end we will just own the transmission and buy the power from Excel anyway right

Let's not waste all of this money

[http://www.dailycamera.com/news/boulder/ci\\_23194089/boulder-researchers-team-xcel-energy-fine-tune-renewable](http://www.dailycamera.com/news/boulder/ci_23194089/boulder-researchers-team-xcel-energy-fine-tune-renewable)

---

name: Dinah McKay

email: [dinah.mckay@colorado.edu](mailto:dinah.mckay@colorado.edu)

zipcode: 80301

own-home-in-boulder:

rent-home-in-boulder:

work-in-boulder:

outside-boulder: yes

comments: I have had solar panels on my roof for 5 years and under XCEL's latest policy arrangements, I can carry forward my solar credits. I do not have to cash them out at the end of the year as was their previous policy. (Many people with solar panels were very unhappy with that previous policy because at the end of the year was precisely the time we needed our credits most and the cash out was for 3 cents a KWh. But when our panels produced the electricity to the grid, it was at peak energy hours when electricity is most expensive and it was not fair that we should be given the lowest value for our credits).

XCEL changed that policy and now I can carry my solar credits forward. My question is, will the new City Utility have this same policy of carrying forward our solar credits ? Also, if some county residents want to cash in their credits, what rate will they receive?

I am in favor of having the City Utility, but there are people who are being told (by XCEL reps) that the new City Utility will not honor any solar incentives which doesn't make sense to me. Please let me know what solar incentives the City Utility will offer.

---

name: Maureen Taylor  
email: [maureen.taylor@mac.com](mailto:maureen.taylor@mac.com)  
zipcode: 80301  
own-home-in-boulder:  
rent-home-in-boulder:  
work-in-boulder:  
outside-boulder: yes  
comments: Just for clarification - you talk about electricity rates not being different between City and County.

As you may appreciate there is the fixed cost of transmission and distribution, balancing, admin etc.. Will there be a difference between the standing charges between City and County residents? We already have to pay more for our water service even though in my case I am literally across the road from the City....

I made it plain at the initial meeting that we would prefer not to be used as a cash cow.

Maureen  
Orange Orchard Member

---

name: bob story  
email: [bobstory2012@gmail.com](mailto:bobstory2012@gmail.com)  
zipcode: 80305  
own-home-in-boulder: yes  
rent-home-in-boulder:  
work-in-boulder:  
outside-boulder:  
comments: I am 4 years into a 20 year contract with SunRun with solar panels on my roof that provide energy to Excel. How will municipalization effect that contract if at all? I am currently paying \$70 per month for electricity which is set for the term.  
bob

---

name: Ron Laughery  
email: [ron@laugherys.com](mailto:ron@laugherys.com)  
zipcode: 80302  
own-home-in-boulder:  
rent-home-in-boulder:  
work-in-boulder:  
outside-boulder:

comments: I find it interesting that you do not cite a link on your web site to my recent column in the Camera regarding your suppression of the Energy models. The link to the Camera web site is [http://www.dailycamera.com/opinion-columnists/ci\\_22851498/laughery-share-municipalization-models-everyone-please?IADID=Search-www.dailycamera.com-www.dailycamera.com](http://www.dailycamera.com/opinion-columnists/ci_22851498/laughery-share-municipalization-models-everyone-please?IADID=Search-www.dailycamera.com-www.dailycamera.com)

I presume it is sufficiently relevant and hope it is to your standards. Should you choose not to include this on your references, any explanation you might offer would be appreciated.

---

name: Meg Tierney  
email: [Tierneyfyi@comcast.net](mailto:Tierneyfyi@comcast.net)  
zipcode: 80305  
own-home-in-boulder:  
rent-home-in-boulder: yes  
work-in-boulder:  
outside-boulder:  
comments: Check out what Ithaca did! We're on the right track!

<http://youthpowersummit2013.wordpress.com/>

---

**From:** Karey Christ-Janer [<mailto:karey@boulder.net>]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 22, 2013 12:43 PM  
**To:** Wilson, Ken  
**Cc:** Council  
**Subject:** Paul Fenn/CleanPowerSF approaches + RE: MAJOR heads-up re: Cost of Carbon

Thanks, Ken. Makes sense.

Folks, in case you want a detailed update on CleanPowerSF (San Francisco's CCA effort), this link will provide the developments in vivid detail, including where Paul Fenn's localization approach has been in the past in this regard, and where it is now. It's very important, I think, to bear in mind the challenges that CCA may have, and this outlines it well. Of course, it relates to the muni effort and/or localization approached adjacently, too, potentially:

<http://www.sfweekly.com/2013-04-10/news/puc-cleanpowersf-pg-e-renewable-energy-credits/6/>

The only update I know of (since then) is that PG&E has filed their new settlement proposal with other parties in the Green Option proceeding, which suggests an in-state renewable product, potentially local, and which could help satisfy the "additionality" issue which some activists covet (I've sent you info on this previously). Of course, that Green Option program would be distinct from CleanPowerSF---the idea is that it would provide fair competition to it, and as an "opt-in" program, as CCA is "opt-out" for those included in the roll-out.

There is an important hearing re: CleanPowerSF tomorrow, I believe.

Karey

"Wilson, Ken" <[WilsonK@bouldercolorado.gov](mailto:WilsonK@bouldercolorado.gov)> wrote:

Karey,

This is not surprising to me. I have said several times that the majority of Munis are very conservative. They worry about keeping the lights on and keeping rates low. Generally Munis are at least as conservative as the cities they represent. Of course, there are exceptions both ways.

This did get me to thinking about the issue of other Colorado cities and potential municipalization in another way. In the first place, and I have also said this for years, I don't think that if Boulder is successful there will be a rush by other cities in Colorado to municipalize. If Boulder could only generate a 51/49 win, other cities would be much the reverse. Other city councils will also not want to take on the years of acrimonious process or the millions of dollars in costs. We would not be a roadmap as we will be looking to get a blue light special on stranded costs and acquisition and if we are successful it would only be because we are able to skim the cream off the top, leaving other cities holding the bag.

But then you bring up an excellent point. If other cities did municipalize, what makes anyone think they would rush to renewables? Cities have historically municipalized because of reliability problems or the desire for lower costs. Why would that not be true in Colorado? On the flip side, if all the Colorado cities were as hot for renewables as BOulder, the pressure they would create on Xcel, the PUC and the legislature would get us there much more quickly.

Best,

Ken

Fracking our way to Muniaplization

---

**From:** Karey Christ-Janer [karey@boulder.net]

**Sent:** Sunday, April 21, 2013 8:26 AM

**To:** Council

**Cc:** Davis, Jerome E; [Craig.L.Eicher@XcelEnergy.com](mailto:Craig.L.Eicher@XcelEnergy.com); Brautigam, Jane; Bailey, Heather; Carr, Thomas; Gehr, David; Kalish, Debra; Driskell, David; Gichon, Yael; Koehn, Jonathan; Mertz, Kara; Crandall, Kelly; Eichem, Bob; Huntley, Sarah; Haddock, Kathy; Barth, Andrew

**Subject:** MAJOR heads-up re: Cost of Carbon

cc: Jerome and Craig, Xcel Energy

**Dear Boulder folks-----please read this thoroughly--the news below may "pull the rug out" from under ALL the muni models, and puts all of us environmentally-minded folks in the same "boat" in many ways....not a pretty boat (I too am devastated, as it affects all of my hopes and goals as well).** I only discovered this last night, very late.

**In breaking news midday Friday, some fossil-fuel industry groups have now begun an attempt to eliminate the regulation of carbon.** (See links below for more info).

**Ironically, the American Public Power Association (representing MUNICIPAL UTILITIES) is fairly "front and center" in this charge.** (And these are the entities who Boulder hopes will line up behind Boulder's model of a muni?) I do not

know if Xcel is a member of one of the industry groups--so far I have not seen their name.

**I think this puts the whole muni endeavor in a FAR different light--no matter how you cut it, cost of carbon adders would be based on future regulation, right? And, would the models hold up without a cost of carbon, if the Supreme Court rules that way? This should be front-page news for Boulder, IMHO.**

Please study the below carefully.....

(As I'd written to you on Friday) first, early/mid last week, an important deadline in implementing regulation of CO2 emissions passed by, and subsequently NRDC, Sierra Club, EDF, ten states and D.C. filed an Intent to Sue relating to the missed deadline...which includes regulation of new electric generation facilities (largely coal) and points also to requirements to subsequently regulate emissions from existing generation facilities.

As the week drew to an end, various industry associations, including the American Chemical Council and UARG (utility industry group) petitioned the Supreme Court to review the lower District Court decision which upheld the regulation of CO2 mentioned above (Clean Air Act Section 111(d) most specifically).

I'd like to think that with the feds seeing their own states suing them, and the very clear rise in global temperatures, the harm caused by carbon will appear obvious, and there will be no threat to the current Clean Air Act requirements by law. And sure hope those requirements are implemented SOON.

Last thing...some industry associations earlier last week---including local Tri-State (powers rural electrics around here) as well as the American Public Power Association filed to fight the EPA on EXISTING "MATS" regs. (mercury and air toxics like SO2 and NOX).

Yes...folks, that includes a "public power" association fighting these regs---as in, municipal utilities, and co-ops.

Just seemed important to bear in mind as we recognize Earth Day tomorrow. If you care...write the White House and make your voice heard, as just one thing you can do to support the Clean Air Act.

(The above 6 PPs, slightly shortened, were written on the Camera site in response to Erika Stutzman's DC editorial today..no need to re-write the same thing so I just quoted that.)

Here are the links explaining this development:

<http://mobile.reuters.com/article/idUSBRE93J01720130420?irpc=932>

AND...(re: Tri-State and American Public Power Association):

<http://m.bizjournals.com/denver/news/2012/04/17/tri-state-sues-over-epa-mercury-air.html?page=all&r=full>

AND see the actual filing from last Friday by one of the entities involved, attached.

Ouch....for ALL of us. Never a dull moment.

Karey

From: Benjamin Swartzwelter [<mailto:swartzski@hotmail.com>]

Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2013 8:26 PM  
To: Council  
Subject: Boulder Internet

Dear Boulder!

With this energy municipalization you have a chance to to what Chattanooga Tennessee did: Wire Fiber Optic internet to every one of their households and businesses. If you do this, your business attractiveness will explode, and it will be one of the best investments ever made. Please DO IT.

Sincerely,  
Keep Boulder Smart  
Ben Swartzwelter

---

Dear City Counsel Members,

I am one of the 49.x percent of the tax payers in the county that voted against the City of Boulder taking over the electric utility operations.

Firstly, a little about my educational and professional experience in the fields of expertise that are germane to evaluation supported by a small majority of voters. Secondly, some observations as to my experience as it related to your "study".

Education: B.S., Industrial Science, University of Massachusetts (International Honor Society - Undergraduate Thesis: "Underground homes for the Eighties")

Post Undergraduate Work in the Field of Energy Conservation / Renewables: 3 years field work as Residential Energy Auditor for state of Massachusetts (Mass Save). 2 Years Field work for the State of California - Energy Auditor, Commercial Load Balancing

M.S. Telecommunications Engineering, University of Colorado. Hewlett Packard Company (20 years)

5 years Engineering/ Project Management, 3 years Departmental Management, 12 years Sales Executive, responsible for solutioning and sales of Global IT Outsourcing contracts in excess \$100M (typically 5 year deals) reporting to C-Level Executives. Task included but not limited to; developing and communicating value proposition (internally and external), sales planning, solution engineering, delivery engineering (to include transition planning), staffing, financial engineering, contract development, contract negotiations, sales presentations, internal review and approval (risk management), ....

Observations:

**"Sales Presentation"**: Given the statements made by many of counsel during the lasts session, you are at risk of alienating ~ 50% of your constituents based upon what I for one observe to be a save the world bias at the cost of sound economic rational (your fiduciary duty).

**Solution Risk**: Brilliant minds around the world have not yet figured out how to deliver wind or solar at economically viable cost, yet the city of Boulder Counsel of Boulder is convinced that they can do so ?

**Transition Risk:** I have worked with some of world best, highly specialized technology Transition Teams developing transition plans to a level of detail that would blow anyone's mind. I have never seen a single transition plan succeed (on time / on budget). In some cases the inability to transition within the specified contract led to legal action. BTW...you will have to have a working relationship with the "incumbent provider if you want to have any chance of success.

**Contract risk:** See Transition Risk. According to the statements made by counsel members on broadcast TV, I will have better rates and reliability (I think better, faster, cheaper is on the tape as well). Please be sure that this is included in the contract, including Critical Milestones Critical Deliverable, Service Level Agreements and associated Penalties and Credits.

**Financial Risk:** See Solution Risk. Other than testimony from a counsel member that stated a community in Germany produced 4 times more energy from Alternative Energy Sources than they used, and another stating that my Electricity would be less expensive and more reliable, please provide your constituents with the scientific / economic data that shows wind / solar will reduce my electric utility costs. Given the FACT that cost per KWH is more expensive, and the taxpayers of Boulder will have to maintain full capacity via conventional mean for days when the sun does not shine and the wind does not blow, I look forward to counsel explaining the model.

**Transparency:** Given the above, and considering the bias that seems to be present, I feel that it is critically important that the model being utilized for the development of a go-no-go business case be fully vetted to ensure it's accuracy. As a member of the community who paid for the model that will ultimate make or break the case for moving forward, I need to know if I have a right to understand it's assumptions, data input, formulas, , .... People who make a living in the world of financial modeling understand that this is where the rubber meets the road. Suggesting it is "proprietary" causes me great concern (why not give it to Excel to poke holes in if it is defensible)?

**Legal Risk:** Exclusion of county residence in the vote (what would happen of you took out the college vote and include the tax payers of the county) , condemnation of existing infrastructure that provides > 99% reliability for the purposed o acquiring property at "fair market value" in order to build a business case, counsel members suggesting (on tape) beyond a doubt that Boulder residence will not only see a reduction in our utility bill, but that reliability will not be effected.

**Objectivity:** This may be your greatest risk. No offense, but I am not drinking the cool-aid, and I suggest counsel would be well served to do the same. To be quite frank, the zeal of council to be seen as a "world changers" has severely limited it's ability to uphold it's fiduciary duty to it's citizen's.

### **"Boulder, Twenty five square miles surrounded by reality"**

Many of the adults who are raising children and paying taxes do not want more reefer shops that Starbucks, a tax on going to the market (if I'm going to pay for a bag - at least make it bio-degradable), higher utility bills, new / expensive / redundant bike paths between Folsom and 28th (bikers have a full lane on Folsom ....no wonder you are going to impose a FEE for road use because the cities maintenance costs is going up).

Based upon this "short list" of facts, I strongly oppose the City Counsel moving forward with further evaluation in accordance with the fiduciary duties required by City Charter.

Among other things, I am a lifelong advocate of Energy Conservation, Renewable Energies, Nuclear Energy, Clean Coal, Biofuels, etc. I support lower taxes of via the reduction of government in our lives. I believe in free enterprise.

Sincerely,

Tim Dooley  
2272 Juniper Avenue  
Boulder, 80304

---

### Siren Song of Wind and Solar Energy

Despite advocates' claims to the contrary, wind and solar continue to be the most expensive sources of electricity. The *New York Times* recently reported that "[wind power is currently more than 50 percent more expensive](#) than power generated from a traditional coal plant."<sup>[1]</sup> Energy Secretary Stephen Chu told the *New York Times* that [solar technology would have to get five times better](#) to be competitive in today's energy market.<sup>[2]</sup> In spite of these reports and [admissions](#), the [public relations campaign](#) for wind and solar powered electricity marches on. For decades, representatives and advocates of wind and solar have claimed that their technology was near a competitive tipping point—but just needed a bit more subsidies, set-asides, and government aid to succeed. But even after 30 years of massive subsidies, wind and solar continue to be more expensive and contribute only a small amount of electricity. In 2008, wind produced 1.3% of the electrical generation in America and solar produced a meager 0.02%.<sup>[3]</sup> The quotations below highlight the errant predictions of near-term viability (with the predictions bolded for emphasis). These are just some of the examples of over 30 years of claims that wind and solar will soon be cost competitive.

#### Overly Optimistic Wind/Solar Claims

In 1983, Booz, Allen & Hamilton did a study for the Solar Energy Industries Association, American Wind Energy Association, and Renewable Energy Institute. It stated: "The private sector can be expected to develop improved solar and wind technologies which will begin to become competitive and self-supporting on a national level by **the end of the decade** [i.e. by 1990] if assisted by tax credits and augmented by federally sponsored R&D."<sup>[4]</sup>

In 1986, Amory Lovins of the Rocky Mountain Institute lamented the untimely scale-back of tax breaks for renewable energy, since the competitive viability of wind and solar technologies was "**one to three years away**."<sup>[5]</sup>

In 1990, two energy analysts at the Worldwatch Institute predicted an *almost complete displacement* of fossil fuels in the electric generation market within a couple decades [i.e. 2010]: **Within a few decades**, a geographically diverse country such as the United States might get 30 percent of its electricity from sunshine, 20 percent from hydropower, 20 percent from wind power, 10 percent from biomass, 10 percent from geothermal energy, and 10 percent from natural-gas-fired cogeneration.<sup>[6]</sup>

#### Overly Optimistic Wind Power Claims

In 1986, a representative of the American Wind Energy Association testified:  
The U.S. wind industry has ... demonstrated reliability and performance levels that make them very competitive. It has come to the point that the California Energy Commission has predicted [windpower](#) will be that State's **lowest cost source of energy in the 1990s**, beating out even large-scale hydro.

...

We are not quite there. We have hopes.[\[7\]](#)

Christopher Flavin of the Worldwatch Institute has been predicting competitive viability since the 1980s. In 1984 he wrote:

Tax credits have been essential to the economic viability of wind farms so far, but will not be needed **within a few years**.[\[8\]](#)

In 1985, he wrote:

Although wind farms still depend on tax credits, they are likely to be economical without this support **within a few years**.[\[9\]](#)

In 1986, he wrote:

Early evidence indicates that wind power will **soon take its place as a decentralized power source that is economical in many areas**.... Utility-sponsored studies show that the better windfarms can produce power at a cost of about 7¢ per kilowatt-hour, which is competitive with conventional power sources in the United States.[\[10\]](#)

### **Overly Optimistic Solar Power Claims**

In 1976, solar advocate Barry Commoner stated:

Mixed solar/conventional installations could become the most economical alternative in most parts of the United States **within the next few years**.[\[11\]](#)

In 1987 the head of the Solar Energy Industries Association stated:

I think frankly, the—the consensus as far as I can see is **after the year 2000**, somewhere between 10 and 20 percent of our energy could come from solar technologies, quite easily.[\[12\]](#)

In 1988, Cynthia Shea of the Worldwatch Institute wrote:

In **future decades**, [photovoltaic technologies] may become standard equipment on new buildings, using the sunlight streaming through windows to generate electricity.[\[13\]](#)

### **Conclusion**

**Wind and solar should not be thought of as “infant industries” but as *government-dependent industries* that penalize consumers and/or taxpayers. “Buyer beware” should apply to the purveyors of political energy.**

On Sat, Apr 20, 2013 at 12:30 PM, tim dooley <[tmdooley759@gmail.com](mailto:tmdooley759@gmail.com)> wrote:

Dear City Counsel Members,

I am one of the 49.x percent of the tax payers in the county that voted against the City of Boulder taking over the electric utility operations.

Firstly, a little about my educational and professional experience in the fields of expertise that are germane to evaluation supported by a small majority of voters. Secondly, some observations as to my experience as it related to your "study".

Education: B.S., Industrial Science, University of Massachusetts (International Honor Society - Undergraduate Thesis: "Underground homes for the Eighties")

Post Undergraduate Work in the Field of Energy Conservation / Renewables: 3 years field work as Residential Energy Auditor for state of Massachusetts (Mass Save). 2 Years Field work for the State of California - Energy Auditor, Commercial Load Balancing

M.S. Telecommunications Engineering, University of Colorado. Hewlett Packard Company (20 years)

5 years Engineering/ Project Management, 3 years Departmental Management, 12 years Sales Executive, responsible for solutioning and sales of Global IT Outsourcing contracts in excess \$100M (typically 5 year deals) reporting to C-Level Executives. Task included but not limited to; developing and communicating value proposition (internally and external), sales planning, solution engineering, delivery engineering (to include transition planning), staffing, financial engineering, contract development, contract negotiations, sales presentations, internal review and approval (risk management), ....

Observations:

**"Sales Presentation":** Given the statements made by many of counsel during the last session, you are at risk of alienating ~ 50% of your constituents based upon what I for one observe to be a save the world bias at the cost of sound economic rational (your fiduciary duty).

**Solution Risk:** Brilliant minds around the world have not yet figured out how to deliver wind or solar at economically viable cost, yet the city of Boulder Counsel of Boulder is convinced that they can do so ?

**Transition Risk:** I have worked with some of world best, highly specialized technology Transition Teams developing transition plans to a level of detail that would blow anyone's mind. I have never seen a single transition plan succeed (on time / on budget). In some cases the inability to transition within the specified contract led to legal action. BTW...you will have to have a working relationship with the "incumbent provider if you want to have any chance of success.

**Contract risk:** See Transition Risk. According to the statements made by counsel members on broadcast TV, I will have better rates and reliability (I think better, faster, cheaper is on the tape as well). Please be sure that this is included in the contract, including Critical Milestones Critical Deliverable, Service Level Agreements and associated Penalties and Credits.

**Financial Risk:** See Solution Risk. Other than testimony from a counsel member that stated a community in Germany produced 4 times more energy from Alternative Energy Sources than they used, and another stating that my Electricity would be less expensive and more reliable, please provide your constituents with the scientific / economic data that shows wind / solar will reduce my electric utility costs. Given the FACT that cost per KWH is more expensive, and the taxpayers of Boulder will have to maintain full capacity via conventional mean for days when the sun does not shine and the wind does not blow, I look forward to counsel explaining the model.

**Transparency:** Given the above, and considering the bias that seems to be present, I feel that it is critically important that the model being utilized for the development of a go-no-go business case be fully vetted to ensure it's accuracy. As a member of the community who paid for the model that will ultimately make or break the case for moving forward, I need to know if I have a right to understand it's assumptions, data input, formulas, , .... People who make a living in the world of financial modeling understand that this is where the rubber meets the road. Suggesting it is "proprietary" causes me great concern (why not give it to Excel to poke holes in if it is defensible)?

**Legal Risk:** Exclusion of county residence in the vote (what would happen if you took out the college vote and include the tax payers of the county) , condemnation of existing infrastructure that provides > 99% reliability for the purpose of acquiring property at "fair market value" in order to build a business case, council members suggesting (on tape) beyond a doubt that Boulder residence will not only see a reduction in our utility bill, but that reliability will not be effected.

**Objectivity:** This may be your greatest risk. No offense, but I am not drinking the cool-aid, and I suggest counsel would be well served to do the same. To be quite frank, the zeal of council to be seen as a "world changers" has severely limited it's ability to uphold it's fiduciary duty to it's citizen's.

#### **"Boulder, Twenty five square miles surrounded by reality"**

Many of the adults who are raising children and paying taxes do not want more reefer shops that Starbucks, a tax on going to the market (if I'm going to pay for a bag - at least make it bio-degradable), higher utility bills, new / expensive / redundant bike paths between Folsom and 28th (bikers have a full lane on Folsom ....no wonder you are going to impose a FEE for road use because the cities maintenance costs is going up).

Based upon this "short list" of facts, I strongly oppose the City Counsel moving forward with further evaluation in accordance with the fiduciary duties required by City Charter.

Among other things, I am a lifelong advocate of Energy Conservation, Renewable Energies, Nuclear Energy, Clean Coal, Biofuels, etc. I support lower taxes of via the reduction of government in our lives. I believe in free enterprise.

Sincerely,  
Tim Dooley  
2272 Juniper Avenue  
Boulder, 80304

---

**From:** Eric Olson [<mailto:eolson@stoller.com>]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 19, 2013 5:54 PM  
**To:** Council  
**Cc:** [commissioners@bouldercounty.org](mailto:commissioners@bouldercounty.org)

**Subject:** Written Comments to City Council regarding consideration of motion to direct staff to move forward with forming a municipal electric utility (Muni)

Dear Madams and Sirs,

I believe this effort to form a Muni is another example of the City treating the County residents in Gunbarrel poorly. It is clear to me, and I am sure to most others, that it was evident very early on in the process that non-City electrical users would be included in the City's Muni. However, it was not until November 2012 that the City contacted us to even state that this might be an option.

After that, when I attended the meetings regarding the evaluation of the merits of a Muni, I observed that the City leadership was very much in an advocate position. While I appreciate that the City staff has put in many hours developing models, I also observed that they are also zealots favoring the Muni. Being a zealot for green power is not necessarily bad, but it is when it clouds good judgment.

To be fair, I joined the debate late and I can see that XCEL have been less than forthcoming with ideas for cooperation. Certainly, there are many concerns that an IOU would have under these situations and I am not sure that the City have always been understanding of XCEL's case. I also took some time to contact the Managing Director for the a Muni at a city of comparable size to Boulder located in Florida. While very much an advocate of Munis, he pointed out the pitfalls and bad experience with an over-reliance on some renewable energy sources. Conversely, the presentation made by Mr. Grimm of Denton TX seemed like a very one-sided sales pitch (even though over the last 5 years he has managed to dissipate the rate advantage they used to have over the rather poorly run local IOU).

Going forward, I have the following concerns.

1. I am very concerned that the City of Boulder-XCEL Energy Partnership Task Force will not have enough time to bring good ideas to the table and fully consider and negotiate these. This is of particular concern given that the City Attorney, Mr. Thomas Carr, pointed out that there is not off-ramp once condemnation is started.
2. I am concerned that the third party consultant will not be truly independent. As a consultant, I know that what the client (i.e., City) wants to hear certainly can influence the review.
3. I worry that future changes in fuel pricing and other changes affecting rates have not been properly considered. As an engineer who has worked with utilities for more than 40 years, I know how important it is to consider and diversify the generation options.
4. Even with 3 board positions for County ratepayers, I feel the City will control the Board. Furthermore, the idea that County residents could take issues to the PUC if we are not properly treated is unlikely to be an effective way of controlling our future.

Please contact me if you have questions.

Sincerely,

Eric Olson  
4408 Wellington Road

Boulder CO 80301  
[eolson@stoller.com](mailto:eolson@stoller.com)

For the record, the following are my comments that were previously sent but excluded from Attachment D to the April 16, 2013 meeting attachments.

March 3, 2013

Boulder City Council  
Attn: Ms. Alisa Lewis, City Clerk  
P.O. Box 791  
Boulder, CO 80306

Subject: Proposal to Form a City Municipal Electricity Provider Incorporating Non-City Residents

Dear Boulder City Council Members:

I am a Boulder County resident living in the Gunbarrel community and am writing in response to the "Study Session" regarding "Boulder's Energy Future Municipalization Exploration" report ("the report"). I am not an expert with regard to the establishment of a "Muni", and am not enamored with Investor Owned Utilities (IOUs), and I am certainly not a proponent of the use of coal for generating electricity. Despite that, I was very concerned and upset after reading the report. There seems to be a strong and misleading bias running through the report that economically favors the formation of the Muni. Some examples of these inaccuracies based on only a quick review are as follows.

1. It is clear that coal prices are dropping rather rapidly rather than increasing. According to Bloomberg Businessweek and the U.S. EIA, prices for coal from the Powder Ridge Basin in Montana and Wyoming dropped 45% in 2012. Predictions are for a continued decrease in the price as more of the older coal plants are quickly being retired across the U.S. As an example, the percentage of electrical generation from coal by the Southern Company dropped from 70% to 32% in the past 4 years. This trend is common throughout the U.S.
2. My understanding is that the estimate of \$405 million for the stranded and acquisition costs associated with forming the Muni is the most likely case. Lower estimates are very unlikely and including them is misleading.
3. The purchasing of renewable power and backup natural gas generation by a small Muni is not a very predictable and easy task given the probable volatility of future generation prices. There is much risk. There are also very significant startup costs for the Muni. I would refer you to the experience of the Gainesville (Florida) City Muni that was recently formed. I would hope that the City of Boulder would draw on such experience before blithely starting this enterprise rather than just seeking opinions of the proponents of Munis.

These biases make the analysis as described in the report highly suspect, and it is unlikely that the Muni, as proposed, would meet the requirements established by the City Council. But, for myself and many of the other residents of the area of Boulder County whom the City is proposing should be subsumed into this Muni, there is an even larger issue. We would be required to be a part of the Muni and with the consequential rate increases without having had a voice in the matter. We did not have a chance to vote on the plan in 2011. This is hardly democracy and is not legal. Furthermore, this lack of voice would carry over to future votes and representation on many City matters that directly or indirectly affect the operation of the Muni.

I would appreciate your attention to these issues. At the least, I would hope you would have a referendum for the affected businesses and homes located outside of the city limits but inside the proposed Muni service area.

Sincerely,

Eric Olson  
4408 Wellington Road  
Boulder CO 80301

cc: Boulder County Commissioners  
Boulder County Courthouse  
P.O. Box 471  
Boulder, CO 80306

---

Dear City Council,

I just wanted to thank you for listening through hours and hours of testimony regarding municipalization last Tuesday. It was great to see everyone that wanted to speak be able to share their story and give their take on the issue.

As one of those giving testimony during public hearing in favor of municipalization I wanted to thank you for moving forward and seeing where this process leads us, as a city. Boulder has a chance to take sustainability to a new level. We can utilize renewable resources like wind and solar, powering our lives in responsible and environmentally conscious ways.

This is such an exciting time for our city. Thank you for your time and I look forward to seeing municipalization become a reality.

Nick Trevino

--

Nicholas Trevino

New Era Colorado Intern  
University of Colorado Senior  
History and Political Science  
[Trevino@NewEraIntern.org](mailto:Trevino@NewEraIntern.org)

---

To the members of City Council,

Thank you so much for all of your time and hard work on moving municipalization forward.

As a young person who is very concerned about climate change and the energy future of our beautiful city, I'm truly grateful for your commitment to creating a sustainable future.

Thank you for listening to hours of testimony and making an informed decision. As one of those who gave testimony in favor of municipalization, I'm very appreciative that you listened with great respect for all who testified. I know that a local utility will provide Boulder with reliable service and low rates while maximizing our use of renewable energy.

Thanks again for listening,

Sarah Winter

---

Hello,

I want to thank the City Council for allowing such extensive public hearing on the issue of municipalization, and I am pleased to hear that this initiative will be moving forward. I really do think that there are extensive opportunities for Boulder residents to play a very prominent role in its implementation. It seems obvious that a groundbreaking decision like this will attract many more of the best and brightest to this city for progressive action in sustainability and good governance. Also, in the absence of an additional vote on the subject, I would like to offer this statistic from a CU Boulder referendum that was voted on in early April.

<http://cusg.colorado.edu/content/spring-2013-election-results-cusg>

Given that many CU Students are taxpayers, Boulder voters, and potential homeowners, it would seem shortsighted to preclude their values in this discussion. **Out of 6,386 voters, 65 percent voted in favor of a [350.org](http://350.org) campaign to remove fossil fuel investments from university endowments.**

27,457 students are undergrads at CU, and over 22,000 live off campus. Even if they aren't registered to vote in Boulder county, they are stakeholders in this decision because currently they pay Xcel, too. I just thought that this should be brought to the Council's attention as encouragement to keep pressing for a sustainable energy future. Keep it up!

Best,

Tim Jenkins

---

Dear Boulder City Council Members,

First and foremost I would like to express my deep thanks for your decision to further explore the possibility of creating a municipal electric utility and move forward as a national leader in environmental sustainability. I also want to thank you for the time that you have dedicated to assessing this issue and taking the Boulder public's statements into consideration when arriving to this decision. As one of many Boulder residents who provided testimony that evening in support of this major stride forward, I really feel that the decision-making process was very inclusive of the Boulder community.

Your tenacity in closely and thoroughly investigating this matter clearly illustrates your commitment to ensuring that our great city is continually exploring ways to enhance the well-being of the Boulder community and to maintain its prominent position as one of the greenest cities in the nation. I sincerely do believe that Boulder has the potential to inspire towns and cities across the country to follow in its footsteps and make a significant impact on our nation's environmental future.

Again, thank you so very much for all the work that you have done thus far to ensure that we make the right decision, a decision that is in the best interests of our shared environmental future.

My Very Best Regards,

Nichole Sierra-Lawrence

---

Dear Boulder (and Xcel) folks---

In case anyone had missed this development on Wednesday (two days ago)---News Alert!

Environmental Defense Fund " ... **joined with NRDC, Sierra Club, ten states, the District of Columbia, and New York City to file a notice of our intent to sue the Environmental Protection Agency to force them adhere to the terms of a 2010 settlement to limit climate pollution from coal-fired power plants.**"

I believe the possible newly looming EPS regs. are a real driver of change for Xcel (and will for other utilities) **in a very bona fide and primary sense.**

**Let's stay hopeful for new renewable energy programs or products for Colorado.**

Have a good weekend.

Karey C-J

---

I would just like to take the opportunity to thank you all for electing to move forward with the municipalization of Boulder's energy.

Climate change is a quickly emerging issue across the globe and so far there have not been many effective solutions developed to remedy the problem. By deciding to further and entertain a possible municipalization of Boulder's energy, you all have provided the opportunity to develop a potentially effective solution.

Based on the studies conducted thus far, municipalization appears to have a strong chance at making a difference in fossil fuel usage. Therefore it is certainly worth it to at least continue to pursue municipalization until the research says otherwise.

Thank you again,

Misha Banks

-->

---

Jenn Dailey [<mailto:jenn@neweraintern.org>]

**Sent:** Friday, April 19, 2013 11:34 AM

**To:** Council

**Subject:** Public Testimony Thank You

City Council Members,

I want to thank you for your time during Tuesday night's council meeting. I know it was a long night for you all, and I really appreciate you all giving the municipaliztion issue the time and discussion it deserves. This is such an important issue for Boulder, and for Colorado.

I was really glad I was able to give a testimony on Tuesday, it felt great to be a part of the discussion. I really do feel that creating this municipal electric utility will be amazing for Boulder. I have lived in Boulder for 5 years now, and I plan on staying here well after my May graduation. I have been so impressed by our community's commitment to sustainable practices, and I think that creating this electric utility will only take us further down a sustainable path.

Boulder is known everywhere for its unique values, and I think that other cities look to Boulder for the latest and greatest in sustainable practices. Boulder has a chance to really step up and be a leader in new energy technologies.

Again, I thank you for your time and for the chance to participate in such an important discussion.

Jennifer Dailey

---

Casey Moher [<mailto:casey@neweraintern.org>]

**Sent:** Thursday, April 18, 2013 11:40 AM

**To:** Council

**Subject:** Thank You Regarding April 16th

Hello City Council,

My name is Casey Moher and I have lived in Boulder for four years. I attended the city council meeting on the 16th for the multiplication of Boulder's energy and I wanted to let you know that I was impressed at the way that you all handled the entire process. You were critical yet open-minded and it seemed to me that you understood the magnitude of the decision, while at the same time you understood the need for information and options. I wanted to thank you for your patience, your ability to ask the necessary questions about the process of multiplication, and your decision to continue looking at the different paths that Boulder could take. It is a brave thing that you are trying to do.

Best,

Casey

---

Karey Christ-Janer [<mailto:karey@boulder.net>]

**Sent:** Thursday, April 18, 2013 9:43 AM

**To:** Council

**Cc:** Davis, Jerome E; [Craig.L.Eicher@XcelEnergy.com](mailto:Craig.L.Eicher@XcelEnergy.com); Brautigam, Jane; Bailey, Heather; Carr, Thomas; Gehr, David; Kalish, Debra; Driskell, David; Gichon, Yael; Koehn, Jonathan; Mertz, Kara; Crandall, Kelly; Eichen, Bob; Huntley, Sarah; Haddock, Kathy; Barth, Andrew

**Subject:** Deregulation,Texas + Another Vote?, etc.

cc: Jerome and Craig, Xcel Energy

Dear Boulder----

I just wanted to first alert you all to Jerome's quotes in the Camera **today**...a new or updated article reiterates what Jerome said last Tuesday at the hearing: **the \$150 million estimate for acquisition costs does not include everything. This is just HUGE news, I'd think**, and it did not get much airplay (or analysis) at the Council meeting--so, **major heads up**. Link:

[http://www.dailycamera.com/energy/ci\\_23049442/boulder-enters-next-phase-municipalization](http://www.dailycamera.com/energy/ci_23049442/boulder-enters-next-phase-municipalization)

Also--I am puzzled a bit why Matt seems to feel that full deregulation is the way to go. **I understand that DENTON, TX opted OUT of deregulation. Did anyone from city staff ask their representative why they did that?** See some quotes below, which may help. Someone I know who worked at the Governor's Energy Office described Texas as a "mess." **It is my belief that markets like these could be the most difficult to coordinate change in a region-wide sense.**

Lastly, I think George had a very interesting comment in that **it DOES seem highly likely that at some point that someone may organize a citizens' vote**. The more I think of this, it seems VERY likely, if it's only 5,000 or 6,000 signatures needed. **What would happen then?**

Sorry to be so sobering, folks.

Do take a look at the below---it's actually very interesting reading.

Karey

<http://www.texastribune.org/texas-energy/electric-reliability-council-texas/the-rolling-chain-of-events-behind-texas-blackouts/>

"...In the next couple of weeks, after the crisis passes, Fraser said he would call a hearing on the blackouts to figure out what happened and how to fix it. He noted that there were "a lot of unusual circumstances" to this storm, and that while Texas was well-prepared for spiking electricity usage in the summer, "to my knowledge we've never been tested for an event during the winter." But it's clearly imperative to fix the system, he said. The Public Utility Commission, which oversees ERCOT, met this morning and is also investigating the cause of the power-plant problems, spokesman Terry Hadley said.

ERCOT said this morning that 3,000 megawatts — the equivalent of nearly twice the output of the Oak Grove coal plant — remained offline this morning. But Roark, the ERCOT spokeswoman, said that **the grid operator was unable to say which plants remained offline today "because this is considered protected information under market rules in a competitive market."**

<http://www.texastribune.org/2011/04/04/texas-energy-lessons-from-the-1970s/>

**Energy conservation, a fact of life during the '70s, has also largely been abandoned** — although Texas today uses energy more efficiently than it did decades ago, meaning that the state's economic output per unit of energy is far greater.

**In November 1973**, just a month after the embargo began, Briscoe decried the “wasteful use of energy in every segment of our society.” He asked state agencies to use less fuel, buy small cars and set thermostats to 65 degrees in the winter. He had put a brigadier general, James M. Rose, in charge of the Energy Conservation Task Force, and Rose delivered regular updates on the falling electricity and natural gas usage at the Capitol building, even seeking to adjust the schedules of the building's janitors so they would not waste light at night.

**In today's environment, where eight-hour rolling blackouts in February sparked outrage, such pronouncements by a Texas politician would be politically unthinkable.**

---

Ken Bonetti [<mailto:kenecon2004@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 17, 2013 6:40 PM

**To:** Council

**Subject:** Muni Electric

Dear Boulder City Council,

I had to work late last night, so did not go to the City Council discussion of the muni electric proposal. I just want to state that despite the risks I want Boulder to proceed with the process. I believe that Xcel, certain people and elements of the Boulder Chamber want Boulder to fail and are doing everything they can to make that happen. That is to be expected from those whose narrow self interests diverge from the welfare of our community and our need for a healthy environment. I want Boulder to succeed. I want Xcel's attempt to sabotage the process and the outcome to fail. I want Boulder's example to spread throughout the state and nation. I am very unhappy with those council members who want our city to fail. I hope those members will re-evaluate their positions and work to help Boulder succeed rather help Xcel propagate fear and defeat. I want those council members to reject Xcel and others who insult our city by insinuating that Boulder is too stupid and incompetent to run an electric utility, though many municipalities throughout this State and Country already do so quite well.

Sincerely,

Ken Bonetti

1170 Monroe Dr.

Boulder, CO

---

Karey Christ-Janer [<mailto:karey@boulder.net>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 17, 2013 4:45 PM

To: Council  
Cc: Brautigam, Jane; Bailey, Heather; Carr, Thomas; Gehr, David; Kalish, Debra; Driskell, David; Gichon, Yael; Koehn, Jonathan; Mertz, Kara; Crandall, Kelly; Eichem, Bob; Huntley, Sarah; Haddock, Kathy; Barth, Andrew  
Subject: Denver Post Ed.: "Boulder and the Utility of the Future"; a tough issue

Dear Boulder folks---

Just a heads up that I have an editorial about the Energy Future issues (and beyond) published in the D. Post today....the Post has been sitting on this for a while but contacted me today to update so that they could post it. Here is the link:

<http://blogs.denverpost.com/opinion/2013/04/17/boulder-and-the-utility-of-the-future/37103/>

Also, I wanted to ask: has it ever been determined whether the CAP and the Occupation tax MUST be collected on Xcel bills? Jonathan, I asked you about this a few months ago, and you had thought that it might be impossible for this to be a problem, but I'm not sure. If they ever did this, I could only speculate on what the argument would be (maybe that after condemnation you might take it off bills until a settlement agreement was made in the voluntary programs to stave off the large cost-shift to Boulder?...just guessing on this and I'm no lawyer). The city could obviously still collect the taxes eventually, but it would be logistically difficult and cause delay, etc., and make funding the whole endeavor tough at least for some period of time, most likely.

Again, as I've said to many of you, I know that there are other things that Xcel likely has as possibly problematic issues. I truly hope that the city is looking at ALL possible negative outcomes, especially before August, when the risks are obviously stepped way up.

Anyway...just a heads up since I did not get to pool time at the hearing after my folks had to leave, and had planned on mentioning this (pretty scary) possibility above.

Karey

---

Steve Sloan [<mailto:saltwatersteve@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 17, 2013 11:58 AM

**To:** Council

**Subject:** Solar Payments and net metering from Xcel if Boulder breaks away

Hi,

I'm a city resident and I'm seriously considering applying for a rooftop solar PV system and, more importantly, rebate through Xcel Energy's Solar Rewards program.

If approved, I sign away 20 years worth of my Renewable Energy Credits (RECs) to Xcel in exchange for payments (a number of cents per kWh produced by my system) paid to me monthly spread over 10 years.

My question is this: what should I expect to happen with this payment contract between me and Xcel if Boulder becomes my electric supplier?

Similarly, I will have a net metering agreement in place with Xcel as well. What should I expect to happen with that?

Thank you,  
Steve Sloan

---

name: Joseph Barsugli

email: [jbarsugli@yahoo.com](mailto:jbarsugli@yahoo.com)

zipcode: 80305

own-home-in-boulder: yes

rent-home-in-boulder:

work-in-boulder: yes

outside-boulder:

comments: On balance, I think that municipalization of our electricity utility is a good idea. While Xcel is hardly the worst of the lot in terms of private for-profit energy companies, I believe that the local control that would come from municipalization would serve Boulder better in the long run. The inherent need to regulate monopolies has led to a long-run success of many municipal utilities nationwide.

Right now I take advantage of Xcel's windsource program, which is a very cheap way to buy non-carbon energy. Because a municipal utility would not be able to go carbon-free right away, I would hope that it would offer the same option at the same price.

---

Vindya H Donahue

email: [yhdonahue@gmail.com](mailto:yhdonahue@gmail.com)

zipcode: 80305

own-home-in-boulder: yes

rent-home-in-boulder:

work-in-boulder: yes

outside-boulder:

comments: Council should move ahead with this plan. I have looked at the recent comparisons among different options, it is time to find out more solid financial data.

About these calls for a revote. If the voters had said "No" in Nov 2011, how would the opponents react now if supporters asked for a revote on the same issue?

---

