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1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM
The meeting was called to order by Co-Chair Bill Siegfriedt at 6:35 pm. Present at the meeting were 9 out of 20 committee members.

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES
Minutes from the meeting on May 19th were discussed and members of the committee provided comments including a few clarifications on content and some editorial items. The committee approved the minutes as revised. Ms. Hurley will update the minutes and redistribute to the committee as well as post them on the City’s website.

3. COMMITTEE REPORTS
A. Update on Finalization of Working Group Reports
Co-Chair Bill Siegfriedt asked if any of the working group chairs had received follow-up comments on their draft reports. Joel Freeman stated that he received an e-mail with some comments and would review those comments to see if they were content or editorial-related and submit an updated document if necessary. Ms. Hurley replied that she would update the working group reports on the website if there were changes. Otherwise the documents as posted on-line would be considered final. Mr. Siegfriedt said that the product from the working groups was good and that content from these working group reports was incorporated into the summary document.

4. STAFF REPORTS
Ms. Hurley stated that there was no report. It was also mentioned by the committee that since the last meeting, the Offshore Wind Council Bill was passed and is now going to the Governor’s Office for his signature. Kevin Glynn stated that he would recommend that the City of Evanston take a proactive approach in securing the seat on the Council created by the Bill reserved for a municipal representative - since the City has expressed the most interest in considering the development of an offshore wind farm at this time.
5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Review of Draft Final Report to City Council

Co-Chair Bill Siegfriedt stated that a draft Summary of Wind Committee Review document was developed by the working group chairs. Copies of the report were available at the meeting for review and comment. Mr. Siegfriedt asked the committee if they had any comments on the draft document. Below is a summary of the comments that were made. A revised and completed version of the Summary of Wind Committee Review document is provided as an attachment to the meeting notes.

- Dick Lanyon was unable to attend the meeting, but submitted the following comment on the document.

  I support the draft of the Summary of Wind Committee Review as submitted except for the following paragraph in the opening section on page 1.

  “The committee wishes to point out that this project is almost certain not to be operational for at least four years, and that the process leading up to the first delivery of power from the wind farm could easily take significantly longer.”

  The wording implies an approved project ready for implementation and I suggest revision as follows:

  “The committee wishes to point out that there are many details to be addressed and approvals to be obtained before construction of this project can proceed, and this can easily take at least four years. The process leading up to the first delivery of power from the wind farm could easily take significantly longer.”

  Mr. Siegfriedt stated that the working group chairs were concerned that people would think that the project could be completed in 2 years, so this statement was intended to give the idea of a longer time frame. Mr. Siegfriedt further stated that the project is still very conceptual in nature and not a final project. The committee decided to remove this text from the document to address concerns around defining a timeframe at the stage of the project.

- Bill Wagner commented that he found the document to lack clarity around the difference between what the report was presenting as information obtained from the RFI responses versus the opinions of the committee. The committee decided to clearly state at the start of the document when the information represents beliefs or comments from the committee versus a summary of the RFI responses. Starting on the second half of Page 2, the remaining information in the memo reflects comments from the Committee. It was stated that the working group reports are the best source to review a summary of the information presented from the RFI respondents.

- Mr. Wagner also commented that the reports from the working group contain valuable information and recommended that the summary report referenced those documents and that they are included as attachments to the summary report. The committee agreed and Mr. Siegfriedt stated he would add the reference.

- Bill Wagner suggested that a recommendation be added to determine and list the specific environmental, social and, as well as the relevance of the project to the Climate Action
Plan. The committee agreed and a refined recommendation will be included after Recommendation Number 3 in the document.

- Kevin Glynn stated that he believed the recommendations should be clean and independent.
- Jack Darin commented that the topic of City collaboration with other entities is important and that perhaps one reason why larger wind developers did not respond to the RFI is because the project is not large enough to attract their interest. He suggested that this information could be added to Recommendation Number 7 or created as a new Number 11. The committee agreed to add more detail to the existing Recommendation Number 11 to address Mr. Darin’s suggestion.
- Ms. Hurley suggested adding an introduction section to list the dates of the meetings and provide some context for the work completed by the Mayor’s Wind Farm Committee. The committee agreed with the recommendation.
- Jeff Smith commented that the energy pricing implications section is entirely from the Committee’s findings and not a summary of information provided by the RFI respondents. It was agreed by the Committee to add “The committee finds that” prior to the 3 points listed under this section.
- Joe Jaskulski was not able to attend the meeting but provided the following comments in the form of an e-mail.

*I think is the majority view and possibly the unanimous view of our group that neither Mercury Wind nor Off grid technologies is a suitable potential partner for the City. I would like a vote amongst those present and if all or most agree, this should be stated as a primary conclusion. There is little we all agree on, but if we agree on this it should be right there in the first paragraph, as this is one of the three main purposes of the RFI.*

*I think we have a duty to report, obvious though it is, that neither respondent has ever built a wind farm, developed a major project of any kind, or shown the financial resources to successfully move this project to conclusion.*

*I also believe that the information from FPL/NextEra, Iberdrola, and Mainstream, summarized in the previous meeting notes, should be included in this summary. This information, however late, are additional responses to our RFI, and the Council has a right to know the views of these experienced firms on the contemplated project.*

Mr. Siegfriedt stated that he did not believe that the committee has a unanimous view of the respondents’ RFI responses and that the nature of the RFI itself does not require a winner or looser be either selected or announced. Mr. Smith stated that he believed it was premature to make such judgments. Further he stated that the Committee wants to encourage participation in these types of RFI requests. He also commented that even with a Request for Qualifications, there is not a need to make a public statement on respondent qualifications. Mr. Glynn stated that he had no objections to putting in the other developers’ comments into the final report.

Ms. Hurley said that Rachel Bisnett was not able to make the meeting but submitted comments via an e-mail which were pertinent to the discussion. They are provided below:
I agree with Jeff that it is neither prudent nor necessary to "bash" either Mercury Wind or Off Grid within the context of the committee's report. Ultimately, as has been stated many times, the companies responded to an RFI and provided information, so there is no justification for commenting on the quality of their work. Further, the purpose of the committee is to summarize the information provided, which does not leave room for those types of commentary. To that end, I believe you have done a good job avoiding language of that type.

In regard to the draft report, I am not entirely convinced that at this time the city should put financial efforts into further review of this project as could be implied by point 9 of the Recommendations section. If another volunteer committee were to be assembled - hopefully smaller in size to encourage a more productive working environment from all - I believe it would be an appropriate way to address the issue of the "role of the city." However, the information that has been provided so far, both on the record from RFI responses, and off the record, from non-responding developers, does not lead me to believe that the project is feasible. Ultimately, if the city truly is serious about playing some role in this endeavor, a feasibility/fatal flaw analysis is essential and would cost some money.

As an aside, I wanted to apologize for being unable to make nearly all of the meetings. I ended up being far busier at work than I initially thought I would be when I made the commitment. While I have enjoyed learning more about the potential for a wind farm, I am disappointed that so much individual effort was put forward for this committee to answer questions that it seems had already been done by Citizens for a Greener Evanston. The organization seemed to comprise an unexpected percentage of the committee, and the have done a fair amount of work; their independent report proposed solutions to many of the most obvious questions (e.g. site, size, etc). It has unfortunately left me questioning how essential this RFI really was for the city - aside from the goal of identifying potential partners. I would hope going forward, if another working group is assembled to determine the City's role, that there is more independent thought for the issue at hand, and less reliance on an existing report. The work products of such a committee would be vital to the City's progress toward or away from an offshore windfarm and should be considered from an unbiased perspective.

Ms. Hurley said that Fred Wittenberg also was not able to make the meeting but submitted comments via an e-mail which were pertinent to the discussion. They are provided below:

As far as I'm concerned, even this has no bearing on the purpose of this committee, is that Evanston is like a pendulum swinging on one end with plastic bags, and the other end with wind turbines out on the Lake. Neither of these should be dealt with, as the city lacks the capability of handling these two items with their own staff, as free outside assistance is limited. Environmentally, let the city only bite off what it can chew. Use the KISS principle!

Co-Chair Bill Siegfriedt asked the Committee if they wanted to include Mr. Jaskulski’s comments into the summary report. The Committee’s vote was 1 to 9 on the question of whether to include the comments so the additional text will not be included in the report.
In response to Ms. Bisnett’s e-mail, Mr. Smith stated that he believed that Recommendation Number 9 – which suggested a committee or board be designated to continue looking into the offshore wind farm – is a good recommendation. He stated that it is not up to the Mayor’s Wind Farm Committee to make the decision on creating a board or committee but that this recommendation should be provided for the City Council to consider. Co-Chair Bill Siegfriedt asked the Committee if they wanted to remove Recommendation Number 9 and the Committee voted against that deletion.

Co-Chair Bill Siegfriedt asked if there were any additional comments on the draft summary document from the committee. With no additional comments provided, Mr. Siegfriedt asked if the Committee was in favor of the revised Summary Report. The committee unanimously voted to accept the report as final. Mr. Siegfriedt and Mr. Schousboe will coordinate with the working group chairs to finalize the document and submit to Ms. Hurley for her distribution to the City Council.

6. NEW BUSINESS
   A. Planning for Presentation to City Council June 20th

Ms. Hurley stated that the Committee would be making their presentation to the Evanston City Council at a special Council meeting on Monday June 20th. The Committee’s presentation can include Powerpoint but should focus on the highlights and be no longer than 10 minutes. The City Council will be given the opportunity to ask questions after the presentation.

Mr. Siegfriedt said that he would take responsibility for getting the slides developed and he would present alongside Co-Chair Schousboe. It was suggested that all members of the Mayor’s Wind Farm Committee attend if they are able to do so. The Co-Chairs would be able to direct questions from the City Council to the appropriate committee member as necessary.

It was asked by a citizen whether it was possible to have public comment after the presentation. Ms. Hurley stated that the City Council sets the agenda and in most meetings the public comment occurs at the beginning.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

Barbara Sykes – 3007 Thayer

Ms. Sykes expressed her thanks for the work completed by the committee and acknowledged that it was a lot of work to complete in a short amount of time. She also stated that she was willing to ‘agree to disagree’. She said that she has a lot of concerns about putting offshore wind turbines in Lake Michigan and has sent those comments and concerns to the City. She feels that the public comments made in the past have been turned off and ignored. She commented that she did not see the issues reflected tonight in the draft summary report and that she did not get to see the paperwork until she arrived at the meeting tonight. She further commented that the feels the process has been exclusionary. She liked the suggestion to add a recommendation for creating a list of pro’s and con’s for the project but she still feels like the City is charging ahead as if this project is a done deal. Ms. Sykes stated that she agreed with Mr. Jaskulski that the qualifications of the two RFI respondents and the info from the other developers should be included in the summary document and wants to include all of the
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previous work that has been completed to date. She believes there is a lot of completed work that is not reflected in the summary document. Ms. Sykes also commented that she was concerned about a statement that was in one of the working group reports that was talking about “key stakeholders” and was concerned that residents were not included as key stakeholders. She wanted to know how residents would be included in the process.

Steve LaVon – 1738 Chicago Avenue  
Mr. LaVon stated that he has been impressed with the Committee, including the diversity, openness to comments and discussion with the public. Mr. LaVon considers it a dream to have renewable energy in Evanston. Coal fire power plants have a very detrimental impact on our air and water resources and he really hopes that this project can happen. He stated that he was happy that all the information has been pulled together by the committee including both positive aspects as well as challenges and negative aspects.

Andrew McGonigle – 2526 Princeton  
Mr. McGonigle started by thanking the Committee for their efforts and commented that they have done good work. Mr. McGonigle pointed to page 2, paragraph 1, for the timeline and stated that he believed it would be much longer than 4 years before power would be delivered from an offshore wind project in Evanston giving the regulatory conditions. He stated that people need to be informed on the likely duration. On page 4, item 3, he recommended including additional studies to understand the impact of the wave action on the wind turbines. Specifically the rising and falling of the lake water level, which he states acts like a bath tub. He stated that he believes the viability of the project could be determined by the impact of the wave motion of the water. For Recommendation #5 – which relates to identifying grants, tax incentives and other means to demonstrate to developers and lenders a favorable environment – assumes that there is a favorable environment in Evanston for this project. However it does not seem that the work has yet been completed to determine if the environment is favorable.

Barbara Janes – 802 Colfax  
Ms. Janes provided a written summary of the comments she made verbally to the committee on the Wind Farm Committee Summary Document. These are attached to the meeting minutes for reference.

Joan Rothenberg – 1575 Ashland  
Ms. Rothenberg provided a written summary of the comments she made verbally to the committee. These are attached to the meeting minutes for reference.

8. ADJOURNMENT  
The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 pm.
Joan Rothenberg, Comments, 6/8/2011

The Mayor's Wind Farm Committee has clearly done a lot of time consuming study and hard work. Each member is to be appreciated for his or her time, energy and voluntary commitment. As a citizen of this City, I recognize this as well as the earlier years of commitment most members of this Committee have made to the study of offshore wind energy for Evanston.

I take very seriously the comments such as (from 5/19/11 Draft of the Committees' meeting minutes):

"Failure of Evanston to act on its own does not mean that there won't be a wind farm visible from Evanston, it would just mean that Evanston would have a lot less to say about any such project and little benefit from it".

The thing that concerns me is that the environmental impact of offshore wind farms on freshwater ecosystems appears to be a big unknown. There is only one such wind farm in the world; Lake Vanern, and this one has been operating for a very short period of time. Of course, we do want to reduce our carbon footprint through alternative-to-fossil-fuel energy sources. But, with the growing preciousness of surface fresh water the world over, are the Great Lakes, our biggest surface freshwater resource here in the U.S., the place to experiment? Should we, perhaps, encourage the appropriate agencies to support a small scale environmental impact study of freshwater wind farms first, before opening this precious resource to the big developers or other entities who may have little or no investment in what actually happens to the benthic, pelagic and coastal environments of the Great Lakes watershed? Had the environmental impact of the Welland Canal been studied prior to its development (and, for example, the impact of ships entering from the ocean discharging their ballast into the Great Lakes), perhaps we would still have a native food resource in the Great Lakes; perhaps we would still be able to get native Great Lakes sturgeon.

I don't think that the fact that wind energy is likely to have a smaller environmental impact than fossil fuels, means that we shouldn't try to know what we're getting into, before we jump in.
Comments To the Evanston Wind Farm Committee

Barbara Janes

June 8, 2011

Having read the report of the Mayor’s Wind Farm Committee from the Public Affairs Working Group I have several comments and questions.

1. It is my understanding that the sole charge of the Mayor’s Wind Farm Committee was to evaluate the RFIs that were provided to the City by Mercury Wind and Off Grid. As I read the Public Affairs Working Group report I am left with the distinct impression that the committee has gone far beyond its charge and is presenting a blueprint on how to make a large wind farm in the lake a reality. That was not the charge to the committee. 

2. On p 1

“Analysis of the FFI responses and other available information indicates encouraging potential for an Evanston offshore wind farm, but also identifies uncertainties and significant potential challenges for the project. Government leadership, including federal support, is key to progress on offshore wind generally and for this project. Maintaining an active interest in the project, participating in state and federal policymaking process, and more clearly defining the City’s role in an offshore wind project, Evanston can position itself to be a major participant in such a project when these obstacles have been overcome and uncertainties have been resolved.”

This is only one of many such comments throughout the committee report. To my knowledge no decision has been made to definitely proceed with building an offshore wind farm. I cannot state strongly enough that NO decision should be made until the entire Evanston community has been involved in a series of objective workshops which present the pros and cons of such a project and the myriad of questions that the committee, City Council and residents of Evanston have about such a project have been answered. And the ultimate question that has not even been raised publicly is, What benefit does Evanston get from an offshore wind farm? Until it is crystal clear that there is a direct benefit to Evanston, no wind farm project should proceed.

3. The second point I would like to make relates to the list of stakeholders presented at the very end of the committee report. My initial reaction to the list was that someone sat down and made up a list of any organization they could find that had key words in their name. It was like a school child writing a long answer to a question hoping that the teacher would be impressed with length of the answer and not pay attention to the content. I personally know that a couple of the groups would not have a stake in the
wind farm. Does a yacht club in Michigan have a stake in what Evanston does? I strongly object to declaring that Northwestern students in general and Greek councils are stakeholders in an Evanston offshore wind farm. These students are here for four to five years and focus their attention on campus activities. They are not invested in what is best for Evanston for next 50 years. I find this offensive. It is even more offensive when a group that is NOT mentioned is the citizens of Evanston, in general. They are the ones who will live with the consequences of an offshore wind farm whether it is good or bad. And it will the tax money of ordinary citizens that pays for studies, potential loss of lakefront access, construction hassles for years and who may never reap any benefits from the project. It is imperative that ordinary citizens be involved in workshops that present the pros and cons of an offshore wind farm so they can make informed decisions as to whether or not such a project is right for Evanston. Then, if the decision is made to proceed to proceed with the project, ordinary citizens should be able to volunteer to be on a committee to oversee the building process.

Until the broader Evanston community is given an opportunity to learn about the pros and cons of a wind farm, NO City money or staff time should be used to further the project. City staff must help to organize information meetings, but not push the project forward. The City is laying off staff and cutting services. We cannot afford to commit staff time to move a wind farm project forward until there has been a city wide dialogue on whether or not an offshore wind farm should be built.
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Historical Background

A Request for Information (RFI) with Respect to The Development of Power From an Offshore Wind Energy Facility in Lake Michigan Off The Northern Shore of Evanston was issued May 1, 2010 and responses were received on June 30, 2010 from Mercury Wind Energy and Off Grid Technologies.

On December 6, 2010, the City Council voted to create a committee to review and evaluate the two responses to the City’s Wind Farm RFI and to provide comments to the City Council within 90 days. The committee had two co-chairs and was staffed by the City’s Sustainable Programs Coordinator.

The members were appointed on March 15, 2011 and the committee met four times, March 24, April 27, May 19, and June 8, 2011, plus multiple sessions by four working groups in April and May, 2011.

Reminder of the Purpose of the RFI:

A Request for Information collects information, usually preliminary to (and less formal than) a Request for Qualifications ("RFQ") or Request for Proposals ("RFP"). An RFI is typically used (and was specifically suggested for Evanston) where a government expected to take leadership on a project does not have enough information to promulgate an RFP and seeks to expand its knowledge base. The City of Evanston RFI here stated, as its intent, "to identify potential partners, determine the City’s role and establish a process for the development of a renewable energy facility off Evanston’s Lake Michigan shore."

Both respondents provided a great deal of information at no charge and in a timely fashion and the committee thanks both Mercury Wind Energy and Off Grid Technologies for their effort.

A summary of pertinent information from these responses, and key information the committee recognized while analyzing the responses, is as follows:

General

The two responses varied in detail and content, but provided at least partial useful information on most aspects of the offshore wind farm concept. In some instances, the committee working groups disagreed with projections, assumptions, or assertions of one response, or both.
Committee working groups also attempted to supplement areas where questions were answered partially or not at all.1

**Information Regarding Equipment and Sizing**

1. Mercury Wind Energy (MWe) proposes a location seven to nine miles from shore, and concludes that a minimum capacity of 100 MW is necessary to achieve economies of scale and profitability.

2. Off Grid Technologies (OGT) proposes the use of vertical-axis magnetic-levitation turbines with an initial capacity of 200 MW. The committee notes that the design appears to be in only a developmental stage, and has not yet been tested at any commercial scale.

3. The committee believes that sizing would affect City role. Commercial economics incentivize building as large a project as possible. Evanston currently does not have sufficient demand to use the full power production capability of a 100MW-200MW wind powered generating system.

4. The committee finds that for a project of this size, the likely location of the grid interconnection will be at Church & Laramie in Skokie, and will involve both the City of Evanston and the Village of Skokie when cable must be routed from the shoreline to that point.

**Information Regarding Overall Timeline**

The committee believes that schedules relative to various environmental studies, interconnection studies, permitting, development of contracts and financing, constructing the necessary factories and infrastructure, and procuring and installing the required specialized equipment, will be significantly longer than those expressed by the respondents. A commercial-scale project, if the first in Lake Michigan, realistically would take at minimum four years, and probably considerably longer.

**Energy Pricing Implications**

The questions "What will the wind farm's generated electricity cost?" and "Who will buy it?" are key to commercial-scale project feasibility but were not explicitly asked in the RFI nor answered in detail.

One necessity for a project of this scale is a power purchase agreement (PPA), a contract between the power producer and the buyer(s) covering, e.g., quantity delivered and the wholesale power price. MWe described many of the considerations applicable to a PPA and these represent useful information, while OGT presented additional examples of provisions the PPA might

---

1 As is to be expected in Evanston, committee work revealed diversity of viewpoints as to some aspects of a wind farm project. Not every participant may embrace every statement in this report or in the working group reports. However, efforts were made to report strong majority sentiment if not consensus.
contain. Respondents only briefly mentioned in passing potential PPA buyers for the wind farm's electricity.

The committee finds that:

1. The retail price of energy for Evanston’s electric energy users currently is not determined by any single power generating facility. Unless the community so chose, the wind farm likely would not affect the price to Evanston customers, with the impact depending on the differential at time of delivery between wind farm-produced power and other sourced power, and upon how much of the wind farm was included in Evanston's power mix.

2. The price of electricity is in flux, with possible large impacts from domestic and international political, economic, and natural occurrences, well beyond Evanston's control. Likely and possible scenarios as to possible electricity price, including demand for renewable energy credits, need more study.

3. Guaranteeing a specific price to Evanston residents is only possible if:
   a. Evanston forms a municipal utility (which it has in the past seriously considered but ultimately declined to do) or
   b. Evanston sets itself up for municipal aggregation of residential and small commercial electric accounts in the city. Note that under this model of City role, customers also might have the ability to opt out.

Involvement of Government

The committee found that the lack of a state and local framework is a disincentive to developers to prepare serious proposals. Governmental leadership is key to progress on offshore wind generally.

1. Federal
   a. It is important to recognize that current federal policy, including financial support, strongly favors offshore wind development.
   b. Federal regulatory approval for the first U.S. offshore wind project is now complete.
   c. National policy documents on the future of offshore wind power repeatedly speak to the critical role of state and local leadership.

2. State of Illinois
   a. The State has a renewable [energy] portfolio standard (RPS), which aids wind power project development generally.
   b. The State owns the lakebed and has started the legislative process to establish a framework for leasing the lakebed and regulating offshore wind.
3. City of Evanston
   Evanston has multiple role opportunities:
   
a. Evanston has helped spur the State of Illinois to consider offshore wind development.

b. Development of the Lake’s strong wind is likely. If the City doesn’t take an active role, it loses its chance to influence any proposed project.

c. The City has limited inherent authority, such as permitting the landing point of the cable from the wind farm.

d. The City can and should foster education and transparent discussion on the subject, and assess public opinion.

These roles are consistent with the City’s Climate Change Action Plan accepted by the City of Evanston in November 2008.

**Recommendations to the City for Next Steps**

**Accelerate our leadership:**

1. Encourage, facilitate and follow the State’s activities for leasing and regulation of offshore wind. Specifically, the City should promptly request that an Evanston representative be the "local government official" on the expected Lake Michigan Offshore Wind Energy Advisory Council.

2. Act in harmony with residents. The City should redouble its efforts to promote awareness and foster transparent discussions.

3. Encourage and facilitate establishment of a meteorological station for obtaining data on which a developer can assess its potential energy production and revenue stream on which to finance the installation and its long term operation. This step is essential for project feasibility, now or in the future. Collaboration with other interested partners, such as Northwestern, will minimize or eliminate direct expenses by the City.

4. Identify the benefits and negative effects of an offshore wind farm. These should include environmental, social, and financial considerations that impact the City and its residents, its commitment to the Climate Action Plan, the University and local business.

5. Encourage, facilitate and follow other key studies that can sufficiently address project feasibility, including avian and other environmental concerns.

6. Identify grants, tax benefits, and other means to demonstrate to developers and lenders a favorable environment.

7. Follow other initiatives that indicate potential models for sharing leasing revenue and the ability to generate tax revenue. The current activities in Ohio may represent one of the possibilities. The City will want to have a leasing agreement, fee or other contractual mechanism for a developer to bring cables onshore and route through City rights-of-way.
8. Actively explore and select the City’s role(s) in the project, including whether the City can or should consider itself a potential direct buyer of a portion of the power produced. The role(s) chosen will drive Evanston’s participation in an RFP. An RFP would be necessary only if the City chooses its role as owner, producer or buyer of the electricity.

9. Identify master planning concepts and imminent projects that may interfere, limit or find synergy with aspects of such a wind farm installation.

10. Promptly designate a committee, board, or commission to work on the above, especially the critical aspect of role determination.

11. Explore and collaborate with potential partners in one or more of the above to minimize or eliminate direct expenses by the City. Explore potential partnerships with local governments, institutions, and other entities that may be interested in sharing costs and aggregating roles.